



UNIVERSITEIT VAN PRETORIA
UNIVERSITY OF PRETORIA
YUNIBESITHI YA PRETORIA

**EARLY RUSSIAN EVANGELICALS (1874-1929):
HISTORICAL BACKGROUND &
HERMENEUTICAL TENDENCIES
BASED ON I. V. KARGEL'S WRITTEN HERITAGE**

by

MIRIAM R. KUZNETSOVA

Submitted in fulfilment of
the requirements for the degree of

PHILOSOPHIAE DOCTOR

In the Faculty of Theology
Department of Church History

University of Pretoria

Pretoria

December 2009

PROMOTER:

PROF. DR. J. W. HOFMEYR

ABSTRACT

The author is going to argue that Russian evangelical bodies – Stundists, Baptists, Pashkovites, Mennonite Brethren, and Evangelical Christians – had their origins in Western piety; likewise Molokans – in Russian Orthodox piety. Biblical piety became the key factor which united these otherwise different movements. I. V. Kargel’s life was a crossroad of these influences. Having become a key figure among Russian evangelicals Kargel actually embodied many features of these movements long before they united historically. Thus, his writing would qualify as a good source for studying Russian evangelical hermeneutics.

The hypothesis for this study is that since Russian evangelicals were primarily pietistic at their roots, their theological hermeneutic is expected to be of pietistic and devotional nature. This means that Scripture would have prime authority. Personal and group studies of the Bible would be carried with the purpose of believers’ edification. The Holy Spirit would be expected to use the pages of Scripture to speak directly to the believers. There would not be much theologizing but rather a desire to “live Christ” in practical life.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First of all I am grateful to God Almighty, the giver of life and the Word. To Him be the glory and praise!

I'd like to express my gratitude to Prof. Dr. J. W. Hofmeyr who kept encouraging and supporting my work when it seemed that it would never be finished.

I am thankful to Prof. Dr. J. G. van der Watt, who inspired my work on this dissertation in the first place and provided a unique opportunity to study theology in Pretoria.

I am thankful to the "Bridge to Russia" for helping in many different ways while my studies at the UP.

There is a special note of thanks to Ms. Thea Heckroodt of the Academic Information Service at the library of the University of Pretoria for her helpful suggestions with the research.

I feel deep gratitude towards my former GRBS professors—Dr. Grier, Dr. Hoch, Prof. Crawford, and others—who first piqued my interest in studying theology. I also admire the work of M. S. Karetnikova, who continues to search for, gather, and publish Kargel's writings.

I am greatly indebted to my family: my godly parents who taught me to love God, His Church, and His Word, in spite of the atheistic environment of Soviet Russia in the years of my childhood and youth; my husband Victor, who supported, understood, and was extremely patient all the time I had to spend in libraries and in front of the computer; and finally my three sons, Andrew, Alexey, and Timothy, who were born and nurtured during my work on the dissertation and who had no choice but to share their mother with her studies.

Last, but not least, I am indebted to Mary Wooten, a dear friend who agreed to proofread my broken English text.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	2
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	3
TABLE OF CONTENTS	4
ABBREVIATIONS	10
TABLE OF TRANSLITERATIONS USED IN THIS PAPER.....	11
GLOSSARY	12
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION.....	13
1.1 The Need for this Study	13
1.2 The Purpose of this Study	14
1.3 The Scope of this Study.....	15
1.3.1 The period of the time under consideration	15
1.3.2 Varieties of Russian evangelicalism.....	15
1.4 The Design of the Study: Brief Description of the Chapters.....	17
1.5 Bibliographic Foreword on the History of Russian Evangelicalism.....	18
1.5.1 Sources on the Russian Evangelical Movement	19
1.5.2 Pre-Revolutionary Orthodox literature.....	21
1.5.3 Post revolutionary period	25
1.5.4 Foreign literature	26
1.5.5 Periodicals.....	28
1.5.6 Memoirs	29
1.5.7 Fiction	31
1.5.8 Recent Studies of the Subject.....	33
1.6 The Research Problems	34
CHAPTER TWO: METHODOLOGICAL STRATEGY.....	36
2.1 History	36
2.1.1 Philosophy of History: Definition and Epistemological Basis for Historical Studies	36
2.1.2 History and Objectivity: Canons of Evidence and Truth	38
2.1.3 The Author's Presuppositions	42
2.2 Hermeneutics	43
CHAPTER THREE: BACKGROUND AND INFLUENCES	46
3.1 Historical Context.....	46
3.1.1 Socio-Political conditions	46
3.1.2 The monopoly of the Russian Orthodox Church	49
3.1.3 Publishing the Bible in Russian Vernacular.....	57
3.1.4 Evangelical movements in nineteenth century Russia	61



3.1.4.1 Molokans	63
3.1.4.2 Stundists.....	66
3.1.4.3 Baptists.....	72
3.1.4.4 Pashkovites	76
3.1.4.5 Mennonite Brethren	79
3.1.5 Conclusion	82
3.2 Foreign Evangelical Influences.....	85
3.2.1 Movements.....	85
3.2.1.1 General tendencies in British evangelicalism by 1870s...87	
3.2.1.2 The Brethren movement.....	91
3.2.1.3 Keswick influence	101
3.2.2 Preachers and Missionaries, their Theological Roots and Influences	104
3.2.2.1 Lord Radstock (1833-1913).....	104
3.2.2.2 Dr. Baedeker (1823-1906).....	119
3.2.2.3 Otto Stockmayer (1838-1917)	125
3.2.2.4 George Müller (1805-1898)	127
3.2.2.5 Reginald Radcliffe	132
3.2.2.6 Jessie Penn-Lewis (1861-1927)	134
3.2.3 Conclusion	136
CHAPTER FOUR: RUSSIAN EVANGELICALS (1874-1929). A HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE	138
4.1 The Rise and the Initial Stage of the Evangelical Movement in St. Petersburg (1874-1884)	138
4.1.1 The First Converts among the Upper Class	138
4.1.1.1 Prominent Women.....	139
4.1.1.2 Colonel Pashkov (1831-1902)	151
4.1.1.3 Count Korff (1842-1933).....	168
4.1.1.4 Count Bobrinskiy (1826-1890).....	172
4.1.2 <i>Domus Ecclesiae</i> —Social Setting for Establishing a Church	175
4.1.2.1 St. Petersburg’s Mansions as Church Meeting Halls.....	176
4.1.2.2 Social Makeup of the Church – Crossroads of Upper and Lower Classes.....	179
4.1.2.3 Theological and Practical Peculiarities of the Church in St. Petersburg.....	183

4.1.2.4 Philanthropy and Evangelism	192
4.1.2.5 Publishing activity	197
4.1.2.6 Attempts to Unite Different Evangelical Groups.....	202
4.1.3 Conclusion	210
4.2 The Development of the Evangelical Movement under Social Pressure (1884-1905)	216
4.2.1 Persecution and Survival of the Movement.....	218
4.2.2 House churches without Pashkov and Korff.....	221
4.2.3 Change of Social and Theological Makeup.....	224
4.2.4 I. V. Kargel's Role and Activity	231
4.2.5 Conclusion	232
4.3 The Growth of the Evangelical Movement during the Revolutionary and World War I Period (1905-1917).....	233
4.3.1 The Edicts of 1905-1906 and their Effect on Religious Freedom	234
4.3.2 Further Relationships between Evangelical Christians and Baptists	240
4.3.3 Increase of Social Pressure before and during World War I	243
4.3.4 New Evangelical Leaders in St. Petersburg and Their Input	246
4.3.4.1 Ivan Stepanovich Prokhanov (1869-1935)	246
4.3.4.2 Willam Fetler (1883-1957)	252
4.3.4.3 Pavel Nikolaevich Nikolaii (1860-1919)	253
4.3.5 Conclusion	254
4.4 "Golden Age" of the Russian Evangelicals (1917-1927).....	256
4.4.1 Some Statistics	258
4.4.2 Relations with the Orthodox	260
4.4.3 Relations to the State: Political Involvement and the Issue of Military Service	262
4.4.4 Theological Education and Publications.....	268
4.4.5 Persecution and Closing the Evangelical and Baptist Unions	270
4.4.6 Conclusion	272
CHAPTER FIVE: STUDY OF VITAL ASPECTS IN THE THEOLOGICAL HERMENEUTICS OF IVAN VENIAMINOVICH KARGEL (1849-1937)	274
5.1 Kargel's Biographical Data in the Context of the Russian Evangelical Movement	274

5.1.1 Kargel's background and the early years: Influence of Russian Baptists	275
5.1.2 Kargel's studies: influence of German Baptists	278
5.1.3 Kargel in St. Petersburg: from "a German Baptist Pastor" to a Pashkovite leader	282
5.1.4 Kargel and Dr. Baedeker: Brethren Influence	295
5.1.5 Back to St. Petersburg: Kargel and Prokhanov – two evangelical leaders	299
5.1.6 Late Years.....	305
5.1.7 Conclusion	312
5.2 Brief Review of Kargel's Written Theological Heritage.....	313
5.2.1 Confession of faith	314
5.2.2 Theological works	316
5.2.2.1 Svet iz teni budushchikh blag [The Reflection of Glories to Come].....	316
5.2.2.2 Vetkhozavetnye proobrazy [Old Testament types]	317
5.2.2.3 V kakom ty otnoshenii k Dukhu Svyatomu? [Where do you stand in your relationship to the Holy Spirit?]	318
5.2.2.4 Gde, po Pisaniyu, nakhodyatsya mertvye [Where are the dead according to the Scripture]	319
5.2.2.5 Khristos osvyashchenie nashe [Christ is our sanctification]	320
5.2.2.6 "Se, gryadu skoro..." ["Lo, I am coming soon..."]	321
5.2.2.7 Grekh kak zlo vsekh zol v etom mire [Sin as the greatest evil in the world]	322
5.2.2.8 Izliyanie Dukha Svyatogo i pyatidesyatnicheskoe dvizhenie [The outpouring of the Holy Spirit and the Pentecostal movement].....	323
5.2.3 Commentaries.....	325
5.2.3.1 Tolkovatel' Otkroveniya svyatogo Ioanna Bogoslova [Interpretation of the Revelation of St. John]	325
5.2.3.2 Zakon Dukha zhizni: Tolkovanie glav 5,6,7,8 Poslaniya svyatogo apostola Pavla k Rimlyanam [The law of the Spirit of life: Commentary of the chapters 5,6,7,8 of the Epistle of Saint Apostle Paul to the Romans].....	326
5.2.4 Lectures	327



5.2.5 Sermons and discourses.....	330
5.2.6 Letters	332
5.2.7 Conclusion	335
5.3 Inductive study of Kargel’s hermeneutics	337
5.3.1 Case study 1. Based on a section from the book, "Where do you stand in your relationship to the Holy Spirit"	340
5.3.1.1 Biblical pattern of promise and fulfilment	341
5.3.1.2 Apocalyptic approach	342
5.3.1.3 “Latter rain” expectations	344
5.3.1.4 Importance of application.....	345
5.3.1.5 View of the Scripture and its study	346
5.3.1.6 Immediacy of the scriptural message	348
5.3.2 Case study 2. Based on the book “Christ is our sanctification”	350
5.3.2.1 Scripture as the Word of God	351
5.3.2.2 The role of the Holy Spirit and studying the text.....	352
5.3.2.3 Scripture and doctrinal matters.....	354
5.3.2.4 Personal searching of the Scriptures.....	357
5.3.2.5 Obedience as a prerequisite for understanding	360
5.3.2.6 Continuity between the Testaments	363
5.3.2.7 Extra scriptural revelations	365
5.3.2.8 Conclusion.....	366
5.3.3 Case study 3. Based on “Sin as the greatest evil in this world”	367
5.3.4 Case study 4. Based on “The Reflection of Glories to Come”	368
5.3.4.1 Christological approach	371
5.3.4.2 Continuing Brethren tradition of the interpretation of Pentateuch	372
5.3.4.3 The usage of typology	374
5.3.4.4 Conclusion.....	377
5.4 Theological Presuppositions in Kargel’s Hermeneutics	378
5.4.1 Scripture and the Holy Spirit	378
5.4.1.1 Inspiration and Inerrancy	378
5.4.1.2 Illumination by the Holy Spirit	381



5.4.1.3 Scriptural Authority	384
5.5 Pietism as the main “root” of Kargel’s hermeneutical strategy	386
5.5.1 Is it legitimate to call Russian evangelicals Pietists?	386
5.5.2 Four features of Pietism	387
5.5.3 Kargel’s hermeneutics of Pietism	392
5.5.4 Critique of pietistic hermeneutics	395
5.5.5 Common ground for understanding: A word in defence of Kargel’s hermeneutical approach	396
5.5.6 Conclusion	398
CHAPTER SIX: SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	403
6.1 Summary of the Discussion	403
6.2 Kargel’s hermeneutical guidelines	410
6.3 The Contribution of this Study	411
6.4 The Prospect for Further Study	412
BIBLIOGRAPHY	414
Sources and Literature	414
Articles	428
Dictionaries and encyclopaedias	431
Electronic Sources	432
Archival Sources	434
Primary Sources on CDs	434
APPENDIX	435
Table 1	435
Table 2	457
Table 3	500
Table 4	523

ABBREVIATIONS

AUCECB – All-Union Congress of Evangelical Christians-Baptists;

BFBS – the British and Foreign Bible Society;

ECB – Evangelical Christians-Baptists;

GPU – State Political Administration (the Soviet secret police from 1922 to 1923);

FSB – Russian Federal Security Service, founded in 1995.

KGB – the Committee for State Security (the former Soviet secret police, founded in 1954);

M. – Moscow;

MVD – Ministry of State Security; the Soviet secret police from 1946 to 1954;

NKVD – People's Commissariat of Internal Affairs (the Soviet secret police from 1934 to 1943: the police from 1943-46);

OGPU – the Soviet police and secret police from 1923 to 1934;

RBS – the Russian Bible Society;

SPb. – St. Petersburg, Russia's capital from 1712 to 1914;

SESER – the Society for the Encouragement of Spiritual and Ethical Reading, sometimes referred to as “the Society”;

USSR – Union of Soviet Socialist Republics



TABLE OF TRANSLITERATIONS USED IN THIS PAPER

A – A

Б – B

B – V

Г – G

Д – D

Е – E

Ё – YO

Ж – ZH

З – Z

И – I

Й – Y

К – K

Л – L

М – M

Н – N

О – O

П – P

Р – R

С – S

Т – T

У – U

Ф – F

Х – KH

Ц – TS

Ч – CH

Ш – SH

Щ – SHCH

Ь – ‘

Ы – Y

Ъ – “

Э – E

Ю – YU

Я – YA

GLOSSARY

chief procurator (<i>ober-prokuror</i>)	Chief lay official of the Orthodox Church in Russia, appointed by the emperor
colportage (<i>knigonoshy</i>)	The book-carriers who walked thousands of miles distributing Bibles across Russia
diocese (<i>eparkhiya</i>)	Main administrative unit of the Orthodox Church and usually identical to the province
district (<i>uezd</i>)	Subdivision of diocese and province
disfranchised person (<i>lishenets</i>)	A Soviet citizen deprived of elective rights and food cards (up to 1936)
Edict (<i>ukaz</i>)	A law or regulation issued by a tsar or his government
Living Church (<i>Zhivaia tserkov'</i>)	Extremely liberal clerical organization formed in the early 1920s that collaborated with the Bolsheviks
Old Belief (<i>staroobryadchestvo</i>)	Religious movement of Orthodox dissenters in the seventeenth century
province (<i>gubernia</i>)	Main administrative unit in civil administration
renovationists (<i>obnovlentsy</i>)	Liberal clergy who since early 1900s demanded radical reform in the Orthodox Church

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

1.1 The Need for this Study

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

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

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

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

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

1.2 The Purpose of this Study

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

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

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

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

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

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

1.3 The Scope of this Study

1.3.1 The period of the time under consideration

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

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

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

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

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

1.3.2 Varieties of Russian evangelicalism

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1.5 Bibliographic Foreword on the History of Russian Evangelicalism

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

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

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

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

1.5.1 Sources on the Russian Evangelical Movement

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1.5.2 Pre-Revolutionary Orthodox literature

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1.5.3 Post revolutionary period

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

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

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

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

1.5.4 Foreign literature

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1.5.5 Periodicals

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1.5.6 Memoirs

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1.5.7 Fiction

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1.5.8 Recent Studies of the Subject

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1.6 The Research Problems

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

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

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

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

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

CHAPTER TWO: METHODOLOGICAL STRATEGY

2.1 History

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

2.1.2 History and Objectivity: Canons of Evidence and Truth

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

2.1.3 The Author's Presuppositions

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

2.2 Hermeneutics

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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.¹⁴ 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.

¹⁴ 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 Church¹⁵ 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

¹⁵ 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".¹⁶ 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

¹⁶ 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".¹⁷ 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".¹⁸ 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

¹⁷ Vernadsky, *A Source Book*, 1:256, in Kazemzadeh 1999:235.

¹⁸ 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'.¹⁹ 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

¹⁹ 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 missionaries²⁰ and in his turn carried on his missionary work for thirty years on extremely small support and travelled as

²⁰ 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.²¹

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.

²¹ 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.²² The “tradition” to invite German Mennonite, Reformed, and Lutheran colonists continued during the following reigns of Paul I and Alexander I.²³ 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

²² 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).

²³ 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.²⁴ 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

²⁴ 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.²⁵ 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

²⁵ 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).

Ratushnyy²⁶, 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).

²⁶ 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.²⁷

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,²⁸ 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

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

²⁸ 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)²⁹ – 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.³⁰ 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 seminary³¹ which was being organized by Oncken (Savinsky 1999:135). This training institute, created for lay evangelists, later evolved into a seminary.³² 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

²⁹ 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.

³⁰ 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).

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

³² *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.³³

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).³⁴

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,

³³ *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.³⁵ 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 1874.³⁶ A few months later V. A. Pashkov, a

³⁴ 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.

³⁵ 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).

³⁶ 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.³⁷

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).

³⁷ "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. Wieler³⁸ 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.³⁹

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

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

³⁹ 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).⁴⁰

⁴⁰ 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,⁴¹ 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

⁴¹ 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. Darby⁴² (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.⁴³

⁴² 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 Brethren⁴⁴, 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” principles⁴⁵ 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

⁴³ Ironside, *A Historical Sketch*, p. 27, in Hagan 1975:349.

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

⁴⁵ 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”.⁴⁶ 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.⁴⁷

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).

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

⁴⁷ 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).

Randall⁴⁸ 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

⁴⁸ 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”.⁴⁹ 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 interpretation⁵⁰ 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.⁵¹ 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,

⁴⁹ *Collected Writings of J. N. Darby*, in Hagan 1975:358.

⁵⁰ 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).

⁵¹ 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.⁵² They recognized no special membership. "That they belonged to Christ was the only term of communion . . . In principle, it embraced

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

all whose faith and walk showed that they had spiritual life”.⁵³ 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 69th and 70th “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 70th 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

⁵³ 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 Brethren⁵⁴, 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 speaker⁵⁵ 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

⁵⁴ 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 Alliance⁵⁶ 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.⁵⁷ 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;

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

⁵⁶ 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).

⁵⁷ 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.⁵⁸ 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

⁵⁸ 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.⁵⁹

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).

⁵⁹ 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.⁶⁰

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).

⁶⁰ 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.⁶¹

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,

⁶¹ 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 salvation⁶² 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

⁶² 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”.⁶³ Korff commented later in his life, “I was struck by his devotion to Christ and full conviction of the Bible’s inspiration”.⁶⁴ 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

⁶³ Trotter, *Lord Radstock*, 102, in Nichols 1991:86.

⁶⁴ 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.⁶⁵

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 mystical⁶⁶ 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.⁶⁷ 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:

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

⁶⁶ 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.

⁶⁷ 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.⁶⁸

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

⁶⁸ 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.⁶⁹ 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.

⁶⁹ 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).⁷⁰ This ministry certainly helped to strengthen the ties between the Pashkovites and other evangelicals. Baedeker also laboured among the

⁷⁰ 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.⁷¹

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.⁷²

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

⁷¹ McGee. Online. 25 June 2009; Moreshead. Online. 25 June 2009.

⁷² Healing and Revival. Online. 25 June 2009; Longman. Online. 25 June 2009.

were sick” and “Himself took our infirmities and bare our sicknesses”.⁷³

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.”⁷⁴

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.⁷⁵ Along with the teaching of divine healing, Stockmayer had great interest in the area of “things to come”.⁷⁶ 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”.⁷⁷ Ada von

⁷³ Gordon. Online. 25 June 2009.

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

⁷⁵ Healing and Revival. Online. 25 June 2009.

⁷⁶ Moreshead. Online. 25 June 2009.

⁷⁷ 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".⁷⁸

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

⁷⁸ Krusenstjerna, *Im Kreuz*, 182, in Corrado 2000:111.

those of Groves⁷⁹ 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).

⁷⁹ 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".⁸⁰ 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",⁸¹ 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.⁸² 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.⁸³ 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.⁸⁴

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

⁸⁰ Korff, *Am Zarenhof*, 31, in Corrado 2000:108.

⁸¹ Ignatev, 187, in Corrado 2000:107.

⁸² 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.

⁸³ Gutsche, 60, in Corrado 2000:114.

⁸⁴ 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".⁸⁵

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".⁸⁶

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

⁸⁵ Müller, 545, in Corrado 2000:108.

⁸⁶ 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.⁸⁷

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.⁸⁸

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.⁸⁹

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.⁹⁰ 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.⁹¹ As for

⁸⁷ White F H, in Poole-Connor. Online. 27 June 2009.

⁸⁸ Poole-Connor. Online. 27 June 2009.

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

⁹⁰ Toon and Smout. Online. 27 June 2009.

⁹¹ 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.⁹² 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.⁹³ 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.⁹⁴ 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

⁹² Wikipedia, "Jessie Penn-Lewis". Online. 27 June 2009.

⁹³ Ibid.

⁹⁴ 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".⁹⁵

Penn-Lewis travelled worldwide, taking her message to people in Russia, Scandinavia, Canada, Switzerland, the USA, and India.⁹⁶ 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",⁹⁷ 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".⁹⁸ 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

⁹⁵ Garrard. Online. 27 June 2009.

⁹⁶ Wikipedia, "Jessie Penn-Lewis". Online. 27 June 2009; Garrard. Online. 27 June 2009.

⁹⁷ Penn-Lewis, 10, in Corrado 2000:112.

⁹⁸ 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.⁹⁹ 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.¹⁰⁰

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.¹⁰¹

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

⁹⁹ Wikipedia, “Jessie Penn-Lewis”. Online. 27 June 2009.

¹⁰⁰ McGee. Online. 25 June 2009.

¹⁰¹ 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.

CHAPTER FOUR: RUSSIAN EVANGELICALS (1874-1929). A HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

4.1 The Rise and the Initial Stage of the Evangelical Movement in St. Petersburg (1874-1884)

4.1.1 The First Converts among the Upper Class

It has been already mentioned that a series of conversions among the upper class took place soon after Radstock's arrival in St. Petersburg. One of the first men converted was Colonel V. A. Pashkov, a future leader of the movement. Almost immediately the largest evangelical meetings were held in Pashkov's and N. Lieven's grand mansions. The revival had started.

Besides Pashkov, there were several famous aristocratic names among Radstock's followers: Madame Chertkova, Count Korff, Princess Lieven and her sister Princess Gagarina, Madame Peuker, Countess Ignateva, Count Bobrinskiy, Baron Nikolai, Count Shcherbinin, Madam Zassetskaya as well as such noble families as the Shuvalovs, Peylens, Golitsyns, Chicherins, and even a family of one of the great princesses (Heier 2002:62-63). This impressive list of names and titles is not comprehensive.

These people formed the core of the new evangelical group in St. Petersburg. This was a stream of genuinely Russian evangelicalism because, although influenced by some foreigners, it had Russian leadership, it consisted of and for Russian people; the services after Radstock's departure were conducted in the Russian language. Although the participants of the movement did not come up with a name for themselves, the outsiders first called those believers Radstockists and then, a few years later, Pashkovites. After all, Radstock had spent very little time in St. Petersburg.

The author will attempt to describe briefly those who were converted under Radstock's ministry and who soon became active in the movement. Since it was upper class ladies who first responded to Radstock's preaching, the author will start with them.

4.1.1.1 Prominent Women

Neither secular nor ecclesiastical Russia of the second half of the nineteenth century left much room for women's activity outside the home. The situation was slowly changing by the turn of the century when women started to gain access to higher education, jobs, etc. From the very beginning the Radstockist-Pashkovite movement was strongly characterised by active participation of women. It actually started with women who invited Lord Radstock to St. Petersburg and opened their homes for his preaching. His meetings "were disproportionately both attended and hosted by women" (Corrado 2000:56). Leskov argues that it was due to Chertkova's activity that Radstock had such warm welcome among the aristocracy of St. Petersburg (Leskov 1877:286). It was also women who provided a link between Pashkovite group and the Evangelical-Christian congregation after the male leaders were exiled out of Russia.¹⁰²

Among the most active Pashkovites who were at the heart of the movement were two sets of sisters. Madames Chertkova and Pashkova were born in the family of Count Chernyshev-Kruglikov, a hero of the Patriotic War of 1812. He belonged to the Orthodox Church, and so did both of his daughters (Leskov 1877:278; Kovalenko 1996:72). Princesses Natalie Lieven and Vera Gagarina were daughters of Count von Pahlen. Their palaces, situated next to each other in Morskaya Street, were among the first homes to be opened to the evangelical meetings of Radstock.

Madame Chertkova (1834-1923)

Madame Elizaveta Chertkova, "the main Radstokian lady" (Leskov 1877:268), was the wife of the General Adjutant to Tsar Alexander II. She was one of those who first invited Radstock to St. Petersburg after she had met him abroad, heard his sermons, and decided that he was a man much needed in Russia (Karev 1999:129). The purpose of her trip to Europe in 1872 was to seek consolation after the death of her two youngest sons. Her son Misha was being brought up by a pietistic Lutheran governor. When dying he tried to

¹⁰² One should remember that at basically all stages of the evangelical movement in Russia the number of women (normally addressed as "sisters") in the churches surpassed the number of men (normally addressed as "brothers").

convince his mother to believe the gospel. This made such an impression on her that she gave up her social life at the court and went abroad looking for a form of Christianity which could quench her spiritual thirst. She visited protestant churches in England and Germany, but it was only when she heard Lord Radstock preach in a small gathering in Switzerland that she found what she wanted (Prokhanov 1993:54-55; Karev 1995:129).

According to Kovalenko, she returned to St. Petersburg a born-again Christian and started giving generously to the work of charity (Kovalenko 1996:70). Even Leskov noticed that she came back to Russia “a completely different person, more secure” and immediately offered a large sum of money to establish a shelter for homeless (Leskov 1877:283). Soon she invited Radstock to St. Petersburg and introduced him to her high ranking friends. Her home was among the five original homes opened to regular evangelical meetings. The others belonged to Princesses Lieven and Gagarina, Colonel Pashkov, and Count Bobrinskiy (Karev 1999:130).

Years later when the other homes stopped holding evangelical meetings for various reasons, hers continued functioning as a church for almost forty years until about 1912 when Dom Evangeliya was completed, the church building project that she personally and generously supported. She was a “member” there till the end of her life. She also wholeheartedly supported Pastor Fetler’s evangelistic work from the time of his arrival to St. Petersburg in 1907 until his banishment in 1915 (Kovalenko 1995. Online).

In her memoirs S. Lieven pointed out that “Chertkova was pietistic by nature and followed the church’s [Orthodox] rituals for a long time. Little by little she realised that new wine is not to be poured into old wineskins” (Lieven 1967:42). She was commended by Leskov for “exemplary holiness of her private life”. Although Leskov did not speak favourably of the movement in general, he made an exception for Chertkova, “She is considered an example of strict honesty, free of any suspicions like a Caesar’s wife . . . In spite of her straightforwardness and boiling activity, she is completely clean of any censures” (Leskov 1877:277-278).

Her “boiling activity” was mostly revealed in the areas of philanthropy and evangelism (Leskov 1877:277, 283). Along with other Pashkovites she was active with sewing and laundry shops, also used as an evangelistic tools (Lieven 1967:47-48). Besides, Madame Chertkova used to evangelize in the

Voronezhskaya gubernia (Ornatsky 1903:9). The result of her work was that in Perly, Ostrogozhky uezd, a congregation of evangelical Christians appeared (AUCECB 1989:104) after one of the peasants started gathering “sectarians” in his home to read Gospel and sing “Favourite Verses” (Terletsky 1891:81). S. Lieven also recalled that Chertkova sometimes “participated in the ministry of the word” (Lieven 1967:112), a common Russian evangelical idiom for preaching.

Along with her friends and relatives Madame Chertkova got involved in prison visitation. She was a member of the Lady’s Committee for Prison Visitation. S. Lieven recorded two accounts of how Chertkova kept coming to a prison hospital to read to the prisoners from the gospel and «gained souls of dying people» (Lieven 1967:37-42). It was through her ministry that a sailor-nurse Shilov who was considering a suicide got saved and later became a presbyter of the Evangelical Christian church in Dom Evangeliya (Kovalenko. Online. 15 August 2005).

Her oldest son Vladimir was of one of Tolstoy’s closest associates. He and his wife were active defending dissenters – Old Believers, Dukhobors, Molokans, Stundists, Baptists, Pashkovites – who were persecuted by the Orthodox Church and Autocracy.¹⁰³

According to Karev, Chertkova had a prominent place among the founders and first leaders of Stundism in the North of Russia (Karev 1999:130).

Princess Natalie Lieven

Another active Pashkovite lady who opened her home for evangelical meetings was Princess N. Lieven. In the words of Brandenburg, the palace of Prince and Princess Lieven became “a focal point of the evangelical movement in St. Petersburg” (Brandenburg 1977:25).

The Lievens, who were a Protestant family, were considered one of the oldest noble families of the Baltic. According to tradition they descended from the first Livonian chief who was baptised soon after 1200. In the eighteenth century Catherine the Great called the wife of General von Lieven from Estonia to act as a tutor to her grandchildren, among whom were the future tsars

¹⁰³ Foreword to the collection of materials by Bonch-Bruevich “Presledovaniya Baptistov” Paris 1902, in Kovalenko. Online. 15 August 2005.

Alexander I and Nicholas I. Since then, and particularly from the reign of Alexander I, the von Lieven family remained close to the imperial court and held high positions. Count Lieven, a curator of Dorpat University, was among the friends of Golitsyn, who promoted the translation and printing of the Bible during the reign of Alexander I. He had tried to put men of the German revival movement into the theological faculty there, in order to overcome the rationalism which was prevailing in the Baltic lands at the time. Indeed, “this family was a witness to the biblical gospel in Russia for a hundred years” and became a kind of traditional link for Protestant influence in St. Petersburg (Brandenburg 1977:25, 30, 103-104).

Princess N. Lieven and her husband, the Master of Ceremonies at the court of Alexander II, were converted in England prior to Radstock’s visit to St. Petersburg (Nichols 1991:22). Before her marriage, Natalie Lieven visited England with her mother. There she found out about meetings in Blackwood's home. She went out of curiosity, but “the Word of God touched her heart and by faith she received forgiveness of sins and redemption in the blood of Jesus” (Lieven 1967:15-16). This happened around 1870 (Savinsky 1999:142).

Once the revival in St. Petersburg started, the Lievens’ home was opened to meetings not only on Sundays but also during the week. The meetings were usually held in the spacious white drawing room (Latimer 1908:79). S. Lieven recalled that, “Our guests often admired our house and my mother used to tell them, 'This house belongs to the Lord, I am nothing but Christ's servant'” (Lieven 1967:69). Chertkova commented on N. Lieven's devotion to Christ saying that, “I never met a person who would so fully without hesitation in all actions first of all seek the Lord's glory” (Lieven 1967:114). The Lieven household also held 8:30 a.m. devotions in which believers from among servants were present as well (Corrado 2000:85).

N. Lieven became a widow in 1881 when her husband died soon after his beloved monarch Alexander II was assassinated by revolutionary terrorists. N. Lieven had to raise her five children alone (Lieven 1967:67). Lieven paid special attention to bringing her children up “in faith” and in understanding the importance of conversion. The conversion experience was one of the hallmarks of the movement and her daughter Sophia’s conversion can serve as a good example. Sophia’s spiritual turning point took place at the age of fourteen after her mother inquired about her spiritual condition with the following words, “Do

you have the Holy Spirit?” (Lieven 1967:107). A year later she confronted her daughter regarding her unregenerate behaviour and suggested she pray.

My mother’s prayer struck me. For the first time I realised what real prayer was . . . I suddenly realised that my mother was actually talking to God about me . . . I knew what I was expected to do, to ask first for God’s forgiveness, and then for N. V.’s, but my whole being was against it . . . However God’s grace prevailed . . . Only after I knelt down I felt the deepness of my sinfulness . . . then for the first time I realised the greatness and mercy of Christ’s sacrifice on the Calvary. I would not dare to approach God so great and holy, but then I saw the cross of Christ . . . As soon as I started praying, the burden fell off and I received inner assurance that I was forgiven and accepted by the Lord . . . This was a decisive hour in my life . . . Both of my sisters experienced something similar, and when in the autumn we returned to the city we were full of desire to serve the Lord (Lieven 1967:108-110).

N. Lieven’s son Anatoliy was highly respected among Protestant Christians and in 1909 he was elected as the chairman of the Russian Evangelical Union (AUCECB 1989:154).

The palace at Bolshaya Morskaya 43 was functioning not only as a church but also as a hotel for preachers. N. Lieven served with her home, inviting Radstock, Baedeker, Müller, and others to stay with her family as guests. Many of Baedeker’s meetings, as well as those of G. Müller, were held in her house (Latimer 1908:9). The room usually set apart for the use of Dr. Baedeker was known as Malachite Hall. “This was the ‘prophet’s chamber,’ and many honoured servants of the Lord have enjoyed the hospitality provided by the noble hostess in that beautiful room, among others Mr. and Mrs. Müller” (Latimer 1908:79).

A number of outstanding men preached the gospel in this palace. Besides Radstock, Baedeker, and Müller, there were Stockmayer, Kargel, Fetler, Prokhanov, Nikolaii, Mazaev, and Odintsov, quite a mixture of Open Brethren, Keswick speakers, Russian evangelicals and Baptists. Baedeker and his wife, as well as Kargel and his wife and their four daughters, stayed there for extensive periods of time. The delegates of the 1884 and 1907 congresses had both sessions and meals there; Lieven also housed the six-week Bible courses for young preachers.¹⁰⁴ Princess Lieven’s palace at Bolshaya Morskaya 43 remained the centre of evangelical meetings for over 30 years, long after the first leaders of the movement were exiled. Savinsky must be mistaken when

¹⁰⁴ Pavlov 1884?:28-29; Prokhanov 1993:125; Kovalenko Online. 15 August 2005.

writing that the meetings in her home stopped in the mid-1890s when she was forced to leave the country (Savinsky 1999:354). Kahle is closer to the truth, dating the end of the meetings in Lieven's palace as late as 1910 (Kahle 1978:83).

However, N. Lieven did much more for the movement than just open her home for meetings and guests. After Pashkov and Korff's banishment in 1884 she basically assumed leadership of the meetings held in her palace. Princess Lieven was reported to the tsar Alexander III, and was told to stop meetings, with the threat of exile. Her famous response was, "Ask His Majesty whom I have to obey, God or Emperor." Alexander III supposedly responded, "She is a widow; leave her in peace", so the meetings in her home continued for many more years (Fountain 1988:40; Lieven 1967:68).

N. Lieven did a lot to preserve the original identity of the Pashkovite movement. Although she was among those Pashkovites who decided to get baptized by Müller in 1883 (Savinsky 1999:354), at the meetings in her home believer's baptism was never a condition of having fellowship or sharing the Lord's Supper with those who held to infant baptism. Nichols thinks that "Lieven's ministry was crucial to the survival of the Evangelical Christians in Russia" (Nichols 1991:24).

When all the male leadership was removed, her leadership successfully fended off the aggressive Baptist doctrine. The Baptists attempted to take leadership of the Bible studies by asserting their doctrines, which were more restrictive and prohibitive than the Pashkovites'. Princess Lieven, in keeping with Colonel Pashkov's teaching, maintained an open fellowship in her home (Nichols 1991:22-23).

Nichols' statement holds some truth, but it seems to be an exaggeration. If one considers a list of guests and speakers at Bolshaya Morskaya 43, it becomes clear that Baptists were welcomed there along with other evangelicals. Nichols rightly calls Lieven's palace "the incubator for many of the future leaders of the Evangelical movement". Among those future leaders he mentions Prokhanov, radio evangelist Earl Poysti, and student leader Baron Nicolaii (Nichols 1991:23). Strangely enough, in his dissertation Nichols does not mention Kargel who was very close to Lieven's family and played an extremely important role in the history of the congregation that held meetings in Lieven's palace.

Madame Pashkova

Madame Pashkova, Alexandra Ivanovna, is best known as E. Chertkova's sister and Pashkov's wife. She came to believe in "the pietistic gospel" when she met Radstock in England (Nichols 1991:41). Later she became instrumental in introducing her husband, a future leader of the Pashkovite movement, to Lord Radstock.

Lord Radstock was a regular guest in the Pashkov's home in St. Petersburg (Nichols 1991:41; Corrado 2000:41). At first Colonel Pashkov tried to avoid Radstock, but upon returning from his Moscow estate he could no longer do so as Radstock was to dine in his home. As usual the dinner was followed by Radstock's sermon and prayer. Pashkov listened patiently as Radstock made comments about the book of Romans (Nichols 1991:41), seemingly one of Radstock's favourite books. It was Radstock's prayer that deeply impressed Pashkov (AUCECB 1989:83). During the prayer Pashkov experienced something that changed his life for good. He afterwards declared, "It was as if a ray from heaven . . . shot through my breast. I arose from my knees, ran into my bedroom, and gave myself to God" (Latimer 1908:82).

Along with Madame Chertkova and Countess Gagarina, Madame Pashkova participated in running sewing rooms for poor girls in St. Petersburg (Lieven 1967:47-52). She also actively participated in musical ministry at the meetings in her home. Mrs Pashkova frequently played the organ while her three daughters sang during the meetings in their palace (Lieven 1967:18; Nichols 1991:42).

Princess Vera Gagarina

Princess Vera Gagarina was a sister of Princess N. Lieven. At the time of the St. Petersburg revival she was a young, pretty, happily married, rich woman who had everything that a person could wish for. She got converted at Radstock's meeting being struck by the verse in Genesis 3, where God addressed Adam with the words, "Where are you?" At the end of the meeting Lord Radstock said he had a feeling that somebody among those present should give oneself to Christ or maybe had already done so. He asked that person to stand up and Gagarina did so. Since then even her appearance changed. S. Lieven recalled that Gagarina "began to dress simply and

modestly, though with good taste". She undertook hospital and prison visitation reading the Word of God to the sick and imprisoned. For the rest of her life she was known for her generosity toward the poor and for her zeal in spreading the Word of God" (Lieven 1967:34-36). Gagarina was also responsible for two sewing rooms (Lieven 1967:48). Together with Konstanza Kozlyaninova, Princess Gagarina oversaw visitation of poor women in the Pesky district.¹⁰⁵

During summer time Pashkov's cousin, Gagarina, along with Konstanza Kozlyaninova (both ladies were the members of SESER), used to visit Gagarina's husband's estate Sergievskoe (Tul'skaya gubernia). They took along religious literature and gathered many people both at home and at the Gagarin's school for girls. They explained the Gospel and sang hymns (Terletsky 1891:80-81). V. Gagarina's evangelistic activity in the country is described by archpriest Sakharov in this way:

Princess Gagarina, Pashkov's cousin, is the most zealous preacher of the Pashkovite falsehood in province. She diligently propagates this heresy in her Sergievsky estate, in Tula gubernia, Krapivensky uезд. She gathered listeners to her place or visited homes of her acquaintances where listeners gathered, mainly women, distributed books and brochures, etc. There were occasions when right in the middle of the village trade fair her home analogion was brought out to the market place and among loud market crowd the sonorous voice of this preacher was being heard. She argued that works did not mean anything in the matter of salvation, and a man was saved only by faith. We heard this teacher ourselves and were convinced that she was straightforward and hid nothing. "We have sinned", said the preacher during one of her talks, "we were born in sin and do not have power to gain God's forgiveness of sins by ourselves; but the Lord in His love towards us sent His only begotten Son for our salvation; He took our sins upon Himself and suffered death on the cross. So, after we are saved, we have a heavenly home prepared for us; and we will enter there. He invites and waits for you to come. He says, 'Come to me'. He wants only your faith in the Saviour who has redeemed us from sin and death"... When a peasant woman mentioned that they often address their Lady, and She, their Heavenly Mediatress, helps them, and they address also the Saints, and they intercede for them before God, the preacher noted that such prayers are useless... Then she added that, "you may if you like address our Lady or Saints but this will be of no use for your salvation" . . . After Gagarina finished with a prayer, she said that those who had heard her should not keep this to themselves but pass it on to other people so that they could also be saved (Sakharov 1897:21-23).

¹⁰⁵ Lieven, *Eine Saat*, 43, in Corrado 2000:99.

Sakharov admits that Gagarina established an excellent school in her estate and an exemplary hospital for common people, and used these establishments to spread her teaching (Sakharov 1897:23). During Gagarina's absence the meetings were held by local Pashkovite activists. The "Pashkovshchina" (Pashkovism) continued to exist in Sergievskoe even after it was forbidden on 24 May 1884 (Terletsky 1891:80-81).

Later, when Saveliy Alekseev (a future presbyter of the Second Evangelical Christian congregation in St. Petersburg) was exiled and his wife and daughter followed him to the Caucasus, their son was left with V. Gagarina who brought him up in her home (Lieven 1967:77).

Gagarina also helped with nondenominational work among students. S. Lieven recalled that when this ministry was developing V. Gagarina always remained a "proven source" of financial help (Lieven 1967:120).

Princess Catherine Galitsina

Princess Catherine Galitsina was a granddaughter of the President of the Russian Bible Society and a cousin of N. Lieven. Princess Galitsina and her two daughters came to faith through the ministry of Lord Radstock during one of his visits to St. Petersburg. She was remembered as a very gentle and soft person. She patiently endured the loss of almost all her fortune after her husband's death (Lieven 1967:50).

Princess C. Galitsina must have written memoirs because Peter Masters quotes from them when describing the beginning of St. Petersburg revival,

By Heaven's power all doors were thrown open to him [Radstock] – halls, chapels and private houses; whole crowds pressed in to hear the glad tidings. It was just after a week of religious rites that I went to see my cousin, Princess Lieven. There I met Lord Radstock, who had just arrived in St. Petersburg (Masters *Men of purpose*, 58, in Fountain 1988:22).

Like E. Chertkova, in the beginning Princess Galitsina was strongly attached to the Orthodox Church.

Catherine derived great pleasure from the pomp and splendour of the Russian Orthodox Church ritual, and she told the English lord about the emotions it stirred within her. But Radstock was not prepared to leave her trusting the shallow, emotional feelings drawn from ritualistic religion. He wanted her to know Christ, and told her how she could (Masters, 54, in Fountain 1988:22).

Searching for God she began to attend every possible meeting held by Radstock. Later she wrote, “At length, after a most blessed sermon, I remained for a private conversation and there we both knelt in prayer before the One who became my Saviour forever” (Masters, 54, in Fountain 1988:22). P. Masters points out that Princess N. Lieven soon followed her cousin in “going to Christ for forgiveness of sins and an experience of new life” (Masters, 54, in Fountain 1988:22), but he must be mistaken with chronological order, because N. Lieven had converted a few years earlier.

Later on, while in England, Galitsina visited Radstock’s home, stayed with his family, and was very impressed by Radstock’s life (Fountain 1988:51-52). Her daughters were also involved in the Pashkovite ministry, busy with the sewing room in Pesky district (Lieven 1967:50).

Countess Elena Ivanovna Shuvalova

Countess Shuvalova, born as Countess Chernysheva-Kruglikova (sister-in-law of Madame Chertkova), was another zealous follower of Radstock’s teaching (Prugavin 1909:194). According to Kovalenko, she was among those few people who were converted during Radstock’s visit to Moscow, an ancient Russian Orthodox citadel (Kovalenko 1996:70).

Countess Shuvalova was the wife of statesman Petr Shuvalov, the head of the Main Police Department. Due to her position, she was quite successful in interceding on behalf of the believers who did not have a “voice” and were suffering persecution. Ironically, some evangelical meetings took place right in the room of Shuvalov’s coachman, who was a believer, after such meetings were strictly forbidden (Lieven, 1967:74-75).

Along with other Pashkovite women Countess Shuvalova engaged in visiting hospitals (Corrado 2000:101).

Heier uses the Shuvalov family as an example to show that the soil of the revival was prepared years before Radstock’s arrival in 1874. In 1869 Petr Shuvalov went to Pastor Dalton requesting him to console his brother Pavel Shuvalov whose wife had died. Dalton’s visit to their home became the beginning of regular group meetings of their relatives and friends for reading and discussing the Bible passages. Heier points out that according to various sources, in the 1860s and 1870s there were other independent Bible study groups in St. Petersburg (Heier 2002:50).

Madame Yuliya Zassetskaya (died in 1883)

Madame Zassetskaya, a daughter of Davydov, the famous soldier-poet of the Napoleonic wars, became another “ardent follower of Radstock” (Fountain 1988:32). She and her youngest sister, Countess E. D. Viskonty, provided a strong link between the movement and such famous Russian writers as Leskov, Dostoyevsky, and Solov’ev (Heier 2002:68). Upon her invitations Dostoevsky visited Radstock’s meetings, “but found it difficult to see any good in it” (Heier 2002:69; Fountain 1988:32). She was a close friend of Dostoevsky and his wife Anna Grigor’evna. Many times the great writer argued with her about religious issues but could not win her back to the “national” church. She considered herself no less Russian than he was; besides she knew the Bible and modern works of English and German theologians (Heier 2002:69-70).

It was Zassetskaya who provided Leskov with materials for his book about Radstock, “The Great Schism”, but she found the book offensive and felt guilty (Heier 2002:80). However, two years later, in 1878 Leskov admitted in *Religiozno-obshchestvennyy vestnik* (Religious Community Herald) that he was too hard on Radstock. This restored his friendship with Zassetskaya (Heier 2002:80).

Zassetskaya opened the first wards for the homeless of St. Petersburg. She spent all her fortune on the poor and was personally involved in operating the ward (Heier 2002:68-69). Pobedonostsev reported that Yuliya Zassetskaya has in her care shelters in the outskirts of Petersburg where she goes there to preach and to pray; in her prayers she avoids mentioning the Mother of God and Saints (Pobedonostsev 1880:3).

She employed her giftedness in literature and translated into Russian John Bunyan’s “Pilgrim’s Progress”, an extremely popular book among the Radstockists. It was published in 1878 in three parts and highly commended by Leskov in the same year in *Religiozno-obshchestvennyy vestnik* (Religious Community Herald) (Heier 2002:69).¹⁰⁶ Zassetskaya also translated Bunyan’s “The Holy War” (Fountain 1988:32). In 1877 she published a collection of

¹⁰⁶ This was not the first publication of *Pilgrim’s Progress* in Russian as it is indicated in “The History of Evangelical Christians-Baptists in the USSR” (AUCECB 1989:85). The book had been published in Russian in 1782 under the title *Lyubopytnoe i dostopamyatnoe puteshestvie khristianina k vechnosti cherez mnogie priklyucheniya*.

devotional sketches in the spirit of religious awakening called *Chasy dosuga* (The Hours of leisure) (Heier 2002:69).

She was the only person among the Radstockists who openly announced her break with the Orthodox Church, which was an act of great courage at that time (Heier 2002:69).

Madame Maria G. Peuker (died in 1881)

Madame Peuker nee Lashkareva was another passionate follower of Radstock. She was highly educated and had many high standing friends in major European cities. In 1872 she participated in the World's Prison Congress held in London and was a chairman of St. Petersburg's prison committee, which upon her initiative founded in St. Petersburg a shelter for women released from prisons. She personally ran this shelter for a few years (Heier 2002:82-83). In 1875 while abroad, M. Peuker and her daughter Alexandra were converted to Christ through the preaching of D. Moody (AUCECB 1989:84).

M. Peuker was an editor of a monthly magazine *Russkiy Rabochiy* [Russian Workman] that was being published in St. Petersburg in 1875-1886. Leskov, who at first was very critical towards this enterprise, later changed his opinion and wrote to Madame M. Peuker in 1879 that the magazine should be restored. That same year he became its consultant and published some of his own articles on its pages. M. Peuker's daughter, Alexandra Ivanovna, continued her mother's work of publishing the magazine. Leskov's participation made the magazine very popular. Peuker carried on extensive correspondence with her readers (Heier 2002:81-82).

Peuker evangelized by the means of both written and oral words. Ornatsky points out that she used to evangelize in Novgorodskaya gubernia (Ornatsky 1903:9). Well after Pashkov's banishment, Alexandra Ivanovna Peuker often spoke at the meetings held by Madame Kamensky in the workers' neighbourhoods. Those meetings were attended by some foreign guests who also spoke there. The daughters of Colonel Pashkov, who had returned to their homeland, sang there their duets.¹⁰⁷ Women played an especially important role in musical ministry. S. Lieven recalled that A. I. Peuker played the harmonium and a group of young girls, including Pashkov's daughters, three daughters of

¹⁰⁷ Lieven, *Eine Saat*, 105, in Corrado 2000:86-87.

the minister of justice Pahlen, and two Golitsyn princesses sang evangelistic songs (Lieven 1967:18).

Countess M. Yasnovskaya

Although Radstock's ministry in Moscow did not have the same resonance as in St. Petersburg, among those sincerely converted there were already mentioned Countess Shuvalova and Countess M. Yasnovskaya. The latter worked later with Baptist Pastor Fetler in St. Petersburg. Yasnovskaya was preaching, editing the magazine "Gost", and translating Christian literature (Kovalenko 1996:70).

4.1.1.2 Colonel Pashkov (1831-1902)

Pashkov and his ministry provided a major link between the meetings held by Radstock and those of Evangelical Christians. He assumed leadership of the group after Radstock's first visit, and later became the main preacher when Radstock was not allowed to return to Russia (Fountain 1988:37; Kovalenko 1996:73). Under Pashkov's guidance the evangelical movement became truly Russian in character, language, and practice, spreading beyond the drawing rooms of Russian nobility and reaching other classes of society. His influence was notable to the extent that participants of the St. Petersburg evangelical revival became known as Pashkovites. This man who stood at the beginning of St. Petersburg's evangelical movement and shaped it significantly for the future certainly deserves close attention in this paper.

Vasiliy Aleksandrovich Pashkov, one of the wealthiest Russian noblemen of his day, came from a distinguished aristocratic family and was one of the most popular members of the St. Petersburg society (Fountain 1988:32). V. Pashkov was the eleventh generation from Grigoriy Pashkevich who emigrated from Poland to Russia in the late 1500s (Corrado 2000:31). As a child he attended an elite military school of the Corps of Pages and upon graduation he was accepted into *Kavalergardy* (the Chevalier Guards) with the rank of cornet. He retired as a colonel, the highest rank within the Guards (Corrado 2000:35).

Pashkov was regarded as a "personal friend" by Tsar Alexander II (Nichols 1991:47). Their palaces facing the Neva River were not far from each other. "Connections" mean everything in Russia and Pashkov was certainly a man of means and connections, related to a number of high ministers. For

example, his sister Ekaterina was married to Aleksandr Timashev, a general adjutant who served as Minister of Internal Affairs from 1868 to 1878. The two men were friends. His wife's sister Elizaveta was married to Grigoriy Ivanovich Chertkov, an infantry general and general-adjutant to the tsar from 1870 until his death in 1884. Pashkov's uncle, Mikhail Vasilievich, was known for his leadership of the Department of External Commerce (Corrado 2000:35-36).

By the time of Radstock's arrival in St. Petersburg Pashkov had already retired from the military, enjoying good connections and enormous wealth (Bogolyubov 1912:7). He owned three large estates besides his grand palaces in St. Petersburg. It is important to name them because they were to become the Pashkovites' evangelical nests. Vetoshkino was located in the Sergachevskiy uezd of the Nizhniy Novgorod gubernia (Kovalenko 1996:72). Krekshino, where Pashkov would preach most actively, was located in the Zvenigorodskiy uezd in Moscow gubernia (Ornatsky 1903:9). Matcherka was located in the Morshanskiy uezd of the Tambovskaya gubernia. He also had estates in Orenburzhskaya and Tverskaya gubernias (Nichols 1991:41; Kovalenko 1996:72). Pashkov also owned copper mines in the Urals in the Ufa gubernia near Bogoyavlenskiy (Corrado 2000:37-38).

Pashkov's religious life was practically non-existent before he met Radstock. "Pashkov was completely indifferent towards the matters of faith; in canonical issues he was childishly ignorant" (Zhivotov 1891:23-24). Pashkov later described his life as an Orthodox in the following words, "without Christ, foreign to the testament of the promise, without hope and without God in the world... For forty years I lived a vain, sinful life, far from God, with an accusing conscience, to the vexation of others and to my own damnation".¹⁰⁸ Interestingly enough, during this "vain" period of Pashkov's life, the Russian Bible Society was holding its annual meetings in one of the halls of his palace.¹⁰⁹

Pashkov's conversion was a direct result of Lord Radstock's ministry in St. Petersburg. M. Korff, who dated his conversion as March 1874, claimed that Pashkov's conversion preceded his own by one month. Pashkov had reportedly spent two months at his Moscow estate after Radstock's arrival trying to avoid

¹⁰⁸ Korff, *Am Zarenhof*, 68-69, in Corrado 2000:38.

¹⁰⁹ Dalton, *Lord Radstock and Colonel Pashkoff*, 107-108, in Corrado 2000:38.

the English preacher, which puts a possible date of Radstock's arrival a few months earlier than commonly believed.¹¹⁰

Later Pashkov explained his conversion experience to an Orthodox opponent in the following way:

Being enlightened through the light of God's word, I saw myself as estranged and hostile, the logical result of my evil deeds (Coll 1:21). I recognised that I was a lost sinner, that I was incapable of doing anything for my own salvation... I turned to Him, as I had lost any trust in myself, and confessed to Him my sins and the confused depravity of my heart. The Lord allowed me to believe in the forgiveness of my sins in His name...¹¹¹

Another account is found in Pashkov's letter addressed to the tsar and written after his banishment:

There was a day in my life when I saw myself accused before the throne of Judgement of holy God who hates sin. His Word by the Holy Spirit reached me and awakened my conscience, and now I can speak about Jesus Christ. The Light of the Word, the holy law of God, enlightened all hidden corners of my heart and revealed to me the depths of evil in me, which I had not even suspected. He awakened in me the desire to get freed from sin, which had bounded me in many different ways . . . I wanted to have this forgiveness from holy God and a personal experience of being freed from the power of sin (Lieven 1967:60).

Following this remarkable experience of "giving himself to God", Pashkov's lifestyle changed drastically. According to Korff he became "a mighty weapon in the Lord's hands".¹¹² He started spending hours reading Scripture and praying, evangelising, and spending his assets on the poor.¹¹³ Pashkov evangelised his upper-class friends in any possible ways, for example, "by a familiar and persuasive method known as 'button-holing'" (Latimer 1908:35). In his youth Pashkov had gained the reputation of a good dancer (Zhiotov 1891:24). Later in his life a woman commented that he had tried to "catechise her during a mazurka".¹¹⁴ The grand ballrooms of his palaces were eventually converted into prayer halls (Pobedonostsev 1880:1).

¹¹⁰ Karev 1999:124-127; Korff, *Am Zarenhof*, 15, in Corrado 2000:40.

¹¹¹ Korff, *Am Zarenhof*, 169-170, in Corrado 2000:42.

¹¹² Korff, *Vospominaniya*, in Karev 1999:128.

¹¹³ Korff, *Vospominaniya*, in Karev 1999:127

¹¹⁴ Anatole Leroy-Beauliev, *The Empire of the Tsar and the Russians* Vol. 3 NY: G. P. Putnam's Son, 1902, p. 471, in Nichols 1991:40.

Both of Pashkov's mansions in St. Petersburg, at French Embankment 10 and Lomanov Pereulok 3 in Vyborg district, became places of public worship services (Kovalenko 1996:73). Korff recalled that in Pashkov's palace, one of the largest palaces in St. Petersburg where the halls were naturally big, at first meetings were small, but with time those halls became so overcrowded that there was not enough room for everybody.¹¹⁵ Archpriest Sakharov wrote emotionally, "What a heart melting sight these meetings were! A cabman in his soiled *zipun* and tar smelling boots sits next to a refined aristocratic woman" (Sakharov 1897:18).

Pashkov did not limit himself to meetings in his home. Soon after his conversion Pashkov started taking the gospel to hospitals, prisons, and factories. His methods were personal conversations, reading Bible passages, and handing out New Testaments and booklets. He visited stables with cabmen, factories, plants, and any place he could find crowds of people and preach (Pobedonostsev 1880:1; Sakharov 1897:18). In this way over time Pashkov's preaching ministry grew out of the palaces into the streets. Pashkov reportedly went to the homes of the rich and the poor, where he read the Gospel, explained it, and urged his listeners to believe in Christ and repent (Feofan 1880:1).

Pashkov learnt much working with Radstock over the course of four years in St. Petersburg.¹¹⁶ Meetings led by Pashkov were similar in style and content to Radstock's, except that Pashkov preached in Russian. Pashkov was even criticised for copying not only the content of Radstock's sermons, but also his manner of speaking (Bogolyubov 1912:7). The fact that Pashkov's teaching did not differ from that of Radstock's was noticed by other Orthodox opponents. "The meetings and talks of Radstock and Pashkov were identical in both content and form" (Ornatsky 1903:7). "Pashkov adopted Radstock's teaching in all fullness and even became such a popular teacher himself that he surpassed his mentor" (Sakharov 1897:18).

Obviously, Pashkov did not have any formal theological training. He did not actually believe it was necessary, saying, "I do not think that in order to be a servant of God a certificate, diploma, or title is necessary... I am a preacher of

¹¹⁵ Korff, *Moi vospominaniya*, in Karev 1999:125.

the Word of God just as you [his Orthodox opponents] are”.¹¹⁷ What Pashkov learnt he learnt from Radstock and from his own systematic reading of the Scripture. He used to get up early in the morning and read Scripture and pray for two hours.¹¹⁸ According to the report of the Nizhegorodskiy governor to the Minister of the Interior, it was only two years after Pashkov’s conversion that he was already holding “readings of the gospel to people . . . with many attending the readings” (Zapiska 1884:12). Thus, in 1876 Pashkov started preaching in his estate, and from 1882 he was travelling across other gubernias, leaving after his visits “centres of propaganda” (Kushnev 1916:47).

It seems that Pashkovites really believed that simply reading the Bible to the illiterate was powerful enough to help people transform their lives. According to a newspaper article in 1880, peasants travelled up to sixty miles to hear the Gospel.¹¹⁹ In 1882 Pashkov was forced to leave his Krekshino estate in Moscow gubernia for holding meetings (Corrado 2000:89-90). The Bishop of Tambov reported that Pashkov visited his Matcherskoe estate twice during the summer of 1882, each time holding religious discourses with his own workers and others (Zapiska 1884:21).

One can easily trace the connection between Pashkov’s way of doing ministry and Radstock’s. Pashkov’s goal in evangelism was no less than to bring to faith the entire population of Russia, including the emperor himself (*Grazhdanin* 13 (1876)), while Radstock was hoping to meet the Russian emperor to tell him about salvation in Christ and “to sing with him a new song to the Lamb”, but this was not meant to happen (Karev 1999:126). These men were used to thinking in a stately manner regardless of how naive they could be at times!

Originally Pashkov was hoping to accomplish his goals without creating a separate sect outside the Russian Orthodox Church (Corrado 2000:49). In this he concurred with Radstock, who “did not establish any separate sect and required nothing similar from his followers” (Leskov 1877:291). Another commonality was avoidance of theological debates with the Orthodox. Seeing

¹¹⁶ Even after their banishments these two men stayed in contact until Pashkov’s death (Corrado 2000:46).

¹¹⁷ *Sluchaynaya vstrecha*, 76-77, in Corrado 2000:60.

¹¹⁸ Korff, *Vospominaniya*, in Karev 1999:127.

¹¹⁹ Quarterly Reporter (July 1880): 12, in Corrado 2000:87.

proclaiming the Gospel of Christ as his only goal, Pashkov explained that “such a discussion would not further the cause of my Christian preaching. That is an issue of doctrine which I do not touch upon in my speaking”.¹²⁰

Like Radstock he did not resort to logical proofs when persuading people to believe.¹²¹ An unbelieving professor, Emile Dillon, put it this way:

Revelation to him [Pashkov] was very much more than the conclusion of a syllogism. Conversion by argument is very often no conversion at all. The true religious apostle communicates his faith, his enthusiasm, his charity, as fire kindles fire. For religion is catching, although it is only the truly religious man who is aflame. To the supernatural world there is no access by mere reasoning, one can perceive only with the inner sense, if at all, the fine threads which link the petty humdrum life of men with the calm sphere of the eternal. Hence Colonel Pashkoff never took his inspiration from outside; his words flowed from an out-welling reservoir within; and went from heart to heart, drawing people towards him in some subtle way, virtue, as it were, going out of him (Dillon, 334, in Corrado 2000:58).

Pashkov was not understood by the Baptists for his acceptance of infant baptism as a legitimate ordinance (Alexii 1908:322-323). The records also lack particular accounts of communion services being held during the “readings” of the Bible and prayer meetings, although the AUCECB’s “History” mentions that it was Radstock who introduced St. Petersburg believers to “open” communion (AUCECB 1989:87). Among early Pashkovites there were no developed worship forms; they came together for Bible readings that consisted of collective singing, a sermon, and more singing (Pobedonostsev 1880:1). In this way Pashkov maintained “the informal distinctive of British pietism” (Nichols 1991:105).

Pashkov’s views on the ordinances must have changed over the course of about ten years following his conversion, as he was baptised in 1882¹²² or 1883.¹²³ Reportedly Pashkov and three other believers were baptised by George Müller, and the Lord’s Supper started to be held each Sunday at the

¹²⁰ Korff, *Am Zarenhof*, 78-79, in Corrado 2000:50-51.

¹²¹ This is still the case with most of Russian believers. There is something about Eastern mentality and perception that is not as rational or logical or systematic as Western

¹²² Kovalenko 1996:74; 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.

¹²³ If Corrado is right and the Müllers’ stayed in St. Petersburg from January through March of 1883 (Corrado 2005:105), then Pashkov must have been baptized in 1883.

Lievens' palace (Corrado 2000:68), an innovation that must have started after Müller's visit. However, this new practice related primarily to the post-Pashkov period of the congregation's history, since Pashkov was forced to leave Russia in 1884. In spite of being baptized himself, Pashkov never imposed believer's baptism upon others, nor did he make it a requirement for participation in the Lord's Supper; rather he interceded before the Baptists on behalf of believers who had been baptized only as infants (Alexii 1908:322).

Just as the authorities could not tolerate having Radstock in Russia, they also could not tolerate Pashkov. Even his wealth and connections were unable to save him from being banished from his motherland. Pashkov's expulsion did not come without warning. In 1878 the authorities became concerned with Pashkov's meetings and ordered the city police to ban such gatherings. However, by 1880 the meetings were more popular than ever, welcoming people of all classes and ages and being copied by some of Pashkov's followers (Pobedonostsev 1882:6). According to Kushnev, Pashkov was first forbidden to preach in St. Petersburg in 1877 and then again in 1880 (Kushnev 1916:47). In May 1880 Pobedonostsev wrote to the tsar in a report concerning the Pashkovites and Pashkov in particular, "While there is time we must take measures to put an end to the Pashkovite and similar meetings . . . to forbid informal prayer meetings and private preaching of Pashkov . . . send Pashkov, at least for some time, out of Russia's boundaries" (Pobedonostsev 1880:4).

The "liberal" tsar Alexander II agreed with the proposed measures and as a result St. Petersburg *gradonachal'nik* [the city governor] received an order to keep under surveillance and not allow any prayer meetings in the homes of Pashkov or his followers (Pobedonostsev 1882:6). Furthermore, Pashkov was "invited" to leave the country for some time, the meetings were temporarily stopped, and Pashkov went abroad for the summer of 1880 (Pobedonostsev 1882:7; Corrado 2000:52). When he returned from England he moved his activity to Krekshino, Moskovskaya gubernia (Nichols 1991:66), and to Nizhegorodskaya, Tambovskaya, Tul'skaya inner gubernias (Skvortsov 1893:57; Terletsky 1891:74). Prayer meetings with preaching, organisation of schools and hospitals, distribution of booklets, and charity remained his preferred evangelistic methods (Ornatsky 1903:9).

In July 1880 the governor of Nizhegorodskaya gubernia reported to the Minister that since 1876, whenever Pashkov would come to his Vetoshkino

estate for three or four months, he would read and explain the Gospel to the peasants. He held similar “readings” at about ten neighbouring estates. After the “readings” he distributed New Testaments and other booklets. Pashkov travelled from Vetoshkino to other villages only on Sundays and holidays when people were not working. During haymaking he went right into the fields to preach. Pashkov held regular 10 a.m. “readings” in the Vetoshkino hospital and 3 p.m. “readings” in his home. In Pashkov’s absence during the summer of 1880 the “readings” were conducted by a hospital nurse and a manager of his estate (Zapiska 1884:12-13).

When newspaper rumours about the Pashkovites ceased Pashkov returned to the capital (Skvortsov 1893:57). In spite of the ban Pashkov resumed his activity when he returned to St. Petersburg in 1881,¹²⁴ and in 1882 he became even more active preaching openly with Count Bobrinskiy (Pobedonostsev 1882:7). Pobedonostsev reminded the Minister of the Interior of the tsar’s orders of 1880 and insisted on sending Pashkov and Bobrinskiy abroad (Pobedonostsev 1882:9). It was also reported that in the summer of 1882 Pashkov twice visited his Matcherka estate (Morshanskiy uezd) and held religious talks. After he left the estate a teacher named Bykova started to gather pupils on Sundays and teach them songs from the Pashkovite songbooks *Lyubimye stukhi* and *Radostnye pesni Siona* (Zapiska 1884:21).

Pashkov’s contacts with evangelical groups and individuals are evident from a number of reports to the office of ober-procurator. Around the time of the Rikenau Baptist Conference in Tavricheskaya gubernia held on 20-22 May 1882, Pashkov was in that gubernia visiting Berdyanskiy uezd and preaching in Astrakhanka, Novovasil’evka, and Novospasskiy villages (Zapiska 1884:14). It was probably then that Pashkov came up with the idea of holding a congress that would bring together the various evangelical groups.¹²⁵

¹²⁴ Nichols mentions another forced leaving of St. Petersburg. After Alexander II’s assassination on March 1, 1881, Pashkov had to leave the capital again due to Pobedonostsev’s pressure on the new tsar Alexander III. Pashkov and Korff moved their work to the Volga region where they met Stundists, Baptists, Pashkovites, and Molokans and supplied them with Christian books and tracts (Nichols 1991:66).

¹²⁵ According to Terletsky, Pashkov visited Molokans in Novovasil’evka, Tavricheskaya gubernia in 1881 (Terletsky 1891:130). The author cannot tell if it was the same visit or two different ones.

The Consistory report mentions that Pashkov sent Wieler 13 poods¹²⁶ of New Testaments and other books (Zapiska 1884:14). Y. Delyakov, who is identified in a report as a colporteur of the SESER, received money and books from Pashkov; he also travelled to St. Petersburg frequently, and had written correspondence with Pashkov (Zapiska 1884:14-16, 18). It was also reported that a presbyter in Prishib village, “the main sectarian point with a prayer house in which the sectarians gather twice a day for Bible reading and singing”, annually received from St. Petersburg large amounts of books and up to 500 roubles (Zapiska 1884:17). Pashkov was in touch with Molokans in villages Androsovka and Tyaglovo-Ozero, Nikolaevskiy uezd, concerning matters of faith and provided religious literature for free distribution (Zapiska 1884:17). It was also reported that Pashkov suggested that some poor Stundists from Dubovyy Log village move to better lands in his Orenburg estate; he promised financial help to those who could not afford to relocate (Zapiska 1884:20). Obviously, Pashkov was making special efforts to build relationships with different evangelical groups.

In 1883 Pashkov¹²⁷ and Korff began to plan for the united conference (Nichols 1991:67). Actually, the Pashkovites had been warned by authorities not to hold the congress, but they proceeded with their plans (Corrado 2000:151). Uniting various evangelical groups seemed to hold crucial importance for them. Opposition to Pashkov climaxed around the time of St. Petersburg’s congress of evangelical believers in April 1884. The police dismissed the congress and arrested visiting delegates. Evidently the Pashkovites’ attempt to unite different evangelical groups was “the last drop” for the authorities.

A month later (on April 30 – May 1) Wieler called the first Baptist Congress in Novovasil’evka where the Baptist Union was formed. Pavlov mentions that Pashkov was present (Pavlov 1999:247), although this is very unlikely. The minutes of this Congress in Alexii’s “Materials” do not contain Pashkov’s name among the guests. The only person from St. Petersburg mentioned is Kargel (Alexii 1908:569-570). Furthermore, Kargel’s letter containing a detailed description of the Congress was addressed to a “dear

¹²⁶ A pood is a unit of weight, used in Russia, equal to 36.1 pounds or 16.39 kilograms.

¹²⁷ It could be that Pashkov felt that his time in Russia was getting short. According to Terletsky, in 1883 Pashkov held “talks” in St. Petersburg openly for everybody (Terletsky 1891:77).

brother in the Lord”, most probably Pashkov (Klippenstein 1992:43). Kargel would not have written this report had Pashkov been present.

On 24 May 1884 the tsar issued the command to close the Society for the Encouragement of Spiritual and Ethical Reading which was still functioning and to take measures to prevent further spreading of Pashkov’s teaching over the territory of the empire. The Society that had done so much for spreading Scripture was closed; books and tracts that had not been distributed were confiscated (Kovalenko 1996:74). Soon the Pashkovites found themselves under the strict watch of the police. In June the banishment followed. Pashkov was summoned by the Minister of Justice and given a document to sign promising not to hold meetings in his home, not to preach, not to distribute Bibles, not to pray in his own words, etc.

Pashkov answered that he could have given up distributing tracts, but to give up distributing the Bible, God’s holy Word, was more than he could do. According to his belief, such a demand could only come from those who had broken any link with Christianity, because the “Bible contains genuine teaching of Christ which all ought to follow” (Prugavin 1909:248). The authorities gave Pashkov and Korff only two days to get out of the country, which was reluctantly changed to fourteen days for Pashkov. Then he left for Paris. Korff’s request to delay his departure due to his wife’s pregnancy was denied.¹²⁸ Pashkov’s family joined him in Paris two years later.¹²⁹

After 1884 Pashkov travelled and preached across Europe, in Paris he preached in connection with McCall Mission. He also contributed financially to General Booth of the Salvation Army, Hudson Taylor of China Inland Mission, and French preacher M. Saillens.¹³⁰ Pashkov also continued supporting the Guinesses in London who ran the Institute for Home and Foreign Missions (Nichols 1991:71). In addition, Pashkov and his wife had a close friendship with the Comptons of the “Pont de Brique” ministry in Paris (Nichols 1991:71).

While in exile Pashkov regularly corresponded with his Russian friends and co-workers Princess N. Lieven, V. Gagarina, I. Kargel, and I. Prokhanov (Corrado 2000:163). He also wrote to the tsar, requesting permission to return to St. Petersburg temporarily. He managed to convince the authorities that he

¹²⁸ Korff, *Am Zarenhof*, 63-64, in Corrado 2000:160.

¹²⁹ Pashkov, *Iz Perepisky*, 74, in Corrado 2000:161; Nichols 1991:71.

needed to return to Russia to see his ill son and to settle his business affairs. Pashkov was allowed to return to Russia only once. As is often the case with studying Russian evangelical history, there is a problem with dates. According to Nichols, it was in 1887 for a three month visit (Nichols 1991:71). According to Kovalenko, Pashkov was allowed to come for a three month visit when his son was ill in 1892-1893 (Kovalenko 1996:75). Savinsky also dates this return to 1892 (Savinsky 1999:181). Pashkov's visit made a strong impression upon the young S. Lieven. She remembered the words of his prayer, "Show them what Thou canst do in Russia through a handful of people fully dedicated to Thee" (Lieven 1967:62).

During Pashkov's stay in St. Petersburg the tsar heard of more prayer meetings and Bible-readings. He sent for Pashkov and pronounced his famous verdict, "I hear you have resumed your old practices . . . which you know I will not permit . . . I will not suffer you to defy me. If I had thought you would have repeated your offences, you would not have been allowed to return. Now go; and never set your foot upon Russian soil again" (Latimer 1908:36). Ironically, in spite of considering Pashkov "a dangerous man for Orthodox Russia" and insisting on his banishment, Pobedonostsev respected him.¹³¹

Pashkov died on 31 January 1902 (New Style) at the age of seventy-one. His family and his close friend Korff were with him during his final days. Theodore Monod, a well-known French pastor, held a large funeral service at the Church of St. Martin in Paris. Pashkov was buried in Rome in the Cimitero Acatolico al Testaccio (Protestant Cemetery). Princess Vera Gagarina sent her three nieces, Princesses Mary, Alexandra, and Sophie Lieven to attend the funeral (Lieven 1967:63).

Pashkov's theology

Knowing that Pashkov never received theological training, that his conversion and discipleship came as results of Radstock's ministry, and that the two stayed in touch for the rest of their lives allows one to expect that their theology would be very similar. As already mentioned, doctrinally Pashkov did not introduce anything significantly different from that believed by Radstock.

¹³⁰ Dillon, 336; Lieven, *Eine Saat*, 54, in Corrado 2000:165.

¹³¹ Korff, *Vospominaniya*, in Karev 1999:127.

Besides, Pashkov himself declared that he held to the same “Bible Christianity” as Lord Radstock (Fountain 1988:37). This fact was noticed by both friends and foes. Both Radstock and Pashkov preached salvation through the recognition of one’s sinfulness before the Lord and faith in Christ, “Admit your sins and believe in Christ, and you are His: you will become a partaker of new life, in which good works will naturally follow the faith” (Ornatsky 1903:5). According to a contemporary, Reformed pastor H. Dalton, “Pashkov’s talks were almost a literal repetition or a copy of those of Radstock”.¹³²

Pashkov’s teaching, according to Skvortsov, could be summarised in several statements. First, salvation has been fulfilled; all who believe in Christ are saved. Second, salvation is given to freely without any assistance by man. Third, man is saved only through faith in Christ and in order to receive salvation he needs only to recognize himself as a sinner, unable to please God by his own efforts, then turn his eyes on Christ, believe that He wants to save him, and put all his hope in the atoning sacrifice of Christ. Fourth, anyone who received Christ does good works which do not save but are the fruit of faith; they follow out of it (Skvortsov 1893:59).

So far it sounds like typical Protestant soteriology. However, the author is interested in more specific theological views of Pashkov. One must remember that Pashkov was converted through the ministry of Radstock, baptized by Müller, and instructed by Baedeker. Among those whom Pashkov supported was Hudson Taylor, the famous missionary to China. Needless to say, all of these men were to a greater or lesser extent connected with the Open Brethren circles and Keswick Conferences. From all of them Pashkov learnt the principle of “living by faith” and trusting God to provide for spiritual and material needs, as well as other Brethren and Keswick principles.

The problem with studying Pashkov’s theology is that Pashkov avoided theological disputes and discussions as did Radstock and Baedeker. Needless to say, he did not write theological works. Corrado finds that the most reliable depiction of Pashkov’s teaching comes from his 1880 correspondence with Protoierey [Archpriest] Ioann Yanyshhev, who at the time was the rector of the St. Petersburg Theological Academy and the priest of St. Isaac’s Cathedral. Pashkov was not eager to enter this public debate, but since Yanyshhev insisted

¹³² *Vera i razum* [Faith and reason] 1884 (II) Ja, p. 166, in Terletsky 1891:30.

Pashkov wrote a letter clarifying his views (Corrado 2000:61-62). In the spring of 1880 *Tserkovnyy vestnik* [The Church Herald] published a number of articles written in regards to their dialogue. Pashkov answered Yanyshev in his typical manner. He stated that his knowledge was limited to the Biblical accounts and that he had no desire or interest to debate theology.¹³³ Since Pashkov's theology for the most part remained "unwritten", the author will have to rely upon secondary sources in order to reconstruct it.

The central point of Pashkov's soteriology learnt by him from Radstock was the doctrine of justification by faith alone (Sakharov 1897:17). Pashkov used to preach that all have sinned and gone astray, but Jesus shed His blood for all people. While Christ's death was sufficient to save everybody, only those who put their trust in Christ will be saved. Those who think that good works or following church rites can justify them before God are not saved and are not His disciples. For justification and salvation faith alone is needed (Sakharov 1897:19). This was the point where most problems with the Orthodox started. Archpriest Ornatsky rebuked the Pashkovites for presenting salvation as something "extremely easy and quick: believe in Christ the Saviour, and you are saved" (Ornatsky 1903:11). In his report to the tsar, Pobedonostsev accused Pashkov in teaching the following "dangerous" ideas: "Love Christ; do not trouble yourself about good works; no good work will save you; Christ has already saved you once and for all and nothing further is needed" (Pobedonostsev 1880:2).

However, Pashkov never taught license to sin or that believers should not do good. Both Radstock and Pashkov taught that good deeds come as a result of faith in Christ (Sakharov 1897:46). Even Zhivotov noticed that although the Pashkovites "preach faith without works, at the same time they base all their actions on charity and with an open hand help the poor" (Zhivotov 1891:22). The doctrine of assurance of salvation gradually getting stronger in a believer's heart was yet another teaching learnt from Radstock and held by the Pashkovites that separated them from the Orthodox (Sakharov 1897:41, 44, 54).

Sanctification was another important tenet of Pashkov's faith. The Pashkovite confession of faith states, "I believe that every Christian must lead a

¹³³ Korff, *Am Zarenhof*, 68-79, in Nichols 1991:87.

holy life and in the fear of God carry out his obligations before God, neighbour, and himself; only such a life proves that we are children of God” (Kushnev 1916:52). Some accused Pashkov of claiming that believers no longer sin (the same charge was brought against Keswick conventions in England) (Corrado 2000:65). When confronted, Pashkov denied the charge in the following way, “Now I hate sin, although I still sin”.¹³⁴ Nichols points out that although Pashkov did not teach Radstock’s general progression to full sanctification, he did teach that a Christian would produce a life of good works (Nichols 1991:100).

Another interesting feature of Pashkov’s faith and ministry related to sanctification actually links him to Kargel, in that both emphasised the important role of the Holy Spirit and His supernatural influence in everyday life. It is by the power of the Holy Spirit that a person is born again, according to the Pashkovite confession of faith (Kushnev 1916:52). The Holy Spirit indwells a believer from the time he repents, strengthening his faith and working out his salvation (Sakharov 1897:56). Like Radstock, Pashkov believed in the Holy Spirit’s ability to lead believers. This confidence in the Holy Spirit’s leadership of every believer allowed Pashkov to maintain an open acceptance of different theological positions in “minor issues” and can explain his downplaying the role of the church. “If the Holy Spirit works directly in every person giving him grace and resurrecting to new life, why would one need the church, rites, and the hierarchy?!” (Sakharov 1897:57). Skvortsov noticed that Pashkov went even further than Luther in speaking about the ecclesiastical system. Pashkov acknowledged neither the educational nor the instructional role of the church (Skvortsov 1905:50). As for supernatural manifestations of the Holy Spirit, Pashkov (as Radstock before him and Kargel after him) exercised healing of the sick and casting out demons (Lieven 1967:19-22).

Just like Radstock, Pashkov considered the Scriptures exclusively authoritative and verbally inspired (Nichols 1991:86). Pashkov had strong faith in the promises of the Bible. Writing to Delyakov, a colporteur, Pashkov described the Word as being “invested with the life-giving power of the Holy Spirit”.¹³⁵ Nichols also emphasised that:

Pashkov shared Radstock’s love of the Scripture . . . This is evident by his memorisation of massive amounts of Scripture. His sermons were

¹³⁴ “Sluchaynaya Vstrecha”, 77, in Corrado 2000:66.

¹³⁵ Pashkov, *Iz perepisky*, in Corrado 2000:53.

characterised by a rapid movement from passage to passage, trusting the Holy Spirit to use the divine words to work conviction in the hearers. Pashkov's main priority became the distribution of Bible to the masses (Nichols 1991:87).

Pashkov and the Pashkovites held that all who accept Christ can comprehend the Scripture and teach it to others. Scripture alone was seen as the source of finding truth and strengthening in faith. Ornatsky summarised the Pashkovite attitude towards Scripture as follows,

Believe only in what is written in the Bible; read it, you will understand the things that the Holy Spirit reveals to you; it is all right if you do not understand something; do not seek any other guide to understanding the Word of God except your believing spirit (Ornatsky 1903:11-12).

Thus the Pashkovites attempted to understand the Word of God on their own with the help of the Holy Spirit, who instructs believers into every truth; the leading of the Holy Spirit was also left to one's own judgement (Ornatsky 1903:23).

Similar observations were made by Sakharov. In his view, a Pashkovite believer insisted on reading and understanding the Bible without any help from outside. None of the Pashkovite booklets mentions the Church as a guide for correct understanding of the Word of God; the basis and source for understanding biblical truths is inner illumination acquired through diligent prayer and strong and living faith (Sakharov 1897:49). Thus, the interpretation of the Scripture was left to every believer's judgment. Malitskiy, who analyzed the Pashkovite doctrine on the basis of the booklets published by SESER, came to the conclusion that in the Pashkovites' view everyone who received Christ could understand the Bible and interpret it to others. To some extent the Scriptures could be understood also by those who had not received Christ (Malitskiy 1881:13).

Pashkov desired that the believers make Russia ready for the imminent return of Christ. In Nichols' opinion this belief that the return of Christ could occur at any moment reflects the pre-millennial views of British piety (Nichols 1991:96). Radstock did not associate with any churches when he was in Russia. It appears that Pashkov also considered himself a part of the Church of Christ, that is, the Universal Church. He actually remained a formal member of the Russian Orthodox Church until his death (Corrado 2000:69-70). Like Ivan Kondrat'ev, one of his peasant followers from Tverskaya gubernia, Pashkov

seemed to understand church as a gathering of believers (Sakharov 1897:62). Rejecting church hierarchy, the Pashkovites taught the priesthood of all believers (Ornatsky 1903:20).

Like Radstock, Pashkov recognised only two ordinances as beneficial for believers, that is, baptism and the Lord's Supper. Pashkov wrote that he could not but recognize the ordinances established by the Lord and His Apostles, but he was also convinced by the Word of God that all ordinances were established only for the believers, and only for such they have the grace-giving action (Bogolyubov 1912:8). However, water baptism was not a requirement for the Pashkovites; they considered it a private matter conducted mostly for simple folks (Sakharov 1897:65). Pashkov himself did not see the time of water baptism (in childhood or adulthood) as something that would affect a person's salvation (Kushnev 1916:81). As for the Lord's Supper, it was performed as a fulfilment of the Lord's commandment (Sakharov 1897:65). Besides baptism and the Lord's Supper, the author did not find any other ordinances ever mentioned by the Pashkovites.

Like Radstock, Pashkov was a member of the Evangelical Alliance (Nichols 1991:104). Radstock's "non-denominationalism" was transmitted to Pashkov who sincerely believed that this new teaching would enrich and more fully explain the Orthodox experience. According to Nichols, Pashkov consistently resisted attempts to move the Evangelical Christian revival away from a non-denominational position (Nichols 1991:104).

It must be also added that evangelism was the core of Pashkov's pietistic theology, just as it was for Radstock. Everything else paled in comparison. Pashkov's enormous wealth and energy were put to the service of evangelism. He financed the printing of Bibles and Christian booklets and then distributed them freely or sold them at a very low price (Bogolyubov 1912:27). Pashkov's cheap canteen also served evangelistic purposes (Bogolyubov 1912:2; Sakharov 1897:18).

In addition, Pashkov took the gospel to homes and public places in St. Petersburg and the inner gubernias, regularly preaching at the meetings. Pashkov's sermons were rather unvaried in their content, at least in the opinion of Orthodox opponents'. He used to say that people had strayed from God, that all were sinners and under condemnation, but the Lord Jesus Christ by His blood had satisfied God's righteousness for sins and saved all people. But in

reality only those who trust Jesus Christ alone for their salvation get saved.

Those who think that good works, fulfilling rites, or rituals have to do with salvation are not saved and are not Christ's disciples. For salvation one needs only faith.¹³⁶ Similar description is provided by Terletsky, "For instance, Pashkov always preached that people went astray from God, that all were sinners and under damnation, but Jesus Christ took upon himself their curse and saved them, therefore in order to be saved and justified one must believe in Jesus Christ, and not to rely on good works which cannot save" (Terletsky 1891:105-106). This is nothing but an evangelistic sermon in brief. If this is what Pashkov preached regularly, then preaching for him was actually evangelizing.

Kushnev emphasised that the Pashkovites were more active and successful in propagating their teaching than other "sectarians" (Kushnev 1916:56-57). Indeed, the goal of Pashkov and the Pashkovites was to spread the gospel all over the Russian empire (Sakharov 1897:19) and beyond.

Summarising, it can be said that Pashkov strongly believed in salvation by grace through faith and actively spread his beliefs. The Bible personally read and understood under the guidance of the Holy Spirit held the highest authority for Pashkov. He strongly preached repentance and conversion. The new birth of a believer was to be expressed in a sanctified life. Spiritual fellowship of believers was more important than organisation, hierarchy, or particular rules in following the ordinances. He did not want to create a new sect and to the end made extra efforts not to get into theological arguments and to stay as acceptable to the Orthodox as possible. Pashkov had little interest in dogmatic theology and was careful to avoid theological debates.

From the discussion above it seems that theologically Pashkov was in perfect agreement with Radstock. Their Christology, anthropology, soteriology, eschatology, and bibliology appeared to be identical. It is difficult to find an area in which Pashkov would differ theologically from a man who in Pashkov's opinion once had preached "sheer nonsense" (Zhivotov 1891:24). The only area in which they seemed to differ a little was ecclesiology. Pashkov moved closer to the Open Brethren in his approach to baptism and communion than Radstock ever did.

¹³⁶ *Pravoslavnoe Obozrenie* 1890, vol. I, in Sakharov 1897:19.

A similar conclusion concerning the Brethren and Mildmay-Keswick influences was made by Nichols. In his dissertation Nichols shows a theological succession from Radstock to Pashkov and finally to the 1913 Confession of faith written by Kargel (Nichols 1991). His conclusion is that Pashkov's theology is very similar to Radstock's and, in its turn, to Mildmay and Keswick theology, which became known to Pashkov through the teaching of Radstock (Nichols 1991:85, 110). "There is no doubt that Mildmay's theology and social activity were transmitted to Pashkov, by Radstock, as an example to follow" (Nichols 1991:84). The author cannot but agree with this statement.

4.1.1.3 Count Korff (1842-1933)

Count Modest Modestovich Korff was another key figure in St. Petersburg revival. A close friend, associate, and co-worker of Pashkov, he shared the destiny of being banished from of Russia.

Born of Swedish, Baltic, and Russian court nobility with both Protestantism and Orthodoxy in his background, Korff was baptised and raised Orthodox (Corrado 2000:46). He wrote his memoirs, which are extremely valuable for restoring his own story as well as that of the movement.

Count Korff held the high position of Lord Chamberlain at the tsar's court. He was "a confidant of almost every member of the Royal Family".¹³⁷ In Korff's own words, during his early life he was religious but not redeemed,

The benefits I had in this world spoiled me, but in my heart I feared God . . . My dear deeply believing mother always supported me, her only son, with her constant diligent prayers. Being a young man I took an effort to be moral, I enjoyed the company of priests, diligently attended church services, prayed a lot, but I did not know Him who carried my sins to the cross . . . No one from the clergy ever told me that my sins were redeemed by the blood of Christ.¹³⁸

Like Pashkov, Korff owes to Radstock's ministry his distinct conversion experience, though even before that in 1867, "although not born again yet"¹³⁹ he carried three thousand copies of the Gospel of John from the World Exhibition in Paris to St. Petersburg and distributed them with the Holy Synod's permission.¹⁴⁰ When Korff came across a flag saying "the Bible" at the

¹³⁷ Peter Masters, *Men of Purpose*, 58, in Fountain 1988:21.

¹³⁸ Korff, *Vospominaniya*, in Karev 1999:120.

¹³⁹ Korff, *Vospominaniya*, in Karev 1999:121.

¹⁴⁰ Karev 1999:121; Nichols 1991:17-18; Fountain 1988:21.

Exhibition, he thought the Bible was some kind of a new invention—and this was a man who attended Orthodox services regularly, went to confession, knew the Orthodox catechism, was pious, and loved to pray.¹⁴¹ In 1870 he was asked by the British Bible Society to build a pavilion for distributing the Scripture. As a result, 62,000 copies of the Bible were distributed there, again with the Holy Synod's permission (Nichols 1991:18; Fountain 1988:21). Interest spread, especially among the noble families in St. Petersburg. Private Bible studies began to be held in the homes of the upper class (Ellis & Jones 1996:41). These Bible studies must have taken place prior to Radstock's arrival.

Korff was impressed by Radstock's "devotion to Christ and full assurance of the inspiration of the Bible".¹⁴² Korff also appreciated Radstock's honesty and sincerity. Sometimes when Radstock was asked to explain difficult passages from the Bible, he answered simply, "I wish I could, but I do not understand this either".¹⁴³ Korff confessed that he has never met a man

who would with such love try to convince me on the basis of Scripture that Christ with his redeeming blood saved me from eternal perishing . . . One of the first questions he [Radstock] asked me was whether I was sure that I was saved. I answered negatively. 'Here on earth nobody knows if he is saved; we will find out when we get to heaven'. Then he asked me, 'Who was the Word of God written for, for those on earth or for those in heaven?'. 'Undoubtedly for those on earth'. Then he started to quote scriptural passages, one after another, clearly proving, that believers in Christ can have that knowledge . . . The Lord was knocking at the door of my heart.¹⁴⁴

The terminology that Korff uses to describe his conversion, which became the defining moment in his life, is very similar to that of Pashkov and typical for the whole revival. Korff described later his confession that took place on 5 March 1874 in the following way, "I wanted to give myself to Christ, but could not. . . . bring myself to separate from the world and all the things that bound me to it... But God heard the prayers of my friends. He removed the distrust of Christ out of my heart and surrounded me with his light".¹⁴⁵ As a

¹⁴¹ Korff, *Vospominaniya*, in Karev 1999:120-123.

¹⁴² Korff, *Vospominaniya*, in Karev 1999:122.

¹⁴³ Ibid.

¹⁴⁴ Korff, *Vospominaniya*, in Karev 1999:123.

¹⁴⁵ Korff, *Vospominaniya*, in Karev 1999:124; Korff, *Am Zarenhof*, 19, in Corrado 2000:48.

result, “I passed from worrying uncertainty to the holy assurance of eternal salvation. This was my birth from above. Since that time I started to grow spiritually and to follow Christ”.¹⁴⁶

Later Korff wrote an essay *Moyo obrashchenie* [My conversion] which was published in St. Petersburg in 1909. He insists that conversion and spiritual rebirth is a supernatural event – the greatest event in his life – that gives assurance in the forgiveness of sins. “I used to belong to this world, now I belong to the Lord Jesus” (Korff 1909:5). In the essay he quotes pastor *Funke, Frederik Gode, Gossner, missionary Gebikh, pastor G. Nitsh, P. Kenel, O. Stockmayer, Dr. Braun, etc.* This list gives an idea of the range of theological literature read by Korff.

Korff also recalled, “The joy over our salvation in Jesus Christ, which we had not known previously, moved us to share this good news with others, not to ‘place a lighted lamp under a bushel’”.¹⁴⁷ “These stately men”, Pashkov and Korff, went to preach in smoke-filled tea-houses with coachmen and workers, in stables with the carriage drivers, and in factories (Corrado 2000:86). Korff visited doss-houses, prisons, orphanages, etc. He became Pashkov’s assistant in the Society for the Encouragement of Spiritual and Ethical Reading.¹⁴⁸ Korff also visited the tea-rooms of the cab drivers, talked to them and distributed tracts and Bible portions (Nichols 1991:19).

Korff, ten years younger than Pashkov, became his lifelong friend. They listened to each other’s confessions and pointed to each other’s sins. Korff was present at Pashkov’s deathbed. His last words to him were, “We shall see each other again in Christ’s presence”.¹⁴⁹ Indeed, Korff’s faith was strong. He wrote in his memoirs, “I know from my own experience how real He is, that all promises are yes and Amen in Him”.¹⁵⁰

In 1875 Korff travelled to Kiev gubernia to visit Stundists in the villages of Chaplinka and Kosyakovka, to make contacts and to promise them financial help on behalf of the St. Petersburg Pashkovites, which was eventually received by the Kiev Stundists (Terletsky 1891:123). As a matter of fact, a sizeable group

¹⁴⁶ Korff, *Vospominaniya*, in Karev 1999:124.

¹⁴⁷ Korff, *Am Zarenhof*, 20, in Corrado 2000:104.

¹⁴⁸ Korff, *Vospominaniya*, in Karev 1999:131.

¹⁴⁹ Korff, *Am Zarenhof*, 33, in Nichols 1991:42; Karev 1998:127.

¹⁵⁰ Korff, *Am Zarenhof*, 71, in Corrado 2000:53.

of “brothers” was imprisoned there for a long time, and two of them died in the Kiev prison.¹⁵¹ Along with Pashkov Korff was at the heart of organising the 1884 evangelical conference in St. Petersburg, which was broken up by the police.

Indeed, the situation had changed since the Holy Synod financed the building of the Bible pavilion at the Industrial Exhibition (Nichols 1991:18). Distribution of tracts and Bible portions to cab drivers was now forbidden (Nichols 1991:19). In 1878 when all public gospel meetings were banned (although the meetings continued in Pashkov’s and Lieven’s homes), Korff and his wife organised sewing-rooms for the poor in different parts of the city. While women were working there somebody would read to them from the Bible. Korff’s wife was in charge of one of those sewing-rooms. They ran these workshops for about two years until the government closed them as well.¹⁵²

In June 1884 Korff was offered a paper to sign identical to the one presented to Pashkov, whereby he would promise to stop preaching, holding meetings, praying in one’s own words, having fellowship with Stundists, etc. The Minister of Justice threatened him, “Unless you sign it, you will have to leave Russia”.¹⁵³ Korff’s response was,

I know the tsar; I value him and respect him deeply; I know him as an honest and good man with a large soul. I also know that his Majesty respects men who act according to their conscience and who are not false, and I cannot act against my convictions and my conscience... I submit to the will of my master and remain to him a loyal subject. I will love him with my whole heart, and I will respect him for the rest of my life.¹⁵⁴

According to Corrado, Alexander III was extremely displeased with the action taken, nevertheless he reluctantly submitted to the joint decision of the Chief Procurator Pobedonostsev, Minister of Internal Affairs D. Tolstoy, and Minister of Justice D. Nabokov.¹⁵⁵ In 1870 Korff had freely distributed 62,000 Bibles, including to members of the royal family. Fourteen years later he was banished from Russia for that same thing. According to Heier, by that time the ecclesiastic authorities had come to understand that access to the Bible and its

¹⁵¹ Corrado 2000:148; Pavlov 1999:240.

¹⁵² Korff, *Vospominaniya*, in Karev 1999:130-131.

¹⁵³ Korff, *Vospominaniya*, in Karev 1999:131-132.

¹⁵⁴ Korff, *Am Zarenhof*, 62-63, in Corrado 2000:159.

¹⁵⁵ Polovtsov, *Dnevnik*, vol. 1, 231, in Corrado 2000:160.

ungoverned interpretation could cause dissenters to spring up in the Empire (Heier 2002:50).

Korff's wife, Elena, was very supportive of her husband. Upon returning to Princess Gagarina's home that day Korff found a telegram from his wife, saying, "Remain strong in the Lord, and do not depart one step from the word of God".¹⁵⁶ Elena Korff refused to stay in St. Petersburg, and though she was pregnant she followed her husband to her parents' home in Paris against her doctor's orders. The Korffs left behind all their possessions when they departed Tsarskoe Selo on 27 June 1884.¹⁵⁷

Eventually the Korffs moved to Baden-Baden, Germany and later to Switzerland. Count Korff died in Basel in November 1933, at the age of ninety-one (Nichols 1991:70). Kovalenko supplies different years of his life (1843-1937) which would make Korff ninety-four when he died (Kovalenko 1996:76). S. Lieven also remembered that she visited ninety-four-year old Korff in Switzerland who died a few months later (Lieven 1967:64).

In Korff's life, as in Pashkov's, one can see a distinctive conversion experience clearly dividing his life into two parts, i.e., before and after being "born again". Korff himself emphasised this division a number of times. After conversion he threw himself into evangelistic work and charity, which eventually brought him into conflict with the established Church and, hence, the autocracy. Not much dogmatic theology can be deduced from his memoirs. The author will assume that it did not differ much from that of Radstock and Pashkov. His favourite topic was the redemptive work of Christ and assurance of salvation. His ministry largely focused on the publishing and distribution of Bibles and Christian literature.

4.1.1.4 Count Bobrinskiy (1826-1890)

Another active leader of the Pashkovite group was Count Alexey Pavlovich Bobrinskiy. He also came from a noble family and owned a large estate of Bogoroditsk in the Tul'skaya gubernia (now the estate is a large museum and park). During the Crimean War he was promoted to Colonel of the Corps of Nobles. From 1871 to 1874 he was a Minister of Ways and Roads.

¹⁵⁶ Korff, *Vospominaniya*, in Karev 1999:132; Korff, *Am Zarenhof*, 62-63, in Corrado 2000:160.

¹⁵⁷ Korff, *Am Zarenhof*, 63-64, in Corrado 2000:160.

Fountain describes Count Bobrinskiy as a man of “colossal intellect” and deeply read in German philosophy (Fountain 1988:30). He was especially fond of the German philosopher Karl Robert Eduard von Hartmann (Corrado 2000:92). As a result he developed a deep scepticism almost to the point of nihilism (Karev 1999:128). Overall Bobrinskiy held liberal political views, was “a man of principle”, and very loyal to the tsar (Corrado 2000:92-93).

Bobrinskiy’s conversion (like Radstock’s) was connected to his experience as an officer during the Crimean War, where he fell ill with typhus fever and almost died. After regaining consciousness, “he vowed that he would pray every day to the God he did not yet know”. His life was spared and for the next twenty years he prayed to “the unknown God” (Fountain 1988:30; Latimer 1908:80).

Count Bobrinskiy’s wife invited Lord Radstock to dinner where the two men met for the first time. Radstock, as usual, brought up the subject of the Gospel and referred to the Epistle to the Romans. Bobrinskiy challenged him with questions concerning some “contradictions” in the Bible. Lord Radstock asked him which particular contradictions he meant. That night Bobrinskiy stayed up late trying to compile the list but, as he recalled later, “every Bible verse that I brought forth to defend my opinion became an arrow against me, and in our conversation I received a clear impression of the power of the Holy Spirit. I could not explain what was happening to me, but I was born again from above” (Karev 1999:128). In this way a casual conversation with Lord Radstock “resulted in a flood of light such as arrested Paul on the Damascus road” (Latimer 1908:34). Bobrinskiy suddenly realised that “Jesus was the key, the beginning and the end of all. Falling on his knees in prayer, he sought mercy and forgiveness and knew straightaway that he was forgiven” (Fountain 1988:30-31).

From that moment in 1874 Bobrinskiy devoted his entire life and wealth to the cause of the Gospel. He opened his home for prayer meetings and Bible hours (Karev 1999:129). His estate in Bogoroditsk became a centre of agricultural and social improvement, but primarily a centre for the spreading of the Gospel (Fountain 1988:31). It seems that Bobrinskiy loved the country and spent most of his time at his estate where he held religious meetings until his death in 1894 (Corrado 2000:92).

Another reason why Bobrinskiy concentrated his work in Tul'skaya gubernia may have been that he saw more opportunities there than in the capital where most state and church officials were located. Nevertheless, his activity did not go unnoticed by Orthodox opponents. Both Terletsky and Ornatsky pointed out that Count and Countess Bobrinskiy had carried out meetings with prayers, preaching, and singing in Bogorodsk (Terletsky 1891:75; Ornatsky 1903:9). According to Nichols, in 1881 Bobrinskiy, who had recently retired, succumbed to Pobedonostsev's pressure and permanently moved to his Tula estate (Nichols 1991:66).

Korff wrote that whenever Bobrinskiy happened to be in St. Petersburg, he discussed the congregation's matters with Pashkov and Korff.¹⁵⁸ He would also hold eight o'clock meetings on Saturday evenings for young people and for those of "maturer years" (Latimer 1908:80). Occasionally Dr. Baedeker preached at Bobrinskiy's St. Petersburg home (Latimer 1908:80-81). In 1877 Bobrinskiy distributed thousands of New Testaments at the Moscow Exhibition (Karev 1999:129). Chief Procurator Pobedonostsev complained to the tsar that Bobrinskiy and Pashkov had established a shelter for the poor with one condition, that they listen to their preaching (Pobedonostsev 1882:8).

After his conversion experience Bobrinskiy looked no further for scientific proofs in the matter of his faith. Lev Tolstoy, a good friend of Bobrinskiy, was impressed by his sincerity and vital faith. Soon after his conversion Bobrinskiy visited Count Lev Tolstoy at Tolstoy's estate Yasnaya Polyana. It is said that the two men on occasion spent eight hours on until six o'clock in the morning absorbed in the essential question of the revelation of God in Christ (Heier 2002:92). The impression gained after a meeting with Bobrinskiy is described by Tolstoy in a February 1876 letter to Prince S. S. Urusov:

A few days ago I was visited by Bobrinskiy, Aleksey Pavlovich. He is a remarkable person, and as if on purpose our conversation turned to religion. He is an ardent believer, and his words after your [visit] had the same effect on me, they provoked in me an envy of that integrity and peace that you possess (Tolstoy 1992:249).

A month later, in March of 1876, he once again expressed his admiration of Bobrinskiy's faith in a letter to his aunt, A. A. Tolstaya, a lady-in-waiting to the Empress:

¹⁵⁸ Korff, *Moi vospominaniya*, in Kovalenko 1996:74.

Nobody ever has spoken to me better about faith than Bobrinskiy. He cannot be contradicted, because he does not set out to prove anything; he merely says that he believes, and one feels that he is happier than those who do not possess his faith. Moreover, one senses that this happiness of his faith cannot be acquired through one's intellect, but only through a miracle (Tolstoy 1992:261).

Tolstoy was in correspondence with Bobrinskiy but unfortunately these letters are lost (Tolstoy 1992:306-307, 522).

Along with opening his home for meetings, Bobrinskiy himself used to preach. He was, in fact, a brilliant speaker equally at home addressing common folk in tea rooms and the upper class in elegant salons (Nichols 1991:20). His exceptional speaking abilities earned him the nickname "Spurgeon of Russia".¹⁵⁹ He never passed up an opportunity to preach to both upper and lower classes, whether at home or abroad (Corrado 2000:94).

In the case of Bobrinskiy, the author sees the same paradigm. Bobrinskiy responded to Radstock's gospel preaching. His encounter with the Bible brought about a mystical change in his whole worldview, which led to a complete change in his lifestyle and activity. From that moment his goal became testifying to others about what God had done for him. He did it through typical Pashkovite means: holding gospel meetings in his home, distributing Bibles, preaching, having personal conversation, and philanthropy. Bobrinskiy died in 1894 in Cannes, France (AUCECB 1989:126).

4.1.2 *Domus Ecclesiae*—Social Setting for Establishing a Church

St. Petersburg's revival of the 1870s took place primarily among the nobility who opened their palaces and mansions for meetings. Those homes literally became house churches. Newly-converted enthusiastic believers did not actually need church buildings because their own halls could cater to more than a thousand people. Furthermore, the owners were not the only people living in their palaces and mansions; armies of servants, sometimes relatives and friends sharing their homes all became quickly involved in the meetings. In this way, a prominent feature of the apostolic church—house churches—found its way into the early history of St. Petersburg evangelicals. For these newly converted Orthodox nobles the concept of church gradually changed from being

¹⁵⁹ Latimer, *Under three tsars*, 75, in Corrado 2000:94.

an Orthodox cathedral to a gathering of believers. This experience turned out to be beneficial during the Soviet regime when believers could not own the needed number of church buildings.

In this section of the paper the author will first concentrate on first-hand descriptions of people who attended those meetings. Then the author will analyse the social profile of the evangelical group as the aristocrats reached out to less fortunate people. After that the author will attempt to examine the theological and practical peculiarities of the group. Then the author will concentrate on their two main hallmarks, evangelism and philanthropy. Finally, the author will try to demonstrate how they reached out to similar evangelical groups beyond St. Petersburg.

Now, since the main “players” have been introduced in a previous section, the author can move towards discussing their ministry and theology. Naturally, there will be some overlaps with the material already presented, but from this point on the author can start summarising the whole picture of St. Petersburg Pashkovites.

4.1.2.1 St. Petersburg’s Mansions as Church Meeting Halls

Radstock’s evangelistic meetings in St. Petersburg were not attended by large numbers of people. A typical meeting would have about 40 people of both sexes primarily from high society. Preaching and praying was conducted in French¹⁶⁰, a language understood only by Russia’s privileged class. However, it was not long before the private drawing-hall “chamber” meetings with Radstock grew into public meetings held in Russian with hundreds present. Korff recalled that meetings began to be held in every home where the owner was converted.¹⁶¹

Reportedly by the end of Radstock’s ministry in St. Petersburg (1876) meetings were held regularly in at least five homes of Russian aristocrats: Colonel Pashkov, Princess N. Lieven (Morskaya 43), Princess V. Gagarina (Morskaya 45), Count Alexey P. Bobrinskiy, and Madame E. Chertkova (Karev 1999:130; Karetnikova 2001:31). Zhivotov mentions that in the first year of Pashkovism there were already up to twenty preachers and four auditoriums in different parts of St. Petersburg (Zhivotov 1891:41).

¹⁶⁰ *Tserkovno-obshchestvenny Vestnik*, in Sakharov 1897:16-17.

¹⁶¹ Korff, *Vospominaniya*, in Karev 1999:125.

After Radstock's banishment Russian-language preaching started, making the meetings appealing to lower classes. As Heier rightly pointed out, reading the Scripture and preaching in Russian was a new phenomenon in Russia and as such stirred considerable curiosity (Heier 2002:116-117). As time progressed, the number of homes opening for meetings multiplied. The orthodox periodical *Missionerskoe Obozrenie* reported meetings held in forty aristocratic homes, and according to various sources, from 700 to 1500 people were present at any given meeting (Corrado 2000:77). By 1880 the Pashkovite meetings in St. Petersburg became extremely successful and were forbidden by the authorities (Corrado 2000:87). In the spring of 1880 Pobedonostsev reported to the tsar that "the halls are becoming too small for the meetings, last Sunday there were no less than 1500 people in attendance representing every grade in society" (Pobedonostsev 1880:1). Shortly before his banishment from Russia, Count Korff recalled a meeting with over 700 present, which was also attended by Pobedonostsev.¹⁶²

St. Petersburg society man R. S. Ignatev, who attended out of curiosity, described his first impressions of a Pashkovite meeting in the early 1880s:

Sunday at 8 a. m. I stepped onto the spectacular perron of the large house of V. A. Pashkov on Gagarin Embankment (now French Embankment), which was painted grey. The large private residence of old manor style had well-lit windows shining over the Neva and round lanterns of frosted glass brightened the entrance... In the large antechamber, servants took our coats and invited us inside. Along with other guests I climbed several steps of a wide white staircase to the first landing and entered through a tall door on the right, draped with a massive silk portiere, where I found myself in a brightly lit hall. The hall was large and long, with a row of windows along the embankment. It was lighted brightly with chandeliers and wall lamps. No decorations were on the walls. Rows of chairs filled the hall. In the distance, a small table stood near the entrance to the next room, separated from the first with the same manner of drapery, and next to it was a small harmonium with a keyboard (Ignatev, 186, in Corrado 2000:75).

A similar picturesque description is found in an article from the *Peterburgskie Vedomosti* [Petersburg News] January 10, 1880 written by a man who happened to visit a public meeting at Pashkov's palace. The article writer was surprised to see how Pashkov's *dvornik* [janitor] assured simple people, strangers, that there would be "readings about the things of God" and that they could enter the palace without a doubt, then how a hall-porter opened the door,

¹⁶² Korff, *Vospominaniya*, in Karev 1999:125.

liveried lackeys helped guests remove their coats and showed the way up to the grand staircase covered with carpets (Prugavin 1909:201-202).

According to Prugavin, such meetings took place every day, in different parts of the city, and Pashkov preached at all of them: on Mondays in some officer's flat at Peterburzhskaya storona, on Saturdays in the flat of a bookbinder at Konnogvardeyskaya Street 2, near Smol'nyy Monastery. Similar "readings" took place at Princess Volkonskaya's home in Furshtadskaya Street (Prugavin 1909:211).

Terletsky adds several more addresses. He wrote that by the end of 1870s the Pashkovites had spread all over Petersburg. The following are some addresses: Zakhariievskaya 11 Apt.13, Sergievskaya 20 Apt.5, Myasnaya 20, Kavalergardskaya 2, Dyagtyarnyy pereulok, Vasil'evskiy Ostrov 7 & 17 linii, Vyborgskaya Storona (Dom Shamanskogo) (Terletsky 1891:5). Some meetings were secret (only for the believers), while others were open for anybody. There were also special meetings for a tight circle of Pashkovites (Kushnev 1916:50). Besides men and women children were present as well (Terletsky 1891:5). By 1882 the Pashkovites had expanded to the outskirts of St. Petersburg; their missionaries were mostly women (Terletsky 1891:77).

During the first few years Pashkovite meetings were announced by advertisements in newspapers and held openly (Ornatsky 1903:7). Lackeys used to go into the street to invite passers-by to come in; Pashkov printed hundreds of thousands of invitations; newspapers carried "reports" of his meetings the same way they printed reviews of plays or concerts (Zhivotov 1891:32-33). Besides printed invitations, there were "coachmen, chambermaids, and all kinds of other servants," who "turned into missionaries proclaiming the good news" (Karetnikova 2001:32).

As Terletsky concluded, "This way, not attending Orthodox cathedrals the Pashkovites opened their homes for religious services" (Terletsky 1891:105). Terletsky provides a brief description of such services. They started with an improvised prayer, always short and simple, followed by a sermon or an exposition of a verse from the New Testament. The sermon was followed by another kneeling prayer. In the end everyone sang from *Lyubimye stikhi* or *Pesni Siona*, accompanied by an organ or a harmonium. Sometimes after services they distributed New Testaments with underlined verses or brochures

published by the Society for the Encouragement of Spiritual and Ethical Reading (Terletsky 1891:105-106).

As a matter of fact, the songs from *Lyubimye stikhi* [Favourite verses] were sung in other meeting places in St. Petersburg as well as in other regions of Russia, for example, in Tverskaya gubernia or Petrozavodsk (Terletsky 1891:65, 85, 89). This hymnbook contains thirty-six songs, almost half of which are still being sung in Evangelical-Christian Baptist churches to this day. Among them there are some well known songs translated into Russian, including "Just as I Am", "Way to Salvation", and "Whiter than Snow". ++++

4.1.2.2 Social Makeup of the Church – Crossroads of Upper and Lower Classes

The basic unit of St. Petersburg high society in the nineteenth century was a household consisting of a master-host with his immediate family, friends, relatives, guests, and servants, which in some ways resembles society of the apostolic time. Those Russian households valued hospitality as a virtue. The host would be present at the dinner table even if he did not like the guests. Russian society of the time was not individualistic. Such St. Petersburg households provided the primary context for Radstock's evangelising and later for bigger gospel meetings. The diversity of attendance of the Pashkovite meetings was truly unbelievable. The unity of the classes presented at those meetings was unthinkable and unheard of hitherto. This was one of the most remarkable features of those meetings. Contemporary socialists could only dream of such a classless society.

Corrado points out that along with Pashkov's changed life came a change in his view of social order (Corrado 2000:118). On Sunday evenings "the splendid apartments which were formerly open only to the elite of Russian society for balls and routs, now stood open and were filled to overflowing by crowds – mostly belonging to the very lowest of society – who desired to hear the good news of salvation".¹⁶³ Ignatev's description of the audience at the meeting he attended helps to visualise a group in the context of a Christian household,

Around me were such various, diversified, ill-assorted people! Among factory workers in dark blue and grey smocks and threadbare coats were

¹⁶³ Dalton, *Lord Radstock and Colonel Pashkoff*, 11, in Corrado 2000:76.

the dark unpretentious blouses of “learned” women and young ladies of society. Next to long poddyovkah huddled modest youth, evidently students... with fervent, searching eyes, holding copybooks on their knees. Scattered throughout were the dark elegant dresses of society ladies, black smoking jackets, the red stripes of generals, silver epaulettes, and academic badges.¹⁶⁴

Indeed, those present for worship at Pashkov’s palace were “from every brand of society. Preachers were recruited from among the masses, some of whom almost knew the Bible by heart, it was said” (Fountain 1988:39). In the nineteenth century, as for that matter in any century, barons, counts and princesses did not associate with servants, factory workers, or peasants. No wonder that this brotherhood that characterised the Pashkovite meetings attracted lots of attention and aroused people’s curiosity.

Is it possible to say precisely who composed the Pashkovite community in St. Petersburg? It does not seem so. There were no membership lists available due to the fact that during the first years of the group’s existence there was no such concept as “membership.” To be a believer meant to be a member of the universal church. This idea was in agreement with Radstock and early Darbyists. Neither it is possible to estimate the percentage of the various social groups present.

The Pashkovite meetings were inclusive not only socially but also ethnically. Kargel wrote in one of his letters, that “Russians, Germans, Lithuanians, Swedes, Estonians, Finns, and Englishmen found themselves together in Pashkov’s home for this purpose” that was asking God to prevent further bloodshed during the Russo-Turkish War of 1877-78.¹⁶⁵ Besides, the Pashkovites did not try to create a new “sect” and did not encourage people to leave their traditional churches, Russian Orthodox, Lutheran, etc. This resulted in people who formally belonged to different denominations worshiping together.

Among the groups represented, noble women deserve special attention because they seemed to be attracted in greater numbers than men. Women were numerous and very active in the movement, not to mention that the first converts were from among women. As time went on in the evangelical movement in Russia women were consistently found in larger numbers than

¹⁶⁴ Ignatev, 186, in Corrado 2000:77.

¹⁶⁵ Kargel, ix, in Jakob Kroeker, *Der achtzigjährige Verfasser. Zur Einführung*, in Corrado 2000:77.

men. A few reasons can be pointed out. First, men were the prime targets of persecution. Second, the movement gave women opportunities for self-expression; they no longer stayed in the background. Philanthropy was an important outlet for the Pashkovite women. Outside the formal setting of meetings, and even occasionally in them, the Pashkovite women took the lead in music, translation, and even preaching. After the banishment of the male leaders, the women took upon themselves the leadership of the whole movement (organizing services, opening their homes to meetings, choosing and inviting speakers, etc.). The words of Bebbington about “the age when avenues for women into any sphere outside the home were being closed” and “Christian zeal brought them into prominence” (Bebbington 1989:26) can be applied not only to Britain, but also to Russia.

It is also important to point out that this kind of social acceptance was not a mark of only the early days of the revival characterized by “the first love”; it remained the movement’s trademark as long as the upper class existed in the country, that is, until 1918. This crossing of social barriers became especially evident at the April 1884 congress. Social differences were unimportant. V. G. Pavlov described the brotherhood experienced at the 1884 congress, at which “a peasant dined next to a count, and distinguished women served simple brethren,” as the greatest highlight of his life (Pavlov 1999:197-198). For instance, at one meeting in the Lieven’s palace a converted cab driver led the Bible study (Brandenburg 1977:112). More than a decade later, in 1897 Penn-Lewis was impressed that “the Princess and her coachman sat together, drinking the cup of the Lord and breaking the bread that speaks of His broken body”.¹⁶⁶

However, in spite of the great mixture of people from all social strata who were welcome in the palace on Gagarinskaya embankment, Zhivotov ironically mentions that common visitors were seated in the back and were not mixed with aristocrats, although all were being called “brothers” (Zhivotov 1891:31). Another custom of St. Petersburg’s upper class was to leave the capital for the summer season and to retreat to their country estates, which ended up helping to spread the evangelical teaching across Russia’s countryside. Prayer

¹⁶⁶ Penn-Lewis, 10, in Corrado 2000:114.

meetings with sermons were common at the country estates of many Pashkovites (Ornatsky 1903:9).

“Pashkovite nests” were established in nearly every part of European Russia (Fountain 1988:38). It has been already mentioned how active was Count Bobrinskiy promoting spiritual and agricultural reform in his Tula estate. Princess Vera Gagarina succeeded in establishing a congregation in her Sergievskiy estate in the same Tula gubernia. Madame E. Chertkova laboured in Voronezh gubernia, Korff worked in Kiev gubernia (Karetnikova 2001:33). Gradually the villages with “Pashkovite nests” appeared in Tverskaya, Yaroslavskaya, Tul’skaya, Voronezhskaya, Olonetskaya, Tambovskaya, Penzenskaya gubernias, Rostovskiy and Uglichskiy uezds, the town of Petrozavodsk, and other places (Kushnev 1916:60).

On the other hand, the habit of spending summers in the country weakened the St. Petersburg congregations, and, as time went on, influenced the social profile of the congregations’ leadership. Lower class believers who were always in St. Petersburg eventually became leaders. For understandable reasons they were less educated, simpler, stricter, and more rigid folk, although they did not lack sincerity, Christian zeal, and dedication to the cause (Lieven 1967:103, 71).

The main cause of “social” problems, however, was Korff’s and Pashkov’s banishment. Korff recalled that the news about their exile soon spread across Russia: “Brothers were very sorry that we had been exiled. To take the place of us two elders, they decided to send seventeen brothers to St. Petersburg”.¹⁶⁷ The author cannot tell if this plan was ever carried out but if those “seventeen brothers” actually did arrive, they would have been quite different from Pashkov and Korff in their origin, education, culture, etc. They would not possess the same theological openness either. But apart from those “seventeen”, there were quite a number of simple men among the Pashkovites in St. Petersburg who considered themselves qualified to teach and preach.

The fact is that social “scissors” did exist among the Pashkovites to some extent. This is clear from Pashkov’s secret reason for visiting Russia around 1888, i.e., to calm down the leadership struggles between older noble ladies

¹⁶⁷ Korff, *Vospominaniya*, in Karev 1999:132.

and younger inexperienced leaders.¹⁶⁰ There is also a hint of these problems in S. Lieven's memoirs where she sadly describes the poor sermons of those who could hardly read a passage and could occasionally build a sermon on a misread word or the case of a Pashkovite lady (countess Shuvalova who used to wear "worldly" dresses) who was forbidden to take part in the Lord's Supper when the "brothers" found something inappropriate in her behaviour (Lieven 1967:71, 74).

Overall, similar to Great Britain in the 1870s, in St. Petersburg evangelicalism became the religion of both the poor and the prosperous (Bebbington 1989:26). The unity of the classes among the Pashkovites was truly amazing, even with some minor misunderstandings and problems.

4.1.2.3 Theological and Practical Peculiarities of the Church in St. Petersburg

There is no need to mention again the extent to which Radstock and Baedeker influenced the Pashkovites. This must be quite obvious by now. Both of them came to Russia mainly because they felt that they were called to preach the gospel. Their followers were converted but still saw themselves theologically unfit. That is why Pashkov, Korff, and Bobrinskiy kept inviting foreign preachers. One of those preachers was the above mentioned Stockmayer from Switzerland, who in the course of a few weeks held talks on sanctification and possibly on divine healing. In 1882-1883 their work was continued by an Open Brethren pastor G. Müller, who baptised Pashkov and three other believers from the St. Petersburg congregation, including N. Lieven and Madame Klassovskaya (Kovalenko 1996:74; Savinsky 1999:153).

Müller's main topic while in St. Petersburg was sanctification, which he viewed as the main thing in Christian life (Karetnikova 2001:37). In those days the St. Petersburg group could not be classified as an "organised congregation". From time to time they had "breaking of the bread" introduced by Radstock, open to all Christians whether baptised as infants or as adults (Savinsky 1999:152). Although Pashkov decided to get baptised, he did not make it a condition for participation in the Lord's Supper or any kind of ministry among the believers (Sakharov 1897:64). Baptism was still a matter of individual

¹⁶⁸ Lieven, *Eine Saat*, 90, in Nichols 1991:72.

conscience. According to Nichols, the records lack any accounts of communion services being held during the Bible studies or prayer meetings (Nichols 1991:109), but it seems that Savinsky is more to be trusted in this matter and that the Pashkovites had the Lord's Supper prior to Müller's visit.

The foreign Christian workers mentioned above were to a large degree responsible for shaping early Pashkovite theology and practice. One can rightly expect to find many similarities between the Pashkovites, the Open Brethren, and the Keswick movement. In Bogolyubov's report, W. Fetler, a Baptist pastor in St. Petersburg, commented at the All-Russia Baptist Congress held in St. Petersburg that the Pashkovites are nothing but Plymouth Brethren (Bogolyubov 1912:3). According to Sawatsky, the early Pashkovites followed the example of Plymouth Brethren, as they did not lay hands, did not baptize, and did not make lists of group members (Sawatsky 1995:34). It is a little strange, though, that neither Fetler nor Sawatsky specified that the Pashkovites were much closer to Open Brethren than to Plymouth Brethren.

Pashkov's preaching, mentioned above, was very different from that of the Orthodox priests and very similar to that of Radstock in both content and form. The very idea of a layman preacher must have been shocking to an Orthodox audience. Pashkov began his sermons reading a passage from the Bible; his sermons were characterised by simplicity and a touch of his own experience, as he explained the plan of salvation in the first person (Corrado 2000:83). S. Lieven recalled:

The deep conviction of V. A. Pashkov and personal testimony about renewing power of God through the work of the Holy Spirit that he had experienced did miracles. The listeners fell to the feet of the Lord with deep repentance and stood up new people, washed by the blood of the Saviour, born again children of God. This way God added the saved ones to the church (Lieven 1967:17-18).

According to Ignatev, "There was nothing special, nothing wise in what Pashkov said. He did not offer theological subtleties from the Gospel texts . . . But his sincere speech affected equally the simple folk gathered in his luxurious palace as well as those of high society".¹⁶⁹ Similar things had been said about Radstock.

¹⁶⁹ Ignatev, 187, in Corrado 2000:83.

These early leaders tried to follow the teaching of the Scripture to the best of their understanding. Their critics kept pointing out that the Pashkovites recognized only the Holy Scriptures as the source of knowledge about God, and rejected the Holy Traditions.¹⁷⁰ “In general the brochures [published by SESER] very often carry a thought about the Holy Scripture as the exclusive source of our religious knowledge, our beliefs, and instruction; the guidance by the Holy Tradition is being omitted for some reason” (Terletsky 1891:57). When reading the Scripture the Pashkovites recommended trusting one’s own mind and the Spirit’s illumination. Without such illumination from the Holy Spirit the Pashkovites considered the words of the Scripture as “dead letters” (Kushnev 1916:54). Since the hermeneutical principles of the early Russian evangelicals constitute the main interest of this dissertation, the author will discuss the Pashkovite attitude towards Scripture in greater detail. The author will rely on the booklets published by the Pashkovite Society (SESER) concerning the topic under consideration.

The first booklet that contained instructions concerning reading the Scripture was published in 1877 under the title *Chemu uchit Svyashchenoe Pisanie?* [What does the Holy Scripture teach?]. It is a very brief description of what the Old and the New Testament are about from the classical Protestant point of view. First, it teaches a Christological approach towards the Scripture, “Both the Old and the New Testament testify about Christ, and God’s holy men in ancient times, having been taught by the Holy Spirit, knew it and believed in Him” (Chemu uchit . . . 1877:4). Second, it points out to the fact that the Scripture was inspired by the Holy Spirit, can be understood, and teaches about the true God and the only way of salvation. “The Holy Scripture is given to us by God’s mercy through the Holy Spirit so that we can understand it all . . . and believe that there is the *only* true God and the *only* Saviour” (Chemu uchit . . . 1877:7). Third, it insists on the uniqueness of the Scripture which deserves a special approach.

Let us open the Holy Scripture with reverence and beg God to allow us through our Saviour and the Holy Spirit to understand its content well, because the Holy Scripture is a sealed book which we cannot understand without the Holy Spirit’s guidance. Therefore we should diligently read, constantly penetrate, carefully consider and apply

¹⁷⁰ Malitskiy 1881:22; Kushnev 1916:53; A.Yartsev, *The Cult of Evangelical Christians*, M.: Atheist Publishing House, 1930:4, in Ellis & Jones 1996:212.

portions read to our hearts. . . We are looking for life: *this book reveals it*; if we do not find life in it we will be lost forever (Chemu uchit . . . 1877:8).

A couple of booklets on Scripture reading were published in 1882. The one called *Dva slova o Svyatoy Biblii* [Two words about the Holy Bible] is a very short introduction to all the canonical books of the Bible. It also suggests a very Christocentric approach to the Old Testament. For example, the peaceful reign of Solomon is presented as a prototype of the peaceful reign of Christ (*Dva slova* . . . 1882:10). A few more quotes will further the point:

You will ask, 'Does the whole Bible testify about Jesus Christ?' 'Yes. The Old Testament points to the promised Messiah, to Christ, that is, to God's anointed one, while the New Testament speaks about Jesus as Saviour. In this way the whole Bible has to do with the Lord Jesus Christ (*Dva slova* . . . 1882:3-4).

Both the Old and the New Testament constitute one inseparable inspired Word of God, therefore the books of the Old Testament are just as important as the books of the New Testament (*Dva slova* . . . 1882:4).

The essence of the Old Testament books is Jesus Christ (*Dva slova* . . . 1882:7).

The booklet promotes a very personal attitude of the reader towards the text: "View it [the Holy Bible] as a dear letter received from the heavenly Father, in which He tells you what to believe, all that you should avoid, and all about how you should live during our short stay on this earth" (*Dva slova* . . . 1882:4). It should be also mentioned that in the last chapters which contain instruction about why and how one should read the Holy Bible, an unknown author quotes a number of church fathers and celebrated Orthodox bishops, including St. Athanasius the Great, Archbishop of Alexandria; St. Basil the Great; St. Theophilus of Alexandria; St. Cyril of Jerusalem; St. Ambrose, Bishop of Milan; St. Tikhon; St. John Chrysostom; St. Irenaeus (*Dva slova* . . . 1882:23-27). This is further evidence that the Pashkovites did not have sectarian overtones.

Another booklet published the same year (1882) was *Kratkoe rukovodstvo k chteniyu Novogo Zaveta* [Short guide to the reading of the New Testament]. The booklet included a brief story of creation, the fall, and salvation; a short dictionary of some Bible terms (e.g., synagogue); instructions for reading the Bible; some maps of Palestine and the Roman Empire with explanations; and a list of Bible references on main events of the New

Testament. The following are the instructions suggested to those who are starting to read the Bible:

How should one read the Word of God? The Word of God is not like a man's word, therefore we should not read it like an ordinary book. The Word of God contains wonderful "power of God unto salvation of every one that believeth" (see Rom. 1, 16); the Word of God is "the sword of the Spirit" (see Eph. 6, 17) for fighting against temptations of the spirit of darkness; the Lord Himself when tempted by the devil repulsed him with words from the Holy Scripture (see Matt. 4, 1-11); the Word of God dispels our wrong beliefs (see Matt. 22, 29); it is the seed sown into our hearts that brings forth good fruit (Lk. 8, 11; Mk. 4, 20).

If you want to profit from reading of the Word of God:

1. Read it with reverence. Before reading cleanse your heart from all the worries of the world and ask the Lord Jesus to open your understanding so that you "might understand the Scriptures".
2. Apply what you read to yourself as if it was written to you . . .
3. Read without haste, trying to understand every word. If you do not understand a word, ponder what it might mean, and pray that the Lord would teach you; if you still do not understand, leave it and go on reading; the time has not come for you to understand that word; you will understand it later.
4. If you understood some instruction from the Word of God, start doing it from that very hour, asking the Lord to help you . . .
5. There is great benefit for strengthening our faith and piety when we heartily thank our Saviour for His great mercy and love when reading God's word (Kratkoe rukovodstvo . . . 1882:18-19).

Interestingly, some very similar instructions can be found in St. Tikhon of Zadonsk. He was a canonised Orthodox saint who lived in the eighteenth century. The Pashkovites published a number of excerpts from his well known work *Istinnoe Khristianstvo* [True Christianity] (1770-1772) (Heier 2002:59). A booklet *O Slove Bozhiem* [About the Word of God] (1895) is an extract from Tikhon's writings and contains general paragraphs concerning the essence, meaning, and use of Scriptures, and stresses the importance of following the Word. "Monarchic edict is published so that his subjects can know and do his will, so was the Word of God written so that we could live according to its rule" (Tikhon 1895:15). The Scripture is continually compared with food for one's soul. "As our body is being fed and strengthened by food, so is our soul fed and strengthened in faith by the Word of God" (Tikhon 1895:26). Then, Tikhon insists on the availability of the Scripture for common folk, a point, no doubt, especially appreciated by the Pashkovites.

Those who think and teach that the Word of God should not be read by simple people but only by priests and other sanctified persons are sinning. Such opinion is a thought and machination of the devil who

diverts people from this profitable reading so that without reading of the Holy Scripture they would not have true and living faith and would not be saved (Tikhon 1895:13-14).

And finally, the instructions for readers:

Those who want to read and to hear the Word of God with profit for their souls should mark the following:

- 1) It is God's precious gift, therefore one must read and hear it with reverence, interest, and fervour . . . Praying to Him in truth and spirit . . .
- 2) One should hear or read the Word of God not in order to become sharp-witted or have an eloquent tongue, but to behold God and Christ, God's Son, and His holy will, and his way to receive eternal salvation. This is the proper end of reading or hearing of the Word of God!
- 3) To conceal it in one's heart like a precious spiritual treasure . . . and to feed one's soul by it as the body is fed with bread and even more so. Because as the body without food becomes weaker and dies, so faith without the food of the Word of God becomes weaker and perishes (Tikhon 1895:18-19).

The Pashkovite newspaper *Russkiy Rabochiy* [Russian Workman] in 1884 published an article called "How one should read the Holy Scripture" which was very much in tune with the approach to reading and understanding the Bible presented above.

When reading the Holy Scripture we are not alone; the Lord is with us, He talks to us, and we can talk with Him... Read the Bible with a strong intention to fulfil its instructions... Your doubts will fade away as the light penetrates your hearts and the word of God is fulfilled in you! Perhaps at first many things will seem dry, but the more we grow in spiritual life, the better we are going to understand the meaning of the Holy Scriptures. Its meaning is unclear only to those whose life is not lived according to the will of God, but it is very clear to those who live according to the will of God (*Russkiy Rabochiy* (5) p. 4, in Terletsky 1891:61-62).

In order to get an idea of how the Pashkovites viewed typology, one should consider the booklet *Dshcher' Siona. Razmyshlenie na Pesn' Pesney*. [Daughter of Zion. Reflection on the Song of Songs] (1883) signed by initials N. S. G. This commentary on the first chapter and the first two verses of the second chapter of the Song of Songs is written entirely from the typological point of view for the edification of the readers. The bridegroom is Christ, his bride is the Church or a believing soul, and so on to less important things mentioned in the book. The booklet might not be a translation from a foreign language because it quotes V. A. Zhukovsky, a Russian writer of the first half of

the nineteenth century. N. S. G.'s approach to the interpretation of types and images is well summarised in the following statement:

This book is filled with deep parallels with which the Lord is teaching a believer's soul as He once used parables to teach people. For those who read superficially these parallels are nothing but empty sounds and poetic images; but for a believing and searching soul they contain teaching, instruction, and consolation, just as the Lord's parables remained for some people interesting stories, while for the disciples they became the source of life. . . In order to understand images presented in the Scriptures one must be a disciple of Christ, to move into that blessed closeness to Him . . . For those who truly want to learn from Him and dwell in His Word, He opens their minds to understanding the Scripture and reveals the mysteries of God's Kingdom, which are hidden from others (N. S. G. 1883:32-33).

The Pashkovites' great emphasis on reading the Scripture resulted in being very well acquainted with its content. Furthermore, as Heier points out, one could often meet peasants who knew the Bible almost by heart (Heier 2002:130).

According to Karetnikova, the Pashkovite favourite and the best understood areas of theology were soteriology and Christology (Karetnikova 2001:27). Malitskiy, who based his study of the Pashkovite doctrine on the verses underlined in the copies of the New Testament that were meant to be distributed, came to the conclusion that all those verses fall under one of three categories: justification by faith; God's great love for mankind; and steadfastness of God's promises (Malitskiy 1881:3). One must keep in mind, however, that those New Testaments were distributed to people who, in the Pashkovites' opinion, were unsaved, which would have influenced the choice of passages that had been highlighted.

Public prayer was also most unusual for an Orthodox audience. Both Radstock and Pashkov opened their meetings with a prayer "in their own words... pronounced on their knees with their face to a chair, head bent down" (Ornatsky 1903:7). The Protestant prayer book of E. A. F. Bersier¹⁷¹ was popular among aristocratic Pashkovite women, but it was never used during public meetings (Corrado 2000:78). Kutepov describes how prayer was conducted at Pashkovite meetings:

The preacher addressed those gathered, 'Shall we pray?' With that, everyone present knelt. The preacher began to speak whatever prayer

¹⁷¹ It is included in 1877 edition of Leskov's *Velikosvetskiy raskol* [Great Schism].

came to mind . . . Only members of the Holy Trinity were addressed in prayer, and for the most part only one idea was revealed: that man is saved through faith in Christ the Redeemer alone. The prayers were generally disconnected, the same thing over and over again, and prayer was not long, five or ten minutes. Sometimes prayer was closed with singing of 'Favourite verses' accompanied by the organ.¹⁷²

Ignatev pointed out that other people present at the meetings were welcomed to pray as well, "several present began to speak improvised prayers aloud, as if feeling in themselves a surge of ecstasy, highly moving, passionately pronounced, from the inmost recesses of the heart. Prayers flowed from their mouths without hesitation, as though inspired from above".¹⁷³ There were some meetings held specifically for the purpose of prayer. According to Kargel, prayer meetings often lasted for hours.¹⁷⁴ Prayer was something they resorted to when having doctrinal disagreements such as the controversy over the issue of baptism at the 1884 St. Petersburg congress, or at a time of problems with authorities such as when Korff went to the Minister of Interior while believers were gathered to pray at Princess Gagarina's home.

Singing was another important feature of the Pashkovite revival, one that is characteristic of revivals in general. Singing as a congregation was new to people used to Russian Orthodox services. *Lyubimie Stikhi* [Favourite Verses] published in 1880 was the first Pashkovite songbook. Pobedonostsev recalled, "Everywhere [at the Pashkovite meetings] you find laid out hymnbooks, translated into rough Russian verse from a collection of well-known English hymns" (Pobedonostsev 1880:2). Hymns were used to open and close services. Ignatev recalled, that "The entire hall rose together, as if one person, and stood to sing, accompanied by the harmonium, of course not very harmonious, but of one spirit. They sang Pashkovite psalms, put to verse in books, a large quantity of which were strewn throughout the hall".¹⁷⁵ As mentioned, Pashkov's wife accompanied on the harmonium, and all three of their daughters sang (Lieven 1967:18).

¹⁷² Kutepov, 62-63, in Corrado 2000:79.

¹⁷³ Ignatev, 187, in Corrado 2000:79.

¹⁷⁴ Kargel, ix in Corrado 2000:114.

¹⁷⁵ Ignatev, 187, in Corrado 2000:80.

Alexandra von Peuker, who originally wanted to train for the opera and during her visit to England was converted through evangelist Moody,¹⁷⁶ became yet another active member of the small household community in the Lieven's palace. Now she used her voice to serve the church and formed a women's choir with a number of young girls, including the Lieven daughters, the Pashkov daughters, two Golitsyn princesses, Countess Shuvalova, two Kozlyaninov sisters, and three daughters of Konstantin von der Pahlen, the Minister of Justice (Brandenburg 1977:108).

Women contributed significantly to the hymnology of the movement, translating Western hymns into Russian. Most songs were translated from German or English Protestant hymns; some were those sung by American gospel singer Ira D. Sankey, associate of D. L. Moody, with melodies adapted to suit Russian tastes (Corrado 2000:81). In addition, the Pashkovites wrote some new songs. For instance, Shulepnikov, Korff's father-in-law, composed melodies to Psalms and other Christian hymns for corporate singing (Lieven 1967:43). Princess Mary, an older sister of Sophie Lieven, translated into Russian a German Sunday School song "Laß die Herzen immer fröhlich und mit Dank erfüllet sein," which became a favourite song at the Sunday school conducted at the Lieven's palace (Corrado 2000:81). As for the quality of songs, Princess Sophie remarked that most of the songs "were musically somewhat primitive, having been taken straight from the English revival hymns".¹⁷⁷

An important contribution to the success of those meetings was the custom of serving refreshments after the official part was finished. "During the 'talks' lackeys dressed in tail-coats and white ties served tea and cookies; on the tray there always was a bottle of rum or cognac of the highest quality" (Zhiotov 1891:31). Pashkov "mingled with the crowd, shaking hands, exchanging bows, blessing the visitors, and answering questions" (Corrado 2000:84). There were also evening meals to which everybody present was invited; it was a four-course meal of "Strasburg pirog", cold appetizers, a hot dish, and champagne. The conversation was about spiritual matters and lasted until very late (Corrado 2000:84-85). An observer recalled, "What surprised me was that I was not at a masquerade, yet non-masked people came to me freely

¹⁷⁶ Moody and Sankey preached the gospel message in the British Isles between June 1873 and August 1875 (Bebbington 1989:162).

with questions, just as masked guests at a masquerade ball would do”.¹⁷⁸ It was Radstock’s custom adopted by Pashkov to meet with people individually after the formal part of the meeting. Holding meetings in homes allowed for this atmosphere of the personal touch and individual attention towards visitors.

The “Pashkovite” period of evangelical history in Russia also introduced children’s ministry. Almost from the very beginning children (those of the Pashkovites as well as those brought from some shelters) were included in the meetings. As the movement spread across the country, Pashkovite activity focused even more on children and schools. With the increase of persecution, children’s ministry at the Lieven palace became more systematic. Madame Klassovskaya, the governess of the Lieven children, began a Sunday school for the children of the home, including the children of servants, altogether about thirty children (Lieven 1967:79; Corrado 2000:115-116). The three Lieven sisters along with an older Baroness Julie Sass led a group for girls on Sunday afternoons under the patronage of the YWCA. Meetings for young women also took place at the Lieven palace and at the Chertkova’s hall on Vasil’evskiy Island with elderly Elizaveta Chertkova herself sometimes speaking to young ladies.¹⁷⁹

To summarise, the Pashkovite meetings and ministry grew out of Radstock’s “talks” which focused on salvation by faith that can be obtained here and now and the consequent assurance of salvation. Under Pashkov’s and Korff’s leadership the meetings became larger and more frequent. Their form of preaching, praying, singing, and children’s ministry were passed on as their legacy to the Evangelical Christian churches and can be still found in Russian congregations today.

4.1.2.4 Philanthropy and Evangelism

In addition to crossing social barriers, charity was another prominent Pashkovite characteristic. However, it would be difficult to discuss Pashkovite philanthropy apart from their evangelistic outreach. On the one hand, the good works they did were a natural consequence of their salvation. On the other hand, their compassion was not an end in itself; they used it in a practical way

¹⁷⁷ Lieven, *Eine Saat*, 37, in Corrado 2000:81.

¹⁷⁸ Glebov, 305, in Corrado 2000:85.

¹⁷⁹ Lieven, *Eine Saat*, 94, in Corrado 2000:117; Lieven 1967:111-112.

to extend to others the love of Christ they had found for themselves. This link between evangelism and charity was not a Russian phenomenon. From the very beginning Evangelicals in Britain actively promoted philanthropy, for instance, Wesley's generosity was legendary (Bebbington 1989:70). G. Müller provided the mode for orphan homes living out the principle of entire dependence on God. Corrado pointed out the similarity of Pashkovite charitable institutions to those in Europe (John Wesley's) and South America (D. L. Moody's) (Corrado 2000:71). Philanthropy became a trademark of the evangelical movement in St. Petersburg as well.

The Russian Orthodox Church with its emphasis upon "good works" has always promoted concern for the poor. What the evangelical revival added was zeal. To a critical outsider it was strange that "people preached only faith without deeds and at the same time based their actions on charity and generously helped the poor" (Zhiotov 1891:22). Pashkov was particularly active, using his great wealth for evangelistic and benevolent purposes. What he did was despised by his fellow-aristocrats, but tolerated by the Orthodox Church in the beginning (Fountain 1988:37).

Pashkov, Korff, and a number of Pashkovite ladies regularly visited hospitals (Lieven 1967:19, 25-26, 38). Stead also described this:

It was no uncommon sight to see a great lady, to whom all the salons of St. Petersburg were open, scurrying through the streets on a humble drozhky, to read and to pray by the bedside of some dying girl in the foul ward of the local hospital. No infection deterred them from the discharge of their self-imposed duties; no place was too dark for them to illuminate it with the radiance of their presence.¹⁸⁰

Besides hospitals, the Pashkovites also visited prisons. Princess Vera Gagarina who had no children was especially devoted to this selfless ministry (Corrado 2000:102-103). According to Dalton, prison work was carried out

in such an unpretentious way that scarcely anyone would think of recognising in the gentle and kindly Bible-reader who day after day makes her appearance in the prison-cells, one who bears an honoured and noble name in the Russia metropolis.¹⁸¹

Pashkov himself often visited prisons and had a reputation for calming down difficult prisoners. In this work he was supported by the Minister of

¹⁸⁰ Stead 355-356, in Corrado 2000:100.

¹⁸¹ Dalton, *Lord Radstock and Colonel Pashkoff*, 110, in Corrado 2000:102.

Justice, Count Pahlen, who provided Pashkov with a pass to visit prisoners in St. Petersburg, including political prisoners (Corrado 2000:102-103).

Pashkov and Korff had a special ministry among cab drivers. They visited tearooms for cab drivers, talked with customers, distributed tracts and Bible portions, and gave short evangelistic addresses (Brandenburg 1977:111). Pashkov and Korff even opened some new tearooms for them. This eventually led to opening a student low priced canteen serving good quality food (Corrado 2000:119). Pashkov reportedly paid Shimanskiy 32,000 roubles for a small plot of land in Lomanskiy pereulok in order to construct a building with cheap apartments and a canteen (Zhivotov 1891:42). That inexpensive canteen could feed up to one thousand people daily (Corrado 2000:119). The people who served in the canteen at the corner of Bol'shaya Samsonievskaya Street were Pashkovites—they not only fed the poor but also preached the gospel (Skvortsov 1905:45).

Later three more eating-places were opened. Originally intended for students, they later became available to anyone in need. Tracts and Bible portions were given out freely in those places (Nichols 1991:45). In 1882 Pobedonostsev complained to the tsar that Pashkov opened and kept financing “a free canteen for the poor”, where he and Count Bobrinskiy preached (Pobedonostsev 1882:8). The walls of the canteen had been decorated with Bible verses. However, at the order of the authorities the Bible verses were removed from the walls; later the canteen was closed and one of the cooks was even expelled from St. Petersburg for having given a New Testament to a policeman on the street (Corrado 2000:120).

To combat social injustice and help the poor earn a living, a bold project was undertaken. Two sisters, Madame Chertkova and Mrs. Pashkova, along with Princess Gagarina continued a work which had been handed to them by a stranger: sewing rooms for poor girls in St. Petersburg. These women taught mostly single girls how to sew, provided material, sold the finished products, and gave the girls a commission from the work.¹⁸² The Pashkovite ladies gathered poor women once or twice a week in the evenings to sew and complete various handicrafts. The city was divided into five districts between Count Korff's wife, Colonel Pashkov's wife, Madame Chertkova, and Princess

¹⁸² Brandenburg 1977:111-112; Lieven 1967:47-52; Kovalenko 1996:78.

Vera Gagarina who oversaw two districts. Sometimes Count Korff would read aloud and testify about Christ to women gathered at his wife's sewing circles (Corrado 2000:121).

As time went on the visitation of poor women continued, although with new Pashkovite ladies in charge. According to S. Lieven, Princess Vera Gagarina and Konstanza Kozlyaninova were responsible for the Pesky district; Alexandra Kozlyaninova was responsible for the district near her home, which was later taken up by Princesses Mary and Sophy Lieven.¹⁸³ Thus, "pastoral care was also provided as the poor women were visited in their dwellings by the Pashkovite ladies" (Brandenburg 1977:112). The Pashkovites also arranged social events for them, especially at Easter and Christmas, where women and their children were fed, entertained, and introduced to the Word of God (Corrado 2000:121-122).

The sewing women completed most of their work at home and received payment immediately. In order to sell the products, annual bazaars were held in the Pompeii and Malachite Halls of the Lieven palace. There were occasions when visitors stole pieces of this semi-precious stone from the columns of the beautiful Malachite Hall, so the Pashkovites temporarily rented a place on Voznesenskiy Prospect until a lower store in the palace was set up for the bazaar. This work continued until the beginning of World War I (Corrado 2000:121-122; Lieven 1967:51-52).

These Pashkovite ladies also set up laundry rooms in each district of St. Petersburg which operated in a similar manner providing jobs for the poor and inexpensive services for districts (Nichols 1991:22).

During the 1877-78 Russian-Turkish War, Pashkovite society ladies left their homes to serve as voluntary nurses.¹⁸⁴ They also organized sewing evenings to help wounded soldiers, and they visited soldiers in the Mikhaylovskiy Palace, where some rooms had been converted into a military hospital.¹⁸⁵

According to the newspapers, twice a week at a children's shelter in Galernaya Harbor, Pashkov and the Pashkovite ladies preached, sang, and distributed booklets (Pobedonostsev 1882:8). Pashkovites also started a home

¹⁸³ Lieven, *Eine Saat*, 43, in Corrado 2000:99.

¹⁸⁴ Dalton, *Lord Radstock and Colonel Pashkoff*, 110, in Corrado 2000:127.

for boys and a home for girls (Nichols 1991:22). This was another area of Pashkovite ministry: founding schools, workshops, and homes for poor children. The Pashkovite school located in Lomonosovskiy Pereulok was in existence before January 1883, since by then the Police Chief was already attempting to close the school.¹⁸⁶ Orthodox Archpriest Ornatsky considered this area of Pashkovite activity the most dangerous. According to Ornatsky the Pashkovites were:

rearing small children in a sectarian spirit in Pashkovite shelters and workshops, where children are taught not to pray according to Orthodox rites . . . not to go to priests or ask for priests' blessings. Such a workshop exists now [1903] in St. Petersburg, at one of Pashkov's buildings on the corner of Sampsonievskiy Prospekt and Lomanov Pereulok on the Vyborg side, and one must wonder why Orthodox parents allow underage children to go to work there (Ornatsky, 1903:8-9).

Other schools were opened on the estates of Pashkovites where aristocratic ladies taught peasants to read.¹⁸⁷

Another charitable institution founded by Pashkov in one of his buildings in the Vyborg side was an inexpensive shelter for homeless women (Corrado 2000:126). In the words of Professor Emile Dillon, Pashkov spent his property

most generously, on the poor and suffering, with a secrecy and tact to which I [Professor Emile Dillon] have never seen a parallel. Students who had been starving on black bread and weak tea were enabled to finish their studies; families about to disperse for lack of subsistence were kept together by relief from an unseen source; the sick were cared for by his physicians or sent to hospitals at his expense... In a few years he spent a large fortune in works of Christian charity.¹⁸⁸

Unfortunately, Pashkovite charity, especially Pashkov's personal generosity, was often misunderstood; some even took advantage of it. There were rumours that Pashkov was "buying" followers with money (Bogolyubov 1912:29), or that poor people who showed interest in joining the "sect" were fed free of charge at the low-priced canteen (Bogolyubov 1912:29). Pobedonostsev reported to the tsar that Colonel Pashkov often paid money to his listeners who

¹⁸⁵ Krusenstjerna, *Im Kreuz*, 85-86, in Corrado 2000:127.

¹⁸⁶ V. A. Pashkov, St. Petersburg, to Ober Politseimeister P.A. Gresser, [Jan-Feb. 1883], Pashkoff Papers, fiche 2/1/a, 11, in Corrado 2000:125.

¹⁸⁷ Dillon, 332, in Corrado 2000:125.

¹⁸⁸ Dillon 332, in Corrado 2000:45.

missed work and to his own workmen he paid the day's wages (Zapiska 1884:13). Later Kushnev ironically mentioned that Pashkov "was flush with money and gave out his publications" (Kushnev 1916:47). Some may have thought Pashkov was wasting his fortune, but time has shown how right he was. Although Pashkov could not have known this in the beginning, his ministry in Russia was limited to ten years. Then, after the 1917 Revolution all private property was confiscated and nationalized anyway.

In summary, one cannot but notice similarities between the Pashkovite movement and British evangelicalism of the time. In both cases believers did not wait for people to come to them but they went to where people were. In both cases women's ministry became common and acceptable. In both cases meetings included domestic servants and representatives from the working classes. In both cases meetings were followed by private conversations. In both cases there were special meetings for children, working women, young people, etc. In both cases philanthropy played a significant role in believers' lives. This kind of behaviour naturally turned heads. Some accused them of hypocrisy and wrong motives, while others were stunned to see the change in their lives caused by receiving the gospel message. A lot of continuity can be found between Pashkovite philanthropy and the evangelical practices of Great Britain. Sewing meetings for the poor, hospital and prison visitations, homes for orphans and prostitutes are only a few examples.

4.1.2.5 Publishing activity

It should be remembered that besides personal contacts, significant evangelistic outreach was achieved by distributing Bibles, tracts, and Christian literature. One must remember that Russians were and still are a nation of readers. The task of printing Bibles and evangelical literature was undertaken by the Society for the Encouragement of Spiritual and Ethical Reading (SESER) founded in 1876 with the approval of the Holy Synod. Korff claimed that it was Pashkov's idea and initiative to organise the Society. Pashkov was its president and a generous sponsor. He also allocated one of his halls for storing publications, well over a million pieces of literature. Although after 1862 the Holy Synod alone had the right to print the Scripture in Russian, it did not hold a monopoly on distribution. By 1881 Pashkov and his followers had distributed thousands of Bibles at their own expense, many of them with passages

highlighted by hand in the fashion of the Marked Testaments familiar in England. In 1882 Pashkov paid the British Bible Society to print complete Bibles. In addition, Pashkov published New Testaments with Psalms himself.¹⁸⁹

In St. Petersburg the Pashkovite literature was available at the bookstore of J. Grotte at Liteyny Prospect 56 as well as in bookstores in other large cities (Corrado 2000:141). Kushnev mentions that Grotte's bookshop was located in Bol'shaya Morskaya Street near the Angliya Hotel (Kushnev 1916:8). In 1882 Count Bobrinskiy organised booths at the Moscow Exhibition where over 120,000 brochures were distributed in the course of four and one-half months (Corrado 2000:143).

Another method already mentioned of distributing literature was by colporteurs, among whom Pashkov worked most with Delyakov. Their close collaboration continued even after Pashkov's exile (Karetnikova 2001:30). The message was also spread by seasonal workers who took Bibles and tracts home to their villages (Fountain 1988:38). "The booklets were given out for free in the preacher's home after the sermon, they were taken to peasants' homes by colporteurs, sometimes peasants were caught with these booklets at their work places, in victualling-house, and in pothouses" (Sakharov 1897:20).

This way, there was a sufficient amount of Bibles in the country. The Society distributed its printed materials, including New Testaments and Bibles, among wide circles of the Russian population. Due to its activity the New Testament in Russian made its way into many remote villages; it became available to the *muzhik* [a peasant man]. Already in 1886 (!) the Pashkovite brochures were found in Siberia being translated into the languages of ethnic minorities and distributed among them (Kushnev 1916:58). In time the Pashkovite literature spread from Murmansk in the north to Tiflis in the South, and from Finland in the West to Sakhalin in the East (Corrado 2000:186).

Prugavin admitted that "one cannot help seeing serious merit of the Pashkovites in this area. The reading of the gospel did its work. Under the influence of this reading, peasants started thinking about moral, religious, and social issues" (Prugavin 1909:246). The Pashkovites generously supplied their printed materials to other evangelical groups in Russia who gladly received the

¹⁸⁹ Korff, *Vospominaniya*, in Karev 1999:131; Karetnikova 2001:30; Savinsky 1999:149; Corrado 2000:139.

Bibles and other Christian literature. That is why Sakharov complained that the Pashkovites “feed with their juices a great tree of Russian Stundism as the adherents of this sect gladly use printed editions of the Pashkovites” (Sakharov 1897:26).

The Society published a hymnbook *Lyubimye stikhi* [Favourite verses] and many other spiritual booklets. Sakharov presents a list of the booklets’ titles which includes 113 entries (Sakharov 1897:26-28), while Skvortsov’s list includes 117 titles (Skvortsov 1893:75-81). Skvortsov also pointed out that there were more than two hundred brochures altogether, some of which were reprinted up to twelve times, approximately five thousand copies each time (Skvortsov 1893:75). Among the books were already mentioned Russian translations by Yuliya Zasetskaya of Bunyan’s *Pilgrim’s Progress*¹⁹⁰ and *The Holy War*. Translations of Spurgeon’s sermons were especially popular.¹⁹¹ Until its forced closure in 1884 the Society managed to publish about two hundred titles including Spurgeon’s sermons, some of which had up to twelve printings (Kovalenko 1996:80; AUCECB 1989:85). However Sakharov points out that, even after 1884, some Pashkovite publications appeared in 1891 and 1892, permitted (according to cover copy) by an ecclesiastical superintendent of printing (Sakharov 1897:24).

Some observations can be made about Pashkovite literature in general. First of all, most of their publications came out anonymously. The author will probably never be able to identify the writers and translators of these items. Whether it was the result of caution in the face of possible persecution, Christian modesty, or both, the author cannot tell. Interestingly, the earliest publications of Plymouth Brethren writers also came out anonymously or were signed only with initials (Ehlert 1957:55-56). Most booklets published were translations from English and German, among which some were written by

¹⁹⁰ The Public Library in St. Petersburg contains a copy of Bunyan’s “Pilgrim’s Progress” published in Russian in 1782 under a long title *Lyubopytnoe i dostopamyatnoe puteshestvie khristianina k vechnosti cherez mnogie priklyucheniya* [The curious and memorable journey of a Christian to eternity through many adventures]. Then there are *Sochineniya Ioanna Byuniana* [Works of John Bunyan] (2nd edition, corrected, from German translation) published in 1786-1787. These publications preceded Zasetskaya’s translation of 1878 by a century.

¹⁹¹ Korff, *Vospominaniya*, in Karev 1999:131; Karetnikova 2001:30; Savinsky 1999:149; Kovalenko 1996:80; AUCECB 1989:85.

Radstock, while others were products of the Russian mind (Sakharov 1897:20; Ornatsky 1903:7-8).

Skvortsov formulated the main idea behind all of the brochures: “Have the Bible and read it, believe in Jesus and look at Him – this is the main and essential thing for salvation. Everything else is not so important” (Skvortsov 1893:76). Commenting on the brochure “Two old men who grew younger”, Terletsky notes, “When reading a brochure one cannot help seeing the traces of Protestant pietism mixed with mysticism” (Terletsky 1891:46). Indeed, the main goal of such brochures was evangelism and the edification of believers. Then, according to Nichols, the SESER purposefully tried to maintain a theologically neutral position (Nichols 1991:51). One reason could be that Pashkovites stood on non-denominational grounds, while the other could be that from the very beginning of the SESER Pashkovites had to deal with censors. Korff recalled:

I often had to go to the censor’s office at the Alexander Nevskiy Monastery. Not infrequently did this lead to theological discussions with the censor. I tried to prove to him, a learned monk, that it was not his duty to defend Orthodoxy, but rather that his job was to see that literature printed did not represent dangerous teachings. ‘Your literature represents the doctrines of Luther, Calvin, Zwingli and Wesley, and they shake the Orthodox Church. Therefore they are dangerous,’ was his usual reply (Korff, *Am Zarenhof*, 49-50, in Corrado 2000:145).

In 1880 even the Chief Procurator could not find a good reason to hinder the distribution of the Society’s publications. Four years later the attitude changed again, and the Society was shut down on 24 May 1884 (Skvortsov 1893:76). The government confiscated a large number of books. Pashkov’s letter written in November 1884 indicated that, “This [confiscation] deprived us, as stated, of the cost of the books: the Society twelve thousand rubles and myself nine thousand rubles”.¹⁹² The total publications of the Society reached several million items (Fountain 1988:38).

The publications can be divided into several groups. The titles of the booklets speak for themselves:

– On sin, repentance and salvation (e. g. “Do you believe that you are a sinner?”, “Repentance,” “Joyful news,” “Good news,” “About Jesus Christ’s readiness to receive sinners,” “Returning of a sinner to God” “Come to Jesus,”

¹⁹² Pashkov, Shortgrave, Newcastle, Essex, England, to Petr Vasilievich, St. Petersburg, 14/26 November 1884, Pashkoff papers, fiche II/1/b, p.1, in Corrado 2000:146.

“Tonight or never,” “The way to salvation,” “Have you made peace with God?,” “He loves me,” “Talks of two friends about the new birth,” “Make them come in” (by Spurgeon)).

- On the meaning of Christianity and Christian life (e.g., “What is a Christian?,” “The name of a Christian and its meaning,” “Do you fulfil the will of God?,” “Children of God, His heirs,” “Do you pray?,” “A few rules of good conduct,” “Do you thank God?,” “A reminder to Christians from the Word of God,” “Christ is all in all,” “About faith in Christ”).

- On the Second Coming and life after death (e.g., “Think of future life”, “Wheat and weeds”, “Heaven and hell” (by Spurgeon), “Saved or lost – be ready,” “Wedding garment,” “Wedding feast”).

- On the Scripture (e.g., “What does the Holy Scripture teach?,” “Thoughts on the Song of Songs,” “Two words about the Holy Bible,” “A short guide to the reading of the New Testament”).

- Excerpts from Orthodox writers (St. Tikhon and the Reverend Michael) on the Scripture, Christian faith, good works, repentance, etc.

- Simple stories for children.

- Against drunkenness.

Russkiy Rabochiy [Russian Workman], a monthly newspaper released to meet the needs of the rapidly growing working class, carried articles written by Orthodox writers, e.g., St. Tikhon, St. Ephraem the Syrian, St. John Chrysostom, archbishop Eusebius of Mogilev (Terletsky 1891:63). This points again to the broadmindedness of the Pashkovites. The newspaper outlived the Society by two years, and was closed in 1886.

Leskov’s detailed study of *Russkiy Rabochiy*, titled *Sentimental’noe blagochestie* [Sentimental piety], criticised the newspaper for being artificial, in that the persons described in the articles were more English than Russian, even if they were called by Russian names (Leskov 1877:305-316, 329-330). He rightly rebukes the publishers for not being well enough acquainted with the realities of Russian life. Leskov also criticised the newspaper for preaching salvation by faith alone without personal merit (Leskov 1877:317-320). He attributed this to the “extreme views of modern Protestants” among whom he named Moody, whose writings were being eagerly translated by the ladies of high society (Leskov 1877:319-320). According to Leskov, “The thought of such

easy access to heaven for anybody who turned to Christ with faith alone surely contains a serious danger” (Leskov 1877:320). In Leskov’s opinion, the newspaper was not what Russian workmen needed (Leskov 1877:265).

Later in 1895 the Russian Workman was revived by Princess M. N. Shcherbatova under a different name, *Voskresnoe Chtenie* [The Sunday reading], similar in form and content to its predecessor (Sakharov 1897:25).

The prayers of Bersier, a French Reformed pastor, became very popular among the Russian Pashkovite ladies of high society in Petersburg. The prayers were translated into Russian for distribution among people who did not know French (Leskov 1877:(II)3-4). Starting in 1877 Bersier’s sermons and other writings were published in St. Petersburg some fifty-five times. The author believes that they deserve closer attention. One of the *Sermons par Bersier* (Paris 1879), titled “Is prayer effective?”, was translated from French by A. Kunitsina and published in 1880. It is about “the instinct of prayer that lives deep down in every human soul” (Bersier 1880:4). Bersier insists that direct prayer to God, not a repetition of memorized words, is more than a spiritual exercise; it can change the course of things (Bersier 1880:11).

“The court preacher”, another sermon from volume two of *Sermons par Bersier*, was also translated by A. Kunitsyna and published in 1880. It is about John the Baptist’s courage and truthful nature. It is directed against the hypocrisy of high society and the need to disclose it. Bersier’s sermons continued to be translated and published even after SESER was shut down. For instance, “Life lived in vain” was published in 1891. The preacher insists that human life that is not directly or indirectly lived for God is fruitless; life that pursues personal interests and praise is utterly useless for God. Again Bersier preaches against the emptiness and futility of high society life with its excessive leisure, with late mornings without prayer and serious reading. He urges his reader to remember his duty because idleness in a Christian perverts one’s soul.

Such was the type of reading which to a great extent formed and moulded the Pashkovites’ worldview.

4.1.2.6 Attempts to Unite Different Evangelical Groups

The main disagreement between aristocratic Pashkovites and peasant Stundists, Baptists, and Molokans was over the issues of their relationship with

the Orthodox Church and infant baptism, which for years prevented an official merger. However, there were a number of attempts to find common ground, many cases of communication and mutual help, and plenty of ties on a personal level.

Pashkov was “a valuable friend to the Stundists scattered over southern Russia” (Latimer 1908:36) for a number of good reasons. After Korff visited Stundists in the Ukrainian gubernias (provinces) of Chaplinka and Kosyakovka in 1875, Baptists and Stundists began to call on Pashkov when staying in the capital, and the Pashkovites supplied them with literature (Corrado 2000:148). Distribution of literature printed by the SESER was a task shared by Pashkovites and southern believers, especially Stundists and Molokans. By 1879 Pashkov himself had visited the Stundists and participated in their activities (Corrado 2000:148-149).

By the 1880s Pashkovite influence was widely spread due to distribution of literature, “voluminous correspondence”, and Pashkovite travels (Corrado 2000:150; Sakharov 1897:19). It has already been mentioned that Pashkov and Korff visited different Evangelical believers in Volga region in 1881, and at about the same time Pashkov got closely involved with the needs of the Ukrainian peasants (Nichols 1991 66-67). Fountain also points out that “Pashkov and Korff undertook extensive preaching tours into the interior, especially into regions heavily populated by the Nonconformists, and the new movement was joining forces with the Nonconformist sects, especially those in the South-West of Russia” (Fountain 1988:38).

Actually, it was the “enemies” of the evangelicals that saw Stundists and Pashkovites as parts of the same movement long before the various evangelical strands began discussing a possible merger. The common term used to describe the evangelicals was “Stundo-Pashkovtsy.” This could be partly due to a certain measure of ignorance or, perhaps, their opponents actually saw through the small differences into a bigger picture. It was the “enemies” again that worried about a possible merger the most. In May 1880 Pobedonostsev wrote to the tsar about the danger created by Pashkov:

He [Pashkov] calls into existence a new schism which, rising in the north, from the capital, and from the upper class of society and the governing intellectuals, threatens to coalesce with the Stunda which sprung up among the peasants of the South-West of Russia (Pobedonostsev 1880:4).

It was persecution that became an important unifying factor. First, unfriendly newspapers and periodicals created free publicity. For instance, in April 1880 after reading an article in *Tserkovno-Obshchestvennyy Vestnik* № 35 aimed against Pashkov, the Vladikavkaz congregation of Baptists began communicating with Pashkov. They wrote, “The editor describes your sermons and prayers, not memorised, but heartfelt, as is your entire worship service... we easily recognised that you were our brothers...”¹⁹³ Second, persecuted Stundists needed the Pashkovites’ help, support, and intercession. Besides, sharing a prison cell tends to unite people. J. Kroeker told an interesting story of a stormy Stundist conference, which ended in dispersal by the police. Two leading representatives, one for infant baptism and one for believers’ baptism, were arrested and put into the same prison cell where “a moving reconciliation took place, sealed by many brotherly kisses” (Brandenburg 1977:92).

In any case, by the end of the 1870s Pashkov and Korff knew a number of Nonconformist groups that preached salvation by faith around the Empire. The Ukraine and the Caucasus, then parts of the Empire, were home to the main branches of the evangelical movement. When on 20-22 May 1882 Mennonite Brethren and Baptists had a conference in Rikenau (Tavrisheskaya gubernia), Pashkov wrote a letter asking them to receive visiting believers from St. Petersburg as brothers and sisters and allow them to participate in the Lord’s Supper regardless of being baptised as infants only.

The minutes of the Baptist Conference in Rikenau contain the following information: Brother Wieler reported that brother Pashkov wishes that Baptists would allow believers from St. Petersburg to take part in the Lord’s Supper in spite of being baptised only as infants. Brothers E. Bogdanov, A. Mazaev, and I. Skorokhodov argued that if they allow this, it would mean that infant baptism was right and Baptists were wrong. However, they decided not to send back any categorical answer and left this issue to be solved in the future (Alexii 1908:567-568). On the one hand, Mennonites and Baptists did not want to sound too harsh (Karetnikova 2001:37-38) because they did not want to scare away the Pashkovites. On the other hand, they considered adult baptism an issue of such great importance that it could not be treated lightly. Nevertheless,

¹⁹³ Dmitriy Udalov, Vladikavkaz, to Vasilii Pashkov, St. Petersburg, 8 April 1880, in hand-written copybook No. 2, in Corrado 2000:148-149.

doctrinal differences in the points of baptism and participation in the Lord's Supper did not hinder the Baptists from receiving Pashkovite literature and financial help. Thus the Pashkovite leaders in St. Petersburg were left to think that association with Baptists was possible.

It seems that around the same time in 1882 Pashkov and his followers were already planning to convene an all-Russia evangelical congress for Bible-centred believers. Pashkov, who was baptised about the same time, now had much more in common with Baptists than previously. The goal of the congress was "to unite different groups of believers in Russia so that they could get to know each other and then work together".¹⁹⁴ Another goal was to unite those groups under a common doctrinal statement written in terms acceptable for all (Corrado 2000:151). The plan was delayed until 1884 when on March 24 letters signed by Pashkov and Korff were sent to Stundists, Baptists, Mennonites, Molokans, Dukhobors, and Evangelical Christians (Zakharovtsy)¹⁹⁵ asking them to send delegates to St. Petersburg (Corrado 2000:152; Ellis & Jones 1996:29-30). Pashkov and Korff provided travel money for those who could not afford it (Nichols 1991:67). Pashkov's wealth allowed him to pay the expenses of about one hundred people or more during their time in St. Petersburg. The Pashkovites used to think and act in a stately manner, set high goals, and see them reached.

The beginning of the united conference was set on 1 April 1884 and was planned for eight days (Karetnikova 2001:42; Ellis & Jones 1996:29-30).

Pashkov engaged a roomy hotel in St. Petersburg and invited the widely scattered bodies to send delegates to the capital city for a series of meetings... They came, to the number of about four hundred. The meetings I believe were held in a hall in the palace of Princess Lieven. Tickets were issued to each person; Dr. and Mrs. Baedeker's tickets were Nos. 1 and 2 respectively (Latimer 1908:36).

Dr. Baedeker was present to welcome the guests. Seventy people were out-of-town delegates who lodged in Pashkov's hotel (Ellis & Jones 1996:29-30). Besides the Baedekers there were a few other foreign delegates. The exact number of delegates is not known. Corrado finds the number of one hundred

¹⁹⁴ Korff, *Vospominaniya*, in Karetnikova 2001:39.

¹⁹⁵ Kovalenko mentions only Stundists, Baptists, Brethren Mennonites, and Evangelical Christians (Zakharovtsy) (Kovalenko 1996:74).

the most reliable estimate (Corrado 2000:152). Sessions were held in the houses of Pashkov, Korff, and N. Lieven (Karetnikova 2001:42).

The 1884 Congress was a high point of the evangelical movement culminating the ministry of Pashkov and Korff before their banishment from Russia. The idea of allowing various evangelicals to meet each other and possibly to find common ground for unity overpowered officials' warnings to not call the conference. Corrado reveals an important fact that on 20 March, two weeks before the united congress, Pashkov and Korff were summoned to appear before General Orevskiy, chief of St. Petersburg political police. He ordered them to stop preaching, stop circulating literature, and not receive delegates from the South. When they refused, General forbade them to correspond with the southern believers whatsoever, and ordered them to leave Russia within a fortnight. If they did not comply, they faced the danger of losing the right to manage their estates. Princess N. Lieven was also forbidden to receive the delegates at her home. Pashkov, Korff, and Lieven ignored these orders and continued as if nothing had happened (Corrado 2000:151).

They would not have taken the risk (Pashkov himself often submitted to what he saw as unjust requests of the authorities) unless the congress to unite the evangelical groups was a matter of such great significance to them. It was a matter of great significance to the authorities as well. They feared nothing more than seeing "sects" scattered all over the vast empire suddenly gathering together.

The 1884 congress is described by a number of participants in many details and with great warmth.¹⁹⁶ Especially memorable was a sense of brotherhood that crossed denominational, social, and national borders:

The halls and drawing rooms for the sessions were filled with people of different classes: among the peasants, official employees, workers, tradesmen there were princes, counts, barons, and ladies from high society (Pavlov 1884?:28).

The sessions started on 1 April. The stated goal of the conference was "to strengthen the brethren in the faith, to deepen their understanding of the Bible, and to emphasise brotherly fellowship" without creating "denominational uniformity" (Brandenburg 1977:112). The main issues being discussed were

¹⁹⁶ Pavlov 1999:197-198 "Vospominaniya ssyl'nogo"; Pavlov 1999:248-249 "Pravda o baptistakh", Latimer 1908:36-38.

spreading the gospel and church organisational matters. The latter issue involved significant controversy (Kovalenko 1996:74). The idea of merging even without reaching “denominational uniformity” was too bold and utopic for the time. Pashkov must have been a great optimist hoping to unite those groups under the same doctrinal statement! The doctrinal differences that Pashkovites viewed as minor proved to be much more important to other groups.

Baptist delegates even refused to participate in the Lord’s Supper held at the Congress because the majority of St. Petersburg believers had not been re-baptised as adults.¹⁹⁷ The Baptists and Molokans, who had been influenced by J. Oncken, practised closed communion (Nichols 1991:68). The Mennonite Brethren also rebaptised everyone who joined their groups; any former baptisms were considered invalid (Kushnev 1916:170). For those groups, “shared communion was possible only with those who had been baptised as believers, by immersion” (Brandenburg 1977:112). In the St. Petersburg group, however, the question of rebaptising adults by immersion was left to the individual conscience (Sakharov 1897:64).

A meeting to discuss the issue of baptism was held on 3 April at the home of Princess Lieven. The draft of the Pashkovite statement on baptism seemed too broad for those holding stricter views, caused arguments, and had to be dropped from the document. It read, “We recognise baptism as an ordinance instituted by God . . . How this command will be fulfilled depends on the conscience of the individual and is left to the individual’s understanding of the Word of God”.¹⁹⁸ As soon as it became clear that the participants would not agree on the issue of baptism, Pashkov, Baedeker, and Radcliff suggested dropping the subject, because “further discussion could create mutual displeasure” (Karetnikova 2001:43). After a few days of discussion and arguments they decided to concentrate on ethical issues (Nichols 1991:68).

Mennonites, Dukhobors, Molokans, Baptists, and Stundists could not possibly agree theologically. The issue of baptism was not the only thing that differed in their views. Mennonites with their longer history did not want to be allied with the Baptists. Apart from other differences, they firmly held to their privilege of refusing armed service, while Baptists were more tolerant in this

¹⁹⁷ Pavlov 1999:248; Corrado 2000:153.

matter; furthermore, Baptists did not forbid the use of tobacco, as the Mennonites did (Brandenburg 1977:91).

Unfortunately, not much can be found in the literature and sources about the specific content of speeches. Pavlov recalled that nobody announced the speakers; anybody could stand up and speak (Pavlov 1999:197). Pavlov himself spoke about the biblical foundations for unity pointing out that it can be reached through the outpouring of the Holy Spirit and returning to the Apostles' teaching (Pavlov 1884?:28). Englishman Reginald Radcliffe spoke on methods of evangelising, warning not to repeat the mistakes of English and German Baptists, namely, not to pay preachers for preaching. He also insisted that women should not be allowed to preach. However, there was a woman speaker at the conference, most likely Princess Lieven, who spoke on the topic "Do not love the world" (Pavlov 1884?:29).

The decision about supporting preachers/missionaries and women's ministry was unanimous: "preachers are entitled to financial support and gifted sisters should be allowed to preach" (Karetnikova 2001:43). A number of Pashkovite ladies (Chertkova, Lieven, Gagarina, the Kozlyaninov sisters, the Kruezer sisters, Peuker, Zasetkaya, and many others) not only evangelised but saved the Petersburg Pashkovite congregation from closure during the difficult times, preached and counselled, especially until Kargel returned in 1885 from Finland and Alekseev was chosen as presbyter in 1888 (Karetnikova 2001:43-44).

On 6 April, the fifth day of the conference, at Bol'shaya Morskaya 43, luncheon was served by Princess Lieven (Ellis & Jones 1996:29-30). However, the Princess, Pashkov, and a few foreign guests waited in vain.

No delegates appeared... A large force of police that had lain in wait for them arrested every one. In the fortress of St. Peter and St. Paul, whither they had been taken, they were carefully searched and separately interrogated as to whence they had come, their purpose in coming, who paid their charges, and their opinions on political and other matters (Latimer 1908:36-37).

The principal officer warned the delegates, "You have no lawful business in St. Petersburg; and therefore we have to send you all back at once to your

¹⁹⁸ Kushnev 1916:81; Bogolyubov 1912:18; Korff, *Am Zarenhof*, 57, in Corrado 2000:153.

homes... If any of you are again discovered in this city, you will be arrested and punished” (Latimer 1908:38).

According to Stead, the time that Molokans, Stundists, Baptists and other delegates spent in the prison of St. Peter and Paul’s fortress contributed more to the desired unity than had the meetings called for that purpose.¹⁹⁹ Overall, as a result of the conference, “a good foundation had been laid for communication between the groups” (Nichols 1991:68) despite theological disagreements. The great value of the 1884 congress in St. Petersburg was that the representatives of various evangelical movements got to know each other. The Pashkovites were the ones who had potential to fulfil this task.

After the St. Petersburg Congress was interrupted by the authorities, in the end of April of the same year a Baptist Conference was organized in Novovasil’evka. Delegates were mostly from the south of Russia and the Caucasus. The chairman was I. Wieler and the vice chairman was I. Kargel. The issue of shared participation in the Lord’s Supper for those baptised as infants and as adults was raised again. After many discussions most of delegates expressed their readiness to share the Lord’s Table with all genuine believers if testing reveals them as such. The Conference resumed leaving this question open for the sake of those who did not have “clarity in this issue from the Lord” (Alexii 1908:580). The Conference commissioned Kargel, as a representative of the St. Petersburg brothers, to express hearty gratitude to St. Petersburg believers for substantial offerings to their missionary work (Alexii 1908:584).

After the dismissal of the conference in St. Petersburg the authorities started taking decisive measures: in May the SESER was closed, in June Pashkov and Korff were ordered to leave the country. Count Korff recalled later, “I was supposed to sign an undertaking not to preach any more, not to organize any more meetings, not to engage in free prayer, and to give up all relations with the stundists and other religious communities” (Brandenburg 1977:113). In June 1884 Pashkov and Korff were both banished from Russia; they lived the rest of their lives in exile (Fountain 1988:39).

While in the exile, Pashkov corresponded with I. Wieler (a German Mennonite, the first president of the Baptist Union), V. Pavlov (the Baptist leader

¹⁹⁹ Stead, 365-366, in Corrado 2000:154.

from Tiflis), Ryaboshapka and Ratushnyy (Ukrainian Stundist leaders), Y. Delyakov (Persian missionary in Russia) and many others (Corrado 2000:163). While the official merger did not work out, personal ties were not broken. Needless to say, Pashkov not only wrote letters, but continued to support a number of projects financially. Using his high connections he also interceded before the authorities on behalf of believers. He even wrote to the tsar himself, arguing that “so-called Evangelical sectarians and Baptists” are not “apostates who deny their native land and people, who separate themselves from everything Russian, who are rebels against the supreme authority, and advocates of the universal levelling of ranks”.²⁰⁰ Pashkov’s correspondence in exile indicates closer contact with Stundists and Baptists than with his own followers (Corrado 2000:172).

To summarise, it must be said that Pashkovites were the first ones in Russia who attempted to unite all other evangelical groups which were similarly Bible-minded. In so doing, they set a precedent. About a month later Baptists met in Novovasil’evka and as a result a Baptist Union was formed. By the late 1880s, outside of the capital evangelicals were commonly known as “Stundo-Pashkovtsy” and “Stundoevangelisty”, no longer distinguishing Pashkovites from Stundists (Corrado 2000:172). In 1897 the Orthodox Missionary Congress came to the conclusion that Stundism had absorbed Pashkovism to the point that Pashkovism does not constitute a separate “sect”, it totally merged with Stundism or joined the Baptists.²⁰¹

4.1.3 Conclusion

So, what was the rise and the initial stage of evangelical movement in St. Petersburg like?

In general, literature about the early Pashkovites carries many emotional overtones. “Friends” are praising them while “enemies” are cursing. The studies lack distinct periodisation of that ten-year period as if the movement remained the way it was during those first “naïve” days of Radstock’s “talks”. I will attempt to fill this gap.

²⁰⁰ Stead, 390-391, in Corrado 2000:164.

²⁰¹ Deyat. 3 Vseross. Miss. s’ezda 1897 g., p. 133, in Kushnev 1916:54.

Through the preaching of Lord Radstock a significant spiritual movement took place among the Russian aristocracy. The first two years 1874-1876 were filled with Radstock's presence, with the conversions of future key Russian leaders including Pashkov, Korff, and Bobrinskiy. During this time meetings grew out of private "chamber" conversations into massive public gatherings. It was a time of almost unlimited freedom. The evangelical group in St. Petersburg was known by the nickname "Radstockists". It must have been Radstock who introduced the Brethren practice of open "breaking of the bread" among his St. Petersburg followers. Actually, in Russian Evangelical-Baptist churches even today the communion is called *khleboprelomlenie* which literally means "breaking of bread".

During the next two years or a little longer, 1876-1878, the group was still mostly concentrated on evangelism with Pashkov becoming the leading figure. The group started to be identified as Pashkovites. Although the movement experienced bad press from Orthodox enthusiasts, there was no official persecution yet, except for Radstock being forced to leave the country. Korff wrote, "All this joyful time when we could freely preach the gospel lasted about five years".²⁰² It was during this time that the movement crossed social, national, and denominational barriers. By 1878-79 the revival reached its highest point in terms of its public activity: a number of homes opened for meetings, attendance was high, popularity was at its peak, printing of Christian materials was abundant.

During the next four years, 1878-1882, the group still lacked any distinctive church organisation, but the search for identity had started. It seems that with Baedeker's arrival in 1877, the group started moving closer towards an Open Brethren type of congregation. With Pobedonostsev as Ober-procurator from 1880 the Pashkovites started facing difficulties in their ministry and had to "slow down" their activity. Even prior to that "in 1878 all public meetings were forbidden, but the Lord helped us to continue meetings in the homes of Pashkov and Lieven".²⁰³ However, according to Korff, "before 1882 all our spiritual

²⁰² Korff, *Vospominaniya*, in Karev 1999:125.

²⁰³ Korff, *Vospominaniya*, in Karev 1999:131.

activity was predominantly evangelistic,²⁰⁴ which means that the group was broadening its boundaries.

During the last two years of the ten-year period under consideration, 1882-1884, with Pashkov and Korff still in Russia, the movement had to adopt new forms. According to Korff, “after the big public meetings came under the ban we started sewing workshops [in 1882]”.²⁰⁵ During this search for identity G. Müller was invited. Now there were more meetings for prayer and edification. With the baptism of Pashkov, Lieven, and a couple others the group moved even closer to Open Brethren structure. The Pashkovites, however, preserved a genuine open communion and did not pressure those who held to infant baptism. This was a time of intense search for connections and unity with other evangelical Bible-minded groups across Russia, especially in the south-western parts.

In the years after Pashkov’s and Korff’s banishment and before the edict of freedom of conscience, 1884-1905, the leadership moved to women, mostly to Lieven and Chertkova, who preserved semi-legal meetings.

By 1884 the theological profile of the Pashkovite group in St. Petersburg became very consistent with the conservative evangelicalism of Great Britain of that time, particularly with Open Brethren and the Keswick convention. Russian literature on the movement consistently makes Radstock a member of a Darbyist church or at least somebody close to becoming a member.²⁰⁶ This seems to be a mistake because Radstock was much closer to Open Brethren. Even more so were his close friends and followers to Russia, Baedeker and Müller. Hence, the Pashkovite movement should have been bearing the character of Open Brethren rather than Exclusive Brethren. The author cannot agree with James Rushbrooke, a past president of the Baptist World Alliance, who classified the movement in St. Petersburg as “bearing the character of so called ‘Plymouth Brethren’ or ‘Darbyists’” (Rushbrooke 1999:189).

As in Britain, the movement in Russia began within the Established Church. It was persecution that drove believers out of the Established Church and actually strengthened the ranks of Nonconformity, as was the case with Wesley and Methodism (Fountain 1988:18-19). Like Keswick and early

²⁰⁴ Korff, *Vospominaniya*, in Karev 1999:130.

²⁰⁵ *Ibid.*

Brethren, “the evangelical revival in Russia in the second half of the last century had this non-denominational character” (Brandenburg 1977:xi).

Of the three streams which constituted the Russian evangelical movement: Stundist, Baptists and Evangelical Christians (the latter linked with the name of the Englishman Lord Radstock), only the Baptists had from the beginning a definite denominational character . . . The Evangelical Christians were noted for their extreme openness (Brandenburg 1977:xii).

The Pashkovite movement was non-denominational, as often happens with such spontaneous revivals. Radstock came from the Open Brethren, who themselves “strove for a Christianity without organization and official positions” (Brandenburg 1977:109). It is not surprising then that Russian evangelicals became non-denominational as well, in the Brethren sense of the word (it has nothing in common with modern ecumenism): having fellowships with all saints regardless of their denominational affiliations, as long as the definition of a “saint” comes from within the group.

Nichols points out that revival movements are rarely known for their systematic theology and are more concerned with a person’s relationship with Christ. This was certainly true of the Pashkovite movement. Radstock and Pashkov succeeded in motivating people towards pietistic Christianity and tried to stay as non-denominational as possible (Nichols 1991:82). Another important point made by Nichols is that for Russians the ability to implement a Christian belief system is more important than the defining that belief. Nichols sees this as the central reason why pietistic teaching exerted such enormous influence on Russian society. “Russians were drawn to a theological system, which offered a distinct ethical system, not distinct theology” (Nichols 1991:109).

The Pashkovites recognised the Bible as the only source of their spiritual authority. In their “no theology” approach that they had learnt from Radstock, they read the Bible, preached the Bible, memorised the Bible, printed the Bible, and believed the Bible. They were people of the Book. Like evangelical believers of all generations, the Pashkovites did not doubt that God inspired the Bible. This belief was transmitted to them by Radstock, Baedeker, and other foreign preacher-teachers who worked among the Pashkovites in St. Petersburg. It seems that just as Wesley avoided “philosophical speculations,

²⁰⁶ Kovalenko 1996:69, Karetnikova 2001:28; Savinsky 1999:141.

intricate reasonings, show of learning, difficult words, technical terms and educational manner of speaking” (Bebbington 1989:52), so did Radstock, Baedeker, and then Pashkov.

Bebbington also points out that “the overriding aim of early Evangelicals was to bring home the message of the Bible and to encourage its devotional use rather than to develop a doctrine of scripture” (Bebbington 1989:14). This statement applies perfectly to the group under consideration. It is very hard to find written theories of infallibility or inerrancy. It seems that the leaders were even avoiding theorisation and forming doctrines and gave reports concerning their beliefs only when forced. In their personal life the role of the Scripture was very clear – it was to be received without questioning and obeyed immediately.

From the absence of written material on the topic it appears that Russian evangelicals were almost unaware of the growing controversy in the Western evangelical world over the issue of the attitude towards the Bible, the attitude that divided the Evangelical world into conservatives and liberals in the wake of the First World War (Bebbington 1989:14). Considering that Russian evangelicals loved C. H. Spurgeon’s sermons, translated and printed them in large quantities, they were close to Spurgeon who claimed that “the plenary verbal inspiration of the Holy Scripture is a fact and not a hypothesis” (Bebbington 1989:14).

Another important characteristic of the Pashkovites was a distinctive repentance and conversion experience. Once they “found Jesus” or “came to know Jesus” they preached over and over again that salvation can be obtained through the blood of Christ here and now and that a believer can have assurance of salvation. The words of the Quaker statesman John Bright addressed to a Congregational preacher could be easily applied to St. Petersburg Pashkovite preachers: “The atonement, always the atonement! Have they nothing else to say?” (Bebbington 1989:14). The assurance of salvation that characterized Pashkovite belief marked the great break with eastern Orthodoxy. It is to this doctrine that Bebbington attributes the success of evangelicalism: “the dynamism of the Evangelical movement was possible only because its adherents were assured in their faith” (Bebbington 1989:42).

After the official ban on big evangelistic meetings and due to preaching of men like Stockmayer and Müller, the focus was shifted to sanctification. In this way the Pashkovites also followed the British evangelical path. “The

implications of the cross for life were also important for Evangelicals. There was a bond between the atonement and the quest for sanctification” (Bebbington 1989:16). As the doctrine of justification was still the most outstanding part in Radstock’s and, probably, the Pashkovites’ preaching, so the doctrine of sanctification would come forward later in the preaching of Kargel, the Russian preacher of sanctification.

In practical and organisational matters the Pashkovites in St. Petersburg were open-minded and flexible in many ways: they had a desire to fellowship with other evangelical-minded groups; they allowed freedom of conscience in the issues of baptism, Lord’s Supper and church membership; they remained loyal to the Established Church as long as they could; they had no tradition concerning dress code, smoking or drinking, no lists of “dos” and “don’ts.”

Summarising, it must be said that there was a large measure of continuity between British and Russian (St. Petersburg) Evangelicalism. For instance: non-denominationalism, vivid new birth experiences, trusting in Christ alone for salvation, the ideal of “primitive Christianity,” and philanthropy (prison visiting, attendance on the sick, help for the poor). Nichols sees no coincidence that the social work of the Pashkovites in Russia was so similar to that in England through the Evangelical Alliance, Mildmay Conference, and later the Keswick Conference – the bodies that through its representatives played the decisive role in the spiritual and practical formation of the Pashkovites. In both countries there were restaurants and hospitals for the poor, provision of reading materials, care of orphans and prostitutes, etc. Both Pashkovites and pietistic British revivalists established independent groups that conducted Bible studies and prayer meetings (Nichols 1991:110).

The Brethren influence upon the Pashkovites was decisive and lasted for decades but it was not static. With the change of preachers one could see changes in the organisation and theological accents as well as in the practices of the Pashkovite congregations. These changes will be dealt with in greater detail below. At this point the author will only say that in spite of many similarities the Pashkovite group was not a mirror reflection of Plymouth or Open Brethrenism.

The question is: what was distinctively Russian in the Pashkovite movement? Did Pashkovites resemble English evangelicalism because of Radstock’s influence or did they accept Radstock because there was something

in them already that made Radstock so acceptable? To the author's mind, the answer to this question is in one word – *blagochestie* [pietism]. Having been reared in the Orthodox pietistic traditions and values, those St. Petersburg aristocrats were naturally drawn to somebody who actually embodied pietism in his life, that is, to Radstock. Even more so, Radstock showed them how they could become genuinely pietistic once they obtained salvation.

There was obvious discontinuity between British and Russian Evangelicalism as well. Russia at the time did not enjoy religious and political freedoms as did England. Lack of freedom restrained the movement from joining forces and spreading to its full potential. There are other differences as well. For instance, in Russia there was not much stress on self-examination, and no Calvinist-Armenian struggle at the time. Another influence in Russian Evangelicalism, partly derived from the Russian Orthodox Church, was the mystical element.

In general the Pashkovite movement can be best characterized as evangelical, pietistic, devotional, non-denominational, loyal to the established Church, and Bible-centred. Along with other evangelical movements in Russia it could be classified as Stundism when understood in the broader sense of the word, because it rallied around Bible studies in private homes.

4.2 The Development of the Evangelical Movement under Social Pressure (1884-1905)

As mentioned above, the state church and ecclesiastic state were inseparable in “Holy Russia”. Evangelicalism threatened to disturb society, a society that historically was no friend to freedom of thought, a society united around three main ideas, i.e., monarchism, orthodoxy, and nationalism. A clash between the state and the growing evangelical movement was inevitable. However, Russian nobility always experienced greater freedom than other groups of the population in this “police” state, as Leroy-Beauliev rightly noted: “If there is freedom anywhere in Russia, it is in the drawing room”.²⁰⁷

That is why persecution against the Pashkovites took time to unfold. But whether in England or in Russia, to preach that “good works were as filthy rags seemed subversive to any morality” (Bebbington 1989:22). Actually this was

²⁰⁷ Leroy-Beauliev, *The Empire of the Tsars*, 471, in Nichols 1991:43.

one of the main accusations against Pashkov. Pobedonostsev worried that the “one-sided and narrow” teaching of Pashkov that came down to calls to “love Christ, not to worry about works, no work will save you, Christ has already saved you once and forever, nothing else is needed” was “extremely dangerous” and would create “an indifference to sin” (Pobedonostsev 1880:2).

The Orthodox Church became seriously alarmed when the movement started spreading beyond the drawing rooms of the aristocracy into the streets (Nichols 1991:43, 46). Uneducated and simple folk were not so diplomatic or interested in keeping status quo in their relationship with the Orthodox. The Pashkovites encouraged listeners to believe in Jesus and be saved, to read and search the Scripture for oneself leaving the outcome in the hands of the Holy Spirit. As a result there were some cases of religious radicalism, a phenomenon well known in history, for instance, at the time of Luther. There were cases when Stundists burnt or chopped up icons and spoke disrespectfully about Orthodox saints or rituals (Kushnev 1916:25). Even the aristocratic Pashkovites did not encourage worshipping icons or attending the Orthodox Church (Bogolyubov 1912:29-30; Kushnev 1916:57). Since the Pashkovites entrusted interpretation of the Scripture to peasants, the result was Bible Christianity in its freest form. Sometimes after hearing a sermon about the uselessness of icons, the peasants simply threw them out of their homes. Such instances further aggravated the relationships between Pashkovites and the Established Church (Heier 2002:130-131).

In April 1880, K. P. Pobedonostsev, the notorious enemy of all “foreign” religions, became the Chief Procurator of the Holy Synod, the highest ecclesiastical body. His dream was “to break the backbone of Russian Baptism, Stundism, and Radstockism” (Mitrokhin 1997:241). In May of that same year he wrote a letter to Alexander II concerning the dangers of the Evangelical Christians in St. Petersburg (Pobedonostsev 1880:1-4). On 25 May 1880 the tsar agreed with the recommendation and sent orders to the police to repress the movement (Nichols 1991:66). But it was not until the reign of the next tsar Alexander III, with whom Pobedonostsev was very close, that the Ober-procurator could get to realisation of his dream (Mitrokhin 1997:241).

4.2.1 Persecution and Survival of the Movement

On 24 May 1884 by Royal Authority the order came “to close the Society for the Encouragement of Spiritual and Ethical Reading and to take measures to the termination of further spreading of Pashkov’s teaching on the whole territory of the Empire” (Edict of St. Petersburg Ecclesiastical Consistory, October 4, 1884 № 3448). Soon after that Grotte’s bookshop had to go out of business; Pashkov’s “talks” also had to stop (Terletsky 1891:78).

The dispelling of the Congress in April 1884, the closing of the Society, and the exiling of Pashkov and Korff marked the end of the “peaceful period of the development of the evangelical movement in St. Petersburg” (Karetnikova 2000:44). The Pashkovites’ activities in St. Petersburg started tapering off and their growth rate slowed (Corrado 2000:167). Although Terletsky states that “the sect was little weakened in its actions after its prohibition” (Terletsky 1891:90), historical accounts of this period are filled with stories of persecution and survival, while very little is said about their theological profile and growth. The author would suggest that major changes in the leadership of the movement and new political conditions that forced the group to continue its activities almost illegally must have drastically influenced their outlook.

The situation in the summer of 1884 was critical indeed. Pashkov, Korff, and Bobrinskiy were gone. Meetings were banned. N. F. Lieven was requested to stop evangelical activity. She and Chertkova lived under the constant threat of exile as well. Somebody demanded the banishment of the widowed princesses.²⁰⁸ Under such conditions the very existence of the St. Petersburg evangelical congregation might have come to its end (Karetnikova 2000:49). But although Lieven and Chertkova were reportedly sentenced to banishment, it never actually happened (Lieven 1967:68). The idea had been “met with a stern rebuke from the tsar, ‘Let my widows alone!’ he exclaimed. And thence-forward they entertained their Christian guests, and held Bible-readings and prayer-meetings in their drawing-rooms” (Latimer 1908:78). However, the threat of being banished was always there.

After Pashkov’s and Korff’s expulsion, double surveillance on behalf of police and ecclesiastical authorities was established over other active Radstockists, including Count Bobrinskiy, Elizaveta Chertkova, N. P. Zinov’ev,

²⁰⁸ Chertkova’s husband had died suddenly in 1884 (Corrado 2005:161).

Princess V. Gagarina, and the N. F. Fon Kruezer family (Prugavin 1909:249). So the Pashkovite believers continued their meetings learning how to survive under new circumstances. For another twenty years they would have no alternative to gathering for meetings in private homes.

According to Sakharov, after the law of 1884 the promotion of Pashkovism did not end, but went from being “open” to being “hidden”. The fact that the Pashkovites did not become extinct is evident from a number of court hearings in the late 1880s and early 1890s; legal proceedings were held against Pashkovites in the Tver’, Novgorod, Yaroslavl’, Moscow and Orel gubernias.²⁰⁹ As for public activity, a number of open disputes were held between the Pashkovites and Orthodox priests. For instance, they took place on 26 February 1887, a couple of times in March 1887, and then in the spring of 1889 (Terletsky 1891:90-91).

Thus, the evangelical movement continued despite the suppression by the authorities and the Established Church. In 1891 Zhivotov wrote that one can hardly find a section or even a block in St. Petersburg without one or another religious congregation. “At the present time in St. Petersburg one can number thirty two congregations and sects besides those that are forbidden and hiding” (Zhivotov 1891:7-8). In the same year (1891) Zhivotov also wrote that in spite of all measures, in the fifteen years since the beginning of the movement the number of followers and gathering places did not dwindle (Zhivotov 1891:30).

The Orthodox leaders were alarmed by the growth of Pashkovite “heresies” and other “sects”. In August 1891 Pobedonostsev convened a special Orthodox conference in Moscow to devise methods of preventing the spread of sectarianism in the Empire. He was concerned with the rapid growth of the Baptist, Stundist, and Pashkovite “heresies.” According to statistics, twenty-eight out of forty-one dioceses were badly “infected”, and “the virulence of the infection” was entirely beyond the control of the clergy. The persecution was about to begin in earnest (Latimer 1908:189; Fountain 1988:39).

According to the resolutions adopted by the conference,

The rapid increase of these sects is a serious danger to the state. Let all sectarians be forbidden to leave their own villages... Let all offenders against the faith be tried, not by a jury, but by ecclesiastical judges. Let their passports be marked, so that they shall be neither employed nor laboured, and residence in Russia shall become impossible to them. Let

²⁰⁹ Sakharov 1897:23; Pashkovtsy, *Entsiklopedicheskiy slovar*, 64, in Corrado 2000:97.

them be held to be legally incapable of renting, purchasing, or holding real property. Let their children be removed from their control, and educated in the orthodox faith (Latimer 1908:190).

Latimer quoted a few “anti-sectarian” articles of the law that illustrate the legislative situation confronting the non-orthodox believers and resulting in a growing number of Stundists, Molokans, and Baptists exiled to the Caucasus:

Article 187. Offence: Leaving the church for another religious community. Punishment: Loss of civil and personal rights. Transportation. In milder cases eighteen months in a reformatory.

Article 189. Offence: Preaching or writing religious works to pervert others. Punishment: First offence, the loss of certain personal rights, and imprisonments from 8 to 16 months. Second offence, imprisonment in a fortress from 32 to 48 months. Third offence, banishment.

Article 196. Offence: Spreading the views of heretics or dissenters, or aiding such. Punishment: Banishment to Siberia, Transcaucasia, or other remote part of the Empire (Latimer 1908:190-192).

In general the harassment of the Pashkovites was not as severe as the attack on Stundists and Baptists (Lieven 1967:74). The high social standing of the Pashkovites allowed them to get away with many things for which their southern brothers were sent to prisons or even killed. However, the persecution in St. Petersburg deprived the Pashkovites of their main leaders and forced them to discontinue large public meetings, stop printing literature, and cut back on charity. Persecution did not eliminate the group but permanently changed its profile. However, persecution sealed one thing – meetings would continue to be held in homes for the years ahead.

By the end of the nineteenth century the movement was getting activated again. At the Third Orthodox Missionary congress in Kazan’ in 1897 it was reported that the Pashkovite movement in the capital was growing fast, with up to forty meetings places (Pashkovshchina 1897:5). In the same year archpriest Sakharov wrote that Pashkovism was continuing to spread in both the higher and lower classes in the capital, especially among factory workers. “After being quieted in 1884 this sect is more active than ever. In all parts of the city it has its centres of propaganda and Pashkovite missionaries are working all over the city” (Sakharov 1897:3). By 1897 the Pashkovites reportedly had spread to the gubernias of Moscow, Nizhniy Novgorod, Tambov, Tver’, Tula, Tautide, and

others.²¹⁰ In addition, the movement had spread as far as Poland, Lithuania, the Persian frontiers, and Siberia.²¹¹

4.2.2 House churches without Pashkov and Korff

Naturally, “the exile and persecution of Pashkovites led to a leadership vacuum in the group” (Nichols 1991:74). Princess Lieven and other prominent ladies privately continued calling prayer meetings and inviting preachers from abroad. They also invited preachers from Stundist and Baptist groups in Russia, “which further served to bring the three groups together” (Fountain 1988:40). Korff briefly mentions, “The news of our exile has rapidly spread across Russia. Brothers were very sorry to hear about our banishment. And instead of us, two leading brothers, they decided to send to St. Petersburg seventeen brothers”.²¹² What happened to that plan is not clear. It seems that immediately after the exile of the male leaders the leadership was temporarily assumed by the ladies, primarily all Chertkova and Lieven (Karetnikova 2000:49, 76).

Emphasizing the role of N. Lieven Brandenburg pointed out that the Lieven’s palace became the centre for converts in the capital after the exile of Pashkov and Korff up until the year 1917 (Brandenburg 1977:114). The meetings at Pashkov’s palace on Gagarinskaya Embankment were moved to Lievens’ palace at 43 Bol’shaya Morskaya (Lieven 1967:68). Princess N. Lieven personally organized the meetings in her home (Corrado 2005:162). In 1909 Latimer testified that “such meetings have been held uninterruptedly until the present day”.²¹³ Actually the meetings continued until 1917 when the revolutionaries seized her palace (Karetnikova 2000:49).

The palace was under police surveillance, but there was no interference. The believers tried to avoid any commotion. Professor Karl Heim, who was in St. Petersburg at the beginning of the twentieth century and attended a service at the Lieven home, recalled that at the end of the meeting those present were asked to leave the house in small groups, not all together (Brandenburg 1977:114).

²¹⁰ Kutepov, 63, in Corrado 2000:97.

²¹¹ Dillon, 332, in Corrado 2000:97.

²¹² Korff, *Vospominaniya*, in Karetnikova 1999:132.

²¹³ Latimer, *Under Three Tsars*, 73, in Corrado 2000:169.

Among “numerous others” whom N. Lieven often invited to preach and teach were Baron Nikolaii and his friend Alexander Maksimovskiy who served at the Council of State (Lieven 1967:80). Her home was always open to Kargel and Baedeker during their long stays in St. Petersburg. Lieven also spoke in public, as evidenced in 1884 when she prayed publicly and spoke at the congress (Corrado 2000:169). Another important feature was that the whole household (including interested servants) gathered every day for prayer at 8:30 a.m. and took turns reading a chapter from the Bible and discussing it (Lieven 1967:83).

Regarding the role of this house church, Nichols points out that “in 1906, long after the early leaders were exiled, Princess Lieven’s home was the centre for the underground Evangelical Christian movement” (Nichols 1991:22). He also concluded, that “Lieven’s ministry was crucial to the survival of the Evangelical Christians in Russia” (Nichols 1991:24).

However, N. Lieven’s palace was not the only place St. Petersburg evangelicals gathered. E. Chertkova also continued to host meetings and even had a special house built on her property on Vasil’evskiy Island for that purpose (Lieven 1967:73). Later she spoke at the meetings held there for young people. Then, starting in 1910 she supported the ministry of W. Fetler, a young Baptist preacher, by hosting meetings for him in her home.²¹⁴

Meetings continued even in one of Pashkov’s homes at the Vyborgskaya side, as well as in some other homes (Lieven 1967:74). “Some other homes” included the palace of Duchess Shuvalova on the Moyka River, Zimnyaya Kanavka Street. The Duchess was the wife of the chief of the police department. Her coachman was a Pashkovite and hosted meetings in his small room in the basement which could hold no more than twelve people. The believers meeting under the very nose of the police chief had to be especially careful (Lieven 1967:75; Popov 1996:22). Yet another gathering place at Bol’shoy Sampsonievskiy Prospect 93 is mentioned in the Orthodox periodical *Missionerskoe obozrenie*, describing a meeting that consisted of three prayers and three sermons.²¹⁵ Interestingly, this is the usual number of sermons

²¹⁴ Lieven, *Eine Saat*, 63, 97, in Corrado 2000:169.

²¹⁵ *Missionerskoe obozrenie* (Feb. 1902): 294-302, in Corrado 2000:168. Nine articles published between 1899 and 1909 by Agniya Dvinskaya described various events among Pashkovites.

preached during one service in the Evangelical Christian Baptist churches up to this day.

Prokhanov recollected that during in his student years in St. Petersburg he was taken to an evangelical meeting and felt as if he were among the catacomb Christians in ancient Rome. The believers entered a dark corridor by ones or by twos. There they were met by the host of the basement room, a military school *storozh* (a watchman), who admitted only those he knew personally or those who were accompanied by a regular member of the group. The small room was very crowded with up to twenty-five people present. The believers had to be very quiet, with no singing, preaching in a low voice (Prokhanov 1993:63-64).

Prokhanov as young student often attended those meetings. “In those days it was impossible to hold public meetings in Russia. All meetings were secret... Every week meeting places had to be changed” (Prokhanov 1993:63). The meetings were also secretly held in homes of believers in the countryside²¹⁶ and even in the forest. Prokhanov’s suggestion to hold summer services in the woods (Prokhanov 1993:64) set a precedent for the years under the Soviet regime.

As for preaching, a number of ladies including Chertkova, Lieven, Gagarina, the Kozlyaninov sisters, the Krueze sisters, Peuker, and Zasetskaya not only evangelized but also “served with the word”. It was they who saved St. Petersburg congregations from being closed and dismissed, especially right after Pashkov and Korff’s banishment and before Kargel’s return from Finland in 1885 (Karetnikova 2000:44). Thankfully, at the April 1884 Congress the issue of women speaking in public had been addressed; it had been decided that gifted sisters must be allowed to preach (Karetnikova 2000:43). However, with time men began assuming roles of leadership among the Pashkovites, especially as informal meetings were replaced with more proper worship services (Corrado 2000:171).

A few observations concerning the Pashkovite meetings of this period can be made so far. First, after the exile of the original leaders the believers still continued to meet around the city, but in smaller and scattered groups. There was hardly any central leadership or co-ordination between the groups.

²¹⁶ Lieven, *Eine Saat*, 63, 70-71, in Corrado 2000:167.

Meetings continued due to believers' strong desire to meet for services as well as the initiative of individuals who opened their homes. Second, private homes remained the only option for such meetings in the years to come. House churches became the norm for Russian evangelicals well into the twentieth century. Third, the believers were successfully learning how to observe the rules of security and continue ministry underground. The paradigm of semi-underground meetings continued throughout most of the next century with the exception of a couple of decades. Fourth, the active role of women in church life became common practice among St. Petersburg evangelicals. Besides, they outnumbered the men then (and still do today).

4.2.3 Change of Social and Theological Makeup

During the years of persecution the evangelical movement stopped spreading among Russian nobility in the way it had prior to 1884. The growth of the movement was shifted to the lower classes. As time went on certain changes started to take place in the social make-up among the evangelicals in St. Petersburg. In 1897 Sakharov wrote that the meetings were still attended by cabmen along with "barons" (Sakharov 1897:3-4). However, it seems that the idyllic situation of simple and noble folk serving God in perfect harmony in a church setting, glimpses of which one could admire in the first period of the Pashkovite movement, was no longer so idyllic. According to S. Lieven, during the first year of the evangelical movement social and class distinctions did not show up in personal relations between the believers (Lieven 1967:102). However, after the first leaders were exiled, people unprepared for leadership positions took their place (Lieven 1967:103). In a way, the Pashkovites repeated the history of the Brethren who eventually became "a predominantly lower middle-class body", even though "the leaders of the first stage of the movement were drawn almost exclusively from the upper ranks of society" (Brock 1984:30).

It has already been mentioned that Pashkovite ladies used to invite various preachers to help with the services. With the exception of Kargel and some other visiting preachers (Baedeker left Russia only in 1895), the local brothers were of simple origin and lacked education. Some of them could hardly read or write (Lieven 1967:70-71). They did not lack zeal and fervour, but there was a huge gap between simple "brothers" and highly cultured and educated

“sisters” (Lieven 1967:71); this was a gap in upbringing, education, mindset, and experience in Christian service between the “old” Pashkovites and newly converted ones.

S. Lieven’s memories shed some light upon the changes that were taking place in the congregation. Her memoirs are almost the sole source that helps decipher what was happening among St. Petersburg evangelicals during the years of Pobedonostsev’s persecution. S. Lieven remembers that the meetings were very simple when there were no travelling preachers present. There were hardly any educated brothers left. Count Bobrinskiy almost never showed up in St. Petersburg. Kargel, who had been invited to preach in one of the churches in Finland, rarely visited St. Petersburg. Others were simple and uneducated; their preaching, though sincere, was not always clear. One Sunday morning Pypin, an elderly factory worker, mentioned that he learnt to read in his fifties only after he came to know the Lord. However, his brief observations from the Bible were very valuable. S. Lieven graciously does not mention the names of the preachers who could base their argument on a misread word of the Scripture (Lieven 1967:71).

According to Corrado this was “a result of inexperience and insecurity”: the newly converted preachers clung closely to the literal Word of God, with no room for discussion. While an admirable solution given the circumstances, this led to pride, one-sidedness and disagreement, and conflict arose between the uneducated men and educated society women of broader views.²¹⁷

Such were some of the men who were gradually assuming the leadership positions, “while sincere in their faith they did not excel in preaching” (Corrado 2000:171). Untrained preachers could produce nothing but low standards of preaching. The irony of the situation was that at the same time there was no lack of well-educated “sisters”, who sometimes preached during the meetings and conducted Bible studies in small groups (Lieven 1967:71-72).

The differences in culture and upbringing were another cause for social clashes. Certain incidents could not be avoided, such as one with Duchess Shuvalova. S. Lieven recalled, “Our leading brothers were strict and once they found something inappropriate in sister Shuvalova’s behaviour. They forbade her to take part in the Lord’s Supper . . . After a while she was restored” (Lieven

²¹⁷ Corrado 2000:171-172, based on Lieven, *Eine saat*, 61, 64, 90-91.

1967:74-75). This kind of church discipline would have been unthinkable under the ministry of Radstock or Pashkov. In general it appears that “simple” folk were not very gracious to the “noble” ones (although the opposite was true during the first years of the movement).

Finally, the most important cause of “misunderstandings” was a difference in theology and mentality. The more strict Baptist views of new preachers clashed with the more open Brethren position of the Pashkovites. Newly converted simpler folk were more receptive to rules and regulations, whereas the “old school” of Pashkovites was dedicated to spiritual freedom. Besides, the brothers who were coming to St. Petersburg from the south and southwest of Russia were mostly Baptists with Molokan heritage. Strictness was in their blood not only when it concerned Baptist doctrine on believer’s baptism, Lord’s Supper, ordination, church membership or discipline, but also when they dealt with all kinds of details regarding lifestyle and dress. Nichols, who plainly sees Baptist influence as a negative one, points out:

When all the male leadership was removed, her [Lieven’s] leadership successfully fended off the aggressive Baptist doctrines. The Baptists attempted to take leadership of the Bible studies by asserting their doctrines, which were more restrictive and prohibitive than the Pashkovites’ (Nichols 1991:22).

Those “attempts” were not very successful. The meetings in Lieven’s home preserved the openness of their original nature including open communion. However, Lieven’s influence was limited to her home and did not reach other evangelical groups around the city. Reportedly, many Pashkovites joined the Stundists and Baptists. According to Nichols, “those who joined the Stundists tried to persuade this group to adopt a more tolerant, evangelical, pietistic perspective” (Nichols 1991:74). Although they must have succeeded to some extent, usually in times of persecution the groups with stricter rules and better organisation have a greater chance of survival.

Pashkov was aware of some tension among St. Petersburg evangelicals, and he returned to Russia in 1887 or in 1892.²¹⁸ The official reasons for his visit were the illness of his son and some business matters. However, Nichols points out another important reason of Pashkov’s visit to Russia, that is, the leadership struggle within the Evangelical Christian group, because his young disciples

²¹⁸ Nichols 1991:71; Kovalenko 1996:75; Savinsky 1999:181.

clashed with the older ladies who did not want to submit to the inexperienced leaders.²¹⁹ Gradually this submission did take place. S. Lieven points out a reason for the change in the leadership's social outlook. As it was pointed out above, the noble members of the congregation used to spend summers in the country while "simple brothers" stayed in the city. Thus the leadership functions (choosing of the brothers' board, admitting new members, excommunication of backsliders) completely fell into their hands (Lieven 1967:103).

On the other hand, there were positive developments as well. S. Lieven remembered that with the growth of the movement new workers appeared "in the field", both from intellectual circles and from the simple folk. Gradually they were learning how to conduct Christian work and become independent leaders. Among the latter she mentions two pastors – Alexander Ivanovich Ivanov and Nikolay Ivanovich Dolgopolov (Lieven 1967:80). Pavel Nikolaii's occasional sermons were especially loved (Lieven 1967:80), as were the sermons of Vasiliy Stepanov, a young Baptist preacher.²²⁰

Stepanov was born in Peski, a village in the Tambov area, into a Molokan family. He started to preach soon after he was baptized in 1892. It was during his military service in St. Petersburg that he actively attended the Pashkovite meetings. In 1903 he was ordained as a presbyter of his home church in Peski (Kovalenko 1996:118; AUCECB 1989:150). S. Lieven mentions him as Brother S., a Baptist, who had a clear and convincing testimony about Christ. He participated in the meetings on the Vyborg side of St. Petersburg and was especially loved by young people (Lieven 1967:82).

N. Odintsov, a leading figure in the Russian Baptist movement, was not a stranger in the Lieven's home. It was he who was honoured to announce the tsar's edict on freedom of conscience in the Red Hall of Lieven's palace on that memorable Easter morning in April 1905 (Lieven 1967:105). There must have been more cooperation between Lieven and Odintsov prior to that day.

I. Prokhanov was not yet playing a decisive role in the St. Petersburg evangelical movement during this period. However, he was very active. From 1888 to 1893 he studied at the Institute of Technology and attended the Pashkovite meetings. He also illegally published the Christian magazine

²¹⁹ Lieven, *Eine Saat*, 90, in Nichols 1991:72.

²²⁰ Lieven, 64, in Corrado 2005:161.

Beseda. From 1894 he was under police surveillance. In January 1895 he had to leave St. Petersburg illegally through Finland for Stockholm. He returned to St. Petersburg only after his marriage in 1901. Then he published a Christian songbook *Gusly* (1902) and a collection of Christian poetry *Struny serdtsa* (1904-1905).²²¹

S. Lieven recalled that Prokhanov rarely visited Lieven's palace during his student years. His activity was mostly concentrated in a different part of the city among brothers who used to gather in small private homes (Lieven 1967:99). He quickly became a regular preacher at such meetings, and they changed under his influence. He taught adult baptism and insisted on a strict and moral lifestyle, much in tune with his Molokan upbringing (Corrado 2005:167). In Nichol's opinion, "He shifted the freedom in lifestyle to a more legalistic basis" (Nichols 1991:101). With time he became an unofficial leader of the meetings in "the other part of the city", and his meetings were known for good organisation and evangelistic fervour (Corrado 2005:168).

Prokhanov's strong leadership style was especially appealing to the young people who craved activity. By 1895 with Prokhanov's participation the first Baptist congregation of St. Petersburg was organized with A. Berdnikov as its pastor (Savinsky 1999:242). S. Lieven also points out that until that time (must be referring to Prokhanov's appearance) believers were led by simple uneducated brothers who strictly watched over the lives of other church members and were very serious about their ministry. Wine and smoking were not allowed.²²² Abstinence from both was a condition of church membership. Icons had to be removed as well. Ladies were taught to dress modestly and not wear jewellery (Lieven 1967:101-102). In S. Lieven's opinion, this was the way those newly converted brothers expressed their first love, but sometimes they went overboard in their methods (Lieven 197:102).

Jakov Kroeker was another preacher invited by Dr. Baedeker to the St. Petersburg circle of Princess Lieven. Kroeker was born in 1872 in the Mennonite colony of Gnadenthal, trained at the Baptist seminary in Hamburg,

²²¹ Prokhanov 1993:52, 58, 62-69, 109-113; Kovalenko 1996:106-107.

²²² The author cannot help recalling of how cognac was served during meals at Pashkov's palace.

and called by the German Mennonites to be an itinerant preacher in Russia.²²³

His contact with Dr. Baedeker, whom he met at conferences, meant a great deal to him (Brandenburg 1977:150-51). For a number of years Kroeker travelled to the capital every winter for six to eight weeks in order to serve many groups of believers there. Here in St. Petersburg he also met German visitors, mostly representatives of Blankenburg Alliance circles such as Otto Stockmayer, Fritz Otzbach, and others (Brandenburg 1977:151).

Kroeker, who travelled Russia from the north to the deepest south, made some insightful observations about “childhood diseases” in the evangelical movement:

First there was the soulish element. Sighs and tears belonged not only to conversion, but to every prayer meeting. The emotional Slavic soul will never let this go completely. But the danger remained that the movements of the soul were confused with the working of the Holy Spirit . . . Widespread lack of experience, ignorance of church history and so on brought about many an immature judgement. They lacked the wisdom which comes from the school of life and a historical orientation (Brandenburg 1977:151).

Brandenburg concludes that it was not surprising that there was “tremendous legalism and narrow-mindedness. This was a fertile ground for Adventism and Sabbatarianism; but even the strict Baptist circles were not free of legalism. In this context, the breadth of the Lieven circle was considered suspicious” (Brandenburg 1977:151).

The lack of sources makes it impossible to fill in many gaps in the histories of separate congregations. It is only known that by 1895 there were a few groups led by Kargel, Prokhanov, Berdnikov, and others (Savinsky 1999:244). It seems that the various congregations were aware of each other. Believers from these congregations would visit each other in spite of differences in doctrine and practice. However, there was no coordinating centre or united leadership. From the second half of 1890 “simply believers” or Pashkovites started to be called “believers of evangelical faith” (Savinsky 1999:244). But it was only after 1910 that the Orthodox stopped targeting Pashkovites by name.²²⁴

²²³ It cannot be overemphasised that those Mennonite, Baptist, and Stundists movements were not completely independent of each other. They constantly overlapped and their workers’ paths crossed all the time.

²²⁴ Wardin, *Evangelical Sectarianism*, 315, in Corrado 2000:186.

In general during these twenty years there was a tendency in St. Petersburg evangelical circles of departing from the Open Brethren principles and assuming Baptist features. Suddenly one finds an organized church structure with a board, church membership, and excommunication practices. The decision of whether to take part in communion could be made by someone other than the person him/herself. Spiritual freedom and structural flexibility was gradually giving in to church order.

According to S. Lieven, the evangelical congregation that gathered in N. Lieven's palace (including Kargel) kept an open view concerning church membership and baptism. All the congregations that gathered in other parts of the city held more strict views. Prokhanov, coming from his Molokan background, was on the strict side (Lieven 1967:104; Prokhanov 1993:29). Corrado also concludes that during the time of doctrinal arguments in St. Petersburg, Kargel held the position of Pashkov, Korff, and Bobrinskiy saying that it was not necessary to rebaptise believers (Corrado 2005:166). Kargel's role deserves special attention and will be discussed below. N. Lieven seemed to trust him wholeheartedly. She saw him as the person who would continue the line of Pashkov and Korff. However, Kargel did not become the type of leader who could have united the evangelical groups scattered around St. Petersburg. He was more a theologian and an itinerant preacher than a leader or organizer.

Most importantly St. Petersburg evangelicals remained Scripture-centric. A collection of reports titled *Pashkovshchina* [Pashkovism] (1897) contains the Pashkovites' confession of faith which circulated as a handwritten copy among St. Petersburg Pashkovites. Concerning the Scripture it states:

I believe that the Holy Scripture of the Old and the New Testament is the divinely inspired revelation of God's will and is the perfect and only rule of faith and a God-pleasing life (Pashkovshchina 1897:3).

Englishwoman Penn-Lewis recalled her 1897 visit to the Pashkovite community: "What struck me first was their implicit faith in the Bible as the Word of God. Their one question was, 'What does the Word of God say?' The fact that it said anything settled it for them: it had to be obeyed".²²⁵ In fact, at the time of her visit the decisive influence upon the community belonged to Kargel.

²²⁵ Penn-Lewis, 10, in Corrado 2000:53.

At the end of the century, during her visits in 1890 and 1897, Penn-Lewis was also impressed by the spirit of sacrifice, prayer, and generosity.²²⁶

As for reading materials, in the 1890s the range of Christian literature in Russian was enriched by Farrar, Brooks, Geik, Jones, Drummond, Montefeltro, Newman, Newton, Spurgeon, Febr, Todd (Komarskiy 1896). Somehow it was possible to publish these authors in translation.

4.2.4 I. V. Kargel's Role and Activity

Soon after the exile of Pashkov and Korff, in 1885 Kargel, not yet forty years old but already an accomplished theologian, accepted Lieven's invitation and moved his family from Finland to St. Petersburg, allowing him to labour there full time (Karetnikova 2000:44, 50). Kargel, his wife, and four daughters occupied a lower floor apartment in Lieven's palace (Lieven 1967:81). For the next ten years (1885-1895) he served the Pashkovites (Corrado 2005:166).

At that time, while Prokhanov was studying at the Institute of Technology, the spiritual leadership of the congregations was in the hands of Kargel (Brandenburg 1977:131). Brandenburg writes of his reputation:

All who knew Kargel remember him with deep gratitude. He was a pastor and a preacher of sanctification. He was concerned to deepen men's faith, to get the believers rooted and grounded in the word of God, and to lead them into a life of complete yieldedness to the Lord, believing in the victorious power of the Holy Spirit. Not only the older men, but also the young ones, especially students and academics, held him in great memory (Brandenburg 1977:132).

According to Kovalenko, Kargel was a leading presbyter of a Petersburg congregation of evangelical Christians around the turn of the century as well; his ministry was mostly geared towards edification of the church (Kovalenko 1996:51). As N. Lieven was spending more time outside of St. Petersburg, the leadership of the meetings in her home was wholly entrusted to Kargel (Lieven 1967:106).

According to Karetnikova, Kargel had a strong influence upon the St. Petersburg congregation in matters of faith and doctrine. The central theme of his preaching from the very beginning was sanctification connected with deepening believers' knowledge of the Lord. He did not drive away those who

²²⁶ Penn-Lewis, 10, in Corrado 2000:167.

did not see the necessity of being baptized by faith, so St. Petersburg believers continued to practice “open communion” until 1888 when Alekseev, a converted shoemaker, was chosen to be a presbyter.

Alekseev remained a presbyter until his death in 1926, excluding ten years when he was in jail (1893-1903) (Karetnikova 2000:76-77). During those ten years Princess Gagarina cared for Alekseev’s son and reared him in her home (Lieven 1967:77). S. Lieven emphasises Alekseev’s role only after his return to St. Petersburg from exile. In St. Petersburg he served as a presbyter of the so-called Second Evangelical Congregation (the one associated with Kargel) (Lieven 1967:77).

Why it was Alekseev and not Kargel who became the presbyter is not quite clear. One reason could be that after Kargel moved to St. Petersburg he continued to travel extensively and was often absent from the city (Lieven 1967:81). S. Lieven recalls that each time Kargel returned from his missionary journeys the believers crowded around to listen to his stories. His main role during his stays in St. Petersburg was to help with the congregation’s business and train the local brothers (Lieven 1967:82).

Another reason Kargel did not become a full time presbyter of the Second Evangelical congregation had to do with his leadership style. Unlike Prokhanov and Fetler, Kargel saw the edification of the church as his main objective. He was a theologian, not a religious activist. It should not be surprising, therefore, that young Pashkovites were drawn to Prokhanov, an active person always full of ideas and projects. Eventually around 1903 a group of young people from Kargel’s congregation started a separate church with Prokhanov as their head.

The third reason could be that "simple" Alekseev was better suited than Kargel to the changed social outlook of the evangelical congregation that had become more "democratic" in the original meaning of the word.

4.2.5 Conclusion

So, what were the main characteristics of the evangelical movement in Russia in 1884-1905? First of all, this period was characterized by persecution, severe against Stundists and Baptists, less severe against the Pashkovites. However, persecution did not destroy the movement. On the contrary, the movement grew as evangelical believers learned new methods of underground

work, including holding secret services, interceding for those persecuted, and living under police surveillance.

Due to the courage of the Pashkovite ladies, the ministries of I. Kargel and Dr. Baedeker, and the correspondence of Pashkov, the Pashkovites did not disappear completely, though they did reach a certain plateau. Their best years had passed. According to Heier, Pashkovism “aimed at Russia’s transformation through the application of moral and religious principles”, but it failed as inner disagreements along with the unequal struggle with church and state authorities did not allow this movement to work out its potential (Heier 2002:4, 157). Although Pobedonostsev did not succeed in breaking the backbone of Russian Stundism and Pashkovism, his policy did not allow either of these movements to continue developing at the same pace. Pashkovism and Stundism were slowly giving way to a more organized Baptist movement.

Among the forty meeting places around St. Petersburg, it appears that only Lieven’s house church preserved the original spirit of Open Brethrenism and Keswick, including the practice of open communion. However, in spite of certain differences and misunderstandings between the Pashkovites, Baptists, and Brethren Mennonites, their mutual ties were growing stronger. During those twenty years a generation of new evangelical leaders came to the front, and not without the influence of Lieven’s “incubator”. Kargel’s role became much more important than it had been before 1884. Among others I will mention Baron Nikolaii, A. Maksimovskiy, I. Prokhanov, A. Ivanov, N. Dolgopolov, V. Stepanov, A. Berdnikov, and S. Alekseev, prominent men who would serve during the next period of evangelical history in Russia.

4.3 The Growth of the Evangelical Movement during the Revolutionary and World War I Period (1905-1917)

Statistical data shows that the period of twelve years starting in 1905 (the beginning of the first Russian revolution when political and religious freedoms were granted by Tsar Nicolas II) and including World War I (which led to two more revolutions) was actually very productive for the evangelical movement in Russia. The number of churches and Christian activities was growing quickly. Statistics found in various sources differ, but all still point to rapid growth among Evangelical Christians and Baptists.

According to Sawatsky in 1905 in Russia there were 86,358 Baptists and 20,804 Evangelical Christians (Sawatsky 1995:23).

Mitrokhin presents a similar number of Evangelical Christians in Russia by 1905, about 21,000 (Mitrokhin 1997:230).

According to Savinsky the number of Russian-Ukrainian Evangelical Christians and Baptists more than doubled (from 20,000 to 50,000) over the period of six years (1905-1911) (Savinsky 1999:262).

According to an advertisement, in 1909 in St. Petersburg “readings of the Word of God” were held in several places: every Sunday in Tenishevskaya auditorium at 33-35 Mokhovaya Street; on Wednesdays and Fridays at 79 Bol’shoy Prospect in Vasil’evskiy Ostrov; on Thursdays at 40 Kazanskaya Street, etc. Those meetings were openly advertised (Korff 1909:16).

According to the report of Z. T. Sweeney, by 1913 evangelical congregations in St. Petersburg and Moscow reached memberships of nine hundred and seven hundred respectively. Sweeney estimated that the Evangelical Christians across Russia numbered approximately 100,000 (*Christian Standard*, 1891, in Ellis & Jones 1996:149).

According to Hargroves, by 1914 the membership of the Russian Baptist Union, which by that time had absorbed Stundists, was 97,000 (Hargroves 1959:250-257). By that time Prokhanov’s group numbered 8500 members, among them Jacob Zhidkov and Alexander Karev (Hargroves 1959:250-257). Kargel’s congregation consisted of 1500 members (Corrado 2005:171).

According to Elliott and Deyneka, by 1917 the evangelicals had grown to number several hundred thousand (Elliott and Deyneka 1999:197).

It would be safe to conclude that in general the number of evangelical believers tripled from 1905 to 1914.

4.3.1 The Edicts of 1905-1906 and their Effect on Religious Freedom

Such rapid growth was very much due to an edict of toleration signed in April 1905, which marked the beginning of a number of changes in the life of Evangelical Christians. The Act, entitled “On the Strengthening of Religious Toleration” issued on 17 April 1905, Easter Sunday, was met with enthusiasm by believers, as S. Lieven recalled:

I remember how in April 1905 on the morning of Christ’s lightful resurrection in house number 43 Bol’shaya Morskaya in our Red Hall, my

mother stood up with a shining face in front of a multiple gathering and said that she could announce to brothers and sisters a joyful message, which would be read by brother Odintsov. The brother read the tsar's *ukaz* loudly and distinctly. It granted freedom to believe according to one's own conscience. Then all gathered fell on their knees and with tears of joy thanked the Lord for this precious gift (Lieven 1967:105).

Jakob Kroeker was another eyewitness in the palace of Princess Lieven that Easter morning. He recalled:

It was in the year 1905. If I remember correctly, there was to be a Christian conference in St. Petersburg over Easter. I too had come from the south of Russia to be there. But we had no idea what a great political event we were to experience there. Nicholas II had conceived the great and fine plan of giving the great Russian empire complete freedom of belief through a manifesto on the first day of Easter. . . On the eve of the first day of Easter we received a sudden invitation to come to an early prayer meeting the next day in Princess Lieven's palace. . . After all guests arrived, one of the big folding doors opened and our beloved princess came into the room, deeply moved, holding a copy of the manifesto in her hand. She could hardly read the glad news for inner excitement and joy.²²⁷

According to Jasnevitch-Borodaevskaya, "everybody, at least for a time, became brothers, and single heartedly have forgotten quarrels, rejoiced, and congratulated each other".²²⁸ Indeed, "the edict of liberty of conscience of 1905 when the tsar granted his subjects freedom in matters of religion was the greatest step in the recognition of the right of humanity since the ukase of 1861 by which twenty-three millions of serfs were emancipated" (Latimer 1908:42).

Half a year later the famous Manifesto of 17 October 1905 was published granting freedom of conscience, speech, meetings, and unions. In the words of Prokhanov, this manifesto "transformed toleration into freedom of conscience and the autocracy into a parliamentary form of government" (Prokhanov 1993:122). Further clarification came a year later, in the 17 October 1906 decree "On the Order and Formation and Action ... for Communities" which legalised Evangelical and Baptist churches (Ellis & Jones 1996:141). This personal *ukaz* was issued regulating the activity of the old believers and sects, making it possible to legalise Evangelical and Baptist congregations under certain conditions (Savinsky 1999:251). According to the law of October 1906, religious congregations outside the state churches would be permitted the rights

²²⁷ Kroeker, *die Sehnsucht des Ostens*, pp. 18 ff., in Brandenburg 1977:128-29.

²²⁸ Jasnevitch-Borodaevskaya, *Bor'ba za veru*, 375, in Savinsky 1999:250.

of a person at law and allowed to keep their own church records, if at least fifty people signed a request for this (Brandenburg 1977:134).

As a result of the proclamation of religious tolerance, evangelical work was officially recognised. Preaching of the Gospel got full freedom. Marriages performed by presbyters were now allowed. Congregations could choose a name, write an *ustav* [organisational charter], and get registered (Lieven 1967:104-105). Nobody knew how long this new freedom would last. It was time to act. Needless to say, the time had arrived for dynamic leaders.

Meanwhile Natalie Lieven and her family were gradually spending less time in the city of St. Petersburg and therefore exerting less influence on the congregation (Lieven 1967:106). The church leadership in Lieven's palace "went completely into the hands of Kargel" (Lieven 1967:106). He used to preach there on Thursdays. The following is a description of a meeting held in 1907:

In a large hall there were benches and a pulpit in the front. People of all stations in the society gathered there. The seats for the rich and for the poor were not divided. All sat simply next to each other. Next to a countess there was a scavenger, next to a princess – a cabman. There was neither choir nor a harmonium or any other musical instrument in this meeting. The only thing that drew people here was a thirst to hear the pure Word of God (Grachev 1997:52).

United worship of the rich and the poor, an outstanding characteristic of the Pashkovite services, had been preserved even into the twentieth century.

It was during this time that Prokhanov's role became especially significant. His great organisational skills could finally be fully realised. The congregations scattered throughout the vast country were united into the All-Russia Union of Evangelical Christians. Every *gubernia* [province] had a fraternal union with a presbyter at the head to watch over the congregations (Lieven 1967:105-106).

Prokhanov complained:

During that period evangelical churches and groups in Russia were not at all connected with each other; besides separate churches did not have proper organisation. Often there was more chaos than order inside the groups, and even the Evangelical church in St. Petersburg was not an exception (Prokhanov 1993:136).

In 1908 Prokhanov registered his evangelical congregation under the name of First Evangelical Congregation of St. Petersburg. Later Kargel registered the house church at the Lievens' as the Second Evangelical

Congregation. After that a Russian Baptist congregation was also registered (Savinsky 1999:251). The congregations led by Prokhanov and by Kargel existed independently of each other (Lieven 1967:105-106). This was when the Pashkovites finally adopted the name “Evangelical Christians”. Until then they had preferred to call themselves “simply believers”.

Two ministries that started around 1895, work among young girls and work among students, continued to grow (Lieven 1967:107). One of the groups for young ladies met at the Lieven palace on Sunday afternoons. Girls took turn leading the meetings where they read and studied the Bible and learnt “spiritual” songs. Afterwards they continued their discussions over tea (Lieven 1967:111-112). Similar meetings were started later in the new meeting hall built by Chertkova (Lieven 1967:112). After 1905 when the Lievens’ spent less time in St. Petersburg, “evangelical congregations grew so strong and big that they themselves started work among youth” (Lieven 1967:115). P. N. Nikolaii started a work among students and Maksimovskiy helped him. A. I. Peuker helped Nikolaii with a ministry to female students. Among those who helped to finance the work was V. F. Gagarina (Lieven 1967:116-117, 119-120). This type of evangelical outreach continued until the Revolution put an end to it (Lieven 1967:122).

Starting in 1906 six-week courses in St. Petersburg were held for preachers. Kargel taught on sin and sanctification, Prokhanov taught theology proper, interpretation of gospels of Mathew and John and the history of evangelical movement abroad. Other lecturers included Nikolaii, Maksimovskiy, Offenbergl, and Strautman (Savinsky 1999:296-97). Grachev dates the beginning of Bible courses a year later, December 1907. They were initiated by Prokhanov and held at 43 Morskaya Street. Besides courses already mentioned, Offenbergl taught how to study the Bible; Stramberg was to lecture on the Holy Spirit; Nikolaii on parables; Strautman on the life of holiness. In addition, the students were to hear the sermons of Kargel and Grebb (Grachev 1997:69). Thus, in the area of Christian education Prokhanov, Kargel, and Nikolaii found ways to work together.

Christian publications of this period became very numerous and varied. Since they allow one to evaluate (to some extent) the theological preferences of the Russian evangelicals of this period, they deserve some attention.

In 1908 “Pchela” publishing house located in St. Petersburg, Nevskiy Pr. 68, released a catalogue that included different publications of the complete Bible, New Testaments with Psalms, five different hymnals, a Bible theological dictionary, John Bunyan’s “The Holy War” and “The Pilgrim’s Progress”, Otto Funke’s “The school of life”, Henry Drummond’s “The city without a church”, I. Frey’s “The land where Jesus Christ lived”, Lutard’s “Apologia of Christianity”, A. Shilov’s “Thoughts about God-man”, etc.²²⁹

By 1909 *Knigoizdatel’stvo dukhovnoy literatury* [A publishing house of spiritual literature] in St. Petersburg, 5 Kazanskaya Street, had a catalogue with sixty-seven different publications. Among them there were books written by W. Fetler, Dr. Campbell-Morgan, Dr. R. A. Torrey, Charles Finney, Colonel Wade, Dr. C. D. Gordon, Amy Le Feuvre, Philip Mauro, John Watson, M. Timoshenko, I. Timoshenko, Gibbon, Count Korff, I. Riney, R. R. Kuldel, etc.²³⁰

The most popular foreign writers were Henry Drummond, Reuben Torrey, and Charles Finney.

Henry Drummond (1851-1897) was a Scottish evangelist, a writer, and a lecturer in natural science. For two years Drummond co-operated with the Moody and Sankey mission. He was actively interested in missionary and other movements among the Free Church students.²³¹ Drummond was “discovered” by Russian evangelicals quite early. Some of his books were published even before the edict of toleration. Among his books translated into Russian and published in St. Petersburg were: *Vysshee blago* [The highest good] (1892); *Estestvennyy zakon v dukhovnom mire* [Natural Law in the Spiritual World] 1896 (the main argument of this book was that the scientific principle of continuity extended to the spiritual world); *Kak preobrazit’ nashu zhizn’* [The changed life] (1900); *Samoe velikoe v mire* [The Greatest Thing in the World] (1900); *Gorod bez khrama* [The city without a church] (1907); *Ideal’naya zhizn’* [The Ideal Life] (1910); and *Programma khristianstva* [The Programme of Christianity] (1912).

Another popular writer whose books were actively translated into Russian was American preacher Reuben Torrey (1856-1928), Congregationalist, evangelist, and Yale graduate. Torrey had also studied at

²²⁹ The list is published at the end of Kargel’s 1908 edition of *Svet iz teni* . . .

²³⁰ Korff 1909.

German universities, and was later invited by Moody to lead a Bible school in Chicago. An advocate of the divine origin and inerrancy of the Scriptures, he travelled extensively and preached in many countries (Savchenko 1994:236). Among his books translated into Russian were: *Kak privodit' chelovecheskie dushi ko Khristu* [How to bring men to Christ] (1909); *Kak poluchit' polnotu sily* [How to Obtain Fullness of Power] (1909); *Ad: dostovernost' ego sushchestvovaniya* [Hell: certainty of its existence] (1909); *Neverie, prichiny, sledstviya* [Unbelief, causes, consequences] (1910); *Kreshchenie Dukhom Svyatym* [Baptism with the Holy Spirit] (1910); *Ispolnyay sluzhenie tvoe* [Make full proof of thy ministry] (1910); *Spasenie* [Salvation] (1911); *Kak preuspevat' v khristianskoy zhizni* [How to Succeed in the Christian Life] (1912); *Potryasayushchiy vopros* [Practical and perplexing Questions Answered] (1916).

The third popular writer among Russian evangelicals was Charles Finney (1792-1875), a pastor from New York City, then president of Oberlin College (Savchenko 1994:235). Finney experienced a dramatic conversion and baptism of the Holy Spirit. Although he affirmed salvation by grace through faith alone, he also stated that it depended on a person's will to repent. Works were viewed by him as the evidence of faith while unrepented sin in the life of a professing Christian meant the absence of saving faith. Finney became a Presbyterian minister and an important figure in the Second Great Awakening, sometimes even called "the Father of Modern Revivalism". He was known for some innovations like women praying in public services and extemporaneous preaching.²³² His books translated into Russian were: *Kak sodeystvovat' dukhovnomu probuzhdeniyu?* [How to assist spiritual revival?] (1909); *Vozrastanie v blagodati* [Growing in grace] (1909); *Otstupniki* [Backsliders] (1908).

This literature was to some degree responsible for forming the theological views of Russian evangelicals.

²³¹ Wikipedia. Online. Accessed on August 26, 2009.

²³² Wikipedia. Online. Accessed on August 26, 2009.

4.3.2 Further Relationships between Evangelical Christians and Baptists

The issue of the relationship between Baptists and Evangelical Christians remained quite complicated. The history of their movement towards each other is full of paradoxes. Ever since the 1884 united congress, the two movements were repeatedly drawn together then apart. Below are some major landmarks borrowed from Popov's research.

Even prior to the edict of toleration in 1902 two representatives from the Petersburg evangelical congregation, V. I. Dolgoplov and G. M. Matveev, attended the Baptist congress in Rostov-on-Don (Popov 1995:4-20). Then, in 1903, Baptists and Evangelical Christians met illegally in Tsaritsin to choose an appropriate name for the movement that would be mutually acceptable (Popov 1995:4-20). The following year, in 1904, Evangelical Christians from St. Petersburg, Kiev, Konopol', and Sevastopol met in Rostov-on-Don and applied for entry to the Baptist Union on the condition that its former name be restored (Popov 1995:4-20).

In May 1905 in Rostov-on-Don an illegal Congress of Evangelical Christians and Baptists was held where the much anticipated decision to unite was made. The Congress accepted the name of Evangelical Christians-Baptists (Savinsky 1999:265). Mazaev commented that "from that historical moment we ceased being Baptists and almost started forgetting that we were Baptists".²³³ In January 1907 a united Congress of Evangelical Christians, Evangelical Christians-Zakharovtsy, and Evangelical Christians-Baptists was held in St. Petersburg chaired by Kargel. At the end the participants conducted the Lord's Supper together (Savinsky 1999:267-268), an important event, which had proved impossible at the 1884 congress. Kovalenko also mentions likely the same conference hosted by Kargel's congregation in 1907 attended by Pashkovites, Baptists, Molokans and Presbyterians; Prokhanov was also present (Kovalenko 1996:107).

It is important to remember, as Savinsky points out, that until 1909 there was no clear difference between Evangelical Christians and Baptists (Savinsky 1999:297). From 1905 to 1909 the congregations of the Baptist Union were

²³³ Mazaev D. I. "Not that road" // Baptist. 1911. № 34, in Savinsky 1999:265.

called Evangelical Christian–Baptist (Kovalenko 1996:107); after 1909 Baptists and Evangelical Christians parted again.

Prokhanov was inspired by the grand but rather unrealistic idea of reforming Russian people. He knew that he might not gain support for this from the leaders of the Evangelical Christians-Baptists, so he started to organize a union of the First and the Second evangelical congregations in St. Petersburg and congregations in the Crimea and Ukraine. In this way, in 1909 the All-Russian Union of Evangelical Christians was founded. Prokhanov remained its president for twenty-five years. In 1909 and 1910 Prokhanov invited the Baptists to join him in activities such as magazine publishing and Christian education.²³⁴ What Prokhanov wanted was a union with Baptists on his own terms.

Overall, “prior to the Revolution, neither group was ready for the move. The Baptists were not in agreement with Prokhanov’s emphasis on social regeneration. The Evangelicals were not enthusiastic about the Baptists’ perceived restrictive doctrines” (Ellis & Jones 1996:164). Brandenburg thinks that it could be due to Prokhanov’s “rather erratic and enterprising nature” which was alien to the Baptist brethren, that they preferred to remain independent (Brandenburg 1977:134).

Three congresses of the Evangelical Christians (not to be confused with Evangelical Christians-Baptists) were held during this period. The first one took place in September 1909 in St. Petersburg (Savinsky 1999:291). Among other issues they discussed ways of uniting with Evangelical Christians-Baptists and Mennonites (Savinsky 199:22-93). The Second congress took place in December 1910 through January 1911. Baptist leaders Mazaev and Balikhin sent a telegram calling “for peace to distant and near”. The delegates discussed incidents of unending local persecution. They also made a decision to call the union “The Union of Evangelical Christians” (Savinsky 1999:293-294). The Third congress took place in December 1911 through January 1912. Prokhanov was chairman; Kargel was his main assistant. The delegates discussed the issues of singing in churches, Sunday schools, youth ministry, women’s ministry, laying on of hands, and marriage and divorce (Savinsky 1999:294-295).

²³⁴ Prokhanov 1993:137; Savinsky 1999:300-301; Samoilenkov 2001:28.

After 1912 the government forbade holding any congresses of All-Russia Union of Evangelical Christians (Prokhanov 1993:138). World War I was at the door. Altogether, Prokhanov chaired all ten union congresses held from 1909 to 1928 (Prokhanov 1993:138; Kovalenko 1996:108).

Besides the friction between the union of Evangelical Christians-Baptists and All-Russia Union of Evangelical Christians, there were tensions between other evangelical groups in St. Petersburg. The author needs to repeat that alongside Prokhanov's "First Congregation" a much older congregation had been gathering at the Lievens' household, which later organized itself in a similar fashion and was called "The Second Evangelical congregation". After Prokhanov agreed to lead the group of young people who split from Kargel's congregation and almost secretly registered his "First Congregation", the relationship between these two churches suffered. Even the Orthodox were aware of this split. In 1912 Bogolyubov stated that St. Petersburg Pashkovites divided into two parts, "the first one is *prokhanovtsy* or 'free Baptists'. Those do everything like Fetler and Mazaev do. Other Pashkovites are following Kargel and keep old Radstockian traditions. Those are faithful to Pashkov until now" (Bogolyubov 1912:30-31).

Another tension could be sensed between Kargel's congregation and Fetler's Baptist church. Fetler, who in the beginning was ministering side by side with Kargel and did not seem to see anything wrong in such cooperation, then started building a Baptist church. Some of the members in his church had been attending services at the Lieven palace. When speaking about the Pashkovites at the All-Russia Baptist Congress in St. Petersburg in September 1910, Fetler pointed out that Evangelical Christians and Baptists could enjoy only "spiritual fellowship", but not a "practical union". His argument was that Evangelical Christians in Russia started with Radstock, a Plymouth Brethren. According to Fetler, Plymouth Brethren and Baptists in England do not share any fellowship; Plymouth Brethren deny any special name and call themselves simply "Christians"; they reject the office of presbyters; anyone can preach at their meetings; they break bread every Sunday, not only on the first Sunday of the month, as Baptists do. According to Fetler a union with the Evangelical Christians was possible only if they accepted the Baptist confession of faith and expressed their desire to join the Baptist Union (Bondar 1911:57; Bogolyubov 1912:3).

When considering the above mentioned facts, the author does not think that a union of different evangelical groups in Russia was possible at the time. Although after announcing the edict of toleration everybody “became brothers, and single heartedly have forgotten quarrels”, as Jasnevitch-Borodaevskaya said, it was only for a time.

4.3.3 Increase of Social Pressure before and during World War I

Prugavin points out repeated cases of religious oppression already in 1908. In October 1908 all prayer houses in Petersburg known as “Pashkovite” or “Baptist” had to be closed. They had been opened after the Manifesto of 17 April 1905 and operated openly in different parts of the city. On 11 and 12 of October there was not a single meeting because of the police order. Only after Stolypin’s intervention were the prayer houses reopened (Prugavin 1909:258-263).

From 1912 (even from 1910) religious freedom in Russia became more and more limited. As during the time of Pobedonostsev, evangelical believers were again oppressed and persecuted (Savinsky 1999:302). By 1911 Orthodox voices began to sound more and more loudly, insisting on stronger measures to limit the dissenters (Ellis & Jones 1996:152).

World War I had not yet started, but “the pressures resumed in 1912 and 1913. In 1913, a 140-page report was submitted to the Fourth State Duma [Russian Parliament] featuring complaints about the Evangelicals in various *gubernias*, whose prayer houses were shut down and rights to worship curbed due to accusation of pan-Germanism” (Ivanov 2002:22-45). The declaration of war in August 1914 brought many initiatives of the Evangelical Christians to a standstill, and persecution broke out once again (Ellis & Jones 1996:150).

The war became an excellent excuse for discontinuing various freedoms including religious freedom. Needless to say, Baptists and Mennonites (two denominations tracing their roots to Germany) became the scapegoats during this war against Germany. According to Ivanov, “the onset of World War I resurrected some of the most reactionary conservative elements in the public and the government calling for a *revanche* against the religious minorities who grew and consolidated themselves between 1905 and 1914” (Ivanov 2002:22-45).

Treason and lack of patriotism became a label, that was attached to... Germans, sectarians, pacifists, and to almost everything non-Orthodox and non-Great Russian... The charge of pan-Germanism and social sabotage was also brought against Russian Evangelical sectarians: Baptists, Stundists/Evangelical Christians, Adventists, and some other groups. They were accused of a conspiracy to demolish the two pillars upon which the Empire rested, the Monarchy and Orthodoxy (Ivanov 2002:22-45).

With the beginning of the war it was as though the tolerant Manifesto of 1905 had never been issued (Brandenburg 1977:157). Stundists once again, as before 1905, even without trial were being exiled to Siberia by governors and police authorities (Brandenburg 1977:157). The general sentiment against the Germans had a profound effect on the Stundist, Baptist, and Mennonite communities. "You have a German religion" was a common accusation (Brandenburg 1977:157). The press stated categorically that Emperor Wilhelm had given the Baptists money "in order to undermine the Russian people" (Brandenburg 1977:158). Orthodox missionaries spread rumours about Baptists becoming traitors and helping Germany (Savinsky 1999:309-310). Unfortunately, Russians tended to believe such accusations.

In 1915 Prokhanov wrote a "note" about the difficult situation of evangelicals in Russia. According to Prokhanov, from the beginning of the war persecution against evangelicals had become similar to Pobedonostsev's times (Prokhanov 1915:2). A number of their meeting places in Odessa, Kazan', Moscow, etc., were closed (Prokhanov 1915:2-5). They were persecuted even for meeting for tea at each other's houses (Prokhanov 1915:5). Over fifty preachers were sent to prisons and to Siberia (Prokhanov 1915:7-10). Even before the war there were publications saying that Baptists, Evangelical Christians, etc., are "the avanguard of Germany" (Prokhanov 1915:15). Prokhanov pointed out that evangelicals were patriots of their country, who with rare exceptions did not reject military duty, and he listed a number of men who were killed or wounded (Prokhanov 1915:41-46).

According to Ellis and Jones, the publication of both *Khristianin* [The Christian] and *Utrennyaya Zvezda* [Morning Star] was suspended. Meetings in St. Petersburg and across Russia were forbidden. Prayer houses were closed. The Bible school was closed. Neither the Evangelical nor Baptist unions were permitted to conduct congresses or conferences. "The anti-German sentiment during the war lumped the Evangelicals with the Stundists and accused them of

fostering a ‘German religion’” (Ellis & Jones 1996:153, Savinsky 1999:309-310). By the end of 1914 “Raduga” Publications, managed by Prokhanov and Braun, a Mennonite, was shut down as well (Ivanov 2002:22-45).

On 7 March 1915 the Ministry of Internal Affairs sent a secret circular to the heads of the police departments and gendarmerie, ordering them “to increase the pressure on the sectarians and socialists alike” (Ivanov 2002:22-45). In June 1915, the Petrograd²³⁵ mayor wrote to the Minister of Internal Affairs that Stundo-Baptists are “nothing but nurseries of Germanism in Russia”.²³⁶ As a result the Baptist leaders continued to be exiled, and their hospitals and prayer houses were shut down (Ivanov 2002:22-45). For example, in 1916 the hospital at Petrograd’s *Dom Evangeliya* was closed by the authorities, and Petrograd evangelical churches were closed too, as many soldiers were attending the services (Ivanov 2002:22-45). Evidently the officials were afraid of certain pacifistic influence, because hundreds of Evangelical Union members, Baptists, and others refused to bear arms or be drafted (Ivanov 2002:22-45).

It is important to point out that the evangelicals continued their philanthropic and evangelistic activities during wartime. The Baptists from *Dom Evangeliya* (Fetler’s congregation) set aside six apartments and a big hall for the wounded where “sisters” took care of them. Churches in other cities did similar things. Baptists and Evangelical Christians started “Good Samaritan” funds to support hospitals, help the families of the dead and wounded, and print Bibles and other Christian literature (Savinsky 1999:308-309).

Prokhanov took an active role by writing many petitions to the government “calling to release the imprisoned preachers and assuring Evangelicals’ support of the war effort” (Ivanov 2002:22-45).

Not only persecution but also the lack of fuel and food caused many to leave St. Petersburg during the war. Only a small group stayed from Kargel’s congregation of 1500 members. Although some returned in the 1920s, only a few original members survived (Corrado 2005:171).

²³⁵ A former name (1914-24) of Saint Petersburg.

²³⁶ TsGIARF, Fond 821, Opis 133, Delo 331. Reel 12, in Ivanov 2002:22-45.

4.3.4 New Evangelical Leaders in St. Petersburg and Their Input

This period of history was characterised by a number of new evangelical leaders who played important roles shaping the movements.

4.3.4.1 *Ivan Stepanovich Prokhanov (1869-1935)*

I. Prokhanov, probably the most outstanding leader in the Russian Evangelical movement of this period, was a controversial figure. Extremely gifted and energetic, he was highly praised by some, and rebuked by others.

For instance, N. I. Saloff-Astakhoff said that Prokhanov “accomplished more than any man since the days of the Apostles”.²³⁷ According to Ellis and Jones, he moved “into the vacuum created by the exile of such leaders as Pashkov, Bobrinskiy, and others” and became “a natural leader who, almost single-handedly, led the Evangelical Christians to remarkable heights during the first quarter of the twentieth century... his genius for organisation well-matched by his boundless energy” (Ellis & Jones 1996:133-134). Further on, Ellis and Jones continue praising him:

[Prokhanov] quickly grasped the need for the biblical expression of faith and for unity among believers...Pashkov's removal in ten years left the movement weak both in leadership and in its perception of how it should develop as a church of Christ. Prokhanov's entry brought vision, energy, and organization. He gathered the scattered remnants of the Pashkovites and Stundists and framed, almost single-handedly, the Evangelical Christians as a closely knit, rapidly growing, confessing body (Ellis & Jones 1996:176).

These and similar statements leave the impression that nobody else continued the work after Pashkov's and Korff's banishment. Nichols does not even mention Kargel in his masters dissertation, and describes Prokhanov as “a long-awaited leader” who “would soon capture the moment and unite the Evangelicals” (Nichols 1991:74-76).

Brandenburg is a little more critical in his perception:

[Prokhanov] always had fresh plans and was tireless in putting them into practice. It may not always have been easy to work with him or under him, but those who got to know him found it difficult to resist his influence. He was without doubt the most important and gifted leader of the Evangelical Christians among the Russians. He was a reformist figure of great and varied talent (Brandenburg 1977:131).

²³⁷ Saloff-Astakhoff, 130-131, in Corrado 2000:180.

Corrado also points out “the rigidity and strictness of his [Prokhanov’s] meetings” which “may have resulted more from his leadership style than theological beliefs” (Corrado 2000:174).

A brief review of Prokhanov’s biography can help to clarify his position which greatly influenced the further development of the movement, because due to his activity the movement became “both an extension of himself and distinctly Russian” (Ellis & Jones 1996:176). Prokhanov was born into a Molokan family in Vladikavkaz and from the age of seven was brought up by Baptist parents.²³⁸ A simple question on a scrap of paper “Do you love Jesus Christ?” restrained him from suicide and led to reading the New Testament and to a spiritual awakening. After being baptized in the Terek River in 1887 he joined a Russian Baptist congregation. However Prokhanov himself avoided the word “Baptist” and called that congregation “a local group of Christian believers”.²³⁹

While his years as a student at St. Petersburg Institute of Technology from 1888 to 1893, Prokhanov became acquainted with the Pashkovites, who were meeting secretly in private homes, including those who grouped around the Lieven household (Brandenburg 1977:131). He immediately became a regular preacher and soon began organizing meetings in the woods (Prokhanov 1993:64; Kovalenko 1996:106).

While Kargel and those believers who met in Lieven’s home retained the characteristics of the early Pashkovites, Prokhanov became the unofficial leader of meetings in smaller homes on the other side of the city. Under Prokhanov’s leadership the meetings took on a different character. Influenced by the strict Baptists of the South and having studied in Western Europe, Prokhanov taught believer’s baptism and insisted upon a strict, moral lifestyle consistent with his Molokan upbringing. His meetings were known “for their organization and outward focus” (Corrado 2000:174-175). During his student years Prokhanov started publishing the first magazine *Beseda*.

Looking for new forms of practical Christianity in 1894, Prokhanov initiated a community called *Vetrograd* which would copy the structure of congregations of the first Christians (Savinsky 1999:278). Together with other

²³⁸ Prokhanov 1993:29; Kovalenko 1996:105; Brandenburg 1977:131.

²³⁹ Prokhanov 1993:46-48; Brandenburg 1977:131.

believers he founded a settlement in the Crimea. He wanted to provide an example to the Russian intellectuals who were influenced by socialist ideas, that a voluntary communism based on the Gospel was not impossible (Brandenburg 1977:132). He wrote of his vision of restoring apostolic Christianity:

The church of the first century, the Church of Christ and the Apostles, as it is revealed to us in the Acts of the Apostles and in their Epistles, is an ideal model for imitation in all times . . . Only the revival of Church in the spirit of primitive Christianity, with its all-embracing and creative religious power, will be able to overcome the spirit of unbelief as manifested in atheism, materialism, and free-thinking, and to prevent its further spreading in the world... Take the old and yet eternally new Gospel as the foundation of your life, to rebuild it according with the teaching of Christ, and then the earth and the heavens will be renewed (Prokhanov 1993:243, 245, 248).

However, the community did not last long (Savinsky 1999:278).

In 1894 Prokhanov came under police surveillance and had to leave the country secretly in order to escape persecution.²⁴⁰ In 1895 he went to Finland and from there to the West to study theology. On Dr. Baedeker's advice and with Quaker Brucks' promise to pay for his studies, Prokhanov studied for a year at Bristol Bible College (Prokhanov 1993:92). After that he attended lectures at a Congregational College in London because he wanted to get in touch with other denominations (Prokhanov 1993:92). In 1896 with the help of the same Brucks and having letters of recommendation from Baedeker and Adams (Evangelical Union secretary), he moved to Berlin and was accepted to the University of Berlin's theology department (Prokhanov 1993:95) where he studied for a semester. During professor Garnak's lectures, Prokhanov got acquainted with rationalistic theology and higher criticism. After close consideration of Garnak's theory Prokhanov came to the conclusion that Garnak's position concerning the origin of the New Testament books was "much milder" than he had expected. According to Prokhanov, "he stood on a traditional point of view" (Prokhanov 1993:95-96). Finally he attended the department of Protestant Theology in Paris for a semester (Prokhanov 1993:96).

While abroad, Prokhanov continued publishing *Beseda* and wrote a great number of Christian songs (Kovalenko 1996:106). Another mission was to help his persecuted brothers in Russia (Kovalenko 1996:106-107). At Quakers'

request he helped ailing Dukhobors on Cyprus where they were on their way to Canada (Prokhanov 1993:100, 102-104). He was able to return to St. Petersburg only after his marriage in 1901 (Prokhanov 1993:109). In 1902 he managed to print 20,000 Christian *Gusly* songbooks at the state printing house (Prokhanov 1993:112). In 1904-1905 he published *Struny Serdtsa*, a book of Christian poetry (Kovalenko 1996:107).

By 1905 Prokhanov was an accomplished leader who had a theological education, experience in living in other countries, and great ambitions. New political conditions in Russia opened before him many opportunities. In January 1905 he agreed to lead a group of young people who had separated from Kargel (Savinsky 1999:281). Later that year he founded the Union of Christian Youth (Samoilenkov 2001:28). Prokhanov, because of his active ministry and missionary vision, could not be satisfied with “the passive mode” in the local church at St. Petersburg that was more concerned with inner perfection and sanctification. He was not in agreement with Kargel who was not ready to take advantage of new possibilities (Samoilenkov 2001:81-82).

After the decree of tolerance Prokhanov started publishing a weekly magazine, *Khristianin* [The Christian], which was both evangelistic and instructive for Christians, and “showed no denominational narrowness” (Brandenburg 1977:134). After the law of 13 October 1906 Prokhanov devoted himself to organizing congregations, something which Pashkov and his circle had paid little attention to until that time (Brandenburg 1977:134).

From 1907-1911 Prokhanov put a lot of energy into defending believers who were persecuted in spite of the edicts of October 1905 and October 1906 (Kovalenko 1996:107). In 1910 he started publishing the newspaper *Utrennyaya Zvezda* (Kovalenko 1996:1907). From 1910 to 1913 he published seven different songbooks (Kovalenko 1996:108). In 1913 he founded a Bible school (Samoilenkov 2001:28). Such are the facts showing Prokhanov’s active Christian ministry.

Since Prokhanov was the first to seek a legal basis with regards to the state, his congregation was called “the First Evangelical-Christian Congregation in St. Petersburg”; there he served as a presbyter for 20 years.²⁴¹ His “First”

²⁴⁰ Prokhanov 1993:88; Kovalenko 1996:106; Brandenburg 1977:133.

²⁴¹ Brandenburg 1977:134; Samoilenkov 2001:28.

evangelical congregation was formed from a number of secret Christian groups, some people from Berdnikov's Baptist congregation, and young people that broke away from Kargel (Savinsky 1999:281). An appeal to register was signed by 140 members; the congregation was registered in November 1908 (Savinsky 1999:287). This came as a surprise to the house church gathering for a longer time in Lieven's home. Since then two evangelical congregations in St. Petersburg existed independently of each other (Lieven 1967:106). Interestingly, the First Evangelical Christian congregation in St. Petersburg was organized according to a Baptist pattern with strict inner discipline (Savinsky 1999:282). Wardin also points out that "Evangelical Christians, led by Ivan S. Prokhanov, were very close in polity and doctrine to Baptists" (Wardin 1994:50-61). Karetnikova also agrees, that "service in Prokhanov's church was strictly Baptist" (Karetnikova 2009:38).

Thus, Prokhanov's congregation differed from Baptist congregations only in name. However, he wanted to have his hands untied and to stay independent from Baptist leaders in order to fulfil his goal, "creating the right, free and balanced life of the state" (Savinsky 1999:282), and "renewing Russia under the condition of spiritual regeneration and self-improvement of every individual".²⁴² Prokhanov wrote, "My goal was intensive missionary activity for the sake of future spiritual revival of Russian nation" (Prokhanov 1993:110). In this point he was in contradiction with Baptist leaders who saw the main goal as "saving souls" (Savinsky 1999:280). According to Savinsky, Prokhanov "needed" this "First congregation" in order to organize a believers' union which "should become an important lever of spiritual regeneration of Russian people".²⁴³

In other words, Prokhanov's goal was God's kingdom on earth, while the Baptist leaders were looking forward to the kingdom of heaven. The activity of the Baptists was mostly limited by their churches. Prokhanov went beyond these limits. For instance, he cooperated with the Orthodox. The Russian Evangelical Union could include Lutherans, Baptists, Evangelical Christians, Orthodox, etc. (Savinsky 1999:284). It caused a negative reaction among Baptist leaders such as Mazaev, Churzin, Balikhin, and Zinov'ev (Savinsky 1999:284-5). Prokhanov's paradox was that, on one hand, he demanded closed

²⁴² Prokhanov I. S., *Avtobiografiya*, in Savinsky 1999:280.

communion in his congregation (Savinsky 1999:282), while, on the other hand, he cooperated with representatives of other denominations.

Another inconsistency was that, on one hand, Prokhanov purposefully avoided the word “Baptist” in the name of his congregation and All-Russia Union of Evangelical Christians founded in 1909, but, on the other hand, he was chosen as a vice-president of the Baptist World Alliance. According to Popov, at the request of Russia’s Evangelical Christians, led by Prokhanov, their church was admitted to the Baptist World Alliance, and later Prokhanov was elected a vice-president of the Alliance. This is how Prokhanov outlined the Evangelical Christians’ position on the unity issue: “Although Evangelical Christians wanted to stay spiritually independent, they joyously accepted unity with all Christians baptized in faith”. Naturally, the leaders of Russia’s Christians-Baptists were not happy with the Baptist World Alliance’s decision to admit the Evangelical Christians (Popov 1995:18).

Brandenburg praises “the genial personality of Ivan Prokhanov” for his extreme openness (Brandenburg 1977:xii), but Brandenburg fails to see a church politician behind this leader. Being “open” was only a part of the game. Summarising, it seems that the main complaints of the Baptist leaders were the following: Prokhanov’s focus on renewing Russia (versus renewing souls); uncontrolled Christian activity (versus church-controlled activity); hopes to reform the Orthodox Church without transforming it into an evangelical body, and collaboration with the Orthodox (versus non-collaboration).

Nichols portrays Baptists as “enemies” of Pashkovites and Prokhanov as their “saviour”:

Their waiting proved worthwhile . . . Prokhanov’s strong administrative skills allowed him to gather together like-minded Evangelical groups from across the country. This enterprise became known as the “Union of Evangelical Christians.” The doctrinal freedom and the innovative leadership style of Prokhanov caused the Baptists to withhold their formal participation. The Union of Evangelical Christians did not ordain clergy, nor did they require baptism, and held most of their meetings in private homes (Nichols 1991:76).

The author cannot agree with this position. Although it is true that the Pashkovites had certain problems in their relationship with Baptists, they did not

²⁴³ Savinsky 1999:282; Prokhanov’s letter, August 1906 // *Khristianin* 1908 № 10, in Savinsky 1999:282.

need Prokhanov's protection. Besides, they also had certain problems with Prokhanov.

When S. Lieven compared Prokhanov with Kargel she diplomatically noted, "If Kargel was moving deep down into spiritual life, Prokhanov was moving out far and wide". Her other statement explains what she meant, "Brother Kargel was seeking to deepen believers in the knowledge of the Lord and His Word, and brother I. S. Prokhanov was calling his members to active participation in congregational life: he organized the Youth Union, a choir and so on" (Lieven 1967:106).

Prokhanov's utopia was twofold, economic (his attempts to create Christian communes, Vetrograd and City of the Sun) and religious (his attempts to unite believers of different denominations and to reform Russia). However, his practical input cannot be underestimated. Russian evangelicals are indebted to Prokhanov for great publishing activity, mission activity, legal protection of the persecuted, Christian education, legal status, and much more.

4.3.4.2 Willam Fetler (1883-1957)

William Fetler was another outstanding evangelical Baptist leader in St. Petersburg. In 1907 he graduated from Spurgeon's Pastor's College in England and came to St. Petersburg in the same year (Savinsky 1999:261). In the beginning he sometimes preached at the Lieven palace as a "helper of brother Kargel" (Lieven 1967:106). Then he joined the gatherings in Chertkova's meeting hall (Savinsky 1999:261). His original plans were to go to China but they did not work out. Instead, he organized a Baptist church in St. Petersburg, joined by many from Prokhanov's "first" congregation.

Fetler became a very popular preacher and spoke in theatres and concert halls to gatherings numbering almost three thousand (Savinsky 1999:261). The main meetings were held in the Tenishev concert hall at 33/35 Mokhovaya Street, which had a capacity of seven hundred. He also initiated and actively participated in building *Dom Evangeliya*, whose capacity of three thousand made it the biggest evangelical meeting hall in Russia (Savinsky 1999:261). In 1909 he started publishing the weekly magazine *Vera* [Faith], which was later succeeded by *Gost'* [Guest] (Savinsky 1999:261).

Prokhanov's follower Saloff-Astakhoff claimed that Fetler was the first to introduce division among the St. Petersburg Evangelical Christians. Yet, as

Corrado noted, Prokhanov's method of assuming leadership from Kargel and the Pashkovites demonstrated a similar aggressive and divisive spirit (Corrado 2000:176). Despite the controversy surrounding his work, Fetler retained the confidence of many elderly aristocratic Pashkovite women (Corrado 2000:177). In 1915 he was banished from Russia without the right to return (Savinsky 1999:364).

4.3.4.3 Pavel Nikolaevich Nikolaii (1860-1919)

Baron Nikolaii was known as a missionary to students. According to Brandenburg, Nikolaii came from a Swedish family. His ancestors had been involved in diplomatic service in Austria and Russia. His grandfather, a tutor to Tsar Paul I, bought the estate of Monrepos near Vyborg from the Duke of Wüttemberg and settled the family there. Nikolaii's father was a minister for some time. From childhood Nikolaii was accustomed to praying and reading the Bible, and at age nineteen he was confirmed at St. Anne's in St. Petersburg, an event he took very seriously.

Nikolaii studied law in St. Petersburg, where he lived with his uncle, the Minister of Cults at that time. His closest friend was Count Konstantin Konstantinovich von der Pahlen, son of the Minister of Justice, one of the noblest figures in St. Petersburg before World War I. Through him, while still a student, he found his way into the Lieven household and the Christian circle there (Brandenburg 1977:136).

In Finland he often visited the family of Baron Wrede and together with the famous Mathilde Wrede visited Finnish prisons. During a Finnish Bible study circle someone mentioned the expression 'semi-Christian'. This expression disturbed Nikolaii and in 1888 he decided to live his life totally for Christ (Brandenburg 1977:137).

Before he started his ministry among students, Nikolaii visited Russian prisons with Dr. Baedeker. In 1898 he was able to write in his diary: "I feel so refreshed after my prison visiting... I cannot thank God enough for the privilege of being able to carry on this ministry at all." This was after he discovered that a cab-driver in Siberia was more grateful for the New Testament he gave him than for the fare he paid (Brandenburg 1977:137).

After getting acquainted in 1899 with John Mott, a well-known worker of the World's Student Christian Federation, Nikolaii started working among

students in St. Petersburg, Moscow, Kiev, and other cities (Savinsky 1999:357). At the Blankenburg Alliance conference, a conference of the German Evangelical Alliance similar to Keswick Convention in England, he met Hudson Taylor (Brandenburg 1977:138).

In 1903 when Karl Heim (who was later to become a professor of theology and student pastor in Münster and Tübingen) visited St. Petersburg, Nicolaii took him to meetings in the Lieven home. Heim called these evenings “a quite unexpected encounter with a piece of New Testament Christian life”. Further, “It was the greatest experience of my time in Russia that through Baron Nicolay and Princess Lieven I came into contact with this New Testament Christian movement.”²⁴⁴

Nicolaii’s views are well presented in his own words:

The people are all religious, but they are excitable, easily divided and shaken, because there are no leaders who are capable of seeing past the secondary things such as baptism, question of the Second Coming, Sabbath observation and so on, and energetically underlining the unifying aspect of faith in Jesus! That is, faith in our crucified king and the rebirth of hearts and spirits by his Spirit (Brandenburg 1977:147).

This attitude is very close to the original convictions of the Pashkovites. Nikolaii did not identify himself with Baptists or Evangelical Christians. However, he made quite an impact on the evangelical movement of the period. Heier considers Nikolaii “the only successor of Pashkov who remained truly non-denominational, which was central to the original movement”.²⁴⁵ S. Lieven also stresses that Nikolaii was “wholly one of their men” (Lieven 1967:116).

4.3.5 Conclusion

Russian historian and politician P. Milyukov felt that had the state not taken measures to limit Pashkovite and other evangelical influence, a Russian Reformation “would have been an accomplished fact”.²⁴⁶ So, Prokhanov with his idea of spiritual regeneration of Russian people may have been not that utopic after all. However, history took a different route.

²⁴⁴ Heim *Ichgedenke der vorigen Zeiten*, Wuppertal 1964 R. Brockhaus Taschenbücher, Vol.76/77 pp.53-62, in Brandenburg 1977:139.

²⁴⁵ Heier, “A Note on the Pashkovites and L. N.Tolstoy” *Canadian Slavonic Papers* 5 (1962):114-121,119, in Nichols 1991:23-24.

²⁴⁶ Milyukov, *Russia and Its Crisis*, 100, in Corrado 2000:180.

Indeed, religious freedom triggered quick growth in the evangelical movement in Russia. Various unions were formed. Congregations got names and registrations. The evangelical groups could finally legalize their activity. These changes caused certain structuring of the evangelical movement.

The most outstanding evangelical and Baptist leaders around St. Petersburg now were Prokhanov, Kargel, Fetler, and Nikolaii. After a long winter of severe persecution, the spring of freedom resurrected great dreams of the past. The explosive energy of a new generation of evangelical and Baptist leaders allowed the realisation of bold projects: revival meetings with thousands in attendance, holding regular congresses, publishing Christian books that were more varied and serious from a theological point of view when compared with the simple booklets published by SESER, starting Christian education, ministry among students, and so on.

The house church at Lieven's palace managed to preserve the original features of the Pashkovite meetings. Representatives from both high and low classes were still meeting together. They also preserved the practice of open communion. They continued special ministries for children, women, and young people. But they finally adopted an official name, the Evangelical Christians.²⁴⁷ The Pashkovite ladies continued to influence the evangelical climate in St. Petersburg. In a way they were playing the role of "fairy godmothers" for the new leaders: N. Lieven hosted Kargel and his family, E. Chertkova stood by Fetler, A. I. Peuker helped Nikolaii to work among female students.

For a time persecution ceased to be a unifying factor for the different evangelical groups, and doctrinal and practical differences surfaced. Moreover, the personal ambitions of the various groups' leaders hindered the process of uniting. Despite several attempts, by the end of the period the evangelical groups were farther from merging than ever before. Nevertheless, reciprocal influence of the Pashkovites and Baptists was observed even by outsiders. In 1916 Kushnev wrote that the Pashkovites yielded a point to Baptists in the issue of adult baptism, while Baptist yielded a point to the Pashkovites stressing justification by faith alone (Kushnev 1916:66).

²⁴⁷ Prokhanov's church although bearing the same name was essentially Baptist, and this creates some confusion.

Unfortunately, the freedom was short-lived, as World War I put a quick end to many liberties and opportunities. This was especially hard on believers with German roots. Baptists and Mennonite Brethren, denominations of German origin, were targeted for persecution and suffered many false accusations.

4.4 “Golden Age” of the Russian Evangelicals (1917-1927)

The turmoil of World War I and all three Russian revolutions put an end to the “aristocratic” period in the history of Russian evangelicals. The revolutions of 1917 made some aristocrats flee the country, while others were almost totally eliminated. Hence, the end was put to “Plymouth”, or, more specifically “Open Brethren”, influence among Russian evangelicals. However, some of this influence was carried on into the 1920s and even the 1930s by Kargel.

Nevertheless, the period that followed the 1917 Revolution is often called “golden age”. In the words of Sawatsky, the “first ten years after revolution truly became ‘the golden age’ for evangelical confessions of all bodies” (Sawatsky 1995:24). Prokhanov considered the period from 1923 to 1929 as the “most productive” time in the evangelical movement all over the Soviet Union (Prokhanov 1993:205). Was it really so? Indeed, for Russian evangelical churches the first twelve years of Soviet rule became a time of “phenomenal growth and multisided development” (Sawatsky 1995:38). How could that be?

After the February Revolution of 1917 (the so-called Second Russian Revolution) the Provisional Government released all political and religious prisoners (Savinsky 2001:14). Long awaited freedom had finally arrived. Many Christian meetings were held all over the country. The Gospel was preached in the streets, squares, and other public places (Savinsky 2001:15).

After the overturn of October 1917, Lenin’s government announced its main decrees: factories and plants – to workers, land – to peasants, peace – to nations. Behind this rhetoric was the nationalisation of land and private property and separate negotiations for peace between Soviet Russia and Germany. These measures plunged Russia into four years of civil war. In January 1918 Lenin’s government issued a decree which separated the church from the state and education from the church.²⁴⁸ All churches became equal in the eyes of the

²⁴⁸ Ellis & Jones 1996:160; Savinsky 2001:17.

state. And since the Orthodox Church was identified with the former regime of the tsarist state it became enemy number one for the Soviets. Other formerly persecuted religions could catch their breath.

Although the reign of terror cannot be considered “golden times” for anyone, this period was characterised by relative freedom for evangelicals and lasted about a decade. Big Christian meetings were taking place. Christian publications were renewed. Congresses were held regularly again. In the words of Brandenburg, the Bolsheviks at first “wooed the evangelical circles” (Brandenburg 1977:168). “The evangelical congregations, with an optimism that later proved to be groundless, sought to use this moment of generally changing conditions to spread the gospel” (Brandenburg 1977:168).

However, after finishing with the Orthodox, the atheistic authorities naturally turned against other confessions. As persecution against the Orthodox Church were a national policy in the 1920s, so persecution against all religion became national policy in the 1930s. In order to understand this period one must not forget that the Russian Revolution was against God (as Berdyaev rightly noted) (Savinsky 2001:10) and the Bolshevik party as well as the Soviet Government had clearly positioned themselves as ungodly.

This period was filled with a number of important events in church life that could be discussed in great detail. First, both the Baptist and the Evangelical Christian Unions came very close to uniting in May 1920. It was admitted that “there was no difference in doctrine, in life and practice of Baptists and the Evangelical Christians” (Savinsky 2001:38-41). However, this attempt to unite (like a number of previous ones) was not successful. The problem seemed to lie in church policy and the ambitions of some leaders in both camps. Second, lots of energy was put into missionary outreach both in Russia and abroad. Third, Christian philanthropy was not forgotten. For instance, an active stand was taken by Baptists during a mass starvation in the early 1920s in the Volga River area. Russian believers turned to their Western brothers and sisters asking them to help the dying areas. As a result, the American Relief Administration and other organisations in the West started sending aid. Fourth, this period of comparative freedom was used to publish the Bibles and hymnbooks which served as the only copies of this kind of literature for decades to come. Fifth, as the author mentioned above, congresses of both Unions were called regularly.

However, the author chose to concentrate on other burning issues of the period, i.e., the relationship with the Orthodox and involvement in politics, because the way various unions and leaders acted in these areas was very symptomatic and revealed where they truly stood theologically.

4.4.1 Some Statistics

It is commonly accepted that real expansion of both Baptists and Evangelical Christians took place after the October Revolution. The extensive social and political upheavals of revolution, civil war, and collectivisation provided fertile ground for sects in general and the evangelicals in particular. The numbers differ from source to source. The truth must be somewhere in the middle.

According to official Soviet statistics, by 1917 the evangelical movement numbered 150,000 members. During the next seven years both Baptists and the Evangelical Christians became five times more numerous.²⁴⁹ According to Mitrokhin, while they had only about 100,000 members before World War I, their number had risen to 500,000 by 1927.²⁵⁰

Hargroves estimates the numerical growth even higher: by 1922 the movement included 250,000 believers and by 1927 there were three thousand congregations with a membership approximating four million (Hargroves 1959:250).

In 1924 Prokhanov reported to Karl Borders that there were 1500 registered congregations; 300,000 recorded baptized believers, with families and adherents – 1.5 million. In 1926, Burnham reported the movement was approaching two million.²⁵¹ In St. Petersburg alone by 1922 Evangelical Christians had dozens of meeting places in the city and a number of places in the suburbs, among which were former Lutheran and Reformed church buildings deserted when German, Swedish, French and other foreign church members had left Russia (Prokhanov 1993:188).

²⁴⁹ Lyalina, *Baptizm i real'nost'*, Moskva 1977, pp. 58-69, in Sawatsky 1995:39.

²⁵⁰ Mitrokhin, 1966, 74, in Lane 1978:139.

²⁵¹ Karl Borders, "The Evangelical Church in Russia", *World Call*, May 1924, p. 17, in Ellis & Jones 1996:174.

Naturally, most church members were new to the movement. As mentioned above, economic difficulties forced many people to leave St. Petersburg. Of Kargel's church of 1500, only a small number of original members remained or returned during the 1920s (Corrado 2000:179). Those thousands of people who filled churches in the 1920s knew very little about "the old days". Similar things must have happened in other churches in Petrograd.

As for the Baptist social profile, at its peak in 1927 Baptists were particularly strong in the western areas of the Soviet Union. Their social composition was almost identical to that of the population as a whole.²⁵² A significant input was made by Russian war prisoners. About 2000 newly converted soldiers returned after World War I. Fetler ministered extensively among them after he was banished from Russia in 1915 (Savinsky 2001:65).

According to Brandenburg, by 1928 the Russian Baptists had about 3200 congregations. The Union of Evangelical Christians was about the same size (Brandenburg 1977:188).

Numbers presented by Savinsky seem to be the most trustworthy. Over the post-revolutionary decade the number of evangelicals quadrupled (from 200,000 in 1917 to 800,000 in 1928). Obviously, this growth could not but bother atheists whose goal was to finish with believers by 1937 (Savinsky 2001:7; 12).

According to NKVD figures for 1926-28, there was a significant increase in the number of Protestants (twenty-two percent). Such growth could be explained by at least two factors. First, "religious liberty" announced by the Bolsheviks affected religious groups whose rights had been restricted before the Revolution. Thus, "Baptists, Evangelicals, Lutherans, and other confessions had a short lived opportunity to preach and expand their activity, provided they expressed loyalty to the Soviet authorities". A second reason for such increase in numbers was that Old Believers, Protestants, and other denominations did not have to hide their religious orientation any longer. However, "by the middle of the 1930s all religious activity was reduced to a bare minimum" (Walters 1999:85).

²⁵² Klibanov, 1969, 73, in Lane 1978:148.

4.4.2 Relations with the Orthodox

It has been already stressed that “for nine centuries the Orthodox Church acted as an absolute ruler on the religious arena of Russia” and it “has always been intolerant to schisms, and any alternative expression of faith by the Russian people” (Samoilenkov 2001:12-13). The Church was connected to the tsarist regime in such a way that the former could not stand when the latter fell:

[The Church], accustomed to existence under the paternalistic control of the State, found itself adrift in the turbulent sea of the revolution. A militantly atheistic regime disestablished the Church, confiscated its properties, desecrated its temples, burned its icons, killed thousands of its monks and deprived the rest of citizenship, and reduced the proud institution to the status of a despised semi-legal organization (Kazemzadeh 1999:238).

In 1922 the state confiscated all church treasures: gold, silver, and precious stones from the churches and monasteries. The Church resisted the surrender of sacramental objects, which led to severe repression. Patriarch Tikhon was placed under house arrest in May 1922. The Church was wracked with multiple schisms. Known as the *Obnovlentsy* [Renewers or Renovators], the schismatics included the “Living Church” (led by Krasnitsky), the “Ancient Apostolic Church” (led by Metropolitan Vvedensky), and the “Church of Regeneration” (led by Metropolitan Antonin) and were exploited by the government.²⁵³ Secret Soviet police (GPU) used the existence of opposition for its own purposes. “The Renovators and the Bolshevic government were aligned in a cooperation of opposites to persecute the Patriarchal Church” (Malone 1980:245).

The first official contacts between the Evangelicals and the Orthodox Church took place in 1911 when Prokhanov addressed the Synod with a proposal to publish pocket canonical Bibles, but the Synod refused (Samoilenkov 2001:58). This schism in the Orthodox Church “served Prokhanov a signal for realisation of his idea of mass evangelical awakening among Russian people”. But if prior to this Prokhanov expected evangelical awakening from the “bottom”, from people, now he decided to use the hierarchs of Higher Church Administration in order to work evangelisation from the “top” (Savinsky 2001:76).

²⁵³ Ellis & Jones 1996:165-166; Savinsky 2001:76.

In September 1922 Prokhanov addressed the “Living Church”²⁵⁴ with so called *Evangel’skiy Klich* [Evangelical Appeal]²⁵⁵ on behalf of the All-Russia Union of Evangelical Churches named by him on this occasion “The Union of Free People’s Evangelical Church” (Savinsky 2001:42-43). He was invited to Moscow where he preached in Orthodox temples. In exchange Metropolitan Antonin (Church of Resurrection) spoke at a large meeting of the Evangelical Christians. On 15 March 1923 Prokhanov was invited to a congress of the Ancient Apostolic Church where he also preached (Savinsky 2001:77).

“Ugly collaboration of *obnovlentsy* with retributive organs of the Soviet state” was not a secret for many believers already in the 1920s (Krapivin 205:107). Was it a secret for Prokhanov? It is difficult to say what pushed him to make this unreasonable compromising step. Was it a desire to enter all open doors or his ambitions of becoming a great Russian reformer in case of success? Whatever the reason, the Baptists could not accept this. However, Prokhanov’s ambitions prevailed, and he proceeded with his contacts with the Orthodox at the expense of confrontation with the Baptists. As Savinsky thinks, Prokhanov saw himself as a religious reformer of the Church (Savinsky 2001:41). This is the key to understanding many of his actions.

Prokhanov personally visited Metropolitan Antonin who said that he agreed with almost everything in Prokhanov’s “Evangelical Appeal” (Prokhanov 1993:194). Later in March 1923 Prokhanov was invited to speak at the congress of the Ancient Apostolic Church where he was the first appointed speaker (Prokhanov 1993:195). A month later, in April 1923, the “Renewers” held a council during which they directed a message to Lenin, declaring loyalty to the “divinely appointed” revolutionary government, gaining them the label “The Red Council” (Ellis & Jones 1996:168). According to Brandenburg, it turns out that Prokhanov was present at this council and even spoke there:

In the spring of 1923 these opponents of Patriarch Tikhon held a council in Moscow. Because this council sent a letter of loyalty to Lenin,

²⁵⁴ Both Christian and secular researchers leave no doubt concerning the nature of “Living Church”. According to Savinsky, it was used by the Soviets to conduct the policy of the Soviet authorities (Savinsky 2001:40). Krapivin is even harder in his evaluation, saying that “Living Church” was a pro-Soviet church faction, sometimes called “red church” (Krapivin 2005:103). The Living Church was “too much aligned with Marxism” (Malone 1980:251).

²⁵⁵ In 1922 Prokhanov distributed 100,000 copies of his article *Evangel’skiy Klich* [Evangelical Appeal] among the Orthodox (Kovalenko 1996:108-109).

recognizing the revolutionary government as a divinely appointed government, it is termed by conservative circles among Orthodoxy the 'red council'. Prokhanov was also invited, and he had the opportunity to give a speech (Brandenburg 1977:174).

According to Ellis & Jones, "Prokhanov's association with these groups . . . harmed the Evangelical movement in the minds of many" (Ellis & Jones 1996:168). However, Samoilenkov does not seem to see much harm in these contacts. Referring to the "Evangelical Appeal", he stated that Prokhanov called "progressive groups within the Orthodox Church" to concentrate on transformation of inner life (Samoilenkov 2001:58-59). Prokhanov's speech at the First All-Russia Congress of the Old Apostolic Congregations is seen by Samoilenkov as "an important event". It was there that on behalf of the All-Russia Union of Evangelical Christians Prokhanov called for unification of the Renewal movement and Evangelical Christians if the Orthodox "agree to return to the early Christian foundation" (Samoilenkov 2001:59, 91). Samoilenkov admits that Prokhanov was ready to cooperate with the Orthodox Church even at the cost of breaking with Baptists (Samoilenkov 2001:95).

How typical for Soviet politics: *divide en impero!* It is rather strange that Prokhanov did not see that his actions lent support to the cause of Soviet politics. As far as the history of the evangelical movement in Russia is concerned, these contacts with the "red priests" made it impossible for Baptists and the Evangelical Christians to unite.

4.4.3 Relations to the State: Political Involvement and the Issue of Military Service

In 1901 Pavlov, a prominent Baptist leader, wrote to Bonch-Bruevich, "I do not want to touch on political issues... All Baptists and I reject the union of church and state which causes all persecutions for faith".²⁵⁶ Russian Baptists were known for not wanting state involvement in church business. They suffered greatly from the state Church in tsarist Russia and therefore especially valued this principle (Savinsky 2001:70-71).

²⁵⁶ Bonch-Bruevich, *Znachenie sektantstva dlya sovremennoy Rossii*. From a letter to Bonch-Bruevich, June 18, 1901, in Savinsky 2001:20.

However, Prokhanov's view of political alignment was different from that of the Baptists'. On 17 March 1917 Prokhanov's idea of founding the first Russian religious political party "Christian democratic Party Revival" was accepted. This party was not related only to the All-Russia Union of Evangelical Christians, but was meant to unite all Christians including Orthodox. Creating this party opened the door for political activity. A significant step in Prokhanov's political career was his election to the State Duma (Russian Parliament). Interestingly, Christian democrats with their candidate Prokhanov received more votes than Social-Democrats (Mensheviks) with a well-known revolutionary Plekhanov. Prokhanov's programme was addressed to various strata of the population and suggested a number of political, economical, and religious reforms.²⁵⁷

Actually, the idea of the formation of the Christian-Democratic "Resurrection" Party – a coalition of Christian Democrats – was declined by the fourth congress of the Evangelical Christians in Petrograd that took place in May 1917. The reason was "the unwillingness to get churches involved in politics". However, this did not stop Prokhanov. He proceeded with his own plans and became the Christian-Democrat candidate for the Petrograd district (Ellis & Jones 1996:162; Savinsky 2001:58).

The Baptist congress in 1920 stated that they keep neutral position in regard to political parties because "involvement in the politics of one party leads to enmity towards the other" (Savinsky 2001:56). But "new Prokhanov-style leadership" was characterized by "seeking cooperation with the Soviets" (Ivanov 2002:44).

Sawatsky pointed out that many leaders, including Pashkov, had been adherents of Christian socialism. They not only approved the socialistic idea but also managed to organize over the territory of the Soviet Union a number of prospering communes. Prokhanov dreamed of building his Soviet "City-Sun" called Evangel'sk that would become an exemplary city of brotherly love. His plans were even approved by the officials, and the local Soviet authorities promised him financial help and took part in the ceremony of symbolic foundation of the city – planting a few trees. A year later, however (in 1928), the building of the city was forbidden (Sawatsky 1995:37-38).

²⁵⁷ Prokhanov 1993:158-159; Ellis & Jones 1996:162; Mitrokhin 1997:259-262.

Although Prokhanov was certainly no friend of Bolshevism (Brandenburg 1977:183), he was flirting with the Soviets. He indicated his attitude to the Revolution in a report dated 6 April 1924: “Inasmuch as we saw social and economic reforms in the revolution, we welcome it. To some extent we saw in it God’s judgement on the guilty. Or else we consider it as purification, out of which Russia must come forth renewed”.²⁵⁸ This is how Prokhanov stated his position when called to the account by the authorities, “I explained my attitude to the red government, pointed to Romans 13 and said that the ideals of the Soviet government were close to Christianity, because the ideas of pure communism corresponded to the second chapter of Acts”.²⁵⁹

Connected to political involvement was the issue of military service. In all history of Evangelical-Baptist brotherhood no other issue brought as much disturbance as this one (Savinsky 2001:27). In order to get a better understanding of this issue one needs to go back to the epoch of Great Russian reforms. One of them was a military reform. Among its measures was introducing in 1874 universal service. At the outset of World War I Russian Baptists and the Evangelical Union believers “reassured the government of their support of the war effort”. In their Confessions both Union stated military duty as an obligation. Prokhanov personally tried to persuade the authorities of “the Evangelicals’ loyalty in service” (Ivanov 2002:42-43).

During World War I both Baptists and the Evangelical Christians went to the frontiers with rare exceptions (Savinsky 2001:27). Meanwhile Mennonites and Dukhobors had always been strongly opposed to military service and suffered persecutions for that even back in the tsarist Russia (Savinsky 2001:28). In rural areas

where local pressures against Evangelicals always tended to be stronger, and the central government’s reach weaker... the dissenting peasants nurtured their understanding of the Gospel, based on the literal approach to many passages, including the Sermon on the Mount... Many peasant believers were prepared to stand by their convictions – after all, they were much better adapted to persecution than their brethren in St. Petersburg (Ivanov 2002:44).

During the Civil War the cases of refusing to take arms among Baptists and the Evangelical Christians became more frequent (Savinsky 2001:28).

²⁵⁸ Gutsche, p.102, in Brandenburg 1977:173.

²⁵⁹ Gutsche, p.113, in Brandenburg 1977:182.

The Bolshevik party won partly due to its slogan “Peace to nations” and promises to put the end to the war. Indeed, in March 1918 Trotsky managed to conclude a separate peace treaty with Germany in exchange to enormous territories in the Western part of Russia. The war was over, soldiers went home... but not for a long time. In August 1918 the Soviets announced a compulsory draft to the army.

By the early 1920s Prokhanov addressed the Bolshevik government (with limited success) with a request for recognition of Conscientious Objector status for Evangelicals, “as the pacifist beliefs constituted some of their value” (Ivanov 2002:44). The decree of 4 January 1919 freed the citizens from compulsory military service on the ground of religious convictions. Mennonites, Dukhobors, Tolstovtsy, as well as Baptists and Evangelical Christians could use this opportunity not to serve or to serve in medical units after being approved by a people’s court (Savinsky 2001:28-29).

As Ellis and Jones rightly observed, the Bolsheviks, during their early consolidation of power, viewed the evangelicals as worthy of wooing. At the Communists’ Twelfth Party Congress it was acknowledged that the evangelicals had been “subjected to the most cruel persecution on the part of Tsarism.” Bonch-Bruevich, a secretary to Lunacharsky, the People’s Commissar of Education, persuaded Lenin and Trotsky to allow those “with conscientious objections against bearing arms” to serve in medical work (Ellis & Jones 1996:168-169).

Many Russian Protestants, including some leaders of the Evangelical Christians and Baptists, were pacifists and actively used the 1919 decree permitting alternative army service. However, in 1923 the authorities started to use pressure against both unions making them change their anti-military ideology (Sawatsky 1995:37). “The militaristic Communist state... appreciated Evangelical opposition to Tsarism on one hand, but wanted even greater loyalty, on the other” (Ivanov 2002:44). Besides, fast growth of evangelical churches was frightening the Soviets. The authorities could not fight with all non-conformists at once. The first strike was against the Orthodox. The second was against the Protestants. In 1925 the League of Militant Atheists was officially organized (Sawatsky 1995:25). It included all members of Soviet government, many scientific and cultural workers, and even some former

Orthodox priests (Savinsky 2001:10). A common atheistic slogan was “Religion is opium for people” (Savinsky 2001:10).

Regarding the issue of military service, it must be said that in 1922 Prokhanov, as a vice-president of the Baptist World Alliance, issued an appeal “Voice from the East” calling all Christians in the world not to participate in military affairs (Savinsky 2001:29-30). The Soviet government regarded this as a political act and used it as a pretence to intervene in church affairs (Savinsky 2001:30).

Kargel, who at the time was not a member of the Evangelical Christian Union, was very upset about the whole matter. It must be said that Kargel from the very beginning was for full recognition of military service. In his letter written in 1931 to the All-Russia Union of Evangelical Christians he calls those leaders in both Unions who made the decision not to serve in the army “intoxicated and lost”. Naturally the authorities “took these bulls by the horns”:

The whole sin that has been causing sufferings to the cause of the Gospel for over ten years was committed when against God’s will at the eighth Congress they got into politics over head and ears . . . This decision filled the congregations with young people who were not Christian and did not think of becoming such. All they wanted was to escape military service (Kargel 1991:264).

The burning question of military service was quickly solved to the Bolsheviks’ satisfaction after Prokhanov was imprisoned by GPU (political police). After spending three months in Lubyanka prison in Moscow, Prokhanov changed his position and signed a letter to his congregations calling brothers to fulfil their military obligation. The letter was immediately published the state newspaper *Izvestiya* [News] on August 1923 under the title, “The Letter of the Highest Union of Free People’s Evangelical Church”.

In a month this letter was discussed at the ninth congress of Evangelical Christians. The resolution was made “to acknowledge military service in Soviet Russia as obligatory for Evangelical Christians”.²⁶⁰ This resolution was adopted by a significant majority (Brandenburg 1977:185). Prokhanov explained the situation: “The government wanted to see what the attitude of the Evangelical Christians and Baptists to it was. Now it is satisfied and thanks to this, there are unlimited opportunities for evangelism. Now for the first time there is real religious freedom” (Brandenburg 1977:185). A similar resolution was passed at

the Baptist Congress later the same year (Savinsky 2001:32). These resolutions elicited a wave of controversy in both Baptist and Evangelical Christian churches (Savinsky 2001:32).

A report written on 27.02.1924 by the chief of the 6-th Department of OGPU (the Soviet secret police) E. A. Tuchkov deserves special attention. It clears up many things that were going on behind the scenes. It concerns OGPU work accomplished among Evangelical Christians. According to this report, OGPU objective was to make sectarians to accept the mandatory military service in the Soviet Russia, to break their unity and to arrest the rise of their numbers. The best opportunity was to bring Prokhanov to account for spreading of antimilitary appeal "Voice from the East". Tuchkov reports that OGPU managed to make imprisoned Prokhanov acknowledge military service as obligatory and to compile a relevant appeal.

This caused a split at the following Congress of the Evangelical Christians. Prokhanov and five other leading persons in the Evangelical Union who had already signed the appeal were almost ready to admit their mistake. However, due to the presence of OGPU informer at the Congress it became possible to assure Prokhanov that by doing so he would undermine his own authority. In the end, the Congress with overwhelming votes accepted the resolution in agreement with the latter appeal. The disagreeing minority started a campaign against Prokhanov and his group. It came to the point when Prokhanov's closest helper, Andreev, asked the authorities to liquidate this group as a dangerous for the Soviets not only in respect to the military issue but also politically. At their request, Savel'ev was arrested.

Further Tuchkov goes on describing how OGPU managed to force the Baptist Union to issue a similar resolution. "Thus both Evangelicals and Baptists recognised mandatory military service for their members in the Soviet Russia and doing so produced a split in their ranks. This will undoubtedly stop the growth of sectarianism and lead to their moral decay".²⁶¹

²⁶⁰ Samoilenkov 2001:54; Savinsky 2001:31; Sawatsky 1995:37.

²⁶¹ Tuchkov. Online. Accessed on November 26, 2004.

Military service was again one of the main issues at the tenth congress of the Evangelical Christians in 1926.²⁶² Both Prokhanov and Kargel were explaining the passages from Scripture that dealt with this subject. Most questions were directed to Kargel (Savinsky 2001:95-96). The leaders of the Baptist Union were not ready to defend pacifism either. In his speech at the Baptist Congress in 1926, Ivanov-Klyshnikov said, "If the Baptist Union should keep freedom of action, our congress should decisively refuse pacifism".²⁶³ By submitting to the Soviet regime in this way, the evangelical leaders hoped to preserve freedom for preaching the Gospel (Sawatsky 1995:39).

4.4.4 Theological Education and Publications

Support from America²⁶⁴ allowed Prokhanov to launch the Bible school on 27 February 1912 at the main meeting place of the Evangelical Christian Church (Danishev's Gymnasium in Fonarnyy Pereulok in St. Petersburg) on the basis of the charter granted by the Department of Education. Unfortunately, the beginning of World War I put an end to this initiative (Ellis & Jones 1996:150). It was ten years later, in October 1922, that Bible school classes resumed (Prokhanov 1993:191).

S. Lieven recalled that after the Revolution two Bible schools were established: Evangelical Christians had their school in St. Petersburg while Baptists had theirs in Moscow (Lieven 1967:122). Besides Moscow and St. Petersburg there were Bible schools in Kiev, Orel and other places (Sawatsky 1995:41). There were short (from one to three months) courses held in different places. For instance, Kargel taught in Nikolaevka (Sumskaya area) and trained fifty-five preachers (Savinsky 2001:108).

According to Savinsky, until 1925 the Bible education offered by the Evangelical Christians was not of a very high quality (Savinsky 2001:108). In 1924 Baptists and the Evangelical Christians tried to cooperate in establishing a

²⁶² It was at this congress that the delegates asked brother Prokhanov to publish a brochure explaining the spiritual condition of "our foreign brothers" in connection with the modernist movement among them, which "rejects much of the pure Christian faith" (Savinsky 2001:96).

²⁶³ Steeves, p. 587, in Sawatsky 1995:23.

²⁶⁴ As a matter of fact, the American Disciples continued sending financial aid for the needs of the Bible education until it was forbidden in 1929 (Ellis & Jones 1996:173).

Bible school. Nine-month combined courses were organised in Leningrad²⁶⁵ with fifty students (twenty-five from each union). Unfortunately, this initiative did not have a continuation (Savinsky 2001:106).

The most successful enterprise in the area of Christian education was annual courses that started on 19 January 1925 in Leningrad. They functioned until 1929 (Savinsky 2001:108). According to Prokhanov, 422 pastors and preachers were taught at that school (Sawatsky 1995:41). Altogether (including nine-month courses) the courses existed for five and a half years (Savinsky 2001:108).

The main teachers were I. S. Prokhanov (Introduction into the Old and the New Testaments; Homiletics), Kargel (Doctrine; Revelation), Bykov (Exegesis), Kazakov (Apologetics), V. I. Prokhanov (History of Christianity), etc. (Savinsky 2001:108). Prokhanov's course on homiletics is being used in Russia even today. In his course Prokhanov insisted that God's Word must play the main role in a preacher's ministry; it should become as food for a preacher. "The goal of the sermon is writing God's Law in people's hearts" (Prokhanov 1989:65, in Samoilenkov 2001:30).

In December 1927, Moscow Bible Courses for Baptists started functioning. The curriculum was designed for three years, but the classes lasted only for one and a half years since authorities shut them down in 1929 (Savinsky 2001:107). According to Sawatsky, Moscow Bible School existed for four years (Sawatsky 1995:47). Among the teachers were Ivanov-Klyshnikov, Miller, Odintsov, and Datsko (Savinsky 2001:107). The academic level of these schools was not very high (Sawatsky 1995:41). Nevertheless, opening the Bible schools was a step in developing Russian Evangelical theology. "Russian Protestants could now not only read the Bible but also think theologically" (Samoilenkov 2001:88).

Christian publishing activity was also revived after the Civil War by both the Baptist and Evangelical Christian Unions. Publications included Christian periodicals, Bibles, New Testaments and hymnals. Prokhanov personally was prolific in this area (Savinsky 2001:05-107). Like great reformers of the past, Prokhanov believed that "only the Bible and the Gospel, freely spread and freely accepted, can help my motherland to reach the highest prosperity" (Prokhanov

²⁶⁵ The former name (1924-91) of Saint Petersburg.

1993:98-99). This belief was behind much of Prokhanov's activity in the publication ministry. Those copies of Christian literature that the evangelicals managed to print during these "golden years" served well for following decades despite being constantly confiscated during searches in believers' homes.

Svet Vostoku, a publishing house located in Wernigerode, Germany, by 1923 published the following literature in Russian: Beteck "The first page of the Bible";²⁶⁶ Bokmelder "History of Christian Church"; Bunyan "The Holy War" and "The Pilgrim's Progress"; Hebelein "Josef and his brothers", "Day by day", "Life and liberty"; Charles Inwood²⁶⁷ "Be filled with the Holy Spirit"; Yakov Kreker "Led by the Holy Spirit", "Alone with the Saviour", "The birth from above", "Perfection of the life of the atoned"; Ernst Modersohn "Sonntag oder Sabbat?", "Do you pray?"; D. L. Moody "Pleasure and profit in Bible study"; Nikolaii "Can an educated man believe in Jesus Christ as God?"; Smith "Apostle Paul, his life and epistles"; Tikhon "Characteristic of Christian faith"; Torrey "How to bring men to Christ"; Trapman "A young man before marriage"; Feeban "Spiritual advice for the newly saved"; etc.²⁶⁸

These were some of the books which formed the circle of reading of the Evangelical Christians and Baptists in the 1920s and the following decades.

4.4.5 Persecution and Closing the Evangelical and Baptist Unions

The Bolshevik Revolution set Russia on a course of official atheism that quickly led to a ban on foreign missionaries and by the end of 1930s "so repressed Soviet citizens of all faith" that religion was "on the verge of institutional extinction" (Elliot & Deyneka 1999:197). But the Soviet authorities did not fight with all confessions and denominations at once. They were eliminating denominations one by one.

When the authorities understood that they could not use the evangelicals for the purpose of "building communism," they quickly abandoned the policy of toleration (Sawatsky 1995:52). The unprecedented rise of evangelistic outreach in 1926 alarmed the atheists. They saw that mere propaganda would not suffice

²⁶⁶ Some titles are translated by the author arbitrarily.

²⁶⁷ A revivalist preacher and leader in the Keswick movement.

²⁶⁸ The list is added to the 1923 edition of Kargel's *V kakom ty otnoshenii k Dukhu Svyatomu?* [Where do you stand in your relationship to the Holy Spirit?].

and started taking stronger measures. In September 1927 the ministers of “Dom Evangeliya” Baptist church were arrested and sent to Solovki labour camps for three years (Savinsky 2001:111). There were cases of occasional arrests even during the “golden years”. But total war against religion was waged in the end of 1920s by means of both the colossal machine of atheistic propaganda and outright *chistki* [purges], the mass arrests of believers (Sawatsky 1995:47).

Already in April 1924 at a congress of Militant Atheists a frightening resolution was passed stating that sects, preachers, and church activists were political agents engaged in espionage (Savinsky 2001:116). Stalin’s first Five Year Plan began on 1 October 1928. On 8 April 1929 a regulation came into effect requiring mandatory registration of religious groups, forbidding missionary activity, and setting a number of limitations:

Religious associations may not: create mutual credit societies, cooperative or commercial undertakings... ; give material aid to other members; organize for children, young people, or women special prayer or other meetings, circles, groups, departments for biblical or literary study, sewing, working or the teaching of religion, etc., excursions, children’s playgrounds, libraries, reading rooms, sanatoria, or medical care (Savinsky 2001:116; Brandenburg 1977:189-90).

This regulation constituted official recognition of a changed policy towards religion in the country. Basically this law was forbidding the very activities responsible for the spread of the evangelical movement in Russia (Sawatsky 1995:47). On 24 April 1929, the government newspaper *Izvestiya* stated that “religious ideology is one of the main obstacles on the way of socialistic construction” (Sawatsky 1995:24). All obstacles were to be removed at any price.

These limitations were fixed on 18 May 1929 in a new edition of article 4 of the Soviet Constitution which allowed “free profession of faith and antireligious propaganda” (Savinsky 2001:116). These antireligious decrees marked the end of “golden age” in the history of Russian evangelicals and put churches under tight state control. All active Christians were put on a black list. Churches were to lose their leaders, who were considered *lishentsy*, that is, those who had no electoral rights because they were not engaged in productive work. As a result, *lishentsy* did not get ration cards, which forced them to rely on support from believers or else pay exorbitant prices on the black market (Brandenburg 1977:191). Waves of arrests and executions lay ahead.

Soviet religious policy's goal was the "eradication of religious prejudices", even though the methods varied (Brandenburg 1977:196). In 1929 both Unions were shut down; publications – forbidden; permissions to gather congresses – hard to get. In this situation no compromises with the state seemed to help (Sawatsky 1995:48). Prokhanov, after attending the Baptist World Alliance congress in Toronto in the summer of 1928, was not permitted to return to Russia. He died in Berlin in 1935 at age 66 (Ellis & Jones 1996:175).

This new policy resulted in persecution that did not wait long to start. Evangelical churches were rapidly losing their members. Whereas by 1929 the evangelical movement had reached half a million members, with families – over four million, by the mid-thirties the number of Protestants in Russia dropped to 250,000 (Sawatsky 1995:23). By the fall of 1929 over one hundred Baptist presbyters were arrested and all regional unions were closed. Those few presbyters who did not get arrested and did not go underground joined the Union of Evangelical Christians which continued its activity with great difficulties (Sawatsky 1995:24). The "golden age" for protestant churches was followed by a truly bloody decade of unprecedented persecution (Sawatsky 1995:24-25).

4.4.6 Conclusion

The "golden age" the Russian evangelicals came during a rather grave period of Russian history: Bolshevik Revolution, the Civil War, reign of terror, and a series of famines. But in spite of these circumstances or, maybe partly due to them, the Russian evangelicals experienced unprecedented growth. However, one should understand that such growth took place partially at the expense of the Orthodox Church and because of the possibility of avoiding compulsory military service. In addition, the time of phenomenal growth was followed by a period of phenomenal decline after 1928.

The Soviets, acting according to *divide en impero* principle, were at first fighting their main religious enemy that had been associated with the tsarist regime, that is, the Orthodox Church. Meanwhile, other confessions were enjoying some freedom. The GPU actively used various schisms within the Orthodox Church, especially the Living Church, in order to strangle the Church with the help of her own "sons". In this light Prokhanov's cooperation with the Renovators appears rather unwise if not provocative. Prokhanov's seeking cooperation with the Soviets did not do any good either to him or to his Union of

Evangelical Christians. All the advances of the Soviets came at a very high price. The Soviets expected loyalty and obedience. Flirting with atheists was a sign of short sightedness at the very least.

Humanly speaking the Russian evangelicals (including Prokhanov and his parents) suffered so much from the Established Church prior the Revolution that they could perceive the persecutions against the Orthodox as just retribution. Had they known that the same was waiting for them in the nearest future they might have had a little more compassion.

The “golden age” was the first period in Russian evangelical history without the Pashkovites. On a large scale there were no aristocrats left among the evangelical believers. Now Russian evangelicals had to look for sponsors for various Christian projects (such as the Bible education, translation and publication of Christian literature, helping the starving population) in the West, mainly in America. The issues that caused disagreements in the past – church membership, ordinances, choosing deacons and presbyters, and other – were now settled once and for all. The organized religion won. The spirit of the Open Brethrenism and Keswick was no longer felt. From that time on, the two main forces in the Russian evangelical arena were the Baptists and the Evangelical Christians.

Overall, both Baptists and the Evangelical Christians tried to use all new opportunities as best they could. Evangelism, open disputes with atheists, opening new churches, baptising and discipling multitudes of new members, printing Bibles and Christian magazines, holding conferences, establishing Bible schools – all of these efforts were aimed at spreading God’s kingdom in Russia. Russian evangelicals of that time were certainly brave and courageous people, wholeheartedly dedicated to the cause of the Gospel. This would be clearly evidenced by the mass martyrdom that followed the “golden age”.

CHAPTER FIVE:

STUDY OF VITAL ASPECTS IN THE THEOLOGICAL HERMENEUTICS OF IVAN VENIAMINOVICH KARGEL (1849-1937)

5.1 Kargel's Biographical Data in the Context of the Russian Evangelical Movement

I. V. Kargel was and still is one of the most outstanding Russian evangelical theologians, greatly respected in both Evangelical and Baptist circles. One of Kargel's contemporaries, Jacob Kreker, a leader of the mission "Light in the East", admitted that at least fifty percent of the evangelical movement among Russian people can be attributed to Kargel (Miller 2009:86).

Unfortunately there is no detailed and verified biography written about Kargel—it is yet to be written. At the present time it reminds a big puzzle with many pieces still missing. The existing material on Kargel's life and ministry is scattered, fragmentary, and often controversial. Kargel lived and ministered in a number of different countries, areas, and cities. As a result there are materials about him in Russian, English, German, Bulgarian, Finnish, possibly Estonian, and Latvian. There are still many important questions to be answered. Where and when was he born? Who were his parents? When exactly and for how long did he study theology? When was he ordained? When and where were most of his theological works written? These are only a few questions that pose a riddle to a researcher.

Taking into consideration the contradictory and fragmentary nature of Kargel's existing biographies, the author finds it important to collect all available data and go to a certain depth attempting to unfold the life story of a man who is still considered the foremost Russian Evangelical-Baptist theologian (Karetnikova 2001:75). The main sources on Kargel's biography consulted so far are biographies and memoirs of those who knew and remembered Kargel personally. Those sources are provided by S. Lieven (in whose mother's home Kargel lived and worked for extended periods of time), M. Korff (whom Kargel knew from the days of the St. Petersburg revival), A. V. Karev (the head of the

AUCECB after World War II), A. I. Mitskevich (who attended Kargel's Bible courses), N. I. Peisty (who remembered Kargel from his childhood and youth in St. Petersburg), D. J. Turchaninov (an eyewitness of last years of Kargel's life in Ukraine), Donald Miller (an American pastor from Soroczin, a town in Volyn, where Kargel had served as a pastor for one or two years). There was also an autobiographical work written by Kargel in German *Zwischen den Enden der Erde* (Wernigerode 1928), which was not available to most of Kargel's biographers.

Secondary sources were also consulted, i.e., biographical articles or historical monographs containing some biographical data on Kargel. Those were written by M. S. Karetnikova, I. N. Skopina (her article is almost an exact repetition of the AUCECB archival materials on Kargel), S. N. Savinsky, W. Kahle (a German scholar who had an access to Kargel's autobiography), A. W. Wardin, L. Kovalenko, I. P. Plett, etc. Other important sources used are Kargel's and his daughters' letters and an official AUCECB magazine *Bratskiy Vestnik* [Brotherly Herald]. Electronic sources were also used extensively.

5.1.1 Kargel's background and the early years: Influence of Russian Baptists

Most of Ivan (or Johann) Veniaminovich Kargel's biographers agree that he was born in 1849²⁶⁹ in Georgia²⁷⁰ into a German family. His father was a German and his mother was an Armenian (Kahle 1978:82). This way, Kargel was at least partly of German parentage (Wardin 1991:148-159). Having a German father, Kargel was raised in a German household (Nichols 2007:75), and he was most comfortable with the German language. Kargel's daughters used to say that they had cause to believe that their ancestors had come from Scotland (Skopina 2002:689). This is also mentioned in Kahle's account, "Nach Aussagen der Töchter Kargels war die Familie Kargel schottischer Herkunft. Die Daten der Übersiedlung nach Rußland lagen im Dunkeln, jedenfalls schon Generationen zurück" (Kahle 1978:81).

²⁶⁹ A German scholar W. Kahle, however, dates his birth five years earlier, in 1845 (Kahle 1978:82).

²⁷⁰ According to Klippenstein, Kargel was born in a Ukrainian German community (Klippenstein 1992:42).

Kargel grew up in a German colony in southern Russia where he, according to his own testimony, came to faith.²⁷¹ In 1851 Kargel's parents moved to Germany, then after a short time, as the conditions improved in the German colonies in southern Russia, they moved back to the Caucasus where Kargel spent his childhood (Turchaninov 2009:62). Karetnikova specifies that Kargel's family spent only two years in Germany.²⁷² Peisty recalled that "Kargel himself used to say that he spent his childhood in southern Russia where he got saved at a young age".²⁷³

According to Kargel's own testimony he was in London in 1867 (Kargel 2002:398). Skopina and Karetnikova both agree that he lived in London some time during that year (Skopina 2002:689; Karetnikova 2009:5).

Savinsky states that Kargel was converted in Tiflis (modern Tbilisi, the capital of Georgia) (Savinsky 1999:351). J. I. Zhitkov recalled that at the closure of the united congress in St. Petersburg in 1907, V. G. Pavlov pointed out the connection between St. Petersburg and Tiflis, saying "I. V. Kargel, our beloved preacher, was born again in our city, Tiflis, and I'm happy to see how God blesses his ministry here".²⁷⁴ When later in life Kargel reflected on his conversion he wrote, "Since then a truly wonderful God's life sprang up in me. The Lord Himself filled my heart and it was on fire to serve Him in everything and to obey Him only. It was a mere joy to fulfil His will because it never seemed too hard for me" (Kargel 2002:79-80).

In 1869 Kargel was baptized in the Caucasus, in Tiflis, by Nikita Voronin, only two years after this "first Russian Baptist" got baptised himself. The Tiflis congregation – "a small but peculiar Baptist brotherhood" organised in 1867 – became Kargel's home church (Karetnikova 2002:685; Skopina 2002:689; Kovalenko 1996:50; Nichols 2007:73; Sawatsky 1995:31). In this way, Kargel began his Christian ministry in Tiflis, in the "embryonic Russian Baptist church" (Nichols 2007:72). The Tiflis church was unique, combining both Russian and German cultures (Nichols 2007:73). The Tiflis Baptist congregation was indeed

²⁷¹ Den Angaben über Kargel liegen Sofija Lieven – „Kratkij ocherk zhizny i dejatelnoisty I. V. Kargelja“ in E.V.1-1940 S.8-10, in Kahle 1978:81.

²⁷² Karetnikova. Online. September, 2004.

²⁷³ Peisty. Online. 2 September 2004.

²⁷⁴ *Bratskiy Vestnik* 1957:60 № 5-6.

the cradle of a number of influential Baptist ministers in Russia and became a pattern for other congregations around the country.

Another candidate for Kargel's birthplace is Bulgaria, where he was allegedly born into a Lutheran family (Plett 1994:35). Karev also mentions Bulgaria as a place where Kargel spent his childhood and accepted Jesus Christ as his personal Saviour (Karev 1999:136). M. Matveev, a native Bulgarian, also states that Kargel spent his childhood in Bulgaria where he accepted Jesus Christ as his personal Saviour, was baptized, and spread the good news among the Bulgarians with great zeal (in those years Bulgaria was still under the Turkish yoke that lasted from 1395 until 1878). He adds that many were getting saved and baptized, so Kargel could be considered a founder of evangelical churches in Bulgaria.²⁷⁵

W. Kahle found a "Bulgarian version" in Gutsche, but personally prefers the "South Russia version" presented by Lieven:

Nach Gutsche's Angaben stammte Kargel ursprünglich aus Bulgarien und habe auf diese Weise seinen türkischen Paß nach Rußland mitgebracht. Den Angaben von Sofija Lieven ist hier der Vorzug zu geben, daß Kargel aufgrund seiner Tätigkeit Rußland in Richtung Bulgarien verlassen hatte, später habe Kargel seine türkischen Staatsangehörigkeit zugunsten der russischen wieder aufgegeben.²⁷⁶

The question is how does one reconcile Kargel's presence in South Russia and Bulgaria at the same time? Could he actually have lived in both places in the course of the first twenty years of his life? There will certainly be a place for Kargel's Bulgarian ministry in the early 1880s. Most likely, this later ministry in Bulgaria added the researchers. Some of the questions get immediately answered if one considers Kargel's own account of his life found in Kahle's footnote. "Zwischen den Enden der Erde, Vorwort S.VIII berichtet über sich selbst, daß er 1869 in Tiflis bekehrt worden sei"(Kahle 1978:81). So, Kargel put his conversion in 1869 in Tiflis. He does not mention baptism, but it was possible that he got baptised the same year.

An important factor is that Kargel was growing up in a multicultural environment and from an early age was introduced to several languages. He travelled and lived in different countries: Georgia and Ukraine within the Russian Empire, Germany, England, and possibly Bulgaria. Kargel had a

²⁷⁵ Matveev. Online. September 2004.

²⁷⁶ Lieven, *Kratkij ocherk*, 8, in Kahle 1978:82.

distinctive conversion experience and was baptized as an adult. The Baptist church that he joined was also multicultural and bilingual. Above all, Kargel was there from the very beginning of its history.

5.1.2 Kargel's studies: influence of German Baptists

Kargel happened to be quite an educated man. He knew several languages including German, Russian, English, Bulgarian, and Finnish. He studied in Germany and England and received both technical and theological training (Mirt, p 1). However, Kargel's studies are a source of just as much confusion as the place of his birth or the circumstances of his childhood.

Nichols tells the most lucid and detailed story of Kargel's encounter with Oncken's Missionary School in Hamburg. According to Nichols, Kargel was accepted there "within months of his baptism." Already in the autumn of 1869, Kargel and sixteen other men from central Europe and the Russian Empire were enrolled at the school, but classes were postponed because of the beginning of the Franco-Prussian War. The school was to be reopened in February 1872, but the classes were postponed again until the spring of 1874 "for lack of funds" (Nichols 2007:73).²⁷⁷

However, Kargel did not waste time waiting for classes to begin in Hamburg. He travelled to the Mennonite colony of Molochna in southern Russia (presently part of Ukraine) and started ministering among the Mennonite communities. In 1873 he attended the second conference of the Mennonite Brethren (Nichols 2007:72, 74). During these meetings Kargel "received his calling into fulltime ministry" (Nichols 2007:74). This report is in full agreement with that of Klippenstein, who stated that after attending a conference in Klippenfeld, Molochna colony, Kargel began devoting himself to Christian work among Russian Germans (Klippenstein 1992:42).

At the suggestion of Karl Ondra (a Polish-born German who served as a Baptist missionary), Kargel moved to Soroczin, Volyn (presently part of Poland) to pastor a German Baptist congregation in place of deceased pastor Johan Kelm (Nichols 2007:74; Miller 2009:82). While involved in this ministry, Kargel was told about classes starting up in the Hamburg school. Along with Ondra, a

²⁷⁷ According to Miller's version, Kargel was enrolled for ten-month missiology courses in Hamburg a few years after his conversion (Miller 2009:82).

returning student, Kargel left the ministry in Poland in order to attend the Hamburg Missionary School (Nichols 2007:74). Thus, in 1874, Kargel received formal pastoral training in Hamburg offered by Johann Gerhard Oncken and the German Baptists (Nichols 2007:72).

Miller does not mention this trip to Germany to study at the Missionary School. According to Miller, Kargel remained in Soroczin until January 1875 when he was called to St. Petersburg to start a missionary ministry under German Baptist leadership (Miller 2009:82-83).

A number of other sources refer to Kargel's studies in Hamburg Baptist Seminary, stating that he actually graduated from there (Karev 1999:137; Savinsky 1999:351). Kovalenko writes about a German speaking seminary from which Kargel graduated with a basic knowledge of Hebrew and Greek (Kovalenko 1996:49). However, it is problematic to state categorically when Kargel attended the seminary and what subjects he studied there. Whether it was called "Baptistenseminar in Hamburg", "Theologisches Seminar in Hamburg" or "Missionary School", it evidently was the same seminary where prominent Baptist leader V. G. Pavlov studied.

Pavlov was baptised in Tiflis two years after Kargel, then studied in Hamburg for about a year starting in April 1875. Pavlov writes that when he arrived in Germany the "missionary school" had only six-month courses,²⁷⁸ which happened to be cancelled at the time. So Oncken assigned him to a local preacher who was to teach him theology and German (Pavlov 1999:244-245). Kahle mentions that V. G. Pavlov "war der erste russische Absolvent des Baptistenseminars in Hamburg in den siebziger Jahren" (Kahle 1978:19).

Who is wrong? Nichols, who dated Kargel's studies to 1874, or Kahle who wrote that Pavlov was the first Russian student there in 1875? It could be, though, that Kahle simply did not consider Kargel "a Russian student". But what is more important that strictly speaking there was no regular Hamburg seminary as yet at that time; there were only Bible courses which did not even function regularly. It is highly unlikely that students had an opportunity to get a good grasp of the ancient languages such as Greek and Hebrew.

²⁷⁸ The Baptist seminary in Hamburg was organised by J. G. Oncken, the pioneer of German Baptists. Oncken began to hold organized classes with his students in 1849, but only in 1880 a proper four-year seminary was established in Hamburg (Wardin, *Mennonite Encyclopedia*. Online. 10 September 2004).

Not much can be determined about the curriculum and theological concepts taught at the seminary, though they must have been in agreement with the views of Oncken himself and German Baptists at the time. Oncken's theology, certainly a decisive influence on the school, was known as "conservative, Calvinistic, and evangelistic. He favoured ministerial education, but not at the expense of spiritual preparation. He held spiritual gifts as a priority over academic preparation. Oncken's motto was 'every Baptist a missionary'".²⁷⁹

H. Giesbrecht characterized the seminary as one of those Bible schools in Europe which moved its students "towards a greater appreciation for other denominations and towards a broader conception of the church as such."²⁸⁰ This way, being characterised by open-mindedness to a certain extent, the seminary valued devotion and dedication over academics. As expected, Kargel "took hold of Oncken's version of the baptist faith, including a strong Calvinistic approach to scripture, the centrality of pastoral authority and a strong emphasis on missions and evangelism" (Nichols 2007:74).

Kahle sheds more light on the role the seminary, or rather "missionary school", played in the Russian Evangelical-Baptist movement. However, Kahle does not seem to know that Kargel attended Hamburg seminary. Kahle only mentions that Kargel "was in Hamburg" in 1875:

Unter den Schulen und Seminaren, die für kürzere oder längere Zeit von russischen Staatsbürgern besucht werden konnten, soweit eine Ausreisegenehmigung vorlag, hat das Seminar der deutschen Baptistengemeinden in Hamburg die größte Rolle gespielt. Die von Oncken gegründete Predigerschule, später zum Seminar umbenannt, hat seit den siebziger Jahren des 19. Jahrhunderts unter ihren Studenten eine große Zahl russischer Staatsbürger gehabt. Allein bis 1911 wird eine Zahl von 40 genannt . . . Bei Ausbruch des Krieges waren am Hamburger seminar 25 Studierende aus Rußland. Sie wurden von den deutschen Behörden interniert, soweit sie nicht rechtzeitig noch in ihre Heimat zurückkehren konnten. Die namhaftesten unter denen, die in Hamburg eine Ausbildung erfahren hatten, waren Vasilij G. Pavlov, der seine Studien 1876 beendet hatte, Ivan Venjaminovich Kargel, der um 1875 in Hamburg war, und Jakob Kroecker (Kahle1978:464-465).

²⁷⁹ Wardin, *Mennonite Encyclopedia*, Online. 10 September 2004.

²⁸⁰ This tradition was carried on by Dr. Baedeker, who had helped to establish the "Allianz Bibelschule" in Berlin-Steglitz (1905), later renamed the Wiedenest Bibelschule (1919) (Giesbrecht H 1981 "Seeking a Faith to Live By: Some External Religious and Theological Influences" Winnipeg, Manitoba <http://www.directionjournal.org/article/?406>).

It is surprising, though, that Pavlov, who must have known Kargel from Tiflis, does not mention Kargel's presence in Hamburg at the same time as he was there. However, if Kargel was in Hamburg in 1874 (as Nichols suggests), then Kargel and Pavlov might not have seen each other while in Germany.

According to Nichols, Kargel finished his studies in Hamburg in August 1874 and returned to his ministry in Soroczin as a pastor of the local Baptist church, itinerant evangelist, and a church planter (Nichols 2007:77). Kargel came back to Poland "as a German Baptist, echoing the voice of Oncken and implementing the tools that he had learned in Bible school" (Nichols 2007:75).

Due to the Russian authority's unceasing interest in sects, we possess a trustworthy document which affirms that Kargel was already "a pastor" in 1874. A secret report addressed to the Ministry of Internal Affairs concerning a congress of German Mennonites and Baptists held on 17 September 1874 in Neydorf, a Mennonite colony (Zhitomir area), states that Kargel was there. About one thousand Mennonites and Baptists (among them nine pastors) from Volynskaya, Khersonskaya, and Ekaterinoslavskaya gubernias attended the congress. They gathered to discuss the tendency of believers to emigrate to America because of the lack of religious freedom in Russia and the issue of military service. Regarding military service, Pastor Ondra recommended excommunicating young men who try to avoid their military duty. This suggestion was unanimously approved of by the delegates.

In the report Kargel is called "a pastor" who announced the contents of a letter received by him from Oncken, in which Oncken expressed his negative attitude towards emigration to America based on what he considered the unsatisfactory spiritual condition of American believers. Pastor Pritskau suggested appealing to the Russian government requesting freedom of conscience for Baptists living in Russia. Kargel and Kesler were chosen to go to St. Petersburg in order to fulfil the mission.²⁸¹ This report reveals at least three important facts. First, by 1874 Kargel was a trusted pastor in German Baptist-Mennonite circles. Second, Kargel knew and corresponded with Oncken. Third, sometime toward the end of 1874 Kargel was supposed to visit St. Petersburg.

After returning from Hamburg, Kargel went back to his work in Soroczin and continued to pastor a local Baptist church, when "brothers" in Hamburg

²⁸¹ "Ezhenedel'naya zapiska" from RGIA Archaivs: SPb f. 1282 op. 3 delo. 124 l. 94-99.

asked him to serve as interim pastor in a small German Baptist church in St. Petersburg (Nichols 2007:77).

Turchaninov tells quite a different story about Kargel's student years. He says that after finishing school Kargel travelled to Germany where he graduated from "some" technical school and then went to St. Petersburg to work as a mechanical engineer (Turchaninov 2009:62). Skopina repeats Turchaninov's story about "some" technical college in Germany, after which Kargel supposedly started working in St. Petersburg as a mechanical engineer (Skopina 2002:689). It is really difficult to find a place in Kargel's biography where this technical education and engineering career could fit.

According to Kargel's testimony in *Zwischen den Enden der Erde*, "1873 an einer Konferenz in Klippenfeld (Molochna) teilgenommen habe, von diesem Zeitpunkt an setzte seine Tätigkeit ein, zuerst in Wolhynien, ab 1875 in Petersburg, um missionarisch unter Deutschen zu arbeiten" (Kahle 1978:81). Thus, Kargel attended the conference in Klippenfeld (Molochna) in 1873. Then he started his active ministry in Volyn and arrived in St. Petersburg as a German missionary in 1875. Not a word is said about his studies abroad, a technical college, or engineering work!

The author tends to agree with Nichols about Kargel's ministry in Soroczin before and after his studying at Hamburg's Bible school in the first half of 1874. By September he was already in the area of Zhitomir, with Oncken's letter to attend the Mennonite Conference. Then he spent a few more months in Soroczin, and left for St. Petersburg. By this time Kargel must have been an ordained minister who after his time in Germany acquired some understanding of German Baptist doctrine. One cannot expect, however, that he could have obtained profound theological education by then.

5.1.3 Kargel in St. Petersburg: from "a German Baptist Pastor" to a Pashkovite leader

So, after pastoring a Baptist church in Volyn, Kargel arrived in St. Petersburg in 1875 at the height of the revival among the aristocracy (Klippenstein 1992:42; Miller 2009:83; Nichols 2007:72). Kargel's task, however, was to pastor the German Baptist congregation in St. Petersburg, which he did from 1875 to 1880 (Wardin 1991:148-159). The small German Baptist church had been founded in 1855 (Nichols 2007:77). Originally Kargel

intended to spend only three months in the capital, but the need seemed so great that he asked his church in Soroczin to let him stay. The Soroczin believers were reluctant to do so (Miller 2009:82-83). Nevertheless, Kargel remained in St. Petersburg.

The German Baptist congregation which Kargel joined was probably the one mentioned by J. K. Dukhonchenko, whose archival materials contain the following information. In 1856 a tailor named Plenus from the Memel congregation moved to St. Petersburg and started distributing Christian booklets. While doing so he met a few likeminded believers and suggested holding Bible studies in homes. Thus, from around 1857 a group of about thirty people, mostly Germans, gathered on Sunday mornings and Monday nights.

In 1864 Oncken visited St. Petersburg to plead with the authorities to ease the conditions for the Baptist congregations in Poland and Latvia. It is likely that while in St. Petersburg Oncken met with the Baptist group. In his diary he mentions that late one night he baptized seven people who “had full hope for salvation and eternal life through the blood and righteousness of Christ”. Nothing is known of those baptized except that they were all Germans. Eventually the meetings were stopped because of some sin and the resulting excommunication of the Plenus’ couple. The remaining “faithful” joined a congregation formed later.²⁸²

Taking into consideration that Kargel was acquainted with Oncken and that Oncken knew of the need for a leader in this German Baptist congregation, it is possible to suggest that it was Kargel who undertook pastoral ministry there. Soviet historian Mitrochin actually attributes to Kargel the founding of the first Baptist congregation in St. Petersburg prior to 1880.²⁸³

During his five year ministry among German Baptists in St. Petersburg, Kargel was “building the congregation on the German model”. However, the work was not easy and the membership was growing rather slowly: from thirty-four in 1876 to sixty in 1880 (Nichols 2007:78). In 1877, two years after he started, there were only forty-five members in his church (Miller 2009:83). Eventually the church grew to one hundred members. From 1875 to 1880, the congregation met at 16 Pochtamtskaya Street (Karetnikova 2009:6). Later they

²⁸² J. K. Dukhonchenko *Istoriya Evangel'skikh Khristian-Baptistov v SSSR // Materialy iz arkhiva Dukhonchenko*, pp.106-107, disc 1.0.

occupied a four-storey building at 4 Serpukhovskaya Street near the Warsaw railway station (Miller 2009:84). Nichols also points out that Kargel was the first person to register a religious body in Russia under a new law in 1879 (Nichols 2007:78).

Meanwhile Kargel did not lose his connections with Hamburg. He attended a Baptist conference in Hamburg in 1876, at which time he was asked to go to Estonia to baptize a group of ladies.²⁸⁴ He went to Estonia, baptized believers there, and then served there as a pastor for some time (Karetnikova 2009:10, 56-57). There must have been other Hamburg conferences attended by Kargel, “where he was often the centre of attention as word spread of his success in Russia”. Beginning in 1876, Kargel’s financial support started coming from American Baptists through the German Baptist Union (Nichols 2007:78).

While in St. Petersburg Kargel met Pashkov and attended Pashkovite services. When and how they first met is yet another big question. According to Savinsky, Kargel became close friends with the Pashkovites in 1875 (Savinsky 1999:351). Nichols similarly states that “Pashkov and other likeminded Russian aristocrats made a deep impression on Kargel, who began attending Pashkovite prayer meetings regularly in 1875” (Nichols 2007:80). Corrado attributes Kargel’s first acquaintance with the Pashkovites to prayer meetings during the Turkish War in 1877 (Corrado 2000:172). According to *Zwischen den Enden der Erde*, Kargel did not get acquainted with Russian brothers until 1877: “1877 machte er, der nach seinen Angaben damals nur unzulänglich russisch sprach, Bekanntschaft mit russischen Brüdern“(Kahle 1978:81).

Gradually, Kargel “came to work very closely with Pashkov as well as with a number of other leaders from Ukraine” including Johann Wieler, a Mennonite Brethren teacher and preacher (Klippenstein 1992:42). Kargel often preached at the Pashkovite meetings while remaining a pastor of his German Baptist church (Miller 2009:84) and reporting to the German Baptist Union (Nichols 2007:80). When young Kargel, not yet fluent in Russian, held his first

²⁸³ Mitrochin, *Baptists in the Soviet society*. Online. 15 September 2005.

²⁸⁴ It could be that trip about which Karev wrote that “after graduating from the seminary Kargel served as a preacher in one of the Baptist congregations in the Baltics” (Karev 1999:137). Actually, Kargel visited Estonia again later, in 1884 and 1886. His daughter Maria was born in Hansel, Estonia in 1886 (Karetnikova 2009:10).

public sermon at a Pashkovite meeting, it was Count Bobrinskiy who translated for him (Kargel ix-x, in Corrado 2000:91-92).

In the light of what has already been said concerning Kargel's biography, Turchaninov's account of how Kargel came across the Pashkovites sounds rather unlikely. Actually, Turchaninov hints that Kargel's conversion was the result of his meeting with the Pashkovites. Supposedly this story was told by Kargel himself. According to the story, Kargel met Pashkovites by chance. One evening on the way home from work he heard "strange" singing. The sign on the building read "Joiner's Shop". He walked in and in the basement he saw people of different social classes gathered together, joiners and smiths, princes and counts. After singing, a young girl read a passage from Matthew's Gospel and explained it. After another song Pashkov started speaking. His speech deeply moved Kargel. After the meeting Pashkov and Kargel got acquainted and Pashkov told him the story of his conversion (Turchaninov 2009:62-63).

Since then, in Turchaninov's words, Kargel "quickly started moving closer to God, and God was moving closer to him." Soon Kargel quit his engineering job and became a missionary (Turchaninov 2009:62-63).²⁸⁵

According to another version it was Dr. Baedeker who, seeing in young Kargel a dedicated servant of the Lord, brought him to Russia and to St. Petersburg. There in St. Petersburg Kargel became friends with Pashkov.²⁸⁶ Who knows, perhaps it was Baedeker who introduced Kargel to the Pashkovites? Whatever the case, Lieven's statement draws a good line, "Ivan Veniaminovich Kargel arrived in Petersburg being a believer, but he always considered Vasiliy Aleksandrovich Pashkov his spiritual teacher and father in Christ" (Lieven 1967:42). What is most important, "While in St. Petersburg, Kargel became acquainted with Victorian evangelicalism, which reflected a

²⁸⁵ This story is most probably borrowed from the AUCECB archives where it is told in the first person. There is an interesting detail added there. Supposedly, Kargel was very surprised when he saw a girl reading from the Gospel of Matthew: "What right does she have to read from the Book that belongs only to the priest?" (AUCECB Archive. History of REC – archival materials. Memoirs of Kargel's life and ministry. 0122a period 2 1851-1893. Disc 2). Kargel had never been Orthodox, so it is strange that he would have had such thoughts about the Bible being the "possession" of priests. Obviously this story of "meeting Christians and getting closer to God" could not have taken place in 1875 when Kargel was a pastor himself; either it was made up or took place much earlier in his life.

²⁸⁶ Peisty. Online. 2 September 2004.

pietistic understanding of the church rather than a denominational approach” (Nichols 2007:78). Slowly but surely Kargel was embracing these new ideas and ways of ministry.

Savinsky mentions that in August 1880 Kargel and August Libich, a presbyter of a German Baptist congregation in Odessa, were invited to Tiflis Baptist congregation for the ordination of the local ministers and “the proper organizing of the local church according to the Word of God” (Savinsky 1999:137-138). The minutes of the meetings of Tiflis congregation on 10 and 17 August 1880 are included in the “Materials” collected by bishop Aleksii (Aleksii 1908:636-640). In those meetings Kargel spoke in German and V. Pavlov translated into Russian (Aleksii 1908:640).

After visiting Tiflis, Kargel returned to Petersburg and continued preaching there (Skopina 2002:690). Later in 1880 Kargel decided to move to Bulgaria and settle in Ruse (Wardin 1991:148-159). It was Pashkov who asked Kargel to establish an evangelical congregation in Bulgaria and it was also Pashkov who supported Kargel for his mission work there.²⁸⁷ Plett also affirms that Kargel was actually “sent by Pashkov to work in Bulgaria” where he, Kargel, founded one Bulgarian and four German congregations (Plett 1994:35). Something must have happened in Kargel’s relationships with the German Baptists to change his orientation, for until now it was Hamburg leadership that had determined much of Kargel’s ministry: his studies in Hamburg, his trip to the Baltics, and his move to St. Petersburg. Now he is going at Pashkov’s request. In addition, the source of Kargel’s financial support also changed from the American Baptists through the German Baptist Union to the personal support from Pashkov.

Another important event took place in Kargel’s life in 1880: he married Anna Alexandrovna, an active Pashkovite girl, the very one who had supposedly preached from the Gospel of Matthew at the first Pashkovite meeting attended by Kargel in St. Petersburg.²⁸⁸ Soon after the wedding, which took place in Finland,²⁸⁹ Kargel and his wife went to work in Ruse, Bulgaria.

²⁸⁷ Karetnikova. Online. September, 2004; Wardin 1991:148-159.

²⁸⁸ Kahle 1878:81; Karetnikova 2009:19; Turchaninov 2009:64; Karetnikova. Online. September, 2004.

²⁸⁹ It is difficult to tell when Kargel first went to Finland. Osmo Pöysti, a Finnish author, mentions that Kargel visited Finland quite often prior to 1880. There were a couple

There he served in a small congregation for four years. It was during his service in Bulgaria that he acquired Turkish citizenship²⁹⁰ and passport (Miller 2009:84-85). Having Turkish citizenship helped him a great deal during his further ministry in Russia. Later, after he returned to Russia he acquired Russian citizenship as well (Karetnikova 2009:11). Kargel did not always stay at the same place in Bulgaria. When recalling his work there he wrote, “When working in ‘God’s field’ in Bulgaria, I visited for the third or fourth time Kasanlyk, a small town in Eastern Rumelia” (Kargel 2002:284). Missionary fervour also took him to Bucharest, Romania (Miller 2009:84-85).²⁹¹

Wardin provides important information about Kargel’s ministry in Bulgaria:

As an ordained Baptist minister on Bulgarian territory, he was in a prime position to help... On 19 September Kargel immersed five candidates, three men and two women, in the Tundzha River. The group was small partly because of the strict questioning by Kargel and Heringer, who would not accept all candidates... Kargel felt he had come to Bulgaria at a most propitious time since the Bulgarians had in 1878 been freed from their Turkish yoke and it was before the penetration of what he considered the acids of unbelief from the West. Kargel, who decided to study Bulgarian, undertook a vigorous ministry, which included travel to sites outside Ruse, such as Bucharest. Ruse...was the logical centre of his work because it provided access to other areas. Kargel quickly crossed ethnic barriers and reported on one occasion that he had baptized ten Bulgarians, two Jews and two Germans. In 1884 Kargel founded the Ruse congregation as an independent Baptist church with 28 members . . . Kargel's preaching and the Baptists' rebaptizing aroused much opposition from the Orthodox, which brought forth attacks

congregations in Vyborg and Helsingfors compiled of Russians. Kargel’s trips to Finland were financed by someone from the St. Petersburg aristocrats (Pöysti. Online. 15 September 2004).

²⁹⁰ The question of when and where Kargel acquired Turkish citizenship is problematic. Like Miller, Turchaninov states that it happened in Ruse, Bulgaria (Turchaninov 2009:64). According to Skopina, Kargel received Turkish citizenship after 1882 when he for some time lived in Romania (Skopina 2002:690). According to Kahle, Kargel lived in Bulgaria and Romania for some time in 1884 after the Novovasil’evka conference, and it was then that he got a Turkish passport (Kahle 1978:82)

²⁹¹ Peisty presents a very different version of why Kargel happened to be Romania. He writes that soon after Kargel’s conversion he started evangelising, which brought persecution against him. This made him leave Russia and move for some time to Romania, which at the time belonged to Turkey, where he continued his Christian service and, according to Peisty, accepted Turkish citizenship (Peisty. Online. 2 September 2004). Romania became independent from Turkey in 1878, so if Kargel really acquired Turkish citizenship in Romania, it must have been prior to 1878.

on the Baptists in tracts and newspapers, and even beatings and threats. Although the Congregationalists did not find the Baptists a serious threat, they nevertheless were irritated by their intrusion and their views on believer's baptism and closed communion (Wardin 1991:148-159).

Wardin's description of Kargel's ministry in Bulgaria presents a clear picture of Kargel as a Baptist leader who holds to adult baptism by immersion preceded by strict questioning of a candidate, and to closed communion. This is important to note, because later when Kargel took responsibility for the Pashkovite congregation in St. Petersburg, he did not insist on these points. Kargel's attitude towards "the acids of unbelief from the West" shows that he was fully aware of liberal tendencies among theologians in Germany and other European countries.

Nichols points out that "Kargel's model of ministry changed slightly in 1880, when he married a friend of the Pashkov's family and moved to Bulgaria" (Nichols 2007:80). J. Dyck in his Master dissertation about J. Wieler (Prague, 2007) sheds some light on the relationship of Kargel and his wife in the first years of their marriage:

In November 1880 Kargel and his Russian wife started their ministry in Ruse, Bulgaria under the guidance of Baptist church in Hamburg. Here, in Ruse, some serious differences between Kargel and his wife came to the surface. Anna, a child of Petersburg's awakening, saw the fellowship at the Lord's table as the centre of church . . . Being alone in this spiritual struggle in Ruse, Kargel and his wife experienced spiritual renewal. Anna wrote, 'At some times the Lord gave my husband and myself such thirst for the Holy Spirit, that we begged Him to keep us wholly in His care and absorbed in His Spirit'. After Kargel had been through this struggle he lost any interest in denominational order in the church, and even more so – to denominations as such. Anna wrote, 'Our precious, wonderful and faithful Father let my husband free of any narrowness' (Dyck, in Karetnikova 2009:20-21).

Kargel and his wife had four daughters; the eldest, Anna, was born supposedly in 1881 (Karetnikova 2009:57). Elena, the second daughter, was born in Ruse, Bulgaria, on 13 July 1883 (Borshch 2009:299). Elena was especially talented and worked as a translator in St. Petersburg.²⁹²

Nichols attributes to Kargel the start of the Baptist movement in Bulgaria (Nichols 2007:72). Kargel and his family lived in Bulgaria until 1884. Then, according to Wardin, "in spite of the pleadings of his church members in Ruse

²⁹² Karetnikova. Online. September, 2004.

to remain there, [Kargel] returned to Russia, where he became a respected leader and theologian in the Pashkovite/Evangelical Christian movement, highly regarded by all evangelicals, including Baptists, in that country” (Wardin 1991:148-159). When Kargel moved back to St. Petersburg in 1884 he “fully was over to the ideas of the Holiness movement” (Nichols 2007:72).

In April 1884, Kargel, “a German preacher from Bulgaria”, as Pavlov called him, along with Radcliffe and Baedeker participated in the united congress of the Pashkovites, Baptists, Mennonite Brethren, Stundists, and New Molokans in St. Petersburg called by Pashkov and Korff (Pavlov 1999:197). “Pashkov, Kargel, Korff and Baedeker hoped that the evangelicals of the Russian Empire could unite under an umbrella organisation similar to the European Evangelical Alliance” (Nichols 2007:81). Partly to this end the conference of 1884 in St. Petersburg was called. Kargel was “a key player” in Pashkov’s attempt to create such a cross-denominational evangelical organisation (Nichols 2007:80).

Korff recalled that Kargel had been active in organising that first united Congress. Along with Dr. Baedeker and Stundist Delyakov, Kargel – “a presbyter of one of Baptist congregations in St. Petersburg” – formulated six questions presented to the delegates.²⁹³ Another person actively involved in the planning of the 1884 conference was Johann Wieler, a Mennonite Brethren leader (Klippenstein 1992:43). After the conference was shut down by the police, Kargel and Wieler, and possibly some other leaders, immediately began planning another conference “to continue the agenda aborted in St. Petersburg”. Their planning led to “a very successful meeting of many evangelical representatives” held in Novovasil’evka²⁹⁴ (Tavrisheskaya gubernia) on 30 April – 1 May of the same year (Klippenstein 1992:43).

Wieler served as chairman and Kargel as vice-chairman of the sessions (Klippenstein 1992:43). This was the first independent Russian Baptist congress where the Union of Russian Baptists was formed (Savinsky 1999:200). Wieler and Kargel “opened the Lord’s Supper to those who had not been baptised by immersion, clearly outside both the boundaries of the Mennonite Brethren and

²⁹³ Korff, *Moi vospominaniya*, in Kovalenko 1996:50.

²⁹⁴ Novovasil’evka was one of the villages settled along the Molochnaya river – the center of sectarianism since the nineteenth century. First there were Dukhobors, then Mennonites, Hutterers, Molokans, Baptists and Evangelicals who settled there (Aleksii 1908:688)

the German Baptists... This reveals some of the influence of Pashkov's Pietism on both Wieler and Kargel" (Nichols 2007:81-82). At the last meeting of the congress Kargel, as a representative of St. Petersburg's congregation, was asked to express the Union's gratitude to "brothers" in St. Petersburg for considerable offerings to the missionary work of the Baptist Union (Savinsky 1999:202).

According to Nichols, Kargel was clearly "moving away from his German Baptist understanding of ministry toward a more open understanding of cross-denominational ministry, yet he returned to Bulgaria to build the Baptist denomination there and accepted the role of vice-president in the organisation that would yield a Russian Baptist Union" (Nichols 2007:82). The author does not see any inconsistency in Kargel's actions at the time. It seems that Kargel did not consider the differences between the Baptists and the Pashkovites as deep and dramatic as they are perceived by Nichols. One must remember that the Pashkovite leaders at the time sincerely believed that the union was possible.

A few days after the conference in Novovasil'evka Kargel wrote a letter to "My Dear Brother in the Lord", almost certainly meaning Pashkov, to whom he was reporting at the time. The letter originally written in German is dated 3 May 1884 and was written from Tiede in the Molochna colony, probably from the home of Wieler. It has been preserved in the personal papers of Pashkov, presently held by the University of Birmingham in Great Britain. Klippenstein quotes the letter, a summary of the conference, in his article. Concerning the issue of open communion, Kargel wrote:

May one take part in the Lord's Supper with those who have views of baptism different from our own? Many brethren speak to this issue, with the great majority feeling that this should not become a divisive issue. There was real joy concerning the open-heartedness which manifested itself in this discussion. It was thought advisable, however, to exercise patience towards a few brethren who were decidedly of another point of view.²⁹⁵

In this letter Kargel also mentioned, "As much as I was able to in the Russian language, I gave testimony to the Lord."²⁹⁶ From Kargel's letter one can sense how busy his schedule was. He wrote,

²⁹⁵ Kargel's letter, in Klippenstein 1992:45-46.

²⁹⁶ Kargel's letter, in Klippenstein 1992:46.

Tomorrow, or perhaps even tonight, I shall be holding meetings in the German colonies. A large assembly has been called in Rueckenau for Sunday at the new church of the Mennonite Brethren.

A mission festival will be held there on the seventh; I expect to be present also. That will leave a few days before I take my leave for the German conference. I shall try to utilize this time to preach the Gospel. If I learn that you plan to come for May 24, I would return to Astrakhanka, but otherwise I shall leave immediately thereafter for Odessa.

I am overjoyed to serve my Lord in this way. There is so much work that I almost lose my desire to travel to Germany . . .²⁹⁷

Kahle adds a few interesting facts, claiming that Kargel left Russia and lived in Bulgaria and Romania for some time in 1884 (Kahle 1978:82). Pöysti suggests that right after the Congress Kargel went to Finland where Russian laws were not followed as strictly, resulting in more freedom than elsewhere in the Empire and offering some people refuge during the time of persecution.²⁹⁸ However, these possible stays abroad could not have been very long, because in June 1884 Pashkov and Korff were banished from Russia and Kargel assumed responsibility for the orphaned Pashkovite congregation (Savinsky 1999:351). So, Kargel came back to St. Petersburg.

Financially supported by Pashkov, Kargel left Bulgaria to assist Princess Lieven and the St. Petersburg group in Pashkov's absence. At this point, he broke with the German Baptist style of church structure, leadership and theology, and began to grow deeper in the Pietistic view of the church and British Holiness theology (Nichols 2007:83).

However, in 1884 and for several more years Kargel's main residence was in Finland (Karetnikova 2002:684), where he preached at the invitation of a local Finnish congregation and could visit St. Petersburg only occasionally (Skopina 2002:691; Savinsky 1999:180).

The situation changed when Kargel accepted an invitation from Chertkova, Lieven, and Gagarina to move to St. Petersburg (Savinsky 1999:180; Karev 1999:137). In 1887 N. Lieven invited Kargel and his family to live in her palace (Morskaya, 43) (Karetnikova 2009:24, 27). As a Turkish citizen Kargel had no problems with the authorities (Savinsky 1999:180). While living at the Lievens' palace Kargel worked on his first major theological work on Old Testament typology, "The Reflection of Glories to Come: Thirty-two discussions on tabernacle and priesthood" (Karetnikova 2002:684). Living in St.

²⁹⁷ Kargel's letter, in Klippenstein 1992:47.

²⁹⁸ Pöysti. Online. 15 September 2004.

Petersburg afforded him access to the libraries of Princess Lieven, Colonel Pashkov, and the Krueze sisters (Karetnikova 2002:684).

Serving among the Pashkovites for about ten years, Kargel was not quick to implement any changes in the congregation. For instance, the Pashkovites used to reserve two hours for meetings every Sunday.²⁹⁹ This practice had started with Lord Radstock and continued into the time of Kargel's leadership. Kargel taught the "brothers" both in small group "evening gatherings" (Abendversammlungen) and in individual "consultations" (Beratungen), even after the exile of Pashkov and Korff.³⁰⁰ When doctrinal differences surfaced among the evangelical believers in the capital, especially concerning the matter of baptism and the Lord's Supper, Kargel "retained the position held by Pashkov, Korff and Bobrinskiy that a second baptism of believers was unnecessary" (Corrado 2000:172-173). As N. Lieven began spending less time in St. Petersburg, "the leadership over the meetings in our home was turned completely into the hands of Ivan Veniaminovich Kargel" (Lieven 1967:106).

Klippenstein points out that "Pashkov's exile gave Kargel increased opportunities of leadership in St. Petersburg congregations of believers. There is, however, little documentation to trace his movements precisely during this period" (Klippenstein 1992:43). In 1885 Kargel visited exiled brothers in a deserted mountainous place called Girusy in Armenia (Karetnikova 2002:684; Skopina 2002:691). In 1885, or a little later, Kargel was instrumental in transferring money from Pashkov to Ryaboshapka (Lyubomirka village) for building a "klunya" on the ground of the latter for the church meetings (Savinsky 1999:183). In 1888 Kargel carried out a three week evangelistic trip around Samarskaya gubernia, where he ministered mostly in German colonies (Karetnikova 2009:29). Kargel mentions his three-week evangelistic journey around Samara province in 1888 in his book "Where are the dead according to the Scripture" (Kargel 2002:193). Kargel's visits to Estonia in 1884 and 1886 were mentioned above.

²⁹⁹ Korff, *Am Zarenhof*, 46, in Corrado 2000:105.

³⁰⁰ Lieven, *Eine Saat*, 70, in Corrado 2000:105-106.

Kargel's third daughter, Maria, was born in Hansel, Estonia, in 1886.³⁰¹ It could be then that Kargel was serving as a preacher in a Baptist congregation in the Baltics (Savinsky 1999:351). A year later, in 1887, Kargel's fourth daughter, Elizaveta, was born in St. Petersburg.³⁰² All four of his daughters received a superior education and mastered several languages while living in Lieven's palace (Turchaninov 2009:64; Skopina 2002:690). The Princess provided for all the needs of Kargel and his family and saw that his daughters got an excellent upbringing.³⁰³ None of Kargel's daughters chose to be married; they remained his best helpers and co-workers. Kargel's wife, Anna Alexandrovna, died young of diphtheria in 1888 or 1889, while Kargel was abroad with his two older daughters. Kargel never remarried. A year later, in 1900, his eldest daughter Anna died at the age of nineteen.³⁰⁴

An important question is how could it be that Kargel, who had perfectly fit the profile of "a Baptist pastor" during his first stay in St. Petersburg in 1875-1880 and during his Bulgarian ministry in 1880-1884, later fit so well into a more "open" Pashkovite congregation? At times it looks like we are talking about two different Kargels. On the one hand, he was highly respected in the strict Baptist and Mennonite circles; he played a leading role at Baptist congresses; personally knew Oncken; stood for the baptism of adults by immersion, for serious testing before baptising, for closed communion, etc. On the other hand, when the time came for Kargel to lead the Pashkovite group, he continued Radstock's and Pashkov's tradition, which allowed more freedom on the issues of baptism and the Lord's Supper. S. Lieven recalled:

In the first years when V. A. Pashkov, Count Korff, and Count Bobrinskiy were still in St. Petersburg and had real influence, there was more freedom of opinion among believers, including the issue of church membership. Some people thought that to become a church member one has to be baptised by faith... others thought that those who were baptised as babies needed only faith and spiritual rebirth, but those differences of opinion created no obstacle to mutual fellowship. The main emphasis was on the candidate's sincere faith in Jesus Christ as a personal Saviour and a testimony of being born again. Once both

³⁰¹ AUCECB Archive. History of ECB – archival materials. Memoirs of Kargel's life and ministry. 0122a. Period 2. 1851-1893. Disc 2; Borshch 2009:300.

³⁰² AUCECB Archive. History of ECB – archival materials. Memoirs of Kargel's life and ministry. 0122a period 2. 1851-1893. Disc 2; Borshch 2009:300.

³⁰³ Karetnikova. Online. September 2004.

³⁰⁴ Skopina 2002:690; Turchaninov 2009:64; Miller 2009:85; Karetnikova 2009:25, 41.

requirements were met, a candidate was accepted as a church member and was welcomed to participate in the Lord's Supper. As time went on some differences appeared. Ivan Veniaminovich Kargel and those who attended meetings in our home held to the latter, freer direction; however, brothers who attended other meetings held to the first stricter view. Ivan Stepanovich Prokhanov joined the stricter ones (Lieven 1967:104).

At the same time Kargel was gradually leading everybody to the understanding of the doctrine of baptism (Karetnikova 2002:685). Plett also points out that the Pashkovites became more "organised in their doctrine and more similar to Baptists" due to the ministry of such brothers as Kargel, Pashkov, and Stepanov (Plett 1994:83-84). Whatever the case, Kargel's way of leading Pashkovites towards "fuller understanding of baptism" was never harsh or offensive. One cannot find any complaints about him on behalf of the Pashkovites.

An interesting observation was made by a Swedish Baptist, who classified Kargel's congregation in St. Petersburg as typical Plymouth Brethren: „Der schwedische Baptist Byström unterschied im ersten Jahrzehnt des 20. Jahrhunderts in Petersburg Baptisten, Evangeliumschrsten, einen Kreis von sogenannten „freien Christen“ und die Brüder von der Prägung der Plymouth-Brüder unter Ivan Venjaminovich Kargel“ (Kahle 1978:83). That is how it was started by Radstock, continued by Pashkov, and basically preserved by Kargel. His goal was never to convert it into a typical German Baptist congregation, although he personally held to stricter Baptist views.

According to Nichols, Kargel's work from the late 1860s to the early 1880s was "denominational, specifically German Baptist". However, "while working in St. Petersburg from 1884 until 1888, Kargel made no attempt to organise the cell groups into churches" (Nichols 2007:80). "There is no record that he ever returned to his German Baptist congregation or re-established contact with the German Baptist Union. Nor did he re-establish his contacts with the proto-Baptist group he had helped found with Wieler" (Nichols 2007:83).

The transition of Kargel's views used to puzzle his contemporaries as well. It is explained by Kahle in this way:

Der Weg Kargels von Südrußland nach Petersburg, wo er nach dem Willen der verbliebenen „Pashkovcy“ die Gemeinde betreuen sollte, hatte nicht nur eine räumliche Veränderung für ihn bedeutet. Dieser Weg führte ihn auch von baptistischer Prägung zu der offenen Haltung, die den Petersburger Evangelischen zueigen war. Es war der Weg hin zum



Allianzverständnis der „offenen Brüder“. Seine baptistischen Freunde haben es Kargel zuweilen übel genommen, daß er in den die baptistischen Gemeinden bewegenden Fragen zu einer anderen Haltung gelangt war. „Daß er die Reihen der Baptisten verließ und in Petersburg Allianzmann wurde, konnten nicht alle seine früheren Mitarbeiter verstehen“ – Gutsche, Westliche Quellen S.67. Kargel hat diesen Weg selbst gedeutet. Dabei weisen seine Angaben deutlich auf seine Herkunft aus Rusland hin. Als einmal die Frage erörtert wurde, ob man Außenstehenden, noch nicht Getauften die volle Teilnahme am gemeindlichen Leben ermöglichen solle, stimmte er dem zu unter Hinweis auf seinen eigenen Werdegang: Als er noch nicht wiedergeboren gewesen sei, habe er doch schon im Chor seiner Ortsgemeinde gesungen, die Worte der Lieder, die er damals sang, hätten ihm das Bewußtsein seiner Sündhaftigkeit erschlossen und ihm so den Weg zur Taufe und Wiedergeburt eröffnet (Lieven Kratkij ocherk S.8) (Kahle 1978:82-83).

It seems unlikely that Kargel, a man who can be characterized by integrity and genuineness, compromised himself. One will see his positive qualities demonstrated on many occasions. However, as he matured, it seems that he also learnt magnanimity and flexibility. He learnt to distinguish between major and minor issues in church leadership. These qualities helped him to draw bridges between the Evangelical Christians and Baptists in Russia. Another factor possibly contributing to Kargel's softening was his close acquaintance and collaboration with Dr. Baedeker.

5.1.4 Kargel and Dr. Baedeker: Brethren Influence

In the course of Russian Evangelical history the names of Kargel and Baedeker are closely connected. A famous prison preacher, Dr. Baedeker dedicated eighteen years of his life to evangelistic ministry in Russia. He chose Kargel as his main interpreter and obviously had considerable influence on him. Skopina dates Kargel's travels with Dr. Baedeker to 1887 (Skopina 2002:691). Baedeker's permit to visit prisons was granted by Tsar Alexander III himself, due to Princess Lieven's intercession through her friend, the tsar's wife. Kargel, as Baedeker's interpreter, also received a permit (Skopina 2002:691).

In her memoirs S. Lieven writes that Kargel, though living with his family in their home in St. Petersburg, often travelled. More than once he accompanied the elderly Dr. Baedeker in journeys all the way to Siberia. Upon their return, many people came to crowded meetings to hear about the trips (Lieven 1967:81-82). Karetnikova dates those journeys from 1887 to 1890

(Karetnikova 2002:684). Among the many journeys undertaken by Kargel and Baedeker, a trip across Russia stands out. Latimer, Baedeker's biographer, writes that Kargel accompanied Dr. Baedeker as an interpreter on his first major missionary trip visiting prisons across Siberia and the Far East,³⁰⁵ starting from Moscow on 11 May all the way to Saghaliën [now Sakhalin] where they arrived on 23 September (Latimer 1908).

There is a lot of confusion in literature concerning the year of that journey. Savinsky mentions 1889 (Savinsky 1999:212), Karev, Skopina, and Plett mention the next year, 1890 (Karev 1999:133; Skopina 2002:692; Plett 1994:75). Skopina actually quotes Baedeker's diary where 1890 is given as the year of that famous journey, "1890, June 21. Kargel and I are going to Minusinsk to find a brother... Tomsk, June 23. Three of us – Davidson, Kargel and myself – celebrated the breaking of the bread yesterday in the hotel ... Krasnoyarsk, June 30..." (Skopina 2002:692). Unfortunately, there is no way of telling whether she had the diary itself or used Latimer's biography of Baedeker.

In letters to his wife Dr. Baedeker describes Kargel as a very helpful man: "Mr. Kargel has been a great help to me this morning. He is bold, and speaks without hesitation. This is a great comfort to me" (Latimer 1908:113). "Dear Kargel has been most helpful in arranging for horses at every post-station, day and night" (Latimer 1908:143). During the journey Kargel made an extra effort to visit Pashkov's servant Kirpichnikov who had been exiled to Minusinsk for his beliefs (Latimer 1908:128-129). As a result of Kirpichnikov's faithful testimony, the first evangelical congregation appeared in Siberia (Savinsky 1999:238).

During the trip they distributed about twelve thousand Bibles and preached the gospel to about forty thousand prisoners (Latimer 1908:162). They visited a number of places outside Russia. "After a two-year journey Baedeker and Kargel came back to St. Petersburg through China, Tashkent, Rostov-on-Don, and then they had a three months rest at the Lieven's country house where they studied Scripture" (Skopina 2002:695). The AUCECB archive contains information that they had their families with them as well. It is also added that they searched the Scriptures from beginning to end on the topic of

³⁰⁵ During Dr. Baedeker's second big journey across Russia he was accompanied by Patkavan Tarajants (Karev 1999:133).

Israel.³⁰⁶ With Dr. Baedeker's Brethren views on eschatology it is not surprising that Kargel held to the dispensational approach when interpreting prophecy and future events.

During those years Kargel visited many places, including Israel. In his book, "The Old Testament Types", he wrote, "In the leprous home in Jerusalem in 1889 I saw many of those miserable people" (Kargel 2002:309).³⁰⁷ He preached in the Caucasus, visited Giryusy, German colonies in Russia, Samara, and other places (Skopina 2002:695). A tireless traveller, Kargel used to visit a congregation of Moscow believers who were followers of Radstock and Pashkov and had existed there ever since Radstock's visit (Savinsky 1999:213). Kargel used to visit a newly formed congregation which included a group established by Bible colporteurs and the Shuvalovs' group. Kargel himself preached and also translated for Dr. Baedeker. In Moscow they stayed at the Shuvalovs' palace. The police were pursuing Kargel, and on one occasion believers had to hide him during a police raid. Kargel, as well as Prokhanov, continued to visit the Moscow evangelical congregation in later years as well (Kovalkov 1966:65-67).

Kargel's preaching in Samara province in 1888 produced fruit: in ten years, around the turn of the century, a congregation was established in Samara which became for Kargel one of his "home churches", and he continued to visit it whenever he could.³⁰⁸ However, his main ministry was still with St. Petersburg's congregation. Although Kargel never became an official presbyter there, he constantly led the services in Lieven's home.³⁰⁹

At the end of the 1880s Kargel and his daughters moved to Finland (then a part of the Russian Empire) where he lived and worked for about ten years.³¹⁰ His long stay in Finland is also mentioned by Kahle:

Ende der achtziger Jahre war er vorübergehend in Petersburg, übersiedelte dann nach Finnland, wo er sich etwa 10 Jahre aufhielt.

³⁰⁶ AUCECB archive. History of ECB – archival materials. "Memoirs of Kargel's life and ministry." 0122a period 2 1851-1893. Disc 2.0; Turchaninov 2009:67.

³⁰⁷ In 1902 Kargel published an article "Ein Besuch in Jerusalem und Umgebung" in *Christliches Jahrbuch zur Belehrung und Unterhaltung*.

³⁰⁸ Savinsky 1999:239; Karetnikova. Online. September 2004.

³⁰⁹ Karetnikova. Online. September, 2004.

³¹⁰ Peisty. Online. 2 September 2004.

Sofija Lieven, die diese Angaben macht, waren die Gründe für den langen Aufenthalt in Finnland unbekannt (Kahle 1978:82).

Nichols explains Kargel's taking residence in Finland by "the persecutions and political turmoil of the late 1880s and early 1890s". In Finland he helped to organize the Russian Evangelical Free Churches. However, from Finland Kargel continued to visit the St. Petersburg Pashkovite congregation and to work as a translator for Baedeker. He also travelled to visit the Mennonite Brethren communities in southern Russia and hold month-long Bible classes there. During those years, many of his theological writings were published in *Zionsbote*, a Mennonite Brethren journal published for the immigrant congregations in North America (Karetnikova 2009:58; Nichols 2007:84).

In 1895 Kargel again accompanied Dr. Baedeker visiting exiled brothers in Elizavetpolsk province and in a remote settlement called Giryusy (Savinsky 1999:229). Besides encouraging the exiled brothers, Kargel handed them funds collected in Russia and abroad as well as those sent personally by Pashkov (Kovalenko 1996:51). Kahle calls Kargel "ein unverdächtiger Beobachter" (Kahle 1978:71). Writing of Kargel's and Baedeker's journey to Giryusy, Kahle revealed some discord between the exiled Baptists, Stundists, Sabbatarians, and Molokans. Certain problems were even caused by the distribution of the very gifts that Kargel and Baedeker had brought (Kahle 1978:71). Kargel and Baron Nicolaii carried on the visitation of prisons after Dr. Baedeker's retirement (Latimer 1908:201).

Kahle does not provide a specific year for Kargel's move to St. Petersburg, but mentions generally the turn of the century: "Kargel wurde um die Jahrhundertwende der Prediger der Petersburge Gemeinde, die ihren Rückhalt nach wie vor bei den Familien Gagarin und Lieven hatte" (Kahle 1978:81). According to Nichols, Kargel returned to St. Petersburg in 1898 in order to resume leadership of the groups started by Radstock and Pashkov. Prokhanov also returned to St. Petersburg that same year (Nichols 2007:84).

5.1.5 Back to St. Petersburg: Kargel and Prokhanov – two evangelical leaders

This time Kargel settled in St. Petersburg and started serving as pastor of the evangelical congregation which met in the Lieven home.³¹¹ Kovalenko also considers Kargel “a leading presbyter” of St. Petersburg’s evangelical congregation at the end of the nineteenth – beginning of the twentieth centuries, the years dedicated to collecting and preparing materials of his major theological work, “The reflection of glories to come” (Kovalenko 1996:51).

Describing the inner atmosphere in the Pashkovite group, Skopina says that at first a joyful unity in the Lord reigned with Kargel’s main goal of deepening believers’ knowledge of the Lord and His Word (Skopina 2002:695). However, the situation did not remain idyllic. Major political changes were in the air and some young people in the Pashkovite group craved more activity. As Nichols pointed out, “Prokhanov’s time had come; he was a well-travelled, educated, well-connected and gifted Russian who could unite the movement into a denomination” (Nichols 2007:87).

It is not perfectly clear when the split took place as a few young people left Kargel’s congregation. Some date it as early as 1903 (Savinsky 1999:281, 363), others – later. According to Skopina and Nichols, it happened in 1905 (Skopina 2002:685; Nichols 2007:86), according to Plett in 1908 (Plett 1994:87). Both Karetnikova and Plett blame it on Prokhanov. Karetnikova states that Prokhanov, wanting to start his own church, actually “stole” those few people from Kargel’s congregation (Karetnikova 2002:685). Plett writes that in August 1908 while Kargel was away from St. Petersburg, Prokhanov initiated the split, and then on November 1908 about two thirds of the members registered with the authorities (Plett 1994:87) with Prokhanov as their leader. Nichols comments:

By 1905 Prokhanov had organized the youth of Kargel’s church into a separate organization. In 1905, Prokhanov also registered the house group that Kargel was pastoring, but made himself pastor. Kargel was not willing to give Prokhanov full leadership, and soon registered another congregation... The two fellowships eventually came to terms and Kargel merged his congregation with that of Prokhanov (Nichols 2007:86).

³¹¹ Skopina 2002:695; Peisty. Online. 2 September 2004.

However, the story presented by Savinsky seems to be the most credible. He states that a few young people (F. M. Trosnov and a few others) who were disappointed with “the lack of activity” in Kargel’s congregation left in 1903. They formed a secret group and were looking for a leader. Prokhanov agreed to become the leader, added a few more scattered groups of believers around St. Petersburg, and in this way formed his own congregation (Savinsky 1999:281, 363). Skopina also writes that Prokhanov became the leader of this group only after those six or seven people had already left Kargel’s congregation (Skopina 2002:696). In 1908, after I. S. Prokhanov registered his group as the First Petersburg’s congregation of Evangelical Christians, Kargel registered his group under the name of Second Evangelical Congregation (Savinsky 1999:251; Lieven 1967:106), although they had come into existence in the reverse chronological order.

There were certain differences between these two congregations both called Evangelical Christian. Prokhanov’s congregation was patterned after Baptist congregations with strict inner discipline and “closed Lord’s supper” (Savinsky 1999:282). It has already been pointed out that in the issues of baptism and the Lord’s Supper Kargel was more tolerant and continued Radstock’s and Pashkov’s tradition. According to Karetnikova, although Kargel held to the Baptist views himself, he did not want to turn away believers who did not share his position on baptism. So the Pashkovites continued practising “open communion” until S. A. Alekseev was chosen as a presbyter, where he served until his death in 1926 (excluding ten years in prison, 1893-1903).

S. Lieven pointed out another difference between Kargel’s and Prokhanov’s congregations:

Little by little it became evident that the congregation led by him [Kargel] is somewhat different from the congregation of Ivan Stepanovich Prokhanov. Brother Kargel wanted first of all to deepen believers in the knowledge of the Lord and His Word, while Prokhanov called his members to active participation in public life: he organised the youth union, chorus, and other things (Lieven 1967:106).

Though the split was painful to Kargel (Savinsky 1999:281), it did not turn him away from Prokhanov. The first decades of the twentieth century were very productive, as Kargel was preaching, participating in numerous conferences and congresses, writing his theological works, teaching at the Bible courses,

etc. In many of these things one finds Kargel working side by side with Prokhanov.

In 1903 Kargel was delegated by his congregation³¹² to the European Baptist Congress in Berlin (Savinsky 1999:351). Kargel was present for the few first days of the Baptist World Congress in London in June 1905 (Savinsky 1999:266), where the Baptist World Alliance was created. However, when Kargel returned and reported on the Congress, he said he regretted going because it was “not very spiritual” (Zhitkov 1957:61). In his article, Zhitkov goes so far as to characterize Kargel as a person holding Anabaptist views (Zhitkov 1957:61).

On 4 December 1906, an appeal to all believers was published calling to form a Russian Evangelical Union (Prokhanov’s idea). The Union was supposed to consist not of churches but of individuals (not necessarily Evangelical Christians or Baptists), with the main goal of regeneration of the nation. Kargel, Nikolaii, Prokhanov, and others signed the appeal. The Union was finally formed in 1909. However, some prominent Baptist leaders including Mazaev disapproved of it (Savinsky 1999:283-285).

In 1907 (from January 15 to February 1) Kargel was a chairman at the Second All-Russia United Congress of Evangelical Christians and Baptists, with New Molokans and other evangelical branches represented, held in St. Petersburg (Savinsky 1999:342). Kargel, along with Prokhanov and other leaders, represented the Evangelical Christians (Savinsky 1999:267). In fact, Kargel’s congregation hosted the Congress, which was dedicated to the issues of defending the legal rights of Christians and expanding gospel preaching after the edict of 17 October 1906 (Kovalenko 1996:51). It appears that Kargel was trying to bring to fruition the ideas of Pashkov and Korff of holding a united congress for various evangelical branches in Russia.

At the Third All-Russia Congress of Evangelical Christians (31 December 1911 – 4 January 1912) Kargel served as one of two vice-chairmen with Prokhanov as the chairman. In 1917 Prokhanov and Kargel led the fifth All-Russia congress of evangelical Christians (Skopina 2002:696).

³¹² Karetnikova makes a point that he was delegated by the Union of Russian Baptists (Karetnikova 2009:38).

Another important facet of Kargel's ministry was teaching Bible courses from their inception in 1905 to the very end in 1929 (Mirt, p 1). Karetnikova emphasises that during this whole period Kargel supported Prokhanov and attached importance and spiritual depth to everything he participated in.³¹³ Kargel taught six-week Bible courses held at Lieven's palace in 1905, 1906, and 1907 (Karetnikova 2009:40; Savinsky 1999:297).

During the first three years the courses enrolled only a few students. Kargel lectured on Revelation, sin and sanctification, and homiletics. Those lectures became the foundation of his two major theological books, "The Reflection of Glories to Come" and "Commentary on Revelation".³¹⁴ Students were both Baptist and Evangelical Christians since "there was no big distinction between the two until 1909" (Savinsky 1999:297). Savinsky names Prokhanov and Nikolaii among other lecturers (Savinsky 1999:297).

In the same period of time, 1906–1907, Kargel preached and taught the same courses on sin and sanctification, and Interpretation of the Revelation in Latvia (Liepae and Ventspils). Among Kargel's courses Skopina also mentions Doctrines.³¹⁵ These lectures probably laid the foundation of his written works such as "Christ is our sanctification", "Sin as the greatest evil in the world", commentaries on Romans and Revelation (Kovalenko 1996:51). In 1908³¹⁶ one of Kargel's major theological works called "The Reflection of Glories to Come" was published in St. Petersburg.³¹⁷ In 1909 the Mennonite Brethren publishing house in Halbstadt published it as well.³¹⁸

Kahle mentions that around this time the Evangelical Christian congregation which had been meeting in the Lieven palace for thirty-five years moved to a different location:

Die Versammlungen fanden im Palais der Familie Lieven in der Belaja Morskaja statt. Als dieses Haus von der Familie aufgegeben wurde,

³¹³ Karetnikova. Online. September, 2004.

³¹⁴ Ibid.

³¹⁵ Mirt, p 1; Skopina 2002:696; Kovalenko 1996:51; AUCECB 1989:354.

³¹⁶ Kovalenko mentions 1913 as the year of its publication but this must be a mistake (Kovalenko 1996:51).

³¹⁷ The book was reprinted in St. Petersburg by "Bibliya dlya vsekh" in 1994.

³¹⁸ Bible courses (by correspondence) opened in 1968 by AUCECB used works of Russian theologians (Kargel, Prokhanov, Karev, etc) as the basis of theological subjects (AUCECB 1989:269).

übersiedelte die Gemeinde 1910 in ein Gebäude auf dem Stoljarnyj Pereulok. Dort blieb sie unter dem Namen der sogenannten „zweiten Gemeinde“ noch bis in die Revolutionsjahre hinein bestehen (Kahle 1978:83).

Yarygin briefly mentions an interesting fact: in 1910 Kargel and Fetler expressed the idea of establishing a “Brotherhood of the Acts of Apostles” (Yarygin 2004:38). An internet article provides some details. In 1910 a fast-spreading Pentecostal movement alarmed Russian Baptists and the Evangelical Christians. Their periodicals were filled with calls to beware of “dangers coming from destructors-Pentecostals”. Fetler suggested organizing *Obshchestvo Apostolov* [Apostolic Society] that would be instrumental in building a congregation similar to the church described in the Acts of the Apostles. Fetler’s idea was supported by I. Kargel and V. V. Ivanov.³¹⁹ Unfortunately the author was not able to find out what became of this initiative.

In 1912 another book by Kargel called *V kakom otnoshenii ty k Dukhu Svyatomu* [Where do you stand in your relationship to the Holy Spirit?] was published in St. Petersburg. It was written as a response to the rising Pentecostal movement which by this time had reached Europe and caused a split in the Evangelical Christian congregation in Helsingfors (Finland), a daughter church of the St. Petersburg congregation (Kovalenko 1996:52).³²⁰

In this connection an important incident must be mentioned. In his 1928 (or possibly later) treatise on the Pentecostal movement, Kargel mentions that twenty-three years earlier (that is, around or after 1905) he had lived in Estland [Estonia] where he came into contact with evangelical congregations impacted by Pentecostalism to the point of tumult. So, Kargel, for the first and the last time in his life, dismissed the congregation and on the following day invited those who wanted to attend decent meetings to come together and organize a new congregation (Kargel 2004:46).

In the same treatise Kargel mentions another encounter with the Pentecostal movement. It was around 1912-1913 when one of the leading

³¹⁹ *Khristianskie sekty Zapadnogo proiskhozhdeniya*. Online. 24 November 2004.

³²⁰ There were a number of splits in German Baptist churches connected with the growing Pentecostal movement. This caused leading German Baptists to write the “Berlin Declaration” (15 September 1909), signed by fifty-seven people, among whom was M. Korff (Kovalenko 1996:228).

Pentecostals came from London to St. Petersburg. “Sister Pashkova”³²¹ wanted to introduce him to Kargel, so she invited Kargel, Fetler, and the Englishman for dinner. The conversation was about baptism by the Holy Spirit. Later, after the war, Kargel heard that the Englishman had left the Pentecostal movement (Kargel 2004:48-49).

In 1913, as persecution against Baptists and Evangelicals grew stronger before the outburst of the World War I, Prokhanov, Kargel, and Dolgopolov drafted and signed a petition to the members of the Cabinet, State Council, and State Duma (Russian Parliament) concerning the legal status and conditions of Evangelical Christians (Prokhanov, 1913). This petition proved to be successful: Baptists and Evangelical Christians resumed their previously forbidden church services in St. Petersburg, Moscow, Odessa, and Kharkov.³²²

One of Kargel’s significant accomplishments was the Confession of Faith which he wrote in 1913 for his Evangelical Christian congregation. Much later, in 1966, it was adopted as the creed of the Union of Evangelical Christians and Baptists at the All-Union Congress (AUCECB 1989:247). Why was Kargel’s Confession of Faith chosen above many others? The reason could be the great respect that Kargel was accorded in both Baptist and Evangelical circles. In view of the fact that the relationship between Baptists and Evangelical Christians in Russia was not always smooth, it is amazing how Kargel managed to enjoy a good reputation in both unions.

In spite of a certain negative “history” in Kargel’s and Prokhanov’s relationships, on the personal level they stayed in touch and often did ministry together. Anna Chekmareva, a student in St. Petersburg in 1907, remembered attending a Sunday service at Prokhanov’s church where Kargel was preaching a sermon from the Old Testament (Grachev 1997:39). Anna and her brother Peter had a chance to visit Kargel at home, who was by then widowed and living with his two daughters. When speaking of the Christian student non-confessional movement³²³ Kargel mentioned that everyone is to have his or her “Christian family.” He added, however, that personally he wished all believers

³²¹ It appears that some time after Pashkov’s death in 1902, Madame Pashkova returned to Russia, St. Petersburg.

³²² Karetnikova. Online. September, 2004.

³²³ Kargel took part in a two day conference in Finland along with P. Nikolaii. He also spoke in the students’ groups in St. Petersburg (Grachev 1997:82; 168).

had the very best relationships with each other regardless of their confessions (Grachev 1997:82-83). This is exactly what he tried to do in his own life. Nichols justly pointed out:

Kargel set aside doctrinal differences and political control in favour of personal piety, seeking to avoid heavy-handed leadership and to emphasise scriptural teaching and a Christian lifestyle. Even when he faced Prokhanov in the crisis of control over the remnant Pashkovites, he stayed true to his pietistic perspective and showed restraint in a time of conflict (Nichols 2007:86-87).

Indeed, it was not easy to get along with Prokhanov, a man capable of patting himself on the back with such pronouncements as, “My extraordinary mental development and erudition is a simple constatation of a fact” (Prokhanov 1993:39), or “I am making an amazing prophesy” (Prokhanov 1993:81). It is difficult to imagine Kargel writing or saying something similar about himself. Unfortunately, the leading St. Petersburg “brothers” (Prokhanov, Kargel, and Fetler) had quite a few disagreements with each other although they were very close in doctrinal matters (Grachev 1997:92).

5.1.6 Late Years

The author does not possess much information about Kargel’s life during the First World War (1914-1918) or the years following the Bolshevik Revolution. During wartime Russia’s ethnic Germans (and Kargel was half-German) were among groups suspected of disloyalty and a lack of patriotism toward the state (Ivanov 2002:26) and had very hard time. Supposedly, Kargel stayed in Petrograd. No specific information concerning Kargel’s whereabouts is found until 1920. Then, at some point during the great famine of 1919-1921, Kargel left Petrograd. Without a permanent place to stay, he had to move from one town to another in Russia and Ukraine. This is how Kahle describes the initial stage of those wanderings:

In der Hungerjahren Petrograds, 1919-1921, übersiedelte Kargel auf das Land; er folgte einer Einladung der Fürstin Gagarin auf ein Landgut. Später, als auch hier, im Gouvernement Tula, die Lebensbedingungen immer schwieriger wurden, wurde Kargel Prediger einer Gemeinde von Evangeliumschrten im Gouvernement Kursk. Auch das war nicht die letzte Station des über Siebzigjährigen. Er half in anderen Gemeinden aus, schließlich noch in Sumy; unter diesen Gemeinden waren auch baptistische (Kahle 1978:83).

A similar story is told by Klippenstein and Miller, that after World War I, during the turmoil of the Civil War, Kargel accepted an invitation to the estate of Prince Gagarin (Klippenstein 1992:47; Miller 2009:87). Karetnikova considers it absurd to think that anybody could find refuge at an aristocratic estate after the Revolution (Karetnikova 2009:46). However, the fact that around this time Kargel served (even as a pastor) in the Evangelical church in Tula is mentioned by Kahle, Miller, and Karetnikova herself (Kahle 1978:83; Miller 2009:87; Karetnikova 2009:49). The author does not suggest that the Gagarins continued living in their mansion house in Tul'skaya gubernia as if no Revolution had taken place. However, not all aristocrats fled Soviet Russia immediately after the Revolution; some continued to live in villages close to their former estates (Lieven 1967:97).

Kargel's movements and activity in 1920 cause just as much confusion. According to Karetnikova, it was in 1920 that he pastored churches in Tula and Kursk (Karetnikova 2009:49). Kursk as the next place after Tula where Kargel served in the Evangelical church is also mentioned by Miller and Kahle (Miller 2009:87; Kahle 1978:83). Turchaninov skips Tula and starts right with Kursk where Kargel moved his family due to the great famine in Petrograd. According to Turchaninov, while they were headed for Kursk they stayed for some time in Staryy Oskol. Then Prokhanov wrote a letter to believers in Nikolaevka (Sumskaya oblast) asking them to help an elderly minister. In August 1920 brother Zakharchenko moved Kargel's family to Nikolaevka village (now Bol'shoy Oktyabr') (Turchaninov 2009:67).

Skopina also does not mention Tula and follows Turchaninov's story with a few variations:

In the beginning of the 1920s a severe drought in many areas of Russia caused famine, and Kargel with his daughters had to leave Petrograd and settle first in Kursk area. In August 1920, as a result of a request from the Sumy area to establish preachers' courses there, Kargel moved to Nikolaevka (Bol'shoy Oktyabr') village, 40 km away from Sumy where in winter two-month annual Bible courses were organized. Kargel taught Doctrines, Homiletics, Revelation, and the Second Coming of Christ. Every year they had fifty to sixty students present (Skopina 2002:697).

Karetnikova also mentions a request from Sumy to the Union to organize two-month winter courses for preachers, after which Prokhanov sent Kargel there, asking brothers from Nikolaevka to take care of him; all of this took place in 1920 (Karetnikova 2009:45). The fact that in 1920 Kargel held courses in

Nikolaevka is mentioned in the “official” AUCECB history, except the length of the courses is different, i.e., a month and a half instead of two months (AUCECB 1989:215).

According to Turchaninov and Skopina, who seem to be the best informed about Kargel’s life in Ukraine, Kargel and his daughters first stayed at Zakharchenko’s flat until a house was built on the grounds belonging to Ternovenko, a local pastor. Under Kargel the congregation grew quickly. By winter Kargel had suggested organizing six-week courses for preachers. His daughter Elena was holding classes for the illiterate but later she returned to Leningrad. Elizaveta preached at meetings, held “talks” for the church ladies, taught at the Bible courses, and helped her father copy his works, sometimes translating from German into Russian (for Kargel it was still easier to write in German). Maria was mostly keeping house. Kargel taught not only in Nikolaevka and surrounding locations, but also travelled back to Leningrad to teach at the Bible school there (Turchaninov 2009:68; Skopina 2002:697).

While Kargel was in Leningrad for three months in 1922, Ternovenko, who was jealous of Kargel’s popularity, sold his house. After that Kargel decided to move away because he did not want to cause a split in the local congregation. Kargel’s belongings were taken to Tokari-Berezhki village, seven kilometres from Lebedino (Turchaninov 2009:77; Skopina 2002:698). Tokari became Kargel’s main residence for about fifteen years (basically for the rest of his life) where he received numerous visitors daily, even from abroad (Skopina 2002:699). According to Mitskevich, Kargel lived in Tokari for only ten years, from 1926 to 1936 (Mitskevich 1946:22-24); this leaves a four-year gap, from 1922 to 1926.

In any case, in 1923 Kargel again organized two-month courses in Nikolaevka, with fifty-five people attending from the whole area. Classes taught included Homiletics, Doctrines, Last events, and Revelation (AUCECB 1989:215; Turchaninov 2009:70).

The elderly Kargel visited Petrograd-Leningrad during the 1920s only to lecture at Bible courses, to take part in congresses³²⁴, or for other specific occasions. For a time Kargel served as a member of the Council of the Union of

Evangelical Christians which had formed under the leadership of Prokhanov in 1909 (Klippenstein 1992:47). According to Kahle, “Zeitweilig führte ihn sein Weg nach Leningrad zurück. Dort wirkte er in den biblischen Kursen für die Ausbildung der Prediger des Bundes der Evangeliumschrsten als Exeget“ (Kahle 1978:83). Although Miller points out that Kargel taught at “the evangelical seminary” (Miller 2009:87), the author tends to believe that the classes offered were more like the Bible courses Kargel had attended at Oncken’s missionary school.

In 1923-1924 Kargel taught at nine-month Bible courses held for Baptists and Evangelical Christians in *Dom Spaseniya* (the main evangelical church in Petrograd) located in Bol’shaya Konyushennaya Street.³²⁵ In 1925³²⁶ when regular year-long Bible courses started functioning in Leningrad (Malaya Konyushennaya Street) Kargel taught there as well (Karetnikova 2009:59). He lectured in Doctrines, Interpretation of the Book of Revelation, and the Teaching about the Second Coming of Jesus Christ (AUCECB 1989:215). Karetnikova also lists Apologetics among Kargel’s classes (Karetnikova 2002:687). Those were the well-known one-year annual courses, which produced about four hundred graduates (Karetnikova 2002:686).

It was then that Kargel’s second major theological work based on forty-three lectures was being shaped. The book, “Interpretation of the Revelation of Saint John”, though not published during his lifetime, was circulated in many manuscripts (dated 1924 and 1928) and finally published in 1991 by the Orthodox (Karetnikova 2002:686). However, two of Kargel’s writings saw the light during that period. In 1926, “Christ is our sanctification” was published in the *Khristianin* [Christian]. In 1928, his autobiography *Zwischen den Enden der Erde* was published in Wernigerode, Germany.

In spite of advanced age Kargel continued to travel, visiting big congregations of Evangelical Christians, ordaining ministers, and serving as a honorary chairman at the Ninth congress of Evangelical Christians (Kovalenko

³²⁴ At the eighth congress of the Evangelical Christians in 1921 the first serious disagreement between Kargel and the leaders of both Unions took place over the issue of political involvement (Karetnikova 2009:58).

³²⁵ Savinsky 1999:351; AUCECB 1989:215; Karetnikova 2009:59.

³²⁶ According to Kovalenko, Kargel regularly taught at the Bible courses in Leningrad from 1923 to 1928; and in Sumy – in 1920 and 1924 (Kovalenko 1996:52).

1996:52). In 1924 and 1925 he visited Kiev and worked there for two weeks each time (Kargel 1925:18). In 1926 and 1927 he visited churches in Kharkov (AUCECB 1989:491; Karetnikova 2009:49). In 1926 at the Tenth Congress of Evangelical Christians he gave explanations on the difficult issue of military service (Kovalenko 1996:52). According to *Bratskiy Vestnik*, Kargel basically supported Prokhanov's position, arguing in favour of military service for Christian men.

Actually, in the 1920s Kargel became seriously worried about the spiritual condition of the evangelical churches. In the magazine *Khristianin* [The Christian] № 3 (1926) he wrote, "A lot is being left out among newly saved people and that is unforgivable. . . for many believers poor faith life is becoming the norm, freshness of spirit is being lost every year, and worldliness is getting greater and deeper rooted both in individuals and entire congregations" (Yarygin 2004:69). It was in 1928 that, according to Kahle, Kargel was betrayed by one of his Evangelical Christian "brothers": „Ein bild, das den Rat des Bundes der Evangeliumschrsten 1928 darstellt, zeigt auch ihn unter den Anwesenden" (Kahle 1978:83), but no names or details are mentioned.

In 1929 during one of his lectures at the Bible Courses in Leningrad, Kargel was arrested and sent out of the city (Karetnikova 2009:49; Miller 2009:87). "The appearance of an armed officer in the lecture room one day in 1929 marked the beginning of the end of all public evangelical activities in the Soviet Union for some years to come" (Klippenstein 1992:47). As Kargel was leaving Leningrad,³²⁷ a crowd of young men accompanied him to the station. Karev approached him with a request: "Write in my book a word that will guide my path!" The old man took the pencil and wrote only two words: *Poznay ego!* [Know him!] (Brandenburg 1977:132; Miller 2009:86). After being banished from Leningrad Kargel moved again to Ukraine (Karetnikova 2009:49).

At the end of the 1920s, after Prokhanov went abroad never to return, Kargel, according to Kovalenko, saw that the leaders of the Evangelical Christian Union started compromising with atheistic authorities. He dissociated himself from them, left Leningrad, and went first to Nizhniy Oskol (the Urals) and later to Lebedino (Sumy area, Ukraine). It was from there that in 1931 at

the age of 82 he wrote his denunciatory letter to J. I. Zhidkov and to the council of Leningrad evangelical congregation refusing financial help, which was conditioned by filling a specific questionnaire required by the authorities concerning one's social background (Kovalenko 1996:53).

Kargel explained that this was even worse than what the authorities had demanded at the Ninth and Tenth Congresses. He was determined that church membership not be conditioned by the authorities' attitude to anybody on the grounds of social background, not to mention that the information gathered through such questionnaires was going to be used against the very people who had answered them. Signing the questionnaire sent to Kargel went against his conscience and his understanding of Scripture. He decided to trust God alone to take care of him and his daughters: "My God who has led me for eighty-two years will continue to help me for the rest of my life" (Kargel 1991:266). One must remember that Kargel was a *lishenets*, a person deprived of voting rights, hence, all other rights including food cards (Karetnikova 2002:686). Though the early 1930s were characterised by an unprecedented artificial famine in Ukraine, Kargel and his daughters survived with the help of believers (Kovalenko 1996:53).

Living in Ukraine, Kargel continued teaching and writing. When the Evangelical Christian Bible school was shut down, Kargel went on ministering among the Mennonite Brethren and Baptists. In 1932 Kargel taught Interpretation of the Revelation in the Mennonite school in Sumy until it was closed (Karetnikova 2009:49).

In 1936 a man named Morgunov from the Kiev Union of Evangelical Christians visited a number of congregations and compiled lists of all active Christian workers and delivered them to the authorities. Soon after he left, many believers got arrested in Tokari-Berezhki, Lebedino, and other places. The arrests usually took place at night after a search. In August 1936, Kargel's daughters Elizaveta and Maria were also arrested; his daughter Elena was in Leningrad at the time. On 27 April 1937 from Vasil'tsov's home in Lebedino, Kargel wrote to friends about an illness that lasted three and a half months with no hope of getting well, making it physically difficult for him to sit, walk, or even

³²⁷ Karetnikova dated Kargel's final departure from Leningrad to the beginning of the 1930's (Karetnikova 2002:686). The author tends to think that Kargel had to leave Leningrad

write (Kargel 2002:676). In another letter written around the same time Kargel mentioned his weak heart and heart attacks in March and April of 1936 (Kargel 2002:678-679). On 15 September 1937, Kargel's daughters were sentenced to five years in Siberian labour camps; they actually spent the rests of their lives in Siberia (Skopina 2002:700; Turchaninov 2009:77-78).³²⁸

Kargel was now completely alone, elderly and ill. Because his friends knew they could be arrested for sheltering him, they sent him to live in the home of an old unbeliever in Lebedino. There, on 5 August 1937, eighty-eight-year-old Kargel was arrested (Turchaninov 2009:78-79). During the search the authorities confiscated eight boxes of "sect literature", including a manuscript of his recently completed commentary on Romans (Skopina 2002:701). Kargel was thrown into an old Sumy prison built in 1650, where he spent seventeen days and was released (Kovalenko 1996:53).

Vasil'tsova, the Christian lady who was looking after Kargel after the arrest of Maria and Elizaveta, wrote to Kargel's eldest daughter Elena in Leningrad asking her to come (Skopina 2002:701). Elena did go to take care of her father, but she had to hide at her friends' because the authorities were hunting for her. Shortly after Kargel's release from prison Elena tried to return to Leningrad, but she was followed and caught on the road (Turchaninov 2009:79). Elena was arrested on 5 December 1937 (while Kargel was still alive, according to other sources) and on 9 December 1937 a so-called *troika* [the three] of the Ukrainian People's Commissariat of Internal Affairs charged her with contra-revolutionary agitation and sentenced her to death by firing squad. She was executed in Sumy at midnight on 16 January 1938 (Skopina 2002:701; Turchaninov 2009:79-80).

Kargel died through the night of 21-22 November 1937 at home (Mitskevich 1946:22-24). He was buried in Lebedino. In 1947 after ten years in Siberian labour camps, Elizaveta visited Lebedino. Maria remained in the camps for three more years (Turchaninov 2009:80). After being released they both lived in Kemerovo, Siberia, until their deaths (Turchaninov 2009:80-81).

earlier, in 1929.

³²⁸ They died in exile in Kemerovskaya area, Elizaveta in 1957, Maria in 1966 (Skopina 2002:700).



5.1.7 Conclusion

Thus one can see that Kargel played a very important role in the development of the early Russian Evangelical movement, not only in St. Petersburg but also in the rest of Russia. The question remains as to why Kargel and his writings, rather than someone else's, serve as a basis for restoring theological hermeneutics of the early Russian Evangelicals? A number of reasons can be listed.

First, Kargel was one of the first leaders in both the Evangelical and Baptist movements actively involved in ministry when both unions were being formed. Being held in high esteem by both sides whose relationships were not always smooth, he served as a bridge between the two movements (later unions) to the point that his confession of faith was adopted as the official creed by the united body of Russian Evangelicals and Baptists more than half a century after it was written.

Second, Kargel remained a key figure in both Baptist and Evangelical circles throughout his long life. Extremely energetic, he travelled extensively helping to organize churches, visiting existing congregations, taking part in many congresses, preaching, teaching, ordaining ministers, etc.

Third, Kargel pastored the Pashkovite congregation in St. Petersburg after the exile of its first leaders. This congregation in many ways became the foundation of the first Evangelical churches in Russia.

Fourth, Kargel was one of the most respected teachers at the Bible courses in St. Petersburg and in a number of other places from their very beginning to the very end where he taught major theological disciplines. These courses gave Russia most of her Evangelical and Baptist preachers and leaders for the twentieth century.

Fifth, having experienced a lot of different influences from the German Baptists and Mennonite Brethren, English Open Brethren, Caucasian Molokans, and Russian Orthodox, Kargel developed original and unique theological views for which he stood strongly. Though not ethnically Russian, he became known and accepted as "the greatest Russian Evangelical theologian".³²⁹

Sixth, Kargel was a prolific writer. Due to the respect he enjoyed among Baptist and Evangelical believers, his works (unlike those of many others) were

³²⁹ Karetnikova. Online. September 2004.

not lost in searches and confiscations during the years of Soviet persecutions. His works were carefully copied (often by hand) and faithfully preserved.

Seventh, he remained faithful to his principles to the very end in the turmoil of the Soviet persecutions of 1930s.

Eighth, Kargel and his writings are still highly respected in Evangelical Christian Baptist churches and even among Pentecostal believers. His works were published over decades in the leading Evangelical-Baptist periodicals following the World War II and are still published by Christian publishing houses, including the Orthodox.

Ninth, Kargel's biography somewhat mirrors the range of the Russian evangelical movement: he grew up in Molokan-populated Tiflis, studied at Oncken's Baptist school in Hamburg, ministered among Mennonite Brethren, considered Pashkov (a faithful follower of Open Brethren Lord Radstock) his "spiritual father", married a Pashkovite girl, served as an interpreter for another Open Brethren Dr. Baedeker, was funded by members of the Victorian Holiness movement . . . Having become a key person among Russian evangelicals, Kargel actually embodied many features of these movements long before they united historically. Taking all this into consideration permits one to use Kargel's written legacy as a source for determining Russian evangelical hermeneutical principles.

5.2 Brief Review of Kargel's Written Theological Heritage

Kargel was probably the most productive writer of the Russian evangelical movement of the period. Unfortunately, not all of his works have been preserved and printed. Some of his writings are still being discovered and published. The author's purpose in this section is to list the known works, to classify them, and to present a short description of the content and some theological tendencies. This section will serve as a literary context for further study of the chosen sections of Kargel's written heritage from a hermeneutical point of view. Thankfully, having a number of theological writings where he inevitably applied his hermeneutical principles and from time to time directly stated what he believed about the interpretation of Scripture allows one to articulate his position as well as to compare what he stated and actually did in the field of Scriptural interpretation.

5.2.1 Confession of faith

In 1913 Kargel wrote *Kratkoe izlozhenie veroucheniya Evangel'skikh Khristian* [A Short Confession of Faith of the Evangelical Christians], published by Petersburg's Second Evangelical congregation. In the confession Kargel emphasised consistent revelation of God to man in three Persons: God the Father, holy, just, and righteous; God the Son in whom love and goodness were revealed; and God the Holy Spirit who glorifies the Son, convicts people of sin, and regenerates man (Kratkoe izlozhenie 1913:1-2).

The portion of his confession which deals with Scripture is rather short. This paragraph titled "On the Word of God" comes second after the doctrine of God:

We believe that all canonical books of the Old and the New Testament, compose jointly the Bible or the Holy Scriptures (excluding the apocryphal books), by the inspiration of the Spirit of God (2 Pet 1:21), and given by the Lord (Ps 148:8-9) as indispensable and unique (Pr 30:6; Mr 7:13), and completely sufficient source for knowing God, for our salvation (Heb 1:1-2; Jn 5:39; Jn 20:31), and for knowing His will concerning our faith (Phlp 1:27) and our life (Ac 20:32; 2 Tm 3:15-17) (Kratkoe izlozhenie 1913:2).

This part of the confession is especially important for the present research because Kargel did not write specifically about his hermeneutical principles.

In general Kargel's confession falls within the lines of evangelical theology. For example, regarding sin it says, "Through the sin of one man all have been poisoned (Rom 5:12-19), and became children of wrath (Eph 2:3) and were inflicted as a punishment for sin, death" (Kratkoe izlozhenie 1913:2-3). Among the Russian Evangelical confessions Kargel's is the only one that speaks of "spiritual, physical and eternal, or the second death, that is the death after physical death" (Kratkoe izlozhenie 1913:3). Of salvation it says the following:

The only salvation is accomplished by God Himself – Jesus Christ (Acts 4:12; II Cor 5:18, 19; I Tim 2:5, 6) by the means of Christ's death for all men (Matt 20:28, Heb 2:9, I Pet 1:18-19; I Jn 2:2), the Lord offers mercifulness (Rom 3:25), reconciliation (II Cor 5:19-20; Col 1:20), forgiveness of all sins (Col 1:14; Col 2:13-14; Heb 9:22), justification (Rom 3:24; Rom 4:5; II Cor 5:21), and eternal life (Rom 6:23; Jn 3:16; Jn 5:24; I Jn 5:11-12). This salvation is accomplished by God for man, but it remains without effect for him, if the work of God is not accomplished in man. The first part has already been completed by Christ without our cooperation (Rom 5:6-8), the second part is being accomplished by the Holy Spirit with the harmony of man (Kratkoe izlozhenie 1913:3-4).

Kargel provided a definition of the universal Church, which is composed of “the saved ones (Acts 2:47), believers (Acts 4:4; Acts 5:14; Acts 6:7), called ones, saints (Rom 1:7; I Cor 1:2; II Cor 1:1; Eph 1:1, etc.), being in this world and those saved ones who are already with the Lord (Heb 12:22-23). The one and the other compose one body whose head is Christ” (Kratkoe izlozhenie 1913:5). Kargel’s confession differs from others in his views on apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors, and teachers. He believes that Jesus Christ continues to provide these offices to the church up to the present time (Kratkoe izlozhenie 1913:6).

Regarding future events, Kargel differentiates Christ’s coming to take His Church (Rapture), which will remain unseen by the world, and Christ’s coming with His own and the angels which will be seen by all:

Christ will come back after His own not seen by this world (Acts 1:10-11; I Cor 15:51-57), as a thief in the night (Matt 24:42-44; I Thes 5:2), but those who await Him will not be overtaken unexpectedly (I Thes 5:4, 5, 9, 10), and the ones ready to enter with Him in glory (Matt 25:10); those who will not be ready will remain with the unrighteous for great tribulation (Matt 24:40-41; Lk 12:45-46; Matt 25:11-13). Coming for His own, He will resurrect the dead, and both will ascend with Him (I Thes 4:16-17), in order to be always with the Lord.

But Christ will come thereupon, with His own and all the heavenly angels (Jude 14; Rev 19:11-14; Matt 16:27, 25:31) visible to all eyes (Rev 1:7; Jn 19:37; Matt 24:30). Then will begin the judgement, but only for all those living upon earth (Matt 25:32-46; Rev 19:15-19), from among the unjust none will be resurrected (Rev 20:5) until the thousand years pass of Christ’s rule with His own (Rev 20:4). After the thousand years there will be a short interval of empoisoning of the nations by Satan (Rev 20:7-10); then there will be the resurrection of the unjust (Rev 20:13) and the final judgement (Rev 20:11, 12, 13, 15) (Kratkoe izlozhenie 1913:10-11).

Strangely enough, Kargel does not mention sanctification in the confession, even though it was one of his favourite topics (Savinsky 1999:314-329).

As mentioned above, much later, in 1966, Kargel’s confession without changes was adopted as the official creed of the United Evangelical Christian and Baptist churches in Russia at the All-Russia Congress. His confession was approved by the Congress mainly because Kargel was equally respected in both Baptist and Evangelical Unions. Besides, the contents of his confession suited both sides.

Although Kargel wrote this 1913 Confession and on occasion quoted from the Short Catechism (Kargel 2002:116), it is interesting that later in his life Kargel spoke not very favourably about the idea of writing confessions or creeds, which he saw as something that could become an obstacle to the development of understanding of God and Scripture. Kargel believed that making the Scripture available to people was the main contribution of the Reformation. However, according to Kargel, the Reformers did not go much farther than developing the doctrine of justification by faith and cancelling some Catholic rituals. Then, according to Kargel, they collected and wrote down truths about faith in the form of confessions of faith, which became the foundation and cornerstone of the reformed church. This is where, according to Kargel, it stands until this day, “blocking itself the way to develop further”. Kargel concluded by saying that a confession of faith can become dangerous, “faith in a container”, whereas “children of God must every day grow in their understanding and knowledge of the Lord” (Kargel 2002:501).

5.2.2 Theological works

Kargel’s theological works are going to be reviewed in chronological order. Although most dates of writing are approximate, and some are still unidentified, the research allowed finding out at least the sequence of Kargel’s books.

5.2.2.1 *Svet iz teni budushchikh blag* [The Reflection of Glories to Come]

This “biggest and the most fundamental theological treatise from those we have written in Russian” (Karetnikova 2002:684) was written by Kargel during his stay in Lieven’s palace. The literal translation of the title is “The Light from Shadows of Future Blessings or Thirty Two Discourses about the Tabernacle, Animal Sacrifices, and Priesthood”. The title itself reveals that this book deals mostly with the Old Testament typology, especially that of the tabernacle and priesthood. Kargel strongly believed in the Christological interpretation of the Bible, as had Luther and other Reformers. For Kargel, the Old Testament was a concealed New Testament. His goal in writing this book was to show what the Old Testament images stood for and how they pointed to Christ.

The book is over four hundred pages long, making it Kargel’s lengthiest monograph. It is basically a detailed commentary on the portion of the

Pentateuch that covers Exodus 25 through Leviticus 8. Kargel touches on a variety of themes, all showing how the Old and New Testaments relate to each other, and how the Old Testament points beyond itself and foreshadows the reality of the New Testament. However, unlike most commentaries, Kargel's material is organized by topics, such as "The Tabernacle in general", "The courtyard and its curtains", "The gates, door, and curtain", "The brass altar", etc., thirty-two "talks" altogether.

According to Kargel's introduction, the book came about as a result of many years of studying this part of the Bible which presents "the shadows of Him who was to come" (Kargel 1908). The book was born out of lectures given during winter months to various groups of fellow believers, while summer months were spent mostly travelling and preaching, as well as gathering material for the "talks". It was first published in 1896 by the German publishing house *Svet na Vostoke* (Karetnikova 2009:34). In 1908 it was published by Mansfeld's publishing house in St. Petersburg; in 1909, it was published by the Mennonite Brethren publishing house in Halbstadt. In 1994 it was reprinted in St. Petersburg by *Bibliya dlya vsekh* [The Bible for everyone].

When the book first came out, a German magazine *Der Freiwillige* highly recommended these "excellent discourses" which introduce the reader to the glorious significance of Old Testament worship. It was said that Kargel had not omitted any detail of the tabernacle and the sacrificial system of the people of Israel as he searched out deep typological meaning in the Old Testament's "coal" for sparkles of the New Testament's "diamonds". Kargel found "an ocean of light in the shadows" of the Old Testament sanctuary because he saw Jesus, the light of the world (Kargel 1908:158).

This book will be a major source for my study of the topic of Kargel's typological approach to interpretation.

5.2.2.2 *Vetkhozavetnye proobrazy [Old Testament types]*

This relatively long book presents another example of Kargel's typological approach to the Old Testament. It consists of a number of articles, each discussing an Old Testament character: Abel, Enoch, Lot, Moses, Naaman, Gehazi, Isaiah, Daniel, and Ruth the Moabitess. This list includes both positive and negative characters, some to be emulated, others to serve as a warning to believers.

The part dedicated to Ruth is the lengthiest, divided into chapters, basically a commentary on this book of the Bible. Kargel's typological approach comes through quite clearly. For instance Boaz is interpreted by Kargel as a type of Christ, our heavenly Boaz (Kargel 2002:345). Ruth is viewed as a type of the Church, the Bride of Christ (Kargel 2002:372).

In general the book is devotional and reminds one of a series of sermons. It is unclear when the book was written.

5.2.2.3 V kakom ty otnoshenii k Dukhu Svyatomu? [Where do you stand in your relationship to the Holy Spirit?]

This book was written as a response to the rising Pentecostal movement. It was not intended to resolve doctrinal questions, but rather to point out the blessings available to Christians. Kargel explained that the reason he was not going to touch on doctrinal issues was that there were "enough outstanding compositions" regarding those things (Kargel 2002:114). In this way Kargel immediately states that this book is devotional in nature.

In the foreword Kargel states that his main goal was to show "directly from the Word of God and also from the experience of the Scriptural personages the great blessings which can be shared by a disciple of the Lord who has the right relationship to the Holy Spirit and because of His fullness" (Kargel 2002:114). Kargel's desire was to see the Holy Spirit having unconditional and full rights over the souls of those saved by the blood of Christ and to make them thirst for the fullness of the Spirit and not to stop until they have it (Kargel 2002:114).

Actually, the role of the Holy Spirit in a Christian's life was one of Kargel's favourite topics (Skopina 2002:696). According to Kargel, the Holy Spirit is crucial for both salvation and sanctification: "Saving faith is impossible without the Holy Spirit" (Kargel 2002:116). In this he was following Radstock, Pashkov, and other representatives of the Holiness movement.

In this book Kargel discusses the following topics: receiving the Holy Spirit, being filled with the Spirit, anointing by the Spirit, the fruit of the Spirit, the Old Testament promises concerning the Holy Spirit, etc.

Most likely this book was published in St. Petersburg in 1912. Although the copy possessed by the public library in St. Petersburg (published by *Tovarishchestvo Andersona i Loytsyanskago*) does not indicate a year of

publication, the library assigned the text to 1913. However, Karetnikova dates it as written in 1926 (Karetnikova 2009:43). In 1945 it was published in Chicago by *Russkaya i Vostochno-Evropeyskaya Missiya* [Russian and Eastern-European Mission].

5.2.2.4 Gde, po Pisaniyu, nakhodyatsya mertvye [Where are the dead according to the Scripture]

This book was written as a result of reading “Where are the dead?”, J. Edgar’s booklet in German. Kargel’s response to Edgar’s views sheds a little more light upon Kargel’s own exegesis than his other works in which he usually does not reveal the process of his encounter with the text but presents his readers only with the results and conclusions.

Commenting on Edgar’s introduction, Kargel expressed his approval of Edgar’s declared attitude towards Scripture, saying that one would tend to trust a man who states the following:

We have the Word of God and this is sufficient... Whence can we expect to receive revelation? Let us lift up our eyes to God, waiting for His answer through the Bible, and not through visions or some extra revelations... If we approach the Bible in the spirit of truth, not out of curiosity and not in the spirit of pride and prejudice, but in humility, with respect, prayer, and a desire to find out what God wants to tell us, not imposing upon the Bible our ideas and presuppositions, sooner or later we will find the truth... We cannot be wiser than the Bible; no matter how much we respect our teachers and parents, we cannot put their words higher than the infallible authority of the Bible (Kargel 2002:181).

It seems that Kargel fully agrees with these statements concerning the Bible. However, in his book he disagrees with most of Edgar’s conclusions concerning the dead and points out that it is one thing to declare biblical authority, but quite another to live out what has been declared. “It is one thing to refer to the Bible, and it is a completely different thing to let the Bible say what it has to say, and what God says through it” (Kargel 2002:182). Kargel says that especially when it comes to the Bible, people “often see only what they want to see and they close their eyes to the things they do not like” (Kargel 2002:187). Kargel calls his readers to come closer “not to human fabrications, but to the infallible Word of God and to judge for themselves what the words of Dr. Edgar with all his references to the Scripture are worth” (Kargel 2002:197).

The date of writing this apologetic work can be calculated from its text. Kargel mentions his more than fifty years of being “in faith” (Kargel 2002:192). If

1869 is the year when Kargel was converted and baptised, then the book must have been written somewhere around 1920.

5.2.2.5 *Khristos osvyashchenie nashe* [Christ is our sanctification]

This book more than any other reflects the influence of the pietistic ideas of English evangelicalism upon Kargel. The Open Brethren and the Holiness movement representatives had not laboured in vain. The believer's sanctification came to be viewed as one of the main goals of the Christian life among Russian evangelicals, in large part due to Kargel's efforts. Sanctification, along with typology and future events, was one of Kargel's favourite and best-developed themes.

"Christ is our sanctification" was written by Kargel as an answer to what he saw as an urgent problem, that is, the lack of attention to the doctrine of sanctification. Regarding the sanctification of believers, "an often neglected doctrine", Kargel writes that "some close their Bibles after the sixth or even the fifth chapter of Romans" (Kargel 2002:49).

Kargel goes on to discuss the meaning, goal, and means of sanctification. He saw sanctification as closely connected to the work of the Holy Spirit, just as justification is connected to the work of Christ. Kargel calls his readers "to give freedom to the Holy Spirit to lead us into an understanding of every truth concerning sanctification" (Kargel 2002:49). This statement, as many other similar ones, shows the importance that Kargel attached to the Holy Spirit not only in the work of sanctification in a believer's life, but also in illuminating Scriptural truths.

In the book Kargel quotes from "dear" Spurgeon's work, *By grace you are saved through faith*, as well as from the "great preacher" Moody. It seems that he held both men in high esteem and his theological views were similar to theirs. Both preachers lived at a time when rationalism was coming to the forefront. Both called not to focus on reason and on man so much, but to believe in the Bible. Like them, Kargel accepted the Bible as the Word of God and argued from a conservative exegetical tradition.

Although Kargel does not mention other authors who were writing on this subject, he may have been familiar with Brethren literature, since this topic was emphasised in their circles. He was well acquainted with Mackintosh's

commentary on the Pentateuch, so may have also come across his book *Sanctification: what is it?*

Actually, Kargel's views on sanctification seem closer to the Open Brethren teaching than to the Darbyites. Open Brethren trends, such as defining sanctification as "separation to God", designating all believers as "saints", seeing justification as the gateway to the Christian life and sanctification as a process of growth in holiness, teaching both the positional and practical meanings of sanctification (Rowdon 1990:99-100) – all these emphases can be found in Kargel as well, which will become more evident in the analysis of the text.

This book was written in 1912 (Karetnikova 2009:43); in 1926 it was published as a series of magazine articles in *Khristianin* [The Christian] № 1-9, the main periodical of the Evangelical churches at the time. Now it is available in its entirety in Kargel's "Collection of writings" published by *Bibliya dlya vsekh* in 2002.

This book plays an important role in restoring Kargel's hermeneutics because it contains a portion on the Scripture (as one of the means of sanctification), in which Kargel expounds some of his views on interpretation.

5.2.2.6 "Se, gryadu skoro..." ["Lo, I am coming soon..."]

End time events were among Kargel's favourite topics in both writing and lecturing at the Bible courses. In this book his dispensational approach comes through rather clearly. He argues for the pre-tribulation rapture of the church and Christ's second coming to inaugurate a literal millennial kingdom. However, he is not rigid when it comes to the boundaries between dispensations. He actually sees a lot of continuity between the testaments and does not look at historical periods as disconnected "boxes".

Kargel's views of future events seem to be rooted in the Darbyist understanding, which Kargel inherited indirectly from Radstock through Pashkov and the Pashkovites and then directly from Dr. Baedeker.

The date of writing can be calculated from the text of the book. Kargel mentions that nine years prior to the writing of this book an important event took place: "in 1919 Palestine found itself under the power of England". This puts the date of writing in 1928. However, Karetnikova dates it to 1909 (Karetnikova 2009:42).

5.2.2.7 *Grekh kak zlo vsekh zol v etom mire* [Sin as the greatest evil in the world]

This is a concise (only forty-four pages) and purely theological treatise written by Kargel on various aspects of sin. It is not clear when it was written and first published. An article called “Sin” was published in the USA in 1948, which included an introduction and the first chapter of the book (Makarenko, 2006). It should be mentioned that Kargel had lectured on the doctrine of sin at Bible courses in the 1920s, so this treatise may have been the result of those lectures. The treatise was included in the collection of Kargel’s writings published by *Bibliya dlya vsekh* in St. Petersburg in 2002.

The content of the booklet is reflected in its outline: sin is rebellion and an insult against holy God; sin is a deadly spiritual illness; sin is a moral defilement; sin is a gained habit; sin is a despotic power; sin is a law reigning in man; sin is a source of the most terrible consequences. Although Kargel approaches the topic of sin in a rather systematic manner operating under the above mentioned headings, this piece of writing resembles an essay far more than a monograph on a chosen topic. Kargel does not aim to present an exhaustive list of different aspects of sin and related issues. His goal is to give attention to a few characteristics of sin as he finds them presented in the Bible.

Kargel believes that most false teachings come out of a limited or mistaken understanding of what sin is (Kargel 2002:5). He writes, “Let us look at sin from God’s point of view, which is presented in the Scripture. The Bible talks about sin more than any other book. From the first to the last page it reveals the beginning, progression, and culmination of sin” (Kargel 2002:7). The only source of truth for Kargel is the Bible, which presents “God’s point of view”. Besides, what is important in the Bible (it talks a lot about sin “from the first to the last page”) automatically becomes important to Kargel as well. Then Kargel moves to soteriology, saying that, “the good news, that fills precious pages of the Bible from the beginning to the end, is salvation in Jesus Christ” (Kargel 2002:7).

Thus Kargel in his theology attaches great importance to the doctrine of sin and depravity, which in turn leads to an appreciation of the greatness of God’s salvation through Jesus Christ and finally to the importance of sanctification by the Holy Spirit. In his hamartiology and soteriology, Kargel closely follows the typical protestant line to make his case. His book contains

citations from Hopkins, Carpenter, Martens' "Christian Ethics", which gives some idea of the scope of Kargel's theological reading.

5.2.2.8 *Izliyanie Dukha Svyatogo i pyatidesyatnicheskoe dvizhenie* [The outpouring of the Holy Spirit and the Pentecostal movement]

This treatise concerns a division with Pentecostals that took place in 1923. Supposedly it is a chapter from Kargel's book "Where do you stand in your relationship with the Holy Spirit" that was missing or intentionally removed (Karetnikova 2004:5). However, the treatise under consideration must have been written after 1928, since in the text Kargel referred to an *Evangelist* magazine dated that year.

In this treatise Kargel discusses the following topics: believers' spiritual condition at the time the Pentecostal movement was spreading; the lack of believers' knowledge of God's work; what actually happened when the Holy Spirit descended to believers; and the origins of the Pentecostal movement.

Because of his prophecies and healings Kargel was considered the most "Pentecostal" preacher among other evangelical leaders in Russia (Karetnikova 2004:5), yet he speaks of the Pentecostalism growing in Russia as "a sad and wrong development" (Kargel 2004:11). Kargel considered Pentecostalism a caricature and distortion of the Holiness movement (Kargel 2004:36). In the dispute with Pentecostals, Kargel urges his readers to go to the authority of the Holy Scripture, which alone can settle "who is right and who is wrong" (Kargel 2004:15).

The book confirms the author's opinion that Kargel was quite strong on the point of continuity of the Testaments, which is important for understanding his hermeneutics. When writing of what the day of Pentecost brought to the believers, he wrote:

No, it was not regeneration that was revealed to the Church of Christ on the day of Pentecost . . . This used to happen and had to happen in the Old Testament through the Holy Spirit as well . . . Those who were converted in the Old Testament had the Holy Spirit indeed, otherwise God would not point to them as the heroes of faith... Wasn't Moses in the closest connection with the Holy Spirit? (Kargel 2004:24).

Besides, most probably, when referring to *brat K* [brother K] Kargel was talking about himself. If this guess is right, the book contains some new data about his life and ministry. Among other things Kargel mentioned that twenty

three years ago “K” lived in Estland (Estonia) (Kargel 2004:45), which would have been after 1905.

Another interesting portion of the book concerns the Holiness movement in England, although Kargel does not use the term when describing it. He talks about the 1870s as the time of a great revival among believers (Kargel 2004:33) in a way that shows his awareness of what was going on:

The Lord suddenly sent a spiritual movement of sanctification ... It began in England among seminary theologians and students with an American preacher. Those were great days for England! This movement spread in many countries and mission fields. Then, in the following years it passed to Germany, Switzerland, and all Protestant countries.

The holiness of life – this was a message of the redeemed ... it was not like it is now. Now, when they speak about sanctification they put believers under the law or personal effort. [Back then] they pointed to the power of God . . .

And they learnt that it was possible to live daily in close connection with the Lord.

For that movement it was natural to study the Word. The Word of God became the delight for tens of thousands of believers. It was not enough to hear the Word of God only on Sunday, everyone personally came to the Source of life, and the consequences were the following: a whole lot of the lost truths were brought to light again, and not only for the mind, but also for life And another truth was learnt by all: all of us were facing the Coming of the Lord . . . such wonderful, clear, and sober literature appeared . . . and for the first time in fifteen hundred years believers began paying attention to the Holy Spirit.

Great gatherings started to be held with up to eight thousand souls participating. Those were meetings about deepening of faith, about Christ’s coming, about holiness, and they lasted for weeks! Thus, the Holy Spirit gained His rights ...

In 1905 the Lord allowed one brother to be in England for three months, and he was surprised to see crowds of the children of God filled with the Holy Spirit (Kargel 2004:33-35).

Kargel did not miss the main emphasis of the evangelical revival: the Holy Spirit, the advent teaching, and the call back to the Bible. “An American preacher” who initiated the “movement of sanctification” in England must have been Moody, whom Kargel highly regarded. According to Bebbington, Moody and Sankey “greatly assisted the arrival of holiness teaching in Britain”, carrying the gospel message around the country between June 1873 and August 1875. Besides, Moody had spoken at Mildmay in 1872 and twenty years later at Keswick (Bebbington 1989:162-164). From the 1870s the Salvation Army was another “vigorous holiness organisation” (Bebbington 1989:165).

This treatise provides additional evidence that Kargel was quite taken by the Holiness movement and in full agreement with its theology and practice. It is also clear that in the late 1920s Kargel had not lost the broad-minded approach to theology that he inherited from Pashkov decades earlier. Neither was he naïve about the tendencies that were felt within Russian evangelical movement, that is, tendencies towards legalism and a shift towards human efforts in Christian living.

Bebbington points out that it was in this wartime atmosphere that Pentecostalism was born. The way had been prepared by talk of “the baptism of the Holy Ghost” in the holiness movement (Bebbington 1989:196). Russian evangelicals could not remain unaffected by this novelty, though for the most part they did not embrace Pentecostalism. And Kargel played a considerable part in this.

5.2.3 Commentaries

5.2.3.1 *Tolkovatel’ Otkroveniya svyatogo Ioanna Bogoslova* [Interpretation of the Revelation of St. John]

Like Brethren writers,³³⁰ Kargel showed much interest in prophecy, evidenced by his extensive treatment of Daniel (in his lectures) and Revelation. In this commentary Kargel continues to argue for the pre-tribulation Rapture of the Church and Christ’s second coming with his church to establish the millennium kingdom. Kargel sees the book of Revelation mainly as a prophetic one. He interprets the letters to the seven churches as being written to historical churches in Asia Minor as well as representing different periods in church history. However, Kargel does not insert strict boundaries between those periods and allows a great deal of overlapping between them (for instance, according to Kargel, the four last church types coexist).

³³⁰ For instance, Edward Irving, a revivalist preacher, was an “ardent preacher of the Second Coming . . . For him, the last days would be accompanied by a restoration of the Church and the apostles as described in the New Testament” including the gifts of the Spirit (Darby 1972:131). His thoughts, somewhat similar to those of J. N. Darby, might have influenced Radstock and possibly Kargel. According to Leskov, Radstock did not approve of Irving’s followers but held Irving’s views concerning the Second Coming of Jesus Christ and expected it any moment (Leskov 1877:131). Kargel also expected the Rapture at any moment.

Although Kargel started writing this commentary before World War I, more than seventy years went by before it was published. At the end of Kargel's book *V kakom ty otnoshenii k Dukhu Svyatomu* [Where do you stand in your relationship to the Holy Spirit] published in 1913, an announcement states that the first part of *Otkrovenie Sv. Ioanna* [The Revelation of St. John] (chapters 1 –14) was to be published in early 1913, while the second part might be ready by the end of the same year or in the beginning of the following year (Kratkoe izlozhenie 1913:160). Obviously, these plans were not realized as the situation changed before and during World War I.

In the second half of the 1920s Kargel taught at the annual Bible courses in Leningrad. Among his subjects were Revelation and the Second Coming of Christ. It was then that his second major theological work was being shaped. Circulating manuscripts were dated 1924 and 1928. Unfortunately, as already mentioned, the book "Interpretation of the Revelation of Saint John," was not published during Kargel's lifetime. It was first published in Toronto in 1986 (Kovalenko 1996:53), then in Russia in 1991 by the Orthodox publishing house. The final version of the book is based on forty-three lectures by Kargel to ministers of the Word from among the Evangelical Christians and Baptists in the early 1930s in Leningrad (Kargel 1991:3).

5.2.3.2 *Zakon Dukha zhizni: Tolkovanie glav 5,6,7,8 Poslaniya svyatogo apostola Pavla k Rimlyanam* [The law of the Spirit of life: Commentary of the chapters 5,6,7,8 of the Epistle of Saint Apostle Paul to the Romans]

This commentary on Romans, written shortly before Kargel's death, should certainly be regarded as one of the most mature fruits of his exegetical work. It was finished by 1937 when the Soviet authorities seized Kargel's archive, which supposedly contained the manuscript of the commentary. For a long time the manuscript was considered lost. It was restored due to the efforts of Ukrainian believers who copied its chapters by hand and carefully preserved them (Kargel 2003:3). The chapters were published as a separate book in 2003 in St. Petersburg by *Bibliya dlya vsekh*.

Indeed, the Epistle to the Romans has a long history of interpretation. It was a favourite of St. Augustine and Martin Luther. Luther, Calvin, and Melanchthon wrote commentaries on it. Nevertheless, Kargel chose this Epistle as an object of his close attention and wrote his own commentary on it, holding

strongly to the protestant tradition of interpretation of the Epistle. He sees justification as a free gift from God, not of works. Kargel stresses God's side, His love and His grace, in salvation (Kargel 2003:17).

Kargel deals with the Epistle to Romans verse-by-verse, clause-by-clause, constantly referring to parallel passages. He is very aware of the Bible context as a whole, especially of the New Testament context, although, as in the rest of his writings, he does not reveal his exegetical process in detail.

In his commentary Kargel quotes a number of other authors: Dr. David Brawn (Kargel 2003:14, 26, 46, 49, 82), Dr. Godel (Kargel 2003:34), Woltersdorf (Kargel 2003:202), Hopkins (Kargel 2003:131, 137, 141), A. Murray³³¹ (Kargel 2003:206), and O. Stockmayer (Kargel 2003:179, 188). These references indicate the scope of his theological reading and interests, and at least were the authors whose books Kargel had on hand during his last years of life in Ukraine.

5.2.4 Lectures

A course of lectures compiled in Leningrad in 1926 was published by *Bibliya dlya vsekh* only in 2006. It is Kargel's attempt to look at universal history from a Scriptural point of view. In Kargel's words, the Bible was written in order to reveal the past, the present, and the future (Kargel 2006:7).

These lectures³³² consist of twelve sections starting from "Creation and its fall" and ending with "Heaven and the new earth". Then there are three sketches added: "Universal history from the book of Daniel 2:1-45", "History of Israel in seventy weeks", and "History of the church", based on John's letters to the seven churches in Revelation.

Kargel's section titles are of particular interest because they make it possible to compare his position with that of the dispensationalists. The whole course of lectures revolves around four "ways" or "lines" which go through the Scripture: the first has to do with the development of the humankind in general; the second deals with the destiny of the chosen people, ethnic Israel; the third

³³¹ A reformed South African writer, Andrew Murray was mentioned above in connection with Jessie-Penn Lewis.

³³² In these lectures Kargel refers a couple of times to the Greek and Hebrew texts of the Bible, as well as to other translations (Kargel 2006:58, 112, 123).

concerns the church; the fourth considers the spiritual and moral condition of all people from the beginning of universal history to the very end (Kargel 2006:20-21).

In “Creation and its fall” Kargel states, that the earth in its original state presented the Kingdom of God designed for a sinless man (Kargel 2006:11). When created, Adam was “perfect, but not perfected”, “clean, but not glorified” (Kargel 2006:14). After the fall “the world became the ruins of the original creation . . . The whole history of humankind took a different direction” (Kargel 2006:18).

The second section, “The way of man”, discusses the mainstream history of humanity, the majority of people who took the “broad road” (Kargel 2006:20). Kargel talks about the major world civilisations: Egypt, Assyria, Babylon, Medo-Persia, Greece, and Rome (Kargel 2006:28-32).

In the third section, “The way of God: An attempt to restore the Kingdom of God with Israel”, Kargel attempts to trace what the Lord was doing through believers during all this time. Since people had lost the ability to perceive God’s revelations, God chose one nation – the people of Israel – in order to communicate with the rest of the world (Kargel 2006:35). Kargel concentrates on Abraham and Moses, and on Israel’s wanderings in the desert. Other subtitles include: “The time of judges or theocracy”, “The time of kings”, “The second rejection of the King by Israel” (that is, the rejection of Jesus Christ), and “The third rejection of the King, and rejection of Israel” (that is, rejection of the disciples’ message after Pentecost and God’s rejection of Israel as a nation). Kargel argues that God’s kingdom was offered to the Jews, but because they rejected it, it was put off for a time, until the millennial kingdom (Kargel 2006:57).

In sections four and five titled “The Way of God. The Church” and “The Rapture” respectively, Kargel deals with the church. According to Kargel, after Israel was temporarily rejected, “we observe an appearance of a new, never seen before, building of God. The Church of Christ appeared. It is not, as many think, the continuation of building of the Kingdom of God started by Israel. This is something new and higher” (Kargel 2006:57, 58). Although the prophets knew about the coming of the Lord as a sacrificial lamb to save the world, they could not see what would be taking place between the first coming and Christ’s claiming the throne of David (Kargel 2006:59).

According to Kargel, all periods of church history, as well as all congregations and local churches, have their prototypes in the seven churches of the first three chapters of Revelation (Kargel 2006:119). After that Kargel does not find the church mentioned again, concluding that the church will be raptured and will be with Christ, not on earth, during God's great judgements of the world (Kargel 2006:121). The Rapture of believers will be a mystery for the world; the world will not even notice it (Kargel 2006:75). At the Rapture only those found ready will be taken up, while the rest will experience the terrible times of the Great Tribulation and Antichrist's reign (Kargel 2006:97).

Section six is titled "Gathering and restoration of Israel". After the Rapture God will turn to Israel and His line will continue. In 1926 Kargel was certain that Jews would be gathering in Palestine even before the Rapture and establish an independent state there (Kargel 2006:88).

Sections seven and eight deal with Antichrist. "Sin is progressing . . . until it reaches its highest expression in Antichrist" (Kargel 2006:17). The whole world will come under the total power of the devil who will be reigning through Antichrist for three and one-half years (Kargel 2006:99, 115).

Section nine is dedicated to God's judgements over the people living on the earth. The righteous and the unrighteous will get what was coming to them. The earth will be cleansed and prepared for the millennial reign of the Lord. Israel will accept her Messiah (Kargel 2006:135).

Section ten is titled "Millennial kingdom of Christ". This peaceful period will last one thousand literal years (Kargel 2006:141).

Section eleven is titled "The last revolt of the devil and the judgement over the dead. The final judgement". According to Kargel, at the end of the millennium kingdom Satan will be released to tempt the living (Kargel 2006:155). This will have tragic consequences: nations will follow Satan and make war against Israel. However, this second attempt to conquer Israel (the first one took place just before the Millennial kingdom) is doomed. The devil will be thrown into the lake of fire (Kargel 2006:156-158). Then the last and final judgement will take place. All dead will be resurrected for this judgement (Kargel 2006:158-159). Although it is believed by some that the earth will be completely destroyed, Kargel insists that the earth will be cleansed and renewed (Kargel 2006:158).

The last section is titled “Heaven and new earth. The third world – eternity”. This new earth, according to Kargel, is earth without sin and evil (Kargel 2006:161). The description of New Jerusalem based on Revelation 21 is understood quite literally by Kargel (Kargel 2006:162-163).

The wording and content of Kargel’s lectures point to the connection of Kargel’s work to that of Darby and the Brethren. However, the idea of dividing biblical history into epochs preceded Darby. Kargel’s list of main periods drastically differs from Darby’s or Scofield’s dispensations. As a matter of fact, Kargel distinguishes only three main periods in human history, which he calls “three worlds”: the first world was destroyed by the flood; the second world will be destroyed by fire; and the third beautiful world, the new heaven and new earth, will last for eternity (Kargel 2006:22). Although Kargel’s scheme has a number of subdivisions, one cannot find blind repetitions of dispensations such as “innocence”, “conscience”, “law”, or “grace”. Nowhere does Kargel refer specifically to Darby or Scofield, suggesting nothing more than indirect influence by the Brethren.

Nevertheless, Kargel’s approach to scriptural interpretation can be classified as dispensational. Besides dividing the Bible into historical ages characterized by different economies, Kargel held a number of typically dispensational views. For example, he was premillennialist and pretribulationist, he expected Daniel’s seventieth week to take place in the future, he made a distinction between Israel and the church, and he believed in the future salvation and restoration of the nation of Israel. It should be pointed out that in spite of his “dispensationalism”, Kargel held to a great degree of continuity between the Testaments, as will be shown below in detailed studies of some excerpts from his books. However, the contradiction is illusory. As a matter of fact, Kargel’s second epoch includes time from the flood to the judgement by fire; hence he does not make any major divisions in the salvific history between the Old and the New Testament.

5.2.5 Sermons and discourses

The list of Kargel’s sermons and articles will probably never be complete, as more and more of them are being found in hand-copied notebooks. Overall, Kargel’s sermons are devotional in character; theologically they present a condensed and popularised version of his books. For example, *Neuznanny*

voskresshiy Gospod' [Unrecognized resurrected Lord]³³³ is a simple sermon about how the disciples on a number of occasions did not recognize the resurrected Christ and had to learn to recognize Him in spirit. Kargel's application: the same way present day believers are so overwhelmed by everyday troubles that they forget that He is not far and cares for them, "He still asks if we have any food, and He knows that we have nothing, but He is ready to feed us. Unfortunately, while 'fishing' we tend to forget that He has a meal ready for us".

A few of Kargel's sermons were published in *Khristianin* [The Christian], the major periodical of the Evangelical Christians. Among them are *Kto zhazhdet* [Who is thirsty] (1906) and *Kak dostich' zhelannoy pristani* [How to reach the desired harbour] (1907).

A number of Kargel's sermons were published in the Christian magazine *Vera i zhizn'* [Faith and life]. One of them is called *Gospod' vpered* [The Lord is ahead] (1980). Another article, *Ispolnyaytes' Dukhom* [Be filled with the Spirit] (1981), suggests that a believer gets filled with the Spirit more than once, that a person is filled by the Spirit in order to serve others, and that the Holy Spirit should not be separated from Christ.³³⁴ One more sermon, *Chto Bog думаet obo mne?* [What does God think of me?] in *Vera i zhizn'*, is signed with the initials I.K. and should probably also be attributed to Kargel.³³⁵

Makarenko mentions a sermon *Grekh* [Sin] published in 1948 in New York, NY by the publishing house "Put' Very", a body the Russian evangelical movement (Makarenko, 2006).

Almost fifty of Kargel's discourses were published in 2006 by *Bibliya dlya vsekh* (Kargel 2006:189-355). The author is not going to discuss them in detail, but some titles speak for themselves:

Beseda o tselomudrii [A discourse about chastity];

Zhizn' po ploti [Life according to flesh];

Put' k zhizni v Boge [The way to life in God];

Ispolnenie Dukhom [Filling by the Spirit];

Izbavlenie ot vlasti grekha [Deliverance from the power of sin];

Osnovnoy zakon kresta [The main law of the cross];

³³³ Kargel. Online. 26 November 2004.

³³⁴ Kargel 1981.

Pokoy v kreste [Peace in the cross];
Chtoby ne vpast' v iskusshenie [Not to fall into temptation];
Nashe edinenie so Khristom [Our union with Christ];
Zhizn' s izbytkom [Life with abundance];
Zapechatleny Dukhom Svyatym [Sealed by the Holy Spirit];
Proshchenie i ochishchenie [Forgiveness and cleansing];
Ne unyvay [Do not get discouraged];
Molitvennaya zhizn' [The life of prayer];
Vosstanavlivayushchaya blagodat' [Restoring grace], etc

Among these, one discourse stands out as especially important to this research: *Chtenie Biblii s blagosloveniem* [Reading of the Bible with blessing], in which Kargel suggests an answer to the question as to when believers get blessings from Scripture reading. He lists six points. First, it happens when believers get answers to their urgent questions from reading the Bible. Second, it happens when believers read the Bible not only seeking something for themselves but thinking of God's plans and desires. Third, it happens when the Word creates a firm spiritual foundation in believers. Fourth, it happens when the Word is fulfilled in the lives of believers. Fifth, it happens when Christ, the Eternal Word, speaks to believers through the written Word. Sixth, it happens when believers dedicate the first half hour of every day to reading the Word (Kargel 2006:316-317).

Some ideas from Kargel's discourse sound like suggestions from the Pashkovite *Kratkoe rukovodstvo k chteniyu Novogo Zaveta* [Short guide to the reading of the New Testament] (1882). For example, Kargel writes, "Some are mistaken thinking that they have to understand the whole chapter that they have read. It is not necessary. It is sufficient to get from the chapter what is needed for this day. And for this end sometimes one verse or even one word is enough" (Kargel 2006:316).

5.2.6 Letters

Over the years Kargel carried out extensive personal written correspondence. For instance, in a letter to brothers in Kiev (1925) he

³³⁵ Kargel. Online. 26 November 2004.

mentioned that this was his twenty-seventh letter since the last congress (Kargel 1925:19), not to mention that this particular letter was thirty-two printed pages long.

This letter deserves special attention. It was published under the title *Nuzhna li subbota? Pis'mo I. V. Kargelya Sovetu Kievskogo Oblastnogo Souza Ev. Khristian* [Do we need Sabbath? I. V. Kargel's letter to the Council of Kiev Regional Union of the Evangelical Christians]. The letter was written at the request of the Council of Kiev Regional Union of the Evangelical Christians. Evidently the Council was experiencing some problems with the Adventists that Kargel addressed in his letter.

Furthermore, the text of the letter is another evidence of Kargel's dispensational approach to interpreting the Old and the New Testaments. He stated that "there is a clear difference between the people of Israel and the Church of Christ; they should never be confused" (Kargel 1925:20). As for the future of the people of Israel, they "are being kept for the earthly Kingdom of God during the millennium" (Kargel 1925:20), whereas "the Church is heavenly people . . . their kingdom is not of this world" (Kargel 1925:20). Kargel does not find any references to "the children of God of the New Covenant" after the end of the seventh chapter of Revelation, when "the last atoned by Christ from all tribes and peoples and tongues enter the glory (Rev. 7, 9) . . . The rest of the book deals with Israel and nobody else" (Kargel 1925:31). These views are in perfect harmony with Brethren dispensationalism for which "a distinction between Israel and the church is the essential distinguishing factor" (Blaising 1988:273). Today Kargel would be labelled as "pretrib" and "premil".

Another important feature of the letter is Kargel's reference to the original text of the New Testament when answering the questions of the Kiev brothers (Kargel 1925:30), indicating that he may have been able to read Greek after all.

Another letter that deserves special attention is Kargel's letter to Zhidkov³³⁶ written when Kargel was eighty-two years old. It was his answer to the AUCECB, a response "to the first menacing strike of antichrist against the Churches of Christ – to the suggestion to approve collaboration of the church with the state, that is, to approve the state's attempt to interfere in the life of the

³³⁶ This letter can be found in the Appendix to Kargel's *Tolkovatel' Otkroveniia* (Kargel 1991:262-266), as well as in *Lektsii, besedy, pis'ma* (Kargel 2006:359-364).

Church” (Kargel 1991:262). In order to receive some financial support from the AUCECB Kargel was required to answer two questionnaires which he refused to do for several reasons.

The first questionnaire inferred that Kargel was supposedly continuing his ministry; since he was feeling rather weak he thought that signing it would be a lie (Kargel 1991:262-263). The second questionnaire included questions concerning his attitude towards the Ninth and the Tenth Congresses of the Evangelical Christians. In his letter Kargel states that he had spoken openly at both Congresses on the military issue, and did so in the presence of the authorities (Kargel 1991:263), therefore he did not see any need to repeat what he had already said. Furthermore, he objected to questions about one’s social origin:

The whole questionnaire “breezes the spirit of this age. It aims to reveal who you were, my dear, prior to your spiritual rebirth, and who your parents were, you, miserable member of the evangelical congregation. If your father happened to be a merchant or you are a merchant yourself, then your membership loses any value, no matter how dedicated to the Lord you are now; and woe to you, son, if your father was an officer in the former troops, and on the contrary, you are blessed if your father happened to serve in the Red Army. And woe to you forever if your parents or you were landowners. This is an unforgivable sin . . . With horror I see the Leningrad congregation that come together to perform the breaking of bread with membership cards received after signing these questionnaires (Kargel 1991:264-265).

Along with his letter Kargel sent back a prepayment (Kargel 1991:266).

Some of Kargel’s last letters *Iz pisem Kargelya* [From Kargel’s letters] were added to the Collection of his writings. These and a number of newly found letters were published in 2006 in St. Petersburg (Kargel 2006:357-410). These are mainly the letters written from Ukraine to his friends Yuliya Yakovlevna and Avgust Mikhaylovich.

A letter dated 31 August 1933 was written in Tokari-Berezhki. In this letter he mentions *grustnyy paralich* “sad paralysis”, meaning the spiritual depression he had experienced. He encourages his correspondent to restore the union with the Lord, and reminds him about the believer’s unchanging position in Christ (Kargel 2002:671).

In a letter dated 3 March 1934, also written from Tokari-Berezhki, Kargel thanks his friends for a parcel and encourages them stay close to the Lord.

The letter dated 27 April 1937 was written from Vasil'tsov's home in Lebedino. In this letter Kargel mentions his illness and discusses the reality of Colossians 1:26-29, "Christ in you, the hope of glory" (Kargel 2002:676-678).

In the last letter included in the "Collection of writings", probably written in early 1937, Kargel mentions the heart problems he had been having for a few years. Because of the heart attacks he could not write for seven months. The whole letter is permeated with Kargel's hopeful waiting for the Lord to take him (Kargel 2002:678-679).

5.2.7 Conclusion

Compared to other Russian Evangelical or Baptist writers, the corpus of Kargel's writing is quite extensive, probably the largest. It is one of the reasons why Kargel is considered a major Russian Evangelical theologian. His writings raise traditional protestant themes, such as human depravity, salvation provided by God, and the sanctification of believers. However, his favourite topics came from the areas of pneumatology, typology, prophecy, and eschatology.

The style of Kargel's dealing with biblical text is more "systematic" than "biblical". Kargel was well acquainted with the Bible text as a whole and he normally worked within the entire biblical context. In his arguments he referred to the passages dealing with an issue throughout the whole Bible, from the beginning to the end. At the same time, he did not concentrate much on the immediate context of the passage. Seeing the Bible as God's Word and the Holy Spirit as its divine author, Kargel treated the biblical text as a monolith. He placed the whole process of exegesis (reading, understanding, and applying Scripture to one's life) under the power of the Holy Spirit

The goal of most of Kargel's works was not the solving of theoretical problems in theology, but the edification of believers. This made his works rather devotional in nature. Unfortunately, Kargel did not have anything written specifically on his hermeneutical approach, although he could not help applying certain principles of interpretation when dealing with Scripture. As a result, one often has to read between the lines to discover Kargel's hermeneutics.

When reading Kargel's works in chronological order, it is hard to find any major changes in his theological views that might have taken place over the years. Perhaps this is because Kargel published his first known theological treatise in his late fifties, well settled in his views, beliefs, and approaches to

Scripture, and finished his last commentary to Romans not long before his death at age 82.

Finally, it should be mentioned that although Kargel's books are mostly devotional, they are not easy to read. The difficulty may be the result of average (rather than excellent) translations into Russian from his original German. With few exceptions, only translations have been published; unfortunately, the author could not find any traces of the German originals.

5.3 Inductive study of Kargel's hermeneutics

It has been suggested that in some sense the history of the church can be viewed as a history of differences in the interpretation of Scripture, especially since the Reformation.³³⁷ This approach is not surprising if one takes into account the large value the Reformers attached to Scripture. The way it was interpreted and understood was to govern the life of individual Christians and the church in the whole, hence to determine the development of the church history. Thus, church history is closely connected to the history of scriptural interpretation. For those who reject tradition and rely only on Scripture to determine their theology, hermeneutics³³⁸ makes all the difference in the world. "Barth was always clear that every theology stands or falls as a hermeneutic and every hermeneutic stands or falls as a theology" (Woodbridge & Balmer 1983:325). The Russian evangelicals were also dedicated to the *Sola Scriptura* principle. The question is: how did they interpret the Scripture?

In order to answer this question the author is going to take a closer look at Kargel's hermeneutical position. His place in the Russian Evangelical movement is assumed. Besides, Kargel serves an excellent reflection of the early stage of the Russian Evangelical movement because he embraced, embodied, and then expressed in his writings the influences that shaped the movement itself. In a way he personified the movement and captured it in his writings. However, Kargel's theological position was not a mechanical sub-total of Brethren-Baptist-Mennonite influences. His position was his own, one he arrived at as a result of lifelong Scripture reading, church ministry, interaction with a variety of people, thinking, preaching, and writing . . .

Therefore before attempting to compare Kargel's position to that of other people and movements, the author should let Kargel speak for himself and

³³⁷ Ebeling G., *Kirchengeschichte als Geschichte der Auslegung der Heiligen Schrift*, 1947, in Braaten 1968:150; Dyck 1984:29.

³³⁸ The term is used widely and can refer to almost anything these days. It "has become increasingly popular in recent decades. As a result it has been pulled and stretched every which way. With so many writers using the word, it seems to behave as a moving target" (Kaiser & Silva 1994:15). In order to avoid ambiguity when discussing "hermeneutics" the author is going to stick to the definition of hermeneutics as the discipline that deals with "methodological rules to be applied in exegesis" (Braaten 1968:151).

determine what views he actually held before his position gets lost in a crowd of “influences”.

According to Kargel's own statements, he held canonical Scripture as the only source of theological truth (Kratkoe izlozhenie 1913). So, the same question comes up. How did he interpret Scripture? Nowhere does Kargel explicitly state the principles of his theological hermeneutics, his theory of understanding and dealing with Scripture. However, without addressing the issue of hermeneutics in particular (the term "hermeneutical principles" would sound very alien in Kargel's mouth), throughout his works Kargel refers to what can be called his hermeneutical presuppositions. Most importantly, he must have had a theory in mind when interpreting Scripture. Therefore it must be possible to cull his hermeneutical principles from his writings. Then, by comparing these stated principles and the hermeneutics implied in his way of doing exegesis, one may judge how coherent was his hermeneutical methodology.

Now, what is the author's methodology of reconstructing Kargel's hermeneutics? In most general terms, the author is going to have a close look at Kargel's theological writings and make observations concerning any hermeneutical rules that might have governed Kargel's interpretation of the Bible. Then the author will attempt to synthesize the results of such primary analysis into a summary which will, to some extent, represent Kargel's theory of understanding the Bible.

Any analysis presupposes using some kind of quest applied to the original data, in our case, the body of Kargel's writings. This quest is always artificial and external to the original data; it cannot follow from the data. And with it one must remember that not all questions are equally useful. Yoder made this valuable statement concerning the studies in the hermeneutics of the sixteenth century Anabaptists:

We hope to get immediate light from the sixteenth century on the questions referred to today as 'the hermeneutical problem,' we are asking the wrong question of the sixteenth century. We can get light, but must do it indirectly and without any prior assumption that the answers defined there will be immediately applicable. We cannot ask what their answers were; at the most we can observe how they went about asking their questions (Yoder 1984:16).

Keeping this in mind, the author does not expect Kargel to supply articulate answers to the hermeneutical problems of the present time. Nor will

the author approach Kargel with a convenient set of questions derived from the modern hermeneutical debate. Even if the author tried to do so, the answers would not be there. The material itself will suggest the questions to be asked. In this way the author proposes evaluating Kargel's hermeneutics within the framework of his own theological methodology, letting him set his own stage, so to speak. So, the questions the author asks will be revolving around possible assumptions and notions in Kargel's mind that caused him to interpret Scripture one way or the other.

In the corpus of Kargel's writings presently available to the author, there are parts where Kargel specifically deals with the Scripture. These parts will be arbitrarily chosen by the author for further analysis as most representative of his exegesis, his treatment of various biblical genres (prophecy, epistles, history, apocalypse), and his views on biblical trustworthiness and authoritativeness. Working with bigger sections will do greater justice to Kargel's text than making some general statements *a priori* and then using his text as a framework for quotations.

From here on the author will be working with chosen pieces of Kargel's text in detail, offering a parallel translation from Russian into English and adding the author's immediate observations. All this work will be organized in the tables available in the Appendix. Each table will contain a separate portion from one of Kargel's books. The author will be referring to the tables in the following way. "T" stands for table; the first number is a particular table number, the second is the number of a particular paragraph within the table. For example, T 1.1 means the first paragraph from the first table. Underlining in the text within the tables is mine.

The result will be an unordered mass of immediate observations with overlaps. The next stage is to systematise this intermediate set of data into some structure. The procedure consists of applying some artificial logical algorithm (a number of operations) with a goal of finding and excluding repetitions, determining which points hold the greatest importance for Kargel, and determining connections and subordination of these points. This procedure will hopefully lead to formulating the final summary of Kargel's hermeneutical principles.

The whole process of moving from the original data (Kargel's theological writings) to the organized hermeneutical system that was supposedly implied by

Kargel is by nature an inductive process. However, the author fully realises that the results obtained through this research strongly depend on the method of analysis and synthesis being applied to the original and intermediate accumulation of data.

Only then will the author proceed to the second goal: to discover some theological and historical roots of Kargel's hermeneutics, and to demonstrate how he related to different traditions of Bible interpretation. The author fully understands that Kargel did not labour in a theological vacuum; he encountered a number of theologians and movements as discussed above. Comparing Kargel's point of view with those of others can help to gain further insight into the distinctives of Kargel's methodology. Besides, the subject of Kargel's indebtedness to earlier sources and traditions has not been sufficiently explored.

The review of Kargel's background suggested that he had been exposed to the influences of Mennonite, Baptist, Brethren, and Orthodox views. Hence the author would expect to find certain issues addressed by Kargel: teaching on holiness, an emphasis on eschatology, dispensationalism, a typological interpretation of the Old Testament, believer's baptism, church membership and discipline, and the Lord's Supper.

Finally, the author also realizes that the obtained results will be open-ended and open to criticism, and that vulnerability cannot be evaded.

5.3.1 Case study 1. Based on a section from the book, "Where do you stand in your relationship to the Holy Spirit"

In this case study the author is going to examine Kargel's hermeneutical principles applied to his treatment of a portion of Old Testament prophecy, that is, Kargel's hermeneutics at work in a chosen area.

This book of sixty-six pages contains nine chapters. Kargel discusses the following topics: receiving the Holy Spirit, being filled with the Spirit, anointment by the Spirit, fruit of the Spirit, the Old Testament promises concerning the Holy Spirit, etc. A brief review of the chapters will provide some context for the piece chosen for closer examination.

Chapter one, "Have you received the Holy Spirit?", is based on Acts 19:1-2. Kargel attempts to answer two main questions: "How is this serious

question concerning the Holy Spirit applicable to the present time?" and "How can we know that we have received the Holy Spirit?"

An exposition on "the power from above" follows in chapter two. The main questions here are: "What is meant by this power from above?" and "What was meant by the promise of the power from above?" The main frame of reference here is passages from the Gospel of John and the Acts of Apostles.

Chapter three focuses on the call to be filled with the Spirit, based on Ephesians 5:18. Chapter four concentrates on Christ's example of being filled with the Holy Spirit.

The subject of chapter five is the Spirit's anointing. Beginning with 1 John 2:20, 27, Kargel explains what anointing is, what it produces, how it works, and finally how a person can receive it. Chapter six deals with the fruit of the spirit. The main passage here is Galatians 5:22-23; the rest of the quotations also come mainly from the Epistles.

Chapter seven is about the Old Testament promise of the Holy Spirit and the present day believers. This chapter will be used for a case study with the purpose of determining Kargel's hermeneutics and it will be examined in detail (see Table 1).

Chapter eight discusses how believers can be filled by the Holy Spirit – the Spirit of the Pentecost. This Spirit was on Christ and He promised Him to His disciples. The Spirit can be given only to believers, and receiving the Holy Spirit puts the end to spiritual drought.

Chapter nine also deals with the Old Testament. In this chapter Kargel works with two examples from Second Kings, those of Elijah and Elisha, and ends up showing what believers can learn from those examples in order to obtain the same kind of Spirit. According to Kargel, the Holy Spirit is crucial for both salvation and sanctification: "Saving faith is impossible without the Holy Spirit" (Kargel 2002:116).

The following are a few principles that follow from of the examined portion of Kargel's text.

5.3.1.1 Biblical pattern of promise and fulfilment

When dealing with the fulfilment of the Old Testament prophecy found in the book of Joel, Kargel examines what Joel's prophesy actually promised, compares it to the events of Pentecost when Peter quoted Joel speaking about

the outpouring of God's Spirit "upon all flesh", and comes to the conclusion that when taken literally the prophecy was not completely fulfilled in the first century (T 1.2, T 1.4, T 1.6, T 1.7). Hence, Kargel resorts to the theory of partial fulfilment of prophecy and seems to hold it strongly.

Kargel also seems to believe that people can delay or speed up the fulfilment of God's plans depending on their spiritual condition and consequent actions (T 1.5). It is notable that in Kargel's exposition of the text of Acts 2:16-21 he develops some trains of thought that one can find in Bruce's commentary written more than half a century later: "Certainly the outpouring of the Spirit on a hundred and twenty Jews could not in itself fulfil the prediction of such outpouring 'upon all flesh'; but it was the beginning of the fulfilment" (Bruce 1977:68).

Kistemaker also points out the absence of any indication that at Pentecost God fulfilled Joel's prediction of signs and wonders. Furthermore, on none of the occasions described by Luke as outpourings of the Holy Spirit in Jerusalem, Samaria, Caesarea, and Ephesus "did the people see signs in nature as Joel predicted them" (Kistemaker 1990:90). Thus the fact that the signs and wonders as Joel predicted them were not recorded around the days of Pentecost is generally recognised by commentators. Kargel goes further and suggests that since they did not happen then, they are still awaiting fulfilment (T 1.5, T. 1.7).

5.3.1.2 *Apocalyptic approach*

Kargel states that Joel's prophecy concerns his [Kargel's] time. He strongly believed that he was actually living during the "the last days" (T. 1.5, T 1.12). Kargel was certainly not alone in the succession of theologians and lay believers who have thought they were living in the last days.

According to Coad, at Plymouth "the tenor of the teaching was strongly apocalyptic" (Coad 1968:67). Coad points out that "much of the teaching and testimony of the church was based upon prophetic interpretation, and upon the apocalyptic expectations of apostasy and judgement which this study generated" (Coad 1968:68). J. N. Darby, whose views could have influenced Kargel, was not the only one whose "doctrine of Church was built up under expectation of the imminent Christ's return, which he dated on one occasion to 1842" (Coad 1968:121). Actually, many Christians through the centuries "have

been unable to maintain the tension of the possibility of the return of Christ in their time and have felt compelled to set the date for the Second Coming” (Clouse 1977:27).

Around 1839 Darby wrote words that could be easily mistaken for Kargel’s:

For me, the near coming of the Saviour, the gathering together of His own, and the sanctification and joy of those who are manifested are always the thought predominant in my soul. There is every appearance that the Lord is hastening the time.³³⁹

The connection Darby makes between the nearness of the Lord’s return and sanctification of His own was very typical of Kargel as well (T. 1.7).

Kargel’s main argument for the Second Advent being near at hand is the number of certain signs of the last days (T 1.5). It seems that Kargel understands the expression “the last days” as “the days just before the end” (T 1.5) which is “the real focus of meaning” (Newman & Nida 1972:43). Among those signs of the last days Kargel mentions the decline of the Christian Church, war rumours and the invention of new deadly weapons, the activity of the “red dragon”, the national awakening and aspirations of the Jews, powerful manifestations of the Holy Spirit, and great awakenings among Christians in different parts of the world (T 1.5).

These arguments were not new either. In 1816, Lewis Way, an Anglican clergyman, stressed in his “Letters” the importance of the return of the Jews to Palestine that was supposed to take place before Jesus Christ’s return:

This new stress on the Jews carried with it another and more literalistic interpretation of some of the Old Testament prophecies referring to Israel. When the prophets spoke predictively of Israel they meant Israel and not the church. Thus one of the most important planks of premillennialism was nailed down . . . In the immediate post-Napoleonic era, events took place that appeared to confirm the premillennial view for a number of British Christians . . . between 1815 and 1830 – they saw a number of signs that indicated the nearness of the Second Coming. And it appeared as if these signs were being fulfilled before their very eyes. One sign was the conversion of Jews . . . Another sign of the nearness of the Second Advent was the preaching of the gospel throughout the world (Rennie 1977:45-46).

Then, according to Rennie, there appeared a political opportunity for the return of the Jews. “In addition, there were signs of apostasy in much of the church

³³⁹ Letters, Vol. I, pp. 31-32 (letter of November 22), 1839, in Coad 1968:113.

[due to Rationalism] and thus the end was near” (Rennie 1977:47). Besides, there was “a sense of upheaval and chaos in society as a whole. The fabric of British life was being strained” (Rennie 1977:48).

Kargel was writing his book after the first Russian revolution of 1905-1907 and two years before World War I broke out. The political situation in Russia was reminiscent of Great Britain a century earlier; the fabric of Russian life was also being strained. The opportunity for Jews to return to Palestine was becoming more possible. Rationalism was stronger and more widespread. The preaching of the gospel was extending even farther in the world.

Indeed, Kargel’s apocalyptic expectations were closely connected with his pessimistic view on the condition of Christendom. However, Kargel’s “decline of the Christian Church” (T 1.1) does not sound as bad as Darby’s “ruin of the Church” proclaimed almost a century earlier (Coad 1968:121). So, Kargel did expect the day of the Lord to take place any time (T 1.5, T 1.12) and was quite certain that his days were the last days. However, he never went so far as to predict the exact year of Christ’s advent.

5.3.1.3 “Latter rain” expectations

As far as the future of the church was concerned, Kargel was more optimistic than Darby and actually expected another Pentecost (T 1.1). This follows out of his literalistic interpretation of Joel’s prophecy (T 1.6, T 1.7), as well as out of the theory of partial fulfilment of the prophecy (T 1.2, T 1.4, T 1.6). The expectation of a great outpouring of the Spirit before “the end” (T 1.5) did not originate with Kargel either. Almost a century earlier premillennialists expected “a special ministry of the Holy Spirit in at least part of the church just prior to the Lord’s return – a ‘latter rain’ – and that this would be accompanied by charismatic activity” (Rennie 1977:48). It was an exciting time:

When news of the expression of the charismatic gifts reached London from Scotland in the early summer of 1830, prophetic anticipation reached a new high in certain circles. . . . Around 1830 many of the premillennialists looked for such outpouring of the Holy Spirit prior to the Second Advent (Rennie 1977:52).

It is hard to say how exactly these Brethren ideas reached Kargel. Did they come through the Darby-Radstock-Pashkov channel, through Baedeker, Müller, or one of those Keswick speakers who visited St. Petersburg, or, perhaps, from reading literature? It is not clear. Considering Kargel’s

connections a number of possibilities exist, especially since such views had been extant for almost a century. It is doubtful that Kargel developed his views concerning the signs of the last days completely on his own, independent from outside influences, with just a Bible in his hands.

In connection with this it is interesting to note Kargel's frequent usage of hidden quotations from the Bible (T 1.7, T 1.11). He seems to employ and accommodate the language of the Bible to the point of doing it subconsciously. His treatment of this hidden quotation about the "dead bones" deserves special attention:

What will it be like, what should it be like, when the Lord literally fulfils this promise and comes down upon thousands of assemblies all over the world, and from them the spirit of life will blow over the 'dead bones'? (T 1.11).

Obviously Kargel expected a great awakening in the midst of thousands of lifeless Christian churches that would affect even the "dead bones", that is, Israel.

5.3.1.4 Importance of application

Having discussed Joel's prophecy, Kargel moved to its application: if the prophecy is going to be completely fulfilled, what is expected of believers in order to become its recipients (T 1.2, T 1.4, T 1.5, T 1.7). Kargel is much more interested in what the prophecy actually means for contemporary believers than what it meant to the first century Christians or to Joel's original audience. It is not surprising that his application is longer than his exegesis.

Kargel uses the historical account of the events surrounding Pentecost to develop a pattern for modern Christians' behaviour (T 1.4, T.1.5). In Kargel's view the things that the Apostles did (for example, they called for repentance) were not only historically true but also set an example or pattern for other believers to follow. This approach was typical for the nineteenth century that witnessed

the growing concern among some Christians for the rediscovery of New Testament patterns of church life . . . This phenomenon is well-described by some historians as the Restorationist Movement. In Britain it found its expression primarily in Plymouth Brethrenism and the Catholic Apostolic Church (Rennie 1977:47).

This tendency for following biblical patterns is connected with what can be called Kargel's hermeneutics of obedience, which is discussed fuller under case study 2 based on Kargel's book "Christ is our sanctification".

Kargel's goal in writing is to edify his readers, not to feed their curiosity or intellect (T 1.9). Kaiser and Silva see this devotional method of studying the Bible as rooted in a strong desire to find in the Scripture solid applications for everyday life:

Such study is not motivated by intellectual, historical, or critical curiosities; instead, it involves a strong commitment to seeing changes in one's own attitudes, values, and actions . . . The major goal in the exercise of the devotional reading of scripture is not the mastery of God but God's mastery of the reader, through the ministry of the Holy Spirit . . . It correctly presumes that the words of Scripture are clear enough to be understood in their basic message . . . The reader is dependent on the Holy Spirit for the work of illuminating those Scriptures used in a devotional study . . . Central to the devotional method is the act of meditating on the Word of God (Kaiser & Silva 1994:164, 162).

Kargel's way of analysing the Bible clearly falls under this definition and can be called a devotional study.

5.3.1.5 View of the Scripture and its study

Kargel appears to hold a very high view of Scripture (T 1.1). He most often refers to it as the Word of God (T 1.5). He calls the passage he is working with "coming from God's mouth" (T 1.1) and "the direct word of God" (T 1.5). The entire Bible is absolutely trustworthy for Kargel. The authority of the Scripture was a subject that needed no special address (T 1.1, T 1.3).

In the matter of inspiration Kargel does not see any difference between the Old and the New Testament (T 1.3). When he deals with a historical account he believes that events described actually did take place in history (T 1.4). When he deals with prophecy he expects its literal fulfilment (T 1.7).

Kargel's repeated calls to study, penetrate, examine and re-examine the text, to obtain the "precise meaning" show that he does not expect the message from Scripture to reach the heads and hearts of believers in some mystical way; he wants to approach Scripture with an open mind (T 1.2). He is willing to give up a previously held opinion if proven wrong by the Scriptures (T 1.2). Concerning the interpretation of difficult passages (T 1.2), Kargel would certainly agree with the Brethren missionary Groves who wrote about things in the Scripture that are hard to understand:

We come to the consideration of them with hearts pre-occupied by ready-made decisions . . . 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.³⁴⁰

Kargel's search for the precise (hence one?) meaning of the text (T 1.2, T 1.3) reminds one of Luther's position, who accepted "no more than one simplest meaning"³⁴¹, or Tyndale's position, for whom "Scripture hath but one sense, which is the literal sense . . . which thou must seek out diligently"³⁴², or Menno Simon's position who, in spite of Anabaptist literalism, "insisted that it was the sense which was the important thing" (Poettcker 1984:74).

Kargel attempts to take up anew the study of the text and is not afraid to question a traditional interpretation of the passage. The traditional interpretation (at least for Kargel) was that the promises found in Joel had been fulfilled at Pentecost (T 1.2). Kargel examines the content of the prophecy and comes to the conclusion that not all those things were completely fulfilled during the time of the apostles (T 1.2). Believing that all of the Bible's promises have to be fulfilled sooner or later (one of his basic premises), he suggests their partial fulfilment in the days of Pentecost and full completion just before the day of the Lord (T 1.4, T 1.5).

Kargel's exegesis starts from the study of contents of the passage (T 1.3). Second, he encourages using one's imagination to place oneself into the original setting (T 1.4). Third, he uses various translations to get a better grasp of the text's meaning (T 1.9). Fourth, he starts from the literal sense as a foundation for developing the spiritual sense (T 1.4). Finally, working from the premise that Scripture is to be obeyed, he develops the application, usually his lengthiest part (T 1.5, T 1.7, T 1.12).

At all times Kargel keeps in mind the context of the whole Bible, which is his main frame of reference. He seems to hold to the principle that Scripture is its own interpreter and that clearer passages can explain more difficult ones. His tendency is to clarify the Old Testament passages with New Testament

³⁴⁰ Memoir, pp. 10-11, in Coad 1968:104.

³⁴¹ Frederic W. Farrar, *History of Interpretation*, Bampton Lectures, 1885 (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1961), p. 329, in Kaiser 1994:225.

³⁴² William Tyndale, *The Obedience of a Christian Man*, in Kaiser & Silva 1994:225.

ones (T 1.3), in the tradition of Reformers Luther³⁴³ and Calvin, who held to the principle of “*Scripture scripturae interpres*” because they believed that “Scriptures are the products of a single divine mind” (Packer 1983:350).

That Kargel’s exegesis seems to be characterized by some measure of literalism (T 1.6) becomes evident from his interpretation of Joel’s prophecy. Kargel actually expects the literal fulfilment of all details mentioned (T 1.7). For him “all” is all and “everybody” is everybody (T 1.6). In this particular portion of Kargel’s text one does not find the emphasis on the Spirit’s illumination in order to gain the correct understanding of the biblical text. What one finds is that on occasion Kargel resorted to a syllogism (T 1.3) and argued from common sense (T 1.7). It also seems that one of Kargel’s epistemological presuppositions is that the more passages speak on a subject the stronger is the case (T 1.5).

A critical approach to the Bible is unacceptable to Kargel (T 1.7). In this matter he was of one mind with premillennialists, who “were stalwart opponents of liberalism. There are undoubtedly various reasons for this, but one certainly would be their literal approach to biblical interpretation” (Rennie 1977:55). As Rennie rightly pointed out, literalism accorded well with premillennialism (Rennie 1977:52). As mentioned already, Kargel maintains the historicity of biblical revelation. Like the Pietists, Kargel simply avoided questions of historical and “higher” criticism, particularly those of the authenticity of the text which he took for granted.

5.3.1.6 Immediacy of the scriptural message

Kargel presses for the relevance of the interpreted passage for his contemporaries (T 1.1, T 1.4, T 1.5, T 1.7). This corresponds well with his sense of immediacy of the scriptural message for his time. For Kargel what Scripture says here and now to us is much more important than what it said there and then to them. Some might accuse Kargel of skipping “the first step” of working with the text, that is, a form of textual interpretation (critical study of the linguistic, textual, and historical aspects of Acts, etc.). Whether he was familiar with these techniques or not, he does not leave traces of that kind of work in his book. The important thing is that Kargel’s goal was never to hear the voice of Luke, but the voice of God.

³⁴³ Kargel spoke highly of Luther as a “living Christian” and “a man of God” and quotes from the Small Catechism (Kargel 2002:116).

One can, of course, focus on differences of culture and mindset that separate the contemporary setting from apostolic times. Kargel instead focuses on the things that unite people of all times – spiritual and ethical issues. Besides, he regards the Holy Spirit as the ultimate author of the Scriptures, who had it written in a way that would be understandable for people of all ages and all generations.

This is how Kargel might have thought: it is true that the apostle Peter had to speak up when addressing the crowd because he had no loud speakers and he was certainly dressed differently from a modern orator; nevertheless, the content of his message and subsequent call to repentance transcends time and culture. (I hope I am not reading too much into Kargel's text.) Kargel tends to spiritualise the words of biblical writers making them timeless, instead of attributing these words to an ancient culture and thus rendering them irrelevant to his time.

Thiselton points out that it was not atypical for “certain individualist strands within religious or Christian pietism” to use “innocent subjective reading in *traditions of pietism*” (Thiselton 1992:530). However, he warns of certain dangers in such an approach:

Very often in religious groups an individual is encouraged . . . to ‘read’ the text as ‘what the text *means to me*’. . . But without any principle of *suspicion*, in Gadamer’s terminology a *premature* fusion of horizons will take place *before* readers have listened in openness with respect for the tension between the horizons of the text and the horizon of the reader. The textual horizon has collapsed into that of the reader’s narrative biography, and is unable to do more than to speak back his or her own values and desires (Thiselton 1992:530-531).

To what extent this might be the case with Kargel is difficult to ascertain. To answer this question the author needs to study more of his text. It is clear, however, that Kargel’s interest in the study of this passage goes far beyond academic speculation. He does not ask the question, “What did it mean to them?” His question is, “What does it mean to us?” and, most importantly, “What is expected of us as a result of the acquired meaning?”

Overall Kargel’s writing style is devotional and edifying. His main goal was the spiritual benefit of common people, hence one cannot expect his writings to sound scholarly. In the portion under investigation Kargel comes forward not as much as an exegete but as a commentator and a preacher. Kargel’s emotional attachment to the Book also comes through quite clearly.

It is believed that the book was written as a reaction against the rising Pentecostal movement, but the author did not find anything that would fight Pentecostalism in Kargel's text. The important point is that for Kargel the Holy Spirit's activity is not limited to tongues, gifts, visions and prophecy, but first and foremost it is about the holy conduct of believers (T 1.8). The behaviour of a person filled with the Spirit is characterised by bearing a testimony for Christ, praying, praising God, devotion, etc. These emphases harmonise well with the holiness movements in Europe, with which Kargel was familiar. The emphasis on sanctification was also characteristic of Pietism (the term speaks for itself). This point will be discussed further under case study 2.

5.3.2 Case study 2. Based on the book “Christ is our sanctification”

This book serves as an example of Kargel's systematic approach to the Christian doctrines of sanctification. In addition, the chosen portion of Kargel's text (see Table 2 in the Appendix) includes a number of explicit statements made by Kargel concerning the Scripture and scriptural interpretation.

Kargel starts this book with listing seven scriptural reasons why believers should be holy. Chapter one presents the essence of sanctification as Kargel finds it in Scripture. The chapter is divided into two sections: the first one discusses the biblical meaning of the word “sanctification”; the second attempts to discover the essence of sanctification from the way God sanctifies people.

Chapter two concentrates on the goal of sanctification. Here Kargel attempts to show from Scripture that the goal of sanctification is “real and practical liberation from sin”, “becoming God's possession”, being indwelt by Christ, and finally becoming likened to the Lord.

Chapter three deals with the means of sanctification. They include believer's knowledge of and relationship with Christ, constant abiding in Christ, complete surrender to the Holy Spirit, the Word of God, faith, prayer, fellowship with other believers, and sufferings.

Kargel's text in Table 2 is quoted from the *Bratskiy Vestnik* [The Brotherly Herald]. Parts of Kargel's text in brackets [...] are quoted from a later (and fuller) edition of the book published by *Bibliya dlya vsekh* in 2002. Bold highlighting in Table 2 is mine. The following is the result of the author's study of Kargel's text.

5.3.2.1 *Scripture as the Word of God*

Now, proceeding to discuss Kargel's treatment of the Scripture more specifically the author will start with Kargel's view of the scriptural authority. A number of times Kargel explicitly identifies the Word of God with the Bible thus taking Bible authority for granted (T 2.2, T 2.3, T 2.4, T 2.5, T 2.62, T 2.68, T 2.69, T 2.83). Kargel states that the Word **is** the Word of God (not to be mistaken with "becoming the Word of God", or being found in the Bible under the leadership of the Spirit).

Although it is easy to assume that the notion of accepting the Scripture as the Word of God naturally follows from holding the doctrine of verbal inspiration so typical for Protestant orthodoxy (Braaten 1968:138), Kargel does not use terms like "inerrancy" or "verbal inspiration." In this approach Kargel is closer to the Anabaptists, most of whom also "identified the Scriptures and God's Word" (Klaassen 1984:5) and by whom "the Bible is simply equated with the Word of God" (Kraus 1984:140), than to Luther, who "spoke of Scripture as being the verbally inspired Word of God" (Ollenburger 1984:46). The Anabaptists were not "primarily concerned with correct theories of inspiration which would guarantee the Bible's rational authority" (Kraus 1984:135). One does not find such theories in Kargel either.

Kargel does not build any hierarchy of revelation. The written Word (Scripture) is no less true and trustworthy than the living Word (Jesus) (T 2.71).

It is common in both the Anabaptist-Mennonite confessions and in Kargel's 1913 Confession to assume the Scripture's authority and then to concentrate on seeking to understand and apply it. For the Anabaptists, the Scripture "was an authority to be obeyed rather than defined" (Kraus 1984:135). The Bible records are viewed "as a rule of faith and conduct" (Kraus 1984:136; Kargel 1913). However, such an approach contains some dangers. First, "this preoccupation with rules of conduct produced many examples of quaint proof-texting and the finding of direct guidance from the pages of the Bible" (Kraus 1984:139). Second,

there is a kind of artless freedom under the guidance of the spirit to use the Scriptures for admonishing the brotherhood. They were not challenged to defend the Bible against attacks upon its authority. When they wrote about it, they magnified and praised it, but they simply assumed its divine origin and validity. Therefore to read a theory of verbal inerrancy into their writings is anachronistic (Kraus 1984:139).

It would be anachronistic to read such a theory into Kargel's writings as well.

5.3.2.2 The role of the Holy Spirit and studying the text

When it comes to the Scripture, Kargel strongly emphasises the role of the Holy Spirit. The Spirit is the ultimate author of Scripture (T 2.16, T 2.19, T 2.20). He spoke through the mouths of the apostles (T 2.83). He leads into the depth of knowledge of scriptural truths (T 2.4). He brings scriptural truths, encouragements, commands, etc., to believers' attention (T 2.65). He helps to accomplish God's goal (T 2.26). Thus, Kargel places the whole process of exegesis (reading the Scripture, understanding, and application in life) under the power of the Holy Spirit. Kargel recognizes the double authorship of Scripture but puts the emphasis on the Spirit (T 2.16, T 2.20); somehow Paul or any other human writer said exactly what the Lord wanted them to say (T 2.83). However, Kargel never speculates on the process itself, never tells how exactly this might have happened.

With all the importance that Kargel attributes to the Spirit, the Spirit does not pass the knowledge of the Scripture to a believer in some mystical way without studying the text (T 2.75). Similar ideas were expressed by Spener who "insisted that the Word does not become effective mechanically like a medicine but must be brought to life in the soul by the Spirit of God" (Stoeffler 1965:240). Kargel was opposed to a mechanical reading of Scripture or even memorising large portions if the motives were not right (T 2.75). Even the divine origin and intrinsic power of the book would do no good unless a reader did the work of searching the Scriptures.

There are other conditions brought up by Kargel that make the Word effective, including being a new creature in Christ (T 2.84), having a desire to obey the discovered will of God (T 2.47, T 2.63, T 2.72, T 2.76, T 2.79), searching the Scripture for one's own spiritual benefit (T 2.48, T 2.80) before using it as a frame of reference for a sermon addressed to others, etc. This last point was also shared with Spener (Stoeffler 1965:240).

It is believed that in the history of interpretation "Calvin emerges fully as the theologian of the Holy Spirit" because in Calvin's exegetical principles "there is special stress on the place of the Holy Spirit in the whole process of understanding and interpretation" (Floor 1982:182).

Calvin carefully stressed that the understanding of the Scriptures is effected through the Holy Spirit, and that the Spirit does it through the

Word . . . The Word first has to be heard acoustically before the Spirit can transmit it from the ear to the heart (Floor 1982:185).

Kargel, with his unceasing attention to the Holy Spirit, seems to play a similar role of a theologian of the Holy Spirit in the Russian Evangelical movement.

Speaking of the Spirit's role in unfolding scriptural knowledge, Kargel makes the following statements: "Let's give freedom to the Holy Spirit to guide us into the depth of knowledge of truth" (T 2.4), "The Holy Spirit must make the Word alive" (T 2.83), and "The Holy Spirit can reveal us the Bible from a new side" (T 2.82). What did Kargel mean by these and similar statements? Did he mean that we should open ourselves to what God has to say? Did Kargel refer to the Holy Spirit's action in exegesis?

It seems that the answers can be found in the position of Kargel's predecessors. The guidance of the Spirit was actively taught by the Pietists. Pietistic biblicism insisted that God's law and promises, revealed in the Bible, "must be rationally applied to man's condition under the guidance of the Spirit" (Stoeffler 1965:80). The approach when "in reading the Bible the pious person now looked for divine truth, which the Spirit of God would directly impress upon his soul" was classified by Stoeffler as "intuitional Biblicism" (Stoeffler 1965:80).

The talk about the Word becoming "alive" did not originate with Kargel either. For instance, for Menno Simons "the Word is not a neutral fact, but a living reality, it opens itself to the believer and closes itself to the evildoer" (Poettcker 1984:65). Calvin held that "because God Himself is actively speaking to us in and through Scripture, Scripture is the *living* Word of God" (Floor 1982:158). Calvin believed that "the Spirit guides us in the truth of Scripture so that we can discern and understand *what* God is saying to us in the teaching of Scripture" (Floor 1982:170). The Anabaptists held that "a biblical text without the penetration and testing of personal appropriation is a dead letter" (Yoder 1984:18). Nicolai, a Lutheran Pietist, taught that "the Spirit of God takes God's revelation in nature and in Scripture and impresses it upon the heart of man . . . Unless this is the case Scripture is no more than a dead letter" (Stoeffler 1965:201). Menno Simon believed that "the Spirit is active through the Word and thus prevents the text from becoming a dead letter" (Ollenburger 1984:51). Kargel also contrasted "dead knowledge" of the Scripture with the "living knowledge" (T 2.44). In Kargel's view "a dead letter" becomes "alive" through the active involvement of the Holy Spirit.

“The constant reliance upon the power of the Holy Spirit” was “the mitigating hermeneutical factor” in Anabaptism (Dyck 1984:35). For instance, Rothmann wrote, “I will never achieve the power of the knowledge of God unless God’s Spirit drives me with power, teaches me, and leads me into the Scriptures”.³⁴⁴ The Anabaptists believed that “through the Spirit the Word became powerful, alive, and immediate” (Dyck 1984:37).

When speaking of the Spirit at work giving insights into the divine Word by telling us what “God would have us to do at our particular time in history”, Cullmann employs the useful verb “actualise” (Dorman 1983:250). And this is what the author thinks Kargel meant: the Spirit actualises the words of Scripture and they become “living knowledge” (T 2.44). Considering the role that the Spirit plays in the process of interpretation for Kargel, one can talk about pneumatic epistemology where a person can come to the true knowledge of the Scripture relying only on the guidance of the Spirit in the process of interpretation.

5.3.2.3 Scripture and doctrinal matters

Discussing the doctrines of justification and sanctification Kargel goes to the Scripture as to the only authority in doctrinal matters (T 2.2, T 2.4, T 2.15, T 2.49). He uses Scripture to define the term of sanctification (T 2.18, T 2.21, T 2.22), to find its essence (T 2.12, T 2.41, T 2.46), and to discover the conditions and goal of sanctification (T 2.14, T 2.16, T 2.22). Kargel begins with a statement that “the Word of God gives us very resolute and positive answer” to the question of sanctification (T 2.2), thereby making Scripture the final court of appeal.

In the doctrine of justification Kargel stands on the classical position of the Reformers (T 2.5). Nevertheless, he thinks that while the Reformers had done a great job in developing the doctrine of justification, they had underestimated the doctrine of sanctification (T 2.2, T 2.64). Kargel sees justification as a foundation and condition for further sanctification (T 2.4, T 2.7). He also sees justification as an event (T 2.11, T 2.13) while sanctification is a lifelong process (T 2.10, T 2.11, T 2.12, T 2.13).

Kargel’s emphasis on sanctification and his worries about the lack of attention to holiness among Christians were not new. Similar concerns were

³⁴⁴ Restitution, 1534, 221, in Dyck 1984:36.

expressed long before Kargel by the Pietists who “sincerely believed . . . that the Protestant reformation had stopped short of becoming the kind of a moral reformation which the Christian faith demands” (Stoeffler 1965:21). “Luther himself, insisted Spener, knew this and regretted the fact that the reformation of doctrine did not proceed to become a reformation of life” (Stoeffler 1965:235). Actually, Luther himself made justification by faith “the central principle of his hermeneutic, throwing the shadow of work righteousness over every effort at holiness” (Dyck 1984:38). Lodensteyn, a pietistic writer, stated that “a reformation of doctrine indeed has taken place . . . But, alas, the Reformed church has stopped with such a reformation. ‘There we stand now’, he laments. ‘There is no Spirit in the doctrine’”.³⁴⁵

Pietism preached piety by definition. Quotes from Stoeffler demonstrate how similar Kargel’s insights concerning the whole holiness issue were to the Pietists in general and to Spener in particular. In their preaching the Pietists constantly repeated that “without conversion and sanctification the individual’s Christianity is hollow and his religious profession mere sham”. He goes on to say that

they did not, as the heresy hunters alleged, attempt to substitute conversion and sanctification for justification. What they did wish to stress was the fact that justification is meaningless from the point of view of the individual who needs salvation unless it is personally appropriated in a fiducial commitment. Justification must be more than a forensic act on the part of God. It must enter into human experience. This it does in the divinely wrought miracle of conversion and in the divinely initiated and supported strivings for sanctification. . . . To right belief must be added the piety which God expects in a new creature according to his revelation . . . to the Pietists it was Biblical Christianity (Stoeffler 1965:17).

As for Spener, who departed from orthodoxy on this very point of sanctification, this doctrine carried a great importance.

While . . . his opponents paid lip service to this doctrine it was not organically related to their system . . . Spener, on the other hand, believed uncompromisingly that Christ came not only to justify men but to sanctify them as well. Sanctification, he held, is not merely a test of true faith, it is a divine intention and hence a valid religious end. Nor is it something done by God alone. God initiates the action, to be sure. He provides the initial impulse and the strength the Christian needs from day to day to live in holiness. But the individual must respond to God’s grace

³⁴⁵ Geestelyke Opwekker, 1740, pp. 117-120, in Stoeffler 1965:146-147.

and bend his will toward the continuous amendment of life (Stoeffler 1965:241).

The emphasis on sanctification had been quite strong in British Evangelicalism as well for a few decades prior to Kargel's writing of the book. The author will only briefly repeat that British Evangelicalism in general was deeply influenced by a new holiness movement from the 1870s onwards (Bebbington 1989:150-152). The Brethren insisted "upon high standards of personal conduct" (Coad 1976:104) in view of the Lord's imminent return. The Keswick movement stressed "holiness by faith" and "promoted practical holiness" (Randall 1999:14, 23). Thus, Kargel stood "on the shoulders" of those pietists and evangelicals who before him had emphasised the doctrine of sanctification.

Kargel in his book attempts to restore what he sees as a healthy and biblical balance of justification and sanctification. "Holiness unto the Lord" is what the book is about. When discussing sanctification Kargel recognizes two levels of spiritual reality found in the New Testament: ontological and ethical. He points out the tension between the positional and practical, the ontological status and ethical condition of a believer throughout the New Testament (T 2.18, T 2.28, T 2.29). Like the Brethren, Kargel mentions the anticipation of the Lord's imminent return in connection with sanctification (T 2.56). In the light of this expectancy he calls believers to be ready, that is, blameless.

At times it seems that while Kargel might not pay a lot of attention to the immediate literal context he is always aware of the larger context of the whole Bible (T 2.8, T 2.19, T 2.20, T 2.22, T 2.60). It is his frame of reference. Behind this approach lies the belief that the whole of Scripture is essential to the interpretation of the parts. Actually, Luther was one of those who insisted on each passage being interpreted in the light of the Biblical message as a whole (Ollenburger 1984:47). Both Luther and Menno Simon dealt with difficult passages by comparing them with the whole Bible (Ollenburger 1984:8).

Kargel's presentation of a theological issue usually goes through several steps. First, he presents a proposition (T 2.2). Then he brings up Scriptural evidence, starting with more abstract sounding passages, then providing examples from Scripture (T 2.10, T 2.30). At times he uses syllogisms (T 2.34). Using devices of formal logic such as syllogisms was another Reformed hermeneutic principle appropriated by Kargel. "While the Reformers maintained

that logical deductions drawn from the Bible had equal authority with the Bible itself, Menno Simon insisted that this was not permissible – this was mere philosophizing and rationalizing” (Poettcker 1984:75).

It seems that, according to Kargel, the more passages address the point the stronger the point is (T 2.16, T 2.57, T 2.58). Old Testament commands which are repeated in the New Testament are considered especially important by Kargel (T 2.16). Finally he draws an application of the scriptural truth for contemporary believers (T 2.23, T 2.32). Kargel’s constant emphasis is on the relevance of Scripture for today (T 2.27). Kargel, like Reformed Pietist Jean de Taffin, constantly endeavoured to make Scripture his guide (T 2.92); for Kargel the Scriptures also were the “objective frame of reference by truth of which he meant to support every statement made. What we have here again, then, is the intuitive Biblicism” (Stoeffler 1965:124).

Thus, although Kargel does not refer to all those above mentioned theologians and movements, his position on the doctrine of sanctification is strongly reminiscent of the Anabaptists, Pietists, Brethren, and adherents of the Holiness movement. Basically, Kargel was continuing a tradition which Stoeffler accurately labelled as intuitive Biblicism.

The theologians that Kargel referred to by name are his famous contemporaries, Spurgeon and Moody. He quotes from “dear” Spurgeon and from “great preacher” Moody in his book (T 2.57, T 2.77). It seems that he holds both men in great respect and shares their theological views. Both preached at the time when rationalism was coming to the front. Both called to not focus so much on reason and man, but to believe in the Bible. Kargel likewise argued from a conservative exegetical tradition and accepted the Bible as the Word of God.

5.3.2.4 Personal searching of the Scriptures

Kargel attributes great importance to Scripture reading (T 2.68, T 2.70). He makes a very strong point for personal and regular reading of the Bible (T 2.68, T 2.77, T 2.81), meditating, making it one’s own, consuming it like food essential for one’s spiritual well being (T 2.73, T 2.79, T 2.81, T 2.83, T 2.86), and not relying on others “to feed” you (T 2.77, T 2.79). The Word is as essential for believers as milk for babies (T 2.68). This kind of attitude was typical for evangelicals in general. It is characterized by a particular regard for

the Bible and devotion to the personal searching of the Scriptures (Bebbington 1989:3). Janzen traces this kind of attitude to the Reformation showing both its strong and weak points:

The Reformation's concern for the Word placed the Bible into the center of Protestant life, but this very attempt to make it 'food for every day' led to its fragmented distribution and consumption: detailed exegesis of a short sermon text; meditation on a brief passage for daily devotions (Janzen 1984:180-181).

The Brethren insisted upon "the direct appeal to the Scriptures over the head of all existing authority" (Coad 1968:104). Kargel also insisted on free access to the Scripture for all people (T 2.81), something that was essential in the Brethren witness (Coad 1968:285). In Kargel's view, one should personally study Scripture. Relying upon the Holy Spirit, Kargel (like Pashkov before him) was not afraid that "private interpretation" would do more harm than good. Kargel hardly ever refers to traditional, accepted or "officially prescribed" interpretations. Whereas the Anabaptists emphasised corporate interpretation of Scripture by the congregation, Kargel called for starting with the individual studying of Scripture. No books, commentaries, or sermons would substitute for personal search of the Scriptures (T 2.79).

It is true that all Reformers including the Anabaptists proclaimed *sola scriptura* as one of their main principles. However, the implications for hermeneutics were not the same for everyone. All Protestant camps recognized Scripture as normative for faith. All recognized the lay people's right to "read it with profit". Luther believed that the Holy Spirit was necessary for correct understanding of the Gospel (Dyck 1984:38). Yet Luther "paradoxically, feared Anabaptist reliance upon the Spirit and their literal, lay interpretation" (Dyck 1984:38). It seems that in this matter (literal, lay interpretation under the guidance of the Spirit), Kargel stood closer to the Anabaptists than to Luther. And not only did Kargel, for this was the favourite principle of Russian Stundism.

In Kargel's view searching and understanding the Scripture must be accompanied by prayer (T 2.48). Here Kargel is of the same mind with the Reformers. According to Luther, "The Bible cannot be mastered by study and

talent, but rather by prayer and inspiration”.³⁴⁶ Calvin also emphasised prayer for the understanding of the Scriptures; for him the true interpretation of the Bible was a gift from God that had to be asked for (Floor 1982:190). Therefore, one should pray “with a deep awareness of our poverty and our blindness, with confession of our guilt” (Floor 1982:190).

As for an awareness of one’s “poverty and blindness”, Kargel warned his readers against spiritual pride. Some people who “know a little” about the Scripture harden their hearts and become “the hardest kind of soil” (T 2.85). By this, Kargel is saying basically the following: Do not think you know it all because those who know a little may be worse than those who know nothing. That “little” puffs them up and blocks the way for further understanding (T 2.85). Similar thoughts were expressed by the Anabaptists, who believed that

if someone comes to the Scriptures with an honest and searching heart, the Spirit of God will illumine the mind and remove hindrances to understanding. Thus only one who comes with the right disposition, which is mainly humility, a readiness to be instructed, will truly understand the Word. No scholarship is of any avail if the humble spirit is lacking (Klaassen 1984:5).

Overall, Kargel presses the importance of one’s attitude. He invites his reader to search the Scriptures personally for oneself, not in order to prove a point or to teach others (T 2.77). Kargel feels sorry for those who never study the Scripture for themselves and find out its truths only through others. In regards to this he reminds the words of Moody who once said that many believers “eat” only when being fed “from the church spoon” (Kargel 2002:93). Kargel writes,

We must use this dear book *for ourselves* and apply it *to ourselves*... For years I used it as a collection of texts: I looked for the texts for others, appropriate texts in order to be able to say something to other. How often the Lord did not give me anything. Then other books, commentaries had to help me. With many tears I begged the Lord not to leave me in poverty. In His love He did not leave me without an answer. His last answer was, ‘I am ready to give something to *you*, specifically to *you*, but in reality you are not looking for something for yourself and are surprised that my Word is closed for you (Kargel 2002:93).

³⁴⁶ E. H. Harbison, *The Christian Scholar in the Age of the Reformation* (New York, 1956), pp. 106, 111, in Poettcker 1984:66.

Kargel encourages his readers to keep an open mind and reading Scripture every day as if for the first time (T 2.83). Being able to maintain a fresh look at the Scripture seems very important to Kargel (T 2.83, T 2.84, T 2.86). Having sincere and humble heart is, according to Kargel, a condition of gaining better understanding of the Scripture (T 2.86).

5.3.2.5 Obedience as a prerequisite for understanding

Although for Kargel the Scripture is the final court of appeal, it seems that in his understanding of *sola scriptura* principle he stood closer to the Anabaptists than to other Protestant groups. In the examined portion of Kargel's text he starts from placing a strong emphasis on studying the Scripture (head knowledge) but never stops there. The goal is "heart knowledge" – loving Scripture, following and obeying it (T 2.75, T 2.78, T 2.81, T 2.82, T 2.86, T 2.91). Furthermore, Kargel viewed obedience to the Scripture as a condition for its further understanding (T 2.16, T 2.47, T 2.61, T 2.63, T 2.72, T 2.76, T 2.79).

There is "a close connection in Anabaptism between understanding the Scriptures and obedience to what they demand . . . The readiness to obey Christ's words is prerequisite to understanding them" (Klaassen 1984:5-6). The Anabaptists believed that "only he who is committed to the direction of obedience can read the truth so as to interpret it in the line with the direction of God's purposes. 'If a man will to do the will of my father, he shall know of the doctrine'" (Yoder 1984:27). It is stated that for Menno Simon the prerequisite of understanding the Scripture was in the attitude of the person coming to the Scripture:

Very briefly this attitude must be marked by obedience . . . a willingness to be instructed . . . and a personal application in seeing the truths as they apply to everyday life . . . Wrongdoing . . . blinds people so that they do not understand.³⁴⁷

It is generally assumed that although the Anabaptists were "of one mind with Luther in his locating of final authority in the *sola scriptura* affirmation", a careful reading of their record reveals that there was actually "considerable difference in what these two traditions understood to mean in practice" (Dyck 1984:30). The Anabaptists came to the Scripture with a presupposition of

³⁴⁷ Henry Poettcker, Menno Simons' Encounter with the Bible, MQR 40 (1966), 115, in Ollenburger 1984:49.

obedience and “its implication for biblical understanding” (Dyck 1984:30). A similar point is made by Kraus: “In contrast to the Protestantism, who defined faith as assent to doctrine . . . the Anabaptists of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries defined it essentially as obedience to Scripture” (Kraus 1984:135). Poettcker also points out that “while all the Reformers began with the same formal principle, *sola scriptura*, it was obvious immediately that their interpretation varied considerably. The reason lay in their different conception of understanding” (Poettcker 1984:63).

Actually, this concept, while not strongly emphasised, was not completely foreign for the Reformers. “The most basic of these presuppositions, as far as Calvin’s hermeneutics as a *Reformer* is concerned, is to be found in his explicit commitment to obey Holy Scripture as the one and only norm for true Christian faith and religion” (Floor 1982:151). Obedience was a Pietistic emphasis as well: “the children of God not only understand the Scriptures, but will do them, which is after all the important thing” (Stoeffler 1965:120).

Here we are talking about the hermeneutics of obedience – a trademark of the Anabaptists (Klaassen 1984:5-6; Yoder 1984:27; Ollenburger 1984:49-50) and of Kargel. It is not surprising to find a similar approach in Kargel when considering the significant Mennonite input into the Russian Evangelical movement. Kargel constantly encourages his readers to take their understanding of Scripture to the next level – application and fulfilment (T 2.63, T 2.72, T 2.87, T 2.80, T 2.83). Serious study of Scripture must be followed by learning from positive examples and obedience to its commands (T 2.83, T 2.88, T 2.30, T 2.29). For Kargel the imperative in Scripture is more than a certain grammatical construction, it is a command to follow. Knowing the will of God surely meant doing it. He taught that the truths which believers learn from Scripture must become the reality of their lives.

Kargel takes it past this point, saying that faithfulness and obedience to the learnt truths are actually the conditions for finding more (T 2.47). For Kargel obedience to the Scripture is a prerequisite for further understanding (T 2.16, T 2.45, T 2.47). Hence it can be argued that Kargel held the epistemology of obedience, so typical for the Anabaptists whose “apprehension of new truths of faith was related directly to their actual faithfulness in discipleship” (Dyck 1984:30).

Finally, obedience to the Scripture leads to the goal of “receiving spiritual blessing” (T 2.86), being brought to the Lord, and finding light and life in Him (T 2.91). These are Kargel’s objectives of understanding the Scripture. It has been noticed that in the post-Reformation period “the individualist strands” emerged within pietism as reactions against theological controversy. “There emerged a type of believer whose only interest in the Bible is what he gets out of it for himself and his own comfort”.³⁴⁸ Indeed, such preoccupation with “self” could lead to excessive individualism. However, Kargel encourages believers to share the blessings find in the Word.

It is also true that the “hermeneutics of obedience” can easily lead to legalism. It is “generally recognised” that “the early Swiss Brethren had a biblicism bordering on legalism” (Klassen 1984:85). Menno Simon himself held that “what the scripture does not positively teach and command is forbidden” (Klassen 1984:85). However, it must be noted that no matter how Kargel presses obedience to the Scripture he warns against legalism (T 2.23). He believes that obedience cannot be forced on others (T 2.24). His attitude is similar to that of Spener who “was more interested in practical piety . . . and unlike the Pietists in the Netherlands and in England he consciously endeavoured not to be overly legalistic” (Stoeffler 1965:238).

Closely connected to obedience is the notion of the believers’ discipleship (T 2.44, T 2.52, T 2.62). For Kargel each believer is Christ’s disciple. It was another Anabaptist pre-understanding that “Jesus was to be followed” (Ollenburger 1984:49). Epistemological implications here would be similar to the case with obedience. Hans Denk believed that, “no man can know Christ unless he follows after him in life” – this is “a condensation of the Anabaptist concern for discipleship and obedience” (Yoder 1984:27). “The concept of discipleship among the Anabaptists . . . has epistemological importance in connection with right thinking and is thus more than a question of piety and ethics”.³⁴⁹

Kargel’s attitude toward the Scripture is not only obedience, but also love. The author wants to point out the language of endearment that Kargel accommodated. For example, phrases such as “precious Scripture” and

³⁴⁸ Stuart Allen, *The interpretation of Scripture*, 1967, p.18, in Thiselton 1992:193.

“beloved Christ” were very typical (T 2.62, T 2.67, T 2.68, T 2.79, T 2.82, T 2.67). This was characteristic for the Pietist, as for all mystics, who “often used terms of endearment in his references to God” (Stoeffler 1965:15-16).

5.3.2.6 Continuity between the Testaments

In the issue of continuity and discontinuity of the Testaments there is a significant difference between the Reformers on the one hand and Anabaptists and Brethren on the other. The classical Reformed position “maintained the unity of God’s dealing with mankind” (Coad 1968:132). Darby, on the contrary, “was building a completely new structure of Biblical interpretation” (Coad 1968:132). Where was Kargel? What was Kargel’s position concerning the Old Testament? Considering two influences – the Mennonite (who stressed the discontinuity between the two covenants) and Brethren (dispensationalists) – it is quite interesting to note that Kargel found a good degree of continuity between the testaments (T 2.9, T 2.25, T 2.37, T 2.43, T 2.82).

Kargel follows prominent theological themes throughout both testaments. He points out that David was justified just like Christians are (T 2.9). In Kargel’s view God’s promises made to Israel apply to Christians. For example, God’s words to Israel, “I’m the Lord who makes you holy”, are the grounds to expect God to make modern believers holy as well (T 2.25). Kargel uses the Old Testament implications of cleansing and consecration as normative for Christians (T 2.22, T 2.37).

Calvin’s position was that “salvation which the faithful shared *before* the incarnation is the same salvation that the faithful received, and still receive, *after* the incarnation” (Floor 1982:177). In contrast, the majority of Anabaptists emphasised the New Testament over the Old (Poettcker 1984:69). In general they reduced “the force of the Old Testament, making the New normative over the Old” (Ollenburger 1984:59). In the issue of the continuity between the Testaments Kargel is closer to Luther and Calvin than to the Anabaptists for whom “to call Abraham a Christian and to consider normative for the Christian the standards of the Old Testament was one of the greatest insults to the Incarnation of Christ” (Klassen [2] 1984:100). So far it appears that Kargel holds

³⁴⁹ Irvin B. Horst 1966 proposition V of the supplementary Thesis appended to his dissertation “Anabaptism and the English Reformation to 1558”, in Yoder 1984:27.

one of the hermeneutical principles of the Reformers, where “Old and New Testaments are of equal validity and authority in debate” (Klaassen 1984:108).

Kargel’s exegesis, however, is reminiscent of the Anabaptists. The way Kargel applied Biblical stories to his own time is similar to how it was done by the Anabaptists and is still done by some modern evangelicals. Menno Simon, for instance, “made much of the devotional use of the Old Testament . . . How comforting it was to observe that God had been with His people, leading them through the severest vicissitudes. Their examples of trust were to be followed” (Poettcker 1984:70). Packer also points out that

the principle of universality in application follows from the unchangeable consistency of God . . . Since He does not change, devilish self-aggrandizement such as called forth His judicial hatred against Tyre (Ezek. 27-28) and Jerusalem (Isa. 1-5) and Rome (Rev. 17-18) will always and everywhere evoke the same hostility. Since the incarnate Son does not change (cf. Heb. 13:8), the compassion shown to the penitent thief (Luke 23:43) and the Galilean prostitute (Luke 7:36ff.) and doubting Thomas (John 20:27ff.) continues to be there for all who know their need of it. . . . Watching how God dealt with people in Bible times, we learn how we may expect Him to deal with us (Packer 1983:351).

Kargel uses the Old Testament for illustrations and object lessons (T 2.37, T 2.38, T 2.90); from the Old Testament he draws examples to be followed (T 2.37). Behind this usage lies the assumption that God is consistent in His dealing with people throughout the Scriptures. Kargel starts from the premise that the Bible is the Word of God. It is applicable to all generations. God is a spiritual being. His Word is also spiritual. There is therefore a spiritual meaning – “the timeless truth inherent in a passage of Scripture as it is applied to the preacher’s day and its spiritual needs” (Lasor 1978:267) – implicit in the Word. On other occasions Kargel resorts to typology (T 2.59). For example, Kargel sees Moses as a type of Jesus (T 2.27). For the verification of his typological approach Kargel goes to the book of Hebrews (T 2.27). Kargel’s typology will be dealt with in detail in case study 4 based on his book “The Reflection of Glories to Come.”

Like Reformers in general, Kargel urges his reader to look for and find Christ in the Scripture because “this Guidebook” leads and points to Christ (T 2.92). This approach was similar to that of Luther, Menno, and Calvin, who searched the Old Testament in order to find Christ. Luther, for whom “the central hermeneutical point” was Christ, “never swerved from his insistence that

Christ is the center of Scripture and that the Spirit is the essential guide to correct interpretation” (Ollenburger 1984:47). For Menno Simon, “all the Scriptures, both the Old and the New Testament, on every hand point us to Christ Jesus” (Ollenburger 1984:51-52). He read the Scripture “devotionally, finding Christ throughout the Old Testament. And he read it as a guide to life, with little or no concern for historical setting” (Ollenburger 1984:52). Calvin also read the Scriptures with the purpose of finding Christ in them (Floor 1982:189). “The law and the prophets have no other goal than Jesus Christ. Christ is the *scopus* and the *summa* of the entire Scripture”.³⁵⁰

So far it can be concluded that Kargel did not see differences between the Testaments to the extent the Anabaptists saw them. Hence he accepted the idea of military service for believers and did not act harshly towards those in the congregation who had been baptized only as infants. However, Kargel’s love and loyalty to the devotional approach to Scripture made his exegesis somewhat similar to that of Anabaptists.

5.3.2.7 Extra scriptural revelations

Kargel’s statement about extra scriptural revelations or direct revelations from the Spirit is rather puzzling. It seems to be much more in agreement with Anabaptist hermeneutics than with Calvin’s. As a matter of fact, “many Anabaptists believed that the Word of God was broader than the Bible . . . The Word of God can also come directly to the believer in the heart” (Klaassen 1984:6). Calvin, on the contrary, maintained the unity of the Word and the Spirit against the Roman Church and the Baptist Movement. Calvin believed that “the opinion of the Holy Spirit is revealed in the Scriptures. And the Holy Spirit is not communicated through any means other than the Scriptures” (Floor 1982:184-185).

However, it seems that these extra scriptural “revelations” remained for Kargel a hypothetical thing. Nowhere does Kargel argue from such “revelations” or even mention that he happened to receive them. Besides, Kargel made such revelations a subject to the testing of the Scripture (T 2.74).

In all fairness it must be stated that for the Anabaptists “the only court of appeal is the text of Scripture. No congregation and no prophet may claim with

³⁵⁰ CR 45, 486; 47, 125. Cf. CR 48, 569; Inst. li, 11, 1; CR 52, 52, in Floor 1982:160.

any authority to have heard the Spirit, unless in the testing of that Spirit Scripture can be appealed to” (Yoder 1984:19). Although a number of leading Anabaptists such as Menno Simon, Marpeck, Rideman, and the Swiss Brethren held that “the Bible was the Word of God, but the Word of God was not limited to the Bible. Nevertheless, all revelation remained subject to the biblical norm” (Dyck 1984:32).

5.3.2.8 Conclusion

Summarising, the author must say that Kargel goes to the Scripture and searches it because he considers it true and beneficial. Kargel shares the Pietists’ emphasis on a “special sense of the very words of scripture, open to those who read them devoutly and through the Spirit, rather than with the eyes either of a preconditioned orthodox system or of rational philosophy” (Frei 1974:158). Similar ideas are stressed by Kargel repeatedly (T 2.47, 2.79) and allow one to argue that Kargel’s approach should be classified as intuitive biblicism. His bottom line is that Scripture can be correctly understood by those who search it diligently and sincerely.

As far as Kargel is concerned, the Holy Spirit’s role, the believer’s obedience, and discipleship are closely connected in the work of arriving at a right understanding of Scripture. Kargel presents it as requiring a divine-human partnership for deep apprehension of scriptural truth to take place. Obedience to the already understood truths is met by the illumination of the Holy Spirit. It looks like a circle: willingness to obey is followed by receiving a better understanding of the revelations from the Scripture, which, in turn, requires obedience.

Kargel’s kind of Bible study is classified as devotional. Tenney defines it “not as much a technique as a spirit of humility, which listens to the voice of God; it is the spirit of adventure which pursues earnestly the will of God; it is the spirit of adoration which rests in the presence of God”.³⁵¹ For Kargel Scripture contains much more than propositions: Scripture commands, encourages, reasons, condemns, etc. The active role of a reader is to believe the teaching, to accept rebuking, to be corrected, and receive training in righteousness (T 2.61, T 2.63, T 2.72, T 2.73, T 2.75, T 2.80, T 2.83, T 2.85).

³⁵¹ Tenney, *Galatians: Charter of Christian Liberty*, 1950, pp.207-8, in Kaiser & Silva 1994:164.

5.3.3 Case study 3. Based on “Sin as the greatest evil in this world”

The present case study aims to show how Kargel was using Scripture in order to gain an understanding of another important Christian doctrine – the doctrine of sin.

First, Kargel sees the Bible-the Scriptures-the Word of God as the only valid source of information about sin. According to Kargel, no other religious book speaks about sin as much as the Bible does (T 3.1). And whatever those “other” books have to say about sin, Kargel is not interested. He goes to the Bible looking for the origin of sin, its definition, characteristics, and consequences. For Kargel the different books of the Bible are of equal importance and truthfulness concerning the issue of sin. This attitude points to his canonical approach to the Bible. Kargel pays special attention to the things that are emphasised in the Bible. If the Bible emphasises something and mentions it repeatedly, then for Kargel it means that this topic is especially important (T 3.1, T 3.17, T 3.37, T 3.38, T 3.47, T 3.48).

Second, Kargel seeks to look at sin from God’s perspective. It is God’s view of sin that defines its nature as it is stated in the Bible (no philosophical or abstract definition of sin is mentioned). As everywhere else in his writings Kargel assumes that the Bible is the reflection of God’s position (T 3.1, T 3.7, T 3.37, T 3.38). Kargel plainly states that “the Bible is the divine revelation” (T 3.5). For Kargel it is sufficient that God of the Bible hates and despises sin and will certainly punish it. It is God’s attitude towards sin that makes sin the sin.

Third, Kargel demonstrates a typically protestant approach: sin is extremely evil; all people have sinned; all deserve death (T 3.7, T 3.43, T 3.44, T 3.45, T 3.46, T 3.47). Following Augustinian teaching Kargel insists that since the fall in the garden men are thoroughly corrupted. Although Kargel writes a lot about sin being “spiritual illness” he does not seem to hold semi-pelagianism. He simply follows biblical metaphors of sin-sickness and doctor-Saviour. He clearly states that the consequence of sin is death for body, soul, and spirit. People can do nothing to save themselves. The only way to salvation is through Jesus Christ.

Fourth, Kargel approaches the issue of sin in biblical-historical progression going from the Old Testament to the New Testament (T 3.8). However, he constantly quotes from a number of his favourite books: Genesis,

Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Psalms, Zachariah, Gospels, Acts, Romans, 1 Corinthians, 2 Peter, and Revelation.

Fifth, in his exegesis Kargel makes use of other translations, Luther's in particular (T 3.16).

Sixth, Kargel sometimes argues from logic. For example, one of his syllogisms is: If Christ had to go to the cross in order to pay for people's sins, then sin must be a really awful thing (T 3.9).

Seventh, an observation can be made concerning Kargel's use of metaphors and his understanding of the term. Kargel insists that sin is called sickness not in a figurative but in the literal sense. However, further on Kargel transfers this "sickness" into the spiritual realm, that is, he actually treats it as a metaphor. It seems that in this case he interprets the text correctly, except that he mixes up the terms "literal" and "figurative". It appears that in Kargel's understanding, "literal" means "in a very serious way" (T 3.11, T 3.12, T 3.14, T 3.30).

Eighth, it appears that Kargel takes the analogy of sin-illness a little too far and interprets some passages from Scripture quite arbitrarily. For example, he understands Psalm 90 as descriptive of sin. It is doubtful that this meaning was implied in the original context. Another example of his arbitrary interpretation is his usage of the imperative not to despise the deaf. He interprets it as a commandment not to despise sinners (T 3.15, T 3.33). This is another one of his syllogisms: (1) sin is spiritual deafness, (2) the Bible says not to despise the deaf. Hence: we should not despise the sinner.

Ninth, for Kargel biblical truth is not a number of abstract propositions, but a call for action (T 3.31).

Tenth, at times it seems that Kargel was so permeated with biblical language and imagery that he starts using it as his own.

Eleventh, Kargel stresses the awfulness of sin. He builds his case on passages speaking of sin's wickedness and corruption, and presents a number of examples.

5.3.4 Case study 4. Based on "The Reflection of Glories to Come"

It is the author's intention here to look at Kargel's position on the interpretation of the Old Testament. His perspective on the problem of the relation of the Old and the New Testaments is most clearly seen in his book

Svet iz teni budushchikh blag [The Reflection of Glories to Come] or “32 discourses about tabernacle and priesthood”. Both the title and the main idea of the book are derived from Hebrews 10:1, “For the law having a shadow of good things to come, and not the very image of the things, can never with those sacrifices which they offered year by year continually make the comers there unto perfect”. A literal translation of the title could read: “The light out of a shadow of good things to come”.

According to Lasor, “spiritual meaning may be drawn in different ways: by twisting or accommodating the text, by allegorizing, by the use of typology, or by strict application of the grammatical-historical method” (Lasor 1978:267). Kargel seems to choose typology.

Regarding his sources, Kargel mentions that he used the opinions of other authors who dealt with the same subject, mainly in English. He points out that in order to avoid citations and multiple references to the same names he mentions them once in his introduction. The main sources listed by Kargel in the introduction are Rogers, Mackintosh³⁵² and Soltau (Kargel 1908). These three, listed by Ehlert as Brethren writers, are Charles Henry Mackintosh (1820-1896), Ebenezer William Rogers, and Henry William Soltau (1805-1875) (Ehlert 1957:49-80). Kargel must have accessed their books in the personal libraries of Lieven, Pashkov, and the Kruezer sisters while he was living in St. Petersburg (Karetnikova 2004:684).

According to Rowdon, C. H. Mackintosh was a “remarkably successful popularizer” of Darby. His writings circulated widely, not only among the Open Brethren but beyond them (Rowdon 1990:92). Mackintosh was a popular writer among Exclusive Brethren (Coad 1968:55). “The easy-to-read devotional classic, ‘Notes on the Pentateuch’, by C. H. Mackintosh, is a good example of this kind of Darby theology in popular form” (MacLeod 1996:155-78). Mackintosh’s commentary on the Pentateuch was even translated into Russian and is well known in the Evangelical circles in Russia.

Mackintosh was an Irish schoolmaster who preached extensively in the revival movement. According to Coad, the initials “C H. M.” became familiar in many pious evangelical homes during the later Victorian and Edwardian years.

³⁵² Along with Darby Mackintosh was one of the leading figures among the early Brethren (MacLeod 1996:160).

Not a critical scholar, Mackintosh nevertheless had the gift of simple Biblical exposition, and his works on the Pentateuch had “an enormous vogue as simple aids to devotional interpretation of the first five books of the Bible” (Coad 1968:210). Besides, Mackintosh provided an example of “one who sought the meaning of a Bible passage through the illumination of the Holy Spirit.” (Fuller 1978:190).

Regarding the typological interpretation of the details of the tabernacle, in his commentary on the book of Exodus Mackintosh wrote

Nature can do nothing here, reason is blind... The most gigantic intellect, instead of being able to interpret the sacred symbols, appears like a bat in the sunshine, blindly dashing itself against the objects which it is utterly unable to discern... God the Holy Spirit is the One Who can... expound to our souls the true meaning of all that meets our view... The One who furnished the beautiful symbols [of the tabernacle] can alone interpret them (Mackintosh 1862:263).

According to Fuller, “The problem with this understanding of the role of the Holy Spirit in biblical interpretation is that the words of the text can play no essential role in conveying its intended meaning even though it is these very words which the writers were inspired to use in translating God’s message to men” (Fuller 1978:190). In table 4 the author will compare portions of Mackintosh’ commentary to similar passages in Kargel’s work in order to arrive at a better understanding of Kargel’s use of Brethren sources.

As for Henry Soltau, Ehlert lists his treatment of the Tabernacle among the most significant in Brethren circles (Ehlert 1957:49-80). Among other books, Soltau wrote “The Tabernacle, the Priesthood and Offerings” and “The Holy Vessels and Furniture of the Tabernacle”. Soltau became a prominent Bible teacher and an elder in the growing Plymouth assembly. W. H. Cole described hearing him teach:

Mr. Soltau was the first, I think, who taught the meaning of the types and sacrifices of the Old Testament, and as he unfolded the teaching of those symbols concerning the manifold perfection of the person and work of the Son of God, a peculiar awe brooded over the assembly, impelling to the silent worship of Him of whom he discoursed... He was withal a great preacher of righteousness.³⁵³

Soltau’s books were intended to open up the biblical teaching of the tabernacle in the wilderness, the priesthood, and the Levitical offerings; most

³⁵³ Bjorlie. Online. 29 March 2008.

books on the subject published in the twentieth century are heavily indebted to him.³⁵⁴ According Coad, Soltau's works on the Tabernacle together with Juke's writings were "in no small degree responsible for the typology which later became second nature to them", that is Plymouth Brethren (Coad 1968:80). It looks as if typology became "second nature" to Kargel as well.

Kargel occasionally refers to a few other writers who were not necessarily Brethren: Gustav Knack (Kargel 1908:23), Martin Luther (Kargel 1908:48), Zinzendorf (Kargel 1908:186), Woltersdorf (Kargel 1908:223), and Ber (Kargel 1908:228). As for Zinzendorf, he was a Pietist and close friend of Spener and Francke, whose

importance lies in the creation of a missionary, service-oriented, ecumenical free church based upon a common experience of salvation and mutual love, and the emphasis upon deep, emotional religious expression (especially in his hymns, prayers, poems, and "daily watch words") which infused new life into Protestant orthodoxy" (Pierard 1978:1071).

This pietistic outlook seems to be very characteristic of Kargel as well. Below are the reflections after careful studying of a portion of Kargel's book "The reflection of glories to come" (see Table 4) and comparing Kargel's writings with those of Mackintosh. Underlining in the table is mine.

5.3.4.1 Christological approach

According to Goppelt, "the fundamental question that divides the various schools of thought is about the relationship of the Old Testament to Jesus Christ" (Goppelt 1982:1). Kargel adopted a Christological approach to the Old Testament (T 4.0, T 4.2) and especially to the Pentateuch, following the Reformers and the Brethren. Kargel's goal is to find Christ, only Christ, and everywhere Christ in Exodus and Leviticus. The question is how he was going to accomplish his task.

Concerning the Anabaptist hermeneutics, Klassen wrote:

Perhaps the most serious hermeneutical problem with respect to the Old Testament is the question of allegory or typology. How does one extract the contents of the Bible from its imagery using methods which have certain built-in safeguards within them? Luther arrived at the standard was *Christum treibet*... The problem is that with this criterion it soon becomes the major task of the exegete to find Christ everywhere in the Old Testament (Klassen 1984:100).

³⁵⁴ Ibid.

Kargel's main instrument for finding Christ in the Old Testament seems to be typology. Both Kargel and Mackintosh consider typology a legitimate approach to the Old Testament. In the recent (and the only one known to the author) Master's dissertation on Kargel's hermeneutics, Makarenko points out that Kargel always looks for spiritual meaning and Christological aspect in every text and detail (Makarenko 2006:19). This appears to be true.

However, Kargel anticipated criticism. His book contains this apologetical statement regarding "too much" Christology in his interpretation:

But if this is Christ and Christ again whom we see in every different object, would not it be too much? Does not it seem to you that a legitimate question comes up, 'What are so many types for? Why to multiply them?' The answer is not difficult, and we will not have to look for it for too long. It is obvious that every separate object, no matter how many sides it has, can show our soul only one main characteristic of the personality of the Lord and may be some other secondary ones. Therefore, in order to let us grasp Christ as fully as possible, as much as we can contain, the Lord had to draw a number of types before us that had to do with Him (Kargel 1908:133).

Kargel recognizes that the truths about Christ in the Old Testament are hidden in the form of pictures and are more difficult to interpret and understand than direct statements by Jesus and the apostles (T 4.0). Kargel points to the importance of diligent and careful study of the text (T 4.0) and to the crucial role of the Holy Spirit in the process of illumination of the meaning of the text (T 4.0). He also emphasises that a serious Christian reader and interpreter must believe in the divine origin of the text in order to understand the importance of every word in the Scripture (T 4.1), and receive the Lord's in order to understand the message correctly (T 4.2). This Christological approach to the Old Testament plus close attention to the details of sacred objects resulted in looking for Christ's characteristics in all these details for both Kargel and Mackintosh (T 4.4, T 4.5, T 4.6). Both commentators regard the main colours of the tabernacle as important, symbolic, and speaking of Christ (T 4.1).

5.3.4.2 Continuing Brethren tradition of the interpretation of Pentateuch

Comparing the texts of Kargel and Mackintosh reveals how extensively Kargel relied on the latter, particularly in his exposition of the tabernacle colours (T 4.4, T 4.5, T 4.6, T 4.11, T 4.19). Although one does not find direct quotations from Brethren writer Mackintosh in Kargel's book, there are oblique

ones. Both Kargel and Mackintosh are searching for Christ; both find great significance in the details of objects of the tabernacle; both pursue devotional goals; both seem quite sure that their interpretation is correct; both consider a critical approach to Scripture unacceptable.

For example, one can compare statements from both commentators, beginning with Mackintosh:

The tabernacle was divided into three distinct parts, namely, 'the holy of holies,' 'the holy place,' and 'the court of the tabernacle'. The entrance into each of these was of the same materials, 'blue, purple, scarlet, and fine twined linen.' (Compare chapters xxvi. 31, 36; xxvii. 16.) The interpretation of which is simply this: Christ forms the only doorway into the varied fields of glory which are yet to be displayed, whether on earth, in heaven, or in the heaven of heavens. 'Every family, in heaven and earth,' will be ranged under His headship, as all will be brought into everlasting felicity and glory, on the ground of His accomplished atonement. This is plain enough, and needs no stretch of the imagination to grasp it. We know it to be true: and when we know the truth which is shadowed forth, the shadow is easily understood. If only our hearts be filled with Christ, we shall not go far astray in our interpretation of the tabernacle and its furniture. It is not a head full of learned criticism that will avail us much here, but a heart full of affection for Jesus, and a conscience at rest in the blood of His cross (Mackintosh 1862:288-289).

Compare this to Kargel:

...we should point out that besides the gates leading into the court... there was also a door leading into the holy place, then in the holy place there was a curtain dividing it from the holy of holies. All three were made from the same material of the same size and decorated by the same colours. This is already enough to make it clear that the same truths apply to all three entrances. They are preaching us Christ as the door through which we get to God. Besides, three different doors do not mean three different Christs but represent one and the same Christ as the entrance into different positions before God (Kargel 1908:18).

Makarenko views Kargel's book as a one-sided interpretation of the Old Testament texts, types, and symbols (Makarenko 2006:19). He also blames Kargel for a lack of cultural-historical reconstruction and contextual analysis. From his point of view Kargel's book lacks unity, wideness, and all-biblical look at the text in consideration. Makarenko's conclusion is that the book is an "example of typological interpretation of the Old Testament texts" (Makarenko 2006:20). However, Makarenko does not see that Kargel's commentary was simply written in a typically Brethren tradition. It was meant as a piece of devotional literature, not an arena in which to fight or argue. Besides, Kargel in his exposition works consistently within his stated presuppositions.

5.3.4.3 *The usage of typology*

Is Kargel's work on the tabernacle typological in nature? In order to answer this question one must first define typology and differentiate between typology and allegory.

Braaten follows Gerhard von Rad, stating that "the typological way of thinking seeks to discover a relation of correspondence between certain types in the Old Testament, such as persons, institutions, or events, which foreshadow similar realities, or antitypes, in the New Testament".³⁵⁵ According to Frei, "a typological (not spiritual) reading had been the main stream of practical Protestant interpretation. Indeed, a basic typological pattern of interpretation had furnished the scheme for the crucial claim that the Bible, particularly both testaments, form a unity" (Frei 1974:252). Goppelt also points out that "typology is the method of biblical interpretation that is characteristic of the New Testament... Typology and the typological method have been part of the church's exegesis and hermeneutics from the very beginning" (Goppelt 1982:4).

According to Virkler,

a type is a preordained representative representation which certain persons, events, and institutions bear to corresponding persons, events, and institutions occurring at a later time in salvation history... Typology is based on the assumption that there is a pattern in God's work throughout salvation history... in the Old Testament there are shadows of things which shall be more fully revealed in the New (Virkler 1981:184).

However, typology must be distinguished from allegory. "Typology is the search for linkage between historical events, persons, or things within salvation history; allegorism is the search for secondary and hidden meanings underlying the primary and obvious meaning of a historical narrative" (Virkler 1981:185). In addition, "in order for a figure to be a type there must be (1) some notable resemblance or analogy between the type and its antitype; (2) some evidence that the type was appointed by God to represent the thing typified; and (3) some future corresponding antitype" (Virkler 1981:187).

Similar ideas are expressed by Goppelt, who maintains:

Allegorical interpretation... is not concerned with the truthfulness or factuality of the things described. For typological interpretation, however, the reality of the things described is indispensable. The typical meaning

³⁵⁵ Von Rad, *Typological Interpretation of the Old Testament*, in Braaten 1968:125.

is not really a different or higher meaning, but a different or higher use of the same meaning that is comprehended in type and antitype (Goppelt 1982:13).

Besides, “allegory goes its own way regardless of the literal interpretation, while the typological use of Scripture begins with literal meaning” (Goppelt 1982:16).

In the words of Goppelt:

The concept of typology with which we begin may be defined and distinguished from other methods of interpretation as follows: Only historical facts – persons, actions, events and institutions – are material for typological interpretation: words and narratives can be utilized only insofar as they deal with such matters (Goppelt 1982:17-18).

Feinberg defines the dispensational position on typology: “(1) a type must have meaning in its own context; (2) the meaning of the type in its own context is essential for a type/antitype relationship (otherwise we have an example of a parable or perhaps an allegory, but not an example of typology); and (3) ignoring items 1 and 2 threatens the very integrity of the Old Testament”.³⁵⁶

However (and this is very important), “typology must not become involved in details... The types can be objects, institutions (priesthood and sacrifices) or events”.³⁵⁷ A cautious attitude towards interpretation of detail is mentioned by a number of scholars, including Virkler:

As in any other kind of comparison, every incidental detail of the type and antitype was not intended by the author to be a point of correspondence. Some commentators, for example, have divined from the fact that the serpent was made of brass (a metal inferior to gold or silver) that this was a type of the outward plainness of the Savior’s appearance. Other commentators have found in the acacia wood and gold of the tabernacle a type of the humanity and deity of Christ, and other types and symbols have been found in the boards, the sockets of silver, the heights of the doors, the linens, the colouring or lack of colouring of the draperies, etc. Such practices seem dangerously akin to the allegorism of the Middle Ages, imputing meaning to the text which is highly unlikely to have been intended by the biblical author (Virkler 1981:190).

For instance, Von Rad was “mindful that a renewal of typology might draw the interpreter’s attention to a host of insignificant details that can be made

³⁵⁶ John S. Feinberg, *Salvation in the Old Testament*, p.47, in Blaising 1988:254-280.

³⁵⁷ Tholuck, *Das Alte Testament im Neuen Testament*, 2nd ed., pp. 17, 42, 13, in

Goppelt 1982:10.

to correspond in the two Testaments”, therefore he gives it “a clear Christological focus” (Braaten 1968:36).

Consequently, biblical scholars loudly warn against getting carried away with applying typological method to minor details of the sacred objects of the Old Testament. However, where to draw the line is not always clear. There seems to be no problem applying the typological method to major details. For instance, Lasor argues that “since the tabernacle was a symbol that was later replaced by the reality it symbolized, it is entirely proper to speak of the tabernacle as a type of Christ” (Lasor 1978:269-270). Further on he continues:

This use of the word “type” is clearly to be distinguished from allegory. An allegorical interpretation of the tabernacle goes into fanciful explanation of every colour, every type of material, every piece of furniture... It is certainly true that some of the items used in the tabernacle cultus were in themselves symbolic of spiritual truth, and even types of realities to come. The sacrifices of bulls and goats... were typical of the sacrifice of Christ... As long as we begin with the reality that is symbolized in the text and proceed to the reality that replaces the symbol, we have controllable interpretation of the text. It avoids the criticism leveled against allegorizing the text, often deserved, and yields the spiritual meaning of the scriptural passage (Lasor 1978:270).

According to the definitions above, Kargel’s work can be classified as typological bordering with allegorical. It is true that Kargel starts with real objects, institutions, and persons described in Exodus and Leviticus and does not diminish their historical importance for the past. He looks for the correspondence of major themes found in both Testaments, for instance, the office of high priest, which “continued until all shadows vanished and the reality was revealed in Christ” (Kargel 1908:286). Another example is slavery to sin and redemption: “For those living in Egypt, that is for sinners, who live in the world and sin, there is no God and Christ abiding with them” (Kargel 1908:10). Mackintosh also compares slavery in Egypt to the slavery of sin (Mackintosh 1962:73). Nevertheless, Kargel, like Mackintosh, pays very close attention to details (colours, material, etc.) and treats them as types. Every small detail becomes a type, exactly the kind of typology scholars Virkler and Lasor consider allegorism.

Overall, in his interpretation of the Pentateuch Kargel was clearly following the Brethren, for whom “the sacrificial piety of the Old Testament is the object of much meditation on the part of the Darbyite Brethren, and . . . they interpret it in a typological sense. For example, all the details of the construction

of the Tabernacle (Ex 25-30) find their meaning in the various aspects of the person and office of Christ” (Darby 1972:135).

5.3.4.4 Conclusion

This book deals mostly with the Old Testament typology of the tabernacle and priesthood. Generally speaking, Kargel interpreted Exodus and Leviticus on the basis of Hebrews. However, this case study has once again shown Kargel’s strong links with the Brethren school of biblical interpretation, in that he follows their typological approach to the point of finding type-antitype correspondence in the details of the sacred objects.

The fact that three main sources cited by Kargel are Brethren highlights Kargel’s close relation with Brethren theology. A comparison of excerpts from the texts of Kargel and Mackintosh confirms that impression. It is true that Kargel’s general approach to interpreting Exodus and Leviticus is similar to Mackintosh’s, and on occasion Kargel directly borrows some thoughts from Mackintosh’s “Notes”. Besides (perhaps, due to the devotional nature of his book), he never indicates any disagreements with the sources that he consulted.

However, a deeper look into both Kargel’s and Mackintosh’s texts reveals certain differences. Kargel does not extend his search of types as far as Mackintosh does. For instance, Kargel does not see Moses as a type of Christ, whereas Mackintosh develops this idea to the point of seeing Moses and his wife Zipporah as types of Christ and his Church (Mackintosh 1862:65-68). Mackintosh wrote that “the Church of God collectively, as prefigured by Zipporah, and the members thereof individually, as seen in Zipporah’s sons, are presented as occupying the most intimate relationship with the deliverer” (Mackintosh 1862:224). His typology seems to border on allegorizing much more than Kargel’s. So, the influence of Brethren approach was strong but one can still consider Kargel a quite independent writer and thinker.

Like Luther and other Reformers, Kargel strongly believed in a Christological interpretation of the Bible. For him the Old Testament was a concealed New Testament. His goal in writing this book was to show what the Old Testament images stood for, particularly, to point out Christ. Finding Christ in the Old Testament helped make it relevant for New Testament believers.

5.4 Theological Presuppositions in Kargel's Hermeneutics

5.4.1 Scripture and the Holy Spirit

5.4.1.1 Inspiration and Inerrancy

The Holy Scripture and the Word of God are terms that Kargel uses interchangeably with both meaning the Bible (T 1.1, T 1.5, T 2.2, T 2.3, T 2.4, T 2.5, T 2.62, T 2.68, T 2.69, T 2.83). The terms themselves indicate Kargel's high view of Scripture being Holy and originating from God. Speaking about the Scripture, the Word of God, or the Bible Kargel means only the canonical books (Kratkoe izlozhenie 1913:2). Thus he works with the closed canon.

Inspiration in Kargel's writings is usually connected to the Holy Spirit, (Kratkoe izlozhenie 1913:2) although one can find it linked to God in general, to God the Father, and to the Lord. On some occasions, Jesus Christ is called the divine Author, "The first and the last, who was dead and is alive" – amazing features that the 'divine Author' signs his message with" (Kargel 2002:473). All three persons of the Trinity, according to Kargel, were somehow involved in the process of composing the Scriptures. He writes, for instance, "The revelation of Jesus Christ comes from God the Father and is given to the Son" (Kargel 2002:450). However, the Holy Spirit is mentioned in connection with Scripture is far more often than God the Father or God the Son.

Kargel believes that the Holy Spirit is truly God and a gift to those who were justified in Christ (Kargel 2003:17). According to Kargel, without the Holy Spirit's work in the human heart no one would come to God the Father or to the Son, and no one would even have the desire to come (Kargel 2003:18). As a matter of fact, Kargel was known for his special emphasis on the Holy Spirit in Russian Evangelical theology just as Calvin was in the Reformed theology.³⁵⁸ The Russian Evangelicals should be thankful to Kargel for drawing their attention to the Holy Spirit's work in various areas, including sanctification, inspiration, and illumination.

For Kargel the Bible is the book of the Spirit, who both authored it and continues to speak through it. In his confession of faith Kargel declared the

³⁵⁸ "We must say that the doctrine of the work of the Holy Spirit is the gift from Calvin to the Church" (Warfield 1956:485).

Bible to be the only necessary and sufficient source for knowing God and for salvation, the foundation of our faith and guidance in all matters of life (Kratkoe izlozhenie 1913:2). This kind of declaration requires a theological presupposition concerning the relationship between the Book and the Spirit. The Scripture is authoritative only due to its divine origin (the Spirit was actively involved in composing the biblical documents – inspiration) (T 1.3, T 2.16, T 2.19, T 2.20, T 2.83) and the Spirit's active role in speaking and working through the Scripture in bringing people to understand these documents (illumination) (T 2.4, T 2.65).

In the matters of dual (divine and human) authorship of the Scripture Kargel emphasises the divine aspect (T 2.16, 2.20, 2.83). For example, when writing of God's demand for holiness, Kargel makes an important statement showing that he believed that the Holy Spirit was the divine author of the Scripture: "the Holy Spirit carried this command into the New Testament and directed it to us with the same seriousness (1 Pet 1:15-16, Thes 4:3)" as He had to the Old Testament believers (Kargel 2002:52). Kargel writes as if there were no Peter or Paul penning the epistles but the Holy Spirit alone deciding what should or should not be "carried into the New Testament".

On another occasion, regarding God's patience, Kargel wrote, "the Holy Spirit did not leave us in ignorance concerning His patience. He left us the whole chapter on patience – 2 Pet 3" (Kargel 2002:498). Discussing the passage I Corinthians 15:50-57, Kargel says that it was the Holy Spirit who allowed Apostle Paul to make an additional comment about the sting of death and the power of sin (Kargel 2002:416). There are many more instances when Kargel calls the Holy Spirit the author of the Bible without mentioning human writers, for instance, "the Holy Spirit had nothing worthy of writing down on the pages of this Holy Book about people who surrounded Enoch" (Kargel 2002:265).

However, human component of scriptural authorship sometimes comes through. For instance, Kargel points out the Thessalonians' lack of knowledge that made the Apostle clarify the issue of the Lord's coming: "He [Apostle Paul] had two reasons to write to them: their deep sorrow about the dead and their lack of understanding about the reason why a child of God should die in sufferings" (Kargel 2002:420-421). Although Kargel often refers to the Holy Spirit speaking in the Scripture, he claims the book of Proverbs was written by

Solomon when he was backsliding (Kargel 2002:199-200). Frequently, Kargel quotes or refers to a passage using the formula, “the Apostle [prophet, etc.] speaking by the Holy Spirit” (Kargel 2002:230).

Although he never mentions the term, Kargel at times seems to advocate the verbal inspiration of Scripture. According to Grenz’s definition,

verbal inspiration... declares that the activity of the Holy Spirit extends to the very words of Scripture. We must be careful, however, not to equate the idea with the theory of divine dictation. Rather than asserting that God dictated every word, we ought to understand verbal inspiration as only claiming that the Spirit superintended the process of word selection and word order to the extent that they are capable of communicating the intended meaning of the text (Grenz 1994:518-519).

Kargel does not explain how the process of inspiration took place, but a few scattered statements in his works allow one to deduce his views. For instance, speaking of Moses as one of the Old Testament types, Kargel says that it was the Holy Spirit who had chosen particular words (Kargel 2002:280).

The idea of verbal inspiration even to the point of divine dictation is especially strong in connection to the book of Revelation. Kargel holds that the book of Revelation is not the revelation of John, because “John was like a secretary who wrote down what he saw and heard. The first verse of the book says that this is the revelation of Jesus Christ” (Kargel 2002:449). However, this approach does not necessarily apply to other books of the Bible. At least, Kargel does not make a general statement that would allow assuming that he viewed all human authors of the Bible as “mere secretaries”. It can be concluded that Kargel allowed for various ways of inspiration taking place: compiling from dictation (in the case of Apostle John writing Revelation), writing from a sense of urgency (Apostle Paul writing to Thessalonians), or from wisdom (Solomon writing the book of Proverbs). However, as a result people possess a unique Book which is the Word of God – this is the truth that Kargel never doubts.

The term that Kargel himself often uses speaking about the Bible is “*nepogreshimoe*” (Kargel 2002:197), best translated as “infallible” or “inerrant”. By this theologians normally mean “not liable to deceive”, that is, since “the Spirit moved in the lives of the authors, the product can be trusted. The writers do not intend to lead their readers astray” (Grenz 1994:519). Indeed, Kargel perceives “the product” as presenting God’s point of view. For example, at the

beginning of the book “Sin as the greatest evil”, Kargel wrote, “Let us look at the sin from God’s point of view, which is revealed in the Scripture” (Kargel 2002:5).

Finally, according to Kargel God’s revelation of truth is basically limited to the Bible. However, Kargel does not rule out the possibility of having direct revelations from the Holy Spirit even in the present day unless they contradict scripture. “It is true that the Holy Spirit even now reveals the will of God directly to His children, but these revelations must be without doubt in accordance with the written Word” (Kargel 2002:92). In this case Kargel seems to differ from the Reformers, especially Calvin, who restricted the operation of the Holy Spirit to scripture.

In this Kargel is closer to the Anabaptists’ point of view that exalted the teaching office of the Holy Spirit and allowed for the possibility of extra biblical revelation coming directly from the Holy Spirit (Klaassen 1984:6). Like the Anabaptists, Kargel did not make correct doctrine of scriptural inspiration fundamental to the rest of doctrine. Neither did he make any attempt to spell out the nature of inspiration or its theological implications. He simply accepted Scripture as a trustworthy guide and the instrument that God had provided for the disclosure of His will (Kraus 1984:135).

5.4.1.2 Illumination by the Holy Spirit

The necessity of illumination of the Holy Spirit in interpreting Scripture follows naturally out of Kargel’s view of inspiration. The Spirit’s work that brought Scripture into existence did not end in the distant past. The Spirit continued to speak to people through the Bible. Seeing the Scripture as inspired by the Holy Spirit makes the role of the Spirit in the process of interpretation crucial and decisive. Who but the author can help readers to gain the true meaning of the text? In Kargel’s view, the Holy Spirit plays the central role in scriptural interpretation (T 2.4, T 2.44, T 2.65, T 2.82, T 2.83). The Spirit is not only the ultimate Author of the Scripture but also a vital agent who sheds light upon it and helps to understand the truth. The following phrase is not atypical for Kargel: “I can learn something today if the Holy Spirit, the author of this chapter, will shed His light upon it” (Kargel 2002:264).

Kargel does not fully explain the way in which the Holy Spirit’s illumination works. However, one can find a few essential hints concerning Kargel’s understanding of illumination in a number of his works. According to

Kargel, it is the Holy Spirit who at the right time would present every “serious soul with more new truths mostly needed by the soul and would also interpret them” (Kargel 2002:94). So Kargel sees the Holy Spirit not only drawing one’s attention to new truths but also interpreting them. Writing about Moses as an Old Testament type, Kargel goes into more detail about the process of illumination:

The Holy Spirit takes one or more features from the walk of faith of an Old Testament saint, places them before us, lights them up by His divine light, and the beauty and attractiveness of the image of the person draws us and makes us follow his faith and life (Kargel 2002:280).

Basically, Kargel is saying that the Holy Spirit makes the Bible “come alive”.

Another important point made by Kargel is that in order to be a good interpreter of the Scripture one must be born again. This view is similar to that of the Reformers, especially Calvin (Rossouw 1982:172), and the Pietists of the 1600s and 1700s (Grenz 1994:507). According to Kargel, an unregenerate person cannot fully understand Scripture: “There is nothing in this book for those who are not God’s servants; there is nothing they can look for. Therefore it is closed for unregenerate interpreters, because it is not for them” (Kargel 2002:450). No matter how much knowledge of the Scripture an unbeliever has, scripture will remain misunderstood by that person. “The best theologian, who is not converted, has no hope” (Kargel 2002:378).

Kargel believes that the Scripture can be either “open” or “closed” to a reader, even to a believer, depending on his/her motives; it is God who has the power to “open” the Scripture to those who seek to find its truths and apply them to themselves (Kargel 2002:93). Speaking of Christ’s abundant richness, Kargel makes the following statement: “Although it is proclaimed on every page of the New Testament, we can still remain blind to it (Eph 3:5). Even when we see Christ, the Holy Spirit must prepare us so that we can embrace Him (Eph 3:8-9)” (Kargel 2002:88). Hence, it takes the Holy Spirit to “open” one’s eyes to the truths that are already in the text.

Kargel points out that quietness and solitude are two important factors for “letting God to speak to us whether through our dwelling upon His precious Word or directly through the Holy Spirit” (Kargel 2002:113). First, Kargel distinguishes between merely getting information from the text and letting “God speak to us” through the Word. In other words, anyone can read the Scripture but not always and not everybody can hear the voice of God through it. Second,

as it was mentioned above, Kargel does not limit God's special revelation to Scripture but leaves some room for direct revelation from the Holy Spirit to a person.

The motives of those who study the Scripture are also very important. In order to gain spiritually from reading Scripture a reader must be willing to search the truth for himself/herself (T 2.68, T 2.70, T 2.77, T 2.81), as well as be ready to put the revealed truths into practice (T 1.5, T 1.7, T 1.12, T 2.16, T 2.47, T 2.61, T 2.63, T 2.72, T 2.76, T 2.79). The attitude of the reader is a factor which can either facilitate or impede the Holy Spirit in revealing biblical truths. In "Old Testament types" Kargel asks,

Do you come to the Word of God as spiritually poor and having nothing? Those who once they hear a passage think they already know what is going to be said rarely receive anything from the Holy Spirit . . . It is the Lord's Spirit that we have to listen to, not a man . . . There is no other way: we must be truly empty in order to be filled up (Kargel 2002:341).

Further Kargel points out how important it is to keep an open mind toward familiar passages and to continue reading them. Otherwise, "you cut the way for the Holy Spirit to add new revelations to the ones you already have" (Kargel 2002:94). He continues:

May we come to the Word with a heart likened to a clean sheet of paper... with desire to find out His will. Then, without a doubt, the Lord will write on it something precious! It is highly important to always wait for something great, something precious from the Lord. May we come for real food and for real drink, for nourishment for our souls, and when we get something, let us stay at the 'table' as long as the Holy Spirit is keeping us there (Kargel 2002:95).

It is the Holy Spirit who, according to Kargel, judges the readiness of a reader to embrace new truths from the Word. "If we are ready to perceive, the Holy Spirit has to show us many more truths. Yes, He can suddenly make this precious Book absolutely fresh for us" (Kargel 2002:93). Kargel calls his readers "to give freedom to the Holy Spirit to lead us into understanding of every truth" (Kargel 2002:49).

Thus, on one hand, there are conditions to be met before the Spirit's illumination can take place. According to Kargel, the illumination does not take place automatically, but the Holy Spirit reveals scriptural truths only to those who believe, who approach the Word seriously and with good motives, who can quietly listen, who are open-minded, who are ready to embrace new truths and are thirsty for them, and who are willing to put those truths into practice. The

Holy Spirit does not illuminate the minds and hearts of those who study the Word only out of curiosity, mechanically, or for the sake of gaining mere cognitive knowledge (T 1.9, T 2.75).

On the other hand, Kargel places an important role upon constant reading, searching, and studying the whole Scripture (T 2.68, T 2.70, T 2.77, T 2.81). An understanding of the text does not come only through some mystical encounter with the Holy Spirit, but also requires work and effort from the reader. Before any truth can be revealed to us, “we should be well acquainted with the Word” (Kargel 2002:92). Kargel refers to the passage in John 14:26, “The Holy Spirit... will teach you and remind you all that I have told you”. Kargel reasonably points out that “one can be reminded only of those things that he already knows or used to know, therefore our knowledge of the Word is a condition of getting instructed in every truth” (Kargel 2002:92). Exegesis is therefore the work of a believer who is open to the guidance of the Holy Spirit.

Finally, Kargel brings together the doctrines of inspiration and illumination saying that, “if we neglect the Word of God, the Holy Spirit will cease giving us His direct revelations, because the Word from the beginning to the end is His revelation, which first of all requires our whole attention” (Kargel 2002:92).

5.4.1.3 Scriptural Authority

First, Kargel affirms biblical authority on the foundation of the Bible’s inspiration. Seeing the Scripture as inspired by the Holy Spirit, it is only logical and natural that Kargel never doubts its trustworthiness and authority. Indeed, if it is not true, “why take the Bible into our hands? For what is all the revelation of God in the Bible then?” (Kargel 2002:233). Kargel calls the Word of God “truly the word of truth” (Kargel 2002:248) and speaks of “the pure and true Word of God” (Kargel 2002:249).

Second, the Scripture is a unique Book because the Spirit presently uses it to reveal and interpret truth. So, for Kargel the Scripture is authoritative for two main reasons: the Spirit originally inspired it, and it is the instrument through which the Spirit speaks. Kargel argues from this basic presupposition. He accepts biblical authority by faith, not as something to be proven by the arguments of reason: “It is through the anointment by the Holy Spirit that we

know for certain that being obedient to the Word we are in agreement with God Himself” (Kargel 2002:142).

Another important reason for Kargel’s high view of Scripture is Christ’s attitude towards it:

Where does He stand in the connection to the Word? Was not He the incarnate Word himself? Did not the Father speak through Him during His whole earthly life (Heb 1:2), and does not the Father even now continue to speak from the place of the glory through the Son (Heb 12:25)? However, when the Lord Jesus came to this earth, He was born according to the Word, lived, suffered, died, and rose up from the dead according to the Word. And we hear again and again, ‘may Scripture be fulfilled’. His whole incarnate existence among us was the continuing fulfilment of the Word of God, so the written Word and the incarnate Word were one (Kargel 2002:92).

The written Word holds the highest authority for Kargel, higher than any human authority or even “direct” revelations from the Spirit (Kargel 2002:92). Kargel regrets that some people “can be convinced by words, opinions, and authority of other people instead of trusting the Word of God” (Kargel 2002:497). Indeed, how can anybody argue with God? Kargel speaks of God sitting on the throne, who said, “these words are true”, therefore, “how can we argue with Him who has written these words and many similar ones into His book” (Kargel 2002:250). In theological argument nothing can be qualified as “truth” for Kargel unless it is found in the Bible: “If there is not a single passage in Scripture speaking of this matter then proclaiming such matter falls under apostolic anathema” (Kargel 2002:230).

Kargel’s high view of the Scripture brings him to the next step, that is, confessing the Scripture as “the only necessary and completely sufficient source for knowing God, for our salvation, and for knowing His will in all matters of our faith and practice” (Confession 1913), which is a traditional Baptist assertion (Grenz 1994:525). Kargel’s acknowledgment of the Bible’s authority “in all matters of our faith and practice” means placing all aspects of a believer’s life, attitudes, and worldview under biblical authority. This does not mean that the Bible should be used as a scientific textbook, but that having a biblical worldview would influence one’s thinking and actions in every facet of life. As a rule, Kargel concentrates on the significance of the text for faith and Christian living and does not get into “academic” discussions concerning difficulties presented by the text. Those do not seem to bother or interest Kargel.

In Kargel's view scriptural authority requires direct practical application. It calls for action and obedience (T 2.75, T 2.78, T 2.81, T 2.82, T 2.86, T 2.91). For him, an imperative in the Bible is imperative, a command for action. In dealing with the passages requiring holiness, Kargel reckons that "if we believe like children that God says what He thinks, then from the passages mentioned above and from many others we must conclude that God's goal for us in our redemption was the complete break with sin" (Kargel 2002:69). A few points can be made from this statement. First, Kargel takes the Scripture seriously the way it is written. Second, scriptural imperatives are obligatory for believers. Third, believers should approach Scripture with simple faith like little children, as something to be obeyed not questioned.

5.5 Pietism as the main "root" of Kargel's hermeneutical strategy

5.5.1 Is it legitimate to call Russian evangelicals Pietists?

It has been suggested a number of times throughout the paper that striving for *blagochestie*, that is, pietism, was the unifying factor of the various Russian evangelical groups. Pietism was the movement that affected Evangelical origins in Russia in the nineteenth century, just as it had affected British Evangelicalism (Bebbington 1989:39). Discussing the origin of the Mennonite Brethren in Russia in the 1860s, Kuiper points out that "the pietistic influence within the Mennonite churches . . . in Russia . . . had probably been even deeper than in Holland" (Kuiper 1984:126).

Speaking of pietistic influence in Russia brings to mind Stundism with its "*Stunde*" traced right back to Spener; the "pietistic movements in Russia's German colonies which spread among neighbouring Slavic peasants" (Elliott & Deyneka 1999:197); and the Pashkovites who "had always enjoyed the pietistic freedom of expression" (Nichols 1991:74-75). "The significant influence of German Pietism" was felt even among early Russian and Ukrainian Baptists in their "egalitarian governance of early congregations" (Corrado 2007:9). For decades pietism remained a feature for which "Russian Baptists had gained a reputation abroad", as Karev, a Baptist-Evangelical leader of the post World War II period, pointed out (Sawatsky 1976:232).

Nichols persistently writes about “the Pietistic ideas of Radstock, Pashkov, and Kargel” that were “echoed by some congregations and individuals who rejected Prokhanov’s attempts to organize them into a denomination and remained independent” (Nichols 2007:87). Now the question is: what were those “pietistic ideas” and how did they affect the method of interpreting Scripture?

Collins insists that “the term Pietism properly refers to a rather well-defined movement which surfaced in the seventeenth century and ran its course by the end of the eighteenth” (Collins1992:77). Stoeffler, however, does not see Pietism as “restricted to a movement within the Lutheran churches in Germany” (Stoeffler 1965:6). According to Stoeffler, Pietism “should be seen as a major reform movement . . . during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries and remained an important source of whatever religious dynamic was developed by Protestants around the world since that time” (Stoeffler 1965:23).

Stoeffler holds a broad concept of Pietism. For him, pietism is “a spirit”, and as such it transcends time, geographical locations, and denominational affiliations. “Whether it occurs in England, in Scotland, in Wales, in the Netherlands, in Germany, in Switzerland, in Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Russia or North America, whether it is linked with Calvinistic, Lutheran, or Arminian theology, its main features are always the same” (Stoeffler 1965:7).³⁵⁹ When understood this broadly it can easily embrace movements like the Mennonite Brethren, Stundism, or Pashkovism.

5.5.2 Four features of Pietism

According to Ferguson, “Pietism, in its post-Puritan expression, had a number of distinctive features. It was a quest for personal holiness and, conversely, a resistance to compromise with the world” (Ferguson 1984:234). For the purposes of our discussion it is necessary to look briefly into some of the features of Pietism. The author is going to rely upon Stoeffler’s insights into

³⁵⁹ Though Hindmarsh points out that “Stoeffler’s argument . . . cuts a swath a little too wide to be finally definitive, leaving out, as it does, ideological factors” (Hindmarsh 1993:49), the author will be using Stoeffler’s characteristics while keeping in mind “ideological” emphases, such as “the New Birth and the priesthood of all believers, teachings that were translated into actuality by itinerant preaching and the *collegia pietatis*, or class meetings” (Hempton 1993:57). Radstock and Baedeker serve as prime examples of such itinerant preaching.

pietism – this “one of the least understood movements in the history of Christianity” (Stoeffler 1965:1). Stoeffler names and discusses four basic characteristics of Pietism; they can all be discerned in the Russian Evangelical movement in general and in Kargel’s writings specifically.

Experientialism is the first general characteristic of Pietism and basically refers to the emphasis on a personal encounter with God.

From the days of the apostles we find running through the history of the Church what we might call an experiential tradition. During the Middle Ages it has expressed itself in a mystical approach to the Christian life In the turbulent days of the Reformation . . . [it] exerted itself with perfectly tremendous force. Neither Luther, nor Calvin were free from its grip The major representatives of sane and responsible Anabaptism [moved in this track] Grebel, Hübmaier, Marpeck, Menno Simon They all, without exception, felt and taught that their theology was the result of the Word which they had inwardly experienced During the seventeenth century this experiential line asserted itself throughout Protestantism in the Pietistic movement (Stoeffler 1965:6-7).

The idea of experiencing the Word inwardly was closely connected with the idea of being indwelt by Christ.

Like all masters of the devotional life in the history of Christianity, beginning with the apostles and coming down through Augustine, the mystics, and the Reformers, Pietists had the further insight that the kind of authority which alone makes Christian faith individually significant is always experiential. Such authority . . . comes to be exclusively in the ‘I-Thou’ relationship (Stoeffler 1965:14).

This sounds almost like medieval mysticism, yet unlike mystics the Pietists emphasised “the new relationship with God which is based upon faith” whether they spoke “of being filled with the Spirit within the individual” or “the indwelling Christ” (Stoeffler 1965:15). Whether they spoke about “Inner identification with God” which was “the universal emphasis of Pietism”, or “the indwelling Christ”, they attempted to point out “the possibility, necessity, and privilege of a Christian’s experiential oneness with God” (Stoeffler 1965:15).

They often used “terms of endearment” in their reference to God (Stoeffler 1965:16). Traditionally Pietists were accused of being primarily concerned with “feeling and hence the emotional enjoyment of religion” (Stoeffler 1965:10). However, “the leading Pietists were sober men who were considerably more concerned about cross bearing and the moral reformation of the person than about pleasurable feeling states” (Stoeffler 1965:10).

There is no doubt that Kargel's writings are characterized by experientialism. Kargel consistently emphasises a personal encounter with God and His Word and being filled with the Spirit (Kargel 2006:249-250, 293-294; T 1.7). Even those "terms of endearment" are not absent in his writings (T 2.62, T 2.67, T 2.68). The emphasis upon the indwelling Christ – "Christ in you" – is one of Kargel's favourite topics (T 2.34, T 2.39, T 2.44, T 2.45, T 2.60). He emphasises "personal" knowledge of Christ (T 2.67).

The second characteristic is defined as religious idealism, which finds its expression in the Pietists' desire to be "entirely Christian" (Stoeffler 1965:16). The Pietists "emphasised a total break with the old life, a total commitment to the new life in Christ, a total acceptance of all of the implications of this new life as they saw them" (Stoeffler 1965:17). They constantly preached that "without conversion and sanctification the individual Christianity is hollow and his religious profession mere sham" (Stoeffler 1965:17). Actually this was one of the reasons for rising of the Pietistic movement.

Those men and women . . . wanted more than baptism, confirmation, and a learned sermon on some disputed point of theology. The result was a Pietistic sermon, practical, deeply ethical rather than theological, fervent, urgent, Biblical and sometimes legalistic . . . in which its implications for daily life became focal points for mutual exhortation (Stoeffler 1965:19-20).

The second characteristic can also be clearly traced in Kargel's writings. His overall emphasis on devotion and commitment to God cannot be missed (T 1.7, T 2.61, T 2.63, T 2.72, T 2.73). Conversion and sanctification are prominent themes (T 2.10, T 2.11, T 2.12, T 2.14, T 2.84). His style of writing is definitely more ethical than theological. His goal is to edify, not to educate (T 1.9, T 2.3).

The third basic characteristic of Pietism is its Biblicism. Pietistic theology "was wholly centred in the written Word . . . having to be inwardly appropriated through the Spirit" (Stoeffler 1965:10). "Reason was still given a prominent place in the interpretation of Scripture but it was reason in subjection to the intuited authority of the divine Spirit" (Stoeffler 1965:82). A typical pietistic notion was that the most important thing in life was to do the will of God as revealed in the Bible. Adherents wanted more than to simply pay lip service to the authority of the Bible; they "insisted upon the kind of interpretation which was relatively free from a narrow confessional perspective" (Stoeffler 1965:183-185).

The Pietists were dominantly concerned with the question, “How are the insights of the Bible to be applied to the problems of daily life?” (Stoeffler 1965:20). Importantly, “men and women who professed to be Christians were to remember that their bodies are in truth a temple of God” (Stoeffler 1965:21). The Pietists “emphasised the necessary connection of a living faith with Christian conduct . . . a life of devotion, and of self-denial, a life lived according to the New Testament pattern as they saw that pattern” (Stoeffler 1965:11). However Stoeffler admits that “at times the Pietistic interpretation became legalistic and most of the time it was austere” (Stoeffler 1965:21).

John Arndt (1555-1621), known as the father of Lutheran pietism (Stoeffler 1965:202) and an effective Pietistic preacher, whose “chief objective was to edify and confirm the heart rather than to inform the head” was convinced “that a preacher must first ‘take heed to himself’, before he undertakes to feed the flock” (Stoeffler 1965:204). Arndt’s chief means to that end was “the daily and prayerful study of the Scriptures” (Stoeffler 1965:204). Pietism was focused on “deepening and strengthening the devotional life of people rather than upon correctness of theological definition or liturgical form” (Stoeffler 1965:2). “Pietism’s productiveness in edificatory literature is indicative of its constant preoccupation with the devotional aspects of the Christian life” (Stoeffler 1965:18). An overall tendency was to let the Bible criticize its interpreters, and not the other way around, as articulated here by Stoeffler:

Pietism from the beginning and through the eighteenth century was strongly committed to Biblical norms of thought and life and became increasingly distrustful of reason . . . It was this implicit, somewhat naïve, trust in the Word, rather than in man’s words about the Word . . . The theory was, of course, that the Spirit of God is able to commend the truth of the Bible to men’s minds and hearts without the tortured interpretations of the professionals (Stoeffler 1965:21).

It is the Pietism that made the Bible “the Book of the masses” (Stoeffler 1965:5) in a very real and practical sense.

[Pietists] trusted the religious opinions of theologically untrained laymen . . . laymen were permitted to testify, to exhort, an even to preach . . . The only requirement was that lay testimony must be Biblically based and supported in him who testifies by a life which exhibits the New Testament ethics (Stoeffler 1965:21-22).

An interpreter’s right attitude was seen as a precondition for the correct interpretation of the text. For example, A. H. Franke (1663-1727) laid down as

one of his hermeneutical principles that “to the extent that you are crucified to the world, you will be able to grasp what the holy scriptures are saying” (Fuller 1978:198).

This kind of pietistic Biblicism sounds very similar to Kargel’s position in general and even in details. The following are but a few points of correspondence. Kargel also proclaimed the Bible the centre not only of his theology but also of his whole life. He viewed the Holy Spirit working to actualize the Bible’s words (T 2.82, T 2.83). Reason was supposed to play only a secondary role (T 1.7). Scripture had to be applied and obeyed (T 2.16, T 2.63, T 2.72, T 2.76, T 2.79). It is quite obvious that Kargel and the Pietists shared a common epistemological model. The Spirit and obedience to the Word were viewed as decisive factors for further and better understanding (T 2.4, T 2.47, T 2.63, T 2.72, T 2.76, T 2.79). Preachers must first “preach” to themselves. It was important for every believer to study and search the Word for him/herself regardless of his/her theological training (Kargel 2006:316-317; T 1.6, T 2.77, T 2.79). The emphasis on daily and prayerful Scripture reading was strong in Kargel’s writings and is still present in the Russian Evangelical circles even today.

The fourth characteristic of Pietism is its opposite character. Stoeffler insists that the term Pietism can be used only when the kind of piety described above “stands over against prevailing norms of faith and life . . . in opposition to the conception of Christian belief and practice which generally prevailed within the Establishment” (Stoeffler 1965:22). With this definition in mind, continental Anabaptists in the sixteenth century, Puritan Pietists in the seventeenth century England, English Brethren in the nineteenth century England would qualify as Pietists in a broad sense of the word.

Russian Evangelicals of the late nineteenth – early twentieth century were indeed in opposition to the Establishment. It was the kind of opposition that brought them to prisons and exiles, and often cost them their lives. Kargel’s biography provides a vivid example of this opposition, discussed above in the historical part of the dissertation. Another commonality of the early European Pietists, Russian Stundists, and the Pashkovites was that they usually did not initiate the break with the Establishment. “Where the possibility existed to remain within the territorial churches the early Pietists were content to do so,

where separation became necessary they accepted willingly the inevitable loss of status or persecution” (Stoeffler 1965:23).

Summarising, it can be concluded that Kargel’s theological profile fits well in the pietistic paradigm as defined by Stoeffler. The next question concerns Kargel’s hermeneutics. How can one qualify it?

5.5.3 Kargel’s hermeneutics of Pietism

One must remember that Kargel lived during the era of classical hermeneutics, which stood on the platform that “there is one intended, literal, proper sense to any given passage of Scripture” (Montgomery 1995:16). That era was in line with Schleiermacher’s tradition with its emphasis on a grammatical-historical approach. However it would be wrong to try to place Kargel within this tradition. For better or for worse, Kargel seemed to avoid the paradigm of a “Cartesian, Newtonian, Baconian” approach to the interpretation of text performed “in a pure, laboratory-clean manner” (Miller II 1995:215). One will search in vain when trying to find in Kargel an inductive approach to the text, reading it “objectively” and “neutrally,” or an attempt to get rid of presuppositions. It is also important to remember (if one wants to avoid asking the wrong questions) that Kargel lived before “the shift towards hermeneutics under the influence of M. Heidegger and R. Bultmann” (Dockery 1994:46).

D. Dockery names a third alternative – the pietistic approach to the interpretation of the text. He points out that “the modern era has generally continued in one of three directions: the Reformation, the Pietistic, or historical-critical approach” (Dockery 1994:43). As far as Kargel’s hermeneutics is concerned the historical-critical approach is ruled out immediately. It is quite obvious that Kargel had nothing to do with the nineteenth-century liberal interpretation of the Bible. Was Kargel aware of liberal hermeneutics, which sought to do away with the supernatural Christ of the New Testament in favour of a “historical Jesus” who was primarily a teacher of ethics, and the attacks against the inspiration and authority of the Bible? Considering his frequent travels around Europe he could have been well aware of the modern trends.

It is hard to tell how well-read Kargel was in German liberal theology, but he must have at least been aware of Lev Tolstoy, the great Russian novelist who accepted only the ethical teachings of the New Testament. Taking into consideration that the liberal camp developed a “special distaste towards

miraculous and eschatological in the Bible” (Dorman 1983:7-8), Kargel occupied the opposite end of the spectrum – he was known for his love for all things eschatological in the Bible. However, unlike fundamentalists, he never engaged in a battle with rigid historicism, which sought to exclude the supernatural element; Kargel probably considered such battles a waste of time.

Under the “Reformation direction” Dockery means the priority of the literal sense, “the emphasis on the grammatical-historical method as the foundation for developing the spiritual message” and “stress on a fuller sense found in the Christological meaning of Scriptures” (Dockery 1994:42-43). Frei points out what served as a common starting point for both the Pietistic and “orthodox” traditions, that is, the acceptance of the truthfulness of Scripture:

[The Pietists] followed the Reformers and a large consensus of Western Christendom from earliest times in their interpretation of biblical narratives. To them all, literal and historical readings of these narratives were in effect the same thing . . . If a biblical text was obviously literal rather than allegorical or topical, and if it was a narrative, then it was historical. Moreover, neither Luther nor Calvin saw any contradiction between a literal reading and the claim that the whole Bible, both Old and New Testaments, preached Christ (Frei 1974:40).

Similar ideas are expressed by Stoeffler: “Early Pietism had its roots in the Protestant Reformation, adhered faithfully to its basic doctrinal norms, and tried to keep alive its spiritual dynamic” (Stoeffler 1965:23). However, the Pietists, although sharing the Reformers’ doctrines, did not stop there.

According to Kaiser & Silva,

pietism was a protest against the doctrinal dogmatism and institutionalism that exhibited an absence of personal faith and pious Christian practice in one’s life-style. In addition to such leaders in the movement as Philipp Jacob Spener and August Hermann Franke, the most valuable contributions to interpretation were made by John Albert Bengel . . . [who] stuck close to the natural meaning of the text (Kaiser & Silva 1994:226).

The Pietists endeavoured “to correct the then current dry-to-dust orthodoxy in favour of the Christianity of the Reformers, which was a living, vital and hence effectively satisfying faith” (Stoeffler 1965:11).

The question is where exactly does Kargel stand in relation to these main directions? If Kargel’s way of doing theology is to be compartmentalised it seems to fit in the category of pietistic hermeneutics. Although Kargel never identified himself with Pietism explicitly (while holding Luther in great regard!), his thoughts, feelings, emphases, expressions, and goals make one look in the

direction of pietistic tradition or rather somewhere between the pietistic and “the Reformation” traditions.

Pietism influenced Kargel indirectly via the Mennonites, Brethren, Stundists, Baptists, and British Evangelicals. The great degree of similarities between these movements makes it difficult to distinguish which particular (if any) influence is responsible for this or that view, position, or thought found in Kargel’s writings. Besides, these movements interacted with each other, which resulted in a significant amount of influence upon each other. For instance, the religious concerns of the evangelical Anabaptists and continental Pietists had been similar (Stoeffler 1965:20).

According to Klassen, the Anabaptists claimed to base their “total position upon biblical revelation” and approached the Bible “earnestly and naively” (Klassen 1984:78). The same can be said regarding the Pietists per se, English Brethren, German (Oncken’s) Baptists, and even native Russian Molokans. They all shared some, if not all, characteristics and emphases of Pietism as described by Stoeffler. Therefore instead of arguing that Kargel inherited one idea from the Mennonite Brethren and another from the Brethren (such statements would be defenceless, ambiguous, and prone to error), it would be much safer and more correct to say that Kargel held the same pietistic approach as the Mennonites, Brethren, and Baptists, unless some of his specific views are recognisably Baptist, Brethren or Mennonite.

Here is an example. In the matter of apocalyptic expectations Kargel seems closer to Darby and the Exclusive Brethren who were “making eschatological views the central point of their system” (Coad 1968:129), than to Baedeker (an Open Brethren) in whose teaching “the intense apocalyptic note was almost entirely absent” (Coad 1968:156). And this is despite the fact that Kargel was much more in touch with Baedeker than with the Exclusive Brethren. Then, apocalyptic expectations were also strong in “nondenominational” Moody and among British Evangelicals in general. The point is that it would be wrong to attribute this specific influence to a particular person or movement.

Here is another example. Like all the early Brethren leaders who “regarded the Scriptures as the final court of appeal in doctrinal matters, and in practical matters of Christian living” (Coad 1968:254), Kargel made a similar statement in his 1913 Confession of Faith. This position can be traced through

his writings. There is no doubt that he believed in the Bible as the infallible and sufficient guide. He took this for granted. This was one of his major presuppositions. It is, however, a common conservative evangelical approach, by no means exclusive to the Brethren. The notion of free and direct appeal to the Scripture accessible to all people was emphasised by the Reformers, Pietists, Brethren, Anabaptists . . . You name it!

Speaking of the “practical matters of Christian living”, the Brethren insisted upon a high standard of personal conduct (Coad 1968:104). And so did the Anabaptists! The author’s point is that the main root of Kargel’s hermeneutical strategy was Pietism in general which he inherited indirectly through all the above mentioned evangelistic movements.

5.5.4 Critique of pietistic hermeneutics

It must be admitted that the Pietistic way of interpreting Scripture draws quite a bit of criticism. The author will turn to a few points in Frei’s critique of pietistic hermeneutics. (The order of the points is mine). First, he points out that the Pietist tradition subjects its hermeneutics to dogmatic theology (Frei 1974:38). Second, he blames the Pietists for exercising a “spiritual” interpretation or “reading,” which results in “double meaning in the interpretation of scripture” (Frei 1974:86, 55, 252). Third, he blames the Pietists for an approach to the Scripture that claims “to rest on the direct influence of the Holy Spirit on the reader, in lieu of settling for its plain meaning” (Frei 1974:55). Fourth, he blames the Pietists for holding to “verbal literalism” (Frei 1974:176). Fifth, he points out their “emphasis on self-positioning,” under which he means “a direct and religious relation to the religious ‘objects’ of the Bible” (Jesus, His blood atonement, His love, and the divine Spirit directly speaking to our hearts from the pages of the Bible, etc.) (Frei 1974:200).

Where does Kargel stand in relation to these accusations? The author is going to look briefly at each one of them in the same order.

First of all, it cannot be concluded that dogma came first in Kargel’s treatment of the Scripture and always predetermined his exegesis. He endeavoured to keep an open mind and admonished his readers to do the same.

Second, it is true that Kargel was looking for the “deeper meaning” of scriptural texts and he seemed to spiritualize text, which was quite

understandable when bearing in mind his presupposition that the Holy Spirit is the ultimate author of the Scripture. Packer pointed out that “there is no such thing as an exhaustive exegesis of any passage. The Holy Spirit is constantly showing Christian men facets of revealed truth not seen before” (Packer 1983:330). Those are the “facets” that Kargel is looking for.

In regard to the third point, which is actually closely linked to the second, Kargel really expects the Spirit to assist the process of interpretation in such a way that the divine task, for which the text was written, will be accomplished. The Spirits’ function in the process of interpretation is another of Kargel’s presuppositions.

Fourth, as far as “verbal literalism” is concerned, it appears that at times Kargel did build the case on a specific word or phrase. Whatever the case, he approaches the words of the Bible seriously.

Finally, it is true that Kargel closely related to “the objects” of the Bible because he believed that this was exactly the reason those objects were put in there. Thus, Kargel worked in accordance with his basic beliefs concerning the Scripture.

As the methodology of interpretation, hermeneutics in some sense serves as an interpretive filter. If someone’s basic presupposition is unbelief in anything supernatural, then in the process of interpretation it would be only natural to disregard all miracles or label them as myths. Kargel, like the Pietists in general, chose to believe everything that he read in Scripture no matter how unrealistic it might sound. It seems that in this point (as well as in many others) Kargel shared the Pietistic hermeneutical strategy.

5.5.5 Common ground for understanding: A word in defence of Kargel’s hermeneutical approach

Schleiermacher who “more than anybody else deserves to be called the father of modern philosophical as well as theological hermeneutics . . . turned to the deeper question: How is it possible to understand another human being?” (Janzen 1984:182). His precondition for understanding was “common psychological constitution” (Janzen 1984:182-183). In other words, “if ancient writers had been beings essentially different from us, understanding would be as inconceivable as it is now between animals and people” (Janzen 1984:185). As if answering Schleiermacher’s question Dorman points out that, “the link

between the biblical writers and modern Christians lies in their common experience of encounter with that about which the Bible speaks” (Dorman 1983:284). He continues his thought saying that, “The biblical message is relevant because we live within the flow of the same salvation history experienced by the biblical writers” (Dorman 1983:312).

Bender makes an interesting point concerning the Anabaptist understanding of the Scripture.

The key to the integrity of their approach to the Scriptures lay in the context, in which they studied the Scriptures and the mindset they brought to the task. It did not lay in their intellectual superiority or in their technical skills of exegesis . . . they, for the most part like Jesus’ original disciples were common folk. What distinguished them in their study of the Bible was their openness to hear God’s word of address and their readiness to respond in obedience and faith (Bender 1984:295).

The same could be said about the Russian evangelicals.

Given Schleiermacher’s precondition of understanding it is very tempting to conclude that “fishermen” of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries³⁶⁰ had good chances for understanding fishermen of the first century. Actually there were more things in common that could assist the correct communication between the ancient biblical text and the Russian evangelical audience of Kargel’s time than just simplicity of origin and profession. It seems that the more the author and the interpreter have in common, the better. In that case the Russian evangelicals stood good chances to become good hermeneutists of the Scripture. Who can relate to poor better than poor, unscholarly and simple better than unscholarly and simple, persecuted better than persecuted, and believers in Christ in all sincerity better than those who believe likewise? The question is an oversimplification but the author hopes that the point is clear.

Speaking of persecutions, the history of common persecution and hostility on behalf of the “world” made it easier for the Russian evangelicals in general and for Kargel in particular to identify with and to understand Jesus and His apostles. It seems that it would be legitimate to talk about such hermeneutics as the hermeneutics of the persecuted. It is obvious that all these

³⁶⁰ Although the author put a great emphasis on Russian nobility within the Russian evangelical movement numerically there were many more simple folks among the ranks of Russian evangelicals.

“commonalities” would not render the correct understanding by themselves. However they might assist in arriving at a better understanding of the text.

It is true that Kargel’s writings were unscholarly, but he definitely shared some “common psychological constitution” with the human writers of the Scripture and their original audience.

In the conclusion the author would like to quote K. Barth’s words that he once said to commend Calvin for great exegesis, which makes “the walls which separate the sixteenth century from the first century transparent! Paul speaks, and the man of the sixteenth century hears” (Barth 1933:7). In Kargel’s case his goal was to reach the point (if the paraphrase would be allowed) when, “God speaks, and the man of the twentieth century hears”.

5.5.6 Conclusion

Kargel’s view of Scripture is well summarised in his own words:

The Bible is not, as many think, a collection of moral laws, regulations and decrees. The Bible is the living word of ever living God, through which He desires to reveal His will to believers, as well as the past, the present, and the future of this world (Kargel 2006:7).

Hints about Kargel’s hermeneutics have been scattered throughout this chapter. Now the author will try to pick up the threads and move to a conclusion. As a result of careful study of excerpts from Kargel’s books examined in the context of the whole body of his theological writing, the author can infer the following:

In general Kargel uses a standard evangelical approach to the interpretation of the biblical text. His overall theological method is rooted in the Augustinian tradition, which accepts Scripture in faith, and then seeks further understanding through a regenerated mind relying on the illumination of the Holy Spirit. Just as Augustine and the Reformers, Kargel strongly believes as “what Scripture says God says”.³⁶¹ One thing is absolutely certain about Kargel’s hermeneutics – his exalted view of the Scriptures.

Kargel considers the Bible fully inspired, generally understandable, and in every part absolutely authoritative in matters of faith and practice. On the one hand Kargel does not delve into apologetics regarding the divine origin or

³⁶¹ Augustine, *Confessions*, CIII.29, in Woodbridge & Balmer 1983:335.

infallible nature of Scripture—he simply does not concern himself with biblical criticism. On the other hand he does not go to Scripture looking for precise scientific data on geography, geology, astronomy, or other natural science. This was never a reason for his Bible reading and study.

By faith Kargel accepts the Bible as trustworthy; he does not question it or try to come up with neat definitions of its inspiration. His rhetorical question speaks for itself: “If the Bible does not tell us the truth in everything it addresses, why do we bother to take it into our hands in the first place?” The obvious answer for Kargel is that the Bible does tell the truth. The logical outcome of this proposition is Kargel’s emphasis on individual submission to its authority in commitment and obedience.

Kargel’s presupposition is that the Bible is God’s revelation, of truly divine origin – the very Word of God. Thus, it is a unique book and should be treated respectfully. An important prerequisite for an accurate understanding of the Bible is to know its Author personally, enjoying a relationship with Him and being indwelt by the Holy Spirit. Only those who believe and trust God can obtain a proper understanding of what He has spoken in His Word. In other words, Kargel trusts the illuminating help of the Holy Spirit to help him to reach correct theological understanding. For this reason Kargel maintains that those who do not believe in God cannot truly understand the biblical text.

Another condition for gaining deeper understanding of the Bible is one’s willingness to submit to the text and obey what is already clear. In Kargel’s opinion, one’s attitude towards Scripture is more important than formal training or a good command of the content. This hermeneutics of obedience makes Kargel a kindred spirit to Pietists in general and the Anabaptists in particular. An interpreter must love the message that he/she attempts to understand. Kargel’s treatment of the Scripture is emotionally charged in the best traditions of the holiness movement. Language of endearment is an added feature that Kargel shares with Pietists.

Kargel uses the Bible primarily as sustenance for spiritual formation in the Christian life, as a source of understanding the truth in the whole spectrum of theological questions, as the guidebook for human life, and only then as a text for preaching or teaching. Kargel’s (like the Pietists’) main emphasis is not theory, but practice; his objective is edification, the transformation of one’s worldview and lifestyle. He maintains that believers should read the Bible,

meditate on its words, trust the guidance of the Holy Spirit, and apply its teaching to real life situations. Thus, Kargel's method applied to the Bible is predominantly devotional.

Kargel might not be exactly famous for using the grammatical-historical techniques. He might generally show little concern as to what the text meant to its original audience. However, he does not lack the willingness to obey its teaching in the present. Kargel's aim was to make the Scriptures freshly alive in the context of his day, to inspire enthusiasm and expressions of commitment to Christ "here and now".

Diligent study of the Scripture immediately moved to the personal level; the Holy Spirit's assistance and obedience to revealed truths played a role in basic epistemological factors for Kargel. If those factors were lacking the exegete would be ineffective in his job. In this approach Kargel stands closer to the Anabaptists and the Pietists than to the Reformers. He differs from the Anabaptists, however, in not making the congregation a judge of interpretation.

Kargel further differs from the Anabaptists by not making a sharp distinction between the Testaments; in this he seems closer to the Reformers. There are other points of correspondence with the Reformers. Kargel held that the text was to be understood in its obvious literal sense (when it was obvious to him); the clearer passages (the ones that were clearer to him) were to be used to shed light on more difficult ones. In addition, Kargel's interpretation is Christocentric, which puts him in the same camp with a long line of Reformers.

Kargel's use of typology, however, rests heavily on Mackintosh and other Brethren. At times his typological interpretation borders on allegorical, as he attempts to interpret all the Tabernacle details and the Old Testament sacrificial system as pointing prophetically to Christ. His interpretation of prophesy (Daniel and Revelation) is also close to Darby and dispensationalism. Although he does not recognise the same periods as Darby, Walter Scott, or Scofield, he sees human history as divided into three distinctive epochs. In his teaching of future events, Kargel is clearly pretribulational and premillennial.

The apocalyptic atmosphere of ongoing wars and revolutions in his day encouraged prophetic studies. It is not surprising that the book of Revelation was interpreted pessimistically. What is surprising is that Kargel does not expect total destruction of the earth in the end: for him, the new earth is a renewed earth.

Kargel uses the Bible extensively. He often bases his exposition on a particular passage and then goes far and wide through the Scripture searching for relevant subject matter. At times, though, he takes verses out of their immediate context, but still keeping in mind the general context of the whole Bible. By appealing to the larger context of the Bible, Kargel practises what is called “the ‘theological’ or ‘canonical’ type of exegesis that was practised more or less skilfully from the patristic period . . . [it] accepts responsibility for identifying and applying the truth about the living God that Scripture yields. Thus it resolves into preaching, and rightly so” (Packer 1983:351).

Kargel’s hallmarks are simple biblical exposition and a devotional interpretation of Scripture. He always goes to the Bible for his own and his readers’ inspiration and guidance. This approach, however, has some weak points. Coad’s analysis of the Brethren movement discusses certain misuses of Scripture “which can easily spring up within any movement which owes so much to the Bible” (Coad 1968:260). Those discussed below seem to apply to Russian evangelicals in general and to Kargel in particular. Coad further describes Open Brethren preaching in a way that might be also applied to Kargel: “a general shallowness of preaching and teaching (despite a wide popular knowledge of the Bible), which marks the absence of the scholar’s understanding” (Coad 1968:221). Besides, Coad mentions

a liberal use of references to bear only most indirectly on the subject in hand. One other danger is that of an over-mystical allegorizing of the Bible . . . its ludicrous medieval developments would have discredited it once for all, if the border between illustrative use of Biblical material and improper allegorization had not been so difficult to recognize (Coad 1968:260-261).

The chief flaws of Kargel’s hermeneutical method, as some might classify it, were his use of verses out of context and the absence of historical critical approach. In this last point Kargel was also in line with the Anabaptists and Pietists. Besides, a critical approach to the Bible would contradict Kargel’s basic presuppositions.

Now, was Kargel a “biblicist”? “Usually the term ‘biblicism’ is reserved for someone who assumes that the Bible is self-explanatory, that it needs only to be memorised and repeated to be effective” (Klassen 1984:80). In this sense Kargel could not be considered a biblicist even though he used the Bible extensively. However, there is more than one form of biblicism. “Biblicists will

declare that the basis of their concept is a personal encounter with the biblical message and, as a fruit of this, an inward experience of illumination by God” (Kuiper 1984:116). In this sense Kargel would be considered a biblicist.

Furthermore, Kargel shared the Anabaptist-Mennonite conviction that the Bible was clear rather than difficult for understanding God’s will. He obviously trusts every believer with the task of reading and interpreting the Scripture regardless of his/her education and experience. Kargel sees significance not only in the biblical text as a whole, but also in individual words and even in word order. He uses Scripture as a frame of reference for almost every statement he makes. Such an approach is appropriately labelled intuitive Biblicism by Stoeffler.

CHAPTER SIX: SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

6.1 Summary of the Discussion

It is commonly accepted that there is little or no Russian evangelical scholarship. This does not mean, however, that there is no Russian evangelical theology. Theology that was not put into writing or properly documented is still theology. If one can talk about Anabaptist theology or Brethren theology, then the author can talk about Russian evangelical theology. Alexander de Chalandeau, when writing about Russian Evangelical Christians-Baptists' theology of the post-World War II period, made a good point: "as strange as it may appear, it is the mass of the believers and the pastors and lay-preachers who never write articles, but who guide the teaching of the Evangelical Christian-Baptist denomination" (Chalandeau 1978:299).

All evangelical groups in Russia in the period under consideration, and especially the Stundists and Pashkovites, searched the Scriptures mostly to discover "God's will" – norms that should regulate their Christian life. Intellectual achievement was never their goal. In their opinion, there were more important things to do because "the time was short". This attitude blended well with their hopes for the Second Coming and premillennialism. Actually, current events proved that their time was short indeed. All they had was a few decades before the movement was swept away in the tidal wave of Stalin's persecution aimed at the total elimination of all things spiritual and religious. Unlike the English Evangelicals who "at least for a while... remoulded British society in their own image" (Bebbington 1989:150), Russian evangelicals did not really have a chance.

So, Russian evangelicals had little time (as a young denomination), and little chance (due to persecution), and little desire (their attitude towards theologising had always been somewhat sceptical) to develop and write down their theology. These are the main reasons why their theology is not well reflected in written form. The mindset that viewed writing theology as unnecessary had been handed down to them as a legacy from the various pietistic movements that influenced early Russian evangelicalism. Perhaps their

position is best articulated by Spurgeon, who even today is one of the most popular and respected preachers among Russian evangelicals: “there is nothing new in theology except that which is false” (Bebbington 1989:146). Nevertheless, there must have been something “old” in theology that Russian evangelicals firmly stood for.

It is difficult, of course, to transport oneself into the world of the 1870s when the Bible was first made available to common Russian people in their native language. Recent converts were finding great joy in newly discovered biblical truths. Many of them overcame the barrier of illiteracy and quickly realised the freedom of reading and searching the Scripture for themselves. And as they did so, the Bible took on enormous significance for them. They regarded the Bible as the disclosure of God’s very will. To this belief they (including Kargel) emphasised the Holy Spirit’s assistance in the process of interpretation and application of Scripture. Another important feature was the great importance that they (as well as Kargel) placed upon obedience to revealed truths and following Christ. It should not be difficult therefore for anyone to understand why Russian evangelical churches rarely engage in doctrinal controversies regarding biblical authority.

To some degree Christian literature also played a part in forming the theological views of Russian evangelicals. That very same literature serves as a “litmus test” for revealing their theological range of interests during that period. It is not a coincidence that Christian writers such as Bunyan, Bersier, Farrar, Mackintosh, Drummond, Newman, Newton, Spurgeon, Moody, Torrey, Finney, and the like were favoured by Russian evangelicals, who did not get tired of translating and publishing their works. The books of these authors are by and large evangelistic, conservative in their approach to Scriptural authority, and often highlighting the Holy Spirit’s ministry, believers’ sanctification, and future events. Parenthetically, these were also key themes in Kargel’s writing; his reading, however, was more extensive because he knew several languages.

Gradually after the 1917 Revolution Russian evangelicals were finding themselves cut off from the world-wide evangelical debate. As atheism was coming to power and persecution was intensifying, the main issue became survival. It is safe to say that the Russian Evangelical movement did not change much theologically between the early 1930s until the time of *perestroika*. This fact was also noted by Nichols who wrote that “there is no change theologically

in the bibliography of the group as it progressed from Radstock to Pashkov and finally to the AUCECB” (Nichols 1991:88). Thus, Kargel has not become outdated; his writing still reflects Russian evangelical theology and hermeneutics. Furthermore, his works are being published and widely reprinted up to this day.

So, what is the Russian “brand” of evangelicalism? First of all, it is “evangelicalism” with its main marks: conversionism, activism, Biblicism, and crucicentrism. But it is also strongly coloured by pietistic strivings characterised by experientialism, religious idealism, Biblicism again, and opposition to the Establishment. Russian evangelicalism is a “sum vector” of Anabaptist-Mennonite, Brethren, British evangelical, Molokan, Stundist, and Baptist influences both theologically and practically. Notice that Baptist is only one of these components. This answers the question why “Baptists” in Russia differ from their Western namesakes.

Now, what was the shared ground in those foreign Brethren-Baptist-Mennonite influences that made them appealing to Kargel and to many Russian believers? What was the common denominator and why did that particular denominator happen to become so appealing to Russian people? The author believes that it was pietism in a broader sense of the word. The Pietistic approach must have been appealing to Russian people who had been brought up in the values of Russian Orthodoxy. *Blagochestie* has always been a highly prized quality among Russians. It was striving for piety that became the common ground between Western Protestantism and Russian Orthodoxy.

As a result we witness the phenomenon of Russian evangelicalism. All the above-mentioned evangelical bodies were in a sense pietistic; they were pietistic in their approaches to worship, personal life, and interpretation of the Scripture. And being of a pietistic disposition they did not become subject to rationalistic influences. Moreover, only this kind of approach would be able to sustain the Evangelical Christians-Baptists through the twentieth century. The biblical pattern of promise and fulfilment also gave them a solid foundation in the midst of their violent history. Hargroves wrote of the Russian Baptists of the mid-1950s: “Their approach to the Bible is not critical but reverential. It is the Word of God. It means what it says. It should be preached that way” (Hargroves 1959:254).

Even up to this day personal piety is emphasised among Russian evangelicals. For instance, great importance is attributed to prayer. Prayers are usually offered both before and after meals, seeking God's blessing not only on the food, but also requesting hunger for spiritual truth and nourishment for their souls. Evening prayers are offered kneeling by one's bed. Prayers often accompany arrivals and departures.

When "preaching the Word", "brothers" often emphasise obedience and faithfulness to God and admonish the assembly to read, study, and meditate upon the Word of God. Serious self-examination and the confession of sins is also encouraged, especially before the services with *khleboprelomlenie* [breaking the bread]. Believers strive to see the Lord's hand in everything that happens in their lives, and sometimes great meaning is attributed to the most trivial events of the day.

The historical succession between the Brethren tradition and the Evangelical Christians-Baptists was seriously violated after the Revolution, when the main carriers of the Open Brethren influence – the Pashkovites – dissipated within the Evangelical Christian churches. Nevertheless, although Russian evangelicals are by no means a replica of the Brethren, they share a number of obvious features.

Modern Russian Evangelical Christians-Baptists have the office of presbyter which is linked to ordination (unlike the Brethren), but not necessarily linked to the completion of a course of theological studies (like the Brethren). This creates a serious gap between "academia" and "assembly" in present-day Russia.

As in the case of the Brethren, the Lord's Supper or "breaking the bread" is performed as the memorial of Christ's death "until He comes". The passage from 1 Corinthians 11 is read every time; however the Lord's Supper is observed monthly, not weekly. When a service falls on the first Sunday of the month it is centred on participation in the Lord's Supper.

The worship service, especially in smaller churches, follows the Brethren pattern where gathered believers can propose a hymn to sing and pray spontaneously. Russian evangelical meetings also include the recitation of Christian poetry. Even in larger congregations, worship takes the form of a series of sermons (including lay-preaching), spontaneous prayers spoken aloud

by believers, and hymn singing. All of these traditions can be found to some extent in Brethren worship (Darby 1972:142).

There is also the phenomenon of itinerant preaching (especially in the unregistered ECB churches), in which certain “ministering brothers” devote their lives to visiting various places and churches with the task of evangelization and teaching. Actually, this is what Kargel was doing for most of his life. Itinerant preaching is also found among the Brethren (Darby 1972:143).

Russian Evangelical Christian-Baptists (especially in unregistered churches) strongly believe in separation from the world. Like the Brethren, they often consider participation in the social and political life of the state contrary to following Christ (Darby 1972:144).

Most importantly, like the Brethren, Russian Evangelical Christians-Baptists deem Scripture reading of great importance. Scripture is received as the Word of God Himself; the expression “the Word” is a synonym for the Bible. It is treated with great reverence (for instance, one can get scolded for laying Bible on the floor) and it is made the subject of regular studies: individual, in small groups, or as a special church event. The Russian evangelical approach (and Kargel’s) to the Scripture is reverential, not critical: the Word of God says what God means and it means what it says.

Thus, Russian evangelicalism was not nurtured in nineteenth century pietism for nothing. The search for godliness has always been and still is there.

In the course of the research it has been demonstrated that Kargel was connected in one way or another to all the main Russian evangelical bodies – Molokans, Stundists, Baptists, Pashkovites, Mennonite Brethren, and Evangelical Christians. He grew up in Molokan populated Tiflis, studied at Oncken’s Baptist seminary in Hamburg, ministered among the Mennonite Brethren, served as a Baptist pastor in St. Petersburg, considered Pashkov (a faithful follower and a theological “replica” of Lord Radstock) as his “spiritual father”, married a Pashkovite girl, worked as an interpreter for Open Brethren Dr. Baedeker, had his living quarters in the palace of a faithful Pashkovite lady – Princess Lieven. . .

However, Kargel started his writing career long after his initial contact with Pashkovites and the European religious developments from which they were drawing (that is, British Evangelicalism in general and the Brethren and

Keswick movements in particular). That is why his writings reflect more of the Brethren and Keswick piety than Baptist or Mennonite Brethren doctrine.

Considering Kargel's background, it is quite natural that his writings are replete with discussions about sanctification and future events. His approach to dealing with Scripture combined the classical Reformation high view of the Scripture, clear, self-explanatory, and whole (continuity between the Testaments); the Pietistic call for personal Bible study and the immediate practical outcome; the Anabaptist stress on obedience; and the Brethren typology and interpretation of future events. Like the Brethren, Kargel's writings are characterised by a constant appeal to the Scripture and by a warm devotional tone. He often bases his exposition on a particular passage, and then moves through the Scriptures in search of relevant passages. A distinctive note in Kargel's instruction is his stress on the work of the Holy Spirit, so typical of the English Evangelicals in the last decades of the nineteenth century.

Close observation of the various formative influences in Kargel's life and a careful reading of his writings make it possible to restore the assumptions behind his interpretation of Scripture. Kargel believed that Scripture was inspired, authoritative, and understandable. He believed that the Holy Spirit could use the Scriptures to speak directly to believers. He believed that it is the Holy Spirit who makes the written words come "alive". He believed that Scripture could provide guidance for daily living. He believed that Scripture could lead believers towards holiness. Kargel attempted to hold together two emphases: giving freedom for the Holy Spirit to speak to the hearts of believers and recognising the importance of Bible study. Kargel believed that being receptive to new truths and being willing obey were the prerequisites of successful Bible study. This is how he viewed the nature of the Bible.

Now, what was Kargel's actual manner of interpreting the Bible? He considered the whole Bible authoritative and quoted from both Testaments. In search of evidence he freely moved from Genesis to Revelation. He read the text as divine and authoritative with obedience as the main objective, rather than to simply discover the "intended meaning" behind the text. Every book and verse was precious to him. Generally he was not concerned with critical questions of date or authorship. In the Bible he was looking for practical guidance along the way of holiness that would lead to heaven. Kargel rarely referred to sources other than the Bible; the Word was the only court of appeal

in matters of faith and practical life. He constantly called believers to read and search it personally. Normally, Kargel was satisfied by the literal sense of the Scripture, though a “spiritual” sense was also possible.

Overall, in Kargel’s approach to Scripture his starting point was faith and reverence, while the end goal was personal holiness. Thus, Kargel’s position can be defined as evangelical pietism. His ultimate objective in studying Scripture was to hear God speak and then to respond in eager obedience. His hermeneutical approach was also characterised by Biblicist piety: his main question could be reduced to, “What does God want of me today as I read His Word?”

Although the names Spener, Arndt, and Francke do not appear in Kargel’s writings, he appropriated some of their insights. It seems that their ideas came to him via the Open Brethren (Mackintosh, Soltau, Müller, Baedeker), and from Pashkov who inherited them from Radstock. There is a high degree of similarity in teaching and practical emphases, whether or not it was the result of direct influence.

Nevertheless, Kargel with all his pietistic tenets cannot be classified as a “Pietist”, a part of that historical movement. Certainly Russian evangelicalism was indebted to the pietistic movement, but it was an awakening movement with its own potential, not a copy of German Pietism of the seventeenth and the eighteenth century. When looking for parallels, it should not be forgotten that Kargel was not “just like” Spener, or Müller, or Pashkov, or Oncken, or Wieler. Thus, all that can be established is an indirect link to the Pietists, and a direct link to the Brethren.

While placing the utmost importance on the devotional aspects of Christian life, Kargel did not deny the usefulness of formal preparation for ministry; for years he laboured in the area of Christian education. However, the schools, or rather, Bible courses, where he taught, were not known for being academically rigorous and intellectually challenging; they were of somewhat devotional nature. If one follows the hermeneutical accents from Radstock to Pashkov, and from Pashkov to Kargel, there will obviously be a good measure of succession. One shared point was their dislike of theology for its own sake: Kargel continued the tradition of Radstock and Pashkov who were no ivory tower theologians.

Other aims common to Radstock, Pashkov, and Kargel included knowing the Bible (canonical books) thoroughly, loving the Bible, and obeying it like little children. All three men considered the Bible inspired and exclusively authoritative. They did not want to know anything but the Bible. They were not concerned with archaeological and linguistic studies. They believed that it was impossible to truly understand the Bible without the power of the Holy Spirit. They allowed for deeper meaning behind the words. While they considered the Bible understandable in general, they admitted that some passages would always remain unclear. They incorporated the Bible into their language pattern. They viewed the Bible as a guide book for all life situations. When preaching or writing they moved rapidly from one passage to another. In their opinion church did not play a major role in the interpretation of the Bible; interpretation was left to individual believers. It was diligent study, sincere prayer, and living faith that was needed for correct understanding of Scripture.

Finally, I would like to say that I realise that my look at the possible roots of Kargel's and consequently Russian Evangelical hermeneutics does not explain everything. But it does explain some things. Or at least I hope so.

6.2 Kargel's hermeneutical guidelines

Briefly Kargel's hermeneutical guidelines can be summarised in the following way:

1. According to Kargel one must come to the text of the Scripture having certain presuppositions: biblical faith in God, recognition of the Bible's uniquely divine origin, prayer, obedience, acceptance of the Bible as truthful and authoritative, and an expectation for the illuminating work of the Holy Spirit to help in the process of interpretation. In most cases Kargel is satisfied with the natural reading of the Bible, which holds the reader responsible to follow through with what such reading requires of him/her. The main objective of his exposition is to see both himself and his readers to become doers of the Word rather than hearers only.
2. The historical and literal meaning of the Bible is not the limit of its meaning. There exists the possibility of a deeper meaning, especially in prophetic literature.
3. Kargel holds to the fundamental rule of classical biblical hermeneutics that Scripture serves as the best commentary on itself (analogy of faith).

4. Kargel expects the Bible to speak to modern readers' concerns. God's Word transcends time and geographical location to the point that it becomes relevant for all readers in any era. Kargel concentrates on the universal commands that apply directly to all people in all cultures, or draws from biblical narratives implications and principles that he expects to be followed.
5. Kargel believes the entire Bible points to Jesus Christ. He often interprets the Old Testament (including the smallest details) typologically. He also often interprets the Old Testament illustratively.
6. Kargel makes some use of various translations, but he rarely resorts to citing the original languages, and then only if absolutely essential for an accurate grasp of the text.
7. In his interpretation Kargel hardly ever uses any of the extra-biblical materials, such as ancient non-biblical documents or modern scientific data.

6.3 The Contribution of this Study

This study was an attempt to analyse the hermeneutics of Kargel in the context of Russian evangelical history as well as in the context of several theological influences responsible for forming the Russian evangelical movement.

The author worked with the Russian version of Kargel's texts, supplying English translations to permit the English speaking reader to judge for himself/herself whether the conclusions concerning Kargel's hermeneutics stand the test.

The author used all relevant data available, including recently discovered details of Kargel's biography and his newly published writings.

In attempting to restore Kargel's hermeneutics the author took into consideration all kinds of formative influences in Kargel's life, including a number of significant personalities and the theological literature that was available to him.

As the pietistic nature of Kargel's theology had been emphasised by earlier research, this work followed his indebtedness to Brethren theology, the British holiness movement, and Mennonite Brethren theology and practice—all important influences that formed Kargel's theological profile.

By the way of a careful comparison of the texts of Kargel and Mackintosh, the author established Kargel's strong reliance upon Mackintosh in

interpreting the Old Testament types which resulted in Kargel's theological work "The reflection of glories to come".

6.4 The Prospect for Further Study

It seems that hermeneutical questions concerning Russian evangelical theology will continue to be raised. The ongoing search for self identity in the ranks of Russian evangelicals, coupled with the desire to understand one's theological roots and to verify present day approaches to scriptural interpretation will compel researchers to turn to the past again and again.

To what extent is Russian evangelicalism Russian? Did Kargel's German heritage and many influences from the west result in his evangelicalism being a syncretism of external influences expressed in a Russian socio-historical context?

This dissertation has only scratched the surface of Kargel's hermeneutical approach. The suggested answers do not presume to be final and irrevocable. Further discussion of Kargel's hermeneutics would allow reaching a closer approximation to the correct answers.

Besides it would be interesting to find out how do Kargel's major hermeneutical concepts compare and contrast with those of Russian orthodoxy. Certain areas, such as the sole authority of Scripture, clearly clash with orthodoxy, but do others, such as the pietistic direction and the prevalence of typology, tend to cohere with the orthodox approach?

Besides Kargel's works, the writings of other Russian evangelical theologians such as Pavlov, Shipkov, Prokhanov, Fetler, Datsko, Odintsov, Vasiliy, and Pavel Pavlov must become the subjects of detailed and serious study, examination, and comparison as well.

Very little attention has been given so far to the development of evangelical faith in Russia prior to the mid-nineteenth century. For example, Grossner's preaching and his calls to conversion in St. Petersburg deserve further studies.

Another interesting topic of research would be the explosion of Russian evangelical poetry during the times of revival, also characteristic of pietistic movements in general.

Then, it could be interesting to trace the connections of Russian evangelical groups with the Evangelical Alliance and the outcome of this relationship.

Finally, Kargel's eschatology deserves special analysis.

Postscript: The author hopes that someday the FSB archives related to Russian evangelical history will be opened to church historians; this would provide almost unlimited opportunity for further studies. Perhaps Kargel's personal files were not destroyed, but are preserved intact somewhere.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Sources and Literature

- Aleksii, episkop, [Dorodnicyn] 1908. *Materialy dlya istorii religiozno-ratsionalisticheskogo dvizheniya na yuge Rossii vo vrotay polovine XIX-go stoletiya* [Materials for the history of the religious-rationalistic movement in the south of Russia in the second half of the 19th century]. Kazan: Tsentral'naya Tipografiya.
- All-Union Congress of Evangelical Christians-Baptists 1989. *Istoriya Evangel'skikh Khristian-Baptistov v SSSR* [History of Evangelical Christian-Baptists in the USSR]. M.: Izdanie Vsesoyuznogo Soveta Evangel'skikh Christian-Baptistov.
- Ayvazov, I 1910. *Beseda s sektantami o Svyashchennom Pisanii i svyashchennom predanii* [A talk with sectarians about the Holy Scripture and the holy tradition]. M.: Ruskaya Pechatnya.
- 1914. *O Slove Bozhiem ili ob istochnikakh khristianskago veroucheniya* (V oblichenie russkikh sektantov) [About the Word of God or about the sources of Christian doctrine (in denunciation of Russian sectarians)]. SPb.: "Kolokol".
- 1915. *Russkoe sektantstvo* [Russian sectarianism]. M.: Pechatnya A. I. Snegirevoy.
- Armerding, C E & Gasque, W W (eds) 1977. *Dreams, visions and oracles*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House.
- Arnott, A 1969. *The Brethren: An autobiography of a Plymouth Brethren childhood*. London: Mowbray.
- Author Unknown* 1895. *Sekta pashkovtsev i razgovor pravoslavnogo s pashkovtsem* [The sect of Pashkovites and a conversation of an Orthodox with a Pashkovite]. SPb.: Obshchestvo rasprostraneniya religiozno-nravstvennogo prosveshcheniya v dukhe pravoslavnoy tserkvi.
- Author Unknown* 1897. *Pashkovshchina* [Pashkovism]. Kiev: Tipografiya I. I. Chokolova.
- Author Unknown* 1877. *Chemu učit Svyashchennoe Pisanie?* [What does the Holy Scripture teach?] SPb.: Izdanie knigoprodavtsa Blismera.
- Author Unknown* 1882. *Dva slova o Svyatoy Biblii* [Two words about the Holy Bible]. SPb.: Tipografiya Kesnevilya i Balasheva.
- Author Unknown* 1913. *Kratkoe izlozhenie veroucheniya Evangel'skikh Khristian*. SPb.: Izdanie 2-oy S.-Peterburgskoy Obshchiny Evangel'skikh Khristian.
- Author Unknown* 1882. *Kratkoe rukovodstvo k chteniyu Novago Zaveta to est' Svyatago Evangeliya i Apostola* [Short guide to the reading of the New

Testament, that is Holy Gospel and the Acts of Apostles]. SPb.:
Tipografiya Aleksandra Yakobsona.

Author Unknown 1880. *Lyubimye stikhi* [Favourite verses]. SPb.: Tipografiya
Departamenta Udelov.

Author Unknown 188-?. *Svedeniya o sekte Pashkovtsev* [Information about the
sect of the Pashkovites].

Author Unknown 1884. Zapiska iz del Kantselyarii Ober-Prokurora
Svyateyshago Sinoda o vrednoy dlya Pravoslavnoy tserkvi deyatel'nosti
Obshchestva pooshchreniya dukhovno-nravstvennago chteniya i
uchreditelya sego Obshchestva, otstavnago polkovnika Pashkova [A
note from the Chancery Office of the Chief Procurator of the Most Holy
Synod Concerning the Danger to the Orthodox Church from the Activity
of the Society for the Encouragement of Spiritual and Ethical Reading,
and from its Founder retired Colonel Pashkoff], in "Svedeniya o sekte
Pashkovtsev" 188-?: 10-22.

Barankova, G (ed) 2001. *Bibliya v dukhovnoy zhizni, istorii i kul'ture Rossii i
pravoslavnogo slavyanskogo mira* [The Bible in spiritual life, history and
culture of Russia and the Orthodox slavic world]. M.: Bibleysko-
bogoslovskiy institut sv. apostola Andreyaya.

Barth, K 1933. *The Epistle to Romans*. Edwyn C. Hoskyns, trans., London:
Oxford.

Batalden, S 1001. Nasledie Rossiyskogo bibleyskogo obshchestva v russkoy
bibleistike XIX i XX vekov [Heritage of the Russian Bible society in
Russian Biblical theology bibliistic of XIX and XX centuries], in
Barankova 2001:212-220.

Bauman, M & Hall, D (eds) 1995. *Evangelical Hermeneutics*. Camp Hill,
Pennsylvania: Christian Publications, inc.

Bender, R T 1984. Teaching the Bible in the congregation, in Swartley
1984:291-302.

Bebbington, D W 1989. *Evangelicalism in modern Britain: A history from the
1730s to the 1980s*. London: Unwin Hyman.

— 1993. Evangelicalism in Modern Britain and America: A Comparison, in
Rawlyk & Noll 1993:183-214.

Bender, R T 1984. Teaching the Bible in the congregation, in Swartley
1984:291-302.

Berg, J Van Den & Dooren, J P Van 1978. *Pietismus und Reveil*. Leiden: E. J.
Brill.

Berman, H J 1999. Freedom of religion in Russia, in Witte & Bourdeaux
1999:265-284.

Bersier, E 1880. *Deystvitel'na li molitva* [Is prayer effective]. SPb.: Tipografiya
(byvshaya) A. M. Kotomina.

— 1880. *Pridvornyy propovednik* [The court preacher]. SPb.: Tipografiya
(byvshaya) A. M. Kotomina.

- 1891. *Bespoleznaya trata zhizni* [Life lived in vain]. Kiev: Tipografiya Z. T. Korchak-Novitskago.
- Bogolyubov, D I 1902. *Ob istochnikakh khristianskago veroucheniya – svyashchennom pisanii i svyashchennom apostol'skom predanii* [Concerning the sources of Christian doctrine – the Holy Scripture and holy apostolic tradition]. Kharkov: Pechatnoe Delo.
- 1912. *Kto eto Pashkovtsy, Baptisty i Adventisty?* [Who are those Pashkovites, Baptists, and Adventists?] SPb.: Otechestvennaya tipografiya.
- Bonch-Bruevich, V 1908. *Materialy k istorii i izucheniyu russkago sektantstva i raskola* [Materials for the history and studying of Russian sectarianism and schism]. Edition 1. St. Petersburg: tipografiya B. M. Vol'fa.
- 1910. *Materialy k istorii i izucheniyu russkago sektantstva i staroobryadchestva* [Materials for the history and studying of Russian sectarianism and Old Belief]. Edition 3. St. Petersburg: tipografiya B. M. Vol'fa.
- Bondar, S D 1911. *Sovremennoe sostoyanie Russkogo Baptizma* [Modern condition of Russian Baptism]. SPb: Tipografiya Ministerstva Vnutrennikh Del.
- Borshch, N I 2009. Ofitsial'nyy document ob areste i posleduyushchey reabilitatsii docherey I. V. Kargelya [Official document about the arrest and subsequent rehabilitation of I. V. Kargel's daughters], in Karetnikova 2009:299-301.
- Bourdeaux, M 1968. *Religious ferment in Russia: Protestant opposition to Soviet religious policy*. Melbourne: Macmillan.
- Bourdeaux, M, Matchett, K & Gerstenmaier, C 1977. *Religious minorities in the Soviet Union: A report prepared for the Minority Rights Group*. London: Minority Rights Group.
- Braaten, C E 1968. *History and Hermeneutics. New directions in Theology today*. Vol. II. London: Lutterworth Press.
- Brandenburg, H 1977. *The meek and the mighty: The emergence of the evangelical movement in Russia*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bruce, F F 1977. *The book of the Acts. New London Commentaries*. London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott.
- Brunk, G R 1984. The Journey to Emmaus – and to faith: an illustration of historical-critical method, in Swartley 1984:203-222.
- Butkevich, T 1909. *Molokanstvo* [Molokanism]. Kharkov: Tipografiya Gubernskago Pravleniya.
- 1913. *Protestantstvo v Rossii* [Protestantism in Russia]. Kharkov: Eparkhial'naya Tipografiya.
- Bychkovskiy, A 1911. *Sleduyut li tak nazyvaemye evangel'skie khristiane Evangeliyu Khristovu?* [Do so called Evangelical Christians follow the Gospel of Christ?]. Tavr. Gub. Tip.

- Carden, A 1990. *Puritan Christianity in America: Religion and life in Seventeenth-Century Massachusetts*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House.
- Carr, E H 1961. *What is History?* Hampshire: Palgrave.
- Carson, D A & Woodbridge, J D (eds) 1983. *Scripture and Truth*. Leicester, England: Inter-Varsity Press.
- 1995. *Hermeneutics, Authority and Canon*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books.
- Chalandaeu, A de 1978. *The theology of the evangelical Christians-Baptists in the USSR: As reflected in the Bratskii Vestnik / par Alexander de Chalandaeu*. Chicago: Harper and Co.
- Clouse, R G 1977. The Danger of mistaken hopes, in Armerding & Gasque 1977:27-39.
- Coad, F R 1968. *A History of the Brethren Movement*. Exeter: The Paternoster Press Ltd.
- Corrado, S 2000. The Philosophy of Ministry of Colonel Vasilii Pashkov. Unpublished MA thesis, Wheaton College Graduate School.
- 2005. *Filosofiya sluzheniya polkovnika Pashkova* [The philosophy of ministry of Colonel Pashkov]. SPb.: Bibliya dlya vsekh.
- Crutchfield, L V 1992. *The origins of dispensationalism*. Lanham: University Press of America.
- Cunningham, J W 1981. A vanished hope: The movement for Church renewal in Russia, 1905-1906. Crestwood, N.Y.: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press.
- Diedrich, H C 1985. *Siedler, Sektierer und Stundisten: Die Entstehung des russischen Freikirchentums*. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt.
- Dockery, D S, Mathews, K A & Sloan, R B (eds) 1994. *Foundations for biblical interpretation*. Nashville, Tennessee: Broadman & Holman.
- Dockery, D S 1994. Study and Interpretation of the Bible, in Dockery, Mathews & Sloan 1994:36-54.
- Dorman, T M 1983. The Hermeneutics of Oscar Cullman. Ph.D., Fuller Theological Seminary, School of Theology.
- Dostoevsky, F M 1959. *Pis'ma IV 1878-1881 pod redaktsiye A. S. Dolinina* [Letters, Vol. IV, edited by A. S. Dolinin]. M.: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo khudozhestvennoy literatury.
- 1981. *Polnoe sobranie sochineniy v tridtsati tomakh*. Tom dvadtsat' vtoroy. Dnevnik pisatelya za 1876 god yanvar'-aprel' [Full collection of writings in thirty volumes. Vol. 22. The Writer's Diary for 1876, January-April]. Leningrad: "Nauka".
- Dupr'e, L K, Saliers D E & Meyendorff J (eds) 1989. *Christian spirituality: Post-Reformation and modern*. New York: Crossroad.
- Durasoff, S 1969. *The Russian Protestants: Evangelicals in the Soviet Union, 1944-1964*. Rutherford: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press.

- Dyck, C J 1984. Hermeneutics and Discipleship, in Swartley 1984:29-44.
- Eaton, K 1997. *Beware the trumpet of judgement: John Nelson Darby and the nineteenth-century Brethren*. Cardiff: University of Wales Press.
- Edgerton, W B 1966. *Leskov, Paskov, the Stundists, and a newly discovered letter*. Munchen: W Fink.
- Elliot M & Deyneka A 1999. Protestant missionaries in the former Soviet Union, in Witte & Bourdeaux 1999:197-227.
- Ellis, G H & Jones, L W 1996. *The Other Revolution. Russian Evangelical Awakenings*. Abilene: Abilene Christian University Press.
- Emerson, R L 1990. Science and moral philosophy in the Scottish enlightenment, in Stewart 1990:11-36.
- Engelbrecht, B 1979. The inspiration and authority of Scripture, in Vorster 1979:75-107.
- Enz, J J 1984. Canon: Creative Biblicism as a hermeneutical principle, in Swartley 1984:165-177.
- Fedotov, G P (comp & ed) 1950. *A treasury of Russian spirituality*. London: Sheed & Ward.
- 1975. *The Russian religious mind (I): Kievan Christianity. The tenth to the thirteenth centuries*. Vol. III. Belmont, Massachusetts: Nordland Publishing.
- 1975. *The Russian religious mind (II): The Middle Ages. The 13th to the 15th centuries*. Vol. IV. Belmont, Massachusetts: Nordland Publishing.
- Feofan, zatvornik, [Govorov] 1880. *Pis'mo k odnomu litsu v S.-Peterburg po povodu poyavleniya tam novogo uchitelya very* [A letter to one person in S.-Petersburg concerning the appearance a new teacher of faith there]. SPb.: Tipografiya F. G. Eleonskago & K°.
- Fletcher, W C 1981. *Soviet believers: The religious sector of the population*. Lawrence: Regents Press of Kansas.
- Floor, L 1982. The Hermeneutics of Calvin, in Walt 1982:181-191.
- Fountain, D G 1988. *Lord Radstock and the Russian awakening*. Southampton: Mayflower Christian Books.
- 2001. *Lord Redstok i dukhovnoe probuzhdenie v Rossii* [Lord Radstock and the Russian awakening]. Al'fom.
- Frame, J M 1995. The Spirit and the Scripture, in Carson & Woodbridge 1995:213-237.
- Freeze, G L 1983. *The Parish Clergy in Nineteenth-Century Russia: Crisis, Reform, Counter-reform*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Frei, H W 1974. *The Eclipse of Biblical Narrative: A Study in Eighteenth and Nineteenth Century Hermeneutics*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.

- Fuller, D P 1978. The Holy Spirit's Role in Biblical Interpretation, in Gasque & LaSor 1978:189-198.
- Gachkov-Katcho, Ya A 1912. *Evangel'skie Khristiane* [Evangelical Christians]. Odessa: Tipografiya S. N. Skarlato.
- Garraghan, G J 1946. *A Guide to Historical Method*. New York: Fordham University Press.
- Gasque, W W & LaSor, W S (eds) 1978. *Scripture, tradition, and interpretation*. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.
- Goppelt, L 1982. *Typos, the typological interpretation of the Old Testament in the New*. Grand Rapids, MI: W. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.
- Grachev, Yu S 1997. *Studencheskie gody* [Student years]. SPb.: Bibliya dlya vsekh.
- Grenz, S J 1994. *Theology for the Community of God*. Carlisle UK: The Paternoster.
- Grunwald, C de 1961. *God and the Soviets*. London: Hutchinson.
- Harris, R & Howard-Johnston, X (eds) 1969. *Christian appeals from Russia*. London: Hodder & Stoughton.
- Heard, A F 1887. *The Russian church and Russian dissent, comprising orthodoxy, dissent, and erratic sects*. London: Sampson Low.
- Hebly, J A 1973. *Protestanten in Rusland*. J.H.Kok, B.V.Kampen.
- Heier, E 2002. *Religioznyy raskol v srede rossiyskikh aristokratov v 1860-1900 gody. Redstokizm i Pashkovshchina* [Religious schism in the Russian aristocracy 1860-1900: Radstockism and Pashkovism]. M.: Ikar.
- Hempton, D 1993. Noisy Methodists and Pious Protestants. Evangelical Revival and Religious Minorities in Eighteenth-Century Ireland, in Rawlyk & Noll 1993:56-72.
- Hill, K R 1991. *The Soviet Union on the brink: An inside look at Christianity and glasnost*. Portland, Or: Multnomah in cooperation with the Institute on Religion and Democracy.
- Hindmarsh, D B 1993. "I am a sort of Middle-Man": The Politically Correct Evangelicalism of John Newton, in Rawlyk & Noll 1993:29-55.
- Hirsch, E 1960. *Geschichte der Neuern Evangelischen Theologie*. Darmstadt: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Mohn.
- Houghton, S M 1980. *Sketches from Church History*. The Banner of Truth Trust.
- Janzen, W 1984. Modes of appropriating the Bible: The problem of distance in Theological Hermeneutics, in Swartley 1984:178-202.
- Johnston, R K 1978. The Role of Women in the Church and Home: An Evangelical Testcase in Hermeneutics, in Gasque & LaSor 1978:234-259.

- Kahle, W 1978. *Evangelische Christen in Rußland und der Sovetunion: Ivan Stepanovich Prochanov (1869-1935) und der Weg der Evangeliumschrsten und Baptisten*. Kassel: Oncken.
- Kaiser, W C Jr. & Silva M 1994. *An Introduction to Biblical Hermeneutics*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House.
- Kamchatnov, A M 1998. *Istoriya i germeneytika slavyanskoy Biblii* [History and hermeneutics of Slavic Bible]. M.: "Nauka".
- Karetnikova, M S (sost) 1999. *Al'manakh po istorii russkogo baptizma* [Almanac on the history of Russian Baptism]. SPb.: Bibliya dlya vsekh.
- 1999. Russkoe Bogoisatel'stvo [Russian God search], in Karetnikova 1999:3-84.
- 2001. *Al'manakh po istorii russkogo Baptizma. Vypusk 2* [Almanac on the history of Russian Baptism. Edition 2]. SPb.: Bibliya dlya vsekh.
- 2001. Istoriya Peterburgskoy tserkvi Evangel'skikh Khristian-Baptistov [History of Petersburg's church of Evangelical Christian-Baptists], in Karetnikova 2001:5-166.
- 2002. Ivan Veniaminovich Kargel' [Ivan Veniaminovich Kargel], in Kargel 2002:684-688.
- 2004. *Al'manakh po istorii russkogo baptizma. Vypusk 3* [Almanac on the history of Russian Baptism. Edition 3]. SPb.: Bibliya dlya vsekh.
- 2009. *Al'manakh po istorii russkogo baptizma. Vypusk 4* [Almanac on the history of Russian Baptism. Edition 4]. SPb.: Bibliya dlya vsekh.
- 2009. Chitaya Kargelya. "Zakon Dukha zhizni" [Reading Kargel. The Law of the Spirit of life], in Karetnikova 2009:190-202.
- 2009. I. V. Kargel. Zhizneopisanie [I. V. Kargel. Lifestory], in Karetnikova 2009:5-60.
- Karev, A V 1999. Russkoe Evangel'sko-Baptistskoe dvizhenie [Russian Evangelical-Baptist movement], in Karetnikova 1999:85-186.
- Kargel, I V 1908. *Svet iz teni budushchikh blag ili tridsat' dve besedy o skinii, zhertvoprinosheniyakh i svyashchenstve* [The reflection of glories to come or thirty two discourses about the tabernacle, animal sacrifices, and priesthood]. SPb.: Tipografiya Yu. A. Mansfel'd.
- 1913. *V kakom ty otnoshenii k Dukhu Svyatomu?* [What is your relationship to the Holy Spirit?]. SPb.: Tipografiya T-va Andersona i Loytsyanskago.
- 1923. *V kakom ty otnoshenii k Dukhu Svyatomu?* [What is your relationship to the Holy Spirit?]. Wernigerode a. Harz.: Svet Vostoku.
- 1925. *Nuzhna li subbota? Pis'mo I.V.Kargelya Sovetu Kievskogo Oblastnogo Souza Ev. Khristian* [Do we need Sabbath? Letter of I. V. Kargel to the Council of Kiev Regional Union of Evangelical Christians]. Kiev: Edition of Kiev Regional Union of Evangelical Christians.
- 1991. Pis'mo Kargelya k Zhidkovu [A letter of Kargel to Zhidkov], in Kargel 1991:262-266.



- 1991. *Tolkovatel' Otkroveniya snyatogo Ioanna Bogoslova* [Interpretation of the Revelation of St. John]. SPb.: Khudozhestvennaya literatura.
- 1994. Neuznannyi voskresshiy Gospod' [Unrecognized resurrected Lord], in Savchenko 1994:117-121.
- 2002. Grekh kak zlo vsekh zol v etom mire [Sin as the greatest evil in the world], in Kargel 2002:5-48.
- 2002. Khristos osvyashchenie nashe [Christ is our sanctification], in Kargel 2002:49-113.
- 2002. V kakom ty otnoshenii k Dukhu Svyatomu? [Where do you stand in your relationship to the Holy Spirit?], in Kargel 2002:114-179.
- 2002. Gde, po Pisaniyu, nakhodyatsya mertvye [Where are the dead according to Scripture], in Kargel 2002:180-254.
- 2002. Iz pisem Kargelya [From Kargel's letters], in Kargel 2002:671-679.
- 2002. Vetkhozavetnye proobrazy [The Old Testament types], in Kargel 2002:255-377.
- 2002. "Se, gryadu skoro..." ["Lo, I am coming soon..."], in Kargel 2002:378-448.
- 2002. *Tolkovatel' Otkroveniya svyatogo Ioanna Bogoslova* [Interpretation of the Revelation of St. John], in Kargel 2002:449-670.
- 2002. *Sobranie sochineniy* [Collection of works]. SPb.: Bibliya dlya vsekh.
- 2003. *Zakon Dukha zhizni: Tolkovanie glav 5,6,7,8 Poslaniya svyatogo apostola Pavla k Rimlyanam* [The law of the Spirit of life: Commentary of the chapters 5,6,7,8 of the Epistle of Saint Apostle Paul to Romans]. SPb.: Bibliya dlya vsekh.
- 2004. *Izliyanie Dukha Svyatogo i pyatidesyatnicheskoe dvizhenie* [Pouring of the Holy Spirit and the Pentecostal movement], in Karetnikova 2004:10-61.
- 2006. *Besedy* [Discourses], in Kargel 2006:187-354.
- 2006. *Lektsii, besedy, pis'ma* [Lectures, discourses, letters]. SPb.: Bibliya dlya vsekh.
- 2006. *Lektsii* [Lectures], in Kargel 2006:3-180.
- 2006. *Pis'ma I. V. Kargelya* [Letters of I. V. Kargel], in Kargel 2006:357-410.
- Kazemzadeh, F 1999. Reflection on church and state in Russian history, in Witte & Bourdeaux 1999:227-239.
- Kistemaker, S J 1990. *New Testament Commentary. Acts*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House.
- Klaassen, W 1984. Anabaptist Hermeneutics: Presuppositions, Principles and Practice, in Swartley 1984:5-10.
- 1984b. The Bern Debate of 1538: Christ the center of Scripture, in Swartley 1984:106-114.

- Klassen, W 1984. Anabaptist Hermeneutics: the letter and the spirit, in Swartley 1984:77-90.
- 1984b. The Relation of the Old and New Covenants in Pilgram Marpeck's Theology, in Swartley 1984:91-105.
- Komarskiy, F S 1896. *Besedy* [Discourses]. SPb.: Tipografiya E. Evdokimova.
- Korff, M M 1909. *Moe obrashchenie* [My conversion]. SPb.: Knigoizdatel'stvo dukhovnoy literatury.
- Kovalenko, L 1996. *Oblako svideteley Khristovykh* [Cloud of witnesses of Christ]. Sakramento.
- Krapivin, M Yu, Dalgatov, A G, Makarov, Yu N 2005. *Vnutrikonfessional'nye konflikty i problemy mezhkonfessional'nogo obshcheniya v usloviyakh sovetskoy deystvitel'nosti (oktyabr' 1917 – konets 1930-kh gg.)* [Intraconfessional conflicts and the problems of interconfessional fellowship under conditions of the Soviet reality (October 1917 – the end of 1930th). SPb.: Izdatel'stvo S.-Peterburgskogo universiteta.
- Krapivin, M Yu, Leykin, A Ya, Dalgatov, A G 2003. *Sud'by khristianskogo sektantstva v Sovetskoy Rossii (1917 – konets 1930-kh godov)* [Fates of Christian sectarianism in Soviet Russia (1917 – the end of 1930th). SPb.: Izdatel'stvo S.-Peterburgskogo universiteta.
- Kraus, C N 1984. American Mennonite and the Bible, 1750-1950, in Swartley 1984:131-150.
- Kuiper, F 1984. The Pre-eminence of the Bible in Mennonite history, in Swartley 1984:115-130.
- Kushnev, I A 1916. *Nemetskiya very* [German faiths]. Orel: Tipografiya A. A. Logunova.
- Kutepov, N 1891. *Kratkaya istoriya i verouchenie russkikh ratsionalisticheskikh i misticheskikh eresey* [Short history and beliefs of Russian rationalistic and mystical heresies]. M.: Tipografiya E. Lissnera i Yu. Romana.
- Lane, C 1978. *Christian religion in the Soviet Union: A sociological study*. London: Allen and Unwin.
- LaSor, W S 1978. The *Sensus Plenior* and Biblical Interpretation, in Gasque & LaSor 1978:260-277.
- Lategen, B C 1979. The historian and the believer, in Vorster 1979:113-134.
- Latimer, R S 1908. *Dr. Baedeker: and his apostolic work in Russia*. London: Morgan and Scott.
- 1913. *Zhizn' i trudy d-ra F. V. Bedekera* [Life and work of Dr. F. V. Baedeker]. Golbstadt: Raduga.
- Leskov, N S 1877. *Velikosvetskiy raskol* [The schism in high society]. SPb.: Tipografiya V. Tushnova.
- 1877. Sbornik molitv pastora Bers'e v russkom perevode [Collection of prayers of Pastor Bersier in Russian translation], in Leskov 1877:(II) 1-26.

- 1877. Sentimental'noe blagochestie. Velikosvetskiy opyt prostonarodnogo zhurnala. (Kriticheskiy etyud.) Razbor ezhemesyachnogo religiozno-nravstvennogo izdaniya 'Russkiy rabochiy' [Sentimental piety. High Society experience of popular magazine. (Critical study). Analysis of a monthly religious-moral publication 'Russian workman'], in Leskov 1877:301-365.
- Lieven, S 1967. *Dukhovnoe probuzhdenie v Rossii* [Spiritual revival in Russia]. Korntal: Svet na Vostoke.
- Lind, M C 1984. Reflections on Biblical Hermeneutics, in Swartley 1984:151-164.
- Lundin, R (ed) 1999. *The Promise of Hermeneutics*. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.
- Mackintosh, C H 1862. *Notes on the book of Exodus*. London: Paternoster.
- Makarenko, I I 2006. Osnovnye voprosy bibleyskoy germeneytiki v bogoslovskikh rabotakh I. V. Kargelya [The main issues of the biblical hermeneutics in theological works of I. V. Kargel]. Unpublished Master dissertation, St. Petersburg Christian University.
- 2009. Osnovnye raboty I. V. Kargelya [Main works of I. V. Kargel], in Karetnikova 2009:203-230.
- Malitskiy, P 1881. Pashkovtsy i ikh bogoslovskie tendentsii [The Pashkovites and their theological tendencies]. Tula: Tipografiya N. I. Sokolova.
- Martsinkovsky, V F 2006. *Zapiski veruyushchego* [A believer's notes]. Novosibirsk: "Posokh".
- Marshall, R H (ed) 1971. *Aspects of religion in the Soviet Union, 1917-1967*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Meshchersky, V P 1876. *Lord-apostol v bol'shom peterburgskom svete* [Lord-Apostle in high Petersburg's society] Vol.1-4. SPb.-M.: M. O. Vol'f.
- 1876. *Pis'mo k lordu Redstoku* [A letter to Lord Radstock]. SPb. Tipografiya knyazya V. Obolenskogo.
- Miller, D 2009. Iogann Kargel [Johann Kargel], in Karetnikova 2009:82-87.
- Miller, W C 1995. *The new apocalypticism: History of dispensationalist thought*. Kansas City: Beacon Hill.
- Mitrokhin, L N 1997. *Baptizm: istoriya i sovremennost'* [Baptism: history and contemporaneity]. SPb.: Izdatel'stvo Russkogo Khristianskogo gumanitarnogo instituta.
- Montgomery, J W 1995. Legal Hermeneutics and the Interpretation of Scripture, in Bauman and Hall 1995:15-29.
- Nash, R H 1984. *Christian Faith and Historical Understanding*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House.
- Newman, B M & Nida, E A 1972. *A translator's handbook on the Acts of the Apostles. Helps for translators*. Vol. XII. London: United Bible Societies.

- Nichols, G L 1991. *Pashkovism: Nineteenth century Russian Piety*. Unpublished MA thesis, Wheaton College graduate School.
- N.S.G. 1883. *Dshcher' Siona. Razmyshlenie na Pesn' Pesney* [Daughter of Zion. Reflection on the Song of Songs]. SPb.: Tipografiya Yakobsona.
- Ollenburger, B C 1984. The hermeneutics of obedience, in Swartley 1984:45-61.
- Ornatsky, F N 1903. *Sekta Pashkovtsev i otvet na "Pashkovskie voprosy"* [The Sect of Pashkovites and a response to "Pashkovite questions"]. SPb.: Tipo-litografiya M. P. Frolovoy.
- Packer, J I 1958. *"Fundamentalism" and the Word of God*. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.
- 1983. Infallible Scripture and the Role of Hermeneutics, in Carson and Woodbridge, 1983:325-356.
- Pascal, P 1976. *The religion of the Russian people*. London: Mowbrays.
- Pavlov, V G 1884? Vypiska iz zapisnoy knizhki Tiflisskago grazhdanina Vasiliya Gur'eva Pavlova [An extract from the diary of the Tiflis citizen Vasily Guriev Pavlov], in "Svedeniya o sekte Pashkovtsev" 188-?: 27-29.
- 1999. Pravda o baptistakh [The truth about Baptists], in Karetnikova 1999:220-272.
- 1999. Vospominaniya ssyl'nogo [Memoirs of an exiled], in Karetnikova 1999:194-219.
- Penner, P 1993. *The Russian Mennonite Brethren and American Baptist tandem in India (1890-1940)*. Winnipeg, Man: Kindred Press.
- Pierson, A T 1902. *George Müller of Bristol*. London: James Nisbet & Co.
- Pobedonostsev, K P 1880. Vsepoddanneyshaya zapiska Ober-Prokurora Svyateyshago Sinoda, predstavlenaya Gosudaryu Imperatoru v Mae 1880 goda [A humble Memorandum of the Chief Procurator of the Most Holy Synod to His Imperial Majesty in May, 1880], in "Svedeniya o sekte Pashkovtsev" 188-?: 1-4.
- 1882. Vypiska iz konfidentsial'nogo otnosheniya Ober-Prokurora Svyateyshago Sinoda k Ministru Vnutrennikh Del ot 22 Aprelya 1882 g. za № 81 [An extract from the confidential statement of Ober-Procurator of the Most Holy Synod to the Minister of Inferior on April 22, 1882 № 81], in "Svedeniya o sekte Pashkovtsev" 188-?: 5-9.
- Poettcker, H 1984. Menno Simons' encounter with the Bible, in Swartley 1984:62-76.
- Porteous, J M 1876. *Brethren in the Keelhowes, or, Brethronism tested by the word of God*. London: Simpkin, Marshall, Hamilton, Kent.
- Pospelovsky, D V 1988. *Soviet studies on the church and the believer's response to atheism*. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Macmillan.



- 1996. *Pravoslavnaya Tserkov' v istorii Rusi, Rossii i SSSR* [The Orthodox Church in the history of Russ, Russia, and the USSR]. M.: Bibleysko-bogoslovskiy institut sv. Apostola Andreyaya.
- Preobrazhenskii, A A (ed) 1988. *The Russian Orthodox Church: tenth to twentieth centuries*. M.: Progress Publishers.
- Prokhanov, I S 1993. *V kotle Rossii* [In the Cauldron of Russia]. M.: "Protestant".
- 1913. *Zapiska o pravovom polozhenii evangel'skikh khristian, a takzhe baptistov i srodnykh im khristian v Rossii* [A note concerning the legal status of Evangelical Christians, as well as Baptists and similar to them Christians in Russia]. SPb.: Tipografiya "T-va V. Andersona & G. Loytsyanskago".
- 1915. *Presledovaniya evangel'skikh i srodnykh im khristian v Rossii vo vremya voyny* [Persecutions against evangelical and related to them Christians during the war]. Petrograd: Chernyshev per. 12.
- Prugavin, A S 1909. *Raskol vverhu. Ocherki religioznykh iskanii v privilegirovannoy srede* [Schism in upper society. Sketches of religious searching in the privileged society]. SPb.: Obshchestvennaya Pol'za.
- Quebedeaux, R 1974. *The Young Evangelicals*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Radstock, G 1870. *Propovedi* [Sermons]. London. (Translated into Russian and reprinted by a typewriter).
- 2004. *Priglasenie na brachnyy pir* [Invitation to the wedding feast]. St. Petesburg: Bibliya dlya vsekh.
- Randall, I 1999. *Evangelical experiences: A study in the spirituality of English evangelicalism 1918-1938*. UK: Paternoster.
- Rashbrook, J 1999. Velikiy russkiy baptist Vasiliy Gur'evich Pavlov [Great Russian Baptist Vasily Gurevich Pavlov], in Karetnikova 1999:187-193.
- Rawlyk, G A & Noll, M A (eds) 1993. *Amazing Grace: Evangelicalism in Australia, Britain, Canada and the United States*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books.
- Reese, A 1937. *The approaching advent of Christ: An examination of the teaching of J. N. Darby and his followers*. London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott.
- Reimer, J 1996. *Auf der Suche nach Identitat: Russlanddeutsche zwischen Baptisten und Mennoniten nach dem Zweitn Weltkrieg*. Lage: Logos Verlag.
- Rennie, I S 1977. Nineteenth-century roots of contemporary prophetic interpretation, in Armerding & Gasque 1977:41-59.
- Rogers, J B 1978. A Third Alternative: Scripture, Tradition, and Interpretation in the theology of G. C. Berkouwer, in Gasque & LaSor 1978:70-91.
- Rossouw, H W 1982. Calvin's Hermeneutics of Holy Scripture, in Walt 1982:149-180.

- Rowdon, H H 1967. *The origins of Brethren*. London: Pickering & Inglis.
- 1986. *Who are the Brethren and does it matter*. Paternoster Press Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House.
- 1994. *The Brethren contribution to the worldwide mission of the church: International Brethren Conference on Missions held at the Anglo-Chinese School, Singapore, 9-15 June 1993*. Carlisle, England: Paternoster Press.
- Sakharov, V 1897. *Pashkovtsy, ikh Izheuchenie i oproverzhenie ego* [Pashkovites, their false teaching and its refutation]. Orel: Tipo-litografiya V. P. Matveeva.
- Samoilencov, S 2001. Missionary activity of I. S. Prokhanov. Unpublished MM thesis, University of South Africa.
- Sandeen, E R (ed) 1982. *The Bible and social reform*. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Rortress Press.
- Savchenko, A (comp) 1994. *Zhemchuzhiny gomiletiki* (antologiya propovedi) [Perls of homiletics (anthology of sermons)]. Mariupol': "Svetil'nik" ORA International.
- Savinsky, S N 1999. *Istoriya Evangel'skikh Khristian-Baptistov Ukrainy, Rossii, Belorussii (1867-1917)* [History of Evangelical Christian-Baptists of the Ukrain, Russia, and Belorussia 1867-1917)]. SPb.: Bibliya dlya vsekh.
- 2001. *Istoriya Evangel'skikh Khristian-Baptistov Ukrainy, Rossii, Belorussii (1917-1967)* [History of Evangelical Christian-Baptists of the Ukrain, Russia, and Belorussia 1917-1967)]. SPb.: Bibliya dlya vsekh.
- Sawatsky, V 1995. *Evangelicheskoe dvizhenie v SSSR posle vtoroy mirovoy voyny* [Soviet Evangelicals since World War II]. M.
- Shirley, E B & Rowe, M (eds) 1989. *Candle in the wind: Religion in the Soviet Union*. Washington, D.C.: Ethics and Public Policy Center.
- Skopina, I N 2002. Iz biografii I.V.Kargelya i ego docherey [From the biography of I.V.Kargel and his daughters], in Kargel 2002:689-701.
- Skvortsov, D 1893. *Pashkovtsy v Tverskoy eparkhii* [The Pashkovites in Tver eparchy]. Tver: Tipographiya Gubernskogo Pravleniya.
- 1905. *Sovremennoe russkoe sektantstvo* [Modern Russian Sectarianism]. Moscow: Tipo-Litographiya I. Efimova.
- Slonimskiy, L 1908. *O velikoy lzhi nashego vremeni: K. P. Pobedonostsev i knyaz' V. P. Meshchersky* [About a great lie of our time: K. P. Pobedonostsev and Prince V. P. Meshchersky]. SPb.: Polit. entsiklopediya.
- Stewart, M A (ed) 1990. *Studies in the Philosophy of the Scottish Enlightenment*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Stoeffler, F E 1965. *The rise of Evangelical Pietism*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Stunt, W T 1972. *Turning the world upside down: A century of missionary endeavour*. 2nd ed. Louisville, Ky: American Printing House.

- Swartley, W M 1984. Continuity and change in Anabaptist-Mennonite interpretation, in Swartley 1984:326-331.
- Swartley, W M (ed) 1984. *Essays on biblical interpretation. Anabaptist-Mennonite Perspective*. Vol. I. Elkhart, Indiana: Institute of Mennonite Studies.
- Tenney, M C 1950. *Galatians: Charter of Christian Liberty*. GR: Eerdmans Publishing Co.
- Terletsky G. 1891. *Sekta Pashkovtsev* [The Pashkovite Sect]. SPb.: Izdanie knigoprodavtsa I. L. Tuluzova.
- Thiselton, A C 1992. *New horizons in hermeneutics*. GR, MI: Zondervan Publishing House.
- 1999. Communicative Action and Promise in Interdisciplinary, Biblical, and Theological Hermeneutics, in Lundin 1999:133-240.
- Tikhon 1895. *O Slove Bozhiem* [About the Word of God]. SPb.: Izdatel'stvo Blismera.
- Tolstoy, L N 1992. *Polnoe sobranie sochineniy. Pis'ma 1873-1879* [Full collection of writings. Letters 1873-1879], vol. 62. M.: "Terra".
- Toews, J B 1967. *Missionary spirit of the Mennonite Brethren Church in Russia*. Fresno, Calif: Bd Of Christian Literature, Mennonite Brethren Church.
- Turchaninov, D Ya 2009. Vospominaniya o zhizni i sluzhenii Ivana Veniaminovicha Kargelya [Memoirs of life and ministry of Ivan Veniaminovich Kargel], in Karetnikova 2009:61-81.
- Vinogradov, N 1890. *Kritiko-bibliograficheskiy etyud* [Critical-bibliographical sketch]. M.: Universitetskaya tipografiya.
- Vins, G P 1976. *Three generations of suffering*. London: Hodder and Stoughton.
- Virkler, H A 1981. *Hermeneutics: Principles and Processes of Biblical Interpretation*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House.
- Vorster, W S (ed) 1979. *Scripture and the use of Scripture*. Pretoria: University of South Africa.
- Walt van der, B J (ed) 1982. *Calvinus Reformer: His contribution to theology, church and society*. Potchefstroom: Potchefstroom University for Christian Higher Education.
- Walters, P 1999. The Russian Orthodox Church and foreign Christianity, in Witte & Bourdeaux 1999:31-51.
- Warfield, B B 1956. *Calvin and Augustine*. Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co.
- Warne, F G 1898. *George Müller: The modern apostle of faith*. London: S. W. Partridge and Co.
- Whately, E J 1877. *Plymouth Brethrenism*. 2nd ed. London: Hatchards, Piccadilly.

- White, J E 1994. Inspiration and Authority of Scripture, in Dockery, Mathews & Sloan 1994:19-35.
- Witte, J & Bourdeaux, M (eds) 1999. *Proselytism and orthodoxy in Russia: The new war for souls*. Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books.
- Woodbridge, J D & Balmer, R H 1983. The Princetonians and Biblical Authority: An Assessment of the Ernest Sandeen Proposal, in Carson & Woodbridge 1983:251-279.
- Yarygin, N N 2004. *Evangel'skoe dvizhenie v Volgo-Vyatskom regione*. M.: Akademicheskii Proekt.
- Yoder, J H 1984. The Hermeneutics of the Anabaptists, in Swartley, 1984:11-28.
- Zhivotov, N N 1891. *Tserkovnyy raskol Peterburga. V svyazi s obshche-rossiyskim raskolom. Ocherki* [Church split in Petersburg. In connection with all-Russia split. Scetches]. SPb.: Izdanie knigoprodavtsa T. F. Kuzina.

Articles

- Balsam, P & Johnson, J 1973. Plymouth Brethren: Called to be true believers. *Christianity Today* 17(Ja 19), 42-43.
- Blaising, C A 1988. Developing dispensationalism. *Bibliotheca sacra* 145(Ap-Ju, JI-S), 133-140, 254-280.
- Bowman, J W 1956. Bible and the modern religions, pt 2: Dispensationalism. *Interpretation* 10(Ap), 170-187.
- Boyer, A N 1967. A response to "The social sources of denominationalism": H.R.Niebuhr's theory applied to Plymouth Brethren. *Iiff Review* 24(Spr), 29-33.
- Brock, P 1984. The Peace Testimony of the Early Plymouth Brethren. *Church History* 53(1), 30-45.
- Bryan, F E 1995. Organization and work of missionaries in the Middle-Volga in the second half of the nineteenth century. *Islam and Christian-Muslim Relations* 6(2), 173-186.
- Chryssavgis, J 1987. Piety – Pietism: An Eastern Orthodox Perspective. *Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 32(2), 143-151.
- Coad, F R 1991. The early history of the Brethren Movement in Britain. *Journal of the Christian Brethren Research Fellowship* 125(Ag), 7-12.
- Collins, K 1992. John Wesley's Critical Appropriation of Early German Pietism. *Wesleyan Theological Journal* 27(1-2), 57-92.
- Coker, J L 1998. Exploring the Roots of the Dispensationalist/Princetonian "Alliance": Charles Hodge and John Nelson Darby on eschatology and interpretation of Scripture. *Fides et Historia* 30(1), 41-56.

- Corrado, S 2007. Introduction: In Search of an East European Baptist Identity. *Eastern European Baptist History: New Perspectives. An Occasional Publication of the International Baptist Theological Seminary*, 7-13.
- Darby, J N 1972. Assemblies of Brethren. *Ecumenical Review* 24(Ap), 130-144.
- Deyneka, P & Deyneka, A 1998. Evangelical foreign missionaries in Russia. *International Bulletin of Missionary Research* 22(2), 56-62.
- Dixon, L E 1987. Have the „jewels of the church“ been found again? The Irving-Darby debate on miraculous gifts. *Evangelical Journal* 5(2), 78/92.
- 1990. The importance of J. N. Darby and the Brethren movement in the history of conservative theology. *Christian Brethren Review* 41, 42-55.
- Drummond, D K 1994. Baptists in Russia: The Pashkov Papers at the University of Birmingham. *Baptist Quarterly* 35(JI), 323.
- Edwards, M 1970. Two early Methodists in prison. *Methodist History* 8(3), 21-27.
- Ehlert, A D 1957. Plymouth Brethren writers. *Annual conference – American Theological Library Association* 11, 49-80.
- Ferguson, D S 1984. John Wesley on Scripture: The hermeneutics of Pietism. *Methodist History* 22(4), 234-245.
- Fish, J H 1993. Brethren Tradition or New Testament Church Truth? *Emmaus Journal* 2(2), 111-153.
- Glanzer, P L 2001. Christian conversion and culture in Russia: A clash of missionary expectations and cultural pressures. *Missiology* 29(3), 319-329.
- Goni-Gaztambide, J 1989. Siedler, Sektierer und Stundisten: Die Entstehung des russischen Freikirchentums. *Scripta Theologica* 21(3), 963.
- Hagan, M R 1975. J. N. Darby, the Brethren movement, and lay ministry. *Religion in Life* 44(3), 347-362.
- Hargroves, V C 1959. The Russian Baptists: A Brief History and an Appraisal. *Foundations* 2, 250-257.
- Ivanov, A 2002. The making of a conspiracy: Russian evangelicals during the First World War. *Religion in Eastern Europe* 22(5), 22-45.
- Kargel, I V 1906. Kto zhazhdet [Who is thirsty]. *Khristianin*. SPb.: Tipografiya Lapshinskogo.
- 1907. Kak dostich' zhelannoy pristani [How to reach the desired harbour]. *Khristianin* (3) February. SPb.: Tipografiya Mansfel'd.
- 1980. Gospod' vpered' [The Lord is ahead]. *Vera i zhizn'* (3).
- 1981. Ispolnyaytes' Dukhom [Get filled by the Spirit]. *Vera i zhizn'* (35).
- Klippenstein, L 1992. Russian evangelicalism revisited: Ivan Kargel and the founding of the Russian Baptist Union. *Baptist History and Heritage* 27(2), 42-48.

- Kovalkov, V M 1966. Origins of Evangelical Christian and Baptist congregations in Moscow. *Bratskiy Vestnik* [Brotherly Herald] 4, 65-67.
- Kraus, C N 1978. Reexamining Mennonite reality: Shapes and meanings of the future. *Mennonite Quarterly Review* 52(2), 156-164.
- Lawrence, J 1972. Religious schism in the Russian aristocracy 1860-1900: Radstockism and Pashkovism. *Eastern Churches Review* 4(Aut), 186-187.
- Linder, R D 1972. Evangelical attitudes towards the Russian Revolution of 1917. *Fides et Historia* 2(Spt), 11-54.
- Lovejoy, D S 1990. Plain Englishmen at Plymouth. *New England Quarterly* 63(2), 232-248.
- Lunkin, R & Prokof'yev, A 2000. Molokans and Dukhobors: Living Sources of Russian Protestantism. *Religion, State and Society* 28(1), 85-92.
- MacLeod, D J 1996. Walter Scott, A link in dispensationalism between Darby and Scofield. *Bibliotheca Sacra* 153(610), 155-178.
- Malone, D C 1980. A Methodist venture in Bolshevik Russia. *Methodist History* 18(4), 239-261.
- McCormack, W J 1996. The 'Plymouth' Brethren? Prolegomena to the Re-Writing of J.M. Synge's Biography. *Religion and Literature* 28(2-3), 83-96.
- McDowell, I 1983. The influence of the "Plymouth Brethren" on Victorian society and Religion. *Evangelical Quarterly* 55(4), 211-222.
- Mitskevich, A I 1946. Poslednie zemnye obiteli I. V. Kargelya [The last earthly home of I.V.Kargel]. *Bratskiy Vestnik* 5, 22-44.
- Nebecker, G L 2002. John Nelson Darby and Trinity College Dublin: A study in eschatological contrasts. *Fides et Historia* 34(2), 87-108.
- Nichols, G 2007. Ivan Kargel and the Pietistic Community of the Late Imperial Russia. *Eastern European Baptist History: New Perspectives. An Occasional Publication of the International Baptist Theological Seminary*, 71-87.
- Nickles, B 1997. Training shortfall may imperil growth. *Christianity Today* 41(Ap 7), 54.
- Patterson, M & Walker, A 1999. Our unspeakable comfort: Irving, Albury, and the Origins of the Pretribulation Rapture. *Fides et Historia* 31(1), 66-81.
- Payne, E A 1961. Contacts between Mennonites and Baptists. *Foundations* 4, 39-55.
- 1978. The meek and the mighty: The emergence of the Evangelical movement in Russia. *Journal of Church and State* 20 (Aut), 565-567.
- Piepkorn, A C 1970. Plymouth Brethren (Christian Brethren). *Concordia Theological Monthly* 41(Mr), 165-171.
- Popov, V & Zacharov, A 1995. Vasilii Gurevich Pavlov and the early years of the Baptist World Alliance. *Baptist Quarterly* 36 (Ja), 4-20.

- Rowdon, H H 1990. The Brethren concept of sainthood: Darbyite and Open Brethren views of sanctification compared. *Vox Evangelica* 20, 91-101.
- Sawatsky, W 1976. A call for union of Baptists and Mennonites issued by a Russian Baptist leader. *Mennonite Quarterly Review* 50(3), 230-239.
- Steeves, P D 1976. Alexander Karev: Evangelical in a Communist land. *Fides et Historia* 8(2), 63-81.
- Swan, J 1978. The meek and the mighty: The emergence of the Evangelical movement in Russia. *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 15(2), 330-331.
- Stump, J P 1965. Two nineteenth century movements. *Evangelical Quarterly* 37(O-D), 221-231.
- Urry, J 1980. John Melville and the Mennonites: A British evangelist in South Russia, 1837 – ca. 1875. *Mennonite Quarterly Review* 54(4), 305-322.
- Urry, J 1987. "Servants from far": Mennonites and the pan-evangelical impulse in early nineteenth-century Russia. *Mennonite Quarterly Review* 61(2), 213-227.
- Wallis, J 1986. A wolf in sheep's clothing. *Sojourners* 15(5), 20-23.
- Wardin, A W 1994. Pentecostal beginnings among Russians in Finland and Northern Russia, 1911-1921. *Fides et Historia* 26(2), 50-61.
- Weber, T P 1999. The Dispensationalist Era. *Christian History* 61, 34-37.
- Yarbrough, S A 1978. The ecclesiological development in theory and practice of John Robinson and Henry Jacob. *Perspectives in Religious Studies* 5(3), 196-210.
- 1982. The influence of Plymouth colony separatism on Salem: An interpretation John Cotton's letter of 1630 to Samuel Skelton. *Church History* 51(3), 290-303.
- Zhitkov, J I 1957. "Na Putyakh Edinstva" [On the Paths of unity]. *Bratsky Vestnik* [Brotherly Herald] 3, 61.

Dictionaries and encyclopaedias

- Bassett, P 1986. s v *The Encyclopedia of Christianity*, vol 2.
- Boraas, R 1986. s v *The Encyclopedia of Christianity*, vol 2.
- Bowman, J W 1962. s v *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*.
- Brown, R F 1986. s v *The Encyclopedia of Christianity*, vol 2.
- Collins, A Y 1992. s v *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*.
- Durnbaugh, D F 1986. s v *The Encyclopedia of Christianity*, vol 1.
- Erb, P C 1999. s v *Dictionary of Biblical Interpretation*.
- Fahlbusch, E 1986. s v *The Encyclopedia of Christianity*, vol 2.
- Fast, H 1986. s v *The Encyclopedia of Christianity*, vol 1.
- Geldbach, E 1986. s v *The Encyclopedia of Christianity*, vol 2.

- Howley, G C D 1978. s v *Oxford Dictionary of Church History*.
- Jeanrond, W G 1992. s v *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*.
- Johnson, J E 1984. s v *Evangelical Dictionary of Theology*.
- Mennecke-Haustein, U 1986. s v *The Encyclopedia of Christianity*, vol 1.
- Merkel, F 1986. s v *The Encyclopedia of Christianity*, vol 1.
- Noll, M A 1984. s v *Evangelical Dictionary of Theology*.
- Pierard, R V 1978. s v *Oxford Dictionary of Church History*.
- Pierard, R V 1984. s v *Evangelical Dictionary of Theology*.
- Ritschl, D 1986. s v *The Encyclopedia of Christianity*, vol 1.
- Rogerson, J W 1992. s v *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*.
- Sauter, G & Phillips, C A 1986. s v *The Encyclopedia of Christianity*, vol 2.
- Schwarz, H 1986. s v *The Encyclopedia of Christianity*, vol 2.
- Spencer, S R 1986. s v *The Encyclopedia of Christianity*, vol 1.
- Stuhlmacher, P & Phillips, C 1986. s v *The Encyclopedia of Christianity*, vol 2.
- The Eerdmans Bible Dictionary* 1987. S v Revelation, book of.
- Wainwright, A W 1999. s v *Dictionary of Biblical Interpretation*.
- Ward, W R 1986. s v *The Encyclopedia of Christianity*, vol 1.

Electronic Sources

- Author Unknown*. "Khristianskie sekty Zapadnogo proiskhozhdeniya" [Christian sects of Western origin]. <<http://www.teolog.ru/lib/t2.php?pid=22>> (24 November 2004).
- Author Unknown*. "We Baptists" by Study and Research Division, Baptist World Alliance, (Franklin Tn, Providence House Pub., 1999) pp 11-13. <<http://www.bwa-baptist-heritage.org/hst-ger.htm>> (25 September 2005).
- Bjorlie, J. "Soltau, Henry". <http://www.plymouthbrethren.org/page.php?page_id=56> (29 March 2008).
- Garrard, M N. "Jessie Penn-Lewis: A Memoir". <<http://www.kingsleypress.com/jessie-penn-lewis-a-memoir-by-mary-n-garrard.php>> (27 June 2009).
- Giesbrecht, H 1981. "Seeking a Faith to Live By: Some External Religious and Theological Influences." Winnipeg: Manitoba. <<http://www.directionjournal.org/article/?406>> (10 September 2004).
- Gordon, A J. "The Ministry of Healing." <<http://crossfaithministry.org/healing.html>> (25 June 2009).

- Healing and Revival Press, 2004. "The Soul is the Life of the Body".
<<http://healingandrevival.com/BioOStockmayer.htm>>. (25 June 2009).
- Karetnikova, M S 1999. "On ostaetsya zhivoy legendoy. K 150-letiyu Ivana Veniaminovicha Kargelya" ["He remains a living legend. To 150-years anniversary of Ivan Veniaminovich Kargel"].
<http://www.baptist.org.ru/html/magazine/easter/page_38_40.htm> (1 September 2004).
- 1999. "Velikiy dukhovnyy uchitel" [The great spiritual teacher] *Mirt* (17) August-September, p1.
<<http://www.krotov.info/yakov/past/20person/kargel.html>> (15 August 2004).
- Kargel, I V 1980. "Chto Bog думаet obo mne?" [What does God think of me?]. *Vera i zhizn'* (3). <<http://www.lio.ru/archive/vera/80/30/article01.html>> (26 November 2004).
- "Neuznannyi voskresshiy Gospod" ["Unrecognized resurrected Lord"].
<<http://www.dom-hleba.info/320036.html>> (26 November 2004).
- Longman, R Jr. 1997-2008. "Pre-pentecostalist history".
<www.spirithome.com/histpent.html> (25 June 2009).
- Matveev, M 1986. "Truzheniki umirayut, no Tserkov' Khristova zhivet. Predislovie izdatelya" ["Workers die but the Church of Christ lives. Editor's forward"]. Toronto. <<http://zryachev.chat.ru/Otkr/Otkr01.htm>> (5 September 2004).
- McGee, G B. "The Calcutta revival of 1907 and the reformulation of Charles F. Parham's 'bible evidence' doctrine"
<http://www.agts.edu/faculty/faculty_publications/lectures/mcgee_lecture_sept02.pdf> (25 June 2009).
- Mitrochin, L N. "Baptists in the Soviet society".
<<http://gn.iphosting.ru/lib/germ/lm.html>> (15 September 2005).
- Moreshead, J A. "Three brothers books".
<<http://www.threebrothersbooks.com/authors.html>> (25 June 2009).
- Peisty, N I. "Neskol'ko slov ob I. V. Kargele" ["A few words about I. V. Kargel"].
<<http://mnogoknig.narod.ru/bvb1/00091/read.html>> (2 September 2004).
- Poole-Connor, B J. "Visitations by grace". <<http://www.revival-library.org/catalogues/1857ff/pooleconnor.html>> (27 June 2009).
- Pöysti, O 2002. "Ivan Veniaminovitsh Kargel".
<<http://koti.japo.fi/~opoysti/kargel.htm>> (15 September 2004).
- Toon, P & Smout, M 1976. "John Charles Ryle. Evangelical Bishop".
<http://www.anglicanbooksrevitalized.us/Peter_Toons_Books_Online/History/rylebiog.htm> (27 June 2009).
- Tuchkov, E A 1924. "Otchet nachal'nika 6 otdeleniya SO OGPU E. A. Tuchkova o rabote, provedennoy v 1923 g. sredi evangel'skikh khristian" [A report of the chief of the 6-th department of SO OGPU E. A. Tuchkov about work accomplished in 1923 among evangelical Christians]. <<http://rus-baptist.narod.ru/dop/voen.htm>> (26 November 2004).

- Wardin Jr., A W. "Baptists Around the World", in Bender, H S, Dyck, C J, Martin, D D, Smith, H C, et al., (eds). *Mennonite Encyclopedia*. <<http://encyclopedia.thefreedictionary.com/Johann%20Gerhard%20Oncken>> (10 September 2004).
- Wardin, A W 1991. "The Baptists in Bulgaria". *The Baptist Quarterly* 34(4), 148-159. <<http://www.geocities.com/muntzer2/baptist.html>> (20 August 2004).
- Wikipedia 2009. "Jessie Penn-Lewis". <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Jessie_Penn-Lewis> (27 June 2009).
- Wikipedia 2009. "Henry Drummond". <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Henry_Drummond> (26 August 2009).
- Wikipedia 2009. "Charles Finney". <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Charles_Finney> (26 August 2009).

Archival Sources

Author Unknown 1874. Ezhenedel'naya zapiska Gospodinu Upravlyayushchemu Vnutrennikh Del Volynskogo Gubernatora [Weekly note to Mr. Administrator of the Interior from Volyn Governor] of September 30, 1874 № 2069. RGIA SPb. f. 1282 op. 3 delo. 124 l. 94-99.

Primary Sources on CDs

- History of Euro-Asian Evangelical Movement. Primary Sources. 2001.
Disc 1.0.
- History of Euro-Asian Evangelical Movement. Primary Sources. 2002.
Disc 2.0.



APPENDIX

Table 1

Kargel's Russian Text	English translation	Observations
<p>В каком отношении ты к Духу Святому?</p> <p>Ветхозаветное обетование о Духе Святом и мы (стр.152-158)</p> <p><i>"Но это есть предреченное пророком Иоилем: "И будет в последние дни, говорит Бог, излию от Духа Моего на всякую плоть, и будут пророчествовать сыны ваши и дочери ваши, и юноши ваши будут видеть видения, и старцы ваши сновидениями вразумляемы будут; и на рабов Моих и на рабынь Моих в те дни излию от Духа Моего, и будут пророчествовать; и покажу чудеса на небе вверху и знаменья на земле внизу, кровь и огонь и курение дыма. Солнце превратится</i></p>	<p>What is your relationship to the Holy Spirit?</p> <p>The Old Testament promise about the Holy Spirit and us (pp.152-158)</p> <p><i>"No, this is what was spoken by the prophet Joel: "In the last days, God says, I will pour out my Spirit on all people. Your sons and daughters will prophesy, your young men will see visions, your old men will dream dreams. Even on my servants, both men and women, I will pour out my Spirit in those days, and they will prophesy. I will show wonders in the heaven above and signs on the earth below, blood and fire and billows of smoke. The sun will be turned to darkness and the moon to blood</i></p>	



во тьму, и луна в кровь, прежде нежели наступит день Господень великий и славный. И будет: всякий, кто призовет имя Господне, спасется" (Деян.2:16-21).

before the coming of the great and glorious day of the Lord. And everyone who calls on the name of the Lord will be saved.'
(Acts 2:16-21)

T 1.1 Должны ли мы, после печального упадка всей Церкви Христовой, еще ожидать новой Пятидесятницы? Есть ли также слово, на которое мы можем безусловно опереться, чтобы снова гореть нетерпением, ожидая вод на жаждущее и потоков на иссохшее? Мы с большим дерзновением отвечаем на эти и подобные вопросы: да, благодарение Господу! И теперь, по истечении 1900 лет со времени первого излияния Духа Святого, у нас есть блаженная возможность снова черпать, как первые ученики Господни, из того же самого преизобильного богатства. Возьмем только вышеприведенное слово, как слово из уст Божиих, вникнем в него поглубже, и нам скоро сделается ясным, что нам в наши дни нет никакой причины отставать от славы апостолов и первой, исполненной Духом, Церкви Иерусалимской.

Should we, after the sad decline of the Christian Church, still expect a new Pentecost? Is there such a word on which we can firmly lean in order to burn again with excitement, expecting waters on the thirsty and flows on the withered? We answer these and similar questions with great daring: yes, thanks be to the Lord! And now, 1900 years after the time of the first outpouring of the Holy Spirit, there is a blessed opportunity for us to draw, as the first disciples of the Lord, from the same abundance of riches. Let's consider only the above-quoted passage, as the Word coming from the mouth of God, and penetrate into it more deeply. And it will soon become clear to us that we today do not have any reason to lag behind the glory of the apostles and the early, Spirit-filled church in Jerusalem.

It seems that Kargel held a pessimistic view of the past and present state of the Christian Church. He does not make exceptions for any Christian groups. However, Kargel is extremely optimistic about the future of the Church on earth. He actually expects another Pentecost. He seems to draw this conclusion from his interpretation of Joel's prophecy.

The paragraph contains an assumption of scriptural authority: the existence of a certain "word" is the only thing that can raise one's expectations concerning the future.

Kargel calls a passage from the book of Acts a "Word coming



<p>Т 1.2 Присмотрелись ли мы когда-нибудь, дорогие дети Божий, ближе и точнее к тому чудному обетованию Божию из пророка Иоиля? Остановились ли мы на его точном смысле и сделали ли его предметом благословенного размышления? Что меня касается, я должен признаться, что, к моему великому сожалению, сделал это только в последнее время. Так как апостол Петр приводит рассматриваемое обетование из пророка и применяет в день Пятидесятницы к совершившемуся излиянию Духа Святого, я всегда смотрел на него, как на раз навсегда исполнившееся и оконченное, и таким образом, никогда не проникал глубже в его смысл. Многие из нас, может быть, делали тоже самое, и в следствии того это славное слово</p>	<p>Have we ever, dear children of God, had a closer and more precise look into that wonderful promise of God from the prophet Joel? Have we ever <u>fixed our attention on its exact meaning</u> and made that passage the subject of our blessed reflection? As for me, I must admit, that, to my great regret, I have done this only recently. Since the Apostle Peter quoted that promise from the prophet and applied it to the day of Pentecost when the Holy Spirit had been poured out, I had I always considered the promise as fulfilled once and for all, so I never penetrated more deeply into its meaning. Many of us, maybe, were doing the same thing, and as a result this glorious word of promise became for us something like a credit ticket, which lost its value and was withdrawn from circulation . .</p>	<p>from the mouth of God” – the highest view of the Scriptures possible.</p> <p>He suggests studying the passage carefully and claiming its promises. There is an assumption that the passage speaks with authority to the issues the contemporary believers face in their situation.</p> <p>Kargel calls for serious examination and re-examination of the chosen passage. He urges his reader to find its “exact meaning”. Unfortunately, Kargel does not name the method he used to determine the “exact meaning”. So far his exegesis is unclear, but it may unfold further on. Having studied the passage with a supposedly open mind, he changed his view on the passage. Although he used to look at the promise as an outdated one, he claims now that Joel’s ancient text was relevant not only in the apostolic times but also for Kargel’s contemporaries.</p>
--	---	---



обетования стало для нас кредитным билетом, потерявшим цену и изъятым из обращения. . . С нашим же древним, драгоценным обетованием дело обстоит совершенно иначе: по точном рассмотрении оно имеет для меня и для всех нас **гораздо большее значение** теперь, нежели когда-либо прежде. Да откроется это и вам в таком виде, когда мы будем разбирать его, потому что тогда возобновятся и не умолкнут пред Господом наши просьбы о Духе Святом в полноте, пока мы не переживем здесь, у себя и во всем мире Пятидесятницы, какой еще никогда не было, потому что такую обещает нам это ветхозаветное слово обетования.

Т 1.3 Мы, во всяком случае, поступим хорошо, **занявшись сначала содержанием этого обетования.** Каково же оно? Без всякого сомнения, его драгоценное содержание есть **дар Святого Духа**, т.е. не только Его действие, сила или влияние, которое мы, дети Божий, более или менее все, в известной мере испытали и еще испытываем, но дар Его Самого, как Лица, как в день Пятидесятницы у апостолов. Ведь то излияние было такое чудное, могучее и очевидное, что даже люди, которым оно было чуждо, которые

. It is completely different with this ancient, precious promise. After careful consideration it has much more importance now than ever before for me and for all of us. May it be revealed also to you in such way as we study it. Then our prayers for the Holy Spirit in completeness will be renewed and will not stop before the Lord until we experience here, at home and all over the world Pentecost of the greatest power ever, because this was promised to us by this Old Testament word of promise.

In any case we will do the right thing if we first of all get engaged in the study of the contents of this promise. What is it about? Without any doubt its precious content tells us about the gift of the Holy Spirit. Not only about His work, power or influence, which we, the children of God, experienced more or less in the past and continue to experience to a certain extent, but about the gift of the Spirit Himself as a Person, such as the apostles had on the day of Pentecost. That outpouring of the Spirit was so amazing, mighty and obvious, that even the

In any case, Kargel suggests that Joel's prophecy was only partially fulfilled on the days of Pentecost but its complete fulfilment is still ahead. As a result of this new interpretation of the passage, Kargel's suggested application is to proceed to action: to pray and ask for the outpouring of the Holy Spirit in His completeness.

It seems that for Kargel the way to arrive at the "exact meaning" starts with the study of the content of the passage.

Kargel goes back to Joel's prophecy quoted by Apostle Peter. The question is "what exactly was meant by Joel's prophecy?" Here Kargel uses a syllogism: since Apostle Peter quoted this prophecy on the day of Pentecost, that is, the day



насмехались над исполнившимися Святого Духа, заметили Его действие. Их насмешки требовали объяснения того, что они видели и слышали. И Петр с одиннадцатью объясняет им это посредством приведенного ветхозаветного обетования: "Это" -, восклицает он, "- *есть предреченное пророком Иоилем*". Значит, сомнение в том, что оно говорит о личном сошествии Святого Духа, о Святом Духе Пятидесятницы, совершенно исключается. Для нас же в высшей степени важно, чтобы мы ясно видели это.

people, for whom it was alien, who sneered at those people filled with the Holy Spirit, noticed His actions. Their reaction required an explanation of what they saw and heard. And Peter with the eleven explained this phenomenon to them by quoting the Old Testament promise: "This" - he exclaims – "is foretold by the prophet Joel". This means that any doubt that the prophecy speaks about the personal advent of the Holy Spirit, the Holy Spirit of the Pentecost, is completely excluded. For us it is extremely important to see that clearly.

when the Person of the Holy Spirit was given as a gift, Kargel assumes that Joel's prophecy undoubtedly concerned the personal descent of the Holy Spirit. Kargel does this under the assumption of the perfect accuracy of both Joel's words and their application by Apostle Peter.

Kargel realizes that there are different time periods in the Scriptures; the prophecy was given centuries before the day of Pentecost. However, there is a close connection between prophecy and its fulfilment. For Kargel one passage of the Scripture clarifies the meaning of the other regardless of the time span dividing them. Taking different books of the Scripture as equally authoritative (in our case Joel and Acts), Kargel uses the historical context of Acts 2:16-21 when the prophecy was quoted in order to disclose the meaning of the original prophecy. Besides, Kargel uses the historical context



<p>Т 1.4 Остановимся же на минуту и посмотрим на это совершающееся перед глазами тысячей чудо, когда Он приносится с небес, подобно сильному ветру, наполняет весь дом, где находятся ученики Господни, пронизает и исполняет их самих, ниспускается даже видимо в образе разделяющихся огненных языков и почивает на каждом из них. И славные последствия этого тотчас же обнаруживаются у всех, так напоенных и объятых Духом Святым, потому что из всех уст льются живые свидетельства о великих делах Божиих на различных языках и наречиях, на которых говорят окружающие люди. Не правда ли, даже одно живое представление этого события в состоянии заставить нас с горячим желанием воскликнуть: <i>"О, Дух Святой, войди в нас и сделай нас Своим жилищем! О, приди, небесное Солнце!"</i> Мы будем принуждены восклицать так, потому что ни у себя, нигде в другом месте мы до сих пор не пережили такого излияния. И все-таки, братья мои в Господе, то излияние еще не было последним словом, которое Он</p>	<p>Let's stop for one minute and look at this miracle that took place before the eyes of thousands people. He descends from heaven like a strong wind, fills the whole house where the Lord's disciples were gathered, enters and fills them, descends even in the visible form of dividing fiery tongues and rests upon each one of them. And the glorious consequences of this event become immediately seen in everybody filled and grasped by the Holy Spirit, because from all the mouths the live witnesses of the great deeds of God are being poured in various languages and dialects of the people gathered around. Is it not true that even imagining this event can make us exclaim passionately: "Oh, Holy Spirit, enter us and make us your dwelling! Oh, come, the heavenly Sun!" We will have to exclaim this, because neither here nor anywhere else have we yet experienced such an outpouring of the Spirit. And nevertheless, my brothers in the Lord, that outpouring was not yet the last word which He intended to say in this respect to His Own and to say to the world. It was only the</p>	<p>of the passage from Acts (the NT) to explain the passage in Joel (the OT), not vice versa.</p> <p>There is a notion that if one tries to visualize the events that were taking place it would help to reach the "exact meaning" of what was going on.</p> <p>There is an absence of any doubts that the events developed the way they are described in the Scriptures, in this case, in the book of Acts. For Kargel they truly occurred in history and occurred the way one finds them described in the Bible. Thus, he starts from the literal sense of the passage as the foundation for developing the spiritual message from the passage and making it relevant to himself and his readers.</p> <p>From visualizing the event that had happened Kargel moves to the relevance of the event for his contemporaries. His logic is simple: if something so grand</p>
--	---	---



<p>намеревался сказать в этом отношении Своим, сказать миру; оно было только великим началом, частичным и предварительным исполнением обещания Божия, содержащегося в приведенных словах пророка Иоила. То, что Господь обещает здесь, начало исполняться в Пятидесятницу, день за днем должно бы было продолжаться, его окончательное исполнение еще теперь предстоит нам и до сих пор составляет предмет ожидания, так что то чудное излияние есть, собственно, только славный задаток большого капитала, еще ожидающего, чтобы мы его приняли. О, если бы мы увидели и осуществили то великое, что обещано нам Богом в этих словах, чтобы оно исполнилось на нас самих и на всем мире так, как Он обещал здесь!</p>	<p>great beginning, <u>partial and preliminary fulfilment of God's promise</u>, contained in the quoted words from the prophet Joel. The things that the Lord promises here began to be fulfilled on the day of Pentecost and should have continued day after day. Their final fulfilment is still ahead of us. It is still a subject of expectation because that wonderful outpouring was, actually, only a glorious downpayment of the large capital still waiting to be received by us. Oh, if we could only see and carry out those great things promised to us by God in these words, so that they would be fulfilled on ourselves and on the whole world the way He promised it here!</p>	<p>could happen to the apostles, why cannot we have a similar experience? Furthermore, Kargel calls believers to desire and pray for such an experience of the Holy Spirit's presence. For him Scripture not only describes what happened to others, it sets a pattern for all believers' personal experiences and prescribes action. Therefore he quickly moves to applications. However, he lays out the theological basis for such applications and claiming scriptural truths for himself and other believers. The basis is the theory of partial prophetic fulfilment, which he confirms here. The events that took place on the day of Pentecost were only "partial and preliminary fulfilment" of Joel's prophecy. Hence, the greatest part is still ahead because "God promised so".</p>
<p>Т 1.5 Приступим теперь ближе к этому драгоценному обетованию <i>и обратим внимание, к какому, собственно, времени</i></p>	<p>Let's now have a closer look at this precious promise and notice to what time period it actually refers. By all means it concerns our</p>	<p>The time of the complete fulfilment of Joel's prophesy in Kargel's mind was his time. He</p>



оно относится. Оно непременно касается нашего времени, в которое мы теперь живем, потому что здесь сказано: "И будет в последние дни", - говорит Бог. Разве существует у кого-либо из детей Божиих сомнение в том, что мы живем в последние дни? Всякий знает, что последние дни у дверей. Я, конечно, знаю, что первые христиане с полной верой ожидали, что пришествие нашего Господа застанет их в живых, и смотрели поэтому на свое время, как на последнее; да оно, наверное, и было бы последним временем, если бы Церковь Христова продолжала идти вперед, как начала, в полноте Духа Святого, потому что только ее упадок, то, что она оставила первую любовь, побудили Господа с великим терпением продлить время (2Пет.3:9). Однако, нам приходится иметь здесь дело не со светом, какой имели тогда дети Божий, но с непосредственным Словом Божиим, с Господом времен и дней, конечно знавшим, что те славные дни Пятидесятницы еще не принадлежали к последним дням. Девятнадцать истекших с тех пор столетий удостоверяют нас в том; но они делают и больше, они говорят нам, что мы значительно приблизились к окончательному исполнению этого обетования. Кроме того, признаки нашего

time, in which we now live, because it says here: "In the last days, God says". Do any of the children of God have doubt that we live in the last days? Everyone knows that the last days are at the door. I certainly know that the first Christians in full faith expected that the coming of our Lord would find them alive and therefore looked at their time as the last days. And it would have probably been the last days if the Church of Christ had continued to go forward as in the beginning, in the fullness of the Holy Spirit, because only the decline of the Church, the fact that she forsook her first love, prompted the Lord to show great patience and to prolong the time (2 Pet. 3:9). However, here we deal not with the light that the children of God had then, but with the direct Word of God, with the Lord of times and days who certainly knew that those glorious days of Pentecost did not belong to the last days yet. The nineteen centuries gone by since then prove that to us; but they tell us more, they tell us that we have come considerably closer to the final fulfillment of this promise. Furthermore, the signs of our time tell us that we live in the last days. The same truth is seen in the great decline of Christianity, the activity of the red dragon from the abyss who is assembling adherents to himself and

points out to the text, which attributes the fulfilment of the prophesy to the "last days". Kargel took for granted that he actually lived in the last days. This is one of his presuppositions. He was aware, however, of the parochial expectations of the apostolic church, which did not prove to come true. Kargel suggests a possible explanation: God can delay carrying out His planned actions due to the unreadiness and unworthiness of people.

It is not clear what Kargel meant by the mysterious "light" he is talking about. Probably he meant some kind of understanding the early Christian had before canonical Scripture was compiled.

The first believers might have been mistaken about times but the Lord certainly could not. According to Kargel, we deal with the "direct Word of God" – another argument for Kargel's



времени говорят нам, что мы живем в последние дни. Это говорит нам окружающее нас великое отпадение в христианстве, деятельность красного дракона из бездны, собирающего себе приверженцев и приготавливающего их для своих целей; это говорит нам пробуждение Израиля и его стремление к возвращению на родину, далее страшные, никогда небывалые вооружения, превосходящие даже народные силы, затем громкий крик: "вот Жених идет!" И жажда многих быть готовыми встретить Его; но громче всего говорят нам это все сильнее бросающиеся в глаза предварительные действия Духа Святого, местами уже действующего в силе. Но, чтобы мы никак не могли впасть в заблуждение, к какому именно времени относится окончательное исполнение этого обетования, еще совсем ясно прибавлено: *"прежде нежели наступит день Господень, великий и славный"* (Деян.2:20). Здесь можно было бы привести более двадцати мест Писания Ветхого и Нового Завета, ясно показывающих, что тот великий и славный день есть день, когда явится Христос, и мы с Ним во славе. Поэтому, именно это выражение не оставляет больше никакого сомнения в том, что это обетование исполнится перед самым

preparing them for his purposes. It is seen in the awakening of Israel and her aspiration to return to her motherland; further on it is seen in terrible weapons, never known before, which are superior even to human forces; and then in the loud cry, "Lo, the Groom is coming!" And in the desire of many people to be ready to meet Him. But the loudest of all are the preliminary actions of the Holy Spirit, more and more noticeable. He is already working in power in certain places. But so that we could not be in any way mistaken concerning the timing of the final fulfilment of this promise, it is absolutely clearly added: "before the coming of the great and glorious day of the Lord" (Acts 2:20). At this point one could refer to more than twenty passages of Scripture from both the Old and the New Testament clearly showing, that that great and glorious day is the day, when Christ appears and we appear with Him in glory. Therefore, this particular expression does not leave any doubt that this promise will be fulfilled right before the coming of our Lord. Let people say what they want; one thing remains incontestably true: during those glorious days of Pentecost, during the time of the Lord's apostles, the disciples were not facing this great and glorious day. To us

high view of Scripture. Kargel identifies the passage from the Bible with the Word of God.

Besides arguing from Scripture, Kargel argues from every day reality. The fact that the Apostolic Church did not live in the last days follows simply from the fact that nineteen centuries later the parousia still has not taken place. The same argument is used to say that "we" are much closer to the final fulfilment than they were.

Kargel interprets the signs of his time as pointing to the "last days". The historical developments around him left no doubt in his mind that those were **the** last days. He mentions the decline of Christianity again, red dragon (he could be referring to the revolutionary activity both in Russian and in Europe), an increased military activity with all new weapons being created which eventually led to the First World War, and finally Israel's claims for her historical



пришествием нашего Господа. Пусть говорят, что хотят; одно непременно остается неопровержимой истиной: в те славные дни Пятидесятницы, во времена апостолов Господних, ученики не находились перед этим великим и славным днем; к нам же, уверовавшим в Него по истечении почти 2000 лет, он, конечно, чрезвычайно близок, и это обетование Божие, таким образом, в особенности принадлежит нам. Поступим же теперь с обетованием Божиим о Духе Святом, как некогда поступили с ним апостолы; мы видели, что они приняли его, пошли в горницу и десять дней приносили в молитве к Богу, пока не получили его исполнения. В противном случае не окажемся ли мы неверующими, не ожидая и не прося Пятидесятницы, как апостолы?

who have believed in Him almost two thousand years later it is certainly extremely close, and thus, this promise of God belongs to us in particular. Let's now deal with God's promise about the Holy Spirit, as the apostles dealt with it then. We saw that they accepted it, went to the upper room, and brought it in prayer to God for ten days, until they received its fulfillment. If we do not do so won't we be found as unbelievers, not expecting and not asking for Pentecost they way the apostles did?

motherland. In addition, he points out the intensified activity of the Holy Spirit. It seems that speaking of those "signs" he alludes to the book of Revelation. Speaking of Israel's claims as something pointing to the "last times" Kargel seems to argue from a position of dispensational hermeneutics which allows for Israel's restoration as a nation after the dispensation of grace is over.

In any case, the final fulfillment concerning the outpouring of the Spirit, according to Kargel, must take place before "the day of the Lord". Kargel understands "the day of the Lord" to be the day of Christ's appearance with the believers in glory: the day of judgement for the ungodly and triumph for believers.

Kargel does not even go into detailed analysis of "more than twenty" passages from both testaments because he believes that his point is well documented.



		<p>It seems that one of Kargel's implied epistemological claims is that the case is especially strong when it is supported with a good number of passages throughout Scripture.</p> <p>And again, from elucidating a scriptural truth Kargel quickly moves to its application. Since the promise belongs to "us", "we" should bring it in prayer before God and insist on its fulfilment according to the apostles' example. No scriptural truth is just an abstract truth for Kargel. Hence, not only are believers expected to obey Scripture's direct commands, but they are also required to follow good examples and to claim the promises that haven't been completely fulfilled.</p> <p>The bottom line is that Kargel not only treats the account in Acts as something that literally happened in the first century, but he also interprets the text in a way that makes it relevant to his</p>
--	--	---



Т 1.6 *Обратим далее внимание на обширность, которую имеет это обетование.* И из нее мы узнаем, что девятнадцать столетий тому назад оно исполнилось только отчасти, и что теперь, вскоре, предстоит его исполнение гораздо более широкое. "Излию от Духа Моего **на всякую плоть**", - говорит Бог; так здесь написано. Означают ли слова "**всякая плоть**" только тех 120 учеников и учениц? "Всякая плоть": разве это только те, обращенные из *народа Израильского*, несколько из Самарии и затем Корнилий со всем домом своим в Кесарии? Означает ли это только церкви, приобретенные только впоследствии чрез ап. Павла и отдельных выдающихся рабов Божиих доныне, о которых мы знаем, что они были исполнены Святым Духом? Какой чудный сонм ни составляют все они, как их все-таки относительно мало по сравнению с теми, кто определяется здесь словами: "**всякая плоть!**" К сожалению, Пятидесятницу так долго ограничивали только теми 120 учениками и 3000 уверовавших с ними; и

Let's pay further attention to the broadness of this promise. From this we will see that nineteen centuries ago the promise was only partially fulfilled, and that now, soon, its fuller fulfillment is going to take place. "I will pour out my Spirit on all people", God says. So it is written here. Do the words "all people" mean only those one hundred and twenty disciples, both men and women? Is "all people" only those who were converted from the people of Israel, a few people from Samaria and then Cornelius with his household in Caesarea? Does it mean only the churches established later through apostle Paul and other outstanding servants of God until now, about whom we know that they were filled with the Holy Spirit? No matter what a wonderful crowd they comprise, they are still very few in comparison with all those who are defined here by the words: "all people"! Unfortunately, the concept of Pentecost was for a very long time limited only to those one hundred and twenty disciples and the three thousand who came to believe. And we,

contemporaries. He works towards finding spiritual truth and applying it.

The expression "all people" (or "all flesh" in the Russian translation) is taken by Kargel literally. Actually the expression "upon all flesh" is a Semiotic idiom meaning "all mankind" (Newman & Nida 1972:43). For Kargel "all" means all. On the basis of this rather literalistic approach he builds a case saying that the promise under consideration could not have been possibly fulfilled to the fullest yet. Those first disciples and first conversions were only a foretaste of the things to come, only a partial fulfillment. Even all the people converted throughout the history of Christianity are very few when compared to "all".

As a result of his literalistic interpretation of the phrase "all flesh" Kargel challenges a traditional "limitation" of Pentecost to the events



мы, может быть, делали тоже самое: несмотря на это всеобъемлющее слово, думали и говорили, что мы никогда не будем в состоянии получить Духа Святого в такой мере, как те. Правильно ли это, по воле ли Божией, по слову ли Того, Кто сказал: "**на всякую плоть**?" Разве каждый из нас, все наши, весь этот город, вся страна, все люди во всех странах земли не принадлежат **ко всякой плоти**? Не имеем ли мы права верить нашему Богу на слово, не суживая Его каким-либо образом? Только вследствие того, что не исследовали Слова Божьего и не верили ему, Церковь Христова и с нею несчастный, окружающий ее, мир остались неимущими в течении 1900 лет; неверием мы стеснили Бога, поставили Ему границы, и с нами случилось по нашему неверию. Ах, если бы мы по одиночке и во множестве встали, принесли пред лицо Божие это древнее, но все еще действительное обетование и вымолили бы для себя и для других его исполнение! "Господи", - имеем мы право сказать, "Господи, это обетование ведь принадлежит и моим домашним, они и я принадлежим ко "всякой плоти"; поэтому излей на нас Твоего Святого Духа с той *силой*, совсем так, как Ты сказал".

maybe, made the same mistake: despite this universal expression we thought and said that we will never be able to receive the Holy Spirit in the same measure as they did. Is this right? Is this according to the will of God? Is this according to the word of the One who said "all people"? Do not each one of us, all our friends, this whole city, this whole country, all people in all countries of the world belong in "all people"? Do not we have the right to trust our God on a word, not limiting Him somehow? Only because we did not study the Word of God and did not trust it, the Church of Christ and the miserable world around us have remained deprived during nineteen hundred years. By our unbelief we have constrained God, have put boundaries around Him, and it happened to us according to our unbelief. Oh, if we would rise as individuals and in multitudes, bring this ancient yet valid promise before the face of God and beg for its fulfilment both for our sake and the sake of others! "My Lord", we have the right to say, "My Lord, this promise belongs also to my household, we belong to 'all people'; therefore pour out upon us of Your Holy Spirit with power, the way You have spoken".

described in the book of Acts.

As a result Kargel calls his readers to take God on His word (no doubt is cast that this **is** God's word since it is found in Scripture) without limiting Him by unbelief.

It is important to notice that Kargel sees the roots of the miserable condition of the Church and the world throughout centuries in the **lack of study of the Word of God** (equivalent of Scripture) and unbelief.

The application here is a call to the readers to claim the promise of God.



<p>Т 1.7 Упомянем еще об одной стороне этого славного обетования, именно о <i>дарах, которые оно обещает</i>. И они показывают, что во всем своем объеме оно еще должно исполниться, и что некогда в Пятидесятницу было положено только начало. Послушайте, что обещает Господь: <i>"будут пророчествовать сыны ваши и дочери ваши, и юноши ваши будут видеть видения, и старцы ваши сновидениями вразумляемы будут; и на рабов Моих и на рабынь Моих в те дни излию от Духа Моего, и будут пророчествовать"</i>. Мы, конечно, с уверенностью можем допустить, что в те дни Пятидесятницы все, обетованное здесь, отчасти исполнилось, хотя о том немного сказано; мы знаем о пророках и пророчествовавших девицах в Церкви Божией, и все-таки в последние дни это должно случиться в гораздо больших размерах. Разве мы не нуждаемся, братья мои, в исполнении этого слова? О, как глубоко больно, когда дети верующих бывают и остаются детьми мира, когда над ними господствует окружающий их дух времени, и они не обращаются ко Христу! Это доказательство того, что их отцы и матери ничего не имеют от Духа Пятидесятницы и что в их домах не живут</p>	<p>Let's mention another aspect of this glorious promise, particularly the gifts, which are promised. And from them we can also see that <u>the promise is still waiting to be fulfilled in all its fullness</u>, and that the time of Pentecost was only the beginning. Listen to what the Lord promises: "Your sons and daughters will prophesy, your young men will see visions, your old men will dream dreams. Even on my servants, both men and women, I will pour out my Spirit in those days, and they will prophesy." We can certainly allow that everything promised here was partly fulfilled in those days of Pentecost, although not much is said about it. We know about the prophets, both men and maidens in the Church of God. Nevertheless in the last days it should take place to a much greater extent. Do not we, my brothers, need the fulfillment of this word? How sad it is when the children of the believers remain the children of the world, when the spirit of the time dominates them, and they do not convert to Christ! This is proof that their fathers and mothers have nothing from the Spirit of Pentecost and that in their homes they do not live according to the life of Christ. However, it is not only about being converted, the normal state of</p>	<p>Here Kargel introduces another argument for the partial fulfilment of Joel's prophecy. Kargel believes that the gifts listed in the passage were not fully exercised in the Apostolic Church. He expects a literal manifestation of those gifts in the last days.</p> <p>Mere cognitive study of the text of Scripture is never an end in itself for Kargel. Since the goal is obedience to the Word, the parts of Kargel's text which call to obedience and application are usually lengthy, longer than the exegetical passages.</p> <p>Kargel expects that since the promise concerns his contemporaries there must be decisions made and certain responses shown. There is no doubt in Kargel's opinion that the Bible relates to modern life.</p> <p>Interpreting Joel's prophecy Kargel uses common sense. He basically asks his readers to look</p>
--	---	---



жизнью Христовой. Однако дело идет здесь не только об обращении, об обыкновенном состоянии уверования, но о бесконечно большем: дело идет об исполнении силой свыше, об избытке и излипании Духа Святого на наших сыновей и дочерей; каждый из них будет пророком Божиим, Он сделает их свидетелями Себе, будет давать им Свои откровения и видения. Не правда ли, этого мы еще не имели в домах искупленных Божиих, а если Господь и совершал подобное кое-где, то это было удивительным исключением, чем осталось и донныне, хотя мы живем в дни, о которых говорит это обетование, когда это должно случиться чрез обещанное излипание Его Святого Духа. Не будем ли мы, отцы и матери, молить о прощении за то, что мы не заботились об этой полноте и не добивались ее у Бога как для себя, так и для наших дорогих? Отцы и матери, подумайте только, что было бы, если бы все мы, исполненные и проникнутые Духом Святым, стали совсем новыми людьми, как ученики в день Пятидесятницы, и наши сыновья и дочери, которые теперь, может быть, полны светскости, мысленно критикуют вас и Слово Божие, даже может быть, полны революционных идей, сегодня или завтра встали бы, начали бы

being a believer, but also about infinitely greater things. It is about being filled with power from above, about abundance and an outpouring of the Holy Spirit upon our sons and daughters; each one of them will be a prophet of God, He will make them witnesses to Himself, will give them His revelations and visions. We have not had this happen in the homes of the redeemed by God yet, have we? And if the Lord has done something like that somewhere, it was a surprising exception, and remained such until now, although we live in the days about which this promise speaks, when this should be happening through the promised outpouring of His Holy Spirit. Won't we, fathers and mothers, ask for forgiveness that we did not care for this fullness and did not attain it from God both for ourselves and for our dear ones? Fathers and mothers, just think what could happen, if all of us, filled and permeated with the Holy Spirit, would become absolutely new people, as the disciples on the day of Pentecost, and our sons and daughter, who now, maybe, are full of worldliness, criticize you and the Word of God in their thoughts, may be even full of revolutionary ideas, today or tomorrow would rise and begin to testify about Christ and prophesy; if all this youth, tormented

around and see for themselves that the things promised, when taken literally, have not yet been fully realized.

Harbouring a critical attitude towards the Word of God (the same as the Scriptures) is clearly viewed by Kargel as a terrible thing and is put on the same list with worldliness and revolutionary thoughts.



свидетельствовать о Христе и пророчествовать; если бы вся эта **молодежь, мучимая и пленяемая похотью плоти, похотью очей** и гордостью житейской, если бы эти юноши, предающиеся теперь, может быть, открытым или тайным грехам и кладущие основание разрушению тела и души, **получали небесные видения**, а греховные помыслы были бы раз навсегда уничтожены, потому что сами они обратились в храмы Духа Святого!

Т 1.8 Но далее. Каких *рабов и рабынь* имел бы Господь в каждом члене Своей, искупленной кровью, Церкви! Если бы каждый из нас был исполнен тем же Святым Духом, каждый в действительности руководим, каждый помазан Им, предан Ему на служение, каждый и каждая были пророком и пророчицей Божией: какую силу представляли бы мы тогда, какой солью земли был бы Его народ! Что почувствовали бы внешние, если бы

and captured by the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life, if these young men, engaging now, maybe, in open or secret sins and laying the foundation for the destruction of their bodies and souls, would receive heavenly visions, and sinful thoughts would be forever destroyed, because they have been converted into temples of the Holy Spirit!

But let us read further. What wonderful servants, both men and women, the Lord would have had then in each member of the Church redeemed by the blood! If each one of us were filled with the same Holy Spirit, each one was actually led and anointed by Him, devoted to His service, each one, both men and women, were God's prophets, what great power we would present then! What salt of the world His people would be! What would the outsiders feel if they saw

There are lots of "hidden" scriptural quotations in Kargel. Kargel often adopted the biblical language as his own. Although the passage mentions only visions, dreams, and prophecy as a result of the Spirit's outpouring, Kargel believes that those "gifts" are incompatible with lust and sin and that the presence of the Holy Spirit will bring holiness of conduct and purity of thoughts. This is his preconceived view on the work of the Holy Spirit, which he brings into interpreting the text.

When Kargel develops his vision of what would it be like if each believer was filled by the Spirit, he brings in his understanding of what it means to be filled by the Spirit probably formed by his study of the rest of Scripture. For Kargel, being filled with the Spirit means being devoted to ministry, being able to prophesy (testify) for Christ, to have power, to be



видели Христа в каждом из исповедующих Его, и что за встречи были бы, когда мы сходились бы между собою в домах или вместе являлись пред Господом: насколько был бы каждый готов открыть свои уста для свидетельства, для благодарения, хвалы, для молитвы и прошения за другого; немного прошло бы времени, пока настало бы то, к чему стремился некогда Моисей, когда воскликнул: "О, если бы все в народе Господнем были пророками, когда бы Господь послал Духа Своего на них!" (Чис.11:29).

Т 1.9 Также и о старцах (*Слово "старцы" в некоторых переводах, имеют также значение "пресвитеры".*) идет речь в обетовании. Да, каких старцев тогда имела бы Церковь Божия! Ничего не делалось бы механически, по лицепритию, нехотя для гнусной корысти (1 Пет 5:1- 4) надменно или лениво, потому только, что должно быть сделано в доме Господнем; но старцы были бы все отцами во Христе, которые не только рожают детей для Него через силу свыше, но и заботятся о них и воспитывают их для Него. Какими нежными и осторожными были бы они по отношению к стаду Христову, как щадили бы они его, как пасли бы и как боялись бы "увлечь

Christ in each one of those professing Him, and what meetings we would have, when we gather in our homes or all of us together before the Lord! How prepared would everyone be to open his mouth for testimony, praise, and prayer for each other. It would not take long before the time comes that Moses desired so much when he exclaimed: "I wish that all the LORD's people were prophets and that the LORD would put his Spirit on them!" (Num.11:29).

The promise also mentions old men (words "old men" in some translations also have the meaning of "presbyters"). Yes, what old men the Church of God would have then! Nothing would be done mechanically, by constraint, unwillingly for filthy lucre (1 Pet. 5:1- 4), haughty or lazy, only because it should be done in the house of the Lord; but the old men would all be fathers in Christ, who not only give birth to God's children through the power from above, but also care for them and bring them up for Him. How gently and cautiously would they treat the flock of Christ, how they would spare it, how they would shepherd it and how they would be afraid "to draw away disciples after them"

the salt of the world, to make Christ manifested in personal lives, to have great Christian meetings, to be ready to witness, to pray, to praise, and to intercede for others.

Kargel finds it profitable to work with different translations in order to develop a better grasp of the meaning of the text. There was no such thing as an "inspired" translation for Kargel.

The short line from the text "your old men will dream dreams" inspires Kargel to preach a "sermon" of what "old men" ought and ought not to be in the Church of Christ. In order to do that he employs three other passages from the NT and some "hidden" allusions to other passages. It



<p>учеников за собою" (Деян.20:30). Они вникали бы в себя и в учение, занимались бы сим постоянно, чтобы себя спасти и слушающих их (1Тим.4:16).</p> <p>Т 1.10 Тогда, безусловно, вернулись бы <i>чудеса и знамения</i>, совершавшиеся в таком изобилии в первой Церкви Божией, чудеса и знамения, которых с упреком спрашивает окружающий нас мир. Снова появились бы все чудеса и дары Пятидесятницы, потому что они свойственны Духу Святому; Господь даже обещал еще больше, чем тогда, именно чудеса на небе вверху и знамения на земле внизу, кровь и огонь и курение дыма. Не было бы недостатка, не было бы потребности, удовлетворения которых мы ожидаем со дней апостольских, которых Дух Святой не восполнил бы.</p>	<p>(Acts.20:30). They would saturate themselves with doctrine, would be studying constantly in order to save both themselves and their hearers (1Tim.4:16).</p> <p>Then, certainly, the miracles and signs shown in such abundance in the first Church of God, miracles and signs, which the world around us reproachfully asks for, would return. All miracles and gifts of Pentecost would appear again, because they are characteristic of the Holy Spirit. The Lord promised even more than happened back then, in particular, wonders in the heaven above and signs on the earth below, blood and fire and billows of smoke. There would be no lack and no need of the things we have been expecting since the days of the apostles, which the Holy Spirit would not fill.</p>	<p>seems that the "old men" filled with the Spirit would not only "dream dreams" but do all that is expected of a believer in the NT. This edification style is typical for Kargel's writings: devotional, deductive, letting himself to be carried away with a particular word or phrase.</p> <p>Kargel takes the words promising "wonders in the heaven above and signs on the earth below, blood and fire and billows of smoke" for what they are and expects them to be literally fulfilled. He does not think of these signs and wonders in terms of figurative symbolism.</p> <p>It must be noticed that Kargel proclaimed that "signs and wonders" were to return as being "characteristic" of the Holy Spirit right in the face of the rising Pentecostal movement, which Kargel opposed. This is a sign of Kargel's personal integrity when it comes to Scripture. If in Kargel's view the Scriptures seem to teach</p>
--	---	--



<p>Т 1.11 И как приобретались бы снова люди вокруг нас! Мы все ведь знаем, что приближаемся с каждым днем ко "времени жатвы" (Мтф.13:30); может ли она начаться без предварительного излияния Духа Святого? Никак! В первый день Пятидесятницы 3000 душ сразу и в одном собрании стали собственностью Христа; это был только первый сноп жатвы, принесенный Господу, потому что Дух Святой еще далеко не излился на "всякую плоть"; что же будет, что должно быть, когда Господь буквально исполнит это обетование, когда Он сойдет на тысячи собраний по всему лицу земли, и от них изойдет дух жизни на мертвые кости, окружающие их? Что тогда случится в этом нашем городе, в нашей стране и по всей земле? Не только местами по одной душе, не только время от времени спасется несколько, как бывает теперь, но "всякий, кто призовет имя Господне, спасется", лишь только успеют призвать они имя Господне, как Дух Святой уже приведет их к Нему.</p>	<p>And how people around us would be gained for Christ again! All of us know that with each day we come nearer to "of time of the harvest" (Matt.13:30). Can it begin without having the outpouring of the Holy Spirit first? In no way! On the first day of Pentecost three thousand souls at once and in one assembly were gained for Christ. It was only the first sheaf of the harvest brought to the Lord, because the Holy Spirit has not been poured upon "all people" yet. What will it be like, what should it be like, when the Lord literally fulfills this promise and comes down upon thousands of assemblies all over the world, and from them the spirit of life will blow over the "dead bones"? What will happen then in our city, in our country, and all over the world? Not only in some places one soul at a time, not only from time to time a few will be saved, as it happens now, but "everyone who calls on the name of the Lord will be saved". As soon as they call on the name of the Lord the Holy Spirit will already bring them to Him.</p>	<p>something it cannot and should not be hidden, diminished or overruled by any reasons or intentions.</p> <p>Here is another proof that Kargel expects literal fulfilment of the promise.</p> <p>Here is another hidden quotation.</p> <p>Interpreting the words "everyone who..." Kargel is being very literalistic.</p>
---	---	--



Т 1.12 Всего этого у нас нет, а мы должны, однако, иметь это по обещанию истинного Бога, по обещанию, совершенно безусловному. Время, в которое оно должно совершиться, именно наше время, оно предречено для его исполнения. Кроме того, вокруг нас в мире уже видно начало его в более сильном проявлении Духа Божия, в великих пробуждениях то здесь, то там. Приготовлены ли **и мы** к этому исполнению? Ждем ли, добиваемся ли мы его и взываем ли о нем? Очищаем ли мы себя для Небесного Голубя, чтобы Он нашел место покоя для ног Своих (Быт.8:9); каемся ли в несвятом житии, и плотских помышлениях, занявших Его место и вытеснивших Его со Своей полнотой? На вопрос: "Что нам делать, мужи братья?" - возникший в день Пятидесятницы, ответили: **"Покайтесь, и получите дар Святого Духа"**. Вот повеление Господне, и нет другого, ко всем, также и детям Божиим, в особенности же, к Церкви Христовой, чтобы им быть в состоянии принять Духа Святого в полноте Его. Воспоследует ли покаяние или нет - вот, что решает вопрос о том, будет ли светильник наш сдвинут со своего места, и у нас станет темнее, или мы вернемся к прежнему, блаженному состоянию первой

We do not have all of this but we should have it according to the promise of the true God, according to this completely unconditional promise. The time when it should happen is our time. This time is foretold for its fulfillment. In addition, great awakenings are taking place in the world around us. Here and there one can already see the beginning of a greater display of the Spirit of God. Are we prepared for this fulfillment? Are we waiting, are we achieving it, are we appealing for it? Are we cleansing ourselves for the Heavenly Dove, so that He can find a place of rest for His feet (Gen. 8:9); are we repenting of unholy living and fleshly thoughts that have been occupying His place and have forced Him with His fullness out? To the question, "What shall we do, brothers?" asked on the day of Pentecost, the answer was, "Repent and you will receive the gift of the Holy Spirit." This is the command of the Lord, and there is no other, to everyone including the children of God, to the Church of Christ, so that they will be able to accept the Holy Spirit in His fullness. Whether repentance is going to follow or not will determine whether our lamp is going to be removed from its place and it will grow darker around , or will we return to the original blessed state of our

Kargel identifies the promise as given by the true God and as an unconditional one.

Another confirmation that the time of fulfilment has come (this was said about a hundred years ago). For Kargel the main sign of the Spirit's presence is "great awakenings".

Kargel refers to a literal dove from the book of Genesis as to the symbol of the Holy Spirit. It does not mean that Kargel interprets Gen. 8:9 allegorically. He uses that passage as an illustration for his point.

According to Kargel, his readers' response to the scriptural command should be that of obedience.

Kargel goes back to the historical context of the beginning of the fulfilment of the promise described in Acts. People who listened to Apostle Peter responded with a question as to



<p>любви (Откр.2:5).</p> <p>Т 1.13 Дал бы Господь нам и всей Церкви Божией на земле великую благодать как можно скорее, сегодня даже, исполнить Его условие, т.е. освободить Ему место в нас и в нашей среде, чтобы нам сделаться участниками благословений Его славного обетования!</p>	<p>first love (Rev.2:5).</p> <p>May the Lord grant us and the whole Church of God on earth His great grace as soon as possible, even today, to fulfill His condition, i.e., to make room for Him in our midst so that we might become participants in the blessings of His glorious promise!</p>	<p>what they should do and willingness to follow the apostle's words. Kargel requires the same response—repentance—from his contemporaries. Kargel treats Peter's reply to the original audience as a universal command.</p> <p>There seems to be a contradiction here. Kargel previously stated that the promise was unconditional, that is, no particular condition is found in the text of the promise. However, now he calls to fulfil God's condition, i.e., "to make room" for the Spirit through repentance for unholy lives and fleshly thoughts. This "condition" seems to appear not only from Kargel's general preconceived ideas of what is expected of a believer in order to be filled by the Spirit, but also from the literal context when Kargel reads further and finds out that Peter actually mentioned a condition for being filled with the Spirit.</p>
--	--	---



UNIVERSITEIT VAN PRETORIA
UNIVERSITY OF PRETORIA
YUNIBESITHI YA PRETORIA



Table 2

Kargel's Russian text	English translation	Observations
<p>Христос освящение наше</p> <p>из "Братского вестника", 1982, №1, 2, 3, 5, 6</p> <p>Вместо предисловия</p> <p>“Необходимо ли освящение возрожденному христианину?”</p> <p>Т 2.1 Поставленный выше вопрос был задан мне одним служителем Божиим. До этого момента он проповедовал своим слушателям только о покаянии, обращении, вере и оправдании. . .</p> <p>Т 2.2 Но Слово Божие дает нам на этот вопрос очень решительный и положительный ответ. Оно даже не допускает возникновения подобного вопроса. И все же в наши дни существуют тысячи детей Божиих, которых</p>	<p>Christ is our sanctification</p> <p>“The Brotherly Herald”, 1982, №1, 2, 3, 5, 6</p> <p>Instead of a foreword</p> <p>“Does a regenerated Christian need sanctification?”</p> <p>A minister of God asked me this question. Up to that moment he used to preach only about repentance, conversion, faith and justification . . .</p> <p>However, the Word of God gives us a very definitive and positive answer to this question. Actually, it does not even raise the question. Still today there are thousands of children of God, who would be satisfied with the explanation that the regenerate does not</p>	<p>Kargel provides his reason for addressing the issue of sanctification, which he believes is underestimated. He starts with the proposition that Scripture contains a clear and positive</p>



<p>удовлетворяло бы разъяснение, что освящение для возрожденного верующего излишне.</p> <p>Т 2.3 Надеюсь, что мы получим благословение, если рассмотрим этот вопрос в свете Слова Божия.</p> <p>Т 2.4 Священное Писание рассматривает вопросы оправдания и освящения отдельно и говорит о них как о святом Божьем требовании. Дадим же свободу Духу Святому – вести нас в глубину познания истины об освящении. Но вначале рассмотрим в свете Слова Божия вопрос об оправдании.</p>	<p>need sanctification.</p> <p>...I hope that we will receive a blessing if we consider this issue in the light of the Word of God.</p> <p>The Holy Scriptures speak about justification and sanctification separately. It presents them as God's sacred requirement. Let us give freedom to the Holy Spirit to lead us into the depth of knowledge of truth about sanctification. But first we will consider the issue of justification in the light of the Word of God.</p>	<p>answer regarding the importance of sanctification for a regenerate Christian.</p> <p>Kargel identifies the Scriptures with the Word of God. Actually this is his favourite and most frequently used expression for Scripture.</p> <p>Kargel's stated goal for the search of the Scripture concerning the issue of sanctification is "to receive a blessing", not to gain some abstract knowledge. Hence, the expected style of his treatise is devotional.</p> <p>The Holy Scripture is the only authority that Kargel consults in order to understand the doctrines of justification and sanctification.</p> <p>There is an assumption that the Holy Spirit plays a crucial role in assisting the reader in getting deep knowledge concerning scriptural truths.</p>
--	---	--



<p>Т 2.5 Прежде всего, в Слове Божиим мы находим, что оправдание всегда относится к грешным людям. Читая первые три главы Послания к Римлянам, мы видим вернейший портрет тех, которым предлагается оправдание через веру во Христа Иисуса, без всяких заслуг с их стороны.</p> <p>Т 2.6 В четвертой главе этого же Послания показан Господь, оправдывающий беззаконника. При этом имеются в виду грешники, находящиеся под проклятием и осуждением. К ним и обращена проповедь о прощении грехов и об оправдании через Кровь Иисуса Христа.</p> <p>Т 2.7 Освящение же всегда относится к спасенным и оправданным. Именно к ним направлен призыв Священного Писания: жить благочестиво и ходить в святости. "Если же, ища оправдания во Христе, мы и сами оказались грешниками, - говорит оно, - то неужели Христос есть служитель греха? Никак" - Гал. 2, 17. Итак, оправданный через Христа должен быть святым. И только таковой и может быть святым...</p>	<p>First of all, in the Word of God we find that justification always concerns sinners. When reading the first three chapters of the Epistle to the Romans we see the most real portrait of those who are offered justification through faith in Christ Jesus without any personal effort.</p> <p>In the fourth chapter of the same Epistle we see the Lord justifying an unrighteous person. There it talks about sinners who are under damnation and condemnation. It is to them that the proclamation of the forgiveness of sins and justification through the Blood of Jesus Christ is addressed.</p> <p>But sanctification always concerns those who have been saved and justified. To them the appeal of the Holy Scriptures to live righteously and to walk in holiness is addressed. "If, while we seek to be justified in Christ, it becomes evident that we ourselves are sinners, does that mean that Christ promotes sin? Absolutely not!" (Gal. 2:17). So, the one justified through Christ should be holy. And only such person actually can be holy . . .</p>	<p>Speaking of justification Kargel stays within the classical Reformation definition of the doctrine. When addressing the doctrine of justification he uses the Epistle to Romans as his main frame of reference.</p> <p>Having laid the theological foundation of the doctrine of justification Kargel turns to the main point of his discussion and uses a passage from the Epistle to Galatians to define who can and should be holy. Since justification is a necessary condition for sanctification Kargel started his discussion with justification.</p>
---	--	---



Т 2.8 Все наши грехи прощены и покрыты - Пс. 31, 1, удалены - Пс. 102, 12, брошены за хребет Божий - Ис. 38, 17; ввергнуты в пучину - Мих. 7, 19, омыты Кровью Христа - От. 1, 5, изглажены - Ис. 44, 22, - и навеки забыты - Ис. 43, 25; Евр. 10, 17. Все это совершилось при оправдании каждого чада Божия...

Т 2.9 Заметим далее, что оправдание относится к прошедшему состоянию. Оправдание - это великий поворотный пункт в жизни грешника, пограничный камень между его греховной жизнью и жизнью для Бога. "Итак, оправдавшись верою" - Рим. 5, 1, мы можем, подобно Давиду, сказать: "Ты снял с меня вину греха моего" - Пс. 31, 5.

All our sins are forgiven and covered (Ps. 32:1), removed (Ps. 103:12), put behind God's back (Is. 38:17); hurled into the depths of the sea (Mic. 7:19), washed by the blood of Christ (Rev. 1: 5), swept away (Is. 44: 22) and forgotten forever (Is. 43:25; Heb. 10:17). All of this took place at the justification of each child of God . . .

...

Let us notice further that justification concerns one's past condition. Justification is the major turning point in a sinner's life, the boundary stone between one's sinful life and the life for God. "Therefore, **since** we have been justified through faith" (Rom. 5:1), we can say with David: "You forgave the guilt of my sin" (Ps. 32, 5).

It is typical for Kargel to use a large literal context – the whole of Scripture as his frame of reference. Having addressed the Epistle to Romans as a basis for his discussion of forgiveness of sins, he brings up other passages on the issue.

It seems, however, that Kargel had his favourite books in the Bible. The Book of Psalms, Isaiah, Hebrews, and Revelation were some of them.

Kargel views justification as something that divides the sinful "past" from the forgiven "present". Here he is arguing from the grammatical structure of Romans 5:1.

It is noteworthy that Kargel makes no distinction between the forgiveness of David in the Old Testament and the Christians of the present era. This presupposes a good measure of continuation between the testaments.



<p>Т 2.10 Как ярко проявилась эта перемена в жизни апостола Павла - Деян. 9, 1 - 20. О Закхее так же сказано: "Ныне пришло спасение дому сему" - Лк. 19, 9. И обратившемуся разбойнику Христос сказал: "Истинно говорю тебе, ныне же будешь со Мною в раю" - Лк. 23, 43.</p> <p>Т 2.11 Итак, Священное Писание говорит об оправдании как о факте, совершившемся в прошлом. Освящение же относится к духовному состоянию верующего в настоящем и в будущем.</p> <p>Т 2.12 Этот факт говорит о том, что в вопросе освящения мы должны постоянно устремляться вперед - Евр. 12, 14; Фил. 3, 13 - 14. К сожалению, многие души смешивают освящение с оправданием.</p> <p>Т 2.13 Оправдание - это лишь начало искупления, а совершенное освящение - это конец славного искупления. Освящение - это простирающееся на всю нашу жизнь искупление. И оно должно продолжаться в нас до тех пор, пока все у нас не будет иметь печати: "Святыня Господу"...</p>	<p>How dramatic was this change in the life of apostle Paul (Acts 9:1 – 20). About Zacchaeus it is also said, "Today salvation has come to this house" (Lk.19:9). And to the crucified criminal Christ said, "I tell you the truth, today you will be with me in paradise" (Lk. 23:43).</p> <p>So, the Holy Scriptures speak about justification as about a fact that took place in the past. However, sanctification relates to the spiritual condition of a believer in the present and future.</p> <p>This tells us that in the area of sanctification we should be constantly straining forward (Heb. 12:14; Phil. 3:13-14). Unfortunately, many souls confuse sanctification with justification.</p> <p>Justification is only the beginning of redemption while perfect sanctification is the end of the glorious redemption. Sanctification is redemption extending throughout our whole life. And it should continue until everything in us has the seal: "holy unto the Lord " . . .</p>	<p>Kargel uses three NT examples to show that justification is not a process but rather an event, which carries a "dramatic" change with it. In this approach Kargel agrees with Protestants and differs from the Russian Orthodox view.</p> <p>Kargel goes to Scripture in order to define the nature of justification as an event and the nature of sanctification as a process.</p>
---	---	--



<p>Т 2.14 В Послании к Римлянам 8, 30 нам указаны различные средства к достижению этой цели. Сама же цель есть подобие Сыну Божьему - Рим. 8, 29 и преображение в Его образ, то есть достижение полноты святости...</p> <p>Т 2.15 Обратим также наше внимание на то, что Слово Божие требует от нас быть святыми. Мы должны быть святыми потому, что таков Сам Господь. "Ибо Я свят", - вот почему Господь требовал от Своего народа чистоты, непорочности и благоугодного Ему хождения.</p> <p>Т 2.16 Господь может иметь с нами общение только на почве святости. Поэтому Он повелевает нам быть святыми. "Будьте святы" - это повеление, как никакое другое, постоянно повторялось в законе Божиим. И Дух Святой, перенеся это повеление в Новый Завет, направляет его к нам с той же настоятельностью - 1 Пет. 1, 15 - 16. В 1 Фес. 4, 3 написано: "Ибо воля Божия есть освящение ваше". Без освящения мы не можем увидеть Господа.</p>	<p>Various means to achieving this purpose are specified for us in the Epistle to Romans 8:30. The goal itself is the likeness of the Son of God (Rom. 8:29) and being conformed to His image, that is attaining complete holiness . . .</p> <p>Let us turn our attention to the Word of God, which requires us to be holy. We should be holy because the Lord is holy. "Wherefore I am holy", that is why the Lord demands that His people be clean, righteous, pleasing to Him in their walk.</p> <p>The Lord can have fellowship with us only on the ground of holiness. Therefore, He commands us to be holy. "Be holy" is a command that like no another is constantly repeated in God's law. And the Holy Spirit, having transferred this command into the New Testament, directs it to us with the same insistency – 1 Pet. 1:15-16. In 1 Th. 4:3 it is written: "It is God's will that you should be sanctified". Without sanctification we cannot see the Lord.</p>	<p>Looking for the means and the end of sanctification Kargel goes back to the Epistle of Romans.</p> <p>The main reason for holiness comes from Scripture, particularly, from the fact that Scripture attributes holiness to God.</p> <p>Another reason for believers' holiness also comes from Scripture. Holiness is a condition for the Lord's fellowship with people.</p> <p>There is an assumption that if something is "constantly repeated" in God's law it must be especially important.</p> <p>By "God's law" Kargel must have meant the Pentateuch. "God's law" plays a part in Kargel's argumentation, especially if its</p>
---	--	--



<p>Т 2.17 И теперь каждый брат и сестра должны ответить себе на этот вопрос: необходимо ли освящение возрожденному человеку, чтобы все оставшиеся дни своей жизни проводить перед лицом Божиим, в свете Его Слова?</p> <p>Освящение</p> <p>Т 2.18 ... Прежде чем вникнуть в сущность освящения, мы должны сначала предпослать краткое разъяснение вопроса освящения: в каком смысле оно</p>	<p>And now each brother and sister should answer this question to themselves, whether sanctification is necessary for a regenerated person in order to spend the rest of the days of one's life before the face of God, in the light of His Word.</p> <p>Sanctification</p> <p>... Before we try to understand the essence of sanctification, we ought to first provide a brief explanation of the meaning of sanctification: in what sense it is mentioned</p>	<p>commands are found repeated in the New Testament.</p> <p>There is a statement concerning the Holy Spirit's authorship of the NT. However, Kargel did not specify how exactly the command was "transferred" into the NT. This is not important for Kargel. The important thing is that the command is directed to us and therefore has to be obeyed.</p> <p>When beginning to address sanctification as the main subject of discussion Kargel tries to avoid ambiguity. He attempts to provide</p>
--	--	--



упоминается в Священном Писании? Внимательно читая Новый Завет, мы убеждаемся, что Господь говорит об освящении детей Божиих в двояком смысле: 1) как о законченном факте, к которому ничто больше не может быть прибавлено, 2) как о деле, еще не законченном, которое должно еще продолжаться.

Т 2.19 В отношении первого значения освящения нет никакого сомнения в том, что святость действительно является достоянием каждого искупленного, о чем нам свидетельствует Священное Писание: "По сей-то воле освящены мы единократным принесением тела Иисуса Христа" - Евр. 10, 10; "Но вы - род избранный, царственное священство, народ святой" - 1 Пет. 2, 9. "Но омылись, но освятились, но оправдались именем Господа нашего Иисуса Христа и Духом Бога нашего" - 1 Кор. 6, 11. "Призванным, которые освящены Богом Отцом" - Иуд. 1, 1. В различных местах Нового Завета верующие называются; "освященными во Христе Иисусе", "призванными святыми" -

in the Holy Scriptures? When we carefully read the New Testament we become convinced, that the Lord speaks about sanctification of the children of God in two ways: 1) as an accomplished fact, to which nothing can be added, 2) as the work, which has not been completed yet and therefore has to go on.

Concerning the first sense of sanctification there is no doubt that holiness really is the property of every redeemed. **The Holy Scriptures witness** to that: "And by that will, we have been made holy through the sacrifice of the body of Jesus Christ once for all" (Heb. 10:10); "But you are a chosen people, a royal priesthood, a holy nation" (1 Pet. 2:9). "But you were washed, you were sanctified, you were justified in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ and by the Spirit of our God" (1 Cor. 6:11). "To those who have been called, who are loved by God the Father and kept by Jesus Christ" (Jud. 1:1). In various places of the New Testament the believers are referred to as "those sanctified in Christ Jesus and called to be holy" (Rom.

a scriptural definition of the term. Hence he desires to work within scriptural language apparatus and is not concerned with any other meanings of the word sanctification, whether ancient, secular, modern, etc.

He starts with two propositions, which he believes to be coming from the Scripture.

Kargel uses a number of NT references that from his point of view are sufficient to show that holiness is attributed to believers.

The reference from Jude in Russian Synod translation is worded closer to King James version "to them that are sanctified by God the Father, and preserved in Jesus Christ, and called" (Jud. 1:1).

There is a hint towards Kargel's understanding of inspiration of Scripture. He plainly affirms that it was the Holy Spirit who spoke



Рим. 1, 7; 1 Кор. 1, 2; 2 Кор. 1, 1. В соответствующих посланиях апостол Павел обращается к верующим как к "святым в Ефесе", "всем святым во Христе Иисусе" в Филиппах, Колоссах и так далее. И если принять во внимание, что так их называет Дух Святой через уста апостолов, /то ;нам станет ясно, что Он имеет в виду дело, уже совершавшееся над святыми.

Т 2.20 С другой стороны, Дух Святой так же убедительно говорит об освящении как о деле, которое еще должно совершиться и продолжаться до полного совершенства. Причем о втором виде освящения Дух Святой говорит более наставительно. Он повелевает совершать "святыню в страхе Божиим" - 2 Кор. 7, 1; говорит, что "воля Божия есть освящение ваше" - 1 Фес. 4, 3 - 4 и настойчиво требует, чтобы мы стремились к святости, потому что без нее не можем увидеть Господа - Евр. 12, 10. Он призывает верующих: "Будьте святы, потому что Я (Господь) свят" - 1 Пет. 1, 15 - 16. Это и другие места Священного Писания говорят совершенно недвусмысленно, что в каждом христианине должно происходить освящение, которое еще не закончено и может закончиться только тогда, когда будет достигнута цель,

1:7; 1 Cor. 1:2; 2 Cor. 1:1). In corresponding epistles apostle Paul addresses believer as "the saints in Ephesus", "all the saints in Christ Jesus at Philippi", at Colossae and so on. And if we take into account that **the Holy Spirit through mouths of the apostles** called them, it becomes clear that He means the work already accomplished in the saints.

On the other hand, **the Holy Spirit speaks** just as convincingly about sanctification as a work, which has to continue up to the point of complete perfection. And **the Holy Spirit** speaks about a second kind of sanctification more forcefully. He commands us to perfect "holiness out of reverence for God" (2 Cor. 7:1); saying that, "It is God's will that you should be sanctified" (1 Th. 4:3-4) and persistently demands that we strive for holiness, because without it we cannot see the Lord (Heb. 12:10). He urges the believers: "Be holy, because I [the Lord] am holy" (1 Pet. 1:15-16). These and other passages of the Holy Scriptures speak without any ambiguity that sanctification should be taking place in every Christian. It is not completed yet and can be finished only when the purpose planned by the Holy Spirit is achieved. This purpose, as we shall

through mouths of apostles. And again, Kargel does not specify how exactly this has happened.

Here Kargel even omits apostles or any other human writers of the Scriptures when attributing the authorship to the Holy Spirit. The phrase "the Holy Spirit speaks" does not refer to any extra-scriptural revelation, which becomes clear from a number of Bible passages listed below.

Kargel appeals to the NT passages only when talking about holiness as a process. He quotes enough passages that seem to illustrate and prove the point without leaving any ambiguity and briefly mentions that there are more. This is the typical style of Kargel's argumentation.



<p>намеченная Духом Святым. Эта цель, как мы можем увидеть впоследствии - чудная, божественная.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Т 2.21 Слово "освящение" или "освящать" означает - отделить для особой цели. Если кто-нибудь хочет отделить какую-либо вещь, какой-либо предмет, то он берет его из числа других подобных ему предметов и пользуется им только для новой цели.</p> <p>Т 2.22 Это обособление часто мы находим и в Ветхом Завете. Например, некогда Господь сказал Моисею: "Пойди к народу и освяти его сегодня и завтра; пусть вымоют одежды свои, чтобы быть готовыми к третьему дню; ибо в третий день сойдет Господь пред глазами всего народа на гору Синай" - Исх. 19, 10 - 11. Моисей должен был позаботиться о том, чтобы были удалены всякая нечистота, всякое пятно с одежд народа, чтобы последний был приятен Господу Богу Своему и мог бы приблизиться к Нему. И это очищение должно было продолжаться три дня. Это означало, что дело это должно быть сделано так основательно, чтобы оно было достойно Господа. А Господь, будучи свят,</p>	<p>see further on, is wonderful and divine.</p> <p>...</p> <p>The words "sanctification" or "to sanctify" mean to separate for a special purpose. If somebody wants to separate anything, any object, then he takes it from among other similar object and uses it only for the new purpose.</p> <p>We often find this idea of setting apart in the Old Testament. For example, the Lord once told Moses: "Go to the people and consecrate them today and tomorrow. Have them wash their clothes and be ready by the third day, because on that day the LORD will come down on Mount Sinai in the sight of all the people" (Ex. 19:10-11). Moses had to see to it that anything unclean was removed, any stain from the clothes of the people, so that they were pleasant to the Lord their God and could approach Him. And this cleansing had to go on for three days. This meant that the work had to be done so thoroughly so that it would be worthy of the Lord. And the Lord, being holy can come near those only who are clean.</p>	<p>In order to avoid ambiguity in using the noun and verb form of "sanctification", Kargel goes to Scripture looking for definition. He wants to make sure that he speaks of sanctification in the biblical sense of the word.</p> <p>Speaking of sanctification as being set apart Kargel follows this idea through the Scripture starting from the book of Exodus and Leviticus.</p> <p>He emphasises that the cleansing was God's command, a condition of approaching Him, it had to be thorough, and it had to be done willingly by people.</p>
--	---	---



может приближаться только к чистым, ибо только таковые могут предстать пред Ним. Таким образом ветхозаветный народ сам должен был отделиться и отстраниться от всего нечистого. Поэтому Господь повелел сказать народу: "Освящайте себя и будьте святы, ибо Я господь, Бог ваш, свят" - Лев. 20, 7. Это освящение должно было быть их собственным делом, личным действием.

T 2.23 Как часто мы хотим принудить других расстаться с тем, что осудил Бог. Однако такой метод не имеет никакой ценности. Мы можем иногда принудить наших братьев и сестер во Христе оставить то или другое, но если в глубине души они привязаны к этим вещам, то мы лишь сделаем их лицемерами, которые непрестанно находятся в противоречии со своим внутренним состоянием и внешним поведением.

T 2.24 Итак, освящение может совершиться только при изъявлении нашей свободной воли, и если она у нас в полном согласии с волей Божией.

T 2.25 Далее мы читаем, что Бог определяет Себя перед обетованным народом как Освящающий. В Книге Левит

Therefore, only such people can appear before Him. This way the Old Testament people themselves had to separate and move away from anything unclean. The Lord commanded to tell the people: "Consecrate yourselves and be holy, because I am the LORD your God" (Lev. 20:7). This consecration had to be done by each of them personally.

How often we want to force others to part from the things that God has denounced. However such a method has no value. We can sometimes force our brothers and sisters in Christ to get rid of this or that, but if in the depths of their soul they are tied to these things we will only make them hypocrites who live in constant contradiction between their internal condition and external behaviour.

Thus sanctification can be accomplished only at the expression of our free will, and if it is in complete agreement with the will of God.

Further on we read that God defines Himself before His people of Israel as the Consecrating One. In the book of Leviticus

The quotation from Leviticus 20:7 has to do with the goal of sanctification. It is God the Father who sets the goal, "I am holy, therefore you should be holy".

Coming from the belief that consecration must be a personal and willing act Kargel warns against legalism and hypocrisy. This is his application so far.

Regarding God's side in the work of sanctification, Kargel argues from the book of Leviticus. Kargel



<p>20, 8 сказано: "Я Господь, освящающий вас". И действительно это удивительное отделение является делом Божиим. Сам Бог глубоко проникает в нашу жизнь со Своей святостью и Своим присутствием отделяет нас от всего, что не угодно Его святой воле.</p>	<p>20:8 it is written: "I am the LORD, who makes you holy". And truly, this wonderful setting apart is God's work. God Himself deeply penetrates our lives with His holiness, and with His presence He separates us from everything that is not pleasing for His holy will.</p>	<p>assumes that God's words spoken to the Israelites "I am the LORD, who makes you holy" apply to Christians as well. This approach points to continuity between the testaments.</p>
<p>Т 2.26 Некогда Господь начал Свое дело освящения с того, что Он предузнал Своих - 1 Пет. 1, 2, затем искупил их Кровью Сына Своего из всякого колена, языка, народа и племени, и обновил сердца через Духа Святого.</p>	<p>There was a time when the Lord began His work of sanctification with the foreknowledge of His own (1 Pet. 1:2), then He redeemed them by the Blood of His Son from all tribes, tongues, peoples, and nations, and renewed their hearts through the Holy Spirit.</p>	<p>Kargel sees sanctification as the goal in the whole process of redemption. God set the goal, the Holy Spirit helps to achieve it.</p>
<p>Т 2.27 Таким образом, мы видим тройкое освящение. Прежде всего посредник Ветхого Завета Моисей должен был произвести освящение избранного народа, чтобы представить его Богу. Это соответствует освящению нас Посредником Нового Завета – Иисусом Христом, Который "дабы освятить людей Кровью Своею, пострадал вне врат" - Евр. 13, 12.</p>	<p>Thus, we see sanctification as threefold. First of all, the mediator of the Old Testament, Moses, had to consecrate the chosen people in order to present them to God. This corresponds to our sanctification by the Mediator of the New Testament, Jesus Christ, who "suffered outside the city gate to make the people holy through his own blood" (Heb. 13:12).</p>	<p>Kargel looks at Moses as a type of Jesus Christ. Typology is one of Kargel's favourite tools to interpret the Old Testament and to make it relevant for his time. Kargel goes to the Epistle to Hebrews for verification of this method.</p>
<p>...</p>	<p>...</p>	
<p>Т 2.28 Дело Христа совершено. Он "одним</p>	<p>The work of Christ is accomplished. "By</p>	<p>It has already been hinted by</p>



<p>приношением навсегда сделал совершенными освящаемых" – Евр. 10, 14. Теперь дело за нами. Мы не только должны войти в Его мир, Его радость, блаженство, но и в Его посвящение Отцу. В нашем существе не должно быть ничего, что не принадлежало бы Богу.</p> <p>...</p>	<p>one sacrifice he has made perfect forever those who are being made holy" (Heb. 10:14). Now it is left to us. We should not only enter His peace, His joy, and happiness, but also His consecration to the Father. There should be nothing in us that does not belong to God.</p> <p>...</p>	<p>Kargel that sanctification has two meanings: positional (provided by Christ) and practical (human side). From the passage in Hebrews 10:14 Kargel argues that the ontological status of believers is holy. God has given this status to believers as a result of the accomplished work of Jesus Christ.</p>
<p>Т 2.29 И все-таки освящение не может совершиться без наших усилий, если нам нужно порвать с каким-либо грехом. Чтобы исполнять волю Божию, мы должны вручить Всемогущему каждое наше дело и быть целиком преданным Ему для абсолютного послушания, и тогда мы вскоре увидим, как Он проявит Свое чудное и славное господство и освятит наш внутренний храм. Он "освятит вас во всей полноте, и ваш дух и душа и тело во всей целости... сохранится без порока в пришествие (Господа нашего Иисуса Христа" - 1 Фес. 5, 23.</p>	<p>And, nevertheless, the sanctification cannot be accomplished without our efforts if we are to break away from sin. To fulfil the will of God we should hand over to the Almighty everything that we do and be completely devoted to Him for absolute obedience. Then we will soon see how He will demonstrate His wonderful and glorious dominion and sanctify our internal temple. He will "sanctify you through and through. May your whole spirit, soul and body be kept blameless at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ" (1 Th. 5:23).</p>	<p>Kargel recognizes that NT theology works with reality in two ways: ontological and ethical. Kargel makes the proposition that there is an ethical component in sanctification. It has to be expressed in deeds. Hence there must be effort on the human part directed towards becoming completely devoted and obedient to God. Then God will step in and helps to accomplish sanctification not only on the ontological but also on the ethical or practical level.</p>
<p>Т 2.30 Превосходные примеры такого освящения дает нам Ветхий Завет во всех случаях, когда обетованный народ освящал</p>	<p>The Old Testament gives us some excellent examples of such sanctification in all cases, when the Lord's people consecrated or</p>	<p>To argue for the above stated proposition Kargel uses the Old Testament examples of</p>



<p>или посвящал что-либо для Господа: было ли то золото или серебро, плоды земли, животные для жертвоприношения и даже люди.</p> <p>Т 2.31 Возьмем, к примеру, из различных предметов, посвящавшихся Богу, хотя бы сосуды храма. Они были святы. Но что сделало их святыми? Они были сделаны из того же материала, из которого были изготовлены и многие другие сосуды в домах иудеев и язычников; и по форме они были похожи на многие из них. Ни материал, ни форма не придавали им никакой святости. Святость заключалась в том, что они изымались из обычного употребления и освящались для служения Богу. И с того времени из года в год через столетия и тысячелетия эти сосуды употреблялись только для служения Ему, для Его целей. С тех пор их уже не смели брать для обычного употребления. И горе тому, кто употребил бы священные сосуды для обычных целей. Когда же царь Валтасар повелел принести эти сосуды, чтобы употребить их на своем пире, и тем осквернил их, то за это участь его тотчас же была решена Богом - Дан. 5 гл.</p> <p>Т 2.32 Да остановится здесь каждое дитя</p>	<p>devoted something for the Lord, whether gold or silver, fruits of the earth, sacrificial animals, or even people.</p> <p>Let us use as an example of various objects consecrated to God the vessels of the temple. They were holy. But what made them holy? They were made of the same material as many other vessels in the homes of Jews and pagans. Their shape was similar to that of many others. Neither material nor shape attributed any holiness to them. Their holiness consisted in the fact that they were withdrawn from ordinary usage and consecrated for the service of God. And from that time on, from year to year, through centuries and millennia these vessels were used only for God's ministry and His purposes. From then on nobody dared take them for ordinary use. And woe to the one who would use the holy goblets for ordinary purposes. When King Belshazzar ordered the goblets to be brought for use at his feast and thereby desecrated them, God condemned him at once for doing so (Dan. 5).</p> <p>May every child of God stop here and make</p>	<p>consecrated objects.</p> <p>From a number of OT examples of consecrated objects Kargel focuses on the temple vessels. Here he interprets the OT in an illustrative way. He makes two points. First, the objects devoted to God had to be set apart and removed from ordinary usage once and for all. Second, God's wrath was poured over the person who did not show proper respect to those vessels.</p> <p>Kargel does not view the vessels</p>
--	---	--



Божие и да сделает сам собою напрашивающийся вывод: если Иегова так наблюдал за посвященными Ему предметами, которые не имели ни жизни, ни души и не были приобретены Им дорогой ценой, то насколько более высока и дорога должна была быть для него святость душ, искупленных Иисусом Христом ценой ужасных страданий.

Т 2.33 Пусть каждый из нас, наконец, поймет, что на себя нужно смотреть как на сосуд, посвященный для Господа. И еще больше: пусть каждый знает, что он является храмом живого Бога и что "кто разорит храм Божий, того покарает Бог" - 1 Кор. 3, 16 - 17.

Т 2.34 Как освящает Господь?

Святость, как свидетельствует Священное Писание, присуща одному Богу; другой святости, кроме этой, которая наполняет и пронизывает Его, не существует. В 1 Цар. 2, 2 мы читаем: "Нет столь святого, как Господь, ибо нет другого"; и в Откр. 15, 4 искупленные восхваляют Бога таким же образом: "Кто не убоится Тебя, Господи, и не прославит имени Твоего? Ибо Ты един свят". А если это так, то, следовательно, нам просто невозможно приобрести

the obvious conclusion. If Jehovah watched so closely over objects devoted to Him, which had neither life nor soul and were not acquired by Him with a great price, then how much higher must He value the holiness of souls redeemed by Jesus Christ at the price of terrible sufferings.

Let each one of us understand at last that it is necessary to look at ourselves as the vessels devoted to the Lord. And even more importantly, let everyone know that he is the temple of the living God and that "If anyone destroys God's temple, God will destroy him" (1 Cor. 3:16 –17).

How does the Lord sanctify?

Holiness is an attribute of God alone, as the Holy Scriptures testify. No other holiness exists, except that which fills and penetrates Him. In 1 Sam. 2:2 we read: "There is no one holy like the LORD; there is no one besides you" and in Rev. 15:4 the redeemed praise God in the same way: "Who will not fear you, O Lord, and bring glory to your name? For you alone are holy". And if this is so, then it is simply not possible for us to acquire holiness in any way, neither by

as prototypes of believers. But he makes an application saying that how much more jealous God can be over those people who were sanctified by the blood of His Son.

Here Kargel argues by resorting to a syllogism. He draws his proposition from Scripture, both New and Old Testament.

1. There is no holiness outside of God.
 2. We, believers, should be holy.
- Therefore, it is possible to acquire holiness only through God's presence in us. Our own efforts would do no good.



святость ни посредством наших усилий, ни посредством нашего самоусовершенствования. Если тем не менее мы должны быть святы, если святость должна наполнить наше существо, то она может прийти исключительно от Бога, единого святого. И она приходит не как отвлеченный дар без Него, но с Ним, через Его личное присутствие в нас. Итак, Он освящает, занимая предоставленное нами для Него жительство. Подтвердим эту истину некоторыми примерами.

Т 2.35 Вспомним сначала горящий куст, который однажды видел Моисей в пустыне и к которому он непреодолимо был привлечен, чтобы подойти и посмотреть - Исх. 3, 1 - 5. Когда же Моисей направлял к нему свои шаги, вдруг он услышал слова: "Не подходи сюда; сними обувь твою с ног твоих; ибо место, на котором ты стоишь, есть земля святая". Это должно было быть для Моисея совершенно ново, потому что в течение 40 лет его пастушества он посетил, конечно, каждое сколько-нибудь подходящее для пастбища местечко

means of our efforts, nor by means of our self-improvement. If nevertheless we should be holy, if holiness should fill our being, it must come exclusively from God, who alone is holy. And it comes not as some abstract gift apart from Him but with Him, through His personal presence in us. So, He sanctifies while occupying the places what we devote for His dwelling. Let us confirm this truth by a few examples.

First let's recall the burning bush, which Moses saw in the wilderness and to which he was strongly drawn to come closer and have a look (Ex. 3:1-5). When Moses directed his steps there, he suddenly heard the words: "Do not come any closer! Take off your sandals, for the place where you are standing is holy ground". This should have been completely new for Moses because for forty years of his shepherding he certainly visited all more or less suitable pasture in the surround vicinity and must have repeatedly stepped on this place. However,

This conclusion might sound like a contradiction at first: several paragraphs above Kargel stated that the ethical-practical component of sanctification is the believers' responsibility. There is no contradiction, however, if one considers that the only thing that according to Kargel must be done by people is to devote all areas of their lives to God. Then, by indwelling that which has been devoted to Him, God sanctifies it. In other words, it is not works that sanctify, it is letting God work.

Having formulated a general conclusion Kargel illustrates it from Scripture. An OT example of sanctification is the burning bush from Exodus 3. Kargel's point (as in the case of the temple's vessels) is that an ordinary place becomes sacred when God indwells it.



<p>обширной окрестности и во всяком случае многократно наступал на это место, однако до тех пор ничего о его святости не было известно Моисею.</p> <p>Т 2.36 Что же произошло с местом, которое, как всякое другое близ него лежащее, вдруг стало святым? За ответом не приходится ходить далеко. Ответ был слышен в раздающемся из куста возгласе: "Я, Бог Отца твоего, Бог Авраама, Бог Исаака и Бог Иакова!" Таким образом, мы видим, что Сам Бог занял это место, устроил Свое жилище и освятил его. И с тех пор эта земля сделалась землей святой. . .</p> <p>Т 2.37 Этот пример учит нас тому, что Бог Сам должен жить в нас. Мы должны быть Им взяты во владение, чтобы Его святость стала нашей святостью. Этот пример учит нас и тому, что как только Господь возьмет нас во владение, Он позаботится и устранил от нас все чуждое Ему и Его святости.</p>	<p>until that time Moses knew nothing about its holiness.</p> <p>What happened to the place that had been no different from any other place until it suddenly became holy? There is no need to go far to find the answer. The answer was heard in the voice coming from the bush, "I am the God of your father, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac and the God of Jacob!" Thus, we see that God Himself occupied that place, made it His dwelling and sanctified it. And from that moment this ground became holy ground . . .</p> <p>This example teaches us that God Himself should live in us. He should take us in His possession so that His holiness might become our holiness. This example also teaches us that as soon as the Lord takes possession of us, He will take care of us and remove from us all that is alien to Him and His holiness.</p>	<p>Kargel's deduction from the OT example is able to "teach" his contemporaries certain truths. There is a general assumption that God's way of dealing with things or people is consistent throughout the centuries. In order to make something (or somebody, for that matter) holy God has to possess those objects (vessels), indwell those places (ground in the wilderness) or – Kargel makes a leap here –</p>
---	---	--



<p>Т 2.38 Другой пример мы имеем в устройстве скинии, впоследствии - храме. Материал, из которого была сделана скиния, был в обычном домашнем употреблении у иудеев - Исх. 25, 1 - 9. И строили скинию и храм обычные ремесленники, и обращались они с отдельными предметами как с обыкновенными до определенного дня, когда эти предметы, как и вся скиния и весь храм, не были освящены. С того дня каждый непризванный для служения в скинии держался вдали. И горе тому, кто, не будучи сам освящен, вступал или прикасался к этому жилищу.</p> <p>Т 2.39 С каких же пор эти вещи получили такую святость? Со времени ли их отделения от обыкновенного употребления или же со дня, когда Моисей объявил, что они святы? Никак! О том, как была освящена скиния, Библия повествует: "И</p>	<p>We have another example. It is the structure of the tabernacle and subsequently the temple. The material of which the tabernacle was made was in the usual domestic use of the Jews (Ex. 25:1 – 9). Craftsmen who built the tabernacle and temple were also normal people, and they worked with separate objects just as with ordinary ones until a certain day when these objects, as well as the whole tabernacle and the temple, were consecrated. From that day on, everyone who had not been called for ministry in the tabernacle kept his distance. And woe to those who entered or touched this dwelling without being specially separated for this.</p> <p>From what time did all these things acquire such holiness? Was it from the time they were set apart from ordinary use or on the day when Moses announced that they were holy? In no way! The Bible testifies to how the tabernacle was consecrated: "And so</p>	<p>people. One can take it a step further: According to Kargel, God used those objects and places as object lessons to show how He deals with people.</p> <p>Another example that illustrates the same point is the building materials of which the tabernacle and the temple were made.</p> <p>Following the story of how the Tent of Meeting was consecrated Kargel makes another point: neither setting apart nor pronouncing something holy can contribute to its holiness, but only</p>
---	--	--



<p>так окончил Моисей дело. И покрыло облако скинию собрания, и слава Господня наполнила скинию. И не мог Моисей войти в скинию собрания, потому что осеняло ее облако, и слава Господня наполняла скинию" - Исх. 40, 33 - 35.</p> <p>Т 2.40 Итак, Господь занял ее, как жилище. Он распростер над нею и над каждым принадлежавшим ей предметом Свою святость; и это сделало ее в один день тем, чем она не была до тех пор. И Своей святостью Господь держит вдали все, что не соответствует ей.</p> <p>Т 2.41 Точно так же повторилось и еще раз, когда было совершено освящение храма - 3 Цар. 8, 10 - 11. Так освящает Господь то, что берет во владение. В этом и состоит сущность освящения. Только туда, куда приходит Сам Господь, приходит и святость. Тогда отступает все наше личное, всякий чуждый Ему элемент, да и мы исчезаем сами, когда Он становится всем во всем.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Т 2.42 Из всего этого мы можем также сделать вывод, что само отделение еще не дает освящения и что, с другой стороны,</p>	<p>Moses finished the work. Then the cloud covered the Tent of Meeting, and the glory of the LORD filled the tabernacle. Moses could not enter the Tent of Meeting because the cloud had settled upon it, and the glory of the LORD filled the tabernacle" (Ex. 40: 33-35).</p> <p>So, the Lord occupied it as His dwelling. He spread His holiness above it and above each object belonging to it. This made it in one day something that it had not been before. And by His holiness the Lord keeps at a distance everything that does not go correspond to it.</p> <p>Precisely the same thing was repeated once again at the consecration of the temple (1 Kin. 8:10-11). This is how the Lord sanctifies what He takes into His possession. This is the essence of sanctification. Only there, where the Lord comes, holiness comes also. Then all our personal issues, all that is alien to Him, even we ourselves disappear, when He becomes all in all.</p> <p>...</p> <p>From all of this we can conclude that separation in and of itself does not accomplish sanctification and that, on the</p>	<p>God's presence and indwelling.</p> <p>There is the assumption that God follows the same pattern when sanctifying something. Kargel moves from one example to another. Finally he defines and confirms "the essence" of sanctification as holiness being attributed to average things (or people) by means of God's presence.</p> <p>Arguing from a number of OT illustrations Kargel arrives at the conclusion that setting something</p>
--	---	--



<p>освящение невозможно без отделения.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Т 2.43 Искупление Христово имеет одну великую цель – соединить Бога и человека, то есть сделать из Бога и человека одно. Уже в Ветхом Завете Господь высказал это желание словами: "И буду ходить среди вас; и буду вашим Богом, а вы будете Моим народом" - Лев. 26, 12.</p> <p>Т 2.44 В Новом Завете это Божье желание должно прийти к своему осуществлению. Господь не только хочет ходить среди Своих искупленных, но и пребывать в них: "Я в них, и Ты во Мне: да будут совершены во едино" - Ин. 17, 23. Так молился о нас великий Первосвященник Иисус Христос. "Пребудьте во Мне, и Я в вас... кто пребывает во Мне, и Я в нем" - Ин. 15, 4 - 5 - вот единственное условие Христа для принесения нами плода. "Я в Отце Моем, и вы во Мне, и Я в вас" - Ин. 14, 20. Эти слова должны сделаться живым познанием учеников Христа, - каждого из нас.</p>	<p>other hand, sanctification is impossible without separation.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Christ's redemption has one great purpose - to unite God and man, that is, to make one of God and man. Already in the Old Testament the Lord has stated this desire by the words: "I will walk among you and be your God, and you will be my people" (Lev. 26:12).</p> <p>In the New Testament this desire of God should come to its realization. The Lord does not only want to walk among the redeemed, but also to abide in them: "I in them and you in me. May they be brought to complete unity" (Jn. 17:23). This was the prayer of the great High Priest Jesus Christ for us. "Remain in me, and I will remain in you . . . If a man remains in me and I in him" (Jn. 15: 4-5) – this is the only condition of Christ for our bringing fruit. "I am in my Father, and you are in me, and I am in you" (Jn. 14:20). These words should become the living knowledge of Christ's disciples – each one of us.</p>	<p>apart for God is a necessary but insufficient condition of sanctification.</p> <p>The next step of Kargel's discussion is the purpose of redemption – the union of God and man. It is typical for Kargel to follow the development of the theme from the OT into the NT. There is an assumption that prominent themes run through the both testaments.</p> <p>Using passages from the Gospel of John Kargel argues that the OT promise of God's walking among His people becomes true by Christ's abiding in believers.</p> <p>Kargel calls his readers to make Christ's words about abiding in Him "live knowledge" (as opposed to dead, head, abstract knowledge?). Under this "live/living knowledge" he probably means making this truth about Christ abiding in believers the reality of their daily lives.</p>
---	---	---



Т 2.45 "Отец Мой возлюбил его, и Мы придем к нему и обитель у него сотворим" - Ин. 14, 23. Это есть обетование тому, кто отдался Христу в полное распоряжение. "Христос в вас" – ныне это открытая тайна и истинное "упование славы" - Кол. 1, 27.

"My Father will love him, and we will come to him and make our home with him" (Jn. 14:23). This is a promise to the one who devoted himself/herself to Christ's complete disposal. "Christ in you" is now a revealed mystery and the true "hope of glory" (Col.1:27).

The immediate context of the quoted words of Christ suggests that the conditions for this promise are to Christ and to obey His words. Kargel does not violate the immediate context when he talks about "dedicating oneself to Christ's complete disposal" as a condition.

"Christ in you" is one of Kargel's favourite topics. In this book he arrived at it through the discussion of sanctification as a state of being indwelt by holy God.

Т 2.46 Итак, истинное освящение и святость могут быть только там, где присутствует Сам Господь и где жизнь и хождение, верующего совершается в Нем, и с Ним, и где Он один действует во всем и над всем. Поразмыслив над сущностью освящения, направим теперь наш взор дальше, на цель освящения.

So, true sanctification and holiness can only exist where the Lord Himself is present and where believer's life and walk are conducted in Him and with Him, and where He alone works in all and over all. Having given a thought to the essence of sanctification we will set our eyes upon the purpose of sanctification.



Цель освящения	The purpose of sanctification	
<p>...</p> <p>Т 2.47 Что же мы можем сказать вообще о цели Божией? Отец Небесный уже от века имел Свою совершенно определенную цель - наше искупление. Но раскрывает Он ее нам только последовательно, ступень за ступенью, [то есть по мере нашей верности и нашего послушания относительно данного Им света и полученного от Него познания] - 2 Пет. 1, 3 - 8.</p>	<p>...</p> <p>What can we say about God's purpose in general? From the very beginning the Heavenly Father already had a very definite purpose - our redemption. But He reveals it to us only gradually, step by step, [according to our faithfulness and our obedience] concerning His light and the knowledge that we received from Him] (2 Pet. 1:3-8).</p>	<p>Kargel recognizes the progressive character of God's revelation concerning redemption. In his view redemption unfolds according to the measure of believers' faithfulness and obedience. This is Kargel's hermeneutics of obedience: in order to understand more one has to obey truths already revealed.</p>
<p>Т 2.48 Если христианин будет больше вникать и понимать Слово Божие и молиться об этом, то Господь будет вести его все дальше, вперед к Своей цели. Здесь будет происходить то же, что при восхождении на возвышающиеся перед нами горы. Каждая желанная и достигнутая вершина является только подступом к следующей вершине, намного превышающей только что достигнутую.</p> <p>...</p>	<p>If a Christian searches and understands the Word of God more and prays about it, the Lord will lead him further ahead towards His purpose. It will be like climbing mountains standing in front of us. Each desired and achieved height is only the starting point for the following height, which is much higher than the one just reached.</p> <p>...</p>	<p>According to Kargel, Scripture should be diligently searched, gradually understood better and better, and approached prayfully. This he sees as the condition for progress in the spiritual journey of redemption.</p>
<p>Т 2.49 Итак, во-первых, цель Божия заключается в том, чтобы освободить нас от греха. "Он спасет людей Своих от грехов их" - Мф. 1, 21 – это первое, что</p>	<p>So, first, God's purpose consists in releasing us from sin. "He will save his people from their sins" (Matt. 1:21) is the first thing told to us on the first page of the</p>	<p>Kargel sees releasing believers from sin as the first stage of redemption. In the following paragraphs he quotes passages</p>



<p>сказано нам на первой странице Нового Завета о нашем прославленном Искупителе еще до Его рождения.</p> <p>Т 2.50 Благодарение и поклонение Господу за то, что Его искупление состоит именно в том, чтобы освободить Своих людей от грехов их. Его народ и грех должны быть отделены.</p> <p>Т 2.51 Так понимал эту истину апостол Павел, рассуждая: "Если же, ища оправдания во Христе, мы и сами оказались грешниками, - то неужели Христос есть слуга греха? Никак!" - Гал. 2, 17. Мы видим, что апостол Павел с негодованием отвергает жизнь во грехе для оправданного по благодати, потому что такая жизнь представила бы Христа поощряющим грех...</p> <p>Т 2.52 Господь хочет освободить нас от греха. Но до какого предела? - спросят некоторые. Я убежден, что Господь не хочет видеть в ком-либо из Своих последователей хотя бы малейшее проявление греха.</p>	<p>New Testament about our glorified Redeemer even before He was born.</p> <p>Praise and glory to the Lord that His redemption consists precisely in releasing His people from their sins. His people and sin must be separated.</p> <p>This is how apostle Paul understood this truth, "If, while we seek to be justified in Christ, it becomes evident that we ourselves are sinners, does that mean that Christ promotes sin? Absolutely not!" (Gal. 2:17). We see that apostle Paul with indignation rejects life in sin for those who were justified by grace, because such a life would present Christ as encouraging sin . . .</p> <p>The Lord wants to release us from sin. "But to what extent?" some people will ask. I am convinced that the Lord does not want to see in anyone of His followers even the slightest sign of sin.</p>	<p>from the gospels and the Pauline epistles to make this point clear. Scripture stands as the only authority in this matter.</p> <p>The few following paragraphs serve as an example of how Kargel uses Scripture to demonstrate that a certain statement is true.</p>
---	--	---



Т 2.53 Апостол Павел в Послании к Титу 2, 14 говорит, что Иисус Христос "дал Себя за нас, чтобы избавить нас от всякого беззакония". "Дабы, как грех царствовал к смерти, так и благодать воцарилась чрез праведность к жизни вечной Иисусом Христом, Господом нашим" - Рим. 5,21.

Т 2.54 Каковы же должны быть практические последствия принятия искупления? Очищение "от всякой скверны плоти и духа" - 2 Кор. 7, 1, неприкосновение к нечистому - 2 Кор. 6, 17, распятие плоти со страстями и похотями - Гал. 5, 24, упразднение тела греховного, чтобы нам уже не быть рабами греху - Рим. 6, 6, охрана от входа греха в нас, будь то чрез глаза или руки, или ноги - Мф. 5, 29 - 30; Мр. 9, 45. Никто из нас не находится в неведении, что цель Божия заключается в том, чтобы представить Себе Церковь славною.

Т 2.55 Но в чем же должна состоять эта сила Церкви? Об этом сказано дальше: "Чтобы представить ее Себе славною Церковью, не имеющей пятна, или порока, или чего-либо подобного, но дабы она была свята и непорочна" - Еф. 5, 27. Не хотим ли мы помочь Церкви быть такой? Если да, то

Apostle Paul in the Epistle to Titus 2:14 says that Jesus Christ "gave himself for us to redeem us from all wickedness." "So that, just as sin reigned in death, so also grace might reign through righteousness to bring eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord" (Rom. 5:21).

What should be the practical consequence of acceptance of redemption? Purification "from everything that contaminates body and spirit" (2 Cor. 7:1), touching no unclean things (2 Cor. 6:17), crucifixion of the sinful nature with its passions and desires (Gal. 5:24), crucifixion of our old self that we should no longer be slaves to sin (Rom. 6:6), guarding against sin that might be caused by eyes, hands, or feet (Matt. 5:29-30; Mr. 9:45). None of us is ignorant of the fact that God's goal is to present the Church to Himself as radiant.

What is this radiance of the Church all about? It states further: "and to present her to himself as a radiant church, without stain or wrinkle or any other blemish, but holy and blameless" (Eph. 5:27). Do we not want to help the Church to be like that? If yes, there should be no stain or wrinkle or any other



<p>на нас не должно быть ни пятна, ни порока, ни чего-либо подобного; ибо что есть на нас, то будет и на Церкви.</p> <p>Т 2.56 Далее сказано, что мы посланы в этот мир с тем, чтобы нам в нем быть "неукоризненными и чистыми" - Фил. 2, 15. Мы должны ожидать пришествия Господа с непорочными сердцами: "во святине пред Богом... в пришествие Господа нашего Иисуса Христа" - 1 Фес. 3, 13. Мы должны "явиться пред Ним неоскверненными и непорочными в мире" - 2 Пет. 3, 14. Это же слово говорит далее, что "всякий, имеющий сию надежду на Него, очищает себя, так как Он чист" - 1 Ин. 3, 3.</p> <p>Т 2.57 Итак, перед тем, как увидеть Христа, как Он есть, должно произойти очищение. Из всех приведенных мест Священного Писания, как и из многих других, мы должны сделать вывод, что цель Божия в Его искуплении нас заключается в том, чтобы мы полностью порвали даже малейшую связь с грехом - 1 Фес. 5, 22. Сперджен в своей книге "Благодатью вы спасены" писал: "Спасение было бы несовершенным делом, если бы оно не простиралось и на эту часть нашей испорченной природы. Мы точно так же</p>	<p>blemish on us, because whatever is on us will be on the Church as well.</p> <p>Further on it says that we are sent into this world to be in it "blameless and pure" (Phil. 2:15). We should be expecting our Lord's return with blameless hearts, "holy in the presence of our God and Father when our Lord Jesus comes" (1 Th. 3:13). We should "be found spotless, blameless and at peace with him" (2 Pet. 3:14). The same Word says further: "every one who has this hope in him purifies himself, just as He is pure"(1Jn. 3:3).</p> <p>So, purification should take place before we see Christ as He is. From all quoted passages of the Holy Scriptures as well as from many others we should come to the conclusion that God's goal in redeeming us consists in our complete break from even the slightest connection with sin (1 Th. 5:22). Spurgeon in his book "By grace you are saved" wrote, "Salvation would be incomplete if it did not reach to this part of our corrupted nature. We should be cleaned just as we were pardoned. Justification without sanctification would not be salvation</p>	<p>There is an expectancy of the imminent return of the Lord and a call to believers to be ready, that is, to have blameless hearts. The nearness of the Lord's coming is identified as another reason for sanctification.</p> <p>Kargel realizes that there is much more in Scripture that has to do with the subject. However, he feels that over a dozen of references are enough to convince his readers.</p> <p>Spurgeon is one of a few authorities that Kargel refers to besides Scripture. His mention of Spurgeon is important because it hints of a certain theological position with which Kargel feels</p>
---	--	--



<p>должны быть очищены, как и помилованы. Оправдание без освящения не было бы спасением; оно объявило бы прокаженного чистым и оставило бы его умирать от своей болезни . . . “</p>	<p>at all; it would pronounce a man with leprosy clean and would leave him to die from his disease . . . “</p>	<p>comfortable.</p>
<p>Т 2.58 Во-вторых, цель Божия заключается в том, чтобы иметь нас Своей собственностью, как и читаем об этом: "Будете Моим уделом из всех народов: ибо Моя вся земля" - Исх. 19, 5. "Вы не свои", - вторит этому апостол Павел - 1 Кор. 6, 19. "Для искупления удела Его, в похвалу Славы Его" - Еф. 1, 14; "Призвал вас благовествованием нашим, для достижения славы Господа нашего Иисуса Христа" - 2 Фес. 2, 14; "Очистить Себе народ особенный, ревностный к добрым делам" - Тит. 2, 14. Имеется много подобных изречений Священного Писания об искупленных Господом, и все эти изречения говорят, что Христос искупил нас для Себя Самого.</p>	<p>Secondly, God’s purpose consists of taking us into His possession, as we read about it: "Out of all nations you will be my treasured possession. Although the whole earth is mine" (Ex. 19:5). "You are not your own", echoes apostle Paul (1 Cor. 6:19). "Until the redemption of those who are God's possession--to the praise of his glory" (Eph. 1:14); "He called you to this through our gospel, that you might share in the glory of our Lord Jesus Christ" (2 Th. 2:14); "to purify for himself a people that are his very own, eager to do what is good" (Tit. 2:14). There are many similar statements in the Holy Scriptures about the redeemed of the Lord, and all these statements say that Christ has redeemed us for Himself.</p>	<p>Kargel deals with his second proposition concerning God’s redemptive purpose in a similar manner. However, this time he does not limit chosen passages to the New Testament. He works in the tradition of systematic theology and at times his style is reminiscent of a concordance.</p>
<p>Т 2.59 В освящении искупленных цель Божия заключается и в том, чтобы вывести из рабства фараонова и наш "мелкий и крупный скот", и ни копыта не должно остаться там - Исх. 10: 24, 26. Ему</p>	<p>God’s purpose in sanctification of the redeemed consists of taking out of Pharaoh’s slavery our "flocks and herds", so that not a hoof is to be left behind (Ex. 10:24, 26). Our strengths, health, mind, and</p>	<p>Here Kargel’s use of the OT reminds one of allegorizing. However, the author would argue that Kargel brings up all those flocks, herds, and hoofs in order</p>



принадлежат наши силы, здоровье, разум, и все, чем Он наделил нас. О, если бы наши уста всегда прославляли Его, наши взоры были бы направлены только на Него, наши руки совершали бы только Его дела, и наши ноги ходили бы только Его путями! Поэтому стремись, дитя Божие, к тому, чтобы отдать Богу то, что Божие. В этом и состоит Его цель в нашем освящении.

В-третьих, Божия цель есть та, чтобы Христос жил в нас

Т 2.60 ...Христос хочет, чтобы Его жизнь проникла в нас так, как жизнь виноградной лозы проникает в ее ветви и проявляется затем в почках, цветах и плодах - Ин. 15, 1 - 15. Господь хочет, чтобы мы жили и действовали через Него - Ин. 15, 7. И как одна и та же жизнь пульсирует в наших членах, так и жизнь Христа должна проявляться в нас - Кол. 2, 19; Еф. 4, 15 - 16. Именно так отражал Христа в своей жизни апостол Павел: "И уже не я живу, но живет во мне Христос" - Гал. 2, 20 или: "Для меня жизнь - Христос" - Фил. 1, 21; "чтобы и

everything that He has given to us belongs to Him. Oh, if our mouth would always glorify Him, our eyes would be directed only to Him, our hands would be busy doing only His work, and our feet would walk only in His ways! Therefore, dear child of God, strain to give back to God that which is His. This is what comprises His purpose in our sanctification.

Thirdly, God's purpose is that Christ would live in us

. . . Christ wants His life to run through us like the life of the grapevine through its branches and becomes evident in its buds, blossoms and fruit (Jn. 15:1-15). The Lord wants us to live and act in Him (Jn. 15:7). And just as the same life pulses through all parts of our body, so the life of Christ should be seen in us (Col. 2:19; Eph. 4:15 -16). This is how apostle Paul reflected Christ in his life: "I no longer live, but Christ lives in me" (Gal. 2:20) or: "to me, to live is Christ" (Phil. 1:21); "so that the life of Jesus may also be revealed in our body" (2 Cor. 4:10);

to illustrate the point more vividly. He does not say that "flocks, herds, and hoofs" actually meant on some deeper level our "strength, health, and mind". All he is saying is that just as all Israelite possessions had to be taken with them out of slavery, so whatever we have today has to be taken out of slavery to sin and dedicated to the Lord. This sounds more like typology.

Here is another example of how Kargel uses the larger context of Scripture to let it speak on the topic of "Christ in us". Kargel hardly comments on it, probably because he views the quoted passages as self-evident and easy to understand.



<p>жизнь Иисусова открылась в теле нашем" - 2 Кор. 4, 10; "силою Его, действующей во мне могущественно" - Кол. 1, 29 и т. д.</p> <p>Т 2.61 "От Меня будут тебе плоды" - Ос. 14, 9 - 10; и "исполнены плодов праведности Иисусом Христом, в славу и похвалу Божию" - Фил. 1, 11. Это Божий путь освящения. Поэтому нам необходимо умяляться, чтобы Он мог возрасть - Ин. 3, 30.</p> <p>Т 2.62 В-четвертых, самая наивысшая цель Божия в освящении - это быть подобным Ему. Христос - наш Спаситель и в то же время Он - великий образец, в который должны преображаться все дети Божий. Как поразительно ясно говорит об этом Священное Писание. Но, если бы Господь не выразил в Своем Слове этой драгоценной истины, то ни один человек не дошел бы до нее. Апостол Павел пишет: "Кого Он предузнал, тем и предопределил быть подобными образу Сына Своего, дабы Он был первородным между многими</p>	<p>"with all his energy, which so powerfully works in me" (Col. 1:29), etc.</p> <p>"Your fruitfulness comes from me" (Hos. 14:8-9) and "filled with the fruit of righteousness that comes through Jesus Christ - to the glory and praise of God" (Phil. 1:11). This is God's way of sanctification. Therefore it is important for us to decrease so that He may increase (Jn. 3:30).</p> <p>Fourth, the highest purpose of God in sanctification is that we become likened to Him. Christ is our Saviour and at the same time He is the great example to which all children God should be conformed. How amazingly clearly does the Holy Scripture speak about it. If the Lord had not expressed this precious truth in His Word no man would have reached it by himself. Apostle Paul writes, "For those God foreknew he also predestined to be conformed to the likeness of his Son, that he might be the firstborn among many brothers"</p>	<p>As usual Kargel ends with an exhortation. According to Kargel it is important not only to understand that bearing spiritual fruit is impossible apart from God, but also to do something about it. Actually he calls believers to adopt the life principle of John the Baptist. Kargel treats John's words as a universal command to all believers.</p> <p>There is the notion that not only Christ's commands have to be obeyed but that His very example is to be followed. In other words, Christ's example is normative for believers.</p> <p>Scripture is the Lord's Word.</p> <p>There is the notion that some truths can be grasped without the means of special revelation while others cannot.</p>
---	---	--



<p>братьями" - Рим. 8, 29.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Т 2.63 И пусть теперь после того, как мы бросили беглый взгляд на Божию цель при нашем освящении, слова апостола Павла сделаются правилом в нашей ежедневной практической христианской жизни: "Забывая заднее и простираясь вперед, стремлюсь к цели, к почести вышнего звания Божия во Христе Иисусе" - Фил. 3, 13 - 14.</p> <p>Средства освящения</p> <p>...</p> <p>Т 2.64 [И если в течение столетий со дней Реформации оправдание по вере сделали предметом заботливого исследования, что принесло бесконечную пользу Царствию Божию, почему же освящение, лишь через которое оправдание входит в свои полные права и которое есть путь для достижения цели Божией, не было удостоено нашего внимательного рассмотрения?]</p> <p>...</p> <p>Т 2.65 Все побудительные доводы и святые</p>	<p>(Rom. 8:29).</p> <p>...</p> <p>And now after we have take a brief look at God's purpose in our sanctification, may the words of apostle Paul become the rule in our daily practical Christian life, "Forgetting what is behind and straining towards what is ahead, I press on towards the goal to win the prize for which God has called me heavenwards in Christ Jesus" (Phil. 3:13-14).</p> <p>Means of sanctification</p> <p>...</p> <p>[If during centuries since the days of Reformation justification by faith was made the subject of careful study, which brought enormous benefit to the Kingdom of God, why has not sanctification which is the only way for justification to enjoy its full rights and for God's purpose to be accomplished, been honoured with our careful observation?]</p> <p>...</p> <p>All the compelling reasons and holy</p>	<p>Kargel shows his affection for Scripture calling its truth "precious".</p> <p>Kargel ends this section with an admonition to comply with what has been revealed. Kargel challenges his readers to make Paul's attitude towards progress in Christian life normative in their daily living.</p> <p>Kargel admits that, when compared to the doctrine of justification, the doctrine of sanctification was overlooked and underestimated in the theology of the Reformers.</p> <p>Scripture contains far more than</p>
--	--	---



поощрения, которые мы находим в Священном Писании и на которые указывает нам Дух Святой, служат тому, чтобы привести нас ко Христу, чтобы сокрыть нас в Нем, чтобы Он производил в нас хотение и действие по Своему благоволению.

Т 2.66 Теперь рассмотрим верные **средства для достижения истинного освящения**. Одним из этих средств является познание нашего Господа и Спасителя Иисуса Христа.

Т 2.67 ... к сожалению, очень немногие возрастают в познании Господа и Спасителя нашего Иисуса Христа - 2 Пет. 3, 18, это и является в большинстве случаев причиной низкого и жалкого духовного состояния. Как печально, что Он - единственный Первоисточник всевозможных благословений небесных богатств - остается неисследованным нами,

encouragements that we find in the Holy Scriptures and to which **the Holy Spirit points**, serve the purpose of bringing us to Christ and hiding us in Him so that He might work in us the desires and actions according to His holy will.

Now we will consider the right **means for attainment of true sanctification**. One of these means is the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

. . . unfortunately, very few grow in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ (2 Pet. 3:18). In most cases this is the reason of a poor and miserable spiritual condition. How sad that He – the unique and primary source of all possible blessings of heavenly riches – remains unexplored by us. And for this reason we are in utter ignorance of what He possesses and what

propositions—it contains reasons and encouragements **for us**. They can be obtained by our looking for them with the assistance of the Holy Spirit who brings those things to our attention. Kargel does not specify how exactly the Spirit does that. One thing is clear, that according to Kargel, the Spirit's assistance is necessary in order to get from the Scripture the truths which serve our highest spiritual good.

Speaking of the knowledge of the Lord Kargel calls to personal knowledge of Him – the kind of knowledge that, according to Kargel, is often missing among believers. Kargel views knowledge in general, understanding of difficult passages of Scripture, as well as



<p>и по этой причине у нас полное незнание того, что имеется у Него и в Нем. Исследовали ли мы, как должно, в Книге Господней все то, что вытекает из познания Иисуса Христа? [Дело не идет о росте познания вообще, а также и не о познании различных учений Священного Писания и не о ясном понимании и знании тех или иных темных и трудных мест его – в этом вовсе нет недостатка у большого числа искупленных, тогда как их волюбленный Господь в великом и целом все же остается относительно чужим для них.]</p> <p>...</p>	<p>is found in Him. Have we thoroughly investigated the Lord's Book to know everything that flows out of a knowledge of Jesus Christ? [I do not mean general knowledge, or the knowledge of various teachings of the Holy Scriptures, or even a clear understanding of difficult passages. Most of the redeemed do not lack anything in this area, but at the same time their beloved Lord remains for the most part a stranger to them.]</p> <p>...</p>	<p>the knowledge of various teachings of the Holy Scripture (theology?) as inferior to a personal knowledge of Christ.</p> <p>Usage of the language of endearment towards Christ.</p> <p>The following section is very important because it contains a number of statements of Kargel's views concerning the interpretation of the Scriptures.</p>
<p>Т 2.68 Одним из следующих средств нашего освящения является чтение Слова Божия. Может быть, иному покажется излишним напоминание об этом благословенном средстве нашего освящения, потому что ведь само собой разумеется, что дитя Божие питается чистым словесным молоком, чтобы чрез него возрастая духовно. И все-таки мы не раз можем убедиться, как равнодушно</p>	<p>One of the means of our sanctification is reading the Word of God. It could be that to someone will deem it unnecessary to give a reminder of this blessed method of our sanctification, because it seems to be self-evident that a child of God spiritually feeds on the sincere milk of the word in order to grow. Nevertheless, we have been frequently persuaded that the majority of redeemed souls are indifferent to the</p>	<p>Here Kargel identifies the Word of God with the words of the Bible.</p> <p>Kargel starts by attaching great importance to reading "the precious Bible" – language of endearment again. He sees Bible reading as absolutely essential to one's spiritual growth, alluding to 1 Pet. 2 where the Word is</p>



<p>большинство искупленных душ по отношению к драгоценной Библии.</p> <p>Т 2.69 И еще больше - именно дети Божий, вполне отдавшие Господу, имеющие Его в сердце и пребывающие в Нем, лукавством врага душ человеческих пренебрегают Словом Божиим. Действие Духа Святого в них, Его милостивое благословенное водительство лукавый может использовать для того, чтобы нашептать им, что они уже и так много знают и поэтому не обязательно читать Слово Божие. С болью вспоминаю я о целом ряде детей Божиих, которые с радостью отдались Господу, но понемногу дошли до того, что стали обходиться без Священного Писания.</p> <p>Т 2.70 "Заблуждаетесь, не зная Писаний, ни силы Божией", - Мф. 22, 29, - сказал Господь саддукеям. Эти слова оправдаются и на нас. Священное Писание и сила Божия соединены в одно; и то и другое должно войти в нашу повседневную жизнь, если мы желаем ходить, согласно благоволению Господню. Но если Слово Божие перестанет быть светильником ноге нашей и светом стезе нашей, мы очень скоро начнем блуждать в жизни - Пс. 118, 105.</p>	<p>precious Bible.</p> <p>Furthermore, it is the very children of God who are totally dedicated to the Lord, who have Him in their hearts and are abiding in Him, who neglect the Word of God because of the slyness of the enemy of human souls. The work of the Holy Spirit in them, His gracious blessed leading can be used by the devil to whisper to them, that they already know a lot and therefore do not need to read the Word of God. With pain I recollect a lot of children of God, who joyfully gave themselves to the Lord, but gradually reached the point when they began to manage without the Holy Scriptures.</p> <p>"You are in error because you do not know the Scriptures or the power of God" (Matt. 22:29), the Lord told the Sadducees. These words are justified on us as well. The Holy Scriptures and power of God are closely connected; both should become a part of our daily life if we wish to walk according to the good will of the Lord. But if the Word of God ceases to be a lamp to our feet and a light for our path, very soon we will begin to wander in our lives (Ps. 119:105).</p>	<p>compared with milk for babes.</p> <p>It is obvious from this and other paragraphs that Kargel uses the terms "the Word of God", "the Word", "the Holy Scriptures", "the Scriptures", "the Bible" interchangeably, almost to avoid repetition. There is no evidence that he implies any difference between them.</p> <p>Emphasis on regular reading of Scripture.</p> <p>Kargel builds his argument for the importance of reading and knowing Scripture by going back to Scripture and quoting Jesus from the NT and David from the OT and applying these words to his time. It follows from the quoted passages that the <u>knowledge</u> of Scripture is connected to the power of God and provides direction for one's</p>
--	---	---



<p>T 2.71 Посмотрите на нашего превознесенного Искупителя, каким было Его отношение к Слову, хотя Он Сам был этим воплотившимся Словом. В нем и через Него говорил Отец Небесный - Евр. 1, 2; и теперь Он нам еще говорит из славы Своей через Слово - Евр. 12, 25. Иисус Христос пришел на эту землю, как предвещало Слово; жил, страдал, умер и воскрес из мертвых также по Слову. И ныне мы все снова и снова слышим: "Да сбудется ременное в Писании" - Мф. 4, 14. Вся Его жизнь среди людей была исполнением Слова Божия, так что написанное и воплощенное Слово - одно и то же.</p> <p>T 2.72 Следовательно, и мы во всех делах и во всех обстоятельствах должны жить по</p>	<p>Look at our exalted Redeemer! What was His attitude to the Word, though He was the embodied Word Himself? In Him and through Him the Heavenly Father spoke (Heb.1:2); and now He still speaks to us from His glory through the Word (Heb. 12:25). Jesus Christ came on this earth, as foretold by the Word; lived, suffered affliction, died, and rose from the dead also according to the Word. And now all of us hear again and again: "May what was said be fulfilled" (Matt 4:14). His whole life among people was a fulfilment of the Word of God, so the written and the incarnate Word are one and the same.</p> <p>Hence, in all things and in all circumstances we should live by His holy rule: "May what</p>	<p>life.</p> <p>Another argument for the importance of Scripture is Jesus' attitude towards it. If He exalted it so much, then so should we. This paragraph reveals Kargel's view on the connection between the written Word and the incarnate Word, Jesus Christ. He sees no contradiction between the two. They are in absolute harmony with the will of God. Jesus fulfilled what was predicted in the OT concerning Him. Nowadays Jesus continues speaking through the Word. According to Kargel, Scripture is no lesser Word than Jesus Himself. There is no indication of any hierarchy of truthfulness when it comes to Scripture and Jesus.</p> <p>Not to mention that Kargel believed in the literal fulfilment of OT prophecies concerning Christ in the person of Jesus.</p> <p>Kargel admonishes not only to know the Scriptures but also to</p>
--	--	--



<p>Его святому правилу: "Да сбудется реченное в Писании".</p> <p>Т 2.73 Мы должны хорошо знать Слово Божие, оно должно быть нашим духовным питанием, нашей ежедневной духовной пищей. Спаситель призывает нас к изучению Слова, говоря: "Дух Святой... научит вас всему и напомнит вам все, что Я говорил вам" - Ин. 14, 26.</p> <p>Т 2.74 Каждый знает, что напомнить что-то может только то, что мы уже знаем или знали. Правда, Дух Святой может и теперь еще открывать непосредственно волю Господню. Но эти откровения должны находиться в согласовании с Священным Писанием. Если же мы вознерадеем о Слове Божиим, то Дух Святой перестанет давать нам Свои непосредственные откровения, потому что Слово - это от начала до конца Его откровение, которое требует всего нашего внимания.</p>	<p>was written in Scripture be fulfilled".</p> <p>We should know the Word of God well; it should become our spiritual nourishment, our daily spiritual food. The Saviour calls us to study the Word, saying: "The Holy Spirit. . . will teach you all things and will remind you of everything I have said to you (John 14:26).]</p> <p>Everyone knows that we can be reminded of something that we already know or used to know. The truth is that the Holy Spirit can still reveal the will of the Lord directly even now. But these revelations should be in agreement with the Holy Scriptures. If we neglect the Word of God, the Holy Spirit will cease to give us His direct revelations, because the Word is His revelation from the beginning to the end, which requires all our attention.</p>	<p>fulfil them according to the example of Jesus.</p> <p>Here Kargel emphasises the knowledge of the Scriptures. It seems that the knowledge he is talking about goes beyond the cognitive realm. "Knowing" something to the point of consuming it as spiritual food indicates very close and intimate knowledge.</p> <p>It seems that Kargel does not believe that "the Holy Spirit will teach all things" without active studying of the Word by people.</p> <p>Kargel's statement about extra scriptural revelations allows for the Spirit's revelations even in the present time. Kargel, however, establishes criteria for the trustworthiness of any extra-scriptural revelations: they have to be in agreement with Scripture. That means that Scripture remains the final judge of the truthfulness of any revelation. It seems that Kargel argues from</p>
--	--	--



<p>Т 2.75 Мы, может быть, не дошли до того, чтобы считать Слово Божие не нужным, но вопрос состоит в том: как мы Его читаем? Механическое чтение Слова Божия не освящает; можно читать целые главы, можно даже выучить их наизусть, и при этом Слово может остаться бессильным воздействовать на нас. Необходимо, чтобы каждый верующий мог найти время ежедневно исследовать Слово, вникать в его смысл, наслаждаться содержащейся в нем истиной и силой.</p>	<p>Maybe we have not reached the point where we consider the Word of God useless, but the question is: how do we read It? A mechanical reading of the Word of God does not sanctify; it is possible to read whole chapters, it is possible even to learn them by heart, and at the same time the Word can remain powerless for us. It is necessary for each believer to find time daily to investigate the Word, to break through to its meaning, and to enjoy the truth and power it contains.</p>	<p>the position that since the Holy Spirit is the ultimate author of Scripture, He cannot contradict Himself when giving “direct revelations” today. It should be noted that Kargel did not identify those “direct revelations” as the Word of God.</p> <p>Kargel sees a direct connection between sanctification and regular reading and studying of Scripture. According to him “mechanical” reading or memorization will not do much good. There is no such thing as a mysterious encounter with Scripture when it would bless a reader while the reader’s mind is uninvolved in the process. Another point that Kargel raises concerning a reader’s encounter with Scripture is that it involves ones emotional (“enjoy”) as well as cognitive faculties. Finally, Kargel states that Scripture contains truth and power.</p>
--	---	---



<p>Т 2.76 Господь дал обетование Иисусу Навину, что он во всем будет иметь успех, однако при этом поставил ему условие: "Да не отходит сия книга закона от уст твоих, но поучайся в ней день и ночь, дабы в точности исполнять все, что в ней написано: тогда ты будешь успешен в путях твоих и будешь поступать благоразумно" - И. Нав. 1, 8.</p> <p>Т 2.77 Увы, как печально обстоит дело с теми душами, которые не исследуют Слово Божие или знают только то, что услышали от других. Великий проповедник Муди сказал однажды, что многие верующие едят только тогда, когда их кормят церковной ложкой.</p> <p>Т 2.78 Какое это наслаждение - питаться самому Словом Божиим! О, если бы нашим удовольствием было день и ночь наслаждаться за трапезой Господней, то есть насыщаться Его Словом.</p>	<p>The Lord has given a promise to Joshua, that he will be successful in everything under one condition: "Do not let this Book of the Law depart from your mouth; meditate on it day and night, so that you may be careful to do everything written in it. Then you will be prosperous and successful" (Jos. 1:8).</p> <p>Alas, how sad the things are with those souls who do not study the Word of God or know only those things that they heard from others. The great preacher Moody told said that many believers eat only when being fed with a church spoon.</p> <p>What a pleasure it is nourish yourself from the Word of God! Oh, if we could take pleasure in enjoying the Lord's meal day and night, that is to be filled with His Word!</p>	<p>It seems that Kargel views the commandment given to Joshua as imperative for the NT Christians as well.</p> <p>Kargel encourages believers to search Scripture for themselves and not to rely upon the things they get from preachers or theologians. The reference to "great preacher Moody" is important as it sheds some light to the theological "camp" with which Kargel would ally himself.</p> <p>The study of Scripture is not an end in itself. Kargel emphasises over and over again that being "filled with the Lord's Word" is for the soul what eating food is for the body. The emotional aspect of an encounter Scripture comes through again.</p>
--	--	--



<p>Т 2.79 Если мы хотим быть поистине освященными, то мы с большей ревностью должны исследовать драгоценную Книгу и исполнять ее повеления. Говорю это потому, что в течение многих лет я читал Библию только с тем, чтобы найти подходящие места для проповеди. О, как часто и даже, можно сказать, в большинстве случаев Господь не давал мне ничего, и тогда я прибегал к помощи других книг и комментариев. Но я со слезами умолял Господа, чтобы Он не оставлял меня в такой скудости. В Своей любви Господь услышал мое моление. Он сказал мне: "Я готов дать тебе, но ты не ищешь пищу для себя. Не думаешь ли ты, что если бы Я теперь захотел дать духовную пищу другим, то Я должен сделать это только через тебя?"</p>	<p>If we want to be really sanctified, we should investigate the precious Book with greater zeal and fulfil its commands. I say this because for many years I read the Bible only to find suitable passages for sermons. Oh, how often, and I could say even in most cases, the Lord did not give me anything, and then I resorted to the help of other books and commentaries. But with tears I begged the Lord not to leave me in such poverty. In His love the Lord heard my prayer. He said to me: "I am ready to give it to you, but you are not searching for food for yourself. Do you think that if I now wanted to give spiritual food to others I must do it only through you? "</p>	<p>According to Kargel, serious study of Scripture must be followed by obedience to its commands.</p> <p>"Books and commentaries" do not hold much value when compared with Scripture itself.</p>
<p>Т 2.80 Благодарение Господу, что Он научил меня читать Слово для себя и применять его к себе. О, какие блаженства открыл Он тогда моей душе! И душа, будучи напитана и напоена, могла раздавать духовную пищу и другим.</p>	<p>Thanks to the Lord, that He has taught me to read the Word for myself and to apply it to myself. Oh, what blessings He revealed then to my soul! And my soul, having received food and water, could distribute spiritual food to others also.</p>	<p>Motivation is an important factor when studying Scripture. If one goes to Scripture searching for proof texts or "lessons" for others, according to Kargel he/she is not going to find much. Unless a person is sincerely looking for answers for him/herself, Scripture will remain a closed book. One's attitude is a key factor.</p>



<p>Т 2.81 Мы станем сильными и укрепленными только тогда, когда будем питаться сами и сделаемся богатыми, когда сами будем собирать небесные сокровища. Господь дал нам это чудесное сокровище - Слово Божие; и наше дело - черпать из него его богатства. И мы должны это сделать, чтобы нам принимать учение, обличение, исправление, наставление в праведности, чтобы быть человеком Божиим, приготовленным ко всякому доброму делу - 2 Тим. 3, 16 - 17.</p>	<p>We will become strong and empowered only when we feed ourselves and we will become rich when we collect heavenly treasures ourselves. The Lord has given us this wonderful treasure – the Word of God; and it is our responsibility to scoop from its richness. And we should do this so that we can accept teaching, rebuking, correcting and training in righteousness, in order to become a man of God thoroughly equipped for every good work (2 Tim. 3:16 – 17).</p>	<p>Emphasis on individual encounter with Scripture. Free access to Scripture for all believers is an important condition.</p> <p>Kargel employs the metaphor of taking Scripture as spiritual food a number of times. A person must first “eat” it himself/herself and only then will he/she be prepared to share it with others.</p> <p>The way Kargel valued Scripture comes through when he talks about the richness of this “wonderful treasure”. He is not trying to hide his affection for Scripture.</p>
<p>Т 2.82 Будем с ревностью и тщанием исследовать драгоценные истины, которые заключает в себе это Слово. Может быть, мы уже нашли многие из них, наслаждаемся и укрепляемся их ценностями, однако Дух Святой готов указать нам еще на многие другие истины. Он может внезапно показать эту драгоценную Книгу совершенно с новой</p>	<p>Let us zealously and thoroughly investigate the precious truths contained in this Word. It could be that we have already found many of them, and we enjoy them and become stronger because of their riches. However the Holy Spirit is ready to show to us many more truths. He can suddenly show us this precious Book from a completely new perspective. Notice that if the Old</p>	<p>A call to “zealous and thorough investigation” involves both the emotional and cognitive capacities of people. Then there is a call for a renewed approach to Scripture in order to see it freshly alive. The book is the same, but the Holy Spirit is able to present it differently and to</p>



стороны. Заметим, если Ветхий Завет указывает нам на нашу вину и власть греха, то Новый открывает нам врата праведности, свободы и жизни.

Т 2.83 В высшей степени важно увидеть, что каждое послание апостола Павла в первой части показывает нам неисследимые богатства Христовы, во второй же - проявление этих богатств и силы в нас. Господь показывает, что все эти блага даются для нашего духовного всеоружия и что мы должны принести плоды. Если мы хотим получать все новые благословения и новые силы из Книги Господней, то мы всякий раз должны приступать к чтению ее с такой жаждой и интересом, как будто мы никогда еще прежде не читали ее. Только при таком подходе к Библии Слово Божие будет питать и оживлять нашу душу. Эта мысль содержится и в ответе Иисуса Христа искустителю: "Не хлебом одним будет жить человек, но всяким Словом, исходящим из уст Божиих" - Мф. 4, 4. Христос Сам вкушал Слово и жил этим Словом. То, что являлось

Testament shows us our fault and the power of sin, the New Testament opens to us the gate of righteousness, freedom, and life.

In a very important to see that in the first part of each of Apostle **Paul's** epistles, he **shows** us the inexhaustible riches of Christ. In the second part he shows the manifestation of these riches and powers in us. **The Lord shows** that all these blessings are given as our spiritual armor and that we should bring for fruit. If we want to receive more new blessings and new power from the **Lord's Book**, we should begin reading it every time with such thirst and interest, as though we have never read it before. Only such an approach to **the Bible, the Word of God**, will feed and quicken our soul. This idea is also contained in the answer of Jesus Christ to the adversary: "Man does not live on bread alone, but on every word that comes from the mouth of God" (Matt. 4:4). Christ Himself partook of the Word and lived by this Word. That which was life and food for the Savior, should be the same for

reveal more new truths.

An important remark concerning the relationship of the testaments: the NT picks up where the OT left off; the OT defined the problem, the NT provided the answer.

First, this paragraph clearly indicates that the expressions "Paul shows" or the "Lord shows" is essentially the same thing for Kargel. He recognizes that Scripture came into being by the means of human authors but at the same time it contains exactly what the Lord wanted to say. Second, here is another example of how Kargel identifies the Bible with the Word of God or the Lord's Book.

When approaching Scripture Kargel calls its readers to get rid of already accumulated prejudices and to look at it anew as if reading it for the first time. This way the Scripture will become freshly alive in the context of today. "Thirst and



<p>жизнью и пищей для Спасителя, должно быть тем же и для нас.</p> <p>Т 2.84 Когда Господь останавливает наше внимание на том или ином месте Писания, никогда не будем думать: "О, я это место уже знаю, больше я в нем ничего не найду и поэтому пропущу его". Не давайте этой мысли гнездиться в вашем сердце, потому что таким образом мы отрезаем путь Духу Святому давать нам новые откровения.</p> <p>Т 2.85 К сожалению, те души, которые имеют некоторые познания в Слове Божиим, являются самой твердой почвой для Евангелия. Эти "сведующие в Писании" часто бывают черствее, нежели глубоко падшие грешники, потому что словами: "это же мы все знаем" - они отдаляют себя от принятия благой вести Евангелия. И не удивительно, если им не приходит свет</p>	<p>us as well.</p> <p>When the Lord brings our attention to this or that passage of Scripture, we should never think, "Oh, I already know this passage, I will not find anything more in it, so I will pass it". Do not allow this idea to nestle in your heart, because in so doing we cut off the way for the Holy Spirit to give us new revelations.</p> <p>Unfortunately, those souls who have a little knowledge of the Word of God are the hardest soil for the gospel. These "knowledgeable in Scriptures" are frequently harder than deeply fallen sinners, because by saying "we certainly know all of this" they distance themselves from receiving the good news of the gospel. And it is not surprising that they do not have the</p>	<p>interest" are other important conditions for being "quickenened". Kargel argues from the example of Christ, "If Christ needed the Word as His daily food, so do we". Kargel does not even question the idea that what was written by Paul in his epistles to various churches is immediately applicable to modern believers.</p> <p>The importance of a fresh look at Scripture. According to Kargel, it is the Lord and the Holy Spirit who bring certain passages to our attention and give us new revelations from the Scripture.</p> <p>Importance of attitude. Those who think that they "know it all" will not find much new and exciting in the Scripture. There is great danger in "little" knowledge, which can close the door for finding more. Head knowledge is not sufficient.</p>
--	---	--



<p>свыше на прочитанное слово.</p> <p>Т 2.86 Будем же приступать к чтению Слова Божия с чистым сердцем, подобным чистому листу бумаги, и Господь, без сомнения, напишет на ней нечто драгоценное. В высшей степени необходимо всегда ожидать от Господа великого, драгоценного. Будем же мы приступать к Слову Божию, как к истинной пище и питию для души. В этом случае мы не останемся без благословения.</p> <p>Т 2.87 Однако есть еще один очень важный момент - пребывание в Слове и пребывание Слова в нас - Ин. 15, 7. О первых христианах говорится: "Они постоянно пребывали в учении Апостолов" - Деян. 2, 42. Это означало, что верующие с жадной воспринимали каждое слышанное от апостолов слово, рассуждали о нем и сами верно проводили его в жизнь.</p> <p>Т 2.88 Такую характеристику мы имеем о Марии: "Мария сохраняла все слова сии, слагая в сердце своем" - Лк. 2: 19, 51.</p> <p>Т 2.89 Как обстоит дело в этом вопросе у</p>	<p>illumination from above upon the word they read.</p> <p>Let's begin reading the Word of God with a pure heart likened to a clean sheet of paper, and the Lord, undoubtedly, will write something precious on it. It is always very important to expect great and precious things from the Lord. Let us approach the Word of God as true food and drink for our soul. In this case we will not be left without a blessing.</p> <p>However there is one more very important thing – abiding in the Word and the Word abiding in us (John. 15:7). It is said of the first Christians: "They devoted themselves to the apostles' teaching" (Acts 2: 42). This meant that the believers received with thirst every word they heard from the apostles, they discussed it, and correctly applied it to life.</p> <p>We have read the same characteristic about Mary: "Mary treasured up all these things and pondered them in her heart" (Lk. 2:19, 51).</p> <p>How are the things in this matter with us?</p>	<p>Another call for a "fresh start" when approaching Scripture. Once more Scripture is compared with spiritual food and drink. The final goal of reading and searching Scripture is not academic knowledge but rather receiving a spiritual blessing for the individual who reads it.</p> <p>As water is needed regularly, even so is Scripture.</p> <p>Kargel's definition of abiding in the Word and devotedness to the Word narrows down to hearing the Word, discussing it, and applying it to life.</p> <p>The early Christians and Mary are examples to follow.</p>
---	--	---



нас? К сожалению, можно привести немало примеров печального опыта у искренних детей Божиих в этом. Лишь только прозвучали слова глубокой проповеди, произведшей заметное впечатление на слушателей, как вдруг по окончании ее исчезло всякое благоговение. Из последующих затем бесед между слушателями можно было заключить, что оно не упало на хорошую почву.

Т 2.90 Чистые и нечистые животные по Ветхому Завету отличались друг от друга только тем, что первые из них жевали жвачку, и копыта у них были раздвоены. Все другие принадлежали к нечистым. Так же обстоит дело и с духовными христианами. Слово Божие вселяется в них обильно, они непрестанно наслаждаются им, и их хождение показывает, что они живут для Господа. Плотские же христиане, хотя и слышат Слово, но не пережевывают его и забывают слышанное.

Т 2.91 В заключение мне хотелось бы сказать: дадим место Слову Божию в наших сердцах, позволим ему довести нас до Господа, ибо "в Нем была жизнь, и жизнь была свет человеков" - Ин. 1, 4. Но если Слово Божие доводит нас только до

Unfortunately, it is possible to recall many examples of the sad experience of some sincere children of God. As soon as the words of a good sermon (which had been making a significant impression on the listeners) were finished, any wonder disappeared. From subsequent conversations with those who were present it is possible to conclude, that the words had not fallen on good soil.

The clean and unclean animals according to the Old Testament differed from each other only by two things: the clean ones chewed and ruminated, and their hoofs were divided. All the rest belonged to the unclean. It is the same story with Christians. The Word of God indwells spiritual Christians abundantly, they continuously enjoy it and their walk shows that they live for the Lord. The carnal Christians, although they hear the Word, do not chew it and forget what they heard.

In summary I would like to say: let's make room for the Word of God in our hearts. Let us allow it to bring us all the way to the Lord, because, "In him was life, and that life was the light of men" (John 1:4). But if the Word of God leads us no further than only to

Typical for Kargel's treatment of the Old Testament law. Although avoiding unclean animals for food is no longer obligatory for NT believers, Kargel treats those two classes of animals (clean and unclean) as examples of spiritual and non-spiritual Christians depending on their manner of "eating" the Word.

The proper place for Scripture is not as much in the head as it is in the heart. The final objective of the study of Scripture is to be brought to the Lord and to find light and life in



<p>известных поучений, впечатлений, то Господь не достиг еще Своей цели, и мы, несмотря на многие знания, останемся все еще в неведении и без силы.</p>	<p>certain ethical teachings and impressions, then the Lord has not achieved His goal in us yet, and we, despite our large knowledge, will remain in ignorance and without power.</p>	<p>Him, not ethical rules, emotional impressions, or head knowledge. As far as Kargel is concerned these three things by themselves would mean powerlessness and ignorance.</p>
<p>Т 2.92 "Исследуйте Писания, ибо вы думаете через них иметь жизнь вечную", - сказал Спаситель и добавил: "А они свидетельствуют о Мне" - Ин. 5, 39. Этим Господь хотел сказать: "Вы должны найти Меня. И вы найдете Меня, если будете искать в Слове, потому что этот святой Путеводитель ведет ко Мне и указывает на Меня. Но, увы, с печалью Христос должен был констатировать: "Вы не хотите придти ко Мне, чтобы иметь жизнь" - Ин. 5, 39 - 40. Иисус Христос смотрит на таких людей с глубокой печалью. В Священном Писании мы должны всегда искать лица Господня; и если мы будем это делать постоянно, то найдем Его, и у нас не будет тогда недостатка в жизни.</p>	<p>"You diligently study the Scriptures because you think that by them you possess eternal life", said the Saviour, and added, "These are the Scriptures that testify about me" (John 5:39). By this the Lord wanted to say: "You should find Me. And you will find Me, if you search the Word, because this holy Guidebook leads to Me and points to Me. But, alas, with grief Christ had to ascertain: "yet you refuse to come to me to have life" (John 5:39-40). Jesus Christ looks at such people with deep grief. In the Holy Scriptures we should always search for the face of the Lord; and if we do it constantly, we shall find Him, and as a result we will not have any insufficiency in life.</p>	<p>Kargel points to the importance of looking for and finding Christ in Scripture and consequently the eternal life in Him.</p>



Table 3

Kargel's Russian Text	English translation	Observations
<p>Грех - зло всех зол в этом мире</p> <p>Содержание:</p> <p>Грех - величайшее зло в этом мире Грех - это оскорбление и возмущение против Святого Бога Грех - смертельная духовная болезнь Грех - это моральное осквернение Грех - это приобретенная привычка Грех - это деспотичный властелин Грех - живущий в человеке закон Грех - это источник невыразимо страшных последствий</p> <p>Т 3.1 Чтобы правильно понять природу греха, необходимо обратиться к Библии, в которой Бог проливает свет на этот, дьяволом запутанный, вопрос. Господь полностью открывает нам темные стороны греха. Слово Божье говорит о нем, начиная</p>	<p>Sin as the greatest evil in this world</p> <p>Contents:</p> <p>Sin is the greatest evil in this world Sin is an insult and rebellion against the Holy God Sin is a fatal spiritual illness Sin is a moral defiling Sin is an acquired habit Sin is a despotic ruler Sin is the law living in man Sin is a source of inexpressibly terrible consequences</p> <p><u>In order to understand the nature of sin correctly, it is necessary to address the Bible, in which God sheds light on this problem</u>, confused by devil. The Lord completely opens the dark aspects of sin to us. <u>The Word of God speaks about it from</u></p>	<p>Kargel approaches the issue of sin in a systematic order. First he looks at it from God's point of view (the vertical aspect), then he looks at what sin does to people (horizontal aspect). In the end he discusses the consequences of sin.</p> <p>Dealing with one of the fundamental theological issues, the issue of sin, Karel fully relies on the Bible. The Bible, according to Kargel, is the only book in which God sheds light on the</p>



<p>с первой и кончая последней страницей. Нет другой религиозной книги, которая, как Библия, говорила бы о грехе, указывая на весь его ужас и вскрывая всю его пагубность. Библия указывает на начало греха, его стремительное распространение, гигантское развитие и его ужасные последствия, когда сатана вместе с дьявольским войском и в союзе с человечеством обратит свое оружие против Бога всевышнего и Его Помазанника Иисуса Христа и будет низвержен в бездну. Вполне понятно, что такая Книга не нравится сатане и грешному человеческому роду и они стремятся либо отстранить ее, либо лишить силы и влияния.</p>	<p><u>the first to the last page. There is no other religious book, which, like the Bible, would speak about sin</u>, pointing to its awfulness and revealing its destructiveness. The Bible points to the beginning of sin, its fast spreading, gigantic development and awful consequences. One day Satan together with diabolical army and in union with mankind will turn his armour against God the Highest and His Anointed Jesus Christ, and he will be thrown in the abyss. It is quite clear, that such <u>Book is not liked by Satan and guilty humanity</u> and they aspire either to discharge it or to deprive of its power and influence.</p>	<p>problem of sin.</p> <p>It is important for Kargel that the issue of sin is being addressed in the Bible from its beginning to the end. The importance of the issue of sin is determined by the Bible's close attention to the topic.</p>
<p>Т 3.2 Но, благодарение Господу: Он открыто и полностью развенчал гнуснейшее из всех зол с его ужаснейшими последствиями, что приводит многих к пробуждению.</p>	<p>But, praise the Lord: He openly and completely dethroned the worst of all evils with its most terrible consequences that results in awakening of many people.</p>	<p>Kargel understands that readers' approach to the Bible is emotionally charged.</p> <p>Kargel recognizes the balance of harmatology and soteriology as both are being developed in the Bible.</p>
<p>Т 3.3 Но еще большая благодарность Господу за то, что среди темной ночи гибели Он излил чудесно яркий свет милосердного Божьего спасения. Во Христе Иисусе Бог послал полное избавление от этого глубочайшего несчастья. Благая весть о спасении наполняет страницы</p>	<p>But still greater praise to the Lord that in the midst of the dark night of destruction He has shed wonderfully bright light of merciful God's salvation. In Christ Jesus God has sent complete rescue from this deepest misfortune. <u>The good tidings about salvation fill pages of the Bible from the beginning up</u></p>	<p>Kargel makes a clear statement concerning the Bible as the divine revelation.</p>



<p>Библии от начала и до конца.</p> <p>Т 3.4 А теперь, дорогой читатель, рассмотрим некоторые контуры ужасной природы греха.</p> <p>Т 3.5 В Библии, как Божественном откровении, дан исчерпывающий ответ на вопрос: "Что из себя представляет грех?"</p> <p>Грех - это оскорбление и возмущение против Святого Бога</p> <p>.....</p> <p>Т 3.6 Грех – это не только слабость человека, не только большое несчастье, заслуживающее нашего и Божьего сострадания. Грех – бесконечно большее зло. Грех есть вражда, мятеж против единого законного Господа и Бога. Грех как бы побуждает святость и справедливость Божью совершить наказание и сам как бы дает меч в Его руку для возмездия. Если бы грех не был прямым мятежом против Бога, то человек мог бы без примирения и без принесенной Христом жертвы вновь вернуться к Нему...</p> <p>Т 3.7 Господь открыл в Священном Писании, что всякому, делающему грех, будь то злодей, преступник или враг, нет</p>	<p><u>to the end.</u></p> <p>And now, dear reader, we will consider some contours of awful nature of sin.</p> <p>The exhausting answer to the question, "What is sin?" is given in <u>the Bible, which is the divine revelation.</u></p> <p>Sin is an insult and rebellion against the Holy God</p> <p>... ..</p> <p>Sin is not only man's weakness or great misfortune deserving God's compassion as well as ours. Sin is indefinitely greater evil. Sin is enmity and revolt against the only lawful Lord and God. Sin makes the holy and righteous God punish it and puts sword into His hand for retribution. If sin was not a direct revolt against God, then man could be reconciled with God without the sacrifice brought by Christ . . .</p> <p>The Lord has revealed in the Holy Scriptures that anyone doing sin whether it is a villain, a criminal or an enemy, deserves</p>	<p>Kargel seems to hold a classical Protestant approach to the issues of sin and wages for sin:</p>
--	--	---



<p>никакого другого возмездия, кроме смерти (Рим.6:23; Иез.18:20). Каждый воспротивившийся Богу человек, какого бы происхождения он не был, подвергается смерти.</p> <p>Т 3.8 Все приносимые левитами жертвы во время богослужения в храме, и каждое пророчество о Христе, взявшем на Себя грех мира, ясно показывали, что иного удовлетворения, как только наказание греха смертью, не может быть. Все, что мы читаем в Писании о возмездии, заключается в словах: "...без пролития крови не бывает прощения" (Евр.9:22). Ничем другим так ярко не доказывается то, что грех есть вражда и возмущение против Бога, как наказанием грешника смертью духовной, телесной и вечной.</p> <p>Т 3.9 То, что грех является враждой и мятежом против святого и праведного Бога, нам более всего показывает великая жертва Иисуса Христа, принесенная за грешников. Бога не могли удовлетворить ни кровь волов и козлов, ни пепел телицы (Евр.9:13), ни смерть лучших людей (Пс.48:8-9) и даже ни смерть ангелов и</p>	<p>no other wages but death (Rom. 6:23; Ezek. 18:20). Each man, opposing God, regardless of his origins is a subject to death.</p> <p>All sacrifices brought by levies during the worship in the temple, and every prophesy about Christ who would take upon Himself the sin of the world, clearly showed, that there is no other satisfaction, except for punishment of sin by death, and there could not be. Everything that we read in the Scriptures about retribution comes down to the words: ". . . without the shedding of blood there is no forgiveness" (Heb.9:22). Nothing else proves so vividly that sin is enmity and rebellion against God, as the punishment of a sinner by death spiritual, bodily and eternal.</p> <p>The truth that sin is enmity and revolt against the holy and righteous God is the best shown to us by the great sacrifice of Jesus Christ brought for sinners. God could not be satisfied with the blood of goats and bulls and the ashes of a heiferthe (Heb.9:13), neither by the death of the best people (Ps 49:7-8), nor even by the death of</p>	<p>a. The Bible is the final and the only authority concerning the matter of sin. b. All have sinned with no exception. c. All reserve death.</p> <p>When approaching the way of God's dealing with sin Kargel views things in historical perspective. He goes back to the sacrificial system of the Old Testament. Then he mentions prophesies about Christ's sacrificial death. His conclusion is that both were pointing toward the ultimate sacrifice of God's Son.</p> <p>His next step is a logical conclusion concerning the awfulness of sin. Horrible consequences of something must point to a horrible source. The sacrifice as great as the death of Christ was necessary only in the worst of situations when there</p>
---	--	--



<p>архангелов. Они не в состоянии снять оскорбление и вражду против Господа славы и Творца всего существующего. Для этого требовалась жертва несравненно большая.</p> <p>Т 3.10 Внести выкуп, который удовлетворил бы оскорбленного Бога, принести эту, несравненно большую, жертву - отдать Свою жизнь - мог только Тот, Который был равен Богу, Который "святой, непричастный злу, непорочный, отделенный от грешников и вознесенный выше небес" (Евр.7:26). Тот, Который был сиянием Его славы и образов Его Божества, - только Он мог С собой совершить очищение нашего греха. Да заметит себе каждый: не иначе как Собой! (Евр.1:3). Как совершил? - "...За претерпение смерти... - говорит Писание, - дабы Ему, по благодати Божией, вкусить смерть за всех" (Евр.2:9).</p> <p>Грех - смертельная духовная болезнь</p>	<p>Angels and Archangels. They are not capable to remove the insult and enmity against the Lord of glory and Creator of all existing. For this purpose an incomparably greater sacrifice was required.</p> <p>I Only the One who was equal to God could bring repayment, which would have satisfied the offended God. Only Christ could bring this incomparably greater sacrifice – to give His life -, ". . . holy, blameless, pure, set apart from sinners, exalted above the heavens" (Heb.7:26). He who was the shining of His glory and image of His Divinity, – only He could provide cleansing of our sin. May everyone notice: there was no other way but "by Himself"! (Heb.1:3). How has He accomplished it? ". . . because he suffered death, so that by the grace of God he might taste death for everyone" (Heb.2:9).</p> <p>Sin is a fatal spiritual illness</p>	<p>was no other way out.</p>
<p>Т 3.11 Иисус в ответ укорявшим Его фарисеям, что Он ест и пьет с мытарями и грешниками, произнес хорошо известные и</p>	<p>Answering the Pharisees who were reproaching Jesus for eating and drinking with tax-collectors and sinners Jesus</p>	<p>There is a tendency to stick to the literal meaning of the text: sin is spiritual sickness, no more, no</p>



<p>ставшие дорогими слова: "не здоровые имеют нужду во врачах, но больные" (Матф.9:12). Это не простой оборот речи, не красивая фраза, не образное выражение. Христос говорил это о грешниках, которые действительно больны.</p> <p>Т 3.12 Точно так же Христос говорил о Себе, Спасителе грешников, как о действительном, а не образном враче. Только болезнь и Его деятельность, как врача, происходили не в телесной области, но в духовной. Господь смотрел на грех как на действительную духовную болезнь, а на Себя - как на врача страдающих этой болезнью.</p> <p>Т 3.13 Это очевидно из Его слов, обращенных к фарисеям: "Пойдите, научитесь, что значит: "милости хочу, а не жертвы" (ст.13). Если бы Господь видел только одну сторону греха, каким мы видели его в предыдущей главе, если бы Господь видел во грехе только мятеж и вражду против Бога, то, чтобы остаться справедливым, Он должен был бы излить праведный гнев и отвернуться от мытарей и грешников или дать достойную жертву за их грехи, которая искупила бы их. Достойная жертва непременно должна была пройти</p>	<p>pronounced well known and precious words: "It is not the healthy who need a doctor, but the sick" (Matt.9:12). <u>This is not a simple figure of speech, a beautiful phrase, or a figurative expression.</u> Christ said it about sinners who were really sick.</p> <p>The same way <u>Christ spoke about Himself, the Saviour of sinners, as about real, not a figurative doctor. However illness and His activity, as a doctor, occurred not in bodily area, but in spiritual one.</u> The Lord viewed sin as real spiritual illness, and He saw Himself as the doctor of those suffering from this illness.</p> <p>It is obvious from His words to the Pharisees: "But go and learn what this means: 'I desire mercy, not sacrifice'" (vs. 13). If the Lord saw only one aspect sin, which we discussed in previous chapter, if the Lord saw sin only as revolt and enmity against God, then in order to remain fair He should have poured the holy wrath and turned away from tax-collectors and sinners or given an adequate sacrifice for their sins, which would have redeemed them. The adequate sacrifice by all means should have passed through death, because enmity and</p>	<p>less. This is how Kargel interprets Jesus' metaphor of a doctor and sick.</p> <p>Although Kargel does not recognize Christ's word as figurative or metaphoric, he [Kargel] actually transfers their meaning from physical to spiritual realm.</p> <p>Balance of wrath and mercy/compassion.</p>
---	---	--



<p>через смерть, так как вражда и мятеж требуют или смерти грешника, или смерти его заместителя. Фарисеи желали, чтобы Иисус именно так и смотрел на грех, когда речь шла о грехах других людей. Но, слава Господу, Он видел и другую сторону; Он смотрел на грех как на тяжелую болезнь, и на грешников как на больных...</p> <p>Т 3.14 Если бы мы глубоко поняли, что живем среди тяжело больного рода человеческого, у которого, как сказал Господь через пророка Исаию: "Вся голова в язвах, и все сердце исчахло. От подошвы ноги до темени головы нет у него здорового места; язвы, пятна, гноящиеся раны, неочищенные и необвязанные и несмягченные елеем" (Ис.1:5-6).</p> <p>Т 3.15 Если бы мы четко представляли себе, что страшная эпидемия греха охватила всех, поразила самые благородные части тела: голову и сердце, и отсюда распространилась на каждый член тела и заразила его, и что грех есть как раз та язва, ходящая во мраке, зараза,</p>	<p>revolt require either death of a sinner or death of his substitute. The Pharisees wished that Jesus had looked at sin their way, when sins of other people were concerned. But, praise to the Lord, He saw another aspect of sin; He looked at sin <u>as</u> bad illness, and at sinners <u>as</u> at patients . . .</p> <p>If we could only deeper understand that we live among seriously ill humankind. The Lord describes its condition through the prophet Isaiah, "Your whole head is injured, your whole heart afflicted. From the sole of your foot to the top of your head there is no soundness – only wounds and welts and open sores, not cleansed or bandaged or soothed with oil" (Is.1:5-6).</p> <p>If we could only imagined that the terrible epidemic of sin has got hold all people and has struck the most noble parts of a body: head and heart, and from there spread to every other part of the body and infected it, and that <u>sin is just like the pestilence that stalks in the darkness, and the plague that</u></p>	<p>Kargel interprets the passage from the prophet Isaiah as referring to a spiritual, not physical problem that is in a metaphorical way. It seems that his failure to recognize the metaphor in sin-illness, doctor-savior comparisons simply means the following: these comparisons re made not to decorate the speech but to bring fourth a very serous point.</p> <p>Interesting application of the passage from Psalm 90. Kagrel likens all the horrors frightening the author of the Psalm to the destructive effects of sin-disease. Here he does not appeal to a biblical metaphor but uses a</p>
---	--	---



опустошающая в полдень, от которой падают тысячи и десятки тысяч (Пс.90:6-7), то в противоположность гордому духу фарисеев, с каким сочувствием и жалостью мы творили бы, как наш Учитель, дела милосердного самарянина! С какой убедительной силой старались побудить несчастных больных грешников принять это драгоценное единственное лекарство!

Т 3.16 О результатах его применения говорят пророк и Апостол следующее; **"...ранами Его мы исцелились"** (Ис. 53:5 и 1 Петр. 2:24). Мы продолжали бы эту благословенную работу до тех пор, пока многие грешники могли бы сказать с Иаковом; **"...сохранилась душа моя"** (Быт.32:30), (В переводе М. Лютера: **"выздоровела душа моя"**.)

Т 3.17 В Библии грех многократно называется болезнью. Господь говорит о **пораненных и больных овцах Израиля, которых не перевязывали и не**

destroys at midday, from which thousands ten thousand fall (Ps. 91:6-7), then unlike the proud Pharisees we would do works of merciful Samaritan with great sympathy and pity, as our Teacher did! What convincing force we would have trying to impel the unfortunate sick sinners to accept this sole precious medicine!

The prophet and the Apostle tell about the results of its application the following, "... by his wounds we are healed" (Is. 53:5 and 1 Pet. 2:24). We would continue this blessed work until many sinners would tell along with Jacob, "... my life was spared" (Gen. 32:30), (In translation of M. Luther "my soul has recovered").

In the Bible sin is repeatedly referred to as illness. The Lord speaks about the sick and injured sheep of Israel who were not healed or bound up (Ezek. 34:4) and promises: "I

description of otherwise literal horrors in order to create a metaphor of his own.

Then he proceeds to using the parable of good Samaritan, implying that the medicine used by him can be compared to the blood of Christ. He does not spell it all out assuming that his readers are capable of understanding of what he meant. Kargel seems to be penetrated by the biblical language and imagery to the point that he starts using it subconsciously.

Kargel alludes to Jacob's words after he fought with the Lord associating life with salvation

Kargel makes use of other translations (in this case the one made by Luther) which seem to bring across the point more vividly.

In Kargel's view things that are repeatedly referred to in the Bible seem to bear more weight.



<p>врачевали (Иез.34:4) и обещает: "пораненую перевяжу, и больную укреплю" (ст.16).</p>	<p>will bind up the injured and strengthen the weak" (vs. 16).</p>	<p>Kargel attributes the passage from the prophet Ezekiel to the Lord. For him the Bible is clearly God's Word.</p>
<p>Т 3.18 Давид говорит о своих грехах: "Смердят, гноятся раны мои от безумия моего" (Пс.37:6) и многократно взывает: "...помилуй меня, исцели душу мою..." (Пс.6:3; 40:5).</p>	<p>David speaks about his sins, "My wounds fester and are loathsome because of my sinful folly" (Ps. 38:6) and repeatedly cries out, "... O LORD, have mercy on me; heal me" (Ps. 6:2; 41:4).</p>	<p>Speaking of sin as spiritual illness Kargel points out to a number of examples and evidence throughout the Bible emphasizing and reemphasizing the comparison of sin and illness. This is typical for his style of writing and the way of thinking.</p>
<p>Т 3.19 В Писании спасение души часто выражено словом "исцеление": "Господи, Боже мой! я воззвал к Тебе, и Ты исцелил меня... Ты вывел из ада душу мою и оживил меня..." (Пс.29:3-4).</p>	<p>In the Scripture the salvation of soul is frequently expressed by the word "healing": " O LORD my God, I called to you for help and you healed me. . . you brought me up from the grave; you spared me from going down into the pit" (Ps. 30:2-3).</p>	
<p>Т 3.20 "Я видел пути его и исцелю его... Я исполню слово: мир, мир дальнему и ближнему, говорит Господь, и исцелю его" (Ис.57:18-19).</p>	<p>"I have seen his ways, but I will heal him . . . Peace, peace, to those far and near," says the LORD. "And I will heal them." (Is. 57:18-19).</p>	
<p>Т 3.21 Удаление и прощение греха также характеризуется Господом как исцеление: "Я сказал: Господи! помилуй меня, исцели душу мою, - ибо согрешил я пред Тобою"</p>	<p>The removal and pardon of sin also is characterized as healing by the Lord, "I said, "O LORD, have mercy on me; heal me, for I have sinned against you." (Ps. 41:4). "But</p>	



<p>(Пс.40:5). "Но Он изъязвлен был за грехи наши... и ранами Его мы исцелились" (Ис.53:5). Господь призывает Израиль: "Возвратитесь, мятежные дети: Я исцелю вашу непокорность" (Иер.3:22) и т. д.</p>	<p>he was pierced for our transgressions. . . and by his wounds we are healed" (Is.53:5). The Lord calls Israel, ""Return, faithless people; I will cure you of backsliding." (Jer.3:22) and so forth.</p>	
<p>Т 3.22 Грех для духа - то же самое, что болезнь для тела. Поэтому так часто Ветхий и Новый Заветы упоминают о них вместе. В книге Исход Господь ставит Израилю одно условие: "Если ты будешь слушаться гласа Господа, Бога твоего... то не наведу на тебя ни одной из болезней, которые навел Я на Египет; ибо Я Господь, целитель твой" (15:26). Следовательно, внутренняя и внешняя болезнь находятся в тесной связи с грехом. Об этом также говорится и в книге Второзаконие 7:12,15.</p>	<p><u>Sin for spirit is the same as illness for body. Therefore so often the Old and the New Testaments mention them together.</u> In the book of Exodus the Lord gives to Israel one condition: "If you listen carefully to the voice of the LORD your God . . . I will not bring on you any of the diseases I brought on the Egyptians, for I am the LORD, who heals you." (15:26). Hence, internal and external illnesses are in close connection with a sin. The book of Deuteronomy.7:12,15 also speaks about it</p>	<p>Having built the case for sin being a spiritual illness, Kargel takes it further and points out to the possible of literal, not only metaphorical connection of sin and physical illnesses.</p>
<p>Т 3.23 Одновременно о грехе и болезни говорит и псалмопевец Давид (Пс.102:3-4).</p>	<p>The Psalmist David also speaks about sin and illness simultaneously (Ps. 103:3-4).</p>	
<p>Т 3.24 Грех и болезнь поставлены рядом и в славной 53-й главе книги пророка Исайи (ст.4-5).</p>	<p>Sin and illness are mentioned side by side in the famous 53-rd chapter of the book of prophet Isaiah (vs. 4-5).</p>	
<p>Т 3.25 В Новом Завете грех представлен как более глубокое зло и как причина наших телесных болезней. Вероятно, поэтому</p>	<p><u>In the New Testament sin is shown even as greater evil and a reason of our bodily illnesses.</u> Probably, this is why the great</p>	<p>Kargel takes notice of how he Old Testament doctrine of sin finds its progression and new emphasis in</p>



<p>великий Врач, когда принесли к Нему расслабленного, начал с исцеления его от духовной болезни (Лук.5:18-20). Других больных после телесного исцеления Христос серьезно предупреждал не грешить, чтобы не случилось с ними чего-либо худшего (Иоан.5:14)...</p>	<p>Physician, when a paralytic was brought to Him, started from healing him from spiritual illness (Luk. 5:18-20). Other patients after bodily healing were seriously warned by Christ not to sin, so that something worse may not happen to them (John.5:14) . . .</p>	<p>the New Testament. He is looking for both continuation and differences.</p>
<p>Т 3.26 Появление греха в сердце всегда сопровождается ужасным приговором: "В день, в который ты вкусишь от него, смертью умрешь" (Быт.2:17). Развитие греха очень верно описано у Апостола Иакова: "Похоть же, зачавши, рождает грех, а сделанным грех рождает смерть" (Иак.1:15).</p>	<p>The occurrence of sin in heart is always accompanied by a terrifying verdict: "for when you eat of it you will surely die" (Gen. 2:17). The development of sin is very truthfully described by the Apostle James: "Then, after desire has conceived, it gives birth to sin; and sin, when it is full-grown, gives birth to death" (Jac. 1:15).</p>	<p>Christ's healing physical illnesses along with forgiving sins (as well as his warnings not to sin in order to stay physically healthy) is another argument towards the close connection of the both.</p>
<p>Т 3.27 Самый злостный из всех ядов первоначально проник в полную и чистую жизнь наших прародителей и распространился на все их потомство. Укрепляющийся за счет наших грехов, этот яд действует до сего часа, внося растление и гибель в дух, душу и тело. Поэтому мы читаем о смерти, вошедшей грехом в мир (Рим.5:12) и царствующей посредством греха (Рим.5:17,21). Мы читаем, что грех,</p>	<p>Most malicious of all poisons has originally penetrated full and pure life of our forefathers and spread to all their offspring. Feeding on our sins this poison works till this day bringing corruption and destruction to spirit, soul and body. Therefore we read about death having entered the world through sin (Rom. 5:12) and reigning by means of sin (Rom. 5:17, 21). We read, that sin working in us, brings a fruit of death</p>	<p>Kargel looks for the origin of sin in the Bible. Historically he finds the origin of sin of the whole humanity in the garden of Eden. Individually, he sees the origin of sin in human desires.</p>
		<p>According to Kargel all people are subjects to sin with no exception. Consequence of sin is always death.</p>
		<p>Kargel holds a holistic approach to the nature of sin: it destroys spirit, soul and body.</p>



<p>действующий в нас, приносит плод смерти (Рим.7:5), что живущие по плоти живут по закону греха и смерти (Рим.8:2).</p> <p>Т 3.28 Значит, грех не просто болезнь, но смертельная болезнь...</p> <p>Т 3.29 Во время земной жизни нашего Господа были слепые и слепорожденные, глухие и глухонемые и т. д. Не только слабость и паралич были последствиями болезни, но люди были лишены способности видеть, слышать, говорить. Что представляет из себя человек, если он не в состоянии воспринимать мысли других, выраженные словами или знаками, а также передать свои мысли другим, читать в глазах или на лицах других их мысли?</p> <p>Т 3.30 Если физическая утрата этих способностей является тяжелым уроном, то насколько хуже тому, в душе которого грех произвел тот же урон? Это подтверждают Писание и опыт. Грех похищает у человека его духовные чувства и то же самое производит с возрожденными, если они опять дают место греху. Разве не буквальная правда написана о многих грешниках в книге пророка Иеремии:</p>	<p>(Rome 7:5); that those living according to the flesh live under the law of sin and death (Rom. 8:2).</p> <p>This means that sin is not only an illness, but a fatal illness...</p> <p>During the earthly life of our Lord there were blind, deaf, deaf and dumb people, etc. Not only weakness and paralysis were consequences of illness, but people were deprived of abilities to see, to hear, to speak. Think of a man who is not capable to conceive ideas of others, expressed by words or signs, and also to transfer his ideas to others, to read thoughts in the eyes or on the faces of others?</p> <p>If the physical loss of these abilities is a heavy loss, how far worse is the condition of a man, in whose soul the sin has caused similar loss? <u>The Scripture and experience confirm it.</u> Sin steals from man his spiritual feelings and the same happens with a born again person, if he again gives room to sin. Is it not the <u>literal truth</u> that is written about many sinners in the book of the prophet Jeremiah: "... people, who have eyes but do</p>	<p>Kargel continues his analogy of physical illness and sin. What illness does to the body sin does to the spirit.</p> <p>Arguing from experience is not excluded for Kargel.</p> <p>As in the case with sin-illness analogy, Kargel talks about</p>
---	--	--



"...народ... у которого есть глаза, а не видит, у которого есть уши, а не слышит" (5:21), и что до сего дня есть духовные стражи, как немые псы (Ис.56:10)?

Т 3.31 Да, Святой Дух свидетельствует, что не спасутся те, "...у которых бог века сего ослепил умы, чтобы для них не воссиял свет благовествования о славе Христа..." (2Кор.4:4). "...Ушами с трудом слышат, и глаза свои сомкнули, да не увидят глазами и не услышат ушами, и не уразумеют сердцем и да не обратятся, чтобы Я исцелил их" (Матф.13:15). Именно поэтому Христос сделался Врачом и пришел к нам! Поэтому направляются Его посланники для благовествования о Христе, чтобы те, кто послушает их, исцелились. Читайте: "Послал слово Свое, и исцелил их..." (Пс.106:20); "Открыть глаза им..." (Деян.26:18) и "...уши глухих отверзутся... и язык немого будет петь..." (Ис.35:5-6).

Т 3.32 Разве те, которые стараются приобрести души для Христа, не находили, что **духовный слух** у некоторых людей

not see, who have ears but do not hear" (5:21), and until this day there are watchmen like mute dogs (Is. 56:10)?

Yes, the Holy Spirit tells that those, in whom "the god of this age has blinded the minds of unbelievers, so that they cannot see the light of the gospel of the glory of Christ..." (2 Cor. 4:4) won't be saved. "... they hardly hear with their ears, and they have closed their eyes. Otherwise they might see with their eyes, hear with their ears, understand with their hearts and turn, and I would heal them" (Matt. 13:15). For this reason Christ has become the Doctor and has come to us! For this reason his witnesses go to evangelize about Christ so that those who will listen to them would be healed. Read: "He sent forth his word and healed them..." (Ps. 107:20); "to open their eyes..." (Acts. 26:18) and "... the ears of the deaf unstopped . . . and the mute tongue shout for joy" (Is. 35:5-6).

Did not those, who tried to gain souls for Christ, find that some people's spiritual hearing was absolutely gone? Others,

spiritual blindness and deafness as "literal truth". Again, it seem that Kargel's understanding of "literal" is "very serious".

For Kargel the biblical truth is not an abstract proposition. It is the call to action.



<p>абсолютно пропал? Иные, хотя и имеют уши, чтобы слышать, все же не слышат, многие годы до них не доходит нежный зов любви, и гром закона не достигает их сердца. Посторонние замечают, как Бог говорит этим душам, они же сами ничего не слышат.</p>	<p>though they have ears to hear, do not hear. For many years gentle call of love does not reach them, and the thunder of the law does not reach their hearts either. Outsiders notice how God speaks to these souls, but they hear nothing.</p>	
<p>Т 3.33 То же самое происходит и с внутренним зрением. Годами проливающийся на них чудеснейший свет не дает ни искорки ясности в ночи их сердца. При этом мы говорим не о язычниках, пребывающих в тени смертной, а о людях, которые с детства знают Священное Писание. Вспомним, что они обворованы сатаной, и мы должны их во что бы то ни стало привести к великому Врачу, дабы Он произнес над ними Свое "эффафа" (что означает "Отверзись") и коснулся их духовных глаз и ушей. Вместо этого мы сердимся на их глухоту, готовы оставить их, говорим о них с пренебрежением, хотя заповедь Господа гласит: "Не злословь глухого, и пред слепым не клади ничего, чтобы преткнуться ему; бойся Бога твоего..." (Лев.19:14).</p>	<p>The same happens with people's internal sight. For years the most wonderful light shines upon them but it does not produce a single spark in the night of their hearts. Here we do not speak about pagans abiding in the shadow of death, and about people who know the Holy Scriptures since childhood. Let us remember that they are robbed by the Satan, and we should by all means bring them to the great Doctor, who He would pronounce His "effafa" over them (which means "open up") and touch their spiritual eye and ears. Instead of it we become angry with their deafness and are ready to leave them. We speak about them with disregard, though the precept the Lord says: "Do not curse the deaf or put a stumbling block in front of the blind, but fear your God. . ." (Lev.19:14).</p>	<p>Having "proved" that sin is spiritual illness and that people can be spiritually blind and deaf Kargel rebukes those who despise sinners referring to the passage of Scripture that prohibits unworthy behavior towards deaf and blind.</p>
<p>Т 3.34 Как ни больно об этом говорить, но</p>	<p>No matter how painful it is to say that, but</p>	<p>Literal "ears" and "mouths" from</p>



грех разрушает и вновь полученные духовные способности верующего. **"Ухо слышащее и глаз видящий - и то и другое создал Господь"** (Притч.20:12). **"И вложил в уста мои новую песнь – хвалу Богу нашему"** (Пс.39:4). Пусть каждый знает: едва грех приобретает в человеке место, даже в малом, духовные зрение и слух, именно эти драгоценные чувства, поражаются в первую очередь.

Т 3.35 С гласа Господнего началась наша духовная жизнь, с неспособностью Его слушать исчезают духовная сила, рост. Действующее Божье правило остается неизменным; **"Приклоните ухо ваше... и жива будет душа ваша..."** (Ис.55:3). Но стоит впустить грех, и способность слышать голос Господа постепенно и незаметно утрачивается. Однажды упустив Божье нежное и любящее приглашение к общению с Ним, упустив Его внутренний зов к тому, чтобы **внимать** поучениям, предупреждениям или обличениям, упустив Его предупреждения о бдительности, труде, молитве или, отложив и недослышав, потому что другие призывы кажутся более важными, - мы расчищаем дорогу для второго раза, когда станет легче быть равнодушным к голосу Господа или

sin destroys newly received spiritual abilities of the believer as well. "Ears that hear and eyes that see – the LORD has made them both" (Pr. 20:12). "He put a new song in my mouth, a hymn of praise to our God" (Ps. 40:3). Let everyone know: as soon as sin gets a place in a man, even in a small way, spiritual sight and hearing, these precious abilities, are getting damaged first of all.

Our spiritual life started with the voice of the Lord. With inability to hear His voice our spiritual power and growth disappear. The effective God's rule remains immutable; "Give ear and come to me; hear me, that your soul may live..." (Is.55:3). But as soon as sin is let in, and ability to hear the voice of the Lord gradually and imperceptibly is being lost. Having once missed God's gentle and loving invitation to fellowship with Him, having missed His internal call to give heed to His teachings, warnings or rebukes, having missed His warning concerning watchfulness, work, prayer or, having postponed and failed to hear, because other appeals seem more important, - we ease the way for the second time, when it becomes easier to be indifferent to the voice of the Lord or to prefer other voices to his,

Proverbs and Psalms Kargel treats as spiritual properties of believers.



предпочсть ему другие голоса, что, в свою очередь, делает сердце жестоким и неспособным к слушанию. Ухо еще существует, но из-за греха оно заболело и постепенно оглохло так, что не слышит самые сильные звуки. И мы спрашиваем; "Почему Господь продолжает говорить, если Его все равно не слушают?"

Т 3.36 Так же бывает и с **духовным зрением**. Какое ясное, наполненное светом, зрение у всех, кого Господь очистил от грехов! Но как затуманивается зрение, когда они забывают об очищении и утрачивают сознание безупречной непорочности, которую даровал им Христос и которую они потеряли по причине внутреннего осквернения и нечистого хождения. О них говорит Апостол Петр, что **они слепы и закрыли глаза** (2Петр.1:9). Как много они теряют от того, что не могут, как прежде, **взирать на Господа**, потому что это доступно только чистым сердцем (Матф.5:8). Как мало освещают их путь откровения Божьи. Познание Бога и Иисуса Христа, познание Его Слова после многих лет или совсем исчезло, или так ничтожно, что не может быть названо ростом, потому что это только собирание крупиц знаний без жизни и силы.

that, in turn, hardens our heart and makes it unable to hearing. An ear is still there, but because of sin it became ill and gradually deaf so that it does not hear the strongest sounds. And we ask; "Why does the Lord continue to speak, if He is not listened to?"

Similar thing happens to spiritual sight. What a clear, lighted sight have those people whom the Lord has cleared of their sins! But as sight becomes foggy, when they forget about cleansing and lose the consciousness of faultless uprightness, which was bestowed to them by Christ and which they have lost because of internal defiling and unclean walk. Apostle Peter speaks about them, that they are blind and have closed their eyes (2 Pet.1:9). How much they lose because they cannot look at the Lord as they could before. We know that only those who are pure in heart (Matt.5:8) can see the Lord. How little does the light of God's revelations lights up their path. The knowledge of God and Jesus Christ, the knowledge of His Word after many years either absolutely disappears or becomes so insignificant, that it can not be named growth. What they do is nothing but picking

Actually the analogy of physical and spiritual hearing and sight is widely used in the Bible. Kargel only picks it up.



<p>Грех - это моральное осквернение</p> <p>Т 3.37 ...Грех - это осквернение. Грех - это то, что противно Богу, что вызывает у Него глубочайшее отвращение. Вовсе не случайно и нисколько не преувеличивая. Писание во многих местах называет грех мерзостью в очах Божьих. Нередко этим словом называется и сам грешник (Лев.18:24-30; 19:7; Втор.18:9-12 и т.д.). Поэтому каждый грех, да и всякий делающий грех, отвратительны перед Богом настолько, что Он отворачивается от них. Грех есть загрязнение и нечистота, в которой ни здесь, ни в вечности никто не может стоять перед Богом. Об этом говорит и Ветхий Завет (Зах.3:3-51) и Новый (Откр.3:4).</p> <p>Т 3.38 Грех является не только враждой, влекущей в погибель, не только болезнью, обязательно приводящей к смерти, но и мерзким осквернением, делающим абсолютно невозможным приближение человека к Богу. Снять это осквернение можно только покаянием и очищением, которое совершает Бог. Писание</p>	<p>up crumbs of knowledge without life and power.</p> <p>Sin is a moral defiling</p> <p>. . . Sin is a defiling. Sin is detestable to God and it causes His deepest disgust. It is not by chance and not at all exaggeration that Scripture in many places calls sin detestable in God's eyes. Quite often this word refers to a sinner as well (Lev.18:24-30 19:7; Deut.18:9-12 etc.). Therefore each sin and anybody committing sin are detestable to God so much that He turns away from them. Sin is pollution and uncleanness, in which neither here, nor in eternity anybody can face God. Both the Old (Zack. 3:3-51) and New Testament (Rev. 3:4) speak about that.</p> <p>Sin is not only enmity leading to perishing; it is not only illness unavoidably resulting in death, but it is also detestable defiling making it absolutely impossible for a man to approach God. It is possible to remove this defiling only by repentance and cleansing performed by God. <u>The Scripture repeatedly testifies to it.</u> Let's recollect, for example,</p>	<p>For Kargel sin is horrible because the Bible says that God hates it. Kargel's view of sin is extremely serious and negative.</p> <p>In Kargel's opinion the case is stronger if both testaments speak about it.</p> <p>Determining the properties of sin Kargel goes back to the Scripture. For instance, stating that sin is "detestable" for God Kargel points out hat "Scripture repeatedly testifies to it". Then he lists a number of examples from both New and Old Testaments.</p>
--	--	--



многократно свидетельствует об этом. Вспомним, например, как отвратителен был Давиду его грех именно как осквернение перед Богом. В одной из своих молитв покаяния он просит: **"Многократно омой меня от беззакония моего, и от греха моего очисти меня... Окропи меня иссопом, и буду чист..."** (Пс.50:4-9).

Т 3.39 Израиль, живущий во грехах и все же дерзко предстоящий перед Господом с жертвами, был отвергнут Богом. Отвергнуты были его жертвы, служение, праздники и молитвы. "...Ваши руки полны крови",- говорит Господь,- то есть запятнаны, осквернены, так что Бог ничего от них не может принять. Затем Бог советует им: **"Омойтесь, очиститесь;** удалите злые деяния ваши от очей Моих... - и добавляет: ...Тогда придите, и рассудим..." (Ис.1:15-16,18).

Т 3.40 В послании Коринфянам Апостол Павел говорит, что некоторые из коринфян были грубыми грешниками, но произошла чудная перемена, которую он описывает так: "И такими были некоторые из вас, но **омылись**, но освятились, но оправдались именем Господа нашего Иисуса Христа и Духом Бога нашего" (1Кор.6:11).

how detestable David's sin became to him especially when he saw it as defiling before God. In one of his prayers of repentance he asks: "Cleanse me with hyssop, and I will be clean; wash me, and I will be whiter than snow" (Ps. 51:4-9).

Israel lived in sins and still dared to bring sacrifices before the Lord was rejected by God. The Lord rejected her sacrifices, ministry, feasts and prayers. "... Your hands are full of blood" said the Lord, that is stained, defiled that God cannot accept anything from them. Then God advises them, "wash and make yourselves clean. Take your evil deeds out of my sight!" and adds, "Come now, let us reason together... " (Is.1:15-16,18).

In the epistle to Corinthians Apostle Paul says that some of the Corinthian believers used to be terrible sinners, but a wonderful change took place, which he describes in the following words: "And that is what some of you were. But you were washed, you were sanctified, you were justified in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ and by the

Kargl balances impurity of sin of cleansing of the blood of Christ, offence and forgiveness, death and life.



<p>Т 3.41 Апостол Иоанн говорит, что Христос возлюбил нас и омыл нас от грехов наших Кровью Своей. И в Откровении он свидетельствует, что право стоять перед престолом Божиим имеют только те, "Которые ...омыли... и убелили одежды свои кровию Агнца" (1:5; 7:13-15). Поэтому еще в ветхозаветные времена ожидали и говорили о Крови Христа как об источнике "для омытия греха и нечистоты" (Зах.13:1).</p> <p>Т 3.42 Эти и многие другие стихи Священного Писания очень наглядно показывают, что грех как нечистота и осквернение особо отвратителен Богу. Если грех как возмущение противостоит Богу, если грех как болезнь выступает против Его жизни, то грех как нечистота и осквернение противостоит Его святости и вызывает у Бога отвращение. Может быть, по этой причине в послании Евреям, где возвышенно говорится о Сыне Божьем и Его славе, более явно говорится о грехе как о пятне и нечистоте. "Бог... в последние дни... говорил нам в Сыне, Которого поставил наследником всего, чрез Которого и веки сотворил. Сей, будучи сияние славы</p>	<p>Spirit of our God" (1 Cor. 6:11).</p> <p>Apostle John says that Christ has loved us and washed us from our sins by His blood. And in the book of Revelation he testifies, that only those who "have washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb" (1:5; 7:13-15) have the right to face the holy throne of God. That is why even back in the Old Testament times people expected and spoke about blood of Christ as the source "to cleanse them from sin and impurity" (Zec.13:1).</p> <p>These and many other verses of the Holy Scripture very vividly show that sin as impurity and defiling is especially detestable to God. If sin as revolt confronts God, if sin as illness acts against His life, then sin as impurity and defiling contradicts His holiness and causes disgust in God. May be it is for this reason in the epistle to Hebrews, where it is loftily spoken about the Son of God and His glory it is more obviously spoken about sin as a stain and impurity. "God . . . in these last days . . . has spoken to us by his Son, whom he appointed heir of all things, and through whom he made the universe. The Son is the radiance of God's glory and the exact representation of his being,</p>	<p>Kargel interprets Old Testament prophesy about cleansing of sins as referring to the work of Jesus Christ.</p> <p>Kargel does not view sin in and of itself. He defines it purely from what it does to God and from god's point of view.</p>
--	--	---



<p>и образ ипостаси Его и держа все словом силы Своей, совершив Собою очищение грехов наших, воссел одесную (престола) величия на высоте" (Евр.1:1-3).</p> <p>...</p> <p>Грех – приобретенная привычка</p> <p>...</p> <p>Грех – это деспотичный властелин</p> <p>Т 3.43 ...Рассматривая далее человека, мы придем к выводу, что и в глубинах человеческого существа пребывает и господствует грех. Господь часто объединяет мысли, желания, решения одним словом; сердце, высказывая Свое свидетельство о нем.</p> <p>Т 3.44 Он осмотрел этот "центр движения" перед наступлением потопа и нашел в нем никогда не успокаивающуюся мастерскую всякого зла. Это заставило Господа осудить все человечество на гибель. Само собой разумеется, если основной источник проявления жизни человека отравлен насквозь, то таким же будет все, исходящее из него. Единственным средством</p>	<p>sustaining all things by his powerful word. After he had provided purification for sins, he sat down at the right hand of the Majesty in heaven" (Heb.1:1-3).</p> <p>...</p> <p>Sin is an acquired habit</p> <p>...</p> <p>Sin is a despotic ruler</p> <p>. . . Examining man further, we will come to a conclusion that sin dominates even in depths of a human being. The Lord frequently speaks of ideas, desire, and decisions using one word - heart, when voicing His witness about it.</p> <p>He examined this "centre of motion" before the flood and has found in it never calming down workshop of all evil. It has forced the Lord to condemn all mankind to perishing. It is self-evident that if the basic source of man's life is poisoned through, then everything coming out of it would be the same. The only means to stop this corruption was its destruction.</p>	<p>Kargel argues from both biblical history (the flood) and biblical propositions (he refers to a number of verses where the condition of human heart is described as evil, wicked, corrupted, perverse, etc.)</p>
---	--	--



предупреждения этого растления было уничтожение его.

Т 3.45 Об этом основном источнике всех проявлений человека, о сердце, в самом первом высказывании Бога говорится: "...все мысли и помышления сердца их были зло во всякое время" (Быт.6:5). Как хотелось, чтобы каждый читатель этого стиха Священного Писания обратил особое внимание на эти Божественные слова. Только тогда он узнает, каково на самом деле его сердце и сердце каждого человека. Обратите внимание: **"...все мысли и помышления сердца их были зло"**, то есть представления, воображения, размышления, стремления, сравнения, которые бесконечным потоком изливаются из человека и являются началом каждого поступка, каждого слова и дела - были зло,- говорит Господь. Это зло не с некоторыми исключениями, и распространяется оно так широко, что Господь, не делая абсолютно никакого различия, добавляет: **"...зло во всякое время"**. На какое полное и единственное господство греха в сердце человека указывает здесь Господь! Правда, такое плохое состояние людей было в древнее время, за которым непосредственно последовал потоп.

It is spoken about this basic source of all manifestations of man, about heart, in the very first statement of God, "... every inclination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil all the time" (Gen. 6:5). I want so much every reader of this verse of the Holy Scriptures pay close attention to these Divine words. Only then he can see what his heart and the heart of every man are really like. Take a notice, "... every inclination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil all the time ", that is, imagination, reflection, comparisons, which by an unbounded flow pour out of man and are the beginning of each act, each word and deed - were evil, - the Lord says. It was evil without exceptions, and it spread so widely, that the Lord without making any distinction adds: "... evil all the time". The Lord points out here to complete and sole domination of sin in the heart of man! It is true that people were in such bad condition in the ancient time, which was directly followed by the flood. The Lord destroyed all mankind, having left only eight righteous souls.

Kargel sees the source of sin in human heart. Then without mentioning the term "total depravity" he basically argues for that.



Господь уничтожил все человечество, оставив только восемь праведных душ.

Т 3.46 После уничтожения безбожного рода, когда еще пылали огни жертв, принесенных Ноем, и вокруг них с благодарностью стояли эти восемь спасенных душ, к нам снова доносится суждение Божье о человеческом сердце и почти в тех же словах, как и в первый раз, только с добавлением: "...**зло от юности его...**" (Быт.8:21).

Т 3.47 Божье суждение о сердце человека по всей Библии следующее: **ожесточенное сердце** (Исх.4:21; 7:13,23; 8:32), **нечистое сердце** (Пс.50:12), **зablуждающееся сердце** (Пс.94:10), **сердце развращенное** (Пс.100:4), **коварное сердце** (Притч.17:20), **сердце, кующее злые замыслы** (Притч.6:18), **сердце исчахло** (Ис.1:5), **необрезанное сердце** (Иер.9:26; Деян.7:51), **сердце, на скрижалях которого начертан грех** (Иер.17:1), **лукавое и крайне испорченное** (Иер.17:9), **каменное сердце** (Иез.36:26).

Т 3.48 В Новом Завете суждение о сердце человеческого значительно обострено: оно

After destruction of a godless generation, when fire of sacrifices brought by Noah was still burning and around there were gathered these eight rescued souls filled with gratitude, the judgment of God about human heart is heard by us again and in the same words, as at the first time, only with an addition: "...evil from childhood..." (Gen. 8:21).

God's judgment about human heart throughout the whole Bible is the following: hardened heart (Ex.4:21; 7:13,23; 8:32), unclean heart (Ps. 51:10) heart that goes astray (Ps. 95:10), corrupted heart (Ps. 101:4), perverse heart (Prob. 17:20), heart that devises wicked schemes (Prob. 6:18), injured heart (Is.1:5), uncircumcised heart (Jer.9:26; Acts 7:51), with sin engraved on the tablets of their hearts heart (Jer.17:1), deceitful above all things and beyond cure (Jer.17:9), stone heart (Ezek 36:26).

In the New Testament the judgment about human heart is considerably intensified: it

Kargel sees the dynamic and progression of doctrines from the



может быть **далекое от Бога** (Матф.15:8), **из него исходят злые помыслы, убийства, прелюбодеяния** (Матф.15:19), оно занято сатаной (Деян.5:3), **не право перед Богом** (Деян.3:21), **омраченное, бессмысленное сердце, преданное в похотях нечистоте** (Рим1:21,24), **приучено к любостыжанию** (2Петр.2:14) и т, д. Однажды поверивший Богу на основании этих свидетельств о нашем сердце не ужаснется ли от того глубокого господства греха?

...

can be far from God (Matt.15:8), out of the heart come evil thoughts, murder, adultery, sexual immorality, theft, false testimony, slander (Matt.15:19), it is so filled by Satan (Acts 5:3), it is not right before God (Acts 3:21), foolish and darkened hearts, given over in the sinful desires of their hearts to sexual impurity (Rom. 1:21,24), accustomed to greed (2 Pet. 2:14), etc. Won't those who once believed God on the basis of these testimonies concerning the condition of our heart be terrified at that deep domination of sin?

...

Old Testament to the New Testament. Here, the idea of the wickedness of human heart is being intensified as it reoccurs in the New Testament.



Table 4

Kargel's Russian text	English translation	Mackintosh' "Notes"	Observations
<p>Т 4.0 В одной из торжественных бесед нашего Господа с иудеями, когда шла речь о Нем, как о посланном Богом Мессии, Он между прочим сказал следующие многозначительные слова: «Исследуйте Писания, ибо вы думаете чрез них иметь жизнь вечную; а они свидетельствуют о Мне» (Иоан.5:39). В те дни еще не существовало Нового Завета, который мы вместе с Ветхим теперь привыкли называть Писанием; по всей вероятности ни одна строчка его еще не была тогда написана. Потому ясно, что этими словами Иисус указывает иудеям на Ветхий Завет, как на свидетеля Своего о Нем, и если мы внимательно</p>	<p>Т 4.0 In one of his solemn conversations with the Jews, when they talked about Him as a Messiah sent by God, the Lord said very important following words, "Search the scriptures; for in them ye think ye have eternal life: and they are they which testify of me" (Jn. 5, 39). In those days the New Testament was not written yet, which today along with the Old Testament call Scripture. Most probably not a single line of the New Testament was written then. Therefore it is clear that by these words Jesus was pointing out towards the Old Testament as to the witness of Himself, and if we carefully follow His speech, we will see that He mainly</p>		<p>In the very beginning of his book Kargel presents a rationale for his approach to the Old Testament interpretation. He builds his position on the words of Jesus that the Old Testament Scriptures testify of Him. Hence, Kargel is going <u>to look for Jesus everywhere in the Old Testament, and especially in the Pentateuch.</u> According to Kargel, this special place of Pentateuch in the Christology of the Old Testament is also based on the words of Jesus who said that Moses wrote of Him. Another basis for searching for Jesus in the Old Testament is His own way of interpreting Scriptures "beginning at Moses and all the prophets" that He used in his conversation with His disciples on the way to Emmaus. Kargel mentions both passages, from John and from Luke. It seems that for Kargel the more testimonies of the same truth we find in</p>



<p>проследим всю Его речь, то увидим, что Он имел в виду главным образом Моисея, потому что, ссылаясь на него, Господь заключает речь эту следующими словами: «Ибо если бы вы верили Моисею, то поверили бы и Мне, потому что он писал о Мне. Если же его писаниям не верите, как поверите Моим словам?» (Иоан.5:46,47)». Итак Ветхий Завет и, в особенности, Моисей, по собственным словам Иисуса, свидетельствуют о Нем. И когда Он, по воскресении Своем, шел с теми двумя учениками в Эммаус, то «начав от Моисея, из всех пророков изъяснял им сказанное о Нем во всем Писании» (Лук. 24:27). Следовательно, Он указал на Себя из Ветхого Завета. Вопрос состоит в том, братья мои, «исследуем», изучаем ли мы так страницы Ветхого Завета, чтобы на самом деле Иисус был найден нами? Действительно, мы читаем главу за главой, но не углубляемся в них настоящим</p>	<p>meant Moses, because when referring to Moses the Lord finished His speech with these words, “For had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me: for he wrote of me. But if ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe my words?” (Jn. 5:46, 47). So, the Old Testament and especially Moses, according to Jesus’ own words, testify about Him. And when He after His resurrection was going with two those disciples to Emmaus, “beginning at Moses and all the prophets, he expounded unto them in all the scriptures the things concerning himself” (Luk. 24, 27). Hence, He pointed out to Himself in the Old Testament. The question, my brothers, is this, “Do we really ‘search’ and study the pages of the Old Testament in order to find Jesus?” In fact, we read one chapter after another but do not plunge into them in a real way and, as a result, do not notice many miracles, do not hear what</p>		<p>Scripture, the stronger the point.</p> <p>Since the Old Testament speaks of Jesus Kargel calls to search for Him deeply and carefully. Kargel acknowledges that it is possible to read Scripture and miss many important truths there.</p>
---	--	--	---



<p>образом и потому не замечаем многих чудес, не слышим того, что там сказано; часто наше исследование бывает неуспешно, потому что мы не производим его под руководством лучшего наставника - Духа Святого. Если б Он был нашим водителем при этом деле, то, воистину, мы всегда видели бы Иисуса, и повсюду Иисуса. «Видеть Иисуса», такова должна быть цель наших собраний по воскресеньям, в которых мне будет позволено возвещать Слово Божие. Если только будет на то Его святая воля, то мы хотели бы увидеть Его из Ветхого Завета, а главным образом из писаний Моисея. Для того, чтобы исследовать и понять все сказанное о скинии, жертвах и священстве, которые так подробно описаны Богом, мы должны приложить к этому предмету не менее внимания и расположения сердечного, как и ко всякому ясному изречению Господа и Его апостолов, потому</p>	<p>is said here. Very often our study is unsuccessful because we do not conduct it under the leadership of the best teacher – the Holy Spirit. Had He been our leader in this matter, then we would truly see Jesus and Jesus everywhere. “To see Jesus” should become a goal of our meetings on Sundays, when I am allowed to preach the Word of God. If there is His holy will, we would like to see Jesus in the Old Testament and mainly in the books of Moses. In order to study and understand everything that is said about the tabernacle, offerings, and priesthood, that are in such great detail described by God, we should apply to this topic no less attention and cordial affection than to any clear statement of the Lord and His apostles, because of these things, although in a form of pictures, show us Him in a beautiful light” (1908:1-2).</p>		<p>There is an assumption that the Holy Spirit plays a crucial role in the illumination of the meaning of the text.</p> <p>The goal of the Scripture study is to see Jesus and see Him everywhere. This approach unites Kargel with Luther.</p> <p>Another precondition of finding Christ in the Old Testament is “God’s holy will”.</p> <p>Since “Christ is to be found in the Old Testament” an important question is: how exactly Kargel is going to do so? First of all, by diligence and careful study of the text. Kargel states that the truths about Christ in the Pentateuch are given in a form of pictures and understanding their meaning is not going to be easy.</p>
---	--	--	--



<p>что они, хотя и картинно, но все же в чудном свете, представляют нам Его” (1908:2).</p> <p>Беседа восьмая. Священные цвета.</p> <p>Исх. 25, 3. «Вот приношения, которые вы должны принимать от них... Шерсть голубую, пурпуровую и червленую, и виссон».</p> <p>Исх. 26, 1. «Скинию же сделай из десяти покрывал крученого виссона, и из голубой, пурпуровой и червленной шерсти».</p> <p>Исх. 28, 6. «И сделают ефод из золота, из голубой, пурпуровой и червленной шерсти, и из крученого виссона».</p> <p>Т 4.1 После того, как нам в прошлой беседе открылось значение брусьев скинии, и мы видели, как их постановкой</p>	<p>Conversation the eighth. Sacred colours.</p> <p>Ex. 25:3-4 And this <i>is</i> the offering which ye shall take of them... blue, and purple, and scarlet, and fine linen, and goats' <i>hair</i></p> <p>Ex. 26:1 Moreover thou shalt make the tabernacle <i>with</i> ten curtains <i>of</i> fine twined linen, and blue, and purple, and scarlet.</p> <p>Ex. 28:6 And they shall make the ephod <i>of</i> gold, <i>of</i> blue, and <i>of</i> purple, <i>of</i> scarlet, and fine twined linen.</p> <p>Т 4.1 After in our last conversation we had discovered the value of tabernacle boards, we saw, how their position</p>	<p>“The section of our book which opens before us contains the instructive description of the curtains</p>	<p>Both Mackintosh and Kargel agree that the colours used in the Tabernacle have a special meaning.</p>
--	--	--	---



<p>устроились стены ее, было бы очень удобно приступить к рассмотрению покрывал, которыми было покрыто жилище Иеговы, и которые, собственно, довершали его. Но там мы встретились снова с различными цветами святилища; и снова перед нами выступила необходимость сначала заняться ими, чтобы, затем, легче уяснить себе значение вышеуказанных тканей. При этом свете приобретают большую цену не только эти покрывала и завесы, но и все остальные предметы, в которых они нам встретятся.</p> <p>Т 4.2 Что эти цвета не случайно попали в священные предметы, но, скорее, имели особенно важное значение в глазах Божиих, этому будет верить, без всякого довода, каждый серьезный, верующий в Библии христианин. Потому что он знает, что Священное Писание «изрекали (и так и писали) святые Божии человеки, будучи</p>	<p>determined the position of walls, it would be very convenient to start looking at curtains which covered the dwelling of Jehovah and which, actually, completed it. Here we again see various colours of the sanctuary; and again it is necessity for us to work with them before we can understand the meaning of the above-mentioned fabrics. In this light <u>not only the curtains and veils have a great value but also all other subjects which will be connected to them.</u></p> <p>Т 4.2 Any serious Christian believing the Bible will accept without doubt that <u>these colours are used in the sacred subjects not by a chance</u>, but had a great significance in God's eyes. Any serious Christian knows that the Scripture «was uttered (and written) by the holy God's people being led by the Holy Spirit» who in every statement</p>	<p>and coverings of the tabernacle, wherein the <u>spiritual eye discerns the shadows of the various features and phases of Christ's manifested character.</u> "Moreover, thou shalt make the tabernacle with ten curtains of twined linen, and blue, and purple, and scarlet: with cherubims of cunning work shalt thou make them." Here we have the different aspects of "the man Christ Jesus." The "fine twined linen" prefigures the spotless purity of His walk and character; while the "blue, the purple, and the scarlet" present Him to us as "the Lord from heaven," who is to reign according to the divine counsels, but whose royalty is to be the result of His sufferings. Thus we have a spotless man, a heavenly man, a royal man, a suffering man. <u>These materials were</u></p>	<p>Details like colours and fabrics are important for both Kargel and Mackintosh.</p> <p>This meaning is revealed to a "spiritual eye" (Mackintosh)</p> <p>Kargel addresses "serious Christians" who believe in:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. divine origin of the Scripture 2. importance of every word used in the Scripture <p>Another reason why these colours bear special importance for both Kargel and Mackintosh is that they are being mentioned a number of times and are repeated in different objects: curtains, veils, priestly clothes.</p> <p>For Kargel an attentive reader needs the help of the Lord in order to understand the meaning of these sacred objects.</p> <p>To find Christ and "Christ everywhere" is he goal for studying the Pentateuch for both Kargel and Mackintosh (see Kargel's opening statement to the book, 4.0).</p>
---	---	---	---



<p>движимы Духом Святым», Который во всяком постановлении, во всяком слове открывает нам чудные планы и предначертания Божии.</p> <p>Т 4.3 Но уже и то обстоятельство, что эти цвета нам встречаются всюду во святилище, должно показывать нам их важность и привлекать к себе наше внимание. Куда бы мы ни обратили наш взгляд, везде он упадет непременно на них. Мы видели их на воротах двора, на двери святилища, на завесе Святого-святых и снова их увидим на облакающих скинию покрывалах; не отсутствуют они даже и в священных одеждах Первосвященника; везде голубой, пурпуровый, червлёный и белый цвет, искусно сотканные в миловидном сочетании, представляются внимательному взгляду наблюдателя. По точному вычислению, эти цвета повторяются в Пятикнижии Моисея в одном и том же</p>	<p><u>and every word opens us wonderful plans and desires of God.</u></p> <p>T 4.3 But even <u>the fact that these same colours are repeated everywhere in the sanctuary</u> should point to their importance and catch our attention. Wherever we turn our eyes we see them. We saw them on the gate of the court yard, on the door of the holy place, and on the veil of the most Holy place. We will see them again in the curtains of the tabernacle. They are also present even in sacred clothes of High Priest. Everywhere blue, purple, scarlet and white colours, skilfully weaved in a pretty combination, are presented to an attentive eye of an observer. On exact calculation, these colours are mentioned in the Pentateuch of Moses 24 times in the same order. <u>May the Lord according to</u></p>	<p><u>not confined to the “curtains” of the tabernacle, but were also used in making “the veil,” (ver. 31,) “the hanging for the door of the tent,” (ver.36,) “the hanging for the gate of the court,” (chap. xxvii. 16,) “the cloths of service, and the holy garments of Aaron.” (Chap. xxxix. 1.) In a word, it was Christ everywhere, Christ in all, Christ alone” (Mackintosh 1862:276).</u></p>	<p>An assumption that the repetitive usage of the same thing (in this case colours and their order) does not occur by chance and must bear certain weight and importance.</p>
--	--	---	---



<p>порядке 24 раза. Да будет же Господу угодно показать нам их значение по благоволению Его.</p> <p>Т 4.4 Впереди всех священных цветов стоит, как мы видим, голубой цвет. За очень немногими исключениями, этот цвет всегда занимает первое место в перечислении вышеозначенных четырех цветов. Таким образом, он является первым по порядку; Бог дал ему первое место. Сам по себе он едва ли был бы в состоянии бросаться в глаза наблюдателю, так как оба красные цвета далеко его превосходили в этом отношении. Бог, однако, дал ему предпочтение, заставляя другие цвета обыкновенно следовать за ним. Цвет же этот - цвет неба и всего небесного. Ведь он простирается по всему небосклону в бесконечное пространство. С какой точки земли ни поднял бы человек глаза свои и не поглядел бы на</p>	<p><u>His goodness show us their meaning.</u></p> <p>Т 4.4 The first among all sacred colours, as we can see, is blue colour. <u>With very few exceptions, this colour always stands in the first place among the above mentioned four colours.</u> Thus, it is the first one in the row; God has given it the first place. In itself it would hardly be noticed by an observer against the background of both red colours because the latter by far surpass it in brightness. God, however, has given it preference, putting other colours behind it. <u>This colour is the colour of the sky and all heavenly things.</u> In fact it colours all the sky. Wherever on the earth a person lifts up his eyes and looks at the sky, he sees this soft, lovely blue colour.</p>	<p><i>“Blue”</i> is the eternal colour, and <u>marks the heavenly character of Christ, who, though He had come down into all the circumstances of actual and true humanity – sin excepted – yet was He “the Lord from heaven”.</u> <u>Though He was “very man,” yet He ever walked in the uninterrupted consciousness of His proper dignity, as a heavenly stranger. He never once forgot whence He had come, where He was, or whither He was going.</u> The spring of all His joys was on high. Earth could neither make Him richer nor poorer. He found this world to be “a dry and thirsty land, where no water is;” and, hence, His spirit could only find its</p>	<p>Blue colour</p> <p>Both Mackintosh and Kargel when interpreting the colours are looking for the manifestation of Christ. The fact that these colours must point to Christ, His character and work, is taken for granted.</p> <p>Both commentators start with a commonly accepted association of blue colour with the sky. Then assuming that this colour should point to Jesus they make a logical conclusion that the blue colour used in the decoration of the tabernacle must speak of the heavenly character of Christ.</p> <p>Kargel’s exposition is longer and more elaborate than Mackintosh’. Kargel quotes more Scripture than Mackintosh. In this portion of his text Kargel borrowed a few ideas about “a heavenly stranger being fully a man and God from heaven who was fully conscious of His own</p>
--	---	--	--



<p>небо, всюду встречается ему этот мягкий, милый голубой цвет.</p> <p>Т 4.5 И от мы находим этот голубой цвет во многих прообразах небесного, которые имеют осуществление во Христе Иисусе. Это очень живо указывает нам на небесный характер Христа Иисуса. Он был ниспосланный к нам с небес Искупитель. На земле не было для нас спасителя; Ему надлежало придти к нам из иного Царства. Он должен был для нас сойти с неба - вот первый важный урок, который Господь хотел нам дать и глубоко запечатлеть в поставлении голубого цвета впереди всех цветов. Мы знаем, что Он был человек, действительно человек, по виду ничем не отличавшийся от человека, и вошедший во все человеческие положения и обстоятельства, кроме греха. И при всем том Он был все-таки совершенно иным человеком,</p>	<p>Т 4.5 And we find this blue colour in many prototypes of heavenly things which have their realization in Christ Jesus. It very vividly <u>shows us heavenly character of Christ Jesus</u>. He was the Redeemer sent to us from heaven. There was no Savior for us on the earth; He had to come to us from other Kingdom. <u>He had to come from Heaven</u> - the first important lesson, which God wanted to give to us and deeply impress in us by putting blue colour ahead of all colours. We know, that He was the person, a real person, who had the same appearance as other people and who entered all human situations and circumstances, except for sin. And for all of that He was a completely different person than we, because He was not, like to us, ashes from ashes and earth from earth but was, as apostle</p>	<p>refreshment above. It was entirely heavenly. "No man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the son of man <i>who is in heaven</i>." (John iii.13). (Mackintosh 1862:280-281)</p>	<p>nature" directly from Mackintosh' text.</p> <p>Even the order of colours is viewed by Kargel as important.</p>
--	--	---	---



<p>нежели мы, потому что Он не был, подобно нам, прахом из праха и землей из земли, но был, как назвал Его апостол Павел «Господь с неба» (1 Кор. 15:47). Он только «посетил нас по благоутробному милосердию Бога нашего», и посетил нас, как «Восток свыше», чтобы «просветить сидящих во тьме и тени смертной, направить ноги наши на путь мира» (Лук. 1:78,79).</p> <p>Т 4.6 Итак, Он был здесь на земле небесным пришельцем с небесной целью, пришельцем постоянно сознающим это свое положение и странствующим сообразно ему. Ни на мгновение не забывал Он, откуда Он исшел, где находился и куда шел. Самые серьезные и самые важные беседы, поглощавшие всю Его душу, не отстраняли никогда от Него этого сознания. Посмотрите на Него, как, в ту столь благословенную для Никодима ночь, Он свидетельствует ему, откуда Он</p>	<p>Paul called Him “the Lord from heaven» (1 Cor. 15:47). He only has visited us “Through the tender mercy of our God”, as «the dayspring from on high hath visited us» in order «to give light to them that sit in darkness and in the shadow of death, to guide our feet into the way of peace» (Lk. 1:78, 79).</p> <p>Т 4.6 So, <u>He was here on the earth as the heavenly comer with the heavenly purpose, the visitor constantly knowing this position and wandering in compliance with it. Not for one instant He forgot where He came from, where He was and where He was going to. The most serious and most important conversations capturing His whole soul never deprived Him of this consciousness.</u> Look at Him as in that blessed for Nicodemus night He testifies to him where</p>		
--	---	--	--



<p>исшел и где Он пребывает, говоря ему: «Никто не восходил на небо, как Только сшедший с небес Сын Человеческий, сущий на небесах» (Ин. 3:13). И иудеям он открыто высказал это: «Вы от нижних, Я от вышних; вы от мира сего, Я не от сего мира» (Ин. 8:23). И как Сам Он не был от мира, то и все мысли, слова и дела Его были небесные, как свидетельствует о Нем Иоанн Креститель: «Приходящий свыше и есть выше всех; а сущий от земли земной и есть и говорит, как сущий от земли; приходящий с небес есть выше всех. И что Он видел и слышал о том и свидетельствует» (Ин. 3:31,32).</p> <p>Т 4.7 Во время своего пребывания здесь, на земле, Он приобретал для неба; Он пришел установить Царство небесное на земле, вернулся назад на небеса и, наконец, придет еще раз с неба, взят к Себе Своих чтобы и они были</p>	<p>He came from and where He stays: «And no man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of man which is in heaven» (Jn. 3:13). And he has openly stated it to the Jews: «Ye are from beneath; I am from above: ye are of this world; I am not of this world» (Jn. 8:23). And as He was not from the world all of His ideas, words and affairs were heavenly as John the Baptist testifies: «He that cometh from above is above all: he that is of the earth is earthly, and speaketh of the earth: he that cometh from heaven is above all. And what he hath seen and heard, that he testifieth» (Jn. 3:31,32).</p> <p>Т 4.7 During His stay here, on the earth He was gaining for the heaven; <u>He has come to establish the Kingdom of Heaven on the earth</u>, he has returned back to the heavens and, at last, he will come once again from the heaven, to take</p>		
---	---	--	--



<p>там, где Он. Этот небесный Его характер обнаруживался тотчас же пред наблюдателем с искренним сердцем и открытым оком. Пока Нафанаил не узнал Иисуса ближе, он мог спросить: «Из Назарета может ли быть что доброе»? Но дайте ему подойти ближе, дайте ему взглянуть на Него настоящим взглядом, и он должен будет воскликнуть: «Ты Сын Божий, Ты Царь Израилев!» И следующий опыт, который он отныне будет приобретать в общении с Ним, по словам Самого Господа, будет таков, что он увидит «отныне небо отверстым и Ангелов Божиих, восходящих и нисходящих к Сыну человеческому» (Ин. 1:49,51).</p> <p>Т 4.8 Тот же опыт повторяется еще до сегодняшнего дня. Пока душа остается Ему чужой и далекой, она не видит в Нем ничего небесного. Иисус для нее все то, что делают из Него люди.</p>	<p>to himself those who are his so that they would be where He is. This heavenly character of his was found out immediately by an observer with a sincere heart and open eye. Before Nathanael got to know Jesus closer, he could ask: «Can anything good come from Nazareth?» But let him approach closer, let him look at Jesus and he would exclaim: «Thou art the Son of God; thou art the King of Israel!» And the following experience which he will get henceforth in fellowship with Jesus, according to the words of the Lord Himself, will be such that «hereafter ye shall see heaven open, and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of man» (Jn. 1:49, 51).</p> <p>T 4.8 The same experience is being repeated today. <u>As long as a soul remains strange and far from Him, it does not see anything heavenly in Him.</u> For such soul Jesus is all that</p>		
--	---	--	--



<p>Он для нее Иоанн Креститель, Илия, Иеремия или один из пророков», или, при переводе на наш современный язык, великий, благочестивый муж, Которого надо почитать и перед Которым надо преклоняться - и больше ничего; но если душа действительно придет в соприкосновение с Ним, Дух Божий открывает ей глаза и если она вступит в святое общение с Ним, как там Нафанаил, то с этого времени она не видит ничего, кроме славы, кроме самого неба. Ей приходится только удивляться, как могла она быть такой слепой и не видеть всего этого раньше.</p> <p>Т 4.9 Если голубой цвет, с одной стороны, показывает небесный характер Христа, то, по отношению к нам, он показывает Христову любовь, благодать и милосердие. Некто отозвался однажды об этом цвете так: «Он привлекает глаз, не ослепляя его, и прилагательное «милый» можно прибавить к нему с</p>	<p>people make of Him. He is “John the Baptist, Elijah, Jeremiah or one of prophets», or, transferring to our modern language, a great, pious man who should be esteemed and admired - and nothing more; but if the soul really comes in contact with Him, the Spirit of God will open its eyes and if it enters sacred fellowship with Him as Nathanael did from that time on it will not see anything, except for glory, except for the very heaven. It should only be surprised how it could remain so blind and not see all of this earlier.</p> <p><u>T 4.9 If blue colour, on the one hand, shows heavenly character of Christ, on the other hand, in relation to us, it shows Christ’s love, grace and mercy.</u> Somebody has once said about this colour: «it attracts an eye without blinding it, and an adjective "lovely" can be rightfully added to it». Whether</p>		
---	---	--	--



<p>полным правом». Независимо от того, правильно ли и верно ли это суждение, - ясно, что сошествие неба нашего Господа являет нам не что иное, как любовь Его и любовь Отца к нам. «Ибо», свидетельствуют уста Сшедшего к нам с небес, «так возлюбил Бог мир, что отдал Сына Своего Единородного, дабы всякий, верующий в Него, не погиб, но имел жизнь вечную» (Ин. 3:16). Да, Бог есть любовь, но мы не познали бы Его, как любовь, без отдачи Сына Его, потому что Он в Своей Собственной личности пришел открыть и показать нам Отца. Мы никогда не узнали бы, как сердце Отца настроено относительно нас, если б Он не пришел к нам с неба; Его пришествие свидетельствовало о любви Его и о любви Отца, и, когда Он был у нас, Он доказал нам ее, выставляя ее во всех Своих действиях. «Бога не видел никто никогда», так свидетельствует Он Сам, «Единородный Сын, суций в</p>	<p>this statement is correct or not, - it is clear, that descending of our Lord from heaven shows us nothing but His love and the love of the Father. «For», as the lips of Him who descended to us from heavens testify, «God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life» (Jn. 3:16). Yes, God is love, but we would not get to know Him as love without giving His Son because He in His own person has come to open and show us the Father. We never would find out how heart of the Father feels about us if He had not come to us from the heaven. His coming testified about His love and about the love of the Father, and when He was with us He has proved it to us exposing it in all His actions. «No man hath seen God at any time» so He testifies, «the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him» (Jn. 1:18). And in</p>		
--	--	--	--



<p>недре Отчем, Он явил» (Ин. 1:8). И в другом месте: «Видевший Меня видел Отца» (Ин. 14:9). И можем ли мы сказать, что что-либо другое, кроме любви, самой чистой, божественной любви, можно было видеть в чудных поступках Сына? Она была нераздельно связана с Ним, что была, собственно, Его природой, и, если Отца называют любовью, то только чрез Него, Кто дал неопровержимые доказательства этой любви.</p> <p>Т 4.10 И теперь, когда вы видите где-либо в скинии собрания этот милый цвет, вспоминайте о синеве небесной во всей ее беспредельности и неизмеримом пространстве, говорящей нам о широте, и долготе, и высоте, и глубине шедшей с небес любви, любви, превосходящей всякое разумение.</p> <p>Т 4.11 Перейдем теперь к следующему цвету - багряному,</p>	<p>the other passage: «he that hath seen me hath seen the Father» (Jn. 14:9). And can we tell, what else except for love, the purest divine love could be seen in the acts of the Son? It has been inseparably connected to Him, that was, actually, His nature, and if the Father is called love that is only through him who has given incontestable proofs of this love.</p> <p>Т 4.10 And now, <u>when you see this lovely colour somewhere in the tabernacle, think of blue sky in all its boundlessness and immeasurable space, speaking to us about breadth, leant, height, and depth of the love that ascended to us from heavens; think of the love surpassing any understanding.</u></p> <p>Т 4.11 Let's move now to the following colour - crimson or</p>	<p>“Purple” denotes royalty, and points us to Him who</p>	<p>Both Mackintosh and Kargel agree that</p>
---	--	--	--



<p>или пурпуровому. Как голубой цвет составляет особенный цвет неба, так багряный, или пурпуровый является характерным цветом земного великолепия. Почти все царства мира сего искали в нем выражения своей славы и величия. Таков был обычай в старину и отчасти он удержался и до нашего времени. Даже слово Божие употребляет его, как символ человеческой царственной власти. Например, в Откровении Иоанна в этот цвет облечен зверь с десятью рогами, о котором нам ясно сказано, что это будет господствующая на земле власть до второго пришествия Христа; точно так же сатана, великий похититель власти, который и зверю даст власть, назван на священном языке «красным драконом» не потому, чтобы в этом цвете было что-либо злое, но потому, что зло здесь присвоило себе величие и господство. Сатана, дух злобы, похитил то, что должно принадлежать Христу;</p>	<p>purple. <u>As blue colour is a special colour of the sky so crimson or purple is characteristic colour of earthly magnificence.</u> <u>Almost all kingdoms of the world saw in it expressions of glory and greatness.</u> This was the custom in old times and partly it is kept till our time. Even the Word of God uses it as a symbol of human authority. For example, in John's Revelation the animal with ten horns of whom it is clearly told that it will have the greatest authority on the earth till the second coming of Christ is dressed in this colour. So is Satan, the great thief of authority who and will give authority to the animal, is named in the sacred language «a red dragon» not because there was something malicious in this colour but because evil here has appropriated greatness and domination. Satan, the spirit of rage, has stolen that should belong to Christ; this is what God shows us here. Further we</p>	<p>“was born King of the Jews;” who offered Himself as such to the Jewish nation, and was rejected; who before Pontius Pilate witnessed a good confession, avowing Himself a king, when, to mortal vision, there was not so much as a single trace of royalty. “Thou sayest that I am a king.” And “hereafter ye shall see the Son of man sitting at the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven.” And, finally, the inscription upon His cross, “in letters of Hebrew, and Greek, and Latin” – the language of religion, of science, and of government – declared Him, to the whole known world, to be “Jesus of Nazareth, the King of the Jews.” Earth disowned His claims – so much the worst for it – but not so heaven; there His claim was fully</p>	<p>purple is a symbol of royalty and authority. The logic is the same: if purple is the symbol of royalty and as a colour used in the tabernacle it should manifest some characteristics of Christ, hence: purple points our to Christ’s kingship.</p> <p>It is important for Kargel that purple symbolizes greatness and power not only in common sense but also in different passages of Scripture.</p> <p>Kargel repeats Mackintosh’ argument concerning Pontius Pilate’s inscription on the cross, which witnesses to Christ being the King of Jews.</p> <p>Kargel also follows Mackintosh in referring to Psalm 2.</p>
---	--	--	--



<p>вот, что показывает нам здесь Бог. Далее, мы читаем, что, желая в насмешку представить Господа нашего, как земного царя, Его облекли в багряницу, вложив Ему в руку трость, вместо скипетра, и этим издаваясь над Его царским достоинством. Этих примеров, думаю, вполне достаточно, чтобы убедить нас, что багряный, или пурпуровый цвет обозначает царское величие.</p> <p>Т 4.12 Пурпуровый цвет, где бы он ни встречался в богослужении левитов, возвещает нам Христа, как Царя земли. И, без сомнения, если Бог Своим искуплением, посланным в мир во Христе, создал новое творение, то никто, кроме Него, не может быть его главой и царем. Человек, венец творения, получил, как царь его, широкое, божественное полномочие: «Наполняйте землю и обладайте ею и владычествуйте над рыбами морскими и над птицами</p>	<p>read that mockingly wishing to present our Lord as an earthly king, people dressed Him in purple and gave Him a cane instead of a sceptre. This way they were insulting his kingly virtue. These examples, I think, are quite enough, to prove to us, that crimson or purple colour designates royal greatness.</p> <p>Т 4.12 Purple colour wherever we see it in Levites' service announces to us Christ as the King of the world. And, undoubtedly, if God in His redemption given to the world in Christ, has made new creation, nobody, except for Him can be his head and king. A man, the crown of creation, has received, as its king wide, divine power: «...replenish the earth, and subdue it: and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth</p>	<p>recognized. He was received as a conqueror into the eternal mansions of light, crowned with glory and honour, and seated, amid the acclamations of angelic hosts, on the throne of the majesty in the heaven, there to wait until His enemies be made His footstool. "Why do the heaven rage, and the people imagine a vain thing? The kings of the earth set themselves, and the rulers take counsel together, against the Lord and against his anointed, saying, Let us break their bands asunder, and cast away their cords from us. He that sitteth in the heaven shall laugh; the Lord shall have them in derision. Then shall he speak unto them in his wrath, and vex them in his sore displeasure. Yet have I set <i>my king</i> upon my holy hill of Zion. I will declare</p>	
--	---	---	--



<p>небесными, и над всяким животным, пресмыкающимся по земле» (Быт. 1:28). Сотворенный по образу и подобию Божию и вооруженный этим полномочием, он был представитель Иеговы здесь на земле. Но как скоро он потерял чрез грех свой царский престол и свое царственное достоинство, как скоро он, повелитель, попал в узы и подданство сатаны и, вместо того, чтобы господствовать, сам был подчинен господству, стал жалким рабом сатаны и всех его похотей. Освободиться самому было для него навеки невозможно, его престол был для него безвозвратно потерян. Но, благодарение Богу, тогда пришел второй Адам, «Господь с неба», «Наследник всего» (Евр. 1:2), «Сильнейший», и, напав на дом сильного, т. е. дьявола, отнял у него имущество, им противозаконно присвоенное. Потому что, как говорит Писание, Он пришел, чтобы стереть главу змею и</p>	<p>upon the earth» (Gen. 1:28). Created according to the image and likeness of God armed with this power, a man was a representative of Jehovah here on earth. But as soon as because of sin he lost his royal throne and virtue; as soon as he, a master, has got into the bondage and under dominion of Satan and, instead of dominating, has become subordinated to dominated, became a pitiful slave to Satan and all his lusts. It was forever impossible for him to release himself and his throne has been irrevocably lost. But, thank God, that the second Adam has come, «the Lord from the heaven», «heir of all things» (Heb. 1:2), the "Strongest", and, having attacked the house of a strong, i.e. devil, He has taken away from him his illegally appropriated property. Because, as the Scripture speaks, He has come to crush the head of the snake and «to destroy affairs of devil». Satan knew and with</p>	<p>the decree; the Lord hath said unto me, Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee. Ask of me, and I shall give thee the heaven for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession. Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron; thou shalt dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel. Be wise, now, therefore, O ye kings; be instructed, ye judges of the earth. Serve the Lord with fear, and rejoice with trembling. Kiss the Son, lest he be angry, and ye perish from the way, when his wrath is kindled but a little. BLESSED ARE ALL THEY THAT PUT THEIR TRUST IN HIM." (Ps. ii). (Mackintosh 1862:281-282).</p>	
---	--	---	--



<p>«разрушить дела дьявола». Сатана знал и с ужасом чувствовал, что дело шло об уничтожении его владычества; отсюда этот трепет и этот вопль страха бесноватых, говоривших его языком: «Пришел Ты сюда прежде времени мучить нас» (Мф. 8:29), они знали, что Он был Сын, Наследник. И потому что сатана знал, что в конце концов в руку Иисуса отдана будет всякая власть на небе и на земле и что все царства мира сего должны будут принадлежать Богу и Христу, т. е. помазаннику Его, он и сделал в пустыне отчаянную попытку, хитростью покорить Его себе, показывая Ему в одно мгновение ока все царства мира сего и делая Ему богохульное предложение: «Все это дам Тебе, если, падши, поклонисься мне». Но (слава Ему!), всякое искушение разбивалось этим вторым Адамом; Он преодолел, Он остался победителем.</p> <p>Т 4.13 Будучи заранее</p>	<p>horror felt, that it was the matter of destruction of his sovereignty; hence the trembling and the cry of fear of the possessed people through whom devil was speaking: «art thou come hither to torment us before the time?» (Matt. 8:29). They knew that He was the Son and the Heir. And since Satan knew that eventually all authority in heavens and earth will be given to Jesus' hand and that all kingdoms of the world should belong to God and Christ, i.e. to the His Anointed, Satan has made a desperate attempt in desert to cunningly subdue Him to himself, showing Him in a glimpse of an eye all kingdoms of the world and making Him an blasphemous offer: «All this I shall give you if you bow to me». But (praise the Lord!), any temptation was broken by this second Adam; He has overcome, He has remained the winner.</p> <p>Т 4.13 Being a beforehand</p>		
---	---	--	--



<p>предназначенным царем земли, таковым был Он и по своему рождению, потому что, как Он был Сыном Давида, так был и Господом его. Он был рожденный царь Израиля, и для того, чтобы быть им, Он пришел в этот мир, и даже в самый страшный час Своей жизни и Своих страданий, когда человеческий глаз не мог открыть никаких следов Его царского достоинства, Он не побоялся засвидетельствовать перед Понтием Пилатом, что Он Царь. Первосвященникам же и старейшинам Своего народа Он сказал: «Вы узрите Сына Человеческого, сидящего одесную силы и грядущего на облаках небесных» (Мрк. 14:62). Бог не преминул возвестить эту чудную действительность всему миру, когда, в минуту Его самого глубокого унижения, Он, сопричисленный к злодеям, висел между двумя разбойниками на кресте, дав надписать над Его головой на</p>	<p>appointed King of the earth; He was such due to his birth because He was both the Son of David and his Lord. He was born to become the king of Israel and in order to become her King He has come to this world even at the most terrible hour of His life and sufferings when a human eye could not find any traces of His royal virtue He was not afraid to testify before Pontius Pilate that He was the King. To High priests and to the elders of people He has told: «Ye shall see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven» (Mk. 14:62). God did not forget to announce this wonderful reality to the whole world, when, at the moment of His deepest humiliation He was added to villains, hung crucified between two robbers on a cross. He allowed a notice being inscribed above His head in three languages of that time, religious, scientific and state, i.e. Jewish,</p>		
---	---	--	--



<p>трех языках того времени, религиозном, научном и государственном, т. е. еврейском, греческом и латинском: Иисус Назорей, Царь Иудейский (Ин. 19:19). Никакие протесты Его враждебного народа против этой надписи тут не помогли; они, которые легко могли достигнуть всякой неправды у трусливого судьи Господня, должны были в отношении этой надписи, казавшейся им почти невыносимым позором, принять непреклонный, решительный ответ: «Что я написал, то написал».</p> <p>Т 4.14 Итак, эта земля не признала в Нем избранного Богом Царя, она оттолкнула Его от себя: люди «не хотели, чтоб Он царствовал над ними», как они этого не хотят еще и теперь, потому что и до сих пор Он отвержен большинством; но определение Божие остается непоколебимо:</p>	<p>Greek and Latin: JESUS OF NAZARETH THE KING OF THE JEWS (Jn. 19:19). No protests of the hostile people against this inscription had any success; they, who easily made a cowardly judge of the Lord to lie, had to accept an unshakable, resolute answer: «That I have written, I have written» concerning this inscription that seemed to them almost intolerable shame.</p> <p>T 4.14 So, this world has not recognized Him as the King elected by God. It has pushed Him away; people «did not want Him to reign over them» as they still do not want it because even till now He is rejected by the majority; but the determination of God remains unshakable:</p>		
--	---	--	--



<p>Т 4.15 Как ни мнутятся народы и ни замышляют тщетное племена, как бы ни восставали цари, и сколько бы ни совещались князья земли вместе против Господа и против Помазанника Его, как бы ни силились они расторгнуть их узы и свергнуть с себя их оковы, - Живущий на небесах посмеется, Господь поругается им; Его определение таково: «Я помазал Царя Моего над Сионом, святою горою Моею» (Пс. 2:1-6). Да, этому Царю Его все-таки дана всякая власть на небе и на земле, и только согласно Его плану должны действовать все владыки и цари земные, как бы враждебно они ни относились к Нему, «потому что Бог положил им на сердце исполнить волю Его, исполнить одну волю» (Откр. 17:17).</p> <p>Т 4.16 В то время, как одни служат Ему, против своей воли выполняя Его план, мы видим в наши дни малочисленный народ,</p>	<p>Т 4.15 No matter how the heathen rage, and the people imagine a vain thing; no matter how the kings of the earth set themselves, and the rulers take counsel together, against the LORD, and against his anointed, no matter how hard they try to break their bands asunder, and cast away their cords from us. He that sitteth in the heavens shall laugh: the Lord shall have them in derision. His appointment for them is this, "Yet have I set my king upon my holy hill of Zion" (Ps. 2:1-6). Yes, to this King all the authority in the heaven and on the earth is given, and only according to His plan all earthly lords and tsars should operate, regardless of how hostile their disposition towards Him is, «For God hath put in their hearts to fulfil his will» (Rev. 17:17).</p> <p>Т 4.16 While some serve Him, against their will carrying out His plan, we see today a small people which voluntary obeys</p>		
---	--	--	--



<p>который добровольно подчинился Ему, и добровольно приносить Ему жертвы в святом благолепии; рассеянный по всей земле, среди всех народов, племен и языков, он ежедневно возрастает числом, пока не сделается великим множеством, которого никто не может перечесть. Они смотрят на Него с наслаждением, как на своего Царя. И скоро придет время, когда «преклонится всякое колено небесных, земных и преисподних, и всякий язык будет исповедовать, что Господь Иисус Христос в славу Бога Отца» (Фил. 2:10,11). И мне кажется, будто я уже вижу Его в духе, грядущего на облаках небесных, и много диадим на челе Его, потому что все царства мира принадлежат Ему; мне кажется, что я читаю написанные на одежде и бедре Его слова: «Царь царей и Господь господствующих» (Откр. 19:16), потому что «Он сокрушил голову в земле обширной» (Пс. 109, 6); я вижу, как Он занимает</p>	<p>Him, and voluntary brings Him sacrifices in sacred grandeur. It is scattered all over the earth, among all peoples, tribes and languages, it daily grows in numbers until becomes so great that nobody can count it. They look at Him with pleasure, as at their King. And soon the time will come when «every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth; And that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father» (Phil. 2:10, 11). And it seems to me, as if I already see Him in spirit, coming on the clouds, and there are a lot of crowns on His face because all kingdoms of the world belong to Him. It seems to me, that I read words written on his vesture and on his thigh: «KING OF KINGS, AND LORD OF LORDS» (Rev. 19:16) because «he shall wound the heads over many countries» (Ps. 110, 6); I see, how He occupies the throne of David</p>		
---	---	--	--



<p>«престол Давида, что владычество Его умножается и нет предела миру Его». Блаженное время, заставляющее нас воскликнуть: «Аминь. Ей, гряди, Господи Иисусе!"</p> <p>Т 4.17 Но, дорогие друзья, раньше, чем продолжать нашу беседу, позвольте вас спросить: все ли вы Его подданные, Его ли вы подданные в настоящую минуту? Действительно ли вы принадлежите к народу Его? Стоите ли вы душой и телом на Его стороне? Здесь нет никакой нейтральной почвы. Не будем обманывать себя: или мы Христовы или принадлежим врагу; подданные Одного или другого, потому что решающее слово Христа в этом отношении таково: «Кто не со мною, тот против Меня».</p> <p>Т 4.18 «О, присягните же Ему пред знаменем креста, «Как подданные, воины Христа!»</p>	<p>and «of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end». What a blessed time making us to exclaim: «Amen. Even so, come, Lord Jesus".</p> <p>Т 4.17 But, dear friends, before we continue our conversation, let me ask you, whether all of you are His citizens at a present minute? Do you really belong to His people? Do you stand your soul and body on His side? There is no neutral ground here. Do not deceive yourselves: we are either Christ's or we belong to the enemy; we are citizens of One or the others because the decisive word of Christ in this respect is this: «those who are not with me are against me».</p> <p>Т 4.18 Oh, swear Him in front of the banner of the cross as citizens and soldiers of Christ!</p>		
---	--	--	--



<p>Т 4.19 Но перейдем теперь к третьему цвету, т. е. червленому. Этот цвет - цвет крови и имеет отношение ко Христу, «пострадавшему за нас во плоти» (1 Пет. 4:1). Без смерти «Господа с неба», «второго Адама», Царя земли, не оказалось бы никого, принадлежащего к семени Его, никого, могущего войти в славу; теперь же через смерть Его принадлежащие Ему освободились от вечной смерти; только смертью Своею явил Он жизнь и нетление, потому что, «как в Адаме все умирают, так во Христе все оживут» (1 Кор. 15:22). Наследство, оставленное нам первым Адамом, - смерть, достигшая всех людей; наследство же, даруемое нам Христом, заключается в вечной жизни, приобретенной смертью Его.</p> <p>Т 4.20 Когда Он ходил некогда на земле, Он был единственным пшеничным зерном совершенно нового небесного семени,</p>	<p>Т 4.19 But we shall pass now to the third colour, i.e. scarlet. This colour – <u>the colour of blood</u> also has to do with Christ, who «hath suffered for us in the flesh» (1 Pet. 4:1). <u>Without the death</u> of «the Lord from heaven», «the second Adam», the King of the earth <u>there would be nobody belonging to His seed, nobody being able to enter the glory</u>. Now through His death those belonging to Him were released from the eternal death. Only by His death He revealed life and incorruption, because, «as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive» (1 Cor. 15:22). The inheritance, left to us by the first Adam, is the death which has reached all people; the inheritance, being given to us by Christ, consists in the eternal life acquired by His death.</p> <p>Т 4.20 When He once walked upon the earth He was the unique wheat grain of completely new heavenly seed</p>	<p>“Scarlet,” when genuine, <u>is produced by death</u>; and <u>this makes its application to a suffering Christ safe and appropriate</u>. “Christ hath suffered for us in the flesh.” <u>Without death, all would have been unavailing. We can admire “the blue,” and “the purple,” but without “the scarlet” the tabernacle would have lacked an all-important feature. It was by death that Christ destroyed him that had the power of death.</u> The Holy Ghost, in setting before us a striking figure of Christ – the true tabernacle – could not possibly omit that phase of His character which constitutes the groundwork of His connection with His body the Church, of His claim to the thrown of David, and the headship of all creation. In a word, He not only unfolds the Lord Jesus to our view, in these</p>	<p>Both commentators view scarlet as symbolizing blood, sufferings and death.</p> <p>Both use the same reference to 1 Pet. 4:1.</p> <p>Both point out that without the death of Christ everything else would be useless.</p> <p>In all of these points Kargel accepts Mackintosh’ treatment of this colour without any criticism.</p> <p>However, as it has been in cases with two other colours Kargel’s exposition is much longer and more detailed. He goes on saying that a wheat grain must die in order to bring forth new life.</p> <p>In this part K heavily relies on the thoughts he must have found in Mackintosh’ work.</p>
---	---	--	---



<p>полным небесной, вечной жизни, тогда как окружавшие Его плевелы были полны смерти; если б это пшеничное зерно не упало в землю и не умерло, то оно осталось бы навеки одно, как это Он Сам сказал нам. Но, благодарение Богу, оно умерло и принесло много плода! - Неправда ли, вы знаете эту чудную притчу, которая, как никакая другая, указывает путь, которым через Его смерть жизнь вечная, Его собственная жизнь, сделалась нашим достоянием. Известно, что пшеничное зерно, как и всякое другое семя, если оно хочет передать жизнь своему, происходящему от него, семени, т. е. другим пшеничным зернам, должно вперед умереть и отдать свою жизнь, чтобы она, как бы через воскресение, перешла в эти его семена; другого пути не существует. Таким образом оно умножается и не остается одно; то же было и со Христом, пришедшим к нам с небес, как сказано: «Когда душа Его принесет жертву</p>	<p>full of eternal life whereas tares surrounding Him were full of death. If this wheaten grain had not fallen in the ground and had not died, it would have remained forever one as He has told us. But, praise the Lord, it died and brought forth a lot of fruit! You surely know this wonderful parable, which like no other shows the way by which through His death an eternal life, His own life, has become our property. It is known that a wheat grain, as well as any other seed, if it is to pass on its life to other grains, should die and give its life so that it, as though resurrection, would pass to these other seeds. There is no other way. Thus it is multiplied and no longer one grain; the same was with Christ who has come to us from heavens as it is said: «when thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin, he shall see his seed, he shall prolong his days» (Is. 53:10). Almost nineteen centuries has passed from that</p>	<p>significant curtains, as a spotless man, a royal man, but also a suffering man; one who, <i>by death</i>, should make good His claims to all that to which, as man, He was entitled, in the divine counsels. (Mackintosh 1862:282).</p>	
---	--	--	--



<p>умилостивления, Он узрит потомство долговечное» (Ис. 53:10). Почти девятнадцать столетий протекло с того потрясшего весь мир события, когда Сын Божий пошел на смерть, и наши очи видят до сегодняшнего дня, как появляются все новые пшеничные зерна; плоды не прекращаются, и снопами собирается великая жатва. О, если бы мы все вошли в составе этих снопов!</p> <p>Т 4.21 Да, возлюбленные, этот червлёный цвет в чудной ткани искупительного плана Божия сияет не меньшим блеском, нежели голубой и пурпуровый. Без смерти Господа и все прочее ведь было бы напрасно для нас. Может быть, наш взгляд с удивлением смотрел бы на чудный голубой цвет Его небесной природы и Его бесконечной любви, сведшей Его к нам; со страхом и почтением смотрели бы мы на пурпуровый цвет Его</p>	<p>event which has shaken the whole world when the Son of God went to death, and our eyes see till today as there are new wheat grains appearing; fruit do not cease, and the great harvest is gathered by sheaves. Oh, if only all of us were a part of these sheaves!</p> <p>Т 4.21 Yes, beloved, this scarlet colour in a wonderful fabric of the redemptive plan of God shines just as brightly as blue and purple. <u>Without the death of the Lord everything else, in fact, would be vain for us. Perhaps, our eyes would look with astonishment at wonderful blue colour of His heavenly nature and His infinite love which has brought Him to us; with fear and respect we would look at purple colour of His glorified greatness seeing how everything is</u></p>		
---	---	--	--



<p>прославленного величия, если бы мы видели, как все Ему покорено, даже и сами мы, хотя, быть может, с трепетом и вынужденно, склонили бы пред Ним наши колена, и уста наши засвидетельствовали бы, что Он Господь во славу Бога Отца; но во всем этом не было бы для нас ни спасения, ни освобождения, потому что лишь Своею «смертью лишил Он силы имеющего державу смерти, то есть диавола, и избавил тех, которые от страха смерти чрез всю жизнь были подвержены рабству» (Евр. 2:14,15). Только чрез отдачу жизни Его было совершено «искупление многих» (Мат. 20:28), и только Его смертно мы могли быть привлечены: «И когда Я вознесен буду от земли», говорил Он Сам, «всех привлеку к Себе. Сие говорил Он, давая разуметь, какую смертяю Он умрет» (Ин. 12:32,33). Да, как ни величественно, как ни превосходно, славно и чудно все, что в Нем есть, что могут</p>	<p><u>subdued to Him.</u> Even we ourselves, perhaps, with trembling would have bow and bend our knees before Him, and our lips would testify, that He is the Lord onto the glory of God the Father. But in all of this there would be neither rescue, nor a clearing for us because <u>only through His «death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil; and deliver them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage»</u> (Heb. 2:14,15). Only through giving of His life «a ransom for many» (Matt. 20:28) has been accomplished, and only by His death we could be drawn near: «And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me. This he said, signifying what death he should die» (Jn. 12:32, 33). Yes, no matter how majestic, excellent, famous and miraculous is everything in Him, that our eyes and eyes of all people can see, all the same, the centre of our salvation and</p>		
---	--	--	--



<p>открыть наши очи и очи всех людей, все-таки средоточием нашего спасения и того, что влечет и приковывает наши сердца к Нему и навеки связывает с Ним, это есть и всегда будет смерть Его, вершина Его любви.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Т 4.22 Нам остается только остановиться еще у последнего белого цвета. Он уже встречался в завесах двора и тогда мы узнали его, как невинность и праведность Господа. Мы видим в нем также и нашу праведность, которую, как говорит апостол, мы получаем «даром по благодати Его», облекшись во Христа. Вот этот белый цвет обыкновенно ставится последним, как это сделали и мы, остановившись на нем после только что нами рассмотренного червленого цвета крови. Что касается нашего отношения к нему, то мы находим, что это самое верное</p>	<p>that attracts and draws our hearts to Him and forever connects with Him is and always will be His death, the height of His love.</p> <p>...</p> <p>T 4.22 We need to stop only at last white colour. It was already seen in the veils of the court yard and then we found out that <u>it symbolized innocence and righteousness of the Lord</u>. We also see in it our righteousness which as the apostle said we receive «freely by His grace», being dressed in Christ. This white colour usually is mentioned as the last one. We also followed the same order having stopped on it after we have considered scarlet colour of blood. As to our attitude to it, we find that this is the best place for it because our righteousness can be only the fruit of the death</p>	<p>“The fine twined linen,” as <u>expressed of Christ’s spotless manhood</u>, opens a most precious and copious spirit of thought to the spiritual mind; it furnishes a theme on which we cannot meditate too profoundly. The truth respecting Christ’s humanity must be received with scriptural accuracy, held with spiritual energy, guarded with holy jealousy, and confessed with heavenly power... (Mackintosh 1862:276-277).</p>	<p>As for this last colour – white – both Mackintosh and Kargel are of the same mind interpreting it as a symbol of purity and righteousness. However their exposition here differs quite a bit: while Mackintosh concentrates on Christ Himself emphasizing that nothing whatsoever could deprive Christ of His spotless nature, Kargel develops a thought of attributing Christ’s righteousness to humans.</p>
---	--	---	--



<p>место для него, потому что наша праведность может быть только плодом смерти Господа. Сначала «Бог незнавшего греха сделал для нас жертвою за грех», потом только «мы в Нем сделали праведными пред Богом» (2 Кор. 5:21). Что же касается его отношения ко Христу, то мы должны сознаться, что он, по своему значению, составляет основание и заключение, альфу и омегу красоты и славы нашего Господа. Уже в самых тканях лежит этот намек, потому что мы не должны забывать, что все эти разноцветные, чудные материи из виссона первоначально были совершенно белые и только впоследствии им были приданы эти многозначительные цвета. Так же и белый цвет праведности, святости и непорочности Христа есть то основание, на котором все другие красоты и совершенства Его получили свое полное достоинство. Он ведь не мог бы сделаться «Сшедшим с небес»,</p>	<p>of the Lord. First God «hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin» and only then “we might be made the righteousness of God in him» (2 Cor. 5:21). As for its relation to Christ we should confess that it, in its importance, makes the basis and the conclusion, an alpha and omega of beauty and glory of our Lord. In the fabrics themselves lays this hint because we should not forget, that all these multi-coloured, wonderful fabrics from white linen were originally completely white and only later they were coloured in these significant colours. So is the white colour of righteousness, holiness and purity of Christ is that basis on which all His other beauty and perfection have received full expression. For He could not become «the One who descended from heavens» which is represented by blue colour if He had not been innocent and just; He could not receive the throne of</p>	<p><u>...the curtains of “fine twined linen” prefigure the moral purity of “the man Christ Jesus”.</u> We have already seen the manner of His conception; and, as we pass along the current of His life here below, we meet with instance after instance of the same spotless purity. He was forty days in the wilderness, tempted of the devil, but there was no response in His pure nature to the tempter’s foul suggestion. He could touch the leper and receive no taint. He could touch the bier and not contract the smell of death. He could pass unscathed through the most polluted atmosphere. He was, as to His manhood, like a sunbeam emanating from the fountain of light, which can pass, without a soil, through the most defiling</p>	
--	--	---	--



<p>каким Его изображает голубой цвет, если б Он не был неповинным и праведным; не мог бы Он получить и престол владычества Своего, как свидетельствует багряный, или пурпуровый цвет, если б в Нем был хоть один недостаток: и кровь Его не могла бы быть ценой выкупа для меня и тебя, как это явствует из червленого цвета, если б Ему пришлось искупать Свой собственный грех. Итак, мы видим, что белый цвет Его праведности представляет основной тон чудного сочетания всех Его совершенных качеств и всего Его существа.</p> <p>Т 4.23 Взглянем, наконец, на чудную тесную связь, соединяющую все эти цвета вместе, и, замечая, как они были сотканы в одно в покрывалах, завесах, ефоде и поясе, мы видим в них Христа, «Чудного», как назван Он еще в Ветхом Завете. И не должна ли Его прославленная личность возбуждать в нас изумление,</p>	<p>sovereignty as purple colour testifies if He had a single fault; and His blood could not become the repayment for me and you as it appears from scarlet colour if He had to expiate His Own sin. So, we see that white colour of His righteousness represents the basic tone of a wondrous combination of all of His other perfect qualities and all His essence.</p> <p>Т 4.23 Let us look, at last, at wonderful and close connection of all these colours, noticing how they have been weaved together in coverlets, veils, clothing and a belt. We see Christ in them, "Wonderful" as He is named in the Old Testament. And should not His glorified person raise amazement in us when we look</p>	<p>medium. He was perfectly unique in nature, constitution, and character (Mackintosh 1862:279-280).</p>	
---	---	--	--



<p>когда мы взираем на Него во свете этих цветов, и видим соединенными в Нем небо и землю, Бога и человека, высшую славу и глубочайшее унижение, даже время и вечность: когда мы видим в Нем единственного Праведника и как Он есть и остается праведным, оправдывая грешника и нечестивого; как Он, «будучи сияние славы и образ ипостаси Бога и держа все словом силы Своей, совершил в то же время очищение грехов наших Самим Собою»?! Да, в изумлении и благоговении повергаемся мы к Его ногам, присоединяясь к славословию праведников, достигших совершенства: «Достоин Агнец закланный принять силу, и богатство, и премудрость, и крепость, и честь, и славу, и державу во веки веков. Аминь» (Откр. 5:12,13).</p>	<p>at Him in the light of these colours and see heaven and earth united in Him, God and man, the supreme glory and the deepest humiliation, even time and eternity: when we see in Him the unique Righteous person and as He is and remains just, justifying the sinner and impious; how He «being the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person, and upholding all things by the word of his power, when he had by himself purged our sins»?! Yes, in amazement and awe we are plunged to His feet joining the praise of righteous people who have achieved perfection: «Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honour, and glory, and blessing... for ever and ever» (Rev. 5:12, 13).</p>		
--	---	--	--