Kyrkohandbok

för

Evangeliskt-Lutherska

Församlingarne

i

Ryska Riket 1832

Utgiven i faksimil och med kommentar

red. Johnny Hagberg

SKARA STIFSTHISTORISKA SÄLLSKAP
SKARA 2011

Boken är tryckt med bidrag från

Segelbergska stiftelsen för liturgivetenskaplig forskning

Samfundet Pro Fide et Christianismo
(Kyrkoherden Nils Henrikssons stiftelse)

Svenska S:t Mikaelsförsamlingen i Tallinn

Ingår i Skara stiftshistoriska sällskaps skriftserie: 59
ISBN 978-91-86681-02-9
Tryck: Fälth & Hässler, Värnamo, 2011

Innehåll

The Road to the Unification of the Lutheran Churches in the Russian Empire under a Single Liturgy

Russian Christianity was identified with the East, not the West, and it knew no Reformation. There was no scholastic development of theology in the Eastern Church and the questions which led to the Reformation seemed to them irrelevant. Thus Lutheranism seemed to the Russians to be a Western sect, in short a western problem with which the Eastern Church had nothing to do. Furthermore, it was against the law for Russians to become Lutherans. To do so would lead to severe criminal punishments.

And yet from the early days of the Reformation there were Lutherans in Russia. They came as merchants, as artisans, as prisoners of war, as was the case of the Livonians. Though they were few in number, they did not leave their Lutheranism at the border and worshipped according to their liturgical traditions of their homelands. Catherine the Great's 1763 invitation to settle in Russia where there was plenty of land available, brought a flood of Lutheran immigrants into the country. Most of them settled along the banks of the Volga River.

However, it was because of military conquest rather than immigration that the majority of Lutherans came into Russia. They did not have to move even a meter, they were conquered. The Russian Empire had grown greatly in the eighteenth century as one after another country bordering the southern and eastern shores of the Baltic Sea came under its control. The Swedish domination of the Baltic lands had come to an end with Sweden's defeat at the Battle of Poltava in 1709. It then withdrew from the region. In 1710 Livonia, Estonia, Ösel (Saaremaa), and Ingria were joined to the Russian Empire. Further expansion came with the three partitions of the Kingdom of Poland-Lithuania in 1772, 1793, and 1795, as

Lutheran Courland and Piltene, and Roman Catholic Lithuania, including Belarus and the northwestern regions of the Ukraine, were added to the empire. With the annexation of the Baltic lands the Lutheran Church in Russia became somewhat more cosmopolitan and it greatly increased in size. The Lutheran Church in Russia was now the third largest religious group in the empire.

Liturgical Diversity among the Lutheran Communities

The Lutheran Churches of the various national groups in the empire were united theologically. In all these churches the doctrinal standard included the prophetic and apostolic Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, the Ecumenical Creeds, and the Confessional Writings found in the Lutheran Book of Concord. However, there was no single standard form of worship to provide an outward sign of Lutheran unity. In most of these churches the divine service derived from the traditional Western Mass, as revised in the days of the Reformation. However, there was no commonality in the music, the ceremonial observances, or the wording of exhortations and prayers.

The liturgical traditions of these churches had moved in very different directions since the Reformation. They showed the marks of the theological, philosophical, and social movements which had influenced society and the church.

Early turmoil caused by radical reformers in Livonia was largely settled with the adoption of the *Kurtz Ordnung* 1530, the so-called Riga liturgy which had been prepared by Johannes Briesmann. This Mass was closely related to Luther's *Formula Missae*: Introit in Latin or a German hymn based on Psalm 67 – Kyrie – *Gloria in excelsis* – Salutation and Collect – Epistle – Alleluia or Luther's German Litany – Gospel – Nicene Creed ("*Wir glauben all' an einen Gott*") – Sermon – Eucharistic Preface – Verba – Sanctus (German or Latin) – Our Father (chanted without Doxology) – Agnus Dei (German

or Latin – sung twice) – Pax Domini – Distribution (distribution hymns) – Salutation and Post-Communion Collect – Benediction. The influence of this liturgy in the days ahead would be prominent not only in Livonia, but in Courland, Estonia, and Ösel as well. The Briesmann liturgy was based upon the Prussian divine service as formulated in the 1525 Prussian *Artikel der Ceremonien.* After its introduction into Livonia in 1532 – 1533 it went through several editions in 1537, 1548, 1559, 1567, 1574, and 1592. Each of the new editions added to the Livonian Church's treasury of hymnody and liturgy. Further supplements to the Briesmann liturgy were published in separate booklets in 1567 and in 1592. All these editions were written in the Low German dialect commonly called *Plattdeutsch* which was in general use in Riga and its vicinity. In 1615 an edition of the Riga hymnal was published in standard German (*Hochdeutsch*). In it the full Briesmann liturgy made its final appearance. The book contained all the divine services for the church's weekly Sabbath, including the Saturday evening Vespers, Sunday Matins, the Mass, and Sunday Vespers. The Swedish occupation of Livonia did not bring with it the requirement that the 1614 Swedish Handbook be introduced there. The Visitation Articles of 1634 required the introduction of the 1632 Church Order and Agenda of Magdeburg and Halberstadt which had been introduced in those cities by Gustavus II Adolphus. However, no mention was made of this requirement in subsequent documents. Throughout this entire period, however, the Livonian Church never had a complete printed agenda. The first appearance of the agenda was in the unpublished manuscript edition prepared by Livonian Superintendent Hermann Samson. Although in 1643 he asked official approval from Queen Christina, Samson's Agenda never received royal authorization.

What can be known about the Livonian liturgy after the appearance of the 1615 hymnal can only be gleaned from the Riga hymnals of 1631, 1660 and 1664. These hymnals contained no

liturgical section but parts of the liturgy could be found dispersed among the hymns. The inclusion of these parts indicates that the Briesmann liturgy was still being used.

The first edition of Briesmann's liturgy in the Latvian language appeared in the Livonian Latvian hymnal of 1615. It followed closely the liturgical provisions found in the Riga German hymnal of that same year, but it also provided some enrichments not found in the German edition. Another new Latvian edition appeared in 1631. It too followed the pattern set by the German hymnal of that same year with parts of the Briesmann divine service scattered among the hymns. The 1685 edition of the Livonian Latvian hymnal added additional settings of some parts of the ordinary of the Mass no longer found in the German edition.

During the Swedish annexation of Livonia there were several attempts to formulate and establish a form of church law which would also regulate liturgical worship in the congregations. The most notable attempt to do so was made by Bishop Johannes Gezelius. However, his 1668 draft Church Law was acceptable neither to the church as a whole, nor to its ecclesiastical and secular leaders. The Livonians would have no proper church law until the publication of a new church order in Sweden in 1686. The new law necessitated the appearance of the new church handbook. Its publication in 1693 brought a sentence of death for the Briesmann liturgy. The new Swedish rites were translated into German and Latvian and by 1708 all parishes were required to use them instead of the old Briesmannian *Kurtz Ordnung*. The Swedish Mass followed this order: Exhortation and Common Confession – Declaration of Grace in prayer form – Kyrie – *Gloria in excelsis* and Laudamus (congregation may sing "*Allein Gott in der Höh' sei Ehr',*" "O Lord God from heaven above," or "All glory laud and praise") – Salutation and Collect – Epistle – Hymn – Gospel – Creedal hymn ("*Wir glauben all' an einen Gott*") or Nicene Creed on highest days – Pulpit Hymn invoking the Holy Spirit or a proper hymn on high feasts – Sermon – Confession of Sins – Admonition to Prayer and Thanksgiving

– Church Prayer or Litany – Hymn verse – Eucharistic Preface – Verba – Sanctus and Benedictus – Our Father – Exhortation to Communicants – Pax Domini – Distribution (Agnus Dei and Communion hymns) – Salutation and Post-Communion Collect – Salutation – Benedicamus – Aaronic Benediction with Triune Invocation – Hymn stanza and hymn for king and all in authority. The Swedish Handbook would continue to be used in Livonia even after Swedish domination of the area came ended in 1710.

In Livonia's southwestern neighbor Courland the Briesmann liturgy was made the church's official form of worship in 1570, shortly after the Reformation of the region. Courland had become an independent duchy after the collapse of the Livonian Confederation. It was a fief of the Kingdom of Poland-Lithuania, but it was permitted to remain Lutheran. The duchy's leader Duke Gotthard Kettler undertook an ambitious program of catechization to bring Reformation doctrine and worship to bear upon the region. The instrument used to accomplish this was the Church Order of 1570 which was actually published in 1572. The order of Mass: Introit in Latin or German hymn – Kyrie – *Gloria in excelsis* (Latin or "*Allein Gott in der Höh' sei Ehr*") – Salutation and Collect – Epistle (or Latvian Catechism) – Tract or Sequence with Alleluia, Hymn, or Litany – Salutation – Gospel – Creed in Latin or "*Wir glauben all' an einem Gott*" or a hymn based on the Apostles' Creed – Pulpit office (at feasts a hymn may be sung before the sermon, Sermon, Thanksgivings and Intercessions and Admonition to Needful Prayer) – Preface – Verba – German Sanctus ("*Jesaia, dem Propheten*") – Our Father – Agnus Dei (Latin or German) – Pax Domini – Distribution – Post-Communion Collect – Benedicamus – Benediction. This service would remain the standard for all Courlandian worship for centuries to come. Included in this church order was a liturgical agenda containing the authorized order of Divine Service and the sacramental and other pastoral acts to be used in the Courlandian Church. It was a formidable order of Baltic origin and it would prove to be influential far beyond the borders of

Courland. A Divine Service in the Latvian tongue based upon this book appeared in Courlandian Latvian language hymnals in 1586 and 1685. In 1727 a Latvian language agenda based upon it would be published. Later editions appeared in 1744, 1754 and 1771. The German agenda based on the 1570 Church Order appeared in 1741 and 1765, although by that time some ceremonial aspects were being dropped from use.

Within the Duchy of Courland was a small independent region which was able to maintain its separate existence. Although Piltene was under the direct control of Poland-Lithuania, this small region was permitted to maintain its Lutheran identity. It had its own liturgical tradition which was largely similar to that of Courland. Its rudimentary church order dated from 1622. Two Piltene Agendas were published: the first in 1741 and the second in 1756. The Piltene liturgy was still in use when the region was annexed by Russia in the Third Partition in 1795.

Liturgical uniformity in Estonia was unknown before 1642. Before that time the history of the church was one of conflicting jurisdictions. The Reformation did not spread into rural areas until after the dissolution of the Livonian Confederation. The land owners, the nobility, were fearful that the introduction of the Reformation would bring with it the sort of social unrest which had earlier plagued Riga, Dorpat, and Tallinn. In 1561 Estonia was annexed to Sweden by its own request and it was the Swedes who pushed forward the Reformation in Estonia. The breaking of the power of the Church of Rome in the region brought church lands under the secular control of nobles who thwarted all attempts to create a single church administration. What resulted was ecclesiastical and liturgical chaos. Each landlord ruled the church on his own land and determined what church order was to be followed and what liturgies were to be used. According the whim of the local noble one might find in use a church order from Courland, Mecklenburg, Pomerania, Nürnberg, Sweden, or the city of Tallinn. In 1627 Swedish Bishop Johannes

Rudbeckius sought to bring order to this chaos but his attempt was thwarted by the nobility. In his Handbooks of 1632 – 1638 Stahl attempted to provide some enrichment to Estonian worship. He had no authority to issue a worship form (*jus liturgicum*), however, in volume 2 (1637) he provided Collects and Thanksgivings, chant tones for the Our Father and Consecration, and proper Eucharistic Prefaces for Christmas, Passion, and other feasts and for general use with musical notations. He also included a Prayer of the Church based on Luther's Paraphrase of the Our Father along with prayers for repentance, bearing the cross, etc. In Stahl's book the Sanctus follows the Preface before the Our Father and the Consecration – the more usual Western practice.

Beginning in 1642 Bishop Joachim Jheringius was able to achieve some small measure of liturgical uniformity, and in 1673 Bishop Pfeiff stated that he was attempting to build upon it and to establish a greater degree of liturgical uniformity by authorizing the use of a common liturgy. His Divine Service proceeded as follows: Hymn and Procession of Penitents who had previously confessed before the pastor – Absolution – *Gloria in excelsis* ("*Allein Gott in der Höh' sei Ehr*") – Salutation and Collect – Epistle – Hymn – Gospel –Creed followed by "*Wir glauben all' an einen Gott*" or "*We now implore God the Holy Ghost*") – Pulpit Office (Our Father, Gospel, Sermon, prayers, Our Father, and Votum) – Hymn – Verba – Distribution (Distribution hymns are sung) – Salutation and Post-Communion Collect – Benediction. Despite its meager fare it must be said that this liturgy represented the high point of liturgical expression in the Estonian Church in the post-Reformation period. It was not until the imposition of the 1693 Swedish Handbook and other provisions of the 1686 Swedish Church Order that the situation in the Estonian Church was much improved. The 1699 Estonian translation of the Swedish rite brought uniformity in worship to the Estonian speaking congregations. The German speaking Estonian congregations got their German language Agenda in 1708 along

with the Livonians. There are indications that a new Estonian edition of the Handbook was published in 1763 and a new German edition appeared in 1789.

A different liturgical development took place on the island of Ösel (Saaremaa) of the coasts of Estonia and Livonia. The collapse of the Livonian Confederation brought the island under Danish control. The Danes found the church there to be unreformed; the Roman Mass was still being celebrated in the Arensburg cathedral and likely elsewhere as well. In 1561 Danish King Frederik II insisted that the Lutheran Mass of the Church of Denmark must be celebrated, but the Arensburg cathedral chapter replied that they were using the old Apostolic Mass and were waiting for the decisions of the Council of Trent about any reforms which might be necessary. The King found this response unsatisfactory. His command was irrevocable and the church had to adopt the 1537/1542 Church Order of Denmark-Norway-Iceland. The liturgy was regulated according to the Altarbook of 1556 and handwritten German translations of its subsequent editions of 1564, 1574, 1580, 1602 and 1611. Control of Ösel passed to Sweden as a result of the terms of the Peace of Brömsebro of 1645. The Church of Ösel was now annexed to the Church of Estonia and Bishop Jheringius required that the Estonian liturgy must be used, although in fact there was at that time no high degree of worship uniformity in Estonia. The Öselian nobles were not satisfied with this decision and the church administration proposed by Bishop Jheringius. They wanted a completely separate Church of Ösel with its own consistory and its own superintendent. Their request that the Swedish crown approve this arrangement was granted in 1650. The newly constituted Church of Ösel, with its own 1650 Church Order, decided that it would order its worship according to the Riga liturgical rites and ceremonies as found in the German edition of the 1615 Riga Hymnal and Samson's Agenda.

The only minority church entering the Russian Empire was the Lithuanian Church. It had survived more than a century of severe

repression. There was no common consistory to exercise leadership or supervision among the several parishes, nor was there a uniform liturgical tradition, but every parish had its own church order and its own liturgy. The most prominent of these church orders was the 1648 Order of the Vilnius congregation. It provided the necessary rubrics for the regulation of public worship in the parish. The section on the Mass was entitled "Church Ceremonies". It included nine directives for the conduct of all public services whether in Polish or German. The order of Mass was as follows: *Veni Sancte Spiritus* and Kyrie (sung by cantor and choir) – *Gloria in excelsis* ("*Allein Gott in der Höh' sei Ehr'*") – Collect – Epistle – Hymn – Nicene Creed ("*Wir glauben all' an einen Gott*") – Sermon (Gospel and explanation) – Hymn verses – Eucharistic Preface and Sanctus – Our Father – Verba (Bread Words – Shorter Sanctus – Cup Words – Shorter Sanctus) – Distribution – Post-Communion Collect – Benediction. The church order stated that fuller provisions could be found in "The Agenda." This unnamed agenda was most likely of Saxon origin. No copies of it are extant, but it is known that a Polish language translation prepared by Pastor Jan Malina in 1640 was used in Polish language divine services. It is also known that the liturgical services of the Vilnius church were liturgical and ceremonial and the clergy wore the traditional Mass vestments including the chasuble. A similar liturgy was used in the congregation in Kaunas which in addition drew upon Prussian sources in its pastoral acts.

When the rights and privileges of the Lutherans and Reformed were restored in Poland-Lithuania in 1768 and 1775, the churches were now able to create consistories. The churches were apprehensive that they might again loose their rights and considered that the creation of a political union between the churches might strengthen their position. In 1776 Lutherans in Major Poland proposed such a union with the Reformed and a document of union was signed in Lissa (Leszno). In Minor Poland and Mazovia a union between the Lutherans and Reformed was established at Sielec in 1777. This union went beyond strictly political considerations. At the general

synod in Wengrów in 1780 a church law was agreed which would govern both the Lutheran and Reformed Churches in Poland in Lithuania. However, the churches were left free to either accept or reject any of the specific provisions of this law which they deemed inappropriate. The Lithuanian Lutherans were not represented at this general synod and many of them refused to accept the church law at all. The Lutheran congregations in Vilnius, Kaunas and Słuck had already established their own consistory in Vilnius. In 1781 some of the remaining Lithuanian Lutheran congregations joined in a political union with the Reformed in the Kėdainiai Union. They established a united consistory with representatives of both confessional groups. In 1782 the Warsaw Lutheran parish, the largest in Poland, left the Sielec Union and established its own independent Lutheran consistory. At a general synod at Wengrów attempts were made to reconcile these groups, but the Lutherans were determined to be independent. The Reformed walked out of the meeting and the Lutherans who remained passed a new recension of the church law. This recension, published in 1783, was supposed to govern both confessional groups in both countries. However, the Lithuanian Lutherans would accept it only in part because they stated that it was not relevant to their circumstances. The 1782 general synod resolved that the Lithuanian Lutherans should make use of whatever in the church law was relevant to them and ignore the rest of it. According to the Church Laws of 1780 and 1783 both Lutherans and Reformed congregations could continue to worship according to their own liturgical traditions. Before the 1782 general synod, however, the majority of the Lithuanian Lutheran congregations had abandoned the Kėdainiai Union and associated themselves with the Vilnius consistory. At the synod in Biržai in 1783 the Lithuanian Lutherans established themselves as a separate body independent of the Poles and adopted the 1783 church order to their situation. At the same time the synod established a commission to examine a Polish proposal that the Lithuanian Lutheran church should agree to use the Saxonian agenda already adopted

in Poland. Nowhere is it stated which particular Saxon agenda was preferred. In Poland the Warsaw congregation is known to have used the agenda of Saxe-Coburg 1747. The liturgical needs of the Latvian speaking congregations in Lithuania were met by Pastor Conrad Schulz whose Latvian language agenda was published in 1795. His Divine Service was Pietist in character but appropriate ceremonies were included.

The city churches of Riga, Tallinn and Narva were independent of the authority of the territorial consistories and maintained their own administrations. The city of Riga used the old Briesmann liturgical service and was able to maintain its own consistory even after the implementation of the 1686 Swedish Church Law in the rest of Livonia. However, in 1708 it too was forced to surrender its liturgy and introduce the 1693 Swedish Handbook. In 1760 a supplementary handbook appeared in Riga to be used together with the 1708 translation of the Swedish handbook. The city churches of Tallinn also used the Briesmannian rite. Here it was not possible to maintain an independent consistory after the imposition of the new Swedish Church Law. The city churches were put under the Estonian territorial consistory and were required to use Swedish Handbook. When the city capitulated to the Russians in 1710, it asked and was granted permission to establish an independent consistory, however, the use of the 1708 Handbook continued. A supplementary liturgical book was published in 1740. The Mass was not included; only the Consecration and Post-Communion were included: Consecration (Our Father and Verba) and after Communion the Post-Communion Collect and Aaronic Benediction.

The Estonian city of Narva on the Russian border also had its own consistory and published its own liturgical handbooks. Its 1698 Handbook did not include the divine service but provided forms for pastoral acts. In 1765, long after the city came under Russian control, another book of pastoral acts was published to be used as a supplement to the 1698 Narva Handbook and the 1708 translation of the Swedish handbook. It included only the formula

of Consecration and the Post-communion as follows: Salutation – Our Father – Verba – Salutation and Post-Communion collect.

In the Lutheran congregations established in Russia before the Third Partition liturgical chaos reigned supreme. Liturgical worship differed from congregation to congregation depending upon the churches from which parish patrons and parishioners had come. The oldest and most prominent congregations were in Moscow. The only church order from there to have survived is the 1668 work of Dr. Laurentius Blumentrost. His church order was a rudimentary work, which was really meant to be little more than a parish constitution. It did not include the form of worship or prayers to be used in the congregation, but it is known that the services were ordered according to the provisions in use in the Lutheran Church in Hamburg, the mother church of the Moscow congregations.

When Peter the Great moved his government from Moscow to St. Petersburg the whole apparatus of government had to be transplanted. Among those who moved to St. Petersburg were German scholars and bureaucrats who then established Lutheran congregations in the new capital city in which the liturgical traditions of the Moscow-Hamburg congregations were perpetuated. In 1711 Peter the Great attempted to unite all Lutheran congregations in Russia proper with a single church order and a single administration under Superintendent Barthold Vagetius. Vagetius published his Church Order in 1717, but he had neither the personality nor administrative skills necessary to implement and the government did not insist. In any case the 1717 Order had said little about liturgy beyond some rubric which cites as its authority the Hamburg Church Order. The Vagetius church order included the following elements: Hymn invoking the Holy Spirit – Luther's Te Deum – Kyrie (*Kyrie Gott Vater in Ewigkeit*) – *Gloria in excelsis* ("*Allein Gott in der Höh' sei Ehr'*") – Collect – Epistle – Hymn – Nicene Creed ("*Wir glauben all' an einen Gott*") – Pulpit Office (Our Father, Gospel text – Hymn – Sermon) – Admonition to Communicants – Our Father – Verba – Distribution (Agnus Dei and other Communion hymns). It can

be assumed that the service closed with a Post-Communion collect and the Aaronic Benediction. This service appears not to have been widely used outside Vagetius' St. Petersburg parish, although it may also have been used in Moscow.

The liturgical situation would soon become further complicated by the arrival of German immigrants invited by Catherine the Great to settle along the banks of the Volga River. They brought with them hymnals and prayer books from their own regions and the parishes they established conducted their worship just as it was done back home in German territories from which they had come.

Pietist and Rationalist Attitudes toward Liturgical Worship

Two important philosophical and spiritual movements swept through the Baltic Lutheran territories in the eighteenth century. Both would have complicating effects on Lutheran faith, life and worship.

The first of these movements was profoundly spiritual in nature. Pietism had its roots in Lutheran Orthodoxy and did not so much react against it, but sought to bring the faith of the heart to more visible expression. The new movement would have great effects on the attitude of people and pastors toward the liturgy, its traditions and its ceremonies. For some that attitude was one of indifference. They continued to use the liturgy but their hearts were somewhere else. To them the liturgy was little more than a mark of profession among men, a heritage from the past to be held in honor but of little practical value or use. Other Pietists eschewed the liturgy as absolutely detrimental to the growth of the Spirit. Thus while some Pietists attended liturgical services in the church on Sunday and went to the prayer houses during the week, others abandoned the church altogether and went only to the prayer house, while others campaigned to turn the church into a prayer house. Liturgical vestments were cast aside as many colored garments of human vanity. In its place was preferred the plain, somber black robe, the *talar*.

The Pietists eventually took control of the churches in Livonia, Estonia, Ösel and along the Volga River in Russia proper. In Major Lithuania, Courland and Piltene they never exercised an influence strong enough to change liturgical traditions and usages. The consistories of Piltene and Courland in particular pledged themselves to fight off Pietist invasions. The 1741 and 1765 Courlandian Agendas and the 1741 and 1756 Piltene Agendas were published for this purpose, and the pastors were strictly required to follow all the directives of these books and not depart from them. In Livonia, Estonia and Ösel the situation was quite different. Here the Pietists had taken control of the consistories and the fulfillment of liturgical directives was no longer considered an important matter.

Only one agenda with a strong imprint of Pietism is known to have been printed in the Baltic region. There was little need for such agendas, since a written might be thought of as interfering with the work of the Spirit. Pastors could continue to use whatever they found useful in their present agendas and ignore the rest. The single printed Pietist agenda was published in Mitau (Jelgava) in 1795 for use in the Latvian speaking congregations in Lithuania. It was needed only because they had no other printed Latvian service at all.

A complicating factor in Livonia, Estonia and Ösel was the spread of the Moravian Brethren, the *Herrnhutians*, in these regions. The superintendents and many pastors had welcomed them as Christian brothers who would help to revive the spiritual lives of the people. The Moravians themselves, however, had their own agenda and it took a more independent course. Although many of those who were attracted to them continued to attend Sunday morning services in the church, on Sunday afternoon and on other days they went to the Moravian prayer houses where the Moravians followed their own unique liturgical traditions, which in some places included foot washings held in conjunction with a monthly Communion service and other rites they had assimilated during their years in Poland and further developed in Herrnhut. Some of the local nobil-

ity were attracted to the Moravians but the majority viewed them with increasing suspicion and apprehension. They sought to have the movement arrested because of their fear that it would create an upheaval of the social order. The consistories based their objections to the Moravians on theological grounds. In 1743 Tsarina Elizabeth I proscribed the movement and the Moravians in her realm were forced underground. Catherine the Great lifted the suspension of the Moravians in 1764 as a part of her efforts to attract new immigrants to Russia.

The second movement was secular in origin but would prove to have a strong spiritual impact on the church. Rationalism, a new view of God, man, and the world, was spreading quickly and many saw it as a call to the church to accommodate her worship, speech, and song to the spirit of the age. In general it may be said that the Rationalists eschewed every form of supernaturalism and saw the church as having value chiefly as a moral institution teaching the moral values of Jesus, the teacher and exemplar. Liturgies needed to be rewritten or rather replaced to reflect this new view of religion and this new understanding to the value given to the worship hour. Sermons would need to stress moral values and the administration of the sacraments would become occasions of symbolic value in which man would reaffirm his moral values and pledge himself to their fulfillment. Rationalism was not congenial with Pietism but Pietism did not have within itself the sort of theological strength needed to fight off the new movement. It had always been rather suspicious of doctrinal theology and preferred to cultivate subjective piety. As a result by the end of the eighteenth century most church leaders and the leading pastors in Livonia, Estonia, Moscow and St. Petersburg were Rationalists riding the crest of the new movement. Even in Courland where Pietism had been stubbornly resisted, Rationalism was making inroads, and leading men of the church were identifying themselves with the spirit of the age.

During this era no official liturgy clearly espousing the Rationalist cause or articulating its principles was published, although in the

eighteenth century a number of unofficial productions appeared. In 1785 and 1786 Pastor Christoph Friedrich Neander in Courland had taken the first steps toward providing a church law built of rationalist principles and Pastor Dr. Karl Dietrich Wehrt made use of Neander's work in formulating an agenda congenial to it. His agenda appeared in 1786 and was bound together with Neander's 1786 edition of the church law. It did not simply rearrange or adapt the existing liturgy. It demolished it and replaced it with something entirely new. Wehrt portrayed the Lord's Supper as the last meal of a popular Jewish teacher with his few remaining followers, an opportunity for him to say a last farewell before he was put to death for his unwillingness to forsake his ideals. For people of rationalist mentality Jesus, the Teacher, was a man whose integrity should remain for all a cause for inspiration. According to Wehrt those who come to the Supper today should come to recommit themselves to the high ideals of Jesus and pledge themselves willing to remain steadfast in their own moral uprightness as he had done. Man receives no sacrament from God; he presents himself to God as a sacrament.

The Rationalists were pleased with Wehrt's Agenda and in 1792 a new edition appeared. Neither the work of Neander or Wehrt ever gained official status in the Courlandian Church. Rationalism was more widely accepted in Riga, and there a handbook heavily influenced by this movement was published in 1801. The agenda did not include the chief divine service but provided forms for Confession, Baptism and Marriage which run from mildly rationalist to forms which left behind any pretense of Christian orthodoxy. Included in the handbook were four forms for Baptism which a pastor could choose according to the measure of how fully he wanted to turn his back on the old orthodox Christianity and affirm the new rationalistic Christianity. These forms stated that the birth of a healthy should be an occasion of festal celebration and Baptism was meant to fulfill this purpose. It should not be thought to convey any blessing to the child, but rather was a ritual welcoming him into the

Christian community and laying the moral obligations of a rational way of life. Among the Latvian speaking population of Courland it was Pastor Alexander Johann Stender, a noted humanist writer, who provided forms of worship congenial to the new age. His work appeared in 1805 but neither did it achieve official status. Only in Courland and Livonia did such liturgies ever reach the printing press. Elsewhere pastors of this persuasion had to be content to alter their service books, striking out all that they found offensive and manipulating words as needed to avoid offending their enlightened hearers. However, Christianity remained an offence to those of rationalist persuasion and no new liturgy was going to bring them back to church.

An Early Attempt to Unite Lutherans under a Single Liturgy

The Lutheran Church in the Russian Empire entered the nineteenth century without a single church order, a single liturgy, and without a single religious and theological viewpoint or confession. On paper the Lutheran Church was the Church of the Augsburg Confession and the Church of Luther's Small Catechism, but in fact little attention was given to either. Each territorial church had its own liturgy and in each church the prescribed liturgy (in whatever languages it appeared) was altered and adapted according to the whims of pastors and patrons. Not only did the liturgy differ from one consistorial district to another, but from parish to parish as well. In Courland official complaints were lodged with the College of Justice in St. Petersburg that pastors were making unauthorized alterations in the church's liturgical services. The problem existed not only in Courland. The Livonian General Superintendent Carl Gottlob Sonntag was among those most responsible for the spread of liturgical chaos. Sonntag defended himself stating that he was not responsible for this situation, that he deplored it, but that he was powerless to correct it. Authorities in St. Petersburg decided

that something must be done lest Lutheranism become only an umbrella organization covering a multitude of diverse and even conflicting religious movements.

The College of Justice had recognized as early as 1773 that the 1686 Swedish Church Order was no longer able to satisfactorily order church life and worship in Livonia, Estonia and elsewhere. It charged the St. Petersburg clergy with the responsibility of offering some new alternative. Nothing much came of the assignment. The Courlandian complaint against liturgical tinkering was signed Count Friedrich Wilhelm von Buxhöwden, the military governor and civil commander of Courland, Livonia and Estonia, and in July 1804 it was sent to Count Viktor Kochubey, the minister of the interior. As a result of this complaint a committee was established to deal with the situation. Included in its membership was the same Livonian Superintendent Sonntag whom Buxhöwden had identified as part of the problem. Also sitting on the committee were Prosecutor Georg Friedrich Sahlfeldt who was a consultant to the College of Justice, Dean Tomas Rheinbott of St. Petersburg, and a number of other prominent pastors, included among whom was Pastor Wehrt who had authored the 1786 and 1792 rationalist Courlandian Agendas.

The task assigned to this committee was to produce a single liturgy which every Lutheran congregation would be obligated to use. It soon became clear that the members of the committee, most of whom were themselves rationalists, were not able to come to any common agreement as to the value and purpose of congregational worship. Although they were charged with the formulation of a new liturgy to be used by people of widely divergent educational backgrounds and conflicting theological positions, they could not even agree among themselves about how this could be accomplished. They could not get beyond a heated discussion about the goal and purpose of liturgy in the Protestant Church. They could all agree that the moral improvement of the worshipper must be a matter of first concern, but there was no common mind among them as to

what any of this had to do with God. As Superintendent Sonntag noted, God is beyond being moved in any way by anything said or done by those who worship him. Thus, he concluded, it should be clear to all that the chief purpose of worship is to move man. In a word, worship is about man; its purpose is to inspire his moral aspirations. The old liturgical services did not properly fulfill this purpose. In addition those services were far too ceremonial, recalling the Catholic era. What was most needed today was worship which would cultivate holy silence, solemnity, the careful attention of the hearers, patriotism and other moral goals. Careful attention must be given to the inclusion of hymns which would implant in man the proper ideals. In short the old service must be eliminated completely. However, the committee could not agree as to what should replace it, excepting, of course, that it must contain within it reverential petitions on behalf of the tsar and his household.

The 1805 Imperial Agenda

The fruit of the work of the committee was the 1805 Imperial Agenda, entitled: *Von Sr. Kaiserlichen Majestät allerhöchst bestätigte Allgemeine Liturgische Verordnung für die evangelisch-lutherischen Gemeinden im Russischen Reiche* (*His Imperial Majesty's General Liturgical Regulation for Evangelical-Lutheran Congregations in the Russian Empire*). It was published in St. Petersburg with the authorization of Tsar Alexander I, who decreed that it was to be used without exception in all Lutheran Churches in the empire. Rationally minded leadership of the church lauded it as a great accomplishment by which all Lutherans would now have a single liturgy. What was in the agenda, however, could only in the loosest sense of the word be called a liturgy. It was a sort of church order having in it chapters concerning church administration, hymnody, some formulas for church and altar prayers, regulations concerning the use of the Our Father and preaching texts, instructions concerning the length and goal of sermons and their proper themes and the goal and proper form of catechization. The chief service of worship would no longer

be the celebration of the sacrament of the altar. That would now officially become an occasional service. The goal of worship was said to be determined by the very purpose of the church itself which was nothing other than to help its members reach the highest level of morality and satisfaction consistent with present day religious and moral circumstances and the needs of the community. The special services of Holy Communion would be special occasions for the recommitment of the individual to his self-identification with Jesus and his righteous cause.

The Imperial Agenda of 1805 was meant to provide a single form of worship for use in all Lutheran Churches throughout the empire. This unity was more imagined than real, however, for the agenda provided little more than a directory of things to be done. It gave no instructions as to what words were to be said or what, if any, actions ought to accompany those words. The committee had not provided these because it was unable to do so. The Lutheran community in the Russian Empire lacked the homogeneity needed to do so. Furthermore, one could not provide common prayers and liturgical ceremonies when there was no agreement as to the purpose of these prayers, what ought to be prayed for, and what ceremonies might be agreed. Little more could be done than to require the use of a general prayer of the church, the central purpose of which was to pray for the tsar and his household. The pastors used the agenda as a regulatory document, as a skeleton upon which they could put the flesh of the prayers and forms with which the people were already familiar. The Rationalists used it as a framework for worship events which to their mind reflected the spirit of the times.

The 1805 document had no power to unify the church. A church law was needed into which it and all other aspects of church life could be fitted. Prosecutor Sahlfeldt provided such a church law in 1808. It was clearly rationalist in spirit, and in its liturgical provisions simply repeated what was found in the 1805 Agenda. Sahlfeldt's work was never officially adopted. The church had a single liturgy in name only; as yet it had no truly uniform rite and church order.

Tentative Moves toward Organizational and Liturgical Unity

Important for the Lutheran Church ecclesiastically, administratively, and eventually liturgically as well was restructuring of the tsarist government in 1818. A new Ministry of Cults and Public Enlightenment was established in that year, headed by Count Aleksandr Nikolaevich Golitsyn. Its Department of Cults was given responsibility for supervising all religious organizations in Russia: Lutheran, Reformed, Roman Catholic, Jewish, Islamic and even Orthodox. This Ministry would provide to Lutherans the guarantees under which the various consistories could operate. It was the hope of the tsar that soon there would be a single Lutheran Church in the empire governed by one administrative body. To this end on July 20, 1819 the tsar charged Golitsyn with the task of appointing a Lutheran bishop after the manner of the Lutheran bishops in Sweden and Finland and Imperial General Consistory to govern the whole church should also be established. This new high consistory of mixed membership was organized on October 25, 1819 and was given responsibility to maintain the doctrinal integrity of the church, to implement of all church ordinances, to provide a decent standard of living for the clergy, and to supervise the consistories. Golitsyn found it expedient to modify the proposal that the new bishop should superintend both the Lutheran and Reformed Churches in the empire. It would be better that a Lutheran bishop be named to administer the St. Petersburg consistorial district only. Dr. Zacharias Cygnäus, Jr., the bishop of Porvoo, was appointed and designated ecclesiastical chairman of the General Consistory. The task given him was to unite the church organizationally.

It would not be possible to achieve any liturgical uniformity until there was only one Lutheran Church. Unfortunately Bishop Cygnäus was not able to accomplish this task. Despite his repeated attempts he was unable to inspire in the Lutherans any strong desire for organizational unity. Count Karl Lieven, the lay chairman of the consistory, was far more dynamic, but his plan of action was deemed

unworkable. Golitsyn realized that the two drafts Lieven presented failed to take into account the necessity that his proposals must have the support of the territorial consistories. Golitsyn had established a Temporary Commission for Examining the Organizational Draft but it failed to accomplish its tasks precisely because the Baltic consistories were unwilling to surrender their prerogatives. This situation did not change until Bishop Cygnäus asked the tsar to dissolve the commission and give him the sole responsibility of creating a workable plan. He hoped to do this with the collaboration of the Baltic superintendents. The tsar agreed and a meeting of representatives of the Livonian, Estonian, Courlandian consistories along with the delegates of the cities of Reval and Riga was held in Dorpat in February and March 1822. The group proposed an organizational structure which would provide adequate representation from all geographical regions. In March 1824 Bishop Cygnäus presented the draft proposal *General Ordinance Concerning Evangelical Church Matters* to Golitsyn who in turn submitted this proposal to Marquis Filippo Paulucci, the Governor General of Livonia, Estonia and Courland, who in turn gave it to a government committee for an opinion. Unfortunately the committee was not competent to deal with ecclesiastical matters. The members simply did not like what was being proposed and rejected it despite the last minute pleas by Peter von Götze, an expert in matters of Baltic church organization. Paulucci announced that the plan was unacceptable. The real reason for its rejection was that the Baltic nobility were unwilling to surrender any of their privileges with regard to the control of the Lutheran Church, and so years of planning for the development of organizational structure for the imperial Lutheran Church came to nothing.

The road to Lutheran unity proved to be long and tortuous. A major obstacle was the insistence of Baltic nobles that their traditional rights and privileges be maintained. This led them to oppose the unification of the church under the Imperial General Consistory with jurisdiction superior to their own Courlandian, Livonian and

Estonian jurisdictions. This frustrated all attempts to create for the church a central organization and common order. Although the tsar wanted his Lutheran subjects to be members of a single ecclesiastical body, Paulucci, his governmental committee, and the Baltic nobles had their own agenda. As late as 1830 the desire which the tsar had expressed eleven years before had still not yet been realized.

After 1805 Lutheran officials were fully occupied with administrative problems and had no time to consider liturgical matters. The 1805 Agenda was supposed to be the church's last word on the subject of liturgy but it was not a liturgical document in any significant sense. Churches with long established liturgical traditions could easily accommodate themselves to the agenda by simply adding the prayers for the tsar to their existing liturgical orders. Such was the practice in the Baltic churches. However, among the newer and mixed congregations along the banks of the Volga River there were no fixed liturgical traditions. It was not until 1821 that there was a single administrative organization to oversee them, the new Saratov consistory. Among the tasks to which the new consistory had to address itself was to supply the congregations with a common liturgical service. This task was taken up by Ignatius Aurelius Fessler, the superintendent of the newly organized consistorial region. He could see that the 1805 Agenda was woefully inadequate. Something far more substantial needed to be provided. The agenda which he produced in 1823 made use of the liturgical traditions of both the Eastern and Western Churches, framed in such a way as to provide little offence to Pietists and the Reformed, while at the same time seeking to support a tradition which was Catholic and Evangelical Lutheran. He added to his liturgy elements not traditionally associated with the Western Rite, such as the Epiclesis, as well as proper Eucharistic Prefaces and other elements of the Eucharist which had fallen into disuse in many places. His work was far ahead of its time.

A very different agenda appeared in Mitau in 1822 for the purpose of satisfying the needs of Latvian speaking pastors and their

congregations who had had no new liturgy since 1708. This work was penned by Pastor Christoph Reinhold Girgensohn who prepared it shortly before his death in 1814. Girgensohn's purpose was to provide a liturgy appropriate to the times in which the church was living, somewhat after the manner employed by Stender for the Courlandian Latvians in 1805. Girgensohn was not critical of the 1805 Imperial Agenda. His plan was to fit its provisions into a traditional structure appropriately reworded. The agenda he produced leaned toward Rationalism. Girgensohn was living in the final days of an era which was fast coming to its close. He tried to put the "old" liturgy into the service of a new "rationalistic faith" which was already old and dying. It is not known whether his work found general acceptance; in any case it left no lasting mark on the liturgical history of the Livonian Church.

During this same period of time a bold program of liturgical reform was being undertaken in the nearby kingdom of Prussia. King Friedrich Wilhelm III, who had done extensive study in theology and liturgy, determined to establish one united church for all Protestants in his realm. Those who in the past had been either Lutheran or Reformed would in the future be "Evangelical", united by a common Evangelical liturgy, a kind of German language Book of Common Prayer. Originally, the use of this liturgy was to be voluntary, but in 1834 the king declared that its use would henceforth be mandatory in every Prussian Evangelical congregation. The Prussian agendas sought to restore many liturgical elements which the Lutherans had lost through a series of increasingly impoverished agendas and to introduce to the Reformed liturgical uses which had never been theirs in the past. The 1821, 1822 and 1829 Prussian Agendas had much in them which liturgical scholars have rightfully praised. Reformed did not like the agenda because it seemed to them too "Lutheran", or even "Catholic". Lutherans opposed the work strongly, because they had no desire to use a liturgy which united them with those who denied essential Lutheran doctrines, such as the presence of Christ's body and blood in bread and wine.

The Unification of the Church under a Single Church Order and Agenda

Liturgical developments in Prussia did, however, encourage those who hoped that something similar could be accomplished in the Russian Empire. The first move toward it was the 1828 decree of the tsar which called for the establishment of a common liturgy and a single church government for the Lutheran Church in the empire. On May 22, 1828 a commission was established to pursue this task. In its membership were Count Paul von Tiesenhausen who was named chairman, Bishop Cygnäus, Livonian Superintendent General Dr. Karl Berg, Dorpat Professor of practical theology Dr. Gottlieb Lenz and Dean Dr. Eric Gustav Ehrström of the St. Petersburg consistory. Lay members included Livonian High Church Warden Hermann Johann von Campenhausen and Estonian Provincial Consistory Chairman Reinhold Gottlieb von Maydell. Also chosen to represent the Baltic nobility was Courlandian Chancellor Gotthard von Bistram and Privy Councilor Friedrich von Adelung, who represented three Lutheran congregations in St. Petersburg. Pastor Dr. Johann Friedrich August Volborth of St. Peter's Church in St. Petersburg took the place of Dean Ehrström's when he found it necessary to leave the committee because of ill health. Ehrström rejoined the commission after the death of Bishop Cygnäus in 1830. Professor Lenz was replaced in 1829 by Dr. Johann Lebrecht Richter, superintendent of Courland, Dean Christian Wilhelm Brockhusen of Riga took the place of Dr. Karl Berg of Livonia when he found it necessary to drop out because of ill health.

Most important for the liturgical and judicial work of the commission was the addition as advisor to its members of Dr. Georg Karl Benjamin Ritschl (1783 – 1858), the superintendent general of Pomerania. His inclusion had been suggested to the tsar by King Friedrich Wilhelm III of Prussia who noted that he would be able to share with the committee the results of the work on liturgy and ecclesiastical government which had been undertaken in the Prussian Union Church.

The task of preparing the liturgy was the special work of the clergy on the committee. Three liturgies would form the primary source material for the new rite: the 1708 German translation of the 1693 Swedish Handbook, the 1811 Swedish Handbook and the 1829 Prussian Union Agenda. The sub-committee was to prepare the draft of the new liturgy and then send it to the theological faculty at Dorpat for evaluation and recommendations. It was also to be sent to the consistories and deaneries, so that church officials, deans and local pastors would have the opportunity to evaluate it and field test its contents.

The sub-committee set down its criteria for the new agenda. It was decided that (1) the basic shape of the Western liturgy should remain intact with the *Kyrie*, *Gloria in Excelsis*, Sunday pericopes, *Sanctus*, *Agnus Dei* (with *Dona Pacem*), all as found also in the Prussian and Swedish rites. (2) Present practice calling three hymns before the sermon and two after must be corrected. There should be two hymns before the sermon, one at the beginning of the service and the other immediately before the sermon. A hymn should follow the sermon and the service should close with a hymn. (3) To enrich the worship and aid in the responsories parishes should have choirs to lead the congregation, and there should be hymn instruction in the schools. (4) In the Baltic provinces there should, when necessary, be two services – one in the national language and the other in German. (5) Pastors should resist the prideful temptation to alter the altar prayers.

The result of the work of the committee was a service which showed the influence of both the Prussian and Swedish rites. In his unsigned preface to the first edition of the 1832 Agenda Ritschl says nothing about the Prussian influences, but states that much was taken over from the Swedish rite and that this in turn was in line with liturgical forms used in Germany at the time of the Reformation. He states also that it conforms to the pattern of liturgical worship as practiced in other evangelical churches.

When the committee completed its work it sent it to the Faculty of Theology at Dorpat. The details of the faculty's critique are not known in detail. It is known, however, that the review, signed by Professor Ernst Sartorius, dean of the faculty, featured 10 suggestions:

1. The Alleluia verse after the Epistle ought to be omitted during the Lenten season, on the Day of Repentance and on the Sunday of the Commemoration of the Departed.
2. On Good Friday a passion hymn should be sung in place of the *Gloria in excelsis.*
3. On the high feasts of Christmas, Easter and Pentecost the full setting of the *Gloria in Excelsis Deo* should be sung.
4. On these high feast days and on Trinity Sunday as well the Apostle's Creed is replaced by the Nicene Creed.
5. On Trinity Sunday there should be a special offering in addition to the regular weekly offering.
6. On feast days a special festal intonation with the Salutation is used.
7. After the words "...and pray for the conversion of the heart" in confession the following words are added "...and consider that so long as he continues in his impenitence his sins will be held against him in the judgment".
8. In the same place the words "...according to our powers" should be struck out and replaced with the words "...with the assistance of the Holy Spirit".
9. In the marriage service to the words "...and now this bridal couple will know many crosses" should be added the words "...to test them".
10. In the burial service Bible verses and hymn stanzas may follow the prayer over the coffin.

The suggestions of the Dorpat faculty were incorporated into the final liturgical document.

Johann von Neumann, Professor of theoretical and practical Russian jurisprudence at Dorpat served as the general editor of the final revision of the new imperial church law of which the Imperial Agenda was a part. His completed work was presented to the tsar on January 2, 1832. It was closely examined by the Imperial Council, translated into Russian, again revised, and then translated back into German. On December 28, 1832 the new church law was signed by Tsar Nikolai I and the senate was instructed to publish the church law, the book of directives for pastors, and the agenda. The road had been long and difficult but now the Lutheran Church in Russia had at last achieved both ecclesiastical and liturgical unity.

The resultant volume consisted of three works bound together: *Gesetz für die evangelisch-lutherische Kirche in Russland* (*Law for the Evangelical-Lutheran Church in Russia*), *Instruction für die Geistlichkeit und die Behörden der evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche in Russland* (*Instructions for the clergy and high officials of the Evangelical-Lutheran Church in Russia*), and *Agende für die evangelisch-lutherischen Gemeinden im Russischen Reiche* (*Agenda for the Evangelical Lutheran Parishes in the Russian Empire*).

The 1832 Imperial Agenda

Unquestionably the 1832 Agenda was an improvement over the 1805 book and the homemade worship orders used in some places. It stood clearly in the main stream of the Lutheran liturgical tradition which derived from the Lutheran divine services of the Reformation Era, even though much of the material was drawn from the impoverished 1811 Swedish Handbook and the eclectic rites of the 1829 Prussian Union Agenda.

The 1832 Agenda marked a return to the mainstream of Lutheran liturgy and theology. Although weekly Communion was not restored, the ancient ante-Communion, i.e., the ancient *Missa catechumenorum* became the standard Sunday service with the *Missa fidelium* added on Communion Sundays. The full service could thus be classified as an occasional service.

After the opening hymn the pastor standing at the altar turns to the congregation and says either the *Gloria Patri* or the *Triune invocation*. The *Triune invocation*, which derived from the priest's confession before the altar before the beginning of the Latin Mass, was taken from the Prussian Agenda. Unlike the Prussian rite there is no provision for an Introit or verse, but instead an Exhortation to Confession and a Confessional Prayer. The Exhortation is based loosely on those of the 1693 Swedish Handbook and the 1829 Prussian Agenda. The Confessional Prayer follows the Prussian Agenda almost word for word. An innovation is the *Kyrie* sung by the choir after the Prayer of Confession as a choral response. The 1693 and 1811 Swedish rites and the Prussian 1829 Agenda did not associate the *Kyrie* with the Confession of Sins, but put it after the Declaration of Grace before the *Gloria*. The 1832 rite appears to be the first case in which the *Kyrie* takes on a penitential character and loses its traditional usage as a festal greeting of the Savior-King. The Declaration of Grace which follows is taken directly from the Swedish rites of 1693 and 1811. An alternative form of Confession, taken from the 1829 Prussian Agenda, is allowed. The Absolution Formula in the optative mood is based on Swedish models.

Three alternative forms of Doxology follow. The first is the traditional *Gloria in Excelsis Deo* and *Laudamus* as in the 1693 Swedish rite. The second and third alternatives are introduced with the intonation by the pastor. In the second the congregation responds by singing the hymn "Holy, Holy, Holy God almighty, etc" taken from the 1811 Swedish rite. The third alternative is either the first stanza or all the stanzas of Nikolaus Decius' *Allein Gott in der Höh' sei Ehr'* (*All glory be to God on high*), without an organ prelude. On Good Friday the *Gloria* is not to be intoned and the congregation should sing a passion hymn instead.

The Salutation and its Response by the choir precede the Collect. If there is no choir the pastor should take both parts: "The Lord be with you, and with my spirit." General and seasonal Collects are provided with some of them from Leonine, Gregorian and Gelasian

sources. A sample Collect from the 1829 Prussian Agenda is printed *in situ*, for which reason many pastors would use it at every service.

From the altar the pastor now reads the Sunday pericope which will not be the sermon text. It is followed by the Alleluia excepting on penitential days. The Apostle's Creed follows, or on the high feasts the Nicene Creed. In both cases the Swedish practice of beginning "We believe..." is followed. The chief hymn of the day follows the Creed and after it the pastor reads his preaching text. The prayer of the church, announcements, intercessions and thanksgivings, Our Father and *Votum* are said from the pulpit. During a short hymn the pastor returns to the altar and intones the *Laudatio*. After a short Collect he sings the Aaronic Benediction and the choir responds with the threefold Amen. A short hymn stanza concludes the service, although it is noted that on Communion Sundays and at other times when there has been no earlier Confession of Sins this hymn verse should be from a hymn of confession and be followed by the Confession and Absolution. It is also noted that when there is no Communion there should be a short catechization after the sermon.

When there is Communion the full Eucharistic Preface in its traditional form is used as in the Swedish rites. The *Vere Dignum* follows the Preface as it should, and is followed again by the *Sanctus*, a practice not maintained in Sweden. As an alternative the *Tersanctus* may be sung "Holy, holy, holy is God, the Lord of Sabaoth, heaven and earth are full of his glory". Another alternative is the use of a shortened *Sanctus* which follows the tradition found in Lithuania and Courland: "Holy is our God, holy is our God, holy is our God, the Lord of Sabaoth." In Lithuania and Poland this Minor Sanctus was sung after the Our Father, and then again at the elevation after the consecration of the bread, and a third time after the consecration of the cup. In Courland it followed the consecration. Following the *Sanctus* the pastor prays the Our Father and then speaks the words over the bread and cup making the sign of the cross, as in the Prussian Agenda. As in all the Swedish and Prussian

rites he imparts the *Pax Domini* and the people approach the altar during the singing of the *Agnus Dei*. Alternative formulas of distribution are offered. The first is based on the Swedish rites: "Take and eat, Jesus Christ, whose body (blood) you receive preserve your soul to life everlasting." The second is taken almost directly from the Prussian Agenda: "'Take and eat,' says Christ our Lord, 'this is my body which is given for you. This do in remembrance of me,' "'Take and drink,' says Christ our Lord, 'this is my blood which has been shed for you for the forgiveness of sins. This do in remembrance of me.'" Unfortunately, this second formula makes no declaration about the nature of the gifts or the blessing they impart. Neither the Swedish nor Prussian formulas say as much as Lutheran *formulae* usually say about the locatedness of the body and blood in the bread and wine. The 1832 rite allows that the pastor may also speak an appropriate Bible verse or deliver a short admonition to the communicants before he dismisses them.

The service concludes with the *Benedicamus*, Luther's post-Communion Collect, and the Aaronic Benediction with the sign of the cross. Unlike the service without Communion, no provision is made for a closing stanza after the Benediction.

The 1832 rite retains the historical structure and contents of the Lutheran Mass while in some measure accommodating itself to some of the practices introduced during the spiritual upheavals of the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. This rite is the fountainhead of the Russian liturgical tradition upon which later liturgies would be built. It stands in close continuity with traditions going back to the Reformation Era and even earlier.

The 1832 Agenda would serve as the standard liturgy of the Lutheran Church in the Russian Empire. Only in Finland and Poland did traditional local materials prevail. This new liturgy was introduced gradually in the German speaking parishes of the various consistorial districts. In Courland introduction of the new liturgy came on December 17, 1833. Latvian parishes had to wait a bit longer. *Swehtā ammata-gramata preeksch Lutera draudses-*

mahzitajeem Kreewju walsti for the Latvians was published in Riga in 1834. The Latvian service was introduced in Courland on December 3, 1834. In that same year Estonian and Swedish translations appeared. The Estonian *Agenda ehk Kässiramat Lutterusse Usso Ristirahwa Koggodustele Wennerikis* was published in Tallinn, in the Northern Estonian dialect and the Swedish *Kyrkohandbok för Evangeliskt-Lutherska Församlingarne i Ryska Riket* was published in St. Petersburg. The translation into Finnish was completed in 1835. It was published in St. Petersburg under the title: *Kirkko-menoin Käsi-kirja Evangelisille Lutheruksen Seurakunnille Wenäjällä.*

The first Russian language edition of the 1832 agenda "*Евангелическо-Лютеранскій краткій служебникъ (Агенда)*" appeared in a compendium only in 1872. In earlier times Lutherans, who were foreigners, were expected to worship only in their mother tongues. Now Russian language was the mother tongue of the children of the Lutheran immigrants, and the minister of the interior offered no objections to Russian Lutheran services as long as it was understood that proselytizing was not permitted. The Russian book was 57 pages in length and included only the most basic materials needed by pastors and sextons.

The Imperial Agenda itself was republished in 1835, 1844, 1860, 1866 and 1879. New Estonian translations appeared in 1877 and 1878 and in 1882 a new Latvian translation was published.

The agenda continued to serve the church until in 1897 it was replaced by the new St. Petersburg Imperial Agenda. The new work was based largely upon the results of the labors of Dr. Theodosius Harnack and the liturgical committee of the Livonian Synod. In 1885 the Livonians had published a provisional agenda formulated on the basis of several decades of research. This provisional liturgy would serve as the most important single source of the 1897 Imperial Agenda.

Darius Petkūnas, Doctor of Theology, Lutheran pastor and member of the presidium in the consistory of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in

Lithuania (ELCL); author of several books and articles on the history of the church and practical theology in Poland, the Baltic States and Russia in peer-reviewed academic journals; chairman of the hymnal committee and member of the liturgy committee of ELCL.