

Enlightenment Influences on Lutheran Liturgical Life in Livonia in the Late Eighteenth and Early Nineteenth Centuries

Darius Petkūnas

John Paul II Center for Christian Studies, Faculty of Social Sciences
and Humanities, University of Klaipėda, S. Nėries g. 5,
Klaipėda 92227, Lithuania; darius.petkunas@ku.lt

Abstract. This article examines the influence of the Enlightenment on the liturgical life of the Livonian Lutheran Church in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, when many clergymen set aside traditional liturgical forms and introduced new ones, based on Enlightenment humanistic principles. It surveys the extent to which the traditional Livonian agenda was still in use at this time and what neological liturgical handbooks were employed in its place. Since the Livonian Church consisted of German, Latvian, and Estonian ethnic groups, the article enquires whether new liturgical forms were also implemented in Latvian and Estonian congregations, which at that time had not yet been affected by the ideas of the Enlightenment.

Keywords: Livonia; Lutheran Church; Enlightenment; liturgy; agenda

INTRODUCTION

The Enlightenment principles, which by the middle of the eighteenth century began to affect Lutheran teaching and preaching, towards the end of the century showed their predominant influence on the liturgical life of the Livonian Church.¹ Attracted by the current philosophical ideals, Lutheran clergy of rationalist persuasion set aside the traditional Livonian agenda and began to pursue the implementation of a modern, up-to-date worship expression of the new learning. In response to these worship alterations, Count Friedrich Wilhelm von Buxhövden, military governor of Riga, filed a formal complaint with Tsar Alexander I in 1804, asking the monarch to take measures against liturgical innovations among the clergy and to order them to conduct services in accordance with traditional liturgical usages.²

Up to the present day, there has been little systematic enquiry into the Livonian liturgy of the Enlightenment era. Students of that period generally focus on matters pertaining to ecclesiastical constitution and governance, occasionally turning their attention to churchly acts and customs, but little has been done to produce a study devoted to an investigation of liturgical practices. Consequently, sources published by contemporary witnesses bear direct testimony of liturgical life in Livonia at that time.³ These sources indicate the

- 1 After the enactment of the so-called regency – the governorship constitution (*Statthalterschafts-Verfassung*) in 1783 – the Livonian Lutheran Church, administered by the High Consistory (*Ober-Consistorium*) in Riga, constituted eight ecclesiastical districts with provosts in each of them: Riga Land, Wenden, Wolmar, Walk, Dorpat, Werro, Fellin, and Pernau. Parishes in the city of Riga and the province of Ösel/Saaremaa formed ecclesiastical bodies independent of the Livonian Church and were administered by their own consistories with their seats in Riga, and Arensburg on the island of Ösel.
- 2 C. G. Sonntag. *Geschichte und Gesichtspunct der Allgemeinen liturgischen Verordnung für die Lutheraner im Russischen Reiche*. Häcker, Riga, 1805, 2.
- 3 Important primary sources include the 1793 treatise of Superintendent General Christian David Lenz in which he presented his critical opinion on liturgical innovations in Livonia and declared himself against the excesses of those who wished to reduce Christianity and its Gospel to moral axioms. (C. D. Lenz. *Antwortsschreiben an einen der Theologie Beflissenen...* Keil, Riga, 1793.) Livonian General Superintendent Carl Gottlob Sonntag's 1805 report recounts the neological attitudes of the members of the liturgical commission charged with preparing the general liturgical directives for the Lutheran congregations in the Russian Empire (Sonntag. *Geschichte und Gesichtspunct*). In his 1788 article, "Anmerkung wegen der jetzigen Versuche die alten Kirchenliturgien zu verbessern", August Wilhelm Hupel describes the readiness of the Livonian clergy to implement changes to the traditional forms of the official 1708 Livonian agenda and their attempts to introduce neological agendas from outside the country (A. W. Hupel. *Anmerkung wegen der jetzigen Versuche die alten Kirchenliturgien zu verbessern. – Materialien zu einer liefländischen Adelsgeschichte... Nebst andern kürzern Aufsätzen etc: Der nordischen Miscellaneen 15tes, 16tes und 17tes Stück...* Hartknoch, Riga, 1788). It must be noted that published primary sources on the Livonian liturgy are not as plentiful as in the case of the publications dealing with the legal and administrative ecclesiastical matters.

prevailing deviations from the prescribed liturgical rites, and to some extent also the scope and nature of the liturgical alterations. However, a more detailed picture of liturgical changes can be drawn only from the agendas and handbooks themselves as well as from archival sources.⁴ The handwritten documents at the Latvian State Historic Archives in Riga contain the responses of the Livonian clergy to the High Consistory in Riga regarding the liturgical agendas they used in their service to German, Latvian, and Estonian-speaking peoples as well as other matters related to the liturgical observances in their congregations.⁵

The purpose of this article is to assess the liturgical situation in the Livonian Church in the early days of the nineteenth century, that is, to determine to what extent the clergy still employed the traditional Livonian agenda by celebrating the chief divine service and conducting pastoral acts, as well as what other liturgical handbooks were circulating in the Livonian congregations in that period. As the Livonian Church was trilingual, the article also seeks to determine the agendas according to which the clergy conducted their liturgical services to Latvian and Estonian-speaking peoples.

- 4 Published Livonian liturgical documents include the 1801 handbook for the congregations in the city of Riga (*Liturgisches Handbuch für die Stadt-Kirchen zu Riga*. Müller, Riga, 1801) as well as the 1802/07/18 liturgical contributions of Carl Gottlob Sonntag (C. G. Sonntag. *Formulare, Reden und Ansichten bei Amtshandlungen*. Bd. 1. Hartmann, Riga, 1802. C. G. Sonntag. *Formulare...* Bd. 2. Hartmann, Riga, 1802. C. G. Sonntag. *Formulare...* Bd. 3. Hartmann, Riga, 1807. C. G. Sonntag. *Formulare...* Bd. 1. Hartmann, Riga, 1818. C. G. Sonntag. *Formulare...* Bd. 2. Hartmann, Riga, 1818). The handbook prepared by Christoph Reinhold Girgensohn, published posthumously in 1822 by Karl Eduard Napierksy, is an important document as it provides a first-hand witness of liturgical practices among Latvian-speaking people. A thorough examination of this handbook is given in: D. Petkūnas. *Russian and Baltic Lutheran Liturgy in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries*. Klaipėdos universiteto leidykla, Klaipėda, 2013, 138 ff. The author's study also examines the neological attitudes that continued to permeate the Livonian Church in the early decades of the nineteenth century and the earliest attempts to unite the Lutheran Church under a single liturgy for use by Lutheran congregations throughout the Russian Empire.
- 5 Latvian State Historic Archives (LVVA) in Riga: reports of the Wenden and Walk Provostries: *Liturgische Berichte I* (LVVA 233, f. 1, apr. 230. lieta); reports of the Riga Land and Wolmar Provostries: *Liturgische Berichte II* (LVVA 233, f. 1, apr. 231. lieta); reports of the Dorpat and Werro Provostries: *Liturgische Berichte III* (LVVA 233, f. 1, apr. 370. lieta); reports of the Pernau and Fellin Provostries: *Liturgische Berichte IV* (LVVA 233, f. 1, apr. 371. lieta).

THE LIVONIAN LITURGY IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

The official Livonian agenda in the eighteenth century was the 1693 Swedish handbook.⁶ In 1696, the Livonian *Landtag* had resolved to allow its provisional use,⁷ and in 1707, King Charles XII ordered the book to be introduced in all Livonian congregations.⁸ The German translation of the handbook appeared in Riga in 1708 under the title: *Hand-Buch, Worinnen verfasst ist....* The same year saw the publication of the Latvian edition for use among Livonian Latvians. It was printed in Riga under the title: *Rohkas Grahmata kurrā sarakstihts irr....* Even earlier, in 1699, an Estonian translation of the handbook, *Kässi-Ramat Kumma sisse on...*, was published in Tallinn, and the use of the Swedish liturgy became widespread in all Livonian congregations.⁹

The 1699/1708 handbook continued to be the standard for liturgical worship even after Swedish rule came to an end with the capitulation of the *Ritterschaft* of Livonia, the Swedish Governor-General in Riga, and the city of Riga in 1710.¹⁰ Additional regulations concerning the proper conduct of preaching and divine services were set out in the 1686 Swedish church law which governed all matters pertaining to ecclesiastical life in Livonia.¹¹ The Livonian High Consistory continued to sit in Dorpat; later it was moved to Riga.

The churches of the city of Riga were under the authority of their own consistory. Liturgical life in the city was regulated by the Swedish agenda, but pastors found the 1708 handbook to lack prayers and other usages for which they saw a need. To satisfy what was

6 Handbok, ther vti är författat, huruledes gudztiensten, med christelige ceremonier och kyrckioseder, vti våra swenska församlingar skal blifwa hällen och förhandlad. Kongl. Maj. Burchardi tryckeri, Stockholm 1693.

7 Th. Harnack. Einleitung und Grundlegung der praktischen Theologie: Theorie und Geschichte des Cultus. Deichert, Erlangen, 1877, 616.

8 "Extract Aus Ihro Königl. Majest. gnädigsten Brieffe an das Königl. Consistorium in Pernau." – Hand-Buch, Worinnen verfasst ist, welcher gestalt Der Gottes-Dienst mit Christlichen Ceremonien und Kirchen-Gebräuchen ... gehalten und verrichtet werden soll. Nöller, Riga, 1708.

9 Kässi-Ramat, Kumma sisse on kokkopantut, Kuida Jummalatenistust, CHristlikko Kombede nink Kirko-Wiside ka meie Ma Koggoduste sees peap peetama nink techtama ... C. Brendeken, Tallinn, 1699; Hand-Buch, 1 ff.; Rohkas Grahmata kurrā sarakstihts irr, us kahdu wihsi tai Deewa-kalposchanai, ar Kristigahm Ceremoniehm un Basnizas Eeradumeem... Nöller, Riga, 1708.

10 A. Andresen. Formal Stipulation and Practical Implementation of Religious Privileges in Estland, Livland, and Courland Under Russian Supremacy: Researching the Core of Baltic Regional Identity. – Ajalooline Ajakiri, 2012, 1/2 (139/140), 38.

11 Kirchen-Gesetz und Ordnung, So der Grossmächtigste König und Herr, Herr Carl der Eilffte, Der Schweden, Gothen und Wenden König Im Jahr 1686. hat verassen und Im Jahr 1687. J. G. Wilcken, Riga, 1687.

lacking, the Riga city consistory published in 1760 a supplementary handbook: *Hand-Buch für die Kirchen der Stadt Riga...*¹²

The 1760 Riga supplement was the only liturgical handbook published in Livonia after the annexation of the region to the Russian Empire. According to the provisions of the 1686 church law, even on the day when Enlightenment ideas began to spread far and wide, the clergy were still required to use the old Swedish agenda and to conduct the chief divine service and all pastoral acts in accordance with its provisions.

By the last quarter of the eighteenth century, however, there were pastors in Livonia who were now willing to accommodate themselves to modern Enlightenment principles and rationalist teachings. They yearned to be up-to-date, full participants in the modern philosophical worldview. This was the direction being taken by the German Lutheran theological faculties, and Livonian theologians and pastors saw this modern path as that which the church must follow.

To the enlightened clergy, the old Swedish handbook was as irrelevant as the antiquated pre-Enlightenment theology it articulated, but no official or unofficial liturgy was published in Livonia that supported or formulated a neological cause. Consequently, many pastors espousing new philosophical principles altered their liturgical services to conform to the new learning and began to look for alternatives elsewhere in German lands. The introduction of new agendas was further enhanced by the fact that the Livonian Church did not reprint the 1708 agenda, and the old book wore out over years of intensive use. As a result, liturgical diversity spread and prevailed in Livonia, and liturgical observances differed widely from one congregation to another.

ENQUIRY INTO LITURGICAL OBSERVANCES BY THE LIVONIAN HIGH CONSISTORY

The Livonian High Consistory in Riga saw a need to determine what liturgies were being used in the parishes, and on November 23, 1801, it requested that every pastor inform it about present liturgical practices in their congregations.

In a circular to the clergy, the consistory stated that it was clear to them that only a small number of clergy in the province were

12 *Hand-Buch für die Kirchen der Stadt Riga, zum bequemern Gebrauch dem Druck übergeben.* Riga, 1760.

adhering closely to the authorised liturgical forms in the official German, Latvian, and Estonian agendas. Therefore, it wished to determine just what liturgical practices were being used in the congregations and the principles upon which these practices were built. In short, they wanted an overview of the present liturgical situation in the congregations. Every pastor without exception was now required to answer the following six questions fully and provide with them a detailed report.

(1) The consistory wanted to know whether in his administration of holy baptism, holy matrimony, and other churchly ministrations among Latvians and Estonians, the pastor made use of the forms as written in the agenda or had he made adaptations or modifications, or, for example, did he leave anything out or add anything, or did he perform his pastoral acts in some completely new way. If so, the pastor was to report exactly what changes and alterations he had made.

(2) Each pastor was to state whether in his ministrations to Germans he made use of the Swedish handbook, and if so, did he use it as printed or did he make alterations. In the latter case, he was to report what changes he had made and indicate the source of these changes. If he employed some other German agenda in place of the Livonian, he was to state which book, and if, on the contrary, he had only altered some agenda formulas, from what liturgical collections had the substitute formulations come and what was the nature of these alterations. Those who had substituted official agenda forms with their own improvisations were to indicate this in their report. They were to send to the consistory a copy of such homemade formularies along with a copy of those rites which they modified in the German agenda. Furthermore, the consistory wished to know whether the clergy employed the same altered formulary without having first discerned the level of education of the worshippers. In cases where the pastor was performing his churchly ministrations of baptism, the Lord's Supper, matrimony, and funerals only to Germans, he was to include a sample of his liturgical usages. In short, the consistory desired that the clergy should send any deviations from the standard forms, whether additions, omissions, or improvisations.

(3) The consistory also wished to be informed whether the general church directives concerning the general confession and absolution had been altered by the pastors. As in the first two questions, this one also had to be answered to include references in all languages.

(4) In cases where liturgical changes were found, the consistory enquired whether these changes had been made by the present incumbent or his predecessor. If he had instituted the changes, did he

do so immediately after assuming this pastorate, but if not, when were these changes initiated and specifically what sort of changes were made. The consistory also wished to know how the congregations had reacted to these changes and whether acceptance of the changes had grown in the years since their initiation.

(5) The consistory indicated its particular interest in the ordering of the Sunday worship service. It also wished to know how many hymns were sung and what the sources of these hymns were. It further asked how often catechisations were held and how frequently German sermons were preached. It also enquired as to whether some extraordinary intercessions, over and above those ordinarily used for the baptised, women after childbirth, the sick, the communicants, and bridal couples, were in use and if intercessions were also requested by members of neighbouring congregations. Furthermore, the clergy were asked to report whether or not their parishioners asked for intercessions from pastors in neighbouring congregations, and if so, what sort of intercessions were requested.

(6) Pastors were also asked to report how often during the year instructions were provided for those preparing for first communion and for what period of time such instructions were offered. The clergy were to report how many hours a day were spent in such catechetical activities and to name the catechetical help they employed in addition to the Lutheran catechism. Furthermore, each pastor was to report how much time he spent instructing catechumens from the nobility and what books he used for their instruction.

The Livonian consistory went on to state that it was expected that the clergy would submit these reports to the provost by the end of February 1802, and that failure to do so would cause the imposition of a fine of five roubles. The same penalty would be invoked in cases where reports were too short or failed to give precise information.¹³

¹³ LVVA 233, f. 1, apr. 231. lieta, 1-4. lp.

ANALYSIS OF THE LITURGICAL SITUATION FROM THE PASTORAL REPORTS

By February 1802, the clergy reports had arrived in Riga. The liturgical situation described in these reports could only be characterised as chaotic. Of the 107 parishes in the Livonian Church, only a handful of German-speaking pastors made use of the 1708 German agenda, which, despite its Swedish origin, was still the official liturgical handbook in Livonia.

The situation was different in the Latvian and Estonian-speaking congregations. The majority of the clergy serving these ethnic groups were still making use of the old liturgical forms. Some of these pastors employed them because of their own confessional convictions, and others only because no other books, excepting Conrad Schulz's 1795 Latvian agenda, were available.¹⁴

Among the confessional pastors was Gustav von Bergmann of Rujen congregation in the Wolmar provostry. In his response, he quoted the Symbolical Books, and the *Formula of Concord* in particular, stating that he was not ashamed to use the old liturgies because they were confessionally sound, and for this reason, no liturgical changes were necessary. However, even Pastor von Bergmann made use of several other Lutheran Latvian agendas in addition to the Swedish handbook. For emergency baptism, he employed the official 1708 handbook, and for ordinary baptisms, he made use of the 1754 Lutheran orthodox agenda of neighbouring Courland.¹⁵ For the baptisms and marriages of Germans, he preferred the 1708 official German agenda but also employed the forms found in Luther's *Enchiridion*. This indicates that even pastors who were still adhering to the old Lutheran orthodoxy were making use of other liturgical handbooks as well.¹⁶

The majority of pastors were baptising and marrying Latvians using the orthodox Courlandian Latvian language agendas, including the 1754 and 1771 *Lettische neuverbesserte und vollständige Kirchen-Agende*.¹⁷ No less popular, however, was Conrad Schulz's agenda,

¹⁴ C. Schulz. Lettisches Pastoral-Hand-Buch oder Kirch-Agende zum Gebrauch bey den Lettischen Gemeinden des Großherzogthums Lithauen. Steffenhagen, Mitau, 1795.

¹⁵ Lettische Neuverbesserte und vollständige Kirchen-Agende oder Hand-Buch, darinnen Alle zu denen geistlichen Priesterlichen Handlungen und Amts-Verrichtungen gehörige und in denen Curländischen Kirchen gebräuchliche Ceremonien und Formeln verfasst sind. Hartung, Königsberg, 1754.

¹⁶ LVVA 233, f. 1, apr. 231. lieta, 171. lp.

¹⁷ Lettische neuverbesserte und vollständige Kirchen-Agende oder Hand-Buch, darinnen alle zu denen geistlichen priesterlichen Handlungen und Amts-Verrichtungen gehörige und

Lettisches Pastoral-Hand-Buch oder Kirch-Agende, which he published in 1795 for use in Latvian-speaking congregations in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. This agenda contained some neological influences. Other clergy used the forms for baptism and marriage, found in Latvian language hymnals.

In the same way, the pastors who served the Estonian-speaking Livonian parishes were using Luther's orders for baptism and marriage, found in the Estonian language edition of the *Enchiridion*. Some of them were still using the official 1699 Estonian language agenda. A larger number employed the 1788 edition of the Estonian prayer book, *Eesti-Ma Rahwa Lühhikenne Palwe-Ramat*, which was printed as the fourth part of the 1793 Estonian worship book, *Eesti-Ma Rahwa Koddo-ja Kirko-Ramat*.¹⁸ The prayer book included prayers of the church, general confession, forms of intercession and thanksgiving for the sick, prayers for women in childbirth, altar collects, and forms for marriage, baptism, and burial. Others claimed to make use of the "old Estonian formulary" or the "old book", most likely the 1699 agenda. Still others stated that they were using "the agenda printed in Reval" which would be the 1699 Estonian handbook. As with the Latvians, there was no uniformity. The clergy chose what was available in their libraries or the books which best suited their needs or taste.

The majority of pastors serving Latvians and Estonians were omitting some of the 'outdated' usages from the old agendas. Almost all of them indicated that they had eliminated exorcism from the baptismal rite. Many of them also had abandoned Luther's "flood prayer", which Pastor Johann Georg Schnell of the Gross-St. Johannis parish in the Fellin provostry described as "allegorical".¹⁹ The clergy themselves made their own corrections to the agenda. Heinrich Andreas Erxleben of Kamby parish in the Werro provostry claimed that he was baptising and marrying according to a "revised" agenda.²⁰ Many others stated that they were using the old rites but with "minor changes" which might mean the rejection of exorcism and some other elements they thought to be outdated.

Despite the fact that traditional Latvian and Estonian language books were set on the altar, this did not mean that the pastors were

in denen Curländischen Kirchen gebräuchliche Ceremonien und Formeln verfasst sind. Steffenhagen, Mitau, 1771.

18 *Eesti-Ma Rahwa Lühhikenne Palwe-Ramat*. Lindfors, Tallinn, 1785; *Eesti-Ma Rahwa Koddo-ja Kirko-Ramat*. Lindfors, Tallinn, 1793.

19 LVVA 233, f. 1, apr. 371. lieta, 162. lp.

20 LVVA 233, f. 1, apr. 370. lieta, 31-32. lp.

following old orthodox provisions by conviction. The fact was that these same pastors, who were serving Germans, were in many cases using neological agendas.

There were a few rationalistically minded clergy who sought to introduce some rationalist liturgical forms into Latvian and Estonian-speaking congregations. Heinrich Gottfried Stüchel of the Pillistfer parish in the Fellin provostry reported that when baptising Estonian children, he only occasionally used the official Estonian handbook, but rather he employed the baptismal, marriage, and funeral forms from the 1786 Electoral Palatinate (*Kurpfalz*) neological agenda which he himself translated into the Estonian tongue.²¹ Johann Christoph Thrämer of Ecks parish near Dorpat reported that his predecessor had performed churchly acts to Estonians using the traditional 1699 agenda, but that after his 1795 arrival in Ecks he translated forms from the Georg Joachim Zollikofer 1777 and Electoral Palatinate 1786 agendas into Estonian and used them there.

A few of the pastors who served the German-speaking population made any use of the old German agenda from 1708. Among them were Christoph Friedrich Brosse of Dünamünde and Gottlieb Benjamin Albrecht of Sissegal-Altenwoga, both near Riga, Gustav von Bergmann of Rujen in the Wolmar region, Georg Simon Everth of Koddäfer near Dorpat, Johann Christian Lisch of St. Jakobi – Kerkau in the Pernau provostry, and few others who preferred the old book because it was founded upon the old doctrinally sound faith.²² Martin Gottlieb Agapetus Loder of Wolmar declared that he too was among those who continued the use of the old agenda because he found rationalist liturgical innovations distasteful.²³ Many of these pastors, however, had reported that despite this, they omitted the exorcism and Luther's "flood prayer". As a rule, the old agenda was used as it stands by the older clergy, while the recent university graduates were keen to go along with the spirit of the age.

Some clergy attempted to combine elements and forms from both the new and old agendas. Among these were Heinrich Johann von Jannau of Lais near Dorpat who reported that he used Zollikofer's 1777 book alongside the German 1708 agenda,²⁴ and Sigismund Pezold of St. Bartholomäi's in the Dorpat provostry who stated that he was

21 LVVA 233, f. 1, apr. 371. lieta, 193. lp.

22 LVVA 233, f. 1, apr. 231. lieta, 51. lp., 57. lp., 171. lp.; LVVA 233, f. 1, apr. 370. lieta, 72. lp.; LVVA 233, f. 1, apr. 371. lieta, 44. lp.

23 LVVA 233, f. 1, apr. 231. lieta, 163. lp.

24 LVVA 233, f. 1, apr. 371. lieta, 196. op.

still using the old German 1708 agenda alongside the 1786 Electoral Palatinate handbook.²⁵

A wide variety of neological agendas were employed by the Livonian clergy in the German-speaking congregations. Among them were Zollikofer's *Anreden und Gebete* of 1777/95;²⁶ the agenda for the imperial city of Lindau, *Neue Liturgie. Zum Gebrauch evangelischer Gemeinden* of 1784; Carl Dietrich Wehrt's *Handlungen und Gebete*, three editions: 1785, 1786, and 1792; Carl Benjamin List's *Ordnung Gebete und Handlungen bey dem öffentlichen Gottesdienste* of the Electoral Palatinate of 1783/86; Georg Friedrich Seiler's *Allgemeine Sammlung liturgischer Formulare der evangelischen Kirchen* of 1787; Wilhelm Friedrich Hufnagel's *Liturgische Blätter* of 1790; the fifth volume of the periodical, *Allgemeines Magazin für Prediger nach den Bedürfnissen unsrer Zeit* of 1791, edited by Johann Rudolph Gottlieb Beyer; Wilhelm Abraham Teller's *Sammlung einiger Gebete zum Gebrauch bey öffentlichen Gottesdiensten* of 1793; the fourth volume of Johann Karl Friedrich Witting's *Praktisches Handbuch für Prediger* of 1795, which included forms for confession, the Lord's Supper, holy baptism, holy matrimony, and general prayers of the church; volume six of *Kleine auserlesene liturgische Bibliothek für Prediger* of 1797; a rather conservative handbook of the Palatinate-Sulzbach, *Vollständige Pfalz-Sulzbachische Liturgie* of 1797; Jacob Georg Christian Adler's *Schleswig-Holsteinische Kirchen-Agende* of 1797; Gottlieb Schlegel's *Sammlung von Formularen und Gebeten* of 1800. Schlegel, who began his ministry in Riga in 1777, and in 1790 was called to Greifswald in Western Pomerania to serve as general superintendent, was well known by Livonian pastors who found his rationalist bent quite acceptable. The single Livonian neological handbook used in German congregations was the *Liturgisches Handbuch für die Stadt-Kirchen zu Riga* which appeared in 1801.

Some pastors stated that they were making use of formularies from a number of agendas – one for baptism, another for marriage, and yet a third for confession and absolution. Heinrich Ernst Schröder of Fellin parish declared that he was using concurrently the agendas of Seiler 1787, Lindau 1784, Electoral Palatinate 1786, and Schlegel

²⁵ LVVA 233, f. 1, apr. 371. lieta, 206. lp.

²⁶ Georg Joachim Zollikofer, Reformed minister in Leipzig, came to be known as the pioneer of neological liturgies in Germany. His work, *Anreden und Gebete, zum Gebrauche bey dem gemeinschaftlichen, und auch dem häuslichen Gottesdienste*, was eagerly grasped by enlightened clergy of both the Reformed and Lutheran confessions not only in Leipzig but throughout the German-speaking lands.

1800.²⁷ August Friedrich Adolph Döbner of the Kalzenau-Fehteln parish in the Wenden provostry stated that in his ministry to Germans, he used Zollikofer's 1777, Electoral Palatinate 1786, and Teller's 1793 handbooks.²⁸ Karl Heinrich Eysingk in the Uexküll-Kirchholm parish in the vicinity of Riga employed Zollikofer 1777, Seiler 1787, Wehrt 1792, and Riga 1801 books.²⁹ In their reports, many pastors indicated that they were using two up-to-date agendas. The most popular of these were those of Zollikofer 1777, Seiler 1787, Electoral Palatinate 1786, Wehrt 1792, and Pfalz-Sulzbach 1797.

Liturgical innovations were introduced into different parishes at different times. Heinrich Johann von Jannau of Lais in the Dorpat provostry began to make liturgical changes in his parish as soon as he arrived there in 1779.³⁰ Johann Andreas Zimmermann, who was pastor in Salisburg in the Wolmar provostry from 1785, claimed that before his arrival, the previous pastors had already made liturgical changes.³¹ The same assertion was made by Johann Christian Cleemann who served Pernigel-St. Matthäi in the same provostry from 1785.³² So too, Johann Andreas Reussner, who came to the Abbenorm parish in the same provostry in 1790, stated that liturgical innovations had been made there before his arrival.³³ Johann Jakob Voss, who served the Nüggen parish in the Werro provostry from 1797, observed that his predecessor had used the Swedish handbook and had only introduced some minor changes in the marriage rite and other pastoral acts.³⁴ Christoph Friedrich Brosse of the Dünamünde parish in the vicinity of Riga reported that all the liturgical changes had been introduced by previous pastors.³⁵ Johann Lorentz Schatz, who came to the Allendorf parish in the Wolmar provostry in 1801, stated that his predecessors had not introduced any liturgical changes there.³⁶

Partially responsible for liturgical alterations was the Livonian High Consistory which had never bothered to reprint the 1699 and 1708 agendas. The fact that some conservative pastors were now making use of the Courlandian orthodox Lutheran handbooks in Latvian translation indicates that by the second half of the eighteenth century there the

27 LVVA 233, f. 1, apr. 231. lieta, 45. lp.

28 LVVA 233, f. 1, apr. 230. lieta, 107. lp.

29 LVVA 233, f. 1, apr. 231. lieta, 33. lp.

30 LVVA 233, f. 1, apr. 371. lieta, 196. op.

31 LVVA 233, f. 1, apr. 231. lieta, 181. lp.

32 LVVA 233, f. 1, apr. 231. lieta, 195. lp.

33 LVVA 233, f. 1, apr. 231. lieta, 206. lp.

34 LVVA 233, f. 1, apr. 370. lieta, 80. lp.

35 LVVA 233, f. 1, apr. 231. lieta, 51. lp.

36 LVVA 233, f. 1, apr. 231. lieta, 191. lp.

Swedish agenda copies had worn out. As a result, liturgical practices differed widely from parish to parish, not only because of neologically minded pastors but also because the old Livonian agenda was no longer available.

REACTIONS TO NEOLOGICAL ALTERATIONS

Reports from the clergy and frequent use of Zollikofer's 1777 and List's 1783/86 handbooks indicate that liturgical changes in Livonia began in the 1780s. Pastors were open to liturgical innovations because they viewed old worship formularies to be outdated and anachronistic, not reflecting their modern philosophical views. In the German-speaking congregations, these changes did not seem to cause much dissatisfaction. A contemporary witness, August Wilhelm Hupel, pastor at Oberpahlen in the region of Dorpat, wrote in his 1788 report, *Anmerkung wegen der jetzigen Versuche die alten Kirchenliturgien zu verbessern* (Note Concerning the Current Attempts to Improve the Old Church Liturgies), concerning modifications made to the old forms of worship:

In some countries, e.g., in Germany, Sweden, and England, for example, serious consideration is being given to the improvement of the old ecclesiastical liturgies which are no longer suitable for the present, more enlightened times, and many attempts and writings about them have recently emerged. In Livonia, one does not write anything regarding this subject, but it has nevertheless gone far ahead in comparison with many other provinces, although only in silence and without making noise.³⁷

Hupel observed that List's 1783 agenda for the Electoral Palatinate had been received with consent by many clergy, as it perfectly matched their modern neological thought:

Some pastors have also begun to modify the formularies of baptism and marriage prescribed in the handbooks that were previously drawn up during the Swedish reign, leaving out passages that seemed conspicuous and inappropriate, and even to use completely new forms instead. The liturgical handbook, published at Heidelberg in 1783 under the title "Order, Prayers, and Ministrations, etc.", was occasionally met with approval, and it is already used by many pastors performing churchly acts.³⁸

³⁷ A. W. Hupel. *Anmerkung*, 781–782.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, 784.

Hupel argued that “gradual changes implemented with prudence cannot offend the weaker minds”. When these amendments were properly communicated to the congregations, they were accepted with approval.

Rationalistically minded German-speaking pastors complained that there were no suitable modern and rationally up-to-date Latvian and Estonian language handbooks available which suited their taste and which they could make use of when ministering to these ethnic groups.

In the preface of his 1785/86/92 agendas, Courlandian liturgiologist, Wehrt, stated that the task of introducing modern forms was especially important among the Latvians because they were an ignorant and uncultured people who needed to be introduced to beautiful songs and uplifting speech which would bring them “closer to God”. This would ennoble them and their Latvian language. Members of Latvian congregations in cities, however, consisted of people who were more sophisticated than their rural neighbours, he believed. They would surely be able to use rationalist forms such as had been introduced among the Germans. They were doubtless ready for “solid food” and not just the “skimmed milk of the word”. Wehrt believed that in this way the Courlandian Church could be led out of “dark and superstitious” notions and be guided by the light of human reason and religious sensibility. Only in this way could religious indifference and immorality be overcome.³⁹

For his part, Hupel claimed that changes to Latvian and Estonian worship services were to be introduced carefully and cautiously so as not to provoke discontent and protest. It is clear from his statements that liturgical alterations among the non-Germans were so far only minor and superficial in comparison to German worship services:

Even in the divine services for non-Germans (Latvians and Estonians), small improvements were made from time to time; the liturgies were shortened, and the previously long sermons were replaced by much shorter ones, but catechisations became longer and more effective. Some pastors even discarded the offensive collection bag and temporarily collected donations from the parishioners through plates or cans at the church doors.⁴⁰

It is evident that even in the early days of the nineteenth century, the Enlightenment had not yet dawned upon the Latvian and Estonian populaces. Contemporary reports indicate that where it had dawned, the “unenlightened” parishioners found the rationalist provisions to

39 *Handlungen und Gebete bey dem öffentlichen Gottesdienst in den Herzogthümern Kurland und Semgallen*. Steffenhagen, Mitau, 1786, 83–84.

40 A. W. Hupel. *Anmerkung*, 783–784.

be dry and overly moralistic. Latvians complained particularly about the rationalist Latvian hymnody in the 1806 Courlandian and the 1809 Livonian hymnals,⁴¹ describing it as “thin and weak blood”, and they were determined to oppose its introduction to their congregations.⁴²

One form of resistance, which was employed by Latvians in Courland, was to simply state that they could not afford to buy the books. They claimed that the price was far too high and was coming at the same time as the cost of such necessary food items as salt was also increasing. Another form of resistance was to circulate petitions against the new book, asking that the old books be continued in use.

Some Latvian countryside folk simply refused to go to church and organised their own church services, sung from the old hymnals. In Liepāja congregations of neighbouring Courland, members stressed that they would expel their pastor if he indented to introduce the rationalist 1806 Courlandian hymnal. Church officials sent pastors from congregation to congregation to persuade recalcitrant parishioners to use the new hymnal. They enjoyed little success. In some congregations, when the hymn leader began his attempt to lead the singing from the new hymnal, the parishioners started singing the old hymns to drown him out. In some places when clergy came to conduct services, they were told that the keys to the church had been lost or stolen. In Liepāja, police and armed military personnel were called in to prevent disorder in the congregations. This is evidenced by a circular, issued in 1817 by the Governor of Courland, Emanuel von Stanecke. It was addressed to the people of Rucava, Nīca, and Liepāja. In it, he condemned their “shameless rebellion” and stated that they had “turned the house of God into a den of murderers”. He vowed that their leaders would be found out and punished severely, but if the people stopped their rebellion and came quietly to the church and willingly used the new hymnbook, no action would be taken against them. Rebellious hostility to the new book was sporadic, but the number of recorded instances indicates that to the vast majority of Latvians the new book was unacceptable.⁴³

Despite the complaints from the rationalistically minded pastors concerning the urgent need to edify the ethnic Baltic peoples, only

41 Jauna un pilnīga Latvešņu Dzeesmu- Grahmata. Steffenhagen, Jelgavā, 1806; Kristīgas Dzeesmas, Widsemes basnīzās un mahjās dzeedamas. Müller, Rīga, 1809.

42 P. Daija. Rationalist Hymnbooks in the Early 19th Century Latvian Literature: An Episode in the History of Reading in Livonia and Courland. – *Knygotyra*, 2018, 70, 86; A. Apinis. *Grāmata un latviešu sabiedrība līdz 19. gadsimta vidum*. Liesma, Rīga, 1991, 132.

43 P. Daija. Rationalist Hymnbooks, 86–87.

in 1822 did a single neological liturgical work for Livonian Latvians finally appear. It was the posthumous work of Pastor Christoph Reinhold Girgensohn, dean of Wenden provostry where he served also as pastor at Pebalg-Neuhof parish. Girgensohn's liturgy was published after his death in 1814 by his successor, Pastor Karl Eduard Napiersky. The book was entitled *Kleines liturgisches Handbuch für Prediger bey lettischen Gemeinden*. Pastor Napiersky noted that Girgensohn's work was incomplete but that it would still prove helpful to pastors who were concerned that something must appear in print which was more suitable than the simple translation of a German work but which took into consideration the intricacies of Latvian terminology and made use of the insights of modern liturgical scholars. He stated that it was his hope that pastors would be pleased to have such a work and would make use of it.⁴⁴

Clergy of neological persuasions serving German congregations could not complain about the lack of progressive liturgical works. Formerly, all such agendas had been imported from abroad, but in the early days of the nineteenth century, the Livonian Church itself brought up young educated clergy who were ready to prepare new handbooks.

In his 1804 complaint to the Tsar, Buxhövden singled out Carl Gottlob Sonntag as a leader of the movement calling for neological changes in the liturgy.⁴⁵ As a representative of Enlightenment rationalism, Sonntag made of the liturgy a celebration of the new thinking. In 1802, he published two volumes of his own formularies, entitled *Formulare, Reden und Ansichten bei Amtshandlungen*. A third volume appeared in 1807. The three volumes were again collected into two volumes and published in Riga in 1818 under the familiar title.⁴⁶

In response to Buxhövden's complaint, Sonntag defended himself, stating that he was not responsible for the chaotic liturgical situation, and that he even deplored it, but that he was powerless to

44 *Kleines liturgisches Handbuch für Prediger bey lettischen Gemeinden*. Steffenhagen, Mitau, 1822, 2–4.

45 C. G. Sonntag. *Geschichte und Gesichtspunct*, 2. As a result of Buxhövden's complaint, a committee was established, consisting of representatives from of the churches of Courland, Livonia, Estonia, and Ingria, to deal with the situation. In 1805, it published liturgical directives, *Allgemeine Liturgische Verordnung für die evangelisch-lutherischen Gemeinden im Russischen Reiche*, to be implemented in all Lutheran congregations throughout the vast Russian Empire. Buxhövden's efforts had not yielded any positive results. The 1805 handbook became the high water mark of Lutheran liturgical rationalism in the Russian Empire. Von Sr. Kaiserlichen Majestät allerhöchst bestätigte *Allgemeine Liturgische Verordnung für die evangelisch-lutherischen Gemeinden im Russischen Reiche*. Schnoorsch, St. Petersburg, 1805, 2 ff.

46 C. G. Sonntag. *Formulare, Reden und Ansichten bei Amtshandlungen* (1802/1807/1818).

correct it.⁴⁷ In fact, as consistorial assessor since 1799, he was among the initiators of the 1801 Livonian liturgical inquiry. This indicates that by sending the questionnaire to the clergy, the Livonian consistory did not intend to take any strong measures against liturgical arbitrariness but simply collected information concerning worship practices in the congregations. Sonntag's rationalist liturgical attitudes did not prevent his continued ascent through the ranks of ecclesiastical leadership. In April 1803, he was named adjunct to General Superintendent Johann Danckwart, and when Danckwart died later that year, Sonntag assumed the office of general superintendent of the Livonian Church.⁴⁸

CONCLUSIONS

The 1802 pastoral reports indicate that there was no liturgical uniformity in the Livonian Lutheran Church at that time and that worship practices differed widely from congregation to congregation. Only a few clergy serving German-speaking parishes still made any use of the old 1708 Livonian agenda. As a rule, this handbook was employed by the older pastors, while the recent university graduates were keen to embrace the principles of the Enlightenment.

Liturgical innovations were introduced at different times, but pastoral reports and frequent use of Zollikofer's 1777 and List's 1783/86 handbooks indicate that the changes were initiated around the 1780s. With the exception of the 1801 Riga handbook and Wehr's 1785/86/92 Courlandian works, all these neological agendas were imported from the German-speaking lands. Some clergy made use of formularies from a number of neological agendas, while a few others attempted to combine liturgical elements from the new and old books.

In the Latvian and Estonian-speaking congregations, most of the clergy still used the old Livonian handbook or other orthodox forms from neighbouring Courland or Estonia. The fact that traditional Latvian and Estonian language books were employed does not mean that these pastors were following old provisions by conviction. The same clergy serving German congregations in many cases used neological agendas. With the exception of Schulz's 1795 Latvian handbook, no neological

47 C. G. Sonntag. *Geschichte und Gesichtspunct*, 3–4.

48 *Allgemeines Schriftsteller- und Gelehrten-Lexikon der Provinzen Livland, Esthland und Kurland*. Vierter Band. S.Z. Steffenhagen, Mitau, 1832, 231–232.

alternatives were available for these ethnic groups. When the copies of the 1699/1708 agenda had worn out, the clergy used orthodox liturgical forms printed in the catechisms and hymnals.

Only a few rationalistically-minded pastors attempted to introduce neological liturgical forms into Latvian and Estonian congregations by translating worship materials into the native tongues. The majority of the clergy made their own corrections to their handbooks, omitting the liturgical elements they thought to be outdated.

VALGUSTUSE MÕJU LIIVIMAA LUTERLIKULE LITURGIALE 18. SAJANDI LÕPUS JA 19. SAJANDI ALGUSES

Darius Petkūnas

Artiklis uuritakse valgustuse mõju Liivimaa luterliku kiriku liturgiale 18. sajandi lõpus ja 19. sajandi alguses, mil paljud vaimulikud loobusid traditsioonilistest liturgilistest käsiraamatutest ja võtsid kasutusele uued, mis põhinesid valgustusajastu humanistlikel põhimõtetel. Artiklis vaadeldakse, kui suurel määral kasutas Liivimaa vaimulikkond jumalateenistusel ja kirikutalitustes endiselt Rootsi kirikukäsiraamatute 1699/1708. aasta saksa-, läti- ja eestikeelseid väljaandeid, ning ka seda, milliseid teisi liturgilisi käsiraamatuid sel ajal Liivimaa kogudustes saadaval oli. Liivimaa kirik koosnes saksa, läti ja eesti rahvusest inimestest ning artiklis uuritakse, kas uusi liturgiavorme rakendati ka läti ja eesti kogudustes, mis olid sel ajal veel valgustusideedest puutumata.

1802. aasta kirikuteated viitavad sellele, et Liivimaa luterliku kiriku liturgia ei olnud 19. sajandi alguses ühtlustatud ja palvustavades oli koguduseti suuri erinevusi. Vana 1708. aasta Liivimaa käsiraamatut kasutasid endiselt vaid mõned saksakeelsetes kihelkondades teenivad vaimulikud. Üldjuhul tegid seda vanemad pastorid, samal ajal kui hiljuti ülikooli lõpetanud võtsid innukalt omaks valgustuse põhimõtted.

Liturgiasse toodi uuendusi eri aegadel, kuid kirikuteated ning Georg Joachim Zollikoferi 1777. aasta ja Carl Benjamin Listi 1783/1786. aasta käsiraamatute sage kasutamine viitavad sellele, et muudatusi hakati sisse viima 1780. aastate paiku. Kui välja arvata 1801. aasta käsiraamat ja Carl Dietrich Wehrti 1785/1792. aasta Kuramaa tööd, pärinesid kõik

need uuenduslikud käsiraamatud saksakeelsetest maadest. Osa vaimulikest kasutas mitmest uuenduslikust käsiraamatust koostatud eeskirjade kogumikku, samas kui mõni teine proovis kombineerida uute ja vanade raamatute liturgilisi elemente.

Läti- ja eestikeelsetes kogudustes kasutas valdav osa vaimulikkonnast endiselt vana Liivimaa käsiraamatut või teisi naaberpiirkondade Kura- või Eestimaa ortodoksseid talitusviise, mis olid trükitud katekismustes ja lauluraamatutes. Asjaolu, et kasutati traditsioonilisi läti- ja eestikeelseid raamatuid, ei tähenda, et pastorid oleks järginud vanu eeskirju veendumusest. Samad vaimulikud kasutasid saksakeelseid kogudusi teenides uuenduslikke käsiraamatuid. Kui välja arvata Conrad Schulzi 1795. aasta lätikeelne käsiraamat, ei olnud nende rahvusrühmade jaoks uusi alternatiive võtta. Kui 1699/1708. aasta käsiraamatute koopiad läbi kulused, kasutati katekismustes ja lauluraamatutes trükitud ortodoksset liturgiat.

Vaid mõni ratsionaalse mõtlemisega pastor üritas juurutada läti- ja eestikeelsetes kogudustes uuenduslikke liturgiavorme ja tõlkis liturgilisi materjale kohalikesse keeltesse. Suurem osa vaimulikest tegi oma käsiraamatutesse parandusi ja jättis välja need liturgilised elemendid, mida pidas iganenuks.