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The present work investigates the liturgies of the Reformed churches of Poland and Lithuania during the 16th and 17th centuries. It examines the development of liturgical theology and its liturgical expression beginning with the 6th decade of the 16th century when the Reformation influence moved from Lutheranism to Calvinism. Special attention is given to the theological controversies between the major Protestant groups, chiefly concerning the Lord’s Supper and Christology, and their relation to the place of Holy Communion and its liturgical celebration. These discussions culminated in the Sandomierz Consensus of 1570 which was supposed to form the basis of a united Polish-Lithuanian Protestant Church. This aim, however, was not achieved, because the issues concerning the Lord’s Supper had not been satisfactorily resolved. Although Lutherans soon came to disregard it, the Consensus played an important role in the formation of the later liturgical rites and traditions of the Reformed Church.

The Polish and Lithuanian churches did not follow parallel liturgical paths. The two churches began from a common liturgical source, the 1550 liturgy of Johannes a Lasco, but used that source differently. This was to have important ramifications. Divergent traditions and liturgies led the churches to seek unification of the rites in the first four decades of the 17th century. This desired aim was only partially realized by the appearance of the Great Gdańsk (Danzig) Agenda in 1637. Dissatisfaction with this monumental work resulted in the publication of a special Lithuanian edition in 1644. Further attempts to publish a final and complete successor to the Gdańsk Book were thwarted by the forces of the Counter-Reformation.

An examination and analysis of the liturgies of the Minor Polish Church shows that these rites occupy a unique place in the continental Reformed tradition. Of special interest is the inclusion in these liturgies of notions concerning the consecration of the elements by the recitation of Christ’s Words over the bread and wine, the use of the Agnus Dei and traditional Gregorian chant melodies, the singing of Nicene Creed, and regulations concerning the proper disposition of the reliquiae after Communion. It is likely that the Minor Polish Reformed wished to show themselves in continuity with the best traditions of the universal church. On the other hand, the Lithuanian Church was far more closely tied to the provisions of Lasco’s
**Forma ac Ratio.** The spirit of Lithuanian liturgy can be described as static and reluctant to change in comparison to the more dynamic and innovative spirit of the Minor Polish rites.

The liturgies of this period demonstrate the path of spiritual development and theological growth in the Polish and Lithuanian churches and considerably enlarge our understanding of the unique history and character of these churches and the outward expression of their faith. This material provides independent support for the findings of recent writers who assert that the Reformation in these countries did not come to an end until the middle of the 17th century, and then gradually lost strength over a period of several decades.

This study provides theologians and liturgical scholars with valuable insights into the particular form of Calvinism which developed in Poland and Lithuania and its public worship expression in liturgy and ceremony. In addition, it will assist the Polish and Lithuanian Reformed Churches to a deeper understanding of the roots of their piety and it should encourage them to reconsider and revaluate their peculiar liturgical tradition and heritage. Finally, it will also provide historians with a new perspective from which to examine the period.
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**Introduction**

The Subject of the Investigation.

Holy Communion stands at the center of the Christian faith and life. It is the one truly unique Christian form of worship. It is understood to have been given to the church by Christ in the words which he spoke in his Last Supper with his disciples in the upper room when he took the bread and cup, and said: “…this do in remembrance of me.” Here man meets God in a way which is particularly profound and decisive. Christ is believed to dwell in believers, and they in him. According to the Catholic tradition, the grace of God is conveyed to man and with it the benefits which grace includes. There is more than the personal dimension here. It is the church which keeps the Supper, and man's relationship to it is governed by his relationship to the church. The body of Christ, understood to be his body mystical, meets together to share one bread and drink of one cup.

The particular understanding of the Holy Communion, both its celebration and participation in it, differ widely in Christian Churches. It is in the prayers and the ceremonies of the liturgy that the churches exhibit their particular understanding of the Holy Supper. The expressions and actions of the liturgy speak from and to the heart; they articulate the church’s confession and theological understanding of the meaning of the Supper. Consequently, the words and ceremonies of the Supper were from the beginning of the Reformation a manner of especial concern to the Protestants. Their provisions for the celebration including the precise wording of their prayers, and the detailing of the ceremonial actions were important concerns for them, for here the faith in the heart was put to practical expression. Even if, for the sake of political and other factors, outward agreement between various Protestant Churches might be proclaimed, here in the wordings and ceremonies of the rites the actual doctrinal situation reveals itself most clearly.

The Polish and Lithuanian liturgies of the 16th and 17th centuries are the special concern of this study. Although they are a rich storehouse of material, these riches have never been opened up and laid before us. Our purpose is to investigate this material, which has been largely untouched for over four hundred years, to see what it reveals. We have before us a large source of knowledge which presents to us a picture of the religious mentality and liturgical life of Lithuanians and Polish Reformed peoples and their churches. By the study of it we gain a greater
understanding and appreciation of the inner life of these churches during this most
decisive period of the Reformation in this large united monarchy.

The Significance and Relevance of the Study.

The study of the early history of the Reformed Church in Poland and
Lithuania has left students of the period with only a partial and incomplete portrait.
Historical studies of the church have concentrated their attention on the relationship
between the Polish and Lithuanian Reformations, their relation to general European
history, the politics of the period, the economic and social situation, and other
external matters. Attention has been given also to the theological struggles within the
church and the relationship between the Reformed and other Protestant Churches.
Much significant data has been gathered by these studies, but still the picture is
incomplete. We know little about the public worship of the church, the translation of
faith into prayer, the communal response into praise, confession, fellowship with
God and man, and the ceremonial actions by which they were displayed. It is here
that we find the beating heart of the church. Here both the strengths and the
weaknesses of faith are most clearly made known. This faith had been arrived at
through decades of discussion concerning the biblical doctrines of God and Christ
and the nature and destiny of man, and now the fruits of this work come to be
expressed in solemn words addressed to God. These words impress upon the
worshiper the particular Reformed understanding of where man stands in relation to
God and the path which he must follow. A study of these factors gives us a fuller and
more complete picture of the internal life of the church and thus contributes to our
understanding of the Reformation of these countries. It is from the study of worship
and liturgy that we are able to distinguish the particular characteristics of Polish and
Lithuanian Reformed Christianity, its strengths and deficiencies, its complicated
relationship with other churches, and its role in the spiritual formation of the
Christian man. It is the gap in our knowledge concerning these important matters that
the present study addresses itself.

The Aim and Objective.

The aim of our study is to gain a thorough and more complete picture of the
church, her life, and her faith, by examining her liturgies in their theological and
historical context. We will also seek to trace the theological and spiritual maturation
of the church as she came to a more thorough self-understanding and as that self-understanding is reflected in her liturgies. We will evaluate the results of our work to
determine whether these liturgies do in fact provide the basis for concise statements concerning the theological and practical life of the churches, their understanding of God and man's stance before him. We will need to ask whether or to what extent these results adequately reflect the goal of religion stated in the church’s formal confessional statements, and how this relates to the Confessions of other Reformed Churches on the continent.

**The Method.**

In order to achieve this goal we must first examine carefully the general history of the period, and more especially those works which have concerned themselves with the history of the Reformation in Poland and Lithuania. Then we must study all available liturgical and related materials, to determine the manner in which they treat the theological issues which faced the church, the theological and liturgical concerns, the difficulties and controversies which surrounded the liturgy, and the manner which the church sought to resolve them. This will provide us with a vantage point from which we may evaluate the liturgies. Then it will be necessary for us to compare the liturgies before us narrowly and in progression as each succeeding work builds upon the liturgies preceded it. Within this narrow perspective we must determine also the relationship between the Polish liturgies and those of the Lithuanian Church. We will examine each liturgy part by part. In the broader perspective, we will examine our material with the classical liturgies of the European Reformed Churches, with special attention to the Reformed liturgies Zwingli, Bucker, Calvin, and Johannes a Lasco. We will also ask whether or to what extent we may detect influences from other Protestant Churches with which the Poles found themselves in close political or geographical proximity. The results will be evaluated to see whether or not we have met our goal.

**The Structure of the Work.**

The main body of this work consists of four chapters. In the first chapter we will trace the history of the Protestant Reformation in Poland and Lithuania, its initial stages, giving special attention to the need obtain legal status and counter-act the resurgence of Catholicism. In chapter two we examine the development of liturgical theology and its liturgical expression, giving special attention to the controversies which confronted the churches with the need to define and articulate their theology of the Lord's Supper. We will describe the circumstances which first led the church's synodical assemblies to pursue particular liturgical forms for use in the worship life
of church and the acceptance of these forms by the congregations. We will also trace
the development of the liturgical books and the role each liturgy played in provoking
the churches to further reflection and liturgical revision. In the chapter three we will
give detailed attention to the individual services of Holy Communion, used by the
Reformed Churches in these countries. We will critically examine the structure of
each service and its individual components, distinguishing the main liturgical
elements and giving careful note to each part of the service. In chapter four we will
examine the distinguishing characteristics and features of each individual service
according to its theological content and its place within the Reformed tradition.
Additionally, we will note practical concerns regarding the celebration of Holy
Communion and the general course of the development of the liturgy during the
period we have examined. This theological consideration constitutes the important
part of this present work. Then we will offer our conclusions concerning the role of
these liturgies in the Polish and Lithuanian Reformed Churches, their adequacy, the
extent of their conformity to the pattern of Reformed theology as found in other
liturgies, the theological and anthropological understandings articulated in the
liturgy, and the role of interchurch relationships in the formation of this liturgical
tradition. Then we will suggest to what extent this study may contribute to our larger
understanding of the Reformation in Poland and Lithuania, its peculiar circumstances
and expression.

The Primary and Secondary Source Material.

Numerous students of Lithuanian and Polish Reformation history have
written this period. Most noteworthy among them are Jolanta Dworzaczkowa, who
studied the general Reformation period in Major Poland and the history of Bohemian
Brethren, Gottfried Schramm, Paul Fox, Theodor Wotschke, Henryk Gmiterek and
Stanislaw Tworek, who wrote numerous works on the Lithuanian and Polish
Reformation, Oskar Bartel and Halina Kowalska, who studied the life and work of
Johannes a Lasco, and others. All of them worked from original sources to provide as
with a foundation upon which to build an understanding of the Reformation in
Poland. With reference to Lithuania, important studies have been produced by Ingė
Lukšaitė, who has written a number of books on the Lithuanian Reformation and its
Polish and German connections, and Józef Łukaszewicz, who published several
important volumes which are still valuable for original source material. Also
noteworthy the works of Joseph Puryckis and Antanas Musteikis, who looked at the
period from differing perspectives. It must be noted that studies of the Lithuanian Reformation are not as plentiful as in the case of the Polish Reformation.

Resource material concerning the theology of the Polish and Lithuanian Reformations is not plentiful. Few have given any detailed attention to this important area. Worthy of note are the works of the German scholars, Otto Naunin, Karl Hein, and Richard Kruske, all of whom gave attention to the theology Johannes a Lasco and its liturgical expression. The Polish scholars Jerzy Lehmann and Oskar Halecki contributed valuable studies of the _Sandomierz Confession_. The Socinian Stanislas Lubieniecki’s historical study of documents from the Polish Reformation together with his brief sacramental comments still makes for interesting reading. Theologically considered, the literature on the Polish and Lithuanian Reformation is like a large mine which yields only a few precious nuggets.

Up to the present time very few liturgical studies of the Reformed rites of this period have appeared. Stanisław Tworek’s short monograph on the historical development of the Polish rites examines 17th century synodical protocols in order to make clear the impulses towards liturgical uniformity. However, he shows no particular interest in the liturgical materials as such. Henryk Gmiterek investigated the problem of the unification of the rites of the Reformed and the Bohemian Brethren in the early decades of 17th century. He is the primary source of our information concerning Bohemian Brethren participation in these negotiations. These appear to be the only essays on this important liturgical subject to have appeared. One or another aspect of our subject has been touched upon by earlier writers, but none has produced a study dedicated to an exposition of the theology of the rites.

Behind the present work stands our study of important primary source material, including the Polish and Lithuanian agendas of 1581, 1599, 1602, 1614, 1621, 1637, and 1644 which have served as the main basis of our examination of the liturgical life and practice in the Reformed Churches in Poland and Lithuania. The synodical protocols of the Reformed Churches in Minor and Major Poland from 1550 onwards, and, from 1611, those of the Lithuanian Reformed Church, have proved to be a very rich source of information on theological controversies and liturgical debates of the period. In the absence of Lithuanian protocols of the early period, we have given special attention to the 1557-1558 debates on the sacrament in Vilnius. Important to our understanding is the record of Radziwill the Black's commitment to the Reformed Church as found in his response to papal legate Aloysius Lippomannus.
This document brings clarity to the question of his conversion to the Calvinist faith. Also available is the work of Francesco Stancaro, which was based upon the 1543 consultation of Archbishop Hermann von Wied of Köln. This was the first church order used by the Church in Minor Poland. Of great value to our understanding of sacramental doctrine are the Consensus and Confession of Sandomierz. This material gives details concerning the problems faced by the Reformed and Lutherans in their attempt reach a common mind with reference to the Lord's Supper. The classical Reformed liturgies of Zwingli, Bucer, Calvin, and Lasco provide insight into the Reformed approach to Holy Communion. Johannes a Lasco’s work is most significant because of its immense influence in Polish and Lithuanian Churches. The liturgical writings of Luther, Lukas from Prague, and Thomas Cranmer help us to relate the Polish and Lithuanian to the larger Protestant world.

Additional primary sources from the period are noted in our bibliography. These have been most important in helping us to gain a more comprehensive understanding of Protestant worship in general and the Polish and Lithuanian rites in particular.
1. A Survey of the History of the Reformation in Poland and Lithuania; its Growth and Decline

In 1569 Poland and Lithuania were joined together by the Union of Lublin into a single Polish – Lithuanian Kingdom. It was political necessity which brought about this union. Lithuania to the East was rich in land but had only a meager population. Thus it lacked manpower to exploit its resources or defend its territorial conquests in the face of the rapidly expanding Muscovite power. For its part Poland was still basking in the glory which it had earned by its decisive defeat of the Teutonic knights. In addition, in 1525 Albrecht of Brandenburg (1490-1568), Duke of Prussia, had chosen to ally himself with Poland.

Geographically both countries sat side by side nestled between Germans in the West and Muscovites and Turks in the East, and subject also to strong pressures from Sweden to the North across the Baltic sea. This contributed to a sense of a common situation and a common destiny. The two cultures had borrowed from each other but remained distinct. For their part the Lithuanians were concerned that their association with Poland should not result in the loss of Lithuanian self-consciousness and identity. The Poles too had concerns about the union. They thought that union with Lithuania might bring with it desires for territorial expansion, making it one of the largest monarchies in Europe. In that case they would now be in much closer contact with the Muscovites whose eyes were turned westward. A backward look leads some present day historians to judge that the Poles were not able effectively to manage this expansion.¹

Although the union brought with it many concerns, not the least of which was fear of the Lithuanians that their national consciousness would be lost, there were many affinities between these neighboring countries. In both countries there was growing tension between the Roman hierarchy and the nobility. In the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries the political and social power of the nobility was increasing and the vast wealth and authority of the Roman Church, along with its increasingly oppressive taxation, were threats to the ambitions of the emerging higher class. The church regarded its possessions and wealth as sacrosanct and often refused to pay its share of military expenses. This only heightened the burdens of the nobility in this time of numerous wars, and it enhanced hostility to the church. An additional

¹ Davies 1998, 98.
irritation to the Lithuanians was the fact that its church was a mere subdivision of the ecclesiastical province of the Polish Archdiocese of Gniezno. These, together with the expansion of the power of the clergy, the widespread abuses of ecclesiastical authority, and the growing secular power of the Roman Church, were reasons why the sparks of the fires of the Reformation in Western Europe quickly spread to Poland and Lithuania and made deep inroads into society - so much so that it seemed for a time as though both would become Protestant countries.
1.1. The Initial Impact of the Lutheran Reformation

The first Reformation movement in Poland was the Lutheran Reformation. Precipitating factors included the increasing recognition among the nobility of the necessity of Reformation, the close geographical and intellectual proximity of Wittenberg and Poland, and the constant movement of tradesman and merchants between Germany and Eastern Europe.

Lutheran influence was felt first in Royal Prussia (West Prussia), that region of Prussia which had been taken over by the Polish King Kazimierz IV (Casimir IV) at the peace of Toruń (Thorn) in 1466 after his defeat of the Teutonic knights. The region continued to have a large German population, especially in the urban regions where German language and culture continued to predominate and the economy depended upon trade with the urban centers of Eastern Germany. The influence of Martin Luther (1483-1546) was felt in the leading city of West Prussia Gdańsk (Danzig) within a year of the posting of the 95 Theses. It came largely through the efforts of Jacob Knade, Preacher of the church of St. Peter and St. Paul.\(^2\) This provoked a strong reaction and attempts to curtail Lutheran influences. After a short period of suppression it became clear by the end of 1522 that a majority of the citizens of Gdańsk were in favor of the Reformation. From the beginning there were those who advocated a conservative Reformation with a strong sense of continuity with the past, and those whose plans and purposes were far more radical, after the manner of Karlstadt in Wittenberg.\(^3\) Soon the Reformation spread to other West Prussian cities, including Thorn, Elbing, and others.

Lutheran influence in Major Poland was always strongest in Poznań (Posen). Commercial and familial links with the German cities and lands brought Humanist influences and Lutheran teaching to the city early in the 1520-ies. By 1522 the writings of Melanchthon and others were already available.\(^4\) As early as 1525 the gospel was publicly proclaimed by Jan Seklucjan (ca.1510/1515-1578) from the pulpit of St. Mary Magdalene’s church. Here, as in West Prussia, ecclesiastical and civil authorities sought to suppress the spread of the Reformation immediately. At the King’s direction the city council removed Seklucjan from the pastorate of St.

\(^2\) Die Evangelischen Kirchenordnungen 1911, 250; Fox 1924, 21.
\(^3\) Fox 1924, 22.
\(^4\) Wotschke 1911a, 61.
Mary Magdalene’s church, but he was not forced to leave the city. He remained in Poznań until 1544, at which time he moved to Königsberg. It is important to note that in Major Poland the spread of Reformation was not limited to the German speaking population. From Königsberg Seklucjan produced and distributed much Lutheran literature in the Polish language. There can be little doubt that the publication and dissemination of Lutheran Literature in both German and Polish provoked the same kind of intellectual curiosity and learned discussion as it had in Germany.

In Minor Poland the focus of influence seems to have been the city Kraków (Krakau). Lutheran preaching there was impossible to control, and a number of aristocratic families found these teachings very attractive. As early as in 1525 and 1526 there were arrests and convictions, and the imposition of the harshest penalties for espousing and circulating Lutheran doctrine. Repeated attempts to suppress Luther's writings were unsuccessful. Protestant influence reached the highest levels of government. Justus Decius, private Secretary of the King, was personally acquainted with Luther and was an admirer of the Reformation, and Francesco Lismanini (Franciszek Lismanin) (1504-1566), Father Confessor to Queen Bona Sforza (1494 - 1557), promoted the Reformation. The Roman Catholic Synod of 1523 reaffirmed Leo X’s bull, excommunicating Luther and condemned his teachings, but on a practical level the aristocrats were prepared to negotiate. They even laid before Pope Clement VII in 1525 an appeal for a general synod to consider the theological issues which had been raised. In response they received only an exhortation to remain firm. The Roman Catholic Synod of Łęczyca in 1527 called for the appointing of an inquisitor in every dioceses and the appointment of expert theologians to instruct the people and preachers to expound the Scriptures.

The earliest contact of the Reformation in Lithuania came through Poland and through the well organized German community resident in Vilnius (Wilno). Lutheranism quickly became identified with the German community, as a foreign, German Church. The first site of Lutheran preaching was in St. Anna Church, where German language service had been held since the beginning of the 16th century.

---

5 Wotschke 1911a, 74-77; Fox 1924, 27.
6 Fox 1924, 30.
7 Fox 1924, 31.
8 Fox 1924, 31.
9 Musteikis 1988, 38.
Here, in 1540, the Franciscan monk Abraomus Culvensis (Abraomas Kulvietis) (ca.1509-1545) begun to openly preach the Lutheran doctrine.\textsuperscript{10} He had studied at Kraków, Leipzig, Wittenberg, and Siena in preparation of his educational activity in Vilnius. In 1540 he started a higher school with Protestant theology.\textsuperscript{11} At this same time we find other evidences of an open movement towards Lutheranism in the preaching of Stanislaus Rapagelanus (Stanislavas Rapolionis) (ca.1485-1547), who defended his doctoral theses under Martin Luther in Wittenberg.\textsuperscript{12} In a short time Jan Radziwiłł (1516-1551), a member one of the highest aristocratic families in Lithuania and brother of Radziwiłł the Black, converted to Lutheranism. However, one cannot judge the introduction of Lutheranism in this period to have been a great success.\textsuperscript{13}

The planting of the Reformation in East Prussia followed a very different course. Although geographically separated from the West in 1466 and under different political control, there was a continued affinity between East Prussia and West Prussia. It is from the West and its open window toward Germany that Eastern Prussia received its first information concerning the Reformation. In 1525 Albrecht, the head of the order of Teutonic Knights became a Lutheran, and with the knowledge and consent of the King of Poland, he used the Treaty of Kraków to become the secular ruler of East Prussia with right of succession and entitlement to the first seat in the Polish parliaments.\textsuperscript{14} Neither the Emperor nor the Bishop of Rome approved of this action, but they were powerless to prevent it. Zygmunt I Stary (1467-1548), himself a loyal servant of the Church of Rome, did nothing to prevent this action, fearing that opposition would lead to the loss of the whole of East Prussia.\textsuperscript{15}

Even before 1525, when he openly declared himself a Lutheran, Albrecht was in personal correspondence with Luther and Philip Melanchthon (1497-1560). Soon there was gathered around him a group of enthusiastic Reformers which included Johann Poliander (1487-1541), Georg von Polentz (1478-1550), Bishop of Samland, Paulus Speratus (1484-1551) and others.\textsuperscript{16} It was these who assumed the responsibility for introducing and spreading the Reformation in Prussia. In 1525

\textsuperscript{10} Biržiška 1960, 46.
\textsuperscript{11} Lukšaitė 1999, 135.
\textsuperscript{12} Lukšaitė 1999, 204.
\textsuperscript{13} Lukšaitė 1999, 250.
\textsuperscript{14} Fox 1924, 25.
\textsuperscript{15} Fox 1924, 25.
\textsuperscript{16} Musteikis 1988, 41; Schumacher 1987, 147-148.
Erhard von Queiss (ca.1490-1529), who had been designated Bishop of Pomesania (Pomerania), issued a *Program of Reformation* which required that in his dioceses the Reformation faith should be regarded as normative.\(^{17}\) It was on the basis of this church order that the Reformation of Prussia was undertaken. Many traditional medieval Catholic practices were abandoned, and all religious orders were banned excepting those which fought against unbelievers, that is, the Teutonic Order of the Sword and the Cross. The knights of this order for the most part enthusiastically supported the work of reform. It was declared that the designated languages for all church services would be German. Hymns to the Virgin would be eliminated in order to avoid idolatry.\(^{18}\)

The Reformation made speedy progress throughout Prussia, excepting in Warmia and the areas immediately surrounding it where the Church of Rome remained firmly entrenched. Extending his aim to spread the Reformation, Albrecht made contact with the leading members of the Lithuanian aristocracy and the German communities in Lithuania. It was from Vilnius that strong intellectual leadership would come when, in 1542, Albrecht founded his new Lutheran University in Königsberg. It may be said that the establishment of the University of Königsberg was a signal event in Baltic Lutheranism. Its aim was to strengthen the Reformation and provide training for those who would be its leaders in areas far from the civilizing influences of the central German states. Among those called to serve in the formative years of this important center of Eastern European education were the Lithuanians Stanislaus Rapagelanus, the first Dean of the Faculty of Theology, and Abraomus Culvensis who had two years earlier occupied the position of Acting Rector.\(^{19}\) Among other Lithuanians were Georg Eyschytzki (Jurgis Eišiškietis), teacher of Pedagogy and Friedrich Staphylus (1512-1564), a German from Kaunas (Kowno), who was later Chancellor of the University.\(^{20}\) Both Rapagelanus and Culvensis translated hymns and lectionary materials from German into Lithuanian. Most important in this regard was the work of Martinus Mossvid (Martynas Mažvydas) (ca.1520-1563), whose 1547 Catechism was the first book published in the Lithuanian language. His major work was a hymnbook *Gesmes Chriksczoniskas*, published in two volumes 1566 and 1570, based upon German Lutheran hymnals of

\(^{17}\) Lukšaitė 1999, 89.
\(^{18}\) Musteikis 1988, 42.
\(^{19}\) Lukšaitė 1999, 204.
the period. Additionally he published orders of Lord’s Supper, Holy Baptism, and other services. His collected writings were to serve as the Agenda for the Lithuanian speaking Lutheran congregations in Prussia and Lithuania, and set the pattern by which future works would be judged.21

We see, then, a rather complex picture. Across the whole area of Poland and Lithuania the early attempts at planting the Lutheran Reformation were very limited in their success. Only isolated areas and a few prominent individuals came to be identified with the Lutheran faith, while large geographical areas remained untouched. Despite interest in the Reformation, the vast majority of the people in Poland and Lithuania remained unaffected by it.

The Lutheran Reformation doctrine did not find in the Polish and Lithuanian lands the same propitious circumstances which it had encountered in Germany. A principal factor in this was the negative influence of those in the highest position of authority among the Poles. In 1520, 1522, and 1523 King Zygmunt I Stary issued the edict prohibiting Poles from studying at Wittenberg or other Protestant universities, forbidding the publication, the dissemination, or importation of Lutheran books into Poland and Lithuania. To this were added threats that those who disseminated Lutheran and other heretical doctrines would lose their property. Under pressure from the Roman Church, in 1534 the King issued an additional edict prohibiting Polish young people from attending Wittenberg University or any other university thought to be a breeding ground for heresy. He ordered those presently in attendance in these schools to return home immediately or suffer the withdrawal of all privileges and permanent exile.22

These edicts infuriated the nobility. They were not sufficient to completely poison the ground and immunize Poland from reformatory ideas. We must look for other factors. It should be noted that many of the writings of the Reformers were written in a foreign language and were not immediately available among those whose native language was quite different from Luther's German. This meant that direct contact with the vernacular works of Luther and other Reformers was largely available only to those who read German. It is among them that the Reformation made its first inroads in Poland. Church officials and other leaders strongly discouraged the study of German, and the Polish people were taught to look askance

22 Lukšaitė 1999, 133, 134.
of things German. In addition, the sad record of strife caused by the German knights only added to anti-German feelings.

In the eyes of the aristocracy the Church of Rome had entirely too much power and authority. Additionally, the higher church officials appeared to have a very little interest in spiritual matters. They concerned themselves with the accumulation of wealth and power, thus forming a new nobility over against the traditional landed aristocracy. What land and power the church could gain came at the expense of an aristocracy already overburdened with the problems of national defense. Frequently the nobility attempted to curb the expansion of the power of the clergy in their regions, even requesting in 1534 that the Diet prohibit the clergy from extending their control over the villages by gift-sale or other methods. They increasingly demanded that the clergy participate more fully both in exercising the responsibilities and carrying the burdens of civil life and national defense. In 1534 and in 1535 the nobility launched a particularly strong attack against the clergy, and in the Diet of Piotrków in 1536-1537 it urged that all ecclesiastical property would be secularized. These efforts were unsuccessful, and the clergy continued to be exempted from the special taxes levied by the Diets. An additional grievance of nobility was the clergy use of ecclesiastical courts to avoid the normal secular courts. The clergy made obvious use of their authority to exempt anyone even remotely associated with the work of the church from civil trial. Even a grave-digger could bring the nobility to judgment in ecclesiastical court for some minor offence, and the nobility were in constant danger of being brought to courts controlled by the church for offences involving the withholding of tithes. The matter of ecclesiastical jurisdiction became a major issue, and the nobility were increasingly frustrated by the lack of official action to resolve the issue. Now individual frustration began to give way to united action. The aristocrats begin to realize that church action against the one of their number would quickly lead to the diminution of aristocratic authority of the nation, and they saw that the counter action must be taken. By the fifth decade of the 16th century the nobility were beginning to unite to thwart the ambitions of ecclesiastical authorities and nullify their decisions. Attempts to compromise were no
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longer possible. In the case of Stanislaw Orzechowski (1513-1566) the nobles openly and defiantly resisted the episcopal authorities. With this the dam broke.\textsuperscript{26}

Thus we see the importance of social and economic factors which issued in an open break between the ecclesiastical authorities and Polish Lithuanian landed aristocracy. Perhaps this explains why the Lutheran Reformation was not the primary vehicle of reform in Poland and Lithuania. The Lutheran Reformation was concerned chiefly with doctrine and not matters of church structure. It was this structure however, against which the anger of nobility was primarily focused. For them a Reformation movement must primarily address that anger and redress their grievances. In addition, many features of Lutheran Reformation were still too reminiscent of the Church of Rome. Liturgy, parish life, and episcopal structure at least in Prussia and Scandinavia did not appear to be essentially different from the Church of Rome. In the view of the aristocrats it did not meet their practical need or aspirations. The nobility were looking for a form of ecclesiastical organization which would leave more room for the influence of the lesser aristocracy, rather then the monarchs and highest public official as was the case in Lutheranism. Additionally, the timing was not right. The great Lutheran explosion in Germany and its spread into Scandinavia came in the 1520’s and 1530’s. Poland was not ready for the Reformation until the sixth decade of 16\textsuperscript{th} century, when the open break between episcopal authorities and the nobility became manifest.

\textsuperscript{26} Schramm 1965, 60, 64-65.
1.2. The Spread of the Reformation and the Advance of Calvinism

The first sign of this break is seen in the action of the Diet of Piotrków in 1547-48 at which the nobility demanded the preaching of the pure Word of God without human or Roman additions, and freedom of worship. They confronted the newly crowned King Zygmunt II August (Sigismund II August) (1520-1572) with their demands. He did not react, as his father had, by repressive measures. Although himself a faithful son of the Roman Church he was well acquainted with Protestant literature and associated freely with Protestant adherents. At this point large numbers of Roman priests turned from the Roman Church to Reformation doctrine and ordered the worship in their congregation according to the Reformed standard. In 1552, Rafał Leszczyński (1526-92), the Palatine of Brześć-Kujavia, a Protestant, was elected President of the Chamber of the Deputies and at the opening Mass of the Diet he refused to participate. In the proceedings of Diet he made it clear that no actions would be taken regarding national defense unless or until the grievances of the nobility concerning ecclesiastical jurisdiction were resolved. Even many loyal Catholics supported this issue.

It is Minor Poland that we see the first signs of the progress of the Reformed Church. The first attempts to the church in that area made no provisions concerning doctrinal allegiance. It was at the first Synod of 1550 in Pińczów that Francesco Stancaro (1501-1574) (Franciszek Stankar) presented his recommendation that the church should pattern itself according to the provisions of Hermann von Wied’s (1477-1552) consultation of Cologne (Köln) of 1543. In that same year another synod in the same place featured a Protestant liturgy. The clergy begun to openly preach against what they understood to be the evils of the church, and to recommend both the administration of the communion cup and the marriage of the clergy. However, we do not find the names of outstanding theologians capable of directing the course of the Reformation. A variety of theological opinions were evident, and their diversity made a common consensus on doctrinal matters impossible. On November 25, 1554 the Synod of the Protestants of Minor Poland met in Słomniki to resolve this complicated situation. Its conclusion was that closer ties be forged
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between the Protestants in Minor Poland and the Bohemian Brethren, whose strong church order and system of discipline could serve as a model for the Poles.\textsuperscript{30} This union was effected at the Convocation in Koźminek in 1555.\textsuperscript{31} No clear doctrinal consensus was yet evident. A large number of Polish groups in the Synods of Secemin and Pińczów in 1556 decided to look to the Swiss Reformers and congregations for a theological and ecclesiastical model. It was at this point that the Synod of Pińczów in 1556 turned to Johannes a Lasco (Jan Łaski) (1499 - 1560), who had fled from Marian London back to his homeland. He was able to formulate a united theological position and organize of the congregations around it.\textsuperscript{32}

Johannes a Lasco established a structure based upon that of the Reformed Church in Friesland, in which church government was made up of superintendent, ministers, deacons, and presbyters (seniors).\textsuperscript{33} Although not everywhere accepted it, this structure had some measure of success. Protestant schools were founded in Pińczów, Secemin and Koźminek.\textsuperscript{34} Frequent synods were held and attempts were made to effect a closer alliance with Lutherans, Bohemian Brethren and the Calvinists in the other areas of Poland. By the end of the sixth decade the Reformed Church in Minor Poland had grown to the extent that a division into districts was necessary. The minutes of the Synod of Sandomierz in 1570 indicate a division into the districts of (1) Chęciny, (2) Szydłowiec, (3) Żarnów, (4) Kraków, (5) Ruś or Przemyśl, (6) Podole, (7) Oświęcim and Zator.\textsuperscript{35} Within a few decades the church was divided into the districts of (1) Kraków, (2) Sandomierz, (3) Zator and Oświęcim, (4) Lublin and Chełm, (5) Ruś and Podole, (6) Belz, (7) Wołyń, (8) and Kijev.\textsuperscript{36}

In Major Poland we do not find the same pattern of rapid growth and increasing influence of the Reformed Churches. In Major Poland it was Lutheranism which quickly gained a foothold. We have already mentioned the spread of Lutheranism among German speaking population in the larger cities from the very beginning of the Reformation. These German Lutherans in the cities of Royal Prussia (Gdańsk, Elbing, Toruń, et al) maintained their own national identity and did not
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\textsuperscript{36} Die Evangelischen Kirchenordnungen 1911, 250.
participate in the affairs of the Polish speaking churches. Now the time had come also for Major Poles to make a decision whether to follow Rome or turn in the direction of Wittenberg or Geneva. They found the Lutheran Reformation more attractive.

Lutheranism’s greatest strength was found in area in and around Poznań in the Western region of Poland, neighboring the German lands. The leading representatives of the Polish nobility, including Andrzej Górka (†1583), Starosta General of Major Poland and Castellan of Poznań, and Stanisław Ostroróg (ca.1520-1568), Castellan of Międzyrzecz, Jan Tomicki, Castellan of Rogoźno, and numerous others begun the implementation of the Lutheran doctrine in the areas which they controlled. They maintained a close connection with the Reformers in Wittenberg. Eustachius Trepka, who served as part time secretary and part time preacher in the household of the Górka family, had personally studied under Luther and Melanchthon at Wittenberg. Although not a theological giant, he proved to be an influential theologian in Major Polish Lutheranism from the fifth decade of the 16th century onward. He was particularly devoted to the *Catechism* of Luther and distributed hundreds of them. During this period many Polish nobles sent their children to Wittenberg to be educated in the Lutheran doctrine, and upon their return to become theologically trained and influential patrons of the Major Polish Church. The situation was such that in 1555 the Archbishop of Gniezno’s Chancellor Dambrowski would declare that “…only seldom does one find a household which is not infested with heretics.”

In July 1556 the Polish Lutheran synod was held in Poznań. One month later count Stanisław Ostroróg informed Melanchthon of the situation and asked that the copy of the Wittenberg Church Order be sent. Nine months later a synod was held in Grodzisk, followed by additional synods in Międzyrzecz and Poznań in 1557 which led to the adoption of a unified order of ceremonies. In the same year Jan Caper was made Superintendent of the emerging Lutheran Church in Major Poland. The church organization decided to divide the congregations into circuits, with a senior pastor at the head of each circuit. Two general superintendents were elected to stand at the head of the entire church. This was later reduced to a single superintendent. It
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was the responsibility of the superintendent to watch over church life, especially to see that pure doctrine was preserved, to call synods, to supervise the ordination of pastors, and discipline those guilty of false doctrine.\textsuperscript{40} The organization of the church had been successful, as the Poznań physician Lindener wrote in 1561 “…the entire nobility of Major Poland confesses the \textit{Augsburg Confession}.\textsuperscript{41} By the end of the sixth decade of 16\textsuperscript{th} century a number of leading families had become Lutheran, among them were Ostroróg, Górka, Tomicki, Krotoski, Zborowski, Orzelski, Ossowski, and Ujejski.\textsuperscript{42}

So it appeared, but appearances can be deceiving. Soon the emerging Lutheran Church of Major Poland found itself embroiled in internal doctrinal controversies especially with reference to the meaning of the Lord’s Supper and the nature of Christ’s presence in the sacrament. In 1560 Superintendent Jan Caper and Pastor Laurentius of Grodzisk became advocates of the practice of celebrating Communion in the Reformed manner, treating it as a table fellowship at which no one kneels but all sit around the Lord’s Table sharing the bread and wine. Ostroróg demanded that they give scriptural grounds for these innovations.\textsuperscript{43} Caper’s final defection to the Reformed came in 1564 when he issued in handwritten form a dialog concerning the doctrine of the sacrament, treating it as did the Swiss Reformers.\textsuperscript{44} On September 28, 1566 in the Synod at Poznań Jan Caper defended his symbolic interpretation of the Words of Institution and Melanchthon's \textit{Variata} edition of the \textit{Augsburg confession} of 1541.\textsuperscript{45} He was not successful in promoting his views, and the synod deposed him from the office of the superintendent.

The Bohemian Brethren also were successful in gaining converts among the Polish people. They felt constrained to leave Bohemia in 1548 and set out for East Prussia where Duke Albrecht had promised them his hospitality. During their travel they came to Poznań where Andrzej Górka, Castellan of Poznań, received them warmly and allowed them to publicly preach and gather converts. They did not remain in Poznań because at the request the Roman Catholic bishop the King ordered them to leave. However, they had established connections which would make it possible for them to return later. By 1557 they were back and had established
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30 congregations and received several leading families including Leszczyński, Krotoski (Krotowski), Opaliński, Tomicki and even Count Ostroróg left the Lutheran Church and became member of the Brethren Church. They made great gains at the expense of the Lutherans and came more and more in closer association with the Reformed in Minor Poland, some of whose teaching they found congenial. Brethren signed the Koźminek Union, according to which intercommunion was established with the Reformed. It is known that in 1569 the Bohemian Brethren territory in Major Poland was divided into three districts: (1) Poznań, (2) Kalisz and Sieradz, (3) Kujavia and Prussia. In the protocols of the synod of 1573 it is referred that the church had been divided in to six districts: (1) Kujavia, (2) Sieradz, (3) Konin, (4) Pyzdry, (5) Kalisz, and (6) Poznań.

The Reformed, however, never made much headway in Major Poland. They were not successful in establishing a sufficient number of congregations to establish districts as they had in Minor Poland. Only a few congregations were organized in the area of Kujavia. These congregations met in a church-wide synod presided over by a spiritual elder, co-elders, and four secular deputies. Reformed theology does not appear to have been attractive enough for Major Poles who lived in such close proximity to Germany to take to heart. The great bastion of the Reformed Church in Poland would remain Minor Poland. It was there that the leading force of the Polish Protestantism would reside until that time when the Roman Church and the Company of Jesus began to take action to win the Polish people back to Catholicism.

We have already noted the strong demands the nobility presented at the Diet of Piotrków in 1547-48. At succeeding Diets the nobility increasingly pressed their demands regarding the preaching of the pure Word of God, freedom of worship, and the abuse of power by clergy. In 1552 at the Diet of Piotrków the Protestants sought to press the issue of their long standing grievances. This time they were successful in forcing at least temporarily the suspension of ecclesiastical jurisdiction. Clear proposals for reform were presented by the nobility at Diet of 1555 in Piotrków. Here again a Protestant, Mikolaj Siennicki, was elected President of the Chamber of the Deputies, and it was he who presented the demands of the nobility. These included
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the liberty to have clergymen who would preach the pure Word of God, to follow their own rituals and ceremonies, to administer and receive Communion in both kinds, to eliminate episcopal jurisdiction in religious matters, to permit the marriage of clergy, to restore all clergy to their formal entitlements, and other matters which were important to the nobility. The approval of such a document would put the Protestants on an equal footing with the Roman Church, which they earnestly desired. The Roman bishops, as might be expected, refused their approval, and it was demanded that the King at his own direction should call a national synod in which these matters would be resolved. The bishops, however, again refused their approval and they appealed to the papacy for advice and assistance. The King himself appealed to the Bishop of Rome to approve a national synod, the use of the Polish language in the Mass, Communion in both kinds, and the marriage of the clergy. By this time the Council of Trent was already in session, and there was no possibility that these reforms would be allowed. The Pope instead sent his special legate, Aloysius Lippomanus (Alojzy Lippomano) (1500-1559), the Bishop of Verona, to investigate the situation and suppress the Reformation. The Protestants strongly objected. In the Diet of 1556 in Warszawa (Warsaw) the prospects of the Protestants were bright. They had great power. The King needed them in order to pursue his defensive measures against the Livonians (Knights of the Sword), and the Protestants repeated their earlier demands. Because this Diet did not mark the defeat of the Protestants, Lippomanus left the country. At the next Diet in Piotrków in 1558-1559, the Protestants were in full control. There was a new call for a national synod, and on this basis the Protestants agreed to set aside their grievances for the present. In 1563 a new papal agent, Joannis Francisci Commendoni, the Bishop of Sutri, came to Poland and took the strong position that no synod could be held in which lay people or heretics might participate. In the Diet of Piotrków 1562-63, instead of pressing forward the demands for the equal rights under the law, the Protestants chose instead to recall the provisions made at Czerwiński made in 1422, and in Jedlnia in 1430, concerning the rights of person and property and the constitution of the Diet of Radmon of 1505 which had declared unconstitutional the royal edicts.
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against heresy.\textsuperscript{56} In this way they thought to establish the antiquity of their claims against the ecclesiastical abuses. The Calvinists thought this to be a triumph for their cause. Again in the Diet in Warszawa in 1563, the Protestants were unsuccessful in their attempts to assert their rights on the basis of precedence. Although they are virtually in control of the Diet, they do not push for legal recognition. Instead they concerned themselves with secondary issues such as exemption from compulsory military service and taxation in favor of voluntary submissions. Their numerical superiority encouraged the nobility to press for the curbing of the power of the clergy to levy taxes from which they themselves were exempted.\textsuperscript{57} The Diet of 1569 coincided with the arrival of the Jesuits in Poland. Again, however, the Protestants appear to have failed to make any progress in attempts to give their movement legal standing. A review of this period leads one to the conclusion that the nobility were primarily interested in personal liberty and the freedom from oppressive power and taxation which they identified with the Roman bishops and clergy. We do not see a commensurate struggle for legal recognition for the Protestant movement as such in this period. It was opposition to the Roman Church which identified the nobility as Protestants. Theological issues appear to have been strictly secondary. This theological weakness in Polish Protestantism is evident also in the emergence of Anti-Trinitarianism. This would prove to be very destructive to their movement.

The dominant figure in the spread of Calvinism in Lithuania was Duke Mikołaj Radziwiłł the Black (“Czarny”) (1515-1565). He was the most important public figure in Lithuania, second only to the King in prestige and authority. He was an educated man, an articulate theological thinker, and an energetic public leader whose interest in the Reformation developed as a result of his foreign travels and personal correspondence with the Reformed theologians. His personal theological statement can be found in his public answer to the accusations of the Pope’s legate Lippomannus in 1556, that he was the leading heretic in Lithuania.\textsuperscript{58} Some members of his larger family had earlier become Lutherans. In the early part of the sixteenth decade Radziwiłł the Black himself exhibited interest in Lutheranism.\textsuperscript{59} But by the middle of the same decade he openly espoused the theology of the Calvinistic Reformation. Thus his personal residence became the site of the first Calvinist
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Church in Lithuania. His conversion pointed the way for other Lithuanian aristocrats who were led by Radziwiłł to look at the works of John Calvin, Johannes a Lasco, and other Reformed theologians for guidance. Grateful for Radziwiłł's support, Calvin dedicated his *Commentarii in Acta Apostolorum* 1560 to him. Through the leadership of Radziwiłł it may be said that the higher Lithuanian aristocracy was soon predominantly Reformed. Included among them were such prominent families as Pac (Pacas), Bielewicz (Bilevičius), Kiežgajlo (Kęsgailas), Kiszka (Kiška), Naruszewicz (Narusevičius), Oginski (Oginskis), Proński (Pronskis), (Sapieha) Sapiehas, (Szemeta) Šemetas, Wołowicz (Valavičius), Wiśniowiecki (Višniaveckis) and others.

The first organized Reformed Church was established in Podlaysia under the leadership of Radziwiłł’s Court Preacher Szymon Zacjusz (1507-ca.1591). The spread of the Reformed movement made it possible for Radziwiłł in 1557 to organize the first Synod in Vilnius of the young Reformed Church. The minutes of the synod, published by Zacjusz in 1559, indicate a strong emphasis on Calvinist interpretation, especially with reference to the nature of Christ’s presence in the Eucharist. A second synod was held on December 15, 1558 in Brześc Litewsk. The frequency of these synods testify to the rapid spread of Protestantism and the need for organizational structure and a system of discipline. In short order publishing houses were established in Brześc Litewsk (1558) and Nieśwież (Nesvyžius) (1562) to aid in the spread of Reformed theology which seemed to be sweeping the country. It is clear that many formerly Roman Catholic parishes had turned Protestant.

The Reformed Church in Lithuania, named *Unitas Lithuaniae*, kept its integrity as an independent entity from the first. It was never subject to domination by the Polish Reformed. Its highest governing body was its synod, called the church-wide synod, having the jurisdiction over the whole Lithuania. While the Lithuanians were represented by delegates at the general synods in Rzeczpospolita (The Commonwealth of Poland and Lithuania), the church itself maintained her
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independence in theological and liturgical matters. At the head of the church districts was the superintendent, elected by the patrons and the ministers.67

Although numerically strong, the Reformed Church in Lithuania seems always to have depended upon the support and encouragement of the Lithuanian aristocracy and, most importantly, Radziwiłł the Black. He appears to have been somewhat unsettled and easily dissatisfied. This is evidenced by his movement over a relatively short period of time from the Church of Rome to Lutheranism, from Lutheranism to Reformed theology. This was not the end of Radziwiłł's theological pilgrimage. From the Reformed theology his interest soon turned to the Anti-Trinitarian movement. In a letter to Calvin he expressed his support of Georgius Blandrata, whose theological opinions were Anti-Trinitarian. He asked that Calvin express his approval of this theological direction.68 His support of Blandrata and the Anti-Trinitarians raises deep question about whether he remained doctrinally Calvinist. After his death in 1565, his son Radziwiłł the Orphan returned to the Roman Catholic Church taking his 3 younger brothers with him. Before his death however, his cousin Radziwiłł the Brown (“Rudy”) (1512–1584) became a Calvinist and roused to its defense.69 He was to become the most notable figure of Lithuanian Protestantism. He financed the studies of Andreas Volanus (Andrzej Wolan) (1530–1610) in Königsberg, the principle voice of Lithuanian Reformed theology. Later patrons included Krzysztof Radziwiłł (“Piorun”) (1574–1603), son of Radziwiłł the Brown, and his sons, Janusz Radziwiłł (1579–1620) and Krzysztof Radziwiłł (1585–1640).70 It is known that in 1595 the church’s territory was divided into six districts: (1) Vilnius (Vilniaus), (2) Samogitia (Žemaičių), (3) ‘Zawilejski’ (district to the east of Vilnius) (Užnerio), (4) Nowogródek (Naugarduko), (5) Podlassia (also known as District of Brześć or Grodno) (Paliesės), (6) Ruš (also known as District of Mińsk or Białoruś) (Rusų).71
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1.3. The Detrimental Effects of the Anti-Trinitarianism and its Impact on the Reformed Church

In contrast to the origin and growth to the Reformation in Germany and elsewhere in Western Europe, in which theological concerns were supreme, the origin and spread of Reformation in Poland and Lithuania was predominantly political. In the earliest period we find no major theologian at the head of the movement in the Reformed Church. Johannes a Lasco appeared on the scene only in a later period, after the church had been already established. The lack of theological leadership left room for such a measure of theological dissension and debates on major theological issues as would result in the crippling of Protestantism in both lands. Under the influence of the Polish nobility, 16th century Poland and Lithuania became a place of refuge for people from all over Europe who were seeking a place where their unorthodox opinions would meet with toleration rather than persecution. Among those who fled to Poland were Italian Anti-Trinitarians, whose theological opinions were far more highly developed then those of the Poles, who were theological neophytes. Among them were Bernardino Ochino (1487-1564), Andreas Alciatus (1492-1550), Georgius Blandrata (ca.1515-1588), Laelius Socinus (1525-1562), Albericus Gentilis (1552-1608) and others, who represented themselves to the Poles as mainstream Protestants. These men were from the beginning participants in the establishment of the Polish Reformed Church.

Already from the earliest days of the Reformed Church, we see the signs of the dissemination of a variety of theological opinions. The same process was at work throughout Poland and Lithuania. In 1556 Francesco Stancaro, who earlier had recommended the *Augsburg Confession* as the Minor Polish church’s theological confession, begun to speak openly in rationalistic terms of humanity and divinity in the person of Christ.\(^{72}\) At the same time Petrus Gonesius in Lithuania begun to teach Anti-Trinitarian doctrine. He had been recommended by the Radziwiłł the Black to the Synod at Secemin in 1556 where he defended his Anti-Trinitarian positions.\(^{73}\) Already at the 1558 Synod in Vilnius Anti-Trinitarian views were mentioned.\(^{74}\) In the same year discussions concerning the Trinity aroused in the Synod on December
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15, 1558 in Brześć Litewsk.\textsuperscript{75} Questionable doctrinal opinions were espoused also by translators of the first Polish Bible. They were the students of Pińczów school, including Grzegorz Orsacius (Orsatius), Piotr Statorius (†1591), Jan Thenaudus.\textsuperscript{76} Chief among the disseminators of the new theology was the Italian Georgius Blandrata (1516-1588), who was doctor in the household of the Queen Bona. At the Synod of Książ on September 13-19, 1560 he was elected a senior of the Church in Minor Poland.\textsuperscript{77} He early represented himself as a Calvinist, though Calvin himself in his correspondence with Radziwiłł the Black warned that Blandrata's theological position was highly suspect. Radziwiłł however did not share Calvin's suspicions and treated him as an outstanding Calvinist theologian and church leader.\textsuperscript{78} At the Synod of Pińczów of 1559 Blandrata spoke regarding the Holy Spirit according to rationalistic terms. Within a few years Calvinists were openly accusing each other of unorthodox theological positions. At the synods of 1561 these new theological opinions gained a substantial following in the Reformed Church. In 1562 this resulted in open dissention and the emergence of two distinct theological groups within the church. The most important leaders, those who had established the foundations of the Calvinist Church, now became Anti-Trinitarians. Included among them were such notable leaders as Stanisław Lutomirski, Senior of Pińczów District, later Anti-Trinitarian Superintendent,\textsuperscript{79} Grzegorz Paweł (Gregorij Pauli) (ca.1525-1591), Francesco Lismanini (ca.1504-1566), Georgius Blandrata and even the Superintendent of the Church in Minor Poland Felix Cruciger (Feliks Krzyżak) itself.\textsuperscript{80}

Those loyal to the church's traditional Trinitarian theology, concerned with the future of the Reformed Church begun to fight Anti-Trinitarianism. Minister Stanislaw Sarnicki (1532-1597) established a group led by Castellan of Biecz Jan Boner (†1562). They acknowledged the necessity of forming a separate synod. On July 20, 1562 the Anti-Trinitarian party called a synod to meet in Rogów for the purpose of avoiding an open schism, but the Calvinists refused to participate. At

\textsuperscript{75} Lubieniecki 1995, 176, 199-201, 323-324.  
\textsuperscript{76} For this reason their Bible, published in 1563 in Brześć through the efforts of Radziwiłł the Black, was later judged by some students of the period to be Anti-Trinitarian. Любовь 1883, 269.  
\textsuperscript{77} Lubieniecki 1995, 324; Akta synodów II 1972, 58.  
\textsuperscript{78} Lukšaitė 1999, 305.  
\textsuperscript{79} Stanisław Lutomirski was elected superintendent at the Anti-Trinitarian synod of Pińczów on October 14, 1563. Akta synodów II 1972, 349.  
\textsuperscript{80} Lubieniecki 1995, 188-198; Akta synodów II 1972, 351.
Kraków a synod of Calvinists met on 14 May 1563 to publicly condemn Anti-Trinitarians.81

In Lithuania the same tendencies were evident. An Anti-Trinitarian synod was held on June 6, 1563 at Mordy in Podlassia, at which 42 ministers publicly subscribed a Confession of Faith which denied the divinity of Jesus Christ.82 They also publicly acknowledged their gratitude to Radziwill the Black for allowing them to gather in his region.83 Thus, we may conclude that 1562-1563 saw the splitting apart of the young Reformed Church, with tragic consequences the Reformation in Poland and Lithuania. In the national Diet of 1565 in Piotrków both groups were in attendance, the one side to warn the nobility concerning the dangers of the Anti-Trinitarianism, the other side to gain supporters for the new movement.84

The scandal of a fragmenting Protestant Church became common knowledge to the whole nation. The Reformation in Poland and Lithuania had now reached its high point and its downfall is near at hand, and the rapid expansion of the church had come to its end. Jakub Sylwiusz complained that as a result of the rapid spread of Anti-Trinitarianism many Protestants returned to Catholicism.85 Indeed, nothing did as much harm to the same cause as the Anti-Trinitarian doctrines which rose in the Helvetian Churches. Any further growth would only bring with it the loss of those who had formerly been faithful adherents. In 1566 at the Diet of Lublin the loyal Reformed together with the Lutherans formally petitioned the King to issue an edict expelling the Anti-Trinitarians. Together with some of the aristocrats, the Roman bishops, aware that the continuing dissension would benefit their course, pointed out that the expulsion of only the Anti-Trinitarians would still leave the Lutherans and Reformed in place.86 Thus we must say that the first sign of the ultimate destruction of the Reformation in Poland and Lithuania came from within the Reformed Church itself. With no unified theological foundation, but only a shared antipathy for the

81 Akta synodów II 1972, 149.
82 “A z synodu list pisali do p. Radziwiłła, wojewody wileńskiego, za tę piłność jego jemu dziękując, którą pokazał w pozwoleniu miejsca synodowi i w prędkim obgłoszeniu i wysłaniu ministrow na synod. A o tym, co na synodzie konkludowali, to mu napisano: Vocabuluma Trinitatis etsi non omnino reiere potuimus propter a liquos infirmiores, maxima tamen ex parte a praesenti abusu illud purgavimus, ut nunc utpote verbum hominum et non divinum, minus valoris quam antea apud multos obtinuerit.” Akta synodów II 1972, 152.
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Roman Church, the Reformed church was soon torn apart by internal divisions and floundered. The process of destruction which the Protestants themselves had begun was soon continued and brought to its final completion by the foot soldiers of the Society of Jesus, who arrived in 1569, determined to win both nations back to Catholicism.
1.4. The Quest for Legal Status through the Consolidation of the Protestant Churches

At the beginning of the eight decade of the 16th century, Protestant power and influence in Polish society appeared formidable. The records of the Diet of 1569 indicate that of the 133 senators in attendance 58 were Protestants, 70 were Catholic and of that number 15 were Catholic bishops. If one puts to one side the 15 senatorial seats occupied by the Catholic bishops, one sees that there were more Protestant aristocrats present than those of the Roman Church. The large number of Protestants among the Polish nobility was a potent force in the Polish state, potent enough to insist that Protestants be given equal rights with the Roman Catholics. According to the report of the contemporary Jesuit Piotr Skarga, some 2000 Roman churches of that day had been taken over by Protestants. Events of the final two and a half decades of the century would lead to a very rapid diminishing of this number by almost two thirds. Historian Henryk Merczyng (1860-1916) calculates the number of Protestant parishes in 1591 to have been 570, of these 250 were in Minor Poland, 120 in Major Poland, and 200 in Lithuania, or one-sixth of the total number of the Roman parishes in Poland and Lithuania. As these numbers indicate, during this period Protestants were a significant and an influential force in Polish and in Lithuanian life.

While the Protestants were able to point to these impressive numbers, there were at the same time strong negative forces at work within Protestantism. Dissention continued between the Calvinists, Lutherans and Bohemian Brethren, all of whom represented themselves as the authentic Christian Church. In addition, the Calvinist community was being torn apart by factions which rejected the traditional Trinitarian doctrines of Western Christendom. The profusion of conflicting confessions of faith caused great confusion among the Polish and Lithuanian people. Their Roman Catholic opponents, and especially the Jesuits, cleverly exploited this situation to discredit Protestantism.

It was evident to the Protestants that they must reach some sort of mutual accommodation among themselves if they were to be successful in their quest for
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religious liberty. Cooperation between the main line Protestant Churches should clearly indicate the doctrinal boundaries within which the Protestants would live and be known in Polish society as authentic Protestants, while at the same time clearly separating themselves from the Anti-Trinitarians and other splinter groups. Only by means of such an arrangement could the Protestants hope to obtain religious liberty and successfully cope with the hostile Roman forces.

The idea of such an arrangement was not new. Collaboration between the Reformed group and the Bohemian Brethren had already been established in Minor Poland in the Convocation at Koźminek in 1555. Although that union had not achieved all of the goals which had been set for it, it did open an era of fraternal collaboration and mutual assistance. Furthermore, after his efforts to meet with the King were rebuffed, Johannes a Lasco, who had earlier pursued an independent course, begun to seek to explore the possibility of a closer alliance with the Lutherans. In his 1556 request for an audience, the King had expressed his concern that Lasco was suspected of holding opinions which were in conflict with the Augsburg Confession, especially with reference to the Sacrament of the Altar. To the Lutherans these were no mere suspicions; they were certain that he held a position in these matters clearly in conflict with the Augsburg Confession, and for this reason they had little interest in collaborating with him. However, by the end of the sixth decade it was clear to all the three main Protestant groups in Poland and Lithuania that they must find common ground on which to form a doctrinal consensus and press for legal status. They understood that future of Protestantism in Poland would depend upon it. Lutherans and Bohemian made efforts in 1565 at Gostyń to find a basis for agreement on important doctrinal issues. Their efforts did not meet with success. As a result of the meeting, the Lutherans drew up a list of 16 points on which they considered the Bohemians to be in error. Recognizing the urgency of the situation, the Lutherans and Bohemian Brethren met again in the Lutheran synod on January 28, 1567, in Poznań to delineate areas of disagreement. As a result of these negotiations the Polish Lutherans noted the points of conflict

90 Kuyper II 1866, 738; Łukaszewicz 1853, pp. 101 ff.
In his response to King, Lasco stated in the strongest possible terms that he was faithful to the Augsburg confession especially with regard to the Sacrament of the Altar: “I should especially take all pains by some public proof to clear myself of any suspicion of my disagreement with the Augsburg Confession, particularly in the manner of the Lord’s Supper.” English translation quoted from: Lubieniecki 1995, 145.
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between the *Augsburg Confession* and the Bohemian doctrinal position. The Bohemians immediately sent a letter of response, and the next year they sent Jan Lorenz (Laurentius) to Wittenberg, where the Crypto-Calvinist Lutheran theologians approved the Bohemian positions and recommended to the Polish Lutherans that they earnestly seek consensus with the Brethren. It was on the basis of this and similar laxity concerning their doctrine positions that the Lutherans would approach Sandomierz meeting in 1570.

However, the most urgent impulse toward consensus was found in the words of King Zygmund II August. He foreswore persecution of dissenters, and, in the last session of the Lublin parliament in 1569, he proclaimed his desire that there be only one church in his realm. The King’s actual words were not clear in meaning, but the Protestants took them to mean that there could be but one Protestant confession which would serve as the basis of a Protestant union. They thought that this would satisfy the King and achieve religious liberty. In his personal words to some of the senators, the King expressed his hope that there would be peace among his Protestant subjects.

At the Colloquium of Poznań on February 14, 1570 the Lutherans pressed the Bohemian Brethren to accept the *Augsburg Confession*. The Bohemians were unwilling to do so. In the attempt to solve this stalemate both parties then begun to examine their confessional positions point by point. The most significant point of difference was in the doctrine of the Lord’s Supper, and this disagreement on a key point made consensus impossible. Less then a month later, on March 3, 1570, Radziwiłł the Brown gathered Lutherans and Calvinists in Vilnius for the purpose of achieving political and doctrinal union. Conversations centered on a formulation of a statement of the Lord’s Supper which would be acceptable in both groups. The text of their agreement is not extant, but we are told that a statement was formulated which was sufficiently vague to satisfy the whole assembly.

This success led to the gathering of representatives of the Polish and Lithuanian Reformed, Lutherans and the Bohemian Brethren in the city of
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Sandomierz on April 9-14, 1570 to negotiate a common confession. The gathering was predominantly Calvinist; they outnumbered the Lutherans and Bohemian Brethren present. Initially each of the three groups presented their own Confessions (Augsburg Confession of 1530, Bohemian Confession 1535, and Second Helvetic Confession of 1566) as the basis for common union. On Tuesday, the April 11, after the report of the agreement between the Lutherans and Reformed of Lithuania was read, it was decided that the Second Helvetic Confession should be used as the basis for their discussion. On the next day the reading and discussion of the confession was completed. Each group was still hopeful that their own Confession would be used as the basis for consensus. However, the Bohemians finally agreed to accept the Confession which had been discussed, as long as they were permitted to retain their own discipline and forms of worship. This caught the Lutherans off guard. In the face of this pressure, the Lutheran representatives Mikołaj Gliczner and Erazm Gliczner (1535-1603), who had been the Superintendent of the Lutheran Church in Major Poland since 1566, stated that while remaining loyal to the Augsburg Confession, they would agree to a further meeting of the three confessions for the purpose of formulating a completely new confession to satisfy the doctrinal concerns of all three groups, since Lutherans could not accept the Calvinist Confession. This threw everyone into confusion. It was agreed that all three groups should meet together in Warszawa (Warsaw) on the feast of the Holy Trinity to formulate the new confession. This meeting was never held. On April 14, it was agreed to adopt and subscribe as the basis of the future document the agreement which the Lutherans and Reformed had concluded in Vilnius. This model for future negotiations was given the title Consensus of Sandomierz. With regard to this preliminary formulation, the Lutherans expressed reservations concerning the Sacrament of the Altar. However, these concerns were successfully addressed by the other parties and the Lutherans agreed to sign, and agreement was declared.

The Reformed came from Sandomierz confident that a breakthrough had been achieved. In the letter to Dr. Zanki in Heidelberg, they asserted that it should now be
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possible to formulate a new Protestant *Corpus Doctrine* on the basis of the unique achievement at Sandomierz. Zanki stated that he rejoiced that agreement had been reached, and that now no such formulation would be necessary.\(^{106}\) At a subsequent Convocation in Poznań on May 18-20, 1570 discussions between representatives of the Lutherans and the Bohemian Brethren again made it evident that it was not possible to formulate a common confession concerning the Lord’s Supper which would be satisfactory to both confessions.\(^{107}\) For their part, the Prussian Lutherans made public their rejection of the *Sandomierz Consensus* as a statement of the authentic Lutheran position.\(^{108}\)

Still, on the basis of their consensus the three Protestant confessions looked to the King and parliament to regard them as a united Protestant Church with full liberty to live and worship according to their beliefs. All three groups begun expectantly to prepare for the coming meeting of the Parliament in Warszawa. Few Lutherans and Bohemian Brethren attended; Calvinists predominated. When the Calvinists appeared before the parliament to represent the entire Protestant community they choose not to present the *Sandomierz Consensus*, but instead their own *Sandomierz Confession* which was explained on the basis of the *Second Helvetic Confession*. This served to greatly diminish the value of the *Consensus*. The bishops and senators rejected the Calvinist Confession, and refused to grant religious liberty on the basis of it.\(^{109}\) This strong negative reaction made it impossible for the King to act favorably toward the Protestants. The battle for the religious liberty which the Protestants had so earnestly sought from parliament was not achieved.

When the Lutherans were informed that the Calvinists had presented themselves and their Confession as representing the entire Protestant community, they were furious. On October 4, 1570, at the Convocation at Poznań they expressed their desire to disassociate themselves from the decisions made at Sandomierz and the subsequent actions of the Calvinists.\(^{110}\) The representatives of the Bohemian Brethren present at the synod interpreted the action of the Calvinists more calmly, reminding the Lutherans that the churches of the *Sandomierz Consensus* allowed for each group to retain its own historic Confession. They noted that they had no exact
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record of what had taken place at the Diet, and that even if it were to be shown that the Calvinists presented their own Confession, this would have been within their rights. The Lutherans determined to limit their public action to a letter to the Reformed congregation in Kraków admonishing them to follow the terms of the Consensus.111

The death of Zygmunt II August in 1572 was to have a profound effect on the future of Protestantism in Poland and Lithuania. Although himself a pious son of the Roman Church, he exhibited great tolerance toward those who dissented from the Roman Church. He appears to have been willing to take measures against them only when forced to do so. He did not always make known his precise intentions, but by his words and actions he conveyed to the Protestants the impression that were they to overcome internal rivalries and present themselves as a united Protestant Church they would be able to secure liberty to practice their faith without penalty. That hope was thrown into doubt by his death. Clearly, the powerful Roman Catholic bishops would not willingly grant them such a status. Without a strong monarch to extend to them his benevolent support their hopes for liberty went unfulfilled.

In both the Protestant and Roman Catholic camps there was great concern as to who would become the King of Poland. Among those prominently mentioned as candidates were Duke Ernest Habsburg (1553-1595), whose major liability was his reputation for intolerance. Tsar Ivan IV the Terrible (1530-1584) was also regarded as a possible candidate. In the face of the growing power of Poland’s Muscovite opponents, Ivan's ascent to the throne would create a balance of power in Central Europe and minimize dangers from the Muscovites. Also considered was John III Waza (1537-1592) who was known to be strongly supportive of the Roman Church. Among his liabilities was his membership in the Lutheran Church. Most seriously considered was Henri de Valois (1551-1589), for whom support was initially very strong. That support waned with the news from Paris of his involvement in the St. Bartholomew’s Day Massacre.112 The intolerance from which such an act came forth was not acceptable to the Poles and Lithuanians. For reasons which cannot be determined, Polish Protestants were inclined to believe that the election of the Valois would enhance the status of the Huguenots in France.
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112 Lukšaitė 1999, 326.
In advance of the election of the new monarch, political and religious factions became increasingly visible and vocal. Prior to the election of the monarch the parliament convened in Warszawa to consider important issues. Among these was the matter of the presence and interaction of opposing religious groups in the state. As a result of the parliamentary debates, the Act of Confederation of Warszawa was passed on January 28, 1573. According to the terms of this act, the nobles of Poland and Lithuania announced that they would not lend their support to any attempt to suppress free religious expression, and in the face of any such suppression would unite to oppose it despite their own religious disagreements.113

The hostility of all but one of the Roman bishops and many of the higher of the Roman nobles against the Act of Confederation became evident at the coronation of Henri of Valois. The presiding bishop presented an alternative oath to be sworn by the King. When it became evident that the terms of the Warszawa Confederation were being ignored, the Grand Marshal Jan Firlej (ca.1521-1574) and Grand Chancellor Dębiński interrupted the ceremony. Firlej took the crown and loudly proclaimed that if the King did not swear the proper oath he would not rule (*si non jurabis, non regnabis*). As a result the King swore that he “…would keep peace between differing believers”114 in the spirit of the Act of Confederation. Henri ruled only four stormy months, at the end of which time he fled the country and a new election was announced. Out of a field of several candidates, it was through the efforts of Polish patriots that the Duke of Transylvania, Stefan Batory (1533-1586), was elected King of Poland. He gained a reputation of an obedient son of the Roman Church, and a patron of the Jesuits.

At the time, Protestants looked upon Warszawa Confederation as a great victory for religious tolerance. In fact the Act of Warszawa Confederation did not insure religious liberty. It merely legislated a relationship of tolerance between the sovereign and his Protestant subjects; it made no statements concerning the legal status of any Protestant group. The question of that status was to be addressed in the future by the parliament.115 As Roman Catholic power increased, dissatisfaction with the terms of the Act of Confederation increased as well. Fueled by the Jesuits, questions were increasingly raised concerning its terms and real intentions. With the
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death of Stefan Batory hostility to the Act showed itself openly, and in the
convocation of Parliament in 1587 the question of its continued recognition and
observance was raised.\footnote{Lukšaitė 1999, 424.}

The situation in Poland was complicated by the fact that the Poles could not
find in their history any precedent by which to interpret the Act. This was not the
case with the Lithuanians. Shortly before the Lublin Union, the Lithuanian
parliament, meeting at Grodno, in 1568, had moved to insure the rights of the
nobles.\footnote{Lukšaitė 1999, 323, 423.} Although no mention was made of recognizing Protestant dissenting
groups, the nobles, among whom were a number of Protestants, were clearly referred
to as Christian men. Lithuanians then could argue this designation as a precedent
upon which to found a suitable interpretation of the Act of Warszawa Confederation.
To more adequately undergird their status, the Protestants sought to legally describe
that status in the Lithuanian Statute. In the Third Lithuanian Statute of 1588, they
provided for the recognition of the legal rights of all Christian people to freely
acquire and dispose of their property and to exercise their faith. Violence against
Christian persons, clergy, schools, cemeteries and other church property would be
regarded as an offence against the noble. The Statute also regulated the areas of
competence of secular and episcopal courts, and required of all judges and other
magistrates that they swear an oath to the Holy Trinity. However, the Protestant
Churches in Lithuania were granted no legal status as institutions, and the Roman
Church was given the right to apply for the return of property taken from them by the
Protestants.\footnote{Lukšaitė 1999, 430.}

The seventh and eight decades of the sixteenth century was the period of the
Protestant progress in the pursuit of their objective of state recognition. The rights
which they secured were only personal, not institutional. The final achievement of
these personal rights in Lithuania was codified in the Third Statute in 1588. The
Protestants in Poland, however, were not able to achieve even this limited goal. Their
situation before the law remained far more perilous. They had only the stated terms
of the Act of Warszawa Confederation to support them, and the meaning of its terms
were in dispute. After the death of Stefan Batory in 1586, the interpretation of
Warszawa Confederation and other juridical regulations fell to those who held the
reigns of power. With Roman Catholic dominance came a model of legal interpretation which was increasingly oppressive to the Protestants. The earlier attitudes of tolerance for religious minorities now quickly disappeared. In 1581 Stefan Batory publicly denounced the burning of Protestant books in Vilnius. Zygmunt III Waza (1566 - 1632) remained silent in the face of the burning of Protestant churches and the physical mistreatment of his Protestant subjects.

Protestant efforts toward political recognition remained unsuccessful. There was need for clarification and a clearer articulation of theological positions within each Protestant group and the subsequent formulation of a mutually agreed common ground. The quest for a common position could not in itself be an adequate basis upon which to build a unified Protestantism. A statement of positive doctrinal agreement was needed. For some the *Sandomierz Consensus* represented just such an articulation, but in the estimation of many, especially among the Lutherans, the *Consensus* did not fulfill the need for a strong, positive, and unanimous statement concerning the Lord’s Supper. To the Lutherans this matter was as crucial as it had been at Marburg in 1529, but the Reformed did not think it to be a important issue.

As early as the General Synod of Kraków which met on September 29 - October 1, 1573, a variety of factors made it evident that questions concerning doctrine should be avoided. Decisions concerning matters of church discipline, public morality, and religious ceremonies were far easier to argue and resolve. However, soon the Lutherans, including Erazm Gliczner and Paweł Gilowski, together with the Reformed, came to regard a consensus as the model which ought to be followed also in Germany. In their letter of 1578 they wrote:

“A perfect understanding prevails amongst us, notwithstanding that foreign intrigues attempt to destroy union. Though separated by minor differences, we compose one body, and one host against Arians and Papists. We wish to the German churches a similar union. It is necessary to convoke a general European Protestant synod, which shall unite all shades of the Reformation into one general confession, and give it a uniform direction.”

120 English translation quoted from: *Krasinski* 1840, 72.
In fact, the General Synod in Piotrków on June 1-3, 1578 also issued a recommendation to the Germans to form a common confession on the model of *Sandomierz Consensus* and proceeded to give illustrations showing how the Poles had been able to resolve practical issues. The doctrinal issues, however, remain unresolved.\(^{121}\)

The picture presented in the statement recommending the Polish model as having effected a perfect and concordant was far from reality. On June 25, 1578 the Colloquium was held between the Lutherans and the Reformed in Vilnius. The Lutherans disassociated themselves from the *Sandomierz Consensus* on the basis of the doctrine of the Sacrament of the Altar, and they declared themselves separate from the other Protestants.\(^{122}\) An even more significant attack was launched at Poznań in Major Poland by the Lutherans Paweł Gericius (Gericke) and Jan Enoch. They stated that it would better for the Lutherans to return to the Roman Church then to support the *Consensus*.\(^{123}\) A General Synod was called on June 19-20, 1583 at Włodzisław to include the representatives of all three groups as well as senators and aristocrats from both Poland and Lithuania. Its purpose was to confirm the Consensus and to legislate ceremonial matters. They confirmed the Consensus and rebuked Gericius and others who had repudiated it. Without dealing with the doctrinal issues out of which the complaints had arisen, the synod was satisfied to resolve only ceremonial and disciplinary issues. Irritated by the rebuke he had received and even more by the failure of the synod to deal with the issues, Gericius mounted an even stronger attack.

Duke Krzysztof Radziwiłł ("Piorun"), Palatine of Vilnius, called for a convocation of Polish and Lithuanian Reformed and Lutherans on June 14, of 1585 in Vilnius to confront and answer the theological issues which had not been answered in *Sandomierz Consensus*. Prussian Lutheran theologians were also invited. The stated purpose was to resolve the difference between the *Augsburg* and *Helvetic Confessions*. An attempt was made to formulate the doctrine of the Eucharist which would be suitable for both sides without addressing the specific issues which had made agreement between Luther and Zwingli at Marburg in 1529
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impossible. Vilnius Convocation ended without any real advance had been accomplished.124

Immediate support for Gericius came from several German theologians. These formidable opinions swayed Erazm Gliczner. As a result he published in the Polish language in 1594 an unaltered Augsburg Confession of 1530 to the chagrin of the Bohemian Brethren.125 A General Synod was called to be held at Toruń on August 21-26, 1595 to address this and other issues Świętosław Orzelski, (1549-1598), the Chairman of the synod, declared in his opening oration that the meeting of the synod was for the purpose (1) of renewing and conforming and consolidating the Consensus of Sandomierz; and (2) of determining means by which the Polish Protestants could avoid the injuries and persecutions which they were suffering, especially from the Jesuits. Gericius immediately objected to the manner in which theological issues in the Consensus to be discussed. He stated that there were contradictory theological statements in the Consensus which must be resolved.126 Orzelski replied that it was common knowledge that Lutherans, Bohemians, and Reformed had theological differences, but that these should not disturb their union. Gericius stated that this was in conflict with the statements of those who formulated these positions and had accused those who thought and wrote differently of error. It was pointed out that Andreas Volanus, in his reply to the Jesuit Piotr Skarga, had inserted the statement that the Consensus of Sandomierz denies the presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the sacrament, as the same denial could be found in the catechism of Paweł Gilowski.127 In an effort to turn the discussion away from the doctrinal matters, Krzysztof Rej (†1626), the Chamber of Lublin, stated that the synod had gathered not to discuss the doctrinal issues of the Lord’s Supper, but to unite more closely with each other and strengthen the Union of Sandomierz. Only Superintendent Gliczner insisted that the doctrinal issues must be faced because many of Helvetian Confession were destroying the Consensus by their teachings and writings. Attention now turned to attempts to force Gericius to sign the Consensus. He left the city rather then subject himself to further pressure, and in order to quiet
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the opposition of Erazm Gliczner, it was resolved to excommunicate him should he fail to repent before the end of the year. 128

Finally, the General Synod of Toruń resolved to accept the Consensus of Sandomierz and to require that every minister in Polish Empire conform himself to its provisions. It was further resolved that no one should be made a minister unless he would sign the Consensus and conform with it. The senior of every district should keep a book in which all ministers of his district subscribe their agreement and confirmation of the union; every year the superintendents of the three confessions should meet to deliberate concerning affairs of the church; churches have liberty in maintaining their tradition ceremonies for the present time until a future synod establishes conformity.129

The synod of Toruń did not resolve the doctrinal issues. It preferred to establish unity by edict and demand conformity. On one side the situation of the Protestant Churches and the need for union in the eyes of society were critical. Those who supported the union looked to it as the only possible means of Protestant survival. On the other hand, some of the Lutherans saw this Consensus and agreement as a falsehood which could never accomplish its purposes, because it did not address and resolve the theological issues which had divided Protestantism into opposing camps. Lutherans opposed to the Consensus remained adamant. Lutheran leaders in several Major Polish cities refused to accept the provisions or sign the protocol of the synod.130 When Gliczner was instructed to carry out the decision of the synod to depose Gericius for continually preaching against the union, the strong reaction of the Poznań congregation moved him to abandon the attempt for fear of violence.131 In one sense the synod consolidated Protestant leadership in their efforts to stand together against the Jesuits. However, the more visible result of the Synod of Toruń was that it made even more evident the inadequacy of the Sandomierz Consensus as a basis for union between the churches.
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1.5. Catholicism’s Successful Efforts to regain the Polish and Lithuanian People

Protestant concerns about the revitalization of Catholicism were aroused by the actions of the Council of Trent (1546-1563). This council undertook a serious examination of the theological, moral and social issues which had fed the flames of Reformation throughout Europe. The Roman Catholic bishops of Poland formerly accepted the decrees of the Council of Trent in a Synod in Piotrków in 1577. Among the resolutions of the synod was an emphatic renunciation of the Articles of Warszawa Confederation, the issuance of an anathema against those who upheld it, and a petition to the King insisting that it be abolished. The synod called for the reform of the morals of the clergy and the correction of other practices which scandalized the Polish people. The definitive doctrinal position enunciated by the Council was finally affirmed. This undercut many of the Protestant grievances which had been presented by the nobles. The program of reform was expertly implemented by the Jesuits. Their order had been specifically founded to attack Protestantism by every means possible and win Europe again to the Roman Church. The Jesuit counterattack in Poland was a model of efficiency and effectiveness. Using the argument of the Protestants that text books in the school should be in the language of the people, the Jesuits produced literature in the Polish and Lithuanian languages to support the Roman position, and in many places they founded their own schools. An outstanding accomplishment was their founding of the University of Vilnius in 1579. It would become the training ground of the future magnates and societal leaders of the Lithuanian people.

Additionally, the Third Statute of Lithuania, 1588, gave the Roman Church a firm legal basis for court action to take back parish churches earlier lost to the Protestants. By this means numerous churches were regained by the Roman bishops. Now the Roman Church had a power to appoint in these parishes Roman Catholic incumbents to lead the people back into obedience to Rome. Protestants in Poland found it even more difficult to retain church property gained in the Reformation. They had not such privileges as were afforded to Lithuanian Protestants by the Third Statute.

133 Lukšaitė 1999, 432.
All these factors combined to make it possible for the Roman Catholics to establish a strong network to counteract Protestant influence. Furthermore, the Union of Brześć of 1596 brought into the Roman obedience the majority of Polish and Lithuanian Eastern Orthodox Christians, materially and spiritually increasing the power and authority of the Bishop of Rome among the Polish and Lithuanian peoples.\footnote{Lukšaitė 1999, 416.}

Dealing from this position of power the Roman Catholics begun to take strong measures against the Protestants. As early as 1581 acts of brutality and the burning of books begun in Vilnius. These were the first signs of the shifting popular sentiment against the Protestants. Later in the same year assaults against church property begun in Vilnius, and in 1591 the Reformed Church was burned a second time. A few of the participants were brought to trial, but the real perpetrators were not identified or charged. The leaders of the Reformed congregation sought to bring to trial the Rector and leading Jesuit professors of the University of Vilnius, but their efforts were unsuccessful.\footnote{Lukšaitė 1999, 410-412.} Acts of physical violence came even earlier in Poland, where funeral processions in Kraków were attacked in 1564, 1568 and 1570. The lack of action against attackers led to more violence. In 1574, 1587 and 1591 church property in Kraków was destroyed. In 1613 students from the city extended their destructive activities to churches which had been moved from Kraków into the country side in an attempt to forestall further violence. In 1606, 1614 and 1616, in Poznań, students formed a mob which destroyed the Protestant churches. Chroniclers of that time credited the Jesuits as the organizers of these acts of violence. The Protestant Churches were powerless to prevent these acts and were without avenues by which to redress their grievances.\footnote{Lukšaitė 1999, 412.} Slowly but surely power was shifting out of the hands of the Protestants.

Sensing their growing peril, the Protestants made some attempts to consolidate their forces. It became imperative that the General Synod of Toruń of 1595 reaffirm the Consensus of Sandomierz, even though doctrinal unity was lacking. The same synod discussed what might be done to prevent further injury and persecution to the Polish and Lithuanian Protestants in the face of the violent assault which the Jesuits had instigated. A letter was read from Duke Konstanty Wasyl...
Ostrogski, Palatine of Kijev, the most important Eastern Orthodox group in Poland, in which he proposed that a union be effected with the Protestants to strengthen their hand against the Church of Rome.137

A meeting between representatives of the Protestants and the Eastern Church was proposed to be held on May 15- June 2, 1595. This meeting finally convened in Vilnius in 1599 for the purpose discussing of a religious and political union. This purpose was not achieved. Ostrogski (1527-1608) and Krzysztof Radziwiłł (“Piorun”), the co-sponsors of the meeting, were not willing to sign the protocol.138 Union was impossible.139

In the rebellion of Zebrzydowski in 1606-1607 the Protestants moved against the policies of King Zygmunt III Waza. The nobles once again attempted to assert their independent authority. It cannot be said that religious motives predominated in this assertion. They played a minor role, but they may not be discounted. There were plans to raise question of religious tolerance in the parliamentary session of 1606.140 However, due to Roman Catholic objections, the King did not allow the issue to be raised. This rebellion was not restricted to the Poles; the prominent Lithuanian Protestant Janusz Radziwiłł played a major role. By common agreement those who had staged this rebellion were granted amnesty, but in the case of Janusz Radziwiłł amnesty meant the loss of his position of leadership in the political life of Lithuania.141 This was a great loss for all Lithuanian Protestants. The rebellion of Zebrzydowski shows that even in urgent situations the Protestants were unable to achieve any measure of agreement and consolidate their political power in the quest for the equality of status with Roman Catholicism. The balance of power finally and completely had shifted in Lithuania, as it had earlier in Poland.

In the eyes of some historians this marks the end the Polish and Lithuanian Reformation.142 But note should be taken that even in this time of political reverses

137 Łukaszewicz 1835, 174
139 The next year, when Cyril Lukaris (1572-1638), Patriarch first of Alexandria (1602), and later of Constantinople (1612), visited Vilnius as a representative of current Patriarch of Constantinople, he did not meet or consult with the Protestants, although he had a brief meeting with Radziwiłł the Orphan, a Roman Catholic. Lukšaitė 1999, 487.
140 Lukšaitė 1999, 418.
141 Lukšaitė 1999, 418;
142 Three possible periods of the end of the Reformation had been proposed by historical scholars. N. И. Кареев, Н. Любовичь, T. Wotschke, J. Purycis and other scholars from the end of 19th and beginning of 20th century date the end of the Reformation to 1565-1570 with the coming of the Jesuits 1565, signing the union of Lublin 1569 and Sandomierz Consensus 1570. Other proposed dates include the first decade of the 17th century with the failure of the protesters to achieve the aims of the
the church had still before it a period of intense activity which showed itself by the publication of a number of worship materials which not only gave guidance to individual ministers and congregations, but also defined the parameters of the church. This body of materials reached its high point only with the publication of the final and definitive liturgical documents at the end of the first half of the 17th century. Therefore, from the liturgical and theological perspective it would be wise to leave open questions concerning the end of the Polish Reformation at least until consideration has been given to these important materials.

It was the Lithuanians who were the first to reach a level of liturgical maturity which made it possible to accomplish the important task of unifying rites and ceremonies in their land. Their 1581 *Forma albo porządek*, based squarely on Johannes a Lasco’s *Forma ac Ratio*, and published together with the church’s catechism and hymnal, was an important indication of the internal strength of the Lithuanian Reformed Church and its early agreement concerning forms of worship. A corrected edition *Forma albo porządek* appeared in 1621.

The Minor Polish Church did reach this level of maturity before the end of the century. It was not until 1599 that the earliest published agenda, entitled *Porządek nabożeństwa*, prepared by Krzysztof Kraiński appeared. It met with immediate success because of its shear size, comprehensiveness and the scholarly acumen which it displayed. The edition of 1602 *Porządek* adjusted to bring it into closer with the theological agreement annunciated by Lasco, was published for use throughout the entire region of Minor Poland. A new edition of *Porządek* appeared in 1614 reflecting the growing theological maturity in the Minor Polish Church.

The comparatively small Reformed Church in Major Poland, centered mainly in the District of Kujavia, never had the resources necessary to publish liturgical documents in the form of an agenda. This church supplied its liturgical needs by the use of handwritten manuscripts, as we see in the case of the Communion service which was hand copied from the work prepared by Daniel Mikołajewski early after the turn of the century. The Bohemian Brethren in Major Poland, whose theological position closely approximated that of the Reformed, made use of own
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rebellion of Zebrzydowski (G. Schramm). Still others (M. Kosman, J. Tazbir, S. Kot, R. Krasauskas, H. Wisner, I. Lukšaitė) point to the middle of the 17th century at which time Anti-Trinitarianism was by parliamentary decision of 1658 outlawed and the end of armed hostilities with Sweden and Russia. *Lukšaitė* 1999, 50-56.

143 *Akta synodów III* 1983, 347.
their distinctive liturgical forms which they had brought with them into exile and which they had adapted linguistically and ceremonially to meet their new circumstances. They translated their rites into Polish and circulated them in manuscript form.

As early as 1603 hopes were expressed that the promise of the Synod of Sandomierz concerning visible unity could be fulfilled by the adoption of common rites and ceremonies in all these churches, including the Lutherans as well. It was not until 1633 that definite steps were taken to fulfill this important dream. Although the Lutherans had indicated that they had no interest of the formulation of common rites, both the Bohemian Brethren and Reformed pledged their full participation in the General Convocations at Orla 1633, Włodawa 1644, and the General Convocation of the Superintendents in Toruń 1636. The result was the publication of a monumental liturgical work, the Great Gdańsk Agenda of 1637. Upon publication of the Gdańsk Book the Lithuanians begun to strongly question some of its provisions. These questions were addressed in the General Convocation at Orla in 1644 and the problems were remedied in the same year in the publication of special edition entitled Akt usług. Although the goal of complete unification proved unreachable, the churches in both countries could point to their accomplishments as signs of continuing vitality of their churches.

We may conclude that this was a period of intense discussion and activity in the Reformed Churches. Although attempts to regain a recognized place in society and further the work of the Reformation in Poland and Lithuania were largely frustrated because of the church’s precarious legal position and the violence of Roman Catholic reaction against the Protestants, life within the church was lively, and fruitful liturgical work was undertaken to benefit the spiritual life of the church. For these reasons one must be very circumspect in examining this period and take note of this important creative activity. It indicates that Polish and Lithuanian Protestantism continued active and vital long after the events which others have identified as signs that Protestantism had been brought to a halt. While outwardly repressed, the church was still strong in spirit, and her corporate spiritual life and the inner life of her people was being richly nourished.
2. Sacramental Theology and its Liturgical expression in the
Reformed Churches of Poland and Lithuania

2.1. The Articulation of Sacramental Theology and Worship
in the Reformed Church of Poland

Liturgical matters were not of primary concern at the beginning of the
Reformation in Poland. The earliest Protestants were Lutherans, and to them the
teaching of Luther's theology was far more important than the ceremonial of worship.
The Lutheran doctrine which Polish students returning from foreign study and
German merchants and travelers brought with them did not require immediate of
dramatic liturgical changes. Far more important was the preaching of the pure
Gospel; what was uncongenial to that Gospel would in the course of time fall
away and die. In consequence we have been left no record of liturgical changes or
dramatically altered forms of worship.

There were of course some changes in the liturgy necessary, most of them
concerned with the omission of some sacrificial prayers found in the Missal. To some
these changes were controversial. Disagreements appeared in 1522 in Gdańsk
(Danzig) between those who wished the Reformation to proceed slowly and those
who insisted that there must be immediate and radical changes in the liturgy. The
king intervened on the side of the more conservative Reformers and brought a
restoration of familiar liturgical ceremonies while leaving Reformation teaching
unchanged.144 The situation at Gdańsk was repeated elsewhere in cities with large
German populations, as in the case of Toruń, Poznań and elsewhere.145 Here too only
nominal changes occurred in the liturgy. Offensive elements in the Mass were
eliminated but the Mass continued with its traditional Catholic ceremonies and
vestments. The most radical changes were in the Pulpit, in the oral proclamation of
the person and works of Christ and their saving benefit.

Although we do not have liturgical materials from the earliest period in
Poland, we do possess church orders relating to various aspects of congregational

144 Fox 1924, 22-24.
145 Similar situations could be found elsewhere in Major Poland in cities with large German
populations. In these congregations the German language was used. Spread of Lutheranism among the
Polish speaking population came only after several decades. The two group maintained separate
organizations until the middle of the 17th century. Wotschke 1911a, 227, 228.
life. These appear to follow a pattern typical of congregations in Saxony during this same period. Apart from the East Prussian Church Orders, which were territorial, we find Lutheran Church Orders in Poland for congregations situated in the commercial centers, where German language populations predominated: Gdańsk, Elbing, Toruń, Poznań, and elsewhere. Gdańsk presents us with the richest resource of information concerning parish life. These documents do not detail changes in the Mass but do provide us with information concerning the provisions made for the needs of the poor, as we see in the Armenordnungen 1525 and 1551.

Catholic ceremonies and Latin hymns were retained until 1557, when the Lutheran congregation in Gdańsk was permitted to make its own decisions in such matters by the special privilege of religion extended to it. The 1557 order is a short Latin document relating to the festivals and other days to be celebrated and includes also the general outline of the celebration of Matins and Vespers. It is noted that Mass is to be celebrated according to the order customary in their churches. We cannot ascertain the provisions of that earlier order but it is stated that the Latin language is to be used. The royal privileges of 1567 granting legal status to Protestants affected only the German Lutheran congregation. The Verzeichniss und ordnung of the same year, providing them equal status, officially encouraged the Lutherans to publish their own German liturgy and directed that it should follow the earlier Latin pattern. Direct references were made to the former order in the Kirchenordnung of 1570. This too was largely concerned with the observance of the church year with special instructions concerning the week day services.

The pattern of Gdańsk also obtained in Toruń and Elbing. The earliest document that we have from Toruń was printed between 1560-1570. Kirchenordnung von den itzigen dienern includes specific directions for Holy Baptism and its ceremonies and the celebration of the Holy Communion together with confession of sins. These instructions were mainly doctrinal in nature and were

146 Die Evangelischen Kirchenordnungen 1911, 162.
147 Die Evangelischen Kirchenordnungen 1911, 181.
148 Die Evangelischen Kirchenordnungen 1911, 169.
149 Verzeichniss und ordnung, wie es mit predigt und anderem in der pfarrkirche zu St. Marien zu halten.
150 Die Evangelischen Kirchenordnungen 1911, 186
151 Die Evangelischen Kirchenordnungen 1911, 188.
152 Die Evangelischen Kirchenordnungen 1911, 162-163.
153 Kirchenordnung von den itzigen dienern der gemeine gottes zu Torn entrichtig geschlossen und in folgende artikel vorfasset.
specifically concerned with the Office of Keys. The individual church order for Elbing in the 16th century is not extant, although its connection with Königsberg and Gdańsk is well founded. The Lutheran congregations in Poznań have not left behind us any collection of their church orders, but it is known that they wished to distinguish themselves generally from Catholic forms.156

It would seem that Lutheran liturgical orders in Poland flowed in two streams. In the first we find Gdańsk, Toruń and Elbing where the liturgy followed, first of necessity and then by conscious decision, a general form which was patterned closely on the Western Catholic liturgical tradition in both language and ceremonies. Information is sparse, and in the case of the second stream, that of Poznań, it is all together lacking. We know only that these congregations wished to separate themselves as much as possible from any taint of ‘Catholicism’. This indicates something of the breadth of liturgical expression allowable within Lutheranism. Although Lutheran theology might be congenial with the basic form and many of the liturgical ceremonies of the Western Catholic tradition, none of these could be regarded as essential to the Lutheran doctrinal tradition.

The liturgical materials used by the Polish speaking Lutherans in Prussia were translations of original Prussian documents, as we see in Ustawa albo porząd Kościelnny, published in Königsberg in 1560. This was a revised edition of an earlier publication, indicating that the Polish speaking Lutherans in Prussia even earlier had a far richer treasure of liturgical forms than their Lutheran brothers in Major Poland and West Prussia. In 1571 in Königsberg the Ustawa albo porząd Kościelnny y Ceremonie, translated from German by Hieronym Malecki was also published.

The coming of the Reformed Church to Poland was quite late. It begun over a several decades after the introduction of Lutheranism, but in the space of less a score
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158 Ustawa albo porząd Kościelnny y Ceremonie, jako w nauczaniu Słowa Bożego, y podawaniu Świątostw w Kościelech Xięstwa Pruskiego ma być zachowany. Z niemieckiego y języka na polski pilnie przełożony przez Hieronyma Maleckiego, Plebana Leckiego r. 1571. W Krolewcu Drukowano u Jana Daubmana, 1571.
159 Jocher 1842, 153.
of years the Reformed Church had come to dominate Polish Protestantism. From the first Lutheranism was largely restricted to the German speaking populations in the larger cities, and it had little support from within the Polish nobility. The situation with regard to the Reformed Church was quite different. In it the use of the Polish language predominated, and both its introduction and its rapid spread were the result of the strong support of Polish nobles who complained about oppressive church taxes and the secular power of the Roman Catholic bishops.

It was in the areas around, but not in, Kraków, in Minor Poland that we find the introduction of any form of Protestantism. The confession of these earliest Protestants is unclear. Protestant preaching was begun by Felix Cruciger in Niedźwiedź on the lands of nobleman Stanisław Stadnicki (†1563), a short distance from Kraków, shortly before 1550. In 1547 the voices of Jakub Sylwiusz, a former Roman Catholic Priest, also proclaimed the Protestant faith in Krzęcice, the village of Hieronim Filipowski. 160 A year later nobleman Krzysztof Pilecki introduced Lutheranism in his lands and insisted that the Roman clergy in Łańcut parish should celebrate Mass according to the Lutheran order. He prohibited the celebration of Masses in honor of the Virgin and Marian devotion in general. 161 Mikołaj Oleśnicki (†1586), noble of Pińczów, became patron of Francesco Stancaro of Mantua, Italy, who had been imprisoned for his Protestant preaching. Stancaro was to play a key role in the establishment of Reformed Church in the area of Kraków and the setting of its ideological stands. 162

The situation of early Protestantism can be described as chaotic. It arose independently in several areas and had no common theological foundation or ecclesiology. In one place Lutheranism predominated, while another other Protestant groups prevailed. It was clear that for Protestantism to become a lively force these diverse movements would need to collaborate closely or perhaps even unite into a single church, so that all Protestants might share a common confession and practice a common way of worship.

The year 1550 was an important for the emerging Protestant Church in Minor Poland. The pressing need for the establishment of a Protestant Church led the Protestants to meet together in October at Pińczów, at what may be called the first
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synod of the emerging church. The most important Protestants were in attendance, including among others Francesco Stancaro, Martinus of Opoczno, Felix Cruciger, Minister of Niedźwiedź, Jakub Sylwiusz, Minister of Pińczów (later of Krzęcice), Martinus Taurinus, Minister of Solec, Gregorius Orsacius and Melchior Cracovianus. The first order of business was not the formulation of a common theological position, but instead the necessity of uniting around a common form of worship. This would create a visible sign of the church’s organization. Reformed sensibilities would make the adoption of a pure Saxonian Lutheran order, such as was used by the Lutherans in Major Poland, inadequate. In the same way the adoption of Calvin’s Geneva service or other published Reformed liturgy would not be acceptable to some. The middle way was proposed by Francesco Stancaro who recommended the adoption the Consultation of Archbishop Hermann von Wied of Cologne of 1543. The names of two prominent theologians were closely connected with this work. One, Martin Bucer of Strassburg, had been a close associate of Ulrich Zwingli and a participant in both the Marburg Colloquium in 1529 and the Diet of Augsburg of 1530. Closely associated later with the Lutheran theologians of Wittenberg, he was also an important associate of John Calvin who made use of his liturgical material in creating French language services for his congregations in Geneva (1542) and Strassburg (1545). The other theologian associated with this work was Philip Melanchthon, the closest colleague of Martin Luther and second only to him in importance in the Lutheran Church. Bucer may be described a Reformed theologian with strong Lutheran leanings, and Melanchthon may be described as a Lutheran theologian with strong ties to Calvinism. Thus the Consultation might be termed a middle way acceptable to those who had not yet determined whether to follow Lutheran and Reformed course, for the sake of those whom the Acta Iacobi Sylvii calls 'weaker brothers.'

The proposal of Stancaro was accepted. Stancaro, however, decided to publish a work less dependent on the Consultation and more suitable for use in the Polish Church. This work was commissioned in 1550 and printed in 1552 in Frankfurt/Oder under the title Canones Reformationis Ecclesiarum Polonicarum. The enlarged Polish version, Porządek naprawienia w koscielech nassych, was

163 “Hoc tempore Franciscus Stancarus obtulerat iisdem ministris Reformationem Colonensiern, quam in primo motu susceperant; videbatur enim esse tolerabilis pro infrinis fratribus. Quae Reformatio plurimum in se complectebatur ex ritibus missionis Papisticae.” Akta synodów I 1966, 2.
printed in Kraków in 1553 at the expense of Hieronim Filipowski.\footnote{Lubieniecki 1995, 453 fn. 243; Akta synodów I 1966, 3 fn. 1; Wotschke 1910, 475.} This edition met with strong resistance at the Synod which met on November 25, 1554 at Słomniki, but nevertheless it was accepted.\footnote{“Secundo, offerebant quidam ex gremio primorum fratrum Reformationem iam in Polonico sermone excusam sub nomine et titulo Stancari Francisci Mantuanial. Non consenserunt huic Reformationi plurimi propter nomen Stancari, qui non pridem ex Regno proscriptus canonicorum studio fuitb. Hoc vero factum est non improbationis gratia, sed fugiendi scandali causa; timebant enim sibi a convicio sectae Stancaricae ne scilicet aliquam notam ex huius boni viri nomine habeat ecclesia. Hanc tamen Reformationem ad ritus ecclesiasticos celebrandos in communi sumpserunt ministri consensu totius ecclesiae.” Akta synodów I 1966, 3.} The work consists of 79 sheets, and, in addition to the Communion Service, it includes, Matins and Vespers, Church Discipline, Christian and Pastoral Duties, Warnings against False Doctrine, Organization and Maintenance of Schools and Church Property, and other practical matters for the emerging Church in Minor Poland.\footnote{An incomplete and damaged copy of this work is among the holdings of the Jagiellonian University Library in Kraków; acquisition number: Cim. Qu 5485.}

Stancaro's Communion Service takes a form of a directory which says what is to be done but does not provide the exact forms to be employed. He notes that the exact forms can be found in other works and need not be included in his order.\footnote{Porządek naprawienia 1553, rj.} He calls for three Sunday Services. The first is a service of preaching and, on the first Sunday of the month, Communion. After the midday meal there should be an exposition of the Epistle and a reminder of the duties of Christian people. The evening service should include one hour instruction on the catechism so that the people hearing God's word addressed to the children may themselves come to know his will.\footnote{Porządek naprawienia 1553, rj.} A special service of preparation should be held on the evening before Communion to which the people should come to confess their sins as they have been taught by the minister and receive forgiveness. Ministers exercise the Office of the Keys by deciding who may be allowed to receive Communion and who needs to be placed under church discipline, as Stancaro has already noted in his books on Communion.\footnote{Among his other writings on Holy Communion is: Opera nuova di F. S. Mantovano della Reformatione, si della doctrina Christiana, come della vera intelligentia dei sacramenti, con maturi consideratione et fondamento della scrittura santa, et consoglio de Santi Padri. non solamente utile, ma necessaria a ogni stato et condizione di Persone, Basel 1547.}

Provision is also made for the Communion of the Sick.

The general impression of Stancaro's work is that it is the production of a former monk who still carries with him many traces of monastic discipline. Provisions for the Sunday services and Matins and Vespers on the week days, Holy
Communion for the Sick, the use of the Litany and its collects, and other liturgical inclusions go far beyond the norm of Reformed worship.

Stancaro does not provide us with more than an outline, so we cannot be certain about the exact form his Holy Communion service was meant to take. On the basis on his recommendation concerning Von Wied’s Consultation, and references to existing liturgical books we surmise that Consultation of Cologne provides us with a picture of his service. The Cologne service begins with an Admonition to the communicants followed by a sermon of the subject of the Holy Sacrament, followed by another Admonition and Confession of Sins. The form of Absolution include short texts from John 16, 1 Timothy 1, 1 John 2, and other passages. The Absolution itself takes a from of a Declaration of Grace and Forgiveness, but without the words: “I forgive you all your sins..., etc.” This is followed by the Introit, where there are clerks and school children to sing in Latin, followed by the Kyrie Eleison and Gloria in Excelsis. The Collect of the Day follows, and after it the Epistle is sung and again, when possible, the Alleluia, Gradual, or Sequence in Latin and German. The Gospel is read to the people in German. After the sermon is the Prayer of the Church, followed by the Preface and the Sanctus together with the Benedictus qui venit. These too are to be sung in Latin, if possible. The priest then sings the Words of Christ over the bread and wine “carefully and slowly” so that the people “…will give careful attention to the Words of the Lord” and the people then answer with “Amen.” Then is said the “Our Father” and the Pax Domini. The pastor says: “The Lord be with you always” and people respond: “And with thy spirit.” Then all who are going to communion come forward devoutly and in orderly fashion, first the men and then the women, to receive the body and the blood of the Lord under both kinds with the following formula: “Take and eat to your salvation the body of Christ which was given for you”, “Take and drink for your salvation this is the blood of the New Testament shed for your sins.” During communion the Agnus Dei is sung in Latin and in German, first one and then the other, then the German Hymn Gott sei gelobet and Jesus Christus unsern Heiland until all have been communed. After communion the priest sings: “The Lord be with you”, people respond: “And with thy spirit.” Then follows Post-Communion Prayer from the Nürnberg Church Order or the prayer from
Luther’s German Mass. Then the Benediction, “The Lord bless you and keep you…, etc.” from the Nürnberg Church Order.\textsuperscript{170}

If Stancaro’s recommendations to follow “other liturgical books” includes the Consultation, the result would be a service which appears strongly Lutheran. It may seem extraordinary that it should be approved for use in Pińczów area of this period. If it is a fair indication of the confessional attitudes of that time, it must be said that the prevailing confession had a Lutheran flavor. There seems little evidence here of Reformed understanding of the Supper.

This order provoked a reaction from the Roman bishop. Stanisław Orzechowski describes Stancaro as having introduced the errors of Zwingli.

“When Stancaro had betaken himself to Pinczow, he began to establish the error of Zwingli, and to take pains to lead Olesnicki away from the religion of his fathers and to persuade him to a foreign religion. According to these precepts he ordered that images be removed from the church, an outlandish (peregrinam) Lord's Supper be instituted in place of the usual one 'and the rites be abolished that the monks used to perform under the old religion in the church of his town. This church together with the adjoining monks’ house, had been erected with great pains and richly endowed by the generosity of [Bishop] Zbigniew Olesnicki and Stancaro was making haste to profane it. But since his plan seemed dangerous to [Lord] Olesnicki, in order that nothing be done unadvisedly, he called his friends and took them into counsel, in which after various judgments had been debated, the following judgment prevailed: the images, together with the rest of the utensils, should remain undisturbed in the church. The monks also should perform their rites according to the old rule, since none of these things could safely be changed. As the King was near at hand, the bishop also had not yet left Cracow. And another time would be more fit for making these changes. For the present it was thought best to institute the Lord's Supper, but this should be done in private in the castle, not publicly in the church, which being in the town is adjacent to the castle. In accordance with this view they permitted Stancaro to appoint the manner of the new Supper and to teach the use of it.”\textsuperscript{171}

\textsuperscript{170} Richter II 1871, 30.
\textsuperscript{171} Orichovit 1854, 58-60; English translation quoted from: Lubieniecki 1995, 105.
The reaction was indeed strong. Oleśnicki was taken into the bishop's court to face the charge of profaning the church. Since Oleśnicki came to court with the strong support of many Polish nobles and even members of the King’s household, the bishop was unable to prosecute him successfully. The bishop’s court declared that they wanted this matter to be taken up by the King’s Court, but upon the promise of Oleśnicki that he would allow the monks to return and do their work in peace, the matter was taken no further. The monks returned and this signaled the departure of Protestant clergy, some to other areas of Minor Poland, some to Major Poland. Stancaro himself went to Prussia.\footnote{Orichovii 1854, 64; Lubieniecki 1995, 107.}

Within a few years the monks again left the area, and Protestant clergy begun to return. Among those who returned was Marcin Krowicki (†1573), who begun to celebrate the Holy Communion first in the household of Oleśnicki and then in the monastery.\footnote{Lubieniecki 1995, 103-104.} Krowicki was a man in transition. First a Roman priest, he had come under the influence of the teaching of Luther, confessed the real bodily presence of Christ in the Eucharist, and called for the distribution of the Holy Communion in both kinds. After his refugee sojourn he returned, bringing with him Reformed influences,\footnote{Lubieniecki 1995, 451 fn. 253.} and it was to the Reformed faith that he soon announced his adherence. We see the same course of development in the case of Jakub Sylwiusz.\footnote{Evidence of Jakub Sylwiusz’ movement toward to Reformed teaching and practice is found in the letters of Orzechowski, published in 1561 by Jakub Górski. Любовичь 1883, 116.} In the area of Niedźwiedź, where at an earlier time Cruciger had preached, we see the similar movement from Lutheranism to the Reformed faith taking place. Here Holy Communion was celebrated according to the Swiss rites, as can be seen in Niedźwiedź, where a certain Alberti Magistri had begun to celebrate Communion according to the rites of the Swiss Reformed.\footnote{Orichovii 1854, 79.} Soon more then a dozen such churches had adopted this practice.

Again there is no unity in faith’s confession and liturgy. Some of the Protestants came forward with a proposal for the Reformation of Minor Poland based on the models of the Cologne Reformation and the Reformation of the Church of England.\footnote{“A zgromadzeni będąc tamedzimy tę Reformacyją Stankarowę od początku aż do końca czytali, wziąwszy też przed się i inne dwie: englicką a kolińską, z nichemny, co się nam najlepszego, z Pismy św. się zgadzającego zdalo, wybrali a wzięli.” Akta synodów I 1966, 35.} In addition, Stancaro suggested the adoption of the \textit{Augsburg Confession}
(most likely based upon Melanchthon’s *Confessio Augustana variata* of 1540) as the church’s confession of faith.\(^\text{178}\) This was not an extraordinary suggestion. The *Augsburg Confession* was indeed to serve as a model for the declarations of faith of other churches as well, as we say in the case of the 39 Articles of the Church of England.

The Reformed in Minor Poland looked upon Francesco Stancaro’s proposal only hesitantly and lukewarmly. The proposal itself seemed reasonable, but Stancaro was suspect because of his disruptive influence at the University of Königsberg and his famous open quarrel with Andreas Osiander (1498-1552) over Christology.\(^\text{179}\) His insistence on such a strict division between the divine and human natures that he insisted that Christ is man’s mediator with God only according to his human nature, led to charges by both Lutherans and Calvinists that he was Nestorian. His boastful publication *De Trinitate* ...\(^\text{1562}\), giving the record of his controversy with Osiander, only added to the suspicions of Protestants, who were themselves labeled sectarians by the Roman Catholics. An additional reason for the reservations of the Protestants in Minor Poland was the fact that he was not a priest, but only an academic without practical experience.\(^\text{181}\)

The Synod at Słomniki on November 25, 1554, not only gave consent to Stancaro's proposals,\(^\text{182}\) but in addition it officially commended the Church of the Bohemian Brethren as a church truly Reformed in all matters, namely in doctrine,
liturgy and church discipline according to the Word of God. The Minor Poles resolved to visit them and become familiar with all aspects of their faith and practice. Hieronim Filipowski and Felix Cruciger, who had already been selected to be the first superintendent of the church, were delegated to visit the Unitas Fratrum in Major Poland on behalf of the church and to report their findings. The influence of Bohemians was to be of great importance to the Minor Poles.

This initiated a series of meetings between the Minor Poles and the Bohemians, which begun with a meeting between Jakub Ostroróg and Hieronim Filipowski in the area of Kraków. Filipowski became acquainted with the doctrine and practice of the Unitas Fratrum, and upon close examination he determined that the Poles and Bohemian had much in common. He was especially impressed by the high level of organization and order in the Bohemian Church, something lacking among the Minor Poles. Subsequent meetings were held first in Krzęcice on March 18, 1555 in Minor Poland, and then in Gołuchów on March 24 in Major Poland. There the Poles asked for further information about Christian teachings among the Bohemians and details concerning their worship and church order. Questions were raised concerning the relationship of Brethren doctrines to Calvin’s Institutes and the theological position of the Wittenberg theologians. This revealed clear theological divisions among the Poles - some leaning toward Melanchthon and Wittenberg theologians, other towards Calvin, and some toward the Bohemians. In particular, differences between Luther’ and Calvin’s doctrines and practices concerning the observance of the Lord's Supper were issues. These questions sprung from the Calvinist concerns regarding church discipline and the testing of those who wished to commune. Although the discussions did not lead to any satisfactory
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188 “A tu potom kde co který jináčce smyslí, ukazovali ne z naší Confessí, ale z hlav těch, kteří še moudřejší zdáli nad jiné být. A některé artikule naše zcela přečitáli, a místo tomu dávali, že tak bezodměně aneb bez odporu smýšlí a drží. Veliká by pašije byla, kdy by še mélo vše vypsatí, j ak tu bylo mezi nmi nemálo rozdílů podle rozdílného učení mezí doktory těmi novými německými. Jeden jednoho, jiný jiného více zachytil, však což celnějších, vše v Calvinovi vězejí a k jeho Institutiím jako kteří smeřují. Někteří, a zvláště kteří studovali v Vitemberku, ti početnosti Filipova rozumu přidrobovali. A při něčem se časem pohádali, ale vše, krotce, dali se jedním druhým napraviti. A když
conclusion, after the meeting Felix Cruciger wrote to the Bohemians expressing the wish that fellowship be declared between them.\textsuperscript{189}

The Minor Poles and Bohemian Brethren met together in Convocation on August 24 - September 2, 1555 at Kožminek in Major Poland. In this meeting the Minor Polish Protestants stated that they had reached unity of confession. “Your teaching is our teaching.”\textsuperscript{190} The present need was that unity be sought in church order and outward ceremonies. The Bohemians responded that there was no real unity for three reasons. First of all unity has not yet been achieved in teaching and worship; secondly, the Minor Polish people were not yet prepared to accept major changes; third, the Bohemian Brethren desired themselves to first consider what is essential to unity and its ramifications.\textsuperscript{191} They further stated that they had some questions concerning whether the Minor Polish delegates present really represented the unanimous opinion of Minor Polish Protestants, and whether they accepted everything contained in the \textit{Confession} and \textit{Apology}.\textsuperscript{192} In response, the Minor Poles asked for copies of these documents along with the forms of worship and agendas for their examination. Upon examining these documents they confirmed their agreement with their contents and stated that in only ceremonial details did they differ.\textsuperscript{193} On this basis the agreement for church union was subscribed by both parties. The union agreement contained five points. (1) The Protestants in Minor Poland stated that the \textit{Bohemian Confession} and \textit{Apology} were as good and true and accepted as their own; (2) They promised to learn the Confession and implement its provisions and teach it to their own people; (3) They stated that when new members were accepted into their fellowship they will keep the same order as was practiced among the Bohemian Brethren. (4) They would gradually introduce the same forms of worship and church order as were practiced by the Bohemian Brethren. Some significant differences
however still remained, particularly with reference to ecclesiology. (1) Certain higher offices in the Polish Church had no counterpart in the Bohemian Church. The Reformed had the office of superintendent, and the Bohemians were not willing to recognize such an office as higher in their ecclesiastical order. (2) The Poles admitted that they could not speak for all Minor Polish Protestants, and that there might be some who did not favor unity with Bohemian Brethren. (3) They stated their intention to continue to practice their own ceremonies until such time as they were more thoroughly acquainted with the practices of the Bohemians and the people had been adequately instructed concerning them. (4) It was agreed that the practices of the Bohemian Brethren would be regarded as the standard for both churches, and Polish practices would not be introduced among the Bohemians. (5) It was stated that the Minor Polish Church would continue to collect the tithe. In these negotiations we note the reticent of the Bohemians to move forward because of their many questions and concerns about the state of Protestantism in Minor Poland. The driving force throughout was the determination of the Poles to effect this union. Though the union was signed, Minor Polish determination would prove to be an inadequate basis for a lasting union.

The Koźminek Union brought with it the use of the Agenda of Lukas of Prague Zprawy tyto wsseho vřadu kněžského... 1527. This agenda had been adopted as an effort to unite the Bohemian people behind one Eucharistic doctrine and practice. Now it was hoped that its use in Poland would accomplish the same result.

This somewhat elaborate order of the Lord’s Supper begins with an admonition to the communicants to examine themselves for worthiness, confess their sins humbly and to ask for God’s grace. This is followed by five prayers, first, for the spiritual presence of Christ, second, concerning participation in the body and blood of the Lord, third, concerning the benefits of participation, fourth, concerning power to receive the benefit, and fifth, concerning the consecration of the bread and wine. This is followed by the Lord’s Prayer and admonition of the faithful and the preparation for the consecration. The consecration includes a canon in remembrance
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of the Lord, the center of which are the Words of Christ spoken over the bread and wine, accompanied by the manual acts. Following this there is an encouragement to fulfill the mandate of the Lord and a prayer of Anamnesis. Then follows an admonition before the reception, and a prayer for worthy reception, instructions concerning the reception, but no distribution formula. A word addressed to the people after reception is followed by the reception prayer, general prayer, final admonition and blessing.\textsuperscript{197}

This agenda pays careful attention to liturgical details and includes a number of admonitions, blessings, and thanksgivings. Several times the worshipers are exhorted to see to it that they receive with pious and thankful hearts, and to confidently believe that they are receiving the body and blood of Christ in a real, but spiritual manner. The nature of this reception is not further explained, so it cannot be asserted that it is built upon a doctrine of bodily presence of Christ in the sacrament. After communion those who have received are assured that in this food and drink they have been guaranteed their participation in the body and blood of Christ, and that even as they had all eaten of the one bread and shared of the one cup so they are one bread and one body.\textsuperscript{198} The liturgy is at once very wordy and yet vague. It does not clearly and boldly articulate either the Reformed or the Lutheran doctrines. It is a uniquely Bohemian statement.

The acceptance of this agenda indicates that the Minor Polish Reformed Church has not yet arrived at a fully Reformed view concerning the Supper of the Lord. It is a movement away of Lutheran specificity, - such as was found in Hermann von Wied's Agenda, toward a more Bohemian nonspecific view which speaks of spiritual participation without clearly linking it to the bread and the wine. The Minor Polish Protestants were still in the process of coming to a clearer articulation of Reformed theology.

An important aim of the Koźminek Union was the establishment and spread of the liturgy and Confession of the Bohemian Brethren among the Minor Polish Reformed. The Synod of Secemin was convened on January 21-29, 1555, for the purpose of implementing these objectives. The union was accepted with great joy, but this joy to be short lived. The steadily growing influence of the theologies of

\textsuperscript{197} Zprawy 1527, cxxxiij-cxxxvij; The agenda of Lukas of Prague (Lukáš Pražsky) is held by Moravský zemský archiv in Brně, acquisition number: G21, III / 582; Coena Domini I 1983, 545-561.

\textsuperscript{198} Zprawy 1527, cxxiij-cxxxvij; Coena Domini I 1983, 550-558.
Zwingli and Calvin were beginning to predominate among the Minor Poles. The Calvinist influence was at least some measure brought about through the influence of Francesco Lismanini.  

Francesco Lismanini was a close confident of the Zygmunt II August the King Poland. Outwardly a Roman Catholic priest, he had strong sympathies for the Reformation, and while on assignment from the King to travel to Western Europe for the purpose for augmenting his library holdings, Lismanini became personally acquainted with John Calvin and the Reformers of Zurich. He was persuaded to forswear any further association with the Roman Church and declared himself Protestant. In 1555 the Minor Polish Protestants invited him to return for the benefit of the church and to provide a positive influence on the King. Calvin was in agreement and wrote a letter of recommendation to the Poles stating that his return would be of great benefit to Reformation in Poland.

Lismanini came from the West with a ‘truer’ view of the Lord’s Supper which he had arrived at on the basis of his own personal study and his acquaintance with Calvin and the other Swiss Reformers. He defended the view that the bread and wine are nothing but ‘sacrament’ by which he means ‘sacred signs or symbols’. Thus he retained the term ‘sacrament’ but gave it a meaning altogether different from the meaning commonly assigned to it. The sacrament of the broken bread is said to recall the broken body of Christ and pouring of the wine is said to recall the shedding of his blood. Christ’s sacrifice is remembered by the acts of breaking bread and pouring wine.

This new understanding would seem to distance his adherents from the position taken by the Bohemians. Francesco Lismanini came highly recommended, and many of the Minor Poles came quickly to agree with his understanding of the Supper. His influence was felt already in the Synod of Pińczów on April 23 – May 1, 1556. The first matter of business to come before the synod was the question of the translation of the Bohemian Confession into Polish. Initial discussion centered around the problem of making this a truly Polish document in language, tenor, and thought. Stanislaw Sarnicki expressed the thought that perhaps it would be better for the Poles to produce their own native confession of faith rather then to adopt a
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foreign document. Some proposed the adoption of the *Augsburg Confession*, but with the wording of the *Variata* edition. No final decision was made on this matter, but the synod expressed its desire that the union with the Bohemian Brethren be maintained.

Concerning the Lord’s Supper, the delegates questioned the representative of the Bohemians to determine whether the Bohemian view was congenial to the views of Calvin and the other Swiss Reformers. Many questions were raised concerning practical details related to discipline, but most important was the interrogation concerning the nature of Christ’s presence in the sacrament and the manner of its reception. According to the Latin protocols it was asked concerning the manner of reception whether it is spiritual and sacramental, and how that presence is understood and comprehended. The answer was given that “…the presence is spiritual and sacramental according to the Bohemian belief and it is known or grasped by faith but not ground by the teeth.” The Polish protocols are far more specific. Here it is stated that Bohemians understand that the consecrated bread and wine are Christ’s body and blood. Those who receive may receive to their benefit or condemnation according to their belief or unbelief. The example of Sodom and Gomorrah was given. The Word of God which was proclaimed in these cities was the true and saving Word of God and continued to be true despite their unbelief. Because they did not believe it, they received it to the condemnation. By analogy, the body and blood of Christ are present in the bread and wine regardless of the faith or unbelief of the communicant, but believers alone receive the benefit while unbelievers receive condemnation.

This articulates a confession similar to the Lutheran doctrine the *medication indigenous*. In the protocols the Reformed make it clear that these Bohemian statements are not compatible with Calvinist teaching.

Here the lines begin to be drawn between the Bohemians and the Reformed party which was increasingly unable to accept the Bohemian doctrine. It was on the question of sacramental teaching, confession, and practice that the Bohemians and
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the Poles began to diverge. Those influenced by Francesco Lismanini found the Bohemian position far too close to the Roman doctrine of transubstantiation and not specific enough in its repudiation of that position. The mutual fellowship of two churches could continue, but lines of division had become evident.

Perhaps the most significant resolution of the synod at Pińczów was to invite Johannes a Lasco (Jan Łaski) (1499-1560) to come to Poland to aid the Polish Reformed Church in its organization and extension. His coming would soon prove to be of decisive importance in the organization of the Polish Reformed, their theology, and their congregational worship. This influence would be felt also beyond the borders of Minor and Major Poland, in the Reformed congregations of Lithuania.

The family of Johannes a Lasco was well known for its distinguished service to the Polish state and Roman Church. His uncle, Johannes a Lasco (1456-1531), was Archbishop of Gniezno and Primate of the Polish Church, a distinguished Jurist and Grand Chancellor of the realm. The younger Johannes seemed destined from boyhood to serve the church. He traveled to Switzerland to question Zwingli first hand concerning his Reformation faith. It was Zwingli who planted in Lasco his first doubts concerning the Roman Church. A devoted follower of Erasmus of Rotterdam, he purchased his library, while allowing Erasmus its continued use. Erasmus was to have a great deal of influence of Lasco’s temperamental and intellectual development. Although, like Erasmus, he remained for the present in the Roman Church, he was increasingly inclined toward the doctrines of the Swiss Reformation. When it became evident to him that the Roman Church was incapable of reforming herself, he left the church and went to Western Europe to further the course of the Reformation. When Ennui, the Count of East Friesland, determined to introduce the Reformation into his state, he proposed to Lasco that he should undertake it. He became the superintendent of all the churches of Friesland.

Here the Reformation was accomplished only with great difficulty, because of the indifference of the people and the moral decay of the clergy. It was here that Lasco established what he described as the pure scriptural manner in which Holy Communion should be received. Albrecht, the Duke of Prussia, wished him to assume ecclesiastical leadership in his domains, but Lasco refused to do so on the
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grounds that the church needed to be completely independent of the temporal power, and he objected strongly to the Lutheran retention of the Roman rites.\footnote{Bartel 1999, 163.} At this point, Lasco drew up a Confession of Faith for the churches of Friesland, articulating the doctrine of Communion held in common by the Swiss and the Anglicans. The Lutherans reacted very strongly to this. As a result the Lutherans made great gains, and Lasco determined to respond favorably to the invitation of Thomas Cranmer (1489-1556), Archbishop of Canterbury, to come to England to assist in the work of Reformation there. He took temporally leave of the congregation and traveled to England for what he described as a temporary visit.\footnote{Bartel 1999, 161.} After staying with Archbishop Cranmer for six months, during which time it became evident that he and the Archbishop held the same views of the Reformation of the church and Reformation doctrine, he returned to Friesland to address the problems which had risen since his departure. The \textit{Interim} of 1548 was a factor in his deciding to leave the country permanently. After some time in Bremen and Hamburg he returned in the spring of 1550 to become the minister of the congregation of foreign Protestants which had been organized there. It was in London that he produced his \textit{Forma ac Ratio} in 1550 as the directory for worship and discipline in refugee congregations.\footnote{Bartel 1999, 166-170.} He continued to serve in London until the accession of Queen Mary in 1553, when Protestantism came under severe persecutions. Lasco left for Denmark, where initially he enjoyed the hospitality of the King, but when it became evident to Joachim Westphalia (1510-1574) and Bugenhagen that his doctrinal position was inimical to the Lutheran faith, this hospitality was quickly withdrawn. Subsequently he found the same situation in Hamburg, Lübeck, and Rostock. He settled in Frankfurt/Main, where he established a congregation for Belgium refugees, the worship and confession of which received the authorization of the city council. In 1555 in Frankfurt/Main he published his \textit{Forma ac Ratio}, which he had written in 1550. A Dutch language version prepared by Martin Micron dates from 1554. It was printed in Emden. Lasco dedicated his \textit{Forma ac Ratio} to Zygmunt II August, the King of Poland, with a letter of recommendation from Melanchthon. In the dedicatory letter which accompanied this book he expresses the wish that he might be of service to his King and Country. Knowing the
favorable attitude of the King, he expressed the hope that in Poland a true Christian Church might be formed.

The travels of Johannes a Lasco brought him into Lutheran territories. There he wished to be accepted as one confessing with the Lutherans the same faith while not in fact formally adhering to the symbol of that faith – the Augsburg Confession. In every instance this brought him into conflict with Lutheran pastors and theologians, particularly concerning to the Sacrament of the Altar. At this point Johannes a Lasco always adhered to the doctrinal position of the Swiss Reformers against the Lutheran doctrine of the bodily presence of Christ in the consecrated bread and wine. The King of Poland was in some measure aware of this situation, and in response to Lasco’s letters, he stated his concerns and asked him to clarify the matter.213 This moved Lasco to attempt a public reconciliation with the Lutherans as a demonstration of his irenic nature and his passion for unity. In a meeting on May 22, 1556 in Stuttgart it was the doctrine of the Sacrament of the Altar that again showed itself to be the main source of contention. It was made clear by Johannes Brenz (1499-1570) that the position maintained by Lasco was in clear conflict with the Confession of the Lutheran Church as it is found in the Augsburg Confession. Even the great friendship which he enjoyed with Melanchthon was not sufficient to overcome the obvious tension between his position and that of the Lutherans. His efforts frustrated, Lasco now turned his eyes to Poland and possibilities of effecting union there.214 In April 1556 he was invited to return to his homeland and work toward the establishment of one Minor Polish Church.215 In December of that year he arrived, and, despite the strong opposition of the papal legate Lippomanus and the Roman bishops, he begun his work.

His teaching concerning the sacrament falls within the Reformed pattern. No saving benefit can be obtained either from the bread or from the earthly body of Christ. This refers to the action of the Supper by which fellowship with Christ and his body and blood is established and sealed. The Words of Christ must be interpreted in a manner which does not conflict with human reason. The word hoc refers to the sign of the action what is being done and est refers to the sealing with the fellowship of Christ in his body and his blood. When Christ says: “This is my
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body” he means that the celebration of this Supper is a visible sign of fellowship in Christ's body. This set Lasco at odds not only with the Roman Catholic doctrine of the transubstantiation but also with the Lutheran doctrine, according to which the substance of the bread and the substance of the body are united and bound together in sacramental union. Christ did not say: “This is simultaneously bread and my body.” To Lasco to make the natural body of Christ and the bread one is impossible, because it posits the identity of the hypostasis of the bread and the body of Christ. Clearly the presence of Christ is not local and corporal, it is rather to be understood on the basis of Christ’s Words: “I am with you always to the end of the world” (Matthew 28:20). This Lasco calls the Unio pacti. Other positions make the Scriptures obscure and contradictory and contain many absurdities, he contended. The acceptance of the notion of the real presence of the substantial body and blood of Christ is not necessary to salvation, it is not helpful, and it stands against the Words of Christ in John 6 and the scriptural report of the Ascension. It denies the comfort which is centered in our fellowship with church, of which the elements are meant to be signs. It obscures the essence of the faith, and it is not far from the papal doctrine of Transubstantiation and idolatry. The ubiquity of the substance of the natural body and blood of Christ is contrary to nature because all natural bodies are locally confined. Thus, if Christ is in heaven he cannot be on the earth. He noted that according to the Lutheran doctrine of ubiquity even the godless receive the substance of the natural body and blood of Christ in the Lord’s Supper and thus they must be said to receive the glory of Christ. This dishonors the body of Christ. It also contradicts the passages which speak of the incarnation of Christ and his Ascension. If Christ is locally and naturally present in the bread, then it cannot be said that he has ascended on high.

We may conclude that Lasco’s sacramental teaching clearly stands in a tradition which is built upon strong philosophical considerations. According to his own statement, the scriptural witness to the incarnation does not allow an understanding of ubiquity and the human nature of Christ must be understood as
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standing in the limitations in human flash also with reference to its mutual relation with the divine nature of the Son of God. His Christology does not permit the bodily presence of Christ in the sacrament. The human nature and the divine nature are not to be understood as coming into direct mutual relationship. The Lord’s Supper therefore brings us into communion with the divine nature, but not the human nature, for only the divine nature can be of saving value. It has nothing to do with the elements as such. The value of the elements is that the Lord makes use of them as the outward signs of fellowship in his body and blood. Thus the Lord's Supper is a social phenomenon which the Lord has instituted to implement fellowship between Christians, and strengthen their hope, and their remembrance of his sacrifice and the forgiveness of sins which he achieved on the cross and gives directly from the Cross.

It is not difficult to see why the proclamation of such a doctrine would meet with strong resistance and even hostility among Lutherans, especially if the person who is proclaiming it claims that he wishes to unite Lutherans and Reformed in one church. From the standpoint of the Lutherans, Lasco's Christology is the stumbling block because it does not allow Christ to be bodily present in the elements. No church union could be possible without the resolution of these problems. One doctrinal position will have to give way to the other; they cannot coexist.

Lasco fundamentally changed the direction of the Protestant Church in Poland. It was through his efforts that the influence of the Swiss Reformation quickly came to predominate. Now the Protestant Church in Minor Poland became the Reformed Church.

Lasco’s earliest appearance was at the Convocation at Iwanowice on January 1, 1557. This synod was concerned with the implementation of the terms of the union negotiated with the Bohemian Brethren, about which some concern had been expressed by the Protestants of Minor Poland. The ministers immediately turned to Lasco for his evaluation. No evaluation was immediately forthcoming, and the delegates resolved to approach the Bohemian Brethren concerning the possibility that some of the language of the union may be further refined. Lasco indicated that they should make revisions with the regard to ceremonies, rites, and observances of Bohemian Brethren, but that the sphere of the office of presbyter were not subject to change since presbyters are ministers and pastors of Jesus Christ, and therefore their offices must remain. No overt criticism of the Bohemian Brethren as such was
offered. Lasco preferred to recommend a contrary position in a more settled manner. 218

Again on June 15-18, 1557, in the Synod at Włodzislaw Lasco indicated a continued favorable attitude toward union with Bohemians. Visitors to the synod from Bohemian Brethren asked whether the terms of the Union were being implemented, especially with regard to matters of ceremony and church order. Concerns were raised by the Reformed concerning the doctrine of the Lord’s Supper of the Bohemian Brethren. Representatives of the Bohemians thought that the Union introduced their teachings concerning the real presence of Christ which Minor Poles had never accepted. 219 These questions were not directly addressed. Instead, on behalf of the synod Lasco asked that the Reformed be given again a copy of Koźminek Union document, since many present in the synod had not participated in the original negotiations. We see evidence of the influence of Lasco in the statement made in this synod by members of the church in Minor Poland that they were concerned that the Union document should neither impede upon their Christian freedom with regard to ceremonies and order, nor impede the possibility of entering into relationships with other Christian Churches not included in the union. Lasco personally raised the question whether for the sake of Polish Protestantism it might not be advisable that the groups represented in this synod enter into a theological discussions with the Lutherans. 220 For this purpose he proposed that a Colloquium with the Lutherans be organized. 221

The results of Lasco’s influence can also be seen in the description of the proceedings of the Colloquium held at Lipnik in Moravia, on October 25, 1558. Here again the doctrine of the Lord’s Supper was a point of contention between the Poles and the Bohemian Brethren. To answer Polish concerns, the Brethren presented the synod with a detailed description of their doctrinal position concerning the Supper and the nature of Christ’s presence in relation to the bread and wine and other
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issues. The Poles did not find this definition acceptable. Although Lasco was not present, his Calvinistic teachings had taken root, and agreement between the Bohemians and the Poles had become more and more difficult. Now differences were evident not only in minor outward ceremonies, but in basic theological approaches.

On this basis the Minor Poles asked that they be permitted to alter the Polish edition of the *Bohemian Confession* to correspond to their theological position. The Bohemians, of course, refused this request, suggesting that it would be more appropriate for the Poles to frame their own doctrinal article and confession.

222 “Christi verbis: Hoc est Corpus meum, hic est Sanguis meus, simplicissime credendum esse docemus. Quia nolimus, ut relationes Hoc et Hic alio quam ad panem et vinum referantur, ut Habrovanitae faciunt, nec admittimus phrases: in hoc, sub hoc, cum hoc, quae ab annis plus minus 50 exclusae sunt. Item, Hoc sum ego. Nec de solis nudis prorsus et vacuis symbolis intelligi ea volumus, sed re vera, quod dicitur, ita esse, panem Corpus, vinum Sanguinem.


His exclusis ea formula loquendi sacramentaliter docemus, secundo, quo scilicet modo essendi panis Corpus Christi sit et vinum Sanguis. Nimirum sacramentali, id est, qui non mutatis rerum symbols facit, ut quoque sint, quod dicitur, non naturaliter, cum hoc a sua natura non habeant, sed per attributionem Domini et institutionem auctoritativam, ut possint efficaciter et significare ac repraesentare et exhibere id, quod dicitur, eaque ratione esse et non putari sola nuda symbo

223 Akta synodów I 1966, 292-293.
Having succeeded in turning the congregations in Minor Poland to his Calvinist theology, Lasco now turned his attention toward Major Poland where Lutherans and Bohemian Brethren predominated. The evaluation of historians such as Elert and Любовичь is that Lasco's purpose was to ‘evangelize’ the Lutherans and ‘complete’ the Reformation by spreading Calvinism. Lasco himself indicated that his only purpose was to achieve friendly union between the non-Roman Churches. Through his influence, the synods of the Minor Polish Reformed Church stated this to be their goal. Lasco’s aim appeared to go beyond the establishment of friendly relations. While traveling to Königsberg in February 1558 he arranged to meet with Lutheran nobles of Major Poland and proceeded to attempt to convert them to Calvinism. The most influential Lutheran was Stanisław Ostroróg who was married to Lasco’s sister. He carefully listened to his arguments but according to his later correspondence he indicates that Lasco failed in his objective. “He accomplished nothing, he only created dissention.”

Upon his arrival in Königsberg on April 14, 1558 he entered into a public disputation concerning the doctrine of the Sacrament of the Altar and the two natures of Christ. Here again he was unsuccessful in moving the Lutherans from their doctrinal position. After the disputation he sought to regain the favor of the Lutherans by presenting a summary of his doctrinal position and calling upon them to enter into fraternal association lovingly in order that they might do battle together against the Papist Church and the power of the Antichrist. Again he was not successful in achieving his goal.

Lasco saw the importance of consolidating the church’s confession in a singular liturgical expression. When he arrived in Poland he found the Protestant congregations to be in a state of disarray. Attempts to implement the order of worship of Hermann von Wied, and, later, the Bohemian Brethren, had not met with general success. The influence of the nobility was very strong and often led the congregations in directions which they did really desire to follow. However, their authority were insufficient to overcome the direction set by the nobles. We must also note however that within the Polish Protestants there was still no common mind in matter theological and liturgical. Theological discussions in the synods had revealed

---

226 Kowalska 1999, 70.
wide ranging differences but had been unsuccessful in their attempts to overcome them. Lasco was aware of the nature and scope of the situation. He was not personally inclined to seek closer alliance with the Bohemian Brethren, because their theological and liturgical views were quite different from his own. His interest was to reshape the Polish Protestants into an image which would give precedence to the standards for which John Calvin and he stood. He wanted a Calvinist Church and sought to implement his vision without creating any strong antipathy to Bohemian theology and worship.

His proposals concerning church order were modeled after the provisions of his *Forma ac Ratio*, and these provisions became the standard for the examination of those seeking the pastoral office. These provisions covered doctrinal matters concerning God and the church but included also statements concerning the place of the minister in the pastoral duties and church discipline within the congregation. His suggestions concerning a catechism for the instruction of the people again was built upon the work which he had done in Western Europe and England. Provision was made for the organization of the congregation. In its leadership structure were the superintendent, minister and the presbyters, or *gubernatores ecclesiae*, to whom the ministers would have to give account of the conduct of their own lives, and deacons who were to assist the minister in administering the material and other means of the parish.\(^{227}\) The superintendent was a minister on the same level as other ministers, as was also the case with the apostle Peter, and like the other ministers, the superintendent was answerable to the church. It was the special responsibility of the superintendent to work for the well-being of the church by supervising the ministers, by protecting the church against false and misleading doctrine, and by mediating disputes between the ministers.\(^{228}\) Ministers were to be ordained in the congregations where they served, and if a minister should move to another parish his term of service there was to again begin with another service of ordination in the presence of the congregation. Monthly pastoral conferences were proposed at which ministers, presbyters anddeacons were to receive instruction in doctrine and in the proper administration of the church discipline.\(^{229}\) Over all, Lasco's proposals show a strong

\(^{227}\) Kuypers II 1866, 53-55; Naunin 1910, 197.  
\(^{228}\) Kuypers II 1866, 57-59.  
\(^{229}\) Kuypers II 1866, 52-55; Naunin 1910, 209.
Calvinist influence and are reminiscent of the reforms which he had previously introduced in East Friesland and the refugees congregation in London.

Lasco’s *Forma ac Ratio* of 1550 includes provision for the celebration of the Lord’s Supper on the first Sunday of the month. A period of fourteen days before Communion Sunday are designated as a period of preparation. Everyone in the congregation is urged to register their intention to commune with the elders, and all are expected to come unless prevented by serious illness or other pressing necessity. The celebration of Holy Communion is seen to be the highest congregational act, because in it the congregation realizes its true form as *Corpus Christi mysticum*. A final preparation is designated to be held on the last day before the celebration at 4 o'clock in the afternoon and all who intend to participate are expected to be present. For the celebration itself a table is covered with a white linen cloth and the participants gather around the Lord’s Table. In the midst of the table was the minister, and when the celebration had been completed what remained of the bread and wine was to be taken to the poor, the sick and the elderly, thus enforcing the close connection between the Lord's Supper and diaconal work.230

The celebration of the Holy Communion is to be celebrated on Sunday morning, and the sermon is to consider the Holy Supper, its signs, its mysterious significance and its aim. After the prayers, which conclude with the Our Father, the preacher admonishes the congregation to be worthy to come to the Supper. Then follows the Lord's Supper prayer, for which the congregation kneels. The recitation of the narrative of the Lord's Supper follows the text of 1 Corinthians 11:23-29. At the close of the exhortation the minister breaks bread for himself and seniors, and deacons and all others who are around the table, saying the words of Paul from 1 Corinthians 10: “The bread which we brake is the communion of the body of Christ.” The bread is then distributed with these words: “Take, eat, and remember the body of our Lord Jesus Christ was given for us into death on the tree of the cross for the forgiveness of all our sins.”231 Then over the cup: “The cup which we bless is the communion of the blood of Christ” and then it is given with these words: “Take, drink, and remember the blood of our Lord Jesus Christ was shed for us on the tree of

230 Kuyper II 1866, pp. 114 ff.
231 “Accipite, edite et memineritis, corpus Domini nostri Jesu Christi pro nobis in mortem traditum esse in crucis patibulo ad remissionem omnium peccatorum nostrorum.” Kuyper II 1866, 163.
the cross for the forgiveness of all our sins.”

232 Men commune first, women second, while one of the ministers reads from John 6, John 14, and John 15. When all have partaken the minister says this to the entire congregation: “Believe and do not doubt, all who are participating in the remembrance of the death of Christ while reflecting upon its mystery, that you have a sure and salutary Communion with Him in His body and blood, unto life everlasting. Amen.”

233 Then comes the Prayer of Thanksgiving, hymns based on the Psalm, Blessing and then as the people dismissed a collection is taken for the poor.

234 This service Lasco also desired to introduce into the Church in Minor Poland. His authority was great and many of his proposals related to church order, ordination of the ministry, congregational organization and presbyterial offices and church discipline met with widespread acceptance, and thus some level of uniformity was achieved. Many of his liturgical proposals, however, were thought to be too innovative. On September 4-15, 1558 the Synod of Włodzislaw again sought to promote unity in ceremonies and worship, indicating that many groups were not favorably inclined to accept the directives set down in Forma ac Ratio.

235 Those not fully inclined to Calvinist doctrine would find his order for Holy Communion too radical. His principle goal to unite the congregations around the principles and forms which he had put forward for the celebration of Holy Communion was not achieved. A synod convened on January 13, 1560 at Pińczów within a few days of his death again faced the issue, and concluded that the congregations should be advised to implement Lasco’s proposals until such time as by the mercy of God the Church in Poland should be properly and completely Reformed and unity achieved.

236 The period between 1560 and 1570 was important as a time for the working out of theological and liturgical relationships between the Reformed, the Bohemian

---

232 “Accipite, bibite et memineritis sanguinem Domini nostri Iesu Christi pro nobis fusum esse in crucis patibulo ad remissionem omnium peccatorum nostrorum.” Kuyper II 1866, 164.

233 “Credite et ne dubitate omnes, qui Coenae huic Dominicae in memoriam mortis Christi participastis cum mysterii sui reputatione, habere vos certam et salutarem cum ipso Communionem in corpore et sanguine suo ad vitam aeternam. Amen.” Kuyper II 1866, 165.

234 Kuyper II 1866, 165-169.


Brethren and the Lutherans. Johannes a Lasco had seen the need for the development of a positive relationship between the Reformed and the Lutherans, not least because he understood that both popular sentiment and royal regulation would insist upon a united Protestantism. There could be no multiplicity of Protestant Churches, each claiming its particular jurisdiction. Recognition and acceptance would require that all classical Protestant Churches be united within one national organization with a common Confession of Faith. However, Lasco's earlier attempt to establish union with the Lutherans had been a complete failure. He had not taken into account the significant differences between the Lutheran doctrine of the Sacrament of the Altar and the Reformed understanding of Holy Communion. He had not recognized the importance of the theological dimension of Lutheran sacramental theology and its intimate relationship with Lutheran Christology. The Reformed regarded these as dogmatic issues of only minor importance. For Lutherans however, they were regarded as essential components of the evangelical Confession of the doctrine of Christ.

The Bohemian Brethren had a deeper understanding of the mind of the Lutherans. There had already been a long history of polemical confrontations between the Bohemians and the Lutherans dating back to the time of Lukas of Prague and Dr. Martin Luther. After initial hesitation, Luther and other Wittenberg theologians in 1533 adjudged the Bohemian understanding of the sacrament to be, if not ‘Lutheran,’ at least unobjectionable. On the one hand Bohemian Brethren might possibly be able to mediate between the Lutherans and Calvinists in the efforts to achieve unity in doctrine. However, there were already clear evidences of strained relationships between the Lutherans and the Bohemians in Major Poland over doctrinal issues. These strained relationships led to disagreements between the two groups and often resulted in open disputes. Additionally, the Lutherans could not have failed to take offense at the successful efforts of the Bohemians to convert influential Lutheran Magnates to their fold.

Lasco's vision of a united Protestantism was in some measure achieved with the signing in 1570 of the Sandomierz Consensus. In it all three Protestant groups were mutually recognized as true Christian Churches whose goal was the strengthening of the bounds of union that they might be one Kingdom in Christ. Unfortunately, the Consensus does not bear witness to a common confession, worship, and theology of the sacraments. It is instead a pledge by the churches to
work together toward a common theology of the Eucharist not yet achieved. The problematic nature of this *Consensus* is revealed when we examine carefully the history of the intense sacramental discussions of the Bohemians and the Lutherans in the decade before the signing of this document.

On April 15-18, 1557, at the Synod of Włodzisław, the Reformed invited the Lutherans and the Bohemians to discuss with them the possibility of union.237 This invitation was rebuffed by Lutheran passivity. The Lutherans did not think that there was sufficient commonality in sacramental teaching to make the union possible. The Convocation in Goluchów, held on October 16, 1557, failed to produce any positive results, because the Lutherans were not present, and the Reformed used this fact as one of the reasons for their own refusal to participate. The Bohemians saw that the vision of the Reformed was unrealistic, because Polish Lutherans were now beginning to question Bohemian sacramental orthodoxy. They expressed the conviction that no further discussions with the Lutherans were necessary, since the agreement *Zmówienie wittemberskie* had been reached with Luther and Melanchthon in 1533.238 The Lutherans were invited to the Bohemian Synod in Poznań on November 1, 1560.239 The eighth canon of that synod recommended that universal agreement be sought concerning the nature of Christ’s presence in the sacrament.240

In 1563 the Lutherans and Bohemian Brethren conferred together to consider the charges which Benedykt Morgernstern (†1599) had raised to Bohemians.241 These included questions concerning repentance born of faith, the role of confirmation, and, most significantly, the presence of Christ under the figures of the bread and wine. On January 28, 1567, at the Synod in Poznań, Lutherans again leveled against the Bohemians the charges which had earlier been raised by Morgenstern. In response

---

237 “A wszakże przedtem jeszcze, mogło li by to być za radą braci, żeby chcieli z luteryjany tu w Wielkiej Polszcze mieć colloquium a one w taź uniją z sobą a z nami wprawić, a tak jednomyślnie się wszyscy przeciwko papieżykom zastawić, a Króla o wolność ewangeliji prosić.” *Akta synodów I* 1966, 201.

238 *Akta synodów I* 1966, 228-229.

239 Łukaszewicz 1835, 54; *Akta synodów II* 1972, 69 fn. 1.

240 “O zgodzie w porządku z inszymi kościoły miłować, chociażby takiego porządku nie mieli, jedno mieli słowo Boże, znać je za braty i gdyby się tafliło, chwalić Pana Boga z nimi i społecznością świętą, braterstwo <im> pokazować, chociażby też było nieco różnego, jedno w czym by się żbawienia nie obrażało a żeby nie było bałwochwałstwo. I chociażby też myślał doskonalego kto nie doszedł w tajemnicach Wieczerszy Pańskiej, jedno żeby znał społecznością Ciała i Krwi Pana naszego Jezusa Krystusa Wieczerzą, a nie gołym znakiem, taki ma być znoszon, jako rozkazuje Duch Boży, abyśmy trwali w tym, którym jeszcze nie objawiono jest, bo mocen Pan im też objawić.” *Akta synodów II* 1972, 71.

241 “Benedykt Morgenstern, De Valdensium schismate ex publico colloquio Thoroniae cum fratribus Bohemius habitò in præsentia duorum palatinorum et aliquid satraparum Polonicorum et fere ducentorum civium anno 1563 8 Septembris die.” *Akta synodów II* 1972, 169.
the Bohemians appealed to the Wittenberg Faculty, which disallowed the charges leveled against the Bohemians and declared the orthodoxy of the *Bohemian Confession*. 242 Crypto-Calvinists on the faculty of Wittenberg could be expected to issue an opinion which approved the position of the Bohemians. The favorable Wittenberg ‘*Gutachten*’ seems to have had the desired positive effect. The Lutherans met with the Bohemians in Colloquium on February 14, 1570 in Poznań. This colloquium came about at the same time that the King was expressing his desire that his Protestant subjects should be united under one confession of faith. 243

In this colloquium a key point in the discussion was concern with the doctrine of the Lord’s Supper, more particularly the nature of Christ’s presence in the bread and the wine and the adoration of the body of Christ in the Supper. The Lutherans insisted upon the use of the terminology of the *Augsburg Confession*, that Christ’s presence in the Supper is *substantialiter, realiter, essentialiter, corporaliter*. 244 The Bohemian Brethren, while insisting that the bread is the true body of Christ and the wine is his true blood, rejected the Lutheran terminology, preferring to define Christ's presence in the earthly elements as *sacramentaliter*, 245 according to which Christ's true body and true blood are present in a sacramental manner, that is in a manner which is unique to the Sacrament of the Altar. On the basis of their interpretation they refused to adopt the *Augsburg Confession*, protesting that their own confessional position was wholly correct and adequate. Concerning adoration, the Lutherans insisted that their position differed from that of the Papists in that they

---

242 *Akta synodów II* 1972, 210-212; *Wotschke* 1911a, 239-240; *Łukaszewicz* 1835, 69-70 fn.*.

243 *Akta synodów II* 1972, 227.

244 “Ut igitur ad articulum controversum accedamus de Cena Domini, notandum est, quod nos aliqibus terminis loquendi iuxta Confessionem Augustanam et doctores eiusdem Confessionis utimur, quibus praesentiam Christi et corporis eius in Cena explicamus esse (scilicet corpus Christi), substantialiter, realiter, essentialiter, corporaliter. A quibus terminis fratres declinant neque iis utuntur, immo in sua Responsione eos terminos loquendi crassa adverbia appellant et sibi ab ipsis cavere censent. Quare si solida inter nos fieri debet concordia et fides nostra de praesentia corporis Christi, ut sit vera, necesse est, ut etiam hos terminos loquendi iuxta Confessionem Augustanam et doctores admissantium fratres et illos suscipiant.” *Akta synodów II* 1972, 239.

did not address their adoration to the earthly elements but to Christ present in them. For their part, the Bohemians stated that they believed that Christ is to be worshiped in heaven and not in the sacrament.\textsuperscript{246} This indicated that the Bohemians did not agree to the Lutheran unitive understanding of the relationship between bread and body, wine and blood. On these points, which included also the nature of faith of children in Baptism, the Lutherans and the Bohemians were not able to agree. They determined to postpone further discussion these matters to the general synod to be held in Sandomierz.

On April 9-14, 1570 representatives of the Polish and Lithuanian Reformed, Lutherans and Bohemian Brethren met in the General Synod at Sandomierz to formulate a document mutually recognizing the basic orthodoxy of all three groups and concerning the future creation of a united Protestant Church with one confession and worship. In their attempts to maintain the particular theological and ecclesiastical stance of their own grounds, each of the three churches presented its own classical Confession as a working model from which its general agreement could be drawn. For the Bohemians this was the Confessio Bohemica 1535, which, as they pointed out, had already been accepted by Luther and the Lutheran Reformers as an acceptable confession of faith. The Lutherans who took the position that the Bohemian Confession was only one of several and these confessions did not represent a united position. Therefore, Lutherans suggested that the Confessio Augustana 1530 alone could serve as the model. The Reformed, who were clearly in the majority, looked to the Second Helvetic Confession 1566 as representing the true spirit of Protestantism. By force of numbers the Reformed prevailed.\textsuperscript{247} The Second Helvetic Confession was read aloud and publicly discussed on April 11-12. The Reformed moved the acceptance of their Confession. The Bohemians noted that such acceptance would be possible only if they would be allowed to retain their own Bohemian Confession and their distinct form of worship and ceremonies. Surprised by this sudden move, Superintendent Erazm Gliczner said on behalf of the Lutherans that it was impossible that they should give up the Augsburg Confession. He suggested that instead of accepting the Calvinist Confession, theologians of each group should meet together to formulate an acceptable common confession. A confession acceptable to all would have to be the fruit of their own labors, not the

\textsuperscript{246} Akta synodów II 1972, 240.
\textsuperscript{247} Akta synodów II 1972, 272-279.
result of the victory of one group over the other two. It was additionally agreed that a *Formula Recessus* be formulated stating the agreement which the three parties had achieved. The basis for this *Formula* was the agreement which had been formulated by the Reformed and the Lutherans in their meeting in Vilnius on March 2-3, 1570.\(^{248}\) The Lutherans considered the bare text of the *Consensus* to be inadequate. They therefore moved that the text of Melanchthon's *Confessio Saxonica* 1551 be included with it as an indication of the proper interpretation of the *Consensus*.\(^{249}\) The *Formula Recessus*, which begins with the words: *Consensus mutuus in religionis Christianae* ...is the primary source for the study of the common agreement.\(^{250}\)

According to the opening words of the *Consensus*, the Protestant Churches of Poland had reached what may be called a ‘minimal’ agreement on certain essential articles and formulas of Christian doctrine.\(^{251}\) Included among these were the doctrines concerning God, Holy Trinity, the Incarnation of Christ, Justification and others. The most difficult part in the *Consensus* was the doctrine of the Lord’s Supper. With reference to it, the *Formula* states:

> “Moreover, as far as the unfortunate difference of opinion on the Lord’s Supper is concerned, we agree on the meaning of the words of our Lord Jesus Christ, as they have been orthodoxy understood by the fathers, and especially by Irenaeus, who said that this mystery consists of two elements, namely, an earthly and a heavenly one. Nor do we assert that those elements or signs are bare and empty; we state, rather, that at the same time by faith they actually [*in ipsa*] exhibit and present that which they signify. Finally, to put it more clearly and expressly, we have agreed to believe and confess that the substantial presence of Christ is not merely signified, but that the body and blood of the Lord are represented, distributed, and exhibited to those who eat by the symbols applied to the thing itself, and that the symbols are not at all bare, according to the

\(^{248}\) “Interea przyszła tu conclusio, abyśmy teraz na dowód tej zgody spisali taki reces, jaki w Wilnie jest złożony, w którym by był consensus de re sacramentaria etc.” *Akta synodów II* 1972, 291.

\(^{249}\) “Denique Gliczneri exigeabant, ut integer articulus ille Saxonicus de Cena Domini recessui addatur.” *Akta synodów II* 1972, 292.

\(^{250}\) *Consensus mutuus in religionis Christianae capitis inter ecclesias Maioris et Minoris Poloniae, Russiae, Lithuaniae, Samogitiae, quae iuxta Confessionem Augustanam, fratrum Valdensium (ut vocant) et Helveticam aliquo modo a se dissentire videbantur, factus in synodo Sendomiriensi anno 1570 14 Aprilis. Akta synodów II* 1972, 295.

\(^{251}\) “Posteaquam diu multumque cum sectariis, tritheitis, Ebionitis, anabaptistis conflictatum esset, tandem divino favore ex tot tantisque certaminibus et deplorandis contentionibus emerimus, visum est isdem ecclesias Polonicis reformatis et orthodoxis, quae in quibusdam capitibus et formulis doctrinae hostibus veritatis et evangelii minime consentire videbantur, pacis et concordiae studio synodum convocare ac consensicionem mutuam testari.” *Akta synodów II* 1972, 295.
nature of the sacraments. But lest the diversity of manners of speaking bring forth another controversy, we have decided by mutual consent, in addition to the article which is inserted into our Confession, to add the article of the Confession of the Saxon churches on the Lord’s Supper, sent to the Council of Trent in 1551, which we acknowledge as correct and have accepted.”

It is evident from this text that the earlier dissention concerning the Lord’s Supper had not been resolved. However, all parties agreed that the Words of Christ concerning the Supper should be understood in a proper manner according to the pattern set by the church fathers, most notably by Irenaeus, who distinguished between the earthly and heavenly elements in the Supper. All three groups believed this to be an acceptable formula, perhaps because each saw in it a reflection of their own position. The assertion was made that the elements are not bare and empty signs but by faith really exhibit and present that to which they point. That is, the substantial presence of Christ is not merely signified, but his body and blood are understood to be represented, distributed and exhibited to the communicants. We may note that lacking here is the typical Lutheran understanding of the locatedness of Christ in the bread and the wine. Indeed, no reference is made to the bread and wine. Neither is it clear how the phrase Substantiali praesentia is to be understood. It may be this lack of clarity which led the Lutherans to ask for the insertion of the words substantialem praesentiam corporis Christi. This request was rejected by the Reformed, however the Lutherans were successful in insisting upon the insertion here of the sacramental section from the Confessio Saxonica 1551. The Reformed were not opposed to this insertion, perhaps because the Saxon Confession leaves open many possibilities of interpretation. It is difficult to distill the essence of the sacramental teaching of this Confession. It does not speak in clear terms of the relationship between bread and body, and the cup and blood. The Lutherans, however, regarded this Confession as

---


253 Akta synodów II 1972, 292-293.
sufficiently specific, and at the same time the Reformed regarded it to be sufficiently
general. Both parties clearly desired to reach a measure of agreement which would
make it possible for them to move forward together. For this reason they included a
fraternal admonition that all their brethren should recognize this mutual Consensus
and build upon it by common worship and intercommunion. Additionally, it was
proposed by the Lutherans that further meetings be held and that the goal be set that a
corpus doctrine or common confession be produced which would be acceptable to all
three churches in Poland, Lithuania and Samogitia.

The Formula Recessus makes it clear that the churches which subscribed to it
regarded it as the first step in process which was to result in the reunion of the
Protestants into one church with a common confession. It appears that the Consensus
does represent a real attempt by all the ecclesiastical parties to more fully understand
and appreciate the theological positions of the participating groups. Both the
Lutherans and the Reformed appear to move closer to each other in this Consensus.
From the Reformed side we see a willingness to make use of such terms as
‘substantial presence,’ and from the Lutherans we see a willingness to move toward
intercommunion.

How are we to understand the sudden apparent willingness of the Lutherans
to abandon the terminology upon which they had insisted in their Colloquium with
the Bohemians at Poznań on February 14, 1570? There they had sought to require of
the Bohemians the acceptance of the terminology characteristic of those who
confessed the Augsburg Confession – substantialiter, realiter, essentialiter,
corporaliter. Of these four words only substantialiter appears in the Consensus.
Historians Łukaszewicz, Halecki, Szujski, and Pelikan posit that the chief
consideration behind the Sandomierz Consensus was political necessity and the need

254 “Ad haec recipimus mutuo consensu omni studio nostris fratribus omnibus persuasuros atque eos
invitaturos ad hunc Christianum et unaniem consensum ampectendum et obsignandum, praecipue
audi-tione verbi frequentando tarn huius, quam alterius ciusuis confessionis coetus et
sacramentorum usu, observato tamen recto ordine et gradu tam disciplinae, quam consuetudinis
uniuscuiusque ecclesiae.” Akta synodów II 1972, 296-297.
255 “Atque ut colophonem huic consensui et mutuae concordiae imponamus ad hanc fraternam
societatem conservandum tuendamque, non incommodum fore putamus in locum certum convenire,
ubi una ex mutuis Confessionibus compendium corporis doctrinae, improbitate hostium veritatis ad id
adacti, eliceremus et in publicum edeamus, ut invidorum hominum ora obturarentur, cum maximo
omnim piorum solacio, sub titulo omnium ecclesiarum Polonicarum reformatarum et Lithuanicarum
et Samogiticae nostrae Confessioni consentientium.” Akta synodów II 1972, 297.
256 Łukaszewicz 1835, 112.
258 Szujski 1894, 399.
259 Pelikan 1947, 831-833.
to present a common front against the Roman Catholic Counter-Reformation and Socinianism (Anti-Trinitarianism). Only overriding political necessities could move the Lutherans to such an agreement. The problematic nature of the Consensus can be seen from the fact that on May 18-20 in the Convocation at Poznań, when the ink of the Consensus was barely dry, dissention concerning the Lord’s Supper again became evident. Unable to reach the stated goal of overcoming all differences in the name of peace and concord, it was affirmed that the Supper of the Lord is to be understood according to the agreed terminology of the Sandomierz Consensus and the Saxon Confession of 1551.260

For their part, the Reformed regarded the Consensus as nothing less than a document of church union. Frequent references are made to it in the protocols of later Reformed synods down to the present time.261 Our examination of Reformed liturgies will show the influences of positions not characteristic of Reformed worship and which can only be explained as part of the legacy of the Consensus.

Within months of the signing of the Sandomierz Consensus, the Reformed forwarded to the King a document which they represented to be a statement of the term of the Consensus and union of the Polish Protestants. They asked that the document be accepted and that they be given legal status. This request was frustrated by the objections of the Roman Catholic bishops and their supporters in the Senate.262 Any Protestant hopes that the publication of this agreement would occasion a significant change in the status of the Protestants were quickly dashed.

It soon came to the attention of the Lutherans that the document which the Reformed set before the King was not in fact the Formula Recessus to which they had consented. It was instead Wyznanie wiary powszechnej Kościołów Krześcijańskich, composed under the supervision of Krzysztof Trecius (Trecy) (†1591), Rector of the Calvinistic gymnasium in Kraków. This Sandomierz Confession was a version of Heinrich Bullinger’s Second Helvetic Confession of 1566, altered only in minor respects and published in Kraków in 1570.

---

260 “De Cena Domini illam sententiam amplectimur, quae est annotata in mutuo Consensu Sendomirienst et articulo Confessionis Saxonicae missae ad Tridentinum concilium anno Christi 1551 vitabimusque terminos, verba et explicationes a verbo Dei et hoc generali consensu et hac ipsa Confessionis Saxoniarum ecclesiamn ad Tridentinum Concilium missa alienas.” Akta synodów II 1972, 309.
262 Halecki 1915, 336-339.
In their meeting with the Bohemians on October 4, 1570 in Poznań, the Lutherans characterized this as a misrepresentation of their common *Consensus of Sandomierz*, and, as they said, a calumny of the Lutheran and the Bohemian positions. The Lutherans, who had not been consulted, characterized this as sinful representation of the decision of the Synod of Sandomierz and particularly with regard to the doctrine of the Lord’s Supper expressed in the *Consensus*. The Bohemians sought to pass over the event as unimportant, since it had been agreed that each church was to remain free to articulate its own particular theology and to continue to adhere to its own particular Confession of Faith.

Even apart from its ecumenical significance, the *Confession of Sandomierz* played an important role in the establishment of a unified doctrinal position among the Polish and Lithuanian Reformed. From the first, the Reformed Church had been subjected to many diverse theological emphases. The struggle against the Anti-Trinitarians at the beginning of the seventh decade of the 16th century made it clear that a statement of classical Reformed orthodoxy was necessary to unite the various Reformed factions. The signing of the *Second Helvetic Confession* in September 1556 by the Minor Polish Church was an important step in the movement toward the forming of a common mind. The composition of the *Sandomierz Consensus* was the final step toward the achievement of a unanimous understanding among the Reformed in Poland and Lithuania of their theological stance which was to become normative for that time.

An examination of the text of the *Confession of Sandomierz* reveals the strong influence of characteristic Reformed sacramental teaching from past generations, beginning with the writings of Ulrich Zwingli and his successors, and in particular the work of Heinrich Bullinger, the author of *Second Helvetic Confession*. It is from the standpoint of the characteristic Calvinist pattern of thought with reference to

263 “Praefatus est igitur Erasmus graviter accusans Cracovienses, qui violent Consensum. Żadne, pry, zgromadzenie z swoją konfesją się wynosić nie miało, ale wszyscy, społem się zjechawszy, mieliśmy spisać corpus doctrinae. Ale bracia Krakowscy wynoszą się z swoją (od nas nie przyjętą, bo w niej wiele błędów etc.) Konfesją et eam fere pro corpore doctrinae obtrudunt, tak jakoby była universalis confessio wszystkich kościołów polskich, i waszych, i naszych, a ku temu się nie mają, aby spisowali insze corpus doctrinae.” *Akta synodów II* 1972, 314.

264 “D. Stanislaus medicus addidit fratres Cracovienses omneo peccare contra generale decretum synodi Sendomiriensis, ubi ita conclusum est, ut conveniatur ad conscribendum corpus doctrinae. Item, peccare eos, qui nomina illa suspectissima in sententia de Sacramento expresse in Confessione sua posuerint etc.” *Akta synodów II* 1972, 314.

265 *Akta synodów II* 1972, 315.

266 Wotschke 1907 b, 54; *Lehmann* 1937, 104.
materiality and spirituality that we must examine the *Confession of Sandomierz* and evaluate its theological emphasis. Most important here is the Reformed dictum *finitum non capax infiniti*, namely, what is finite and material is not able to contain and communicate that which is infinite and heavenly. This provides us with the key to the understanding of the relationship of the material elements to the saving person and works of Christ, the value of his presence in the sacrament, and the place of the sacrament in the life of the church.

In order to understand the place of the Lord's Supper and its significance, it must be first of all noted that the Reformed theologians find it useful to begin by positing a general definition of sacraments which fits into the Reformed pattern of thought. Thus both New Testament sacraments are understood to be outward and visible signs (*signa*) of inward and invisible blessings (*res signata*), as is stated in *Confessio Sandomiriensis*, Article XIX. The signs are designated to be sacramental in the sense that they visibly point to the spiritual blessings which God has promised.267 They are not understood to themselves convey the blessings and grace of God, but only point toward that grace which faith alone receives.268 They are observed in obedience to the Lord's command, and by means of them faith is nourished and increased.269

Article XXI moves beyond the *Second Helvetic Confession* in its definition of the Supper of the Lord and its benefits. The definition of the Lord’s Supper is not merely a spiritual feeding of the faithful but, while not using the word ‘Spiritual’ which had been used by Bullinger, it is simply stated that the purpose of Communion is that the faithful be fed with Christ’s body and blood.270 These benefits are received from the hand of the minister as from the hands of the Lord himself so that they are

---

267 “Sákrámentá tedy ábo Świątości są upominki tájemne álbo sprawy święte od Bogá postánowyone / złożone s pozwiżnych znákow zymskich y z duchownych rzeczy známionowych y z obietnice ábo słówá Bożego do nich przydzáne.” *Confessia* 1570, k.  
268 “... iest błąd szkodliwy... Y tych ktorzy rzeczy duchowne niebieskie y láskę Bożą ták śćislo do pozwiżnycnego używania thych upominkow świętych przywięzuyą / że mniemáy aby każdy przestępca użytkelnik sákrámenthu Pańskiemu...” *Confessia* 1570, kvi.  
269 “Thym thedy sposobem przybywa y pomnaża sie wyáry w cžłowieku Krześcyjáńskim / y wąthpliwosość przyrodzenia obchodźi...” *Confessia* 1570, lv.  
270 “Wieczérza Pańská / którą y stolem Pańskim / y Eucháristiá / to iest dziękcygniением zowiemi / iesth názwaná dla tego pospolicie Wieczérzą ... Abowym iako prawdziwie ná oney wieczérzy swoyey Pan Krystus Apostołówm ciało y krew swoęe ku pożywaniu podawał / tak y dzis na kádey wieczérzy Pánskýe / prawdziwie wszysczy wierní ciáłem y krwiá iego bywááí násyceni.” *Confessia* 1570, l-lij.
united with Christ’s holy body and fed though the Holy Spirit. By the reception of the consecrated material elements the faith of the communicants is sealed, so that they may not doubt that the flesh and the blood of Christ have been given for them.

The sacraments are related to the work of Christ in that at while the communicants receive the earthly elements, Christ through the Holy Spirit inwardly gives them his flesh and blood to nourish them to the eternal life. Thus, Christ's body and blood are understood to be given simultaneously with the bread and wine, but on higher spiritual level.

In describing the manner of reception, the *Sandomierz Confession* speaks of several kinds of eating, all them basically spiritual in nature. Corporeal eating is rejected, since this food is not given for the sake of the stomach. It is the heavenly food of Christ’s true body and blood that is most important. This differs only slightly from *Second Helvetic Confession*, which includes a very specific rejection of the reception of Christ's true body by the mouth. Indeed, Christ's body and blood cannot come to us by means of fleshly eating, for such can provide no spiritual blessing, as is clearly stated in John 6:63, which *Confession of Sandomierz* quotes in this regard. This follows the pattern of the Reformed *finitum non capax infiniti*. It is not earthly but heavenly and spiritual refreshment that is offered in the Supper.

Although in some cases the *Confession of Sandomierz* tries to avoid specifically Reformed terminology, here it is stated that Christ can and must be received only by faith, so that he might dwell in his people and they in him. This clarifies the position of the Confession, although the use in some places of such phrases as ‘very body’ and ‘very blood’ of the Lord sounds almost Lutheran. Lutherans would state that all communicants receive this true body and blood with the mounts on their bodies, but only those who receive by faith, receive the benefit of the sacrament. The *Sandomierz Confession* speaks rather of a sacramental eating of the Christ's body and

---

271 "...prawdziwą wiarą na Krystusą Páná swego pilnie pátrzái / ták iž iákoby własne z rąk Páná Krystusá sámego bráli / to czo przez posługowanie sług kościelnych przyjmuyą."

272 "... od sługi kościelnego bierzemy to obyczáyem widomym / pozwirzchnym y poswiątynym / á od Páná sámego bierzemy tho we wnątrz przez spráw Duchá S. ktory nas karmi ciałem Krystusowym / y nápawa krwiá iego ku wzrostowiżywotà wiecznego."

273 "Abowiem nigdzýey w pismie swiétych nie masz tákovych słów y terminow o tey zacney Swiátości / żeby cielesná y materiálnym sposobem P. Krystusá wierni ieś ci / chocia prawdziwé ciało j krew iego prijmuyą."

274 "Abowiem nie jest tho pokarm zuładkowi ludzkiemu służacy / ále pokarm niebieski dusze wierne obżywiáyací.”

275 "A ták gdy bierzemy y przyjmuyemy Sákráment Páñski / bierzemy prawdziwe ciało iego zá nas wydáne / y krew wylaná dla grzechow názych.”
blood by those receive the outward elements. The purpose of this sacramental eating is that their faith may be kindled and increased and refreshed. It is faith that provides the point of connection between the sacramental eating, that is, the reception of the material elements, and the spiritual blessing which Christ has promised.276

How then can unbelievers be said to eat and drink judgment upon themselves? The Second Helvetic Confession says that unbelievers failed to receive the substance of the sacrament; they bring condemnation upon themselves by dishonoring the death of Christ. The Confession of Sandomierz says instead that unbelievers dishonor the body of the Lord.277 We may ask if this specific reference to the body of the Lord is meant to approach the Lutheran understanding of unworthy eating and drinking, though without affirming the manducatio oralis? The Sandomierz Confession move beyond this by stating that unbelievers do not participate in the body and blood.278 Although this Confession rejected the manducatio oralis, it does speak of the possibility that one may receive the sacrament unworthily.

Of special interest is the section on the presence of Christ in the Eucharist. Although this article follows the pattern set by the Second Helvetic Confession, the Confession of Sandomierz directs its fire against ‘Roman Sophists’ and their doctrine of transubstantiation. The Lutheran understating of the hiddenness of the body of Christ in the Bread, or under its form, is also specifically rejected, because such understandings lead only to virulent disputes and dissentions among the Christians.

In order to avoid such eventualities the confessors pledged themselves not to go beyond what Christ himself says by his clear words: “Take, eat, this is my body…, etc.” “And thus when we take and receive the Lord's Sacrament, we receive the true

276 “Jest jeszcze trzeć sposob jedzenia pokârma tego / który zowiem Sákrámentowy ábo poswiałny / to jest ten widomy y pozwirzchny ksât swiâtości ciòâła y krwie Pâńskiye / gdy lud Boży do stołu Pâńskiye przystępuje / y niebieskye one á wieczné pokârmy w Swiâtości od sługi kœsâlnego widomie bierze. A tu nie rozumiemy żeby to próžna iâka á nieużyteczna sprâwá bymiáła. Abowiem ácêkrowieke áirwey przez wiârą prawdziwâą áęł Krystusâ w sobie mieszkâjącego / y pozywaâe ciòâła y krwie iego obyczâýem duchownym / Jednâk zhu przy stole Pâńskim wiêkszá y ofbítszá âaska thobie sie pokâáye / gdyÁie sie sam pan iákoby w ręce twe podawa y s tóbn ono duchowne zlâczence iââiáne i widomie wyswiâdza / prâwie kłádąc przed oczy twôye ony wieczné á niewidome dobrâ / które nam spráwí miáką á sâmercą sâwóu.” Confessia 1570, lv.

277 “PrzeÁe winnemi sie stawáyá cioâła y krwie Pâńskiey / y ná sąd á potépienie iedzâ y piyâ / ábowiem niórezznawáyá y nie uwaÁâyá w sobye cioâła Pâńskieyá ná sâmerc wydáne á dla odkupienia y zbiáwieni wswiâstwíu.” Confessia 1570, lv-lvi.

278 “Acêkrowiek ktoby bez wszelâkiey pokúty y wiârê do têy swiêtey Wiecêrzêy przychoðził / rzecz pewna że thám stád dârow zbiáwnienných cioâlà y krwie pâńskiey odniése nie moÁêe prze sâwóye niedowiarstwó…” Confessia 1570, lv.
body given for us, and the true blood, shed for our sins.”

What is meant by the phrase true body and blood is best understood on the basis of the context in which this phrase is found. Thus we may conclude that in this document the presence of Christ in the Supper is not identified with the earthly elements as such.

We observe that the terminology is not easily to understand. The term ‘sacrament’ appears to refer to the visible elements, that is the bread and wine. However, in terms of reception, the word ‘sacramental’ refers to a reception which is not bound to the physical elements, but includes the thing signified. The minister gives the outward sacramental gift, while Christ himself administers the substance of the sacrament. Thus the sacramental eating and drinking of Christ's body and blood may be said to occur simultaneously with the eating of the bread and wine, but there is no direct connection between them. Why? It is because the thing signified is neither defined nor delimited by the sign. Specifically disapproved is the doctrine that grace and the thing signified are bound to and included in the signs in such a way that unworthy persons receive either grace or the things signified, that is the body and blood of Christ. Christ cannot be received in any positive manner by those who do not receive the signs by true faith. For them the sacraments are without value.

It is insisted that it is necessary that the sacraments be consecrated by the Word of God. This is the Word which was spoken of the Lord at the Last Supper before his passion and death. It is this Word which makes the Supper special. Without it, there would be no sacrament. It is not the word of man which consecrates, but the Word of God. However, the Word of God is to be spoken and the divine name invoked to indicate that these elements have been consecrated, and that they have been sanctified by Christ. In other words, the Words of Christ over the bread and wine in the upper room are understood to effectively consecrate and sanctify the

---

279 “Nie powiadamy też aby Krystus miał być zákryty w chlebye álbo pod chlebem / álbo złączony s chlebem / iákich mow zgorszliwych dosyć thych cZasow niespokoyne disputacie námnożyły. Ale ták mowimy iako sam Pan Krystus ná Testhámcie swoim wyswiádszy račzył: Bierzcie iedzcie to ciáło moye. A ták gdy bierzemy y przyimywey Sákráment Páński / bierzemy prawdziwe ciáło iego zá nas wydáne / y krew wylaną dla grzechow nászych.” Confessia 1570, lvi.

280 “Skád pilnie rozreznapíaw powinien káždy wierny przy uzywániu Sákrámentow miedzy słągą á pánem: álbowiem słudzy kosciełni podawáy na swiadtość pozwirzchnym obyczáyem / Lecz Pan Bog sam rzecz duchowną w światóscia oznáymioną y wyswiádszoną podawa sercu wiernemu przez sprawę wnetrzną Duchá S.” Confessia 1570, kí.

281 “Pan Bog w nich podawa prawdziwie rzeczy obiecáne / y wyswiádszone / chociaa niewierni dárow Boskich sobie podawanych nieprzyimyua / przez swoyü nieposobność y niedowiárstwo.” Confessia 1570, kvi.
bread and wine of the Supper for all time. The words are repeated in the celebration of the sacraments in remembrance of that first act of consecration, so that the congregation does not celebrate the sacrament in any other way but that enjoined by the Lord before his passion.282 Here there seems to be an approximation of the position taken by the Lutherans in *Formula of Concord*, Article VII. However, we observe the same reticence to identify the bread and wine of the Supper with the body and blood of Christ which is so evident in all Reformed treatments on the Lord's Supper.

Although terminology is often used which is characteristic of the Lutheran doctrine of the Lord’s Supper rather than that of the Reformed or Calvinists, - it can be said that this *Confession* displays at most superficial evidences of Lutheran influence. In general the text follows the *Second Helvetic Confession* of Heinrich Bullinger in both structure and contents with only minor omissions or emendations. This is especially evident when the subject matter approximates the Lutheran doctrine, such with reference to the nature of Christ’s presence in the sacrament and the consecration.

We may note that the Reformed used the term *Sandomierz Confession* to refer to this *Consensus*. They understood the *Sandomierz Consensus* on the basis of the Confession, and this Confession has remained an important document in the Reformed tradition in Lithuania and Poland up to the present time. The influence of the *Sandomierz Confession* and its terminology will be evident in the liturgical documents which were produced beginning in the final decade in the sixteenth century and continuing well into the seventeenth century.

It is characteristic of the Reformed Churches that there is no impetus toward doctrinal consensus with the rest of the Reformed world. Reformed confessions are basically national in character, and individual Reformed Churches in the various

---

nations have their characteristic Confession. Of course, these confessions have a certain super-national dimension as well; the *Westminster Confession* of 1646, for example, is not limited to the people of Great Britain but is part of the doctrinal position of other English speaking churches as well. So too, the *Second Helvetic Confession* has a significance which moves far beyond the German speaking Swiss Reformed and has impressed itself upon other Reformed Churches, even as, geographically far removed as Poland and Lithuania. However, the *Sandomierz Confession* which interpreted *Sandomierz Consensus* marks the beginning of a theological self-consciousness and self-definition which Polish Reformed Churches had previously lacked. Its significance in the life of Polish and Lithuanian Churches extends far beyond the time and place of its formulation. It marks the particular doctrinal usages of the Reformed Churches in these lands over against other Reformed Churches in Switzerland and Germany, and other Christian confessions. At the end of the 16th century, the Reformed in these lands looked upon the *Sandomierz Confession* as an ecumenical document and served as the basis of their discussions with the Lutherans and the Bohemian Brethren and with the Orthodox Eastern Churches as well.

The *Sandomierz Consensus* and *Sandomierz Confession* established the Eucharistic doctrine upon which liturgy and practice in the congregations was to be based. This doctrine moved beyond the doctrine articulated by Heinrich Bullinger in *Second Helvetic Confession* mainly in its terminology, which is meant to assuage the Lutheran clergy and their congregations and serve as a point of possible reconciliation between the churches. The Lutherans found these attempts inadequate. They saw in them the familiar Reformed distinctions between the finite and the infinite, between the corporeal and sacramental presence, with which they were already very familiar. The Lutherans could not hold these documents in the same high regard as Reformed, and with the passing of time their interest in them waned. What was for the Reformed a high water mark in their self-definition and theological articulation was of far lesser significance for the Lutherans, many of whom looked to the newly published *Formula of Concord* in 1577 and the *Book of Concord* in 1580 as definitive. Here the lines between the Lutheran and Reformed theology were clearly drawn. The Lutherans had now reached a level of self-consciousness which was beginning to lead to an awareness that union between the churches could not be
long maintained. In the ninth decade of the sixteenth century we see increasing evidences of alienation, mainly because of the teaching about the Lord’s Supper.

Within the Reformed Church, the Synod of Sandomierz and the documents built upon it represent the final statements concerning the churches doctrinal positions, especially with reference to the sacrament. From this point on attention turns away from doctrine to practice, especially to discipline within the congregations, Communion practices, and worship in the church. At the General Synod of Kraków on September 29 - October 1, 1573, much attention was given to question of civil morality, church membership and excommunication. It was resolved that no person excommunicated from one Protestant Church might be accepted at the Lord’s Supper of the another church until the matter will be resolved in the congregation where the excommunication had been declared.283 Further consideration was given to the question already raised in Sandomierz about the bodily disposition of those receiving Communion, whether it be by standing, kneeling, or sitting, as Lasco had ordered in his *Forma ac Ratio*. Here the synod found it necessary to distinguish the main body of Protestant Christians from the Anti-Trinitarians who pointed to their practice of receiving Communion while seated as evidence of their continuity with Lasco. The synod resolved in favor of kneeling or standing.284 This indicates not only of variety of practice, but also of the need to counter the claims of the Anti-Trinitarians.

The General Synod of Sandomierz, while seeking to foster unity and harmony among the churches, had made provision that each church be free to continue its customary rites and ceremonies. Unification of these rites, although desirable, would have to wait for future implementation. The General Synod at Piotrków on June 1-3, 1578 again stated that it would be desirable that the Protestant Churches in the Polish empire administer the Lord Supper according to a common ceremonial procedure. However, the ‘weaker brethren’ should not be compelled or disciplined because of their reticence to abandon their form of practice, as long as the sacrament was received while kneeling or standing. With regard to the Communion of the sick and the dying, it was resolved that all Christians should be prepared to leave this present life fully confirmed in the hope of salvation. However, for the sake of weak consciences, the sick who while of sound mind request the sacrament should not be

283 Akta synodów III 1983, 7.
284 Akta synodów III 1983, 12.
denied their request. Properly speaking, Holy Communion is meant to be a public or congregational act, but pastoral concern for the individual must prevail. Differences arose concerning the elements in Holy Communion at the General Synod of Włodzislaw on June 19-20, 1583. The matter was considered on the basis of the terms set down in the *Sandomierz Consensus.* The synod limited its consideration of the sacrament to reiteration of the provision that communicants should kneel or stand to receive it. 

It must be noted here that this period of relative peace with regard to the Lord’s Supper continued until June 25, 1578, when Lutheran and Reformed theologians met in Vilnius. At this meeting the Lutherans declared themselves against the Union of Sandomierz as doctrinally unsound and separated themselves from the other Protestants. This was a local action about which more will be said when we come to consider the Lithuanian situation in detail. In the same year, however, tensions concerning the doctrine of the Lord’s Supper and Lutheran agreement with the *Sandomierz Consensus* were beginning to become evident in Poznań. In 1582 Pawel Gericius, the Lutheran pastor in Poznań and Jan Enoch, openly declared against the *Consensus* mainly because of its Eucharistic doctrine.

Renewed debates concerning the Lord's Supper were on the agenda at the General Synod an Toruń in 1595. The *Consensus* was built upon the willingness of its delegates to remain quite imprecise by speaking of the manner of Christ's presence in the Supper. The Lutherans were left free to consider that presence to be corporeal in nature. The Reformed could understand the presence quite otherwise. Both churches were free to propound their particular doctrines, because the *Consensus* had deliberately not spoken to this issue. When the Reformed theologian Volanus, in his *Vera et...*

---


286 “[Z] strony ceremonii przy użyciu Wieczernie Pańskiej dawna namowa synodu generalnego sędmińskiego i konkluzji synodu generalnego krakowskiego pochvalona jest, żeby siedzenie w żadnych zbiorach tego konsensu naszego w Małej i w Wielkiej Polszcz, i w Księstwie Litewskim etc. używane nie było, ale koniecznie złożone, a insze, tj. stojenie i klęczenie, jako gdzie zwyczajnie jest, wolne sobie bez obrażania się i przygany jedni drugim zostawujemy.” *Akta synodów III* 1983, 82.

287 Jablonski 1731, 81-86; Adamowicz 1855, 54.

288 *Akta synodów IV* 1997, 49.

orthodoxa,\textsuperscript{290} articulated clearly the Reformed position, the Lutherans reacted strongly.\textsuperscript{291} Thus it became clear that questions unresolved in Sandomierz are crying out for resolution, but they were ignored. They were simply declared to be out of order, or not helpful. The Reformed theologians were indeed following the provisions of \textit{Sandomierz Consensus} and their own \textit{Confession of Sandomierz}.

There were important debates throughout the whole General Synod of Toruń, held on August 21-26, 1595. Of particular interest to us are the statements of Krzysztof Kraiński, who would play the most important role in the formulation of the first Reformed agendas of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. Kraiński stated that the Reformed Churches teaches that communicants eat the true body of Christ and drink his true blood not in physical or miraculous manner but rather in a mystical participation which by the Holy Spirit is apprehended by faith. The fruit of such mystical Communion is the forgiveness of sins, righteousness, and eternal life. This position follows typical Polish Reformed pattern. The true presence of Christ is not denied, but its bodily reception is. To say that one receives mystically rather then physically is again to build upon the conviction that spiritual benefits cannot be directly related to material elements and their physical reception.\textsuperscript{292} We will need to take these words into consideration when interpreting the liturgical words and ceremonies which Kraiński included in his liturgical services.

Although the majority of delegates, including the Lutherans, led by their Superintendent Erazm Gliczner, were reassured by the results of the synod, it confirmed the \textit{Consensus of Sandomierz}. However, the unity was beginning to crumble. Gericius was adamant in his rejection of the resolutions of the synod. Future events would show that he did not stand alone. He was the spokesman for a growing number of Lutherans who were clearly aware of deficiencies of \textit{Sandomierz Consensus} in matters pertaining to the sacrament.

\textsuperscript{290} \textit{Vera et orthodoxa veteris ecclesiae sententia de coena Domini ad Petrum Scarga per Andream Volanum. Typis Castri Loscensis 1574. Akta synodów III 1983, 124 fn. 5.}

\textsuperscript{291} “At nunc ab aliquibus palam rescinditur, praeertim in Lithuania, ubi Consensum alium praefatum inierunt, libros, qui Consensi repugnant, ediderunt, veluti d. Volanus, in cuius contra Scargam responso in fronte libri haec verba extant. In isto libro negatur praesentia Corporis in Cena Domini.” \textit{Akta synodów III 1983, 124.}

\textsuperscript{292} “Licet quaestio de modo manducationis Corporis Christi sit admodum difficilis, non tamen esse reticendam, quatenus in Scripturis exprimitur et articulis fidei ac sacramentorum analogiae respondet. Nos ergo docere pura conscientia nos in sacramento verum Corpus Christi edere ac Sanguinem bibere, sed non modo physico aut miraculoso (prout proprie miracula dicuntur), sed fide apprehendente et Spiritu S. applicante nobis Christum cum omnibus bonis, ut eius vere, mystice tamen, participes facti, remissionem peccatorum, iustitiam et yitam aeternam ex ipso hauriamus.” \textit{Akta synodów III 1983, 127.}
With the confirmation of a theological position concerning the sacrament, the synod of Toruń suggested that moves be made toward establishing unity of practice in the congregations of the Protestant confessions, although for a time the churches would be permitted choose to continue to make use of their traditional ceremonies and form of worship. In Minor Poland there was no such unity. A variety of forms had been used since the introduction of Protestantism, all of them expressing the theological view point of one or another Reformed theological streams. The establishment of a united Reformed theological position must now express itself by the use of commonly agreed liturgical services. This was a daunting task, given the conservative attitudes of both, ministers and people concerning liturgical matter. Such changes would be difficult for people who clung to the familiar words and forms.

Up until this time, discussion had been limited to matters of discipline related to the celebration and reception of the Holy Communion. In the District Synod of Lublin on July 19, 1594 there were discussions concerning liturgical forms. Here it was decided that the next synod should be devoted to the establishment of a common ritual to be used by the parishes in their district. An important step toward the implementation of these proposals was made at the District Synod of Lublin on May 29, 1595 which decided that there should be everywhere a common ritual for the administration of the sacrament in this district. The protocols of the Church-wide Synod of Ożarów on September 21, 1598, identifies Superintendent Krzysztof Kraiński as the author of the agenda to be used and states that the form that he had recently prepared should be given over to the seniors of Minor Poland for any necessary editing or amendment. Kraiński’s work, which he finished in 1598, declares that his agenda had been accepted at the District Synods of Krylów and Lublin, for the use in Districts of Lublin, Belż, and Chelm, was published in 1599.

293 “O cerymonijach, na ten czas nie odmieniając konkluzyj przeszłych synodów, ale każdemu zborowi zwyczajne według wolności krześcijańskiej zostawiając, na przyszły Synod generalny deliberację o porównaniu ich a przywiedzieniu w jednaką formę odkładamy.” Akta synodów III 1983, 606-607.
294 Akta synodów III 1983, 105.
297 Kraiński does not provide the dates of these synods. A search of the available materials reveals no mention about Kraiński’s work. It is first mention in the protocol of the Synod of Ożarów 1598. Akta synodów III 1983, 198; Porządek nabożeństwa 1599, 85.
Although Toruń is identified as the place of publication, the *Porządek nabożeństwa* was actually published elsewhere. Kraiński gave Toruń as the place of publication in order to cover up the fact that his work had been published by the Anti-Trinitarian Aleksy Rodecki (ca.1540-1606) in Kraków.298

Kraiński built his Communion service upon existing forms, on the basis of liturgical writings which had appeared in French, English, Scottish, Hungarian, Swiss, Dutch, and other Reformed Churches with which, as Kraiński claims, the Polish Reformed were in doctrinal agreement.299 He furnishes in the margins detailed notations of ancient and Reformed writers as an indication of the Apostolic and Protestant nature of his work. At the same time he disputes against the positions taken by medieval Catholic theologians. In his introduction to the work Kraiński notes that his church continued to tolerate diversity in the liturgical usages as had been approved by earlier synods, beginning with Sandomierz in 1570.300 He remarks that the Lutherans and Bohemian Brethren have a common theological understanding of the Eucharist. If there are any differences, they are not differences in faith, but only in such outward matters which may be turned *adiaphora*, such as in ceremonies and words.301 He declared that he has prepared this liturgy for use if not everywhere in Minor Poland, then at least in the Districts of Lublin, Bełz, and Chełm.302 This work of 497 pages attests to the competence of its author and the careful nature of his scholarship. It is impressive that this first Minor Polish Protestant Reformed Agenda should be so comprehensive in nature, making provision for virtually every aspect of church life.

The publication of Kraiński’s work appears to have met a need and excited further interest in the liturgy for public worship. Although it was accepted by a limited number of districts in Minor Poland, other districts now began to express their interest. Within a year, note was taken at the District Synod of Oksza on July 14, 1600 that at the next synod the matter of liturgy would be fully discussed.303 At the District Synod of Chmielnik, held on September 21, 1600, it was resolved that Kraiński's work should corrected on the basis of the liturgical writings of Johannes a

298 *Kawecka -Gryczowa 1974, 160.*
299 *Porządek nabożeństwa 1599, 83.*
300 *Porządek nabożeństwa 1599, 17-18.*
301 *Porządek nabożeństwa 1599, 45.*
302 *Porządek nabożeństwa 1599, 84-85.*
303 *Akta synodów III 1983, 214.*
Lasco, whose *Forma ac Ratio* “…was closest to the Word of God.”

The Church-wide Synod at Ożarów, which was held from September 29 to October 1, 1600 established a committee consisting of the Superintendent Franciszek Jezierski (†1617), Seniors Franciszek Stankar (†1621), Krzysztof Kraiński and Maciej from Baranów to meet on November 25, 1600 in Czyżów, to prepare material for a liturgical work which would be acceptable in all districts of Minor Poland. It was noted that the rites used in the District of Ruś contained only minor differences in wording, indicating that general acceptance of the new work would not be difficult. The committee met a month later in Czyżów and completed its work to the satisfaction of the entire committee and the delegates of the districts. At the District Synod of Kock on February 11, 1601 the seniors approved the work as pleasing the sight of God. They recommended its immediate adoption in the congregations. At the District Synod of Secemin, held on May 4-6 of the same year the ministers present used their free time to copy extracts from the new form by hand. The Church-wide Synod of Włodzisław on September 28, 1601 declared that it would be pleasing to the Holy Spirit that all congregations should endorse and make use of the new form. District superintendents were directed to press for its adoption and in their visitations to determine whether these directions were being followed.

The new *Porządek nabożeństwa* was authorized by the seniors on January 25, 1602 at their Convocation in Radzanów. According to the introduction, Kraiński’s work served as the basis of this new edition, which is materially shorter then the model from which it was taken. According to its introduction, the agenda had already been accepted by the Church-wide Synods of Ożarów and Włodzisław for use in

---


306 *Akta synodów III* 1983, 221.

307 “Forma była czytana, od braciej senijorów dystryktowych złożona, i przyjęta z pochwałą Pana Boga wszechmogącego, i według niej zaraz odprawować będą ministrowie nabożeństwo.” *Akta synodów III* 1983, 220.

308 *Akta synodów III* 1983, 221.

309 “Podobało się Duchowi św., aby zborz ewangelickie w Małej Polsce jednakiej Formy odprawowania nabożeństwa krześciańskiego, zgodnie od wszystkiego synodu prowincjalnego spisanej i aprobowanej, używały. Którą senior każdy w swym dystryktie braciej ministrom powinien będzie podać, obowiązując je kościoła Bożego posłużeniem, aby tej używali, a na wizytacjach, jeśli będzie w używaniu, mają się dowiadować i doglądać.” *Akta synodów III* 1983, 229.
every congregation throughout the Minor Poland. The committee explained that what was too long, they shortened, and what was lacking, they had added. Perhaps we see at work here the general principle that successive liturgies tend to move from complexity to simplicity. Additionally, it is probable that in many matters Kraiński’s decisions were based upon his personal preferences and did not sufficiently reflect the mind of the larger church.

The 1602 agenda made changes in Kraiński’s 1599 order of the Lord’s Supper in some details. Kraiński’s lengthy introduction and its many quotations from the church fathers and the Scriptures and medieval theologians has been reduced to a few quotations from Justin Martin and Augustine. Only one setting of the antiphon Veni Sancte Spiritus is included. The Confirmation of God’s Grace and Exhortation to Confession is replaced with a much shorter Exhortation. Kraiński’s lengthy Declaration of Forgiveness is abbreviated; now it is called the Absolution. Kraiński’s prayer after the Verba Testamenti is moved to a place immediately after the Creed, before the Words of Christ. The Testamentary Words are accompanied by the manual acts, a new feature in this liturgy. The Meaning of the Testament and the Admonition shorten the form provided in the 1599 order. The form of Excommunication in the 1602 book again shortens the form found in Kraiński’s order, and it contains no enumeration of groups to be excluded from the Lord’s Table. The explanation following the reading from 1 Corinthians 5 is shortened.

The most striking innovation in the 1602 rite is in the Distribution. Kraiński’s formulas, which repeat the Words of Christ over the bread and the wine, are replaced by more traditional formulas in which the Words of Christ are not repeated over the bread and cup. There are no directions concerning the blessing of additional elements. During communion the Hymn from the Catechism is sung. A new Prayer of Thanksgiving is given. It is based upon the Preface of the Western liturgy—beginning with the vere dignum and including the traditional Sanctus and adding after it a general prayer. Added also is the Aaronic Benediction spoken by the minister before the Offering and the final hymn. In general term it may be said that the shape of the service provided by the Kraiński has been retained, and only a few

310 Porządek nabożeństwa 1602, Przedmowa.
311 “Albowiem weyrzawszy pilnie w Formę wydaną 1599 r. brata milego Xiedza Krzysztofa Kraińskiego, którą zebrał z wiela form różnych w słowiech ale zgodnych w rzeczy y w fundamentem słowa Bożego, y wydał dla districtu Lubelskiego y Belskiego godną zaprawdę czytania, tedychym w niey to co było przy dłuższym skrocił, a to co było do budowania snadniejszego przydali, y one na iawe wypuścili.” Porządek nabożeństwa 1602, Przedmowa.
elements have been displaced or completely eliminated. Some new elements have been added, but in most cases Kraiński’s service has been retained in a shortened form.

The District Synod of Lublin on June 8, 1602 stated that the form which had been approved in two synods was *sacrosanct* and was to be accepted and embraced.\(^{312}\) The Church-wide Synod of Ożarów on September 27, 1602 declared that the form, having been newly published and approved by the two synods, was to be accepted, and no one was to distance himself from it. Again, regional visitors were instructed to determine that the new work was being used.\(^{313}\)

Through the work of the synods, Minor Polish church now had one form of worship to be used in all parishes. Parishes, however, were not in every case ready abandon their traditional forms and ceremonies. Synods may move quickly, but parish congregations are sometimes slow to follow. The matter came to the attention of District Synod in Gorlice in 1603. The parish congregation there had not adopted the new form, and the synod found it necessary to admonish the people to adopt the new form and directed that a parish visitation should ascertain compliance with this directive. For their part, the people had little desire to adopt the new form.\(^{314}\) Undoubtedly some parishes found themselves in the same awkward situation. In response, the Church-wide Synod of Łańcut held on September 28, 1603, stated flatly that there would be but one form for the celebration of the Holy Communion throughout the church.\(^{315}\) Later synods reiterated this same declaration.

The wide success of the 1602 agenda opened up for the Reformed the vision of a common form of worship to be used not only by all Reformed parishes in Minor Poland, but also by the Lutherans and Bohemian Brethren in both Poland and Lithuania. This was not a new idea. The Reformed had aspired to it as early as the time of the Koźminek Union in 1555, when they introduced into their church in Minor Poland the liturgical rites of the Bohemian Brethren.\(^{316}\) The use of these rites however continued for only a few years. They were soon superseded by the liturgy

\(^{312}\) “Forma albo porządek nabożeństwa we zborzech naszych, na dwu synodach prowincjalnych od wszystkich seniorów Małej Polski aprobowany i sacrosancte przyjęty, a wszystkiej braciej ku usługowaniu podany.” *Akta synodów III* 1983, 236.

\(^{313}\) “Formę, na dwu synodach prowincjalnych approbatam, a nowo wydrukowaną, zgodnie wszyscy jako przedtem, tak i teraz przyjmujemy i od niej odstąpić nie chcemy, czego seniorowie mają na wizytacjach doglądać.” *Akta synodów III* 1983, 241.

\(^{314}\) *Akta synodów III* 1983, 244.

\(^{315}\) “Aby ceremonia stania przy używaniu św. Wieczerzy Pana Jezusowej w każdym zborze Małej Polski zachowana była, jedna forma, także i katechizm rewidowany.” *Akta synodów III* 1983, 244.

\(^{316}\) *Akta synodów I* 1966, 18-47.
which Johannes a Lasco brought with him from Western Europe. Still the church held out the hope that at some point in the future a common Pan-Protestant liturgy could be formulated and agreed. This long held hope was fanned into a living flame by the popular acceptance of the 1602 agenda in Minor Poland. Now the broad vision was brought forward of a rite to which not only the Bohemian Brethren and the Reformed of Major Poland, but also the Reformed Church in Lithuania and even the Lutherans of Rzeczpospolita could accept.

The possibility of Lutheran acceptance was based upon the memories of the successful negotiations between the Reformed, Bohemian Brethren, and Lutheran Churches which led to the Sandomierz Consensus. Although in that Consensus it had been stated that the three churches would each keep their own characteristic rites and ceremonies, all shared in common an agreeable doctrine of the sacrament. This statement of common agreement that all should look forward to the possibility that at some point in the future a common liturgical rite could be formulated to express it. In addition the Sandomierz Consensus included within it a statement of the practical expression of agreement produced. It was affirmed that by mutual consent Christians of one confession might receive Communion in the churches of the other confessions so long as they observed the order, discipline, and customs of that church. A wish for the adoption of common celebration and distribution of the Holy Communion in all three churches was expressed in the General Synod of Kraków in 1573, but action was not taken at that time. The churches resolved to continue their present individual ceremonial freedom in imitation of the early church. In the Synod of Poznań in April 1578 it was the Bohemian Brethren who took the initiative in speaking of the importance of establishing common ceremonies "in Poland with others." In a special letter to the synod, the ministers proposed that ceremonial consensus should be reached with the Lutherans and to avoid giving scandalous offence to the Germans. At Poznań Lutheran Pastor Paweł Gericius had begun to raise concerns

317 “Ritus autem et caeremonias liberos uniuscuiusque ecclesiae hac concordia et coniunctione relinquimus. Non enim multum refert, qui ritus observentur, modo sarta tecta et incorrupta existat ipsa doctrina et fundamentum fidei ac salutis nostrae.” Akta synodów II 1972, 297.

318 “O ceremonijach, a mianowicie przy uzywaniu Wieczerzy Paniowej, wziawszy przed sie rozbieranie, mogly li by we wszystkich koscielech naszych byc jednake, tak sie zamknienie stalo, zeby wedlug zwyczaju starożytnego kosciola wolnosci krześcijanskiej ceremonije miemy nami puszczone a darowane byly...” Akta synodów III 1983, 12.

319 “Stara¢ sie o tym, zebyśmy mieli jednakie ceremonije tu w Polszcze z drugimi.” Akta synodów IV 1997, 49.

320 “O ceremonijach, w których nam równość zadawajĄ, stara¢ sie o zgodę z luteran. Jako by zabie¿¿ææ scandalo excitato per concionatorem Germanicum.” Akta synodów IV 1997, 343.
the terms of the *Sandomierz Consensus*. Perhaps the Bohemians thought that the Lutherans would be satisfied with something less than complete doctrinal agreement, especially since the Bohemian Brethren had expressed in the same synod that true Evangelicals could never make use of the same ceremonies as were used by the Pope. The Lutherans for their part had continued the use of some ceremonies which the Bohemian Brethren would call ‘papist’. Two months later a General Synod was held in Piotrków where the matter was once again taken up. It appears that here it was the Lutherans who held back and refused to permit the initiation of practical work toward the goal of a common liturgical expression. Again Christian liberty was given as the reason for allowing a multiplicity of rites and ceremonies. Infighting among the Lutherans at the General Synod of Toruń in 1595 led to the expulsion of a small, expressly confessional group led by Gericius. Perhaps their expulsion led some to hope that now Lutheran objections would be quieted and that agreement could be built on the level of ceremonies without further concern about doctrine. This hope proved well founded. Strong voices in all three groups asserted that not only liturgy and ceremony but also hymnals and catechisms must be brought into agreement. It was decided that work on this should begin with the next general synod.

No general synod was held between 1595 and 1602, but this period saw the production of two major liturgical works in Minor Poland: Krzysztof Kraiński’s liturgy of 1599 and the revised edition of 1602. The successful introduction of the revised book of 1602 throughout all the districts of Minor Poland encouraged the notion that the time was ripe to begin work on a common agenda. The Church of Minor Poland invited the Bohemian Brethren and the Lutherans to attend a general convocation to be held in Belżyce on October 18, 1603 to begin the work. The

---


322 “O ceremonijach, zwłaszcza przy sprawie Wieczerzy Pańskiej, pożądliwą by to a bardzo dobra rzecz była, żeby po wszystkich państwach Korony Polskiej we wszystkich ewangelickich kościołach jednakimi ceremoniami Wieczerza Pańska sprawowana była. A owszem nie barzo by trudno tego dowieść, ile się tyczą samych ministrów a baczniejszych ludzi, lecz iż pospólstwo a ludzie prości odmianną obrzędów kościelnych wielce by się obrażali a do ceremonij zwyczajowi swemu przeciwnych zgoła by się przywieść nie dali, a gdzieby więc w tym mieli być niewoleni a przymuszeni, snadź by przyjść musiało do używania dyscypliny a kaźni kościelnej przeciwko nim. Ale to dla pozwierzchnych obrzędów bić a trapić ludzi pobożnych nie jest wola Pańska ani pierwszego szczyrego. kościoła krześcięciańskiego zwyczaj. Przeto ceremonije swobodzie krześcijańskiej darujemy a wolno puszczamy, żeby stojąc abo klęcząc ludzie wierni sakramentu Ciała i Krwi Pańskiej pożywali.” *Akta synodów III* 1983, 40.

323 *Akta synodów III* 1983, 166.
Lutherans did not attend and the Bohemian Brethren who attended - Maciej Rybiński, Jan Turnowski and Marcin Gracjan Gertych - were only interested observers. The result was that the proposed general convocation became only a district convocation of the Reformed Church in Minor Poland, capable only to make recommendations. It was decided that the matter of the creation of the common agenda and hymnal should be brought before the general convocation to be held in Baranów, on May 1, 1604. The Bohemian Jan Turnowski was assigned the task of studying the hymnals and the liturgies of the three bodies in order to create common hymnal and agenda suitable for use in all three churches. The results of this work were to be presented for discussion in Baranów.

The strong hopes held out for the meeting at Baranów in 1604 were frustrated from the start. Neither the Lutherans nor the Lithuanian Reformed attended the meeting. Discussions were held, but only between Reformed Church of Minor Poland and the Bohemian Brethren of Major Poland. It was decided to postpone any further work on catechisms, hymnals and liturgical materials until after the new edition of the Bible had been published. Meanwhile ministers so gifted should continue their work of preparing such material with the final goal that one common form should be agreed. The hope was expressed that this goal could be reached at the next general convocation. Special attention was given to the development of a common form for the celebration and the distribution of the Holy Communion. A comparison of the several liturgies showed that all were of the same mind with regard to the need to produce a common form. Because no Lutherans were present and the Brethren could not act without the advice and consent of their synods and seniors, it was decided to postpone action for a short time, until with God's help the work could be completed.

324 “Iż na konwokacji przyszłej w Baranowie mówić mają bracia o jednej formie sakramentów szafowania i o jednym kancjonale wedle którego nabożeństwo w kościelech tak konfesji helweckiej i czeskiej, jako i auspurckiej mogło być odprawowane, przetoż poruczyśmy br. x. Janowi Turnowskimi, aby wzięwszy trzy formy i trzy kancjonala trzech konfesji, spisał jedną formę i kancjonał jeden. Którą pracą, da Pan Bóg, ma z sobą przynieść ad diem l Maii do Baranowa ku przejrzeniu.” Akta synodów III 1983, 257.

325 “Na koniec konferowaliśmy z sobą o porównaniu we zborach zwierzchnich obrzędów i jednostajnym zażywaniu ceremonii w odprawowaniu nabożeństwa, a zwłaszcza przy sakramencie Pańskich, i z łaskiej Bożej doznaliśmy, iżemy wszysty zgodnie z jedności i zniesienia tych rozności w kościele Bożym skłonni. Ale iż nie mogli bracia wielgopolscy nic o tym bez synodu swego i zezwolenia inszych kolegów swych (także przeci(115,179),(869,859)
The wide ranging aims of the Convocations of Bełżyce and Baranów were unrealistic. The Lutheran rejection of the Reformed overtures clearly shows that they no longer thought unification to be workable. According to Lutheran principles, a liturgy expresses the church’s confession of faith. To fabricate a rite without theological agreement on the doctrine of the sacrament would be to build upon a weak foundation that would soon crumble. No real agreement had been achieved in this area between the Reformed and Lutherans. The Reformed recognized this by stating on September 22, 1616 in the Church-wide Synod at Bełżyce that there was a unity of faith with the Lutherans even though there was a diversity in rituals. Only the Bohemian Brethren and Reformed were willing to proceed with the common project, but it would be almost three decades before the two groups would sit together and formulate a common agenda.

The period between 1602 and 1613 was one of adjustment as Calvinist parishes in Minor Poland came more and more into line with the new form. With both its strengths and the weaknesses becoming evident, by 1613 the time was right for the formulation and publication of a revised liturgy. This matter came to the attention to the Church-wide Synod and General Convocation of Bełżyce on September 19-24, 1613. There the publication of a new agenda was authorized and signed by Franciszek Stankar, Superintendent of Minor Poland and Senior of Kraków, Jakub Pabianovius, Senior of Sandomierz, Jan Chocimowski, Senior of Ruś and Podole, Krzysztof Krański, Senior of Bełź, Wołyn, and Kijev, Bartłomiej Bythner, Senior of Zator and Oświęcim, Jan Grzybowski Senior of Lublin and Chełm.327

The Porządek nabożeństwa of 1614 still built upon the initial work of Krański and represented the seasoned practices of the Holy Communion in the Reformed congregations. The form of the Lord’s Supper is similar to that of the 1602 and shows increased conformity to Reformed traditions. Lasco's recommendation of a two week period of preparation reemerges in this liturgy. The recitation of the Last Supper narrative is reduced to those sentences pertaining directly to Christ’s Words over the bread and cup. The Agnus Dei is permitted, but not required. Where used, it

326 “Reasumujemy kanony synodów generalnych i prowincjalnych o konsensie z bracią konfesyjej augustańskiej, aby był zachowany in omnibus provinciis Regni, salva unitate fidei in diversitate rituum…” Akta synodów III 1983, 375.

327 Porządek nabożeństwa 1614, Przedmowa.
is sung at the Offiara, rather than at communion. The more important change is found in the formula for the distribution. The words “in faith” are used at the minister’s self-administration, thus indicating that the communicants also receive the heavenly substance by faith, although the words ‘in faith’ at the distribution of the bread and wine to the communicants are not repeated. Provision is made for the repetition of the consecration should extra supplies be needed. The 1599 liturgy had made this provision, but 1602 book had made no mention of it. This order of the Lord's Supper would prove to be a major development in the maturing of Reformed liturgical worship in Minor Poland until the publication of the Great Gdańsk Agenda.

The new liturgy was adopted unanimously throughout Minor Poland, but in actual practice in some places the ministers ignored it. The synods often had to remind the congregations and clergy that they were to use the officially prescribed services. Protocols of the visitation of Aleksandrowice on September 25-26, 1616, indicate some laxity in practice, and some departures from the uniformed provisions.328 Again on September 27, 1624 the Church-wide Synod at Gliniany called upon the congregations to follow the practices stipulated in the agenda, especially with reference to the Holy Communion.329 In the District Synod at Ożarów on July 9-11, 1627 the clergy were reminded to follow the 1614 agenda and not depart from it in the celebration of the sacraments.330

The Minor Polish Church continued to hold out to the goal of unifying rites and ceremonies with the Church in Major Poland. The outcome of the convocations at Będzycie and Baranów in 1603-1604 indicated that only the Reformed and Bohemian Brethren were willing to cooperate in efforts to establish a common liturgy. Even then, the high hopes expressed in the protocols did not come to immediate fruition, and both groups continued to use their own separate agendas. The Bohemian Brethren again directed the attention of the convocation, which met at Ostroróg on February 23, 1608, to the need for the unification of hymnals, agendas, and catechisms. It was moved that the matter should be thoroughly aired at the next synod, however, this intention was not acted upon.331 At the meeting of the seniors at Ostroróg on October 26, 1611, the Bohemian Brethren announced their intention to

329 Akta synodów III 1983, 462.
330 Akta synodów III 1983, 496.
331 “Namowę o jedności pieśni, agend, katechizmów etc. odkładamy do blisko przyszłego synodu.” Akta synodów IV 1997, 186.
proceed with the revision and publication of their own agenda.\textsuperscript{332} The work was assigned to the Senior Maciej Rybiński (†1612), with instructions that he keep in close contact with Jan Turnowski (†1629). Subsequently, at the Convocation on January 25, 1612, in Koźminek it was resolved that the Polish language agenda of the Bohemian Brethren should be brought into conformity with the Czech agendas and only then should it be submitted for publication.\textsuperscript{333} Although it is known that a Czech language agenda was published in Königsberg in 1612,\textsuperscript{334} we have no information concerning the publication of a Brethren agenda in the Polish language.\textsuperscript{335} It is most likely that the Königsberg 1612 agenda, which is a reprint of a 1580 book, was in fact published by the Bohemian Brethren of Major Poland, because the Prayer of Thanksgiving after communion appears in the Great Gdańsk Agenda of 1637 in Polish translation as an alternative Prayer of Thanksgiving.\textsuperscript{336}

The matter of the unification of rites was taken up again in 1613 at the Church-wide Synod and General Convocation in Bełżyce. The Reformed specifically asked that the Bohemians abandon their traditional practice of using Communion hosts and placing the sacrament into the communicants mouth and instead adopt the ‘scriptural’ practice of the Reformed of breaking the bread and giving it into the hands of communicants. Bohemian seniors were asked to discuss this matter and arrive at a God-pleasing decision which would make the unification of the rites possible. A copy of a manuscript by the Daniel Mikołajewski,\textsuperscript{337} Senior of the Calvinist Church in Kujavia, Major Poland, was given to them to persuade them of the correctness of the Calvinist practice.

\textsuperscript{332} “Rewidowanie i w druk podanie agend naszych zostawiu się w ręku br. M[acieja] Rybinijusa, senijora, żeby się za okazyją teraźniejszą z br. Turnowski o to namówić, a co by w tej mierze najlepszego być nalaż, do skutku przywiódł.” Akta synodów IV 1997, 238.
\textsuperscript{333} “Agendy polskie br. Maciej senior ma podlug czeskich konformować tym sposobem, jako się tu namowa stała, a potem do druku mają być podane.” Akta synodów IV 1997, 242.
\textsuperscript{334} Agenda při Wečerí Pánu. Zpravená a wytisstěná, [w Kralicích], Léta Krystova M.DC.XII. This book is held by the Morawský zemský archiv v Brně, acquisition number: Přiv k č. 53.
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Proposals that work should be done on a common rite were no more than proposals. The work was not undertaken. The Bohemian Brethren were very circumspect. While speaking about the desirability of a unified rite, they continued to work on their own Bohemian Rites. The Calvinists did the same. The Bohemians in attendance at the funeral of Stanisław Latalski at Izbica on November 25-26, 1619, took time to discuss the matter of common rites among themselves. While remaining open to the discussion of new ceremonies, they determined that the long standing traditions of their church in Holy Communion and other rites should be kept.

The initiative for further work came unexpectedly within a few years from the Lithuanian Reformed Church. In 1621 the Lithuanians published their own Forma to be used in all their parishes. At the Synod in Vilnius in 1622 Duke Krzysztof Radziwiłł presented his 15 point proposal for a program of reformation. Among the points was a call for the immediate commencement of work on the unification of all ceremonies to bring the Lithuanian and Polish into agreement. The Lithuanians were not enthusiastic about these proposals but because of the great stature of the presenter the synod enacted the proposal.

The Lithuanians were reticent to embark on such a program, because they were generally satisfied with the form of worship which they had been using. Their liturgical provisions had been in place for over sixty years and on this basis a distinctive liturgical tradition had grown which was in many respects quite different from practices in Minor Poland. In addition, their own Podlassian District had aroused negative feelings in the rest of the Lithuanian Church by their adoption of the liturgical forms of their neighboring Minor Polish Reformed Church and their generally independent attitudes. Intolerable to the majority of the Lithuanian Reformed was the use of liturgical terms and melodies reminiscent of Roman Catholicism, with which they wanted nothing to do. On the other hand they had

339 “Tylko żeby puriores ceremoniae nie tylko oprymowane nie były, ale żeby i tam, kiedy wniesione, zachowane były, a gdzie by Bóg drogę pokazał, wprowadzone ad aedificationem Ecclesiae żeby były, z tym jednak dokładem, aby i dawniejse, kiedy by aedificationis spes nie była, zachowane były, z strony Wieczery Pańskiej ceremonije i inny zwyczajny rząd Jednoty calo zostawiając.” Akta synodów III 1983, 347.
340 Akta synodów 1915, 71-72.
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only four published liturgical forms, whereas the life of the church required many more.

In agreement with Radziwiłł’s proposal, the Lithuanians called for the convening of a general synod to pursue the matter. However the Minor Poles responded that the proposed date of the synod was not suitable to them. We see no indications that the Lithuanians were willing to pursue the matter further. They did not rescind the invitation, but apparently they believed that they had done all that ought to do to in response to Radziwiłł’s directive and left the matter on the table for action at some future date.

By this time the Minor Polish agendas had reached not only the Lithuanian Podlassian District but the congregations in Major Poland as well. We do not know to what extent the Minor Polish agendas were influential in Major Poland, but it is reasonable to assume that there was some agreement between the usages of Minor Polish Church and Reformed Church in Kujavia, as we saw in the case where the Minor Polish Reformed recommended to the Bohemians that they examine the agenda which had been prepared by Daniel Mikołajewski. It was probably some cross fertilization between the Minor and Major Polish Churches with respect of the their liturgical usages.

In 1626 Superintendent Jan Grzybowski invited the Lithuanians to attend the synod in Będzyce to discuss the unification of catechisms, prayer books, hymnals and agendas. A delegation was appointed with strict instructions not to depart from "the ceremonies of our Lithuanian Church". Once again, while outwardly expressing interest in unification of the rites, the Lithuanians were concerned to hold the line in maintaining its own unique tradition. Action was taken in 1627 to prohibit the use of hymnals and liturgical forms other than those provided in the 1621 Vilnius Catechism. The only exception to this rule was that Minor Polish sources could be used in cases not provided for in the Lithuanian Catechism.

Eight years passed before any action was taken. A new group of ethnically Czech Moravian Brethren had arrived in Poland after 1629. They brought with them liturgical ceremonies and rites unique to their group, and distinct forms used by the
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Brethren already in Major Poland. In the Synod of April 1632 in Leszno, Bohemian Brethren expressed their strong desire that a consensus and union be established between the Polish and Lithuanian Reformed, the newly arrived Brethren immigrants, and themselves. They called for the seniors to take responsibility for formulating agreements concerning liturgical rites and to produce materials to be used in all the churches. We have no record of a response from the seniors but within a short time the Bohemian Brethren sent an official communication from their synod to the Minor Polish Church stating their position on the matter. They thought the proposed program to be important and resolved to pursue it on condition that hymns, catechisms, and agendas be made uniform. They proposed that a synod be called in the near future to include the delegations consisting of two clergymen and one laymen from each church to discuss, decide and finally implement the resolution.347

It was suggested that the meeting be held in Stara Wieś in Major Poland in territory administered by Radziwill. Great initiative was shown by the ministers of Bohemian Brethren, especially those who served in Minor Polish areas. Their voices prevailed in the Synod of Ostroróg on April 13, 1633, where they asked for meeting with the Minor Polish and Lithuanian Churches at a date and time to be mutually agreed. In 1633, shortly after Easter at a meeting in Leszno the senior clergy stated their approval of further contacts, but insisted that the Czech Moravian Brethren must be included in any plans for unification of rites.348

The Minor Polish Reformed Church responded positively to the Bohemian overtures. Superintendent Tomasz Wegierski sent letters to both the Lithuanians and Bohemians suggesting that a general convocation be held in Orla, Podlassia on August 24, 1633. The initiatory letter was received by the Bohemians early in May.349 The initial response of the Bohemians Senior Jan Rybiński (†1638) indicates some reluctance to become involved in this endeavor, but the general enthusiasm for the project among the clergy soon overcame his hesitancy. In his official response he noted that despite some minor misgivings he and his church would move ahead. They would send delegates to the proposed meeting with the hope, that conformity in rites might indeed result. He further asked that he be informed whether or not this date was agreeable to the Lithuanians.350
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The Lithuanians discussed this matter in their 1633 Synod in Vilnius and agreed that the unification of rites is a pressing need of God's church. The proposed date was acceptable to them, and they chose delegates. The delegates were instructed to make certain that the rites agreed to were simple and pure, thereby indicating that they preferred their simple style of worship to the more highly developed Minor Polish forms which they suspected were rather too ‘Catholic.’ At the same time they decided again to ratify the *Sandomierz Consensus* with the Lutheran. Were the Lutherans not willing to subscribe to such a reaffirmation, there should at least prevail a spirit of brotherly love between the two groups.\(^{351}\)

The Minor Polish Church elected their delegates in the Church-wide Synod at Oksza on April 28, 1633, but we are given no clear picture of what preparatory measures they may have taken for the meeting. Since the Minor Polish Church had a rich liturgical tradition and it was evident that their agendas would serve as the basis for common rite, it appears that they did not think that it needed to do further preparatory work. Delegates to the convocation included Superintendent Tomasz Wegierski, Tomasz Petricius (†1641), Senior of Belz, Minister Wojciech Węgierski, and Lay Patron Mikołay Ossoliński.\(^{352}\)

It was the Bohemian Brethren who devoted themselves to the most extensive and careful preparation for the convocation. In July 1633 at the Synod in Leszno the two Bohemian groups, the Bohemian and Czech Moravian Brethren chose their delegates. Three leading churchmen, Mikołajewski, Cyrillius, and Paliurus, had died since the important 1632 synod, and only Moravian Senior Jerzy Erast was still alive. Many in the 1633 gathering indicated that they had questions about what had actually been decided and to what they had committed themselves at the earlier meeting. It was decided that it was now too late to pull out or to reconsider, and they should move forward and participate fully. They stated that for sixty years the Lutherans had frustrated their attempts to formulate common ceremonies and a united church. Now they could at last move ahead and achieve unity with the Reformed. Thus two great confessions would become one. Under the present circumstances it would be better to move forward than to move back. Only if the St. Bartholomew’s meeting at Orla should proof a failure would they hold back.\(^ {353}\) They designated as delegates Marcin
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Orminius, Senior of the Church in Major Poland, Consenior Jakub Memoratus, Minister Jan Bythner, and Lay Patron Maciej Głośkowski, thus following the same pattern as the Minor Polish Church. The delegates were instructed to pay specially close attention to matter of the unification the Hymnal and Agenda. A common catechism would be less likely to create problems. Further, no changes were to be allowed concerning internal ecclesiastical structure and polity. Should these matters arise, the Brethren delegates would be expected to support the traditional Brethren position on these matters, since only the unification of rites and ceremonies was to be discussed. It was further stated that final acceptance of the decisions at Orla must be left to the Bohemian Synod.354

The Bohemians gave primary attention to the order for the Lord's Supper and expressed particular concern about the form of confession to be used.355 Kraiński had included a specific form of confession, however he did not give the form of the prayer to be used. The 1602 agenda also had provided no confession prayer, and the 1614 book as well included the recommendations but provided no form. The Bohemians wanted a settled form. Their views of the Lord's Supper were such that they did not want this matter left to the discretion of the local clergy and the congregations. They affirmed the practice of a two day preparation for the celebration and the reception of the Holy Communion with special emphasis being given to bodily fasting and they traditional practice of using the host instead of ordinary bread.356

Armed with the authorization and the recommendations of the groups they represented, the delegates convened in Orla on St. Bartholomew, August 24, 1633, for the purpose of unifying the Catechisms, Hymnals and Agendas of their respective churches. The progress of the negotiation are not given; the protocols reflect only the conclusions reached by the delegates. They agreed that Kraiński's work should serve as the agenda's basis. Size, script and title, and outward form of the new book should match that of the 1614 agenda, which they refer to as ‘Kraiński's’ work.357 Forms were prepared for the pastoral acts, including Baptism, Churching of Women, Lord's Supper, Communion of the Sick, Holy Matrimony, Confirmation and Admission to Holy Communion (separate forms for the Confirmation of Children, Adults, and a
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form for the Reception of Converts, such as Jews, Turks, Tatars, Arians, etc.), the Ministry of the Keys relating to Discipline and Excommunication, Reception of Penitents, Visitation of the Sick, and Burial of the Dead. Most of these forms were taken from the 1614 agenda, with only minor changes. The title of the agenda should be *Porządek Nabożeństwa etc., przez Starsze Zborow Reformowanych Koronnych y Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego.*

Tomasz Wegierski, Superintendent of Minor Poland, was assigned the task of preparing the Preparatory Service on the Day before Communion in consultation with the other two superintendents. The work of preparing the orders of Repentance and Excommunication was given to Lithuanian Superintendent Andrzej Dobrzański (†1640). He was also made responsible for the Rite of Divorce, and the introductions to the Hymnal and the Agenda. By Lithuanian request it was decided to omit the Calendar and its explanation. Each participating church should pay 150 Zlotych to defray the costs of preparing and printing of the Agenda and Hymnal. Each church was asked to conform these arrangements in its own church-wide synod.

The protocols of the General Convocation of Orla show that the momentous decision to pursue the work of unifying the rites, hymnals and catechisms of the Bohemian Brethren, the Lithuanians and Minor Poles was accomplished easily with no dissention. When one considers the years of work and the long held hopes which lay behind the decisions made at Convocation at Orla, one may be surprised that these three distinct liturgical traditions should determine to move ahead to merge their worship life and its expression after only few days of general discussion. It is evident that each of the three groups had to make many compromises. This is especially true of the Lithuanians, who agreed to surrender their simple and stark form of Holy Communion for the foreign and far richer liturgical service of Minor Poland. It is evident that it was the urgings of Duke Radziwill which moved them to take this path. Up until the day of the convocation he repeatedly urged them to pursue this desirabe task to its completion. In a letter addressed to the convocation
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Radziwill expressed his heartfelt joy that this decisive step had now been taken to glory of God and to the good of the church.\textsuperscript{364}

Work on the preparation of the forms for the new agenda was put in the hands of the Reformed from Minor Poland and the Lithuanians. The Bohemian Brethren took no active role. Outwardly it appeared that they were in complete agreement with the Minor Poles and Lithuanians and felt that active participation was unnecessary. Indeed the Brethren willingly put the preparation of the new rites into the hands of Minor Polish Superintendent Tomasz Wegierski. He had been raised as a member of their church and was well acquainted with their traditions and liturgical practices. Further, he had been invited to accept the position of first senior in the Bohemian Church after the death of Paweł Paliurus (†1632).\textsuperscript{365} Consequently the Bohemians felt that their interests were well represented. However he did not enjoy such a uniformly high regard in Minor Poland, where the extent of his loyalty to Calvinistic rites and ceremonies was suspect. At the Synod of the Lublin District in April, 1634 at Kock a comparison of his forms with those of Krajński showed that he leaned toward the Brethren. The Lublin clergy, however, favored Krajński's provisions.\textsuperscript{366}

First reactions to the decisions of the Orla Convocation came from the Bohemians at the Synod of Ostroróg in May, 1634. Here the ministers publicly expressed their strong desire that the work be completed as quickly as possible. The higher clergy, however, expressed some reluctance at this regard. The ministers, however, enthusiastically responded that even though the liturgy was still unpublished they were ready to introduce the new forms in their congregations. One such innovation was the practice of standing during the singing of the Introit. Perhaps the most significant innovation was the substitution of unleavened bread for the host and the practice of breaking of the bread which they called \textit{essentiae ritum}. This was not a small change. It indicates that they have acquiesced to the Calvinist understanding that Christ's command "This do" calls for an imitation of Christ's actions in the Supper, thus moving away from exclusive concentration on eating and drinking to a more comprehensive imitation of what Christ is understood to have done and required. The synod resolved to communicate to both the Minor Poles and
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then to the Lithuanians their desire that the book be published as soon as possible after the seniors have reviewed and approve its provisions.\textsuperscript{367}

In a letter to a Minor Polish synod, Bohemian Senior Rybiński asked that no impediments be allowed to interfere with the immediate publication of the work. He expressed his hope that the synod formally affirm the work that had been done and that a convocation of the three churches be called to meet at Toruń to make a final decisions without further correspondence or delay.\textsuperscript{368}

Although Rybiński's May 12 letter did not arrive in time to be red and considered, the Church-wide Synod of Bełżyc, held on May 18, 1634, was evidently of the same mind. They approved the Orla decisions and moved that a general convocation be held at Włodawa on September 22, 1634. Superintendent Węgierski’s work was approved and the delegates were appointed to attend the coming meeting. Among them were ten clergy, including seniors and ministers from every district and seven laymen: Jerzy Rzeczyski, Zbigniew Gorajski, Samuel Bolesstraszycki, Walerian Otwinowski, Mikołaj Dębicki, and Jan Firlej.\textsuperscript{369}

The work was positively received in the Vilnius Synod in 1634. It may seem strange that most attention at the synod was given to second part of the agenda, the secondary rites, rather then the Communion service which held so much meaning for the people. The Lord's Super contained within it many features with which the Lithuanians were unfamiliar and some toward which they might exhibit outright hostility. At Orla they had expressed willingness to adopt the new service which was a clear departure from their traditional Communion liturgy, which went back to the time of Johannes a Lasco. However, it was not here that discussions found their center. Rather, they strongly objected to the provision which allowed catechists to perform baptisms and celebrate Communion as though they were ministers of the church. Nor did they agree to the notion that in that case lay district seniors should be ordained to their positions. Further disagreements included some of the provisions for parish visitations by seniors and superintendents and innovations in the marriage rite. They believed the ceremony of installation of regional superintendents to be unnecessary, and they stated that the required examination of candidates for ordination should take place in the synod of the church and not before the
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congregation. The tone of their criticisms was quite strident and showed that on some of these matter at least they were not willing to compromise in the convocation.\textsuperscript{370} Perhaps at this point the Lithuanians were expressing some fear about losing their own distinct identity as a national church. They had been caught up in the enthusiasm at the moment, but now with the objective results of the program to which they had agreed before them they were beginning to wonder whether the gains would as great as the loose.

On September 22, 1634, representatives of the three churches met at Włodawa as planned for their final deliberations on the new agenda. The proceedings at Włodawa are known to us through the report of the Bohemian delegates to their next Synod, which was held on February 27, 1635 at Leszno. According to their report, on the first day the order of business was set. Permission was given for Czecz-Moravians to participate, as Senior Jan Amos Comenius (†1670) had requested. The delegation of Bohemian Brethren consisted of Marcin Orminius, Jan Rybiński, Paweł Orlicz (Orlicius) (†1649), Jan Bythner, who represented Czech Moravian Brethren. Jan Amos Comenius and Adam Hartman were also in attendance as representatives. The delegates gave the impression that proceeding did not go as easily as in Orla. Each group was bound to the close instructions of the synods which had sent them.\textsuperscript{371}

As the Lithuanian Church had asked, discussions were primarily centered in the second part of the agenda. Representatives discussed ecclesiastical hierarchy, especially the respective offices and responsibilities of the deacons, ministers, and superintendents, ordination and installation forms and related matters. Complete consensus on these matters could not be achieved. In some cases where no agreement could be reached each group, would continue to follow its own tradition, and the appropriate alternative forms would be included in the agenda. Dobrzański was again assigned the responsibility of finishing of the divorce rite, and the preface to the hymnal and agenda. The provisions for the Calendar, which had been dropped at Orla at the insistence of Lithuanians, were now reintroduced, indicating that all parties were willing to make at least minor compromises.\textsuperscript{372} The fifth canon, \textit{De Adiaphoris}, allowed for external ceremonies in the administration of the Lords
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Supper to be regarded as Adiaphora and allowed the churches certain liberties with references to them.\textsuperscript{373} There are no further references to rite of the Holy Communion which later would prove to be a major obstacle to the acceptance of the new book in Lithuania.

600 copies of the new book were ordered to be printed by Hünefeldt in Gdańsk; thus the work has come to be known as the Great Gdańsk Agenda. Each church agreed that after publication they immediately would purchase the number of copies assigned to them: 300 to Lithuania, 200 to Minor Poland, and 100 to Major Poland.\textsuperscript{374} The work of arranging for the publication was assigned to the Bohemian Brethren. Similar arrangements were made concerning the publication of the Hymnal.

All groups came away from the convocation feeling that as a result of the candid and sometimes difficult discussions real agreement had been achieved and the work would now go forward unimpared. All that now would be required would be final ratification of their work by the synods.

The Lithuanians were satisfied with the results of the general convocation, and the Synod at Vilnius in 1635 accepted the work unanimously with thanksgiving to God. It was decided that a copy of the proceedings be placed in the archives both as a commemoration of the event and as a research document. It was resolved to pay the Lithuanian portion of the costs for publication and to distribute the new agendas and hymnals to ministers for use in their congregations.\textsuperscript{375}

It was decided at Włodawa that henceforth the superintendents of the three participating churches should meet annually at Toruń, Orla, and Włodawa. The first such meeting was held in Toruń on October 18, 1636 for the purpose of making the final decision concerning the works which have been approved by the participating churches. The forms prepared by Dobrzanski and Węgierski, were corrected by Jan Amos Comenius, Piotr Zimmerman, Paweł Orlicz, Jan Hiperek, and Adam Hartman as evidence of the great faith and careful study of those who had prepared this
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work.\textsuperscript{376} Arrangements were made for printing 1000 copies of the Hymnal, 800 copies of the Prayer Book and 600 copies of the agenda.\textsuperscript{377} Paweł Orlicz put forward the needed payment in return for the promissory notes of the churches. The project had reached its completion, and it appeared to all that the results of the labors which had first began over sixty years before at Sandomierz at least partly had been reached their successful conclusion.

The Hünefeldt Publishing House in Gdańsk begun work on the new agenda immediately. By May 19, the date of the Synod of Bohemian Brethren in Leszno, enough of the first part had been completed for preliminary materials to be put into the hands of all participants. The delegates were most gratified and looked forward the early completed of the entire work in time for it to be distributed to all the clergy in the autumn visitation.\textsuperscript{378} The new agenda came into the immediate use among the Brethren, and beginning with 1638 the Ordination of Acolytes, Deacons, and Ministers was made according to the new order.\textsuperscript{379}

The Church-wide synod of the Minor Poles in Bełżyce on September 25-29, 1637 received the work with thanksgiving and unanimously moved the acceptance of the already completed agenda, hymnal, and prayer book. The Minor Poles emphatically stated that the agenda was to be used in every parish of every district.\textsuperscript{380}

The Great Gdańsk Agenda was the most comprehensive liturgical book produced in Poland since the Reformation. It was very detailed and its service of Lord’s Supper was more highly developed than any earlier rite. Mostly important it was produced as a result of the collaborative efforts of the representatives of the Major and Minor Polish Churches and the Lithuanian Church. While generally standing in the Lasco tradition, it was clearly a Polish work in that it builds on the foundation of the earlier Minor Polish agendas and incorporates many features peculiar to that tradition.

The Communion service consists in two sections. The first is a form for the preparation for those who intend to come to the Lord’s Supper, and the second is the form of the Communion service itself. For the first time a complete and detailed order is given for the service of preparation on the Day before Communion. It
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includes the Invocation to Triune God, the Call to Self-Examination, the form of Public Examination, the Admonition to turn from darkness and walk in the light, the Confession of Sins, words assuring the sincere penitents of their forgiveness, and the Enrolment of the Communicants. The dominant note throughout is one of encouragement and reassurance. Sinners who sincerely hope for forgiveness are assured that they are forgiven and those who registered their intention to come to the Lord’s Table are assured that their names are also written in heaven.381

The form of the Lord’s Supper structurally runs in line with the agendas of 1599, 1602, and 1614. Some sections have been reworked or otherwise moved around. The Lord’s Prayer has been mowed to a place before the Invitation to God’s Table and the Agnus Dei, which in 1599 and 1602 proceeded the Breaking of the Bread, and 1614 the Words of 1 Corinthians 5, is now placed much earlier in the service in connection with the Confession of Sins. Lasco practice of the separate communion, a feature in all Minor Polish agendas is perpetuated. The Distribution Formula follows the wording of the 1614 rite, with the omission of the minister’s words and his self communion “In faith I eat …” The words of the Communion Blessing are new. Newly introduced are Lasco’s Words of Consolation and Encouragement after communion which are found in all Lithuanian rites. An additional new element not found in any earlier agendas is the Admonition to live true Christian life which precedes the Benediction.382

In one important respect the agreement made at Włodawa was not followed. At that convocation it had been agreed that the title of the book was to be called Porządek Nabożeństwa. When the book appeared the name on the title page read Agenda álbo Forma Porządku... instead. The term ‘Agenda’ in the title had not previously been used in Polish or Lithuanian liturgical books, but it was a common usage among the Bohemians, who were responsible for the printing. It seems likely that this change was made by them.

The book was immediately put to use throughout both Minor and Major Poland.383 The Minor Polish Church-wide Synod again gave its official approval to
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the work in its meeting on September 24-26, 1638, at Krasnobreć and on September 23-26, 1639, at Oksza. In the face of reticence of some clergy to use the new book, the Church-wide Synod at Chmielnik on September 28, 1640 provided an incentive for reticent ministers by resolving to impose penalties upon those who did not use the new work.

Lithuania presents us with a different picture. Here from the start one obstacle after another was raised to prevent the acceptance of the new work. Even before the publication of the whole book, when the delegates became acquainted with the contents of the first 310 pages of the book put before them in the June 1637 Synod at Vilnius, they were appalled by its contents and immediately protested. The Polish Reformed and Bohemian Brethren were puzzled and chagrined by this development. The Lithuanians had in effect rejected a work in which they had been major contributors. They appeared to be turning their back on the work which they had earlier so enthusiastically supported and subscribed not only in the General Convocations at Orla and Włodawa, but also in their 1634 and 1635 Synods in Vilnius. Seven years of delicate negotiation would be needed before a solution to this impasse could be found. An accompanying work Akt usługi published in 1644 in Lubicza went far to answer the Lithuanians grievances.

In retrospect, we note that liturgical work did not begin until long after the Reformation was first planted in Poland. No effective work could be done until the Polish congregations had reached some tentative consensus concerning the theology of the sacraments. This work could not even be begun until the church had dealt with internal theological divisions caused by the Anti-Trinitarians and other radical groups. In addition to the clarification to its own theology, the Reformed had also to seek an approach to the Lutherans and the Bohemians Brethren. This was accomplished in the meetings which led to the Sandomierz Consensus in 1570 and the Reformed Confession of Sandomierz which soon followed. Here the Polish Reformed doctrine of the sacraments was finally formulated, to be further refined over the period of the next two decades. The appearance at the end of the century of Kraiński’s work represents the fruit of these decades of struggle. The refinement of
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384 Synody 1611-1844, 19; Acta Albo Constitucie 1618-1704, 123-128.
385 Księga dystryktowa 1634-1722, 31-32.
386 Księga dystryktowa 1634-1722, 40-41; Gmiterek 1985, 113.
387 Akta Synodów Litewskich 1611-1637; Synody 1611-1844, 13.
388 We will deal more fully with conditions in Lithuania in following section.
the Polish Reformed liturgical tradition would continue through several decades of
the seventeenth century with the publication of agendas in 1602 and 1614 and the
progressive acceptance of their provisions in the congregations. At the end of this
line is the Great Gdańsk Agenda of 1637, usually described as the final and
determinative liturgical production of the Polish Reformed Church. It makes
selective and critical use of the agendas earlier appeared. Despite its antiquated
language, this book continues in use today in the Reformed Churches throughout the
region.

The complete unification of the rites and ceremonies in Poland and Lithuania
was only in some measure achieved. Although the churches had hoped that the time
would come when a single common agenda for all three churches could be published,
these hopes were not to be fulfilled. The churches had to give their primary attention
to other pressing matters. They were in a fight for their own survival against the
onslaughts of the Counter Reformation led by the zealous and energetic Society of
Jesus. In such a situation continued work toward a common agenda had finally to be
laid aside in the hope that one day God would make it possible for them to again take
up this significant work.
2.2. Developments in Sacramental Theology and Liturgical Practice in the Reformed Church of Lithuania

Reformation theology first came to Lithuania through the influence of Germans and Prussians. As was the case in Poland and elsewhere, the first wave of Reformation thought was predominantly Lutheran. The impact of Lutheranism was seen first among the Franciscan monks in Vilnius. As early as 1525 an unnamed Franciscan monk taught Lutheran doctrine in a local church.\(^{389}\) This preaching did not long continue. It was not until 1540 that Lutheran preaching was again heard from the pulpit of St. Anna church, the gathering place of the German speaking community in Vilnius.\(^{390}\) Here the preacher is known to have been Abraomus Culvensis who in that same year established a Lutheran academy in Vilnius, at which some 60 students were tutored in Lutheran doctrine.\(^{391}\) It may be assumed that there was little done to alter the outward form and ceremonies of the liturgy at this time. To do so would have provoked popular reaction by the conservative populist. Culvensis seems to have agreed with the position taken by Lutherans elsewhere that this was not a matter of first concern, for such matters were termed *adiaphora*. Reformation preaching, however, provoked reaction from the ecclesiastical authorities, and Bishop Paulus Algimundus (Algimantas Alšeniškis) called for the immediate suspension of Lutheran preaching at St. Anna church.

Lutheran preaching recommenced with the establishment of the Lutheran parish in Vilnius in 1555. This church was built in the German district of the city and was popularly identified as the German church. From secondary sources we gain the impression that the liturgy of the parish was Saxonian, as was the case also throughout Poland.\(^{392}\) No liturgical books of this period are extant. Earliest published evidence dates only from 1640.\(^{393}\) In this year Pastor Jan Malina published in Vilnius

\(^{389}\) Some historians are of the opinion that this monk was Stanislaus Rapagelanus. This is a conjuncture which has been recently called into question. *Lukšaitė* 1999, 131, 132 fn. 3.

\(^{390}\) *Biržiška* 1960, 46; *Musteikis* 1988, 38.

\(^{391}\) *Lukšaitė* 1999, 136.

\(^{392}\) *Adamowicz* 1855, 42.

\(^{393}\) This source formerly available is now lost. It perished in the destruction caused by WWII, so we can only speculate about the relationship between the Vilnius Lutheran liturgy and the Saxonian liturgies of the period.
a Polish language agenda *Porządek obrzędów zwyczajnych kościoła Augustanskiey Konfessyi* for use throughout the Lutheran parishes in Lithuania.394

Elsewhere, in Samogitia, we see a similar development. In 1536 Catholic Priest Jonas Tartila (†1558) (Tartylowicz Batocki) preached Lutheran doctrine in the parish church in Šilalė, near Tauragė in South Western Lithuania. Nothing is known concerning changes in the liturgy in his parish. Because of persecution by the Samogitian Bishop Wiktoryn Wierzbicki (†1555), he was forced to flee to Prussia, but the promotion of Lutheran doctrine continued in private in that area of the country, under the protection of members of the nobility who opened their estates for Lutheran worship and preaching.395 Before the mid 1540’s several students from the area, under the patronage of Jan Stanisław Bielewicz (Jonas Stanislovas Bilevičius), Starosta of Samogitia, were sent to Königsberg to study Lutheran doctrine at the newly established University.396 At the head of the Faculty of Theology were Dean Stanislaus Rapagelanus and Abraham Culvensis, who had been forced to flee from Vilnius. Both understood the importance of providing worship materials in the language of the Lithuanian speaking people and to this end they translated popular Reformation hymns and Gospel pericopes. Although no liturgical materials of this period have survived we may assume that parts of the Prussian liturgy were also provided in Lithuanian translation. It was the work of Martynas Mažvydas (Martinus Mosvidius), a Samogitian student and later pastor in the Ragnit (Ragainė) parish, which had the greatest impact on both the catechetical and liturgical life of the Lithuanian speaking congregations. The material which he provided in Lithuanian translation was all taken from the Prussian Lutheran Church Orders, which were themselves strongly influenced by the Saxonian orders. Some of the material he included in his Catechism – the Litany, Our Father, Creed (Apostles and Nicene), and Psalms – is given with melodies which enabled both students and parishioners to rapidly become familiar with them and participate more fully in liturgical worship. He later supplemented this early work by publishing the Rite of Baptism, the Ambrosian hymn *Te Deum Laudamus*, Luther’s German litany, the *Paraphrasis*, which consists in an invitation to prayer based on the Our Father and the words of institution as both are found in Luther’s German Mass. Mažvydas *Magnum opus* was

394 *Jocher* 1842, 154.
396 *Biržiška* 1960, 79-80; *Lukšaitė* 1999, 211.
his two volume hymnal *Gesmes Chriksczoniskas* (1566, 1570), which included also the Lithuanian translations of the offices of Matins and Vespers, Introits, Collects, Antiphons, Vesicles and other liturgical materials. This work was destined to leave an indelible mark on Lithuanian teaching and practice. Even Reformed congregations in Lithuania would later come to make use of Mažvydas' hymn translations.397

Lutheran theology and practice did not make deep inroads among Lithuanian people. Only a small number of groups and leading citizens became adherence to Lutheranism. Most notable among these was Jan Radziwiłł (1516-1551) who converted to Lutheranism in 1548-1550 and worshipped as a Lutheran until his untimely death in 1551.398 The sudden increase in popularity of Reformed theology was the result of the decision of Radziwiłł the Black, whose power and authority was exceeded only that of the King himself. Most historians believe that in his earlier years he was attracted to Lutheranism.399 He established Protestant worship, probably Lutheran, at his estate in Brześcę Litewsk in 1533.400 During this same period he became attracted to the theology of the Swiss Reformers and quickly became the leading advocate of Reformed theology and practice throughout Lithuania.401

Radziwiłł’s was a man of immense influence. It was he who determined which path the Lithuanian Reformed church would follow. He was personally interested in all areas of theology and ecclesiology and was concerned to see to it that the Reformed church be clearly cleansed of every taint of the Papal Church. The
summary of his theological and practical ideas is found in his *Confessio fidei*, which he composed as a rebuttal to the papal legate Aloysius Lippomanus, who had publicly accused him of being the flag bearer of the heretics in Lithuania. His *Confessio* is apologetic and polemical in nature. In addition to his ecclesiological notions here he informs us concerning liturgical reform. In addition to his statement that both the bread and cup must be administered to the people, he insists upon the elimination of every inward and outward form of Papal idolatry so that only the pure Gospel remains. All traditional vesture and ceremonies must be eliminated, in imitation of primitive Christianity of the post-apostolic age. Rejected also is any notion of the offering of Christ as a sacrificial victim in the Mass. The sacrificial altar must be replaced by a simple table, and pictures of the saints together with statuary and other ornaments must be allowed no place in the purified church. 402 Most interesting is his sacramental theology, which reveals that already by 1556 he had left Lutheranism behind and traveled theologically from Wittenberg to Geneva. In accordance with Reformed he asserts that the body of Christ may in no way be identified with the earthly bread used in the Lord’s Supper. 403 He further indicates that Christ cannot possibly be physically present on the altar according to his human nature, since that nature is spatially limited to the right hand of God. 404 In any case the flesh of Christ can be of no avail, as he understands Christ himself to say in John 6. 405

Among the close associates and members of Radziwiłł’s entourage we find the man who would take responsibility for shaping the faith and worship of the Reformed church in Lithuania. One of these, Szymon Zacjusz (1507-ca.1591), Radziwiłł appointed to be preacher in his chapel. He received his education at the University of Kraków, earned his Master’s degree and was ordained to the priesthood in the Roman Church. He enjoyed a good reputation as a learned scholar and taught
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402 Lukšaitė 1999, 251.
403 “Quo fit, ut repudiatiu uestrīs eiusmodi idolis & superstitionibus, non latitantem, aut delitescentem in placentis uestrīs, ut uos uultis Iesum Christum Dei & Mariae filium, uerum Deum, & uerum hominem, sed a dextris Deisedentem, ibique cum ipso Patre, perpetuo regnantem, inferiora haec pro placito gubernantem…” *Duae epistolae* 1556, fij.
404 “Sed priuatas uestrīs Missas, in quibus Coenam Domini, ipsum Eucharistiae Sacramentum, turpissime pro fanatis, filium Dei a dextris Patris in fordissimas omnique scelere plenas Sacrificulorum manus, magicis uestrīs incantationibus detrahendum…” *Duae epistolae* 1556, fij.
405 The public dissemination of Radziwiłł’s Confession came through the efforts Petrus Paul Vergerio (†1565), Lutheran bishop and formerly Papal nuncio in attendance at the Diet of Augsburg in June 1530. The publication of this important document had a major impact throughout Lithuania. Любовичь 1883, 174.
for several years in the *Collegium Maius* at the university. He became closely acquainted with Reformation theology, converted to the Protestant faith, and in 1550-1551 was subjected to persecution because of his new theological opinions.\textsuperscript{406} He fled to Brześć Litewsk, where Radziwiłł became his patron and protector.

In the earliest period Reformed preaching was restricted to private estates, but 1557 Radziwiłł determined that time ripe to go public. In that year he brought Zacjusz to Vilnius for the purpose of engaging in public debates and establishing Reformed church in the Capital city.\textsuperscript{407} Between December 14, 1557 and February 15, 1558 a series of public were held at which Zacjusz presented what he termed the “pure” confession of Christian faith. His presentations were published in 1559 under the title *Akta to jest sprawy zboru krześciańskiego Wileńskiego ... 1557*.

These documents, which were directed against the erroneous opinions of the Romans, Lutherans, and sectarians, reveal much about Radziwiłł’s and Zacjusz’s personal convictions concerning the constitution of the church. The *Acta* may be considered a formal Confession of Faith, but it is not the purpose of the author to present the comprehensive confession of the whole body of the Christian doctrine. Instead Zacjusz wished to focus upon the controverted articles, namely the Lord’s Supper and the person and work of Christ, articles which were in strong contention among the Lutheran and Reformed theologians and churches. Notes taken during the debates indicate that some present at the meetings took strong exception to Zacjusz sacramental opinions and defended the Lutheran position on the real presence of Christ in the Sacrament.\textsuperscript{408} It appears that Radziwiłł and Zacjusz regarded the Lutheran community, which had already been established, rather than the Roman church, as their primary focus for mission activity. Evidently they believed that the Reformed church could be established and prosper most easily at the expense of the Lutherans.\textsuperscript{409}

At the third meeting differences concerning the nature of Christ’s presence in the Lord's Supper were addressed. The protocols indicate that some participants confessed the teaching of Christ’s bodily presence in the sacramental species and that the body of Christ is bodily received. In rebuttal Zacjusz presented a sacramental teaching with special reference to Christ’s Words: “This is my body” which was,
according to his words, the true scriptural teaching. After the manner of the Swiss Reformers, he built on the basis of analogous texts a doctrine according to which bread and wine stand as figures representing the body and blood. To clarify his meaning, he made reference to the words: “This cup is the New Testament in my blood” (1 Corinthians 11:25; Luke 22:20). He wondered how a cup could be the New Testament, and discoursed on the phrase: “Where I am, there shall also my servant be” (John 12:26). If Christ were in the bread and in the cup, he posited, then St. Paul and all the apostles must also be bodily present there. Further, if Christ’s Words: “I and my Father are one” (John 10:30) were to be taken literally, then the death of Christ would have to be understood to the death of God. Consequently, we are bound by logic, he asserted, to insist that passages regarding Christ's presence must be taken spiritually or figuratively.

In the meeting on February 15 he turned his attention to the doctrine of two natures in the one person of Jesus Christ. His thesis was that the divine nature is unlimited, but the human nature is limited by its humanness. Therefore, although according to his divine nature Christ can be omnipresent in all places, according in his human nature he is limited to the place to which he has ascended, namely, the right hand of the Father in heaven. The divine nature cannot be circumscribed, enclosed, or hidden. According to Zacjusz, this precludes Christ’s presence in the earthly elements, in which he is said to be circumscribed, enclosed, and hidden. He pointed out that in the Scriptures many things are attributed to the human nature which cannot appropriately be ascribed to the divine nature. Thus to speak of Christ’s death, his descent into hell and other experiences is inappropriate speech if the subject is the divine nature.

In the final meeting Zacjusz summarized his position, stating that reason makes it clear the Christ’s presence in the sacrament must be understood to be figurative in nature. Thus he clearly put himself in the main stream of Reformed sacramental teaching as it had been developed by John Calvin. Those who receive the earthly elements of bread and wine in faith at the same time receive the heavenly

410 “Na they Schadzce Simon z Prossovic superintendens, chcę uczynić dość pismem świętym niekthorym bratom, którzy twierdzili o wieczerzy Pańskiej, aby tam było ścieśnie ciało Pana Christusowo pożywane, podał na piśmie naukę o wykładaniu swiętnego pisma, pod them titulem y themi słowy, iako tu niʒę, a to dla wyrozumienia tych słow: TO JEST CIAŁO moie.” Akta to jest sprawy 1913, 7.
411 Akta to jest sprawy 1913, 10-11.
412 Akta to jest sprawy 1913, 15.
413 Akta to jest sprawy 1913, 11.
body and blood of which the former are mere signs and figures. The fruit of the heavenly blessing is that the communicants offer thanks to God, partake of the pledges of his salvation, and are united spiritually with Christ who by faith lives in them and they in him.414

At the beginning of his lectures Zacjusz had stated that his lectures were directed against the Anabaptists, Libertines, Enthusiasts, Swenkfeldians, the followers of Michael Servetus (1511-1533), and the New Arians. Included also were those who hold an Capernaitic view of the sacrament.415 In the course of the lectures it became evident that his fire was directed specifically against the Pope’s theology and that of the Lutherans. He took aim against both the doctrine of transubstantiation and the teaching that Christ is bodily present under the forms of bread and wine.416 He reiterated the Reformed insistence that the bodily eating would be fruitless, since Christ is not food for the stomach but sacramental food for the soul, which alone is able to apprehend it by faith.417

All this represents a mature Reformed position which with regard to the sacrament is Calvinistic in approach and content. The axiom finitum non capax infiniti reveals itself as a basic principle upon which the relationship between the divine and human nature of Christ and the nature of Christ’s presence in the Supper are to be understood and confessed. His lectures are built in a logically congruent fashion upon his major premise. Only in conclusion does he draw specific attention

414 Akta to jest sprawy 1913, 19-20.
415 “Tak okrutnie nadyma Złudych swoje dudy, Nowokrczence, Libertyny, Enthusiasty, Swenckfeldiusesse, Serwety y Goniądcze nowe Arriany, które za czelnieysse członki w Kościele Krzescianskim miano. Nie mniejysse tez zaburzenie y Kapernaitowie cżinią, które o przitomnosci ciała i krwie panskiey, w nasewithssym sacramencie wiecerzy pańskiey, grube a sprostne mnimania maią, a onych upornie z wielkiem zgorsseniem kościoła wssytkiego bronią.” Akta to jest sprawy 1913, 5.
to the errors of Roman Catholic Transubstantiation, and Lutheran sacramental teaching, it is evident that this conclusion has from the start been his goal. Although it would be quite unfair to characterize Roman and Lutheran sacramental teaching as Capernaitic, he is able to make clever use of this pejorative to characterize the position of his opponents. We may also see this Confession and its conclusions as liturgically significant, in that the importance of frequent Communion celebration and reception receive scant attention. Holy Communion is to be an occasional service, which seals and certifies the forgiveness one has received apart from the Communion itself, rather then the acknowledged normal weekly worship service in the churches. More important then Communion reception is preaching and teaching by which faith is instilled and fortified. Without this faith the celebration and reception of Communion would be of no spiritual value.

In retrospect, historians regard this series of meetings to have been the first synod of Lithuanian Reformed Churches. It was at the third of these sessions on January 18, that, according to the protocols, Zacjusz became the Superintendent of the Vilnius District.\(^{418}\) As Catechist the assembly selected Szymon Budny (1530-1593), who already was espousing an unsound theology and soon became an Anti-Trinitarian. At a Synod on December 15, 1558, in Brześć, a second district was created, testifying to the expanding influence of Reformed Church.\(^{419}\) This was a clear sign of a rapidly expanding network of districts and local churches throughout the region.

As noted above, Lasco had been unsuccessful in his attempt to unite the Reformed and Lutherans in Poland. His public debates in Königsberg in 1558 had been a complete failure. Radziwiłł though that his immense political and social prominence would make his attempts to implement Lasco’s program successful. His vision included also a union which would extend beyond the borders of Lithuania to encompass both the Prussians and the Livonians in a united protestant church.\(^{420}\)

This matter was publicly presented on May 5-9, 1560, at the Synod in Pińczów, in Minor Poland, where Mikołaj Wędrogowski, Superintendent of Vilnius District, spoke of the creation of such a union.\(^{421}\) This would necessitate an easing of
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\(^{421}\) “Nicolaus Wędrogowski publice rogavit istud fieri a nobis, ut significemus ecclesiis de generalibus synodis, adferens praeterea eum affectum inesse alisis provinciis, puta il. principi duci Prussiae et
theological tensions between the groups, especially with reference to Christology and the nature of Christ’s presence in the sacrament. In a letter addressed to the Prussian pastors an attempt was made by the Reformed congregation in Vilnius to establish the goal of the union of their confessions. This letter was received by the Prussians of the 26th of September.422

This letter, entitled De Confessione ministrorum ecclesiae Vilnensis, represents the Confession of Faith of the Vilnius Reformed parish.423 As was the case in the public debates of 1557-1558, attention is directed specifically to the question of Christ’s presence, the adoration of the sacrament, and related matters. The position of the parish is presented on behalf of all, but its author is unknown. This document, which consists of seven articles, is important source material for us regarding the theological position of the Reformed Church in Lithuania in a situation which called for the easing of theological tensions.

In the Confession the congregation says that those who eat and drink in faith receive the true body and true blood of Christ. The use of the term *corpus verum* is not a typical Reformed term, however, in line with the Reformed tradition, it is said that only those who eat and drink in faith receive the body and blood, and unbelievers do not, for its reception is spiritual and available only by faith.424 The second article deals with differences between the Reformed and Lutherans. Christ’s presence is understood to be neither natural nor corporeal, and the body and blood of Christ are said to be only spiritually present, not locally included in the bread and wine. While acknowledging that this terminology is different from that used by Luther, the claim is made that the differences are only minimal and therefore...
insignificant. Without direct mention of either of Roman Catholics or Lutherans, the article goes on to deny any understanding of the sacrament involving a Capernaitic reception or the doctrine of transubstantiation, and states that the impious fail to receive sacramental benefits. In the third article, the adoration of the sacrament is denied. Article six rejects the *ex opere operatio* understanding of the sacrament, and the seventh article again denies that the impious or unfaithful receive the sacrament or its benefits.

It must be said that the general tenor of the document is clearly Reformed and runs in line with the 1557 Confession. However, it should be noted that no mention is made of Christological doctrine and nowhere is the Lutheran position help up to criticism. Instead, the impression is given that differences between the Reformed and the Lutherans with reference to the Supper are of little consequence. The *manducatio oralis* is denied and it is definitely stated that reception is not with the mouth but rather by faith alone.

We have no information concerning how the Prussians may have replied to this document. Perhaps we may rightly expect that those who have failed to be convinced by the arguments of Johannes a Lasco in 1558 remained unmoved by the overtures of the Lithuanian Reformed. Two years later, when Duke Albrecht sought a theological opinion concerning the union between the Reformed and Lutherans, the response of the Faculty of Theology in Königsberg warned him about the Calvinist doctrine of Holy Communion.

It is difficult to determine what liturgies were actually used in the Reformed congregations in Lithuania in the earliest period. The pertinent synodical records, together with the Reformed church building, were destroyed by students of Vilnius
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426 “Sic et vocabulum spiritualiter non in alieno aut impio aliquo sensu hoc loco accipiendum ost, quemadmodum a quibusdam fieri videamus, qui corpus Christi in spiritum commutatum esse fingunt, vel spiritualis praesentiae appellatio sola cogitationen nostram seu recordationem corporis et beneficiorurn Christi intelligent. Sed spiritualis praesentia intelligatur ea, quae coelest ac spirituali seu mystico modo sit, qui modus fide apprehendi potest, ratione autem et intelligentiae nostrae, dum in hac vita versamur, comprehendi nori potest.” *Wotschke* 1911b, 303.

427 *Wotschke* 1911b, 304.

428 *Wotschke* 1911b, 279 fn. 2.
University in 1611, upon the urging of their Jesuit instructors. Consequently, we lack any primary source material and must depend upon second hand reports.

Two students of this period, Józef Łukaszewicz and Joseph Puryckis, who wrote long after the fact, report that Marcin Czechowic (1532-1613), minister of the Reformed congregation in Vilnius, was sent by Radziwill in 1561 to Geneva to meet with John Calvin on matters pertaining to Lithuanian Reformed Church. They report that he brought back to Vilnius the liturgical rites of Calvin's Church in Geneva, and that these were adopted for use in Lithuania. Both of these scholars quote the Socinian Stanisław Lubieniecki to this effect. However, we do not find in the latter's work any clear indication of this report. Further it must be asked whether an established church or group of churches would find it necessary or advisable to so radically alter their present liturgical services. In our examination of Lithuanian liturgies we will find influence of Calvin’s Geneva (1542) and Strassburg (1545) rites, but not to the same extent one might expect from reading the statements of Łukaszewicz and Puryckis.

Reformed influences from outside Lithuania were not lacking. A most important influence was Lasco’s *Forma ac Ratio*, which was introduced in many congregations. Records of the period indicate that Lithuanians were often in attendance at synodical gatherings in Minor Poland during Lasco’s residence there. Further, Lasco was Radziwill’s guest in March 1557, when he traveled to Vilnius for the purpose of meeting the King. We may suppose that their discussions covered not only theoretical matters but practical matters as well. The thesis that Lasco’s liturgical rites in Minor Poland also exercised an influence in Lithuania is defended by Theodor Wotschke. He states that the church order of Minor Poland was introduced into the Lithuanian congregations as a result of the Synod at Włodisław on September 4-15, 1558. It should be noted, however, that we lack the evidence supporting this move. Poland and Lithuania were separate countries, and the Polish synod was not empowered to legislate on behalf the Lithuanian congregations. The protocols of the synod speak only of the importance of uniformity in the public
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432 Lithuanians in their 1581, 1594, 1598, and 1600 Agendas reproduced Calvin’s introductory rubric concerning the observance on the week before communion and on the day of communion together with the form of excommunication from his Geneva (1542) and Strassburg (1545) orders. This, however, cannot be equated to the influence of Lasco’s *Forma ac Ratio* of 1550.
433 Wotschke 1911a, 177.
ministry doctrine and rites in Poland,\textsuperscript{434} although Lithuania, Russia, and Podlassia are also mentioned with reference to a common public confession.\textsuperscript{435} Zacjusz participated in this synod as the delegate from Radziwill and the Podlassian District. However, he is mentioned in the protocols only with reference to the discussion concerning the two natures of Christ.\textsuperscript{436} It is more likely that the influence of Lasco’s rites came gradually over a period of several years as a result of the continuing close contact between the Lithuanians and the Poles. The evidence of Lasco’s influence on the Lithuanian worship will become clear to us later, when we examine the 1581 service of Holy Communion.

The period from 1560 to 1570 was a time of growing dissention caused by the Anti-Trinitarian movements. This dissention was great enough to push problems with the Roman Catholic and Lutheran sacramental teaching to one side, while full attention was given to this issue. Although they denied essential doctrine to the Christian faith, the Anti-Trinitarians strove in every way possible to give the appearance that they were the church which was the legitimate heir of Johannes a Lasco. The form for the celebration of the Lord’s Supper found in Peter Morzkowski’s Socinian Agenda of 1646, almost three quarters of the century after the death of Lasco, is patterned after the \textit{Forma ac Ratio} in its ceremonial detail. The preparation of the table, the manner in which it is set, and the directive that worshipers approach and seat themselves around the Lord’s Table as the disciples were gathered around Jesus follows Lasco’s service in minute detail. Even the admonition which follows words of distribution is based upon the words of Lasco whose Calvinist presuppositions about the nature of Christ’s body are still clearly evident in this Socinian liturgy.\textsuperscript{437}

Since the outward expression of Anti-Trinitarianism was so similar to that of the Reformed church, Polish and Lithuanian people were unable to distinguish properly between them. The Reformed reacted by discarding some of their traditional practices. To disassociate themselves from this movement, the Lithuanian and Polish Reformed both repeatedly directed that communicants should receive communion standing or kneeling. With the passing of time the outward form of worship came to

\textsuperscript{434} \textit{Akta synodów I} 1966, 271.
\textsuperscript{435} \textit{Akta synodów I} 1966, 269.
\textsuperscript{436} \textit{Akta synodów I} 1966, 280.
\textsuperscript{437} \textit{The Polish Brethren} 1980, 468-471.
be so altered that by the end of the 16th century it was no longer recognizably Lasco’s service, but it had become a service which flowed from the Lasco tradition.

Events of the 1570 proved to be very important for the program of unifying the Lithuanian Reformed and Lutheran churches. Here the goals which the Poles had failed to achieve in their meeting in Poznań in February, 1570, were successfully accomplished. Representatives of both groups met in Vilnius under the auspices of Mikołaj Radziwiłł the Brown (1512-1584) in a two day meeting, which begun on March 2, 1570. They succeeded in devising a formula of agreement between the two Churches. We have only indirect information concerning this meeting. It is generally held by students of Lithuanian and Polish Church history that it was agreed that church buildings would be opened for the use of both groups, that the official acts of ministers of both churches would be mutually recognized, and that both churches would work together in the matters relating to the government. It has been suggested by some that agreement was also reached concerning the Lord’s Supper and that this agreement was brought to the attention of those who shortly afterwards met in Sandomierz. However, since we have no definite evidence of this, we may suggest that any agreement of this nature would have been cast in very general terms, such as would be acceptable to both the Reformed and Lutherans.

It may be that the Lithuanian Reformed representatives came to the general Synod of Sandomierz held on April 9-14, 1570, with optimism because they had a formula of agreement with the Lutherans in their hands. Agreement at Sandomierz proved far more elusive than had been the case at Vilnius. Representatives of the three churches found held their ground, and thus they were unable to formulate a mutually agreeable confession. The Lutherans were unwilling to accept the Reformed doctrine found in the Second Helvetic Confession, which had been used as the basic framework for a consensus. In frustration the delegates turned to the Vilnius agreement as the only possible statement to which all could agree. It was this document which provided the shape and the content of the new consensus. However the Lutherans did not regard this as a sufficient statement. They insisted that the Saxon Confession of 1551 must be included as well.

The Consensus of Sandomierz was not sufficient. Although all three churches consented to it, it was evident that no real harmony had been achieved on

438 Friese 1786 a, 433; Akta synodów II 1972, 291.
sacramental teaching. The political situation was such that the deficiencies of the consensus could be overlooked for a time. For the next several years all three groups determined not to press the matter further in their general synods. Instead, they turned their attention to matters all could agree were adiaphora. The deficiencies of the consensus, however, could not long be ignored. With the publication of the Lutheran *Formula of Concord* in 1577, the Lutherans began to examine the positions to which they had agreed in the light of their church’s fuller doctrinal statement on the sacrament of the Altar. Now they would be forced to choose whether to Lutheran, or go to Geneva. By June 25, 1578, the 48th anniversary of the presentation of the Augsburg confession, the Lutherans in their convocation with the Reformed at Vilnius repudiated the terms of the *Consensus*, as did Paweł Gericius in Poznań in that same year.\(^{440}\)

These open differences between the Reformed and the Lutherans with regard to sacramental teaching made it necessary for Krzysztof Radziwiłł (“Piorun”), Palatine of Vilnius and Hetman of Lithuania, to make an attempt to reconcile them. He convoked a Colloquium in Vilnius on June 14, 1585 for this purpose. Participating in this meeting were Paul Weiss, professor of Divinity in Königsberg, Martin Henrici, Job Sommer, Lutheran Pastor of Vilnius, Paul Oderborn, Lutheran Pastor of Kaunas, and distinguished members of the Vilnius parish. The Reformed were represented by Krzysztof Radziwiłł himself, Stanisław Naruszewicz, Castellian of Mińsk (Mściślau), Andreas Zawisza, (*tribunalassesor*), Jan Abramowicz, Starosta of Lida, and Reformed theologians Stanisław Sudrowski (Sudrovius) (ca.1550-ca.1600), Johann Ulrich, Mathias Johannides, Andreas Chrząstowski, and Andreas Volanus, an eminent scholar and secretary of the King.\(^{441}\)

Volanus, speaking for the Reformed, made the Lord’s Supper the central subject. He stated that pressures from the forces of the Antichrist made it most desirable that Lutherans and Reformed should form a common opinion. He declared that this could best be done by laying aside the important work of Luther, Zwingli, Calvin and Oecolampadius and all other human authorities, except the ancient fathers. Weiss warned that it would be best not to give undue credence to the works of the fathers, since even Augustine of Hippo was not entirely free of foreign

\(^{440}\) Jablonski 1731, 81-86; Adamowicz 1855, 54; *Akta synodów IV* 1997, 343.
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influences. Volanus begun his presentation by asking the delegates to consider and
decide the following issue:

“[According to the] abridged Confession of all the evangelical churches of
England, France, Switzerland, the Low Countries, and of the greatest part of Germany,
as well as of Poland and Lithuania, concerning the sacrament of the body and blood of
our Lord Jesus Christ at his last institution. We believe and acknowledge that when the
sacrament of the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ is distributed to the believers
according to his institution, the bread is his body and the wine is his blood, not by an
exterior and invisible transformation of elements into heavenly and visible things, but by
the real and true gift of the body and blood of Christ, in such a manner that those who,
being endowed by the grace of God with true faith and repentance, receive with the
mouth the external elements, are partaking at the same time with the spirit and faith of
the body and blood of Christ, to the certain remission of sins and the gift of eternal life,
which is obtained by the death of our Lord Jesus Christ.”

Volanus’ subsequent arguments are built upon the foundation which he
established by his careful distinction between earthly and heavenly things, after the
manner of the distinction between the *signa* and *res signata*. It is basically a Neo-
Platonist argument. He alludes to evangelical confessions from other countries, all of
which clearly built upon the same philosophical foundation. He speaks of the true
gift of the body and blood of Christ, but he does not equate it with the physical eating
of the external elements. While using terminology which Lutherans employ in
speaking of sacramental gifts, he does not relate to the heavenly gifts to the
consecrated bread and wine. Weiss, speaking of behalf of the Lutherans, noticed this
at once and objected to this omission of the doctrine of the *manducatio indignorum*
and the terms *substantialiter* and *corporaliter*. In support, Pastor Sommer stated that
the sacrament had been instituted for whole church, which in this world is *ecclesia
mixta*. Volanus responded to the Lutheran arguments using a crude illustration
according to which the body of Christ is received naturally, and must therefore also
be eliminated naturally, a point which the Lutherans refused to discuss or accept.

---
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The Lutherans and Reformed had reached an impasse. Duke Krzysztof Radziwiłł saw the need to find a solution. He himself was no stranger to the intricacies of sacramental theology. Lew Sapieha, in a letter to him on December 24, 1580, observed that earlier Radziwiłł had entertained a teaching of the sacrament which was not identical to that of the Lithuanian Reformed Church. In this letter Sapieha confessed his own belief that the sacrament is not a figure and that Christ is bodily present in the sacrament, a teaching clearly at odds with the official position of the Reformed Church. But he feels bound to his belief because the Word of God so clearly teaches it. It is hard to escape the impression that he believed that Radziwiłł shares the same position.445

Radziwiłł himself though it best that at the Convocation in Vilnius traditional terminology be replaced with words which were not quite so provocative. He therefore proposed to the Lutherans that they avoid using the terms corporaliter and corporalis. The Lutherans presented as their final word a Confession which goes beyond anything permitted in the Sandomierz Consensus:

“We believe and acknowledge that in the Holy Supper which our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God and Mary, has instituted on the last night when he was betrayed, the true, natural, and real body of Christ, which is given for us, is truly and substantially present; and his true, natural, and substantial blood which was spilt for us on the altar of the cross is present on earth, in a lawful act and distribution thereof, in such a manner that when the element of wine is distributed and received, the blood of Christ is truly drunk with the mouth of the body in an unconceivable and inscrutable manner, not only by the believers and the worthy, but also by the unbelievers and the unworthy, yet to different purpose; because to the believers, the forgiveness of sins is by it applied and sealed; but the unworthy eat and drink judgment to themselves, and become guilty against the body and blood of the Lord. We have founded this our doctrine on the true and immutable Words of Christ, who has instituted this Supper: Christ is truth and life. John xiv. 6. And of whom the eternal Father says: This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased, hear ye him. Matthew xvii. 5.”446

446 English translation quoted from: Krasinski 1840, 86.
The term corporaliter was not used, but even without it such a confession was beyond possibility of ratification by the Reformed. In consequence the meeting was unable to meet the goal which Krzysztof Radziwiłł (“Piorun”) had envisioned.

The Vilnius meeting reveals the firmness with which the Reformed had come to regard their traditional sacramental teachings. According to the Reformed, rational philosophical principles concerning the relationship between the material and heavenly worlds and their relation to the Lord’s Supper should move the Lutheran to make such adjustment. They themselves could not adjust their position, because the Reformed corpus doctrine is built upon it. From the standpoint of Reformed liturgy, this meeting would serve to indicate that some adjustments might be allowed in matters judged to be adiaphora, but the liturgy itself must reflect the characteristic emphasis of the Reformed doctrine of the Supper.

In 1594 the Jesuits succeeded in their efforts to attract the Eastern Orthodox church of Poland and Lithuania into a Union with the Roman Church. The Greek synod which convened in Brest in that year resolved to put itself under obedience to the papal see. However, a great number of orthodox believers were firmly opposed to this action and resolved to remain in communion with the patriarch of Constantinople. Duke Konstanty Wasyl Ostrogski attended the 1595 General Synod in Toruń, bringing with him a letter which he had composed depicting the miserable conditions under which Orthodox believers were forced to live. They found their situation similar to that of the Protestants. He called for a meeting between the three main protestant churches and the Orthodox for the purpose of creating a union for their mutual defense and protection against the Roman Church.

The meeting was finally convened in Vilnius, where the Reformed, representatives of the Eastern Church, and representatives of the Lutherans met from May 15 to June 2.447 At this convocation it became clear that there was no possibility that the Eastern Church could come to a consensus with Protestant Churches under any circumstances. Even if such a consensus were within the realm of possibility, it still would be hindered by the internal doctrinal divisions within Protestantism. Nevertheless, a statement of articles in which the Protestants agreed with the Greeks was drawn up with the hope that it might lead ultimately to union. With reference to the sacrament it was noted only that in the Lord’s Supper all the faithful are to

447 Łukaszewicz 1835, 175-185; Łukaszewisz 1848, 82-83; Lukšaitė 1999, 486-487.
receive both kinds.\textsuperscript{448} Lukas, Metropolitan of Belgrade, declared that while the Greeks would continue to live in concord and mutual love with both Protestant Churches, there was no possibility of union short of the conversion of the Protestants to Eastern Orthodoxy.\textsuperscript{449} Subsequently when Cyril Lukaris, future patriarch of Constantinople, visited Lithuania in 1600, he met with Radziwill the Orphan (“Syrotka”), a converted son of Radziwill the Black and a committed Roman Catholic; he did not meet with the Protestants at all.\textsuperscript{450}

From the beginning the Lithuanian Reformed church developed a stable tradition which was based upon the liturgical materials, provided by Johannes a Lasco in Polish translation with such minor adaptations as the situation of the Lithuanian church dictated. None of these liturgical materials from the earliest period have survived. The earliest extant Lithuanian Reformed liturgy available to us is Forma álbo porządek published in 1581 in Vilnius.

The 1581 book consists of hymnal, liturgy and catechism, according to the pattern of that period. Such an arrangement was common also in Germany and elsewhere, where the people were provided their own book with the public services of worship, hymns and other devotional aids and a summary of the church's faith in the form of the catechism. Already in use from 1563 was the hymnal and catechism published in Nieśwież for use by the Lithuanian Reformed, but in the extant copy of Katechizm of 1563 we find no liturgy included.\textsuperscript{451} Now all three elements were included in one small manual for daily service in the home, school and church.

This book reveals Lasco's strong influence among the Lithuanian Reformed. Indeed, we find that many phrases have been translated \textit{verbatim} from Lasco's \textit{Forma ac Ratio}. The Lithuanian text in general, however, is much shorter and for the sake of economy of expression it summarizes the verbose Lasco text. Most of Lasco's provisions are found also in the Lithuanian text. Some differences are minor; others, however, are more significant. Lasco's instruction that communicants should receive the Supper while seated is not followed, since the church has already passed through the Anti-Trinitarian controversy. Further, although Lasco places the invitation to the Lord’s Table before the setting apart of the bread and the reading of
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1 Corinthians 10, the Lithuanian 1581 agenda places it after these elements, immediately before the Prayer of Humble Access and Distribution. Lasco’s distribution formula stressed the remembrance of Christ’s sacrifice on the cross. In the Lithuanian order its place is taken by the traditional bread formula, in which central attention is given to nature of the gifts and the forgiveness of sins that comes with them. The Post-Communion liturgy of 1581 agenda is followed with the addition of a specific form of blessing which is in this case not the Aaronic Benediction.\textsuperscript{452} Lasco provides for the inclusion of a Benediction but does not give us a text for it.

A notable feature of the 1581, 1594, 1598, and 1600 forms of Holy Communion is that it is written in the Polish language rather than in Lithuanian. Lithuania was at that time an vast country, covering a wide area and many diverse populations with languages including not only Lithuanian and its many dialects, but also Polish, Belarusian, Ukrainian and Russian. Nobles who identified themselves as Lithuanians usually spoke of their nationality but not of their language or culture. While maintaining a strong national self-consciousness, their lingua franca was not Lithuanian. Lithuanian was the language of the hinterlands and of the inhabitants of the villages and country side in Western Lithuania. These people were untouched by the Reformed. Whereas the Lutherans had published materials in the Lithuanian language from as early as 1547, the Reformed took no interest in following their example. This eventually would be one of the factors in the Reformed Church’s loss of influence among Lithuanian speakers. The Reformed did not become aware of their plight until the end of the 16th century, when as a result of the work of the Society of Jesus in Lithuania they begun to lose their churches. In 1595 the Jesuit Mikalojus Daukša (Mikołaj Dauksza) (ca.1527–1613) published a Kathechismas and in 1599 a Postilla Catholicka for use among Lithuanian speaking people, in imitation of the common practice of the Reformation Churches.

The first Holy Communion order in the Lithuanian language Spróuvva Węćiarios Poná was published in the book Polski z Litewskim Katechism 1598.\textsuperscript{453} The form of the Lord’s Supper in this Catechism corresponds exactly to the

\textsuperscript{452} Forma albo porządek 1581, ciij.
traditional Lithuanian rite of Holy Communion as found in their Polish language catechisms of that time. The 1598 Catechism’s translator, Malcher Pietkiewicz (Merkelis Petkevičius) (ca.1550-1608), a Secretary in the territory of Vilnius, gives the Polish text and an exact Lithuanian translation on facing pages. As he states in his introduction to the work, the church had in the past neglected the needs of the Lithuanian speaking people by failing to provide Lithuanian speaking ministers and books in the Lithuanian language. The nobility knew Polish, and because they were unable to find Lithuanian speaking ministers, many of them put Polish speaking ministers into office. It is his hope that this book - the catechism, hymnal and rites of the church, will help to remedy this deplorable situation and to move God’s church forward.454

The appearance of this book and Postilla Lietuwiszka published by Jakob Markowicz (Jokūbas Morkūnas) in 1600 represent a tardy entrance of the Reformed into the world in which most Lithuanian people lived. It was only in the 17th century that we see significant results of this strategy. In several places this plan was without positive effect, and the Polish language continued to predominate. In the case of Vilnius, German was used together with Polish as the languages of worship and catechesis in the Reformed community. In Birže (Biržai), Kiejdany (Kėdainiai), Popiel (Papilyš), Rosenie (Raseiniai), Gialów (Gėluva), Poszuszwie (Pašuvys), Szwabiszki (Švobiškis) and many other areas of Samogitia, Vilnius and Biržai Polish and Lithuanian language were used side by side.455 The patrons of the parishes continually advised the synods that the pastoral candidates and teachers must speak Lithuanian. The move from Polish was gradual. By the middle of the 17th century 17 of the 37 congregations in Samogitia district were conducting services in Lithuanian.456 In the whole of the country 37 parishes out of 229 came to conduct liturgy and catechize in the Lithuanian language.457 As a result of this strategy by the end of the century, the Biržai parish was growing and requested the service of one additional minister and catechist.458

More certain information concerning liturgical developments among the Lithuanian Reformed comes from the synodical protocols which date from the

---
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second decade of the 17th century. The records trace the decisions of the Lithuanian Reformed synods concerning the forms of worship to be used and the manner of their implementation.

One of the earliest records preserved, the protocols of the Vilnius Synod held on July 1-4, 1612, note that decisions concerning the form of the administration of the sacraments would be taken up at the synod to be held in the next year. At that subsequent Synod in Vilnius, on June 13-19, 1613, Ministers Jan Zygrowius (1574-1623), Samuel Lenartowicz, and Marcin Bielański Tertullian were appointed to implement such corrections as the synod deemed necessary. The corrected form would then be introduced in the Vilnius parish and become the standard to be used in every parish throughout the Lithuanian Church. At the same synod a committee was selected to work on the hymnal and catechism.

These synodical resolutions indicate that there was the need to reestablish unity of liturgy and ceremony in the face of the growing practice in some places of introducing unauthorized forms and ceremonies from other churches. The church understood that in this situation it was necessary to evaluate the available materials and decide what could most appropriately be used in the congregations. According to traditional Lithuanian practice the liturgy, hymnal, and catechism were published in one volume, therefore revision of the liturgy would necessitate a careful review also of the other material to be included in the same book. At the Synod which ended on June 25, 1614 the need for uniformity in liturgy according to the standard forms in the Vilnius parish was again urged. Questions concerning the proper celebration of the major church feasts were answered by the adoption of new forms for these celebrations. Again for the sake of unity parishes and their ministers were admonished not to depart from these provisions. At the Vilnius Synod held from June 30 to July 6, 1615, it was stated that with God’s help a new edition of the

---
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church’s catechism had been prepared. The delegates were assured that all review work and last minute adjustments by the ministers whom they had appointed could be completed at their meeting in Vilnius on St. Bartholomew’s Day.\(^{464}\) Actually the work was not completed on schedule. At the June 7-13, 1617 Synod in Vilnius the committee, consisting of the Andrzej Chrząstowski, Superintendent of Vilnius, Fineasz Goiski, Superintendent of Nowogródek, Paweł Lucynjusz Papłoński, Superintendent of Samogitia, Jan Kozakowicz, and the Lay Patrons Adam Talwosz, Chorąż Wołkowysk, Kamieński, Paweł Progubicki († 1625), and Dawid Szwykowski was instructed to remain in the city until the review had been completed, the corrections made, and the work was finished.\(^{465}\)

Apparently the work was not completed at that time, because the catechism that appeared in print in 1618 in Lubcza was not an edition authorized by the synod. At the 1618 Synod in Vilnius this caused great consternation. Minister Jan Zygrowius (†1623), one of the correctors of the liturgy appointed by the synod in 1613, had taken it upon himself to publish this catechism. Not only was it an unauthorized publication, but it contained many deficiencies and doctrinal errors, the most infamous of which was that the doctrine of the Holy Trinity was left unclear. To address this problem a committee consisting of Mikołaj Minwid, Superintendent of Samogitia, Minister Samuel Lenartowicz, Minister Jan Dominik, Minister Jan Minwid, and the Lay Patrons Hołubicki, Rafał Roszczyc, Hieronim Czechowicz, and Salomon Rysiński was appointed. After thoroughly examining the book the committee was instructed to meet in Vilnius at Pentecost 1619 to review their findings and prepare their for presentation at the synod to be held that year.\(^{466}\)

The matter of the catechism was the first item on the agenda at the 1619 Synod in Vilnius. It was again noted that the catechism of 1618 was an unauthorized publication. The problem was a serious problem, because several dozen copies had already been distributed in congregations throughout the church. A thorough investigation of the matter was called for, and Jan Szwykowski, Jan Frąskiewicz, Minister Piotrow, and Minister Łukasz Bednarski together with Duke Krzysztof Radziwiłł were asked to go to Lubcza to investigate how this had happened. The former committee consisting of ministers and laymen was reappointed to prepare a
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corrected edition of the catechism. They were instructed to thoroughly review all materials, including psalms, hymns, catechetical material and other related elements to determine that no terms or phrases of Papal or Anabaptist wordings were found in them and to make certain that the name of the Holy Trinity was given prominence in the title of the work. The corrected material was to be put into the hands of the superintendent, who would meet with the ministers on St. Michael day and give the work final approval. The official publication of the authorized manuscript was delegated to the control of Salomon Rysiński and Jan Dominik.467

Some of those involved in this important work voiced the opinion that Polish Reformed materials should also be examined in the reviewing of the catechism. In a letter of September 16, 1619 Bartłomiej Krośniewicki wrote to Duke Krzysztof Radziwiłł (1583-1640) expressing his opinion that the Polish catechetical materials should be duly noted, despite the opposition expressed at the synod in Vilnius of that year. In that meeting many had clearly stated that the Lithuanians wanted nothing to do with the Polish catechisms. He asked that a copy of Zygrowius’ unauthorized catechism should be sent to the Polish Church for their review and comments.468

The work went more slowly than had been anticipated. It was not until the 1620 Vilnius Synod that the new edition of the catechism was officially approved. The protocols indicate that the major obstacle was the agenda which was to be included in the catechism and more specifically the order of the celebration of the Lord’s Supper. The orders of Holy Baptism, Marriage, and Visitation of the Sick were to be kept according to the old forms, which had already been corrected by the ministers. Concerning Holy Communion two forms would be provided. The first rite would follow the provisions of the traditional Lithuanian pattern with any necessary corrections, and the second rite would incorporate forms from Lithuanian and Polish Reformed Churches. Unable to make a final decision in this matter, the synod asked Duke Krzysztof Radziwiłł to decide which rite should be authorized and published. Supervision of the publication of the corrected work was put into the hands of Samuel Lenartowicz and Jan Dominik.469 The decisions of the synod show us that
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469 “Postanowiono na tym Synodzie świętym, żeby ten Katechism do druku był podany, który teraz ostatnią razą od Braci na to wysadzonej był przejrzaný, j od Synodu aprobowany. Forma o krzcie świętym, o Małżeństwie świętym, o nawiedzeniu chorych według starego Katechismu od tej Braci poprawionego ma być zachowana. A co się tknie Wieczerzy Pańskiej ta dwoiaka ma być napisana. Jedna od Braci, na przyszłym Synodzie na to naznaczonej, według starego Katechismu poprawiona, a
although Krośniewicki represented a minority opinion, his suggestion to the Duke was not summarily cast aside. He was successful in pressing the point that Polish liturgies should be taken into consideration. In his letter of July 9, 1620, to Duke Krzysztof Radziwiłł he presented the synod’s request and suggested that the final decision should be based upon a consideration of what would be closest to hearts of the Lithuanians.⁴⁷⁰

At the June 28, 1621 Synod in Vilnius the delegates were informed that the new catechism had been printed. It was solemnly declared that the long period of consideration and review had been completed and now their prayers had been answered. The synod declared that it was not scarcity of available copies of the old catechism which had necessitated this new work, it was instead the need for uniformity in the form of worship in God’s church in Lithuania which had impelled the church to issue this revision. The synod directed that this book alone should be the standard for all worship services, prayers, hymns, and sacraments in the church. In addition to its public use this book should be used also for devotion and instruction in the homes of all families of the Reformed Church.⁴⁷¹

Our particular concern is the order of the celebration of the Lord’s Supper. We have only three identical copies of the catechism available for examination and all three of them lack title pages. This causes some perplexity: is this the unauthorized 1618 book or the authorized 1621 book? In addition, none of these catechisms contain the Forma of the Lord’s Supper usually found in the official books. The synodical protocols of the period in question give us no indication that the 1618 book included such as this form, however, they clearly state that it was included in 1621 together with other rites. This leads us to the conclusion that the
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manuscript rite of the Lord’s Supper Sprawa Wieczerzy Panskiey, which Samuel Lenartowicz advertised as having been taking from a Lithuanian catechism is the official 1621 order and the three identical copies of the catechism which are available to us are in fact from 1618.472

The 1621 order of the Lord’s Supper shows itself to stand squarely within the Lithuanian tradition. It indicates that Duke Krzysztof Radziwiłł had a good understanding of the mind and heart of the Lithuanian Reformed people and knew what they would be willing to accept as clearly Lithuanian. Many sections of the old liturgy remain exactly as they had been in the past. There are few changes and most of them bring the Liturgy more closely into line with Johannes a Lasco’s Forma ac Ratio. Major provisions of the older order, such as the orders for the Second Week before Communion and the Day before Communion, are lacking in the manuscript copy, probably because the copier saw no need to reproduce them. Among the changes are the addition of a Call to Worship from the Psalm 124:8, a logical separation is placed between the Exhortation and Excommunication, and for Form for Excommunication is shortened. The Prayer for Right and God Pleasing Worship is inserted between the Exhortation and Excommunication. The Admonition to Worthy Reception and the Prayer for communion are both shortened, and the Invitation to the Lord’s Supper is altered by the introduction of a new question which asks of communicants that they solemnly affirm the nature of the church and the truth of the word it proclaims and the sacrament it administers. Finally, the reading of John 6 during distribution is replaced by the singing of Communion hymns.

Although Krośniewicki was not entirely successful in his efforts to move toward a uniformity in the celebration of the Lord’s Supper with the Poles, he did plant a seed which would soon bear fruit. In 1622 Duke Krzysztof Radziwiłł presented to the Vilnius Synod his 15 point proposal to begin without delay to consult with the Polish Churches with the aim that the church might soon achieve uniformity in the churches’ rites and ceremonies. Krośniewicki and Maciej Bańkowski were made responsible for pursuing this matter.473 It was difficult to agree concerning a date for a meeting. The Minor Poles did not find the dates which

472 The absence of the title pages strengthens this impression. It is likely that they had been removed because of their lack of Trinitarian soundness. Those who possessed these books would not wanted known that they possessed catechisms which had been officially condemned as heretical.

473 “Znieść się bez odwolki z Pany Coronnymi de Uniformitate odprawowania wszystkiego Nabożeństwa.” Akta synodów 1915, 71; Tworek 1971, 123.
the Lithuanians suggested agreeable to them. The Lithuanians did not press the issue, and it was four years before the Vilnius synod again brought up the matter.

The 1626 Vilnius Synod again considered the question of the unification of the rites together with the new common edition of the Bible prepared for use in both Poland and Lithuania. Superintendents Andrzej Dobrzański (Nowogródek), Adam Raszewski (Samogitia), Jan Raniszewski (Ruś), and Mikołaj Wysocki (Podlassia) were appointed to participate in the Convocation at Bełżyce and were given detailed instructions concerning the process of negotiations with the Minor Poles. They were instructed to work toward unity with the Minor Polish Church in catechism, prayer book, hymnal, and liturgical rites. At the same time they were reminded that the Lithuanians had no interest in departing from their own worship traditions and practices in any respect. They should proceed most carefully and dexterously in their negotiations, especially in matters pertaining to the Lord’s Supper and hymns used at the sacrament. Lithuanians could not tolerate some Minor Polish Communion hymns which they believed to be reminiscent of Catholicism. These instructions seem to indicate that the Lithuanians were less than wholeheartedly in favor of unification unless it should be accomplished on their own terms. They officially supported Duke Krzysztof Radziwiłł’s proposal, but they were not really eager to see it fulfilled.

Question concerning uniformity of rites and ceremonies in the 1627 Vilnius Synod did not concern itself primarily with negotiations with the Polish Churches. It was more concerned with the ongoing work of achieving uniformity according to the 1621 rite among its own congregations. This synod resolved that all services in Lithuanian Church be held according to the provisions in the 1621 book and charged the superintendents with the responsibility of enforcing this resolution. Liturgical problems were most evident in the Podlassian district, where many new practices had been imported from Minor Poland without approval from Vilnius. It soon became evident that the liturgical situation in Podlassia was out of control, and Vilnius decided not to make an issue of the matter for the present. Officially it was stated that liturgical forms from Minor Poland could be used in those cases where Lithuanian forms had not been furnished. As a final point the Lithuanians assured the Poles that the unification of rites was still their goal and they would take up the matter again in the future.475

474 Akta Synodów Litewskich 1611-1637, 141.
475 Akta Synodów Litewskich 1611-1637, 153.
The Lithuanian Church was clearly not of one mind on liturgical matters. The group pushing for unification grew to the point where large numbers supported Duke Krzysztof Radziwill’s proposals and pressed for change. Now for the first time the church officially permitted the general use of some Minor Polish forms in its congregations. Although the synod still pressed for conformity to the 1621 book, it was evident that the situation was complicated. Under these circumstances the wisest course of action was for the Lithuanians to enter discussions aimed at conformity of rites and ceremonies with the hope that it could maintain as much as possible of its Lithuanian heritage.

The Vilnius Synod of 1633 took a major step toward liturgical conformity by resolving to participate with Minor and Major Poles and the Bohemian Brethren in a General Convocation at Orla. According to the synodical protocols this step was necessary for the well-being of Gods church. Delegates to the convocation included Andrzej Dobrzański, Superintendent of Nowogródek and Vilnius, Piotr Kochlewski, Senior and Deputy respectively of Vilnius, Samuel Minwid, Superintendent of Samogitia, Mikołaj Wysocki, Superintendent of Podlassia, and Rejnold Adami, Doctor of Theology. Lay patrons were: Tomasz Wolan, Marshal of Oszmiana, Piotr Kochlewski, Aleksander Przypkowski and Daniel Naborowski.476 They were instructed to give most careful attention to the need for simplicity and purity in the rites and to insist that the traditional Lithuanian psalms, prayers, and hymns be included. With regard to the Lord’s Supper it was important that the breaking of the bread be maintained, and that the kneeling posture and the giving of communion into the mount during the distribution be rejected.477

Leading churchmen of both areas of Poland and Lithuania were eventually successful into approving a common agenda of the ministerial acts in the General Convocation at Orla in August, 1633. The work which resulted from this resolution would become the first part of the Great Gdańsk Agenda.

In a letter addressed to the Lithuanian Church signed by all the delegates from the Church-wide Synod in Bełyce on May 22, 1634 the Minor Polish Church expressed its great joy at the positive results achieved at the Convocation at Orla. The delegates further emphasized that it was essential that unification of the rites proceed and asked that the Lithuanian Church make known their proposals

476 Akta Synodów Litewskich 1611-1637, 401.
477 Akta Synodów Litewskich 1611-1637, 401.
concerning the second part of the agenda for consideration at the convocation to be held at Włodawa.⁴⁷⁸

The 1634 Vilnius Synod received the report of the delegates they had sent and approved the results of the convocation. Recommendations were given concerning the second part of the agenda rites to be administered by superintends and seniors. The following were appointed to attend the next convocation at Włodawa: Mikołaj Wysocki, Andrzej Dobrzański, Balcer Łabęcki, Minister of Vilnius parish, and Samuel Minwid, Minister of Sereje parish. The laity were represented by Tomasz Wolan, Piotr Kochlewski, Daniel Naborowski, and Jan Szwykowski, Piotr Piekarski and Mikołaj Kościuszko-Ciechanowicki.⁴⁷⁹

The success of this collaborative work led to a further resolution at the General Convocation at Włodawa in September, 1634 to revise the second part, pastoral acts reserved to seniors and superintendents.

In a letter addressed to Lithuanian Church on May 11, 1636 Tomasz Węgierski, Superintendent of Minor Poland, expressed thanksgiving for all that had been accomplished with the help of God to further the objecting of the unifying of the rites. He gave details concerning the publication of the agenda to be done in Gdańsk by the Hünefeldt publishing house together with its publication of hymnal, and the prayer book. Final decisions concerning the forms to be included in the agenda would be made on the day of St. Luke (October 18) in the meeting of the superintendents of the participating churches in Toruń, he noted.⁴⁸⁰

At the following synod held in Vilnius in 1635 thanksgiving to God was expressed because of the successful work at Włodawa and the results of the meeting were accepted unanimously. It was resolved to pay the costs of publication assigned to the Lithuanian Church.⁴⁸¹

The completed work was received and accepted at the General Meeting of the Superintendents at Toruń on October 18, 1636 with Andrzej Dobrzański (†1640) signing for the Lithuanians.⁴⁸² Signers included: Tomasz Węgierski (†1653), Jan Amos Comenius (1592-1670), Piotr Zimmerman, Paweł Orlicz, Jan Hiperik, Adam Hartman, and others.

⁴⁷⁸ *Synody* 1611-1844, 9.
⁴⁷⁹ *Akta Synodów Litewskich* 1611-1637, 413.
⁴⁸⁰ *Synody* 1611-1844, 10.
⁴⁸¹ *Akta Synodów Litewskich* 1611-1637, 426.
⁴⁸² *Akta synodów* 1570-1676, (manuscript 3) 41; *Acta Albo Constitutie* 1618-1704, 161; *Księga synodów* 1636-1678, 103; *Spis Synodów* 1913, VII; *Tworek* 1971, 130.
The new book, commonly called the Great Gdańsk Agenda or *Agenda álbo Formá Porządku 1637*, was the most significant liturgical production of the Reformed Churches in Poland and Lithuania. It brought with it the introduction into Lithuania of many elements from Minor Polish sources. The result was a form of Holy Communion quite foreign to the experience of the Lithuanian Reformed. Their previous standard, the 1581 *Formá álbo porządek*, had been built upon the model provided by the liturgical work of Johannes a Lasco. It was very simple and straightforward, and over a period of 50 years it had won cherished place in the hearts of the people. Now something almost entirely new was being set before them.

Although the new liturgy perpetuated some familiar elements from the Lasco tradition, these seemed almost lost among the new and elaborate provisions. New and unfamiliar to the Lithuanians was the Invocation of the Holy Spirit with the hymn *Veni Sancte Spiritus*. Included for the first time also was a formal Absolution pronounced by the minister acting in the name and the place of Christ. The Lithuanians had not had an Absolution in their service, but instead a Declaration of Grace stated in general terms. Also among the newly added elements were the *Agnus Dei*, unfamiliar to most Reformed liturgies, since it awakened suspicions concerning the adoration of Christ in the sacramental elements. New also was the use of Apostolic Creed furnished with traditional Gregorian melody. Like the *Agnus Dei*, the Nicene Creed was not a familiar feature of Reformed liturgies, nor were the Reformed familiar with notions of consecration in the prayer before Christ's Testament. Another major innovation was the introduction of the separate distribution of the bread and the cup. What had for them always been a single act was now a double act, with a separate distribution of the bread after Paul's words concerning the bread in 1 Corinthians 10, followed by the communion of the cup after the recitation of Paul's Cup words in the same chapter. In addition, the Invitation to the Table had been removed from its accustomed place and put much earlier in the service, before ceremonial act of the Breaking of the Bread. The invitation, which the Lithuanians had always associated with their communion, was now made to serve as a general introduction to the rite of Communion. Also for the first time the Old Testament Aaronic Benediction is given before the final Ascription of Praise, the hymn *Bogu Oycu y Synowi*. The Lithuanians were happy to see Lasco's
familiar admonition *Credite et ne dubitate* after communion, but that seemed small recompense among so many new terms, new words, and new liturgical actions.  

The Poles and the Bohemians thought that because the Lithuanians had so whole heartedly participated in the work of preparing the new rites in Orla and Wlodawa, the Vilnius Synod would quickly overcome any initial hesitancy, mollify the antagonized, and, after thoughtful and prayerful discussion, would move to accept the book as presented and proceed with its implementation. No one was prepared for the negative reaction of the Lithuanians. It came as complete surprise. The expected approval was not forthcoming. Indeed the Lithuanians decided not even to mention the agenda in the official minutes of the Vilnius Synod, which began of June 21, 1637. The protocol states only that the Hymnal and Prayer Book were accepted, though without much enthusiasm.  

A careful examination of the protocols of the General Convocation of Orla in 1633 reveals a significant reason for the Lithuanian rejection of Gdańsk Book. Among the matters which the editors who prepared work for publication ignored were alterations in the service of the Holy Communion. The Lithuanians were not consulted in this matter, and it is clear that had they been consulted they would not have agreed to the changes. The Orla convocation had agreed to the distribution of the Holy Communion according to the Lithuanian pattern, which was quite different from the Polish order. The Lithuanians distributed the blessed bread and wine together, whereas the Poles separately distributed the elements with the Pauline cup words, prayers and hymns standing between the two distributions. The Lithuanians had made it clear at Orla that they were not willing to accept this change in the manner of distribution, and the convocation had agreed to follow the traditional Lithuanian pattern.  

When the first 310 pages of the new book appeared, the communion was found to follow the Polish order rather than the Lithuanian. When the Lithuanians examined these pages at the Vilnius synod in 1637, they were infuriated. It was as though no discussion of the matter had taken place at Orla, or that the resolutions of that synod were being treated as inconsequential. Nationalistic feelings too were aroused. It seems to them that the Poles were treating them in a high handed and  

---

483 *Agenda* 1637, 78-127.  
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dismissive manner. This was inexcusable. There was only one course open to them. The book must be rejected.

Other factors in the reception of this book were stated in a letter from the Vilnius Synod to the Polish Churches dated June 25, 1637. (1) They could not agree to the new title given to the work because it used terminology with which they were not familiar and which was reminiscent of the Church of Rome. Lithuanian ears were no longer familiar with such sounds, they wrote. They saw no need to speak in complicated terms when simple words were adequate. (2) They were disturbed by the inclusion of the ‘Catholic’ Calendar. They saw no need for it, since the ministers could easily teach the Christian story without resorting to spurious tales and legends which are full of superstitions. (3) They wanted only liturgical acts clearly warranted by the Holy Scripture to be included, but they noted that several acts were found in the book which had not been practiced in Lithuania for decades. Such observances as the Advent and Lenten seasons were no longer used in Lithuania. They also found the inclusion of citations from the church fathers, councils, popes and synods to be unnecessary and offensive. (4) The contents and form of the preface of the book were far removed from any with which the Lithuanians were familiar in their tradition. (5) They objected to the inclusion of the Form of Divorce, since it was used only by superintendents and seniors, and saw it needed to be only in manuscript form. (6) Concerning the forms which they had not yet seen, they could not yet make any evaluation. Only when they had the complete book would they be able to provide an adequate critique of these services.486

The Lithuanians stated that there had been a heated discussion in their synod, that many parishes simply would not accept the work, and were it to be introduced it would cause an undesirable schism. At the same time they assured their Minor and Major Polish brothers that they wished to remain in a warm, fraternal relationship with them, and they expressed the hope that the work would be revised and put in into an acceptable form. This would require that the preface be revised, the original agreed title of the work be restored, and the offensive orders, such as the Advent, Lenten and other observances, together with the citations from church fathers, popes, councils and synods be removed. Precise instructions concerning corrections to the Communion liturgy were also included. They insisted that the entire historical recitation of the instruction of the Lord's Supper as written in 1Corinthians 11:23-30

486 *Synody* 1611-1844, 13.
must be included, and not just the instituting words of Christ.\footnote{The Lithuanians never included verse 30 in the historical recitation of the Institution. Here they had in mind 1 Corinthians 11:23-29.} The form of the hymn invoking the Holy Spirit Święty Duchu zawitaj k nam should be in the same form that as found in the old Lithuanian Catechisms. The short prayer preceding distribution Boże bądź miłościw must be restored. The Lithuanians had based their criticisms of a review of the first 310 printed pages, since the rest of the book had not been printed by the time of the meeting. They noted that if there were objectionable features found in the rites they had not yet seen, they would notify the Poles about them.\footnote{Synody 1611-1844, 13.}

One may appreciate the perplexity of the Poles at the Lithuanian reaction after having been so closely involved in the production of the common agenda, the Lithuanians had now abruptly rejected the work. The Poles were certain that the forms provided were not new to the Lithuanians. They had all been scrutinized by the delegates of all three churches at Orla and Wlodawa. Agreement had been reached concerning the contents and terminology. They could not understand how the minor changes incorporated in the final edition should cause such a strong reaction among the Lithuanians. Surely the rejection of the book was unwarranted.

In a July 1637 letter to the Bohemian Superintendent Marcin Orminius (†1643), Lithuanian Superintendent Andrzej Dobrzański revealed that the leader of the opposition to the new book was Piotr Kochlewski, who had been one of the delegates and had approved the work at Orla and Wlodawa. He had offered no objections at those meetings, but now his complaints were loud and harsh. The work as published was not in agreement with the protocols of the 1633 Orla meeting. Dobrzański and some others still desired the authorization and use of the material from new book in Lithuania, but the opposing forces won the day by employing powerful, sensitive arguments to which they could give no satisfactory response.\footnote{Gmiterek 1985, 113.}

In their Church-wide Synod at Bełżyce held on September 25-29, 1637 the delegates gave their approval to the agenda and discussed the impediments to Lithuanian acceptance of the work.\footnote{Synody 1611-1844, 19; Księga dystryktowa 1634-1722, 24-25.} In a September 29 letter signed by all the delegates they sought to reassure the Lithuanians that they understood the difficulties which they were experiencing and appreciated their concerns. They reminded the

\footnotesize\text{488 Synody 1611-1844, 13.}
Lithuanians that to construct an order uniting three diverse traditions was no easy matter; there were bound to be difficulties. Furthermore, it had not been their aim to produce a book which would be perfect in every respect, indeed it was not possible to produce such a work. Their own synod had thoroughly considered these matters and decided to accept the book, and heartily encouraged the Lithuanians to do the same. Since the Great Gdańsk Book was meant for use by the ministers, and not for common parishioners, it could be put to use until such time, as the second edition was ready - in it all problems would be addressed and corrected. They stated that it is their fervent prayer that with God's assistance the Agenda could be used and all the difficulties overcome.\footnote{Synody 1611-1844, 12.}

At the same time, the Notary of the Synod, Andrzej Węgierski, wrote a personal letter to the Lithuanians in which he wondered how, after having been so completely involved in the production of the work and agreeing in every aspect of it, the Lithuanians could now become so completely negative. They had known what they were doing, and they had ratified the decisions of the convocations at the Synod in Vilnius in 1635. He especially noted that a large number of copies had been printed with on the basis on the expressed understanding of Lithuanian participation, and now they were morally bound to accept them. Of course, if some parts of the work were totally unacceptable they could be corrected by mutual agreement.\footnote{Synody 1611-1844, 20.}

The Bohemian Brethren expressed similar sentiments. They addressed a letter to the Lithuanians during their Convocation at Leszno in 1638, in which they expressed astonishment that the Lithuanians were now renouncing a work to which their had previously put their signatures. The letter brings to light a further point of contention. The Lithuanians had agreed to pay their proportion of the expenses for the production of the book in the convocation, and they had not done so. They pleaded that the Lithuanians both preserve to whatever degree possible the unification of the rites and pay the debt which they had incurred to Paweł Orlicz.\footnote{“Nam wielce łaskawi w Chrystusie Bracia! Na list Synodu prowincjalnego wileńskiego anno superiori do nas die 25. Junii pisany, odpisaliśmy Jchmościom Panom i patronom ecclesiarum vestrarum in M. D. Lit. a przy Jch Mośi i WM. naszym w Panu wielce łaskawym Braciom. Hoc vero satis mirari non potuimus, żeśmy i przy innych Jchmościach Chirografia WMosiów w tym liście widzieli, WMosiów, którzyśże na konwokacjach przeszły, a osobliwie włodzkiej z nami wespół agendy albo formy usług kościelnych, approbowali. Teraz, ut videmini, one z innymi Jchmościami retractujecie i ręce swe rękom własnym, zdania zdaniom i samych siebie sobie opponujecie. Już to po czasie deliberować o tem, jeżeli agendy przyjąć, czyli nie, które od WMciów, jako plenipotentów zborów litewskich approbowane i do zborów Bożych w Wielkiej i Małejpolsce już
No one was more disturbed than Orlicz himself. He had advanced the cost of publication upon the solemn promise of the churches that they would repay him in a timely manner. No payment from the Lithuanians had been made. In a long letter from Toruń to the Lithuanians dated May 24, 1634, he reminded them of the obligation they had undertaken and its terms. He appealed to them to honor their obligation as Christian gentlemen to settle their debt.\textsuperscript{494}

At the Vilnius Synod in June, 1638 the real Lithuanian situation came to light. The church dissociated itself from the Gdańsk Book, but in order to preserve their brotherly relationship with the Poles they indicated that they were willing to make use of some of the forms included on a temporary basis until new forms have been agreed. But this did not include the forms already provided in the Lithuanian Catechism, namely, Holy Baptism, Lord’s Super, Visitation of the Sick and Holy Matrimony. In these services only the traditional Lithuanian rites would be permitted. The synod’s debt to Paweł Orlicz was also discussed. Jósef Pietkiewicz, Notary of the Synod, was authorized to transfer to Orlicz from Synod’s treasury the full amount of the debt which they had incurred.\textsuperscript{495}

The Minor Poles continued to press the Lithuanians to be more specific in their criticism, since the goal of the book was the unification of all rites in all three churches. The Church-wide Synod of the Minor Poles, held on September 24-26, 1638, at Krasnobród, again approved the hymnal, prayer book and agenda.\textsuperscript{496} The synod charged Superintendent Tomasz Wegierski with the responsibility of writing to the Lithuanians stating their policy and concerns.\textsuperscript{497} It was their earnest desire to address the problems in such a way that full participation by the Lithuanians would be assured.

On behalf of both churches Wegierski addressed a letter to Lithuanians on May 31, 1639, in which he asked that for the sake of a God pleasing unity in the one

\textsuperscript{494} Synody 1611-1844, 17.
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orthodox faith that the three groups meet together in General Convocation at Orla on October 18, 1639 for the purpose of adjudicating their differences that agreement might be reached. He asked also that the Lithuanians bring with them examples all of the forms in use in their churches and to appoint their delegation at their coming synod in Vilnius.\footnote{Synody 1611-1844, 19.}

At their Synod in Vilnius in July, 1639 the Lithuanians discussed and accepted the proposal. They chose a sizeable delegation to represent them. Included were Mikołaj Wysocki, Superintendent of Podlassia, Balcer Łabęcki, Superintendent of Vilnius, Samuel Minwid, Superintendent ‘Zawilejski’ (District to the east of Vilnius), Jan Raniszowski, Superintendent of Ruś (also known as Mińsk or Białoruś), Samuel Tomaszewski, Superintendent of Samogitia, Andrzej Musonius, Consenior of Nowogródek, Jakub Biskupski, Consenior of Podlassia, and Ministers Tomasz Chociszewski, Fineas Gójski and Jan Ostrowski; and Lay Patrons Tomasz Wolan, Piotr Kochlewski, Daniel Naborowski, Stanisław Krzyszkowski, Joachim Morlin. However the Lithuanians asked that the meeting be postponed until February 10, 1640.\footnote{Księga druga aktów 1638-1675, 21-22; Tworek 1971, 133.}

A delegation of sixteen representatives was selected by the Church-wide Synod of the Minor Poles at their meeting on September 23-26, 1639 at Oksza. Included among their delegates were Tomasz Węgierski, Wojciech Węgierski, Andrzej Węgierski, Jan Militius, Senior of Kraków, Adam Jarzyna, Senior of Belz, Jan Żurowski, Consenior of Lublin, Paweł Bochnicius, Consenior of Ruś, Jakub Milius and Łukasz Dobrzański. Lay seniors were: Aleksander Rożeński, Jan Gliński, Paweł Zieliński, Franciszek Gorzkowski, Zbigniew Latyczyński, Stanisław Drohojowski and Jan Gorajski.\footnote{Księga dystrykowa 1634-1722, 31-32; Tworek 1971, 133.}

However, the meeting was not held because of two important developments which shook the Lithuanian Church. The first was the death of their great benefactor, Duke Krzysztof Radziwiłł, and the second was the destruction of the Vilnius Reformed Church by students of Vilnius University incited by the Jesuits. Immediate attention had to be given to these open wounds, and liturgical matters had to laid aside for the present time.
At the Vilnius Synod in June, 1641 first attention was given to providing security for worship service and ministerial acts throughout the church. But now there was again opportunity take up the matter of the unification of rites, as 26th item for consideration. The synod resolved to reaffirm its 1639 Canon on *Uniformitas* and to invite their Polish brothers to meet with them on October 13, 1641 in Zabludów to discuss the matter. Those who had been appointed in 1639 were asked to take up the responsibility which they had been unable to fulfill earlier. However, the upheavals of the past year and the continuing situation in the church made it simply to difficult to keep this schedule.501

In its 1642 meeting the Vilnius Synod briefly discussed the matter and determined that because of other pressing concerns it could not see any possibility of holding a general convocation with the Polish Churches. It was left to Superintendent Mikołaj Wysocki of the Podlassian District to communicate with the Poles about the matter and report back to the synod for them to consider and decide.502

The Minor Poles were unwilling to drop the matter. At their Church-wide Synod in Krasnobaród on September 26-28, 1642 they wrote another letter to the Lithuanians, again signed by all the delegates stressing the importance of consensus in faith and unification of the Rites.503 They proposed that final adjustments could be made and approved at the General Convocation at Orla or Zabludów, on September 21, the Day of St. Matthew.504

The Vilnius Synod in 1643 again confirmed interest in pursuing the matter with both the Minor and Major Poles. Apparently the September date in Orla or Zabludów was not agreeable, for they asked again for a statement of place and time for convocation.505

The Minor Poles decided that it was time for them to encourage the Lithuanians to action. At their Church-wide Synod at Oksza on September 24, 1643, they resolved to press the matter not only by letter but also by sending to the Vilnius Synod Andrzej Węgierski, Senior of Lublin, as their representative to make concrete suggestions to finalize their proposals and to establish a date for the general
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A special letter was sent from the delegates of the synod to the Lithuanians informing them of this decision. The Major Poles concurred with the resolution of the Minor Poles in a letter sent to the Lithuanians from their 1643 Synod at Leszno.

Wegierski’s mission was successful. The 1644 Vilnius Synod, at which he was in attendance, agreed to meet for General Convocation at Orla on August 29. All three churches begun their final preparations for this important gathering.

The Lithuanians decided that their representatives should be Superintendents Jakub Biskupski, Jan Grzybowski and Apollos Styrzyński and Lay Patrons Stanisław Rajski, Piotr Siestrzenciewicz and in two new lay delegates Bneski and Wotkowiski. The synod gave them very specific instructions. (1) The work should proceed according to the letter of instruction which the Lithuanians had sent to the Poles at 1637. (2) Purity, antiquity, and simplicity were to be the three characteristics of the work. Nothing was to be allowed which would leave the church open to charges of idolatry or ‘unfaithful Arianism’. (3) If the Bohemian Brethren were to create difficulties by introducing their peculiar practices, then the Lithuanians should at least strive for agreement with the Minor Poles, with whom they shared allegiance to the Second Helvetic Confession. They should strive for agreement with the Major Poles for the sake of simplicity and purity of the rites such as was found in the early church. (4). It should be made clear to the Poles that only if they agreed completely to the requirements of the Lithuanians could unification of the rites proceed. Here they seemed to leave very little room for negotiation. (5) The delegates should consider the statements presented by the Poles in their 1639 Vilnius Synod concerning the need to formulate common rites. Added was a final reminder of the need to print a corrected edition of the new hymnal.

These instructions given by the Lithuanians appeared to leave them very little room for movement. It was made to appear that if the Poles do not agree to every demand of the Lithuanians they would be responsible for doom the project to failure. Some of the Lithuanian points seemed to be ultimatums. The emphasis on purity, simplicity and antiquity indicate that two different liturgical traditions were
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locked in a struggle for supremacy. The Lithuanians did not consider the richer and more complex forms used in Poland to be purer than the simple and chaste forms with which they were familiar. The negotiations at Orla would be difficult, and their outcome would clearly indicate which side had prevailed.

The Minor Poles chose the following clergy as their delegates: Tomasz Węgierski, Andrzej Węgierski, Paweł Bochnicius, Jan Malkolm, Daniel Stephanus, Jan Żurowski, Jakub Mylius, Samuel Płachta, Stanisław Zajączkowic and Krzysztof Pandlowski. Lay patrons were: Aleksander Rożeński, Jan Gliński, Andrzej Rej, Adam Rej, Franciszek Gorzkowski, Stanisław Drohojowski and Gabriel Hulewicz. They advised their delegates to listen calmly to all of the criticisms and comments of the Lithuanians and to make only those concessions which they had thoroughly discussed among themselves and mutually agreed. Clearly, the Minor Poles were entering the negotiations with a wholly different spirit from that of the Lithuanians. They would hold their peace, listen carefully and respond thoughtfully and as a group.512 Delegates from Major Poland included Superintendent Jan Bytner, Senior Jan Amos Comenius (Komeński), Minister Maciej Ambrosius, Lay Patron Stanisław Kochlewski and others.513

The consideration of the unification of the rites would prove only a secondary matter in the Convocation at Orla from August 24 to September 4, 1644. Of first importance was the call that had been issued the King Władysław IV Waza for a Colloquium charitativum among all Polish Christians to established peace between them and to pave the way for the reconciliation all groups into one church. The Reformed, Bohemian Brethren and Lutherans all looked with suspicion upon this proposal. They understood that the goal was unrealistic and unreachable, but since the King was behind it, they had to participate. It was their hope that through their participation they perhaps might achieve some legal standing in the country.514 The Bohemians and Polish Reformed wanted to present their own united confession to the Catholics in the Colloquium, and they entertained the hope that the Lutherans might be willing to participate in its formulation. The Lutherans declined. It was the

512 Akta synodów 1570-1676, (manuscript 4) 16-21; Tworek 1971, 134.
513 Akta synodów 1570-1676, (manuscript 4) 16-21; Tworek 1971, 134.
Polish Reformed and Bohemian Brethren alone who formulated their common Confession at Orla for presentation to the Roman Catholics. 515

Consideration of the Agenda was postponed until the last item in the protocol. It was agreed that the preface should be rewritten and that the new preface would include an explanation concerning the inclusion of the calendar, the citations of the church fathers and councils, "public prayers read in public gatherings," 516 and other matters which had raised the concerns of some. Lithuanian concerns were addressed by the decision to publish liturgical forms for Holy Baptism, The Lord’s Supper and Marriage. According to the protocols this matter was thoroughly discussed and unanimously agreed by all three delegations. The title of the book would be Akt usług chrztv s. y s. wieczerzey panskiey...1644, the name originally agreed upon. The book is for public use in Lithuania. In addition 100 copies will be sent to the church in Minor Poland and 50 copies to the Brethren in Major Poland. Other forms from the Great Gdańsk Agenda might be corrected as needed in the next edition of the full agenda. The Act of Divorce was to be removed from the book and given into the hands of the seniors and superintendents. If the Lithuanians wished they might print it for themselves as page 441. Special attention was given to the form of Lord's Supper, which was revised according to the requirements of the Lithuanian Church. These changes were to be printed and subscribed by hand by all the delegates with the appropriate seals and signatures. 517 Because of Lithuanian concerns over the term ‘Agenda,’ it was decided that they may be allowed to title the book Akt usługi. However, it was stated that this must not be understood to establish a precedent. The term ‘Agenda’ could still be used as the title of a future book. 518

The Akt usługi appeared in the Polish language late in 1644, in Lubcza, Podlassia. The order of the Lord’s Supper exhibited some minor changes. The Polish tradition predominated, but some Lithuanian elements had been reintroduced. Two hymns were given at the Invocation of the Holy Spirit, one of which was from the Lithuanian catechismal tradition. The Prayer towards the Words of Christ, which the Gdańsk Book has joined together with the Confession of Sins, was restored as a

515 Generalis Confessio Doctrinae Ecclesiarum Reformatorum in Regno Poloniae, Magno Ducatu Lithuaniae ... ad Liqvidationem Controversiarium maturandam proposita. Sprawy-Duchowne 1612-1853, 64-73.
518 Akt a synodów 1644-1775, 1-4; Akta synodów 1570-1676, (manuscript 4) 1-21; Acta Albo Constitucie 1618-1704, 170-172; Księga synodów 1636-1678, 109.
separate act before the Testamentary Words. The recitation of the Narrative of the Institution from 1 Corinthians 11:23-29, a Lithuanian tradition, was offered as a permissible alternative to the form found in the Gdańsk Book. The Our Father was given without melody, although it was noted that it was permissible to sing it. The most significant alteration was a restoration of a single distribution of the bread and wine together. The Gdańsk Book had called for the distribution of the bread after Paul’s words over the bread (1 Corinthians 10) to be spoken, then the distribution of the cup was to take place after the speaking of Paul’s words over the cup. The Lithuanians solved this problem by issuing the invitation to the table only after Paul’s words have been spoken in their entirety. They had not been satisfied with the distribution formulas in the Gdańsk Book and therefore amended them by adding the words “Christ said, this is my body...” and “Christ said, this is my blood...”, thus muting the significance of the phrases "Body of Christ" and "Blood of Christ.519

It may seem strange that the 1644 service included some elements against which the Lithuanians had earlier complained, such as Confession (Spowiedź) and Absolution (Rozgrzeszenie).520 It is noteworthy too that they continued to allow the use of the Agnus Dei, which in the Western tradition is a prayer of adoration directed to Christ on the Altar. Here, however, it was placed earlier in the rite to be sung in connection with Paul’s words concerning the broken bread from 1 Corinthians 10. Remarkably, this service also included a Gregorian melody for the singing of the Creed, a melody which one would have expected to be dropped because of its association with the Roman Church.

It is difficult to avoid forming the impression that Lithuanian victory in the Convocation at Orla was not as comprehensive as they may have thought it to be. In the end we find a basically Polish Holy Communion to which some Lithuanian elements have been added. Although the Lithuanians may be said to have been victorious in their struggle, the cost of victory was in fact the surrender of a liturgical tradition which extended back to the time of the great theologian and liturgist Johannes a Lasco. Lithuanians had come to Orla in a contentious spirit, issuing ultimatums to the effect that the Poles must accept all their proposal for the sake of unity. However, their proposals, though strictly worded, were too narrow. They

\[\text{519 \ Akt usługi 1644, 20-47.}\]
\[\text{520 In the case of “Confession” (“Spowiedź”) this agenda also provides for the use of an alternative title, “Confession of Sins” (“Spowiedź, abo wyznanie grzechow”).}\]
called for no major reworking of the service. What they proposed was easily fitted into the pattern of the Gdańsk Service of the Holy Communion. In the last days of Orla the spirit of contention seems to have disappeared, with the result that in the end the Lithuanians accepted terms, such as Confession, Absolution, and Agenda, which they had earlier labeled offensive and reminiscent of Rome.

The use to which the *Akt usługi* was put is not altogether clear. It is known of course that it was used in Lithuania and that the copies were distributed also to the sister churches for their use. However, the Poles saw no pressing reason to make use of this book or its provisions. They were already well used to the Gdańsk Book and it reflected well their own traditions. Their participation in the formulation of *Akt usługi* must be seen as evidence of their intense desire to maintain some measure of unity with the Lithuanians in the hope that future negotiations would indeed result in the unification of the rites and the publication of the new agenda.

The final goal of the Orla Convocation was the publication a single agenda to be used in Poland and Lithuania by all the Reformed and Brethren congregations. The publication of the 1644 book was a step forward, but the final goal had not yet been reached. Within a year, at their Convocation at Bełżyce held on May 1, 1645, the Minor Poles recalled that aim and formally acquainted their congregations with the terms of the Orla agreement.\(^{521}\) The question would be put before the next general convocation of the churches.

The Lithuanians too brought the question of the unification of the rites in their Synod, which began on June 10, 1646, in Vilnius. Here the delegates declared themselves heartily in favor of the unification of the rites, but at the same time they insisted that the continued use of their familiar Lithuanian services did not impede unity. This statement indicates a certain ambivalence in Lithuanian attitudes. They desired to please the Poles with words supporting unification, but at the same they sought to placate their own Lithuanian congregations by assuring them that they could continue to use some of their familiar rites and ceremonies.\(^{522}\)

 Eight years passed before any action was taken on the agenda. At their Church-wide Convocation in Bełżyce on May 1, 1654 the Minor Poles seized the initiative. Perhaps remembering that positive results had come in 1643 because they had sent to the Lithuanians both a written petition and a personal representative, the
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\(^{521}\) *Acta Albo Constitucie* 1618-1704, 172.

\(^{522}\) *Księga druga aktów* 1638-1675, 105.
Poles delegated their Minister Arnolf Jarzyna to Vilnius Synod persuade the delegates to act favorably on the matter of unification.\textsuperscript{523}

In the Synod at Vilnius which began on June 14, 1654, the Lithuanians assented and assured the Minor Polish Church that they maintain unity in the sacred rites. They noted that in accordance with the decisions at Orla they were making frequent use of the three sacred acts printed in the 1644 book. But with regard of the observance of the administration of the Lords Supper, they exercised that liberty which the Wlodawa 1634 Convocation had allowed them. They noted that they were not alone in exercising such liberty, for the other churches do the same. The other ministerial acts of the agenda which were corrected at Orla have been introduced into the congregations to be used, as feasible. They stated their agreement that the other rites and ceremonies should be negotiated in the coming general convocation. In addition they sent a minister of their church, Andrzej Paszkowski, to the Minor Polish Synod at Oksza to discuss these statements and the question of a general convocation.\textsuperscript{524}

At the Church-wide Synod at Oksza on September 18-21, 1654, both this question and the question of establishing a seminary for the Lithuanian and Minor Polish Churches were on the agenda. The Poles asked that Lithuanians consider these matters at their next synod.\textsuperscript{525} The Vilnius Synod, which began on June 6, 1655, resolved that both questions should be put to a coming general convocation to be held shortly. They send Andrzej Paszkowski as their delegate to the Synod in Chmielnik to discuss the question of the convocation on their behalf.\textsuperscript{526} The convocation did not meet, and no further work was undertaken on the unification of the rites in that decade.

On October 5-6, 1663, at the Church-wide Synod at Chmielnik the question of a general convocation was again raised. The synod decided to send Samuel Keschner, Senior of Lublin, to Lithuania and Daniel Kalaj, Consenior of Kraków, to Major Poland to urge the convening of a general convocation.\textsuperscript{527} For reasons unspecified made it impossible for Keschner to go to Vilnius. Subsequently the District Synod of Oksza meeting from September 30 to October 1, 1665 decided that

\textsuperscript{523} Ksi\ę\w{g}a druga aktów 1638-1675, 185; Tworek 1971, 136.
\textsuperscript{524} Ksi\ę\w{g}a druga aktów 1638-1675, 185-186.
\textsuperscript{525} Ksi\ę\w{g}a dystryktyowa 1634-1722, 119-123.
\textsuperscript{526} Ksi\ę\w{g}a druga aktów 1638-1675, 204.
\textsuperscript{527} Ksi\ę\w{g}a dystryktyowa 1634-1722, 140-142; Tworek 1971, 137.
the security of a general convocation could not be guaranteed. Therefore it was necessary to postpone it.528

The next initiative came from the Lithuanians at their 1668 Vilnius Synod. The second matter on the agenda was unification of the rites and church order. They declared that this was a pressing necessity to which all three churches must give attention at a general convocation. As an indication of their seriousness, they selected delegates to represent them at the meeting. Delegates selected included the highest nobleman Bogusław Radziwiłł, along with the lesser nobles Jan Tryzn, Teofil Rajecki, Jan Grudzewski, Jan Frackiewicz-Radzimiński, Puzyn, Jan Czyż, Jan Cedrowski, Stefan Cedrowski, Jan Kamiński, Jan Rynwid. Their instructions were to observe the same instructions as had been issued to the delegates attending the 1644 Convocation at Orla. The meeting was set for September 20, 1671.529 The 1669 meeting reaffirmed these arrangements.530 However, once again it was not possible for the general convocation to gather.

The Vilnius Synod which began on July 3, 1672 once again affirmed the importance of a general convocation. Krzysztof Potocki, the Lithuanian representative, and Samuel Keszner, Superintendent of Minor Poland, were given the responsibility of finalizing arrangements for the meeting.531 The Vilnius Synod which began on June 26, 1675 called the convoking of a general convocation a matter of great necessity and approved the selection of Chmielnik as the site of the meeting to be held in 1676. On the list of delegates we find Krzysztof Żarnowiec, Senior of Białoruś, Mikołaj Minwid, Superintendent of Samogitia, Krzysztof Kraiński, Consenior of Podlussia and others. Once again precise instructions were given to the delegates.532 For reasons which are not altogether clear, no reference is found in these instructions to the matters of the unification of rites. It may be that political conditions were more pressing, and the question of rites had once again been relegated to a secondary position.

At long last the General Convocation of the three churches convened at Chmielnik on January 21-23, 1676. Twenty one items were on the agenda for discussion, with unification of rites in last item. Little more was said about it than

528 Księga dystryktowa 1634-1722, 148.
529 Księga druga aktów 1638-1675, 289-291.
530 Księga druga aktów 1638-1675, 307.
531 Księga druga aktów 1638-1675, 336; Tworek 1971, 137.
532 Księga druga aktów 1638-1675, 375.
that it would be on the agenda for the next general synod.\footnote{Akta synodów 1570-1676, (manuscript 5) 1-15.} They were not to know at that time that the next general synod would convene only after 53 years had passed. When the churches gathered again at the 1719 General Synod in Gdańsk the unification of the rites was no longer a matter of concern.\footnote{Akta synodów 1570-1676, (manuscript 9) 1-11.} The Counter Reformation had swept through Poland and Lithuania, and the Protestant communities were now living in hostile territory as a faithful remnant concerned chiefly with the ultimate question, the question of survival.

By the second half of the 17th century the older forms were beginning to disappear from Lithuania and memories of past traditions were fading. In their hands they had the Gdańsk Book and the 1644 Akt usługi. Younger generations grew up knowing only these, and thus the disappearance of the uniquely Lithuanian tradition of Johannes a Lasco was inevitable. In its place was a liturgy agreed at Orla 1644, a Polish creation with a few specifically Lithuanian elements. As Akt usługi came into ordinary usage, it engendered in the people a loyalty which looked upon it as truly Lithuanian. They remained faithful to it, and in 1742, 98 years after its first publication, they reprinted it in Königsberg, giving it the title \textit{Sześć aktów}. To its three services they added three more forms, taken from the Great Gdańsk Agenda, to make it more useful to the ministers as manual of pastoral acts.\footnote{Sześć aktów 1742.} In its new and somewhat more adequate form it would continue in use to be treasured by generations yet to come.

It must be said that the unification of the rites, at least as far as the Poles envisioned it, was only partially accomplished. Although the Lithuanians may be said to have lost their unique tradition of the Lord's Supper, the spirit which formed that tradition remained. Thus something of a uniquely Lithuanian liturgical identity was never completely eradicated, but continued to endure.
3. The Contours of the Holy Communion Rites in the Agendas

The survey of Reformed forms for Holy Communion reveals that nowhere in them does Holy Communion appear to be based upon the same pattern as the usual Sunday worship. In every case it represents a special, occasional celebration of great spiritual moment in the life of parish and its members. In this it departs from the classical pattern of the Western Church as it continued to be used also after the Reformation in the Roman Catholic and Lutheran Churches.

The usual Sunday worship among the Reformed found its center, not in Holy Communion, but in systematic preaching, usually based upon the exposition of a book of the Bible. Holy Communion was celebrated only occasionally and was made of the celebration a great social, as well as, spiritual event in which all members of the Communion were expected to participate. Indeed, participation in the celebration and Communion reception were understood to be public marks of Christian faith and profession. As would be the case also later in Pietism, to an even greater extent, so too in this earlier period great emphasis came to be placed upon an often and elaborate form of preparation for participation. Here as elsewhere in the Reformed tradition the \textit{fractio panis} becomes an essential part of the Reformed rite. Among the Reformed it was understood to be an essential Eucharistic action by which the church of the present day imitates the action of her Master in the first Supper.

Accordingly, the analysis of the structure will proceed along somewhat different lines then would the case if were parallel to the tradition of other churches in the Christian West and East, i.e., the division between the \textit{Missa catechumenorum} and the \textit{Missa fidelium}. We will not be able to isolate the parts of the service immediately surrounding the setting apart and distribution of the elements from the rest of the rite, for it is the action as the whole which is important. It lays before us the full understanding of the sacrament in these Reformed Churches. Indeed it is difficult in examining these orders to detect any clear division between the major parts of the service. What is called for is a cautious approach to the examination of these liturgies and, in turn, an analysis of each part of the service, which avoids the temptation to oversimplification.
Forma albo porządek 1581

Form or Order for the celebration of the Lord's Sacraments, such as Holy Baptism and general Lord's Supper together with other Ceremonies and Services of the Lord's Congregation for the use of pious Pastors and true Ministers of the Lord Christ, newly published and printed at Vilnius in the year of the Son of God 1581.

71 pages. The book measures approximately 15.5 cm long and approximately 9 cm wide. It has never before appeared in Polish and Lithuanian bibliographies. It was recently found in the Public Library of Schaffhausen in Switzerland, acquisition number: KSt 9. It claims to be a reprint of an earlier edition which had been published in the printing house of the Radziwill the Brown in Vilnius. It is the oldest extant liturgical source available. Although prepared for use in Lithuania, it is written in the Polish language. Several later reprints appeared. The 1594 edition is held by the Uppsala University Library, acquisition number: Obr.65:232. The 1598 edition is found in Vilnius University library, acquisition number: II 2240, and the edition for the year 1600 is found in the Ossoliński National Institute Library in Wroclaw (Breslau), acquisition number: XVI.O.267. This work represents the third part of a larger work which included also a catechism and hymnal. It is printed in fraktur, to be used by Reformed congregations throughout Lithuania. Included together with the form of the Lord's Supper are Orders for Holy Baptism, Holy Matrimony, and Visitation of the Sick. We have no external evidence concerning the authorization of this work for use in the Lithuanian Church, since the protocols from this period are no longer extant. The book is for use of the ministers and by members of the congregation, to guide them in their preparation for worship and their participation in the services. A second 1598 edition provides Polish and Lithuanian on facing pages, giving us the first and only extant early liturgy in the Lithuanian
language from this period. The translator was Malcher Pietkiewicz (Merkelis Petkevičius) (ca.1550-1608), the Secretary of Vilnius region.

The service of the Holy Communion shows the strong imprint of Lasco's *Forma ac Ratio*. Building upon the foundation which his work had provided, many innovations may be noted, particularly with reference to the distribution. Some of Lasco's provisions have been shortened, particularly the sections dealing with the services which lead up to the preparation for Holy Communion. Unlike the later Polish rites, musical notation is not provided. The complete celebration of the Holy Communion calls for a series of services to be held.

**Order for the Second Week before Communion.** Directions for the celebration for the Holy Communion require that two weeks before the day designated for Communion the minister is to publicly announce its approach and admonish the people to a careful self-examination, so that the sacrament might not be dishonored. Children will not be admitted, but only those who can give an account of their lives, who have been catechized and publicly profess their faith. Travelers and other visitors are not to be admitted unless they have given evidence to the minister of their profession of faith and obedience to the church’s teachings.

**Order for the Day before Communion.** The elders and other ministers are to assemble themselves in the places of honor before the congregation and examine them particularly with regard to their sins. The purpose of this examination is to assist the unlearned to make a thorough examination and a good confession. The people are also admonished to bodily fasting and fervent prayer until the Communion service.

**Order for the Day of Communion.**

1. **Sermon.** The minister is to direct attention in his sermons to Holy Communion or make Holy Communion the subject of his sermon, so as to remind the people what Christ wishes to say and signify by this mystery, and in what way it behooves them to receive it. This directive corresponds exactly to that found in Calvin’s Geneva (1542) and Strassburg (1545) orders.
2. **Prayer for the Right and God-pleasing Worship.** The minister gives glory to God and calls upon him graciously to grant the worshipers true faith that they may give him fitting praise.

3. **Exhortation and Excommunication.** Exhortation to worthy Communion and Declaration of Excommunication of the unworthy, according to the terms set in Calvin's 1542 Geneva order.

4. **Confession of Sins.** The congregation confesses sins and pleads for mercy for the sake of Christ. Amendment of life is promised.

5. **The Word of Comfort.** The minister speaks the Word of Comfort as extended to those who are eternally sorry for their sins. God’s mercy is promised to those who are both sincerely sorry and trust in God’s mercy and who believe that God will honor his promise to be merciful to such.

6. **Admonition to worthy Reception.** The minister reminds the people that whatever good is in them is not their own; it is the work of God and, by the power of the Holy Spirit they are to give themselves to the imitation of Christ, so that their present and future partaking may be worthy.

7. **A Prayer for Communion.** The minister prays for communion with Christ and the confirmation of fellowship in him with one another, and that those who will receive Christ, the spiritual food and drink for the soul, may attest that God is their merciful Father.

8. **The Words of Christ’s Testament.** The historical narrative from 1 Corinthians 11, 23-29 is read. At the Words of Christ ‘Take, eat’ the minister takes the bread in his hands and breaks it. There are no manual acts associated with the cup.

9. **The Meaning of the Testament and Admonition.** The minister reminds the communicants of Paul’s words concerning unworthy eating and drinking which they had just heard. He incites them by the Holy Spirit to lift up their eyes and hearts to be united with Christ’s body and blood in heaven.

10. **Words of 1 Corinthians 5.** The minister calls upon the people to keep the feast and eat the bread with sincerity and truth, for Christ their Paschal Lamb has been offered for them: “Christ our Passover is sacrificed for us. Therefore let us keep the feast, not with old leaven, neither with the leaven of malice and wickedness; but with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth” (1 Corinthians 5:7b, 8).
11. *The Breaking of the Bread and the Words over the Cup.* The ministers recites the words of Paul concerning the broken bread from 1 Corinthians 10 while he breaks the bread and fills the paten. Then, taking the chalice, he pours wine into it while reciting Paul’s words concerning the cup of blessing from 1 Corinthians 10.

12. *The Our Father.* The minister invites the congregation to join him in praying the Our Father.

13. *Invitation to God’s Table, Examination of the Neophytes.* The minister initially invites those who are coming for the first time, and asks them (1) if they intend to remain firm in the faith which they have confessed, (2) if they confess that they have been admitted to a holy gathering in which God’s word is rightly preached and his sacraments rightly administered. He asks further (3) whether they intend to remain under the church’s discipline.

14. *Prayer of Humble Access.* The minister asks that God would make the communicants worthy, making them the very vessel into which the body and blood of Christ is placed and poured. Finally, it is asked that Christ would feed these communicants with heavenly food.

15. *The Distribution of the Bread and Cup.* The bread of the Supper is given into the hands of the communicants with the words: “Take, eat, this is the body of our Lord Jesus Christ which he gave into death for us and for our salvation.” At the giving of the Cup he says: “Take, drink from this all of you, this cup is the New Testament of the blood of our Lord Jesus Christ which for the redemption of our sins is shed on the cross.” While the people commune, men first, a lector reads aloud the sixth chapter of the Gospel according to John.

16. *Words of Consolation and Encouragement.* After all have communed and returned to their places, the minister encourages the people to believe without any doubt that they have participated in this Supper of the Lord in memory of the death of Christ and therefore should be certain that they
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536 “Bierzcie / iedzcie / to iest ciâlo Páná nášzego / Jezusá Krystusá / ktore zá nas iest ná śmierć wydáne dla zbawienia nášzego... Bierzcie / piycie z tego wszyscy / ten Kubek iest Nowy Testáment we krwi Páná nášzego Jezusá Krystusá / ktora dla nas iest wylana ná krzyžu / na odpuszczenie wszystkich grzechow nášzych.” *Forma albo porządek* 1581, c.
have Communion with Jesus Christ though his body and blood, to life everlasting.

17. Exhortation to Thanksgiving. The minister expresses the conviction that none who have commended will have failed to feel the power and fruitfulness of their Communion with Christ, the Lord. He also expresses the hope that all will in the future take their places with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob in the Kingdom of God in celebration of the merit and victory of Christ the Lord.

18. Prayer of Thanksgiving. The minister gives thanks that God has given his only-begotten Son, through whose death they have received forgiveness of all their sins and together with it fellowship in all righteousness, merit, and victory. He also recognizes their continuing weakness and prays that these gifts would establish their thankfulness and that they would through the Holy Spirit produce good fruits.

19. Collection of Alms. Offerings for the poor are then to be taken.

20. Benediction. The people are blessed: “May the merciful Lord God who has fed and given us to drink the body and blood of his most beloved Son, graciously keep our hearts and souls for his praise and glory and bless us through all the ages.”

21. Dismissal. The service ends with the final hymn: Błagosław nam nasz Panie.\footnote{Forma albo porządek 1581, b-ciiij.}
Order for the Lord's Supper.

This handwritten manuscript was found in the Library of the Academy of Science in Vilnius, in a collection of documents, cataloged as Sprawy duchowne 1612-1843, acquisition number: F40-460. The manuscript measures approximately 33 cm long and 20.5 wide and comprises 4 pages. It announces itself to be a copy of the form of the Holy Communion from the Lithuanian catechism.\textsuperscript{538} The Lithuanian Church only produced two catechisms in the early decades of the 17\textsuperscript{th} century. The first was published without synodical approval by Jan Zygrowiusz (†1623) in Lubcza in 1618. The church rejected this catechism because of weaknesses in its presentation of the doctrine of the Trinity. The second catechism appeared in Lubcza in 1621.\textsuperscript{539} It was produced by a synodical commission in 1620 and received the official approval of the church. According to the synodical protocols, this catechism included \textit{Forma albo porządek} with the liturgical orders for Holy Communion, Holy Baptism, Holy Matrimony, and Visitation of the Sick. Samuel Lenartowicz, who identifies himself as the copyist of the \textit{Sprawa Wieczerzy Panskiey}, was responsible for the preparation of the form of Holy Communion included with the official catechism.\textsuperscript{540} Three copies of Lithuanian catechisms from this period have survived,\textsuperscript{541} but the title pages and dates of publication are lacking. None of them included the liturgical forms which were included in the official catechism of 1621, so we must assume that these catechisms are from 1618. Therefore we conclude that the present document is from the catechism of 1621 which is no longer extant, and

\textsuperscript{538} Ta Forma Wzięta jest z Katechizmu Litewskiego. X. Samuel Lenartowicz. \textit{Forma albo porządek} 1621, 77.
\textsuperscript{539} The date is approximate. It may have been published in the late months of 1620, however, the protocols of the Vilnius synod of 1621 indicate that the work was officially introduced in 1621. We will refer to this catechism as the 1621 catechism, after the year of its official introduction.
\textsuperscript{540} \textit{Akta synodów} 1915, 55.
\textsuperscript{541} Library of Academy of Science in Vilnius; acquisition number: L - 17 / 279; Jagiellonian University Library in Kraków; acquisition numbers: Cim. 754, Cim. 1393.
represents the official liturgy of the church of that time. We refer to it as *Forma albo porządek* 1621, prepared by the synodical Notary Samuel Lenartowicz.

The synodical protocols indicate that at the Vilnius Synod of 1620 two forms were prepared, one was very traditional, and another showing marks of the influence of newer liturgical developments. Duke Krzysztof Radziwiłł was asked to examine these two liturgies and to decide which would be closer to the heart of the Lithuanian people. An examination of the present form shows that Radziwiłł decided for the more traditional pattern of service. Indeed the 1621 form of the Lord’s Super follows closely the provisions found in earlier books, dating back to the 1581 agenda. Although most of the service in *Forma* follows the earlier book word for word, there are a few minor changes.

The orders the second week before Communion and the day before Communion are not found in our manuscript copy. This does not necessarily mean that these services had been dropped. It is more likely that Samuel Lenartowicz saw no need to recopy these lengthy services, since he was limiting himself the actual liturgical changes in the new order. The manuscript is limited to the actual liturgical actions.

**Order for the Day of Communion.**

1. *Call to Worship.* The minister recites Psalm 124:8: “Our help is in the name of the Lord who made heaven and earth.” This element was not found in earlier Lithuanian liturgies. The 1581 order had begun with the sermon and with directions concerning the purpose of the supper and beneficial participation.

2. *Exhortation.* The Exhortation is taken from the 1581 service *verbatim.* However, 1581 agenda had joined this exhortation with the announcement of excommunication. In this liturgy the following prayer intervenes between the two.


4. *Excommunication.* A shortened form of the excommunication from the 1581 service follows. Backsliding and stubborn members are no longer singled out.

5. *Confession of Sins.* The 1581 text is reproduced.

7. *Admonition to worthy Reception.* The admonition is shortened version of the 1581 text.

8. *A Prayer for Communion.* The prayer is shortened from the 1581 order. Omitted is the last section which identifies Christ as the meat and drink of the soul, through whose blood the people are blessed to be the nation and sons of God the Father.

9. *The Words of Christ’s Testament.* The 1581 text is reproduced. There are no manual acts associated with the bread and cup. The section about the meaning of the testament is omitted.

10. *Words of 1 Corinthians 5.* The 1581 text is reproduced.

11. *The Breaking of the Bread and the Words over the Cup.* The 1581 text is reproduced.

12. *The Our Father.* The 1581 text is reproduced.

13. *Invitation to God’s Table, Examination of the Neophytes.* An altered wording of the three scrutinies is provided. The first scrutiny concerns the nature of this gathering and the truth of the word proclaimed in it, and the sacraments which it are administer in the church. The second concerns faithfulness unto death - in 1581 order this had been the first question. The third question is concerns willingness to remain under the discipline of the church. It is shortened from 1581.


15. *The Distribution of the Bread and Cup.* The 1581 text is reproduced, but the reading of John 6 has been replaced by a hymn.

16. *Words of Consolation and Encouragement.* The 1581 text is reproduced.

17. *Exhortation to Thanksgiving.* The 1581 text is reproduced.

18. *Prayer of Thanksgiving.* The 1581 text is reproduced.

19. *Collection of Alms.* The 1581 text is reproduced.

20. *Benediction.* The 1581 text is reproduced.

21. *Dismissal.* The 1581 text is reproduced.\(^{542}\)

\(^{542}\) *Forma albo porządek* 1621, 74-77.
Porządek nabożeństwa 1599

Order of worship of the Universal, Apostolic Church, established upon the Word of God and founded upon Jesus Christ, who is the God of Israel, Son of God, united with the Father from before the Ages, Savior, Priest, the only Source without Deputy, who atoned for the Sins of Men. Written to the Praise of God, who is One in Trinity, in the year 1598. By the Minister Krzysztof Kraiński, Superintendent of the Reformed Churches in Minor Poland with the recommendation and permission of the Brethren of the District of Lublin. Printed in Toruń, 1599.

497 pages. The book measures approximately 19 cm long and 12.5 wide. It is held by the Ossoliński National Institute library in Wrocław (Breslau), acquisition number: XVI-3070. It is written in Polish, in fraktur. Authorized in 1598 at the District Synods of Lublin and Kryłów and published for the use of the Reformed congregations in Minor Poland for the ministers in Districts of Lublin, Bełz, and Chełm. The author of this agenda is Superintendent Krzysztof Kraiński, who also produced the hymnal together with the catechism (1596), a postil (1608), and numerous other works for the church’s use. Included in the agenda are the forms of Holy Baptism, Churching of Women, Lord’s Supper, Communion of the Sick, Holy Matrimony, Ordination of Deacons, Ministers, Seniors, Visitation of the Sick, Burial of the Dead, Confirmation, Reconciliation of Penitents, Acceptance of Converts from Roman Church, Arians, Anabaptists, Jews, Turks and Tatars, Sabbath Worship, Worship on Work Days, Worship in Advent, Christmas, Lent, Easter, Ascension Day, Pentecost, Day of the Holy Trinity, Martyrs, St. Mary, the Apostles, the Angels, and the day of Fasting and Prayer. It continued in use for only three years. A successor volume was published in 1602 for use in a much wider area of Poland.
The examination of *Porządek nabożeństwa* of 1599 indicates that Communion is to be celebrated four times a year, at Christmas, Easter, Day of Pentecost, and the Sunday after St. Michael’s day. A special order of preparation for entire week services is provided, including the detailed instructions for morning and evening prayers, together with the supplement to order for the day of Communion for use in the Autumn and on special occasions. In general, the rite follows the pattern established by Johannes a Lasco's work, although not to the same extent as the Lithuanian books.

**Order for One Week before Communion.** A special order for an entire week of services is provided for use before the autumn celebration and all special celebrations of Holy Communion. Both morning and evening services are to be held during this week. For the morning services the following order is provided. The service opens with the singing of two hymns *Znamy Oycze nász niebieski* and *Jezus Krystus nász miły*. Paul’s historical recitation of the Lord’s Testament is read and explained, a special prayer for Holy Communion is offered, and the service concludes with the ascription of praise *Bogu Oycu y Synowi*. The evening service begins with the hymns *O błogosławiony kądy ten* and *Bądź chwała Bogu na wysokości*, a reading and explanation of John 6 follows, then the evening prayer is offered, and the *Bogu Oycu y Synowi* concluded the service. On Friday the time of fasting begins and the prescribed service for times of fasting is used with the addition of the prayer for Holy Communion.543

**Supplement to order for the Day of Communion for Use in the Autumn and on Special Occasions.** On the day of Communion three services are held. The morning service begins with the ascription of praise *Bogu Oycu y Synowi*, the people sing the hymns *Zchodźmy się a weselmy się* and *Jezus Krystus Pan ten*, then the sermon provided further instruction about Holy Communion. Afterwards the congregation sings *Ciebe Bogá chwalimy* and the minister prays a Communion prayer. The service concludes with the singing of *Bogu Oycu y Synowi*.

The Main Service begins before noon.

1. **Ascription of Praise.** The minister begins with the words *Bogu Oycu y Synowi*.

543 *Porządek nabożeństwa* 1599, 494.
2. **Exhortation.** He speaks about the reason for this special gathering with special emphasis on the remembrance of the death of Christ, the strengthening of faith, the assurance of forgiveness and eternal life received through the sacrament. Confession of sins and the confession of faith are omitted in this service. After the exhortation people sing the hymns *Pánie náš studnico dobroći* and *Prośmyśrz dźiś ducha świętego*.

3. **Readings.** The minister gives the apostolic blessing and reads the Sunday gospel or another passage pertaining to the sacrament. After the reading the hymn *Smiluy się Pánie nád námi* is sung.

4. **Sermon.** The sermon is followed by Psalm 84: *O iák sq mise twe przybytke Pánie.*

Without prayer, the act of Communion immediately follows, according to the form provided in the Order for the Lord's Supper.

The evening service begins with two hymns *Czego chcesz po nas Pánie* and *Święty Duchu rácyzsz záwitác k nam*. This is followed by the appointed epistle for the day and the hymn *Jezu Kryste Pánie miły*. The evening prayer is offered, along with the *Bogu Oycu y Synowi*.

Finally, it is noted that this special form is to be observed in all times excepting Christmas, Easter and Pentecost.

---

**Order for the Day of Communion.**

1. **Invocation of the Holy Spirit.** The minister exhorts the congregation to join him in calling on the Holy Spirit, without whom there is no possibility of faith, godliness, or worthy Communion celebration and reception. Then is sung either the antiphon: *Święty duchu záwitay k nam* (*Veni Sancte Spiritus reple tuorum corda*), or the hymn: *Duchu święty záwitay k nam* (*Veni Sancte Spiritus et emite*).

2. **Confirmation of God’s Grace, Exhortation to Confession.** The minister recounts the goodness of God which he confirms to his people in his word and the church’s sacraments, and calls upon the congregation to kneel with him and make confession of sins.

3. **Confession of Sins.** A lengthy confession follows, read by the minister after which he says the Amen. No congregation responses provided.

---

544 *Porządek nabożeństwa* 1599, 495.
4. Declaration of Forgiveness. The minister encourages the congregation to firmly believe that God has forgiven their sins for the sake of the merit of Christ, according to his promise. He then states that as an apostolic minister set in office by the church he declares forgiveness in the name of the Father, Son, and the Holy Spirit to those who truly turn to God, repent of their sins, and live in charity with their neighbors.

5. Confession of Faith. Then either the Apostles Creed (*Credo in Deum Patrem omnipotentem*) or the Nicene Creed (*Credimus in unum Deum Patrem*) is sung by the congregation while the minister places bread on the paten and wine in the chalice and reverently covers then.

6. The Words of Christ’s Testament. Paul’s narrative of the Last Supper is introduced with words locating this event in the upper room.

7. The Meaning of the Testament and Admonition. The minister reminds the congregation of the seriousness of Paul's words concerning unworthy eating and drinking, and urges them to examine their consciences before participating in the Supper, lest they come into eternal condemnation.

8. Excommunication. Now the minister declares who may not participate in the Supper, namely unbelievers, pagans, Anabaptists, Jews, Turks, and others, even as Jesus warned that dogs and swine must be kept from the God’s Table. He does this as a steward of the mysteries of God, empowered to excommunicate those who are unworthy to participate.

9. Prayer toward the Words of Christ. The minister prays that Christ would himself bless the Supper and make the communicants worthy to receive his body and blood. Confessing complete unworthiness and need, he asks that Christ himself would come in blessing, so that he who is present at God’s right hand might strengthen the souls of his people with spiritual food and that the visible signs in the sacrament might confirm to the people their spiritual benefit forgiveness of sins and eternal life. The minister sings in Polish the antiphon *Naydroższą krwią swoią* (*Sanguine proprio redemisti nos Deus*) to introduce his Invitation to the communicants to come to the God’s Table.

10. Invitation to God’s Table. He invites the communicants to approach the sacrament with fear, faith and Christian love. First the men present
himself then the women forming a row in accordance with ancient Christian tradition.

11. **The Our Father.** The Lord's Prayer is sang or spoken by all, kneeling.

12. **Words of 1 Corinthians 5.** The minister uncovers the vessels and takes them in his hands while speaking the Pauline Words: “Christ is our sacrifice…, etc.,” and explains these words as meaning that Christ has himself offered the full and complete sacrifice for all sins. This unrepeatable sacrifice is remembered in the Lord's Supper as Christ himself commands in his words: “Do this…, etc.”

13. **Agnus Dei.** The *Agnus Dei* is sung to commemorate Christ’s sacrifice and plead for his mercy.

14. **The Breaking of the Bread.** The minister takes the bread and breaks it into three parts, and places them on the paten while repeating Paul’s words about the broken bread from 1 Corinthians 10.

15. **Recitation of Christ’s own Words over the Bread.** He then repeats Christ’s own Words over the bread: “Our Lord Jesus Christ when he came to his suffering sat together with his disciples at Supper as the holy evangelists say. He took bread (the minister takes bread), gave thanks, and broke it, saying: ‘Take, eat, this is my body. This do in the remembrance of me.’” At the words “He took…” the minister takes the bread in his hands.

16. **The Distribution of the Bread.** The bread is immediately distributed to the communicants with the words: “This same I also say unto you in the name of Christ: Take, eat, this is the body of our Lord Christ which is given for you.” All receive standing. The bread is received in hand.

17. **The Pauline Words about the Cup of Blessing.** Then when all have communed the minister takes the cup into his hands and repeats the Pauline Words from 1 Corinthians 10: “The cup of blessing which we bless is the communion of the blood of Christ.”

18. **Recitation of Christ’s own Words over the Cup.** Then he repeats Christ’s own Testamentary words as found in the Gospel according to Luke. “After Supper [he] took the cup and gave thanks and gave it to them saying: ‘Drink, all of you, this cup is the New Testament in my blood, which is shed for you for the forgiveness of sins. Do this as often as you
drink it in remembrance of me.’” At the words “He took the cup…” he takes the cup in his hands.

19. *The Distribution of the Cup.* The minister then distributes the cup, saying: “This same I also say unto you in the name of Christ: Take, drink, this is the blood of our Lord Christ which is given for you for the forgiveness of sins.” During communion, the Lord's Supper hymn from the catechism is sung. Should more bread and wine be needed, the necessary words are to be repeated. It is not made clear whether the necessary words consist of both the words of Paul and the Words of Christ, or whether it is the words of Paul or the Words of Christ which are to be considered primary.

20. *Exhortation to Thanksgiving.* When all have communed, the minister exhorts all to fervent thanksgiving, for now their consciences have been comforted and that they have received assurance of their place as guests in Christ's heavenly banquet.

21. *Prayer of Thanksgiving.* The Prayer of Thanksgiving follows - to each of the three members of the Holy Trinity in turn.

22. *Collection of Alms.* Then he reminds the congregation of the needs in their midst, and the needs of the poor.

23. *Dismissal.* The service ends without a final blessing with the hymn: *Bogu Oycu y Synowi.*

---

545 *Porządek nabożeństwa* 1599, 139-176.
Porządek nabożeństwa 1602

Order of Worship of the Universal, Apostolic Church, established upon the Word of God and founded upon Jesus Christ. Written to the Praise of God, who is One in Trinity, in the year 1602. By the authorization of the Seniors of the Reformed Churches in Minor Poland, with the recommendation and permission of the Synods of Ożarów and Włodzisław.

171 pages. The place of publication is unknown. The book measures approximately 19 cm long and 12.5 cm wide. It is held by the Ossoliński National Institute library in Wrocław, acquisition number: XVII-440. It is written in Polish, in fraktur, for the use of the clergy throughout all the districts of the Reformed Church in Minor Poland. It was authorized by direction of the Church-wide Synods of Włodzisław in 1601 and Ożarów in 1602 and was approved for use in the parishes by the seniors of the Reformed Church in Minor Poland in their 1602 Convocation at Radzanów. Subsequently the Church-wide Synod of Łańcut of 1603 also authorized the use of this book. Included are the forms of Holy Baptism, Churching of Women, Lord's Supper, Communion of the Sick, Holy Matrimony, brief provisions for special Worship during the Week, Sabbath Worship, special days, Advent, Christmas, New Year, Epiphany, Lent, Easter, and etc., provisions for Fasting and Communion preparation, Reception of Converts and Penitents, Visitation of the Sick, Burial of the Dead, Duties of Lectors, Ordination of Deacons, Ministers, Seniors or Superintendents, Order for Synods, Installation of the Ministers, and Visitation of the Parishes. This book continued in use until the publication of its successor volume in 1614.

This agenda is built upon the foundation of the great work of Krzysztof Kraiński which had appeared only three years earlier. Kraiński’s work had excited interest beyond the borders of the Districts of Lublin, Belz, and Chelm for which it
had been prepared. It was the purpose of the editors of the new book to make good
use of Kraiński's material by producing a work which would reflect the mind of the
larger church. Individual judgment should now give way to the considered judgment
of a larger number of students of the Reformed worship tradition. It will be no
surprise then that the two works appear very similar and differ only in details.

Order for the Second Week and the Day before the Communion. The
1602 work returns to the traditional practice of special admonitions and examinations
administered two weeks before the celebration and the day before the celebration of
Communion. We do not find them in the prominent place which they had occupied in
Lasco's original work and the 1581 Lithuanian book, but they appear in the form of a
note or rubric directing that these pious practices are to be observed in the churches;
the announcement of the coming celebration two weeks in advance, a further
announcement concerning fasting in preparation for the Supper, and registration of
all who wish to commune. Where circumstances dictate, the gathering of the
communicants before the elders and ministers for the purpose of examination may
also be reintroduced. Prayers, hymns, and other public exercises in preparation for
the celebration are also encouraged.\footnote{Porządek nabożeństwa 1602, 81.}

Order for the Day of Communion.
1. Invocation of the Holy Spirit. The service begins with the Invocation of
the Holy Spirit after the manner of the 1599 book. The first part of
Kraiński's introduction is quoted \textit{verbatim}. The 1602 book, however,
omits the second part of Kraiński's introduction, turning instead to an
antiphon: \textit{Duchu święty zāwitay k nam (Veni Sancte Spiritus reple tuorum
corda).}
2. Exhortation to make a Confession. The new book also shortens the
admonition which follows this antiphon. Whereas Kraiński had used it as
an occasion to speak of God’s mercy and the confession, the newer book
turns immediately to an exhortation to confess sins.
3. Confession of Sins. The form of confession which follows is adapted from
the confession of Kraiński.

5. *Confession of Faith.* Both the 1599 and 1602 agendas provide similar plainsong melodies traditionally associated with the Nicene Creed. The 1602 book uses the Gregorian melody which Luther used for his versification of the Nicene Creed *Wir glauben all' an einen Gott.* Apostles Creed is provided but it lacks a melody line. There is no provision for the preparation of the bread during the singing of the Creed as in the 1599 book.

6. *Prayer toward the Words of Christ.* The Prayer toward the Words of Christ which in 1599 rite follows *Verba Testamenti*, is found in the 1602 book immediately after the Creed, before the Christ’s Testamentary Words. Although this prayer is found before the Words of the Testament in the 1602 book, it is almost identical to the prayer which in 1599 immediately precedes the Invitation to God’s Table. The minister sings the antiphon *Naydroższą krwią swoją* (*Sanguine proprio redemisti nos Deus*).

7. *The Words of Christ’s Testament.* The Testamentary Words are quoted from Paul and the minister is directed to take the bread in his hands and break it into parts and to take also the chalice as the Bread-Words and Cup-Words are spoken. As in the 1599 book the Words of Christ’s Testament are taken from Paul's account in 1 Corinthians 11:23-29 in a narrative form.

8. *The Meaning of the Testament and Admonition.* A shortened form of Kraiński’s Admonition to caution and worthy Communion follows the recitation of the *Verba Testamenti*.


10. *Invitation to God’s Table.* The Invitation to the Table of God immediately follows without the intervention of other prayers, as in Kraiński. The Invitation is followed by the Lord’s Prayer.
11. The Our Father. The Lord’s Prayer is sung to the same melody as in 1599 book.

12. Words of 1 Corinthians 5. These are the same as in Kraiński, but with a much shortened version of his explanatory words.

13. Agnus Dei. The hymn Agnus Dei or as altered version: Synu Boży który głądzisz grzechy wszystkiego światâ (“Son of God who takes away sins of the world, we beseech you to hear us”) is sung. Kraiński had not provided the alternative.

14. The Breaking of the Bread. Kraiński's form for the Breaking of Bread, repeating the words of Paul from 1 Corinthians 10, follows.

15. The Distribution of the Bread. The minister distributes the blessed bread with the words: “Take, eat, this is the body of the Lord Christ, which is given for you.” This is a departure from Kraiński, who before the distribution repeated the Words of Christ over the bread and then proceeded to distribute it: “This same I also say unto you..., etc.”

16. The Pauline Words about the Cup of Blessing. When all have communed, he speaks Paul’s Words over the Cup from 1 Corinthians 10.

17. The Distribution of the Cup. The minister distributes the cup, saying: “Take, drink, this is the blood of the Lord Christ, which is shed for the remission of sins.” This again departs from Kraiński, who repeats the Words of Christ from Luke, and then distributes: “This same I also say unto you..., etc.” No provision is made for the setting apart of the additional elements. It is directed that during the administration of the sacrament the people should sing the hymns from the catechism.

18. Exhortation to Thanksgiving. The Admonition is similar as in 1599 book.

19. Prayer of Thanksgiving. The Prayer of Thanksgiving is much shorter and does not appear to be derived from Kraiński. The prayer is built upon the model of the traditional Vere dignum of the Prefatio, including the Sanctus, followed by a prayer for all sorts and conditions of men. An optional short hymn may be sung before the Benediction if time allows.

20. Benediction. The minister blesses the people with the Aaronic Benediction.

21. Collection of Alms. Ministers reminds the congregation of the needs of the church and of the poor.
22. *Dismissal*. The service concludes with the final hymn: *Bogu Oycu y Synowi*.\(^{547}\)

\(^{547}\) *Porządek nabożeństwa* 1602, 23-44.
Order of Worship of the Universal, Apostolic Church, established upon the
Word of God and founded upon Jesus Christ. Written to the Praise of God, who is
One in Trinity, in the year 1602. By the authorization of the Seniors of the Reformed
Churches in Minor Poland with the recommendation and permission of the Synods
Ożarów, Włodzisław and Łańcut. Second printing in the year 1614.

236 pages. The place of publication is
unknown. The book measures approximately 18.5
cm long and 14.5 cm wide. The agenda identifies
itself as the second printing of the 1602 volume,
but in fact there are numerous changes. It is held
by the Academy of Science in Vilnius, Lithuania,
acquisition number: XVII/613. Written in Polish,
in fraktur, it is primarily for the use of clergy in
the districts of the Reformed Church in Minor
Poland and was authorized by the Church-wide
Synod of Bełżyce in September 1613 and
approved for use, as we see in the preface, by the
seniors of the districts in Minor Poland. This
volume includes those offices which were in the 1602 book and adds several more. It
begins with a detailed calendar which runs to 23 pages and includes
commemorations from earlier centuries, including Biblical Saints, Fathers and
Doctors of the Church, and traditional observances from the life and ministry of
Jesus. The orders included are divided into two sections. The first consists in the
usual ministerial acts and the second includes forms of ceremonies restricted to
seniors and superintendents. Part I: Holy Baptism, Churching of Women, Lord's
Supper, Communion of the Sick, Holy Matrimony, brief provisions for special
Worship during the Week, Special Days, Advent, Christmas, New Year, Epiphany,
Purification of Mary, Lent, Easter and others. Included also are the commemoration
of Biblical Saints, Fathers and Doctors, days of special Prayer at Fasting, and
Provisions for Special Needs (War, Famine, and Plague), Reception of Converts,
Penitents, Visitation of the Sick, Burial of the Dead. Part II: duties of Lectors,
Ordination of Deacons, Ministers, Duties of Conseniors, Ordination of Seniors, Duties of the Superintendent, Order for Synods, Installation of the Ministers, Visitation of Parishes, Dedication of a Church, and Readings for church feasts. This book continued in use until the publication of the Great Gdańsk (Danzig) Agenda in 1637. It may be assumed that this new edition made the older book obsolete.

The 1614 agenda perpetuates the structure and in many cases also the wording of the 1602 rite. It is advertised as a reprint of the 1602 book, however, it departs form the earlier work in a few important respects. The detailed provision which earlier appeared in Lasco’s *Forma ac Ratio* and in the Lithuanian 1581 book for Communion preparation now reappeared, and the section on distribution is more precisely formulated.

**Order for the Second Week before Communion.** The content of the section of preparation is strongly reminiscent of Lasco’s 1550 and 1581 rites, although it is shorter than either of them. The first provision calls for a public announcement by the minister of the coming celebration of the Holy Communion and the necessity that each prospective communicant should examine himself concerning his worthiness to receive. Travelers or new comers who wish to commune are to be examined by the minister according to the criteria set down by St. Augustine about the sign of the sacrament and the reality toward which it points. Those who would commune are called upon to prepare for reception by fasting not one, but two days before Communion to increase thereby their worthiness to receive.

**Order for the Day before Communion.** On the day before the Communion there may be a session at which the communicants gather before the minister and elders for public examination and confession. At this time public sinners and others unworthy of participation are formally excluded form the community and its Communion. In accordance with the General Synod of Sandomierz of 1570, those who have not publicly announced in their intention to Communion to the minister and receive forgiveness will not be allowed to do so.

**Order for the Day of Communion.**

1. *Ascription of Praise.* The minister begins with the Ascription of Praise:
   “Eternal praise and glory be to God, the Father and the Son Jesus Christ
and the Holy Spirit, one God in Trinity” (Bogu Oycu y Synowi...). Congregation responds: “Amen.” A proper hymn or hymns de tempore are to be sung.

2. Sermon. The sermon begins with another ascription of praise to the Father, Son, and the Holy Spirit. There are no directions included regarding the text or subject of the message. It can be assumed that here as elsewhere the sermon will relate to the Lord's Supper and its worthy reception.

3. Invocation of the Holy Spirit. The form is identical to that in 1602. As in the earlier service the hymn is: Duchu święty záwitay k nam (Veni Sancte Spiritus reple tuorum corda).

4. Excommunication. The minister pronounces the Excommunication here rather than after the Testamentary Words of Christ, as in 1602. The text follows the earlier book with the addition of three introductory sentences not found in the 1602 rite. By placing them here the natural flow from the Words of Christ to communion is not disrupted.

5. Exhortation to make Confession. The admonition to confession of sins is the same as in 1602 form.

6. Confession of Sins. The confession is reproduced verbatim from 1602.

7. The Absolution. The Absolution is the same as in the 1602 rite.

8. Confession of Faith. Both the Apostle’s and Nicene Creeds are provided. A Gregorian melody is given with the Apostle’s Creed, and Luther’s melody is given with the Nicene Creed.

9. Prayer toward the Words of Christ. The prayer and hymn Naydroższą krwią swoj (Sanguine proprio redemisti nos Deus) which follows it reproduce the provisions included in the 1602 rite.


11. The Meaning of the Testament and Admonition. The Admonition is somewhat briefer than in 1602 and no longer serves to introduce the formula of Excommunication. The hymn for worthy reception O Wszechmocny Boże takes the place formerly occupied by the form of Excommunication.
12. *Words of 1 Corinthians 5*. The minister speaks the words of Paul called the ‘Offering.’ Again, the whole section is as in 1602.

13. *Agnus Dei*. Then follows the hymn *Agnus Dei* or its alternative: *Synu Boży ktory głądzisz grzechy wszytkiego świátá* is sung.

14. *Invitation to God’s Table*. During the singing of *Agnus Dei* the minister invites the communicants to come to the table.

15. *The Our Father*. The Lord’s Prayer is sung according to the same melody provided in the earlier book.

16. *The Breaking of the Bread*. The minister takes into his hand the bread and speaks the words of Paul concerning the broken bread.

17. *The Distribution of the Bread*. He then distributes the bread to the communicants. He communes first himself, saying: “In faith I eat the body of Christ for the salvation of my soul.” Then he distributes the blessed bread to the communicants, who stand to receive it, saying: “Take, eat, this is the body of the Lord Christ which is given for you. This do for the remembrance of his death.” The recipient responds: “Amen.”

18. *The Pauline Words about the Cup of Blessing*. Then he takes the cup into his hands and repeats the words of the Paul concerning the cup of blessing.

19. *The Distribution of the Cup*. The minister drinks from the cup, saying: “In faith I receive the blood of Christ for the forgiveness of my sins.” He then gives the cup to the communicants, saying: “Take, drink, this is the blood of the Lord Christ which is given for you for the forgiveness of sins. This do in remembrance of his death.” They respond: “Amen.” During Communion the communion hymns from the catechism are sung. If more bread or wine are needed, the minister sets it apart with the Christ's Testamentary words and following that the Pauline Words. He then administers with the same formula found above.

20. *Exhortation to Thanksgiving*. The Exhortation to Thanksgiving follows the wording of 1602.

21. *Prayer of Thanksgiving*. The Prayer of Thanksgiving as in 1602 with the addition of an eschatological note.

22. *Benediction*. The minister blesses the people with the Aaronic Benediction. No provision for a hymn before the blessing is given.
23. *Collection of Alms.* The minister reminds the congregation of the needs of the church and of the poor.

24. *Dismissal.* The service closes with the final hymn: *Bogu Oycu y Synowi.*

* Additional note concerning reliquiae. If any thing remains in the paten or in the chalice, the minister is to consume them, “…according to ancient tradition.”

---

548 *Porządek nabożeństwa* 1614, 25-55.
Agenda álbo Forma Porządku 1637

Agenda or Form of Worship of the Divine Service in the Evangelical Congregations of the Kingdom and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. To the eternal Praise and Glory of the Father, Son, and the Holy Spirit, God, who is One in Trinity, by common agreement and approbation of all the Congregations, now newly revised and published in Gdańsk. Published by Andrzej Hünefeldt in the year of the Lord 1637.

468 (+4) pages, published in Gdańsk (Danzig). The book measures approximately 18 cm long and about 13.5 cm wide. It is held by the Vilnius University Library, acquisition number: XVII/604. It is written in Polish, in fraktur. The book was prepared for use in the parishes throughout Major and Minor Poland, and Lithuania. Approval of the various parts was done successively in the General Convocations at Orla, 1633, Włodawa, 1634, and the completed work was accepted at the General Convocation of the Superintendents at Toruń, 1636, by the superintendents and seniors of all districts in Major and Minor Poland, and Lithuania. This is the first instance we have of a work approved by all three groups in Rzeczpospolita (The Commonwealth of Poland and Lithuania). The agenda follows the general plan of the 1599, 1602, and 1614 book, with a division made between pastoral acts for ordinary clergy and acts restricted to seniors and superintendents. It begins with a Calendar, as in the 1614 book. Part one includes the forms of Holy Baptism, Churching of Women, Lord's Supper, Communion of the Sick, Holy Matrimony, Reception of Converts (such as Jews, Turks, Tatars, Arians, and etc.), Reception of Penitents, Visitation of the Sick, and Burial of the Dead. The provisions are given for special Worship during the Week, Special Days, Advent, Christmas, Lent, Easter, a Day of Prayer and Fasting. Part two consists in the ordination of Acolytes, Lectors, Deacons, Ministers, Conseniors, Seniors or Superintendents, Election of Seniors or Superintendents, Order for General, Church-wide and District
Synods, Installation of the Ministers, Visitation of Parishes, Questioning of Patrons, Church Servants and Clergy during Visitation, Dedication of a New Church, Administration of Church Discipline, the Rite for Withholding Communion (Minor Excommunication), the Rite of Major Excommunication, and form relating to the Dissolution of Marriage. No documents have superseded the Great Gdańsk Agenda in Poland. However, its reception in Lithuania was not enthusiastic and a successor document appeared in 1644 in Lubcza. At the present time many of the provisions of the Gdańsk Book are still used throughout Lithuania and Poland.

The Great Gdańsk Agenda is both comprehensive and highly detailed in its regulations for the celebration of the Holy Communion. The preparation for Holy Communion here provides a more highly developed form than any other Lithuanian or Polish rite. It is the 1614 agenda which provides that basic pattern for the Lord’s Supper, but we find also the strong imprint of Lasco’s 1550 *Forma ac Ratio*, as well as some elements from the Lithuanian agendas of 1581 and 1621. Elements from all these rites combine in the creation of a new and more developed liturgy than any which preceded it.

**Order for the Second Week before Communion.** The traditional practice of announcing of the coming celebration two weeks in advance and admonishing the people to earnest preparation were kept in Poland and Lithuania. Specific form had been provided by Lasco and by the 1581 and 1614 agendas and the continuation of the practice had been recommended in the rites of 1599 and 1602. The Gdańsk Book provides a very detailed form of preparation to be practiced by all who intend to commune. The shape of this form is similar to that found in earlier books. Included are the citation of relevant Bible passages and as well as quotations from Irenaeus, Tertullian, Augustine and others. Also included is a detailed instruction concerning the Supper, again with quotation from the church fathers. A week before Communion the people are to register their intention to commune and attend a service of public confession. Mandated is the stipulation of a two day fast before Communion.

**Order for the Day before Communion.** Here for the first time in the Polish and Lithuanian agendas the preparations for the day before Communion are given definite shape and content.
1. *Triune Invocation*. The meeting begins with the Ascription of Praise to the Triune God.

2. *Admonition to Self-Examination*. The minister exhorts the communicants to think earnestly about their preparation, to make a close examination of themselves and to consider the meaning of the Christian faith for daily life as it is set down in the Gospel and the articles of the Christian faith.

3. *Examination*. Three scrutinies follow in which (1) the communicants are asked to acknowledge their sinful status and their standing before God, (2) to confess their faith in the forgiveness of sins through the blood of Christ, and (3) to state their intention to improve their life according to Christian standards.

4. *Admonition to walk in the Light*. The minister then solemnly reminds the communicants that they must turn from the path of darkness and walk in a way of light by the power of God’s mercy, which alone can accomplish what man is unable to do.

5. *Prayer*. He then prays a long prayer in which on behalf of the congregation he asks for forgiveness for every sin which leads to unworthiness and asks that all such sins be overcome for the sake of Christ, so that all who approach the God’s Table may do so worthily.

6. *Declaration of God’s essential Goodness*. The minister assures those who have confessed their sincere hope that God will forgive them and assure them of his kindness. He invites those who need a more personal Word of Comfort to come to him either individually, or together with others in a small group. He then enrolls the names of the communicants in the church’s journal.

7. *Assurance*. After the enrollment he assures the communicants that their names are assuredly written in heaven in the book of life, inscribed there from all eternity to God’s glory and their eternal blessedness.

8. *The Pax Domini and Apostolic Benediction*. The minister dismisses the people addressing to them the *Pax Domini* and the traditional Apostolic blessing from Romans 16:24.
It should be noted that it is a practice of some parishes that those who intend to commune appear before the session. A precise form is provided for such sessions.549

**Order for the Day of Communion.**

1. **Call to Worship.** The service itself begins with the words: “Our help is in the name of the Lord who created heaven and earth, Father, Son, and the Holy Spirit.” It is based upon Psalm 124:8 with the addition of the Triune name. An alternative form of ascription built upon Galatians 3:17, and John 6:35,41 is offered.

2. **Invocation of the Holy Spirit.** The Invocation begins with the same words as in 1614 book. The melody and words of the *Veni Sancte Spiritus* are given with some modifications from the earlier rites (*Święty Duchu przybądź á sercá tobie szczerże oddánych rządź*).

3. **Excommunication.** The form for Excommunication which follows is as in 1614 volume.

4. **Exhortation to make a Confession.** The admonition for confession differs slightly from the 1614 book.

5. **Confession of Sins.** The prayer of confession contains two parts. The first part is not found in earlier orders. The second part draws upon the Prayer toward the Words of Christ which in the 1614 agenda was placed immediately before the Words of the Testament.

6. **Agnus Dei.** The congregation sings the hymn: *Báránu nasz jedyny.*

7. **The Office of the Absolution.** It contains two elements. The first entitled: “Toward the Absolution” admonishes the people to heartily believe that God has heard their prayer and receives them graciously for the sake of Christ. For their further assurance God has provided the Office of the Keys, which the minister will now exercise. In the Absolution the ministers refers to himself as both a servant and ruler of the mysteries of God who speaks in the place of Christ. As such he proclaims that Christ forgives all who sincerely confess and repent and gives them permission to come to the Lord’s Table to receive eternal life. Whereas in 1614 the

549 *Agenda* 1637,78-99.
minister forthrightly said: “As a servant of Christ … I proclaim … the forgiveness of your sins,” the 1637 book softens this by saying “…in the stead of Christ … I proclaim … that God forgives all your sins.” The minister speaks: “Amen.”

8. Confession of Faith. In the Assurance of Forgiveness the congregation is invited to confess their faith, singing the Apostles Creed according to a plainsong melody. During the singing the minister prepares the bread and the wine.

9. The Words of Christ’s Testament. The minister speaks the Word’s of the Testament from 1 Corinthians 11:23-25. While doing so he unveils the bread and cup and speaks the Words of Christ, beginning with the words: “Our Lord Jesus Christ…” As he speaks, he lifts in his hands the bread and breaks it, and then lifts the cup in imitation of the action of Christ.

10. The meaning of the Testament and Admonition. The minister then explains the meaning of the sacrament and gives words of caution in an amplified version of the 1614 words. The congregation then sings the hymn: Naydroższą krwią swoią (Sanguine proprio redemisti nos Deus…) which in 1614 was sung before the Words of the Testament.

11. The Our Father. The congregation then sings the Lord’s Prayer in the manner as in the 1614 rite, according to the Gregorian melody.

12. Invitation to God’s Table. The minister invites the people to approach the table.

13. The Breaking of the Bread. The minister speaks the Pauline words over the bread. The wording is exactly the same as in 1614, but the Pauline question is made a declarative statement.

14. The Distribution of the Bread. He then distributes the bread to the communicants, saying: “Take, eat, this is the body of Lord Christ which is given for you. This do for the remembrance of his death.”

15. The Pauline Words about the Cup of Blessing. He takes the cup into his hands and speaks the words of Paul about the cup. Again, Pauline question is made a declarative statement.

16. The Distribution of the Cup. He gives the cup to the communicants, saying: “Take, drink, this is the blood of Lord Christ which is given for
you for the forgiveness of sins. This do in remembrance of his death.\textsuperscript{550}

During the distribution the people sing appropriate hymns. Provision is made for the setting apart of the additional elements by the recitation of the Pauline Words over the bread and cup. There is no reference, as in 1614, to the Testamentary Words of Christ.

17. \textit{Communion Blessing.} He gives the Communion blessing, saying: “He, the living bread which has come down from heaven and which gives life to the world, our Lord Jesus Christ, who has fed us with his holy body and given us to drink his precious blood, sanctify you completely, so that your spirit, soul and body remain without stain until Jesus Christ will come. May this be to his holy glory and your eternal salvation.”

18. \textit{Words of Consolation and Encouragement.} For the first time in the Polish liturgy the Words of Consolation of Lasco, found also in the Lithuanian rites, find their way into the common agenda of all three churches. “Believe and do not doubt all of you, who in this Lord's Supper have participated in the remembrance of the death of Christ with the contemplation of his mystery that you have certain and saving fellowship with he himself in his body and blood to eternal life.”

19. \textit{Exhortation to Thanksgiving.} The introductory words in the Exhortation to Thanksgiving appears to be modeled somewhat loosely on the words of Lasco, but on the whole this appears to be an independent production.

20. \textit{Prayer of Thanksgiving.} The prayer itself is the same as in the 1614 rite. As an alternative a general prayer of the church from the Bohemian Brethren Königsberg Agendas of 1580 and 1612 is provided.

21. \textit{Admonition to live a true Christian life.} The minister admonishes the people not to receive the grace of God in vain, but henceforth to live upright Christian lives and to provide for the support of the church and those who are in need.

22. \textit{Benediction.} The minister blesses the people with the Aaronic Benediction, to which has been added the \textit{Testimonium Davidium} and the \textit{Tersanctus}.

23. \textit{Dismissal.} The service concludes with the hymn: \textit{Bogu Oycu y Synowi}.\textsuperscript{551}

\textsuperscript{550} \textit{Agenda} 1637, 116-117.
\textsuperscript{551} \textit{Agenda} 1637, 100-127.
Akt usługi 1644

Form of the Service of Holy Baptism and the Holy Lord's Supper, together with the Form of Matrimony. For common and frequent use taken from the Agenda of the Evangelical Congregations of the Kingdom and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. 1 Corinthians 14, 19.40 “I would rather speak five words with understanding that I may teach others, than ten thousand words in a tongue. Let all thing done decently and in good order.” Published in Lubicza, anno 1644.

75 pages. The book measures approximately 19 cm long and 12.5 wide. It is held by the Ossoliński National Institute library in Wrocław, acquisition number: XVI.O.267. The book is written in Polish, in fraktur and printed in Lubicza, Podlassia, to be used primarily in Lithuanian Congregations, and recommended also for use in the congregations in Minor and Major Poland. The General Convocation of Orla authorized the publication of this work at its meeting in 1644 to answer Lithuanian objections concerning some provisions of the Great Gdańsk Book. The book includes forms for Holy Baptism, the Lord's Supper, and Holy Matrimony. Although the extent of the use of this work in Minor and Major Poland is unclear, this revised work was well accepted and was chiefly used in Lithuanian Church for the next century. In 1742 it was reprinted, with the addition of several pastoral acts taken directly from the Great Gdańsk Agenda.

The provisions in this document are represented as reprints of the same services in the Gdańsk Book. The careful inspection of the Communion liturgy shows as that the 1644 service departs from the Gdańsk liturgy in several places. These departures are most evident in the opening part of the service and in practices regarding communion distribution where the agenda returns to the Vilnius tradition. Omitted is the entire section regarding Communion preparation. No mention is found of the Gdańsk rubrics concerning two weeks before and the day before Communion.
or the regulations concerning the keeping of the fast. The omission of this order should not be taken to mean that it was dropped.

Order for the Lord's Supper.

1. Call to Worship. The same alternative formulas are provided as in the 1637 volume.

2. Invocation of the Holy Spirit. The invocation is virtually identical as in 1637 volume. However, in place to the hymn Święty Duchu przybądź ā sercā tobie szczzerże oddánych rządź (Veni Sancte Spiritus), the congregation may sing Święty duchu záwitay k nam (Veni Sancte Spiritus reple tuorum corda), a provision found in 1599, 1602, 1614 agendas and the Lithuanian catechisms of 1563, 1581, 1594, 1598 and 1600.

3. Excommunication. The Excommunication follows 1637 verbatim.

4. Exhortation to make a Confession. It is the same as is found in 1637.

5. Confession of Sins. The confession of sins eliminates this part of the 1637 prayer which pertain to the notions of consecration. The Lithuanians restored this part to the prayer which immediately precedes the Testamentary Words of Christ.

6. The Office of the Absolution. The preparation for the Absolution and the Absolution follow the 1637 form.

7. Confession of Faith. The creed follows the pattern of 1637 in both words and music.

8. Prayer toward the Words of Christ. The 1644 book restores to its more traditional place after the Creed. The Admonition to prayer and the Prayer toward the Words of Christ as in 1614, however, omitted in this later liturgy is that portion of the prayer which makes reference to spiritual eating and drinking by the soul.

9. The Words of Christ's Testament. The Testament follows the form of the manual acts of 1637. However, an alternative form is provided which allows for the reading of Paul's passion narrative from 1 Corinthians 11:23-29 without attendant manual acts.

10. The Meaning of the Testament and Admonition. The Admonition to godly use of the sacrament follows the wording of 1637.
11. The Breaking of the Bread and the Words over the Cup. The words of Paul concerning the broken bread are returned to their original form as a question.

12. Agnus Dei. During the Breaking of Bread the congregation sings the hymn: Báránku nasz jedyny. While the wine is poured into the cup the congregation sings: Naydroższą krwią swoią (Sanguine proprio redemiste nos Deus).

13. The Our Father. The Lord’s Prayer is said or sung, however no music is provided.

14. Prayer of Humble Access. The minister prays the Prayer of Humble Access which in the 1581 and 1621 Lithuanian rites had followed the Invitation to God’s Table. Here it precedes the Invitation, and appended to it is a prayer invoking the Holy Spirit to strengthen the confidence of the communicants that Christ has given himself for them.

15. Invitation to God’s Table. The minister invites the people to the Table of God using the same form as in 1637 volume.

16. The Distribution of the Bread and Cup. He then administers the bread, saying: “Christ the Lord, at the distribution of the sacrament of his body to his disciples, spoke these words: ‘Take, eat, this is my body which is given for you;’ you do the same: Take and eat, this is the body of Christ the Lord, which is given for you; do this in remembrance of his death.” Then, distributing the cup to the communicants, he says to them: “Christ the Lord, at the distribution of the sacrament of his body to his disciples, spoke these words: ‘Drink, all of you, this is my blood of the New Testament which is shed for you and for many for the forgiveness of sins;’ you do the same: take and drink, this is the blood of Christ the Lord, which is shed for you, for the remission of your sins; do this in remembrance of his death.” During the reception the congregation sings appropriate hymns as in 1637. The provision for the setting apart of the additional elements by the Pauline Words as in 1637 is provided.

17. Communion Blessing. After all have communed the minister pronounces the Communion blessing, which is as in 1637.
18. *Words of Consolation and Encouragement.* The minister closes the distribution section with the same comfortable words as are found in the 1637 agenda.

19. *Exhortation to Thanksgiving.* The Admonition to Thanksgiving exhibits only minor verbal differences from the 1637 book.

20. *Prayer of Thanksgiving.* Both prayers from the 1637 book are provided.

21. *Admonition to live a true Christian Life.* The ministers speaks the concluding words which are the same as in 1637.

22. *Benediction.* The Benediction follows the provision of 1637, joining the Aaronic Benediction and the *Tersanctus.*

23. *Dismissal.* The services closes with the hymn *Bogu Oycu y Synowi,* as in the earlier agenda.552

---

552 *Akt usługi* 1644, 19-48.

87 pages. The book measures approximately 18.5 cm long and 14 wide. It is held by the Vilnius University Library, acquisition number: IV 9706. It is written in Polish, in fraktur and published in Königsberg in 1742. The book, sometimes referred to as the ‘Minor Agenda,’ includes forms for Holy Baptism, Public Preparation for the Lord’s Supper, Lord's Supper, Communion of the Sick, Holy Matrimony, and Visitation of the Sick. The forms for Holy Communion, Holy Baptism, and Holy Matrimony are those found also in the 1644 book, but no musical notation is provided. In all other services the provisions of the Great Gdańsk Agenda are followed. From the time of the Counter-Reformation the Gdańsk Agenda and other Reformed publications became rare. This volume may have for a time served the needs of congregations which no longer had access to the larger volume. We have no indication of its continuing use in more recent times.

The 1742 document stands beyond the scope of our present study. However, it is important to us, because it clarifies some issues concerning the 1644 work and shows that even a century after the Gdańsk Book was published, Lithuanians still

---

553 Mūsų žodis 1922, 8.
maintained some features of their liturgical tradition. The Königsberg volume includes both a service of preparation for Holy Communion and the form for Holy Communion. The form for preparation which had been lacking in the 1644 book was taken directly from the Gdańsk Agenda. It gives a form of service on the day before communion and makes no provision for a special service of preparation on the day of communion itself as in the 1637 book.

* Forma odprawowania nabożeństwa czyli mała Agendka.

Form for the celebration of Worship or Minor Agenda. Łaszczów 1602.

This book is mentioned in the bibliography of Jocher and Estreicher where it is noted that it was printed in Łaszczów in 1602 and consists in 497 pages. However Alodia Kawecka-Gryczowa, an acknowledged expert in the area of Polish bibliography, questions the existence of this work. We found no references to it in any synodical protocols. The only work of this date which we can find is the agenda of 1602, the revised work of Krzysztof Krański. Since both the 1599 book and Forma odprawowania nabożeństwa consist of 497 pages, we may surmise that Jocher and Estreicher are mistakenly referring to a copy of Krański’s 1599 Agenda.

We have translated a few important elements of these forms of the Lord's Supper not already translated into English in cases where wording of the text is of particular interest and importance.

---

554 Sześć aktów 1742, 12-19.
555 Sześć aktów 1742, 20-36.
556 Jocher 1842, 154; Estreicher 1898, 208.
557 Kawecka-Gryczowa 1974, 231.
4. Analysis of the Individual Holy Communion Rites and Preparatory Services and their Execution

4.1. Examination of the Holy Communion Rites according to their Components

In the Communion liturgy the church puts into words and acts the faith which it otherwise articulates in its creeds and confessions, for the Reformed *lex orandi* must flow out of the *lex credendi*. This study is a detailed examination of the rites of the Polish and Lithuanian Reformed Churches which provide the worshipful and liturgical expression of the unique form which the Reformed Churches in these lands identified as their own. Therefore, in addition to the necessary work of comparing and contrasting these works, we must examine in what manner and measure they express the faith of the churches which made them their standard forms of public worship. We will be concerned to see how these liturgies articulate positions which all Reformed Churches share in common, especially regarding the relationship between man and God, body and spirit, time and eternity, earth and heaven. In addition we will want to explore the role of Holy Communion in the life of the congregation and of the individual believer as these are expressed in these liturgies.

This may best be done by examining pertinent sections of the liturgy in all the documents and by comparing the theological emphases of each document with the others, showing which particular emphases continued throughout the whole period, and which either grew in importance or declined as time passed. It will also be necessary for us to inquire about historical emphases and the influence of prominent theologians and their works on these documents. Finally, we must locate these documents and the positions they articulate in the larger context of continental Reformed liturgies of the period. In this way the particular and unique Polish and Lithuanian elements come to light.

It is not easily possible for us to map out in these rites a common shape which fits into the classical pattern of the Western liturgical tradition. We do not find in them the distinction between the Service of the Word, the ancient *Missa catechumenorum*, and the Service of the Sacrament, the *Missa Fidelium*, which we find in the medieval and post Reformation Catholic liturgies and the vast majority of Lutheran rites, and the Anglican tradition. Instead, we found a new creation. The
Reformed could state that they were simply returning to the ancient pattern of separating the two services from each other. This could possibly provide a rational for holding a special service of preparation on the day before Communion. In any case, we do not find in these Reformed rites the usual order of Introitus, Kyrie, Gloria, Collecta, and traditional Pericopes, or the Sursum corda, Vere dignum, Sanctus, Benedictus qui venit, etc. Some of these elements are found in their original or altered forms in these liturgies, but they are not put in their ancient order and are not used as they had been in the classical tradition.

We do however find certain common features and structure in the Polish and Lithuanian Reformed services. In most cases the liturgies use these elements similarly, so that a common structure is seen to be imprinted upon the whole tradition. In individual rites we occasionally find one or more elements displaced or moved elsewhere in the service. In these cases we will need to inquire about the meaning of these changes. As far as possible our divisions will follow the emphases that are laid down in the rites themselves.

The liturgical tradition is built upon the Forma ac Ratio 1550, the acknowledged source from which all the Reformed liturgies in Poland and Lithuania grew. Although each individual liturgy adapted that tradition according to its own needs and circumstances, each new service was understood to be a lineal descendant of Lasco’s accomplishment.

The structure of the Polish and Lithuanian rites is threefold. The first section consists in the service for the second week before Communion. Although in some liturgies there is no specific mention of this preparatory service, it is clear from the context that such services were maintained throughout the entire period and were integral to the observance of the Supper. This service is primarily instructional. It serves to remind the congregation of the proper preparation which must take that in order that the people may worthily come to the Lord’s Table. The second section is the special observance of the day before Communion. The majority of the agendas make specific references to this service, providing recommendations for its proper observance. However, only the Great Gdańsk Agenda of 1637 gives us the full text of this liturgy. The third section is the Communion service itself. Behind the great variety exhibited by the forms of the Communion formulated in the agendas, we are still able to ascertain a basic common structure which fits all the services. In order to uncover this structure we have had to examine the key elements in all the services.
and reference them first to Lasco’s work and secondly, to the definitive product of the Lithuanian and Polish liturgical traditions, the Great Gdańsk Book of 1637. Some elements, such as Confessions of Sins, Absolution or Declaration of Grace, the Confession of Faith, Christ Testamentary Words, the Our Father, the Pauline Bread and Cup Words, and the Prayer of Thanksgiving are universally present, although not always in the same order. Some elements are unique and peculiar to a particular church. Included among these are the wordings of the admonitions, the various prayers and antiphons, and most particularly the words and practices associated with the distribution of the elements. These we systematized according to their relative placement in the rites. We localized all forms of distribution in one section under the general heading of Preparation of the Elements, their Distribution and Consumption.

On the basis of this examination of the rites and their component elements, we see the following basic common pattern emerge:

**Order for the Second Week before Holy Communion.**

**Order for the Day before Holy Communion.**

- Triune Invocation.
- Admonition to Self-Examination.
- The Examination.
- Admonition to Walk in the Light.
- Prayer.
- Declaration of God’s essential Goodness.
- Assurance.
- The *Pax Domini* and Apostolic Benediction.

**Order for the Day of Holy Communion**

- Call to Worship.
- The Sermon.
- A prayer for a Right and God-pleasing Worship.
- Invocation of the Holy Spirit.
- The Excommunication.
- Exhortation to make Confession.
- Confession of Sins.
Declaration of Forgiveness.
Confession of Faith.
Prayer toward the Words of Christ.
Christ's Testamentary Words.
Explanation of the Mystery of Lord's Testament.
Invitation to God's Table.
The Our Father.
Words of 1 Corinthians 5.
The Preparation of the Elements, their Distribution and Consumption.
    a) The Breaking of the Bread and the Blessing of the Cup.
    b) Prayer for Right Reception.
    c) The Distribution.
    d) Post Distribution.
Exhortation to Thanksgiving.
Prayer of Thanksgiving.
Closing Admonition.
The Dismissal.
    a) A Prayer Benediction.
    b) Collection of Alms.
    c) The Ascription of Praise.
4.1.1. Order for the Second Week before Holy Communion

The first feature common to the majority of these rites is the special significance given to corporate preparation for the celebration of the Holy Communion. In no case is the celebration of the sacrament the usual Sunday service of the congregation. Instead Communion is always a special occasion, and is always marked by a period of preparation. This preparation ordinarily involved three special observances which we will examine individually.

Five of the agendas direct that two weeks before Communion the minister is to publicly announce the coming celebration and admonish the congregation to proper preparation and reception through self-examination.

The 1581 order provides that two weeks before the day of Communion the minister is to make the required announcement and admonition and stipulate that only those who can give account of their lives can be admitted to the service. Neither children nor the uncatechized, nor those who have no public profession of their Christian faith may be admitted. Those who are strangers or visitors may be admitted if they appear before the minister and give evidence of their faith and their knowledge of the church's teachings. The 1602 order simply states that the two week announcement is to be given, but no details are provided. Detailed instructions, however, appear again in the 1614 agenda, which contains directions similar to those of the 1581 order, but in an expanded form. Paul's warning concerning unworthy eating and drinking is given as the reason why self-examination is necessary, as well as the general rule from the church fathers that the communicants should examine themselves. No specific mention of children is made in the 1614 book, and with reference to travelers and visitors it is said that they are to be instructed that faith looks beyond the bread and the wine and believes it to be the body and blood of Christ. The Gdańsk Book repeats the rubrics from 1614 with only minor stylistic differences. The 1644 Lithuanian book gives no provision for this order. Since the Gdańsk Book also continued in use in Lithuania, the form may have been omitted in this shorter volume only because it was already generally available in the larger book. It should be noted that the reprint of the 1644 book in 1742 contains a provision for this service, taken from the Gdańsk Book.558

558 *Forma albo porządek* 1581, b-bi; *Porządek nabożeństwa* 1599, 494-495; *Porządek nabożeństwa* 1602, 81-82; *Porządek nabożeństwa* 1614, 25-29; *Agenda* 1637, 78-82;
The 1581, and 1602 agendas do not provide forms for a second announcement the week before Communion. An unusual feature of Kraiński’s 1599 book is his directive that the congregation should meet for special services in both the morning and the evening every day in the week before the Holy Communion service. The purpose of these services is twofold. They serve as both a spiritual preparation and a time for close instruction concerning the nature of the sacrament. It is the catechetical element which predominates, for the people need instruction concerning the nature of the sacrament and its proper reception. Therefore they hear and receive instruction concerning 1 Corinthians 11 in the morning service and, in the evening, John 6. The 1614 order calls for an public announcement one week before Communion again calling the people to self-examination. It directs them to fast two days before coming to Communion for the discipline of their bodies and to give strength to their prayers, and to make them more worthy communicants. It quotes the words of St. Chrysostomus concerning the ancient tradition of fasting, both before and after Communion, in Christian humility as is fitting for those who have received the Holy Spirit. 1637 repeats these words and adds to them a whole new paragraph. There is to be public registration of communicants and a public confession at which the penitents confess their sins, relating also the circumstances attendant to their commission. Ambrosius is cited to the effect that with tears, sighs, and mourning they should exhibit a Christian remorse which others will recognize and approve. It is stated that in accordance with the decision of General Synod of Sandomierz, only those approved by the minister and seniors will admitted to the sacrament.

A two week preparation seems indeed formidable. One might ask why such a long period should be required. Would it not be sufficient that an announcement of the coming celebration be made only a day before the Communion? There does not seem to be precedent for a two weeks period of preparation either in Roman Catholic or Lutheran circles, nor do we find evidence to support it in Zwingli, or Bucer. It is in Lasco that we find a foundation of the two weeks custom which becomes an important feature of his *Forma ac Ratio*, prepared for the German and Wallon congregations in London.559 He appears to have brought a practice with him when he came to Poland. His provisions spread also to the Lithuanian congregations.

559 *Kuyper II* 1866, 122-138.
Provision for a special observance one week before communion is found in Calvin’s Geneva (1542) and Strassburg (1545) orders. In order that people might better prepare themselves for the Lord’s Supper and that the minister might have enough time for instructions, Calvin recommends that the minister announce the coming Communion Service on the Sunday prior to the celebration of the Lord’s Supper. Closely related to Calvin’s provision, and perhaps even a source for Lasco, is found in the rubric included in the English *The Order of the Communion* of 1548, which requires of the priest that he announce the coming celebration of the Lord's Supper a week in advance and admonish the communicants both to refresh their faith and knowledge concerning the passion of the Lord to which the sacrament points and to prepare themselves to be worthy communicants by an earnest and heartily repentance which calls upon God for forgiveness promising him amendment of life.

We have already seen that in many liturgical provisions the Lithuanians and Poles show themselves to be listening to Lasco. We see many examples of this in the orders of 1581, 1614 and 1637. All of them emphasize the glory of the sacrament and the importance of earnest preparation for worthy participation and reception, lest the glory of the Lord should be defiled. Provision is made for the consolation of those with weak consciences and pertinent questions are provided, though far fewer in number then Lasco's almost four dozen scrutinies. All require a preparation which is both spiritual and physical, for the shriven soul must have as its counterpart a body disciplined through fasting and self-denial.

Throughout the later Middle Ages, great emphasis was placed upon preparation for Communion - so much so that Communion was received very infrequently. Jesus was pictured as man's Judge, and his coming to the communicant in his Supper represented to them the coming of him to whom all hearts are open, all desires known, and whom no secrets are hid. In the mentality of the people, no amount of personal preparation could be thought adequate. One must have recourse to the sacrament of penance and plead for absolution and enabling grace, so that he might come to the altar without fear of condemnation and destruction. From the time

560 *Thompson* 1972, 203-204.
561 “First, the Parson, Vicar, or Curate, the next Sunday or Holy-day, or at the least one day before he shall minister the Communion, shall give warning to his Parishioners, or those which be present, that they prepare themselves thereto, saying to them openly and plainly as hereafter followeth, or such like...” *The order of the Communion* 1548.
562 Lasco’s order for the day before the communion provides far fewer questions.
of the Fourth Lateran Council in 1215 the church designated the period between Easter and Pentecost as a time of holy obligation during which every Christian must receive the sacrament. Thus the whole period of the *Quadragesimae* and Passiontide could be given over to fasting and other acts of self-denial and intensive preparation for the coming Communion Season. The practical outcome of this teaching was not increased reception of the sacrament, but instead increased self-awareness of one’s pitiable state and the need for God’s grace, so that one might be prepared to answer the summons ‘come on to me’ (Matthew 11:28).  

Luther cut through this matter in his sacramental writings, especially those written between 1523 and 1532. In these he rejected the whole notion of the Mass as a work of man offered to propitiate the wrath of an angry God and a self-centered piety which placed far more emphasis on one's preparation for Communion then on Christ’s friendly invitation. This breakthrough is well summarized in Part Six of Luther's *Small Catechism* question Five. “Who, then, receives such Sacrament worthily?” “Fasting and bodily preparation are indeed a fine outward training; but he is truly worthy and well prepared who has faith in these words, "Given and shed for you for the remission of sins."  Here preparation turns one's attention away from himself to meditate on the Words of Christ and the greatness of the gift which in the sacrament he so freely offers to sinners. One does not, as in former times, approach the altar with fear for one’s life and salvation, but rather with Christ’s Words ringing in his ears. One is always prepared if he boldly grasps and holds to the Words of Christ. Without these words no amount of preparation would be adequate. “… he who does not believe these words or doubts is unworthy and unprepared for the words for you require all hearts to believe.” For the preparation of those who would come to the altar, Luther prepared his *Christian Questions and Answers*.  

Here again one notes that the prospective communicant is drawn away from himself to meditate on the mercy of God and the gracious gift of the sacrament through which that grace is ministered to those who receive the sacrament with the mouths of their bodies. No amount of time is stipulated for preparation, and one is neither
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566 Appended in many editions of the Small Catechism, it is uncertain whether Luther himself prepared these questions and answers in this form. In any case, it is his theological position which stands behind them.
commanded to receive nor, apart from the manifest evidence of unbelief and the scandalous behaviors which proceeds from it, is one restrained from reception on the basis of his lack of knowledge of sacramental theology.

We have already seen that a far different situation obtained in the Reformed Church. Bucer retained weekly celebration of Communion, and Calvin would have done so, but for the restrictions placed upon him by the Geneva city council. In neither case is the celebration of the sacrament the usual and ordinary divine service. It is always a special and occasional service even when those occasions are frequent. Far more typical of the Reformed is the position taken by Ulrich Zwingli, who called for a quarterly celebration, and Johannes a Lasco, who stipulated bi-monthly celebration. For the Reformed celebration of Holy Communion and its reception are always exceptional and call for exceptional preparation on the part of all who would participate. This preparation must be manifest and well ordered. The public announcement and admonition to self-examination and godly preparation is to be given 14 days before the day of Communion.567

Lasco would say that the purpose of such preparation is that one might be comforted with the assurance that he is receiving the elements worthily, and that for this purpose one must carefully examine himself and give account of his faith and works. A thorough reading of Lasco's words and those of Second Helvetic Confession and Sandomierz Confession reveal something of the nature of the faith which is required for the sacrament. The heart of the matter is Christian knowledge about the deeper things of God, most especially the relationship between the human and divine natures of Christ and the earthly and heavenly elements in the sacrament. This knowledge is to Lasco and his Reformed contemporaries an absolute requirement for worthiness. If for a Lutheran it is enough to come with a heartily confidence believing the Words of Christ, to the Reformed of even greater importance is a deep understanding of the significance of the Words of Christ as they are understood in Reformed theology. We are dealing here with a definition of faith far different from that of the Lutherans. As we are told in the Sandomierz Confession, he who comes to this sacred Table of the Lord without faith communicates only in the sacrament and does not receive the substance of the sacrament whence comes life and salvation, and such a man eats from the Lord's Table unworthily.568 The nature

567 Kuyper II 1866, 122.
568 Confessio 1570, lv-lvi.
of this faith is far different from the simple and bold confidence which clings to the Words of Christ without providing a rationale for them. Faith becomes knowledge of the essence of the sacrament, according to the *signa / res signata* schema and disciplined obedience within the life of the congregation.

This provides us with an insight into the rationale behind the establishment of the two week period for Communion preparation and the exclusion of those who lack this knowledge. The 45 questions which Lasco provides for those who prepare for Communion are not simple questions, nor do they allow for simple answer. The communicant must know the meaning of the ascension of Christ and his rule at God’s right hand as Reformed Christology understands them. He must be able to differentiate distinctly between the material elements of the sacrament and heavenly blessings toward which they point, the reason it is this necessary that the bread be broken, and the various benefits of the Lord's Supper. Again and again it is pointed out that the earthly elements in the sacrament are incapable of conveying any spiritual blessing and cannot be considered means of grace in the usual sense. They are instead means of reassurance that Christ's body and blood were broken and shed on the cross for man’s forgiveness and it is there alone that forgiveness can be found.569

The departures of the Lithuanians and Poles from Lasco's order are minor and have little significance. In the public service Lasco had reduced his 45 questions to three, but all three require only a single answer.570 The Lithuanians may have used these 45 questions in the communion service itself only three questions are to be asked. The emphasis of the Lithuanian questions is on the church’s reliability, the confession of faith, and faithfulness unto death in a life lived obediently under the church’s discipline.571 The minister addresses three questions also in the Great Gdańsk Book in the order for the day before Communion.572

In the service two weeks before Communion the Lithuanian 1581 and 1621 agendas follow also recommendations given in Calvin’s Geneva (1542) and Strassburg (1545) orders.573 Following Calvin, the 1581 and 1621 agendas require
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569 *Kuyper II* 1866, 127-135.
570 *Kuyper II* 1866, 136.
571 *Forma albo porządek* 1581, c.
572 *Agenda* 1637, 86-92
573 “It is proper to observe that on the Sunday prior to the celebration of the Lord's Supper, the following admonitions are made to the people: first, that each person prepare and dispose himself to receive it worthily and with such reverence that it deserves; second, that children may certainly not be
that newcomers, neophytes and travelers must be closely examined, so that the minister may be assured that they will communicate with the heavenly body and will not defile the Table of the Lord or receive the sacrament to their condemnation. Only those children whose knowledge of the church’s doctrine is beyond question and whose participation has been approved by the congregation’s minister and elders may be allowed to attend and participate.\textsuperscript{574} One would suppose that such knowledge could be assimilated by children in their early teenage years.

An important social emphasis may be added. Those who dwell together in the congregation are to be reconciled and at peace with one another, because the Supper is a meal of fellowship, and this fellowship is not to be destroyed by human disagreements and the bitterness which attends them. The period of preparation is meant to be a time for reconciliation and the healing of such wounds, that the Table of the Lord may be a table of peace, and those who commune may not sin against the significance of the Supper. Worthiness, then, is no simple matter of faith in the Words of Christ. Indeed one may not know for certain that he is truly worthy and well prepared. Like his medieval predecessor, he can only do all that it is in him to do, and hope that God will supply his deficiency. Therefore he approaches the table hopefully, and yet with fear that he might not receive the benefit of participation but bring judgment upon himself. It is a foregone conclusion that he will not come often.

Before the end of the 16\textsuperscript{th} century churches in Lithuania and Poland had already cast aside Lasco's recommendations for bi-monthly Communion and were offering Lord’s Supper at most four times a year.

4.1.2. Order for the Day before Holy Communion.

The liturgies speak of an order of service for the day before Communion as early as 1581. The agendas of 1581, 1599, 1602, and 1614 all provide for services on this day, but only the Gdańsk Book 1637 provides us with liturgical details for the order of worship on this occasion.575

The 1581 order directs that the elders and other ministers should publicly examine the members of the congregation regarding their sins and assist them in making a thorough examination and a good confession. In addition, the people are admonished to fast and occupy themselves with fervent prayer until the time of Communion. Kraiński’s 1599 liturgy provides no special form but recommends that the already existing order of fasting be followed with the addition of a prayer for the Holy Communion. Fasting should begin on Friday. The 1602 and 1614 agendas also recommend this service but they do not provide the details of the prayers in this service. The communicants appear before the minister and elders of the congregation, who reprove and punish, and excommunicate notorious sinners. Others too are to be scrutinized concerning their manner of living so that the Lord’s Table will be sullied by the presence of the unworthy. The communicants are invited to come either individually or in small groups to the minister to present before him the concerns of their souls and to write their names in the Communion register, according the ancient fathers, the General Synod of Sandomierz, and the venerable doctor John Calvin.

Preparation for the Day before Communion we find not only in Reformed, but also in Lutheran and Anglican sources. Paul's words in 1 Corinthians 11:28 "…let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of the bread and drink of the cup…" were understood to require of each communicant both an understanding of the Words of Christ over the bread and wine and their meaning and a personal examination of his life. This examination was to be made of the ten commandments, followed by confession of sins before the pastor and the acceptance of the forgiveness proclaimed by the pastor in the word of absolution. Indeed, the goal of the exercise of the Office of the Keys is understood to be Confession and Absolution.

575 Forma albo porządek 1581, b-bij; Porządek nabożeństwa 1599, 494-495; Porządek nabożeństwa 1602, 81-82; Porządek nabożeństwa 1614, 29-30; Agenda 1637, 83-99; Sześć aktów 1742, 12-19.
Similar provisions could be found in the Lutheran Church of neighboring Prussia. As early as 1525 the *Artikel der Ceremonien* makes provision for public confession with a confessional sermon, although it is not stated that this service is to be held on the day before Communion.\(^5^7^6\) The 1544 Prussian *Ordenung vom eusserlichen gotsdienst* provides a more elaborate form for Communion preparation, including confession before one’s own pastor or another ordained minister of the church. The pastor is to satisfy any doubts he may have concerning the faith of the communicant, so that no one may receive the sacrament who has not received sufficient instruction and absolution. Again, Saturday is not specifically designated, although it may inferred from the statement that the people will be receiving the sacrament in the morning.\(^5^7^7\) The 1568 Prussian *Kirchenordnung und ceremonien* provides that at the Office of Vespers on Saturdays and the eve of feast days there should be instruction of the chief parts of the Christian doctrine with emphasis on repentance, absolution and the Power of the Keys. Provision is made for private absolution for those who wish to receive it according to the provisions in Matthew 9 and Luke 7. It is noted that confession is offered before and after Vespers for the benefit of those who will commune on the next day.\(^5^7^8\) The church orders of neighboring Sweden include like provisions in the Swedish Church Order of 1571 and the handwritten Order from the time of John III, 1575. Swedish orders provide that at a time before the service begins those who wish to participate should privately confess their sins to the pastor, using the church's usual form.\(^5^7^9\) By the turn of the century formulas for private confession were included in the Swedish Catechisms. As we have noted, the Anglican *Order of the Communion* 1548 provides also that a special preparation be publicly offered on either the Sunday or the day before Communion. Its purpose is that the minister may warn the people that they must prepare themselves for the godly and heavenly banquet by turning their former evil lives and to be reconciled with their neighbors whom they have offended, and that those who desire a further word of comfort and absolution may receive it from the minister.

We do not find specific provisions in the earliest period for a special service of preparation on the day before the Holy Communion in the Reformed rites.

\(^5^7^6\) *Die Evangelischen Kirchenordnungen* 1911, 34.
\(^5^7^7\) *Die Evangelischen Kirchenordnungen* 1911, 68.
\(^5^7^8\) *Die Evangelischen Kirchenordnungen* 1911, 74, 76.
\(^5^7^9\) *Den svenska kyrkoordningen* 1971, 71.
Oecolampadius (1526), Bucer (1539) and Calvin (1542, 1545) incorporate preparation for Communion within the Communion Service itself and provide lengthy exhortations, prayers of confession, and, in the case of Calvin, a special warning and declaration of excommunication directed to those whose public actions call for severe reprimand.\textsuperscript{580} In contrast to the Lutheran understanding of the exercise of the Keys, the Reformed, especially Calvin, relate the Keys to church discipline.\textsuperscript{581} A life of humble obedience to the church indicated a strong and lively faith which opens the way to the Holy Table. To those who refuse to accept this discipline, the way is closed, and the Keys have securely locked them out.

The introduction of the special observance on the day before the celebration of the Holy Communion in the Lithuanian and Polish Churches undoubtedly was taken over from Johannes a Lasco's \textit{Forma ac Ratio}. It is he who is the source of this special practice, and his order provides both the framework and the content of the Polish and Lithuanian Saturday services. He calls for the preaching of a special sermon at two o'clock in the afternoon on the day before Communion which will provide special emphasis on the proper meaning and use of the Lord's Supper and an earnest admonition directed to all who wish to come to the Communion. These must present themselves before the minister and the elders and receive their approving judgment, declaring that they are indeed worthy and prepared to come to the Holy Table.\textsuperscript{582}

These directions are followed by most of the liturgies\textsuperscript{583} up to the appearance of the Great Gdański Agenda of 1637. This book provides a specific liturgical order to serve as a framework for this service. The central emphasis in the 1637 order is to reinforce the communicant’s knowledge of his unworthiness and yet assure him that with the proper preparation he may dare to stand before the Lord and not eat and drink to judgment. To accomplish this the minister exhorts the members of the congregation at great length to examine their personal lives, and most particularly their relationship to their neighbor, which in this context means fellow members of

\textsuperscript{581} Rietschel 1951, 820.
\textsuperscript{582} Kuyper II 1866, 138.
\textsuperscript{583} Of special interest are the provisions of Kраjiński’s Agenda of 1599. He provides for special morning and evening services on the day of Communion and a special supplement to the Communion service itself to be added at the very beginning of the Communion service, which should commence shortly before the noon hour. At the special morning service and at the beginning of the main service he speaks about the reason for Communion and preaches on its meaning. The evening service is the service of praise for the gift of Christ and the Holy Communion. \textit{Porządek} 1599, 494-495.
the congregation. They must also examine their understanding of the Christian faith and most especially the merit of Christ, which is the fruit of his sufferings on the cross, and the supreme necessity of an earnest intention to better themselves and walk in the light. To such as are willing to follow these exhortations, the minister can give assurance of God’s kindness toward them, on the basis of their obedience born of faith and understanding, and their godly intentions. What is lacking is a sure and certain word of absolution. The introduction to this order had stated that it was required by the General Synod of Sandomierz that no one should come to the Communion unless he had received absolution for his sins. But in place of it we find here an assurance of God’s mercy which must be said to apply only to those who have met the threefold requirement stated above. A proper prayer of confession and word of absolution are left for the day of Communion itself.

**Triune Invocation.** The 1637 order begins with the Triune Invocation on the worshipers: “The name of God, the Father, Son, and the Holy Spirit be with you. Amen.” This at the same time states as the purpose for this service that the Triune God may be praised and glorified through the godly repentance of those who wish to worthily approach his Holy Table.

**Admonition to Self-Examination.** The minister reminds the communicants of their duty to approach the Holy Table only after thoughtful self-examination concerning both their outward behavior and also their inner life and the manner in which they have conducted themselves as Christians both publicly and privately on the basis of the requirements set down in the Gospel and the doctrinal content of the Christian faith. The necessity of self-examination is built upon a threefold foundation. First, the example of Aaron and Moses teaches that those who present offerings of sacrifice to God must be cleansed, so that their sacrifices may be worthy to be received by God. Second, the Lord Jesus Christ constantly taught and admonished his disciples and warned them that they must not cast pearls before swine and the dogs. These are nothing other than unworthy sinners who live in filth from which they must be cleansed. Finally, the words of the Apostle Paul warn that those who approach the Lord’s Table must examine themselves lest they eat and drink unworthily and to their judgment. These are the reasons given for the necessity of the earnest preparation for the sacrament, for it is upon these that a worthy and helpful participation depends. Worthy preparation depends (1) upon an examination

---

584 *Agenda* 1637, 83.
by which one minutely examines one’s personal conduct and life in the world, specifically how one has kept his Baptismal vows and acted toward his neighbor, and the acknowledgement of the sins by which one has insulted God, and the thoroughness of one's sorrow for these sins. (2) One must understand the teachings of the Word of God, especially God’s promises concerning the forgiveness of sins and Christ's merit and one's desire to continue in them until death. Finally, (3) one must pledge that by the help of God he will turn from every form of wickedness to live a godly life as long as he continues in this world.585

We see here evidence of a Covenant theology in which God may be expected to fulfill his promises if man successfully fulfills his. Baptism is here not spoken of as a gift but rather as a responsibility which obliges the baptized to fulfill his intentions. This stands within the understanding of Baptism as an obligatory symbol of the New Covenant of which the Supper is the Covenant Meal. All these promises stand within the terms of this covenant and are required of those who seriously intend to continue within it: namely, that they live a pious life, are at peace with their neighbors, bear no hatred in their heart toward others in the community, and promise to be faithful until death in maintaining the faith which they have now come to understand. Thus preparation will enable those who participate in the Supper to enjoy the assurance of their covenantal relationship with the Christ who by his death on the cross gained merit for his elect. These terms will now be elucidated in greater detail in the three examination questions which reveal what is thought to be most centrally necessary for those preparing to commune.

The Examination. The minister addresses the following three questions to the prospective communicants as a group. Firstly, the minister asks whether the people know that they are sinners and that they have insulted God by their sin and deserve from him present and eternal punishment. Secondly, he asks whether they doubt God’s desire to be merciful to those who hunger for righteousness and believe singularly and as a group that sins are forgiven for the sake of the sufferings and death of Jesus Christ. Finally, the worshipers are asked whether they promise to God and the church elders before whom they are assembled that when they receive God’s grace they will forthwith turn away from all sins and impiety, be wary of all lusts, and spend the rest of their days in a righteous and pious Christian life.

585 Agenda 1637, 84-86.
Here the agenda builds on the heritage of a Lasco, who gives the directive concerning the questions to be addressed to the communicants and supplements his 45 questions with an additional three to be directed to the gathered congregation. His questions concern themselves with one's holding to the heart of the doctrine of the Gospel of Christ in both faith and action, and one's placing himself under the spiritual care of the congregation in accordance with the Word of God, and the continued exercise of a Christian life.

The questions found in Lasco and the Polish and Lithuanian liturgies indicate that the central emphasis is not to be found in the sacrament itself or forgiveness of sins in the sacrament, but rather in the acknowledgment of one's position as a sinner and the discipline of the Christian life. This we can understand from the Calvinist doctrine of the nature of the sacrament. One does not receive Christ's body and blood in the bread and wine for pardon and peace, for these are found alone at the Cross. But here the sacrament is a sign of the forgiveness already received independently of the sacrament, to strengthen faith and establish obedience.

In the Reformed understanding of Communion man is thought to stand alone before God. It seems strange then, that we find lacking in this section a satisfactory statement of this personal dimension. All the questions are addressed to the congregation as a whole in the plural, and the answers are given in like manner. It is the group rather the individual which is in the spotlight. Where one would expect to say 'I have sinned' and the Christus pro me, this dimension is nowhere evident. An additional unusual characteristic of the extended use of Biblical quotations after every question. These hold out hope for those who have responded satisfactory. This serves to underline the general impression that both sin and forgiveness are here understood juridically, from within a legal framework. One may be comforted if he meets the criteria set for those who wish to be comforted.586

**Admonition to Walk in the Light.** After the examination and the vows which they have made, the worshipers are now reminded that they are henceforth to walk in the light by abstaining from every form of uncleanness, such as drunkenness, adultery, trivial pursuits, dissensions, etc. They are to cloth themselves to Christ and not satisfy the lusts of the body. Since human strength is an inadequate to fulfill such obligations, the people must now confess their sins and implore God that by his  

586 *Agenda* 1637, 86-92.
mercy he would accomplish what man in his weakness is unable to do. The Admonition is based upon Romans 13:12-13 and 2 Corinthians 3:5.\textsuperscript{587}

Those who choose the path of light continue in the fellowship of the church which in this world serves as the visible image of the true church which is above. Here there is no place for those who continue in sin or whose sorrow for sin is not adequate to impel them into the way of light. One does not glorify God with manifest thanksgiving by continuing in sin. Such would only render the church impure and in unfit representation of the church which is above.

**The Prayer.** The section which follows is simply titled: “Prayer.” The minister asks on behalf of the congregation for the forgiveness of every sin which leads to unworthiness, and asks that all such sins be overcome for the sake of Christ. He speaks of how God has already forgiven the sins of the people for the sake of Christ without their deserving. For this they ought to be truly grateful and show forth the fruits of life they have not done so. One might say they have sinned against their forgiveness, and they are for this reason unworthy to come to the Supper which is the sign of forgiveness. So the minister asks that God would once again show his mercy, cleanse the worshipers, and prepare them to come worthily to the Holy Table. He prays that God would generate new faith, and stir up the hearts of love toward the neighbor, and to stand firm in every time of temptation that their Christian life might remain pure and undefiled.

It is worthy of note that the prayer seems to move almost effortlessly between a confession of man’s complete inability to accomplish any spiritual good, and the necessity of man's accomplishing such good. We find here a mixture of law and gospel elements which is typical of Reformed theology and its understanding of the relationship between faith and works and their goals. How can the fallen man, who is incapable of good, perform that which is good? This, according to Calvin, is the work of the Holy Spirit, for no believer can perform any active “…obedience to him, than that which he has given them”\textsuperscript{588} Indeed it is obligatory to believers that with the aid of the Holy Spirit they perform such works as are pleasing to God. Accordingly, the minister prays for the coming of the Holy Spirit to make it possible for the worshipers, who are in themselves sinners, to present their bodies and souls to God in the Holy Communion and to accomplish all such things as glorify God and

\textsuperscript{587} *Agenda* 1637, 92-93.

\textsuperscript{588} *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, Book III, Chapter 8, Paragraph 4.
are pleasing in his sight. We find in this prayer a mixture of confession of sinfulness and its liabilities, and faith which believes that the Holy Spirit will accomplish all good in believers.\textsuperscript{589}

**Declaration of God’s essential Goodness.** For those who have made this prayer their own, the minister now offers assurance that God will forgive their sins and look upon them with kindness. Those who struggle under heavy burdens or otherwise need a more personal word of consolation may come either individually or in small groups to receive such comfort as they desire.

As we have indicated, the prayer in this rite is not easy classified, and the word which follows it includes neither an Absolution nor the explicit declaration of God’s forgiveness for those who have confessed their sins. The minister instead counsels the worshipers not to doubt that God has heard them and will assuredly look upon them kindly. If they, however, are struggling with this great truth or are in doubt concerning it, the minister invites them to come to him that he may clarify the matter through further instruction. Special attention must be given to the young for they face danger in the body and soul.\textsuperscript{590}

**Assurance.** Then the minister writes one by one the names of the communicants in the church’s journal. He declares to those whose names are thus enrolled that they should rejoice and be glad, for surely their names also are written in heaven to the glory of God and as an assurance of their eternal blessedness.

From the classical liturgical perspective, the specific statement of the forgiveness of sins would be called for as a prerequisite to the enrollment. Those who are enrolled in heaven are those who have been cleansed of their sins and clothed in the new robes of Christ's righteousness. Its absence here seems to be a glaring omission. On what basis does the minister assure the enrollees that their names are written in heaven? We may seek the answer in the basic philosophical understanding between the earthly and heavenly which is so important to Reformed theology and not least its ecclesiology. There is no membership in the heavenly church for those who have turned their back upon the earthly church or who refuse her authority and governance. Those whose names are now written in the church’s journal are those who have publicly lamented their sins, expressed their profound sorrow for them, confessed the church's doctrinal position, professes the church’s faith, prayed for the

\textsuperscript{589} Agenda 1637, 93-95.
\textsuperscript{590} Agenda 1637, 96.
Holy Spirit’s guidance, promised amendment of life, and submitted themselves to church’s governance and discipline. As such, they have shown themselves worthy, pious, and upright members of the church on earth. It is of such as these that the heavenly church consists, and the minister assures them that they may count themselves among her eternal members.\footnote{\textit{Agenda} 1637, 96.}

**The Pax Domini and Apostolic Benediction.** The minister now dismisses the worshipers as a group, addressing to them the \textit{Pax Domini} in the plural form and the traditional Apostolic blessing: “The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you. Amen.” (Romans 16:24). Those whose names are written in heaven may now go forth at peace with God and one another.\footnote{\textit{Agenda} 1637, 97.}

In some places the preparatory service is held on the day of Communion. Here those who wish to participate in the service appear before the minister and the leaders of the congregation for admonition, and examination according to the pattern similar to that outlined above. At the close of the session the celebration of Holy Communion immediately follows.\footnote{\textit{Agenda} 1637, 97-99.}

The examination of the whole preparatory office has shown that its chief purpose is that those who intend to commune should by every means possible seek to improve and deepen their spiritual state, so that they might approach worthily and receive the gifts to their benefit and not to their judgment. A period of two weeks is set aside for the purpose of admonition, self-examination, renewed catechesis concerning the sacrament, and recommitment to disciplined life in the fellowship of the church. Opportunity is also provided for the minister and elders to become acquainted with those who are new in the community and inquire concerning their spiritual state. While all these are meant to benefit the soul of man, so too his body is to be exercised by a period of fasting and determined struggle against bodily sins and fetterless behavior.

Our examination of this order rises some questions. In the scrutiny the people are called to state their agreement with the fact that they are sinners who have insulted God and deserved nothing good from him; they are asked also to agree that they are sorry for their sins and believe in Christ's forgiveness; they further recognize their obligation to do better. We must note the absence any clear word of forgiveness
addressed to worshipers. They are told that they should not doubt their forgiveness. They are to base this assurance on the nature of God’s essential goodness and upon of the genuineness of their contrition. These are sufficient for the minister to assure them that their names are written in heaven and that they may approach the earthly banquet with the certainty that they will also be worthy participants in the heavenly banquet. They may assume that they are cleaned and worthy. This leaves unanswered one question which will arise when we examine the order for the day of Communion itself. How is it possible, after all this, for the minister to solemnly pronounce excommunication upon some whom in this service he assured were worthy to come to the Lord’s Table? Further, if the worshipers are to have no doubt, why will confession and absolution be included in the Sunday service?
4.1.3. Order for the Day of Holy Communion

The comparative study of the orders of preparation shows a remarkably high degree of structural uniformity. The pattern for the day before Communion is easily discerned too, because only the 1637 Great Gdańsk Book gives the full written form of this service. Such however is not the case in the orders appointed for the day of Holy Communion. Only with careful study are we able to discern the guiding principles in the Polish and Lithuanian services.

None of these liturgies follows the ancient Western pattern of worship, found in Medieval Catholicism and after the Reformation in rites of the Roman Catholic, Lutheran and the Anglican prayer books. We may suggest a number of reasons for this. The Reformed doctrine of the sacrament clearly breaks with medieval Catholicism and Lutheran sacramental theology, which the Reformed thought to be far too close to that of the Roman Church. Further, the Reformed all seek in their individually diverse orders to exalt the Reformed sacramental principle that earthly creatures of bread and wine cannot be bearers of heavenly content. In these liturgies we see this principle clearly enunciated again and again, although not in a uniform manner. Finally, the Reformed liturgies all seek to create a liturgical action which imitates Christ's act of instituting and giving the Supper in the upper room in the night of his betrayal. The words which accompany these acts are meant to provide the biblical warrant for the Reformed understanding of the Eucharist and its liturgical reenactment. Every Reformed liturgy seeks to go about this task from its own particular perspective and in its own way. Thus we find in the larger context of the European Reformed liturgies the unique liturgical contributions of Zwingli, Oecolampadius, Bucer, Calvin, Lasco, and others. This variety is reflected also in the orders which we are examining.

As we have already noted, the strong imprint of Johannes a Lasco is particularly evident. This is especially visible in the preparatory orders and, in so far as we may speak of a common shape of order for the Lord's Supper at all, it is his influence which is reflected. A few elements such as the public pronouncement of the excommunication, the physical act of the Fractio Panis, and the quotation of the Pauline Words concerning the broken bread and the cup of blessing are features common to all Reformed liturgies. There are also within the subgroups of Lithuanian
and Polish liturgies certain elements which are unique to each group and evidence of national liturgical traditions. This requires of us that we examine these orders in a manner different from that by which we would examine the Communion liturgies of churches in which the Western tradition still prevails. We will need to examine the material before us in the order in which it has been placed in the various liturgies, making note of the special significance of each part within its own agenda, according to the structural pattern already given.

**Call to Worship.** The service begins with invocation of the Divine Name in the orders 1614, 1621, 1637, and 1644. In the 1614 order there is an ascription of praise: “Eternal praise and glory be to God, the Father and to the Son Jesus Christ, and to the Holy Spirit, one God in Trinity.” The congregation responds: “Amen.” In 1637 the minister calls upon the Triune God: “Our help is in the name of the Lord, who made heaven and earth, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.” An alternative form recalls the words of Paul in Galatians 3:17 and the Words of Christ in John 6:35.41, setting a clearly Christocentric and Eucharistic tone: “Let our help be in your most holy name, Lord Jesus, bread of life, who came down from heaven and gives life to the world.” The 1644 book repeats the provision of the Gdańsk Book. Lithuanian 1621 liturgy gives only the quotation from Psalm 124:8: “Our help is in the name of the Lord, who made heaven and earth.” The 1581 and 1599 agendas make no provision for a Triune Invocation. Thus we see two forms for the Ascription of Praise to God’s Name. One from Psalm 124 (in two cases with the Triune names and in the third case without it) and the other a specifically Christocentric, Eucharistic ascription of praise.

The quotation of Psalm 124:8 is common in the Western tradition and is particularly associated with Invocations, Collects, Canticles and acts of Blessing. Here God’s people confess him to be the Creator of all things. It is found specifically in the priest’s preparation for the celebration of the Mass at the confession of sins. In the Reformation Churches it is found at the confession of sins in the liturgy at Nürnberg 1525, Brandenburg-Nürnberg 1533, Schleswig Holstein 1542 and others. It comes to be used by the congregations in Sweden 1531, Hamburg 1537, etc. In the
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Reformed tradition it is found in Calvin’s 1542, and Strassburg 1545 orders.\textsuperscript{598} The addition of the Trinitarian name in the 1637 and 1644 liturgies may be seen as a witness against the Anti-Trinitarian influences in both countries. The Creator God is here identified as the Blessed Trinity, and the worshiping congregation as Trinitarian.

The second form is specifically Christocentric and identifies as man's helper him who is known among his people by his association with the bread of the Supper. Just as in other parts of the Western tradition the Introit sets the tone, here it is the Christocentric ascription which once stated clearly predominates throughout the entire service. The association with the words of John 6 make clear a central feature of Reformed theology. The bread which brings salvation is not the bread which lies upon the table and is received into the mouths of the communicants, but rather the bread of heaven which comes down from above and enters the hearts of believers. Christ is to be sought not in the earthly bread but in the bread which comes from heaven. Hearing these words the worshipers are to turn their attention from earthly things that their hearts and minds may ascend to receive him whom earthly elements cannot contain.

The Sermon. We have only three services which follow the pattern of Lasco by directing a sermon to be preached. The 1581 order, following Calvin’s Geneva (1542) and Strassburg (1545) orders,\textsuperscript{599} says that ministers should in their sermon direct attention to the Holy Communion. To this end, Holy Communion may be made the subject of the entire address, or a specific mention of the Holy Communion may be appended at the end of the sermon. In speaking of the Lord's Supper, the minister should give special attention to the need to explain to the people what our Lord wishes to say and signify by this mystery, and in what way it behooves us to receive it.\textsuperscript{600}

Kraiński’s 1599 book provides for a sermon about Holy Communion to be given at a special morning service before the main service on the day of Communion. In addition a sermon on the Holy Gospel or another text pertaining to Holy Communion is to be preached at the beginning of the main service.\textsuperscript{601} The 1614 order notes that the sermon should begin with the ascription of praise. Nothing is said

\textsuperscript{598} Riechsel 1951, 365; Graff 1937, 156.
\textsuperscript{599} Thompson 1972, 203.
\textsuperscript{600} Forma albo porządek 1581, b.
\textsuperscript{601} Porządek nabożeństwa 1599, 495.
concerning the theme or content of the minister's message. The other agendas make no provision for preaching at this service.

The first generation of the Reformed theologians included sermons in the service of Holy Communion. Zwingli put it in the beginning of the service. We find sermons in Oecolampadius 1526, Bucer 1537, and Calvin 1542 orders. The most specific directions concerning the sermon are found in the *Forma ac Ratio* of 1550. Lasco is very specific in his instructions concerning the content and purpose of this sermon. The preacher must instruct the people concerning the nature of the bread and wine as signs, the symbolic significance of participation as a sign of membership in Christ's body, and the remembrance of Christ’s death, and its relationship to ceremonial reception of bread and wine. Most careful attention is given to the question of the relationship between the outward signs and the inward disposition of the heart and its ascent to Christ. Finally, careful attention must be given to the mystery of the Supper as a sign which is carried out in remembrance of Christ's passion and death, and worthy preparation for reception. Whereas Bucer and Calvin place the sermon in its usual setting after the reading of the Word of God, Lasco sets it at the beginning of the rite where it may serve as both an instruction and an admonition to those who will participate.602

Omission of the sermon in the four other liturgies may indicate that it was thought that the extended period of preparation and the admonitions were sufficient to accomplish the purposes which Lasco had enumerated. There would be no need for further instruction, since worshipers had been given ample opportunity to be admonished and tutored in matters relating to the sacrament and its worthy reception.

**A prayer for a Right and God-pleasing Worship.** In the Lithuanian liturgies we find this following unique provision. The following prayer is said in 1581 immediately after the minister’s sermon, and in 1621 liturgy it is found between the Admonition and the Excommunication. This prayer is not found in the Polish orders, or in the Lithuanian order of 1644. It reproduces almost *verbatim* the opening prayer in Zwingli’s 1525 rite. We give the 1581 prayer and Zwingli’s original prayer.
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602 *Kuyper II* 1866, 159.
Zwingli 1525

“Oh Almighty, Eternal God, whom all creatures rightly honor, worship call upon and praise as their, Lord, Creator and Father: grant us poor sinners that with real constancy and faith we may perform thy praise and thanksgiving, which thine only begotten Son, our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, hath commanded the faithful to do in memory of his death; through the same Jesus Christ, thy Son, who liveth and reigneth with thee in unity with the Holy Spirit, God for ever and ever. Amen.”

Forma albo porządek 1581

“Oh Almighty, Eternal God, whom all creatures properly and rightly honor, worship and praise as their, Preserver, Creator and gracious Father: grant us poor sinners that in true faith we may perform thy praise and thanksgiving, which your Son, beloved Lord Jesus Christ has commanded us to accomplish; through the same our Lord Jesus Christ, your Son, who reigns with you in eternity. Amen.”

One is immediately struck by the inclusion of a Zwinglian prayer in a liturgical milieu which seems to be predominantly Calvinist. Both the Polish and Lithuanian Churches show the influence of the Eucharistic doctrine of Calvin and Bullinger which is evident in the Calvinistic tone found in the Confession of Sandomierz. Although the Lithuanians chose to espouse a Eucharistic doctrine which the Lord's Supper is understood, in Calvinistic terms, to be the occasion of a strong spiritual Communion between the believer and Christ, it must be noted that in their Eucharistic thought they share some common features with their spiritual father from Zürich. This liturgy seems to draw upon the larger Reformed tradition than the liturgies which follow it.

Clearly reflected here is the Reformed notion of the heavenward direction of the church’s worship, a theological conception not all together foreign to that of the Middle Ages, but quite different from the Lutheran understanding of worship which sees the Divine Service as the occasion of God’s work in and for his gathered congregation. The Reformed liturgy is understood as a service directed toward God,

603 Thompson 1972, 151.
and it is the congregation’s prayer that it might accomplish it confidently and faithfully. This is an aspiration which is clearly as congruent with the Calvinist theology as it is with that of Zwingli. The congregation’s act of worship is to celebrate a memorial meal which is a reminder of the redemption which is theirs through the death of Christ. Thus, the Communion is essentially an act of praise and thanksgiving. This is clearly stated in this Lithuanian recension of Zwingli's prayer. The only significant difference between the two prayers is the omission from the Lithuanian prayer of any specific mention of the Holy Spirit at this point.

**Invocation of the Holy Spirit.** The liturgies of 1599, 1602, 1614, 1637, and 1644 begin the order for the Holy Communion with the solemn Invocation of the Holy Spirit.° In some cases the Latin antiphon *Veni Sancte Spiritus reple tuorum corda* is specified, and in others the *Veni Sancte Spiritus et emite* is offered as an alternative. These antiphons are understood to be prayers calling upon the Holy Spirit to be present and at work in the celebration and reception of the Lord's Supper. In every case the singing of the antiphon is preceded by an Admonition which reminds the congregation that they are unable rightly to come to this Supper in a worthy manner without the aid of the Holy Spirit. Therefore he must be called upon to be present and extend his blessing. Kraiński’s 1599 order adds to this a much more detailed elaboration of the congregation’s need and inability to stand rightly before the throne of God. Without the Holy Spirit no man is able to confess his faith in the Lord, to call upon him in prayer, to possess what is necessary for faith and salvation, to receive the sacraments, and to live a pious life.

The Invocation of the Holy Spirit is a common feature in Western tradition. It is found in priest’s preparatory prayer in the Middle Ages.° It generally begins the celebration of the Eucharist in the Lutheran Church orders. Here, however, it takes on a special significance, for according to the Reformed tradition no true confession of Christ or worthy worship is possible excepting through the presence and activity of the Holy Spirit. This is clearly revealed in the controversies which raged through the 1520’s between the Lutherans and the Reformed and were unable to be settled even by the colloquium between Luther and Zwingli, and their conferrers at Marburg in 1529. Both Luther and his Reformed counterparts would agree concerning the
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absolute importance of the Holy Spirit. They, however, disagreed concerning the manner of his coming and the relationship between God and his physical creation. To Luther God’s promises and blessings are always tied to earthly things, both in the case of the Old Covenant with its rite of Circumcision and the New Testament with the Holy Baptism and the Supper of Christ’s body and blood.\(^6\) One who comes to the altar receives Christ’s work of forgiveness and reconciliation by receiving his true body and blood in the bread and wine. These are to be received in that faith which the Holy Spirit has planted in man though the water and Word of the Holy Baptism and the proclamation of the Holy Gospel through earthly creatures. For Zwingli the Holy Spirit comes without mediation, apart from any physical means, for it is his conviction that earthly elements cannot be bearers of heavenly content or divine blessing. According to his understanding, Holy Communion is a reminder of the work which Christ has accomplished on the cross, an opportunity to contemplate the goodness of God manifested in the cross of Christ, and a social event by which Christians express their solidarity with one another.

Calvin moves beyond the understanding of Zwingli to a doctrine of spiritual Communion effected by God’s Holy Spirit. Following his doctrine, the Polish and Lithuanian liturgies include a special prayer of invocation of the Holy Spirit which emphasizes the essential work of the Holy Spirit in the reception of the benefits of the Lord's Supper. According to Calvin, the Holy Spirit works simultaneously with the receiving of the bread and wine, but apart from them, to assure faithful communicants that just as surely as they receive the earthly bread and wine, so too by his operation they are made partakers of Christ's body and blood in his heavenly realm. Thus, while following the same thought patterns as Zwingli according to which Christ’s body and blood are in heaven therefore cannot be upon the earth - Calvin adds a spiritual dimension according to which the hearts of true believers ascend to heaven to participate in body and blood of Christ. Calvin's teaching is reproduced in the *Heidelberg Catechism*, the standard vehicle for instruction in the Polish and Lithuanian Reformed Churches. Mention is made of the earthly elements received ‘by the mouths’ and the heavenly body and blood. “… by these visible signs and pledges … we are as really partakes of his true body and blood by the operation of the Holy Spirit as we receive by the mouths of our bodies these Holy signs in

\(^6\) *Luther's works* 1960, 293; *Sasse* 1959, 318.
remembrance of him." Here terminology is employed which is familiar to us from Luther's *Small Catechism*, but the doctrine itself posits no identity or sacramental union between the bread and body or the cup and blood. The same teaching as is found in the *Heidelberg Catechism* is reflected in the *Confession of Sandomierz*, where it is stated that in the same moment that the minister give the bread and cup, the Holy Spirit inwardly gives the flesh and blood of the Lord.  

In the Polish liturgies this emphasis on the Holy Spirit finds its first clear expression in the Krański’s liturgy of 1599. Krański had previously articulated his position at the General Synod of Toruń in 1595 in words reminiscent of Heidelberg and Sandomierz. Christ's true body and blood are indeed received by communicants, but in a mystical, sacramental, or spiritual manner rather than through the physical act of eating and drinking the bread and wine. It is from such mystical participation that the Holy Spirit ministers the forgiveness of sins, righteousness and eternal life to believers. Hence Krański gives the Invocation of the Holy Spirit a prominent place in his liturgy, a place it would retain in the agendas which came to be adopted in later years.

**The Excommunication.** The solemn pronouncement of Excommunication upon all who are unworthy to receive the Supper is a prominent element in all the Lithuanian and Polish rites. It is always found in order for Communion, although its exact location in the rite varies. In 1581 book it comes near the beginning of the service, after the Prayer for the Right and God-pleasing Worship which follows the sermon. It forms a part of the first formal Exhortation to Communicants, although it does not seem to fit comfortably into that setting. Accordingly, Lithuanian liturgy of 1621 makes of it a separate act, placing it after the Exhortation and the Prayer for God-pleasing worship. Krański's 1599 agenda and the 1602 rite locate it much later in the service, after the Words of Christ's Testament and the accompanying address concerning the meaning of the Testament and Admonition to communicants. Agendas of 1614, 1637, and 1644 place it immediately after the Invocation of the Holy Spirit, near the beginning of the rite where it would remain.

The solemn rite of Excommunication formed an essential part of the Reformed understanding of church discipline in the 16th century. In connection with
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Communion its purpose is to avoid the profaning of the Lord's Supper by excluding from the fellowship of the church those who by word or example have shown themselves to be ungodly and unbelievers. As such, excommunication is an important concomitant of the exercise of the Keys of the kingdom of heaven, by which those whose speech and manner of life are inconsistent with their Christian profession are formally excluded from the fellowship of the church until such time as they promise to amend their lives and show by their actions the sincerity of that promise. Those are to be excommunicated who would unworthily receive Christ’s body and blood. By their participation they would bring judgment not only upon themselves but upon the whole congregation, as is stated in question 82 and its answer in the *Heidelberg Catechism*. If unbelievers or ungodly men should be admitted to the Supper, they would thereby profane the Covenant of God and kindle God’s wrath upon the whole congregation.611

Calvin in his Geneva (1542) and Strassburg (1545) orders places the excommunication after the narrative of the Institution of the Supper.612 We find the same arrangement in Kraiński’s 1599 agenda and the 1602 book.613 This gives us some insight into the significance of the inclusion of Pauline narrative from 1 Corinthians 11. It is the purpose of this recitation to set the scene by recalling the circumstances of the first celebration of the Lord's Supper and drawing from it what are thought to be necessary conclusions concerning participation in this present day. For some this did not seem to be the most appropriate place in the liturgy for the pronouncement of excommunication. One has just heard the comforting Words of Christ that he has shed his blood and gives forgiveness of sins and peace, and now this comfort is abruptly withdrawn. That is a matter which needed to be given prior attention. Therefore the Lithuanian rites of the 1581, 1621, 1644 and the Polish rites of the 1614 and 1637 place it near the beginning of the service.614

In part the Polish and Lithuanian orders build the excommunication upon the foundation provided by Calvin in his Geneva 1542 rite and in part they quote his

611 “Are they also to be admitted to this supper, who, by confession and life, declare themselves unbelieving and ungodly? Answer. No; for by this, the covenant of God would be profaned, and his wrath kindled against the whole congregation; therefore it is the duty of the Christian church, according to the appointment of Christ and his apostles, to exclude such persons, by the keys of the kingdom of heaven, till they show amendment of life.” *Heidelberg Catechism*. Question and Answer 82.

612 Thompson 1972, 205-206.

613 Porządek nabożeństwa 1599, 165-166; Porządek nabożeństwa 1602, 36-37.

614 Forma albo porządek 1581, bij-bij; Forma albo porządek 1621, 74-75; Porządek nabożeństwa 1614, 33-34; Agenda 1637, 101-103; Akt usługi 1644, 21-22; Sześć aktów 1742, 21-22.
words. Like him they pronounce the excommunication to all idolaters, blasphemers and despisers of God, all heretics and those who create private sects in order to break the unity of the church, all perjurers, all who rebel against father or mother or superior, all who promote sedition or mutiny; brutal and disorderly persons, adulterers, lewd and lustful men, thieves, ravishers, greedy and grasping people, drunkards, gluttons, and all those who lead a scandalous and dissolute life. The Lithuanian 1581 and 1621 agendas add the statement that some have by their word and action already excommunicated themselves to their eternal condemnation. Kraiński’s 1599 agenda adds the specific mention of Jews, Tatars, Turks, Arians and Anabaptists; They must be excluded in accordance with the commandments that what is holy must not be cast before swine and dogs, lest it be trampled under the foot. The 1581 and 1621 rites make the excommunication an act of the Christian community. It is the action of the whole community under the leadership of its minister and the leading members, since the whole community would be harmed and rendered unworthy were the ungodly and unbelievers allowed to remain members and receive the Supper. Kraiński in 1599 and the later liturgies give excommunication to the minister. The excommunication done in the name and by the power of Christ, is said to be an exercise of the Keys of the Kingdom of heaven. “…in the name and by the power of our Lord Jesus Christ, whose mission I fulfill, I excommunicate…” The minister has taken upon himself the responsibility to see to it that the Supper is not profaned or the congregation harmed by the presence and participation of the unworthy.

We must address once again the question why the excommunication should appear here after the two week period of preparation with its special services, devotional exercises and the assurance given at the registration that those whose names are written in the congregations register are enrolled also in heaven. Perhaps its inclusion is pro forma, a liturgical feature which identifies the liturgy as Calvinistic. However, it may be that its inclusion should be regarded as tutorial, a reminder to all the members of the importance of the holy living, not only for the
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Christian individual but for the entire congregation. A little leaven leavens the whole lump. All must be wary lest they become that evil leaven which must be cast out for the good of all.

**Exhortation to make a Confession.** All of the liturgies which we are examining include a preparatory exhortation to confession, as well as a form of public confession of sins and words of consolation or absolution. Although the exhortation is everywhere present, there it does not take a common form. The motives offered for confession differ sometimes, and the forms themselves vary quite widely in length, form and theological content.

The Exhortation in the 1581 and 1621 Lithuanian agendas is short and straightforward. The minister simply invites those who do not doubt God’s mercy to present themselves before God as guilty sinners and make confession of their guilt.618

In contrast, Krański's 1599 agenda differs greatly. His exhortation, called a “Confirmation of God’s Grace,” is of a great length and shows a different theological emphasis. He describes the people as a people who formerly walked in ignorance, with no knowledge of God or of his mercy. They were children of disobedience destined for wrath. But now through his grace God has made them his children, friends, and his church, through the indwelling of the God’s Spirit. Once they were like sheep without a shepherd, but now they have returned to the shepherd and bishop of their souls. For the sake of the merit of Christ’s blood they are heirs of the heavenly Kingdom, which Jesus has prepared for those who hearken to his voice. This exhortation is interspersed with quotations from the words of 1 Corinthians 3:16, 1 Peter 2:25, John 14:2, 3, Matthew 25:34, and other scriptural texts. At the same time it must be said that the parishioners are all sinners, and as such they are still subject to the wrath of God. But through God’s grace they are the inheritors of the heavenly Kingdom, which is sealed and certified by the sacraments of Jesus Christ, namely Baptism and the Holy Communion. The minister moves back and forth between words which speak of the peoples’ total unworthiness to call themselves the children of God, and the great theme of Christ's mercy. Instead of bettering their lives they continue to drink the foul waters of sin and close their eyes to the judgment under which they stand. They should be fearful, lest they fall from God’s grace and find themselves bereft of his mercy. In order not to loose the grace of God and eternal life they must use the time God has given them to exercise
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themselves in God-pleasing repentance which consists in this: that man acknowledges and confesses his sin to the greater honor of God and to his own utter humiliation, and promises that by the grace of God he will henceforth live a God-pleasing life. This manner of repentance is shown us in the pages of Holy Scripture by the examples of David, Daniel, Peter, Mary Magdalene and others. Finally, all may confess that without doubt God is merciful and will forgive them through the blood of Christ.619

The 1602 order is much shorter but follows the same general pattern. It states first the oneness of believers with Christ in this unity, calling them sons and daughters of God and heirs of eternal life. There follows an examination of the negative: their own fallen nature and the sins which have proceeded from it, and for the sake of which they now stand before God without excuse and with no possibility of escaping through their own efforts. Now they have come to God’s Majesty and their bishop Jesus Christ with pious prayer, shamefacedly, to humbly confess their sins and ask for his mercy. The same Admonition is found in the 1614 rite.620

A somewhat different shape is found in Great Gdańsk Book of 1637. The minister speaks in very simple terms. He states that the purpose for which communicants come to the God’s Table is their need for salvation and their need to show obedience to Christ's commandment. He invites them to humble themselves by confessing their guilt before God’s mighty hand to the honor of his Majesty, so that God may himself consecrate his Holy Table and make the worshipers worthy participants.621

The 1644 rite again moves to simplify. The people are invited to confess that they are sinners who want to be participants of Christ's body and blood, not doubting God’s mercy. To this end they must accuse themselves before the face of God, confessing their sins and asking for his forgiveness.622

The whole extended period of preparation for Holy Communion now comes to its focus in the final act preparation before Communion. The worshipers have prepared themselves through two weeks of examination, prayer and special services. They have received the admonishment in the solemn service held on the day before Communion or earlier on the day of Communion. Some have been told that they will

619 Porządek nabożeństwa 1599, 153-155.
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not be admitted to the sacrament because their words and actions do not fit the Christian profession. Those who now stand before the table are those who have successfully gone through the required steps of preparation and have not been excommunicated. Now, assured that they are prepared rightly to stand before the throne of God and will not bring dishonor and God’s wrath upon the congregation, they must face one last test before they may come to receive the sacramental tokens. The minister can take them no further. The rest of the way they must go alone. Each for himself makes his way toward the Holy Table. The communicant must stand alone before God, in confidence that God will count him among the number of those whom he calls his own.

What must the minister say to guide those who now take this last step? In all these liturgies those who approach the Lord’s Table are to cast aside any doubt that God is merciful toward them. No word is given us to tell why doubt must be cast aside, but we assume that such doubt would be taken to indicate that God’s grace is lacking. This is a principle theme in Calvinist theology and one which was refined and raised to new heights by Theodore Beza (1519-1605). Furthermore, in most of the liturgies the worshipers are reminded that they are sinners standing now before God’s judgment throne. The minister could see and reprove all manifest and open sins, but only God can look into man's heart. Now he exhorts the people to confess the sins which God alone can see and of which they themselves perhaps ignorant. What is not confessed is not forgiven. From the positive side, he encourages them to come in faith and to trust in the mercy of God, who sent his Son to shed his blood on Calvary for man's redemption. It is this mercy which has brought man to this time and place before the Table of the Lord. The promises of God are for such as have shriven themselves before the throne of God and call upon him to be merciful.

Such confidence is necessary, because if it is lacking, dire consequences will follow. The communication with the body and blood of Christ through the Holy Spirit will not take place. Man will bring judgment upon himself and, because of his unworthy reception, he will eat and drink to his judgment. Here we see the strong and clear relationship between confession and the Lord's Supper. At this point Reformed theology moves beyond Roman Catholicism and Lutheranism. The Roman Catholic makes confession in order to receive the sacrament in the state of grace. Worthy Communion is necessary if one is to receive in their fullness the benefits of God’s sanctifying grace in the sacrament. The Lutheran goes to Communion fully
cognizant that in and of himself he is not worthy of such a gift, but he comes trusting the Word which proclaims that this sacrament is given for the forgiveness of sins. This Holy Table is for sinners who desire forgiveness of sins, oneness of Christ, and newness of life. Luther’s Latin and German Masses contain no confession and absolution at all, because in Luther's theology confession and absolution are most intimately connected with Holy Baptism and the call to daily repentance is seen to be an invitation to live in the Baptismal gift. Forgiveness depends upon faith in Christ’s Words “…given and shed for you for the remission of sins” for faithful reception of Christ body and blood in the bread and wine according to Christ’s Words. For the Reformed there is no forgiveness directly connected with the bread and the wine. Eating and drinking are understood to provide an outward assurance of that inward Communion in Christ which is effected by the Holy Spirit. In order to receive this sacrament properly, one must believe that Christ has come to save sinners and to call them to repentance that their lives may be changed. Those who are reluctant to confess their sins or to turn from them will not receive the benefit of the sacrament. We must turn now to consider the form by which the liturgies respond to these admonitions.

Confession of Sins. In the prayers of confession we see two different patterns. We find the first in the Lithuanian agendas of 1581 and 1621. Here first place is given to a confession of the majesty of God, before whom man must bow down in utter humility because of sins which have condemned man and insulted the Divine majesty in heart, body and sensuality. Such creatures can cry out for undeserved mercy, for God has sent his Son that none may parish but receive mercy and salvation. God is asked to confirm this by sending his Holy Spirit to strengthen the people and enable them to refrain from further insults to the Divine majesty which might incite his wrath. Finally, these things are asked on the grounds of God’s everlasting mercy.623

Beginning with Kraiński’s agenda of 1599, the prayer of confession is shaped according to the preceding admonition. God is addressed as him who, through the sufferings and death of his Son, has established a covenant with his people, confirming them in his grace for all eternity. Yet man has not properly responded to this covenant; he has trampled it underfoot as though it were nothing. God’s mercy has been forgotten. By his sins man has offended God’s goodness, and as the result

623 Forma albo porządek 1581, biij-biiij; Forma albo porządek 1621,74.
he dare not even look to heaven, from which salvation comes. The people confess that they are no more worthy to be called God’s sons and daughters, for their sins are more than sands of the seashore. All these sins, and more besides, they now confess before God, asking that he look upon them with the eyes of his mercy, that he would remember his desire that man should not be lost to his honor and to the shame of man. Finally, they ask for the gift of the Holy Spirit, that by his operation they may worthily come to the Holy Table for the sake of God’s Holy Son who went to death and rose.624

The 1602 and 1614 liturgies shorten both Kraiński’s admonition and prayer, but the structure and in many instances the wording as well remains the same. God is reminded that he has sent his Son, whom the people rejected. All sins known and unknown are confessed, and forgiveness is sought on the basis of the sinner’s humiliation before the goodness of God. Finally, they ask that through the Holy Spirit the communicants may be worthy to approach the Holy Table.625

1637 liturgy follows a similar pattern. The first part of the prayer follows the patterns of the preceding admonition, although in this new liturgy both the exhortation and the prayer pass over the earlier remembrance of the sending of the Son to establish a New Covenant. The people confess their sins of thought, word and deed, and call upon God to forgive for the sake of his mercy. We find several other evidences of the influences of Kraiński. Some earlier expressions are used, such as the heavenly city upon which they dare not to gaze, and sins more than the sands of the sea, and that forgiveness should be to the honor of God and shaming of man. The second part draws upon the Prayer toward the Words of Christ which in the 1614 book was placed immediately before the Words of the Testament.626

The 1644 liturgy follows the 1637 rite, although the Prayer toward the Words of Christ is put back in its more customary place before the Christ’s Testamentary words. Further, prayer is made that God should favorably look upon his church, the first time the word ‘church’ is used in place of people.627

We observe two distinct patterns. In the Lithuanian pattern, first attention is given to God’s majesty. Sin consists in that God’s majesty has been insulted. This form of prayer is reminiscent of Calvin's 1542 order, excepting that it speaks of

624 Porządek nabożeństwa 1599, 155-158.
625 Porządek nabożeństwa 1602, 27-28; Porządek nabożeństwa 1614, 35-37.
626 Agenda 1637, 104-106.
627 Akt uślugi 1644, 23-24.
God’s majesty in a far more restrained manner. Before God’s majesty man confesses that he is sinner. The Lithuanian prayer moves far beyond this to speak of sin chiefly as an insult to Divine majesty. The Divine majesty is mentioned no less than three times. Knowledge of God should lead to a proper regard for his majesty. Failure to acknowledge it is the basis of all disobedience to his will and commandments. This runs in line with Calvinist notions concerning God’s sovereignty and man's sin against it. God is ruler of all things, and man's sin consists chiefly in his unwillingness to acknowledge this and bow down before him and live lawfully as his creature. The new life given by the Holy Spirit shows itself in the fruits of willing obedience to this sovereign.

The other pattern is seen in the Minor Polish orders, of which Kraiński's liturgy is a primary example. His pattern appears to be quite unusual. Instead of beginning with a confession of sins, Kraiński goes to great lengths to describe God as the initiator of a New Covenant in Christ and Christ’s willingness to suffer and die for our forgiveness. Man's sin consists in his rejection of this covenant. In short, man has sinned against the Gospel and left himself bereft of aid. The Gospel becomes the occasion of even greater and more damning sin than man knew under the terms of the Old Covenant. God has sent his Son and man has turned from him in rejection. All that is left for man is to plead for undeserved mercy on the basis of God’s characteristic goodness. It must be noted that it is on the basis of the attribute of God rather then the sufferings and death of Christ that man calls upon him to forgive.

All prayers of confession ask for the gift of the Holy Spirit to teach God’s will and provide worthiness to those who approach the Holy Table. The Holy Spirit is the only one who can join people to Christ. There is no immediate connection with him through his word or the means of grace, for these can only point beyond themselves. It is the Holy Spirit alone who is understood to provide the possibility of Communion between Christ in heaven and worshipers on earth which is clearly articulated in the prayer which contrasts sinful man and the heavenly city to which he dare not look. Therefore the invocation of the Holy Spirit becomes a key element, both in the preparation and the reception.

Declaration of Forgiveness. The Reformed rites do not seem to have been of one mind with regard to what is traditionally called the Absolution. In the case of Oecolampadius (1526) confession of sins is followed by an absolution more or less

628 Thompson 1972, 197.
according to the traditional pattern. First, Oecolampadius speaks of faith which believes in the forgiveness of sins, and then he declares absolution to those who believe this on the basis of the fact that they believe it.\footnote{Thompson 1972, 213.} It seems almost reminiscent of Luther – “Be it done for you as you have believed.”\footnote{Die Bekenntnisschriften 1956, 519. English translation quoted from: The Book of Concord 1959, The Small Catechism: V, 28.} Bucer’s absolution or word of comfort in the Strassburg liturgy (1539) follows the pattern of Oecolampadius. Absolution is offered on the basis of the words of Paul from 1 Timothy 1:15: “…Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners.”\footnote{Thompson 1972, 170.} Bucer calls upon the congregation to acknowledge this into their hearts and believe in Christ. On this basis he proclaims the absolution. Calvin's Strassburg order of 1545 announces the absolution to those who ask for God’s mercy in the name of Jesus. Those who repent, humble themselves before God, and acknowledge that God wishes to be gracious to them in Christ are absolved. “I declare that the forgiveness of sins is effected.”\footnote{Thompson 1972, 198.}

We see the same struggle with the absolution in the Lithuanian and Polish liturgies. Indeed, the Lithuanians make it known that the term absolution is distasteful to them, since it puts them in mind of the Catholicism which they have rejected. They prefer to speak of words of comfort and encouragement to those who have acknowledge their sins. The 1581 and 1621 orders speak such encouragement to those who trust in God and believe that he is merciful. Such people need no word of absolution for they are already forgiven on the basis of their faith in God’s mercifulness and his promises of forgiveness.\footnote{Forma albo porządek 1581, biiij; Forma albo porządek 1621,74-75.}

The Minor Poles continue to speak of absolution. Krański in 1599 rite refers to the absolution as an instance of the exercise of the Keys to heaven given to the apostles.\footnote{Absolution in Krański’s 1599 agenda is titled: “Opowiedanie odpuszczenia grzechow” (“Declaration of the Forgiveness of Sins”). Other Polish agendas use term “Rozgrzeszenie” (Absolution).} The minister exercises the Keys as a steward of God’s mysteries to the benefit of those who truly and earnestly repent, believe in Christ’s merit, promise whole hearted amendment of life, intend to practice charity toward their neighbors, and forgive them the wrongs they have done. To such as these he declares God’s grace, forgiveness of sins, and eternal life in the home of the Father, Son, and the Holy Spirit. Specific mention is made of the promise given to the apostles in John 20
VERSE 23: “Whose sins you forgive…”635 This pattern, though greatly shortened, is found again in the 1602 and 1614 liturgies. By the power of the Keys the minister and steward of God’s mysteries announces to those who confess their sins the mercy of God, forgiveness of Sins and life everlasting in the name of Triune God.636

The 1637 and 1644 orders divide the office of absolution into two sections: coming to the absolution and the proclamation of the absolution. In the first part those who intend to attend the sacrament are admonished to believe that God forgives them because they have asked for forgiveness and Christ has promised that what they asked the Father in his name, they will receive. That this faith may be strengthened and trust made more sure, they must listen and hearken to the words which the steward of God’s mysteries speaks to exercise the Keys. The minister describes himself as standing in the place of Christ, announcing to the faithful and, truly penitent, that God has forgiven them all their sins for the sake of his dear Son and granting them permission to partake of this Holy Table and inherit eternal life. All this is effectively proclaimed with the help of the heavenly Kingdom in the name of Triune God.637

In the Polish and Lithuanian liturgies we see no traditional Western absolution. Even where traditional terminology such as ‘in the place of Christ,’ ‘the power of the Keys,’ and so on is employed, the word of forgiveness is never spoken of as a word which gives forgiveness. Instead there is a statement that God is merciful under certain circumstances and people are encouraged to believe that these circumstances are true for them. As we particularly noted in the liturgies of 1637 and 1644, the purpose of the word is understood to be to encourage and strengthen believers that God’s mercy is extended to them and at the same time to encourage them to live lives by which God’s forgiveness may be worthily received. Such forgiveness no man can offer, but God alone, because in the Reformed understanding the words of man cannot be the effective instrument of God’s grace. They can merely be an earthly sign which points toward heavenly reality. In this regard the Poles and

636 Porządek nabożeństwa 1602, 29; Porządek nabożeństwa 1614, 37.
637 Agenda 1637, 104-107-108; Akt usługi 1644, 24-26.
Lithuanians do not differ, though the Poles continue to use traditional terms such as ‘Rozgrzeszenie’ (‘Absolution’).

**Confession of Faith.** Historically the Confession of Faith stands as a safeguard bearing witness to what the church has ever believed, thought and confessed concerning God on the basis of the words of the prophets and apostles and most particularly the words of Christ Jesus himself. The ancient symbols self-consciously confess this faith faithfully and compendiously. In the Western tradition, the Nicene Creed came into the Mass only in the Middle Ages: first in France and finally in Rome, where its inclusion with the Western addition of the *filioque* became the occasion of the great schism between the Eastern and Western Churches.\(^\text{638}\) In Reformation liturgies it came to be placed by Zwingli (only in *Epicheiresis* of 1523) and Luther in *Deutsche Messe* (1526) after the reading of the Gospel, as a summary of Biblical teaching. The Lutheran Church orders follow the lead of Luther, and in agreement with them are the books of *Common Prayer* of 1549 and 1552.\(^\text{639}\)

The Nicene Creed was not a familiar feature of continental Reformed liturgies. Among the Reformed the Apostles Creed was ordinarily used. Zwingli in his 1525 order places it after the reading of the Gospel and Oecolampadius (1526) at the very beginning of the service after the initial admonition. In Bucer's 1537 liturgy it comes after the collection of alms, immediately before the Payer of Intercession. Calvin in 1542 Geneva and 1545 Strassburg orders places it before the Words of Institution.\(^\text{640}\) We do not find creeds in Lasco's *Forma ac Ratio* of 1550.

The Lithuanian 1581 and 1621 agendas follow the pattern established by Lasco and do not provide a confession of faith. It appears in Kraiński's 1599 order after the Declaration of Forgiveness and all subsequent Polish agendas follow this pattern, linking Confession of Faith with the Confession of Sins. It is an innovation, and perhaps not inappropriate, that the congregation having confessed its sins and having heard the word of forgiveness now confesses its faith in the forgiving God. The 1599 agenda provides two options. The first is the traditional Western version of the Apostle’s Creed, set to the Gregorian tone. The second option is somewhat startling. It is not a second versified setting of the Apostle’s Creed, but instead one finds Luther's *Wir glauben all' an einen Gott* of 1524, which is based upon the

---

\(^\text{638}\) Jungmann I 1986, 469.
\(^\text{640}\) Thompson 1972, 153, 172, 204, 211.
plainsong melody.\textsuperscript{641} The pattern is followed again in the 1602 and 1614 agendas. Subsequent liturgies in 1637 and 1644 no longer offered the option of Luther's hymn setting of the Nicene Creed, leaving only the Apostles Creed in general use.\textsuperscript{642}

Perhaps one reason why the Minor Polish Reformed chose to make use of Luther’s versification of the Nicene Creed can be found in the second stanza which deals with the person and work of Christ. The occasion for the composition of the Nicene Creed in the period from 325 A.D. to 461 A.D. was the Arian heresy. The Arians had erred concerning the divinity of the Son. The Polish Reformed needed to address very similar errors in their own church from the very beginning of its existence. Anti-Trinitarians, Socinians, and others had caused controversies, dissentions, and heretical divisions because of their departure from the traditional Western teaching concerning Christ. Luther's simple and sing-able exposition of classical Christology was found to be very helpful in promoting a suitable understanding of this controverted article.

Further, at this time the Polish Reformed were making overtures to the Lutherans to join with them in the production of a common agenda, and the inclusion of Luther's version of Nicene Creed may have been related to this invitation. We find the same options offered in the 1602 Agenda; it was this Agenda which marked the overt invitation of the Polish Reformed at their Church-wide Convocation in October 1603 at Belżyce to formally invite the Lutherans and the Bohemian Brethren to join with them in collecting and evaluating the Reformed, Lutheran, and Bohemian Brethren liturgies and hymnals for the purpose of preparing a common worship book.

**Prayer toward the Words of Christ.** All Polish and Lithuanian orders include the report of Christ’s Words over the bread and cup in the night of his betrayal. In every case this recital is preceded by a prayer. At first glance the 1637 order seems to have omitted such a prayer, but upon closer examination we find it conjoined to the confession of sins.

We find prayers before the Words of Christ in the Medieval Roman rite and in Reformation liturgies, with the important exception of Luther's rite. The Medieval Roman rite surrounded the Words of Christ with a series of short prayers which asked for the blessing of the bread and the wine, as a holy and spotless sacrifices

\textsuperscript{641} The wording of Polish translation depart only slightly from Luther's text, calling Christ the Lamb of God and confessing his present Kingship.

\textsuperscript{642} Porządek nabożeństwa 1599, 159-162; Porządek nabożeństwa 1602, 29-31; Porządek nabożeństwa 1614, 37-40; Agenda 1637, 108-110; Akt usługi 1644, 26-27.
offered for the benefit of the church, for all faithful and devout living and dead, that the sacrifice being offered might be acceptable to God and provide deliverance from eternal damnation. We see here a clear link between the prayers and the Words of Christ over the bread and cup. The celebrating priest prays that this sacrifice which the church now offers might be united with the sacrifice that Christ has offered, and that as Christ once offered his body and blood, so the church might now do the same for her own benefit and the benefit of all the faithful. After the Words of Christ, further prayers ask that this sacrifice might benefit the living and the departed.\textsuperscript{643}

All of the Reformers rejected the notion of an unbloody repetition of the sacrifice of Christ body and blood articulated in these prayers. With the exception of Luther, Reformers on the continent and in the British islands generally sought to retain the practice of a special prayer before the Christ’s Testamentary Words. However there was no common notion as to the scope or contents of such a prayer. Zwingli in his 1523 order replaced the Canon with prayers which remember the sacrifice of Christ and his proclamation of himself to be our food and drink. Bucer in 1539 order replaced the Canon with a number of prayers from which the minister may make a selection or he may create his own. Other Reformers did not feel the need to imitate the Medieval shape, but simply to provide some appropriate word of prayer before the Words of Christ. In some cases this prayer bares no close relation to the Words of Christ, but take as its theme worthy reception, worthy Christian living, humble access, and related subjects. This is especially true of those Reformers for whom Christ’s Words do not serve as words of consecration.\textsuperscript{644}

One of the patterns for later prayers in Central Europe is found in the liturgy of Johannes a Lasco 1550. It is the prayer which precedes the historical narrative of Christ's Supper. The Lithuanians followed this model in the 1581 and later agendas. The prayer begins by noting that the people have assembled to remember Christ's death of the cross. This remembrance is understood to be the object of Christ's command ‘do this,’ namely he wishes that his death be remembered in the church. Further, this celebration confirms the union of this particular congregation with the universal church. This is accomplished by the work of the Holy Spirit as the people are prompted to consider the goodness of God’s Son, so thereby their faith is increased and they receive grace for eternal life. What is lacking in 1621 order is the

\textsuperscript{643} Thompson 1972, 73-77.
\textsuperscript{644} Jasper & Cuming 1990, 184, 206-211, 237-238.
second section of the old 1581 prayer, which asks that those who eat and drink in this Supper may receive benefit to their souls as God is acknowledged as their God and Father so that through the blood of God’s Son they are made to be blessed sons of God. It is clear here that it is not the eating of the bread and drinking of the wine that occupies the central place, but rather the mental activity of recalling the death of Christ and meditating upon it to the increase of faith and union with the church. Such can of course take place apart from eating and drinking. The eating and drinking may be regarded as secondary to the spiritual activity of remembering the passion of Christ. More important than the Words of Christ over the bread and cup are the spiritual fruits of the work of Christ on the cross. Bread and wine cannot effectively communicate such gifts.645

We see in the Polish orders a stronger association between the Supper and the Words of Christ. The Polish agendas ask in this prayer that Christ be present in his words with power to consecrate the bread and the wine, as he did for his disciples, that the participants in the Supper might worthily receive Christ’s body and blood. This emphasis, which first appears in Kraiński’s 1599 liturgy, is found in all subsequent Minor Polish agendas. Kraiński placed this prayer after the historical recitation of the Last Supper, but before the repetition of Christ’s Words over the bread and cup. In 1637 agenda the prayer was connected to the confession.646 This seemed out of place liturgically, and the 1644 rite restored this prayer to its original place.647 In 1602 and 1614 the prayer preceded the Words of Christ as would appear fitting for a prayer of Consecration.

Such a prayer of consecration seems quite unusual in a continental Reformed liturgies, since bread and wine cannot be regarded as bearers of heavenly blessing. Yet these consecratory words to the same effect are found in the Minor Polish orders:

“Even now God’s people, coming to the Lord’s Table, rising hearts to heaven, we ask the most high bishop and Lord Jesus Christ that he would be present with his godly power at his Holy Action, we ask that he himself would consecrate this bread and wine and that he would make us worthy and acceptable to eat his body and drink his blood. This we do kneeling and praying: o worthy of praise, most high Lord Jesus Christ, pastor and bishop of our souls, …. we humbly ask you to consecrate with your

645 Forma albo porządek 1581, b; Forma albo porządek 1621, 75.
646 Agenda 1637, 105-106.
647 Akt usługi 1644, 28-29.
word this bread and this wine, as you consecrated it for the disciples, when you sat together with them at the table.”

The prayer is further clarified beginning with 1614 liturgy with the addition of these words: “…that when you have consecrated them they might be to us the sacrament of your holy body and blood.” Additionally, in the 1614 agenda it is noted that any remaining consecrated bread and wine are to be consumed.

We must now address the question of the meaning of these formulas in the context of the Reformed theological tradition. If we would correctly understand the petition: “…consecrate this bread and this wine with your word,” we must determine how these words are to be understood from the Reformed perspective. Are we to understand that the bread and wine are here identified with the body and blood of the Lord? If so, how does this differ from Luther’s doctrine that the bread is the body and the wine is the blood, in contradiction to the Reformed dictum: *finitum non capax infiniti*?

Ulrich Zwingli eschewed the notion of the consecration of the bread and wine and regarded it as a Catholic peculiarity which must be repudiated. For him it went hand in hand with the Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation. Further, he stated that the consecration of the bread and wine is in no case necessary, since earthly elements cannot bring spiritual and saving benefits. He is philosophically bound to insist upon discontinuity between the earthly elements and the body and blood of Christ, which are locally found only at the right hand of the Father in heaven. This set the pattern of thought which becomes a distinctive mark of Reformed theology and its liturgical expression. Those who are regarded as Zwingli’s theological descendants had taken great care to speak of the body and blood of Christ in a way which does not identify them with the bread and wine. Luther in his 1527 essay *That These Words of Christ, “This is my Body,” etc. groups Zwingli together with Andreas Karlstadt (1480-1541)*

---


649 “Zeby nam były te dary zá poświęceniem Sáktáméntem ćiálá i krwie twoiey święety.” *Porządek nabożeństwa* 1614, 42.

650 *Porządek nabożeństwa* 1614, 55.

651 *Porządek nabożeństwa* 1599, 167-168.
and Johannes Oecolampadius (1482-1531), saying that all three are agreed that Christ’s Words do not mean what they say. Whether primary attention is focused on ‘this’ or ‘is’ or ‘my body,’ the outcome is the same – the finite element is understood to be incapable of communicating the body of Christ. In his major study *This is my body* Hermann Sasse observes:

“… Zwingli and all Reformed Churches reject the idea that the elements are consecrated by reciting the Words of Christ. In fact, for Zwingli as for Karlstadt, the Lutheran idea of a consecration of bread and wine was a sure proof that Luther's understanding of the sacrament was still Papist, and the Reformed Churches have followed Zwingli in this verdict, whatever their opinion on Zwingli's theology otherwise may be. This is born out by the fact that none of the classical liturgies of the Reformed Churches contains a consecration in the proper sense. The Words of Institution are rather understood as a historical narrative addressed to the people.”

Calvin stressed the spiritual communion of Christians with their Lord in his Supper but he did not clearly identify that spiritual Communion with the earthly elements in the Supper. The bread and wine serve as signs which point beyond themselves to the heavenly body and blood in such a way that the communion of the elements becomes the occasion of spiritual Communion with Christ but not its inevitable cause. Therefore for Calvin too, the Words of Christ are regarded as a historical recitation rather than a consecratory act.

Luther understands the Words of Institution and their power to consecrate from a different perspective. For Luther, the Words of Christ must be taken as they stand; their meaning is not to be determined on the basis of philosophical notions concerning the relationship between heaven and earth, God and man, spiritual and material. Christ’s power to accomplish his presence by the power of his Word is not to be denied because of our inability to explain it, or because our philosophical position forbids it. The Words retain forever the same power as when Christ first spoke them. These Words of Christ now spoken by the priest have the same result as when Christ first spoke them in the presence of the disciples. The sacramental union is accomplished by the Words of Christ spoken over the bread and wine. Before the

---

652 *Luther's works* 1961, 41-42.
653 *Sasse* 1959, 164-165.
consecrating Words of Institution the bread is mere bread and the cup is mere wine. However, by virtue of the Words of Christ the bread and wine are consecrated to be the body and the blood of Christ.

“This his command and institution can and does bring it about that we do not distribute and receive ordinary bread and wine but his body and blood, as his words read, ‘This is my body,’ etc., ‘This is my blood,’ etc. Thus it is not our word or speaking but the command and ordinance of Christ that, from the beginning of the first Communion until the end of the world, make the bread the body and the wine the blood that are daily distributed through our ministry and office.”654

The *Formula of Concord*, Article Seven, states that it is simply restating Luther's position when it says:

“This is to be ascribed only to the almighty power of God and the Word, institution, and ordinance of our Lord Jesus Christ. For the truthful and almighty words of Jesus Christ which he spoke in the first institution were not only efficacious in the first Supper but they still retain their validity and efficacious power in all places where the Supper is observed according to Christ’s institution and where his words are used, and the body and blood of Christ are truly present, distributed, and received by the virtue and potency of the same words which Christ spoke in the first Supper. For wherever we observe his institution and speak his words over the bread and cup and distribute the blessed bread and cup, Christ himself is still active through the spoken words by the virtue of the first institution, which he wants to be repeated.”655

Here we observe two quite different estimates of the Words of Institution and the role they play in the churches' liturgies. In the Reformed tradition the words are valued as an historical recital of the Institution of the Lord's Supper in the upper room. The words themselves have no consecratory significance. Luther on the other hand centers everything in the Words of Christ's Testament. These words, recited or sung over the bread and wine, make them what the Lord says they are, namely his

body and blood, given and shed once on the cross and now present in the elements for Christians to eat and drink. Therefore the Words of Institution are central and essential to every Lutheran celebration of the Supper.

Where are Kraiński and the redactors of the subsequent Minor Polish agendas to be placed in this theological and liturgical spectrum? We have seen that in these liturgies the minister calls upon God to consecrate the sacrament by the power of Christ’s own Word. This Word can only be understood to be the Word which Christ spoke over the bread and wine in the first Supper. This is consistent with the provisions of the 1599 liturgy, which includes not only the traditional historical recitation of the Testament (1 Corinthians 11,23-29) but also provide for the additional recitation of the Words of Christ over the bread and cup before distribution. It is seen clearly in the directive of the 1614 agenda that the words of Christ should be spoken over new supplies.

A closer examination of this prayer and of the Reformed understanding of the discontinuity between the earthly elements and the heavenly gifts leads us to understand that the consecration of the bread and wine cannot be regarded as making them the bearers of the body and blood of Christ, a notion completely foreign to Reformed thought. Christ is in heaven and cannot be locally present in the bread and wine, and bread itself cannot be the bearer of Christ's body according to the principal finitum non capax infiniti. Close study of the words of the prayer reveal the scope and purpose of the consecration. Bread and wine are consecrated to be the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ; that is, they are visible signs which point toward the body which was broken on the cross and the blood which was shed for sinners. These alone convey the grace of God. In other words, this prayer asks that this bread and wine might be a special, sacramental bread and wine which point heavenward, toward the body and blood of the Lord. The prayer asks that those who receive the outward signs may be worthy to partake in faith of the heavenly body and blood.

In this context the use of the term consecration may be misleading, since this term traditionally is associated with the setting apart of bread and wine by the Words of Christ to be themselves his body and blood and the instruments of God’s gracious blessing. Here the word ‘consecration’ is put to a different use, as we have seen. This Reformed theology is well articulated in the Confession of Sandomierz 1570, the official Lithuanian and Polish Reformed interpretation of the Sandomierz Consensus 1570. Following the theology of Bullinger’s Second Helvetic Confession of 1566, the
Sandomierz Confession says of the consecration (‘Poświęcenie’) of the sacrament that when “the Word of God is added” to the earthly elements they are Christ’s body and blood.\textsuperscript{656} In common with the Western tradition great emphasis is placed on the Words of Christ to consecrate bread and wine, but the elements thus consecrated are in no case regarded as themselves bearers of those heavenly realities toward which they point.

With the exception of the Church of England, in which conservative Catholic theology continued in a struggle with other positions during this period, the use of the term ‘consecration’ never became common in Reformed churches.\textsuperscript{657} The Polish Reformed Church was one the few churches to make use of such terminology which gives consecratory significance to the Words of Institution. We do however find such terminology in liturgies proposed for use in the Church of Scotland in the first half of the seventeenth century. These exhibit a high view of the Words of Institution. In the Scottish \textit{Booke of Common Prayer} of 1618, prepared by bishop William Cowper (1568-1619) of Galloway, the Words of Institution are repeated after the Lord’s Prayer for the purpose of ‘consecrating the elements.’ “The prayer ended, the minister shall repeat the Words of Institution for consecrating the elements, and say: ‘The Lord Jesus the same night …’”\textsuperscript{658} The 1637 Scottish \textit{The Book of Common Prayer} provoked a negative reaction among the Reformed in Scotland by its inclusion of a prayer of consecration in which the Epiclesis asks that “…the gifts and creatures of bread and wine … may be unto us the body and blood …” It is followed immediately by the Words of Institution and Manual Acts.\textsuperscript{659} The Reformed regarded this practice as imitative of Roman Catholic practice – “It hath the popish

\textsuperscript{656} “Ale gdy do nich przystąpi słowo Pańskie / przez które tę Pan postanowić y poswięścić rażył / iż tąko we rzeczyj stawają się świętemi / y od Krystusā Pańą wyswiadżonymi upominką / iż wodą we Krzcie iż jest omyciem odrodzenia / a chleb y wino ná Wiećzerzy Pańskey iż jest ciacho y krew Pańska. Alowiem słowo Pańskye y oná pírwsza ustáw Światości zupełną y skuteczną moc w soby mā / y teraz y káżągo wieku ludziom, waży ono pírwsze Pańskye poswiaczenie / gdzye sie wedy postanowienia iego przy Światosciach spráwuyę.” \textit{Confessia} 1570, kiiij.

\textsuperscript{657} Even in England, however, the emphasis on consecration did not long prevail. The First Prayer Book of Edward VI (1549) included a formal consecration; however in the 1552 English \textit{Prayer Book} the consecration of the elements was replaced by a simpler prayer for the setting apart of the bread and wine for a ‘holy use.’ \textit{Dix} 1949, 670-671.

\textsuperscript{658} \textit{Coena Domini I} 1983, 484.

\textsuperscript{659} “Then the Presbyter, standing up, shall say the Prayer of Consecration, as followeth. But then, during the time of Consecration, he shall stand at such apart of the Holy Table, where he may with the more ease and decency use both his hands. {....} Hear us, O merciful Father, we most humbly beseech thee, and of thy Almighty goodness vouchsafe so to bless and sanctify with thy word and Holy Spirit these thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine, that they may be unto us the body and blood of thy most dearly beloved Son; so that we, receiving them according to thy Son our Savior Jesus Christ's Holy institution, in remembrance of his death and passion, may be partakers of the same his most precious body and blood: (The Words of Institution followed).” \textit{Coena Domini I} 1983, 410-411.
consecration, that the Lord would sanctify by his Word and by his Holy Spirit, these gifts and creatures of Bread and Wine, that they may be unto us the body and blood of his Son, and then repeat the Words of Institution to God for that purpose.”

The Poles do not appear to have reacted negatively to the use of the term ‘consecration,’ and this is a unique element in their liturgies.

**Christ’s Testamentary Words.** The Testamentary Words of Christ always occupied a very predominant place in the Western tradition. Indeed, we find no Western rites in which these words are not found. They are regarded as the words which institute the sacrament and their recitation is regarded as consecratory: the bread and wine of the Super are consecrated by the officiating priest’s recitation over them of Christ’s Words: “This is my body…,” “This cup is the Testament of my blood…”

In the Medieval rites these words are spoken aloud, but in a very low voice, because of their great power. As early his *Formula Missae* Luther insists that these words should be clearly and audibly heard to all worshipers who are present. In the *Deutsche Messe* he provides for their recitation according to the chant tone used for the recitation of the Holy Gospel. No bread or wine is to be distributed to communicants over which the Words of Christ have not been spoken or sung, so that none may doubt that they are receiving what Christ intends them to receive - his very body and blood in the consecrated bread and wine.661

Not all Reformers agreed concerning the significance of the consecratory power of Christ’s Words, or the significance of their recitation in the Lord's Supper. Zwingli in his 1523 order includes the Words of Christ within a prayer which concludes each of the four alternative prayers which he provides as substitutes for the Roman canon. His 1525 order includes the recitation of the traditional *Verba* beginning with the words “…on the night that he was betrayed…” (1 Corinthians 11, 23-25) under the heading: “The way Christ instituted his Supper.”662 This may be said to form the model for subsequent Reformed liturgies, which regard the recitation of Christ's Institution as an historical narrative of the circumstances and manner in which Christ instituted his Supper. Zwingli notes that after this recitation those designated as servers are to convey the unleavened bread to the worshipers that each

660 *Coena Domini I* 1983, 467 fn. 10.
661 Well known is Luther’s judgment against Simon Wolfrinus who was said to have given bread and wine not consecrated in this manner. He adjudged him to be a Zwinglian.
662 *Thompson* 1972, 154.
may take a portion of it and, following that, the cup that each may drink of it. Bucer in his 1539 order places the words (1 Corinthians 11:23-25) after the exhortation to set the scene historically. After the recitation he exhorts the people to believe in Christ and proclaim his death. So saying, he distributes the bread and wine. Calvin in both his Geneva (1542) and Strassburg (1545) orders chooses to give the larger context of the Institution by quoting the Words of Paul from the 1 Corinthians 11, beginning at verse 23: “I have received of the Lord…” The recitation continues through verse 29, making it even more clear that this is an historical remembrance, not a consecration. Calvin follows the practice begun by Oecolampadius in his 1526 order. This would now become standard practice in most continental Reformed liturgies, as we see in Lasco's *Forma ac Ratio* 1550.

The full text of 1 Corinthians 11:23-29 is found in the Lithuanian and Polish orders 1581, 1599, 1602, 1621, 1614, and in the 1644 service it appears in the second of two options. Only the Gdańsk Book (1637) and the first option in the 1644 book omit the larger context in favor of the traditional wording: “Our Lord Jesus Christ…” (1 Corinthians 11:23-25). The 1637 book was produced for use in both Poland and Lithuania, but the Lithuanians found in it not much to their liking. Therefore the 1644 book returned to the earlier pattern and provided the fuller Pauline text as an option. The historical character is noted by the Words of Institution, provided in all the liturgies. The Lithuanians in 1581 and 1621 books make use of the introductory formula build upon Calvin’s Geneva and Strassburg liturgies: “Let us hear how Jesus Christ instituted his Holy Supper for us, as Paul relates it in the eleventh chapter of 1 Corinthians…” Kraiński's Polish order of 1599 provides a fuller introduction. He notes that the holy evangelists give us the record of the Institution, but most comprehensive is the report given by the Apostle Paul in 1 Corinthians 11, to which the worshipers should now listen carefully with pious hearts. Thus the traditional pattern of including Christ’s Words is honored, but it takes on a wholly different significance. The words, which of course are merely human sounds, are incapable of consecrating bread and wine to make them bearers of heavenly blessing.

663 Thompson 1972, 177.
664 Thompson 1972, 186, 214.
665 Kuyper II 1866, 161.
666 Forma albo porządek 1581, bv; Forma albo porządek 1621, 75; Porządek nabożeństwa 1599, 163; Porządek nabożeństwa 1602, 34-35; Porządek nabożeństwa 1614, 43-45; Agenda 1637, 110-112; Akt usługi 1644, 29-32.
667 Forma albo porządek 1581, bv.
Kraiński was not satisfied that Christ’s words should be spoken as part of the historical recitation of the historical narrative of the Supper in the Upper Room. In his 1599 order he decided to repeat Christ’s Words over the bread and cup later in the section, titled: “Blessing, Breaking, Distributing and Eating.” First the words of Paul: “The bread which we break is the communion of the body of Christ” (1 Corinthians 10:16 b) are recited with a strong voice. Following this, the minister says the Words of Christ found in Luke 22:19: “Our Lord Jesus Christ when he went to his suffering and when he seated himself together with his disciples at Supper, as the holy evangelists say, he took bread (the minister takes bread), and gave thanks, and brake it, and gave unto them, saying: ‘This is my body which is given for you: this do in remembrance of me.’” The minister distributes the bread. After the minister speaks the words of Paul over the cup: “The cup of blessing which we bless is the communion of the blood of Christ,” (1 Corinthians 10:16 a). Then he repeats the Words of Christ found in Luke 22:20 and 1 Corinthians 11:25: “After Supper, as St. Luke says, [he] took the cup and gave thanks and gave it to them saying, ‘Drink, all of you, this cup is the new testament in my blood, which is shed for many for the forgiveness of sins. Do this, as often you drink it, in remembrance of me.’” He then distributes the cup. This rather strange liturgical practice appears to have no precedent in the Western liturgical tradition, but for Kraiński this was the best way to resolve the tension between traditional notions of consecration and the Reformed understanding of the Words of Christ as a historical recitation. It is hard to escape the impression that Kraiński regarded Christ’s Words spoken over the bread and wine as consecratory words. This impression is further strengthened by Kraiński’s directive that the formula he has given should be repeated over any additional bread and wine.

The 1614 agenda also appears to give consecratory significance to recitation of Christ's Testament. A regulation is included which directs that if the minister needs more bread he should take the bread into his hands and recite these words from 1 Corinthians 11: “Our Lord Jesus Christ took the bread; and when he had given thanks broke it, and gave it to the apostles, saying: ‘Take, eat, this is my body, which is given for you. Do this in remembrance of me.’” The same action should be repeated with the cup: “Our Lord Jesus Christ took the cup; and when he had given thanks gave it to the apostles, saying: ‘Drink this, all of you, this is my blood of the new Covenant, which is shed for many for the forgiveness of sins. Do this, as often

668 Porządek nabożeństwa 1599, 173-174.
you drink it, in remembrance of me.”669 The consumption of any consecrated elements which might remain after the distribution is also called for.670

The 1599 and 1614 agendas clearly move beyond the normal provisions found in Reformed liturgies, but we must not overestimate these divergences. Here as elsewhere Kraiński wants to associate himself with the universal Western tradition which gives prominence to the Words of Christ. This does not nullify his Reformed understanding that consecratory power can only be ascribed to the words which Christ spoke in the upper room at the first Supper. The words spoken on that occasion consecrate forever the bread and wine distributed to communicants in every subsequent Communion celebration.671 The recitation of those words in each individual celebration is an active commemoration, recalling the original event and Christ powerful words. This conforms to his Reformed understanding that mere human words spoken by a man have no power to consecrate even though the man in quoting the Words of Christ's for here as elsewhere earthly things cannot be bearers of heavenly grace or power. The consuming of the remaining elements called for by the 1614 agenda is described in that book as a traditional act. The act in itself says nothing about the nature of the food and drink being consumed.

**Explanation of Mystery of Lord's Testament.** A feature that regularly appears in the liturgies we are examining is an exposition of the mystery of the Supper. Only the liturgy of 1621 lacks such an exposition. Although the 1581, 1637 and 1644 orders devote a separate section to the consideration of the nature of the Supper, most of the liturgies include it in the section which gives the historical recitation of the institution of the Supper.

The explanation of the Testament is innovative in Western liturgies. We find nothing like it among the prayers which constitute the Roman canon. Luther and the majority of Lutheran Church orders have only the Words of Christ with no introductory formula or exposition. Roman Catholics and Lutherans did not include explanatory words because their understandings of the Words of Christ do not

---


670 Porządek nabożeństwa 1614, 51.

671 Confessio 1570, litj.
require special comment. In Roman Catholicism the bread is believed to become the body of Christ, and in Lutheran theology the body of Christ is said to be present in and under the earthly form of the bread.

Within the Reformed tradition, with its understanding of discontinuity between the heavenly body and blood and the earthly creatures of bread and wine an exposition of the mystery seems highly appropriate, for the recitation of Christ's word must not become the occasion of misunderstanding. The beginnings of this practice are found already in Zwingli’s *Action or Use of the Lord's Supper* of 1525. Here the words of explanation precede the Testamentary words. Zwingli says that Christ commands that the people should eat the bread and drink the cup to commemorate, praise, and give thanks for the death he suffered for them and for the shedding of his blood by which their sins are washed away. Bucer in his 1539 agenda speaks of a four fold action of the Supper. Christ communicates his body and blood, so that the people may consider the corruption of their own body and blood that Christ took upon himself flesh and blood that man's flesh and blood might be restored and sanctified, so that the bread might be the communion of his body and the cup the communion of his blood, and that the Lord's memorial may be kept with true devotion and thankful praise. In Bucer’s liturgy these words come at the conclusion of the sermon. In Calvin's Geneva (1542) and Strassburg (1545) orders the Testamentary words are followed by the solemn excommunication and an exhortation that the worshipers should lift their spirits and hearts on high and not be preoccupied with the earthly and corrupted elements which they see with their eyes and touch with their hands, for such bread and wine are to serve as signs and witnesses to the nurturing of the soul which the Word of God promises to those who are lifted above earthly things and enter the kingdom of heaven. It is Calvin who most clearly adheres to the sign-nature of the bread and wine. He is concerned lest the people fall into the error of thinking these signs are bearers of God’s blessings. Lasco’s *Forma ac Ratio* follows the pattern set down by Calvin. However, he adds to it a strong note of warning of the spiritual peril which must be faced by those who

---

672 Thompson 1972, 153.
673 Thompson 1972, 171.
674 Thompson 1972, 206.
would come to the Supper. Martin Micron’s 1554 Dutch liturgy enlarges upon Lasco’s warning.

The words which follow the Testamentary Words in the 1581 Lithuanian liturgy are the words of warning. Here the minister speaks of the many and great dangers which must be faced and overcome by those who would rightly keep and use the Lord's Supper. They must be wary lest they be guilty of not discerning the Lord's body and so eat to their damnation. Such discernment is the fruit of sincere self-examination. It enables believers to lift their hearts to heaven by the Holy Spirit to dwell there in union with Christ and his members. Kraiński's 1599 Polish liturgy follows the same pattern, using even stronger language. Christ’s Words are a solemn law or commandment which must be taken to be both a consolation and a warning of dire consequences to those who do not heed them. The Holy Spirit warns those who approach, that they may not commune to their judgment and eternal damnation. The final result is eternal death. Therefore the minister warns that communicants must approach with wholesome dread in accordance with the words of the Apostle Paul about unworthy eating and drinking. The minister addresses these words to the conscience of each of those present, that none might fall under this terrible judgment. The 1602 and 1614 agendas both shortened this exposition and muted it.

The Words of Christ are still referred to as law and testament but we do not see the same unrelenting emphasis on dread and eternal judgment. The bread and wine are signs which awaken and strengthen faith. Christ can be depended upon to give what he has promised, for although heaven and earth shall pass away his promise will remain firm. The Gdańsk Agenda of 1637 and agenda of 1644 speak of the Words of Christ as law and testament, but instead of the extended warnings concerning unworthy eating and drinking found in earlier rites these agendas speak of the twofold nature of the eating and drinking.

“This is the Testament and command of our Lord Jesus Christ, by which he undoubtedly appointed and commanded that this twofold Supper should be eaten and drunk. The first is holy bread, earthly and visible, which he deigned to take into his holy

---

675 Kuypers II 1866, 162.
677 Fornia albo porządek 1581, bv.
678 Porządek nabożeństwa 1599, 163-165.
679 Porządek nabożeństwa 1602, 35-36; Porządek nabożeństwa 1614, 45.
hands, in order to bless, break, distribute it, and so too with the blessed wine in the cup,
which he gave to be consumed by all. The other food and drink are heavenly and
unseen, his true body given for us on the cross, and his precious blood, which worthily
poured forth from his body for the forgiveness of our sins. This we should believe
wholeheartedly.”

Predominant throughout is the understanding that the Words of Christ over
the bread and wine are testament and law. They are testament in that they bare
witness to the breaking of his body and the shedding of his blood on the cross. It is
from the cross that blessings flow. They are the words of law in that they both
remind man of his sinful state and of his spiritual jeopardy. The later liturgies mute
this aspect in favor of an exposition of the central theological premise of the
Reformed theology. In the Words of the Testament Christ designates earthly bread
and wine to be signs of the spiritual gifts which are given to believers. Worshipers
must know these things so that they will not place their trust or give undo attention to
the earthly bread and wine, but ascend in heart and mind to communicate with Christ
at the right hand of the Father’s throne.

Special attention should be given to the expositions in the 1581 and 1599
liturgies which speak in dramatic of God’s judgment upon unworthy communicants
and seek to instill in the worshipers great dread, lest by their unworthiness they
offend God and call down judgment and eternal damnation upon themselves. No
words of Gospel comfort are evident here. No note of joyful participation or the
casting away of earthly cares by those who are made the happy participants in
Christ's banquet is evident. We may picture the scene in the Vilnius Reformed
Church in 1581 or Kraiński's Minor Polish congregation in 1599 marking
Communion Sunday as a joyless occasion. All are turned in upon themselves, giving
their entire attention to their heroic efforts to be worthy communicants, rather than
focusing their attention on the love of God communicated through the sufferings and
death which Christ so happily took upon himself for man's salvation, and who

680 “Toć jest Testáment / y ustáwá Páná názsrego Jezusá Chrystusá / w ktorey niewatpliwy / dwojáki
pokarm y napoy miánowá y odkazá nam raczyty, jeden ziemski wiadziały / miánowicie Chleb święty
/ ktryy Pan w swoje święte ręce wziť / błogosławić / łamáć / y do pożywania podać raczył; także
kielich z winem poświęconym / ktryy też wziął Pan / á podziękowawszys / do używania wszystkim
podal. Drugi zá Pokarm y Napoy niewidzialny á niebieski / jest ćialo jego prawdziwe / zá nas ná
śmierć krzyżowa wydane; y krew jego droga / hoynie z cialá jego wylana / ná odpuszczenie grzechow
instituted his Supper for the strengthening of faith and to make glad the hearts of man. Under these circumstances infrequent celebrations of the Holy Communion could be expected. But undoubtedly when the Supper was celebrated Communion attendance was high. For surely all would aspire to be worthy and show themselves to others to be among those whom God had made his own. No pious citizen would turn from the Lord’s Table, even though aware of his own unworthiness, for fear of judgment and eternal damnation by God, and a lost of esteem in the eyes of others. There can be little doubt that these unrelenting, heavy words provoked a reaction which led the liturgical revisers in 1602 to recast this expository section in brighter terms.

**Invitation to God’s Table.** At this point the Polish agendas of 1599, 1602, 1614 and 1637 direct that the minister invites the people to the Lord's Table according to a pattern of words which are virtually the same in all four cases. The Lithuanian orders of 1581 and *Forma* 1621, and the agenda of 1644 place the Invitation after the recitation of Paul's words from 1 Corinthians 10 over the bread and cup. The difference in location is explained by the fact that the Polish orders, beginning with Krański's 1599 agenda, are self-consciously following the order of Lasco's *Forma ac Ratio* of 1550. Here the Invitation precedes the Pauline Words, because Lasco in self-conscious imitation of the first Lord's Supper directs that the bread be distributed to all communicants after the Pauline words, before the setting apart of the cup. Lasco puts the invitation first in order to avoid interrupting the flow of the blessing and distribution. If he had placed the invitation after the setting apart of the bread, he would have needed to issue a similar Invitation after the setting apart of the cup.

The Lithuanians did not follow Lasco's directives concerning separate distribution of bread and wine. They chose to follow the traditional pattern according to which bread and wine are blessed and then distributed together. Therefore they placed the Invitation immediately before the Distribution.

The inclusion of a special invitation to the Lord’s Table appears to be characteristic of Reformed rites. There are no words of invitation to communion in the medieval Mass, nor can an invitation be found in Luther's orders. In the case of

---

681 *Porządek nabożeństwa* 1599, 169; *Porządek nabożeństwa* 1602, 37; *Porządek nabożeństwa* 1614, 48; *Agenda* 1637, 115.

682 *Forma albo porządek* 1581, bv; *Forma albo porządek* 1621, 75; *Akt usługi* 1644, 37.

683 *Kuyper II* 1866, 162.
Luther the invitation is found in Christ’s Testamentary words in which Christ’s Words to his disciples are understood to apply also to the worshiping congregation.

The Polish invitations exhort those who would come to the Supper to an upright, moral, and virtuous life of piety, faith, and Christian love. Also included are directions which call for the men to come first, followed by married women, and others in turn. The Lithuanian 1581 agenda directs that the newly converted should come first of all and addressed to them three specific questions concerning their continued firmness in the faith that they have confessed, their certainty that in this gathering God’s word is rightly preached and his sacraments rightly administered, and their intention to remain under the discipline of the church. Those who answer in the affirmative are allowed to approach the Holy Table and share in the gifts.

**The Our Father.** In most liturgies of the Western tradition the *Orate Fratres* is included in close connection with the Testamentary words.\(^{684}\) We find no unity of practice in the Polish and Lithuanian orders in this regard. The Polish orders of 1599, 1602 and 1614 place the Lord’s Prayer immediately after the Invitation to the Lord’s Table. In 1599 and 1602 it precedes the *Ofiara*, the statement from 1 Corinthians 5 that “Christ, Our Passover is sacrificed for us…” In 1614 those words have already been spoken and so the minister proceeds immediately to the breaking of the bread. The 1637 agenda places the Our Father before the Invitation to the Lord's Table. The Lithuanian orders of 1581 and 1621, and order of 1644 places the Our Father after the breaking of the bread and the blessing of the cup. The position of Our Father in the Minor Polish liturgies is explained by the separation of the distribution of the bread and cup.\(^ {685}\)

The Our Father is a distinctly Christian prayer which those who are conscious of their fellowship and brotherhood in Christ pray together before coming to the common table of fellowship. The emphasis on fellowship and brotherly love is especially strong in the Reformed liturgies. It is the fruit the acknowledgement of Christ's lordship and disciplined obedience within the church.

**Words of 1 Corinthians 5.** The liturgies of 1581, 1599, 1602, 1614 and 1621 follow the directive set down by Lasco in *Forma ac Ratio* which calls for the recitation of the Words of 1 Corinthians 5:7b, 8: “Christ our Passover is sacrificed

---

\(^{684}\) *Jungmann II* 1986, 81-90; *Graff* 1939, 137-138.

\(^{685}\) *Forma albo porządek* 1581, bv; *Forma albo porządek* 1621, 75; *Porządek nabożeństwa* 1599, 169-170; *Porządek nabożeństwa* 1602, 37-38; *Porządek nabożeństwa* 1614, 48-49; *Agenda* 1637, 114-115; *Akt usługi* 1644, 35-36.
for us. Therefore let us keep the feast not with the old leaven, nor with the leaven of malice and wickedness, but with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth.\textsuperscript{686}

We are at first perplexed by the inclusion of Paul’s words in 1 Corinthians 5 in the Eucharistic setting. It is difficult to understand its appearance at this place. However, there are two key words which make it possible for us to unlock the meaning. First word is Passover. According to the Reformed understanding, the Lord's Supper is an ordinance of the New Testament given by Christ to replace the ancient ordinance given to Moses by which bread and wine are shared in remembrance of the Passover in Egypt by the Angel of Death. The second significant word is ‘Offering.’ Against the Roman notion that the Mass is an unbloody sacrifice by which Christ is once again offered to the Father, it is understood that Christ's sacrifice is complete and unrepeatable, and therefore the Lord's Supper cannot be a sacrifice in the sense that Roman Catholics understand it to be.

This passage is included in a section of the Reformed called ‘Ofiara’ (‘Offering.’) Its inclusion here may be understood to be didactic or tutorial, rather than liturgically significant. This estimation may help us understand why the recitation of these words does not appear in the Gdańsk liturgy of 1637, or the subsequent agenda of 1644.

The preparation of the elements, their distribution and consumption.

Most of the liturgies follow the general pattern set down by Lasco in his \textit{Forma ac Ratio} for the preparation of the bread and wine, its distribution, and its consumption. Lasco prescribed that after the Passover words from 1 Corinthians 5 the bread to be distributed is to be set apart with the recitation of Paul's words from 1 Corinthians 10: “The bread which we break is the communion of the body of Christ.” The bread is then broken for distribution and each communicant takes a portion. When all have received the bread, Paul’s words over the cup are spoken: “The cup of blessing which we bless is the communion of the blood of Christ.” The minister then distributes the cup. Added in the 1599 rite are the recitation of Christ’s Words over the bread and cup, prior to the recital of Paul’s words over them. Notable feature in these agendas is the separate distribution of the bread and the cup. This was to become a characteristic feature of all the Minor Polish rites and the liturgy of 1637

\textsuperscript{686} Kuyper II 1866, 163; \textit{Forma albo porządek} 1581, bv; \textit{Forma albo porządek} 1621, 75; \textit{Porządek nabożeństwa} 1599, 171; \textit{Porządek nabożeństwa} 1602, 39; \textit{Porządek nabożeństwa} 1614, 46.
with an exception that the breaking of the bread in this rite occurs after the Invitation to God's Table since the words from 1 Corinthians 5 are not present.

The Lithuanians, however, did not prefer the practice of a separate communion. They developed a somewhat more detailed pattern of liturgical action in its place. In the liturgies of 1581 and 1621 the Pauline words over the bread are followed immediately by the words over the cup. Then the minister and congregation pray together the Our Father. It is after the Our Father that the rites place the formal Invitation to God's Table, including with a special Examination of the Neophytes, and a Prayer of Humble Access. Only then comes the distribution of bread and wine together. The protocols of the 1633 Orla Convocation show that when the two distribution traditions met and the delegates considered what course should be followed in the new book, the Lithuanians were most insistence that their traditional pattern of a single distribution of the bread and wine should prevail. They were astonished when in 1637 they discovered that the Poles and Bohemians had decided to follow the Polish practice of separate communion without their prior knowledge or agreement. It became one of the chief reasons why the Lithuanians rejected the Gdańsk Book. They presented their case at the special Orla Convocation in 1644 and insisted that their practice be adopted. When the 1644 book appeared, the distribution tradition, which the Lithuanians had followed, was restored. The agenda of 1644 begins this section with the Pauline words over the bread, followed by the hymn Agnus Dei. Then follows the recitation of the Paul’s words over the cup and the singing of the hymn Nadroższą krwią swoją. After the minister and congregation pray together the Our Father and the Prayer of Humble Access, and this is followed by the Invitation to the Lord's Table, as in 1581 and 1621 rites, but without the Examination of the Neophytes. Bread and wine are distributed together. These actions may be described as the heart of the sacrament. We may speak of them as the ‘customary usage’ of the Polish and Lithuanian Reformed tradition.

We use the term ‘customary usage’ to describe what is integral to the celebration and reception of the Lord's Supper. In Lutheran theology this would be called the Sacramental Action - the consecration (the speaking of Christ’s Words over the bread and cup), their distribution, and the eating and drinking of the consecrated elements by the communicants. Lutheran theology would speak of this three-fold action as the essential use or usum, outside of which there is no sacrament.
(extra usum non sacramentum). It is a bit more difficult to describe the usum in the Reformed tradition. Here one is confronted by much diversity. Calvin himself includes in his 1542 rite the historical recitation of the Words of Christ's Testament, which may not be described as consecratory. Before communion the worshipers are admonished to lift their hearts and minds on high above all earthly things and attain to heaven where Christ dwells in the Kingdom of God. Then the bread and wine are distributed with the traditional formula. Our description of the ‘customary usage’ in Reformed liturgies is made more difficult by the fact that Calvin's liturgy does not seem to fall into a pattern in which essential actions can be easily identified. Christ’s Words are spoken to set the scene of the original celebration and not to set apart or consecrate the bread and wine of the present celebration, nor are Paul’s words over the bread and cup included at all. The customary usage is more clearly seen in Lasco Forma ac Ratio. At the heart of Lasco's liturgy is the recitation of Paul’s words from 1 Corinthians 10, the distribution of the broken bread and its reception by the people, and the Pauline words over the Cup, its distribution and its reception by the people. Indeed these elements appear to be in common use in the greater number of second and third generation Reformed liturgies.

The identification of the elements which comprise the customary usage in most of the liturgies are clearly labeled. Kraiński in 1599 and 1602 rite calls this section: “Blessing, Breaking, Distributing and Eating.” The term is dropped in 1614 rite and subsequent orders in favor of the title: “Breaking for Distribution and Eating.” Thus three parts are clearly identified throughout – breaking, distributing, and eating. The bread is broken in imitation of Christ’s action at the first Supper, the bread is distributed that the communicants might have it, and it is consumed in order that thereby commemoration and reception of Christ’s body and blood after a spiritual manner may be effected.

a) The Breaking of the Bread and the Blessing of the Cup. In the early days of the Reformation, the desire was expressed by Luther and later by other

687 Schmid 1961, 530.
688 Central to the Reformed understanding of the celebration of the Lord’s Supper is the notion that the church is to imitate Christ’s actions in the first supper; that is, in a proper celebration of the Lord’s Supper the church does what Jesus did. Kraiński identifies these basic actions - “Blessing, Breaking, Distributing, and Eating” – as central to the rite, thus anticipating by several hundred years the theses of Dom Gregory Dix, who identifies a classical four fold (or seven fold) shape of the liturgy in his The Shape of the Liturgy. In both Kraiński and Dix greater prominence is given to the repetition of Christ’s action than to the repetition of particular prayers or formulas. Dix 1949, 48 ff.
689 Porządek nabożeństwa 1599, 172; Porządek nabożeństwa 1602, 40; Porządek nabożeństwa 1614, 49; Agenda 1637, 116; Akt usługi 1644, 34.
Protestant Reformers that the congregations return to the simple form of the Mass as it was celebrated in the upper room. During the 1520’s Luther lost interest in this project because of the lack of clarity in the scriptural texts concerning the outward circumstances and ritual of the meal of the upper room. His interest came quickly to center on Christ's Testamentary Words.\textsuperscript{690} Such ceremonial details as the breaking of bread were not for him a matter of importance because he understands Christ's mandate: ‘This do’ to refer not to liturgical details but to the eating and the drinking in remembrance of Christ and for the forgiveness of sins.

The Breaking of the Bread took on a much greater significance among the Reformed theologians. It was understood to be a significant component of Christ's commandment. Together with eating and drinking, breaking is an object of Christ’s commandment, a way in which his passion is remembered, for his body was rent on the Cross for man's salvation. This ceremonial detail came to be an important part of the Reformed celebration of the sacrament, one which was under no circumstances to be omitted, although no verbal formula accompanied it in the earlier Reformed rites. Without a doctrine of Real Presence importance shifts from the elements to the ceremonial handling of the elements, acts undertaken in obedience to the Words of the Lord. Such acts are symbolic of the fact that the Christian life, the life in the church is a life of unquestioning obedience. Thus what was originally done for utility becomes a matter of highest importance liturgically, so that the church’s celebration of the Supper may be conducted in a manner obedient to the Lord's instruction.

Johannes a Lasco carried this process one step further. His desire was that the celebration of Holy Communion should follow as closely as possible the form and manner of the first celebration. The congregation should do what Jesus did. A table was set in the midst of the congregation and the communicants seated themselves around it, just as the apostles in the upper room seated themselves at the table with the Lord. The narrative of the original institution was read to set the scene, not consecrate or set apart the bread and the wine. Other words must be found to designate the special purpose for the distributing and eating of this bread and the drinking of this cup. Lasco found this in the Pauline words concerning the broken

---

\textsuperscript{690} Luther deals with this question at length in \textit{That These Words of Christ, “This Is My Body,” ... Still Stand Firm Against the Fanatics} 1527. \textit{Luther’s works} 1961, pp. 3 ff. See also \textit{Confession Concerning Christ’s Supper} 1528. \textit{Luther’s works} 1961, pp. 153 ff. \textit{Admonition Concerning the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Our Lord} 1530. \textit{Luther’s works} 1971, pp. 91 ff.
bread and the cup of blessing in 1 Corinthians 10, though in a different context.\textsuperscript{691} It may be said that these words served Lasco as kind of ‘consecratory formula,’ and in this the Lithuanian and Polish liturgies all follow.\textsuperscript{692} Paul’s question from 1 Corinthians 10:16 b: “The bread which we break is it not the communion of the body of Christ” and the words which precede it in 16 a: “The Cup of blessing which we bless is it not the communion of the blood of Christ,” become the occasion of the physical breaking of the bread for distribution and reception and the blessing of the cup and its reception.

b) \textit{Prayer for right reception}. Beginning in 1581 agenda, the Lithuanians included immediately after the Pauline words and the questioning of the neophytes a prayer for the right reception of the spiritual gifts of Christ’s body and blood.

“O God be merciful unto us your poor, unworthy creatures. O God, by your mercy make us worthy vessels to receive your precious and the most holy body and blood of your Son who was sacrificed for our sake. O Son of God, refresher of our souls, heavenly food, feed us your hungry and exhausted pilgrims with your body and give us to drink of your blood for eternal life.”\textsuperscript{693}

This prayer did not find its way into the Polish liturgies, and its absence from the Gdańsk agenda 1637 was one reason for the Lithuanian rejection of the Holy Communion Service in that book. The subsequent 1644 liturgy includes this prayer.

This short prayer encapsulates the Reformed understanding of the separation between the material and celestial elements in the sacrament most emphatically, and the Lithuanians would not allow for any waver ing or timidity on this point. It nails down the Reformed understanding of the spiritual nature of Communion with Christ.

c) \textit{The Distribution}. The distribution of the elements of bread and wine is accomplished with appropriate distribution formulas. The formulas differ from order to order and are distinctive features of each agenda, since they speak about the nature of the gift and its purpose.

\textsuperscript{691} Kuypers II 1866, 163.
\textsuperscript{692} Forma albo porządek 1581, bv; Forma albo porządek 1621, 75; Porządek nabożeństwa 1599, 172-173; Porządek nabożeństwa 1602, 40-41; Porządek nabożeństwa 1614, 50-51; Agenda 1637, 116-117; Akt uługi 1644, 34-35.
\textsuperscript{693} Forma albo porządek 1581, c; Forma albo porządek 1621, 76. English translation by writer.
The evidence might lead us to posit that the formulas which accompany the distribution of the elements were not thought to be of great import. In the earliest days of the Reformation indeed little attention was given to what words might to be spoken as the elements were given. Luther's Latin and German Masses make no provision for distribution formulae. No distribution formula is found in the Communion service of Lukas of Prague of 1527, even though his order otherwise has provided lengthy and very exact rubrics concerning the distribution. Zwingli's Latin order *Epicheiresis* uses the traditional Medieval Latin words “*Corpus domini nostri Iesu Christi prosit tibi ad vitam ęternam. Sanguis domini nostri Iesu Christi prosit tibi in vitam ęternam.*” His German order gives no words at all. Bugenhagen speaks against the use of any formula, since the Words of Christ just heard are imprinted upon the minds of the hearers. “When one gives the sacrament let him say nothing to the communicants, for the words and the commandments of Christ already have been said in the ears of all, and he cannot improve upon them” (Schleswig Holstein [1546]).

It was as the differences between the Lutheran and Reformed doctrines of the Lord's Supper and its significance came to be more clearly articulated that distribution formulas begun to assume greater significance. It is at this point that Reformed liturgies begin to employ more elaborate formulas of distribution, expressive of what they understood to be theologically acceptable and unacceptable regarding the Supper. Zwingli might have used ‘The body of Christ,’ but now more must be said about the nature of this body, the manner it is given, and how it is to be received. Thus while giving the bread and the wine, Bucer in his 1539 rite moves to turn the attention of those who receive them beyond these earthly forms, saying: “Believe in the Lord, and give eternal praise and thanks to him” and after the cup: “Remember, believe and proclaim that Christ the Lord died for you, and gives himself to you for food and drink to eternal life.” Bucer would not have communicants think that the benefit or blessing of the Supper is in the bread and wine. Johannes a Lasco's in his *Forma ac Ratio*, gives the bread, but makes no direct reference to it: “Take, eat, and remember the body of our Lord Jesus Christ was

---

694 Zprawy 1527, cxxxvi; *Coena Domini I* 1983, 557.
695 *Coena Domini I* 1983, 188.
696 English translation quoted from: *Reed* 1947, 375.
697 *Jasper & Cuming* 1990, 211.
698 *Jasper & Cuming* 1990, 211.
given into death for us on the cross for the forgiveness of all our sins.” The cup is then distributed with a formula which is virtually the same: “Take, drink, and remember the blood of our Lord Jesus Christ was given into death for us on the cross for the forgiveness of all our sins.”⁶⁹⁹ Here too he points us beyond the bread and wine to a higher Communion which is spiritual and unseen. Cranmer moves from his more traditional formula of 1549: “The body of our Lorde Jesus Christe which was geuen for thee, preserue thy bodye and soule unto everlastinglye”, to a clearer articulation of the separation between bread and body in the 1552 rite: “Take and eate this, in remembraunce that Christ dyed for thee, and feede on him in thy hearte by faythe, with thanksgeuing.” The words over the Cup are virtually identical: “Drinke this in remembraunce that Christ’s bloude was shed for thee, and be thankefull.”⁷⁰⁰ It is an unsolved puzzle whether, or to what extent, these formulas represent Cranmer’s movement away from a traditional understanding of ‘Real Presence’ to a new understanding which may be called ‘True Presence’.⁷⁰¹ Thus even in the more traditional formulas the Reformed liturgies take care, lest the communicants mistakenly identify earthly bread and wine with the spiritual realities of which they are only the signs. Although not clearly didactic, these formulas do have a certain tutorial value, most especially because of what they do not say. In some cases the formulas concentrate in a single sentence the essence of the Reformed understanding of the Supper. In other cases it is not so clear, but there is almost always present some word or phrase which calls close connection between the earthly and heavenly into question.

The formulas in both the Lithuanian and Polish liturgies show a great breath in theology and wording. In some cases the wording seems to stand close to the Western tradition. Although the Calvinist flavor of the rite becomes evident from subsequent words which articulate more clearly Reformed doctrine. A case in point is the Lithuanian orders of 1581 and 1621. Here we see a clear difference between the bread and cup formulas. “Take, eat, this is the body of our Lord Jesus Christ which he gave into death for us and for our salvation.” “Take, drink from this all of

⁶⁹⁹ “Accipite, edite et memineritis, corpus Domini nostri Iesu Christi pro nobis in mortem traditum esse in crucis patibulo ad remissionem omnium peccatorum nostrorum.” “Accipite, bibite et memineritis sanguinem Domini nostri Iesu Christi pro nobis fusum esse in crucis patibulo ad remissionem omnium peccatorum nostrorum.” Kuyper II 1866, 163-164.

⁷⁰⁰ Coena Domini I 1983, 407; Kuyper II 1866, 163-164.

you, this cup is the New Testament of the blood of our Lord Jesus Christ which for
the redemption of our sins is shed on the cross.” What is given is identified - “The
body of our Lord Jesus Christ,” “The blood of our Lord Jesus Christ.” Added is the
purpose for which it is given – “for us and for our salvation”, “for the redemption of
our sins.” The cup formula, however, differs in the sense that the benefit is not
spoken as being given here and now. It has been given in the past, namely, on the
tree of the cross. There is no identity established between the material gift and the
heavenly gift.

Kraiński's 1599 liturgy offers a very comprehensive and, one may say, elaborat e formula of distribution. Because the bread and the wine are distributed immediately after each has been blessed, the impression is given that the minister's formula of distribution for each follows naturally from the consecratory words. At the distribution of the bread the minister breaks it saying the word of Paul form 1 Corinthians 10. He immediately repeats Christ’s own words over the bread from Luke 22:19 and distributes the bread, saying: “This same I also say unto you in the name of Christ: Take, eat, this is the body of our Lord Christ which is given for you.”702 After all have communed he does similarly with the cup. After the Pauline word over the cup, he then repeats the following account from Luke 22:20 and 1 Corinthians 11:25 and distributes the cup, saying: “This same I also say unto you in the name of Christ: Take, drink, this is the blood of our Lord Christ which is given for you for the forgiveness of sins.” 703

The formula of distribution is traditional. The bread-words state that the gift is the body of Christ, given for the disciples. The cup-words state that what is given is the blood, given to the disciples for the forgiveness of sins. What is unusual, is that the consecratory Words of Christ are included at the distribution found in Luke 22:19-20 and 1 Corinthians 11:25, along with the phrase: “This same I also say unto you in the name of Christ.” Their inclusion here is puzzling. The key to unlocking this puzzle is easily found when we remember that in their celebration of the Lord's Supper the Reformed always desired to do what the Lord did. Kraiński recited and repeated the events of the Last Supper. As Christ had taken bread and wine, so the


minister took the bread and wine. As Christ’s had spoken over it his words of consecration, so the minister spoke over it the same consecratory words. And as Christ had distributed it to his apostles, saying: ‘This is my body…, etc.,’ so the minister said the same. The words and action here must be understood as imitative of the first Supper. Kraiński found an excellent opportunity to satisfy all by simply saying what Christ has said. If one asks what the minister is given, Kraiński’s answer would be that this is what Christ gives. What Christ said and gave “This same I also say [and give] after him.” Kraiński may not have directly answered the question what to the communicants receive, but it is not his purpose to do so.704

Perhaps Kraiński’s purpose was to write a liturgy in the spirit of the Sandomierz Consensus which would be acceptable not only among the Reformed but also among the Bohemian, and most especially among the Lutherans. Elsewhere we noted the inclusion in Kraiński’s liturgy of some specifically Lutheran elements, most particularly Luther’s setting Wir glauben all’ an einen Gott, and the singing of the Agnus Dei. These were all new elements in the Reformed liturgical tradition. Further, he was the first to speak of the consecration or blessing of the elements, and for this purpose he gave the traditional Verba, a prominence not earlier found in Lithuanian Reformed liturgies. At the same time Kraiński seems close to Luther in his directive that the elements be distributed immediately after their consecration. Finally, the words of distribution are stated in terms be satisfactory to all parties, thus enhancing the value of this liturgy as a possible union agenda.

The 1602 agenda keeps the title: “Blessing, Breaking, Distributing, Eating” but the formal blessing, the recitation here of the Words of Christ over the bread and wine, has been dropped. Instead we find only the words of Paul from 1 Corinthians 10 in their interrogative form. The separate communion of bread and wine is retained, and the words of distribution are: “Take, eat, this is the body of the Lord Christ, which is given for you,” as in 1599.705 This is the most traditional formula of the words of distribution that we find in the Polish and Lithuanian agendas. The gifts are named ‘body’ and ‘blood,’ and at least in the case of cup its purpose is described:

704 By using this formula Kraiński was able to adhere to the Reformed understanding of the nature of the presence of Christ in the Lord’s Supper as that understanding had been articulated in their Confession of Sandomierz, in the Article XIX: ‘Of the Sacraments of the Church of Christ’ (O Światostociach kościałKrystusowego). “Ale ták mowimy iako sam Pan Krystus ná Testhámcenc svoim wyswiädszy račyž: Bierziec iedziec toć iest ciáło moye. A ták gdy bierzemy y przyymuemy Sákräment Páński / bierzemy prawdziwe ciáło igo zá nas wydáne / y krew wylaną dla grzechow nászych.” Confessia 1570, lvi.
705 Porządek nabożeństwa 1602, 41.
“For the forgiveness of sins.” It should be noted that this formula is unusual for the church of this period when Reformed liturgies tended to be far more specific in their terminology regarding the gifts of Communion and their purpose.

In the 1614 agenda the term ‘Blessing’ is no longer found. However, should more supplies be needed, this liturgy calls the repetition of Christ’s Testamentary Words over them. The title of the distribution section becomes: “Breaking for Distribution and Eating,” a term both utilitarian and descriptive. After the minister repeats the Pauline words from 1 Corinthians 10, but before distributing the bread to the communicants, he says in a loud voice: “In faith I eat the body of Christ for the salvation of my soul.” Then he gives the bread to the communicants, saying: “Take, eat, this is the body of the Lord Christ which is given for you. This do in remembrance of his death.” The recipient responds: “Amen.” After speaking the Pauline words over the cup the minister communes, saying aloud: “In faith I receive the blood of Christ for the forgiveness of my sins.” Then he gives it to the people with the formula: “Take, drink, this is the blood of the Lord Christ which is given for you for the forgiveness of sins. This do in remembrance of his death.” The recipient responds: “Amen.”

Here again we find more precise terminology articulating the Reformed viewpoint; bread is received by the body, but the body of Christ is received by faith, as is clear from the words: “In faith I eat the body…” and “In faith I receive the blood...” The words ‘in faith’ are understood to govern the Communion of the all the participants of the Supper, even though they are not specifically repeated. The reception of Christ's body and blood are dependant upon faith. Faith is the instrument by which the heavenly gifts are received. We see in the formula the new phrases introduced concerning the purpose of communion: “This do in remembrance of his death” and “This do for the remembrance of him.” This follows Bucer, Lasco, and other theologians of the Reformed tradition, for whom the act of Communion is primarily an act of obedient remembrance of the sufferings of Christ on the Cross. Faithful eating receives the blessing and properly remembers the death...
of Christ. Such remembrance is more than a mere acknowledgement. It claims the effectiveness of Christ's death for those who eat and drink in faith. Faith believes that this earthly eating and drinking is the occasion of spiritual partaking for those who fix their attention upon the cross and desire its fruits.

The Gdańsk Book of 1637 continues the provisions of the 1614 order. As in 1614 there is no mention of the blessing of the elements. The section whole is entitled: “Breaking for Distribution and Eating.” There are, however, some significant changes. The minister’s words at his communion: ‘In faith’ are no longer used. Instead we have only the general distribution formula for the bread and wine from that earlier order. “Take, eat, this is the body of the Lord Christ which is given for you. This do in remembrance of his death,” “Take, drink, this is the blood of the Lord Christ which is given for you for the forgiveness of sins. This do in remembrance of his death.” The special words at the communion of the minister had been dropped because they are not necessary. All who have been examined at the time of preparation know that only those who receive in faith receive the heavenly benefit.

A major change is found in the agenda of 1644. The revisers who prepared this agenda chose to use a formula strongly reminiscent of Krański's 1599 order. In 1599 Krański had chosen to repeat over the bread and cup those portions of the historical narrative which referred directly to consecration of them. The 1644 order recasts this in a form which will obviate any notion that these words are a blessing. “Christ the Lord, at the distribution of the sacrament of his body to his disciples, spoke these words: ‘Take, eat, this is my body which is given for you;’ you do the same: Take and eat, this is the body of Christ the Lord, which is given for you; do this in remembrance of his death.” Concerning the cup he says: “Our Lord Jesus Christ, at the distribution of the sacrament of his blood to his disciples, spoke these words: ‘Take, drink all of you, this is my body of the New Testament which is given for you and for many for the forgiveness of sins;’ you do the same: take and drink, this is the blood of Christ the Lord, which is shed for the forgiveness of your sins; do this in remembrance of his death.”

708 Agenda 1637, 116-117.
709 “A podawiając Kommunikántom, Rzeczę: Pan Chrystus rozdawiając Sakrámént Cialá swego / Uczniom swoim / mówił te słowa: Bierzcie, iedźcie, To iest Cialo moie: ktores za was będzie wydane: A ták y ty / Bierz, á jedz, To iest Cialo Páná Chrystusowe, ktores zá ćié iest wydáne: to czyń ná pǎmiątke Smierći jego.
emphasis on the keeping of the Lord’s Supper as an imitation of Christ’s acts in the upper room.

d) Post Distribution. An unusual feature of Lasco’s *Forma ac Ratio* is the special formula which is spoken by the minister when all have received the Supper.\(^ {710} \) It is reproduced *verbatim* in the 1581, 1621, 1637, and 1644 liturgies. When all have communed, the minister says the Words of Consolation and Encouragement:

> “Believe and do not doubt, all of you who for the remembrance of the sufferings of the Lord have become partakers in this Holy Communion, that you have a true and salutary fellowship in the body and blood of our Lord unto eternal life.”\(^ {711} \)

A post-distribution formula of dismissal became a common feature in Reformed rites to signal the end of the distribution, so that others might now approach the Holy Table. The Roman Mass had provided a dismissal formula for the communicants: “The body of our Lord Jesus Christ preserve your souls for life everlasting.”\(^ {712} \) It is a prayer that the communicant might receive and retain the blessing of the sacrament. This blessing came to be used also in many Lutheran Church orders, following Luther's suggestion in the *Formula Missae*. Usually it took an optative form: “May the body of our Lord Jesus Christ guards your soul to life eternal, etc.”\(^ {713} \) A similar prayer was spoken after the communion of the cup. Luther stated: “If one desires to use this and other prayers from the Roman Missal, which were spoken at the reception of the body and blood, he would not pray wrongly.”\(^ {714} \)

A prayer of this sort was of course not suitable in the Reformed Communion agendas. Neither Zwingli, nor Calvin or other classical Reformed theologians would approve of the use of a prayer from the Roman Mass at Communion, especially one which referred to the elements given as the body and blood of Christ. They simply

---

\(^ {710} \) “Credite et ne dubitate omnes, qui Coenae huic Dominicae in memoriam mortis Christi participastis cum mysterii sui reputatione, habere vos certam et salutarum cum ipso communionem in corpore et sanguine suo ad vitam aeternam. Amen.” *Kuyper II* 1866, 165.

\(^ {711} \) *Credite et ne dubitate omnes, qui Coenae huic Dominicae in memoriam mortis Christi participastis cum mysterii sui reputatione, habere vos certam et salutarum cum ipso communionem in corpore et sanguine suo ad vitam aeternam. Amen.* *Kuyper II* 1866, 165.

\(^ {712} \) Thompson 1972, 85.

\(^ {713} \) Thompson 1972, 133.

\(^ {714} \) Thompson 1972, 113.
replaced it with an admonition to give thanks. Lasco, however, wished to provide a
word of comfort to those who had communed which would tie together their
reception of the earthly elements with the heavenly body and the blood. Additionally,
he made use of this opportunity to speak of the purpose of participation in this Holy
Communion as an act of remembrance of the sufferings of the Lord by which
believers have true and salutary fellowship in the body and blood of our Lord. The
Lithuanians found this a very suitable conclusion to the distribution.

The 1637 Gdańsk Agenda and agenda of 1644 imported the Words of
Consolation and Encouragement from the Lithuanian rites of 1581 and 1621, but
preceded it with a specific Communion Blessing which included words concerning
the fruit of faithful communion, calling down the blessing of God upon those who
had faithfully communed.

“He, the living bread which has come down from heaven and which gives life to
the world, our Lord Jesus Christ, who has fed us with his holy body and given us to
drink his precious blood sanctify you completely that your spirit, soul and body remain
without stain until Jesus Christ will come. May this be to his holy glory and your eternal
salvation.”\(^{715}\)

This blessing is unique among Reformed liturgies, which ordinarily do not
include such a word of blessing. We may find here some faint echoes of Luther's
creative use of the Dismissal formula from the Roman rite, but now recast in words
more suitable to Reformed theology. There is the statement that Christ has fed the
communicants with his holy body and given them to drink of his holy precious
blood, but the words are no longer directly connected with the individual distribution
to the communicants. They are spoken instead only after all have communed, thereby
distancing them from the oral reception of the bread and wine. The blessing is no
longer directly connected to the reception of the bread and wine.

**Exhortation to Thanksgiving.** All of the Lithuanian and Polish orders
include a lengthy Exhortation to Thanksgiving addressed to all who have participated
in the Lord's Supper.

It is right and proper that those who have received the Supper should give
thanks, but neither the Roman Catholic Mass, nor the liturgical writings of Luther

\(^{715}\) *Agenda* 1637, 117-118; *Akt usługi* 1644, 39. English translation by writer.
and their descendants include a special exhortation to those who have participated, outlining in detail how they are to regard the Supper which they have shared, or how they are now to conduct themselves. Zwingli in 1525 had no such exhortation, but directed that according to the example of Christ thanks should be given by the minister, the men, and the women by saying antiphonally Psalm 113:1-9. Then the minister should offer a short prayer reminiscent of the thanks given after ordinary meals in the Middle Ages.\footnote{Thompson 1972, 155.} Bucer has no exhortation, but includes three prayers of thanksgiving. An early example of a such of exhortation is an \textit{Exhortation finale}.\footnote{Coena Domini I 1983, 345-346.}

The exhortation calls upon the people to thank the Lord for his very great blessings and to intercede to the Father on behalf of all who are in authority, and that he would fill with the Holy Spirit those who have communed that they may be truly united in one body by a living and genuine faith and bear witness and live as disciples of Christ and no more be partakers with the unfaithful, or conformed to wicked world, and that those who are in poverty may be filled and the people may live in accordance with God and his word to the upbuilding of all and the advancement of the Holy Gospel. Particularly important is the exhortation of Lasco in \textit{Forma ac Ratio} who exhorts that none may fail to feel the power and fruit of their fellowship with Christ in his body and blood, by which they have been sealed in the victory of Christ and his holy merit. He urges that those who have sat at this table might with the eyes of faith see themselves seated with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob in the confidence of the merit of Christ, and that they might feel the presence of the Holy Spirit and give to the Father thanks and praise here and now, and also day by day.\footnote{Kuyper II 1866, 165-166.}

This is followed by a lengthy Prayer of Thanksgiving.

The Lithuanian 1581 and 1621 agendas shorten Lasco's exhortation, concentrating on communion in the body and blood of Christ for the comfort of the conscience. The occasion of the assurance of this communion is described as: “...when we touched the bread with our hands and ate it with our mouths and drunk wine from, the cup.”\footnote{Forma albo porządek 1581, cii-cij; Forma albo porządek 1621, 76.} The eyes of faith look beyond to that Communion which they have with Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and all faithful. In Lasco, and in 1581 and 1621 orders, it is the purpose of the exhortation to assure the communicants of the

\begin{footnotes}
\footnote{Thompson 1972, 155.}
\footnote{Coena Domini I 1983, 345-346.}
\footnote{Kuyper II 1866, 165-166.}
\footnote{Forma albo porządek 1581, cii-cij; Forma albo porządek 1621, 76.}
\end{footnotes}
significance of their participation as and outward sign and seal of their Fellowship with Christ and his holy ones.

Kraiński in his 1599 rite speaks in much the same terms, adding at the beginning a strong exhortation that the people should firmly and without doubt believe that they receive these blessings in this way. To his exhortation he adds Christ's word's from the Gospel according to Luke 22:29 that the Father has given him the kingdom and that according to his promise those who eat and drink at this table will also be seated at his table in his kingdom. What stands out here is the understanding of the Supper as a seal of fellowship between Christ and his believers by which forgiveness comes to man from Christ. All this becomes the basis for the believers thanksgiving and praise of God.

The 1602 and 1614 liturgies take up another theme from Lasco's exhortation, namely, that those who have participated might not take the grace of God in vain, but show the fruits of faith and pious living ever more with each passing day. They must understand that they have been elected by God and must not associate themselves with the works or deeds of this dark world. May God himself present them stainless in body, soul, and spirit in the day of his judgment. It is in the 1602 and 1614 liturgies that we find allusions to the Calvinist understanding of election. In the theology of John Calvin, thanksgiving to God and the praise of his grace are closely connected to the doctrine of the Double Predestination. Whether one is eternally elected to salvation or to damnation, God is to be praised and glorified for his unchangeable decree which determines each man's fate. The doctrine of Predestination is found in corpus doctrine of the Polish and Lithuanian Churches in the Confession of Sandomierz and the Second Helvetic Confession. Predestination is considered from the standpoint of the doctrine of Christ. The term ‘Double Predestination’ is not used, and the notion receives little emphasis. The purpose of election in Christ is that his saints should be a holy and blameless people before him in love, to the praise of the glory of his grace.  

The 1637 agenda begins the Exhortation to Thanksgiving by recalling that man was made to praise God as King David states in Psalm 103:1-2 with the words: “Bless the Lord, O My Soul, and all that is within me, bless His holy name. Bless the Lord, O My Soul, and forget not all His benefits.” In addition, the church has the

720 Confessio 1570, d-diij.
strong example of the Lord Jesus, who after he had supped with his disciples did not leave the table before he had led his disciples in a song of thanksgiving to his Father in heaven (Matthew 26:30). Following this example the people are to make their thanksgiving, and present their prayers for the suffering church and her many needs. Further, to the word and example of the Lord must be added the command of the Apostle in 1 Timothy 2:1-4, when he says that prayer should be made for kings and all who are in authority, that the Christian people may live quite and peaceful lives in godliness and honesty. Here we see a shift from a prayer of thanksgiving in a narrow sense to a general prayer of the church. The same exhortation is found in the 1644 agenda.

Thus, we see the development of broader themes for this prayer from a specific thanksgiving for the gift of Communion to a more comprehensive prayer for the needs of the church in the world. The earlier agendas used this exhortation as a final reminder of the blessings associated with the church’s Communion and sought to move man's vision beyond this parochial event to the church's fellowship with their Lord in heaven. In 1602 and 1614 books church's separation from this corrupted world predominated. In the latest rites the exhortation has been superseded by a prayer for the general needs of the church in the world. It is hard to escape the conclusion that the church has now found her place as a suffering minority in the world and sees the world as the arena of God’s activity. While the counter-Reformation gains strength, God’s church continues in this world as the suffering church and prays that God would sustain her. For this purpose the church intercedes on behalf of those who are in authority for her own well-being.

**Prayer of Thanksgiving.** The prayers which follow the exhortations are, in fact, more comprehensive than the exhortations themselves might lead us to believe. Even the earlier liturgies show a tendency toward making this a more comprehensive prayer of the church. The individual prayers differ in their construction. While the prayers in the Lithuanian 1581 and 1621 agendas followed Lasco, Kraiński composed a new prayer in Trinitarian form invoking, in turn, each of the members of the Holy Trinity. The 1602 and 1614 liturgies recast the traditional Prefatio into a thanksgiving for all God’s saving work. The high point of the prayer is a recitation of
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721 *Agenda* 1637, 118-120.
722 *Akt usługi* 1644, 40-42.
723 *Forma albo porządek* 1581, b-ciij; *Forma albo porządek* 1621, 76-77.
*Tersanctus* as it is found in the Communion liturgies of the Roman and Lutheran Churches. This prayer is also found in the 1637 and 1644 liturgies along with a lengthy alternative prayer for all the needs of the church.

The Polish and Lithuanian agendas do not follow the general pattern of post-communion thanksgivings found in the tradition of Western liturgies. There, these prayers follow the classical Collect pattern; they are very short and concise. Luther complained of the post-communion prayer in the Roman rite that it predominantly spoke of sacrifice. He therefore substituted a simple collect formerly spoken privately by the priest and communicants. “Thy body, O Lord, which we have received, etc.”

Reformed theologians beginning with Zwingli provided post-communion of a different kind. Zwingli in his 1523 rite offered an antiphonal reading of the first 9 verses of Psalm 113. Bucer gave three prayers, the first one offering thanks and praise for the gift of Christ, the second offering a thanksgiving for the offering and presentation of the bread of heaven and the food of eternal life, and the third praying that communion with Christ would be effective and strong, and lead to a new and godly life. Calvin’s prayer, in both Geneva (1542) and Strassburg (1545) orders, gives thanks for the benefit which God has shown to poor sinners by drawing them into communion with Christ and by giving them the meat and drink of eternal life. He prays that God would imprint these things upon the heart, and that the people might daily grow and increase in faith to the praise of God and the upbuilding of their neighbors.

Of special interest to us is Lasco's prayer, used by the Lithuanian liturgies of 1581 and 1621. He gives thanks for the food of eternal life and acknowledges God’s goodness and mercy toward those who are weak and needy. He incorporates his people together into one body in Christ and shows them his grace that they may increase day by day in faith through that strengthening which comes by the Holy Spirit. He speaks of the renewal of the Spirit and responsibility of love which must rule in the hearts of all to increase of religion throughout the world and to the glory of the Holy Trinity. The Lithuanians found this prayer most congenial to their religious spirit and adopted it with only minor variations in wording.

The Polish liturgies adopted an entirely different pattern. They provided here a lengthy prayer for the church and her needs. In 1599, Kraiński built this prayer upon the model of the *Tersanctus*. The opening word of his prayer, directed to the

---

724 Thompson 1972, 113.
Father, are somewhat reminiscent of Lasco's prayer, but he moves beyond it to include an intercession for the well-being of the church under the Polish King, that the people of Rzeczpospolita may live in peace, and be protected from the sword of the enemy, famine, and bad weather. The Son of God is thanked for the revelation of the Gospel, which confirms the Father's grace, the forgiveness of sins, and eternal life. He has washed away sins and justified his people, protected them from Satan and united them with the Father. He has fed his people with his body and is now asked to preserve them from being lured away from his grace. The Holy Spirit, who came upon Mary that she might give birth to Christ, is thanked and asked to be forever the comforter of Christians, especially since they must bear the cross and suffer hardship for the sake of the Gospel. He is asked to be the doctor who teaches them the faith, and the leader who guides them into the way of a pious life and toward the heavenly goal. To this end, the minister prays that the Holy Spirit might strengthen them, that hardship and persecution might never lead them to renounce their faith and the heavenly truth.  

The 1602 and 1614 prayers are similar in wording and content. The prayer opens with a thanksgiving to God the Father for his graciousness in creating man according to his own likeness and for the gift of redemption through Christ. From this point the prayer is shaped according to the traditional Western *Vere dignum* of the *Prefatio*. Then the Father is asked, as in 1599, to bless the King and protect his church and to preserve the people from famine and plague. The Son is thanked for feeding his people with his body and precious blood and for uniting them with the Father. Thanks is given to the Holy Spirit for the gift of sanctification, and he is asked to strengthen the people in the faith to live a pious life and to persevere under all trials and hardships. It is worthy of note that the Western Prefatio never found a place in the Reformed liturgies. The Poles, however, incorporate elements of it in a prayer which followed communion. Perhaps they found its use in this place attractive because it sounds so clearly the note of thanksgiving, as is evident already in the opening words of the traditional prayer. “It is meet, right, and salutary that we should give thanks..., etc.”

---

725 Porządek nabożeństwa 1599, 174-176.
726 Porządek nabożeństwa 1602, 42-44; Porządek nabożeństwa 1614, 53-54.
The 1637 and 1644 liturgies give the prayer from 1602, but allow also an alternative another prayer not found in the earlier agendas. This alternative prayer is adapted from the Königsberg 1580 and 1612 agendas of the Bohemian Brethren. This new prayer begins immediately with a thanksgiving to God who has provided food for the hungry and thirsty souls. This food is the living bread from heaven which gives life to the world and the living water which quenches thirst forever. The prayer is still loosely modeled on the Preface, and the predominant theme is the pervasive glory of God in creation and in his elected congregation. The congregation may not presume upon God’s grace, but freed, from sin and error, it should walk in uprightness and virtuous life until it attains to that eternal feast in heaven which has no end. Intercessions are include for those who err, the sick and dying, those persecuted for truth's sake, and the King and nation, that they might live in peace and govern wisely. So all the people will continue in a godly and honest life. Again the theme of persecution arises and forgiveness is asked for persecutors and those who ignorantly oppose God’s will. The prayer concludes with an ascription of praise to God with the threefold Sanctus.

**Closing Admonition.** Following a pattern found in Lasco’s 1550 rite, the liturgies of 1637 and 1644 add a concluding admonition to those who have participated in the Lord’s Supper. The content is very different from Lasco's. Lasco's in *Argumentum admonitionis post Coenae Dominicae administrationem* admonished the congregation to think rightly concerning the elements of the Supper, that they might not fall victim to Roman Catholic notions concerning transubstantiation or otherwise believe, or regard the bread and wine to be the body and blood of Christ. Under five points Lasco goes on to explain the symbolism of the use of bread, gathered from many grains into one, and to repudiate the notions of those who would make of it more than a symbol. The 1637 and 1644 agendas call this section *Conclusia* and make it the occasion for admonishing the people not to receive the grace of God in vain and to provide for the support of the church and those who are in need. There follows a series of quotations from 1 Corinthians 6:1-4, Matthew 5:16, Hebrew 13:16, 1 Corinthians 9:7, Galatians 6:10, Proverbs 3:9, all of which admonish the congregation to pious and upright lives of faithfulness and self-offering.

---
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to God, as is fitting for those who have been guests in his Holy Table. Nothing is said concerning the nature of the elements, the doctrine of transubstantiation, or other erroneous teachings concerning the Supper. Thus the Poles and Lithuanians make use of this Admonition to speak in positive and directive terms of the requirements of the Christian life, the new law under which the church lives.\textsuperscript{731}

**The Dismissal.**

a) **A Prayer Benediction.** All the liturgies we are examining except Krański's 1599 order have a formal prayer of blessing, spoken by the minister over the congregation. In most cases some form of the Aaronic Benediction from Numbers 6:24-27 is used. An exception is the Benediction found in the 1581 and in 1621 Lithuanian liturgies which serves as a blessing for the congregation in general and the communicants in particular.

In the Middle Ages the Western liturgy generally concluded with a direct word of Dismissal: *Ite missa est* – “Go, it is the dismissal,” to which the congregation responded: *Deo gratias*. In the course of time the traditional word of blessing which the bishop would speak over the people as he left the church: “May the almighty God bless and preserve you, the Father, Son, and the Holy Spirit” was taken up into the Mass as a prayer spoken by the priest before the Last Gospel (John 1:1-14). It was understood as a final blessing over the people.\textsuperscript{732} Luther in the *Formula Missae* directed that after the congregation’s *Deo gratias* the customary Benediction should be given, that is the one from the Roman Mass, or the Aaronic Benediction from the Numbers 6:24-27: “The Lord bless us and keep us, the Lord make his face shine upon us and be gracious to us, the Lord lift his countenance upon us and give us peace,” or Psalm 67:6-7: “God, even our own God shall bless us. God shall bless us; and all the ends of the earth shall fear him.” “I believe Christ used something like this when, ascending into heaven, he blessed his disciples”, Luther wrote.\textsuperscript{733} Zwingli in 1525 rite follows the example of the Roman Mass and closes with thee simple words: “Depart in peace.”\textsuperscript{734} Bucer closed the Communion service with the Aaronic Benediction from Numbers 6, as in Luther, adding after it the words: “Depart, the Spirit of the Lord go with you unto eternal life.”\textsuperscript{735} Calvin in his
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Geneva (1542) and Strassburg (1545) rites closes with the Aaronic Benediction as in the usual Sunday service. Lasco in *Forma ac Ratio* 1550 notes the service should close with the Benediction but he does not specify what Benediction is to be used.\(^736\)

We find the first use of the Aaronic Benediction among the Poles in the revised agenda of 1602. Here the words of Numbers 6:24-26 are given in the form of a prayer: “May the Lord bless you and keep you. May the Lord make his face shine on you and be gracious to you. May the Lord lift up his countenance upon you and give you peace.” We find the same wording in the agenda of 1614.\(^737\) The editors of the 1637 and 1644 rites added after the Aaronic Benediction the *Testimonium Davidum* from Psalm 121:8 and the *Tersanctus*, again in the form of prayer: “May the Lord bless you and keep you. May the Lord make his face shine on you and be gracious to you. May the Lord lift up his countenance upon you and give you peace. To this end may [the Lord] bless your going out and your coming in both from this time forth and even forever; Holy, Holy, Holy Lord, our only God, to whom be praise and glory for ever and ever.”\(^738\) We should note that Psalm 121:8 is not usually associated with the blessings of worshipers at the close of the service. Following Medieval precedent Luther used it in the Baptismal service to indicate the entrance of the candidate into the fellowship of the church. The candidate has gone out of the world through water and the Spirit and entered into the fellowship of the body of Christ.\(^739\) In the context of these Reformed agendas and Reformed theology, the coming in and going out came to be associated with participation in the worship service and departure from the church to life into world to live obediently to the praise and glory of God under the new law of Christ. This understanding was strengthened by the concluding Words of the *Tersanctus* “…to whom must be praise and glory for ever and ever.”

The Lithuanian agendas of 1581 and 1621 do not follow the usual pattern. Here we find a wholly different prayer of Benediction which relates the sending forth of the people to the blessing of Communion: “May the merciful Lord God, who has given us to eat and to drink of the body and blood of his dear Son, graciously direct our hearts and souls to his praise and glory and bless us now and forever.”\(^740\) Now

\(^{736}\) Kuyper II 1866, 169.
\(^{737}\) *Porządek nabożeństwa* 1602, 44; *Porządek nabożeństwa* 1614, 54-55.
\(^{738}\) *Agenda* 1637,127; *Akt usługi* 1644, 48.
\(^{739}\) Luther’s works 1965, 128.
\(^{740}\) *Forma albo porządek* 1581, cit.; *Forma albo porządek* 1621,77.
consoled and strengthened by Communion they are to go forth into the life of obedient service to which they have been called and in which they are to do all things to the praise and Glory of God.

b) **Collection of alms.** The Lithuanian agendas of 1581 and 1621 and the Polish agendas of 1599, 1602, and 1614 direct that before the end of the service the congregation is to made aware of the special needs of the poor and of the church.741 The 1581 and 1621 agendas place this offering before the final blessing; in the Polish rites it comes at the end of the blessing. At this point a collection is taken on behalf of both, poor and the church. The 1637 and 1644 rites in the section ‘Conclusia’ admonished the congregation not to be grudging when considering the plight of those in need.742

We note by the unusual place of the collection of alms in these agendas. Earlier the Reformed, most particularly Bucer (1539), had provided for the collection of alms after the sermon, but here the collection takes place at the very end of the rite, either before, or following the final Benediction.743 In this they follow the example of Johannes a Lasco, who directed that at the end of the service thedeacons should position themselves at the doors of the church to collect alms for the poor and to distribute any remaining bread and wine for the needy and the sick.744 The Lithuanian and Polish liturgies make no mention of deacons standing at the door, but direct that the collection is to be made at the end of the service. Here the collection is made the object of a special admonition as a response called forth by obedience to the law of Christ, which requires not only personal piety but also concern for and relieve of the need of the poor.

c) **The Final Hymn.** The public worship of the congregation concludes with an appropriate hymn. The Polish liturgies of 1599, 1602, 1614, 1637, and 1644 call for the singing of the ascription of praise *Bogu Oycu y Synowi* (“Eternal praise and glory be to God, the Father and to the Son Jesus Christ”).745 1637 and 1644 allow also for the singing of an additional hymn after which the people leave the church.746

741 *Forma albo porządek* 1581, cii; *Forma albo porządek* 1621, 77; *Porządek nabożeństwa* 1599, 176; *Porządek nabożeństwa* 1602, 44; *Porządek nabożeństwa* 1614, 55.
742 *Agenda* 1637,126-127; *Akt usługi* 1644, 47-48.
743 Thompson 1972, 167
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745 *Forma albo porządek* 1581, cii; *Forma albo porządek* 1621, 77.
746 *Porządek nabożeństwa* 1599, 176; *Porządek nabożeństwa* 1602, 44; *Porządek nabożeństwa* 1614, 55; *Agenda* 1637,127; *Akt usługi* 1644, 48.
The 1581 and 1621 Lithuanian orders direct the congregation to sing Psalm 67 *Błagosław nam náš Pánie* (“Bless us, our Lord”).

The place of this hymn or psalm at the end of the rite is unusual. Bucer (1539) and Calvin (1542) had a hymn or psalm before the prayer of thanksgiving. Lasco's Latin rite allows the singing of the hymn directly before the Benediction, but not after. We do not find precedence for a hymn at this place in the classical Reformed liturgies. It is a practice which would be increasingly favored in the 17th and 18th century services of the Reformation churches - as a hymn or verse of praise or thanksgiving, as a response to the blessings of the service.⁷⁴⁷

---
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4.2. Liturgy and Praxis

4.2.1. The Music of the Liturgy

The Polish liturgies display a rich musical tradition which stands in contrast to the scant musical settings of the Lithuanian liturgies, which do not provide musical notations.\(^748\) They exhibit an abundance of sequences, hymns, and liturgical sections set to music, some of it based upon Medieval, Reformed and Lutheran sources. In this regard the Polish Reformed do not follow the usual pattern of Reformed Churches.

The liturgist and theologians of the Reformed tradition were not of one mind concerning the role of music in the worship. Zwingli forbade singing and instrumental music in worship as inappropriate and distracting. Music, as part of the created world, must not be allowed to divert one’s attention away from the spiritual.\(^749\) Martin Bucer in Strassburg was not of the same opinion. His congregation was musically rich and John Calvin found in Strassburg a congregation well versed in singing metrical versions of Biblical texts. When he prepared a French service for his Strassburg congregation, Calvin provided metrical Psalms to be sung by the people. He developed the same practice at Geneva, and with the help of French composer Louis Bourgeois stately tones were provided for the Psalms.\(^750\) Their use was to become a central feature of French-speaking and other Western European Reformed traditions, particularly in England and Scotland. Lasco also provided for the singing of Psalms but included no musical notations in his work. We noticed in all cases that the most essential elements of the service were always spoken by the minister and the people. The use of music was restricted to the singing of Psalms.

We find quite a different development in Minor Poland. Here in addition to the regular use of Medieval and Reformation era hymns we find important elements in the service chanted by the minister and the congregation. Included are traditional antiphons, the Creed, the Our Father, and the Agnus Dei, etc.

\(^{748}\) The Lithuanian hymnals of 1581, 1594, 1600, et al. have hymns with accompanying musical notations, but the liturgies we have examined provide no hymns, sequences, or other liturgical sections with musical notations.
\(^{749}\) Gäbler 1986, 107-108.
\(^{750}\) Reed 1959, 174.
The Invocation of the Holy Spirit. Three hymns of the Invocation of the Holy Spirit are found in the Polish Reformed liturgies.

a) In the Liturgies of 1599, 1602, 1614 and 1644 we find the traditional antiphon: Święty duchu záwitay k nam (Veni sancte Spiritus, reple tuorum corda) in Polish. It is a general Invocation of the Holy Spirit, found in the Liber Usualis as an introduction to the hymn Veni Creator Spiritus and the traditional collect for Pentecost Sunday. The melody is that found in common use for this antiphon, with minor modifications. This tune in the liturgies of 1602 and 1614 used with the hymn words Duchu świety záwitay k nam.

Agenda 1599
"Veni sancte Spiritus, reple tuorum corda"

b) As an alternative, Kraiński's 1599 liturgy suggests Duchu świety záwitay k nam (Veni, Sancte Spiritus, et emitte coelitus). This is the traditional sequence hymn for Pentecost Sunday in the Medieval Mass. Kraiński gives a Polish translation but employs the traditional Gregorian Melody.
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c) 1637 and 1644 liturgies offer an antiphon: *Święty Duchu przybądź* based upon the *Veni sancte Spiritus, reple tuorum corda*, but with some modifications to make of it a more complete prayer of the Invocation of the Holy Spirit. The melody is based upon the traditional melody.

**Agenda 1637**

"*Veni sancte Spiritus, reple tuorum corda*"

The Invocation of the Holy Spirit is prominent in the Western tradition. He is the Third Person of the Holy Trinity, he is the Lord and Giver of life. It is he who has spoken through the prophets and the apostles; he is invoked as the Spirit of communion or unity binding together with the Father and the Son. In the regular

755 Agenda 1637, 101; Akt ushagi 1644, 20-21.
Sunday Mass in the Medieval church the Invocation of the Holy Spirit was incorporated into the priest's prayer of preparation. Additionally, the antiphons, hymns, and prayers of the Holy Spirit are found in connection with the celebration of the Pentecost Sunday, Monday and Tuesday, the theme of which is the coming of the Holy Spirit.\(^{756}\) As in the Medieval Mass Luther invokes the Holy Spirit liturgically through the celebration of the Pentecost Sunday, the continued use of Latin hymnody, and through his translation of the *Veni Creator Spiritus* into German.\(^{757}\)

He sees no special need to give particular prominence to the Holy Spirit, for Word and Spirit always go together. It is the Holy Spirit who through the means of grace brings Christ, awakens faith, bestows spiritual gifts, and guides the church.

The Reformed give more particular attention to the Holy Spirit. Along with the whole Western tradition, the Reformed confess that there is no true confession of Christ or worthy worship apart of the presence and activity of the Holy Spirit, but they put special emphasis on the immediacy of the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit cannot be tied down or in any way bound to earthly things, and therefore earthly words and the elements of bread, wine, and water cannot be bearers of heavenly content. The Holy Spirit is received apart from them, and it is for this coming that Calvinist liturgies fervently pray. From the very beginning of the service the presence of the Holy Spirit is invoked since it is through him that the Christians are spiritually united with his Lord and able to commune with him on a heavenly plane.

**The Creed.** Unusual form the Reformed perspective is the inclusion of the creed as a sung element in the service. Two versions are found. One is a straightforward chant version of the Apostles Creed, and the second is a Polish translation of Luther’s *Wir glauben all'an einen Gott.*

a) Apostles Creed. The Apostles Creed *Wierze w jednego Bogá* is found in all the Polish liturgies; only the 1602 agenda lacks a melody line.\(^{758}\) The liturgies of 1599, 1637 and 1644 include a melody based upon *Credo in unum Deum* in the *Liber Usualis,*\(^ {759}\) a well known medieval plainsong melody. The agenda of 1614 employs a different plainsong melody, less familiar to us, and not found in the *Liber.*
Agenda 1614

“Credo in unum Deum”, based on medieval plain song melody

Agenda 1644

“Credo in unum Deum”, based on medieval plain song melody
b) Nicene Creed. The Nicene Creed is included in the Polish liturgies of 1599, 1602, and 1614. The presence of *My wierzymy w jednego Boga*, a Polish translation of Luther's versification of the Nicene Creed *Wir glauben all' an einen Gott* is worthy of note. The appearance of this Creed in any form in continental Reformed liturgy is unusual; everywhere among the Reformed the Apostles Creed was ordinarily needed.

*Agenda 1602*

*M. Luther 1524, “Wir glauben all an einen Gott”, based on a 13th century plain song melody*

A one stanza versification of the Nicene Creed is already known from the time of Luther. It is assumed that it was brought to Luther’s attention by Stephen Roth of Zwickau. The melody is a familiar Gregorian melody from the 13th – 15th centuries of German origin. It was Luther who reconstructed the hymn, putting it into three stanzas for the three members of the Holy Trinity. It is his three stanzas translated into Polish that we find in these agendas.

**The sequence “Nadroższą krwią swoją.”** All of the Polish liturgies include the hymn *Nadroższą krwią swoją*. This sequence is translation from the Latin *Sanguine proprio redemisti nos Deus*. The place of this hymn varies. In the 1599
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liturgy it is sung after the Prayer toward the Words of Christ, immediately before the Invitation to the God’s Table. The 1602 and 1614 liturgies keep it after the Prayer toward the Words of Christ, but in these liturgies both the prayer and the sequence are found earlier, after the Confession of Faith, and before the *Verba Testamenti*. In 1637 this hymn loses its connection with the Prayer toward the Words of Christ and is placed after the Words of Christ’s Testament and the meaning of Testament and the Admonition, immediately before the Our Father. In 1644 the connection with the Our Father is maintained, but both elements come later after the breaking of the bread and Pauline words over the cup. In 1644 the sequence serves as a hymn of the cup, and follows the *Agnus Dei*, the hymn of the bread. Thus a direct connection is established between this sequence and the blessing of the cup. The hymn recalls the blood of the Redeemer as the means by which sinners are cleansed and made acceptable to God, and heirs with all the saints of heaven with all its treasures.

*Agenda*1602

“Sanguine proprio redemisti nos Deus”

![Music notation](image)

The *Ojcze nász* is given with two familiar medieval plainsong melody of the *Pater Noster*, adjusted to fit the words of the Polish text.763

The researches of the liturgical scholars have shown the close connection between the Our Father and communion, as the most fitting prayer to be said by one who intends to receive the Holy Sacrament. All Polish and Lithuanian rites maintain the ancient practice according to which the Our Father is prayed after the Words of Christ's Testament, but before communion is received. The exact position of the Our Father differs in the various agendas. We are nowhere given a reason in the agendas why the Poles chose to sing the Our Father, rather than simply to recite it as other Reformed Churches. We are told only that it is an ancient Christian tradition that the people should pray the Our Father, and that they should do so kneeling. We may ask whether the sung Our Father was not introduced in imitation of the almost universal practice of Lutherans of that period to sing the Our Father, either together or antiphonally with the pastor.
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Agnus Dei. A hymn seldom encountered in Reformed Communion services is the Agnus Dei. This hymn, originally introduced in the 7-8 centuries, became a standard feature in Polish liturgies. The hymn O Báránku nász iedyny found in the rites of 1599, 1602, 1614, 1637 and 1644. The agendas of 1602 and 1614 provide as alternatives another setting of the same hymn, Synu Boży, using another melody and different wording. There is little agreement in the rites concerning the place of this hymn. The Liturgies of 1599 and 1602 place it after the Our Father and the words of Paul from 1 Corinthians 5, before the Breaking of the Bread. The point of connection is Paul's Words of 1 Corinthians 5, which speak of Christ as the Passover, who has been sacrificed for us. The connotation is that Christ is the sacrificial Lamb of God, thus making for a natural connection with this section. This impression is strengthened by the 1614 rite, where the Words of 1 Corinthians 5 are followed immediately by the Agnus Dei, come even earlier before the Invitation to God’s Table. This connection is broken in the agenda of 1637, which does not include the Words of 1 Corinthians 5. Here the Agnus Dei comes earlier in the service,

764 Porządek nabożeństwa 1599, 172; Porządek nabożeństwa 1602, 40; Porządek nabożeństwa 1614, 47; Agenda 1637,106; Akt usługi 1644, 34.
765 Porządek nabożeństwa 1602, 40; Porządek nabożeństwa 1614, 47.
immediately following the Confession of Sins. The 1644 rite places it after the Breaking of the Bread, its original place in the Western Mass, where it had served as the fraction hymn, to be sung again and again until sufficient bread had been broken for all communicants.  

Agenda 1602

“Agnus Dei” (“Son of God”)

Agenda 1644

“Agnus Dei”

The *Agnus Dei* came to the Western liturgy from the East. In the East the sacrificial gifts were called the Lamb, an expression which was occasioned by the Apocalypse by St. John. Early texts from Western Syria and elsewhere refer to the sacrament, and especially the broken bread as the Lamb of God. The reference is not to Christ himself, but rather to Christ as present in the Eucharist. The same connection comes into the West and this connection is strengthened by the fact that this image is recalled as the consecrated bread is being broken into small pieces to be consumed by the communicants. The inclusion of the *Agnus Dei* in Luther's liturgical services fits easily to the confession of the real presence of Christ under bread and wine. Present for the communicants is the very body which was given unto death for their sins, the flesh of the Lamb of God who takes away the sins of the world. The Lutheran use of this hymn could give rise to charges that those who sung it were worshiping the bread on the altar, a charge which the Reformed often laid against the Lutherans. Thus it is unexpected that we find in the 1599, 1602, 1614, 1637 and 1644 liturgies such frequent and prominent use of this hymn. The almost constant changing of its location would lead us to assume that the Polish Reformed were somewhat uneasy about its use.  

766 J ugm ann II 1986, 332.

767 The same uneasiness concerning the use of the *Agnus Dei* and its place can be found in the decision to omit it in the 1552 English Prayer Book. Dom Gregory Dix notes: “The singing or saying of the *Agnus Dei* between consecration and communion might easily have ministered to the ‘high’ Lutheran doctrine that our Lord is truly and substantially present at least in the ‘use’ of the sacrament.” Dix 1949, 668.
The 1644 agenda, obviously unsatisfied with the 1637 arrangement, placed it back into the context of the Breaking of the Bread.

**The Hymn O Wszechmocny Boże.** In the 1614 liturgy we find the hymn *O Wszechmocny Boże*, which is neither Medieval nor Lutheran in origin.768 This hymn is an original Calvinist composition in which thanksgiving is offered to God for having determined that the communicants are worthy to receive spiritually the body and blood of Christ. The communicants ask that they may be as a branch grafted into the Holy Body and bear fruit and be filled with the Holy Spirit whom God promised to his faithful ones. They pray that they might be truly thankful and worthily praise him for his goodness in his eternal Kingdom. This hymn follows the recitation of Words of Christ Testament and the explanation of the meaning of the Testament and Admonition. It is placed immediately before the Passover words from the 1 Corinthians 5, mentioned above. Thus, it fits in with the general theme of spiritual eating which is so central of the Reformed understanding of the sacrament. At the same time it is a mixed metaphor, which speaks of grafting into the body instead of being grafted into the Holy Wine, as we would expect from Paul’s words in Romans 11:17, or we would expect that they would be asked to be fruitful branches in the living wine in John 15. Coming as it does after the explanation of the Words of Christ and Admonition, this hymn serves to strengthen the notion of spiritual participation as the real significance of a communion.

*Agenda 1614*

**Other hymns.** Several other hymns are mentioned as appropriate for liturgical use at the end of public worship. The Lithuanian liturgies of 1581 and 1621 concludes with the singing of Psalm 67 *Błagosław nam nasz Panie* (“May God be merciful unto us an bless us and cause his face to shine upon us”).769 Unlike most of the Polish agendas, the Lithuanian rites contain no musical notations. The Psalm 67 is given without a melody line but we may assume that this lack of music would create no problems because the people could easily turn to the Psalm in the hymnal which was bound together with the liturgy. A hymn stanza without melody is

---

768 *Porządek nabożeństwa* 1614, 45-46.
769 *Forma albo porządek* 1581, ciij; *Forma albo porządek* 1621, 77.
included in the Polish rites is the *Bogu Oycu y Synowi* (“Eternal praise and glory be to God, the Father and to the Son Jesus Christ, and to the Holy Spirit, one God in Trinity”). The liturgies we have examined contain a mixture of Medieval chant tones, the Creed, the Our Father, the *Agnus Dei*, and other sequence hymns. All give the impression that we have before us evidence of a conservative Western liturgical tradition with which the rites stand in continuity. The church is not willing to be labeled a sect, as charged by the Jesuits, but a church which understands itself to be Catholic and Universal in time and place, as has otherwise been emphasized in the titles of the Minor Polish agendas, in the marginal notes, and in other public writings.

---

770 *Porządek nabożeństwa* 1599, 176; *Porządek nabożeństwa* 1602, 44; *Porządek nabożeństwa* 1614, 55; *Agenda* 1637, 127; *Akt usługi* 1644, 48.
771 *Porządek nabożeństwa* 1614, 31.
Deserving of special attention are the practical concerns attendant to the administration of the Holy Communion, including frequency of celebration, the uncovering the bread and wine in the Communion and their distribution, posture of the communicants, and other matters.

The celebration of the Holy Communion was an exceptional occurrence, not the usual Sunday service. It entailed particular preparation, and it required the observance of extraordinary procedures. It was celebrated as a exceptional occasion at a time announced well in advance both to give due to the worshipers, and to insure that all communicants would have an opportunity to prepare. We have already outlined the features of these periods of special preparation with reference to the individual agendas.

It is in Minor Poland that we find the first detail instructions for the celebration of the Lord’s Supper. These were given in the Stancaro, Bohemian Brethren, and Lasco orders. Most important  was Lasco’s order. From it all future orders would be derived. In his *Forma ac Ratio* he called for bi-monthly celebrations of the Holy Supper. He directed that in the German congregation in London Lord’s Supper should be observed on a first Sunday of January, March, May, etc. In the congregation of the Walloons the celebration was to take place on the first Sunday of February, April, June, etc. Thus in one or the other congregation there would be a Communion service on the first Sunday of every month. He directed also that the Communion might be celebrated at other times by the decision of the church elders. He also noted that the use of lighted candles, altars, ringing bells and other items associated with adoration including liturgical vestments should be done away with.

Communion was to be celebrated at a plain table, set up in view of the congregation, and on which had been put a clean linen table cloth. Seated around the table were the elders and those who would participate as guests in the Supper. On the day before Communion the confession was to be held at 2:00 o’clock in the afternoon and on the day of Communion the service began at 8:00 o’clock in the morning. Upon the table were four glasses and three tin plates. In the largest of these white bread, such as ordinarily used at home, was placed. A linen cloth covered everything. The largest plate was put in the middle of the table, and the smaller one on each side. It is into these smaller plates were the bread to be put after it has been broken. The four glasses were filled with wine and were placed by each of the two plates into which the broken bread would be put. These directions indicate Lasco's attempt recreate the scene in the upper room and celebrate Communion as it was first celebrated in the
night when Jesus was betrayed.\textsuperscript{772}

It is evident that both Lithuanian and Polish Churches followed many of practices from Lasco’s service. Some remained only for a time, as in the case of sitting for communion, but other continued in use. The protocols of the Minor Polish church indicate that Communion was ordinarily celebrated four times a year – on Christmas, Easter, Pentecost and on the Sunday after St. Michael’s Day (September 29).\textsuperscript{773} Only the Kraiński’s 1599 agenda specifies that additional celebrations are allowed in times of plague, famine, war, and other times of great need, as determined by the minister.\textsuperscript{774} Later agendas do not speak in specific terms about appropriate dates for the celebration of the Lord’s Supper.

The utilitarian practice of uncovering the bread and wine and the manner of their distribution differs in the liturgies we have examined. In the Liturgy of 1599 the elements are uncovered after the Our Father, before the Passover words from 1 Corinthians 5 after the recitation of Christ’s Words over the bread and wine.\textsuperscript{775} This indicates that Kraiński wished to obviate any notion that the bread and wine were in some sense set apart by the historical narrative of the Institution. The inclusion of these words were simply meant to set the scene of the institution of the first Supper. Kraiński made provision for the repetition of the Words of Christ over the bread and wine immediately before the distribution. The 1614 agenda called for the uncovering of the bread and wine immediately before the recitation of Christ’s Words.\textsuperscript{776} This rite included the use of manual acts at the mention of the bread and wine in the historical narrative. The 1637 and 1644 rites repeated this same provision.\textsuperscript{777} It appears that the purpose of unveiling the elements at that early point was to accommodate the manual acts which illustrate Christ's acts by taking of the bread and cup by imitation. Nothing is said in the 1581, 1621, or 1602 agendas about the uncovering of the elements, but here the inclusion of the manual acts of taking the bread and wine while Christ’s words are being recited indicate that the elements must have been unveiled at this point.

The manual acts which accompany the Testamentary Words of Christ indicate the Reformed understanding that Christ's command ‘This do’ includes the imitation of his physical actions. If Christ took bread and broke it, the minister also should take bread into his hands and break it in two parts, as the majority of the

\textsuperscript{772} Kuypers II 1866, 114-116; Naunin 1910, 229-233.
\textsuperscript{773} Akta synodów II 1972, 203, 320.
\textsuperscript{774} Porządek nabożeństwa 1599, 494.
\textsuperscript{775} Porządek nabożeństwa 1599, 171.
\textsuperscript{776} Porządek nabożeństwa 1614, 43.
\textsuperscript{777} Agenda 1637, 110; Akt usługi 1644, 29.
Polish agendas direct. If Christ took the cup in his hands then the minister should do the same.

The agenda of 1599 follows one ceremonial pattern found in Luther’s *Formula Missae* in that he suggested that during the creed the bread and wine should be prepared in the customary manner for the consecration.\(^778\) Krański directed that wine should be poured into the chalice and bread should in like manner be put into the paten during the singing of the creed.\(^779\) The agendas of 1602 and 1614 are silent about this matter, but we find a directive similar to Krański’s revived in 1637 order.\(^780\) The same directive is followed in 1644 order, excepting that wine is poured after the Pauline words over the cup, during the singing of the hymn *Nadrożną krwią swoią*.\(^781\) The Lithuanian agendas do not include directives concerning the unveiling or the preparation of the elements. Perhaps the preservation of earlier patterns made specific directives unnecessary.

The order of the reception of the communion elements varies in the agendas. Krański in his 1599 liturgy directs that minister should commune last of all.\(^782\) This order was changed in the 1614 rite. There the minister is to commune first and a special formulas for the self-communion of the minister were provided.\(^783\) The 1637 and 1644 agendas extends this provision by directing that the minister should first commune himself, then deacons and lectors, and finally the men, and ‘the hoary heads’.\(^784\) Other orders do not have directives about the minister’s communion, but all the Lithuanian and Polish agendas state that man commune first, and after them the women.

The placing of the bread into the hand of the communicant is specifically mentioned in the Lithuanian liturgies of 1581 and 1621.\(^785\) In every case it was understood to be necessary, since Christ’s command specifically note that the bread to be taken. This is clearly different from the practice of Roman Catholics and Lutherans of this period who normally delivered the sacrament into the mouth of the communicant.\(^786\)

An extraordinary sensitive issue was the question of the proper posture for reception of communion. As we have noted before, Lasco had directed that in imitation of the first Supper communicants should be seated at the table to receive

\(^{778}\) Thompson 1972, 111.

\(^{779}\) Porządek nabożeństwa 1599, 159.

\(^{780}\) Agenda 1637, 108.

\(^{781}\) Akt usługi 1644, 26, 35.

\(^{782}\) Porządek nabożeństwa 1599, 174.

\(^{783}\) Porządek nabożeństwa 1614, 50.

\(^{784}\) Agenda 1637, 116; Akt usługi 1644, 37.

\(^{785}\) Forma albo porządek 1581, c; Forma albo porządek 1621, 76.

\(^{786}\) Lutherans particularly spoke to this issue during their discussions with the Reformed at the General Synod at Sandomierz in 1570. *Akta synodów II* 1972, 273.
the sacrament. This practice had to be abandoned because of its association with heretical and schismatic elements within the Polish and Lithuanian Reformed community. Acrimony developed because this practice came more and more to be identified with the Anti-Trinitarians, who claimed for themselves that they, following Lasco, were the true Reformed Church. Although in general the Poles in this period were quite broad minded in accepting of diverse Christian groups, their toleration did not extend to Anti-Trinitarians and others who denied the Biblical doctrine of God. Accordingly, the protocols of the General Synods of 1570, 1573, 1578, 1583 specifically direct that the communion is not to be received seated, and they recommend standing or kneeling.\textsuperscript{787} Kneeling, however, is never mentioned in the agendas as an acceptable practice. It had come to be associated with the veneration of the sacrament, a practice which the Reformed regarded as idolatrous bread worship. A typical Reformed sentiment was that while standing with their bodies they were kneeling with their hearts.\textsuperscript{788} Therefore the Polish agendas of 1599, 1602, and 1614 direct that people must stand for the reception of the elements.\textsuperscript{789} The protocols of the 1633 Orla Convocation indicate that communion is to be received standing. The Gdańsk Book of 1637, however, makes no mention of it.

All Polish liturgies provide for the continuation of the old custom of singing hymns during communion. However, the Lithuanian liturgy of 1581 does not offer this provision. It directs instead that during communion the sixth chapter of the Gospel of John is to be read.\textsuperscript{790} This provision was taken from Lasco's \textit{Forma ac Ratio} 1550 and served to articulate the Reformed notion of spiritual communion.\textsuperscript{791} However, the liturgy of 1621 provides instead for the singing of appropriate hymns.\textsuperscript{792}

\textsuperscript{787} In every case when the general synods determined to maintain liberty in the rites and ceremonies of the churches of Sandomierz Consensus, they permitted the same liberty regarding the posture of those receiving Communion. \textit{Akta synodów II} 1972, 272-273, 297; \textit{Akta synodów III} 1983, 12, 40, 82.
\textsuperscript{788} \textit{Akta synodów III} 1983, 272-273.
\textsuperscript{789} \textit{Porządek nabożeństwa} 1599, 173-174; \textit{Porządek nabożeństwa} 1602, 41; \textit{Porządek nabożeństwa} 1614, 50-51.
\textsuperscript{790} \textit{Forma albo porządek} 1581, c.
\textsuperscript{791} Kuypers II 1866, 164.
\textsuperscript{792} \textit{Forma albo porządek} 1621, 76.
4.3. A Critical Evaluation of the Rites and their Interrelationships

We have critically examined each section of the liturgical rites found in the Polish and Lithuanian agendas, in order to understand their theological significance within the Reformed community. We have also considered the relationship of the parts of these liturgies to the greater European Reformed tradition, and the traditional liturgical patterns of the Medieval Western Church. It remains for us now to examine more closely the course of the liturgical development which finally issued in the publication of the 1637 and 1644 agendas. We must inquire concerning the nature of this development and the course which it followed, noting what portions of the liturgy must face fresh consideration with the passing of time, what had proved unhelpful, and what served to express the heart and soul of the final liturgical expression.

We have seen that within the Reformed Church in Poland and Lithuania there stood two strong independent liturgical traditions, separately representing the worship practices of the Polish and Lithuanian peoples. During the period covered by this study, these traditions came into a closer mutual contact, and finally a common rite was issued for use in both churches. The first attempt to express this unity in a common worship form of 1637 was not entirely successful. It was necessary to publish an amended and corrected edition of 1644 to satisfy the needs of the Lithuanians.

The earliest rites we studied were Lithuanian. Their construction and direction were straightforward, but their real significance comes to light only with the appearance of the Great Gdańsk Book of 1637 which was meant to supersede it. The Lithuanian rites showed themselves to be quite stable. The church was not interested in novelties or in the production of a rite which in any way recalled the worship practices of other churches. The successive agendas of 1581, 1594, 1598, 1600 and the Lithuanian edition of the rite in the Pietkiewicz (Petkevičius) 1598 catechism are exact copies of that earlier Lithuanian rite. The only information we have about this earlier rite is found in its 1581 reprint which, according to the earlier source, had been printed in the printing house of Radziwill the Brown in Vilnius. Of all the Lithuanian sources only liturgy of 1621 departs from the early text, and then only in minor details.

The Lithuanian rite of 1581 shows the strong influence of Lasco. Many parts of Lasco’s *Forma ac Ratio* are found in the later rite, but in a more elaborate form. The verbal formulas are more concentrated. The formula for excommunication is new, and is made a part of the exhortation to the communicants. This is an unusual
feature which departs from other Calvinist liturgies and seems to inappropriately bind together two elements of the liturgy which would better be kept separate. The invitation to God’s Table which Lasco had put after the recitation of Passover words from 1 Corinthians 5, is now put after the breaking of the bread. The examination of the neophytes is put after the invitation instead of at an early place in the Communion day rite or on preparatory services. Its presence at this point seems to diminish the significance of the general invitation just announced. Perhaps its use here is meant to accent the Covenant Meal nature of the Supper, requiring of the Neophytes a special commitment of faithful obedience. Lasco’s distribution formula, which stressed the remembrance of Christ’s sacrifice on the cross, is replaced by the different bread formula, which speaks about the nature of the gifts and their intended fruit, the forgiveness of sins. The formula for the distribution of the cup, however, runs in line with Lasco, stressing the blood shed on the cross. The bread is received into the hands, in order that the commandments of Christ might be fulfilled (1) ‘Take’, (2) ‘Eat’. Apart from these minor adaptations and the rejection of sitting communion, Lasco’s *Forma ac Ratio* is followed closely.793

The liturgy of 1621 was derived from the 1581-1600 rites. The most significant innovation of this agenda is its reworking of the opening part of the service. It was traditional in Lithuania to begin worship with the prayer *Wszęchemogący wieczny Boże*, a Prayer for Right and God-pleasing Worship. This was followed by the admonition to the communicants, and the declaration of excommunication comes immediately thereafter, somewhat abruptly. 1621 book wished to smooth this transition. The service began with a Psalm 124:8: “Our help is in the Lord who created heaven and earth.” It separated the excommunication from the admonition by inserting the prayer for right and God-pleasing worship between them, thus achieving a greater sense of balance and effecting a smoother transition from the admonition to the solemn warning to those who refuse to heed it. The excommunication was shortened by dropping the reference to those who have no desire to repent and had thereby excommunicate themselves. Finally, Lasco’s prayer *Omnipotens aeterne Deus* is shortened by altering the closing doxology. The integrity of the rite was maintained and only minor ‘housekeeping’ changes were incorporated. What is lacking in this agenda is any detailed instructions concerning the form for the traditional services of preparation two weeks one week, and one day before the celebration of the Supper. In this the 1621 rite stands out from other Lithuanian forms of Lord’s Supper. Surely this does not indicate that the preparatory

793 *Forma albo porządek* 1581, b-ciiij.
orders have lost their significance. Apart from this omission the service is not notable and gives us no clue as to the course of development which led to its composition.794

The Polish liturgies, however, present us with many opportunities for further exploration. They reveal something of the struggles through which the church passed in order to achieve the creation of the agenda to be used both in Poland and in Lithuania.

With the 1599 rite we find a special emphasis upon the invocation of the Holy Spirit and the confession of his essential role in Holy Communion as it is understood from the Reformed perspective. Beginning with 1599 we find a declaration of grace as well, and not just a word of comfort. In the context of the meaning of the testament and the admonition, Kraiński included a formal statement of excommunication which ‘fences the table’ and warns the ungodly and disobedient of the seriousness of their need for repentance. The inclusion of excommunication at this point, after the Words of Christ, is somewhat startling and creates unnecessary tension, since the assembled congregation had already been through two weeks of special services and intensive spiritual preparation, had already confessed their sins, and had heard the declaration of grace and the Words of Institution.

Kraiński perpetuated Lasco's directive that all should receive the bread together after Paul’s and Christ’s own Words over the bread, and before the Pauline words over the cup. In order to follow this directive, he found it necessary to repeat the Words of Christ from Luke 22:19-20 and 1 Corinthians 11:25 which had already been spoken once, since they are included in the historical narrative from 1 Corinthians 11. This gives what may seen from the Reformed perspective undue attention to Christ's Testamentary words, which according to Reformed tradition are not consecratory. Of course it was not necessary for Kraiński to repeat Christ’s Words at all. He could instead have connected the communion of the bread with Paul’s words from 1 Corinthians 10, since the reference is to broken bread and now the bread has been broken. But the second reference speaks of a cup of blessing, and this cup has not been blessed, so Kraiński undertakes to bless it with the Words of Christ. Pauline words concerning the cup of blessing direct our attention to Christ’s Words over the cup. This leaves Kraiński open for possible criticism, since he appears to capitulate to a view of actual consecration not appropriate to the Reformed tradition. Another point of interest in Kraiński’s liturgy is the formula of distribution which he has fashioned, beginning with the Words of Christ and then taking those words into his own mouth. Christ has said: “Take, eat, this is my body…” and “This same I also say unto you in the name of Christ: Take, eat, this is the body of our Lord

794 Forma albo porządek 1621, 74-77.
Christ which is given for you.”\textsuperscript{795} A parallel formula is used for the distribution of the cup. Thus Kraiński presents a formula which easily connects with the traditional words: “Take, eat, this the body of Christ…” and yet gives them a form which will not violate the canons of Reformed theology or the sensibilities of his listeners. All receive the sacrament standing. Here the liturgists appear to have been far more concerned about the possibilities of idolatrous worship of the bread than the general synods and their theologians who presented the possibility of kneeling at communion. Surprisingly, the concluding portion of the service does not include either a blessing or the prayer of blessing over the people.

The appearance of a new agenda after only three years indicates that Kraiński's work had exited interest beyond the borders of the districts for which he had prepared. The new book was to be used of the clergy throughout all the districts in Minor Poland. Actually, the changes incorporated into the 1602 service were quite minor. The shape of Kraiński's work was thrown into question and certain specific features of his rite had to be altered to make them acceptable to the larger group. We note that Kraiński's declaration of grace has been replaced by a form which was identified by an Absolution, a term not common among the Reformed and which could easily provoke heated discussions. Secondly, the prayer toward the Words of Christ has been moved to a place before instead of after Christ's Testamentary Words. Most significant in the rite are the changes found in the section: “Blessing, Breaking, Distributing and Eating.” The word blessing had been kept from 1599, but there is in fact no act of blessing which includes Christ’s Testamentary Words. The term ‘Blessing’ is kept but now blessing is identified with Paul’s words from 1 Corinthians 10. Christ’s Words had been spoken already in the historical narrative, and communion would follow upon the words of Paul from 1 Corinthians 10. The editors decided to replace the distribution formula of Kraiński's agenda with the more traditional formula: “Take, eat, this is the body of the Lord Christ …” The service concludes as it did before, excepting that now the Aaronic Benediction is included, a feature not found in 1599 rite.\textsuperscript{796}

The twelve year interval between the liturgies of 1602 and 1614 indicates that, although liturgical matters have not yet been settled satisfactorily the issue was not as pressing as in earlier times. The Reformed Churches had taken time to evaluate and consider what changes ought to be made. The title of the 1614 agenda does not indicate that any changes have been made at all. It announces itself to be simply a reprint of a 1602 book, however, an examination of the two services reveals that there have been in fact a number of changes, although one would probably be

\textsuperscript{795} Porządek nabożeństwa 1599, 139-176, 494-495.
\textsuperscript{796} Porządek nabożeństwa 1602, 23-44, 81-82.
hard put to call any of them radical or dramatic. Of significance, however, is the fact that the directives concerning the two weeks of preparation before the Communion are far more detailed than in earlier rites. As in the case of the Lithuanian orders, prescriptions for these services are very detailed and specific. The service on the day of Communion begins with the ascription of praise. The excommunication is now spoken immediately after the invocation of the Holy Spirit. This relieved the tension found in Kraiński’s 1599 liturgy to a certain extent, since the excommunication has been removed from its former place after the Testamentary Words of Christ to a place much nearer the beginning of the rite. Here it would remain in subsequent rites, although we may question whether it ought to have been retained at all, given the rigorous period of self-examination and repentance which the worshipers have already experienced. Concerning communion we notice that the reference to the blessing in the distribution section has been removed from the title. However the additional supplies should be set apart using the Christ's Testamentary words, following the words of Paul from 1 Corinthians 10. This provision together with the directive that the *reliquiae* are to be immediately consumed are somewhat perplexing. It is hard to avoid the conclusion that the framers of this liturgy are still struggling with notions concerning consecration which they have not yet been able satisfactorily to resolve. This rite also introduces a new distribution formula to replace the traditional: “Take, eat, this is the body of Christ…” The following formula for the minister’s self-communion demonstrates the change: The minister says as he communes himself: “In faith I receive the body …” and then as he gives the bread into the hands of the people he says the traditional formula: “Take, eat…” The same procedure follows concerning the cup. The ministers self-communion formula indicates that the instrument of reception is not the mouth, but faith. This is giving a new twist to the traditional 1602 formula.

The Gdańsk Book of 1637 is not simply another in a growing of agendas published by the Polish Church. It was rather proved to be the final step, the culmination of decades of efforts to formulate an acceptable and theologically sound Reformed liturgy to be used in the churches of Poland and Lithuania. Although the Lutherans had long since indicated that they would not participate in any further union efforts with the Reformed, it must be noted that there was at least nominal involvement by the Bohemian Brethren in the publication of this book. We find in this book the fusion of two worship traditions. The first and older of which goes back to Johannes a Lasco. It was this tradition which shaped worship among the Lithuanian Reformed. The second tradition came to printed expression in the work of

---

797 Porządek nabożeństwa 1614, 25-55.
Kraiński in 1599. This agenda and its subsequent revisions gave shape to a liturgical tradition which predominated in Minor Poland but came to exercise some important influence among the Lithuanians as well. Now these two traditions met in the work of 1637, in what was meant to be the final product of both Polish and Lithuanian liturgical work.

An examination of the work reveals that the Minor Polish liturgies had clearly predominated. Almost in every place where Lithuanian traditions differed from the Polish practices, the Lithuanian traditions had to give way to the Polish. Even in cases when the Lithuanians had been told that their practices would be followed, as at Orla 1633, the Poles presumptuously broke their word for their own purposes. Most significant are the parts of the service that have to do directly with the Holy Communion and the use of terminology. The Poles used language and liturgical elements reminiscent of Catholicism which the Lithuanians had long since discarded. The Lithuanians service had not begun with the Invocation of the Holy Spirit. It had no office of absolution, no confession of faith, no *Agnus Dei*. Some of these innovations, such as the invocation of the Holy Spirit and the Creed were not offensive. Others appear to have caused some concern, especially, those parts which represented significant changes from the forms with which the Lithuanians had become familiar through more than a half a century. The greatest change for the Lithuanians was in the distribution of the Holy Supper. Among the Lithuanians the bread and wine had always been distributed together after the Pauline Words over the bread and cup had been recited. Although Lasco had directed separate communion of the bread and wine, the Lithuanians had adopted a different practice. Now the Gdańsk Agenda directed them to distribute communion in a manner which was foreign to their usual practice. Also missing from the new rite was the familiar Prayer for Humble Access which the Lithuanians had always used before the distribution.\footnote{Agenda 1637, 78-127.}

Lithuanian contributions to the new liturgy were very nominal and limited to elements which for the Poles were novelties. These included the introduction of the Words of the Consolation and Encouragement after Communion, which had been taken from Lasco’s *Forma ac Ratio*.

Omitted from earlier Lithuanian and Polish liturgies was the citation of Passover words from 1 Corinthians 5: the ‘Passover words.’ New to both traditions was the detailed schema of the preparatory services and most particularly the elaborate order for the day before Communion. These had been found in a rudimentary form in earlier agendas, but only now were they worked out in detail. Most striking is the decision to combine the prayer toward the Words of Christ with
the prayer for the confession of sins. It is hard to understand on what theological grounds this alteration was based. It seems that there may have been a desire to take attention away from any notions of consecration. Finally, there was added a new element not previously found in the earlier Lithuanian and Polish agendas: the admonition to live a true Christian life which precedes the benediction at the close of the service.

In the course of the ensuing discussion between the leaders of the Polish and Lithuanian Churches, it was decided to authorize the publication of a new book which included the revision of a few directives and forms which appeared to have caused offence.

The revised work was published in 1644 and included some revisions of the service of the Holy Communion which would make it more readily acceptable among the Lithuanians. Two options were presented with reference to the Words of Christ's Testament (1 Corinthians 11:23-25 and 1 Corinthians 11:23-29). The manual acts might be used, but ministers and congregations were free to omit them. This allowed the Lithuanians to recite the narrative without accompanying actions. Most significant were the acts surrounding the distribution of Holy Communion. Once again the Lithuanians were able to receive the bread and wine together instead of separately. After the bread had been broken and the cup-words had been spoken, the congregation would join in the Our Father, the minister would say the prayer of humble access, restored from Lithuanian tradition, and the people would be invited to come to the Lord's Table. A controvert point on which the Poles now acquiesced to the older tradition was the restoration of the prayer toward the Words of Christ to its former place, a decision which the Lithuanians found congenial. We note also that the communion formula of 1637, which was similar to that with which both Lithuanian and Polish liturgies were familiar, was replaced with a form, which closely followed the wording of Krański’s 1599 rite: “... this same I also say to you...” This allowed the minister to give the sacrament without himself making a definite statement about what was being given.\footnote{Akt usługi 1644, 19-48.} It should be noted that the Gdańsk Agenda was not entirely rejected. Many of its forms were used and therefore they were not included in the 1644 printing.
Conclusions

The scope of this study has been to examine the liturgies of the Polish and Lithuanian Reformed Churches during the first century of their existence up to the year 1644 with special attention given to the services of Holy Communion and their theology. The special concern of the study has been to bring to clearer light the doctrine of Holy Communion, and the liturgical expression of that doctrine in the services of worship used in the Reformed congregations of that period.

On the basis of our study of the rites we have seen that the Calvinist Reformation in Poland, primarily in Minor Poland, was not at first theological in nature. The lack of theological acumen we see in the Protestants’ inability to formulate a single and adequate liturgical service for use in the Reformed congregations. What stood at the center of their Reformation was their negative reaction against Catholicism in all its forms. This explains why the Lutheran rites suggested by Francesco Stancaro in Pińczów in 1550 were thought to be as being too ‘Catholic.’ The Poles were looking for something dramatically different and more congenial to their Protestant spirit. A variety of forms from other Reformed Churches were used, but none seemed wholly satisfactory. The lack of a uniform theological direction led them to take the decisive step of borrowing the liturgical rites of the Bohemian Brethren. A measure of Polish theological self-awareness and self-confidence came only with the arrival of Johannes a Lasco in 1557. He brought with him a bold and clearly defined form of Reformation doctrine and rites, imbued with the spirit of Calvin's Geneva Reformation upon which the Poles could build an expression of their faith which was not merely reactive.

It would be many years before this emerging theological consciousness would express itself in a genuine Polish liturgy. The influence of Johannes a Lasco alone was not enough to establish such a liturgy. A variety of forms remained in use until the end of the 16th century. Although synod after synod expressed the desire for a unification of rites on the basis Lasco's liturgy, the desire remained unfulfilled. When at last a liturgy was approved and published in 1599, the Eucharistic rites and ceremonies provided by the great spiritual father of the Polish Reformed Church in his Forma ac Ratio were in strong evidence, by they have been newly shaped and moulded by the hand of Kraiński.

The appearance of the Kraiński’s 1599 liturgy marked the inauguration of a rich and creative period in the life of the Minor Polish Church. Within a period of less than two decades two major liturgical works, the agendas of 1602 and 1614, were published for use in the congregations of the Reformed Church. These books
established a liturgical tradition unique to Minor Poland and gave birth to the desire for a common liturgy to be used in all Reformed and Bohemian Brethren congregations in both countries.

From its very beginning Reformed Protestantism in Lithuania presents a different picture. Although we see the same strong reaction against Catholicism, we here find it combined from the very beginning with a better understanding of the liturgical and sacramental issues which lay at the heart of the Reformation. With the Minor Polish experience already behind them the Reformed Church in Lithuania was built on a somewhat more solid theological foundation, as we see from the first public debates in Vilnius in 1557-58.

The Lithuanians were able to agree on a common liturgy in the earliest period. The document available to us was published in 1581. It was a reprint of an earlier liturgy which was itself built upon the pattern set by Lasco’s *Forma ac Ratio*. The later 1594, 1598 and 1600 Lithuanian books follow this earliest work exactly. This indicates that Lithuanian worship during this period was very stable and agreement upon it was wide spread.

The Lithuanian agenda provided rituals for only the four most basic pastoral and congregational forms, bound together with a hymnal and catechism in a single sparse volume. While recognizing their need for a fuller agenda, the Lithuanians were not willing to adopt the Polish books. Although the goal of this period was to strive for a richer and more adequate liturgy, the 1621 rite did not meet this need; it simply followed in the path of the books which preceded it.

By the third decade of the 17th century, Lithuanian, Polish Reformed, and Bohemian Brethren had agreed to begin negotiations with the goal of unifying the rites in both countries. For the Lithuanians it was a bittersweet moment. The unwillingness of the Podlassian District to remain faithful to the old Lithuanian books, as well as pressure from Duke Radziwill, and other reasons made it necessary for the Lithuanians to seek unification. So it was that in the 1633, 1634, 1636 convocations they subscribed to the production of a common book which came to be known as the Great Gdaňsk Agenda of 1637.

The disregard for Lithuanian traditions and the continued presence of certain ‘Catholic elements’ in the new book caused the rejection of the Great Gdaňsk Agenda by the Lithuanians. However, they were unwilling to cut their ties with the Polish Church, and in 1638 they proposed that a new general convocation should prepare an amended work. The Poles indicated their willingness to make concessions for the sake of harmony. In 1644 the newly agreed form of the Holy Communion was published. The concessions made were minor, but Lithuanians found them sufficient
to satisfy their needs.

It was planned that the whole agenda as amended be published. Discussions on this matter at a number of synods were inconclusive. In later decades fierce persecution by the Roman Catholic majority occupied the churches’ full attention. The question of survival was of greater importance, and the need for a unified agenda faded. The 1742 Lithuanian agenda was simply a republication of the 1644 volume with the addition of several acts taken directly from the Gdańsk Agenda.

The spirit of the Minor Polish liturgical rites may be described as dynamic and ever-changing. Reflective of the church’s growing awareness of the need for internal identity, they worked through many decades to achieve the measure of theological and ecclesiological self-confidence needed to provide the congregations with public worship services adequate to meet the spiritual needs of the people. The Minor Polish Church did not fear innovation and was quick to cast aside formulations which might be insufficient or even misleading and to change direction as necessary. The spirit of the Lithuanian Church was quite different. The theological and liturgical tradition was set in early times and remained quite static until, due to social circumstances and the desire for a fuller expression of its faith, the church moved very cautiously and tentatively testing each new proposal according to standards determined by strong self-consciousness and liturgical tradition. When these two traditions came together in the Gdańsk Book it was evident that one would have to give place to the other. Although neither church willingly or wholly gave up its sense of self-identity and its strong traditionalism, in the end it was the Lithuanians who had to give way to the stronger and more dynamic spirit of sister church in Minor Poland.

The material we have examined has provided us an accurate picture of the faith of the Lithuanian and Polish Churches. In the present day it is no longer considered a significant function of liturgy to reflect an established doctrinal position. Faith is often thought to be the distillation of a way of praying and worshiping according to the maxim lex orandi, lex credendi. The Reformers and their immediate descendants would not have agreed. They understood liturgy to be an expression of faith, not faith’s source and norm. To them faith and its doctrinal expression were to be formulated on the basis of the Word of God. This word, according to the first article of the Second Helvetic Confession, is divinely inspired in all its parts. In the earliest days of the Polish and Lithuanian Reformation the formal doctrinal expression of the faith was understood to be secondary to the preaching and reading of the Holy Scriptures and almost no place was given to extra-biblical material including even the creedal statements which arose out of the doctrinal
controversies of the third and fourth centuries. It was only after long struggle with the Anti-Trinitarians and other radical groups that the Polish and Lithuanian Reformed came to understand the importance of the testimony of the ancient fathers, the creeds, and the councils. Now they came to an understanding that they must formulate prayers and liturgies expressive of this faith: *lex credendi, ex orandi*.

As the church emerged from this period of struggle toward clearer self-identity was necessarily also a congruent expression of the church’s teaching in the liturgy. The liturgies give a record of the doctrinal path taken by the Polish and Lithuanian Reformed and the increasingly adequate expression of the Reformed faith in public worship. This liturgical material, when viewed from its historical context and in conjunction with the doctrinal resolutions formulated in the synodical protocols and the general history of the Polish and Lithuanian Churches, is most helpful to us as we seek to draw a fuller picture of the church in this period. It provides much more than a record of how the Polish and Lithuanian Reformed Protestants spent their Sunday worship hours. It reflects their struggle toward doctrinal understanding and their developing ecclesiology. In the case of Lithuania, where no church protocols prior to 1611 are available to us, this liturgical material is the most important evidence we possess that life and faith. Indeed, without the consideration of this material only a very partial and inadequate picture could be drawn.

The faith set forth in these liturgies find their center in God himself. It is God in his complete power and majesty who is the center of worship. His omnipotence is emphasized above all else. He is the maker and ruler of all things and the judge of all man. All things are in his hands and there is no appeal from his decrees and judgments. He will have mercy on those to whom he desires to show his mercy, and none can complain of unfair treatment should he determine to withhold his mercies. The man who recognizes himself to be under the hand of God calls upon him, pleading for mercy for the sake of Christ and pledging himself to a life of obedience to God’s holy law. Man's faith is understood primarily in terms of his obedience, which is by no means merely theoretical. Obedience is to be rendered to God on the basis of his eternal edicts set down in the divine law in the pages of Holy Scripture. It is with the specific aim of living a life of obedience that the worshiper both comes to worship, and goes forth from worship. Worship is his duty, and he goes from the duty of worship to perform his moral and religious duties as they are set down in God’s commandments.

Even in the midst of the congregation, man stands alone before the Omnipotent God. The role of the minister in these liturgies is to guide him, to
encourage him, and to warn him of the dire consequences, both temporal and eternal, of disobedience to God and to his church. In the moment of communion and in the presence of whole congregation each man stands before his Lord and partakes of the signs of the sacrament, and spiritually eats the body and blood of Christ. If one is not adequately prepared or doubts, this spiritual eating will not take place and the man himself will stand under God’s Judgment. Indeed if the unworthy should even partake of the outward elements there is danger that God’s wrath may break out upon the whole congregation. The purpose of the minister is to assist the worshiper in preparing for that moment of truth. He will guide him through a period of preparation as long as two weeks in length and he will determine whether there are sufficient outward signs of piety and obedience to indicate that one may be admitted as a worthy communicant. Finally, he will excommunicate, that is ‘fence off’ from the Lord’s Table, any whom he deems to be unworthy. But more he cannot do. Now the moment of truth has come, and man must stand alone before God. It is the moment of fear and trepidation filled with high emotion, not a time in which the Christian soul is arrayed in gladness and rejoicing.

In order to stand worthily before the omnipotent God in the Holy Communion man must be cleansed of sin. It is noteworthy that we find in these liturgies no unequivocal word of absolution after pattern of the word of forgiveness. The word which declares God’s grace is spoken in general terms and does not address the individual personally and directly, since no word of man can be the bearer of such an awesome power. Man can depend only upon the internal testimony of the Holy Spirit and the evidence of his own works of faith to provide him with some measure of assurance that his sins have indeed been forgiven and that he may now worthily come to the sacrament and receive the spiritual body and blood of Christ in obedience to his Lord's command.

The liturgies express the general Reformed thought about the relationship between material and spiritual. From the standpoint of anthropology, sin is most clearly located in man's bodily nature. It is through bodily actions that he expresses disobedience to God’s law. The flesh is not only weak, it is the locus of man's corruption. Sin is understood primarily in bodily terms, i.e., in terms of man's creatureliness. Even at its best what is outward and material can only point beyond itself to what is spiritual and immaterial. Man's soul is imprisoned in his sinful body. If one correctly follows the law of God, he will turn away from all fleshly allurements and preoccupations, in order that his soul may flourish. The goal is that the body should reflect man's spiritual nature in acts of obedience. Thus the body will more properly point beyond itself to the treasure which resides within it - man's
immortal soul.

With reference to ecclesiology, the liturgies reflect the Reformed notion of the church as the pure, elect people of God. One of the marks of the visible church is the administration of discipline, the purpose of which is to mark out and exclude from the church all those who have given evidence by their actions that they are not among the pure. Such persons have no place in the gathering. From this perspective Holy Communion is understood to be the banquet of the purified, and not the supper in which Christ forgives and grants his grace to penitent sinners. After the agreement with the Lutherans which was expressed in the *Sandomierz Consensus*, Calvinists took offence at the Lutheran practice of admitting to the sacrament public sinners whom they regarded to be by no means worthy of participation. From their point of view the true church is not an *ecclesia mixta* but rather a church in which members are strongly disciplined and the disobedient are removed with dispatch. Only in this way can the earthly church truly point beyond itself to the heavenly fellowship and to the unblemished bride of Christ, the heavenly church. Church government rests in the hands of ordained ministers and exemplary members of the congregation who assist him in extending the rule of Christ over the congregation, according to the usual pattern in Reformed Churches. They participate with him in the examination of the communicants and the decision concerning who may and may not be admitted to the sacrament.

The Lord’s Supper played a special role in the lives of the Polish and Lithuanian Reformed peoples. Religious devotion at this time was largely evaluated on the basis of one’s participation in the worship life of the community and unquestioned obedience to the minister and leaders of the congregation. Christian life in the home was closely tied to the corporate worship life of the community. In a reciprocal relationship, the services of preparation before Holy Communion called for concentrated meditation and self-examination in the home by those who desired to participate in the celebration of the Holy Supper. Excommunication would bring with it not only a prohibition to come to the Lord’s Table; it would also strongly affect one’s social standing in the community. The edict labeling one publicly as a condemned sinner would have great personal as well as social effects. Thus membership and active participation and obedience became the measure of the righteous life in both the civil and religious communities. On the theological level, the member of the congregation sees his life in its wider dimensions. His life has come from God, and now he fulfils God’s requirement to give him all glory and praise in the community of the redeemed and to live his life in that obedience which God’s law requires of his redeemed and purified people.
In relation to the larger family of the Reformed Churches, it has often been remarked that the Reformed Churches are quite individual theologically and liturgically. Each has followed its own path, depending upon the ethnic characteristics of the people and the strong individuals who emerged to lead these national groups. Therefore it is no surprise that the liturgical traditions in Poland and Lithuania were influenced by the diverse rites of other Reformed Churches. In the earliest period we see the influence of the Swiss, German, English, Bohemian and other Reformed liturgies. Most prominent was the liturgy Johannes a Lasco wrote for his congregation in London. It was not until the end of the 16th century that the particular traditions which had developed on the basis of these rites begun to assert themselves. Lithuania continued strongly in the tradition which had been set by Lasco and which by this time had effected a uniquely Lithuanian expression. In Poland, beginning with Kraiński's 1599 liturgy, we see in addition to Lasco's influence a greater latitude which allows the introduction of elements and melodies from Lutheran and Catholic sources. The spirit of Kraiński remained imprinted upon all subsequent Polish rites and this was indeed a major point of contention between the Lithuanians and the Poles in their controversies over the terminology and the ceremonial usages. In the larger family of Reformed liturgies, Kraiński's work stands out as a unique expression of Reformed Christianity. There is nothing akin to it in the other Reformed Churches. It is uniquely Polish in form, terminology, and theology. Although many of its specific provisions were later suppressed, the impact of this work would be ongoing. All future works would be measured according to it.

The standard form of the Western liturgical tradition which continued in use in the Roman, Anglican, and Lutheran Churches was cast aside in these liturgies. The liturgies of Zwingli 1524, Bucer 1537, and Calvin 1542, still conformed somewhat loosely to the pattern of the ancient Missa catechumenorum and Missa fidelium. The Polish and Lithuanian rites departed from this tradition. It may be said that these liturgies are more Calvinist than Calvin, in that everything moves relentlessly toward the goal of the Christian appearing before God, offering him praise, and receiving the remembrance of the saving work which Christ has accomplished for him. There is little evidence of the ancient Liturgy of the Word, and little prominence is given to exposition. Holy Communion is by no means the ordinary form of Sunday worship. It is reserved for very special occasions which are determined by the passing of the seasons. Communion is not just about Christ, it is about man and his affirmation as a member of a purified people of God.

We have found in Minor Polish rites uncharacteristic references to an act of consecration, and the use of traditional terms such as Confession, Absolution, etc.
We notice as well the use of the manual acts during the historical recital of the Institution, the use of formulas of distribution which refer to the elements as the body and blood of Christ, the use of extracts from the traditional Western Prefatio and Sanctus in the prayer of thanksgiving after communion, the singing of the Agnus Dei, and the use of traditional Gregorian chant melodies and Luther’s metrical version of the Creed Wir glauben all’ an einen Gott. We may wonder what is the source of these elements which seem so foreign to the spirit of Reformed worship and theology. Given the political and social circumstances of the time and the strong role played by the Roman Catholic Church in the public persecution of the Reformed Church, we must seriously doubt that these elements were imported into the liturgies directly from Roman Catholic sources. We must look elsewhere. Lutheranism appears to be the likely source of these elements and their use in the Reformed Church would most naturally stem from that period during which the Reformed were anxious to form an alliance with the Lutherans. This takes us back to the Sandomierz Consensus of 1570 and the Reformed hope that the time would soon come when all three churches which signed to that agreement would use a common rite of Holy Communion and a common agenda. The victory of the Sandomierz spirit over the emerging party of confessional Lutherans in the General Synod of Toruń in 1595 and the appearance of Kraiński’s 1599 agenda and its successor rite in 1602 moved the Reformed to a careful examination of their own liturgies and those of the Lutherans and Bohemian Brethren. However, the Reformed enthusiasm was not shared by the Lutherans, and no common rite with the Lutherans ever appeared. It is to the events of the period 1570-1602 that we must look to see how foreign terminology and practices made their way into the Polish Reformed agendas.

Doctrinal considerations still ruled. The communicants must receive communion in their hands, not in their mouths, since the Reformed regarded the Dominical Word ‘take’ as requiring that each communicant receives the bread from the hands of the minister into his own hands and takes the cup from the officiant to drink for himself. The earliest practice of receiving communion while seated around a table did not long continue. The need to distinguish the Reformed Church from its heretical offshoots meant that the manner of communion reception must be restricted. It was no longer regarded as an adiaphora. Since sitting was forbidden, the agendas strongly recommend that all communicants stand. The Lutheran practice of kneeling was not employed, so as to avoid even the outward impression of artiology, i.e., the worship of bread, since they believed that Christ is not in the bread but in heaven. While outwardly standing, the worshipers should inwardly kneel in heart and mind before the heavenly throne. Although many concessions could be made to the
Lutherans, here the line had to be drawn, for what is earthly cannot be the bearer of the heavenly body of Christ since *finitum non capax infiniti*.

These liturgies represent a picture of the spiritual development and theological maturation of both the Polish and Lithuanian Reformed. The Gdańsk liturgy of 1637 has played a most significant role, for worship life in both churches is still built around this volume. It represents the mature expression of Reformed theology concerning man's relationship to God in which he seeks above all things to give the worship and praise that are his due. Unfortunately, few outside Poland and Lithuania are aware of the existence of these liturgical traditions and even fewer are well acquainted with its provisions. The forces of history have conspired to turn the attention of historians and liturgical scholars to other matters. As a result, the 1644 liturgy has been almost completely forgotten, and the 1637 Great Gdańsk Book is but a dim memory. Careful study, however, greatly enhances our understanding of the special characteristics of the Reformed Church and worship, and the forms in which it is expressed in these rites.

The study has helped us to peel away the outward veneer of apparent uniformity to see two churches which are in fact quite individual. Historians have often treated the Lithuanian and Polish Reformed Churches under a single heading, as though they differed only in location, language, and national sentiments. The study of the rites and ceremonies makes it clear that the Polish and Lithuanian Churches were two very different bodies, exhibiting different spiritual temperaments. One remained quite static, with a theological spirit born of the conservatism which was exhibited in Lasco's Church Order. The other was more adventurous, and its spirituality was tied to an ecumenical hope. They were finally unable to blend together in a completely harmonious liturgical expression. It is clear that the historical study of these churches deserves careful, but separate, attention.

The study of these liturgies helps us also to answer the perennial question concerning the periodization of the Reformation in these countries. Nineteenth century historians took the view that the Reformation in Poland and Lithuania came to an abrupt end with the arrival of the Jesuits in 1569. More recently scholars have preferred a somewhat later date. They have related the close of the Reformation to the climax of open hostilities against the Protestants which came with the destruction of the churches, as in Vilnius in 1611, and even earlier in Poland. It was during this time that the Polish and Lithuanian Protestants lost their last chance to wield political influence. In the most recent decades a third group of scholars has suggested that the Reformation in these countries did not come to an end until the middle of the 17th century. Our work supports this third view. We had seen that even though the
churches were decreasing in membership and had been shorn of political power, they were still spiritually vibrant and remained so for several decades. The end of the Reformation in these lands cannot be tied to a momentous historical event such as would be evident to historians who concern themselves chiefly with secular events. Instead, the Reformation Churches lost their vitality little by little until, after the middle of the 17th century it became clear that the question of survival was uppermost and the melding of the liturgical rites was secondary.

Our quest to understand the Reformation in these countries has led us to examine more closely the nature and significance of the Sandomierz Consensus. Lutheran, Reformed, and Roman Catholic students of this period are not agreed in their interpretation of the Consensus or its significance. We have seen that from the very beginning the Consensus was only very superficial and represented no theological breakthrough. In so far as consensus was reached, it was based upon the worsening political and social circumstances of the time. On a deeper level, no doctrinal agreement was reached concerning the nature of the Lord’s Supper. The Reformed interpreted the document as a Reformed victory and viewed it in the light the Second Helvetic and Sandomierz Confessions. The emerging Lutheran spirit which would so soon show itself in the publication of the Formula of Concord and the entire Lutheran Book of Concord was such that, while still publicly expressing agreement, the Lutherans came more and more to consider the consensus inadequate. As confessionalism grew, support for the consensus gradually waned, and finally it was most clearly repudiated at the Colloquium Charitativum in 1645, when the Lutherans refused to make common cause with the Reformed and Bohemian Brethren before the Polish monarch.

This study should also be of value both for students of the Reformed tradition and for the Reformed Church itself. Previous examinations have not studied the liturgical life of the church closely. Most have been content to speak only of the Great Gdańsk Book as the final expression of Reformed piety. The scholarship which went into the production of this volume was indeed great. But the picture still has been incomplete. We have seen that the introduction and use of the Gdańsk Book was the occasion of new tensions and controversies between the churches. It is to be hoped that this examination will inspire students of this tradition to reconsider this book and its place in the worship life in the church. This study should also be of value to Reformed Church in Lithuania. It provides an opportunity to reconsider and reevaluate the church’s peculiar liturgical tradition and spiritual heritage. These matters had not been given careful attention in the past. It has generally been assumed that the 1637 book was from the start the unqualified expression of the life
and faith of both nations.

Questions remain. Some of them will not be answered until and unless documents come to light which are presently unknown or which are now thought to have perished. The destruction of the Vilnius church in 1611 was a tragedy not only in the immediate sense, but also because so many important records perished with the building. They are unrecoverable. We hold out the hope that further diligent searches and the careful sifting of all writings from this period will cast further light upon these matters.

The attention to this study has been directed to the liturgical celebration of the Lord's Supper. Consideration should be given also to other rites including Holy Baptism, Marriage, Ordination, the Visitation of the Sick, Burial, etc. These were beyond the scope of this present study. As attention is given to them in the future, our understanding of this period will be further enhanced.
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