A HISTORY OF THE DISSOLUTION OF ANCIENT LITURGICAL FORMS IN THE LUTHERAN CHURCH OF GERMANY

PAUL GRAFF

Translated by Matthew Carver

CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE • SAINT LOUIS

3558 S. Jefferson Ave., St. Louis, MO 63118-3968
1-800-325-3040 • cph.org

Unless otherwise indicated, all quotations from Scripture and other authors in this work are translated from volumes 1 and 2, *Geschichte der Auflösung der alten gottesdienstlichen Formen in der Evangelischen Kirche Deutschlands*.

Manufactured in the United States of America

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 34 33 32 31 30 29 28 27 26 25

Contents

Foreword to the Second Edition of Volume I

The first edition of this work appeared in 1921 as *Geschichte der Auflösung der alten gottesdienstlichen Formen in der evangelischen Kirche Deutschlands bis zum Eintritt der Aufklärung und des Rationalismus* [A history of the dissolution of ancient liturgical forms in the Lutheran Church of Germany until the rise of the Enlightenment and Rationalism]. Now, as the second volume (already announced at that time) containing the period of the Enlightenment and Rationalism is approaching, the title of this work appears as *Geschichte der Auflösung der alten gottesdienstlichen Formen in der Evangelischen Kirche Deutschlands, 1. Band: Bis zum Eintritt der Aufklärung und des Rationalismus* [A history of the dissolution of ancient liturgical forms in the Lutheran Church of Germany, volume 1: Until the rise of the Enlightenment and Rationalism].

That first edition, printed during a period of inflation, nevertheless received so many advance subscribers and other customers that it has been out of print for ten years. The desire for a new edition on the part of those who, though familiar with the first edition, have missed the important findings of scholarship in this field of the last fifteen years, as well as those who could not procure it, has long since moved the publisher and author to the decision to publish a second edition. But when we consider the events since 1921—the currents, movements, crises, and consortiums, and above all the further work in the fields of church hymnody, church music, and particularly Luther studies, and when we further observe the new discoveries of the foundations of the cultural and spiritual life of the German people in that period from the Reformation to about 1700 (we need only mention a word such as "Baroque," a name such as "Dilthey"), it is immediately clear that a new edition is more meaningful than a mere survey regarding the literature which has appeared in the meantime, all of which is not so immediately visible in comparison with the first edition but is all the more so upon more detailed use.

Added to this is the fact that other academic pursuits, and especially the pastoral work connected to taking on an urban parish, brought with them constant delays. That the work has now been completed is a true source of joy and gratitude for both publisher and author.

The origins of the finished manuscript go back to a time which has already been assured a permanent place in the history of our nation, when the whole German people experienced a radical change and was lifted up out of disgrace and humiliation. The hope endures that their fragmentation into territories and territorial churches still issuing

from the past will give way to a better arrangement through thoroughgoing change in both arenas. The realization would have as a result a substantial reworking of the section beginning on page 28, on the examination of the sources (church orders, agendas, etc.) given according to extant or former territories. Accordingly, it has been left as is with the exception of the territorial adjustments which have been made, and only so much consideration as necessary has been given to an improved overview and ecclesial context of imperial Germans and ethnic Germans because of the borders lately established by peace treaties.

Indeed, the statement of the venerable liturgical scholar Julius Smend that "the question of worship is a question of the future and life of churchly Protestantism" still continues to hold true even today. May this book, for its own part, fulfill its task in the spiritual strife of our time for the foundation and the development of our Evangelical Church.

Hanover-Ricklingen, St. John's Day, 1937.
Paul Graff.

Foreword to Volume II

In Eastertide 1889, I entered the last year of the six-year *volksschule* in my hometown of Osnabrück. Now (at last!) we too were allowed to "sing" the funeral processions—that is, when it was our turn. This class, taught by our very honored and able head instructor and cantor, who still sat at the organ bench at 82 years of age, had 120 students at the time! Until then, we had only looked on wistfully as the funeral procession led by the singing schoolboys approached from this or that farming community of my father's wide-ranging parish; and as one of the choristers stepped out, ran ahead, and reported in the parsonage: "The deceased is here"; and as they would proceed to the cemetery, then into the church; and then as the students, with a loud cry: "Veier sesse, veier sesse" ["Four, six, four, six"], would tumble into the cantor's house to receive the four or six wheat loaves that would be handed out after their task. Most received four; only the first twelve—who sang at the open casket (!)—received six. But what did they sing there? The hymns were completely unfamiliar to me. Written in little booklets, they were passed on from year to year. The first thing, when I came home, was to ask about these hymns which were not found in our new Hanoverian hymnal of 1883—an idea unimaginable to me! Then I learned about this and could also read it in a very old hymnal. A remark by my father was not entirely clear to me at the time, though I understood it much more later, namely, that these hymns showed that we were still dealing with Rationalism and that in a congregation which, being immediately adjacent to the Ravensberg territory, experienced the whole blessing of the time of Awakening and became one of the most churchly congregations of the Hanover territory, for which I owe an enormous debt as long as I live.

At the casket we always sang: "Mein ganzer Geist, Gott, wird entzückt, wenn er in deinen Himmel blickt" ["My whole spirit is enrapt, O God, when it peers into Thy heaven"], reworked by Diterich; and by Klopstock, yet likewise revised: "Selig sind des Himmels Erben" ["Blessed are the heirs of heaven"]; and at the end of the graveside service: "Nun, du Erlöster, schlaf in Ruh, wir gehn nach unsern Hütten zu" ["Now, redeemed one,

sleep in peace; we are going to our dwellings"]. What is presented in this second volume may be said, in this enclosed context for the first time, is not only a Rationalism which explores but also, in a certain sense, is itself experienced. The impressions which I once received have, through the many years, where the investigation and representation of that period occupied all my powers, remained constantly alive.

Now it is finished. Publisher and author are able to present volume 2 precisely a year after the publication of the second edition of volume 1. And both are glad and grateful that the promise made a year ago was able to be kept.

Volume 2 follows directly from where volume 1 left off, and the chapters and sections, often corresponding, are nothing other than a simple and natural continuation of the discussions offered in volume 1. Yet on the whole, a different procedure is taken. The period of the Enlightenment and Rationalism which is under discussion is in fact not a natural continuation. By placing ourselves into this period, we simultaneously take a "step from the Baroque into the Classical." We are witnesses of a tragedy, namely, of the decay of the Baroque and its successors, and into this decay, the liturgical and ecclesio-musical life of the Evangelical Church so intimately tied to it are pulled along and brought to utter collapse and dissolution. The first volume already answered the question why it was, in the end, unable to offer any resistance. Our own age is uniquely poised to sympathize with this fact.

Nevertheless, the present volume is not limited solely to liturgics and church music in the proper sense. Regarding the outlook of that period with respect to divine services and "divine reverences," it makes notable contributions to homiletics and catechetics.

The abundance of literature available from that period meant that the preliminary work consumed several years. It was a fortunate circumstance that in the libraries of both Hanoverian preachers' seminaries—in that of Kloster Loccum and particularly in that of Erichsburg—the literature of these years is found in ample measure. I owe the greatest debt of gratitude to these two libraries, as well as to the Formerly Royal Library in Hanover, for all the support that they have generously given me.

Regarding the references to now-obsolete political divisions and boundaries made on pages 475–500, I may refer to what I said in the foreword of volume 1.

May this volume receive as kind a reception as the first, and may both, as one whole, accomplish the great task appointed for them: the service of our Evangelical Church.

Hanover-Ricklingen, Reformation Day, 1938.
Paul Graff.

From the Foreword to the First Edition

The first impulses toward the present work came to me twenty-five years ago out of the exceptional religious instruction of my honored teacher, Herr Professor C. Schmidt, of the Städtliches Lyceum II (now the Staatliches Goethe-Gymnasium) in Hanover. It is to this institution first (which recently celebrated its fiftieth anniversary at Easter 1921), and to

its remarkable teaching faculty, that I hereby tender my thanks and wishes of prosperity, with the hope that it may continue at the high level which it now maintains.

If I acted on those impulses less during my first years of study in Tübingen and Greifswald, I did so all the more during the last years spent in Göttingen, and especially through the constant exchange of ideas carried on to the present day with my dear uncle and instructor, Dr. Paul Althaus, now professor at the University of Leipzig. Thus during my four-year residence (1902–6) in Loccum Abbey, first as *hospes* in the preachers' seminary, then as librarian of the cloister library, I was able, with the assistance of its rich treasures, to begin independent research in this field, especially as the more I read, the more I discovered how unfamiliar and unexplored the Age of Rationalism was.

However, I found almost immediately that my original plan to write a "history of the liturgics of Rationalism" had to be expanded, first to include a history of the time leading up to it. For as soon as I tried to trace any conspicuous occurrence of liturgical forms in the period of Rationalism to its origins, I was led to the age of Pietism, of Orthodoxy—indeed, even back to the sixteenth century. These repeated observations completely displaced my original plan, substantially altered my views of that period, and finally convinced me that a most thorough study would have as its object not the actual Age of Rationalism, but rather the preceding period.

Presently, however, very substantial difficulties appeared in my way. For while the pre-eighteenth century sources of interest were mostly easily accessible for me, it took a great deal of effort, patience, and expense to find the agendas, etc., from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. I cannot forget to express my most deserved thanks to the library for the constantly willing obligations and to the archive for the ready support:

Hardly any more words are needed, I think, for such a grateful heart to remember the most important attribution of gratitude. It is my wish that each of the following pages should furnish evidence that it has all been written only for His glory and for good of His church. Many of the questions and concerns appearing today also affected hearts in those days. This account of those questions, then, should not be seen as resulting from a need to engage in research or a hobby—which, alas, is still the focus with liturgical life for all too many people. Still today, this field, if any, counts as a *scientia eminens practica*, a science that will serve our living generation and leads us into our own era precisely by taking us with it into previous ones.

Klein Freden (Leine), April 14, 1921.
The Author.

Volume I

Until the Advent of the Enlightenment and Rationalism

Part I

The View of the Divine Service in the Seventeenth Century

Chapter One

The Legacy of the Reformation Era

All Our reformers regarded the arrangement of liturgical rites in Christianity as something entirely natural, self-evident, and, indeed, willed by God, pleasing to God. Even the Evangelical Church was not to dispense with them. Two possibilities presented themselves: either, on the basis of new ideas, to establish an order of divine service wholly distinct from the current one or to adhere to the extant one, purifying it, reforming it, reshaping it. We are certainly aware that they took the latter path.[1] The manner and method in which they proceeded springs from their opposition to the Roman Mass, above all in its distortion as an *opus operatum*. This resulted in the Lutheran divine service, despite all its dependence on the Catholic orders, being regarded in the eyes of the Catholic Church as a wholly "anti-liturgical heresy."[2] Obligation and priestly rites toward a laity behaving passively are to be replaced by the Evangelical principles of freedom and the universal priesthood—the personal activity of the congregation. The sermon becomes a rule. A full Lutheran Mass without a sermon is almost unthinkable and rare. Indeed, the sermon at once claims a dominant position among the various elements of the order of worship.

But this very renewal, called forth by the constant emphasis on the formal principle in a period which could not rejoice enough in the newly uncovered Word of God, appears to have taken a fatal step backward into Catholicism. While the Mass, properly speaking, was abolished, the obligation to attend the sermon was gradually and increasingly intensified, and even the distinction between pastor and the "people" remained intact. The pastor delivers the sermon; the "people" are to listen and receive instruction. On the basis of many expressions of this kind, some liturgists, such as Achelis and Jacoby above all, as well as Grünberg and Pollit,[3] though less obviously, went so far as to judge

1 AC XXIV (Müller, p. 51): "Thus also in the public ceremonies of the Mass, no notable change has been made except that in certain places German songs (to teach and train the people) are sung in addition to the Latin songs."

2 Cf. Rendtorff, *Geschichte des christlichen Gottesdienstes*, p. 14.

3 Achelis[2] I, pp. 548ff.; Jacoby, *Liturgik der Reformation* I, pp. 147ff.; Grünberg, "Ansichten Luthers vom Gottesdienst," *SuK* (1888), pp. 409ff.; Pollit, "Preußische Hauptgottesdienstordnung," *NkZ* (1915), p. 105. And on Luther: Greiner, *Luthers Auffassung vom Gottesdienst* (1917); also see the literature appendix.

the activity of the Reformation era in the liturgical arena as truly unfavorable, since **the divine service was in this period only a "means of instruction."**

Indeed, many statements of **Luther's** can be cited in favor of this view. The sermon in the church is nothing other than an expanded domestic service, which of course—one might think of the catechism—has the purpose of educating children and servants into the Christian faith. "By this, the domestic sermon was turned into a pastor's sermon," writes Luther in the preface to his *House Postil*.[4] Here, emphasis was laid especially on his statements in the *German Mass* (1526), in which he remarks that such orders are not made for the sake of those who are already true Christians—they already have their divine service in the Spirit; rather, they are made primarily "for the sake of the simple and the young people, who ought and must be daily *trained and educated* in Scripture and God's Word." On the basis of this and many other striking expressions, Jacoby also arrives at the unbalanced judgment that Luther distinguished between the divine service needed by advanced Christians and that which is salutary for the immature. "While it is true that he only discussed them in an early period, we may not conclude from that fact that he did not take another view later. Rather, we will see, first, why he abandoned this idea and perceive, second, that the divine service, which continually occupied him, was always valuable and meaningful to him only for the sake of the immature."

The principles which Luther laid out in the *German Mass* were not, in his mind, to be binding "for the whole of Germany." Neverthless, through **Bugenhagen's** fruitful and successful activity in the creation of church orders, so dependent on the *German Mass*, they were authoritative for the majority of northern Germany. With Bugenhagen, accordingly, the didactic view of the divine service would likewise have to be expected, all the more as he was forced completely to reorganize along Evangelical principles the congregations entrusted to him. To accomplish this purpose, he took an interest above all in education and connected it to the church and to the divine services. Yet he does not express explicit principles to this effect. Gottschick,[5] in the prefaces to his church orders, desires only one liturgical principle to be detected, namely, the purging out of the papistic leaven.[6] But much in the Braunschweig CO 1528 also suggests that he views the historically developed custom of the church, the necessity of the congregation as a "prudent practitioner,"[7] and Christian love as equally important principles for the establishment of

4 Cf. Rietschel I, p. 35.

5 Op. cit., pp. 79ff.

6 But cf. [Bugenhagen's] position on the Interim, below, pp. 19–20. For Bugenhagen's conservative handling of a gradual transition to "purer"—but not instantly pure—Evangelical forms, cf. his worship order for the cloisters and chapters (*Pia ordinatio ceremoniarum* 1535), primarily for Pomerania, then carried over into the Danish, Schleswig-Holstein, Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel CO 1543 (reproduced by Uckeley in *ARG* [1908] and in Sehling IV, no. 67). In this order, which is chiefly turned against the invocation of saints, he keeps the seven cloister services in purified form: "Let them not sing or read publicly anything that is not taken from Sacred Scripture."

7 Kawerau, "Bugenhagen," in *PRE*^{3} 3:531; but see also Flemming, p. 65, and Jannasch, pp. 15ff.

liturgical forms.[8] A particular inclination to "staticness"[9] was also ascribed to him. Where "*si placuit*" ["if it pleases"] might otherwise have been used in an order, he prescribed it as binding and always obligatory. Yet he seems not to have laid as much stress on the form. In 1536, while dealing with Bucer, he told him that he frequently celebrated the Supper without candles, without Mass vestments, without elevation—possibly even more simply than was done in Strasbourg.[10]

If Luther's views cannot but appear extremely unusual, such will not be the case when they confront us in **Melanchthon**. According to much else that we know of him, the more juristic and didactic understanding that "sermons and exhortation to the people are the true purpose of the divine service"[11] seems quite conceivable in him, even as he also viewed the divine service as a divine institution. He even regards the other ceremonies received from previous generations as good outward ordinances,[12] but only for the simple people. Those who are "advanced" are no longer subject to them. For "saints are free from ceremonies, or they are not necessarily subject to pedagogy."[13] Not only Jacoby but also Rietschel[14] thinks that Melanchthon also represented mainly that unevangelical, didactic view of the divine service.

Thus it was also necessary that they should find their way into the **Confessions** and **church orders**. It is scarcely possible to demonstrate a fundamental, united philosophy of the liturgy in the symbolical books. On the one hand, they emphasize that in ceremonies complete freedom must reign and consciences must not be burdened by them; on the other hand, they support just as strongly the institution of new ceremonies and the retention of old ones, provided they can be kept without sin. But why is this the case? They discuss this subject only sporadically, and more the "how," namely, that they should be instituted according to the principles of Holy Scripture, including that of charity, "lest offense be given recklessly and without cause,"[15] "for the sake of beauty and order," and for the edification[16] of the congregation. The latter **concept of edification** (*aedificatio*), which

8 Hering, *Bugenhagen* (1888), p. 59. Peculiarities of his COs and other liturgical writings—including a Reformation festival, a closing liturgy for a divine service without Communion, placement of the Lord's Prayer in the Communion liturgy, absence of a distribution formula, preaching series on the catechism, Passion harmony, consecration of water, Baptism on the head, adult Baptism, and the introduction of ordination—are, as far as they concern us, treated more fully below. See also Scholz, "Bugenhagens COs," *ARG* X; Clemen, "Bugenhagens Trauformulare," *ARG* III.

9 Rietschel, *Ordination*, pp. 19ff.; see also Kolde, in *SuK* (1894), p. 239.

10 Kawerau, in *Monatsschrift für die ev.-lutherische Kirche Preußens* (1873), p. 287.

11 From a reflection on the Margrave George of Brandenburg, in Salig, *Historie der Augsburgischen Confession* (1730), p. 266.

12 Letter to Luther from Augsburg, July 23, 1530, in Salig, p. 267.

13 CR 24:263, in Melanchthon's postil.

14 *Liturgik* I, p. 37.

15 Art. XVII of the Schwabach Articles, in Kolde, *Augsb. Konf.*, p. 127; see also AC XXVIII (Müller, p. 67).

16 The word *edification* itself is found in the Confessions first in the Formula of Concord (Müller, p. 552), yet before that it can be found as the aim of the divine service in the prefaces of the Württemberg CO 1536 and 1553 (see also below, on Brenz, pp. 13–14); see also Kolb, p. 31. Cf. also the Reformed Herborn Synod of 1586, according to which ceremonies serve for edification, and the Lauenburg CO 1585 in the confirmation order: "that this may all be treated for edification, the glory of God, and the welfare of the children of the whole congregation." Cf. also, e.g., the Great Elector's [Friedrich Wilhelm] famous provision of 1662 to withhold all rebuke from the pulpit and to preach to congregations nothing "that

became so significant for the subsequent period, must be examined to gain a broader perspective of the Confessions' understanding on this point. The word *oikodomē*, frequent in New Testament usage, does not mean merely "laying a foundation," since that had already happened with the recipients of the epistles of Paul and Peter. Rather, for them it means above all "the furthering and completion of the building."[17] It should be noted in any case that the expression "edification" always presupposes something "unfinished, in need of completion."[18] Corresponding to this, according to the symbolical books, the divine services would have to be instituted not only for the simpleminded but rather for the congregation, which already consists of Christians, to strengthen and support those for whom the foundation has once been laid in their baptismal upbringing [*Tauferziehung*]. This understanding of the symbolical books can no longer be called unilaterally didactic. Such expressions are made by Melanchthon, for example, in the Apology:[19] "Boys sing the psalms that they may learn, and the people sing that they may either learn or pray." But, in general, no matter where the symbolical books discuss ceremonies, this didactic understanding never becomes so conspicuous as might be expected based on what has been said above regarding Luther and other reformers.

Nevertheless, it is understandable if Ritschl[20] believes it possible to ask whether the view allegedly represented by Luther and Melanchthon—that church attendance is mainly a means of discipline and instruction of the young and the uneducated masses—must be regarded merely as their personal opinion, or whether it is really to be seen "as the substance of the Evangelical confession" and is thus one of their "most embarrassing" principles. If the unilaterally didactic understanding were really the original one, Ritschl's judgment would be entirely appropriate. The history of this divine service during the next three centuries has sufficiently shown how embarrassing it really was that such statements exist at all about the didactic nature of the divine services from the Reformation era.

But none of this was the central tenet of the reformers, nor could it be. In unilaterally emphasizing their statements of purely didactic nature, it is too easy to forget that they were actually in a state of emergency at that time. It must have been of primary importance to them, first of all, to remedy the vast ignorance of the congregants and to lay a new foundation by giving the people thorough instruction. The common people were in truth a simple and unlearned "multitude." On the other hand, however, there is something justifiable in this understanding, even in healthy ecclesial circumstances. As little as Luther himself regarded as a Christian one who had no problem avoiding the

does not serve for their edification" (in Petrich, *Paul Gerhardt*, p. 133). Accordingly, this concept is fairly widely spread even before Pietism (*contra* Rietschel I, p. 53; and Achelis[2] I, p. 25).

Note: It is the congregation which is to be edified; the individual, only insofar "as he is incorporated into it, fixed within it, intimately associated with it." That this biblical as well as reformatory use of the concept of edification has become so decidedly subjective for us (e.g., "he edified me") is the fault of the Pietist subjectivism and individualism of that time; see also Bassermann, *Beiträge*, pp. 103 and 112. On the use of the concept of edification by Rationalism, see also Peters, "Predigtlehre des Rationalismus," *NkZ* (1914), pp. 836ff.

17 Rietschel I, p. 52.

18 Smend, *Der evangelische Gottesdienst*, p. 5.

19 Müller, p. 212.40.

20 *Geschichte des Pietismus* II, p. 313 n. 3.

public divine service, so little also will even a seasoned Evangelical Christian be able to escape the "salvific-didactic"[21] influence of a congregational divine service, however it may be arranged in detail. This is precisely where the concept of "edification" enters, as it was presented above. Luther himself did not have the German word *Erbauung* ["edification"], but in the preface to the *German Mass* he speaks not only of the "simple" but also of those who ought to be even stronger in their Christian faith.

However, it is difficult to support the view that the Reformation valued the divine service only as a means of education when one considers that the pinnacle of the chief divine service according to the Lutheran view was the celebration of the Supper, the worthy partaking of which depended precisely on the fact that the congregation participating in that celebration already possessed the right knowledge and faith. With reference to the ancient church designation "Eucharist," Luther refers to the celebration of the Supper—that is, the entire Lutheran Mass—as a sacrifice of thanks and praise, particularly in the familiar sermon for Maundy Thursday in his *Church Postil*.

B And, indeed, it can be demonstrated that **this understanding of the divine service as a sacrifice of praise and thanks is properly Evangelical** so that, to put it in more modern terms, the "independent value of the divine service" was already familiar.[22]

And here it comes down to the position of the sermon among the rest of the liturgical components. If the divine service is a sacrifice of praise and thanks, the sermon, in order to correspond, cannot be so catechetical in nature, but it would have to be predominantly a cultus-sermon, that is, "a self-witness of the celebrating congregation."[23] If the congregation listens with reverent devotion to a sermon grounded on God's Word, this sermon itself becomes a sacrifice, since it is then received with praise and thanks.[24] At the same time, the unevangelical distinction is eliminated between the preacher as solely active and the people who are inactive. The sermon is then no longer only the work of the pastor who delivers it, but it is also a liturgical act of the congregation, which serves God with praise and thanks in it, the members of which are also "co-priests" here, and the parish pastor is the "mouth" of them all, their spokesman.[25] Thus a congregational divine service emerges in truth. And as a congregational divine service, it is, in the first place, a *divine* service. For the concept of a divine service inevitably includes the common celebratory act[26] of the redeemed congregation, which gives thanks, exhorts, and comforts.[27] Such a celebration is free from all constraint. It gathers us, "called forth not by external force, but by the internal drive," and we come, drawn and summoned, to the liturgical celebration,[28] to do what we as Christians do with our whole life, namely, to praise and thank God,

21 Grünberg, op. cit., p. 414.

22 Smend, *Der evangelische Gottesdienst*, p. 8.

23 Bassermann, op. cit., p. 205; Hans, op. cit., p. 110.

24 Höfling, *Liturgische Urkundenbuch*, p. 13.

25 Luther, in the treatise *On the Secret Mass and Priest's Consecration* (1533); further, in the Torgau consecration sermon. See also Grünberg, op. cit., p. 432.

26 Höfling, op. cit., p. 8; Otto, *Praktische Theologie* II, pp. 59ff.

27 Jacoby, *Liturgik Luthers*, p. 4.

28 Schöberlein, *Ausbau*, p. 95.

only here in a special, communal action. This, then, is the true Evangelical nature of a divine service, in which all individual parts—and if it is a divine service with a sermon, this too is an equally liturgical, only more pronounced, component—are united to make possible the sacrifice of praise and thanks lying on the heart of the entire congregation.

And this is precisely **Luther's** opinion of the divine service as well.[29] By "divine service," Luther understands primarily four things: (1) faith, which is the highest divine service; (2) works of love; (3) ceremonies; (4) works of one's vocation ("Exposition of the Prophet Hosea," *Opera Latina* 24, pp. 476ff.). Faith consists of our serving God according to the first three commandments. However, He is also served through the works of love in fulfillment of the commandments of the Second Table. Both contain the confession of God, but "all the good that we can do is *praise and thanks, which is also the true and only divine service*."[30] Similar expressions can be adduced for the works of one's vocation. But what becomes of the "cultic" divine service? There is evidently no place here for those who serve God in Spirit and in truth in every part of their life. Thus Luther sees all external ceremonies as completely free. He knows very well that the nature of the divine service commended by him, with the express purpose of educating the people for the divine service, has hardly anything in common with the divine service proper. It is not merely "an ordered and specific gathering." From these words, as well as from the familiar suggestion that those "who seriously wish to be Christians" must gather for special divine services, it is clear that Luther knows very well the need of Christians, beyond faith and works of love and vocation, to gather for a divine service which is not, as that other one is, merely to educate people for divine service but is also a true divine service, where God is confessed and worshiped in thanks and praise. In this special gathering—"to pray, to read, to baptize, to receive the Sacrament, and to do other Christian works"—the instructive sermon does not play the main role. The components mentioned there, especially the celebration of the Supper, are the sacrifice of praise and thanks of the believing congregation gathered together. In Luther's *Exhortation to the Sacrament* (1530) it reads: "By this reception I wish to confess and bear witness that I also am one of those who desire to praise and thank God." A natural corollary to this is the true prayer (cf. the explanation of the Fourth Petition). In this celebration, we honor God for what He did and in what we accredit to Him.[31]

But Luther does not stop here. If the *verbum visibile* ["visible word"] is a sacrifice of praise and thanks of the believing congregation, then the spoken word of the sermon must also be a sacrifice of praise and thanks of the entire congregation.[32] In the same *Exhortation to the Sacrament* he says, "If I cannot or must not preach, yet I will listen; for he who listens also helps to give thanks and to honor God." There is a need to do this worship communally. In this way it becomes a powerful praise;[33] the people stir up one

29 Cf. especially Rietschel, "Luthers Lehre vom Gottesdienste," in *Halte, was du hast* [*Zeitschrift für pastoral theologie*] (Reuther & Reichard, 1895), pp. 1ff. and 65ff.; and Gottschick. Differently Allwohn, p. 67: the principle of cultus is faith; see also especially Knolle.

30 Erl. 7:68ff.

31 Gottschick, op. cit., p. 33.

32 Yet see also Achelis[3] II, p. 29n.

33 It is completely certain that this does not pave the way for unevangelical "dubious theurgic effects of mass petitions to God" to enter the Evangelical Church, as Achelis[2] I, p. 560, seems to fear.

another. Everyone belongs to this congregation. Everyone, not simply "the multitude," has the moral duty to attend the divine service of the congregation. It is clear that this appreciation for a true congregational divine service with the participation of the congregation[34] on the basis of the universal priesthood was something truly Evangelical, and thereby the doubtful question of whether Luther was a genuine liturgist instantly resolves itself.[35]

Luther seeks to demonstrate that the sermon is an act of praise by citing Ps. 50:23: "He who offers thanks glorifies Me." "For through preaching, God's grace is glorified, and that is the same as offering praise and thanks. . . . For this reason I said that offering thanks is the chief part of the sermon."[36] In the aforesaid sermon for Maundy Thursday, he says, "When I preach God's Word, I make an offering; when you hear God's Word with your heart, you make an offering." In addition to the sermon, all the other liturgical components—such as the Agnus Dei, in which we praise Christ for bearing our sins, or the Creed—are "*nothing but praise and thanks, for which reason we also keep them in the Mass*."[37]

God desires this thanksgiving, he argues; therefore, we are necessarily bound to gather together. This is not a legalistic view of the Sabbath, however. For Luther, the power of the Spirit governing us turns it into a voluntary act.

If the divine service is a sacrifice of praise of the congregation, there must also be an object there for which we praise and give thanks. In Word and Sacrament, we receive a gift of God. Luther explains this in greater detail in his sermon for the consecration of the Torgau Chapel (1544): "Our coming together in time and place where we are one, to handle and to hear God's Word and to bring before God the common and general needs of ourselves and others, and so to send a mighty, powerful prayer to heaven and with thanksgiving to extol and glorify together God's beneficence . . . so that nothing else happens therein but that our dear Lord Himself speaks with us through His Holy Word . . . and we in turn speak with Him through prayer and songs of praise." And this is echoed in his hymn of 1523: "Nun freut euch, liebe Christengemein" ["Dear Christians, One and All, Rejoice"]!

This gift of God must be continually present, since the congregation, celebrating and praising in faith, must always be strengthened in its weakness and newly yoked together by Christ into one congregation.[38] And it is here, in the point of edification, that the didactic side of the divine service finds a place. We are not yet perfect in our thanksgiving, but we are to grow more and more so. As prayer strengthens us in our communion with God, so the divine service furthers and edifies us, it "incites" us to still deeper faith. It is the

34 One may also think of Luther as a church hymn writer and church musician, since there is an intimate relationship between his hymns and their melodies, as he himself said, "The notes bring the text to life"; see also Nelle, *Ev. KL*, p. 28.

35 Rendtorff, op. cit., p. 22, disagrees, ascribing to Luther a complete disinterest in liturgics which he shared with Jesus and Paul. But in view of Luther's constant preoccupation with liturgical questions, it is hardly possible to speak of "disinterest." Luther's statements concerning his own liturgical endeavors—that they should not be forever binding—his opposition to liturgical mechanicalism and formula, etc., are certainly sufficient proof of his interest. Cf. with this also Knoke, "Ist es zutreffend, Luther einer liturgischen Interesselosigkeit zu zeihen?" *MGkK* (1917), pp. 4ff.

36 Cf. Gottschick, op. cit., p. 41.

37 Erl. 23:191.

38 Rietschel, op. cit., pp. 74ff.

sermon especially that does this, since in it the grace of God, for the receipt of which we give thanks, is presented in an entirely unique way.[39] Yet this didactic element is by no means irreconcilable with the understanding of the divine service as a sacrifice of praise, but rather fits quite easily with it,[40] without depriving it of the properly essential aspect of being the whole gathered congregation's sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving.

This, Luther's proper understanding of the divine service, is summarized by Rietschel[41] as follows:

> The congregational divine service does not arise from the immediate internal impulse of believers but rests on an ordinance of God, which in turn answers the internal needs of Christians. This ordinance is given in the gift of the Gospel and in the institution of the Supper by Christ. This ordinance of God is to draw us to the communal and joyful sacrifice of thanks and praise for the salvation given us in Christ and to the longing for the grace in Word and Sacrament to stir up, deepen, and strengthen the faith in baptized Christians on the various stages of their journey. The grace experienced in the divine service in turn drives them to thanksgiving, so that thanking and receiving, receiving and thanking always remain inextricably linked to each other. Through this divine service, the redeemed are more and more firmly united with Christ, the Head, and thereby with one another in faith and love for the congregation of saints.

The assertion that Luther's proper understanding of the divine service is that of a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving on the part of the congregation is further supported by the statements of **Erasmus Alber**, who even by personal admission is entirely a disciple of Luther's. Noteworthy, then, is Alber's remark that divine services are to be joyful celebrations: "When the Christian congregation gathers to hear the Holy Gospel, it is treated in precisely the same way as when a wedding feast is held."[42]

In **Melanchthon's** works too, this understanding can be found to echo his own. Rietschel[43] has already noted that Melanchthon sees Communion as the congregation's sacrifice of praise and thanks for the gifts of God received. Yet Rietschel believes that Melanchthon only occasionally attaches such a meaning to this aspect of the congregational divine service and that apart from that the aforesaid didactic understanding predominates in his work. Contrary to this, Drews[44] rightly points out that, according to Melanchthon's view, the divine service is not merely an external institution restricted to the immature but is for the entire congregation and for every Christian. For this, Melanchthon appeals first to the fact that, according to the Third Commandment, this is God's will. He places decidedly more importance on this than Luther. This also explains his statements (differing from Luther) concerning the day of rest as instituted by God, by which Melanchthon in particular became the father of similar liturgical and dogmatic viewpoints which are

39 Gottschick, op. cit., p. 46.

40 No more contradictory than 1 Pet. 2[:9], where in one chapter there is the admonition to lay aside all malice, and with it: "You are the chosen generation . . . that you should show forth the virtues [תְּהִלָּה] of Him who . . . ." See also Smend, *Der evangelische Gottesdienst*, p. 18.

41 Op. cit., p. 78.

42 Cf. E. Körner, "Zur Liturgik der Reformatoren," *NkZ* (1911), p. 794.

43 *Liturgik* I, p. 47.

44 In a discussion of Rietschel's *Liturgik*, in *SuK* (1900), pp. 488ff.

subsequently observed with greater frequency, as well as of the prescriptions of compulsory church attendance in the church orders. He writes: "God desires that we gather, hear the Word, join our prayers, and pray in unison, that the church may be preserved and the light of the Gospel may not be extinguished."[45] The divine service is thus an ordinance of God for both the unlearned and the advanced, just as Mary and Joseph also went to the feast.[46] Thus according to Melanchthon too, the purpose of the divine service must be something other than mere education. The main evidence for this are his statements in the third edition of the *Loci* (1559) under the heading "*De libertate Christiana*" ["On Christian Liberty"],[47] which even Jacoby could not ignore: "And God desires His Gospel to resound in public worship and honorable gatherings, as it is written: 'His praise is in the church of the saints' (Ps. 149:1). There He wishes His name to be called upon and celebrated in some frequency, and He adds a promise for the congregation (Matt. 18:20). . . . Whenever you come to church, think of the great benefit of God in gathering for Himself an eternal church by the ministry and voice of the Gospel." Accordingly for Melanchthon too, the purpose of the divine service is not simply education but above all an activity of praise and confession.

He makes similar statements in the **Confessions**. According to Article VII of the Augsburg Confession, the divine service is a necessary component—indeed, in the nature of its expression, an infallible mark of true Christian life. Of course, ceremonies, which men make use of according to their human judgment for the sake of order, are free and do not need to be the same everywhere.

Such a divine service of the assembled Christian congregation is thus fundamentally distinguished from the Roman Mass because no operation *ex opere operato* is ascribed to it, as is done by Romanists with their sacrifice of the Mass. For Melanchthon, the only sacrifice that reconciles us with God is the death of Christ; all others, he argues, are only sacrifices of thanksgiving for that.[48] The Apology in this regard distinguishes between *sacramentum* and *sacrificium*. "Sacrament" is a ceremony by which God gives us that which offers the divine promise which is attached to the same ceremony. *Sacrificium* or "sacrifice," on the other hand, is a ceremony or work that we give to God with which we honor Him. It designates as such sacrifices: faith toward God, thanksgiving, praise of God, the preaching of the Gospel, the cross and suffering of the saints, and so on.[49] Through the sermon, the name of the Lord is exalted because His grace is promised in Christ. It is a pure, holy sacrifice together with the "believing, invoking, prayer, the Gospel, and confessing Christ before the world, etc." That the whole divine service of the congregation is thus included under the designation of a sacrifice presented to God is finally affirmed by these words: "For if we call the sermon a sacrifice of praise, the

45 CR 24:261.

46 CR 24:261–62.

47 CR 21:1048; cf. also *Loci* 1553 (German ed., Koethe, p. 253).

48 Apology (Müller, p. 251.16ff.).

49 [Müller,] p. 255.

ceremony of the Supper can in itself be a sacrifice of praise,"[50] namely, when in it we gratefully celebrate the memorial of the death of Christ.[51]

In this understanding of the divine service, the significance of the gift of God is not diminished, and yet the collective divine service, with all its parts, may still be called an act of the congregation.[52]

But if the entire divine service is thus a *sacrificium*, a sacrifice, it is not feasible to join Kliefoth in dividing it externally into sacramental and sacrificial parts, the former including the declaration of the Word and the distribution of the Sacrament, and the latter, mainly singing and prayer. Even the Apology plainly and distinctly calls Word and Sacrament a sacrifice of praise, and thus also views the ostensibly sacramental components as sacrificial. Or, as Harnack[53] succinctly puts it, the whole Evangelical cultus is a sacrifice, a sacrifice of praise and thanks, in which Christ and the Christian congregation are simultaneously priest (sacramental) and sacrifice (sacrificial). Alternatively, the entire cultus is "an action of faith on the part of the congregation" itself,[54] a self-act of the congregation. Or, so as not to pass over the significant aspect of edification, we do better to cite Jacoby,[55] who says that as our entire Christian faith is a process of becoming and a struggle, this too must find expression in the "cultic" divine service: "The divine service must *become* a victorious act." Only then is the understanding of the Lutheran reformers rightly represented. The modern idea of a pure self-presentation of the congregation, of a "monologue" or "dialogue" of the congregation with itself, was completely foreign to them. All sacrifices of praise and thanks presented in the divine service are to them nothing else than the immediate answer to the proofs of God's grace experienced every moment, including the hour of the divine service—here, indeed, in an entirely unique way by the proclamation, offering, and lavish distribution of the treasures of the Gospel.[56]

Now the question is to what degree this found expression in the **church orders**. An attempt toward this is without question found in the assignment—indeed, the novel introduction[57]—of a hymn at the close of the divine service,[58] and beyond that, the keeping of a feast on many of the traditional feast days, including the days of the apostles and Mary, which, precisely in accord with Luther, were celebrated to the glory of God. Of note also are the statements in the church orders regarding the understanding of the divine service represented by them. Thus the Pomeranian Agenda 1568/1569 says, "So too God the Lord desires to be thus honored, worshiped, praised, and glorified through

50 [Müller,] p. 255.33.

51 [Müller,] p. 257.38.

52 Rietschel, *Liturgik* I, p. 62.

53 *Praktische Theologie* I, pp. 275ff. On this see also A. Krauß, *Lehrbuch der prakt. Theologie* I, p. 55.

54 Schöberlein, *Schatz* I, p. 1.

55 "Der Kultus als Monolog und Dialog," *Dienet einander* XIX, pp. 266ff.

56 Cf. on this also Smend, op. cit., p. 4, on "speaking and hearing," and the indispensability of the sermon, the "half of the whole."

57 Diehl, *Gottesdienst*, pp. 163 and 173.

58 See below, p. 242; also in the Reformed COs, Electoral Palatinate 1563, and related: "Praise the Lord with your singing."

us men in the assembly of the congregation."[59] And the Mecklenburg CO 1552ff.,[60] and after it also those of Lüneburg 1564ff. and Liegnitz 1594, declares:

> Since the eternal, divine Majesty preserves all Christian principalities . . . that there may be dwellings and temples of God wherein the true knowledge and invocation of God and of our Savior, Jesus Christ, may shine, and an eternal church may be gathered for God through His Word and preaching office, in which gatherings master and subject, young and old together call upon, thank, praise, and glorify God . . . God[61] maintains the public gathering, that His Son and the Gospel may be confessed throughout the world. . . . Ps. 148 [149:1]: "His praise is in the gathering of the saints." . . . So it is also true that there is on earth no more beautiful thing than these gatherings in the church, which are a picture and similitude of the everlasting gathering in heaven.

The Nassau-Saarbrücken CO 1576 states: "All who come together in the congregation are to participate in all singing, teaching, reading, praying . . . that God may be called upon, honored, praised" (thus praised through teaching!) "and glorified."[62] Similarly, the "special declaration" of the Colloquy of Thorn (1645) proclaims in the beautiful section "*De cultu Dei*": "That worship owed to God consists first of devout adoration . . . then of calling upon God. . . . To this also pertains the celebration of divine praises through psalms and hymns . . . thanksgiving, hearing the divine Word, the faithful communion of the Sacraments."[63]

The southern German—or, in view of the following lines, probably more accurately the southwestern German—church orders are all traced more or less back to **Brenz**,[64] for which reason it will suffice to go briefly into his understanding of the divine service. All these church orders, as has been well stated, occupy a "medial position between the Lutheran and Reformed type." Brenz himself is thoroughly Lutheran. He is also very conservative with respect to the ancient customs of the church and a friend of images, music, and singing, but he did not penetrate everywhere with his views. His rejection of the exorcism and the sign of the cross in Baptism, his stance on general confession, the "declarative" meaning which he assigned to the Words of Institution in the celebration of the Supper is not a Zwinglian influence but springs from the endeavor to avoid everything that might give the impression of the "magical."[65] To do justice to his church orders, it is

59 Fol. 61b.

60 According to the edition of 1650 (Preface).

61 Fol. 149ff.

62 See also Knodt, *Nassau-Saarbrücken KO*, p. 34. The (Reformed) Herborn Synod 1586 says, "The church . . . shall sing to the glory of God and for the strengthening of faith."

63 In Moser, *CJE* II, pp. 1121ff.

64 Brenz authored the Schwäbisch-Hall CO and collaborated on the Brandenburg-Nuremberg CO, although the latter is mainly Osiander's. On their unique place, see below. The Nuremberg CO in part passed over into the Württemberg CO, for the composition of which, along with Schnepf, Brenz likewise is not ruled out, even if Schnepf and Blaurer must be regarded as the main authors. The Württemberg CO then became the standard model for the church orders of the adjacent territories of Baden, the Palatinate, Hanau, and many imperial cities, among others. Indeed, the Strasbourg CO 1598 is dependent on it. On the third type of southern German COs, besides Strasbourg and Württemberg, i.e., Nuremberg, see below, p. 65.

65 Günther, on Brenz's views of the divine service and influence on the Lutheran churches of southwest Germany, in *MGkK* (1901), p. 91; likewise, see Christa Müller, in *MGkK* (1934).

necessary to understand him in the same way as Bugenhagen. Both had the task of organizing things practically, and both therefore had to account for their given circumstances. Yet Brenz may be praised for assuming a clearer and firmer stance against the Interim than did Bugenhagen.[66] In Brenz too, it is possible to find statements to the effect that the divine service is to pursue didactic aims so that, as it says in the Schwäbisch-Hall CO 1526, the people may be "instructed" in it and "drawn" to prayer. But he means it more in the sense of edification, which, as mentioned above, is to be found repeatedly in his writing. Before the Württemberg CO 1559, the Württemberg Confession, composed for Trent, contains words to the effect that the bishops may, with the consent of their church orders, establish feast days, lessons, or sermons "to teach and build up the right, true faith in Christ." Neither, indeed, is the appraisal of divine services as sacrifices of praise and thanks foreign to him.[67] This can all be summarized, with Günther,[68] by noting that "the understanding of the divine service confronting us in Brenz can be identified as wholly consistent." Divine service (*Gottesdienst*), in the fullest sense of the term, means for him, as it does for Luther, the faith of justification with the fruit of sanctification. The contemplation of the external divine service, in view of the dominant nature of the empirical congregation, proceeds from its catechetical, didactic purpose and merges back into it without that purpose exercising unilateral rule at any given time. Rather, for Brenz also the recognition that the believing congregation presents to God the sacrifice of its praise and thanks on the basis of the divine, saving grace presented to it in Word and Sacrament in its collective, liturgical activity forms the pinnacle of his view. But the relationship of the cultus to the advancement or edification of the congregation as well as of the individual is even more in focus. The fact that there is a divine service is an ordinance of God, in which Brenz agrees with Melanchthon. But while he confronts the external forms of the cultus as freely as does Luther, yet by virtue of his sober, judicious streak he also counters the emergence of phenomena reminiscent of Catholicism, including in those points where Luther's vigorous realism was not in a position to counter them. The Lutheran churches of southwestern Germany, which developed under Brenz's influence, not only still evince today a trace of the mark that he left on them, they also cannot deny their connection to his ideas about the Christian divine service.

As an addendum, we may also include a few words about **Bucer**, whose activity in southern Germany, especially after Zwingli's death, was of great importance. He "built the bridge on which Lutheranism invaded even into southern Germany."[69] Strasbourg, Hanau-Lichtenberg, Baden, Württemberg, Ulm, Augsburg on one side, western and central Germany, that is, Hessia (confirmation and ordination), on the other side, took a great deal from him. Especially relevant for his understanding of the divine service is his treatise *Grund und Ursach aus göttlicher Schrift* [Foundation and cause from divine Scripture] (Strasbourg, 1524),[70] in which he declares that whatever cannot stand up to the New Testament must give way. He sees it as necessary to return to what is "ancient,

66 See also below, pp. 19–20.

67 Many examples for this in Günther, op. cit., p. 84.

68 Op. cit., p. 92.

69 "Butzer," in *RGG* 1:1131ff., and Grünberg, in *PRE*[3] 3.

70 Smend, *Messen*, pp. 147ff., and the same author in *MGkK* (1897).

correct, and eternal"; old customs—such as crossing oneself, using a surplice (*chorrock*), and the like—are not to be dismissed out of hand. He rages against the feast days, however, since they had overtaken the Sundays. Of foundational importance for the public divine service in his view is brotherly love. He says that we sing with the heart for the glory of God, with the mouth for the edification of the congregation (the congregational divine service!). He could have been called the "Pietist among the reformers," largely because of his treatment of the confirmation question, yet there was also an almost exaggerated spiritualism with him.[71] By "true divine service," which congregations were supposed to arrive at after a steadily advancing renunciation of tradition, he means pure, spiritual interaction with God. The teaching about practical-moral purposes which Bucer adds to this is very minuscule and cannot imbue congregational divine services with genuine life as he ultimately pictures them. Since Bucer, beguiled by the excess of the sensual in the Catholic divine service, sees sin in everything sensual and contrasts it with God's transcendence of sensuality, then, as Smend rightly concludes,[72] there will be for him no living interaction of a multiplicity of faithful hearts. "Bucer simply overlooks the fact that Christianity is a historical religion and that such a thing cannot be nurtured except by means of a vigorous and multifaceted perspective."

Thus as certain as it is that the actual Lutheran view of the divine service is also familiar to the church orders,[73] it is just as certain that **these principles served far too little as guides in the creation of new orders for the divine service**. In the divine service orders of northern German church orders, under the influence of the *German Mass*, and in those stemming from Bugenhagen, no less than in the southern German ones especially, more or less following the character of Württemberg 1559,[74] the sermon appears as the chief component. While the first group intends the Sunday celebration of the Supper following the sermon to be the highpoint of the "Mass," even these orders had to reckon early on with the possibility that communicants would not register every Sunday. Thus the sermon in reality becomes the chief component of the divine service. The other components of the divine service then appear only as a liturgical introduction and framework around the sermon, the "factual and practical" focus of the celebration,[75] and hence the disregard for those divine services which, like the incidental services of a purely liturgical character, lacked the sermon. Thus the Pomeranian Agenda 1568/1569 stipulates that preachers instruct their congregations to attend the ceremonies even when there is no preaching. This also explains the tendency of congregations from the beginning to leave after the sermon and not to remain during Communion, as the church

71 Lang, *Evangelienkommentar Martin Butzers*, p. 128.

72 Smend, "Butzer's 'Grund und Ursach,' " *MGkK* (1897), p. 209.

73 Thus it is hard to grasp how Kliefoth (see also Armknecht, *Hauptgottesdienst*, p. 6) causes the mainly liturgical parts of the divine service in the church orders to be seen as an "essential part" of the congregation's educational materials.

74 On the origins of the unique Württemberg Order, after everything that happens in the pulpit, see below, pp. 184–85.

75 Cf. Grünberg, *Spener* I, p. 26. On the difficulty of the right relationship of the sermon, which though a free, personal testimony yet also was to belong in turn to the "linked" components of the divine service, cf. Smend, *Kultusrede*, p. 221: "Cultus ruined speech, and speech ruined cultus."

orders repeatedly encourage them to do (see below, pp. 211–12); or to not stay for other occasions, such as ordinations, public repentance, etc.; or even to arrive shortly before the sermon,[76] preferring to wait in the churchyard during the liturgy.[77]

The blame for this was certainly borne by the church orders too, if not exclusively. People were often well aware of their imperfections. Neither was there ever any claim that truly Lutheran model services had been created. It was enough temporarily to have a simplified liturgy, purified of Romanish aspects,[78] into which the sermon, as the most crucial innovation, had been inserted, and this was first of all to instruct the people. That such a divine service of a more catechetical nature—though, according to various church orders, the parts of the catechism were to be rehearsed to the hearers before or after the sermon—was in Luther's eyes only a temporary measure, he asserts, for example, in a letter from 1540:[79] "The whole form of ecclesial polity will have to be deliberated among the faithful, if there will be any who embrace the Gospel." At that time, in any case, the moment had not yet come. Indeed, it might appear as if, in Luther's opinion, it might never come at all.[80]

Neither, for that reason, may it be said with Schöberlein[81] that in those days the liturgical task appointed to the Lutheran Church was only partly fulfilled, that people were not yet in a position then to build a truly uniform liturgical sytem upon the received historical foundations and that we must still carry on this work. Rather, we must confess that the creation of a truly Evangelical divine service order is a task that does not merely involve the continuation of a work already begun[82] but was an unsolved problem in its infancy and is so to this day.[83]

Regard for the nature of the existing congregations was the reason the divine service orders were so ineffective. For the sake of the congregations, the usual ceremonies were kept intact as much as possible. But not only this; there was also a desire to preserve the connection to the ancient church, which cannot be dismissed out of hand as a pet notion of the reformers, nor can their preference for relying on the Roman Mass therefore be reproached as flawed from the start. Rather, it must be observed that a "law of liturgical development" finds its confirmation here,[84] namely, that the form in which a new faith presents itself in its initial phase is linked to its received means of expression. Thus as the early Christians were linked to the Jewish divine service, so also Luther was naturally linked to the medieval divine service. "This whole attitude of Luther's shows that he knew

76 Tholuck, *Rationalismus* I, p. 124.

77 Especially in Westphalia. Cf. the complaints lodged in Soest in 1628 about gatherings in the cemetery during the divine service: see Rothert, *Soest*, p. 162.

78 Kliefoth, *Ursprüngliche Gottesdienstordnung* (1st ed.), p. 24.

79 De Wette V, p. 266.

80 N. Müller, *Kirchengebäude*, p. 15.

81 *Schatz* III, foreword.

82 Jul. Hans, *Der protestantische Kultus*, p. 12: "Thus we have in Luther's reforms of the cultus not the faithful expression of his principal views of the divine service but a compromise between these and the existing conditions of his time."

83 Gottschick, p. 81.

84 E. v. d. Goltz, "Über Lebensgesetze," *Philotesia* (1907), pp. 178ff.; also his *Das Vorbildliche in Luthers Kultreform*.

the peculiar laws of liturgical development or, to put it better, that he sensed them with the accuracy of a genius."[85] This development has not yet reached its conclusion even today, as the present state of the Lutheran divine service demonstrates. Nevertheless, development has taken place. This can also be seen in the fact that, for our times, a truly faithful reproduction of the Reformation era divine service is among those tasks which are intrinsically impossible.[86] If we wish to be critical, it is the maintenance of the divine service orders, regarded as they were by the reformers as merely temporary forms, which should be reproached as being at the root of that development and not, as so often, the thing itself, which even in Luther's eyes was only incomplete. Indeed, if in the Roman Mass liturgical components from different periods and originally of entirely different meanings were only artificially linked together into an external unity, how much more must that be the case in an order which, by force of necessity, was only brought together into a whole out of individual pieces wrested from their original context, as Luther writes in the preface to the *German Mass*? If, for example, Bugenhagen, in the event that no communicants are present, closes the divine service in the Braunschweig CO 1528 with a curtailed Communion liturgy (Preface, Sanctus, Our Father, Agnus Dei, collect, and benediction), but already a year later in the Hamburg CO abandons this and only has a closing hymn sung after the sermon, it is clear that such ordinances could not but deprive the leading divine service orders of any internal unity, even if it would have been present otherwise. But they were lacking in this too. The Lutheran divine service order is only the "ruin of a divine service."[87] And this is why every attempt to defend it fails.[88] It is as though Bugenhagen pruned a tree's crown of its dry wood and caterpillars, excised everything "contrary to nature," and returned to it both shape and air.[89] What remained "was no flourishing tree, but a decrepit, crumbling trunk"[90] or, as Löhe says, "a beautiful but broken column." **The history of the Lutheran divine service thus became a history of its decay.**[91]

This divine service was bound to disintegrate because its course was not defined by the proper Lutheran view of the divine service. For the sake of the congregation, a great deal was kept intact. Yet what was created has to the present day remained incomprehensible

85 Ibid., p. 191.

86 Cf. Schöberlein, *Ausbau*, p. 121.

87 Gottschick, p. 72. Bishop Kettler called the Lutheran divine service "castrated Mass."

88 Rendtorff, p. 42:

> In Luther's peculiar stance toward liturgical heritage outlined above, it is necessary to remember this remarkable intertwining of hostile aversion, disdainful indifference, inner freedom, and sensitive sympathy, and to remember the previously described disinterest (see above, p. 7) with which he generally confronted liturgical orders, and his own task in particular, if we wish to defend the divine service orders proposed by him. Only from this perspective does it become clear that Luther, in knocking out the heart of the Roman Mass by eliminating the offertory [prayer] and completely restructuring the Canon, nevertheless simultaneously shortened the overall structure of its remnants, left as a torso, and the bulk of its individual parts, but retained them essentially unchanged for the Evangelical divine service.

On the continuing significance of the legacy of the Lutheran liturgy, see Knolle, "Lutherische Gottesdienst," p. 140.

89 Sengelmann, *Hauptgottesdienst in Hamburg*, p. 28.

90 Röhlk, p. 19; *Die Hochkirche* (1932), p. 31.

91 See also Tümpel's assessment below, p. 180 n. 8.

to the majority of congregants. For this reason, this order was unable to fulfill its main task of being the liturgical act of the collected congregation. The participation of the congregation that Luther envisioned and that found expression in some actual innovations of lasting value—more German language and German congregational singing, an attempt to restore authentic Communion[92]—yet receded again as long as so many parts were kept in Latin and a dominant role was in many places assigned to the choir.[93] Congregational participation cannot be assessed as having "largely"[94] been achieved either in the sixteenth or in the seventeenth century. The congregation receded far too much indeed. In the villages it was perhaps not so apparent. In the cities, however, the choir, singing "in the name of the church" (as expressed in the Leipzig *Kirchenandachten* as late as 1694),[95] predominated. The congregation also must have felt the restraints imposed on it in the fact that not only the sermon and the numerous orations but even the singing, as much in Latin as German, and even the feasts of the church year, still mostly calling for praise and thanksgiving, were viewed from a didactic perspective. The same holds true for the occasional and weekday services. Matins and Vespers, originally pure divine services of praise and thanksgiving, were properly maintained only in the characteristic "early services" [*Frühgottesdiensten*] of Nuremberg according to the order of the Sunday liturgy, yet without sermon or Communion. For the rest, they sank to the level of pure catechetical affairs designed for the servant class and the young. In other words, they decayed. The congregations were not concerned with maintaining what was often not designed for them except in name only. Wherever they lasted so long, as in Nuremberg, there were clearly other reasons.

Yet the chief divine service also suffered the same fate, especially as, much to its detriment, this didactic perspective became increasingly dominant.[96]

The age of **Orthodoxy**, in the opinion of which a Christian divine service depended on the proclamation of pure doctrine, which was so attacked on every side—the proclamation being imparted mostly through didactic preaching—saw the barbarization of the populace by means of the Thirty Years' War. This led to the challenge of rebuilding and reassembling the congregations first, which it often did too much in the manner of a "restoration" through a further tightening of the screw and frequently quite literal reprints of the old, lost church orders.

Pietism also viewed the congregations as unconverted masses to be ushered to regeneration and awakened through the sermon. The regenerate man no longer needed such preaching. Their divine services became assemblies of individuals in which every

92 Cf. Kliefoth, op. cit., p. 21; and Gottschick, pp. 72ff.

93 Cf. Brückner, *Betrachtungen über der Agende*, p. 27.

94 As Kliefoth believes, *Die ursprüngliche Gottesdienstordnung* (1st ed.), p. 194.

95 See below, p. 181; cf. also Calvör's understanding of the liturgical antiphonal singing, *Rituale ecclesiasticum* II, p. 666: "Hi populum sibi invicem accinentes repraesentant" ["These, singing back and forth to each other, represent the people"].

96 Here may be mentioned the didacticism of sermons, their polemical content, the various uses [*usus*] of homiletics—didactic, educational, refutational [*didacticus, paedeuticus, elenchthicus*]—and the application [*applicatio*], the verbosity of the sermonlike prayers, the length of many hymns, the doctrinal sermons increasingly coordinated with every *locus* of dogmatics and ethics available. See also Smend, *Kultusrede*, pp. 231ff., on the long Reformed Communion exhortations, etc.

man sought to "edify" himself, each according to what personally moved him. The relationship of the individual with the congregation was torn asunder. The subjectivism of the time and its societal conditions (distinctions of rank and class) had already done their preparatory work and now asserted themselves most emphatically.

Regarding **Rationalism**, it has often been shown that in that period, that detrimental [didactic] perspective experienced its heyday, and the pastor became a "religious intructor." Not so often shown, however, is the fact that this Rationalism had already begun to gain ground around 1700. In connection with the Lutheran doctrine of the "teaching estate" [*Lehrstand*], there had already long been the view of the pastor as "teacher,"[97] and in order that the **Enlightenment** might not be lacking, one might almost say, Nikolaus Haas[98] sought in 1701 to recommend the "art of reason" to preachers for their pulpit orations: the "dispositions of men" are "moved" (note the linguistic style of Rationalism) most safely "when *logica* or the art of reason is used and an irrefutable conclusion is drawn."[99]

Incidentally, a great many of the Lutheran divine service orders still in force at the dawn of the seventeenth century are not to be seen merely as an incomplete, temporary work of the reformers themselves. Rather, they underwent alteration in the intervening time, specifically in southern and western Germany: first, through Reformed influences; second, through the Wittenberg Concordia (private confession, Communion of the sick); and later through the reception of the Formula of Concord and Andreä's activity in southern Germany; additionally, through external pressure there where Lutheran minorities lived under the heterodox. But it happened most especially through the **Interim**.[100]

The reformers themselves had a fairly free approach toward all ceremonies. They kept many in northern Germany, where the congregations often clung to them for the sake of the weak, but few in southern Germany, since the congregations subject to Swiss influence took offense at them. Then came the Interim and demanded the reintroduction of these elements, such as candles, surplices, several feast days, and Latin for the pericopal readings, the Creed, and Verba. Such things were not unusual in northern Germany—hence the relative indifference of Melanchthon and Bugenhagen toward these new changes, which won them many enemies—while in southern Germany, Brenz's popularity grew.[101] Melanchthon and Bugenhagen thought they were still maintaining the old position toward ceremonies, yet they had fundamentally and completely changed their attitude when they not only admitted ceremonies as adiaphora out of love for the congregations but also tried to compel the congregations against their consciences out of deference to those in power.

97 Compare this to the abundance of those by Lilienthal in his writings quoted in *Archivarius*, p. 400, wherein the pastor, ca. 1700, is already seen as "teacher"; also the works on pastoral theology, funeral sermons, etc., then, which try to depict the "image of a true teacher."

98 *Der allzeit fertige Redner* (1701), in the ninth chief question of the "Predigerfackel" (preface).

99 Schian, *Orthodoxie und Pietismus*, p. 150, justly draws attention to the fact that this was already written long before Wolf.

100 Ißleib, *Interim in Sachsen*; Sehling, *Kirchengesetzgebung unter Moritz*; Schnell, *Bekenntis*; Bossert, *Interim in Württemberg.*

101 Hering, *Bugenhagen*, p. 151; Ißleib, op. cit., p. 218; Sehling, op. cit., pp. 191ff.; Bossert, op. cit., p. 13.

This is why their argument that the main thing is to save the core of Lutheran teaching was unable to make any impression.

The lasting effect of the Interim, however, was that in many localities in southern Germany,[102] where those aforesaid elements had been abolished almost everywhere—a notable exception being, for example, Nuremberg[103]—they were reintroduced and accordingly continued to be an offense to the congregations for a long time.[104] Yet it should be noted that in many places—for example, in Frankfurt am Main and Ulm—at the very moment when the Interim broke down, Lutheran doctrine triumphed over Swiss, and certain similarities to the central and northern German church orders were adopted.[105] Conversely, the Interim greatly hindered the expansion of the public, solemn confirmation of children, which, according to the thinking of the Interim's opponents, seemed, not without reason, a strongly catholicizing celebration with sacramental significance.[106] But above all, the result of the Interim in western Germany was that while in northern and central Germany a great deal was merely confirmed by the Interim, it was rather abolished here, especially in Rhineland and Westphalia, through the violent aversion to it. And thus in those regions, which had originally followed so entirely the Saxon and northern German type of divine services, the liturgical rites became very simplified. This was, incidentally, the fault not only of the Interim but also partly of the Reformed environment nearby and partly of the Catholic pressure against a number of congregations, which were content simply to enjoy a meager, simple, Evangelical divine service.[107]

102 Flügge II, p. 210. E.g., in Nuremberg, private confession, see Medicus, p. 122; in Regensburg, the feasts of John [the Baptist] and Michaelmas, see Gemeiner, p. 205; in Württemberg, the surplice and alb, see Bossert, p. 172, also below, pp. 132–33; in Frankfurt am Main, the so-called "Interim feasts": Circumcision, Ascension, two feast days.

103 Herold, *Alt-Nürnberg*, p. 102; see also below, Schubert, especially p. 198.

104 On the difficulties faced by, e.g., the council of Frankfurt in continuing to keep said "Interim feasts," see Becker, p. 50, and Dechent, pp. 183ff.

105 Note that numerous new COs were published in the years immediately following 1552.

106 See below, pp. 360–67.

107 See also below, Oven, *Kultus*, pp. 94, 100, 135ff.

Chapter Twelve

Baptism

"Luther's[1] second formulary from 1526[2] so resolutely constitutes the basic type in all the early church orders throughout the Lutheran territories that essentially no variations appear among them in their actual execution, and all the differences relate almost entirely to the formularies for addresses, though even some of these are found in nearly all said church orders. The extensive and widely divergent agenda family of the greater Württemberg CO, which, according to Höfling's[3] grouping, is usually characterized as the "third class of old Protestant Baptism formularies,"[4] has in its **Baptism liturgy** precisely the same type as that of Wittenberg, except that the exorcism and sign of the cross (*signatio crucis*) are omitted. Therefore the beginning of the ritual is necessarily structured somewhat differently. This is how things remained until the nineteenth century—with the single exception of the abolition of the exorcism by legislative means, as was the general practice during the eighteenth century. The old baptismal form was not eliminated until Rationalism.

From this it is apparent

1. that while expansions (addresses, prayers, hymn, etc.) were added here and there in various ways, nevertheless the actual rite is executed the same way everywhere, and
2. that almost the only point of alteration in the Baptism liturgy concerned the exorcism.

In fact, northern German no less than southern German Lutherans had an awareness of the complete agreement in the elements of the actual Baptism rite. The patently

1 Result of studies in P. Althaus, *Grundlagen der lutherischen Taufliturgie*, pp. 1ff.

2 At Chemnitz's advice and by request of Elector Palatine Ludwig, Luther's Baptismal Booklet (*Taufbüchlein*) is omitted in the second (Dresden) edition of the Book of Concord because many Upper German churches had already adopted other liturgical orders. Not until the seventeenth century is it included again in Saxon editions, though not without opposition, and still only in the German; thus controveries over departures from the Baptismal Booklet do not absolutely affect confession. See S. J. Baumgarten, *Erläuterung der symbolischen Schriften* (1747), p. 166, and Höfling, *Taufe* II, p. 185; see also Rietschel II, p. 75. On the entire matter, see also Ramge, pp. 75ff.

3 Contra Althaus, Günther, "Brenz," op. cit., p. 137, sides with Höfling and calls Brenz's *Taufformular* (1553) his "most characteristic and most successful."

4 The "simple form of Baptism among the Upper Germans," says Spener (*Bedenken* I.a, p. 164).

Lutheran superintendent of Ulm, K. Dietrich,[5] divides the "fitting" ceremonies during Baptism explicitly into *essentiales* ["part of its essence"] and *accidentiales* ["peripheral to its essence"]—the latter being free and not subject to compulsion. Such *accidentiales* include prayers, reading of Scripture, exhortations and warnings to that end, sponsors, the renunciation (*abrenuntiatio*), giving a name—or "even using the exorcism," making the sign of the cross, and putting on the baptismal gown.

Most independent from Luther's Baptismal Booklet are the Strasbourg and related orders, since they seem to depart from the other Lutheran churches in dogmatic respects as well, inasmuch as they direct the questions not to the child but only to the sponsors as representatives of the church and congregation. Yet this variation—extremely significant for the question based on the "children's Creed" in the theology of the seventeenth century, though in this respect they become so similar to the Reformed orders—is not paid much attention; neither does it need to be treated further except to establish this fact, especially since the order in itself is in no way un-Lutheran.[6]

The following overview may serve for better clarification of further discussions.

5 *Sonderbare Predigten* I, p. 343.

6 Büchsenschütz, *Histoire des liturgies*, p. 140: "This liturgy bears a strictly Lutheran stamp."

Luther's Baptismal Booklet 1526	Coburg 1626	Lüneberg 1643	Hessia 1574/1662	Württemberg 1533/1559/1660	Strasbourg 1598/1670	Calvin, Electoral Palatinate 1563[7]	Augsburg 1718[8]
						Votum	Same
				Request for the name of the child and whether it has not already been baptized		Request to the sponsors whether the child is to be baptized	
	Address	Same	Same	Same	Same	Same	Same, and within the same the children's Gospel
		"How is this child to be named?"					
Before the church							
Small Catechism	Same	Same					
Sign of the cross	Same	Same					
Prayers	Same	Same	Prayer with Our Father paraphrase, then another Our Father with audible or silent prayer	Same, with Our Father, the latter spoken in unison	Prayer	Same; in the Palatine, abbreviated Flood Prayer, yet not in Calvin; Our Father	
Great exorcism	Same	Same					
Children's Gospel	Same	Same	Same, within an address		Same, with an address		
	Address of sponsors with vow	Same, or as Luther					
Our Father	Same	Same		Same			

7 CR 34:185. CO of the expatriate community in Frankfurt 1554; see Richter II, p. 155.

8 Almost entirely in agreement with 1537 and 1555.

Luther's Baptismal Booklet 1526	Coburg 1626	Lüneberg 1643	Hessia 1574/1662	Württemberg 1533/1559/1660	Strasbourg 1598/1670	Calvin, Electoral Palatinate 1563	Augsburg 1718
At the font							
		In many places, an address to sponsors, along with vow (question and answer)	Address to sponsors	Same	Same	Same, with questions	
			"Give the child a name"				
Renunciation	Same	Same	Same	Same			
Confession of Creed	Same	Same	Same	Same	Same (with three very explicit questions, but the renunciation is only indicated here; sponsors answer for themselves, not for child)	Same (and vow); Palatinate: Request to sponsors to confess the Creed "on which this child is baptized"; Creed, question: "Do you desire from true faith in the promise . . . that He will not only be our God but also our offspring's, to the thousandth generation, that this child should be baptized hereupon and receive the sealing of the sonship of God?" Response: Yes.	
"Wilt thou be baptized?"	Same	Same	Same (Friedberg 1704: "Wilt thou be baptized upon this Christian confession?")	Same: "Wilt thou be baptized hereupon?"			

Luther's Baptismal Booklet 1526	Coburg 1626	Lüneberg 1643	Hessia 1574/1662	Württemberg 1533/1559/1660	Strasbourg 1598/1670	Calvin, Electoral Palatinate 1563	Augsburg 1718
					Request for name of child	Father or sponsors give child a name	
							Our Father with prayer
Baptism	Same	Same	Same	Same	Same	Same	Same
Putting on baptismal gown with		Same					
Post-baptismal votum	Same	Same	Same	Same	Same	Same	Same
			Closing exhortation to sponsors				
Peace	Same	Same				Same	
					Salutation (one-sided)		
			Prayer of thanksgiving	Same	Same	Same	
				Reminder to parents and sponsors present		Same: exhortation to give child a Christian upbringing	Closing exhortation
			Only the peace: "Go in peace. Amen."	Benediction	Same		Same

[The **individual parts of the baptismal rite** are as follows.] Luther's way of beginning the baptismal rite immediately with the lesser exorcism disappears more and more in later church orders. Usually an address precedes, but sometimes, though very sporadically, there is first the **baptismal hymn**, which cannot appear at all until the part of Baptism conducted outside the church before the church door is no longer done as it was originally. Nevertheless, if the hymn is desired, the soonest it can come is at the beginning of the second part taking place inside the church, as, for example, in Waldeck (see below). In Saxony, the choir is already participating in the more ornate infant Baptisms in the sixteenth century;[9] in the Austria CO 1571 (fol. 123b), several Baptism hymns are suggested "if there is time"; and in the formulary for adult Baptism in the same church order, there is to be choral and congregational singing within the rite and at the conclusion. According to the Weimar *Feldpredigerordnung* (Colmar, 1643), singing can be done before the baptismal sermon: "Christ, unser Herr" or "Nun lob, mein Seel." According to the Bayreuth *Chorordnung* (1724), the choir sings one or two stanzas at the beginning of the rite from "Christ, unser Herr" or another baptismal hymn. In Schweinfurt,[10] until it is forbidden in 1716, organ music and church music took place before and after Baptisms. In Rhineland-Westphalia,[11] table hymns also used to be sung at home Baptisms.

Likewise seldom in that time was the **opening votum**, for which not only Zwingli, Calvin, and their orders, as well as Augsburg,[12] but also medieval ones have Ps. 121:2: "Our help . . . ."[13] It is found later also in Oettingen 1707. In Mecklenburg 1708, it is "In the name of our Lord Jesus Christ"; and in Braunschweig 1709: "In the name of Jesus! Amen."

The **Words of Institution** (Matt. 28:18–20 and [or] Mark 16:15–16) as the divine, constitutive commandment was incorporated only in Erbach 1560/1745, Schwäbisch-Hall 1615, and Mecklenburg 1708 in combination with the aforesaid votum as an "introit" at the beginning of the observance—a position certainly appropriate for them. Many other agendas also include them embedded in their opening addresses, in which form it spread throughout the regions of Braunschweig and Lüneburg as well as in Verden[14] and Lauenburg: "The parents of this child have . . . ," where they occur right at the beginning. Other exhortations of this kind are found in Coburg 1626, Meiningen 1682, Hildburghausen 1685, Gotha 1689, and Goltz's private agenda of 1614. They are further inserted in a number of places in the disseminated southern German exhortation: "A child has been presented to us here . . . ." It is found thus in Schwäbisch-Hall, Burg Friedberg, Ulm (from 1700), Baden 1720, etc.; Frankfurt 1644ff., Speyer 1700, Strasbourg in the address: "Beloved in the Lord, since you have brought this your child . . ."; also in certain Augsburg exhortations; likewise in Leutkirch. Especially impressive are the Words of Institution in the adult Baptism formulary from Austria 1571, yet after the Flood Prayer.

9 See Rautenstrauch, *Luther und die Musikpflege*, p. 110.

10 *Polizeiordnung* 1716, p. 185.

11 Von Oven, *Kultus*, p. 69.

12 In Augsburg, the "apostolic greeting."

13 Rietschel II, p. 62.

14 In Bremen 1702 likewise, but at the close of the exhortation: "Dear, devout Christians, forasmuch as this child has been brought . . . ."