

Music, Worship and Martin Luther

Charles P. St-Onge
4th Year Master of Divinity Student
Concordia Theological Seminary
Fort Wayne, IN

1622 Cheshire Circle
Middletown, OH 45042

March 30, 2003

Introduction

In his best-selling book *The Purpose Driven Life*, Pastor Rick Warren writes, “There is no such thing as ‘Christian’ music; there are only Christian lyrics. It is the words that make a song sacred, not the tune. There are no spiritual tunes. If I played a song for you without the words, you’d have no way of knowing if it were a ‘Christian’ song.”¹ On the other hand, composer Paul Hofreiter writes that the very music of Bach’s *Mass in B Minor* contains “the various theological emphases found in Lutheranism, such as a high Christology, justification and sanctification, law and gospel, the sacraments, *theologia crucis*, *simul justus et peccator*, the *finitum capax infiniti*, and eschatological hope.”² These two statements, diametrically opposed one to the other, serve as an entrée into the question at hand: is instrumental music, considered apart from lyrics, theologically-neutral? To put the question another way, is there a specifically ‘Lutheran’ music that corresponds to the distinct Lutheran confession of the Christian faith? This question is here addressed from two perspectives. The first is from the historical perspective of Luther, his time, and his own views on music. The second is from the point of view of contemporary research into the connection between music and cultural as well as theological discourse.

Music and Martin Luther

Luther was trained in music performance and was himself an accomplished composer. Author Helen Pietsch writes, “As with most music students of his time, Luther had a grounding in both singing and the lute and was recognized as a skilled lute-player with a pleasant tenor voice.”³ For Luther, music was not a ‘dark art’ but one which he grasped as well as any other educated person of his time. He enjoyed singing and playing his lute at home. Some Christian writers of the past, notably Augustine, were distrustful of music and its emotional effect. Augustine was “afflicted with scruples of conscience whenever he discovered that he had derived pleasure from music and had been happy thereby” and “was of the opinion that such joy is unrighteous and sinful.”⁴ Not so Luther. He affirmed as a great benefit the power of music to move the emotions. Luther wrote the following concerning music:

Whether you wish to comfort the sad, to terrify the happy, to encourage the despairing, to humble the proud, to calm the passionate, or to appease those full of hate — and who could number all these masters of the human heart, namely, the emotions, inclinations, and affections that impel men to evil or good?—what more effective means than music could you find?⁵

This belief in the positive emotive quality of music was not to be restricted to the secular sphere. Luther felt that church music could and should move the emotions, as well. When presented with some choral canons by the composer Lukas Edemberger, Luther commented that “they were neither enjoyable nor pleasing because the composer seemed more interested in writing counterpoint than writing interesting music. ‘He has enough of art and skill, [Luther said,] but is lacking in warmth.’”⁶

Music in Luther’s Social Milieu

A word is necessary here on the role of music in the society of Luther’s day. The massive music industry of the United States had no counterpart in 16th century Europe. Music was not a business, but an integral part of the fabric of life. The line between ‘professional’ and ‘amateur’ musician was not nearly as stark as it is now. “In Luther’s time, the dichotomy between secular/sacred and popular/classical music was not as wide as it is today.”⁷ In our time, there is a heavy stress on novelty and innovation in music. The hit groups of today are the ones who have successfully created a unique musical style – one might consider Jazz/Country/Pop artist Norah Jones or the girl-band/string-quartet Bond as exemplary of this trend. In Luther’s time, tradition and familiarity were the ideal.⁸

Second, there was an emphasis on tune over effect. Music was characterized by its melody line – the more memorable the melody, the more likely the music would survive and spread in popularity. This is also in contrast to current trends in popular music, where the effect the music creates in its listeners often leaves any thought of melody far behind. The reason for this emphasis on familiar and memorable melodies was the use of music as a conveyor of information. Music was not meant to awake emotions in the listener for the sake of the emotions alone. The emotion of the music was designed to complement a particularly story or message. More than that, the music made the text more memorable and therefore more likely to *be* remembered.⁹

One could therefore argue that Luther used music in the same way that the poets and minstrels of the village tavern used it: to communicate information. There was a “fluid boundary between the sacred and secular spheres,” and religious songs would be as apt to be heard in the tavern as tavern tunes were to be heard in the home, or even adapted for use in the liturgy.¹⁰ This accounts for the fact that, as one author writes, “stylistically there is very little difference between a German popular song in the sixteenth century, a sacred Protestant chorale and a *Leise*.”¹¹ What did concern Luther was the direction in which music took one’s emotions. This direction should be directly related to the text that accompanied the music. Music could arouse love, but if the love spoken of in the words was lustful and not directed in more wholesome directions – towards wife, Christ, church, or even state, for example – it did not have Luther’s approval. In his introduction to the Wittenberg hymnal of 1524, Luther writes:

These songs were arranged in four parts to give the young—who should at any rate be trained in music and other fine arts—something to wean them away from love ballads and carnal songs and to teach them something of value in their place, thus combining the good with the pleasing, as is proper for youth.¹²

Music in Luther’s Reforms

Music certainly played a key role in Luther’s reformations of the Christian church. First, Luther encouraged the use of music in the church’s worship. This is not at all to imply that music was not part of worship before his reforms. However, music had been to a certain extent relegated to ‘professionals’ and taken away from the people. What Luther wanted to restore was the involvement of the people in the worship of God. Communion in Christ’s blood was not to be reserved for a special priestly class; even less was the praise of the people to be restricted to a special musical class. “By involving the people in music, Luther ensured that the formerly passive audience, who comprehended little of the Latin service, would be participants in worship.”¹³ Carl Schalk, the eminent Lutheran hymn writer, believed that “Luther’s desire for the active participation of the congregation through hymnody was a result of his concern that the people participate actively *in the singing of the liturgy*.”¹⁴

Luther drew inspiration for his congregational music from three sources.¹⁵ The first was Latin, or what is commonly called Gregorian, chant. These chants had a long history within the church, and Luther adapted many of the more common ones for congregational use. An example of a Gregorian chant adapted to become a congregational song is “Creator Spirit Heavenly Dove,” *Lutheran Worship* Hymn 156. A second source of congregational hymnody was popular medieval unison hymns, such as “In the Very Midst of Life”, *Lutheran Worship* Hymn 265.¹⁶ A third source of music for Luther was traditional folk tunes. It is on this point that there arises the most controversy. Some see these folk tunes as having both a secular and a religious origin. The religious folk tunes were melodies associated with pilgrimage songs and tales of the saints. The secular tunes were more closely related to the sharing of political news and of satire. Of those who believe that traditional folk tunes can be

divided into “secular” and “religious” origin, some believe Luther used only the latter. One LCMS musician writes, “There is no evidence in his corpus of chorales that he borrowed popular melodies for his hymns.”¹⁷ Other researchers believe that Luther used both secular and religious tunes.¹⁸

But the controversy surrounding Luther’s use of both ‘religious’ and ‘secular’ folk music may well be beside the point. As observed earlier, the line in Medieval Germany between the sacred and the secular is, musically speaking, difficult to draw. A tune used to accompany a story about St. Anne may, the next night, be used to tell the news of the Emperor’s death, and then to describe the value of a good mistress. One historian of the period writes, “All types of [folk] music were monophonic...composed of four to eight lines of poetry, and based on simple musical structures such as the German Bar form (AAB).”¹⁹ Here is where the popular notion of Luther’s use of ‘bar music’ comes in. Luther did indeed use popular ‘bar’ music. What this means, however, is that Luther used a very common compositional technique in setting his hymns to music. It does not mean that Luther necessarily raided the taverns of Wittenberg for ‘secular’ tunes for his church. Rather, Luther wrote his hymns following an A-A-B ‘bar’ form. Such a form consists of a melodic system that repeats twice, followed by a unique and unrepeatable melodic system. An excellent example of this ‘bar form’ music is Luther’s hymn, “Dear Christian One and All Rejoice,” *Lutheran Worship* Hymn 353.²⁰

In any case, whether the music Luther adapted was a folk tune, a chant, or a medieval hymn, the emphasis was always on an enjoyable and *singable* melody. The importance of a tune’s ‘singability’ can best be seen in a technical examination of Luther’s hymns. The melodic range Luther used most often was a ninth, a very comfortable singing range.²¹ The modes that Luther most often used were the easiest ones to sing: the Dorian and Ionian modes.²² Luther was also very concerned that whatever music was used for a hymn, it not only had to make the text easy to sing but it also had to match the intangibles of the text. For Luther it was not enough for a chosen tune to ‘match syllables;’ it also had to match the feeling of the text. Regarding his composition of the *Deutsche Messe*, Luther writes:

To translate the Latin text and retain the Latin tone or notes has my sanction, though it doesn’t sound polished or well done. Both the text and notes, accent, melody, and manner of rendering ought to grow out of the true mother tongue and its inflection, otherwise all of it becomes an imitation, in the manner of the apes.²³

Luther in Theological Context

Where did Luther’s views on music place him among the other reformers of the church? Luther had a high view of the value of music, and as has been shown approved of using several different melodic forms of music in worship. Luther also approved of using hymn lyrics not necessarily taken word for word from the Scriptures. While his texts often paraphrased the Scriptures, they also explained them, and propounded specific points of doctrine. Luther certainly approved of using instruments to enhance the music of the church’s liturgy, including the organ. He also had “a tendency to accommodate renaissance thinking, to value music humanistically as a performance and as art...rather than...[as] a mathematical science valued for its theoretical content.”²⁴ Luther parted ways with Augustine, Ambrose, and other writers of the early church in believing that the emotive value of music was a positive, not a negative. Lastly, Luther valued the musical tradition of the church. He is recorded to have said regarding Lutheran worship, “It would be good to keep the whole liturgy with its music, omitting only the canon.”²⁵ All of these views placed Luther occasionally at odds with John Calvin, but most certainly so with Ulrich Zwingli.

For both Luther and Calvin, music was seen as something theologically significant. Both of them believed that music could “arouse devotion and is a tool of the Holy Spirit.”²⁶ They shared the belief

that the use of music Scriptural backing. Calvin, however, was more pessimistic than Luther about the “pure benefits” of music for the church and the Christian. He tended to fall in with Augustine’s view, that anything other than Scripture that aroused the emotions must be somewhat suspect. Calvin permitted the use of music in worship, but sought to control its emotive effects:

Calvin’s concern that music has the ability to take one’s attention away from the spiritual also resulted in his insistence on monophony: [Calvin writes:] ‘And we have never been forbidden to...delight in musical harmony...But to wallow in delight...to intoxicate mind and heart with present pleasures...such are very far removed from a lawful use of God’s gifts.’²⁷

Zwingli went much further than Calvin in his distrust of music. Like Luther, Zwingli was well trained in the musical arts. Musical training, after all, was an important part of medieval education. Nonetheless, Zwingli “prohibited all singing and instruments in worship services and even permitted the desecration of church organs.”²⁸ Why this radical forsaking of the musical tradition not only of the church, but of his society in general? The answer can be found in Zwingli’s theology. Zwingli rejected the Lutheran and Roman Catholic understanding of God working through means, for he saw no way for the divine and spiritual to work through the physical world without denying its divine nature. In the same way, Zwingli also concluded that true music, if it is to praise the divine, can not in any way be of physical origin. Zwingli went so far as to say that when Paul spoke of spiritual songs and psalms, he meant music that is made “with the heart, and is private and not audible.”²⁹

The difference between Luther’s, on the one hand, and Calvin’s and Zwingli’s understanding of music on the other, can be traced to the same disparity between their theologies of the creation and of the incarnation. For Calvin and Zwingli, the things of this world, including our ‘flesh’, are sinful and cannot bring about much good. Since music, too, is a product of the world, it tends to lead people into worldliness, not to what is good and spiritual. “The spirit gives life, the flesh profits nothing.” (John 6:63). For Luther, though, God is now fully man, fully a part of history, and fully a part of creation. Creation itself has been redeemed by Christ, not simply the realm of the spiritual (Romans 8:21). Music is not an evil worldliness, then, when brought into the service of God in Christ Jesus. Music can arouse our God-given emotions, and help us to learn about God and his work on our behalf in Christ. Music serves theology, and in Luther’s view, stands next to theology as the highest art. Luther writes about this aspect of music in his preface to Georg Rhau’s *Syphoniae lucundae*:

Thus it was not without reason that the fathers and prophets wanted nothing else to be associated as closely with the Word of God as music. Therefore, we have so many hymns and Psalms where message and music join to move the listener’s soul, while in other living beings and [sounding] bodies music remains a language without words. After all, the gift of language combined with the gift of song was only given to man to let him know that he should praise God with both word and music, namely, by proclaiming [the Word of God] through music and by providing sweet melodies with words.³⁰

Luther saw the great value of music, more so than either his contemporaries or even Church Fathers such as Augustine and Ambrose. He was not embarrassed by music’s ability to affect the emotions; rather he embraced that aspect of music. Luther saw described in Scripture an intimate connection between music and the Word of God. How else could he account for the fact that the longest book of the bible is a book of musical poems, the Psalms? The best music, then, is that which weds itself with beauty to the Word of God. Music should never seek to be master over the text, but serve it by making it more memorable, and by helping to communicate its intellectual, but also its emotional, message. Music should make the liturgy of the church accessible to everyone. Any music that

accomplishes these purposes, whether a folk tune, a chant, or a medieval chorale, Luther found to be suitable and of value in the worship of the reformation church.

Music and the Contemporary Situation

For a church that lives and breathes 21st century air, understanding Luther in his own context does not sufficiently answer our most pressing questions. Luther's views must be translated, however inadequately, into our present day situation. Luther's horizons were confined to western Europe, while our world is, in the words of Marshall McLuhan, a "global village." The boundaries between the sacred and the secular were blurry in Luther's time; in our age, most starkly here in the United States, the boundary between sacred and secular is a battlefield. The key to bridging the gap between Luther's age and our own is to discuss current insights into music's ability to communicate, as well as to examine the role of music in our own 21st century western culture.

Does Music Carry Meaning?

There is without a doubt a firm belief in the musical academy that music, however imperfectly, carries meaning. It is simply not true to say that the communicative value of music is nil. Anyone can grasp this fact simply by considering how certain musical styles continue to be associated with certain secular rituals. A polka or disco music would not, at least as yet, be acceptable as the entrance march for a graduation ceremony. To the author's knowledge, no bride has as yet processed down the aisle to the strains of Beethoven's 5th Symphony or to the rapping rhymes of Limp Bizkit. The time for this may indeed come. But there remains within western culture a sense that music communicates emotion and attitude, and certain music is appropriate, and inappropriate, for specific rites and events. Liturgical musicologist McGann writes the following in this regard:

A Latino community singing *cantos*, accompanied by a *conjunto* or *Mariachi* ensemble; an Indian assembly singing *bhajan* to the accompaniment of a *tabla* and harmonium; a Vietnamese assembly chanting sacred texts and prayers in *doc khin* – an a capella form of chanting based on the tonal scale of the Vietnamese language. Each idiom is not only an acoustic/sonic tradition, but a carrier of social customs, or ritual expectations, of spirituality, and of cosmology.³¹

This is a stunning statement, akin to that made by Hofreiter at the beginning of this paper. Music not only evokes emotion, but is now also believed by musicologists to carry "social customs," "spirituality," and "cosmology." It may in fact be so stunning that one must take it with a grain of salt. What cosmology, for example, is communicated by the music of 'Greensleeves', 'Yellow Submarine,' or 'Listen God is Calling'? Nonetheless there may at least be some truth to the statements of McGann and other musicologists that "acoustic/sonic traditions" carry with them cultural contexts. McGann's belief that "aesthetic media are carriers of cultural meaning in themselves"³² must be taken seriously. If "music is a form of communication...that is inseparable from the human persons who make it and their cultural context,"³³ one must ask the question: what is the cultural context of the church, and what culture is the church communicating through its music? If music communicates nothing but worldly cultural elements, such as polkas bringing to mind beer and *liederhosen*, well and good. But if music also communicates, as McGann suggests, "spirituality" and "cosmology," should one perhaps be more cautious in choosing the forms of music to be used in Christian worship? Should one attempt to use only "Christian" music? Does such a music exist?

The Place of Music in our Culture

Unfortunately, we must recognize that no music is "culture free." To suggest that there is a "culture-free" music is to suggest the existence of some kind of "spiritual" music over and against a "worldly"

music. This type of reasoning would lead one to speak of Christ apart from his Jewish background, and apart from his historical time and place. This in turn leads to a radical reinterpretation of the incarnation. Lutherans confess that the Son of God was incarnate in a certain man who lived in certain years in a certain country. We cannot hold to this belief, while also denying that our preaching, our worship, and even our music *also* take place in a cultural context. It cannot be helped. To suggest otherwise is to return to a Zwinglian view of Christianity, and to see a radical disjunctive between the material world and the spiritual and divine realities of God.

Such is the path taken by those who argue that the church is its own “culture.” The church is not its own culture; it includes all cultures, although it in turn transcends them. Consider the words of John the Divine:

And they sang a new song, saying, ‘Worthy are you to take the scroll and to open its seals, for you were slain, and by your blood you ransomed people for God *from every tribe and language and people and nation*, and you have made them a kingdom and priests to our God, and they shall reign on the earth.’ (Revelation 5:9-10, emphasis the author’s)

The church is made up of every tribe, language, people and nation – every *culture* – on earth. Yet all these people have been gathered into one kingdom – a new nation, one whose culture transcends that of its members. This kingdom sings a new song. Yet at the same time, this song can not be quantitatively different from the old. It cannot be of a completely different nature, because the church remains in this world. While in this flesh and on this earth, Christians are confined to making music with the same instruments and the same voice boxes as unbelievers. The true City of God is intertwined inextricably in this world with the City of the World. So what remains is a paradox. The church’s music comes from the world, yet it must be of a different quality than the world. The church’s music may arise out of the old, but it must at the same time be a new song.

We must consider for a moment, then, our modern musical situation. What musical air does our American culture breath, for example? Certainly one of the most important aspects of our culture’s music is rhythm. Simon Frith, a British rock critic and cultural studies scholar, writes about rhythm’s importance:

For the popular music audience the easiest way into the music is almost always rhythmically... it is through rhythm ... that we most easily participate in a piece of music, if only by tapping our feet, clapping our hands, or just jiggling our head up and down.³⁴

Rhythm is definitional for our modern culture’s understanding of music. Underneath the mass-marketed pop, rock, and hip-hop music of Los Angeles, underneath the country and western music of Austin and Nashville, underneath the blues and jazz of Chicago and New Orleans, we find across the board a strong emphasis on rhythm. Herein lays both a profound similarity and radical difference between music in our time and in Luther’s time. Ironically, complex and syncopated rhythms were as important a part of music in Luther’s time as they are in ours. Consider Luther’s *magnum opus*, “A Mighty Fortress.” As it was originally written, it is a highly syncopated and rhythmic piece.³⁵ Only in the 17th and 18th century did the “simplified” version come into widespread use. When the modern Christian music group *Maranatha* recorded “A Mighty Fortress” for a “Promise Keepers” rally, it should be obvious which version they chose to use. The difference between Luther’s time and ours is that, for Luther’s congregation, the tune was known and easy for the people to sing. The *Maranatha*

version does not, and is not meant, to encourage congregational singing, but rather turns the congregation into an audience.

Conclusion

Herein lies the crux of the problem with the indiscriminate use of any and all music in western Christian worship. From the perspective of Luther, the problem with the average so-called 'contemporary worship service' is not with the drum-set, the electric guitar, or the so-called 'praise singers.'³⁶ Neither is it with the use of country, hip-hop, blues, rock, or pop 'music' as the backing for any newly minted 'hymns.' One cannot find in Luther justification for using only one type of music. Certainly one cannot find in Luther justification for avoiding syncopated or rhythmic music. Furthermore, as shown above, there is no 'culturally-neutral' music that can serve as a basis for critiquing any other musical forms. A musical form cannot simply be rejected because it is "not from our continent." Luther would instead have critiqued any new form of music to be used in worship on this basis: whether it aids or detracts from the congregation's ability to worship; in other words, to *sing*. The music of the church must undergird, and never overpower, its associated text, and it must bring the congregation into, not lead it away, from participation in the church's liturgy.

Carl Schalk criticizes the music of today's North American church for bowing to "the banal melody, the trite rhythm, the treachery harmony, and a striving for easy effect."³⁷ All this may be true. But the critique Luther would mount against much of today's church music, I believe, would be different. First, too much so-called "church" music does not promote congregational participation. Whether the music is led front and center by a band with overwhelming electric instruments and an unfollowable melody, or whether it is backed by an overpowering organ playing an unknown tune, Luther's critique would be the same. "Is the music you're playing helping the people to worship? Is it encouraging the people to participate in the church's liturgy, or reducing the congregation to the status of audience?" Second, Luther would critique our obsession with emotionalism. On the one hand, come congregations are obsessed with finding music that will awake just the right 'feeling' in the congregation. On the other hand, congregations can be just as obsessed with completely divorcing music from any emotion or feeling. One should never allow one's emotions to get in the way of true worship! Neither of these approaches is wholesome; neither is Christian; and neither, for certain, is Lutheran.

Our own Missouri Synod is caught in what at least one professor on this campus has dubbed the "Worship Wars." There is no denying that our Synod is split over the issue of what is happening when Christians gather together on Sunday morning. At the heart of the split is the issue of music. As is often the case in any conflict, all the factions seem to be at least a little in the wrong. The best way out of the impasse, as this author sees it, is a recovery of Luther's understanding of music. There is no place in our worship for a fixation on one form of music as the "correct" and exclusive form. Besides, what form shall we pick?³⁸ Whatever form is suggested as the appropriate one will almost certainly exclude another form that would have been considered perfectly acceptable to Luther. Neither is there a place in the church's music for an "anything goes" attitude toward music. We must as Christians recognize that our American culture is a musical "mess". Music is being removed from school curriculums. The average parishioner, who at one time knew not only how to sing but how to play at least one instrument and to read music, is now for all intents and purposes musically illiterate. Our society no longer shares a common musical heritage, but is fragmented into a myriad of musical styles and preferences, almost all of which are in a constant state of flux. The musically novel is upheld and honored, while the stable and constant is maligned and left behind. Given all of this, it is not so much imperative that the church's music captivate people's ears, as that it encourages people to open their mouths and move their tongues. That is the only attitude toward church music that would be faithful

to Luther. I believe such an attitude would create a musical atmosphere in our congregations that would make the Great Reformer proud.

End Notes

¹ Rick Warren, *The Purpose Driven Church*, (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2002), 66.

² Paul W. Hofreiter, "Bach and the Divine Service: The *B Minor Mass*" in *Concordia Theological Quarterly*, July 2002, 224.

³ Helen Pietsch, "On Luther's Understanding of Music" in *Lutheran Theological Journal*, December 1992. 160.

⁴ Pietsch, 162.

⁵ Martin Luther, "Preface to Georg Rhau's *Symphoniae Iucundae*" in *Vol. 53: Luther's works, vol. 53 : Liturgy and Hymns*, J. J. Pelikan, H. C. Oswald & H. T. Lehmann, Ed. (Fortress Press: Philadelphia, 1999, c.1965), 323.

⁶ Carl Schalk, *Luther on Music*. (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1988) 24.

⁷ David W. Music, "Getting Luther out of the Barroom" in *The Hymn*, July 1994, 51.

⁸ "Although singers sometimes created new melodies for their songs, the more common (and practical) procedure was to create a contrafactum, a new text for a preexistent, and ideally well-known, melody." Oettinger, 27.

⁹ Rebecca Wagner Oettinger, *Music as Propaganda in the German Reformation*. (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2001) 25.

¹⁰ "The fluid boundary between the sacred and secular spheres made popular music welcome in the Christian churches of Germany, either as part of the liturgy or in paraliturgical religious activities. Religious song was also at home in the non-sacred world, sung as devotion or as entertainment in the same homes and streets where secular pieces predominated." Oettinger, 21.

¹¹ Oettinger, 21.

¹² Martin Luther, "Preface to the 1524 Wittenberg Hymnal" in *Vol. 53: Luther's works, Liturgy and Hymns* J. J. Pelikan, H. C. Oswald & H. T. Lehmann, Ed. (Fortress Press: Philadelphia, 1999, c1965), 315

¹³ Pietsch, 166.

¹⁴ Schalk, 41.

¹⁵ A fourth source of Reformation music, polyphonic chorales, was retained by Luther but remained a special province of the choir and instrumental musicians. Luther saw the value of retaining this music, but it could never be a way of opening up participation in the liturgy to the general congregation. It should also be noted that Luther saw the choir as a tool for teaching new music. Unfortunately both the choir, and its contemporary equivalent the so-called "Praise Band," have too often become performers rather than teachers in our day. See in this regard Vol. 53, Luther's Works, 193.

¹⁶ Edward J. Foley, "Martin Luther: A Model Pastoral Musician" in *Currents in Theology and Mission*, December 1987, 407.

¹⁷ Daniel Zager, "Questions of Musical Style for the Church" on worship.lcms.org/plenaries/plenary-zager.pdf, (last accessed March 20, 2003), 6.

¹⁸ "The consistent and predominant employment of familiar texts and tunes thus begins to reveal the makings of a traditional yet imaginative talent in a clearly pastoral mode" Foley, 407. See also the introduction to Luther's hymns in the American Edition of his works: "The German folk song was the good earth from which all of Luther's hymns sprang. Its style textually and musically is evident everywhere, and its patterns are often clearly recognizable. The very first hymn by Luther, "A New Song Here Shall Be Begun," is modeled after the folk ballads, which told the stories of important events and personalities. Characteristic stock phrases and melodic turns of the folk song are found in all of Luther's hymns." Vol. 53: Luther's Works, 196.

¹⁹ Oettinger, 21.

²⁰ Foley, 409.

²¹ Even Luther's creedal hymn, 'We All Believe in One True God,' notable for its one-octave leap to a high D followed by a high E at the beginning of the second melodic system, has a range of only a 10th. *Lutheran Worship*, Hymn 213.

²² Unlike modern western music, which is based on 'major' and 'minor' scales, several types of 'scales' existed in Luther's time. These scales were known as 'modes.' The two modes Luther used most often, the Dorian and Ionian modes, are more or less the modes that will become known in our time as 'major' and 'minor',

(continued on next page)

respectively. It is not without reason that the other modes disappeared from common usage; they are much more difficult for the ear to hear and the voice to replicate. See Foley, 412.

²³ Martin Luther, "Against the Heavenly Prophets" in *Vol. 40: Luther's works, Church and Ministry II*, J. J. Pelikan, H. C. Oswald & H. T. Lehmann, Ed. (Fortress Press: Philadelphia, 1999, c1958), 141

²⁴ Pietsch, 161.

²⁵ Martin Luther, *Vol. 54: Luther's works, Table Talk*, J. J. Pelikan, H. C. Oswald & H. T. Lehmann, Ed. (Fortress Press: Philadelphia, 1999, c1967), 361.

²⁶ Pietsch, 162.

²⁷ Pietsch, 163.

²⁸ Pietsch, 161.

²⁹ Pietsch, 162.

³⁰ Martin Luther, "Preface to Georg Rhau's *Symphoniae Iucundae*," in *Vol. 53, Luther's Works, Liturgy and Hymns*. Edited by Pelikan, Jaroslav Jan, Hilton C. Oswald, and Helmut T. Lehmann. (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1999, c1965), 320.

³¹ Mary McGann, *Exploring Music as Worship and Theology*. (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 2002) 9.

³² McGann, 20.

³³ McGann, 21.

³⁴ Zager, 8.

³⁵ The author was born and raised in a Lutheran body in which the original version of "A Mighty Fortress" was never used. When introduced to the piece while in high school by a former Missouri Synod pastor, the author could not help but call it "the Jazz version" of the hymn.

³⁶ Even the most conservative Lutheran musicians and pastors recognize that the use of various instruments is desirable in worship. "[Lutheran music directors, pastors and congregations] are providing the best musical instruments they can for their musicians, the organ remaining central as the best support for congregational singing, but the piano, acoustic guitar, and wind and string instruments being used at the discretion of discerning church musicians." Zager, 14.

³⁷ Schalk, 52.

³⁸ Lutheran musician Carl Schalk notes that the church's music will change radically in our global culture. "No single group of Christians will or should be able to hang on indefinitely to whatever its particular vision of parochial provincialism may be." Schalk, 55.

Bibliography

- Foley, Edward. "Martin Luther: A Model Pastoral Musician" in *Currents in Theology and Mission*, December 1987. 405-418.
- Hofreiter, Paul W. "Bach and the Divine Service: The B Minor Mass" in *Concordia Theological Quarterly*, July 2002. 221-255.
- Luther, Martin. "Against the Heavenly Prophets" in *Vol. 40: Luther's works, vol. 40 : Church and Ministry II* (J. J. Pelikan, H. C. Oswald & H. T. Lehmann, Ed.). Luther's Works . Fortress Press: Philadelphia, 1999, c1958
- Luther, Martin. "Preface to the 1524 Wittenberg Hymnal" in *Vol. 53: Luther's works, vol. 53 : Liturgy and Hymns* (J. J. Pelikan, H. C. Oswald & H. T. Lehmann, Ed.). Luther's Works . Fortress Press: Philadelphia, 1999, c1965
- Luther, Martin. "Preface to Georg Rhau's Symphoniae Iucundae," in *Vol. 53, Luther's Works, Vol. 53 : Liturgy and Hymns*. Edited by Pelikan, Jaroslav Jan, Hilton C. Oswald, and Helmut T. Lehmann. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1999, c1965
- McGann, Mary. *Exploring Music as Worship and Theology*. Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 2002
- Music, David W. "Getting Luther out of the Barroom" in *The Hymn*, July 1994. 51.
- Oettinger, Rebecca Wagner. *Music as Propaganda in the German Reformation*. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate, 2001.
- Pietsch, Helen. "On Luther's Understanding of Music" in *Lutheran Theological Journal*, December 1992. 160-168.
- Schalk, Carl F. *Luther on Music*. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1988
- Susan, David J. "Some Parallel Emphases Between Luther's Theology and His Thought about Music, and Their Contemporary Significance" in *Concordia Journal*, January 1985.
- Warren, Rick. *The Purpose Driven Life*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2002.
- Zager, Daniel. *Questions of Musical Style for the Church*. worship.lcms.org/plenaries/plenary-zager.pdf, (last accessed March 20, 2003).