

MEMOIRS OF THE LUTHERAN LITURGICAL ASSOCIATION

Volumes I-VII.

Published by the Association Pittsburgh, Pa., 1906.

Copyright, 1906,

by

The Lutheran Liturgical Association.

[These volumes have been scanned and proofread, but may still contain errors. Original pagination has been indicated throughout.]

Volume VII

VII 1 LITURGICAL COLORS (P. Z. STRODACH)

VII 19 CONSECRATION (G. U. WENNER)

VII 27 THE LITURGICAL USE OF THE CREEDS (J. W. HORINE)

VII 35 THE LITURGY OF THE NORWEGIAN LUTHERAN CHURCH (E. K. JOHNSEN)

VII 49 CHRISTIAN WORSHIP IN THE FIRST POST-APOSTOLIC AGE (C. M. JACOBS)

VII 73 THE APPLICATION OF LUTHERAN PRINCIPLES OF THE CHURCH BUILDING (E. T. HORN)

VII 121 THE BIDDING PRAYER, LITANY, AND SUFFRAGES (C. K. FEGLEY)

VII 159 THE USE OF STAINED GLASS IN ECCLESIASTICAL ARCHITECTURE (E. F. KRAUSS)

VII 169 SACRED MONOGRAMS—THE CHARISMA AND THE HOLY NAME (E. F. KREVER)

LITURGICAL COLORS.

THE liturgical colors are those which the Church employs in her Cultus. There are liturgical colors in a wide and narrow sense. Those in the former are such as are prescribed for any artistic embellishment to Sanctuary or Church, in the dress of statuary, paintings, hangings, banners, carpets, even to the minutest detail in decorative color schemes.* In the narrow sense, with which we deal in this paper, the liturgical colors are those which the Church uses in the vestments for altar and priest in her various Offices. In both connections the colors are looked upon as being symbolic, and in their application, this symbolism is called upon to play an important part in conveying to the beholder particular attributes and ideas. In the latter case, in addition to their symbolism, the colors are so employed or scheduled, that their use may indicate the various Events and Seasons which make up the Church's Year. They are doubly-symbolic then, as a service-use, as well as a festival- or season-use. Their symbolism however is entirely the result of their religious use. The colors in use to-day in the Roman, Lutheran and Anglican Communion are, white, red, green, purple and black. These are *the* "Liturgical Colors."

Footnote: *This is the case in the Greek Church.

The *use of colors* in the worship of the Church is not of Christian origin. There can be no doubt that in this as in many other things, the Church of the New Covenant has adapted to her use that which existed for centuries in the Church of the Old Covenant. In addition to this she may have been influenced by the heathen systems with which she came in contact in so far as

she noticed the use of certain colors for priestly dress and in their sacrificial rites.* However the direct line seems to be that which leads back to the O. T. Church.† The colors which form the two groups are, in three out of five cases, the same; their symbolism is but slightly different, (due allowance being made for the difference between the two Churches, and the development of the Church of the N. T.);‡ the uses are the same: priest's dress and the important hangings and cloths in the Sanctuary.

Footnote: * This is not to be taken as an unqualified statement that such an influence bore direct results. The heathen systems employed an official priestly dress, as well as colors, in this and ritual. These were used symbolically. Cf. PORTAL: *Les Couleurs Symboliques*, Paris, 1857, under the various colors.

Footnote: † This cannot be absolutely proven simply because the color system of the Church is not found completely developed and in use till comparatively late. (In the 12 Cent. Innocent III) and the centuries to be bridged over give but scant traces of anything that might be considered as evidences of such a development. However those that do appear and can be accepted as genuine and accurate are fair ground for the establishment of such a claim. These will be referred to in the sequel.

Footnote: ‡ For example, where in O. T. times a color is looked upon as symbolic of an attribute of God, in the new this will be developed to the fuller symbolism, applied to One of the Persons of the Holy Trinity.

The use of colors in the Old Testament Church is not the result of man's artistic choice, nor is it a mere adaptation from another religion.§ It has the highest possible authorization. It is of Divine origin. It comes into existence in and with the Law, in Divine revelation. The colors so authorized are enumerated in Exodus 28, 5. They are: gold, blue, purple, scarlet and white (fine linen). The application of these colors as prescribed for general liturgical use, through the various chapters of Exodus and the other books of the Law, is as follows: ¶ The textures used for the hangings of the Tabernacle, and its inner

Footnote: § A negative critic might very readily try to prove that such a system is founded on Egyptian usage. That the Egyptian theology contained symbolic colors may be gathered from a number of writers, among them Portal as above; but the colors and symbols are so widely different that it will admit of no comparison whatever.

Footnote: ¶ Cf. F. DELITZSCH (Lotz): *Farben in der Bibel*, in P. R. E. 3 Ed. V, 759 ff.

roofing, and those for the sacred vestments of the priests, were of four colors, blue, purple, scarlet and white, These four combined were used in the outer curtains; the veil, the entrance curtain;* and the curtain for the gate of the court.† They were also used in the ephod, girdle and breast-plate of the High Priest.‡ Purple, blue and scarlet were used in the pomegranates about the hem of the High Priest's ephod.§ The robe of the High Priest's ephod, the lace of his breast-plate and the lace of his mitre, were exclusively of blue;¶ as well the fifty loops of the ten inner curtains.¶¶ The coats, mitres, bonnets and breeches of the priests were all of one color, white.** The hangings for the court were also of white.†† Cloths in which the sacred utensils were to be wrapped during the Pilgrimage were either of blue,‡‡ scarlet,§§ or purple.¶¶ Colors may also be found in use in some of the sacrificial rites, e. g., the scarlet thread in the cleansing of lepers.¶¶¶ The "gold" is enumerated with the four colors mentioned above, in Ex. 28: 5, and used in combination with them in various articles of the High Priest's dress, it is not looked upon as a color in the sense in which the others are considered, but is used for its appearance of splendor and brilliancy.***

The exact and comprehensive manner in which every Ser-

Footnotes: * Ex. 26: 1, 31, 36. † Ex. 27:16. ‡ Ex. 28: 5, 6, 8, 15.
 § Ex. 28: 33. ¶ Ex. 28: 28, 31, 37. ¶¶ Ex. 26: 4, 5.
 **Ex. 39: 27, 28. †† Ex. 27: 9; 38: 9. ‡‡ Num. 4: 6
 §§ Num. 4: 8. ¶¶ Num. 4: 13. ¶¶¶ Lev. 14: 4, 6, 5 1.

*** These colors and their use in the vestments have been tabulated by ROLFE: *The Ancient Use of Liturgical Colors*, London, 1879, p. 10, as follows:

VESTMENTS	WORN BY	COLOR
The Ephod	High Priest	gold, blue, purple, scarlet, white
The Girdle	High Priest	gold, blue, purple, scarlet, white
The Breast-plate	High Priest	gold, blue, purple, scarlet, white
The Robe of the Ephod	High Priest	blue
The Broidered Coat	High Priest	white
The Mitre	High Priest	white
Holy Crown	High Priest	gold, blue
The Coats	The Priests	white
The Girdles	The Priests	blue, purple, scarlet, white
The Bonnets	The Priests	white

vice—need, every object in and about the Tabernacle, every vestment for High Priest and his assistants, is described in the Law, is not only a positive proof of the definiteness and orderliness of the worship of Jehovah; but when attached to this all is its Divine origin and the Divine command authorizing this as the manner in which God is pleased to be worshiped, there is given to it all a weight which compels observance, and places it above the sphere of human choice or pleasure. And as the accessories are developed *for* man, so is the entire Cultus, coming directly from Jehovah, man's mind having no share in plan or ordering. It is revealed in complete form for man to obey and use; not a disconnected mass of indiscriminate rites, but a whole harmonious in all its parts. It is so developed and ordered that it *must* stand as one great *symbol* of the relation of Jehovah to Israel, and everything that develops out of that relation. There can be nothing then that is superfluous, nor that does not contribute its quota of meaning to that of the rest to make up the whole.

The fact then that the vestments of the High Priest and his assistants and the various curtains and coverings are so carefully described in every detail, is one whose importance to the system cannot be denied.* That they were to be of certain color, or combinations of color, or decorated with certain colors—all definitely ordered—is as important. This led many to believe that a distinct purpose was meant to be expressed thereby. This, is called their “symbolism;” and writers both ancient† and modern‡, have attempted to develop it.

Footnote: * In addition it may be noted that God forbids priests to appear in other garb when ministering before Him.

Footnote: † Among the ancients, PHILO, *Opp. I* and JOSEPHUS: *Ant. Bk. III, c. vii, § 7, p. 84.* WHISTON AND BURDEN Ed. Also *Ancient Jewish Commentators.*

Footnote: ‡ Moderns: CALVOER: *Rit. Eccl. Jena, 1705. II, Sec. III, c. 23.* KRAUSE: *De Colore Sacro. Lit. 1707.* CREUZER: *Symbolik, I. 125 sq.* BAHR: *Symbolik, I. 335.* FRIEDERICH: *Sym. d. Mos. Stiftshuette. Lpz. 1841, Studien und Kritiken. 1844. II. 315.* DELITZSCH: *Farbenstudien und Blumenstuecke. Lpz. 1888.* ROLFE: as above. LEGG: *The Anc't Use of Lit. Colors. London. 1882.* DELITZSCH (LOTZ) article as above.

Philo adapts his to the current Gentile philosophy and is of little service to our purpose; but Josephus, though he follows Philo's thought to some extent, produces a symbolism that is very interesting. He says:* "The veils which were composed of four colors declared the four elements; for the linen was proper to signify the earth, because the flax grows out of it; the purple, the sea, because that color is dyed by the blood of a shell-fish; the blue is fit to signify the air, and the scarlet will be an indication of fire. ... The vestments of the High Priest, being made of linen, signified the earth; the blue denoted the sky being like lightning in its pomegranates and resembling thunder in the noise of its bells; and the ephod showed that God had made the universe of four elements; and as for the gold interwoven, I suppose it related to the splendor by which all things are enlightened. He also appointed the breast-plate to be placed in the middle of the ephod to resemble the earth for that has the very middle place in the world; and the girdle which encompassed the High Priest round, signified the ocean which goes round about and includes the universe. The mitre which was of the color of blue seems to me to denote Heaven, for how otherwise could the Name of God be inscribed upon it? It was also illustrated with a crown of gold because of that splendor with which God is pleased."

Footnote: *Antiquities*. III. vii. 7. Latin in CALVOER: *Rit Eccl.* Pt. II. Sec. vii. c. xxiii. p. 485.

Footnote: † For example: *Green* is looked upon as the color symbolic of hope, because one thinks of the green of the plant which in Winter dies away, but in Spring revives again; or *blue*, as the symbol of *faithfulness*, reminding one of the Heavens whose blueness though for a time o'ercast, *always* breaks through again.

This, of course, is no symbolism in the true sense of the term nor worthy of the use of the colors in which they are found. These colors may have a natural symbolism,† but they are not symbolic in themselves. They only become symbolic in that the representation of particular subjects and ideas, is combined with them. Bearing this in mind, let us attempt to develop the

symbolism of these colors as used in the worship of Jehovah. Examining the table given above, one cannot help noticing the preeminence of the use of the “fair-linen,” (Byssus), the white. It appears to be *the* liturgical color and rightly so. It cannot be spoken of as a color in the exact sense of the term, yet it is. It is the simplest, purest,—primary and is the foundation for all the others. White is that wherein the light of the sun is reflected unhindered. Light is white and white is the *light* “color.” In contrast to it is black (which note is never authorized as a vestment or Tabernacle use) which absorbs all colors and does not reflect the light of the sun. The light in it is subdued, the colors buried. These two present the contrasts with which we must start: Life, light, joy, holiness, activity on the one side; over against them, death, darkness, sadness, wickedness, inactivity. These are the Biblical contrasts in which these colors figure. Alone, WHITE in the Scriptures is the mark of *purity* and *victory*. It is that which is the particular color symbol of the Deity* and hence of those in His immediate Presence,† and those directly ministering to Him. This then in the dress of the priests, used so thoroughly would mark the fact of *their official ministry*, the representatives of the Holy One and servants in His worship. In the garb of purity, serving Him the Pure and Holy One, they stand before the people clothed in that raiment which to them is the symbol of that in which they must come before their Lord, to offer to Him their sacrifices with clean hands and pure hearts. White is the color common to all priests. It is *over this* that the High Priest wears the “golden vestments” in which all the colors appear.

Footnote: * The Ancient of Days, the Eternal in Dan. 7:9 in snow-white robe. The Transfiguration of Christ.

Footnote: † The Angels and Spirits. Elders and souls washed clean. Rev. of S. John.

The purple has been the color of kingly garb from oldest time,‡ and always a mark of those in authority. In the garb of the High Priest it would mean that he is the servant of Him

Footnote: ‡ Judges 8: 26.

Who is spoken of as the King of kings and Lord of lords. *Purple* and *blue* being co-related as colors would be indicative, when used together in these vestments, of a two-fold activity of the Heavenly King.

PURPLE points to the *Majesty of God* in His *sublimity* and BLUE to the *Majesty of God* in His *condescension*. In connection with this latter note the color which is so prominent at the giving of the Law—beneath the Presence the purest blue—(sapphire)—It would follow from this that blue would always remind them of their Mighty God, the Law-Giver. Purple and blue then in the High Priest's vestments would mean that he is the servant of that Majesty, Who is sufficient unto Himself and yet condescends to covenant with man and is faithful in His covenant.

Scarlet is the color of fire, symbolic of destruction. Sins are spoken of as being "as scarlet" therefore deserving of wrath—punishment. It is scarlet which is found in cleansing and sacrificial rites. It may then be looked upon as a symbol of man's sinfulness and hence his guilt for which he must be punished unless he atone and obtain pardon. SCARLET then in the High Priest's vestments, with the white, would mean that he is the servant of the Holy God not only in His love but also in His wrath.

This is the liturgical use of colors in the O. T. Church. It has the Divine authority, but there is none for its symbolism. Yet we think there is one there and rightly so, whether that attempted is fitting or not. The use of the colors mentioned to the exclusion of all others, their definite appointment, cannot be considered as other than pointed and full of meaning. God authorizes, and man does no wrong to seek His purpose therein, if that purpose is to illuminate the use and aid in the understanding thereof.

The present use has much in common with the old. To say

it is traced back to the old and to trace it are two very different matters. Some writers say unqualifiedly that it comes direct and that there is excellent authority for it. These are in almost every case, Romanists and the authority, "Tradition." Others claim that with the development of some of the Church's dogmas, primarily those of the "Priesthood" and the "Sacrifice of the Mass" the entire Cultus had to be developed in conformity with it. This latter is the better position and more can be said in support of it. For when he who ministers becomes priest, then Sacrament becomes Sacrifice. How quickly then would a priestly dress arise, and where would one look for it more readily than to the example of the O. T. dress.* This, adapted to their need but feeling the effects of the customs in their time, with the additions necessary to the doctrine of the N. T. Sacrifice, would appeal the strongest. Had it not Divine authority? Was it not used in His worship?

Footnote: * Modern scholars do not consider this; but this use *is the legitimate example*, and we believe was considered, even though the fashion of the day made itself directly felt in the *form* the garments took.

Let us consider first what may be said for the former view mentioned above in the light of this development in the Church, and see to what it leads us.

The tradition is that some of the Apostles wore parts of the High Priest's dress. Eusebius† quotes a tradition which says St. John wore "the golden mitre." Epiphanius‡ bears the same testimony for St. James, the brother of the Lord. Valesius, Baronius,§ Bona¶ and other Romanists accept this as sufficient ground for their conclusion. The Council of Trent¶¶ adds to it its authority. There are many excellent evidences that the priests wore a white vestment** in secret during the Persecutions,

Footnote: † *Hist. Eccl.* III, 31.

Footnote: ‡ EPIPHANIUS: *Haer.* LXXVII, 14

Footnote: § *Analecta*, c. 34, n. 39.

Footnote: ¶ *Rerum Liturgicarum.* Lib, I, c. xxiv.

Footnote: ¶¶ Session 22. c. v.

Footnote: ** AUGUSTI: *Denkwuerdigkeiten*, XI, 309, where references may be found to Gregory Naz., Athanasius, Chrysostom, Sozomen, Jerome, Gregory of Tours.

but this is only hinted at, due to the “Secret Discipline” *—and openly as soon as the Church was left in peace. It is said of Constantine, that he presented “glorious” vestments to various churches for use at the Sacraments, as a thank-offering. A rubric in the Liturgy of St. Clement† bids the Bishop to put on the “glorious vestment” at the *Αναφορά*. There are a few other scattering references to priestly dress during the next few centuries, enough to lead to the time when they are found in wide use and almost completely developed.

Footnote: AUGUSTI: *Denk.* VIII, 208.

Footnote: † NEALE AND LITTLEDALE: *The Lits. of St. Mk., St. Jas., etc.* 3 ed. '75. DANIEL: *Codex Lit.* Vol. IV. *A. N. F.* Vol. VII.

There is sufficient evidence here to maintain without question that there was a distinct priestly official dress, and that it was white; but that other colors were employed, or that a complete symbolism was connected with it, cannot be shown.

Through these centuries comes the development of the doctrine of Sacrifice, and as it develops it brings many things with it. The Service—“the Mass”—develops with it. The Church Year side by side—until the Church stands forth outfitted with a complete system, a veritable “machinery of worship.” The church buildings, their furnishings, those of the Sanctuary and of those that minister there, all grow with and are added for its sake. It is then, late in this period that the Mass vestments appear in almost their present form, suddenly complete, and immediately considered symbolic. *These vestments are colored.*

The Pseudo-Alcuin is the first to mention five liturgical colors; and note their appointments. § The first authorization is found with Innocent III (1198-1216). ¶ He mentions four:

Footnote: ‡ A. KRAZER: *de Liturg.* 1786, p. 278 sqq. and in MSS illuminated by monks, wherein the coloring of vestments may be looked upon as evidence, as well as ancient mosaics.

Footnote: § BINTERIM: *Denkwuerdigkeiten.* IV, I. p. 197. ALCUIN: *de offic. eccl. c. de vestibus sacris.*

Footnote: ¶ INNOCENT III: *de sacr. Miss.* Lib. I. c. 65. *de quatuor coloribus principalibus, quibus secundum proprietates dierum vestes sunt distinguenda.* M. S. L. 217 p. 799. The other Rom. references may be added in this connection. RUPERTUS: *de div. off.* Lib. I. BONAVENTURA: *de explic. Missae.* WALF. STRABO *de reb. eccl.* c. 24. HUGO DE S. VICTORE: *de Sacram. Lib.* II. Parte IV. RABANUS MAURUS: *de institut. clericorum,* I. SICARD OF CREMONA: *Mit.* II. c. 5. M. S. L. 213. p. 77.

white, scarlet, black and green; and *bases the use on Exodus 28: 5 ff.* His appointment follows: *Color albus tanquam symbolum candaris vita, et castitatis*—for Feasts of Confessors and Virgins; *color rubeus*—for Feasts of Apostles and Martyrs; *color viridis*—for *Dominicales* and Feast Days; *color niger*—for Fast Days and Masses for the Dead. Added to these is the *color liturgicus quintus: violaceus*, which at his time was used only twice in the year at Rome: *Dominica Laetare* and *Festo Innocentium*. This use is limited to Rome and the sections of the Church where her direct influence was felt. In other sections while there is a use the differences are marked.* But this coming from the Pope served to introduce it more widely and make the use approach uniformity. The next century finds this the common use,† and as it is found developed in Durandus, with but few exceptions it is found authorized by Pius V (1566-1572) in the General Rubrics of the *Missale Romanum*. ‡

Footnote: * In Gall, Milan, England. Cf. first Table in ROLFE as above.

Footnote: † Wm. DURANDUS: *Rationale div. off.* Venice. 1589. Lib. III. c. xviii. *De quatuor coloribus, quibus ecclesia in ecclesiasticis utitur indumentis.* p. 54 ff. The “use” hereafter includes the other paraments as well.

Footnote: ‡ c. xviii. p. xxxix. Ed. *Mechliniae*. 1880.

The appointment of these colors and their symbolism as found in Durandus is as follows:

The four principal colors are white, red, black and green.

WHITE is used on the Festivals of Virgins who are not martyrs; and of angels; on all the Feasts of the Virgin; and on the Feast of All Saints, (though some use red on this day). White is here the symbol of purity.

On the Festivals of S. John, the Evangelist; of the Conversion of Paul; and of the “Throne of Peter” (reason to be given later); also from the Vigils of the Nativity to the Octave of the

Epiphany inclusive, intervening Martyrs' Days excepted. Reason: because of the splendor of the Star.

At the Nativity of the Saviour, and of John the Baptist since both were born without sin, for John was sanctified in the womb. (!)

On the Festival *Coena Domini* because of the consecration of the chrism for the purification of the soul.

On *Dominicales* at the office of the Mass until the Octave of the Ascension inclusive, whenever the office is celebrated *de tempore*, except on Rogation or Martyrs' Days.

At Easter because of the white raiment of the angel, and the white robes of those who are then baptized.

At the Ascension because of the whiteness of the cloud which received Christ and the white apparel of the angel.

At the Consecration of a Church, on whatever day it comes, for the Church is the Bride of Christ.

RED (SCARLET) is to be used on the Feasts of Apostles, Evangelists and Martyrs, because of the blood which they shed.

On the Feast of the Invention of the Cross, in memory of the Blood of Christ; some however, prefer to use white on this day.

From the Vigils of Pentecost to the following Saturday inclusive, in memory of the fire which descended on the Apostles.

The death of John the Baptist is celebrated with red.

All Saints' Day is celebrated with red as it was instituted in honor of the Martyrs; but the Roman use is *white* ("they shall stand clad in white raiment"), moreover, Virgins and Confessors who are not Martyrs are included in that celebration.

BLACK is to be used on Good Friday—*feria sexta in parasceve*; on days of affliction and abstinence on account of sin; and on Rogation Days; at penitential processions and Masses for the Dead.

From Advent to the Vigils of the Nativity and from *Septuagesima* to the *Sabbato magna*.

On the Feast of the Holy Innocents, though some prefer red.

Black is the symbol of affliction for sin, of adversity, of sorrow and death, and marks deep penitence.

GREEN is to be used on *feria* and common days and especially between the Octave of the Epiphany and *Septuagesima* and between Pentecost and Advent. “For green is between whiteness and blackness and redness.”

To these four colors others are related as violet to black. To use violet on days when black is to be used is not improper. Hence the Roman Church uses violet from I Advent to the Vigils of the Nativity and from *Septuagesima* to the Vigils of Easter (exclusive), excepting *feria quinta Coena Domini* (white) and *feria sexta in parasceve* (black).

Another Roman use* is three colors on the altar at Easter. First, black—removed after the First Lesson, signifying the time before the Law; second, whitish (*sub albus*), removed after the Second Lesson, typic of the time under the Law; third, red, removed after the Third Lesson, stands for the reign of grace through the Blood of Christ.

Footnote: * DURANDUS: *Rat.* I. c. 3 p. 13

The above includes the main Roman appointments and a symbolism of the use widely accepted. In many respects it is pointed and very beautiful, and serves its purpose in lending its share to the complete harmony of Office and Season or Feast. But the color symbolism does not stop there. It is pushed into an artificial use which makes it well-nigh valueless. The vestments and other paraments† have their own peculiar symbolism,

Footnote: † BONA: *Tract Asceticus de Missa.* c. V. § II. p. 121. Also his *Rer. Lit.* Lib. I, cxxiv. p. 280 ff. opp. Antwerp. 1694. Cf. Collects to be said when vestments, etc. are assumed. *Miss. Rom.* lxxvi ff. Bona concludes his chapter *De sacris vestis et earum significatione* thus: *Sicut autem casula in duas partes dividitur, ita charitas duplex est, erga Deum et proximum: et sicut illa varias exigit colores, juxta temporis aut festivitatis diversitatem, ita haec varias affectus, nunc laetitiae ob Dei magnalia, nunc gratitudinis ob ejus beneficia, nunc fortitudinis in adversis, nunc tristitiae ob propria et aliena peccata.*” opp. p. 121.

some very beautiful, some very artificial; and then the *colored* vestment, etc. is provided with one as well. It is in such a complexity* that all the beauty of the simple symbolism is the result proves its uselessness to the original purpose. That, we take it, was to aid both priest and worshiper to gain the *most* good out of the great harmonious, beautiful Office. Through the Church Year trying to make vivid the Great Things in her history, of Christ and His work, and to aid, appointing a color which with its simple and effective meaning, would always bring home through eye and thought some event or teaching; through the Church Year reflected in every Office, and the Office itself lending its share, in ministrant garbed in vestment of the Season—or Feast—color, serving before the altar whereon or about which it showed again—could one help but *see* the purpose?

Footnote: * During the Middle Ages “symbolism” runs riot in the Church, in every sphere. Cf. JOS. SAUER: *Symbolik d. Kirchengebaudes und seiner Ausstattung in der Auffassung des Mittelalters*. Freiburg. 1902.

The simple use is the proper and legitimate use, nothing can be said against it. Years of use have given it sanction sufficient to remain untouched to-day. Nor is there need to prove its growth from pre-Christian times to make it valid. If it subserves a good purpose and is in harmony with the Church’s faith and doctrine, then let it be used.

Much is urged against the use of these colors in the Lutheran Church; some would keep but one or two. Their scheme is “foreign.” Their purpose of “little value.” Their use “overdrawn.” “We have no scheme of priestly garb.” But the garb and the colors are ours as much as the Liturgy and the *altar* and the *antependia* which hang before it! One could make an excellent plea merely from an artistic standpoint, but a stronger argument the Church *lives* every year. It is her *Church Year*. There is nothing that lends itself to marking the various Seasons and Feasts in the Year so vividly as the changing colors. The spirit of the Day or Time may make itself felt in the Variables

and other parts of the Service; but there is the Day's and Season's *color with its meaning*. The eye beholds and instantly the mind is working. What is the result? Is it helpful or valueless?

From an evangelical standpoint, this meaning has been summarized by Meurer very pointedly. He writes:* “WHITE, the pure brilliant white, ‘the unbroken light,’ ‘the color of angels and saints’ as Luther calls it, is certainly the chief Festival Color, if one dare name it color.

“In RED, that majestic color, the color of fire and blood, the Bride of Christ, the Church—which was founded through the Baptism of Fire of the Holy Spirit and preserves the testimony of so many precious blood-witnesses and followers of the Lamb Who, was slain—clothes herself rightly on her highest Feast Days.

“GREEN is the most common and widely diffused color, the every day garb of the earth, the color which the eye is able to stand in great masses without being tired or blinded thereby and which always has something fresh about it. It will therefore lend itself—as a complete contrast to the red,—as the best color for the Church's common Seasons.

“VIOLET is a solemn earnest color and is especially appropriate for the times of preparation.

Concerning BLACK there is need for little comment. It is the negative to light, the other pole of the color scale. It is accepted as the universal symbol of the deepest sorrow and humility.

The appointments proper to the Lutheran Church.

WHITE:— Festival of the Nativity and throughout the Christmas Cycle to and inclusive of the Festival of the Epiphany, and the Sunday which falls in its Octave.

Festival of Faster, its Octave, Quasimodogeniti

Footnote: * MEURER: *Altarschmuck*. p. 52.

and the Easter Cycle inclusive of the Feast of the Ascension and the Sunday after, Exaudi.

All Festivals of the Virgin which are retained.

RED (SCARLET):—Feast of Pentecost, and its Octave, Feast of the Holy Trinity.

Festival of the Reformation.

Festivals of Apostles, St. Michael's Day, Feast of All Saints.*

At the Dedication of a Church.

A Day of General Thanksgiving, and Festival of Harvest.

GREEN:—The Epiphany Season exclusive of the Festival and its Octave, and the Trinity Season exclusive of the Festival of the Holy Trinity, and any Apostles' or other Days otherwise appointed.

PURPLE:—The *Tempora clausa*, Advent and the Passiontide beginning with Septuagesima and continuing through the Saturday in Holy Week, excepting Holy Friday.

BLACK:—Holy Friday. † Days of Humiliation and Prayer; and the "Festival of the Commemoration of the Dead" (Totenfest) if observed. ‡

A *complete* "Table of Appointments" is hard to find. The writer has compared some which are quite full but which do not agree in all respects with each other, nor with the above. This is based upon those existing at the time of the Reformation. If a use was found to be pure it was retained, if not the attempt was made to make it so.

As the Centre of all the Church's Life is Christ, so is the

Footnote: * White would not be an inappropriate use; for reason see above under "white," p. 6 and note "†".

Footnote: † Some appoint this for the entire Holy Week.—MEURER.

Footnote: ‡ This "Festival" is of German origin and widely observed in the German Churches.

Centre of the Church's Year, His Life and Work, and That in Its humility and exaltation is reflected in her days. For the humility, she takes the color of royalty to express the majestic lowliness of That Life for It is not a common life of humility and martyrdom, but That of the Royal Son of God; and when the deepest hour is reached and the Cross is raised, as the earthly sun is darkened and awe and fear reign when He gives up the ghost, so too she takes that color for her symbol. It shrouds the Church, it shrouds the heart in memory of that awful Day. It is pointed that she uses this color but one day in all her Year; and as it passes quickly from the eye to give place to its opposite, so too that awful thought is lost in the wonder and glory of the Resurrection.

For the days that tell of herself and her own faithful and martyred ones, she takes the color symbol, of her birth, of her ardent service, of the blood-giving of her children.

For her quiet days. she takes the green—ever fresh, ever bright, to pass through her long Seasons as she gives the Word though so often heard, but always holding something new for those who journey with her, through the quiet, refreshing, ever green pastures of the Word.

There is no complete satisfactory treatment of the subject of Liturgical Colors, their history, use and symbolism, to the writer's knowledge; and the working out of this paper has been a matter of going through many things, in many cases in vain, hunting for threads of testimony with the purpose, to gather the accurate and let them speak for themselves. The treatment is far from thorough and complete; but if some hints have been contributed which will show the value, beauty and usefulness of the Use, then the purpose will be accomplished.

Liturgical colors—and one cannot speak of colors as “liturgical” without meaning they are symbolic*—are and always will

Footnote: * They never were *simply a scheme of colors*.

be classed as *adiaphora*. But as we have sought and claim to have the pure and true in the Essentials, and seek to make them what the Church has always thought them, a grand harmony illuminated by its every part; then we dare not neglect a part which adds its share thereto. We would say unhesitatingly if Liturgical Colors could be shown to be useless to, and of no value in, the Church's Cultus, that they should not have a moment's thought. On the other hand if they are of value should they be slightly passed over or altogether ignored?

How helpful to the worshiper when, on entering the Church, say on S. Paul's Day, he sees Altar and Pulpit decked with the scarlet hangings embroidered with the ancient symbols of the Deity. They draw and hold his eye and soon he thinks of S. Paul, Apostle—Martyr—Apostle working with never wavering love and devotion for the Lord Whom he had been granted to know; and Martyr finally bearing last witness for His cause and to his fervent love for it in giving his blood. There hangs the color that wakens that thought—the color of fire, the glowing tongues of the Spirit, through Whose coming the soul is wakened—the color of love, which is shown in the consecrated service—the color of blood with which that service is sealed. And should there be a “Cross and Crown” embroidered upon the Frontal, would it be useless or add another word? Rather the latter—for there is shown the life of loving service accomplished only 'mid trial and temptation, finally receiving the reward the crown that fadeth not away. Does it all not make us think of these great Examples and serve to urge us, mutely, to make our love and service as glowing and faithful?

Or let it be the Feast of the Nativity; and white is everywhere. White the peculiar color of the Deity, white the symbol of light and glory and victory. We hear a Babe is born in such lowly surroundings. We hear the Prophecies. We hear the Angel speak to Mary. But here we see a Little One like all oth-

ers; but while we look we hear the Angels of God singing their message, and we know Who has come and why. There then everywhere before us is the color of purest joy, of victory foreshadowed, of the Blessed God and His light and glory revealed in That Babe, mutely urging us to make our hearts pure and true for, and fill ourselves with this joy in, the coming of the Holy One.

PAUL ZELLER STRODACH.

Easton, Pa.

In addition to the works referred to in the Notes the subject may be found dealt with in the following:

(With those marked * the writer is not acquainted):

RIETSCHEL: *Lehrbuch d. Liturgik*. I. 150 ff.

JAKOB: *D. Kunst im Dienst d. Kirche*. p. 348 ff.

BUERKNER: *Kirchenschmuck u. Kirchengeraet* p. 81.

BRAUN: *Zur Symbolik d. Lit. Farben*.*

MARRIOTT: *Vest. Christianorum*. p. 175-186.

WALCOTT: *Sacred Archaeology*.*

ROHAULT DE FLEURY: *La Messe*. VIII. 25 ff.*

OTTE: *Handbuch d. Kirche. Kunstarchaeologie d. deutsch. Mittelalters*. I. 272 ff.*

THALHOFER: *Handbuch d. Kath. Lit.* I. 911 ff.

FLUCK: *Kath. Lit.*

Portions of DURANDUS' *Rationale* are found in English translated by:

NEALE AND WEBB: *The Symbolism of Churches and Church Ornaments* which is a translation of Book I.

PASSMORE: *Sacred Vestments*. (Bk. III.)

Articles in SMITH AND CHERTHAMS: *Dict. Christian Antiquities*.

CONSECRATION.

THE Lutheran Church occupies a peculiar position on ecclesiastical questions. On the one hand she retains many of the customs of the past and is altogether favorable to the historical and aesthetic point of view. On the other hand she sets her face against every custom that is doctrinally questionable.

I have been led to this remark by observing the frequent recurrence of the word Consecration in our ecclesiastical vocabulary. We read of the consecration of churches, the consecration of bells and even of the consecration of deaconesses. In the case of deaconesses it follows that if *they* are consecrated, the rest of the women in the Church are not consecrated. Or, as the Romanists put it, some are religious and the rest are secular. The act of "consecration" lifts the former into a different class. If it does not, the word is a misnomer. I have not yet heard the term used with us in connection with the appointment of *men* to the office of the ministry, but there is no telling when we shall read that so and so many men have been "consecrated."

Has the word a legitimate place in the Lutheran Liturgy? I hesitate to make a dogmatic assertion. I would rather invite a discussion of the question and thus bring out the reasons in favor of its use. Perhaps as an *advocatus diaboli*, I may provoke the friends of the term to defend the usage. In the imperfection of language it is sometimes difficult to find the right word for an idea, and words have often lost their first meaning. But, on the other hand, words are things and help to make ideas. It has happened before this that one generation played with an expres-

sion which a subsequent generation changed into a dogma. History makes words, but words also make history.

Etymology is sometimes helpful in a search of this kind, but in the present investigation it has proved of only secondary value. The word, being such a good one, was early applied to illegitimate uses, and was frequently confounded with other words of similar import.

According to Harper's Latin Dictionary, *consecrare*, sometimes written *consacrare*, in classic usage meant to devote something as sacred to a deity. Used in connection with persons it meant "to elevate to the rank of deity, to place among the gods." But when we turn to *dedicare* we find it has practically the same meaning, "to set apart a thing to a deity." Temples and places were dedicated. But there is still another word that must be reckoned with, *benedicere*, which meant to consecrate or hallow. In the Vulgate, *kadash*, Genesis 2, 3 is translated *benedixit*.

In ecclesiastical usage the words *consecrare*, *dedicare*, *benedicere* come into frequent contact, but the distinctions are not always sharp or permanent. DuFresne's *Glossary** gives the following definitions:

A bishop *dedicates* a hall, temple, altar. That is he presents the place to God, blesses and sanctifies it.

A bishop *consecrates* the vessels of the church, the chrism, oil, incense, etc. He consecrates those things which are thus separated from a common to a sacred use.

When the grace of God is invoked on persons and on a religious use of things, the *benediction* is pronounced. It is performed with the sign of the cross, invocation of the Holy Ghost, imposition of hands, ointment, holy water, incense, etc., with the use of the prescribed forms contained in the Benedictionals of the Roman Church. Some of these benedictions are pronounced by bishops only, others by any ordinary minister.†

* Cf. HERZOG's *Real Encyclopadie*. 2d Ed. s. v. *Benediktionen*.

† AUGUSTI, *Denkwuerdigkeiten*, Vol. X, p. 170, refers to J. H. BOEHMER, *Jus eccles. Protest.*, as giving a definition of these three words. Who can find this book?

These definitions indicate the chief differences, but they are not beyond question and are sometimes confounded. One cannot help noticing however that the tendency among modern ritualists is to make Consecrations of many acts that were formerly Benedictions.

A better source of information than Etymology is Church History and History of Doctrines. In the Old Testament both men and things were consecrated or dedicated, that is, set apart for the service of God. In the New Testament all Christians are dedicated to God's service. "Ye are a holy priesthood, a peculiar people." As to persons, when a man becomes a minister he enters an office, but is not thereby lifted into a new order. The conceptions of sacerdotalism are a later development. Likewise, of later origin was the practice of consecrating things such as churches, cemeteries or *vasa sacra*. It seems to have been suggested by the Manichaeian doctrine of evil. But in the New Testament things in themselves are not evil. According to I Timothy 4, "Every creature of God is good," but our use of it may be evil. Hence it is a Christian duty to make a right use of things, which is possible through the Word of God and prayer. When a blessing is asked at table, the food is not consecrated or made any better, but our use of the food is consecrated.

The necessity of consecrating men and things seems to have been suggested still further by the teaching which prevailed in regard to the Mass. At first the Lord's Supper was the Common Service. But in the days of Cyprian, the Common Service began to give place to the Sacrifice offered by the minister for the purpose of securing the grace and favor of God. It was about this time that men began to speak about the consecration of the elements, bread and wine. In the East the moment of consecration or transubstantiation was in the so-called *Epiclesis* or invocation of the Holy Ghost. In the Western Church the

change was regarded as taking place in the use of the *verba*.

When once the idea of the consecration of the elements was thoroughly fixed in the mind, it became easy to transfer the thought of consecration to other objects. Benediction and consecration came to mean the same thing in the minds of the people. By parity of reasoning it was held that what consecration did for the elements of the Mass, benediction or dedication or consecration, for these terms began to be loosely defined, would do for persons and things. Miraculous powers were conferred by this act. Consecrations were multiplied. At first only bishops were consecrated. Then everybody and everything. Our modern consecrators seem to have caught the spirit of the third century.

Where the doctrine of the consecration of persons is held, there follows easily the doctrine of Apostolical Succession. Ministerial authority is conferred by tactual transmission. The bishop, by manual imposition, transmits to the candidate a *character indelebilis*. The Anglicans accepted this doctrine, and it is one of the, chief grounds for their ecclesiastical claims, and for spelling their church with a capital C. Their Prayer Book has a form for the Consecration of Bishops.

The Methodists, as children of the Anglicans, inherited verbiage and forms of the Prayer Book and they too have a form for the Consecration of Bishops, although when they make mere minor ministers they use another word.

The Lutheran teaching on Ordination does not endorse this position, although the ideas which underly this development are widely spread, and it is difficult to purge out the old Roman leaven. Even among us the idea prevails "once a minister, always a minister," and men who have long since demitted the ministry and entered into other employments are still looked upon as members of the sacred order.

CONSECRATION OF CHURCHES.

The earliest account of a church dedication is given by Sozo-

menus.* In the year 335 Constantine caused the Church of the Martyrs to be built at Jerusalem. A Synod being in session at Tyre, he invited all the bishops to come over to Jerusalem, and the church was dedicated with great pomp. The Church continued to celebrate the anniversaries of this occasion. This was the origin of the church-dedication anniversaries which became popular both in the East and the West. Ambrose made much of church dedications, but with him the church is holy because it is the place where the Sacrifice is made.†

The *Rituale Romanum* places the dedication of churches under the head of Benedictions. The Anglican books call the act a Consecration. The Methodists call it a Dedication.

Lutherans repudiate the idea of a special sanctity of churches. They deny that they are more holy than any other space on earth. They deny that there is a special Divine presence in the consecrated building, revealing itself there more than in any other place.‡

The Roman thought of the consecration of a church, was that God and His manifestations were in a special manner connected with the church. With such a conception the Lutheran Church was compelled to take issue and did so in the last of the Smalcald Articles.§ “There remain the papal juggleries connected with such foolish and puerile things as church dedications,

* Cf. KLIEFOTH, *Lit. Abh.*, 2, Vol. II, P. 1 16.

† *Ibid.* p. 237.

‡ It is not an easy task for the writer to say these words. Our people are not in special need of them. They are not manifesting too great a spirit of reverence in their churches. The way in which many of them enter the church, and the way in which many of them conduct themselves in the church does not indicate a pressing necessity for this doctrine. Personally I wish that I could take a different position, and impress upon ministers and young people a doctrine of the sanctity of the Lord's house which would prepare them for a more worthy participation in the Services of His house. But it is better to tell the truth, even though some may wrest it to their own destruction. It is a duty to be reverent in the house of God, but the duty must be enforced by other considerations than the sanctity of the building.

§ Cf. K. A. 4, 152.

baptism of bells, etc.” (What would Luther say of the baptism of ships, if he lived in our day?)

The early Lutheran *Agenda* therefore contained no forms for church dedications. (Perhaps also because there were no churches to dedicate.) But in the year 1546 Luther himself dedicated a church. He commenced the Service with the following address:

“My dear friends, we are now about to bless this house and dedicate it to our Lord Jesus Christ. This duty devolves not only upon me but you also are to take hold of the sprinkler and censer so that this house may be consecrated, to the end that nothing else may take place here than that our Lord Jesus Christ may speak in it through His holy Word and we on the other hand may speak with Him through prayer and hymns of praise. Therefore, that it may be properly blessed and consecrated in a Christian manner, not like the churches of the papists with their bishops’ chrism and incense. ... let us pray.” After the prayer he preached a sermon from Luke 14, 1-11, on the proper celebration of the Lord’s Day, and closed with these words: “Enough has now been said from the Gospel on the subject of the dedication of this house. And now dear friends, since you have helped to sprinkle it with the real holy water of God’s Word, take hold of the censer, that is prayer, and let us call upon God and pray first for His Holy Church, that He may continue to us His Holy Word and spread it abroad everywhere, and that this house which has now been dedicated may be kept pure through the sanctification of God’s Word, that it may not be desecrated by the devil or made unclean by his lies and false teaching...” And this was the dedication.

Church dedications in Saxony at the beginning of the 18th century are thus described by Gerber: “The procession started from the parsonage or from the old church, went around the new church and entered it with the singing of a hymn. The school children walked in front followed by the ministers carrying the

vessels and the books. Then came the congregation walking two and two. The Service in the church was held in the usual manner with Psalm 84, Psalm 87, Psalm 132: 8, 9, or other suitable passages as lessons, and an appropriate sermon and prayers.* With reference to the dedication of bells, pulpits, organs, altars, fonts and cemeteries, the same principles governed the Lutherans as in the dedication of churches. Whenever such objects were dedicated, the service consisted in their public presentation and use, and in supplicating the blessing of God upon their use and upon those who should use them. This was a very different thing from the Roman practice of consecrating these articles in the Mass, for the purpose of communicating to them some spiritual efficacy.

But Lutherans were not content with simply criticising ancient usage. They maintained, the positive principle which should govern the Christian in his use of God's creatures as laid down in I Timothy 4. The creature did not need any sanctification to accomplish the object for which God had created it. But men needed sanctification and this could be attained only by the Word of God and by prayer. And men needed it not only for some things but for the whole life. Not the thing but the use of the thing is to be sanctified.†

Abraham Lincoln was not a liturgist, but in his Gettysburg speech he seems to have come very close to the Lutheran conception of consecration:

“We have come to dedicate a portion of that field. But in a larger sense we cannot dedicate, we cannot consecrate, we cannot hallow this ground. The brave men, living and dead, who struggled here, have consecrated it far above our poor power to add or detract. ... It is for us the living rather to be dedi-

* K. A. 4, 153

† Discussions of the Lutheran position on this subject are to be found in the Brunswick KO of 1531, BUGENHAGEN'S, and in the *Corpus Doctrinae* of the Brunswick-Wolfenbuettel KO of 1569, composed by CHEMNITZ.

cated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced. It is rather for us here to be dedicated to the great task remaining before us.”

With the recognition of this principle that it is not the *thing* which is to be consecrated but that *we* are to be consecrated and that *our use* of the thing is to be consecrated, we gladly accept every service in which persons or things are devoted to the service of God. But our consecration will be larger and more free. We shall ask a blessing over a good book as well as over a meal. The humble widow who in the fear of God supports her family at the wash-tub is as truly consecrated as the sister who wears a garb, and the “man with the hoe” stands on the same plane as the consecrated bishop.

I would not wish to be understood as desirous of doing away with any of the beautiful services in which the Church sets apart earthly objects for sacred use. On the contrary, I would gladly see them multiplied. But such a service is not a consecration in the historical significance and in the popular conception of the term. It is an offering to God, and a prayer for a sanctified use of that which has been offered. I would therefore venture to hope that some other word might be substituted for consecration. For places and things, would dedication be better? For persons I am not prepared to suggest a substitute. As I stated in the beginning, my purpose is to awaken discussion and not to affirm a dogmatic certainty.

GEORGE U. WENNER.

New York.

THE LITURGICAL USE OF THE CREEDS.

IT is, perhaps, a mere coincidence that the Oecumenical Creeds, which are Trinitarian in character, should be three in number, the *Nicene*, which was adopted at the Council of Nicaea, 325 A. D.; the *Apostles'*, whose latest clause was added 650 A. D.; and the *Athanasian*, which originated in its earliest form about the middle of the fifth century and gained its present form about the middle of the ninth century.

In the Communion Service, the Nicene or the Apostles' Creed is used at the Morning Service, according as there is or is not a Communion. No Creed is recited at the Vesper and Matin Services. The Apostles' Creed is found in several of the Orders for Ministerial Acts. The Athanasian Creed appears at some place in the Service-Book, but it nowhere forms a part of the public worship. When it is remembered that the public worship reaches its highest point in the Communion Service and that in this Service the Nicene Creed alone is employed, it will be seen that the relative value set upon the Creeds, in their Liturgical Use corresponds to their historical order (in their definitive form)—the Nicene, the Apostles', and the Athanasian.

I. THE NICENE CREED.

As has just been said, this Creed is the Communion Confession and is recited whenever the Communion is administered. Its use in the Service began at an early date. Already in 488 A. D., Peter the Fuller, Patriarch of Antioch, directed that it should be recited at every gathering of a congregation, and a similar

direction was given by Timotheus, Patriarch of Constantinople, 511 A. D. From the East this use gradually spread to the West, entering Europe by way of Spain, 589 A. D. “Thence it came, with the addition of the *filioque* in the Third Article, to France and Germany under Charlemagne. Finally, it was accepted by Rome under Benedict VIII, in the year 1014. Luther rightly kept it, and in 1524 gave it to the people in versified form, to be sung by them after the minister had introduced the first line.”*

II. THE APOSTLES’ CREED.

As the Nicene properly belongs to the Communion Service, so the Apostles’ properly belongs to the Baptismal Service and the subordinate weekly and daily services, the two Creeds corresponding to the two Sacraments.† In this use is preserved its historical character, for this Creed is founded on and developed from the Baptismal Formula, Matt. 28: 19. The Creed itself is the gradual development of the Confession of Faith required of the Catechumens in the early Church. Its use, however, formed no part of the public worship. “For a long time the rule of faith was regarded as a secret, and was withheld even from the Catechumens till the last stage of instruction. This explains the fact that we have only fragmentary accounts of it in the writings of the sub-Apostolic and following age, Even as late as the time of S. Augustine we find him laying it down as a fundamental principle, *Symbolum nemo scribit ut legi potest*, ‘No one writes down the Creed that it may be read.’‡ When, where and by whom this Creed began to be used in the public Offices of the Church, is not known with any degree of certainty.

III. THE ATHAISTASIAN CREED.

This Creed does not enter into the public Service of the Lutheran Church at the present time. At the time when Luther’s

* *Liturgics*. HORN. p. 56.

† JACOBS’ *Lutheran Movement*. p. 302.

‡ MACLEAR’S *Introduction to the Creeds*. p. 10.

metrical version of the Nicene was more common than that Creed itself, the Athanasian was occasionally used, as on Trinity Sunday and at Ordinations. The *Te Deum* was also used at times.* It is interesting to note that two of the old names of this Symbol (tenth and eleventh century, respectively) are, *Hymnus S. Athanasii de Trinitate*, “a Hymn of S. Athanasius concerning the Trinity,” and, *Psalmus Quicumque Vult*, “the Psalm *Quicumque Vult*.” In a printed sermon defending the use of the Athanasian Creed in the Anglican Service-Book, Canon Liddon has this foot-note: “To refer to the ‘*Quicumque*’ as a Psalm may be only a pedantic crotchet. But if it is intended to imply that as a Psalm the *Quicumque* is not properly a Creed, this is to contradict the formal language of the Church of England both in the Articles and the Prayer Book.”† It may here be stated that in the Anglican Liturgy the use of the Creeds is as follows: The Nicene is said in the Order for Holy Communion. In the Order for Evening Prayer only the Apostles’ is used. In the Order for Morning Prayer the Apostles’ is used, “Except only such days as the Creed of S. Athanasius is appointed to be read.” There are twelve of these Days, including, of course, Trinity Sunday. The Athanasian Creed also forms part of the Liturgy of the Greek Church. The Holy Spirit is said to be “of the Father.” The words, “and of the Son,” are omitted.

THE POSITION OF THE CREED IN THE SERVICE.

We here speak of the Nicene Creed. Its earliest place was in the *Missa Fidelium* before the *Preface*, the place which it still holds in the Eastern Church. Upon its introduction into the Church of the West, it was recited by the congregation before the Lord’s Prayer. It was in France and Germany that it was placed after the reading of the Gospel.‡ In the Lutheran Orders

* JACOB’S *Lutheran Movement*. p. 302

† For the Sermon advocating the retention of the Creed, see *University Sermons*. Second Series. PP. 95-114

‡ HORN’S *Liturgics*. P. 56.

it is introductory and subordinate to the Sermon. “In a few Orders,” says Dr. Jacobs,* “it directly follows; but in most, it precedes. In the latter case, its Office is to give a summary of the faith as a whole before the minister expands the part contained in the Gospel for the Day. The whole horizon of the faith sweeps before the view, and, then, the hearers are prepared to enter the one limited part. Where it follows the Sermon, as in the Reformation of Cologne, it is the affirmative answer to the Sermon. Another explanation is sometimes given. ‘The Creed is recited after the Gospel that while, by the Holy Gospel, there is faith unto righteousness, by the Creed, there may be confession with the mouth unto salvation.’ (Durandus). ‘After Christ has spoken to His people, it is proper for them to express their belief the more ardently and intently, as it is written in the Gospel of John that they did, who had heard the word from the Samaritan woman.† (Gerbert).

THE PURPOSE OF THE CREEDS IN THE SERVICE.

The Creeds form a fixed and normal part of the Liturgy, and belong to the Sacrificial Acts of Christian worship. They are a tribute of praise rendered by the worshipper to the Triune God and themselves constitute an act of objective worship. They honor God by this declaration of faith in Him as he has revealed Himself to be, and they honor His Holy Word by this acknowledgment of its absolute truth. To confess before God our faith in Him is to describe Him as He is; to describe Him as He is, is to worship Him with praise,—as we do when we declare before Him our belief in “One God, the Father Almighty, Maker of Heaven and earth, And of all things visible and invisible. And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Only-begotten Son of God, Begotten of His Father before all worlds, God of God, Light of Light, Very God of Very God, Begotten, not made, Being of one substance with the Father, by Whom all things were made.

* *Lutheran Movement*. p. 301

... And I believe in the Holy Ghost, the Lord and Giver of Life, Who proceedeth from the Father and the Son, Who with the Father and the Son together is worshipped and glorified, Who spake by the Prophets." Such is the very language of devotion and adoration,—of a John the Baptist, "I have seen, and have borne witness that this is the Son of God;" of a Nathanael, "Rabbi, Thou art the Son of God, Thou art the King of Israel;" of a Peter, "We have believed and know that Thou art the Holy One of God;" of a Martha, "Yea, Lord, I have believed that Thou art the Christ, the Son of God;" of a Thomas, "My Lord and my God;" of a St. Paul, "There is one God the Father, of Whom are all things, and we unto Him. And one Lord Jesus Christ, through Whom are all things, and we through Him." It is, we repeat, the very summit of adoring worship when we come before the Triune God and in the language of the Creeds make confession of our steadfast faith in God the Father, Who has created us, in God the Son, Who has redeemed us, and in God the Holy Ghost, Who has sanctified us.

The subjective benefits which accrue to the faithful confessor in the Liturgical Use of the Creeds are manifold. For one thing, as Dr. Liddon has pointed out,* they prevent religious emotion from becoming a passing sentiment, destined to evaporate and disappear. If the emotion is to last, it must not be separated from the event or person that called it forth. As the event is lost from mind, as the person fades from view, the impression becomes dim and indistinct, and then dies away; and the emotion shares its fate. "Here is the value of the Christian Creeds: they fix in clear outline before the soul of the believer the great objects of his faith, which rouse in him movements of love and awe: they resist the tendencies of unassisted emotion to lose itself on what is vague and indistinct: they place before him God, in His Essential Threefold Nature, and in His Redeeming and Sanctifying work, and in this way they sustain, the living emotion of the

soul directed towards God, as revealed by Himself. The Creeds are not a series of detached propositions: they are a collection of statements which correspond to a living whole. To an unbeliever a Creed only suggests the reflection: How many propositions—dogmas—for a man to believe! To a believer, before whose soul's eye the Divine Object described in the Creeds is livingly present, a Creed suggests the reflection: How impossible to omit any one of those elements of a description which the Reality demands.”

From Bishop Westcott* we learn several further uses served by the Creeds in general, and more particularly in the Service. Such a confession of our faith gives a positive distinctness to aspiration and offers a watchword for effort. Having found the truth ourselves, we will not be satisfied merely to give expression to it in a verbal formula; but because this truth concerns others as well, we will be constrained to impart it also to them. Again, a formal Creed witnesses to the universality of our faith. “Let us extend our thoughts, and remember that the confession which we make is made practically in the same form from day to day by countless congregations in Western Christendom, and we shall know that that which we have in common with all who bear Christ's Name is greater, immeasurably greater, than the special beliefs, however precious to ourselves, however perverse and wilful and unfounded in the eyes of others, which keep, and must keep us apart.” Again, the Creed which binds us all together now, even in spite of ourselves, binds us to all the past. “As often as we repeat the Creed of our Baptism we repeat the words by which Martyrs have lived and died, the words under which nations have been enrolled as soldiers of Christ's army, the words which have remained through every vicissitude the standard of Christian belief. And he must be something less than a man who is not moved by the power of this unbroken fellowship with the past, which makes us heirs of every victory of Faith.” Once more, the Creed which unites us with the past, preserves for us,

* *The Historic Faith*. pp. 19-22.

in complete and harmonious outline both the foundations and the proportion of Faith. "The Creed is of no one age. As often as we repeat it we are guarded from forgetting the articles which our circumstances do not force upon our notice. All the facts remain; and when a crisis comes, that will be ready to our hand which our fathers have delivered to us. We want nothing new, but the old rekindled by a fuller light."

Such, then, is the Use of the Creeds in the Service. There are other incidental offices performed by such Liturgical Use, but the principal functions have at least been alluded to. It is a necessity arising from a law of our being that when we arrive at a conviction of truth we do give expression to it. We have such a conviction of religious and distinctively Christian truth, and we feel impelled to declare in words our heart's belief. The words which express this belief the most clearly and fully are furnished to us in the three General Creeds. We adopt their language not because the Church has made them for us and demands of us such adoption and confession, but spontaneously, willingly, gladly, because they best express the personal convictions which we have derived from God's pure Word alone. The God Who has revealed Himself in His Holy Word, the Triune God, Father, Son and Holy Spirit, Creator, Saviour and Sanctifier,—it is this God in Whom we delight to confess our personal belief. While we confess Him, we moreover worship and adore Him; and as individuals and as a congregation, we recognize our place and portion and blessed privilege in the Holy Christian Church, the Communion of Saints.

The Service opens in the Name of the Triune God: it closes with a Doxology to the Triune God. In the middle stands the Creed, explaining and justifying both the Name and the Doxology.

Charleston, S. C.

JOHN W. HORINE.

THE LITURGY OF THE NORWEGIAN LUTHERAN CHURCH.

The congregation comes to church to glorify God and to upbuild itself.—It does not come together simply to serve God through prayer, confession, thanksgiving and praise, but also to receive the peculiar blessing which God has promised it, and which gives and nourishes a new spiritual life.

God's means of blessing are His Word and the Sacraments.

That God comes to His people through these means of grace, and that they can serve Him in the manner already stated, are basic principles in the Norwegian Lutheran Church Service.

These principles were fixed by Luther and the "Augsburg Confession."

Luther, in his *Formula Missae* of 1523 followed the Roman Catholic Liturgy as closely as possible, leaving out whatever was false. And in Central and North Germany this formula was made the basis of the Order of Service, while in Southwest Germany, where the Lutherans came into touch with the Catholics and the Reformed, his *Deutsche Messe* was used. Even this latter formula has had an influence on the Norwegian Liturgy, in that it has been followed in the Order of Service that has to do with the Sacraments, as the *Formula Missae* has been followed in what has to do with the Word.

The Order in the *Formula Missae* is: Introit, *Kyrie*, *Gloria*, Collect, Epistle together with Gradual and Hallelujah, Gospel, Nicene Creed, Sermon, Preface in Latin, the Words of the Institution in German, the *Sanctus*, *Benedictus*, Lord's

Prayer and Pax, and the singing of the *Agnus Dei* during the Distribution, and finally another Collect and the Aaronitic blessing.

The *Deutsche Messe* is more radical, that is, it is less like the Roman Catholic. In the first part of the Service there remains only *Kyrie*, Collect, Epistle, Gospel, Creed and Sermon. A noteworthy addition were the hymns sung in German. Even the Creed was made a hymn—but that goes too far. The sacramental ceremonies are likewise impoverished, for the Preface was dropped, the Lord's Prayer was paraphrased as a part of the Exhortation, the rich expressions about the death of Christ and the remembrance were not given at all.

The more strict Lutherans adopted the *Formula Missae* and strove hard to get a beautiful Service. They began to use the Apostles' Creed instead of the Nicene; they introduced Confession and Absolution, and the General Prayer after the Sermon; they established the Exhortation to the communicants; and they provided for the singing of the Litany if there was no Communion. Their Service carries out the basic principles of the Lutheran Service fully; it shows a harmonious and living activity by both minister and congregation; it balances between freedom and rule, between the free word and the liturgical parts.

At the time of the Reformation Norway was united with Denmark. It is true that Norway was still called a kingdom and retained her old national laws; yet, as she was really governed by Copenhagen, we may consider her little else than a Danish province. Therefore when the Reformation entered Denmark, it came also to Norway.

The transition from the Roman Catholic to an Evangelical faith and practice was naturally slow; and during these many years there was an uncertainty in the forms of the Church Service. When the authority of the Pope was set aside in 1536 and the State Church of Denmark was established, King Christian III was obliged to write to the Elector of Saxony to “borrow” Bu-

genhagen and Melanchthon “for the glory of God and the establishment of a Christian Order.” Denmark did not then have capable men for this work, and Germany could not spare those asked for.

Thereupon King Christian appointed a committee of his own men to draw up an Order of Service. He changed it somewhat and then sent it to Luther, who, together with the theologians at Wittenberg, approved of it. At the same time that Luther made his reply, Bugenhagen came to Denmark. The King and he went through the Order of Service again, making a few changes in it and adding eight appendices. In 1537 the “Ordinance” went into force and in 1539 it was passed by the Diet; in 1542 it was published in Danish. It treats of Church Government as well as the Order of Service; it is at once a manual of Church Law and Liturgy. As already stated, it follows both the *Formula Missae*, and the *Deutsche Messe*. It remained in force until 1685, when it was superseded by the “Ritual.” In Norway it was copied in all its essentials by the “Ordinance” of 1607

During this transition period just described there was no fixed form of Service, owing to the fact that each pastor was left to follow his own judgment in the matter. But even after the “Ordinance” of 1542 was published, there was considerable shifting, because, while the “Ordinance” specified the Order of Service, it did not give the specific form of each part. In this matter it simply referred to other handbooks, of which there was already a number, such as, Peder Plades’ “Enchiridion” of 1538, and Frantz Vormordsen’s “Manual” of 1539. The first named is a translation of Luther’s “Enchiridion” and his book on Baptism and Marriage. The last is a handbook of the whole Service, giving forms, Collects, references to the speeches that belong to the several liturgical parts, etc.; it did not contain the texts, but only the references to them in the Bible. The great fault with these and other handbooks was, that they did not contain all that was to be used in each part

of the Service; another was, that they did not agree in all parts. The "Ritual" mentioned above was the "Ordinance" without the parts on Church Government. Its authorization was due to Bishop Hans Bagger, Provost Henrik Bornemann, Dr. Hans Leth and Bishop Thomas Kingo. The "Book of Service" appeared three years later in 1688, published by Bishop Bagger, —the Ritual which, excepting a few changes, has been used in the Norwegian Church to the present day. This book of Bagger's contained also a good deal of pastoral advice, some of it very curious to our notions. This was printed in the Norwegian editions of the book until the "New Ritual" came out. As an example of this pastoral advice, I quote the following from a Norwegian edition of 1879: "Whoever wantonly swears and curses, and thus takes the Name of God in vain, shall be considered as one who does not deal honestly... If, during the Service at church, the children profane it by play, noise or any other misdemeanor on the church grounds, then the authorities shall have the power to punish the younger ones with whippings and the older ones with the pillory," etc.

In the first decades after the Reformation in Denmark there were made two important changes in the Service: the one, that the Sermon was given a fixed place; the other, that Danish hymns took the place of some of the old chants sung by the preacher and the choir. Both of these changes became permanent.

The "Ordinance" Service began with silent confession by the minister, during which he knelt at the altar, and after which, at the King's desire, he offered up prayer for the Word, the King and the realm. While he was doing this the congregation, kneeling, read a silent confession. In place of this, in the "Ritual" there was an opening prayer which was read while the congregation knelt. Then, in the "Ordinance," followed the Introit and *Kyrie* (sung three times by the congregation), but in the "Ritual" the *Kyrie* followed the opening prayer. The next

part was the angels' anthem, "*Gloria in Excelsis*", which was afterwards made a hymn. Then, the minister, turning to the congregation, sang, "The Lord be with you," to which the congregation, rising, sang: "And with thy spirit." The next was the Collect, with an "Amen" by the congregation; and then the Epistle, followed by the Hallelujah. But in the "Ritual" a hymn bearing on the Epistle or introducing the Gospel was substituted for the Hallelujah. The Gospel was thereupon read and replied to by the congregation in: "God be praised for His glad tidings," or, as in the "Ritual," "Praise be to Thee, O Christ." The Creed was read next, later replaced by a hymn. The Service from the pulpit was to begin with prayer. The "Ritual" required the minister to admonish to prayer and all to unite in the Lord's Prayer. In the festival season of the year, from Christmas to Pentecost, a festival verse was sung before the reading of the Gospel text, and sung three times on the great Festivals, while the minister knelt in the pulpit. After the Sermon followed a general Confession and Absolution, which, however, was soon dropped. The "Ordinance" and the "Ritual" prescribed the form of the General Prayer after the Sermon, leaving the contents to the judgment of the minister, but the "Handbook" of 1539 gives a model. Thereupon came the Lord's Prayer and (in the "Ritual" only) the Aaronitic blessing and a hymn.

Baptism and the Lord's Supper were next. The Exhortation before Communion, of a polemical-dogmatical tone, was originally from Melanchthon's "Articles of Visitation", though here from *Deutsche Messe*, and is still used. It was followed by the Lord's Prayer and the Words of the Institution of the Sacrament and the Consecration. The minister gives the bread and wine to the Communicants saying to each one: "This is the true Body of

Christ" and "This is the true Blood of Christ." This formula was introduced for the first time by Jesper Brockmann, in 1646, the word "true" being against the Calvin doctrine. The *Agnus*

Dei was sung three times during the Distribution according to the "Ritual." A Communion blessing and a hymn of thanksgiving closed the Communion ceremony, and the Aaronitic blessing, with the sign of the cross, and a hymn and closing prayer end the Services.

In the comparison given above, it will be noted that the Service in the "Ritual" is a little more meagre than in the "Ordinance," though it may still be considered Apostolic to the core. It gave the Sermon and hymns more prominence than its predecessor.

Still greater changes were made by Pietism and Rationalism. The Service became meagre indeed. Pietism cut out the formal prayers and limited the ceremonial parts, and Rationalism did its best to make it short. Bastholm published in 1785 "An Attempt Towards a Better Plan in the Church Service," which aimed to make the Service "short, interesting and inspiring." Its character was to be dramatic. As illustrating this may be mentioned: During prayer the congregation knelt; they sang the Amens; the chants, Creed and Blessings were omitted; and the Lord's Prayer was re-written where used. A new so-called "Evangelical Christian" hymnal was introduced. But the old hymns, which it contained, had been so hideously distorted, that the book was said to be neither evangelical nor Christian.

The "Rescript" of 1802 did not really proceed as far as Bastholm. The new hymnal was adopted and the following changes made in the Service: The Kyrie was omitted; the Creed and Gloria were used alternately every other Sunday, but both were soon omitted in practice; the Gospel was not read before the altar; fewer verses of the hymns were sung; the Sermon was made more prominent. In short, the Service had become very impoverished, though the marks of glory were not altogether defaced.

And this was the Order of Service and its character at the time of the first Norwegian emigration to America and even down to 1887. This was the Service that the Norwegians of

America brought along with them. Its parts were: Opening Prayer, Hymn, Collect, Epistle, Hymn, Sermon, General Prayer, Blessing, Hymn, Collect, Hymn, closing Prayer. The Baptism and Communion parts retained their character.

In the meanwhile great changes had taken place in Norway, in religion and Church affairs not the least. A deep, spiritual, religious movement, begun in about 1800 by Hans Nielson Hauge, a layman, grew apace on every side, especially among the common people. This awakening was sound and Lutheran. The old devotional literature and hymns were again in high honor and pious use. Though the rationalist Order of Service was kept at the regular public meetings, other forms were observed at the special devotional meetings, which began to be common. At first the ministry was very hostile to the movement, but, little by little, it weakened as the new life seemed to course through the veins of the Church. Minister after minister became its defenders; until at last, about 1850, the theological faculty at Christiania also were of this new mind. Since then the late Professor Gisle Johnson has been the greatest spiritual leader of Norway.

The Norwegian people were almost completely regenerated in the first half of the nineteenth century. In 1814, when the union with Denmark was dissolved, they awoke to a new sense of nationality and secured a Constitution, which made them as free as any people in the world. The King of Sweden is at the same time King of Norway, but otherwise she is independent and a land of freedom. At the same time that her people pushed forward to political freedom, did they extend their activities in other ways. Religion, as I have shown, was one of these; it quickened these other endeavors and was in its turn quickened by them.

It is not to be wondered at that inside the Church were heard demands for reform. The pulpit revived the pure doctrine and breathed a new spirit. A religious press came on the field,

anxious to propose questions of moment and to discuss them. One of the first problems was as to a hymnal. The Evangelical Hymnal, which had never been popular, had already been superseded by Guldberg's. But Guldberg's, again, was not satisfactory either. Here, then, was a great problem. And there arose the man to solve it. This was M. B. Landstad, a man thoroughly in sympathy with the new religious spirit, himself a poet, completely national, and thus able to give expression to the religious emotions of the Norwegian heart. By his side we may place the musician Ludvig Lindeman, likewise possessed of the new religious and national enthusiasm. He has composed many hymn-tunes, the motives of many of which are taken from the folk ballads. He has taught his people how to sing unto the Lord; he has done more than any one else to make the Norwegian congregation a singing congregation. The Landstad-Lindeman hymnal, which was prepared to meet a great need, has proved very satisfactory, and deserves all the admiration it has awakened in all who know it well.

In connection with the new spirit of preaching came a demand for a richer content,—one series of texts was felt insufficient. This problem was assigned to a committee to work out; after several years two new series of texts from the Gospels and Epistles, essentially like those in the Swedish Church, were proposed. Since 1887 the three series have been in general use in the Norwegian Church. The men to whom we are most indebted for the completion of this work are Professors Gisle Johnson and A. Bang and Rev. Sven Bruun.

Still another question was in regard to the Liturgy. Revs. Hesselberg and G. Jensen, whose scholarship on this point was the greatest, undertook the difficult task of revising the Book of Service. In their revision, the ministerial acts (Baptism, Communion, Marriage, Burial, etc.) were left substantially as in the old Book of Service, but, on the other hand, the Order of Service was entirely reconstructed. The royal decree of January 8, 1887,

which authorized this new Book of Service, gave preference to the new Order of Service, although the congregations were permitted to use the old.

The number of congregations, both in Norway and America, that has adopted the newer and richer Order of Service is constantly increasing.

This new Order of Service, which is based mainly on the Liturgy of the Bavarian Church, is as follows:

Opening Prayer, read by the Assistant (Precentor) before the Chancel, while the Minister kneels at the Altar. "O Lord, we have come into this Thy holy house to hear what Thou, God the Father, our Creator, Thou Lord Jesus, our Saviour, Thou Holy Spirit, our Comforter in life and in death, wilt say unto us. By Thy Holy Spirit, and for Christ's sake, O Lord, so open our hearts that we may learn to be sorry for our sins, to believe in life and in death on the Lord Jesus, and to make daily progress in holiness of life and conduct. Hear and answer us for Christ's sake. Amen."

Opening Hymn, contents determined by the Church Year.

Confession of Sin. Minister. "Let us bow before the Lord and confess our sins." (Kneeling before the Altar) "I, a poor sinner, confess unto Thee, holy and almighty God, my Creator and Redeemer, not only that I have sinned against Thee in thoughts, words and deeds, but also that I have been conceived and born in sin, so that before Thee, O righteous God, I am altogether guilty and worthy of condemnation. I therefore flee for refuge to Thine infinite mercy, and pray Thee for Christ's sake: God be merciful to me a sinner. Amen." Or: "Holy God, Heavenly Father: Look in mercy upon me, a poor, sinful man. I have provoked Thee by thoughts, words and deeds, and know the evil desires that are in my heart. Have patience with me. Forgive me all my sins and grant that I may fear and love Thee alone. Lord have mercy upon me. Amen."

The Kyrie, or a Litany Hymn.

The Gloria. Minister (intones) “Glory to God in the highest.” congregation (sings) “And on earth peace, good will toward men.”

Salutation and Collect for the Day (intoned).

The Epistle. Congregation standing.

Short Hymn, corresponding to Epistle or a Hymn of Praise.

The Gospel. Congregation standing, and singing after the Gospel the Response “Praise and glory be to Thee, O Lord,” or “Blessed be the Lord for His glad tidings.”

Apostles’ Creed (Minister facing Altar).

Hymn.

Sermon, preceded by a Prayer from the Pulpit and closed with the *Gloria Patri*.

The General Prayer, for which two forms are given, closing with the Lord’s Prayer and the Apostolic Benediction.

Hymn. Here may follow Baptism of children or Catechization.

Hymn, or

The Preface, including *Salutation*, *Sursum Corda*, *Gratias Agamus* and *Vere Dignum* (all intoned).

The Sanctus.

The Exhortation, after which as many of the Communicants as can do so kneel before the Altar and all others stand until the Distribution.

The Lord’s Prayer (intoned).

The Words of Institution (intoned).

The Distribution, with the Sentences, “This is Christ’s true Body,” “This is Christ’s true Blood,” and “Our crucified and risen Lord, Jesus Christ, Who now hath bestowed upon you His Holy Body and Blood, whereby He hath made full satisfaction for all your sins, strengthen and preserve you in true faith unto everlasting life. Peace be with you. Amen.”

A Hymn of Thanksgiving.

Thanksgiving Collect. Minister faces Congregation and in-

tones "Let us give thanks and pray" and facing Altar intones "We thank Thee, O Lord, Almighty and Everlasting God, that Thou hast refreshed us with these Thy salutary gifts. We now beseech Thee, of Thy mercy, to strengthen us, through these same gifts of Thine, in faith toward Thee, and in fervent love toward one another, through Jesus Christ, Thy Son, our Lord."

Salutation and Aaronic Blessing (intoned).

The Closing Hymn.

The Closing Prayer, read by the Assistant (Precentor) before the Chancel, while the Minister kneels at the Altar. "O Lord, with all our heart we thank Thee that Thou hast now taught us what Thou wilt that we shall believe and do. Help us now, our God, by Thy Holy Spirit, for Christ's sake, to keep Thy Word in a pure heart, thereby to be strengthened in faith, perfected in holiness of conduct, and comforted in life and in death. Amen." This prayer concludes with the Lord's Prayer.

When the Holy Communion is not administered the Hymn after the Sermon is followed by a Collect for the Word, the Benediction, Closing Hymn and Closing Prayer as above.

The Minister is permitted to *say* the words he should intone "if he possess little or no ability to sing."

The English translation of the "Alterbog" here given is the Order of Service officially adopted by the United Norwegian Lutheran Church in America.

We might, in passing, note that this Service Book was fortunately brought forward in Norway under a liberal ministry, of which the famous Jacob Sverdrup was leader. Under him it was sure to be adopted in conformity with the needs of the Church. It was adopted, and has proved peculiarly satisfactory.

It would make an interesting study to account for the character and form of, say, Confession and Absolution and the reasons for the changes made in these, as well as in the Order of Service proper. Here, however, I will let it rest in saying that every part of the Service has an interesting history.

But to mention a few characteristics of the new Order of Service. The two-fold principle with which we started—that the congregation came to serve God and to receive His blessing—, is adhered to throughout. The pastor appears as God’s spokesman; the congregation is made more than a passive recipient. Note that the congregation takes part not only in the singing of hymns, but also in confession, praise and creed. Note also the fulness of the expression of faith—in confession, praise and creed. It is true that in spoken prayer the congregation is not allowed to take part other than through the precentor, who makes the opening and closing prayers. But note that the General Prayer following the Sermon has been given a permanent form and contents and not only a form into which might be put anything as in the case of the “Ordinance” prayer. What is lacking now to make our Services more ideal is: that the congregation take part in the General Prayer in some way and that there be an Introit and Hymns for the new text series.

A rich and complete Order of Service is a good thing. One who does not understand it may underestimate its value and even despise it. Yet, even though it is not understood, even though it does not appeal to the unbeliever, it is a great help in preserving the spirit and order among the believers; in fact, it is often as inspiring as the Word itself. There have been times when the Word of God has not been preached from the pulpit; such times may come again. The new Rationalism is already at the church door to be admitted as spokesman. Now, if the liturgic part of the Service be not heavily freighted with God’s truth, and if the dire evil should come to pass that the pulpit again become rationalistic, what should we say about the plight of the congregation?

On the other hand, if the congregation shall come to understand and prize its Liturgy, it can get nourishment for its spiritual existence in faith through the Liturgy when the Sermon becomes spiritless and unsound. And as the congregation is kept

in the faith by the Liturgy, the Minister, in turn, is strengthened in his Purpose to be true to his faith by the example of his congregation as well as by the influence of the Liturgy itself.

The new Liturgy is as beautiful as it is inspiring when it is properly rendered. The hymns contribute somewhat to this effect. Also Lindeman's revised chants, which are more melodic than the originals, at the same time that they are recitative. Another important contribution is Professor Rydning's arrangement of the communion Liturgy for the organ. Professor Rydning has been a pupil of Lindeman and possesses a considerable knowledge of Church Music; he is the instructor in music at the United Church Seminary.

The Norwegian Church has a beautiful Order of Service. The fixed forms are inspiring. May God then grant us the inspired testimony from the mouth of living witnesses, a testimony that permits Christ's glory to shine forth enlightening and quickening the congregation, while it reverently listens to the Word of the Lord and takes it to heart. Then the Service will be in truth pleasing to God, a glorifying of His Name and an inspiration to His congregation.

United Norwegian Church Seminary, St. Anthony Park, St. Paul, Minn.

E. KR. JOHNSEN.

CHRISTIAN WORSHIP IN THE FIRST POST-APOSTOLIC AGE. (BEFORE THE YEAR 150.)

The purpose of this paper is to present in brief form a picture of the worship of the Christian congregations, so far as we are able to trace it, in the time between the close of the Apostolic Age and the middle of the second Century. No attempt will be made to construct even a relatively complete Liturgy in this period, for such an attempt would result only in ignominious failure and we shall confine ourselves to the simpler task of setting down what our sources give us and accounting, so far as may be, for what we find.

The chief danger that confronts us in dealing with such a subject is that of reading into the sources ideas which they do not actually contain and of assuming that customs universally prevalent in later times must have had their origin in the period under discussion if not, indeed, in one still earlier. A second temptation, scarcely less alluring, and equally fatal to historical truth, lies in the assumption that traces of liturgical customs, or language which may be so interpreted, found in a document of Syrian or of Roman origin applies to any other part of the Early Church. If the student succeeds in avoiding both of these snares, a third is still in his path, in the form of faulty editions of second Century documents which have been emended by later hands, and few of the sources for the history of the second Century have come down to us in their unaltered form. Fortunately the labors of the nineteenth century have reduced the last dan-

ger to a minimum. and we may feel at last reasonably safe in using any of the good modern editions.

Before approaching the proper subject of this paper, it may be well to take account of certain facts which bear directly or indirectly, upon every phase of life of the Church in the -period which we are studying.

The second Century was not an age of forms. It was on the contrary, the most plastic age of the Church. The truth as it is in Christ Jesus had entered the life of the Roman Empire as a great force, the full meaning of which was only faintly apprehended. It had to work upon the material which it found, and the results could not be uniform when the preparation had been so various. The Jew, the Greek, the Roman, were bound to be affected in different ways by the, message of the Gospel which came to all, and, centuries were to pass before there could be even relative unanimity of opinion concerning the great central truths whose possession was to give the Church its power. At the end of the second Century Christian doctrine was still in a fluid state, and Gnosticism, the earliest of the heresies, was still a living power. Before the century ended, however, the power which was eventually to define the Catholic faith and extirpate heresy had begun to show itself. That power was the so-called monarchical episcopate. Each Church had its own bishop who was regarded as the depository of Apostolic truth.

The organization of the Church preceded, and had to precede, definition of doctrine, but it was not alone the fight with heresy which made the organization necessary. The second Century was a time of wonderful missionary activity. This was the special work of the "Apostles"—the charismatically endowed preachers of the Gospel who wandered from place to place—but the retention of converts within the fold, the prevention of backsliding into heathenism and of "lapsing" in times of persecution these things demanded compactly organized congregations.*

*Cf. HARNACK, *Mission and Ausbreitung des Christenthums*, pp. 256ff, 316 ff.

A third element in the development of Church organization was the need of an officer to preside over the administration of the finances of the congregation and to direct its charitable work.* But upon these points we do not wish to dwell. Enough has been said to account for the organization which meets us in the second Century—an organization with the bishop at its head and with presbyters and deacons under him. In this organization the congregation found its unity, upon this organization it was at a later time to base its claim to catholicity and apostolicity.

The beginnings of this organization the Church of the second Century had inherited from the Apostolic Age.† It had also inherited certain traditions of worship, together with certain rudimentary forms of prayer, and it had inherited the two Sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper. This triple inheritance was the seed from which the Liturgy was to spring.

The first liturgical practice to be definitely fixed was the observance of Sunday as the day of common worship. The Church in Jerusalem had met every day.‡ By the time the First Epistle to the Corinthians was written Sunday had become the regular day of meeting,§ and in the second Century all our sources agree in assigning the assembly of Christians to the first day of the week. Pliny (*Eb.* x. 96 (97) to Trajan) says simply “on a fixed day (*die stato*) they are accustomed to assemble.” The *Didache* (ch. xiv) says:—“on the Lord's Day of the Lord, gather your

* HATCH in *The Organization of the Early Christian Churches*, and *The Greek Influence in the Early Church*, traces the episcopate to this source.

† This is not the place to discuss the organization of the New Testament Churches. Whatever that organization may have been, it was the result of conditions which the Church had to face and was not of Divine institution. The present writer is inclined to believe with those who see, in the “angels” of the Seven Churches, bishops presiding over these Churches. The functions of such bishops, however, would differ widely from those of the “monarchical” bishop whose claims are asserted in the Ignatian letters and realized in the second and third centuries.

‡ Cf. the present writer's “Christian Worship in the Apostolic Age,” MEMOIRS, Vol. VI, No. 4, p. 48

§ l. c. p. 49

selves together and break bread and give thanks.” Ignatius, (*Ad. Magn.* ix), Barnabas (ch. xv), and Justin Martyr also testify to the observance of the Sunday and assign reasons for the selection of that special day. Ignatius says: “Those who had walked in ancient practices attained unto newness of hope, no longer observing Sabbaths, but fashioning their lives after the Lord’s Day, on which our life also arose through Him and through His death.” Barnabas after an examination of Old Testament passages relating to the Sabbath, on which he puts a fanciful interpretation, concludes:—“Ye see what is His meaning; it is not your present Sabbaths that are acceptable, but the Sabbath which I have made, in the which, when I have set all things at rest, I will make the beginning of the eighth day, which is the beginning of another world. Wherefore also we keep the eighth day for rejoicing, in the which also Jesus rose from the dead, and having been manifested, ascended into the Heavens.” Justin Martyr (*Ap.* I, lxvii) is more concise. He says: “Sunday is the day on which we all hold our common assembly, because it is the first day, on which God, having wrought a change in the darkness and matter, made the world; and Jesus Christ our Saviour on the same day rose from the dead.”

The obvious conclusion from these passages—drawn as they are from sources of the most various local origin—is that the observance of Sunday in the first half of the second Century was universal, and that the observance consisted in worship. In the second place we notice that all of our authors regard the observance of the Sabbath as an “ancient practice” which has passed away. The Sunday takes the place among the Christians that the Sabbath held among the Jews, but it is regarded neither as a continuation of the old institution nor as a substitute for it. It is something as new as the Gospel itself.

It commemorates not the end of the first creation, but the beginning of the new creation, the entering into the world of the new life brought by the Resurrection of the dead. As such it is a

day of joy, which could not but find expression in the Service.* Three other seasons which were destined to play a large part in the liturgical history of the Church call for passing comment here. The first of these is Easter Day. That it was observed by the first converts from Judaism is certain, and that it had a place in the Gentile congregations founded by Paul is evident from I Cor. 5: 6-8. These two circumstances combined with the fact that Sunday was regarded as a weekly celebration of the Resurrection, make it certain that the observance of Easter was universal in the Church from the beginning. Even in our period, however, there are traces of the differences in Easter observance that were afterwards to give rise to the Quarto-decimian controversy, for according to Irenaeus (quoted by Euseb. H. E. V, 24) Polycarp (†155). and Anicetus of Rome (154-165) had disagreed concerning the day on which the celebration was to take place. Polycarp claimed to follow the practice of S. John in observing the 14th Nisan, while Anicetus adhered to the usage of the Roman Church and observed the Sunday after the full moon. The controversy—which was to result in the first victory of the Roman tradition over the Asiatic—did not culminate until the end

The longer Greek recension of the Ignatian letters, which dates probably from the latter part of the fourth or beginning of the fifth century, presents an interesting amplification of *Ad. Magn. ix*, already quoted, which is in full accord with the spirit of the shorter and genuine version. It reads as follows:

“Let us, therefore, no longer keep the Sabbath after the Jewish manner, and rejoice in days of idleness; for ‘he that does not work, let him not eat.’ ... But let every one of you keep the Sabbath after a spiritual manner, rejoicing in meditation on the law, not in relaxation of the body, admiring the workmanship of God, and not eating things prepared the day before, nor using luke-warm drinks and walking within a prescribed space nor finding delight in dancing and senseless applause. And after the observance of the Sabbath let every friend of Christ keep the Lord’s Day as a festival, the Resurrection day, the queen and chief of all the days, ... on which our life both sprang up again and the victory over death was obtained in Christ.”

The passage testifies convincingly to the fact that the Early Church not only did not regard Sunday as a substitute for the Sabbath, but actually in some localities or in some congregations, observed both days, yet in the observance abrogated those practices which according to Jewish law were the essential things of the hallowing of the day.

of the century, but the differences seem to have existed from the first.

When the dispute finally attained serious proportions, however, we find it involving another question; that, namely, of Lenten observance. It was customary to precede the Easter celebration with a fast. This fast seems to have been universal but its duration varied in different Churches, Irenaeus (*l. c.*) tells us: "Some consider themselves bound to fast one day, others two, days, others still more, while others fast for forty." In this passage we observe the beginnings of the Church Year with Easter as its center. The origin of the observance is to be found in the forty hours' fast preceding the Easter celebration, typical of the forty hours' rest of Jesus in the grave, which was the usage of the Roman Church. This period was subsequently extended, probably at Rome, to forty days, the period of our Lord's fasting in the wilderness and the Roman use became universal sometime in the fourth Century.*

The origin of the Station Days† (*dies stationum*) is much older than that of the Lenten fast. The *Didache* (9: 1) is the earliest authority for the observance of Wednesday and Friday as days of fasting and prayer. We read there:—"Let not your fastings, be with the hypocrites, for they fast on the second and fifth days of the week; but do ye keep your fast on the fourth and on the preparation day." Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* VII, 12) refers this custom to the commemoration of the council of Christ's enemies (Mark xiv: 1) and the crucifixion.

This custom is especially noteworthy as showing the importance which the Early Church attached to the Christian week, before the development of the Christian year. Each week was a repetition of the week of our Lord's Passion, culminating in the Sunday celebration of His victory over death. Even after the Church Year had reached its full develop

* See MOELLER, Kg2 1, 346 and literature there cited.

† So named first in HERM. Sim. V, 1.

ment* the cycle of the Week maintained itself and has remained in the Roman usage to the present day.†

Along with this development of the liturgical seasons we find another, which has its origin in our period and which was destined to a rapid growth, to long duration and to serious abuse. In the letter of the Smyrneans (ch. 18) describing the death of Polycarp (55 A. D.) we find the following passage:—"So we afterwards took up his bones, and laid them in a suitable place where the Lord will permit us to gather ourselves together, as we are able, in gladness and joy, and to celebrate the birthday of his martyrdom for the commemoration of those that have already fought in the contest and for the training and preparation of those that shall do so hereafter." In this celebration of the "birthdays of the martyrs" (i. e. the days of their martyrdom) we find the origin of the Saints' Days which had such a large place in the Catholic period of the Church's history. They were at first purely local, each Church commemorating its own martyrs, and down to the time of Cyprian we have no evidence to show that they were observed with the celebration of the Eucharist, but the outbreak of the general persecutions, which multiplied the numbers of the martyrs and placed on martyrdom such a high valuation, made the observance universal and opened the way for later abuses.

* Not later than the fifth century. See Ap. Const. V, 13, 20. † In an interesting passage in the V Similitude HERMAS thus describes the "acceptable fast." "This, then, is the way that thou shalt keep the fast. First of all keep thyself from every evil word and every evil device, and purify thy heart from all the vanities of this world. If thou keep these things thy heart shall be perfect for thee. And thus shalt thou do. Having fulfilled what is written, on that day on which thou fastest, thou shalt taste nothing but bread and water; and from thy meals which thou wouldst have eaten, thou shalt reckon up the amount of that day's expenditure, which thou wouldst have incurred, and shalt give it to a widow or an orphan, or to one in want, and so shalt thou humble thy soul, that he that receiveth from thy humiliation may satisfy his own soul, and may pray for thee to the Lord. If, then, thou shalt so accomplish this fast, as; I have commanded thee, thy sacrifice shall be acceptable in the sight of God and this fasting shall be recorded; and the service so performed is beautiful and joyous and acceptable to the Lord." (Sim, V, 3).

Our survey of the liturgical seasons has carried us somewhat far afield. Let us return to the traditions of worship which the Church of the second Century inherited from the Apostolic Age.

The New Testament offers clear testimony to the custom prevailing in the Church at Corinth and, by legitimate inference, in many other of the Gentile congregations, of holding on each Sunday two assemblies for worship. That this custom was still followed in the beginning of the second Century is evident from Pliny's description of the worship of the Bythinian Christians about 111 or 113 A. D. (Pliny Ep. x. 96 (97) to Trajan). One of these Services was held early in the morning (*ante lucem*) and may be assumed to correspond to the Service for edification existing in Corinth. The elements of this Service were Prayer, Scripture-reading, Hymns and Preaching. The second Service was held later in the day and was devoted to the common meal (known later as the *Agape*) which culminated in the Lord's Supper.* We shall see that the two Services were soon combined into one and that the combination of the two is the starting point for the chief Service of all later Liturgies, but for the present we are concerned chiefly with the second, or evening Service, at which the Lord's Supper was administered.

The oldest prescriptions for liturgical worship which we possess are those contained in the section of the *Didache* which deals with this Service. It comprises chapters ix, x and xiv, and reads as follows:

14. "And on the Lord's Day of the Lord, gather yourselves together and break bread and give thanks (εὐχαριστησάτε), first confessing your transgressions, that your sacrifice may be pure. And let no man having his dispute with his fellow join your assembly until they have been reconciled, that your sacrifice may not be defiled;† for this sacrifice it is that was spoken of by the

* See the present writer's "Christian Worship in the Apostolic Age," MEMOIRS Vol. VI, No. 4, PP- 49 ff -

† Cf. Matt. 5: 23, 24

Lord; *In every place and at every time, offer He a pure sacrifice; for I am a great King, saith the Lord, and My Name is wonderful among the nations.*”*

9. “But as touching the Eucharistic thanksgiving (ευχαριστία), give ye thanks thus:

“First as regards the cup:

“We give Thee thanks, O our Father, for the holy vine of Thy son David, which Thou madest known to us through Thy Son Jesus; Thine is the glory for ever and ever.

“Then as regards the broken bread:

“We give Thee thanks, O our Father, for the life and knowledge which Thou didst make known unto us through Thy Son Jesus; Thine is the glory for ever and ever.

“As this broken bread was scattered upon the mountains and being gathered together became one, so may Thy Church be gathered together from the ends of the earth into Thy Kingdom; for Thine is the glory and the power through Jesus Christ for ever and ever.

“But let no one eat of this Eucharist but they that have been baptized into the Name of the Lord; for concerning this also the Lord hath said: *Give not that which is holy unto the dogs.* †

10. “And after ye are filled thus shall ye give thanks: we give Thee thanks, Holy Father, for Thy holy Name which Thou hast made to tabernacle in our hearts, and for the knowledge and faith and immortality which Thou hast made known unto us through Thy Son Jesus; Thine is the glory for ever and ever.

“Thou, Almighty Master, ‡ didst create all things for Thy Name’s sake, and didst give food unto men for enjoyment, that they might render thanks to Thee; but didst bestow upon us spiritual food and drink and eternal life through Thy Son. Be

* Mal. 1: 11, 14.

† Matt. 7: 6.

‡ δεσπότης-the regular form of address to the Father in the Greek Liturgies.

fore all things we give Thee thanks that Thou art powerful; Thine is the glory for ever and ever.

“Remember, Lord, Thy Church to deliver it from all evil and to perfect it in Thy love; and *gather it together from the four winds**—even the Church which has been sanctified—into Thy Kingdom which Thou hast prepared for it; for Thine is the power and the glory for ever and ever.

“May grace come and this world pass away.

“Hosanna to the God of David.

“If any man is holy let him come; if any man is not, let him repent.

“Maranatha.

“Amen.

“But permit the prophets to offer thanks as much as they will.”

In these prayers there are several things which deserve special attention.

It must be borne in mind, first of all, that the prayers here set down are not regarded as inflexible forms which must always be followed, but are intended to provide against a contingency which would seldom arise in the earliest period of the Church but would become more common as time went on. This contingency is indicated in the last sentence quoted,—“Permit the prophets to offer thanks as much as they will.”

The proper officiating personage is “the prophet,” not the bishop and not the presbyter. A bishop or presbyter might, indeed, be a prophet and exercise “prophetic” functions, but his “ordination” and the official position in the congregation which it conferred, carried with it no right to preside at the *Agape* or to offer the Eucharistic prayer. That was the prerogative of the man who had the special endowment of the Holy Spirit and his sole right to perform this duty rested upon his possession of the *charisma*. Such a man would be a member of the congregation

*Matt. 24: 31.

and is entitled to congregational support (*Did. xiii*), “For,” says the author of the *Didache* significantly, “they are your chief priests.” The prayer of a prophet, however, like all his other utterances, was regarded as the result of a direct inspiration of the Spirit and could not, therefore, be confined to any formula. Accordingly he was to be allowed “to offer thanks” (εὐχαριστέω) in whatever way he pleased, i. e., extemporaneously. The extempore character of the Eucharistic prayer seems to have maintained itself for a considerable time. Justin Martyr, in the passages which will be quoted later, says that the president “offers thanks at considerable length” (*Apol. I, lxv*) or “according to his ability” (ch. lxvii) and the *Apostolic Constitutions* (*Bk. VII, ch. xxvi*) quote the words of the *Didache*, substituting “presbyter” for “prophet.”

But in the days when the prayers of the *Didache* were composed the charismatic ministry was dying out. “Speaking with tongues” (I Cor. xii ff) lasted for so short a time that it has sometimes been supposed to have existed only at Corinth. By the beginning of the second century it was quite possible that a congregation should have no prophet among its members and under such circumstances there could be no inspired prayer. It was to meet such a contingency that the prayers above quoted were composed. As the prophetic gift became more rare these and similar set forms would become the ordinary usage of the Church and extempore prayer would become less and less frequent until eventually it would entirely disappear.

Meanwhile the question must have arisen—“In the absence of a prophet, who is to offer these prayers and preside at the administration?” The *Didache* does not answer this question at all, and Justin Martyr calls this functionary simply “the president of the brethren” or “that one of the brethren who presides,” for the Greek text admits of either translation. We may assume, however, that the duty would naturally devolve first upon one of the presbyters, and then, as the single bishop gained authority,

upon him. I just when this transference of duties began it is impossible to say. The charismatic and the official ministry were beginning to run into one another as early as the time of the Pastoral Epistles where we find (I Tim. iii. 3) “aptness to teach”—a distinctly charismatic trait, according to I Cor. xii. 28—demanded of the candidate for the bishop’s (or presbyter’s) office. The Ignatian letters (110-117 circ.) represent the first clear emergence of the later monarchical bishop from among his presbyters. They form, so to speak, the platform of the episcopal party and claim for the bishop a position which he had not by any means attained and was not to attain for many years. When, therefore, we find Ignatius writing to the Smyrneans (*ad Smyr.* viii):—“Let that be held a valid Eucharist which is under the bishop or one to whom he shall have committed it;” and again: “It is not lawful apart from the bishop either to baptize or to hold a love-feast;” we are not to conclude that this was the universally accepted view of the Church, but we may assume that the episcopate, in its development, was on the way to absorb those liturgical functions which belonged primarily to the ‘prophets.’ “

Turning again to the prayers we notice in the second place that we are still in the time when the Lord’s Supper was preceded by a common meal. The whole procedure was regarded as a religious rite and was known as the Eucharist or breaking of bread, while the prayers that introduce the two parts of the Service show the spirit in which it was conducted.

The Service was preceded by a public confession of sins and no man having a quarrel with a fellow-Christian was allowed to come to the assembly (ch. xiv). After this they sat down to the meal and prayers were offered in consecration of the bread and wine that were set before them. After this eating and drinking, more prayers were offered, to each of which, as to each of the preceding prayers, the congregation would respond with the “Amen.” Then, with the sentences given

at the close of ch. x, the solemn administration was begun:

“May grace come and this world pass away!” *Amen*.

“Hosanna to the God of David!” *Amen*.

“If any man is holy let him come; if any man is not, let him repent. Maranatha!” *Amen*.

The Distribution would follow and the congregation would be dismissed.

We could wish that our information was more detailed. There can be little doubt that many things were customary in this Service which, as matters of well-known observance, are not here set down. Still we may believe that the essentials of the rite, or those, things which were then regarded as essential are given us. These were simply the elements, the Eucharistic prayers, and the communication, and even the nature of the prayers would vary when a prophet was present (v. *supra*).

It remains only to ask: what conception of the Sacrament is here expressed?

In chapter xiv the Service is spoken of as a “sacrifice.” It is true that this word was used in a wholly figurative sense as referring chiefly to the prayers of the communicants, but these prayers had already given the Service a new name. By S. Paul and by numerous writers of the Early Church it had been called the “breaking of bread,” but here (ch. ix) and in the Ignatian letters (e. g., *ad Smyrn. viii*) it is called for the first time the Eucharist, and this title was eventually to become universal. We may say, therefore, that while there was as yet no idea of a repetition of the sacrifice of Christ upon the Cross connected with the Lord’s Supper, the Service was nevertheless conceived even at this time under the category of sacrifice rather than under that of sacrament. It was a Service, a spiritual sacrifice of thanksgiving offered to God.

We are not, however, to suppose that the sacramental element was not consciously present. The idea of a sacramental gift is very clear in the second of the prayers given in ch. x.

That gift, however, does not involve the doctrine of the Real Presence in any way. It is “spiritual food and drink and eternal life;- it is the “Holy Name;” “knowledge, faith and immortality.” In the prayer over the cup (ch. ix), where we would expect to find a reference to Christ’s atoning death, there is no, direct allusion to the communion of the Saviour’s blood, but only thanks “for the Holy Vine of Thy servant David.” The prayer over the bread (ch. ix) and the final prayer (ch. x), especially the former, allude most beautifully to the body of Christ, but it is His spiritual body, which is the Church, that is there symbolized. Such is the interpretation which the Early Church, or a part of it, placed upon the words of Paul.—“The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ.”

We need not wonder that the teaching of St. Paul had been thus obscured. It is doubtful how far the Church, even in the Apostolic Age, had been able to receive the Apostles’ teaching, and it is certain that the atonement had a smaller place in the theology of the second Century than it had in the theology of Paul. The Incarnation was regarded as the one fact of supreme importance. The Resurrection was conceived as a testimony to the reality of the Incarnation, and the Parousia, (*παρουσία*) as the completion of all that the Incarnation had begun. With a doctrine which made the life of Jesus, with its revelation of life, light and immortality, the chief things in the Gospel and reduced His atoning death to an episode, these prayers are in thorough harmony. That they were not in accord with the later views of the Church is shown by the alterations and insertions made in them at a subsequent period.*

The question may be asked, if ‘the connection of the Lord’s Supper with Christ’s death has been lost, what idea has been substituted for it? As a matter of fact there was no substitution. The meaning of the Lord’s Supper is not exhausted by the reference to the sacrifice on Calvary, and the obscuration of that ref

*Comp. Note I at the end of this article.

erence has only brought two other ideas, subordinate, but inherent in the rite, into prominence. The first of these is the unity of the Church, a unity amid diversity, here on earth symbolized, but not realized, in the common participation of the consecrated bread. Seldom has that idea been more beautifully or more reverently expressed than by the unknown author of this prayer: "As this broken bread was scattered upon the mountains and being gathered together became one, so may Thy Church be gathered together from the ends of the earth into Thy Kingdom." "Remember, Lord, Thy Church, to deliver it from all evil and perfect it in Thy love; and gather it together from the four winds into Thy Kingdom which Thou hast prepared for it."

The second idea is that of the prophetic character of the Sacrament. It looks forward devoutly to the second coming of the Lord and symbolizes the consummation, when the Lord Himself shall with His followers "drink anew with them in the Kingdom of Heaven." "May grace come and this world pass away! Maranatha (the Lord cometh)" is the formula that immediately precedes the Distribution, which is a continual reminder of the Parousia, that vivid hope which dwelt so deep in the heart of the Early Church. Of the Holy Supper Paul had written (I Cor. xi. 26):—"As often as ye eat this bread and drink of the cup ye proclaim the Lord's death *till He come.*" When the first idea was obscured the second came into greater prominence. The Church afterwards changed the emphasis and laid all importance to the first idea, with the natural consequence of all but disregarding the second thought—viz., that the Lord's Supper is, and should be, a prophetic symbol as well as the memorial of an accomplished fact.

Leaving the *Didache* we turn now to the second main source for the worship of the Early Church. In his First Apology, addressed to the Emperor Antoninus Pius, written not later than A. D. 150, and perhaps as early as A. D. 138 or 139, Justin Martyr gives a double description of the Eucharistic Service. Chap-

ter lxx connects directly with lxi in which the rite of Baptism has been described and discussed. It reads as follows:

“But we, after we have thus washed him who has been convinced and assented to our teaching, lead him to the place where those who are called brethren are assembled, in order that we may offer hearty prayers in common for ourselves and for him who has been illuminated (i. e., baptized, cf. chapt. lxx), and for all others in every place, that we may be counted worthy, now that we have learned the truth, by our works also to be found good citizens and keepers of the commandments,* so that we may be saved with an everlasting salvation.

“Having ended the prayers, we salute one another with a kiss.

“Bread and a cup of wine mingled with water are then brought to the president of the brethren;

“And he, taking them, gives praise and glory to the Father of the Universe, through the Name of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, and offers thanks at considerable length, for our being counted worthy to receive these things at His hands.

“And when he has concluded the prayers and thanksgivings, all the people present express their assent by saying ‘Amen.’ This word Amen answers in the Hebrew language to γένοιτο (i. e., So be it!).

“And when the president has given thanks and all the people have expressed their assent, those who are called by us deacons give each of those present the bread and wine mixed with water over which the thanksgiving was pronounced, and they carry away a portion to those who are not present.

The opening sentences of chapter lxxvii should be connected with the close of chapter lxxv. They complete the description of the Eucharistic Service.

“And we afterwards continually remind each other of these things.

“And the wealthy among us help the needy; and we always keep together.

“And for all the things wherewith we are supplied we bless the Father of all through His Son Jesus Christ and through the Holy Ghost.”

This then is the Service which follows the administration of Baptism. Let us turn to the same author’s description of the

* The words have no special doctrinal significance, but are a part of the author’s refutation of the charge of lawlessness so commonly brought against the Christians.

regular Sunday worship, It takes up the greater part of chapter lxvii.

“And on the day that is called Sunday all who live in cities or in the country gather together to one place, and the memoirs of the Apostles (i. e., the Gospels, cf. above chap. lxvi) or the writings of the prophets are read, as long as time permits:

“Then, when the reader has ceased, the president verbally instructs and exhorts to the imitation of these good things.

“Then we all rise together and pray;

“And, as we before said, bread and wine and water are brought, and the president in like manner offers prayers and thanksgivings, according to his ability (or, with all his might), and the people assent, saying Amen; and there is a distribution to each and a participation of that over which thanks has been given (or of the Eucharistic elements), and to those who are absent a portion is sent by the deacons. “And they who are well-to-do and the willing, give what each thinks fit; and what is collected is deposited with the president, who succors the orphans and widows and those who through sickness or any other cause are in want, and those who are in bonds and the strangers sojourning among us, and in a word takes care of all who are in need.”

The first thing that we notice in this description as compared with the condition of affairs indicated in the *Didache* is that the *Agape* has fallen away from the regular Sunday Service. This separation must have occurred in various parts of the Empire at different times and was doubtless due to various reasons. We have seen* that the custom gave rise to serious abuses even in the Apostolic Age and these abuses would increase rather than diminish as time went on. Then, too, the increasing number of the Christians would soon render it impossible for the whole congregation to take part in the common meal. Finally the imperial prohibition against secret societies, in localities where it was strictly enforced would have exposed the Christians to the danger of legal suppression if not of persecution.

This last reason seems to have led to the complete abandonment of the custom in Bythinia. Pontus as early as 112 A. D., †

* MEMOIRS, Vol. VI, No. 4, pp. 61 f.

† PLINY writes to Trajan:—“But even from this they had desisted after my edict; in which, in pursuance of your commands, I had forbidden the existence of clubs (*sodalitates*).

and the fact that Justin nowhere refers to the love-feasts would seem to indicate that the same law had resulted in their abandonment in Rome before the year 140. But even where the custom was still maintained* the reasons first mentioned seemed early to have brought about its entire severance from the sacramental Service.†

The place of the love-feast in the Service was supplied, however, by the consolidation of the early Service for edification,, with the Service of the Sacrament and this is the Liturgy the main features of which are described in the long passage from Justin Martyr. It is to be remarked, however, that the distinction between the two Services is by no means lost to view. On days when a baptism was performed the baptismal Service takes the place of the Service for edification. The missa *catechumenorum* of a later day was essentially the original early Service as described by Paul in the First Epistle to the Corinthians, stripped of its charismatic features and expanded, while the Morning Prayer of the Church of England and the weekly Morning Service of our own Liturgies preserve the old distinction.

Upon closer examination of the description of the Service given by Justin we find that it consists of the following elements.

I. The Reading of the Scriptures, here specified as the “memoirs of the Apostles (by which are meant the Gospels, cf. ch. lxvi) or the writings of the Prophets.” The Old or the New Testament might therefore be read, and the rubric would say “as long as time permits.”

* e. g., in Africa, see TERTULLIAN, *Apol.* ch. xxxix.; It is also referred to in CLEMENT ALEX. and in several passages in the Canons of HIPPOLYTUS.

† The letter of Ignatius to the Smyrneans (ch. viii) speaks of the Eucharist and the love-feast in such a way as to imply that they were separately observed. For argument to the contrary see, however, LIGHTFOOT, *APOSTOLIC Fathers*, pt. ii, Vol. II, p. 312.

§ See above p. 56.

2. The Sermon, based upon the text just read and delivered by the “president of the brethren.” Originally this duty had fallen to the lot of the “prophet,” but like the right of presiding at the Eucharist, it had passed into official hands, i. e., into the hands of the bishop or of one of his presbyters, for there can be no doubt that by this time presbyters and bishops were distinct. An interesting example of this early preaching has come down to us from this period in the so-called Second Epistle of Clement which is a fragment of an ancient homily.

3. Prayer. This was the General Prayer for all sorts and conditions of men to which reference is made in I Tim. ii. 1, 2. That this prayer while still the function of the man with the charisma was extempore, goes without saying. That it would soon acquire some kind of a fixed form when it was offered by men who had not the spiritual gift is equally certain, and the common consent of scholars declares the prayer found in the First Epistle of Clement (chs. lix, lx, lxi) to be a part of the Roman Liturgy or, at all events, a good specimen of congregational prayer, dating from the close of the first or beginning of the Second Century (probably about 96 A. D.).*

A fourth element was the Singing of Hymns, not mentioned in this passage probably because regarded by the author as belonging to the non-essentials of worship, but referred to in Ab. 1, ch. xiii. We “offer thanks by invocations and hymns.”

5. The Kiss of Peace is mentioned by Justin in connection with the Baptismal Service and in such a way as to make it appear a part of that Service rather than of the Eucharistic Service which follows. In speaking of the ordinary Sunday worship he omits all reference to it, but it will be noted that in the Baptismal Order it follows immediately upon the General Prayer, from which the congregation passes to the Eucharist. In the Clementine Liturgy—probably the oldest that we possess—the Kiss is given at that point in the Mass of the faithful where the doors are

* See MEMOIRS, Vol. VI, No. 4, PP. 53 ff.

closed and the solemn celebration properly begins.* From this and the New Testament passages† which seem to imply that the Kiss of Peace was even then a liturgical custom,—we infer that it formed the first part of the Eucharistic observance, and preceded the bringing in of the elements.

6. The *Consecration* follows upon the Kiss. Bread and mingled wine are brought to the president who offers the Eucharistic prayer “at considerable length” (ch. lxxv), “according to his ability” (ch. lxxvii). The words of chapter lxxvi§ are usually understood as interpretative of this Eucharistic prayer, and are commonly quoted as authority for the statement that the prayer of consecration included, as in later Liturgies, a repetition of the Words of Institution, but of this we cannot be certain. It seems probable, but with the fact in mind that the *Didache* makes no reference to them, our assertions must be guarded.††

As to the further content of this Eucharistic prayer we may safely say that the forms of the *Didache* or similar forms independently derived—for Justin is writing at Rome—would probably be followed.¶

7. The *Distribution* was the work of the deacons, (ch. lxxv) who carried the elements to the congregation and reserved a portion to be sent to those who were unavoidably absent. Justin and the *Didache* are both silent concerning any post-Communion usage.

8. After the Eucharist followed the *Collection*. The offerings of the congregation being gathered and deposited with the “president” who distributes them to the needy. This fact alone would indicate that “president” was with Justin only another

* *Ap. Const.* Bk. VIII, ch. xi.

† Rom. xvi, 16; 1 COT. Xvi, 20; 11 COT. Xiii, 12; 1 Thess. V, ~26; 1 Pet- v, 14.

† The writer withdraws the statement made in MEMOIRS VI, No. 4, p. 63.

§ See below NOTE II

†† Compare, however, MEMOIRS, Vol.. VI, No. 4, p. 63.

¶ For a very interesting hypothetical analysis of those prayers see KLIEFOTH, *Liturgische Abhandlungen*, Bd. IV, PP- 302 ff.

name for “bishop.”

The administration officer of the congregation and the *leitourgos* are one and the same man and the claims of Ignatius are in a fair way to realization.*

With Justin Martyr our period ends. The traditions of worship and the organization which the Church inherited from the Apostolic Age, both have taken on new forms, but both are recognizable for both bear upon them the marks of their origin. Of greatest significance, however, is the fact that the organization in its development has displaced the old charismatic ministry and taken the worship of the Church into its own hands. When the new conception of the ministry, the germs of which are to be seen in the Ignatian letters, has taken full possession of the Church’s thought, when the “president” of Justin Martyr has become the “priest” of Tertullian a new era will open up in the history of the Liturgy.

* For Justin MARTYR’S View of the Lord’s Supper see NOTE II at the end of this article.

NOTE 1.

LATER VARIATIONS IN THE PRAYERS OF THE DIDACHE.

In the Seventh Book of the *Apostolic Constitutions* the prayers of the *Didache* are given in an expanded form which is instructive as showing the change which had taken place in the view of the Lord’s Supper, and the new emphasis which was now laid upon the death of Christ. The variations are of sufficient importance to warrant us in presenting them without further comment, in parallel columns:

<p>DIDACHE. Ch. 9. We give Thee thanks, O our Father, for the holy vine of Thy son David, which Thou madest known through Thy Son Jesus, We give Thee thanks O our Father for the life and knowledge which</p>	<p>AP. CONST. BK. VII Ch. 25. We give Thee thanks, O our Father, for that life which Thou</p>
--	--

<p>Thou didst make known to us through Thy Son Jesus.</p> <p>As this broken bread was scattered upon the mountains and being gathered together became one, so may Thy Church be gathered together from the ends of the earth into Thy Kingdom.</p> <p>Ch. 10. We give Thee thanks, Holy Father, for Thy holy Name which Thou hast made to tabernacle in our hearts, and for the knowledge, and faith, and immortality which Thou hast made known to us through Thy Son Jesus.</p> <p>Thou, Almighty Master, didst create all things for Thy Name's sake, and didst give food unto man for enjoyment, that they might render</p>	<p>hast made known to us through Thy Son Jesus, through Whom also Thou makest all things and takest thought for the whole world; Whom too Thou didst send to. become man for our salvation, and didst permit Him to suffer and to die, Whom Thou didst also raise up and wast pleased to glorify and hast seated Him on Thy right hand; through Whom also Thou hast promised us the Resurrection from the dead.</p> <p>Do Thou, O Lord Almighty, eternal God, as this grain was once scattered and afterwards gathered together so as to form one loaf, so gather Thy Church together from the ends of the earth into Thy Kingdom,</p> <p>Furthermore we thank Thee, O our Father, for the precious blood of Jesus Christ, which was shed for us, and for His precious body, whereof we celebrate the antitype, He Himself having commanded us to show forth His death. (The Doxology follows).</p> <p>Ch. 26. We give Thee thanks, O God and Father of Jesus our Saviour, for that holy thing which Thou hast made to tabernacle within us, and for the knowledge, and faith, and love, and immortality, which Thou hast given unto us through Thy Son Jesus.</p> <p>Thou, O Almighty God, the God of the universe, didst create the world and the things which art, therein, through Him; and didst im-</p>
---	---

<p>thanks to Thee; but didst bestow upon us spiritual food and drink and eternal life through Thy Son Jesus. Before all things we give Thee thanks that Thou art powerful.</p> <p>Remember, Lord, Thy Church to deliver it from all evil and to perfect it in Thy love; and gather it together from the four winds-even the Church which has been sanctified into Thy Kingdom which Thou hast prepared for it.</p>	<p>plant a law in our souls, and didst prepare things beforehand for their reception by men. O God of our holy and blameless fathers, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, Thy faithful servants, Thou art powerful and faithful and true and without deceit in Thy promises. Thou didst send upon earth Jesus Thy Christ, to converse among men as man and to take away error by the roots, being Himself both God the Word and man.</p> <p>Do Thou, even now, through Him, remember this holy Church which Thou hast purchased with the precious blood of Thy Christ, and deliver it from all evil, and perfect it in Thy love and Thy truth and gather us all together into Thy Kingdom which Thou hast prepared.</p>
--	---

NOTE II.

JUSTIN MARTYR'S CONCEPTION OF THE LORD'S SUPPER.

Reference has already been made to the view of the Lord's Supper contained in the prayers of the *Didache* and it seems advisable to add a word touching the view held by Justin. The reader is left to make comparisons and deductions for himself.

In the midst of the description of the rite already quoted we find (Apol. I, ch. 66) the following passage:

“And this food is called among us Εὐχαριστία, of which no one is allowed to partake but he who believes that the things which we teach are true, and who has been washed with the washing that is for the remission of sins and unto regeneration, and who is so living as Christ hath enjoined. For not as common bread and common drink do we receive these, but in like manner as Jesus Christ our Saviour, having been made flesh by the Word of God, had both flesh and blood for our salvation, so likewise have

we been taught that the food which is blessed by the prayer of His Word, and from which Our blood and flesh by transmutation is nourished, is the flesh and blood of that Jesus Who was made flesh. For the Apostles in the memoirs composed by them, which are called Gospels, have thus delivered unto us what was enjoined upon them; that Jesus took bread and, when He had given thanks, said: ‘This do in remembrance of Me; this is My body;’ and that after the same manner He took the cup and gave thanks and said: ‘This is My blood;’ and gave it to them alone.”

With this passage we may now compare three others, which occur in the Dialogue with Trypho, and which throw some light upon the vexed question of Justin’s meaning.

The first of these is in ch. 41:

“And the offering of fine flour which was prescribed to be presented on behalf of those purified from leprosy, was a type of the bread of the Eucharist, which, in remembrance of His suffering which He suffered in behalf of those men who are purified in soul from all evil, Jesus Christ our Lord prescribed to be made, in order that we may at the same time thank God for having created the world, with all things therein, for the sake of man, and for delivering us from the evil in which we were, and for utterly overthrowing principalities and powers by Him Who suffered according to His will.”

Then, quoting Mal. i, 10-12, he continues:

“He speaks, then, of those Gentiles, namely of us, who in every place offer sacrifices to Him, i. e., the bread of the Eucharist and likewise the cup of the Eucharist.”

The second passage is in the same writing ch. 70:

“Now it is evident that in this prophecy (Is. Xxxiii, 1.3-19~ [He alludes) to the bread, which our Christ commanded us to eat* in remembrance of His being made flesh for the sake of those who believe on Him, for whose sake also He became a sufferer; and also to the cup, which He commanded those who partake in the Eucharist to drink* in remembrance of His blood.”

The third passage is that of ch. i 16. Quoting again Mal. i, 10-12 Justin comments:

“God says that He is pleased with the prayers of that nation then dispersed and calls their prayers sacrifices. Now that prayers and thanksgivings, when offered by worthy men, are the only sacrifices perfect and well-pleasing to God, I also admit. For these alone Christians have undertaken

*Literally “to do” ἄρτον ποιεῖν, ποτήριον ποεῖν used *as termini technici* in speaking of the Eucharist.

THE APPLICATION OF LUTHERAN PRINCIPLES TO THE CHURCH BUILDING.

DER KIRCHENBAU DES PROTESTANTISMUS VON DER REFORMATION BIS ZUR GEGENWART. Herausgegeben von der Vereinigung Berliner Architekten. Mit 1041 Grundrissen, Durchschnitten und Ansichten. Berlin. Toeche. 1893.*

HANDBUCH DES EVANGELISCH-CHRISTLICHEN KIRCHEISTBAUES, von Dr. Phil. *Oskar Mothes*, K. S. Baurath. Mit 59 Illustrationen im Text. Leipzig. Tauchnitz. 1898.†

IT is said that the Lutheran Churches of the United States build a new House of Worship for every day of the year. Many of these are small and are built of perishable material. They are intended to give place to more substantial structures. They follow the styles of building which obtain in the regions in which they are built, and bear curious marks of the untrained taste of those who have contributed to their erection. Even if pastor and committee have some peculiarity of taste or a little knowledge of architecture, their means are limited they must borrow and must hasten to pay; and there are so many incongruous ends to be served by the building, that it seems vain to aim at unity or to consider symbolism, or any of the rules of art. If the edifice, on the other hand, is to be built of brick or stone, and is in any sense built for the future, as well as the present generation,

**Church-Building of Protestantism from the Reformation until the time. Edited by the SOCIETY OF ARCHITECTS of Berlin. With 1041 plans, sectional drawings and views. Berlin. Toeche. 1893.*

† Handbook of Evangelical- Christian Church-Building, by Dr. Phil. OSKAR MOTHESE, K. S. Baurath. With 59 illustrations in the Text. Leipzig. Tauchnitz. 1898.

it is recognized to be wise and necessary to consult an architect; but not one architect in a thousand has any knowledge of German Church Architecture, or of the requisites of a Lutheran Church; and they therefore copy either Protestant Episcopal Churches, whose principles are altogether different from ours, or Methodist or Zwinglian Churches whose spirit is opposed to ours; or, if a well-schooled German architect is chosen, his work does not find the sympathetic cooperation of the builders or the approval of the community. The time has come, I think, for a consideration of the principles of Lutheran Church Architecture. In what respect do these differ from the principles of Roman Catholic or Reformed architecture? Is there a history of Lutheran Church Building? Is there any distinctively Protestant style of architecture; any distinctively Lutheran? What peculiar arrangement or style is demanded by the genius and history of Lutheran belief and worship?

The books whose titles accompany this article dispose of the notion that the Protestant Reformation merely adopted the church buildings that had been in use, with few and no characteristic modifications of their interior, and that there has been little church building in Germany until the recent immense growth of cities required the formation of new parishes and a heavy outlay upon new places of worship. Instead, they tell us of hundreds of churches, many of them of monumental construction and style, of all varieties of architectural style, obedient to the tastes prevalent in different eras, in some cases of daring experiments undertaken to invent new, distinctive, evangelical styles of architecture, and beginning in the age of the Reformation and sprinkled through all the years that have elapsed since. Both books give us a lively scientific criticism of these attempts, and discuss the theories of architects; while the Berlin architects give us pictures and plans which make the discussion intelligible. They make it perfectly clear that there is no postulate which has not been considered in the Fatherland, no novelty

which has. not been tested. They also show us that German architecture is peculiar. At another time I may attempt a comparison of English Church Architecture with the same art in Lutheran Germany, a subject that promises the utmost interest and instruction. They demonstrate, moreover, that Protestantism is not wedded to any particular style of architecture but may make use of all the historical styles. While Mothes agrees, in this, he evidently prefers the Gothic style and urges that it is native to the German. They hold that certain modifications of pre-Reformation architecture are required by the principles of Evangelical Protestantism; but, at the same time, that these modifications are a return to the usage of the Church in the ages preceding the dominance of Roman Catholicism.

Mothes closes his suggestive preface with these words:

“Luther did not, and the Evangelical Church neither can nor will, cast to one side the tradition of the Christian Church, but they would cleanse it from the human opinions and the abuses which have formed upon it in the course of time; and they demand the same purification of ecclesiastical art, of architecture.

“A Handbook for this art therefore should, first of all, give a veracious description of the development of ecclesiastical art before the Reformation, based on careful investigation, and show how this followed the course of the history of the Church, and in what places, within what limits, and in what way, the resultant tradition can be used by the Evangelical Church or must be rejected by her. It must show what has been done for Evangelical ecclesiastical art since the Reformation, its achievements, failures, and faults, With this it should give suggestions, how the edifices of the Evangelical Church should be shaped and completed so as to agree in their ARRANGEMENT with the ritual-liturgical as well as with the practical requirements of our Church: in their CONSTRUCTION with the modern technical standpoint and the general principles now acknowledged; in their FORM and CHARACTER with the spirit of Christianity in gen-

eral, the simplicity and inexhaustible depth of the nature and word of Jesus given in the Gospel, with the Evangelical Church especially, which is built on this foundation; and with the unchangeable laws of BEAUTY, which have their origin in the will of God, are symbolized to us in Nature, and therefore answer to that spirit.”

An attempted condensation of the contents of these books would be tedious. To discuss even a few of the topics they suggest, might bewilder the reader and lead his attention away from the points which are really essential. I cannot pretend to the knowledge of the subject which would give value to any opinion I may express. It is more important that I should tell what those who are of authority say. Yet it is a duty of those who have given anxious attention to the matter, and see the errors which ought to be corrected, to state the conclusions to which those of authority lead them. I propose, therefore, to lay down a few propositions which I hope may become a basis of discussion, and to add to them in the form of Notes material drawn for the most part from these books. It will be evident from my omissions what I consider to be open questions, and the attentive reader will discover that in some cases I am not convinced by the books. And it is right to add that though I think that these principles should be much more closely observed than they have been, I do not think that they ought to be regarded as a law and that every reverend old church ought to be altered to accord with them. The truth is, that we may learn a great deal from the ways in which our fathers, who certainly were not without the “Lutheran consciousness,” endeavored to satisfy what they knew to be essential to their faith and their traditions.

PROPOSITIONS FOR DISCUSSION.

I. The Lutheran Church is bound to no particular style of Architecture. The style should be chosen with reference to the site of the building, its surroundings, and its purpose.

While the Gothic style may seem to have especial claims, on the other hand it is doubtful whether the Gothic is suited to the small structures which many are compelled to build. A large Gothic church with nave and aisles is not favourable to a Service where the minister must be seen in all parts of the Service and distinctly heard.

II. While many churches which had been built before the Reformation were taken over and in some respects were altered to adapt them to their new use, so many new Lutheran churches have been built in all periods since the Reformation, so many experiments have been tried, that the requirements and character of a distinctively Lutheran church building are fully known.

III. A Lutheran Church differs from a Roman Catholic Church

1. in having but one Altar;
2. in making due provision for the preaching of the Word;
3. in providing that the whole congregation may intelligently take part in the whole Service of worship;
4. in not making a separation between a "clergy" and a "laity;"
5. in providing for the Communion of the people, instead of a Celebration of the Sacrament;
6. in arranging for a Service whose reality depends on the presence and participation of the Congregation. On the other hand, the sanctity of a Roman Catholic Church is guaranteed by the supposed Presence of Christ upon the Altar, and the Consecration of the church.

IV. A Lutheran Church differs from a Non-Lutheran Protestant Church because in the former

1. Christ is present in His Word and Sacraments, through them speaks to us, and through them imparts Himself to us;

2. and the Holy Communion is not merely a mark of the confession and communion of the people of God, but is a Sacrament.

(The word "Reformed" is used in German books to connote what we have attempted to express by "Non-Lutheran." We acknowledge that there are Churches in other communions than the Lutheran which, in greater or less degree, accord with Lutheran principles. By "Non-Lutheran" we mean the whole of Protestantism which rejects and stands opposed to the positive principles confessed by the Lutheran Churches.)

V. It is for these reasons that a place must be accorded the Word and Sacraments in a Lutheran Church *separate* from the Congregation, speaking to it in the Name of God, and dominating the whole arrangement of the church. The Altar should be central, at the end of the main axis of the church, because it is the place of direct communion with God in the Sacrament and in prayer; the Pulpit and the Lectern should be in organic relation to it; and all must be so arranged that the minister at the Altar, or in the Pulpit or at the Lectern, will be visible and his voice will be intelligible from every seat in the church.

VI. No place of worship can be arranged to answer the purposes of both a Sunday School and a Church. The former is a School, the latter is a Church. In the former the Altar and the Pulpit are out of place, in the latter they are essential. There ought to be but one Altar of the congregation. It is manifestly unfitting that the Altar and the Altar-space (Choir, Chancel) should be used in any way and for any purpose other than the worship of the congregation conducted by the Minister. (We

use the word *Altarspace* as well as Choir for the German *Chorraum*, instead of the usual term “recessed chancel.” The Germans say “Kanzel,” where we say Pulpit.)

VII. The Organ and the Choir of Singers should be placed at the end of the church opposite the Altar.

The Organ should not be placed behind the Altar. This position is defended by those who hold that the whole Service depends on the Congregation, and deny the Real Presence in the Word and Sacraments; and by those who declare that, the Service properly consisting of responsive interchange between Christian people, it is part of the function of the Choir to preach the truth. It is also urged that in this position the organ and choir lead the singing of the congregation more efficiently. This is not the case. Their leadership lessens in power with the length of the church. It is most efficient when the music of the choir and organ proceeds in the same direction as the singing of the people, when coming from behind the congregation it is the background, and gathers up the singing and holds it together. Singing for entertainment or display is out of place in the church. The choir, as a part of the congregation, confesses the truth given by God through His Word. It does not dispense the Word. The Word, the division of the Word, the Ministry of the Word, and the administration of the Word in the Holy Sacrament, must be distinguished as the sole source of the congregation’s life and being.

Neither should the Organ and the Choir be in the Chancel nor to the side of it in view of the congregation. This custom is derived from the Protestant Episcopal Church, which teaches that there is a distinction between Clergy and Laity, and does not hesitate to adopt the imitation of a priestly choir and to throw the Choir between the people and the Means of Grace. In a Protestant Episcopal Church, the worshippers may consist of Clergy, Choir, and People. In a Lutheran Church only the Peo-

ple are in the presence of God; the Choir is a part of the Congregation; the Minister exercises the Office of the Word, in which God speaks. There are the same practical objections to this position as to the position rejected in the preceding paragraph.

VIII. An open space should be preserved before the seats of the congregation for the convenience of those who go to and from the Table of the Lord.

IX. There should not be a screen or closed rail between the Altar and the people. A rail is needed only for those who kneel at the Altar. It is most accordant with Lutheran principle and usage to erect the rail at each side of the Altar and not in front of it.

X. The Altarspace should be raised above the floor of the church to render all that goes on in it visible, and to give it dignity; but for the convenience of the minister and the communicants the floor of the Altarspace should not be raised more than two steps above the floor of the church.

XI. The Altar itself should stand upon a little platform raised one step above the floor of the Altarspace. It should stand free from the wall, at least so far from it that the communicants may be able to walk around it. Its size and shape are regulated by the uses made of it, and its derivation from a table, from the grave of a martyr, and from its character as the altar hearth of the congregation.

XII. The Pulpit is most conveniently placed at the pillar of the Chancel-arch. Historically it should be on the "Epistle Side," i. e., to the South side of the church when the Altar is in its historical position at the Eastern end. It should not obstruct the view of the Altar from any part of the church.

XIII. The Desk from which the Gospel is read should stand in a corresponding position on the other side.

XIV. The Font should have a place of its own, corresponding to the ancient baptisteries. This may be found in the Corner of the nave to the Gospel side of the Altarspace.

XV. The Altarspace should be lighted by a window or windows. Windows of coloured glass, leaded, often interfere seriously with light and ventilation. But it is necessary to shut out the sights of everyday.

XVI. A modern prejudice against Galleries is not justified. They are necessary in a large church where Preaching is a part of the Service, in order to bring as many as possible within sound of the preacher's voice. They ought to be built in harmony with the general style of the church. They should not extend into the Altarspace, but should stop at such a distance from it that the Altar will not be hidden from any seat in them. Where there are transepts, it would be better to put them in these. Where there are galleries, there should be two rows of windows.

XVII. In the decoration of the church and of the windows all the traditional symbolism of the* church (colours, emblems, etc.) should be observed.

XVIII. Every detail of the church should be in harmony with the architectural style chosen.

NOTE A.

THE EISENACH REGULATIVE.

(Set forth *June 5, 1861, by the Conference of German Authorities in Eisenach.*)

The notes inserted in italics are critical remarks by Mothes. The notes marked R are the remarks appended to the *Regulative* by Rietschel in his *Liturgik, Vol. I.*

I. Every church should be orientated according to ancient custom, i. e., so built that the Altarspace lies towards the East. (*The custom is Pre-Catholic, and is founded on the breaking of the dawn, the coming of the light of faith. The Jesuit custom of turning to the West, reminds us of the coming of darkness. A practical reason is that the chief Service takes place in the early part of the day, and again, that it is uplifting to look towards the East.*)

Rietschel: We hold the question of Orientation to be nonessential. Where possible, the old custom should be kept, but it should not be allowed to interfere with the suitability of the building for its purposes. If much light pours in through the altar windows, it will be necessary to curtain them through the whole Service. On the other hand, if the Altar be towards the West, windows of a dark colour will hardly answer their purpose on dark winter days.

2. The ground plan of a church which best answers to the Evangelical worship is an oblong right-angled parallelogram.

(*This is rarely found except in the often abominable and inappropriate prayer rooms of Rationalism, etc.*)

The external height including the main gable in churches with a single nave should be in the proportion of $\frac{3}{4}$ of the breadth, while the acoustics of a church are better in proportion as the breadth of it approaches its length.

(*Here two sentences are jammed together both of which are unfounded and both confounded. Many a church with only a nave is*

only 6m. broad, and then ought the roof be more than 4-1/2 m. high? The second sentence leads to the paradox that the square is acoustically the best parallelogram).

A prolongation to the East for the Altarspace (Apse, Tribune, Choir), and on the Eastern part of the long sides for a Northern and a Southern Transept (*which is impossible except in the case of a pretty long Pparallelogram*) gives to the building the suggestive form of the Cross. In a church built about a centre without cross-arms, the octagon is acoustically permissible, but for the same reason a round church is inadmissible. (*This dictum cannot be established either from theory or from practice; it is unfortunate because not supported by examples. polygons and rotundas already have been excluded by the requirement of an extension for the Altar*).

R. The question between a long nave or a “central” building must not be considered essential. For smaller churches a single long nave will answer, while for churches of greater size the “central” arrangement will be suitable, because it permits a larger number of seats to be placed not far from the pulpit and Altar. As to the size of the building, Luther’s advice is decisive: “Feine maessige Kirchen mit niedrigen Gewoelben sind die geeignetsten fuer Prediger und Hoerer.” Monumental churches, in so far as they no longer let the church appear as a house in which the congregation assembles around the preaching of the Word, in whose further parts the human voice no longer is intelligible, can never again be regarded as suitable for Evangelical churches.

3. The Dignity (*This word is not well chosen. “Dignity” is aimed at in heathen styles. What is meant is the Christian CHARACTER of the church*) demands (*for the present*) the use of one of the historically developed Christian styles of architecture, and recommends in the fundamental form of a long parallelogram besides the old Christian Basilica (*found also in the form of a square, shorter than its breadth, and made to appear longer by the arrange-*

ment of the nave: e. g., cella trichora, oratorium cruciforme, basilica cruciformis) and the so-called Romanesque (*Pre-Gothic*) style (*this word scientific writers apply rather to the manner of construction than to, the form*) especially the so-called German (*Gothic*) style. (*But the German Renaissance, Norman, Byzantine, ought not to be summarily ruled out*). The choice of the system of architecture (*What is meant here?—the style of building or the system of form?*) for the particular case should follow not merely the artistic taste of the builder, (*Does this mean the one who pays the cost, or the designer?*) but the prevailing character of the architecture of the locality. (*Many a region has no such character, or one that is undignified, or Catholic, or the like*). Remains of older church buildings that can be used, should be preserved carefully and used as a model. (*Here is no warning against Ike despotism of such Portions of old buildings belonging to different periods*). And so all the parts of the building in its inner arrangement, from the Altar and its vessels down to the seats and furniture, even the organ, must correspond with the style of the church.

R. We must object strenuously to the rigid insistence on one of the old styles. We must regard it as an advance of modern development that the question concerning the specifically church style has fallen more and more into the background. Of course voices still are heard urging that the Gothic or the Renaissance is the only one endorsed by history. But, if we see aright, the newer development shows an increasing emancipation from a strict imitation of any historical style of the past, that no particular style is urged, and that according to the needs of Evangelical worship and with reference to the character of the city and region, the manifold motives of different styles come to harmonious but free employment. Only in this way can there be a sound evolution, since neither in a simple return to a past time, nor in the invention of a new style (*new styles are not invented by reflexion but are the fruit of an organic growth*) lies the calling of our time.

A simple revival of the Gothic of the Middle Ages would conflict with sound Evangelical feeling. As certainly as the Evangelical were able to adapt themselves to the Gothic church buildings of the Middle Ages, so little can their great choirs, which place the Altar out of sight of the congregation and therefore make a side Altar necessary for the liturgical Altar Service, be regarded as a model for new buildings. Here also a chief principle of the Gothic is violated. A Gothic structure with its columns cutting off the view of Altar and Pulpit is not especially suited to the Evangelical Service. There are objections to the dominion of the Gothic on account of acoustics. And the more the several ornaments of the Gothic style must stand in inner connexion with the whole organism of the building, the more objectionable will be the employment of the various motives of the Gothic separated from the whole. It is certain also that a simple revival of the *Basilica* or the Romanesque style, with its high choir and its strong columns, will not answer for the Evangelical Church. Yet the noble and simple motives of the Romanesque have found fruitful use in the Evangelical Church in recent times.

4. The church building requires durable material and a solid construction, without any deceptive covering or wash. (*It would be better to say, A church building, as a building for a congregation that survives for ages, should be and appear monumental; and therefore should be of durable material and construction; for truth's sake all pretense should be avoided, and everything that seems perishable, and therefore all accommodation to the passing fashion.* If wood be chosen for the interior, which in the ceiling is especially favourable to acoustics, it must not be made to represent stone. The Altarspace in any case should be massively vaulted. (*"Massively" is unnecessary.*)

5. The chief entrance of the church is most appropriately in the middle of the small Western end, so that the long axis of the church extends from it straight to the Altar. (*The motive*

should be stated: e. g., striving forwards to the light, drawing nigh to God, the Altar is the goal of the arrangement of the church, the Sacrament is the culmination of the Service, etc.).

6. There should always be a tower, if the means permit it; and if these are wanting at the time of building, it should be added afterwards. It is desirable (*No, indispensable*) that it should be in organic connexion with the church, and as a rule it should be over the Western entrance. (*This is not energetic enough. A motive is not given, e.g., to summon, to show the way*). Two towers may either stand at the sides of the choir (*first introduced by Odo of Cluny, † 942, only Catholic and Monkish*) or close the West front of the church (*as early as 526 by the Arians, therefore not Catholic, and therefore permissible.*)

7. The Altarspace (Choir) is to be elevated several (*better at least two, at most five*) steps above the floor of the nave. It is large enough if on every side of the Altar it affords the room that is, needed. No other seats except those for the ministers and the authorities of the congregation, and, where it is usual, the Confessional, belong in it. (*No seats for the Bridal Pair and witnesses, for the Communicants, and Confirmants?*) Nor should any rails separate the Altarspace from the nave. (*Very questionable. The argument that every appearance of an hierarchical spirit is to be avoided, has no force against a rail with a broad open entrance.*)

R. In the Wiesbaden Program it is desired that there be no Choir, because with the removal of a separate priesthood there is no longer use for a place for the priests. But the separate choir in the Evangelical sense is to be taken not as a room for the clergy, but as the place of the celebration of the Holy Supper. The Lutheran Church will not give up the Altar and the Altarspace, though she does not think of it as the place of sacrifice but as the Table of the Lord. Whether the Altar be put into a building made for it (not too deep a recess, however), or if it be found in the church building proper, it will always

have its own separate place. Nor may it be placed on one side. In this the Eisenach Regulative and the Wiesbaden Program agree. If now the significance of the Altar as the Table of the Lord requires this, its position is fixed in the chief axis of the church by the fact that in confirmation and marriage the congregation within the church gathers closely around the Altar. The Altar requires for practical uses a large special Altarspace before it, which could not be given it in a side position without destroying the symmetry of the building. This necessity is as great in a Reformed Church as in a Lutheran Church. But for aesthetic reasons also a separate Altarspace should be preserved.

That the Altarspace is raised a little above the floor of the nave does not mean that it is considered holier, but is grounded on its use for the celebration of the Supper and in occasional acts. And primarily this is required by the practical purpose, that the minister officiating at the Altar may be seen and understood the better. But the elevation should not be unreasonably great. The Altar itself should be raised one or (better) two steps, because thus at confirmations, marriages, and other rites it is rendered possible to kneel, and because it is easier for the minister to give the Cup to Communicants if he stands higher than they.

8. The Altar may be placed, according to liturgical and acoustic requirements, to the rear between the choir-arch and the rear wall of the choir, but never against this wall. (*Here should be given the minimum width of the passage behind the Altar, and with reference to the windows of the choir the maximum*). One step above the floor of the choir (*better two*) it must have rails (*NO, the platform must have side arms, appodiatorien*), and provision for the kneeling of confirmants, communicants and wedding couples (*for the second at the sides, though this is not the custom everywhere; and for the first and third at the front*). The Altar is marked as such by the Crucifix; and if over the Altar table an architectonic addition be erected, the picture, relief or

image upon it must represent one of the chief elements of redemption.

9. The Font can stand within the walls of the church in the vestibule of the main entrance (*not a very dignified position, often draughty, and obstructive*), or in a chapel erected for the purpose near the choir. Where Baptism is administered in the presence of the congregation, the best place for the Font is just before the entrance to the Altarspace. (*Here it obstructs the view of the Altar, is in the way, and is likely to be used for profane purposes. For the one Sacrament as well as for the other only one position should be assigned.*) It may not be replaced by a portable table. (*Good; but neither may it be replaced by a basin set on the Altar.*)

10. The Pulpit may stand neither before nor behind nor over the Altar, nor in the choir. Its proper place is where choir and nave meet, on a column of the choir-arch towards the nave; in churches having several aisles, on one of the Eastern columns of the middle aisle. (*This is too vague. Better to keep to the first sentence.*) The height of the Pulpit must depend on that of the galleries, and should be as low as possible (*not under 2m. from floor to floor, and not over 3-1/2 m.*) so that the preacher may be seen from the galleries and from the space under them. (*The height of the galleries also may be adjusted to the height of the Pulpit.*)

R. If it be conceded that the Altar for theoretical, aesthetic and practical reasons ought to be kept as heretofore in the chief axis of the church, the question arises whether the same argument applies to the Pulpit. This has been urged in recent times with the greatest pertinacity. It can be effected only in one of three ways: Pulpit and Altar must be thoroughly united with each other; or the Pulpit must stand separate behind the Altar; or it must be placed before the Altar.

The first way has often been adopted in the Evangelical Church, the Pulpit being made to spring from the Altar and hang over the altar-table. It is extravagant to say that thus the Altar is trodden underfoot, or is desecrated, In the Evangelical

Church the Altar as a piece of furniture has no especial sanctity. Only while it is in use has it a meaning. But aesthetic reasons speak against this arrangement, and among more recent architects there will be found hardly one champion of this form. An especial objection is, that in this case the preacher is separated from his hearers by a great open space, which must be kept free for communicants, confirmants, or a wedding party. The very argument urged in favor of this arrangement, that a preacher ought to stand in the midst of the congregation, is thus nullified. He becomes a pulpit orator who speaks to an assemblage separated from him by an open space. Sulze's proposal, to unite Pulpit, Altar and Font, so that the table by the addition of a desk becomes a pulpit, cannot make the open space unnecessary, and is too much in conflict with historical usage to find many adherents. Besides, for acoustic reasons the preacher ought to be raised above the hearers in the nave of the church.

Aesthetically it is better to place the Pulpit separate from the Altar behind the Altar. This arrangement can be defended from the custom of the ancient Church. Yet we must admit that this suggests a distinction between the clergy and the laity. There is also the practical objection that the separation between the preacher and the congregation is greater than in the former case.

These objections are obviated by placing the Pulpit in front of the Altar. But if a separate room exclusively devoted to the Holy Supper is not provided, the concealment of the Altar by the Pulpit will always be offensive. The view of the Pulpit from the Altar will be unpleasant apart from the fact that the Pulpit will then interrupt the view of the nave from the Altar and the view of the Altar from the nave. Such an arrangement renders a second altar necessary in front of the Pulpit for the liturgical Service, and thus the old unevangelical arrangement of an High Altar and a lesser altar is revived. And how shall the sounding board be put into place or the so-called *Schallpfefer* to which it must be affixed?

So there is left for the Pulpit the position at the side, which has been usual hitherto. The best place for it is on one of the pillars of the Chancel-arch. This position is often opposed on practical and aesthetic grounds and said to be abnormal in a symmetrical church. The placing of the Pulpit in the axis is demanded as an unconditional evangelical postulate. But wrongly. When the Pulpit is put forward into the nave the congregation can gather immediately around the preacher. He is not a pulpit orator standing before them, but a witness standing in their midst, who, inwardly connected with them utters the faith which binds them all together. The Pulpit, however, should not be too high, lest the minister appear like one standing over the congregation and out of living connexion with it. As to the alleged offense against symmetry, there is no such offense if the Pulpit is recognized as a necessary member of the building. It gives life to the building, while a mechanical symmetry would only give an impression of stiffness. The transference of the Pulpit to one of the middle pillars of the nave is indeed often necessary in the older structures from the Catholic period, but should be avoided in new buildings because it occasions great difficulty and disharmony in the arrangement of the seats.

11. The Organ, at which also the precentor and the singing choir must be stationed, finds its natural position opposite the Altar at the West end of the church upon a gallery over the main entrance, but its view of nave and choir must not be obstructed by the beams of the gallery.

R. The position of the Organ is also a subject of debate in our day. The champions of a combination of Altar and Pulpit in the middle axis hold, in contradiction to the Eisenach Regulative, that the Organ ought to be in view of the congregation at the East end of the church. They argue that in listening to the rendition of a piece of music one naturally turns his face towards the musician. The fallacy of this argument lies in the false view that the organ and the singing have an independent aesthetic

significance.

On the other hand, the first use of the organ and the choir is to lead the singing of the congregation. The Liturgy with its responses between the minister and the congregation makes the position of the organ opposite the Altar the most suitable one for the Organ. Otherwise the minister during the Liturgy would stand between the choir and the congregation, which properly belong together and are to respond to him. The parts in which the choir and organ have independent action are quite different from the presentations of the concert-room. Another external reason for putting the organ and choir in the rear of the congregation is, that sometimes members of the choir must move about, and sometimes there is difficulty in maintaining order, which would greatly disturb a congregation.

The only argument in favor of placing the organ and choir in the Altarspace in view of the congregation which is worthy of consideration, is the sound thought of Spitta, that responsive singing between the choir and the congregation ought to be introduced. But this would require only the stationing of a choir in view of the congregation, not the transference of organ and choir to the Altarspace.

12. Where a Confessional or a *Lehrstuhl* is used it belongs in the Altarspace. (*Why? Shall every penitent be exposed to the view of the congregation?*) The latter should be before the Altar or on one of the steps that lead from the nave to the choir (*therefore very near the Font, which often leads to buffing the desk on the Font*), yet so that the view of the Altar be not hindered; or on a column of the choir arch, in order that it may be turned before the Altar for the purpose of catechisation, etc. (*It should be a special desk. The Gospel desk should not be movable, just as the Gospel, the firm foundation of our faith, is immovable.*)

13. Galleries, if they cannot be avoided (*a concession to their enemies*), except the Western, must be put on the long sides of the church, in such a way that they will not interfere with the free survey of the church. In no case may they extend into the

choir. The breadth of these galleries, whose seats are to rise in rows one above the other, unless the extension of the transepts, allows a greater depth, may not exceed one-fifth of the whole width of the church, and their height above the floor of the church should not exceed one-third the height of the walls. Of several galleries one above the other no mention can be made. In planning new buildings in which provision must be made for galleries, it is best to put above the galleries longer windows, which will serve to light the church, and smaller windows to light the space beneath, instead of long windows which would be broken by the galleries.

R. For the sake of room galleries cannot be dispensed with in many new edifices, and their advantageousness for acoustics must be considered. But, as the Regulative says, they must not be treated as arbitrary additions, but must be organically connected with the church. The unfavorable impression made by many galleries is due to a wrong execution of this architectural motive. "It may not be overlooked that the use of galleries in the architecture of Protestantism, as Semper emphasized, has been justified by history, and that by giving them up we would deprive ourselves of the most essential means of characterizing the Protestant House of God."

14. The seats for the congregation are, if possible, to be so arranged that from them Altar and Pulpit may be seen throughout the Service. Before the steps leading up to the Altarspace a convenient space should be left free of seats. A broad aisle should run through the middle of the nave, or if it be not needed then two aisles of proper breadth should run along the pillars or the supports of the galleries. (*This often is less necessary than aisles along the walls, where the heating apparatus may be placed.*) The bases of the columns are not to be taken for seats. (*All reversible seats should be avoided.*)

15. The church needs a sacristy, not a room taken from the interior of the building (i. e., *not an inorganic, disturbing*

thing) but an adjoining structure (*often more disturbing*), adjacent to the Altarspace, roomy, cheerful, bright, heatable, and that may be arranged and furnished in churchly style.

R. The so-called grouped church buildings, recommended by March, in which all sorts of rooms for various purposes are added, are not to be approved, even if some of the purposes mentioned by March have to be omitted, as parsonage, apothecary, rooms for sewing and housekeeping classes, little dwellings for the sick and aged, rooms for the Church Council, for social and intellectual entertainment of all sorts, reading rooms, libraries, kitchens, and the like. The church as the place of worship and edification must, be separate from the dissipation of everyday life, a place that admonishes to self-recollection.

NOTE B.

THE WIESBADEN PROGRAM.

(In general accord with the principles of Sulze in Dresden. By Pastor Veesenmeyer in Wiesbaden.)

1. A church should bear in general the character of the house for the assembling of the worshipping congregation, and not that of a House of God in the Catholic sense.

2. The unity of the room should give expression to the oneness of the congregation and to the principle of the priesthood of all believers. Therefore it should not be separated into several naves, nor should there be a division between nave and choir.

3. The celebration of the Supper should not take place in a room separated from the place of assembly, but in the midst of the congregation. The Altar, provided with a passage around it, therefore should have a place at least symbolically accordant with this rule. All lines of view should converge upon it.

4. The Pulpit, as the place where Christ is offered to the congregation as their spiritual food, is to be treated with at least as much respect as the Altar. Its place should be behind the Altar, and it should be organically combined with the organ and the platform for the singers, in full view of the congregation.

NOTE C.

QUOTATION FROM *Der evangelische Gottesdienst* OF JULIUS SMEND.

The former part of this quotation is given in order to show the extreme non-Lutheran position and the grounds on which it rests, and also the manner in which it meets what might be described as an extreme Lutheran position. The latter part shows the reasons Smend gives for still retaining the Choir.

Der evangelische Gottesdienst is a most readable book, and will help a Lutheran to a clear recognition of the essential principles which accord with our faith, over against the Roman Church or modern unchurchliness. In the *Monatschrift fuer Gottesdienst und Kirchliche Kunst*, edited by Smend and Spitta, there has been much debate of these principles and their application.

“Instead of seeking the light on this subject, many wish to reduce the whole difference of views to the contrast between Reformed and Lutheran. Accordingly, a view is presented as the Lutheran, which has for its champion neither Luther nor the Lutheran Confessions, but on the other hand seems to be defended by Reformed theologians, as, for instance, Achelis. The strife has finally been concentrated upon the question concerning a Choir (Chorraum, or, as we say, a *Chancel*), especially in the *Monatschrift fuer Gottesdienst und Kirchliche Kunst*. We may take the following (from *Brathe*) as the classical expression of a widespread and still dominant view: ‘The church building is intended to be the place of worship of the Christian community.’

In this there is an actual communion between God and the congregation. Both are active in it. As now it is useful to have a room for the congregation, so is it useful to have one for the action of the Omnipresent God, Who here acts within time and space. By means of a definite second room adjoining that of the congregation, having as its middlepoint the Altar, the practical need is supplied, and the consciousness is awakened that besides the visible congregation the Invisible God is present and deals with His people.' That these thoughts have been derived from thoroughly Catholic ideas, is clear. Only a Tabernacle over the Altar is needed to make of such a church a Mass-church. The visible place of God and the subordination of the people to a ministry operating thence, stand in intelligible connexion. 'The action of the worshipping congregation is receptive, therefore indeed most active, though not spontaneous.' (*Achelis.*) The Means of Grace are offered it as immediate gifts of God, in whose origin, mediation and administration it takes no part. Of course, bridal parties, confirmands, and guests at the Holy Supper may occasionally enter the place of God, but the permanent use of this place by the members of the congregation, would be improper. (*Brathe.*)

"The objection that our people are not in sympathy with this view, has not much weight. On the contrary, the belief in the sanctity of the Altar is deeply rooted in many Evangelical countries. But this does not change the case. What a mixture of thoroughly unevangelical and sub-christian notions are at home in the masses of Protestant people! We do not need to take account of such outgrowths of popular syncretism. That a view of worship, which culminates in a demand for a Holy of Holies, is edifying for many of the people, cannot be denied. But it appears objectionable to build on popular sentimentalism, because it has some worth for edification, theoretical constructions which demand quite a different foundation. Luther's words in the Torgau Consecration Sermon, so often quoted, that in the worship of God nothing else takes place than that 'our dear Lord speaks

to us through His Holy Word, and we in reply speak to Him in prayer and praise,' are thoroughly intelligible to the people and have an enduring value. But homiletical figures like these do not afford a basis for a liturgical theory, a doctrine of 'two subjects dealing with each other in the Cultus.' We may show what really may be learned from this for the arrangement of the church. But for the moment we stand on the ground of scientific explanation. The requirement of two spaces, as devotees of the choir-apse mean it, proceeds upon the assumption of a cultus of the fellowship of believers either commanded or imparted, a cultus which founds that fellowship and calls it into being, which was there without its contribution and before it began to be, and remains on the whole independent of its cooperation. Word and Sacrament as 'the constitutive factors in worship' are held to be of purely Divine origin. This shows their value over against that which the Christian Church has created, over prayer, Church-song, and sermon. In these God's people speaks; but in those, God. What is more natural than to give to these historically and actually so unequal utterances spaces in the House of God of different dignity? It is not enough to make a difference of degree; there is a difference of kind. Accordingly, the fourth of the *Eisenach Counsels*, like Sec. 4 of the *Regulative*, requires that 'the Altarspace in every case be massively vaulted;' and the seventh *Counsel* proceeds from the same motive to say: 'The greatest care is to be given to the ornamentation of the Altarspace.' The repeated commandment to raise the floor of the choir, hardly springs from the practical consideration that the minister during the Liturgy must be seen from every part of the church.

"Now it is evident that this estimate of the Word and Sacrament is not historically valid. That the Christian Church, or rather its hierarchical representatives, gave the Scriptures of the New Testament to itself as a Canon, and put the collection which was derived from the Synagogue by its side, is well known. For the contents of these books the name 'God's Word' is, apart

from its religious signification, scientifically inadmissible. Our Sacraments were not ordained by Jesus, and in their present form it is doubtful whether they were the creation of the Church.

“If for religious considerations this estimate of the Word and Sacrament is rejected, then we shall be compelled to acknowledge that sermon, hymn and prayer are the work of God, and therefore are to be considered only from a purely religious standpoint. God’s Word teaches us to pray, to sing, to bear testimony; the churchly sanction, which is not wanting to these methods of utterance in worship, is of later date, but just as really was it mediated through men as were the words of the Bible and the celebration of the Sacrament.

“We do not assail the judgment of faith according to which the Holy Scriptures and those early Christian observances are held much higher than all Agendas, Hymnbooks and Postils in the world. We merely refuse to acknowledge that a liturgical theory based on that estimate has any claim to scientific validity. Judged from a religious standpoint, everything that goes on in our worship and belongs to it, has been given by God, and the congregation itself is God’s counsel and deed. But it is just as certain that, tried by the Canons of scientific investigation the whole content of our Cultus, without any exception whatever, is the ordinance and expression of the life of the Christian congregation.

“And therefore the requirement of a separate space as a place of God, separated from the place of assembly of the congregation, is groundless.

* * * * *

“A thoroughly sounder thought lives however in the wish to retain or recover the old *Basilica-apse*. It has been repeated often enough in these pages that congregational worship in order to be inwardly and outwardly living, must have an ordered responsive Service. Such a Service is impossible or at least difficult if the room be not so divided that in the place of the litur-

gical action an actual and immediate exchange can go on between the worshippers. The traditional arrangement of our churches provides for this by having the minister stand facing his fellow worshippers so that most of them can see him and many of them can hear him. But here the exchange in worship is limited to dialogue between the minister and the congregation, or perhaps between the minister and the choir. Even the sermon is not understood everywhere to be an exhortation to activity in worship. If, however, the minister turns his back to all the people, the last remnant of dialogue is taken away, on which the livingness of the action depends.

“How much more Evangelical is the suggestion of *Sulze*, to take the room of the congregation as the extended and true choir, which comprises in itself all that in the old Church was reserved for the priests. Yet it may not be forgotten that this united fraternal fellowship in order to worship must come out of itself, and we cannot agree with the same theologian that a separate room, not visible from the church-room proper, is to be reserved for special actions in a smaller circle, such as Marriage, Baptism and the Holy Supper. It is true that the view that our churches have a double purpose as the house of God and as the house of the congregation, has a justification apart from all practical necessities, if only two points be kept in mind, namely, that here we do actually offer, experience and accept the revelation of God and in response confess it; and on the other hand, that the one as well as the other takes place through the lips of the congregation, and it is perfectly free to choose whom it will entrust with the Word of God, and whom with the word of confession.

“And thence it follows of necessity that that arrangement of the space in the church is most rational, i. e., the best adapted to the case, which offers the best facilities to such responsive interchange. Everything that is done in the form of a dialogue, requires a standing face to face. In other words, what the congregation would have offered to it obviously must be offered in

face of it, from before it. And for this purpose the former priestly choir-space, provided it is large enough, is admirably adapted. To unite in it Pulpit, Altar, Organ and Choir of Singers in one group, is the most natural thing in the world, and is well known to be no new thing, though this good Evangelical arrangement has fallen into forgetfulness in many places, or has been rejected in renovations as contrary to a true style. Newer examples furnish the proof that this arrangement not only does not detract from edification but furthers it, and that the aesthetic objections made to it are not valid. Whoever frequently takes part in a church arranged in this way will afterwards have to overcome a great deal before he can feel at home again in a church arranged according to the *Regulative*.”

NOTE D.

MOTHE'S' LIST OF TECHNICAL REQUIREMENTS TO BE PROVIDED FOR IN MAKING PLANS FOR A CHURCH-BUILDING.

A. TECHNICAL REQUIREMENTS.

1. The building must present and represent an organized and unified group of spaces; (a) for the assembly of the congregation and preaching of the Word, (b) for the reception of the gifts of Grace in the Sacrament, Benediction, etc., and separate spaces (c) for the administration and the life of the congregation.

The space intended for the assembly of the congregation to hear the Word, and for their common prayer, thanksgiving and praise (not a separate room, and improperly often called a *Predigtkirche*) must provide for the number of persons it expects to accommodate so that these may be able to follow the sermons with undivided attention and to take their due part in the liturgical rites. This requires bodily comfort, protection against

noise and profane sights, and the satisfaction of all requirements connected with such hearing and participation, especially a good view, good acoustics, maintenance of necessary quiet, and avoidance of all motions that do not belong to the Service and amelioration of those that do.

2. The room must therefore be large enough and must be provided with the necessary number of comfortable and accessible fixed seats, which, with a few standing places, will permit the eye and ear to follow the course of the Service without effort from every one of them. They are to be so arranged that from every one of them a person can easily see the minister at the Altar, in the Pulpit, or wherever he may have to officiate, and hear all that he says, and take part in all the appropriate rites; and therefore should be provided with arrangements for the hymnbooks and for kneeling. No special seats should interfere with the others. In every place, moreover, the print of the hymnbooks and the numbers on the hymnboards should be legible. But the good lighting here required should not blind or distract. The windows also should not present to any seat a distracting view of profane life. Good acoustic arrangement and construction. for speech and music require that there should be insurance against outside noise. Doors, passages and steps should be provided in sufficient number, and so arranged, that easily, without disturbance, there may be access to all the seats at the beginning of the assembly, and at the end of it, or if there be danger of a panic there may be an exit convenient to every one. The exclusion of the profane may be secured by vestibules, which also may answer as storm doors.

3. In order to provide pure air for several hours in sufficient volume, dryness, humidity and temperature, there are needed plentiful and well-arranged means for ventilation and heating.

4. In the main room, considered as a place for preaching, are required besides the hymnboards a pulpit and a desk for the Gospels. Both must be comfortable and convenient to the minis

ter, visible to all present, so placed that all may hear him, and constructed on good acoustic principles. They should be elevated; the pulpit on a higher level than the reading-desk, but not so high as to make the preacher dizzy and to compel his hearers to look straight up into his eyes. It should not be overlooked that the pulpit has developed out of the Epistle-ambon, which like its predecessor, the *πυργος*, stood on the Epistle side, a little farther forward than the Altar, and that the reading-desk is the successor of the Gospel-ambon. We may keep their origin in mind without reference to the use of both; remembering also that the reading-desk, because of the comparatively brief use made of it, does not so often have an *Ueberbau* or *Rueckwand* as the pulpit, and that the former is used for the most part only in early Service, while the latter is used at every part of the day. When the sun is in the South, or in the Southwest, it strikes more upon the Gospel column than upon the Epistle column. Both should cover the lower body and legs of the minister, because this gives to the majority of speakers a feeling of greater security. Both are not pieces of furniture, but fixed organic parts, for the Word is the firm refuge, the immutable basis, of our faith.

5. Since galleries not only are necessary for the accommodation of a greater number and for economical reasons, but also contribute in fairly large congregations to a family-like gathering of the assembly around the speaker, in contrast with other auditoriums, and therefore are almost characteristic of Evangelical architecture, they must be arranged in connection with the pulpit in such a way that the preacher can be seen and heard equally well by those in the galleries and those under them, and so that the unity of the room is presented. Therefore the seats in the gallery must be so arranged that no straining of the neck will be needed to see the Altar, and so that those sitting in them will not have their attention diverted, and that those on the rear seats will not have the heads of those before them between them and the preacher.

6. The organ is intended first of all, alone or supported by a choir of singers or by other instruments, to open, accompany and close the Services in a clear, significant but not obtrusive way, and especially to complete and dignify, lead and accompany the unison singing of the congregation. A further employment for concerts, etc., must give place to this liturgical purpose and function. Therefore, according to acoustic principles, its tones ought to go forth in the same direction as the song of the congregation, not come towards it, and the playing of it and the personality of choir and soloists should neither obtrude upon the congregation nor seem to be a part of what is offered to the congregation, but rather a part of what is done by it. The proper place for the organ, therefore, is in the rear of the congregation. The organ-loft should be built at such a height that the tones will quickly and evenly spread through the whole room, even its lowest parts; and the size of the organ and its power must be carefully adapted to the size of the room. Care should be taken not to make it too large. The organ case should be firm enough, should protect the instrument against dust and other disturbing bodies, against sudden and excessive variations of temperature, should provide room enough within for repairs, and accessibility and convenience within and without, and also protection of the keyboard and the performer against injury and crowding. Before the completion of the building-plan all that is necessary concerning size, accessibility, position, protection, temperature, etc., for instrument, case, the mechanism and size of the bellows, bellows-room, manner of blowing, console, the organist's view of the minister, of the congregation, singers and musicians, should be agreed upon between builder, architect, contractor Pr musical director, organist and organ-builder. The latter often wish to build too large organs, and yet do not provide for large enough and convenient bellows-rooms. This warning is in place even against many modern architects.

b) *The space intended for the administration of the Sacra-*

ments and other gifts of grace, to the parts of the Liturgy which refer to the self-offering of Christ and the thank-offering therefor, should provide room enough for those participating and for the necessary furniture.

7. The Altarspace especially is not for us Lutherans a specially sacred spot, not a holy of holies, or hierarchically enclosed *abaton*, *adyton*, *aphauston*, *atheaton*, *anaktoron*, but the place of those distributions and liturgical rites in which not the whole congregation yet a certain group out of it take part, those rites which are to be solemnly celebrated in view of the congregation. Therefore it must be and especial space adjoining that intended for the assembly of the congregation and distinguished from it, yet an integral part of it, not a separate room (Altar-kirche), but rather so arranged. that the rites performed in it may be followed by the whole congregation with lively sympathy, may be seen and heard by all, therefore wide open in front and somewhat elevated, yet so that those rites may not be hindered by those who are not taking part in them.

The Supper is, in our conception, not merely a memorial supper of believers among themselves, nor a memorial of Christ's Offering and a thanksgiving for it; but a Sacrament; a distribution of the gracious gift of the inmost union with the Lord in the new covenant sealed by that Offering; and has its roots not in what we do, but in what the Lord does to us. Therefore the Altar is primarily the Table of the Lord; but not only this, but also the place of this inmost communion, of the thanksgiving, of the unspoken vow involved in such a communion of fidelity to this covenant, and of further rites of initiation, and of vows of confirmandi, bridal pairs, ordinandi, etc., of benedictions, blessings for those who offer, celebrate, and vow; for the whole congregation therefore, not as a place of offering in a heathen sense. Both its form and material should be monumental, if possible of stone; although, because it is a table and is developed from a table, a solid and thorough construction of wood is not excluded. It should be of

a table form; should not be formed like a grave in reference to the Risen One; nor like a hearth as the heathen and Jewish altars for burnt offerings were. It should be set with a Crucifix. It should be large enough for the necessary vessels, lights, etc., convenient, broad enough for all who may have to officiate at it, elevated so that it may be seen, and therefore provided with a *Podest* in front, which again should be surrounded by a kneeling-step. Two such, that is, three in all, might be inconvenient to the officiant. No rails around it are needed, but two supports for the arms at the sides of the *Podest*. It does not stand like a Catholic grave altar or Mass-altar or lay-altar or cross-altar, against the wall, but—like the old Christian table-altar and the high-altar that grew out of this and afterwards was taken from the laity—it should stand free. To put the Altar against the wall is a return to Catholic ways, just as is its position before a windowless wall in a dark Chancel.

8. The Font as the place of the second Sacrament should not be movable, and should not be fashioned like a piece of furniture. It should be so placed and shaped that there will be no hindrance to those taking part in a Baptism, that a fair part of the congregation may take part as witnesses, and that all profanation of it even when not in use will be prevented, Provision should be made for necessary attention to the child, and the protection of its health.

c) Rooms must be provided for the various offices of the Church,

9. Here belong the necessary stairways and passages, according to the size of the congregation and other circumstances, one or more sacristies and confessional rooms, a room for confirmandi, toilets, chambers for paraments and furniture, heating apparatus, cloak-chamber, bell-room, bellows-room, wardrobes, etc. All these rooms should be placed, sized and arranged appropriately and conveniently, before all else so as not to interfere with the chief rooms, and so that one of them does not interfere with another, especially with one more important. Whether all

of these rooms, or only some of them, how many, and what rooms besides these, may eventually be necessary, what space and arrangement will be needed, all this should be considered in the program. (Local needs should be considered.)

d) *The building belongs to the Congregation as such, therefore no one mortal, but to an immortal owner, who often comprises a whole district. This must find expression in Position and form.*

10. The spot chosen for the building should be easy of access to all parts of the congregation, and generally visible, and should be provided with entrances enough properly distributed. Bell and clock and dial should be audible and visible in every direction.

11. The building should provide for all these things and for their security, not for one generation only, but for the whole life of the congregation. It should therefore be solid, monumental, without being strange, in style or expensive. All that can be known of the laws of nature and of the nature of materials and of technical mastery and use of the materials should be devoted to this end.

B. DEMANDS UPON ART, IN REFERENCE TO FORM AND CHARACTER,

a) *The building should also aim at ideal ends. It dare not bear the character of profane places of assembly or auditoriums, but must give expression to its higher purpose. The two spaces already described, without diminution of their fitness for their several purposes must be wrought out to a higher unity, even as Goethe says, "Unity of conception and living organization according to the difference of the parts must characterize every work of art."*

12. Within this unity, the place of the congregation in its arrangement must contribute to devout hearing of purely spiritual addresses, to active participation in song, prayer, praise and adoration, to self-surrender in all the rites of worship; it must even excite thereto, and therefore it should be solemn, dignified,

elevated, free from every suggestion of that which is profane, noisome, humble or disturbing, and not strangely uncomfortable, exciting, distracting; but it should raise above the everyday world, clarify and collect, and before all things make one feel at rest. Its form and arrangement should not suggest outside tendencies, nor, difference of rank, etc., but rather in recognition that all are alike before God it should make every member of the congregation feel his equal rights, so far as official station in the congregation does not make a difference.

13. The Altarspace, open to every eye, and an integral part of the whole, should serve to increase this feeling of exaltation above all that is earthly. It should appear to be the culmination and goal and completion of the place of the congregation and so, announce that it is the place for communion with the Lord. If, as we have said, there should be no Altar-screen, this does not forbid the low rail that was in use before Leo III, with a broad and always open entrance. There may be fixed seats for the representatives of the congregation; never, however, behind the Altar.

14. Every part, even the smallest, should not only be in perfect unity with the whole, but also should show that it serves a nobler and more abiding purpose than like things do in profane buildings-walls, floors, footstools and other parts must be monumental, not in the passing fashion nor of a trivial elegance. They must suggest the super-earthly. They must have a holyday, not a holiday, character. The perfection of workmanship should not provoke admiration of cunning or skill. There ought to be a quiet feeling rather than a clear consciousness of security against the outer world, without any thought of the means which have produced it. The inside walls should not be carried out with naked bricks for instance, but if hewn stone is too costly, should be colored with something like the style of a tapestry. (Smoothness and convenience for cleaning are the rule for the inside walls; solidity and firmness for the outside.) The use of

the forms of plants and figures depends on the confessional character; symbolical representations are to be taken only from the circle of evangelical symbolism. Pictures from the Bible, or of angels, require great premeditation, the representation of God in a human form had better be avoided, at least in active intercourse with men. Besides Biblical figures, like the patriarchs, prophets, Apostles, etc., reformers and persons connected with the locality of the congregation can be represented, but only in historical scenes, or in modest portraits, and the method of representation or the place assigned to the picture should never incite to adoration, or to any transgression beyond a mere memorial of celebration of an example. As to texts and mottoes, it must be borne in mind that they suggest thoughts which may interfere with attention to the sermon.

15. The various vessels must have a more solid character than the same sort of things would have in dwellings and the like. The seats must differ from those of concert, halls, schools or theatres, the reading-desk and pulpit from a teacher's desk or a music stand or a platform, galleries and organ-loft from the galleries and orchestra in a dancing-hall or theatre. And especially should the Altar-table not be at all like a dining-table, or the buffet in a palace.

16. There should be an antechamber, and if possible a *Vorplatz*, whether this be a churchyard, a garden, or an elaborate court.

b) *The character of the Evangelical Church should be expressed by the exterior as well as in the interior of the building which serves it. It should be distinguished from buildings for profane purposes, and also from the temples of other religions or other confessions.*

17. The chief form should witness that the building serves no small but the greatest purpose, no passing end but an eternal, no material use but an ideal, no worldly aim but a spiritual, no lowly purpose but the very highest; that it belongs to no person,

but to the whole congregation, invites the whole congregation to enter, take part in assembly, prayer, praise, illumination through pure doctrine, in short to the adoration of God and exaltation to Him; but also that the chief principle of the worship celebrated in it in Evangelical freedom is embraced in the notions of congregational assembly, common hearing of the Word, thanksgiving for Christ's work of redemption, reception of the gifts of His grace, and therefore has nothing to do with processions, the sacrifice of the Mass and other mystical ceremonies, the worship of the saints, etc. For such a witness the building needs primarily, earnestness and dignity of appearance, great simple masses, even with modest additions and wide organization of members., an ideal form, aspiring relations, avoidance of forms which are subject to passing fashion, declaration and awakening of assurance of long continuance by means of solidity, external signification of inner sanctity by great windows, and a broad entrance under a tower rising up towards Heaven. In all, in every particular, in every part, mass and form, the exterior should render the inner purpose, that inner organization in antechamber, congregational space and Altarspace, and their unified combination, visible. On the room of the congregation should be impressed the character of rest and quietness; on the Altarspace of motion, of aspiration; without interfering with the artistic unity. But everything that might remind one of a mystery, of the advance of a procession, of a separation of the priesthood from the laity in contradiction of the universal priesthood of the congregation, or of adoration of the saints, is to be strictly avoided.

18. The separate forms are also to bear the stamp of *truth* and clearness. Necessary side rooms, e. g., the sacristy, confessionals, toilets, are not to be masked under forms which do not belong to Evangelical Churches, e. g., chapels for saints, great windows not intended to give light, e. g., behind the organ, are to be avoided, great doors before little rooms, and every other pretense. This rule also forbids the concealment of necessary

constructions behind parts thought to be true to the architectural style, and superfluous ornaments.

b) *If then the progress of technique is not to be concealed by a mask taken from antique art, if the talent given to us is not to be hid in the earth, and therefore the adoption of the whole outworn system of construction of an old style is forbidden, this does not forbid the employment of an antique style as if the Evangelical Church had broken with the older Christian tradition*

Rather, because Papism pushed the traditional development off from its true course, it must leave the false way then taken, resume the old, true, pre-Catholic tradition, and carry it on on the right way.

19. Purist or archaic employment of a style is not desired nor defended, but a conscientious employment of one style only in all parts of the work according to its own rules.

20. Among the universal Christian but not Catholic principles are the choice or the artificial creation of an elevated site for the church-building, which in olden times was advised and even prescribed, and its orientation. By the introduction of the Eastern position of the Altar in 420, no ritual prescription was broken, but only the Jewish and heathen custom of placing the doors to the East. This was for the sake of the place of the Crucifix and the direction in prayer, with which the position of the Priest at the Altar no longer corresponded. Catholicism fought against the logical removal of the seats of bishops and priests from behind the Altar, by elevating these still more; and giving them additional ornamentation; and against the logical admission of the sunlight in the morning directly upon the Altar (which the Arians adopted) by having the apse windowless, on account of transubstantiation and other mysteries; but about the ninth century gave up the fight, and built upon the rear of the Altar a retable or superfrontal. Out of this was developed the Altar *Bildschrein* (Altar-screen, *reredos*) (first mentioned 1240). The eastward position of the Altar was retained by Catholicism on account of

its symbolism of the coming of Christ, etc. In later times the congregations and masons succeeded in establishing the custom of having East windows, but shortly after the Reformation, in the Counter-reformation, the Jesuits returned to the Western Altar, to the region of darkness. The position in the East and the "*lucida*" therefore is Evangelical and proper, though not directly required. The traditional old Christian way of burying the dead agrees with it, and a change would, as *Neuser* says, disturb. So *Hoelscher* rightly lays stress on the fact, that the orientated churches of old cities gives the picture of a city so great and monumental quietness. And as much is to be said for the traditional West portal entrance of the church, facing towards the Altar.

21. The Tower, as a sign and summons, stands properly over the chief entrance, at the West. In spite of all attempts to find a proper position, as early as the Seventh Century, therefore long before Leo III, that over the West portal became the favorite and almost the rule. The few exceptions were either due to necessity or to the incompleteness of the building, or like the double towers at the Choir, which were derived from Cluny and were of monkish origin. Therefore another position of the chief tower is to be allowed only to local necessities.

22. Where the form of the Communion requires that the Communicants pass around the Altar from the bread side to the cup side, in order to avoid confusion and the distraction of the minds of those standing before the Altar a reredos may be erected, which, ornamented with a representation of one of the chief events of our redemption, may offer to the eye an elevating and inspiring point. It must not interfere with other parts, nor with the light from the windows.

23. The Pulpit belongs in the room of the congregation and to the Epistle side. In large churches it cannot be put behind the Altar without injury to the acoustics. This was perceived 1500 years ago. In larger churches it does not often occur, but

in churches of a moderate size it often occurs that there is an evil echo if the pulpit be put in the main axis of the church. To place the pulpit in the middle of the square before the Altar, spoils the acoustics for all in its neighborhood and interferes with the view of the Altar. Its construction with the Altar or *behind* it detracts from the dignity of the latter, and fuses the instruction and admonition of the congregation too closely with the distribution of the gifts of grace, benediction, etc. The position advised does not mean that the pulpit is shoved to one side. As the weightiest and worthiest part of *the room* of the congregation, the pulpit should be monumental in form. According to most ancient tradition the preacher should not make his appearance *quam deus ex machina*; therefore the steps leading to the pulpit should be partially visible. The wall behind it and the soundingboard (*schalldeckel*) must not seem to be provisional or transitory or be movable.

24. The Lectern for the Gospels should not only be fixed and firm but should appear so. Under the desk there should be space to have ready books, notices, etc., so arranged that these and the taking up and laying down of them should not be seen by the congregation. Therefore, and that the person of the reader may be covered, it should not be like a music-stand and it should be free at the back. All this leads to such a position and form as is indicated by the development from the Gospel-ambon.

25. Galleries often will reduce the cost and offer the advantages mentioned in Sec. 5, but of course only when the number of seats they furnish stands in proper relation to the cost of their erection and arrangement, which will not be the case if there be but two rows of seats, nor if there be three; and when their form is such that they do not look like a temporary scaffold but are integral monumental members of the building, and present to the congregation a character of oneness and homelikeness. Treated in such a way, they should be acknowledged as characteristic, organic constituents of Evangelical church-architecture. The

construction of several galleries one above the other detracts from unity and dignity and therefore should be avoided. At the utmost, in very great churches two such stories might be introduced, but they must not interfere with the clear survey and total impression of the interior and degrade the character of the place of assembly to that of a theatre or an auditorium. Nor may they extend into the Altarspace, to a line with the Altar; and in new buildings they should not be allowed to cut the windows. The introduction of galleries into small churches or an irregular arrangement of them can be excused only by necessity. When sufficiently established rights require that special seats be granted to any in the galleries, this must not disturb the unity of the building, nor may they be made prominent by ornament. For much the same reason boxes in the Altarspace belong only to those whose position in the congregation justifies it, as patrons, officers of the congregation, representatives of the Church government, the pastor's family, etc., and are admissible in front of the line of the Altar, not behind it.

26. The Organ-loft, which is at the same time the Choir-loft, has in general the same character as the galleries, but has more to support. The organ-case, however, should not be shaped as a member of the building dependent on the other constructions, but as an independent instrument. The form of a *building is* 'to be avoided, and the ethereal character of music is to be suggested by a light ornamental style. The form should not be derived from the forms of constructions in stone, nor should it point to arrangements which indicate limitations caused by the necessities of the building; but it should have a complete space, arranged for it with due deliberation. The bellows-room should be bright and free from draughts, be readily accessible to the player, and should not in any way interfere with the interior of the church. Only in extreme necessity should it be placed over the organ.

27. The Font should not be placed anywhere like a piece of

furniture, but should have its own special, chosen and prepared position. The position in the entrance-vestibule, while apparently correct because of the symbolism, takes from its dignity, and sometimes leads to its profanation as a mere clothesrack, makes it difficult to properly heat the room and to provide for the children to be baptized, and obstructs the passage; and the position in the choir just at the ascent to the Altar is also objectionable, because there the Font is in the way of those that come and go, and interferes with the view of the Altar. The position recommended by *Semper*, behind the Altar, in the *apse*, is forbidden, like any position either in the congregational room or the Altarspace, by the fact that the person brought to Baptism is not yet a member of the congregation, and on the other hand by the fact that the place of administration of a Sacrament has a claim to monumental position and form, and ought not seem to be shoved to one side.

d) *In the artistic elaboration of the details of all these Paris, the style chosen for the building itself (of course with the exclusion of everything not Christian) is to be carried out with the same consequence as is indicated in Sec. 19, with reference to the material and ideal purpose, and with full use of all the means which advanced technique offers to secure easier mastery and churchly character, especially without concealment and hypocrisy in material and construction, and without pedantic copying, therefore with an inner comprehension of the true style and its laws.*

28. The realms from which such aids may be drawn are, (in accordance with the maxim, "*All things are yours; prove all and holdfast that which is good*"), especially the following: plastic work in stone, brass, wood, terracotta, etc., (not plaster of Paris and lime), decorative and figured painting on wall, tablets and glass, molten work and work in metals, tectonic and ceramics, etc., in all their modern perfection, and the now so advanced technique in lighting and heating. All that runs into virtuosity, the employment of substitutes and unmonumental materials, con-

cealment and deceit, all artificialities and tricks, unworthy of art and of honest construction, must be forbidden.

29. If for a new building a style is chosen, or if a church which is to be restored is of a style, in whose most flourishing period some of the technical means now at the disposal either were not known or were yet undeveloped, their use is not therefore forbidden; but the shaping of the parts should be in the spirit of the chosen style, therefore in analogy with the technical means that belonged to the style, in the way that masters of that period would have developed them if they had possessed them. This of course requires a deep understanding of the inner substance of the style.

e) *Partly for the sake of better preservation, longer use, greater cleanliness, etc., Partly in direct service of the Liturgy, means must be found for proper protection and for enduring and periodically changing ornamentation in other arts than architecture, in the textile arts for instance, and this must accord with the general principles already laid down.*

30. Here belong the vestments for the Altar, Pulpit, Lectern, etc.

A. *Altarcloths.* These were considered indispensable in old Christian times and must be recognized as such by both Lutherans and Reformed, and are a protection against the dampness of the stone. This protection may be partially secured by Covering the stone Altar-top with wood, but better by laying on it a *chrismal*, that is, a linen cloth stiffened by a wax-bath, of the size of the Altar, over which should be laid a cloth of unbleached or stiff bleached linen of the same size, which often is omitted although it contributes very much to the preservation of the other vestments. in the oldest, and therefore pre-Catholic times, a third covering was regarded as liturgically necessary, namely, the actual Altarcloth of pure white linen. This should extend only a little beyond the edge of the Altar and needs no embroidery besides crosses of red or white yarn in the corners and perhaps a

narrow border of the same sort at their junction; but it may be provided with a solid linen fringe. Under every vessel there may be a little linen cloth, a *Corporale*, and upon each a *Palla*. The custom of covering all the vessels upon carrying them to the Altar and until the proper beginning of the sacramental action with a Veil (*velum*) is still followed in most Lutheran and Reformed Churches. At the beginning of the celebration proper this is taken away, folded up and laid with the candles, in order to be put over the vessels by the minister at the close of the celebration, and this may be convenient on account of the size of the vessels. It would be well to have uniformity of usage in this matter. Besides, the Altar should be provided with small cloths, *Purificatories*, with which to wipe the cup, especially the rim of it at every filling, and also the *Vorhalletuecher*, still in use in many regions, which are of a breadth of 30 to 40 cm, and as long as the armrests on each side of the Altar, and are held there by two boys.

B. Not ritually indispensable but yet called for by the Liturgy is the decorative clothing of the Altar. This may have been added to the linen very early and used without special rules. It is only natural that special feasts should be distinguished thus above the ordinary Sundays. Then the Altar and its belongings were covered for fast days and memorials, and decked in white for festivals of joy (such as Christmas, Epiphany, Easter, Ascension Day). With the multiplication of feasts of Martyrs and Saints, the need grew of marking the gradually ordered seasons of the Church Year, and so at a comparatively late period the designation of particular colours to particular seasons arose. Since many Saints' Days fell into disuse at the Reformation, and the Church Year (beginning at Christmas and ending with the preparation of Advent) became more prominent, the Evangelical Church can adopt this significant custom of the liturgical colours, though it grew up in Catholic times, and could hardly put anything better into its place. According to

a few gradually recognized alterations the order is the following:

White: Though many deny it to be a colour, yet the positive pole of the scale of colours, the colour of spotlessness, of the candidates for Baptism, etc., by Luther called the colour of the angels and of all saints, for Christmas and its cycle until Epiphany, in Saxony for the Annunciation also, Easter, and the First Sunday after Easter as the White Sunday of the newly, baptized, (here and there only) until Ascension, Trinity, and St. John Baptist.

Red, the majestic colour of dominion, of joy, of light-giving doctrine, of the fire of the Holy Ghost, of blood and of martyrdom, for Whitsunday, its octave, and the feasts of the Reformation and church dedication which are a result of Whitsunday, and where white is wanting to take its place.

Green, the everyday colour of the earth, the restful and refreshing colour of hope, of peace and of victory, for the everyday times of the church, i. e., for Epiphany and Trinity-tide.

Violet, (not purple nor lilac nor blue) the solemn earnest colour of modesty, humility, concentration, penitent concentration in one's self, for the closed times, Advent, Lent, Passion.

Black finally, the negative pole of the scale, the colour of sadness and humiliation, for Good Friday, days of penitence, feasts of the dead, and also where necessary in the place of Violet.

On the other hand the following are excluded:

Blue, although the colour of Heaven, of truth. and faithfulness, which often deserves and finds its place in ecclesiastical art, does not appear nor should it appear as the representative of a festival or a particular season, and only in dark shade in a peacock blue may it be used in place of violet.

Yellow, which in Catholic Art sometimes occurs as a substitute for gold, denoting the sun and the goodness of God, is however, rather the colour of envy, avarice and faithlessness. The mantle of Joseph is properly bright brown; of Peter, orange.

Yellow is assigned to Judas. To use rose colour or orange instead, of red; instead of dark green, Maygreen, applegreen, olive or bronze green; instead of violet, lilac; in general instead of full pure colours, dull colours, so-called fashionable colours, is to be positively advised against, as also to let ornaments, etc., of other shades of the same hue be added to the foundation colours in such measure as to take from the foundation colour or make it uncertain.

Silver or White is to be sparingly used in black, neutral gray only in little spaces; and in greater spaces as the colours of the mortification of the flesh it is not advisable.

The vestment must not conceal an essential part of the form or decoration of that which it covers, e. g., in the case of the Altar its form as a hearth or a table, of the pulpit its rail, the cupform of the Font; and must never take the form of a coat or fall in long folds.

On the Altar it ought to cover the table and fall over the edge about a handbreadth. Where the Altarcloth is used only at the Holy Communion the form is a matter of course. But in the majority of Lutheran Churches the Altarcloth is always in use, and it would be unnecessary and too costly to put the liturgical colours under it all over the Altar.

An *Antependium* may be used where the Altar itself is not artistically finished. Extending over the whole front of the Altar, it presents a fine opportunity for artistic treatment. If the Altar is artistically treated, then the *Antependium* should be only half its width. The Altarcloth proper should be laid over it. Vestments for Pulpit and Lectern belong to the desk only. The front needs no covering changing with the seasons.

31. On the Altar only fresh flowers should be used, not artificial nor dried. The vases should be of monumental material, of metal or firm ceramic material, not of glass or the like, of correct style, form and colour, of dignified churchly character,

and should not always be on the Altar; and still less should they be of one piece with it.

32. Nails, etc., should not be driven for purposes of decoration. Provision should be made for this in building. The same can be said of wardrobes, hatracks and the like.

EDWARD T. HORN.

Reading, Pa.

THE BIDDING PRAYER, LITANY, AND SUFFRAGES.

THE historical continuity of the Church of the *Augsburg Confession* with the Evangelical Christianity of the ages has long been one of her boasts. Her right to this distinction was obtained through the conservative principle which governed the Lutheran Reformers, i. e., Things which are not forbidden by God's Word and which serve as aids to devotion and life shall not be rejected.* The proof of the justice of our claim to an unbroken stream of Christianity is seen not alone in the doctrines of our Church but as well in her life as expressed in practice, worship and environment.

How the Order of Common Service now recommended to our Churches in America and used so largely by them supports the contentions of the preceding statements has been discussed in some of the papers Which form part of the Association's MEMOIRS. We purpose to take up another phase of the subject in the following discussion, viz., "The Responsive Church Prayers." Of these our Liturgy possesses great ancient treasures in the *Litany*, the *General Suffrages*, the *Morning and Evening Suffrages*, and the *Bidding Prayer*.†

Here again the Lutheran Church demonstrates her ecumenical Character. The *Litany* in its specific form is an early product of the Western Church; her Canonical Hours furnish the material for the Suffrages; while the Eastern Church, from a still earlier and primitive age, supplies the Diaconal Prayer.

* *Aug. Conf.* Art. VII and XV.

† *Church Book*, pp. 132-149; *Book of Worship* (G. S.) pp. 165-206; *Book of Worship*, (U. S. S.) pp. 94-107

The question arises whether our pastors know sufficient of the, history and sources of these prayers, or have studied their inner harmony, beauty and power closely enough to have a desire or an ability to recommend and encourage their use in the public Services of our Churches. To know and use these Common Prayers wherein pastor and people unite antiphonally in supplication before the Throne of Grace, cannot but impress upon the people the reality of the common Christian life, and infuse the spirit of large-hearted Christian consciousness and sympathy. It emphasizes also the evangelical priesthood of all believers in a way that a long, unbroken, personally extemporized string of petitions on the part of the pastor can never do. It helps to keep uppermost in the minds of the members the fact that *they* are praying; and gives a personal touch and sense of participation otherwise unobtainable. As our people take part in the other divisions of the Service by their responses, so also in these prayers.

We take them up in what is, roughly speaking, their chronological order.

I. THE BIDDING, OR DIACONAL PRAYER.

The immediate source of the Bidding Prayer in our own Liturgy is the Schwäbisch-Hall KO (1526). From Horn's Liturgies,* we infer that a large number of similar formularies of an admonitory character exist in Lutheran Liturgies. We were, however, unable to procure a copy of Höfling's *Urkundenbuch* for a comparative study of these forms. Löhe† has the heading, "The Bidding or Diaconal Prayers of the Lutheran Church." He also calls it a "Union of Exhortation and Prayer." After treating of the ancient prayers of this character, he continues, "A beautiful, quickening and not altogether dissimilar form has found its way into *many* Lutheran Liturgies." He proceeds to

* p. 77, q. 87-88.

† *Liturgy*, transl. by LONGAKER.

give two forms: one especially adapted for use on Good Friday (a form “used for many years in Neuendettelsau”) and the other “for the Lord’s Day.” The former parallels our own Bidding Prayer up to the fifth Collect, the Collect “for all in authority” preceding that “for our catechumens.” Löhe’s form then contains an Exhortation to pray for schismatics,* the Collect being the one numbered nineteen in our collection.† The next Exhortation deals with the Jews* with the use of Collect twenty-three;† and the following admonition mentions the heathen,* using Collect twenty-four with some slight variations. The rubric in our book calls attention to these Collects but gives no bidding form for the several estates of men mentioned. Throughout the prayer the bidding sections are delegated to the deacon, then the minister says, “Let us pray;” the deacon, “Let us humbly kneel;” and then the minister offers the prayer, the people responding “Amen.” The direction, however, is that no exhortation to kneel be given before the Collect for the Jews.‡ Whether the people stood during the reading of each exhortation and knelt for each Collect we have no means of knowing. Perhaps the “Let us humbly kneel” was more a spiritual than a physical direction. The final exhortation is given by the minister as follows: “Finally let us pray for all those things for which our Lord would have us ask, saying: ‘Our Father,’ etc.” In the second form: “For the Lord’s Day” both exhortation and Collect are taken by the minister. There is also an introductory exhortation. The order is as follows: (a) For the whole Church; (b) for governments; (c) for deliverance from error, etc.; (d) for peace; (e) for enemies; (f) for all in perils of child-birth; (g) for the fruits of the earth; (h) the Lord’s Prayer..

From this we can see that the form now printed in our Liturgy is a combination of these two, one Collect being omitted.

* Liturgy, transl. by LONGAKER.

† *Ch. Bk. P.* 114, P- 115 and p. 116.

‡ This Collect is said standing.

But our contention has been that our Church had preserved in its Bidding Prayer an ancient, eastern form of prayer and this must be substantiated.

A study of the ancient Liturgies shows us that the beginnings of this form of prayer are found in the earliest orders of public worship. It was the custom in the Early Church that the deacons should be “monitors and directors to the people in the exercise of their public devotions in the Church.”* To accomplish this they had certain set phrases which they used to announce the different parts of the Service, to notify the various orders of worshippers when to take their part in the Service, and to call upon each order to pray, directing the burden of their prayers. This custom it has seemed to me, although I have no authority to quote, must have been necessitated by the lack of printed forms by means of which the people could follow the Service. Successive deliveries of the call to prayer were addressed to a) the catechumens, b) the energumens, c) the baptized, d) the penitents, and e) the faithful, and were styled διὰ προσφονέσεως (bidding prayers).

After each class had been thus exhorted to prayer and guided in devotion, it was dismissed. The order for the catechumens will serve as an example:†

Deacon. “Pray ye catechumens.” “Let all the faithful pray for them saying, ‘Lord have mercy upon them.’” The deacon then directs the prayers of the faithful in a series of thirteen or fourteen suggested petitions. To each of these the people, and particularly the children respond as above. The deacon then bids the catechumens arise and bids them to offer several petitions for themselves. To these also the response is “Lord have mercy upon them.” Then the deacon bids them bow for the bishop’s benediction which is a prayer summing up briefly, though not specifically, the petitions concerning which the above

* BINGHAM, *Antiquities of the Christian Church*.

† *Apos. Const.* Bk. VIII.

mentioned exhortations had been given. After this the deacon says, "Catechumens depart in peace." The same order is followed in shorter or longer degree in the case of each class.

When all but "the faithful" had been dismissed the *Missa Fidelium* began with a long Bidding Prayer based upon the analogy of the Apostolical injunction, I Tim. 1: 1, 2.* The rubrics of these early Liturgies are somewhat confusing but it can be safely argued that in this Bidding Prayer for the Faithful, each petition was responded to by a Kyrie, or by the response, "Save them, O God, and lift them up by Thy mercy." The Liturgy of St. Chrysostom which is practically that used by the orthodox Greek Church to-day has similar prayers, although they are somewhat shorter. We find similar forms, some longer some shorter, "after the Divine oblation," "after the participation," and in the morning and evening Offices, in all the ancient Eastern Liturgies. A decree of the Council of Laodicea (4th Cent.) directs in the 19th Canon that after the dismissal of the catechumens and penitents, "the three prayers of the faithful be said as follows: the first in silence; but the second and third by the method of prosphesis."† Thus we see that the "bidding" form was the common type of public prayer in the Eastern Church, and that it has so remained even to this day.

To what extent this particular class of prayer passed over into the Western Church is somewhat hard to determine. That the form was known and used by the Western Churches is proven by the few examples to be found in ancient Western Liturgies‡ and by the still extant perfect specimen in the Roman Catholic Office for Good Friday afternoon. This it will be seen is the source of our own form, and it may also be noted is the most nearly evangelical of all the Romish forms. May not our short "Let

* *Apos. Const.* Bk. V111.

† MANSI, *Sact. Concl.* V01. 3.

‡ BINGHAM, *Ant. Christ. Ch.* quotes two: one from *Codex Fulda* and the other from the *Ambrosian Liturgy*. FREEMAN, *Principles of Divine Service* refers to a collection of Bidding Prayers from 1349 downwards, by Parker.

us pray” before the Collect *de tempore* in the Common Service, in the Communion Office and before the Collects in the Matin and Vesper Orders be a condensed survival of this ancient practice?

The Lutheran Church seems to have been the only Protestant communion to retain the old Bidding Prayer form in approximate purity in her Liturgies. However, traces of it are to be found in the Episcopalian Liturgy. Freeman calls attention to the “Prayer for the Church Militant” which occurs in the Communion Office of the Book of Common Prayer, after the alms have been offered and before the exhortation. He identifies it both with the prayer “after the oblations” in the ancient Liturgies, and also with the Bidding Prayer “for the faithful” which as we have seen, prefaced the *Missa Fidelium*.* He also asserts its relationship to the Good Friday prayer of the Romish Liturgy. He finds a reason for the use of this “supplication for unity” in the Eucharistic Office, in its analogy to the great high-priestly prayer of Christ† on the “night of institution.” The form used in the Episcopalian Office has a single “bid:” “Let us pray for the whole state of Christ’s Church Militant.” Then having recited the Apostle’s injunction (I Tim. 2: 1) the prayer supplicates: a) for the reception of the oblations; b) for the unity of the Church Universal; c) for the preservation of the Church’s members; d) for Christian rulers; e) for the local congregation; f) for the sick and distressed; g) a commendation of the “faithful departed.” Blunt‡ gives another Bidding Prayer enjoined by the 55th Canon of the Church of England. It is the only approved form to be used in the Communion Service after the Creed and preceding the sermon § He explains that this is a modern

* FREEMAN, *Principles of Divine Worship, Vol. II.* SMITH AND CHRETHAM, however, *Dict. Chr. Ant.* seem to deny the identity, taking the stand that the Bidding Prayers of the Episcopal Church took their rise in a distinctively mediaeval practice.

† St. John 17: 1-26.

‡ *Annotated Book of Common Prayer.*

§ Canon 55, “Before all sermons, lectures and homilies the preachers and ministers shall move the people to join with them in prayer in this form, or to this effect, as briefly as conveniently they may: “Ye shall pray for, etc.”

ized form of the ancient “Bidding of the Bedes.”* The subjects of this prayer are: a) Christ’s Holy Catholic Church-, b) King James; c) Queen Anne, etc.; d) Ministers of God’s Holy Word; e) Councils and Magistrates of the realm; f) commons of the realm; g) the departed. This is a pure bidding form, each subject being introduced by “ye shall also pray;” and a petition is suggested in each case. Local Episcopalian clergymen have assured me that nothing similar to this prayer or practice is known or used in their American Churches.

In the Reformed Churches where practically all liturgy was rejected, and where the difference between the subjective- Christian prayer and the common prayer of Christ’s unified Body was lost sight of, we naturally find no trace of this ancient and primal form of the “Church Prayer.”

It seems unfortunate that while rubrics are attached to the other responsive general prayers, the Bidding Prayer was left without any, to direct where, when and how it may be used. Löhe in his *Agende* has the rubric, “For Sundays when there is no Communion and especially for the Afternoon Service on Good Friday.” † This recognizes both the characteristic ancient uses of this form of prayer: 1st, as the general prayer, according to the usage of the Eastern Church; 2nd, as the special embodiment of the “unity” idea in Christ’s last intercessory prayer, and hence most suitable for use at the Good Friday memorial Service, according to the long-established custom of the Western Church.‡ When we consider, however, that it is but a modernized form of the prayer always used by the Early Church in the *Missa Fidelium* what objection could there be to its use in the full Communion Office? And why should our people remain ignorant of this

For a discussion of this subject cf. HOOKER, *Dict. Chr. Ant.*

† U. S. S. alone has the rubric, “By ancient usage this prayer was specially appointed for Good Friday.”

* MURATORI, *Lit. Rom.* and SALA, *Notes to Bona.*

treasure? Says Löhe, “The sweet and refreshing character of this form of prayer can be learned only by use.” Variety can be obtained in the way suggested by Löhe’s two forms: omitting the prayers for schismatics, Jews, and heathen on ordinary occasions, and using them on Good Friday or other Special Days. This is, provided for by the one rubric.*

As to how it may be used, Löhe, who has been our guide in the study of this prayer, has the following to say: “The minister announces the things for which prayer is to be offered, reads the Collect in order, and the people conclude each with *Amen*, and the whole with the Lord’s Prayer. If a *deacon* would read the recurring exhortations, the minister offer the prayers, and the congregation conclude them with *Amen* we would have indeed a restoration of the ancient form of *Bidding Prayer*.”

Upon the vexed question of kneeling for this prayer Löhe throws no light except as has been noted already. The alternate kneeling and rising would prove not only irksome but even would verge upon the ridiculous since some of the Collects and Exhortations are very brief. We have suggested the probability of the figurative sense of the original “Let us kneel.” The writer has been in the habit of using this prayer successively with the Litany and General Suffrages in the Chief Service during the Lenten Season. We have the people to kneel and one of the deacons, standing in the Chancel† reads the Exhortations, while the pastor kneeling at the Altar reads the Collect, the people responding *Amen*, and all unite in the Lord’s Prayer.

We will not examine into the parallelism between the original form, the Romish, the Episcopalian, and our own but will leave that to our pastors and people. But we do express the hope that, despite the manifest imperfections, this dissertation may be of service to our Church toward the renewed and extend

* “Here *may* be offered, etc.” *Ch. Bk. P- 148*

† SMITH AND CHEETHAM, *Did. Christ. Ant.*, “The deacon announced the prayers from the *Ambo*.”

ed use of this beautiful and powerful form of common intercession.

II. THE LITANY.

If the Bidding Prayer is a survival of the earliest form of the Church prayer known to liturgiologists, and is distinctly a product of the Eastern Church, *the Litany* is also a purified survival of a prayer form, which, if not quite so ancient as the Bidding Prayer, nevertheless is equally as closely allied with the life of the Western Church as the former is with the Eastern.

It seems permissible to claim that while the term *litany* is manifestly of Greek extraction (*λιτάνεια* from *λιτανεύω* or from *λιτή* through *λίσσομαι*) yet the specific form of prayer to which present usage attaches the word is specifically a product of the Western Church. The use of the word *litany* in the epistles, homilies and decrees of the Church Fathers is such that much confusion results from anything but a thorough study of the various passages. Palmer* and Blunt† both refer to this fact and seek to specify and classify the uses. Drews‡ also has a clear and careful classification. Bingham§ does not seem so clear on this point. The treatment by all the authorities consulted points undoubtedly to the fact that the word has come to have a specific meaning which precludes its identification with many of the former uses.

Drews‡ establishes the fact that in the Eastern Church the word had a general usage analogous to its classic signification, i. e., any supplicatory prayer. When processions began to be performed by the Church they came through force of circumstances to contain prayers and then the word assumed a double meaning: a) the prayer itself, as used in the procession; b) the procession. He quotes largely from patristic sources in support

* *Origines Liturgicae*.

† *Annotated Book of Common Prayer*.

‡ Article *Litanei* in HAUCK-HERZOG *Real-Encyclopedie*.

§ *Antiquities of the Christian Church*.

of these conclusions.* The processions in the Eastern Church evidently were not organized originally from the same causes which led to their institution in the Western. Neither could they have taken their rise earlier than the Fourth Century after persecutions had ceased. During this Century the Arian heresy troubled the Church and by imperial decree Arians were restrained from holding their services within the city. They seized upon this restriction as an opportunity to propagate their teachings. Organizing their followers into processions they marched through the city to the gates, singing hymns and anthems which set forth their peculiar heresies. Chrysostom was fearful of the proselyting effect this might have upon Christians; and so by the aid of the Empress Eudoxia who supplied silver crosses to be carried in procession, he organized counter-demonstrations of great magnificence. It would seem that the violent earthquake of the year 404 changed the character of these processions; they became more supplicatory and penitential in aspect, the decree going forth that costly clothes, and equipages were manifestly out of place and therefore, forbidden. There appears to be no reference or fragment in any of the extant writings-in as far as we have been able to consult authorities-to give any idea of the exact nature of the organization of these Eastern processions.

Drews cites four uses of the word in the Western Church: 1st, a term applied to the *Kyrie Eleison, Christe Eleison*, etc.; 2nd, as a designation of the Bidding Prayer;† 3rd, as a title of the processions; 4th, in the present sense, applied to “the rogation prayers beginning with the *Kyrie*.” He says that the application of the term to the mere repetition of the *Kyrie*, as done by the *Ordo Romanus*, by Strabo and others, has no parallel in

* LAMBING, *The Sacramentals of the Catholic Church*, argues that “the term applies rather to each petition than to the form of prayer as a whole,” since “the word is always in the plural in the liturgical language of the Church.”

† “Litania bedeutet das im Gottesdienst gebetete prosphonetische Kirchengebet, die griechische Ekteine, die litania diaconalis.”

the East. This is an aid in tracing the independent development of the *Litany* in the West.

Can we not deduce the probable development of the form of the *Litany* in these different uses? Undoubtedly the word found its way into the West from the East and naturally would attach itself first of all to the form of prayer which it originally described—the Bidding Prayer. Now one of the features of this prayer was the recurring response, *Kyrie Eleison*, so that gradually and naturally the term designating the whole would come to be applied to a part, the *Kyrie*. When processions took their rise in the West they were the outcome of times of distress and terror and consequently partook of an intensely penitential and supplicatory character. For emphasizing this particular feature of their performance nothing could be better fitted than of recurring *Kyries*; and thus gradually they took a prominent place among the Psalms and hymns chanted during such processions. These prayers or ejaculations would naturally take the name “*litany*” and in course of time the order would be reversed and once more the *whole* would be designated by the term for a part. But by this time the entire character and arrangement of the prayer had undergone a change so that the word took a new meaning entirely unapplicable to the original.

Whether the present form of the *Litany* is an amplification of the *Kyrie* or whether the *Kyrie* in the Service is a condensed survival of the ancient Church prayer is a mooted question, one upon which we are not qualified to venture a decisive opinion. For it is a fact that originally* the *Kyrie* was repeated three, nine, twelve or an unlimited number of times and later the *farced* (or amplified) *Kyries* became prevalent, followed closely by the “*Kyrie hymns*”‡ for the different seasons. It should be noted also that the developed form of the *Litany* gradually found

* *Ordo Romanus*, etc.

† “*Ad arbitrium celebranti.*”

‡ Kirchenbuch: Hymns 407-413. ROBINSON, “*Music in the Western Church.*”

its place in the Mass (taking the place of the *Gloria*) and remained there until the Ninth Century.* It still occupies the same position in the Milan Missal on *Quadragesima*.

Just where and when and how the Litany form of prayer took its rise, and grew into its present condition not even Roman Catholic scholars can agree. Löhe acknowledges the relationship between the Bidding Prayer of the Fast and the Litany of the West but dismisses the vexed question of their interdependence by saying, "There is, however, some difficulty to show exactly the development of the latter (*Litany*) from the former (*Bidding Prayer*.) Drews divorces them almost entirely and seeks to prove an independent source in the West—an ancient heathen prayer formula.

Another question shrouded in disputed uncertainty is the primary date, place and author of the processions which later produced the specific Litany formula. Bishop Mamertus of Vienne in the year 467-8 instituted a solemn three-day season of fasting, procession, and prayer, prior to Ascension Day of that year. This was done in an endeavor to gain relief from a series of particularly destructive and demoralizing earthquakes. But the testimony of Sidonius‡ goes to show that a like proceeding on similar occasions had obtained throughout Gaul during the Fifth Century, although with great irregularities and lack of devotion. Sidonius' letters and the writings of Avitus show us that "the office performed in these rogations instituted by Mamertus appears chiefly to have consisted in psalmody and prayers" together with "long lessons of Scripture" but "the services during procession itself consisted of psalmody." Evidently the prayers and lessons were said in the Church. It is not until the close of the Sixth Century, in the time of Gregory the Great that we find direct mention of a similar custom in Rome upon the 25th of April

* MURATORI, *Lit, Rom.*

† *Agende.*

‡ "*EP. ad Mamertum,*" quoted by BLUNT, BINGHAM, AND DREWS.

(Feast of St. Mark). Gregory undoubtedly took the idea from the common practice of his time. The particular occasion in Rome was a threatened pestilence and to avert it he appointed a “*letania septiformis*,” i. e., processions of seven different classes of people from as many different starting points. The order of the Office seems to have differed somewhat from that observed in Gaul.

We know that when Gregory revised the Roman Sacramentary he introduced the Kyrie. He refers to the Roman use as unique.* The fact that he introduced the *Kyrie* into the Services seems to Burbidge† an argument that he was encouraging the use of Litanies in the Service. That the repetition of the *Kyrie* early found a place in the Offices of the processions is evident from an extract from the writings of Gregory of Tours. In describing a Litany in Rome in the time of Gregory the Great he says, “A choir of singers came to the church, crying through the streets of the city *Kyrie Eleison*.” That Gaul *adopted* this feature (repetition of *Kyries*) from Rome and did not *originate* it can be seen from a decree of the Council of Vaison (529), which commends “the agreeable and salutary custom” prevalent in Rome and Italy, Of using “a frequent repetition of the *Kyrie Eleison* with great earnestness and contrition;” and directs its introduction at Matins and Vespers as well as at Mass. The *Ordo Romanus* “speaks as if the repetition of *Kyries* formed the greater part of the (*processional*) service.”‡ It says “Let no one then presume to ride but let all walk with bare feet. Let no women lead the choirs but let all together sing *Kyrie Eleison* and with contrition of heart implore the mercy of God for the pardon of

* “We have not been accustomed, neither do we now say the Kyrie as the Greeks do. For among the Greeks all say it together, but with us it is said by the clergy and then answer is made by the people, and *Christe Eleison* is said by us the same number of times, which is not said at all by the Greeks.” Epistle to John, Bishop of Smyrna.

† *Liturgies and Offices of the Church*.

‡ PALMER, *Orig. Lit.*

their sins, for peace, for deliverance from plague, for preserving the fruits of the earth, and for other necessities." Here we can see a rough outline of the present component parts of the Litany. During the centuries following Litanies multiplied in great variety and number; and their form and use did not always retain an evangelical character. However the character of the prayer took a great hold upon the esteem of the people and so gradually from the original use outside the liturgical Offices they found their way in greater or less degree into almost every Service. The times, crowded as they were with droughts, famines, pestilences, invasions, and with confused and insecure political institutions, tended to emphasize and multiply the necessities for these "fastings and prayers." The echo of those "days which tried men's souls" is still heard in some of the Supplications, Versicles, and Collects of our Liturgy. The impress of those evil times is, still more apparent in the older forms, had we time to examine them. Hooker says,* "Rogations or Litanies were then the very strength, stay and comfort of God's Church." "And so," says Blunt,† "it became natural to adopt a form of prayer which took so firm a hold on men's affections, on various occasions where processions were not used. At ordinations or at consecrations, at the conferring of monastic habits, at coronation of Emperors, at dedication of churches, etc., it became common for the school or choir, the subdeacon or the deacon, to begin the Litany starting with *Kyrie Eleison* or *Christe, audi nos*. A Litany never came amiss: it was particularly welcome as an element of offices for the sick and dying:‡ its terseness, energy, pathos seemed to gather up all that was meant by *being instant in prayer*." The Litany began to take a place as a "Church Prayer." The Councils time after time decreed Rogation observances for three days prior to Ascension Day. The Gallican custom spread year by year from

* *Dict. Chr. Ant.*

† *Annotated Book of Common Prayer.*

‡ *Cf. our own Ch. Bk., "Min. Acts," pp. 383 and 404.*

country to country but was not established in Rome until 816 by Leo III. Spain, adhering to the ancient idea that no fasts should occur during the Easter cycle, appointed its Rogation Days in Lent, Whitsunweek, and Autumn. We have the survival of these combined seasons in the “Ember Days” of the Roman Catholic and Anglican Churches appointed for the Advent, Lent, Easter (Ascension Week), and Trinity Seasons.

Gradually the invocation of saints found its way into the Litanies and became the principal part of them. This is another peculiarity differentiating the Western Litany from the Eastern -counterpart. These invocations began to be used about the Eighth Century as is proven not alone by the silence in respect to this class of invocations in the writings of Gregory of Tours, Avitus, Sidonius, and Gregory the Great, but as well by the actual text of many forms of earlier Litanies, still extant. One such is found in the Breviary of a Bavarian monastery, another in the form still used in the Milan Missal on *Quadragesima*, and several shorter ones in the Mozarabic Breviary (6th and 7th Cent). Despite these evidences Roman Catholic writers claim for their present “Litany of the Saints” a great antiquity antedating even the time of Gregory the Great; although conservatives attribute it to him. Lambing* says, “It is not strange, however, that this Litany should be attributed to St. Gregory, inasmuch as he had a great devotion to the saints, and had their Litany chanted with special solemnity in the processions which he caused to be made through the streets of Rome on the occasion of the plague that raged there during his pontificate.” To what ludicrous extent these invocations were multiplied appears from the notice in Blunt’s “*Annotated Book of Common Prayer*” of an old Tours form for the visitation of the sick wherein the list of saints is more than four columns in length. Others mention local Litanies with as high as two and three hundred saints’ names, all to be responded to ill dreary monotony by “*ora pro nobis.*” When we

* “*The Sacramentals of the Catholic Church.*”

learn further that in time they came to have "*letania septiforma*," *Ilquina*," or "*Ierna*," in which seven, five or three subdeacons, as the case might be, each repeated every supplication and response in order, multiplying the original manifoldly, we gain another view of the religious extravagances of the Middle Ages.

Gradually, despite their multiplicity, and diversity of purpose, a uniform outline began to assert itself so that Blunt,—who, in his, *Annotated Book of Common Prayer* must examine no less, than thirty separate specimens—says, "The general divisions of Mediaeval Litanies were: 1. *Kyrie* and "Christ, hear us," etc. 2. Entreaties to each of the Divine Persons and to the whole Trinity. 3. Invocation of Saints. 4. Deprecations. 5. Obsecrations. 6. Petitions. 7. *Agnus Dei*, *Kyrie*, Lord's Prayer. 9. Collects. This will be seen to correspond in part with the arrangement of our own which is a purified form of the Roman Catholic "Litany of the Saints."

By the Fifteenth Century this "Great Litany" had become fixed in its form. It was approved in 1601 according to Drews.*It is now known as above, having sixty-three invocations of saints. It is the especial "liturgical Litany" and is used at the bestowal of holy orders, at the blessing of the font on Holy Saturday and the Eve of Pentecost (in a shortened form), on April 25th, and on the Rogation Days. On these occasions it is always used in Latin. "It is known in liturgical language as the Greater, and Lesser Litany. The former is chanted in the solemn processions on the feast of St. Mark, and the latter on the Rogation Days."†

The former obligation to recite this Litany on all Fridays during Lent was removed by Pius V; but aside from the above public recitals those who are bound to the recitation of the Divine Office are also bound to recite the Litany of the Saints on St. Mark's Day and on the three Rogation Days. There is no indulgence attached to the recitation of this Litany. The "Litany

* BAUCK-HERZOG, *Real-Encyclopedia*.

† LAMBING.

of the Blessed Virgin” or of “Our Lady of Loretto” was approved in 1587.* Lambing claims for this an antiquity greater than the “Litany of the Saints.” He quotes Quarti’s opinion that it was “composed by the Apostles after the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin into Heaven.” Drews says, “However, it first appears at the close of the Sixteenth Century; the oldest imprint hitherto known is heard of in 1576.” The recitation of this Litany once a day gains an indulgence of two hundred days by the grant of Sixtus V (1585) and Benedict XIII (1784). For every recital, by the clemency of Pius VII (1800), the faithful gain three hundred days indulgence; while for a daily recital on the five feasts of obligation (Immaculate Conception, Nativity, Annunciation, Purification, and Assumption), a plenary indulgence, “on condition of confession, communion, visiting a church, and praying according to the intention of the Holy Father.”† The third approved Litany: that of “The Holy Name of Jesus” was approved partially in 1862 and fully in 1886. It is not so old as the other two.¹ There is an indulgence of 300 days to be gained through its recital once a day “by all the faithful of the Christian world.” Other Litanies such as that of the “Sacred Heart,” or the “Blessed Sacrament,” or “For the Faithful Departed” are not universally approved but their use occurs in some dioceses by clemency of the Bishop.

In the Protestant Church, the Lutheran, Anglican, and Moravian divisions have retained the use of the Litany in purified forms. We will glance briefly at the differences in form and usage before closing our discussion.

A. *In the Anglican Church.* It seems to be the endeavor of the Anglican writers to prove an almost independent development for the English Litany as now used by the Church of England and the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of

* DREWS.

† LAMBING.

‡ “Of Jesuitical Origin.” HORN, *Liturgics*.

America. The British Church undoubtedly was one of the first to adopt the custom instituted by Mamertus, for when St. Augustine went to the island on his mission from Rome in 596 A. D., he entered Canterbury chanting an anthem which was part of the Rogation Tuesday Service in the Lyons Office. Copies of the early Litanies used in English Churches are numerous. The most noted are the so-called "Anglo-Saxon Litany," and those in the Sarum, York and Hereford rites; these are in Latin. English Litanies dating back to the beginning of the Fifteenth Century are noted by Maskell,* but they did not affect the final form in the Prayer Book to any extent. In its present form the Litany is practically the English Litany translated and arranged by Cranmer in 1544, with slight revisions, mainly in rubrics, introduced in the several editions of the Prayer Book (1548, 1552, 1559, 1662).

The issuance of a Litany in an approved English form was the greatest step toward liturgical reform which Henry VIII could be prevailed upon to take. Bishop Cranmer, according to a letter upon this subject addressed to the King, says he "was constrained to use more than the liberty of a translator;" he "altered divers words," "added parts," took away parts, dropped others, and in some cases added whole divisions. He most likely had before him the old English Litany of the "Prymers," the Sarum Breviary and that of York, the Reformed Breviary of Cardinal Quignonez, the Reformed Liturgy of Hermann, Archbishop of Cologne, and very likely Luther's Latin or German Liturgy of 1529. Upon Cranmer's own statement, quoted above in part, we see that all these contributed to the form which he compiled and doubtless the two German arrangements (both practically Luther's) did so more largely than the rest since they were the most evangelical in tone. Yet Blunt says, "But these foreign Reformers had scarcely any influence beyond a few clauses in the Litany, and it is somewhat doubtful whether in the case of the Litany

* *Monumenta Ritualia.*

our English form was not in reality the original of that in Herman's book."* Jacobs in his "*Lutheran Movement in England*" has shown by a paralleling of Luther's Latin Litany (1529) and the English of Marshall's Primer (1535), and by a careful comparative study of the component parts and separate expressions, how largely the German Reformer's liturgical conservatism influenced the reformation Litany and Liturgy in England. Aside from Blunt the other Anglican authorities which we have examined seem to know nothing of the Lutheran Litany. The Roman form appears to have exerted but little influence upon the English Church.

Although the old Latin Litanies began with the *Kyrie* and were followed in that respect by the Litanies of the Primers, Cranmer rejected it and opens with the expanded form, "O God, the Father, etc.," which follows the *Kyrie* in the old forms and in those at present used in the Roman and Lutheran Churches. The transposition of the intercessions for temporal rulers to a place preceding that for the spiritual shows the influence of Henry VIII's pretensions as head of the Church. Even in America where the claim is of course invalid the inversion stands unchanged. The invocation of saints was rejected most naturally as being one of the "abuses." which the Reformation was to do away. Palmer† gives four arguments in justification of this act: "First, because the Litanies of all Churches were devoid of them for seven centuries; secondly, because they were unnecessary; thirdly, because they were imprudent; and, fourthly, because they originated and promoted the danger of heresy and blasphemy.) Y

Processionals were very popular in England but the abuses connected with them became so notorious that they were forbidden by the injunctions of Edward VI (1547), which ordered that "the priests with other of the choir" were to kneel in the midst

* *Annotated Book of Common Prayer.*

† *Origines Liturgicae.*

of the church immediately before High Mass “to sing or say the Litany.” In the Prayer Book of 1549 the Litany, printed after the Communion, was ordered to be said or sung on Wednesdays and Fridays. In the edition of 1552 it was printed after the office of Evening Prayer, “to be used on *Sundays*, Wednesdays, Fridays and at other times.” The present Anglican Book of Common Prayer has the rubric, “to be sung or said after Morning Prayer upon Sundays, Wednesdays and Fridays, and at other times when it shall be commanded by the Ordinary.* The rubric in the American Prayer Book reads, “To be *used* after Morning Service on Sundays, Wednesdays and Fridays. There are a few slight changes in the text of the American Book. There is no provision for the use of the Litany as a Church Prayer in the Chief Service. In fact the Anglican arrangement of the liturgical offices is such as to preclude the use of a “general prayer” in the sense known to the Ancient Church and to us. The Litany is always used as a special or extra Service.†

There is no rubric in direct connection with the Litany for the place from which it is to be used, but in the Anglican “Order of Communion” the rubric before the Fifty-first Psalm says, “Then shall they all kneel upon their knees, and the priests and clerks kneeling (in the place where they are accustomed to say the Litany) shall say this Psalm.” This seems to recognize a particular place for the use of the Litany, distinct from the station for the performance of the ordinary offices. The early offices prescribe a choir of seven boys to chant the Litany in “the midst of the Church” and this custom appears to have prevailed until the present. At other times the priest or deacon leads the Litany kneeling in the nave upon a prayer desk, known as a faldstool. This practice is based upon Joel 2: 17. The Litany is generally

* In accord with the use observed in the mediaeval Churches, the Anglican Orders retain the Litany in the Offices for the ordering of deacons, of priests, and consecration of bishops, immediately after the candidates have been presented.

† FREEMAN, however, “*Principles of Divine Service*,” seems to appreciate this character of the Litany. Cf. pp. 321-329 and 441.

sung in the English Church, especially in the Cathedrals. The American Prayer Book has no rubric on place and the invariable custom is to say the Litany.

There is a great wealth of musical settings to the Litany in the Anglican Church but they nearly all retain Plain Song characteristics. The settings are provided only for the “former part of the Litany,” i. e., as far as the Kyrie. The second section beginning with the Lord’s Prayer is known to Anglican usage as “The Suffrages.” The popularity of the Litanies, and their early passage into the vernacular even before the Liturgy itself was reformed—and the disposition to sing them on all occasions accounts for the preservation of the Litany chant “in a more entire and unmutilated state in our cathedrals than any other part of Plain Song.”* Jebb says in the introduction to his edition of various settings‡ “For three hundred years, i. e., ever since the Reformation (at least), it has been the established and uninterrupted custom of our Church, at least in her principal choirs, to sing all the Preces, Responses, and the former part of the Litany *to harmonies, accompanied by the organ*, on the great Festivals and on solemn occasions.” He gives the notation of Tallis, in five different harmonies, together with one notation each by Bird, Day, King, Wanliss, and Loosemore (penitential). Archer and Reed refer to the antiquity of the “traditional Litany melody of the Anglican Church.”

This is of necessity a brief and imperfect study of the Anglican usage of the Litany but it will suffice, let it be hoped, for comparison.

B. *In the Moravian Church.* The history of the Litany in the Church of the *Unitas Fratrum*, known to us as the Moravian, is interesting. The history of this body of evangelical Christians begins in reality before the Reformation, belonging to the results

* RIMBAULT.

† *Choral Responses and Litany of the United Churches of Engl. and Fr.*

‡ Preface to *The Choral Service Book*.

of the work of Huss. The principles of reformation upon which this community was founded were purely evangelical and were characterized by extreme Biblical simplicity. Hence they were led to discard Church forms and their cultus for a long time was extremely plain. The use of the Holy Scriptures as a guide in everything, the prominence given to congregational singing, and the use of the vernacular in all services prevented the establishment of a Liturgy for the first hundred years. They could not help, however, but be influenced by the Reformation of the Sixteenth Century, nor are they averse to acknowledging their indebtedness to the Reformers for certain things. The confession of the "Ancient Church of the Brethren" was revised many times, and two editions* had an introduction by Luther. The "Renewed Church" has no officially recognized document as its Confession of Truth but from the "Results of the General Synod of 1899" we learn that it adheres to the doctrines of the Apostles, and that it recognizes "that in the twenty-one doctrinal articles of the Augsburg Confession, as being the first and most general confession of the *Evangelical (Protestant) Church*, the chief doctrines of the Christian faith are clearly and simply set forth." Although they were the first body of evangelical Christians to publish a hymn-book in the vernacular for congregational singing, † it was not until about 1566- that a Liturgy began to develop. In a large hymnal published in that year Luther's German Litany of 1529 was incorporated. This Litany, practically unaltered, appeared again in the first hymnal of the "Renewed Church" in 1735. From that time may be dated the independent development of their Litany until in its accepted form to-day it partakes more of the character of an Office of Worship than that of a mere prayer. The first Moravian Litany was compiled in 1742. It reached its completed and fixed form in 1790, ‡ although

* German, 1533; Latin, 150,

† 1501.

‡ Die grosse Kirchenlitanie.

the hymnal of the German branch published in 1869 incorporated an abridged form* which is now used generally through Germany. The need for an abridgment was necessitated by the gradual combination of the Litany with the “Predigt Gottesdienst.” Formerly it had been a separate Service held at nine o’clock.

When the English branch of the Church was founded in 1742 the Herrnhut Litany was translated for its use. This translation has undergone equally as many emendations as the German. Some of the changes and editions embodied were suggested by the Anglican Bishop of London. A comparison of the forms of the two Churches should serve to show what these were. The English form has “a kind of Introit before the *Kyrie*.” The Moravian Church in America adopted the English form but in 1870 revised it in comparison with the original. The American Church introduced, the introductory form of confession and absolution and inserted the Apostles’ Creed and the Gloria Patri before the invocations. The independent features of the Moravian Litany are a) the forms just mentioned, b) the multiplication of the deprecations, obsecrations, and intercessions, c) the use of the petitions of the *Lord’s Prayer* as the response to the first of the invocations, † d) the introduction of a praise Versicle between two groups of intercession, e) the absence of any concluding Versicles and Collects, and f) the introduction of hymn singing between the different parts. After the Absolution and before the Creed the last four verses of a metrical *Te Deum* are sung; between the invocations and the deprecations the last three verses of the second stanza of “All glory to God on high;” after the obsecrations, the first stanza of a Litany hymn to the Saviour; be

* Die kleine Kirchenlitanie.

† Lord God, our Father, which art in Heaven, *Hallowed be Thy Name, etc., Amen.*
 Lord God, Son, Thou Saviour of the world, *Be gracious unto us.* Lord God, Holy Ghost, *Abide with us forever.*

fore the *Agnus*, a stanza by Gregor, “Lord for Thy coming us prepare.”*

The analysis or explanation of the Litany as given in the Moravian Manual will show us how the elements of the opening part of our *Chief Service* are embodied in this Litany.

“The *Kyrie Eleison*, an invocation and an invitation to confession are followed by a confession of sins, all kneeling. The Absolution leads to the Creed, a Hymn intervening. Then follows the Gloria Patri and the Lord’s Prayer, joined with brief intercessions to the Son, and the Holy Spirit. After another verse is sung general intercessions are made with reference to, Providential surroundings and spiritual needs; prayers for the Church universal, the denomination itself and its congregations, and all classes therein follow another Hymn. Intercessions on behalf of temporal requirements and the discharge of social duties, prayers for missions among the heathen, the Hebrews and Islam, petitions in behalf of the constituted authorities of the land and for its peace and prosperity, for travelers, the persecuted, the sick, the aged and the dying—for all men and for the coming of Christ’s Kingdom, finally, after another Hymn, lead to responsive intercessions, wherein faith in the atonement and a benediction of peace is besought with this as its sure foundation.”

This Litany is prescribed as the opening order for the rite of “Consecration of a Bishop.” That it was the basis upon which all their forms of Service were built is a conclusion deduced from the presence of parts of it in almost every form given in their *Liturgy*. The phrase “We poor sinners pray, hear us gracious Lord and God,” common to all other Litanies, is not found in the body of their “Church Litany” but it occurs in the “Easter Morning Litany” and in the “Office for the Burial of the Dead.” It is not in the form of Versicle and Response but is used entire, as a Response. The invocations are used in an “Office of Worship for Sunday Evening,” in one for the Epiphany Season, and also in that for Trinity Sunday. The *Kyrie* is used in nearly all the Offices, while parts of the obsecrations and the *Agnus* occur in many of them. The “Easter Litany” referred to is in reality

* Cf. *Liturgy and Hymns of The American Province of the Unitas Fratrum*, Bethlehem, 1903. Morv. Publ. House.

a form of Service for Easter Morning since it contains scarcely any of the Litany elements. It is composed of the Easter greeting, paraphrases of the several articles of the Creed* to each of which the congregation responds, successively, *This I verily believe, This I most certainly believe, This I assuredly believe.* The Lord's Prayer and Scripture passages are also used, all the parts being interspersed with stanzas from Easter hymns. This Service was compiled about the same time as the *Church Litany.*

The *Office for the Season of Lent* is an American compilation based upon the second Litany of the German Church† used there both in Advent and Lent. It opens with one section of the *Agnus*, uses passages from the Epistles and Prophets referring to Christ and His mediatorial work, stanzas of hymns, a group of eight deprecations, one of seven obsecrations and another of four, and two obsecrations with separate responses.

The last edition of the Moravian "*Offices of Worship and Hymns*‡ gives "chants for the Litany."

There are intonations for the "Minister and Choir," and response chants for "All." These, however, cover only the opening *Kyrie*, the *Gloria* after the Creed, the invocations (only for the Doxology of the Lord's Prayer), the praise Versicle and Response, the *Agnus*, and the final *Kyrie*. Evidently the remaining portions of the Litany are *said*. It may be remarked that in all the chants for the Services, musical provision for the minister's part is always made. There is no indication of the identity of the composer of the Chants but there is a uniformity of progression, tempo and harmonization which would point to a common composer for all the office music.

C. In the Lutheran Church. The Litany as the Lutheran Church has it to-day is practically of Luther's composition. Litanies in their various mediaeval forms and uses were equally as

* Based upon Luther's exposition.

† *Litanei vom Leben. Leiden und Sterben Jesu.*

‡ Bethlehem, 1902, Morv. Publ. House.

popular in Germany as in other countries, judging from the rapidity and universality with which Luther's forms, both Latin and German, were adopted. Jacobs* refers to a curious *Litany for the Germans* used on Ash Wednesday, "adapted at Wittenburg into a prayer for Luther's cause." The responses were, "Have mercy on the Germans," "Help the Germans... Protect the Germans," etc. Even the Psalm began, "Make haste, O God, to help the Germans." In the early days of the Reformation processions remained in vogue and the old Litanies were still in use, but by 1525 they had been rejected. Early in 1529† Luther published a purified form and introduced the use of it in the Church at Wittenburg. It was received with great delight and Luther himself considered it "a precious spoil" and according to Gerber spoke of it as second only to the Lord's Prayer. Drews‡ says that the spread of Luther's Litany was accomplished 1st, by a special edition of the text issued in 1529§; 2nd, by its being appended to the third edition of the *Small Catechism*; and 3rd, by its incorporation into the hymnbooks. Edition after edition of the various "Gesangbücher," so popular throughout Germany, were printed. Some have only the Latin text which was used mostly in the schools, others, the German text, and many have both forms. Its introduction into the KOO, followed quickly, which is not surprising. South and Southwest Germany took the lead in this. Brenz and Bucer by sermon and letter recommended its adoption. It was found in all the important KOO of every section of the Fatherland by the close of the Sixteenth Century.

When we examine the form in which Luther gave to the Church this great prayer in its purification, we find that he incorporated many changes from the Roman form, and made many

* *Luth. Mov. in Engl.*

† March 13.

‡ HAUCK-HERZOG, *Real-Encyclopedie*.

§ Wittenburg, "Er kostete 7 Pfge."

additions. Naturally the invocation of saints dropped out. The invocation, “Holy *Trinity, one God*” was dropped and a few changes made in the responses. A significant deprecation, “From all error” was adopted; “From Thy wrath” disappeared. Further changes in the deprecations reduced their number from eleven to ten. Another characteristic omission is that of the obsecration, “By the mystery of Thy Holy Sacrament.” The order of the obsecrations underwent some change. “Temptations,” “Agony and Bloody Sweat” were added. The petitions for help in tribulation, prosperity and the hour of death were new. Three intercessions (“That Thou spare us,” “pardon us,” and “vouchsafe to grant us true penance”) no longer were used. The rest of the intercessions underwent great changes because they were infused largely with errors (for the Pope, the dead, etc.) Many intercessions were added, increasing the number to twenty-one * The responses to the *Agnus* were altered and an *Amen* added to the *Kyrie*. The Lord’s Prayer was said aloud by all the people instead of having the final petition as a response. The Roman Litany used a part of the Sixty-ninth Psalm. This Luther dropped. Instead of the eleven Versicles and Responses he provided two, and in place of the ten Collects, selected five from other sources. There seems to be some disagreement as to the number of Collects and Versicles. Drews credits him with five Versicles and three Collects. Having had access alone to the Latin copy, we are unable to say whether the German differed in this respect. One of the two Versicles given* in the Latin is not found in our English version, neither in the German of the *Kirchenbuch*. The five Collects now in the English are in the, Latin; but the “Collect for Peace” which is the only Collect now surviving from the Roman original is not included.

As we had no access to the archives we are unable to account for the difference between the Latin of Luther and our present

* *Peccavimus, Domine, cum Patribus nostris: Injuste egimus iniquitatem fecimus.*

form. The petition for travelers was inserted by the joint Committee on Liturgy.* There seems to be a considerable change in the petitions relating to civil affairs for which we cannot account. The “O Lord Jesus Christ, Son of God, We *beseech Thee to hear us*” does not appear in the Latin text. We have found nothing on the sources of the Versicles to Collects two, four and five.

When the arrangement into groups followed by a single response arose is not known to us. It cannot be the result of the translation into the English, and the consequent influence of the Anglican Litany, since Löhe knows the practice and condemns it. “The arrangement of the petitions into groups, which never found much favor ought not, to be countenanced at all. The power of this prayer, internal as well as external, lies in the refrains which follow the intonations of each part as stroke upon stroke; for it is sung or said either by minister and congregation or by choir and congregation.”† ‡ This grouping of the parts may have been the natural result of the orderly arrangement which Luther gave to the petitions in their several classes, and as well of the desire on the part of the people to shorten its rendition during the time when it gradually passed into almost total disuse, in the Eighteenth Century.

An analysis of this prayer will show us great harmony, beauty, comprehensiveness and strength. No better appreciation of the prayer can be given than that of Löhe.

“The Litany in its Lutheran form is like the magnificent cathedrals the Middle Ages, which become the more dear and precious to the heart the more the beauty of symmetrical form and plan is recognized. With humble confession of sin, and knowing no way of deliverance except by grace and mercy, it lifts the soul in this way, all the more powerfully to the reverent worship of the Triune God. Its *Kyrie* and its *Eleison* point—the one to the loftiest heights, the other to the lowest depths. Between these heights and

* Cf. Standard MS of Common Service.

† Our rubrics give the choice of methods, placing the ancient first, however.

‡ *Agende*, translated by LONGAKER.

depths mediates our Lord Jesus Christ, Who, as the prayer advances appears more clearly and refreshingly with His merit and satisfaction. The Litany begins with an act of humble worship, continues with confession of Christ and concludes in the sweet Agnus. The deeper the heart sinks itself into this prayer, the stronger its cry, and the more will its worship become the song of Moses and the Lamb—the song of the New Covenant. What a beginning, continuation and ending are here, how thoroughly evangelical; how absolutely in accord with the doctrines of our Church. Between the three high towers of beginning, continuation and end are two courses of well-arranged petitions. First in order are the *deprecationes mali*, supplications for deliverance from evil; then follow the *apprecationes boni*, petitions for all manner of good, which gradually pass over into *interpellationes or* intercessions; and finally a thankful prostration of the heart at the feet of Jesus, the Lamb of God. Here then, are prayers, supplications, intercessions and thanksgivings unto Him Whose will it is to be a Saviour of all men, especially of them that believe. Everything for which we ought to pray is included in one or the other of the petitions.

In the use of such a form there is no room for weak sentimentality or idle talk; nevertheless it allows before all other forms the pressing of specific petitions, for its spirit is as elastic as its form is rigid. Here is room for every sigh of the heart and the clear classification of the petitions will itself show the earnest worshipper where to introduce special petitions, supplications or intercessions. Likewise it is easy to determine where to say: *Good Lord, deliver us*, or *We beseech Thee to hear us, good Lord*.

To the indifferent the Litany is indeed a lengthy and formal affair. Sung or said by Christless souls it is certainly only a shell, a lifeless form. But when used by the earnest Christian, it contains power, spirit and life. No one who has never used it should pass judgment on it, for if there is a spirit to pray, prayer is certainly possible by means of the Litany. But where there is no spirit of prayer there can also be no prayer, no matter whether the words are after a form as rigid as that of the Litany or as formless as the words of those who reject all forms of worship.

The *use* to which this prayer was put in the Reformation Church shows certain innovations. Of course its use on the ancient *dies stationum*, Wednesday and Friday, was continued Luther appointed it for Matins on Wednesdays and for Vespers on Fridays. Not many followed this order. Many KOO leave a choice between the two days; some ordain its use on both days

and others only † on Friday.* A number have no set days but leave the choice of days to the best convenience of the people. Very soon the Litany became appointed for Vespers on Sundays and Feastdays, and even on Sundays after the sermon—if there were no communicants. † Lossius fixed the singing of the Litany at the place of the Church Prayer, Mecklenburg has the unique provision for its use either “before or during the Communion,” possibly in the latter case as a private devotion. Some orders give it a place after the Epistle. It was especially appointed for use on *Reminiscere*, the 12th Sunday after Trinity, in the four Ember-weeks, when sermons upon the catechism were preached, and at ordinations* by various orders. The Pfalz-Neuburg, (1543) directs its use on St. Mark’s Day and on the Rogation Days with processions “from one church to another.” Some of the Southern Orders have set days of humiliation on which the Litany is to be said after (nach) the sermon, and confession. Löhe differs from this somewhat; “In many of the KOO the Service of Public Confession and Absolution is *preceded* by the Litany.”

Our own rubrics permit of its use at “Matins on Sundays when there is no Communion and at Vespers on Sundays, Wednesdays, and Fridays and on Days of Humiliation and Prayer.§ According to our rubric for the *General Prayer* the character of the Litany as a *Church Prayer* is recognized and its use permitted. Why no reference to that use is made in the rubric on page 132 is not clear. We have two other Litanies in our *Church Book*: in the *Visitation of the Sick*, and in the *Commenda-*

* NAUMBERG, 1538, “Alle Freitag nachmittag um zwoelf hoya singet man das Tenebrae und haelt die Litanei darauf.”

† Koenigsberg, and Saxon Visitation Articles.

‡ BRAUNSCHWEIGER, 1543, HILDESHEIMER, 1544, and MECHLENBURGER, 1532 appoint its use at ordination.

§ U. S. S. and G. S.: *at morning Service when there is no Communion. Kirchenbuch: Wenn beim Morgengottesdienst am Sonntag das Heilige Abendmahl nicht gefeiert wird, ist es passend, statt des Allgemeinen Kirchengehet zu halten.*

tion of the Dying. * The latter is almost an exact translation of the brief Litany in the Roman Catholic *Ordo Commendationes Animae*, the saints's names being omitted. The former opens with the invocations; has seven deprecations with the response, *Defend (him), Good Lord*; four obsecrations and seventeen intercessions, closing with the *Agnus*. The character of the intercessions is worthy of study. The source of this Litany is not known to us. In the way of devotional Litanies there is Löhe's "*Litany to the Holy Ghost*" in his *Agende* and in Dr. Seiss' *Golden Altar*, there are the *Litany to the Saviour* and the *Litany to the Holy Ghost*, presumably from his own pen.

On the manner of reading the Litany there is not much to offer historically. In the original customs, according to the practice noted in the *Apostolic Constitutions*, the children were used in the praying of the Litany. The school-boys, or some of the catechumens† "kneeling before the great altar" sang the Litany, the congregation rendering the responses. Another plan was to have the choir sing the intonations and the congregation the responses; or where there were two choirs the second led the congregational responses. In the absence of such choirs the pastor intoned the Litany standing or kneeling before the Altar. For a long time the Litany was sung at all its renditions but with 1598 the Strasburg KO began the practice of saying it. Very soon the custom arose to have the pastor say the entire prayer himself without any response at all. This marked the beginning of the decline of its popularity, which was only arrested by Schöberlein and Kliefoth. Naturally when the people no longer took part they lost interest, and then knowledge of the prayer disappeared until finally they failed longer to seek the blessing to be gained by its fervent and intelligent use. Once more we refer to Löhe. "The very essence, the majesty and power of the Litany are to

* *Ch. Bk.*, pp. 383-4 and p. 405.

† Luther's directions were for from two to five "Knaben mit guten, reinen Stimmkin oder der Liturg im altar."

be found in the recurring responses of the congregation. No one with any liturgical instinct, therefore, will say that the minister alone ought to read it. To sing it or say it antiphonally is the proper way to use it. If sung, it is usually, though not always, without organ accompaniment.* ... On Sundays it is more appropriate to sing it on account of the festival character of the day; Wednesday and Friday it should be said.”

Luther's arrangement of the Choral music for the Intonations and Responses was such that when the first choir sang “*Kyrie*,” the second responded “*Eleison*,” when the first sang “*Christi*,” the others, “*Erhoere uns*.” He used the Plain Song melody, and this, according to Archer and Reed,† has remained almost the universal use in Germany since the Reformation period. Other melodies, which appeared in great abundance according to, Kuemmerle, had but a brief local vogue. Spangenburg's arrangement of the choral melody for the Responses was given to the American Church in Mrs. Harriet Krauth Spaeth's *Church Book with Music*. The full Intonations and Responses in pure Plain Song for the entire Litany are to be found in the *Choral Service Book* by Archer and Reed. There is an independent setting in Dr. Seiss' *Church Song* but the name of the composer is not given. It does not possess the simple majesty nor breathe the inner spirit of the prayer as does the impressive and appealing melody of the Plain Song chant.

D. *Litany Hymns*. The full development of the subject of the metrical Litanies or Litany Hymns is prevented by lack of time and space. It is a most interesting study. Julian‡ says that the metrical Litany is of comparative modern date. The references in the authorities consulted in the preparation of other sections of this paper would lead one to question that statement. There were metrical Litanies in the different countries-especial

* Cf. JEBB on Anglican custom as quoted above.

† Preface to *The Choral Service Book*.

‡ *Dict. Hymnology*.

ly in England—before the Reformation, and they were sometimes alternated with the other forms during the more elaborate celebrations of the Rogations. Soon after the appearance of Luther's Litany it was published in "liederform" in North Germany. Johann Feder is looked upon as its author but not with any certainty. Nicolaus Puelitz in Hesse published some "Litaneilieder" which gradually took the place of the regular version during the decline. The *Kyrie Lieder* in the *Kirchenbuch** are most interesting as being the metrical versions of the "farced *Kyries*." The *Lirchenbuch* contains quite a number of Litany Hymns. We cannot quote them exactly. Our own *Church Book* contains eight hymns of this character.† Our *Sunday School Book* has five.‡ The *Episcopal Hymnal* contains about nineteen hymns with a *Kyrie* refrain to each stanza. Seven of these are especially designated "Litany Hymns." They are entitled: "Litany of the Holy Ghost," "Litany of the Church," "Litany for the Children," two, "Litany of the Incarnate Life," "Litany of Penitence," "Litany of the Words on the Cross." The English Litany Hymns all date from the Nineteenth Century and in that far Julian's claim is supported. There are a number of beautiful hymns of this type in the *Moravian Hymnal*.

III. THE SUFFRAGES.

Our Common Liturgy includes among the "General Prayers," the *General Suffrages* and as well the *Morning* and *Evening Suffrages*. The forms as we have them come from the Roman Breviary which contains the Services of the Canonical Hours. Originally these consisted of but the Matins and Vespers instead of the eight "hours" which developed afterwards. The Matins and Vespers of the Eastern Church always had prayers of the bidding variety at the close of the Service. In contents these

* Nos. 407-413.

† Nos. 25, 172, 232, 263, 439, 490, 603, 649.

‡ Nos. 112, 164, 181, 218, 219.

were almost identical with those in the *Missa* but after the dismissal of all but “the faithful,” there was a special prayer and blessing.* The history of the development of the Canonical Hour Offices in the West is a complicated but interesting subject. As in all Liturgies the tendency of the development was toward extremes. Many revisions and condensations occurred and reoccurred ere the Roman Breviary reached its present form. The Reformation Church felt the need of the educational and devotional aid of the *auxiliary* services† but she wanted them for the people and not for monks and nuns. So she returned to the simple and more practical observance of but two hours of daily prayer: Matins and Vespers. In this also the Reformation returned to primitive usages, and added one more link to the chain uniting her with all the Early Church.

The mere outline of these two Services: Psalmody, Lessons, Hymns, Prayer, made but “little provision by supplications and intercession except when the Litany was used.”-’ Hence the *preces* of certain hours of the Breviary were transferred for the devotional enrichment of our Offices. The more elaborate *Preces* used at *Lands* (2nd “hour”) and *Vespers* (7th “hour”) supplied the *General Suffrages*, with but few changes.§ The shorter *preces* at prime (3rd “hour”) furnished the *Morning Suffrages*. Here the introductory supplications, “O Christ, Thou Son of the living God, have mercy upon us, etc.,” are omitted as is also “Confession and Absolution” between the sixth and seventh set of Versicles and Responses. In the Sunday *preces* at this hour, following the part with which our *Suffrages* close, there is a commemoration of the dead, another set of *Kyrie*, Lord’s Prayer,

* *Apos. Const.* Bk. VIII.

† *Nebengottesdienst.*

‡ Löhe.

§ Change in the Versicle and Response, “Lord save the King, etc.” and rejecting of the Versicle and Response, “Let us pray for the faithful departed, etc.” We were unable to locate the last two of our Versicles and Responses, “give peace, etc.,” in the Roman Breviary.

Versicles, and Collect. The ferial office of Prime contains another set of Preces leading up to the Confession and Absolution. Löhe gives both these forms in his *Agende*. The *Evening Suffrages* are the preces at *Compline* (8th “hour”) without any changes. The closing Collects in both our forms are from other sources than the Breviary. The direct Lutheran source from which these prayers were transferred to our Liturgy was the appendix to Luther’s Catechism.

It is to be noted that in the Roman Offices from earliest times both the *Pater Nosier* and Credo are said *in secreto* as far as the sixth and seventh petitions in the prayer, and the two final clauses in the Third Article. These parts are used as Versicle and Response. In the *General Suffrages* the original use in the prayer was followed except that it is not said silently. The adherence to ancient usage is seen in the omission of the doxology of the prayer. By resolution of the joint Committee the doxology was allowed; but none of the three Bodies inserted it. In the shorter Suffrages the prayer and Creed are said by all. Löhe preserves the ancient use.

The Anglican and American Episcopal Offices of *Morning*, and *Evening Prayer* have a mutilated remnant of the Suffrages in the preces there included as in invariable part of the Office. The American Order is the shorter, containing no Kyrie and having less Versicles and Responses. In both Orders the Creed precedes the beginning of the preces. While the English preces consists of six Versicles and Responses, and six ‘Collects in each Office, the American has only two Versicles and Responses in the morning preces, no Lord’s Prayer, and seven Collects; and in the evening, six Versicles and Responses, and seven Collects. The Collects vary for the two Offices. There is no *Benedicamus in* either form. Freeman, Blunt and others endeavor to show a parallelism between the consecutive sets of Versicles and Responses and the Collects which follow.

The rubrics of our own books are worthy of consideration.

The *General Suffrages* have the rubric, “*May be used at Matins or Vespers in the same manner as the Litany.*”- The question arises whether it would be proper to use this prayer in place of the *General Prayer* as is done with the Bidding Prayer and Litany. The rubric in the Chief Service says, “*or a selection from the Collects and Prayers, or any other suitable prayer,* (See pp. 132154).”* This would seem to include the use of the *General Suffrage* at least. The other form, it can be seen readily, does not contain sufficient of the elements of the General Prayer. The special rubrics for the shorter forms contain a fruitful suggestion: “*At the Morning Prayers of the household*” and “*At the Evening Prayers of the household.*” The original Matins and Vespers were held in private houses-especially after the persecutions ceased and in the history of our own Church these Offices have been used principally in the schools, until the adoption of the Vesper Order for the Sunday Evening Service by the American Church. Might not our pastors find in these prepared forms an aid to their efforts to re-establish the salutary but waning custom of family worship?

The Suffrages may be sung or said; and the Lutheran musical authorities quoted in connection with the Litany will be found to have provided also for the Suffrages. The observation of Löhe as to singing the Litany on Sundays and saying it during the week is equally applicable to the *Suffrages*.

It will be noticed that nearly all the Versicles and Responses are taken from the Psalms. How they came to be selected and how they gradually took form we are unable to explain but they seem to be a remnant of the more abundant Psalmody of the early arrangements of the Offices.

The etymology of the word is interesting. It comes from the Latin *suffragor*, “*to support with one’s vote or interest;*” hence a *suffrage* is “*a vote in support of some measure.*” Thus it comes to mean *assent*. In the liturgical sense of the word we

* The G. S. and U. S. S. have the rubric but do not specify the pages.

give a suffrage whenever we assent by the *Amen* to the Collects, Prayers, Confessions and Hymns of our Services. In this particular form of prayer we give assent to the statement of each Versicle by the Response. It is not hard to understand why these should be called "General Prayers" nor to realize how their use tends to emphasize not only the universal priesthood of all believers but also their essential unity in thought and aim and life.

We can now appreciate slightly the helpful treasure which our Church offers her people in these three forms of responsive prayer. A little study, a little interest, a little thought, a little explanation, a little use will soon reward us as pastors and people with large and numerous blessings. Dare any one charge the Lutheran Church with rigid formalism and deadening similarity of Service when these variables in prayer joined with the other variables of our Orders offer us the opportunity of an almost countless variety in our Sunday and Weekday Services?

CHARLES KRAUTH FEGLEY.

Allegheny, Pa.

THE USE OF STAINED GLASS IN ECCLESIASTICAL ARCHITECTURE.

WINDOWS are the eyes of a building. As the eyes determine the character of a face for beauty or ugliness, so the windows are dominating factors in the impression which the structure makes upon the intelligent onlooker. There is nothing more aggressive in the inanimate world than light and light modified by passing through glass. On entering the House of God, the light by which it is pervaded, by its impression upon our senses, speaks to us the first word, whether we are conscious of it or not. While we are within the sacred walls, its influence is continually with us; and, on leaving the gates of beauty, it sends after us the last message we carry away. It is well worth the while, then, of those 'who are interested in the beautifying of the sanctuary and in the embellishment of its Services, to give earnest heed and sincere attention to the use of glass in ecclesiastical architecture. This subject may be viewed from a number of standpoints. The study of its history is intensely interesting and profitable. Many valuable books have been devoted to this branch of the subject. An exhaustive study of glass in the decoration of churches would naturally open with a treatment of the history of the subject. After this there would logically follow a discussion of the technical processes involved in the making of the glass and its composition into the decorated window. It is not the design of this paper to enter upon a consideration of either the historical or the technical phase of the subject, but simply to define the more important principles which must be ob-

served in the use of decorative glass in ecclesiastical architecture. The first principle is a structural one. The substance of which the window is composed, like every other material substance, is subject to the pull of gravity, and must be securely supported. Consequently, in all good work the sheets of glass are adequately supported on bars which cross the window and render it firm and solid, and secure the glass in place. This is a structural necessity of which no true artist is ashamed. To try to hide or minimize these bars is foolish and unworthy of the truthfulness and honesty of all pure art. The sheets of glass suspended on these bars are mosaics of stained glass. These must be held together by means of what are technically called "leads." These, too, are a structural necessity and must be duly honored by the artist. Properly to lead a window takes time and study, and is expensive. Such windows are not picked up at the bargain-counter; and, as a consequence, the makers of decorated windows in modern times have manifested a tendency to diminish the width and the weight of the leads and to do away entirely with the cross-bars by the use of steel frames as a substitute. As a result of such wretched work, unworthy of the name art, we are told on good authority that "one-half of the churches of New York City are double glazed with outside sash of plain glass to protect the poor leaded work of the windows proper from leaking or being blown to fragments by the winds." To show that this is entirely unnecessary it is but necessary to continue to quote from the same author:—"We have the living evidence that well-constructed leaded glass will last seven hundred years and more, and that under the most trying conditions of war and neglect: as witness the Eleventh Century windows. But they are all made with large, expensive leads and are properly barred; in many cases bars having been added from time to time; which fact accounts not a little for much of the richness of tone of the old glass, the contrast of their blacks giving much of the jeweled brilliance of the glass showing between them." We are told

furthermore:—"The old makers well understood the worth and added beauty which were derived from their sustaining bars. They often made them heavier than structural necessity demanded, or ran them in large geometric patterns over the openings; the spaces between being filled with leaded glass and the black value of the iron being frankly used in the play of values." All first-class makers of decorative glass, of which there are but few, are beginning to realize the necessity of observing this principle of structural honesty in their work, and they make as deep a study of the leads as they do of the glass itself. To quote from another:—"It is not an expedient, an unfortunate necessity, to be reduced to the smallest size and quality; it is of equal honor, of equal importance, with the glass. To the glowing colors of the quarries it gives the strength and vigor they would otherwise lack. The treating of the leads as a misfortune to be minimized and concealed is one of the worst offences of the modern makers of picture-windows, and vitiates their work permanently." The lead-line, as already stated, is a structural necessity and dare not be ignored. Art always rewards him who honors her by yielding obedience to her principles. Thus we see that by honoring the structural necessity of the lead-line and the bars, our best modern makers of decorated windows have found that these have a distinct decorative value. As the rest and the discord have their value in music, so the black line of the iron and the wood emphasize the gem-like colors of the window and by contrast heighten its glory of light. Just as we are told that the pearl-oyster on finding it impossible to dislodge the grain of sand which has found entrance into its shell, covers it with beauty and transforms it, into a pearl for the bosom of a princess, so the bars and leads in a decorated window, ugly in themselves but absolutely necessary, when properly employed, become elements of strength and beauty. This is the foundation principle which must be observed in the production of the decorated window. Just as he in Scripture is designated the foolish man who attempted to build his

house on the sands, so he is worthy of contempt that would fly in the face of the laws of gravity by endeavoring to give the impression that he is suspending the substance of a decorated window on air.

The second principle is determined by the medium employed in the making of the decorated window. This is what is technically called "pot-metal" or "painted" glass. In making painted glass the color is put upon the glass and burned into it. In "pot-metal" the color is mixed in with the "batch" in the "pot." In "pot-metal" the color is in the glass, in painted glass it is on it. Paint on glass more or less interferes with its transparency and does not yield itself so readily to the production of genuinely artistic effects. Fortunately the best American makers of decorated windows use no paint in their work except light touches on 'hands and faces. Even this is no longer necessary since the glass in the hands and faces can now be joined by means of fusing, without the use of the leads. The American glass-makers have their faults, but the use of painted glass is not one of them. Mr. Ralph Adams Cram in his excellent work on Church Building says:—"If sensationalism in the use of modelled and opalescent glass is the killing vice of American work, painted glass is very surely an equally deadly sin in English work. Both violate every law of good glass-making, both are widely popular, and both are quite unendurable."

Translucent glass, then, which holds its color in suspension is our medium with which we have to work. Every substance legitimately employed in the service of art has its excellencies and its limitations. In the use of his materials the artist aims to produce the best results which can be secured by the use of the medium in which he is working. When in the use of a substance he strains after effects which can better be reached by the employment of another, or endeavors by servile imitation to simulate such effects, he may make an impression of smartness and may excite the wonder of the gaping crowd, but he really wastes his

labor, is guilty of attempted deception, and fails to make a contribution to genuine art. A very creditable bust of Abraham Lincoln, a copy of the Venus de Milo, or an exact miniature reproduction of the Capitol at Washington may be wrought out in butter. A castle of architectural beauty may be fashioned in blocks of ice, but every one knows that such performances are not art. They excite in the onlooker, who has a sense of the eternal fitness of things, pity and contempt in view of the waste of good material and the prostitution of skilled labor in the production of such freaks.

The characteristic qualities of glass with which we have to deal in the decorated window, are richness, purity, subtlety of color and translucence. "Colored glass is the ideal of materialized color." By means of it we can secure a glassy glory and a jewelled brilliance which can be secured through no other mediums. Properly to use these qualities and not to abuse them in the attempt to do what they were never intended to accomplish, must be the aim of the honest worker in decorated glass. A creditable imitation of the Apollo Belvidere might possibly be perpetrated in stained glass and doubtless many newspapers and the unthinking multitude would give such a performance unstinted praise, but it would never pass for genuine art. It would be on a par with the making of the Capitol in butter. The proper material for a statue is marble or bronze and never glass.

Some of our good people in the innocent simplicity of their hearts seem to think it the proper thing to turn their churches into the suggestion of picture galleries by making the windows do duty as canvas upon which to depict Luther and other Reformation worthies. We have seen very creditable likenesses in this line, but they always suggest the butter-maker's skill and the of ice-architecture referred to above. Canvas and other opaque surfaces and not glass are the proper materials upon which to represent realistic scenes and likenesses. If you employ glass to do the work of canvas, you lose its effect as glass. The

dark colors required in the representation of clothing make your window too dark for its proper uses as a window. If, in your attempts at making a realistic likeness in glass, you have some regard for the peculiar qualities of glass, you give your picture an unreal and unearthly glory which dare be associated with no mere man. In our admiration of the Great Reformer we accord him the place next to the Apostle Paul as the greatest man after our adorable Saviour. Nevertheless, whenever we see a picture of the rugged Reformer in glass, a number of conflicting emotions are aroused. We are indignant if the qualities which properly belong to glass have been given their true expression, since then he shines with a permanent glory that is blasphemous in its suggestion. We read of Only One Whose face on only one occasion "did shine as the sun, and His raiment was bright as the light." We are filled with pity and contempt if more emphasis has been laid in the perpetration of this attempt at portraiture upon the realistic production of a speaking likeness, since a good window has been spoiled at the expense of several hundred hard-earned dollars, where five or ten dollars invested in a picture of the Great Reformer on canvas would have given far better satisfaction. A picture-window is properly speaking neither a picture nor a window. By virtue of the limitations existing in glass it 'cannot be both at the same time. Let it be understood that it is not the pictorial character to which objection is made, but the unsuccessful attempt to secure results in glass which can be adequately accomplished only by the painter on canvas or some other opaque surface. Let us honestly employ glass in the production of results for which its character and qualities manifestly adapt it. Yet the sorry work of abusing this decorative feature in our churches is steadily going on, and there are reputable firms to be found in all our large cities that will undertake to represent in' glass anything under the sun. We quote again from the work cited above:—"Certain manufacturers—a great majority in fact have taken to copy in glass the works of the old masters; and the

dull wonder that these triumphs of trickery and bad art have created has given them a singular vogue. The whole idea is so wrong-headed, so perverse, so without a possibility of justification, that it is a waste of time to condemn it in detail...

It is bad, thoroughly and hopelessly bad, and that is all one can say ... To show the false position the art of glass-staining occupies nowadays let me speak of an incredible occurrence I know of. Certain people who were proposing to give a memorial window, and who had a liking for the painter Millet, asked a certain firm of glass-painters to make a window representing "The Sower," and, instead of refusing the commission, it was accepted with alacrity. Now no one subject could be chosen which was less adaptable in stained glass than this particular picture; and yet the work was cheerfully undertaken, without the least regard to the absurdity of the idea. Not only this, but, at the instigation of the donors, the glass-maker copied the well-known picture; and because the man in whose memory the window was to be erected wore a beard, they showed this beard in Millet's picture. Could anything be more preposterous and disheartening? Yet this is an example of what is asked for and gotten at this time; and it shows how totally false is the attitude of the public and the makers of glass toward this most noble and exalted form of religious art."

Let us, then, in closing this section emphasize strongly this important principle drawn from the material employed in the making of the decorated window, that stained glass must not be unnaturally forced to represent that for which it is not adapted. just as some men have a Divine call to preach and others are clearly marked out as scientists, painters and sculptors, and are of but little use in the world unless they exercise themselves in these callings; in like manner glass has certain qualities and adaptabilities which manifestly fit it for positive effects. Study these carefully and use them to secure legitimate results and the reward will be a thing of beauty and a joy forever; abuse them

by endeavoring to make them, render a service for which they were never adapted, and the result will be disappointment and chagrin.

The true function of a stained glass window is emphatically not pictorial representation, as shown above, but *decoration*. This principle remains true in spite of the fact that “to every person who will regard a window as the decoration of a wall-space,, superb above all other forms of mural decoration by reason of its translucence, there is an indefinite number who view it only as a picture.” Art principles are not fixed by the counting of noses in estimating majorities. This decorative character of the stained glass window we must strongly emphasize in a consideration like this, especially so on account of the perversity and the persistence with which the majority regards a stained glass window as simply a picture in glass. To accord the window its proper artistic treatment, we must understand its true function. The decorated window is simply and purely the decoration of a wall-space made translucent by means of colored glass. It is simply a mural decoration. The first object in the insertion of windows is to keep out the weather; the second is to admit light. They continue the wall-surface, and are consequently simply a part of the wall made translucent. The art of the decorator applied to this part of the wall-space gives us the decorated window.

Since the function of the stained glass window is simply decorative, it must extend the flat surface of the wall without any attempt at perspective or modelling. Any device or art by which the impression of perspective is given is to be condemned in a window. To endeavor to produce the impression that it is a hole in the wall, which it is not, is deception, and cannot be tolerated by the true artist. Yet who has not seen windows which give representations of landscapes with mountains and clouds in the background, and with lambs skipping on green meadows intervening between the foreground and the mountains in the rear?

This is not decoration, but an attempt at realistic representation to which glass does not artistically yield itself and which must be studiously avoided by the artist when working in this medium.

Since glass may be used legitimately only for decorative purposes, the designs and the figures on decorated windows must be conventional and not naturalistic. "Now the law of ecclesiastical decoration is that everything should be both decorative and symbolic. Every angel and archangel, every saint, be he martyr or confessor, every prophet, every king, has his proper symbolical vestment and his special attributes. Our Lord Himself, when He is portrayed in glory is clothed in the splendor of both the royal and the priestly vestments that show forth His twofold glory of Priest and King. The impulse that leads to rebellion against these vestments, these attributes, because of some fancied association is not one that needs to be considered; for even the Christian style of architecture—nay, even all art itself—falls under the same condemnation."

The window-spaces are necessarily broken up by the mullions and the tracery. The decorative scheme must not be extended over and beyond these natural barriers. These are essential limitations beyond which a representation dare not pass. Who has not already seen a window, divided by a sash-bar in the middle, yet wholly covered by the figure of an angel, or saint, or other worthy?

This principle of limiting the figure or design to the open spaces determined by the mullions and the tracery, however, is not violated by the representation in a double or triple window of a scene which demands the introduction of several prominent figures, if the different ones are confined to their proper limiting spaces. The whole may be appropriately unified by a homogeneous treatment of the canopy-work in such a way as to bind the whole window into unity.

Owing to the fact that the peculiar characteristics of stained glass are especially aggressive, the principle of subordination and

restraint is often neglected in using this form of decoration. It dare not assert itself in such a way as to distract the attention from everything else. It must naturally hold its place without insolence or insistence. It is simply a means to an end, a small part of a great whole. The otherwise charming effect of a beautiful church may be spoiled by the wrong treatment of its windows. This subordinate part of the architecture may insolently thrust itself forward in such a way as to take the chief place in our consciousness somewhat after the manner of a strong voice with a peculiar timbre in an untrained choir. There is an architectural harmony in every properly constructed church. When this harmony is impaired by a wrong treatment of the windows, a fundamental principle has been violated.

In conclusion let us remember that we are dealing with art when we contemplate the principles which govern the use of stained glass. Art ought to make the impression of beauty, and the contemplation of art-forms should give us pleasurable impressions. Much that wrongly passes for art has been imposed upon the Church. It is to be hoped that the day is not far distant when the true principles of art in decoration may be understood by the many, so that there may be an end of the reign of what is cheap, tawdry and positively ugly; and that our sanctuaries, with the growth of our appreciation of the beautiful and the true in art, may grow into a closer correspondence with the heavenly beauties of the spiritual blessings which are mediated in them through the Means of Grace.

ELMER F. KRAUSS.
Chicago, Ill.

SACRED MONOGRAMS—THE CHRISMA AND THE HOLY NAME.

THE CHRISMA.

Ɔ

FROM the glyptic art we learn, according to Chabouillet,* that the earliest forms under which the Christians allowed themselves to represent the Saviour were purely emblematical—the Good Shepherd, the Dove, and the Fish. In the Second Century Clement of Alexandria gives Christians some advice†: “Let the engraving upon your ring be a dove, a fish, or a ship running before the wind; or a ship’s anchor, which Seleucus had cut upon his signet. If the device represents a man fishing, the wearer will be put in mind of the Apostles, and of the little children drawn up out of the water. For we must not engrave upon it idols, which we are forbidden even to look upon; nor a sword or bow, for we are followers of peace; nor a drinking cup, for we are sober men.”

The earliest manifestations of Christian painting‡ frequently exhibit pagan models in the attempt to typify the Saviour. Thus he is represented as the Orpheus§ of the new faith, charming and taming ferocious animals by the sound of his lute. When Christian art first dared to court the light of day under Constantine,


* *Antique Gems and Rings*, by C. W. KING.

† *Paedagogus*, iii, i i.

‡ Note in *History of Miniature Art*, by J. L. PROPEST.

§ A Greek mythical poet, who with his lyre enchanted everything that had life. Even in Hades the charm of his music caused the torments to cease.

it felt an instinctive repugnance to draw its inspiration from classical works, produced under the influence of what in a Christian sense was a debased and immoral creed. In the place of “form” was established a school of “idea” and “symbol”, and allegory became the dominant feature of the early Byzantines. But the Council of Constantinople, 692 A. D. commanded symbolism to cease, * and ordained that the central object of the Christian faith should be depicted as in the flesh, free from the veil hitherto employed. Unfortunately the interference of the Church produced an inflexible code of rules which for centuries prescribed the exact forms, attributes, etc., to be observed in the rendering of the human form. Art became a poor form of tradition, continued without enthusiasm or progress. So thinks Propest.


The two sacred monograms universally employed in Christian art are the  [chi-rho] and the **IHS**, the former standing for the name Christ and the latter for the name Jesus. The former is a combination of the Greek **X** (English, CH) and **P** (English, R), the first two letters in the Greek name **XPICTOC** (CHRIST). The latter is a Latinized variation of the first three letters of the Greek name **IHC OY C** (JESUS). Each of these monograms has a history, and if all were told, a long story it would be.

GREEK FORMS.

The Chi Rho, also called the *Chrisma*, is perhaps the most ancient symbolical representation of Christ. In popular usage it long antedates the **IHS** which was seldom seen before the Ninth Century, but from the Twelfth Century on replaced the **XP** altogether. Just why the monogram of the name *Christ* should come into vogue before that developed from Jesus is not easily explained. It may have been because the Divine name of the Saviour was early emphasized; He was known distinctively as “The Christ.” Or it may have been due to the influence of

* For example, Canon 80 expressly forbids representing our Lord under the figure of a lamb

Constantine. If so, whence did Constantine derive it? He certainly did not invent it. Or Christians may have adopted it from another source and adapted it to their own needs, and this perhaps because it resembled the cross.

The origin of the *Chrisma* is commonly ascribed to the emperor Constantine, the story running thus: In the year 312 Constantine marched toward Rome for the purpose of meeting in battle his rival Maxentius. On the way he saw in the sky a luminous cross surrounded by the inscription **TOUTO NIKA*** “BY THIS CONQUER. “On the eve of the battle, according to Lactantius,† preceptor to the emperor’s son Crispus, ‘he was directed in a dream to inscribe on his soldiers’ shields the letter **X**, with a perpendicular line drawn through it, and turned round at the top  [chi-rho] being the cipher of Christ. Having this sign his troops draw the sword.’ The next day after entering Rome, he summons the artists and commands them to make the *Labarum*, which Eusebius describes thus It was a long spear, covered with gold, and having a transverse bar like a cross. At the top of the spear was a wreath of gold and gems. In this they designed the *sign of the saving name*, that is to say the first two letters of the name of Christ, the **P** crossing in the midst. These letters the emperor was accustomed to wear on his helmet ... The Emperor always used this saving sign as a standard against his enemies, and caused ensigns to be made after the same pattern for all his armies.”

While this story may explain how the Chi Rho came to be commonly used as a Christian symbol, yet it hardly points out

* The popular Latin version adopted by the Knights Templar is IN HOC SIGNO VINCES. But a medal of Constantius II (353-361) shows this prince as holding a standard on which is inscribed with the *Chrisma*, HOC SIGNO VICTOR ERIS. It seems probable that the Latin is the original version, Constantine being a Dalmatian. Eusebius, who reports the vision in his *Life of Constantine*, wrote in Greek

† *De Mort. Persec.* ch. 44.

‡ *Life of Constantine*, lib. I, c. 31

the origin of such use. The Sign is found long before the time of Constantine. King says that ✱ like [crossed I and X] was not invented by the Christians. In fact coins of the Ptolemies are known to bear the monogram ✱. Also those of Herod the Great, struck forty years B. C. have this $\overline{\text{P}}$. Similarly the monogram formed of I and X is figured on the denarius of L. Lentulus, flamen or priest of Mars, with the portrait of Julius Caesar, in which it represents the star of Venus, fulium Sidus [crossed I and X]. Another of the same kind is figured on some medals of the kings of the Bosphorus, for instance on those of Sauromates Rescuporis etc., although the star is commonly figured like the Sigla (monogram on a seal) **X** which among the Romans served to indicate the denarius. The letter **X** traversed by a vertical bar terminated at the upper end by a circle [] or by a small dot [] may be compared with the sigla [crossed I and X], which denotes, it is supposed, the commander of a thousand men— $\text{XIAIAPKO}\Sigma$; and which, crossed by a horizontal bar **X** makes its appearance on some coins of the Ptolemies.

But from the unvarying arrangement of the lines in the monogram on the medals of the period of Constantine, the bar crossing the **X** being vertical, we may reasonably conclude that the lines are so disposed *intentionally*, and not for the purpose of representing stars which are also to be seen on coins of the same epoch. And yet as soon as we admit that these signs are tokens of Christianity, it follows that we must equally recognize as crosses and monograms of Christ the same symbols when they accompany the figures of *Mars Conservator* and *Sol Invictus*. This would imply that Constantine permitted himself to be styled the Sun and Light of the world, somewhat like the Chinese emperor. Another writer suggests that ✱ in the earlier coins may have stood for $\text{XPH}\Sigma\text{TO}\Sigma$, good, genuine. A medallion of Trajan, Decius (249-251) struck at Metonia in Lydia has an inscription in which occurs the word $\text{APXONTE}\Sigma$ in which the **PX** for a monogram exactly like the *Chrisma*.

* *Early Christian Numismatics*, by C. W. KING.

That the *Chrisma* was used as a Christian symbol before the time of Constantine, may be regarded as certain if Bishop Kip's work* is to be believed. He cites among other inscriptions in those subterranean tombs the two following which record their own date: "In the time of the Emperor Adrian, Marius a young military officer, who had lived long enough when with his blood he gave up his life for **CHO** [with line above] (pro CHRISTO)." Beside this inscription, rudely drawn is ✠. Hadrian reigned 117 to 138 A. D. That this monogram in the catacombs stands for Christ is assured by this inscription: "*Victorina in pace et in ✠.*" Another in Latin runs thus: "Lannus the martyr of **XPI** [with line above] rests here. He suffered under Diocletian." That is between 303 and 305 A. D. On a gem dating, as is supposed, † about the year 300 A. D. on either side of a young man bearing a sheep on his shoulders, illustrating the Good Shepherd, is inscribed ✠ ✠ [but backwards]. And yet some writers hold that the earliest examples to be found in the catacombs date no farther back than 331.‡ Martigny § claims the earliest (323 A. D.) under a pavement in the Basilica of St. Lawrence in agro Verano. For the love of the curious we mention that Justin Martyr (110-165) quotes 11 Plato as saying in the *Timaeus* that God placed his Son in the universe in the form of the letter **X** (*Chiasnia*). But Justin refers in this passage to the cross.

It is barely possible that the earliest representation of the name of Christ is found in the abbreviations and contractions used in writing that name. By abbreviation is meant the shortening of a word by dropping one or more letters from the end; by contraction, the shortening of a word by omitting, some of the

* *The Catacombs of Rome as Illustrating the Church of the First Three Centuries*, by the RIGHT REV. Wm. INGRAHAM KIP.

† *Symbolism in Christian Art*, by F. EDWARD HULME F. S. A.: NORTH-COTE'S *Epitaphs of the Catacombs*.

§ *Dict. des Ant. Christ.*

¶ *Apology*, ch. LX.

letters within the word. Thus *Penna.* is an abbreviation and *Pa.* a contraction of the word Pennsylvania. From very ancient times down to the common use of the art of printing, and even long after, it was the universal practice to abbreviate and contract words. The object was, no doubt, to save time and labor, as all writing was by hand. In the ancient manuscripts the name of Jesus Christ is invariably abbreviated or contracted. According to Grenfell and Hunt* this usage extends far back into the Second Century. In what is probably the oldest Christian fragment† yet published—a papyrus of late Second or early Third Century are found the contractions ΘC [with line above] (ΘEOC, GOD), IHC [with line above], and XC [with line above]. The line above is the sign of contraction. Also part of a leaf from a papyrus book, written at the end of the Fourth or beginning of the Fifth Century containing a passage from I John 4 ch. shows the same thing. The form **IC XC** [with lines above] is found in all Greek uncial manuscripts of the New Testament from the Fourth Century down. It is on a medal found at Urfa, Syria, of the Fourth or Fifth Century; on the Stone of Cana, -I late Sixth Century; on paintings of the Ninth Century; on a coin of John Zimisces of the Tenth Century; on a painting in the Convent church, Isle of Salamis, Eighteenth Century; on the silver seal of the government of Mt. Athos; and on the sacramental bread of the Greek Church today. It is of course to be expected that the Greek church would retain the Greek form of the name of Christ. We also find other forms of contraction. Thus **XPC** [with line above] in Codex Bezae of the Fifth Century in the Golden Gospels at Stockholm, Seventh or Eighth Century and in a book of the Gospels in the library at Munich, Ninth Century.

LATIN FORMS.

So much for the Greeks. How did the Latins contract the sacred name? Here, as might be expected, the Greek influence

Publications of Egyptian Exploration fund, Graeco-Roman Branch.

† Recently discovered by Grenfell and Hunt near Oxyrhynchus in Egypt.

‡ HILPRECHT, *Recent Research in Bible Lands.*

remains. Indeed the Latins frequently wrote the purely Greek form **XPC** [with line above]. Thus the Sermons of St. Augustine, written in Latin uncials, Sixth Century; in a Latin Psalter of Eleventh Century; and in the manuscript sermons of the Fourteenth or Fifteenth Century, in my possession. More frequently however, did the Latins render **XPC** [with line above] into **XPS** [with line above], substituting the Latin S for the Greek Sigma. This is well seen in the Codex. Bezae in which the Greek and Latin versions stand in parallel columns. The latter form finds examples on the medal of Urfa, Fifth Century; in an "Evangeliar" made. for Charlemagne, Ninth Century; and in Missals and other writings of Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries. In mediaeval manuscripts of all kinds the form **xpus** [with line above] is also used. In an old Reliquary of the Tenth Century is seen the plain form **X** [with line above].


There are instances in which individuals have had the temerity to use the sacred contraction in writing their own names. One is that of a Dutchman. He produced a picture and wrote under it "*Magister Petrus xpi* [with line above] *me fecit anno 1449.*" That is, Master Peter Christi made me in the year 1449.


Let us now return to the time of Constantine. Through the influence of that Christian emperor the use of the Chrisma became popular throughout the Roman empire. The common form then employed was **✠** being a mere combination of the **X** and **P**. This is found on the coins of Constantine's successors down to Honorius (395-423) and on those of most of the Eastern emperors to Heraclius. It is also seen on a Roman pavement in Britain of the Fourth Century, on monuments in France of the same period, on sarcophagi, mosaics, lamps, glass vessels, coins, in fact throughout the whole range of sacred art.

The form **Ɀ** is also very ancient, being found in the Catacombs and on coins of Constantine. It was no doubt regarded as more suggestive of the cross and became very common. According to J. R. Allen,* this suggestiveness explains the changes


* *Christian Symbolism in Great Britain and Ireland.*


which took place in the shape of the Chrisma. An interesting correspondence shows how widespread was the use of this style. In the British Museum is a manuscript written in England in the Eighth Century, containing passages from the Gospels, the Lord's Prayer and others, letter of Christ to Abgar etc. On many of the pages at the upper

left corner is . Recently at Oxyrhynchus in Egypt were unearthed some old Coptic ostraca (pottery and stone chips) belong to Sixth to Eighth Centuries. On these ostraca are inscribed, in Greek and Coptic, episcopal edicts, letters to bishops, Biblical and liturgical passages, letter of Christ to Abgar, etc. With few exceptions the writing begins

or ends with the same sacred symbol . Even secular documents were prefaced with the Chrisma, as in a deed of Edgar, 961 A. D.*

Besides those depicted above, the Chrisma developed a great variety of forms as may be seen from the examples given below. Allen † thinks that all the variations can be traced to two causes: (1) the addition of a horizontal bar to the original form, thus

 as written on one of the Coptic ostraca, (2) the gradual alteration in the shape of the loop of the **P** which becomes more like an **R**, and falls away alto-

gether. Thus if from the last shape you drop **X** the result will be . The cruciform shapes, consisting either of **I** and **X** combined, or of **+** and **X**, result from the omission of the loop of the **P**. Hence according to Allen the development of the Chrisma runs thus:

X P ICTOC

[crossed **I** and **X**] [crossed **+** and **X**]

(Read from top downward, and from left to right.)

* It should not be forgotten, in this connection, that copies of the Bible were made in Alexandria for sale in Western Europe, and that all our oldest † manuscripts show their origin by the Egyptian form of spelling in some of the words. *History of Egypt*, by RAPPOPORT.


† *Christian Symbolism in Great Britain and Ireland* by J. ROMILLY ALLEN F. S. A., Scotland.

While this is a very attractive theory, I doubt whether he can prove it from historic facts. He recognizes that two or three variations often occur together on the same coin, or sarcophagus, but says this only shows that there was a great deal of caprice in the choice of forms, and that no special one was adhered to rigidly. The above formula also supports the theory that the plain cross as a sign was evolved from the Chrisma.

The addition of the letters Alpha and Omega took place as early as A. D. 347.* Thus † ^A✠^Ω. They occur on coins of Constantius and are seen in the Catacombs. Notice particularly that the Omega is drawn in the ancient uncial style **Ω**. I have not seen one instance of **Ω** as modern workers in ecclesiastical art depict it. There is a unique example of the **A** and **Ω** the **IH** [with line above and **XPS** [with line above] all occurring together on a tombstone in 'Bresal' now preserved in St. Kevin's Kitchen at Glendalough County Wicklow, Ireland.

The Origin of the circle, in which the Chrisma is often written, is either ornamental or may be taken from the wreath or crown of glory which also frequently surrounds it. The idea of eternity is also associated with the circle, as is seen in a Latin inscription found in Scotland: "This circle contains the name of the Supreme King whom you see to be without beginning and without end." The circle of the monogram survives in the ring which joins the arms of the Celtic crosses.

In another interesting study Mr. Allen tries to show how the Maltese cross was developed from the Chrisma. He finds his examples on stones in Scotland and Ireland. There are four steps:

 [1. with P hook and circle, 2. with hook and circle, 3. with circle]

* NORTHCOTE gives 362 A. D.

† PAUL LACROIX *Military and Religious life of the Middle Ages*.

The process of development here is two-fold. (1) The extremities gradually widen. (2) The loop of the **P** disappears. The last is a common shape of the ancient Celtic cross. The third is on the face of a stone slab near Whitehorn, Scotland, and is regarded as one of the oldest monuments of Christianity in that section. The other forms are well known. Concerning that peculiar loop of the **P**, Quaritch * has this to say: “ In early Roman writing the Greek p had a little stroke added to it (???) to distinguish it from **P** π).”Perhaps a study of Paleography might throw some light on this subject. The following most interesting form occurs with a Latin inscription on a grave stone found along the Rhine. It belongs to the end of the Sixth Century.

???

Paleography, by BERNARD QUARITCH.

THE HOLY NAME.

IHS

WHO has not sat in the Sanctuary and allowed his attention to wander from the devotions to the decorations of the chancel? While thus engaged has not his curiosity been aroused to know the meaning of those mysterious letters **IHS** carved on the face of the Altar or worked on its *antependium*?

The Monogram of the Holy Name—for so have these letters been termed, probably because they stand for a name Divinely given (Luke 1:31)—came into common use much later than the Chrisma (✠) although it probably originated at the same time. Today it holds the chief place as a design for church decoration. The letters **IHS** have been variously explained, as our readers must know. The writer has seen the following interpretations. There may be others.

I **H**ave **S**inned.

I **H**ave **S**uffered.

Inspiration (*of the*) **H**oly **S**pirit.

In **H**oc **S**igno—referring to the sign ✠ in Constantine's vision.

In **H**ac (cruce) **S**alus—"In this (cross is) salvation."

Iesus **H**umanitatis **C**onsolator—"Jesus of men the Consoler," referring to the Greek **IHC**.

Iesus **H**ominum **S**alvator—"Jesus of men the Saviour."

This Latin inscription, Halliwell says, * is found in some European churches. It is the interpretation of the Jesuits who use it, in its fully developed historical form **IHS**, [with a Latin cross above the **H**] as their badge and motto. On the election of the first general of their order, in 1541, which resulted in the choice of Ignatius, the latter had headed his vote with **IHS**, and the sign *ih̄s* [with a line above] was engraved on his seal, the

* *A Few Lines to Novices in Manuscript Literature.*

same with which the election of the generals since Jacob Laynez has always been sealed. *

The last opinion, † to which the writer of this paper inclines, is that these letters are a contraction or abbreviation of the Greek name **IH-COYC, IESOUS**, Jesus—pronouncing the **I** as y in *yet*, the **E** as in *fete*, the **S** as in soul.

GREEK FORMS.

The earliest example of the monogram of the Holy Name is found on a fragment of papyrus recently discovered at Oxyrhyncus in Egypt. Messrs. Grenfell and Hunt I who discovered these fragments state that they contain some theological writing embodying a quotation from the New Testament, Matthew, and that the ordinary contractions such as ΘC [with a line above] for ΘEOC GOD, XC [with a line above] for XPICTOC, CHRIST, and IHC [with a line above] for JHCOYC, JESUS, occur in these writings. These fragments they date not later than 250 A. D. and possibly as early as the latter part of the Second Century. Another fragment, which they place late in the Fourth Century or early in the Fifth Century, contains part of I John 4: 11-17. Here the same contractions are seen. While it may seem like towering presumption to differ with such masters in archaeology, yet upon examining the facsimile of the Matthew fragments, it appears that only three dots and the contraction sign remain of what they restore as **IHN** [with a line above], the contraction of the accusative **IHCOYN**, the body of the letters being erased. Now comparing the style of writing on the papyrus with the most ancient New Testament manuscripts, we find that both are

* *J. N. Proeschel* in MCCLINTOCK AND STRONG. Also *Handbuch der Kirchlichen Kunst-Archeologie des Deutschen Mittelalters* by HEINRICH OTTO.

† This opinion is espoused by the Cambridge Camden Society in a work which they published on the subject: *Argument for the Greek Origin of the Monogram IHS*. London 1841. The writer of this paper has not yet been able to consult the work.

‡ *The Oxyrhyncus Papyri* in Publications of the Egyptian Exploration Fund.

in the same uncial or large hand.* We also note that aside from the Saviour's name, other contractions, such as ΘEOC GOD, are the same in both. From this we may reasonably conclude that the contraction for the word JESUS, if restored in the papyrus, would be **IN** and not **IHN** as Grenfell and Hunt suggest, **IN** being the accusative of **IC**. This granted, we may say that from the remains so far discovered the oldest sign which stands for the name *Jesus* is the contraction **IC**, that for the full name being **IC XC**. We find it thus written uniformly in the *Logia* or *Sayings of Jesus* (Third Century) also discovered at Oxyrhynchus, in the Vatican and Sinaitic manuscripts of the New Testament (Fourth Century), in the Alexandrian Codex (Fifth Century) and in other Greek uncial writings, as late if not later than the Tenth Century. In the same manuscripts the genitive case of the Sacred Name is written **IY XY** (**Y** being a form of **U**). But in the passage Rev. 22: 20 the Sinaitic and Alexandrian manuscripts differ, the latter having the vocative **KE IY** (for **KYRIE IHCOY** (Lord Jesus), while the former has **KE IHY**. In the three most ancient codices I have not seen the nominative written **IHC**. The form **IC** is also found in the Sa'idic version of the so-called *Letter of Christ to Abgar* of the Sixth Century, on a gem presumably of the Sixth Century, on a Coptic altar of the Sixth Century, over the head of Christ in a fresco of the Fifth Century (perhaps!), in an uncial *Commentary on Isaiah* of the Ninth Century, † on an Evangelistary or Book of Gospel Lessons of the Tenth Century, and on the medal

* Ancient manuscripts were written in what are known as *majuscule* and *minuscule* letters. Majuscules might be either uncials or capitals. In Greek manuscripts pure capital letter writing was never employed except in ornamental titles. Uncial letters were large and well rounded. Greek manuscripts in the uncial hand were written from the Second Century B. C. to the Ninth Century A. D. Minuscule writing was a kind of reduced alphabet, combining both uncial and old cursive forms. It originated in the Seventh Century A. D. and continued in use up to the time of printing. From about the Ninth Century minuscules were gradually substituted for the old uncial writing.

† SILVESTRE *Paleography*.

of Urfa, previously mentioned. This medal a certain missionary places in the Fourth or Fifth Century, but it seems to be almost identical with a coin which numismatists ascribe to John Zimisces in the Tenth Century. The coin has on the one side, in addition to **IC XC, IHS XPS REX REGNANTIVM**; and on the other side, **IHSUS XRISTUS BASILEU BASILE**.

The tri-literal Greek form in majuscules is **IHC**. It is probable that in ancient times it was regarded as a contraction, since the last letter varied with the case. For example recall the passage Rev. 22: 20 in the Codex Siniaticus where **IHY** is written for the vocative. The same thing occurs in an inscription of pope Gregory III (731-741 A. D.) in the Basilica of St. Paul, but here it stands for the genitive. The nominative **IHC** is inscribed on a gem found in the Roman catacombs, doubtless very ancient, and over the head of Christ in a miniature on the Codex Egberti (Tenth Century). In the Harleian Psalter, in the British Museum, is this inscription (probably close of Tenth Century) on a picture of the crucifixion: **HIC EST NAZAREN' IHC REX IUDEOR**. Notice the absence of the contraction line over the letters. This is frequent. A Coptic Gospel of Mark (Eleventh Century) shows the same letters. Inscribed on a rock at the grave of the first abbot of St. Bavon, in Ghent, (middle of Seventh Century) are the letters in monogrammatic form, the earliest of the kind which I have seen; thus [H with I-superscript above and S-subscript below]. Romilly reports that a Würzburg manuscript has **IHS XHS** i. e. in Greek capitals. The H is evidently intended for R, the early form of both letters being nearly alike.

LATIN FORMS.

As was observed above, the Greek bi-literal **IC** and trilateral **IHC** are frequent in Latin remains. The Latin form of the monogram in capital letters is the same as the Greek, ex-

cept the last letter, the **C** giving place to the **S**. This varies with the case, as in the Greek. Of Latin bi-literals de Fleury* gives two instances, one **IS** on the bowl of a chalice of probably the Eighth Century, and the other **HS** [superimposed on each other] on the clasp of a lock, in a Marseilles collection. In the latter either perpendicular of the **H** may be expected to stand for the **I**, or perhaps the Holy Name began with an **H**. Proeschel says† that **IH** is the first representation of the name of Jesus of which we have any knowledge, referring to the Epistle of Barnabas (probably Second Century) which has this passage: † “Learn then my children that Abraham the first who enjoined circumcision, looking forward in spirit to Jesus, practiced that right, having received the doctrine of the three letters. For [the Scripture] saith, “And Abraham circumcised ten, and eight, and three hundred men of his household.” What then was the knowledge given to him in this? The ten and the eight are thus denoted—Ten by **I** (iota), and eight by **H** (eta). You have [the initials of the name] Jesus.. And because the cross was to express the grace by the letter **T**, he says also “three hundred.” He signifies therefore Jesus by two letters, and the cross by one.” But it can hardly be argued from this passage that **IH** was at that time commonly recognized as a symbol of the Holy Name. It rather looks as though the writer of Barnabas, after some effort, concocted an allegory.

For the popularization of the Latin tri-literal **IHS** the West was indebted to Bernard of Sienna who, as he preached from place to place, was wont to exhibit a tablet on which the monogram was painted in golden letters, surrounded by a halo of golden rays. To this he directed his hearers’ devotions. He

* *La Messe Études Archeologiques sur Les Monuments*,

† *McClintock and Strong’s Cyclopedia*, Vol. VI, p 507.

‡ *Ante Nicene Fathers*, Vol. 1, p 142.

was accused of innovation, but succeeded at length in satisfying pope Martin.

When we study the Latin tri-literals which seem to be most commonly employed by modern church decorators, we are brought face to face with some very difficult problems. Observing that the Latin turned, **IHC** into **IHS** or **ihc**, it is not difficult to explain that the first letter **I** is the same in both Latin and Greek, and that the Latin **S** is substituted for the Greek **C** both standing for the same sound. But how about the middle letter? Is this the Latin **H** or the Greek *Eta* retained? Analogy would seem to indicate that it is the Greek *Eta*. That is, when we see that in an Evangelistary of the Ninth Century, over the head of Christ is **IHS XPS**, we may reason that since the first two letters of the second part are Greek, the first two of the first part must also be Greek. But how with this—**ihc xps** on a coin of Basil I, A. D. 867? Also this on a miniature of Codex Egberti, over Christ's head, rudely written, **IHS XRC**? Here analogy seems to fail.

Reverting now from the contraction to the Holy Name written in full, and observing how variously it was spelled, we find ourselves involved in still greater perplexity.

IHESUS—Title of Latin manuscript in Gothic minuscles, written 1462. Also on a cross, Tenth Century, in St. Mauritius at Mduster.

IESVS—On reliquary cross, Twelfth Century, in Museum of Freising.

ihesu cristi—genitive case, in colophon of Scheefer's Bible, 1462.

ihesus in Book of Hours of queen Anne of Brittany, about 1490.

ihesus in a prayer in the same book.

iesu in "Devote Meditatione", Venice, 1508.

hiesus on cross in refectory of convent of Santa Cruce, Florence.

Whether these various modes of spelling had anything to do with writing **IHS** is doubtful. They would rather indicate that the word Jesus was pronounced by some as though it began with an aspirate. The last example would seem to prove this. Perhaps many people were as reckless in their use of the letter **h** as some of our English cousins; or perhaps many believed that the Greek-Eta (**H**) was to be sounded as an aspirate. The last supposition may not be far from right, for in Greek the sign **H** before it represented long **E** was used for the rough breathing, and may have thus passed over to the Latin. Philology alone can decide this question. In the old Latin bibles Jerome is spelled Hieronymus, and Jerusalem, Hierusalem. Some have Iheronimus and Iherusalem.

The same difficulties seemed to puzzle the ancients. Amalarius of Metz, author of *De Officiis Ecclesiasticis* asks in a letter to Jeremiah, archbishop of Sens, in the year 827, why the name of Jesus is written with an aspirate, an **H**, and expresses the opinion that according to the Greek it should be written **IHC**.^{*} To this Jeremiah answers that it is not an aspirate but the Greek Eta. He also asks bishop Jonas whether it were more correct to write **IHS** or **IHC**, and was answered that the latter form was preferable, the first two letters being taken from the Greek and the last from the Latin, as had been done in **XPS**.

An explanation is offered by James O. Halliwell,[†] who holds that the Latin scribes, not knowing Greek, confused the Latin **H** with the Greek *Eta* when they transcribed **IHS**, as *ih̄s* in minuscule texts. This would seem to be the correct explanation in the case of *ih̄t* which is found in some manuscript sermons in my possession, of probably the Fifteenth Century. Here *ih̄t* was doubtless derived from **IHC**. In this manuscript Jesus is uniformly written *ih̄t*, dative *ih̄u*, accusative *ih̄m*. Christ is written *xpt*, also *xps*, genative *xpi* or *x* with *i* superscript, dative *xpo*,

^{*} *D'Achery, Spicilegium*, iii, 330, quoted in McClintock and Strong.

[†] *A Few Hints to Novices in Manuscript Literature*.

accusative $\chi\rho\mu$. Antichrist is written $\text{ant}\acute{\iota}\chi\rho\tau$. Holy Spirit is written in the genitive $\text{sp}\acute{\iota}\tau\ \text{s}\acute{\tau}\iota$ for Spiritus Sancti. Notice the Greek τ for the Latin s . Thompson * cites $\text{ep}\tau$ for episcopus, $\text{tp}\tau$ for tempus. While it may be true that the mediaeval monks who copied manuscripts knew little Latin and less Greek, and doubtless made many errors, yet we must also remember that language like other human phenomena does not always develop along logical and conventional lines. When we study the early use of **IHS** or $\text{i}\eta\text{s}$ we are hardly justified in declaring that it was due to ignorance. Take for example the Greco-Latin codices of the New Testament-manuscripts in which the Greek and Latin texts are written in parallel columns. In the Codex Bezae, written probably in the Fifth Century, we find uniformly in the Greek column **IHC** and in the corresponding Latin passages $\text{i}\eta\text{s}$, both in the uncial hand. The accusative is written, Greek **IHN**; Latin $\text{i}\eta\mu$. Other bi-lingual uncials most likely have the same thing.

We might also refer to the Gothic forms of this monogram, but this paper would become too lengthy. One other feature deserves mention and that is the cross which often surmounts the monogram. This was obtained in the Greek uncial and Latin capital forms by a single vertical stroke drawn through the contraction mark. Thus **IHC** and **IHS** [each with a cross superimposed on the **H**]. Or in the Latin minuscule form by crossing the vertical line of the **h** with the contraction line. Thus **ih̄s**. [with a cross on the **h**]

That the Holy Name was often used in conjurings and incantations is not surprising, and when written for such purposes usually took the form of the monogram. Mr. C. W. King informs us that **IHS NAZARENVS** was an inscription very good against epilepsy and therefore is frequently found on silver rings of mediaeval make. Also the phrase “**IHS** autem tran-

* *Handbook of Greek and Latin Paleography* by EDWARD M. THOMPSON,

siens per medium illorum ibat” i. e. “Jesus going through the midst of them passed by” (John 8: 59) was a safeguard against all dangers in traveling by sea and land. Says an old writer, “And therefore seyen some men when thei dreded them of theses on any way, or of enemyes, ‘**IHS** autem etc’ in tokene and mynde that our Lord passed through oute of the Jewes’ crueltie and scapte safely fro hem.” Edward III had these words inscribed on his gold noble* in memory of his miraculous escape at the naval battle off Sluys.

The Roman church has instituted a festival in honor of the Holy Name (Aug. 7) on which special services are held. An old Sequence of this festival has the following verse preserved in the Sarum Missal and with this we close.

Hail! Name so precious to the ear!
Sweet Jesus! Name which all revere:
May naught on earth prevail to tear
This title from our heart.
By this let sin be done away,
To this let each one homage pay,
Through this in heavenly bliss, we pray,
May we obtain a part.”

EDWIN F. KEEVER.
Calasauqua, Pa.

*See *Century Dictionary*.