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**ABSTRACT**

Martin Luther’s views on the pipe organ as a functional instrument in the liturgy of the Reformation have been regarded as controversial for over 500 years. Based on selective research in the past, he has too often unjustifiably been stigmatised as the reformer who fervently rejected the instrument extensively throughout his lifetime. The main purpose of this research is to affirm empirically Luther’s insights into music in general, and particularly the pipe organ, by assessing his personal comments, his change in perceptions that followed in subsequent years, as well as addressing a number of fabrications attributed to him pertaining to the instrument. The research also endeavours to dismiss ultimately the tenuous narrative that he was completely opposed to the use of the pipe organ in the liturgy of the Reformation throughout his life. By focussing on ascribing the correct and proven opinions of Luther about the pipe organ and its liturgical purpose, it will endorse his position in history as a man of exceptional musical depth, camaraderie, appreciation and understanding. By applying this methodology, it becomes possible to re-envision Luther as someone who did not unwarrantedly reject all Roman Catholic musical traditions; he embraced it as a foundation for the implementation of a reformed musical liturgy, enhanced by the purposeful employment of the pipe organ in such a setting.
I. Introduction

Martin Luther (1483-1546) was an accomplished instrumentalist and composer in his own right. Pietsch (1992:160) surmises that, “[A]s with most music students of his time, Luther had a grounding in both singing and lute and was recognised as a skilled lute-player with a pleasant tenor voice”. His music education was based on his sound understanding of its theological framework and impact on the liturgy, both in theory and in praxis. He used this structure as an effective foundation to affect drastic changes in the optimal employment of music for the congregation to actively form part of the worship ceremony (Leaver, 2007:208; Routley, 1979:1). He therefore afforded the idea of community singing a new and functional purpose, thereby encouraging his congregants not to gather as mere audience members in the liturgy, but by participating as musically active members.

However, Luther’s views on the pipe organ have been controversial for over 500 years, occasionally expressing negativities about the organ. He has often been stigmatised as someone who vehemently disapproved of the instrument extensively throughout his lifetime. Although several scholars have focused on the writings of secondary authors on the subject, Luther’s own perception of the instrument in his own words has not always been accurately relayed. Based on selective and prejudiced research in the past, the narrative was inevitably created that he was totally opposed to the utilisation of the pipe organ in the liturgy during the Reformation. Some of the research that was done in the past, mostly seems to focus on interpreting the incorrect attributions to Luther about the pipe organ rather than holistically evaluating his own first-hand accounts of the instrument. In fact, some authors remain silent on this aspect, opting to focus attention on the, sometimes, misguided ascriptions. Moreover, those opposed to the legacy of Luther during his time — and even moderately today — doubt the validity and uniformity of his philosophy and dogma on many focus areas (Santrac, 2017:1).

It has not always been conclusive whether Luther regarded the pipe organ in its totality as a non-liturgical instrument. According to Leaver (2010:4), Luther’s alleged notion of describing the undesirable characteristics of the pipe organ should rather be viewed within the context of the developmental state of the pipe organ during his time as opposed to an outright denunciation of the instrument on principle. Moreover, his attitude toward the pipe organ was rooted decisively in a theological foundation rather than an aural viewpoint — its employment in the Roman Catholic liturgy certainly had much to do with Luther’s utterances on the subject. As we will observe later, it appears that in subsequent years he even promoted and encouraged the appropriate utilisation of the instrument in the divine service.

Therefore, the main purpose of this research is to investigate and affirm factually Luther’s views about music in general, and specifically the pipe organ, by evaluating his personal observations, his subsequent
change in perceptions, as well as speaking to a number of misconceptions. The study also seeks to dispel ultimately the notion that he was entirely against the use of the pipe organ in the liturgy of the Reformation throughout his entire life.

2. Luther’s appreciation of music

According to Pietsch (1992:161), Luther had “a tendency to accommodate renaissance thinking, to value music humanistically as a performance and as art … rather than … [as] a mathematical science valued for its theoretical content”. Luther’s method of interpreting the Bible from a tropological (moral) point of view, which focuses on the spiritual and the existential part of Christianity, reached its zenith between 1516 and 1519. All his subsequent writings on the immeasurable value of music in the Reformation liturgy occurred after this era (Barber, 2006:2). It is clear that he had an unpretentious and rational approach to music in general, and how to utilise it optimally in the service of praising God in particular. Luther’s view was that music was secondary to the function of theology, but he never underestimated music’s role in imparting the knowledge of theology (Knight, 2010:38).

Luther, unlike his Reformation contemporaries, did not condemn everything that was deemed Roman Catholic. His fellow reformers rebelled among other issues against the music tradition of the Roman Catholic Church, which they regarded as overtly extravagant and dramatic. Based on Luther’s exegetical believe and principles, it was his view that any form of worship was appropriate in the Reformation liturgy as long as it was not in contrast with the teachings of the New Testament. In other words, what was not prohibited in the New Testament was permitted (Barber, 2006:1-2; Leaver, 2007:298). In fact, Luther’s hermeneutic approach was paramount in his holistic conceptualisation of music worship in the New Testament and considered it as authoritatively more significant to that of the Old Testament. In his preamble to the Baptsche Gesangbuch of 1545, Luther outlines that (Barber, 2006:3):

… in the Old Testament, under the Law of Moses, the church service was very cumbersome … The people had to offer many and varied sacrifices of all that they possessed at home and in the field. They did this unwillingly for they were lazy and avaricious and did these things only to obtain some temporal benefits. If there is such an unwilling and lazy heart, nothing, at least nothing worthwhile can be sung. Where one would sing, heart and mind must indeed be happy and full of joy. Therefore, God has dispensed with such an unwilling and lazy service … The worship of the New Testament is on a higher plane than that of the Old…

In his foreword to Georg Rhau’s (1488-1548) Symphonaie lucundae (1538), Luther unambiguously relays his attitude toward music as a direct spiritual gift from God that was to become a cornerstone of his ideological framework (Barber, 2006:5):

I, Doctor Martin Luther, wish all lovers of the unshackled art of music grace and peace from God the Father and from our Lord Jesus Christ! I truly desire that all Christians would love and regard as worthy the lovely gift of music, which is
a precious, worthy, and costly treasure given to mankind by God. The riches of music are so excellent and so precious that words fail me whenever I attempt to discuss and describe them... In summa, next to the Word of God, the noble art of music is the greatest treasure in the world. It controls our thoughts, minds, hearts, and spirits... Our dear fathers and prophets did not desire without reason that music be always used in the churches. Hence, we have so many songs and psalms. This precious gift has been given to man alone that he might thereby remind himself that God has created man for the express purpose of praising and extolling God. However, when man’s natural musical ability is whetted and polished to the extent that it becomes an art, then do we note with great surprise the great and perfect wisdom of God in music, which is, after all, His product and His gift; we marvel when we hear music in which one voice sings a simple melody, while three, four, or five other voices play and trip lustily around the voice that sings its simple melody and adorn this simple melody wonderfully with artistic musical effects, thus reminding us of a heavenly dance, where all meet in a spirit of friendliness, caress and embrace. A person who gives this some thought and yet does not regard music as a marvellous creation of God, must be a clodhopper indeed and does not deserve to be called a human being; he should be permitted to hear nothing but the braying of asses and the grunting of hogs.

The thoughts above undeniably affirm Luther's spiritual importance and regard for music, which he also links to good and proper art. This typical narrative of his portrays the influence that he asserted, not only in the religious and cultural spheres of his time and beyond, but more so in the liberation of liturgical music from the authoritarian control of the Roman Catholic Church.

In his emphasising of the moving quality and impact of music, Luther also wrote the following as part of the preface to Rhau's Symphoniae (St-Onge, 2003:1):

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

Luther, like his reformer contemporaries such as John Calvin (1509-1564), was very cognisant of the ideology that music had the power to corrupt his fellow man easily. However, Luther was resolutely more mindful of the sacred effect of music, in particular congregational hymnody, as a means to bring the gospel closer to the people (Wren, 2000:69).
3. Luther and the pipe organ

3.1 The pipe organ “demonised”

During the Calvinist period, the pipe organ was labelled, among others, as the “Devil’s Bagpipe”, the “Pope’s Bagpipe”, the “Devil’s Trumpet”, as well as the “Seducer to the Worship of the Roman Anti-Christ” (Engle, 2011:113; Harper, 1991:183). According to McClintock and Strong (1894:762), Luther proclaimed that “the organ in worship is the ensign of Baal … The Roman Catholics borrowed it from the Jews”. What is quite controversial, however, is that various sources incorrectly replace the term “ensign” with “insignia”. The dilemma with this statement generally directly attributed to Luther is that scholars are unable to locate this quote in any of his writings.

The demolition of icons during the sixteenth century was a hallmark of the Calvinist Protestant movement in response to anything that was associated with Roman Catholicism, including ceremonial rites, the liturgy, images, choirs and instruments (particularly the pipe organ) (McGrath, 2007:5; Pietsch, 1992:161). Ulrich Zwingli (1484-1531), Luther’s fellow reformer, even went as far as to sanction the complete desecration of pipe organs in places of worship (St-Onge, 2003:4). This disapproval manifested itself in a highly emotional milieu with the religious doctrinal battles in the late Middle Ages as backdrop.

Initially, Luther himself seems to have been totally opposed to pipe organs and their ubiquitous presence. Some of his extremely critical observations that allude to the instrument are quite condemning. A few examples follow.

In his An Exposition for the Lord’s Prayer for Simple Laymen of 1519, Luther’s scathing comments on insincere prayers proclaim that (Leaver, 2007:7):

> [T]hese people utter this prayer with their lips, but contradict it with their hearts. They are like lead organ pipes which fairly drawl or shout out their sounds in church, yet lack both words and meaning. Perhaps these organs represent and symbolize these singers and petitioners.

Elaborating on 1 Corinthians 14 in his De votis monasticis (1521), Luther espouses yet another negative reference to the pipe organ (Leaver, 2010:6):

> If now (as Paul says) some unbeliever were to enter into the midst of these men and heard them braying, mumbling, and bellowing, and saw that they were neither preaching nor praying, but rather, as their custom is, were sounding forth like those pipe organs (with which they have so brilliantly associated themselves, each one set in a row just like his neighbour), would this unbeliever not be perfectly justified in asking, “Have you gone mad? What else are these monks but the tubes and pipes Paul referred to as giving no distinct note but rather blasting out into the air?”

In 1522, Luther criticised (according to him) the superfluous histrionics of the Roman Catholic Church
rites and applications - mentioning the pipe organ as well (Leaver, 2007:7):

[St. Paul] perceives with great clarity what great fools they all are who want to become pious through works, and he will not give one penny for all the tonsures of priests, monks, bishops, and popes nor for cowls, incensing, ringing of bells, burning of candles, singing, organs, and reciting prayers with all their external performance.

3.2 A change in perception

Researchers acknowledge that, as the one reformer who did not follow the instructions of Zwingli and Calvin by allowing instrumental music in the Reformation liturgy, Luther did not oppose the use of instruments in the church as such (St-Onge, 2003:3). It is ironic that Zwingli as reformer would oppose the use of instruments in the liturgy – he was a well-trained musician and composer in his own right who played a number of instruments (Wren, 2000:50). Luther, in stark contrast, approved of using instruments to enhance the music of the reformed liturgy, including the use of the pipe organ. However, his reformer contemporaries did not appreciate the presence and use of pipe organs prevalent in the churches and perceived them as overly useless in a functional liturgical structure, regarding them as remnants of Roman Catholicism (Barber, 2006:1). There is a general quasi-fundamentalist perception among some scholars that whatever Luther pronounced at a certain time during his tenure as reformer, that these sentiments were cast in stone, never to be altered or reconsidered by him in later years. However, in his writings it is apparent that his theological foundation remained unchanged, but as reformer he was in a constant evolving state. He personally stated (Santrac, 2017:3), “I did not learn my theology all at once, but had to search deeper for it, where my temptations took me”.

While attending the University of Erfurt, Luther continued his intense training in music by focussing on the study of polyphony and composition. It follows therefore that he had a keen sense of what good music should entail and the subsequent effect it should advocate to the listener. His natural inclination to appreciate good music, coupled with his sound theoretical knowledge and his own performance prowess, made him a credible and respected critic among his peers. According to Leaver (2007:31), Luther became notorious for airing his adverse opinions of second-rate music and performances – a trait that he was infamously remembered for throughout his life. For example, when he was probed about his observations of the composer Lukas Edemberger’s choral canons, he remarked that “they were neither enjoyable nor pleasing because the composer seemed more interested in writing counterpoint than writing interesting music. He has enough skill, [Luther declared,] but is lacking in warmth” (Schalk, 1988:14&24).

It is interesting to note another incident that prompted Luther to be quite scathing in his criticism. When Georg Planck, an organist from Zeitz, performed in public in the 1540s, Luther wrote the following about him in one of the so-called non-Aurifaber Table talks (Leaver, 2007:101): “That lex iiram operator [the Law works wrath] is evidenced by the fact that Georg Planck plays better when he plays for himself than when he plays for others…”
Therefore, Luther's negative comments about pipe organs must be seen from a musical point of view that have more to do with the employment of the instrument in a non-theological musical manner than the actual sound of the instrument – put plainly, the improper use of the pipe organ in a non-reformed liturgical music setting. A prominent point to deliberate on is that Luther’s initial negative assertions on the pipe organ date from the very commencement of the Reformation, before he himself altered the musical liturgy in Wittenberg – a period when his mission was to rid religious ceremonies of all non-reformist traditions (Leaver, 2010:7).

A contemporary of Luther and an avid European traveller confirmed the excellent pipe organs of the time. Travelling through Germany in 1517 and 1518, the Italian Antonio de Beatis recorded in his journal his views on the splendid stops and sounds of the organs of southern Germany (where Luther was active) and lyrically proclaimed how these instruments were more impressive than their northern German counterparts of the time (Leaver, 2007:8).

Luther’s colleague at Wittenberg, the anti-Catholic theologian, Andreas Bodenstein von Karlstadt (c. 1482-1541), has been proven to be the progenitor for the cause to ban instruments, and specifically pipe organs from the reformed liturgy in the Wittenberg area. Karlstadt was a devoted disciple of the radical reformer, Thomas Münzer (d. 1525). When Luther was summoned by the Roman Catholic Emperor, Prince Frederick III (1463-1525), Elector of Saxony (also known as Frederick the Wise) to attend the Diet of Worms (1521) for his notorious believe system, Karlstadt deputised for Luther (who went into hiding in Wartburg Castle after the summons, fearing for his life). The absence of Luther in Wittenberg offered Karlstadt the ideal opportunity to institute fundamental changes to Luther’s methods and applications in the reformed liturgy, including forbidding the use of the pipe organ. Luther was duty-bound to return to Wittenberg to overturn these unconsented changes – proof that his attitude to liturgical musical reform, and by implication the utilisation of the pipe organ in this context, was quite conformist and conservative (Knight, 2010:36; Leaver, 2010:7-8).

### 3.3 Encounters with pipe organs and organists

In the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, the differentiation between professional and amateur musicians was not as patently striking as it is in our epoch. Luther certainly came into contact with the pipe organs and organists of the vicinity wherever he found himself at a particular point in his life. As a passionate appreciator of the arts and in his surroundings as a scholar and theologian, he would have been acutely cognisant of instruments and composers of a high calibre, even during this actual era of relatively and comparatively conservative engineering and creative advances. During his early musical training in the late 1480s, he surely experienced the pipe organs of Mansfeld (Magdeburg) and Eisenach. He would also have become accustomed to the aesthetic sound of the instruments in the district of Erfurt where he was active in the local school choir and later became a monk in the Augustinian monastery of the town in 1505. When he completed his doctorate, he accepted a teaching post in theology at Wittenberg University in 1512, which has had a university church since 1502 and undoubtedly housed an appropriately sufficient pipe organ (Knight, 2010:34-35).
The founder of the university in Wittenberg, Frederick the Wise (referred to earlier), had a tendency to secure the services of only the best musicians and organists of the time to serve in his chapels. Leaver (2010:8) advocates that these musicians in the service of Frederick the Wise certainly had to be highly trained to function at the same level as those of the Holy Roman empire of the Harbsburger, Maximillian I (1459-1519), where notable composers and musicians such as Heinrich Isaac (1450-1517), Ludwig Senfl (1486-1543), Heinrich Fink (1444-1527) were active.

During Luther’s time at the university in Wittenberg, the most prominent musician of the period who was appointed by Frederick the Wise during 1498 and 1499, was the Austrian organist, Paul Hofhaimer (1459-1537), who was also employed in the Maximillian Hofkapel in the late fifteenth century. Luther must definitely have experienced and heard this sought-after musician performing on the pipe organ, using the instrument to its full capacity at one of the official ceremonies in Wittenberg. (It is unfortunate that Luther never recorded his impression of Hofhaimer and his performance technique.) Undoubtedly, the pipe organs in these venues were of a highly regarded level of organ building proficiency and workmanship, as well as being concomitantly maintained to ensure their optimal functioning in the liturgy and other related ceremonies (Leaver, 2010:8).

Of interest is to note that, although Luther denounced the heretical doctrine of the Catholic Church, he never outright condemned its music traditions as opposed to his reformer contemporaries (Knight, 2010:34-36). In 1510, Luther was obliged to travel to Rome as an Augustinian monk. It is here that he had a first-hand account of the finest musical traditions in Europe, including the vast cathedrals accommodating fine pipe organs. It was in Rome where he also heard the music of Josquin Desprez (1440-1521) for the first time in his life — a composer he regarded as unparalleled and whom he revered for the rest of his life. His journey to the south also took him to noticeable cities such as Neurenberg, Ulm, Milan and Florence. Naturally, Luther would also have seen and heard the pipe organ in St. Peter’s Basilica in Rome.

Upon his return to Wittenberg, he travelled past regions such as Mantua, Augsburg and Innsbruck. Most of these cities had cathedrals or huge churches with a rich and dynamic culture of liturgical music. Here, too, Luther in all probability got to hear extraordinary pipe organs, including the iconic Venetian-styled instrument in the Domkirche of St. Jakob in Innsbruck, which is still extant (Knight, 2010:36; Leaver, 2010:8). Williams and Owen (1988:87) remark that the sound of the pipework of these types of pipe organ had a mild tone that was round, rich and had a singing character. They also mention in particular the extremely strong tone of the Innsbruck instrument, which is considered the oldest extant two-manual-and-pedal pipe organ in the world. In his journal, Antonio de Beatis (referred to earlier), wrote of the Innsbruck pipe organ (Leaver, 2007:8):

In the chief church [in Innsbruck] there is an organ which, while not particularly large is most beautiful, with many stops which produce the purest tone representing trumpets, fifes, flutes, cornets, crumhorns, bagpipes, drums and the … songs of various birds …; indeed, of all the many organs we saw in the course of our whole journey, this was pronounced the most perfect.
Luther as reformer and musician himself collaborated and worked closely with organists. One such example is the connection dating from 1506 with Johannes Weinmann (c. 1477-1542), the esteemed organist of the Castle Church in Wittenberg. Another one of Luther’s organist acquaintances was the theology student, Wolfgang Dachstein (1487-1553), who became organist of the Thomaskirche in Strassburg. He was responsible for spearheading the introduction of Lutheran chorales in the churches of the area (Leaver, 2010:9). In the 1530s, Luther also had regular interaction and contact with the organist and court official from Freiberg (Saxony), Matthias Weller (1507-1563). In writing to Weller, who at some point was very downhearted and dejected, Luther encourages him (Courey, 2015:118):

> When you are sad, therefore, and when melancholy threatens, to get the upper hand, say: ‘Arise! I must play a song on my regal’ [a portable organ] … Then begin striking the keys and singing in accompaniment, as David and Elisha did, until your sad thoughts vanish. If the devil returns and plants worries and sad thought in your mind, resist him manfully and say, ‘Begone, Devil! I must now play and sing unto my Lord Christ.’

According to Leaver (2010:10), Luther’s appreciation and reverence for organists are confirmed by one of his pupils, Erasmus Alber (c. 1500-1553) in his writings of 1556 declaring: “Die edle Kunst der Maler und Organisten…hat [Luther] lieb” [The noble art of the painter and organist … is loved by Luther]. Luther was very impressed with the organ performance technique of one Wolff Heinz (Wolf Heintz), a composer and organist from Halle. In 1541, Luther gave Heinz a German Bible as a gift wherein he penned a personal handwritten inscription with Psalm 149:1. It reads (Hendrickson, 2005:242):

> … The stringed instruments of the following psalms are to help in the singing of the new song; and Wolf [organist in Halle, 1541] an all pious, Christian musicians should let their singing and playing to the praise of the Father of all grace sound forth with joy from their organs and whatever other beloved musical instruments there are (recently invented and given by God), of which neither David nor Solomon, neither Persia, Greece, nor Rome, knew anything. Amen.

### 3.4 The Pipe Organ and Reformed Liturgy

Leaver (2007:209) advances that the congregation’s participation in Luther’s reformed liturgy consisted of a wide range of vocal and instrumental music, including organ music. It is Schalk’s (1988:41) believe that “Luther’s desire for the active participation of the congregation through hymnody was a result of his concern that the people participate actively in the singing of the liturgy”. His motivation for suitable congregational music stems from three basic sources: Gregorian chant, medieval unison hymns and traditional folk songs (St-Onge, 2003:2). According to Ferguson (1972:81), “[W]hen introduced in the Middle Ages, the organ was still not part of the liturgical proper. That is, it did not initially accompany the hymn service, but was a separate item in the service. The type of chant employed left no place for instrumental accompaniment until new styles of music developed”.

For Luther, musical instruments in general played a fundamental part in worshipping God. Despite
the initial criticism, organ music in the Reformation liturgy was not totally discarded – in re-evaluating its use the instrument was assigned specific functions for particular sections in the liturgy. For instance, in 1525, the provisions for the liturgy for the Schloßkirche in Wittenberg proposed, in conjunction with Luther, the active employment of the organ in specified detail (Leaver, 2007:8&345). During the period of Luther’s reformed liturgy, the pipe organ was used in *alternatum* with the hymns’ sung verses by either the congregation or the choir, a practice that dates as far back as the fifteenth century (Harper, 1991:185; Snyder, 2007:100). The use of the pipe organ as an accompaniment instrument in the liturgy only developed and manifested during the mid-seventeenth century. In a relatively new development in 1685, for example, the organist of St. Laurens in Alkmaar (Netherlands) requested the main organ division to be lowered closer to the congregation in order for them to hear the instrument better during congregational accompaniment (Williams & Owen, 1988:137). Leaver’s (2007:209) opening sentences of his chapter on liturgical chant summarises that:

> The widely-accepted concept is of strong congregational singing with organ accompaniment. While it has almost universal currency, this understanding of the Lutheran chorale is nevertheless a fairly late development, a construct based largely on the practice of the later eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, when the effects of the twin forces of Rationalism and Pietism had reduced Lutheran church music almost exclusively to congregational song.

### 4. Conclusion

The aim of this research was to ascertain empirically Luther’s views on music in general, including his spiritual ideology as perceiving it to be a direct gift from God. The literature in his own words indisputably illuminates his appreciation of music that occupies a foundational role in his personal regard of its impact and effect, both physiologically and spiritually.

Luther’s opinions of this art form within the context of the Reformation liturgical environment were also highlighted. Unlike his fellow reformers, he did not totally denounce the musical tradition of the Roman Catholic Church, but rather endeavoured to adjust it to allow the congregation of the Reformation to become optimally part of the liturgy, instead of being mere inactive spectators.

The script then focused specifically on Luther’s sentiments pertaining to the pipe organ by identifying and evaluating his initial and subsequent personal observations. In discussing these aspects, the study analysed his ensuing change in perceptions of the instrument and its function within the reformed liturgy. This consequently lead to addressing a number of misconceptions and misattributions commonly ascribed to Luther. It concentrated on his possible encounters with pipe organs during his years as a chorister, university student, Augustinian monk, on his travels, and as a reformer himself. The meetings and exposure to world-class musicians, composers and performers within this context proved that Luther was a man who was privy and witness to some of the best European music culture of his time. Various incidents of his personal correspondence with organists were underlined, shedding light on the high reverence with which he regarded these artists and their instruments, including empathising with some of them and being concerned with their spiritual well-being in executing their
The study then concentrated on the narrative to dispel ultimately the notion that he was entirely against its use in the liturgy of the Reformation throughout his life. This was confirmed by citing numerous instances where Luther displays his relatively conservative approach to the transformation of the Reformation liturgy.

It is hoped that this study will contribute to the fair and just acknowledgement of Luther’s sentiments toward the pipe organ as a functional instrument in the Reformation liturgy of his time and that future research on the subject be approached from this viewpoint. Conversely, narratives that contradict these sentiments need to be equally supported with proper research and evidence-based analysis.

REFERENCES


Courey, D.J. 2015. What has Wittenberg to do with Azusa? Luther’s Theology of the Cross and Pentecostal Triumphalism. United Kingdom: Bloomsbury T&T Clark.


