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Abstract

This historical research capstone project examined Martin Luther’s philosophy of music education and its relationship to modern Lutheran music education and related stakeholders. Major topics included 1) a historical analysis of Luther’s philosophies of music and education, along with the life influences that shaped his views in each realm on the basis of primary sources (his published writings, lectures, sermons, and letters/oral correspondence) and secondary sources (biographies and other historical research), which then supplement a synthesis of Luther’s philosophy of music education, and 2) a comparison of Luther’s philosophy of music education with Lutheran music education in America today, based on contemporary Lutheran philosophical writings, educational statistics and data from the Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod (WELS), and a contemporary Lutheran music curriculum. This research demonstrated that Luther’s philosophy of music education was strongly influenced by humanism, particularly in its emphasis on human agency and personal experience. Although Luther’s philosophy was firmly rooted in theological considerations, he strongly advocated for music’s role in education as a fundamental field of study through both theoretical and practical application, a revolutionary idea for its time. A comparison of Luther’s philosophy with modern Lutheran music education authors and programs yielded some unexpected results pertaining to a modern view that is in some ways skewed toward utilitarian theological considerations. Discussion of these results offer possible contemporary applications of Luther’s philosophy, including potential implications in secular and non-Lutheran contexts.
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Martin Luther and Music Education:

The Impact of Luther's Philosophy on Lutheran Music Education Today

A confluence of musicologists, historians, and music education researchers agree that Martin Luther played a significant role in the development of music education as a discipline (Tarry, 1973; Schalk, 1988; Mark, 2002; Barth, 2013; Kolb, 2018). Luther (1526/1965) himself wrote of the importance of education and music specifically, which he believed should “be praised and extolled before all people” as the discipline which, next to theology, “deserves the highest praise” (p. 211). The value that Luther and the Lutheran Church that followed him placed on both music and education naturally resulted in a Lutheran parochial school system in Germany that emphasized music education. Wolf (1977) traced how the German migrations to the United States helped to shape the course of music education in America by bringing that parochial system and German educators to the new world, which influenced the curricula and institutions already in existence here.

While much has been documented concerning the practical influence of Luther's views of music, little has been written comparing Luther's philosophy of music education with the processes and institutions that are extant in modern Lutheran education in America. An examination of the literature demonstrated that Luther's philosophy of music education incorporated his view of the fundamental role of music in the educational process, particularly on the basis of Renaissance humanist ideals (Tarry, 1973; Loewe, 2013; Mattes, 2017). At the same time, Luther's (1526/1965) own writings showed the importance he placed on music and education as a whole as being directly intertwined with the Word of God, such that in his view one of the “purpose[s]” for which “our schools were founded” was evangelistic ([Vol 53] p. 31). In this light, the main argument of this capstone project is that Luther’s theological
considerations did not obfuscate his belief in the fundamental integrity of music as a discipline worthy of study. Rather, his philosophy of music education advocated the study of music both theoretically and practically through musical experience—a philosophy from which modern Lutheran education has somewhat drifted.

**Methodology**

This research project was inspired in 2019 during a graduate-level course dealing with the philosophy of music education. In a cursory assignment discussing prototypical pioneers in music education, I casually suggested that Luther’s doctrinal convictions affected his musical thought. The professor thoughtfully replied to this commentary by rhetorically asking what might have happened if Luther’s philosophy was not so deeply intertwined with doctrinal considerations. That question was the impetus behind this research project, which examined that question in the inverse: To what extent exactly was Martin Luther's philosophy of music education theological? Or, put another way, was the matter of theology so endemic to Luther’s thought that no other insights can be gleaned from his philosophical approach to music; and, how were these appropriated by the Lutheran Church after him?

To answer these questions, this project engaged in a thorough analysis of all 55 volumes of *Luther’s Works*, which are widely regarded as the academic English standard for study of the Reformer’s university lectures, sermons, personal correspondence, commentaries, literary prefaces, and table talks. In addition, I examined his writings in the *Book of Concord* and his *Bondage of the Will*, as well as secondary sources that contain bibliographical and other historical research vital to this study. After procuring access to a digital copy of *Luther’s Works*, I was able to enter search queries relevant to this study, including ‘music,’ ‘education,’ ‘school,’ ‘song,’ ‘singing,’ ‘teaching,’ and other similar keywords. The copious amount of data gleaned
from the 55 volumes and ancillary works yielded over 90 pages of data. These were then collated based on an internal coding system. After distilling superfluous and redundant entries, the results included in this study were representative of a complete yet succinct demonstration of the Reformer’s writings and the various factors precipitating them. Following the narrative presentation and analysis of these results, I developed a synthesis of Luther’s philosophy of music education. This was then compared with selected data from American Lutheran educators and school systems, including philosophical writings, statistical data pertaining to institutions, and curricula. Research questions guiding the study included:

1. What distinctive qualities of music education developed from Luther's philosophy of music education?
   1a. How does this affect Lutheran music education today?

2. What was the role of theology in the development of music education in Lutheranism?
   2a. Did any distinctive qualities of Lutheran music education manifest in educational practices that still exist in secular American and/or nominally/ modern American ‘Lutheran’ contexts, but separated from their initial religious paradigm?

**Luther’s Philosophy of Music Education**

Much has been written by experts in various disciplines, both sacred and secular, concerning the influence of Martin Luther (Juroska, 1988; Østrem, Fleischcer, & Petersen 2003; Loewe, 2013; Leaver, 2017; Kolb, 2018). As Barth (2013) indicated in his academic guide to critically analyzing Luther, it is important to rigorously examine the literature on the basis of the primary sources and not be contented with a singular restrictive interpretation of Luther’s paradigm. This is no less true concerning the influence of Luther in the realms of music and education. In order to form a more adequate background picture of Luther’s philosophy from the
literature, it is helpful to consider Luther’s music and education philosophies based on a triangulation of sources from his own writings, as well as from secondary sources dealing with the biographical and historical research surrounding the Reformer’s life. This section will be divided into three main subsections, the first two dealing with his philosophies of music and education, and the third dealing with his philosophy of music education.

**Luther’s Philosophy of Education**

On the basis of his own words and writings, it can be demonstrated that Luther’s views on education—and, as will later be shown, on music—were largely shaped by his experience in the socio-economic, political, and religious landscapes of the late 15th and early 16th centuries. Among these, none were so eschewed by the Reformer as what he viewed as the misused power of the papacy, which manifested personally in Luther’s life through the educational institutions he attended, his monastery experiences, and within religious services offered by the church. In a broader context, too, Luther felt the abuses of papal authority in what he called the secular estate, which he believed should be separate and governed distinctly from ecclesial authorities. Luther believed this mingling of sacred and secular—and, more distinctly, an over-concern with the secular at the expense of the sacred on the part of the ecclesial authorities—to be at the heart of many of the problems he fought so ardently against. Of these, the poverty of education among the common people is paramount for consideration here. Luther (1537/1921) went so far as to characterize papal malfeasance in this regard as a “power so false, mischievous, blasphemous, and arrogant” that its efforts were “purely diabolical affairs and transactions” that ultimately set themselves against God Himself, going even further so as to identify the papacy as “Antichrist” ([II:IV] par. 3, 10). Luther did not employ this rhetoric lightly, which ultimately formed an integral part of his theology with profound impact on his doctrine and practice. As an educational
reformer, Luther’s negative critique of the papal and broader medieval system shifted the
discourse on what education was and what it should be, as will be demonstrated in the sections
that follow.

Luther’s Experience and Critiques of the Medieval School System

Luther’s experience with formal education began at a young age. Although “humble
beginnings” are often ascribed to Luther in hagiographical accounts, historians like Kolb (2018)
identified Luther’s family as “upwardly mobile” (p. 14). His mother Margaret came from a
leading merchant family in Eisenach, while his father Hans came from a line of farmers that was
less well-to-do in Eisleben; today one might consider them on the spectrum of middle class.
Hans Luther eventually chartered a successful mining business of his own, which secured his
family’s financial stability. In this context, Luther’s father was equipped to provide his son
Martin with an education, ideally in the interest of furthering his family’s economic station
(evidently, Hans wanted Martin to study to become a lawyer).

The earliest accounts of Luther’s education in this period come from his time in
Mansfeld, where his family relocated about a year after his birth (Kolb, 2018). In the preface to
Volume 44 of Luther’s Works, James Atkinson (1966) went into some depth in describing the
historical realities of the education system in Germany from the early middle ages through
Luther’s time, which can provide more detail than is necessary here. In sum, during the early
middle ages, monastic schools served as the primary vehicle through which one could obtain an
education. These institutions largely served families of some means, though certain nobles might
have employed private tutors as well. As urban centers grew in the later middle ages, cathedral
schools offered an option for more students to study under a curriculum slightly expanded from
the monastic model. Meanwhile, guild schools developed in the years leading up to the
Renaissance as means for specialization in a specific craft. Aside from some instances of the latter that were under the province of secular authorities, nearly all education at the time fell under the authority of ecclesiastical powers and their theological systems.

Although the burgeoning humanist philosophy, which will be examined more closely in a subsequent section, was beginning to advocate an alternative to these models, the “Latin School” of Mansfeld, which still adhered to the medieval system, was among Luther’s earliest experiences with education. By today’s standards, the methods employed at the Mansfeld school might be considered barbaric. Luther (1526/1972) compared the situation in the school at Mansfeld to being caged:

So the monks confined their pupils as though in a cage and forbade them to see or talk with people, with the result that they learned and experienced nothing, even though there is nothing more dangerous to youth than solitude. The mind needs to be trained with good sense and ideas, so that people are not corrupted by association and contact with evil men, since according to the body they have to live in the very midst of such things. ([Vol. 15] p. 274)

A hallmark of the Latin schools was a formulaic “mode of learning” through rote repetition and severe discipline (to the point of corporal punishment). Luther (1524/1962) went so far to describe his own experience in this context as “a hell and purgatory in which we were tormented with *casualibus* and *temporalibus*, and yet learned less than nothing despite all the flogging, trembling, anguish, and misery” ([Vol. 45] p. 369). Throughout his works, Luther often referred to “the schools” of the papal and monastic system *en masse* as “devil’s training centers,” equating their curricula and models to, literally, “asses’ dung” (p. 321).
Luther’s criticisms of the existing church-sponsored schools, however, was not primarily based on pedagogical strategies and curricula, but rather on the quality of the education that was being offered on a theological level. Luther’s most scathing rebuke of the papal monopoly over church and state was not with regard to its political malfeasance, but rather its failure to carry out its primary function, which he viewed as caring for the spiritual needs of the common people.

Perhaps the clearest and most authoritative injunction he issued regarding this state of affairs was in the preface to his *Small Catechism*, which both Luther and the Lutheran Church after him regarded with primacy among all his works:

> The deplorable, miserable condition which I discovered lately when I, too, was a visitor, has forced and urged me to prepare [publish] this Catechism, or Christian doctrine, in this small, plain, simple form. Mercy! Good God! what manifold misery I beheld! The common people, especially in the villages, have no knowledge whatever of Christian doctrine, and, alas! many pastors are altogether incapable and incompetent to teach [so much so, that one is ashamed to speak of it]. (Luther, 1529/1921, par. 1)

Not only did Luther find that the common people failed to comprehend the most basic elements of the Christian faith—he went on to list the Lord’s Prayer as an example—but he specifically lamented that the pastors, in his estimation, were also woefully uneducated and incapable of teaching others accordingly. In a lecture on 1 Timothy, Luther (1528/1973) negatively critiqued the renowned papal theologian Erasmus, who was a lifelong interlocutor of the Reformer’s, as an example of church leaders who were not effective educators: “In the church people should teach and educate. Erasmus does not teach. Even if he teaches, he muddles about. Thus the Enthusiasts are not teachers, because they don’t strengthen consciences” ([Vol. 28] p. 325). Similarly, in his “Exhortation to All Clergy Assembled at Augsburg,” Luther (1530/1960) warned the assembled
clergy of the ineffectual leadership manifest in the bishops’ inability to inculcate and catechize what he believed were the core tenets of doctrine: “No bishop has ever dealt with such topics and besides your people have never thoroughly understood or been taught them” ([Vol. 34] p. 53).

In addition to the failings of church leaders, Luther’s critiques extended to parents, whom Luther believed to bear the primary responsibility in educating children, and, by extension, the civil authorities. Luther (1529/1921) went on to adjure both in the preface to the Small Catechism:

> Urge magistrates and parents to rule well and to send their children to school, showing them why it is their duty to do this, and what a damnable sin they are committing if they do not do it. For by such neglect they overthrow and destroy both the kingdom of God and that of the world, acting as the worst enemies both of God and of men. And make it very plain to them what an awful harm they are doing if they will not help to train children to be pastors, preachers, clerks [also for other offices, with which we cannot dispense in this life], etc., and that God will punish them terribly for it. (par. 11)

Luther believed that the impoverished state of education in the middle ages was the result of a diabolical attempt to prevent the flourishing of the “true Gospel” and, subsequently, the flourishing of a Christian society.

**The Purpose of Education**

Luther believed that education was necessary for the inculcation of the Christian faith. Coupled with the impoverished state of education in the early 16th century, this reality helps to explain Luther’s educational philosophy and the impetus he felt for reform. It would be misleading to deny the primacy of theological considerations as a purpose of education in Luther’s paradigm; to this end, he wrote in a lecture on the Psalms:
I have preached and written a great deal urging that good schools should be established in the cities in order that we might produce educated men and women, whence good Christian pastors and preachers might come forth so that the word of God might continue to flourish richly. (Luther, 1523/1962, [Vol. 45] p. 317)

Luther’s negative experiences with ineffective pastors and teachers in the Reformation, ill-equipped to teach the common people, led him to encourage all people to be educated in order that the Word of God might be preserved more efficiently from one generation to the next. To this end, Luther’s view of education was such that children should be thoroughly equipped for potential service. “It is also reasonable that the young should be trained in many languages; for who knows how God may use them in times to come? For this purpose, our schools were founded” (Luther, 1526/1965, p. 31).

Although Luther’s Reformation-era context, along with his criticisms of the papal church, led him to emphasize the importance of education in developing faithful ministers, church workers, and parents to pass on the faith to their children, he also believed in the importance of education to equip students to be well-informed citizens in various fields of discipline. In some ways, this “secular” aspect of education also served a spiritual end, such that educated individuals could best serve in whatever vocation God intended for them. In a lecture on Genesis, Luther (1522/1962) emphasized this perspective:

Thus the church is the pupil of Christ. It sits at His feet and listens to His Word, that it may know how to judge everything—how to serve in one’s vocation and to fill civil offices, yes, how to eat, drink, and sleep—so that there is no doubt about any area of life, but that we, surrounded on all sides by the rays of the Word, may continually walk in joy and in the most beautiful light. ([Vol. 2] p. 353)
Luther’s belief that the Word should govern all disciplines and vocations explains the paramount connection he made between evangelistic goals and the founding of schools. He did not view schools as indoctrination centers, but rather as a means to enable students to be the best they possibly could be in their varied vocations for the glory of God.

**Parental Involvement in Education**

Luther emphasized the important role of parents in ensuring student involvement and success in the educational process. Schooling not only ensured spiritual development, but also the growth of children into well-rounded human beings who could fulfill their vocations in service to God and others. “Because it is God’s will, then, parents should send their children to school, and prepare them for the Lord God so that he may use them for the service of others” (Luther, 1528/1958, [Vol. 40] p. 314). In Luther’s paradigm, parental authority extended to governments, which Luther believed derived their authority from the parental arrangement (incidentally, the view that the marital union was the purview of the state was a major shift in Reformation thought from the papal view of marriage as a sacramental or church union). One of his clearest writings on the topic was his open letter, “To the Councilmen of All Cities in Germany that they Establish and Maintain Christian Schools” (Luther, 1524/1962, [Vol. 45] p. 356f).

**Combatting a Low View of Education.** Luther began his general address to the secular leaders of Germany concerning schooling by recounting for them what he viewed as the lamentable circumstance of ecclesial schools, as was outlined in the preceding sections. However, he then criticized the situation that developed in the inverse, such that parents simply stopped sending their children to school entirely with no educational recourse. Luther employed harsh criticisms of parents who failed to educate their children in this regard, referring to such
negligence as a grave sin that is “not even recognized or acknowledged and is never atoned for” (ibid.). On the basis of this perception, Luther proffered the idea that the government should step in to ensure that children were being properly educated:

Ah, you say, but all that is spoken to the parents; what business is it of councilmen and the authorities? Yes, that is true; but what if the parents fail to do their duty? Who then is to do it? Is it for this reason to be left undone, and the children neglected? How will the authorities and council then justify their position, that such matters are not their responsibility? (Ibid.)

In this way, Luther put the onus on governmental authorities as well as parents to ensure the education of the young.

Although criticisms of the theological content of the medieval system played a role in the declining attendance of the schools, many parents were simply unconvinced of the merit of formal education outright. In the general preface to “To the Councilmen…” in volume 45 of Luther’s Works, Brandt (1962) posited rhetorically, “If a youth were not destined for the church or for one of the learned professions— theology, law, or medicine— why should he waste his time in acquiring an education which had no direct relationship to the world of trade and industry?” (p. 342). Against this ideology, Luther had to advocate for the intrinsic worth of education in its own right. In this vein, he appealed to the educational philosophy proffered by humanism.

**Humanism in Luther’s Educational Paradigm**

What has already been established in the preceding sections begins to demonstrate the appeal of humanism in Luther’s outlook. Juroska (1988) and Mattes (2017) both examined in some depth the role of humanism in the development of Luther’s educational philosophy. The practical application of humanism in Luther’s musical philosophy will be examined in a later
section, but a brief outline of the humanist philosophy and its model of education is pertinent at this point to establish the basis of Luther’s own pedagogical offerings.

As a philosophical model, Loewe (2013) described the humanism of the Renaissance as a sort of *ad fontes* return to the philosophical underpinnings of Western civilization evident in the philosophies and structures of the Greeks and Romans (a common practice among humanists to this end was the Latinization of surnames; thus, Luder became Luther). On a philosophical level, humanism was concerned with the intrinsic worth of human beings both on a personal and communal level. The appeal of this burgeoning philosophy can be seen in Luther’s views and philosophical writings. Luther believed in the worth of each individual in the eyes of God; this was one of the key facets of his Reformation movement. In fact, Luther directly advocated the study of humanist ideals as directly related to the advancement of his gospel:

I myself am convinced that without the knowledge of the [Humanistic] studies, pure theology can by no means exist, as has been the case until now: when the [Humanistic] studies were miserably ruined and prostrate [theology] declined and lay neglected. I realize there has never been a great revelation of God’s Word unless God has first prepared the way by the rise and the flourishing of languages and learning, as though these were forerunners, a sort of [John] the Baptist. (Luther, 1523/1972, [Vol 49] p. 33). In this light, unlike in the monastic schools, which were based on a strict disciplinarian and theological model, Luther the humanist advocated for a repristination of the “ancient” (Greek and Roman) model of education that he believed would lend agency to individuals and the community in whole:

So it was done in ancient Rome. There boys were so taught that by the time they reached their fifteenth, eighteenth, or twentieth year they were well versed in Latin, Greek, and all
the liberal arts (as they are called), and then immediately entered upon a political or military career. Their system produced intelligent, wise, and competent men, so skilled in every art and rich in experience that if all the bishops, priests, and monks in the whole of Germany today were rolled into one, you would not have the equal of a single Roman soldier. (Luther, 1524/1962, [Vol. 45] p. 355)

This excerpt is not only a stunning indictment of the monastic/ecclesial system, but also a staunch endorsement of the liberal arts education proffered by humanist ideals.

While the educational structure Luther advocated was based on the ancient Greek model, whose philosophers viewed education in terms of the function it served in creating good citizens for the betterment of society, the humanist paradigm Luther shared also emphasized the individual’s personal enrichment. One’s learning was to be undertaken to edify the individual as well as society through mastery of the various liberal arts, so as to create a life “rich in experience.” This rhetoric was prototypical of later pragmatic philosophies, which emphasized sensory experience and hands-on learning through a methodological approach. At the same time, Luther also championed the value of education to policymakers as “a city’s best and greatest welfare, safety, and strength” through “its having many able, learned, wise, honorable, and well-educated citizens” (ibid.). In this light, Luther was not averse to appealing to the communal benefits of education while still lauding its intrinsic worth to the individual.

**Universal Education**

The importance of individual agency in Luther’s view of education resulted in his promotion of educational reform in a universal context:

But, you say, everyone may teach his sons and daughters himself, or at least train them in proper discipline. Answer: Yes, we can readily see what such teaching and training
amount to. Even when the training is done to perfection and succeeds, the net result is little more than a certain enforced outward respectability; underneath, they are nothing but the same old blockheads, unable to converse intelligently on any subject, or to assist or counsel anyone. But if children were instructed and trained in schools, or wherever learned and well-trained schoolmasters and schoolmistresses were available to teach the languages, the other arts, and history, they would then hear of the doings and sayings of the entire world, and how things went with various cities, kingdoms, princes, men, and women. (Luther, 1524/1962, [Vol. 45] p. 368)

The model Luther advocated involved only “an hour or two” a day (ibid.), the rest of which would be spent at home, as an acquiescence to skeptical parents. This model was suggested for both girls and boys: “In like manner, a girl can surely find time enough to attend school” (ibid.). In a very real way, this model of universal education was later adopted by the Lutheran Church (Wolf, 1977), which created a parochial school system for its adherents that was unparalleled in scope and remains a significant force to this day, as will be examined later on.

**Luther’s Design for a Reformed School**

Luther actually provided an initial design and curriculum for schools in the Reformation movement. The impetus for this design began in 1525, when Luther urged his Elector, John of Saxony (also known as “John the Steadfast”), to deal with the plight he viewed in the Church as described above. The Elector enjoined Luther to prepare a proposal, which resulted in what is known as visitations. These visitations were performed by a group of nobles/councilmen to the various ecclesial institutions and priests within the Elector’s Saxon jurisdiction. These visitors used a document known as “Visitation Articles” to examine both the economic and spiritual state of the jurisdiction. In 1528, the Elector urged Luther to draft a preface to explain the various
articles in more depth. In this document, Luther (1528/1958) also outlined the structure of part of the school system to be employed, which consisted of three divisions based on student achievement level:

The first division consists of children who are beginning to read. [. . .]

The second division consists of those children who can read and should now learn grammar. [. . .]

When now the children have been well drilled in grammar the more excellent ones may be chosen for a third group. [. . .]

When they have mastered etymology and syntax the pupils shall go on to prosody, wherein they become accustomed to composing verses. For this practice is very useful in learning to understand other writings. Also it gives the pupils a rich vocabulary and makes them apt in many ways.

When they have sufficiently studied grammar they may use these hours for dialectic and rhetoric. Of the second and third divisions should be required each week a written exercise such as a letter or a poem.

The pupils shall also be required to speak Latin. The schoolmaster himself, as far as possible, should speak only Latin with the pupils so that they become accustomed to and are encouraged in this practice. ([Vol. 40] p. 314)

This document also contained references to specific content to be studied, with curricular prescriptions pertaining to various Latin texts such as Virgil, Cicero, and the like. Also notable within this curriculum are specific time allotments for the study of music, particularly since Luther did not prescribe time allotments for all of the liberal arts assumed in his classical
humanist approach to education (See “Visitation Prescription for Schools,” Luther, 1528/1958, [Vol. 40] p. 314-319, for the full document, as well as the later section on Music Education).

**Government Aid and Private Sponsorship**

Part of the Visitations entailed the allotment of government funds when and where they were necessary to both churches and schools. But government aid was limited. Kolb (2018) reported that in jurisdictions sympathetic to the Reformation, Papal holdings (monasteries and the like) were often confiscated and reallocated for use where needed. The funds were not endless, especially at a time when tensions were high between the Papal and Reformation factions. On the one hand, Luther (1539/1966) urged public officials to support the churches and schools:

> The former emperors, kings, and princes did well when they showed such diligence in building many schools, high and low, monastic schools and convents, to provide the church with a rich and ample supply of people; but their successors shamefully perverted their use. Thus today princes and lords should do the same, and use the possessions of the cloisters for the maintenance of schools and provide many persons with the means for study. If our descendants misuse these, we at least have done our duty in our day. ([Vol. 41] p. 176)

At the same time, Luther believed that both churches and schools were the provenance of the local community and must be supported by individual citizens and stakeholders, not solely or even primarily by the government:

> We must give ear to it and receive this lesson with thanksgiving, knowing that whatever we give to the cause of the church we give to God. I believe that it will soon be brought home to peasants, burghers, and noblemen that they are doing nothing, that they are
giving nothing, and that they are scraping and hoarding everything for themselves. For it is too grievous a sin that they let Christ famish, that is, do all in their power that the pulpit, the ministry, and the schools may become extinct. Thus Christ is constrained to beg for a drink of water. [. . .]

It is a great calamity that people are so steeped in greed. The Christians indeed realize the wickedness of usury; the others, however, regard it their joy and delight. At the same time it betokens the mercy of God and is a genuine Christian benefaction to maintain churches and schools with one’s money. (Luther, 1537/1966, [Vol. 22] p. 518-520)

Luther believed that everyone, as they were able, had a responsibility to pitch in and provide for the needs of their churches and schools as a service to God and his intended order of society.

**Luther the Educator**

**Pastor.** A thorough understanding of Luther’s view of education must entail not only his philosophical and theoretical contentions, but also the practical way he fulfilled the role of educator. Among these, the role of pastor might be paramount: “Our pastor, preacher [. . .] shall maintain a constant and faithful supervision over this office of teaching school and governing the youth; every Sunday as need may arise they shall consider this matter, take action, and implement it with the utmost seriousness” (Luther, 1524/1962, [Vol. 45] p. 161). These thoughts come from an ordinance Luther wrote pertaining to dealing with communal property and establishing a community chest of sorts in Leisnig. However, this excerpt also clearly demonstrated the Reformer’s contention that teaching was in the purview of the pastoral office. Later in the ordinance, he outlined that teachers who were hired derived their authority from the Pastor and were delegated on his behalf to teach:
The advice and approval of our elected pastor and preacher [. . .shall be sought] to call, appoint and dismiss a schoolmaster for young boys, whereby a pious, irreproachable, and learned man may be made responsible for the honorable and upright Christian training and instruction of the youth, a most essential function. This schoolmaster shall be required to train, teach, govern, and live at all times in conformity with and hold unswervingly to the mandate of the aforementioned ordinance for the pastoral office of our congregation which is deposited in the coffers of our common chest. (Luther, 1524/1962, [Vol. 45] p. 188)

This context shows the vital responsibility Luther believed to be vested in the pastoral office and the Church by extension in the general education of its people in all areas, not simply with respect to spiritual considerations (as one might think of ‘Sunday School,’ ‘Bible Study,’ or the like).

Luther’s self-reference through the lens of pastor and preacher helps to explain his own thought process when it concerned his considerable writings in the areas of teaching and education. Verifying Luther’s (1530/1959) own recognition of his role in this respect, his lectures on the Gospel of St. John provide a most vivid summation:

Ordinarily it is improper for a private person to testify of himself, but it is different with a public personage vested with authority. I am not a preacher of myself and for myself in this place, as the schismatic spirits are. Nor was it by choice or daring that I took over this office. No, I have testimony that I was asked and called into the ministry here. I am preaching at the request and behest of others. Otherwise let the devil do the preaching! Consequently, I am not a private person. I am not a preacher because my name happens to be Martin, but in view of the fact that I am called Doctor Martin or a preacher I am a
different person. [. . .] Thus I am a pastor, not by reason of my birth from my mother but on the strength of my call and my competence for this community service. I was not born into this office, but I was made and ordained a preacher. ([Vol. 23] p. 341)

Luther believed that the office as pastor uniquely charged him and others to be educators of the highest order.

**Teacher and professor.** Luther also filled the formal role of educator as a university professor. Part of this study has involved analysis of copious amounts of Luther’s classroom lectures. Luther’s formal career as an educator began when Johann von Staupitz, the Vicar General of the Augustinian order in Germany (in which Luther was a monk), who was also Luther’s Father Confessor at the time, became the first dean of the new University of Wittenberg and requested Luther’s services as a teacher in 1507. In 1512, Luther received his doctorate and became a member of the faculty and a department head. Luther maintained this position for the rest of his life, throughout the tumultuous period of the Reformation. Luther’s own philosophical, theological, and personal growth occurred during his tenure as a university professor, making his lectures a valuable source of information and a demonstration of his position and development as an educator. They have been cited throughout this paper accordingly.

**Housefather.** Another key role that shaped Luther’s views of education was his vocation as *hausvater*, or housefather. In his preface to the book of Tobit, Luther (1534/1960) described the apocryphal tome as perfect for the housefather, in that its text dealt with “the common man and housefather [as] a true teacher and comforter in all things” [Vol. 35] p. 347). Luther’s theology viewed the family unit as the source of all other authority, both sacred and secular. In his treatise, “The Estate of Marriage,” Luther (1522/1962) expounded upon this in greater depth:
Most certainly father and mother are apostles, bishops, and priests to their children, for it is they who make them acquainted with the gospel. In short, there is no greater or nobler authority on earth than that of parents over their children, for this authority is both spiritual and temporal. ([Vol. 45] p. 46)

The import of these words became more than theoretical for Luther in 1525, when he married his wife, Katharina von Bora, who like Luther had formerly been cloistered through monastic vows.

Martin and Katherina Luther conceived seven children, five of which lived past infancy and four that made it to adulthood, while also raising four orphaned children. A letter to the educator Marcus Crodel showed that Luther was not afraid to delegate his authority as housefather to other capable men to train his children. In the letter, Luther (1542/1975) detailed his expectations for the education of his firstborn, his son Hans (b. 1526), as well as the orphan Florian (his wife’s nephew, who was under his care). This letter also demonstrated Luther’s views regarding education in a group setting being more effective than private tutoring:

I am sending my son John to you so that you may add him to the boys who are to be drilled in grammar and music. Also, keep an eye on his conduct and correct it, for in the Lord I have great confidence in you. I shall liberally pay for your expenses, and you will please inform me how much he has progressed in [a certain] time, and how much one might expect of him. I have added the boy Florian, especially since I see that these boys need the example set by a crowd of many boys; this seems to me to accomplish more than individual, private education. But be very strict with this one, and if you can place him with a citizen, do it; otherwise send him back. May God prosper what has been begun. ([Vol. 50] pp. 231–232)
This citation showed Luther’s practical views of education in the context of his own children, which are perhaps even more instructive than his theoretical writings in their personal import.

This analysis of Luther’s educational paradigm has demonstrated his role as an educational reformer, with a philosophy firmly rooted in practical socio-economic and theological considerations. At the same time, it has also shown that Luther was significantly influenced by contemporary theological and philosophical thought and personal experience as both a student and teacher. This context will be helpful to keep in mind when considering Luther’s views on music.

**Luther’s Philosophy of Music**

A logical starting place in the exploration of Luther’s philosophy of music might be his proposed treatise on the subject, “On Music.” Unfortunately, the original manuscript no longer exists, meaning that it is not included in the 55 volumes of *Luther’s Works*. However, much can be gleaned simply from the context in which Luther proposed the treatise in 1530. By that time, nearly two decades since the nailing of his *Ninety-Five Theses*, Luther was an outlaw, kept in protective custody at Coburg Castle for his own safety. Although a significant Imperial Diet was occurring at Augsburg, which ultimately resulted in the signing and presentation of the Augsburg Confession to the Emperor, Luther was unable to attend the proceedings. In fact, he could not even pen the Augsburg Confession—which to this day is the chief article of the denomination that bears his name. Instead, that honor went to his trusted friend and lay colleague, Philipp Melanchthon.

At the fore of the debate that culminated in the Augsburg Confession was Luther’s theological teachings. One might expect, then, that theological content would be at the fore of his mind and the tip of his pen. Instead, Luther wrote a treatise “On Music” while confined in
Coburg Castle. Although the original is lost, Buszin (1946) and Leaver (2006) helpfully provided a translation of the outline, which was copied in the writings of Veit Deitrich (a theologian contemporary to Luther):

I love music.

He who despises music, as do all the fanatics, does not please me.

1. For music is a gift and largess of God, not a gift of men.

2. Music drives away the devil.

3. [Music] makes people happy; it induces one to forget all wrath, unchastity, arrogance, and other vices.

4. After theology I accord to music the highest place and the greatest honor.

   We note that David and all the saints used verse, rhymes, and songs to express their godly thoughts; quia pacis tempore regnat musica

5. For music reigns in days of peace.

   It will be difficult to keep these delightful skills after us, for they are of peace. The Dukes of Bavaria are to be praised in this, that they honor music. Among our Saxon [Dukes] weapons and cannons are esteemed. (Buszin, 1946, p. 88; Leaver, 2006, p. 126)

This outline is evidence of a profound change in thought from the paradigm of the preceding century. First, Luther opened with an expression of his “love” of music, referring to it as something experienced, rather than the theoretical. Leaver (2006) pointed out that medieval treatises on music heavily focused on the theoretical nature of music as mathematical. Luther, in contrast, simply stated that he “love[s] music.” In other words, he was focused on the experiential aspects of music—as something to be performed, listened to, and experienced, rather than a construct in the abstract. In some ways, this was prototypical of more modern aesthetic
views of music. At the same time, Tarry (1973) observed that the Greek doctrine of ethos was pivotal in Luther’s aesthetics theory. Put briefly, the ancient Greeks used the concept of ethos (lit. “character”) to both describe fundamental beliefs inherent to an ideology or community and as a description of the power of music to influence human emotion and behavior. Both of these senses of ethos are evident in Luther’s “love” of music.

He substantiated this “love” on the basis that music is 1) an objective creation of God, not something dreamt by men, along with 2) its objective ability to drive away evil, 3) the decidedly humanist idea that music can affect the mood of people, and the fact that he 4) closely links theology with music. The proposed treatise would conclude with the consideration that 5) music is the provenance of prosperous, progressive societies, and effective governments would do well to support the art accordingly. Although this outline was never fully fleshed-out by the Reformer, a careful analysis of his writings will demonstrate that this outline formed the basis of his musical philosophy and output.

**Music as a Gift of God**

Luther believed music was ontologically woven into the fabric of nature. Throughout his writings, he described natural operations in musical terms. In his lectures on the Psalms, he analogized “works” or daily tasks with “songs,” particularly in the context of antiphonal chants (Luther, 1514/1976, [Vol 11] p. 104ff). Throughout his letters, sermons, and other writings, he frequently referred to non-musical operations in musical terms. In a very real way, he believed:

From the beginning of the world it has been instilled and implanted in all creatures, individually and collectively. For nothing is without sound or harmony, Even the air, which of itself is invisible and imperceptible to all our senses, and which, since it lacks both voice and speech, is the least musical of all things, becomes sonorous, audible, and
comprehensible when it is set in motion. (Luther, 1538/1965, [Vol. 53] p. 321)

Luther (1535/1958) elaborated on the relationship of music to the created order in his lectures on Genesis, where he described the very operation of the cosmos in musical terms, in keeping with the Pythagorean philosophical paradigm of the ancient Greeks:

> We have become deaf toward what Pythagoras aptly terms this wonderful and most lovely music coming from the harmony of the motions that are in the celestial spheres. But because men continually hear this music, they become deaf to it. ([Vol. 1] p. 125)

Ultimately, Luther (1524/1962) defined music as part of the “whole of mathematics,” in keeping with Pythagorean principles ([Vol. 45], p. 369). In this way, Luther’s view of music was that it constituted an objective discipline with properties innate to its creation.

That particular term, ‘creation,’ points to another important factor in Luther’s understanding of music as one of the greatest gifts from God. Like Socrates, who viewed music as a divine gift, Luther (1538/1965) believed music was a gift of God. He thought that music was “properly” used for the “benefit” of Christians and in praise of their Creator:

> I would certainly like to praise music with all my heart as the excellent gift of God which it is and to commend it to everyone. But I am so overwhelmed by the diversity and magnitude of its virtue and benefits that I can find neither beginning nor end or method for my discourse. As much as I want to commend it, my praise is bound to be wanting and inadequate. For who can comprehend it all? ([Vol. 53] p. 321)

Luther’s understanding of music as created by God with objective qualities endemic to its created nature resulted in somewhat of a dualistic understanding of musical products. Either musical works reflected the principles instilled in the art objectively by God, or they were perverted diabolically:
Take special care to shun perverted minds who prostitute this lovely gift of nature and of art with their erotic rantings; and be quite assured that none but the devil goads them on to defy their very nature which would and should praise God its Maker with this gift, so that these bastards purloin the gift of God and use it to worship the foe of God, the enemy of nature and of this lovely art. (Luther, 1538/1965, [Vol. 53] p. 323)

This fundamental dichotomy between good and evil latent in Christian thought was a key part of Luther’s musical philosophy.

**Music and Behavior**

Luther’s caution against perverting influences in the art of music are indicative of the secondary aspect of ethos latent to the ancient Greeks’ philosophical definition, or the ability to affect behavior and mood. This was the primary Aristotelian view at the time, a view that significantly influenced the later humanist philosophers of the Renaissance. Luther held that music had significant properties in this regard. In his “Preface for All Good Hymnals,” Luther (1538/1965) wrote a poem in the voice of “Dame Music,” which began:

> Of all the joys upon this earth
> None has for men a greater worth
> Than what I give with my ringing
> And with voices sweetly singing.
> There cannot be an evil mood
> Where there are singing fellows good,
> There is no envy, hate, nor ire,
> Gone are through me all sorrows dire. ([Vol. 53] p. 317)
This poetic reference demonstrated the power that Luther attributed to music in its relationship to human mood and behavior. This and other influences of humanism on Luther’s philosophy will be examined in greater depth in following sections, particularly those dealing with his compositional strategies.

**Music’s Power over Evil**

Luther’s belief in the affective power of music also translated into the spiritual dimension. In a treatise on the last words of King David, relating to the narrative of not-yet-King David playing music to drive out an “evil spirit” from then-King Saul, Luther (1526/1972) wrote:

> The music, or the notes, which are a wonderful creation and gift of God, help materially in this, especially when the people sing along and reverently participate. In 2 Kings 3:15 we read that the spirit of prophecy was aroused in the prophet Elisha by a psaltery, on which psalms were obviously played after the manner of David. David, too, often banished the evil spirit of Saul or restrained and subdued it with his lyre, as we read in 1 Sam. 16:23. ([Vol. 15] p. 273)

Elsewhere, Luther (1530/1972) expounded his belief in the power of music to “manifest proof [of this is the fact] that the devil, the creator of saddening cares and disquieting worries, takes flight at the sound of music almost as he takes flight at the word of theology” ([Vol. 49] p. 428).

**Music and Theology**

Luther’s view of music was also shaped by a lifetime of interaction with the art in both sacred and secular contexts, albeit that dichotomy is a bit anachronistic given the significance of ecclesial power at that time. Although “secular” forms, like drinking songs, were not foreign to the Reformer—he actually quoted one in a letter to his wife (Luther, 1534/1975, [Vol. 50] p. 81)
—one of the most notable and impactful of the Reformer’s interactions with music came in the form of his experience of music in an ecclesiastical context. A modern aesthetic philosophy of music might view its employ in the context of worship as something functional and distinct from the pure aesthetic experience of music in its own right. But for Luther, the distinction between musical experience in the abstract and worship as musical experience was not as profound. In fact, Luther wrote of the profound relationship between music and theology, such that he viewed the two as the most exceptional of all the arts and as having many of the same functions, including that they could drive out the devil. Luther (1530/1972) went so far as to say that, next to theology, music “alone produces what otherwise only theology can do, namely, a calm and joyful disposition” ([Vol. 49] p. 428).

Luther wrote of the impact that church music had in his own devotional life in the context of its effect on his mood, providing evidence of his humanist philosophy in personal experience. Concerning the responsory for Compline from Psalm 4:8, which Luther would have sung every evening during his monastic days and, possibly, from his childhood at Latin and cathedral schools, he said, “this tenor melody has delighted me from youth on, and does so even more now that I understand the words” (Luther, 1530/1972, [Vol. 49] p. 428). Though Luther recognized the impact of the personal meaning he derived from the words, he also acknowledged the implicit power of the music itself, divorced from its theological context in his youth, as having the power to delight and lift his spirits in ways that no other pursuit was able.

Music in Peace

There is ample evidence that Luther viewed music as something that was the property of progressive and peaceful civilizations. In one table talk, he is reported to have said that music was a “commodity” which “benefits all,” should not be used “for pay,” and lacks individuals
willing to “learn or love it” (Luther, 1537/1967, [Vol. 54] p. 246). This view of music as something that is a “commodity” indicative of progress is not limited to the table talks. In his lectures on Genesis, Luther (1535/1958) interpreted the occupations of the descendants of Cain recorded at the beginning of the book along these lines:

Some became shepherds; others, workers in bronze; still others devoted themselves to music, in order to obtain from the descendants of Adam grain and other products of the earth which they needed for their support. But if the Cainites had been so hard pressed by hunger, they would have forgotten their harp and the other musical instruments in their poverty. There is no room for music among people who suffer hunger and thirst. ([Vol. 1] p. 317)

This seems to demonstrate a peculiar view Luther held that music is something that societies suffering from material difficulties do not actively engage in. This view may stem from his overly dualistic view of music as either reflective of the creative work of God in the operation of the cosmos or as a corruption of the devil.

**Luther the Musician**

Luther’s belief in the power of music to influence human mood, behavior, and spirituality was not constrained solely to the theoretical realm. Luther’s philosophical considerations stemmed from personal experience and the influences of key figures and ideologies in his life. In many ways, his considerations neatly aligned with the predominance of humanism in the flourishing period of the Renaissance, which arguably gave birth to the Reformation as a movement. These influences can also be seen in Luther’s musical experience as a performer and a composer.

**Performer and Student.** In one sense, Luther was critical of his musical performance, if
one might call it that, in an ecclesiastical context under the monastic system. Regarding this musical engagement, he described his musical performance as involved with “painstakingly distinguishing one part from another, […] making proper pauses and phrases, giving the closest attention to these details […] regarding for just one thing, and that is how well, how devotedly, and how commendably the office has been read or sung” (Luther, 1521/1966, [Vol. 44] p. 324). Although Luther criticized this practice under the monastic system as a way in which proper focus on theological constructs was obscured by secondary considerations (i.e., liturgical formality), it also demonstrated his acute awareness of minute musical detail in the realm of performance. Although Luther wished for the Word to be paramount in ecclesiastical contexts, that does not mean he rejected excellence in music outright.

For his own part, Luther was an accomplished tenor, lutenist, and flautist. What is more, he studied music extensively from a young age, as Kolb (2018) pointed out in highlighting Luther’s beginning studies in music from his time at Mansfeld and in the church school. Leaver (2017) further demonstrated Luther’s expertise by examining the curriculum of the University of Erfurt, which was the most prestigious university in Germany when Luther attended at the turn of the 16th century. The university required study of the Musica speculativa secundum Boetium of Johannes de Muris as part of a one-month intensive for all students of the baccalaureate program at that time. This meant that Luther extensively studied music theory at one of the premiere universities of his time as a requisite part of the curriculum.

Musical Authority. Luther’s extensive training and arguable expertise in the art of music made him a sort of authority among his peers in musical matters. In part, this could be attributed to his popularity as a leading personality of the era. For example, Georg Rhau, one of J. S. Bach’s musical predecessors at St. Thomas in Leipzig, who was also known as an early printer of
musical collections, was so infatuated with the Reformer that he relocated to his base of operations in Wittenberg. Rhau later solicited Luther to write a preface for a series of symphonies in 1538, titled *Symphoniae iucundae*, or “Delightful Symphonies” (Luther, 1538/1965, [Vol. 53] p. 321). This tome, which this study quoted extensively in its section on Luther’s humanist view of music, explained the Reformer’s belief in the power of music to affect the mood and, generally, to extol “this great art” (*ibid.*).

In a different instance, the City Council of Leisnig appealed to Luther’s musical authority to provide ordinances for proper singing and music in ecclesiastical contexts, among other requests. To this Luther (1523/1972) replied:

I willingly make my services available on the other two points for which you, dear Friends, have asked my help: namely, to organize the office of pastor on the basis of Scripture, and to prepare an ordinance for singing, praying, and Scripture reading—although by God’s grace you have among yourselves the God-given talent to do this, and are not in need of my poor abilities. ([Vol. 49] pp. 31f.)

This demonstrated Luther’s important role as an influential arbiter of various facets of ecclesial and civic administration, including in the musical realm.

**Luther as Composer. The Deutsche Messe.** An appeal to the Reformer’s musical authority was perhaps no more clearly seen than in his composition of the *Deutsche Messe*. In the early period of the Reformation, there was discord among those loyal to the movement concerning the composition of a veritable German Mass. Initial attempts by various individuals to construct and compose a vernacular iteration of the Mass were not favorably viewed. Luther himself was hesitant to create such a Mass for a number of key reasons. In one sense, he was afraid of issuing a musical form that would be viewed as somehow binding simply because he
had composed it. In principle, Luther (1525/1958) believed there was room for diversity in music both in the Church and otherwise:

I am happy the mass now is held among the Germans in German. But to make a necessity of this, as if it had to be so, is again too much. This spirit cannot do anything else than continually create laws, necessity, problems of conscience, and sin. (Luther, 1525/1958, [Vol 40] p. 140)

This contention was not strictly in terms of a desire for diversity, but also as a check against a legalistic enforcement of a German Mass for its own sake.

Luther’s secondary concern more clearly revealed his musical convictions: he wanted it to be excellent—he did not want to simply provide another entry to the cacaphony of musically inferior vernacular Masses that were already proliferating in Germany. Thus it was not until October 29th of 1525, some eight years after the posting of his Ninety-Five Theses, that Luther first published his German Mass. In a Sermon from that date, he expressed his final acquiescence:

We have started our efforts to hold a German Mass. [. . .] I have resisted to make an effort concerning the German Mass for so long [. . .] but since so many people from all countries now have asked me in writing and letters [. . .], [we] must think and accept that it is God's will. (Luther, 1525, as cited in Leaver, 2007, p. 183).

Luther seemed to recognize the public demand for a German Mass as a sort of divine mandate to employ his musical creativity toward that end.

Luther’s German Mass, as a composition, showed the principles of his musical philosophy in a practical way. In particular, the humanist ideals of the era were on full display. At the time of the Renaissance, humanist philosophy identified specific emotions with each of the eight church modes. Luther’s use of specific church modes in the composition of the Mass
corroborated with these traditional associations. He explained his modal intention in this regard to his kantor Johann Walther as such:

"Christ is a friendly Lord, and his sayings are gentle, therefore, we want to take the Sextum Tonum for the Gospel; and because St. Paul is a serious Apostle, we want to appoint the Octavum Tonum for the Epistle." (Luther, n.d., as quoted in Walther, 1565, as quoted in Leaver, 2007, p. 333).

As the longest and most intricate of all his compositions, the way Luther weaved mode and melody throughout the Deutsche Messe demonstrated his compositional ingenuity most clearly. In addition to the context explained above, the chant tone for the Gospel cleverly moved the voice of Christ an octave lower than the rest of the narrative chant (see Figure 1).

![Figure 1--Luther’s composition of the Gospel chant. (Luther, 1525/1965, [Vol. 53] p. 75)](image)

In addition to reflecting Luther’s humanist ideals (i.e., the first mode reflected deep piety in the humanist schema), its employ here was also indicative of Luther’s desire to utilize music as a means to teach the people. This was demonstrated throughout the various canticles of the
Deutsche Messe. The melodic theme used in the Kyrie, for example, is revisited in the Agnus Dei. A comparable symmetry is also found between the Gloria and the Sanctus. The musical nuance of the Service, however subtly, points to the Reformer’s compositional ingenuity, such that he actually created a clever symmetry between the two halves of the service, facilitating his ultimate goal of relaying key teachings through specific modes and motifs (See Appendix A). He specifically wanted the people to understand that the Communion portion of the Mass corresponded to the readings of the Word, such that they were both pure Gospel, in contradistinction to the Papal understanding.

The Chorale. Next to the Deutsche Messe, Luther’s most prolific musical output was realized in the chorale. The Reformer is credited with composing and arranging over 45 chorales along with their attendant prose (Kelley, 1957). In fact, Schalk (1988) described Luther’s role as pivotal in the development of the chorale as a musical form, a development in Western music with far-reaching implications that remain undisputed. In a letter to George Spalatin in 1523, Luther (1523/1972) described his intention regarding the chorale as a construct:

[Our] plan is to follow the example of the prophets and the ancient fathers of the church, and to compose psalms for the people [in the] vernacular, that is, spiritual songs, so that the Word of God may be among the people also in the form of music. ([Vol. 49] p. 69)

Like the Deutsche Messe, the invention of the chorale demonstrated the intimate connection between music and spirituality that existed in Luther’s paradigm. He literally believed the Word of God was extant “in the form of music.” Luther also wanted the chorales to enable congregational participation in music, rather than having music be strictly the provenance of the church choir and professional musicians. Luther wanted the chorales to be simple enough
to enable children to participate, but with beauty in their simplicity as befitted their nature as vehicles that conveyed the Word of God.

In this context, it is particularly noteworthy that Luther called his chorales “German Psalms.” His chorales were intended to function as the Psalter in Scripture, but in an idiomatic way that related to the common tongue of the common people. To this end, many of his earliest hymns, such as perhaps his most famous *Ein Feste Burg ist unser Gott* (A Mighty Fortress is our God), or the so-called Battle Hymn of the Reformation, *Ach Gott vom Himmel sieh Darein* (O Lord, Look Down From Heav’n, Behold), were based on the Psalter—Psalms 46 and 12, respectively. For Luther, the Psalter provided an example *par excellence* of music, which in his worldview consisted literally of the Word of God. Of course, only the texts of the Psalms were extant in the Scriptures of Luther’s time, so the musical context of the Psalter was strictly associated with the chant melodies of the medieval papal church. It is unsurprising, then, that many of Luther’s chorales were based on ancient Gregorian melodies and hymns, such as *Nun Komm der Heiden Heiland* (Savior of the Nations, Come), based on the ancient Latin melody *Veni redemptor gentium*, or his paraphrase, *Allein Gott in der Höh sei Ehr*, based on the ancient Gregorian *Gloria* for the Paschal season. Luther believed in the power of the music of these melodies in spite of dubious texts, as he said in his *Preface to Burial Hymns*:

This is also why we have collected the fine music and songs which under the papacy were used at vigils, masses for the dead, and burials, [. . .] But we have adapted other texts to the music so that it may adorn our article of the resurrection, instead of purgatory with its torment and satisfaction which lets their dead neither sleep nor rest. The melodies and notes are precious. It would be a pity to let them perish. (Luther, 1542/1965, [Vol. 53] p. 326)
This further demonstrated his belief in music’s capacity to have an inherent quality that is separate from--albeit innately connected to--the text.

**Luther and the Psalter**

Luther’s writings on the Psalter, particularly in a theological context, also shed light on his views of music. Luther viewed the Psalter as concealing deeper teachings exposited in the New Testament. In his exposition of Psalm 49, Luther (1513/1974) explained how this was analogous to the way musical instruments functioned, such that they “do not produce a word, but only a sound (that is, a sound that is not articulated by syllables that are intellectually significative, but only sound that is perceived by the senses)” ([Vol 10] p. 228f). Going even further, he compared this in the context of his hermeneutic of Law and Gospel, such that:

> The entire ancient law is only a voice or a sound, because it deals only with things subject to the senses, and the mystical meanings are without a word. For as through the incarnation of Christ the Word of God was added to the flesh, so the Spirit was revealed through the same. The Spirit is like the word of the voice and like the Godhead of the flesh. And so the prophet wants to say that Christ will open the word, the Spirit and hidden Godhead, on the psaltery. *(ibid.)*

This dichotomy was paramount in Luther’s theology, making its application in a musical context all the more profound.

The dichotomy of Law and Gospel permeated the way Luther viewed music, compositions, and even composers; commenting on Josquin de Paraz, Luther (1531/1967) said:

> What is law doesn’t make progress, but what is gospel does. God has preached the gospel through music, too, as may be seen in Josquin, all of whose compositions flow freely, gently, and cheerfully, are not forced or cramped by rules, and are like the song of
The employ of this dichotomy in musical terms seems to indicate that Luther viewed non-vocal music as almost “mystical,” containing deeper truths that can be exposted by text. This would corroborate with his humanist view of music as able to convey meaning simply on the basis of mode, which can be emphasized through the addition of text.

Luther’s love of the Psalter led him to actually compose a motet based on Psalm 118, “I Shall Not Die but Live (originally titled Non moriar sed vivam D. Martin Lutheri III vocum aus seinem schönen Confitemini; see Appendix B), which had provided him comfort during his stay at Coburg Castle. But his fondness for the Psalter was also engendered through years of praying it in the monastic tradition. This underlying passion was evidenced in a letter to Louis Senfl, a relatively famous court composer from the period. In the letter, Luther commissioned Senfl to compose a setting of one of his favorite verses from the Psalter, itself from the monastic Office of Compline, “in peace [I will both lie down and sleep].” (Incidentally, this letter is also the provenance of one of Luther’s (1530/1972) most well-known dictums, “except for theology there is no art that could be put on the same level with music,” [Vol. 49] p. 428). So, too, Luther’s last words on his deathbed were none other than the Responsory from Compline: “Into Thy Hands, O Lord, I commend my spirit; For Thou has redeemed me, O Lord, Thou God of Truth” (Psalm 31:5).

**Music and Family**

The significance of Luther’s humanist philosophy is evident in the unique ways that interpersonal relationships affected his musical output. His concern for the common people has already been demonstrated in his compositional technique in the Deutsche Messe and his
chorales. But an important influence was also found in the persons closest to Luther, namely his beloved wife Katie and their children.

One of Luther’s original melodies and texts, *Vom Himmel Hoch* (From Heaven Above), was not based on a Latin chant or church song, but rather was likely composed specifically for his children. Some scholars even contend that Luther used the hymn as “a miniature Christmas pageant” of sorts, its stanzas divided “with the angel singing stanzas 1–5, individual children stanzas 7–14, and stanzas 6 and 15 sung by the whole group” (Leupold, 1965, [Vol. 53] p. 289). One can almost imagine the Reformer using his lute to accompany the folk-like melody, which has the character of many of the secular Christmas songs of that time. Though the pageantry may seem juvenile, it fits with Luther’s (1538/1965) own sentiments that, “if we wish to train children, we must become children with them” ([Vol. 53] p. 289).

**Luther’s Philosophy of Music Education**

The dictum, “if we wish to train children, we must become children with them” provides a useful segue into Luther’s writings on music education (*ibid.*). Although his writings on education and music distinctively are manifold, there is much less on the topic of music education directly. Still, the Reformer’s writings do contain a number of thoughts on the subject, from which even more can be inferred based on a careful consideration of his views on music and education.

**Writings on Music Education**

One of the most notable aspects of Luther’s writings on music education is the paramount role he placed on the discipline for school curricula. “For my part,” he wrote in 1524, “if I had children and could manage it, I would have them study not only languages and history, but also singing and music together with the whole of mathematics” (Luther, 1524/1962, [Vol. 45] p.
369). And, indeed, Luther followed through with this sentiment after the birth of his first child a mere two years later. In a letter dated 1542, he sent well-wishes to the composer Johann Walther, also commending his son to him “for learning music. For I, of course, produce theologians, but I also would like to produce grammarians and musicians” (Luther, 1542/1972, [Vol. 50] pp. 232–233). Luther valued musical development on the same level as theological (perhaps the most paramount in his worldview) and grammatical education.

Luther considered music one of the seven liberal arts that were part of a fundamental education in the classical tradition throughout the middle ages. This remained the case under the humanist paradigm. Specifically, music formed a part of the quadrivium, or the four academic disciplines (arithmetic, geometry, music, and astronomy). These built upon the trivium (grammar, logic, and rhetoric), which would be established in grammar schools. However, Butt (2004) pointed out that music’s inclusion in the medieval quadrivium was primarily in terms of musica theorica, or music theory, as an academic discipline. Musica practica, or performance/composition, in contrast, was considered a more ‘blue collar’ pursuit—so much so that a “‘true’ musician would not soil his hands" with performance (p. xiii). As Luther’s philosophy of music and his own musical training demonstrated, he viewed music in much more experiential terms than his medieval predecessors, a view that had significant implications beyond the theoretical medieval conception of music education. While Luther’s proposed design for schools was based upon the classical arrangement, humanist thought in Luther’s philosophy of music affected his view of how music should be addressed in education.

Luther’s design of a three-division school structure showed that he followed the classical model in incorporating music into the general curriculum he prescribed for Reformation-affiliated schools. For the first division, he simply directed: “These children shall also be taught
music and shall sing with the others, as we hope by God’s help to show later” (Luther, 1528/1958, [Vol. 40] p. 314). The inclusion of “singing” here shows the incorporation of *musica practica* in the Lutheran educational model, which was a fundamental shift from the medieval approach. Luther went on to prescribe for the second division: “the children, large and small, should practice music daily, the first hour in the afternoon,” while for the third he similarly prescribed: “Along with the others these shall rehearse music the hour after noon” (*ibid.*).

In addition to student curriculum, Luther’s views on music education also touched on the importance of teachers being trained musicians:

Music I have always loved. Whoever knows this art is a good sort, fit for anything. It is imperative that music be kept in schools. A schoolmaster must be able to sing, or I will not consider him, and a young man should not be ordained into the preaching ministry without first experiencing and practicing it in schools.” (Luther, n.d./1921, p. 84).

Luther believed that all music education stakeholders in his tradition—himself included—should be skilled in the art of music. He thought that “disdaining musical skills amounts to disdaining propriety” (Luther, 1539/1971, [Vol. 38] p. 265). This included pastors (see the section above on music and the pastorate) and parents, such that “parents and guardians” were expected to hear recitations of singing from their children in the learning of theological hymns (Luther, 1525/1965, [Vol. 53] p. 65).

This theological connection, particularly to hymns, also points to another important facet of Luther’s writings on music education. In his preface to the *Wittenberg Hymnal of 1538*, Luther (1538/1965) contended:

These songs were arranged in four parts to give the young—who should at any rate be trained in music and other fine arts—something to wean them away from love ballads
and carnal songs and to teach them something of value in their place, thus combining the good with the pleasing, as is proper for youth. Nor am I of the opinion that the gospel should destroy and blight all the arts, as some of the pseudo-religious claim. But I would like to see all the arts, especially music, used in the service of Him who gave and made them. I therefore pray that every pious Christian would be pleased with this [the use of music in the service of the gospel] and lend his help if God has given him like or greater gifts. As it is, the world is too lax and indifferent about teaching and training the young for us to abet this trend. God grant us his grace. Amen. ([Vol. 53] p. 316)

Although not specifically referenced as part of a curriculum like the one described above, this reference showed a primitive understanding of hymnals as a viable way for young people to learn to sing music, even in SATB choral settings, as well as Luther’s expectation that children would be otherwise trained in theory to aid in this function. And it also highlighted the intimate role Luther believed existed between music education and theology, a thought that underpinned his whole educational paradigm.

While Luther’s writings on music in education did not specifically reference creativity in music education in a curriculum, he did discuss music education’s ability to engage the learner in the creative work of God through musical composition (in this case describing polyphony specifically):

But when [musical] learning is added to all this and artistic music which corrects, develops, and refines the natural music, then at last it is possible to taste with wonder (yet not to comprehend) God’s absolute and perfect wisdom in his wondrous work of music. Here it is most remarkable that one single voice continues to sing the tenor, while at the same time many other voices play around it, exulting and adorning it in
exuberant strains and, as it were, leading it forth in a divine roundelay, so that those who are the least bit moved know nothing more amazing in this world. (Luther, 1538/1965, [Vol. 53] p. 324)

In a very real sense, Luther believed that musical creativity constituted a participation in the divine, which in any event should form a part of the learning and developmental process.

**A Synthesis of Luther’s Philosophy of Music Education**

On the basis of this thorough analysis of Luther’s writings on music, education, and music education, the following synthesis of his philosophy of music education can be drawn. First, music formed a vital part of the human condition within the Reformer’s paradigm. Ontologically, Luther believed music was woven into the fabric of nature and was a primary way humanity could communicate with God. This consideration was preeminent in his worldview. In this light, Luther believed music should form a key part of the educational process given its core relationship to the human experience. To this end, he believed in the universality of music education, and that it should form one of the fundamental parts of education from the elementary level on through rigorous daily study. He believed all teachers and music education stakeholders should be thoroughly trained in music to facilitate in this goal.

Due to the fundamental importance Luther placed on music education within the context of education as a whole, Luther strongly believed in the importance of individual agency in ensuring the propagation of the same. This responsibility was a fundamental aspect of the parental vocation, the authority of which extended to both the Church and the State. In the realm of the Church, he believed that pastors, with whom the ultimate responsibility for education in the Church rested, along with the teachers under them, should be thoroughly equipped and funded to ensure that music education was provided to the students in their care. Where parents
or the Church are without the means to provide this, Luther believed it was the responsibility of
the secular authorities to step in and ensure that its citizens are properly cared for in this regard.

In terms of the curricular aspects of music education, Luther believed that the learning of
music necessitated study of theory and the fundamentals, which he almost took for granted as a
bedrock for the study of music in an ensemble setting. While specific theory texts were not
recommended by the Reformer’s writings, inferences can be made based on the theory methods
he was familiar with from his own elementary, secondary, and university experiences. Although
Luther criticized certain aspects of his medieval training, particularly its lack of emphasis on the
experiential, he did not eschew the theoretical.

But unlike his medieval predecessors, Luther believed in the experiential aspect of music,
so much so that he also took for granted that children would be trained in SATB choral singing,
for which purpose he pioneered and wrote a prolific number of chorales. The use of hymnody in
music education also points to Luther’s belief in the use of others’ musical works to help
understand the development of music historically and interpersonally. While Luther did not
commend specific works beyond chorales to this end, we can make inferences based on his
general curricular suggestions (see Luther, 1528/1958, [Vol. 40] p. 314-319). In studying Latin
in the classical tradition, Luther prescribed the use of classical works as a basis to study and learn
the language. A similar approach in musical instruction would have been just as sensible in using
the works of master composers. Considering Luther’s writings about master composers and their
works he admired, we can infer a similar usage in the realm of music. To wit, the use of ancient
Gregorian melodies and historical church music would also fit within this paradigm, as was
evidenced by Luther’s own compositions and preferring of liturgical music for pedagogical
reasons.
In terms of musical experience and creativity, Luther believed that practically experiencing music was a participation in the creative work of God Himself, a paramount consideration in his philosophical framework. Pedagogically speaking, making the same inferences as above, we can trace Luther’s prescriptions through the three divisions of his school design. Luther believed that music was experiential, something that required an active participation even as a listener. In learning the fundamentals, this mode of learning would give way to the performative (personal repetition of classical examples), improvisatory (exploring in spontaneous musical creativity), and compositional (employing logical and rhetorical nuance to develop an original product). Luther prescribed this succession in his educational design for the learning of Latin. These creative modes of learning correspond neatly to the creative listening, performance, improvisation, and composition that are fundamental in conceptions of creativity in music education today.

While Luther contended for music’s value as something to be personally experienced, its ancillary benefits were also part of his philosophy. He believed music could affect mood and behavior, which made it particularly valuable in an educational context with respect to student productivity. He also strongly believed in music’s interdisciplinary applications, ranging from the other liberal arts/mathematics to theology itself, with which he thought it shared the most intimate connection. In the end, the pedagogical connection between music and theology would probably be the Reformer’s paramount consideration in an educational context, since theological concerns reigned supreme in his educational paradigm entirely. But this would have been a holistic paradigm, incorporating all of the preceding contentions within its framework. The point of music education, like all education, was an expression of fidelity for the glory of God. This was accomplished through making use of His gifts for personal enrichment and with a view
toward service and love of one’s neighbor. In short, Luther championed music education so that students could excel as musicians to the best of their ability, something Luther believed should be a person’s goal in any vocation or pursuit as the ultimate expression of fidelity.

**Luther’s Philosophy of Music Education and Contemporary Lutheran Pedagogy**

The influences of Luther’s philosophies of music, education, and music education were evident immediately in the fledgling Reformation movement and remained so in the centuries that followed. In keeping with Luther’s view of music as experiential, the Lutheran Church after him became known by the moniker of the “singing Church” and produced some of the most well-known composers in the Western canon to this day, including Pachelbel, Praetorius, Scheidt, Buxtehude, Bach, Mendelssohn, and countless others, who were products of its system of music education. Butt (2004) in particular demonstrated the historical development of music education in the Lutheran church in the 16th and 17th centuries, specifically highlighting the philosophical incorporation of performance *and* composition into the umbrella *musica practica* approach to music education, which was conceptualized by Luther’s view of music as experiential in contradistinction to the medieval approach.

The implementation of Luther’s philosophy of (music) education was also evident in the establishment of an extensive school system sponsored by the jurisdictions that came to be under the influence of the Lutheran Church. Although these schools were predominantly sponsored by congregation members, patrons, and parents in the earlier centuries of the Reformation movement, there were occasional state sponsorships where possible and as need dictated. However, as the state’s role in administrating churches grew (culminating in a firmly established state church), so did the level of resources available from governmental sources. Wolf (1977) briefly surveyed what this looked like in practice, also explaining the hierarchical structural of
Lutheran parish schools, which often stretched parish musicians beyond their liturgical duties into serving the dual-role of schoolmaster in order to ensure a rigorous music education—and save coin. Bach himself served as a famous example of this multiplicity of functions within the ecclesial context (Butt, 2004).

Wolf (1977) also specifically highlighted the transition of the parochial school system from the context of state oversight in Europe to the United States after the significant immigration of German Lutherans in the 19th century. This migration was precipitated by a dissatisfaction with the state churches in Saxony and a desire for more religious freedom. The case study Johann Gottfried Schmauk, a music educator whose musical strategies and songbooks influenced other pivotal music educators in a secular context during that period, provided an instructive example of the transformation of Lutheran schools to a new world context, which involved much more patronage, sacrifice, and dedication on the part of the Lutheran pioneers without the state sponsorships that existed in Germany.

This period of Americanization of the Lutheran school system also brought other changes. This section will provide a brief analysis of contemporary Lutheran music education as it exists today in the United States in two key areas. First, it will analyze modern Lutheran philosophical approaches to music education from various contemporary 21st century authors and compare them to Luther’s philosophy. Then, it will broadly analyze the Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod (WELS) parochial school system (the church body in which the author is a musician) for practical similarities and differences from the approach to music education proffered by Luther.

A Brief Survey of 21st Century Lutheran Philosophies of Music Education
In considering the contemporary philosophy of Lutheran Education in the 21st century United States, the anthological collection *The Pedagogy of Faith: Essays on Lutheran Education* (2016) proved an invaluable resource. The reference book described itself as a state of the art "guide and resource" for Lutheran educators written by leading experts in American Lutheran education. In examining the table of contents of the anthology, one can immediately note that music is only referenced once amid the 39 essays—and that in the 25th chapter. A careful search of the other essays yielded the following references to music in the context of Lutheran education.

Aside from the prefaces describing the contents of the book, the first reference to music in the anthology occurred in Schmidt’s (2016) chapter, "The Role and Importance of Lutheran Schools," in the context of the ways that Lutheran schools can engage families within the congregation: "children's choirs [that] provide musical offerings" on Sundays (par. 15) and schools can influence their communities through "the arts with music and the visual arts" (par. 19). Oberdeck's (2016) "God's Design of the Brain" similarly referred to music in the context of the other arts as an evangelical tool: "the arts--music, drama, painting, poetry, and literature--are especially helpful tools in communicating the Gospel" (par. 20). Pingel's (2016) "The Tip of the Spear: Turning the Mission on for Off-Campus Employees" referred to music educators in the context of typically extracurricular positions: "athletic coaches, drama and music directors, forensics and student council mentors, to name a few, are the tip of the spear in terms of your school's public identity, visibility, and community perception" (par. 6). Aside from one passing reference to music as something an author utilized for personal enrichment, the final reference to music in the tome occurred in "Welcoming and Incorporating the Homeschool Family into the
Lutheran School Community,” where Kortze and Kortze (2016) referred to music among other 
"specialized subjects" that can attract a homeschooled family to a Lutheran parochial school:

Many Lutheran elementary schools are also offering attractive specialized subject areas 
such as music, art, and drama, which may interest a growing family as well. Students 
who can be successfully integrated into these settings can experience the best of both 
educational worlds. (par. 6)

Although these are ancillary references to music within the tome, not the primary essay 
dealing with music within the anthology, they nevertheless point to certain paradigms within 
contemporary Lutheran education that seem at odds with Luther’s philosophy at a cursory 
glance. First, these references to music are almost entirely ensemble-oriented, particularly in an 
extracurricular context, and geared toward what affect these ensembles might have on the 
community or a certain program. One reference goes so far as to refer to music as a “specialized 
subject,” in the vein of an extracurricular like “drama.” Luther’s philosophical consideration of 
music as the fundamental art next to theology that should be an integral part of daily elementary 
and secondary education would probably not agree with this classification. Nor would he rest his 
educational paradigm on what music programs can offer to the community. In fact, this 
consideration as it is described by these authors did not seem to enter his thought process at all. 
While he did believe that music served the community in the formation of potential future 
citizen-servants, as well as through singing in the church, at the elementary level Luther 
emphasized the role that the community played in serving its schools by ensuring a rigorous 
educational process for the betterment of the student first and foremost, rather than in 
consideration of the immediate effect the student might have on the community.
The main essay pertaining to music education, "The Role of Music in Teaching the Faith," was written by Dr. Kenneth Kosche (2016). Dr. Kosche is a professor emeritus of music at Concordia University Wisconsin, the premiere ministerial and teacher's college of the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod (and also this author’s alma mater), as well as an active parish musician, composer, and writer. He might be thus considered one of the leading experts on music education in contemporary Lutheranism. Looking first at his choice of title, one might be initially reminded of the philosophical connection Luther made between music and theology. The connection Kosche proffered between music and the faith seems to fall within this vein. However, upon closer inspection, Kosche’s usage seems to champion music primarily as a tool to teach the faith; although Luther did say music was “second” to theology, he also indicated that it was a special creation of God in its own right and a discipline so fundamental to nature and education that it is worthy of its own study independent of “the faith” (in the same way that mathematics might be studied without frequent theological discourse).

That being said, Kosche began his essay by stating "words and music independently affect heart and mind significantly. [. . .] Propagandists of every era wrote words and tunes to influence public behavior" (par. 1). This is certainly in keeping with Luther’s humanist philosophy of music, which emphasized the power of music to affect human mood and behavior. However, the connection Kosche made between “words and music” belied an underlying perception of music’s power to have a spiritual effect as largely dependent on text. This was made especially clear a little further on in the essay, where he clearly stated:

Purely instrumental or keyboard music, unless it reminds one of Christian texts, does nothing for faith formation. There is much music that sounds noble and can stir the emotions, such as Bach organ music. However, faith comes from the “Word of Christ.”
For purely aesthetic reasons, please do teach your children Bach, but for faith formation, you must sing words. (par. 10)

In one sense, Luther would not deny the necessity of Scripture for the development of the faith. At the same time, Luther believed that music, meaning the notes and sounds themselves, held spiritual power, even to drive out demons. Further, Luther’s prescriptions regarding the study of music emphasized its interdisciplinary application beyond simple aesthetics.

On the whole, this anthology seemed to indicate an underlying stream of thought in modern Lutheran education that relegates music’s role to an ancillary tool for propagating the faith and outreach. It is particularly telling that there was not a single reference to the study of music in a way that is distinct from hymnody or ensemble performance. While Luther certainly held to a paradigm of music’s power as an intimate form of spirituality and faith formation, his philosophy of music education was much more nuanced than the one presented by these modern educators, particularly in terms of institutional structure and in the curricular design of theoretical approaches and experiential performance and creativity. In the section that follows, these more practical elements of music education will be considered through specific examples from an American Lutheran parochial school system.

**Music Education in the Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod**

The Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod (WELS) is the third largest Lutheran institution in the United States, with a total membership of 353,753 (History, 2020). In spite of its relatively small size compared to other denominations, the parochial school system maintained by the WELS is a tribute to Luther’s educational reforms. As of the 2019-20 school year, the WELS had the fourth largest private school system in the United States, with 120 standalone early childhood programs (ECM), 37 standalone elementary schools (LES), 252
combined ECM and LES, 25 high schools, two preparatory high schools, two colleges, and one seminary (School Statistics, 2020).

Philosophically, the WELS parochial school system follows a number of Luther’s prescriptions. Luther’s charge to establish schools at various levels for the training of children in a Christian context seems to be taken seriously by the WELS. His specific admonishment to parents and congregations in particular appears to have taken root, as most of the schools listed above are reported as being supported by individual and congregational patronage. Within the WELS, generally speaking, in following Luther’s philosophy, pastors are viewed preeminently within congregations and their parish schools as bearing the ultimate spiritual responsibility for education (ibid.).

At the high school level, congregations are supported by a consortium of congregations. The Synod in whole also sponsors congregations in areas that are considered missions. In many ways, this heavy emphasis on local responsibility for educational institutions seems to be a return to Luther’s original paradigm as opposed to relying primarily on state sponsorship as occurred in the 17th and 18th centuries in Germany. At the same time, more recently WELS schools have not been afraid to accept government funds in the form of school choice programs, which have been employed to allow students from disadvantaged communities to attend with government funding (ibid.). This is still not inconsistent with Luther’s belief that the state should provide, as means allow, where parents and other stakeholders are unable to provide for the education of their children.

Another aspect of the WELS approach to music education that echoes Luther’s writings is seen in the importance of schoolteachers and pastors being trained in music. All future elementary teachers are required to take three credit hours of a general survey of fine arts or
music history course, along with three semesters of some kind of keyboard training and two semesters of vocal training (Elementary Education, 2020). For aspiring teachers specializing at the secondary level, there is a rigorous course of study for music education, though other specialized educators are only required to take the general survey course (Middle and Secondary Education, 2020). This is apparently out of sync with Luther’s expectation that all teachers should be fully trained musicians. However, the expectations for future pastors are higher, with men entering the seminary required to take a semester of vocal training in college in addition to a general survey course (ibid.). The men are also encouraged to join the seminary chorus at the graduate level; this culminates in further requirements to take six credit hours related to the practical application of music in liturgical contexts at the seminary level (Annual Seminary Catalog, 2020).

**Music Education Specialization**

The WELS ministerial college, Martin Luther College in New Ulm, MN, has a dedicated music education major as part of its teacher training program. This program is divided into three specific areas of specialization, including parish music, vocal music, and instrumental music at the K-12 levels (Music Majors, 2020). The parish music specialization is in the spirit of the traditional cantoral role filled by music educators discussed by Butt (2004) and Wolf (1977), where a teacher serves a dual role as an educator in a parish school and the main musician for the congregation (e.g., organist, worship planner, etc.). Meanwhile, the vocal and instrumental specializations are much more analogous to their secular counterparts, with positions mostly geared toward one of the WELS’ 27 high schools, which also generally sponsor grade school band programs from the consortium of parish/elementary schools that support the specific high school (ibid.).
The curriculum prescribed for music education majors is rigorous, including the typical theory, sight singing/ear training, applied organ and keyboard, ensemble, music history, repertoire, conducting and rehearsal technique, pedagogical strategy training, technology training, psychology of learning/adolescent psychology, and field training/student teaching practicum courses, among other general education courses, that one might expect from a public university. The course of study is approved not only for certification in WELS schools, but also follows the prescribed state standards as well, equipping students to receive licensure in the state of Minnesota (where the college is located) as well, with reciprocity in other states.

On the one hand, these data seem to be of a piece with Luther’s expectation for rigorous teacher training in music. On the other hand, the specialization of music education in the WELS context seems to have relegated its function in LES and ALHS contexts to an auxiliary position, which is not something that is consistent with Luther’s philosophy. Particularly noteworthy is that the parish music specialization is primarily designed for the elementary level, which does not seem to allow for rigorous music education at the secondary level. In fact, the WELS’ largest ALHS, Wisconsin Lutheran High School in Milwaukee, WI, does not even have music theory courses, only offering one “Music Spectrum” general survey course, open to students of all grade levels; instead, the school primarily promotes its ensembles, which seems to be the norm throughout the Synod (Fine Arts, 2020). This is certainly not in keeping with Luther’s rigorous expectations for music education at the primary, secondary, and tertiary levels.

**Sing and Make Music**

While the WELS’ education statistics demonstrated certain areas where Luther’s music education philosophy is both exemplified and found wanting in the WELS school system, they do not show what music education looks like in a practical curriculum. The most recent example
of a K-8 music curriculum published by the WELS publishing house was *Sing and Make Music* (Meyer, 1997). Helpfully, the curriculum is prefaced with a philosophy statement, which can be compared to Luther’s own philosophy:

Music and the ability to produce music are precious gifts of God and are used for his glory and in his service. God in his Word repeatedly urges Christians to use music. “Sing to the LORD with thanksgiving; make music to our God on the harp” (Psalm 147:7). “Sing to the LORD a new song; sing to the LORD, all the earth” (Psalm 96:1). “Speak to one another with psalms, hymns and spiritual songs. Sing and make music in your heart to the Lord, always giving thanks to God the Father for everything, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ” (Ephesians 5:19,20). Christians use music to worship God, to aid in building his kingdom, and to enhance the quality of life.

Christian education provides students with both the experiences and the training necessary for communicating and responding to the gospel with music. Music education is, therefore, an essential part of Christian education.

As children become involved in making music, they develop performance skills, increase their understanding of music, and grow in their appreciation for music. Lutheran music education provides experiences in singing, listening, reading, playing, moving, and creating. These experiences lead to understanding the concepts of rhythm, pitch, harmony, form, timbre, dynamics, and tempo. Lutheran music education uses a variety of music types and styles, including sacred and secular, vocal and instrumental, old and new, folk music and art music. (Meyer, 1997, p. 1)

Most notable in this philosophy statement is the concurrence with Luther’s view of music education as “an essential part of Christian education.” This understanding of the form music
education should take also corresponded to Luther’s experiential view of music in terms of performing and creating, while still emphasizing the theoretical aspects of music education in a practical way. The curriculum also designed the development of this theoretical framework in a three-stage process not necessarily related to specific grade level (though the volumes of the curriculum are divided by grade level), much the same way that Luther proffered a three-tiered approach to education:

The three-stage music learning process is rarely completed in a single lesson, unit, year, or level. Its completion may not occur until several years or levels later, at which time the full notational system of music becomes meaningful. Music learning as a developmental process includes many activities and covers a span of years. As the learner reaches greater maturity, music concepts of increasing complexity are presented. This organizational structure or “spiral curriculum” is followed in Sing and Make Music. (p. 4)

The Sing and Make Music curriculum seems to be a practical modern iteration of the music education paradigms that Luther set into motion with his educational reforms. Its content is replete with musical examples both classical and modern, classroom improvisatory and compositional activities, and aural and vocal training, along with theory instruction in rhythm, articulation, style, and other fundamentals (See Appendix C for an outline of the content of the Sing and Make Music curriculum).

Unfortunately, this curriculum is no longer in print (in fact, I purchased the final copy of the curriculum from the publishing house on clearance when I began teaching in 2018). Further, given the lack of music theory education required of elementary educators, it is unclear if the fundamental training in music theory and practice contained in this curriculum is extant in contemporary WELS school contexts; I have been unable to discover any other music curriculum
currently proffered by the Synod. Dwindling enrollment and funding also make it unlikely that small parish schools can afford a dedicated music educator. While it is heartening that middle school and high school music education specialists are trained for the synodical parochial school system, even at these levels there is no universality to the requirement of music education involvement, much less in the realm of theory. In my own experience, music theory was not a requirement throughout K-12 education in a WELS context.

**Discussion: Practical Applications of Luther’s Philosophy Today**

Examining Luther’s philosophy of music education and comparing it to a small glimpse of contemporary Lutheran educators’ philosophical statements and the practical application of music education that exists in contemporary Lutheranism may appear to be a parochial topic on the surface. However, the discussion of Luther’s philosophy has broader implications for the field of music education at large. From a purely historical perspective, Luther was an education reform pioneer. His experiential philosophy of music education has had far-reaching impact even on philosophers outside the religious sphere. Tarry (1973) and Mattes (2017) went so far as to suggest that Luther’s philosophy was a prototypical statement of the aesthetic philosophy of music education that Reimer developed in the 20th century, which is usually considered the first iteration of a formalized music education philosophy as we think of it today. In some sense, then, one might consider Luther significantly ahead of the curve. And yet, the analysis I have proffered here intimated that Luther’s view was also more practical—or, as I have described it previously, *experiential*—than the aesthetic approach. In his rejection of the medieval paradigm of music that was strictly in the theoretical realm, Luther bequeathed to us a view of music that was equally based in performance and creative development and output.
And yet it can be argued, in some jurisdictions at least, that the pendulum may have swung too far in the opposite direction. Like the Lutheran educators analyzed by this study, modern music educators may be all too familiar with school administrators (and perhaps themselves!) viewing school music programs strictly in terms of ensemble performances, related community outreach, and similarly ancillary and utilitarian goals. Perhaps the music program in their institutions have been entirely relegated to an extracurricular status.

Luther’s pioneering emphasis on the experiential was reminiscent of later educational reformers like Pestalozzi and Fröbel, who similarly recognized the way that hands-on experiences and activities enabled students across social classes and means to equally engage in the learning process (Maslow, 1970). Luther’s philosophical belief in the universality of (music) education is equally pertinent in this regard, urging educators to not be complacent with programs that leave students behind (vis-à-vis the so-called ‘other 80%’). His philosophy has implications and provided a philosophical basis for arguing for the universality of music education to administrators and policymakers alike. A study of Luther’s philosophy demonstrated a basis for music education that is predicated on and advocates for the study of music as a unique discipline in its own right. Unlike the Pestalozzian emphasis, channeled by early music education pioneers in America, which championed a utilitarian philosophy of music’s inclusion in education on the basis of its ability to serve ancillary functions, Luther’s philosophy showed a basis for music that is not necessarily reliant upon other considerations. **The Question of Theology**

One of this study’s guiding research questions was the extent to which Luther’s theological premises affected his philosophy of music education in ways that might still exist in modern contexts divorced from their original theological premises. My initial suspicion was that
music education in contemporary Lutheran thought had become somewhat secularized. My analysis of leading Lutheran authors has led to an unexpected conclusion. In some ways, an overly theological emphasis on “faith formation” seems to have diminished music education in some Lutheran contexts through a sort of utilitarian philosophy of music education.

Upon further reflection, the question of Luther’s theological considerations and the constraints it had on his philosophy in a secular context need not be so concerning. In the first place, one need not agree with all the beliefs of a philosopher to learn from his philosophy. The Greek philosophers are studied as a foundation of philosophical thought in spite of the fact that we do not share their mythological contentions. Furthermore, it is clear that the close relationship Luther placed between theology and music was predicated on a paradigm in which theology was de facto related to all of life’s considerations. Performing any task or vocation to the best of one’s ability was, in Luther’s mind, an inherently evangelical pursuit—his thinking of music as a divine gift does not mean engaging with his music education philosophy necessitates a theological disputation.

Prior to this study, I also expected Luther’s philosophy to demonstrate theological utilitarianist elements in its application of music education. I knew that Luther had written a large corpus of hymnody and liturgical music geared toward theological pedagogy. What I was not aware of was the extent of his writings pertaining to music education as a unique discipline. Modern Lutheran educators seem to have abandoned Luther’s more nuanced philosophy in favor of a utilitarian approach of their own, which views music’s function largely in terms of its being a tool to relay the Word of God. While Luther certainly cherished this capacity of music, he did not limit music’s application to this end. What is more, he believed that music had inherent power in its own right on a melodic and compositional basis. Unfortunately, there does not seem
to be much contemporary Lutheran discussion of music and music education toward this end, being rather focused on utilitarian theological ends. Of course, a utilitarian approach is not somehow unique to Lutheran education, albeit the theological bent is parochial. But an outreach and ensemble-focused view of music programs is an issue in a wide variety of secular settings.

**Personal Significance to the Author (and other Lutheran Music Education Stakeholders)**

As the product of the Lutheran PreK-12 and university systems, this study has personal significance to my experiences as a student. As a teacher in a K-8 Lutheran Elementary School, this study has practical implications for me as a music educator. In the first place, as a Lutheran music stakeholder, I want to follow Luther’s charge to be as well-trained in music as possible to most effectively teach my students. In a very real way, this capstone project is the fruition of my efforts to do just that through my graduate studies.

Luther’s philosophy also serves as an encouragement to ensure that my curriculum incorporates a holistic approach to both theoretical and practical approaches to music education. The pressure to teach, especially in an ensemble setting, with an eye toward major performances can be overwhelming, especially when the context is framed in terms of evangelistic outreach where “souls are on the line.” Maintaining Luther’s staunch view of music as a discipline with self-contained integrity is a useful counter to this mentality. Meanwhile, studying his theological convictions also helps to form a healthier view of music from that perspective as well. Rather than an evangelistic “means to an end,” Luther’s philosophy shows that performing and teaching to the best of one’s ability is God-pleasing in its own right without needlessly forcing proselytization into every note. At the same time, Luther’s beliefs concerning the ontological and spiritual natures of music lend more significance to music as a discipline as well, and further outline the importance of its rigorous, whole-hearted, and focused study.
Conclusion

Martin Luther was a paragon of reform in the realms of music and education. This study has shown the cumulative effect of his writings in both of these realms and in his philosophy of music education outright. In the realm of music, Luther believed that music was something to be experienced, rather than a strictly theoretical pursuit relegated to medieval scholastic abstraction. In the realm of education, Luther pioneered the notion of a societal obligation for the universal education of the citizenry, with an educational model that put music at the fore. Synthesizing these two realities, along with his extant writings on the topic, demonstrated that Luther’s philosophy of music education posited a uniquely practical approach to the discipline that was predicated on its own merits. He advocated for a hands-on approach to musical practice, rooted in a rigorous education in the fundamentals, which would enable students to engage with music on a personal basis through creativity and performance.

Contemporary Lutheran educators can draw important implications from Luther’s philosophy of music education. A return to the Reformer’s philosophical premises will enable Lutheran educators to view music as something other than a means to something other than a theological end. A view of music as an independent field of study in its own right, rather than as a subservient vehicle of theology, is an important aspect of Luther’s view. Further, the secular music educator can also benefit from this approach. Where administrators and districts relegate music to extracurricular contexts and emphasize ensemble performance, the music education stakeholder can benefit from a historical analysis of the Reformer’s philosophical perspective and the applications of his beliefs beyond a theological context. These are most clearly demonstrated in his view of music education as something for students to experience in a hands-on way, combined with a thorough historical and theoretical education. Hopefully, a closer
analysis of the Reformer’s philosophy will yield insights for all music education stakeholders, which can positively affect a more holistic approach to theory, performance, and creativity in one’s pedagogy.
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Appendix A

Deutsche Messe Symmetry (Leaver, 2017, p. 187).
Appendix B

Appendix C

I. Literature
A. Songs of the liturgies used in Lutheran worship
B. Chorales and hymns in a variety of musical settings
C. Religious songs
D. Secular songs, including patriotic and American folk songs
E. Music by master composers

II. Music Skills
A. Singing
1. Sing melodies
2. Sing parts other than the melody
3. Sing with correct vocal technique

B. Listening
1. Distinguish between pitches that are higher, lower, or the same
2. Identify melody movement: up, down, same, step, skip, pattern,

scale, and chord tones
3. Differentiate beat, accent, and meter
4. Recognize note values and rhythm patterns
5. Recognize triads and chords, chord changes and progressions,

major and minor modes
6. Identify repetitions, alterations, and contrasts
7. Recognize motives, sequences, and phrases
8. Recognize song forms
9. Identify instrumental and vocal timbres

10. Identify textures
11. Identify dynamic levels and changes
12. Identify tempos and changes

C. Reading
1. Understand standard notation symbols: staff, ledger lines, clef signs,

names of lines and spaces, sharp, flat, natural, key signature, notes, rests, meter signature, bar line, measure, tie, fermata, symbols for repetition

2. Sing from notation
3. Use so-fa syllables and hand signs
4. Play classroom instruments from notation
5. Follow scores
6. Observe tempo, dynamic, and other expressive markings
7. Write rhythm and pitch patterns upon hearing them
D. Playing
1. Play classroom rhythm, melodic, and harmonic instruments
2. Add instrumental accompaniments to existing compositions: rhythm patterns, ostinatos, chorded accompaniments, descants, and chord roots

E. Moving
1. Indicate melodic contour and structure
2. Indicate beats, accents, and rhythm patterns

F. Creating
1. Apply knowledge of music concepts in creating original material
2. Create original accompaniments for existing material
3. Express musical elements and meaning through other artistic mediums

III. Concepts

A. Rhythm
1. Pulse, accent, accent grouping, and meter
2. Note and rest values, subdivisions of the beat
3. Rhythm patterns, their repetitions and changes
4. Basic rhythm terms: beat, accent, meter, even, uneven, syncopation, and anacrusis

B. Pitch
1. Directions: same, higher, lower, step, and skip
2. Melodic patterns: repetitions and changes
3. Scales and modes: major, minor, church modes, pentatonic, whole tone, chromatic, and tone row

C. Harmony and Texture
1. Monophonic, homophonic, and polyphonic textures
2. Thick and thin textures
3. Consonance and dissonance
4. Triads and chords: major and minor
5. Tonality, sense of cadence, changes of harmony, chord progressions, and change of mode

D. Form
1. Motive, sequence, phrase, and repetition
2. Forms: AB, ABA, rondo, theme and variations, fugue, concerto,
sonata, cantata, oratorio, opera, symphony, concertato, chant, hymn
and chorale, and chorale prelude

E. Timbre

1. Instruments: families and timbres
2. Vocal colors: soprano, alto, tenor, and bass

F. Dynamics

1. Pianissimo, piano, mezzo piano, mezzo forte, forte, fortissimo, and accent markings
2. Crescendo, decrescendo, and diminuendo

G. Tempo

1. Largo, lento, adagio, andante, moderato, allegretto, allegro, presto, and vivo
2. Ritardando, accelerando

—*Sing and Make Music* Curriculum (Meyer, 1997, pp. 2-3).