# Sister Reformations III
# Schwesterreformationen III

From Reformation Movements to Reformation
Churches in the Holy Roman Empire and
on the British Isles

Von der reformatorischen Bewegung zur Kirche
im Heiligen Römischen Reich und auf den
britischen Inseln

Edited by / Herausgegeben von

Dorothea Wendebourg, Euan Cameron
and/und Martin Ohst

Mohr Siebeck

*Dorothea Wendebourg* war zuletzt ordentliche Professorin für Mittlere und Neuere Kirchengeschichte/Reformationsgeschichte an der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin.

*Euan Cameron* ist Henry Luce III Professor am Union Theological Seminary New York.

*Martin Ohst* ist ordentlicher Professor für Kirchengeschichte und Systematische Theologie an der Bergischen Universität Wuppertal.

# Inhalt – Contents

## III.

### *Alte und neue Traditionen*

### *Old and New Traditions*

## IV.

*Das Bild der Reformation von sich selbst*

*The Reformation's Self Image*

# Liturgical Space in the German and Scottish Reformations

## Andrew Spicer

The late medieval landscape included many sites that had sacred associations, such as holy wells or shrines, which became places of pilgrimage and the focus of popular devotion. Alongside these religious sites, the Roman Catholic Church carefully delineated and defined what constituted liturgical space. Rites of consecration set particular buildings apart from the secular world and dedicated them for religious use, in particular for the celebration of the mass and parochial worship. These churches often stood in graveyards which had also been consecrated for the interment of the dead, separated from the rest of the community by a wall or ditch. There was a gradation of holiness from the churchyard to the church, with the most sacred site being the high altar, which was also consecrated for liturgical use.[1] Here the mass was celebrated and, through transubstantiation, Christ became manifest. The chancel was therefore divided from the remainder of the church by a rood screen and was largely the preserve of the clergy.[2] The sanctity of the church was therefore delineated by the rites of consecration and reconciliation – which restored the sanctity of a profaned site – as well as by the liturgical use of the interior. Although there was criticism of consecration, particularly because of the fees paid to the bishop for performing the rite and the cost of the celebratory banquet, it was not until the Reformation that this understanding of places of worship was fundamentally challenged.[3]

---

[1] *The Rationale divinorum officiorum of William Durand of Mende*, edited by Timothy M. Thibodeau (New York, 2007), 54–88; Eric Palazzo, *Liturgie et société au Moyen Age* (Paris, 2000), 71–77; Dominique Iogna-Prat, »L'église ‹Maison de consécration› et bâtiment d'exception dans le paysage social«, in Didier Méhu (ed.), *Mises en scène et mémoires de la consécration de l'église dans l'Occident médiéval* (Turnhout, 2007), 347–63; Derek A. Rivard, *Blessing the World. Ritual and Lay Piety in Medieval Religion* (Washington, 2009), 89–131; Will Coster and Andrew Spicer, »Introduction. The Dimensions of Sacred Space in Reformation Europe«, in Will Coster and Andrew Spicer (eds), *Sacred Space in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge, 2005), 9–11.

[2] Miri Rubin, »The Space of the Altar«, in Lawrence Besserman (ed.), *Sacred and Secular in Medieval and Early Modern Cultures. New Essays* (Basingstoke, 2006), 167–68, 173.

The ability of Catholic rites to confer sanctity was derided by the Reformers. Martin Luther dismissed the consecration of churches as being part of »the papal bag of tricks«, which should not to be tolerated.[4] At the inauguration of the new castle chapel at Torgau in 1544, he argued that it would be »rightly and Christianly consecrated and blessed, not like the papists'church with their bishop's chrism and censing, but by God's command and will«, through preaching. Furthermore, he rejected the notion that

»we are making a special church of it, as if it were better than other houses where the Word of God is preached. If the occasion should arise that the people did not want to or could not assemble, one could just as well preach outside by the fountain [in the castle courtyard] or somewhere else«.[5]

The Genevan Reformer, John Calvin, similarly attacked the notion that any one place was more suitable than another for worship. In his *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, Calvin argued that places of worship did not

»by any secret sanctity of their own make prayers more holy, or cause them to be heard by God. But they [temples] are intended to receive the congregation of believers more conveniently when they gather to pray, to hear the preaching of the Word, and at the same time to partake of the sacraments [...] but those who suppose that God's ear has been brought closer to them in a temple, or consider their prayer more consecrated in the holiness of the place, are acting according to the stupidity of the Jews and Gentiles. In physically worshipping God, they go against what has been commanded, that, without any consideration of place, we worship God in spirit and truth.«[6]

These Reformed sentiments regarding the perceived sanctity and efficacious character of places of worship were later shared by the Scottish reformers.

Nonetheless, it was the existing parish churches that were taken over by the Lutherans in the Holy Roman Empire and the Reformed Kirk in Scotland as their places of worship. This article will consider the rearrangement of existing church interiors and liturgical space to meet the

---

[3] Andrew Spicer, »›God will have a house‹: Defining Sacred Space and Rites of Consecration in Early Seventeenth-Century England«, in Andrew Spicer and Sarah Hamilton (eds), *Defining the Holy. Sacred Space in Medieval and Early Modern Europe* (Aldershot, 2005), 210.

[4] »The Smalcald Articles«, in Robert Kolb and Timothy J. Wengert (ed.), *The Book of Concord. The Confessions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church* (Minneapolis, 2000), 326.

[5] *D. Martin Luthers Werke kritische Gesamtausgabe* (Weimar, 1883 seqq.) [hereafter *WA*], XLIX: 588, 592; Jaroslav Pelikan et al (eds), *Luther's Works*, 56 vols (St Louis, 1955–86) [hereafter *LW*], LI: 333–34, 337.

[6] John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion: 1536 Edition*, translated by F. L. Battles (Grand Rapids, 1986), 73; John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, edited by J. T. McNeill, 2 vols (Philadelphia, 1960), II, 893.

particular requirements of these two confessions. Although there were significant differences, the Lutherans and the Reformed both emphasised the importance of the administration of the sacraments and the preaching of the word of God. These principles underscored the adaptation of buildings initially designed for the celebration of mystery of the Catholic mass. Furthermore, by the early seventeenth century, the high regard for preaching and the sacraments led the ecclesiastical authorities to ensure that the places where this took place were appropriate, seemly and dedicated for their religious use.

## 1. The Holy Roman Empire

Although Luther considered that it was legitimate »to preach on the street, outside a building, without a pulpit«, he did acknowledge that it would be better to have a designated place of worship:

»for the sake of children and simple folk, it is a fine thing and conducive to good order to have a definite time, place, and hour to which people can adapt themselves and where they may assemble«.[7]

Therefore, for practical reasons, the Lutherans took over the existing churches as their places of worship. Even though Luther had derided the Catholic mass, he was reluctant to specify how these liturgical spaces should be reconfigured for worship. This was a reaction against the legalistic and prescriptive character of late medieval Catholicism.

In 1516, Luther had attacked the Church's requirement

»to build this and that church or that we ornament them in such and such a way, or that singing be of a certain kind or the organ or the altar decorations, the chalices, the statues and all of the other paraphernalia which are contained in our temples. [...] For all of these things are shadows and signs of the real thing and thus are childish«.[8]

This stance was combined with the reformers' opposition to aspects of Catholic worship that did not have biblical sanction. Luther drew a distinction between those matters »either commanded or forbidden by God and thus have been instituted by the supreme Majesty« and those »things which are not necessary, but are left to our free choice by God and which we may keep or not«.[9] Those aspects of worship that had not been ordained by God were regarded as *adiaphora* or matters of indifference; it

---

[7] *WA*, L: 649; *LW*, XLI: 173.
[8] *WA*, LVI: 493–94; *LW*, XXV: 487.
[9] *WA*, X.3: 21; *LW*, LI: 79.

was an issue of Christian freedom as to whether or not they were imple-
mented.[10] Luther's unwillingness to be legalistic and to assume a prescrip-
tive approach to worship is evident in the opening lines of his preface to
the German mass. He argued that those who desired to use the service
should

»not make it a rigid law or entangle anyone's conscience, but use it in Christian
liberty as long, when, where, and how you find it to be practical and useful«.[11]

Luther's initial liturgical reforms to the mass sought

»to purify the one that is now in use from the wretched accretions which corrupt it
and to point out an evangelical use«.

However, his rejection of Catholic legalism and assertion of Christian
freedom meant that elements regarded as *adiaphora* – such as candles,
vestments, and vessels – remained. In his German mass, he commented
that

»we retain the vestments, altar, and candles until they are used up or we are pleased
to make a change. But we do not oppose anyone who would do otherwise«.[12]

Luther's intention was not to alienate those who had not fully embraced
the Reformation by making radical changes to the externals of worship
but, nonetheless, with the expectation that in due course these could be
removed.

One of the consequences of this ideological stance was that there was
no major reorientation of liturgical space, although some changes were
necessary in order to balance the administration of the sacraments and
preaching. Initially, Luther did envisage the altar being relocated; he com-
mented in his German Mass that

»in the true mass, however, of real Christians, the altar should not remain where it
is, and the priest should always face the people as Christ doubtlessly did at the Last
Supper. But let that await its own time«.[13]

In 1523, Luther gave an account of how the mass was conducted in Wit-
tenberg:

---

[10] *WA*, VIII: 511, L: 649–51; *LW*, XXXVI: 168, XLI: 173–75. See also Caroline By-
num, »Are Things ›Indifferent‹? How Objects Change Our Understanding of Religious
History«, *German History* 34 (2016), 88–112; Andrew Spicer, »*Adiaphora*, Luther and
the Material Culture of Worship«, in Rosamond McKitterick, Charlotte Methuen and
Andrew Spicer (eds), *The Church and Law*, Studies in Church History 56 (2020), forth-
coming.
[11] *WA* XIX: 72; *LW*, LIII: 61.
[12] *WA* XIX: 80; *LW*, LIII: 69.
[13] Ibid.

»when the mass is being celebrated, those to receive communion should gather together by themselves in one place, and in one group. The altar and the chancel were invented for this purpose. God does not care where we stand and it adds nothing to our faith«.[14]

The *German Mass* of 1526 was less specific about the location for receiving communion merely instructing the faithful that

»there be a decent and orderly approach, not men and women together, but the women after the men, wherefore they should also stand apart from each other in separate places«.[15]

Although Luther sought to reject the notion that a particular part of the church was more appropriate than another for receiving communion, the liturgical importance of the east end, nonetheless, continued. Furthermore, in a number of churches, the pre-Reformation high altar remained not only in situ but also in use for the celebration of the Lutheran mass.

In his commentary on Psalm 111, published in 1530, Luther noted that

»the chancel, which since ancient times is especially built and set aside for the purpose of celebrating the Sacrament and keeping the remembrance of Christ, as is still done in the public Mass«.[16]

As the numbers who actually received communion each week were limited, the choir was large enough to accommodate the participants. A similar arrangement can be seen in other parts of northern and central Germany, particularly in areas where Johannes Bugenhagen was influential in defining and establishing Lutheran rituals.[17] In his church order for Braunschweig (1528), Bugenhagen asserted:

»The choirs were surely made for communicants for this purpose since ancient times, before the extensive singing was initiated«.[18]

The liturgical significance of the chancel was no doubt further emphasised by the removal of the side altars from the main body of the building. These had been rendered superfluous with the abolition of private and requiem masses; official orders were given for their removal in East Frisia, Mecklenburg and Weimar but elsewhere it was left to the discretion of the individual parishes.[19] The focus on the east end of the church was height-

---

[14] *WA*, XII: 216; *LW*, LIII: 33; Amy Nelson Burnett, »The Social History of Communion and the Reformation of the Eucharist«, *Past & Present* 211 (2011), 98.

[15] *WA*, XIX: 99; *LW*, LIII: 82.

[16] *WA*, XXXI.1: 406; *LW*, XIII: 365.

[17] Susan C. Karant-Nunn, *The Reformation of Ritual. An Interpretation of Early Modern Germany* (London, 1997), 119–20.

[18] Johannes Bugenhagen, *Selected Writings*, edited by Kurt K. Hendel, 2 vols (Minneapolis, 2015), II, 1359.

[19] Nigel Yates, *Liturgical Space. Christian Worship and Church Buildings in Western Europe, 1500–2000* (Aldershot, 2008), 12; Bodo Nischan, »Becoming Protestants. Lu-

ened in some German states, from the mid-sixteenth century, by the erection of small subsidiary altars at the junction between the chancel and the nave. This made the rite more visible and allowed the pastor to face the congregation, as Luther had suggested, which was not feasible at the monumental high altar. These subsidiary altars were used for weekday and Sunday services with the high altar reserved for feast days.[20]

While there was a degree of spatial continuity within the church for the German mass, this needed to be balanced with the arrangements for preaching. Although there had been preaching in German churches, principally in urban areas, before the Reformation, Luther claimed that God's word had effectively been silenced in public worship. He argued that

»a Christian congregation should never gather together without the preaching of God's Word and prayer, no matter how briefly«.[21]

Existing medieval pulpits were used for preaching,[22] although sometimes these were moved to a more convenient location in the nave which was better suited for preaching to the congregation. In some cases, this required the removal of other liturgical furnishings. At Nuremberg in 1542, for example, the city council ordered the dismantling of three side altars in the Sebalduskirche because

»they get in the way of the people hearing the Word of God and in front of them the preacher cannot be seen or heard well«.[23]

The pulpit therefore became an important liturgical focal point within the post-Reformation church interior. This was further emphasised by the iconography of the newly erected pulpits, such as in the Marienkirche and the Dom at Lübeck and the castle chapel at Torgau.[24] With their biblical

---

theran Altars or Reformed Communion Tables?«, in Karin Maag and John Witvliet (eds), *Worship in Medieval and Early Modern Europe* (Notre Dame, 2004), 96; Bridget Heal, *A Magnificent Faith. Art and Identity in Lutheran Germany* (Oxford, 2017), 47–48.

[20] Karant-Nunn, *The Reformation of Ritual* (see note 17), 120–21; Maria Deiters, »Epitaphs in Dialogue with Sacred Space: Post-Reformation Furnishings in the Parish Churches of St Nikolai and St Marien in Berlin«, in Andrew Spicer (ed.), *Lutheran Churches in Early Modern Europe* (Farnham, 2012), 64–67; Per Gustaf Hamberg, *Temples for Protestants. Studies in the Architectural Milieu of the Early Reformed Church and Lutheran Church* (Gothenburg, 2002), 75; Jeffrey Chipps Smith, »The Architecture of Faith. Lutheran and Jesuit Churches in Germany in the Early Seventeenth Century«, in Jan Harasimowicz (ed.), *Protestantischer Kirchenbau der Frühen Neuzeit in Europa. Grundlagen und neue Forschungskonzepte* (Berlin, 2015), 170.

[21] *WA*, XII: 35; *LW*, LIII: 11.

[22] Heal, *A Magnificent Faith* (see note 19), 49; Emily Fisher Gray, »Lutheran Churches and Confessional Competition in Augsburg«, in Spicer (ed.), *Lutheran Churches* (see note 20), 46.

[23] Quoted in Heal, »Sacred Image and Sacred Space«, in Coster and Spicer (eds), *Sacred Space in Early Modern Europe* (see note 1), 48.

references, they were in marked contrast to the 1518 pulpit at Eisenach – from which Luther preached his last sermon – with its visual references to the Virgin Mary and the cult of saints.[25] Furthermore, the role of the pulpit as the vehicle for preaching the Word of God imbued it with such significance that the authorities sought to ensure that this part of the church was treated with respect and due decorum. It symbolised the clerical office, which went one step further at Ratzberg cathedral where the portrait of the first Lutheran minister on the back wall of the pulpit gave the impression that the word of God was being constantly preached.[26]

Besides locating the pulpit in the most appropriate place for preaching to the entire congregation, the need for an attentive and receptive audience led to the rapid expansion in the construction of pews during the 1520s and 1530s. Although prominent figures – ecclesiastics, patrons, officials – often had benches or pews in their parish church before the Reformation, the new seating accommodated ordinary members of the congregation. The removal of side altars provided more space as the authorities sought to maximise the church's capacity for Lutheran rites, which was not always straightforward as the building had been designed for a different liturgical use.[27] However, the construction of pews could sometimes hamper Lutheran worship. The Church Ordinance of Electoral Saxony in 1580 addressed a »common complaint« that

»now and then seats are built in churches that prevent people from being able to see the preacher in the pulpit, or at the altar when the holy sacrament is distributed; likewise such seats are also erected in the public aisles, so that, because of these, people cannot easily come and go«.[28]

There were also difficulties for those who sat in the area between the pulpit and the altar as they needed to face in opposite directions during the course of the service. In churches, such as St Anna's in Augsburg where

---

[24] Bonnie B. Lee, »Communal Transformations of Church Space in Lutheran Lübeck«, *German History* 26 (2008), 160–62; Jeffrey Chipps Smith, *German Sculpture of the Later Renaissance, c. 1520–1580. Art in an Age of Uncertainty* (Princeton, NJ, 1994), 87–90; Joseph Leo Koerner, *The Reformation of the Image* (London, 2004), 408–10.

[25] Gotha Stiftung Schloss Friedenstein, *Martin Luther. Treasures of the Reformation* (Dresden, 2016), 360–61.

[26] Margit Thøfner, »Framing the Sacred: Lutheran Church Furnishings in the Holy Roman Empire«, in Spicer (ed.), *Lutheran Churches* (see note 20), 119–22; Heal, *A Magnificent Faith* (see note 19), 178; Chipps Smith, *German Sculpture* (see note 24), 107–08.

[27] Koerner, *The Reformation of the Image* (see note 24), 411–12; Tanya Kevorkian, *Baroque Piety: Religion, Society, and Music in Leipzig, 1650–1750* (Aldershot, 2007), 55–56; Bonnie Lee, »Communal Transformations of Church Space«, 153–54 (see note 24).

[28] Quoted in Koerner, *The Reformation of the Image* (see note 24), 415.

the pulpit was located on the north side of the building and the altar at the east end, modifications to the seats made it possible for the congregation to face both liturgical focal points during the service. The seats fitted with back rests – *drehgestühl* – which could be flipped over, meaning that the fixed seating could face in alternate directions during a service.[29]

Although the sites for communion and preaching were the most prominent liturgical spaces within the church, the location of the baptismal font was also important. Luther made only limited changes to the baptismal rite; his first liturgy including an epilogue listing various aspects of the service which survived but were regarded as *adiaphora*.[30] Medieval fonts continued to be used and survive in significant numbers across Germany, including the late fifteenth-century bronze font at Wittenberg.[31] Traditionally, fonts were located at the west end of the nave, often between the north and south doors to the building. Although Luther did not consider that there should be a prescribed position, commenting that it was just as appropriate for fonts to be found beside the Elbe, in a number of Lutheran states they remained in their original location after the Reformation.[32] Luther did emphasise the connection between preaching and the sacrament, arguing that baptism only occurred when »water and the Word of God are conjoined«.[33] The association of preaching with baptism made by Luther led some communities from the early seventeenth century to move the font to the front of the church, so that it was in closer proximity to both the altar and the pulpit.[34] Furthermore, the liturgical significance of the place of baptism resulted in elaborate screens being erected in some churches to establish a ritual enclosure for the font.[35]

---

[29] Emily Fisher Gray, »The Body of the Faithful: Joseph Furttenbach's 1649 Lutheran Church Plans«, in Andrew Spicer (ed.), *Parish Churches in the Early Modern World* (Farnham, 2016), 113; Fisher Gray, »Lutheran Churches« (see note 22), 58; A. L. Drummond, *The Church Architecture of Protestantism. An Historical and Constructive Study* (Edinburgh, 1934), 20.

[30] *WA*, XII: 46–48; *LW*, LIII: 101–03; Bryan D. Spinks, *Reformation and Modern Rituals and Theologies of Baptism* (Aldershot, 2006), 9–14.

[31] Thøfner, »Framing the Sacred« (see note 26), 113–15.

[32] *WA*, XII: 695. Silvia Schlegel, »Festive Vessels or Everyday Fonts? New Considerations on the Liturgical Functions of Medieval Baptismal Fonts in Germany«, in Harriet M. Sonne de Torrens and Miguel A. Torrens (eds), *The Visual Culture of Baptism in the Middle Ages. Essays on Medieval Fonts, Settings and Beliefs* (Farnham, 2013) 129–47, esp. 131; J. G. Davies, *Architectural Setting of Baptism* (London, 1962), 61–63, 93, 104; Sergiusz Michalski, *Reformation and the Visual Arts: The Protestant Image Question in Western and Eastern Europe* (London, 1993), 41.

[33] *WA*, XXX.1: 112; *LW*, LI: 185.

[34] Davies, *Architectural Setting* (see note 32), 104–05; Thøfner, »Framing the Sacred« (see note 26), 116–17.

[35] Thøfner, »Framing the Sacred«, 104–05, 117–18 (see note 26).

While existing churches were adapted to meet the needs of Lutheran worship as conveniently as possible, the construction of new buildings attempted to resolve some of the issues relating to the arrangement of liturgical space. The new castle chapel at Torgau might appear initially to have continued the problematic layout of the pre-existing churches. The altar was located at one end of the building while the pulpit was placed in the centre of the gallery along the side of the chapel. This did create two focal points for the congregation but for the Saxon electors seated in the first floor gallery at the west end of the chapel, the altar and pulpit were on the same alignment.[36]

Joseph Koerner has described Lutheran church building from the mid-sixteenth century as representing »a game of alignment« that sought to co-ordinate the liturgical arrangement of the building so that the administration of the sacraments and preaching could be witnessed by all of the congregation from their seats.[37] One of the earliest attempts to resolve this issue can be seen in the castle chapel erected at Schmalkalden between 1585 and 1590, which had some parallels with Torgau. However, the communion table incorporated a baptismal basin and it was overlooked by the pulpit at first floor level. The key liturgical furnishings of the chapel were therefore placed on a single vertical axis at the east end.[38] Half a century later, a similar arrangement was proposed by Joseph Furttenbach the Younger in his treatise *KirchenGebäw* (1649) which outlined the optimum design for a Lutheran place of worship in Augsburg. This included a *Kanzelaltar* or pulpit-altar at the east end, together with the small altar and font, but the design was not implemented and this *Principalstück* arrangement was not adopted by many churches before the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.[39]

Rather than a vertical arrangement, some new churches grouped the liturgical furnishings in one part of the building. The church erected at Wolfenbüttel between 1608 and 1623 (although parts of the building were

---

[36] Koerner, *The Reformation of the Image* (see note 24), 414, 421.

[37] Ibid., 421.

[38] Hugo Johannsen, »The Protestant Palace Chapel. Monument to Evangelical Religion and Sacred Rulership«, in Hugo Johannsen, *Masters, meanings & Models. Studies in the Art and Architecture of the Renaissance in Denmark*, edited by Michael Andersen, Ebbe Nyborg and Mogens Vedsø (Copenhagen, 2010), 39–41; Dieter Großmann, »L'église à tribunes et les tribunes des églises en Allemagne au XVIᵉ siècle«, in Jean Guillaume (ed.), *L'église dans l'architecture de la Renaissance* (Paris, 1995), 259, 265; Ernst Badstübner, »Die Rezeption von Schloßkapellen der Renaissance im protestantischen Landkirchenbau, Schmalkalden und die hessische Herrschaft«, in Harasimowicz (ed.), *Protestantischer Kirchenbau* (see note 20), 260–63.

[39] Fisher Gray, »The Body of the Faithful« (see note 29), 113–17; Koerner, *The Reformation of the Image* (see note 24), 427–28.

completed later due to the disruption of the Thirty Years War) maintained the traditional pre-Reformation ground plan of a rectangular nave and chancel. The liturgical space was arranged so that preaching and the administration of the sacraments all took place around the chancel. The pulpit was sited at the junction of the nave and choir, the high altar with a monumental altarpiece at the east end, a baptismal enclosure in front it and in the foreground a second smaller altar for more regular use. The pews in the nave all face towards the liturgical focal point of the building.[40]

Heinrich Schickhardt adopted an experimental design – an L-shaped ground plan – for the church erected for the new town at Freudenstadt in *c.* 1608. The altar, font and pulpit were all placed at the intersection of the two arms of the church to create a single liturgical focus, which could be seen by the congregation in both wings of the building. This arrangement satisfied the requirements for Lutheran worship but also allowed for the segregation of the congregation; the men and women were both physically and visually separated.[41] This was an unusual arrangement of liturgical space that was not adopted by other communities, even the contemporary church built by Schickhardt at Montbéliard had a more traditional ground plan.[42] It was not until the eighteenth century that more imaginative and polygonal liturgical spaces were erected for Lutheran worship.[43]

These new buildings were marked out as dedicated for liturgical use through services of consecration. In spite of Luther's rejection of the practice, churches or parts of the building together with other liturgical furnishings, such as pulpits, and vessels continued to be consecrated after the Reformation.[44] This did not represent a continuation of the Catholic rite with the asperging and chrism that Luther had rejected at Torgau in 1544 but dedication through preaching. Buildings were inaugurated with sermons that drew comparisons with the Temple of Solomon and focused on function of a church and its liturgical space. They emphasised the sanctity of these places of worship as liturgical spaces, which were distinct from other buildings because of the rites performed within them. This was

---

[40] Chipps Smith, »Architecture of Faith« (see note 20), 169–70.

[41] Hamberg, *Temples for Protestants* (see note 20), 52–58; Chipps Smith, »Architecture of Faith« (see note 20), 170–73.

[42] A. Bouvard, »L'architecte Heinrich Schickhardt à Montbéliard. La construction du Temple Saint-Martin«, *Bulletin et mémoires de la Société d'émulation de Montbéliard* 109 (1986), 303–90.

[43] Koerner, *The Reformation of the Image* (see note 24), 421–24; Bridget Heal, »Better Papist than Calvinist«: Art and Identity in Late Lutheran Germany«, German History 29 (2011), 585–86.

[44] Ernst Walter Zeeden, *Faith and Act. The Survival of Medieval Ceremonies at the Lutheran Reformation* (St Louis, 2012), 51.

underscored by the increasing efforts to ensure appropriate behaviour and decorum within both the church and churchyard as well as the banning of inappropriate activities.[45]

## 2. Scotland

In the wake of the Scottish Reformation in 1560, the First Book of Discipline set out the parameters for establishing Reformed worship across the northern kingdom. The parish church became the focal point for worship, as other ecclesiastical buildings had been rendered redundant by the religious changes:

»Abbeyes, Monkeries, Freiries, Nonries, Chappels, Chanteries, Cathedrall Churches, Chanonries, Colledges, others then presently are parish churches or schooles [were] to be utterly suppressed in all bounds and places of the Realme«.[46]

The former Catholic parish churches were adapted by the Reformed for preaching the word of God and the administration of the sacraments. The importance of this liturgical space over private meeting places was emphasised by the First Book of Discipline, which condemned

»some idiots [...] [that] dare counterfeit in their house, that which the true Ministers doe in open congregations«.[47]

Twenty years later in 1581, the General Assembly of the Kirk also condemned the administration of the sacraments in private places.[48]

The parish churches were built for the celebration of the mass rather than for Reformed preaching, and so had to be reconfigured spatially to meet these new liturgical requirements. The First Book of Discipline ordered the abolition of idolatry which it defined as

»the Mass, invocation of Saints, adoration of images, and the keeping and retaining of the same. And finally all honouring of God, not contained in his holy word«.[49]

Following this admonition, parish churches were purged of statues and altars were cast down. In Edinburgh, it took ten workmen nine days to remove all traces of the altars and the rood screen from the principal parish church of St Giles.[50] Although these reforms were undertaken re-

---

[45] Vera Isaiasz, »Early Modern Lutheran Churches: Redefining the Boundaries of the Holy and Profane«, in Spicer (ed.), *Lutheran Churches* (see note 17), 17–37; Heal, »›Better Papist than Calvinist‹« (see note 43), 600–03.

[46] *First Book of Discipline*, edited by J. K. Cameron (Edinburgh, 1972), 94.

[47] Ibid., 205.

[48] *Acts and Proceedings of the General Assemblies of the Kirk of Scotland*, ed. T. Thomson (Bannatyne Club/Maitland Club 81, Edinburgh, 1839–45), 524–25.

[49] *First Book of Discipline* (see note 46), 95.

latively swiftly in Edinburgh, the pace of change varied across the country. In 1574, the authorities in Aberdeen, for example, were ordered by the Privy Council, to remove the »priests' stalls and backs of altars« in order to improve the space available for people to hear the sermon.[51] The pre-Reformation church interior had been compartmentalised with the liturgical space around the principal and side altars being divided by screens and curtains, which were also removed during these reforms.[52]

The church interiors were reconfigured to form a single liturgical space for the preaching of the word of God and the administration of the sacraments. The simple rectangular structure of many parish churches, particularly in rural areas, meant it was relatively straightforward to adapt many of these buildings; the rood screen was removed and the sanctuary area was integrated into the main body of the church.[53] In other places where there was a small chancel, it was sometimes demolished or, more often, sealed off from the remainder of the building. This former liturgical space was reutilised as either a mausoleum or lairds'aisle, providing a local landowning family with a private room or loft from which to follow the service with a burial space below.[54] This represented the privatisation and, to a degree, secularisation of what had previously been liturgically the most important part of the church.

The different requirements of the Reformed Kirk meant that some of the large urban parish churches had more space than was required for worship. As a result, some buildings were subdivided to accommodate

---

[50] Andrew Spicer, *Calvinist Churches in Early Modern Europe* (Manchester, 2007), 46.

[51] *The Register of the Privy Council of Scotland*, ed. J. Hillburton *et al.* 14 vols (Edinburgh, 1877–98), II, 391; M. G. H. Pittock, »The Faith of the People«, in E. P. Dennison, D. Ditchburn and M. Lynch (eds), *Aberdeen before 1800. A New History* (East Linton), 292–93.

[52] Spicer, *Calvinist Churches* (see note 50), 46. Again this could be a protracted process, the church of Foulis Easter was found to still have its rood screen when the church was visited in 1612, ibid., 48.

[53] Spicer, *Calvinist Churches* (see note 50), 48; Deborah Howard, *Scottish Architecture from the Reformation to the Revolution, 1560–1660* (Edinburgh, 1995), 177; Miles Kerr-Patterson, »Post-Reformation Church Architecture in the Marischal Earldom, 1560–1625«, in Jane Geddes (ed.), *Medieval Art and Archaeology in the Dioceses of Aberdeen and Moray* (Oxford, 2016), 102.

[54] Andrew Spicer, »Defyle not Christ's kirk with your carrion«: Burial and the Development of Burial Aisles in Post-Reformation Scotland«, in Bruce Gordon and Peter Marshall (eds.), *The Place of the Dead. Death and Remembrance in Late Medieval and Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge, 2000), 160–61; Howard Colvin, *Architecture and the After-Life* (New Haven, 1991), 295–300; Richard Fawcett, Richard Oram and Julian Luxford, »Scottish Medieval Parish Churches: The Evidence from the Dioceses of Dunblane and Dunkeld«, *The Antiquaries Journal* 90 (2010), 265, 274–75. See also Kerr-Patterson, »Post-Reformation Church Architecture« (see note 53), 104–08.

more than one congregation within the existing structure; the superfluous remaining space could also be allocated to secular use. The town council in Edinburgh resolved in 1560 to reduce the liturgical space at St Giles' Kirk. Walls were erected within the structure to provide space for a school, tolbooth (the Scots term for a town hall), prison and clerks' chamber as well as »sufficient rowme for the preiching and ministracioun of the sacramentis«.[55] The liturgical space was altered again in 1578, when a wall was built across the former choir to separate the »East Kirk« from the congregation occupying the »Middle Kirk«; a third congregation also worshipped in the building.[56] There were similar divisions of liturgical space elsewhere in Scotland; a wall erected at the crossing of the parish church of St Nicholas, Aberdeen, in 1596, created two liturgical spaces for »preaching the word of God, and ministracioun of the sacramentis«.[57]

Although the administration of the sacraments, particularly the Lord's Supper, were highly regarded in the Reformed tradition, it was preaching that became the focus of weekly worship and determined the internal arrangement of parish churches. Scottish churches were sparsely furnished before the Reformation with few having a pulpit, although most of them would have possessed a lectern, and only limited seating for the clergy and local elite.[58] The purged church interiors were rearranged to form a centralised space with the pulpit as its focal point. Usually erected at the centre of the south wall of the building, this represented a dramatic reorientation of liturgical space from the pre-Reformation east-west to a north-south axis. Furthermore, the pulpit was usually placed between two large windows ensuring that this was the lightest part of the building for preaching.[59]

The positioning of the pulpit was intended to ensure that the minister could be seen and heard by the entire congregation, but it also meant that they in turn could be seen and heard by the minister. Calvin had argued

---

[55] *Extracts from the Records of the Burgh of Edinburgh*, ed. J. D. Marwick and M. Wood, 4 vols (Scottish Burgh Records Society, 1869–82), III, 66, 99.

[56] Ibid., I, 87.

[57] *Extracts from the Council Register of Aberdeen, 1570–1625*, ed. J. Stuart (Spalding Club, 19, 1848), 135.

[58] George Hay, »Scottish Post-Reformation Church Furniture«, *Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland* 88 (1953–55), 53; Stephen Jackson, »Kirk Furnishings: The Liturgical Material Culture of the Scottish Reformation«, *Regional Furniture* 21 (2007), 1, 3–4; Andrew Spicer, »›Accommodating of Thame Selfis to Heir the Word.‹ Preaching, Pews and Reformed Worship in Scotland, 1560–1638«, *History* 88 (2003), 411–12, 421.

[59] George Hay, *The Architecture of Scottish Post-Reformation Churches, 1560–1843* (Oxford, 1957), 26. See also Howard, *Scottish Architecture from the Reformation to the Revolution* (see note 50), 177; Spicer, *Calvinist Churches* (see note 50), 53–54.

that the pulpit was the means by which God communicated to His people, who were to be active recipients of the word of God.[60] John Knox, himself, expressed similar sentiments regarding preaching stating that in the pulpit »I am not the master of myself but mist obey Him who commands me to speak plain«.[61]

The provision of seating was important to ensure that the parishioners remained attentive and receptive during services. There was a marked expansion in pew-building in the post-Reformation period. In 1586, the visitation of the diocese of Dunblane had enquired as to whether churches were provided a pulpit, seats and communion tables.[62] Initially, there appears to have been a combination of fixed seating installed for the more prominent members of the congregation while the majority sat on stools and benches for the service. The expectation that the entire parish would attend the sermon put pressure on the available church space. The introduction of fixed seating and allocated places made it easier to accommodate more people but also to monitor attendance. The capacity of many churches had to be increased further by the erection of galleries.[63]

The significance of the pulpit as the liturgical focal point of the church interior was further emphasised by the changes that took place regarding baptism. The pre-Reformation font had stood near the entrance to the church creating another ritual centre but the Catholic practices surrounding the sacrament were condemned in the First Book of Discipline. This sought to ensure that the rite »was voyd of all such inventions devised by man« and that there should be »the element of water onely«.[64] The requirement for churches to have »a basyn for baptisme«, implicitly meant the rejection of the font.[65] The liturgy of the Book of Common Order linked preaching with baptism by requiring that the rite took place during the Sunday service after the sermon.[66] It was an association that was further emphasised by the use of a bracket to attach the basin to the pulpit.[67]

---

[60] T.H.L. Parker, *Calvin's Preaching* (Edinburgh, 1992), 35–53.

[61] Quoted in J. Kirk, »John Knox and the Historians«, in R. A. Mason (ed.), *John Knox and the British Reformations* (Aldershot, 1998), 21.

[62] *Visitation of the Diocese of Dunblane*, ed. J. Kirk (Scottish Record Society, new series, 11, 1984), xliii, 23, 33–34, 36, 44, 54, 84.

[63] Spicer, »›Accommodating of Thame Selfis to Heir the Word‹« (see note 58), 413–15; Margo Todd, *The Culture of Protestantism in Early Modern Scotland* (New Haven, CT, 2002), 318–25.

[64] *First Book of Discipline* (see note 46), 91. See Spinks, *Reformation and Modern Rituals* (see note 30), 44–46.

[65] *First Book of Discipline* (see note 46), 203.

[66] *The Book of common order of the Church of Scotland*, edited by G. W. Sprott and T. Leishman (Edinburgh, 1901), 134; *John Knox's Genevan service book, 1556: the liturgical portions of the Genevan service book used by John Knox while a minister of the English Congregation of Marian exiles at Geneva, 1556–1559*, ed. William D. Maxwell (Leighton Buzzard, 1965), 105.

The administration of the Lord's Supper required more liturgical space than had been occupied by a pre-Reformation altar. The First Book of Discipline emphasised that the sacrament was »most rightly administered« when it came closest to Christ's own actions at the Last Supper. On that occasion

»Christ Jesus sate with his Disciples; and therefore doe we judge that sitting at a table is the most convenient to that holy action«.[68]

Congregations were required to have »tables for the ministration of the Lordis Suppar«.[69] Unlike the parish mass, this sacrament was not held every Sunday and was administered infrequently, so in most churches there was a temporary rearrangement of the liturgical space. A long table was erected for the congregation to sit around and participate in breaking the bread, drinking from the cup and passing the elements to their neighbours. The tables were usually placed in the body of the church before the pulpit and subsequently dismantled.[70] A few larger churches had sufficient space for a dedicated communion aisle, the former choir being used for this purpose at Crail, Fife and Perth; the south transept of Holy Trinity, St Andrews was similarly assigned. These more permanent liturgical spaces were railed off from the remainder of the church and reserved for the administration of the sacrament, the division also serving as a barrier for those not admitted to the Lord's table.[71]

The existing parish churches generally fulfilled the requirements for Reformed worship but in some instances, it was necessary to increase their capacity through the erection of »aisles«. Constructed at right angles to the original rectangular ground plan, these »aisles« resulted in a T-shape, which became a characteristic of many Scottish post-Reformation places of worship. The pulpit was placed at the intersection of the three parts of the T shape, to ensure that the minister could be seen and heard by the entire congregation. Some new churches were built to this T-shaped design and occasionally a fourth aisle was added to form a cross, such as at Fenwick, Ayrshire, and Lauder, Lothian, to provide accommodation for the laird.[72]

---

[67] Hay, »Scottish Post-Reformation Church Furniture« (see note 58), 48–49; Jackson, »Kirk Furnishings« (see note 58), 4–5; Todd, *The Culture of Protestantism* (see note 63), 27, 121, plate 5; Spicer, *Calvinist Churches* (see note 50), 48.

[68] *First Book of Discipline* (see note 46), 91.

[69] Ibid., 203.

[70] Todd, *The Culture of Protestantism* (see note 63), 102–03; G. B. Burnet, *The Holy Communion in the Reformed Church of Scotland, 1560–1960* (Edinburgh, 1960), 26–27; W. McMillan, *The Worship of the Scottish Reformed Church, 1550–1638* (London, 1931), 163.

[71] Hay, *The Architecture of Scottish Post-Reformation Churches* (see note 59), 26, 178–80.

The T-shape churches represented an evolution of liturgical space from more traditional Catholic designs to one that more readily accorded with the demands of preaching. The most innovative solution to the requirements of Reformed worship was the church erected at Burntisland, Fife, in the 1590s. This was very much a civic project that was intended to reflect the port's recent elevation to the status of a burgh. The church was built to a centralised, square-shaped ground plan; four central columns supported the roof. In 1602 the authorities decided to furnish the church with raked seating along three sides, presumably focused on the pulpit which was erected against one of the pillars. In the subsequent decades, the kirk session gave permission for galleries to be erected so that the occupants might more commodiously »heir & sie the minister at preaching & prayeris«. The interior resembled an auditorium, which prompted William Laud's dismissive jibe following his visit to the church in 1633 that it resembled »a square theatre« rather than a church. This experimental form of liturgical space, however, was not adopted by other Scottish church builders before the eighteenth century.[73]

Besides re-ordering the liturgical space of existing places of worship, the Reformed Kirk sought to redraw the parochial landscape. To better facilitate the preaching of the word of God and the true administration of the sacraments, it was prepared to abandon some ancient places of worship in remote or inaccessible places for new buildings that were more centrally and conveniently located for the congregation.[74] Although this was not undertaken systematically, local communities sought to resolve the difficulties they regularly faced in attending their parish church, especially in winter, which might be further away than the place of worship in a neighbouring parish. With the dispersed settlements in some rural parishes, calculations were made about the size of the farmsteads and communities as well as their distance from the parish church as part of the process of church relocation.[75]

In spite of the efforts undertaken by the Kirk to reconfigure and rationalise liturgical space, there remained a popular attachment not only to sacred sites and holy wells but also to places of worship that had been

---

[72] Spicer, *Calvinist Churches* (see note 50), 94–5, 103.

[73] Ibid., 57–60.

[74] Kerr-Patterson, »Post-Reformation Church Architecture« (see note 53), 108–12; Andrew Spicer, »Redrawing the Parochial Landscape of Post-Reformation Scotland«, (forthcoming).

[75] See Andrew Spicer, »Disjoynet, Dismemberit and Disuneited: Church-building and Re-drawing Parish Boundaries in Post-Reformation Scotland: A Case Study of Bassendean, Berwickshire« in *The Archaeology of Post-Medieval Religion* (Woodbridge, 2011), 19–3.

suppressed. In November 1581, the Scottish Parliament legislated against the

»observing of [...] superstitious and popish rights to the dishonour of God, contempt of the true religion and fostering of great error amongst the people«.

This included

»pilgrimage to any kirks, chapels, wells, crosses or such other monuments of idolatry«.[76]

The kirk session at Elgin had repeated difficulties with people who frequented the cathedral, which had been abandoned at the Reformation, rather than the parish church. In 1615, it ordered

»that nane within this congregatioun ha[u]nt the Chanonrie kirk to ther prayeris seing the prayeris ar daylie red in this kirk wher the trew word is preitched and the sacramentis celebrat, and therfor that ilk ane keip the publict meittings the tyme of preitching and nocht to go to ther avin privat prayeris in the Chanonrie kirk«.

Although the kirk session imposed fines on those who continued to visit the cathedral ruins to say their prayers, they were forced to reiterate their prohibition in 1641.[77] Beyond the town, the kirk session also condemned those who went »to the idolatrous places of the chappell at Speyside«, which was associated with a holy well.[78] The sites of former religious houses also continued to be used by some noble families for interments, where in the past their ancestors had been buried and had benefited from the prayers of the religious community. The east end or former location of the high altar were particularly favoured illustrating the continued perception of the holiness of this former liturgical space.[79]

Besides the on-going use of these sites for burial, the desire for interment within the parish church persisted in spite of the objections of the Kirk. In some instances, this became a useful source of income for the parish or the local authorities.[80] A detailed attack upon the practice was made by the minister William Birnie in his tract *The Blame of Kirk-Buriall*

---

[76] *The Acts of the Parliaments of Scotland, 1124–1707*, ed. T. Thomson and C. Innes, 12 vols (London, 1814–75), III, 212–13; *The Records of the Parliaments of Scotland to 1707*, K. M. Brown et al eds (St Andrews, 2007–2018), 1581/10/25: www.rps.ac.uk/trans/1581/10/25 (Date accessed: 3 June 2018).

[77] *The Records of Elgin, 1234–1800*, ed. W. Cramond, 2 vols (New Spalding Society, 27 (1903), 35 (1908), II, 71, 137, 144, 169, 193, 238.

[78] Ibid., II, 97, 202.

[79] Spicer, »Defyle not Christ's kirk with your carrion‹« (see note 54), 153–55, 157–58.

[80] See Alison S. Cameron and Judith A. Stones, »Excavations within the East Kirk of St Nicholas, Aberdeen«, in Geddes (ed.), *Medieval Art and Archaeology* (see note 53), 82–98; Gordon D. Raeburn, »The Changing Face of Scottish Burial Practices, 1560–1645«, *Renaissance & Reformation Review* 11 (2009), 181–201.

published in 1606, which reflected on the appropriate use and perception of liturgical space. Birnie defined churches as being »an oratory or house of prayer« where the congregation gathered for worship; his approach accorded with other Scottish churchmen who described the building variously as »God's house«, a »temple«, a »house of prayer and spiritual exercise«.[81] Through preaching, God communicated with his people and according to the First Book of Discipline, the ministers were His mouthpiece, the »servants and ambassadors of the Lord Jesus«. The Kirk sought to ensure that parish churches were repaired and furnished for »the quiet and commodious receiving of the people« being concerned lest »the unseemliness of the place« would bring »the word of God and ministration of the Sacraments« into contempt. It was therefore not considered seemly for the place »appointed to preaching and the ministration of the Sacraments shall be made a place of buryall«.[82] While the authorities rejected the belief that churches had any inherent sanctity, they nonetheless sought to prohibit intra-mural burial and other inappropriate behaviour within places of worship.[83]

Attitudes towards liturgical space became polarised in the early seventeenth century as a result of the religious policies pursued by the crown, in particular the Five Articles of Perth – which were reluctantly accepted by the General Assembly in 1618 – and in the introduction of liturgical reforms during early 1630s, specifically the Book of Canons and the new Scottish Prayer Book. One of the most contested issues, introduced as one of the Five Articles, was the requirement that members of the congregation should receive the Lord Supper while kneeling. Half a century earlier, John Knox had vehemently opposed the practice in the context of the English Reformation.[84] The widespread opposition to kneeling rather than being seated for communion led many to absent themselves from services or attend churches where the measure was not enforced.[85] In Edinburgh,

---

[81] William Birnie, *The blame of kirk-buriall, tending to persvvade cemiteriall ciuilitie* (Edinburgh, 1606); Spicer, »›Defyle not Christ's kirk with your carrion‹« (see note 54), 150–51.

[82] *First Book of Discipline* (see note 46), 102, 201–02.

[83] Andrew Spicer, »›What kinde of house a kirk is‹: Conventicles, Consecrations, and the Concept of Sacred Space in post-Reformation Scotland«, in Will Coster and Andrew Spicer (eds), *Sacred Space in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge, 2005), 90–94.

[84] Iain R. Torrance, »A Particular Reformed Piety: John Knox and the Posture at Communion«, *Scottish Journal of Theology* 67 (2014), 400–13.

[85] Burnet, *Holy Communion in the Reformed Church of Scotland* (see note 70), 77–85; McMillan, *The Worship of the Scottish Reformed Church* (see note 70), 178–82; P. H. R. MacKay, »The Reception given to the Five Articles of Perth«, *Records of the Scottish Church History Society* 19 (1975–77), 185–201. See also Laura A. M. Stewart, »The Political Repercussions of the Five Articles of Perth: A Reassessment of James VI and I's Religious Policies in Scotland«, *Sixteenth Century Journal* 38 (2007), 1013–36.

some dissidents attended conventicles held in private houses at the same time as the usual church service. Private prayer meetings spread through the southwest of Scotland during the 1620s and 1630s.[86] Mass gatherings also met to hear evangelical sermons outdoors as well as sometimes to receive the Lord's Supper.[87] These religious tensions therefore challenged the role of the parish church as the sole place for religious activities.[88]

While some were alienated by the religious policies of the 1620s and 1630s, there was a heightened view of the significance of liturgical space for those churchmen influenced by ›Laudian‹ principles. Their belief in the »beauty of holiness« meant that they sought an appropriate setting for the communion rite. The private chapel erected at Dairsie, Fife, by Arch-bishop Spottiswoode in 1621 reflected these changes with the floor of the east end being raised up and with a screen which separated it from the remainder of the building. In Edinburgh, Charles I ordered that St Giles's church should once again become a single place of worship and elevated it to being the seat of a new bishopric.[89] Some new places of worship were even consecrated during this period.[90] The ›Laudian‹ reordering of chur-ches and their liturgical space was very limited and proved to be short lived in the face of widespread opposition to the crown's religious policies, which led to the signing of the National Covenant and the Glasgow Assembly in 1638.

## Conclusion

There were significant differences between Lutheranism and the Reformed faith, but both confessions rejected the Catholic mass and advocated the true administration of the sacraments together with the preaching of the word of God. How these faiths translated these broad principles into actual religious practice differed markedly. The circumstances and nature

---

[86] D. Stevenson, »Conventicles in the Kirk, 1619–37. The Emergence of a Radical Party«, *Records of the Scottish Church History Society* 18 (1972), 101–08.

[87] L.E. Schmidt, *Holy Fairs. Scottish Communions and American Revivals in the Early Modern Period* (Princeton, NJ, 1989), 21–22, 28–29.

[88] D. Stevenson, »The Radical Party in the Kirk, 1637–45«, *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 25 (1974), 136–37.

[89] Peter Lake, »The Laudian Style: Order, Uniformity and the Pursuit of Holiness in the 1630s«, in Kenneth Fincham (ed.), *The Early Stuart Church, 1603–1642* (Basings-toke, 1993), 164–74; Spicer, *Calvinist Churches* (see note 50), 71–72; Andrew Spicer, »Laudianism‹ in Scotland? St Giles'Cathedral, Edinburgh, 1633–39 – A Reappraisal«, *Architectural History* 46 (2003), 95–108. See also Leonie James, *'This Great Firebrand«. William Laud and Scotland, 1617–1645* (Woodbridge, 2017).

[90] Spicer, »›What kinde of house a kirk is‹« (see note 83), 98–102.

of regular worship came to determine the spatial arrangement and liturgical use of Lutheran churches and Reformed kirks.

Although the Reformed valued the administration of the Lord's Supper highly, they were only willing to allow the worthy members of the congregation to participate, who had been subject to the exercise of ecclesiastical discipline. Even in the city state of Geneva, this precluded the monthly administration that Calvin desired and it came to be held quarterly.[91] These difficulties were more acute across the 1100 parishes of the Scottish kingdom and made more problematic by the shortage of ministers to administer the sacrament. As a result, the Lord's Supper was held infrequently with the ritual not being administered in some churches for several years.[92] While the Lutherans did examine the faithful on the principles of their faith, relatively few members of the congregation actually regularly received the sacrament, even though the German mass was celebrated on a weekly basis. Furthermore, Luther's reluctance to regulate the appropriate setting for worship or to alienate those who were less committed in their faith by undertaking radical change, meant that there was a degree of continuity in the use of liturgical space in the transition from Catholicism to Lutheranism.

For Luther preaching the word of God was a fundamental part of regular worship but it was not the only component of weekly services. The situation was different in Scotland, where due to the infrequent administration of the Lord's Supper, the sermon became the focus of regular worship. Liturgical space was therefore configured for preaching, in a way that best accommodated the congregation so that they could hear and see the minister. Only periodically was this space rearranged to allow for the administration of the Lord's Supper. In the Lutheran churches of the empire, however, there was more than one liturgical focal point – the altar and the pulpit as well as the baptismal font. While there were some attempts to bring together the church furnishings required for preaching and the sacraments, this was a spatial arrangement that was only really adopted in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

Almost half a century after the German Reformer's protest against indulgences in 1517, the Scottish Kirk was not tentative in its rejection of the setting of the mass with the abolition of idolatry and the requirement that every church should have »a pulpit, a basin for baptism, and tables for the

---

[91] »Ordonnances ecclésiastiques«, in *Registres de la Compagnie des Pasteurs de Genève*, ed. J. F. Bergier et al. (Geneva, 1964–), I, 9; Harro Höpfl, *The Christian Polity of John Calvin* (Cambridge, 1982), 61–63.

[92] Burnet, *Holy Communion in the Reformed Church of Scotland* (see note 70), 13–14, 16–17, 120–25.

ministration of the Lord's Supper«.[93] Luther had similarly recognised the importance of »baptismal fonts, altars and pulpits« for worship.[94] However, the circumstances surrounding the implementation of religious reform and divergent theological perceptions regarding the preaching of the word of God and the administration of the sacraments meant that there were marked differences in the configuration of liturgical space in the Lutheran churches in the Holy Roman Empire and the Scottish kirks.

---

[93] *First Book of Discipline* (see note 46), 203.
[94] *WA*, XXXVII, 670; *LW*, LVII, 187.