MULTILINGUALISM IN ANCIENT CONTEXTS

Perspectives from
Ancient Near Eastern
and Early Christian
Contexts

EDITORS

Louis C. Jonker
Angelika Berlejung
Izak Cornelius

15

MULTILINGUALITY
AND THE CELEBRATION
OF CHRISTIAN WORSHIP

Alexander Deeg
Leipzig

15.1 CHRISTIAN WORSHIP AS A MULTILINGUAL PHENOMENON

This discussion is a liturgist's view on multilinguality in liturgical contexts – an aspect which seems quite far away from other discourses about multilingual realities today dealing with questions of globalisation, of interaction between speakers of different languages, of minorities, of dynamics of exclusion and inclusion, etc.

I hope that my 'narrow' liturgical perspective may help to shed some light on current questions and to discover more dimensions of multilingual realities – the basic one being the tension between 'sacred' languages and everyday languages.

When I was a boy in my confirmation class in northern Bavaria, Germany, in the 1980s, we read a text with the title: "And he started to sing in a foreign language."¹ It was a story about a confirmer attending the first Sunday service in his local church. The text written from Arthur's (the confirmer's) perspective, showed how strange this worship service was for him. Arthur describes one of his impressions as follows: "Pastor H. drehte sich um, was ganz schön unhöflich war, und fing an, ausländisch zu singen: *Kyrie eleison*." In a rough English translation, this would be: "Pastor H. turned around, which was quite impolite, and started to sing in a foreign language: *Kyrie eleison*." The Greek words "*Kyrie eleison*" are part of the church's liturgical heritage from its very beginning² and are used in most German Protestant Sunday services every Sunday. Still, they were – as it seems – entirely unknown for Arthur.

The story was our pastor's starting point for his teaching about the Sunday service, its structure, and content. At the same time, the story intended to sympathise with us confirmeres who felt estranged by the celebration of classical Sunday services with their old melodies and unintelligible texts. The 1970s and 80s were a period in which more and more Protestant pastors became aware of the 'threshold' which had to be passed by 'outsiders' to feel part of a Sunday morning celebration. 'Lowering the threshold' ("die Schwelle erniedrigen") was (and still is) a motto for many liturgical reforms in my German Protestant context.

But what happens if we do so? Should pastors eliminate the "*Kyrie eleison*" because some young people (and surely a lot of older people as well) do not understand the meaning of these words when participating for the first time in a Sunday morning celebration? If we do eliminate the '*Kyrie eleison*', then what about: "Hosianna", "Hallelujah" or even "Amen"? Arthur's story provides a first glimpse of current liturgical questions seen

1 The text can be found, e.g., predigt[e]n.de, *Die Predigt vom 2. Juli 2000: "Gemeinde: abschreckend oder einladend?"* Available at: [http://www.predigt\[n\].de/743.htm](http://www.predigt[n].de/743.htm) (Accessed 28 May 2020).

2 Cf. Karl-Heinrich Bieritz, *Liturgik* (Berlin/New York: De Gruyter, 2004), 346-8.

under the lens of multilinguality. In Arthur's case, liturgy's "foreign language" is a matter of inclusion and exclusion.

In what follows, I will briefly go along the history of Christian worship and outline seven constellations³ that show that and how multilinguality is a perspective that helps to describe some fundamental theological, phenomenological, ethical, and practical liturgical questions.

Christian worship is a multilingual phenomenon from the very beginning.

1 Cor 16:22-24, the end of Paul's first letter to the congregation of Corinth, Achaia's capital and centre of international trade, which was in itself a multilingual congregation, reads: "[...] if anyone has no love for the Lord, let him be accursed. Maranatha! The grace of the Lord Jesus be with you. My love be with you all in Christ Jesus. Amen."⁴ It is striking to read the Aramaic word "Maranatha" (מרנא־תא) meaning "Come, our Lord" (cf. Rev 22:20; *marana* = our Lord; *ta* = come) here. Apparently, this word was quite common in early 'Christian' congregations – even in those in which Aramaic was surely not the common language. Paul seems to have been sure that the congregation will at least understand this Aramaic phrase – which is an argument for its widespread use and its liturgical 'Sitz im Leben'.⁵

It is even more surprising to read Paul's *Maranatha*, as we know that there was a widespread aversion against so-called 'barbarism' in the Roman Empire at Paul's time.⁶ Already the Septuagint, translated from around 250 BCE to 100 BCE in its main parts and finished by the end of the 1st century CE, usually translates *every* Hebrew (and Aramaic) word.

3 Cf. for a practical-theological reception of Walter Benjamin's concept of "Konstellationen" Albrecht Grözinger, *Praktische Theologie und Ästhetik. Ein Beitrag zur Grundlegung der Praktischen Theologie* (München: Kaiser, 1987).

4 In Greek: "εἴ τις οὐ φιλεῖ τὸν κύριον, ἦτω ἀνάθεμα. μαράνα θά. ἡ χάρις τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ μεθ' ὑμῶν. ἡ ἀγάπη μου μετὰ πάντων ὑμῶν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ."

5 Cf. Did 10:6, where the word appears in a Greek text and in a liturgical context. It is striking to see that the "Revised Standard Version" eliminates the Aramaic word and offers a plain English translation, whereas, e.g., the German "Lutherbibel" retains the Aramaic wording. Of course, it could be argued that Paul wanted the congregation of Corinth to read and hear a word they do not simply 'understand' to underline the connection to Judaism and stress the specific character of faith in Christ which transcends all 'understanding' (cf. 1 Cor 1:18-25). On the other hand, the use of "Maranatha" in Didache makes it more plausible for me to assume that the congregation still understood the term.

6 Cf. Martin Hengel, "Abba, Maranatha, Hosanna und die Anfänge der Christologie", in Martin Hengel, *Studien zur Christologie. Kleine Schriften IV* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006), 496-534, here 496.

Usually, words from Hebrew or Aramaic were also translated in the liturgy of the Greek speaking synagogue – except for *Amen* and *Hallelujah* (which were already seen as part of the common liturgical language).

Concerning *Maranatha*, German scholar Martin Hengel (1926–2009) suggests that everyone seems to have known what this formula means (“Paulus kann in dem beschwörenden, eigenhändigen Schluss des ersten Briefes auf eine Übersetzung verzichten, weil jeder wusste, was diese Formel bedeutet”).⁷ Hengel is convinced that *Maranatha*, as well as the Aramaic word *Abba* (“father”) and the Hebrew word *Hosanna*, originated in the first community of ‘Christian’ believers in Jerusalem. The Jerusalem congregation was at least bilingual, as Jews from all parts of the world came together, and Greek and Aramaic were the languages used by them. In Hengel’s eyes, *Abba*, *Maranatha*, and *Hosanna* mirror the Christology of the first congregation in Jerusalem, which was based on the idea of some kind of ‘binitarian’ unity of father and son and unity of action of both.⁸ Thus these words are totally different from *Halleluja* or *Amen*.⁹ Using these words in Hellenistic contexts could have been a symbol of unity between the community in Jerusalem and other communities around the Mediterranean in which non-Jews were the clear majority. Or in Hengel’s words:

Derartige aramäische Rufe wie *Abba* oder *Maranatha* waren der *sprachliche Ausdruck für diese Teilhabe* und damit für die – trotz aller heftigen Auseinandersetzungen des Paulus in Jerusalem, Antiochien, in (Süd-) Galatien und in Korinth – *letzte Einheit* zwischen jüdischer Urgemeinde und den immer stärker ‘heidenchristlich’ werdenden Missionsgemeinden paulinischer und anderer ‘apostolischer’ Prägung.¹⁰

This may explain why these words disappeared when the connection to Jerusalem got lost (and only show up in the *Didache* again).¹¹ In contrast, other words – especially *Hallelujah* and *Amen* – remain in liturgical use. In any case, Christian worship starts as a bilingual phenomenon in the multilingual Roman Empire.

7 Cf. Hengel, “*Abba*, *Maranatha*, *Hosanna*”, 499.

8 Ibid., 522.

9 Ibid., 505.

10 Ibid., 506.

11 The Aramaic “*Abba*/father/אבא” seems to have been a part of early Christian prayer (Gal 4:6; Rom 8:15; Mk 14:36), but was soon translated into its Greek equivalence Πάτερ (cf. Mt 6:2; Lk 11:2).

15.2 SEVEN CONSTELLATIONS OF MULTILINGUALITY AND LITURGY OR: A PANORAMIC VIEW ON DIFFERENT ASPECTS OF THE THEME AND POSSIBILITIES FOR FUTURE RESEARCH PROJECTS

15.2.1 The Basic Bilinguality of Christian Worship or: The Jewish-Christian Context

Liturgical bilinguality as reflected in *Maranatha*, *Halleluja*, *Hosianna*, *Amen*, and *Abba* is not only a linguistic but much more a theological phenomenon. There was a long process of “parting of the ways”¹² between Christianity and Judaism, and the influence of Jewish practices and theory on Christian practices and theory remained vivid for centuries – and vice versa.¹³

Paul never wanted to establish ‘Christian’ congregations in the sense of a new and separated ‘religion’. For him, and the other authors of the New Testament, the Jewish context was self-evident and essential for the belief in Jesus as the Christ (משיח). In this sense, Christian worship is structurally and theologically inseparably connected with Jewish worship – an aspect which I tried to describe some years ago as basic Jewish-Christian liturgical intertextuality.¹⁴

The advantage of the paradigm of intertextuality is that it is not about linear historical developments. In previous research, it seemed to be clear that Jewish liturgies are the older ones and the ‘roots’, and Christian liturgies are later adaptations of Jewish versions.¹⁵ Recent research has shown that it can be vice versa as well.

A good example is, in my view, the so-called “Sanctus” in Christian worship – a combination of Isa 6:3 and Ps 118:26 (Mt 21:9). Usually, scholars assume that this liturgical structure has its origins in the Jewish “Qedusha”, a liturgical sequence combining Isa 6:3 with Ez 3:12 and Ps 146:10, but as the oldest text sources we have do not allow a clear historical assignment, the Jewish Qedusha could also be a reaction to, and correction of, the Christian way of using and interpreting Isa 6:3 and combining it with the story of Jesus entering the city of Jerusalem and approaching Zion (Mt 21:1-11).

12 Cf. James D.G. Dunn, ed., *Jews and Christians. The Parting of the Ways A.D. 70 to 135* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999).

13 Cf. Israel Yuval, *Two Nations in Your Womb. Perceptions of Jews and Christians [Hebr.]* (Tel Aviv: Am Oved, 2000); German translation: Israel Yuval, *Zwei Völker in deinem Leib. Gegenseitige Wahrnehmung von Juden und Christen in Spätantike und Mittelalter* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2007).

14 Cf. Alexander Deeg, “Gottesdienst in Israels Gegenwart. Liturgie als intertextuelles Phänomen”, *Liturgisches Jahrbuch*, 54 (2004): 34-52.

15 Cf. Frieder Schulz, “Die jüdischen Wurzeln des christlichen Gottesdienstes”, in Frieder Schulz, *Syntaxis* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1997), 15-36.

The Jewish Qedusha culminates in God's eschatological reign and his sovereignty on Mount Zion.

Intertextuality does not primarily deal with historical lineages, but with the hermeneutical question, what it means for the understanding of texts that they are connected and can only be interpreted one with the other.

In this sense, the basic idea is that Christian worship is never possible without its Jewish context. Again: for Paul and the authors of the New Testament, this is still self-evident (and his way of using *Maranatha* may show precisely this). However, in the history of Jews and Christians, there is a complete change, and very soon in Christian history (not later than the middle of the 2nd century) Jewish worship is perceived by Christians as the old way of worshipping God, which lost its significance with the crucifixion and resurrection of Jesus Christ.¹⁶ But still: Hebrew (and Aramaic) words remain part of Christian worship like old stone structures in a cathedral and mark the interrelation of the two faith traditions. *Amen*, *Hosianna* and *Halleluja* are liturgical placeholders showing the distinctness *and* inseparability of Jewish and Christian services throughout history.

It is, in my eyes, of utmost theological importance that Christians do not lose this connection, as Christian faith would lose its substance if it was disconnected from Judaism and the Hebrew Bible.

In one of the daring pictures of the Book of Revelation, John sees worship in heaven and a strange number of elders participating:

At once I was in the Spirit, and behold, a throne stood in heaven, with one seated on the throne. [...] Around the throne were twenty-four thrones, and seated on the thrones were twenty-four elders, clothed in white garments, with golden crowns on their heads. (Rev 4:2-4)

There are many different explanations for the number 24; one of them is that they stand for the twelve tribes of Israel and the twelve disciples of Jesus, thus representing the heavenly worship-unity of 'Christians' and 'Jews'. This is, of course, not where we are currently in our worship.

By pointing out the interconnectedness of Jewish and Christian worship, I am not advocating for blurring the boundaries of two distinct faith traditions and their religious practices. Hermeneutically, Christian worship would blow out its theological

16 Cf. e.g., the famous Easter sermon of Melito of Sardis *Peri pascha* from the midst of the 2nd century CE; cf. Melito, *On Pascha. With the fragments of Melito and other material related to the Quartodecimans*, ed. Alistair Stewart-Sykes (New York: Yonkers, ²2016).

content if it lost this connection, and theologically, Christians would lose their eschatological hope, which again unites them with the Jewish people. The danger of losing this connection lies in the fatal idea of Christian self-sufficiency, which is the deepest source of anti-Judaism and supersessionist theologies.

To remain aware that we are not yet where we will be and in order not to lose hope, we need words like *Halleluja*, and *Amen* and *Hosianna* in Christian liturgies, which are not only like old stones structures in a cathedral and like placeholders, but also like stumbling blocks reminding Christians of their unfinished existence and incomplete identity: “For now we see in a mirror dimly, but then face to face. Now I know in part, then I shall know fully ...” (1 Cor 13:12).

15.2.2 The Latin Service and the ‘Making’ of a Christian Sacred Language

In the beginning, Christian worship seems to have been a phenomenon of manifold inculturation. It was soon celebrated in many different languages: Greek, Syrian, Coptic, Armenian, Georgian, Gheez (Ethiopian), Latin, etc.

On the threshold to the Middle Ages, a difference between the language of the worship service (and of theological discourse) and the vernacular starts to develop – a difference that contributed to the making of a ‘sacred language’ in Western Christianity.

The translation of Christian worship into Latin probably started in northern Africa (Carthage). Only later, Rome became the centre of Latin/Western liturgy and of influential translations into Latin.

Around 380 CE, under Pope Damasus (366–384), the Eucharistic Prayer (*Canon Missae*) was finished in its Latin version.¹⁷ However, some words of the liturgy remained untranslated – and again the liturgy seems like an old cathedral in which some older stones and structures remain even if the church is rebuilt and renovated.

This is especially true for the Greek words *Kyrie eleison*. There are at least three answers to the question of why these Greek remnants remained in use. The first and easiest is that these words were still widely understood, which is undoubtedly the case in the time when the liturgy was first translated into Latin. The second answer is that leaving some parts of the liturgy in the older Greek version connects the worship services with their history and with other Christian congregations in the east of the Roman Empire, using Greek as their liturgical language.

17 It is important to note that this Latin version was not only a translation of a former Greek version, but at the same time a new composition of the prayer using the structure and central elements of former Eucharistic prayers, but also creating a new prayer fitting to the different language. Cf. Bieritz, *Liturgik*, 29.

The third answer is that these Greek words remain as remnants and mark a first step towards the creation of an own language of liturgy, symbolising that liturgy is not about understanding in a superficial and purely cognitive sense of the word but has to do with God who “surpasses all understanding” (Phil 4:7). If this were the case, Greek words in the Latin worship service would signalise a shift towards a *sacred language* interrupting everyday language and becoming a symbol for God’s interruption of the world. This development would then go hand in hand with the 4th century’s transformation of liturgy and worship into a *cultus*: Liturgical language spoke more often about ‘sacrifice’, and in church architecture, the altar, and the spaces where only clergy was allowed to enter, were more and more separated from the ‘rest’ of the congregation.

In the Migration period, Latin Christianity made its way into Germanic contexts. Wherever Arianism was the dominant theological direction, the language of liturgy was translated into the vernacular,¹⁸ but those who converted to Catholic Christianity celebrated the Roman liturgy in Latin.¹⁹ Latin became the language for ‘holy things’, disconnected from the vernacular. Liturgical scholar Karl-Heinrich Bieritz (1936–2011) writes:

Dies war eine folgenreiche Entscheidung, die das Gesicht des Abendlandes für Jahrhunderte prägte und dazu führte, dass der Gottesdienst in seinem Kern bis in das 16. Jh. – in der römisch-katholischen Kirche bis in das 20. Jh. – in einer Sprache gefeiert wurde, die weiten Teilen der Bevölkerung fremd war.²⁰

Of course, Latin was not only the sacred language of liturgy in Western medieval times. It was comparable to the Greek koiné and today’s English. It was the language of the intellectual elites and the language used in church and theology.

On the other hand, it disconnected the worship service from the everyday life of large parts of the population. In the Carolingian period, the so called *Pronaus* was established, offering readings and some prayers in the vernacular, which was celebrated before the Eucharistic Mass in Latin.²¹

There are many questions connected with the ‘making’ of a liturgical (and sacred) language in the early Middle Ages – questions concerning the development of the

18 Cf. the translation of Wulfila (310–383) into Gothic.

19 Cf. Bieritz, *Liturgik*, 30.

20 Bieritz, *Liturgik*, 30.

21 By the way: There are many parallels between the development of a ‘sacred language’ and the development of liturgical cloths. No one ‘invented’ special liturgical cloths. But in the Migration period clergy continued to use the formerly ‘normal’, everyday cloths (*tunic*), whereas others usually wore trousers in their everyday lives. Thus, the formerly ‘normal’ cloths became special liturgical vestments.

role of clergy and its power, the ongoing liturgical exclusion of ‘normal’ people whose participation was more or less reduced to watching what happens on the liturgical stage, the development of theologies of sacrifice and holiness, etc.²²

The development of a sacred language is just one aspect of a thorough transformation of church life in these years, but it is an aspect which helps to make visible what happened in these years and is, therefore, a fruitful basis for future research.

15.2.3 Celebrating in the Vernacular or: The Impulse of Reformation and the Intelligibility of Worship

For Paul in his first letter to the Corinthians (the letter which ends with the Aramaic word *Maranatha*), prophecy is more important than glossolalia, as prophetic words can be *understood* thus uplifting and uniting the congregation. He writes:

For one who speaks in a tongue speaks not to men but to God; for no one understands him, but he utters mysteries in the Spirit. On the other hand, the one who prophesies speaks to people for their upbuilding and encouragement and consolation. (1 Cor 14:2-3)

Understanding one another is the basis for a feeling of belonging, as Paul argues some verses later:

There are doubtless many different languages in the world, and none is without meaning, but if I do not know the meaning of the language, I will be a foreigner to the speaker and the speaker a foreigner to me. (1 Cor 14:10-11)²³

To be an insider and part of the group, language must be understood. In the early 16th century, the movement of Reformation with its radical shift of authority structures also meant the empowerment of all those who are baptised (“priesthood of all baptized”). Thus, the language of the service had to be translated into the vernacular.

All the more astonishing is that Martin Luther, who was amongst the first to translate the Bible, was not amongst the first who translated the Latin mass into German (other Reformers did so much earlier). Instead, Luther developed a bilingual liturgical

22 The developments in Orthodox Christianity are much more complex. In principle, there was never a decision in Orthodoxy not to translate liturgical texts in the vernacular. In reality, these translations, once established, were and are used for centuries. The consequence is that the language of the service is the language, which was used hundreds of years ago and can hardly be understood by most people today.

23 The English translation of 1 Cor 14:10 is problematic. The Greek text reads: “καὶ οὐδὲν ἄφωρον” – a more accurate translation would be: “nothing is without language” (which is a very general, but at the same time a deep philosophical insight). Cf. the translation in the German “Lutherbibel”: “... und nichts ist ohne Sprache.”

program and argued for it in the preface of his translation and adaption of the Mass (Deutsche Messe, 1526).

On the one hand, he wants people to be able to celebrate in more than one language and to retain the multilinguality of Christian worship. There is no way for him “to abrogate” the Latin service.²⁴ His main argument is pedagogical – and his keen vision is the celebration in *four* languages: the two Biblical languages Hebrew and Greek, the previous language of the Church service Latin and the German vernacular. He writes:

For I would in no wise banish the Latin tongue entirely from the Service, for the youth is my chiefest concern. If I could bring it to pass and Greek and Hebrew were as familiar to us as the Latin, and offered as much good music and song, we would hold mass, sing and read on successive Sundays in all four languages, German, Latin, Greek and Hebrew.²⁵

For Luther, Christianity should never be confined to just one specific language – as was the problem, as he says, of the “Waldensians in Bohemia”.²⁶ Luther’s multilingual approach seems to be very modern. But pedagogy is not only the reason for retaining the Latin mass, but also for offering a German translation. The German mass “should be introduced for the sake of the simple laymen”.²⁷ Luther writes, “Our Service is a public provocation to faith and to Christianity.”²⁸ Also: “[...] the chief and greatest aim of any Service is to preach and teach God’s Word [...]”.²⁹ It is all about understanding for those who do not understand yet (and it is interesting to note that again the *Kyrie eleison* is kept in Greek,³⁰ whereas Luther offers a German version of the Sanctus).³¹

The greatest chance and the greatest problem of Luther’s idea of translation seems to be the pedagogical impulse. He translated the mass to enable people to exercise their ‘Christian freedom’. On the other hand, the result of the liturgical transformations was very often that a dominant pastor uses the Sunday worship to teach his congregation, thus transforming the pulpit into a mighty space for public pedagogy for centuries.

The question – did the impulse to empower the congregation paradoxically result in the reduction of the freedom of the sacred space of worship?

24 Martin Luther, “The German Mass and Order of Service”, in *Works of Martin Luther*, translated with introduction and notes, vol. 6 (Albany: AGES-Software, 1997), 123-37, here 124.

25 Martin Luther, “The German Mass”, 124.

26 Ibid., 125.

27 Ibid.

28 Ibid.

29 Ibid., 128.

30 Ibid., 130.

31 Ibid., 135.

15.2.4 Back and Forth or: Vernacular and Sacred Language in Reform Judaism

In the early 19th century, the Jewish Reform movement started as a liturgical and homiletical reform program. The early Reformers called for sermons in the vernacular to help Jewish people in their transition from “Jews by fate” to “Jews by faith”.³² At the same time, many Reformers translated parts of the *Siddur* (the Book of Prayer) into German. The first German prayer book was printed in Berlin in 1817 and had the characteristic title “Die deutsche Synagoge” (a title which might have reminded readers of Luther’s “Die deutsche Messe”).³³ In the preface, the editors and translators Eduard Kley and Carl Sigfried Günsburg write:

Soll aber Gottesfurcht den Weg zu unserm Herzen finden, [...] so muß sie eine Sprache reden, die der Knabe, wie der Mann, der Jüngling, wie der Greis, die Jungfrau, wie das Weib, der Hohe, wie der Niedrige, der Reiche wie der Arme, verstehen und begreifen [...]. [...] *Heilig* ist die Sprache, in welcher Gott einst unsern Vätern das Gesetz gab [...]: *heilig* ist uns diese Sprache als ein Denkmal aus den Tagen grauer Vorwelt [...]. Aber siebenfach noch heiliger ist die Sprache uns, die der Gegenwart gehöret [...].³⁴

The idea of the Jewish Reformers of the early 19th century was comparable to the concept of the Protestant Reformers 400 years before: To be able to participate and to be a part of the praying community, the language must be intelligible. It is interesting to see, that for Kley and Günsburg, the concept of a “Holy Language” was present – and Hebrew surely is a holy language for them, but even ‘holier’ is the language in which people communicate in their everyday life.

The early ‘Temples’ of the Reform movement proved to be attractive for many Jewish people, and were soon too small for the number of those who wanted to pray there. On the other hand, there were huge discussions from the very beginning about the legitimacy of the Reformers’ ideas, and also about the translation of the sacred language. Opponents of the Reform saw in these Temples, and especially in the translation of (some of) the prayers, a destruction of the whole idea of Jewish prayer. For them,

32 Cf. Ismar Schorsch, “Emancipation and the Crisis of Religious Authority. The Emergence of the Modern Rabbinate”, in *Revolution and Evolution. 1848 in German-Jewish History*, ed. Werner E. Mosse u.a., SWALBI 39 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1981), 205-47; cf. also Alexander Deeg, *Predigt und Derascha. Homiletische Textlektüre im Dialog mit dem Judentum*, APTLH 48 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2006).

33 Eduard Kley & Carl S. Günsburg, *Die deutsche Synagoge oder: Ordnung des Gottesdienstes für die Sabbath- und Festtage des ganzen Jahres zum Gebrauche der Gemeinden, die sich der deutschen Gebete bedienen, Erster Theil* (Berlin: Maurersche Buchhandlung, 1817). Two years later the prayer book of the newly established Hamburg Tempelverein was printed, cf. Seckel I. Fränkel & Meyer J. Bresselau, *Ordnung der öffentlichen Andacht für die Sabbath- und Festtage des ganzen Jahres. Nach dem Gebrauche des Neuen-Tempel-Vereins in Hamburg* (Hamburg, 1819).

34 Fränkel & Bresselau, *Ordnung der öffentlichen Andacht*, x-xi.

language was connected with identity, and understanding meant much more than just deciphering the words of a text.

Around 100 years later, Franz Rosenzweig (1886–1929) and others in a movement often called “Jewish Renaissance” wanted to reconstruct Jewish life. One aspect was to bring Jewish people back into the realm of the Hebrew language. For Rosenzweig, the language of the Bible and of Jewish prayer cannot be translated; they are “unübersetzbar”,³⁵ he writes: “An der Sprache hängt der Sinn” (Meaning is connected with language).³⁶

It is interesting to see that the Reform movement in the United States also made its way back to Hebrew in the last decades, as the titles of the prayer books clearly show:

- Union Prayer Book (1892);
- Gates of Prayer – Sha’are tefilah (1975); and
- Mishkan Tefilah. A Reform Siddur (2007).

The 1975 siddur still has an English main title. The current siddur of the US-American Reform movement is the first one in history which has a Hebrew main title, mirroring the increasing role of Hebrew in Reform worship services. In the context of this discussion, this development can be understood as a reestablishment of liturgical bilinguality: It seems to be not ‘enough’ to pray in the vernacular only; Hebrew interrupts and transcends usual ways of everyday communication, connects people who pray today with those who have done so in the centuries before, and unites Jews from all over the world. The 19th-century idea of understandability and intelligibility is not the only criterion for the liturgy.

15.2.5 The Reduction of Liturgical Multilinguality or: Liturgical ‘Reform’ in Nazi-Germany

As shown earlier in this chapter (15.2.1), there is a fundamental Christian liturgical bilinguality, as Christian worship service is and remains connected with Jewish prayer. Hebrew ‘remnants’ in the text of the liturgy are like stumbling blocks reminding Christians of their always incomplete and fragmented identity. Over the centuries, Christian anti-Judaism tried to eliminate these stumbling blocks, theologically, hermeneutically, and practically.

35 Franz Rosenzweig, “Zeit ists”, in Franz Rosenzweig, *Zweistromland. Kleinere Schriften zu Glauben und Denken, Der Mensch und sein Werk. Gesammelte Schriften 3*, eds. Reinhold & Annemarie Mayer (Dordrecht: Nijhoff, 1984), 461-81 (first published in 1917).

36 Rosenzweig, “Zeit ists”, 466.

The most radical attempt to eliminate liturgical multilinguality or bilinguality can be seen in the work of the Eisenach Institut “zur Erforschung und Beseitigung des jüdischen Einflusses auf das deutsche kirchliche Leben/Institute for the Study and Elimination of Jewish Influence on German Church Life”, founded in 1939 under the leadership of the “Deutsche Christen”. The institute reworked liturgical texts and hymns and made them ‘German-only’.³⁷

The institute published a hymnal without any Jewish ‘remnants’. Thus, they transformed – to show just one example – the famous Christmas song “Es ist ein Ros entsprungen”, which originated in the late 16th century.³⁸ The original German version of verses 1 and 2 (1587-88) reads as follows:

Es ist ein Ros entsprungen aus einer Wurzel zart, wie uns die Alten sungen,
von Jesse kam die Art, und hat ein Blümlein bracht mitten im kalten Winter
wohl zu der halben Nacht.

Das Blümlein, das ich meine, davon Jesaja sagt, hat uns gebracht alleine
Marie, die reine Magd, aus Gottes ewgem Rat hat sie ein Kind geboren,
welches uns selig macht.

The revised version eliminates “Jesse” (the father of David) and the prophet “Jesaja” (Isaiah):

Es ist ein Ros entsprungen aus einer Wurzel zart, wie uns die Alten sungen
von wunderbarer Art. Und hat ein Blümlein bracht mitten im kalten Winter,
wohl zu der halben Nacht.

Das Röslein, das ich meine, davon die Kunde sagt, hat uns gebracht alleine
Marie, die reine Magd. Aus Gottes ewgem Rat hat sie ein Kind geboren,
wohl zu der halben Nacht.³⁹

The construction of a monolingual Christianity is not only a linguistic question but stands at the same time for the transformation of religion into ideology and shows that the question of liturgical language is politically relevant.

15.2.6 Catholic Liturgical Reform following the Second Vatican Council or: Participatio Actuosa and the Vernacular

Around 450 years after Protestant Reformation, the second Vatican council and its liturgical constitution “Sacrosanctum Concilium” (1963) marked a turning point in the history of the Western Latin mass. For many decades, liturgical reform movements had developed the principle of “participatio actuosa” (active participation) of the

37 Cf. Susannah Heschel, *The Aryan Jesus. Christian Theologians and the Bible in Nazi Germany* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008).

38 Verses 3 and 4 were composed in 1844.

39 “Großer Gott wir loben dich”, 1941, Nr. 145.

people gathered for worship services, as did the reformation in early 16th century. The constitution declares that priests have to “ensure that the faithful take part fully aware of what they are doing, actively engaged in the rite, and enriched by its effects”.⁴⁰

Celebrating in Latin, of course, prevents congregants from being “fully aware” of what the priest says and does and what they should maybe say or do. However, “Sacrosanctum Concilium” does not abrogate the Latin mass and actually formulates quite cautiously:

[...] the use of the Latin language is to be preserved in the Latin rites. [...] But since the use of the mother tongue, whether in the Mass, the administration of the sacraments, or other parts of the liturgy, frequently may be of great advantage to the people, the limits of its employment may be extended.⁴¹

What happened after the Council, was one of the biggest enterprises of translation in the history of the Church.

Latin liturgy, which had been more or less stable for almost 400 years, was translated in quite a short time in many different languages, and quite often, these translations were also accompanied by attempts to inculturate the liturgy in different cultural contexts.

It is interesting to see that the Vatican tried to control these works of translation, but as it took some years to finalise ‘official’ translations of the liturgy, many ‘free’ and ‘unauthorised’ translations appeared in the late 1960s and early 1970s. The idea of the Council of Trident of the late 16th century to create a mass which remains stable and guarantees identity for the church ‘forever’ – an idea that worked for almost 400 years – broke down in a decade.

Concerning the question of liturgical multilinguality only two aspects should be noted here:

1. It is comparable to the time of Reformation that the translators’ intention was to translate the *whole* Mass from Latin into the vernacular. But again, the old Greek remnants *Kyrie eleison* remained Greek (as they did in most translations in the times of Reformation). The idea of creating a Latin-Greek-Vernacular multilingual version of the Mass was not realised in these years (and as far as I know, not even discussed). This is a difference to most of the Jewish congregations in early 19th century, in which some prayers remained in Hebrew. The reason undoubtedly is that Latin was not considered to be a ‘sacred language’ by most of the Catholics in these years.

The ongoing discussion between the adherents of the Latin Mass and those who want to celebrate in the vernacular only could be an exciting starting point for

40 Sacrosanctum Concilium, 11.

41 Sacrosanctum Concilium, 36,1-2.

further research, discovering the role and relevance of ‘sacred languages’ for the construction of social religious identities.⁴²

2. The work of translation was accompanied by a lot of enthusiasm by a majority of priests, bishops, and Church members. From the very beginning, there was some severe critique as well. I just mention one of the (in my view) most interesting critics: Alfred Lorenzer (1922–2002).

Lorenzer was a psychoanalyst and sociologist. The main problem of the liturgical reform and especially of the work of translation for him was the transformation of liturgy into a ‘discursive symbol’ and of language into a means of transmission of messages.

Lorenzer writes: “Das Ritual soll [...] Informationsimperativen gehorchen, es soll nur noch der Rezeption des Informationsgehalts einer durchrationalisierten Liturgie dienen.”⁴³ Also: “Das Ritual tritt nun als Disziplinierungsübung in den Dienst der ideologischen Textvermittlung.”⁴⁴

For Lorenzer, language is much more than just a means of communication and should not be reduced to this aspect. Celebrating a liturgy in which people might not understand discursively and intellectually every word and sentence, is, for Lorenzer, the possibility to enter into a realm of freedom and to escape the totality of a discursive world.

15.2.7 Accessibility of Liturgy or: The Question of Inclusion and Exclusion

The question of the understanding of liturgy is also a permanent theme of discussion in German Protestantism. I see at least three dimensions of this discussion, which are interconnected:

1. Many people see the language of the church service as old-fashioned and out-dated, full of ‘empty’ theological terms and conventional language. People say that churches continue to speak “the language of Canaan”, that they use a specific “jargon”,⁴⁵ that it sounds ‘churchy’ whenever you enter a church, etc. In my view, it is not easy to deal with this critique. On the one hand, language in the context of prayer and ritual, will always have some aspects of ‘strangeness’ and show some ‘resistance’ against the language games (Wittgenstein) of everyday life. It will always mark some ‘difference’, as it deals with a different reality.

42 This is a question which could, as shown, also be asked in the Jewish context, and surely the relevance of the Arabic language for Islam could and should be discussed here as well.

43 Alfred Lorenzer, *Das Konzil der Buchhalter. Die Zerstörung der Sinnlichkeit. Eine Religionskritik* (Frankfurt am Main: Fischer, 1988), 185.

44 Ibid., 190.

45 Cf. Erik Flügge, *Der Jargon der Betroffenheit. Wie die Kirche an ihrer Sprache verreckt* (München: Kösel, 2016).

On the other hand, this difference is not the same as the preservation of some kind of linguistic conventionality, which stabilises a particular in-group and is nothing more than a sociolect giving a home to those who know and like it, and excluding others, thus cultivating an ‘extra world’ in this world. ‘Translation’ in this context means not to lose what has to be ‘special’ and not to conserve what should be given up.

2. Since the 1980s, the theory of social milieus became prominent in sociological studies⁴⁶ and soon gained popularity in churches as well. Pastors and preachers realised that they only reach and attract some (actually very few) social milieus: especially the traditionals, the conservatives, and the well-established.⁴⁷ There are many reasons for this, but one is that churches only speak the language of these milieus, and by using this language reproduce their ‘milieu-constriction’ (‘Milieu-Verengung’) again and again. The imperative was to find new ways of liturgical language which ‘work’ for other social milieus to overcome the unintended exclusion of most of the social milieus in our society. But again, this work of translation means walking on the ridge described above (1).
3. The aspect of exclusion is dominant in the discussion on the so-called “Leichte Sprache” (“Plain Language”).⁴⁸ The simple observation is that liturgical language (like language in many other parts of society: administration; news; etc.) is too complicated in semantics and syntax and cannot be understood by many people. Guidelines for the translation of language into “Leichte Sprache” were published and adapted to liturgical language.⁴⁹ The ethical aspect of this discussion is obvious. However, the confrontation of an ethical necessity with an aesthetic reality (the ritual of the Church service) is again a challenge for every work of translation.

All these three dimensions underline the problem of ‘understanding’ liturgical language and contour the challenge of translation.

46 Cf. Gerhard Schulze, *Die Erlebnis-Gesellschaft. Kulturosoziologie der Gegenwart* (Frankfurt am Main: Campus Verlag, ⁶1996).

47 Cf. Claudia Schulz, Eberhard Hauschildt & Eike Kohler, *Milieus praktisch. Analyse- und Planungshilfen für Kirche und Gemeinde* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, ³2010).

48 Cf. Plain Language Network. Available at: <http://www.plainlanguagesnetwork.org> (Accessed 30 July 2020).

49 Cf. e.g. Anne Gidion, ed., *Leicht gesagt! Biblische Lesungen und Gebete zum Kirchenjahr in Leichter Sprache, gemeinsam gottesdienst gestalten 22* (Hannover: Lutherisches Verlagshaus, 2013).

15.3 FIVE DIMENSIONS OF FURTHER RESEARCH

I briefly touched seven aspects of liturgical multilinguality. There could have been many more observations showing that liturgy today, and in the past, provides manifold aspects for further research and exploration.⁵⁰ Summarising, I suggest that any study on multilinguality and liturgy should consider the basic theological bilinguality of Christian worship in its Jewish-Christian context; in addition, liturgical multilinguality is a phenomenon which touches (at least) four dimensions, which are again interconnected.

15.3.1 The Fundamental Theological Dimension: Jewish-Christian Bilinguality

In Jewish-Christian dialogue, the interconnectedness of Judaism and Christianity has been widely explored in the last decades. As far as I can see, the reflection and research perspective of multilinguality has not been used as a heuristic instrument so far. I hope that this chapter has shown that the Jewish-Christian relation can be described as bilinguality in a theological and practical-linguistic dimension.

For Christian theology, it has to be asked what it means that Christian worship is never ‘complete’ without Jewish prayer and worship. To use the already quoted picture of Rev 4: As long as the ‘12 elders’ of Judaism and the ‘12 elders’ of Christianity are not united in their prayer around God’s throne, there is a ‘gap’ in each of the two liturgical practices. Christians have tried over the centuries to eliminate this ‘gap’ by neglecting

50 In a current project, I am working with colleagues in Brazil on the transformation of German-Lutheran liturgies in the Brazilian context in the last 200 years. In 1822/23 the German immigration to Brazil started, which had its height in the midst of the 19th century. The immigrants brought their religion and their liturgies with them. German Protestant/Lutheran liturgies were an important ‘source’ for the stabilisation of ‘German’ identity in the Brazilian context.

the Jewish context of Christian worship using theologies of supersession and sometimes even trying to eliminate the ‘Old Testament’ or other Jewish ‘stumbling blocks’.

By realising this gap, the eschatology of Christian worship can be rediscovered. ‘We are not there yet.’ It is an essential task for liturgical studies to explore this liturgical eschatology, helping congregations to celebrate Sunday services which overcome the “Melancholie der Erfüllung” (“melancholia of fulfillment” Ernst Bloch).⁵¹ It is not only a historical, theological, and hermeneutical question, but also a practical one. How can Christian services be celebrated to ‘stage’ the Jewish-Christian bilinguality again and again? There are many ways to do so – and I only mention pastors in Germany who pray the Psalms in their congregations in a German-Hebrew version,⁵² to give the congregants a chance to experience the Jewish context of Christian worship. Especially in a time of rising Antisemitism, this seems to be a question of increased importance.

15.3.2 The Phenomenological Dimension: Sacred Spaces and Sacred Languages

In the last decades, the sensitivity for the relevance of ‘sacred spaces’ grew, after many years in which a functionalised view reduced this aspect.

The so-called spatial turn in cultural studies rediscovered Michel Foucault’s idea of *heterotopos* (first published in a short essay).⁵³ Many different theories were developed, trying to describe what ‘makes’ places ‘sacred’. One of the ideas is that it is always the action and interaction of people, which constitutes the atmosphere of a space.⁵⁴

Klaus Raschzok used an older expression of Hans Asmussen, who spoke about “Spuren im Kirchenraum” (traces in the church room), which ‘are there’ and are a result of the use of this space in the past.⁵⁵ The so-called ‘new phenomenology’ (Gernot Böhme; Hermann Schmitz) uses the term ‘atmosphere’ to overcome the idea that every notion of ‘sacredness’ is only a result of the emotions and reflections of people (atmospheres ‘are there’).⁵⁶ A research project in Germany discusses these theories in the context of transformations of sacred spaces.⁵⁷

51 Ernst Bloch, *Das Prinzip Hoffnung. In fünf Teilen: Kapitel 1-32* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1967), 343.

52 Cf. Johannes Thon, ed. *Hohenthurmer Psalter. Hebräisch-deutsche Psalmen für den Gebrauch im evangelischen Gottesdienst* (Hohenthurm: Private publishing by Johannes Thon, 2020).

53 Cf. Michel Foucault, “Different Spaces”, in *Aesthetics, Method, and Epistemology. Essential Works of Foucault 1954–1984, vol. 2*, ed. James D. Faubion, transl. Robert Hurley (New York: The New Press, 1998), 175–85.

54 Cf. Martina Löw, *Raumsoziologie*, stw 1506 (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 2001).

55 Cf. Klaus Raschzok, “Spuren im Kirchenraum. Anstöße zur Raumwahrnehmung”, *Pastoral-theologie*, 89 (2000): 142–57.

56 Cf. Hermann Schmitz, *Atmosphären* (Freiburg: Karl Albert, 2014).

57 Cf. Sakralraumtransformation. Available at: <http://www.transara.de> (Accessed 31 July 2020).

I am convinced that it is time to reflect on the idea of *sacred language* again – also in Protestantism, where the notion of ‘*Verständlichkeit*’ (‘understandability’) has been widespread since the 16th century.

A ‘sacred language’ can but does not have to be connected with a foreign language (as it is connected in Jewish liturgy). It is at the same time a question of language styles, including the lexis and syntax and the rituality of language. Especially in Protestantism, there have been over the centuries serious arguments against a sacred language. Still today, the notion that the language of the service has to be fresh and relevant and authentic is important,⁵⁸ but at the same time, the importance of ritual has been rediscovered.

My idea is that the relationship of “word” and “ritual” is the basic tension of any Protestant worship; this tension is reflected in the tension between everyday language and sacred language as a specific practical aspect of liturgical bilinguality.

15.3.3 The Ethical Dimension: Inclusion and Exclusion in Worship

From the very beginning of Christian worship, there is an ethical aspect of discussing the language of worship. Paul writes that there “is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither slave nor free, there is no male and female, for you are all one in Christ Jesus” (Gal 3:28), and it is a challenge for Christian worship to be inclusive in this very basic sense.

Paul’s critique of the Corinthian practice of Eucharist in 1 Cor 11 is a critique of the structures of exclusion which prevented the poor people in the congregation to share their food with the rich people.⁵⁹ Three chapters later, Paul’s critique of the dominant role of glossolalia in Corinth is a critique of its possible exclusive effect (cf. 1 Cor 14:10-11).

Language must always be reflected in the context of power dynamics. The discussion on “plain” language or “*leichte Sprache*” is not only about concrete rules of how to write and speak, so that as many people as possible can understand, it is also a broader context and discourse asking the question what liturgical language is really about and what the role of ‘understanding’ is in liturgy.

58 Cf. Ilona Nord, “‘Simple, fresh, relevant, not too doctrinal in tone nor unreal in expression.’ Über die Sprache des Gebets im Reformierten Gottesdienstbuch und über betendes Sprechen am Beispiel von Slam Poetry”, in *Die Sprache der Liturgie*, ed. Michael Meyer-Blanck, (Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2012), 171-91.

59 Cf. Alexander Deeg, “Essen, was wir sind oder: Die Politik des Abendmahls”, *Kerygma und Dogma* 66 (2020): 140-56.

15.3.4 The Hermeneutical Dimension: Understanding Languages

‘Understanding’ is a complex term with many different definitions and dimensions. Of course, every speaker wants to be ‘understood’, but understanding an instruction manual is something else and different from understanding a hymn, a poem, or a blessing. There is a tendency in liturgical contexts – at least in Protestantism – to reduce ‘understanding’ to its cognitive dimension, thus flattening liturgical communication.

Ferenc Herzig showed in his dissertation that there is always a dimension of non-sense which is basic for religious communication.⁶⁰ Especially “that whereof we cannot speak” (Wittgenstein)⁶¹ is paradoxically the foundational language of religion.

Again, it is evident that this discourse on the limits of understanding is dangerous insofar as it can be misused as an argument for reproducing a specific sociolect, excluding others from participating. At the same time, it seems clear that it is a necessary task for future research to work on the complexity of liturgical understanding of language, including cognitive, emotional, and ritual aspects.⁶²

15.3.5 The Practical Dimension: Challenges for using Languages in Worship

Many aspects of liturgical practice have been mentioned in this discussion. Talking about and reflecting liturgy is never possible without considering the praxis of liturgy. In this conclusion, I want to stress two more aspects not mentioned so far, which provide another basis for future research.

(1) In Catholicism, the question of translation of liturgical texts popped up again in the early 2000s, when the “Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments” published “*Liturgiam authenticam*. On the use of vernacular languages in the publication of the books of the Roman liturgy” (2001).⁶³ In this instruction, we read:

[...] that the translation of the liturgical texts of the Roman Liturgy is not so much a work of creative innovation as it is of rendering the original texts faithfully and accurately into the vernacular language. While it is permissible

60 Cf. Ferenc Herzig, *Unsinn zur Unzeit. Ein Dialog mit Gilles Deleuze über “Ereignis” im homiletischen und liturgischen Horizont*, EKGP 6 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2020).

61 Ludwig Wittgenstein, *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus* (New York: Barnes & Noble Books, 2003), 157.

62 Cf. Bent F. Nielsen, “Körpervergessenheit? Eine Anfrage an das protestantische Religionsverständnis”, in *Menschsein und Religion. Anthropologische Probleme und Perspektiven der Glaubenskultur des Christentums*, ed. Wilfried Engemann (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2016), 103-19.

63 Vatican, “*Liturgiam authenticam*”. Available at: https://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/ccdds/documents/rc_con_ccdds_doc_20010507_liturgiam-authenticam_en.html (Accessed 29 May 2020).

to arrange the wording, the syntax and the style in such a way as to prepare a flowing vernacular text suitable to the rhythm of popular prayer, the original text, insofar as possible, must be translated integrally and in the most exact manner, without omissions or additions in terms of their content, and without paraphrases or glosses.⁶⁴

A lot of scholars in liturgical studies, bishops, and priests, criticised this instruction from the Vatican, which led to some ‘new’ translations which could not (be) and were not used in the practice of congregations.

The idea of being ‘exact’ in translation is a complex question, and it is worthwhile to integrate the perspectives of translation studies in further research on sacred languages, liturgical languages, and everyday languages.

(2) More and more international congregations and migrant communities have been established in big cities all over the world in the last decades. In many of them – of course – English is the *lingua franca* of most of the people celebrating worship. Some research is needed, and very well possible, to find out what kind of English is used in these communities; if and when other languages are used in these services; and in what sense these worship services can be described as multilingual.⁶⁵

15.4 PENTECOST AND GLOSSOLALIA: MULTILINGUALITY AND TRANSLINGUALITY

According to Luke’s account of the first Pentecost celebration in Jerusalem after Jesus’ death and resurrection, the beginning of Christian proclamation starts with a wonder of multilinguality: “And they [the disciples] were all filled with the Holy Spirit and began to speak in other tongues as the Spirit gave them utterance” (Acts 2:4). Two verses later, it becomes clear that this wonder of speaking in different languages is also, and at the same time, a wonder of *hearing*: “[...] and they were bewildered, because each one was hearing them speak in his own language. They were amazed and astonished, saying, ‘Are not all these who are speaking Galileans? And how is it that we hear, each of us in his own native language?’” (Act 2:6-8).

It is not that all languages are united into *one*, but Pentecost is a multilingual event. The work of the Holy Spirit makes unity in difference possible and provokes understanding in a multilingual and truly international context (“Parthians and Medes and Elamites and residents of Mesopotamia, Judea and Cappadocia, Pontus and Asia, Phrygia and

64 *Liturgiam authenticam*, 20.

65 Cf. Tape Omoniye, “Multilingualism and Religion”, in *The Routledge Handbook of Multilingualism*, eds. Marilyn M. Jones, Adrian Blackledge & Angela Creese (London: Routledge, 2012), 347-65.

Pamphylia, Egypt and the parts of Libya belonging to Cyrene, and visitors from Rome, both Jews and proselytes, Cretans and Arabians”; Acts 2:9-11).

The work of the Holy Spirit is another theological dimension of Christian worship. Also, Martin Luther refers to the very beginning of Christian service – and sees multilinguality as the primary intention of the Holy Spirit:

This [reducing all worship to one single language; AD] was not the method of the Holy Spirit at the beginning. He did not tarry until all the world came to Jerusalem and studied Hebrew, but gave manifold tongues for the office of the ministry, so that the apostles could preach wherever they went. I would rather follow this example.⁶⁶

Maybe multilinguality is not the right word or concept here, and it would be better to speak of an eschatological or Pentecostal translanguality – but this would open the floor for new theological discussions and would be above the scope of this rough outline of basic aspects of liturgical multilinguality and possible perspectives for future research.

66 Luther, “The German Mass”, 125.