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LAST YEAR, Pope Francis was in Lund, Sweden, as part of a year of preparation for the joint commemoration of the five-hundredth anniversary of the Reformation. In recent times, we have come to take events such as these for granted, but this is surely to miss the extraordinary progress achieved over the past 50 years of ecumenical dialogue between the Roman Catholic Church and the Lutheran World Federation.

While this dialogue is ongoing, there can be few who could have possibly predicted that in 2013 the Lutheran-Roman Catholic Commission on Unity could issue a remarkable document entitled *From Conflict to Communion: Lutheran-Catholic Common Commemoration of the Reformation in 2017*. This document set out to examine how the anniversary could be commemorated anew in an ecumenical age, taking account of new historical perspectives on Luther in the more recent, less confessional past, and noting how both Lutherans and Roman Catholics have many reasons to ‘retell their history in new ways’.

Over the centuries, scholars, ecclesiastics, and controversialists have credited Martin Luther and the birth of Protestantism with a vast array of consequences, intended or otherwise. Numbered among these are the following: the restoration of a purer Christian church; the splintering of western Christendom; religious warfare; the ushering in of the Enlightenment; the birth of modern liberalism, tolerance, democracy, capitalism, individualism, subjectivism, nationalism, pluralism, hyper-pluralism, freedom of conscience, modern science, secularism, atheism, materialism, consumerism; and the list goes on. Whatever one’s interpretation of the events of All Hallows Eve, 1517, few would argue with the claim that they subsequently gave rise to a historical juggernaut (or perhaps, more accurately, juggernauts) with effects that scholars are still devoting their careers to more fully understand.

Before asking ‘how should we remember the Reformation?’ in 2017, it is a valuable exercise to retrace our steps to where we have been. How has the Reformation been remembered in the past, and what do those ‘rememberings’ have to say about those who did the remembering? What follows examines some of the ways in which anniversaries of 1517 were previously marked, exploring what this can tell us about the various meanings ascribed to the events of that year. It draws in particular on the work of Thomas Howard and Peter Marshall who have recently made some significant contributions on this topic.


2. None of these terms is unproblematic, and account must be taken of a multiplicity of meanings attached to each of these when considering whether, in fact, the ‘Reformation’ gave birth to ‘modernity’. Moreover, many scholars nowadays prefer to speak of an age of Reformations which both pre- and post-dated what has traditionally been understood as the ‘Reformation’. See Brad S. Gregory, *The Reformation and Modernity: Explaining the Causal Nexus*, in Thomas Albert Howard and Mark A. Noll (eds), *Protestantism after 500 years* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), 141-66; for the use of the plural in a recent major study of the period, see Carlos M.N. Eire, *Reformations: the Early Modern World, 1550-1650* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2016).

REMINDING 1517

On All Saints Day 1527, a mere ten years after the events of All Hallows Eve, Martin Luther wrote a letter to his friend Nicholas von Amsdorf and signed it ‘Wittenberg, on the Day of All Saints, ten years after trampling indulgences underfoot, in memory of which at this hour we have drunk, encouraged on both sides’. These may have been Luther’s feelings on the matter as he looked back ten years on, but closer to the original events, in March 1518, he confided the following in a letter to the jurist and diplomat, Christoph Scheurl, who was one of the first to print Luther’s 95 theses and who had wondered why Luther had not sent him the theses immediately after composing them:

It was not my idea or intent to publish them but first to confer about these [Theses] with a few who lived with us or in the vicinity, so that by the judgment of many people, if condemned they would be destroyed or if approved they would be published. And now they have been printed and copied so often, and completely beyond my wildest expectations, that I now regret bearing this offspring, not because I do not favor that the truth be known broadly [vulgo] – indeed, I sought this alone – but because this is not a suitable mode [of writing] for instructing the wider public [vulgus]. But the horse had bolted at that stage, and events had taken on a momentum of their own.

Although the date of 31 October 1517 and the ‘posting of the 95 theses’ played little role in the earliest commemorations of the Reformation, the centenary celebrations of 1617 brought a greater public awareness of this iconic event. Centenary woodcuts depicted Martin Luther before the door of the castle church in Wittenberg, wielding a huge quill pen, which he held high in the air, the end of which stretched far behind him and pierced the ears of a lion and, once out the other side, toppled the triple tiara from the head of Pope Leo X. Abraham Scultetus, the Reformed royal chaplain at Heidelberg stated in a New Year’s day sermon in 1617 that 100 years ago ‘the eternal all-powerful God looked upon us graciously and delivered us from the horrible darkness of the papacy’.

And yet by 1617 inter-confessional fissures among reformers themselves had already made it a tricky enterprise to celebrate Luther with one voice. Wittenberg’s theological faculty wrote to the Elector of Saxony requesting that ‘the first Luther Jubilee’ (primus Jubileus Lutherani) be ‘celebrated with festive and heartfelt worship’ after which an edict called on Saxony and all ‘pure’ Protestant (that is, not Calvinist) lands to observe 31 October through 2 November with appropriate festivities. It would not be until after the Thirty Years War (1618-1648) that Calvinists would win the recognition that the Peace of Augsburg of 1555 had afforded Lutherans and Roman Catholics.

As for the papacy, whose loss Abraham Scultetus hardly mourned, in early 1617 Pope Paul V clearly feared that the Protestants had stolen a march on him, for he declared the remainder of the year to be one of extraordinary Catholic jubilee and of prayer to protect the Church from its heretical enemies. This move prompts Howard to call 1617 a year of ‘duelling jubilees’.

For the most part, the first two centenary celebrations of the Reformation (1617 and 1717) were highly confessionally in nature, confined to the Holy Roman Empire, and centered on the person of Luther himself. However, the three-hundredth anniversary, celebrated in 1817, would mark a new departure and a shift in celebratory
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tone: increasingly, the narrative emphasised the Reformation as a major catalyst on the path to the progress of civilisation, intellectual freedom and the freedom of scholarly enquiry. By contrast, Roman Catholicism was viewed not only as a false, corrupt and superstition-laden church, but also as a clear impediment to progress. Friedrich Schleiermacher, Dean of the University of Berlin's theology faculty, marked the occasion with an address which praised the Reformation for introducing a scholarly spirit into theology, without which it would slip back into Catholic dogmatism, itself a species of 'Jewish priestcraft'.

There was also a political edge to it: German students staged a rally at the Wartburg castle in October of 1817, which invoked Luther's memory to celebrate Napoleon's downfall and an emboldened sense of Deutschum (German-ness), which led also to the burning of 'un-German' books. At the University of Leipzig, the philosopher Karl Politz delivered a lecture entitled 'The Similarity between the Fight for Civic and Political Freedom in Our Age and the Fight for Religious and Ecclesiastical Freedom in the Age of the Reformation'. Meanwhile, the biblical scholar, Wilhelm de Wette, at the Friedrich Wilhelm University at Berlin could claim that thanks to 'the spirit of Protestantism ... Protestant freedom leads necessarily to political freedom'. Two decades later, in his monumental *German History in the Age of the Reformation* (1839-47) the great German historian, Leopold von Ranke, declared the Reformation the beginning of modernity and Luther the father of the German nation.

German unification in 1871 meant that the fourth-hundredth anniversary of Luther's birth, celebrated in 1883 took on the form of what Howard calls a 'belated birthday party for the German nation'. But Luther could not be celebrated by everybody; indeed, the Prussian historian, Heinrich von Treitschke, regretted the fact that German Catholics, who were still reeling from the effects of the Kulturkampf, could not fully appreciate Luther's legacy. For Treitschke, Luther was 'the pioneer of the whole German nation' who possessed 'the power of independent thought that typifies the German character' and in throwing off the 'foreign Roman yoke' had united Germans in a quest for freedom and in the conviction that 'no one can sit in judgment over the human conscience but God alone'.

A dissenting narrative was provided by the German historian and Catholic priest, Johannes Janssen, whose *History of the German People since the End of the Middle Ages* (1878-94) portrayed Luther and his followers not as modern liberators but as tragic destroyers of a thriving late medieval German Catholicism, and indeed, German culture.

The anniversary of Luther's birth was also widely marked elsewhere, most notably the United States where, by now, Luther was an icon for all American Protestants beyond the small immigrant Lutheran population alone. This wider adoption of Luther reinforced ideas of a connection between Protestantism and modernity and, by extension, supported a sense of the destiny of America as a progressive Protestant nation. Other voices begged to differ - the Archbishop of Baltimore, John Martin Spalding (1810-1872), argued that Luther's political legacy was repressive and authoritarian, contrasting it with that of Catholicism, which, in the United States, traced its origins to the religious tolerance of Lord Baltimore's Mary-
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land colony. For his part, the Bishop of Richmond, Virginia, James Gibbons (1834-1921), made the somewhat dubious claim that 'the Catholic Church has always been the zealous promoter of religious and civil liberty'.

In 1917, the four-hundredth anniversary of the Reformation assumed a different hue again, owing to the fact that Protestant nations found themselves at war with each other. In Germany postcards were produced with Martin Luther, Otto von Bismark and Field Marshal Paul von Hindenburg standing side by side, united in common purpose. Adolf von Harnack, Germany's leading theologian, readily joined in the agglutination of Luther and other leading figures from Germany's past, claiming that 'Without him, Germany would never have had a Leibniz, a Sebastian Bach, a Kant, a Goethe and Schiller, and indeed a Bismark ...'.

Predictably, this did not go down well with many Protestants of other jurisdictions such as the United Kingdom and the United States who resented what they considered a hijacking of Luther to bolster the German wartime spirit. It led the Scottish Presbyterian, James Stalker, while emphasising Luther as a champion of freedom and conscience, to assert that as a 'freedom-loving people ... we [British] claim to be better disciples of Luther than the Germans themselves'. Meanwhile, the editors of the American journal *The Christian Century* chose to mark the centenary with a familiar boast: 'As we look around our world we observe that the leading nations are, for the most part, Protestant ... it is clear that the Protestant faith has been favourable to the development of modern civilisation'.

The first half of the twentieth century would see a number of calls for more careful historical scholarship on Luther and a move away from teleological accounts of the relationship between the Reformation and modernity. With the rise of Nazism and the outbreak of the Second World War, some Anglo-American scholars began to focus on the less attractive elements of Luther's political thought, not least his diatribes against Jews. By the 1960s, some Lutheran scholars such as Bernd Moeller were re-evaluating the state of pre-Reformation Catholic piety and questioning some of the assumptions of previous Protestant scholarship regarding the level of decay in the medieval Church. It was a sign of the times that the examples that Moeller used had already appeared in the Roman Catholic Johannes Janssen's thoroughly confessional work at the end of the nineteenth century.

As a further example of the rapprochement that was under way in Roman Catholic-Lutheran scholarship, in 1939 the Catholic priest-historian, Joseph Lortz, extended an olive branch to Protestant scholars by arguing that the Reformation was inevitable because by the year 1500 the Church had become so corrupt and theology so poor that something had to give. This was a significant admission by a Catholic historian in the context of the history of wider Catholic scholarship on Luther.

**ROMAN CATHOLIC PORTRAYALS OF LUTHER:**
**A REMARKABLE JOURNEY**

The Catholic historian, Adolf Herte (1887-1970), once argued that almost all Roman Catholic biographies until the twentieth century derived their judgements and opinions from a book by Johannes Cochlaeus, *De Actis et Scriptis Martin Lutheri*, published in 1549, which portrayed Luther as a monster, spawn of the devil, a drunkard and a violator of nuns. When Herte wrote his work (in 1943) his aim was to 'seek understanding, to de-poison the confessional atmosphere and
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to heal old wounds'.

From the late sixteenth century, Catholic writers were actively encouraged to compile pamphlets highlighting the abuses precipitated by heretics and their evil lives, with some success. For instance, one famous convert, the Protestant deacon, and later Jesuit, Francis Walsingham, remarked that, if the lives of Luther and Calvin were as bad as Catholic writers suggested, he doubted that 'the religion can be good, which was framed or founded ... by them'.

But these attacks were often culturally conditioned; for example, from very early on, Luther was excoriated as a destructive force who sought to split the church, as a gravely immoral individual who was sexually depraved and, most serious of all, that he was the progeny of a demon with whom his mother had had sexual relations. In 1800, John Milner, vicar apostolic to the midland district of England, challenged a recent defence of Luther in a work by John Sturges, Anglican chancellor of Winchester. In the interests of balance, the ultramontane Catholic Milner 'acknowledged and reprobated the crimes of a Sergius, a John X, an Alexander VI, and of every other bad Pope', but wondered, 'Why then would you not be equally liberal in abandoning as indefensible the characters of a Luther and a Cranmer?' Meanwhile, in his rather inaptly named The End of Religious Controversy (1818), he claimed, furthermore, that Luther was 'turbulent, abusive, and sacrilegious ... [a] trumpeter of sedition, civil war, rebellion, and desolation ... the scholar of Satan'.

Monsignor Patrick O'Hare, an Irish-American priest based in Brooklyn and a promoter of temperance, in a book confidently entitled The Facts about Luther, published in 1916, painted Luther as a heavy-drinker and a tavern-haunter.

As noted above, however, these Catholic diatribes against Luther were culturally conditioned. In this regard, what is absent from Catholic critiques of Luther is as important as what appears: despite levelling all sorts of slanders against Luther, Catholic controversialists rarely if ever seemed to challenge him on his vitriolic writings against the Jews. This in itself, demonstrates how myopic even the most acerbic of confessional controversialists could be in their own time, reminding us, in the words of Maurice Halbwachs, that 'most social influences we obey usually remain unperceived'.

The turn to a more sympathetic Catholic reading of Luther came with an article by Franz Xaver Kieff in 1917, which argued that Luther's actions should be interpreted as fuelled by theological motives arising from Luther's deep religiosity. Catholic historians such as Sebastian Merkle and Anton Fischer continued in this vein in chapters published in 1929. But it was largely the influential two-volume work, Die Reformation in Deutschland by Joseph Lortz (1887-1975) in 1939-40, which attracted the attention of scholars, precisely because of its irenic approach. Furthermore, Lortz's views were disseminated in his contributions to popular university handbooks and lexicons such as Lexicon für Theologie und Kirche (1963) and Sacramentum Mundi (1969). Incidentally, one of Lortz's students, Erwin Iseroh (1915-96) would create a sensation in the early 1960s by questioning the historicity of that most iconic event of the posting of 95 theses to the castle church door.

In 1960, Albert Brandenburg (1908-78) argued that the theology of early Luther represented a new hermeneutics, which should be reintegrated into the Catholic Church. In a later work in 1977, he...
called Luther 'the first evangelical theologian in the Church' and argued that were he to receive his deserved place in the Church 'Catholicism and Protestantism [could] expect a renewal of Christianity'.

For Otto Hermann Pesch (1931-2014), the historical approach of distinguishing between Luther's 'heretical' views and the orthodox view of the Church missed the point: for him, Luther's theology should be considered on its own merits as a genuinely legitimate line of Catholic thought. Playing down the differences between Catholic and Protestant approaches, he contended that the bitter polemics of almost 500 years were, perhaps, largely the result of misunderstandings. If the statements of the Reformers were listened to carefully enough, and were properly understood, then they should no longer divide the churches. 

By 1983, the Joint Lutheran-Roman Catholic Study Commission could pronounce that 'He [Martin Luther] is beginning to be honoured in common as a witness to the gospel, a teacher in the faith, and a herald of spiritual renewal'. These words echoed the declaration by Cardinal Johannes Willebrands (1909-2006) on the occasion of the Fifth Assembly of the Lutheran World Federation in 1970 that Luther is a 'doctor communis' of the Church and 'a common master in this field', to be respected by all theological schools within the Church.

For the French Luther scholar, Daniel Olivier (1927-2005), the tragedy was that at the time the bureaucracy of the Roman Catholic Church did not look at the theology of Luther on its own merits but from the context of organisational preservation. In the Council of Trent, the Roman Catholic Church defined itself dogmatically in a way that contributed to the further split within Christianity. As the Church focused its energies on trying to maintain authority and outward unity, it refused to see the good in much of Luther's theology and reforms. This was, indeed, quite the journey.

A CAUTIONARY NOTE

And yet some historians such as John Frymire have recently sounded a more cautionary note. For Frymire, 'ecumenical aspirations, no less than blatantly confessional ones, sometimes misrepresent or denigrate the past in the interests of the present'. He cites the From Conflict to Communion document of 2013, which calls on us not only to heal our memories but to purify them as well. Frymire asks what precisely 'purifying one's memory' means, suggesting that 'healing is what one begins to do only after fully acknowledging that which has caused the sickness, whereas purifying is suggestive of forgetting and thus erasure'.

Part of the danger, for Frymire, of attempting to short-cut careful historical scholarship is that we sometimes fail to take people from the past seriously. So Frymire adverts to the fact that after Joseph Lortz's olive branch to Protestant scholarship, many began to argue that Luther sought only to reform the Church from within, but ended up being cast out due to the incompetence and theological confusion of his opponents. Chief among these was the intellectual Johannes Eck who, according to Lortz and his students, 'failed to understand Luther's theology in the first place'. For Frymire, this raises a methodological problem:

But let us think of the massive methodological problem, not to mention the modern arrogance, inherent in the claims (some made as recently as 2006) ... that Johannes Eck and other Catholics 'had no real understanding of the Reformation and its most basic set of theological ideas'. My question is this: if
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Johannes Eck, a doctor of theology versed in the ancient languages who held a university chair and was obviously infinitely more familiar with the intellectual matrix and lived experience of the sixteenth century than we will ever be ‘failed’ to understand Luther, then what hope might we have in 2017 or thereafter?  

Peter Marshall has a similar concern that we are often in a rush to make the journey from, in Richard Stauffer’s words, ‘destructive criticism of Luther’ to ‘respectful encounter’. Indeed, it may be that in rightly celebrating the progress made in the signing of joint agreements on key issues of doctrine, we risk losing sight of the fact that for most people, religion is ultimately not about assent to what are often contested recondite doctrinal points; rather, it is an everyday lived experience, which profoundly shapes social and cultural identity. Thus, citing Brad Gregory, Frymire argues that ‘until we acknowledge and understand why Catholics and Protestants took the task of murdering each other with profound seriousness and resolve, we will never be in a position to remember the Reformation era in a way that will contribute significantly to the goals we pursue as twenty-first century Christians’.  

LOOKING TO THE FUTURE  
Perhaps a more sure-footed approach to remembering the Reformation is to take the people of the past and their values seriously, especially those that seem so abhorrent to our own, while fully acknowledging the depths of the hurts exchanged on all sides. It is also to recognise that those who will eventually write about our own values in retrospect will undoubtedly find in us much that they will deem objectionable, unpalatable; perhaps, even bizarre. Moreover, an altogether altered global reality means that the Reformation is sure to continue to be remembered in new ways. In 1917, an estimated 89% of all Protestant Christians lived in Europe or the USA. A century later, that figure is fewer than 25%. It is likely, therefore, that the next centennial commemoration of the Reformation—which will occur in 2117—will be a very different affair.  
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Parish serving community – Where denominational national schools have demonstrated the capacity to welcome a wide diversity of enrolment, in terms of both national and regional identity, their adaptation to meet this need can be of great importance to the service of integration and social harmony. Parish communities in disadvantaged areas, both urban and rural, are often the only community-based organisations with premises and personnel which are committed exclusively to the service of that local community. Their capacity to stand with the local community and empower them to articulate their needs and organise themselves to address them – directly and in partnership with public bodies – can be a powerful witness to progressive values, as well as an effective response to specific needs.