

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

**PayPal**

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for *Irish Biblical Studies* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_ibs-01.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_ibs-01.php)

LUTHER QUINCENTENARY

Modern Roman Catholic Reaction to Luther

R.F.G.Holmes

Luther is a child of the devil, possessed by the devil, full of falsehood and vainglory ... he lusts after wine and women, is without conscience, and approves any means to gain his end ... He is a liar and a hypocrite, cowardly and quarrelsome. /1

Thus wrote Johannes Cochlaeus, contemporary and one-time friend of Martin Luther, a Catholic reformer who had become disillusioned with Luther's reform movement and what he considered to be the contradictions and absurdities in Luther's position, though, as a modern Catholic scholar has shown, Cochlaeus gave no evidence of having read more than the prefaces and epilogues of Luther's books. /2

His Septiceps Lutherus or Seven-headed Luther, published in 1529, has been described as 'a masterpiece of distortion, misrepresentation and also stupidity' /3, but his even more strident Commentaria de actis et scriptis Martinus Lutheri, published in 1549, set the tone for much subsequent Roman Catholic writing about Luther, as the Catholic scholar Adolf Herte demonstrated.

If Protestants have seen and have presented Luther as a special servant of God, providentially raised up to lead Christ's church back to the truths of the Gospel, Roman Catholics have seen and presented him as a child of the devil - indeed Cochlaeus solemnly reported the fable that Luther was the result of his mother's intercourse with Satan.

It must be conceded, of course, that, in the words of one of our most distinguished contemporary Luther scholars, Gordon Rupp, Luther presented special problems for Roman Catholics:

Luther was a religious who apostasized, renouncing the most sacred vows, and he married a runaway nun. He initiated the most disastrous series of events in the history of the Western Church, he attacked the most revered authorities, the most hallowed rites with outrageous and insulting vehemence. His teachings have been repeatedly and authoritatively condemned. /4

It was therefore exceedingly difficult for Catholic scholars to consider Luther objectively and, in spite of the enormous contribution to the development of modern historical scholarship made by men like Mühlner, Dollinger, Lord Acton and Johannes Janssen in the nineteenth century the Cochlaeus tradition of condemnation and character assassination continued dominant in Roman Catholic Reformation historiography until after the First World War. Indeed it was documented and buttressed by the massive publications of two Austrian scholars, Heinrich Denifle, a Tyrolean Dominican and archivist in the Vatican Library and Hartmann Grisar, a Jesuit and professor in the University of Innsbruck.

Denifle was a distinguished mediaevalist and his Luther and Lutheranism, a series of studies rather than a history, made use of unpublished material and he claimed: 'My sole source for the study of Luther was Luther'.

Denifle acknowledged that the sixteenth century Church needed reform and that Luther began as a reformer but was ill-equipped for the task and soon lost his way. He was a reprobate who devised theological excuses to justify his personal self-indulgence, a charlatan who neither discovered nor re-discovered any Christian truth. Denifle presented the results of his examination of sixty-six commentaries on Paul's letter to the Romans, from the fourth to the sixteenth century, to demonstrate that no commentator took the view of the righteousness of God as the punitive justice of God which Luther claimed to be the way he understood it before his Reformation break-through. /6

Denifle's studies appeared between 1904 and 1909 and shortly afterwards, in 1911 and 1912, Grisar's three volume Luther, another collection of essays, was published. Though less violent than Denifle in his denunciations of Luther he still presented him as a man ruined by pride and sensuality, a neurasthenic and psychopath. /7 Neither Denifle nor Grisar considered that Luther had anything of value to say to the Catholic Church, the Lutheran movement was an aberration and Lutherans should return to the Catholic Church without delay.

The perspectives of historians like Denifle and Grisar were reflected in an encyclical of Pius X in May 1910 Editae saepe, Editae saepe which described the Reformers in unflattering terms:

proud and arrogant men, enemies of the Cross of Christ ...  
earthly minded men whose God is their belly... they spurned  
the authorised guidance of the Church to follow the most  
corrupt passions, principles and persons. /8

When papal encyclicals and the publications of scholars set an example in character assassination it is scarcely surprising that popular Catholicism followed their lead in producing caricatures of Luther. P. F. O'Hare in The Facts about Martin Luther, published in America, presented him as 'a blasphemer, a libertine, a revolutionary, a propagator of immorality and open licentiousness' and the Reformation as a 'deformation' which inevitably brought terrible corruptions in its train. /9

In Britain many Roman Catholics probably got their picture of Luther from Hilaire Belloc, a writer who could be brilliant and amusing but whose treatment of the Reformer in his Europe and the Faith, published in 1912, was superficial and prejudiced. Even such a fine scholar as the late H.O.Evennett, Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, at whose feet I myself sat with great profit thirty years ago, though he was incapable of substituting personal abuse for reasoned criticism, contributed to Roman Catholic lack of understanding of Luther by presenting him as a morbidly introspective German who personified Teutonic wrongheadedness, and whose doctrine of justification by faith was essentially antinomian. /10 A recent Roman Catholic writer has observed: 'Generations of priests and nuns, educated on these authorities could hardly be faulted for taking a low view of Protestants and Protestantism.' /11

Changes were taking place, however, particularly in Germany, under the impact of advancing historical scholarship and the accelerating ecumenical movement and Roman Catholic scholars who questioned the authenticity of the portraits of Denifle and Grisar and the classical caricature of Cochlaeus began to emerge. At the University of Wurzburg F.X.Kiefl and Sebastian Merkle and in Cologne Anton Fischer began to suggest that there might have been genuinely Christian elements in Luther's protest. /12 Hubert Jedin, who later became famous as the historian of the Council of Trent was warning Catholic historians who wanted to understand Luther in the 1930s that they should ignore the portraits of writers like Denifle and Grisar. /13

The great break-through came in 1939-40, just as Europe plunged into the maelstrom of the Second World War, with the publication of Joseph Lortz's Die Reformation in Deutschland. Even though most Europeans had other things to think about, Lortz's two volume study caused a stir. It has been described as treating Luther no longer as a demon to be exorcized but a fellow-Christian to be understood.

In keeping with contemporary fashions in historical scholarship Lortz rejected the simplistic idea that Luther could be held personally responsible for the Reformation - the 'great man' theory of history - though he acknowledged that the impact of his remarkable personality and experience was important. 'The Reformation', he judged, 'was caused by the disintegration of the basic principles and basic forms upon which the medieval world was built'. /14 More controversially he considered that the Roman Curia was as much to blame as Luther for the schism which took place - a view which, incidentally, had been anticipated a century before by the famous Anglican convert to Roman Catholicism, John Henry Newman. /15

Lortz had no doubt that Luther was a man of God and a Christian, but he had his own criticisms of the Reformer. He charged him with subjectivism, placing his personal interpretation of Scripture above the teaching authority of the Church and his own understanding of the Gospel above the teaching of Scripture when it seemed to be against him. This led to one-sidedness which exaggerated one aspect of Christian truth at the expense of the whole. Lortz also considered that Luther was guilty of a renunciation of reason in turning his back upon the great Christian tradition of rational theology to embrace a religion of feeling and experience. /16

Luther was not wholly culpable, however, in Lortz's view, for what he rejected as Catholicism was not truly Catholic. Lortz considered that Luther was absolutely right in his attack on Indulgences in 1517 and Leo X and Albert of Brandenburg absolutely wrong: 'Corruption could scarcely have been more blatantly expressed', he wrote. 'Anyone can see that the whole affair was utterly at war with the Spirit of Christ'./17

Lortz became Director of the Institute of European History at the University of Mainz and influenced a number of scholars who worked under him. His own research and writing on Luther and the Reformation continued. In 1965, in an essay entitled 'The basic elements of Luther's Intellectual Style' which he contributed to a Festschrift for Hubert Jedin, he wrote:

Thirty years ago in The Reformation in Germany I put forth the thesis with regard to the central Reformation article, justification by faith alone, that Luther had rediscovered an old Catholic doctrine which was new for him and seen onesidedly. In fact Luther was more Catholic than I then imagined. /18

Lortz expressed his conviction that Catholics were coming to recognise 'the Christian, even the Catholic richness of Luther' and, conscious of their guilt in having expelled him from the Church, were anxious to draw his richness back into the Church. /19 He suggested that Catholics could sometimes understand Luther better than Protestants could, a thought which has been echoed by Professor J. J. Scarisbrick, the recent biographer of Henry VIII, in his view that Catholics who have taken to heart the message of Vatican II were particularly well equipped to study the Reformation with compassion and objectivity. /20

Lortz has argued that Luther's 'no' to the sixteenth century papal church needs to be re-examined for it was the rejection of a sub-Christian reality which was not Catholicism, and he cited in support of his view a statement by Roger Schutz of the Protestant community of Taizé that Luther would have thanked God for Vatican II's expression of the Catholic Church's repentance and faith. /21

Some of Lortz's students have gone on to take the dialogue between their Church and Luther a stage further. One of these is Professor Erwin Iserloh who has raised a question mark over the familiar story of Luther nailing his 95 Theses to the door of the Castle church at Wittenberg. According to Iserloh it was Melanchthon and not Luther himself who told the story and that it did not circulate until after Luther's death. /22 Iserloh presents Luther as a prophetic figure who sought to recall the Church to the truth of the Gospel which is that Christ Himself must be at work in us before we can work for Him./23

Otto Pesch, O.P., has compared the theologies of Luther and Thomas Aquinas, which he has labelled respectively, 'Existential' and 'Sapiential' theologies. He has tried to show that what appear to be contra dictions between these two theologies tend to dissolve on closer examination. Aquinas might have rejected Luther's paradoxical understanding of the Christian as simul iustus et peccator but he himself would have accepted that a Christian can sin and be forgiven. Pesch concluded that the two ways of doing theology are complementary rather than contradictory and that the Church needs both if it is to live out all the tensions involved in being Christian. /24

Another of Lortz's pupils is Peter Manns who has recently published a new biography of Luther. /25 Manns believes that the sixteenth century distinction between Roman Catholic and Protestant is

no longer valid, that Luther represented an authentic aspect of Catholic tradition. In a careful study of Luther's lectures on Galatians in the late 1530s he argued that Luther did not reject entirely all human co-operation with divine grace in the process of salvation, what he did insist upon was that man's co-operation in the process of his salvation was totally dependent upon grace. /26

Thus Lortz's pupils have gone beyond their master, in the view of a distinguished contemporary Reformation scholar, Steven Ozment, who has suggested that while Lortz's Luther was sincere, but still a heretic, in his pupil's work Luther is no longer properly heretical./27

Not long after the publication of Lortz's original magisterial work on the Reformation in Germany another German Roman Catholic scholar, Adolf Herte of Paderborn, published a detailed review of Roman Catholic Luther historiography, showing that the influence of Cochlaeus had cast a long shadow over Catholic thinking about the Reformer. At the same time he appealed for a reciprocal gesture from Protestants, inviting them to repudiate the misrepresentations of Roman Catholicism in much Protestant and anti-Catholic polemic. /28

The work of historians has contributed to changing attitudes on the part of theologians, who have also been increasingly aware of, and responsive to, what has been going on on the other side of the ecclesiastical divide.

Karl Adam of Tübingen was early in the field, in 1947, crediting Luther with 'an original understanding of the essence of Christianity' and paying tribute to 'his unfathomable reverence for the mystery of God, his tremendous consciousness of his own sin, the holy defiance with which, as God's warrior, he faced abuse and simony, the heroism with which he risked his life for Christ's cause and, not least, the natural simplicity and child-like quality of his personal piety'. /29 Adam, however, like Lortz, saw Luther as a tragic figure who had lost his way, taking up a subjective position against the authority of the Church and falling into errors as when he exaggerated the depravity of fallen man and the spiritual impotence of his will.

Probably the best known progressive Roman Catholic theologian of the post Second World War period has been Hans Küng, also of Tübingen. In his treatment of the doctrine of Justification he argues that there is no longer any real reason for disagreement between Roman Catholics

and Protestants on 'the article of a standing or falling church'. He considers that there is no essential difference between the doctrine of Karl Barth, which he takes to be a modern statement of Luther's doctrine, and his own interpretation of Catholic teaching. /30

Just as the older negative Roman Catholic view of Luther reached the general public through popular publications, the newer, more positive views of Lortz and Jedin soon began to receive wider publicity. In 1961 a German Benedictine, Thomas Sartory, broadcast on Bavarian radio a series of lectures, later published as Martin Luther in the View of Catholics. Repudiating the character assassination of the past he insisted that Luther had something to say to Roman Catholics:

the Luther who speaks of man's Christian existence, who expressed his personal experience of God, who explains Holy Scripture, who proclaims the Word with untiring voice, who expresses his adoration in his hymns ... we in the Catholic world do not want to be without this spiritual man, this pastor and preacher. /31

The theologian Karl Rahner expressed his approval of Sartory's broadcasts, in spite of what he considered to be the error of some of Luther's teachings and acknowledged that Roman Catholic theologians could learn much from the Reformer, who had not been specifically condemned by the Council of Trent. /32

So far our attention has been focussed largely upon German scholars but parallel developments could be found in France, Holland and the U.S.A.

As early as 1937, that is, before the publication of Lortz's magnum opus, the eminent French theologian, Yves Congar, in a book entitled Chrétiens Désunis, published in English as Divided Christendom, argued that there was no future for Roman Catholic/Protestant dialogue unless Catholics took the trouble to understand Luther and do justice to him historically and stopped simply condemning him, though he considered that Luther had erred through his subjectivism and individualism. /33

Louis Bouyer, a convert to Roman Catholicism himself, has been another French advocate of the more positive Roman Catholic approach to



Luther. Like K ng he can see nothing un-Catholic about Luther's doctrine of justification by faith. He does not share Lortz's and Congar's suspicions about Luther's subjectivism, considering that Luther was responding in a personal way to the transcendent reality of Christ. For him Luther's error came in his failure to recognise the objective value of the sacraments, his disparagement of human good works and his refusal to obey ecclesiastical authority. /34

More recently Luther studies have been enriched by the publications of Daniel Olivier, an Assumptionist Father and professor at the Institut Sup rieur d' tudes Oecumiques in Paris. His eminently readable Trial of Luther has been hailed by its English translator, Dr John Tonkin, of the University of Western Australia, as an excellent example of the way in which recent Roman Catholic writings about Luther have been distinguished, not by any specifically Catholic perspective, but simply by their intrinsic qualities of historical and theological insight. /35

He has also given us, in 1982, Luther's Faith. The Cause of the Gospel in the Church in which he has expressed his conviction that Luther recovered the essence of the gospel in the sixteenth century and that the Council of Trent responded too negatively and legalistically to his protest. He finds a more positive response in Vatican II and, like Otto Pesch, he advocates complementarity in the Roman Catholic/Protestant relationship, rather than conflict.

Thomas McDonough, whose The Law and the Gospel in Luther was published by the Oxford University Press in 1963, is one of a number of American Roman Catholic scholars who have contributed to the modern Roman Catholic understanding of Luther.

In an essay entitled 'The Essential Martin Luther', published in 1969, he argued that Luther was responsible for saving the Catholic Church in the sixteenth century by forcing it to embark upon a path of reformation which it is still following. 'There is a growing consensus among Catholic scholars', he wrote, 'that Martin Luther, on the fundamental issue of the Reformation was absolutely right', and he identifies that issue as the sovereignty of God. /36 Luther proclaimed what he called 'an entirely orthodox and truly Catholic doctrine, namely, that God alone, Father, Son and Holy Spirit, creates, redeems and sanctifies man and it is here that he finds the essential Luther - Luther the Reformer. /37

Holmes, Luther, IBS 6, January 1984

In spite of his all too human failings Luther was a genuinely religious man and that is how he should be understood. Luther was a preacher rather than a systematic theologian and when Catholic scholars translated the dynamic, experiential language of the prophet into the logical categories of scholasticism they produced contradictions and absurdities which they rejected. But Luther's overriding concern was soteriological, his conviction that only the power of God could save sinful man led him to over-emphasise the corruption of human nature making man seem less than a person when what he was really saying was that every attempt by man to establish his own righteousness must end in failure. /38

McDonough is only one of many Roman Catholic scholars in the United States who are contributing to the new Roman Catholic view of Luther. Another is Paul Tavad, who has recently been quoted as stating that 'today, many Catholic scholars think Luther was right and the sixteenth century Catholic polemicists did not understand what he meant'. /39

Lutheran and Roman Catholic theologians in America have recently released the text of the results of a five year study of the doctrine of justification by faith, so divisive in the sixteenth century and a common declaration of their agreement that 'our entire hope of justification and salvation rests on Christ alone'.

The fact that the new Roman Catholic view of Luther and the Reformation is percolating into popular history can be seen from a book like A Concise History of the Catholic Church by Thomas Bokenkotter, first published in the United States in 1977. Dealing with the Reformation Bokenkotter quotes modern Catholic scholars who find much that was Catholic and Christian in Luther /40, and declares:

One of the tragedies of the affair was that, from the beginning, Luther's opponents refused to meet him on theological and scriptural grounds... The only occasion for calm debate was furnished by Luther's fellow Augustinians at their Chapter at Heidelberg in 1518 where Luther won over the majority to his view. /41

An English Roman Catholic biographer of Luther who has popularised the modern positive approach to the Reformer is J.M.Todd, who has been

greatly influenced by the work of Lortz, and also by the Methodist scholar, Gordon Rupp. Todd's biography, originally published in 1964 has reappeared recently in a revised edition. While insisting that Luther was too complex for simplistic judgments his impression of him is 'of a man driven by a passion for the Divine, driven, too, by horror of evil, convinced of its eventual futility'. /42 He presents him as a man of prayer under whose impact the Christianity of Europe began to look more like the gospel of the New Testament, though, in the end the Reformer's church became as narrow and legalistic as the papal church had been, if not more so. /43

If any doubt remains that the attitude of the Roman Catholic Church to Luther has changed it must have finally been dispelled by the decision of the present Pope, John Paul, to attend a Lutheran church service in Rome in 1983, the year in which the quincentenary of Luther's birth is being celebrated, and to address the congregation. Perhaps the suggestion of some years ago of Jaroslav Pelikan that Luther should be canonised by the Roman Catholic Church is not so far-fetched after all!

Finally let us consider a Protestant response to indications that there has been a change in Roman Catholic attitudes to Luther and the Reformation. James Atkinson, formerly Professor of Theology at the University of Sheffield, is an Anglican Evangelical and prominent Luther scholar. He considers that the changed attitude of Roman Catholic scholars to Luther is symptomatic of changes which have been taking place in modern Roman Catholicism and which provide an opportunity for a new and creative dialogue between Protestants and Roman Catholics. His opinions have been expressed in the Foreword to a new edition of his Martin Luther and the Birth of Protestantism and in his Rome and Reformation Today: how Luther speaks to the new situation, both published in 1982.

Atkinson believes that, not only have distinguished Roman Catholic scholars given their opinion that Leo X made a ghastly mistake in his response to Luther in the sixteenth century but that the Roman Church, in the Second Vatican Council, has, to a large extent, abandoned its sixteenth century posture and its old language of anathema and condemnation and has begun to speak what he calls 'the plain, vital and dynamic language of the bible, unchallengeable in its authority, creative in its testimony'. /44

Atkinson argues that the great issues raised by Luther were faced by Vatican II in a simple historical, biblical way and that the Council could yet issue in the kind of Reformation Luther sought. /45

At the same time he is not naively optimistic. He acknowledges that the documents of Vatican II do not speak with one voice and that much of the old theology of Trent and Vatican I is re-affirmed alongside the newer insights. /46 Nevertheless he is hopeful because the developments which are clearly expressed in the Vatican II documents are endorsed by 'the weighty decisions of a world gathering of the Council Fathers' and are no longer simply the views of a few avant garde scholars. /47

In particular he regards Vatican II's decree on Ecumenism with its recognition of the authentically Christian character of non-Roman communions as a radical departure from previous statements, authoritatively made, which described Protestants as heretics outside the Christian fold. /48 The new emphasis is on the need for common penitence and mutual forgiveness which provides us with an occasion of hope.

Both traditions have taken wrong paths since the sixteenth century divide. Protestantism has been bedevilled by fissiparous tendencies, the consequence of excessive individualism and also from 'liberalising' tendencies which have led to a loss of distinctively Christian commitment. /49 In his view the Roman tradition's rejection of Luther deprived it of its rightful biblical and evangelical heritage, its negative exclusivism robbed it of true catholicity, it became authoritarian rather than authoritative, but, for all its faults and deficiencies, it has, in areas of Christian spirituality and ethics, remained more faithful to Christianity than has Liberal Protestantism. /50

It would demand much from both traditions to respond to the challenge of the present situation and perhaps neither is capable of rising to that challenge but Atkinson believes:

History is asking us now whether we know what the Gospel truly is and truly means. The answer to this question will take the combined resources of all Christendom to receive from God nothing less than the penitent purification of all the people of God and a Pentecostal movement that will sweep through our churches and make us all one in Christ. /51

NOTES

1. Quoted in J. Lortz, The Reformation in Germany (E.T.London, 1968), I, p.296.
2. A.Herte, Die Lutherkommentare des Johannes Cochlaeus (Munster, 1935), p.9.
3. G.Wiedermann, 'Cochlaeus as a Polemicist' in P.N.Brooks (ed) Seven-headed Luther (Oxford, 1983), p.200.
4. E.G.Rupp, The Righteousness of God (London, 1947), p.18.
5. Ibid., p.23.
6. R.Stauffer, Luther as seen by Catholics (London, 1967), p.14.
7. Ibid., pp 15-16.
8. R.E.J.McNally, 'The Reformation: A Catholic Reappraisal' in J.C.Olin, J.D.Smart and R.E.McNally (eds) Luther, Erasmus and the Reformation (New York, 1969), p.36.
9. P.F.O'Hare, The Facts about Martin Luther (New York and Cincinnati, 1916), pp 257 and 357.
10. H.O.Evennett, The Reformation (London, 1937), pp 9-10 and 14.
11. F.W.Meuser, The Changing Catholic View of Luther. Will Rome take him back? (Minneapolis, 1969).
12. Stauffer, pp 37-9.
13. Ibid., p.39
14. Lortz, I, 8.
15. Stauffer, p.40.
16. Lortz, I, 442-4, 455-8, 471-7; II, 340-1.
17. Ibid., I, 226.
18. E.Iserloh and K.Reppen (eds), Reformata Reformanda (Munster, 1965) I, 217. An English translation in Jared Wicks (ed), Catholic Scholars' Dialogue with Luther (Chicago, 1970), pp 4-33.
19. Ibid., I, 217; Wicks, p.7.
20. Ibid., p.6; J.J.Scarisbrick
21. Ibid., p.33.
22. E.Iserloh, Luther zwischen Reform und Reformation (Munster, 1966); Wicks.
23. Wicks, p.57.

24. 'Luther and Aquinas', in Wicks pp 59 ff. See also O.H.Pesch 'Twenty Years of Catholic Luther Research', Lutheran World XIII (1966) 303-16.
25. P.Manns, Martin Luther 1983.
26. 'Luther on Justification in his Commentary on Galatians, 1531-5' in Wicks, pp 122-52.
27. S.Ozment, The Reformation in the Cities (New Haven and London, 1980), p.5.
28. A.Herte, Das katholische Lutherbild im Bann der Lutherkommentare des Cochlaüs (Munster, 1943); Stauffer, pp 42-4.
29. K.Adam, Una sancta in katholischer Sicht (Dusseldorf, 1948), E.T. One and Holy (London and New York, 1954).
30. H.Kühng, Justification (London, 1964), pp 262-71.
31. Stauffer, p.53.
32. Ibid., p.54.
33. Ibid., pp 76-7.
34. L.Bouyer, The Spirit and Forms of Protestantism (London, 1956).
35. D.Olivier, The Trial of Luther (Oxford 1978), p.ix
36. J.T.McDonough, 'The Essential Luther' in Olin, Smart and McNally, p.59.
37. Ibid., p.60.
38. Ibid., pp 63-5.
39. Time, 17 October 1983, p.52.
40. T.Bokenkotter, A Concise History of the Catholic Church (New York, 1979), p.221.
41. Ibid., p.225.
42. J.M.Todd, Luther: A Life, p.373.
43. Ibid., p.372.
44. J.Atkinson, Martin Luther and the Birth of Protestantism (London, 1982), pp xxii-xxiii.
45. Ibid., p.xxiv and J.Atkinson, Rome and Reformation today (Oxford, 1982), p.31.

46. Rome and Reformation today, p.5. It must also be said that not all Roman Catholic writers on Luther take the modern positive attitude to the Reformer. Paul Hacker, The Ego in Faith: Martin Luther and the Origin of Anthropocentric Religion (Chicago, 1970), takes Lortz's criticisms of Luther's subjectivism a stage further and, in Germany, Remigius Bäumer has recently shown in his biography of Cochlaeus (Aschendorff, 1980) that the tradition associated with Luther's sixteenth century assailant is not dead and buried. See G.Widermann 'Cochlaeus as a Polemicist' in P.N. Brooks, op. cit., pp 204-5.
47. Ibid.
48. Ibid., pp 5-7.
49. Ibid., p.22.
50. Ibid., p.33 and Martin Luther and the Birth of Protestantism, p.xxiii.
51. Ibid., p.28.