Martin Luther had a fairly low opinion of himself, though one must leave open the question if this was because he was profoundly convinced that such was the case, or because he thought it to be good politics to say so, or because he saw himself as analogous to the Old Testament prophets who similarly had a way of denouncing their own importance. “I am but a stinking bag of worms,” he observed on one occasion. And even though he had also insisted that at his death all his books and writings should be burned and “the children of God not be called by my name,” neither, in fact, proved to be the case. Luther’s long shadow fell over the subsequent centuries. With the passing of time, posterity chose not to take Luther at his word, and the importance he had attained during his own lifetime was dwarfed by an ever-increasing importance afterwards. Arguably, Luther’s legacy has been one of the most striking phenomena in Western intellectual history. The fundamental observation, all the same, is that such dramatic eminence notwithstanding, Martin Luther has also been one of the most controversial figures in Western life and thought. Indeed, there has been controversy not only about his theology, but also about his impact on German history. For a long time, mentioning the name of Luther meant to step on to the barricades.

Three facets have intermingled to mold Martin Luther’s legacy – judgments made about his person; evaluations of his theology; and assessments of his ecclesiastical influence. Obviously, these three facets interweave. Those who admire his theological prowess were also most likely to admire him as a person as well. However, conceptually these three facets can be kept separate.

**The Luther of History**

Luther’s legacy began already during the reformer’s own lifetime, and sentiment about him, expressed by friend or foe, had a way of setting the course for the centuries that followed. As early as 1521, Albrecht Dürer wrote in his diary, upon learning that Luther might have been killed by Charles V:
“Oh, if Luther is dead, who will henceforth expound to us the true gospel.”

Luther’s colleague and co-worker Philip Melanchthon’s funeral oration for Luther movingly expressed deep filial appreciation:

Thus he must be counted among the number and order of those mighty and special people, whom God sent to gather his church on earth… Luther brought the true and pure Christian teaching to the light of day… I will not quarrel with those good-hearted men who tell us that Dr. Luther was a bit too rough, but will use Erasmus’s answer often given by him, namely that God prescribed a harsh and bitter physician for these last days, when a grave illness had begun to take over.

Melanchthon also confessed later that he had found Luther’s dominating personality oppressive: “In earlier days I had to submit myself to Luther like a servant, since he frequently persisted in his disturbing stubbornness, which was not a minor characteristic, rather than in a concern for his own person and the common good.”

Soon after the reformer’s death his disciple Matthias Flacius Illyricus began to publish his *Ecclesiastica Historia integram ecclesiae Christi ideam complectens*, the so-called “Magdeburg Centuries,” a history of the church from apostolic times to the present. Tellingly, as Flacius put it on the very first page, the story of the church is described as “the beginning, progression, and ruthless efforts of the Antichrist,” surely a rather gloomy perspective which allowed Flacius, all the same, to put Luther into an even more striking light. What in Philip Melanchthon and in other contemporaries of Martin Luther had been a deep appreciation of Luther’s theological and biblical insight, was made by Flacius part and parcel of universal salvation history. The assertion was that Luther had been the sole authentic interpreter of the gospel since the days of the apostles. This was a different tone than that expressed by Luther’s own contemporaries. The Lutheran veneration of the reformer had its beginning right then and there. Melanchthon’s had been the voice of Luther’s contemporaries. Flacius spoke as a filial worshiper.

Luther’s foes, in turn, were in the reformers’ camp as well as in the Catholic phalanx. Luther’s erstwhile supporters Thomas Müntzer and Andreas Bodenstein Karlstadt were illustrative of former supporters, while Johannes Cochlaeus and John Eck were representative of the phalanx of Catholic protagonists. All four offered vehement and vitriolic criticism of Luther. The two fellow reformers, Karlstadt and Müntzer, offered the same strident criticism, but made subtle distinctions. For both, Luther was not “radical” enough. But while Karlstadt argued that Luther had failed to see
the full ramifications of his own theological premises, Müntzer concluded that Luther had surrendered his biblical insights to an easy accommodation with the rulers and political authorities. Müntzer called Luther the “soft-living body in Wittenberg,” while an Anabaptist writer observed that Luther had “broken the pope’s pitcher, but had kept the pieces in his hand."⁹ This notion, stated in varying degrees of judgmental theological appraisal, may be seen as the common denominator for all Protestant, non-Lutheran views of Luther. This is understandable, of course, in that the existence of separate Protestant traditions apart from Lutheranism meant that in one way or another one had to find fault with Luther.

The Catholic polemists, in turn, found in Luther a plain old-fashioned heretic. Johannes Cochlaeus, while by no means Luther’s foremost theological opponent (that credit must go to Johann Eck), was the major Catholic polemicist when it came to Luther, pursuing him from 1520 onward with a steady stream of polemics. After Luther’s appearance before the diet at Worms in 1521, Cochlaeus published an account of his discussion with Luther, and from then on he regularly added his vitriolic commentary on specific writings of Luther’s as they appeared. In 1529 he published Septiceps Lutherus, ubique sibi, suis scriptis, contrarius in Visitationem Saxoniacam in which he found Luther to be “seven-headed,” a hardly complimentary reference to the biblical dragon with the seven heads, the symbol for evil identical with the devil or representative of him. Cochlaeus meant inconsistency among the seven Luthers – the “doctor,” “Martinus,” “Lutherus,” “ecclesiastes” (preacher), “Suermerus” (radical), and “Barrabas” (spiritualist). In 1549 Cochlaeus published his lengthy Commentaria de actis et scriptis Martini Lutheri on Luther’s life and thought. Even though Cochlaeus got a crony of his to write a preface on the “proper way to write history” (de ratione scribendi historias), his book is a passionate compilation of all the negatives about Luther’s life and the congruence of Luther’s teachings with ancient heresies. Not surprisingly, Cochlaeus’ book became the standard arsenal for virtually all Catholic anti-Lutheran assessments and polemics until the twentieth century.¹⁰

The Catholic polemics were clear in their rejection of Luther, though strikingly they seemed to be most concerned to garner adverse details about his life. The notion, of course, was that by demonstrating a despicable life, Luther’s theology would be also discredited.¹¹ In the generation after Luther’s death (in fact, already anticipated in Luther’s later years) something else of importance for Luther’s legacy came to the fore – stark disagreement among Martin Luther’s own followers as to what was, in fact, the reformer’s authentic teaching. In a way, this was surprising, for no such disagreement characterized the followers of John Calvin.
This had, at least on the face of things, a good reason. Luther was not a systematic theologian in the sense of having written a systematic exposition of theology. He was what might be called a “polemical” theologian – Karl Barth used the term “irregular” theologian to characterize the likes of Luther.12 His theology was not expressed in works of a systematic nature and character, but in polemical works, books and treatises written with specific controversial issues in mind (much like those characteristic of St. Augustine), and in biblical commentaries, where specific scriptural passages determined topic and compass of exegesis. This fact makes it understandable why there was among Martin Luther’s followers far more disagreement about his teaching than, say, among the followers of John Calvin. Other than in his two catechisms and the Schmalkald Articles, Luther did not offer a coherent exposition of the faith. He wrote on specific topics, usually in the context of a fierce controversy – against the Anabaptists, against John Eck, or Huldrych Zwingli. To be sure, it is possible to systematize Luther’s utterances from various settings – Martin Luther did have a coherent theology – but it is not easy. That some of his followers were able to read one kind of notions into his writings, and others quite different theological notions, becomes understandable.

In the sixteenth century this disagreement among Luther’s disciples found expression, beginning already during Luther’s own lifetime, in several theological controversies and disagreements among his followers. No less than six theological controversies beset German Lutheranism in the sixteenth century. The points of contention of these controversies strike us today as quite foreign as will the intensity with which these fraternal battles were fought. Intriguingly, protagonists on both sides of the various issues saw themselves as authentic advocates of Luther’s understanding, and thereby also of the gospel.

The Antinomian controversy had to do with the contention of Johann Agricola that the Decalogue, thus the law, had no place in the Christian proclamation. The Adiaphoristic controversy was triggered by Philip Melanchthon’s notion that certain matters, such as details of the liturgy, were adiaphora, “matters of indifference,” and could be changed or modified without affecting the fundamental fidelity to the gospel. The Majoristic controversy pertained to Georg Major’s argument that good works were necessary for salvation, an argument that led to the Gnesio-Lutheran retort, propounded by Nikolaus Amsdorf, that reliance on good works was in fact detrimental to salvation. The Synergistic controversy focused on the question of human co-operation – through human will or human effort – with divine grace in salvation. The Osiandrian controversy took its name from the
Nuremberg reformer Andreas Osiander, who held that the believer will overcome the lack of righteousness because the indwelling Christ in the believer will bring about all sorts of good works. The Crypto-Calvinist (or “hidden Calvinist”) controversy, finally, had to do with the manner of Christ’s presence in the bread and wine of the Lord’s Supper, seen by Calvinists as a symbolic or spiritual presence, the charge being that some alleged Lutherans were in fact holding to the Calvinist point of view and were thus “crypto” Calvinists.

In one way, these controversies were hardly noteworthy in that through the centuries before as well as after the Reformation, disagreements among theologians have neither been confined either to the sixteenth century or to theologians of Lutheran persuasion. It was an important characteristic of these controversies, however, that all protagonists, especially the Gnesio-Lutherans, claimed fealty to Martin Luther. That they were able to do so, at least with a modicum of justification, was the outgrowth of the nature of Luther’s theologizing, to which should be added Luther’s rather broad-minded attitude when it came to ensuing disagreements among his followers during his lifetime. The fierceness of these controversies about Luther’s theological legacy was no less fierce than that between Catholics and Protestants in that age.

After the Peace of Augsburg, of 1555, this internal Lutheran discord in Germany had woeful consequences. The Gnesio-Lutherans rejected the Philippists’ claim of the Augsburg Confession as their confessional statement, thus arguing that the theological disagreement between the two factions was not over peripheral matters but pertained to the very heart of the Lutheran understanding of the Christian faith. Even more importantly, the internal controversies sapped the external vitality of German Lutheranism. Energies were consumed by these controversies, and little attention was paid to the dissemination of the Lutheran faith beyond the territories and cities in which Lutheranism had been established. Calvinism, on the other hand, was free from such internal dissension and was able to devote its energies to a dramatic expansion of the Calvinist faith throughout Europe.

The resolution of these intra-Lutheran controversies in 1577 through the Formula of Concord and, in 1580, through the Book of Concord, was more than the end of this incessant internal feuding. It also marked the promulgation of the definitive statement of the meaning of Luther’s theological legacy. The Book of Concord expressed what was understood to be Luther’s interpretation of the gospel. It included several creeds and confessions which had remained unchallenged in the various controversies: the Apostles’ Creed; the Nicene Creed; the Athanasian Creed; the Augsburg Confession,
together with the Apology of the Augsburg Confession; Luther’s two catechisms; the Schmalkald Articles, and the Formula of Concord. Luther’s theology was made – through the inclusion of his catechisms and the Schmalkald Articles – the incisive standard for the Lutheran churches as to how to interpret the ancient creeds. Prior to 1580, any number of Lutheran churches in the various German territories and free cities had adopted their own bodies of normative doctrinal writings, the so-called corpus doctrinae, as their respective rules of faith. A Lutheran pluralism existed. After 1580, such pluralism was replaced by the affirmation of a single book, the Book of Concord. Formal Lutheran theology had been definitively delineated. The controversies ceased. Lutheran pastors pledged allegiance, in their ordination vows, to the Book of Concord.

A further point is worth noting. The theological controversies were resolved not by the instigation of theologians, but by the active intervention of the political authorities. Though the initial efforts of the Lutheran rulers at so-called “peace synods” had failed to produce theological agreement, it was their persistence that in the end carried the day. Without the intervention of the rulers, the theological controversies would have lasted longer and been more tediously resolved. As a result of such governmental intervention, however, the power and authority of the rulers, particularly the more important ones, such as the Saxon elector or the Hessian landgrave, over ecclesiastical affairs were enhanced. This was a fateful development which – while by no means confined to Germany and the Lutheran churches – gave Lutheran rulers in Germany a particularly powerful role in church matters. This was the beginning of the fateful alliance of “throne and altar,” which tied the Lutheran churches to inordinate subservience to the ruling authorities. In the eighteenth century, to cite just one example, the Prussian King Frederick William I issued royal directives dealing with liturgical details of the Lutheran worship service, while early in the nineteenth century King Frederick William III forced the Lutheran and Reformed churches in Prussia into a merger, the so-called Church of the Prussian Union.

Martin Luther’s increasing importance in the religious tradition he brought about found expression in the fact that the “churches of the Augsburg Confession” (as the “Lutheran” churches circumspectly referred to themselves) adopted the name “Lutheran” in the second half of the sixteenth century, and quite proudly so. Until that time, the term “Lutheran” had only been used disparagingly by Catholics, while Lutherans themselves used various circumlocutions, if for no other reason than they wanted to record their public abhorrence of partisan labels. They called themselves “evangelicals,” “protesting churches” (referring to the “protest” lodged at the Diet at Speyer in 1529 by the “adherents of the Augsburg Confession”).
Aided by such anniversaries as 1583 (the centenary of Luther’s birth) and 1617 (the centenary of the Ninety-five Theses), Luther increasingly became the theological canon for the ecclesiastical tradition that bore his name. Moreover, by the end of the sixteenth century Luther himself had become an object of increasingly exuberant veneration.

During the period of the Orthodoxy, which dominated the better part of the seventeenth century, it was, understandably, a theological Luther who was esteemed and lauded. Luther had recovered the pure teaching of the gospel and he was valued because of his teaching. Luther’s writings were “a treasure above all treasures.” Indeed, Luther was increasingly identified as the apocalyptic angel of the Book of Revelation (14:6), always with the notation that his contribution lay in his recovery of the true biblical teaching. By the middle of the seventeenth century Martin Luther had become, for the Lutheran tradition, the personification of the gospel, which, as professor of theology, he had a bounden duty to interpret properly. At the same time, Orthodox theologians showed little interest in the person of Martin Luther. The divine authorization of his teaching was all-important. At the same time, however, there were also different voices to be heard, that of Johann Saubert, for example, who in his *Lutherus Propheta Germaniae*, of 1632, related Luther’s dire warnings of a decline of spirituality in the church to the state of church affairs in the middle of the seventeenth century.

When the Lutheran clergyman Philip Jakob Spener published his *Pia Desideria* in 1675, as a call for enhanced spirituality and piety in the Lutheran churches, and in so doing launched the Pietist movement, he insisted emphatically that he was only seeking to implement what Martin Luther had himself always wanted. Spener acknowledged that Luther’s theology was authentically biblical. Quite appropriately Spener wrote that “we praise Luther most highly and almost make an idol of him.” But criticism of Luther’s personal demeanor – that he was too impulsive, too intense, too uncouth – is also voiced.

At the same time, Spener and the other Pietists expressed grave misgivings about the state of piety in the Lutheran churches, thus echoing the sentiment already found in Saubert’s book. Thus, they criticized the tradition that bore Luther’s name. Not surprisingly, therefore, the Lutheran establishment felt that the memory of Luther was severely assailed by the Pietists. The Pietists in turn sought to justify their own theological emphases by appealing to the “young” Luther, that is, to the Luther before the year 1525, as over against the “old” Luther. This dichotomy found a first, but classic, expression in Gottfried Arnold’s *Unpartheyische Kirchen- und Ketzerhistorie*, of 1699.
The Enlightenment continued to express enthusiasm for Martin Luther, except that it now was a blatantly non-theological Luther who was hailed and praised. The eighteenth century cared little about Luther’s theological sentiment, such as his notion of the “hidden God,” the *deus absconditus*, but saw him as a gifted and virtuous individual, one who composed Christmas carols which he sang with family and friends around the Christmas tree, one who proved to be a warrior against medieval superstition, an advocate of religious freedom and conscience. Luther’s pointed theological opinions about the theology of the cross or about justification were characterized as the “unprofitable, dogmatic extravaganzas of a profound and courageous, though occasionally one-sided spirit.” He was the liberator from servile, foreign collectivism, supra-naturalism, superstition, in short, the herald and hero of a new age and the creator of the modern spirit. Luther’s historical significance is seen in his courageous defiance of medieval superstition and intolerance, against which he set out his own convictions derived freely from the Bible. Luther was, according to one eighteenth-century author, “a veritable guardian angel for the rights of reason, humanity, and Christian liberty of conscience.”

The Luther image of the nineteenth century largely continued the eighteenth-century understanding of the reformer. This image, however, must be seen against the backdrop not only of the theological climate of the nineteenth century, but also of the German intellectual and political history. Most of the anniversaries of the Reformation celebrated in the nineteenth century – the anniversaries of 1517, 1521, 1530, to cite just a few – fell into a time of an emerging German national self-consciousness and nationalism. Not much that was new was said about the theological Luther; the standard Orthodox, Pietist, and Enlightenment perspectives were simply reiterated. What was new, however, was the appropriation of Luther as the quintessential German, the hero of German history. These elements significantly shaped a new Luther picture. Luther was interpreted according to the categories of German Idealistic philosophy. Alongside the reiteration of notions that had been bandied about in the eighteenth century, there now was added a nationalistic sentiment. This distinctly German nineteenth-century appropriation of Luther surely served the need for a common legacy that would serve to give the diverse German states a unified German past. Given the ever-increasing Prussian hegemony in setting a German agenda, Martin Luther suggested himself as an appropriate figure.

This theme was picked up by the German historians of the time, by Leopold von Ranke, Heinrich von Treitschke, and others. Thus, Heinrich von Treitschke wrote in his memorial address on the occasion of the quadricentennial of Luther’s birth in 1883:
A foreigner may well ask with consternation how such wonderful contradictions can be together in a single soul – this power of overwhelming anger and this intensity of pious faith, this sublime wisdom and this childish simplicity, this profound mysticism and this \textit{joie de vivre}, this uncouth roughness and this tenderheartedness… We Germans do not find any of this an enigma, we simply state: This is blood of our blood. Out of the deep eyes of the unspoiled German peasant son flashed the ancient “Teutonic heroism which does not seek to escape from the world but seeks to dominate it through the power of the moral will.”\textsuperscript{18}

Nineteenth-century Protestant theologians from Schleiermacher to Harnack reiterated traditional notions about Luther. Interestingly enough, the most penetrating theological assessment of Luther in the nineteenth century, Theodosius von Harnack’s \textit{Luther’s Theology} (1862–86), hardly influenced either the theological or the public appropriation of Luther. For non-theological readers it was too theological a work, while theologically interested readers concluded that it was too far removed from concerns of the time. It was too theological, while the perception of Albrecht von Ritschl, who was in fact far less thoroughly acquainted with the reformer’s writings, did make an impact in that it succeeded in presenting a picture of Luther that corresponded to the \textit{Zeitgeist}.

Early twentieth-century perceptions of Luther are foremostly associated with the work of Ernst Troeltsch who started out as a systematic theologian but switched to a professorship in philosophy because of his uneasiness with normative, confessional scholarship. Troeltsch doggedly attacked the prevailing picture of Luther that had made him into a champion of modernity and an ur-German. According to Troeltsch, Luther was anything but the progenitor of the modern world. His worldview was medieval, as were his theological concepts. In regard to German political history, Luther was nothing short of a catastrophe, because his conservative-patriarchic worldview made for an undue authoritarian emphasis in German political life, a political passivity of the German people. Moreover, the complete absence of an ethos of a Christian society in Germany must be laid at Martin Luther’s doorstep.

Troeltsch was vehemently contested, but his jaundiced view of Luther informed a great deal of the non-confessional perceptions of Luther in the twentieth century. Troeltsch’s great opponent was Karl Holl, who more than any other single scholar was responsible for what has been the “Luther Renaissance” of the twentieth century. That is, Holl laid the groundwork for theological appraisals of Luther in the twentieth century. Thus, Holl’s
themes were Luther’s understanding of justification, the wrath of God, and predestination.

Holl inveighed against Troeltsch not only with his insistence that Martin Luther was the pivotal theological figure in the sixteenth century, with all other theologians of the time dependent on him, but also with his argument that Luther was also the pivotal figure for the emergence of modernity in all areas of culture.

The Luther picture of Neo-Orthodoxy essentially echoed the themes of Holl. It is surely telling that many of the scholars who contributed to Luther research in the course of the twentieth century were in fact not historians but systematic theologians, suggesting that the theological appropriation of Luther was as important as the historical one. The names of Paul Althaus, Philip Watson, and Gordon Rupp come to mind.

This close connection between systematic theology and Luther scholarship at once offers an explanation as to why Luther scholarship has been dominated by scholars of Lutheran orientation or sympathies: Germany and the (Lutheran) Scandinavian countries were the centers of scholarship throughout the twentieth century and continue to be highly influential in the present. The English-speaking world of scholarship has tended to be dependent on European continental scholarship.

Not surprisingly, the current phase of Luther scholarship was the result of a convergence of the impact of the Nazi totalitarianism in Germany between 1933 and 1945 and the role the Lutheran churches and theology played during that time, the general increasing focus of historical scholarship on social issues in the past, and also the Luther anniversary.

In short, the Luther of history is a complicated figure, no less ambiguous than sixteenth-century contemporaries found the historical figure. This amazing malleability may convey bewilderment, yet it also denotes a richness of appropriation and helps explain the enduring significance of the reformer. Martin Luther proved a worthwhile paradigm not only for theologians and churchmen, but for statesmen and politicians as well. However guardedly, even Hitler and the Nazis found strikingly positive words to say about the reformer.

THE GEOGRAPHIC DIMENSION

Martin Luther’s influence triggered the establishment of churches eventually bearing his name in many parts of Europe. The Lutheran tradition had its beginnings in Central Germany, from where it spread essentially into a northerly direction. By the time the ecclesiastical ways of Europe had stabilized by the early seventeenth century, two major locales of Lutheran
influence had been established – Central and Northern Germany and Scandinavia. In addition, a number of South German cities, such as Nuremberg, had embraced Lutheranism, even as there were pockets of Lutheran congregations in southeastern Europe. Moreover, Lutheran churches were official in central and northern Germany. They had been granted official recognition through the Peace promulgated by the diet at Augsburg in 1555. This Peace stipulated that the ruler should determine the religion of his subjects, a policy which subsequently was expressed by the phrase “cuius regio, eius religio.” Consequently, Lutheranism in Germany developed along territorial lines.

In Scandinavia, King Gustava Vasa had severed the ties of the Swedish Church with Rome in 1527. As was to be the case in England less than a decade later, this rupture did not entail immediate theological significance, even though the standard Reformation slogans, such as the centrality of the Word of God or the rejection of human tradition, were variably voiced by those advocating reform. In Sweden, even as subsequently in England, the introduction of the Protestant faith was an act of state. Vasa was little interested in theological issues but discerned astutely that the religious turbulence allowed him to confiscate the property of the church and to curtail its political power, both important objectives. Changes in church life, liturgy, and theology were slow in coming. The same held true for Finland which, in the sixteenth century, was part of Sweden. Importantly, the only confessional adapted by the Swedish Church in the sixteenth century was the Augsburg Confession, the most ecumenical of Lutheran confessional statements. Moreover, the historic episcopate was retained in Sweden, when in 1531 the Lutheran Laurentius Petri was consecrated by Petrus Magni, bishop of Västeras, and other Swedish bishops, as Archbishop of Uppsala. The bishops undoubtedly saw Laurentius Petri as an Erasmian reformer, albeit fundamentally Roman Catholic. They were mistaken. Laurentius proved to be a determined Lutheran, who capped his many years as archbishop with the promulgation of a church ordinance in 1571 that still lacked Lutheran specifics. Toward the end of the century, under King John III, Sweden almost returned to the Catholic fold. Indeed, had Pope Gregory XIII been willing to accept a married clergy, the vernacular mass, and communion under both kinds, John would have taken the country back to Catholicism. A similar situation occurred under Sigismund III, himself a Catholic. By that time, however, both clergy and people had become so solidly swayed by Lutheranism that Sigismund’s efforts failed. Laurentius Petri’s church order, which Sigismund had abolished, was reinstated and subscription to the Augsburg Confession was required by the Swedish kings.
Perhaps the most notable Luther disciple and critic in the nineteenth century was the Dane Søren Kierkegaard whose own legacy, however, lay not so much in his own time as in posterity, especially in twentieth-century Neo-Orthodoxy. Kierkegaard combined a deep appreciation for Luther, expressed, for example, in his statement “Oh, Luther is, after all, the master of all masters” with increasing criticism of the reformer that matched, in its intensity, the most strident comments levied in the sixteenth century. When Europeans emigrated to North America in the course of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, a notable portion were Lutherans from Scandinavia and Germany. They brought their Lutheran faith with them and the churches they established not only used the Swedish, Finnish, Norwegian, or German vernacular, but were also organized in ethnic synods. Not until the twentieth century did a series of mergers bring about Lutheran ecclesiastical bodies in the United States that transcended the various European ethnic backgrounds.
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