

auch in den ältesten Urkunden der Bibel schon der Glaube an das Ewige Leben waltet. K. Fittschen (93–99) stellt Gustav Friedrich Dinters „Schullehrerbibel“ als in seiner Zeit durchaus ernstzunehmendes Zeugnis eines sehr durchdachten religionsdidaktischen Konzepts vor, dessen Andenken zu Unrecht von Spott und Hämie verzerrt worden ist. D. Fleischer zeichnet nach, wie sich seit dem 2. Drittel des 18. Jahrhunderts die Kirchengeschichte gegen skeptische Tendenzen und den historisch wenig interessierten Rationalismus der Wolffschen Schulphilosophie aus einer bloß propädeutischen Hilfswissenschaft zur theologischen Kerndisziplin emporzuarbeiten vermochte. In einem weiteren Beitrag (75–92) weist er darauf hin, dass Johann Salomo Semler in der Auseinandersetzung mit den von Lessing publizierten Reimarus-Fragmenten ein in die Zukunft weisendes Verständnis historischer Quellen zur Geltung brachte: Er überwand die Reimarus'sche Alternative von authentischer Tatsachendokumentation und Betrug und forderte stattdessen ein Verständnis der biblischen Zeugnisse als Dokumenten religiöser und theologischer Lern- und Bildungsprozesse. – Meine Schlaglichter auf einige Aufsätze, deren Auswahl ausdrücklich kein Qualitätsurteil über die nicht erwähnten enthält, haben hoffentlich verdeutlicht, dass hier durchweg gewichtige Forschungsbeiträge vorliegen.

Wuppertal

Martin Ohst

Karim Schelkens: *Catholic Theology of Revelation on the Eve of Vatican II. A Redaction History of the Schema De fontibus revelationis* (1960–1962), Leiden: Brill 2010 (Brill's Series in Church History 41), x, 295 S., 978-9004-18105-2.

The Leuven-based author of this work is known for his editions of valuable Vatican II materials, such as the *Carnets conciliaires* de Mgr Gérard Philips (Leuven 2006) and *The Council Notes* of Edward Schillebeeckx 1962–1963 (Leuven 2011). The present volume is an English version of his dissertation, originally in Flemish and moderated by M. Lamberigts, which he defended in the Leuven Catholic Theology Faculty in 2007. The English translation is for the most part smooth, in spite of several errors regarding names, word-selection and grammar.

The work aims to be a revisionist account of the draft dogmatic constitution, *De fontibus revelationis*, prepared by a sub-commission Vatican II's preparatory theological commission. This text stood first in the booklet of seven initial draft texts distributed for treatment at

the Council, where it was debated 14–21 November 1962, leading to the momentous *Wende* of its removal for revision by a mixed commission in which Cardinal Bea's ecumenical Secretariat had equal membership with Cardinal Ottaviani's Doctrinal Commission.

The dissertation informs the reader well about background currents affecting Catholic theological work on revelation, tradition and Scripture in 1960, about the membership of the sub-commission *de fontibus*, and about successive drafts of the schema with several parts being offered extensively in footnotes. For *De fontibus* Sch. is a moderate apologist aware of the text's weaknesses, such as its locutionary-instructional notion of revelation, its juxtaposition of different modes of biblical inspiration, and its unnuanced and harsh censures of directions in New Testament exegesis, which came not from a majority on the sub-commission but from Ottaviani. But Sch. dissents from the global criticisms that rained down on the text in the opening days of Vatican II and in subsequent historical and theological accounts of the Council. Against the critics, he urges how his redaction-historical study shows that the "Roman" theology of 1960 was not unitary, that the responsible sub-commission was not affected by the integrist currents of the Lateran University then at war against the Pontifical Biblical Institute, and that *De fontibus* was enriched by several themes taken from Lucien Cerfaux's internal draft texts, especially his *Constitutio de Scriptura* of early 1961.

A number of critical observations, however, must be made. While he reviews well the contributions of Belgian bishops and the Louvain faculty to the pre-preparatory collection of proposals for Vatican II, Sch. makes no mention of the influential 1960 recommendations for Council teaching and action made by the Vatican curial departments, such as the Holy Office and the Congregation on Seminaries. Later we learn that the mid-1960 *Urtext* on the sources, the *Schema compendiosum de fontibus revelationis*, was obeying the Holy Office recommendation when it asserted that "divine tradition is not only explanatory of Scripture but contains revealed truths not given in Scripture" (104). Furthermore, Sch. takes no account of the distinctive style of the *Schema compendiosum* on the sources, in comparison with the other compendious drafts on the church, on preserving the deposit of faith, and on moral foundations. These simply list topics for development, while the initial form of the text on revelation and Scripture consists in theses and positions (77–80), which were to be fleshed out by the sub-commission into doctrinal and disciplinary paragraphs. The

work, from its inception, stood under forceful guidance from above.

One can easily follow in Sch.'s text and footnotes the genesis of the schema's opening chapter, *De duplici fonte revelationis*, from an original version submitted to the sub-commission by Damien Van den Eynde, 21 April 1961, through its successive revisions (171 f, 192–195, 197 and 228), with the last modification being a seven-line revision by S. Tromp on the nature of tradition. But Sch.'s analysis, while noting Cerfaux's influence as the text developed, takes no note of the original shaping of text by Trent's decree on Scripture and traditions, by Vatican I's *Dei Filius* and by Pius XII's censorious 1950 encyclical *Humani generis*. H. de Lubac astutely noted that the schema selectively omitted Trent's designation of revelation as "the gospel" (225), which Trent specified as the source of all saving truth and norms of practice.

Sch. does relate the sharply critical treatment of *De fontibus* on 10 November 1961 by the cardinals (König, Döpfner, Alfrink, Frings and especially Bea) of the Central Preparatory Commission (238–244). But in the revision that was to follow, Tromp responded with an extensive contestation of the modifications requested by these influential council leaders, doing battle with them by refusals and rebuttals on behalf of the schema. Small modifications did enter, but on substantive points, "Tromp has clearly imposed his own will" (252). This is a dramatic moment of Vatican II's history, which goes contrary to the general direction of K. Sch.'s evaluations and helps explain the "fall" of *De fontibus* in November 1962, which was an event of long-range church-historical consequence.

For a comprehensive evaluation of the doctrine and directives proposed in the schema *De fontibus*, one could well contrast it point-by-point with the April 1962 votum of the Bea Secretariat on tradition and Scripture (U. Betti, *La dottrina del Concilio Vaticano II sulla trasmissione della rivelazione*, Rome 1985, 297–298). The Secretariat's proposals gained importance as Council members appropriated John XXIII's specification of Vatican II's central orientations and as the Secretariat joined the mixed commission to revise the schema. Today, a fascinating comparison would be with Joseph Ratzinger's incisive Bemerkungen on the schema, offered to the German-speaking bishops 10 October 1962 (*Gregorianum* 89/2008, 296–309; or *Mitteilungen Institut Papst Benedikt XVI*, 2/2009, 36–48). Shortly after, on 26 October 1962, Pieter Smulders composed for the bishops of Indonesia a *Iudicium generale* on *De fontibus* (*Gregorianum* 82/2001, 591–593).

Smulders notes, in a telling observation, the worried insistence of the schema, repeated no less than seven times, that Catholic reading of Scripture must follow the lead of the magisterium, with no mention of the inverse relation of the teaching authority subjecting itself in faith to God's written and transmitted word. Ratzinger and Smulders were not from "theologically progressive lobby groups", swaying the Council majority (lamented by Sch. on p. 5), but were *periti* bringing their broad competencies to bear on *De fontibus*. Admittedly, the reception-historical readings I propose do go beyond the work of K. Sch., but they are no less integral to satisfactory text-interpretation.

Columbus, Ohio USA Jared Wicks SJ

*Dietrich Blauffuß* (Hg.): *Wilhelm Löhe*. Erbe und Vision, hrsg. von, Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus 2009 (Lutherische Kirche – Geschichte und Gestalten 26), 381 S., ISBN 978-3-579-05781-1.

Mit dem Ende 2009 veröffentlichten Buch liegt der zweite, die derzeitige internationale Löheforschung dokumentierende Sammelband vor. Wie dem von Hermann Schoenauer Ende 2008 herausgegebenen Band „Wilhelm Löhe (1808–1872). Seine Bedeutung für Kirche und Diakonie“ ging auch diesem Exemplar eine diesmal von der „International Loehe Society“ (ILOeS) und der „Gesellschaft für Innere und Äußere Mission im Sinne der lutherischen Kirche“ (GIÄM) im Juli 2008 in Neuendettelsau veranstaltete internationale „Informations-, Arbeits- und Forschungs-tagung“ voraus. Die von den sechzehn Autoren überarbeiteten und vom Herausgeber sorgfältig redigierten Vorträge der Tagung im 200. Geburtsjahr Wilhelm Löhes sind in die vom Deutschen Nationalkomitee des Lutherischen Weltbundes herausgegebene Buchreihe „Die Lutherische Kirche – Geschichte und Gestalten“ mit dem Hinweis aufgenommen worden, dass sie „viele neue Einblicke und Impulse für die wissenschaftliche Löhe-Forschung“ bieten.

In der Einleitung verzichtet Blauffuß mit Hinweis auf die bereits von John T. Pless besorgte Zusammenfassung der Tagung (*LuthQ* 22, 449–454; *CTQ* 73, 182–186) auf eine Vorstellung der einzelnen Beiträge. Stattdessen legt er ausführlich seine den bisherigen wissenschaftlichen Leistungen der GIÄM und ILOeS verpflichtete Sichtweise zum weiteren Fortgang der Löhe-Forschung dar. So zeigt er sich etwa überzeugt davon, dass die Forschung auch in Zukunft an den im Auftrag der GIÄM von Klaus Ganzert herausgegebenen 12 Bänden der „Gesammelten Werke“ (GW) Löhes