

ARTICOLI (cum summariis)	pag.
Jared Wicks, Six texts by Prof. Joseph Ratzinger as <i>peritus</i> before and during Vatican Council II	233-311
Oliver Davies, The Interrupted Body: Transformation Theology	312-331
Ángel Xolocotzi Yañez, La síntesis fenómeno-lógica. Aspectos metódicos de la apropiación heideggeriana de la fenomenología de Husserl	332-346
Salvador Pié-Ninot, La Iglesia hoy y la Palabra de Dios	347-367
Donath Hercsik, Das «Wort Gottes» und die Christologie	368-395
Nunzio Capizzi, Parola di Dio e συγκατάβασις divina	396-419

RECENSIONES

Biblia: J. MARBÖCK, *Weisheit und Frömmigkeit. Studien zur alttestamentlichen Literatur der Spätzeit* (N. Calduch-Benages), 420-421. – G. BENZI, *Ci è stato dato un figlio. Il libro dell'Emmanuele (Is 6,1-9,6): struttura retorica e interpretazione teologica* (R. Meynet), 421-422. – G.G. XERAVITS – J. ZSENGELLÉR (edd.), *The Book of Tobit. Text, Tradition, Theology* (N. Calduch-Benages), 422-424. – P.C. BEENTJES, "Happy the One Who Meditates on Wisdom" (*Sir 14,20*). *Collected Essays on the Book of Ben Sira* (N. Calduch-Benages), 424-425. – G.G. XERAVITS – J. ZSENGELLÉR (edd.), *The Books of the Maccabees: History, Theology, Ideology* (N. Calduch-Benages), 425-426. – J.E. AGUILAR CHIU – F. MANZI – F. URSO – C. ZESATI ESTRADA (edd.), «*Il Verbo di Dio è vivo*». *Studi sul Nuovo Testamento in onore del cardinale Albert Vanhoye* (J. Beutler), 427-429. – P. PETRUZZI, *Leopardi e il Libro sacro. Memoria biblica e nichilismo* (O. De Bertolis), 429-430.

Teologia: R. BERNDT (ed.), *Schrift, Schreiber, Schenker. Studien zur Abtei sankt Victor in Paris und den Viktorinern* (S.P. Bonanni), 430-432. – J. S. DREY, *Kurze Einleitung in das Studium der Theologie mit Rücksicht auf den wissenschaftlichen Standpunkt und das katholische System (Tübingen 1819)* (L.F. Ladaria), 433-434. – A.Y. THOMASSET, *L'ecclésiologie de John Henry Newman anglican (1816-1845)* (R.J. Taylor), 434-436. – G. CHANTRAINE, *Henri de Lubac. I. De la naissance à la démobilisation (1896-1919)* (D. Hercsik), 436-438. – R. PELLITERO (ed.), *Los laicos en la ecclesiología del Concilio Vaticano II. Santificar el mundo desde dentro* (D.G. Astigueta), 438-439. – M. TIBALDI, *Kerygma e atto di fede nella teologia di Hans Urs von Balthasar* (J. Servais), 440-441. – A.L. PITSTICK, *Light in Darkness. Hans Urs von Balthasar and the Catholic Doctrine of Christ's into Hell* (J. Servais), 442-443. – CATI, *La fede e la sua comunicazione. Il Vangelo, la Chiesa e la cultu* (G. Mazza), 443-444. – M. LAMBERIGTS – L. BOEVE – T. MERRIGAN (edd.), *Theology and the Quest for Truth. Historical- and Systematic-theological Studies* (D. Hercsik), 445-446. – N. LAMDAN – A. MELLONI (edd.), *Nostra Aetate. Origins, Promulgation, Impact on Jewish-Catholic Relations* (N. Tanner), 446-447.

JUL 02 2008

FRANCISCAN UNIVERSITY
OF STEUBENVILLE
STEUBENVILLE, OH 43952

Six texts by Prof. Joseph Ratzinger as *peritus* before and during Vatican Council II

A significant chapter in the life of Pope Benedict XVI unfolded during Vatican Council II, at which he worked as a theological *peritus*. In 1961, before the Council opened, the 34-year old Prof. Joseph Ratzinger, chair-holder for fundamental theology in the Catholic Theology Faculty of the University of Bonn, first assisted Cardinal Josef Frings of Cologne. Such theological help of this high-ranking cardinal continued once the Council opened in October 1962, with the work also expanding into collaborative efforts with other *periti*, especially Karl Rahner, Aloys Grillmeier, and Otto Semmelroth, when Bp. Heinrich Volk of Mainz convened these men for theological contributions to the Council. In 1963 Prof. Ratzinger moved from Bonn to Münster, where he held the chair of dogmatic theology recently vacated by H. Volk. But J. Ratzinger continued serving as Card. Frings's theologian for the rest of the Council, while also assisting the Council's Commissions. (1) He helped on the Doctrinal Commission's revisions of *De ecclesia* and *De revelatione*; (2) he assisted the Council's Commission on Missions in its early 1965 creation of what became Ch. I of *Ad gentes*; and (3) he proposed in October 1965 a revision leading to new material in an important paragraph of the schema *De ecclesia in mundo huius temporis*, later promulgated as *Gaudium et spes*, no. 10.

The present contribution is a further step toward recovering and presenting a number of the many-sided theological contributions of Vatican II's *periti* throughout the Council's preparation, deliberations, and formulation of texts.¹ Here we make known a part of Prof. Ratzinger's

¹ This presentation continues the author's work in five articles under the general title «Pieter Smulders and *Dei Verbum*» in *Gregorianum*, beginning in vol. 82 (2001) and continuing into vol. 86 (2005). Also, «Yves Congar's Doctrinal Service of the People of God» in *Gregorianum* 84 (2003) 499-550; «I teologi al Vaticano II. Momenti e modalità del loro contributo al Concilio» in *Humanitas* (Brescia) 59 (2004) 1012-38; and «*De revelatione* under Revision, March-April 1964: Contributions of Charles Moeller and Other Belgian Theologians» in D. DONNELLY et al. (eds), *The Belgian Contribution to the Second Vatican Council II*, Leuven, forthcoming in 2008.

Council contribution.² I present here six texts which illustrate theological expression in a variety of genres. Two texts, nos. 1 and 3, have already been published, but over the signature of Cardinal Frings. The research of the Cardinal's biographer, Norbert Trippen, now assures us that they were composed by Frings's theological consultant, Joseph Ratzinger. One of the following texts, no. 5, has been published as a contribution of J. Ratzinger, but in a place where few would read it, that is, in the Appendix of a Gregorian University dissertation published in *Analecta Gregoriana*. Finally, texts nos. 2, 4, and 6 were found in archives and so are published here for the first time both in translation (in the Presentation of Texts, below) and in their original form (in the Appendix, below) to further inform readers about the theological drama of Vatican Council II, the work of the Council's *periti*, and the thought of the theologian-pope, Benedict XVI.

General Introduction to Six Texts

(1) Our first text is a wide-ranging survey of the world in which Vatican II will meet and of what this world indicates to the Council about its task. This was J. Ratzinger's initial assistance given to Cardinal Frings in connection with Vatican II, having the form of a public lecture composed by *peritus* Ratzinger and given by Card. Frings in Genoa on November 20, 1961, in a series on the coming Second Vatican Council. The Cardinal had been asked to compare the situation in which Vatican II will be meeting with conditions ninety years earlier when the First Vatican Council was held (1869-70). Prof. Ratzinger had been teaching in Bonn near Cologne since Spring 1959. He prepared the text in German at the request of the Cardinal and the latter thought so well of it that he presented it before his fellow German bishops at their meeting at Fulda, August 29-31, 1961.³

² Two recent studies of J. Ratzinger's work at the Council are T. WEILER, *Volk Gottes – Leib Christi. Die Ekklesiologie Joseph Ratzingers und ihr Einfluß auf das Zweite Vatikanische Konzil*, Mainz, 1997, especially pp. 151-249, and P. BLANCO SARTO, «Joseph Ratzinger, perito del Concilio Vaticano II (1962-1965)» in *Anuario de Historia de la Iglesia* 15 (2006) 43-66. From the subject himself a helpful guide is J. RATZINGER, «Kardinal Frings und das II. Vatikanische Konzil» in D. FROITZHEIM (ed.), *Kardinal Frings: Lebn und Werk*, Cologne, 1980, 191-205. More general is the chapter, «Beginning of the Council and Transfer to Münster» in *Milestones. Memoirs 1927-1977*, San Francisco, n.d., 120-131.

³ N. TRIPPEN, *Josef Kardinal Frings (1877-1978)*, vol. 2, Paderborn, 2005, 239-241. A twenty-page, typed copy of this text was kept by Cardinal Julius Döpfner, now in Erzbischöfliches Archiv München, Kardinal-Döpfner-Archiv, Konzilsakten, Nr. 2557 (I am grateful to the Döpfner Archive for a copy of this text). This is the same as the printed version in *Herder Korrespondenz*, mentioned below in my «Presentation of Texts», in the introduction to Text 1.

The German text was translated into Italian for delivery in Genoa, and shortly afterward the original text appeared in print in two German journals, as Cardinal Frings's analysis of the world of thought that Vatican II must take into account. Also, a French translation followed, along with publication of the Italian translation in a volume with the other lectures of the series in Genoa. In February 1962, Pope John XXIII read the Italian version and he summoned Card. Frings to a private audience to thank and commend him for setting forth ideas which agreed with ways in which he, Pope John, saw the situation and tasks of the coming Council.⁴

The Genoa lecture, summarized with selected translations as Text 1, below, begins with an initial consideration of how councils are closely connected with the conditions of the age in which they meet, deliberate, and issue their doctrinal and disciplinary texts. The lecture then surveys major changes in the world since Vatican I, both in political history and in the arena of culture and world-views. The body of the lecture takes up four characteristics of spiritual and intellectual life in the world in which Vatican Council II is being prepared. These are the more acute sense people now have of human unity, the impact on them of technology, the general credibility of science and its methods, and the present status and influence of major ideologies. The review of each component leads to stating consequences which follow for Vatican Council II in its work of doctrinal renewal and reform of practice in the Church – in an age in which profound challenges affect many people's lives of faith. The lecture concludes with a reflection on two prominent and dynamic realities of Catholic life in the middle years of the twentieth century, namely, Marian devotion and the liturgical movement from which have followed fresh approaches to the Bible, the Church Fathers, and to separated Christians in ecumenical exchanges.⁵

Our first Ratzinger-text, composed for Cardinal Frings in 1961, contains a striking reflection on relativism, which even includes a positive judgment on having this outlook, to a certain extent, regarding the European cultural heritage. We read as well about how the human person finally eludes analysis by the physical and social sciences, especially because of the human phenomena of love, of guilt, and of the cry of the heart out of desi-

⁴ N. TRIPPEN, *Josef Kardinal Frings*, 262.

⁵ In his overview of the German bishops' utterances and interventions during the preparation of Vatican II (1959-62), Klaus Wittstadt's report on lectures and writings by individual bishops begins with a 1.5-page review of the Ratzinger-Frings Genoa lecture. K. WITSTADT, «Perspektive einer kirchlichen Erneuerung – Der deutsche Episcopat und die Vorbereitungsphase des II. Vatikanums» in F.-X. KAUFMANN and A. ZINGERLE (eds), *Vatikanum II und Modernisierung*, Paderborn, 1996, 96-97.

re of an infinite object. The Gospel message should be framed in a manner taking account of the restless human yearning for God that wells up from the created human spirit.

This 1961 text gives witness to the broad horizon of a young theologian's perception of the world and of his own age, within which occur numerous detailed observations and from which arise pertinent indications for the work of the Council convened by Pope John XXIII.

This lecture-text appears below as Text 1, in outline form, with summaries of its theses, selected passages translated into English, and several annotations to explain its content.

(2) Our second text, to date not published, casts light on a development in the work of the Central Preparatory Commission of Vatican II, of which Cardinal Frings was an active member. This development was the emergence, in Spring 1962, five months before Vatican II began, of dissatisfaction on the part of ranking Cardinals over the disorganization of the preparation and the poor quality they were encountering in the draft texts coming to them from the ten preparatory commissions of the Council.

The Central Preparatory Commission had begun in November 1961 its evaluation of schemata prepared for the Council by the special Preparatory Commissions. From this time on, the Commission reviewed various texts, for example, doctrinal drafts from the Theological Commission, such as *De fontibus revelationis* on November 9, 1961, *De deposito fidei pure custodiendo* on January 15 and 20-23, 1962, and *De ecclesia* in two parts on May 8-9 and June 18-19, 1962. The Commission on the Lay Apostolate had presented its draft for review by the Central Commission on April 14, 1962. The Central Commission also evaluated during these months other draft-texts on aspects of the lives of clergy and members of religious orders and on sacramental, pastoral, and administrative practice in dioceses and parishes.⁶

During the May 4, 1962, Central Commission meeting, Cardinal Frings went beyond remarks on a text on the pastoral care of migrants to express his general dissatisfaction over the preparation of the Council. Far too many schemata are being prepared, so that the members of the Council will have no time to review them adequately. The Central Preparatory Commission must, according to Frings, find a way to select only texts on major topics and to assure that they are prepared with utmost care for what will be taught or decreed. After this intervention, Cardinal Leo Suenens and

⁶ Antonino Indelicato recounted the work of the Central Preparatory Commission in *Difendere la dottrina o annunciare l'evangelo. Il dibattito nella Commissione centrale preparatoria del Vaticano II*, Genoa, 1992.

Archbishop Dennis Hurley of Durban, South Africa, both seconded Frings's complaint.⁷

The next day, May 5, Cardinal Frings expanded on the steps he would recommend to improve the situation. The Central Commission should ask for the Pope's permission to form a special Sub-Commission and give it authority to carry out three tasks: (1) to draft an Introductory Constitution, expressing clearly the goals of the Council, that is, the renewal of Catholic life and the adaptation of the Church's apostolate to contemporary conditions in the world; (2) to notably simplify the schemata while combining those which treat the same matter; and (3) to remove from the Council's agenda the prepared texts which do not promote the Council's goal, leaving these for possible use in a revision of the Church's Code of Canon Law.⁸

Many Central Commission members agreed with Cardinal Frings's proposal and the General Secretary, Pericle Felici, agreed to report on it to Pope John XXIII. But the Secretary added that the Pope was reviewing the prepared materials and that he had already selected six drafts for sending to the Council members in two months' time, after the Central Commission completed its work. Regarding Frings's first point, Secretary Felici added that the end and purpose of the Council had been determined by the Pope and any further specification of this would have to be the work of the Council itself.

Sometime after the May meetings of the Central Commission, Cardinal Frings asked Prof. Ratzinger to compose a draft of the Introductory Constitution on the goal of Vatican Council II, of which the Cardinal had spoken on May 5.

In June Prof. Ratzinger's text was ready, comprising just over 800 words in three substantial paragraphs, which appear below as Text 2 in English translation and in our Appendix in its Latin original. The schema begins by recalling Christ's intention that the Church be a city on a mountain top from which the light of truth may enlighten those walking in this world's dark-

⁷ *Acta et Documenta Concilio Vaticano II apparando*. Series II, *Preparatoria*, 3 vols. in 7 parts, Vatican City, 1960-1995, II/3, 745-746. On this intervention and the support from Suenens and Hurley: N. TRIPPEN, *Josef Kardinal Frings*, 272-274. Also A. INDELICATO, *Difendere la dottrina*, 223-224. Insistence that councils treat only major topics and do this with great care had been a theme stressed in the advice given to Cardinal Frings by another *peritus* who assisted him, Prof. Hubert Jedin, also a chair-holder in the Bonn Faculty of Catholic Theology.

⁸ *Acta et Documenta*, Ser. II, II/3, 814-815. Also A. INDELICATO, *Difendere la dottrina*, 232-233. Once Vatican II began, Cardinal Frings repeated a part of his plea before the whole assembly, at the end of his intervention on *De fontibus revelationis*, November 14, 1962: «Ideo mihi videtur ut aliqua minoris momenti schemata omittantur, alia radicitus abbrevientur et inter se coniungantur. Ideo audeo proponere ut duo prima schemata inter se coniungantur et fere ad quartam partem reducantur». *Acta Synodalia Sacrosancti Concilii Oecumenici Vaticani II*, 6 vols. in 35 parts, Vatican City, 1970-99, I/3, 35-36.

ness. It condenses what the Genoa lecture had said about technological advances affecting negatively human abilities to know God and how a witness to God can still appeal to human yearning for infinite love. The Council wants to speak a language which people of this age can grasp, but it especially aims to renew the Church both interiorly and in its order of life. Renewal occurs amid suffering, which however can purify the Church. The intended renewal should bring a surge of the Christian apostolic spirit, especially among lay persons, who are endowed charismatically for witness and service. This renewal, the Council Fathers also hope, will attract Christians separated from the Catholic communion to dedicate themselves all the more to the quest for unity, since discord between believers casts a shadow over the light of Christ. Christian unity, in this brief sketch, is given at the table of the Lord, by sharing the Eucharistic body of Christ in the one house of God (cf. 1 Cor 10:17).

This second text of our collection reveals how Cardinal Frings and his theological *peritus* J. Ratzinger understood the aim and purpose of Vatican II in late Spring 1962, more than three years after Pope John's initial announcement and just four months before the Council's public inauguration. It was composed under the influence of the concern to which Card. Frings gave voice, but which other members of the Central Commission shared, for example, Cardinal L. J. Suenens (Mechlin-Brussels), who had spoken to Pope John in March about the need to bring clarity and order into the preparation of the Council. On May 16, 1962, Suenens sent a detailed plan for the Council to Pope John.⁹ The Ratzinger-Frings text antedates, and probably influenced, the activity of Cardinal P.-E. Léger (Montréal) who canvassed other cardinals to obtain their backing for a new organization of the Council, leading to an appeal to Pope John in a letter of September 11, 1962.¹⁰

⁹ Card. Suenens told of this in «Aux origines du Concile Vatican II» in *Nouvelle revue théologique* 107 (1985) 3-21, including the text of his plan for the Council worked out in April-May 1962. This appeared in English as «A Plan for the Whole Council» in A. STACPOOLE (ed.), *Vatican II Revisited by Those Who Were There*, Minneapolis, 1986, 88-105. This entered Suenens's memoirs, translated as *Memories and Hopes*, Dublin, 1992, 78-100. Suenens's letter to Pope John, with his plan for the Council, is now given in the *acta* of the Council's General Secretary, *Acta Synodalia*, VI/1, 62-71.

¹⁰ The appeal by Léger, supported by Cardinals Frings, Döpfner, König, Suenens, and Alfrink, is given in *Acta Synodalia*, VI/1, 53-62. It was studied by G. ROUTHIER, «Les Réactions du Cardinal Léger à la préparation de Vatican II» in *Revue d'histoire de l'Église de France* 80 (1994) 281-302. On these initiatives to define the overall purpose and organize the material of Vatican II, see Joseph Komonchak's treatment in G. ALBERIGO - J. KOMONCHAK (eds.), *History of Vatican II*, vol. 1, Maryknoll - Leuven, 1995, 339-350, noting on p. 347, n. 627, the presence of our present text in the papers of Cardinal Léger, but with three pages added in which Frings has organized the schemata of the Preparatory Commissions under six headings, including a series of theses for Part VI, «De caritate et adiutorio sociali», on areas for development aid to poor countries and on the need to spread Catholic social teaching, e.g., Pope John's encyclical *Mater et magistra*.

Our Text 2 intends to be what the Council itself can say and in this it differs from the more ample text of Cardinal Suenens, who told how a good number of the already prepared schemata, once they are duly revised to give them vitality and allure, can fit into an overall conciliar architecture of the Church in itself and its life (*ad intra*) and of the Church and the problems besetting families and nations (*ad extra*). The Ratzinger Text 2 is not a plan of work, but a statement of Vatican II's identity, globally and prospectively, in the form of a short mission statement. In adopting a more elevated conciliar tone, it differs from the spirited intervention of Cardinal Léger who worked out both the reasons why the Church must renew itself and the orientations that must guide renewal. Léger's appeal contains particular and discerning evaluations of the prepared schemata, many of which do not show the vital influence of the original Christian sources, while speaking without élan under a heavy juridical overlay. This critical approach to draft texts from the preparation of the Council will mark a text written soon after by J. Ratzinger and given below as our Text 3. But in Text 2 we have an illustration of an effort in mid-1962 to show how Vatican Council II could well state its identity and its overall purpose, while indicating globally some main topics which will appear on its agenda.

(3) Our third text is a brief but incisive evaluation of the seven initial schemata which had been sent out in August 1962 to all the future members of Vatican Council II. Text 3 has been published in Appendix I of the Council's *Acta Synodalia* as a Latin letter of Cardinal Frings, of September 17, 1962, to the Papal Secretary of State, Amleto Cicognani. However we know now that the body of the letter was wholly the work of Prof. Joseph Ratzinger. Below, I offer as Text 3 an English translation of the Latin text published in *Acta Synodalia*.

On July 3, 1962, Pope John XXIII had authorized sending to all future members of the Council seven draft texts (*schemata*), which had come through the process of approval by the Central Preparatory Commission and review by that Commission's Sub-Commission on Amendments. Four of the texts originated in the Preparatory Theological Commission: I. *On the Sources of Revelation*; II. *On Preserving the Purity of the Deposit of Faith*; III. *On the Christian Moral Order*; IV. *On Chastity, Marriage, the Family, and Virginity*. The Preparatory Liturgical Commission had prepared a draft constitution on liturgical renewal (V), while the Secretariat for Social Communications presented a schema on the communications media (VI), and the Preparatory Commission on the Oriental Churches had prepared a draft-decree on the unity of the Church, which regarded only the separated churches of Eastern Orthodoxy (VII).¹¹

¹¹ For an account of the seven texts and of the initial responses of Council members, see Klaus Wittstadt's section in G. ALBERIGO - J. KOMONCHAK (eds.), *History of Vatican II*, 410-429.

The booklet of seven texts went out to the Council members accompanied by a letter of July 23, 1962, in which Cardinal Cicognani asked the recipients to inform him by letter about their initial evaluations of the schemas by September 15, as a step toward determining the Council's agenda. Because of the press of time, only 176 future Fathers, less than 10% of the Council membership, sent in their reactions, which however were printed in selected parts in the first Appendix volume (1983) of the Vatican II *Acta Synodalia*.¹²

In late August Cardinal Frings sent his copy of the book of seven schemata to Prof. Ratzinger requesting the latter to examine them from the perspective of three questions: (1) What has been changed in the light of the discussion of draft texts on these topics in the Central Preparatory Commission? (2) What should simply be rejected? (3) What can be improved?

Prof. Ratzinger sent the book of seven texts back to the Cardinal on September 14, 1962. The Professor's analysis of the texts had benefited by his participation in a meeting September 9-11, at the residence of Bishop Hermann Volk in Mainz, at which several theologians led by Karl Rahner had gone over the draft texts.

The Professor indicated the recent changes introduced into the texts by notes in the margins of the volume. But since the Cardinal Secretary of State had asked for a letter of evaluation, Prof. Ratzinger composed a letter in Latin which the Cardinal could use as the basis of such a response. When Cardinal Frings received the Professor's draft letter he was on vacation and had no way of composing a different letter. Frings was quite pleased with Ratzinger's draft letter and so the Cardinal simply added the date (September 17, 1962), a salutation to Cardinal Cicognani, and his own signature. Then, after having a copy made for his records, he sent it on to the Cardinal Secretary of State.¹³

J. Ratzinger evaluated positively only two of the seven initial texts, the schema on liturgical renewal and the schema on unity with the Orthodox churches. They both harmonize well with the overall aim of the Council and, if Vatican II were to begin with these two, this would have the advantage of not starting with complex topics which mainly concern theologians. But for dealing with the topic of Church unity, the text now offered should make it clear that a parallel text on relations with Protestants is also on Vatican II's agenda.

¹² Since only four of the seven schemas came onto Vatican II's agenda in their mid-1962 form, the Appendix volume gives only the parts of the letters concerning these texts, omitting the Council members' comments on texts II, III, and IV, from the Theological Commission. The complete letters are in Archivio segreto Vaticano, *Conc. Vat. II*, 753, «Animadversiones Episcoporum ante Concilii Oecumenici Vaticani II initium».

¹³ N. TRIPPEN, *Josef Kardinal Frings*, 307-313, which includes a German translation of the letter.

More generally, recalling what happened at the beginning of Vatican I in 1869, one has to demand that all Council texts avoid the style and content of textbook theology and that they speak instead the vital language of Scripture and the Church Fathers. The Council must abstain from settling topics of legitimate inner-Catholic dispute between theologians and in teaching it must make clear what is binding doctrine and what is exhortation.

Applying these criteria to the seven schemata, the Professor gave a failing grade to Schema II, on preserving the deposit of faith, which should be set aside. He concluded that Schema I, on the sources of revelation, needs thorough revision, both to complete it, by adding a first chapter on God's revelation, and to transform its concluding chapter on Scripture in the Church, by taking over a schema, *De verbo Dei*, prepared by the Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity. The other doctrinal schemata, on moral principles and sexuality, are oppressively verbose in their repetitions of previous papal teaching and they need severe trimming and transformation into uplifting accounts of the positive riches of the Catholic tradition.

Text 3 shows Prof. Ratzinger, in September 1962, arguing critically from clear criteria and anticipating arguments which in time resounded in numerous interventions by the Fathers of Vatican II during the Council's first working period from October to December 1962. But he soon had an opportunity to go into greater detail in a further, notably more critical treatment of the first official schema, *De fontibus revelationis*.

(4) Text 4 is J. Ratzinger's critical assessment of the Preparatory Theological Commission's schema on revelation, Scripture, and tradition, in an evaluation of sustained argument from clearly articulated theological positions. Ratzinger did this in a lecture given to the German-speaking bishops in Rome on October 10, 1962, a day before the solemn inauguration of Vatican Council II. Cardinal Frings, President of the German Episcopal Conference, convened the ordinaries and auxiliary bishops of the twenty-five dioceses of Germany, along with others from Austria and Switzerland, for a gathering that day at the residence for German-speaking priests working in Rome, Collegio S. Maria dell'Anima, near Piazza Navona. During the working periods of Vatican II, these bishops gathered for such meetings regularly on Monday afternoons, initially for lectures by invited experts on upcoming Council topics. In time the meetings became working sessions for preparing interventions by one bishop in the name of all who subscribed to the position taken. With bishops of Austria, German-speaking Switzerland, and Scandinavia also taking part, the group comprised some sixty-five Council members.

For the October 10 meeting, Cardinal Frings invited Prof. Ratzinger to offer a critical analysis of the schema, *De fontibus revelationis (On the Sources of Revelation)*, which stood first among the seven official drafts pre-

pared by different Preparatory Commissions of the Council and authorized by Pope John for sending to the Council members.¹⁴

De fontibus had been prepared by the Preparatory Theological Commission, which began work in mid-1960 under its President, Cardinal Alfredo Ottaviani, with Fr. Sebastian Tromp, S.J., of the Gregorian University, serving as Secretary to organize the extensive work of preparing preparatory drafts on this and five other topics. Fr. Salvatore Garofalo, Rector of the Pontifical Athenaeum for Mission Clergy, the «Urbanianum», and member of the Pontifical Biblical Commission, headed the sub-commission responsible for composing *De fontibus*.¹⁵

Prof. Ratzinger's incisive critique of the prepared draft anticipated many of the arguments made against its suitability as a conciliar text when the Council members took it up on November 14, 1962, leading to the vote of Nov. 20 in which 1368 Fathers expressed their judgement that the text should go back to the Doctrinal Commission for extensive revision.¹⁶

In this, the longest text of this presentation, Prof. Ratzinger spoke of God's revelation, that is, his gracious and saving action of self-manifestation, being *the source* of Scripture and tradition, which however the schema called «sources» (*fontes*) of revelation. The text spoke this way because it was subject-centered in privileging the order of our knowing over the order of objective reality. Ratzinger warned against a positivism that would identify God's action of revealing himself with the concrete attestations of this revelation in Scripture and the Church. God's action of gracious illumination, resulting in faith that takes hold of God's word, is always more than human formulations can communicate. Furthermore, the draft text overstepped proper bounds when it proposed giving conciliar ratification to the position that some parts of God's revelation come to us from the Apostles via tradition alone and not by Scripture. This would amount to censuring the contrary conclusion of J. R. Geiselmann of Tübingen, drawn from the absence of the famous *partim-partim* phrasing from the Council of Trent's promulgated decree on the Gospel and its transmission. Prof. Ratzinger

¹⁴ As of October 10, no official notice had been given about the order in which the initial draft texts would be discussed. Thus, it was logical to begin with the first text in the booklet of schemas. Five days later, the board of Council Presidents decided that Vatican II would take up first the draft on liturgical reform. A month later, November 14, Council Fathers began discussing *De fontibus revelationis*.

¹⁵ The genesis of *De fontibus revelationis* has been described in depth in the dissertation of K. SCHELKENS, «Deus multifariam multisque modis locutus est [...]. *De redactie van het preconciliaire schema De fontibus revelationis*. Een theologiehistorisch onderzoek met bijzondere aandacht voor de Belgische bijdrage», Leuven Theological Faculty, 2007.

¹⁶ See the account by G. RUGGIERI, «The First Doctrinal Conflict» in *History of Vatican II*, 2, 233-266.

added reasons why such a censure is not needed as a conciliar action by Vatican II. Further reasons for abstinence on this topic come from the Fathers of the Church and the classic figures of Sts. Bonaventure and Thomas, who held Scripture to be *the* source of Catholic doctrine, although not in isolation from the life of the Church.

On biblical inspiration, Prof. Ratzinger criticized the schema *De fontibus* for proposing that the Council affirm as Church teaching a view of God's influence on biblical composition which comes from Philo of Alexandria by way of Augustine. This theory of inspiration should not be espoused, because it fails to incorporate the factor of personal action by the human authors, while also taking no account of their placement both in God's covenantal history with his people and in roles of service to the community of God's people. Inspiration does not necessarily exclude erroneous biblical statements on matters outside the central intention of revelation, for its aim is to bring God in his mystery near to us by and through human language. Regarding the words by which Jesus taught and interacted with his contemporaries, the Gospels pass them on as words of a living person whom the evangelists have heard speaking to the community in which they wrote.

In characterizing the Old Testament, the Council should recognize that it is totally Christological in intention, but also show an awareness of how salvation in Christ has a universal scope in reaching even the many human beings who lived and still live outside Israel and the Church.

In a general concluding remark, applicable as well to the other schemata coming from the Preparatory Theological Commission, the Professor reminded the German-speaking Council Fathers that a Council does not assemble with the aim of legitimating one school of Catholic theology over against other schools. Instead, it has to look to the world where unbelief is amply present and to give this world the witness of faith in Christ.

This fourth text makes present to readers today one of the first theological debates of Vatican II, which set in opposition two approaches to formulating Catholic doctrine. The *Schema de fontibus* came from exponents of a teaching which consolidates more recent positions and formulations, especially those of the papal magisterium of the previous seventy years. But J. Ratzinger's critique came from an exponent of doctrinal renewal by drawing afresh on the biblical, patristic, and liturgical sources of Catholic doctrine, in *ressourcement*, to produce simpler, more attractive, and spiritually more nourishing teaching. Text 4 also displays in seminal form several themes and positions which entered subsequent revisions of the Council's draft on divine revelation along the way to its Dogmatic Constitution of Divine Revelation, *Dei Verbum*, finalized by solemn promulgation on November 18, 1965.

Below I give an English translation of this important lecture of October 10, 1962, while offering the original German text in the Appendix of this article.

(5) Text 5 presented below is a later composition by Prof. Ratzinger during the interval between the third and fourth working periods of Vatican II. It proposes a constructive theology of the basis of the Church's missionary activity. It arose in Prof. Ratzinger's service as a specially invited *peritus* of the Council's Commission on Missions late in 1964 or perhaps very early in 1965. This striking set of «considerations» contributed to a new opening chapter of a revised schema on the Church's missionary activity, after a previous abbreviated text had met a storm of criticism during discussions in St. Peter's November 6-9, 1964. Text 5 of our presentation shows its author at work in a sub-field of ecclesiology, working constructively, to present the Church-in-mission doctrinally, from its basis in God, the work of Christ, the apostolic message, and the life and worship of communities assembled by those who proclaim the Gospel. This was a doctrinal text responding to an urgent need which arose late in the work of the Council. It can also transcend its origin to enrich the Church and its mission in any theological account proceeding from foundational Christian convictions.

The Vatican II Commission on Missions had been hampered in its preparation of a schema on missionary work by opposition in its ranks between those associated with the Vatican Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith and exponents of Catholic missiological thought as it was developing in centers such as Münster and Louvain.¹⁷ The Commission on Coordinating the Work of the Council, the «director» of Vatican II, rebuffed the Mission Commission in July 1963 by refusing to pass on to the Council members the schema of the latter, because it lacked theological and pastoral declarations, gave no definition of «mission», and was excessive on canonical aspects of mission churches. The Commission on Missions then produced a revision, in four chapters and twenty-five paragraphs during Vatican II's second working period in 1963.¹⁸ But in Spring 1964, the revised mission schema fell victim to the attempt to bring Vatican II to a rapid close and the Commission had to reduce its text to fourteen succinct theses. These made up the text discussed in Council meetings in November 1964, during which several speakers, intervening on behalf of numerous Council members, called for a full and doctrinally

¹⁷ A thoughtful narrative is by E. LOUCHEZ, «La Commission de missionibus» in M. LAMBERIGTS – Cl. SOETENS – J. GROOTAERS (eds.), *Les Commissions Conciliaires à Vatican II*, Leuven, 1996, 251-277. A concise account of both the preparatory and conciliar work on missions appears in James B. Anderson's conclusions to the narrative part of his work, *A Vatican II Pneumatology of the Paschal Mystery. The Historical-Doctrinal Genesis of Ad gentes I*, 2-5, Rome, 1988, 201-209.

¹⁸ During late 1963, the Commission on Missions also responded to a request of the Doctrinal Commission for a short doctrinal text on missions which was incorporated into the latter Commission's *Schema de ecclesia*, as no. 17, concluding Ch. II on the people of God.

grounded text which would do justice to the importance of the Church's missionary activity.

In a step toward meeting the desires of the Council members, the Mission Commission created, on November 16, 1964, a Sub-Commission of five members and several *periti* to produce a new text. To assure solid theological contributions, the Sub-Commission chairman, Fr. Johannes Schütte, S.V.D., asked J. Ratzinger to serve as *peritus*, while a Sub-Commission member, Bp. Guy Riobé (Orléans), asked Yves Congar to also assist in the work of revision.¹⁹ The Sub-Commission held a working meeting at Nemi, January 11-26, 1965, during which different drafts made by its *periti* were consolidated into a new schema on the Church's missionary activity, which the full Commission on Missions approved, also at Nemi, where it met March 29 to April 3.²⁰ This new schema went out to all the Council members in June 1965 and was discussed, revised somewhat, and voted upon during Vatican II's fourth period, leading to its promulgation on December 7, 1965, as the Decree *Ad gentes*.

J. Ratzinger composed our Text 5 between the end of the Council's third period in late November 1964 and the Nemi meeting in January 1965 of Fr. Schütte's Sub-Commission. The presentation below will identify where these «considerations» contributed to formulations now found in Chapter I, nos. 2-9, of *Ad gentes*. Among the five Vatican II works by Joseph Ratzinger presented here, Text 5 stands out as a work of theological exposition drawing on key New Testament texts. The first foundation of mission is the Johannine Christology of the Son sent (*missus*) to give himself for the life of the world, along with the Holy Spirit's mission to continue what Christ came to do. The Triune God is *bonum diffusivum sui*, goodness pouring itself out in love. Thus mission is not a conquest of souls for Christ, but a witness to them of divine love. The Church is intrinsically driven to give witness to the

¹⁹ Congar had already had an anonymous influence, since he had composed an influential intervention of Bp. Xavier Geeraerts, W.E., who spoke on Nov. 9 for 75 missionary bishops, calling for a statement that missions have their doctrinal basis in the missions of God the Son and God the Holy Spirit. *Acta Synodalia*, III/6, 431-33, given by J.B. ANDERSON, *A Vatican II Pneumatology*, 68-70. Congar noted in his diary on Nov. 9, «J'entends mon texte très bien donné par Mgr. Geeraerts» (Y. CONGAR, *Mon Journal du Concile*, vol. 2, Paris, 2002, 248).

²⁰ The Mission Commission's cooption of Congar means that we have from him numerous diary entries on the Mission text and its drafting by the Sub-Commission, beginning on Nov. 6, 1964. On the January work of the Sub-Commission at Nemi: *Mon Journal*, 297-303; then on the March plenary of the Mission Commission, 349-358, during which Congar found his fellow *peritus*, André Seumois, O.M.I., too stubborn for smooth collaboration, but, «Heureusement qu'il y a Ratzinger. Il est raisonnable, modeste, déintéressé, d'un bon secours» (355-356). On Nov. 12-13, 1965, Congar and Ratzinger prepared for the Commission a detailed treatment of how *modi* handed in during the penultimate votes could well be handled, which the Commission accepted in large part on Nov. 17 (472-473 and 477).

truth that God has shown it, which sounds forth as an invitation to God's banquet. Rom 15:16 qualifies the goal of mission liturgically as the self-offering of the peoples who together adore God in living worship.

Missionary proclamation has its essential content from Mk 1:15, in which Jesus announces the arrival of Reign of God and calls out, «Repent and believe the Gospel». The Church announces judgment/repentance and healing grace in a world which is not just «natural» but already penetrated by supernatural life and human sin. Baptismal death, by both individuals and their cultures, is normative, leading to new life and the bearing of much fruit (cf. Jn 12:24f). As believers are gathered into the body of Christ, the Lord is reaching the fullness of his assumption of our humanity, while people come together in a reversal of the dispersion at the Tower of Babel. But the assembly is catholic in its diversity, as indicated by the Gospel being heard in all languages at Pentecost. A final passage places missionary coordination under the episcopal college, described in *Lumen gentium*, Ch. III, promulgated shortly before, on November 21, 1964.²¹ This presentation of six texts, thus, includes in Text 5 a small gem of theological exposition.

Text 5 appears below in English translation with a brief introduction which relates where the original Latin text has been published.

(6) Text 6 of this presentation arose in October 1965, close to the end of Vatican II, when many Fathers and *periti* worked under pressure of time to prepare a revised text of the schema on the Church in the modern world. A previous revision had been distributed to the Council members in May-June 1965 and Council members discussed it in twelve congregations from September 21 to October 8. After the 160 oral interventions of these days and the collecting of the further comments in writing (of which 108 treated the first parts of the schema), the responsible Mixed Commission, made up of members from the Council's Doctrinal and Lay Apostolate Commissions, went to work in ten sub-commissions to prepare another revised text for voting by the Council members.²²

The schema of mid-1965 had the structure of the eventual *Gaudium et spes*, with a short Preface (*Prooemium*), a developed «introductory exposition» on the condition of human beings in the modern world (nos. 4-9), Part I in four

²¹ Shortly after Vatican II, J. Ratzinger wrote an instructive essay on the Council statements on missions in its other documents: «Konzilsaussagen über die Mission außerhalb der Missionsdekrete» in J. SCHÜTTE (ed.), *Mission nach dem Konzil*, Mainz, 1967, 21-42, translated in J. SCHÜTTE (ed.), *L'Activité missionnaire de L'Église*, Paris, 1967, 121-147.

²² G. TURBANTI, *Un concilio per il mondo moderno. La redazione della costituzione pastorale «Gaudium et spes» del Vaticano II*, Bologna, 2000, gives the membership of Fathers and *periti* of these subcommissions on pp. 632-34, while surveying the aula discussion of 1965 on pp. 651-86 and describing the concentrated work to revise the text on pp. 686-722.

chapters on the human vocation and the Church's role in the world, and Part II in five chapters on concrete and urgent problems of the modern world.

Prof. Ratzinger was a *peritus* of Subcommittee 4, deputed to revise Part I, Ch. 3, on human activity in the created world. But he was called as well to join a special group mandated to revise no. 9, which concluded the exposition on humanity in the present world. The prior text had set forth the aspirations and deeper questions arising from human beings amid the rapidly changing modern world and the disturbances arising from present-day conditions. J. Ratzinger's text, our no. 6, below, became a step toward the creation of a new paragraph, no. 10, on the deeper questions of humanity as perceived in faith and related to convictions, focused on Jesus Christ, from which the Church will speak, in its dialogue with wider humanity.

The need of such a properly Christian and theological conclusion to the introductory account of the human condition had been urged by several Council members who spoke on this section of the schema.²³ Cardinal Juan Landázurri Ricketts of Lima, Peru, urged on Sept. 21 that the schema should proclaim Christ's gospel forthrightly and show the meaning of life from our Lord's death and resurrection.²⁴ The next day Cardinal Julius Döpfner of Munich, speaking for ninety-one Fathers, said the text should draw on faith to state what the Church contributes to throw light on the world and to consolidate it. The Church should show that it has deeper insights into the human situation than do secular disciplines of historical and social analysis.²⁵ Bp. Simon Lourdisamy, coadjutor-bishop of Bangalore, spoke on Sept. 23 for sixty-two Indian bishops to insist that the text set in clearer light the central position of Christ, in whom creation reaches its fullness.²⁶ On Sept. 24, Bp. Hermann Volk of Mainz said that the exposition needs to include a properly theological account in which the Church says about the world what the world cannot know or say on its own. This would be that Christ is the head and foundation of the universe and that fallen human beings are redeemed by him and so enabled to reach their supernatural end that is attainable only through Christ who is light and life for all humans.²⁷ On Sept. 28, the Armenian Patriarch Ignatius Peter XVI Batanian

²³ The introductory exposition, as the members received it in June 1965, is in *Acta Synodalia*, IV/1, 436-441. It describes humankind in the modern world under these headings, most of which were retained for the paragraphs of further revisions: 4. Hope and anguish; 5. Deep-seated transformations; 6. Changes in the social order; 7. Psychological, moral, and religious changes; 8. Disruptive imbalances in today's world; and 9. Deeper aspirations and questions now becoming ever more universal among human beings.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, IV/1, 562-563

²⁵ *Ibid.*, IV/2, 29, 31.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, IV/2, 382.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, IV/2, 407-408.

urged that the survey of the modern world treat not only problems disturbing human life but also the principle of their solution, which is Christ in whose name the Church addresses the world.²⁸

When the central commission of the Mixed Commission on the Church in the modern world met on October 8, its convener, Abp. Gabriel Garrone stated that, based on the Council members' interventions, the first parts of the schema will surely have to be revised in a way which will make the mystery of Christ foundational for the whole text.²⁹

For the revision of the no. 9 of the prior text, a small group of *periti* was formed, in which J. Ratzinger worked with Canon Pierre Hautmann, the lead redactor of the whole schema.³⁰ The revision began with J. Ratzinger's 370-word Latin text proposed as a more theological revision of the final sentences of the existing no. 9.³¹ This reformulation aims to develop the schema in directions indicated in the members' interventions just cited. Among its particulars, (1) the text states the weakness of the human will in the face of world-historical forces, (2) it describes briefly the alternatives of a secular or Marxist hope for a man-made future and, in contrast, an existentialist despair of meaning, (3) it indicates the call to divine life, transcending human nature, as one reason why the human heart finds no equilibrium in itself, and (4) it states the Church's conviction that Jesus Christ reveals the human calling, brings the kingdom of God, and is the definitive answer to the major human questions. Thus (5) the Church approaches a dialogue with the world in which she will speak to today's problems in the light of God's glory resplendent in the face of Jesus Christ (cf. 2 Cor 4:6).

From this text, then, by further redactional steps, a significant revision of no. 9 of the previous schema came into being, with expansions leading to the creation of a new no. 10, on deeper human questions and Christ as the source of answers. By November 10 this new text came from the printer and was quickly distributed to the Council members.³²

²⁸ Ibid., IV/2, 621-622.

²⁹ Archivio Segreto Vaticano, *Conc. Vat. II*, 1209, document 713, which is the 5-page *relatio brevis* of Abp. Garrone to the group that met to formulate overall directions to guide the revision of the schema by the Subcommissions and their *periti*.

³⁰ On the interaction of Ratzinger and Hautmann as the latter amalgamated their concepts, see P. BORDEYNE, «Pierre Hautmann au Concile Vatican II» in *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 77 (2001) 361-362, and ID., *L'homme et son angoisse. La théologie morale de «Gaudium et spes»*, Paris, 2004, 161-167.

³¹ The text we have, and give below, is from the papers of Canon Hautmann, Institut catholique de Paris, no. 1927, on which Hautmann wrote on the top «Ratzinger, 17 octobre 1965», presumably the day on which he received the one-page text. I am grateful for this and further texts conveniently provided by the Archive of the Institut.

³² From the archives in Paris, we have Canon Hautmann's French draft (Institut ca-

This text by J. Ratzinger provided one step toward realizing what Council members had called for in the next draft of the schema's survey of the human condition. In the redrafting, the previous no. 9 was divided, so that a new no. 10 treated in its first paragraph humankind's deeper questions, with several sentences taken over from the Ratzinger proposal. No. 10,1 locates a fundamental disturbance in the human heart that is upset by experiencing its own limitations along with sensing its call to a higher realm of reality. Human beings know their own weakness, as lamented by St. Paul in Romans, ch. 7. The new text mentions the two options of secular liberation fulfilling human desires and an existentialist creation of meaning for an otherwise meaningless human life. Facing the fundamental and perennial questions, a second paragraph of the new no. 10 followed the line first indicated by J. Ratzinger, while developing considerably his wording, in a forthright profession of faith in Jesus Christ as the source of light and power for humans as they face the challenges of survival in the modern world.³³

Thus our presentation of Vatican II texts by *peritus* J. Ratzinger ends in the midst of the intense work of autumn 1965 to recast portions of the future *Gaudium et spes*, Vatican II's emblematic text of orientation *ad extra* to the world. This impressive collection ends with a word on human beings in their struggle to live up to the high vocation that Jesus Christ reveals as he makes known God's saving purposes for the world and becomes the unique source of authentic human fulfillment.

tholique de Paris, Fonds P. Hautmann, no. 1925) that transformed the latter part of the earlier no. 9 into a new paragraph, «9bis (Le fond du problème)», while incorporating several parts of the Ratzinger text, but also reorganizing the presentation. A Latin translation (no. 1923) was made from the French, which then the whole Mixed Commission examined on October 20. Under the guidance of Gérard Philips, the Commission introduced several changes and important condensations, as documented in the minutes in the *Diarium Secretarii* of Sebastian Tromp (Archivio Segreto Vaticano, *Conc. Vat. II*, 791), vol. XII, pp. 1011-12. The first parts of a *textus recognitus*, including no. 9bis as no. 10, came out in a booklet printed on November 10, 1965. See *Acta Synodalia*, IV/6, 429-430, for the new no. 10, and 432-433, for the *relatio* on the changes.

³³ The revised schema of November 1965 contained in no. 10, 2 two of the three statements of the «Christological credo» of this passage in the final text of *Gaudium et spes*: «Firmiter autem credit Ecclesia Christum, pro omnibus mortuum et resuscitatum, homini lucem et vires per Spiritum suum praebere ut ille summae suae vocationi respondere possit; nec aliud nomen sub caelo datum esse hominibus, in quo oporteat eos salvos fieri. Similiter credit in benignissimo Domino ac Magistro suo clavem, centrum et finem hominis inveniri necnon totius humanae historiae» (*Acta Synodalia*, IV/6, 429-30). The third «article» was added in the promulgated text from a *modus* proposed during the voting of Nov. 15-17, on Christ as the unchanging fundamental principle, who is the same yesterday, today, and forever (Hebr. 13:8). The designation of *Gaudium et Spes* 10,2 as the Constitution's «Christological credo» comes from Thomas Gertler, who treated the text in *Jesus Christus – Antwort der Kirche auf die Frage nach dem Menschen*, Leipzig, 1986, 107-114.

Further Vatican II Texts Composed by J. Ratzinger?

The six texts of this presentation are far from being the complete record of J. Ratzinger's theological writing as a Vatican II *peritus*. He composed a number of passages which entered the oral and written interventions made by Cardinal Josef Frings during the four working periods of the Council. N. Trippen has indicated these in his ample account of the Cardinal's participation in Vatican II.³⁴ But one has to be cautious in ascribing passages of Cardinal Frings's discourses, now in the Vatican II *Acta Synodalia*, to J. Ratzinger. The latter has told of the methodical preparation of these addresses, a work conditioned by Cardinal Frings's failing eyesight. The preparation began with a slow oral reading to the Cardinal of the schema on which he was to speak, during which the Cardinal would at times interrupt to pose questions and give initial reactions. Some problematic passages would be read again, leading to interpretations and evaluations. After a discussion of the whole text, the Cardinal and his theologian would work out the main points to be made in the intervention. Then J. Ratzinger or the Cardinal's Secretary would compose a written text in Latin, but then another reading would follow, which could lead to a discussion of the issues and to revisions in the text. Finally, the Cardinal would go to work with his secretary to memorize what he would say in St. Peter's.³⁵ Therefore, for this presentation, while Texts 1 and 3 presented below can be certainly ascribed to J. Ratzinger as author on behalf of Cardinal Frings, the interventions *in aula* cannot be taken in this way.

The *peritus* J. Ratzinger was, however, the co-author of the well-known and important unofficial text at Vatican II, *De revelatione Dei et hominis in Jesu Christo facta*, the fruit of collaboration with K. Rahner. This was an effort to demonstrate how one could improve on the initial schemata of 1962, specifically on God's revelation, Scripture and tradition, and the deposit of faith. Shortly after J. Ratzinger spoke to the German-speaking bishops on *De fontibus* on October 10, 1962 (Text 4, below), Karl Rahner addressed the same group on *De deposito*. By October 19, 1962, Rahner could speak of starting work on the text of «a new dogmatic schema», in

³⁴ N. TRIPPEN, *Josef Kardinal Frings*, 313-348 (on Period I, 1962), 366-400 (II, 1963), 414-454 (III, 1964), 464-490 (IV, 1965).

³⁵ J. RATZINGER, «Kardinal Frings und das II. Vatikanische Konzil», 202-203. On the centenary of Card. Frings's birth, J. Ratzinger surveyed the contents of the Cardinal's speeches, organizing them lucidly under four categories, noting shifts in emphasis as Vatican II developed, highlighting how Frings's positions were of a piece with his pastoral activity, and insisting on the ongoing pertinence of the Cardinal's varied contributions. «Buchstabe und Geist des Zweiten Vatikanums in den Konzilsreden von Kardinal Frings» in *Internationale katholische Zeitschrift «Communio»* 16 (1987) 251-265. In English: «Cardinal Frings's Speeches during the Second Vatican Council» in *Communio. International Catholic Review* 15 (1988) 131-147

view of a meeting that evening of German and French bishops and theologians convoked by Bp. H. Volk.³⁶ Y. Congar wrote in his diary about this meeting, where those present agreed on preparing an alternative text featuring the history of salvation and announcing the good news of Christ, but two days later, on October 21, it was clear that several texts were developing, including one by J. Ratzinger and K. Rahner working together.³⁷

Cardinal Frings then took the initiative of inviting to his residence on October 25, 1962, six leading cardinals, namely Alfrink, König, Liénart, Suenens, Montini, and Siri. In view of the coming discussion of *De fontibus*, Frings spoke of the likelihood that this schema on the sources of revelation would divide the Council members, because of fundamental difficulties sure to be raised about its content. The Cardinal of Cologne then invited the other cardinals to hear a text by his *peritus*, J. Ratzinger, which illustrated a fresh approach to revelation and its communication. The aim was to gain the backing of these ranking cardinals for presenting to the Council a text like the one read by Ratzinger to substitute for the official doctrinal schemata. J. Ratzinger speaks of the text he read on October 25 being further revised and developed, that is, in collaboration with K. Rahner.³⁸ The work of the two *periti* was mimeographed in ca. 2000 copies and, under the patronage of Cardinal Frings and five other episcopal conference presidents, was distributed widely among the Council members.³⁹ *De revelatione*

³⁶ Rahner wrote to H. Vorgrimler on Oct. 19, 1962, that the week before he had spoken to the German, Austrian, and Swiss bishops, with Card. Frings presiding, on *De deposito fidei* and that he would go that afternoon to the meeting called by H. Volk, bringing a sketch of his text, so that something positive would be on hand as an alternative to the official doctrinal schemata. Given in H. VORGRIMLER, *Understanding Karl Rahner*, New York, 1986, 155-156.

³⁷ Y. CONGAR, *Mon Journal du Concile*, vol. 1, Paris, 2002, 122-124, 133-134. The initial plan on Oct. 19 was for German-French cooperation on a text by K. Rahner, J. Daniélou, J. Ratzinger, M. Labourdette, and Y. Congar. When these five met on Oct. 21, they decided to prepare several texts, one by Congar as a preface (*proemium*), one by Ratzinger and Rahner on the topics of the official dogmatic schemata, and a text by J. Daniélou for use by the Coadjutor Archbishop of Paris, Pierre Veuillot. Rahner mentioned in a letter of Oct. 30 that he was «struggling over attempts at a schemata which Ratzinger and I, Congar and Philips are working on. They will probably be no good to anyone [...]. I get on well with Ratzinger. And he is very much in Frings's good books» (given in H. VORGRIMLER, *Understanding Karl Rahner*, 157).

³⁸ J. Ratzinger told of speaking to the cardinals in «Kardinal Frings und das II. Vatikanische Konzil», 198-199, and in his memoirs, *Milestones*, 128, where he also adds that the «second text» (*De revelatione Dei et hominis*) was «much more Rahner's work than my own». Cardinal Siri wrote in his diary about the meeting called by Frings, at which he and Montini said they felt it was not opportune to give backing to a text like that read by Ratzinger because it had not been prepared by the Council's constituted commissions. B. LAI, *Il papa non-eletto*, Bari, 1993, 369-371.

³⁹ On Nov. 5, Rahner wrote that the next morning he would go to see Card. Frings and that he and Ratzinger would present to the Cardinal the schema «that we've sweated over». On Dec. 5, he recalled that the Ratzinger-Rahner schema had been mimeographed at Card. Frings's order at the Collegio dell'Anima. H. VORGRIMLER, *Understanding Karl Rahner*, 158, 159.

Dei et hominis is a well known text of Vatican II's first period and has been widely translated and studied.⁴⁰ But, just as with the Vatican II discourses of Cardinal Frings, the complex circumstances of the composition of this latter text make it impossible to ascribe it or any part of it with certainty to the work of Joseph Ratzinger.

Major Theological Themes of These Six Texts

Research on the work of J. Ratzinger as a Vatican II *peritus* has in fact yielded six texts of which his authorship is certain. These, the reader will see, contain numerous observations and explanation of no little theological substance. Vatican II was for this theologian a singular theological *kairos* in the midst of the other *periti* who collaborated with the members of the Council.

Among the many insights communicated in these texts, I would single out, selectively, six characteristic theological convictions. They follow here in thesis-form, with general references to the texts below in which J. Ratzinger stated and developed each, along with much else, during his service at Vatican II.

(1) Today, in view of the impact on human sensibilities by technology, one should present the Gospel message in relation to the restless yearnings of the human heart. This conviction, formed from Augustine, should direct the Council, but also guide apologetics, preaching, and catechetics, toward the interior realities and outreach of the human spirit, as appears in Texts 1 and 2, below, and receives brief mention in Text 6.

(2) Christian teaching, for vigor and allure, should draw on the fundamental sources which are Scripture and the Church Fathers, while stressing what is positive and uplifting in the Catholic tradition. Text 3, below, states this requirement, while Text 5 exemplifies it in its constructive exposition, largely dependent on Scripture, of the missionary activity of the Church.

(3) God's revelation is his gracious, saving, and luminous self-manifestation, an action reaching its term in the human spirit become believing in faith. This is always more than what a written witness to revelation, even that of Scripture, can incorporate. Text 4, below, states this primacy of reve-

⁴⁰ It came out in Italian in D. FAVI, *Il Concilio Vaticano II. Cronica della I Sessione*, Vicenza, 1963, 197-221; in French as an appendix of B.-D. DUPUY (ed.), *La révélation divine*, vol. 2, Paris, 1968, 577-587; in the Latin original and German translation in E. KLINGER - K. WITTSTADT (eds.), *Glaube im Prozeß*, Festschrift K. Rahner, Freiburg, 1984, 33-50; and finally in Latin and English in B. CAHILL, *The Renewal of Revelation Theology*, Rome, 1999, 300-317.

lation and applies it to understanding Scripture and tradition both in themselves and in relation to each other.⁴¹

(4) A satisfactory account of biblical inspiration, at the level of conciliar teaching, should refrain from espousing a system. Still, it ought to have three focal points: the human author taken into God's service, the history of God's dealings with humankind, and how the biblical authors were embedded in the communities that they served by writing. Below, Text 4 defends this approach and works out its main lines.

(5) Christian missions share in and extend God's own outpouring of love in the missions of the Son and of the Holy Spirit. At the center of missionary activity is the call to repentance and faith in the Gospel (Mk 1:15), by which God gathers scattered humans (Babel) into a Catholic community of faith (Pentecost). Text 5, below, elaborates this constructively.

(6) When the Church dialogues with the wider human family on the great issues of modernity, its contribution arises from its own certainties of faith, that is, that humans are fallen and impeded, but as well that Jesus Christ provides definite answers to the deepest human questions. Text 6, below, formulates this.

Thus, Prof. Ratzinger's service as a Vatican II *peritus*, in interaction with the members of the Council, led to remarkable theological accounts of God's revelation, of the human addressee of God's word, of the inspired Scripture, and the mission of the Church amid the human family to which God sent Christ and the Spirit.

PRESENTATION OF TEXTS

Text 1 – The World and the Church: a Contrast between Vatican I and Vatican II: Lecture-Text for Cardinal Frings (1961)

Introduction

The text of the following lecture, composed by J. Ratzinger but delivered by Cardinal Josef Frings, in Genoa, November 20, 1961, was published as «Kardinal Frings über das Konzil und die moderne Gedankenwelt» [Cardinal Frings on the Council and the Modern World of Thought] in Herder-Korrespondenz 16 (1961/62) 168-174. It also appeared in other venues in the

⁴¹ In his centenary address, Cardinal Ratzinger gave a spirited resumé and present-day application of the issue of revelation's primacy over its formulated attestations. «Buchstabe und Geist», 253-257; «Cardinal Frings's Speeches», 135-138.

original German and came out translated into French. The Italian translation for delivery in Genoa also appeared in a book containing this and other lectures in the series in which it was given.⁴²

Because the text can be found in several published forms, what follows is an English outline-summary with translations of selected passages and some added annotations.

Outline, Summary, and Selected Passages in Translation

A. Two Preliminary Considerations

1. The Council and the Present Age

[i] Councils always express God's word in ways influenced by contemporary circumstances which make it imperative to give Christian doctrine a new formulation.

[ii] Councils use the thought of their own age with the aim of taking the self-willed minds of their contemporaries captive for Christ (cf. 2 Cor 10:5) and to lead the Church in spiritual growth toward «the full stature of Christ» (Eph 4:13).

[iii] For the success of the coming Council, with its aim of *aggiornamento* (Pope John XXIII), it is especially important to examine the cultural and intellectual world of today, in the midst of which the Council intends to place the Gospel not under a bushel basket but on a lamp-stand, so that it may enlighten everyone living in the house of the present age (cf. Mt 5:15).

2. Changes in the Cultural and Intellectual Situation since Vatican Council I

[i] Vatican I met [1869-70] when liberalism was dominating politics and economic life, while also making initial inroads into theology through historicism, which soon led to the Modernist crisis in Catholic theology as the 20th century began.

[ii] Before Vatican I, after the seismic shocks of the Enlightenment, a theological rebirth had begun, along with the indispensable growth of sound philosophy. But a seething uncertainty, common to new beginnings, marked Catholic thought, as it swung between the extremes of rationalism and fideism in trying to ward off the attacks of liberalism. Also Feuerbach and Haekel were making initial proposals of materialism.

⁴² The German text also appeared in *Geist und Leben* 34 (1961) 448-460, and as a 36-page pamphlet (Cologne, 1962). The French version came out in *Documentation catholique* 59 (Feb. 18, 1962) 255-267. The Italian version was published in *Concilio ecumenico Vaticano II*, Genoa, 1962.

[iii] One might think our situation resembles that of Vatican I, but major changes have taken place in the Church's relation to the world around it.

– In now united Italy, the Church is far different because of the end of the Papal States.

– France has seen the triumph of laicizing secularism and the German monarchy came crashing down [in 1918], while secularizing governments in Latin America have expelled the Church from influence on public life.

– But North American Catholicism, which relates to the world much differently than does the European Church, is gradually extending its influence through the world.

[iv] The two World Wars set us at a distance from Vatican I.

– World War I brought the end of one type of liberalism with its proud confidence [in promoting human progress].

– Catholic life was finding new vigor [in the 1920s], while two powerful movements filled voids left by discredited liberalism, namely, materialistic Marxism in Russia and romantic nationalism in Italy and Germany, leading to the horrors of World War II.

– With the evil abyss of these movements unmasked, liberalism is surging anew and making some aspects of our situation seem similar to that of Vatican I.

[v] But the past does not simply return, whatever may be the connections between the present and what was present in embryo in 1869-70. Our age is really different, and so we will try to characterize the basic currents of present-day culture and thought, which affect the task incumbent upon the teaching work of coming Council

B. The Church and Modern Thinking: The Spiritual-Intellectual Condition of Humanity on the Eve of the Council

1. The Experience of the Human Race as One

[i] Perhaps the most notable experience marking our present situation is how the world has shrunk and humanity senses its oneness. Radio and TV bring the whole world into every home and in large cities we meet persons from all over the world.

[ii] Covering over the special aspects of particular cultures, a unified technical culture influences our lives and gives all people the common categories of the European-American technological civilization, a situation comparable to the common Hellenistic culture around the Mediterranean in Jesus' time.

[iii] This is a *kairos* for the church, a divine call to look to all human beings. «It has to become in a fuller sense than heretofore a world Church».⁴³ The process has begun in mission lands with the erection of indigenous hierarchies, but further steps must follow.

[iv] When Christianity first spread, it did not hesitate to embrace the *koinē* Greek of the day and proclaim the Gospel in the terms, and even the Stoic immanentist, categories, of that language. Today another *koinē* is at hand, namely, the terms and categories of a technological civilization.

Regarding the missionary problem, we speak much of accommodation, by which the content of faith becomes assimilated to different national cultures [...]. One can ask whether it is not at least just as urgent to look for a new form of proclamation which will take captive for Jesus Christ the thinking of today's unified technological culture and so transform humanity's new *koinē* into a Christian dialect.⁴⁴

[v] One might see the dominance of this new civilization as a victory of European ways. But the experience of two world wars has revealed the dark and violent side of European culture, leaving other peoples skeptical about Christianity and its potential for changing the world. Asians take note of the Christian history of bloodshed and persecution and ask themselves whether the patient genius of India or the abstaining and forgiving smile of the Buddha does not offer a more credible promise of peace than does Christianity.

[vi] Paradoxically, the victory of technology has been accompanied by a limited rebirth of other cultural currents, as we see in revived study of the Qur'an among Arabs and the attraction of Westerners to Hindu and Buddhist ways. This affects the self-understanding of Christians who had inclined to attribute a certain absolute value to the Western heritage.

The emergence of new worldwide perspectives has left Westerners disillusioned and aware of the limited significance of their own culture and history. This takes away one of the most important external supports for faith in the absolute character of Christianity and it exposes Westerners to a relativism that is probably one of the most characteristic elements of today's intellectual life, an outlook present in believers too. But it would be mistaken to think that relativism is completely bad. If it leads us to recognize the relativity of all human cultural forms and so inculcates a modesty which sets no human and historical heritage as absolute, then relativism can serve to promote a new understand-

⁴³ «Kardinal Frings über das Konzil und die moderne Gedankenwelt» in *Herder-Korrespondenz* 16 (1961/62) 169.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 169.

ding between human beings and open up frontiers previously closed. If it helps us recognize the relativity and mutability of merely human forms and institutions, then it can contribute to setting free what is really absolute from its only apparently absolute casing and so let us see this really absolute more clearly in its true purity. Only when relativism denies all absolutes and admits only relativities, is it then certainly a denial of faith.⁴⁵

[vii] Amid this new concern for the special values of particular peoples outside Europe, the Church has the task of inculcating the unity of faith and worship as it carries out its vocation of creating peace across all frontiers.

[viii] The situation calls the Council to an examination of conscience with a view to opening the Church more than before to the varieties of human culture, which is proper to the *Catholica*. As the truly spiritual people born of the Spirit and water (Jn 3:5), it has to remain open to the variety of humankind and «within the higher framework of unity it has to realize the law of diversity».⁴⁶ This has consequences, in order to make Catholicism more catholic.

– Not all laws are valid in the same degree in every country.

– While liturgical worship should be a sign of unity, it must also be an appropriate expression of the given cultural specificity, if it is to be a peoples' spiritual worship of God (Rom 12:1).

– Local episcopal authority has naturally to be strengthened in order to meet the needs of particular churches, while keeping bishops together in the unity of the whole episcopate around its stable center, the Chair of Peter.

2. *The Impact of Technology*

[i] The new technological culture affects human beings religiously in a manner different from that of previous cultures. Earlier humans had many direct encounters with nature, but the world we now encounter bears the mark of human work and organization.

[ii] Historically, direct encounters with the natural world were important starting points of religious experience, since God was to be known through the things he made (Rom 1:20). But now we lack this significant source of religious existence, as shown by the decline of faith among modern industrial workers.

[iii] But we should not demonize technology, since God gave the earth over to human beings to till and subdue (Gen 2:15, 1:28). In fact, every

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 170.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 170.

human situation has its own potential and its dangers, and fallen humans even worshiped God's natural creatures. But technology can lead to worship of the human itself.

[iv] Now the world has become irreversibly profane and humans appear worthy of homage for bringing about progress. In this new situation religion has to interpret and justify itself in new ways. To indicate the way ahead, we have to introduce a further consideration.

3. *The Credibility of Science*

[i] Masses of people now have high expectations from science, even for solutions to deep human needs, e.g., for norms of practice from social research, like the Kinsey-Report,⁴⁷ or for healing from therapy based on psychological insights. Many hope to evade ethical struggles.

[ii] But here is the point at which the meaning of faith can be shown to those of the technological era.

The human person remains «the unknown» entity (A. Carrel)⁴⁸ or «the great abyss» (Augustine),⁴⁹ about whom, to be sure, today's scientific methods explain much, but in whom an unexplained and inexplicable remainder always lies beyond sociology, psychology, pedagogical research, and whatever else. This remainder is basic, in fact decisive, for it is what is properly human. Love remains the great miracle outside all calculation. Guilt remains the dark possibility that statistics can never discuss away. In the depths of the human heart, a solitude remains which cries out for the infinite and finds ultimate satisfaction in nothing else. It remains true *solo Dios basta* [God alone suffices].⁵⁰ Only the infinite suffices for the human being, whose true measure is nothing less than the infinite.

Should it be impossible to make technological humans aware of this? While they no longer have nature to speak to them of God, they still have themselves and their hearts which cry out for God. This is the case even when they no longer understand the language that springs from solitude and need interpreters to lay open its meaning.⁵¹

⁴⁷ A.C. KINSEY et al., *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male*, Philadelphia, 1948.

⁴⁸ A. CARREL, *Man, the Unknown*, London, 1935.

⁴⁹ «The power of memory is prodigious, my God. It is a vast, immeasurable sanctuary. Who can plumb its depths?» (*Confessions*, X, 8). A little later, on memory, «it is awe-inspiring in its profound and incalculable complexity. Yet it is my mind; it is my self [...]. The wide plains of my memory and its innumerable caverns and hollows are full beyond compute of countless things of all kinds» (X, 17 – citation from the translation of R.S. Pine-Coffin, London, 1961, 216, 223-224).

⁵⁰ St. Teresa of Avila, conclusion of her seven-line «bookmark» poem, found on a slip of paper in her prayer book after her death in 1582.

⁵¹ «Kardinal Frings über das Konzil», 171.

[iii] In the technological age, religion will be more sparse in content, but perhaps deeper. To give persons the help they expect, the Church may well leave behind older outward forms, to allow what are properly matters of faith to appear more clearly as being of lasting value.

[iv] The Church must show itself fearless before science, since she is secure in God's truth, which no true progress can contradict. The Church's certainty, underlying its freedom and composure, can well point our contemporaries toward that unconquerable faith that the world cannot overcome because such faith contains the force that overcomes the world (1 Jn 5:4).

4. *The Ideologies*

[i] So far, no mention has been made of Marxism, existentialism, and neo-liberalism, the ideologies born from a world made profane to replace faith as an account of the world and source of meaning in life, which they do offer, but without referring to a transcendent Other. Ideology springs from the human person thrown back upon himself and hesitant to make the wager of faith, but still producing what religion once gave.

[ii] Actually wide swaths of the European, American, and Russian populations have been «de-ideologized» and live from a pragmatic but shrunken worldview no longer promising earthly paradise but only serving to support consumerism and comfort. But this is no lasting answer to the human quest.

[iii] Here the Church has its positive task, namely, to show that Christian faith is the true answer to the human quest for meaning. It has to make perceptible what appeals to individuals in the ideologies, such as a hope that saves from despair. This rests on a promise valid not only for the individual, but for humanity, the earth, and the whole world.

[iv] Nineteenth century Christianity went too far in concentrating on individual salvation in eternity, while neglecting Christianity's universal hope for the whole of creation destined for salvation, since Christ is Lord of all things.

Christianity has the task of thinking this through anew and meeting modern people's ardor for the earth with a fresh interpretation of the world as creation giving witness to the glory of God and as a whole destined for salvation in Christ. He is not only head of his church, but Lord as well of creation (Eph 1:22; Col 2:10; Phil 2:9f).⁵²

[v] Liberalism promotes true values, such as a tolerant respect for the spiritual freedom of others and an unconditioned drive for honesty over

⁵² *Ibid.*, 172-173.

against slogans. Christians can well embrace these outlooks, which ground opposition to totalitarian claims. The Church, in the Council, should undertake a full and critical review of its own practices, like the *Index of Forbidden Books*, which resemble totalitarian restrictions on the quest for truth.

[vi] The Holy Father has spoken of the coming Council as especially a reform council dealing with practical matters. In re-examining old forms, the Council will find a series of tasks which may seem concerned with externals, even with small points. But if this is carried out, such action, more than many words, will make the Church more accessible for people of today as the Father's house in which they can dwell joyfully and securely.⁵³

C. Concluding Thoughts

[i] So far we have spoken of the world outside the Church, not taking account of the Church's modern condition, to which the last half-century has brought benefits unthinkable at the time of Vatican I. Charismatic gifts of God's Spirit abound for the vitality of the Church and they have taken their place alongside the order created by regular Church government.

[ii] Two broad movements have arisen and been officially recognized as relevant for the whole Church, namely, the Marian movement spurred on by Lourdes and Fatima, and the liturgical movement beginning in French, Belgian, and German Benedictine monasteries. The latter has led many to discover the Bible afresh, along with the Church Fathers, and this has created conditions for dialogue with separated Christians and most recently led to the creation of the new Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity.

[iii] But the two movements, with their characteristic impulses, are strangely alien to each other. Liturgical piety can be called «objective and sacramental», while Marian piety is «subjective and personal». In liturgy one moves «through Christ to the Father», while Marian devotion goes «to Jesus through Mary». Although both are present everywhere, the Marian movement flourishes in Italy and lands where Spanish and Portuguese are spoken, while the liturgical movement is strong in France and Germany.

[iv] This shows, first, that diversity enriches, as peoples bring their own gifts into the unity of the body of Christ. We cannot yet imagine the new riches to come when the charisms of Asia and Africa make their contributions to the whole Church.

[v] A glimmer of the unity of the two movements begins to emerge with the insight that Mary does not stand alone, but is the icon and image of

mater ecclesia [Mother Church]. She shows that Christian devotion does not leave individuals alone before God, but takes them into the community of the saints, where Mary is central as our Lord's mother. She shows that Christ will not remain alone, but intends to form believers into one Body with himself, to have «the whole Christ, head and members» (St. Augustine).

[vi] This community comes together in liturgical prayer and the liturgical movement should in the coming decades seek to integrate Marian piety, with its warmth, personal commitment, and readiness to do penance, while promoting among Mary's devotees a holy sobriety and the disciplined clarity of early Christian norms of prayer and worship.⁵⁴

[vii] Finally, there is the witness of suffering and martyrdom, which has marked the past half-century even more widely than in the first three centuries of Roman persecution. This gives good reason not to bewail our spiritual situation as tired and impoverished, for the power of the Holy Spirit is not absent amid such signs of victorious life.

[viii] The Council must serve this vitality of the Church, promoting the witness of Christian life more than issuing doctrines. This will show the world what is truly central, namely, that Christ is not merely «Christ yesterday», but is the one Christ «yesterday, today, and forever» (Hebr 13:8).

Text 2 – A Draft of an Introductory Constitution of Vatican Council II (June 1962)

Introduction

The following text is preserved among the Vatican II papers of Cardinal Julius Döpfner of Munich.⁵⁵ It covers three typed pages in Latin, under the heading Introductio, to which Card. Döpfner added in pencil, «Vorschlag v.

⁵⁴ This portion of the Ratzinger-Frings lecture prompted a reflection by É. FOUILLOUX, «Mouvements» théologico-spirituels et concile (1959-1962)» in M. LAMBERIGTS – Cl. SOETENS (eds.), *À la veille du Concile Vatican II*, Leuven, 1992, 185-199. The historian clarified the genealogy of the renewal movements and noted how on the eve of the Council (1) Catholic biblical scholarship was in fact threatened (Lateran University vs Biblical Institute), while (2) liturgical renewal was endangered by unauthorized «experiments», and (3) the Magisterium had in 1958 halted the drive for further Marian definitions (e.g., of universal mediation, co-redemption). (4) Catholic ecumenism, while meeting small impediments, was growing soundly, because of the prudence of leaders such as Jan Willebrands and Christophe Dumont, O.P. Fouilloux judges unrealistic the Ratzinger-Frings dream of an integration of Marian piety, deriving significantly from the counter-reformation, with the biblical-liturgical renewal that aimed (successfully, it turned out) to replace the anti-Protestant and anti-modernist orientations of modern Catholicism.

⁵⁵ Erzbischöfliches Archiv München, Kardinal-Döpfner-Archiv, Konzilsakten Nr. 3282.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, 174.

Kard. Frings zu einer Einleitungskonstitution des Konzils (entworfen v. Prof. Ratzinger) – Juni 1962» [Proposal by Card. Frings for an Introductory Constitution of the Council (drafted by Prof. Ratzinger) – June 1962]. Permission to publish and translate was first granted by Director of the Archive of the Archdiocese of Munich and Freising, Dr. Peter Pfister. The essential permission was then given by the author of the text., conveyed by letter of January 21, 2008, from the Vatican Secretariat of State.

What follows is an English translation of an Introductory Constitution on the goal of the Council. Prof. Ratzinger's original Latin draft is given below on pp. 293-295, in the Appendix of this presentation. To ease reading, the translator has introduced further paragraph divisions beyond those of the original text..

Introduction

Our Lord Jesus Christ founded his Church so that it might be a «city set on a mountain» (Mt 5:14), from which the true light of the divine word (cf. Jn 1:9) would enlighten people who walk in darkness in this world and in «the shadow of death» (Is 9:2; Lk 1:79). Mindful of this divine commission, this holy Synod, representing the holy people of God, comes together fully aware of the shadows of this age, in which the divine sunlight seems darkened and our Lord appears to be sleeping amid the storms and waves of today (cf. Mk 4:37f).

For the human condition has been transformed in the brief interval of one century by striking advances in the natural sciences and by marvels of technological invention which human genius has produced with disturbing rapidity. As a consequence, the truth of God, the Creator of the world, seems almost inaccessible to people inhabiting a world largely made by themselves. This world no longer «shows forth the glory of God and the work of his hands» (Ps 18:1 Vulg.), but instead speaks of the glory of humans and of their genius.

Today many certainties of past ages have been destroyed and people take as certain only what can be experimentally demonstrated. The word of God seems to them uncertain and inaccessible like a relic of past ages. This is not the place to set forth other causes of this widespread forgetting of God, which is the dark mystery of this age.

But there still remains in the hearts of those created in God's image (cf. Gn 1:27) an outcry for God, for the God who alone can fill human hearts which are made with a capacity for the infinite, hearts which come to rest in infinite love alone. A witness to this hidden desire, a witness to God not being absent in the abyss that is the human person, is a certain sadness that fills the world even while it enjoys delights of its own making, along with the

many-sided hope of some kind of earthly paradise. These reflect that hope beyond any extinguishing by which humans desire «true light, total fulfillment, everlasting joy, gladness without end, and perfect happiness» (Prayer of St. Thomas).⁵⁶

This holy Synod, a humble handmaid of the divine word, while trusting in the help of the Holy Spirit who leads into all truth (Jn 16:13), desires nothing more than to give witness to Jesus Christ for those now living at this hour of world history. Following the example of St. Paul, who for Christ «became all things to all people» (1 Cor 9:22), the Council wants to be a contemporary of people of today, for Christ the Lord is not only «Christ yesterday», but He is Christ «today and the same forever» (Heb 13:8).

The Council intends to promote with God's help the renewal of the Church's interior life, so that just as the spiritual person who lives by God's Spirit «is renewed day by day», so also the Church, Christ's spouse, might be renewed day by day (2 Cor 4:16). Even the spiritual person's troubled earthly life brings about the wasting away of what is outward, but one living interiorly does not fail but is renewed. In the Church, in much the same way, the wasting away amid this passing earthly life of many outward aspects leads it to live more intensely, even glorying amid tribulations (Rom 5:3), knowing it is renewed by this in its own interior life.

The Church sees the adaptation of its discipline to contemporary circumstances as a part of the renewal of which it always has need. It recognizes in the needs of the day that God is somehow speaking to it. By modifications of its disciplinary order, which this synod must undertake, it hopes for a new surge of the apostolic spirit, by which the light of truth will radiate more clearly «even to the ends of the earth» (Acts 1:8) and will shine into the clouds of unbelief arising among Christian peoples. Each and every believer has a call to some form of apostolate, for no one lives for himself alone and no one who is forgetful of his brothers and sisters can return to the common Father of all. Christ wanted to be «the firstborn among many brothers» (Rom 8:29). Therefore everyone should work according to the grace received (cf. Rom 12:6) and not only according to imposed rules, following the Apostle's word, «Extinguish not the spirit» (1 Thes 1:19). But in order that «all things may be done decently and according to order» (1 Cor 14:40), this holy Synod proposes a new plan of the lay apostolate, to the end

⁵⁶ So ends a prayer, traditionally ascribed to St. Thomas Aquinas, to be said after mass in thanksgiving for reception of Holy Communion. One praying asks to be led to the final heavenly banquet where Father, Son, and Holy Spirit will be the light and joy, etc., that human beings desire. It is given in Latin and English among the prayers of J.P. CHRISTOPHER et al. (eds.), *The Raccolta or Manual of Indulgences. Prayers and Devotions Enriched with Indulgences*, Boston, 1952, 92-93 (no. 160).

that the entire holy people of God may work together in one spirit «for building up the body of Christ, until we all come together in unity of faith and knowledge of the Son of God» (Eph 4:12).

The Fathers assembled in this Council around the Church's supreme pastor designated by Christ, the Successor of Peter, hope that the renewal of the Church's interior life, which, along with a new plan of the apostolate of the faithful, is the immediate goal of this Council, will prove to be, for our separated brothers and sisters, a gentle stimulus toward seeking the unity of everyone who, marked by the sign of the holy cross and washed by the saving water of baptism, confesses Jesus Christ as Lord. The Fathers are well aware that the division of Christians into opposed groups is a dangerous scandal to the world which, according to our Lord's prayer, should come to recognize his truth by this, that all those are one who have come to believe by the word of the Apostles (Jn 17:20f). We know that in the world the light of Christ is darkened as long as discord among Christians rends the body of the Lord. In the present time of darkness and human forgetting of God, agreement in faith among those holding to God's word is a more pressing need than in past ages. Hence they are consoled by the fresh desire for unity that in our day has been stirred by the work of the Holy Spirit in believers' hearts. It is the Lord himself who will draw all believers to the unity of his flock, when according to his hidden counsel he is pleased to do so. But may the renewal of God's house, which the Lord may deign to grant through the humble service of this Council, prove to be an invitation to all those now separated from the See of Peter, to return to the unity of the table of the Lord, to share together with us the heavenly bread at one altar in the one house of God, according to the Apostle's word, «We being many are one bread, one body» (1 Cor 10:17). So may the Lord bless this Council assembled in his holy name.

Text 3 – Evaluation of the First Draft-Texts for Vatican II, prepared for Cardinal Frings and submitted by him to the Cardinal Secretary of State (September 1962)

Introduction

Cardinal Frings's Latin letter, composed by Joseph Ratzinger, is given in Acta Synodalia Sacrosancti Concilii Oecumenici Vaticani II, Appendix (Vatican City, 1983), 74-77. Because the Latin original has been published, an English translation by J. Wicks is offered here along with some explanatory notes.

*Text in English Translation from the Latin Original*⁵⁷

Concerning the First Series of draft texts for discussion in the meetings of the Council, the following comments seem especially important.⁵⁸

I. In this first series, two draft texts are much better than the others, both in their style and content. These two texts, on the sacred Liturgy and on the unity of the Church (Ut omnes unum sint), correspond very well with the goal of the Council as the Supreme Pontiff has stated this. The aim is the renewal of Christian life and the adaptation of church discipline in the light of today's needs, so that the witness of faith might shine forth with new brightness amid the shadows of the present age. It seems very important that the Council, in its first meetings, avoid entangling itself in difficult questions posed by theologians which people of our day cannot grasp and which upset them. It is especially important that it say first something contributing perceptibly to renewal and having the potential of somehow enlightening persons of good will. Consequently, the Council should take up for discussion and decision the two texts just mentioned, before it treats all other drafts. Certain particular questions, for example, defining the nature of the sacrament of Extreme Unction (which seems too far from the tradition of the Latin Church), will have their place later in the Council's discussions. The draft on the unity of the Church deals only with the Eastern Churches, saying nothing about the churches arising from what we call the Reformation. A preamble should say that this text concerns only the Orientals, while adding that another draft is being prepared which will concern Protestant Christians. This is needed to head off the potentially troublesome suspicion that the Council means to sow discord between different non-Catholic Christian communities. Also, it seems good to consider whether this text can be published simultaneously in Greek, so that the Church, the mother of all Christians, might speak to the separated brethren in their own language, a language pertaining to the Church and venerated as an original language of Holy Scripture, as done in the most solemn liturgies to this day.

⁵⁷ For assistance in translating from Latin this text and others which follow, the author is grateful for the help of a *peritus*, Dr. Claude Pavur, S.J., visiting professor of classics, John Carroll University, 2006-2008.

⁵⁸ The opening sentence mirrors the official title of the first booklet of seven draft texts, *Schemata Constitutionum et Decretorum de quibus disceptabitur in Concilii sessionibus*. Series I, Vatican City, 1962.

II. Regarding the other draft texts, some general points can first be made

1. Following what the Fathers of Vatican Council I already called for, the texts should not be treatises in a scholastic style, as if they were taken over from textbooks of theologians, but should instead speak the language of Holy Scripture and of the holy Fathers of the Church.⁵⁹ Furthermore, this Council, according to the intention of the Supreme Pontiff, aims to offer the separated brethren a gentle stimulus to seeking unity. It also seeks to give fresh witness to Jesus Christ and to his holy Church for people in the greatly changed conditions of today, who sad to say are far from the faith of their fathers. Consequently, the Council has to always keep in mind the outlook and thinking of these brethren. Even though the truth has to be proclaimed «in season and out of season» (2 Tim 4:2), still let the truth be done in charity (cf. Eph 4:15). In fact, according to the Apostle, «we who are stronger ought to bear the infirmities of the weak and not please ourselves» (Rom 15:1).

2. The Council, following the ancient practice of past councils, should not decide points now disputed in the Church among Catholic theologians, but it ought to issue judgments only on errors truly incompatible with a Christian spirit. Also, in the notes it is dangerous to cite occasional discourses of the Popes and to refer to them in the same way as to Encyclicals or even to decrees of earlier Councils. Clearly the discourses differ among themselves and are not of such dogmatic weight that one can include them without qualification among the sources of an ecumenical Council.

3. If these decrees are received by the Council, their dogmatic standing is extremely important. Some of the texts sound like dogmatic definitions, while others present only a type of exhortation. To avoid endless uncertainty, it seems necessary to state clearly whether they do or do not contain dogmas in the strict sense.

4. On some topics, for example, the means of social communication, it would be helpful and proper to have the advice of competent lay persons whose field of work is involved here.

⁵⁹ The text refers here to Vatican I's opening debate. As that Council began in December 1869, the members received a text for discussion, *On Catholic Doctrine against the Many Errors Derived from Rationalism*, consisting of eighteen chapters elucidated by forty-three substantial annotations. In initial discussions, the members rained down objections on the text as too technical, too ample, and too concerned with settling issues internal to Catholic theology. As a result, the Deputation on Faith selected only four chapters, those on God, Revelation, Faith, and Faith/Reason, which after revision of them, discussion and further modification, became the Council's concise *Constitution on the Catholic Faith*. For the original draft: J.B. MANSI (ed.), *Sacrorum Conciliorum Nova et Amplissima Collectio*, 53 vols., Florence et alibi, 1759-1924, 50, cols. 59-119. Accounts of its reception, revision, and passage are given by K. SCHATZ, *Vaticanum I*, 3 vols., Paderborn, 1992-94, 2, 81-94, 313-355, and by C. BUTLER, *The Vatican Council*, London, 1930 (reprint, Westminster, 1962, 157-170, 235-247).

III. These general norms are applied very well in the texts *On the Sacred Liturgy* and *On the Unity of the Church*. But the other drafts are excessively scholastic and still take too little account of the outlook of our separated brethren. For this reason they need to be once more studied, abbreviated, and revised, especially since revisions proposed by the Central Commission were not sufficiently heeded.⁶⁰ Because the texts of these schemata still need further careful discussion, what follows here are only a few points regarding various aspects of these different drafts.

1. Of all the drafts, the second text, *On Preserving the Purity of the Deposit of Faith*, is still in no way suitable but is so faulty that as it stands it cannot be proposed to the Council.⁶¹ It follows no clear order as it takes up, from different areas of dogmatic theology, disconnected items, which in the way they are treated offer little or no benefit. Furthermore, the first and second chapters enter into philosophical discussions and in doing this they confuse what belongs to philosophy and to theology.⁶² They mix up what rests on scholarly method and what is personal witness and proclamation. Because of this, it would be better to simply omit this schema and to transfer its more important topics, such as the condemnation of spiritualism, to another place.

2. The draft *On the Sources of Revelation* has to be revised to make it no longer prejudicial to internal disputes of Catholic theologians. It also needs an added initial chapter treating revelation itself, for which some parts could be taken over from *On the Deposit of Faith*, Ch. IV, «On Public Revelation and Catholic Faith» (pp. 36ff).⁶³ In place of Chapter V, much of the draft text presented by Cardinal Bea, *On the Word of God*, could well be substituted, since it treats the same topic and does this better.⁶⁴

⁶⁰ Cardinal Frings had taken part in the extensive meetings of the Central Preparatory Commission of Vatican II, between June 1961 and June 1962, in which all the schemes had been subjected to evaluation by ranking cardinals and bishops, who formulated many pointed proposals of textual modification.

⁶¹ In addition to being printing in the first booklet of draft-texts, *De deposito fidei pure custodiendo* is given in *Acta Synodalia*, I/4, 653-694. It has been studied by A. INDELICATO, «Lo schema "De deposito fidei pure custodiendo" e la preparazione del Vaticano II» in *Cristianesimo nella storia* 11 (1990) 309-355, and, with special attention to Ch. IV on revelation and faith, by B.J. CAHILL, *The Renewal of Revelation Theology*. On the Commission that produced *De deposito*, see R. BURIGANA, «Progetto dogmatico del Vaticano II: la commissione teologica preparatoria (1960-1962)» in G. ALBERIGO - A. MELLONI (eds.), *Verso il Concilio Vaticano II (1960-1962). Passaggi e problemi della preparazione conciliare*, Genoa, 1993, 141-206.

⁶² Chapter I treated human knowledge of the truth, while Chapter II was on human knowledge of God from creation.

⁶³ *Acta Synodalia*, I/4, 633-670; given in the original Latin and English translation of its two forms in B.J. CAHILL, *The Renewal of Revelation Theology*, 266-291.

⁶⁴ This dense but elegant schema of a pastoral decree *De verbo Dei*, prepared by the Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity, is in *Acta et Documenta*, III/2, 454-457. It came

3. Regarding draft-texts nos. III, IV, and VI, one has to say first that they wear out the reader and almost overwhelm him with their excessive abundance of words.⁶⁵ One cannot understand why all that was said in the Encyclicals *Casti connubii* and *Miranda prorsus* has to be repeated and moreover greatly amplified.⁶⁶ The texts should give answers to more urgent questions and they should do this, in so far as possible, not by judging and condemning, but they should speak maternally with an ample presentation of the riches of the Christian faith and its consolations. Regarding matrimony, respect should be shown for the Eastern tradition, following the example of the Council of Trent, which softened its seventh canon on marriage, «to avoid offending the Greeks».⁶⁷ The schema *On the Means of Social Communication* should give more recognition to the proper responsibility of lay people, since in this area one has more confidence in them than in the protective concerns of clerics.

before the Central Preparatory Commission during its last meeting, June 20, 1962, and so was known to Prof. Ratzinger from the booklets for this meeting shown him by Cardinal Frings.

⁶⁵ The dogmatic Schema III was *De ordine morali christiano*, given in *Acta Synodalia*, I/4, 695-717, while Schema IV, also dogmatic, was *De castitate, matrimonio, familia, virginitate*, now in *Acta Synodalia*, I/4, 718-771. Schema VI, *De instrumentis communicationis socialis*, is found in *Acta Synodalia*, I/3, 374-416.

⁶⁶ *Casti connubii*, Encyclical on Christian Marriage, of Pope Pius XI, December 31, 1930. *Miranda prorsus*, Encyclical on the Communications Field: Motion Pictures, Radio, and Television, of Pope Pius XII, September 8, 1957.

⁶⁷ In November 1563, Trent issued its basic doctrine on marriage and added twelve «canons» proscribing errors. However, Canon 7, on the indissolubility of the marriage bond, does not speak directly to its topic, by declaring the denial of indissolubility to be heretical or erroneous, but proscribes instead holding and saying that the Catholic Church errs in such teaching. See N.P. TANNER (ed.), *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, vol. 2, London – Washington, 1990, 754-755. Trent adopted the formulation after a petition by the ambassador of the Republic of Venice asking that the Council show consideration for the Greek inhabitants of the Venetian island-possession Crete, Cyprus, and Corfu, who followed a tradition that permitted a second marriage after adultery of one party in a first marriage. H. JEDIN, *Geschichte des Konzils von Trient*, vol. 4/2, Freiburg, 1975, 108-109. This formulation by Trent was analyzed by P. Franssen, S.J., who indicated the moderation used to avoid phrasing prejudicial to the Greeks: «Die Formel "Si quis dixerit ecclesiam errare" und ähnliche Ausdrücke bei der Beratung des 4. und andere Kanones der 28. Sitzung des Trienter Konzils» in *Scholastik* 25 (1951) 191-221, reprinted in H.E. MERTENS – F. DE GRAEVE (eds.), *Hermeneutics of the Councils and Other Studies*, Leuven, 1985, 95-125 (including on p. 121, that the formulation was softened «ut Graecis [...] non fiat praeeiudicium»).

Text 4 – On the schema On the Sources of Revelation: address to the German-speaking bishops, October 10, 1962

Introduction

What follows is from a copy of the 16-page typed text of the lecture that Prof. Ratzinger gave on the eve of the solemn inauguration of Vatican II. The Professor gave a copy to Fr. Pieter Smulders, S.J., for the latter to use in his theological service at Vatican II of the bishops of Indonesia. This text is preserved in the Katholiek Documentatie Centrum, Nijmegen, The Netherlands, in the Archive Pieter F. Smulders, Folder 100, and is translated here, and published below, with the initial permission of the Centrum's Director, Dr. Lodewijk Winkeler. The text's author granted his permission via letter from the Vatican Secretariat of State on January 21, 2008.

There follows an English translation by J. Wicks, with a number of explanatory notes and further paragraph divisions to facilitate reading. The Appendix of this article, on pp. 295-309, gives the original German of Prof. Ratzinger's address.

Text 4 in English Translation

Observations on the Schema *De fontibus revelationis*⁶⁸

The schema on the sources of revelation raises questions pointing in three main directions: first, there is the question of the relation of Scripture and tradition; second, the question of biblical inspiration and inerrancy, both of which include large complexes of detailed questions; and, third, more on the margins, the question of the relation between the Old and New Testaments and the correct way to integrate both into the whole of salvation history and into world history.

I. Scripture and Tradition

The title itself, *On the Sources of Revelation*, immediately raises problems. To be sure, all theological textbooks speak this way. Also, admittedly,

⁶⁸ The text treated in these observations stood first, on pp. 9-22, in the booklet of seven schemas sent to the Council members in August 1962 and is also given in *Acta Synodalia*, I/3, 14-26. Its numbered paragraphs were divided as follows into five chapters: I. *De duplici fonte revelationis* (nos. 1-6); II. *De Scripturae inspiratione, inerrantia et compositione litteraria* (nos. 7-14); III. *De vetere Testamento* (nos. 15-18); IV. *De novo Testamento* (nos. 19-23); V. *De Sacra Scriptura in ecclesia* (nos. 24-29).

Vatican I, in its chapter on revelation, used this phrase as the section-title of its reaffirmation of the Council of Trent's decree regarding Scripture and tradition. But Trent itself did not speak this way and in Vatican I's text itself this way of speaking does not occur.

In fact, the formulation, even though it has become common, is not without its dangers, since it entails an astounding narrowing of the concept of revelation, which then has a decisive effect on the understanding of all that follows. Actually, Scripture and tradition are not the sources of revelation, but instead revelation, God's speaking and his manifesting of himself, is the *unus fons* [one source], from which then the two streams Scripture and tradition flow out. This is the true way of speaking of tradition, which Trent used and took for granted.

The reversal by which the composed and formulated expressions of revelation, Scripture and tradition, are made sources and revelation becomes something following from them, probably became common in the early phase of historicism, when people everywhere were asking about sources and Christians came to call Scripture and tradition the sources in which they found revelation. This way of speaking is flawed in failing to distinguish the order of reality from the order of our knowing. Scripture and tradition are *for us* sources from which we know revelation, but they are not *in themselves* its sources, for revelation is itself the source of Scripture and tradition.⁶⁹ Accordingly, it was traditional in the Middle Ages to call Scripture *fons scientiae* [the source of science], but never *fons revelationis* [the source of revelation]. While it is right that theological work have Scripture and tradition as its «sources», it is dangerous and one-sided to use here the title of a theological treatise on Scripture and tradition in a way wholly centered on the knowing subject, which does not depict the order of reality but instead only that of our approach to reality. This brings with it the danger of conceiving revelation wrongly. For revelation is not something following upon Scripture and tradition, but is instead God's speaking and acting which comes before all historical formulations of this speaking, being the one source that feeds Scripture and tradition.⁷⁰

⁶⁹ On November 14, when debate opened on *De fontibus*, Cardinal Frings's oral intervention rested on a text summarizing what was said here, that is: «Haec doctrina vera est in ordine cognoscendi pro nobis hominibus, sed in ordine essendi ipsa revelatio est unicus fons, ex quo duo rivuli, sc. sacra scriptura et traditio prodeunt» (*Acta Synodalia*, I/3, 36).

⁷⁰ For this notion of revelation as God's action, turning toward human recipients of his revelation, and on this resulting directly not in written Scripture but in the God-given spiritual understanding of faith, J. Ratzinger was influenced by his studies of St. Bonaventure, as for his *Habilitationschrift* of 1957. See J. RATZINGER, *The Theology of History in St. Bonaventure*, trans. Zachary Hayes, O.F.M., Chicago, 1971, 57-58, 62-63, 66, and 71 («In the light of what has been said, *revelation* must always be understood as a *gratia gratis data*, and thus as the working of

What has been said so far may seem an academic dispute over words. But one should not forget that the term used affects decisively the understanding of an object and in matters of faith the right use of terms is of major importance. In this case, giving priority to revelation as the one source of its historical forms of transmission, Scripture and tradition, can have a series of significant consequences for how this schema takes shape. If revelation comes first, with Scripture and tradition proceeding from it and only being understood from it, then one cannot simply begin a presentation of revelation with Scripture and tradition. The latter order fits with historicism, but not with faith. Before speaking of the documents, one has to say something about God's action from which the documents come; otherwise, while they may be tools of historians, they will not be wellsprings of faith and of life welling up to eternal life. In a word, one has to speak here first of revelation in itself before saying anything about the witnesses to revelation.

From this starting point, a second issue arises naturally, which one can describe as follows. Characterizing Scripture and tradition as the sources of revelation means in effect that one identifies revelation with its material principles. This brings with it the acute danger of slipping into «scripturalism», that is, holding *sola Scriptura* [Scripture alone] and identifying Scripture and revelation. One only has to affirm that tradition adds no supplementary content to Scripture and the outcome is that Scripture is the whole of revelation, that Scripture and revelation are identical in extent, and so you have *sola Scriptura* in a strict and exclusive sense. This is an inevitable danger of the special kind of positivism that identifies revelation with its concrete attestations. The authors of this schema have clearly fallen into this trap because of their starting point. They defend the position, as I will show next, that beside Scripture tradition has to contain things proper to it, since they obviously think this is the only way to ward off a *sola Scriptura* position. But scripturalism is no threat once one sees that this positivism is wrong, with its mixing of the orders of reality and knowing and its absolutizing of the perspective of the subject.

But there is no danger at all of scripturalism, once you grasp that revelation comes before its material attestations. Then it is clear that revelation itself is always more than its formulated witness in Scripture, for revelation

God on the individual»). J. Ratzinger make this clear in the conclusion of an early essay, «Offenbarung – Schrift – Überlieferung» in *Trierer theologische Zeitschrift* 67 (1958) 27. See also his first «thesis» in «Revelation and Tradition», in K. RAHNER – J. RATZINGER, *Revelation and Tradition*, Freiburg, 1966, 35-37. More recently: J. RATZINGER, *Milestones*, 127, and M.H. HEIM, *Joseph Ratzinger – Kirchliche Existenz und existentielle Theologie unter dem Anspruch von Lumen gentium*, Frankfurt, 2004, 149-150.

is the living reality that surrounds Scripture and expands it. I will next speak about this in greater detail. But, first, I want to summarize the requirements that follow from these initial considerations.

(1) The title *De fontibus revelationis* has to be changed to *De revelatione* or *De verbo Dei*, because revelation itself is the source of Sacred Scripture and divine tradition, but Scripture and tradition are not sources of revelation itself, but only sources of knowing revelation.⁷¹

(2) The whole text needs to begin with a new Chapter I, on revelation itself, for which material can be taken from the present Chapter I and from Chapter IV of the second schema.⁷²

(3) Wherever the expression «*fontes*» occurs in the text, it should as far as possible be replaced by another term. For this, Ch. I, no. 3 offers the term *transmissio* [transmission].⁷³

(4) To formulate the result of the considerations offered so far, we can say that the relation between the two realities Scripture and tradition can be only be grasped rightly when one subordinates them to a third reality, which actually comes first, namely, revelation itself, which precedes its positive attestations and transcends them. Scripture and Tradition are material principles of our knowing revelation, not revelation itself.

This insight takes on importance when we move on to consider nos. 4-6 of Ch. I.⁷⁴ Here several changes have to be made to avoid an improper nar-

⁷¹ J. Ratzinger wrote his justification of the proposed new titles in Latin, with a view to this point being argued in a Council intervention: «quia ipsa revelatio est fons sacrae scripturae et traditionis divinae, non autem scriptura et traditio fontes revelationis ipsae, sed solummodo fontes revelationis cognoscendae». – The first action of the Mixed Commission, formed by Pope John XXIII to revise *De fontibus*, when it met on Nov. 25, 1962, was to adopt as the title of what the Commission would produce, *Schema de divina revelatione*. I related this in «Pieter Smulders and *Dei Verbum*: 3. Developing the Understanding of Revelation to Israel, 1962-63» in *Gregorianum* 83 (2002) 229-230.

⁷² In *De fontibus*, nos. 1-3 treated revelation and apostolic preaching. *Acta Synodalia*, I/3, 14-15. The second published schema was *De deposito fidei pure custodiendo*, with Ch. IV in *Acta Synodalia* I/4, 663-670. Brendan Cahill gives the text with an English translation of *De deposito*, Ch. IV, in *The Renewal of Revelation Theology*, 265-291. In the Mixed Commission, a new *Prooemium* on revelation did not come from these sources but from a contribution which Abp. Gabriel Garrone worked out on the basis of a text composed by Jean Daniélou. See my «Pieter Smulders and *Dei Verbum*: 5. A Critical Reception of the Schema *De revelatione* of the Mixed Commission (1963)» in *Gregorianum* 86 (2005) 93-96, with the Garrone text given on pp. 116-118.

⁷³ In *De fontibus*, the content of no. 3 was indicated as: *De transmissioe revelationis Novi Foederis*.

⁷⁴ These sections began with these indications of their content in parentheses: 4. *De duplici fonte revelationis*; 5. *De habitudine unius fontis ad alterum*; 6. *De habitudine utriusque fontis ad Magisterium*.

rowing down of church teaching in a way which would not do justice to the complexity of this cluster of issues. These sections obviously aim to defend the Catholic principle of tradition against what could possibly be an intrusion of Protestant scripturalism. The sections in effect say this: Scripture and tradition contain revelation and they do this in such a way that parts of revelation are *only* in tradition. Tradition offers a plus in content over Scripture, because the former is made up of unwritten words passed on solely «from hand to hand» in the Church. The examples given of such truths that the church comes to know solely by tradition independently of Scripture are the inspiration, canonicity, and integrity of Scripture both in particular books and as a whole.

Clearly this doctrine has without doubt the backing of most all textbooks of theology. But here the concern is less to oppose the Reformation confessions than to directly oppose another adversary, namely those [Catholics] who are trying to examine in a fresh way the nature of tradition, especially the effort in Germany initiated by the writings of the Tübingen dogmatic theologian, Geiselmann.⁷⁵ The latter discovered that the Tridentine formulation, «these truths [of the Gospel of Christ] [...] are contained in written books and unwritten traditions»,⁷⁶ involved a modification introduced at the behest of different Council Fathers who objected to the previous wording that the truths were contained «*partim* [partly] in written books, *partim* in unwritten traditions». Accordingly, the Council declined to take over this unambiguous determination of the relation of Scripture and Tradition and left open the question about how they relate to each other. Thus, by not taking the position that Scripture and tradition each contain a proper part of the truth of revelation, Trent wanted to avoid censuring the position of others who held that all the necessary content of faith is given in Scripture alone and so the relation has to be conceived more as a *totum-totum* than a *partim-partim*.

Further aspects of Geiselmann's proposal are not relevant here, but there is no doubt that Trent wanted on this point to leave room open, which means that in the Church up to now the position can stand that holds the existence of particular truths contained only in tradition, but one can also hold that Scripture is materially complete. But the adoption of this schema

⁷⁵ J.R. GEISELMANN (1890-1980), «Das Konzil von Trient über das Verhältnis der Heiligen Schriften und der nicht geschriebenen Traditionen» in M. SCHMAUS, *Der mündliche Überlieferung. Beiträge zum Begriff der Tradition*, Munich, 1957, 123-206. Also *The Meaning of Tradition*, New York, 1966. J. Ratzinger heard Geiselmann expound his thesis in 1956 and this stirred him to reflect on the relation of revelation and Scripture (*Milestones*, 124-128).

⁷⁶ Council of Trent, Session 4 (April 8, 1546), *Decree on the Sacred Books and Apostolic Traditions*, in N. TANNER (ed.), *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, 663.

as presently worded would mean the end of this openness and in effect a late victory for the *partim-partim* position. However, there is no reason for taking such a step, but instead reasons against it. Obviously it is impossible in our present setting to explain all that is involved in an even somewhat adequate manner. But I would like to briefly indicate two perspectives which indicate the strong inadvisability of narrowing down Trent's dogmatic teaching.

1. History can name practically no affirmation that on the one hand is not in Scripture but on the other hand can be traced back even with some historical likelihood to the Apostles. There are three classic examples given in textbooks, namely, the canon of Scripture, the existence of seven sacraments, and infant baptism. But these do not pass the test.

Those who know the history of the canon know as well the difficult struggle over determining what the Church came to recognize as canon, as its own rule, and what it excluded. The Church possessed no formulated communication left as its own legacy by the last living Apostle concerning which books should go together to make up Scripture. Instead the Church had to ponder the effects in herself of the work of the Holy Spirit amid arduous historical questioning, before she separated from each other the books in which she did and did not recognize this Spirit and so separated normative expressions of its nature from books not containing this. This living struggle in the Holy Spirit is a process of *tradere* [handing on], with the plus of tradition over Scripture and its letter, with the former not being a prepared statement to be handed on.

One can say the same thing about the seven sacraments and the explicit specification of them as only seven in the twelfth century. It is not that earlier the corresponding seven realities were not present, but rather their order and the insight into them as belonging to the classification «sacrament», in a word, the structuring of the sacramental cosmos, like that of determining the «biblical cosmos», was again a process that involved a historical labor in the Holy Spirit, and not the communication of a formulated statement.

Infant baptism may well be somewhat different, for perhaps it was practiced in apostolic times, but then again it was not transmitted as a statement, but as a part of the actual being of the church and of her life in the Holy Spirit.

An objection arises right away, namely, that some dogmas are proved only by Tradition and not by Scripture. After 1950, one often heard that the dogma [of Mary's assumption] was a typical example of a tenet provable solely through tradition. But such an account in this case really does not help, for it is basically an escape, not an explanation. For tradition clearly knows nothing about the bodily assumption of the Mother of God before

the 5th century and when the first accounts do begin to appear they are not at all later records of something handed on orally down to that time. Instead, the insight came to light only after centuries of struggling to understand it, until finally in 1950 the Church declared that the insight was from the Holy Spirit and belongs to the basic content of revelation. Such an approach leads to no proof from tradition as a distinct material principle, but again it appears to be a process of spiritual appropriation and of elaboration of the mystery of Christ amid the Church's historical struggles.

This historical account of events should, I believe, be decisive in refusing to ratify the position of the draft, at least in the sense in which it is presented. I repeat: there is no affirmation that is not found in Scripture but can be traced back with any historical probability to the time of the Apostles. If this is so, and it is so, one may not define tradition as the communication of unwritten affirmations.

2. Neither the Fathers nor pre-Tridentine scholastics held this position. With this, an inner-theological consideration joins the historical data. Here even more I can only give some indications. One may say that from the beginning the concept of *paradosis* [tradition] was foundational for patristic thought and belief. But the Fathers did not see this as a set of affirmations being passed on alongside Scripture. In fact, they simply denied the existence of such statements. For them tradition was the insertion of Scripture into the living organism of the Church and the Church's right of possession of Scripture, as Tertullian formulated in classic fashion in *The Praescription of Heretics*. For them, tradition is simply *scriptura in ecclesia* [Scripture in the Church]. Scripture lives in the midst of its vital appropriation by the Spirit-filled Church and only so is it truly itself. For most of the Fathers the idea of tradition as a set of affirmations communicated alongside Scripture was an idea they rejected as gnostic.

The stance of the great scholastics is no less clear. I limit my self to giving just a few citations from the two greatest of them, Bonaventure and Thomas. The former said, «The truth of faith and holiness of life is drawn from no other source than the Scriptures». ⁷⁷ And in another place, «All saving truth is either in Scripture, or flows from it, or is traced back to it». ⁷⁸ Several times he varied his language and cited Pseudo-Dionysius, «Take over nothing except what is expressed for us in the sacred words». ⁷⁹

⁷⁷ Opusculum 13; *Doctoris Seraphici Sancti Bonaventurae Opera omnia*, 10 Vols. (Quaracchi 1882-1902), VIII, 339. Prof. Ratzinger gave this and further references to works of Bonaventure and Thomas in parentheses in his lecture-text.

⁷⁸ *Opera omnia*, IX, 138.

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, V, 420; III, 24.

Regarding the conclusion of John's Gospel, on Jesus having done many miracles not recorded in this book (Jn 21: 25), a verse that later served as a main support of the *partim-partim* theory, Bonaventure remarked, «Thus not everything is recorded, but only what suffices for our faith».⁸⁰ (Compare on this the works of P. de Vooght and G. Tavard.⁸¹)

St. Thomas is no less clear. He concluded that «in this doctrine (= in theology) nothing else is handed on other than what is drawn from Holy Scripture».⁸² He went so far as once to utter what sounds offensive to us. «All the means by which faith comes to us are beyond suspicion. For we believe the prophets and apostles, because God gave testimony to them by performing miracles, as it says in the last chapter of Mark, “confirming the word with signs that followed” (16:20). We do not believe the successors of the prophets and apostles unless they announce to us what the latter left in writing».⁸³ An anonymous disciple of Thomas tried to further explain this by an example bordering on bad taste, «We do not believe the Church as such, unless in so far as it bases itself on Scripture [...]. Thus if the Supreme Pontiff, together with a Council, were to teach that Tobias's dog had no tail, he should not be believed».⁸⁴ Again, Thomas commented on the Creed, «This is not added to Sacred Scripture, but is rather taken from Scripture».⁸⁵ (On this, see the investigation of Bruno Decker in the Festschrift for Bishop Stohr.⁸⁶)

In spite of such texts, neither Bonaventure nor Thomas are scripturalists, since they both know well that revelation is always more than its material principle, the Scripture, namely, that it is life living on in the Church in a way that makes Scripture a living reality and illumines its hidden depths. So we are back at the beginning. If one identifies revelation with its material principles, then tradition has to be set up as a proper material principle in order to keep revelation from being totally in Scripture. But if revelation is prior and greater, then there is no trouble in having only *one* material principle, which even so is still not the whole, but only the material principle of the superior reality revelation, which lives in the Church. This means, to be

⁸⁰ Ibid., VI, 516.

⁸¹ P. DE VOOGHT, *Les sources de la doctrine chrétienne d'après les théologiens du XVIIe siècle et du début du XVIIIe*, Bruges, 1954; G. TAVARD, *Holy Writ or Holy Church. The Crisis of the Protestant Reformation*, New York, 1960.

⁸² Commentary on Pseudo-Dionysius's *De divinis nominibus*.

⁸³ *De veritate*, q. 14, art. 10, ad 11.

⁸⁴ This text is from a 15th century Dominican theologian of Vienna who commented on St. Thomas's *Summa contra gentiles* and was cited by Bruno Decker in the article mentioned in note 86, below, p. 124.

⁸⁵ *Summa theologiae*, pars II-II, q. 1, art. 9, ad 1.

⁸⁶ B. DECKER, «Sola Scriptura bei Thomas von Aquin» in L. LENHART (ed.), *Universitas. Dienst an Wahrheit und Leben*, Festschrift Albert Stohr, vol. 1, Mainz, 1960, 117-129.

sure, that the three realities, Scripture, Tradition, and the Church's Magisterium are not static entities placed beside each other, but have to be seen as one living organism of the word of God, which from Christ lives on in the Church.

From what I have said, the most important conclusion appears to be this: the proposed schema would not only condemn Geiselman but as well most of the Fathers and the classical scholastic theologians, beginning with Thomas Aquinas and Bonaventure. But that should not happen. One cannot in the name of tradition condemn as wrong the largest and most venerable part of the tradition. But it would not be right to go in the other direction and demand the condemnation of the *partim-partim* position and the affirmation that Scripture is the sole material principle of revelation. Note that such a doctrine does not mean the same as holding the material sufficiency of Scripture – against which there are serious difficulties. The aim must be that the question remain open, just as heretofore, and that the Council make clear its openness to positions like those of Thomas and Bonaventure. Practically this means removing from sections 4-6 all the formulations that depict tradition as an autonomous material principle. In their place, in so far as possible, formulations should be added which make clear both the close interrelation between Scripture, tradition, and church proclamation, and the Church's profound obligations regarding the word of Scripture.⁸⁷

II. Inspiration and Inerrancy of Scripture

The doctrine of inspiration developed in nos. 8-11 of Chapter II no doubt has behind it a large number of the present-day theological textbooks, but that by itself does not suffice to make the doctrine suitable for a Council to teach.⁸⁸ Rather this is one of the points that raise concern over the drafts presented so far. For they give the impression of attempting to make dogmatically binding the average-level theology of the Latin text-

⁸⁷ In the Mixed Commission instituted by Pope John XXIII to revise *De fontibus*, the plus of revealed truths in apostolic oral tradition was fiercely debated in the work of a sub-commission and was not settled until votes were taken on February 23 and March 1, 1963, to observe abstinence and not settle this question. I gave an account of the initial internal debate in «Pieter Smulders and *Dei Verbum*: 4. Assessing the Mixed Commission's 1962 Work on Scripture/Tradition and Biblical Inspiration» in *Gregorianum* 85 (2004) 243-248. On the vote not to settle the question, see Jan Grootaers account in his treatment of the «second preparation» of Vatican II in G. ALBERIGO – J. KOMONCHAK (eds.), *History of Vatican II*, 386-387.

⁸⁸ In Ch. II, the content of these sections were described by these phrases in parentheses: 8. *Inspirationis propria natura et definitio*; 9. *Plures auctores humani*; 10. *Inspiratio personalis hagiographi et communitas*; 11. *De extensione inspirationis*.

books, which in itself certainly has a rightful place and significance, but what is rightfully taught as *theology* is here being given an *ecclesial* significance which from the tradition it cannot claim to have. The first request to register here is that the Council avoid all unnecessary determinations and in this matter refrain from describing in detail the process of inspiration, which both Trent and Vatican I with good reason refrained from doing.⁸⁹ Thus the first part of no. 8 should be notably shortened and replaced by a simple reference to the earlier councils.

With this negative request a positive consideration arises, because the depiction in no. 8 of the process of inspiration depends on ideas received in the Western Church above all from Augustine. But in this area Augustine on his part was largely dependent on ideas coming from Philo, who drew his account of inspiration in a peculiar way not from his own [Jewish] prophetic tradition but from Middle Platonic mysticism and generally from the Hellenistic thought of his day.⁹⁰ It must be seen as unfortunate that this pagan view of inspiration, because of Augustine's authority, later gained such widespread acceptance. For this view includes two accentuations which make it extremely unsuitable for a Christian doctrine of inspiration.

First, based on the Greek mysticism of identity, it assumes that the divinity wholly overpowers the human person. The latter is taken as bereft of will and an instrument of the divinity, as when the schema speaks of *organon* and *instrumentum* [organ and instrument], although no. 9 does mark progress by also calling the human writer *auctor* [author], which should logically also be expressed in no. 8, which has places for developing this.

A second aspect is connected with this deprivation of human capability, namely, the unhistorical nature of the inspiration-process. What occurs here has no least constitutive connection with history, because what in fact transpires is that the human being is swallowed up in God who alone acts and speaks. But what is specific to biblical revelation is that it expresses a history that God carries out with humans. One can set this in the wide context of comparative religion. The Bible differs from the holy books of

⁸⁹ *De fontibus*, no. 8, took over a descriptive account of inspiration from Pope Leo XIII's Encyclical *Providentissimus Deus* (1893) on God's internal influence on biblical writers, in their minds, wills, and expressive powers, so that they rightly conceived and faithfully wrote all that God wanted expressed in Scripture. No. 8 calls inspiration *speciale quoddam charisma* by which God works in and through the sacred author, who is the «organ» or «instrument» of God, the principal author of the biblical books.

⁹⁰ Philo of Alexandria (ca. 15 B.C. – ca. 45 A.D.) was a Jew of broad Hellenistic culture who depicted inspiration as causing an ecstatic state in which the divine Spirit so overmasters the biblical author's human faculties that they bring forth only divine things. See, for example, *Quis rerum divinarum heres sit*, nos. 258-266 in F.H. COLSON et al. (eds.), *Philo*, vol. 4, Cambridge (Ma), 1949, 282-284.

Hinduism, Buddhism, or Islam, precisely in this that these are taken to be timeless divine dictation, whereas the Bible is the result of God's historical dialogue with human beings and only from this history does it have meaning and significance.

The sacred writer is much more than an organ of the community spirit of a particular time or people, an idea condemned in no. 10, for he is one personally called by God and taken into God's service.⁹¹ But it is essential to the writer that he lives amid the history that God carries out with humans. He is certainly God's «organ», but he is this at a quite definite place in history, that is, only by being at the same time «organ» of the Body of Christ and of the people of God in their covenant with God. What no. 10 says, after condemning the idea of the community spirit, about attention to historical circumstances possibly being very useful in exegesis is right, but it shows that the author has not at all seen what is at stake here, namely, the necessary insertion of Holy Scripture in the organism of God's people, which indeed is the basis of the Church's magisterium and grounds that living tradition which gives Scripture its true meaning.

An inspiration doctrine developed from what is properly Christian embraces these basic categories: the person, whom God calls personally, not as an «organ», and takes into his service; history; and the people of God. But the Philonian account has no place for these. Certainly everything essential was in spite of all this preserved in Catholic theology, but a coherent doctrine of inspiration could not be developed and theology did not get beyond a laborious combination of quite heterogeneous elements. It would be unfortunate for theology and the Church if the Philonian-Augustinian doctrine of inspiration, after centuries of life only in textbooks, were today to receive an ecclesial sanction, at the very time when we finally have the possibility of developing an inspiration doctrine that is authentically biblical in character.

For this reason, in summarizing what has been said, two points can be made. First, as I said, the description at the beginning of no. 8 should be deleted. Second, nos. 8-10 should be developed so as to show that the human writer really is an *auctor* [author] and is inserted into the people of God. That can be done with light touches so that it does not lead to dogmatically defining a new theory in place of the old, which should not be called for, but that the account leave the way open for further thinking

⁹¹ No. 10 affirmed inspiration as a personal charism of human authors, rejecting a notion of it as given to the community and shared corporately. It does add, however, that the biblical books are connected with the life of the community in which their authors wrote them and so their interpretation benefits by taking account of that community life.

about these aspects and only exclude errors really opposed to revealed faith as such.⁹²

What has just been said casts light on the topic of Holy Scripture's inerrancy and historicity, treated in the following sections.⁹³ Here the schema speaks very sharply, as it works out this deduction: God is supreme truth and cannot err; but God dictated the Scripture; therefore, the Scripture is precisely just as free of error as is God himself – «*in qualibet re religiosa vel profana*» [in every religious or profane matter]. Here however the dictation theory that is assumed, as just indicated, expresses no single thought that is specifically Christian. Thus it is not surprising that according to a practically irrefutable consensus of historians there definitely are mistakes and errors in the Bible in profane matters of no relevance for what Scripture properly intends to affirm. One can point out small matters, like the fact that Mark speaks of the High Priest Abiathar (Mk 2:26) instead of his father, Achimelech, an error which Matthew and Luke correct in their accounts. One can point to greater matters, such as the well-known differences between Chronicles and the Books of Kings or Daniel's unhistorical indication of Belsazar as the son of Nebucadnezar.

Today one thing is clear, namely, that inspiration did not mean to avoid, in telling about things mentioned in passing, the lack of clarity we have at the margins of the wide horizon of human affirmations. Instead, inspiration means to let the mystery of God draw near to humans by using truly human expressions. The true humanity of Scripture, behind which the mystery of God's mercy arises all the more, is now finally dawning on our awareness, namely, that Scripture is and remains inerrant and beyond doubt in everything that it properly intends to affirm, but this is not necessarily so in that which accompanies the affirmation and is not part of it. As a result, in agreement with what no. 13 says quite well, the inerrancy of Scripture has to be limited to its *vere enuntiata* [what is really affirmed]. Otherwise historical reason will be led into what is really an inescapable conflict.

The conclusion of Ch. II calls for a further remark, where it cites Heb 4:15 on our Lord being like us in all things «*praeter peccatum*» [outside of sin]. Here the author of the schema appears to be dissatisfied with Scripture

⁹² In his Nov. 14, 1962, intervention on *De fontibus*, Card. Frings echoed this when he spoke to the schema's doctrine of biblical inspiration and inerrancy, «*quae nimis severa videntur, nimis coarctans libertatem scientiae theologiae et appropinquans ad doctrinam de inspiratione verbali*». The text seems to be choosing between different schools of Catholic theology, which Councils never do. *Acta Synodalia*, I/3, 36.

⁹³ *De fontibus* continued with these sections: 11. *De extensione inspirationis*; 12. *De inerrantia ut consecrarium inspirationis*; 13. *Quomodo inerrantia diiudicanda sit*. No. 12 affirmed that by inspiration all error «in whatever religious or profane matter» is excluded from Scripture, since it comes from God, the supreme Truth.

and so he added «*et ignorantiam*» [and ignorance]. That is, to speak openly, hardly edifying and it will leave especially our separated brethren uncomfortable. Furthermore this «supplement» of Scripture is still more dubious when we find precisely the opposite said in Mk 13:32, «Concerning that day or hour no one knows, neither the angels in heaven nor the Son, but only the Father». However one interprets that verse, it at least shows in one specific sense, a sense certainly open to and needing further explanation, that one may speak of Jesus as man lacking knowledge. The text as presented made a quite questionable addition to Scripture, which must be deleted, even more so because it was not in the first draft of the text.

After all I have said, the remaining desires to register in the context of this area can be presented briefly. Here too the issue is essentially to leave pathways open where it is not necessary to close them off. This is first the case regarding Ch. IV, no. 19, where an explicit «*tenet ecclesia*» [the Church holds] is laid down regarding the authorship of four specific persons, Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John. That is trying to do too much. One should not feel obliged to solve the Matthean and Johannine problems purely from on high. What followed the decisions of the Biblical Commission in 1906 (on the Pentateuch) and 1908 (on Isaiah) shows with sufficient clarity that problems like these, once they are raised, take on a life of their own and should not be cut off from outside but be allowed to mature from within the discussion. It should suffice to emphasize the apostolic origin of the Gospels, adding that it was not without reason that they were attributed to the four traditional authors.

Similarly in stressing the objective truth of the history of Jesus, it seems improper to list the infancy narrative, resurrection from the dead, and ascension beside each other on the same level.⁹⁴ It simply goes beyond the competence of a council to make such a detailed determination, which here is unable to adequately express the different nuances of this topic. Again, we should recall the necessary distinction between the witness given by the Council and the analysis given in a textbook. What is desired can be fully achieved by saying that above all those facts connected with faith admit of no doubt. Developing a treatment of the details has to remain the work of theologians.

But no. 22 calls forth a slightly different reservation.⁹⁵ It is certainly the case that one has to reject the thesis that the words of Jesus reported in the

⁹⁴ *De fontibus*, no. 21, affirmed the historical reliability of the Gospels on the events and the deeds of Jesus, while condemning pernicious errors which raise doubts about the validity of the narratives, specifically, about Jesus' birth and childhood, his miracles, his resurrection, and his ascension to the Father.

⁹⁵ *De fontibus*, no. 22, condemned as erroneous any interpretation of the Gospels that took Jesus' words and teaching as not coming from him but instead as put in his mouth by the biblical author or, worse, by the community in which the author wrote.

Gospels are mostly not our Lord's words but those of the evangelist or of the community. But no Catholic theologian asserts such a view. Here the schema oversimplifies what it presents. We know today that the community on its part did not «invent» words of our Lord, but felt itself bound by what the eyewitnesses had seen and heard. But it knew as well that it was empowered and obliged not to pass on our Lord's words as words of a deceased person kept in an archive. Instead they transmitted them in the power of the Holy Spirit as words of a living person, of the Christ of today, by the process we call tradition. They heard as well in these words what was relevant to the church life of their own time, as shown most clearly in the history of the synoptic tradition. Nothing is more in accord that this with the Catholic understanding of Scripture and tradition and of Christ and the Church, but again, as on inspiration and the community, the schema's author did not get to the real problem but was blinded by the ghost of modernism and was fixated, here where something else is at stake, on the idea of the community spirit. Clearly a horror of modernism is still so deep in the bones of some theologians that they hear nothing else whenever the community is mentioned. It will hardly be possible to express the point at issue here in a positive manner, but it would be good to formulate the text in a more open manner, by a simple insertion, that is by «*solam mentem – solius communitatis*» [only the mind – only the community] on page 18 in lines 3 and 4.

Appendix. The Old Testament, New Testament, and World History

In concluding, please allow me two brief observations on Ch. III, which I have so far skipped over.⁹⁶ These go beyond the topic of inspiration to treat the basic understanding of the whole of God's salvation history with humankind. First, in no. 15 we have a formulation that does not sufficiently do justice to the unity of salvation history, namely, where it says that the authority of the Old Testament continues in force in those matters that are related to the founding of the Christian religion. This says both too little and too much. For the phrasing gives the impression that certain parts of the Old Testament have no connection with the founding of the Christian religion and therefore are simply relegated to the past, while other parts are at

⁹⁶ *De fontibus*, Ch. III, had these sections: 15. *De auctoritate Veteris Testamenti in Ecclesia*; 16. *De habitudine inter Vetus et Novum Testamentum*; 17. *De indole Veteris Testamenti*; 18. *De auctoribus humanis Veteris Testamenti*. – The revision of this chapter by the Mixed Commission was a significant advance toward the teaching on God's revelation in word and event that in time marked Ch. I of the Constitution *Dei Verbum*. On the revision of Ch. III: J. Wicks, «Pieter Smulders and *De Verbum*: 3. Developing the Understanding of Revelation to Israel (1962-63)» in *Gregorianum* 83 (2003) 225-267.

the same time directly Christian and as such continue in force. But the Pauline and general New Testament view of the Old Testament is different, as we hear in a text that the schema itself offers [in no. 15], «For whatever was written, was written for our instruction» (Rom 15:4). The whole Old Testament, not just some parts of it, speaks of Christ, for its intention is Christological and as such it is the basis and foundation of the Christian religion. But the whole Old Testament also has to pass through a Christological transformation and it then has force not from itself but from Christ and in reference to Christ, who is the one who removes the veil that covered the face of Moses (2 Cor 3:12-18).

The text of no. 16 gives occasion for a further consideration, when it says, «God's relations with humanity after the fall of Adam aimed to give every human creature access to the hope of salvation, by the promises made to our fathers, by the prophetic oracles about the Redeemer, and by the ever clearer message concerning him». This is correct, but the formulation surely takes too little account of the huge change that the past century has brought in our way of seeing the world and human history. This provides the Christian message with a completely new background, making it necessary to interpret this message in a fresh way in relation to this background so that its original and single truth may still be intelligible.

We know today that the history of Israel and the Church occupies only a tiny part of the whole history of humankind, so that from a purely quantitative viewpoint salvation history almost disappears as a very minor part of world history. With this the ancient phrase about the *ecclesia ab Abel* [the Church from Abel] takes on new significance, for it says that, nonetheless, this totality of history has a Christological structure and that in its totality history lives in an unseen manner from the brightness of that trace of light that began to shine with Abraham and then showed itself in Christ to be the true light of every human being who comes into this world.

A Council of today, which the whole world, including non-Christians, will be watching, should make it clear that it knows well the breadth, height, length, and depth, that is, the truly cosmic dimensions, of salvation in Christ, and that it is not imprisoned in the cage of a medieval view of history, within which it cultivates a kind of ecclesiastical provincialism. The Council has to grasp questions posed by people of today and be ready to give its answers. Therefore the formulation has to bring out more clearly than is done in the schema that salvation by Christ, which makes itself known in the history of Israel and the Church, is not hemmed in by the outer walls of Israel and the Church, but has always been open to everyone. Augustine once expressed this in his own way: «All those from the beginning of the human race who believed in him and understood him somehow or other and lived pious and just lives according to these commandments, whenever and wherever they lived, were undoubtedly saved

through him».⁹⁷ The Council has to say this in a new way in *its own*, that is, in our own, language.

We have still to mention Chapter V, about Sacred Scripture in the Church, which does not raise any particular issues and which in several passages represents real progress.⁹⁸ However, this text, except in its initial two sections, relates closely to the Schema *De Verbo Dei* presented by Secretariat for Promoting the Unity of Christians.⁹⁹ Accordingly, in order to prevent duplications, it would be desirable to simply replace this Chapter V with the Secretariat's schema, which does more justice to the topic and so is even better adapted to become a text promulgated by the Council.

Permit me one final remark. Eusebius of Caesarea, the historian of the first Ecumenical Council [Nicea, 325 A.D.], reported that Emperor Constantine, once he had conquered the external enemies of the Church, then decided to make war against invisible enemies then sowing confusion inside the Church. He called together an ecumenical council, much like an army of God in battle array (*Life of Constantine*, III, 4). Behind this is an image from which the Church has from the beginning interpreted itself and Christian living, that is, as the *militia Christi* and of Christian life as a struggle and contest against evil powers. The Council assembled is God's army. But one should never forget that the battle for which Christ assembles his forces is not a fight between those and against those who gather, but that they fight together against the powers of darkness.

Consequently, the meaning of the Council does not lie in authoritatively settling internal theological issues, but in giving a common witness of faith against the unbelief of this world. A number of the schemas make it all too clear that here *one* theological school wants to finally drive the other school from the arena. This brings to mind a bitter passage of de Lubac in which he is defending his account of the origin of the idea of God and he says about the critics who judged him, «Enclosed within the sheltered circle of their scholastic disputes, they imagined in all good faith that these pages were written with them in view—against them, as they thought. Miraculously protected against the very sound of the assaults delivered

⁹⁷ St. AUGUSTINE, *Letter 102*; PL 33, col. 374, cited from *The Works of St. Augustine, Letters 100-155*, transl. Roland Teske, S.J., Hyde Park (N.Y.), 2003, 26. Prof. Ratzinger gave the original Latin: «Ab exordio generis humani, quicumque in eum crediderunt eumque utcumque intellexerunt et secundum eius praecepta pie et iuste vixerunt, quandolibet et ubilibet fuerint, per eum procul dubio salvi facti sunt».

⁹⁸ *De fontibus*, Ch. V, had these sections: 24. *De curis Ecclesiae circa S. Scripturam*; 25. *De versione latina Vulgata*; 26. *De lectione S. Scripturae apud sacerdotes*; 27. *De lectione S. Scripturae apud fideles*; 28. *De exegetis catholicis*; 29. *De habitudine theologiae ad S. Scripturam*.

⁹⁹ *De Verbo Dei* was examined by the Central Preparatory Commission at the end of its work, on June 20, 1962. The text is given in *Acta et Documenta*, III/2, 454-457.

upon our faith in God, they apparently have not suspected for a moment the principal adversary which those pages had in mind. And yet that adversary is legion».¹⁰⁰

The army of Christ has in this hour other things to do than to enter into academic disputes. The world is not awaiting from us further refinements of a system, but it looks to hear the answer of faith in the hour of unbelief.

Text 5 – Theological foundation of the Church's missionary activity, for the drafting sub-commission of the Vatican II Commission on the Missions (January 1965)

Introduction

The original Latin version of the following text was found in the personal Council archive of Fr. Yves Congar by James B. Anderson during research for his Gregorian University doctoral dissertation. Fr. Anderson gave the text as Appendix II of his published dissertation, A Vatican II Pneumatology of the Paschal Mystery. The Historical-Doctrinal Genesis of Ad gentes I, 2-5, Rome, 1988), 301-304.

Since the original Latin has been published, what follows is an English translation by J. Wicks, who has added notes to explain terms used and to indicate passages in Vatican II's Decree on the Missionary Activity of the Church Ad gentes, which were first formulated in this contribution of peritus J. Ratzinger.

Text in English Translation

1. Considerations regarding the theological foundation of the Church's mission

In my opinion the first foundation of all mission theology must be seen in the mission given by the Father to the Son for the salvation of the world,

¹⁰⁰ H. DE LUBAC, *The Discovery of God*, trans. Alexander Dru, Grand Rapids, 1996, 214-215. The original, *Sur les chemins de Dieu*, Paris, 1956, was written in the aftermath of Pope Pius XII's defense of the validity of scholastic philosophy in the encyclical of 1950, *Humani generis*, when unnamed opponents were claiming that de Lubac's works had been targeted by Pius XII. Prof. Ratzinger cited here the German translation, *Über die Wege Gottes*, p. 213, which in accord with German orthography gave the final word capitalized as «Legion», so as to suggest the evil spirit that Jesus drove out of the Gerasene demoniac (Mk 5:9).

and consequently in the Holy Spirit's mission which continues the former mission (see for example Jn 16:17). In setting forth the nature of this mission, one has to look above all to the Christology of the Gospel of St. John, in which *missus* [one who is sent] is almost a title of Christ. In fact the whole of this Christology can be traced back to the idea of mission. Christ is essentially *missus* [one sent], that is, one who has nothing of himself, but who depends wholly upon the Father and who represents the Father totally.

For this reason this Christological foundation is as well and inseparably a Trinitarian foundation. If Christ is essentially one who is sent, that is, who is not of himself but of another (being «the Son»), then with him and in him we see the Father (Jn 14:9) and we see Him as the one who in sending the Son gives Himself to the world. This Christology of mission shows forth God as *bonum diffusivum sui* [the good pouring itself forth],¹⁰¹ as love that gives itself.

In the Church, the Body of Christ, this mission of the Son continues. As living from Christ, the Church is also necessarily *missa* [sent] and *missio* [mission]. It is never sufficient unto itself, but the movement of shedding forth divine goodness continues, which has its ground in the mission of the Son, in this abundance of divine love. Necessarily, therefore, the Church transcends itself, being always sent to others, seeking others, and in it God Himself is seeking human beings. Thus mission and mission activity is founded in the intimate Christological and Trinitarian essence of the Church.

Regarding missionary activity, a first consequence of this foundation is that mission is love «handing itself over» to others, just as God «handed over» the Son to human beings and the latter «handed over» himself.¹⁰² This is not a battle aiming to capture others and take them into one's own group. But mission is primarily a witness to divine love, which has shown itself in Christ.¹⁰³

¹⁰¹ This characterization of divine goodness, widely used in scholastic thought, comes from the 6th century mystical theologian Dionysius the Pseudo-Areopagite, *De divinis nominibus*, who wrote that God is subsistent goodness. «This essential Good, by the very fact of its existence, extends good to all things». It is somewhat like the sun that gives light to all. *The Divine Names*, IV, 1, in PSEUDO-DIONYSIUS, *The Complete works*, transl. Colm Liubheid, New York – Mahwah, 1987, 71-72.

¹⁰² Playing on the verb *tradere* in the Latin New Testament, Prof. Ratzinger assimilates missionary action to God's action in Rom 8:32, «Qui etiam proprio Filio suo non pepercit, sed pro nobis omnibus tradidit illum»; and to Christ's handing himself over according to Gal 2:20, «in fide vivo Filii Dei, qui dilexit me et tradidit seipsum pro me». For the latter, see also Eph 5:2.25.

¹⁰³ Vatican II's decree *Ad gentes* grounds the Church's mission in the Father's sending of the Son and Holy Spirit in nos. 2-4, in passages based on the text drafted by Yves Congar at the same time J. Ratzinger was preparing this text. See the synoptic presentation of these sections, beginning with Congar's draft and ending with the final text of the Council, given by J.B. ANDERSON, *A Vatican II Pneumatology of the Paschal Mystery* (as in the Introduction to this text), 216-229.

2. Secondary foundations of mission

a) «You shall be witnesses to me [...] to the ends of the earth» (Acts 1:8). The Church gives witness to divine truth, against the lying of the prince of this world.¹⁰⁴ The Church may not keep silent about divine truth revealed to her in Christ. She is not the light but one who offers testimony to the light. A Church keeping silent or fostering only its own life would not be the Church of God, for God came out of His own realm to come to us. He is not God of only some people but of all and He wants all to be saved. A universal mission is a sign both of God's universality and unity and of God's abundant love which seeks out everyone.

b) Obedience is shown to the word of Christ just as Christ obeyed the Father, as in Mt 28:19f and Mk 13:10, «Unto all nations the gospel must first be preached». Christ's command in Lk 14:16-24 expresses nothing other than the divine hospitality, inviting everyone to God's banquet. For this reason, mission is also to be taken as an eschatological sign (Mk 13:10). God's messengers go out to invite people to the heavenly banquet, which the Lord's Supper prefigures. One must also mention here the image of the harvest, as in Lk 10:2 («The harvest indeed is great»), at the beginning of the second mission, that of the seventy, who by Old Testament symbolism represent the nations, while the twelve, sent out in Lk 9:1-10, stand for Israel. The «harvest» is in the Old Testament an image of the last judgment, but in the Church's mission this becomes a mission of grace, as set forth in the word of reconciliation (2 Cor 5:20).

c) In Rom 15:16 Paul calls himself «the liturgist» of Christ Jesus among the Gentiles, who «sanctifies (*hierourgounta*) the Gospel of God, so that the oblation (*prosphora*) of the Gentiles may be made acceptable and sanctified in the Holy Spirit». This shows the final goal of the Church's mission among the Gentiles, namely, that God be adored by living worship, in a cosmic liturgy, by which the human race becomes an offering acceptable to God, a living temple of God in which He dwells. In St. John's Gospel, the term «glory» indicates the same goal. John 12:20ff is a central text for all mission theology. The Gentiles come near in order to see Jesus, which is the arrival of the eschatological hour, the hour of mission. In this hour the Father is glorified in Christ, as the glory of God shines forth through Christ. One carries out mission so that the glory and power of God may be shown forth in the world. Mission is done so that God may be adored.¹⁰⁵

¹⁰⁴ The Devil or Satan is «prince of this world» (Jn 12:31) and «father of lies» (Jn 8:44).

¹⁰⁵ This paragraph left a mark on *Ad gentes* 7.3, beginning, «Finally, by this missionary activity God is fully glorified».

d) «For all have sinned and have need of the glory of God» (Rom 3:23). Human salvation is neither the sole nor the first foundation of the Church's missionary activity, but is nonetheless a true foundation. This does not mean that persons not incorporated into the Church are usually eternally lost, but it does mean that the mission gives witness that no human person will be saved by himself and by his own powers. The mission of the Church gives the utterly necessary testimony that all human beings are sinners and under God's wrath, and that no human effort and no human religion can save them, for all salvation comes from Christ.¹⁰⁶ In missions, God is exhorting through the Church, «For Christ, we beseech you, be reconciled to God» (2 Cor 5:20).

3. The *summa* of missionary proclamation

a) It pertains to mission to preach the whole Catholic faith, whose sum-total we hear at the beginning of the preaching of our Lord Jesus Christ: «The time is fulfilled and the kingdom of God is at hand: repent and believe the Gospel» (Mk 1:15). Two themes are essential: *metanoia* (repenting) and *euaggelion* (the kingdom of God at hand), that is, judgment and grace. One should note how, in the first mission of the twelve apostles, their activity embraced repentance and healing as its essential elements (Mk 6:12f; cf. Lk 9:2, on preaching the kingdom of God and healing the sick). Missionary preaching brings a person to know that he is a sinner and this leads to conversion (*metanoia*). Then it reveals to the person the healing grace given in Christ and so it brings forth the response of faith, hope, and love.¹⁰⁷

b) According to these two essential themes, which complement each other as judgment and grace, repentance and faith, all missionary preaching falls under the law of the cross and resurrection. No one enters the Church, the body of Christ, unless by baptism he dies with Christ, but he dies in order to rise as one renewed. What holds in the case of individuals also has to be said, *mutatis mutandis*, regarding shared values, one's own culture, and one's religious values. Here also Christ's word remains the norm: «Unless the grain of wheat falling into the ground dies, it remains alone. But if it dies, it brings forth much fruit» (Jn 12:24f). «One who finds his life shall lose it; and one who loses his life for my sake, shall find it» (Mt. 10:39).

¹⁰⁶ See *Ad gentes* 8, citing Rom 3:23 and affirming, «No people are freed from sin by themselves or by their own efforts [...]; all have need of Christ, who is model, master, liberator, savior, and giver of life».

¹⁰⁷ See *Ad gentes* 8, citing Mk 1:15 as the gospel announcement of judgment and grace, of death to the old and of newness of life.

The cultural and religious values of the nations are not simply natural values which precede the Gospel and as such are simply added to it. Such an outlook ascribes to such values both too much and too little. In this world of ours, nature and the supernatural are never strictly separated but they penetrate each other. Because of this all truly human values are marked both by a divine supernatural elevation and by human sin. They can never be simply added to the Gospel, but they serve the Gospel in accord with the law of cross and resurrection. Pagan religion dies in Christian faith, but in the same faith human religion rises and offers to faith the forms in which faith then in different ways articulates itself.

c) The foundation of this assumption of human values conformed to the cross and resurrection is the *assumptio hominis* [assumption of man] that, according to the Church Fathers, occurred in the incarnation of the Word.¹⁰⁸ In building up the body of Christ, the Church, that assumption comes to its fullness (*pleroma*).¹⁰⁹ In the interval between the first and second coming of Christ, the Gospel «must be» preached (Mk 13:10) so that Christ's fullness may be reached.¹¹⁰ Just as in the Gospel the coming of Christ continues and Christ constantly comes, so in the faith of the peoples the assumption of human flesh into God's Word comes to completion. In this assumption, on one hand, human beings are changed (death and the cross), while, on the other hand, the whole fullness of humanity is outfitted for service of the divine word and has to be truly assumed, to fulfill that «must be» about which our Lord spoke.

4. The goals of missionary activity are these:

- a) Giving witness to God's love, for the glory of God. See, above, 2, c.
- b) The implanting of churches, which are instruments of the coming

¹⁰⁸ The Alexandrine Fathers (Athanasius, Cyril of Alexandria) conceived the Incarnation as the union of the Logos with flesh (*sarx*), from Jn 1:14. But the school of Antioch (Theodore of Mopsuestia, John Chrysostom) wanted to set in greater relief the human nature of Christ and so thought of God assuming a human nature, thus, *assumptio hominis*. On these developments of the 4th and 5th centuries, see J. J. WALSH, «Jesus Christ, II, In Dogmatic Theology» in *New Catholic Encyclopedia*, New York, 1967, 9, 920-921.

¹⁰⁹ The term «fullness» / *pleroma* occurs in Col. 1:19 («In him all the fullness was pleased to dwell») and 2:9 («In him dwells the fullness of divinity»). The first text gives a dynamic notion of the fullness of life and wisdom spread abroad in Christ and those united to him. See the entry by P. LAMARCHE, «Fullness» in X. LÉON-DUFOUR (ed.), *Dictionary of Biblical Theology*, New York, 1973, 198.

¹¹⁰ *Ad gentes* 9.2, concludes the doctrinal principles of Ch. I by taking up this theme. «Thus missionary activity tends toward eschatological fullness [...]. By missionary activity the mystical body is enlarged until it reaches the mature fullness of Christ [...]; the spiritual temple where God is adored in spirit and truth».

kingdom of God.¹¹¹ This implanting of churches is not complete simply with the erection of their own hierarchies, for the hierarchy is not the sole criterion of the Church of God. St. Paul said, «For Christ did not send me to baptize, but to preach the Gospel» (1 Cor 1:17). In setting up churches, evangelization is no less important than the erection of a hierarchy and the dispensation of the sacraments. In other words, the implanting of the church demands a certain penetration of peoples and their cultures by the word of life. Such evangelical penetration has to be considered an essential goal of all missionary activity. Mission is therefore carried out in order that people may hear, and by hearing may believe, and by believing may be saved (cf. Rom 10:11-17).

c) The work of the missions carries out the divine economy that intends to gather together «the children of God that were dispersed» (Jn 11:52). Just as «Babylon» (Gen 11)¹¹² stands for the confusion of this world, in which exclusive self-love confuses tongues, scatters the peoples, and stirs them up against one another, so then Pentecost is a sign of the Church which speaks all languages and by love understands them all embracing them in a single love, and so overcomes the Babylonian dispersion.¹¹³ Mission therefore is a sign of unity. Just as sin scatters people, so then the one faith assembles them in one new person: «For you are all one [*unus*] in Christ Jesus» (Gal 3:28, Greek text; also, Eph 2:14, on Christ our peace, who has made both one, and Eph 2:17, peace to you who were far off and peace to those who were near). Therefore it is of the nature of missions to give and to continue offering a sign of Pentecost, that is, of the assembling of humanity in one love by which God embraces all things.

5. The whole Church is the active subject of missionary activity

Because the Church is governed in its activity by the hierarchy, the governance of the missions pertains in the same way to the hierarchy and it does this according to the essential structure of the hierarchy, which embraces both the ministerial task of the successor of St. Peter and the ministerial task of the college of bishops and its coadjutors, all united to their head, the

¹¹¹ J. Ratzinger adopts, regarding the aim of mission work, the notion of *plantatio ecclesiae* featured by the Louvain School of missiology, led by Pierre Charles (d. 1954). See S. DIANICH, «Missione» in G. BARBAGLIO et al. (eds.), *Teologia*, Cinisello Balsamo, 2002, 1009-26, at 1011-12.

¹¹² The biblical reference shows that the Professor meant «Babel» not «Babylon».

¹¹³ That is, the dispersion from Babel, according to Gen 11:8-9. This notion entered *Ad gentes* 4, on the Holy Spirit's coming at Pentecost uniting peoples «in a church which speaks every language, understands and embraces all tongues in charity, and thus overcomes the dispersion of Babel».

successor of Peter. It seems to be of special importance to recall that the whole college of bishops, not just the Supreme Pontiff, is responsible for the work of the missions.¹¹⁴ This involves all the churches united in the one communion of the one Catholic Church. The ways of implementing this care of the episcopal college can vary according to the conditions of the time. Today, linkage would seem helpful, with the individual episcopal conferences seeing to this missionary care as conferences or with several neighboring conferences undertaking a common work. Discussion is needed on how the religious orders, which actually carry out most missionary activities, can support the initiatives of episcopal conferences and collaborate with them.

Episcopal conferences, either singly or united for this purpose, should set up secretariats for missions. These secretariats should consult with one another and help others, exchanging news and experiences. A secretariat set up in Rome should coordinate and bring together all such activity and foster activities arising in different regions. But the central secretariat would not be the sole initiator of activity, which should take place in different regions where it can be done better than in the center.

Text 6 – Proposed revision of October 17, 1965, for the schema De ecclesia in mundo huius temporis, no. 9, modifying and expanding the final three paragraphs of the prior text

Introduction

Above, pp. 246-249 described the context of this text's composition, as peritus J. Ratzinger contributed to a late reformulation of no. 9 of the schema *De ecclesia in mundo huius temporis*, of which the draft of early 1965 had been discussed in the Council aula from September 21 to October 8, 1965. This proposal aims to make a revised text speak from faith about the human predicament and deeper human questions, while offering an important expansion on Jesus Christ, so as to bring the revised draft into line with several incisive proposals made by Council Fathers during the aula discussion.

The date stems from what chief redactor Pierre Hauptmann wrote on the top of the page containing the text. In the Appendix of this presentation, pp. 309-310 give the original Latin of this text, which was furnished to the author

¹¹⁴ Writing in late 1964 or early 1965, J. Ratzinger has in mind the Dogmatic Constitution on the Church, *Lumen gentium*, promulgated a few weeks before, on November 21, 1964, which set forth in its third chapter the «collegiate character and structure of the episcopal order» (LG 22).

from the papers of P. Haubtmann by the Archives of the Institut catholique de Paris. Permission for publishing and translating the text was given by its author in a letter of January 21, 2008, from the Vatican Secretariat of State.

Text in English Translation

P. 10, l. 22ss¹¹⁵ The text could be composed as follows:

They [human beings] know obscurely that their own good will lacks the ability to direct rightly the forces that they themselves cause to emerge and which can later either oppress or help them. By these forces they appear to be gradually coming to rule over all things. But toward what goal should they tend? In what meaning can they place their trust?

Thus, in the midst of all the inventions and external progress, the ancient questions of the human race remain and pose themselves: What is the meaning of pain, evil, and death, which in spite of such great progress still exist? What follows after this life? To what purpose is all this?

Individuals are not lacking who hope that a true and full redemption of the human race will arise from human achievements themselves. They think that a future human kingdom will bring fulfillment of the promises that faith looks to be fulfilled in God's kingdom. But others despair of there being any meaning in human efforts and so they praise the courage of those who bear with life lacking all meaning. They creatively project a way of life according to the meaning they can themselves construct.

But the Church places its hope in the kingdom of that man who is at the same time true God and in whom the kingdom of God and the human kingdom coincide. In him, as well, she learns the true expanse of the human calling, which extends to participating in God himself. This often seems to almost burst the vessel that is our human condition. Human beings, whose calling infinitely transcends their own essence, can find no equilibrium in themselves, because their desires are always greater than finite realities and are never fulfilled by them. In the face of Jesus Christ crucified, moreover, the Church knows that humans are not only wounded by that divine love that embraces them and makes their hearts restless, but they are wounded as well by their own infidelity, by which they turn away from God to seek only their own gain and not seldom bite and devour each other (cf. Gal 5:5).

¹¹⁵ The reference indicates a page and line-number of no. 9, mid-way in its sixth paragraph, in the booklet containing the early 1965 version of the schema *De ecclesia in mundo huius temporis*. The revision would begin at this point, which corresponds to *Acta Synodalia IV/1*, 440, last line on the page.

Thus the Church believes that the definitive answer to the pressing questions of the human race is found in Christ, true God and true man. Therefore she intends to respond to the questions of today in the light that God makes resplendent in the face of Christ (2 Cor 4:6).

Still she can and must enter into sincere dialogue with all people, first, by bringing to the common questions that light she believes she is given by faith in Christ, and, second, by seeking to understand her own faith more deeply in the light of human truths.

Thus the Church invites all people to hear the message that she brings forth from her faith and she wants to hear the questions and answers of all those with whom she forms one human race and one history.

APPENDIX

*Text 2 (June 1962) in its Original Latin*¹¹⁶

Introductio

Dominus noster Jesus Christus ecclesiam suam constituit, ut sit «civitas supra montem posita» (Mt 5,14), ex qua lux illa vera verbi divini (Joa 1,9) luceat hominibus, qui in huius mundi «tenebris et in umbra mortis» (Is 9,2; Lc 1,79) ambulant. Huius divini mandati non immemor haec sancta synodus, sanctum Dei populum repraesentans, convenit bene sciens huius saeculi obscuritates, in quibus sol divinus quasi obscuratus videtur et Dominus dormiens in medio procellarum (cf. Mc 4,37s). Magnis enim illis progressibus scientiarum naturalium et admirandis technicis adinventionibus, quae in quasi perturbanda velocitate hominum ingenio dabantur intra breve unius saeculi spatium humanae vitae conditio ita immutata est, ut veritas Dei, creatoris mundi, fere inaccessibilis facta videtur hominibus in medio mundi cuiusdam a seipsis fabricati viventibus, qui non iam «gloriam Dei et opus manuum eius annuntiat» (Ps 18,1), sed gloriam hominis eiusque ingenium sonat. Tot certitudinibus, quae putabantur praeteritis saeculis nunc destructis, non iam certum aestimant, quod non experimento demonstrabile est et Dei verbum quasi incertum aliquod et inaccessibile eis videtur, saeculorum praeteritorum reliquiae. Non est hic locus pandendi alias causas, ex quibus haec tanta Dei oblivio ascendit, quae huius saeculi mysterium est obscurum. Attamen in corde hominis ad Dei imaginem con-

¹¹⁶ Erzbischöfliches Archiv München, Kardinal-Döpfner-Archiv, Konzilsakten, Nr. 3282. Above, the text is introduced on pp. 261-262 and presented in English translation on pp. 262-264.

diti (cf. Gen 1,27) clamor quidam manet, qui Deum quaerit, Deum, qui solus implet hoc cor capax infiniti et non nisi in infinito amore quiescens. Testis huius occulti desiderii, testis Dei in hoc abisso, qui homo est, numquam plene absentis est tam tristitia quaedam, quae mundum etiam in medio deliciarum ab eo datarum implet quam spes multiformis paradisi cuiusdam terrestri, in qua spes illa inextinguibilis refulget, qua homo «lucem veram, satietatem plenam, gaudium sempiternum, iucunditatem consummatam et felicitatem perfectam» desiderat (Or. s. Thomae).

Haec sancta synodus, ancilla humilis verbi divini, auxilio confisa Spiritus Sancti, qui in omnem inducit veritatem (Joa 16:13), nihil aliud vult quam testimonium Jesu Christi perhibere hominibus in hac saeculi hora viventibus. Exemplum Sancti Pauli sequens, qui pro Christo «omnibus omnia factus» est (1 Cor 9,22), hominibus hodiernis hodierna esse vult, quia ipse Christus dominus non est «Christus heri» solum, sed Christus «hodie [...] et in saecula» (Hebr 13:8). Interiori vitae ecclesiae renovandae Deo dante vult servire, ut sicut homo spiritualis a Spiritu Dei vivens «renovatur de die in diem», ita etiam ecclesia Dei, sponsa Christi, renovetur de die in diem (2 Cor 4,16). Et sicut is qui foris est homo etiam in spirituali homine aerumnis terrenaе vitae corrumpitur et tamen non deficit ex renovatione eius qui intus est vivens (ibid.), ita etiam si in ecclesia multa quae sibi foris solummodo sunt corrumuntur fluxu vitae terrenaе, eo plus vivit in tribulationibus glorians (Rom 5,3), renovata ex eis secundum vitam suam interiorum. Ad hanc renovationem sibi semper necessariam pertinere aestimat adaptationem disciplinae suae ad vitae hodiernae adjuncta, in necessitatibus temporis Dei vocem quodammodo cognoscens. Ex emendatione ordinis disciplinae, quae ergo ab hac synodo praeparanda est, novum impetum spiritus apostolici exoptat, qui lucem veritatis clarius splendescere facit «usque ad ultimum terrae» (Acta 1,8) et in nebulas infidelitatis in medio christianorum exortas. Unusquisque fidelium ad aliquam apostolatus formam vocatus est, nemo sibi soli vivit et nemo immemor fratrum ad patrem communem redire potest, quia ipse Christus «primogenitus in multis fratribus» (Rom 8,29) esse voluit; omnis ergo secundum gratiam, quae data est sibi (cf. Rom 12,6) et non solum secundum regulas sibi impositas operetur sequens illud Apostoli: «Spiritus nolite extinguere» (1 Thess 5,19). Ut tamen «omnia [...] honeste et secundum ordinem fiant» (1 Cor 14,40), haec sancta synodus novum ordinem apostolatus laicorum proponit, ut totus populus sanctus Dei unanimiter «in aedificationem corporis Christi» cooperetur, «donec occurramus omnes in unitatem fidei et agnitionis Filii Dei» (Eph 4,12s).

Hanc interioris vitae ecclesiae renovationem, quae cum ordine novo apostolatus fidelium finis immediatus huius concilii est, patres in eo una cum pastore supremo ecclesiae a Christo constituto, successore scilicet sancti Petri, congregati, suave incitamentum fore sperant fratribus separa-

tis ad unitatem quaerendam omnium, qui sanctae crucis signo signati et aqua salutari baptismatis abluti Dominum Jesum Christum confitentur. Bene sibi conscii sunt scissuram christifideles in partes adversas separantem scandalum periculosum parare mundo, qui secundum Domini orationem veritatem ipsius cognoscat ex hoc, quod unum sunt omnes, qui credunt per verbum apostolorum (Joa 17,20s). Sciunt lumen verbi domini obtenebratum esse in mundo, quanto tempore Domini corpus dilaceratur christianorum discordia, hac autem hora obscuritatum et oblivionis Dei inter homines exortae plus prioribus temporibus necessariam esse fidem concordem omnium, qui verbo Domini adherent. Itaque magno est eis solatio novum desiderium unitatis nostris temporibus in cordibus fidelium undequaque non sine Spiritus Sancti operatione excitatum. Ipse Dominus est, qui ad unitatem gregis sui ducet omnes credentes, quando sibi placet secundum arcanum suum consilium. Renovatio autem domus Dei, quam Dominus per huius sancti concilii humile servitium donare dignetur, sit invitamentum omnibus a sede Sancti Petri separatis, ut redeuntes ad unitatem mensae Domini una nobiscum panem caelestem ab uno altari unius domus Dei edant secundum illud Apostoli: «Unus panis, unum corpus multi sumus» (1 Cor 10,17). Sic Dominus benedicat hoc concilium in suo sancto nomine congregatum.

Text 4 (October 10, 1962) in its Original German¹¹⁷

Bemerkungen zum Schema *De fontibus revelationis*

Das Schema *De fontibus revelationis* wirft Fragen hauptsächlich in drei Richtungen auf: 1. Die Frage nach dem Verhältnis von Schrift und Überlieferung; 2. Die Frage nach Inspiration und Irrtumslosigkeit der Schrift (Beides einen ganzen Komplex von Detailfragen einschließend); 3. taucht mehr am Rande noch die Frage nach dem Verhältnis von Altem und Neuem Testament und der Einordnung beider ins Ganze der Heils- und Weltgeschichte auf.

¹¹⁷ From the Katholiek Documentatie Centrum, Nijmegen, The Netherlands, the Archive Pieter F Smulders, Folder 100. Above, the text is introduced on pp. 269 and presented in English translation on pp. 269-285.

I. Schrift und Überlieferung

Die Problematik hebt bereits bei der Überschrift an «De fontibus revelationis». Zugegeben, alle Lehrbücher sagen so; zugegeben auch, das Vaticanum I gebraucht im Caput 2 De revelatione diesen Titel als Zwischenüberschrift, wo es die tridentinischen Beschlüsse bezüglich Schrift und Überlieferung neu einschärft. Aber das Tridentinum selbst hat nicht so gesprochen und im eigentlichen Text des Vaticanum kehrt die Ausdrucksweise denn auch nicht wieder. Tatsächlich ist die Formulierung, so üblich sie geworden ist, nicht ungefährlich, schließt sie doch eine erstaunliche Verengung des Offenbarungsbegriffes ein, die das ganze weitere Verständnis des Problems entscheidend präjudiziert. In Wirklichkeit sind ja nicht Schrift und Überlieferung die Quellen der Offenbarung, sondern die Offenbarung, das Sprechen und Sich-selbst-Enthüllen Gottes, ist der unus fons, aus dem die beiden rivuli Schrift und Überlieferung hervorfliessen: So ist es die wahre, auf dem Tridentinum noch mit Selbstverständlichkeit geltende Sprechweise der Überlieferung; die Umkehrung, die die bereits gefaßte und geformte Gestalt der Offenbarung – Schrift und Überlieferung – nun zur Quelle und die Offenbarung zur nachgeordneten Größe macht, dürfte in dieser Form wohl erst in der Frühzeit des Historismus eingentlich in Übung gekommen sein, in der nun allenhalben die Frage nach den Quellen erhoben wurde und der Christ als die Quellen, aus denen er die Offenbarung schöpft, Schrift und Überlieferung benennt. In einer solchen Redeweise steckt deutlich eine mangelnde Unterscheidung von Seins- und Erkenntnisordnung. Schrift und Überlieferung sind für *uns* allerdings die Quellen zur Erkenntnis der Offenbarung, aber sie sind nicht *an sich* die Quelle der Offenbarung, sondern an sich ist die Offenbarung die Quelle von Schrift und Überlieferung. Demgemäß heißt in der mittelalterlichen Überlieferung die Schrift zwar *fons scientiae* u. ä., aber niemals *fons revelationis*. So richtig es also für die theologische Arbeit ist, daß ihre «Quellen» Schrift und Überlieferung sind, so gefährlich und einseitig ist es, diese ganz vom Subjekt her bestimmte Formulierung, die nicht die Ordnung der Wirklichkeit, sondern nur unsern Zugang zur Wirklichkeit schildert, schlicht als die Etikette des Traktates von Schrift und Überlieferung hinzunehmen, weil solcher Vorgang, wie gesagt, die Gefahr einer Verkehrung im Offenbarungsbegriff einschließt: Offenbarung ist nicht eine den Größen Schrift und Überlieferung nachgeordnete Sache, sondern sie ist das Sprechen und Handeln Gottes selbst, das allen geschichtlichen Fassungen dieses Sprechens vorausliegt, sie ist die eine Quelle, die Schrift und Überlieferung speist.

Mag sein, daß alles bisher Gesagte wie ein Wortgezänk unter Schulmeistern wirkt. Aber man darf nicht vergessen, daß im Wort sich das Verstehen der Sache entscheidet und daß so dem rechten Gebrauch der Worte, gerade in Sachen des Glaubens, eine große Bedeutung zukommt. So schließt die Vorordnung der Offenbarung als der einen Quelle gegenüber

Schrift und Überlieferung als den geschichtlichen Übermittlungsformen dieser einer Offenbarung für die konkrete Gestaltung des Schemas bereits eine Reihe von wichtigen Folgerungen ein: Wenn die Offenbarung das erste ist und Schrift und Überlieferung aus ihr hervorkommen und nur von ihr her zu verstehen sind, dann kann man eine Darstellung der Offenbarung nicht einfach mit Schrift und Überlieferung beginnen. Das ist wieder ein Vorgehen, das mehr die Luft des Historismus als die des Glaubens atmet. Sondern dann muß, ehe man von den Dokumenten redet, etwas von dem Tun Gottes gesagt werden, aus dem sie kommen, ohne das die Handwerkzeug der Historiker, nicht aber nun ihrerseits Quellen von Glauben und Leben wären, die hinübersprudeln ins ewigen Leben. Mit einem Wort: Es muß zuerst etwas über die Offenbarung selbst und als solche gesagt werden, bevor man etwas von ihren Zeugnissen sagt.

Ein zweiter Sachverhalt, der sich zwanglos aus unserem Ansatz ergibt, läßt sich folgendermaßen umschreiben: Wenn man Schrift und Überlieferung als die Quellen der Offenbarung bezeichnet, identifiziert man praktisch die Offenbarung mit ihren Materialprinzipien. In diesem Fall wird die Gefahr, in den Skripturismus, d. h. in das *sola scriptura*, in die Identifizierung von Schrift und Offenbarung, abzugleiten, besonders akut. Man braucht ja nur zu behaupten, daß die Überlieferung keine zusätzlichen Inhalte zur Schrift hinzubringe, dann ist damit schon klar, daß die Schrift die ganze Offenbarung ist, daß Schrift und Offenbarung sich decken, daß «*sola scriptura*» in einem strengen und exklusiven Sinne gilt. Diese Gefahr ist mit dem eigentümlichen Positivismus, der die Offenbarung mit ihren konkreten Zeugnissen gleichsetzt unausweichlich gegeben. In der Tat sind die Verfasser unseres Schemas offenbar in diese mit ihrem Ausgangspunkt gegebene Falle gegangen: Sie verteidigen, wie anschließend zu zeigen sein wird, die Lehre, die Überlieferung müsse eigene Materialien neben der Schrift enthalten, weil sie offensichtlich meinen, nur so sich gegen das *sola scriptura* abschirmen zu können. Sobald man aber begriffen hat, daß dieser Positivismus, der überdies auf einer Vermengung von Seins- und Erkenntnisordnung und einer Absolutsetzung der Subjektperspektive beruht, falsch ist; sobald man begriffen hat, daß Offenbarung in jedem Fall ihren materialen Bezeugungen vorausliegt, besteht die Gefahr des Skripturismus überhaupt nicht mehr. Denn dann ist klar, daß die Offenbarung selbst immer ein Mehr ist gegenüber ihrer fixierten Bezeugung in der Schrift, daß sie das Lebendige ist, das die Schrift umgreift und entfaltet. Davon wird gleich des näheren zu sprechen sein; zunächst möchte ich die Forderungen zusammenstellen, die sich aus dem Bisherigen ergeben:

1. Der Titel «De fontibus revelationis» ist abzuändern in «De revelatione» oder «De verbo Dei» (quia ipsa revelatio est fons sacrae scripturae et traditionis divinae, non autem scriptura et traditio fontes revelationis ipsae, sed solummodo fontes revelationis cognoscendae).

2. Dem Ganzen ist ein Caput I De revelatione ipsa vorzuschicken, für das Materialien aus dem bisherigen Caput I und aus Schema 2 Caput IV herangezogen werden können.

3. Der Ausdruck *fontes* ist, auch wo er im Text auftaucht, nach Möglichkeit zu ersetzen durch andere Ausdrucksweisen. Caput I,3 bietet den Ausdruck *transmissio* an.

4. Das sachliche Ergebnis der bisherigen Überlegungen könnte lauten: Das Verhältnis der beiden Größen Schrift und Überlieferung ist nur zu begreifen in Unterordnung dieser beiden Größen unter die dritte, die in Wahrheit die erste ist, unter die Offenbarung selbst, die ihren positiven Bezeugungen vorausliegt und sie übergreift. Schrift und Überlieferung sind Erkenntnis- und Materialprinzipien der Offenbarung, nicht die Offenbarung selbst.

Diese Erkenntnis wird nun wichtig, wenn wir in die Betrachtung der Abschnitte 4-6 von Caput I entreten, wo einige Änderungen im Text unerlässlich erscheinen, wenn nicht eine ungebührliche Einengung der kirchlichen Lehre stattfinden soll, die die Komplexität des Sachverhaltes kaum noch gerecht werden könnte. In diesen Abschnitten, denen es augenscheinlich um die Verteidigung des katholischen Traditionsprinzips gegen ein etwaiges Eindringen des protestantischen Skripturismus geht, wird etwa Folgendes gesagt: Die Offenbarung ist in Schrift und Überlieferung enthalten und zwar so, daß Teile der Offenbarung *nur* in der Überlieferung gegeben sind, daß die Überlieferung ein inhaltliches Plus gegenüber der Schrift zu bieten hat, Worte, die nicht aufgeschrieben, sondern nur von Hand zu Hand in der Kirche weitergegeben wurden. Als Beispiel für solche einzig und allein durch die Überlieferung, unabhängig von der Schrift der Kirche zur Kenntnis kommende Wahrheiten werden Inspiration, Kanonizität und Integrität der Heiligen Schriften im einzelnen und im ganzen genannt. Es ist klar, daß diese Lehre, die zweifellos eine starke Mehrheit theologischer Lehrbücher hinter sich hat, hier zunächst weniger gegen die reformatorischen Bekenntnisse selbst gerichtet ist, sondern daß die unmittelbare Frontrichtung anderswohin zielt. Es handelt sich um jene Versuche einer Neubesinnung auf das Wesen der Tradition, die in Deutschland vor allem durch die Arbeiten des Tübinger Dogmatikers Geiselman in Gang gekommen ist. Geiselman hat festgestellt, daß die tridentinische Formulierung «hanc veritatem [...] contineri in libris scriptis et sine scripto traditionibus» eine durch die Einwände verschiedener Konzilsväter veranlaßte Abänderung für «contineri partim in libris scriptis – partim in sine scripto traditionibus» sei. Das Konzil habe, indem es auf eine so eindeutige Festlegung des Verhältnisses von Schrift und Tradition verzichtete, die Frage nach dem Verhältnis der beiden Größen offen gelassen und neben der Meinung derjenigen, die glaubten, in Schrift und Überlieferung sei nur je ein Teil der Offenbarungswahrheit enthalten, offen-

sichtlich auch die Meinung der anderen unangetastet lassen wollen, die der Ansicht waren, alles zum Glauben Notwendige sei auch in der Schrift allein enthalten, das Verhältnis von Schrift und Überlieferung müsse eher im Sinne eines *totum-totum* als im Sinne eines *partim-partim* gedacht werden. Die weiteren Überlegungen Geiselmans stehen hier nicht zur Debatte; daß Trient einen Spielraum lassen wollte, kann tatsächlich kaum in Zweifel gezogen werden. Das bedeutet, daß bis zur Stunde in der Kirche sowohl die Meinung derjenigen ein Recht hat, die an die Existenz besonderer, nur in der Überlieferung enthaltenen Wahrheiten glauben, wie auch die Meinung derjenigen, die an eine materiale Vollständigkeit der Schrift denken. Die wörtliche Annahme des gegenwärtigen Schemas würde zur Folge haben, daß es mit dieser Offenheit von jetzt an zuende wäre und das *partim-partim* der Sache nach jetzt doch noch zu einem späten Siege käme. Für einen solchen Schritt gibt es keine neuen Gründe, wohl aber neue Gegeninstanzen. Es ist selbstverständlich unmöglich, in dem zur Verfügung stehende Rahmen diese Tatbestände auch nur einigermaßen angemessen zu entfalten. Ich möchte nur in aller Kürze auf zwei Gesichtspunkte hinweisen, die eine Verengung des Tridentinischen Dogmas höchst unratsam erscheinen lassen.

1. Die Geschichte kann praktisch keine Satz nennen, der einerseits nicht in der Schrift enthalten ist und andererseits auch nur mit einiger historischer Wahrscheinlichkeit bis auf die Apostel zurückgeführt werden könnte. Gerade die drei klassischen Lehrbuchbeispiele – Kanon der Schrift, Siebenzahl der Sakramente, Kindertaufe – bestehen diese Probe nicht. Wer die Kanongeschichte kennt, der weiß auch, welch mühsames Ringen um die Abgrenzung dessen sie einschließt, was die Kirche als Kanon, als *regula* ihrer selbst anerkennen will und was nicht. Nein, die Kirche hatte keine fertig formulierte Mitteilung des letzten Apostels zur Verfügung, der testamentarisch hinterließ, welche Bücher zusammen die Schrift ausmachen sollten. Sondern sie mußte in der Selbstbesinnung auf den in ihr wirksamen Heiligen Geist in der Mühsal menschlicher Geschichte sich fragen, in welchen Büchern sie diesen Geist erkannte und welchen nicht, ehe sie scheiden konnte, was ihr Wesengesetz ausdrückte und was nicht. Und dieses lebendige Ringen im Heiligen Geist, das ist der Vorgang des «*tradere*», das ist das über die Schrift und ihren Buchstaben hinausgreifende Plus der Tradition, nicht aber ein fertiger material zu tradierender Satz. Das gleiche läßt sich hinsichtlich der 7 Sakramente zeigen: Man weiß heute, daß die Siebenzahl als solche ausdrücklich erst im 12. Jahrhundert fixiert wurde, nicht als ob es vorher die entsprechenden sieben Wirklichkeiten nicht gegeben hätte, sondern ihre Ordnung und ihre gemeinsame Erkenntnis unter dem einen Oberbegriff Sakrament, kurzum die Fixierung des sakramentalen Kosmos parallel der Fixierung des Kosmos der Heiligen Schriften, ist wiederum ein

Vorgang, der ein geschichtliches Ringen im Heiligen Geist einschließt und nicht durch Weitergabe fertiger Sätze sich zuträgt. Etwas anders mag es bei der Kindertaufe liegen: Vielleicht ist sie schon in apostolischer Zeit geübt worden, aber auch dann ist sie nicht im Sinn eines Satzes weitergetragen worden, sondern als ein Teil der einen Tatsächlichkeit Kirche und ihres Lebens im Heiligen Geist.

Natürlich drängt sich hier sofort der Einwand auf: Aber es gibt doch Dogmen, die nur aus der Überlieferung, nicht aus der Schrift zu beweisen sind. Nach 1950 war keine Auskunft beliebter als zu sagen, dieses Dogma sei ein typisches Beispiel eines nur durch die Tradition zu beweisenden Satzes. In Wirklichkeit ist gerade in diesem Fall mit einer solchen Auskunft gar nichts gewonnen, sie ist im Grunde eine Flucht, keine Erklärung. Denn auch die Überlieferung weiß bekanntlich vor dem 5. Jahrhundert von der *assumptio corporalis* der Gottesmutter nichts und es ist historisch vollständig klar, daß es sich bei den ersten schließlich auftauchenden Nachrichten keineswegs um verspätete Neiderschriften einer bisher nur mündlich weitergegebenen Nachricht handelt, sondern um eine Erkenntnis, die eben erst neu ans Licht drängt, um deren Verständnis dann ein jahrhundertlanges Ringen anhebt und von der schließlich 1950 die Kirche erklärt hat, daß es eine Erkenntnis im Heiligen Geiste war, die zum Grundbestand der Offenbarung zu rechnen ist. Die Tradition als ein eigenes Materialprinzip kann man gerade von hier aus nicht beweisen, sondern wiederum erscheint sie als der Vorgang der geistigen Aneignung und Entfaltung des Christusgeheimnisses in der geschichtlichen Mühsal der Kirche.

Ich glaube, daß dieser historische Tatbestand entscheidend sein sollte, um eine Fixierung in dem von der Vorlage vorgesehenen Sinn auf alle Fälle zu verneinen. Ich sage nochmal: Es gibt keinen Satz, der einerseits nicht in der Schrift steht und andererseits mit irgendeiner historischen Wahrscheinlichkeit bis in die Apostelzeit zurückgeführt werden könnte. Wenn es so ist – und es ist so – dann darf man Überlieferung nicht als materiale Weitergabe ungeschriebener Sätze definieren.

2. Die Väter und die vortridentinischen Scholastiker haben das auch nicht getan. Zu dem historischen Gesichtspunkt tritt dann ein innertheologischer. Noch mehr als vorhin muß ich hier bei Andeutungen bleiben. Es läßt sich sagen: Der Begriff der *Paradosis* ist von Anfang an einer der Grundpfeiler patristischen Denkens und Glaubens. Aber unter dieser *Paradosis* verstehen die Väter nicht Einzelsätze, die neben der Schrift einherlaufen (sie haben vielmehr die Existenz solcher Sätze entschieden bestritten), sondern sie verstehen darunter die Einfügung der Schrift in den lebendigen Organismus der Kirche und das Eigentumsrecht der Kirche auf die Schrift, wie es Tertullian in seiner *Praescriptio haereticorum* klassisch formuliert hat. Tradition – das heißt für sie einfach «*scriptura in ecclesia*»,

Schrift lebt in der lebendigen Aneignung durch die geisterfüllte Kirche und nur so ist sie sie selbst. Den Gedanken der *Paradosis* einzelner neben der Schrift laufender Sätze hingegen hat der Großteil der Väter als gnostisch abgelehnt.

Nicht minder klar ist die Position der großen Scholastiker. Ich beschränke mich darauf, ein paar Zitate von den zwei größten – von Bonaventura und Thomas – zu geben. Bonaventura sagt: *Veritas enim fidei et vitae sanctitatis non aliunde quam ex scripturarum fonte hauritur* (Opusc 13; VIII 339). An anderer Stelle: *Omnis veritas salutaris vel in scriptura est vel ab ipsa emanat vel ad eam reducitur* (t IX 138). Mehrmals variiert und zitiert er das Wort des Pseudo-Dionys: *Nihil assumendum est, nisi quod ex eloquiis sacris nobis expressum est* (V 420; III 24). Zu der Abschlußbemerkung des Johannes-Evangeliums, Jesus habe noch viele Wunder getan, die nicht in diesem Buche aufgeschrieben seien (21, 25), das späterhin zu einer Hauptstütze der *partim-partim* Theorie wurde, bemerkt er: *Et ideo non omnia scripta sunt, sed quae sufficiunt ad fidem nostram* (VI 516; vgl. die Arbeiten von P. de Vooght und G. Tavard).

Der heilige Thomas ist nicht minder deutlich. Er stellt fest, daß in *hac doctrina* (= in der Theologie) *non alia tradantur quam ea quae in Sacris Scripturis habentur* (Komm. zu *De div. nom.*). Ja, er wagt in den *Quod de veritate* sogar die für unser Ohr fast anstößig klingende Formulierung: *Omnia media, per quae ad nos fides venit, suspicione carent. Prophetis enim et apostolis credimus ex hoc quod Deus eis testimonium perhibuit miracula faciendo ut dicitur Marci ultimo (v. 20): «Sermonem confirmante sequentibus signis». Successoribus autem apostolorum et prophetarum non credimus nisi in quantum nobis ea annuntiant quae illi in scriptis relinquunt* (q 14 a 10 ad 11). Ein anonymes Thomasschüler hat das mit einem wenig geschmackvollen Beispiel noch etwas mehr zu erläutern gesucht, wenn er sagt: [...] *cum non credamus Ecclesiae ut sic, nisi secundum quod innititur Sacrae Scripturae. [...] Unde si Summus Pontifex simul cum Concilio determinarent quod canis Thobiae non habuit caudam, non esset ei credendum. Und nochmal Thomas, über das Symbolum: Quod quidem non est additum sacrae Scripturae, sed potius ex sacra Scriptura sumptum* (S. theol II II q 1 a 9 ad 1; vgl. zum ganzen die Untersuchung von Bruno Decker in der Festschrift für Bischof Stohr).

Trotz solcher Texte sind weder Bonaventura noch Thomas *Scripturisten*, weil sie darum wissen, daß die Offenbarung immer mehr ist als ihr Materialprinzip, die Schrift, daß sie Leben ist, das in der Kirche lebt und so erst die Schrift lebendig macht und ihre verborgenen Tiefen aufleuchten läßt. Damit sind wir wieder beim Anfang: Wenn man die Offenbarung mit ihren Materialprinzipien identifiziert, dann muß man Tradition als eigenes Materialprinzip aufrichten, wenn nicht die Offenbarung als ganze in der Schrift aufgehen soll. Wenn man aber Offenbarung als das

vorausgehende und größere erkennt, dann kann man es ruhig dabei belassen, daß es nur *ein* Materialprinzip gibt, das dennoch immer noch nicht das Ganze ist, sondern nur das Materialprinzip der übergeordneten Größe Offenbarung, die in der Kirche lebt. Dann ergibt sich freilich auch, daß man die drei Größen Schrift – Überlieferung – Kirchliches Lehramt nicht statisch nebeneinander stellen kann, sondern als einen lebendigen Organismus des Wortes Gottes betrachten muß, das von Christus her in der Kirche lebt.

Die wichtigste Schlußfolgerung aus dem Gesagten scheint mir zu sein, daß mit dem vorgelegten Schema nicht nur Geiselmannt verurteilt werden würde, sondern auch der Großteil der Väter und der klassischen scholastischen Theologen, an der Spitze Thomas von Aquin und Bonaventura. Das aber darf nicht geschehen: Man kann nicht im Namen der Tradition den größten und ehrwürdigsten Teil der Tradition als falsch verdammen. Es wäre wohl unbillig, nun umgekehrt zu fordern, daß statt dessen das partim – partim verurteilt und die Schrift als einziges Materialprinzip der Offenbarung gelehrt werde (was nicht gleichbedeutend ist mit der Idee einer materialen Suffizienz der Schrift, gegen die es ernsthafte Schwierigkeiten gibt), sondern anzustreben ist, daß weiterhin Offenheit bleibe, wie bisher und daß das Konzil deutlich an der Offenheit auch für den Weg eines Thomas und Bonaventura festhält. Praktisch bedeutet das: In den Abschnitten 4-6 sind alle jene Stellen zu streichen, die die Vorstellung der Tradition als selbständiger Materialquelle ausdrücken. Umgekehrt sind nach Möglichkeit Formulierungen einzufügen, die die enge innere Verflochtenheit von Schrift, Überlieferung und kirchlicher Verkündigung und die tiefgehende Bindung der Kirche an das Wort der Schrift erkennen lassen.

II. *Inspiration und Irrtumslosigkeit der Schrift*

Die Inspirationslehre, wie sie in Abschnitt 8 – 11 von Caput 2 entwickelt wird, hat zweifellos wiederum einen Großteil der gegenwärtigen theologischen Lehrbücher hinter sich, aber das allein kann doch nicht genügen, um sie konzilsreif erscheinen zu lassen. Viel eher ist dies einer der Punkte, die an den bisher vorgelegten Schemata besorgt stimmen können: Daß man den Eindruck gewinnen muß, hier werde versucht, die Durchschnitts-Theologie der lateinischen Lehrbücher, die als solche durchaus ihr Recht und ihre Bedeutung hat, dogmatisch verbindlich zu machen, was nun doch heißt dieser Theologie, die als *Theologie* ihr Recht hat, ein *kirchliches* Gewicht zu geben, das sie von der Überlieferung her nicht beanspruchen kann. Der erste Wunsch, der hier anzumelden ist, wäre demnach wiederum der, das Konzil möge keine unnötigen Fixierung bringen, es möge darauf verzichten, die Einzelheiten des Inspirationsvorganges zu beschreiben, wie schon das Tridentinum und das Vaticanum I nicht ohne guten Grund darauf verzichtet

haben. Der erste Teil von Abschnitt 8 wäre also stark zu kürzen und durch einen einfachen Hinweis auf die früheren Konzilien zu ersetzen.

Neben diesem negativen Wunsch drängt sich aber auch eine positive Überlegung auf. Die Schilderung des Inspirationsvorganges geschieht nämlich in Abschnitt 8 in Anschluß an Vorstellungen, die vor allen Dingen durch Augustinus in der lateinischen Kirche angesiedelt wurden. Augustinus ist dabei seinerseits durch einige Vermittlungen hindurch weitgehendst von Philo abhängig, der seinerseits wiederum seine Inspirationsvorstellung eigenartigerweise nicht aus der prophetischen Überlieferung seines Volkes, sondern aus der Mystik des mittleren Platonismus und überhaupt des Hellenismus seiner Zeit geschöpft hat. Daß diese heidnische Inspirationsvorstellung sich durch die Autorität Augustins später in solchem Maß durchsetzen konnte, muß als ein Unglück angesehen werden. Sie schließt nämlich zwei Akzentsetzungen ein, die für eine christliche Inspirationslehre denkbar ungeeignet sind: Erstens geht sie im Anschluß an die griechische Identitätsmystik von einer vollkommenen Übermächtigung des Menschen durch die Gottheit aus; der Mensch wird zum willenlosen Instrument der Gottheit (die Ausdrücke *organon* und *instrumentum* kommen denn auch in unserem Schema vor, obgleich Abschnitt 9 einen wirklichen Fortschritt bringt, in dem er auch den menschlichen Verfasser «auctor» nennt – das müßte konsequenterweise bereits in 8 zum Ausdruck gebracht werden; Ansatzpunkte dazu sind vorhanden). Mit dieser Entmächtigung der menschlichen Person hängt ein zweites Phänomen zusammen: der ungeschichtliche Charakter dieser Inspirationsvorstellung. Was sich hier abspielt, hat keinen irgendwie konstitutiven Zusammenhang mit Geschichte, weil ja der Mensch völlig verschlungen ist von dem allein handelnden und sprechenden Gott. Das eigentümliche der biblischen Offenbarung aber ist es gerade, daß sie Ausdruck einer Geschichte ist, die Gott mit den Menschen macht. Das ließe sich übrigens auf die ganze Breite der Religionsgeschichte anwenden: Der Unterschied der Bibel zu den Heiligen Büchern etwa des Hinduismus oder des Buddhismus oder des Islam ist es gerade, daß die letzteren als ein zeitlose göttliches Diktat gelten, während die Bibel Niederschlag des geschichtlichen Dialogs Gottes mit den Menschen ist und nur durch diese Geschichte hindurch und in ihr Sinn und Bedeutung hat. Obgleich also der heilige Schriftsteller weit mehr als ein Organ des Gemeingeistes irgend einer Zeit oder eines Volkes ist (eine Lehre, die in Nummer 10 verurteilt wird), nämlich ein persönlich von Gott Berufener, in Dienst Gestellter, ist es ihm doch wesentlich, in einer heiligen Geschichte zu stehen, die Gott mit den Menschen macht; er ist Organ Gottes, gewiß, aber er ist es an einem ganz bestimmten geschichtlichen Ort, nämlich nur so, daß er zugleich Organ des Leibes Christi, Organ des Volkes Gottes in seinem Bund mit Gott ist. Wenn Abschnitt 10 nach der Verurteilung der Idee des Gemeingeistes

sagt, es sei aber richtig, daß die Beachtung der geschichtlichen Umstände für die Exegese sehr nützlich sein könne, so zeigt dies, daß der Verfasser das eigentliche Anliegen, um das es hier geht, gar nicht zu Gesicht bekommen hat: die notwendige Einfügung der Heiligen Schrift in den Organismus des Gottesvolkes, auf der ja erst die Möglichkeit des kirchlichen Lehramtes und jener lebendigen Überlieferung gründet, die der Schrift ihre wahre Bedeutung gibt. Eine aus dem eigentlich Christlichen entwickelte Inspirationslehre umfaßt die Grundkategorien der Person, die Gott als solche (und nicht als organon) anruft und in Dienst nimmt, der Geschichte, des Gottesvolkes: lauter Kategorien, die in der philonischen Lehre gar nicht auftreten können. Gewiß, es ist trotzdem alles Wesentliche in der katholischen Theologie immer bewahrt worden, aber eine einheitliche Inspirationslehre ließ sich nicht entwickeln, sondern es blieb bei einer mühsamen Zusammenfügung von teils recht heterogenen Elementen. Es wäre ein Unglück für Theologie und Kirche, wenn die philonisch-augustinische Inspirationslehre nach Jahrhunderten, in denen man sie auf die Lehrbücher beschränkte, gerade in dem Augenblick kirchlich sanktioniert würde, in dem sich endlich die Möglichkeit anbietet, eine Inspirationslehre genuin-biblischer Prägung zu entwickeln. Aus diesem Grunde ist, um das Bisherige zusammen zu fassen, zweierlei zu wünschen:

1. die Beschreibung am Anfang von 8 ist, wie gesagt, zu tilgen.
2. In 8-10 sind Ergänzungen vorzunehmen, die den menschlichen Verfasser als wirklichen auctor erkennen lassen und auf seine Einfügung in das Volk Gottes hinweisen. Das kann so diskret geschehen, daß nun nicht umgekehrt eine neue Theorie an Stelle der alten dogmatisiert wird (was sinnvoller Weise nicht verlangt werden darf), sondern daß die Wege für das Weiterdenken in jeder Hinsicht offen bleiben, und nur jene Irrtümer ausgeschlossen werden, die wirklich dem Offenbarungsglauben als solchen zuwider sind.

Mit dem Gesagten fällt auch Licht auf die Frage der Irrtumslosigkeit und Historizität der Heiligen Schrift, die in den folgenden Abschnitten angegangen wird. Das Schema spricht hier eine sehr scharfe Sprache. Es deduziert: Gott ist die höchste Wahrheit und kann sich nicht irren. Gott hat die Schrift diktiert. Also ist die Schrift genau so irrtumsfrei wie Gott selbst «in qualibet re religiosa vel profana» (Z 27). Nun drückt aber die hier unterstellte Diktattheorie, wie eben gesagt, gar keinen spezifisch christlichen Gedanken aus. So braucht es nicht zu verwundern, daß sich in profanen für die eigentliche Aussageabsicht der Schrift belanglosen Dingen nach der einmütigen und kaum noch zu widerlegenden Ansicht der Historiker durchaus auch Versehen und Irrtümer in der Bibel finden. Man kann auf Kleinigkeiten verweisen, wie die Tatsache, daß Markus (2,26) vom

Hohenpriester Abiathar redet, statt von dessen Vater Achimelech, ein Irrtum, den dann Matthäus und Lukas in ihrem Text korrigiert haben. Man könnte auf größere Dinge wie auf die bekannten Abweichungen der Chronikbücher von den Königsbüchern, auf die ungeschichtliche Bezeichnung Belsazars als Sohn Nebukadnezars bei Daniel u. a. verweisen; eines dürfte heute klar sein: Es war offensichtlich nicht der Sinn der Inspiration, in dem breiten Horizont der menschlichen Aussagen jede Randunschärfe in den beiläufig mitgesagten Dingen zu vermeiden, sondern es war ihr Sinn, in wahrhaft menschlichen Worten den Menschen das Geheimnis Gottes nahekomen zu lassen. Die wahre Menschlichkeit der Schrift, hinter der sich umso größer das Geheimnis des göttlichen Erbarmens erhebt, kommt uns erst allmählich zum Bewußtsein; irrtumlos ist und bleibt die Schrift ohne Zweifel in all dem, was sie eigentlich aussagen will, aber nicht notwendig in dem in der Aussage Mitgesagten, das kein Teil der eigentlichen Aussage selber ist. Deshalb muß, in Übereinstimmung mit dem, was in Abschnitt 13 recht gut ausgeführt wird, die Irrtumslosigkeit der Schrift auf die vere enuntiata beschränkt werden, wenn nicht die historische Vernunft in einen geradezu ausweglosen Konflikt geführt werden soll.

Der Schluß des 2. Kapitels fordert nocheinmal eine Bemerkung heraus: Es wird Hebr 4,15 zitiert: Der Herr ist uns in allem ähnlich geworden «prae-ter peccatum». Der Verfasser des Schemas scheint indes mit der Schrift nicht zufrieden; er fügt hinzu: et ignorantiam. Das ist, um offen zu sein, ein wenig erbauliches Verfahren, das vor allem auch die getrennten Brüder mit Mißbehagen erfüllen wird. Überdies muß diese «Ergänzung» der Schrift umso mehr bedenklich stimmen, als in Mk 13,32 ausdrücklich das Gegenteil gesagt wird, wenn es heißt: «Über jenen Tag und jene Stunde aber weiß niemand etwas, auch nicht die Engel im Himmel, auch nicht der Sohn, sondern nur der Vater». Wie immer dieser Vers auch auszulegen ist, er zeigt auf jeden Fall, daß in einem bestimmten (gewiß näherer Erläuterung fähigen und bedürftigen) Sinn von einem Nichtwissen des Menschen Jesus gesprochen werden darf und daß es sich im vorliegenden Text um eine recht anfechtbare Ergänzung der Schrift handelt, die zu streichen ist, zumal sie auch in der ersten Vorlage nicht gestanden hatte.

Die restlichen Wünsche, die im Rahmen dieses Frangenkreises anzumelden sind, können nach allem Gesagten kurz dargestellt werden. Auch hier geht es im Wesentlichen einfach darum, die Wege da offen zu lassen, wo es nicht notwendig ist, sie zu versperren. Das gilt zunächst in Caput IV Abschnitt 19. Wenn hier die Verfasserschaft der vier bestimmten Personen Matthäus, Markus, Lukas, Johannes mit einem ausdrücklichen «tenet ecclesia» versehen wird, so dürfte doch wohl des Guten zu viel getan sein. Man sollte die Diskussion der Matthäusfrage und des Johannesproblems nicht glauben rein von oben lösen zu müssen. Daß Fragen, die einmal aufgetreten sind, ihre eigene Wucht haben und nicht von außen abzuschneiden

sind, sondern von innen her reifen müssen, zeigt die Nachgeschichte der Bibelkommissions-Entscheidungen von 1906 (Pentateuch) und von 1908 (Isaias) deutlich genug. Man sollte sich also damit begnügen, den apostolischen Ursprung der Evangelien zu betonen und allenfalls hinzufügen, daß die Zuweisung an die vier von der Überlieferung genannten Autoren non sine ratione iusta geschieht.

Ebenso erscheint es unangemessen, wenn bei Betonung der objektiven Wahrheit der Geschichte Jesu Kindheitsgeschichte, Auferstehung von den Toten und Himmelfahrt in gleicher Linie nebeneinander genannt werden. Eine derartig ins Detail gehende Festlegung überschreitet einfach die Möglichkeiten eines Konzils und bleibt dabei doch außerstande, den vielfältig nuancierten Tatbestand adäquat einzufangen. Wieder möchte man an den notwendigen Unterschied zwischen dem Zeugnis eines Konzils und der Analyse eines Lehrbuches erinnern. Der angestrebte Zweck wird vollkommen erreicht, wenn gesagt wird, daß vor allem jene Fakten keinen Zweifel dulden, die den Glauben selbst berühren. Diese Aussage auf die Einzelheiten hin zu entfalten, muß Sache der Theologen bleiben.

Wieder etwas anders liegt der Vorbehalt, den Nummer 22 herausfordert. Gewiß ist es richtig, daß man die These ablehnen muß, die in den Evangelien berichteten Worte Jesu seien meistens gar nicht Worte des Herrn, sondern des Evangelisten oder der Gemeinde. Kein katholischer Theologe behauptet solches. Aber das Problem, um das es geht, erscheint dabei doch allzusehr vereinfacht. Denn wir wissen heute, daß die Gemeinde einerseits nicht gewagt hat, Herrenworte zu «erfinden», sondern sich wirklich an das gebunden wußte, was die Augenzeuge gesehen und gehört hatten; daß sie sich aber wohl ermächtigt und verpflichtet wußte, diese Herrenworte nicht einfach archivarisch wie die Worte eines Toten weiterzugeben, sondern sie als Worte eines Lebendigen, das Christus heute, weitergegeben hat, sie in der Vollmacht des Heiligen Geistes weitertrug (was wir Überlieferung heißen) und auch ihr kirchlichen Heute in diese Worte mithineingehört hat, wie die Geschichte der synoptischen Überlieferung aufs deutlichste beweist. Nichts ist dem katholischen Verständnis von Schrift und Überlieferung, von Christus und Kirche gemäßer als das, aber der Verfasser ist wiederum (ähnlich wie bei der Frage Inspiration und Gemeinde) zum wirklichen positiven Problem gar nicht vorgestoßen, sondern ist, von dem Gespenst des Modernismus geblendet, bei einer Gefahr stehen geblieben, in der es im Grunde um etwas ganz anderes, eben um die Idee des Gemeingeistes, geht, die vom modernistischen Schreck her manchen Theologen offenbar noch so sehr in den Gliedern liegt, daß sie, wo sie Gemeinde hören, überhaupt nichts anderes mehr denken können. Es wird kaum noch möglich sein, das Positive auszudrücken, um das es hier geht, aber es wird gut sein, den Text durch eine einfache Einfügung (solam mentem – solius communitatis S. 18 Z 3 und 4) offener zu machen.

Anhang. Altes Testament, Neues Testament und Weltgeschichte

Zum bisher übersprungenen Caput III mögen mir abschließend noch zwei kleine Bemerkungen gestattet sein, die über das Inspirationsthema hinausführen auf das grundsätzliche Gesamtverständnis der Heilsgeschichte Gottes mit den Menschen hin. Da findet sich zunächst in Abschnitt 15 eine Formulierung, die der Einheit der Heilsgeschichte nicht genügend gerecht zu werden scheint, wenn gesagt wird, in jenen Dingen, die sich auf die Grundlegung der christlichen Religion beziehen, bestehe die Autorität des Alten Testaments fort. Das ist zu wenig und zu viel in einem. Denn mit einer solchen Formulierung wird der Eindruck erweckt, als ob bestimmte Teile des Alten Testaments sich nicht auf die Grundlegung der christlichen Religion bezögen und daher einfachhin vergangen seien, als ob andere Dinge gleichsam schon direct christlich seien und so als solche weiterbestehen würden. Die paulinische und überhaupt neutestamentliche Sicht des Alten Testaments ist eine andere: sie klingt in dem Zitat an, das der Text des Schemas selbst bietet: *Quaecumque enim scripta sunt, ad nostram doctrinam scripta sunt [...]* (Rom 15,4) – das ganze Alte Testament redet von Christus, ist christologisch gemeint und ist als solches Grundlegung, Fundament der christlichen Religion, nicht bloß einzelne Stücke daraus. Aber auch das ganze Alte Testament muß gleichsam durch die christologische Verwandlung hindurch, gilt nicht aus sich heraus, sondern von Christus her und auf Christus hin, der erst den Schleier wegzieht, der über dem Antlitz des Moses gelegen hatte (2 Kor 3,12-18).

Noch ein Stück weiter führt die Überlegung, zu der der folgende Abschnitt 16 Anlaß gibt, wenn es heißt: «Gottes Hinwendung zum Menschen zielte vom Sündenfall Adams an darauf ab, daß durch die Verheißungen an die Väter, durch die prophetische Vorankündigung des Erlösers und durch die fortwährend deutlichere Botschaft von ihm jeder menschlichen Kreatur der Zugang zur Heilshoffnung offen stünde». Dieser Satz ist richtig. Aber er berücksichtigt in seiner Formulierung doch wohl zu wenig den ungeheuren Wandel des Welt- und Geschichtsbildes, der sich in den letzten hundert Jahren zugetragen und der christlichen Botschaft einen ganz neuen Hintergrund gegeben hat, sodaß sie vor diesem Hintergrund sich selbst neu auslegen muß, wenn sie in ihrer alten Wahrheit verständlich bleiben will. Wir wissen heute, daß die Geschichte Israels und der Kirche nur einen winzigen Ausschnitt aus der Gesamtgeschichte der Menschheit darstellt, daß also rein quantitativ gesehen der Anteil der sogenannten Heilsgeschichte an der Weltgeschichte verschwindend gering ist. Das alte Wort von der Ecclesia ab Abel gewinnt damit eine neue Bedeutung; es läßt uns wissen, daß dennoch diese ganze Geschichte letzterdings christologisch strukturiert ist und in ihrer Ganzheit verborgenerweise von der Helligkeit jener schmalen Lichtspur lebt, die mit Abraham beginnt und in Christus sich als das wahre Licht eines jeden Menschen enthüllt, der in

diese Welt kommt. Ein Konzil, auf das heute die ganze, auch die nicht-christliche Welt hinschaut, sollte auch erkennen lassen, daß es um die ganze Breite und Höhe, Länge und Tiefe, um die wahrhaft kosmische Dimensionierung des Christusheiles weiß, daß es nicht in den Gittern eines mittelalterlichen Geschichtsbildes gefangen so etwas wie einen kirchlichen Provinzialismus pflegt, sondern die Frage des Menschen von heute verstanden hat und bereit ist, ihr Antwort zu geben. Es müßte also in der Formulierung, deutlicher als es geschieht, zum Vorschein kommen, daß das Christusheil, das sich in der Geschichte Israels und der Kirche manifestiert, nicht an die äußeren Mauern Israels und der Kirche gebunden ist, sondern allezeit allen offen stand: *Ab exordio generis humani, quicumque in eum crediderunt eumque utcumque intellexerunt et secundum eius praecepta pie et iuste vixerunt, quandolibet et ubilibet fuerint, per eum procul dubio salvi facti sunt* – so hat Augustinus einst in seiner Sprache ausgedrückt (Epist 102,12 PL 33, 374); das Konzil müßte es in *seiner*, in unsere Sprache neu sagen.

Es bleibt noch hinzuweisen auf das *Caput V De sacra scriptura in ecclesia*, das keine besonderen Fragen aufwirft und in manchen Stücken einen wirklichen Fortschritt darstellt. Allerdings fällt auf, das es sich mit Ausnahme der ersten beiden Abschnitte engstens mit dem vom Sekretariat für die Förderung der Einheit der Christen vorgelegten Schema «*De verbo Dei*» berührt. Um Überschneidungen zu vermeiden, wäre es demnach wünschenswert, dieses *Caput V* einfach durch das besagte Schema zu ersetzen, das seinem Thema noch mehr gerecht werden dürfte und für eine konziliare Verabschiedung daher noch besser geeignet ist.

Noch eine Schlußbemerkung sei gestattet. Der Historiker des ersten ökumenischen Konzils, Eusebius von Caesarea, berichtet, daß Konstantin sich, nachdem er die äußeren Feinde der Kirche besiegt hatte, zum Krieg entschloß gegen den unsichtbaren Feind, der die Kirche in Verwirrung stürzte: Er ließ die ökumenische Synode zusammentreten wie eine Streitmacht Gottes (*Vita Const III 5/6*). Dahinter steht ein Bild, in dem seit den Anfängen die Kirche sich selbst und das christliche Leben auslegt: die Idee der *militia Christi*, des christlichen Lebens als Agon, als Wettstreit gegen die finsternen Mächte. Die Synode ist versammelt als Streitmacht Gottes. Aber man darf dabei nie vergessen, daß mit dem Kampf, zu dem Christus seine Miliz versammelt, nicht der Streit untereinander und gegeneinander, sondern der gemeinsame Kampf gegen die Mächte der Finsternis gemeint ist. Deswegen kann es nicht der Sinn des Konzils sein, die internen Fragen der Theologie autoritativ abzuschneiden, sondern das gemeinsame Zeugnis des Glaubens gegen den Unglauben in dieser Welt abzulegen. So manche Texte legen allzusehr die Idee nahe, hier wolle *eine* Schulrichtung die andere entgültig aus dem Felde schlagen und es kommt einem ein bitteres Wort von Lubac in den Sinn, mit dem er seine Ausführungen über den

Ursprung der Gottesidee verteidigt, wenn er über seine Richter sagt: «In ihrem engen Kreis der Schulstreitigkeiten eingeschlossen, haben sie guten Glaubens gemeint, diese Seiten seien für sie – d. h., wie sie meinten gegen sie – geschrieben. Sie, die wunderbarer Weise selbst gegen den Lärm der Angriffe gegen unseren Glauben an Gott geschützt sind, scheinen nicht einen Augenblick den Hauptgegner geahnte zu haben, gegen sie in Wirklichkeit gerichtet waren. Dieser Gegner ist indes Legion» (Über die Wege Gottes 213). Die *militia Christi* hat in der Tat in dieser Weltstunde anderes zu tun als sich in den Dienst von Schulstreitigkeiten zu stellen. Die Welt erwartet nicht weitere Verfeinerungen des Systems von uns, sondern sie erwartet die Antwort des Glaubens in der Stunde des Unglaubens.

JOSEPH RATZINGER

Text 6 (October 17, 1965) in its Original Latin¹¹⁸

P. 10, l. 22 ss textus sic componi posset:

Subobscure novit ipsius hominis bonam voluntatem per se solam non sufficere, ut vires, quas ipse suscitavit et quae eum postea opprimere aut ei servire possunt, recte dirigantur, quibus pedetentim imperium omnium sibi arripere videtur. At quo tendere debet? Cui sensui confidere potest?

Sic in medio omnium novitatum omnisque progressus externi veteres illae generis humani quaestiones manent et urgent: Quid significationis in dolore, in malo, in morte, quae non obstante tanto progressu existunt? Quid post hanc vitam subsequetur? Quemnam sensum habent tum existentia tum conamina hominum? Ad quid haec omnia?

Non desunt, qui ex ipsis adinventionibus hominum veram et plenam redemptionem generis humani sperant et in futuro regno hominis promissa illa, quae fides de regno Dei expectat, adimpletum iri autumant. Alii de sensu omnium conaminum hominis desperantes illam fortitudinem laudant, quae vitam sensu carentem tolerat eamque proprio sensu pro posse transfundit. Ecclesia autem regnum illius hominis expectat, qui simul verus Deus est et in quo regnum Dei et regnum hominis coincidunt. In Eo etiam veram amplitudinem vocationis humanae cognoscit, quae usque ad participationem Dei extenditur et saepe vas conditionis humanae quasi dirumpere videtur. Homo, cuius vocatio suam ipsius essentiam infinite transcendit, nullum aequilibrium in seipso invenire potest, quia eius desiderium rebus

¹¹⁸ Institut catholique de Paris, Fonds P. Haubtmann, Ha 55, no. 1927. Above, the text is introduced on pp. 291-292 and presented in English translation on pp. 292-293.

finitis semper maius est eisque numquam impleri potest. In vultu Jesu Christi Crucifixi Ecclesia insuper cognoscit hominem non solum vulneratum esse vulnere divini amoris, qui eum tetigit et cor inquietum reddidit, sed etiam vulnerare propriae infidelitatis, qua se a Deo avertit quaerens solum, quae sua sunt et haud raro seipsum mordens ac devorans (cf. Gal. 5, 15).

Sic Ecclesia in Christo, Deo vero et homine vero, responsum definitivum invenire credit pro quaestionibus urgentioribus generis humani. Qua de causa in ea luce, quam Deus in facie Christi splendescere fecit (2 Cor 4, 6), quaestionibus etiam hodiernis respondere intendit.

Sincerum tamen dialogum cum omnibus hominibus instituere potest et debet, in quantum ipsa lumen, quod sibi in fide Christi datum credit, quaestionibus communibus affert et ex altera parte in lumine veritatum humanarum ipsam fidem suam profundius intelligere quaerit.

Sic homines invitat nuntium audire, quem Ecclesia ex fide sua profert sicut et ipsa audire vult tam quaestiones quam responsa hominum, quibus unum genus humanum unamque historiam efformat.

Schell House Jesuit Residence
John Carroll University
20700 North Park Blvd
University Heights, OH
USA

JARED WICKS, S.J.

SUMMARY

Further research on the theological contributions of experts (*periti*) at Vatican Council II has led to identifying six texts by Prof. Joseph Ratzinger, which are presented here. The theological themes expressed in these texts include (1) an insistence on the interior dynamics and questioning of human beings in conceiving the present-day "hearer of the word" to which Vatican II will speak. One is not surprised by (2) the Professor's repeated call for doctrinal formulations drawn from the biblical and patristic sources (thus, *ressourcement*) instead of borrowing from recent theological textbooks. The lecture of October 10, 1962, develops, among other topics, (3) an impressive account of God's self-revelation, which has primacy over the codified witness given by Scripture and tradition, which derive from the one *fons* that is God's self-manifestation. On biblical inspiration (4) the Council should not attempt a systematic account but simply make reference to essential aspects: those active as human authors, their context which is salvation history, and the communities that they served by writing. All missionary activity in the Church (5) arises ultimately from God's love poured out upon the world in the missions of the Son and Spirit and such action has its *summa* in Jesus' inaugural proclamation, "Be converted and believe in the Gospel" (Mk 1:15). In approaching its dialogue with the contemporary world, (6) the Church speaks out of a complex conviction combining awareness that human beings are wounded and weakened by sin along with deep confidence in Christ as the one whose face reflects divine light (2 Cor 4:6) to enlighten human beings and give them the strength needed for living humane and holy lives.

Ulteriori ricerche sui contributi teologici degli esperti (*periti*) al Concilio Vaticano II hanno portato all'identificazione di sei testi composti dal prof. Joseph Ratzinger, che si presenta in questa sede. Si nota tra i temi teologici di rilievo nei testi del peritus Ratzinger (1°) l'insistenza sulle dinamiche interiori e gli interrogativi dell'uomo come caratteristiche dell'uditore odierno del messaggio cristiano. Non sorprende (2°) la chiamata insistente a una formulazione dottrinale che attinge dalle fonti bibliche e patristiche (*ressourcement*) piuttosto che a dare conferma alle tesi dei manuali recenti. La conferenza del 10.X.62 elabora, tra altri temi, in modo impressionante (3°) l'auto-rivelazione divina nel suo primato sulle testimonianze codificate nella Scrittura e nella tradizione, le quali provengono dalla *fons* dell'auto-manifestazione di Dio. La presentazione conciliare dell'ispirazione biblica (4°), pur evitando di tentare un'elaborazione sistematica, deve attendere all'autore umano, all'ambiente della storia della salvezza e alla comunità in cui l'autore esercita il suo ministero della parola scritta. Tutta la missione della Chiesa (5°) proviene dall'amore divino riversato sul mondo nelle missioni del Figlio e dello Spirito e ha la sua *summa* nella parola inaugurale di Gesù, «Convertitevi e credete nel vangelo» (Mc 1:15). La Chiesa porta al dialogo col mondo odierno (6°) una convinzione complessa che combina la consapevolezza del vulnere del peccato che affligge gli uomini con una fiducia profonda in Cristo, come colui sulla cui faccia risplende la luce divina (2 Cor 4:6), che illumina l'uomo e gli dà la forza necessaria per una vita sana e santa.