



UNIVERSITÄTS-  
BIBLIOTHEK  
HEIDELBERG

---

**Francia. Forschungen zur westeuropäischen Geschichte**  
Herausgegeben vom Deutschen Historischen Institut Paris  
(Institut historique allemand)  
Band 17/3 (1990)

DOI: 10.11588/fr.1990.3.56686

---

#### Rechtshinweis

Bitte beachten Sie, dass das Digitalisat urheberrechtlich geschützt ist. Erlaubt ist aber das Lesen, das Ausdrucken des Textes, das Herunterladen, das Speichern der Daten auf einem eigenen Datenträger soweit die vorgenannten Handlungen ausschließlich zu privaten und nicht-kommerziellen Zwecken erfolgen. Eine darüber hinausgehende unerlaubte Verwendung, Reproduktion oder Weitergabe einzelner Inhalte oder Bilder können sowohl zivil- als auch strafrechtlich verfolgt werden.

pouvait trouver une autre Allemagne, une Allemagne habitée par Kant, Hegel, Hölderlin, Aristote, Parménide.

Faire un procès à Heidegger n'a guère d'autre sens que celui du refus de la pensée. Les grands penseurs ne sont pas des êtres supérieurs qui seraient à l'abri de la sottise et des vicissitudes de l'histoire: un philosophe de talent peut aussi être un Allemand moyen. Ce qui reste essentiel sont donc l'œuvre et l'enseignement de Heidegger, avec tout ce qu'ils continuent à nous donner à penser. En ce qui concerne les événements de 1933 la question est, comme le suggèrent G. SCHMIDT, O. PÖGGELER et M. MÜLLER, celle d'une philosophie pratique. N'y a-t-il pas une limite pour une ontologie fondamentale qui reste prise à bien des égards dans les mailles de la métaphysique et de son destin nihiliste, dans la mesure où le penser est fondamentalement un questionner qui reste sans réponse? L'ontologie qui pose l'identité d'un destin de l'Être peut-elle penser l'altérité requise pour assumer l'éthique et la politique? La question n'est donc pas d'accuser ou de disculper Heidegger. Elle est de savoir ce que peut être la notion de responsabilité à l'époque de l'extrême accomplissement de la métaphysique.

Jean-Marie VAYSSE, Toulouse

Robert STUPPERICH, unter Mitarbeit von Martin STUPPERICH, Otto Dibelius. Ein evangelischer Bischof im Umbruch der Zeiten, Göttingen (Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht) 1989, 706 S. – Edwin H. ROBERTSON, Dietrich Bonhoeffer. Leben und Verkündigung. Mit einer Einführung von Renate BETHGE. Aus dem Englischen von Marianne MÜHLENBERG, Göttingen (Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht) 1989, 335 S.

Though the *Kirchenkampf* understandably provides a major focal point for analysis of twentieth-century German Protestantism, most scholars would probably agree that the Third Reich constitutes only one chapter, however dramatic, in the larger story of the churches' struggle to forge a coherent identity in the face of far-reaching cultural and institutional change. Successive political upheavals over the past seventy-five years have nullified the historic equation of »throne and altar« and forced churchmen to grapple in new ways with questions about the nature and limits of secular authority. At the same time, long-term forces of modernization have threatened to undermine many traditional assumptions about the nature, structure, and purposes of the church itself. As a result, discussion of recent church history is rarely possible without reference to broader social, political, and cultural currents in German history.

Though seldom addressed directly, this larger historical framework is basic to the concerns of both Robert Stupperich and Edwin Robertson. Their books deal with two influential modern churchmen, both of whom are crucial to a balanced assessment of developments within Protestantism since World War I. Otto Dibelius and Dietrich Bonhoeffer shared much in common. Both were trained theologians, steeped in the broad tradition of Lutheran piety, who worked tirelessly to promote an authentic religious witness responsive to the challenges of contemporary society. Both drew inspiration from contacts with foreign churches, especially in England and the United States. Both were adamant in their rejection of National Socialism and played important roles in the Confessing Church; Bonhoeffer joined the conspiracy against Hitler and ultimately paid with his life. Both men, as it happened, were also accomplished amateur musicians. For all their similarities, however, they belonged to different generations and embodied significantly different tendencies within the church of their time. Otto Dibelius (1880–1967), who grew up in the Berlin of Bismarck and Wilhelm II., lived to see the city he loved destroyed by war and divided by the Wall. An involuntary witness to discontinuity in political affairs, he served as a persuasive apologist for continuity in church affairs. Though anything but a hidebound traditionalist, he remained unswerving in his conviction that the basic values of the historic Protestant *Volkskirche* could and should be

adapted to meet the new realities of post-monarchical Germany – a project outlined most memorably in his much-discussed book, *Das Jahrhundert der Kirche* (1926). For more than half a century he provided vigorous leadership in defence of his church's institutional prerogatives and its right to an authoritative voice in public life. He was no less vigorous in his efforts to make the church a more vital spiritual force in the lives of its members by fostering better preaching, more active piety, and more intensive pastoral care. Dietrich Bonhoeffer (1906–1945) was born the year Dibelius began his parish ministry, and he had little exposure to the Wilhelmine certainties that formed the bedrock of the older man's outlook. Bonhoeffer's own passionate quest for Christian integrity, documented in such modern classics as »Nachfolge« (1937), led not to an affirmation of Dibelius' Volkskirche model but to an increasingly radical critique of traditional formulations regarding the church and the responsibilities of believers in a »world come of age«. If Dibelius helped shape the imposing institutional structure of postwar German Protestantism, with its well-funded network of federal and ecumenical ties, Bonhoeffer's legacy lay in the abiding challenge of his personal moral witness and the complex resonance of his famous prison-cell speculations about the future of a »religionless Christianity«.

Though Dibelius could point to more obvious practical accomplishments during his lifetime, Bonhoeffer has clearly attracted more lasting and widespread theological interest; in the preface to his book, Robert Stupperich notes that Dibelius' intellectual world »blieb [der jüngeren Generation] oft fremd« (p. 13). While Bonhoeffer has been the subject of countless studies, including substantial biographies by Eberhard Bethge (1967) and Mary Bosanquet (1968), Stupperich's book is the first comprehensive treatment of Dibelius to appear in print. Stupperich provides a sure-handed analysis of Dibelius' life and times, based on thorough research in published and unpublished sources. He traces in detail the several main stages of Dibelius' career, from his rise to prominence as General Superintendent of the Kurmark in the late 1920s (a position stripped from him at the beginning of the *Kirchenkampf*), through his decade of service on behalf of the Confessing Church, to his return to prominence after 1945, when he became a noted public figure as bishop of Berlin-Brandenburg, chairman of the national Protestant church federation, and (from 1954 to 1960) president of the World Council of Churches.

Stupperich's primary aim is to identify the inner consistency of purpose that marked all of Dibelius' work despite drastic changes in his external circumstances. Dibelius once described his own ecclesiastical outlook as typical of an earlier era »in der nichts alltäglicher war, als mit dem Herzen ein pietistischer Konservativer und mit dem Kopf ein kritischer Liberaler zu sein« (p. 609). With his innate tolerance for diversity and instinct for mediation, he was a born ecumenist, a man very much made in the image of his native Prussian Union Church, with its mingling of Lutheran and Reformed elements. Appropriately enough, he belonged to none of the established theological factions in Germany and drew inspiration from traditions as diverse as Scottish Presbyterianism and high church Swedish Lutheranism. During and after the *Kirchenkampf*, he sought to make common cause both with Barthians, many of whom faulted him for being too much of an institutional loyalist, and with Lutheran conservatives, who sometimes found him too open to non-Lutheran views. But if he steadfastly promoted a spirit of accommodation within the church itself, he just as steadfastly refused to accommodate the church to the dictates of secular authority, especially after 1933, when the state seemed in the grip of what he believed to be fundamentally anti-Christian religious loyalties. As Stupperich shows in some detail, the precedent of the *Kirchenkampf* also colored his sometimes controversial views of the GDR, which he eventually concluded could not be recognized by Christians as having legitimate authority in the sense of Romans 13.

Stupperich provides a balanced but on the whole warmly sympathetic portrait of Dibelius as churchman and citizen. He is fair-minded and irenic in his treatment of Dibelius' debates, with Barth and others, over the nature of the church and the proper norms for civic engagement.

Appropriately enough, the longest section of the book is devoted to the period after 1945. Stupperich succeeds in conveying the impressive range of Dibelius' activities, especially in the early postwar years, though the topical arrangement of his material sometimes fails to do full justice of the complex interrelationships between ecclesiastical reconstruction and Cold War politics that marked this turbulent period. To be sure, Stupperich seems less concerned with presenting a definitive interpretation of Dibelius' times than with delineating the essential components of Dibelius' personal churchmanship. His ultimate evaluation is thoroughly positive: »was er [Dibelius] als die Aufgabe der gesamten Kirche proklamierte, hat er für seine Person erfüllt, nämlich die Forderung, der Öffentlichkeit ins Gewissen zu reden und Versöhnung zu predigen« (p. 618).

Edwin Robertson's biography of Bonhoeffer first appeared in English in 1987. Robertson helped prepare the English editions of many of Bonhoeffer's writings; he was also instrumental in arranging for publication of Eberhard Bethge's biography in English. The present volume makes no pretense of supplanting Bethge's magisterial work. Presumably intended for a general readership, it offers a straightforward account of Bonhoeffer's life and thought, largely unencumbered by intricate historical or theological analysis. The narrative ends rather abruptly with Bonhoeffer's execution in April 1945; it would probably have benefited from a brief conclusion, recapitulating some of the arguments in support of the author's contention that »Bonhoeffer war ein radikaler Theologe – aber gleichzeitig, wie Luther, immer in der biblischen Grundlage verwurzelt« (p. 27). The German edition includes an informative essay by Renate Bethge, Bonhoeffer's niece, on life in the Bonhoeffer family during the Nazi era. It also quietly corrects one or two minor errors in the original English version (including, interestingly, the confusion of Otto Dibelius with his cousin, the theologian Martin Debelius).

David J. DIEPHOUSE, Grand Rapids, Michigan

Gérard CHOLVY, Yves-Marie HILAIRE, Histoire Religieuse de la France Contemporaine, Bd. 3: 1930–1988, Toulouse (Editions Privat) 1988, 569 S.

Mit dem vorliegenden Band kommt die große Darstellung der zeitgenössischen Religiosität in Frankreich zum Abschluß<sup>1</sup>. Die Entwicklungen im Katholizismus stehen naturgemäß im Vordergrund; aber die gleichzeitigen Vorgänge im Protestantismus sowie im Judentum werden insgesamt angemessen berücksichtigt.

Das Werk ist in zwei annähernd gleiche Teile gegliedert. Der erste behandelt die Jahre 1930 bis 1960 und ist konzentriert auf das Aufblühen des Christentums, seine religiösen, intellektuellen, kulturellen, aber auch sozialen Leistungen (*L'apogée du rôle des chrétiens dans la société*, S. 13–255). Man mag fragen, ob die Rolle des Katholizismus in der Vichy-Zeit nicht ein wenig zu positiv gesehen wird; jedenfalls ist die Behauptung allzu undifferenziert, diese Kirche habe – wie in Italien und Spanien! – sich als ernsthafter Hemmschuh gegen die Faschisierung der Gesellschaft ausgewirkt (S. 82). Nichtsdestoweniger führten Krieg und Niederlage auch in Frankreich zu religiöser Besinnung und Vertiefung; brachten dann vor allem – wie in anderen Ländern Europas und vornehmlich in den USA – die Nachkriegsjahre viel soziales und politisches Engagement aus betont christlicher Verantwortung – wie u. a. am MRP mit seiner Familien- und Sozialpolitik und insbesondere dem Eintreten für ein neues Europa deutlich wird. Ausgesprochen spannend liest sich danach der Abschnitt über die religionssoziologischen Erhebungen in den verschiedensten Teilen Frankreichs (S. 167–220), weil hier belegt ist, wie wenig selbstverständlich man von einer einliedrig fortschreitenden Entchristlichung des Landes reden kann. Neben der Erosion kirchlicher Bindungen begegnet Stabilität, neben Niedergängen stehen Aufschwünge und offenkundige Vertiefungen.

1 Vgl. FRANCIA 16/3 (1989) S. 208–210.