

English summarie

Objekttyp: **ReferenceList**

Zeitschrift: **Revue de Théologie et de Philosophie**

Band (Jahr): **48 (1998)**

Heft 2: **Figures du néo-protestantisme**

PDF erstellt am: **16.07.2024**

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Inhalten der Zeitschriften. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern. Die auf der Plattform e-periodica veröffentlichten Dokumente stehen für nicht-kommerzielle Zwecke in Lehre und Forschung sowie für die private Nutzung frei zur Verfügung. Einzelne Dateien oder Ausdrucke aus diesem Angebot können zusammen mit diesen Nutzungsbedingungen und den korrekten Herkunftsbezeichnungen weitergegeben werden. Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. Die systematische Speicherung von Teilen des elektronischen Angebots auf anderen Servern bedarf ebenfalls des schriftlichen Einverständnisses der Rechteinhaber.

Haftungsausschluss

Alle Angaben erfolgen ohne Gewähr für Vollständigkeit oder Richtigkeit. Es wird keine Haftung übernommen für Schäden durch die Verwendung von Informationen aus diesem Online-Angebot oder durch das Fehlen von Informationen. Dies gilt auch für Inhalte Dritter, die über dieses Angebot zugänglich sind.

ENGLISH SUMMARIES

J.-M. TÉTAZ, Protestantism and modernity, systematic perspectives and historical constellations, RThPh 1998/II, p. 121-149.

The European enlightenment provoked a double displacement of the social and cultural components of Christianity : rationalist criticism of religion and the privatisation of belief led to a process of secularization to which Christianity had to react. To do so, Protestantism developed a theory of Christianity based on paradigms formulated by Kant, Schleiermacher and Hegel. It was through a selective return to these three thinkers that in the 19th and 20th centuries, German Protestantism took a position in the modern world, trying to identify those social and cultural spheres which would foster a theme essential to both its theological truth and its social-cultural pertinence : the theme of freedom. This theoretical framework allowed it to explain often tarnished concepts such as liberal theology, Kulturprotestantismus, neo-protestantism.

F. W. GRAF, Critical theology serving bourgeois emancipation : David Friedrich Strauß (1808-1874), RThPh 1998/II, p. 151-172.

Strauß intended to work for modern, emancipating aims. He did so by a new interpretation of Christian history, notably by universalizing christology : what is said about one man – Jesus – must be valid for every person. Strauß' attempt to establish the liberty of the actor took finally a post-Christian form. Moreover, one might ask, with Nietzsche, if it did not end in deadlock with artificiality and particularity, thus failing to assure liberty in effectively concrete individuality.

V. DREHSEN, The Christian vision of an ethical age outside the church : Richard Rothe (1799-1867), RThPh 1998/II, p. 173-192.

In contrast to the differentiations at work in modern society, which result from the increasing autonomy of its spheres of activity, the pluralism of culture and the progressive individualism of religious existence. Rothe set up a prudent program of reconciliation via Kulturprotestantismus, reflection via the theology of a mediation and modernisation via neo-Protestantism. Following Schleiermacher, Rothe developed his own theory of Christianity in which he did not conceive of religious change in the modern world in terms of losing out to radical secularisation, but opened up to new possibilities for an ethical-religious praxis within Christianity.

H. RUDDIES, Accepting modernity and reformulating the tasks of theology : E. Troeltsch (1865-1923), RThPh 1998/II, p. 193-212.

The intention of Troeltsch's theological program was to elaborate, for the passage from the 19th to the 20th century, a well thought out theological acceptance of modernity. This is why Troeltsch worked, on the one hand, on a theory of modernity which interpreted its nature of crisis as a consequence of social and conceptual innovation. On the other hand, he prepared the way for a post-conventional theology which related to this cultural process, because a responsible theology must also consider its historical situation as grounds for self-understanding, in terms of its foundational duties. Thus Troeltsch wanted to promote modernity in the field of theology while confronting modernity with theological traditions.