

English summaries

Objekttyp: **ReferenceList**

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

Band (Jahr): **58 (2008)**

Heft 4: **La théologie entre reprises différées, déplacements et ruptures**

PDF erstellt am: **12.07.2024**

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. KAEMPFER, A polemical and militant theology, RThPh 2008/IV, p. 291-294.

Theology, according to Pierre Gisel, is not just a body of affirmations about God, creation, salvation, etc., but includes more general reflection on humankind and relation to faith. Such a wish to widen theology is questioned here in its combative dimension (as presented as engaged against «idealisation») and in its generalizing aim: does it not then fall back into a propos which is, fundamentally, that also of literature?

P. GISEL, In response to J. Kaempfer, RThPh 2008/IV, p. 295-300.

This response starts by picking up the suspicion of anthropological reduction in order to situate the problem in a large history. This is followed by a problematic re-examination of the differences between theology and the science of religions. We continue with the question of agonistics and of neutrality, before concluding on the proximity to literature.

P. BORGEAUD, Genealogy and comparativism in the view of theology, RThPh 2008/IV, p. 301-306.

Pierre Gisel proposes to remove theology from its traditional definition, to thus make of it a history of the questioning of modernity in its relation to «the absolute». This means working on subconscious structures (ideological elaborations) at the same time as religious realities within a theory of the religious and its constructs. Such a theory of religion will remain fundamentally a theory of Christianity, even with a relative decen-
tration, a shifted view of the internal authorities of alterity and, subsequently, of «others» from the outside.

P. GISEL, Response to Philippe Borgeaud, RThPh 2008/IV, p. 307-312.

This response underlines the need for a comparative vision in order to understand any given religion. It goes on with some clarifications of the so-called genealogical perspective, before taking up the question of the reflexive, the problematic and the theoretical.

P. GROSOS, Questioning theology, RThPh 2008/IV, p. 313-318.

Pierre Gisel proposes to think theology as an “anthropology of believe”. That presupposes the abandoning of denominational reading and also of revelation. But, without revelation, is it possible for theology to be anything else besides anthropology?

P. GISEL, Response to Philippe Grosos, RThPh 2008/IV, p. 319-324.

This response basically picks up the theme of revelation as it now stands in Christianity, after its having been the subject of a major shift in the 20th c. It goes on by examining the question of what is at the heart of theology and what would define it as a discipline: a sort of relation to the object.

G. WATERLOT, A reading and some questions, RThPh 2008/IV, p. 325-329.

In this essay, we bring out what appears to us to be the main thrusts of Pierre Gisel's book. Four principal threads are picked up and then four points of discussion with the author are briefly developed.

P. GISEL, Response to Ghislain Waterlot, RThPh 2008/IV, p. 331-335.

This response picks up on what Ghislain Waterlot says of *La théologie*, giving some symptomatic inflections on Christianity as recapitulation, on relation to the absolute, fundamental or not, on revelation, on necessity and on contingency. Continuing the debate, it reviews the relationship between fundamental theology and particular traditions; the question whether or not theology, here, becomes philosophy; the question, finally, of particularity and universality, especially the relationship between them, before asking if theology has or not the task to be a propositional force.

J. KAEMPFER, P. BORGEAUD, P. GROSOS and G. WATERLOT: In reply, RThPh 2008/IV, p. 337-343.

Each of the four writers reacts in turn to the responses of Pierre Gisel. Jean Kaempfer agrees with the mix of implied adhesion and knowledgeable distance, while underlining that literature recognizes the character of fiction and asking if theology can do this without being lost as theology. Philippe Borgeaud once again underlines the need for decentration and comparison, before pointing out the lucky particularity of the discipline and practice of the historian of religions. P. Grosos repeats the difficulty of linking together anthropology and social-cultural practices on one hand, and the believe at the heart of beliefs on the other. Ghislain Waterlot returns to theology as being in a field of its own and follows up the dialogue on the subject of universality and particularity.

P. GISEL, Conclusion: a more radical displacement, RThPh 2008/IV, p. 345-349.

This conclusion picks up, in a synthetic and prospective manner, the question of what is attached to theology. This leads to an accusing perspective of western history, a re-thinking of the posts and modes of work on religion today in relation to social change and finally to a new distinction of the institutional conditions of this work in public universities.

P. BÜHLER, *La Théologie*, is it still theology? An objection, RThPh 2008/IV, p. 351-363.

As indicated by its sub-title, this article develops an objection to the book of Pierre Gisel, subject of the debate in the present edition. In critical dialogue, it tries to formulate a different way of conceiving theology today. After exposing the conditions and basis for agreement in this debate, it takes up in succession the question of the definition of theology, the problem of the relationships between theology and the science of religions and the difficulties linked to the re-reading of traditions, finishing with a global evaluation of the project of Pierre Gisel.