

English summaries

Objektyp: **Group**

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

Band (Jahr): **148 (2016)**

Heft 4

PDF erstellt am: **27.06.2024**

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.

Ein Dienst der *ETH-Bibliothek*
ETH Zürich, Rämistrasse 101, 8092 Zürich, Schweiz, www.library.ethz.ch

<http://www.e-periodica.ch>

ENGLISH SUMMARIES

- C. GROSSE, N. FORNEROD, A third way between the Genevan “model” of ecclesiastic discipline and that of Jean Morély? Guillaume Houbraque and his treatise on the correction of vices and excommunication (1567), RThPh 2016/IV, p. 713-732.

This article analyses a short treatise produced by the French Reformed pastor Guillaume Houbraque about church discipline and excommunication. This rare text has never been studied closely. Yet, written in 1567, in the context of the controversies raised by Jean Morély's De la discipline et police Chrestienne (1562), it sheds new light on the existence, within the Reformed French churches of the time, of a third way, seldom analysed, between the Genevan “model” and Morély's ideas on the topic. Neither as “aristocratic” as in Geneva, nor as “democratic” as with Morély, this third way considers that, even if discipline must be exercised by the Consistory, the parish assembly must still be able to agree with the Consistory's decisions et thus has the right to intervene in the procedure.

- D. DOAT, Vulnerability : in search of a conceptual reconstruction, RThPh 2016/IV, p. 733-754.

Vulnerability generally characterizes any sensitive beings whose dependence on their environment for subsistence or self-fulfillment exposes them to the risk of getting hurt or the weakening their abilities, who require protection, support and the preparation for risks. If such an acceptation of vulnerability is completely right, the purpose of this study is to show that it is not enough. Based on a re-evaluation of etymological, semantic, biological and phenomenological references to the concept, the author shows that vulnerability also constitutes, paradoxically, a power in the active sense of the term.

- S. BIANCU, The symbol (still) gives rise to thought, RThPh 2016/IV, p. 755-768.

After a brief overview of the rediscovery in the first half of the 20th century of the problem of symbolism (§ 1), this article seeks to refine an adequate perspective from which to study such an irreducible human dimension (§ 2), a perspective to be found in the philosophy of culture as a philosophy which chooses to question humankind from the outside. Next, it tries to delimit the sphere of symbolism in relation to similar notions, notably that of signs (§ 3). And lastly, it evaluates not only the importance of this “rediscovery” of the symbolic, but also the consequences for philosophy itself (§ 4).

- B. REYMOND, Friedrich D. E. Schleiermacher and original sin, RThPh 2016/IV, p. 769-780.

In his Christian Faith, Friedrich Schleiermacher had dedicated a significant amount of energy to think about sin, including original (or, rather, hereditary) sin (Erbsünde). This article presents and analyzes the way in which Schleiermacher tackles this theme in the first edition of his masterwork, published in 1820-1821. It does so by, first,

contextualizing Schleiermacher's reflexion in the overall context of the time and, more specifically, within the dogmatic treatise and its aim. In the final part of the article, the author seeks to better understand the reasons which might have led Schleiermacher to offer such an expansive and detailed interpretation of this topic.