

Zeitschrift: Revue de Théologie et de Philosophie
Herausgeber: Revue de Théologie et de Philosophie
Band: 151 (2019)
Heft: 3

Rubrik: English summaries

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Zeitschriften und ist nicht verantwortlich für deren Inhalte. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern beziehungsweise den externen Rechteinhabern. [Siehe Rechtliche Hinweise.](#)

Conditions d'utilisation

L'ETH Library est le fournisseur des revues numérisées. Elle ne détient aucun droit d'auteur sur les revues et n'est pas responsable de leur contenu. En règle générale, les droits sont détenus par les éditeurs ou les détenteurs de droits externes. [Voir Informations légales.](#)

Terms of use

The ETH Library is the provider of the digitised journals. It does not own any copyrights to the journals and is not responsible for their content. The rights usually lie with the publishers or the external rights holders. [See Legal notice.](#)

Download PDF: 24.03.2025

ETH-Bibliothek Zürich, E-Periodica, <https://www.e-periodica.ch>

ENGLISH SUMMARIES

K. BARTH, “Reality, possibility, necessity of Christian knowledge”, RThPh 2019/III, p. 193-199.

In this previously unpublished lecture delivered in Leysin's Swiss University Sanatorium on September 15, 1943, Karl Barth presents Christian knowledge under the three aspects of its reality, possibility, and necessity. The aim is to briefly delimit the contours of this knowledge, via a constant attention toward its object, God's word, as well as the human subject and his fallibility. In a final section, Karl Barth comments on the advantages and disadvantages he perceives in the two main currents which stand in contradiction within contemporary Protestantism, namely between liberal theology and orthodox theology.

A. PÁRVAN and B. L. McCORMACK, “Immutability, (im)passibility and suffering: Steps towards a ‘psychological’ ontology of God”, RThPh 2019/III, p. 201-228.

We call psychological ontology the attempt to think the being of God starting from his self-revelation in the individual life of Jesus Christ. We consider the ontological identity of Jesus Christ and the way the unity of his person is conceived crucial for understanding who this Christian God is, an understanding we take as the entry point into thinking what God is. We start from Augustine's exegesis of the two names of God and Barth's doctrine of election, and point out internal tensions in their respective views on divine immutability and (im)passibility, and how these connect with their concept of God and their understanding of the person of Christ. The unresolved problems in both thinkers lead us beyond their ontologies to argue that the divine-human relation that ontologically accounts for Jesus Christ's unity is from eternity that which gives identity to the second person of the Trinity. Based on this claim we propose a reconceptualization of God's immutability which is shown to be compatible with divine suffering and passibility.

G. ANTIER, “Karl Barth: Grace and seriousness. Need and promise of Christian preaching in liquid modernity”, RThPh 2019/III, p. 229-245.

Through a reinterpretation of “The Need and Promise of Christian Preaching”, Barth's well-known lecture from 1922, three lines of inquiry are explored, as a way to test the relevance of Christian proclamation in a late modernity which has become “liquid”, tending to evacuate the question of the real from the human horizon. The article begins by examining the relation between the Scriptures as a stable datum and the Word as uncontrollable event, in the context of a certain attraction, in certain quarters, towards firm identities (“tentation identitaire”). Second, in relation to the anthropological question of the constituting of human subjects, the notion of grace is considered, as an expression of the mystery which human beings remain to themselves. Finally, the notion of seriousness is considered. This legacy from Kierkegaard invites us to confer to Christian preaching a certain gravitas, thereby allowing to cultivate a sense for the impossible—which is the only way to render fruitful the realm of possibilities.

A. HAY, "Karl Barth's exegesis of 1 Corinthians 1-2 in *Die Auferstehung der Toten*", RThPh 2019/III, p. 247-261.

Investigating Karl Barth's exegesis of 1 Corinthians 1-2 in Die Auferstehung der Toten (1923) is important both for historical aims (it illuminates the period between his Römerbrief and Göttingen lectures, and it is a precursor to select sections of his Kirchliche Dogmatik) and for theological aims: the notion that God remains the subject of his revelation was indeed a paradigmatic point of Barth's theology. This paper attends historical concerns about the development of Barth's thought by pinpointing his work on 1 Corinthians in contemporary theological dialogues. Barth's reading of 1 Corinthians 1-2 continues to be exegetically stimulating today because he took the historical Paul seriously. To be precise, he recognized the implications of Paul's argument for the "foolishness" and "weakness" of God as indicating God's right to have the last word: the word of the cross "from God" is God's wisdom and God's strength. Barth's theological exegesis thus allowed him to identify Paul the theologian and safeguard him against the historicizing inclinations of the New Testament scholars of his era.

C. CHALAMET, "French liberal theologians and Karl Barth: a complicated relation. The case of Auguste Lemaître", RThPh 2019/III, p. 263-283.

The relationship between French-speaking liberal theologians and Karl Barth was complicated, from the 1920s until Barth's death in December 1968. The reasons for these difficulties are many and have much to do with the significant increase of interest in doctrinal and dogmatic issues, in Barth's footsteps, in those years, especially since the 1930s and 1940s. Auguste Lemaître, who taught dogmatics at the University of Geneva during thirty-six years, was among those who, while remaining on friendly terms with Barth (for the most part), opposed his theology. The present article retraces the various phases of the exchanges between the two theologians.