UNIVERZITA KARLOVA V PRAZE

Evangelická teologická fakulta

Protokol o obhajobě písemné práce

předložené *(zatrhni)*

- ☐ ke státní závěrečné zkoušce bakalářského studia,
- ☐ ke státní závěrečné zkoušce magisterského studia,
- ☐ ke státní rigorózní zkoušce,
- ☒ ke státní doktorské zkoušce,

konané dne: 30. M. 2010 od 10 hodin

Autor/ka: ERIC TITUS, M. DIV.

Název práce: THE MYTH OF THE ANALOGIA ENTIS; KARL BARTH'S DOCTRINE OF SECULAR MISERY IN WEIMAR CONTEXT

Obor: SYSTEMATICKÁ A PRAKTICKÁ TEOLOGIE

Oponenti: PROF. DR. ALASDAIR HERON

WARREN KAY, DR. THEOL.

☒ Oponentské posudky přiloženy.

Předseda komise: prof. ThDr. Ing. JAKUB S. TROJAN

Členové komise: doc. PAVEL HOSEK, Th.D.

prof. ThDr. JAN HUS

doc. ThDr. PETR HAJEK

Dr. TIMOTHY NOBLE

Průběh obhajoby:

Klasifikace (slovy): prospěl

Klasifikační stupnice pro státní závěrečné zkoušky: *výtečně (A) – velmi dobře (B) – dobře (C) – uspokojivě (D) – dostatečně (E) – nedostatečně (F).*

Klasifikační stupnice pro státní rigorózní a státní doktorskou zkoušku: *prospěl/a – neprospěl/a.*

Podpisy: _____ _____

předseda členové komise

Tento protokol se odevzdává studijnímu oddělení děkanátu a archivuje se.

p. o. box 529
Černá 9
115 55 Praha 1
www.etf.cuni.cz

UNIVERZITA KARLOVA V PRAZE

Evangelická teologická fakulta

Zápis o dílčí zkoušce

jež je součástí *(zatrhni)*

☐ Bc studia, jakožto	☐ průběžná	☐ státní závěrečná
☐ Mgr studia, jakožto	☐ průpravná	☐ první souborná
	☐ druhá souborná	☐ státní závěrečná
☒ Dr studia, jakožto	☐ průběžná	☒ státní závěrečná
☐ státní rigorózní zkoušky		

Datum konání: 30. 11. 2010

Zkoušený/á: ERIC TITUS, M. Div.

Disciplina: SYSTEMATICKÁ A PRAKTICKÁ TEOLOGIE

Zkoušející:

Otázky:

The Doctrine of Justification
Divine Attributes according to Barth
American reception of Barth (Frei)
Concept of the Church in Romans 9 a CD
Barth and Post-modern Interpretation
Contextual Theology in KD of CD?
God and Evil in the World

Klasifikace (slovy): prospěl

Klasifikační stupnice: *výtečně (A) – velmi dobře (B) – dobře (C) – uspokojivě (D) – dostatečně (E) – nedostatečně (F).*

Klasifikační stupnice pro státní rigorózní a státní doktorskou zkoušku: *prospěl/a – neprospěl/a.*

Podpis: _____
zkoušející

Tento protokol se odevzdává studijnímu oddělení děkanátu a archivuje se.

p. o. box 529
Černá 9
115 55 Praha 1
www.etf.cuni.cz

READER'S REPORT ON THE DOCTORAL DISSERTATION

THE MYTH OF THE *ANALOGIA ENTIS:*

KARL BARTH'S DOCTRINE OF SECULAR MISERY

IN WEIMAR CONTEXT

Submitted by Eric J. Titus

2010

The thesis of this dissertation is stated by the author in his introductory Abstract:

> To understand the content of Barth, one must understand the context of Barth. This paper begins with an effort to effectively tie Barth's doctrine of the *analogia entis* to the realities of the Weimar context. Only by binding these two elements together does a clear picture emerge of Barth's understanding and utilization of the *analogia entis.* Egressing from this picture is that Barth's rejection of the *analogia entis* is not esoteric rhetoric against Roman Catholic theology. It is a theological rejoinder rather born out of engagement with the ethos of National Socialism and connatural ideologies which delivered the Protestant Church and German Society over to a "secular misery" via the myth of the *analogia entis*. This contextual understanding demonstrates that Barth viewed the *analogia entis* as *primarily* a Protestant issue and only *tangentially* as a Protestant-Catholic issue. The study concludes with an examination of the evangelical movement in the United States as a contemporary case study for the need to recover Barth's contextual formulation of the *analogia entis*.[1]

Here the author has accurately announced the argument which he then repeatedly asserts in similar terms throughout the study. He believes by the end to have demonstrated it sufficiently to correct other views and interpretations of Barth's rejection of the *analogia entis*. He also finally holds it possible and indeed necessary to deploy this rediscovered emphasis in Barth against tendencies in current North American right-wing evangelicalism[2] which (albeit in other forms) display discomforting resemblances to the mind-set of many of Barth's contemporary protestant Christians in Germany under the influence of Nazi thinking

What the author means by "the myth of the *analogia entis*" is first unfolded in "A Narrative Prologue".[3] The *analogia entis* is for Barth not only a myth because what it envisages is unreal, but because it is a profoundly powerful lie bearing on every aspect of life.[4] A "secondary myth" is the idea that the issue of the *analogia entis* is for Barth (and others) chiefly a Protestant-Roman Catholic issue: it was in fact a profoundly Protestant issue for Barth. "That the Protestant Church, a rising religious nationalism, and even religious National

---

[1] P. v.

[2] For a little more personal background detail on this, cf. the Preface, pp. ix-xi.

[3] Pp. xiii-xix

[4] P. xvii.

Socialism were embracing the myth of the *analogia entis* in the Weimar Republic years (1918-1932) of Germany led Barth to deem it a secular misery, led by a Protestant clergy, Protestant theologians, and Protestant politicians of the burgeoning neo-conservative movements in Weimar."[5] A "tertiary myth" is the idea that the issue of the *analogia entis* need only concern academics, for "the myth of the *analogia entis* lives and it lives large, especially among Protestants in the United States."[6] On this follows a ten-page "Introduction"[7] programmatically describing the procedure to be followed in order to show the importance of the Weimar context for Barth's rejection of the *analogia entis* and the motive for that rejection as a response less to an "esoteric" Roman Catholic challenge than to an urgent Protestant threat on a broad front.

In accordance with this programme the study falls into three parts. Part One deals generally with the historical antecedents and ideological exploitation of the "myth of the *analogia entis*" in the Weimar period and its outworking in society, church and university; Part Two focuses mainly on what are presented as Barth's responses to the "myth"; and Part Three considers (a) two more recent responses to Barth and (b) the current climate of North American evangelicalism:

Part One: Contextual Reconstruction – The Secular Misery of Weimar

Chapter 1: Ideological Instaurations: Referential Ideologies as Foundations of the Myth[8]

Chapter 2: Ideological Instaurations: Derivative Inter-reactionary Ideologies[9] as Foundations of the Myth[10]

Chapter 3: Contextual Realities. The Ethical-Existential Effects of the Myth in General Weimar Environs

Chapter 4: Contextual Realities: The Ethical-Existential Effects of the Myth in the Protestant Church

Chapter 5: Contextual Realities: The Ethical-Existential Effects of the Myth in the University Context

Part Two: Doctrinal Constructions – The Myth of the *Analogia Entis*

---

[5] P. xviii.
[6] P. xix.
[7] Pp. xx-xxx.
[8] This chapter deals in turn with Joachim of Fiore, Meister Eckhart, J.G. Fichte, J.G. Herder, G.W.F. Hegel and the 20th century Luther renaissance, including Paul Althaus, Werner Elert and Emanuel Hirsch.
[9] For Titus' understanding of this rather opaque term see p. xxi and n. 5; also pp. 2 and 28-29.
[10] This chapter concentrates on H.S. Chamberlain, A. Rosenberg, Antisemitic Conspiracy Ideologies and National Socialist Ideology and Propaganda.

Chapter 6: Direct Ethical Contextual Responses

Chapter 7: *Ethics* and the Myth of the *Analogia Entis*

Chapter 8: Responses to the Response: Przywara and Brunner

Chapter 9: *Dogmatics:* A Preface to a Problem

Part Three: Contemporary Considerations – Secular Misery and the Myth Redux

Chapter 10: Barr and Betz: Two Examples of Post-Reich Approaches to the Myth

Chapter 11: Myth Redux: An American Revival.

A summary "Conclusion"[11] then reasserts the thesis already outlined: the study has "endeavored…to demonstrate…that the Protestant-Catholic divide over the *analogia entis* was in fact a secondary concern for Barth, and that the myth of the *analogia entis* that was spreading in the Weimar Republic's general, ecclesiastical, and academic environs were [sic] of far more concern to Barth than the Protestant-Catholic divide."[12] Further, it has been demonstrated in the final chapter "that in new forms both radical right Christians and moderate evangelicals are advancing a similar message […] advancing through the vehicles of natural theology and the *analogia entis*".[13]

Finally the author brings two appendices:

Appendix 1: The Ages of Joachim of Fiore

Appendix 2: "How Long…?" A translation of *Quousque Tandem…?*

These are to be explained by the fact that Joachim of Fiore figures in the first chapter as the first (and in later times frequently quoted) prophet of a coming glorious "Third Age", while Barth's vigorous article "Quousque Tandem…?", published in *Zwischen den Zeiten* in 1930, is a key document for Titus' reconstruction of Barth's attitude to "the myth of the *analogia entis*".

The study concludes with a bibliography of some twenty-five pages containing mainly English but also a selection of German literature. This and the footnote references show that the writer has researched quite widely in the various fields he takes into view and has made serious efforts to achieve an all-round perspective, particularly on the German intellectual background and the Weimar context. These chapters cannot be said to contain any original research, but they do report informatively on a variety of findings gleaned for the most part from a selection of historical literature. The author has also sought in Part Two to see Barth's

[11] Pp. 266-269.
[12] P. 266.
[13] P. 267.

theological work in the Weimar period from various angles, taking into account not only Barth himself but also his exchanges with Erich Przywara and Emil Brunner, and also (in Part Three) defending Barth in view of more recent critiques by James Barr and John Betz.

So far, so positive. There is, however, another side, chiefly the highly problematic formulation of the central thesis, which attempts to harness Barth's criticism of the neo-scholastic defence and exploitation of the notion of the *analogia entis* for two purposes:

(a) to supply the name and label for a "myth" widely diffused in the most diverse and sometimes obscure forms in what Titus calls the "inter-reactionary ideologies" supportive of National Socialism and invading the German protestant church in the Weimar period; and

(b) to show that Barth's rejection of the *analogia entis* was primarily and centrally directed against that diffused but destructive myth.

Titus' language and his repeated references to "the myth of the *analogia entis*" as flourishing and spreading in the culture, atmosphere, church and universities of Weimar leave no doubt that he believes these two identifications to be valid. The "myth of the *analogia entis*" in Nazi and associated ideology and the theology of those who came to call themselves the German Christians is moreover, he believes, the real object of Barth's attack when he says in 1932 in the Preface to volume I/1 of the *Church Dogmatics*:

> I regard the *analogia entis* as the invention of Antichrist, and I believe that because of it it is impossible ever to become a Roman Catholic, all other reasons for not doing so being to my mind short-sighted and trivial.[14]

His specific interpretation of this particular sentence may well be said to be pivotal for Titus' entire argument.[15]

There are, however, two major hermeneutical obstacles to this revisionist interpretation of Barth's side-swiping remark. The first is the inherent implausibility of Titus' thesis as an exegesis of what Barth says in the sentence itself, which clearly, naturally and quite rightly refers to the *analogia entis* as the foundation of sophisticated Roman Catholic philosophical theology. The second comes into view in the light of the immediate context in which the sentence is formulated. Barth is discussing there the shift he had found it necessary to make from his original intention of carrying on further with his *Christliche Dogmatik,* of which he had published the one-volume *Prolegomena* in 1927, to the fresh start with volume I/1 of the *Church Dogmatics* in 1932.[16] He explains that the work of 1927 had given some cause for suspicion that he (Barth) was seeking support for theology in philosophical existentialism, but any such undertaking would be impossible; it would only resume the old line - which Barth

---

[14] *CD I/1,* 2nd edn, 1975, p. xiii.

[15] Cf. especially chapter nine, pp. 205ff.

[16] Titus appears not appear to be familiar with the *Christliche Dogmatik* of 1927, which does not appear in his bibliography. See also p. 205, where he simply - and wrongly - identifies the *Göttingen Dogmatics* as the "earlier dogmatic endeavour" referred to by Barth in the Preface to *CD* I/1. Without such awareness of what Barth is actually referring to, this passage in *CD* I/1 can scarcely be properly understood or appropriately interpreted.

himself had so often criticized – running from Schleiermacher via Ritschl to Herrmann,[17] and that could not be a viable option for protestant theology. So he goes on to say, "I can see no third alternative between that exploitation of the *analogia entis* which is legitimate only on the basis of Roman Catholicism [...] and a Protestant theology which draws from its own source, which stands on its own feet, and which is finally liberated from this secular misery."[18] The "secular misery" lies in relying on philosophy as a basis for theology, on a "so-called natural knowledge of God".[19] Only on the next page and after further discussion of his relation to Roman Catholic theology and catholic dogma does Barth come to:

> the constantly increasing confusion, tedium and irrelevance of modern Protestantism, which, probably along with the Trinity and Virgin Birth, has lost an entire third dimension – the dimension of what for once, though not confusing it with religious and moral earnestness, we may describe as mystery – with the result that it has been punished with all kinds of worthless substitutes, that it has fallen the more readily victim to such uneasy cliques and sects as High Church, German Church, Christian Community and Religious Socialism, and that many of its preachers and adherents have finally learned to discover deep religious significance in the intoxication of German blood and their political *Führer*."[20]

It is stretching the point more than it can bear to attempt to discern here any direct linking of National Socialism with the "myth of the *analogia entis*". Nor do Titus' efforts compensate for this by supplying any clear alternative evidence for Barth's establishing of this alleged connexion.[21] A related difficulty is that Titus fails to produce any evidence that the "inter-reactive ideologies" spoke of an analogy of being in the philosophical sense; so far as I can see the theme is only explicitly documented by him in the case of Rosenberg, who *rejected* it on the ground that analogy offered too *weak* an identification of the human with the divine.[22]

With this I do not mean to suggest that there is no substance *behind* (if not *in*) Titus' thesis. There is clearly a connexion to be drawn between Barth's rejection of natural theology in all its various forms (including as the most sophisticated and intellectually respectable – and precisely as such "the invention of Antichrist" - the Roman Catholic exploitation of the *analogia entis*) and his contemptuous dismissal of the crass absurdity of National Socialist and German Christian religious or quasi-religious ideology at the other end of the scale. But the latter was something he could not take *theologically* or even *intellectually* seriously except as a manifestation of human blindness and sin. There is thus a world of difference between

---

[17] It is also striking that this line of tradition in German protestant theology, against which Barth had struggled consistently and vociferously from the second edition of his *Commentary on Romans* onwards, barely receives a mention, let alone any serious attention, in Titus' whole study.

[18] *CD* I/1, p. xiii.

[19] Ibid.

[20] Op. cit., p. xiv.

[21] Cf. e.g. the whole of chapter seven, particularly the following claim on p. 152: "[Barth's] *Ethics* is a *tour de force* against the myth of the *analogia entis*. Although Barth did not employ the term directly in these lectures, it is quite clear that what Barth understood as the *analogia entis* is manifestly present throughout his construction." It would be more correct to say that Barth does indeed talk in *Ethics* of "*the* great anthropological myth, the myth of apostasy and revolt, *the* great lie" of *human deity* (*Ethics*, p. 210, quoted by Titus on p. 173), but on Titus' own account Barth nowhere there calls it "the myth of the *analogia entis*".

[22] Pp. 38-39.

that and Barth's declining of the glittering *analogia entis* offered by an Erich Przywara. Titus does indeed refer to their friendly relationship and Barth's appreciation of Przywara, but without perhaps realizing the implications.[23] To that extent, what the author sees as the central illuminating discovery of his research turns out to be more of a chimera. The thesis could and should have been differently formulated to fit what is really to be found in the sources explored and to generate convincing explanatory power. This could easily enough have been done; the result might have been on the surface less strikingly dramatic than Titus' supposed history of the "myth of the *analogia entis*", but it would also not in any way have undercut the genuinely serious concerns of the final chapter.

Another critical point is related to this. Titus repeatedly indicates that he believes he is offering a fresh insight into Barth as compared with the generality of Barth interpretation. On closer examination, however, his study of secondary literature on Barth seems more than a little thin and selective. Admittedly the whole breadth of Barth literature is enormous and one cannot expect a doctoral candidate to have read it all. It remains a surprising weakness, however, that such authors as George Hunsinger or Bruce McCormack in America, John Webster in Britain or Matthias Freudenberg in Germany (for example) are not to be found in the bibliography, although all of them are prominent front-line Barth scholars and McCormack[24] and Freudenberg[25] in particular have (quite some years ago now) published major and well-known studies on Barth's work in Germany during the Weimar period.

It may be added that some of the theological or philosophical material Titus has taken over from others or develops in dispute with them is not very lucid or clearly comprehensible. There seems to me a certain lack of clarity, for example, in the account of the Barth/Brunner debate,[26] in the material borrowed from Pöhlmann on the subject of analogy,[27] and in the discussion of Kant in the critique of John Betz.[28]

While these are the major points that have to be made in a critique of the thesis, there are other weaknesses as well - particularly, I regret to say, in the area of language. The author does not always display a fluent or plastic English style; his sentences are often awkwardly constructed and poorly expressed.[29] One example is the ubiquitous split infinitive, which even in American English has not traditionally been regarded as a mark of good style (though regrettably now making inroads even into such relatively high-quality journals as *Time* magazine!). At the same time he shows an egregious tendency to employ rare or archaic words, not always in their proper sense. The work also has more than its share of

---

[23] P. 186. One might add that Titus' suggestion that to relate Barth's rejection of the *analogia entis* to Roman Catholicism would reduce it to "esoteric rhetoric" fails to recognise the theological, ecclesiastical and ecumenical realities of Barth's European, specifically German context - as contrasted perhaps with that of at least some varieties of North American protestantism.

[24] Bruce McCormack, *Karl Barth's Critically Realistic Dialectical Theology*, Oxford: Clarendon, 1995.

[25] Matthias Freudenberg, *Karl Barth und die reformierte Theologie*, Neukirchen, 1997

[26] Pp. 199-203

[27] P. 178.

[28] Pp. 232-241.

[29] I have indicated a number of instances in pencil in the copy sent to me, but I make no claim even to have tried to pick up every infelicity.

typographical errors: e.g. "Aryan" repeatedly appears as "Ayran" and Werner Jeanrond, now of Glasgow, is consistently misspelled as "Jeanround".[30]

A further case in point is the translation of *Quousque tandem...?* offered in Appendix 2. This bristles with imprecision in the rendering of Barth's text and is certainly not fit to be published as an English version of the article without thoroughgoing reworking.

This then leaves the question of what advice should be given to the examining committee. There is, I think, no question of the work's being publishable by a serious theological publisher in its present form. If that is a key criterion for the commission, the work must be rejected or returned for rewriting. If, however, it is not decisive that the work be publishable, but only that it display a respectable measure of serious study, reflection and industrious effort, even though flawed in content and style, then I would judge that the doctorate could be awarded, but only with a modest grade such as *rite* or at the most *cum laude*,[31] but certainly not *magna* or *summa*. If under these circumstances the author were to wish to withdraw the thesis for reworking with a view to resubmission in a revised and improved form, I would be in favour of his being given that opportunity and it is this course I would prefer to recommend – also in the author's own interest.

Alasdair I. C. Heron

(Prof. Dr.) Alasdair I. C. Heron

Erlangen, 11th November 2010

[30] Note 29 applies here also!

[31] In the German scale of grading this would mean either a 4 (ausreichend/pass) or at best a 3 (befriedigend/satisfactory).

November 10, 2010

TO: Dr. Petr Macek
Protestant Theological Faculty
Charles University,
Prague, CZ

FROM: Dr. Warren A. Kay
Merrimack College
North Andover, MA 01845 USA

RE: Comments on the Dissertation by Mr. Eric J. Titus, "The Myth of the *Analogia Entis*: Karl Barth's Doctrine of Secular Misery in Weimar Context"

General Comments:

This dissertation by Mr. Eric J. Titus is a clarification of an important aspect of Karl Barth's theology by examining his doctrine of the *analogia entis* in its historical context (political, social, and theological). It is a basic truth of hermeneutics that to understand a text it is necessary to understand its original context as well as the context of the reader, and in this impressive study of Barth's theology, Mr. Titus does just that as he investigates the roots of Barth's rejection of the *analogia entis* doctrine. By doing this, Titus is able to rescue important theological content with which he is able to demonstrate the continued relevance of Barth's theology, most specifically in the context of the contemporary American evangelical movement.

In this work Titus, shows a breadth of knowledge, a facility with primary sources in original languages, and a creative exploration of important theological issues, which he places in this extended and closely reasoned treatise. For me, it is evident that Mr. Titus has written a scientific theological monograph which merits acceptance as part of the requirements for the granting of a doctoral degree.

However, on the following pages I make suggestions which I believe should be taken into consideration before the publication of this work.

Specific Comments:

I haven't had a chance to examine it, but a recent issue of the *Princeton Theological Review* was devoted to "The Analogy of Being" (Volume XV, No. 1, Spring 2009). This issue can be downloaded for free in a PDF format at http://www.princetontheologicalreview.org/past_issues.html.

In the "Note to the Reader" (p. vii) it may be worth noting that the English confusion with the word "evangelical" has been avoided in the German-speaking world by using "Evangelisch" for "Protestant" or "Reformed," and "Evangelikalismus" to refer to a specific conservative movement within Protestantism (see: Fritz Laubach, *Aufbruch der Evangelikalen*, Witten, 1972).

Also on p. viii, the deifition of evangelical" in the United States is too casual for a scientific work such as a dissertation (even in the note to the reader). It would strengthen the dissertation if here and in chapter 11 some reference to the generally accepted definitions given by evangelical scholars in historical or systematic writings. Reference to one or more of the following works:

- George M. Marsden, *Understanding Fundamentalism and Evangelicalism* (1991).
- Mark Noll, *A History of Christianity in the United States and Canada*, (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1992).
- Mark Noll, David W. Bebbington and George A. Rawlyk (eds.), *Evangelicalism: Comparative Studies of Popular Protestantism in North America, the British Isles and Beyond, 1700–1990*, (1994)
- Pierard, Richard V. (1979), "The Quest For the Historical Evangelicalism: A Bibliographical Excursus," *Fides et Historia* 11 (2): 60–72.
- Rawlyk, George A., and Mark A. Noll (eds.), *Amazing Grace: Evangelicalism in Australia, Britain, Canada, and the United States* (1993).
- W. R. Ward, *Early Evangelicalism: A Global Intellectual History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006).

In footnote 1 on page ix the date is missing

In the "Narrative Prologue" the discussion of myth (pp. xiii-xiv) is also too casual, it is difficult to understand in a systematic way what "myth" means. This is especially important since Mr. Titus uses the term on the following pages and only on page xviii begins to define it with more precision.

In the "**Introduction**" I think it is significant to point out that it is customary in scholarly literature about Barth to include German citations. If for convenience the author is quoting from the English translation, then the citations should include reference to the German original (with pages), followed by the citation in the English edition (see for example, footnotes in Thomas F. Torrance, *Karl Barth: Biblical and Evangelical Theologian*, Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1990).

Shouldn't "secular misery be in quotation marks (page xxv, 6 lines up from the bottom of the page; and page xxvi, 3 lines down from the top)?

On the bottom of page xxvi, Mr. Titus states that "Both Catholic and Protestant scholars have spent a fair amount of time contemplating the issue..." Who is he referring to here? I would like to see some examples from the Protestant and the Catholic side mentioned (even here in the Introduction).

On page xxvii Mr. Titus states that "The analogia entis is in this case less anti-catholic than supposed and more anti-inter-reactionary than previously considered." Would it be fair to say instead that it is "not exclusively anti-Catholic as has previously been thought."?

Also, the term "Catholic" should be capitalized when referring to the Roman Catholic Church (p. xxvii, et passim).

On page xxviii Mr. Titus states "This point of Barth's *The Epistle to the Romans* is what had exploded, as John R. Franke put it, like a bomb in the theologians' playground..." I believe this should be attributed to Karl Adam (1876-1966) who said it in a review of the second edition of Barth's *Römerbrief.*

Mr. Titus says (on page xxix) that the dissertation would be incomplete without some mention of "treatments of the analogia entis with respect to Barth since his open attack against it." He then goes on to say that he will deal with James Barr and John Betz in this regard. Why did he pick them specifically? It might be helpful to include that here (and I didn't notice explicit reasons for picking them in chapter 10 either).

Chapter one begins with more than one page including new information without citations. If this is to be of value to other scholars, footnotes for this material is needed.

On page 3 of this chapter Mr. Titus begins a discussion of Joachim of Fiore. In an English language dissertation the English designation of his name should be used (not Joachim von Fiore) and it is typical to refer to "the Kingdom of the Holy Spirit" not the "Reich". This section is not essential for the dissertation as a whole, but it depends on somewhat dated scholarship (the article cited by Mr. Titus is from 1955). There has been much written on Joachim in the 55 years since then. These are a few significant examples of such work:

- Marjorie Reeves, *Joachim of Fiore and the Prophetic Future*, (Stroud, Gloucestershire: Sutton Publishing, 1999).

- Warwick Gould and Marjorie Reeves, *Joachim of Fiore and the Myth of the Eternal Evangel in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries* (New York: Oxford University Press, revised and enlarged edition, 2002).

- Wilhelm Baum "Joachim von Fiore und das kommende Reich des Geistes," *Jahrbuch der Oswald-von-Wolkenstein-Gesellschaft.* 13 (2001/2002), pp. 77–97.

I am not sure what the value of including the Appendix with a diagram of the three ages spoken of by Joachim.

Keeping the European context of this dissertation in mind, I am concerned about the references to Martin Luther (on page 24, 109,) where particular American editions of the works of Luther (or selections) are given. For European scholars who may wish to follow these references, finding Martin Luther's Basic Theological Writings (edited by Timothy Lull) might be difficult. I believe the one, standard English edition *Luther's Works* should be used exclusively.

Chapter two includes important discussions of Houston Stewart Chamberlain and Alfred Rosenberg. It would be helpful to the reader to introduce them in the opening paragraphs (Who are they? When did they live?).

In the discussion of Chamberlain, some indication should be given that the *Foundations* was originally written in German under the title *Die Grundlagen des Neunzehnten Jahnhunderts*. In a footnote the original title and bibliographical information should be cited first, then the English. Even though the English edition is being used, it would be helpful to refer to the book throughout the discussion by an abbreviation of the German title – thus, the *Grundlagen*.

As with Chamberlain, so with Rosenberg. A citation of the original German (with bibliographic information) should be given – *Der Mythus des zwanzigsten Jahrhunderts* (abbreviated in the text as *Der Mythus)*.

Footnote 31, page 36, can be read to suggest that Paul Lagarde was not a theologian! He was influential as an Old Testament scholar (cf. the article on Lagarde in *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, 3rd edition, vol. 4, 200-201).

On page 45, footnote 57 cites a 1964 study for an account of the development of anti-Semitism in the church. Far more significant as scholarly studies are the following, the first being the most detailed study available in any language (translated from Russian), and the second, a more recent study by a history professor at the Hebrew University:

- Léon Poliakov, *The History of Anti-Semitism*, Volume 1: *From the Time of Christ to the Court Jews*, translated by Richard Howard; Volume 2: *From Mohammed to the Marranos*, translated by Natalie Gerardi; Volume 3: *From Voltaire to Wagner*, translated by Miriam Kochan; Volume 4: *Suicidal Europe, 1870-1933*, translated by George Klin, (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2003).

- Robert S. Wistrich, *Antisemitism: The Longest Hatred*, (New York: Pantheon Books, 1991).

On page 47, footnote 68, the book title is incorrectly given as *Antisemiten-Cateschismua* and should be *Antisemiten-Katechismus* (a facsimile edition is currently available, and it can be read on-line).

On page 59 Mr. Titus writes "The tendency to keep Barth and his theology disassociated from his surroundings, culture, and his world is rather pedestrian." Who does this?

Chapter three begins with a lot of information on the first page or so. Again, there are no citations. How can the interested scholar follow up on that information?

In chapter four Titus includes a discussion of the Manifesto of the 93 German Intellectuals and footnotes an English translation which is available on-line. The German original is also available at a number of sites on-line, but also in printed form in the following:

- Klaus Böhme (editor). *Aufrufe und Reden deutscher Professoren in Ersten Weltkrieg.* (Stuttgart: Reclam Universal-Bibliothek Nr. 9787, 1975), pp. 47 – 49 for the text of the manifesto, but without the names of the 93 subscribers.

- Jürgen von Ungern-Sternberg and Wolfgang von Ungern-Sternberg. *Der Aufruf "An die Kulturwelt!" Das Manifest der 93 und die Anfänge der Kriegspropaganda im Ersten Weltkrieg* (Stuttgart: Steiner, 1996).

In **chapter five,** there is no reason to "apologize" for using the term "Aufklärer" (page 117, note 20). There is a long history of such loan-words in specialized fields such as theology (e.g. Sitz im Leben, Formgeschichte, etc.). I would simply explain the meaning of the term in the footnote and leave out the clumsy English translation.

Also on page 117, I was confused by the placement of the name of the 20th century philosopher Karl Jaspers between two 18th century figures (Pestalozzi and Kant).

In **chapter six** Mr Titus again begins with a number of statements that need citations (beginning on page 136, and including the entire discussion of Cicero, page 137).

Also on page 137, Titus discusses Barth's response to the "Myth" in his essay "Quousque Tandem…?". There he notes (footnote 2) the inclusion of his own translation of the essay as *Appendix 2*. But he does not refer to his own translation in the subsequent discussion (I believe all the footnote references are to the German edition). I don't see the need to include the translation, but if the Appendix is retained, it should contain the proper bibliographic information, which is currently lacking.

In **chapter seven** I was particularly pleased to see on pages 178-179 the adoption of the logical analysis of the *analogia entis* formulated by Horst Pöhlmann (*Analogia entis oder Analogia Fidei*, 1965). European theologians are often more at home with the existentialist/phenomenological philosophical traditions while ignoring the analytical tradition of Anglo-American philosophy. Pöhlmann, Ingolf Dalferth (my professor at Zürich), to name a few, are happy exceptions to this tendency, and I am glad that Mr. Titus includes this important aspect in his work.

As an observation of inconsistency, Mr. Titus quotes from English sources in the text of his dissertation (which is also written in English) but the New Testament reference on page 177 is in Greek.

Although the material in chapter eight is very interesting, I was disappointed that Titus ignored some modern studies of Przywara such as the dissertation by Stefan Nieborak (University of Augsburg, 1993), „Homo analogia": zur philosoph.-theolog. Bedeutung d. „analogia entis" im Rahmen d. existenziellen Frage bei Erich Przywara S.J (1889-1972), (Frankfurt am Main u.a.: Peter Lang, 1994); or the recent article by Keith L. Johnson, "Erich Przywara's Early Version of the Analogia Entis," *Princeton Theological Review*, (Volume XV, No. 1, Spring 2009), pp. 7-19.

Chapter eleven often feels like a personal statement rather than a scientific study. Adequate reference is made to significant figures of the Evangelical movement, but more of a general context prepared by historical analyses of the movement would have been beneficial. Many such studies are available, and I name only a few of what I consider to be the most important of them:

- David W. Bebbington, *Evangelicals in Modern Britain: A History from the 1730s to the 1980s*, (London: George Allen & Unwin, 2008).

- Larry Eskridge, "Defining Evangelicalism," *Institute for the Study of American Evangelicals* (1995). http://www.wheaton.edu/isae/defining_evangelicalism.html

Finally, I was surprised that no mention was made of the recently published book by Keith L. Johnson, *Karl Barth and the Analogia Entis*, "T&T Clark Studies in Systematic Theology," (Edinburgh: T & T Clark International, 2010).

I hope these comments will be taken in the constructive spirit in which they were made. They are in no way intended to detract from the excellent research of Mr. Eric J. Titus. Thank you for this opportunity to read his very stimulating study.