existence, then such criticisms could become less ardent in both content and tone. Similarly, if it is recognised that Volf's work makes no claim to be all-inclusive and complete, but is merely an exploration of the links between the Trinity and the church, then Bidwell's overarching critique of its neglect of Christology becomes less significant. For a complete view of the church must surely look beyond the analogical links between the Trinity and the church, *and* beyond the links between Christ and the Church. There are also analogical links between the eschatological kingdom and the Church, between missiology and the Church, between creation and the Church, and between anthropology and the Church. Indeed, for an ecclesiology to even approach completeness there must be adequate links formed to every theological *loci*. Volf certainly makes no claim to exclusivity or completeness, so the overarching critiques of Bidwell that is predicated on this assumption are quite overstated.

KEITH L. JOHNSON, *KARL BARTH AND THE ANALOGIA ENTIS*. LONDON: T&T CLARK, 2010. [ISBN 978-0-567-44134-8]

JOHN C. MCDOWELL
UNIVERSITY OF NEWCASTLE

Early in Barth's career he was negatively reviewed by Adolf Jülicher who accused him of a "subjectivist" reading of Paul's *Epistle to the Romans*. Since then Barth's work has been dogged by criticisms that have raised charges of "irrationalism", "fideism", and so on. A key moment in that critical story has been Barth's famous 1934 *Nein* to Emil Brunner's appeal to a form of "natural theology". Particularly in England (and to a lesser degree the United States), where a response to a more empiricistic version of the Enlightenment traditions dominated the modern intellectual imagination, this was perceived to be a clear indication of Barth's theological obscurantism. In this way, then, Barth's theologising has frequently been regarded as unhelpful to the engagement in fruitful conversation with an increasing post-Christian world, and as a betrayal of the *ratio fidei* (or the rationality of faith).

More recently, however, scholars have begun to appreciate more fully Barth's intellectual context—that his work was conceived in many ways as a response not simply to the legacy of nineteenth century theological liberalism, but more particularly to the impact of German Idealism. This has helped shape an appreciation of his critical response to certain types of rationalistic theology that have been uncritically generated by modern intellectual currents. In this context Keith Johnson's readable and insightful historically attentive theological study, the fruit of his Princeton doctorate, is most welcome. In several ways it may even be one of only a handful of near model doctoral theses on Barth in published form, coming as it does with an admirably clear, focused and manageable thesis; a careful depiction of texts and their contexts; a good scholarly theological style not threatened into self-justifying polemic; and attention to the development of thought in the story's two main figures.

I mentioned German Idealism in the context of Barth's broad umbrella judgments about "natural theology", and there are only brief and passing references to this in Johnson's text, as there also are to the 1934 controversy with Emil Brunner. The book's focus is instead on a set of critical conversations mid 1920s onwards that Barth had which contributed to his critique of one type of natural theology, the *analogia entis*. These conversations are with Roman Catholicism, and in particular a version of Thomism associated with the work of Polish Roman Catholic scholar Eric Przywara. The thesis is a simple one, but is particularly well developed in its historically focused engagement, careful reading of the relevant texts and in its sophisticated use of detail. The target of the thesis is largely the reading of Hans Urs von Balthasar, and to a lesser degree Brunner's, and Johnson maintains this: Barth's concerns with the uncontrollability of the event of divine Self-revelation, and of human sinfulness became focused on the *analogia entis* in the mid 1920s as a result of his accurate understanding of that doctrine as articulated by Przywara; and that although Barth did come in time to stop explicitly discussing the *analogia entis* his account of the *analogia fidei* and *analogia relationis* did not involve a theological shift towards Przywara's position. Instead, it was in fact an expression of analogy done well, or done in the shadow of Barth's own lifelong concerns with the Reformation principles of *sola fide* and *sola gratia*.

Along the way there is a very helpful explication of Przywara's theology through the impact of John Henry Newman on him. This is especially useful since Przywara's *corpus* remains little known to English speaking Protestants. The conclusion summarises well some implications of the style of the study for all further work in the area, two of which are worth noting: that it needs to be more carefully concrete and specific in its use of terms; and that it is about considerably more deeply rooted differences in theological commitment than that simply of *analogy* itself, commitments to "key theological doctrines that have distinguished Protestants from Roman Catholics for centuries." [p. 234]

The rhetoric of Protestant-Roman Catholic difference is important, but its form might be contested by some thinkers in order to prevent it from exaggerating and ossifying these differences. A prominent English Roman Catholic once informed me that Przywara's reading of Thomas was skewed by the late medieval receptions of Thomas. Johnson comes close to arguing the same, largely through Gottlieb Söhngen's and von Balthasar's theological conversations with the later Barth (see p. 232). The difference is that my Roman Catholic conversant believed that there were varieties of the *analogia entis* that were *prior to* the work of Barth, whereas Johnson regards the varieties as more recent and in many ways as the very product *of* theological engagement with Barth's work. If the former is the case, then Johnson's claims about the relationship of Protestantism and Roman Catholicism may not be as entirely stable as they appear in his text. This is a point of detail that does not deeply affect the benefit received from reading Johnson's text, but it does have more significant ramifications for further consideration of the nature of Roman Catholic claims to 'natural theology' and their potential convergence with, and divergence from, various Protestant theologies.

A slight gripe about the published form of Johnson's commendable book, however, is that a short abstract of the thesis on the rear of the book would be more helpful than the space being exhausted by four scholars' commendations. The publisher would do well to provide this for all future printings.