

# Erich Przywara on *Sieg-Katholizismus*, bolshevism, the Jews, *Volk*, *Reich* and the *analogia entis* in the 1920s and 1930s

Paul Silas Peterson

Eberhard Karls Universität Tübingen, Evangelisch-theologische Fakultät,  
Liebermeisterstraße 12, 72076 Tübingen,  
paul-silas.peterson@uni-tuebingen.de

While much has been written on Erich Przywara's (1889–1972) philosophical theology, little attention has been given to the relationship between his ideas and his historical contexts.<sup>1</sup> Here a few issues are introduced which shed further light on Przywara's work in its cultural, socio-political, theological and ecclesial contexts. Six issues are presented: first, Przywara's relation to the development from Catholic "cultural inferiority" to culture Catholicism in the early twentieth century. Second, Przywara is introduced in the context of the political ideas of Carl Schmitt and Alois Dempf; all three were drawing upon Juan Donoso Cortés. Third, Przywara's understanding of bolshevism as a religious and intellectual phenomenon is introduced. Fourth, Przywara's popular *analogia entis* is analyzed in its cultural context. Fifth, his *Volk* theology and anti-Semitism are presented. Finally, Przywara's remarks on the *Reich* are briefly addressed.

Przywara was born in Katowice (*Kattowitz*), west of Krakow, in Upper Silesia (*Oberschlesien*), a predominantly Catholic region (85.5 %), taken under Prussian control in the eighteenth century Silesian Wars.<sup>2</sup> Przywara's mother came from a German administrative family (*Beamtenfamilie*) from

---

<sup>1</sup> Przywara's personal letters, documents and handwritten manuscripts are preserved in the Archiv der Deutschen Provinz der Jesuiten (Munich). A list of Przywara's personal books, which have now been added to the library of the Hochschule für Philosophie (Munich; previously the "Berchmanskolleg" – founded by Augustin Bea – in Pullach, near Munich), has been drafted by Ms. Andrea Wagner-Weldi (Dipl.-Bibl.) at the same library. These books contain some personal notes and various entries which are important for further research on Przywara. I would like to thank Ms. Wagner-Weldi for her assistance.

<sup>2</sup> According to the 15th ed. Brockhaus in 1925 there were 144.377 Protestants (10 %) in Upper Silesia, 1.221.000 Catholics and around 10.000 Jews (1 %); *Der große Brockhaus*, vol. 13, 570. Leipzig: Brockhaus, 1932. After WWI, the region remained a part of Germany as the Upper Silesia Province while the eastern part of Silesia, including Katowice, was later transferred to Poland in 1922. The region belonged to the Erzbistum Breslau. In 1933, the Archbishop Adolf Bertram (1859–1945), as the leader of the Fulda Conference of Bishops, annulled that conference's earlier condemnation of the NSDAP. The Protestants of the region belonged to the Old Prussian Union.

Neiße; his apparently successful father came from a Polish farmer background.<sup>3</sup> In 1908 he became a Jesuit at the age of 18. From 1917 to 1921 he studied theology at an exiled German Jesuit institute which was established in the late nineteenth century in Valkenburg aan de Geul in the southeast Netherlands.<sup>4</sup> From 1922 to 1941 he worked for *Stimmen der Zeit* (StZ), the popular publication of the German Jesuits based at this time in Munich, Germany.<sup>5</sup> The clear departure point of his philosophical theology was his work on Max Scheler (1874–1928) and John Henry Newman (1801–1890) in his 1923 publication, *Religionsbegründung: Max Scheler – J. H. Newman*.<sup>6</sup> Przywara is well known for his writings on immanence and transcendence and his popular work of 1932, *Analogia Entis*.<sup>7</sup> His philosophical theology, which begins to develop in the early 1920s (while Przywara was in his early thirties), is an example of the critical Catholic re-

<sup>3</sup> Przywara adds regarding his father: “[...] aber Kaufmann und bald Organisator der oberschlesischen Kaufmannschaft wurde”. Przywara, *In und Gegen. Stellungnahmen zur Zeit*, Nürnberg: Glock u. Lutz, 1959, 12.

<sup>4</sup> Following the suppression and banishment of the Jesuits in the German Empire in 1872, a house of study was founded in Valkenburg and operated there from 1894 to 1942. Before the establishment of the anti-Jesuit law, the primary Jesuit institution was located at the Maria Laach Abbey (near Koblenz in the Rhineland region) from 1863 to 1872. Following the abolishment of the anti-Jesuit law in 1917, in 1925 a college was founded again in Pullach, near Munich (see above, nt. 1).

<sup>5</sup> See: Gustav Wilhelmy, ed., *Erich Przywara: 1889–1969. Eine Festgabe*, Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1969; Leo Zimny and Hans Urs von Balthasar, eds., *Erich Przywara: sein Schrifttum 1912–1962*, Einsiedeln: Johannes, 1963; Friedrich Wulf, “Christliches Denken. Eine Einführung in das theologisch-religiöse Werk von Erich Przywara (1889–1972).” In *In Gottes Nähe: religiöse Erfahrung in Mystik und Offenbarung. Festschrift zum 65. Geburtstag von Josef Sudbrack SJ*, ed. Paul Imhof, 353–366. Würzburg: Echter, 1990; Thomas O’Meara, *Erich Przywara, S.J.: his theology and his world*, Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 2002, 1–32. To Przywara’s biographical “deep rooting” “im Katholischen”, see Martha Zechmeister, *Erich Przywaras Weg negativer Theologie*, Münster: LIT, 1997, 75 f.

<sup>6</sup> The work was published in Freiburg at the Herder Verlag. The convert from Protestantism to Catholicism, J. H. Newman, quickly became the Catholic Hegel in promoting the idea of the development of dogma. His work was popular among many of the progressive Catholics on the continent in the early twentieth century, not least because he managed to preserve the standings of old ecclesial structures in his modern philosophy of intellectual progression.

<sup>7</sup> Eva-Maria Faber, “Przywara, Erich.” In *TRE*, 28, 607–610, here: 608. Benjamin Dahlke has also offered a helpful summary of the importance of Immanenz, Transzendenz and the analogia entis for Przywara, cf., *Die katholische Rezeption Karl Barths: theologische Erneuerung im Vorfeld des Zweiten Vatikanischen Konzils*, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010, 18 f., 92–136. See also: Bernhard Gertz, *Glaubenswelt als Analogie: die theologische Analogie-Lehre Erich Przywaras und ihr Ort in der Auseinandersetzung um die analogia fidei*, Düsseldorf: Patmos-Verl., 1969; Thomas Schumacher, *In-Über: Analogie als Grundbestimmung von Theo-Logie; Reflexionen im Ausgang von Erich Przywara*, München: Inst. zur Förderung der Glaubenslehre, 2003, and Julio Terán-Dutari, “Die Geschichte des Terminus ‘Analogia entis’ und das Werk Erich Przywaras.” *Philosophisches Jahrbuch* 77 (1970): 163–179; *The Analogy of Being: Invention of the Anti-Christ or Wisdom of God?*, ed. Thomas Joseph White, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010.

ception of early twentieth century phenomenology.<sup>8</sup> Although there is a complex philosophical and theological background to Przywara's *Analogia Entis*, the development of this new metaphysical theology was also related to a more general cultural reform taking place in the early twentieth century. One of the defining features of Przywara's intellectual context was the struggle against a perceived Catholic "cultural inferiority" in the development of a cultural Catholicism. As a Catholic theological response to, and partial integration of the vanguard modern philosophy of his time, Przywara's *Analogia Entis* (1932) is itself a specific instance in the complex process of German Catholic intellectual modernization following the socio-cultural tensions of the liberal Protestant dominated German Empire.

### I. From Catholic "cultural inferiority" to anti-Protestant cultural Catholicism

Catholicism in the modern *Deutsches Kaiserreich* (1871–1918) suffered from a Protestant-leaning power imbalance and a cultural inferiority complex.<sup>9</sup> Although a third of the population of the German Empire was Catholic, a higher percentage of the Catholic population, in comparison to the Protestant, lived and worked in the agrarian world. Catholics were over represented in the industrial, agricultural and mining sectors and under-represented among the political, economic and academic elite in the *Kaiserreich*.<sup>10</sup> The under representation in the German Empire brought about a "kulturel-

---

<sup>8</sup> The modernizing of Scholasticism in a new phenomenological style was so successful that even the popular Protestant theologian of crisis, Karl Barth (1886–1968), gave it a critical response. This opened the debate about the analogy of being and the analogy of faith (*analogia fidei*) for the 1930s and ultimately set the stage for the standoff between the followers of Barth and the followers of Przywara, and those in between, for the rest of the twentieth century. Barth was familiar with Przywara's *Religionsphilosophie katholischer Theologie* (1927). Przywara developed his immanence-transcendence-analogia entis ontology in this work and then later in *Analogia Entis* (1932). Barth's rejection of the analogia entis – calling it a creation of the Antichrist, and a good reason for why one could not become a Catholic – was likely drawn from his knowledge of *Religionsphilosophie katholischer Theologie* and not the contemporaneously published *Analogia Entis*. Cf., Barth, *Die kirchliche Dogmatik* [hereafter: KD], 1/1, 11th ed., Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1985, VIII.

<sup>9</sup> Cf., Dagmar Pöpping, *Abendland: christliche Akademiker und die Utopie der Antimoderne 1900–1945*, Berlin: Metropol, 2002, 73 f. Further to the dynamics and cultural situation of Catholicism in the nineteenth and early twentieth century, cf., Martin Baumeister, *Parität und katholische Inferiorität: Untersuchungen zur Stellung des Katholizismus im Deutschen Kaiserreich*, Paderborn: Schöningh, 1987; Timothy Verhoeven, *Transatlantic anti-Catholicism: France and the United States in the nineteenth century*, New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.

<sup>10</sup> Ulrich Bröckling, *Katholische Intellektuelle in der Weimarer Republik: Zeitkritik und Gesellschaftstheorie bei Walter Dirks, Romano Guardini, Carl Schmitt, Ernst Michel und Heinrich Mertens*, München: Fink, 1993, 23.

len Nachholbedarf des deutschen Katholizismus".<sup>11</sup> Many Catholics were viewed as "romhörig" (Ultramontane) and thus only partially reliable in their service to the *Kaiserreich*. Some of the Catholic isolation in the nineteenth century was also a result of Catholic resentment of the new German Empire; there was a concern for the "Verpreussung" of the many smaller regions in the process of Prussian hegemonic unification.<sup>12</sup> The First Vatican Council (1869–1870), the establishment of Papal Infallibility and the related development of Ultramontanism also contributed to the Catholic distance from the German Empire which was often played out in the political posture of the German *Zentrumspartei*. A modern German Catholic identity developed in this context in the latter part of the nineteenth century as a bulwark against modernism, materialism and liberalism and as a counter-pole to the Protestant Prussian liberal state.<sup>13</sup> The polarity was later challenged by avant-garde, progressive (*fortschrittlich*) Catholic intellectuals who sought to overcome the division and resolve at least one aspect of the Culture Wars with the *Neukatholizismus*.<sup>14</sup> In 1903 Karl Muth (1867–1944) founded the journal *Hochland*. This Catholic journal for culture and literature attempted to open up the Catholic cultural world while also promoting a deep criticism of modern art.<sup>15</sup> After *Hochland*, *Stimmen der Zeit* was the second most popular German Catholic journal for culture in the 1920s and 1930s. Although it was exclusively run by the Jesuits, its influence extended beyond the Jesuit milieu. It was based on the models of other Catholic culture jour-

---

<sup>11</sup> Wolfgang Frühwald, "Katholische Literatur im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert in Deutschland." In *Religiös-kulturelle Bewegungen im deutschen Katholizismus seit 1800*, ed. Anton Rauscher, 9–26, here: 10 f. Paderborn: Schöningh, 1986. See also: Margaret Stieg Dalton's treatment of "Catholic Inferiority" in her *Catholicism, Popular Culture, and the Arts in Germany, 1880–1933*, Notre Dame, Ind.: Univ. of Notre Dame Press, 2005, 23 f.; and the general introduction to the "Catholic Milieu" from the late nineteenth century to the early twentieth: *ibid.*, 14–35. Dalton's conclusion: "the Catholic cultural movement was defeated [...] by its own inherent weakness." (*Ibid.*, 240); she continues in claiming that it "never became more than an artificial alternative to a vibrant national culture. [...] the novels, paintings, plays, and films of Catholic culture have ended up on the shelf." (*Ibid.*) Its end "freed Catholics to participate fully in the national culture". *Ibid.*

<sup>12</sup> Bröckling, *Katholische Intellektuelle in der Weimarer Republik*, 25 f.

<sup>13</sup> Cf., Claus Arnold, "'Gegenintellektuelle' und kirchlicher Antimodernismus vor 1914." In *Intellektuellen-Götter: das religiöse Laboratorium der klassischen Moderne*, ed. Friedrich Wilhelm Graf, 21–38. München: Oldenbourg, 2009.

<sup>14</sup> The Würzburg professor of theology, Herman Schell, published a plea for a developmental Catholicism in his *Der Katholizismus als Princip des Fortschritts* (1897). The reform text called for an understanding of the essence of Catholicism in terms of development and thus sought to overcome the outsider cultural position. Albert Ehrhard's *Katholizismus und das zwanzigste Jahrhundert im Lichte der kirchlichen Entwicklung der Neuzeit* (1901) displayed a related sentiment.

<sup>15</sup> Frühwald, "Katholische Literatur im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert in Deutschland", 10 f. See also Albrecht Langner, "Weimarer Kulturkatholizismus und interkonfessionelle Probleme." In *Probleme des Konfessionalismus in Deutschland*, ed. Anton Rauscher, 71–116. Paderborn: Schöningh, 1984.

nals from the nineteenth century.<sup>16</sup> It started in 1865 with irregular publications as *Stimmen aus Maria Laach*.<sup>17</sup> Guido Müller has given an account of the journal's view of Europe from 1918 to 1933.<sup>18</sup> The journal shows signs of bridge building to the Nazis in the early 1930s, while the Jesuits also distance themselves from some aspects of the new nationalism. Müller shows how "tief völkisch-biologisches und sozialdarwinistisches Gedankengut" already set in with at least one Jesuit in the journal as early as 1915.<sup>19</sup> Müller argues that the journal became more political during WWI. (155) After 1919 he also claims that the journal turned from the more radical anti-modernist integralist approach to a more dialogical position. Przywara joined the staff from 1922 and worked at the journal until its closure in 1941. The new approach to culture was a significant development but the early twentieth century continued to be very complicated for the new culture-Catholics.<sup>20</sup> Despite the new openness to modern culture, the larger project of *Kulturkatholizismus* was often joined with an intense anti-modernist and anti-Protestant posture.<sup>21</sup> For many in this period, and not only Catholic culture critics, modern art of the Weimar Period was seen as demonizing the *ständische Gemeinschaft* and the *Volksgemeinschaft*; it was often held that it caused the destruc-

<sup>16</sup> Guido Müller, "Das Europabild der katholischen Monatszeitschrift 'Stimmen der Zeit' im jesuitischen Umfeld (1918–1933)." In *Le discours européen dans les revues allemandes (1918–1933)*, ed. Michel Grünewald, 149–179, here: 150. Wien: Lang, 1997.

<sup>17</sup> The old seal was taken from the Vulgate: "ut testimonium perhibeam veritati" (Jn. 18:37). The leading Jesuit journal promoted a new approach to culture after 1909; in this year the new leadership abandoned the earlier Ultramontanist position of the journal under the previous leadership of Karl Frick SJ (1856–1931). After Frick departed, Peter Lippert SJ (1879–1936), Jakob Overmans SJ (1874–1945) and Max Pribilla SJ (1874–1956) moved the journal into the direction of the *Neukatholizismus*. Hans Urs von Balthasar came on staff later from 1937 and worked there until the end of 1939. Cf., Klaus Schatz, "'Stimmen der Zeit' im Kirchenkonflikt." *Stimmen der Zeit* [hereafter: StZ] 224 (2006): 147–161, here: 147. See also Müller, "Das Europabild der katholischen Monatszeitschrift"; idem, *Europäische Gesellschaftsbeziehungen nach dem Ersten Weltkrieg. Das Deutsch-Französische Studienkomitee und der Europäische Kulturbund*, München: Oldenbourg, 2005.

<sup>18</sup> Müller, "Das Europabild der katholischen Monatszeitschrift"; see also: idem, *Europäische Gesellschaftsbeziehungen*.

<sup>19</sup> Müller, "Das Europabild der katholischen Monatszeitschrift", 156.

<sup>20</sup> In 1907, Pius X issued his *Pascendi* which condemned all forms of modernist thinking. A few years later in 1910 the Oath Against Modernism was set into force which also hindered the reform of cultural isolation. Despite the papal resistance to modernism, the attempt to develop something like "Kulturkatholizismus" in the face of the trauma of the "cultural superiority" of *Kulturprotestantismus* nevertheless echoed into the Weimar Period. Martin Baumeister speaks of "das Trauma von der 'Kulturüberlegenheit des Protestantismus'", *Parität und katholische Inferiorität*, 89; cited in Friedrich Wilhelm Graf, "Kulturprotestantismus." In *TRE*, 19, 230–243, here: 235. Cf., Richard Faber, *Männerrunde mit Gräfin: die "Kosmiker" Derleth, George, Klages, Schuler, Wolfskehl und Franziska zu Reventlow; mit einem Nachdruck des "Schwabinger Beobachters"*, Frankfurt/M.: Lang, 1994, 125.

<sup>21</sup> On "kulturkatholische Protestantismuskritik", cf., Langner, "Weimarer Kulturkatholizismus und interkonfessionelle Probleme", 74–78; and to the characterization of Catholic "Objektivismus" and Protestant "Subjektivismus", *ibid*, 78 f.

tion of the “natural interrelation (*Zusammenhang*)” between the artist and the *Volk*.<sup>22</sup> Anti-modernism and the critique of Protestantism became a unified front and a central feature of Weimar culture Catholicism in the early twentieth century.<sup>23</sup> Przywara drew upon Friedrich Nietzsche (1844–1900) in his critique of Lutheranism: “Nietzsche ist der verzweifelte Protest echten Menschentums gegen seine Verkümmern im Erbsündefanatismus und Spiritualismus des Luthertums.”<sup>24</sup> Przywara’s hefty criticism of Protestantism is found throughout his *Ringten der Gegenwart*, a collection of essays and articles from the 1920s. Protestantism functions as a foil for his presentation of Catholicism. While during the *Kulturkampf* the word *Katholizismus* was often associated with anti-nationalistic sentiment and cultural isolation, after the First World War, there is an attempt to recover the term positively.<sup>25</sup> Younger Catholic intellectuals of the Weimar Period, such as Przywara, and many others, saw *Kulturprotestantismus* as a counter pole.<sup>26</sup> The

<sup>22</sup> Cf., Laura Lauzemis, “Die nationalsozialistische Ideologie und der ‘neue Mensch’ – Oskar Schlemmers Folkwang-Zyklus und sein Briefwechsel mit Klaus Graf von Baudissin aus dem Jahr 1934.” In *Angriff auf die Avantgarde. Kunst und Kunstpolitik im Nationalsozialismus*, ed. Uwe Fleckner, 5–88, here: 55 f. Berlin: Akademie, 2007.

<sup>23</sup> According to Langner, “die protestantismuskritische und antimodernistische Frontstellung” became a “Kerngehalt des Weimarer Kulturkatholizismus.” Langner, “Weimarer Kulturkatholizismus und interkonfessionelle Probleme”, 71; cited in Graf, “Kulturprotestantismus”, 235. See also: Langner, “Politischer Katholizismus im Urteil des Weimarer Protestantismus.” *Civitas* 6 (1967): 84–97; cf., Przywara, “Die religiöse Krise in der Gegenwart und der Katholizismus” (1925), in idem, *Katholische Krise*, Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1967.

<sup>24</sup> Przywara, *Ringten der Gegenwart: Gesammelte Aufsätze 1922–1927*, vols. 1–2, Augsburg: Filser, 1929, vol. 1, 175; see also his essay “Neue Theologie?” in Przywara, *Ringten der Gegenwart*, vol. 2, 669–725. Hans Urs von Balthasar would write in 1966 about the importance of Nietzsche for Przywara: “Nietzsche als neuer Heraklit wird zu einer Art Gegenpart von Ignatius.” Hans Urs von Balthasar, “Erich Przywara.” In *Tendenzen der Theologie im 20. Jahrhundert. Eine Geschichte in Porträts*, ed. Hans Jürgen Schultz, 354–359, here: 358. Stuttgart: Kreuz, 1966. To Przywara’s Nietzsche reception and assimilation, cf., Zechmeister, *Erich Przywaras Weg negativer Theologie*, 257–283. For a glance into Przywara’s analysis of popular cultural streams of thought in light of Nietzsche, see his 1920s essay: “Um das Erbe Friedrich Nietzsches” (in: Przywara, *Ringten der Gegenwart*, vol. 1, 169–179). For Przywara, in the work of Friedrich Nietzsche “leuchtet altes katholisches Gold.” (178.) For, among other things, it is “urkatholisch, das organische Gebilde des Volkes zu pflegen gegenüber dem Zweckgebilde eines reinen Machtstaates.” (178).

<sup>25</sup> *Kulturkampf* is a term for both the more specific conflict between Prussia and the Catholic Church from 1871 to 1887 and in a more general sense, the conflict between the church and the state. In the early twentieth century Germanophone catholic context, the debates of the later nineteenth century became a central feature of the shared memory. Other terms, such as Ultramontanism, are also related to this conflict with modernism and the modern state in the nineteenth century, but continue to have meaning and influence into the twentieth century. Cf., Olaf Blaschke, “Kulturkampf.” In *RGG*<sup>4</sup>, 4, 1838–1843; Winfried Becker and Susanna Schmidt, “Kulturkampf.” In *LThK*<sup>3</sup>, 6, 517–521.

<sup>26</sup> Scheler, who converted to Catholicism in 1899, was also instrumental in promoting a new self-confident Catholicism and the idea of the end of liberalism, as was Guardini. Cf., Pöpping, *Abendland*, 88 f.

(divine) “judgment” of WWI, as many Catholic culture critics saw it, and many in the *George-Kreis* as well, showed the internal contradiction of liberal individualism and proved its ultimate decline.<sup>27</sup> The consequences of WWI thus opened a new way forward.<sup>28</sup> Przywara’s 1920s article, “Katholische Krise”, also attests to this sense of the new situation after WWI.<sup>29</sup> He addresses the *Nachkriegszeit* and offers a plea for a “Katholizismus der demütigen Erdnähe einer wahrhaft ‘gelebten’ Menschwerdung” for the solution to the Catholic crisis.<sup>30</sup> Similarly, in his article, “Wohin?”, from the same collection, he writes: “Die nachkriegliche Entwicklung hat nun in steigendem Maß dem deutschen Katholizismus positive Verantwortung für das wirkliche Leben in Politik, Wirtschaft, Bildung usw. in die Hände gegeben. Es genügt nun nicht mehr, sich über das Mittelalter zu ergehen.”<sup>31</sup> He ends his article by stressing, in strong distinction to the *Kulturkampf*, that there is a way to emphasize Catholic culture, politics and economy without denying the state and culture their own right. Already in the 1920s, Przywara was looking for a new cooperative approach and seems to be redrawing the lines of the cultural

<sup>27</sup> Przywara’s George reception and assimilation has not been completely researched but a few mentions of it are made in Zechmeister, *Erich Przywaras Weg negativer Theologie*, 62, 260.

<sup>28</sup> Przywara writes about the new possibilities following WWI: “Es ist für uns Katholiken ein wahrer Segen des großen Krieges geworden, daß wir unserer geistigen Stellung in der Vorkriegszeit nun unbefangener gegenüberstehen. Jetzt, da überall der religiöse Mutterboden sich auflockert, erkennen wir deutlich den eigentlichen Charakter von Lebensanschauungen und Lebenshaltungen, die wir vor dem Krieg unbedenklich pflegten, ja, nicht selten mit Betonung als ‘katholisch’ zu bezeichnen geneigt waren, ohne zu sehen, dass wir unbewusst Luthertum und Kantianismus herübernahmen.” “Gottgeheimnis der Welt” (1923). In *Schriften I. Frühe religiöse Schriften; Schriften II. Religions-philosophische Schriften; Schriften III. Analogia Entis: Metaphysik; Ur-Struktur und All-Rhythmus*, II, 146. Einsiedeln: Johannes, 1962 (Przywara goes on to cite Scheler); cited in Pöpping, *Abendland*, 88. Przywara goes on to speak of the “Infizierung” that had taken hold in the past. A brief review of some of his earlier literature shows that a great deal of his earlier work and interests are not represented in the highly selective *Schriften* from the 1960s. See also Manfred Lochbrunner’s account of the genesis of the *Schriften* in his *Hans Urs von Balthasar und seine Theologenkollegen: sechs Beziehungsgeschichten*, Würzburg: Echter, 2009, 105 f. Przywara often presents Protestantism as leading to either theo-panism (God is everything [cf., Rudolf Otto]) or pantheism (everything is God), the humanization of God or the divinization of man. (Cf., Gertz, *Glaubenswelt als Analogie*, 138 f.) The history of theology, philosophy and literature is read through the new paradigm of polarity. The fall story is the dissolving of the dialectics, as his famous student, Balthasar, would present the narrative in the first volume of his *Apokalypse der deutschen Seele* (vol. I, 1937; vols. II, III, 1939).

<sup>29</sup> “Es weht noch durch unsere Reihen, so oder so, etwas von der Seelenhaltung eines jahrzehntelang unterdrückten Volkes, das ängstlich und liebdienerisch nach der Geste des Zwingherrn schielt. Und es muß einmal offen herausgesagt werden – keine unserer sogenannten Richtungen ist davon frei.” Przywara, *Ringens der Gegenwart*, vol. 1, 90.

<sup>30</sup> Ibid. The deployment of Incarnational theology, in the context of the plea – common among the new Catholics – to turn to the church towards social interests, was also popular in France. See: Bernard Besret, *Incarnation ou eschatologie? Contribution à l’histoire du vocabulaire religieux contemporain*, 1933–1955, Paris: Cerf, 1964.

<sup>31</sup> Przywara, *Ringens der Gegenwart*, vol. 1, 116–132, here: 125.

polarity by bringing Catholics into a new self-confident engagement.<sup>32</sup> He engaged the ideas of Nietzsche and many other German literary figures in his construction of a Catholic-friendly reading of German literature in anthologies, essays and reviews. The new culture Catholicism that Przywara promoted was a kind of renewal program that sought both to overcome Catholic isolation and also erect a new cultural bulwark against the perceived failure of Protestant liberalism. A part of the larger program was also re-thinking politics in face of the new historical realities following WWI.<sup>33</sup>

---

<sup>32</sup> Cf., Przywara, "Zwischen Religion und Kultur." *StZ* 108 (1925): 321–332. Here he addresses the "Minderwertigkeit" and "Minderwertigkeitsbewußtsein" (328) which are related to viewing Catholic art, culture or philosophy as one party among others, and thus overlooking the "Gott alles in allem". The *analogia entis* theology comes into play throughout this article.

<sup>33</sup> As Albrecht Langner claims, Przywara sought to employ the "Kulturkraft gegen die bisherige Dominanz der säkularisierenden Moderne und des Protestantismus in Deutschland." Langner, "Weimarer Kulturkatholizismus und interkonfessionelle Probleme", 114, cf., 75. The "form principle" of Przywara's *analogia-entis-in-über* Catholic ontological polarity was also central to his critique of liberal, subjective Protestant theology and culture. For Przywara, Protestantism fluctuates between "pietistischem Sektentum und verwässertem Kulturchristentum". "Gott in uns oder Gott über uns? (Immanenz und Transzendenz im heutigen Geistesleben)." *StZ* 105 (1923): 343–362, here: 353. He also criticizes, drawing upon Scheler, a Catholic "antiprotestantische" Einstellung" and discusses the results of "Inferioritätsschmerzen". (353; cf., 356.) Przywara's anti-Protestant position is somewhat differentiated. He is more critical of the liberal modern positions of Harnack and Rudolf Otto than of the new crisis theology which he sees as a revival of Protestantism. (350) He is critical of Harnack's "weltbürgerlichem Christentum" (346) and in reference to Harnack and Otto he speaks of the symptoms of the "naturnotwendig [em] Abfall" of "Protestantismus von seinem ursprünglichen Standpunkt und der hieraus resultierenden Mittelstandpunkte, an denen unser Geistesleben leidet." (351) In his "Zum Problem Max Scheler" he warns against the "sicknesses of German Catholicism" against a "rein reaktive Abwehrhaltung." *StZ* 108 (1925): 78–80, here: 80. Many Catholic culture critics, such as Muth, Peter Wust, Theodor Haecker, Dempf, Guardini, Scheler, Przywara, Pribilla, Schmitt and Balthasar saw a new opening for *Kulturkatholizismus* in the wreckage and ruin of 1918 and the "final collapse" of liberal modern Protestantism, the end of the *Neuzeit*. Cf., Guido Müller, "Der 'Katholische Akademikerverband' im Übergang von der Weimarer Republik ins 'Dritte Reich'." In *Moderne und Nationalsozialismus im Rheinland*, ed. Dieter Breuer and Gertrude Cepl-Kaufmann, 551–576. Paderborn: Schöningh, 1997. The rejection of the liberal conception of relative human independence ran together with critiques of the Weimar Constitution and sometimes the state itself. The new Catholicism also tended to promote a conception of theonomic rights, hierarchical cultural dominance of the church, and often a new Middle Age "organic" *Ständegesellschaft* ideal. Many of these intellectual streams joined together in the promotion of the *Kulturkatholizismus* in the journals *Hochland*, *Stimmen der Zeit*, *Schönere Zukunft*, *Abendland*, *Allgemeine Rundschau* and the *Schweizerische Rundschau* in the 1920s and 1930s. Graf, "Kulturprotestantismus", 235. To "Sieg-Katholizismus", cf., Langner, "Weimarer Kulturkatholizismus und interkonfessionelle Probleme", 75 f. See also: Reinhard Mehring, *Carl Schmitt zur Einführung*, Hamburg: Junius, 2011. To Schmitt's "Katholizismus als politisches Credo", cf., Reinhard Mehring, *Carl Schmitt: Aufstieg und Fall*, München: Beck, 2009, 142 f. Schmitt claimed that *Action Française* was the most interesting journal of his time. (*Ibid.*, 144.) Like Balthasar, Schmitt was enthralled with the French Catholic



## II. *Przywara among the political theorists: Juan Donoso Cortés, Carl Schmitt and Alois Dempf*

Przywara addressed political and social issues in the 1920s and 1930s. Catholic intellectuals could look back to *Rerum novarum* (1891) or *Quadragesimo anno* (1931) as examples of social and political interest of the church, but the tradition is also older.<sup>34</sup> In the later nineteenth century, after the rise of the industrial revolution, a more general awareness of societal problems and a commensurate social critique emerged.<sup>35</sup> Although the later encyclical from Pius XI, *Quadragesimo anno*, did not displace the *magna carta* standing of *Rerum novarum*, it went beyond it in some regards.<sup>36</sup> Catholic counter-responses to nineteenth century liberalism took various forms in the early twentieth century. They often sought to align with streams of thought sympathetic to tradition, social values and sometimes national and *völkisch* concerns. Although there are some similarities to be found in these responses with the later radical ideologues of National Socialism, there was nevertheless some abiding incongruence with regard to the role of religion, the claim

---

renewal literature of Bernanos, et al.; the “Kronjurist des Dritten Reiches” and friend of Erik Peterson was fluent in French and had close contact with Jacques Maritain for a time.

<sup>34</sup> Wilhelm Dantine and Eric Hultsch, “Lehre und Dogmenentwicklung im römischen Katholizismus.” In *Handbuch der Theologie- und Dogmengeschichte, Bd. III*, ed. Carl Andresen, 289–423, here: 324 f. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, <sup>3</sup>1998. In the early nineteenth century the relationship of ecclesial bodies to political sociality had undergone a new reform (e. g., Franz Baader, 1765–1841). Adam Müller’s (1779–1829) three volume *Die Elemente der Staatskunst* (1809) made a point to highlight the Volksgeist and describe the state as a moral collective-person. (303) He also emphasized Volk, Gesellschaft, Staat and Monarchie; not surprisingly, the King of Prussia, Friedrich Wilhelm III (1797–1840) was interested in Müller’s extramural ideas.

<sup>35</sup> Cf., Dantine and Hultsch, “Lehre und Dogmenentwicklung im römischen Katholizismus”, 325 f. A classic example from the later nineteenth century is Carl von Vogelsang (1818–1890). Vogelsang came into conflict with capitalistic and liberal economic ideas which were growing in popularity in the mid nineteenth century. (325 f.) His critique of capitalism ran together with his critique of “Judenherrschaft”. The social critique and attempt to bring the ecclesial voice into the social debate was also expressed in Leo XIII’s social encyclical *Rerum novarum*, which became the foundation for all other social encyclicals. In it he ordered the Church’s identity and role within the capitalistic system (“modo capitalistico vivit Ecclesia catholica”) utilizing elements from both the liberal and conservative critiques of the economy. He propagated class peace instead of class wars, social compromise instead of social radicalism, and mediation instead of strike. *Ibid.*, 328.

<sup>36</sup> Many claim that it was an endorsement or encouragement of a kind of fascist *Ständestaat*: a political order based upon the rejection of democracy in the turning back of nineteenth century liberalism to a renewed authoritarian political structure, or a corporative state. It was used in this manner by many promoting this politic. (329 f.) Oswald von Nell-Breuning holds that *Quadragesimo anno* “ist tot. Die Enzyklika des Subsidiaritätsprinzips ist vom Totalitarismus des autoritären Staats überrannt worden und mußte sich dabei noch gefallen lassen, zu dessen Rechtfertigung mißbraucht zu werden.” Oswald von Nell-Breuning, *Wie sozial ist die Kirche? Leistung und Versagen der Katholischen Soziallehre*, Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1972, 134; cited in Dantine and Hultsch, “Lehre und Dogmenentwicklung im römischen Katholizismus”, 330.

upon absolute authority, neo-paganism and the most radical forms of the racial ideas.

The new Catholicism and the political intellectuals representing it were interested in establishing a new image and distancing themselves from the simple anti-Germanic, Ultramontane reputation earned from the nineteenth century. Przywara, Carl Schmitt and Alois Dempf were at the forefront of this new approach. Przywara was on the cutting edge of a new movement of academics promoting a new Catholicism that was in dialogue with popular ideas in the 1930s in Germany while also incorporating some of the nineteenth and early twentieth century Catholic social and political critique.<sup>37</sup> Already in the 1920s, in his article, “Integraler Katholizismus”, Przywara engages Hugo Ball and others in an attempt to determine correctly an integral Catholicism. He hopes for a strong self-conscious Catholicism, for only a “Sieg-Katholizismus [kann] auf das Trümmerfeld treten”.<sup>38</sup> Przywara was no stranger to the political and cultural climate of Nazi Germany. His later anthology, *Heroisch* (1936),<sup>39</sup> is a good example of his own integration and inclusion of what Armin Mohler would call, in his *Konservative Revolution*, “Der ‘heroische Realismus’”.<sup>40</sup> The language on the cover page of Przywara’s book is typical of post-1933 Germany: “Es entwickelt aus den Propheten der Gegenwart das Bild der Gegenwart und stellt es in das Licht der großen Tradition heroischer Haltung in Antike und Christentum.” A significant section of the anthology is concerned with promoting Juan Donoso Cortés, the author of the famous *Ensayo sobre el catolicismo, el liberalismo y el socialismo* (1851). He was not only the hero of Przywara, but also of Carl Schmitt. Schmitt drew upon him to overturn political liberalism and pluralism in his justification of a homogeneous total state.<sup>41</sup> Donoso Cortés

---

<sup>37</sup> Some of his contemporaries also recognized this. The popular Zurich based fascist, Julius Schmidhauser (1893–1970), who published his work in Germany, specifically admired Przywara’s movement away from the liberal “vergewaltigenden parteihaften Denken”. Julius Schmidhauser, *Der Kampf um das geistige Reich: Bau und Schicksal der Universität*, Hamburg: Hanseatische Verlagsanstalt, 1933, 320. The Crown Jurist of the Third Reich, Carl Schmitt, seems to have had a high regard for Przywara as well. Schmitt contributed to a Festschrift for Przywara: Carl Schmitt, “Nomos – Name – Name.” In *Der beständige Aufbruch. Festschrift für Erich Przywara*, SJ, ed. Siegfried Behn, 92–105. Nürnberg: Glock & Lutz, 1959. Cf., Bröckling, *Katholische Intellektuelle in der Weimarer Republik*; Mehring, *Carl Schmitt: Aufstieg und Fall*; idem, *Carl Schmitt zur Einführung*.

<sup>38</sup> Przywara, *Ringens der Gegenwart*, vol. 1, 133–145, here: 140. In this essay Przywara also addresses George on more than one occasion, and often negatively.

<sup>39</sup> Wien/Zürich: Schöningh-Paderborn.

<sup>40</sup> Cf., Armin Mohler, *Die Konservative Revolution in Deutschland 1918–1932. Ein Handbuch*, Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1972, 123 f.

<sup>41</sup> Michael Behnen, “Schmitt, Carl.” In *Literaturlexikon. Autoren und Werke deutscher Sprache*, 15 vols., ed. Walther Killy, et al., 10, 321. Gütersloh: Bertelsmann Lexikon Verl., 1988.

was a significant source for Schmitt and is often called the forerunner or indirect justifier of national socialist ideology.<sup>42</sup>

In *Heroisch*, Przywara tracks the “heroic posture” from Cortés’s anti-French Revolution anti-liberalism, to Nietzsche, then to Rainer M. Rilke, Stefan George, Ludwig Derleth, Dietrich Eckart and Sigrid Undset. He concludes with “Heroismus” in general.<sup>43</sup> He begins with Cortés, “der einstige Abgott der spanischen Liberalen”. (7) Przywara promotes his most critical passages of anti-liberal ideology. The “hero” Cortés sets himself against Montalembert, and against “das Weltbild des Fortschritts der Humanität das Weltbild des Aufstandes und der Katastrophe des Menschen.” (8) At the beginning of his many citations, Przywara approvingly cites Cortés’s selection of the dictator over the democratic rule of the people. (7 f.) He summarizes Cortés second speech in his own words<sup>44</sup> and goes on to praise Cortés as a great politician: “So sehen die letzten Zeichnungen des großen Staatsmannes das folgerichtige Entweder-Oder zwischen Anarchie und Katholizismus.” (10 f.) Przywara publishes this praise of Cortés in 1936, as the German dictator was in full power. He praises the ideology of the dictator (“Spitze des Staates”) in collaboration with Catholicism against “Republikanertum” and thus seems to endorse the Nazi dictatorship in collaboration with Catholicism. The heroic Cortés has a new vision against barbarism and civilization. His view of the person has room for the sinfulness of man; Przywara comments: “So setzt mit Donoso Cortes die große Umkehrung des Bildes vom Mensch ein.” (14) It is thus a new vision of the person, as Przywara summa-

<sup>42</sup> “Vorläufer (oder indirekter Rechtfertiger) nationalsozialistischer Ideologeme”. Dieter Reichardt and John Bendix, “Donoso Cortés, Juan. Ensayo sobre el catolicismo, el liberalismo y el socialismo considerados en sus principios fundamentales.” In *Kindlers Literatur-Lexikon* [hereafter: KLL], 18 vol., ed. Heinz Ludwig Arnold, et al. 4, 716. Stuttgart/Weimar: Metzler, <sup>3</sup>2009.

<sup>43</sup> *Heroisch*, Wien/Zürich/Paderborn: Schöningh, 1936, 165. In the general treatment of heroism at the end of the book he discusses Heraclitus, Parmenides, Plato, Aristotle, the Apostle Paul, Augustine, Aquinas, Ignatius, Teresa of Ávila, John of the Cross, Thérèse of Lisieux, The Child Jesus and the Holy Face.

<sup>44</sup> “Die zweite große Rede vor den spanischen Cortes vom 30. Januar 1850 schließt dann den Kreis zur ersten, da sie das kommende Europa entwirft, für das es keine andere Rettung wird geben als die ‘Diktatur von oben’, die den Menschen des Gehorsams und Opfers aufruft, in Kampf und Blut. Es gibt nur das Entweder-Oder zwischen einem dreifachen Ja und einem dreifachen Nein. Ein dreifaches Ja vom Religiösen her ins Politische: zu einem persönlichen Gott, – und darum auch zu einer persönlichen Spitze des Staates; zu einem persönlichen, durch seine Vorsehung wahrhaft regierenden Gott, – und darum auch zu einer persönlichen, wahrhaft regierenden Spitze des Staates; zu einem persönlichen, direkt eingreifenden Gott, – und darum auch zu einer persönlichen, unmittelbar eingreifenden Spitze des Staates. Ein dreifaches Nein vom Religiösen her ins Politische: Deismus, der das unmittelbare Eingreifen Gottes leugnet, – und ihm entsprechend der politische ‘Fortschritt’, der die persönliche Spitze des Staates zwar beläßt, aber entmächtigt [sic]; – Pantheismus, der Gott beläßt, aber ihn als persönlichen Gott leugnet, – und ihm entsprechend das Republikanertum, das eine oberste Gewalt noch zugesteht, aber nicht in der Form einer Person; – Atheismus, der Gott überhaupt leugnet, – und ihm entsprechend die politische Anarchie, die jede Regierung beseitigt.” *Ibid.*, 8.

rices: “Befehl und Gehorsam sind darum die Inbegriffe der realen Humanität.” (16) In the midst of an authoritarian state, Przywara harmonizes Cortés’s view of the person with Christianity in terms of command and obedience.<sup>45</sup> He goes on to cite the arch national socialist author, Dietrich Eckart (1868–1923). For his citations, he draws upon the chief Nazi ideologue, Alfred Rosenberg’s *Dietrich Eckart: Ein Vermächtnis* (Munich, 1928). Eckart was the friend of Rosenberg and the editor of *Auf gut deutsch*, which established a front against the Weimar government and Jews. He had unreserved admiration for Adolf Hitler and was a passionate supporter of the NSDAP. He promoted anti-Semitism and participated in the 1923 Hitler Putsch. He died later that year in Berchtesgaden but was viewed among the Nazis as a martyr for the new Germany. His work was popular in the NS period and Hitler dedicated a sentence to him in the closing lines of the second edition of his *Mein Kampf*. Hitler saw him as a true man committed to the *Volk* in his thought, poetry and ultimately in his action.<sup>46</sup> Richard Steigmann-Gall points out that Eckart, one of Hitler’s mentors, advanced Nazism with Christianity; Christ was seen as the true man, anti-Semitic and heroic.<sup>47</sup> Przywara praises Eckart’s deep insight, he shows the “zugrundeliegende Situation in restloser Nacktheit, ohne Überkleidung durch Brokat und ohne

---

<sup>45</sup> Przywara goes on to summarize this mystery of human existence: “Um dieses ‘furchtbarste aller Geheimnisse’ willen sind dann Krieg und Blut das Realere von Befehl und Gehorsam, weil in ihnen der Gehorsam seine Sühnegestalt hat, darin die je neue Revolte der Freiheit ausgebrannt wird.” (17) After citing a few pages of Cortés’s rationale, Przywara again summarizes: “Und also kann dem abgezwungenen Opfer des Blutes nichts anderes begegnen als das freiwillige Opfer des Blutes.” (19) Before the beginning of WWII, Przywara already seems to have found a way of theologizing and philosophizing about sacrifice and death in obedience to command. He continues in his summary: “Darum hängt das Heroische der Opferung an der Torheit der überflutenden Liebe”. (21) He goes on to cite Cortés on beauty, glory, sacrifice, soldiers, the church, priests, etc.: “in diese große Situation mündet die zweite der prophetischen Cortes-Reden”. (24) He continues: “Dieser Heroismus ist dann die Überwindung aller dumpfen Tragik in den Adel, ja in die Poesie der Huldigung, wie sie dem echten Menschen entspricht und wie sie gerade der ‘ritterliche Spanier’ ins Wort und die Gebärde zu prägen weiß: vor der Heiligkeit Gottes, vor der Heiligkeit der Frau, vor der Heiligkeit der Fahne.” (24) He further relates Cortés’s reflection on the three greatest loves: the love to God, to the wife/or unto the woman (“zur Frau”), and to the fatherland. (25) Later Przywara connects Nietzsche to the spirit of Cortés relating his birth year to the feast day of Teresa of Ávila. (27) Nietzsche stands in the tradition of the great “heroic man” which also has its tradition “im Preußentum”. (27) As he connects the heroic spirit from Cortés to Nietzsche, he also connects it then later to Derleth who was born in the time of the “Siege Deutschlands über Frankreich”; he sees with Derleth “das ausgesprochenste Manifest des Heroischen”. (46) With George and Derleth one finds “die ideale Konkretheit einer deutschen Romanität des Heroischen”. (47) Later he cites George’s comments about blood, faith, power and the beautiful life. *Ibid.*, 61.

<sup>46</sup> Jürgen Hillesheim and Elisabeth Michael, *Lexikon nationalsozialistischer Dichter: Biographien, Analysen, Bibliographien*, Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann, 1993, 133 f.

<sup>47</sup> Steigmann-Gall, *The Holy Reich: Nazi conceptions of Christianity, 1919–1945*, Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Pr., 2003, 18 f.

Übertäubung durch Rausch.”<sup>48</sup> Przywara not only established a *modus vivendi* with the Nazi Christianity, but a posture of endorsement. Throughout his praise of the heroic spirit in the various authors, he often returns to Cortés. He finally ends his presentation of the heroic pathos with Thérèse of Lisieux, The Child Jesus and the Holy Face, from *Histoire d'une âme*, a citation about the banner of a king and the mystery of the cross. (195) With Przywara, the final heroic spirit is seen in this joining of Catholicism with the political order in a dictatorial and authoritarian regime that functions on orders given and obedience rendered. In 1936, during the glory years of the Third Reich, Przywara attempted to bring Catholicism closer to the existing political order, and to win the respect of the ideologues, like Rosenberg, by showing that the religion was capable of aligning itself with the heroic age.

Alois Dempf (1891–1982) was another leading Catholic intellectual who was interested in Cortés and acquainted with Przywara. Dempf published his *Christliche Staatsphilosophie in Spanien* (Salzburg: Anton Pustet, 1937) a year after Przywara's *Heroisch*.<sup>49</sup> Dempf's *Christliche Staatsphilosophie in Spanien* also endorses the popular forerunner of Nazi ideology, Cortés, and is exemplary of the conservative Catholic reception familiar to Przywara.<sup>50</sup> Drawing upon his “großen Meister” he explains the “Abstieg

---

<sup>48</sup> *Heroisch*, 76. Przywara presents his insights as a heroic and fearless prophet of the present: “Rücksichtslos offen gibt sich darum in den Anfängen Eckarts die Situation der Jahrzehnte vor dem Weltkrieg.” (76) The nationalistic *Volk* sentiment is reproduced and approved by Przywara. He writes in the middle of his reproduction: “mitten darin kommt doch der Klang aus der Höhe in die schwarze Tiefe, und die ‘dunkle Existenz’ ringt mit ihm”. (78) He goes on to praise this prophet figure for his religious ideas: “In diesem Ringen gebiert sich das echt Deutsche einer widersprüchlichen Einheit zwischen schwärmender Entzücktheit und unbeugsamen Trotz, wie es in die verstreuten Gedichte und Lieder Eckarts unbekümmert eingeht. Es spinnt sich der Traum einer ewigen Existenz über die Zeit”. *Ibid.*, 80.

<sup>49</sup> Lochbrunner has provided a summary of Balthasar's correspondences with Dempf, the date of their first meeting is not known, however. Manfred Lochbrunner, *Hans Urs von Balthasar und seine Philosophenfreunde: fünf Doppelporträts*, Würzburg: Echter, 2005, 117–142.

<sup>50</sup> When writing about his objective he states: “Wir werden ohnehin diese Methode bei ihrem ersten großen Meister, Donoso Cortés, zu schildern haben, der schon glänzend alle weltanschaulichen Fehler des Liberalismus und Sozialismus, besonders ihren Pantheismus und Atheismus, aus der einseitigen Stellungnahme für die Volkssouveränität aufgezeigt hat”. Dempf, *Christliche Staatsphilosophie in Spanien*, 9 f. Although the Weimar democracy was disabled in Germany, Dempf thought it necessary, in 1937, to remind his readers of the dangers of liberalism, liberal democracy and all that go with them, including social destruction: “Der *Liberalismus* leugnet zunächst die Gesamtverantwortung und Existenz der Blutsaristokratie und damit bald die der Familie überhaupt.” (*Christliche Staatsphilosophie in Spanien*, 160) He goes on to speak of its danger to “Solidarität”. While liberalism endangered the *Blutsaristokratie*, communistic thinking leads to “einem universalen Weltdespotismus”. (162) For Dempf, the way into the harmonious future was neither communism nor liberalism, but a third way of solidarity. He ends his “Nachwort” in hope that the “männliche Volk” will find itself again and also its “groß[e] Tradition: hispanidad y cristianidad.” (167) The Spanish Civil War was well underway in 1937.

zur Katastrophe” in liberalism, democracy and constitutional monarchy.<sup>51</sup> The argument continues in this manner but takes on a more explicit theological orientation<sup>52</sup> before addressing the “Analogie der soziologischen Seinsweisen und des absoluten Seins”. (135) Dempf’s language of analogy and being seems at the least related to Przywara’s. Dempf was with Josef Pieper and Erich Przywara around 1930 at a congress in Neiße, Silesia (Schlesien); they were photographed together there.<sup>53</sup> Przywara, Dempf and Schmitt were all drawing upon and promoting the anti-liberal thought of Cortés in the 1930s. There was a new hope that the fall of the liberal order would be an opportunity for the rise of a new age of cooperation between the state and church. One of the central opponents, a shared opponent, was bolshevism.

---

<sup>51</sup> “Der Liberalismus erscheint nur mehr als Mittelstufe zwischen dem totalen Ordnungssystem des Katholizismus und dem totalen Unordnungschaos des Sozialismus. Der Liberalismus wird zum bloßen juste milieu der Kompromißstellung zwischen Autorität und Anarchie, das Adjektiv konstitutionell, das der Monarchie beigelegt wird, ist eine vergebliche, aber gefährliche Konzession an die Demokratie, und das Adjektiv liberal, das zu Demokratie hinzugesetzt wird, ist eine vergebliche Rettungsmaßnahme vor der totalen sozialen Demokratie oder genauer vor dem demokratischen Sozialismus. Die Dialektik der konstitutionellen Monarchie und der liberalen Demokratie erweist sie als vergebliche Gleichgewichtskonstruktion einer schwächlichen Vermittlungspolitik, die zwischen den Mühlsteinen des total autoritären und des total anarchischen Systems zerrieben werden muß. Kulturkritisch gesehen, ist der Abstieg von der absoluten Monarchie zum Liberalismus und Sozialismus eine Zersplitterung der hierarchischen Einheit des Religiösen, Politischen und Sozialen, wie sie den Katholizismus kennzeichnet, zur bloßen Politik des Spielens mit den Regierungsformen im Liberalismus und zur ausschließlichen Geltung des Gesellschaftlichen oder Wirtschaftlichen im Sozialismus.” *Ibid.*, 133.

<sup>52</sup> “Dem politischen Abstieg geht parallel der theologische Verfall: zur konstituierenden und tatsächlichen Souveränität der absoluten Monarchie gehört der gesetzgebende und allmächtige Gott des Theismus. Zur konstituierenden, aber nicht regierenden Souveränität der konstitutionellen Monarchie gehört ein bloß gesetzgebender, aber nicht regierender Gott, der Deismus. Zur gemäßigten Volkssouveränität der liberalen Demokratie gehört ein nicht von der Welt getrennter Gott, der Pantheismus, und zur ausschließlichen Volkssouveränität der sozialen Demokratie gehört die volle Gottesleugnung, der Atheismus.” *Ibid.*, 134 f.

<sup>53</sup> Vincent Berning and Hans Maier, *Alois Dempf: 1891–1982; Philosoph, Kulturtheoretiker, Prophet gegen den Nationalsozialismus*, Weissenhorn: Konrad, 1992, 168. Four pages are dedicated to the section titled “Prophet gegen den Nationalsozialismus” (without a single citation from Dempf). Dempf is a popular character in Klaus Breuning’s long exposition on “Die Vision des Reiches” in German Catholicism from 1929 to 1934; he appears throughout the narrative on the emergence of the “Reichsideologie”. Dempf’s *Sacrum Imperium: Geschichts- und Staatsphilosophie des Mittelalters und der politischen Renaissance*, München: Oldenbourg, 1929, was a pathfinder in the “reichsideologische Programm”. Klaus Breuning, *Die Vision des Reiches: deutscher Katholizismus zwischen Demokratie und Diktatur (1929–1934)*, München: Hueber, 1969, 73. For further discussion of Dempf in this work, see 23, 59, 67, 73–75, 78, 82, 207, 211, 223, 227, 231, 239 f., 276, 291, 296, 303, 306 f., 309, 319, 354, 362, 368. To Dempf’s self declaration that he formed theology in the NS period “art- und blutgemäß”, cf., Müller, “Der ‘Katholische Akademikerverband’ im Übergang von der Weimarer Republik ins ‘Dritte Reich’”, 564 f.

### III. "Bolschewismus als religiös-geistiges Phänomen"

The violence of communist ideology was well known by the 1920s throughout Europe. Przywara addressed the political phenomenon in its religious aspects and links it to Western ideas. Przywara's "Bolschewismus als religiös-geistiges Phänomen" from 1931, published in the *Schweizerische Rundschau*, was originally a radio lecture. Przywara presents bolshevism as a religious and intellectual problem, more exactly as a religious and intellectual failure and a radicalization of "westlich" ideas on Russian ground: "*Konsequenter Marxismus* ist vorerst leidenschaftlicher *Glaube an die Rationalisierung und Maschinisierung* von allem. Es ist der Geist der westlichen Aufklärung, der aus den Höhen seiner ursprünglichen aristokratischen Bürgerlichkeit ins Proletariat hineinsteigt."<sup>54</sup> It is also, however, a "*Glaube an die Masse*." (939) In its vicious character, it is not only "Amerikanisierung" but "Überbietenwollen des amerikanischen Tempos." (940) Thus Germany is met with perversions to the west and to the east. He goes on to connect the corruption to the Orthodox Church: "Orthodox-russisches Christentum war, gerade durch seine praktische Leugnung des römischen Primates und überhaupt einer Rechtskirche, immer betont ein Christentum der End-Zeit und des End-Gerichts, unterirdisch glühend im Radikalismus eines solchen Eschatologismus." (941) Communism is only an enlightened ("aufgeklärt") form of this erroneous religion of the end. (941) He sees the problems of his time as reaching back into the nineteenth century.<sup>55</sup> According to Przywara, the unfolding and fulfillment of the "romantischen *Radikalismus*" is also seen in the *Jugendbewegung* and the new liberal culture ("der geistig Wilden und Primitiven"). This is the "Bolschewismus in uns", "bolschewistische Religiosität [sic] in uns." (942) This condition cannot be met with a liberal "bürgerliche Kulturarbeit", which is a matter of the "Vorkriegszeit".<sup>56</sup> In

---

<sup>54</sup> "Bolschewismus als religiös-geistiges Phänomen." *Schweizerische Rundschau* 31 (1931): 939–943, here: 939. A footnote on the first page refers to a Silesia radio program, it reads: "Vortrag in der Schles. Funkstunde 4. 10. 1930."

<sup>55</sup> "Unsere heutige Gegenwart ist in überraschendem Sinn Vollendung der Romantik. Im Ideal einer reinen Aporetik in der Philosophie, d. h. der Auflösung der Lösungen in Probleme, im Protestantismus der Theologie Karl Barths, die sich nicht ohne Grund 'dialektische Theologie' nennt und in ihren Anfängen dem religiösen Sozialismus entstammt, im Ausmünden dieser Theologie in den neuen 'religiösen Sozialismus' Paul Tillichs, – hierin vollendet sich das romantische Ideal der Dialektik: Auflösung alles idealen in die Zerrissenheit und Dämonie der Kreatur. Gleichzeitig vollendet sich aber auch das leidenschaftliche Sehen und Träumen der Romantik vom 'Dritten Reich': als Erwarten der Endzeit, als Erwarten eines neuen Deutschlands, als Erwarten der Sowjet-Welt." (942) Schmitt was also very critical of Romanticism's challenge to theological conceptions of the world.

<sup>56</sup> "Ist der Bolschewismus das, als was wir ihn sahen, ein westlich religiöses Phänomen, so wird ihm auch nicht durch 'bürgerliche Kulturarbeit' begegnet, durch all die kluge Weisheit, die wir von der Vorkriegszeit her gewohnt sind. Der heutige gänzliche politische Zerfall des bürgerlichen Liberalismus vor den Glut-Parteien der äußersten Rechten und der

1931, Przywara sees a “Religiosität” [sic] as the solution. (943) A virile religion which can look death “Aug in Aug”; he hopes for a *Christentum* which “reift zur Kraft, die letzte Angst um sich selbst dranzugeben in das unbekümmerte sachliche Dienen.” (943) Although he calls for a manly Christianity strong enough to confront the problems of the present time, Przywara distances himself from “der äußersten Rechten und der äußersten Linken”. He was looking for a middle path, a religious one. In 1931, the NSDAP was still officially criticized by the Catholic Church. Rosenberg was also launching a critique with other Nazis against traditional Catholicism. Both Przywara and the radical Nazis seem to have been convinced that the civil liberalism had entirely dissolved. The question in 1931 was the way into the future. Przywara was seeing a religious, Christian approach, one which was strong enough to overcome bolshevism which he saw as a corrupt Western ideology.<sup>57</sup>

#### IV. *The analogia entis in cultural and political context*

According to Bernhard Gertz, Przywara uses the term *analogia entis* for the first time in his early 1920s article, “Gotteserfahrung und Gottesbeweis”.<sup>58</sup> Although Przywara seems to have believed that the term *analogia entis* came from Aquinas,<sup>59</sup> it first emerges in the Scholastic literature of the fifteenth century to describe the dependence of creation upon God.<sup>60</sup> He became fa-

---

äußersten Linken, die in gleicher Weise europäischer Bolschewismus dem Geist nach sind, dieser Zerfall ist der schlagende Beweis.” Ibid., 943.

<sup>57</sup> Further to this viewpoint, cf., Müller, “Der ‘Katholische Akademikerverband’ im Übergang von der Weimarer Republik ins ‘Dritte Reich’.”

<sup>58</sup> Cf., Przywara, “Gotteserfahrung und Gottesbeweis.” *StZ* 104 (1923): 12–19; cited in Gertz, *Glaubenswelt als Analogie*, 237. Przywara also mentions this in *Analogia Entis*, 1. *Prinzip*, München: Kösel & Pustet, 1932, VII.

<sup>59</sup> “Darum ist auch sein [des Thomas] letztes Wort die berühmte, viel mißverständene ‘analogia entis’.” *Ringens der Gegenwart*, 928; cited in Terán-Dutari, “Die Geschichte des Terminus”, 174, n. 58. In 1926 he also addresses the “Deutung der Thomasformel der ‘analogia entis’”. Przywara in the *Anzeiger für die katholische Geistlichkeit* (45/1); cited in Terán-Dutari, “Die Geschichte des Terminus”, 174, n. 58. In the foreword to the original edition of *Analogia Entis* he also claims that his study of Thomas was a decisive impetus for his work.

<sup>60</sup> Analogy, the instance between equivocal and univocal predication (cf., Aristotle, *Met.* IV. 1–2; *Eth.* I. 4), is a term originally from Greek mathematics and often translated with *proportio* in Latin. *Analogia entis* is used by the anti-Scotian and anti-Averroist Dominican, Thomas Cajetan ([Jakob de Vio] 1468–1534; e.g., *De nominum analogia*, cap. II, n. 24; cap. VI, n. 180) and the Salamanca School Jesuit, Francisco Suárez (1548–1617; e.g., *Disp. met.* XXVIII, sect. III, nn. 5, 11, 22); see: Gertz, *Glaubenswelt als Analogie*, 236; Terán-Dutari, “Die Geschichte des Terminus”; Przywara, “Analogia entis II. –IV.” In *LThK*<sup>2</sup>, 1, 470–473; Rudolf Teuwsen and Gerhard L. Müller, “Analogie.” In *LThK*<sup>3</sup>, 1, 577–582; Wolfgang Kluxen, “Analogie I.” In *HWPb*, 1, 214–227; Edward P. Mahoney and James South, “Renaissance Aristotelianism.” In *Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, 2, 404–413; C. H. Lohr, “Analogia.” In *LexMA*, 1, 569–570; L. Hödl, “Analogia



miliar with the term during his period of study.<sup>61</sup> In the early 1920s Przywara uses the term to correct subjectivism. The general rise of phenomenological subjectivism around the turn of the century in philosophy and psychology in the wake of Edmund Husserl (1859–1959) and others was critical preparation for the intellectual subjectivism and immanentism in the philosophy of religion with Rudolf Otto's *Das Heilige. Über das Irrationale in der Idee des Göttlichen und sein Verhältnis zum Rationalen* (1917), Max Scheler's *Vom Ewigen im Menschen* (1921), and Friedrich Heiler's *Das Wesen des Katholizismus* (1920).<sup>62</sup> While the emphasis on immanence in Przywara's analogy

---

(fidei)." In *LexMA*, 1, 570; Joachim Track, "Analogie." In *TRE*, 2, 625–650. The predecessor to the *TRE*, the *Realenzyklopädie für protestantische Theologie*, does not have an article on analogy.

<sup>61</sup> While in Valkenburg, during his period of study, Przywara became familiar with the Suárezian tradition of the analogia entis in the work and teaching of the German Jesuit and psychologist, Joseph Fröbes (1866 [Betzdorf, Rheinland]–1947). In Valkenburg, Przywara attended his lecture on ontology in the winter semester of 1910/1911. The third thesis of the unpublished Latin text, which was presumably the basis for his lecture on ontology, bears the title: "Analogia entis". Its tenor reads: "Conceptus entis ut sic est analogus, et quidem quoad Deum et creaturam, quoad substantiam et accidens analogia attributionis intrinsecae." (*Ontologia*, 21; from the first fascicle; cited in Terán-Dutari, "Die Geschichte des Terminus", 164.) Fröbes also presents the opposition to the ontology, such as Rodrigo de Arriaga (1592–1667) and André Semery (1630–1717), and the Scotists and Nominalists who affirm that "being" is "simply univocal, indeed generic" ("ens simpliciter univocum, imo genericum"). (*Ontologia*, 23; cited in Terán-Dutari, "Die Geschichte des Terminus", 164.) The concrete idea proposed in Fröbes's work is that God and creation are not two entities having a similar existence, but that creation has its being as a derivation from the primary being of God. This is expressed in another passage from the unpublished work that emphasizes the difference between God and creation: "non possunt Deus et creatura connumerari quasi dua entia, quia modus essendi tam infinite distat in utroque casu" (*Ontologia*, 27; cited in Terán-Dutari, "Die Geschichte des Terminus", 165.) Terán-Dutari has given various examples of the use of terminology. Przywara would have been aware of not only Fröbes's account of the analogia entis, but also Karl Frick's *Ontologia* (1894), which Fröbes often cites in his *Ontologia*. (Carolo/Karl Frick, *Ontologia sive metaphysica generalis in usum scholarum*, Freiburg: Herder, 1894; 4th ed., 1911). Karl Frick SJ (1856–1931) also used the term analogia entis. (Cf., Frick, *Ontologia*, "De entis analogia" art. 3 of ch. 1, p. 25 f.) Frick was the leading editor of *Stimmen der Zeit* from 1903 to 1909. Frick begins his presentation of ontology with an analysis of being and the transcendentals: "ens, res, aliquid, unum, verum, bonum." (3) For aspects of his formal structure and for many of his Scholastic citations, Przywara may have drawn from Frick's *Ontologia* and Fröbes's *Ontologia*. The final lines of Frick's work challenge atheism as nihilism: "Ergo aut existit unus Deus, ens a se, infinitum, omnis perfectionis plenitudo, actus purus, aut nihil prorsus existit. Idcirco atheismus est nihilismus. [...] Cum igitur nihilismus sanae menti repugnet, nequit esse vera philosophia, quae mentem non ducat ad certam cognitionem unius veri Dei." (*Ontologia*, 232.) Fröbes also wrote a two volume *Lehrbuch der experimentellen Psychologie* (1917/1920).

<sup>62</sup> Subtitle: *Sechs Vorträge, gehalten im Herbst 1919 in Schweden* (1920). See also his *Katholischer und evangelischer Gottesdienst* (1921) and his earlier works: *Das Gebet: eine religionsgeschichtliche und religionspsychologische Untersuchung* (1918); *Luthers religionsgeschichtliche Bedeutung* (1918; perhaps this work influenced Przywara's own view of Luther); *Die buddhistische Versenkung: eine religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung* (1918).

of being was not an absolute departure from this new school,<sup>63</sup> his call for a strong transcendent orientation marks the birth of a new generation, a new orthodoxy that corrected the subjectivist phenomenology of religion with metaphysical objectivity, form, structure and hierarchy. Indeed, Przywara corrects Scheler's focus on immanentism and love with transcendence and "fear" ("Furcht").<sup>64</sup> In his "Zum Problem Max Scheler" from 1925, and already before in his *Religionsbegründung* (1923), he holds that "Scheler ist [...] nicht ein katholischer Philosoph".<sup>65</sup> In his programmatic literature review essay from 1923, "Gott in uns oder Gott über uns? (Immanenz und Transzendenz im heutigen Geistesleben)", Przywara addresses the new interest in the "Gottesfrage" (343) in contemporary theology and philosophy. Some of the foundational logic of Przywara's analogy of being is presented in this early article. In practice, the primary content has less to do with the doctrine of God than the celebrated decline of liberalism, the passing of mod-

<sup>63</sup> Przywara's work is an example of the qualified integration of modern philosophy into a more traditional Catholic theology. Using familiar terminology from antiquity and medieval doctrina, Przywara's theological response to Scheler, Heidegger, et al. largely substantiated many aspects of the early twentieth century phenomenology in a Catholic metaphysical framework and simultaneously rehabilitated onto-theology in the wake of Heidegger's criticism. While the subjective aspects of the first-person perspective philosophy are downplayed by virtue of the objectivity of Middle Age Christian metaphysics, some of the impulses from phenomenology, such as the intuitive perception of essential structures (Wesensschau), the experiential movement of consciousness, and existence's representational character, are largely affirmed by Przywara's philosophy of religion. Already in 1923, Przywara is using the "Formprinzip" language in theological engagement and in phenomenological terminology: the "'Gott in uns und über uns' [wird] als das in der 'Wahrheit' als Materialem wirksame Formprinzip anschaulich". ("Gott in uns oder Gott über uns?", 347; cf., 346.) Coming rather close to Scheler's own view of love as the essence of the human person, in 1923 Przywara writes: "darum ist Liebe [...] das Sein: analogia entis der ungeschaffenen und geschaffenen Liebe". (*Religionsbegründung*, 181, cf. 109 f.; cited in Terán-Dutari, "Die Geschichte des Terminus", 171.) See also Przywara's "Gotteserfahrung und Gottesbeweis".

<sup>64</sup> Cf., "Metaphysik und Religion." In *StZ* 104 (1923): 132–140. Here he calls for the reunion of metaphysics and the 'religious' with aid of the analogia entis. He draws upon Augustine in his endorsement of a "fürchtend[e] Liebe und liebender Furcht", 139 f.; cf., "Gott in uns oder Gott über uns?", 343–346.

<sup>65</sup> "Zum Problem Max Scheler." In *StZ* 108 (1925): 78–80, 79. The extent and nature of human knowledge of God was an important background question which the analogy of being ontology aided in answering. In this regard, the debate about Scheler's phenomenology of religion in the early 1920s, e.g., with Joseph Geysler, was of special importance for the development of Przywara's philosophy. Cf., Joseph Geysler, *Max Schelers Phänomenologie der Religion: nach ihren wesentlichsten Lehren allgemeinverständlich dargestellt und beurteilt*, Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1924; idem, *Augustin und die phänomenologische Religionsphilosophie der Gegenwart: mit besonderer Berücksichtigung Max Schelers*, Münster in Westf.: Aschendorff, 1923. Cf., Przywara, *Religionsbegründung*; idem, "Zum Kampf um Max Scheler." *Germania* (journal associated with the German Catholic Zentrumsparthei) 13/4 (1924); "Gott in uns oder Gott über uns?"; "Metaphysik und Religion." *StZ* 104 (1923): 132–140; "Zum Problem Max Scheler." *StZ* 108 (1925): 78–80. Although Przywara initially validates Geysler's metaphysics, he later distances himself from what he calls a Scotist viewpoint. Cf., Terán-Dutari, "Die Geschichte des Terminus", 175, nt. 68.

ern subjectivism and the rise of a new interest in order and transcendence. He approaches these matters under the representative terminology of “immanence” and “transcendence”. He seeks to strike a balance between pure immanence (“Gott in uns”; roughly equivalent to modern subjectivism) and pure transcendence (“Gott über uns”; roughly equivalent to the new Dialectical Theology). His solution is “Der Gott der analogia entis, der ‘Gott über uns *und* in uns’”. (344) In contrast to Protestantism, he calls his solution the “katholisch[e] Spannungseinheit von Transzendenz und Immanenz”. (351) Although he distances himself from aspects of the crisis theologians’ God-world-ontology and presents his position as a third way,<sup>66</sup> both his approach and the new Dialectical Theology were actually rather similar in the new emphasis on a strong “manly” transcendence against modern subjectivism (350); for indeed “die unmännliche Haltung eines Sich-behängens mit fremdem Geistesgut” is foreign (“wesensfremd”) to the “true Catholic spirit” (“echt-katholische[r] Geist”) of this “Grundform”, the “Gott in uns und über uns”. (356) Similar to the Crisis Theology “from above” (“senkrecht von oben” [Barth]), the *in-über-analogia entis* ontology was essentially Przywara’s alternative to the “verabsolutierten Subjektivismen”. (362) From the *in-über* ontology, he can draw upon and endorse (“begrüßen wir den eigentlichen Kern”), with inconsequential amendment,<sup>67</sup> Herman Hefele’s *Der politische Katholizismus* (Darmstadt: Reichl, 1919), which against all “formlos zerflatternden Erlebnissubjektivismus” emphasizes the “Gemeinschaft” not only as “Erlebnis”, but also as “objektive Form und Ordnung.” (357) Romano Guardini’s (1885–1968) “Formgedanke” is also analyzed with Przywara’s *in-über* Catholic ontological polarity.<sup>68</sup> The Liturgical Movement, which Guardini was active in, will then not only be a “liturgische Gemeinschaft”, but also a “Gemeinschaft des Lebens und Arbeitens im grauen Alltag.”<sup>69</sup> Already in 1921, and perhaps before, Friedrich Heiler (1892–1967) was developing the same polarity of objective and subjective.<sup>70</sup>

<sup>66</sup> He claims that the “Gott über uns” leads to the separation from God and thus to the divination of man. (“Gott in uns oder Gott über uns?” 344.) Later he claims similarly, in reference Protestantism, Nominalism and the turn to Voluntarism, that from the plain “Gott über uns” alone, “das Geschöpfliche” becomes a mere “wesenlose Erscheinung” of the will of God. *Ibid.*, 348.

<sup>67</sup> By drawing attention to and emphasizing the “Eigenwert der individuellen Seele”, “Gott in uns oder Gott über uns?”, 358.

<sup>68</sup> Przywara’s work in the 1920s adopts the popular terminology of dialectic, polarity or Gegensätze, a theme which was also developed by Romano Guardini in the 1920s. Cf., Guardini, *Der Gegensatz. Versuche in einer Philosophie des Lebendig-Konkreten*, Mainz: Matthias-Grünewald, 1925. To Przywara and Husserl, cf. Gertz, *Glaubenswelt als Analogie*, 152; Scheler, *ibid.*, 153 f.; Heidegger, 158 f.; Barth, 161 f.; and Simmel, 149 f.

<sup>69</sup> “Gott in uns oder Gott über uns?”, 358. Cf., Przywara, *Ringens der Gegenwart*, vol. 2, 569 f.

<sup>70</sup> For a recent discussion of his joining of the objective and subjective in polarity, cf., Alexander Deeg, *Das äußere Wort und seine liturgische Gestalt: Überlegungen zu einer evangelischen Fundamentalliturgik*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011, 262–267. Further to the cultural aspects of the polarity of objectivism and subjectivism in this

Przywara may have modified Heiler's concept. He was nevertheless critical of Heiler. In the same article, and again with masculine language, Przywara claims that Heiler's paradigm of "evangelischer Katholizität" loses all the "Muskelwerk des Objektiven" (346); indeed Heiler is merely a new "Stadium des Modernismus" (354); Heiler is "blutsverwandt den französischen und englischen Modernisten, die gerade aus Liebe zur Mystik Hasser des Dogmas waren." (355) The basic critique of modern subjectivism from the early 1920s was a primary impetus for the development of the ontology that would later take full form in Przywara's popular work from 1932.<sup>71</sup> Przywara engages many streams of thought in *Analogia Entis*, including, as he mentions in his *Vorwort* from 1932, Johann Plenge (1874–1963), the self-proclaimed intellectual father of National Socialism ("selbsternannter geistiger Vater des Nationalsozialismus").<sup>72</sup> The modern debates about

---

milieu, cf., Langner, "Weimarer Kulturkatholizismus und interkonfessionelle Probleme", 78 f.

<sup>71</sup> Przywara's main title of the planned but not completed two volume work was *Analogia Entis: Metaphysik*. The first volume, which is today simply referred to as *Analogia Entis*, originally took the title *Analogia Entis, 1. Prinzip*. The second unpublished volume was intended to deal with "die inhaltlichen Grundzüge (Bewußtsein-Sein-Welt)." (Przywara, *Analogia Entis, 1. Prinzip*, München: Kösel & Pustet, 1932, IX.) The first page of the 1932 edition is accompanied with an image of a serious and darkly clad Przywara, deep in thought, sitting with his right hand under his chin supporting his head. A line printed on the bottom of the page reads: "Das katholische Cogito, ergo sum!" The *Analogia Entis* book is divided into two sections; the first section deals with metaphysics in general, the second with the principle of the analogy of being itself. Przywara begins by asserting that metaphysics goes behind the physical, that which has its highest instance in the psychological. Metaphysics goes into the backgrounds and deals with the formal question ("die formale Frage") of the "in sich selbst Grund und Ziel und Sinn", which presents itself *from being as being* ("die [i.e., "die formale Frage"] vom Sein als Sein her sich stellt". Przywara, *Analogia Entis* [1932], 3). Przywara's entire metaphysical theology essentially unfolds this sentence and the triadic *foundation, end and sense* of being, while drawing much from Martin Heidegger (1889–1976), Scheler and Husserl and also distinguishing himself from them by aid of a creative *ressourcement* from classical philosophy and theology.

<sup>72</sup> Peter Mantel, *Betriebswirtschaftslehre und Nationalsozialismus: eine institutionen- und personengeschichtliche Studie*, Wiesbaden: Gabler, 2009, 797. On the first page of the *Vorwort* (*Analogia Entis* [1932], V), Przywara locates the genesis of his work early and explains that the impetus for the work came from his study of Thomas from 1912 to 1913 and the distinction between *Sosein* and *Dasein*. He claims that some of the original manuscripts were developed for lectures in the winter of 1924/1925 and then later 1926/1927. He also mentions his study of Augustine, Pseudo-Dionysius and German mysticism from 1914 to 1918. Goethe and Romantic philosophy, such as Franz von Baader, are mentioned. (The Romantic authors, Joseph Görres [1776–1848], author of *Die christliche Mystik*, 4 vol. [1836–1842], and Martin Deutinger [1815–1864], author of various works on philosophy, art, culture and religion, e.g., *Rede über die Bedeutung der Philosophie für die Gegenwart* [1847], *Grundlinien einer positiven Philosophie* [1843–1849], *Das Verhältniß der Kunst zum Christenthum* [1843], were equally important for the development of Przywara's philosophical theology, Cf., Gertz, *Glaubenswelt als Analogie*, 107 f.) In the *Vorwort* he also names the "dynamic heroism" of Nietzsche, Simmel's "aporetic", the "ethical dynamism" of Troeltsch, Newman's "dynamic antithetic", as well as Kant, Hegel and Kierkegaard. His engagement with Barth is presented as aiding the theological formation of the *analogia entis*. He also mentions Edith Stein (1891–1942),

the existence and nature of God in the nineteenth century, and the Neo-Scholastic rationalist response to these debates, were also an important background component to Przywara's field of view. His work offers an alternative to – or, an advancement of some of these more rationally oriented proposals.<sup>73</sup> Przywara's Catholic cultural and pastoral concerns also played a role in awakening his enthusiasm for the analogy of being. On many occasions he criticizes the ghetto mentality of Catholicism by drawing upon the metaphysics of the whole.<sup>74</sup> The general style in which he writes his *Analogia* also accords with some of the new literary trends in early twentieth century German literature and German literary studies.<sup>75</sup> Although the *terminus*

---

Husserl and Heidegger. Przywara also mentions his work on Scheler (and the concepts of the "Ewige im Menschen" and the "Unmittelbarkeit des Religiösen").

<sup>73</sup> The term *analogia entis* was used in arguments in the French context against agnosticism, symbolism or immanentism in the debate about Modernism and the popular vitalism (*élan vital*) of Henri-Louis Bergson (1859–1941). Przywara was apparently aware of this French literature. (Cf., Terán-Dutari, "Die Geschichte des Terminus", 167–169, 175, nt. 70.) The new subjectivist philosophy became somewhat attractive in this standoff for progressive theologians and religion-friendly philosophers. A version of the new philosophy provided another – or indeed, alternative – front by which to address the issue of divine existence and by extension the legitimacy of religion in the modern world. With other forms of new mysticism from the early twentieth century, Przywara's analogy of being offers an alternative to the "rationalistic" "dual-level" philosophical theology of Neo-Scholasticism. See also Przywara's essay from the 1920s: "Mystik und Distanz", in Przywara, *Ringgen der Gegenwart*, vol. 1, 469–501. This nineteenth century rationalism was being challenged on many fronts in the early twentieth century, and not least with language from *Lebensphilosophie*.

<sup>74</sup> In an article from 1925, the *analogia entis* plays a critical role in his argumentation, which challenges Catholic cultural isolation while addressing a "Minderwertigkeitsbewußtsein". Cf., Przywara, "Zwischen Religion und Kultur." *StZ* 108 (1925): 321–332, here: 327 f., see also, 323. The ontology is also used to challenge cultural isolation, for "alles menschlich Echte und Große, das auf fremdem Boden wächst, in seiner Echtheit und schlichten Aufrichtigkeit schon im Keime katholisch sei, weil eben der Gott des Katholiken kein anderer ist als der Gott des Weltalls, in dem alles lebt, sich regt und ist." ("Gott in uns oder Gott über uns?" 357).

<sup>75</sup> Some of these, with Stefan George (1868–1933) for example, were distancing themselves from the older historical philology and seeking a deeper "soul" and "essence" (*Wesenschau*) of the literature, philosophy, and in this case, theology or religious experience. In this style, texts and sources are rarely addressed according to their historical aspects or in the context of their historical problems or backgrounds. This is also related to the general trend of early twentieth century anti-historicism. Przywara claims that historicism has been overcome on multiple occasions. (Cf., "Gott in uns oder Gott über uns?" 343.) The analogical language and the doctrine of the *analogia entis* can be understood, in a related sense, as the theological correlative of the new symbolism and new naturalism, a new literary genre which was modifying and developing naturalism around 1900, and especially in the George-Kreis. The icon, the symbol, is the revelation of a deeper mystical connection of reality behind the various phenomena. The overcoming of a simple naturalistic realism is itself a deeper recovery of the mysticism, deeper orders and meanings of nature and life. George emphasized the higher reality of appearances, not above nature in the sense of a simple dichotomy, but as the deeper rationality of nature itself: in and beyond. Cf., "Gott in uns oder Gott über uns?" Helmut Koopmann, *Deutsche Literaturtheorien zwischen 1880 und 1920. Eine Einführung*, Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1997, 36 f. See also Przywara's treatment of George in *Heroisch*, 60 f.

*technicus* is found in many writings after Cajetan, it was never chosen as the sole and central theme of a philosophical work or a programmatic formal principle of all philosophical and theological thinking. Rather than being located in the title of a work, the term was rather usually treated under the broader subject of ontology.<sup>76</sup> While the term was well known among many in Przywara's Catholic milieu, the shift with Przywara is precisely the centralization of the theme. Przywara offers the analogy of being as the determinate of all philosophy and theology, a singular *Formprinzip*.<sup>77</sup> This earned him popularity and also an adversary among the new anti-liberal dialectical theologians of crisis.<sup>78</sup> The *analogia* theological debate of the

---

According to Zechmeister, Przywara's "Sprache [wird] schon früh durch Stefan George beeinflusst". (*Erich Przywaras Weg negativer Theologie*, 62.) Przywara refers to George and the George-Kreis, occasionally, and sometimes critically, in his two volumes of articles and essays from the 1920s, *Ringten der Gegenwart*. According to Zechmeister, Przywara sees a new turn to reality in "einem neuen philosophischen 'Mut zur Wirklichkeit', der die Abwendung vom Neukantianismus vollzieht, und schließlich in einer bewußten Leibkultur, wie sie Przywara z. B. im Kreis um Stephan George aufleben sieht." Zechmeister, *Erich Przywaras Weg negativer Theologie*, 260.

<sup>76</sup> In the Jesuit Suárezian tradition, it is treated as an extension of the *analogia attributionis*.

<sup>77</sup> To the history of the term *analogia entis* and Przywara's use of it, cf., Gertz, *Glaubenswelt als Analogie*, 235 f.; Terán-Dutari, "Die Geschichte des Terminus". A primary reference point for his thinking is the idea of "Tanta similitudo und maior dissimilitudo", so great the similarity between God and creation so ever greater the dissimilarity: "eine unbegrenzt 'schwebende' Analogie". (*Analogia Entis* [1932], 97 f.) In the 1932 edition of his work he supports his argument by citing the First Vatican Council. (Cf., Session 3: "Dogmatic Constitution on the Catholic Faith", Ch. 1, "On God the creator of all things"): God is "über alles, was außer Ihm ist oder gedacht werden kann, unsagbar erhaben" (*Analogia Entis* [1932], 97; i.e., "super omnia, quae praeter ipsum sunt et concipi possunt, ineffabiliter excelsus", DH 3001). The term "maior dissimilitudo" is however also used in the Fourth Lateran Council which, according to Gertz, Przywara begins to reference in 1925. (Gertz, *Glaubenswelt als Analogie*, 238.) In later works he draws more specifically upon a sentence produced by the Fourth Lateran Council to support this claim. Although the *analogia entis* term is not used in the council's text, he sees it as the high point of analogical thinking: the similarity between God and creation is to be understood in an always greater dissimilarity. While his creative application of the council's teaching allowed for a deployment of church-verified metaphysics, it has little foundation in the actual historical intension of that document. Against the erroneous account of the unity of the persons, as a *unitas collectiva*, supposedly from Joachim of Fiore's heretical critique of Peter Lombard, the Lateran Council of 1215 declared that the unity of the Trinity was a true unity. Commentary upon John 17:21 ("That they all may be one; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us" KJV) is then given in illustration of the point, where it is declared that the word "one" in this passage must be understood differently when applied to God (sc. as an identity in nature) and when applied to man (sc. a gracious union of love). In this context, it is remarked that the similarity between the Creator and creature is to be seen within a greater dissimilarity ("quia inter creatorem et creaturam non potest similitudo notari, quin inter eos major sit dissimilitudo notanda", DH 806). While the thirteenth century manuscript sought to affirm the unity of the Trinity against a speculative exegesis, Przywara finds in the dependent illustrative argument the final *reductio in mysterium*, the central feature of Christian thinking.

<sup>78</sup> To the reception of Przywara's conception of the analogy of being with Barth, Gottlieb Söhngen, Theodor Haecker, Balthasar, and Hans Wagner, cf., Gertz, *Glaubenswelt als*

1930s and onward drew upon a well of resources that extended beyond the immediate cultural context. As a theological dispute about God and creation and the God-creation-relationship, it comes in the wake of nineteenth century philosophical problems from German Idealism and reflects some perennial issues surrounding Christian Platonic philosophy. The new interest in the God-creation-relationship, the relationship of the individual to the whole (and that which lies beyond it), and the whole to the individual, nevertheless took on new meaning in the context of post-WWI socio-cultural fragmentation.<sup>79</sup> Perhaps it is not mere coincidence that the argument for the *analogia entis* emerged so strongly in the context of the rise of totalitarian thinking in Europe. While the teaching about the analogy of being does not necessarily lead to totalitarian social politics, it certainly offers some ideas that proved useful in challenging liberal individualism at a fundamental, indeed ontological level. In Munich, in February 1932,<sup>80</sup> in the introduction to *Analogia Entis*, Przywara mentions Plenge when addressing the genesis of his work.<sup>81</sup> Przywara seems to have understood the relationship between metaphysics and social systems. Plenge was interested in metaphysics, the turning back of liberalism in the national consolidation of the economy during and after WWI, the deepening of socialism, promotion of nationalism and the synthesis of nationalism and socialism.<sup>82</sup> Przywara's analogy of being reflects some of this authoritarian thinking in the genre of the philosophy of religion.

---

*Analogie*, 250–281. As far as he understood Przywara, Barth seems to have seen the metaphysics of the analogia entis as a challenger to his theological consolidation. On at least one occasion, Barth suggests that the teaching about the analogia entis implies a univocal ontology. While specifically attempting to contradict the idea of an analogia entis, in 1950 he called it nonsense (an Unfug) to hold that being (Sein) is a generic term (Oberbegriff) which envelops (umfaßt) God and creation (KD III/3, §49 Gott der Vater als Herr seines Geschöpfs, Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1980, 116. Cf., Przywara: “[...] zwischen Gott und Geschöpf [besteht] keinerlei gemeinsames genus”, *Analogia Entis* [1932], 148). Although Barth promoted the alternative analogy of faith, his usage of this term has little similarity to the Pauline usage or the later dogmatic usage. (Cf., L. Hödl, “Analogia (fidei).” In *LexMA*, 1, 570.) Barth also used the term analogia relationis.

<sup>79</sup> In this regard, Przywara's ideas reflect the collective intellectual embrace of Ganzheit thinking in the 1920s and 1930s. Przywara's work promoted the turn to morphology, form, order and the general correction of – or rather, assault on – modern subjectivism, individualism and liberalism. The subjective philosophy of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century was confronted with a new anti-liberal dialectical emphasis which sought to reintroduce objectivity and overcome historicity. The 1932 publication in Catholic philosophy of religion is a representative of this intellectual turn.

<sup>80</sup> The date and place given in the Vorwort, *Analogia Entis* (1932), IX.

<sup>81</sup> “In eine überraschende Parallele geriet dann noch endlich die Arbeit zu Joh. Plenge, der in seinem großen Tafelwerk der Methode und des Systems einer Soziologie zu einer Ontologie der Beziehung vorstieß und hierin notwendig zur Problematik der Analogie. Unsere Arbeiten schlagen sich nicht wenig ineinander.” Przywara, *Analogia Entis* (1932), VI.

<sup>82</sup> He was the author of *Der Krieg und die Volkswirtschaft* (1915), *Durch Umsturz zum Aufbau: eine Rede an Deutschlands Jugend* (1918), *Zur Vertiefung des Sozialismus* (1919), *Drei Vorlesungen über die allgemeine Organisationslehre* (1919), *Die Zukunft Deutschlands und die Zukunft der Staatswissenschaft* (1919), *Zur Ontologie der Beziehung* (1930).

Already in 1929, the Breslau based social democrat and pro-Weimar Republic Jewish philosopher, Siegfried Marck (1889–1957), claimed that Przywara's philosophy was an "autoritärer Kompromiß"<sup>83</sup> which promoted an "ehrfürchtig[e] Distanz".<sup>84</sup> The articulation of a *total* metaphysical order was particularly attractive philosophical and theological material for the group of culture critics, theologians, academics and philosophers of religion, who were also endorsing the *all inclusive Reichstheologie*. While criticizing the "chaos" and disorder of liberalism, some of these intellectuals were also promoting conceptions of metaphysical and physical order and hoping for a new non-capitalistic religious socialism in cooperation with the *Reich* and the church. As Breuning argues, although Przywara did not employ his *analogia entis* directly for the *Reichstheologie*, the cosmic construction idea fitted with the hierarchical and all inclusive *Reich* idea.<sup>85</sup> Although the *Reich* terminology does not appear in *Analogia Entis* from 1932, the spirit of the program is present.<sup>86</sup> Like Dempf's more explicit "Analogie der soziologischen Seinsweisen und des absoluten Seins", Przywara's view of metaphysics in the early 1930s could make room for the popular interest at that time in the *Gemeinschaft* language and an all inclusive religious totality: "*relativierender Theozentrismus*". The "Spannungseinheit zwischen Individuum und Gemeinschaft" which Przywara addresses in the context of his metaphysics was also a major theme for many fascists who were battling the "destructive

<sup>83</sup> Siegfried Marck, *Die Dialektik in der Philosophie der Gegenwart*, vol. 1, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1929, 108; Przywara briefly mentions Marck, cf., Przywara, *Analogia Entis* (1932), VIII. To Marck's intellectual development, cf., Franz Walter, *Vom Milieu zum Parteienstaat: Lebenswelten, Leitfiguren und Politik im historischen Wandel*, Wiesbaden: VS Verl. für Sozialwissenschaften, 2010, 22–28. Member of the SPD from 1918, 1933 retired by the NSDAP, immigrated to France, then in 1939 to America.

<sup>84</sup> Siegfried Marck, *Die Dialektik in der Philosophie der Gegenwart*, vol. 2, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1931, 171. He describes Przywara's metaphysical formula ("Sosein – in – über – Dasein") as "unzugänglich" (ibid.) and calls it a "metaphysische Hieroglyphe." (Ibid., 178.) "Die Metaphysik bleibt im Glauben verankert". (Ibid.)

<sup>85</sup> "Es lag aber nahe, daß man Przywara in diesem Sinne verstand, zumal er selbst in einer Reihe von Besprechungen in diesen Jahren seinen reichsideologischen Standort zu erkennen gegeben hatte. Wie selbstverständlich Przywaras Analogiedenken und hierarchisches Seinsverständnis als politische Konsequenz das *Reich* fordern, wird in einigen seiner Publikationen nach 1945 deutlich, vor allem in einem seiner Vorträge, der 1964 veröffentlichte wurde." Breuning, *Die Vision des Reiches*, 298 f. Breuning goes on to cite numerous places where Przywara endorses the *Reichsidee* with theological language in his *In und gegen: Stellungnahmen zur Zeit*, Nürnberg: Glock u. Lutz, 1955. He also points to Przywara's interest in the "kosmische Bauprinzip".

<sup>86</sup> In the *Vorwort* from the original edition he writes about his work: "Es zeigt sich in meinen Schriften auf der einen Seite eine Theorie, die (gegenüber dem schulthomistischen *individuum de ratione materiae*) eine Erfassung der individual [sic] *differenzierenden Universalismus* der 'Spannungseinheit zwischen Individuum und Gemeinschaft'; – auf der andern Seite aber eine solche, die (gegenüber einem humanistischen Rationalismus bis in die Neu-Scholastik hinein) eine radikale Beugung aller (ontischen) Selbstzwecklichkeit von Ich und Gemeinschaft und alles (noetischen) glatten Errechnens unter die Souveränität Gottes meint: ein alles Menschliche *relativierender Theozentrismus* des 'Gott in Christo in der Kirche'". Przywara, *Analogia Entis* (1932), VIII.



individualism” of liberal culture or the “reckless” egalitarianism of the communist program.<sup>87</sup> The interest in the dynamics of the *Gemeinschaft* and an account of the “Totalitätsmensch” between individualism and the *Gemeinschaft* is also present in his articles and essays throughout the 1920s.<sup>88</sup> In one such essay, “Grundlinien des Katholizismus”, reference to the *analogia entis* appears where Przywara is concerned with reestablishing the Catholic understanding of the relationship between created and Creator, sinner and Savior, as well as “*Innerlichkeit und Gemeinschaft*”.<sup>89</sup> In the Catholic understanding, according to Przywara, God is in both the inner depths of the soul (“Sich-abscheiden aus aller sichtbaren Gemeinschaft der leblosen wie lebendigen Natur, der bürgerlichen wie religiösen Gemeinde”) and in the positive expression, “das gesamte All umfassende Gemeinschaft, ein geöffnetes Sich-verströmen in alle Sichtbarkeit von Menschheit und Kosmos.” (665) For Przywara, the *analogia entis* rightly expresses this: “Ja, tiefer gesehen, ist diese ‘analogia entis’ für den Katholiken eigentlich weniger logisch als lebenshaft gegeben in jener Urspannung von Liebe (gegenüber dem ‘Gott in uns’) und Ehrfurcht (gegenüber dem ‘Gott über uns’), wie sie ebenfalls Augustinus lehrt.” (667) Thus the *analogia entis* was a way of conceiving the *totality* of all of society, nature, and God in one large and harmonious, in terms of *Lebensphilosophie*, “lebenshaften” *Gemeinschaft*: “Für den Katholizismus ist beides ineinander gebunden. Gott ist ‘in’ der Welt und darum ist erst die ganze Welt über Raum und Zeit Ihm Gleichnis und Hülle und Offenbarung und Fleisch [...]. Gott ist aber ebenso ‘über’ der Welt und darum muß ‘in’ dieser inneren Verbundenheit der Gemeinschaft eine letzte Freiheit und Gelöstheit von aller Kreatur (des Außenlebens wie Innenlebens) bestehen”. (665 f.) Przywara’s *analogia entis* seems to mirror his promotion of the totalitarian *Reichstheologie*.<sup>90</sup> Przywara, Hans Urs von Balthasar (1905–1988)

---

<sup>87</sup> Przywara, *Analogia Entis* (1932), 154. In almost every case, the third way was desired, a social one, and in Przywara’s case, a theocentric social order. The “natürliche Ordnung” and the “holy order” were important aspects of the concluding thoughts of the *Analogia* for Przywara in the early 1930s in Germany, as they were for Karl Adam. (125) Przywara’s metaphysical discourse is loaded with language popular to his context. In the spirit of *Quadragesimo anno* (1931), he claims that “alles Einzelhafte [ist] zum Dienst und Sinn des Universums”. (128) He also turns to the popular *corpus mysticum* thematic, a theological *locus*, with the Incarnation, used by many new theologians of social thought. The guiding vision was the whole, the total body of Christ, which mysteriously extends beyond the church and seemed to include all of society. (Cf., Besret, *Incarnation ou eschatologie?*) He ends *Analogia Entis* with these words: “Wir sehen also noch einmal, wie die *analogia entis* als Prinzip im Eins ihres  $\acute{\alpha}\nu\acute{\alpha}$  und  $\acute{\alpha}\nu\omega$  steht:  $\acute{\alpha}\nu\omega$  des je ‘über hinaus’ und doch und darum  $\acute{\alpha}\nu\acute{\alpha}$  der ‘inneren Ordnung’.”

<sup>88</sup> Przywara, *Ringens der Gegenwart*, vol. 2, 606 f.

<sup>89</sup> Przywara, *Ringens der Gegenwart*, vol. 2, 662–668, here: 665.

<sup>90</sup> Cf., Breuning, *Die Vision des Reiches*, 22. For Przywara’s positive orientation to the “Vision des Reiches” in the 1930s, see Breuning, *Die Vision des Reiches*, 116, 121, 133, 144; and further under the section “Reichstheologie” (238 f.), see: *ibid.*, 239; and to Przywara’s influence on Alfred Delp in context of the “Reichsideologie”, see: 289; and to

and Guardini were not the only Catholic intellectuals who were focused on the *Gestalt* in the early twentieth century following WWI. In partial response to the cultural transformations of the time, many turned to themes of order, morphology and structure in their literature.<sup>91</sup> The *analogia entis* was a debate about metaphysics and fundamental theology in the 1930s. In another regard, however, it reflected the new cultural interest in the vital aspects of existence and the larger mystification of nature and the turn to order, form and transcendent hierarchy. The hierarchical view of nature also extended to Przywara's understanding of women.<sup>92</sup> The philosophical theology provided an ordered framework that aided in legitimatizing the authoritarian, hierarchical estate society against the "chaos" of liberalism and democracy.<sup>93</sup> In some cases, reference to the *natural essence* of the *Volk* was also used to establish a non-rationalistic basis of society.

### V. Volk and anti-Semitism

Like many others, Przywara addressed the *Volk* and the Jews in the 1920s and 1930s. This muscular *Volk* language, the turn to *Gemeinschaft* thinking and the problem with the Jews were related phenomena that often also went with an anti-modernism syndrome and an anti-individualist, anti-capitalist (or anti-communist) framework of thought. There are also some specific Catholic intellectual aspects to Przywara's thoughts on the *Volk* and the Jews in the early twentieth century.

According to early twentieth century fascist reform ideology, the foundation of society is not based upon the *rationalistic, parliamentary* institutions of government, but a deeper *natural basis* beyond all destructive par-

---

the "Reichsgedanken" in Przywara's *Christkönig-Lieder*, see: 316; and for a list of relevant literature from Przywara on this subject from Breuning's research, see: 380.

<sup>91</sup> Concentrating on *Form* or *Gestalt* in the 1930s was common in the *Neukatholizismus* and the avant-garde *Kulturkatholizismus*. Carl Schmitt and Herman Hefele were also promoting the conception of *Form* and *Ordnung*. Bröckling claims that the trend was in part a response to the "Krisengefühl" and the "Erfahrung von Formverlust". (Bröckling, *Katholische Intellektuelle in der Weimarer Republik*, 55.) Lutz Raphael has also addressed the relationship of "radikales Ordnungsdenken" to the NS ideology. Przywara's *Analogia Entis* is itself a *Gestaltlehre* of metaphysical proportions. Cf., Lutz Raphael, "Radikales Ordnungsdenken und die Organisation totalitärer Herrschaft: Weltanschauungseliten und Humanwissenschaftler im NS-Regime." *Geschichte und Gesellschaft* 27 (2000): 5–40.

<sup>92</sup> Przywara takes the story of Mary and God and relates it to women and men in his essay on the role of the woman from the 1920s "Mutter aller Lebendigen": "Ja, Mariens 'Mir geschehe nach Deinem Wort' ist wie geheimnisvolle Idealerfüllung jener Absoluthaltung, von der wir eben sprachen: als 'Magd des Herrn' die Idealerfüllung der fraulichen Hingebetheit, als 'fürbittende Miterlöserin' die Idealerfüllung männlicher Kraft nach unten." Przywara, *Ringende Gegenwart*, vol. 1, 528–539, here: 532.

<sup>93</sup> As Breuning has argued, the turn in the 1920s and 1930s to ontological-hierarchical metaphysics was related to the turn to an autoritär-ständischen concept of politics. Breuning, *Die Vision des Reiches*, 291 f.

liamentarian thinking. The *Volk* concept was a mystical basis of society that encouraged the idea of a shared destiny, the natural *Volksgemeinschaft* and solidarity rhetoric. It often went together with anti-Semitism and general racist thinking. It also worked to replace the bloodless concept of a “republic” or a “civilization”. The Christian theological response had two options available for dealing with the new cultural emphasis on the natural *Volksgemeinschaft*, *Volk* and political socialist solidarity rhetoric. One option was the simple and elementary negation of these concepts, which have little rooting in the theological traditions of Christianity. The other option was a complicated mediating position, or one of a variety of different mediating positions. Henri de Lubac (1896–1991), who was also, like Przywara, deeply interested in the nature/super-nature problem, emphasizes Nietzschean “virility”, the community and anti-rationalistic theology in the context of new interest in solidarity thinking. Against individualistic liberalism and egalitarian communism he promotes a Catholic *personalisme*: “Catholicisme et personnalisme s’accordent et se fortifient mutuellement.”<sup>94</sup> Lubac shows an attempt at rethinking Christianity in a context that was interested in solidarity thinking. Schmidhauser is another example of a mediatory position; he pled for an understanding of the “Schöpfungssinn allen Volkstums” and thus for a Christian concept of the *Reich*.<sup>95</sup> Karl Adam (1876–1966) is also an exemplary *Volk*-theologian.<sup>96</sup> In 1933, Adam, who was praised by Lubac,<sup>97</sup> would bring the natural elements closely together with the supernatural and the higher intellectual *Geistigkeit*, *Denken*, etc.: “das Blut [ist] die physiologische Grundlage unserer ganzen Geistigkeit”; he could thus famously call for “eine auf Blutreinheit des Volkstums bedachte Gesetzgebung”.<sup>98</sup> The natural-supernatural aspect comes together in Michael Schmaus’s (1897–1993) thought as well. The NS friendly *Volk* theologian argued that the divine supernatural does not destroy the natural but raises it up: “Je reicher die Natur an Werten ist, um so mehr Ansatzpunkte findet die Gnade.”<sup>99</sup> He argued for the deep affinity of NS ideology and Catholic Christianity. In this system, the

<sup>94</sup> Henri de Lubac, *Catholicisme. Les aspects sociaux du dogme*, Paris: Cerf, 1938, 263; cited in David Curtis, “True and false modernity: Catholicism and Communist Marxism in 1930s France.” In *Catholicism, politics and society in twentieth-century France*, ed. Kay Chadwick, 73–96, here: 81. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2000.

<sup>95</sup> Schmidhauser, *Der Kampf um das Geistige Reich*, 346.

<sup>96</sup> Cf., Lucia Scherzberg, *Karl Adam und der Nationalsozialismus*, Saarbrücken: Universaar, 2011; idem, *Kirchenreform mit Hilfe des Nationalsozialismus: Karl Adam als kontextueller Theologe*, Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2001.

<sup>97</sup> See Lubac’s introduction to *Catholicisme* (1938).

<sup>98</sup> “Deutsches Volkstum und katholisches Christentum.” *Theologische Quartalschrift* 114 (1933): 40–63, 61.

<sup>99</sup> Michael Schmaus, *Begegnungen zwischen katholischem Christentum und nationalsozialistischer Weltanschauung*, Münster: Aschendorff, 1933; 3rd ed., 1934, 36; cited in Lucia Scherzberg, “Katholische Dogmatik und Nationalsozialismus.” In *Die katholische Schuld? Katholizismus im Dritten Reich zwischen Arrangement und Widerstand*, ed. Rainer Bendel, 177–194, here: 181. Münster: LIT, 2004.

National Socialist concern with the “natural health” of the *Volk* is brought together in perfect harmony with the theological concept of the “super natural” health of the *Volk*. Although there were a variety of possibilities for application of this concept, the natural and the supernatural were generally held to be deeply bound with one another in a mysterious union; analogously, and with a critical second step, the deeper unity of *Volk* and *Religion* could be established. This mystical program conflicted with the Neo-Thomistic rationalism. As Lucia Scherzberg holds: “Das Problem der neuscholastischen Konstruktion bestand darin, dass sie die Natur von Gott ablöste und nicht zuließ, bereits in der geschöpflichen Wirklichkeit der Menschen eine Hinordnung auf Gott zu erkennen.”<sup>100</sup> The interest in the new nature metaphysics may have aided in overthrowing the rationalist philosophy and theology of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, but it also encouraged a *Wessensschau* – a peering into the deeper sense of nature. Przywara’s *Analogia Entis* promoted this new interest and was concerned with the *Gemeinschaft* problem, but the work does not address the *Volk* or the *Volksgemeinschaft*. Przywara’s *völkisch* thinking is nevertheless brought to the foreground in his engagement with the Jews.

In the concluding remarks of Przywara’s long engagement with contemporary Jewish authors in his essay from 1926, “Judentum und Christentum”, he turns to an anti-capitalistic, anti-bolshevist and anti-Zionist critique which focuses on the deep essence of Judaism in contrast to Christianity.<sup>101</sup> Przywara presents many standard views of the Jews in Germany in the later 1920s: wealth mongering, liberal, immoral capitalists or atheist communists. He seems to present the Jews in a Zionist world conspiracy in America and Russia. With Przywara there is a deeper, religious explanation as well. He goes on to condemn “Internationalismus” and Cohen’s “‘Allgemeinmenschlichkeit’”.<sup>102</sup> He writes: “Darum ist das Judentum auch praktisch der Feind

<sup>100</sup> Scherzberg, “Katholische Dogmatik und Nationalsozialismus”, 180.

<sup>101</sup> “Judentum kann allein überwunden werden vom Christentum der folgerichtigen bedingungslosen Glaubenshingabe an den übergeschöpflichen Gott. [...] der jüdische Kapitalismus ist, wie Buber sehr wahr gesehen hat, nichts weiter als die Folge der Einengung des Judentums auf die Geldgeschäfte. Nur das Christentum des absoluten ‘Credo’ vom ‘Credo in Iesum Christum, filium Dei’ bis zum ‘Credo in sanctam ecclesiam catholicam et apostolicam’ ist seiner ungeheueren Gewalt gewachsen, weil es selber, in seinem innersten Wesen, die gottgewirkte Erfüllung der innern Sehnsucht dieser Gewalt ist. Judentum ist innerlichst Religion und innerlichst Religion bis in seine verdorrtesten Zweige hinein. Gewalt des Kapitalismus und Gewalt des Kommunismus sind beide letztlich religiöse Gewalt. Nur daraus wird es verständlich, wie sehr ‘Jerusalem’ von bolschewistischen wie kapitalistischen Juden, Westjuden Amerikas wie Ostjuden Rußlands als die Erfüllung begrüßt wird.” “Judentum und Christentum. Zwischen Orient und Okzident.” *StZ* 110 (1926): 81–99, here: 98. The later transcription has both errors and intentional omissions, cf., Przywara, *Ringens der Gegenwart*, vol. 2, 624–661, 658 f.

<sup>102</sup> “Judentum und Christentum. Zwischen Orient und Okzident”, 99. Przywara, *Ringens der Gegenwart*, vol. 2, 659 f.

aller Rasseneigenart und der Freund aller Völkernivellierung.”<sup>103</sup> Before the NSDAP was pumping out its propaganda about the *Rasseneigenart* from the offices of Berlin, Przywara was making theological arguments for it in the 1920s: “so muß jedes Volk dieses Judentum auf die Dauer als so etwas wie anmaßenden Störer seines Volkstums empfinden.”<sup>104</sup> Przywara’s anti-Semitism comes together with his Christian *Volk* theology.<sup>105</sup> Przywara included himself with the group of *Volk* theologians in finding deep theological reasons for the “Verschiedenheit der Völkerindividualitäten”. The religious analysis of anti-Semitism is largely repeated in 1943 with Balthasar’s “Mysterium Judaicum”.<sup>106</sup> In both cases, the fault lies with the Jews. In this argument, the Jews and their religion are finally responsible for the hate that is brought upon them, not Christianity, nationalism, or the *Rasseneigenart* fixation.

In Przywara’s 1920s essay, “Paul Natorp-Clemens Bäumker”, he takes the opportunity to address “real philosophy” while drawing upon various sources, including Aquinas. He writes: “Also wächst echte Philosophie so wenig aus einem ‘Absehen von’ den individuellen und völkischen und zeithaften Verschiedenheiten, daß sie vielmehr diese als Wesensbestandteil fordert: sie ist nicht Schulvorlage, nach der Individuen zurechtgeschnitten werden, sondern ist Organismus, der aus unversehrten Individuen wächst.”<sup>107</sup> Already in the 1920s Przywara is holding to the *völkisch* category in the biological language of the popular *Lebensphilosophie*. A subtle essentialist concept of “the Jewish” also appears in 1932 when he critically engages, in his *Analogia Entis*, Spinoza (as well as Giordano Bruno and Nietzsche); he speaks of a “philosophie-immanente Theologie”, a “Mythos”: “Man wird hier beobachten können, wie jüdischer Messianismus so oder so am Werk ist. Das liegt in seinem Formgrund: der Vergöttlichung des ‘Gesetzes’ und hierin dem Angewiesensein Gottes auf das Werk des Menschen (bis zur talmudistischen Mystik des ‘Werdens Gottes in und durch den Menschen’).”<sup>108</sup> Erroneous philosophy was brought into relation with a *wesentlich* Jewishness (“Formgrund”), be it in early modern philosophy with Spinoza or the

<sup>103</sup> “Judentum und Christentum”, 99; in the later version: “Darum wird das Judentum so sehr als der Feind aller Rasseneigenart und der Freund aller Völkernivellierung angesehen.” Przywara, *Ringten der Gegenwart*, vol. 2, 660.

<sup>104</sup> “Judentum und Christentum”, 99; cf., Przywara, *Ringten der Gegenwart*, vol. 2, 660. Przywara cites Buber and Jakob Klatzkin.

<sup>105</sup> “Der Judenhaß der Weltgeschichte ist im Grunde notwendiges Ahasverschicksal des Volkes, das sich an die Stelle des übergeschöpflichen Gottes gesetzt hat. Christentum hingegen, dessen Glauben an den übergeschöpflichen Gott seine alles entscheidende Grundstruktur bildet, ist der langsame Schöpfer der Menschheitseinheit, die aus der Verschiedenheit der Völkerindividualitäten sich aufbaut, weil diese Einheit nicht Mensch heißt, sondern Gott: ‘Haupt und Leid ein Christus’.” “Judentum und Christentum. Zwischen Orient und Okzident”, 99. Cf., Przywara, *Ringten der Gegenwart*, vol. 2, 660.

<sup>106</sup> “Mysterium Judaicum.” *Schweizer Rundschau* 43 (1943/1944): 211–221.

<sup>107</sup> Przywara, *Ringten der Gegenwart*, vol. 1, 251–261, here: 178.

<sup>108</sup> Przywara, *Analogia Entis* (1932), 41 f.

Talmud. Przywara's "Theologie des Judentums" from 1933 in *StZ* has a complicated logic which rejects the location of the *Göttliche* in the "Blut und Boden". He rejects this in both Judaism and in his review and rejection of Hans Joachim Schoeps (*Jüdischer Glaube in dieser Zeit*, 1932). Przywara claims that Schoeps turns to this "Blut und Boden" concept in a "biologische Sakral-fundierung", which is the ancient sin of the Jews against which the Prophets always battled. This is then turned against the contemporary ideology. Przywara turns his critique of the Jewish author, for falling into a blood and soil complex, against the popular blood and soil ideology itself. He claims that the ideology, which often went with anti-Semitic rhetoric, was itself Semitic: "die 'biologische Sakralfundierung' ist der Rückfall in das Heidentum des Semiten, der das Göttliche in Boden und Blut sieht. Umgekehrt aber ist es das Gericht Gottes über alle ungläubigen Antisemitismen, daß sie selber diesem Semitismus von Boden und Blut verfallen, der 'biologischen Sakralfundierung'."<sup>109</sup> Przywara challenges the blood and soil theme by claiming that it is "Semitismus". Przywara enters into the rhetorical framework of the anti-Semitic blood and soil propaganda and uses it against itself while also endorsing some of its own values, namely anti-Semitism. In the end, "Semitismus" is an ultimate problem and adversary as well as the neo-pagan blood and soil ideology which threatened the position of the Catholic Church in its quest for a new religion. This is not to claim that Przywara was in any way opposed to the *Rasseneigenart* idea, for he was clearly not willing to give this up.<sup>110</sup> While endorsing an interpenetration ("Sich-durchdringen") of "nation", "state" and "church" in his "Nation, Staat, Kirche" from September of 1933, Przywara's argument focuses on the uniqueness of the different *Völker* (English, French, German), and provides a theology to support this variety. He also addresses the Jews more than once, the "ungläubige Judenvolk" who *verwerfen* Christ "immer neu".<sup>111</sup> He mentions the "Kraft dieser 'Erde'" but also the critical "über hinaus' zum Reich der Wahrheit, Gutheit, Schönheit"; he then claims: "Darum haben die verschiedenen nationalen Ideale mit Vorliebe die Form des Menschhaften als solchen: nicht 'Engländer' zu sein, sondern 'gentleman', nicht 'Franzose', sondern 'chevaleresque', nicht 'Deutscher' zu sein, sondern 'einfach und ehrlich und innig'." (378) The *völkisch* categories are something that Przywara wants to preserve; later he writes, countering the "weltbürgerliche Distanz", that "Gott allein ist der 'alles in allen'. Die Kreatur aber ist gerade dann tief in Ihm, wenn sie an ihrem Platz, der nicht 'universal' ist, sich und hierin Ihn verschenkt." (378) Thus the language of the *analogia entis* comes into play in his defense of *völkisch* categories: "an ihrem Platz". The etymology of the nation is explained at the beginning of the article, "Natur kommt von 'nasci', 'geboren werden'. Geborenwerden weist nicht

<sup>109</sup> "Theologie des Judentums." *StZ* 124 (1933): 340–342, here: 342.

<sup>110</sup> Przywara, *Ringens der Gegenwart*, vol. 2, 660.

<sup>111</sup> *StZ* 125, Sept. (1933): 370–379, 377.

nur zurück auf Zeugung und Empfängnis, sondern eben hierin auf den ‘Stamm’.” (370) Przywara’s most popular protégé, Hans Urs von Balthasar, was also a defender of the *analogia entis* and the *Volk* idea in the 1930s, while also promoting anti-Semitism.<sup>112</sup> In an article which did make it into Przywara’s *Schriften*, “Philosophie als Problem” (1941), Przywara addresses the problem of philosophy when it strives to absolutes. This problem is seen in philosophy as cosmology, in Chinese Tao, or in the Aristotelian philosophy, or in Renaissance philosophy, or in philosophy as anthropology; many other examples are also listed. As one aspect of this philosophy as anthropology he lists the special case of it “in der ‘Totalität’ (Menschheit, Volk, Gemeinschaft-Gesellschaft) als Absolutum (in der Menschheits-Philosophie der Aufklärung, der Volks-Philosophie Herders und der Romantik, der neueren Soziologie und Rassen-Philosophie).”<sup>113</sup> He goes on to list other examples then he writes about all of these attempts at absolutization: “Die erlösende Ent-absolutierung aller erbsündig ‘absoluten’ Philosophie läßt erstens die oben gezeichneten Absoluta in ihrer geschöpflichen Relativität erscheinen und löst so den Widerspruchs-Kampf absoluter Philosophien gegeneinander zur sich-bedingenden Spannung zwischen den Sach-Möglichkeiten philosophischer Aspekte.”<sup>114</sup> In 1941, the philosophy in the “‘Totalität’ (Menschheit, Volk, Gemeinschaft-Gesellschaft)” and that of the “neueren Soziologie und Rassen-Philosophie” were also given their place in the larger “sich-bedingenden Spannung” which Przywara imagined. In a publication from 1955, he presents Husserl’s work as representative of the classic Jew: “die Stirnbinde der klassischen Juden”.<sup>115</sup> With some similarity to the old theme of Jews as secular liberals, Przywara refers to Husserl’s “Säkularisierung des Geheimnisses der Menschwerdung” in a book published in 1952.<sup>116</sup>

The strong mystical emphasis on the depths of nature in the *analogia entis* theology and philosophy seems to have aided the theological reflections about order, social order, the *Volk* and the all encompassing vision of a *Reich*.

---

<sup>112</sup> See also my articles on this matter, “Anti-Modernism and Anti-Semitism in Hans Urs von Balthasar’s Apokalypse der deutschen Seele.” *Die neue Zeitschrift für systematische Theologie und Religionsphilosophie* 52 (2010): 302–318; “Fortschritt und Untergang: die antimoderne Moderne in Hans Urs von Balthasars frühen Schriften.” *Kirchliche Zeitgeschichte* 24 (2011): 1–24.

<sup>113</sup> Przywara, *Schriften*, III, 309.

<sup>114</sup> Przywara, *Schriften*, III, 309. See also the three lectures “Gottgeheimnis der Welt” (1923), and the discussion about “Wille zur Gemeinschaft” (*Schriften*, II, 142 f.) and the four lectures “Gott” (1926) in the discussion of “Gott der Seele und Gott der Gemeinschaft” (*Schriften*, II, 308), so also the “Spannung” between Individualismus and Kollektivismus (*Schriften*, II, 314).

<sup>115</sup> *In und Gegen*, 45; cited in Gertz, *Glaubenswelt als Analogie*, 152.

<sup>116</sup> Przywara, *Humanitas: der Mensch gestern und morgen*, Nürnberg: Glock u. Lutz, 1952, 475; cited in Gertz, *Glaubenswelt als Analogie*, 153. See also, “Judentum und Christentum. Zwischen Orient und Okzident.” *StZ* 110 (1926): 81–99.

## VI. Przywara and the Reich

Another broad aspect of Przywara's Germanophone Catholic context is the post-WWI political situation. One of the major problems on the cultural horizon in the 1920s and 1930s in Europe was the meaning of WWI. Not only from today's perspective, but also for those who lived at the time, the conclusion of WWI in the American invasion of Europe, the emergence of the Russian Communist Revolution, and the calling forth of a German and Austrian Republic after the end of military engagement in November 1918, marked the final decline of an epoch and released a deep sense of crisis among many intellectuals. One of the alternatives to endorsing the Weimar Republic was the turn to a renewed discourse about the *Reich* and the *Ständestaat* idea.<sup>117</sup>

In Przywara's "Deutsche Front" (1933) he presents the thoughts of conservative revolutionaries such as Carl Schmitt, Edgar J. Jung, Moeller van

<sup>117</sup> Cf., Breuning, *Die Vision des Reiches*; Bröckling, *Katholische Intellektuelle in der Weimarer Republik*; Pöpping, *Abendland*; Graf, "Kulturprotestantismus"; Müller, "Der 'Katholische Akademikerverband' im Übergang von der Weimarer Republik ins 'Dritte Reich'"; Vanessa Conze, *Das Europa der Deutschen: Ideen von Europa und Deutschland zwischen Reichstradition und Westorientierung (1920–1970)*, München: Oldenbourg, 2005, 51 f.; Kurt Sontheimer, *Antidemokratisches Denken in der Weimarer Republik: die politischen Ideen des deutschen Nationalismus zwischen 1918 und 1933*, München: Nymphenburger, 1964; Oded Heilbronner, "The Place of Catholic Historians and Catholic Historiography in Nazi Germany." *History* 88 (2003): 280–292. "Ständestaat." In *Der Große Brockhaus*, 15. Aufl., vol. 18 (1934), 57 f.; "Ständestaat." In *LThK*<sup>3</sup>, 9, 929 f.; Gerhard Jagschitz, "Der österreichische Ständestaat 1934–1938." In *Österreich 1918–38*, vol. 1, ed. E. Weinzierl und K. Skalik, 497–515. Graz: Styria, 1983; Quirin Weber, *Korporatismus statt Sozialismus. Die Idee der berufständischen Ordnung im schweizerischen Katholizismus während der Zwischenkriegszeit*, Freiburg: Universitätsverlag, 1989. Regarding the Catholic Church in the Third Reich, see: Smolinsky, "Nationalsozialismus, IV. 1." In *LThK*<sup>3</sup>, 7, 658; cf., *Enzyklopädie des Nationalsozialismus*, ed. Wolfgang Beltz, München: DTV, <sup>3</sup>1998, 188 f.; "Kirchenkampf (im Dritten Reich)." In: Georg Denzler and Carl Andresen, *Wörterbuch der Kirchengeschichte*, 318–321, München: DTV, <sup>5</sup>1997; Joachim Mehlhausen, "Nationalsozialismus und Kirchen." In *TRE*, 24, 43–78; *Die katholische Kirche im Dritten Reich: eine Einführung*, ed. Christoph Kösters, Freiburg: Herder, 2011; Christoph Strohm, *Die Kirchen im Dritten Reich*, München: Beck, 2011; *Die Katholiken und das Dritte Reich: Kontroversen und Debatten*, ed. Karl-Joseph Hummel, Paderborn: Schöningh, 2009; Hubert Gruber, *Katholische Kirche und Nationalsozialismus 1930–1945. Ein Bericht in Quellen*, Paderborn: Schöningh, 2006; Gerhard Besier and Francesca Piombo, *Der Heilige Stuhl und Hitler-Deutschland: die Faszination des Totalitären*, München: Dt. Verl.-Anst., 2004; Georg Denzler, *Widerstand ist nicht das richtige Wort: Katholische Priester, Bischöfe und Theologen im Dritten Reich*, Zürich: Pendo-Verl., 2003; Michael Kißener, "Ist 'Widerstand' nicht 'das richtige Wort'?" In *Die Katholiken und das Dritte Reich*, ed. Hummel, 167–178; Ernst-Wolfgang Böckenförde, *Der deutsche Katholizismus im Jahre 1933: Kirche und demokratisches Ethos. Schriften zu Staat-Gesellschaft-Kirche*, vol. 1, Freiburg: Herder, 1988; Klaus Scholder, *Die Kirchen und das Dritte Reich, 1: Vorgeschichte und Zeit der Illusionen: 1918–1934*, Frankfurt a.M.: Ullstein, 1986, idem, *Die Kirchen und das Dritte Reich, 2: Das Jahr der Ernüchterung 1934*, Frankfurt a.M.: Ullstein, 1985; and in the same series: Gerhard Besier, *Die Kirchen und das Dritte Reich, 3: Spaltungen und Abwehrkämpfe 1934–1937*, Berlin: Propyläen, 2001.



den Bruck, Heinrich von Gleichen and Max Hildebert Boehm, the *Ring-Kreis* and the National Socialist ideologues, Ernst Graf zu Reventlow, Alfred Rosenberg, Richard Darré and Ernst Kriek. Here he sees all of the ideas of the “Erneuerungsbewegungen” after WWI, but also a “Wenden vom Subjektivismus zum Objektivismus im Gedanken der Repräsentation und der Autorität”, so also “vom Individualismus zum Korporativen im Gedanken des ständischen Staates” and “vom Intellektualismus zur Natur im Gedanken des Volkstums”. These turns could be understood, from the perspective of Przywara, as a “Wende zum Katholizismus”.<sup>118</sup> He nevertheless sees a problem “in der Eigenschaftlichkeit des Subjektes”. For this reason he warns of the “geheimen Tragik” of the German Front which could fall back into subjectivism of the “Haltungen”, while its “will” to the *Gemeinschaft* could fall into a mechanical mass and the “will” to nature could fall into an “intellektuell organisierte Primitivität”.<sup>119</sup> Addressing a Catholic audience which was in a process of changing its official position on the NS program, Przywara writes an article titled “Deutsches Schicksal” in January of 1933, the month Hitler began to take power in Germany. The “Deutsch[e] Aufbruch” and the “Deutsch[e] Front” raise the question of the “German destiny” for the Jesuit. He asks about the right path to “nationale Selbstbesinnung zum Recht des eigenen Volkes”, while comparing Germany to France in 1870, Spain under Philipp II, and the “Italien des Faschismus”.<sup>120</sup> He wishes to find the right way to a “nationales Ideal, das durch und durch von religiöser Sehnsucht getragen ist und die beste Tradition des katholischen Mittelalters erneuert”. (217) Przywara is familiar with the new German nationalism: “Der neue deutsche Nationalismus will das Nein zum Marxismus, aber das Ja zum Sozialismus.” (217) He goes on to extrapolate and promote the thoughts of Hugo Fischer, who criticized Marxism, and then Leonhard Ragaz, who promotes religious socialism in his *Reich Gottes – Marxismus – Nationalismus*.<sup>121</sup> Przywara seems to be offering advice for advancing the NS revolution in a cooperative manner with Catholicism. He then progresses to the future destiny of Germany: “Der neue deutsche Nationalismus will weiter das Nein zu einem *Internationalismus*, aber das Ja zu einem *deutschen Imperium*.”<sup>122</sup> He presents the thoughts of Werner Picht and Albert von Trentini against post-WWI internationalism. Przywara leads his reader to the next station on the way of “Deutsches Schicksal”: “Der neue deutsche Nationalismus will endlich durchaus das Nein zu einem *atheistischen Materialismus*, aber das Ja zu einer *deutschen Religion*.” (219) Drawing upon the *völkisch*

<sup>118</sup> Przywara, “Deutsche Front”, *StZ* 124 (1933): 166 f; cited in Müller, “Das Europabild der katholischen Monatszeitschrift”, 162.

<sup>119</sup> Przywara, “Deutsche Front”, 167; cited in Müller, “Das Europabild der katholischen Monatszeitschrift”, 163.

<sup>120</sup> Przywara, “Deutsches Schicksal.” *StZ* 124, Jan. (1933): 217–226, 217.

<sup>121</sup> Cf., Leonhard Ragaz, *Reich Gottes – Marxismus – Nationalismus. Ein Bekenntnis religiöser Sozialisten*, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1931.

<sup>122</sup> Przywara, “Deutsches Schicksal”, 218.

anti-Semitic thinker, Paul de Lagarde,<sup>123</sup> Przywara shows that Protestantism is a problem in this area because it led to a dissolving of German unity.<sup>124</sup> This opens up to a discourse about various positions within the new Protestant theology around Barth. He ends with a long citation from Gertrud von Le Fort's *Hymnen an Deutschland*. As Przywara writes: "Den 'deutschen Mythos' im echten Sinn, wie ihn die heutige Stunde fordert, schenkt uns die große deutsche Dichterin".<sup>125</sup> Le Fort knew Przywara since 1924; she was an author who dreamt of "[das] christliche Heilige Deutsche Reich".<sup>126</sup> Przywara's citation begins with "Völker sind Mächte", the hymn goes on to address the "Priesterliche Volk", Christ, kneeling, "Kaiser-volk der Erde", etc., and then ends with "Feindlos werd' ich am Sieg".<sup>127</sup> Przywara seemed to have set his hopes on this "Deutsches Schicksal", and "Der neue deutsche Nationalismus". He seems to have hoped for a Catholic friendly version of it, the German myth "im echten Sinn". In Przywara's "Nation, Staat, Kirche", in September of 1933, he notes the difference between the Aristotelian and the Platonic concepts of politics and emphasizes their similarities in finding a balance between "Ein-Herrschaft und Demokratie".<sup>128</sup> At the end he explicitly claims that the Catholic position prefers no state form, citing Pope Leo XIII's accidentalist encyclical *Immortale Dei*, issued during the *Kulturkampf* in 1885: "nulla per se reprehenditur ex variis reipublicae formis". (378) Following the National Socialist Revolution, the collapse of the democratic Weimar Republic and the resulting shift of powers, no form of government is *per se* condemned. Przywara seems to draw upon ecclesial authority to affirm the transition; there is thus something like a "Schaukelpolitik katholischer Anpassung". (378) Above the citation from the Pope, he positively mentions the *Römisches Reich Deutscher Nation*. The article approaches National Socialist ideology with Catholic resources in a hope to establish, again drawing upon Leo XIII, the "Sichdurchdringen zwischen Nation, Staat und Kirche". (379) According to the moods of his day, Przywara's "Dynamismus", from 1934, roundly affirms the activism of Oswald Spengler (1880–1936) and Barth and provides his own form

<sup>123</sup> Alfred Rosenberg praises him throughout his *Mythus*; at one place he writes: "Es ist solange nicht her, daß dieser große deutsche Träumer von uns ging: Paul de Lagarde starb am 22. Dezember 1891. Er war nach Meister Eckehart vielleicht der erste, der den deutschen ewigen Traum ausgesprochen hat ohne jene Bindungen, die den großen Lehrer früher noch fesselten." Rosenberg, *Der Mythos des 20. Jahrhunderts*, München: Hoheneichen, 1930, 434.

<sup>124</sup> Cf., Paul de Lagarde, *Deutsche Schriften*, Göttingen: Dieterich, 1878; the later edition: Paul de Lagarde, *Schriften für das deutsche Volk*, 2 vols., München: Lehmann, 1924; and one which was popular in the Third Reich: *Drei deutsche Schriften*, Leipzig: Reclam, 1933.

<sup>125</sup> Przywara, "Deutsches Schicksal", 224 f.

<sup>126</sup> Backofen, "Gertrud Freiin von Le Fort." In *KLL*, 9, 738–739, here: 738.

<sup>127</sup> Przywara, "Deutsches Schicksal", 226.

<sup>128</sup> Erich Przywara, "Nation, Staat, Kirche." In *StZ* 125, Sept. (1933): 370–379, here: 375.

of Catholic dynamism to keep pace.<sup>129</sup> Przywara's "Tradition", from 1939, praises "jene große Einheit deutscher Tradition" and a work from Gertrud von Le Fort.<sup>130</sup> Le Fort's vision of a Catholic *Reich* seems to have encouraged Przywara's theo-political diagnostic at the height of the Third Reich. In 1939 one could already look back on the *Rheinlandbesetzung* (1936), the *Anschluss* of Austria (March 1938, confirmed by Austrian plebiscite in April), the transfer of the Sudetenland from Czechoslovakia to the *Großdeutsches Reich* in the *Sudetenkrise* (1938), and the *Novemberpogrome*. In this context Przywara praises "jene große Einheit deutscher Tradition", and the words from Le Fort: "Du Volk des Sieges". Przywara clearly saw the historical relation of fascism to the ideological family of the Catholic tradition.<sup>131</sup> He also convinced his Swiss protégé that war was to be understood as "Sühne, entsühnendes Blut", as Balthasar remarks in a letter from 1951 in reference to Przywara's religious understanding of war.<sup>132</sup> Richard Faber shows how Balthasar and Przywara introduced the popular ideas from the *Konservative Revolution* into theology. In general, Balthasar and Przywara are Faber's examples of the religious and theological expression of the *Konservative Revolution*. In his treatment of "Faschistischer Katholizismus" he begins with Przywara.<sup>133</sup> Faber writes in reference to Przywara's understanding of the *Widerstand*: "der katholische 'Widerstand' gegen den deutschen Faschismus [war] ein faschistischer".<sup>134</sup>

<sup>129</sup> Przywara, "Dynamismus." In *StZ* 126 (1934): 155–168.

<sup>130</sup> He concludes with these remarks and words from Le Fort: "So aber gerade bricht durch allen Kampf zwischen Germanisch, Antik, Christlich und durch allen Gegensatz zwischen Tradition des Nordens und Tradition des Südens jene große Einheit deutscher Tradition, wie sie Gertrud von Le Fort in ihren 'Hymnen an Deutschland' (1932) gewaltig formte: 'Volk, es ward dir gerecht die gewaltige Tröstung/ eines einigen Leidens,/ [...] schon wohnt kein Enterbter deines Schicksals, kein Vergessener mehr in allen Schmerzen von Deutschland/ [...] Du Volk des Sieges/ und du Volk des Erliegens,/ Held und Leider deiner Brüder:/ wie blüht dir ewig im Schicksal/ der dunkle Dorn des Erlösers!'" Przywara, "Tradition." In *StZ* 135 (1939): 302–318, here: 318.

<sup>131</sup> As he later wrote in 1953: "Steckt nicht als Tiefstes hinter den Faschismen ein absoluter Romanismus? Steckt nicht als Tiefstes hinter dem Bolschewismus ein absoluter Slawismus? Steckt nicht als Tiefstes hinter dem Nationalsozialismus ein absoluter Germanismus? Und was sind die Absoluta in allen dreien, als ein säkularisierter Katholizismus hinter den Faschismen, eine säkularisierte Reformation hinter dem Nationalsozialismus, eine säkularisierte Orthodoxie hinter dem Bolschewismus?" Przywara, *In und gegen*, 131.

<sup>132</sup> Manfred Lochbrunner, *Hans Urs von Balthasar und seine Literatenfreunde: neun Korrespondenzen*, Würzburg: Echter, 2007, 113 f.

<sup>133</sup> Richard Faber, *Roma aeterna. Zur Kritik der "Konservativen Revolution"*, Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann, 1981, 233–240.

<sup>134</sup> Richard Faber, "Die Kirche ist der Staat von gestern, der Staat die Kirche von Morgen. Über Faschismus, Katholizismus und Totalitarismus." In *Intellektuelle im Nationalsozialismus*, ed. Wolfgang Bialas and Manfred Gangl, 284–298, here: 287. Frankfurt/M.: Lang, 2000. Cf., Faber, *Roma*.

## VII. Conclusion

Przywara's thinking does not seem to change dramatically after WWII. In 1947, Przywara writes: "Wir können, – trotz aller Repristinationsbestrebungen, – kein neues Mittelalter mehr aufbauen, – es wäre Fiktion –, noch können wir die Vorstellungen dieser sogenannten Neuzeit aufrechterhalten, sie sind überholt und widerlegt."<sup>135</sup> This diagnosis is also seen in other essays in his *In und gegen* (1955). Przywara was not alone in believing that the consequences of WWI or even WWII had marked the end of the modern age. Guardini, Balthasar and others held to similar interpretations of the historical events. While Przywara distances himself from a pejorative caricature of medieval romanticism, he still does not seem to grasp the fact that his basic advancement of the 'end of the modern age' rhetoric contributed to the ideological swing in the 1920s and 1930s which helped to enable the radical break with the Weimar Republic and the formation of the authoritarian anti-liberal *Reich* itself. He still sees himself, willingly perhaps, in the midst of a struggle against an adversary, the "Neuzeit", or some other variation of the secularization, or subjectivism thematic.

The "Katholische Krise", to use Przywara's expression, did not end with the nineteenth century *Kulturkampf*, and it was not resolved by the break-up of liberal cultural Protestantism in and after WWI, the emergence of Crisis Theology, the rise of cultural Catholicism, or the destruction of WWII. The *Krise* was neither exclusively brought about by simple external conditions (cultural, economic or political) nor was it resolved in their absence. A significant part of the "crisis" was generated by theologians themselves, like Przywara, and other anti-modernist intellectuals (such as Schmitt, Dempf and many others), as they grappled with the modern world and provided conceptual frameworks for assessing it and overcoming it. One way through the "so called modern period" ("sogenannt[e] Neuzeit") was a fascist "Sieg-Katholizismus", a way that Przywara and many others tried in the 1930s. Although it is to be distinguished from the internally contradictory and diverse NS ideology, it was more often than not interested in the total (*Ganzheit*), "organic" (*Lebensphilosophie*) religious *Reich* idea and an anti-liberal, anti-democratic, anti-Semitic *Gemeinschaft* and *ständische Gesellschaft* concept which found correspondence philosophically in the *analogia entis* and theologically in new accounts of the *corpus mysticum*, *Gemeinschaft* or *Volk* ecclesiology (e.g., in Karl Adam or Henri de Lubac), and the *missio* emphasis in the Incarnation. Although during and after WWII the socio-political, cultural and ideological frameworks of these popular ideas and theologies began to fall apart, many of the metaphysical and theological debates continued. While the contemporary meanings of these theological and philosophical matters, including the *analogia entis* ontology,

<sup>135</sup> "Weltbild Claudels" (1947). In: idem, *In und gegen*, 147. See also his remarks from 1964: idem, *Logos: Logos, Abendland, Reich, Commercium*, Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1964, 169.

go beyond the original contexts of the early twentieth century (contra a genetic reduction), and in some cases have taken on completely new orientations and related doctrinal *topoi* in their expression, familiarization with the original historical context still aids in understanding the multifaceted nature of the philosophical theology and perhaps even assists one in recognizing its limits.<sup>136</sup>

There are many questions to be answered concerning Przywara's intellectual sources and development. Further research is required on the origin and development of his political ideas, cultural background, understanding of the Jews, and *Reich*-theology both before 1945 and after. Although there is much literature on Przywara and the analogy of being, a critical and extensive study of his *Analogia Entis* (1932) in comparison with his sources, contemporary competitors in philosophy (of religion), the specific ecclesial background and general *Zeitgeist* of the 1920s and 1930s, is a desideratum.

#### Abstract

While Erich Przywara's philosophical theology, or theological philosophy, and especially his *Analogia Entis* (1932) has been the subject of some research, less is known about the broader cultural and political framework of his thought in the 1920s in the Weimar Republic and in the 1930s during the NS period. Here Przywara is presented in context of his unique religious, political and social milieu (for example, the turn from "cultural inferiority" to culture Catholicism). His writings on social, religious and political issues (for example, bolshevism), including his account of the *analogia entis* concept, are brought into relationship with his context and some of his contemporaries. Przywara's reflections on the *Reich* are analyzed and his engagement with the popular *Volk* concept is also addressed in connection with his anti-Semitism.

---

<sup>136</sup> The analogy of being ontology deserves a second evaluation once it is purged of Przywara's fascist themes and untangled from the vocabulary and ideology. Nevertheless, while there are many good reasons for endorsing the most basic Plotinian ontology (God is not simply another agent in the cosmos, but the basis of being and beyond being), to claim that the *analogia entis* is the supreme "form principle" of all religion and theology is to overextend a term from late Scholasticism.