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extraordinary (with a few exceptions) as they have been. He has effec­
tively caught the Catholic community in its many dimensions as it
evolved from a church of Maryland gentry, servants, and slaves to a
collection of polyglot ethnic groups to a maturing middle-class body
entering the mainstream of American society. S. is especially good at
fitting this story within the larger backdrop of city and state and nation.
He has made a major contribution to American Catholic history.
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DEITY AND DOMINATION: IMAGES OF GOD AND THE STATE IN THE
NINETEENTH AND TWENTIETH CENTURIES. By David Nicholls. New

Nicholls sets out to examine the relationship between images of divine
and civil government in selected 19th- and 20th-century religious think­
ers. The analogy between God and the state, he believes, is at least as
productive a source for understanding the connections of religion and
politics as is the more frequently considered ethical linkage. He proposes
to focus on the history of this dialectical relationship, believing that only
when it has been laid out in some detail can we draw any conclusions
about how ideas of God and the state should be juxtaposed.

In a lengthy and discursive introduction, N. explains some of the
terminology he will use and provides a brief overview both of the sweep
of the argument and some of the underlying themes. He also explains
that the work is written “anticlockwise” (that is, backwards), beginning
with the most recent of his chosen sources and working by degrees
towards the earlier. He promises a second volume that will do for the
17th and 18th centuries what this work does with more recent times.

In the body of the work N. examines in turn the connections between
attachment to the “welfare state” and devotion to a paternalistic God,
the correlation between an emphasis on divine sovereignty and the
politics of totalitarianism, the democratization of God in the American
theopolitical climate, the views of God and the state in the writings of
early-19th-century German philosophers, and the interplay of atheism
and anarchy in other parts of the 19th-century world. A large number of
thinkers are discussed, both the famous and the frankly obscure, but the
lengthiest discussions are devoted to William Temple, Karl Barth, Fichte,
Schleiermacher, Hegel, Proudhon, and Shelley.

Since from one point of view this book is itself a historical survey of
the progress of thought through a 200-year period, it is impossible to give
an account of the development of the argument. Indeed, the questionable
decision to write anticlockwise subverts the very possibility of identifying
any such train of thought in the cunning of historical reason, and such
may indeed be N.’s best justification for structuring the work this way.
On the other hand, he asks why we should not “proceed by tracing antecedents” rather than adopt the more normal course of “working toward the present and looking for consequences” (15). Yet the work as it stands at present, while we await the second and somehow earlier volume, maintains each chapter-long discussion in fair isolation from the others, and does not even conform in all respects to the promised anticlockwise approach. If the antecedents are to come last, then surely the atheistic anarchists of the mid-19th century should be considered before the great German idealists against whose political and religious thinking they might rightly be thought to be reacting. Or, to take a different example, the valuable and informative chapter on James, Dewey, Whitehead, Hartshorne and the Chicago School seems to have been written more or less clockwise. Moreover, at no point are the antecedents uncovered in such a way as to make explicit their value in the understanding of what has already been discussed.

A second and perhaps more fruitful way to view this book is as illustrating a thesis rather than developing a line of thought, and from this perspective the historical direction in which it is constructed is hardly relevant. N. undoubtedly has a hypothesis he wishes to test, namely, that images and concepts of God are often drawn from the political arena, but leave the marks of their origins behind and in a later reversal can come to affect political discourse anew. From this second angle, N.'s work provides a wealth of illustration of the dialectical nature of the God/state relationship, though the generality of the hypothesis leads to the suspicion that it might be difficult to verify, still more to disprove. On the other hand, the hypothesis can be stripped down to a principle that is as unlikely to be controverted as it is to be informative, namely, that we are all children of our times, and struggle with our culturally inherited patterns of thought. N. needs to step beyond the generalities, work to establish the connections and to reinforce the various patterns hinted at here and there in his work, particularly in the more synthetic conclusion. His undoubted scholarship would then be of considerable value in examining the really significant underlying issue here, the struggle between culture and eternal truth.
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Fitzer's anthology is not merely another welcome collection but, surprisingly, the first of its kind. It makes 14 texts of 19th-century Catholic thought available in English, from F.-R. de Chateaubriand in 1802