

That quotation should leave us in no doubt that this is a work which does not prescind from faith. The likeliness of the truth of the message is not separated from the meaning of the message. At the beginning, and the end of the book, he pays tribute to another Jesuit, Bernard Lonergan and his influential work, *Method in Theology*. From Lonergan, he takes the importance of conversion for any theologian. O'Connell compares theologians to teachers of drama, who should not teach drama unless they are themselves frequent attenders of theatre. This does not quite work as some drama critics happily attend theatre with a view to sharing their sneers with the wider populace. It is true though, that negative criticism is of no value, unless the critic admits the possibility of true greatness in a dramatic performance. We have to believe, if our disbelief is to have any value.

A concern for me in the use of Lonergan, is the way that, at least as he is taught in seminaries, his four buzzwords, 'Experience, Understanding, Judgement and Decision', can suggest a linear approach. We understand our experience, judge our understanding and decide on that basis. So for decades, seminarians have come out of their colleges, chanting the acronym, 'EUJD', often forgetting what the letters stand for. (They sometimes don't know what INRI means either).

Yet as St Thomas says, '*voluntas et intellectus mutuo se includunt, nam intellectus intelligit voluntatem, et voluntas vult intellectum intelligere*' (I q. 16 a. 4 ad 1). 'Will and understanding include each other, for the understanding understands the will, and the will wants to understand our understanding'. To put it simply, knowledge precedes love but then love precedes knowledge. In terms of Lonergan's work, we can go from experience to decision but we also have to decide what we will experience. Pascal's wager is a call for a decision.

In practice, *Rethinking Fundamental Theology* in its survey of the ways we come to revelation bears witness to the interpenetration of our understanding and our desires. It is written in a specific sequence, but any book has been written in a sequence, because books are material objects. How we understand a book, after we have read it, brings us into that interpenetration of thought and love which comes from our being images of the Trinity.

The book is packed with the extensive learning and wisdom that Fr O'Collins has acquired in his long career. Much of his work has been on Christology and in this book, the resurrected Jesus, is seen as the fullness of revelation. It is the Resurrection which gives credence to that revelation. Christ reveals and we can find that revelation through a faith in him. In reaching out to the larger world, we can find the presence of Jesus in other religions, and if we have faith, we should expect to find him there, a finding which continues throughout history.

EUAN MARLEY OP

GEORGE AMIROUTZES: THE PHILOSOPHER AND HIS TRACTATES by John Monfasani, *Peeters, Leuven-Paris-Walpole MA, 2011, pp. vi + 211, € 45, pbk*

The story behind John Monfasani's recent publications on George Amiroutzes is worth retelling by way of an introduction in this review: it is of an enviably dramatic nature. Until very recently, Amiroutzes's known works were very few, and the main work, the *Dialogus de fide*, was known only through a Renaissance Latin translation. Monfasani's work has changed all that. Asked to review the edition of the *Dialogus de fide* published in 2000 by Oscar de la Cruz Palma, Monfasani started on a voyage of discovery. First, he was able to rediscover the fifth part of the Latin translation itself: the edition was based on the translator's autograph manuscript, located in Paris, from which a fifth of the text was missing. Monfasani realised that three Vatican manuscripts contained the full text, and

published an article recording this and providing an edition of the missing text. But the story does not end there. Monfasani was next able to make a connection with a manuscript in Toledo, when he realised that the *incipit* of a text recorded in an 1892 catalogue as being the work of Theodore of Gaza corresponded to the opening of Amiroutzes's *Dialogus de fide*. Thus was the original Greek rediscovered. But still the story continues: this manuscript, *Biblioteca Capitular* 96–67, itself a rather fascinating compendium of texts, also contained a set of tractates by 'The Philosopher', clearly, by virtue of context and content, indicating their composition by Amiroutzes himself. It is these tractates, with introduction, edition and translation, which are made available by Monfasani in the volume at present under review.

The rarity and interest value of this material are considerable. To set the basic historical context, Amiroutzes was one of a trio of Byzantine lay scholars who played a major role at the Council of Ferrara-Florence, the other two being the far better-known George Gemistus Pletho (*sic*) and George Scholarius. A native of the far-flung Byzantine territory of Trebizond, Amiroutzes was involved, as a high-ranking official, in the surrender of Trebizond to Mehmed II in 1461, and subsequently enjoyed esteem as a philosopher in the household of the Conqueror. However, although Amiroutzes was evidently, like Pletho and Scholarius, a figure of considerable note in his time – albeit one with rather different intellectual bias, as will be seen – his career, particularly with regard to intellectual contribution, has hitherto been something of a blank.

The fleshing-out of our knowledge and understanding of Amiroutzes enabled by Monfasani's work is thus an extremely valuable addition to what is available for understanding Late-Byzantine intellectual history. The fifteen tractates published by Monfasani are not, it should be emphasised, polished works; not, so to speak, prepared for publication. Monfasani describes them as 'a residue of George Amiroutzes's teaching as a philosopher' and suggests that 'at least some of the tractates reflect Amiroutzes's activities as a school teacher'. The tractates are of unequal length, at times rudimentary, at times disjointed. However, what they contain should be of interest to a wide range of scholars dealing in intellectual history.

A particular group to whom they should be of interest is one likely to form part of the readership of this review: namely, Thomists, or those with an interest in Thomism. It is well known that, following the translations of Aquinas (and other Latin theologians) into Greek from the middle of the fourteenth century, by Demetrius Kydones most notably, but also by later figures following his lead, Thomist influences spread amongst Greek intellectuals. The extent of this, and its impact, is an under-studied, but increasingly widely-appreciated, phenomenon. A major project is currently under way aimed at advancing study into this phenomenon: I refer to the Thoma de Aquino Byzantinus project (see: www.rhul.ac.uk/Hellenic-Institute/Research/Thomas.htm). Amiroutzes's tractates, as Monfasani emphasises, clearly demonstrate the impact of Thomism in his thinking and approach. I leave it to others far more expert to evaluate the value and nature of the Thomist element in Amiroutzes: but it is clearly an important piece in the jigsaw puzzle that makes up the attempt to trace the course and nature of 'Byzantine Thomism'.

Briefly, to conclude, a few words about the general tenor of the tractates, and the kind of material to be found in them. The level, as already mentioned, is very varied; at times they are little more than very basic introductory notes, at other times the sequence of thought is lost; the tractates certainly do not represent a cohesive whole. However, at the same time certain emphases recur and are developed within them. A particular interest is the nature of being, a subject which recurs in more than half of the tractates. Amiroutzes, firmly anti-Platonic and pro-Aristotelian, insists repeatedly on following the opinion of the

'legists' (*nomikoi*: apparently religious lawgivers in general, not necessarily of the Christian tradition) rather than the 'philosophers' (*philosophoi*: specifically, it would seem, in the Platonic tradition) in viewing existence as the product of divine will rather than as necessary emanation. Monfasani compares this with another known writing of Amiroutzes, his 'supplicatory prayer', which, while containing no specifically Trinitarian allusions, enunciates this theme, and others found in the *Tractates*, strongly.

In terms of style, there is much in the tractates which chimes with Aristotelian/Thomist traditions, and will be familiar to readers of such material. Deducing precisely where the elements discussed come from and why they are managed in the specific way in which they are managed would, however, be a complex task, which Monfasani has started upon but (self-confessedly) by no means completed. In terms of originality, it is fair to say that a sense emerges that Amiroutzes was engaging as an original thinker with his material, although the nature of the text makes it difficult to build up a comprehensive picture of his teaching and ideas. In general, the tractates are tantalising rather than fully satisfying; but that they are now available is a huge benefit to scholarship.

JUDITH RYDER

GEORGES GOYAU (1869–1939) – Un intellectuel Catholique sous la IIIe République, by Jérôme Grondeux, *Collection de l'Ecole française de Rome* 381, Rome, 2007, pp. ix + 443, € 53, pbk

On the cover of this book, we read: '*Histoire de l'Ecole française de Rome*'. However, important as that institution was in the life and labours of Georges Goyau, it is only one of the contexts or locations of this once prominent French Catholic writer. He was obviously destined for a brilliant academic career from his *lycée* years in Orléans where he studied in the company of Charles Péguy and from a very promising career at the *Ecole Normale Supérieure* under Léon Ollé-Laprune. Although Goyau and Péguy remained in touch, their studies there did not overlap. Thereafter their paths increasingly diverged – Péguy's was the more daring way, skirting abysses, Goyau's the safe and prudent route. Nothing so clearly brings out the contrast than their divergence over the Dreyfus case. Péguy was a passionately partisan Dreyfusard and Goyau discreetly in the opposite camp. Goyau, as Mauriac put it, '*pousse vers l'Académie française son solide esquif pavoisé de blanc et de jaune*'. Despite flying the papal colours so prominently throughout his life, Goyau's national reputation by 1922 made it inevitable that he would find a berth in the haven of '*Les immortels*'. Such laurels for Péguy were out of the question, yet *his* powerful voice continues to resonate and Goyau's words having, in a sense, served their purposes, quietly repose in the archives of the *Institut catholique* and the *Bibliothèque nationale*.

Why did Goyau turn aside from that promising career in the *Université*? Grondeux believes that this talented young man, visiting and subsequently working in Rome, *persona grata* in influential Vatican circles, was enthralled by the excitement of ecclesial politics. During the years 1888 to 1894, such manoeuvres came totally to absorb his interest. Indeed, Grondeux goes so far as to claim: '*Cum grano salis, nous pourrions dire qu'il y a en Goyau un comploteur*'. Here, in Rome, at the *Ecole française* he discovered his *métier* – to expound '*catholicisme intégrale*'. He would immerse himself in study of the affairs of the Church, using his talent as a scholar and writer, as an apologist for the course upon which Leo XIII and Rampolla, the Secretary of State, had set the Church and particularly the Church in France. In Paris, a Republican and a devout Catholic, Goyau threw himself into the campaign of '*Ralliement*' and, as a disciple of Henri Lorin,