

'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,

supported emergent Christian Democracy. These ardent young Catholic activists were inspired by Leo XIII's remarkable encyclical, *Rerum Novarum*. Goyau seized opportunities afforded by this pontificate to promote rapprochement between Church and state in the acutely polarised politics of *fin de siècle* France. Yet, he and his friends were doomed to frustration. The next pontificate, that of Pius X, was too neurotically defensive. Vatican blunders played into the hands of determined anti-clerical Republicans in France and the result was the radical 'séparation' of Church and state in 1905.

One need only turn to Grondeux's excellent bibliography to appreciate the astonishing volume of Goyau's writings. They range from his many books to dozens of articles in *Le Revue des Deux Mondes*, innumerable articles written for *Le Figaro* in the 1920s and 1930s. Grondeux devotes twenty-two pages listing all these writings. Nor is this an exhaustive catalogue. The four volumes of his *L'Allemagne religieuse*, much appreciated by leading French and German Protestants of the day, were remarkable for their objectivity and fair-mindedness. He was indeed a journalist and a polemicist, but a scholarly, intellectual one. He brought to his substantial works a theory of history upon which Grondeux, never one for concision of style, bestows the unwieldy title of '*Le providentialisme historico-critique*'. Goyau believed that, by the '*force d'histoire*' and governed by divine will, the concept of papal infallibility was carried to its consummation by the decree of July 1870 when authority was at last indisputably 'incarnated' in the Pope. Goyau is a latter-day Lamennais, or perhaps more accurately, a latter-day Joseph de Maistre. His ardent ultramontanism survived the operations of the Vatican 'thought-police' during the pontificate of Pius X when even he, the safest pair of hands in Catholic Europe, had a brush with the inquisitors. Goyau is a man whom one may justly call 'Roman' in every fibre of his being. Even the catastrophically inept Vatican handling of the so-called 'Modernists', which he regretted, did not shake the foundations of his '*romanitas*' – all would be ultimately for the best in the divine ordering of history. Even the appalling first world war fulfilled the will of God by humbling nationalism and compelling Catholics to look more directly to Rome for authoritative guidance. Whether he sustained that view with any enthusiasm during the rise of National Socialism in the 1930s, one wonders. He certainly had no time for Nazi ideology and approved the papal condemnation of Maurras's *Action Française* while preserving amicable relations with the leader who certainly, at times, felt free to mock Goyau. Like many Catholics in the 1930s, but not Mauriac or Bernanos, he supported Franco and failed to protest over the bombing of Guernica.

What then is admirable about Goyau and why commend this detailed survey of his life as a Catholic apologist? His prudence and caution certainly do not make for a compelling dramatic narrative like that of the life of Félicité de Lamennais. Yet, Grondeux's book conducts us with profound erudition through a fascinating and agitated period in the life of the Church in France. This chronicle underlines the prescience of the liberal Catholic Montalembert's appropriation of Cavour's *mot* when, at Malines in 1863, he daringly appealed for a free church in a free state. That is what Catholic Republicans like Goyau schemed and campaigned for, though, at the same time, for the preservation of the Church at the heart of the nation's culture. However, the rift was too wide for that to be possible. Even after Catholics had demonstrated their patriotism during the 1914–1918 war, there was a recrudescence of anti-clericalism and anti-Catholicism on the part of the *Cartel des Gauches*. Goyau and his allies saw off that last, not inconsiderable, threat. An uneasy truce with *laïcité* ensued and has endured to this day, so that it appears now to be a settled principle of governance in France.

It is much to Goyau's credit that he insisted that the Church must not evade the challenges and questions of the age. He was a courteous opponent and, although well able to deliver a shrewd polemical blow, never descended to the malicious

contestation which so often disfigures polemics. He demonstrated that it is entirely possible to unite a spirit of liberality to zealous ultramontane convictions. Although his 'high' papalism was enough to make any *papabile* candidate decline the office, Goyau's chronic dependence on papal authority might persuade the reader of Grondeux's account to think critically about the risk of placing undue weight on the glib maxim: '*Roma locuta est; causa finita est.*' He wrote in *Le Vatican* (1895): '*Une incarnation perpétuelle de l'absolutisme divin, voilà le seul remède pour que la société ne soit point à la fois la dupe et la victime de ces droits souverains auxquels prétendent les individus. La papauté dans l'histoire, fut cette incarnation...*' Such an authority, '*le vicariat de Dieu*' he continues, would be opposed to all abuse of power.

Not without justification did Yves Guyot call Goyau: '*Légat laïque du Pape de France*'. Insufficiently critical of papal authority Goyau may be, certainly in his public statements, nevertheless he was a voice for moderation in the French Church as disputatiously and reluctantly she came to terms with the legacy of the French Revolution. Goyau deserves to be remembered and Grondeux's account will ensure that the reputation of this zealous defender of the faith does not quietly repose in the national archives.

TONY CROSS

KIERKEGAARD'S CRITIQUE OF CHRISTIAN NATIONALISM by Stephen Backhouse, *Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2011, pp 272, £65.00 hbk*

What relevance can an academic book on Soren Kierkegaard's 19th-Century social theology have for the practical social issues of the 21st Century? The likely answer is: more than many of us may be prepared to accept.

Backhouse's thesis can be laid out briefly: Kierkegaard's ruthless critique of the Christian nationalism of 19th- Century Denmark is directed not merely at an extreme version of feeling for country but at the idea of Patriotism itself. Patriotism, the affinity among those who share a common culture and language, is, according to Kierkegaard, an impediment to the realization of true Christianity. Backhouse uses two of Kierkegaard's contemporaries to set the context for his supporting argument: H.L. Martensen (1808–1884), the head of the established Lutheran Church in Denmark, and N.F.S. Grundtvig (1783–1872) an evangelical pastor, writer and politician. Martensen was a cultural imperialist who believed European Christendom to be the apotheosis of civilisation and an increasingly close approximation to the Kingdom of God on earth. Grundtvig was both more radical and more specific in his cultural claims. For him it is the Danish culture which is demonstrably superior to all other European varieties, even those of other Scandinavian nations. In choosing these two protagonists, Backhouse has laid out the boundaries of the theological and political space which Kierkegaard chose to invade.

Kierkegaard's choice of intellectual weapons for penetrating this space includes both theological and philosophical concepts which permeate each other so that it is difficult to untangle his thinking from his believing. Kierkegaard's theological position is that it is not culture that produces either faith or a Christian society, but rather a continuously renewed decision to live with, for and as Christ that breaks through all cultural accidentals. Custom, convention, moral attitudes are for him things that hide Christ. Nationalism, or even the milder attitude of patriotic feeling, is unchristian principally because it restricts or distorts our judgments about who is our neighbour, who it is that we are to confront with our own submission in self-denying charity. Patriotic sentiment is therefore destructive of