

does not abandon that experience of perception which is the foundation of his proof. Next it is argued that Berkeley was right not to deny religious belief before starting on a philosophical proof. Here I would want to say that while such proof can only explicate what is in some way already known, the world being God's first revelation to all men, yet surely, before we argue towards him, we need to set aside false assumptions as to what God is, and even the assumption that anything at all can ever tell us what he is. This in effect is the fundamental and unanswerable criticism finally brought against the proof by Fr Sillem himself. Berkeley thought that we can know God as we know any other spirit; he thought of him as the first cause in a class of causes. In other words he failed to appreciate that the name of God can never be given to a being who does not totally transcend all experience. Such philosophical naivety must in the end exclude Berkeley's proof from serious consideration. But for all that every theist can learn from him, and should be grateful to Fr Sillem for a fine piece of work.

LAURENCE BRIGHT, O.P.

THE PSEUDO-CYPRIANIC DE PASCHA COMPUTUS. Translated by George Ogg. (S.P.C.K.; 6s. 6d.)

CYRIL OF JERUSALEM AND NEMESIUS OF EMESA. Edited by William Telfer. (Library of Christian Classics, Vol. IV. S.C.M. Press; 30s.)

Your ignorance of how St Cyprian did not calculate—and with some inaccuracy—the date of Easter, is a gap in your Christian knowledge which is here being filled in for you almost before you are aware of it. Even when you have read this short treatise, it is more than possible that you will still not understand how this enthusiastic amateur astronomer reached his conclusions, unless you are such an astronomer yourself. But at any rate you will have picked up much interesting, and not always merely chuckle-worthy, biblical exegesis; for example that the Temple of Solomon was generally agreed to be made in the veiled likeness of Adam. And you may perhaps be helped to appreciate the symbolic importance of celebrating Easter on a movable date, whose astronomical premises link the feast up with the creation of sun and moon, and thus give a fitting cosmic value to the memorial of universal redemption and cosmic re-creation.

The catechumens whom Cyril was preparing for their Easter baptism at Jerusalem were concerned with less recondite matters. The catecheses here translated are in fact instructions on the creed, with some introductory talks on sincerity of conversion, repentance, and baptism. This dogmatic and moral instruction before baptism would be followed by instruction on the sacraments in the 'mystagogic' sermons after Easter. It is perhaps a pity that the mystagogic sermons

conventionally ascribed to Cyril do not follow the selection from his catecheses in this volume. It is true that the editor states a good case for crediting them to Cyril's successor John. Even so, they would have made a more appropriate bed-fellow than the treatise of Nemesius to Cyril's catecheses.

However, the editor has given us such an excellent historical and topographical introduction on the fourth-century Church of Jerusalem that we have no business to cavil at his preferences. And I would risk a guess that the matter nearest his heart in the book before us is the treatise of Nemesius of Emesa on the nature of man, and that Cyril was brought in as a second string only.

Nemesius is so shadowy a figure that his treatise was frequently ascribed to Gregory of Nyssa; sometimes they share the honours as Nemesius of Nyssa or Gregory of Emesa. It was known to the medieval scholastics as a work of Gregory's. And perhaps its chief interest is its speculative scholastic temper. Nemesius's viewpoint could perhaps be described as semi-Aristotelian. He illustrates the point that scholasticism was not an invention of the medieval Latin West, but was derived from the ancient world. But in the Church of the late Empire it flourished mainly among the Greek Fathers, the theological approach of the great figures of the Latin West being by contrast more literary and rhetorical.

E.H.

A SCHOLASTIC MISCELLANY: ANSELM TO OCKHAM. Edited by Eugene R. Fairweather. (Library of Christian Classics, Vol. X. S.C.M. Press; 35s.)

This book succeeds by modesty. 'An editor who is not a professional medievalist', to quote his description of himself, but has taken the utmost care with documentation and advice, has produced a volume of extracts from twelfth- and thirteenth-century theologians selected wisely, translated sparsely and without pomp, and introduced with an informed precision. The book falls into three parts. The first introduces St Anselm with balance and restraint: when one thinks of the mistakes that might have been made here and are not, the full stature of the editorial work can be assessed. There follow translations of the *Proslogion* and the *Cur Deus homo?*, together with important excerpts from other works, and two biographical extracts from Eadmer. The second part deals with the twelfth-century schools—Chartres, Laon, Abelard, the Victorines, Lombard; and the third part gives a very rapid glimpse of thirteenth- and fourteenth-century systems other than that of St Thomas Aquinas, who has a volume of the series to himself. In this third part the glimpses are perhaps too rapid, and we