

than to celebrate the Eucharist: and even untrained catechists in Africa are entrusted with this responsibility.' *Presbyterorum Ordinis* explains that the prime job of the priests is to preach; it seems that the catechists are already doing this job and even extending the preaching to more men in the sense that they often stay more closely adapted to local idiom than the seminary-trained priest. I would have liked to hear the author comment further upon the catechist as preacher as this seems to me one of the main indicators of suitability for priesthood.

Given the enormous need in Africa and given the length of time that has passed without any useful solution to the problem, the author's plea for the priestly ordination of the catechists seems entirely sensible. As a method of procedure,

too, it makes sense. Rather than setting up an office, e.g. permanent diaconate, and then seeing whether it takes on, surely it would be sensible to take accepted roles, such as catechist, and complete them by the recognition of order. The acceptance of the suggestion would be bound to have further repercussions. Would it be possible to get a nice match between itinerant celibates and static married priests? Would the married never be suitable for leadership positions? Might they not be the animators and counsellors of the itinerant? Why should not other parts of the world spot similar needs and solutions? It does not seem to me possible to see it as only an african expatriate answer to an african problem, but it certainly seems an instance where a start could be made of benefit to the whole western church.

JONATHAN FLEETWOOD O P

THE CITY OF THE SUN, by Thomas Campanella. Translated by A. M. Elliot and R. Millner, with Introduction by A. L. Morton, *Journeyman Press*. 1981. pp 64. £1.75.

Campanella (1568-1639) was one of the most controversial Dominicans of his period. He advocated a radical empiricism in philosophy, and seems to have been involved in revolutionary politics in his early 30's (he was a Sicilian, and eager to be rid of Spanish rule). He was extremely interested in the new science, and wrote a pamphlet in support of Galileo. For many years he was in and out of prison, but later on he nearly became a consultant for the Holy Office. Contrary to what the Herder *Church History* claims, he never left or was expelled from the Order (unlike Giordano Bruno, with whom he is often associated). He died in the Dominican convent of St Honoré in Paris, in high esteem with Robespierre, and at least a figure of some interest to his brethren, who were still telling stories about him when Quétif was working on his monumental *Scriptores Ordinis Praedicatorum*. As a theologian, he engaged in some not unsuccessful apologetics against Lutheranism, and recommended fairly radical church reforms. In a treatise on Predestination he adopted a rather unThomistic stance, which did not

endear him to his brethren in Rome, where he was living at the time.

In spite of considerable interest in Campanella on the continent, he is almost entirely unknown in England, receiving only very casual mention in most works about the period. It is with great pleasure, then, that we can welcome this excellent little translation of his *Utopia* (which is, to some extent, indebted to that of St Thomas More). The brief Introduction is helpful, in spite of its brevity, and the translation reads well, and, judging from the passages I have checked against the original, it maintains a very high standard of accuracy.

The text itself is of the same kind of interest as other *Utopias*. Maybe it is a literary form which has only a limited appeal now; but in an age of science fiction like ours, in which many writers speculate about modes of life unaffected by our own planet's tragedy of original sin, it is not without interest to see Campanella's dream of human innocence (and it is probably significant, as Romano Amerio suggests, that he situates his *Utopia* in an

equatorial island also associated with the earthly Paradise). He has some fascinating suggestions about education, and advocates common ownership of everything, and a rigorously eugenic supervision of

people's sexual activities. Campanella certainly deserve his place among the radical social thinkers of the Renaissance period.

SIMON TUGWELL O P

COLLECTED PHILOSOPHICAL PAPERS, VOLUME III by G E M Anscombe. *Basil Blackwell, 1981. pp ix + 161. £12.00.*

This third volume of the much to be appreciated *Collected Philosophical Papers* of Elizabeth Anscombe is devoted to writings on Ethics, Religion and Politics, though there are only two papers on religious matters properly so called: a CTS pamphlet 'On Transubstantiation' and a hitherto unpublished lecture on faith, which is primarily concerned with the question of what might be involved in believing God.

The most famous paper in the collection is probably 'Modern Moral Philosophy', a mile-stone of ethical inquiry in which Anscombe (to my mind most effectively) argued (a) 'that it is not profitable for us at present to do moral philosophy'; (b) 'that the concepts of obligation, and duty – *moral* obligation and *moral* duty, that is to say – and of what is *morally* right and wrong, and of the *moral* sense of "ought", ought to be jettisoned if this is psychologically possible'; and (c) 'that the difference between the well-known English writers on moral philosophy from Sidgwick to the present day are of little importance' (p 26). Some moral philosophers have learned from these theses. A large number, alas, have not.

The other papers are less well known, but all of them are worth reading, especially, as it seems to me, 'On Frustration of the Majority by the Fulfilment of the Majority's Will' (pp 123-129), which is something of a *tour de force* the upshot of which should be put on the BBC News. We all believe in democracy, do we not? But what are its implications when it comes to decisions based on the expressed will of

individuals? As Anscombe shows: 'the majority may be satisfied on every issue, while nevertheless the majority is frustrated over a majority of issues' (p 129). More precisely: 'There is thus the possibility of a certain technique of tyranny whose every measure has the support and is truly in accord with the desire of the majority, those whom any given measure hurts being in the minority; or again, one by one "merely sectional interests" are damaged. Since everyone not wretchedly isolated belongs to several "sections", it will be possible for the tyrant to damage the interests of anyone or any group (that does not support him, say) while truthfully claiming "democratic" support for his measures. Or again, the process of damage to sectional interests – that is, to a majority of the population – may occur in a democracy in a haphazard fashion and without design, always in accordance with the will of the majority' (p 129). These points are obvious when one comes to think about things properly. But one needs someone like Anscombe to prod one into doing so.

It is worth pointing out that the volume contains a misleading foot-note. At the bottom of page 117 the reader is led to believe that the second volume of Anscombe's *Collected Papers* contains her essay 'What is it to believe someone?' But that is not so. The essay can, however be found in C F Delaney (ed.), *Rationality and Religious Belief* (Notre Dame and London, 1979).

BRIAN DAVIES O P