

ment. It reflects an indulgence of aggressive instincts; it is utilizing the law in order to release the very instincts that are condemned in the criminal. The thoroughgoing Freudian interpretation of punishment is no doubt naïve in its determinism, but stripped of its jargon it describes faithfully enough the unconscious drives that influence the advocates of a punishment—such as execution—which in effect is moralized aggression.

These three essays provide useful evidence, carefully marshalled, on the negative aspect of the matter. There are references of course to alternatives to capital punishment, but the time has come to emphasize much more strongly the responsibility of society to find effective means of punishment which affirm, as any Christian tradition must, the disapprobation of wrong while at the same time providing for a hope (at least) of reform and rehabilitation without which any punishment is indeed barbaric and, in the last analysis, unacceptable. It is to be hoped that Catholic opinion, fortified with this valuable summary of Christian ethical principles and the facts that have to be faced, will bring its weight to bear in resolving a debate which is not so much a matter of mercy as of justice and the good of the community.

PEREGRINE WALKER

THE PRIMACY OF PETER, by J. Meyendorff, A. Schmemmann, N. Afanassieff, N. Koulomzine; Faith Press, London; 15s.

VOIX DEL'ÉGLISE EN ORIENT, by Patriarch Maximos IV and others; Desclée de Brouwer; 210 Fr.B.

UNION ET DÉSUNION DES CHRÉTIENS, by L. Bouyer, J. Coppens, I-H. Dalmais, H. Jedin, A. Simon; Desclée de Brouwer; 90 Fr.B.

The four Orthodox contributors to *The Primacy of Peter* are all Russian theologians of the emigration with first-hand experience of the ecumenical movement and continental catholicism. Their essays, though written from the traditional eastern standpoint, offer the western reader a view of the papacy 'from the other side' and some insight into eastern ecclesiology. The eirenic spirit of these studies and the authors' frankness in recognising the problems and weaknesses of historical Orthodoxy establish the book as a serious contribution to Orthodox-Catholic relations.

The place of St Peter in Byzantine theology is considered by Fr J. Meyendorff. For the Orthodox, the primacy of Rome rests on a dual foundation: Rome as see of Peter and as capital of the empire. The first of these is not sufficient of itself for them, in view of St Peter's links with Antioch and Jerusalem; while the second carries the implication that a shift in political power could effect a shift in patriarchal seniority. Fr Meyendorff draws a sharp distinction between the apostolate and the episcopate and this point is further developed by N. Koulomzine in his essay, 'St Peter's place in the early church'.

Orthodox ecclesiology exists largely by inference and has its seeds in the writings of the Greek Fathers. It has never been articulated and it is only in recent times and under the combined pressures of the growing diaspora and the ecumenical movement that Orthodox theologians have begun to probe the theological foundations of the Church as an entity. Fr Schmemann's essay on 'The idea of primacy in Orthodox Ecclesiology' is thus of special interest and it translates the book from the category of a historical study to that of a significant contribution to Orthodox theological interpretation. He shews that the absence of an ecclesiological interpretation of primacy is at the root of the canonical and jurisdictional troubles and divisions which have beset the Orthodox Churches in recent years.

The interpretation turns on the affirmation of the Church as an organism or organic unity: *either* (according to Fr Schmemann) universal *or* eucharistic. He shews that if the universal view is accepted, the papacy is not merely a possible consequence but an essential one, and he adds: 'The idea, popular in Orthodox apologetics, that the Church can have no visible head because Christ is her *invisible* head, is theological nonsense'. He regards the true Orthodox interpretation of organic unity as eucharistic: *primacy* being essentially a matter of witness and not of power. Fr N. Afanassieff elaborates this theme more discursively in his essay, 'The Church which presides in love', which is the longest of the four.

It is not clear why Fr Schmemann assumes that his 'either-or' interpretations of organic unity must be mutually exclusive. He recognizes that the development of Canon Law appeared to leave little room for the notion of the Body of Christ so that the life of the Church inevitably came to be expressed in juridical terms. But in emphasizing the eucharistic interpretation he seems compelled by the logic of his own position as an Orthodox to reject even a complementary place for the universal aspect of organic unity.

Western readers will find the viewpoint of Eastern Catholics set forth in *Voix de l'Église en Orient*. This selection of writings of Eastern Catholic bishops was made by Patriarch Maximos IV whose leadership in this sphere has become better known to the west through the Second Vatican Council. The book bears witness to the dual role of Eastern Catholicism: solidarity in spirit and tradition with the Orthodox, and fidelity to the Papacy. Patriarch Maximos and his bishops believe fervently that their Church, though numerically small and poor in terms of worldly wealth and influence, has a key part to play in restoring unity between Rome and the Orthodox east.

The historical problems which divide Christians and some attempts to overcome them form the subject of the collection of scholarly lectures *Union et désunion des chrétiens*. Apart from Père Dalmais's two contributions on liturgy and oriental rites, the emphasis is on western divisions and includes a paper on *Le cardinal Mercier et l'union des Églises* by A. Simon and a hitherto unpublished letter from Lord Halifax.

HELLE GEORGIADIS