

FELLOWSHIP SUMMER CONFERENCE 2007
The Hayes Conference Centre, Swanwick, 6-8 July

Conference Report

There was real joy at being able to meet together again, to renew friendships, to make new ones, to share some worshipping life and to hear stimulating talks, as well as participate in discussion and workshops. The joy, as always, lay partly in the way that in the Fellowship we can meet across jurisdictional boundaries and sense something of what Orthodoxy in this country might be about. This year there was of course a certain poignancy because of jurisdictional changes. There was a great hope that attendance might be renewed or experienced by all the jurisdictions in this country. Where there have been temporary (please God) ‘partings of friends’, while changes are worked through – we pray that the Fellowship might continue to be a meeting place, sometimes even a melting pot, and certainly a sign of hope for essential unity, in spite of ethnic differences.

We were happy to welcome Metropolitan Kallistos, in his new title, and the fact that the name has undertones or overtones connected with trains we knew would not displease him! We were also sad that he had decided that his term as our chairman must come to an end and we are very grateful for all his lively and deep encouragement and support, which we know has not come to an end. In fact, it was emphasised how pleased we all were that Metropolitan Kallistos and Bishop Basil remain our senior friends. We were also glad at the AGM to welcome John Speak as the new chairman and to pledge our support to him and the committee.

One particular source of delight at the conference was the presence of so many younger members, who provided energetic support and music. Thanks to all of them. Some of us managed to stay up late enough for an entertainment, and I remember Miriam’s ability to lead the dance and Anna’s considerable dramatic talent in storytelling, with great pleasure. The heart lifts; with such talented young people around there is, under God, hope, and future.

The main speakers were all very different and each much appreciated. I am glad that the texts of their talks will be published [two in the following pages and the third in the summer 2008 issue – Ed.], so that their truths will be there for us to ruminate upon and integrate into our living of the Faith in today’s complicated world.

It was good to hear and meet with Fr Thomas Hopko, bringing us his long years of experience: in the priesthood, in America and at St Vladimir's. Many of us have been stimulated and challenged to new areas of dialogue by his writings. He spoke on 'Living the Liturgy: learning and teaching the faith through our Eucharistic worship'. We were very struck by his repetition of the word 'nevertheless': whatever happens, is happening, will happen, *nevertheless* there is the way the Lord acts in our liturgical *acts* and any reflection or thought is secondary to that fact. The Liturgy breaks through space and time – the Eternal is present – with the Mother of God, the angels, the saints. In our worship, we become *zoon koinetikon*, a living community. At the epiclesis, we call the Spirit to come down on *us*, as well as on the holy gifts; we, as well as the bread and the wine, *are* the real presence of Christ. Fr Thomas's talk was very rich and full; how endlessly we need to learn together how to savour the riches of what is being *done*, effected, in the Liturgy.

I kept thinking here is a man, a priest, who has lived and suffered. I would like to know more of his journey in the Faith. Perhaps one day he will be able to share more of it. Living stories, life stories, do help us. Those thoughts continued when we heard Metropolitan John (Pelushi) of Korca speak to us on 'Mission and Evangelism: witnessing to our faith before the world'. Truly, we were all riveted by the experiences and sufferings of the church in Albania, and the deep and joyful promise of renewal represented in his very person by Metropolitan John, who had a particular openness to women and men, together in the church, in the stories he told, and in his way of handling discussion in this conference. I can still hear some of his emphases. It is when we feel the *pain* of sin that we then look for healing. The Truth *breaks* upon us. 'Through the Cross joy has come to all the world' was his lived focus. The sacrificial way is the *means*, the means of sanctification. We must shake off the culture of complaint and compliance. He was an inspiration.

On the Sunday afternoon, we had the pleasure of hearing Professor David Frost, now heading up the Cambridge Institute, on 'Christian Education: a Retrospect and a Prospect'. We must hope that this will be the first of many occasions on which he will share himself, his wide experience, his work, and his courage in tackling the problems of the 'world' in which we live, and which God loves, and bringing the problems into our lived experience of the Faith in worship and in studying together.

We were all given a collection of quotations around the themes of the conference, kindly and generously collated by Metropolitan Kallistos, whom we all wished ‘Many Years’ as he celebrated 25 years, at Pentecost, of his ordination to the episcopate. There were eight substantial workshops; no doubt each could provide an article for *Forerunner* if the relevance of their topics is any indication.

It was an excellent conference. Thank you for all your hard work, those of you who organised it. Let us pray that the Spirit will continue to bless the Fellowship and keep us all open and forgiving towards each other.

Wendy Robinson

Living the Liturgy: learning and teaching the faith through our Eucharistic Worship

Thomas Hopko

The Liturgical Gathering

The Divine Liturgy tells us first of all that human beings are persons in communion with others. The very word *liturgy* means a *common act*. We are not autonomous individuals. We are members one of another. We cannot be human alone. If we are to find life, discover truth and be human beings as God wills us to be, we can do so only in communion with other people, and, indeed, with all of God’s creatures. Our first liturgical act, therefore, is to assemble with others.

Being with others shows us what we are. It reveals our real condition. To ‘fulfill the law of Christ’ we must ‘bear each other’s burdens’ (Gal 6.2). We must learn to love, and specifically to love as God loves, in Christ, by the Holy Spirit. We come to church, or more accurately, we ‘come together as church (*synerkhomenon en ekklesia*)’, in order to learn this (1 Cor 11.18). We come to learn to be human, and so to become divine, by our common action with others, by which (as the Pastor of Hermas said centuries ago) our spiritual filth is scrubbed off, our ragged edges are made smooth, and our self-centred ‘roundness’ is flattened and straightened so that we can fit together to form a living temple of God.

Only those who come to the Divine Liturgy with good-willed intentions can participate worthily and fruitfully. Some such people may come simp-

ly as observers, guests and friends. Others may come seeking to find what is true, good and beautiful in life. They come searching for God in order, if they can, to find, believe and live in Him. Others come as unbaptized catechumens or Christians from non-Orthodox communities intending to enter the Orthodox Church. Some Church members come as penitents who refrain from Holy Communion for therapeutic reasons. And some, of course, come as baptized and chrismated members of the Orthodox Church who desire to glorify God, hear His Word, sacrifice their lives to Him in and with His Son Jesus, receive His Holy Spirit, and partake of Christ's body and blood for the remission of sins, the healing of soul and body and the attaining of everlasting life through repentance, witness and service to others in Christ's name.

So, only good-willed guests, sincere seekers, those intending to join the Church, Orthodox penitents and Orthodox communicants, come to the Church's Eucharistic Worship in a worthy manner. All others, especially those claiming to be believers, who come in another spirit, for other reasons, come unto their own harm. Their being at the Liturgy inevitably makes them worse instead of better. In stating this traditional Orthodox teaching, we must be sure to affirm that Orthodox Christians who fully participate in the Church's Divine Liturgy in good faith never stop being guests, seekers, learners and penitents until their last breath.

A Human Gathering becomes God's Holy Church

At the Divine Liturgy, a human gathering is transformed into the Church of God. This happens when the bishop or presbyter who images God and Christ (or, perhaps more accurately, God in Christ and Christ in God) takes his place at the head of the assembly. Indeed, when the Liturgy is ready to begin, the deacon asks the blessing of the church's presiding member, addressing him with the psalmist's words: 'It is time for the Lord to act.' He receives his blessing with the prayer: 'May the Lord direct your steps' (Ps 119.126-128). This action tells us that the '*qa'hal Israel*' is only '*qa'hal*', that is '*ekklesia*' or 'church,' when the Lord Himself is formally present and active, making it to be what it is (see Numbers, esp. ch. 10).

When a human gathering is transformed into God's Church by the appearance of its ordained leader, not only is God's presence in and with His glorified Son and Holy Spirit guaranteed, but the gathering is also graced to transcend its bounds and limitations as a merely creaturely assembly. It is given the participation of God's people of all times and

places, present, past and still to come, with the bodiless powers of heaven and all of God's creatures that glorify Him in unceasing service and song (see Hebrews, esp. ch. 12, and Revelation, esp. ch. 4-7).

Thus, we see that for human beings to be really human, they must be 'recreated' by being 'born from above' by water and the Spirit. They must repent, believe and be baptized into Christ, sealed by the Holy Spirit, and made a 'new creation' and a 'new humanity' in the risen and glorified Messiah (see Acts 2.37-42; 2 Cor 5; Gal 6.14-17; Eph 2-4; Col 1-3). Their 'biological hypostasis' (as Metropolitan John of Pergamon might say) must become an 'ecclesial hypostasis'. Or, in scriptural terms, their identity in the first Adam, the man from dust, must be replaced by their identity in the last Adam, the man from heaven (1 Cor 15). In a word, they must become 'church'. Otherwise, they remain part of the damaged and death-bound humanity of 'this age' whose 'form is passing away' (1 Cor 7.31).

Prayer, Psalms and Hymns

The Divine Liturgy tells us that human beings are made to know God, and to give Him unceasing glory, honour and worship in and with His only-begotten Son and Holy Spirit. It tells us what the Apostle Paul tells us in the first lines of his letter to the Romans, namely that the invisible things of God, His eternal power (*dynamis*) and divinity (*theotes*), are perceived in all that He has made by those who give Him glory (*doxa*) and gratitude (*eucharistia*). And it tells us, with the Apostle, that the refusal of human beings to be *doxological* and *eucharistic* (as Fr Alexander would put it) is the cause of all human wickedness and misery that leads to death.

These are St Paul's words:

...for although they knew God, they did not honour him as God or give thanks to Him, but they became futile in their thinking and their senseless hearts were darkened. ... Therefore God gave them up in the lusts of their hearts to impurity, to the dishonoring of their bodies among themselves, because they exchanged the truth about God for a lie and worshipped and served the creature rather than the Creator, who is blessed forever! Amen. (Rom 1.18-25)

The Divine Liturgy begins with the blessing of God's Kingdom and the all-embracing Great Litany in which we pray in peace for everyone and everything, without telling the Lord what He should do about what is His. The Great Litany shows us that true prayer is not (as Fr Alexander would

also say, quoting his spiritual father Archimandrite Cyprian Kern) informing God about what He already knows, and telling him what He ought to do about it. It is simply holding all people and things before God's Holy Presence and commending everyone and everything to Him to do with as He wills.

After the Great Litany, we sing psalms and hymns appropriate to the particular liturgy. God provides the words for our petitions and praises. He puts the proper words into our mouths for our good and His glorification. In liturgical worship, as St Benedict said, we do not put our mouth where our mind is. We do just the opposite. We put our mind where our mouth is. And so we sing and pray with one mind, heart and mouth (as the Liturgy says), worshiping God in the words and rites that the Lord himself has given us. (Exactly which psalms and hymns are sung at this part of the Liturgy of the Word may differ from church to church.)

The Victory Procession into the Holy Place (The Little Entrance)

The first liturgical movement of the Church's Eucharistic Worship, after the act of gathering and glorifying God in peaceful prayers, psalms and hymns, is our entrance into the Holy Place following the Book of the Holy Gospels.

The book enthroned on the Altar Table and solemnly carried in procession through the Royal Doors into the Sanctuary at the Church's Divine Liturgy is not the Bible. Nor is it the New Testament. It is the Gospel Book that represents Christ to us, the book that we venerate at every Lord's Day Matins as the very presence among us of the risen and victorious Lord Jesus, the incarnate Word of God.

A 'gospel' is a peculiar thing. It is not 'glad tidings' or 'good news' in general (like John and Judy are getting married, or we'll see Bishop Kallistos, or Joe found his lost wallet). An '*evangelion*' is, first of all, an official royal proclamation of a king, which his subjects are obliged to receive as 'good news', whatever its content. And, even more specifically, it is a formal heralding of the king's victory over his enemies in battle, a victory that secures salvation and peace in his kingdom for all of his people. Thus, God's Gospel in His Son Jesus is the official proclamation of the Lord's victory over His enemies, and the enemies of his faithful people. It is the formal announcement that our King has saved those who belong to Him from every foe and adversary, from everyone and everything that can harm and destroy them - especially the 'last enemy' which is

death itself (1 Cor 15.26). [We should remember that the word for *victory* and for *salvation* in Hebrew is the same word, as is the word for *victor* and *saviour*, which is our English *Jesus*.]

Thus, after praying, singing psalms, chanting the creedal hymn (*Only-begotten Son and Word of God...*) and the prescribed ‘entrance hymns’, we follow the presiding bishop or presbyter into the Holy Place with the traditional victory hymns of the Bible: *Save us!* and *Alleluia!* and *Holy! Holy! Holy!* We follow the liturgy’s leader with the Gospel Book as we follow the Lord Jesus Christ himself: the true and final Adam; our prophet, teacher and shepherd; our apostle, bishop and pastor; our judge and advocate (*parakletos*); our highpriest (*arkhiereus*), forerunner (*prodromos*), pioneer (*arkhegos*) and mediator (*mesites*) – the faithful witness, the first-born of the dead, and the ruler of kings on earth (*ho martys ho pistos, ho protokos ton nekron kai ho arkhon ton vasileon tes ges*), who is the finisher and perfecter (*teleiotes*) of our salvation, our victorious and triumphant messianic king (see Hebrews and Revelation).

The Proclamation of the Gospel

After the solemn singing of the *Trisagion*, in which the Holy God is proclaimed as Mighty and Immortal (which singing at a hierarchal Liturgy is solemn indeed!), the liturgical celebrant is enthroned on the High Place to which he proceeds with the triumphal declaration *Blessed is he that comes in the name of the Lord* (Ps 118. 26). We then again sing *Alleluia*, with psalm verses and the offering of incense between the two evangelical readings. The first reading is from the book of Acts or an apostolic Letter and the second is from one (or more) of the four Gospels, to which *wisdom* we are called to *be attentive* while *standing upright in peace*. [At this point we remember that ‘God’s gospel in Jesus’ was first proclaimed in apostolic letters, particularly those of St Paul, before the Gospels were written in four different biblical genres: Mark in apocalyptic form, Matthew as torah, Luke/Acts as narrative chronicles, and John the Theologian as divine wisdom. And we may also note that the incensing accompanies the singing of *Alleluia* with the appointed psalm verses. It does not go with the *Trisagion*. Nor does it go with the prokeimenon and Apostle reading, which is not only incorrect, but highly distracting to those trying to be attentive, especially when the incenser has bells!]

The proclamation of the Holy Gospel, and the homily that follows the evangelical readings as their normal extension, is preceded by a prayer

asking the Lord to illumine our hearts and open our minds to the understanding of His Gospel so that we may conquer carnal desires and enter into a spiritual manner of living, always thinking and doing what is well-pleasing to Him who ‘desires all men to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth’ (1 Tim 2.4). [‘Knowledge of truth (*epignosis aletheias*)’ is a ‘technical’ biblical expression used several times in the liturgical prayers. This knowledge (or ‘super-knowledge’) is an essential element of being human, and so of being a person made, recreated, reborn and saved in Christ.]

This first entrance into the Holy Place, which concludes with the celebrant’s ascension to the High Place and the proclamation of the Holy Gospel, with the accompanying victory hymns and prayers, culminates in the first act of ‘holy communion’ at the Divine Liturgy. It is our act of communion with Christ the Logos that makes possible our communion with Christ the Lamb. The Liturgy of the Word has the same shape and dynamic, and contains all the same elements, as the Great Eucharistic Anaphora to come at the Liturgy of the Faithful. It tells us that baptized and sealed believers in the Gospel may proceed to the Mystical Supper of God’s Kingdom in Christ only by way of the Word. And so it shows us, once again, what it means to be human: a person who hears the Word of God and does it.

Intercessory Prayers and Dismissal of Non-Communicants

After the evangelical readings and homily, prayers are made for particular purposes according to the people’s desires and needs. Whoever the people are, whatever spiritual state they are in, and whatever their supplications may be, their requests for prayers are welcomed and accepted, provided only that they can be made in Christ’s name, i.e. according to the Lord’s teaching about what is beneficial for His creatures. No distinction or discrimination is made at this point between Orthodox and non-Orthodox, Christians and non-Christians, believers and non-believers.

After the ‘fervent supplications’, those who are unable to offer themselves in sacrifice to God with Jesus at the Divine Liturgy, and to partake of his body and blood, because they are not baptized, or are not members of the Orthodox Church, or are under therapeutic penance, are solemnly prayed for, blessed and dismissed from the assembly.

The dismissal (or relocation within the gathering) of guests, seekers, catechumens, and penitents virtually never happens in our churches today,

where either no instruction is made for them to depart, or where such instruction, when given, is not heeded. We must address this issue, and resolve it in some way. This will be no easy task because of Christian divisions and attempts at reunion, and because of what ‘church-going’ has come to mean in our time. The fact that our Orthodox Church is virtually the only Christian church that strictly reserves offering and partaking of the Eucharistic Gifts to baptized believers (with their baptized children) who fully identify with the Orthodox Church, take full responsibility for its faith and life, can say ‘amen’ without exception or condition to its liturgical prayers, and are not under therapeutic penance for compromising their baptismal promises, requires that we do so.

The Victory Procession of the Messianic King (The Great Entrance)

The Liturgy of the Faithful begins with prayers asking God to forgive and cleanse the communicants, and count them worthy of offering their ‘spiritual and unbloody sacrifices’ for their own sins and for those of all the people. It seems that these prayers apply primarily, if not exclusively, to the liturgical celebrants (which the long prayer before the Great Entrance surely does), but it is also certainly the Christian teaching that the entire ecclesial assembly of the prophetic, priestly and royal People of God is offering itself to God through the ministry of its ecclesial leader and his ordained and appointed assistants.

The People of God confess in their prayers that they are a sinful and unworthy people. But, as the prayers declare, they *nevertheless* find themselves counted worthy by God’s grace to offer themselves and their gifts to the Father through His Son Jesus, who, as the prayer puts it, is alone ‘the one who offers and is offered, the one who receives the offering, and the very offering itself that is distributed’ to the faithful for Holy Communion.

The Great Entrance of Christ into God’s Presence as the messianic King of Glory in his procession of triumphal victory over all the enemies of God and His People, and our entrance in and with Him is prepared and accompanied by the recitation of Psalm 50/51 and the chanting of the Cherubic Hymn. It seems clear that the biblical psalm that originally fulfilled this purpose (reminding us that ‘sacrifice to God’ is a ‘broken spirit’ and a ‘broken and humble heart’), with the silence that accompanied the procession, has now been overshadowed by the Offertory Hymn (*Cherubikon*) that triumphantly proclaims the evangelical significance of the event. In any case, what is happening at this point is clear: the faithful people of

God are following their Head, the Pioneer and Perfecter of their salvation, the Great High Priest and King of Glory, into the Holy Place not made by human hands. They are entering with Him into the presence of God his Father, there to commune with Him as the Lamb of God and Bread of Life in His broken body and shed blood at the table of the mystical supper of the marriage of the Lamb. They are entering to show themselves as the Lamb's virgin bride in the endless day without evening of the new and heavenly Jerusalem. They are asking the Lord God to remember them when He comes in glory as king. And they sing again *Alleluia! Alleluia! Alleluia!* (see, once more, Hebrews and Revelation). [We may note that the celebrant's exclamation at the Great Entrance that 'the Lord God would remember you and all Orthodox Christians in His kingdom' (and not all Christians, or believers, or humanity as a whole, as we sometimes hear in our churches) is because only Orthodox Christians are there offering themselves to God in and with Christ in their memorial 'gifts' of bread and wine. Theoretically, no others are present, and no others are making the offering.]

The Great Entrance is not simply the victory procession of the messianic King alone. It is the solemn, sacrificial procession of God's people in and with the Lord to his heavenly Father. In St Augustine's celebrated expression, it is the procession of 'the whole Christ, head and body (*totus Christus, caput et corpus*). And, like Christ's own procession to the Cross, and through the Cross to the Father to be enthroned at His Right Hand, it is accomplished 'through the eternal Spirit' (Heb 9.14). Thus, this triumphal procession is completed by a prayer to the Lord to accept our 'sacrifice of praise', to bring us to His holy altar, and to enable us to offer Him gifts and spiritual sacrifices that He will find well-pleasing. And we pray, again, that His 'good Spirit' would rest upon us, and the gifts we offer, and all His people. [Here we may note that the expression 'sacrifice of praise' (*thysia aineseos*) which occurs many times in the Bible, especially the Torah and the Psalms, and many times in the Divine Liturgy, when translated into English from the Hebrew (rather than the LXX), is consistently rendered as 'sacrifice of thanksgiving'.]

Love and Faith

Early in the second century St Ignatius of Antioch defined Christ's 'catholic church' as a 'union of love and faith (*henosis agapis kai pisteos*)'. This definition is perhaps nowhere more sharply revealed than at the Divine

Liturgy when the movement of the faithful to God's mystical table and throne requires these two qualities from its participants: love and faith. This tells us that love (*agape*) for God and His creatures, and faith (*pistis*) in God as God really is, are what make human beings human. The refusal of *agape* and *pistis*, with *doxa* and *eucharistia*, is humanity's primordial sin. It is the cause of all our misery and grief. It is the violation of God's basic commandment to His creatures.

And this is His commandment, that we should believe in the name of His Son Jesus Christ and love one another, just as He has commanded us. All who keep His commandments abide in Him, and He in them. And by this we know that He abides in us, by the Spirit which He has given us. (1 Jn 3.23-24)

The call to the faithful to 'love one another' comes first. This is because love empowers the faithful to confess the Creed 'with one mind': *Let us love one another so that with one mind we may confess.....* The clergy kiss the offered gifts and the holy table, and the signature of their bishop on the antimimension on which the Eucharist is celebrated. And they give each other the 'kiss of peace', declaring that Christ is and always will be among them. This liturgical expression of love between the clergy raises the question about the need for some such concrete, external expression of love among the faithful people as well; and, if such an expression is needed, what form it might take in our time. What cannot be questioned, however, is the necessity of love as an essential condition for offering our gifts, and so our very selves, to God in and with His Son Jesus.

After the call to love one another, the faithful are called to attend in wisdom to the recitation of the Symbol of Faith. The liturgical singing or saying of the Creed is in the first person. It is the only such act at the Divine Liturgy (with the prayer read aloud in some churches before Holy Communion: *I believe, O Lord, and I confess...*). This tells us that each member of the Church must personally believe for himself or herself. It also tells us that we each must personally accept and reaffirm our baptism and chrismation in the Orthodox Church. If we are unwilling or unable to do so, we cannot and may not participate in offering the Eucharistic gifts and receiving Holy Communion.

The introduction to the Creed by the exclamation 'The Doors! The Doors!' tells us once again that the Liturgy of the Faithful is exclusively

for faithful members of the Orthodox Church who are not under therapeutic penance.

Offering Ourselves to God in Christ

The Eucharistic Anaphora is our participation in Christ's sacrificial offering to the Father on the Cross. The remembrance (*anamnesis*) of this act provides our access to it, here and now, in the Holy Spirit. We are called to stand aright, with fear and attention, in order to offer the holy oblation in peace. We 'have our hearts on high' and 'give thanks to the Lord' for all that He has done for us in Jesus. In offering our gifts of bread and wine in remembrance of Christ, and of his broken body and shed blood, we offer everything to God that is His own. We offer ourselves, the whole of creation, and Christ himself. And we do so again singing the 'victory hymn' (*epinikios hymnos*): *Holy! Holy! Holy!* and *God save us (Hosanna)!* and *Blessed is He that comes in the name of the Lord!*

It may seem to be 'too much' or even totally wrong to say that we offer Christ to God the Father in the Eucharistic Anaphora. Is it not rather Christ who offers us? Of course it is the latter. But since Christ became one of us, and identified with us, and is truly the new and last Adam, we may dare even to say that when we offer to God everything that is already His - 'Your own of Your own' - what is first of all 'His own' is His only-begotten Son himself. And then, in and with God's Son and Word, is everyone and everything that God created by, through, for, in and towards him who is 'the Alpha and the Omega, the first and the last, the beginning and the end', the Godman in whom 'all things hold together' (Rev 22.13; Col 1.15-20).

Christ offers himself to God the Father, with all of humanity and the whole of creation. And we offer ourselves, with the whole of creation, in and with him to God his Father. We offer him to God his Father as being really and truly one of us, our advocate and mediator, the true Adam and head of humanity and indeed, the 'head over all for the church which is his body (*he kephale hyper panta ti ekklesia hetis estin to soma autou*)' because of his suffering and death on the cross. And we do all this by the indwelling in and among us of the Holy Spirit who is God's Spirit and the Spirit of Christ.

This all-embracing, all-satisfying and all-perfecting sacrifice of Christ in us and us in him is the 'spiritual worship' (*logike latreia*) of the New Covenant, the worship 'in spirit and in truth' that the Father desires from

His faithful people that Jesus the Messiah makes possible (Jn 4.23-24). The expression ‘spiritual [or reasonable] worship’ (*logike latreia*) comes from St Paul’s letter to the Romans. It refers to the offering of our bodies (*ta somata*) as a living sacrifice (*thysian zoon*), holy and well-pleasing, to God:

I beseech you therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, that you present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable to God (*ta somata hymon thysian zosan hagian to theo euareston*) which is your reasonable worship (*ten logiken latreian hymon*). (Rom 12.1)

That our bodies are the living sacrifice that is holy and acceptable to God in Christ as the spiritual or reasonable worship of the New Covenant Church is crucial to our understanding of Eucharistic Worship, and so also to our understanding of what it means to be human and Christian. Christ offered his body to the Father on the cross. The Church is his body that is offered in and with him. The bodies of believers ‘are member of Christ’ (*ta somata hymon mele Christou estin*) who sacrifices himself (1 Cor 6.15). And we believers are called to ‘glorify God in our bodies’ through a chaste life that is fulfilled by our dying with Christ in love for God and humanity and the whole of creation (1 Cor 6.20). An early Christian hymn that was probably sung at the earliest eucharistic meals testifies to this conviction:

If we have died with him, we shall also live with him;
if we patiently endure, we shall also reign with him;
if we deny him, he will also deny us;
if we are faithless, he remains faithful –
for he cannot deny himself. (2 Tim 2.11-13)

In offering his body on the tree of the Cross, and giving his broken body and shed blood as food for the faithful, Christ’s death becomes the unique, all-embracing and all-satisfying sacrifice of the New Covenant. It fulfills, completes and perfects all the sacrifices of the Mosaic Law: the sin, guilt, peace, praise and thank offerings for mercy, forgiveness, cleansing and atonement that were made with the body and blood of sacrificed animals. The crucial scriptural text is again found in the letter to the Hebrews.

For it is impossible that the blood of bulls and goats should take away sin. Consequently, when Christ came into the world, he said, ‘Sacrifices and offerings thou hast not desired, but a body thou hast prepared for me; in burnt offerings and sin offering thou hast taken no pleasure. Then I said, “Lo, I have come to do thy will, O God,” as it is written of me in the roll of the book.’ When he said above, ‘Thou hast neither de-

sired nor taken pleasure in sacrifices and offerings, and burnt offerings and sin offerings’...then he added, ‘Lo, I have come to do thy will.’ (...) And by that will we have been sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all. (Heb 10.2-10)

‘On us and on these gifts here offered’

After remembering what Jesus did at the Supper on the night when he gave himself up ‘for the life of the world’ (Jn 6.33,51), and remembering the ‘saving commandment’ that he gave us to eat his body and drink his blood in his remembrance, and remembering everything that God has done for us in him – the cross, the tomb, the resurrection on the third day, the ascension into heaven, the sitting at the right hand, and the second and glorious coming – we offer to God that which is His, on behalf of all, in all, through all and for all. And we crown this solemn anaphoric act with the simple song which is the high point of our Eucharistic Worship: *We praise (hymn) You, we bless You, we give thanks to You, O Lord. And we pray unto You, O our God.*

We then invoke the Holy Spirit upon ourselves and upon the bread and wine that we offer so that both we and our sacrificial gifts might be changed into the very body and blood of Christ:

And yet again we offer to You this spiritual [or reasonable] and unbloody worship (*ten logiken tauten kai anaimakton latreian*) and we ask You, and pray You, and implore You: send down your Holy Spirit upon us and upon these gifts here set forth, and make this bread the precious Body of your Christ, and what is in this cup the precious Blood of your Christ, making the change by your Holy Spirit.

Fr John Meyendorff always pointed out that when we pray at the Eucharistic Anaphora for the Holy Spirit to ‘make’ (or in St Basil’s Liturgy to ‘show’) the bread to be the Lord’s very body, and the wine mingled with water to be the Lord’s very blood, the prayer for ‘changing’ (which is not in the Liturgy of St Basil) has no direct object. He insisted that it be translated ‘making the change by the Holy Spirit’ (rather than ‘changing *them*’) because the ‘change’ refers not only to the bread and wine, but to ‘us’ as well, perhaps, we may even dare to say, in the first instance. [We may also note at this point that the faithful people in the great majority of Orthodox churches never hear the prayers of the Eucharistic Anaphora which the celebrant reads silently, and often very rapidly, if at all. Also in some churches where the prayers are read aloud, the great

hymn *We praise you, we bless you* is read after the calling of the Holy Spirit (*epiklesis*) and prayer of consecration, thus destroying the flow of the Anaphora and distorting its meaning. And in some churches this hymn is sung as a sort of ‘background’ and ‘cover’ for the prayer of consecration being read silently, rather than as the central and highest prayer of the Anaphora itself.]

In the Divine Liturgy we, the Church, are ‘made’ or ‘shown’ to be the very body of Christ himself, and our bodies are ‘made’ or ‘shown’ to be ‘members of Christ’. Our life, signified in the blood, is to be Christ’s own very life that is given ‘for the life of the world’ (Jn 6.33,51; Col 3.3-4). The Apostle Paul teaches this in the sole reference to the eucharistic meal in apostolic scripture, in chapter 11 of his first letter to the Corinthians. He insists that in our eating and drinking we ‘proclaim the Lord’s death until he comes’ (1 Cor 11.26), and he equally insists that if we eat and drink ‘without discerning the Lord’s body,’ we ‘eat and drink judgment (or condemnation)’ upon ourselves (1 Cor 11.29). The *body* St Paul refers to here seems clearly to be the Church. We need only to read chapters 12 to 14 of this letter, and many passages in his other epistles, to see that this is so. [Prof. Richard Schneider from Canada once suggested that, while traditional Christians usually say that the consecrated eucharistic gifts are the ‘real’ body and blood of Christ, and his ‘real presence’ in the world, with the Church being the Lord’s ‘mystical body’ and ‘mystical presence’, perhaps just the opposite is true. He claimed that the Fathers seemed to hold that the eucharistic gifts are Christ’s mystical or sacramental presence, while his faithful people who sacrifice themselves in and with him, and even die with him, are his ‘real body’ and ‘real presence’ on earth until he comes.]

In any case, one thing is for certain: baptized believers who do not sacrifice themselves to God the Father in and with His Son Jesus Christ by the Holy Spirit’s power, and who do not really suffer and die with Him, having their own bodies broken and their own blood shed in love for God and His creatures through the indwelling of God’s Spirit – or who do not at least desire to do so and sincerely repent that they do not – have denied the Christian faith and betrayed their baptism, and so they eat and drink at the mystical supper unto condemnation and judgment. They have failed to ‘discern the Lord’s body.’

The Eucharistic Anaphora ends with remembering and including everyone and everything in the great sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving

through which the Church enters into Christ's saving death on the Cross by which the Messiah and his 'members' are raised and glorified at the Father's right hand in God's unending kingdom. It is marvellous to note that the liturgical sacrifice is offered, as Christ's re-deeming death itself is offered, especially *for* (or in St Basil's Liturgy, *with*) Christ's mother, the holy Theotokos, and all the saints through the ages, beginning with the patriarchs and prophets of the Old Testament who 'apart from us should not be not perfected' (Heb 11.40).

Abba! Father!

All that remains for the faithful to do before actually eating and drinking Christ's broken body and shed blood in Holy Communion is to pray the prayer that Christ gave his disciples to pray. The Lord's Prayer is not for everyone. It is only for the baptized and sealed faithful. It was a 'secret' in the early Church that was revealed to the catechumens just before their baptism, chrismation and first participation in Holy Communion at the feast of the Lord's Pascha.

In the Divine Liturgy, just before Holy Communion, the faithful implore their Master to be counted worthy to dare, with boldness and without condemnation, to call upon the supra-heavenly God as Father, and to say the prayer that Jesus gave them to pray. We address God as father not metaphorically, and not because of 'patriarchal culture'. We pray to God as father because God is really (not metaphorically) the father of Jesus Christ who is His real (not metaphorical) Son, and because Jesus himself has commanded us to do so, counting us to be so worthy by faith and grace through the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, 'providing that we suffer with him' (Rom 8.15-17, Gal 4.6).

And so we pray to God in the words that Jesus gives his disciples. The 'epiklesis' of the Holy Spirit on us and our gifts enables us to do so. We call upon God as our 'Abba, Father' praying that His name be sanctified, His kingdom come and His will be done 'as in heaven' in His Son, the glorified Messiah at His right hand, 'so also on earth' in us his members. We also pray that we would have 'this day' the *epiousios artos*, the 'super-substantial [not daily] bread' of the coming age, the bread of God's kingdom, the 'living bread' that is Jesus Christ himself (see Jn 6.25-59). We also pray to be forgiven what we owe as we have already forgiven everyone what they owe us, for this is what we did when we were baptized into Christ's redeeming death that paid off all our debts, primarily the 'debt of

love' that we owe to God and our neighbours, including our worst enemies. ['Owe no one anything, except to love one another,' St Paul teaches, 'for he who loves his neighbour has fulfilled the law' (Rom 13.8).] And we pray to stand firm in every test, trial and temptation, especially those of the 'final tribulation' that has come upon the world after the crucifixion and glorification of Christ, and the outpouring of the Holy Spirit. And we pray, finally, to be delivered from the 'evil one': every evil person, every antichrist, every demon and power of darkness, and the devil himself.

Holy Communion and Holy Witness

We now draw near and receive Holy Communion. In this act, we know what we humans were made for, with the whole of creation, from the very beginning. We know what Jesus saved us for, as God's messianic king. And we know what to expect, ever more perfectly, deeply and truly in the age to come: 'the day without evening' of the kingdom of God (see Is 60; Rev 21-22). We pray to partake of the broken body and shed blood in a worthy manner, 'discerning the Lord's body'. We pledge that we will not reveal the Lord's Mystery to his enemies, nor give him a kiss like Judas. We pray again to be remembered when Christ comes in his kingdom.

After participating in Holy Communion we sing the post-communion hymns and pray the post-communion prayers by which we thank God for counting us worthy to partake. We declare that we have seen the true light, received the heavenly Spirit, and found the true faith, worshiping the Holy Trinity who has saved us. We ask God to keep us in His holiness that we might ceaselessly meditate on His righteousness. We praise Him for our participation in His divine, holy, heavenly, awesome, immortal and life-creating mysteries. And we crown our hymns again with the victory cry: *Alleluia! Alleluia! Alleluia!*

The post-communion hymns and prayers at the Divine Liturgy cannot but remind a knower of Holy Scriptures of the frightening passage in the letter to the Hebrews.

For it is impossible to restore again to repentance those who have once been enlightened, who have tasted the heavenly gift, and have become partakers of the Holy Spirit, and have tasted the goodness of the Word of God and the powers of the age to come, if they commit apostasy, since they crucify the Son of God on their own account and hold him up to contempt. (Heb 6.4-6)

Thus the faithful pray in these hymns and prayers (which seem to be inspired by this biblical passage) to be kept faithful to their holy illumination in baptism and chrismation and to retain, and ever more deeply to acquire, the gift of the Holy Spirit, which makes them sons of God in and with Jesus, God's incarnate Word, whose goodness they have tasted, together with the heavenly powers, through their partaking of his body and blood in Holy Communion.

The faithful are then invited to 'depart in peace, in the name of the Lord'. They are blessed and empowered to live as faithful Christians and genuine human beings in this 'sinful and adulterous' age dominated by 'the lust of the flesh and the lust of the eyes and the pride of life' (Mk 8.38; 1Jn 2.15-17). They live in constant anticipation of Christ's coming in glory to establish God's kingdom throughout His creation.

Picking up on the key words of the Christian Gospel, we may summarise what we learn and teach through our Eucharistic Worship by saying that the *doxa* and *eucharistia* (glory and gratitude), and the *agape* and *pistis* (love and faith), which we express in our *liturgia* (corporate activity), constrain us to testify in our daily lives to our *soteria* (salvation and victory) in the crucified and glorified Christ. Thus we go forth from the Divine Liturgy in peace, each in his or her own way, to our daily work of *propheteia* (prophecy), *didaskalia* (teaching), *homologia* (confessing), *apologia* (answering), *diakonia* (serving), *philanthropia* (loving humanity) and *martyria* (witnessing) to God's Gospel in His Son Jesus, whose evangelical Word and whose body and blood we have received and become in the *logike latreia* that is our Eucharistic Worship.

Christian Education: a Retrospect and a Prospect

David Frost

I was asked to speak to you on 'Christian education from the cradle to the grave'. I am going to modify that very general topic somewhat and present something that is highly personal: a *retrospective*, based on over 50 years in education and communication; and a *prospective*, in that I shall derive lessons from my experience and apply them to what we should do now.

Not, therefore, ‘Christian education, from the cradle to the grave’, but ‘Christian education from *my* cradle to (not far short of) *my* grave’. During that half-century, I have been first a Boy Scout leader attached to a church troop in South London; then a Cambridge don for ten years, teaching English literature from a declaredly Christian standpoint; from my late twenties a member of the Liturgical Commission of the Church of England and then of the Anglican Church of Australia, entrusted with the task of expressing the Christian faith in worship; for 22 years Professor of English Literature at Newcastle University, New South Wales; and throughout that time on the governing body of an Anglican seminary; then a Director of the Institute for Orthodox Christian Studies, Cambridge; and finally, Principal of what is the only institution in Western Europe that teaches the Orthodox faith in English at all academic levels from introductory to doctoral studies. Besides publishing Christian fiction, composing prayers and translating the Psalms, I have run a national symphony orchestra, organised grand opera, and administrated in Newcastle Cathedral a production of the Chester Mystery Plays, playing the parts of Lucifer and Herod. From that last, you will know with what level of seriousness to greet my observations.

I shall be talking of the problems that face Christian education in the twenty-first century in the United Kingdom. However, I want first to take you to another focus for Christian educational endeavour: to the great sub-continent of India. My wife and I return from every visit to her birthplace as red-hot evangelicals: the chaotic glory of that deeply religious country cries out for the light of the gospel. Yet nearly 2,000 years of heroic missionary toil have made little progress, so that you can still find in India the closest living approximation to that pagan world to which Christianity was first preached.

Some years back, we were in the city of Haridar [Hàridwar] at night-fall, joining the thousands who every evening throng the banks of a rushing, wide but shallow torrent, watching the clear head-waters of Mother Ganges stream over white, polished boulders from the snowy foothills of the Himalayas to invigorate the central plains of India. Hindu temples on the far bank flamed with sacrificial fire, with the circular waving of lamps in the ceremony of *aarti* to the sound of priests chanting their praises to the great river-goddess. Suddenly, the darkening current bobbed with little centres of light, as thousands of tiny palm-leaf boats, each laden with flowers around an oil-lamp and driven by a palm-leaf sail, were released

into the torrent by worshipers on either bank. I remember whispering in my wife's ear: 'Only the Orthodox would know how to deal with *this*.'

By that I meant that Protestants might feel obliged to destroy the ceremony as being worship offered to false gods. In discouraging idolatry, they would take from that society one of its cherished communal celebrations, an expression of the sanctity of all things and an honouring of the life-giving power of water. They would kill the fun in favour of their own dark conventicles that promote not life but crucifixion and proclaim through grim posters, seen at railway stations throughout India and often the first contact of Indians with Christianity, that "'THE WAGES OF SIN IS DEATH' (Romans 6.23)".

What might the Orthodox do? They would fill the temples with beautifully robed priests, holding candles to symbolise the light of the gospel, swinging censers of incense to sanctify and bless the sacred waters. They would explain that the reverence directed to Mother Ganges was an unknowing tribute to the one creator God behind all so-called gods (an idea not unpalatable to Indians), that the water had been given to refresh both the land and our own bodies and souls, to wash away corruption and, through baptism, to bring us to new and eternal life. And the boats, little centres of light spreading out into all corners of the darkness, would each have its palm-leaf sail converted into a Palm Sunday cross, to signify the light of the gospel spreading to all parts of the earth, under the sign of that eternal and creating Word, who brought all things into being, who as man died on a cross but rose again to proclaim victory over death and to reconcile all things with himself, 'trampling down death by death', so that all mankind might conquer death and be transfigured into images of him, as lights to the world in their various generations.

There are several reasons why the Orthodox might achieve this transformation that does not repudiate a good already there. In my last decade, I have discovered among the Orthodox a fuller and more universal version of the Christian gospel. As our Liturgy puts it: 'We have seen the true light, we have received the heavenly Spirit, we have found the true faith, worshipping the undivided Trinity.'

Orthodoxy has a kinder view both of God and of Man: of God as 'the lover of mankind', rather than an offended, wrathful figure drawn from the Old Testament; of Man, not as totally depraved as a consequence of the departure from God, but as a being who remembers something of what he or she was meant to be, in whom the image of God is not entirely obli-

terated. Hence, we yearn toward a lost Eden, and still retain a capacity to work with God towards our salvation, the capacity we call *synergy*. The emphasis is on resurrection as much as crucifixion, with Christ's death not a substitutionary sacrifice of the innocent to appease the Father's need for legal justice, but the prelude to a victory by the perfect Man over sin and death on our behalf.

And because Orthodoxy has not lost the gift of worship, or a feeling for 'the beauty of holiness', or a sense of the sanctity of all created things, it would be possible to see the ceremonies of Haridar [Hàridwar] as a stirring of reverence for God in the glory of his works, a rejoicing in the essential goodness of creation, a reaching-out to the unknown Christ whose Spirit permeates all things and who has not left vast numbers of the human race without a glimmer of his presence. The ceremony would therefore need not to be destroyed, but to be transformed and perfected by the good news of Christ.

If we have such a treasure in store, this has implications for Christian education east and west. We will not be excused if we hoard it in a ghetto or treat it as the secret knowledge of some exclusive religious club. The time for nervousness about so-called proselytizing is past, if ever there was such a time. The Institute for Orthodox Christian Studies was founded in Cambridge because other Christian denominations wanted us to be there, because we have from our unbroken Tradition insights to contribute to the understanding of the Christian faith, because people like the current Archbishop of Canterbury, Rowan Williams, had in his youth one of his three formative experiences of the presence of God, at an Orthodox liturgy. Great Britain is sick, the churches struggle to cope and are losing heart and numbers: our fuller gospel is the remedy. Or, to change the metaphor: the sea of the unchurched is vast, the shoals of fish are such that there is no need to trawl in other peoples' waters, though, as Fr Michael Harper has wittily put it when talking of our outreach programme, 'The Way', 'If the fish insist on jumping into the boat, we will not throw them back.'

If I describe my Christian education half a century ago, it is because it was not untypical of those times. The official teachers were almost without exception incompetent. I was taught the faith largely by accident. The Sunday School to which I was sent by unbelieving parents 'to learn the difference between right and wrong' was led by two slightly dippy twin sisters, who during the week were kindergarten teachers and on Sunday set us to colouring pictures of Jesus standing amidst a flock of sheep. My clearest

memory of later Sunday Schools is of my first lesson, at the age of ten, in contraception, which came from other boys at the back of the class and which I found both horrifying and fascinating. The local vicar was an Associate of King's College, London (AKC), well-meaning, conscious of his lack of academic qualifications. I cannot recall him teaching any doctrine and his sermons were vague reflections on current events. At primary school, one Scots lady taught us to recite the names of the books of the Bible and shook us violently by gripping each side of our shirt-collar if we made a mistake. A popular myth was that on one occasion she had shaken a child so violently that her wig fell off and she had rushed from the classroom bald-headed to replace it. During several close shakings, I could never detect the clips that were alleged to hold it on. After I won a place at a major public school, I was taught scripture by the French master, a Jew whom we bated mercilessly by demanding why he rejected the obvious conclusion that the messianic prophecies proclaimed Christ. His reasons were, as I remember, highly plausible. Next year, R.I., Religious Instruction, was taught by the Greek master, who loved boys, translated Greek plays for Penguin Books, and once confessed to me a yen to restore the pagan religions of Greece and Rome. As we approached the age for confirmation, we were prepared by the Chaplain, who doubled up as a maths master and introduced himself as, first and foremost, a mathematician. Being smart, we boned up on a new heresy every week: 'Sir, I find Arianism very persuasive' – and so stretched him to rebut last week's heresy at each new session.

I came into contact with real Christianity by what C.S. Lewis once called 'good infection'. First through the Cubs and then through the Boy Scouts, I met three loving and idealistic people who set a standard of behaviour of such overwhelming righteousness that I honoured them, and wanted to be like them, and hence to understand the strange, irrational faith that made them tick. Still a mere deist in my first year at Cambridge, I spent my time reading Christian books: the epistles of St Paul in that modern version by J.B. Phillips, *Letters to Young Churches*, the writings of C.S. Lewis, Thomas à Kempis and so forth – till in early summer I burst into tears hearing a record of Paul Robeson singing 'Were you there when they crucified my Lord?' That week I told the College chaplain that I had moved from unbelief to Christianity, only to be greeted with the news that I was the one person he had met from my year who had journeyed in that direction.

My wife thinks I may have been unlucky and points to the efforts of the churches to improve Christian instruction. Certainly, she is right to remind me of the influence on our early years together of the magazine *Renewal*, with its mind-engaging yet Spirit-filled exposition of a revived, pentecostal faith. Yet my 50 years as a teacher of English literature lead me to suspect that the paths of conversion and the means of teaching the Christian faith have not much changed. When I taught English literature in 1998 as a Visiting Professor in the University of Zhengzhou, central China, the Communist Party Secretary attached to our department told all my graduate students that they could not hope to understand English literature without reading the Bible. Yet in the early 1960s in my first academic post in Wales, in Cambridge for the next ten years, later in Australia and right up to the present day, the knowledge of Christian doctrine and the scriptures that students bring to their work has been and is more or less non-existent. I have yet to meet the student who, without prompting, can pick up that Polonius' advice to his son Laertes, in *Hamlet* ('Neither a borrower nor a lender be') is not from the Bible but is worldly wisdom in direct contrast to Christ's injunction: 'Give to him that asketh of thee, and from him that would borrow of thee turn thou not away' (Mt 5.42 in the King James version).

Yet if there is not much change, perhaps in the methods and certainly in the results of Christian education, the context in which that education must take place has radically altered. When I began teaching, the United Kingdom was still, residually, a culture permeated by Christianity. Many of my schoolmasters were Christian; of the three men who supervised my studies at Cambridge, the two atheists had both won scripture prizes at school, one in England, the other in Australia, and the Christian went on later to write distinguished religious poetry. The Cambridge English Faculty held noted Christians: among them Jack and Joan Bennett, the medievalist John Stevens, and C.S. Lewis himself. The ethos of our studies was humanist, its values and assumptions still Judaeo-Christian. We were yet in the era of the upright unbeliever, brought up with an intensely Christian background, who had rejected the faith as irrational yet still retained unquestioned its moral premisses. But they could not pass on those unsupported premisses to a second generation.

When I took early retirement in 1998, I had been for 22 years Professor of a department where, for all that time except for one brief interlude when we engaged a tutor on a short-term contract, I was the only Christian among

some 23 or so staff. My subject had been taken over by 'Theory', the creation of continental and American literary philosophers who rejected our humanist assumptions as unfounded and a means of political and social coercion, who condemned any doctrine of a continuing human nature as 'universalism' (thus rendering the literature of the past irrelevant), who made all meaning and values relative, who denied the significance of the author and any supposed 'intention' he or she might have had, who asserted that human personality was itself a 'language-construct' and who 'deconstructed' literature as having no discoverable meaning, being only a field for continuous and ambiguous interpretation. The 'canon' of so-called great works was attacked, curricula revised, Shakespeare, Dickens, Wordsworth and others at least in theory demoted, and the study of comic books was accorded equal esteem to research on Milton's *Paradise Lost*. Students who rejected 'Theory' tended to be marked down and I remember an undergraduate from the large literature department at Monash University complaining on ABC radio that it was impossible to remain a Christian beyond one's first year.

Meanwhile, society as a whole had been subject to the greatest educational change ever: the advent of the mass media. From before I was born, there was the development of tabloid journalism on a large scale, of the film, of radio and of records. From my youth, it has been television, then home videos, CDs and DVDs, the easy recording of sound and vision, and now the internet. I first recall noticing the power of television when it became impossible to call any meeting on the evening when *The Forsyte Saga* was on.

That change vastly increased the nation's opportunities for learning and for being entertained. Its malign aspects might not have been so great had it not coincided with a rejection politically of the socialism of the immediate post-war years (often of Christian non-conformist origin) and a distrust of state control that in countries like India had made the developing media primarily an instrument of instruction. In the West, the Reithian ideals that had founded the BBC as a means of moral and cultural education were mocked and in effect rejected by giving large parts of the media to commercial interests dependent on advertising.

I must remind you that I speak from a Luciferian and Herodian perspective: emphasising the successes of the 'dark side', telling perhaps no more than dangerous half-truths. But my viewpoint shows me a progressive debauching of the British population in the last 40 years by means

of the mass media. The evidence is there in the change in popular music from the Beatles to the violence of 'heavy metal' and the Sex Pistols; in popular comedy from the humane characterisations of *Dad's Army* to the sordid inanities of *Men Behaving Badly*. The need for advertising revenue led commercial TV companies to build a mass market by exploiting human weakness and appealing to base instinct and the lowest common denominator, so that millions now absorb themselves in the voyeurism of *Big Brother*. The advertising that bombarded families (who at one time were reported as leaving the television on for eight hours a day on average) promoted the consumer society, stimulated artificial needs, appealed to social envy and acquisitiveness, promoted anxiety and discontent, and obsessively stimulated and debased human sexuality as a means for promoting sales.

Such developments coincided with a move politically to the right, with a belief that self-interest best motivates society, with an abhorrence of government intervention, a rejection of so-called 'paternalism' and 'do-gooding'. The victory of capitalism over socialism and communism world-wide meant a growing promotion of 'market forces' as the key to society's well-being. 'Business-values' and the extension of business practices into all walks of life are now preached as a mark and recipe for excellence, in government, in schools and universities, even in the Church. From Lucifer's perspective, it would seem that British society, in the choice between God and Mammon, has opted unequivocally for Mammon. If you seek to understand why educated Muslims commit terrorist outrages in the name of Allah and Sharia law, it is because they repudiate the corruptions of Western life, corruptions in which their parents and often they themselves have been complicit and from which they seek to redeem themselves through violent self-sacrifice.

We live in what is proclaimed as 'a post-Christian society'. That may be an overstatement: but, certainly, Christian educationists have not worked in so pagan an environment since the days of the early Church. What then shall we do? The elements of persuasion are largely in hostile hands; the old, haphazard, half-competent methods are no longer enough. We must infiltrate the media, the schools and universities, with our own well-trained propagandists. But to do that we need teaching institutions that can inculcate the same communication skills and efficiency as are commanded by the enemy. We need well-trained priests; yet the Orthodox Church has no functioning seminary in the United Kingdom. We des-

perately need educational bodies such as the Institute. Yet the Institute for Orthodox Christian Studies struggles for funds to keep going, plagued by sectional rivalries and the belief that intellectual and spiritual knowledge is only a dispensable supplement, compared to simple faith.

Of course, the situation has never been so bleak as Lucifer's view-point has painted it. In my youth, we had C.S. Lewis and Archbishop Anthony Bloom exploiting the relatively new medium of radio for broadcast talks on the faith, which captured large audiences and were later published by popular demand. My younger son, the only one of my four children who has drifted away from the faith, still regards the films *Jesus Christ Superstar* and *The Mission*, and what my elder son once called the 'Christian allergies' of the Narnia tales, as some of the major influences on his childhood. Recent television presentations of *The Monastery* and then *The Convent* commanded such audiences for their portrayal of the transforming power of life in a Christian community that the Religion and Ethics Department became the flavour of the month at the BBC and money for religious programmes is now much easier to come by.

The educational problem that Christians now face is not, I think, what I thought it to be for most of my working life. It is not primarily the challenge of scientific materialism, or of Darwinian evolution, or Enlightenment rationalism, or that false 'scientism' which claims that what science cannot comprehend has no reality. Bodies such as the excellent Faraday Institute in Cambridge battle such creeds in the name of a science not necessarily inimical to religion. But I cannot say, in a lifetime of trying to challenge scientific materialism, that I have made one convert by that means. If people read Richard Dawkins in such numbers as to make him a best-seller, it is because they have *already* rejected the faith and seek a justification, however inadequate.

The human need for God, for meaning, for a faith to live by, does not go away, whatever the post-modern critics of 'universalism' might say. It seems that the population-drift from country to city is not so harmful to religion as we romantics once feared. I quote from the United Nations *State of the World Population Report 2007*:

Rapid urbanisation was expected to mean the triumph of rationality, secular values and ... the relegation of religion to a secondary role. Instead, there has been a renewal in religious interest in many countries.' (*The Times*, 30 June 2007, p.79, 'Faith News')

There is a reviving interest in religion here and worldwide. The problem is that, if they are coming back, they are not coming back to *us*. The Christian Research English Church Census 2005 (with responses from over half the known churches in the country), though published under the title *Pulling Out of the Nosedive*, reported that congregations were still declining at the rate of 2.3% a year, as against a rate of 2.7% in the 1990s. Roman Catholics and Methodists were worst affected, the Church of England having suffered a decline of ‘only 11%’ in the past seven years, as against the national average of 15%. Only the Pentecostals were picking up numbers and were now more numerous than Methodists. To get a spin-free picture of what is happening: attendance at Sunday mass in the Roman Catholic Church has declined from 1,703,000 in 1989 to 875,000 in 2005, a fall of 49%.

If not back to the mainstream churches, where have the seekers gone? A close cousin, product of the same primary school and scout troop as myself, slipped easily from the Arian Anglicanism of our boyhood into becoming a Muslim – admittedly to marry a Muslim girl. Some of my pupils went to eastern religions, interesting themselves in Buddhism, Hindu beliefs, transcendental meditation, mysticism and yoga. (Incidentally, Orthodoxy also benefits from being ‘Eastern’, somewhat exotic and perhaps a shade esoteric.) My brother has gone to ouija boards, ‘channelling’ and divination, and now to organising ‘Spiritual Fairs’, where sitting amidst a plethora of arcane alternatives, he offers spiritual counselling. Many of my students and staff made use of mind-expanding drugs – and here perhaps is the common factor. All seem to have been seeking experience, a spiritual and emotional ‘high’, contact with the divine or ‘the Other’, with the supernatural or the more-than-rational. Hence it is that the single instance of growth among Christians is the Pentecostal Churches.

But if ‘we have seen the true light, if ‘we have received the heavenly Spirit’, if ‘we have found the true faith’, then we should be the natural refuge of those who wander among the many cults in a world not unlike that of pagan Greece and Rome. In 300 years, the Christian faith drew to itself the known world: if then, why not now?

Looking back over my 50 years of teaching, thinking of my contemporaries who rejected the faith, I see two crucial failures: we have failed to preach a full gospel, and we have failed to live up to the gospel we had. A novel situation since the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, however, has been that it is Christian-derived beliefs that have most often been used

to attack the Christian Church. We have been remarkably successful in persuading the world of some of our basic doctrines. Hindu and Buddhist reformers paid us the compliment of extensive imitation, so that by the end of the nineteenth century it was possible to promote some 'world-faith' that seemed to be a distillation of the best in all religions and was alleged to be superior to divisive Christian doctrine. The French, the American, the socialist revolutions were derived from Christianity in their basic ideals. The 'truths' that the Declaration of American Independence held to be 'self-evident' were truths that stood on an unacknowledged foundation of Christian faith, and as statements of any historical or contemporary reality were manifestly untrue. Jean-Jacques Rousseau's 'Man is born free' is nonsense as a statement of fact: it makes sense only as a belief in what Man was intended by God to be and as what he might become in the liberty of Christ. Where except in the Christian gospel has 'the brotherhood of man' been taught, in human culture or in world religion? Human 'equality' is unbelievable as an account of our physical or mental gifts or our political power: we are only of equal value because we are esteemed such by the love of God. As for 'inalienable human rights', such an idea would be inconceivable to a Roman father contemplating his family and slaves, or to a medieval knight viewing his serfs: 'human rights' only have reality if we obey Christ's injunction to treat others as we would wish to be treated ourselves and if we accord to other human beings value equal to ourselves as children of God.

This is the danger of a partial gospel. We have taught successfully only one side of a Christian paradox – that we are free in Christ but slaves to God; that others should accord us 'equal rights' as children of God but none of us have any 'rights' that we can demand from God. Because we have taught only half of the paradox, we are meeting a half-truth that has the power of a Christian heresy. We Western Christians find it hard to defend ourselves against a charge of cruelly denying those 'basic rights': the so-called 'right' of a woman to choose, to control her own body and so to abort her child; the 'right' of any individual to avoid suffering by euthanasia; the 'right' to express one's sexual preference in what ways one pleases; the 'rights' of children to do as they wish; the 'rights' of animals, plants, now even fish. Essay after essay from my undergraduate pupils passionately rejected the Church for infringement of 'human rights'.

But the major losses of young idealists to the faith in my lifetime seem to me to have been three-fold. In the first phase, we lost the best of several

generations to the Christian heresy of communism: to the ideal of human brotherhood, to the gospel abolition of distinctions of race, class and sex, even if it was also at the same time the heresy of seeking to establish the kingdom of heaven on earth by violent political struggle. I was taught by men who had fought against the Catholic fascist Franco in the Spanish Civil War, who accused the Pope after the Concordat between the Vatican and Mussolini of blessing fascist planes as they departed to bomb defenceless Abyssinians. The historical record of Christian churches denying the brotherhood of man by favouring oppressive regimes, of siding with the ruling classes, identifying with national interests and condoning military conquest is incontestable – we save face by lauding the exceptions.

There, we betrayed the gospel that we had. But the attempt in recent years to make the Church a force for social justice and international justice, though atoning for past hypocrisy, has tipped us into a new lopsidedness, where we largely neglect the Church's eschatological destiny. We forget that our kingdom is not of this world and that it is the Second Coming alone that will usher in the renewal of earth and heaven and the reign of peace.

The next episode of loss that I would identify in my lifetime is more controversial. It began in the fifties and sixties of the last century and continues to the present. Among my undergraduate contemporaries at that time, I saw friend after friend, once active members of the Crusaders or the Christian Union, who abandoned Christianity entirely and even became hostile, just as soon as they had relations with the opposite sex. You might see that crudely as abandonment to the lusts of the flesh, though some at least of them went on to make stable and successful marriages. Yet they never went back. The churches' ambiguous and grudging attitude to human sexuality had convinced them that Christians were 'wowers' (to use the Australian term): against sex, booze, and all the pleasures of this life. I think the churches, East and West, have never fully come to terms with the influence from the late third century of monasticism and ascetic celibacy. There is still, despite Christ's wisdom in choosing the married Peter and the celibate Paul as twin pillars of his Church, a suspicion that celibacy is not a gift given to some but in some way a 'higher', more spiritual way of life, and monasticism a model to which all Christian endeavour should aspire. Orthodoxy is particularly prone to this distortion, which encourages prejudices against the body that probably came from outside Christianity, from gnosticism and dualist cults. Without kow-

towing to lasciviousness or compromising on the gospel strictness, the churches need to recover the doctrine of body and soul as one unity needing redemption, but with the things of the body, including sexual pleasure, an aspect of God's good creation, not to be downgraded or abused.

A correspondent in *The Times* recently explained his defection from the faith as occurring when he found out that the Church had been telling lies about sex being good only in marriage and discovered that it was good fun outside. That leads me to point to a progressive defect in Western theology, one which the Orthodox and the Pentecostals are happily without. Contrary to the gospel, we have in the West tended to downplay the metaphysical reality of evil and the power of the evil one, ignoring the fact that for much of the world the attraction of Christianity has been and is its power to deliver from evil within or without, human and demonic. The only answer to *The Times* correspondent would be to question not the reality but the *nature* and *origin* of his pleasure. If it was philosophically tenable for Augustine to define evil as simply a privation of good, it is nevertheless the case that there is a terrible, powerful and demonic pleasure in doing evil. I have talked with men who have killed in battle and confess to the joys of bloodlust. In sex too, there is pleasure in cruelty, in domination, in corrupting, in selfishly using another, in misdirecting what was intended to be an immense force for bonding a man with a woman, and making it an irresponsible and private gratification. But we cannot counter properly the charge of wowseryism levelled against the Church till we can assert the full doctrine of the goodness of the body as created by God, together with the capacity of evil to lead us into perverse and demonic pleasures.

I could talk about the more recent loss to the Church of those who go into Earth-Mother or Gaia cults, whose love for the natural world leads them to see Christians as a destructive force who exploit their supposedly God-given 'dominion' over all creatures and all things and violate the natural world. It is something to be grateful for that the Orthodox Church has retained a veneration of all creation as an expression of God's nature and was early in expressing concern for the environment. We have had the advantage too of not so far being much implicated in the ugliness and irreverent destruction that has characterised Western industrial development. In this, our strengths harmonise with the concerns of those we hope to recover for Christ.

I see the third great loss of the youth of the modern world to the Western Churches as being occasioned by the decline of true worship. As at the beginning of the Christian era, when people abandoned the state religion for mystery cults that offered a taste of the divine, so the moderns are abandoning official Christianity for cults that offer personal experience. After many years of trying to mould modern liturgies that would invoke the numinous, I must confess that worship in the churches of the West is, more often than not, an embarrassment: at best, a straining toward something dimly felt, at worst inconsequential chatter to and about a domesticated and trivialised deity. I must say also that I found ten years ago in the Orthodox liturgy what I had been striving toward for much of my working life. I have never gone from an Orthodox liturgy disappointed. It is no accident that the current Archbishop of Canterbury met God there; it was no fantasy when I presented Orthodox worship to you as capable of fulfilling the yearnings of the devotees of Mother Ganges at Haridar [Haridwar].

But for true worship ‘in the beauty of holiness’ you need instruction; for grappling with unbelief you need education in the full gospel and in the skills to teach it. We cannot do without centres of Christian learning. I regard the Principalship of the Institute for Orthodox Christian Studies as the most important task I have ever been given and the continuation of the Institute as a necessity if the faith is not to be set back for a generation.

We hear attacks on ‘theology’ as something abstruse, unnecessarily intellectual, as opposed to ‘simple faith’. But you cannot speak of God at all without entering into theology; and mistaken notions about God are a major cause of the disturbances of this present time. Why must there be a choice, between ‘simple faith’ on the one hand, and ‘theology’ on the other? Why either/or, when we need *both*?

Report of the Third Orthodox Youth Festival Ilam, May 2007

‘FRIENDSHIP AND ORTHODOX CHRISTIANITY’

[personal impressions of the Festival were included in the last issue of *Forerunner*]

‘By this will all men know what love is, and who I am, if they see you loving one another as I have loved you.’ (John 13.34-35)

The Third Pan-Orthodox Youth Festival organised under the auspices of the Orthodox Fellowship of St John the Baptist took place at Dovedale House, Ilam, in the Peak District National Park from Friday 25th to Monday 28th May. The aim of the event was to bring together around 50 young people (aged 18-35) to worship God together and encourage them to think about their Orthodox faith.

Interestingly, the theme for this year’s Festival arose organically. Many people had commented at the first two festivals on the strong sense of love and unity that was evident between us as a group of friends, and this year we decided to explore this further as an over-arching theme. We wanted to learn more deeply about the mystery of God’s love and how the link between man’s friendship with God is the way to acquire wholeness and healing through Christ, which will in turn transfigure the quality of our friendships, and also to understand that building on healthy relationships is central to the quality of our Christian lives, in terms of their impact on others, both in and outside the church. There was also a strong sense of wanting to grow and look outwards, with an acknowledgment that when Christian love is tangible and made manifest, it attracts non-believers to Christ. The challenge then: how to act as living witnesses of love and unity to reflect Christ’s character in a broken world – the most powerful way to draw people to our Trinitarian God, who has the power to transform.

It was with great joy that we were able to welcome the now Metropolitan Kallistos of Diokleia, then chairman of the Fellowship, to come and share with us for the first time at the Festival. His talk on ‘Friendship and the Inner Life’ touched on the mystery of our relationship (or friendship, as he put it) with Christ. His talk expressed well the essence of our Festival this year: how to relate to one another as human persons. We were told that the Greek word for a person means ‘face’ or ‘countenance’, and that essential to our personhood is to be in relationship, principally with God, for our hearts are faint and weary until they find their rest in Him. But, as

Metropolitan Kallistos explained, we all have a need to face one another to let the other look into our eyes and vice versa. To be without friends is to be not human. He pointed out that in the Lord's Prayer we use the words 'us', 'we' and 'our'. There is no place for individualism in prayer. No one can be the friend of Jesus, without having many other friends, or, as St Macarius expressed it: 'I need you in order to be myself.' Metropolitan Kallistos challenged us by stating that one definition of hell is 'myself, cut off from the other and refusing to relate', or in the words of T.S. Elliott: 'Hell is myself, alone, the other figures merely projections.' The poignancy of people's isolated lives in the Western world struck hard. Unpacking true friendship further, he explained that it has four essential features, which are reflections of the mystical relationship that Christ offers each one of us:

First, friendship implies equality. We are not the slaves of God, but rather we are 'the friends of God'. In our relationship with Him, we do not obey out of fear, or for a reward, but we serve Him out of love. A close friend therefore loves and understands at all times, like Christ. He is one to whom we can reveal the closest secrets of our inner world. To receive such a gift from another requires us to take our masks off, but also to love ourselves. A good friendship will not be able to grow if we despise ourselves, and we therefore need to have a good self-love, but hate our false selves at the same time. If we exercise vigilance in these areas, it will help the development of good, strong healthy friendships. We need to value ourselves well, with a humble but genuine understanding of our worth in God's sight. A question then: How can we be friends with God? Metropolitan Kallistos reminded us that Aristotle claimed that this could not be, but scripture confirms that it became possible, because through the Incarnation, our Creator has become man and therefore our brother.

Second, we learnt that true friendship has to be offered as a free gift. We cannot force it on another, for then it would be a false friendship. Freedom is necessary in any friendship. Where there is compulsion, there is no true love. There must be no constraint in love, and this is as true in our relationships with each other as it is with God.

Third, we learnt that there is something in every person that is God given and rare, and so our friendships with one another will be unique. They have different purposes and qualities, and each is God given for reasons sometimes beyond our understanding. We were reassured that, as Christians, we have a new name that is only known by God, for we are all

different. Each person is irreplaceable. God never makes the same soul twice, even with twins, for the world has need of every single one of us. We are all called by Him to do something beautiful. Friendship is not just generalised love. To say that one is friends with everyone is not necessarily true, and may come close to meaning we are not friends with anyone. Again, each human person is irreplaceable, and interacts uniquely with another, a great mystery.

Fourthly and finally, there is a need for vulnerability in friendship. We need to look closely at one another to see the other's character clearly. We need to forgive one another quickly and realise our frailty before one another. There is no fear in perfect love if a friendship is truly drawn from God's love. With no cross, there is no crown. Jesus is the friend who never gives up on us, and we must do likewise with our friends, even when they hurt us or themselves. We were exhorted to strip away the outer layers of the masks that we sometimes wear, and humble ourselves before one another. Then we will become more our true selves. This was most poignant at the Liturgy when His Eminence invited us to renew the tradition of the early church in sharing the kiss of peace (or perhaps the modern version 'hug of peace'), which many people found to be a moving experience and an expression of our love for one another on this occasion.

The following day we were delighted to welcome Fr Benedict Ramsden and Ionut Nazarcu (a visiting social worker from Romania) to develop the theme further in a talk entitled 'Friendship in Action'. We considered how 'having the same love' and 'being one in spirit' is for a purpose: to bond us together so we can be united in looking outwards to the needs of others. Fr Benedict openly recounted his experience of sharing his life with adults suffering with the torments of mental illness, and the joys and challenges that this has brought. He also spoke honestly about the beauty of marriage and family life, which blessed us through its rawness. How precious and rare to hear a priest speaking so candidly about such things, and how grateful we were for his vulnerability in removing 'his mask' before a group of people he did not know. Similarly, in sharing a collection of slides of his work with elderly people in Romania, Ionut challenged us to start thinking about how we, as young people, can directly touch the lives of others in need and deprivation. Both speakers illustrated how faith and service entwined, giving examples from their lives, and offered practical suggestions of how to embrace this in our parishes, for

example by visiting people in prison and in hospital, and praying for those in despair.

There are so many encouraging things to share with you from our festival, making it hard to be brief, but perhaps of interest was a workshop on ‘Friendship and Intimacy’, back by popular demand two years running, which set further personal challenges. Its premise: How can we aim to cultivate intimacy in our future relationships and marriages when constantly under attack from a secular world, which promotes alien values? Andrew and Georgia Williams led us in single sex groups to unpick some of the following questions: What is the nature of Orthodox Christian relationships? What are the hallmarks of healthy male and female friendships? What does intimacy mean? What is the true understanding of Christian love (in platonic and exclusive relationships)? What are the challenges and dangers to purity in modern life (in relation to the internet, TV and films, magazines, media)? What effects do these have on our spiritual life, and on our present and future relationships? What are the teachings of Christ and the church in protecting us with boundaries before and during marriage, and how does this link to the understanding of our bodies being sacred? Understandably, there were many challenges and questions, but how much it strikes me, year after year, that young people are asking for teaching in these areas. There is a need, and this is their voice. Andrew and Georgia now take their pastoral experience to be developed further at Holy Cross Seminary, Boston, and we wish them well and remember them gratefully in our prayers for all the insight and wisdom they brought to us this year.

There were other discussion groups which fell broadly under the theme of ‘Hindrances to the inner life’ and included topics such as ‘Struggles in prayer and fasting’ (Peter Schadler), ‘Living in a consumer world’ (Miriam Craddock), ‘Using Orthodox literature and the internet to develop you faith’ (Ambrose Nankivell), ‘Social action’ (Ionut Nazarcu) and the popular mystery topic workshop by Borce Kitanov.

Over the last two years, we have moved towards celebrating the Divine Liturgy twice during the weekend, wanting to live out our communion together liturgically. The tangible unity, love and friendship that we have is a gift, and one we must nourish. In the words of a newcomer to the festival: ‘the participants’ faces were bright with joy – this was particularly evident in our services. At the end of evening prayers no one wanted to leave the church, people stood singing spontaneously in English, Greek, Slavonic, Romanian, there was no embarrassment or pretension, this was

church as I have never experienced it before.’ And the excursion to St Bertram’s (8th C.) holy well the following day gave us the opportunity to sing the Troparion alongside fellow Orthodox Christians from every nationality represented in our homeland. Standing around the well, on a rainy English hill in the Peak District, alongside my rare and unique friends, I was reminded of how enriched our faith is by people from Orthodox lands, but aware too of the wealth of the saints in our own islands and the need to venerate them.

A cynic might say, well, this love and unity you talk about is surely effortless over a spirited weekend, but not necessarily so easy in our parishes. A challenge indeed, which I was reminded of, even within days of returning to Cambridge, and only possible through the love and grace that Christ gives us. The question Metropolitan Kallistos put to us still remains with me: Will we be courageous enough to allow ourselves to be humble and vulnerable with one another? To let the other look through the window of our eyes, to take off our masks and say to each other: I need you in order to be more myself?

The Festival aims:

- to provide a meeting place for young people to live in Christ
- to rediscover and strengthen our faith together
- to share the practical experience of Orthodox life
- to receive practical teaching in areas relevant to young people
- to encourage us to take an active role in the Church
- to exchange fresh ideas between parishes
- to strengthen links between young people in different parishes

OBITUARY

Kenneth Storer (1924-2007)

Kenneth Storer has died, at the age of 83, after a short illness. His funeral was served by Bishop Basil of Amphipolis at the parish church in Westbourne, Hampshire, on 13 November 2007. It was a beautiful service, attended by many friends and relatives, both Orthodox and non-Orthodox.

Kenneth led a long and active life, which fell into various, quite different, phases. He went up to Oxford University in 1941 to read English, but this period of study was interrupted by the war. He returned to Oxford to finish the degree in 1947 and there met his future wife, Jill, who was studying French at St Anne's College. Kenneth stayed on to do a course in teacher training, after which he joined the colonial civil service and went to Nyasaland (later called Malawi) as an inspector of schools. Kenneth and Jill were married in 1957 and their two children, Catherine and Andrew, were born in Africa. Returning to England in 1968, Kenneth then worked for the Administration of Further Education in the West Midlands, commuting to Birmingham from his home in Stratford upon Avon. It was soon after this that both Kenneth and Jill became interested in Orthodox Christianity and in Byzantine Studies, and they attended the weekly seminars held in the Centre for Byzantine Studies at the University of Birmingham. Jill took an MLitt in the same department, writing a thesis on the iconography of the Anastasis scene in Byzantine art, under the supervision of Zaga Gavrilović. Kenneth also began attending the Orthodox Church in Oxford, where he was instructed by Bishop Basil and was eventually received into the Church in 1982. After Kenneth retired from work in the early 1990s, he and Jill decided to move to Hampshire in order to be closer to their children, who had now both married and were beginning to start families. Although Kenneth continued to collect books and to read widely in church history and especially the study of liturgy, he and Jill also became interested in local history and in church archaeology.

They also spent much time looking after their grandchildren before and after school, filling in the gaps when Catherine had to be at her demanding job as a teacher. Jill describes Kenneth as a 'brilliant grandfather'; he gave much time and attention to the young children. The houses in both Stratford upon Avon and Emsworth were always beautiful and restful havens, from which Kenneth and Jill offered warm hospitality to their

many friends and relatives. Kenneth devoted much time to the gardens in each, dividing his spare time between work outdoors and extensive reading in the garden shed which he had converted into a library.

Most members of the Fellowship will remember Kenneth from the conferences that he regularly attended, as well as from pilgrimages organised by the Anglican and Eastern Churches Organization and the Friends of Mt Athos. He served as Secretary of the Diocese of Sourozh from June 1987 to November 1993. As Bishop Basil reminded us at the funeral, Kenneth performed many vital services both for the diocese and for the wider Church community in this role. After this job ended, Kenneth dedicated himself to working for the Voice of Orthodoxy.

His friends remember Kenneth above all as a man with complete integrity and dignity—even statesmanlike qualities. Physically, he stood very straight and tall, and this stance seemed to reflect his inner character. Kenneth was also someone who undertook every task very seriously and worked at it methodically. He was never known to let anyone down with regard to something that he had promised to do. But beyond this, friends and colleagues remember his calm presence, good humour, and great charm. He was quiet and retiring, but when talking with him one had a sense that he was completely focused on the conversation. Occasionally he would interject a wry comment with a twinkle of good humour and wit—these were moments which made dialogue with Kenneth a great treat for those, like myself, who only saw him rarely. Kenneth was also extremely knowledgeable about many aspects of church life, including liturgy, music, and theology. He was nonetheless modest about displaying this wisdom. It seemed that after discovering Orthodox Christianity some 25 years ago, Kenneth blossomed especially as a result of his life in the Church. He made many friends in the Church, as well as in the wider ecumenical circle, and seemed to find in Orthodoxy a true spiritual home.

As a loyal friend and dedicated husband, father, and grandfather, Kenneth will be missed by many. May his memory be eternal!

Mary Cunningham Corran