

UNIT 3B: PASTORAL AND ASCETICAL THEOLOGY

78: Relationships, Marriage and Family

Preface

The scope of this lecture is very specific; namely to examine the praxis of Christian relations in friendship, marriage and family life, in the context of a post Christian culture where individualism and narcissism increasingly predominate. We shall be exploring, therefore, Orthodox Christian teachings concerning communion, vocation and commitment in a theological context. It is not, however, the primary purpose of this essay to describe those practical aspects of Orthodox Christian marriage and family life which are readily available elsewhere. For example, we shall not be considering the family in prayer as part of the domestic Church, the raising of children in the fear and love of God or the resolution of conflicts in relationships within marriage and family life. *[At the end of this lecture, however, there will be a short end piece with appended web resources supporting a discussion of these practical issues in local centres where these lectures are delivered].*

This focus may surprise our readers but it is the view of the authors that there are deeper reasons for the arguable relative failure of an Orthodox Christian culture to take hold in the West beyond two or three generations. We ourselves as Orthodox Christian adults, together with our children, need to learn to think differently about relationships from a Christian point of view and then to distinguish those insights from the prevailing secular interpretations that deeply affect our individuality and common life. It might then be possible to see the practical working out of our marriages and family lives as maturing in a more robust and transformative way, even transforming the culture itself, while avoiding the spiritual cul-de-sac which is disengagement and retreat into the “Orthodox bubble.”¹ We start, therefore, with what it is to know another person, and indeed, God Himself.

¹ Coined by Archpriest Gregory Hallam, co-author of this lecture in his blog article here:- <http://antiochabouna.blogspot.co.uk/2017/01/what-will-become-of-my-children-what.html>

1. Introduction: Understanding Relationships among People and with God

In order to understand the meaning of a genuine meeting between two people, let us begin with the earliest memory of the Jewish philosopher and theologian, Martin Buber (1868-1965). He was not yet 4, and as his mother left him, the young lad was chatting on a balcony of his grandparents' home "with a girl several years older ... to whose care [his] grandmother had entrusted [him]." Buber began his autobiographical fragments with this scene. He wrote:

I cannot remember that I spoke of my mother to my older comrade. But I hear still how the big girl said to me: 'No, she will never come back.' I know that I remained silent, but also that I cherished no doubt of the truth of the spoken words. It remained fixed in me; from year to year it cleaved ever more to my heart, but after more than ten years I had begun to perceive it as something that concerned not only me, but all men [and women]. Later I once made up the word *Vergegnung*—'mismeeting,' or 'miscounter'—to designate the failure of a real meeting between [people]... I suspect that all I learned about the genuine meeting in the course of my life had its first origin in that hour on the balcony.²

To understand relationships, we need to perceive whether we are having meaningful encounters or simply "miscounters" with those we meet. Are we really understanding and relating to those we meet or simply pretending that a meeting is taking place?

Martin Buber expressed his "understanding of engaged interaction," or as he called it, "the life of 'genuine dialogue' in 1923 in *I and Thou* in which the I-Thou relationship in this world has an inherent tendency to become an I-It situation in which "the intense presence of *Thou* moments inevitably flows away, becoming objects, frozen ideas relegated to past experiences."³ For Buber, "In the beginning

² *Meetings*, Ed. Maurice Friedman (LaSalle, IL: Open Court, 1973), p.18f.

³ Kenneth Paul Kramer with Mechthild Gawlick, *Martin Buber's I and Thou: Practicing Living Dialogue* (New York: Paulist Press, 2003), pp.1, 24-25.

is relationship,” that is the relationship between the child and the mother in the womb, where “the primary awareness of I-Thou relationship begins.”⁴

Martin Buber’s approach appears to contrast with that of St John the Evangelist, in one of the most famous passages in the New Testament: “In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. He was in the beginning with God.” (John 1:1-2). But consider the position more carefully. While St John is reflecting on Christ, Buber links I-Thou relationships between humans to “the I-Thou relationship humans have with God, ... the eternal Thou ... who cannot become It.”⁵ Thus both St John and Buber are reaching out for an understanding of the Incarnation, in which St John has grasped its fullness in Christ, but Buber is probing how “the eternal presence of God” can be “glimpsed in the immediacy of relationship itself,” as well as in “the realm of the between”—that is, in the midst of life between humanity and God.⁶

While adhering to the Incarnation, we should also see the importance of Buber’s distinction between three types of relationships among people—genuine dialogue, technical dialogue and monologue disguised as dialogue:

Dialogue becomes *genuine* when each of the participants is fully present to the other or others, openly attentive to all voices, and willing to be nonjudgmental. Dialogue becomes *technical* when the need to understand something, or gain information, is the focal point of the exchange. Dialogue becomes in fact *monologue* when one participant is only interested in imposing his or her point of view to the exclusion of all other views.⁷

Indeed, if we are to achieve viable relationships with the people we encounter, as well as with God, we need to consciously seek both genuine and technical relationships, while learning to recognise when we or others are engaged in

⁴ Kramer, p. 28. Lecture 72: Healing and Deliverance has considered how this I-Thou relationship is sometimes debased, but can be recovered.

⁵ Kramer, p. 24.

⁶ Kramer, p. 25.

⁷ p. 33, drawing upon Buber’s *Between Man and Man* (New York: Macmillan, 1965), p. 19.

monologue. For Martin Buber and for us, the aim is that “each participant experiences mutual presence, a vital reciprocity, an elemental togetherness not restricted by time-awareness.”⁸ It is a task that lasts a lifetime.

2. Marriage: Its Dangers and Possibilities

Sometimes relationships are fleeting or end in sorrow. Sometimes relationships lead to marriage; and sometimes marriage itself leads to sorrow. In the United States, 2016 estimates suggest that 50% of all marriages are ending in divorce, while 42% of marriages in the UK are ending in divorce. On average, first marriages that ended in divorce lasted about eight years. However, divorce rates in both the United States and the United Kingdom are decreasing. Furthermore, these broad estimates disguise important trends, such as the higher the level of education, the more likely men and women are to remain married, while people who are married twenty or more years are unlikely to divorce.⁹

Because of these high divorce figures throughout the developed world, as well as increasing levels of cohabitation, both short-term and long-term, Archdeacon John Chryssavgis is right to warn in *Love, Sexuality and the Sacrament of Marriage* that:

Speaking of human love, one must recognize that life is full of people who are deeply wounded in an infinite variety of ways, including the ways of love, and specifically of sexual love. We do not know whether the wounds and the damage could always have been avoided. The only means of not being taken in by any gamble over the issue is for one to preserve one’s fidelity to the vision of men and women true to themselves in their wholeness and freedom....¹⁰

⁸ Kramer, p. 20.

⁹ See <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/uknews/12011714/Divorce-rate-at-lowest-level-in-40-years-after-cohabitation-revolution.html> and <https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2016-06-17/boomers-are-making-sure-the-divorces-keep-coming> .

¹⁰ Brookline, MA: Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 1998; p. 4.

It is essential then that in any expression of love between a man and a woman, whether that expression is sexual, emotional, intellectual or spiritual there is an underlying respect for the other person and for the reality of a person-to-person relationship, in which both persons give and take from each other.

For the Orthodox Christian, our primary concern is not with statistics about marriage “or with general principles or with a theoretical code of morality, but with the salvation of unique and particular persons created in the divine image.”¹¹

When you make a decision to marry, you are, to a considerable extent, placing your salvation on the line—expressing the conviction that spending your life with a particular person will empower, not undermine, your joint salvation.¹² Thus marriage is not in itself a better state than being single or being in a monastery or convent. St Symeon the New Theologian (949-1022) was certainly right: **“In every situation, whatever the work or task involved, it is the life lived for God and according to God that is wholly blessed.”¹³**

Each person finds their own unique vocation, as was set out in Lecture 77: Vocation and Work. With respect to the choice between marriage, monasticism and the consecrated single life, it is essential each of us wait on the Holy Spirit and discern God’s will for our lives.¹⁴ Nevertheless, **it is still appropriate to see “the mutual love of man and woman within marriage [as]... the primordial human**

¹¹ Foreword, [Metropolitan] Kallistos Ware in David and Mary Ford, *Marriage as a Path to Holiness: Lives of Married Saints*, South Canaan, PA: St Tikhon’s Seminary Press, 1999, p. ix.

¹² Metropolitan Kallistos concurs: “The supreme purpose of marriage is that husband and wife should each help the other to enter the heavenly kingdom.... As an eternal union between two unique and eternal personalities, the sacrament of marriage has no other end than this” (p. xi).

¹³ Chapters, iii. 65; quoted by Ware, p. xi.

¹⁴ Citing Paul Evdokimov, Metropolitan Kallistos suggests: “There is only one way in which to learn the distinctive value of the monastic vocation, and that is by learning to appreciate the wonder and sanctity of the married state. By the same token married couples cannot properly perceive the beauty of their own vocation unless they also honour the monastic life. The two callings are not opposed but complementary: each affirms the other” (p. xi). Archdeacon John Chryssavgis agrees: **“Whether a monk or a married person, one must continually struggle to become what one already is. Even more so, one must strive to become what one is called to be: enraptured and empowered by the flame of divine love”** (p. 15). For further reflections, see Section 5 of this lecture on developing Orthodox self-awareness.

relationship, on which all other expressions of interpersonal community are based,” with marriage itself as ‘the sacrament of love.’¹⁵ The real danger in such a view, as Archdeacon John Chryssavgis has pointed out, is “not so much that lovers might idolize each other but they might idolize love itself rather than the loved one,” although it is also important that “the other person (whether a spouse, a parent, or a friend)” does not turn “into a substitute for God.”¹⁶ The words with which Father John ends his own text are an appropriate concluding comment for the reflections on marriage in this lecture:

Life is a journey—a difficult and complex journey. And marriage is one way of travelling—indeed of enjoying and not simply enduring—this journey through sharing. Yet the goal of the journey lies ahead; the significance of the sacrament lies in the Kingdom. It is this Kingdom for which we truly hope and which is our true home.¹⁷

So be it.

3. Family: Threats and Opportunities

“Childbirth is the natural, holy and necessary element in Christian marriage.”¹⁸ However, as couples raise children this is also the time when their marriages are under the greatest threat, when their tempers are the shortest, and when they struggle with the inevitable demands that children place upon both parents. In the Orthodox wedding ceremony, immediately after the priest has united the right hands of the bride and the groom, there is the prayer that God would “unite them in oneness of mind and heart; crown them in one flesh; grant to them the fruit of the womb and *the enjoyment of good children*.”¹⁹ The problem is that children are not always good—they want what they want when they want it. Therefore, it is essential that both parents and children are clear which behaviours are acceptable

¹⁵ Ware, p. x.

¹⁶ Chryssavgis, p. 3.

¹⁷ Chryssavgis, p. 35.

¹⁸ John Meyendorff, *Marriage: An Orthodox Perspective*, 3rd rev. ed. (Crestwood, NY: SVSP, 1984), p. 61.

¹⁹ The italics for “the enjoyment of good children” is not in the original text.

and which boundaries will be enforced.²⁰ **The sign of a successful parent is often having raised an independent person, but the goals of that independence are also important.**²¹

A Russian saint, Theophan the Recluse (1815-1994), stresses how **parents seek to communicate love and faith to their children.** This is a difficult task. He wrote:

One cannot define just when a person comes to the awareness of himself [or herself] as being a Christian and to the independent resolve to live in a Christian way. In actual fact this happens at different times: at the age of seven, ten, fifteen, or later.²²

Lecture 85: Christian Education will consider whether St Theophan is right in stressing the importance of piety over learning, especially when “the river of our life is interrupted by the turbulent period of youth.”²³

4. Confronting Secularity, Ecclesiastical Inertia, and Excessive Reliance on Ethnic Inheritance

The three pastoral challenges being considered in this lecture—relationships, marriage and the family—are lived out within a very secular Western culture. **We cannot work out viable pastoral resolutions without confronting that secularity.** Protestant, Roman Catholic and Orthodox theologians agree that living in the contemporary culture is difficult for all Christians. The Protestant theologian David Wells begins his study, *God in a Wasteland: The Reality of Truth in a World of Fading Dreams* with Peter Berger’s comment: “Modern man is afflicted with a permanent identity crisis, a condition conducive to considerable nervousness.”²⁴ The Roman Catholic Dominican theologian, Father Aidan Nichols, has written of how

²⁰ See Robert J. MacKenzie, *Setting Limits: How to Raise Responsible, Independent Children by Providing Clear Boundaries* (Rosewood, CA: Prima Publishing, 1999).

²¹ See John D. Zizioulas, *Being as Communion: Studies in Personhood and the Church* (Crestwood, NY: SVSP, 1997).

²² *Raising Them Right: A Saint’s Advice on Raising Children*, 2nd ed. (Ben Lomond, CA: Conciliar Press, 2000), pp. 29-30, 47.

²³ St Theophan, pp. 47-48, 53.

²⁴ Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 1995; p. 3.

in Great Britain “the force of secularism has been underestimated, and the latent power of a Christian imagination left untapped...”²⁵ The Orthodox theologian, Father Georges Florovsky notes that “our age is, first of all, an age of unbelief;” and he addressed those “who may be unwilling or unprepared to change themselves, who want to linger in the age that is rapidly passing away.”²⁶

In an historical perspective, spanning 1,500 years, Father Georges points out that:
... the fact remains: Christians as Christians were building culture for centuries, and many of them not only with a sense of vocation, and not only as in duty bound, but with the firm conviction that this was the will of God.²⁷
Today we need that same sense of vocation and duty, that same commitment to discover and implement the will of God, because, as Father Georges points out, a culture imbued with “the right faith” emerges only within “a process, and it can be preserved and continued only by a constant spiritual effort, not just by inertia or inheritance.”²⁸ **In brief, if our Orthodox hopes for sound relationships, marriages and families are to be fulfilled, we must move beyond ethnic inheritance and ecclesiastical inertia.**

This is quite a challenge; and this reality has been with us in the West for many decades. Writing in 1985, Father John Meyendorff (1926-1992), former Dean of St Vladimir’s Seminary, did not mince his words in setting out both the problem and a possible resolution that relies on the power of the Eucharist:

Unless the visible reality of our Church life becomes consistent with that communion which is revealed to us in the Eucharist, unless our ecclesiastical structures—especially here in the West—conform themselves to that which the Church truly is, unless the eucharistic nature of the Church is freed from under

²⁵ *Christendom Awake: On Re-energising the Church in Culture* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1999), p. xi.

²⁶ *Christianity and Culture, Vol Two, Collected Works* (Belmont, MA: Nordland, 1974), pp. 9-10.

²⁷ p. 21.

²⁸ p. 26.

the façade of anachronism, and ethnic politics, which hide it today, no ecumenical witness, no authentic mission to the world is possible.²⁹

How can we confront secularity? How can we face inertia and excessive reliance on inheritance grounded in ethnicity?

5. A Pastoral Challenge: To Replace Individualism with Orthodox Self-Awareness

A crucial problem in the West is our failure to acknowledge and resolve our excessive commitment to individualism. To begin to resolve this problem **we need to work out an understanding of the Church, an ecclesiology in which our communion with Christ within the Church is much more important than our concerns as individuals in a secular society.** Metropolitan John Zizioulas frames the issues in the opening paragraphs of *Being as Communion*:

The Church is not simply an institution. She is a ‘mode of existence, ‘*a way of being*’... From the fact that a human being is a member of the Church, he becomes an ‘image of God,’ he exists as God Himself exists, he takes on God’s ‘way of being.’ This way of being is not a moral attainment, something that man *accomplishes*. It is a way of *relationship* with the world, with other people and with God, an event of *communion*, and that is why it cannot be realized as the achievement of an *individual*, but only as an *ecclesial* fact.³⁰

Lecture 80: Orthodox Ecclesiology will explore these issues further. The key point here is that for Metropolitan John Zizioulas, and for us, **“there is no true being without communion;”**; **the cause of this communion is God himself.**³¹

For many decades Metropolitan John Zizioulas has been reflecting on how to achieve this communion; and in 2006 he set out his understanding in *Communion and Otherness: Further Studies in Personhood and the Church*.³² The Metropolitan sets out with considerable care how and why we are afraid of other people and the very

²⁹ Foreword, p. 12 in Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*.

³⁰ p. 15; italics in original.

³¹ pp. 17-18.

³² Ed. Paul McPartlan (London: T&T Clark, 2006).

existence of otherness. He points out that “even if we accept certain others, we accept them on condition that they somehow are like ourselves;” and this “fear of the other is in fact nothing but the fear of the different,” which leads to division, that confronts each of us with the need to repent, because “we cannot discriminate between those who are and those who are not ‘worthy’ of our acceptance.”³³ In essence, **just as we acclaim a new deacon or priest with the words, “He is worthy!” we need to learn to say, “You are worthy” to every member of the Church, even if they are quite different from us in ethnicity or in attitudes. We are all seeking to live in communion with God.**

At the same time as acknowledging that others are worthy, we need to affirm our own worthiness—that God considers us worthy to be part of His Church, that we are privileged to be His servants.³⁴ Benjamin D. Williams and Michael T. McKibben, writing in *Oriented Leadership: Why Every Christian Needs It*, point out that such **self-acceptance begins with defining our identities honestly to ourselves:**

- What sort of person am I? ..
- What quality do I give others that they consider to be my strongest asset? ...
- What quality is it that shows up spontaneously and naturally?...
- What’s right with my life? What’s wrong with it?
- What do I really want out of life; to do and become? ...
- What do I care about?
- What’s holding me back?

³³ pp. 2-6. Metropolitan John’s argument rests upon the centrality of The Trinity in our lives and the life of the Church: **“There is no model for the proper relation between communion and otherness either for the Church or for the human being other than the Trinitarian God. If the Church wants to be faithful to her true self, she must try to mirror the communion and otherness that exists in the triune God. The same is true of the human being as the ‘image of God’. The relation between communion and otherness in God is the model both for ecclesiology and for anthropology.”** (pp. 4-5)

³⁴ As Metropolitan Kallistos has commented in Note 13 above, there is also a sense that **“one must continually struggle to become what one already is.”** In other words, we are not, in a sense, completely worthy, but by struggling to become so, we become more worthy.

- What kinds of things am I best at?
- What do I know the most about?...
- What circumstances today caused me to be enthusiastic, energetic, and full of spirit?³⁵

Such a self-assessment is “grounded in the fact that we are persons created in the image and likeness of God,” not persons created and grounded in a secular culture.³⁶ This is a first and important step in becoming aware of ourselves as persons formed by our commitment to being Orthodox Christians, helping to empower us to tackle relationships of all kinds.

To enter into, engage in and complete this process of replacing individualism with Orthodox self-awareness requires considerable humility. The ultimate goal is to create and maintain a genuine relationship with God Himself. The (Roman Catholic) Benedictine monk, Father Laurence Freeman has suggested that in the midst of “all the interesting faults of our ego” we need to focus on

... perfect humility in which we simply know ourselves, in God, with all our self-evident faults, exactly as God knows us. In this humility-which-is-wisdom we are blown away by realising, sometimes by painfully slow graduations that we are, actually irrefutably loveable. It takes time and it’s not as easy to get to as it sounds.³⁷

This is an essential experience for any Christian who seeks to be formed by Christ.

6. Conclusion: Communion Empowers Us to Live in Community

Unfortunately, even if we do increase our understanding of how to form relationships, as well as our Orthodox self-awareness, such a perspective is still somewhat self-focused, rather individualistic in the Western context. Furthermore,

³⁵ Wayne, NJ: Orthodox Christian Publications Center, 1994, p. 13.

³⁶ Williams and McKibben, pp. 14-15.

³⁷ “All she remembers as she changed her life was that she felt accepted and known,” *The Tablet*, 18/25 December 2010, p. 23. Emphasis added.

we cannot reject the influences of secular culture without building an alternative culture. The importance of creating alternative persons and alternative communities has already been noted in Lecture 75: Asceticism. However, **to gain this formation in Christ does require considerable struggle. In the midst of this struggle, it is essential to understand the distinction between “community” and “communion.”**

In *Being as Communion*, Metropolitan John Zizioulas attempts to distinguish between his theology and that of Martin Buber. Metropolitan John writes:

... communion is not a relationship understood for its own sake, an existential structure which supplants ‘nature’ or ‘substance’ in its primordial ontological role—something reminiscent of the structure of existence met in the thought of Martin Buber. Just like ‘substance,’ ‘communion’ does not exist by itself: it is the Father who is the ‘cause’ of it.³⁸

In other words, Metropolitan John believes that Martin Buber is primarily concerned with human life as it is lived—with existential relationships in which a relationship refers “to a close human bonding in which both partners affirm, accept, and confirm each other.”³⁹ The community that emerges from many people forming such relationships is “a vital intersection between persons standing toward a living center as well as toward each other in ever-renewed reciprocal giving and receiving.”⁴⁰ In contrast, Metropolitan John sees God himself as “a relational being”—the Trinity—and the resulting “theology of the person” is only possible because of “the mystery of the Church.”⁴¹

It should be noted that **Buber’s “living center” which is the focus of community is vaguer than Metropolitan John’s presentation of the Church as the focus of communion. However, it is important to recognise that both Buber’s understanding of a “living center” and the Orthodox understanding of the**

³⁸ p. 17.

³⁹ Kramer, p. 204.

⁴⁰ Kramer, p. 202.

⁴¹ *Being as Communion*, pp. 17-18.

Church require commitment and full participation in the life of the living God. Furthermore, Buber pondered whether he believed in the same God as a Christian clergyman and realised:

If to believe in God means to be able to talk about him in the third person, then I do not believe in God. If to believe in him means to be able to talk to him, then I believe in God.⁴²

This indicates that Martin Buber, like Metropolitan John, sees God as “a relational being,” even if that relationship is not to The Trinity, but rather a relationship of a divine person and a human person to each other.⁴³

Metropolitan Kallistos opens the revised edition of *The Orthodox Way* with John 14.6 (“I am the Way, the Truth and the Life”) and a citation of Father Georges Florovsky’s understanding of the Church which demands belief and commitment:

The Church gives us not a system, but a key; not a plan of God’s City, but the means of entering it. Perhaps someone will lose his way because he has no plan. But all that he will see, he will see without a mediator, he will see it directly, it will be real for him; while he who has studied only the plan [but not entered the Church] risks remaining outside and not really finding anything.⁴⁴

In a very real sense, we need the Church, both to find God and to control our individualism. The communion that the Church offers then empowers us to live in a community centred on a Trinitarian God, where we relate to each other with genuine and technical dialogue and avoid monologue. If we each seek communion with God linked to the Church, one of the consequences will be a living community.

⁴² *Meetings*, p. 44.

⁴³ Buber affirms strongly an “eternal Thou” and insists that “if you hallow this life you meet the living God”: “Every particular *Thou* is a glimpse through to the eternal *Thou*; by means of every particular *Thou* the primary word addresses the eternal *Thou*” (Kramer, pp. 135, 127 and Chapter 5, “Glimpsing the ‘Eternal Thou’, pp. 127-155).

⁴⁴ Crestwood, NY: SVSP, 1998, p. 7. The citation of Father Georges is from *Bible, Church, Tradition: An Eastern Orthodox View, Collected Works*, Vol 1 (Belmont, Mass: Nordland, 1972), pp. 50-51.

In confronting the present culture of individualism, and its lack of genuine community, Father Georges concluded his essay “Faith and Culture” with the advice:

Christians are not committed to the denial of culture as such. But they are to be critical of any existing cultural situation and measure it by the measure of Christ. For Christians are also the Sons of Eternity, i.e., prospective citizens of the Heavenly Jerusalem. Yet problems and needs of ‘this age’ in no case and in no sense can be dismissed or disregarded, since Christians are called to work and service precisely ‘in this world’ and ‘in this age.’ Only all these needs and problems and aims must be viewed in that new and wider perspective which is disclosed by the Christian Revelation and illuminated by its light.⁴⁵

Lecture 88: Politics and Social Justice will explore these issues further. Here it is sufficient to recall that in the reflections on asceticism in Lecture 75 stress was placed on how mystical union with Christ begins in this life but is only completed after we die. So it is with our relationships. As Nicholas Cabasilas insists: “**The life in Christ originates in this life and arises from it. It is perfected, however, in the life to come ...**”⁴⁶ Nevertheless, because we belong to Christ and to the Orthodox Church, we can each spend our lives reaching out toward perfection, even if we do not achieve it—in our relationships, in marriage, in family life or in community.

Online Resources on the Practical Issues of Marriage and Family Life

OCA: Marriage in the Eucharistic Life: <https://oca.org/parish-ministry/familylife/marriage-in-the-eucharistic-life>

OCA: Religious Education in Family Life:

<https://oca.org/parish-ministry/familylife/reinforcing-religious-education-in-family-life>

OCIC: Living an Orthodox Life: The Orthodox Family* (a compendium of many different online resources):

http://orthodoxinfo.com/praxis/pr_family.aspx

*(*Note: Some Orthodox may find some of the resources on the above site unduly conservative but there is also much that is excellent and uncontroversial in there as well. If in doubt, consult your priest or spiritual father).*

⁴⁵ *Christianity and Culture*, p. 30.

⁴⁶ Nicholas Cabasilas, *The Life in Christ* (Crestwood, NY: SVSP, 1974), p. 43.