



DIALOGUES

Discussion Between Shorena Shaverdashvili and Robert Arida

¹ *The Wheel*, Issue #1,
Spring 2015

Introduction

This conversation started when Fr. Robert asked me for feedback on his essay, “How to Expand the Mission.”¹ While he referred specifically to the mission of Orthodox Church in America, I think the questions raised are relevant to Orthodoxy across the globe. In the countries with which I am familiar (the United States, Greece, Russia, and Georgia), the Orthodox Church seems to be confronted by the same fears and dilemmas: how to remain true to the living tradition of Christ and at the same time be open to addressing questions raised by of our times. My main concern here is how to understand and live Orthodoxy while keeping an open mind about legitimate questions posed to the Church. I am not concerned with a theoretical solution

to expanding the heart of the Church, but with the practical matter of how to make our hearts able to receive the spirit and grace of Orthodoxy. To me the big question for expanding the mission is how to overcome our passions, how to learn the spirit of our faith, and how to be truthful to the living tradition not just intellectually but in our lives, through oftentimes lonely suffering and though striving to make more room for God in our hearts. I think this is the essential battleground—a very personal battleground for each of us striving to be Orthodox, but nonetheless the one which may determine the fate of our Church. Fr. Robert’s responses are illuminating, and he concentrates on formulating different approaches to handling these questions. Like him, I oppose confining our faith to the past, idolizing patristic teach-

ings, and building fortresses out of our churches which repulse “the sinners” and those of different of opinions. I hope this conversation will be as useful to your readers as it was for me. I am grateful to Fr. Robert for his time and humility, and for helping me to think this through.

—*Shorena Shaverdashvili*

Dear Father Robert,

Thank you for being interested in my feedback on your essay. Needless to say, I am in no way equipped to contribute a theological response, but I can share some sincere reflections, based on the little spiritual experience I have and the readings I have come to love, especially those of St. Ignatius Brianchaninov and Fr. Seraphim Rose.

I wholeheartedly sympathize with the difficulty of the subject matter—expanding the Orthodox mission in America—and I share the spirit of your main argument: “If the Church is to have a credible presence in our culture, offering it more than a condemning word couched in the language of love, then it is necessary for the Church to expand its mind and heart.” The question is how we should expand our mind and heart while remaining true to Orthodoxy.

I am not sure I agree with the resolution you propose in your last paragraph. “Consequently, Holy Scripture can continue to be interpreted and clarified. Patristic writings can continue to be reassessed and even corrected. Liturgical texts can con-

tinue to be composed while existing texts can be revised.” Revising patristic texts or making corrections to the contemplations of the Holy Fathers, which are saturated with the Holy Spirit and grace, seems like a grave compromise in order somehow to make our lives easier or to lower the standard we should be aiming for with every day of our lives, no matter how difficult or impossible it might seem. To put it more bluntly, are we to “revise” the Holy Spirit in order to make our spiritual dilemmas easier, more in harmony with our contemporary world and cultural struggles?

The spirit of Orthodoxy, as far as I can perceive it, has never been in harmony with “the times.” The world has never been any easier or more accommodating for Christians—the difficulty of the choice we have to make between this world and the heavenly realm has not undergone any kind of transformation. We are, as always, destined for Golgotha and the crucifixion of our passions and transgressions, if we want to be part of the resurrection, of life rather than death. In this matter, there is no distinction between the past, the present, and the future.

I would be more at ease if your proposed conclusion were a call to learning and dwelling, as deeply and truthfully as possible, without “revision,” in the Scriptures and the well of Patristic texts, in authentic voices of Christianity, in order to fathom the depths of our faith, discover responses to our concerns, and find strength to embark on the narrow path of Orthodoxy. As Fr. Seraphim Rose writes, “The Orthodox rule ... is not intended to ‘avoid problems of conscience,’ but rather to call be-

lievers to a difficult, inspiring, and humbling standard of Christian life; if they fall short of the standard, then at least they can see how far their life is from the standard, the norm, which always remains the same" ("Towards the 'Eighth Ecumenical Council,'" *The Orthodox World* 71).

Our creativity, an open mind, and a loving heart should be directed at bringing the Scriptures and the works of our Fathers to contemporary minds, without amending them, with precision and utmost care. Critical analysis will come in handy in trying to carve out the essence of their responses to our most contemporary dilemmas.

So my questions to you are: Why should we console ourselves with anything less than the Truth? Can we expand our mind and heart by our own intellectual effort or scholarly exercise? Isn't there a danger that we are becoming too "worldly"? Shouldn't we aim to transform ourselves entirely, through zeal for the love of God, through our ascetic efforts, and with reference to the higher standard? The more I understand our faith, the surer I become that there is no Christianity without asceticism, without fasting and prayer, without pain of the heart. Is it possible to come to Orthodoxy theoretically and intellectually, without living it? I know from painful experience that my faith is only superficial, unless I give up my old will and my most internal and beloved passions—and all of us have passions, no matter our sexual orientation or cultural affiliations.

Father Robert, I apologize for the long response, but since I found your

last paragraph most problematic, I concentrated on that.

Looking forward to our conversation,

Sincerely,

Shorena

Dear Shorena,

Thank you for the time and effort you spent in responding to my reflection. I am very grateful to you for wanting to continue the conversation. I apologize for the long response.

The question you ask, "How to expand the mind and heart?" is the great challenge for the Orthodox Church as a whole and for each of us who claim to be Orthodox Christians. I believe that there is no exhaustive answer to your question. However, there are two approaches that result in two different and even opposing answers. Ironically, both approaches adhere to the basic premise that there must be fidelity to the living Tradition of the Church—to the Scriptures, Ecumenical Councils, Canons, Patristic writings, and liturgical practice. Using broad brush strokes, I will try to describe the two approaches.

The first approach sees expanding the mind and heart of the Church as adherence to what has been said and written in the past. As I tried to point out in my reflection, when the Church is oriented only to the past, it affirms that all questions have been raised and all answers have been given relative to human life, the cosmos and salvation. We can add that all

questions have been raised and answered regarding belief and how this belief is expressed theologically and liturgically. Given this approach, expanding the mind and heart is a matter of knowing and repeating what has already been said and written. Inherent in this approach is the idea that the Holy Spirit acts in the present by drawing our attention to the past. In other terms, the Holy Spirit is perceived as being unable to utilize the cultural, i.e. the philosophical, scientific, and artistic material of a particular historical context to further expound upon and proclaim the Gospel. More specifically, the universality of the Holy Spirit who acts in all places and in all times is bound to a particular culture of a particular time, i.e. Byzantium and/or pre-revolutionary Russia. That the Holy Spirit instills creativity in the mind and heart throughout time and space is muted, if not strangled, with this approach.

Fidelity to the past can also imply a deep fear of the present. Certainly, the Church must never capitulate to any ethos except that of the Gospel. The “standard” or “rule” of the Christian life referred to by Fr. Seraphim Rose must never be compromised. Here I would add the words of St. Maximus the Confessor: “Those who apply themselves with a pure heart to divine philosophy [i.e. theology / the spiritual life] derive the greatest gain from the knowledge it contains. For their will and purpose no longer change with circumstances, but readily and with firm assurance they undertake all that conforms to the standard of holiness” (First Century on Theology, §86) Clearly for St. Maximus and for all the saints the standard of holiness is Jesus Christ. But,

as St. Maximus implies, our holiness is ever moving, ever ascending. Orthodox spirituality stresses that holiness is not a static mode of existence. Christ remains the same “yesterday, today and forever” (Hebrews 13:8) but we are called to be ever changing. Holiness is dynamic because our relationship with God and our relationship with one another continues to change. Yet, for many Orthodox Christians, when the spiritual life is static due to fear and ignorance, even our Lord can become an idol with no breath—no life—bound to the past.

When the past becomes a safe haven from the demands of the present, the Church becomes a fortress. It builds with the brick and mortar of its Tradition un-scalable walls, which protect it from the turbulence of everyday life. A fortress church replaces our relationship with God with the recitation of texts and formulas often used as polemics to attack the prevailing culture(s). In its most extreme manifestation, a fortress church does not require belief but fidelity to an idealized or fictionalized past. The novelist Flannery O'Connor has referred to this as “the Church of Jesus Christ without Jesus Christ” (*Wise Blood*). Yes, the Church has never been in “harmony with the times”—but this should not mean that the Church is to escape from its historical and cultural context. If the Church becomes an escape from the present, then Christ himself can only speak from the context of the past, unable to communicate in an idiom understood by those of our time. This is certainly the case with the use of so-called “liturgical languages” which are no longer part of the life of the believer. For many Orthodox Christians the Scriptures and the lit-

urgy are proclaimed in an incomprehensible language. Any attempt to change this would be seen by some as an attack on the immutable Tradition of the Church and therefore an attack on the Holy Spirit.

You are absolutely right in saying that the Orthodox Church walks the narrow path. Yet we should never equate this path of ascetic ordeal with narrow-mindedness and, by extension, spiritual stagnation. The narrow path is not the sclerotic path that hardens the mind and heart of the Church. On the contrary, the narrow path is the way of the second approach, which recognizes that if the Church is to remain faithful to its living Tradition then it must never cease to expand its mind and heart. The second approach views Christian life as dynamic. It sees the Church in its two-thousand-year history as having undergone change so as to better articulate the Gospel. For example, the Ecumenical Councils were vehicles of the Holy Spirit to clarify and further interpret the Scriptures relative to the Christological and Trinitarian controversies of their time. These Councils, as well as the patristic writings, bear witness to the fact that the Scriptures had to be interpreted. For those who look to the Fathers as the only sources of biblical exegesis, the idea that interpretation is ongoing can be very unsettling. Interpreting the Scriptures is an inexhaustible enterprise, because our relationship with Christ is inexhaustible. St. Maximus the Confessor writes: "Just as God in his essence cannot be the object of man's spiritual knowledge, so not even his teaching can be fully embraced by our understanding. For though Holy Scripture, being restricted chronologically to the times

of the events which it records, is limited where the letter is concerned, yet in spirit it always remains unlimited as regards the contemplation of intelligible realities" (Second Century on Theology, the Divine Economy, Virtue & Vice, §92). This passage helps us to see that interpretation is not merely an intellectual exercise but presupposes being immersed in the ascetic arena where, like the Fathers, we are called to wrestle not only with our passions and sins but also with God and neighbor.

Just as the Scriptures require interpretation, so too the Patristic texts that possess their own inner tension i.e. they provide a fundamental stratum for knowing and living the faith and yet they are not collectively infallible. Here I would like to share with you a portion of a letter written by Fr. Georges Florovsky, which is dated December 12, 1963 and addressed to an Anglican priest:

Just yesterday the question was put to me in my Patristic seminar, by one of the participants: we enjoy immensely, he said, the reading of the Fathers, but what is their "authority"? Are we supposed to accept from them even that in which they obviously were "situation-conditioned" and probably inaccurate, inadequate, and even wrong? My answer was obviously, No The "authority" of the Fathers is not a dictatus papae. They are guides and witnesses, no more. Their vision is "of authority," not necessarily their words. By studying the Fathers we are compelled to face the problems, and then we can follow them but creatively, not in the mood of repetition.... So many in our time are still looking for authoritative answers, even before they have encountered any problem. I am fortunate to have in my seminars students who are

*studying Fathers because they are interested in creative theology, and not just in history or archaeology.*¹

The process of interpreting is radically different from the process of revising. To revise is to change the text; to interpret, as St. Maximus implies, is to enter more deeply into the reality of the inexhaustible mystery of Christ who is the Word. This movement is simultaneously our Golgotha and Resurrection. It is Golgotha because, like our Lord, we sense a personal loneliness and vulnerability which is derived from leaving what we are familiar with. Our loneliness and vulnerability take us from the comfort and even smugness of thinking our relationship with God is secure so long as we can repeat what was derived from the past. Our Golgotha leads us into the unknown—into the eschaton where we, here and now, begin to experience our Resurrection. Moving into the unknown we deepen our relationship with God. We acquire a freedom in Christ whereby our relationship with God and neighbor is ever renewed and refreshed. Consequently, we no longer fear one another but seek to establish and maintain communion with the other. The one who was the enemy becomes the one we love.

Again, thank you Shorena!

Father Robert

✱ ✱ ✱

Father Robert,

Thank you very much for your thoughtful response. I am grateful for the opportunity to be able to try to think this through. I was very

interested in what you had to say about our spiritual life being “ever ascending,” and the danger of the ascetic path leading to “narrow-mindedness.” I also liked your final paragraph, about the difference between revision and interpretation.

But I am still trying to understand and address the main question—the need to expand the heart and mind of the Church. I feel that my spiritual experience and knowledge are perhaps not enough for this contemplation. I will simply stress one point that I think is the point of diversion and tension between the two approaches you outlined.

You quote St. Maximus: “Those who apply themselves with a pure heart to divine philosophy derive the greatest gain from the knowledge it contains.” Purification and healing of the heart and mind, in order be able to experience God, seems to be the main purpose of our living tradition. We are called to the ascetic ordeal by Scriptures and our Holy Fathers exactly for this purpose—to purify our soul and deepen our relationship with God. This can fundamentally transform us, drawing us closer to the heavenly order.

I can in no way understand this process as an “escape from the present,” or “fear” of dealing with new contexts. On the contrary, the quest for the ascetic ideal requires utmost bravery and dedication, and the concentration of our spiritual efforts toward getting rid of the layers of our old self and the opening of our mind and heart to the truths and depths of Orthodoxy. In my experience, this is the most dynamic, challenging, and fruitful process, free of blind adher-

¹ Georges Florovsky to Dobbie Bateman, December 12, 1963, quoted in Anastassy Brandon Gallaher, “Georges Florovsky on Reading the Life of St. Seraphim,” *Sobornost*, 27:1 (2005): 62.

ence to the dogmatism of the past. In my opinion, Fr. Seraphim and others are not opposed to our active participation—through our lives—in interpreting (as you define it) and living our faith. Rather, they are guarding the ascetic ideal itself, that way of life, stressing that there is no alternative to this if our goal is to purify ourselves and attain the Holy Spirit. As far as I see it, in their view this standard that should not be amended. I do not see narrow mindedness in their lives and preaching, so I do not quite see how this approach can lead to spiritual stagnation. Perhaps I don't quite understand your argument, so can you share some concrete examples?

In addition to aspiring to ascetic standards, “details” like covering our heads with headscarves and strictly observing fasting rules seem important. It is humbling to wear a headscarf: it transforms my attitude towards the liturgy, it helps me distance myself from the world outside the Church and enter the house of Christ with more respect. The same goes for fasting: the more I manage to extricate myself from pleasures, comforts, and tastes of daily food, the better I can pray. From my experience, it is as straightforward and simple as that. More sleep than necessary fogs my mind, as does unnecessary talk, which fills one up with words having no life, no meaning, no transforming power. So many times, keeping the mind in internal silence helps keep my heart in prayer. So perhaps observing these simple and basic rules, as well nourishing our minds through reading, is all we need to expand our mind and heart? You mentioned the incomprehensible language of the Scriptures,

and how that can be an obstacle. I can certainly sympathize with that. It is even harder in Old Georgian, Greek, or Slavonic. However, there can be an upside to this as well. By studying these “old language”, we somehow penetrate the body of the text and the times—it gradually begins to come to life, and brings the sense of authenticity, so essential to Orthodoxy. I have witnessed how my ten- and eight-year-old boys begin to hear and appreciate the words from little prayers they read before bedtime, when they are not too lazy! I am not sure we can compensate for our laziness in our duty to learn with anything other than constant warfare with our lifestyle and habits, with the help of our spiritual guides.

As you see, I am resisting both simplistic answers to our search and closing doors on differences of opinion. I think we have to live through each of these differences in order to live and not only think our faith. I cannot experience God without communion with others, so how can we fear each other? And no matter how far I drift in my thoughts, I am drawn back to my own vulnerabilities and solitude, as you so beautifully said, and to the truths of our faith.

Thank you again for all your time!

With Love,

Shorena

✱ ✱ ✱

Dear Shorena,

I am very grateful that we continue to have our conversation. It might help to further clarify what I mean

by “expanding the mind and heart” of the Church if I point out the extremes that can develop from the two approaches I tried to describe.

The first extreme is idolatry, i.e. when Christ stifles intellectual and spiritual growth. This can be seen in how the Tradition of the Church is often abused, particularly when it comes to reading and interpreting the Scriptures and the Fathers. A case in point is the misuse of the bible and patristic literature as scientific texts. The idolization of these texts, which makes them scientifically infallible, has not allowed for the much-needed dialogue between theology and modern science. Because there is no official dialogue, fundamentalists within the Church forge ahead to relegate the science and biblical research of our time to that of the ancient world. For example, if we ignore the textual research and archaeological discoveries of the past century or the wonders revealed to us through neuroscience, astrophysics and quantum physics, then expanding and improving biblical interpretation, as well as clarifying and, if necessary, correcting the Fathers remains an impossibility. Consequently, there is no room to discuss a range of issues that threaten the worldview of those fundamentalists who call themselves Orthodox Christians. Matters of anthropology (e.g. human sexuality, particularly homosexuality); the place of women in the ecclesial, familial, and social context; the sacrament of marriage as being more than the means for procreation; the theory of evolution; the concept of infinity relative to the ongoing expansion of the universe; and the responsibility placed upon every human being to care for and protect the creation—these are some

of the taboo issues for those who are making the living Tradition a dead idol. Tragically, the synthesis of biblical research, scientific discoveries and Patristic insights is prevented. Equally tragic and quite frightening, is how this idolization of the Tradition is being used to promote political agendas.

The second extreme is iconoclasm, i.e. when intellectual and spiritual growth are in constant flux leaving little or no room for Christ as the permanent standard. Ultimately, iconoclasm does not acknowledge the need to maintain continuity with the past. Paradoxically, both idolatry and iconoclasm advocate a desire for God. Yet, what St. Paul writes to the Romans about Israel and the Gospel his preaching applies to these two approaches: “I bear them witness that they have a zeal for God, but it is not enlightened. For, being ignorant of the righteousness that comes from God, and seeking to establish their own, they did not submit to God’s righteousness.” (10:2–3)

When speaking of idolatry, it needs to be stressed that the ascetic ordeal can work toward destroying the mind and heart of a particular person as well as that of the Church. Perhaps the best examples I can cite come from Christ himself. During the preparatory Sundays leading to Great Lent we are confronted with two disturbing parables. The first is the parable of the Publican and the Pharisee (Luke 18). I like to point out to my parishioners that the Pharisee is a model for those Orthodox Christians who, among other things, are bound to the form of piety but tragically have no living relationship with God or their neighbor. In the

² John Chrysostom,
On the Incomprehensibility of the Divine Nature, Homily no. 5.

context of the Pharisee's prayer there is no place for the mournful Publican who calls out for God's mercy. As you remember, the Pharisee does all the right things—all those things that identify him as an observant and believing Jew. He prays, he fasts, he keeps the commandments, and he is charitable. Yet, Christ says that this man is not justified before God. Doing all the correct things keeps this tragic person from going outside of himself: his prayer is a monologue that focuses on himself. The genius of this parable lies in its irony, which is brilliantly expressed by St. John Chrysostom, who compares the Publican and Pharisee with two charioteers:

*This discourse shows us two men driving their chariots in the arena. The one driver is inclined towards righteousness united to pride, the other is inclined to sin united to humility. But he who is inclined to sin overtakes the one inclined to righteousness, not by his own power and authority but by the virtue of humility which runs with him; the other is defeated not through the fault of righteousness but because of the weight and mass of pride.*²

The second parable is that of the Prodigal Son (Luke 15). Careful reading of this parable shows that there are in fact two prodigals. The first and more obvious is the younger son who leaves his father's house after he has liquidated his inheritance. The second prodigal is the older son who remains with his father and who ostensibly shows love, respect, and fidelity to his father. This older son lives, works, prays, and eats with his father. And yet his hardness of heart is revealed when his younger and repentant brother returns home and is embraced by his father—the

father who, for all intents and purposes, was treated as if he were dead. The father forgives his younger son and restores him to his former place within the household. The older son, who remained out of a sense of duty or obligation and not because of his love for his father, stands apart. Duty and obligation prevent the older brother from being in communion with his father. Doing all the right things relative to living and working with his father prevent him from truly knowing his father. Sadly, the older son squanders his relationship with his father. All that he does is done for himself. All that he does is empty of joy—the joy of being with his father (and his brother).

The ascetic ordeal is, as you point out, the way toward deepening our relationship with God. But it is first and foremost a personal response to God's love for us. Asceticism is a life of love, a life in which we overcome the world, not to reject it or to flee from it, but to be re-joined and reintegrated with it. We struggle in the ascetic arena as an expression of our love for God who has loved us first: "We love, because he first loved us" (1 John 4:19). We struggle to maintain the ascetic ideal so that the love of Christ that heals all divisions can be extended into the world. I often feel that this social dimension of the ascetical life is lacking.

Yes, the ascetic ordeal must be practiced. But it must never become an idol. It must never replace Christ or reduce Christ to an object or weapon that divides oppresses and persecutes. That there are those calling themselves Orthodox Christians who use their faith and the ascetic ordeal as a license to verbally and physically

assault those they perceive as immoral, along with those who would question the status quo of the Church with regard to using the Gospel to promote a realpolitik, is a great hypocrisy. Anton Chekhov sums this up very well when he writes, “purity and virtue scarcely differ from vice, if they’re not free of malice” (“A Boring Story”).

The words of the pre-Socratic philosopher Heraclitus come to mind when I think of the ascetic ordeal and its relationship to iconoclasm: “All things change and nothing remains.” Here iconoclasm uses the ascetic ordeal to advocate, explicitly or implicitly, a Christianity bound to relativism. From this perspective the ascetic ordeal creates a spirituality and corresponding ethos which have no permanent or immutable standard. For the iconoclasts, the Church, if it is to remain relevant, must capitulate to the standards and trends of fluctuating cultures and societies. This kind of relativism stands in opposition to the relativism Fr. Florovsky wrote about, i.e. a relativism that understands our knowledge of the Truth as an act of inexhaustible interpersonal communion which cannot be bound to particular laws or systems.

While idolatry presents a distorted face of Christ, iconoclasm presents a faceless Christ. Both extremes ultimately confirm the painful indictment of Nietzsche: “God is dead. God remains dead. And we have killed him” (*The Gay Science*). It seems to me that, if the two approaches are to be transcended, there must be the acknowledgement and demonstration of the fact that both permanence and change coexist within the living Tradition of the Church. This is the chal-

lenge before us—before the Church. Sadly, it appears that the Church is afraid to meet this challenge. The issues of the day cannot, at this time, be reexamined and, if need be, re-evaluated.

I look forward to hearing from you when time permits.

Father Robert

✱ ✱ ✱

Dear Father Robert,

It was such a pleasure to read your last email. I found no points of disagreement between us. The two parables carry the essence of our faith and I cherish them deeply.

The need for the Church to enter substantive dialogue with the science and cultural anthropology of our times seems very obvious to me too. This is especially striking on local levels. Even before coming back to Orthodoxy just a couple of years ago, I felt the need to hold a public conversation with at least the more educated parts of the Georgian Church. Here, the gap between secular intellectuals and the Church had led to grave animosity, mutual aggression, and cynicism. Liberals never miss an opportunity to label the Church as backward, uneducated, fundamentalist, and political, “holding back the progress of the country.” The overwhelming majority of Georgians name the patriarch as the most influential figure in the country. In response, the Georgian hierarchy and clergy publicly demonize their critics as enemies of the “Georgian identity” and our most precious values. It seemed obvious to me that we

should have been able to hold a civil and respectful conversation. I had higher expectations from the “defenders” of Orthodoxy. I felt that our liberal publications, i.e. those willing to raise questions relative to human rights vis a vis a one-party political system and powerful Orthodox Church, could serve as platforms for dialogue. But my attempts failed. The Church’s fear and the voices of the critics together seemed too loud and overbearing. Neither side desired dialogue.

So, instead of direct confrontation, I thought we could offer the alternative—responding to our problems indirectly, by a positive approach, by preaching Christianity. Fr. M. started

blogging, and we have held interviews with a couple of the more open-minded clergy. I cannot say that this has been of no use at all but I think it requires persistence and courage to keep the conversation going. At points along the road, I have thought that this is fruitless, perhaps because I was not ready for the undertaking. Since then I have tried to come back to myself and to my own dilemmas, educating myself before undertaking any other public tasks. This has been my answer so far. But the problems are there, and the gap is not closing, here or elsewhere—quite the contrary.

Sincerely,

Shorena ✱



Shorena Shaverdashvili is a publisher and former editor-in-chief of an independent print and online political publication in Georgia. *Liberali* has served as an active platform for both political as well as religious debates, trying to start a conversation between the Orthodox community under the Georgian Church and civil society. Since 2004 Shorena has published three other magazines, and she has been an activist for media and human rights from 2008 to 2012. She has also served on the boards of the Georgian Public Broadcaster and the Media Coalition for Advocacy. She is a graduate of Tufts University in Boston.



The V. Rev. Robert M. Arida is Rector and Dean of Holy Trinity Orthodox Cathedral in Boston, Massachusetts. He is a graduate of St. Vladimir’s Seminary. Some of his published and unpublished articles and essays can be found on the HTOC website at holytrinityorthodox.org.