



The 2013 Inclusive Church Lecture

Southwark Cathedral

June 20th 2013

On Being Together: The Possibility of Church

Martyn Percy

Ripon College, Cuddesdon,
Oxford



Inclusive Church Lecture

Southwark Cathedral

June 20th 2013

On Being Together: The Possibility of Church¹

Martyn Percy

Ripon College, Cuddesdon, Oxford

It would be obvious, I suppose, to say that the earthly life and ministry of Jesus – and his advocacy and augmentation of the Kingdom of God – is the measure against which we judge the church. Jesus' ministry confounded his contemporaries, and it continues to disturb our sense of boundaries. He reaches out to the Samaritan woman; and tells stories about good Samaritans, much to the annoyance of his potentially loyal Judean audience. He embraces the widow, the lame, the ostracised, the deprived and despised, and the neglected. He befriends the sinners and sinned against. He takes his tea with tax collectors. Jesus heals nobodies; the gospels, in nearly all cases, not able to name the afflicted individuals. The people Jesus reached out towards were excluded from the mainstream of society and faith. Jesus was no crowd-pleaser; he was, rather, their confounder. Jesus was a disturber of crowds. He did not seek their praise. He sought their commitment.

The kingdom that Jesus preached, however, was more than just a creature of his adult imagination and inspirational prophetic vision. His childhood, I think, had probably taught him a thing or two about people, society and God. He grew up in occupied territories, so had seen the good and bad side of that coin – oppression traded off against organisation. His childhood had included a sojourn in Egypt. And we know that by working in Joseph's trade – carpentry and building (Gk. *tekton*) – he had, by living in Nazareth, been exposed to the nearby Roman settlement of Sepphoris. This was a Hellenized community of almost 30,000 in Jesus' childhood, compared to the population of Nazareth, which boasted a mere 300. So Nazareth was a dormitory village supplying labour to a much larger cosmopolitan community nearby. It would have been full of Gentiles of every kind. So, from an early age, Jesus would have been exposed to a world beyond his native parochial Judaism.

The theatre at Sepphoris seated 5,000. It is almost certain that Joseph took Jesus. For Jesus, in his adult life, uses the Greek word 'hypocrite' quite a few times, which simply means 'actor' – one who is masked, and playing a part. What is significant about this, I think, is this. Jesus' Kingdom of God project, was, from the outset, supra-tribal. It reached out beyond Judaism to the Gentiles. Indeed, he often praised gentiles for their faith, and often scolded the apparently 'orthodox' religion of his kith and kin for its insularity and purity. Jesus saw that God was for everyone; he lived, practised and preached this.

We see this in the healing miracles that Jesus wrought – to a Canaanite girl, a Samaritan woman or a Roman centurion's servant. To lepers, the blind, the demon-possessed; Jesus touches the untouchable, hears the dumb, speaks to the deaf and sees the blind. His healings are highly partial, being overwhelmingly directed to the marginalised and ostracised. It is there in parables too, with Jesus constantly

teaching us about the least, the last and the lesser; God can't take his loving eyes off the people and situations we most easily neglect.

The ministry of Jesus is startling in its inclusivity. Consider, for example, the feedings of the 5,000 and the 4,000. It is customary, in a kind of lazy-liberal and rather reductive way, to suppose that the gospel writers simply got their maths muddled, and were a bit confused about a single event. But in actual fact, there may be good reasons to regard the two miracles as quite separate. The feeding of the 5,000 takes place on the western banks of the Sea of Galilee. The region was almost entirely Jewish, and the twelve baskets of leftovers symbolise the twelve tribes of Israel. What then, of the feeding of the 4,000, and the seven baskets of leftovers? The event occurs on the eastern shores of the Sea of Galilee, and the region was almost entirely Gentile in composition. The seven baskets of leftovers correspond to the seven Gentile regions of the time (i.e., Phoenicia, Samaria, Perea, Decapolis, Gaulanitis, Idumea and Philistia). Moreover, the baskets in the feeding of the 5,000 (*kophinos*) are smaller than those mentioned in the feeding of the 4,000 (*spuridi* – a basket big enough for a person, as with Paul in Acts 9: 25). The point here is that the new manna from heaven will be distributed evenly, across all lands. There is plenty for all. The gospel of Christ is, in other words, radically inclusive: Jew, Greek, Gentile, slave, free – all shall be welcome in the Kingdom of God.

To some extent, it is a pity that the term 'inclusive' today has become so bound up with a slightly tribal and 'liberal' identity. But perhaps this should not surprise us. For the word 'include' began its life with a fairly insular definition. Drawing from the Latin word *includere*, it means to 'to shut in, enclose or imprison' – just as 'exclude' meant to 'shut out'. But Jesus is not for either option. The defining character of the Kingdom of God Jesus inaugurated draws from a rather richer word: incorporate. That is to say, to put something into the body or substance of something else; from the Latin *incorporare*, it means to 'unite into one body'. The Kingdom of God, like the church, was to be one of hybridity. A lesson Jesus learnt in his childhood, and embodied in adulthood. God brings us all together. He's all done with working through a single tribe or race. The church that begins at Pentecost has been dress-rehearsed in Jesus' ministry: it will be multi-lingual, multi-cultural and multi-racial. It will be multiple. Yet we, though being many, are one body.

The worldwide Anglican Communion is, arguably, born of a hybridity and diversity that affirms the spirit of Jesus' Kingdom project. Yet today its rich diversity also means that it also contains a great many varieties of tensions. On the surface, some of the most manifest difficulties appear to be centred on issues such as sexuality, gender, the right use of the bible, and the appropriate interpretation of scripture. But on its own, as a thesis, this is clearly inadequate, as tensions have existed within Anglicanism from the outset. There has not been a single century in which Anglicanism has not wrestled with its identity; it is by nature a polity that draws on a

variety of competing theological traditions. Indeed, hybridity is an important key in understanding the wisdom of God – in Christ, his incarnate son – who chooses to work through miscibility rather than purity.

Jesus is for incorporation, and aware of the costs of that. Anglicans are born of hybridity and incorporation; in compromise – literally, to promise together – we find God. If this sounds an unlikely thesis, consider what the Jesuit scholar, Luis Bermejo, muses on his work *The Spirit of Life* (1989).² There are four stages of ecclesial life, he says: communication, conflict, consensus and communion. Issues in the Anglican Communion tend to get refracted through this four-fold process, as much as they do through scripture, tradition, reason and culture. This is how the Holy Spirit moves the church; it is not the case that only the last of these stages – communion – is the ‘spiritual’ stage. The Holy Spirit is also manifest in conflict.

To have conflict, you have to have meetings: this is where difficulty, disagreement and acrimony are primarily encountered. But lest this sound negative, we do well to remember that Christian history, generally, is a history of progression through tense meetings. The great councils of Nicea and Chalcedon, or the debates at Worms, the Reformations in Europe, right the way through to the First and Second Vatican Councils, and to Lambeth Conferences, are gatherings of differences and diversity. These are places where ideas clash, are discerned and distilled, before slowly forming into a rich harmony infused with tension and agreement. As any parish priest knows, it is no different in the local church. Christians work through differences to find common ground. *Lex Orandi, Lex Credendi, Lex Vivendi: As we Worship, So we Believe, So we Live.*

Tense meetings then, are rather uncomfortable vehicles to sit in; but those on the journey generally reach unity. But unity is not to be confused with uniformity. The first Lambeth Conference gathered because of disunity, not unity. In 1867, as now, a number of bishops refused to come. But it was not a disaster. Conflict is not a bad thing in itself; it can be creative and point to maturity in polity that is the envy of narrower ecclesiological frames of reference. Conflict can challenge commitment and breathe life into the connections that configure communion. Church is, after all, a long-term community composed out of committed relationships. It is not a short-term project or relationship that depends on agreement in the present; let alone an immediacy of rapport. In Communion – just like a good marriage – Anglicans work *through* conflict and difficulty; our faithfulness to God and one another sees to it that we find enrichment rather than weakness in our apparent tiffs and tantrums.

In focussing on the very idea of meetings – even difficult ones – we might be able to see more clearly something of the revolutionary character of the church. This lies in the radical nature of gathering, which in turn was rooted in the revolutionary character of a theology that believed in a God who called us to together to form a

new community. The ecclesiology flows from the theology. Exactly how is this? To make the point more sharply, we need to understand that long, long ago, there were essentially two kinds of god.³ The older and more primal gods are those that emerged out of communities, tribes and nations, and consecrated their habits and forms of association as virtuous and sacred. The gods of the pagan world were of this kind, and they tended to reside in shrines and other specific places, and unless visited or called upon, did little to alter the day-to-day world of their followers. These gods looked like humans, lived and loved like humans; and they could even be as fickle as humans.

The other kind of God does not live in a shrine. The second kind calls new communities into being. Every area of life is touched. God is infinite and beyond human thinking and emotions – indeed, beyond comprehension. The second kind of God is timeless and placeless, and there can be no image for such a deity, save perhaps, the one that the Gospel of John gives us: the word made flesh. This kind of God is indescribable. All the words and images that convey the mystery and overwhelming reality are inherently insufficient.

And there are two kinds of religions.⁴ The first is older, and shrine-based. In ancient Rome, followers of the gods were much more like a clientele than a membership of worshippers. Clients came to temples with specific issues. But they patronised the temples and shrines; they did not belong to them. Thus, an average Roman in AD30 might pay a visit to the temple of Zeus in the morning for one serious matter; and perhaps hoping for luck in love later on, might patronise the shrine of Aphrodite or Eros on their way home from work. The temples and shrines charged their clientele for prayers, feasts, services and rituals. And many of the temples and shrines received financial support from the state as well. The gods who dwelt therein were appealing precisely because they were quite human in their virtues, faults, passions and proclivities. And they supported the state – and the status quo.

The second kind of religion was more difficult to fathom. The religion of the monotheists made no sense to the modern world of the first century Romans. A God who seemed distant and difficult to comprehend was one problem. But the larger problem for the first century Romans was that monotheistic faiths tended to gather crowds, or congregations. The worshippers belonged to their God, and then to one another in worship and bonded fidelity. Moreover, to follow this one God necessarily meant that there was one kingdom – yet to be realized – that was greater than the state. To belong to a faith that had one omnipotent ruler or God was to align oneself with a spiritual and political outlook that potentially placed the congregation above and certainly at odds with the state. The catholic ideal was, therefore, first and foremost, a vision of faith that preceded the state, and would finally triumph over temporal authority. The earthly kingdoms of the present were mere interludes.

Partly for this reason, the Romans persecuted the Zoroastrians and the Magi, who intentionally gathered together for worship. They suppressed the Bacchanalians too, who also gathered as one. Isis inspired congregations too – and the Romans suppressed them as well. Just as the Romans also suppressed the Jews, and then the Christians – who also both formed congregations. There were good reasons for the Romans to be fearful of congregations. Every meeting was, potentially, a subversive political gathering; and coming together for worship could not fail to make a socio-political statement. To some extent, you can see the traces of this problem in modern China. The state is largely happy to support Daoism, Confucian and Buddhist temples – where attendance at shrine-based places of worship is mainly individual, not corporate. So churches, which gather people together, need a more watchful eye from the state.

There were other reasons to fear the new congregations rooted in monotheism. The old faiths dealt with the baser senses, and were rooted in civic ceremonies, private petitions and public feasts. The new faiths – of monotheism – touched the senses in quite different ways, and were rooted in liberation, joy and even ecstasy. There was talk of love for one another; and of a God who loved creation and humanity too. No Roman seriously believed that Jupiter loved them; their gods were fickle, and to be feared. But monotheists did think that God loved them – and although God was to be feared too, God was also a redeemer.

The new monotheistic faiths also stressed individualism and virtue. The gods of the state were to be set aside in favour of personal salvation. The monotheists believed that individuals could be saved; practices such as purification, prayer, baptism and other practices emphasized this. The new faiths also had scriptures – something the old faiths lacked. The emerging new faiths were, quite suddenly, written and therefore rational. They also became organized – not only with priests, deacons and overseers – but also as distinct bodies with memberships. Congregations came into existence. Romans were infrequent and irregular visitors to their temples and shrines. The new faiths gathered intentionally, purposefully and regularly: ‘when you gather...do this, in remembrance of me’. And this is partly what made them such a threat to the Romans. This is indeed partly why the church, like the synagogues, were persecuted; the simple act of gathering was of itself revolutionary.

But just how radical were these gatherings? If you could travel back in time to Paul’s Ephesus, you would notice, like any Mediterranean city of the day that it was buzzing with cultural and ethnic diversity – much like our cities today. But there were some crucial differences. It was difficult to keep order in such cities. Magistrates and other officers handed out justice, but a person who was not a citizen of that city could ask to be tried by their own people under their own laws. Paul, as a Roman citizen, was able to invoke the privilege. Cities, to be well-ordered, were governed

by assemblies. These were sometimes called *ekklesia* – an ancient commonplace secular word from which we derive the term ‘church’. And to help keep order in cities, ethnic groups who were non-citizens often lived in neighbourhoods or ghettos. Indeed, even in modern times, we find areas of a city – sometimes called ‘quarters’, such as a Latin Quarter, literally meaning places to stay – for the Spaniards, French, Chinese; and sometimes for groups that are marginalised (e.g., Jewish ghetto). In ancient times, the areas reserved in a city for non-citizens were known as *paroikia* – from which we get the English word ‘parish’. This is where the resident aliens lived; those who lived in the city, contributed to its welfare, but had no voting rights as such.

In the churches that Paul knew, the *ekklesia* was complex. People gathered – they assembled; in itself, unusual for a religion. In the first churches, we find Jews, Greeks and Romans; slave and free; male and female. All one in Christ. The slaves are marked with tattoos; the children run free; the men and women mix; origin and ethnicity no longer matter, for all are one in Jesus Christ. In this radical new ‘assembly’ of non-citizens, all are equal. Class, race, gender and age are all transcended. The ‘parish church’, then, is the inside place for the outsider. Or as William Temple once put it, the only club that exists for non-members. This is what it means to be one in Christ: built together to be the dwelling place of God; the *oikos* – ‘God’s household’. The body of Christ, indeed.

Churches rarely think about the origins of their identity in this radical way. They mostly go about their business assuming their values, and implicitly imbibing these from one generation to the next. In a way, this is a pity, as valuable practices are often left to chance: inchoate by nature, they simply persist implicitly. Churches rarely think, for example, about how and why they welcome the strangers and aliens in their midst – mostly very easily, and without fuss or further reflection. But welcome they do: not only giving to the stranger, but also receiving from them. This is not merely an observation about how Christians engage with others who are not kith and kin; it is also a remark about the oft-hidden dynamic of reception, gift and charity. So just how revolutionary is the church? Thomas Tweed observes that they:

(Religions)...are confluences of organic-cultural flows that intensify joy and confront suffering by drawing on human and supra-human (i.e., divine) forces to make homes and cross boundaries.⁵

I am rather drawn to this definition of religion, and by extension, of churches. Churches, at their best – and one presumes a passionate real faith in a real God as a basis – know that good religion, when it comes together and gathers intentionally, performs four important transformative tasks.

First, they intensify joy. They take the ordinary and make it extraordinary. They know how to celebrate lives, love and transitions. They bless what is good, and raise hope, thanks and expectation in prayer and praise. They lift an institution and individuals to a new plane of existence – one of the blessing and thankfulness for what is and can be. And they not only move, but also intensify. Just as a birth becomes even more in a baptism, so in mission and ministry does a ceremony become more with prayer and celebration. Second, suffering is confronted. Working with pain, bereavement, counselling and consolation will be familiar to all ministers and churches – providing the safe space and expertise that holds and slowly resolves the suffering that individuals and institutions carry inside them. Third, the making of homes is a profoundly analogical and literal reference to the function of faith. Making safe spaces of nourishment, well-being, maturity, diversity and individuation; our 'faith homes' are places both of open hospitality and security. Fourth, faith helps us to cross boundaries – to move forward and over the challenges of life to new places. It can be crossing deserts to find promised lands; or passing from darkness to light. Religion never keeps us in one place; even with our homes, it moves us. It is in gathering that we meet the One who is present in bread and wine as we sit at table; who is there in the breaking of the bread; who makes our hearts burn as the scriptures are read. Meeting together is where we encounter Jesus Christ more richly than we can on our own. We discover the life-saving truths for the world in the radical act of our gatherings.

The *Gospel of John* seems to suggest that one of the key words or ideas to help us understand the ministry of Jesus and the subsequent blueprint for the church is that of 'abiding'.⁶ The word is linked to another English word, 'abode'. God abides with us. Christ bids us to abide in him, and he will abide in use. He bids us to make our home with him, as he has made his home with us. Christ tells us that there are many rooms in his father's house. There are many places of gathering and meeting there. And central to the notion of an abode is the concept of abiding. To abide is to 'wait patiently with'. God has abided with us. He came to us in ordinary life, and he has sat with us, eaten with us, walked with us, and lived amongst us. That is why John ends his gospel with Jesus doing ordinary things. Breaking bread; or eating breakfast on the seashore. God continues to dwell with us. He was with us the beginning; and he is with us at the end. He will not leave us. And he wants his church to abide with the world – and especially to be with all those who have no-one to be with them. The friendless, the forlorn, the forgotten – God wills us to abide with them, and with each other. Deep, abiding fellowship is God's will for creation, not just well-organised congregations.

For some time now, I have held that one of the wrong-turns we have taken in mission and ministry is that we have assumed that the church is an organisation. That it can be managed, branded, and mobilised. Add the right three-word strap-line to a church or diocese and watch it fizz and buzz. 'Committed to Growth; 'Going for

Growth'; 'Empowered for Mission' – it's all there. But the church is not an organisation. And our clergy are not its salaried staff; and our bishops are not our CEO's. The church is not an organisation. It is, rather, an institution. It exists not to adapt, survive and succeed; but rather to be faithful, independent of its popularity. It may be called to martyrdom, not growth. Of course I do think churches should be organised. But I don't think they are organisations. True, our Unique Selling Point (USP) is indeed Jesus. But our Key Performance Indicators (KPI's), and drawn from the gospels, are rather mixed. It may be an abundant harvest; it may be martyrdom. It may be conversions; but it may also being hated by our friends and family for our faith. We are not, in other words, called to measure ourselves through metrics of popularity and growth. The only game in town is faithfulness. David Hare, in his play *The Power of Yes* (2009), has an imaginary conversation between a pro-organisation banker and someone in public service, who works in an institution. The character speaking puts it like this:

I come from the private sector myself but I do get tired of a certain private-sector (organisational) arrogance. When people say, 'Oh get some private-sector people into the schools, that'll sort them out.' Actually I doubt if there are many jobs in finance as hard as teaching a class of fourteen year old boys in a tough school. Because business is in some way quite simple, it has clearly defined aims. The aim is to make money. So you have a measure against which to judge all the subsidiary actions which add up to the overall result. Managing a hospital is rather more complex. Because it's very hard to know what your objective is. There's no money-metric to help make the choice between better cancer care or having a better A & E. It's a judgement call. And running a hospital is an endless series of judgement calls where the criteria and objectives are very far from clear. So don't tell me that's easier than making money.⁷

It is a pity that so much of our church-focussed mission is about getting people in; but the gospel is basically about getting people out: 'go!' is one of the last words Jesus says to us. We should focus our energies on finding our communities and loving them; not on hoping they might find us, and like us long enough to stay awhile. Our misplaced sense of priorities is the problem. We often assume that the two fundamental problems confronting humanity are death and well-being; or poverty and lack. In other words, we do all we can to avoid ourselves, our communities and our churches declining; and do all we can to encourage growth.

But I think the heart of the gospel tells us that the main problem might be something different: alienation. Or perhaps put more sharply and pastorally, loneliness.⁸ Our isolation from each other, and from God, is the fundamental problem. This is how R S Thomas puts it in his poem, 'The Word':

A Pen appeared, and the god said:
'write what it is to be
Man.' And my hand hovered
Long over the page,
until there, like footprints
of the lost traveller, letters
took shape on the page's
blankness, and I spelled out
the word 'lonely'. And my hand moved
to erase it; but the voices
of all those waiting at life's
window cried out loud: 'It is true.'⁹

And that is why God is Emmanuel – God is with us. He made us for company with each other, and for eternal company with him. God is with us in creation; in redemption, and finally, in heaven. God with us is how John's Prologue begins – the Word was with God; he was with us in the beginning. God is with us in Psalm 23; he is with us in light and dark, chaos and order; life and death. Jesus, in his hour of darkness, longed for the disciples to stay with him; but they fled. But the women stood by him at the cross. And in the resurrection, Jesus is again, with us – more powerfully and intensely than ever. God is with us.

And I guess that is the question for the possibility of the church. As God is with us, can we be with each other? As God bears us all, can we bear each other? Can we truly bear the price of the church, which is togetherness; not being alone? For the possibility of the church is locked up in forsaking isolation from one another. Because togetherness, for company, and so that we should not be alone, is for what we were created. So I want to suggest that at the heart of ministry there is a deep theological mandate. To be with one another, as God is with us; and for our church leaders not to be so much for this or that; but with us too. We don't want our bishops merely to manage decline; or to simply lead us into relative growth and prosperity. We want them to be with us, as a sign of God's total commitment to this since creation; and in redemption. He is Emmanuel; God with us.

The gospels tell us, so often, that we find Jesus, and therefore true ministry, in tough, tiring and trying places. Not necessarily at the place where we are at our freshest or best, or even most confident. But God often does meet us here. In the liminal places. A wonderful story is told of Studdert Kennedy – or Woodbine Willie, as he is sometimes known. He was a Ripon Hall alumnus, and understood that Christian ministry – like Christ's own ministry – was getting out into the world, and into those tough and demanding places that may require the ultimate sacrifice. In the trenches one day, Studdert-Kennedy heard of a small party of soldiers marooned in no-man's land, trying to save a colleague. He crawled out, under fire, to meet them. 'Who are

you?’ asked one startled soldier when Studdert-Kennedy eventually reached them. ‘The Church’, he replied. ‘What on earth are you doing *here*?’ asked the soldier. ‘My job’ replied Studdert-Kennedy.

Ultimately, the shape of God’s future kingdom, and of our own church, eludes us. And this is certainly true for Anglicanism – both locally, on the ground, as well as internationally, as a Communion. For all of our ecclesiology and organization, and no matter how much we might claim our churches or denominations to be born of God’s nature or derived from human nurture, we need to heed Paul’s injunction: ‘I decided to know nothing among you except Jesus Christ and him crucified’ (1 Corinthians 2: 2). This is more than a declaration of some historical fact. Paul understands the crucifixion of Christ in cosmic terms: it stretches from the present to the very end of time. And so the Christ whom we know in the church – the only one we can know – is the One who was crucified and raised. But even when raised, still bears the marks of crucifixion.

The first disciples were troubled by this. They expected to see Christ manifest in some form of triumphant glory. But it was not so. The Christ who is revealed on the cross is the same who is revealed in the resurrection. The fullness of the revelation lies in the continuity. And this means that the church bears scars, wounds, pain and suffering in its ongoing life. The church – as wounded, but raised – is the body of Christ. The glory of God, it seems, will be made manifest in our weak and powerless states, not just our strengths and gifts. We find God in differences and in conflict, as well as in consensus and communion. The glory of Anglicanism lies, ironically, partly in its dependency and its incompleteness, as well as in its reformed catholicity. It lies in its breadth and depth; a pale reflection, no less, of God’s omnipresence and all-encompassing love. The true exists by incorporation – a lesson Jesus learnt in childhood, and embodied in adulthood. So here is how one former skeptic, a journalist, writes about the Church of England:

Why do I love it? Let me count the ways...I love it because it is patient. It does not expect the world to change in an instant, or to be bludgeoned into belief, because it knows that certain things take centuries. I love it because it is kind. It is kind enough to welcome strangers, whatever their beliefs, and shake their hands, and offer them a coffee after church...I like the fact that it is not arrogant or rude. I like the fact that it does not insist on its own way, but is genuinely tolerant of other religious beliefs – and none. I like the fact that it does not rejoice in wrongdoing, but quietly presents an ethical framework of kindness. I like the fact that it believes in the values of the New Testament, and of St Paul's description of love, which I've just paraphrased, but also believes that it is more important to embody them than to quote them. I like the fact that it doesn't speak like a child, think like a child, or reason like a

child. I like the fact that it is mature enough to value faithful doubt. I like the fact that it is calm...¹⁰

This may all seem like an argument – as a genre of posters, coasters and other cultural ephemera currently proclaims – to ‘Keep Calm and Carry On’. And to some extent, that is indeed my counsel for Anglicanism. The Church will survive. It is God’s body. He will not neglect it. That is precisely why gathering matters so much for churches and denominations, even when we are not quite sure of our moorings any more, and perhaps even fear we may no longer belong together. Just ask the disciples, who when all seemed lost and hopeless, did not split up and go their separate ways. They still gathered together in an upper room, and waited for what must have seemed like an eternity. But wait together they did, for the promise of the Spirit to come upon them. And two other disciples, walking together one late afternoon, still in grief and shock at the loss of their messiah, and after a long hike up the road to Emmaus, invited a stranger who had strolled with them, to share in their simple supper. Anglicans know how that story ends. In breaking bread together, Jesus was truly present. And so, ‘the Lord be with you...’.

Endnotes

¹ Some earlier parts of this paper were initially explored in *Anglicanism: Confidence, Commitment and Communion* (Ashgate, 2013), *Thirty-Nine New Articles: An Anglican Landscape of Faith* (SCM-Canterbury, 2013), a lecture given at St. John’s College, Auckland, New Zealand, April 2013.

² Luis Bermejo SJ, *The Spirit of Life: The Holy Spirit in the Life of the Christian*, Chicago, Loyola Univ Press, 1989

³ Rodney Stark, *The Triumph of Christianity*, New York, Harper 2011, pp. 9-31.

⁴ Stark, 2011. pp. 20-31

⁵ Thomas Tweed, *Crossing and Dwelling*, Harvard, Harvard University Press, 2006, p.12.

⁶ Ben Quash, *Abiding*, London, Bloomsbury, 2013.

⁷ David Hare, *The Power of Yes*, London, Faber, 2009, p. 39.

⁸ I owe a profound debt to Sam Wells for these insights. See his OxCEPT paper from February 2013 on ‘what exactly is our problem, and what does God expect us to do about it?’, delivered at Ripon College, Cuddesdon.

⁹ R S Thomas *Laboratories of the Spirit*, London, Macmillan, 1975.

¹⁰ Christina Patterson, *The Independent*, July 29, 2009, p.28.

Martyn Percy is Principal of Ripon College, Cuddesdon, Oxford. He is a member of the Faculty of Theology at Oxford University, a Professor of Theological Education at King’s College London and Professorial Research Fellow at Heythrop College, University of London. He is also an Honorary Canon of Salisbury Cathedral. Martyn has served in a variety of public roles specialising in ethics and consumer affairs, including the Advertising Standards Authority, the Portman Group (the self-regulating body for the alcoholic drinks industry), the Direct Marketing Commission and the British Board of Film Classification. He writes on Christianity and contemporary culture, modern ecclesiology and practical theology. His recent books include *Clergy: The Origin of Species* (2006) and a trilogy on ecclesiology (Ashgate) *Engaging Contemporary Culture* (2005), *Shaping the Church* (2010) and *The Ecclesial Canopy* (2012). He was recently described in the journal *Theology* as the British Theologian who is ‘closest to being a missionary anthropologist’.