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I would like to thank Bishop Tom for his rich, inspiring, thought-provoking and hopeful paper. It is an honour to bring a response from an Orthodox perspective to a presentation by such a widely respected biblical scholar. He begins by saying that bridge-building between different Christian groups and churches has been one of his aims over the years. Today as well, now with the Orthodox Churches, he is building a bridge with Paul. As he notes at several points, for some Evangelical Christians what he and other Paul scholars have uncovered is new and controversial. But for the Orthodox there is a familiar ring in much of what he says. So my first response is that he is opening up an *old* bridge that hasn’t been used for some time and needs maintenance.

I am grateful that Bishop Tom sent me his paper well in advance, along with recommendations for additional reading, so I have had the better part of the summer to ruminate on his thinking. As I look over my notes on his draft there are “yesses” with exclamation points alongside his paragraphs. But in this brief response I will just look at some of the remarks that most jumped out and where Orthodox experience might shed further light or provide a slightly different view on Paul, mission and bridge-building.

Before getting into the response I also want to acknowledge how grateful I am to be back in Cambridge for this consultation. I owe a deep debt of gratitude to Tyndale House, and its then Warden, Dr Bruce Winter, who welcomed me in the mid-90’s when I was doing my PhD on St Paul while attached to the University of Thessaloniki and travelling periodically to Greece to work with my supervisor, Prof Petros Vassiliadis. Dr Winter became a second mentor to me, and Tyndale House became a friendly and uplifting scholarly home for three years. My friend Dr Bill Black is here from Kenya and we shared those days together in Tyndale House. I am also glad to see Fr Dragos Herescu, the Principal of the Institute for Orthodox Christian Studies, which by God’s grace I had a hand in founding 20 years ago with my wife Denise, Metropolitan Kallistos (Ware) of Diokleia, Fr Andrew Louth and many others. Selwyn College also holds a special place in my heart for one very specific feature. Monday through Friday, in good weather and bad, I would ride my bike the twenty minutes or so from North Cambridge to Tyndale house, past the gates of Selwyn College. The inscription from 1 Cor 16:13 above the main doors was a daily pep talk: στήκετε ἐν τῇ πίστει, ἀνδρίζεσθε, stand firm in the faith, be courageous.

Let me now respond to Bishop Tom’s paper in detail.

1. We begin the bridge-building with a shared love of Paul, and a desire to see him read and studied much more closely on the level of our congregations. St John Chrysostom expressed this well in 4th century Constantinople, at the start of his lengthy series of sermons on Romans. “*As I keep hearing the Epistles of the blessed Paul read, and that twice every week, and often three or four times, whenever we are celebrating the memorials of the holy martyrs, gladly do I enjoy the spiritual trumpet, and get roused and warmed with desire at recognizing the voice so dear to me, and seem to fancy him all but present to my sight, and behold him conversing with me. But I grieve and am pained, that all people do not know this man, as much as they ought to know him; but some are so far ignorant of him, as not even to know for certainty the number of his Epistles. And this comes not of incapacity, but of their not having the wish to be continually conversing with this blessed man. For it is not through any natural readiness and sharpness of wit that even I am acquainted with as much as I do know, if I do know anything, but owing to a continual cleaving to the man, and an earnest affection towards him.* (John Chrysostom, *Homilies on the Epistle to the Romans,* NPNF-1, Vol 11, 335.)[[1]](#footnote--1)

2. Bishop Tom underlines the importance of Christian unity to Paul, who was determined that followers of Christ should resist pumping-up their differences into church dividing issues. Unfortunately, we are not as far ahead on accepting each other, being together, praying together, or working together as one might have hoped by this stage of Christian history. Some seventy of us are here from Orthodox and Evangelical circles, but I think we are all aware that the Lausanne Orthodox Initiative is a rare space for such conversations and collaboration. In both the Orthodox and Evangelical worlds there are still deep prejudices that prevent this kind of initiative in most places. Indeed, we risk being labelled “ecumenists,” a dreaded epithet in both our circles. And yet it’s worthwhile remembering that the term Christian was once an epithet. It still is in many parts of the world.

3. Bishop Tom recognizes that we still have our differences but is pretty certain that we can at least read the Bible together. Yet even on that point we may need to take a step back and first listen-in on how we each read the Bible separately. There is a world of experience and assumptions that stand behind our simple act of reading the Bible, and I’m not convinced we are ready to read together with shared silent assumptions about *how* we are reading. But we can *be* together, be with each other as each worships and reads and expounds the scriptures and be mutually illumined in this way, uncovering and explaining our assumptions and experience. That said, Bishop Tom’s positive personal experience in Durham of inter-Christian Bible reading is hopeful, so perhaps I should be less cautious and join him in saying, “Let’s just start and see what happens.”

4. Bishop Tom’s lecture title is, “Learning from Paul Together: How New Insights into Paul’s Teaching can Help Move us Forward in Mission.” He focuses here on three key words: “mission,” “teaching” and “together.” But an Orthodox will also instinctively jump at the word “new.” Perhaps we too often equate “new” with another Orthodox taboo word, “innovation.” As Jesus said, “[No] one after drinking old wine desires new; for he says, ‘The old is good [or as some texts read, “the old is better.”] (Luke 5:38-39.) We Orthodox can be sympathetic to Paul’s Jewish opponents who were perfectly satisfied with their faith and way of life built around written and oral Torah. But this is precisely the point where we also need to be challenged and unsettled by what Bishop Tom calls the “shocking” newness of the Gospel, the early church and Paul (although Bishop Tom noted that this newness did not come from nowhere: it was in fulfilment of all that came before.) “Creating a new covenant family, bringing Jews and gentiles together in a single family, casting aside such basic identity markers as circumcision and kosher laws”—this was radical newness for a pious Jew. And this innovation—which is how they saw it—was the reason relatively few Jews accepted Paul’s gospel. Jewish faith, centered on the Torah and its communal memory of interpretation, was what devoted Jews had pledged to maintain, even in the face of persecution and suffering. The Maccabean martyrs were still a relatively fresh memory for Paul’s contemporaries, so how could a pious Jew contemplate turning his back on the Torah to follow the rabbinic renegade Paul? The entire project of mission to the Gentiles was *new,* and despite Paul’s biblically based arguments, this was seen as a dangerous challenge to Jewish tradition. And yet remarkably, Paul and the early Jewish Church accepted this sacrifice of what had been essential identity markers of Jewish tradition in order to bring Christ to the wider family of the God of Israel, “from whom every family in heaven and on earth is named” (Eph 4: 14.)

Once this radical newness of Christianity is appreciated, then we Orthodox can take a more balanced view of discerning the times and discerning the spirits as we respond to current conditions in new ways as well as old. This applies especially to conditions in the so-called diaspora, beyond the Orthodox homelands in the Middle-East and Europe. In fact, Paul’s first century churches have much more in common with our religious environment in North America than with the times and places where Orthodox churches are powerful national religious institutions closely aligned with the cultures and the states of Greece, Russia, Romania, Serbia and so forth. In these ethnic homelands of the national mother churches Orthodoxy is the dominant tradition known by all. Orthodoxy in those lands, with their ancient churches, holy sites, monasteries, thousands of clergy and hundreds of bishops represents the ancient, settled, completed patrimony of the Christian past which is to be delivered to the next generation as both a religious and national duty. This is totally unlike either the first century or the North American and western European scene today. Speaking about mission in North America Archbishop Anastasios of Albania, perhaps the leading Orthodox missiologist, has said we need to rethink what we’re doing.

In North America especially, the Orthodox witness is offered within a dynamic society with universal interests. In such a society Orthodoxy is in a state of mission—and she cannot, certainly, be content with a museum-like preservation of the glorious Orthodox past of far away homelands. Something substantially new and important ought to arise. [[2]](#footnote-0)

*Something substantially new and important ought to arise*. This is both a challenge and an episcopal blessing for the Orthodox, and we ought to take full advantage of it. Metropolitan Kallistos (Ware) of Diokleia, expressed this same kind of bold openness when he was interviewed at the Anglican Lambeth Conference in 2008. He remarked that when facing decisions on any new issue the Church must be attentive to keeping a balance between “catholic consensus” and “prophetic action.” If the Orthodox have stressed consensus in the past, he said, they must nevertheless also remain open to the possibility of Spirit-inspired change coming from the most unexpected places.

Will you ever have change unless some people are willing to stand up and say, this is what we ought to be doing? And even if their testimony is highly controversial, who will nonetheless stand by their position… Christ did not tell us that nothing should ever be done for the first time. The whole witness of the early Church points in a different direction. [[3]](#footnote-1)

5. Bishop Tom is correct that what he is presenting as Paul’s holistic and transformative vision of the new-creation may be controversial in some Protestant circles, but is familiar to the Orthodox. Fr Sergius Bulgakov, one of the most prolific Orthodox theologians of the 20th century, said that we Christians are put on earth not merely to be knowers of God, but to be transformers. No aspect of life in society was to be left untouched by Christ’s sacrificial love—through members of the Body of Christ. In this sense, as Bishop Tom says, the Church *is* Christ’s mission in this world. “God always purposed to work within creation through his image-bearers, so that saving people from sin and death was not simply for their own benefit but so that through renewed humans God would rescue creation itself.”The uniting of heaven and earth through the Church is a constant theme in Orthodox worship. The temple is seen as a microcosm of the new creation. Indeed, in the Russian tradition one hears regularly that the aim of mission is the “churching” of the world, *votserkovlenie,* although this is often reduced to a kind of ecclesiasticalization. I’ll say more about this later.

“God puts humans right so that they can then be part of his putting-right project for the world.” We share with Bishop Tom a high anthropology, a high view of the role of human beings in creation and in the outworking of salvation. This is reflected in our understanding of the pivotal role of Mary, the Mother of God, for God was powerless to effect salvation without her. Divine-human synergy is also what Paul is speaking about in Col 1:24, which perhaps sounds blasphemous to evangelical ears: “Now I rejoice in my sufferings for your sake, and in my flesh I complete what is lacking in Christ’s afflictions for the sake of his body, that is, the church.”

Practical application of this vision to transform society has not always been the Orthodox strong suit—often because of severe persecution or political constraints—but there is growing Orthodox involvement in practical action for the common good both in Orthodox homelands and around the world (Patriarch Bartholomew’s ecological activism and International Orthodox Christians Charities are two prime examples.) I think we can heartily agree with Bishop Tom that, “Fresh teaching in all these areas is urgently needed if we are to understand our shared mission as *both* the announcement of Jesus as the crucified and risen Lord, demanding the personal response of obedient faith, *and* the inauguration of new creation, with signs of healing and hope pointing forward to the eventual renewal of the whole cosmos.”

6. Bishop Tom emphasizes “Mission and Teaching go together.” I couldn’t agree more, but here too we face our own internal challenges. As Rod Dreher recently pointed out in *The Benedict Option,* Christians in general—and Orthodox are no exception—are losing touch with the historic Christian teaching and way of life, and replacing this rich inheritance with the pottage of “Moralistic Therapeutic Deism.”[[4]](#footnote-2)

1. A god exists who created and ordered the world and watches over human life on earth.
2. God wants people to be good, nice, and fair to each other, as taught in the Bible and by most world religions.
3. The central goal of life is to be happy and to feel good about oneself.
4. God does not need to be particularly involved in one's life except when God is needed to resolve a problem.
5. Good people go to heaven when they die.

A Catholic priest in New Jersey recently told me, “We are making consumers, not disciples.” To makes disciples, we urgently need liturgical preaching and biblical teaching inspired by the Fathers, saints and liturgy of the Church. We need to teach people how to read the Scriptures and build it into their daily routines. And all of this in the context of teaching people how to pray. Fr Thomas Hopko of blessed memory spoke of prayer as three commitments he learned from his mother at an early age: say your prayers, go to Church, remember God. Meaning: commitment to a daily rule of prayer, to participation in liturgical life and constant remembrance of God during the day (using the Jesus Prayer, for example.)

7. Bishop Tom underlines the centrality of holiness in Paul’s thinking, and how it is intertwined with unity. He says, “The world will take no notice of a divided church. The world will take no notice of an unholy church.” However, from an Orthodox perspective—and I would argue from Paul’s as well—the two are not of equal weight. The unity of the church is indeed “one of Paul’s overriding passions,” but he refuses to purchase that unity at any price. Paul has a very high tolerance for differences and sins within the Body of Christ, but we must not forget that he is willing to say “anathema” and exclude from communion those who seriously threaten the holiness of the church. This doesn’t mean splitting lightly “over every disagreement,” and Paul dismissed as insignificant whatever nuances were driving Corinthian factionalism in 1 Cor 1:12. But the case of blatant the public immorality in 1 Cor 5:1-13 was serious enough for Paul to expel the offender from communion, at least temporarily. Even more seriously, in Galatia the soul of the church was being threatened by a new imposition of Jewish law that cut the heart out of the universal Gospel: this had to be forcefully resisted and the perpetrators excluded.

**6**I am astonished that you are so quickly deserting him who called you in the grace of Christ and turning to a different gospel— **7**not that there is another gospel, but there are some who trouble you and want to pervert the gospel of Christ. **8**But even if we, or an angel from heaven, should preach to you a gospel contrary to that which we preached to you, let him be *anathema*. **9**As we have said before, so now I say again, If any one is preaching to you a gospel contrary to that which you received, let him be *anathema*. (Gal 1:6-9)

Paul emphatically repeats his anathema against the “circumcision party,” who threatened the truth, grace, freedom and universality of the Gospel message. It was not just that they threatened the unity of the new covenant family, they threatened the very heart of its message. This is why Paul was so disturbed by Peter’s cowardly dissembling. Paul desires unity *almost* more than anything else, but when truth and justice are at stake, there can be no compromise. Consider John Chrysostom’s commentary on Romans 12:18, “*If possible*, so far as it depends upon you, live peaceably with all.”

For there are cases in which it is not possible [to live peaceably with all], as, for instance, when we have to argue about the faith, or to contend for those who are wronged. … And his meaning is nearly as follows: Do your own part, and to none give occasion for war or fighting, neither to Jew nor gentile. But if you see he cause of faith suffering anywhere do not prize concord above truth, but make a noble stand even to death. And even then be not at war in your soul, be not averse in temper, but fight with the things only. For this is the meaning of “so far as it depends upon you, live peaceably with all.” But if the other will not be at peace, do not fill your soul with tempest, but in mind be friendly as I said before, without giving up the truth on any occasion.(*On Romans,* Hom XXII, NPNF-1, 508)

8. Appreciation for Paul’s Jewish background is one of the hallmarks of the New Perspective on Paul. However, we also have to admit that Paul’s interpretation of Jewish faith was alien to most Jews, from his time down to the present day. Nor was Paul’s love for Israel picked up by the later church. Speaking just for the Orthodox tradition there are only rare voices that rejected the anti-Jewish feeling that found its way into church tradition and vilified, ghettoized, suppressed and persecuted Jews. This is not from Paul. We could benefit from familiarizing ourselves with the Jewish roots that shaped not only Paul but our Lord Jesus Christ. Just as importantly today we could learn to value the living tradition of contemporary Judaism that has withstood so much suffering. A pioneering Orthodox voice in this regard was Fr Lev Gillet whose far-sighted book *Communion in the Messiah,* published in 1942 during the Holocaust, goes “beyond advocating Christian solidarity with persecuted Jews in Hitler’s Europe” and “sets out to identify points of convergence between Jewish and Christian theology, spirituality and religious practices.”[[5]](#footnote-3)

9. Bishop Tom asks the question, “[Who] is really a member of the family of Abraham, the family promised in the foundation covenant of Genesis 15 which Paul expounds in Romans 4 and Galatians 3?” This is probably the biggest question facing the Orthodox in relation to other Christians and other religions, because we have difficulty affirming kinship outside the boundaries of the Orthodox nuclear family. We aren’t alone in this temptation to exclusivism, but I can’t help thinking of C.S. Lewis’ *The Last Battle,* in which the dwarves refuse to find kinship or common cause with others. Their refrain is, “The dwarves are for the dwarves.” This is where I think we could learn especially from the self-emptying, kenotic Christ of St Paul’s letter to the Philippians.

Let each of you look not to your own interests, but to the interests of others.

Let the same mind be in you that wasin Christ Jesus, who, though he was in the form of God, did not regard equality with God as something to be exploited but emptied himself [ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν], taking the form of a slave…(Phi 2:4-7, NRSV)

Annually in Holy Week we are forcefully reminded of Christ’s self-emptying example, for instance this hymn from Holy Thursday:

Instructing Your disciples in the mystery, Lord,

You said to them:

“My beloved, see that no fear separates you from Me.

Though I suffer, it is for the sake of the world.

Let me not be a cause of scandal to you.

I came, not to be served, but to serve,

To give myself for the redemption of the world.

If you are my friends, then imitate Me.

Let the first among you be the last.

Let the master be like the servant.

Abide in Me and bear fruit, for I am the vine of life.”

*(Holy Thursday, Matins Aposticha)*

Christ’s self-emptying generosity became the pattern for Paul and the early church, which was revolutionized by inclusion of Gentile outsiders. But this new and generous ecclesiology was also the single greatest threat to the peace of the early church as traditionalists held on to a restrictive model. We see the results of that contest especially in Galatians.

The kenotic way of Christ points the Orthodox Church and the Church as a whole to an entirely new way of looking at others and to a new ecumenical method. Up to now the Orthodox have proceeded from the presupposition that ecumenical dialogue is successful when we Orthodox recognize in other churches the beauty, if only partial, of the Tradition we alone have retained in all its fullness. But Christ’s self-emptying for the sake of the broken, sinful, rebellious world turns this on its head.

Metropolitan John Zizioulas underlines this essential point, saying that Christ’s love—precisely as love of the ungodly and ugly—overturned the classic Greek formula of love for the good and beautiful. The more one is purified of “self-affirmation,” the more one will be willing to shed one’s glory and love what is debased and ugly, even as Christ did.

…[Freedom] from the self leads to a movement of finding one’s identity not through self-affirmation, but through the other. This makes mysticism agapetic or erotic but in a way that distinguishes it from the Platonic eros of antiquity, for in the latter case love is not free; it is bound by the law of attraction exercised by the beautiful and the good. One cannot love the ugly or the sinner for one cannot be attracted except by the Good. In the ascetic experience, based on kenotic Christology, one loves precisely what is debased and ugly and this means that one loves free from all rational or moral necessity or causality…The ascetic loves first of all and above all the sinner, not out of condescension and compassion but out of a free existential involvement in the fallen human condition.[[6]](#footnote-4)

“One loves precisely what is debased and ugly.” Perhaps this isn’t quite right. The Lord embraces the one who is ugly, weak and sinful not just because he embraces the fallen human condition, but because he sees past all of that to the beauty of the divine image that can never be eradicated. If the Orthodox have questions about the imperfection and “ugliness” of others, then this ought to be motivation not to stand apart, but to recognize that we are all the objects of Christ’s generous self-emptying forgiveness and mercy. Paul understood this better than anyone.

Commenting on Romans 8 St John Chrysostom says, “For full of affection is the whole race of the saints. Wherefore also St. Paul says, ‘Put on therefore, as the elect saints of God, bowels of mercy [σπλάγχνα οἰκτιρμοῦ], kindness, humbleness of mind’ (Col. iii. 12.) You see the strict propriety of the word, and how he would have us continually merciful. For he does not say, “show mercy” only, but put it on, that like as our garment is always with us, so may mercy be. And he does not say merely mercy, but ‘bowels of mercy,’ that we may imitate the natural affection of relations…Let us not then be bitter judges of others lest we also get a strict account demanded of us. For we have sins that are too great to plead any excuse. And therefore let us show more mercy towards those who have committed inexcusable sins, that we also may lay up for ourselves the like mercy beforehand.” (*On Roman,* 8:18ff).

10. The kenotic mercy of Philippians 2 might illumine our spiritual eyes to look out on the world (including other churches and faiths) as Paul did in Philippians 4:8.

**8**Finally, brethren, whatever is true, whatever is honorable, whatever is just, whatever is pure, whatever is lovely, whatever is gracious, if there is any excellence, if there is anything worthy of praise, think about these things.

Fr Alexander Schmemann said, “The Christian is the one who wherever he looks, everywhere sees Christ and rejoices in him.” Without tampering with our ecclesiological assumptions I don’t believe there is anything that prevents us from generously opening our eyes to recognize and bless whatever is good in the mission of our various churches, and collaborating. When the Institute for Orthodox Christian Studies was being founded in Cambridge as part of the Cambridge Theological Federation—a consortium of theological colleges representing Roman Catholic, Anglican, Reformed and Methodist traditions—at the first organizational meeting with representatives from Cambridge the late Fr Sergei Hackel said “it’s not about being less than Orthodox, but about being *generously* Orthodox.” That is the spirit—what we might call kenotic ecumenism—that that ought to inspire us here as well.

11. Bishop Tom concludes by opening up the possibilities for just such collaboration in mission: “[Why] should we not, together, engage in projects of generous and healing love and hope in the wider communities where we find ourselves?...Once we grasp the truth that our own justification by faith is part of God’s larger project to put the whole world right – then there should be nothing to stop us….” And this is where the challenge will be for us as Orthodox: seeing ourselves—and other Christians, even other people of faith and good will—“as *part* of God’s larger project to put the whole world right.” As I said earlier, we find it difficult to include others in the Church and in the family of God. But this is also where we need to keep coming back to Paul’s most basic Gospel message.

Time and again, throughout his letters, Paul brings his readers and listeners back to Christ as the new center of their lives, boldly using his own example as model. “I decided to know among you, except Jesus Christ and him crucified” (1 Cor 2:2.) “Be imitators of me, as I am of Christ” (1 Cor 11:1; cf 1 Cor 4:16, 1 Thes 1:6.). “It is no longer I who live but Christ who lives in me” (Gal 2:20). In other words, everything else is secondary.

Here I would like to conclude my response to Bishop Tom’s paper by citing Mother Maria Skobtsova, a 20th century Orthodox saint, because for her, as for St Paul, Christ is the center and everything else comes second. She was an unconventional Orthodox nun who had been married, divorced, had children, served the poor and protected Jews in Nazi-occupied Paris. She was also a poet, philosopher and colleague of Nicholas Berdyaev. She died in Ravensbruck concentration camp near the end of World War II and was canonized in 2004.

While other Orthodox theologians in the early decades of the 20th century spoke of “churching” the world, Mother Maria preferred to focus on Christ and to speak of “christifying” the world. She felt that an emphasis on “churching” all too often obscures the heart of commitment to the evangelical path of Christ.

What is most characteristic of this path? It is a desire to “Christify” all of life. To a certain degree this notion can be contrasted to that which is understood not only by the term “churching” but also the term “Christianization.” “Churching” is often taken to mean the placing of life within the framework of a certain rhythm of church piety, the subordination of one’s personal life experience to the schedule of the cycle of divine services, the incorporation of certain specific elements of “churchliness” into one’s way of life, even elements of the Church’s liturgical order [*ustav*.]. “Christianization,” however, is generally understood as nothing more than the correction of the bestial cruelty of man’s history through inoculation with a certain dose of Christian morality. And in addition to this it also includes the preaching of the Gospel to the whole world.

“Christification,” however, is based on the words, “It is no longer I who live, but Christ who lives in me” (Gal. 2:20). The image of God, the icon of Christ, which truly is my real and actual essence or being, is the only measure of all things, the only path or way which is given to me. Each movement of my soul, each approach to God, to other people, to the world, is determined by the suitability of that act for reflecting the image of God which is within me.

If I am faced with two paths and I am in doubt, then even if all human wisdom, experience, and tradition point to one of these, but I feel that Christ would have followed the other — then all my doubts should immediately disappear and I should choose to follow Christ in spite of all the experience, tradition and wisdom that are opposed to it.[[7]](#footnote-5)

May we all be given the faith and courage to follow this evangelical path.

1. Chrysostom goes on to say that in general the woeful state of Christianity arises from ignorance of the Scriptures. “*For from this it is that our countless evils have arisen—from ignorance of the Scriptures; from this it is that the plague of heresies has broken out; from this that there are negligent lives; from this labors without advantage. For as men deprived of daylight would not walk aright, so they that look not to the gleaming of the Holy Scriptures must needs be frequently and constantly sinning, in that they are walking in the worst darkness. And that this fall not out, let us hold our eyes open to the bright shining of* *the Apostle’s words; for this man’s tongue shone forth above the sun, and he abounded more than all the rest in the word of doctrine; for since he labored more* *abundantly than* *they, he also drew upon himself a large measure of the Spirit’s grace* (*On Romans,* 335.) [↑](#footnote-ref--1)
2. Archbishop Anastasios, *Mission in Christ’s Way,* Brookline, MA/Geneva: Holy Cross/ World Council of Churches: 2010, 266-67. [↑](#footnote-ref-0)
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