



REPORT OF THE TASK FORCE ON HOLINESS IN RELATIONSHIPS AND THE BLESSING OF SAME-SEX RELATIONSHIPS

Episcopal Diocese of San Diego

June 2009

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Section 1 – Holy Scripture.....	4
Why is Scripture Authoritative?	4
Differing Views of the Authority of Scripture.....	4
Different Ways to Interpret Scripture	5
Marriage & Holiness in Scripture	6
A Scriptural Argument for the Holiness of Traditional Marriage	6
A Scriptural Argument for Holiness in Same-sex Relationships	7
Scriptural Texts That May Condemn Same-Sex Relations.....	9
Genesis 19: 1-16, Jude 7: Sodom and Gomorrah.....	9
Leviticus 18:22-23, 18:26-30, 20:13: The Holiness Code.....	11
Deuteronomy 23:17, 1Kings 14:24, 15:12, 22:46: Condemnation of temple prostitutes	13
Mark 10:2-12, Matthew 19:3-12: Jesus’ teaching on divorce.....	14
Romans 1:18-32: The exchange of natural intercourse for unnatural intercourse	16
1 Corinthians 6:9-11: Wrongdoers will not inherit the kingdom of God	19
1 Timothy 1:8-11: The law is good if one uses it legitimately	20
Scriptures That May Portray Positive Roles of Gays and Lesbians.....	21
1 Samuel 18-20: David and Jonathan	22
Daniel 1:9: “God caused the [palace] master to look on Daniel with kindness and goodwill.”	23
Matthew 19:10-12: The role of eunuchs.....	23
Ruth 1:6-17: Where you go, I will go	25
Matthew 8:5-13, Luke 7:1-10: Jesus heals the centurion’s slave.....	26
Acts 8:38: Philip baptizes a eunuch	27
Love in Scripture.....	28
Can We Find in Scripture Potential for Holiness for Gay and Lesbian Relationships?	28
Conclusion	30
Section 2 - Church History and Tradition.....	31
The Church’s Teaching on Marriage.....	31
Reformed.....	31
Catholic.....	32
Biblical	32
Practical	33
The Decline and Defense of Marriage.....	33
The Changing Role of Lesbians and Gay Men in the Church	34
Changes in Secular Society and the Church	38
The Role of Blessings in the Episcopal Church	40
Implications of Church History and Tradition Related to Sexuality and Marriage.....	411

Section 3 – Practical, Pastoral, and Sacramental Theology 43

Practical Considerations 43

Pastoral Theology 46

Sacramental Theology 48

 What Is a Sacrament?..... 488

 The Purposes of Matrimony: Fidelity, Procreation, and Union..... 499

 What Does Canon Law Provide? 50

 What Is Meant By “Blessing?” 511

 Can There Be a Local Option? And What Would It Mean to Bless a Same-Sex
 Relationship in the Context of Worship? 511

Section 4 – Movement of the Holy Spirit544

Our National and Local Community 555

The Diocese of San Diego 566

Our Task Force..... 577

Summaries and Recommendations..... 60

Summaries 60

 Summary of a Traditional View 60

 Summary of an Alternate View 60

Recommendations..... 62

Bibliography 64

Other Useful Associations and Websites. 70

Appendix: A Guide for Dialogue 72

Endnotes 75

REPORT OF THE TASK FORCE ON HOLINESS IN RELATIONSHIPS AND BLESSINGS IN CHURCHES OF THIS DIOCESE

Introduction

The Task Force on Holiness in Relationships and Blessings in Churches of this Diocese was formed in 2008 by Resolution 08-09 of the 34th annual Diocesan Convention. That resolution provided the following charge:

Be It Resolved, that the Bishop of the Diocese of San Diego is urged to appoint a theologically diverse Task Force of clergy and lay people reflective of the Diocese, to study Holiness in Relationships and Blessings in Churches of this Diocese from the perspectives of holy scripture, church history and tradition; practical, pastoral and sacramental theology; and the movement of the Holy Spirit; and then prepare an academic paper on the subject to be presented to the 2009 Convention of the Diocese of San Diego, with additional recommendations as that Task Force might deem appropriate.

The Bishop, after consultation and solicitation of volunteers, named the Rev. Robert Nagy, St. Thomas of Canterbury, Temecula, and Suzanne Foucault, St. Peter's, Del Mar, to co-chair a group consisting of the following individuals: Barbara Andrade, St. James-by-the-Sea, La Jolla; Rev. George Calvert, Church of the Good Shepherd, Bonita; Rev. Brent Carey, St. David's, San Diego; Mike Carson, Church of St. Paul in the Desert, Palm Springs; Mike Collier, Holy Cross, Carlsbad; Bill Eadie, St. Paul's Cathedral, San Diego; Elisabeth Fidler, St. Mark's, San Diego; Frances Harrison, St. Dunstan's, San Diego; Rev. Tom Phillips, St. Dunstan's, San Diego; Jill Sanford, St. Paul's Cathedral, San Diego; Caryl Stanley, St. Paul's, Yuma; Rev. Canon Allisyn Thomas, St. Paul's Cathedral, San Diego; and Sandia Tuttle, St. Dunstan's, San Diego. Canon Howard Smith served as liaison between the task force and the Diocesan office.

The task force first convened in August 2008. Our work began by sharing parts of our faith stories, as we understood that this group is the first within the Diocese to

study issues related to its lesbian and gay members that included openly lesbian and gay individuals. We generated a set of topics that we thought would be important to discuss in relation to our task, and we began to gather and share information relating to these topics. We held a series of meetings where we worked in small groups on the suggested topics; at each meeting, the groups were deliberately scrambled so that there was a representation of clergy and laity in each group and so that each task force member could have an opportunity to work with each other task force member.

Clearly, our topic was a complex one. We soon realized we would not be able to report in time for the 2009 Diocesan Convention, as called for by the resolution. A new deadline of March 31, and later May 31, was requested of and granted by Bishop Mathes.

We have organized this report into the sections called for by the resolution. Each section was initially drafted by a small group of task force members and then reviewed by all members. Eventually, the entire task force held day-long meetings where we went through the report line-by-line to insure that we were being as clear as we intended. The following guidelines were adopted as we engaged in this careful review:

The goals of our report are as follows:

- Educate the diocese on different points of view
- Provide a study guide for similar conversations (*regional and/or parish based*)
- Maintain a balanced viewpoint/presentation of issues
- Give an even-handed voice and language for views
- Be descriptive, not prescriptive
- Ask and answer the question: Do we maintain the status quo or do we recommend change?
- Model how to discuss these issues
- Provide perspectives, not arguments
- NOT offer conclusions or advocacy related to the perspectives

- Encourage continued study
- Generate a useful document

Bill Eadie took charge of editing the final document; he was assisted by Mike Collier and Elisabeth Fidler. Barbara Andrade compiled and maintained the references that the task force consulted, and Sandia Tuttle assisted Barbara in compiling a bibliography of those sources.

We were charged with writing an academic paper for an audience that included our Bishop, the members of the Diocesan Convention, our diocesan clergy, and congregants in the various parishes of the Diocese of San Diego. We believe that our efforts have resulted in a document that is both authoritative and reflective of the diversity of viewpoints present in the task force. We also hope that this report will fulfill our goal of modeling how to discuss these issues by presenting a unified perspective where we agreed and clear arguments for our differing points where we disagreed. We present this report to the glory of God and to the continuation of the discernment process on these issues by the clergy and laity of the Episcopal Diocese of San Diego.

Section 1 – Holy Scripture

As Episcopalians, we generally agree on the function of Holy Scripture in our life as a Church, but we disagree sharply about the interpretation of Scripture. The discussion that follows presents those differences in opinion and point of view related to disagreements. Two scriptural views of marriage and partnership are presented, discussing alternative views on key scriptural texts that may prohibit same-sex relations, and of scriptural texts that may affirm same-sex relations.

Why is Scripture Authoritative?

There is general consensus on the authority of Scripture as “the revealed Word of God” as stated in the Lambeth Quadrilateral. The catechism of our Book of Common Prayer (BCP) asks, “Why do we call the Holy Scriptures the word of God? The answer is, “We call them the Word of God because God inspired their human authors and because God still speaks to us through the Bible.” Holy Scripture is the text through which God’s self and will is revealed to human beings. Because the church considers the Scripture to be the authoritative written revelation, it is read in worship services across cultures and down through the ages. Scripture is the authoritative written revelation because it is the primary witness, in all its diversity and complexity, to Jesus Christ. However, the ultimate authority of God on earth is Jesus Christ, the living Word of God incarnate.

Differing Views of the Authority of Scripture

While the church believes that Scripture is authoritative, there are different ways of understanding the authority of Scripture. Some may understand the authority of Scripture to be literal, believing that God has dictated every word of the Bible and that the Biblical text is infallible in all matters; however, most Christians see the Scripture as authoritative because God speaks in and through the words of the text. In this view, the text itself is not infallible, but the message of the text accurately reveals God’s self and will. There are also people of faith who reject the authority of Scripture as the revealed

word of God and see the Bible as merely a useful resource to guide their spiritual journey. This view of Scripture as merely a resource is not a view endorsed by the BCP and is, therefore, not part of the Episcopal Church's official teaching. The Episcopal Church believes Scripture to be nothing less than "the revealed word of God."

The church, while under the authority of Scripture in matters of faith and morality, is also given the task of interpreting Scripture with the guidance of the Holy Spirit. Scripture cannot be rejected or overridden by the church but must be interpreted by the church with the help of the Holy Spirit.

Different Ways to Interpret Scripture

There are several different approaches to Biblical interpretation. Most of these approaches take account of the fact that Scripture is both a human and a divine document. It is human insofar as the text originated in a particular cultural setting; it is also a divine document in that God is speaking in and through the text. Any method of interpretation, if it is a true one, must be able to discern revelation within the cultural setting.

Clearly, words and phrases of Scripture do not always mean what they literally say. For example, Jesus was metaphorically the "lamb of God," not literally a lamb. As noted in the Episcopal Church response to the Windsor Report, "From the beginning, Scripture was seen as complex and contested: two creation stories; two rival accounts of how Israel got its first king; ... the argument for exclusivism countered by traditions of inclusion in Isaiah 2 and Jonah. Scripture itself corrected and amended earlier versions of scripture in some cases; in other cases, rival arguments were allowed to stand side by side unresolved."¹

How scripture is interpreted even changes over time. Although many people may have held a belief or an interpretation in the past, that belief or interpretation is not necessarily the one in use. For example, for centuries, some used Scripture to justify slavery (ref. 1 Corinthians 7:26, "remain as you are", or "Slaves, obey your masters"), but the majority of people no longer hold that interpretation and now believe it to be a misuse of Scripture. "To limit it to what past generations have thought

of it, is to misunderstand the very nature of Scripture.”² The Word of God is alive and active (Hebrews 4:12). We must be open to new interpretations, yet at the same time there must be some consistency of interpretation as well, if our interpretation as a whole is to have integrity; the difficulty is agreeing on precisely what should remain consistent. Finally, we must keep in mind that not all of Scripture is intended as legal code. “Different scriptures function in ... different ways, according to context, genre,” and other factors.³

Marriage & Holiness in Scripture

A Scriptural Argument for the Holiness of Traditional Marriage

From Genesis 2:1 onwards, marriage is where holy sexual relationships traditionally happen. Other sexual behaviors, such as polygamy, adultery, and homosexual behavior, are described in the Bible, but are not prescribed as holy.⁴ Because a monogamous marriage between a man and a woman exists in the Garden of Eden, many maintain that this is the prescribed behavior for all sexual relationships, a part of the natural order of God’s creation. The institution of marriage exists prior to any legal arrangement, in the natural order established by God in creation. This is why Eve is referred to as Adam's wife in Genesis 2:25. Heterosexual fidelity in marriage is seen as holy; anything that violates or compromises this fidelity is seen as unholy: sexual relationships before marriage, extramarital relationships, polygamy, bestiality, or sexual relations between two people of the same gender.

In the Bible, it is impossible to be considered holy before God and violate in any way the natural order of marriage established in creation. However, the mere fact of being single does not violate the order of God’s creation; Jesus and some disciples were not married, yet holy before God. The Garden of Eden is a model of holiness in nature and in human behavior; it is free from sin, and the institution of marriage exists as part of this holy world. This is not to say that the individuals in a marriage are holy and free from sin. As George Carey, Archbishop of Canterbury, said in a 1997 address at Virginia

Theological Seminary, “I don’t find any justification from the Bible or the entire Christian tradition, for sexual activity outside of marriage.”⁵

In Genesis 1:27, “God created human beings in his own image; in the image of God he created them; male and female he created them.” In this first creation story, human sexuality, male and female, is good because it reflects the image of God. In Genesis 1:28, God says to Adam and Eve, “Be fruitful and increase; fill the earth.” To some, it is clear that in this story, procreation is an important part of sexuality, perhaps the most important part.

In the second creation story of Genesis 2:21-22, we read that male and female are made for each other, in that God created Eve out of Adam’s rib. A sexually undifferentiated human, Adam, is split into two sexually differentiated beings. Marriage is treated here as a reunion of two complementary sexual others, a re-construction of the sexual unity of the original Adam.⁶ Genesis 2:24 says, “That is why a man leaves his father and mother and attaches himself to his wife and the two become one.” In the Bible, this fact of the natural created order that men and women in their bodies are made for one another, is more important than any emotional feelings or sexual passions.

According to this view, two males or two females in a sexual union would not restore the created order of one-flesh-ness that is required in the second creation story. The heterosexual reality of our bodies as shown in our human anatomy reveals God’s plan for sexuality. The one-flesh idea refers to the human body as it exists in nature, but also includes the whole entity that the male and the female become together, not only bodily, but in emotional and other ways as well. The holiness of marriage entails the wholeness of the man and woman coming together as one flesh: holiness is related to wholeness.

A Scriptural Argument for Holiness in Same-sex Relationships

Scripture celebrates some relationships that do not fit traditional marriage. For example, though Genesis 2:25 refers to Eve as Adam’s wife, many traditionalists would not consider a relationship like theirs to be “married” today, since they did not have a

ceremony. David was considered holy before God, when he was single and when he was with Jonathan. In the Song of Songs, the Bible celebrates two young lovers who are most likely unmarried, since society disapproved of their love (Song of Songs 1:6, 5:7).⁷

In Genesis, the Bible simply uses a common example of a man and a woman and does not intend to prescribe any one form of sexual congress as being more appropriate or blessed. We cannot argue on the basis of an assumption of what was *not* said. For example, the Bible mentions dogs, not cats—does God not like cats?

Genesis emphasizes “the creation of human beings as a whole (‘let them have dominion’). The first human serves as a microcosm for all human beings.” So when Genesis 1:28 urges us to “be fruitful and multiply”, this commandment thus “belongs to the species as a whole, not to each individual.” Single, celibate, and childless persons—including Jesus—are not disobedient sinners, not unnatural or unholy.⁸

The argument of genital complementarity should not be used to exclude same-sex relationships. “Male and female” does not refer to an anatomical “fit”—Hebrew does not have specific words for genitalia. “When Adam sees Eve, he does not celebrate her otherness but her sameness....If achieving anatomical complementarity were the primary point, Adam would not really need Eve.”⁹ The emphasis here is on the fact that Adam and Eve are of the same flesh.¹⁰ In fact, Laban greets Jacob with Adam’s words: “Surely you are my bone and my flesh” (Genesis 29:14). So, it is reasonable to conclude that “one flesh” means kinship, not sex.

It can be argued that the second creation story focuses on companionship, not procreation, as the most important part of sexuality. If the statement “it is not good that the man be alone,” is true for people in general, then it is as true for homosexuals as for heterosexuals. If God’s intent in creation is to provide for companionship, that companionship must lead to commitment in order to be holy. To say that no same-gender relationship can be a marriage, because all same-gender erotic love must be “fornication” (*porneia*), is to take for granted something that has yet to be proven. Covenantal relationships can exist between two adults, whatever their gender. Many would argue that forcing a gay person into an opposite-gender marriage would be as

profane as forcing a heterosexual person into a same-gender marriage. It is an affront to each of the two people: first, it denies to the gay person the intimate companions/he needs and desires; second, it frustrates the reasonable expectations of the unwitting spouse.¹¹

Paul invites us to consider whether a person's ethical conduct exhibits the fruit of the spirit, or whether it more closely resembles the vices he calls "works of the flesh." The immorality, debauchery, and licentiousness that he condemns, bear no resemblance to the exclusively committed same-gender relationships that we must assess today. Gay and lesbian couples (and families) who are living lives of integrity deserve our support and blessing. By the grace of God, these couples are just as capable as heterosexual couples of modeling a desire and devotion worth consecration.¹²

Scriptural Texts That May Condemn Same-Sex Relations

"The word *homosexuality* is never used in Scripture. Nothing is said about homosexual *orientation* as understood through modern science, nor is anything said about a loving relationship of two same-sex persons who have covenanted to be life partners."¹³ Scripture uses terms that are more specific than "homosexuality" or "homosexuals." "In every case, Biblical prohibitions refer to one-sided and exploitative behavior, not nuptial love."¹⁴ In the Biblical world, for a man to be penetrated was an insult, a humiliation, an act of domination. It disqualified him from military service.

Genesis 19: 1-16, Jude 7: Sodom and Gomorrah

Genesis 19: 1-16

The Depravity of Sodom

The two angels came to Sodom in the evening, and Lot was sitting in the gateway of Sodom. When Lot saw them, he rose to meet them, and bowed down with his face to the ground. He said, "Please, my lords, turn aside to your servant's house and spend the night, and wash your feet; then you can rise early and go on your way." They said, "No; we will spend the night in the square." But he urged them strongly; so they turned aside to him and entered his house; and he made them a feast, and baked unleavened bread, and they ate. But before they lay down, the men of the city, the men

of Sodom, both young and old, all the people to the last man, surrounded the house; and they called to Lot, "Where are the men who came to you tonight? Bring them out to us, so that we may know them." Lot went out of the door to the men, shut the door after him, and said, "I beg you, my brothers, do not act so wickedly. Look, I have two daughters who have not known a man; let me bring them out to you, and do to them as you please; only do nothing to these men, for they have come under the shelter of my roof." But they replied, "Stand back!" And they said, "This fellow came here as an alien, and he would play the judge! Now we will deal worse with you than with them." Then they pressed hard against the man Lot, and came near the door to break it down. But the men inside reached out their hands and brought Lot into the house with them, and shut the door. And they struck with blindness the men who were at the door of the house, both small and great, so that they were unable to find the door.

Jude 7

Likewise, Sodom and Gomorrah and the surrounding cities, which, in the same manner as they, indulged in sexual immorality and pursued unnatural lust, serve as an example by undergoing a punishment of eternal fire.

An Argument That These Texts Condemn Same-Sex Relations

This story is about gang rape and inhospitality, but also about homosexual behavior. The men in the town want to rape two male angels. Jude 7, in recounting this passage, indicated that the actions involved were unnatural. The Sodom and Gomorrah story about homosexual gang rape certainly differs from modern, committed homosexual relationships. Rape can never be equated with a loving, monogamous relationship. But as Jude makes clear, part of the sin of Sodom and Gomorrah is that they indulged in "unnatural lusts." While the story is a warning against rape and inhospitality, it is also a warning against homosexual behavior. Homosexual behavior is an essential part of the story.

An Argument That These Texts Do Not Condemn Same-Sex Relations

The story of Sodom and Gomorrah is often portrayed as a warning against debauchery, primarily against sexuality between men. Some believe that these verses do not resemble a modern male-male relationship at all; nor do these verses concern

lesbian relationships. “Except for the lone voice of Jude 7, the rest of the Bible comments on the sin of Sodom and Gomorrah as the sin of greed.”¹⁵ Scholars even debate whether the Hebrew word, translated as “know,” is used here as a sexual euphemism; it serves as such a euphemism no more than 11 times out of 1000+ times “know” is used in the Old Testament.¹⁶ These verses are concerned with inhospitality to travelers (a violation of strong Middle Eastern social mores) and humiliation by violence; the use of the term “outcry” (18:20-1, 19:13) points to a general abuse of justice (male-male rape, not sex).¹⁷ In Matthew 10:14-15 and Luke 10:10-12, Jesus compares inhospitality to his disciples with Sodom and Gomorrah.

In fact, Ezekiel 16:48-9 speaks to the “guilt of ... Sodom: pride, gluttony” because Sodom “did not aid the poor and needy”. Isaiah 1:10-17, 3:9, Jeremiah 23:14; and Zephaniah 2:8-11 all refer to Sodom as featuring injustice, oppression, partiality, adultery, lies, evil. The term “Sodom” came to be used to refer to the time before Noah when people were indifferent to God. Wisdom 19:13 speaks of the sin of Sodom as “bitter hatred of strangers” and “making slaves of guests.”¹⁸ 2 Peter 2:4-6 mentions wicked Sodom, but without any sexual offence.

Leviticus 18:22-23, 18:26-30, 20:13: The Holiness Code

Leviticus 18:22-23

You shall not lie with a male as with a woman; it is an abomination. You shall not have sexual relations with any animal and defile yourself with it, nor shall any woman give herself to an animal to have sexual relations with it: it is perversion.

Leviticus 18:26-30

But you shall keep my statutes and my ordinances and commit none of these abominations, either the citizen or the alien who resides among you (for the inhabitants of the land, who were before you, committed all of these abominations, and the land became defiled); otherwise the land will vomit you out for defiling it, as it vomited out the nation that was before you. For whoever commits any of these abominations shall be cut off from their people. So keep my charge not to commit any of these abominations that were done before you, and not to defile yourselves by them: I am the Lord your God.

Leviticus 20:13

If a man lies with a male as with a woman, both of them have committed an abomination; they shall be put to death; their blood is upon them.

An Argument That These Texts Condemn Same-Sex Relations

As part of the holiness law of the Old Testament, Leviticus 18 deals with prohibitions against sexual behaviors outside of marriage. It includes a long list of sexual behaviors that are prohibited, rejecting incest, bestiality, homosexuality, and adultery. A key part of the chapter is verse 23, “nor may a woman submit herself to intercourse with an animal; that is a violation of nature.”¹⁹ In verse 22, we see that you must not lie with a man as with a woman, which is also a violation of nature. The holiness of sex has to conform to the natural order that God established in creation.

Some interpret this passage to be about unclean but not immoral sexual practices. While true, they may also be immoral practices. The word “abomination” refers to the violation of nature (a man lying with a man), not other cultural or religious taboos such as promiscuous sex or cult prostitution (see below). In no sense can the word abomination be construed as a positive endorsement of homosexuality.

An Argument That These Texts Do Not Condemn Same-Sex Relations

Some scholars write that the purpose of these passages is to set apart God’s chosen people (as circumcision does). Leviticus does *not* use the Hebrew word for *sin* to describe gay acts. Nor do the ancient Greek translations use the Greek word for sin (as is the case in other passages).

Homogenital acts identified a person with the Gentiles, who engaged in them; therefore, those acts were considered religious idolatry, a betrayal of the Jewish religion. This passage is not an ethical or moral argument, but a religious commentary. One contemporary parallel is that Catholics used to require no meat on Fridays year-round, not just during Lent — to violate this tradition was a mortal sin.²⁰ There is no sex act today that has the *religious* associations to which Leviticus objected.

Men are admonished here not to bring sexual dishonor to themselves or others. “To lie with” in Hebrew Scripture refers not to the *manner* of the act, but to the specific *context* of the act. It connotes a promiscuous, extramarital, heedless sexual liaison.²¹

“Abominable” meant “unclean” (see examples in Leviticus 20:25-6), not “intrinsically evil.” All violations of the Holiness Code are “abominations” (Leviticus 8:26-30), such as round haircuts, cattle inbreeding, harvesting fruit trees before the fifth year, wearing fabric blends, tattoos, and sex during menstruation; yet we consider that these no longer apply today. The Bible also refers to other activities or attitudes as abominations²² for which we, as a society, do not exclude or condemn people today.²³ In fact, eating ostrich (Leviticus 11:13-19) is today praised for its health benefits. As Johnson contended, “There are few laws that operate without reasonable exceptions.”²⁴

Lastly, Leviticus does not mention female-female relationships. “This silence about ... lesbianism is telling, underscoring the fact that the concern is with protecting male dignity, not protecting women or any particular marital ideal.”²⁵ If *all* same-sex activity was to be avoided, why prohibit only certain male-male acts?

Deuteronomy 23:17, 1 Kings 14:24, 15:12, 22:46: Condemnation of temple prostitutes

Deuteronomy 23:17

None of the daughters of Israel shall be a temple prostitute; none of the sons of Israel shall be a temple prostitute.

1 Kings 14:24

there were also male temple prostitutes in the land. They committed all the abominations of the nations that the Lord drove out before the people of Israel.

1 Kings 15:12

He put away the male temple prostitutes out of the land, and removed all the idols that his ancestors had made.

1 Kings 22:46

The remnant of the male temple prostitutes who were still in the land from the days of his father Asa, he exterminated.

Scholars believe there were gross errors in translating the term “sodomite” and that the New Revised Standard Version, quoted above, translates the passage more accurately. In these texts, the Jewish kings were trying to keep Israel holy by eliminating idolatry and temple prostitution. Temple prostitutes were not acceptable, no matter what their sexual orientation.

One type of temple prostitution was men who received sex from other men. Such practices exist in pagan cults. It is a very real possibility that these texts refer to homosexual prostitution.

Mark 10:2-12, Matthew 19:3-12: Jesus' teaching on divorce

Mark 10:2-12

Some Pharisees came, and to test him they asked, “Is it lawful for a man to divorce his wife?” He answered them, “What did Moses command you?” They said, “Moses allowed a man to write a certificate of dismissal and to divorce her.” But Jesus said to them, “Because of your hardness of heart he wrote this commandment for you. But from the beginning of creation, ‘God made them male and female.’ ‘For this reason a man shall leave his father and mother and be joined to his wife, and the two shall become one flesh.’ So they are no longer two, but one flesh. Therefore what God has joined together, let no one separate.”

Then in the house the disciples asked him again about this matter. He said to them, “Whoever divorces his wife and marries commits adultery against her; and if she divorces her husband and marries another, she commits adultery.”

Matthew 19:3-12

Some Pharisees came to him, and to test him they asked, “Is it lawful for a man to divorce his wife for any cause?” He answered, “Have you not read that the one who made them at the beginning ‘made them male and female,’ and said, ‘For this reason a man shall leave his father and mother and be joined to his wife, and the two shall become one flesh?’ So they are no longer two, but one flesh. Therefore what God has joined together, let no one separate.” They said to him, “Why then did Moses command us to give a certificate of dismissal and to divorce her?” He said to them, “It was because you were so hard-hearted that Moses allowed you to divorce your wives, but at the beginning it was not so. And I say to you, whoever divorces his wife, except for unchastity, and marries another commits adultery.”

His disciples said to him, "If such is the case of a man with his wife, it is better not to marry." But he said to them, "Not everyone can accept this teaching, but only those to whom it is given. For there are eunuchs who have been so from birth, and there are eunuchs who have been made eunuchs by others, and there are eunuchs who have made themselves eunuchs for the sake of the kingdom of heaven. Let anyone accept this who can."

An Argument That These Texts Condemn Same-Sex Relations

Both of these passages report on Jesus' teachings about the subject of divorce, and both contain similar content. Jesus is asked, "Is it lawful for a man to divorce his wife?" Jesus' answer, according to Mark, includes the important words in verse 6, "but in the beginning, at the creation, 'God made them male and female.'" With these words, Jesus re-affirms the creation account as the norm for sexual behavior. In verses 7 and 8 Jesus continues along this theme "that is why a man leaves his father and mother and is united with his wife, and the two become one flesh." Then Jesus says, "it follows they are no longer two individuals: they are one flesh. Therefore what God has joined together, man must not separate." In this teaching on divorce, Jesus is saying that all divorce is sinful because it breaks a union established by God in creation between a man and a woman and makes it clear that all divorce is against the will of God.

Some scholars note that this passage of Jesus' teachings has implications for other types of sexual behaviors as well. Here, Jesus is ruling out the practice of polygamy as an ethical option. These scholars believe that he is also ruling out the practice of homosexual behavior as an ethical option. Since Jesus is the ultimate standard of revelation in the Bible, and he declares the Genesis 2 creation story to be the norm for sexuality, then it must be normative for all sexual relationships.

The Matthew 19 version declares that "unchastity" is allowable grounds for divorce. Jesus sets a high standard for human sexual behavior in both of these passages, but it is also clear from the way he treated the woman caught in adultery that he dealt with people who violated this standard in a very loving and pastoral way. Many believe that we, in the church, do not have the authority to overturn the ethical

teachings of Jesus; it is our calling to implement these teachings in the loving and pastoral way that Jesus did.

An Argument That These Texts Do Not Condemn Same-Sex Relations

In Matthew 19:10-12, Jesus explains why not everyone *has to marry*. The verses create a strong argument against remarriage after divorce, but not necessarily an argument for complementarity of men and women. From this perspective, Jesus' purpose is not to affirm heterosexual marriage as the only approved sexual experience; he does not say that two people of the same sex cannot love each other. Jesus also states in Matthew 19:11 that celibacy "is a course that not everyone can accept, but only those for whom God has appointed it;" thus it is unreasonable to expect that all gay men and women have been given the gift of celibacy.

Romans 1:18-32: The exchange of natural intercourse for unnatural intercourse

Romans 1:18-32

The Guilt of Humankind

For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and wickedness of those who by their wickedness suppress the truth. For what can be known about God is plain to them, because God has shown it to them. Ever since the creation of the world his eternal power and divine nature, invisible though they are, have been understood and seen through the things he has made. So they are without excuse; for though they knew God, they did not honour him as God or give thanks to him, but they became futile in their thinking, and their senseless minds were darkened. Claiming to be wise, they became fools; and they exchanged the glory of the immortal God for images resembling a mortal human being or birds or four-footed animals or reptiles.

Therefore God gave them up in the lusts of their hearts to impurity, to the degrading of their bodies among themselves, because they exchanged the truth about God for a lie and worshipped and served the creature rather than the Creator, who is blessed for ever! Amen.

For this reason God gave them up to degrading passions. Their women exchanged natural intercourse for unnatural, and in the same way also the men, giving

up natural intercourse with women, were consumed with passion for one another. Men committed shameless acts with men and received in their own persons the due penalty for their error.

And since they did not see fit to acknowledge God, God gave them up to a debased mind and to things that should not be done. They were filled with every kind of wickedness, evil, covetousness, malice. Full of envy, murder, strife, deceit, craftiness, they are gossips, slanderers, God-haters, insolent, haughty, boastful, inventors of evil, rebellious towards parents, foolish, faithless, heartless, ruthless. They know God's decree, that those who practise such things deserve to die—yet they not only do them but even applaud others who practise them.

An Argument That This Text Condemns Same-Sex Relations

Paul is clear in this section of his letter to the church in Rome that he is talking about how God is known in creation. In verse 20, he says, “Ever since the creation of the world his eternal power and divine nature, invisible though they are, have been understood and seen through the things he has made.”²⁶ Man and woman are two of the things that God has made in creation, and God's will is made known in how man and woman complement each other. Paul is referring to Genesis 2 in this Romans passage, and what is natural is sexual intercourse between a man and a woman. What is unnatural is when this intercourse is exchanged for same-sex intercourse. Paul is not concerned here with heterosexuals engaged in homosexual activity as going against their sexual nature; he is concerned that any homosexual behavior is contrary to the created order established by God. The word “nature”, used by Paul is *physis*, - the natural order of things - and when Paul says that sexual relations are unnatural, the word “unnatural” is *para physin* - against the natural order.²⁷

An Argument That This Text Does Not Condemn Same-Sex Relations

In the original Greek, and the world of Paul, this passage does not strongly or obviously condemn same-sex acts as it is often made out to be. Paul uses “degrading passions” and “shameless acts” in this text; both refer to social disapproval, but neither has an ethical connotation. Paul did *not* use the words for “ethically wrong” here. Words for “ungodliness and wickedness” do occur in Romans 1: 18, 29-31, but there is

no mention of sex acts. Does verse 28 speak at all to two gay men or lesbians who *do* acknowledge God?²⁸

Paul does not use the word “nature” as we use “nature,” in the abstract; he means something specific, such as “consistent with the kind of person one is,” or “what is characteristic to a situation.” Nor does “natural” mean “created.” In fact, in 1 Corinthians 11, Paul invites readers to “discern for yourselves” what is natural or unnatural. The Greek *paraphysiken* should not be translated as “unnatural”, but as paranormal, extraordinary, or metaphysical (*beside, more than, beyond, the ordinary*). Therefore, “unnatural” relations equals engaging in practices other than the usual ones. Roman aristocracy was, in practice, often bisexual and appallingly promiscuous. Paul’s statement “is so sweeping” that he cannot be “directing his comments to a small minority” (gays), but is condemning “the whole Gentile world”, calling them idolaters and sexual deviants.²⁹

Still, “unnatural” does not imply ethical condemnation. Even God acts “unnaturally” (Romans 11:24) when grafting a wild tree onto a cultivated tree. “Unnatural intercourse” did not mean to Paul only what it means today: it meant *variant* sexual practices, including a number of heterosexual practices and positions, sex during menstruation, and sex between a woman and an uncircumcised man.³⁰

It may be that Paul is referring to heterosexuals who perform homosexual acts, “against their nature.” The Greek word often translated as “intercourse” actually means “use, usage.”³¹ “Intercourse” in English implies reciprocity—a mutual, peer relationship—but in the Greek it does not. Paul is not discussing an equal relationship, but hedonistic sexual practices of pagan peoples who do not acknowledge God; male-male sex may have been considered the most extreme form of heterosexual lust.³²

Likewise, Paul may also be referring to “inordinate desire of females within marriage.”³³ There is no need to read lesbianism into Romans 1: 26-7; the verses are parallel only in that both men and women could be involved in something “beyond the ordinary.” If Romans 1:26 refers to lesbianism,³⁴ further explanation is needed because lesbianism was not a major topic of discussion in the Greco-Roman world. It is

mentioned nowhere else in the Bible, with only a handful of references to it in *all* existing ancient texts. Why would Paul have made an issue of lesbianism here? If it is important, why is it never mentioned again?³⁵

Paul wrote Romans to appeal to both Jewish and Gentile Christians, while keeping them in harmony. He starts by condemning the Gentiles; then he takes to task the Jewish Christians (Romans 2:17), followed by the Gentile Christians. He did not want false issues to divide them (Romans 14:14). Paul used homogeneity to make his point that Jewish law is irrelevant in Christ because in the 1st century A.D., it was a safe topic. He couldn't talk about clean and unclean foods because debates over foods and circumcision were still splitting Christian communities. "The point of the list seems to be that all of humanity, having engaged in one or more of these sins, is radically dependent on the grace of God."³⁶

It might be concluded that Paul is not addressing healthy, committed same-sex relationships here. The burden of proof rests on those claiming that Romans 1:26 refers to lesbian sex *and* is an *ethical* condemnation of it. What sense would the case against homosexuality make if only male, not female, activity is condemned?

1 Corinthians 6:9-11: Wrongdoers will not inherit the kingdom of God

Do you not know that wrongdoers will not inherit the kingdom of God? Do not be deceived! Fornicators, idolaters, adulterers, male prostitutes, sodomites, thieves, the greedy, drunkards, revilers, robbers—none of these will inherit the kingdom of God. And this is what some of you used to be. But you were washed, you were sanctified, you were justified in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ and in the Spirit of our God.

An Argument That This Text Condemns Same-Sex Relations

Paul lists a number of sins that will prevent a person from inheriting God's kingdom. Among these are the sexual sins of fornicators (all who have sex outside of marriage), adulterers, the *malakoi* (a Greek word for soft men who play the sexual role of women) and *arsenokoitai* (the Greek word for the penetrating man in this relationship). The *malakoi* need not necessarily be male prostitutes as is sometimes translated into English, nor need they necessarily be boys. If Paul had been primarily

concerned with prostitution or pederasty as some commentators have suggested, he could have used words to describe these relationships. In this viewpoint, it is clear that Paul sees homosexual activity as well as other types of sexual activity outside of marriage as being incompatible with God's kingdom.³⁷

An Argument That This Text Does Not Condemn Same-Sex Relations

These verses refer to male prostitutes (not slaves), as those taking the passive role, and their male customers taking the active role in sex. "Neither the sexually immoral (*pornoi*), nor idolaters, nor adulterers (*moichoi*), nor soft men (*malakoi*), nor males who lie with males (*arsenokoitai*) will inherit the kingdom of God."³⁸ Until the Reformation (or the 20th century, for Catholic Bibles), *malakoi* was translated as "masturbators" (or, as one author³⁹ has noted, "...as prejudices changed, so have translations"). "Soft" could refer to "loose," wanton, lewd, unrestrained heterosexuals; the Greek word cannot be applied to women. Since Paul says "this is what some of you used to be", some think that Paul refers to *heterosexuals* who engaged in homosexual acts. The terms probably condemn pederasty ("Greek love"—exploitative, abusive male sex between a Roman superior and a male subordinate) and lust.⁴⁰

1 Timothy 1:8-11: The law is good if one uses it legitimately

Now we know that the law is good, if one uses it legitimately. This means understanding that the law is laid down not for the innocent but for the lawless and disobedient, for the godless and sinful, for the unholy and profane, for those who kill their father or mother, for murderers, fornicators, sodomites, slave-traders, liars, perjurers, and whatever else is contrary to the sound teaching that conforms to the glorious gospel of the blessed God, which he entrusted to me.

An Argument That This Text Condemns Same-Sex Relations

Paul has another list of behaviors that are contrary to God's moral law in the Gospel. This list in verse 10 includes the sexual sins of fornication and homosexual intercourse. The Greek word again is *arsenokotai*, a male sexual penetrator of another male. The fornication and the homosexual behavior of this passage are wrong because they are outside the marital union established by God in creation.

An Argument That This Text Does Not Condemn Same-Sex Relations

These verses refer to male sexual slave trade, “an especially pernicious feature of Roman life.”⁴¹ “for murders, fornicators (*pornoi*), sodomites (*arsenokoitai*), slave traders (*andrapodistai*), liars, perjurers....” *Andrapodistai* has been translated as kidnappers, slave traders, or procurers—“men who sell boys or girls into slavery at brothels.”⁴² Some scholars believe the three terms refer to: (1) male prostitutes or sex slaves, (2) men who buy them, and (3) slave dealers who procure them. Together, these three categories are persons who break the commandment against adultery; this passage does not refer to committed same-sex relationships.⁴³ Again, it may be concluded that the Greek words do not refer to women; therefore, they do not condemn lesbianism.

Scriptures That May Portray Positive Roles of Gays and Lesbians

One view is that there are no positive roles in scripture for any sexual relationship outside of heterosexual marriage, so there are no positive role models for homosexual behavior in scripture. Contrary to this view, however, others do see positive examples in scripture of non-conforming sexuality, including homosexuality.

For decades, gay and lesbian Christians have seen themselves in the story of David and Jonathan, or in Ruth’s interactions with Naomi. Some have asked whether any of these heroes were gay, and received a resounding “no” for an answer. Yet in the past 15 years, some scholars have indeed published evidence supporting one homosexual interpretation or another for a few scripture passages.

Granted, scripture never says that any person is homosexual, whether in a positive or a negative light. Nor does scripture state that David and Jonathan were lovers, or that Ruth’s love for Naomi was erotic. Nevertheless, these passages resonate deeply with Christian gays and lesbians, who identify with these characters in scripture.

If David and Jonathan were lovers, how would we expect scripture to discuss their relationship? Given the time and place that these passages were written, it is unlikely that scripture would tell their story any more explicitly.

Likewise, it is unlikely that scripture would describe a physical relationship between two women, even if it existed. There are only a few places in all of scripture where a conversation between two women is even recorded—what women did in the absence of men was irrelevant, unless it directly affected a man’s interest.⁴⁴

Under Old Testament law as interpreted by many scholars, anyone with nonconforming sexuality was excluded from God’s plan or God’s temple; this included homosexuals (cf. Leviticus discussion on pp. 11-13, above) and men with damaged reproductive organs (Deut 23:1), which would include most, if not all, eunuchs. Yet there are also instances later in scripture where eunuchs are portrayed in a positive light, and even offered salvation. There is some debate regarding several aspects of eunuchs in the ancient world: eunuchs may or may not have been homosexual; eunuchs may not have been castrated; and at least some castrated men have been capable of intercourse, though not of ejaculation; modern studies find that one-third of castrated men could engage in intercourse.⁴⁵ Thus, scripture mentioning eunuchs may have bearing on the inclusion in the church of gay men as well as lesbians and other persons whose sexuality is outside the heterosexual norm.

1 Samuel 18-20: David and Jonathan

David and Jonathan were “more than” brothers. 1 Samuel 20:30 seems to use code words for a sexual relationship: “you have chosen the son of Jesse to your own shame and to the shame of your mother’s nakedness”; ‘the words “shame” and “nakedness” are common biblical ways of talking about sex.⁴⁶ “The soul of Jonathan was bound to the soul of David, and Jonathan loved him as his own soul. Jonathan made a covenant with David, because he loved him as his own soul. Jonathan stripped himself of the robe that he was wearing, and gave it to David, and his armor, and even his sword and his bow and his belt” (1 Samuel 18:1-4). The relationship fits the then-common model of military lovers (Sumeria, Sparta, mid-East); this type of relationship was so common that it would not have to be noted explicitly. However, years later, David and Jonathan married women according to Jewish rule, to increase Jewish population and provide heirs. When Jonathan died, David wept, saying, “I grieve for

you, Jonathan my brother; you were most dear to me; your love for me was wonderful, surpassing the love of women.”

Some scholars would go further, and say that Saul was a jealous lover of David, not merely a rival for power.⁴⁷ (1 Sam. 16:21ff)

Later in life, David did lust after and pursue Bathsheba, but that might be a case for David being bisexual, not a case for him being exclusively heterosexual.

A Response

David’s close relationship with King Saul’s son Jonathan was forged on the battlefield when the real dangers of being killed can cause men to bond in a powerful way. The bonding of two souls in these circumstances does not imply any bodily bonding or romantic attraction.

When David receives word of Jonathan’s death in battle, he looks back over Jonathan’s life and says of his friend “your love for me was wonderful, surpassing the love of women.” David is referring to Jonathan’s courageous acts of love in war and friendship, not to a sexual relationship.

But the most compelling evidence against David being involved in a homosexual relationship is that we know his sexual orientation. In 2 Samuel 11-12, David’s lusting after Bathsheba, his plotting to get her and his adultery with her all shows a man of a strong heterosexual orientation.

Daniel 1:9: “God caused the [palace] master to look on Daniel with kindness and goodwill.”

Some translate this passage as “with devoted love”. There is serious speculation that the court servants or “eunuchs” of the ancient Middle East were homosexual men, not necessarily castrated—and that Daniel’s career at court was partly advanced by a sexual liaison with the palace master.⁴⁸

Matthew 19:10-12: The role of eunuchs

His disciples said to him, “If such is the case of a man with his wife, it is better not to marry.” But he said to them, “Not everyone can accept this teaching, but only

those to whom it is given. For there are eunuchs who have been so from birth, and there are eunuchs who have been made eunuchs by others, and there are eunuchs who have made themselves eunuchs for the sake of the kingdom of heaven. Let anyone accept this who can.”

Jesus includes people who differ from the sexual norm in the kingdom of heaven. This passage represents a radical departure from Deut. 23:1, “no man whose testicles have been crushed or whose organ has been cut off may become a member of the assembly of the Lord.”

The most common version of eunuchs in the Roman world were those “who have been made eunuchs by others”—who had been castrated and turned into servants and sex slaves. Isaiah 39:7 makes a promise to Israelites who have been carried off and made eunuchs by foreign captors—they will have a heritage greater than the children they’re unable to sire. Isaiah 56:4-5 promises that if they hold fast to the covenant, they will be given a name whose lineage will never be cut off.⁴⁹

A Response

In his series of lectures titled, *The World of Byzantium*, Dr. Kenneth W. Harl of Tulane University observed that the eunuch was a valuable asset to monarchies and empires and served in many positions with great responsibilities. The reason for this was that one could not trust the safety of such an exalted figure as one’s king, pharaoh, or Caesar with mere mortals. Eunuchs were usually captured slaves, separated from family and cultural ties. They were well treated and richly rewarded, but also were safe because they could never rule. Hence, they would not be a threat to the reigning monarch.

Hart stated that the Moslems, when they overran the Eastern Empire, did not know what to do with eunuchs at first, and only later decided to use them to guard their harems the way they had previously guarded their rulers.⁵⁰

The Hebrew and Greek words for eunuch are from the word, “to emasculate.”⁵¹ Almost always, the word “eunuch” refers to a castrated male, a chamberlain for women’s quarters in the royal household. However, there were some married eunuchs

(Gen 39:1), but Potiphar may not be literally a eunuch, as the word may indicate his office only.

In the New Testament, the term eunuch can also be used in a metaphysical and not a physical sense, to be a eunuch for Christ's sake (Matthew 19:12). These metaphysical eunuchs voluntarily give up using their reproductive powers to better serve the kingdom.

So, the word eunuch can refer to a castrated male, an office, or voluntary celibacy for spiritual purposes. Eunuchs were outcasts from the Jewish community. It is clear that Jesus wanted to reach out to these outcasts, but it is also clear that in doing so he was not endorsing sexual intercourse outside of marriage.

Ruth 1:6-17: Where you go, I will go

Then she started to return with her daughters-in-law from the country of Moab, for she had heard in the country of Moab that the Lord had had consideration for his people and given them food. So she set out from the place where she had been living, she and her two daughters-in-law, and they went on their way to go back to the land of Judah. But Naomi said to her two daughters-in-law, "Go back each of you to your mother's house. May the Lord deal kindly with you, as you have dealt with the dead and with me. The Lord grant that you may find security, each of you in the house of your husband." Then she kissed them, and they wept aloud. They said to her, "No, we will return with you to your people." But Naomi said, "Turn back, my daughters, why will you go with me? Do I still have sons in my womb that they may become your husbands? Turn back, my daughters, go your way, for I am too old to have a husband. Even if I thought there was hope for me, even if I should have a husband tonight and bear sons, would you then wait until they were grown? Would you then refrain from marrying? No, my daughters, it has been far more bitter for me than for you, because the hand of the Lord has turned against me." Then they wept aloud again. Orpah kissed her mother-in-law, but Ruth clung to her.

So she said, "See, your sister-in-law has gone back to her people and to her gods; return after your sister-in-law." But Ruth said,
 "Do not press me to leave you
 or to turn back from following you!
 Where you go, I will go;

where you lodge, I will lodge;
 your people shall be my people,
 and your God my God.
 Where you die, I will die—
 there will I be buried.
 May the Lord do thus and so to me,
 and more as well,
 if even death parts me from you!”

This passage is often read during marriage services, yet applies to two women who have a covenantal relationship. This passage uses the language of Genesis 2:24: Ruth refuses to “leave” Naomi and insists on “cleaving” to her.⁵² Some scholars think theirs is a lesbian relationship.⁵³ However, this relationship does not seem to refer to lesbianism, since Ruth eventually marries a man. Yet the man takes care of both women, so Naomi is saved through her covenant with Ruth.

A Response

In the Middle East, people can show nonsexual love for each other by kissing. The ancient church had the kiss of peace, which is the basis for “passing the peace” in church today.

In this story, the kissing is not sexual, the relationship is not romantic, and the covenant is one of loyalty, not sexual love. Making a covenant with a person does not necessarily imply having a sexual relationship.

Matthew 8:5-13, Luke 7:1-10: Jesus heals the centurion’s slave

Matthew 8:5-13

Jesus Heals a Centurion’s Servant

When he entered Capernaum, a centurion came to him, appealing to him and saying, “Lord, my servant is lying at home paralysed, in terrible distress.” And he said to him, “I will come and cure him.” The centurion answered, “Lord, I am not worthy to have you come under my roof; but only speak the word, and my servant will be healed. For I also am a man under authority, with soldiers under me; and I say to one, ‘Go’, and he goes, and to another, ‘Come’, and he comes, and to my slave, ‘Do this’, and the slave does it.” When Jesus heard him, he was amazed and said to those who followed him,

“Truly I tell you, in no one in Israel have I found such faith. I tell you, many will come from east and west and will eat with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven, while the heirs of the kingdom will be thrown into the outer darkness, where there will be weeping and gnashing of teeth.” And to the centurion Jesus said, “Go; let it be done for you according to your faith.” And the servant was healed in that hour.

Luke 7:1-10

Jesus Heals a Centurion’s Servant

After Jesus had finished all his sayings in the hearing of the people, he entered Capernaum. A centurion there had a slave whom he valued highly, and who was ill and close to death. When he heard about Jesus, he sent some Jewish elders to him, asking him to come and heal his slave. When they came to Jesus, they appealed to him earnestly, saying, “He is worthy of having you do this for him, for he loves our people, and it is he who built our synagogue for us.” And Jesus went with them, but when he was not far from the house, the centurion sent friends to say to him, “Lord, do not trouble yourself, for I am not worthy to have you come under my roof; therefore I did not presume to come to you. But only speak the word, and let my servant be healed. For I also am a man set under authority, with soldiers under me; and I say to one, ‘Go’, and he goes, and to another, ‘Come’, and he comes, and to my slave, ‘Do this’, and the slave does it.” When Jesus heard this he was amazed at him, and turning to the crowd that followed him, he said, “I tell you, not even in Israel have I found such faith.” When those who had been sent returned to the house, they found the slave in good health.

It is very likely that the centurion was so concerned about this slave, at least in part, because they had a sexual relationship. One of the functions a slave would perform for a Roman soldier was sexual gratification;⁵⁴ the word “slave” was synonymous with being a sexual object. The Greek *pais* is the root of “pederasty”, which was *not* necessarily sex with a minor. Astonishingly, Jesus does not rebuke the centurion, either for having a slave or for how he treats the slave.⁵⁵

Acts 8:38: Philip baptizes a eunuch

He commanded the chariot to stop, and both of them, Philip and the eunuch, went down into the water, and Philip baptized him.

Philip baptizes the Ethiopian eunuch, even though under the law, “his nonconforming sexuality bars him from the covenant.”⁵⁶

A Response

None of the above examples are a positive role model for homosexual relationships or other sexual relationships. They are examples of non-sexual holy relationships.

Love in Scripture

“God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten son.” Christianity is about sharing the love of God with all people. We are called to love all people because God loves all people, no matter what sexual orientation. Holiness must be connected to the love of God as revealed in Jesus Christ, for God is love. In Ephesians 5:25-28 we are told, “husbands, love your wives just as Christ loved the church and gave himself up for her, in order to make her holy by cleansing her with the washing of water by the word, so as to present the church to himself in splendor, without a spot or wrinkle or anything of the kind - yes, so that she may be holy and without blemish. In the same way, husbands should love their wives as they do their own body. “He who loves his wife, loves himself.” In Ephesians 31 and 32, Paul compares this love of Christ for the church with the love of a man and a woman becoming one flesh. Love, if it is true love, must be the love of Christ, a love of giving one’s self to another. Our goal is to love all people and to do so within the order that God has established for us in creation.

Can We Find in Scripture Potential for Holiness for Gay and Lesbian Relationships?

One commentary notes that

Jesus would not score high on a test measuring commitment to today’s notion of “family values” when he tells his disciples to *leave* their traditional families.... What is valued is not biological procreation but godly association. Being Jesus’ follower has little to do with whether one’s family follows conventional patterns of family ties, and everything to do with what and who one is living for. Jesus’ vision of God’s reign includes calling into question certain

societal conventions concerning marriage. So why are those same conventions being used by some of his followers today to exclude gay and lesbian people from the full benefits of community?⁵⁷

There are numerous examples in the New Testament of groups and individuals being included in the Christian community, despite earlier exclusion according to Old Testament law. For example, Acts 10:15 states, “What God has made clean, you must not call profane.” What matters is not ritual purity, but justice and righteousness.⁵⁸ Or as in 1 Corinthians 7:19 and Galatians 5:6, “circumcision is nothing, and uncircumcision is nothing; but obeying ... is everything.” The council of elders and apostles decreed that circumcision was unnecessary: they understood that God did not reject the uncircumcised, that they too could be just and holy. Eventually, non-Jews were not required to follow the dietary laws of Judaism; purity requirements were part of being a Jew, not part of being a faithful person worthy of the kingdom of heaven. In stating that “a person is a Jew who is one inwardly” (Romans 2:29) and “in the Lord Jesus, nothing is unclean in itself” (Romans 14:14), Paul redefines what it means to be God’s chosen people.⁵⁹

Finally, the most striking claim for fully including all sexual orientations in the church is made by Galatians 3:28, “there is ... no longer male *and* female; for all of you are one in Christ Jesus.”⁶⁰ Note that Paul does not say “no longer male *or* female.” This phrase quotes from Genesis 1:27 “*male and female* he created them”. Radically, the reality of gender itself is being declared irrelevant within the community of the gospel. Gender roles and expectations, “gender complementarity,” and gender identity need no longer determine the identity of the baptized. Connecting Galatians 3:28 and Genesis 1:27, Gregory of Nyssa argued that gender distinctions did not exist prior to the Fall, would not exist after resurrection, and could be transgressed in the present, in anticipation of the age to come.

Galatians 5:14-26 and Romans 13:8-10 remind us that “the whole law is summed up in a single commandment, ‘You shall love your neighbor as yourself’” and to “live by the Spirit and not by the flesh;” “there is no law” with regard to the fruits of the Spirit.

If a committed, monogamous, faith-filled relationship of a gay or lesbian couple gives evidence of the “fruit of the spirit” the couple should be fully included in the life of the church.

As the early church saw fit to include Gentiles, even though it meant going against the clear meaning of the circumcision scriptures, the church today might honor the presence of the Spirit and include the covenantal love expressed by committed gays and lesbians. “When anyone finds a suitable life partner, it is appropriate for the community to give them its blessing. For they have become one bone, one flesh.”⁶¹

A Response

While it is true that monogamous, homosexual relationships are closer to the one-flesh model of Genesis 2 than promiscuous homosexual relationships, some believe that any homosexual relationship violates the created order of Genesis 2 so cannot be considered holy. Celibate homosexuals can lead a holy life; undoubtedly, many of the greatest saints of the church have been homosexuals. But homosexual intercourse cannot be reconciled with holiness as understood in scripture. Paul condemns all sexual relations outside of marriage.

Conclusion

Any discussion of holiness in relationships must of necessity be both broad and complex because there are two or more distinct interpretations of the scriptural language involved. Also, there is disagreement regarding a number of Biblical examples that can be cited to make a case for either condemning or blessing same-sex relationships.

Section 2 - Church History and Tradition

This section reports the results of the research that the Task Force conducted on how the topics of marriage, the role of lesbians and gays in the church, and the nature of blessings have been approached over time by the Episcopal Church. We will present first how the church has treated marriage. Then we will discuss how the roles of gays and lesbians have changed both in society and in the Episcopal Church since World War II. Finally, we will note how the Episcopal Church has understood and practiced the nature of blessings.

The Church's Teaching on Marriage

“Dearly beloved, we have come together in the presence of God to witness and bless the joining together of this man and this woman in Holy Matrimony.” This is one of the most recognized phrases in the English language. The phrase was first penned by the eminent liturgist, theologian and Archbishop, Thomas Cranmer in the first Book of Common Prayer (BCP, 1549). Cranmer’s words are so familiar now that it is hard to imagine how truly radical they were in their time. Inasmuch as the Church teaches and believes what it prays, it is crucial that we understand what is being said in these paragraphs as we discuss the Church’s teaching and beliefs on marriage. That teaching can be characterized in four ways: (1) Reformed, (2) Catholic, (3) Biblical, and (4) Practical, as set out below.

Reformed

The marriage service as a whole represents substantial changes being stressed in theology and teaching of the church during the Reformation. The location of the marriage ceremony was changed. Prior to 1549, weddings would have been performed in the narthex of the church. Local custom dictated the marriage ceremony, and the clergy merely blessed the union. A rubric in Cranmer’s BCP moved the ceremony into the sanctuary: “the persons to be married *shall come into the body of the church.*”

[*emphasis added*] Marriage was being incorporated into the ministry life of the church, not just an adjunct celebration of village life.

Marriage became an outward and societally important expression of Christian faith. In particular, it was an expression of this newly reformed faith. This move gave liturgical expression to the teaching in Ephesians 5, that marriage is a reflection of the relationship Christ has with his church. Within a limited sphere, the bride and groom were raised to the level of ministers of the Gospel and their marriage became a microcosm of the Church.

Prior to the Reformation, holiness and readiness for Church ministry were determined by vows of poverty, chastity, celibacy and obedience. The Reformation took the locus of spirituality away from the monasteries and teaching orders and centered it in local parishes and homes. The Reformation removed the requirement of celibacy as a qualification for ministry outside the monastery and inserted vows and promises that reflect those made at ordination. The idea of the ‘priesthood of all believers’ was being instituted through a most intimate institution.

Catholic

The Reformers were emphatic about limiting the sacraments to the two instituted by Christ: Baptism and the Eucharist. In 1215, the church catholic defined marriage as a sacrament. This thinking taught that married couples should become ministers of the Gospel in their familial relationships.⁶² Even with the Oxford and Liturgical Renewal movements, the emphases of the Marriage Rite have not substantially changed in almost 500 years. Marrying couples must still today sign a declaration of intent affirming the Church’s understanding of marriage before the ceremony can be conducted.⁶³

Biblical

The two opening paragraphs of the marriage service are profoundly informed by scripture, referencing the marriage passages in the Bible. The phrase, “Holy Scripture commends it to be honored among all people,” is a brilliant, summary phrase that

captures the thrust of scripture, including the prophets, Psalms, Proverbs, Song of Solomon, the Apocrypha, Matthew, Mark, Luke, Corinthians, The Pastorals, Jude and the Revelation.

Cranmer saw a common thread referencing the love of God mediated through word and covenant. Although it could be entered into for any number of reasons, marriage was a binding covenant, ordained by God. The overarching reality was grace; the attending virtues included the vows, possessions, heart and body, and the character traits associated with holiness. Romance and affection may have been anticipated, but they were not the primary motivation until much later.

Practical

There are four practical expectations of marriage in the second paragraph of the prologue in the BCP: mutual joy, mutual help and comfort, procreation and nurture of children (when it is God's will), and holiness. The BCP teaches that marriage is God's idea, and that it was intended for the good of humanity. It is to our benefit because, "it is not good for a man to be alone." (Genesis 2)

"Help and comfort" is also from Genesis. When he needed help, Adam reviewed all of the traits of the animals but found none able to be a true helper. Therefore, God created Eve, who does, indeed, fit the description.

The third is "procreation and nurture of children." Married couples are to create their own, individuated homes. In these homes there may be children. Marriages take on the ministry of evangelizing these children in the "...nurture, knowledge and love of the Lord."

The fourth expectation is "holiness." Because of its divine origin, Christian marriage is to be set apart from all other human attachments. Therefore, "*...it is to be entered into reverently, discreetly, soberly and in the fear of God.*"⁶⁴

The Decline and Defense of Marriage

The marriage service in the BCP served for centuries to be the Church's teaching, and underscored the value of marriage in Western society and throughout the world.

However, many researchers and scholars seem to think marriage between one man and one woman reached its nadir in the 1950s. Since then, the value of the classical teaching on marriage as found in the BCP has been both challenged and vociferously defended.

There has been a profound cultural shift over the last 50 years: traditional marriage is seen by many as an inadequate and overly restrictive institution. For many others, this shift is not seen as social progress but rather as “secular individualism,” focusing away from religion and social traditionalism and towards a faith in political activism, personal independence, tolerance for diverse life styles, and “rational” self interest.

The Episcopal Church has seen strident efforts, some successful and some unsuccessful, to alter, refocus, or ignore its teaching on marriage and related issues, such as divorce, remarriage, chastity, celibacy, and adultery. Many within the church argue that substantially changing the marriage rite, its meaning, or its boundaries, challenges the authority of Scripture and Church tradition and detracts from more intentional strategies such as preparation, maintenance, and enrichment of marriage. Others argue that the hallmark of a holy relationship is not heterosexuality, but a monogamy, commitment, and Christian faith.

Here in the Diocese of San Diego, we find ourselves in community, living through this dynamic tension of opposing perspectives on marriage and blessing rites, and yet committed to the teachings of Jesus Christ and ministry to each other and the world in which we live.

The Changing Role of Lesbians and Gay Men in the Church

The role of lesbians and gay men in the Church is changing in conjunction with changes in society’s attitudes toward gays and lesbians in the United States and their roles in American society. Change within the Church is more limited than change within secular society because Episcopal canon law, on this issue, has not kept pace with changes in U.S. law. However, since 1967, General Conventions have repeatedly

authorized dialogues and studies regarding the theology and psychological aspects of homosexuality and adopted a variety of resolutions regarding sexuality, homosexuality, civil rights, ordination, and same-sex relationships.

Following is an attempt to describe the changes in the secular world regarding gays and lesbians in American society while noting parallel or similar changes, or lack of change, in the circumstances of gays and lesbians in the Church.

It was not until after World War II that significant events began to occur regarding human rights, civil rights, women’s rights, gay rights and sexuality in America as well as within the Church.

Society	Year	Church
1 st lasting gay men’s group, Mattachine Society, established.	1950	
1 st lasting lesbian group, Daughters of Bilitis, established.	1955	
Frank Kameny argues 1 st U.S. civil-rights case based on sexual orientation, in the U.S. Supreme Court, disputing that homosexuals are a federal "security risk."	1961	
Illinois 1 st state to decriminalize homosexual acts between consenting adults.	1962	
	1964	General Convention resolves to gather data, formulate studies, and make recommendations on the Christian understanding of sexuality.
Frank Kameny and his re-formed Mattachine Society picket the White House and the Pentagon to focus attention on gay rights.	1965	
1 st "gay" march held in front of Independence Hall, Philadelphia.		
	1967	General Convention resolves to initiate studies to express Christian attitudes toward homosexuality.
Stonewall riot in New York City (1 st occasion of gays and lesbians fighting back against gov't.-sponsored persecution of homosexuals).	1969	
Gay Liberation Front founded (1 st organization to use "gay" in its name).		
<i>The Advocate</i> becomes the 1 st national gay and lesbian publication.		
Gay-rights parades held in several cities.	1971	
American Psychiatric Association removes	1973	

homosexuality from its list of mental disorders.

California Proposition 6 defeated (would have banned gay teachers from public schools).
Harvey Milk becomes 1st openly gay man elected to public office in a major city (San Francisco).

Wisconsin 1st state to outlaw discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation.
Gary Studds (MA) becomes 1st serving member of Congress to "come out."

Barney Frank becomes 2nd openly gay serving member of Congress.
ACT UP gay AIDS activism coalition formed.

- 1974 Integrity founded (The Church's 1st homosexual support and advocacy group).
- 1975 House of Bishops adopts "Dialogue with Homophile Community" resolution.
- 1976 General Convention resolves to study the matter of ordination of homosexual persons ;
Also resolves that homosexual persons are "children of God" entitled to equal protection under the law.
- 1977 Bishop of New York ordains an avowed lesbian, subsequently issues statement of regret at having upset his fellow Bishops.
Executive Council expresses hope that no Bishop will ordain or license a professing and practicing homosexual until the issue is resolved at General Convention.
The Church's Committee on Theology issues report stating the Church is right to confine the nuptial blessing exclusively to heterosexual marriage.
- 1978
- 1979 Standing Committee issues report on human sexuality with few agreements and no conclusions: "...there is not one position that has emerged; rather there is a diversity of opinion, particularly on the ordinations of homosexual persons."
House of Bishops affirms traditional teachings of the Church on marriage, marriage fidelity, and sexual chastity; candidates for ordination are expected to conform to the standard. (NOTE: This position has not been overturned by subsequent General Conventions.)
- 1982 General Convention reaffirmed homosexuals are children of God, entitled to full civil rights.
- 1985 General Convention enjoins Dioceses to become involved in the ongoing dialogue regarding gays and lesbians.
- 1987
- 1989 Assistant Bishop of New Jersey ordains a gay man living openly with another man.
- 1990 Presiding Bishop's Council of Advice disassociates

		itself from the Bishop of New Jersey's action in carrying out the ordination.
	1991	Human Affairs Commission unanimous that humans are not meant to be alone, and gay relationships provide comfort and support. General Convention resolves to "reconcile discontinuity between the teaching that sexual expression is appropriate only in marriage, and the experience of many members of this body."
"Don't Ask, Don't Tell" policy instituted for the U.S. Armed Forces.	1993	General Convention acknowledges the extent to which the whole Church "groans in travail, waiting for the guidance of the Holy Spirit."
	1994	88 bishops sign "Statement of Koinonia," affirming their support for ordained gays and lesbians. General Convention resolves that no rites honoring the love and commitment between persons of the same sex be developed until authorized by General Convention.
President Clinton signs Defense of Marriage Act (DOMA): bans federal recognition of same-sex marriage, authorizes states to do the same.	1996	
Tammy Baldwin (WI) becomes 1 st "out" lesbian elected to Congress.	1998	Lambeth Convention called upon the Episcopal Church (USA) to repent from its views and actions regarding homosexuality and same-sex marriage.
Vermont becomes 1st state to legalize same-sex civil unions.	2000	General Convention calls upon the Church to acknowledge and protect same-sex couples in the Church.
The <i>New York Times</i> begins to publish commitment/wedding announcements for same-sex couples.	2002	
U. S. Supreme Court rules sodomy laws unconstitutional. Massachusetts begins issuing marriage licenses to same-sex couples.	2003	General Convention confirms the consecration of openly gay Bishop Gene Robinson; resolves: "local faith communities are operating within the bounds of our common life as they explore and experience liturgies celebrating and blessing same-sex unions." Windsor Report concludes "the Episcopal Church (USA) has acted in ways incompatible with the communion principle of interdependence and our fellowship together has suffered. A number of primates and provinces declared themselves in an impaired relationship with the Episcopal Church (USA) which has caused deep offence to many and is invited to express its regret."
Connecticut legalizes same-sex civil unions.	2005	

<p>New Jersey legalizes same-sex civil unions.</p>	<p>2006 Katharine Jefferts Schori becomes 1st female Presiding Bishop. General Convention reaffirms historical support of gays and lesbians as children of God entitled to full civil rights; opposes any state or federal constitutional amendment that prohibits same-sex civil marriage or civil union; agrees to temporarily refrain from consecrating any further homosexual bishops.</p>
<p>New Hampshire legalizes same-sex civil unions. California Supreme Court rules same-sex couples have a right to marry. Connecticut legalizes same-sex marriage. Jared Polis (CO) becomes 3rd openly gay man elected to Congress. California passes Proposition 8, writing an opposite-sex-only definition of marriage into its constitution. On-line dating service eHarmony agrees to serve gays and lesbians. President-elect Obama refers to "gay" people in his acceptance speech.</p>	<p>2008</p>
<p>President's website advocates full civil unions and federal rights for lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) couples, as well as repeal of "Don't Ask, Don't Tell", and opposes a ban on same-sex marriage. Iowa Supreme Court legalizes same-sex marriage. Vermont legalizes same-sex marriage. Maine legalizes same-sex marriage. New Hampshire legalizes same-sex marriage. California Supreme Court upholds Proposition 8 but allows same-sex marriages to stand as legal.</p>	<p>2009</p>

Changes in Secular Society and the Church

While secular society seems to be slowly moving toward inclusion of civil and human rights for all persons, the Episcopal Church appears to be moving at an even slower pace. There is no lack of guidance and direction from General Conventions and the House of Bishops regarding love and acceptance of all persons, and the affirmation of gay and lesbian persons as "children of God" within the church. But beyond this love and acceptance, just what have been the changing roles of lesbians and gays in the Church since the 1940's - and, for that matter, the changing roles of gays and lesbians in secular society?

Changes in Secular Society

- Support organizations formed
- The “Gay Rights” movement
- Homosexuality is no longer illegal
- Homosexuality is no longer a mental disorder
- Discrimination on the basis of homosexuality is outlawed
- Sodomy laws ruled unconstitutional
- Gays and lesbians allowed to serve in the military, though not openly.
- Openly gay and lesbian persons elected to Congress
- Same-sex civil unions recognized in some states
- Same-sex marriage recognized in at least six states.

Changes in the Church

- 45 years of study and discernment
- The Church has become sensitive to the needs of the gay and lesbian community
- A gay rights group founded within the Episcopal Church
- Openly lesbian and gay priests ordained
- Gays and lesbians recognized as “Children of God”
- The Church demands equal protection under the law for gays and lesbians
- Openly gay bishop consecrated
- The Church opposes civil law prohibiting same-sex unions.

There remains, however, a strained relationship with the greater Anglican Communion over the issues of same-sex unions and ordination of homosexual persons. Specifically, within the Church there is a chasm between beliefs and opinions on these same issues, a chasm that will only be bridged by continued dialogue and further prayer, study and discernment of these divisive issues.

The Role of Blessings in the Episcopal Church

The call for a blessing is power-laden. “Blessing” denotes a covenantal relationship between God and each of us. When we call for a blessing, we are asking for the presence of God, and for God’s favor or “grace;” that the blessing will result in a setting apart as sacred that which is blessed. As Christians, we believe that the relationship between human beings and God cannot be separated. God’s creation of human beings created relationship between God and man; God’s creation of two human beings also created relationships between us as beings. We humans may choose to sever or ignore our relationship with God, but the relationship is everlasting. God never withdraws from us.

God’s blessing or grace does not depend on our merit, because it is a gift to us as believers in the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus Christ. When the Church chooses to “bless” someone or some thing, the Church is entering that covenanted relationship and blesses God in return by giving thanks.

All forms of love – *agape*, *eros*, and *filios* – can be holy. Our own *Book of Occasional Services*, as approved by General Convention in 1994, provides for a wide variety of liturgical resources including blessings of pregnant women, marriage anniversaries, reaffirmation of ordination vows, healing, and other life events, such as the purchase of a car or a home.

As God created us, we are relational creatures. And it is the quality of our relationships that determines the quality of our lives. Through intimate relationships, we come to know and experience God in ways we would not otherwise. The married relationships blessed by God through the Church are those which are faithful and monogamous.

Christian heterosexuals and homosexuals both desire to be married in a way that allows them to live faithfully. Both desire to create family relationships recognized by the church, which allow their children to learn faithfulness, love, and acceptance. The Church community becomes the means by which the family, parents and children alike, contributes to its faith, and from which it draws its strength.

Implications of Church History and Tradition Related to Sexuality and Marriage

Over the last 25 years, by actions of General Convention, the Episcopal Church has approached recognition of same-sex relationships, with early emphasis on dialogue and understanding and later recognizing same-sex civil unions. Yet confusion exists. The 1994 General Convention action prohibiting same-sex rites seems to be in conflict with the 2003 General Convention action recognizing those dioceses and churches using such liturgies as operating within the bounds of our common life.

In our own diocese, it is often misunderstood that same-sex marriages and blessings have *not* been approved by our Bishop; the Bishop's opposition to California Proposition 8 (2008), which repealed same-sex civil marriage, was also misunderstood as support for same-sex blessings and marriage in the church.

The Episcopal Church relies on the BCP definition of marriage as an exchange of vows between a man and a woman, for the purpose of "love, honor, comfort, and faithfulness." Those who seek same-sex blessings or same-sex marriage request that existing liturgies be adapted and trial liturgies adopted, as they have been regarding other issues and BCP changes several times in the past. These trial liturgies give us opportunities to discover the best ways of honoring our covenant with God through our worship.⁶⁵

The idea that church is a safe place to disagree is attractive, but living it out is difficult. Doing so requires that we expand our boundaries of acceptance to include those we do not understand, or with whom we do not agree, on matters of great importance, because we do agree on matters of the *greatest* importance – the love and salvation offered by Jesus Christ. While we may disagree over the definition of marriage, and how Scripture regarding divorce and sexuality is understood, we agree on our common mission to relieve suffering, and to celebrate the Eucharist.

Honoring the integrity and holiness of gay couples and their families, while also honoring the deep traditions of the church is possible if same-sex marriage or blessing is seen as a "means of grace" as reflected in Scripture.

Blessing a same-sex relationship provides a context for a structured, faith-centered commitment to another person, and witnesses God's commitment to us, as the human beings God created, sexuality and all.

Section 3 – Practical, Pastoral, and Sacramental Theology

The third section of our report presents our analysis of how pastors and parishioners are called to minister to coupled but unmarried people, including lesbians and gay men, within their parishes. The section is divided into three parts, reflecting the concerns that our enabling resolution asked us to address. The first part examines societal trends in forming unmarried partnerships, the second part examines pastoral responses to unmarried couples, and the third part considers the canonical and sacramental nature of both marriage and blessings.

Practical Considerations

We acknowledge that while the issues of human sexuality are not yet resolved, there are currently couples in the Body of Christ and in this Church who are living in marriage and couples in the Body of Christ and in this Church who are living in other life-long committed relationships. And be it further resolved, we expect such relationships will be characterized by fidelity, monogamy, mutual affection and respect, careful, honest communication, and the holy love which enables those in such relationships to see in each other the image of God.⁶⁶

Trends in marriage and cohabitation have shown great change over the 20th century. Practically speaking, marriage has been evolving into an institution of choice – to marry or not. Since 2005, households of married couples have been the minority; 51% of women are living without a spouse. Over the past four decades, cohabiting has increased. Many American young adults spend part of their lives living together outside of marriage. It is estimated that 25% of unmarried women ages 25 – 39 are living with a partner; an additional 25% have lived with a partner at some time in the past.

More than half of all first marriages are now preceded by living together, compared to almost none 50 years ago. Some young people believe that living together before marriage helps them avoid a bad marriage and subsequent divorce. Their concern is that 40% - 50% of marriages end in divorce. This opinion is countered by studies showing no evidence that those who cohabit before marriage will have stronger

marriages than those who do not. Furthermore, studies show that cohabitation before marriage leads to a greater incidence of divorce.⁶⁷

Married heterosexual couples with children now constitute less than 25% of U.S. households. Marriage has declined among all groups, but more so among lower-income couples. This statistic may indicate marriage is becoming an institution for only more educated and higher-income groups of people.

Cohabitation is an alternative to marriage for many, including working class and poor families, people who are less religious, those who have been divorced, and those who have experienced fatherlessness, parental divorce, or parental discord in childhood. When couples marry, one or both may lose benefits such as medical coverage, Social Security or other insurance. Overall, young adults decide to marry because they feel the time is right, rather than because of societal pressure to marry.

Older couples may come together after divorce or the death of a spouse. They often have already experienced the companionship, commitment, and community of a long marriage. They cite avoiding loneliness and other emotional benefits as reason to cohabit. Since they commonly have grown children, they avoid conflict with their children regarding finances and other inheritance complications by remaining unmarried. Their families often feel better knowing their parents are not alone.

Gay and lesbian couples have always existed as part of most communities, but in the last 30 years or so have become more visible. Some of them have raised or are raising children, either from previous marriages or relationships, or through reproductive technology, adoption, or foster care. They play active roles in their professions, their children's education, and their neighborhoods. Gay and lesbian couples exhibit the same dedication and interest in their families as do heterosexual couples. Many are involved in places of worship. As a book published by the California Council of Churches has noted:

Gay and Lesbian persons have long been in committed relationships with no legal protection, and have encountered many problems because they lacked legal status in their relationships. Civil unions have been compared to the

“separate but equal provisions that were dismantled in the era of racial civil rights” legal action. Domestic partner benefits have added necessary and critical protective provisions, yet remain different, are different from state to state, and do not have the same permanence.⁶⁸

In considering the role of the church, a task force of The Episcopal Diocese of Vermont explained, “We believe our congregations ought to be able to support and uphold the relationship of commitment of all their members. We see this as a ‘conservative’ move that promotes the stability of families and holds all couples accountable to the traditional values of fidelity, monogamy, mutual affection and respect, open communication and holy love.”⁶⁹

There has been growing support for gay marriage and civil unions – civil unions more than marriage. According to a 2008 *Newsweek* poll, 52% of Americans opposed a ban on same-sex marriage and 43% favored such a ban. When asked about state measures, 45% said they would vote for an amendment outlawing gay marriage in their states, and 49% said they would oppose it. More people than ever before approve of gay legal rights – inheritance, health insurance and employee benefits, Social Security, hospital-visitation rights, adoption rights, and open military service for lesbian and gay individuals.⁷⁰ As shown in Section 2 of this report (pp. 35-38), some states have granted more of these rights to gay couples who register as domestic partners. On the other hand, many states have passed legislation banning same-sex marriage or civil unions.

A key factor in these policy debates has been the difference in the public’s consciousness between “sexual orientation” and “sexual preference,” which are terms that differ by the degree of choice involved. Many lesbian and gay individuals believe that their same-sex attraction has not been a choice that they made, either consciously or unconsciously. Their only decision was whether to act on feelings that they could not change.⁷¹

This decision often provokes internal conflict. Throughout past decades, lesbians and gay men have related childhood experiences as victims of anti-gay epithets, bullying, and physical violence in schools throughout the country.⁷² And so,

acknowledging one's identity is usually difficult, because of a desire to avoid further bullying and other negative consequences. It has been said that if one is gay, the most difficult person to come out to is oneself. Some may choose to keep their orientation hidden, but those who have struggled through this period of discernment report a great relief in coming out.

Some also may be confused about their sexuality and may seek therapy to sort out that confusion. Others may seek therapy in an attempt to lead a heterosexual lifestyle.⁷³ Still others, particularly men, live a heterosexual lifestyle but seek out sexual encounters with others of the same sex.⁷⁴

As a Church, we acknowledge the worth of lesbian and gay people, but from one parish to another there are disagreements about the conditions under which these individuals are welcomed. Lesbian and gay people bring with them many gifts, but they also bring unique challenges for both clergy and parishioners. We shall explore some of these challenges in the section that follows.

Pastoral Theology

Often lost amidst the lengthy moral, theological and other discussions about human sexuality are the actual people to whom we are referring. These persons are not abstractions but living, breathing human beings created by the same Creator of us all. These often-abused individuals want and need God's Word, God's protection, and God's grace.

Granted, like far too many people in these times, those actively seeking God are becoming scarcer. Many citizens of the U.S. and other developed countries feel that God is irrelevant. Gay and lesbian seekers are an even smaller percentage of Christendom than they are in society as a whole.

Many gays and lesbians have left the church in anger because they felt unwelcome, but there are also many who have remained in the church. Today, there are millions of gay Christians, just as always, only now they are more visible. They are committed, dedicated believers, but they are also acutely aware that they are not

welcome in every parish. They understand that there are even those fellow Christians who would deny them a seat at the Lord's Table unless they are willing to repent of "sins" which they do not believe they have committed. Gays and lesbians may well feel that the slogan, "Love the sinner, hate the sin" is only applied to them.

Christ invites us to leave our bad habits and follow him. Gay and lesbian Christians approach the throne of grace with as much baggage as anyone else. Many lesbians and gays continue to wonder if the Church will be there to care for them, or if it will continue to require that they check their sexual identity at the door before there is any real welcome.

As an established religious organization, The Episcopal Church has some things to say about the pastoral care of its members. Title I, Canon 17 states, "No one shall be denied rights, status or access to an equal place in the life, worship, and governance of this church because of race, color, ethnic origin, national origin, marital status, sex, sexual orientation, disabilities or age, except as otherwise specified in the Canons." One of those "otherwise specified" caveats appears, for example, in Canon 18, where marriage, Holy Matrimony, is defined as "a physical and spiritual union of a man and a woman."

Many lesbian and gay couples within the Church have been together for decades and have faithfully attended services and paid their pledges. But many also worry that if one of them becomes ill, their parish priest may not visit and pray with them. The same worry may exist for anniversary celebrations or baptisms. They would certainly feel reticent to seek pastoral counseling if one of the pair is having sexual or fidelity issues. Depending on the priest, the place, the issue, and other factors, gay men and lesbians know that the response from their clergy can vary widely.

While this report deals mostly with matters surrounding the blessing of same-sex relationships, Task Force members discussed other kinds of relationships as well. Blessing these other relationships, such as opposite-sex couples who choose not to marry for financial reasons, requires a response from the Church that allows everyone to feel respected, cared for, and loved.

Sexual relations outside of marriage are contrary to the Church's teaching. Nevertheless, that teaching cannot be the only response to these couples seeking the Church's counsel. A considerable amount of time will likely be required to discern the circumstances of each individual situation.

Certainly, marriage remains the Church's ideal for sexual relationships. How the Church responds to other committed monogamous sexual relationships is still controversial. Some task force members believe the Church should be open to blessing these relationships, while others believe to do so would undermine the institution of marriage. There is agreement however, that the Church is called to advocate for change when civil policies impose financial penalties on those who marry.

Once it can be determined that a request of the Church, made by a couple who find themselves unable to be married due to any number of reasons, is based on all other factors supporting a loving, life-long union, our duty lies in the support of that relationship including, possibly, the blessing of that relationship.

No one is suggesting here that clergy members should discard their moral compasses. Let us reinforce the teaching that, inspired by the Holy Spirit, it is the duty of all Christians to lead others to Christ and affirm them positively as children of God. The consistent message of the Living Word is that we love our neighbors as ourselves. Generally it seems that the wiser choice would be to err on the side of love and acceptance rather than judgment and exclusion. Pastoral theology can be a thing of great complexity or as simple as the Great Commandment. At the very least we should be a Church of compassion and understanding for all, regardless of circumstances.

Sacramental Theology

What Is a Sacrament?

Sacrament is "a word derived from the Latin word *sacramentum* which was used to translate the Greek word for 'mystery.' Sacraments are the means by which Christians partake in the mystery of Christ. The fundamental mystery is the Incarnation of Christ and, depending on that, the Church, his Body, through which he communicates

himself to humankind. This communication is accomplished through Symbolic acts (i.e. Holy Eucharist and Holy Baptism) interpreted by the Gospel and the response of faith.”⁷⁵

An Outline of the Faith in the BCP further defines the sacraments as “outward and visible signs of inward and spiritual grace, given by Christ as sure and certain means by which we receive that grace.”⁷⁶ The two great sacraments of the Gospel are Holy Eucharist and Holy Baptism. There are, in addition, five sacramental rites that “evolved in the Church under the guidance of the Holy Spirit.”⁷⁷ They are Confirmation, Ordination, Holy Matrimony, Reconciliation of a Penitent, and Unction of the Sick. These rites differ from the great sacraments in that “they are not necessary for all persons in the same way that Baptism and the Eucharist are.”⁷⁸

The last of the sacramental rites to evolve was Holy Matrimony (the Church established exclusive jurisdiction over matrimony in the 12th century). *An Outline of the Faith* defines Holy Matrimony as “Christian marriage, in which the man and woman enter into a life-long union, make their vows before God and the Church, and receive the grace and blessing of God to help them fulfill their vows.”⁷⁹ The Celebration and Blessing of a Marriage in the BCP sets the ceremony in the context of the bond and covenant established by God in creation, reflected in the many covenantal relationships which God established with humankind over time, and fulfilled in the presence of Jesus Christ among us. The wording of the Celebration is explicit – what is being celebrated and blessed is the joining together of a man and a woman.

The Purposes of Matrimony: Fidelity, Procreation, and Union

“The purpose of matrimony has traditionally been understood as threefold: fidelity, the procreation of children, and union of the parties in marriage.”⁸⁰ Fidelity is defined as loyalty or faithfulness. Partners in the marital relationship pledge faithfulness and loyalty to one another (to live in monogamous relationship), “forsaking all others,” until “parted by death.” Procreation, within marriage, is understood as being the function of the love between partners and God’s will. Within the bounds of love and God’s will are a number of procreative possibilities for couples including the choice to not to have children (for reasons of health or age), the choice to adopt

children, and the choice of the number of children to bear, assuming the ability to provide for their “nurture in the knowledge and love of the Lord.” The Rev. R. David Cox wrote that marriage “is the most complete, most intimate relationship any two human beings can have”, “a union in multiple senses,” including intimate sharing of the body, the emotions, and the spirit. With such intimacy also comes vulnerability or the ability to be wounded. What sustains the couple within this vulnerability is love and trust which “allows the union to grow even stronger.”⁸¹

What Does Canon Law Provide?

Title I, Canon 17, Section 5: No one shall be denied rights, status or access to an equal place in the life, worship, and governance of this Church because of race, color, ethnic origin, national origin, marital status, sex, sexual orientation, disabilities or age, except as otherwise specified by Canons.

Title I, Canon 18, Section 1: Every Member of the clergy of this Church shall conform to the laws of the State governing creation of the civil status of marriage, and also to the laws of this Church governing the solemnization of Holy Matrimony.

Title I, Canon 18, Section 2: Before solemnizing a marriage the Member of the Clergy shall have ascertained:

That both parties have the right to contract a marriage according to the laws of the State.

That both parties understand that Holy Matrimony is a physical and spiritual union of a man and a woman, entered into within the community of faith, by mutual consent of heart, mind, and will, and with intent that it be lifelong.

As prescribed in the Canon law of the Episcopal Church, in *An Outline of the Faith*, and in *The Celebration and Blessing of a Marriage*, marriage is the union of a man and a woman. While civil marriage may be legal in a number of state jurisdictions, unless or until the Episcopal Church changes both its legal and sacramental understanding and definition of what types of partners may be married, Holy Matrimony will not be a sacramental option for same-sex couples. Despite the inclusiveness in Canon 17, same-sex couples are barred by Canon 18 from full participation in the worship life of the Church when it comes to Holy Matrimony, and Canon law does not provide for any alternative.

What Is Meant By “Blessing?”

“Blessing” has been defined as “the authoritative pronouncement of God’s favor... In Christian practice, blessing finds a frequent place in liturgy, especially in the blessing of the elements in consecration and the blessing of the people at the end of the Mass.”⁸² In Holy Matrimony, the formal name of the service is “The Celebration and Blessing of a Marriage,” the conclusion of which is “The Blessing of the Marriage.” The 1979 version of the BCP also provides for “The Blessing of a Civil Marriage.”

The Book of Occasional Services provides blessings for the seasons of the liturgical year, blessings in the home at Epiphany and Easter, and blessings over food at Easter. Outside of blessings prescribed in our liturgical books, many people say a blessing over meals and we often say, “God bless you,” when a person sneezes.

So, what is a “blessing,” from a theological perspective? If a blessing is the pronouncement of God’s favor, does that also imply God’s approval? Blessings appear to have one function in liturgy (the act of consecration or to make holy) and another in the context of the blessing of a home. In such a blessing, homes are not made holy in the way that a church is dedicated or consecrated as holy space. What is happening when a home is blessed? Could it be that we are inviting God’s favor in the hope that we’ll be worthy of such favor and that we’ll make every effort to align our lives with God’s will? If so, the function of the blessing is to remind the ones blessed of who we are and whose we are. By grace, we receive the blessing of God with the expectation or hope that we’ll live our lives oriented toward God. The blessing is intended to be relational, a two-way street.

Can There Be a Local Option? And What Would It Mean to Bless a Same-Sex Relationship in the Context of Worship?

The polity of the Episcopal Church is such that diocesan bishops have enormous independence and latitude over the liturgical affairs within their jurisdictions. A variety of supplemental liturgies are in common use throughout the Church, including alternative Eucharistic prayers, public services of healing, and the burial of a child, just to cite a few. Beyond those prescribed and published, it is common for priests to

employ worship forms from other parts of the Anglican Communion, other faith traditions, or newly developed forms, with permission from their bishop. This practice meets with the approval of some bishops and is discouraged by others. The local option in such matters already exists.

Several dioceses within our Church have authorized the use of rites for the blessing of same-sex unions on a trial basis, including the Episcopal Dioceses of Vermont, California, and Los Angeles. Each has done so after extensive study, prayer, reflection, debate, and communication. In order to clear the path for such practice, these dioceses have undertaken a thorough examination of the issues from the standpoints of scripture, theology, tradition, culture, and practice. While the authorization of such rites may not be greeted with the approval of all within any given diocese, it must be said that conflicting points of view are held in respectful tension with an understanding that further conversation and examination of the practice will ensue. It is further understood that not all priests will be willing to participate in such blessings and that they should not be compelled to do so.

To bless a same-sex union within a locally authorized jurisdiction of the Church is to allow the blessing to be both holy, at the level of God's favor, and relational. The Bishop's Task Force on Marriage in the Episcopal Diocese of Los Angeles calls upon the Church to view the blessing in the light of a "life-long covenant" and to prepare for it as such. According to the report of that Task Force:

In the case of the sacramental blessing of life-long covenants, two people who have developed a committed relationship with one another come before God and the community of faith. They publicly vow and express their intention to live together in a life-long covenantal relationship. This relationship is covenantal insofar as the two persons make promises to one another that they will support and nurture one another without condition.⁸³

In deciding to bless an opposite-sex relationship, clergy expect to find the following qualities: love, lifelong covenantal faithfulness, monogamy, intentionality, promise, mutual support, and on-going, life-giving nurture. Clergy would expect to find

these same qualities in potentially blessing same-sex relationships. Were such a blessing to be offered, it would be in the context of public worship, with those in attendance serving as godly witnesses to that which God has blessed, and authorized by the local bishop. In the words of the Diocese of Los Angeles report, “The priest/officiant hears these vows and blesses the union in the name of God and on behalf of the church.”⁸⁴ This would constitute a sacramental, holy, act, one that brings the blessed couple into deeper relationship with God and the Body of Christ.

Section 4 – Movement of the Holy Spirit

The final section of our report examines how the Holy Spirit has moved among us, and what we believe the movement of the Holy Spirit has revealed to us.

In the Gospel according to John, Jesus promises to send the Holy Spirit to guide his people. Jesus said, “I still have many things to say to you, but you cannot bear them now. When the Spirit of truth comes, he will guide you into all the truth; for he will not speak on his own, but will speak whatever he hears, and he will declare to you the things that are to come.” (John 16:12-13)

In the days following Jesus’ death and resurrection, his apostles undoubtedly experienced strong mixed emotions. They had seen for themselves their risen Savior. And the same forces that moved against Jesus, culminating in his death, were moving towards them as well. These were dangerous times. According to Acts, on the day of Pentecost the apostles were together in one place. “And suddenly from heaven there came a sound like the rush of a violent wind, and it filled the entire house where they were sitting. Divided tongues, as of fire, appeared among them, and a tongue rested on each of them. All of them were filled with the Holy Spirit and began to speak in other languages, as the Spirit gave them ability.” (Acts 1:1-4) This was the very Spirit promised them by Jesus before he was killed (John 14:26), and it sustained them throughout the remaining days of their lives.

As our task force considered the movement of the Holy Spirit, we identified three principles on which to reflect. First, Scripture tells us that the Holy Spirit will be our guide and will reveal all things to us, but only when we are ready. Second, the spiritual disciplines that prepare us to be ready for the Holy Spirit’s work are listening and prayer. Finally, we can perceive revelation, but we need holy community as a focal point for interpreting such revelation.

We believe the Holy Spirit speaks to us in many ways: through Scripture, through changes in the world around us, through our spiritual disciplines, and through our interactions with others. We examine this process of guiding on three levels: (1)

our national and local community, (2) our Diocese of San Diego, and (3) within our task force.

Our National and Local Community

Clearly, lesbians and gay men have become more accepted in secular society. More and more individuals are open about their sexuality, even those in positions where gays and lesbians used to keep their sexuality quiet.

Generally, San Diegans seem to have a “live and let live” attitude when it comes to sexuality. A 2004 KPBS/Competitive Edge Research and Communication poll on lesbian and gay issues in San Diego found that 60% of respondents professed to have a favorable attitude toward lesbians and gay men; while 26% held a negative attitude (the remaining 14% were uncertain or declined to answer).⁸⁵ Given that a fair amount of those who responded as undecided may have actually held negative feelings, these figures may be interpreted as indicating that San Diegans are not necessarily bothered by the presence of lesbians and gays in their midst, but that sexuality is still an issue for a significant minority.

Interestingly, while political and social ideology made a difference in the responses of those surveyed, those differences were not as profound as one might think. Those who described themselves as moderately conservative reported having favorable attitudes towards those with same-sex attraction. Even among those who indicated that they were conservative or very conservative, about half reported favorable attitudes.

Just as ideological conservatives were divided, those who reported attending church weekly were split as well. Those who reported less regular church attendance felt more positively in their attitudes than did those who said they attend weekly. At a minimum, San Diegans tolerate gays and lesbians, and a majority of San Diegans profess to approve of lesbians and gays in equal measure to heterosexuals. We do not have data for other parts of the Diocese, however, and attitudes may be different in those other areas.

These mixed-to-favorable attitudes apparently did not generalize to votes on specific issues, such as 2008's Proposition 8, however. Statewide, Californians voted 52% to 48% to write a ban on same-sex marriage into the State Constitution. San Diego County voted slightly more in favor at 54% to 46%. Imperial County, in contrast, voted 70% to 30% in favor of Proposition 8, while Riverside County's vote was 65% to 35%. San Diego County's vote being only slightly higher, percentage-wise, than the state total is remarkable given that the county was a hotbed of fundraising and campaign activity in favor of Proposition 8, while the "No on 8" campaign was much less visible in the county.

While demonstrations against the vote occurred throughout the state, central San Diego's demonstrations were among the larger and more diverse ones, drawing thousands of heterosexual allies of lesbians and gay men to protest what they saw as legalizing discrimination.

The Diocese of San Diego

As in many other dioceses, the Episcopal Diocese of San Diego has struggled with the issue of blessing relationships outside the bounds of what is considered traditional marriage. In fact, several of its parishes chose to break away in recent years from the Episcopal Church in response to what they saw as the Church's movement away from Biblical principles and tradition.

Pursuant to the directive of the 1985 General Convention, the Diocese engaged in a formal discussion process over issues of sexuality. Facilitators were trained to help individual parishes participate in such discussions and several parishes did so. Nonetheless, while these discussions might have been meaningful in the context of these individual parishes, there was no official follow up and any results are anecdotal. It remained the policy of the Diocese, as it does to this day, that only those couples who wished to enter into marriages could have their relationships formally blessed in the Church.

From that time to the General Convention of 2003, the Diocese remained together in an uneasy tension between those who advocated for greater inclusion of

lesbian and gay Episcopalians and those who saw such inclusion as contrary to the faith. General Convention's consent to the election of The Rt. Rev. V. Eugene Robinson as Bishop of New Hampshire increased that tension markedly.

Consistent with what was happening elsewhere in the Church, by 2006, certain parishes which identified themselves as "conservative" or "orthodox," chose to leave the Diocese and affiliate with what they considered to be more like-minded dioceses outside of The Episcopal Church, moves which were in and of themselves controversial but beyond the scope of this report. Nonetheless, their departures convinced many that it was essential for people in the Diocese to engage in some sort of process by which they would talk *to* each other about these issues, rather than *about* each other.

Furthermore, Diocesan leaders felt that such a process should not only be about results, but also about learning to live with difference, learning to appreciate what we hold in common, and, hopefully, learning in a deep way, what it means to be reconciled with God and each other. From these desires, a resolution calling for the formation of the Holiness in Relationships Task Force was presented at the 2008 Diocesan Convention and garnered broad support from across the Diocese. To be able to have these kinds of discussions openly with people of different perspectives (and to have lesbians and gay men participate) is tangible evidence to many of us of the healing power of the Holy Spirit.

Our Task Force

While examination of societal changes is useful in discerning the movement of the Holy Spirit, it is by no means definitive. The most reliable means of understanding the workings of the Holy Spirit comes from a process of discernment. Discernment can take many forms, and individual spiritual disciplines, such as prayer, provide the basis for such discernment. The Episcopal Church has a tradition of collective discernment, and we gather periodically to engage in understanding where the Holy Spirit is leading us. The key to any sort of discernment is the ability to listen. As the Benedictine tradition advises, "Listen with the ear of your heart."

Our task force has been engaged in this deliberate discernment process. We have met over a period of months, shared resources of interest to our discussions, listed a set of topics to discuss, and discussed them in a deliberate manner. We rotated the members of the task force through a series of small groups, so that we each had an opportunity to listen and interact with every other person at least once. A highlight of our time together came when we shared a Christmas meal and exchanged cookie gifts, as that event served to connect us in an emotionally deep manner. We found that we were able to speak frankly with each other about our beliefs. While we recognized and respected insurmountable differences, we found ourselves much more in agreement than in disagreement. We had significantly beneficial conversations with people in this group with whom we might not have otherwise spoken. Our hope is that other groups within the diocese might experience the honesty and the care in listening we did. For us, the task force experience itself represented the movement of the Holy Spirit.

There are members of our task force, as well as clergy and laity within the diocese, who have been ready for some time to proclaim that the Episcopal Church should bless holy and committed relationships. There are others who see a time for such blessings coming but believe that such a time has not yet arrived. Still others believe that same-sex relationships should not be blessed.

Some feel that we should provide only blessings for all holy relationships, rather than participate in the civil institution of marriage. Still others are firm that the church should continue to perform legal marriages. Among the clergy who hold these beliefs, most have stringent criteria for conducting marriage ceremonies, including, for some, that the couple be heterosexual.

While some have found their patience stretched thin by the process of discerning whether we are ready for action on the topic of same-sex blessings, we are all cognizant that The Episcopal Church will continue to consider these and related issues. Given that such discernment may result in revisions to the Canons of the Church, we are reluctant to move forward unilaterally.

The Holy Spirit continues to move through the lives of God's people, giving us insights, abilities, comfort, and courage we would not otherwise have. As we consider the Church's response towards a fuller and perhaps more inclusive understanding of how it bestows its blessing upon persons in committed, Christ-centered, relationships, the Spirit guides us in ways that can be exhilarating, troubling, confusing and deeply moving all at the same time. But because of the Spirit, while this necessary period of discernment might feel beyond our abilities, it is within the bounds of what we can accomplish, and the results will be far greater than we can even imagine.

Summaries and Recommendations

The Task Force agreed in most of the areas the Diocesan Convention members asked us to consider. The areas where we disagreed, however, were significant ones and would lead to conclusions that differ substantially from one another. We decided, therefore, to give voice to different points of view in this section, allowing each perspective to be “summed up” and its recommendations explained. In structuring this section, we found it useful to rely on the Anglican “three-legged stool” of scripture, tradition, and reason.

Summaries

Summary of a Traditional View

The area where we disagree most substantively centers on what scripture says and how scripture should be interpreted. We believe that scripture not only condemns sex outside of marriage but it specifically condemns sexual relations between two men. In Genesis, God provided us with a model for intimate relationships: a man and a woman who are joined together by God, primarily for procreation but also for companionship and support. In later verses (particularly in Leviticus but echoed in other texts as well), God specifically deplores sexuality between two men. We understand the

Summary of an Alternate View

While the Genesis model of a loving relationship between a man and a woman indeed represents God’s plan for procreation, our concept of marriage has evolved as society has evolved. It is unclear that God would condemn loving relationships between people of the same sex; in fact, there are a number of Biblical examples of such relationships that scripture clearly holds up as models of holiness. Moreover, Task Force members agree that there are faithful interpretations of scripture that differ. Scholarship reveals instances where translations of original texts can be clarified. Archeological findings provide

arguments that this sexual behavior was part of pagan cultural and religious practices that no longer exist, but we believe that the condemnation was meant to be a general one. Sexuality that serves to divert humans from the male-female intimacy that God has established in the created order can never be blessed by the Church on God's behalf, even if that sexuality is engaged in out of love and support for another individual.

Our tradition, too, sees Holy Matrimony as a means of joining families to the Church, by bestowing God's blessing on couples who intend to live a holy life and to raise children in holiness. We believe that the Church undermines this tradition by even considering extending this blessing upon couples who do not qualify for Holy Matrimony.

Reason, while technically a separate leg of the three-legged stool, must be consistent with and subordinate to scripture and tradition. If scripture and tradition proclaim something to be immoral, we cannot use reason as a means of coming to a different

new insights into the historical and cultural milieu in which scripture was written. These insights help to uncover meanings for texts that might differ significantly from how they are read with contemporary eyes. The Task Force members agree that scripture is the inspired word of God. Tradition and reason, however, help us to understand that word more fully. A careful look at scriptures that appear to condemn sex relations between men yields significant doubts that the condemnations were blanket ones. They were just as likely to be condemnations of specific practices of the time when the scripture was written.

The Anglican tradition generally and the Episcopal Church specifically values how we live out Jesus' commandments to love God fully and our neighbors as ourselves. The General Convention of the Episcopal Church has on more than one occasion openly embraced the value of diverse groups such as lesbians and gay men as full participants in the body of Christ. There are no second-class citizens in our church, and so what is available to one

conclusion.

We wish to provide a welcome to all in our midst who seek Christ. We realize that many strive for holiness but do not qualify for Holy Matrimony. We want to ensure that the Church welcomes these individuals, provides care and support for them, and brings them to the love of Christ through the word and sacraments. We know that the love of Christ has the power to heal all our ills, as long as we are willing to confess and be obedient. We cannot contravene the word of God, even though we want to strive to include all persons in understanding God's love for them. In the end, the Church should be *in* the world, not *of* the world.

group of faithful church members should be available to all faithful church members, including all of the sacraments of the Church.

God gave us minds and told us to use them. As our understanding of sexual behavior has changed, the church has used reason to modify its positions on sexuality. As society becomes more accepting of same-sex marriage, the Church, too, needs to determine how to adapt to a new societal order. Perhaps a solution will be found in separating the role of the Church in civil marriage from the role of the Church in Holy Matrimony. Perhaps some other solution will be found. In any case, we are convinced that our bonds of affection will be strengthened, not weakened, through diversity of belief and constructive engagement.

Recommendations

The Task Force makes the following recommendations to the Bishop, the Diocesan Convention, and to clergy and parishes of the Diocese of San Diego:

1. We encourage individual parishes and missions to study and discuss this report and to advise the Bishop of the character and outcome of their efforts.
2. We encourage our 2009 General Convention deputation to support measures that allow the exercise of an "option" to perform blessings of same-sex

relationships, rather than measures that would direct such blessings to be performed or direct such blessings to be prohibited.

3. Should an “option” approach to the blessing of same-sex relationships be enacted by General Convention, we encourage our Bishop to put into place a process by which a church can discern if the blessing of same-sex relationships is appropriate to occur within its community.
 - a. We encourage this discernment to include extensive study and discussion of the appropriate General Convention resolution, this Task Force report, and the effects of the decision on the spiritual life of the congregation.
 - b. We also recommend against coercion or sanction that might be brought against any priest or congregation choosing to exercise or not to exercise such an option.
4. In discussion of these questions, we encourage congregations to follow the guidelines for discussion adopted by our task force and included in the Appendix to this report.
5. We encourage our Diocese and its congregations not to take any unilateral action that will knowingly further endanger the relationship of The Episcopal Church with the Anglican Communion.
6. We encourage our Diocese to advocate for changes at the State and Federal levels that grant domestic partnerships and civil unions the same legal rights and privileges as married couples, including the elimination of financial penalties for those who marry. In addition, we encourage our 2009 General Convention deputation to support resolutions that would commit The Episcopal Church to similar advocacy on these issues.
7. We encourage our Diocese to continue to advocate for equal protection under the law regarding domestic partnerships and civil marriages.
8. We encourage readers of this report to explore its bibliography, appendix, and references included in the endnotes with the intent of achieving a balanced view of the issues raised in these pages.

Bibliography

- The American Gay Rights Movement: A Timeline. Retrieved 23 March 2009, from <http://www.infoplease.com/ipa/A0761909.html>.
- American Psychological Association. Answers to Your Questions for a Better Understanding of Sexual Orientation & Homosexuality. Retrieved May 15, 2009, from <http://www.apa.org/topics/orientation.html>.
- Andrade, Barbara. "A Parent's Story." Personal interview. September 2008.
- "Answers to Your Questions for a Better Understanding of Sexual Orientation and Homosexuality." American Psychological Association. 15 March 2009 <http://www.apa.org/topics/orientation.html>.
- "Baldwin Breaks Barrier, Becomes First Openly Lesbian House Member." 23 March 2009 <http://www.cnn.com/ALLPOLITICS/stories/1998/11/03/election/house/wisconsin.cd2/>
- Battle, Michael, Katherine Grieb, Jay Johnson, Mark McIntosh, Catherine Roskam, Timothy Sedgwick, Kathryn Tanner, and Pamela W. Darling. *To Set Our Hope on Christ – A Response to the Invitation of Windsor Report Paragraph 135*. New York: The Office of Communication, the Episcopal Church Center, 2005.
- Bishop's Task Force on Marriage – Episcopal Church in the Diocese of Los Angeles. "Some Questions and Answers: The Sacramental Blessing of Life-long Covenants," 2008.
- Bishop's Task Force on Marriage – Episcopal Church in the Diocese of Los Angeles. "Some Questions and Answers: Same-Sex Marriage and Holy Matrimony," 2008.
- "Blessing Holy Relationships." St. Dunstan's Episcopal Church. May 2008.
- Bloomquist, Karen and Ronald W. Duty. *Talking Together as Christians about Tough Social Issues-Division for Church and Society*. Evangelical Lutheran Church of America. Chicago, Illinois: Augsburg Fortress Publishers, 1999.
- Boswell, John. *Same-Sex Unions in Premodern Europe*. New York: Vintage Books, 1995.

- Breidenthal, Thomas E. *Sacred Unions, A New Guide to Lifelong Commitment*.
Cambridge: Cowley Publications, 2006.
- "Bridge Builder." *Living Stones Ministries 2* (2008) 2. 15 March 2009,
<http://livingstonesministries.wordpress.com>.
- Burby, Liza N. "To Knot or Not; Late-in-life Couples Weigh the Social, Emotional and
Financial Issues of Marrying Again." *Newsday* 16 August 2008.
- Bullough, Vern. "When Did the Gay Rights Movement Begin?" *History News Network*. 18
April 2005. <<http://hnn.us/articles/11316.html>>.
- Buttrick, George Arthur, ed. *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, Vol. 1 and Vol. 2.
Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1962.
- California Constitution*. 23 March 2009 <http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/.const/article_1>.
- Campo-Flores, Arian. "A Gay Marriage Surge." *Newsweek*, 16 December 2008.
Accessed May 14, 2009, at <http://www.newsweek.com/id/172399>.
- Cavanaugh, Amy. "Polis Becomes 3rd Openly Gay Member of Congress." *Washington
Blade* 5 November, 2008. Accessed 23 March 2009 at
http://www.washingtonblade.com/thelatest/thelatest.cfm?blog_id=22220.
- Chicago Consultation. 23 March 2009 <<http://www.chicagoconsultation.org/>>.
- Childs, James M. and Margaret G. Payne. *Journey Together Faithfully, Part Two – The
Church and Homosexuality*. Evangelical Lutheran Church of America. Chicago,
Illinois: Augsburg Fortress Press, 2003.
- Chittister, Joan D. "Prayer in Honor of Those Whom Jesus Loved." 1999. from a card
sold by The Benedictine Sisters of Erie, PA. Erie, PA: Benetvision, 1999.
- Clift, Eleanor. "The Quest for a Spiritual Home." *Newsweek* 26 January 2009: 62.
- Cohen, Richard. *Coming Out Straight: Understanding and Healing Homosexuality*.
Winchester, VA: Oakhill Press, 2000.
- "Constitution and Canons of The Episcopal Church." Church Publishing Incorporated:
New York, 2006. 23 March 2009
http://www.episcopalarchives.org/earchives/canons/CandC_FINAL_11.29.2006.pdf.

- Coontz, Stephanie. "For Better, For Worse; Marriage Means Something Different Now ." The Washington Post 1 May 2005,B.01.
- Coontz, Stephanie. "Too Close for Comfort". *The New York Times* 7 November 2006.
- Cox, R. David. *Bond and Covenant: A Perspective on Holy Matrimony from The Book of Common Prayer*. New York: Church Publishers, 1999.
- Creasy, Bill. *Homosexuality*. Los Angeles, California: Logos Ministries, 1997.
- Cross, Frank Leslie and Elizabeth A. Livingstone, eds. *Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, 3rd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Dallas, Joe "Responding to Pro-Gay Theology." *The Journal of Human Sexuality*, n.d. Accessed May 15, 2009 at <http://www.leaderu.com/jhs/>.
- Dawn, Marva J. *Sexual Character, Beyond Technique to Intimacy*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1993.
- Deprimo, Michael. "How Gay Activists Hijacked Marriage." *AFA Journal*, February 2009.
- Eadie, William F. "A Primer on Relationships." Written for the Holy Relationships Task Force. September, 2008.
- Eadie, William F. "In Plain Sight: Gay and Lesbian Communication and Culture." In Larry A. Samovar, Richard E. Porter, and Edwin R. McDaniel (eds.), *Intercultural Communication: A Reader*, 12th ed. (219-231). Belmont, CA: Thompson Publishing Company, 2008.
- Ellison, Marvin M. *Same-Sex Marriage? A Christian Ethical Analysis*. Cleveland: The Pilgrim Press, 2004.
- The Episcopal Diocese of Vermont. "A Report to the Bishop and People of the Episcopal Diocese of Vermont from the Task Force on the Blessing of Persons Living in Same-Gender Relationships" June 8, 2004, accessed March 12, 2009, at <http://www.dioceseofvermont.org/Resources/TFonBlessings/VT%20Blessings%20Report.pdf>.
- Farley, Margaret A. *Just Love: A Framework for Christian Sexual Ethics*. New York: The Continuum International Publishing Group Inc., 2008.

- Gagnon, Robert A.J. *The Bible and Homosexual Practice: Texts and Hermeneutics*. Nashville: Abingdon, 2001.
- Gagnon, Robert A.J. and Dan O. Via. *Homosexuality and the Bible – Two Views*. Minnesota: Augsburg Fortress, 2003.
- Gagnon, Robert A.J. “More than ‘Mutual Joy’: Lisa Miller of *Newsweek* against Scripture and Jesus.” 16 December 2008. Accessed May 15, 2009 at <http://www.robgagnon.net/NewsweekMillerHomosexResp.htm>.
- Gay Rights Poll. KPBS / Competitive Edge Research. June, 2004 223 March 2009 <<http://cerc.net/public-research/kpbs/>>.
- Hallman, Janelle. *The Heart of Female Same –Sex Attraction: A Comprehensive Counseling Resource*. Downers Grove, IL: IVP Books, 2008.
- Harden, Blaine. “Numbers Drop for the Married with Children; Institution Becoming The Choice of the Educated, Affluent.” *The Washington Post* 4 March 2007.
- Harl, Kenneth W. *The World of Byzantium* (audio and video lecture series). Chantilly, Va.: The Teaching Co., 2001.
- Harrison, Mark. “Commitment Ceremony.” Personal email. September 2008.
- Hatchett, Marion J. *Commentary on the American Prayer Book*. New York: Seabury Press, 1980.
- Helfand, Duke. “Faith Forms a Bond for a Lesbian Priest and a Mormon Father of Three.” *Los Angeles Times* 13 February 2009.
- Helping, Charles, ed. *Our Selves, Our Souls and Bodies, Sexuality and the Household of God*. Cambridge: Cowley Publications, 1996.
- Helminiak, Daniel A. *What the Bible Really Says About Homosexuality*. Tajiue: Alamo Square Press, 2000.
- Hopkins, Michael W. “Claiming the Blessing: A Message to the Church,” 2002. Accessed May 15, 2009, at <http://www.claimingtheblessing.org>.
- Hopkins, Michael. *What does it mean for the church to give its blessing?* Accessed 13 March 2009 at <http://www.claimingtheblessing.org/files/pdf/CTBTheology_Final_.pdf>.

- Horvat, Marian Therese. "Rewriting History to Serve the Gay Agenda." Accessed 23 March 2009 at http://www.traditioninaction.org/bkreviews/A_002br_SameSex.htm.
- Hultgren, Arland and Walter Taylor. *Journey Together Faithfully, Part Two: The Church and Homosexuality*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 2003.
- Jayson, Sharon. "Sooner vs. Later: Is There an Ideal Age for First Marriage?" *USA Today*. 9 November 2008.
- Jernigan, Dennis. *Giant Killers*. New York: Random House, 2005.
- Johnson, William Stacy. *A Time to Embrace: Same-Gender Relationships in Religion, Law, and Politics*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2006.
- Kamp Dush, Claire M., Catherine L. Cohan, and Paul R. Amato. "The relationship between cohabitation and marital quality and stability: Change across cohorts?" *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 65.3 (2003): 539-549.
- Keeley, Jim R. "A Father's Story." Personal interview. 2006.
- LeMasters, Philip. *Toward a Eucharistic Vision of Church: Family, Marriage and Sex*. Minneapolis: Light and Life, 2004.
- Marshall, Paul V. *Prayer Book Parallels*. New York: The Church Hymnal Corporation, 1989.
- Marshall, Paul V. *Same-Sex Unions, Stories and Rites*. New York: Church Publishing, 2004.
- Metzger, Bruce M. and Roland E. Murphy, eds. *NRSV Bible with the Apocrypha*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991.
- Miller, Lisa. "Our Mutual Joy." *Newsweek* 16 December 2008.
- Moore, Peter. "Homosexuality and the Great Commandment." Trinity Episcopal School For Ministry, Annual Convention of the Diocese of Pittsburgh, 2002.
- Mouw, Richard. "Less Shouting, More Talking." *Newsweek* 9 February 2009: 26.
- Moyers, Bill. "Homosexuality and the Episcopal Church (1976–2007)." *Bill Moyers Journal*, PBS, 2008.

- Myers, David and Letha Dawson Scanzoni. *What God Has Joined Together: The Christian Case for Gay Marriage*. New York: Harper Collins, 2006.
- Popenoe, David. "The Future of Marriage in America." *The State of Our Unions, 2007*. New Brunswick, New Jersey: The National Marriage Project, Rutgers University, 2007. Accessed May 15, 2009, at <http://marriage.rutgers.edu/Publications/SOOU/TEXTSOOU2007.htm>.
- New Revised Standard Bible*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 2005.
- Paglia, Camille. "Boswell Reviews." *The Washington Post* 17 July 1994. Accessed 23 March 2009, at <<http://www.fordham.edu/halsall/pwh/bosrev-paglia.html>>.
- Peterson, Kavan. "50-State Rundown on Gay Marriage Laws." 3 November 2004. Accessed 23 March 2009, at <<http://www.stateline.org/live/ViewPage.action?siteNodeId=136&languageId=1&contentId=15576>>.
- PFLAG.com* - National Blog. Safe Schools for All. "Safe Schools - Cultivating Respect." Accessed 31 March 2009, at <<http://community.pflag.org/Page.aspx?pid=1011>>.
- Pickens-Jones, Linda. *Living Lovingly: Talking About Marriage Equality from a Faith Perspective*. Sacramento: California Council of Churches.
- Resolution Urging the Bishop to Form a Task force to Study Holiness in Relationships and Blessings in Churches of the Episcopal Diocese of San Diego. 2007.
- Roberts, Sam. "51% of Women Are Now Living Without a Spouse." *The New York Times* 16 January 2007.
- Rogers, Eugene F. *Sexuality and the Christian Body: Their Way into the Triune God*. Malden, Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers Inc., 1999.
- Satinover, Jeffery. "The Gay Gene." *The Journal of Human Sexuality*, n.d. Accessed May 15, 2009 at <http://www.leaderu.com/jhs/>.
- Scanzoni, Letha Dawson and Virginia Ramey. *Is the Homosexual My Neighbor? A Positive Christian Response*. New York: HarperOne, 1994.
- Shepherd, Jr., Massey Hamilton. *The Oxford American Prayer Book Commentary*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1950.

- Silker, Jeffrey S. *Homosexuality in the Church, Both Sides of the Debate*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1994.
- Spong, John Shelby. *Living in Sin? A Bishop Rethinks Human Sexuality*. New York: Harper Collins Publishers, 1990.
- Spong, John Shelby. "Statement of Koinonia". 25 August 1994. Accessed 23 March 2009, at <<http://andromeda.rutgers.edu/~lcrew/koinonia.html>>.
- "Stonewall and Beyond: Lesbian and Gay Culture."
<<http://www.columbia.edu/cu/lweb/eresources/exhibitions/sw25/case1.html>>.
- Stott, John. *Same-Sex Partnerships? A Christian Perspective*. Grand Rapids: Revell, 1998.
- Strauss, Mark and Peter Vogt. *To Set Our Hope on Christ*. St. Paul: Bethel University, 2005.
- Sullivan, Andrew. *Same-Sex Marriage, Pro and Con*. New York: Vintage Books, 2004.
- Thomas, Rev. Canon Allisyn Thomas. "True Stories." Personal interviews. September 2008.
- Thomas, David M. "What Makes Marriage a Sacrament?" *Christian Marriage: The New Challenge*. Collegeville, Minnesota: Liturgical Press, 2007.

Other Useful Associations and Websites

- American Academy of Pediatrics. 141 Northwest Point Blvd., El Grove Villiage, IL 60007, 1-847-434-4000. <<http://www.aap.org/>>.
- American Association of Christian Counselors. Box 739, Forest, VA, P.O. Box 739 24551 800.526.8673 <<http://www.aacc.net/>>.
- American Association of Christian Therapists. Day Spring Ministries. P O Box 76048, Granburg, TX 76048, <<http://aactonlinetx.tripod.com/>>.
- American Medical Association. 515 N. State Street, Chicago, IL 60654. (800) 621-8335 <<http://www.ama-assn.org/>>.
- American Psychiatric Association. 1000 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 1825, Arlington, Va. 22209-3901 phone: 703-907-7300 <<http://www.psych.com>>.

American Psychological Association. 750 First Street, NE, Washington, DC 20002-4242. 800-374-2721; 202-336-5500. TDD/TTY: 202-336-6123.
<<http://www.apa.org>>.

Family Research Council. 801 G Street, NW, Washington, D.C.
20001, <<http://www.frc.com>>.

National Association for Research & Therapy of Homosexuality (NARTH) 1-888-364-4744, <<http://www.narth.com>>.

Appendix: A Guide for Dialogue

The task force members gave each other the gifts of time and personal commitment as we approached the task before us. We began discussion gently, with discussion guidelines and ground rules, taking care to balance the initial small groups in terms of general point of view, clergy and laity. Step by step, we grew into a community of mutual respect and support that faced difficult and controversial subjects directly. With great intention, we came to recognize the presence of the Holy Spirit.

Our willingness to address the difficult, controversial subjects, candidly, without blame or defense became the blessing of our work. We became better informed, and more sensitive and respectful to each other as persons of common faith.

It is our recommendation and hope that you will invest in a similar process: address the difficult subjects, seek understanding (not necessarily agreement) of other points of view, and nurture your community. We pray that you will do this in love for the Episcopal Church, and your call to live out the Gospel of Jesus Christ.

Guidelines for Discussion

- Be as committed to listening to others, as to speaking for yourself.
- There are not “right” answers or “wrong” answers, no winners, no losers.
- Share your ideas and feelings – do not debate or insist on proving your point.
- The most important part of the discussion is your respect for each other.

Study Questions

Scripture

1. How do we determine which translation of Scripture to use to support our study and interpretation?
2. Is it appropriate to interpret Scripture on the basis of what was “not said?”
3. After learning the different ways of interpreting Scripture, which way do you find to be most helpful for yourself?

4. After reading the different views about scriptural texts, which of these particularly resonate with you?
5. What does Scripture say about homosexual or same-sex relations?
6. What does Scripture say about heterosexual or opposite-sex relations?

Holy Relationships

7. What kind of relationships can be holy - only opposite-sex relationships, or would you include same-sex relationships?
8. If a same-sex relationship does not include sexual intercourse, can it be holy?
9. If an opposite-sex relationship includes premarital or extra-marital sexual intercourse, can it be holy?
10. How would the blessing of a couple in a committed relationship differ from the marriage of a couple in a committed relationship?

The Church

11. What does "blessing" mean to you?
12. How has the Church's teaching about marriage changed over the centuries? What has stayed the same? What has prompted change?
13. Should the clergy of our diocese dispense with being the agents of civil marriage and focus only on blessing holy relationships, regardless of whether civil marriage has occurred?
14. If "local option" to conduct same-sex blessings were allowed by General Convention and the Diocese of San Diego, what should be the discernment process be *in each congregation* to determine the appropriateness of conducting these blessings?
15. Should the decision to bless a relationship require the same standards and pastoral oversight as requests to conduct a marriage ceremony?

Personal Reflection

16. The Episcopal Church bases its faith on the “three-legged stool” of Scripture, tradition and reason. What is the importance of each? Is any one more important than is any other?
17. What experiences have you had that have influenced you to look again at the relationships of gay couples within the church?
18. What have you learned from your study? What have you learned from your discussion? Into which topics would you like to delve more deeply?
19. Has this study helped you to understand different perspectives on these issues?
20. How can we live in community with each other, when we disagree about these important matters?

Endnotes

¹ Strauss, Mark and Peter Vogt. *To Set Our Hope on Christ*. St. Paul: Bethel University, 2005, p. 10. All Biblical texts in this report are quoted from the New Revised Standard Version, unless otherwise noted.

² Johnson, William Stacy. *A Time to Embrace: Same-Gender Relationships in Religion, Law, and Politics*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2006, p. 151.

³ Johnson, p. 272.

⁴ There is a difference between the Bible *describing* a behavior and *prescribing* a behavior.

⁵ Quoted in Stott, John. *Same-Sex Partnerships? A Christian Perspective*. Grand Rapids: Revell, 1998, p. 40.

⁶ Gagnon, Robert A.J. *The Bible and Homosexual Practice: Texts and Hermeneutics*. Nashville: Abingdon, 2001, p. 61.

⁷ Johnson, p. 121.

⁸ Johnson, pp. 115-6.

⁹ Johnson, p. 120.

¹⁰ Johnson, p. 146.

¹¹ Johnson, p. 118.

¹² Johnson, p. 153.

¹³ Myers, David and Letha Dawson Scanzoni. *What God Has Joined Together: The Christian Case for Gay Marriage*. New York: Harper Collins, 2006, pp. 84-5.

¹⁴ Johnson, p. 153.

¹⁵ Strauss and Vogt, p. 20.

¹⁶ Myers and Scanzoni, p. 86. See also Helminiak, Daniel A. *What the Bible Really Says About Homosexuality*. Tajiique: Alamo Square Press, 2000, p. 45.

¹⁷ Hultgren, Arland and Walter Taylor. "Background Essay on Biblical Texts" for *Journey Together Faithfully, Part Two: The Church and Homosexuality*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 2003, p. 4.

¹⁸ Helminiak, p. 48. It was common for the master to use slaves sexually; see discussion of Luke 7:1-10 below.

¹⁹ Stott, p. 45.

²⁰ Helminiak, p. 55.

²¹ Johnson, p. 127.

-
- ²² For example, Proverbs 16:5, “All those who are arrogant are an abomination to the Lord.”
- ²³ Myers and Scanzoni, p. 89.
- ²⁴ Johnson, p. 128.
- ²⁵ Johnson, p. 126.
- ²⁶ Gagnon, p. 76.
- ²⁷ Stott, p. 46.
- ²⁸ Myers and Scanzoni, p. 99.
- ²⁹ Hultgren and Taylor, p. 10.
- ³⁰ Myers and Scanzoni, p. 98. See also Scanzoni, Letha Dawson and Virginia Ramey. “The Debate in Christendom.” *Is the Homosexual My Neighbor? Revised and Updated: Positive Christian Response*, 1994, pp. 131-2.
- ³¹ Hultgren and Taylor, p. 11.
- ³² Hultgren and Taylor, p. 12.
- ³³ Hultgren and Taylor, p. 12.
- ³⁴ This passage reads, “Their women exchanged natural usage for unnatural.”
- ³⁵ Helminiak, pp. 78-104.
- ³⁶ Strauss and Vogt, p. 23.
- ³⁷ Gagnon, p. 83.
- ³⁸ Gagnon, pp. 81-2.
- ³⁹ Helminiak, p. 106.
- ⁴⁰ Johnson, p. 132.
- ⁴¹ Johnson, p. 133.
- ⁴² Gagnon, p. 87.
- ⁴³ Johnson, pp. 132-3; Hultgren and Taylor, pp. 16-7.
- ⁴⁴ The longest exchange between two women is that of Rachel and Leah, over who gets to sleep with Jacob!
- ⁴⁵ Of course, eunuchs may be passive partners in sexual activity as well.

-
- ⁴⁶ Helminiak, p. 123.
- ⁴⁷ Helminiak, pp. 123-6.
- ⁴⁸ Helminiak, p. 127.
- ⁴⁹ Johnson, pp. 140-1.
- ⁵⁰ Harl, Kenneth W. *The World of Byzantium* (audio and video lecture series). Chantilly, Va.: The Teaching Co., 2001.
- ⁵¹ *The Interpreters Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. 2, pp. 179-180.
- ⁵² Johnson, p. 145.
- ⁵³ Helminiak, p. 126.
- ⁵⁴ See Seneca the Elder, *Controversiae* 4, 1:431, "Unchastity is a ... necessity for a slave...."
- ⁵⁵ Johnson, pp. 141-2; Helminiak, pp. 127-9.
- ⁵⁶ Johnson, p. 141.
- ⁵⁷ Johnson, p. 138. As with heterosexual relationships, homosexual relationships are not proscriptively promiscuous.
- ⁵⁸ Myers and Scanzoni, p. 102.
- ⁵⁹ Helminiak, pp. 70-2.
- ⁶⁰ Johnson, pp. 147-152.
- ⁶¹ Johnson, p. 147.
- ⁶² Admittedly, this is not stated explicitly in the BCP.
- ⁶³ I.18.3, National Canons of The Episcopal Church.
- ⁶⁴ Before 1786, the BCP included an added dimension reportedly not found in marriage services in other faith traditions: "...therefore (it) is not by any to be enterprised, nor taken in hand, unadvisedly, lightly, or wantonly, to satisfy men's carnal lusts and appetites, like brute beasts that have no understanding."
- ⁶⁵ The Los Angeles Diocese has used the trial liturgy approach to sanction the blessing of all holy relationships.
- ⁶⁶ From DO39: Human Sexuality: Issues Related to Sexuality and Relationships. Adopted by the Seventy-third General Convention of the Episcopal Church, Denver, CO, July 2000.
- ⁶⁷ See, for example, Kamp Dush, Claire M., Catherine L. Cohan, and Paul R. Amato. "The relationship between cohabitation and marital quality and stability: Change across cohorts?" *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 65.3 (2003): 539-549.

⁶⁸ Pickens-Jones, Linda. *Living Lovingly: Talking About Marriage Equality from a Faith Perspective*. Sacramento: California Council of Churches, p. 11.

⁶⁹ The Episcopal Diocese of Vermont. "A Report to the Bishop and People of the Episcopal Diocese of Vermont from the Task Force on the Blessing of Persons Living in Same-Gender Relationships" June 8, 2004, accessed May 14, 2009, at <http://www.dioceseofvermont.org/Resources/TFonBlessings/VT%20Blessings%20Report.pdf>, p. 3.

⁷⁰ Campo-Flores, Arian. "A Gay Marriage Surge." *Newsweek*, 16 December 2008. Accessed May 14, 2009, at <http://www.newsweek.com/id/172399>.

⁷¹ According to the American Psychological Association (<http://www.apa.org/topics/orientation.html#whatcauses>, accessed June 1, 2009), "There is no consensus among scientists about the exact reasons that an individual develops a heterosexual, bisexual, gay, or lesbian orientation. Although much research has examined the possible genetic, hormonal, developmental, social, and cultural influences on sexual orientation, no findings have emerged that permit scientists to conclude that sexual orientation is determined by any particular factor or factors. Many think that nature and nurture both play complex roles; most people experience little or no sense of choice about their sexual orientation."

⁷² It is known that this harassment has damaging and sometimes tragic consequences for gay youth. Anti-gay harassment destabilizes the learning environment for all students. Now, more schools nationwide are supporting each child's right to a safe and equitable learning environment, free from harassment, violence and discrimination, through policy development, enforcement, and teacher and student training.

⁷³ Therapy is a complicated issue in the gay community. Because gay men and lesbians were historically portrayed as "sick" individuals, many of those individuals chafe at the idea that therapy should be available that is designed to "cure" them, that is, to turn them into heterosexuals. Indeed, the American Psychiatric Association, in 1973, removed homosexuality from its list of mental illnesses (see p. 35 of this report). Still, there are religious and quasi-religious organizations that advocate for the availability of what has been called "reparative," "restorative," or "conversion" therapy to provide services for individuals who are struggling with their sexuality and for families of adolescents who may be lesbian or gay. These forms of therapy have adherents and claims of success (see, for example, Cohen, Richard. *Coming Out Straight: Understanding and Healing Homosexuality*. Winchester, VA: Oakhill Press, 2000; and Hallman, Janelle. *The Heart of Female Same-Sex Attraction: A Comprehensive Counseling Resource*. Downers Grove, IL: IVP Books, 2008.). These claims are countered by statements from groups such as the American Psychological Association to the effect that there exists no scientific evidence that such a therapeutic approach is safe or effective (see American Psychological Association. *Answers to Your Questions For a Better Understanding of Sexual Orientation & Homosexuality*. Retrieved May 15, 2009, from <http://www.apa.org/topics/orientation.html>). The Episcopal Church's 2003 General Convention also weighed in on this topic with the following resolution (C004): "Resolved, That the 74th General Convention of The Episcopal Church affirm that sexuality is a gift of God and insists that any religious, spiritual, psychological, or psychiatric treatment which seeks to assist those who are confused about or unhappy with their sexual orientation not be coercive or manipulative; and be it further Resolved, That this Church oppose any religious, spiritual, psychological, or psychiatric consulting or treatment which compromises our baptismal covenant to respect the dignity of every human being, affirming that medical treatment, psychological therapy, and pastoral counseling should conform to the professional standards of the respective professions."

⁷⁴ Public health officials call these individuals MSMs, "men who have sex with men." These individuals often do not identify themselves as being gay and sometimes refer to their activities as being on the "down low."

⁷⁵ Cross, Frank Leslie and Elizabeth A. Livingstone, eds. *Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, 3rd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

⁷⁶ *BCP*, p. 857.

⁷⁷ *BCP*, p. 860.

⁷⁸ *BCP*, p. 860.

⁷⁹ *BCP*, p. 861.

⁸⁰ Cross and Livingstone.

⁸¹ Cox, R. David. *Bond and Covenant: A Perspective on Holy Matrimony from The Book of Common Prayer*. New York: Church Publishers, 1999.

⁸² Cross and Livingstone.

⁸³ Bishop's Task Force on Marriage – Episcopal Church in Los Angeles Diocese. "Some Questions and Answers: The Sacramental Blessing of Life-long Covenants," 2008, p. 3.

⁸⁴ Bishop's Task Force, p. 3.

⁸⁵ Full poll results available online at <http://cerc.net/public-research/kpbs/>. These data have been partially confirmed by a May 2009 national poll by the Gallup Organization. See <http://www.gallup.com/poll/118931/Knowing-Someone-Gay-Lesbian-Affects-Views-Gay-Issues.aspx> for details.