

**Final Report of the Special Committee to Study
Issues of Civil Union and Christian Marriage**

includes the minority report



As approved by the 219th General Assembly (2010) Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.)

Final Report

**Special Committee to Study Issues of
Civil Union and Christian Marriage**

including the minority report

Approved by
The 219th General Assembly (2010)
Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.)

Published by
The Office of the General Assembly
100 Witherspoon Street
Louisville, KY 40202-1396

Copyright © 2011
The Office of the General Assembly
Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.)

Printed in the United States of America

Cover design by the
Office of the General Assembly
Department of Communication, Development, and Technology

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronically, mechanically, photocopying, recording, or otherwise (brief quotations used in magazine or newspaper reviews excepted), without the prior permission of the publisher.

The sessions, presbyteries, and synods of the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) may use sections of this publication without receiving prior written permission of the publisher.

Transmittal of the Actions of the 219th General Assembly (2010) on the Report of the Special Committee to Study Issues of Civil Unions and Christian Marriage

Dear Friends,

Attached is the action of the 219th General Assembly (2010) in response to the action of the 218th General Assembly (2008) calling for the appointment of a Special Committee to Study Issues of Civil Union and Christian Marriage. You will find the final report and recommendations of the special committee as approved by the General Assembly. Also included is a minority report and recommendations that accompany the final report at the request of the 219th General Assembly (2010).

We have also provided a brief sketch of the work done by the special committee and the principles that guided them as they went about their task.

Please give full consideration to these two documents, especially the call to mutual forbearance with one another; and begin every discussion of these issues with the reminder that whatever our disagreements about particular issues such as these, we are bound together in Jesus Christ and are called to remain in fellowship with one another as we continue to seek God's will.

Yours in Christ,

Gradye Parsons
Stated Clerk of the General Assembly

Background

As soon as they were appointed by the Moderator of the 218th General Assembly (2008) in early 2009, members of the Special Committee to Study Civil Unions and Christian Marriage went to work. They were diverse in almost every respect, including perspectives on the scriptural warrant for covenanted same-gender relationships and the institution of Christian marriage, as well as the appropriate role of the state in certifying such relationships.

As they worked, it was quickly apparent that for all their differences, every member of the committee held their views in the context of devout faith in Jesus Christ and obedience to Scripture. The one thing about which all agreed was the unity they had in Jesus Christ.

Acknowledgment of their overriding unity led them early on to create and adopt a covenant to guide their deliberations and debates, which affirmed that even in the midst of disagreement they were ultimately united under the Lordship of Jesus Christ. They covenanted to demonstrate mutual forbearance because of their unity, and that bond was consistently reinforced by worship at the beginning and ending of each session when the committee met around the Lord's Table to share the bread and the cup.

As the committee gathered information called for by the 218th General Assembly (2008) and began to wrestle with how they would speak to the 219th General Assembly with a common voice, that message became, in simplest terms something like this:

We don't agree about the nature of marriage, especially as it may involve couples of the same gender. We don't agree as to the most faithful approach to how we welcome covenanted same-gender couples and their families into the fellowship of the church. What we do agree about is the central truth that we are one in Christ; therefore, no one can leave the table as we wrestle with one another seeking God's will on these difficult issues.

It was this willingness to work to live out their common, overriding bond in Christ that shaped the final report of the committee. Its centerpiece is the call to the whole church to struggle with these issues, remembering that even in our most serious disagreements we are all bound together in Christ.

The committee offered, in one sense, a *framework* for faithful wrestling with conflict-laden issues of faith and practice, rather than an answer to which all are bound. As a help in this process, the committee lifted up the biblical injunction to show mutual forbearance to one another and offered to the church the covenant that guided the committee as they carried out their mandate.

In the end, three members of the special committee could not endorse the committee's report. It was their conviction that the committee's report did not adequately lift up the witness of Scripture and of our church's Constitution, which to them are unequivocally clear that God's intention for marriage is between a man and a woman only and that celibacy is mandatory for all who are not married. (It should be noted that other committee members shared this view, but agreed to support the committee's approach.)

Pursuant to their disagreement, the three committee members filed a minority report that stated in clear terms their convictions about Christian marriage and sexual behavior as mentioned above, and they provided additional commentary to support their report.

The special committee report and the minority report were presented to the members of Committee 12 of the 219th General Assembly, which sustained the special committee's report by a vote of 47-8.

Notice of a minority report was then filed by five of the dissenting members of Committee 12, bringing forward to the whole assembly the original minority report. When the two reports were offered to the General Assembly, the motion from Committee 12 to support the report of the special committee was sustained. An amendment was then offered from the floor to the effect that when the special committee's report was transmitted to the church at large, the minority report should also be offered to the church to provide a fuller picture of the committee's work. That amendment was approved by the assembly.

It was the advice of the Stated Clerk of the General Assembly that the report and recommendations of the special committee be transmitted to the church, along with the minority report and its recommendations. Both are commended for study and action as the church seeks ways to be more welcoming to covenanted same-gender couples and their families—the original intent of the 218th General Assembly (2008) that called for the creation of this special committee.

CONTENTS

Recommendations	1
Report	3
I. Introduction	3
II. Biblical and Historical Summary	3
A. Old Testament	3
B. New Testament	4
C. Historical Summary	5
1. The Early Interplay of Church and State	5
2. The Protestant Reformation	5
3. Early America	6
4. Recent Developments in Marriage Law	6
5. Marriage in the PC(USA)	7
6. Mirroring the Civil Disagreement in the Church	7
7. Where Other Christian Traditions Currently Stand	7
III. The Relationship Between Civil Union and Christian Marriage	8
A. The Difference Between Civil Marriage and Christian Marriage	9
B. A Comparison of Civil Union and Marriage	10
IV. The Effects of Current Laws on Same-Gender Partners and Their Children	10
A. Census Figures	11
B. Federal Laws	11
C. Varieties of State Laws	11
D. Current Research	12
V. What Is the Place of Covenanted Same-Gender Partnerships in the Christian Community?	12
A. Our Current Situation	13
B. Resources of Our Tradition	13
C. Our Covenant	14
D. Steps Toward Mutual Forbearance	14
VI. Conclusion	15
Endnotes	16
Minority Report Special Committee to Study Issues of Civil Union and Christian Marriage	20
Recommendations	20
I. Introduction	20
Our Starting Place	20
II. What Is the Place of Covenanted Same-Gender Partnerships in the Christian Community?	21
A. Our Current Disconnect	21
B. Variant Interpretations	22

C. A Question for the Church.....	23
D. Historic Principles.....	23
E. The Constitution Holds.....	24
F. A Faithful Answer.....	25
G. Our Covenant.....	25
III. Conclusion	25
Rationale/Commentary ²	26
A. Biblical and Historical Summary.....	26
1. Old Testament.....	27
2. New Testament	27
3. The Early Interplay of Church and State	28
4. The Protestant Reformation	28
5. Marriage Laws in America	29
6. Marriage in the PC(USA)	30
7. Other Christian Traditions and Marriage.....	30
B. The Relationship Between Civil Union and Christian Marriage.....	31
C. The Effects of Current Laws on Same-Gender Partners and Their Children	32
1. Census Figures.....	33
2. Federal Laws.....	33
3. Varieties of State Laws	34
4. Current Research.....	34
Endnotes for Minority Report.....	35

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The Special Committee to Study Issues of Civil Union and Christian Marriage recommends that the 219th General Assembly (2010):

a. commend the committee’s report and the minority report from the committee to sessions and presbyteries, and urge them to engage in study of the issues presented in the report; and

b. commend to the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) the covenant “Those Whom God Has Joined Together, Let No One Separate” (see at V.C. below) as a guide by which we broken and hurting people, seeking to be faithful, might come together to discuss issues about which we disagree.

2. The Special Committee to Study Issues of Civil Union and Christian Marriage recommends that the 219th General Assembly (2010):

a. affirm the church’s call to extend Christ’s compassion to all; and

b. encourage presbyteries and sessions to be diligent in their exercise of care in all the transitions of life, confessing our common brokenness and our unique individual expressions of that brokenness (W-6.3009, W-6.3010).

3. The Special Committee to Study Issues of Civil Union and Christian Marriage recommends that the 219th General Assembly (2010):

a. encourage all presbyteries and sessions to provide resources consonant with the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) regarding use of church facilities administered by said governing bodies for marriages and blessing ceremonies; and

b. encourage all presbyteries to provide resources consonant with the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) regarding clergy participation in marriages and/or same-sex union ceremonies. Such resources should include guidance on fulfilling the requirements for solemnizing of marriages within the civil jurisdiction or jurisdictions within which the presbytery is located.

4. The Special Committee to Study Issues of Civil Union and Christian Marriage recommends that the 219th General Assembly (2010) direct the General Assembly Mission Council, through its Office of Theology Worship and Education, and the Office of the General Assembly’s Department of Constitutional Services, to provide updated guidelines and resources addressing the difference between a ceremony of Christian marriage and a same-sex union ceremony.

5. The Special Committee to Study Issues of Civil Union and Christian Marriage recommends that the 219th General Assembly (2010):

a. encourage all sessions to engage in study of issues of biblical interpretation using the General Assembly papers, “Presbyterian Understanding and Use of Holy Scripture” and “Biblical Authority and Interpretation”;

b. direct the General Assembly Mission Council, through its Office of Theology Worship and Education, to develop and distribute a study guide for use with the General Assembly papers, “Presbyterian Understanding and Use of Holy Scripture” and “Biblical Authority and Interpretation” that will help sessions engage in issues of civil unions and Christian marriage in light of the principles contained within those papers; and

c. commend to sessions the use of additional resources related to biblical interpretation, specifically the video segment *Biblical Authority and Interpretation*, with its accompanying study guide, that was developed by the Theological Task Force on Peace, Unity, and Purity of the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.).

These recommendations and report are in response to the following referral: *2008 Referral: Item 04-13. On Equal Rights for Families of Same-Gender Partners, Recommendation 2. Direct the Moderator to Appoint a Special Committee, Representing the Broad Diversity and Theological Balance of the PC(USA) to Study History of Laws Governing Marriage and Civil Union, How Theology and Practice of Marriage Have Developed in Reformed and Broader Christian Tradition, Relationship Between Civil Union and Christian Marriage, Effects of Current Laws on Same-Gender Partners and Their Children, and Place of Covenanted Same-Gender Partnerships in Christian Community—From the Presbytery of Denver (Minutes, 2008, Part I, pp. 258–60).*

REPORT

I. Introduction

So then you are no longer strangers and aliens, but you are citizens with the saints and also members of the household of God, built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, with Christ Jesus himself as the cornerstone. In him the whole structure is joined together and grows into a holy temple in the Lord; in whom you also are built together spiritually into a dwelling place for God. (Eph.2:19–22)

The Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) is wrestling with the issue of same-gender marriage. Responding to this struggle, the 218th General Assembly (2008) of the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) directed the Moderator

... to appoint a special committee, representing the broad diversity and theological balance of the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.), to study the following, ... including any policy recommendations growing out of the study:

- a. The history of the laws governing marriage and civil union, including current policy debates.
- b. How the theology and practice of marriage have developed in the Reformed and broader Christian tradition.
- c. The relationship between civil union and Christian marriage.
- d. The effects of current laws on same-gender partners and their children.
- e. The place of covenanted same-gender partnerships in the Christian community. (*Minutes*, 2008, Part I, p. 259)

As members of Christ's church, we differ profoundly; but can we see that those who disagree with us are seeking to love one another with God's grace, advance the gospel in all its far-reaching inclusiveness, and promote greater faithfulness to the Triune God under the authority of Scripture and guided by the confessions? Though we reach very different conclusions, we can rejoice that our church is willing to wrestle together prayerfully with the question: How do we extend the grace of God to all, calling all persons to repentance, transformation, and discipleship—regardless of sexual orientation—so that all will experience God's gracious intention for humanity?

In many ways, life in the body of Christ is not unlike a marriage: In the course of our life together, we have good days and bad days, good times and challenging times, great joy and wrenching pain. We talk, we laugh, we cry. We agree and disagree. Occasionally, we get angry and are tempted to walk away. But like Christian marriage, in the body of Christ we know that the One who holds us together is more important than the arguments that threaten to tear us apart. That One is Jesus Christ, who said, "I give you a new commandment, that you love one another. Just as I have loved you, you also should love one another. By this everyone will know that you are my disciples, if you have love for one another" (Jn. 13:34–35). **Included in the mandate of this special committee was a directive that the PC(USA) constitutional definition of Christian marriage not be changed. In our confessions, marriage is consistently defined as a lifelong covenant between God, a man and a woman, and the community of faith.**

II. Biblical and Historical Summary

*The one sufficient revelation of God is Jesus Christ, the Word of God incarnate, to whom the Holy Spirit bears unique and authoritative witness through the Holy Scriptures, which are received and obeyed as the word of God written. ...*¹

In matters of faith and practice, the church turns to Scripture to hear the testimony of the Holy Spirit, acknowledging that it comes to us in human words, conditioned by the times in which they were written, times different from our own. Guided by literary and historical understanding, we study Scripture, so that we might follow the Word of God incarnate in our changing world.

In our study, considerable differences became apparent in understanding what the words of the Bible and the confessions say. Our committee's differences reflect similar differences within the denomination. The General Assembly has approved documents that detail the different ways Presbyterians approach Scripture.²

A. Old Testament

The Old Testament assumes an ancient Semitic understanding of marriage as the basis for the family, the fundamental unit of Hebrew society. Marriage provides four benefits to humanity:

- The birth and nurture of children (Gen. 1:28; 9:1; 15:1–6; 16:1–16; 21:1–7, and 29:1–30:24);
- Companionship, mutual support, and affection (Gen. 2:18–24 and 1 Sam. 1:1–28);

- Economic partnership, providing financial support for the family (Prov. 31:10–31 and the book of Ruth); and
- A political tool to form alliances between nations and advance political ambitions (1 Sam. 18:17–27; 19:11–17; 25:44; 2 Sam. 3:13–15; 6:16–23; and 1 Kings 11:1–4).

The Torah contains many laws regulating marriage and divorce. These include Ex. 20:14, 17; Deut. 5:18, 21; Lev. 18:6–18; 20:10; Num. 5:11–31; Deut. 22:13–21; 24:1–5; and 25:5–10.

Marriage is used often by the prophets as a symbol of God’s relationship to Israel. Usually, it represents the exclusive attachment of Israel to God, who is referred to as Israel’s husband. The repeated history of the Israelites worshiping gods of the people around them is likened to adultery.³

- Hosea marries a prostitute, symbolizing God’s gracious love for Israel as Hosea forgives her.
- God restores God’s forsaken wife, Israel (Isa. 54:1–8, 62:1–5).
- Jeremiah speaks to Israel as a young bride (Jer. 2:2), while in 3:6–10 he represents the faithlessness of Israel as adultery.
- Ezekiel depicts Israel’s disobedience as the adultery of an unfaithful wife (Ezekiel 16).

Since God is consistently represented as the husband of Israel, the exclusively female images of the unfaithful partner flow from the imagery. With Judah (Gen. 38:26) and David (1 Sam. 12:1–15), Scripture censures male infidelity, as well.

B. *New Testament*

Jesus’ public ministry begins at a wedding feast in Cana, where he performs his first miracle (Jn. 2:1–11). Throughout his ministry, Jesus makes significant statements about marriage:

- Jesus addresses a question about a hypothetical widow of seven husbands, indicating that marriage is not part of life in the resurrection (Mt. 22:23–33, as well as Mk. 12:18–27, and Lk. 20:27–40).
- Jesus condemns divorce, restricting it further than provided by Jewish law (Mt. 19:3–9 and Mk. 10:2–12).⁴
- Jesus seems to indicate a preference for celibacy in his comment about eunuchs, while acknowledging this may not be best for everyone (Mt. 19:10–12).
- Jesus uses marriage as an illustration in several parables (Mt. 22:1–14; Mt. 25:1–13; and Lk. 12:35–38).

In the first-century church, marriage was an issue because of the expected imminent coming of the kingdom of God and because the diverse marriage practices in the Greco-Roman culture posed a challenge to good order in the Christian community.

- Paul writes of the divine gift of marriage as an antidote against *porneia*, a Greek term originally meaning “prostitution,” but later broadened to cover a range of sexual misconduct (1 Cor. 7:2–6).⁵
- Paul writes against divorce (1 Cor. 7:7–9, 32–40).
- Paul indicates his preference of celibacy over marriage (1 Cor. 7:7–9, 32–40).
- An analogy is drawn elsewhere between the marriage of husband and wife and the union of Christ with his church (Eph. 5:25–27; Rev. 19:6–8; and Rev. 21:9–10).

Toward the end of the first century, as the expectation of an imminent arrival of God’s kingdom faded and the church prepared itself to be a continuing human institution, several trends emerged, as mentioned in 1 Timothy:

- Qualifications for church leaders (ministers) included being married, but only to one wife (3:2).
- Some parties within the church promoted celibacy as an ideal, even as a requirement for faithful Christians, but this was rejected by the orthodox leaders (4:1–6).
- Young widows were encouraged to remarry for economic support, procreation, and to avoid immorality and scandal (5:14).

C. Historical Summary

1. *The Early Interplay of Church and State*

The institution of marriage appears not only on the pages of Scripture but also in the ancient world. In ancient Rome, a couple was considered legally married if they agreed that marriage was the intent behind their cohabitation. Because marriage alliances in the ancient world were based on money and power, they could be revoked as quickly as they were invoked if another marital alliance offered more of either.

Early Christians understood themselves as set apart and distinct from the culture around them. In Ephesians and elsewhere, the ideas of mutual submission and love distinguished Christian marriage from the absolute rule of the *paterfamilias*⁶ characteristic of Graeco-Roman marriage.

The early Christian church was an underground and often persecuted movement with little ability to influence official policies in the Roman Empire on matters like marriage. Nevertheless, theologians showed a vital interest in the understanding and practice of marriage in the early Christian community. When Christianity became a legal religion of the Roman Empire in 313, laws enacted under Constantine and his successors began to reflect the influence of Christian views about marriage. Augustine expounded upon the three “goods” of marriage—offspring, exclusive fidelity, and the unbreakable bond between husband and wife.

By the mid-fifth century, legal codes enacted after Constantine⁷ included many statutes on marriage:

- Restrictions on divorce and remarriage,
- Prohibition of same-sex marriage, and
- Proscription of clergy to marry, though married men could become clergy.

After the disintegration of the Roman Empire in the West, and for the next several hundred years, marriage was regulated at a local level. The church was involved, but not in a regulatory capacity. Gradually, local customs were combined with biblical interpretations and developed into canon law. Beginning about 800, the church increasingly asserted its authority over marriage.

In 1215, the Fourth Lateran Council decreed the absolute prohibition of “clandestine weddings”⁸—the longstanding practice that if two people had privately consented to marry, it was a valid marriage. By so doing, the church claimed jurisdiction over marriage by insisting that all marriages be held in the church building and before a priest.

During the Middle Ages, the Roman Catholic Church developed further canon law governing marriage, including proscriptions against incest, polygamy, bestiality, and sodomy. Provisions were made for the annulment of marriages formed through duress or fraud, as well as those between persons related by blood or family ties; the church also claimed the power to declare valid marriage bonds indissoluble. By the early sixteenth century, the church’s canon law was the predominant law governing marriage in the West.⁹

Thus, on the eve of the Reformation, in the Roman Catholic Church:

- Celibacy was the norm for clerical and monastic life;
- Marriage, although less holy than celibacy, was a sacrament and “means of grace”; and
- The church regulated marriage law.

2. *The Protestant Reformation*

In the sixteenth century, the Protestant Reformers insisted that Scripture alone be the basis of authority in the church, and re-examined marriage and canon law in light of biblical teaching. In Protestant churches:

- Marriage became a Christian vocation and was considered good, but no longer a sacrament, and
- Celibacy was no longer required of clergy.

However, Protestant views on the theology and regulation of marriage differed:

- Martin Luther (1483–1546) promoted the state’s role in the regulation of marriage. For Luther, civil magistrates acted as God’s vice-regents in the governance of marriage. Civil marriage codes replaced canon law, although many of the principles of canon law (consent, publicity, proscription of prohibited relationships) continued in force. Church leaders were expected to counsel civil authorities in the administration of marriage law.

- King Henry VIII (1491–1547) broke with the Roman Catholic Church to obtain a divorce. He placed church authority under the monarchy, thus beginning the English Reformation. Henry regulated the church, and the church retained control of marriage. The family was seen as a “little commonwealth” and the fundamental institution undergirding society.
- John Calvin (1509–1564) brought his legal background to his theology. He stressed marriage as a covenant between individuals, God, and the community. Calvin’s three reasons for marriage were mutual love and support, the birth and nurture of children, and protection from sexual sin. Regulation of marriage in Calvin’s Geneva was shared between church and state.

Some radical reformers extended the principle of “Scripture alone” to justify polygamy using the example of the Patriarchs and Old Testament laws.¹⁰ Others understood Christ’s redemptive act as freeing true believers from sin, so that nothing done in Christian love was sinful. Reformed church leaders distanced themselves from such unorthodox beliefs and unruly behaviors.

The Reformed understanding of and concerns about marriage were made evident throughout the Reformation-era confessions. The Second Helvetic Confession cautioned against making celibacy a mark of spiritual merit and explicitly condemned polygamy.¹¹ The Heidelberg Catechism urged Christians to “live chaste and disciplined lives, whether in holy wedlock or in single life.”¹²

The Westminster Confession of Faith addressed the excesses that abounded in England between 1640 and 1660, attacking polygamy and spousal desertion to consort with another, both advanced on religious grounds. The Westminster Confession’s original provision on marriage indicated that polygamy was an issue of concern for the Westminster divines: “Marriage is to be between one Man and one Woman: neither is it lawfull for any Man to have more than one Wife, nor for any Woman to have more than one Husband; at the same time.” The confession then outlined the purposes of marriage: “...ordained for the mutual help of Husband and Wife, for the increase of man-kinde with a legitimate issue, and of the Church with an holy seed and, for preventing of uncleannesse.”¹³

3. *Early America*

Immigrants from Lutheran, Reformed, Anglican, and Roman Catholic traditions brought their own assumptions and practices of marriage to the American colonies, making understandings of marriage complex. Enlightenment thinking introduced a fifth pattern—marriage as a social contract. The Enlightenment was an eighteenth-century philosophical movement that held human reason as applicable to all areas of life, including biblical studies. It stressed ideals of freedom, equality, and individual rights, and found fertile ground in the American colonies. Over time, this emphasis resulted in marriage becoming more focused upon personal happiness and self-fulfillment and being seen increasingly as a bilateral personal contract.

In America, states regulated these personal contracts. Marriages were required to be registered with civil authorities. While courts routinely ruled that public cohabitation was sufficient evidence of a valid marriage, by the latter part of the nineteenth century, states began to nullify such “common-law” marriages. They exerted more control over who was allowed to marry, including the prohibition of bigamy and a subsequent series of federal laws designed to prohibit the practice of polygamy. States prohibited marriages on the basis of a variety of conditions, including alcoholism, drug addiction, prior marriage, or lack of mental capacity. Significant among these prohibitions were interracial relationships during Jim Crow segregation.

4. *Recent Developments in Marriage Law*

As societal attitudes about marriage began to change, so did the government’s assertion of its authority to regulate marriage. The U.S. Supreme Court’s 1967 ruling in *Loving v. Virginia*¹⁴ eradicated state laws prohibiting interracial marriage. The court ruled that Virginia’s prohibition of interracial marriage violated the Fourteenth Amendment:

Marriage is one of the “basic civil rights of man [sic],” fundamental to our very existence and survival.... To deny this fundamental freedom on so unsupportable a basis as the racial classifications embodied in these statutes ... is surely to deprive all the State’s citizens of liberty without due process of law.¹⁵

With this ruling, the court granted all adults the right to marry without consideration of race, citing constitutional principles of equal protection and due process in limiting the state’s power to regulate marriage.

With the Supreme Court having declared marriage a fundamental civil right, both church and nation began to struggle with whether the principles voiced in *Loving* extended to persons barred from marriage on the basis of their gender.¹⁶

In 1996, Congress passed the Defense of Marriage Act (DOMA), defining marriage as a legal union between one man and one woman for purposes of all federal laws, and including the provision that states in which same-gender marriage is not

legal do not have to recognize a same-gender marriage from another state. To date, thirty-seven states have approved their own DOMAs, thirty-one of which have state constitutional amendments defining marriage as between one man and one woman.

Opponents to DOMA have questioned the constitutionality of the act based on the Full Faith and Credit Clause of the Constitution (“Full faith and credit shall be given in each state to the public acts, records, and judicial proceedings of every other state”). This clause generally mandates that states must recognize marriages solemnized in any other.

Concerned with potential court challenges to DOMA, advocates introduced legislation calling for a Federal Marriage Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, which would preclude any constitutional challenge to DOMA. The amendment has been introduced unsuccessfully four times in Congress since 2003.

In 2004, Massachusetts became the first state to expand civil marriage to same-gender couples. At the time of this writing, four additional states (New Hampshire, Vermont, Iowa, and Connecticut) and the District of Columbia have done likewise. Several others, including California, New Jersey, Washington, and Oregon, allow civil unions or domestic partnerships that provide same-gender couples some rights and privileges of marriage under state law.

5. *Marriage in the PC(USA)*

Changing societal views on marriage over the last two centuries have affected the church in general and the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) in particular. In examining Scripture and the cultural assumptions about marriage in biblical times, the church has come to embrace marriage as an equal partnership between husband and wife. In the 1950s, the church also re-examined the issue of divorce in light of the full sweep of Jesus’ teaching and modern experience, and loosened doctrinal restrictions by amending The Westminster Confession of Faith.¹⁷

The Confession of 1967 lifts up “anarchy in sexual relationships” as one of four issues of particular concern in the church at that time. The confession enumerates the positive benefits of marriage¹⁸ as a remedy for the “perennial confusion about the meaning of sex.”

Since the late 1970s, issues related to homosexuality have been debated in the PC(USA) and its predecessor denominations. People of deep faith and commitment are struggling to discern how the church can respond in theological and biblical integrity and love to the changing patterns of marriage and sexual practice in American culture.

6. *Mirroring the Civil Disagreement in the Church*

Since 1991, the PC(USA) has wrestled with the question of same-sex union and Christian marriage. The General Assembly Permanent Judicial Commission (GAPJC) has declared that any same-sex ceremony “considered to be the equivalent of a marriage ceremony...would not be sanctioned under the *Book of Order*.” As such, it has instructed ministers of the Word and Sacrament not to “state, imply, or represent that a same-sex ceremony is a marriage,” and has instructed sessions against the use of church facilities in any same-sex ceremony deemed to be the equivalent of a marriage.¹⁹

In *Benton, et al. v. Presbytery of Hudson River* (2000) the GAPJC did allow for individual ministers and sessions to conduct a same-sex ceremony that “celebrates a loving, caring and committed relationship” that does not “confer a new status” but “blesses an existing relationship.” These services are not to be confused with Christian marriage or civil marriage, “do not constitute a marriage ceremony,” and “should not be construed as an endorsement of homosexual conjugal practice proscribed by the General Assembly.”²⁰

Thus, the GAPJC decision permitted ecclesiastical rites for same-sex couples that allow those couples to receive a public benediction, but do not confer a new status to these couples or their families within the community of faith.

Just as with same-sex unions, some view public rituals of blessing for same-sex couples, without a change of status, as socially indeterminate. Others find it to be a helpful compromise. Finally, others believe that the blessing of same-gender relationships may implicitly, if not explicitly, condone and/or encourage behaviors that they believe to be biblically inappropriate.

7. *Where Other Christian Traditions Currently Stand*

Several Christian denominations and traditions are confronting the issues raised by same-gender marriage.

The three bodies with whom the PC(USA) is in full communion have taken differing positions to date:

- The United Church of Christ (UCC) recognizes same-sex marriage: “We ... affirm that all humans are made in the image and likeness of God, including people of all sexual orientations, and God has bestowed upon each one the gift of

human sexuality. Further, we recognize and affirm that, as created in God's image and gifted by God with human sexuality, all people have the right to lead lives that express love, justice, mutuality, commitment, consent and pleasure."²¹

- The Reformed Church in America (RCA) restricts marriage to "the union of one man and one woman, to the exclusion of all others." In 1996, the RCA entered into a dialogue with the UCC, "encouraging the UCC to move toward a more biblically faithful understanding of human sexuality and a repeal of all policies condoning homosexual behavior." While neither denomination changed its views, better understanding resulted from the dialogue. In recent years, the RCA held three years of dialogue after which they affirmed their position on marriage.

- The Evangelical Lutheran Church in America (ELCA) affirms "marriage is a covenant of mutual promises, commitment and hope authorized legally by the state and blessed by God. The historic Christian tradition and the Lutheran confessions have recognized marriage as a covenant between a man and a woman..." Currently, the ELCA "lacks consensus" on the matter of "lifelong monogamous same-gender relationships," and "encourages all people to live out the faith in the local and global community of the baptized with profound respect for the conscience-bound belief of the neighbor."²² Its churchwide assembly voted in 2009 to "commit itself to finding ways to allow congregations that choose to do so to recognize, support and hold publicly accountable life-long, monogamous, same-gender relationships."²³

The Roman Catholic Church holds to its sacramental view of marriage, continuing to refuse to countenance divorce. "The matrimonial covenant, by which a man and a woman establish between themselves a partnership of the whole of life and which is ordered by its nature to the good of the spouses and the procreation and education of offspring, has been raised by Christ the Lord to the dignity of a sacrament between the baptized."²⁴

Standing outside the Western tradition, the Orthodox Church in America maintains its ancient, sacramental understanding of marriage between a man and a woman as a "Holy Mystery." It is not a juridical contract and is not entered with vows or oaths. It is, in essence, the "baptizing and confirming" of human love in God by Christ in the Holy Spirit. The Orthodox Church recognizes as a Christian sacrament only those marriages entered into by baptized communicant members.²⁵

The Episcopal Church views marriage as a "sacramental rite." "Holy Matrimony is Christian marriage, in which the woman and man 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." There is great ferment and disagreement within the Episcopal Church over the issue of same-gender marriage.²⁶

The United Methodist Church, an offshoot from the Anglican tradition, appears to have adopted an understanding of marriage as a contract. "We affirm the sanctity of the marriage covenant that is expressed in love, mutual support, personal commitment and shared fidelity between a man and a woman."²⁷

The Universal Fellowship of Metropolitan Community Churches, "the world's first church group with a primary, positive ministry to gays, lesbians, bisexual and transgender persons,"²⁸ strongly supports "marriage equality."

The Southern Baptist Convention teaches: "Marriage is the uniting of one man and one woman in covenant commitment for a lifetime. It is God's unique gift to reveal the union between Christ and His church and to provide for the man and the woman in marriage the framework for intimate companionship, the channel of sexual expression according to biblical standards, and the means for procreation of the human race."²⁹

This report has not considered the positions of many other denominations and independent Christian bodies, both in the United States and around the world. Given their wide variety of theological views, cultural contexts, and ways of understanding and interpreting Scripture, similar diversity in their views of marriage, divorce, and same-gender relationships can be expected. As we seek understanding around these issues within the PC(USA), we also strive to maintain communion with our brothers and sisters in the global church, a goal that is made more complex because of that diversity.

III. The Relationship Between Civil Union and Christian Marriage

The PC(USA) *Book of Order* states that "marriage is a gift God has given to all humankind for the well-being of the entire human family. Marriage is a civil contract between a woman and a man. For Christians, marriage is a covenant through which a man and a woman are called to live out together before God their lives of discipleship. In a service of Christian marriage, a lifelong commitment is made by a woman and a man to each other, publicly witnessed and acknowledged by the community of faith" (W-4.9001).

As noted above, included in the mandate of this special committee was a directive that we were not to change the *Book of Order's* definition of marriage. Because there are distinct differences in the way terms like marriage, civil union, and

domestic partnership are understood, and because those terms are interpreted differently in various civil jurisdictions, the chart below outlines our understanding and identifies the way these terms will be used in this study.

	Civil Marriage	Redefined Civil Marriage ³⁰	Civil Union/ Domestic Partnership ³¹	Christian Marriage in the PC(USA)
Structure	government-licensed contract between a man and a woman	government-licensed contract between two persons	contract between two persons by an individual jurisdiction	covenant before God of a lifelong commitment between a man and a woman
Recognition	all states and federal level	not all states or federal level	not all states or federal level	all states and federal level ³²
Purpose	social institution consisting of a man, a woman, and any children they have	social institution consisting of two people and any children they have	legal arrangement between two people	a gift of God to humankind for the well-being of the entire human family; marriage is the full expression of love between a man and a woman
Institution	commitment, publicly witnessed	commitment, publicly witnessed	commitment, publicly registered	lifelong commitment, publicly witnessed, acknowledged by the community of faith
Rights/Privileges	households recognized as social units	households recognized as social units	reciprocal rights/responsibilities that may or may not approximate marriage	those who are married “live out together before God their lives of [Christian] discipleship” (<i>Book of Order</i> , W-4.9001)
Responsibilities	accountable to each other and government	accountable to each other and government	accountable to each other and government	accountable to each other and government; called to live out discipleship before God

A. *The Difference Between Civil Marriage and Christian Marriage*

Noting the difference between civil marriage and Christian marriage is important to understanding the relationship between civil unions and Christian marriage. Civil marriage, whether or not it is redefined, is a state-licensed *contract* between two consenting adults. Christian marriage is a *covenant* through which “a man and a woman are called to live out together before God their lives of discipleship.”³³

Civil marriage occurs through a state-licensed contract granted to parties who meet particular criteria, which may include residency, identification, premarital counseling, evidence that neither party is currently in a civil marriage, medical testing, lack of consanguinity, and age. In most states, difference in gender is a state-required criterion; in some, people of the same sex may be licensed to marry.

Civil marriage determines the delineation of the household and a person’s next-of-kin, primary parental rights and responsibilities, and other benefits granted by states to those in licensed civil marriages (e.g., filing taxes together, joint home-ownership). Civil marriage is a necessary, but not sufficient, criterion of Christian marriage in the PC(USA).

In Christian marriage, a couple’s covenant to live out their discipleship together in lifelong commitment must accompany civil marriage. A couple must demonstrate sufficient “Christian understanding” to be able to enter into the covenant of Christian marriage.³⁴ Thus, while every state empowers ministers of the Word and Sacrament to officiate on its behalf in civil marriage, the *Book of Order* instructs them not to conduct any covenant ceremony of Christian marriage that they feel is “unwise.” This covenant is so important that the *Book of Order* provides an opportunity for a civilly married couple to enter into it.³⁵

B. A Comparison of Civil Union and Marriage

Marriage, whether civil or Christian, represents more than a mechanism to gain state and/or federal benefits. Both constitute the creation of a social unit, household, source of meaning, and identity.

Institutions like marriage and parenthood are not simply mechanisms to fulfill individual needs and aspirations. They are also thick, multi-layered realities that speak to the needs for meaning and identity within human community.³⁶

Since civil unions do not share a connection to this social dimension of marriage, some think that such unions cannot adequately substitute for marriage, fearing that the socially indeterminate nature of civil unions may even encourage impermanence among such couples.³⁷ Others see it as a helpful compromise in a polarized and polarizing debate.

While there may be significant, small populations for whom a civil union is a useful contract,³⁸ civil unions, as qualitatively different from marriage, cannot fully make peace between those who view homosexual practice differently.

IV. The Effects of Current Laws on Same-Gender Partners and Their Children

*God gave us marriage for the well-being of human society, for the ordering of family life, and for the birth and nurture of children.*³⁹

Scripture and the confessions recognize marriage as creating a basic unit of ordered human society. The family provides a structure for the birth and nurture of children, essential for the continuation of the human race. Marriage is held up as “an expression of hope and confidence in God’s providential care.”⁴⁰

As the body of Christ and as people of God, we have a responsibility for the “shelter, nurture, and spiritual fellowship of the children of God” and a responsibility to the culture around us for “the exhibition of the Kingdom of Heaven to the world.”⁴¹ While we hold differing interpretations of Scripture regarding same-gender relationships, we still have an obligation to understand and respond to the social implications of the situation in the society around us for families of same-gender partners.⁴²

Laws are the result of a political process, which is an “allocation of public values,”⁴³ and therefore will always differ according to value outlook. Among those differing perspectives are⁴⁴:

Perspective 1: Laws that fail to give benefits equal to marriage to same-gender couples and their families violate the standards of social justice and equality.⁴⁵ The differences in benefits result in legal, financial, and social hardships that create social justice issues that may affect children. Using the Equal Protection clause of the U.S. Constitution, there should be no difference made between relationships based on gender. From a biblical perspective, it is important to note the different cultural settings between modern and biblical times, especially in the role of the extended family structure in the latter.⁴⁶ From a sociological direction, there is no clear evidence whether children from same-gender parent families are at a developmental disadvantage.⁴⁷

Perspective 2: Same-gender relationships are of low importance in comparison to other more pressing societal issues. While the concerns of those who oppose same-gender marriage may be understandable, when it comes to matters of faith, it is God’s place, not the place of human beings to determine the appropriateness of a relationship.⁴⁸ Under no circumstances should children of same-gender couples be treated any differently under the law because of their parents’ relationship. Same-gender couples and their families should receive fair treatment by society and the church.

Perspective 3: It does not violate social justice or equal protection to offer different benefits to same-gender couples from those offered to a man and a woman who are married. Every relationship or contract does not have to be accorded the same value, protection, or benefit. Marriage between one man and one woman is foundational to the stability of society and is the best possible context for the nurture and flourishing of children. In controlled studies, children separated from one or more biological parent fare less well.⁴⁹ All children should be supported regardless of their family situations; however, public policy should not grant the same favor to relationships in which children are separated from at least one biological parent, such as same-gender partnerships. To promote social stability and justice for children, the law should encourage relationships that are optimal by granting particular benefits to a woman and a man who marry.⁵⁰

Perspective 4: Opposing the acceptance of same-gender marriage rises beyond a sociopolitical argument to an issue of conscience. All sexual activity outside of marriage between a man and a woman is unacceptable. Behavior that is explicitly proscribed by Scripture cannot be encouraged. Providing legal benefits equal to marriage for same-gender couples makes society complicit in encouraging this behavior.⁵¹

A. Census Figures

Determining the size of the populations involved is not a straightforward task because information on same-gender partners has not been collected in past decennial census reports. However, information collected on same-gender couples by the U.S. Census Bureau’s 2008 American Community Survey⁵² indicated a total of 564,743 same-gender couple households in this country. Approximately one-fifth (115,421) of those households included children.

For purposes of comparison, the survey showed around thirty-eight million households with children under the age of eighteen. Of those, twenty-six million households were “male-female parent” households, married and unmarried, and twelve million households were single-parent households. So, while the number of same-gender partner households with children under the age of eighteen, 115,421, is statistically small (0.30 percent), the number of households is still significant.

B. Federal Laws

Since the federal government has adopted the Defense of Marriage Act (DOMA) and does not currently recognize same-gender relationships, same-gender couples do not enjoy the federal benefits that are afforded to married heterosexual couples. A 1997 Government Accounting Office report found 1,049 federal laws in which “marital status is a factor,” and a 2004 update found 1,138 “federal statutory provisions” in which “marital status is a factor in determining or receiving benefits, rights, and privileges.”⁵³ The extension of some benefits to same-gender partners of federal employees in June 2009 marks one of the few significant federal recognitions of these relationships. Other extensions are being considered.

Areas most significantly affected by federal laws, principally DOMA, are:

- Tax code: Given the complexity of the federal tax code, the benefits, or penalties, of a married filing status depends on a household’s financial situation; still, low- to moderate-income couples who can file as married pay less federal tax than couples that cannot file as married.⁵⁴

The tax code offers other benefits to married couples. For example, the premiums paid for health insurance for a spouse and children are exempt from federal taxes, while premiums paid for a domestic partner are not.

- Social Security and federal retirement benefits: These programs provide benefits to the spouse of a deceased or disabled plan member. Spousal benefits are limited to a spouse of the opposite sex. A domestic partner or same-gender spouse is not eligible for these benefits.

- Immigration: A same-gender spouse of a U.S. citizen is not eligible for legal permanent resident status (“green card”) or work visa based on marital status. If the individual is in the country without current immigration documents, he or she may be subject to deportation. This applies equally to same-gender couples legally married in the U.S. or in another country.

- Recognition of same-gender marriage across state lines: A provision of the federal DOMA declares that states need not recognize other states’ same-gender marriages. While this has withstood several challenges in lower courts,⁵⁵ the U.S. Supreme Court has yet to hear an appeal of these cases.

C. Varieties of State Laws

States can be divided into five general configurations.⁵⁶

State configurations						
		Constitutional prohibition states (e.g., S.C.)	DOMA states (e.g., Wash.)	Non-DOMA states (e.g., N.M.)	Civil unions/ domestic partnerships states (e.g., Calif.)	Redefined civil marriage states (e.g., Maine)
Legal elements	Constitutional language	yes	no	no	yes	no
	DOMA	yes	yes	no	no	no
	Restrictive state law	yes	maybe	yes	no	no
	Civil unions/ domestic partnerships	no	maybe	maybe	yes	no
	Recognition of other states’ redefined civil marriages	no	no	no	no	yes

Some of the states that recognize civil unions/domestic partnerships have granted benefits that are arguably equivalent to the benefits granted through marriage.⁵⁷ These benefits fall into several broad categories:

- **Parental:** Without the recognition of a civil marriage/domestic partnership, many parental rights may be denied to one member of a same-gender couple. These include joint or co-parent adoption and recognition of a child's relationship to both parents, as well as eligibility for foster parenting. This lack of a recognized relationship can have implications for the ability to direct medical care for a child, custody of a child on the death of the biological parent, eligibility for public housing or subsidy programs, and ability to extend the nonbiological parent's employer health insurance to the children.
- **Partner:** The rights and benefits not available to an unmarried partner are even more numerous. They include the lack of health insurance and Medicare benefits, as well as the inability to direct medical care and receive survivor benefits. They extend into many economic and commercial areas that married couples take for granted, including the ability to have joint credit, and to own property with special tax benefits and legal protections for a married couple. A number of legal benefits and processes are also unavailable—protection against being forced to testify against a spouse in court; the ability to structure a dissolution of the relationship through a court-supervised divorce, including child custody and visitation rights; and the right to sue for wrongful death of a partner.
- **Tax code:** State and local tax codes vary too widely to draw general conclusions about the benefits or penalties of marriage. In general, state tax laws are roughly parallel to federal laws and, more often than not, low- to middle-income married couples receive more favorable treatment than similar unmarried couples. Married couples generally receive more favorable treatment regarding the taxation of income from self-employment, family businesses, and inheritance.
- **Health benefits:** Current legislative activity is focusing on securing medical coverage for same-gender partners and the nonbiological children of the insured partner.⁵⁸ Family medical leave is also a concern.

D. *Current Research*

While it is possible to describe the differences in the law regarding same-gender relationships, including differences in benefits that might arise between heterosexual marriage and same-gender relationships, it is still difficult to make definitive statements on the sociological effects of these laws on same-gender families and their children. Research on this specific topic encounters some significant challenges.

The journal of the American Academy of Pediatrics offers a comprehensive review of the literature related to the psychosocial aspects of same-gender parents and their children, including the challenges to conducting and evaluating this research.⁵⁹ Factors such as small sample size, children originally born into a heterosexual parental relationship, investigator bias, and community attitudes are still present in some current research.

In addition, the effect of the laws and the developmental differences of children in same-gender parent families are difficult to determine because cultural attitudes are not static. As community attitudes change and same-gender marriage finds greater acceptance, outcomes in current and future studies of children being raised in such families can be expected to differ from earlier studies.⁶⁰ As one article states:

...whether same-sex marriage would prove socially beneficial, socially harmful, or trivial is an empirical question that cannot be settled by any amount of armchair theorizing. There are plausible arguments on all sides of the issue, and as yet there is no evidence sufficient to settle them.⁶¹

V. What Is the Place of Covenanted Same-Gender Partnerships in the Christian Community?

But now in Christ Jesus you who once were far off have been brought near by the blood of Christ. For he is our peace; in his flesh he has made both groups into one and has broken down the dividing wall, that is, the hostility between us. ... So then you are no longer strangers and aliens, but you are citizens with the saints and also members of the household of God, built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, with Christ Jesus himself as the cornerstone. In him the whole structure is joined together and grows into a holy temple in the Lord; in whom you also are built together spiritually into a dwelling place for God. (Eph. 2:13–22)

“We belong to one another only through and in Jesus Christ,” Dietrich Bonhoeffer writes:

What does this mean? It means, first, that a Christian needs others because of Jesus Christ. It means, second, that a Christian comes to others only through Jesus Christ. It means, third, that in Jesus Christ we have been chosen from eternity, accepted in time, and united for eternity.⁶²

We all come to Christ as sinners, as strangers, whether we are in worship the week we are born or come to know Christ in our youth or old age. But once in Christ, we are inextricably linked to one another—not by affinity, comfort, or culture, but because we belong to Christ. It is Christ who sets a place for us at the table; it is Christ alone who calls.

With Christ's call comes the forming of Christ's mind in each believer. In Christ, no matter who we are or what our condition, we come to understand our own and others' essential humanity, which Christ redeems from the shadows of sin. Because Christ alone knows us, it is through the mind of Christ alone that we truly come to know others.

Christ is the center of our lives, individually and together. Christ calls us to leave behind our lives bound by sin and alienated from self, others, and God, and to enter into fellowship with people we did not and might not have chosen. As Bonhoeffer states, "When Christ calls a man [sic], he bids him come and die."⁶³ We are not our own. We have been bought with a price.

A. *Our Current Situation*

The Presbytery of Denver's overture to the 218th General Assembly (2008), which commissioned this study, envisioned an emerging compromise that might cool the conflict over homosexual practice to the point that both sides could disagree in peace without impinging on one another's liberties of action or conscience. This two-tiered form of recognition of committed relationship (one being civil union or domestic partnership and the other civil marriage, defined as between one man and one woman) has not found hoped-for acceptance. In church and society, the conflict over homosexuality and the definition of marriage has hardened and deepened.

This seemingly insoluble conflict mocks the hopes and prayers of our brothers and sisters who first reported to the 190th General Assembly (1978) of the United Presbyterian Church in the United States of America that:

the church's grappling with the issue of homosexuality has already energized its membership in a remarkable awakening of prayer and theological study. Our study should continue with the aim of reaching harmony in our diverging positions on homosexuality and other critical issues. Our prayer should now be concentrated upon this process of internal reconciliation⁶⁴

History's trajectory during the thirty years since the expression of those hopes and prayers has not been a gradual harmony, but an increasingly strident and rigid disharmony that threatens once more to tear the church asunder. But the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) is not our possession; it belongs to Christ.

What is the place of covenanted same-gender partnerships in the Christian community? The members of the PC(USA) cannot agree. We affirm that individuals in same-gender relationships, no differently from any persons in the Christian community, are to be welcomed by the church and—no differently from any other persons in the Christian community—are called to be transformed by the radical and redeeming love of Jesus Christ. Still, some believe acceptance of same-gender partnerships to be tantamount to approving homosexual practice, which they find at odds with Scripture and our confessions. Others have no difficulty accepting same-gender partnerships, pointing to biblical principles of love and justice.

But "when Christ calls a man [sic], he bids him come and die."⁶⁵ The PC(USA) is not ours, and our unity in Christ does not depend on our agreement. We did not choose Christ; Christ has chosen us and appointed us—each and every one—to go and bear fruit that will last in this part of Christ's vineyard. We believe that it is our Christ-given calling to stay in relationship with one another, especially when we disagree.

B. *Resources of Our Tradition*

We are Presbyterians. Our polity, our way of living and working together in faithfulness, relies not on hierarchical human authority to compel or enforce, but upon God's Spirit to form the mind of Christ in each believer. We trust that the Spirit is working—even when we cannot see it clearly—to reshape and reform us according to God's word.

Our historic principles of church order begin with words from The Westminster Confession of Faith:

God alone is Lord of the conscience, and hath left it free from the doctrines and commandments of men [sic] which are in anything contrary to his Word, or beside it in matters of faith or worship.⁶⁶

With this radical freedom comes a radical responsibility. We are held accountable to Christ before the God of history for how we act, how we live, how we love. We hold:

that truth is in order to goodness we are persuaded that there is an inseparable connection between faith and practice, truth and duty.⁶⁷

The tension between our freedom and our responsibility has meant that our life together is often marked by disagreement, a sign of how seriously we take the gospel and the consequences of our actions. So, we believe:

that there are truths and forms with respect to which men [sic] of good characters and principles may differ. And in all these we think it the duty both of private Christians and societies to exercise mutual forbearance toward each other.⁶⁸

It is to this principle of mutual forbearance that we appeal. Recognizing that Christ is our peace, we must love, support, and trust each other as together we search for Christ's truth. This is how we model what it means to be the body of Christ for each other and for the world.

But if we come to see our brothers and sisters with whom we disagree as our—or worse yet, Christ's—enemies, we have denied the unifying power of Christ's redeeming, reconciling love. We must seek a way to live together as the body of Christ, not through peaceable uniformity, but by exercising mutual tolerance and forbearance in those areas where people of good faith differ. The sacrifice required to do this should be evenly distributed and shared across the whole body until Christ the Head brings clarity, which may not come quickly. And even when clarity does come, we must understand and accept that it will sooner or later be followed by yet another conflict.

C. *Our Covenant*

“Baptism is the sign and seal of incorporation into Christ. . . . The body of Christ is one, and Baptism is the bond of unity in Christ.”⁶⁹ Thus, we all have been brought into a covenant relationship with one another, perhaps expressed by a new commitment to an age-old declaration: Those whom God has joined together, let no one separate.

Throughout our time of prayerful deliberation—and sometimes difficult disagreement—the members of the PC(USA) Special Committee to Study Issues of Civil Union and Christian Marriage have been blessed and challenged by a profound sense of our unity in Christ. Because of that, our time together has been marked by a remarkable degree of mutual respect, commitment to one another, and Christian love. We can only attribute these gifts to the living presence of Christ among us and to the transforming power of the Holy Spirit.

From the gifts of unity, respect, commitment, and love that we have received, we commend to our brothers and sisters in the PC(USA) the following covenant, particularly when governing bodies meet together to discuss divisive issues.

Those Whom God Has Joined Together, Let No One Separate

We acknowledge and confess that the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) displays the marks of the true Church (the gospel is rightly preached and heard, the sacraments are rightly administered, and ecclesiastical discipline is uprightly ministered).⁷⁰ Christ has chosen each one of us here, and has called us to this place. *Those whom God has joined together, let no one separate.*

By the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, with the love of God, and in the communion of the Holy Spirit, we covenant together to:

- Honor the truth that Christ has called and God works through each member;
- Listen to one another with openness and respect;
- Support and pray for each other and for one another's ministries;
- Earnestly seek and carefully listen to each person's discernment of God's will found in Scripture;
- Struggle together with perseverance to find God's will for us even when the way is difficult;
- Love one another even when we disagree, and to commit ourselves to the reconciliation of any broken relationships we have with one another;
- Honor who we are as Presbyterians by respecting the fallible discernment of the body, bearing in mind that individual conscience, held captive to the word of God, cannot be thus bound.

D. *Steps Toward Mutual Forbearance*

Exercising the mutual forbearance to which we are called:

1. We agree that Christ calls all persons into fellowship with him, regardless of race, sex, occupation, ethnic origin, sexual orientation, or any other worldly condition, and that congregations are to welcome all persons who respond in trust and obedience to God's grace in Jesus Christ and who desire to become part of the membership and mission of Christ's church.⁷¹

2. We confess that we are brothers and sisters bound together in Christ, and that while these conversations are difficult and intense, our disagreements do not negate our unity. Threats of departure or coercive ways of achieving uniformity are

ultimately unhelpful and do little more than draw lines and force us to become more deeply entrenched in our positions and prejudices.

3. We recognize that our interpretations of Scripture lead us to different conclusions regarding homosexual behavior and same-gender partnerships. We hold that the Christian life is one of sanctification, and we confess that Scripture holds out a transforming hope of radical change in Jesus Christ that requires us to be dead to sin and alive to all that is good. For some of us, that means same-gender couples should be encouraged to abstain from sexual relations; for others of us, that means that same-gender couples should be encouraged to enter into faithful, covenanted, lifelong partnerships.

4. We agree that Christian marriage is not a “right” conferred upon anyone, but a gift given to us by God to nurture and form human beings into the kind of sacrificial, self-giving love that we see in Jesus Christ.

5. We recognize the organic nature of the Presbyterian church’s polity, where responsibility and accountability for ministry and governance is assigned at all levels of the church. Questions of marriage and civil union are already being addressed at congregational and presbytery levels, where the issues have human faces, concrete circumstances, and real consequences. Any successful resolution must begin with individual sessions and presbyteries. In this time of flux, all voices are needed in this conversation.⁷²

6. We acknowledge that current law, in which clergy act as agents of the state, is a source of confusion.⁷³ Some argue that the church should relinquish its state-sanctioned power to marry. Others feel that, even in confusion, it should be retained to further the cause of the gospel.

7. We affirm that the church is called to offer pastoral care to all members of the church family experiencing times of special need and crisis.⁷⁴ Recognizing our common brokenness and our unique individual expressions of that brokenness, we encourage presbyteries and sessions to extend appropriate pastoral care to all experiencing the joys and sorrow of human life in all of its manifestations.⁷⁵

8. We acknowledge the presence of same-gender partners in our communities and congregations. Together, we are members of the body of Christ and joined by the reconciling work of Christ. As the body of Christ, we affirm the call of the church, in its ministry and mission, to offer to all persons God’s gracious provision of redemption and forgiveness, calling all persons into loving obedience to God’s will.

VI. Conclusion

A struggle continues in the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.)—a struggle mirrored by the members of our committee.

- We find that our church is united in our gratitude for God’s word that is authoritative for us and for the theological heritage that has formed and informed us. Yet our different ways of interpreting the Bible and other foundational texts have left us deeply divided about the conclusions we draw from these sources of guidance. We have honest and sincere disagreements, but also a conviction that we should not caricature or condemn our sisters and brothers with whom we disagree.

- We see great diversity in the laws around this issue, and these laws have changed even as we have embarked on this study. We have reached no consensus on a faithful response to the changing nature of civil marriage.

- We find that there are a significant number of children in same-gender households, and the reported numbers will likely increase in the next U.S. Census. Our responses as a church to the questions raised have real consequences in the lives of these children.

- We find that the compromise suggestion of civil unions/domestic partnerships offers no true solution to the struggle around same-gender partnerships. Civil unions/domestic partnerships provide neither the state-sanctioned benefits nor the societal acceptance that marriage (redefined or not) offers.

A struggle continues in the PC(USA), but important points of unity are also present—unity mirrored by the members of our committee.

- The church is not ours; it belongs to Christ. We are part of the church solely by the grace of God. Thus, it is inappropriate for us to seek to define “the place” for any of our sisters and brothers in Christ within Christ’s church. Rather we confess that, apart from anything we have done, Christ has prepared a place for every one of us.

- Every one of us is called to mutual forbearance and mutual accountability in how we practice our lives of faith together.

- We are the body of Christ, called to live into our Christ-reconciled life together, acting in a manner that lives out our covenant, “Those whom God has joined together, let no one separate.”

We now offer to the church the work we have done together in two forms—a report and a call to covenant. Far more than commending our work, we entreat the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) to affirm the covenant relationship into which Christ calls all of us by praying for and seeking to live into the covenant life that Christ provides for us, a covenant life marked by reconciliation.

In truth, this is only the most current in a long series of disagreements and differences of opinion that the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) has had to and will have to confront. The nature of our polity predisposes us to debate and struggle with each other, always striving to discern the mind of Christ for our life together. We have weathered these debates before and we will face them again in years to come.

The question before us is not what issue will define us at any given moment, but whether the PC(USA) can confess that our unity in Christ supersedes any other claim or argument that vies for our attention. Our hope and prayer is that this current debate provides an opportunity to reflect upon and renew our relationships in the body of Christ and our call to ministry together.

Whatever actions the 219th General Assembly (2010) of the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) takes, we commend to you this covenant as a way to remember that it is Christ who calls us, Christ who redeems us, and Christ who reconciles us to one another in covenant faithfulness.

Those whom God has joined together, let no one separate.

Members of the Special Committee to Study Issues of Civil Union and Christian Marriage: The Reverend Clayton F. Allard; The Reverend Emily J. Anderson; The Reverend Earl Arnold; Elder Luis Antonio De La Rosa; Emily W. Miller, candidate for minister of the Word and Sacrament; Elder Katina Miner (through August 2009); The Reverend Margaret Aymer; Elder Stephen L. Salyards; The Reverend Tracie Mayes Stewart; The Reverend Jim Szeyller (moderator); The Reverend William Teng; Elder Lisa Cooper Van Riper; The Reverend Derrick Weston.

The following committee members have reserved the right to submit a minority report: The Reverend Tracie Mayes Stewart; The Reverend William Teng; Elder Lisa Cooper Van Riper.

Endnotes

1. *The Book of Confessions*, 9.27.
2. “Presbyterian Understanding and Use of Holy Scripture” and “Biblical Authority and Interpretation” are printed together and available from Presbyterian Distribution Service (#70420-98-006) or online at <www.pcusa.org/oga/publications/scripture-use.pdf>.
3. Some of these passages have been misappropriated to excuse spousal abuse. Because of our deep concern with domestic violence, we refer all readers to the excellent treatment of this in “Turn Mourning into Dancing! A Policy Statement on Healing Domestic Violence,” 213th General Assembly (2001) of the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.), <<http://www.pcusa.org/oga/publications/dancing.pdf>>.
4. This passage is quoted widely in discussions regarding marriage and it should be noted that by Jesus pointing them back to Genesis 1–2, some read this passage as also condemning homosexuality and polygamy.
5. Frederick Danker, et al., *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, 3rd edition (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001); Robert A.J. Gagnon, *The Bible and Homosexual Practice* (Nashville: Abington Press, 2001), 436.
6. The *paterfamilias* (“father of the family”) was the male head of a Roman household who held the power of life and death (*patria potestas*) over all members of the household, including slaves. [Suzanne Dixon, *The Roman Family* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 1992), chap. 2.]
7. Matthew Kuefler, “The Marriage Revolution in Late Antiquity: The Theodosian Code and Later Roman Marriage Law,” *Journal of Family History*, 2007.
8. Stephanie Coontz, *Marriage, A History: How Love Conquered Marriage* (New York: Penguin Books, 2005), 106.
9. John Witte Jr., *From Sacrament to Contract: Marriage, Religion, and Law in the Western Tradition* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press), 4.
10. See Deut. 21:15–17.
11. *The Book of Confessions*, The Second Helvetic Confession, 5.245, 5.246.

12. *The Book of Confessions*, The Heidelberg Catechism, 4.108.
13. *The Book of Confessions*, The Westminster Confession of Faith, 6.131.
14. 388 U.S. 1 (1967).
15. 388 U.S. at 11, citing *Skinner v. Oklahoma*, 316 U.S. 535, 541 (1942), citations omitted.
16. Compare *Baker v. Nelson*, 191 N.W.2d 185 (1971)—rejecting constitutional challenge to same-sex marriage prohibition, and *Goodridge v. Department of Public Health*, 440 Mass. 309 (2003)—sustaining a constitutional challenge.
17. See *The Book of Confessions*, The Westminster Confession of Faith, 6.132 and 6.137–139. The original language of Chapter XXIV, paragraphs 5 and 6, is available at <http://www.reformed.org/documents/westminster_conf_of_faith.html>.
18. *The Book of Confessions*, The Confession of 1967, 9.47 “...each person has joy in and respect for his (sic) own humanity and that of other persons; a man and woman are enabled to marry, to commit themselves to a mutually shared life, and to respond to each other in sensitive and lifelong concern; parents receive the grace to care for children in love and to nurture their individuality.”
19. Request 91-23, *Minutes*, 203rd General Assembly (1991), Part I, p. 395; *Jane Adams Spahr v. Presbyterian Church (U.S.A) through the Presbytery of Redwoods*, <<http://www.pcusa.org/gajpc/decisions/pjc21812withconcurrences.pdf>>, also *Minutes*, 2008, Part I, p. 330ff.
20. <http://www.pcusa.org/gajpc/decisions/pjc21211.pdf>, see also *Minutes*, 2000, Part I, p. 588.
21. <www.ucc.org/assets/pdfs/in-support-of-equal-marriage-rights-for-all-with-background.pdf>, p. 2–3.
22. “Human Sexuality: Gift and Trust,” August 19, 2009, Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, <<http://www.elca.org/~media/Files/Who%20We%20Are/Office%20of%20the%20Secretary/Assembly/CWA%202009%20Revised%20Social%20Statement%20HSGT%20FINAL%20090309.pdf>>.
23. Resolution 2 at <<http://www.elca.org/Who-We-Are/Our-Three-Expressions/Churchwide-Organization/Office-of-the-Secretary/ELCA-Governance/Churchwide-Assembly/Actions/Voting.aspx#MP>>.
24. <http://www.vatican.va/archive/ENG1104/_P3V.HTM>.
25. <<http://www.oca.org/OCchapter.asp?SID=2&ID=56>>.
26. <http://gc2009.org/ViewLegislation/view_leg_detail.aspx?id=898&type=Final>.
27. <http://www.umc.org/site/apps/nlnet/content.aspx?c=IwL4KnN1LtH&b=5066287&content_id={1F927523-A422-4005-BA60-517220DB6D1E}¬oc=1>.
28. <<http://www.mcccchurch.org>>.
29. Southern Baptist Convention, “The Baptist Faith and Message,” as amended June 14, 2000, <<http://www.sbc.net/bfm/bfm2000asp>>.
30. “Redefined civil marriage” denotes the extension of the rights of marriage to same-sex couples.
31. The terms used and benefits conveyed vary among jurisdictions.
32. PC(USA) marriages are required to fulfill the legal requirements of civil marriage (*Book of Order*, W-4.9001).
33. Here and throughout this report, Christian marriage refers to *Book of Order*, W-4.9001.
34. *Book of Order*, W-4.9002b.
35. *Book of Order*, W-4.9002b.
36. Dan Cere, *The Future of Family Law: Law and the Marriage Crisis in North America*. (New York: Institute for American Values, 2005), 40.
37. <<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2009/02/13/AR2009021303365.html>>, last accessed 15 September 2009.
38. For example, two elderly persons who need to retain separate custodial living arrangements, but who wish to be blessed within the church.
39. *Book of Common Worship* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1993), 842.
40. *Christian Marriage: Supplemental Liturgical Resource 3* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1986), 91.

41. *Book of Order*, G-1.0200.
42. James G. Pawelski, et al, “The Effects of Marriage, Civil Union, and Domestic Partnership Laws on the Health and Well-being of Children,” *Pediatrics* 118, no. 1 (2006), <<http://pediatrics.aappublications.org/cgi/content/full/118/1/349>> (1 July 2006). While a bit older, this article covered this topic in more detail than available to the committee.
43. Walter E. Volkmer, *American Government*, 8th edition (Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1998), 4.
44. For a thorough treatment of the spectrum of viewpoints regarding same-gender relationships, see William Stacy Johnson, *A Time to Embrace: Same-Gender Relationships in Religion, Law, and Politics* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmann, 2006), 39–108.
45. Mt. 22:39, Mt. 7:12, Am. 5:24.
46. Ruth 4:13–17, Esth. 2:7.
47. “Transforming Families,” 216th General Assembly (2004) of the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.), <http://www.pcusa.org/oga/publications/transformingfamilies.pdf>, see also *Minutes*, 2004, Part I, p. 747ff.
48. Mt. 7:1–5.
49. “Transforming Families,” 216th General Assembly (2004) of the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.), <<http://www.pcusa.org/oga/publications/transformingfamilies.pdf>>, see also *Minutes*, 2004, Part I, p. 747ff.
50. Gen. 1:27–28; 2:23–24, Mk. 10:6–9, Eph. 5:21–6:4.
51. Heb. 13:4, 1 Cor. 6:12–7:17, Eph. 5:1–3.
52. <<http://www.census.gov/acs/www/index.html>>. Narrative by Gates, <http://www.law.ucla.edu/williamsinstitute/pdf/ACS2008_Final%282%29.pdf>.
53. <<http://www.gao.gov/archive/1997/og97016.pdf>>; <<http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d04353r.pdf>>. Not all of these provisions are of equal magnitude. See further <<http://www.marriagedebate.com/pdf/iMAPP.GAO.pdf>>.
54. Stephen T. Black, “Same-Sex Marriage and Taxes,” *BYU Journal of Public Law* 22, no. 327, <<http://www.law2.byu.edu/jpl/Vol22.2/Black.pdf>>. Due to the complexity of the federal tax code, higher income married couples may have different tax burdens and benefits.
55. <<http://www.domawatch.org>>.
56. The current status of a particular state can be found at <<http://www.ncsl.org/IssuesResearch/HumanServices/SameSexMarriage/tabid/16430/Default.aspx>> or <<http://marriage.about.com/cs/marriagelicense/a/samesexcomp.htm>>.
57. See Glenn T. Stanton and Bill Maier, *Marriage on Trial* (Downers Grove, IL: Intervarsity Press, 2004), 20 for the affirmative argument, and Palewski (p. 356) for the negative.
58. Linda J. Waite and Maggie Gallagher, *The Case for Marriage* (New York: Broadway Books, 2000), 20.
59. Pawelski, p. 358ff.
60. Pawelski, p. 359.
61. Meezan and Rauch, 2005, “Gay Marriage, Same-sex Parenting, and America’s Children,” *The Future of Children*, vol. 15, no. 2, p. 110. Even the most recent comprehensive summary, the monograph *Lesbian and Gay Parents and Their Children: Research on the Family Life Cycle* (Abbie Goldberg, American Psychological Association, 2010), recognizes methodological limitations and the need for further research regarding children, youth, and adult children of same-gender couples.
62. Dietrich Bonhoeffer, *Life Together* (New York: Harper & Row Publishers, 1954), 21.
63. Dietrich Bonhoeffer, *The Cost of Discipleship* (New York: Macmillan, 1959), 7.
64. “The Church and Homosexuality: Policy Statement and Recommendations.” United Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, *Minutes*, 1978, Part I, pp. 261–66, p. 58.
65. *Ibid.*
66. (“Men” and “man’s” in this 18th-century quotation should be understood as applying to all persons.) *The Book of Confessions*, 6.109. See also *Book of Order*, G-1.0301.

67. *Book of Order*, G-1.0304.

68. *Book of Order*, G-1.0305.

69. *Book of Order*, W-2.3001, W-2.3005.

70. *The Book of Confessions*, 3.18.

71. United Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, *Minutes*, 190th General Assembly (1978), Part I, p. 261ff; and Presbyterian Church in the United States, *Minutes*, 119th General Assembly (1979), Part I, p. 362ff.

72. See particularly *The Book of Confessions*, 9.40.

73. We acknowledge that a conflict may exist between some current civil definitions of marriage and the definition of Christian marriage. However, changing the definition of marriage in the *Book of Order* (W-4.9001) falls outside the mandate of this committee.

74. *Book of Order*, W-6.3005.

75. *Book of Order*, W-6.3010.

Minority Report

Special Committee to Study Issues of Civil Union and Christian Marriage

[Not approved by 219th General Assembly (2010) Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.)]

We the undersigned, a minority of the Special Committee to Study Issues of Civil Union and Christian Marriage, recommend that the 219th General Assembly (2010):

1. Approve the minority report (I. Introduction; II. What is the Place of Covenanted Same-Gender Partnerships in the Christian Community?; and III. Conclusion) and provide the section *Rationale/Commentary* as commentary to, and rationale for the minority report.
2. Commend this report to sessions and presbyteries, urging them to engage in study of the issues presented in this report.
3. Commend to the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) the covenant, found at II.G. in this report, as a guide for a broken and hurting people, seeking to be faithful, that they might come together to discuss issues about which they disagree.

The Reverend Tracie Mayes Stewart

The Reverend William C. Teng

Elder Lisa Cooper Van Riper

These recommendations and report are in response to the following referral: *2008 Referral: Item 04-13. On Equal Rights for Families of Same-Gender Partners, Recommendation 2. Direct the Moderator to Appoint a Special Committee, Representing the Broad Diversity and Theological Balance of the PC(USA) to Study History of Laws Governing Marriage and Civil Union, How Theology and Practice of Marriage Have Developed in Reformed and Broader Christian Tradition, Relationship Between Civil Union and Christian Marriage, Effects of Current Laws on Same-Gender Partners and Their Children, and Place of Covenanted Same-Gender Partnerships in Christian Community—From the Presbytery of Denver (Minutes, 2008, Part I, pp. 258–60).*

I. Introduction

The Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) is wrestling with the issue of same-gender marriage. Responding to this struggle, the 218th General Assembly (2008) of the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) directed the Moderator

... to appoint a special committee, representing the broad diversity and theological balance of the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.), to study the following, ... including any policy recommendations growing out of the study:

- a. The history of the laws governing marriage and civil union, including current policy debates;
- b. How the theology and practice of marriage have developed in the Reformed and broader Christian tradition;
- c. The relationship between civil union and Christian marriage;
- d. The effects of current laws on same-gender partners and their children; and
- e. The place of covenanted same-gender partnerships in the Christian community. (*Minutes*, 2008, Part I, p. 259)

The members of the special committee reached different conclusions—reflective of the divide in the larger church—over the nature and meaning of Christian marriage and therefore the place of covenanted same-gender partnerships in the Christian community.

It is the intent of this report to represent the church's biblical, historic, and confessional position that, among all varieties of sexual relationships, only marriage between a man and a woman is ordained by God and blessed by our Lord Jesus Christ.

Our Starting Place

Included in the mandate of this special committee was a directive that the PC(USA) constitutional definition of Christian marriage *not* be changed. In our confessions, marriage is consistently defined as a lifelong covenant between God, a man and a woman, and the community of faith.

The PC(USA) *Book of Order* states:

Marriage is a gift God has given to all humankind for the well-being of the entire human family. Marriage is a civil contract between a woman and a man. For Christians marriage is a covenant through which a man and a woman are called to live out together before God their lives of discipleship. In a service of Christian marriage a lifelong commitment is made by a woman and a man to each other, publicly witnessed and acknowledged by the community of faith. (W-4.9001)

II. What Is the Place of Covenanted Same-Gender Partnerships in the Christian Community?

So then you are no longer strangers and aliens, but you are citizens with the saints and also members of the household of God, built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, with Christ Jesus himself as the cornerstone. In him the whole structure is joined together and grows into a holy temple in the Lord; in whom you also are built together spiritually into a dwelling place for God. (Eph.2:19–22)

When Christ calls a man [sic], he bids him come and die.¹

A. Our Current Disconnect

The Presbytery of Denver's overture to the 218th General Assembly (2008) of the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) is part of the larger struggle that our denomination has had over homosexual practice for the past three decades.

The 190th General Assembly (1978) of the United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. issued a report on homosexual practice that found the following: (1) "homosexuality is a contradiction of God's wise and beautiful pattern for human sexual relationships revealed in Scripture ..."; (2) "unrepentant homosexual practice does not accord with the requirements for ordination"; (3) "Persons who manifest homosexual behavior must be treated with the profound respect and pastoral tenderness due all people of God" as they "strive toward God's revealed will in this area of their lives and make use of all the resources of grace"; (4) "There is no legal, social, or moral justification for denying homosexual persons access to the basic requirements of human existence" (*Minutes*, UPCUSA, 1978, Part I, pp. 261–66) The authoritative interpretation on ordination (point 2 above) was set aside by the 218th General Assembly (2008) (*Minutes*, 2008, Part I, p. 373).

This same 1978 report asserted that

the church's grappling with the issue of homosexuality has already energized its membership in a remarkable reawakening of prayer and theological study. Our study should continue with the aim of reaching harmony in our diverging positions on homosexuality and other critical issues. Our prayer should now be concentrated upon this process of internal reconciliation.... (*Minutes*, UPCUSA, 1978, Part I, pp. 261–66)

History's trajectory, looking at the thirty years that separate us from those hopes and prayers, has not been a gradual harmony, but an increasingly strident and rigid disharmony that threatens to once more tear the PC(USA) asunder.

Two reasons for this continued discord are: (1) disconnect between the theological/pastoral and advocacy strands of the 1978 report on homosexuality and (2) divergent readings of Scripture. Because these are foundational principles, the special committee could not reach consensus.

Over the past three decades, General Assemblies have agreed to pursue advocacy for the homosexual person. During the same time, in presbytery votes, the theological standards have been upheld, particularly in regard to the sexual behavior of those seeking ordination. Recent General Assemblies have begun to advocate for rights for same-gendered couples instead of the individual person.

Most recently, the 218th General Assembly (2008) acted to "renew and strengthen the long-standing Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) commitment to equal protection under the law for lesbian and gay persons and the 216th General Assembly (2004)'s affirmation of the right of same-gender persons to civil union and, thereby, to all the benefits, privileges, and responsibilities of civil union" (*Minutes*, 2008, Part I, p. 259). This action did not define what the "benefits, privileges, and responsibilities of civil union" should be or how they might relate to the privileges and responsibilities of civil marriage or Christian marriage.

The difficulty is this: Whereas one could advocate for civil rights of the person while continuing to uphold the theological standard cited above and providing pastoral care that worked toward conformity with this theological position, when the General Assembly began to move toward advocacy for the couple, the strands became disconnected for many members in the PC(USA). It seemed contradictory to encourage public favor and subsidy for a behavior that the church had found to be outside of God's design. Or, from the other perspective, it seemed contradictory to demand equality in society that was denied within the church.

B. *Variant Interpretations*

Second, there truly exist variant interpretations of Scripture that in turn dictate different pastoral models and advocacy models. The variant interpretations of Scripture are the foundational reason that the 1978 theological/pastoral/advocacy strands have unraveled. The ongoing controversy around this issue and others will not be resolved until consensus is reached on the interpretation of Scripture. Unity cannot be reached through polity inventions. Unity will only be reached through common affirmation of truth.

There are at least two larger approaches to biblical interpretation at play in these debates. One tends to call itself “liberal” or “progressive.” The other is variously labeled as “evangelical,” “conservative,” “orthodox,” or “traditional.” Admitting that the terms and descriptions are oversimplified and miss many nuances, it is still useful to compare the two perspectives.

Both approaches appeal to Scripture, although they read it differently. Both refer to history and biological and social sciences. Both see their approach as compassionate toward lesbians and gays, although they understand the requirements of compassion quite differently.

Traditionalists tend to focus on specific biblical commandments that appear to prohibit same-sex relations categorically. Progressives tend to focus on broader principles of love and justice that they regard as more important than the specific commandments.

Traditionalists tend to emphasize a core meaning of marriage established by God in creation. They see the near universality of marriage in almost all known cultures as confirmation of God’s design in creation. They think it unwise for either church or society to alter the core meaning of marriage. Progressives tend to emphasize the variability of marriage across human history and around the world. They are reluctant to fix a core meaning. They view further evolution of the institution as natural and necessary.

Traditionalists tend to see the biblical writers, and the church through its history, as elaborating a fairly consistent strand of teaching on marriage, under divine inspiration. They believe that the church can apply that teaching directly today, despite the differences and even injustices of the societies in which it was formed. Progressives tend to stress contradictions between various biblical passages and church attitudes toward marriage over the years. They view the biblical authors as captives of limited cultural perspectives prevalent in societies deformed by patriarchy and other injustices. They are reluctant to apply sexuality standards originating in the ancient Near East to a modern society that has more scientific knowledge about sexuality.

Traditionalists tend to view the two sexes, male and female, as an important part of God’s providence in creation. They therefore regard marriage, the institution joining the two sexes, as of unique social importance. Although they recognize how sin has distorted relationships between the sexes, and how the grace of Jesus Christ may open new possibilities for just relationships between men and women, they do not believe that God’s grace in Christ nullifies God’s earlier grace in making two complementary sexes to be joined together. Progressives tend to be wary of any purported distinctions between the sexes, in which they suspect the taint of past patriarchal attitudes. They take Paul’s declaration that in Christ “there is no longer male and female” (Gal. 3:28) as a mandate for reconfiguring institutions, such as traditional marriage, that take account of sex differences. For them the biological or social gender identity of a spouse should be an irrelevant factor.

Traditionalists tend to see God’s commands as offering clear choices between limited options. For them, marriage is the single norm for human sexual expression. The ways to God’s blessing are two: either fidelity in marriage or chastity in singleness. Progressives tend to be open to other kinds of covenanted sexual relationships.

Traditionalists draw out biblical themes of purity, emphasizing the calling of Christians to keep their bodies as “the temple of the Holy Spirit.” They speak against specific sexual acts—homosexual acts, or any sex outside of marriage—that they understand to violate that purity. Progressives tend to regard this emphasis on purity as outdated and unhelpful. They are more concerned about the emotional content of a relationship—the love, trust, and commitment between individuals—than about the form of the relationship or the bodily acts by which it is expressed.

Traditionalists acknowledge that sexual desires may be deep-seated; however, they emphasize the choices that individuals have in how to act on their desires. They affirm that, by God’s grace, the behaviors—and even sometimes the desires—can be transformed. Progressives tend to view sexual orientation as a fundamental, indelible part of an individual’s personality. They stress the likelihood that persons will act on their desires and the unlikelihood that the desires can be redirected.

Traditionalists acknowledge that the church has changed its mind previously on issues such as slavery, divorce, and women’s ordination. But they believe those revisions of doctrine came about because of fresh insight into the Scriptures—not

merely out of a desire to conform to social trends. They do not see the issue of homosexuality as analogous, because the biblical texts on that topic are much less ambiguous. Progressives believe that sometimes God moves first in society to bring about greater justice and then pulls the church along behind. They believe that changes in teaching on slavery, divorce, and women's ordination do set a valid precedent for a possible change in teaching on sexuality.

The pastoral model for traditionalists is: Compassion toward practicing homosexual persons means calling them, with all heterosexuals who have departed from God's intentions, to repentance and restoration. The advocacy model is to call society away from its destructive "anarchy in sexual relationships" (*The Book of Confessions*, The Confession of 1967, 9.47). For progressives the pastoral model is: Compassion means affirmation of everyone's sexual orientation and encouragement to use it responsibly in covenanted relationships. The advocacy model is to seek the dissolution of distinctions between marriage and same-gender relationships.

C. *A Question for the Church*

The 2008 overture that mandated the formation of this special committee recognized this disconnect. The overture recognized that there are same-gendered partners in the PC(USA). It asked the special committee to state the place of such partnered couples within the Christian community. The overture further asked the committee to explore marriage from a historical, sociological, and political (legal) perspective. The committee has attempted to do this exploration in an accurate, descriptive manner.

Discerning the place of same-gender partnerships in the Christian community, however, requires us to move beyond description and affirm an understanding of the nature of Christian community. First, the Christian community is found in the church. The church is for "the gathering and perfecting of the saints" (*The Book of Confessions*, The Westminster Confession of Faith, 6.142). We are sealed by baptism into this community. But baptism signifies "forgiveness of sins" (*The Book of Confessions*, The Nicene Creed, 1.3), "walk[ing] in newness of life" (*The Book of Confessions*, The Westminster Confession of Faith, 6.154), "an open and professed engagement to be wholly and only the Lord's" (*The Book of Confessions*, The Larger Catechism, 7.275), "dying with Christ and a joyful rising with him to new life" (*The Book of Confessions*, The Confession of 1967, 9.51), "present[ing] [our] bodies to be living sacrifices to God" (*Book of Order*, W-1.3033).

Therefore the question must be addressed from the perspective of the church as a place to gather and perfect the saints. Ultimately, we find the answer in the person and work of Jesus Christ, as known in Scripture, affirmed in the confessions, and operationalized through the *Book of Order*. It is only by looking at this question as one of discipleship, of sanctification, that we can ensure that the PC(USA) bears the marks of a true church: "first, the true preaching of the Word of God ...; secondly, the right administration of the sacraments of Christ Jesus ...; and lastly, ecclesiastical discipline uprightly administered, as God's Word prescribes ..." (*The Book of Confessions*, The Scots Confession, 3.18). It is only when we find our unity in the purity of the Word of God that we fulfill our connectional responsibilities to each other.

Based on the above-outlined diversity in views of Scripture and resulting pastoral and advocacy models, the special committee could not develop consensus on the question about same-gender partnerships. The special committee believes there is also significant disagreement among members and officers of the church regarding this question.

D. *Historic Principles*

In this situation of disagreement, we do well to return to the "Historic Principles of Church Order" expounded in Chapter I of the PC(USA) Form of Government: "God alone is Lord of the conscience," it declares, "and hath left it free from the doctrines and commandments of men [sic] which are in anything contrary to his Word, or beside it, in matters of faith or worship" (G-1.0301). So our consciences are not free in every respect, but rather we are called to bring them into captivity to God's Word. It is only when confronted with demands that are "contrary to his Word, or beside it," that we may claim freedom of conscience.

Regarding such scripturally undetermined matters, the historic principles state that "there are truths and forms with respect to which men of good characters and principles may differ." They advise that "in all these we think it the duty both of private Christians and societies to exercise mutual forbearance toward each other" (*Book of Order*, G-1.0305). On the other hand, where Scripture does determine a question, "it is incumbent upon these officers, and upon the whole Church, in whose name they act, to censure or cast out the erroneous and scandalous, observing, in all cases, the rules contained in the Word of God" (*Book of Order*, G-1.0303).

The issue before us is whether this question of covenanted same-gender partnerships is determined by the Word of God or not. The fact that equal sisters and brothers in Christ have differing convictions does not imply that all those convictions have equal standing in the church. The historic principles maintain that "no opinion can be ... more pernicious or more absurd than that which brings truth and falsehood upon a level, and represents it as of no consequence what a man's opinions

are. On the contrary, we are persuaded that there is an inseparable connection between faith and practice, truth and duty” (*Book of Order*, G-1.0304).

E. *The Constitution Holds*

As we work through our disagreements, we recognize that church teaching and church policy are still set by the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.). Members of the special committee may not agree on civil unions and Christian marriage; however, the Constitution has authoritative provisions that bear on these questions. Until such time as the church’s understanding of marriage is changed in *The Book of Confessions* and the *Book of Order*, those provisions remain in force. The burden of proof rests on those who would change the teaching.

Since decisions relating to marriage are made by ministers and sessions, it is well to review the obligations of those officers. All church officers vow to “be instructed and led by those confessions as [they] lead the people of God.” They also pledge to “be governed by our church’s polity” and “abide by its discipline” (*Book of Order*, W-4.4003c, e).

“So far as may be possible without serious departure from these standards [of the Reformed faith and polity as expressed in *The Book of Confessions* and the Form of Government], without infringing on the rights and views of others, and without obstructing the constitutional governance of the church,” officers have “freedom of conscience with respect to the interpretation of Scripture.” But “in becoming a candidate or officers of the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) one chooses to exercise freedom of conscience within certain bounds. His or her conscience is captive to the Word of God as interpreted in the standards of the church so long as he or she continues to seek or hold office in that body” (*Book of Order*, G-6.0108a–b).

Regarding marriage, the Constitution consistently declares that:

- Marriage “was instituted by the Lord God himself” (*The Book of Confessions*, 5.246; also 6.131, 6.133, 7.130, 9.47, and *Book of Order*, W-4.9001);
- Marriage is a “spiritual and physical union [of] one man and one woman” (*The Book of Confessions*, 6.131; also 5.246, 6.133);
- Marriage is “designed of God to last as long as they both [husband and wife] shall live” (*The Book of Confessions*, 6.133; also 6.131, 6.137, 9.47 and *Book of Order*, W-4.9001);
- “Marriage is a gift God has given to all humankind for the well-being of the entire human family” (*Book of Order*, W-4.9001; also *The Book of Confessions*, 6.131);
- Marriage serves purposes including “the mutual help of husband and wife; ... the safeguarding, undergirding, and development of their moral and spiritual character; ... the propagation of children and the rearing of them in the discipline and instruction of the Lord” (*The Book of Confessions*, 6.134; also 6.131);
- “Marriage is a civil contract between a woman and a man” (*Book of Order*, W-4.9001);
- “For Christians marriage is a covenant through which a man and a woman are called to live out together before God their lives of discipleship” (*Book of Order*, W-4.9001);
- Christian marriages are to be “publicly witnessed and acknowledged by the community of faith” (*Book of Order*, W-4.9001);
- Christians are called to continence in single life or “complete love and concord” in marriage (*The Book of Confessions*, 5.245–246; also 4.108, 7.248–249).

Authoritative interpretations of the Constitution have established that:

- “Officers of the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) who are authorized to perform marriages shall not state, imply, or represent that a same-sex ceremony is a marriage because under W-4.9001 a same-sex ceremony is not and cannot be a marriage” (*Spahr case, Minutes*, 2008, Part I, p. 331, 333).
- Sessions “should not allow the use of the church facilities for a same sex union ceremony that the session determines to be the same as a marriage ceremony” (*Minutes*, 1991, Part I, p. 395).
- Ministers and churches may celebrate a “loving, caring, and committed relationship” between persons of the same sex. But such a ceremony should not “appropriate specific liturgical forms from services of Christian marriage,” nor should it “confer a new status” upon the persons being blessed. It should not be “construed as an endorsement of homosexual conjugal

practice.” Same-sex couples should be instructed “that the service to be conducted does not constitute a marriage ceremony” (*Benton* case, Minutes, 2000, Part I, p. 588).

F. *A Faithful Answer*

God calls us into relationship with God and then with others. In fact, the call to love one’s neighbor is a command. In fulfilling this command for relationship with others, we must act in conformity with the first relationship to God that we have through Jesus Christ. Then in this life of discipleship to Christ, we are called to become his bond servant: body, soul, and mind. Our bodies are the dwelling place of the Holy Spirit. We must use our bodies within God’s design. Because God’s design is rooted in creation, this design is not just for the believer but for humanity. Therefore, friendships, whether of same or opposite gender, which do not violate God’s boundaries of sexual expression as defined in Scripture, the confessions, and the *Book of Order* can be honored and encouraged. However, those relationships, whether same or opposite gendered, that although committed and caring, which are outside of God’s design of sexual expression, cannot be encouraged or blessed. Pastoral care must be extended to all people within the body of Christ. Such care should always conform to the standards of the confessions as the church works to “gather and perfect” the saints.

For over three decades, the PC(USA) has wrestled with questions of human sexuality. When presbyteries have been asked to depart from the historic teaching of the church, they have declined. The *Book of Order* has been amended to make clear that chastity outside of marriage and monogamy within marriage, with marriage being defined as one man, one woman is a requirement for ordination. If this standard is considered serious enough to bar ordination, then the church in good conscience cannot encourage behavior or relationships that violate this standard. The *Benton* and subsequent decisions make it clear that in blessing same-sex couples, such blessings cannot be seen as marriage and cannot be construed as blessing sexual activity within these relationships.

This answer to the question about the place of covenanted same-gender partnerships may not be the answer that the Presbytery of Denver expected or desired. Others, too, may be disappointed. But this is the most faithful answer that we can give, within the faith that we have received and to which we have pledged ourselves.

G. *Our Covenant*

Throughout our time of prayerful deliberation—and sometimes difficult disagreement—the members of the PC(USA) Special Committee to Study Issues of Civil Union and Christian Marriage have been blessed by a remarkable degree of mutual respect, commitment to one another, and Christian love.

From the gifts of unity, respect, commitment, and love that we have received, we commend to our brothers and sisters in the PC(USA) the following covenant.

By the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, with the love of God, and in the communion of the Holy Spirit, we covenant together to:

- Honor the truth that Christ has called and God works through each member;
- Listen to one another with openness and respect;
- Support and pray for each other and for one another’s ministries;
- Earnestly seek and carefully listen to each person’s discernment of God’s will found in Scripture;
- Struggle together with perseverance to find God’s will for us even when the way is difficult;
- Love one another even when we disagree, and to commit ourselves to the reconciliation of any broken relationships we have with one another.

III. Conclusion

In conclusion, the question of the place of covenanted same-gender partnerships in the Christian community lifts up only one segment of our community. However, in Ephesians 2, we remember Jesus Christ came to reconcile all of us to God. Therefore, we call the church to a radical inclusivity that invites all people to be transformed by the radical redeeming love of Jesus Christ. We boldly proclaim the power of Jesus Christ to be our peace and to deliver us from all activities and passions that Scripture and our confessions call sin. We challenge the PC(USA) to gather around the cross of Christ and to rejoice that sin and death have no power over the Christian. We call all within our church to repent of whatever sin binds them.

Ephesians 2 talks of growing into a “holy temple in the Lord” (Eph. 2:21) and becoming a “dwelling place for God” (Eph. 2:22). As persons within whom the Spirit of God dwells, we are to pay particular attention to the ways we use our bodies. Our bodies are precious to God. Even the hairs on our head are numbered by our good and glorious God. We believe our bodies will be resurrected one day from dust, ashes, and decay. The way we conduct ourselves sexually is therefore extremely important, and God in God’s mercy has given us a perfect plan for this.

In Genesis God says it is not good for man to be alone. A woman is made who completes Adam and the two of them become one flesh. Adam’s joy knows no bounds as he embraces Eve and cries out, “This at last is bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh” (Gen. 2:23). God’s gracious intent for our sexuality is that we would find the one who completes us. Our bodies are carefully designed by the Creator to belong to the one created for us before the foundation of the world was laid. Any sexual activity outside of marriage violates this beautiful intention of God.

Humanity is created male and female, and the sexes complete and complement each other. When creation is so marred, God destroys it with a flood, and it is restored by those who enter the ark two by two, male and female. Jesus mentions the two becoming one flesh as he speaks against divorce and polygamy. “The one who made them at the beginning ‘made them male and female’ ... and two shall become one flesh” (Mt. 19:4, 6; cf. Mk. 10:6, 8). We are to be celibate until marriage and to not violate our marriage vows.

Too often in our hedonistic culture, sex is seen as a liberating act. We falsely believe that there is freedom in doing what feels good and what we want. But like all sin, sexual sins have consequences. God’s beautiful gift of sex wrongly used causes terrible emotional and physical carnage. As the church, we should call our young people to the empowering liberation and freedom of knowing they are far too precious not to wait for the one God designed for them. We should see celibacy as a gift as Paul did and support and encourage single people.

The Christian life is one of sanctification. We are to be dead to sin and alive to all that is good. We are to transform our culture and offer to all the joy, grace, and freedom that come from striving daily to be obedient to God’s Word. We are to proclaim without exception the all-encompassing power of Jesus Christ to deliver us from any sin with which we struggle. This journey will have times of difficulties, and we will all fail, but the church should be a place of grace, repentance, and restoration, as we seek to be molded into the image of Christ.

The Confession of 1967 says,

The relationship between man and woman exemplifies in a basic way God’s ordering of the interpersonal life for which he created mankind. Anarchy in sexual relationships is a symptom of man’s alienation from God, his neighbor, and himself. ... The church, as the household of God, is called to lead [all] out of this alienation into the responsible freedom of the new life in Christ. Reconciled to God, each person has joy in and respect for his own humanity and that of other persons; a man and woman are enabled to marry, to commit themselves to a mutually shared life, and to respond to each other in sensitive and lifelong concern; parents receive the grace to care for children in love and to nurture their individuality. The church comes under the judgment of God and invites rejection by man when it fails to lead men and women into the full meaning of life together, or withholds the compassion of Christ from those caught in the moral confusion of our time (*The Book of Confessions*, 9.47).

We are called to offer the Gospel’s grace to a hurting world full of people who desperately need to know God loves them and they can be freed of the things of this world that so easily enslave us. Love is never about license and, for too many years, the PC(USA) has been silent as the carnage of sexual hedonism engulfs our culture. Let us boldly proclaim that God has a place for sex: It is within marriage between a man and woman and that commitment is for life. Let us work to support, encourage, and nurture those who are not married and help them know that God’s plan for them is just as important as God’s plan for married people. Let us honor celibacy and those who practice it as engaging in a profitable spiritual discipline that may be lifelong or for a season of life.

Holding us all to the same biblical standard will help strengthen the peace, unity, and purity of the PC(USA) and help us all grow in the grace of our Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ.

To God alone be the glory!

Rationale/Commentary²

A. Biblical and Historical Summary

*The one sufficient revelation of God is Jesus Christ, the Word of God incarnate, to whom the Holy Spirit bears unique and authoritative witness through the Holy Scriptures, which are received and obeyed as the word of God written.*³

In matters of faith and practice, the church turns to Scripture to hear the testimony of the Holy Spirit, so that we might follow the Word of God incarnate in our changing world. A review of Scripture, the confessions, and the history of marriage in the church presents a consistent view of the most foundational aspect of the nature of marriage: that it unites a man and a woman.

Therefore a man leaves his father and his mother and clings to his wife, and they become one flesh (Gen. 2:24).

[Jesus] 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” (Mt. 19:4–6).

Christian marriage is an institution ordained of God, blessed by our Lord Jesus Christ, established and sanctified for the happiness and welfare of mankind, into which spiritual and physical union one man and one woman enter, cherishing a mutual esteem and love, bearing with each other’s infirmities and weaknesses, comforting each other in trouble, providing in honesty and industry for each other and for their household, praying for each other, and living together the length of their days as heirs of the grace of life (*The Book of Confessions*, The Westminster Confession of Faith, 6.131).

1. Old Testament

Genesis 2:18–24 tells how God gives humanity the gift of marriage. The Old Testament presents marriage as the basis for the family, the fundamental unit of society. Marriage provides:

- Complementary completeness for man and woman: Genesis 1–2;
- The birth and nurture of children: Gen. 1:28, 9:1 (creation, after the flood), 15:1–6, 21:1–7 (Abraham and Sarah);
- Companionship, mutual support, and affection: Gen. 2:18–24 (Adam and Eve) and 1 Sam. 1:1–28 (Hannah);
- Economic partnership, providing financial support for the family: Prov. 31:10–31 (the virtuous wife).

Marriages were also used as political tools to form alliances: 1 Sam. 18:17–27, 19:11–17, 25:44, 2 Sam. 3:13–15, 6:16–23 (Saul’s daughter, Micah, and David), and 1 Kings 11:1–4 (Solomon and his wives).

The Torah contains many laws regulating marriage and divorce. These include Ex. 20:14, 17; Deut. 5:18, 21 (the Ten Commandments); Lev. 18:6–18; 20:10; Deut. 24:1–5 (divorce and no military service).

Marriage is used by the prophets as a symbol of the exclusive attachment of Israel to God, who is referred to as Israel’s husband. Worshiping other gods is likened to adultery.⁴

- Hosea marries a prostitute, symbolizing God’s gracious love for Israel as Hosea forgives her.
- God restores God’s forsaken wife, Israel (Isa. 54:1–8, 62:1–5).
- Ezekiel depicts Israel’s disobedience as the adultery of an unfaithful wife (Ezekiel 16).

Scripture censures male infidelity, as well (Judah—Gen. 38:26; David—2 Sam. 12:1–15). The exclusively female images above flow from the imagery of God as the husband of Israel. These images are transformed in the New Testament where the church (the new Israel) becomes the bride of Christ.

2. New Testament

Jesus’ public ministry begins at a wedding feast in Cana, where he performs his first miracle (Jn. 2:1–11). Throughout his ministry, Jesus makes significant statements about marriage:

- In addressing a question on divorce, Jesus defines marriage (Mt. 19:4–6; Mk. 10:6–9). In this definition Jesus wipes away generations of misused tradition (divorce, polygamy) and brings humankind back to God’s design in Gen. 2:24.
- Jesus addresses a question about a hypothetical widow of seven husbands, indicating that marriage is not part of life in the resurrection (Mt. 22:23–33, as well as Mk. 12:18–27 and Lk. 20:27–40).
- Jesus seems to indicate a preference for celibacy in his comment about eunuchs, while acknowledging this may not be best for everyone (Mt. 19:10–12).
- Jesus uses marriage as an illustration in several parables (Mt. 22:1–14; Mt. 25:1–13; and Lk. 12:35–38).

In the first-century church, marriage was an issue because of the expected imminent coming of the kingdom of God and because the diverse marriage practices in the Greco-Roman culture posed a challenge to good order in the Christian community.

- Paul writes of the divine gift of marriage as an antidote against *porneia*, a Greek term originally meaning “prostitution,” but later broadened to cover a range of sexual misconduct (1 Cor. 7:2–6).⁵
- Paul writes against divorce (1 Cor. 7:7–9, 32–40).
- Paul indicates his preference of celibacy over marriage (1 Cor. 7:7–9, 32–40).
- Marriage is used as a metaphor for the union of Christ with his bride, the Church (Eph. 5:25–27; Rev. 19:6–8; and Rev. 21:9–10).

Toward the end of the first century, as the expectation of an imminent arrival of God’s kingdom faded, several trends emerged, as mentioned in 1 Timothy:

- Qualifications for church leaders (ministers) included that those who were married have only one wife (3:2).
- Some parties within the church promoted celibacy as an ideal, even as a requirement for faithful Christians, but this was rejected by the orthodox leaders (4:1–6).
- Young widows were encouraged to remarry for economic support, procreation, and to avoid immorality and scandal (5:14).

3. *The Early Interplay of Church and State*

Marriage, in varied forms, is almost universal among human societies. It appears as an already existing institution in the earliest records of civilization.⁶ Early Christians understood themselves as set apart and distinct from the culture around them. In Ephesians and elsewhere, the ideas of mutual submission and love distinguished Christian marriage from the absolute rule of the *paterfamilias*⁷ characteristic of Greco-Roman marriage. Christians also distinguished themselves from pagan cultures in confining full sexual expression to marriage between a man and a woman.

The early Christian church was an underground and often persecuted movement with little ability to influence official policies in the Roman Empire on matters like marriage. Nevertheless, theologians (John Chrysostom, Tertullian, etc.) showed interest in the understanding and practice of marriage in the early Christian community. When Christianity became the official religion of the Roman Empire in 313, laws enacted under Constantine and his successors began to reflect the influence of Christian views about marriage and chastity. The writings of Augustine (354–430) were a primary source for Christian understandings of marriage. Augustine expounded upon the three “goods” of marriage—offspring, exclusive fidelity, and the unbreakable bond between husband and wife.

By the mid-fifth century, legal codes enacted after Constantine⁸ included many statutes on marriage:

- Restrictions on divorce and remarriage,
- Prohibition of same-sex marriage,
- Proscription of clergy to marry, though married men could become clergy.

After the disintegration of the Roman Empire in the West, marriage was regulated at a local level. The church was involved, but not in a regulatory capacity. Gradually, local customs were combined with biblical interpretations and developed into canon law. Beginning about 800, the church increasingly asserted its authority over marriage.

By the early sixteenth century, the Roman Catholic canon law of marriage was predominant in the West.⁹ It included proscriptions against incest, polygamy, bestiality, and sodomy. Provisions were made for the annulment of marriages formed through duress or fraud; the church claimed the power to declare valid marriage bonds indissoluble. Celibacy was the norm for clerical and monastic life. Marriage, although seen as less holy than celibacy, was a sacrament and “means of grace.”

4. *The Protestant Reformation*

In the sixteenth century, the Protestant reformers insisted that Scripture alone be the basis of authority in the church, and re-examined marriage and canon law in light of biblical teaching. In Protestant churches:

- Marriage became a Christian vocation and was considered good, but no longer a sacrament.
- Celibacy was no longer required of clergy.

However, Protestant views on marriage differed:

- Martin Luther (1483–1546) promoted the state’s role in the regulation of marriage. In Luther’s doctrine of the earthly and heavenly kingdoms, civil magistrates acted as God’s vice-regents in the governance of marriage. Civil marriage codes replaced canon law, although many of the principles of canon law continued in force.
- King Henry VIII (1491–1547) broke with the Roman Catholic Church to obtain a divorce. He placed church authority under the monarchy, while the church retained control of marriage. The family was seen as a “little commonwealth” and the fundamental institution undergirding society.
- John Calvin (1509–1564) stressed marriage as a covenant between individuals, God, and the community. Calvin’s three reasons for marriage were mutual love and support, the birth and nurture of children, and protection from sexual sin. Regulation of marriage in Calvin’s Geneva was shared between church and state.

The Reformed understanding of marriage was made evident throughout the Reformation-era confessions. The Second Helvetic Confession cautioned against making celibacy a mark of spiritual merit and condemned polygamy.¹⁰ The Heidelberg Catechism urged Christians to “live chaste and disciplined lives, whether in holy wedlock or in single life.”¹¹

The Westminster Confession in the original 1647 version stated: “Marriage is to be between one Man and one Woman: neither is it lawfull for any Man to have more than one Wife, nor for any Woman to have more than one Husband; at the same time” (*The Book of Confessions*, 6.131). “Marriage is designed for the mutual help of husband and wife; for the safeguarding, undergirding, and development of their moral and spiritual character; for the propagation of children and the rearing of them in the discipline and instruction of the Lord.”¹²

Although the reformers viewed the sacramental nature of marriage differently from the Roman Catholic Church, and although the reformers took varying views on the role of the state in marriage, all never wavered in their view of the basic nature of marriage as a union of man and woman.

5. *Marriage Laws in America*

Immigrants from Lutheran, Reformed, Anglican, and Roman Catholic traditions brought their traditions of marriage to America. Enlightenment thinking introduced a fifth pattern—marriage as a social contract. The Enlightenment was an eighteenth-century philosophical movement that held human reason as applicable to all areas of life. It stressed ideals of freedom, equality, and individual rights. During this time, neither laws nor church teachings questioned the nature of marriage as a union of man and woman.

Marriages were required to be registered with civil authorities. States imposed various limitations on each person’s choice of possible marriage partners, excluding categories such as close blood relatives, minors, persons deemed legally incompetent, and persons already married. Significant among these prohibitions were interracial relationships during Jim Crow segregation.

As societal attitudes about interracial marriage began to change, the federal government intervened. The U.S. Supreme Court’s 1967 ruling in *Loving v. Virginia*¹³ eradicated state laws barring interracial marriage. The court ruled:

Marriage is one of the “basic civil rights of man [sic],” fundamental to our very existence and survival... To deny this fundamental freedom on so unsupportable a basis as the racial classifications embodied in these statutes ... is surely to deprive all the State’s citizens of liberty without due process of law.¹⁴

The court concluded that race was an extraneous feature having nothing to do with the essence of marriage, and therefore states lacked the power to limit the choice of possible marriage partners to members of the same race. But within these national constitutional parameters, states still retained the ability to regulate marriage.

Proponents of same-sex marriage later tried to extend the reasoning in *Loving* to their cause. They suggested that biological sex, like race, might be an extraneous feature having nothing to do with the essence of marriage, and therefore states might lack the power to limit a person’s choice of potential marriage partners to members of the opposite sex. Several states rejected this reasoning. An example is *Baker v. Nelson*, a case in which the Minnesota Supreme Court ruled that Minnesota law “does not authorize marriage between persons of the same sex and that such marriages are accordingly prohibited” and that this limitation did not violate the U.S. Constitution. The plaintiffs appealed, and the U.S. Supreme Court dismissed the appeal “for want of a substantial federal question.”¹⁵

In 1996, Congress passed the Defense of Marriage Act (DOMA), defining marriage as a legal union between one man and one woman for purposes of all federal laws, and including the provision that states in which same-gender marriage is not

legal do not have to recognize a same-gender marriage from another state. To date, thirty-seven states have approved their own DOMAs, thirty-one of which have state constitutional amendments defining marriage as between one man and one woman.

Opponents of DOMA have questioned the constitutionality of the act based on the Full Faith and Credit Clause of the Constitution (“Full faith and credit shall be given in each state to the public acts, records, and judicial proceedings of every other state”). This clause generally mandates that states must recognize marriages solemnized in any other.

In 2004, Massachusetts became the first state to redefine civil marriage to include same-gender couples, a year after its state’s highest court ruled that a ban on gay marriage was unconstitutional.¹⁶ At the time of this writing, four additional states (New Hampshire, Vermont, Iowa, and Connecticut) and the District of Columbia have done likewise. Several others, including California, New Jersey, Washington, and Oregon, allow civil unions or domestic partnerships that provide same-gender couples some rights and privileges of marriage under state law. Legislative and judicial efforts to redefine marriage in Maine and California have failed in public referenda.

6. *Marriage in the PC(USA)*

The PC(USA), in careful study of Scripture and its application to current culture, has come to embrace marriage as an equal partnership between husband and wife. The church has also amended The Westminster Confession of Faith concerning divorce, calling it a result of sin but allowing remarriage after repentance.¹⁷

The Confession of 1967 lifts up “anarchy in sexual relationships” as one of four issues of particular concern in the church. The confession enumerates the positive benefits of marriage¹⁸ as a remedy for the “perennial confusion about the meaning of sex.” This confession clearly defines marriage as between a man and a woman.

Since the late 1970s, issues related to homosexuality have been debated in the PC(USA) and its predecessor denominations. People of deep faith and commitment are struggling to discern how the church can bring God’s redemptive grace to a culture experiencing what The Confession of 1967 refers to as sexual “anarchy.”

In 1991, the General Assembly responded to a request for constitutional interpretation by declaring that any same-sex ceremony “considered to be the equivalent of a marriage ceremony ... would not be sanctioned under the *Book of Order*” (*Minutes*, 1991, Part I, p. 395). It advised sessions against the use of church facilities in any same-sex ceremony deemed to be the equivalent of a marriage. A more recent General Assembly Permanent Judicial Commission (GAPJC) decision instructed ministers of the Word and Sacrament not to “state, imply, or represent that a same-sex ceremony is a marriage.”¹⁹

In 1996, the *Book of Order* was amended to require that those being ordained “lead a life in obedience to Scripture and in conformity to the historic confessional standards of the church. Among these standards is the requirement to live either in fidelity within the covenant of marriage between a man and a woman (W-4.9001), or chastity in singleness.”²⁰ All attempts to delete this section from the *Book of Order* have failed to be ratified by a majority of presbyteries.²¹

In *Benton, et al. v. Presbytery of Hudson River* (2000) the GAPJC did allow for individual ministers and sessions to conduct a same-sex ceremony that “celebrates a loving, caring and committed relationship.” Such a ceremony does not “confer a new status” but “blesses an existing relationship.” These services “do not constitute a marriage ceremony” and “should not be construed as an endorsement of homosexual conjugal practice proscribed by the General Assembly.”²²

7. *Other Christian Traditions and Marriage*

The three bodies with which the PC(USA) is in full communion have taken differing positions:

- The United Church of Christ (UCC): “We ... affirm that all humans are made in the image and likeness of God, including people of all sexual orientations, and God has bestowed upon each one the gift of human sexuality. Further, we recognize and affirm that, as created in God’s image and gifted by God with human sexuality, all people have the right to lead lives that express love, justice, mutuality, commitment, consent and pleasure.”²³
- The Reformed Church in America (RCA) restricts marriage to “the union of one man and one woman, to the exclusion of all others.” In 1996, the RCA encouraged “the UCC to move toward a more biblically faithful understanding of human sexuality and a repeal of all policies condoning homosexual behavior.”
- The Evangelical Lutheran Church in America (ELCA): “[M]arriage is a covenant of mutual promises, commitment and hope authorized legally by the state and blessed by God. The historic Christian tradition and the Lutheran confessions have recognized marriage as a covenant between a man and a woman.”²⁴ In 2009, its churchwide assembly voted to “commit

itself to finding ways to allow congregations that choose to do so to recognize, support and hold publicly accountable life-long, monogamous, same-gender relationships.”²⁵

The Roman Catholic Church holds to its sacramental view of life-long marriage. “The matrimonial covenant, by which a man and a woman establish between themselves a partnership of the whole of life and which is ordered by its nature to the good of the spouses and the procreation and education of offspring, has been raised by Christ the Lord to the dignity of a sacrament between the baptized.”²⁶

The Orthodox Church in America maintains its ancient, sacramental understanding of marriage between a man and a woman as a “Holy Mystery.” It is not a juridical contract and is not entered with vows or oaths. It is the “baptizing and confirming” of human love in God by Christ in the Holy Spirit.²⁷

The Episcopal Church views marriage as a “sacramental rite.” “Holy Matrimony is Christian marriage, in which the woman and man 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.” There is great disagreement over the issue of same-gender marriage.²⁸

The United Methodist Church: “We affirm the sanctity of the marriage covenant that is expressed in love, mutual support, personal commitment and shared fidelity between a man and a woman.”²⁹

The Universal Fellowship of Metropolitan Community Churches, “the world’s first church group with a primary, positive ministry to gays, lesbians, bisexual and transgender persons,”³⁰ strongly supports “marriage equality.”

The Southern Baptist Convention: “Marriage is the uniting of one man and one woman in covenant commitment for a lifetime. It is God’s unique gift to reveal the union between Christ and His church and to provide for the man and the woman in marriage the framework for intimate companionship, the channel of sexual expression according to biblical standards, and the means for procreation of the human race.”³¹

Other church bodies in the United States, Canada, and Europe are wrestling with issues similar to those our special committee was charged with considering. It is important to note, however, that the vast majority of churches in developing nations view these debates negatively and even threaten to break communion with churches that would deviate from traditional views of marriage. This is seen in the current debates within the Anglican Communion.³² Most Pentecostals, Church of God in Christ, nondenominational, and charismatic churches also hold a more traditional view of marriage.

B. The Relationship Between Civil Union and Christian Marriage

There are distinct differences in the way terms like marriage, civil union, and domestic partnership are understood, and because those terms are interpreted differently in various civil jurisdictions, the chart below outlines our understanding and identifies the way these terms will be used in this study.

	Civil Marriage	Redefined Civil Marriage³³	Civil Union/Domestic Partnership³⁴	Christian Marriage in the PC(USA)
Structure	government-licensed contract between a man and a woman	government-licensed contract between two persons	contract between two persons by an individual jurisdiction	covenant of a life-long commitment between God, man and a woman, and the community
Recognition	all states and federal level	only some states	only some states and localities	all states and federal level ³⁵
Purpose	social institution by which a man and a woman form a family, often with the expectation of children resulting from their sexual union	social institution by which two people form a family; children with biological parent(s) outside the household may be brought inside	legal arrangement between two people	mutual help of husband and wife; moral and spiritual development; propagation and rearing of children in the discipline of the Lord (The Westminster Confession of Faith, 6.134)

	Civil Marriage	Redefined Civil Marriage³³	Civil Union/Domestic Partnership³⁴	Christian Marriage in the PC(USA)
Institution	commitment, publicly witnessed	commitment, publicly witnessed	commitment, publicly registered	lifelong commitment, publicly witnessed, acknowledged by the community of faith
Rights/Privileges	households recognized as social units	households recognized as social units	reciprocal rights/responsibilities that may or may not approximate marriage	those who are married “live out together before God their lives of Christian discipleship” (<i>Book of Order</i> , W-4.9001)
Responsibilities	accountable to each other and government	accountable to each other and government	accountable to each other and government	accountable to each other and government; called to live out discipleship before God
Sexual Expression	traditionally consummated by male-female intercourse	sexual relationship presumed but acts not specified	no necessary sexual relationship	the full expression of love between a man and a woman (<i>Book of Common Worship</i> , 842)

Civil marriage in forty-five states is a state-licensed contract between a man and a woman. In five states and the District of Columbia, marriage has been redefined as a state-licensed contract between two consenting adults. Christian marriage is a covenant through which “a man and a woman are called to live out together before God their lives of discipleship.”³⁶

Civil marriage occurs through a state-licensed contract granted to parties who meet particular criteria, which may include residency, identification, premarital counseling, evidence that neither party is currently in a civil marriage, medical testing, lack of consanguinity, and age. In the vast majority of states, difference in gender is a state-required criterion; in a small minority, people of the same sex may be licensed to marry.

Civil marriage determines the delineation of the household and a person’s next-of-kin, primary parental rights and responsibilities, and other benefits granted by states to those in licensed civil marriages (e.g., filing taxes together, joint home-ownership). Civil marriage is a necessary, but not sufficient, criterion of Christian marriage in the PC(USA).

In Christian marriage, a man and a woman’s covenant to live out their discipleship together in lifelong commitment must accompany civil marriage. The man and woman must demonstrate sufficient “Christian understanding” to be able to enter into the covenant of Christian marriage.³⁷ Thus, while every state empowers ministers of the Word and Sacrament to officiate on its behalf in civil marriage, the *Book of Order* instructs them not to conduct any covenant ceremony of Christian marriage that they feel is “unwise.”³⁸

Marriage, whether civil or Christian, represents more than a mechanism to meet the needs of individuals and gain state and/or federal benefits. Both constitute the creation of a social unit, a source of meaning and identity.

Since civil unions do not share this social dimension of marriage, some think that such unions cannot adequately substitute for marriage, fearing that the socially indeterminate nature of civil unions may even encourage impermanence among such couples.³⁹ Others see such unions as a helpful compromise in a polarized and polarizing debate. In any case, civil unions cannot fully make peace between those who view homosexual practice differently.

C. *The Effects of Current Laws on Same-Gender Partners and Their Children*

Scripture and the confessions recognize marriage between a man and a woman as creating a basic unit of ordered human society. “The birth and nurture of children are essential for the continuation of the human race and are an expression of hope and confidence in God’s providential care.”⁴⁰

Laws are the result of a political process, which is an “allocation of public values.”⁴¹ Our view of the beneficial or detrimental effect of any legal proposal will be dependent upon our value outlook. Among those differing perspectives which are represented within the PC(USA) are:⁴²

Perspective 1: Laws that fail to give benefits equal to marriage to same-gender couples and their families violate the standards of social justice and equality.⁴³ The differences in benefits result in legal, financial, and social hardships that may affect children. Using the Equal Protection clause of the U.S. Constitution, there should be no difference made between relationships based on gender. From a biblical perspective, it is important to note the different cultural settings between modern and biblical times, especially in the role of the extended family structure in the latter.⁴⁴ From a sociological direction, there is no clear evidence whether children from same-gender parent families are at a developmental disadvantage.⁴⁵

Perspective 2: Same-gender relationships are of low importance in comparison to other more pressing societal issues. While the concerns of those who oppose same-gender marriage may be understandable, when it comes to matters of faith, it is God's place, not the place of human beings to determine the appropriateness of a relationship.⁴⁶ Under no circumstances should children of same-gender couples be treated any differently under the law because of their parents' relationship. Same-gender couples and their families should receive fair treatment by society and the church.

Perspective 3: It does not violate social justice or equal protection to offer different benefits to same-gender couples from those offered to a man and a woman who are married. Every relationship or contract does not have to be accorded the same value, protection, or benefit. Marriage between one man and one woman is foundational to the stability of society and is the best possible context for the nurture and flourishing of children. In controlled studies, children separated from one or more biological parent fare less well.⁴⁷ All children should be supported regardless of their family situations; however, public policy should not grant the same favor to relationships in which children are separated from at least one biological parent, such as same-gender partnerships. To promote social stability and justice for children, the law should encourage relationships that are optimal by granting particular benefits to a woman and a man who marry.⁴⁸

Perspective 4: Opposing the acceptance of same-gender marriage rises beyond a sociopolitical argument to an issue of conscience. All sexual activity outside of marriage between a man and a woman is unacceptable. Behavior that is explicitly proscribed by Scripture cannot be encouraged. Providing legal benefits equal to marriage for same-gender couples makes society complicit in encouraging this behavior.⁴⁹

1. Census Figures

Determining the size of the populations involved is not a straightforward task because information on same-gender partners has not been collected in past census reports. However, information collected on same-gender couples by the U.S. Census Bureau's 2008 American Community Survey⁵⁰ indicated a total of 564,743 same-gender couple households in this country. Approximately one-fifth (115,421) of those households included children. The vast majority of these children are from previous heterosexual relationships.⁵¹ The number of same-gender couple households with children represents .3 percent of around 38 million total households with children under the age of eighteen.

2. Federal Laws

In 1997, the General Accounting Office (GAO) reported there were 1,049 laws (updated to 1,138 in 2004) in which "marital status" was a "factor ... even though some of these laws may not directly create benefits, rights, or privileges" (for example, this includes some laws that apply to American Civil War widows). The GAO cautioned:

[N]o conclusions can be drawn, from our identification of a law as one in which marital status is a factor, concerning the effect of the law on married people versus single people. A particular law may create either advantages or disadvantages for those who are married, or may apply to both married and single people. For example, those who are unmarried fare better than their married counterparts under the so-called marriage penalty provision of the tax laws, while married couples enjoy estate tax benefits not available to the unmarried.⁵²

Areas most significantly affected by federal laws, principally DOMA, are:

- Tax code: Given the complexity of the federal tax code, the benefits, or penalties, of a married filing status depend on a household's financial situation.

The tax code offers other benefits to married couples. For example, the premiums paid for health insurance for a spouse and children are exempt from federal taxes, while premiums paid for a domestic partner are not.

- Social Security and federal retirement benefits: These programs provide benefits to the spouse of a deceased or disabled plan member. Spousal benefits are limited to a spouse of the opposite sex. A domestic partner or same-gender spouse is not eligible for these benefits.

- Immigration: A same-gender spouse of a U.S. citizen is not eligible for legal permanent resident status ("green card") or work visa based on marital status. This applies equally to same-gender couples legally married in the U.S. or in another country.

- Recognition of same-gender marriage across state lines: A provision of the federal DOMA declares that states need not recognize other states’ same-gender marriages. The U.S. Supreme Court has yet to hear an appeal of these cases.⁵³

3. Varieties of State Laws

States can be divided into five general configurations.⁵⁴

State configurations						
		Constitutional Prohibition States (e.g., SC)	DOMA States (e.g., WA)	Non-DOMA States (e.g., NM)	Civil Unions/ Domestic Partnerships States (e.g., CA)	Redefined Civil Marriage States (e.g., MA)
Legal Elements	Constitutional Language	Yes	no	no	yes	no
	DOMA	Yes	yes	no	no	no
	Restrictive State Law	Yes	maybe	yes	no	no
	Civil Unions/ Domestic Partnerships	No	maybe	maybe	yes	no
	Recognition of Other States’ Redefined Civil Marriages	No	no	no	no	yes

Some states that recognize civil unions/domestic partnerships have granted benefits that are arguably equivalent to the benefits granted through marriage.⁵⁵ These fall into several broad categories:

- Parental: Without the recognition of a civil marriage/domestic partnership, many parental rights may be denied to one member of a same-gender couple. These include joint or co-parent adoption, recognition of a child’s relationship to both parents, and eligibility for foster parenting. This can have implications for the ability to direct medical care for a child, custody of a child on the death of the biological parent, eligibility for public housing or subsidy programs, and ability to extend the nonbiological parent’s employer health insurance to the children. However, as previously noted, the vast majority of children residing in same-gender households are from previous heterosexual relationships. Differences described in this section may not apply to these children.
- Partner: Rights and benefits not available to an unmarried partner include health insurance and Medicare benefits, and the ability to direct medical care and receive survivor benefits. They extend into many economic and commercial areas that married couples take for granted, including the ability to have joint credit, and to own property with special tax benefits and legal protections. A number of legal benefits are also unavailable—protection against being forced to testify against a spouse in court; the ability to structure a dissolution of the relationship through a court-supervised divorce, including child custody and visitation rights; and the right to sue for wrongful death of a partner.
- Tax code: State and local tax codes vary too widely to draw general conclusions about the benefits or penalties of marriage. State tax laws are roughly parallel to federal laws.

4. Current Research

While it is possible to describe the differences in the law regarding same-gender relationships, it is still difficult to make definitive statements on the sociological effects of these laws on same-gender families and their children. Research on this specific topic encounters significant challenges.

The journal of the American Academy of Pediatrics offers a comprehensive review of the literature related to the psychosocial aspects of same-gender parents and their children.⁵⁶ Challenges such as small sample size, children originally born into a heterosexual parental relationship, investigator bias, and community attitudes are present in current research.

The effect of the laws and the developmental differences of children in same-gender parent families are difficult to determine because cultural attitudes are not static. As one article states:

“... whether same-sex marriage would prove socially beneficial, socially harmful, or trivial is an empirical question that cannot be settled by any amount of armchair theorizing. There are plausible arguments on all sides of the issue, and as yet there is no evidence sufficient to settle them.”⁵⁷

Endnotes

1. Dietrich Bonhoeffer, *The Cost of Discipleship* (New York: Macmillan, 1959), 7.
2. This “Commentary,” though similar to Sections II–IV. of the majority report, reflects a different perspective. Members of the minority appreciate the work of the full committee.
3. *The Book of Confessions*, The Confession of 1967, 9.27.
4. Some of these passages have been misappropriated to excuse spousal abuse. Because of our deep concern with domestic violence, we refer all readers to the excellent treatment of this in “Turn Mourning into Dancing! A Policy Statement on Healing Domestic Violence,” 213th General Assembly (2001) of the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.), <<http://www.pcusa.org/oga/publications/dancing.pdf>>.
5. Frederick Danker, et al., *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, 3rd edition (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001); Robert A.J. Gagnon, *The Bible and Homosexual Practice* (Nashville: Abington Press, 2001), 436.
6. Code of Hammurabi (Codex Hammurabi, c. 1790 BC), no. 127–156. Also, “In all or nearly all human societies, marriage is socially approved sexual intercourse between a woman and a man, conceived both as a personal relationship and as an institution, primarily such that any children resulting from the union are—and are understood by society to be—emotionally, morally, practically, and legally affiliated with both parents.” [David Blankenhorn, *The Future of Marriage* (New York: Encounter Books, 2007), 91.]
7. The *paterfamilias* (“father of the family”) was the male head of a Roman household who held the power of life and death (*patria potestas*) over all members of the household, including slaves. [Suzanne Dixon, *The Roman Family* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 1992), chap. 2.]
8. Matthew Kuefler, “The Marriage Revolution in Late Antiquity: The Theodosian Code and Later Roman Marriage Law,” *Journal of Family History*, 2007.
9. John Witte Jr., *From Sacrament to Contract: Marriage, Religion, and Law in the Western Tradition* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press), 4.
10. *The Book of Confessions*, Second Helvetic Confession, 5.245, 5.246.
11. *The Book of Confessions*, Heidelberg Catechism, 4.108.
12. *The Book of Confessions*, The Westminster Confession of Faith, 6.134.
13. 388 U.S. 1 (1967).
14. 388 U.S. at 11, citing *Skinner v. Oklahoma*, 316 U.S. 535, 541 (1942), citations omitted.
15. *Baker v. Nelson*, 191 N.W.2d 185 (1971).
16. *Goodridge v. Department of Public Health*, 440 Mass. 309 (2003).
17. See *The Book of Confessions*, The Westminster Confession of Faith, 6.132 and 6.137–139. The original language of Chapter XXIV, paragraphs 5 and 6, is available at <http://www.reformed.org/documents/westminster_conf_of_faith.html>.
18. *The Book of Confessions*, The Confession of 1967, 9.47 “... each person has joy in and respect for his [sic] own humanity and that of other persons; a man and woman are enabled to marry, to commit themselves to a mutually shared life, and to respond to each other in sensitive and lifelong concern; parents receive the grace to care for children in love and to nurture their individuality.”
19. Request 91-23, *Minutes*, 203rd General Assembly (1991), Part I, p. 411; *Jane Adams Spahr v. Presbyterian Church (U.S.A) through the Presbytery of Redwoods*, <<http://www.pcusa.org/gajpc/decisions/pjc21812withconcurrences.pdf>>, also *Minutes*, 2008, Part I, p. 330ff.
20. *Book of Order*, G-6.0106b.
21. In 1994, 1997, 2001, and 2008.
22. <http://www.pcusa.org/gajpc/decisions/pjc21211.pdf>; see also *Minutes*, 2000, Part I, p. 588.
23. <www.ucc.org/assets/pdfs/in-support-of-equal-marriage-rights-for-all-with-background.pdf>, pp. 2–3.
24. “Human Sexuality: Gift and Trust,” August 19, 2009, Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, <<http://www.elca.org/~media/Files/Who%20We%20Are/Office%20of%20the%20Secretary/Assembly/CWA%202009%20Revised%20Social%20Statement%20HSGT%20FINAL%20090309.pdf>>.

25. Resolution 2 at <<http://www.elca.org/Who-We-Are/Our-Three-Expressions/Churchwide-Organization/Office-of-the-Secretary/ELCA-Governance/Churchwide-Assembly/Actions/Voting.aspx#MP>>.
26. <http://www.vatican.va/archive/ENG1104/_P3V.HTM>.
27. <<http://www.oca.org/OCchapter.asp?SID=2&ID=56>>.
28. <http://gc2009.org/ViewLegislation/view_leg_detail.aspx?id=898&type=Final>.
29. <http://www.umc.org/site/apps/nlnet/content.aspx?c=lwL4KnN1LtH&b=5066287&content_id={1F927523-A422-4005-BA60-517220DB6D1E}¬oc=1>.
30. <<http://www.mcccchurch.org>>.
31. Southern Baptist Convention, “The Baptist Faith and Message,” as amended June 14, 2000, <<http://www.sbc.net/bfm/bfm2000asp>>.
32. Conclusion based on the reading of Thaddeus Barnum, *Never Silent* (Colorado Springs: Eleison Publishing, 2008).
33. “Redefined Civil Marriage” denotes the extension of the rights of marriage to same-gender couples.
34. The terms used and benefits conveyed vary among jurisdictions.
35. PC(USA) marriages are required to fulfill the legal requirements of civil marriage (*Book of Order*, W-4.9001).
36. Here and throughout this report, Christian marriage refers to *Book of Order*, W-4.9001.
37. *Book of Order*, W-4.9002b.
38. *Book of Order*, W-4.9002b.
39. <<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2009/02/13/AR2009021303365.html>>, last accessed 15 September 2009.
40. *Christian Marriage: Supplemental Liturgical Resource 3* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1986), 91.
41. Walter E. Volkmer, *American Government*, 8th edition (Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1998), 4.
42. For a thorough treatment of the spectrum of viewpoints regarding same-gender relationships, see William Stacy Johnson, *A Time to Embrace: Same-Gender Relationships in Religion, Law, and Politics* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 2006), 39–108.
43. Mt. 22:39, Mt. 7:12, Am. 5:24.
44. Ruth 4:13–17, Esth. 2:7.
45. “Transforming Families,” 216th General Assembly (2004) of the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.), <http://www.pcusa.org/oga/publications/transformingfamilies.pdf>; see also *Minutes*, 2004, Part I, p. 747ff.
46. Matt. 7:1–5.
47. “Transforming Families,” 216th General Assembly (2004) of the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.), <http://www.pcusa.org/oga/publications/transformingfamilies.pdf>; see also *Minutes*, 2004, Part I, p. 747ff.
48. Gen. 1:27–28; 2:23–24, Mk. 10:6–9, Eph. 5:21–6:4.
49. Heb. 13:4, 1 Cor. 6:12–7:17, Eph. 5:1–3.
50. <<http://www.census.gov/acs/www/index.html>>. Narrative by Gates, <http://www.law.ucla.edu/williamsinstitute/pdf/ACS2008_Final%282%29.pdf>.
51. “The Effects of Marriage, Civil Union, and Domestic Partnership Laws on the Health and Well-beings of Children: In Reply,” Den A. Trumbull, Joseph R. Zanga, Leah M. Wilson, and Vicki Tucci, *Pediatrics* 2006; 118; 2261b-2264 DOI: 10.1542/peds.2006-2310, p. 2262.
52. <<http://www.gao.gov/archive/1997/og97016.pdf>>; <<http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d04353r.pdf>>. Not all of these provisions are of equal magnitude. See further <<http://www.marriagedebate.com/pdf/iMAPP.GAO.pdf>>.
53. <<http://www.domawatch.org>>.
54. The current status of a particular state can be found at <<http://www.ncsl.org/IssuesResearch/HumanServices/SameSexMarriage/tabid/16430/Default.aspx>> or <<http://marriage.about.com/cs/marriagelicense/a/samesexcomp.htm>>.

55. See Glenn T. Stanton and Bill Maier, *Marriage on Trial* (Downers Grove, Ill.: Intervarsity Press, 2004), 20 for the affirmative argument, and Palewski (p. 356) for the negative.

56. Pawelski, p. 358ff.

57. Meezan and Rauch, 2005, "Gay Marriage, Same-sex Parenting, and America's Children," *The Future of Children*, vol. 15, no. 2, p. 110. Even the most recent comprehensive summary, the monograph *Lesbian and Gay Parents and Their Children: Research on the Family Life Cycle* (Abbie Goldberg, American Psychological Association, 2010), recognizes methodological limitations and the need for further research regarding children, youth, and adult children of same-gender couples.