



Commission on the Marriage Canon
Anglican Church of Canada
80 Hayden Street
Toronto, ON M4Y 3G2

Dear Canon Falby and colleagues,

Attached is a report for your commission. I have taken seriously as my theme the reference to the Solemn Declaration of 1893 in the amended Resolution C003. I believe that the Solemn Declaration is the best reference we have to Anglican norms for considerations of doctrine and order in our Church, and that a careful consideration of various parts of the Declaration may help us in this process.

My paper is long, tedious and the worst kind of scholarship – historical. History was added only in the last 150 years to the theological curriculum, although theologians have forever talked about a past of their own choice. Theological historians, like other academic historians, deal with histories, books about histories, and discussions about books about histories. We are the bane of the systematic theologians. Perhaps we can be of some use to those who must consider the precedents of order. I offer you this in all humility and, I hope, charity.

This is my own personal statement, although it represents input from many students, faculty colleagues and parishioners over some years. When we began to talk about some of these matters, we did not dream that our country would alter the laws on marriage. The changes in statute law have made things clearer, but also more difficult, since our Church law is always tied so closely to the law of the land, and we take more care about our church law than about our teachings.

I congratulate our Church that it has undertaken this careful consideration, as I know it will be difficult for you and for all of us to deal with the conflicting emotions and thoughts, and the grief and hurt that will come whatever we do. But if we are serious in the declaration and undertaking of the Solemn Declaration to transmit the Doctrine, Sacraments and Discipline of Christ to posterity then it is better to engage in a real and inclusive discussion earlier rather than later.

Sincerely yours,

David Neelands

September 30, 2014

The bearing of the Anglican formularies on decisions about same-gender marriage in the Anglican Church of Canada¹

0. The Solemn Declaration of 1893

In the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

We, the Bishops, together with the Delegates from the Clergy and Laity of the Church of England in the Dominion of Canada, now assembled in the first General Synod, hereby make the following Solemn Declaration:

We declare this Church to be, and desire that it shall continue,

- in full communion with the Church of England throughout the world,
- as an integral portion of the One Body of Christ composed of Churches which,
 - united under the One Divine Head
 - and in the fellowship of the One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church,
 - hold the One Faith revealed in Holy Writ,
 - and defined in the Creeds as maintained
 - by the undivided primitive Church
 - in the undisputed Ecumenical Councils;
 - receive the same Canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments,
 - as containing all things necessary to salvation;
 - teach the same Word of God;
 - partake of the same Divinely ordained Sacraments,
 - through the ministry of the same Apostolic Orders;
 - and worship One God and Father through the same Lord Jesus Christ,
 - by the same Holy and Divine Spirit
 - who is given to them that believe to guide them into all truth.

And we are determined by the help of God to hold and maintain

- the Doctrine, Sacraments, and Discipline of Christ
 - as the Lord hath commanded in his Holy Word,
 - and as the Church of England hath received and set forth the same
 - in ‘The Book of Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments and other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church, according to the use of the Church of England; together with the Psalter or Psalms of David, pointed as they are to be sung or said in Churches; and the Form and Manner of Making, Ordaining, and Consecrating of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons’;
 - and in the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion;
 - and to transmit the same unimpaired to our posterity.

¹ A report prepared for submission to the Commission on the Marriage Canon “on the matter of amending Canon XXI (“On Marriage in the Church”) so as to provide for same-sex marriage in the Anglican Church of Canada”, September 30, 2014, by David Neelands, Trinity College, Toronto.

1. The Canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testament (compare Article 6).

Discussion of doctrine, sacraments and discipline in the church must begin with texts from the Bible, which as the Solemn Declaration notes, is the common inheritance of the universal church, not only Anglican churches. As William Bright observed, 150 years ago, the Anglican appeal to history is not the appeal to Anglican history. Christian Theology does and should begin with texts from the Bible. A number of Biblical passages are frequently cited in theological discussions of same-sex matters:

- *Genesis* 19: The apprehended male rape² of Lot's visitors in Sodom
- *Leviticus* 18.22; 20.13: legal prohibitions against certain male-male sexual behaviour
- *1 Kings* 14.23-24; 15.12-13; *2 Kings* 23.5-7, cf. *Deuteronomy* 23.17, 18: the removal of the male prostitutes from the first Temple in Jerusalem
- *Romans* 1.26-27: Paul's reference to some pagan same-sex sexual behaviour as an illustration of the sinfulness of (idolatrous) pagans
 - *Romans* 1.26-27 also appears to raise the principle of natural law with respect to the natural purposes of sex. This principle of reason appears to be one of those principles apparent to pagans as derivable from human reason (19-21). It seems that the male-male sexual activity that is condemned derives from an excess of lust.
- *1 Corinthians* 6.9-11: Paul's inclusion of some male-only sexual behaviour as typical of Christians' earlier behaviour and behaviour incompatible with inheritance of God's promises
- *1 Timothy* 1.8-11: the Pastoral Epistles' identification of the proper as opposed to the improper use of the law

1.1 What do these passages refer to?

At first sight none of these passages refer to persons in same-gender committed relationships, and most or all of them use the reference to same-gender activity as illustrative of another point; these are "by-speeches" as Richard Hooker would call them.³ As has long been recognized, in the interpretation of scripture, the study of the context of the writing and the writer should precede judgment of its meaning.⁴

² Note that there are many forms of male-male sexual activity other than the activity which might arise in a committed same-sex relationship, including rape, male prostitution, and religious ritual. It is not clear that the Bible ever refers to sex within committed same-sex relationships.

³ Richard Hooker, *Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity* III.5.1. Hooker noted the tendency of Puritan critics of the Church of England to rely on incidental observations rather than direct commands in their arguments for the Presbyterian system.

⁴ Augustine, *De doctrina christiana* III.2.4 & 5.

Some clearly refer to alien cultic practice, derived from the surrounding nations. This clearly applies to the removal of male prostitutes from the Temple in Jerusalem by the reforming kings Asa and Josiah. The existence of male cult prostitutes in both Canaanite and Babylonian religion is well established from the Ugaritic texts found at Ras Shamra⁵, and various tablets excavated in Babylon⁶. The introduction to the various prohibitions in *Leviticus* 18 refers to the customs of both Egyptians and Canaanites, although it does not link the various activities directly to cultic practice. The fact that the “passive” participant, like an abused animal in the parallel injunction against bestiality (*Leviticus* 20.15), was to be killed as well as the person who broke the commandment, also suggests to us that there was a ritual impurity in the defiled man or animal, rather than the injury that would be involved in a sexual crime of violence or lust.⁷ *Leviticus* 18.22, as well as *Leviticus* 18.7 (a man’s sexual relations with one’s father), 18.14 (with one’s father’s brother), were included among the 613 *mitzvot* of Rabbinical Judaism, generally interpreted as forbidding all male-male intercourse, but subject to a variety of interpretations.⁸

Nevertheless, violent male-male sexual activity is explicitly contemplated in the incident at Sodom. Not unknown in our world, male rape is clearly a terrible crime, deserving a harsh punishment, but has no obvious bearing on the question of committed same-sex relations. As is well known, subsequent references in the Bible to the crimes of Sodom, when they do not suggest general evil-doing deserving destruction, tend to associate those crimes with severe inhospitality, (*Matthew* 10-14-15), or lustful activity (*Jude* 7), not same-sex activity itself.

Paul’s famous characterization of gentile vice in *Romans* 1 undoubtedly refers, among many other things, to same-sex behaviour between men, which common human reason shows to be wrong; it is less clear that the “unnatural” acts of Roman women are with other women (contemporary Roman writers found many sexual excesses to accuse upper class women of that were not same-sex activity).⁹ This behaviour is characterized as lustful excess (“the desires of the heart” (v. 24), “consumed with passion for one another” (v. 27)). And astonishingly, the behaviours, which are just the beginning of a long list of vicious behaviour, come

⁵ G. Ernest Wright, *Biblical Archaeology* (Philadelphia, PA: Westminster, 1962), 113.

⁶ A. Kirk Grayson and Donald B. Redford, eds., *Papyrus and tablet* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1973), 149.

⁷ Mosaic law recognizes the concept of tort or damages in sexual assault. Compare *Deuteronomy* 22.28-29.

⁸ See Rabbi Steven Greenberg, *Wrestling with God & Men: Homosexuality in the Jewish Tradition*, University of Wisconsin Press, 2004. A case of the interpretation of laws against cultic practices as moral laws, which may help in the application of *Leviticus* 18 and 20, is the Jewish prescription against eating meat and milk together. This is one of the 613 *mitzvot*, and it seems never to have been a Christian rule; it comes from *Deuteronomy* 14.21d “You shall not boil a kid in its mother’s milk,” broadened with a “fence” around it to include all meat and milk. See G. Ernest Wright, cited above. Cultic prohibitions may be interpreted as moral prohibitions when the original context is lost.

⁹ Nevertheless, it has been argued cogently that Paul is using pagan views to articulate a new sense of the unnaturalness of female-female sexual activity. See Robert Jerrett, *Romans: a commentary* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007), 174-77.

from God, on account of the idolatry of their culture: “God gave them up” (vv 26, 28), that is, did not stop them or help them from acting out their passionate excess. And Paul introduces a supposedly empirical confirmation from pagan sources, (as physicians were saying) such men “received in their own persons the due penalty of their error” (with a special complaint that was thought by physicians to come to the passive partner in male-male anal intercourse¹⁰).

The famous passage in *1 Corinthians* 6.9-11, which uses two words for vicious sexual acts, has been notoriously difficult to interpret. The first of these two words, unique to the New Testament, could easily be seen as an attempt to put the earthy phrase in *Leviticus* 18.22 into Greek, although it does not entirely parallel the Greek words of the Septuagint version of that passage. In any case, the words are on a list of vices typical of Christians’ earlier behaviour and behaviour incompatible with inheritance of God’s promises, among other things probably involving sex with young prostitutes¹¹ and brothel behaviour, the kind of sex men would seek in a brothel, the root meaning of “fornication”. The example of the sexual behaviour of the Emperor Nero, contemporary with Paul’s writing, and described in Suetonius,¹² would probably suggest the excesses involved.

The former word is repeated in *Timothy* 1.10, which may suggest that something forbidden in Scripture is involved, but the list seems to include some items not ruled out by Jewish law or Roman law, so it may more likely be that a set of “house rules” is referred to.

None of these passages refers directly to committed same-sex relations, which are not generally violent, are not generally part of a pagan cult, do not stem from idolatry, and do not involve exploitation of minors or brothel behaviour.

1.2 How were these passages received in the universal Church?

Despite the variety of issues that are involved in these passages, for most of Christian history, when questions of male homosexual behaviour were considered, these passages, taken as a whole, and some taken alone, suggested that all such behaviour was sinful and sub-Christian. In this, the church generally agreed with the surrounding society. The early church took sexual sins very seriously, including

¹⁰ Jerrett, *Romans*, 179.

¹¹ This is the vice that is mentioned in the list in *The Didache* 2.2, an early Christian community handbook: “do not corrupt boys”. Strikingly, the *Didache*, a first century Christian document that seems to represent an earlier stage of the transmission of Christ’s teaching than that found in the gospels, singles out sexual abuse of boys for attention among the sexual sins, rather than adult homosexuality, on which it appears to be silent. This reference to a well-known abuse of the first century Roman empire appears to be the most likely reference to the somewhat obscure words used in the New Testament.

¹² Suetonius, *Life of Nero* xxix. It is worth noting how many times Suetonius uses the adjective “unnatural” of behaviour of the Roman emperors of the first century, especially with respect to Julius Caesar, Tiberius, and Caligula. If gold rust, what will iron do?

fornication, adultery and male same-sex activities.¹³ Irish missionaries began to compose *Penitentials* for hearing confessions, manuals that listed as many sinful acts as were known and some that were only thought of;¹⁴ same-sex activities often led to deposition from clerical office and severe penances. Any sexual act that engaged in for pleasure was forbidden (as was marital sex on the many days of abstinence).¹⁵

Peter Damian (ca. 1007-1072), compiled the *Liber Gomorrhianus* about 1050, a scathing reform treatise which “invented” the term “sodomy” for a list of sexual activities of the clergy, including some that are solitary, and some that involved other men, and linked their sinful character to the pleasure they gave and the excess of lust they derived from; none of these activities which were clearly linked with the story of Lot and his visitors at Sodom. Although the treatise was not entirely accepted, and although there was inconsistent precedents for considering the crime of Sodom to be related to personal sexual sins, rather than inhospitality or male rape, the word became a technical one, used in church circles and beyond for all male same-sex sexual activity, sometimes including solitary sins.¹⁶

In 1120, the Council of Nablus, a meeting of secular and religious authorities, established the first written laws for the Crusader kingdom of Jerusalem, a kingdom with a restless body of single Christian men, few married couples and a muslim majority. Canons 4 to 15 deal with a variety of sexual crimes, and list a variety of punishments, indicating the relative gravity of the crimes. Adultery is to be punished by the removal of the penis and banishment of the male party (and deposition from order for a cleric), removal of the nose in the female (unless the husband forgives her, in which case punishment is the banishment of both). Canons 8 to 11 deal with punishments for “sodomy”, apparently the first such punishments in medieval public law. Both the “active” and the “passive” party are to be burned at the stake (unless the passive party is a child or old person who admits the crime (before being accused of it?) and repents). If a sodomite repents, he may avoid punishment; a second time, he may avoid punishment but will be banished. Christian men who have sexual relations with muslim women are to be castrated.

¹³ “Also, while the Donatist controversy was raging, St. Basil, a catholic, laid out the canons for penance in a letter to Amphilochius, giving time periods of excommunication for various sins. According to Basil, fornication makes one ineligible to receive the sacrament for seven years, while practicing homosexuals and adulterers both are to be excluded for 15 years. These canons show the high moral standards required for clergy and laity.” (Schaff and Wace, NPNF Second Series, volume VIII, 256).

¹⁴ This was in the interest of thoroughness in spiritual direction; some of the vices had not been considered by the penitent, and Peter Damian wisely counsels that it is not good to lead the penitent in the examination of his vices; it may put worse ideas into his head.

¹⁵ The only mention of sodomy in any high level statement within the Latin churches comes from a consideration of penance, and does not appear until 1665. “Voluptuousness, sodomy, and bestiality are sins of the same ultimate species, and so it is enough to say in confession that one has procured a pollution.” Apparently all three derive from the excessive or lustful sexual desire. *Various Errors on Moral Matters*, 24. Denziger 1124.

¹⁶ Mark D. Jordan. *The invention of sodomy in Christian theology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1997.

Christian women who have sexual relations with muslim men have their noses removed. Thus sodomy was treated somewhat less seriously than adultery, in that repentance removed the capital punishment. This Council, however, created a precedent by putting sodomy into a civil criminal code.¹⁷

Thomas Aquinas (ca. 1225-1274), summarizing various authorities in a treatise on the virtues and vices, describes as the most sinful form of the vice of lust, “the unnatural¹⁸ vice”, which includes (a) sex without copulation for the derivation of pleasure, (b) bestiality, (c) same-sex copulation, including female-female union as well as male-male, and (d) “not observing the natural manner of copulation”; that is non-procreative sex generally.¹⁹ (*Summa Theologiae* II-II.154.11-12). The Roman Catholic Catechism continues to speak of homosexual activity as “intrinsically disordered”, acts of “grave depravity” and “contrary to the natural law”.²⁰

¹⁷ Roman law had previously included a *lex Julia* from the period of the early empire that had forbidden male same-sex activity (along with laws that forced people to marry) in an attempt to increase the birth rate! This law was largely ignored or unknown, although it was included in the Code of Justinian, but in an appendix. There is apparently little evidence that it was enforced, although it was known to jurists.

¹⁸ Thomas’s theological system placed great emphasis on the “law of nature”, a concept of the ordered tendency to forms of behaviour related to the inbuilt nature of every natural being, a concept closely related to the philosophy of Aristotle, although known in medieval theology especially through Duns Scotus Erigena, whose phrase *natura naturans* described the whole of creation. From these sources, medieval theology elaborated an account of natural law that was read into the New Testament, especially St. Paul’s description of the “natural”, even though the New Testament’s use of the “natural” is closer to the Stoic view, and to “second nature”, that is habitual learned behaviour.

¹⁹ With respect to natural law theory, which has probably informed most of Christian teaching against same-sex activity, although same-sex sexual activity is as such, non-procreative, the Church has usually acknowledged the validity and appropriateness of most marriages that did not, or could not, produce offspring.¹⁹ In addition some manifestations of the natural desire for procreation have been rightly forbidden and even punished, so not everything that is natural is allowed. But the question of what is truly “natural” may challenge traditional natural law theory: sexual activity is “natural” for fertile couples at times when there is no prospect of conception, and there are some interesting examples of same-sex activity in the non-human natural world. Further, infertile heterosexual couples and same-sex couples are manifestly capable to nurturing and raising children, and thus of forming families. With respect to Paul’s language, the question of what is “natural” also includes what is conventional, as in the length of men’s and women’s hair (*1 Corinthians* 13.14-15). All of which may mean that natural law arguments, though suggested by Scripture, need to be used with caution.

²⁰ *Catechism of the Catholic Church*, 1996. *Offenses against chastity*. 2357. “Homosexuality refers to relations between men or between women who experience an exclusive or predominant sexual attraction toward persons of the same sex. It has taken a great variety of forms through the centuries and in different cultures. Its psychological genesis remains largely unexplained. Basing itself on Sacred Scripture, which presents homosexual acts as acts of grave depravity [Cf. *Gen* 19:1-29; *Rom* 1:24-27; *1 Cor* 6:10; *1 Tim* 1:10]. tradition has always declared that “homosexual acts are intrinsically disordered [CDF, *Persona humana* 8].” They are contrary to the natural law. They close the sexual act to the gift of life. They do not proceed from a genuine affective and sexual complementarity. Under no circumstances can they be approved.” This assessment is apparently related to sexual lust: “2351 *Lust* is disordered desire for or inordinate enjoyment of sexual pleasure. Sexual pleasure is morally disordered when sought for itself, isolated from its procreative and unitive purposes” [i.e., even by persons who are not homosexual although 2357 does not appear to include such acts; so same sex activity by persons who are not homosexuals as defined is a form of lustful excess.]

In 1534-5, the parliament of Henry VIII passed *An Act for the Punishment of the Vice of Buggery*, making a restricted form of male sex with another male or with a beast a capital offence; the existing (canon law) provisions were declared to be insufficient; clergy were not allowed to claim access to church courts or exemption from the death penalty; monks appear to have been a particular target in England, as they were consistently opposed to the king on grounds of separation with Rome and had great (and available) wealth. Similar laws were adopted in most countries, Catholic and Protestant, across Western Europe (with the exception of Poland) in the Sixteenth Century. Later courts found the law hard to interpret, and in the nineteenth century capital punishment for the crime was abolished and another, more easily applied crime, *Gross Indecency*, was added. These laws have generally been repealed in the second half of the twentieth century.

Only occasionally were same-sex relationships held up for approval and church recognition, and it is not clear what the physical sexual assumptions were in those that were recognized.²¹

About fifty years ago, these conclusions came to be questioned consistently by Christians. One early contribution to this movement was a pamphlet published in Britain, *Towards a Quaker View of Sex*.²² This pamphlet was followed by a number of other works, and by now there is a considerable body of literature, popular and scholarly, on the subject. With respect to the list of Biblical passages listed, several things became clearer, and especially careful consideration suggested that they may have been addressing different matters, but there was no clear indication that they referred to behaviour that was based on a homosexual orientation or committed friendship, but rather that they were concerned with rape, cultic practice, prostitution, or promiscuity, none of which had much to say about same-sex sexual unions or about a homosexual orientation. Many have concluded that Scripture knows nothing of homosexuality as an orientation (as opposed to certain kinds of male-male sexual behaviour) and that it never clearly addresses same-sex committed relationships. There is no clear reference to female same sex activity, although some have argued that it is expressly referred to in *Romans* 1.26.

In interpreting these scriptures, it seems likely that the tendency to generalize to all same-sex activity has more to do with the interpreters than with the texts themselves. In a parallel case, long ago, St. Augustine warned that some portions of scripture are meant to be useful for all, some for only a select group: in the specific case in point, Augustine held that it would be wrong for celibates to interpret away all the positive sayings about marriage, and vice versa for the married, that is, wholesome interpretation is enhanced by a community that has mixed interests.²³ For a very long time, the Church has lacked input on interpretation from those who

²¹ Alan Bray, *The Friend* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003).

²² Alistair Heron, *Towards a Quaker view of sex: an essay by a group of Friends*. Friends Home Service Committee, 1963.

²³ Augustine, *De doctrina christiana*, III.17.25.

had sympathy for same-sex love, with the possible exception of such saints as Anselm of Canterbury, who was not ashamed of his affection for the monks he taught and who refused to impose in England the “reforms” of St. Peter Damian. The inclusion of those who have discerned different sexual orientations and identities in our time may enrich the Church’s exegesis.

2. The bearing of the Anglican standards on questions of Doctrine, Sacraments and the Discipline of Christ

The Solemn Declaration includes the determination of the first General Synod to an on-going commitment, to be worked out in the life of the Canadian Anglican Church, the holding and maintaining of “the Doctrine, Sacraments and the Discipline of Christ” transmitted to posterity, and to do so *deo auxiliante*, God being my helper. It lists the Anglican *formularies*, the *Book of Common Prayer*, the Ordinal, and the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion.

The first test of the authenticity of this commitment is God’s commandments in his Holy Word. The second is the inherited formularies of the Book of Common Prayer, the Psalter, and the Ordinal. Into this set of formularies, the Articles attract the two books of Homilies from the sixteenth century, as containing a godly and wholesome Doctrine, and necessary for these times (Article 35).

2.1 What do the Anglican standards say about the authority of scripture?

Three points need to be recognized in the proper use of scripture in the Anglican world:

- The ceremonial and civil law in Scripture are either abrogated or optional, while the moral law binds all Christians. (Article 7)
- All “matters necessary for salvation” must be found in the Scriptures or derived from them” (Article 6)
- The Church, which has authority in deciding on disagreements of doctrine (including those that come from scriptural interpretation) and to establish ceremonies, may nevertheless not decide anything that contradicts Scripture. (Article 20)

2.1.1 Matters of explicit commandments

The many commandments in Scripture (other than the moral law) do not necessarily bind the Church, but require judgement. The moral law itself is found in the Ten Commandments, especially interpreted as the love of God seen in the love of the human neighbour.²⁴ The Church cannot make decisions that deny the love of God and the love of neighbour.

²⁴ Jesus’ answer (*Matthew* 26.32-40, *Mark* 12.28-31) to the question what is the one greatest commandment is that all the law and prophets are summed up in the love of God (*Deuteronomy* 6.4-5), to which the love

But the laws dealing with sacrifices, as well as the laws about cleanliness as the vehicle to holiness are abrogated, as the example of Jesus and the Pauline churches make clear.²⁵ And the civil law that applied to God's people as an independent nation do not necessarily apply.²⁶

Nevertheless, the church has the ability to decide to observe ceremonial or civil law, as for instance, provisions in church law and practice for:

- Abstaining from blood (*Leviticus* 7:26, *Acts* 15:20)
- Separation of women during the time of their menstrual periods (*Leviticus* 15:19-24)
- Conferring on princes ecclesiastical rule (Article 37)
- Barring from priestly ministry in the church those who are eunuchs, illegitimate or who have spilled blood, as butchers or bearers of the sword (*Leviticus* 17:3, *Deuteronomy* 23:1-2)

In these cases, the church may change its rules. One famous example is found in the correspondence between Augustine of Canterbury and Pope St. Gregory. Augustine was perplexed that English Christians did not separate off women during their periods, whereas that was the custom in Rome and elsewhere (and the Orthodox rule until this day). St. Gregory's answer informs the usual church attitude to such rules, even when they come from Scripture: "*For things are not to be loved for the sake of places, but places for the sake of good things. Choose, therefore, from every church those things that are pious, religious, and upright, and when you have, as it were, made them up into one body, let the minds of the English be accustomed thereto.*"²⁷ Gregory thus enunciated a double principle for the church's rules in a new nation, of retaining the good from local culture, and not basing decisions strictly on the norms of the mother church or on the customs of the Bible.

It is interesting to compare this process with what was adopted by the Jewish rabbis after the fall of Jerusalem. The rabbis separated out most but not all those commandments which survived the end of sacrifice in the Temple and the end of a Jewish political authority. These were eventually codified in the list of 613 *mitzvot*, attributed to Moses Maimonides, "Rambon".

of neighbour is attracted (*Leviticus* 19:18) Paul refers simply to the love of neighbour (*Galatians* 5:14, *Romans* 13:9-10) as the summary of the whole law.

²⁵ The rabbis retrieving Jewish practice after the destruction of the Temple made compromises: the laws of sacrifice did not make it into the 613 *mitzvot*, while the law of clean and unclean did, in 26 commandments. For the rabbis too, the civil law was considered suspended, perhaps temporarily.

²⁶ The distinction between ceremonial, civil and moral law found in Article 7 is not found in scripture, although it is suggested by the practice of Jesus and the experience of faithful like in the Christian diaspora. It is a scholastic one, shared by many theologians. See: Thomas, *Summa Theologiae* I-II, q. 104, a. 2; q. 109, a. 3; Henry Bullinger, *Decades* II, 2; III, 7, 8; Calvin, *Institutes* II, vii.

²⁷ Bede, *Ecclesiastical History*, Book I, chapter 27.

The Articles also deal with proposed rules for church and nation, proposed by Christians who derived them from the Bible (“Anabaptists”), and reject them as binding for either church or individual Christian despite their Biblical foundations:

- Community of goods (Article 38)
- Rejection of paedobaptism (Article 27)
- Self-appointed ministers (Article 23)
- Forbidding of oaths (Article 39)
- Disobedience to the magistrate (Article 37)
- Forbidding the carrying of weapons (Article (Article 37)
- Forbidding the death penalty (Article 37)
- Forbidding military service (Article 37)

That is, not everything that can be found in scripture or derived from it is binding in the same way as those matters “necessary for salvation”.

2.1.2 The Matters “necessary for salvation”

All “matters necessary for salvation” must be found in the Scriptures or derived from them” (Article 6). This was a very careful expression of the unstated principle of “*sola scriptura*”. In core doctrine and in irreducible Christian ethics, the Bible alone is the authority. This principle had already been stated in the clergy vows in the Ordinal, and in Cranmer’s Homily 1 “A Fruitful exhortation to the reading of holy Scripture.” The initial bearing is related to the detested heresy trials of the period, when Christians were executed for holding doctrines contrary to church teaching on such matters as transubstantiation, which manifestly could not be found in scripture or derived from it. But a positive list of them was not given.

The principle derives from scholasticism, where it referred to a short list of statements about God and about Jesus that formed the “rule of faith” and that had been identified as early as the conflict about Gnosticism in the time of Irenaeus and Tertullian, the *necessaria fidei*. These were all to be found in a literal interpretation of passages in the Bible.²⁸

The first Homily, in a passage assumed to be from John Chrysostom, expands this list beyond doctrinal affirmations, to include sufficiently our experienced knowledge of our own sin and the judgement of God, our hope for life in God, and our restoration to spiritual health [through faith?], although these appear not to belong to any one passage of Scripture,²⁹ and go along with Biblical injunctions the Articles find mutable.

²⁸ Compare: “nothing *necessary for faith (fidei necessarium)* is contained in a spiritual sense which Scripture does not pass on elsewhere by the literal sense.” Thomas, *Summa Theologiae* I.1.10 ad 1.

²⁹ “For in holy Scripture is fully contained what we ought to doe, and what to eschew; what to beleue, what to loue, and what to looke for at GODS hands at length. In these Books we shall finde the father from whom, the sonne by whom, and the holy Ghost, in whom all things haue their being

The question of whether or not the Church allows the marriage in Church of two persons of the same gender appears not to be a “matter necessary for salvation”. In June 2004, General Synod requested the Primate to ask “the Primate’s Theological Commission” the question of whether the blessing of committed same-sex unions is a matter of doctrine”. In May 2005, the Commission issued “The St. Michael’s Report”, which held that the matter is a matter of doctrine, but not a matter of “what is often referred to as core doctrine in the sense of being credal.” In June 2007, General Synod agreed with the conclusion of the report it had commissioned and that concluded “the blessing of same-sex unions is not in conflict with the core doctrine” of the Anglican Church of Canada. Although this is not the same question, it is sufficiently similar to be attracted into the same consideration.

2.1.3 Limits on the Church’s authority to establish ceremonies

- The Church, which has authority in deciding on disagreements of doctrine (including those that come from scriptural interpretation) and to establish ceremonies, may nevertheless not decide anything that contradicts Scripture. (Article 20)

Historically, the Church of England has identified a number of Scriptural injunctions that void previous Church ceremonial practice:

- Following Luther, the Church of England ruled that, at Communion, the chalice may not be denied to the congregation (Article 30), for Jesus had explicitly said, in ordaining the rite, “drink ye all of this” (*Matthew 26.27, Luke 22.17*). Thus enforced communion in one kind cannot be the Church’s order. The *Book of Common Prayer* clearly provides for communion to be offered in two kinds.
- Similarly, following various reform movements of the Sixteenth Century, the Church of England removed graven images that had become subject to idolatrous practices in contradiction to the Ten Commandments (*Exodus 20.4-5*). (Article 22)

and keeping vp, and these three persons to be but one GOD, and one substance. In these books we may learne to know our selues, how vile and miserable we be, and also to know GOD, how good he is of himselfe, and how hee maketh vs and all creatures partakers of his goodnesse. We may learne also in these Bookes to know GODS will and pleasure, as much as (for this present time) is conuenient for vs to know. And (as the great Clerke and godly Preacher Saint Iohn Chrysostome sayth) “whatsoever is required to saluation of man, is fully containd in the Scripture of GOD. He that is ignorant, may there learne and haue knowledge. He that is hard hearted, and an obstinate sinner, shall there finde euerlasting torments (prepared of GODS iustice) to make him afrayd, and to mollifie or soften him. He that is oppressed with misery in this world, shall there finde releefe in the promises of euerlasting life, to his great consolation and comfort. He that is wounded by the Diuell onto death, shall finde there medicine whereby he may bee restored againe vnto health.”

For more than 400 years, the traditional rules about degrees of kindred and affinity that derived from Roman Law, and that informed marriage law, were rejected, as contradicting scripture. This case, relating to the Table of Kindred and Affinity, deserves some detailed consideration as one that vexed the Church on the question of the limits of Church authority in relation to Scripture. It is the principal factor in the warning, in the marriage service of the *Book of Common Prayer* “for be ye well assured, that so many as are coupled together otherwise than God’s Word doth allow are not joined together by God; neither is their Matrimony lawful.”

- In 1526-27, Parliament, under direction from King Henry VIII and his Council, passed “An Act for the Establishment of the Imperial Crown of this Realm”, decrying the marriages of persons “within the degrees of marriage prohibited by God’s law” [*Leviticus* 18.1-29, 20.1-27] It also declared that the Church cannot give dispensations for such impediments (as had been done so that Henry could marry Catherine) and clarified that it is “carnal knowledge” itself and not marriage that creates the affinity, a Biblical principle not part of Roman law. This statute overruled church courts and canon law, which had used the Roman system of degrees of kinship.
- In 1563, Archbishop Parker promulgated “The Table of Kindred and Affinity”, including all those in the Henrician legislation, as well as those with closer relationships. This table was printed with the *Book of Common Prayer* and posted in parish churches. In 1604, a new Canon 99 forbade marriages “within the degrees prohibited by the laws of God and expressed in a Table set forth by authority in the year of our Lord 1563”. Such marriages are dissolved as “void from the beginning”. In this table, injunctions against women were added to the Scripture: if it was forbidden for a man to marry his mother’s sister, it must also be forbidden for a woman to marry her sister’s son, etc. And it was explicitly forbidden to marry one’s own child, although this was not mentioned in the Bible.
- In 1907, after a heated and extended public debate that did nothing to improve the reputation of the Church, and during which the Levitical standard was frequently appealed to, the British parliament passed the *Deceased Wife’s Sister’s Marriage Act*, which allowed widowed men to marry their deceased wife’s sister. Such marriages could not be conducted in church. In 1921, a corresponding *Deceased Brother’s Widow’s Marriage Act* allowed widowed women to marry their deceased husband’s brother. In 1946, the canons of the Church of England were changed to allow for such marriages in Church and the Table of Kindred and Affinity shortened. For a time, an incumbent priest in the Church of England who had scruples about the matter was not compelled to solemnize such a marriage but was not entitled either to repel from the altar those who are married under the provision of the Acts as “open and notorious evil livers”.

- In Canada, parliament amended the Table of Kindred and Affinity, between 1882 and 1932. In 1946, General Synod removed prohibitions in respect of sisters-in-law, brothers-in-law, aunts and uncles by marriage and nieces and nephews by marriage. The Lambeth Conference was apparently never asked to discuss these matters, despite the possible bearing of *Leviticus 18* and *1 Corinthians 5.1-6*, but Anglican Churches elsewhere which had inherited Archbishop Parker's table made similar amendments.
- In 1991, the Canadian *Marriage (Prohibited Degrees) Act* came into force. The list of prohibited degrees was radically shortened to include only relations "lineally by consanguinity or adoption", brother and sister by consanguinity, brother and sister by adoption. In 2007, the General Synod adopted amendments to Canon XXI, *Marriage in the Church* that reduced the list to those included in the statute, as well as those who "live, or have previously lived" in the same household and one of them is or has been treated by the other as child or parent", taking account scientific conclusions about inbuilt sense of incest, and expanding the scriptural legal principles by a conclusion of reason and science.

This case, both tedious and at times exasperating to many, illustrates the role of the Church's judgment in these matters. What seems at one time to limit the church's authority to ordain ceremonies may, by the church's considered judgement at other times, be considered not so to limit: the principle of casuistry in moral theology must apply: the ordinances were made for man and not man for the ordinances (*Mark 2.27*) and room for judgement must always be made.

The case of the marriage of divorced persons in church would yield similar examples. In particular, after years of debate, including inconclusive recommendation from the Lambeth Conference, the Anglican Church of Canada agreed to amendments of Canon 21 with respect to the remarriage of divorced persons. It did so with a thorough incorporation of relevant Biblical standards. In section 4, it acknowledged the "aspects of the regulations of marriage in the apostolic Church" as recorded in the New Testament. These included the observation that "in preparation for marriage Christians were directed to seek partners from among their fellow believers [1 Cor. 7:39, 2 Cor. 6:14, cf. 1 Thess. 4:2-8 (RSV)]" that did not and do not bind Anglicans in Canada; the observation that "a believer already married to an unbeliever might be declared free from such a marriage bond [1 Cor. 7:12-16]", did not bind, although it had previously been insisted on; it noted that the principle that "remarriage during the lifetime of a former spouse was described, with one exception, as an adulterous union [Matt. 19:9, Mark 10:11f, Luke 16:18, cf. Ro. 7:3]" was not required later in the canon. In this canon, the Anglican Church of Canada, apparently clearly knew what was involved in its respect for Scripture, and it clearly sought, "by the help of God" to do what was required by place and time.

Perhaps Article 34 “Of the Traditions of the Church” helps most in the consideration of the Church’s attempt to discern, in time, the right order for the specific time and place as it comes to judgments in its determination “to hold and maintain the Doctrine, Sacraments and Discipline of Christ and to transmit the same unimpaired”. This may not involve uniformity, and has not; it has provided for changes of mind and for novelty.

XXXIV. Of the Traditions of the Church.

It is not necessary that Traditions and Ceremonies be in all places one, and utterly like; for at all times they have been divers, and may be changed according to the diversities of countries, times, and men’s manners, so that nothing be ordained against God’s Word. ... Every particular or national Church hath authority to ordain, change, and abolish, ceremonies or rites of the Church ordained only by man’s authority, so that all things be done to edifying.

2.1.3 Passages of Scripture that might guide the Church in the case of the marriage of persons of the same gender in Church

In accordance with the Solemn Declaration, to hold and maintain Anglican norms with the help of God, no help of God can be greater than the Bible itself. In same-gender considerations, as seen above, the Bible has generally been interpreted as forbidding all same-gender sexual activity, let alone same-gender marriage. But the Bible cuts both ways in these questions, and some Biblical passages would inform more inclusive attitudes to persons of same-gender orientation and their intimate relationships.

- Scripture describes *cases of passionate friendship* (*1 Samuel* 18.1-5, 20; *2 Samuel* 1:17-27), apparently with approval and despite criticism that they are perverse and a source of sexual shame (*1 Samuel* 20.30)³⁰
- There is an evangelical imperative in Scripture that overturns the inherited rules when that is necessary
 - *Matthew* 10.18-26; *Mark* 5.24-34; *Luke* 8.43-48; etc. The Gospels frequently describe Jesus’ reaching out and including those relegated to the margins by religious authorities and society, even to the point of

³⁰ Recently, the case of Daniel’s relationship with Ashpenaz, as described in *Daniel* 1.9, has been brought forward as a passionate same-sex relationship apparently approved in the Bible. Ashpenaz was a eunuch, the chief of the court officials of Nebuchadnezzar King of Babylon. Probably Daniel was also a eunuch. [Males castrated after puberty may still retain sexual drive, so the fact they were probably both eunuchs would not preclude sexual contact. No other sexual partner of Daniel is mentioned elsewhere in the Bible.] *Daniel* 1:9 asserts rather bluntly: “Now God had brought Daniel into favour (Heb. *chesed*, “mercy”) and tender love (*v’rachamim*, “mercy” or “physical love”) with the prince of the eunuchs” (KJV)

treating their impurity under the accepted religious legal standards as irrelevant, as with a woman with a hemorrhage and several lepers.

- *Mark 2.23-28; Luke 6.1-11; John 5.10-18*. Scripture describes Jesus' own attitude, scandalous to some religious authorities, to the sacred traditional law and its regulations, and sets an example for others, "who have the mind of Christ" (1 *Corinthians* 2.16); consistently, Jesus makes clear that the regulations are made for people and not people for the regulations.
 - It is the evangelical imperative of that Lord Jesus who speaks in the following verse of John Bell's hymn "The Summons",
Will you love the 'you' you hide
if I but call your name?
Will you quell the fear inside
and never be the same?
Will you use the faith you've found
to reshape the world around
through my sight and touch and sound
in you and you in me?
- In the mission to the Gentile world, the Law appears to have been interpreted so that the requirements of holiness become the requirements of love of neighbours. Thus, in *Matthew*, where the apostles are sent to baptize "all nations" and teach them Jesus' commandments (28.19-20), the commandments include the "Sermon on the Mount", "Be ye therefore perfect, even as your father which is in heaven is perfect" (5.48), which seems to be a re-interpretation of the verse that introduces a number of prescriptions about holiness in personal conduct, "You shall be holy; for I, the Lord, am holy." (*Leviticus* 19.2)
- In its mission to the Gentile world, the church of the New Testament was guided by what has been called a "*missiological pragmatism*":
 - acknowledging that the role of Old Testament law had changed with the coming of Christ (*Galatians* 3.23-27); and
 - accepting the social arrangements and accepted roles of the culture, rather than inherited religious cultural standards (*I Corinthians* 11.1-16);
 - despite the fact that all things are lawful (*I Corinthians* 6.12; 10.23); and
 - despite the fact that in Christ all the social distinctions of these cultural standards have been broken down (*Galatians* 3.28; *Colossians* 3.11).
 - *The Acts of the Apostles* 15.13-30 describes a decision by a definitive apostolic conference in Jerusalem, acting through the Holy Spirit, that

Gentiles who adhere to the way of Christ are not to be required to observe the strict demands of the Law, including the purity codes, but are simply to refrain from eating meats offered to idols, and from blood, and from things strangled, and from “fornication”³¹ [*porneia*].

- Christian tradition assumed that the civil and ceremonial law were not binding on Christians (Thomas Aquinas, Heinrich Bullinger, John Calvin, Article 7 of the Thirty-Nine Articles); this was qualified by some theologians who pressed the continuation of God’s Covenant(s) with Christian nations
- Many of these practical standards of the Gentile mission became a new Christian law, but even of these many have changed over time. Thus, although “fornication” is still now considered incompatible with the Christian way, the prohibition from eating blood is apparently not now considered binding, especially in cultures where such food as blood sausage is eaten. And marriage of a man with his father’s widow, once considered scandalous to pagan and observant religious person alike (*1 Corinthians* 5.1-5, compare *Leviticus* 18.8; 20.11) and until recently forbidden in Church and secular law, is now permitted. But above all, when there is a difference of opinion on these things in the Church, Christians are to live lives of acceptance despite their lack of agreement (*Romans* 14.1-15.13).

3. The challenges of our time

- The English word “homosexual” and the word “Lesbian” for persons of same sex orientation or behaviour were first used in the last 200 years. More recently, the acknowledgement that some persons have an involuntary and fundamental sexual preference for persons of their own sex has become increasingly expressed, inside and outside the church. However, some authors argue that “homosexuality” and “homophobia” are “Western intrusions”.³²
- In the 1960s legislation in Britain and Canada changed to make consenting sexual behaviour between adults legal; this change was not followed in many states of the United States and in other jurisdictions, but has been accepted

³¹ This restriction worked itself into Canon Law in the East, although (I am told) the restrictions on eating blood are not generally enforced: “The divine Scripture [Acts 15.29] commands us to abstain from blood, for things strangled, and from fornication. Those therefore who on account of a dainty stomach prepare by any art for food the blood of any animal, and so eat it, we punish suitably. If anyone henceforth venture to eat in any way the blood of an animal, if he be a clergyman, let him be deposed; if a layman, let him be excommunicated. Canon 67 of the Council of Trullo, AD 692) One early and notable attempt to provide for a definitive list of prescriptions for the Christian, parallel to Christ’s commission to “teach them [the Gentiles] my commandments” [*Matthew* 28.20], *The Didache* [*The Lord’s Teaching to the Heathen by the Twelve Apostles*] clearly identifies the corruption of boys and fornication as the forbidden sexual acts [*Didache* 2.1].

³²

broadly so that persecution of persons on account of their sexual orientation or behaviour is broadly considered a breach of fundamental human rights.

- From 2003, courts in various Canadian provinces had made same-sex marriage legal; 20 July 2005, the federal Civil Marriages Act was approved. Massachusetts has recognized same-sex marriage since 2004. Also many other countries, such as Belgium, Netherlands, South Africa and Spain, *et. al.*
- Yet the Lambeth Conference 1998, while generously accepting the diversity of opinions within Anglican Churches on the various matters of sexuality,³³ has explicitly, but without much explanation, repeated the long-time consensus: “rejecting homosexual practice as incompatible with Scripture”. This hastily drawn up phrase needs careful attention. With respect to homosexual practice as “incompatible with Scripture”, it has been noted that this mode of reference to Scripture has been used only twice before in Lambeth Conference resolutions: 1930.19 on illicit and irregular sexual unions, and 1978.8 on the illegitimacy of racism and tribalism; it is to be doubted that Scripture speaks with a uniform voice on either of these issues.³⁴

Like the early church in the Roman Empire, Anglican Churches know almost no variation in the definition of marriage and the judgments of marriage from the societies in which they live.

- The English word “homosexual” and the word “Lesbian” for persons of same sex orientation or behaviour were first used in the last 200 years. Persons began to identify their patterns of affection and behaviour, and to recognize distinctive genders and orientation in groups of support and friendship that shared that identity. More recently, the acknowledgement that some persons have an involuntary and fundamental sexual preference for persons of their own sex has become increasingly expressed, inside and outside the church by those who do not identify with a specific orientation or gender. Most persons who consider the matter would conclude that a certain portion of the population, though a minority, has a constant and abiding gender identity as of same-sex orientation
 - However, some authors argue that “homosexuality” and “homophobia” are “Western intrusions”.³⁵
- In 1969 the Roman Catholic Organization Dignity was founded; in 1975 Integrity was founded for Episcopalians and members of the Anglican Church of Canada. Both have clarified, for their respective churches, that there are

³³ Lambeth 1998:1.10 “Human Sexuality”, “commends to the Church the subsection report on human sexuality.” See the Subsection Report on *Section I Report, Theme 3, Human Sexuality in The Official Report of the Lambeth Conference 1998* (Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, 1999), 93-95.

³⁴ See Mark D. Chapman, *The Anglican Covenant: unity and diversity in the Anglican Communion* (London: Mowbray, 2008), 31.

³⁵ Mark Chapman, *Anglican Covenant*, 30.

devout Christians who are gay, or lesbian, or of another sexual identity not previously considered normal.

If indeed, as the Anglican standards on Doctrine, Sacraments and the Discipline of Christ, each national church “hath authority to ordain, change, and abolish, ceremonies or rites of the Church ordained only by man’s authority”, then the Anglican Church of Canada may now make changes in its practice of marriage “according to the diversities of countries, times, and men’s manners, so that nothing be ordained against God’s Word” (Article 34), whether or not homosexuality and homophobia are regional “intrusions”.

In this the Church should be guided by what the Book of Common Prayer says about Matrimony, especially in its liturgy of marriage. *The Book of Common Prayer* 1962 (and indeed *The Book of Alternative Services*) preserves the theological framework of the *Books of Common Prayer* of the Church of England, including that in place in 1893, and, following a long tradition going back to St. Augustine, recognizes three doctrinal purposes for marriage: offspring, fidelity and “sacrament”.³⁶

Briefly, although offspring is rightly considered a purpose of marriage, there has never been any theological doubt that persons may have childless marriages. And many same-gender marriages have children who are “brought up in the fear and nurture of the Lord” as in other Christian households.

Secondly, fidelity in marriage is already present in the civil marriages of Christians of same gender, who know “the mutual society, help, and comfort, that the one ought to have of the other, in both prosperity and adversity”. And fidelity is held to nullify the sinfulness of any lust that remains within marriage.

Thirdly, “sacrament” may be present in such marriages if such couples are allowed to make their vows in Church, before God, and receive the Church’s blessing. This would be the principal novelty in allowing such marriages to fall under the liturgy of marriage. Legal assumption before 1753 would imply that this may already exist even though the church has not solemnized the marriage; previously it was acknowledged that real marriages existed if the vows of marriage were made outside the church.

³⁶ For a detailed consideration of these three purposes, see my paper “The nature and sacramentality of marriage as understood in the Anglican Church of Canada” prepared for the Anglican-Roman Catholic Dialogue meeting in Mississauga, Ontario, November 8-10, 2014 attached to this paper as an appendix.

The nature and sacramentality of marriage as understood in the Anglican Church of Canada¹

Until relatively recently, discussion within the Anglican Church of Canada about the nature of marriage has been limited. There has been discussion about the marriage of divorced persons during the lifetime of their previous spouses and some discussion about reform of the liturgy. Within the last century, there has been considerable discussion about the table of kindred and affinity. The General Synod now proposes to discuss amendment of the Marriage Canon to allow for Church weddings when the spouses are of the same gender. Yet, although consistent discussion has been episodic, there has been continuous attention given to marriage because of the widespread use of the attention-demanding Anglican Church's rites of marriage, whose words have become part of colloquial English.

Authoritative historical documents. The various *Books of Common Prayer*, the Thirty-Nine Articles of Religion, the canons on Marriage in the Church, and the Books of Homilies provide the principal documents with authority, although the current authority of the Books of Homilies, except for the homilies on justification, faith and good works is mostly spent, and has force here largely as a comment on the service of the Solemnization of Matrimony in the *Books of Common Prayer*. In 1985, the Anglican Church of Canada adopted the *Book of Alternative Services*, which includes a revised rite of marriage now widely used.

Summary of doctrine relating to marriage in the Book of Common Prayer of the Anglican Church of Canada, 1962. The Anglican service of Matrimony appeared first in the *Book of Common Prayer in 1549*, and included an intelligent and pastoral summary of the theological assumptions about matrimony present for some time before that, and not much contested at the time except in the Biblicist extremes of the Anabaptist wing, where monogamy was briefly challenged. It did not intend to break from Latin Christian tradition, and it did not intend to reduce the liturgy to what could clearly be found in the Bible. Nor did it accept the growing sense within the Reformation world that marriage was simply and essentially a contractual matter.

The traditional first part of the rite, the public declarations of consents and the vows of the bride and groom, were moved from the home or outside the church doors into the nave of the Church, and the prayers and blessings into the chancel. The priest's extended address to the congregation and the bridal party rehearsed a large number of matters theological and legal:

1. The gathering is a sacred one and a public one. The Priest's first words are:
"DEARLY beloved, we are gathered together here in the sight of God, and in

¹ A paper prepared by David Neelands of Trinity College Toronto, for the Anglican-Roman Catholic Dialogue meeting in Mississauga, Ontario, November 8-10, 2014.

the face of this Congregation, to join together this man and this woman in holy Matrimony.” The congregation is constituted by the “friends and neighbours” who have accompanied the persons to be married into the “body of the church”, with an optional Psalm or hymn during the entrance. The congregation is involved in the service: it has an important legal role in attesting that there are no legal impediments to the contemplated marriage, just as they have a responsibility if banns are read in advance of the wedding: “if any man can show any just cause, why they may not lawfully be joined together, let him now speak, or else hereafter for ever hold his peace.” In the new alternative rite, they are termed “witnesses”, and are called upon to support and uphold the marriage and to remember their loyalty to their own covenants.

Initially, propers were provided for a nuptial eucharist. Later, these were removed, and the rubric added “It is fitting that the new-married persons should receive the holy Communion at the time of their Marriage, or at the first opportunity after their Marriage.” In the Canadian Book of Common Prayer 1962, eucharistic propers are again provided.

There are two or three blessings offered by the priest during the course of the service: the first occurs in the nave immediately after the declaration of marriage, the priest blesses the couple in a Trinitarian formula; it is a prayer for grace that they “may live together faithfully in this world, and in the world to come [they] may inherit life everlasting”. The second is in a series of intercessions that occurs in the chancel; it includes a prayer that God will “bless these thy servants, and sow the seed of eternal life in their hearts ... that they may abide in thy love unto their lives’ end”, that God will “bless the home of these thy servants”, that they will share in the blessing of the increase of mankind and receive from God “the heritage and blessing of children” and length of days to nurture them, and that God will “bless them both” as they love, honour and cherish each other and live together in faithfulness and patience.” The third is declarative, and is usually considered the nuptial blessing proper, in which the priest says “sanctify and bless you, that you may please him both in body and soul, and live together in holy love unto your lives’ end.”

2. Marriage is an honorable “estate” and a serious one; it is “is commended in holy Scripture to be honourable among all men: and therefore is not by any to be entered upon, nor taken in hand, unadvisedly, lightly, or wantonly; but reverently, discreetly, advisedly, soberly, and in the fear of God”. It is an “estate” creating a new public social status and a new household, for which prayers are offered after the vows and declaration². There is a certain silent

² HEAVENLY Father, we beseech thee to bless the home of these thy servants by thine abiding presence; that they who dwell therein, being preserved from all evil, may joyfully serve thee in godly quietness; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

neutrality of some of the attributes of the Roman family law of *cum manu* marriage (except for the new obedience of the wife to the husband in the older versions of the rite), as for instance the migration of the wife to the husband's *gens*, although in England and Canada until recently, when there were surnames, the surname (*gens nomen*) of the bride changed in law; but this is not alluded to in the rite, although some priests erroneously introduce the couple as "Mr. and Mrs."

3. Marriage is of divine institution; it is "instituted of God". This principle is incidentally referred to elsewhere in the rite, and is important in the consideration of the sacramentality of marriage in Anglican tradition; the union of marriage is an act of God. For instance, in the charge to the bride and groom to disclose any impediments to their marriage they may know, the priest declares "that so many as are coupled together otherwise than God's Word doth allow are not *joined together by God*". After the vows and giving of the ring or rings, "the Priest shall join their right hands together, and say: THOSE whom *God hath joined together* let no man put asunder."³ This paraphrase of Jesus' words, used in all Anglican marriage rites, also figures in the question of the sacramentality of marriage. In the Collect for the nuptial eucharist that may follow the wedding service the priest prays "grant that *those whom thou by matrimony dost make one*, may steadfastly keep the covenant betwixt them made".
4. Although God joins the bride and groom, the agents of marriage are both the persons to be married (as in Roman Law) and the priest acting for the church. The bride and groom come not simply to join themselves, but "to be

³ *Matthew* 9.6; *Mark* 10.9. The liturgy has not picked up the impersonal "what" of "what God hath joined together", preferring the more intelligible and personal "those whom". Perhaps not enough has been made of this difference of language. The source of Jesus' dictum, an oral tradition in his time, held that God spend a part of each day "making marriage bonds between man and woman" (*Targum Neofiti to Deuteronomy 32.4*). This extra-Biblical tradition was presumably shared by Jesus and by his rabbinical debaters who offered a variety of opinions on the appropriateness of divorce. Anglican interpretation, until recently, has followed Western Christian tradition that marriage is indissoluble except by the death of one of the spouses. It is more likely that the words of Jesus occur in the context of rabbinical disputes about divorce, of which Jesus, like the Essenes, disapproved. In this context, what Jesus is criticizing is the legalist formalism to enable divorce, despite a substantial and theological account of marriage that the lawyers share, and the legalism ignores the moral crisis for the husband and wife. It is noteworthy that Paul, although aware of and sharing Jesus' attitude to divorce, does not treat marriage as absolutely indissoluble (*I Corinthians* 7.12-16), nor perhaps does Jesus (*Matthew* 5.32). But the dissolution of a marriage is a theological matter.

joined". Yet, on several occasions, the critical and necessary role of the bride and groom in constituting the marriage is made clear: they marry each other. In the summary of the conditions for the declaration of marriage, the priest lists five conditions that this particular couple have met during the solemn public liturgy: (a) they "have consented together in holy wedlock", through their public "I will" to the question of consent; (b) they "have witnessed the same before God and this company" by the same "I will"; (c) they "have given and pledged their troth either to other" in the vows of marriage; (d) they "have declared the same by giving and receiving of a ring" and (e) by joining of hands". All of these conditions are actions of the bride and groom, and all embedded in the legal ceremonies of Roman *cum manu* marriage, at least in the *conferratio* version required for the social elites. This insistence on the sufficiency and irreducibility of the present vows to the constitution of marriage (and not, for instance, of a physical consummation of the union, or the Church's blessing of it) had long been a principle of Latin Christian theological understanding.⁴ In giving the ring, the giver says "with this ring I thee wed". Nevertheless, the priest, acting for the whole church has a constitutive⁵ role in a church wedding: "we are gathered together ... to join together this man and this woman in holy matrimony"; the priest, confirming that the formal conditions have been met, solemnly declares "I pronounce that they be man and wife together, In the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."

5. Marriage is a unique gift to the couple to be married and indeed the human race independent of its actual fallen state: marriage was instituted of God "in a time of man's innocency". This arresting statement links marriage to the account of the man and the woman in *Genesis 2*, relating not to offspring (which are not mentioned until the next chapter), but rather to the radical loneliness of the man that is graciously remedied by God in the gift of one entirely like himself, a friend to cleave to for life. Its theological value relates to the integrity of marriage that cannot be lost through the venality and selfishness of the married people and relates to the redemptive character of the married state, as outlined in the rite.

⁴ Compare Pope Nicholas' letter to the Bulgarians (866 AD). See Denziger 344; *The Sources of Christian Doctrine*, (Fitzwilliam, NH, 1954), 134. (The question of "consummation" to the validity of the marriage was not entirely irrelevant: prolonged failure to achieve physical consummation could, in some circumstances, lead to a declaration of nullity for the marriage.)

⁵ Until restricted by statute in 1753, marriage without a priest, even by custom ("*per usum*" or "*sine manu*"), was recognized as legal in England. Compare Council of Trent, *Canons on the Reform of Marriage*, chapter 1; *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, ed. Norman P. Tanner (London, 1990), II.755. Thus the priest's role, though not the couple's, might be considered to be regular but not strictly necessary.

6. Marriage, though an institution of creation, is also Christological and soteriological. The address to the congregation, in referring to the dignity of marriage, refers to “Christ’s presence and first miracle that he wrought in Cana of Galilee.” This reference to the narrative of *John 2* is left undeveloped, but follows an arresting statement, based on *Ephesians 5* on the dignity of marriage as an image of the union of Christ and the church, that is, of salvation: “signifying unto us the mystical union that is betwixt Christ and his Church”.⁶ This image is repeated in the prayer for eternal life of the couple later in the service: “GOD, who hast consecrated the state of Matrimony to such an excellent mystery, that in it is signified and represented the spiritual marriage and unity betwixt Christ and his Church.”
7. Finally, the address to the assembled congregation carefully lists three theological purposes to marriage. This item is significant enough to warrant separate treatment. (See below.)

Summary of doctrine relating to marriage in the Canon XXI, the Thirty-Nine Articles of Religion, and the Homily on the State of Marriage. Canon XXI On Marriage in the Church, the current Marriage Canon of the Anglican Church of Canada, enunciates important theological and pastoral understandings of marriage in the early sections, with some Scriptural references:

2. The Church affirms in like manner the goodness of the union of man and woman in marriage, this being of God’s creation [Cf. Gen. 1:27–31]. Marriage also is exalted as a sign [Eph. 5:31f.] of the redeeming purpose of God to unite all things in Christ [Eph. 1:9f.], the purpose made known in the reunion of divided humanity in the Church [Eph. 2:11–16].

4. Aspects of the regulation of marriage in the apostolic Church are recorded in the New Testament. A new standard of reciprocal love between husband and wife was introduced leading towards an understanding of their equality [1 Cor. 7:3f, 11:11f, Eph. 5:21–33, cf. Gal. 3:28]. In preparation for marriage Christians were directed to seek partners from among their fellow believers [1 Cor. 7:39, 2 Cor. 6:14, cf. 1 Thess. 4:2–8 (RSV)]. In Christ’s name separated spouses were encouraged to seek reconciliation [1 Cor. 7:10f.]. In his name also divorce was forbidden though not without exception [Matt. 5:31f, Mark 10:2–9, cf. Mal. 2:13–16]. In certain circumstances a believer already married to an unbeliever might be declared free from such a marriage bond [1 Cor. 7:12–16]; in others, and here in the name of Christ, remarriage during the lifetime of a former spouse was described, with one exception, as an adulterous union [Matt. 19:9, Mark 10:11f, Luke 16:18, cf. Ro. 7:3].

⁶ Strikingly, although images of marriage ceremonies, celebrations, garments and purity are common in the New Testament in relation to the mysteries of Christ, this passage in Ephesians is one of the few that link the state of marriage, rather than marriage rites, to salvation.

The *Thirty-Nine Articles of Religion* have only a few things to say about Matrimony. First, although it is commonly called a sacrament, it is not “one of the Sacraments ordained by Christ”, and is presumably, a “state of life allowed [i.e., supported] in the Scriptures” and has “not any visible sign or ceremony ordained of God” (Article XXV. Of the Sacraments). And, second, “it is lawful for [clergy and laity alike] to marry at their own discretion, as they shall judge the same to serve better to godliness”, that is, celibacy cannot be required of anyone, and there is no separate standard for the clergy. The decision to marry or not is properly based on a decision as to personal vocation. (Article XXXII. Of the Marriage of Priests.)

Thirdly, the Thirty-Nine Articles refer to the *Books of Homilies*, as containing “a godly and wholesome doctrine and necessary for these times,” and judges them “to be read in Churches by the ministers diligently and distinctly, that they may be understood of the people.” (Article XXXV. Of Homilies) Homily 11 of the First Book, Against Whoredom and Adultery, has little light to shed on the theology of Marriage, but does suggest in no uncertain terms that sexual infidelity for the married is entirely imprudent.

Homily 19 of the Second Book, “Of the State of Matrimony”, however, has much light to shed on the Prayer Book’s rites of Matrimony, which it preceded.⁷ Although published for the first time in 1563, it is a combination of two older works. More than 50% is a direct translation of an address of Veit Dietrich or Theodor (1506-49), a student of Luther and Melanchthon at Wittenberg, and “a preacher of great celebrity at Nuremberg”; the rest a freer translation of a homily of John Chrysostom⁸. Since Theodor died in 1549, his text was available well before Cranmer composed the Address to the Congregation in the Marriage Rite of the *Book of Common Prayer*, which appeared for the first time in 1549, and may be one of the many Lutheran sources for the *Book of Common Prayer*.

For the Homily, marriage is a “state” as the title declares. And the vast proportion of the homily is given to exhortation to married couples to discipline themselves to a state of virtue, so that they may live in marriage as Christian pilgrims and not be distracted from their life of prayer. Marriage is an ethical matter, the relationship between two parties, and the practice of marriage will lead to a transformation of wills, and concord. There is a startling recognition that marriages are not automatically states of concord; discord is usual: “how few matrimonies there be without chidings, brawlings, tauntings”. Husbands are instructed to love their wives and honour them by being conciliatory and persuasive, though they could demand obedience without persuasion, and even though it may be fashionable for men to adopt more conventional masculine attitudes; men are not less masculine for being moderate towards their wives, “the weaker vessel” [1 Peter 3.7]. Men should not beat their wives (they would not beat their female servants), but women must

⁷ The scholarly edition of this homily is to be found in [John Griffiths ed.] *The Two Books of Homilies Appointed to be Read in Churches* (Oxford, 1859), 500-515.

⁸ Homily xxvi on I Corinthians, NPNF1 12.148-158, (§6-8, 155-58).

accept such beatings as marks of their own good character. Wives are to obey, but husbands are to be gentle and humane, like Sarah and Abraham. Women are to wear head coverings to show that they are “under covert and obedience” to their husbands. Socrates is offered as an example of marital virtue: he accepted “a cursed wife, a forward, and a dunkard” as, in words attributed to him, “a schoolmaster, and an example how I should behave myself abroad: for I shall ... be more quiet with other, being thus daily exercised and taught in the forbearing of her.”⁹

While the Homily has some significance in supporting the two purposes of marriage, fidelity and sacrament as outlined by Augustine (see below), it is a sobering reminder that, even on questions as important as marriage, the details related rightly change over time. They may have been “necessary for these times”, as the Articles of Religion say, in the sixteenth century, but very few, if any, in the Anglican Church of Canada, would recommend that wives simply submit to violence from their husbands in order to maintain the recognition of their virtue; and not many would opt for the requirement for one-sided obedience that is built into this homily, with its concomitant requirements that married women cover their heads to show their husbands’ authority. Assumptions about the practice of marriage, as distinct from its theological and spiritual character, have changed in the church, and may change in the future.

Manners and morals relating to marriage in the Book of Common Prayer of the Anglican Church of Canada, 1962. The assumptions about the conventional manners and morals apparent in the Homily are obsolete in detail and have been for some time. Yet, with this homily in the background, many details of the Marriage rite become clearer: in giving their consent, the bride and groom promise to *love, honour and keep*¹⁰, not just to remain faithful to each other for the rest of their lives. The prayers emphasise God’s grace and protection, and their trust in God; the priest prays that they may live ethically in the married state, a school of virtue eschatologically viewed: that they will learn from God’s Word, they will receive “the seed of eternal life in their hearts”; that their home may be blessed and be place of joy and “godly quietness”; that they may have “the heritage and gift of children” (if they are able); that they may live together to see their children “christianly and virtuously brought up”; that they may be so blessed as to “inherit thy everlasting kingdom”. The alternative service includes the phrase, in the final nuptial blessing,

⁹ Xenophon, *Symposium* 17-19. Compare Shakespeare’s *Taming of the Shrew*, Act 1, Scene 2: Petruchio compares Katherina “As Socrates’ Xanthippe or a worse”.

¹⁰ Previous versions of the promises and the vows included the asymmetrical vow of the wife to obey, and “serve”. An optional homily was formerly provided to be used if there were no sermon at Matrimony, a catena of New Testament passages involving a one-sided requirement of obedience by the bride, a borrowing from Roman Law via St. Paul, and very different from the moral assumptions in Jewish sources (cf. the prayer of Tobias and Sarah in *Tobit* 8.4-8).

“that you may faithfully live together in this life, and in the age to come, have life everlasting.”

The three Purposes of Marriage: In insisting on the seriousness of undertaking marriage, the priest rehearses the purposes of marriage: “Matrimony was ordained

1. for the hallowing of the union betwixt man and woman;
2. for the procreation of children to be brought up in the fear and nurture of the Lord; and
3. for the mutual society, help, and comfort, that the one ought to have of the other, in both prosperity and adversity.¹¹

Earlier versions of the Prayer Book stated these principles in a different order, with a different set of words for one of them.

First, It was ordained for the procreation of children, to be brought up in the fear and nurture of the Lord, and to the praise of his holy Name.

Secondly, It was ordained for a remedy against sin, and to avoid fornication; that such persons as have not the gift of continency might marry, and keep themselves undefiled members of Christ's body.

Thirdly, It was ordained for the mutual society, help, and comfort, that the one ought to have of the other, both in prosperity and adversity.

Another version of these three purposes, in a different order, was found in the Homily on the State of Matrimony: “the word of Almighty God doth testify and declare” that marriage was “instituted of God”

- “to the intent that man and woman should live lawfully in a perpetual friendly fellowship”
- “to bring forth fruit,”
- “and to avoid fornication”

The remote source of this list of three purposes, variously stated, is Augustine’s anti-manichaeon treatise *De bono conjugali* (“On the Gift of Marriage), a treatise widely copied and read in the intervening centuries. Towards the end of the treatise, Augustine gives the three reasons in summary:

[1. *Proles* “Offspring”] marriage takes place for the sake of begetting (*generatio*) children... [2. *Fides* “Fidelity”] the faith of chastity (*castitas*) ... [3.

¹¹ In the alternative rite, two of the three “purposes” of marriage are explicit in the priest’s address to all present: offspring and sacrament; fidelity is clearly explicit in the vows.

Sacramentum “*Sacrament*”] the sanctity of the Sacrament (*sacramenti sanctitas*)¹²

Augustine introduces some other important themes that survive into the Anglican liturgies: marriage is a union of friendship (§§ 1,3) (“the mutual society”) and there is a mutual obedience related to fidelity, that is, shared obedience to the vows of marriage (§§ 28-30).¹³

The purpose of offspring: The link between marriage and “the heritage and gift of children” is clear in the marriage rite, and is expressed in ethical terms linked with the rearing and nurture of children in the new household: “for the procreation of children to be brought up in the fear and nurture of the Lord”. As the Book of Alternative Services rite puts it: “that they may be blessed in the procreation, care, and upbringing of children”; “May they receive the gift and heritage of children, and the grace to bring them up to know and love you”. In both the official versions, as in Augustine (§ 32), and the alternative version, this purpose is not essential to the marriage. Childless marriages are nevertheless marriages.

The purpose of fidelity, the ethical purpose: This purpose is variously stated, bluntly in the older versions of the prayer book: “for a remedy against sin, and to avoid fornication; that such persons as have not the gift of continency might marry, and keep themselves undefiled members of Christ's body” and more euphemistically and theologically in the newer versions: “for the hallowing of the union betwixt man and woman”. The alternative service continues the vow “forsaking all others, to be faithful to her/him, so long as you both shall live.” Augustine had opined that, even if not for the purposes of procreation, and even if lustful, sexual congress in

¹² *De bono conjugali*, 32 (NPNF 2.3:412). Compare *De genesi ad litteram*, bk 9, chap. 7, n. 12. Peter Lombard, *Sentences* Bk IV, distinction 31, chap. 1 (§182). Augustine's three purposes are referred to in the decrees of the Second Vatican Council but not listed explicitly, *Gaudium et spes*, 48.

¹³ Augustine also introduces some themes that have figured in later Anglican discussions, but do not figure prominently in the liturgy: when lust is present in marriage, it is not a major sin (§§ 3-6, 11); this means that non-procreative sexual activity may be part of the purpose of fidelity and the sanctity of the sacrament, but the special kinds of sexual gratification typical of prostitutes (“fornication”) is unnatural particularly if non-consensual, and is not justified by taking place within marriage; sexual activity within marriage is to be mutual, that is, giving each partner what is due to them and conjugal rights, unlike obedience, are symmetrical within the sanctity of the sacrament (§ 12) [compare *I Corinthians* 7. 3,5 and the Marriage Canon]; Roman law, the *lex Julii* that had been around since the Emperor Augustus no longer applies: Christians may decide to be childless, and celibacy is the better choice in this age (§ 9); yet although celibacy is better than marriage in some respects, obedience makes marriage better than a celibacy that is attached to a disorderly person (§§ 28-30).

marriage was not a serious sin, because of the purpose of fidelity (§§ 4-7). The alternative service has the words: “that they may know each other with delight and tenderness in acts of love”. In the purpose of fidelity, the opportunity for growth in virtue is also found: as the alternative version puts it, “It is God’s purpose that, as husband and wife give themselves to each other in love, they shall grow together and be united in that love, as Christ is united with his Church.” The prayers included a prayer “that their home may be a place of truth, security, and love; and their lives an example of concern for others.”

The purpose of sacrament or union: Anglican liturgies use different words to emphasize *the* gift of a grace of unity through God’s joining together those who make vows of marriage to each other. As the Canadian Prayer Book states it, “the hallowing of the union between a man and a woman”. In the words of the Homily on the State of Matrimony, “the word of Almighty God doth testify and declare” that marriage was “instituted of God to the intent that man and woman should live lawfully in a perpetual friendly fellowship”. The final blessing in the marriage rite of the Book of Common Prayer includes the words “and live together in holy love until your lives’ end”. The alternative rite returns to the Biblical words used by Christ, “one flesh”.

Augustine’s use of the word “sacrament” is somewhat more precise and traditional in *De bono conjugali* than in such important texts with respect to the sacraments as the two Letters to Januarius.¹⁴ Although Augustine, following Tertullian and general Latin custom, regularly used the word “*sacramentum*” as a translation of the word *mysterion* in the Greek New Testament and in Greek theology, his sense in *De bono conjugali* seems closer to the original sense of the Latin word, that is “a sum deposited by a party in a civil process, as security for a future judgment, forfeit money, guaranty”. In other words, Augustine had in mind the vows of the bride and groom and the “surety” handed over by the groom (the antecedent of the wedding ring), as a *sign* of the sacramental union.

¹⁴ “I desire you therefore, in the first place, to hold fast this as the fundamental principle in the present discussion, that our Lord Jesus Christ has appointed to us a “light yoke” and an “easy burden,” as He declares in the Gospel [Matt.xi.30.] in accordance with which He has bound His people under the new dispensation together in fellowship by sacraments, *which are in number very few, in observance most easy, and in significance most excellent, as baptism solemnized in the name of the Trinity, the communion of His body and blood, and such other things as are prescribed in the canonical Scriptures,* with the exception of those enactments which were a yoke of bondage to God’s ancient people, suited to their state of heart and to the times of the prophets, and which are found in the five books of Moses.” Augustine, Letter LIV, NPNF1 1.315. This text was quoted in the Anglican Article 26 of the 42 Articles of 1553, the first version of the Thirty-Nine Articles, on the understanding that the sense of sacrament used was the same as that in contemporary sixteenth century theology.

Nevertheless, marriage was included, along with baptism and eucharist, among the major sacraments by Latin divinity from Peter Lombard on.¹⁵ The Catechism of the *Book of Common Prayer*, adopting one of the definitions of sacrament from Peter Lombard, declared simply that a “sacrament of the outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace”. Yet, as we have seen, the *Thirty-Nine Articles of Religion*, in its brief statement on sacraments, refers to Matrimony not as a sacrament, but as “commonly called” a sacrament, a “state of life allowed” but not “ordained by Christ” and without “any visible sign or ceremony ordained of God.”

Do Anglicans count Matrimony as a sacrament?

This complex history provides a confusing background about the assumptions of the sacramentality of marriage in the Anglican world. Anglicans who honour the broader Reformation heritage sometimes wish to share with their Protestant friends a sheer denial that marriage is a sacrament, no matter the complications of the Anglican formularies of the Sixteenth Century. On the other hand, in the Twentieth Century, the bishops at Lambeth have easily referred to marriage as a sacrament, without qualification.¹⁶ Historically, Puritans within the Church of England in line with the majority in the Protestant world, pressed for a contractual view of marriage, rather than a sacramental view. An English statute during the Puritan-dominated commonwealth included the declaration that “marriage be no sacrament”, and took matrimony away from the Church altogether.¹⁷ This enactment was voided at the Restoration of the Anglican rites in 1660, and Anglicans (as they are now called) thereafter occasionally referred to the sacramentality of marriage.

In the first place, although the vocabulary of “sacrament” in this sense is obsolete, they may mean what Augustine meant by the *quiddam sacramentum*: a union given by God’s grace to two people who vow to give themselves to each other in a unique friendship, to be for the other until one of them dies.

They could, further, refer to marriage as a “sacrament” by analogy with the sacraments explicitly so called by Augustine in his Letter to Januarius, by the Articles of Religion, and by the Catechism, the “Sacraments of the Gospel”.

¹⁵ Although Peter may have recognized that marriage did not fit the pattern of the other sacraments.

¹⁶ Lambeth Conference 1930, resolution 13.

¹⁷ An extended treatment of these shifts may be found in John Witte, *From Sacrament to Contract: Marriage, Religion and Law in the Western Tradition*. Philadelphia: Westminster John Knox Press, 1997.

- There is an outward and visible sign, in fact, a series of them, rehearsed by the priest at the liturgy as a preamble to his declaration that the bride and groom are married.
- Although there is no visible sign of ceremony ordained of God, in marriage there is the invisible grace gift of God, emphasized in the repeated liturgical formula “joined by God”.
- There is even the word of Christ, relaying a rabbinical opinion “those whom God has joined together”, although no dominical injunction to marry.
- But Anglican texts are clear that the sacrament was not initiated by Jesus Christ in redemption, but by God in creating human beings for this permanent friendship.

This may be sufficient analogy for the claim that Matrimony is a sacrament, as the Lambeth Conference assumed.

Augustine, *On the Good of Marriage* in NPNF2 3:397-413

<http://www.ccel.org/ccel/schaff/npnf103.v.ii.html>

The Book of Common Prayer, 1962 <http://c2892002f453b41e8581-48246336d122ce2b0bccb7a98e224e96.r74.cf2.rackcdn.com/BCP.PDF>

Canon XXI. On Marriage in the Church

http://images.anglican.ca/pdf/handbook/221_canon_XXI.pdf>

The Thirty-Nine Articles of Religion, 1571

<http://www.anglican.ca/about/beliefs/39-articles/>

The Two *Books of Homilies* <http://www.anglicanlibrary.org/homilies/index.htm>

The Book of Alternative Services, 1985 <http://c2892002f453b41e8581-48246336d122ce2b0bccb7a98e224e96.r74.cf2.rackcdn.com/BAS.pdf>