

Fall 2010 House of Bishops Meeting

Standing Commission on Liturgy and Music Consultation on 2009 General Convention Resolution C056

Table Conversation, September 18, 2010 Executive Summary

Table conversation centered on the following questions:

Question 1. What pastoral needs must the resources developed meet in your diocese?

Question 2. To what extent do the theological principles (attached) address the questions that people in your diocese are asking?

Question 3. How well do the liturgical principles (attached) reflect your understanding of Anglican theological and liturgical sensibilities?

Question 4. How can this work be done in a way that will both resource the church and strengthen the body of Christ?

Question 5. How do you want the SCLM to consult with the House of Bishops for the duration of this triennium as this work goes forward?

Each table received a set of notes pages for reporting feedback to these questions. The notes were collected and later transcribed into a single spreadsheet. (Note that the table identifications in the spreadsheet were assigned randomly for transcription purposes only. There was no recording of who participated at each table.)

The Bishops' comments spanned a broad spectrum of ideas. Following is an attempt to categorize and summarize the comments. Themes are presented roughly in order from most to fewest references.

- **Theological and Liturgical Principles.** Feedback on the principles was widely varied, but the majority of comments were positive. The liturgical principles were especially well received. Several comments serve as reminders of the importance of articulating a strong theological foundation for this work. (Note also that one Bishop offered that the theological principles are pastoral in nature, while another said they're liturgical theology.) There were many comments noting the lack of direct scriptural references in the principles, and suggesting that theological work must include scripture references and liturgies must incorporate scriptural language. Participants at two tables suggested adding a missional component to the theological principles; others variously suggested attention to concepts of friendship, intimacy, and fruitfulness; and at least two tables noted connections to baptismal living. Two commended Bishop Breidenthal's book, *Christian Households: The Sanctification of Nearness*.
- **The Nature of the Liturgical Rites.** A large number of comments were related to the understanding of same-gender relationships and the rites that would be used to bless them. These comments often referred to the choice of terms, but they reflect deeper questions about

exactly what the Church means to express through the liturgical rite. For example, there was diversity of thought about whether this work should be about same-gender *marriage*. Other comments indicate that the issue is more fundamentally whether same-gender blessings are *sacramental*. Still other comments questioned the meanings of the terms *blessing* and *covenant*.

- **Continuing Consultation with the House of Bishops.** Most tables had at least one request for check-ins from the SCLM about its work on C056 between now and General Convention 2012. Many suggested at least a brief appearance at each House of Bishops meeting, with perhaps more time at the fall 2011 meeting. Some also suggested additional reports, posting of information on the College for Bishops website, mailing or emailing material to bishops, or access to materials as it is being developed. Others discussed the role of the Bishops in authorizing liturgy. Others mentioned the role of the House of Deputies or suggested contact with diocesan liturgical commissions.
- **Care for those of Differing Views.** Many comments expressed concern about making room for and caring for those who disagree with the provision of rites for blessing same-gender unions.
- **Resources for Conversation.** A number of tables requested resources for conversation and education in congregations and dioceses.
- **Legal Considerations.** There were comments about the varied legal contexts now faced by Dioceses and requests for clarity about the relationship between Church rites and civil law. Note that four tables expressed concern about the Church's role in civil marriage (of different-gender couples) and hope that this function might be separated. At least two tables asked about consequences if a couple subsequently breaks up.
- **Diversity of Participants.** Many observed a lack of geographic diversity among the C056 presenters, and several offered that the people working on these resources must reflect the diversity of the Church, including moderate and conservative voices. [Note: The Bishops were introduced only to the Task Force Chairs; the full Task Force rosters have subsequently been posted on the College for Bishops website.]
- **Authorization of Rites.** There was concern about clear communication that any rites developed would not be mandatory and about the role of the Bishop Diocesan in authorizing rites.
- **Preparation of Same-Gender Couples.** Several comments expressed the need for good materials for the preparation of same-gender couples, especially materials that consider how their preparation might be different from different-gender couples.
- **Broad Engagement.** Several comments were related to the importance of engagement on this work with Dioceses and various entities of the Anglican Communion.
- **Other Rites for Blessing.** Comments from at least three tables mentioned the need to develop a rite for any couple that would like to have their relationships blessed but cannot have a civil marriage (for example, an elderly couple for whom civil marriage would create financial hardship).

Fall 2010 House of Bishops Meeting,
Table Conversation, September 18--Transcribed Notes

Table	Question	Comment
A	1	We need a lot of pastoral explanation (help us contextualize)
A	1	Optional nature of rites
A	1	"Pastoral needs" are being met by clergy
A	1	Role of ecclesiastical authority
A	1	Bless relationships when needed without marriage (e.g. when to "get married" would mean loss of benefits/income)
A	1	Explanations for "conservative" people as to why this is a Godly and conservative way of acting
A	1	General Concern: Process is everything. There is no diverse voice (not just a "coastal" voice) preparing and presenting (Berkeley and N.Y. voices need to be augmented)
A	1	Therefore, Body that does the work needs to show the breadth of the Church
A	1	We need clarity on canonical/legal status of these rites
A	1	Guidance on what is appropriate in such rites
A	1	Look forward to the SCLM's "report" to G.C. but warn/caution on pushing to "authorized liturgies"
A	1	Emphasize the double-blessing as iconic of what God is doing
A	1	Unpack "eschatological" for general consumption
A	2	"Household" vs. "Family" language. (Needed family as household) (oikos)
A	2	Bishop Breidenthal's book commended
A	2	Expand idea of committed relationship to include marriage of all persons and to resist an aggressive secularization
A	2	We need to educate our people to these principles
A	2	What are our English, Canadian, other churches of the Communion doing in this regard?
A	3	Be clear. This is not marriage.
A	3	Like the approach/principles
A	4	More representative presentation and presenters
A	4	More regional approach (Provincial meetings?)
A	4	Do <u>not</u> accept Foundation Funding for Church effort like this. It is a very slippery slope for <u>any</u> issue mandated by the G.C. (Note: Not a complaint on commission that was <u>not</u> funded by G.C. But the concern continues)
A	5	Start at grassroots as much as possible
B	1	Assurance that those opposed will be heard, and not disenfranchised
B	1	How can the Bishop be a faithful pastor to congregations that don't agree with the Bishop on this?
B	1	Good counseling resources for preparation for union, particular to the same gender situation
B	1	Where is the theological underpinning and foundation to support same gender unions
B	2	We need a substantive theological justification: How can we casually disregard our tradition
B	2	We need some serious work to connect the innovation with 2000 years of moral teaching
B	2	We haven't done sufficient theological work
B	3	We like 'em. (There was an argument for being a little obtuse, though.)
B	4	It should be done with humility
B	4	This is not a done deal for many people, or for our Church
B	4	Needs more recognition of other opinions and points of view
B	4	Let's go slowly; Let's be deliberate.
B	4	A general sense of welcome and incorporation for gay and lesbian people, but some are not ready to take this step, not because they are homophobic but because they are concerned that this is contrary to scripture and tradition
B	5	Don't tell us what to debate or not debate
B	5	We need a report at each gathering of the HOB, and interim reports

Fall 2010 House of Bishops Meeting,
Table Conversation, September 18--Transcribed Notes

Table	Question	Comment
B	5	We don't want to be surprised
B	5	Could the materials be made available in another way, in addition to the College for Bishops' website? (mailed or e-mailed, rather than being made available. Pushed rather than fetched)
C	1	Recognition that some dioceses have not had conversation about this.
C	1	Not hot topic for some dioceses. Independent nature of people in West.
C	1	Issue of marriage and how blessings affects marriage and its sacramental nature
C	1	How to protect conservative minority (Is there still room for people to disagree)
C	1	Cultural reality that in some contexts, such "things are not discussed" e.g. some topics are taboo in some cultures.
C	1	Certain weariness of this conversation
C	1	Suitable in contexts where marriage is legal for all persons
C	2	Need to address scriptural concerns of conservative positions in marriage
C	2	Union with Christ. Solid theological position and basis for argument.
C	2	Make case for how to embrace blessings from a scriptural perspective
C	2	Challenge assumption people want to address then issues--But people want to talk about other issues--feels hierarchical approach
C	2	Sacramental identity--Is this an additional sacrament? Or a pastoral rite? Marriage?
C	2	Can the language be phrased to support Baptism? Does this reinforce baptismal living?
C	2	Question of using word "marriage"
C	2	How to connect with provisions given by states--and different context
C	3	Flexible rites yet coherence between options
C	3	Recognize contextual differences where civil marriage is legal, unions legal, neither legal
C	4	Wider/earlier conversations with Anglican Communion
C	4	Consult with provinces that agree and disagree with us (in Anglican Communion)
C	4	Need to educate people about liturgies--how used/why we have
C	4	Need to make scriptural case for this Rite
C	5	Bring update of work of SCLM to HOB in March 2011 (if possible send 1 person or bishop member of SCLM)
C	5	Conversation about theological principles
C	5	Conversation about ramifications
D	1	How to develop process by which priest/parish makes a decision as to if and how to proceed with SSU
D	1	Guidelines for pre-union requirements and issue of divorce and subsequent union. Not only in states that have ssu/marr but where church may act despite state law.
D	2	We do not believe these are theological principles. They are pastoral in nature.
D	2	Ecumenical dialogue enhanced if we admit theological principles are not leading us, but pastoral principles. This would help bishops, dioceses, people who do not see theological justification, but who can respond to pastoral need.
D	2	Other ecumenical partners differentiate between marriage as sacramental and SSU as blessed relationship. Old Catholics, Amsterdam.
D	3	Bishops are <u>the</u> liturgists and teachers of the Church and are not subject to the HOD or its president. They are guided by the HOD.
D	4	Include a couple of people who are moderates and from whom the SCLM may be aware of how certain phrases and emphases may maintain and encourage unity.
D	5	Post info on College of Bishops web-site
D	5	Tell us what you heard from our responses and what impact these comments have had on your deliberations.
D	Other	We do not believe report represents Anglican theology.
D	Other	Leave out "theological" implications and stress pastoral
D	Other	The theological report to HOB on SSU was very weak from liberal point of view
E	1	Educational resources on the rationale for blessing

Fall 2010 House of Bishops Meeting,
Table Conversation, September 18--Transcribed Notes

Table	Question	Comment
E	1	Emphasis on the voluntary nature of this--no parish is required to do this.
E	1	What is the theological basis for blessing marriage in the first place
E	1	Theological significance of all human relationships.
E	1	Relation between role of Church and the State in recognizing union of couples
E	2	(We had to discuss this before we had time to read the attached principles)
E	2	Concern for the problems of members of the community (as opposed to the couple) who can't understand this.
E	2	Biblical, cultural, and traditional taboos need to be addressed
E	2	Literal reading of scriptures seems to forbid this.
E	2	What are the theological reasons for a) "monogamy", and b) "life long".
E	2	There seems to be an assumption that blessing of unions = Holy Matrimony
E	2	The role of procreation in marriage as it relates to same-sex unions seems to define a basic difference
E	2	Something similar to the bans of marriage which invites congregational discernment would seem appropriate before the priest proceeds. Does the "community" present the couple?
E	3	Pretty solid
F	1	Documentation on differences in counseling same gender couples vs. different gender couples, if any
F	1	Maintaining connection with community rather than "about the couple"
F	1	Examination of theology of marriage and <u>theology of friendship</u> and covenantal relationships
F	1	Covenant vs. contract
F	1	Assistance to congregations in engaging the conversation
F	1	Exploration of power dynamics in covenantal relationships
F	1	Emphasis on co-equality as part of the common good for the household/the Church.
F	2	Principles are excellent, however these will need translation into the incarnate experience in the local. Perhaps use of anecdotes that "capture" the real questions people are asking which are <u>not on the surface, addressed by these principles</u>
F	3	Well-done
F	4	Use lots of biblical language to demonstrate the scriptural/theological integrity of the action
F	4	Cast the discussion with themes of theology of friendship and the Church's role in blessing covenantal relationships; consider developing theologies of friendship and covenant as way of <u>building up the life of the whole Church around multiple issues</u>
F	4	Is there a way for this "task" to enable a discussion about "unhooking" the role of the Church <u>and the role of the State in blessing marriages/unions...?</u>
F	4	In states like Michigan (with "Defense of Marriage Act") we are coming to see that getting the Church <u>out</u> of the civil role in marriage is necessary for us to move into a broader <u>understanding of the relationships we bless.</u>
F	4	State=contract. Church=covenant. Continuing to link these in The Church weakens our <u>teaching about marriage</u>
F	5	Continue work with HOB through Bishop reps of SCLM
F	5	Send draft of report for Blue Book
F	5	Send 1 or 2 reps to Fall 2011 HOB meeting to engage us in discussion
G	1	Robust and communicable theology. This is a pastoral need.
G	1	The Church will be greater at ease once we have done our theological
G	1	Challenge will be filling the outline--"what kind of clothes on the skeleton"
G	1	Make sure that it is for community as well as individual.
G	1	Communicates well

Fall 2010 House of Bishops Meeting,
Table Conversation, September 18--Transcribed Notes

Table	Question	Comment
G	1	Bishop needs a role: exercising the long time pastoral role of overseeing rite/ritual; the same case as divorced couples; re-marriage type oversight; in this "first season" some consent "in general" for use; careful attention to EOW practice that materials are used with discretion of the ordinary
G	2	Address the biblical passages and their differences: not a dismissing of the negative or acceptance of the positive but engagement; we must show real engagement with the scripture so that the work cannot be dismissed
G	2	Diversity and reading of text must be supported by diversity of group.
G	3	Right on the money!
G	3	Get out of the marriage business and look at ways of dealing with clarity around what is civil and what is church.
G	3	Can this be a first step towards moving away from legal marriage completely.
G	3	We assume there will be a discussion about what "blessing" is.
G	4	Tone--hit the right register
G	4	"Weighty"--we are doing something serious--not like "riding a bike".
G	4	Transparency--public and well communicated.
G	4	These are supplemental not alternative
G	4	This is not for trial use so "you have to nail it!"
G	5	A report at our next meeting as comprehensive with opportunity for reflection and feedback
G	5	It must all be excellent!
G	5	We as Bishops are concerned with each of these areas
G	5	Appreciated not being talked down to.
H	1	For those angry about these developments.
H	1	For the utilization of resources in state where the practice is against the law
H	1	Introduction and summary--introductory teaching piece e.g. preface to ordination rite
H	1	Distinction between blessing of a union and marriage.
H	1	In contexts where there is opposition--teaching revealing this is not a threat but a blessing
H	1	Pastoral resources for people seeking it.
H	1	A conversation tool for congregation to resolve on whether or not to use these resources--A process to help avoid or resolve conflict.
H	2	Further develop Theological Principles as a teaching tool for the wider Church
H	2	Help in pastoral guidance for those "living together" but not married in terms of the eschatological vision . . . helping us to see other kinds of human relationships in terms of practical theology
H	3	Open with a teaching--declarative intent
H	3	Might need additional musical resources
H	4	The theological principles have the capacity to expand our understanding of marriage and other kinds of covenantal relationships.
H	4	Find a way to share the theological and liturgical resources across the Communion for dialogue and input.
H	5	HOB desires updates by Sept. 2011 meeting. Brief report in March. Fall report in September.
H	5	Specifically--report on feedback from across the Anglican Communion in detail.
I	1	Resources to help people with ways to talk about what we are doing.
I	1	Clarity about the meaning of the language we are using: <u>sacrament</u> , <u>covenant</u> , <u>relationship</u> , <u>union</u> , <u>blessing</u> , <u>marriage</u> .
I	1	What are the legal implications
I	1	What do we mean by "blessings" and by "marriage"
I	2	People are generally not asking those questions
I	2	We Bishops are impressed by the principles the team has set forth.

Fall 2010 House of Bishops Meeting,
Table Conversation, September 18--Transcribed Notes

Table	Question	Comment
I	2	It is important to help people move the Church away from a few proof-texts to a whole scriptural approach.
I	2	We need more theological consideration of what the <u>church</u> is and the public nature of this.
I	2	We need to define clearly the meaning of "covenant." How does it contrast with "contract." Both are legal terms.
I	2	We need to be clear that the two relationships--marriage and same-sex relationships--are, in Rowan Williams' words, "morally equivalent."
I	3	Add to the list " the language of scripture"
I	3	The language needs a cadence--it needs to speak well--add this principle: "Will the language speak?"
I	3	What you mean by "performative"?
I	4	Open up a deep discussion about marriage through this process
I	4	Invite people into conversation about accountability.
I	4	What would we mean were we to call this an "estate" as we do marriage. We are called to be the church in the world. We need to get the state out of the marriage business rather than call on ourselves to get out of the marriage business.
I	4	It is with marriage, not same-sex relationships, where we have caved into the culture.
I	4	Because the marriage vows speak of what the couples' marriage has to do with the community (church), the vows in the new rite need to be the same or very close, at the least.
I	5	We would like a chance periodically to have input
I	5	We would like to see the liturgical materials as they develop.
I	5	We need reports at every meeting (We <u>really</u> appreciate the generosity of your time in consulting with us--Thanks to the SCLM members here today)
I	5	We wonder how you are connecting with the HOD--We want to be sure the HOB and HOD are on the same page.
I	5	Will straight couples be permitted to use the new rite?
J	1	Explicitly acknowledge and pastorally address these resources will challenge
J	1	How do you meet a genuine pastoral need of gay and lesbian couples
J	1	Why does the church continue to act as an agent of the state in a legal contract that has historically subjugated women?
J	1	Need a pastoral resource that helps us to wrestle and address the question as to why we should act as agents of the state in any capacity regarding marriage in any capacity
J	1	Help us to explain why the church is doing what it is doing.
J	1	We have to address that elderly heterosexual couples want their relationship blessed--but not legally married because of social security/financial issues
J	1	C056 does not allow us to solemnize homosexual relationships
J	2	Some discussion of koinonia would address this new thing in the life of the Church and congregational community
J	2	We should remember that it is the mission of God that we are invited to participate in. We need to remember this when talking about the mission of the Church.
J	2	Vocation--people are called into vocation via Baptism--all vocation including committed relationships flow from this.
J	2	Name the absence of scripture regarding homosexual relationships being a blessing.
J	3	We want to see vernacular as a liturgical principle
J	3	Are we going to design these rites as sacramental rites? We need to have a very intentional conversation about this. If it does it probably will not pass through this House.
J	4	By responding to those who vigorously disagree with the blessing of same-sex relationships.
J	4	To broaden the conversation with the ELCA, Metropolitan Church, and United Church of Christ.

Fall 2010 House of Bishops Meeting,
Table Conversation, September 18--Transcribed Notes

Table	Question	Comment
J	4	Acknowledge our interpretive so other denominations who oppose what we are doing understand our rationale for taking the actions that we have made.
J	5	Engage with us regularly at the HOB
J	5	Continue the communication with Diocesan liturgical bodies
K	1	Discernment for congregation and its larger ministry in surrounding culture
K	1	Distinction between blessings and marriage
K	1	Pastoral concerns that gay and lesbian couples have that hetero couples do not have
K	1	Clear, theological-- <u>Biblical</u> --teaching materials (plain language)--articulate the "orthodoxy" of the blessings
K	1	Help for communities to accept and maintain different theological positions re: blessings of same-gender couples
K	1	Resources for preparation
K	2	The principles do not address the difference between "partnership" and <u>sacramental relationship</u> --that a "blessing" is not a sacramental rite as is marriage
K	2	Principles are helpful to move discussion out of sociological language and perspectives
K	3	Excellent work and encouraging!
K	4	Call for and empower timely conversation in dioceses (well before 2012 and G.C.)
K	5	Tell us what you are thinking about and looking at--send samples of work in progress
L	1	Rites need to assure the congregation that the couple take this commitment as seriously as marriage.
L	1	Pastoral need of the community to be reminded that the success of every relationship depends on the community's support.
L	1	The blessing and commitment of relationships is a <u>sacramental</u> act. It's not joining in the latest fad--We are people who do sacraments.
L	1	Need to develop pastoral resources for those parishes who disagree.
L	1	Pre-liturg counseling needs to happen.
L	1	C056--need to develop liturgy for senior heterosexual couples.
L	1	Need time for people to absorb what is happening--it is a pastoral need.
L	1	There is a difference between the BCP supplemental liturgies--Bishops need to work with clergy to help them understand the use.
L	1	Is this going to be the same rite to be used for those who marry or have civil partnerships? Are separate rites to be developed?
L	1	Where marriage is available--we expect a marriage license to be available--where a marriage license is not available--is the rite the same?
L	2	Where is fidelity/monogamy under Section III?
L	2	Commending Tom Breidenthal's work Christian Households, Sanctification of Nearness
L	2	Please unpack, reflect on, give us meat about the section III: vocation, spiritual discipline, household, fruitfulness, covenant
L	2	Address Thomas Aquinas' notion on natural law.
L	3	We want to affirm the intent of these principles.
L	3	The Church acknowledging the work of God.
L	3	But needs to be <u>biblical</u> .
L	3	Needs to be participative by the congregation. It is something the community does.
L	3	Needs to articulate the theology of relationship.
L	4	Needs to be done prayerfully and transparently and not rushed.
L	4	Needs to be done deliberately.
L	4	Needs to be stated that it is not <u>mandatory</u> for all to do. Not required by clergy to do.
L	4	This will be symbolized by putting into the corpus of the EOW work.
L	4	Not to make a big thing of it--downplay it against all the other work of the Church.
L	4	What happens when the couple breaks up? This needs to be addressed. In those states where marriage is possible--but what about where it is not? What if later they want to re-marry, re-covenant--what do we do?

**Fall 2010 House of Bishops Meeting,
Table Conversation, September 18--Transcribed Notes**

Table	Question	Comment
L	5	Wrong question--What do we need to do as a House to be able to approve the new EOW?
L	5	This gathering and presentation was very helpful.
L	5	Only 3 meetings between now and the next GC--once more before General Convention--1 year from now.
M	1	Maine caught in limbo between same-gender marriage and blessings.
M	1	Easton is not proceeding with blessings until it is passed by diocesan convention. Dialogue is open.
M	1	Europe needs some way of counseling same gender couples. Yet the process remains open.
M	1	Resources will need to be shared with clergy.
M	1	Process needs to be shared with dioceses.
M	1	North Carolina permits blessings as a pastoral response. Several parishes have requested this ministry.
M	2	Principles are very helpful, particularly principles related to household and fruitfulness.
M	2	What is relationship between blessing and marriage?
M	2	Is marriage a sacrament?
M	2	How do civil and sacramental elements relate/merge/diverge? Role of cleric in civil role/authority?
M	2	Theological education needed in theological principles in many places. Need to create safe conversations.
M	3	Performative principle is key. Must move beyond political correctness or theological affirmation to do what it purports to do.
M	3	Language needs to be lively and graceful, not pedestrian.
M	4	Work must be done in local congregations and dioceses like 1979 Prayer book revision. Local education and conversation is essential.
M	4	Must permit local variation and cultural diversity. "Permissive" rather than "necessary." No change to canon requiring clergy to perform marriages.
M	5	Come back. Regular updates at HOB meetings.
M	5	Frequent written communication. First drafts. Trial liturgies for feedback.
M	5	Written communication inviting us to check HOB/College for Bishops website.
N	1	How can the rite be used in states where marriage between same gendered couples is not valid?
N	1	How can resources be developed that acknowledge the different pastoral needs of same gendered couples?
N	1	What are we trying to produce: Blessings? or Marriages?
N	1	How do these developed rites impact the consciences of those who will not welcome them?
N	2	In light of our allowing the sacrament of marriage to be co-opted how will we prevent misunderstandings and compromises of the communal nature of blessings of same gendered couples?
N	2	Why should the Church bless this particular relationship?
N	3	In marriage the why is "Joy, comfort in prosperity and adversity, procreation of children and this nurture well stated"--how do we well state the meaning(s) "the why" of these covenants. Suggestion: The communal nature of love in community and trinitarian life.
N	4	Get some folks from the south and southwest to inform this work. Do this quickly!
N	5	Do not surprise us. Let us be participants in the process.
N	5	Another report in March please!
O	1	Information about availability of texts
O	1	Information about state of the conversation
O	1	Resource--a teaching or conversational resource as this develops
O	2	Want to see vocation really fleshed out as the heart of the matter

Fall 2010 House of Bishops Meeting,
Table Conversation, September 18--Transcribed Notes

Table	Question	Comment
O	2	Are these covenanted relationships marriage? How does this square with definition of marriage on P. 422 of BCP?
O	3	Excellent principles--literary, formal, holy, meaningful, metaphoric and performative. Lacks only one thing--biblical. It is said that 70% of the BCP is or echoes scripture and this liturgy ought to as well.
O	4	We want the best theologians and the best liturgists in TEC to evaluate and help create the liturgy of blessing, regardless of their point of view, not only stakeholders (expansiveness not obstruction)
O	4	Deep concern about further dividing Communion.
O	5	Is there an app for this?
O	5	We would like to give you time at every one of our House of Bishop meetings between now and 2012 to update us and enter into conversation. Don't need a full blown panel each time, but a briefing from someone on SCIM.
P	1	If a church wanted to study the issue, to have resources; or if a committee in diocese was established to study the issue, it would be good to have resources
P	1	Provide reassurance to those opposed to blessings that they will have a place in the Church, that they won't be second class
P	1	Education that shows this is not exclusively "hippie types"
P	1	Discipline on rites
P	1	Canonical and legal resources
P	2	We haven't gotten that far--it is still visceral
P	2	There is not a widespread theological understanding in our diocese
P	2	Consider putting in a preface that expresses what the event and relationship is about
P	2	What are we going to call this? Marriage or union?
P	3	They are excellent
P	3	Reflects the intentionality of Anglican liturgical tradition
P	3	Feeling at this table that we will not revise 79 BCP--we are moving in another direction
P	4	It will lie in the canonical structure if we do this
P	4	The invitation to participate/consult/solicit opinions on this work
P	4	It is not whether we should gather this material, but that it needs to be presented to GC '12
P	4	This work presented a wonderful opportunity to reinforce and support sacramental nature of all relationships
P	4	Squelch the idea that people have to do this
P	4	Need to continue to legitimize the diversity
P	5	Show up at every meeting with progress report
P	5	Offer drafts for comment
P	5	Get invited to provincial synod
P	5	No one (especially Bishops) should be surprised when GC gets it (like the progress that led up to 79 BCP)
P	5	How can we differentiate churches that support blessings and those who don't?
Q	1	Relationship counseling specific to stage in relationship (pre-marriage, retirement planning, etc) specific to gay and lesbian couples, specific to civil/legal jurisdictions
Q	1	Counseling for social security, pension, survivor benefits for gay and lesbian couples
Q	1	Pastoral education for communities on how loving relationships are opportunities of blessing in and for wider community; couples as bearers of blessing
Q	1	Need information about clarification about have to conform to both laws of the state and canons when laws of the state/local jurisdiction have marriage laws on the books
Q	2	Third principle--missional--This is response to God's mission
Q	2	Federal Ministries, Louisiana: Just beginning conversation
Q	2	It is time to focus on what it really means to bless! As charism of the Church
Q	2	Need to address lead on prayer book definition of marriage. Time for Church to get out of civil marriage business

Fall 2010 House of Bishops Meeting,
Table Conversation, September 18--Transcribed Notes

Table	Question	Comment
Q	3	Well done by the SCLM!
Q	4	Make it build consensus; legislative toward consultation model
Q	4	Try to bring everybody along without the fear that this will force people into mandatory use of resource
Q	4	We need to define resource as not mandatory
Q	4	Look at legal definition--e.g. supplemental text
Q	4	We need to discuss the controversy around "authorized rite"
Q	5	Need to come back with periodic reports!! Process work with HOB.
Q	5	We need plenty of time for discussion within HOB and early in GC 2012.
R	1	Needs explicit statement about optional character and not mandatory nature of rites.
R	1	Requirement was that "liturgical resources" be brought forward, <u>not</u> that liturgical rites be developed for the 2012 General Convention. Another volume of EOW was not what was authorized.
R	1	Bishop is chief liturgical officer--must give permission.
R	2	Is this the sacrament of marriage, or is it something else? It needs to be something else, clearly.
R	2	Problem with "covenant" as defined. Community of faith has previously defined what is a covenant. Is anything that is a covenant an entry into the fullness of God?
R	2	What do we mean by "blessing"? We see God in this and we wish it well?
R	3	Good work on theological principles.
R	5	Would like to see draft materials before anything goes forward.
R	5	Don't publish anything before HOB approval. Do not authorize anything without HOB approval.
R	5	There needs to be more geographical diverse component on SCLM.
R	5	Very disappointed in liturgy being used at HOB. We hope this is not indicative of liturgical quality coming forward.
S	1	Relationship with the civil laws
S	1	Relationship between same-sex blessings and Holy Matrimony in the BCP
S	1	Involvement of diocesan liturgical commissions and the Bishop in this process
S	1	Process for rectors, vestries, and congregations to study and decide how to engage this new resource or not . . .
S	1	Relationship between sacrament and blessing (in sacrament of matrimony and service of blessing)--need to be distinguishable; provide clear alternatives in liturgical resources.
S	1	Clergy resources for preparing same-sex couples for blessing--pastoral care training etc.
S	2	Great need for a rich and comprehensive theological apologia for such blessings, rooted in Scripture and Christian doctrine. [What was presented was purely <u>liturgical</u> theology, not doctrinal.]
S	2	The vocabulary of the presentation was not accessible to regular lay membership.
S	2	Use the model of Prayer Book Studies (before '79 BCP) and publish a study volume for the 2012 Convention to receive and study for a triennium before considering rites.
S	3	The summary was very good and comprehensive in terms of Anglican liturgical tradition and ethos/style. <u>But</u> Anglican liturgy must find roots in Scriptural texts and express these roots in rites written and celebrated. [For instance, "it is not good for the man to be alone"(Genesis 2) . . . Galatians "bear one another's burdens . . . "]
S	3	At least two liturgical alternatives need to be offered . . . one very different from Holy Matrimony; another like it perhaps (but not the same).
S	4	Strongly honor the diversity of opinion in the Church on these issues and reflect the spectrum of theological conviction among us.
S	4	The committee leading this work needs to be more balanced with persons who bring a more moderate/conservative viewpoint.

Fall 2010 House of Bishops Meeting,
Table Conversation, September 18--Transcribed Notes

Table	Question	Comment
S	4	Argument from justice and inclusion has its place, but as we look at liturgy theological and moral dimensions come to the forefront for us.
S	4	Seek the via media in this in order to comprehend the full community of this Church.
S	5	Regular updates at all of our meetings please.
S	5	Ask for diocesan liturgical commission input.
T	1	Resources that would help clergy working with communities, vestries, leadership could engage in self-study.
T	1	Theological piece (pastoral resources) on "any" blessing. Reclaiming meaning of committed relationship
T	1	Need for extensive counseling. Pro action on future issues. Rules?
T	1	Response/affirmation of long term pastoral response for people well established.
T	1	Need to move incrementally i.e. use of vocabulary--blessing humans as opposed to marriage.
T	1	Bishops need to be affirmed in their pastoral judgment.
T	1	Distinction between civil blessings and legal relationships.
T	2	Principles stated do <u>not</u> respond to question being asked. Questions being asked are more fundamental. How is this similar or different from marriage?
T	2	Affirm principles, but they are not the ones being raised. a) fear of congregational conflict. b) talking points for press?
T	2	Articulation of a theological principle of intimacy is needed.
T	2	How do we help congregations deal with reality of the failures of relationships? (transitions that come with divorce and/or new sexuality).
T	3	Will there be options in the liturgical rites? Would that imply different theologies?
T	3	If we list literary first, we risk giving the impression that all of this is about aesthetic rather than holiness of life.
T	4	We need to allow ourselves to let this unfold as it can happen.
U	1	Must be pre-blessing counseling
U	1	Handling of "fall out" (new and old) for/with couple, congregation, and diocese.
U	1	Be clear about authorization of use of EOW (all vols., esp. this one) requires the explicit authorization of the Bishop Diocesan.
U	1	Need to be clear that the church [???] church is <u>blessing</u> and not (necessarily also) acting on behalf of the State, nor does blessing as such need or have any legal standing.
U	1	Essay comparing and contrasting BCP marriage liturgy and Blessing Liturgy as to form, content, and intention.
U	1	Essay on the theological meaning of blessing as such.
U	2	The definition of "vocation" is too static. The vocation of marriage is dynamic and life-long.
U	2	Appreciate the principle of "household".
U	2	Need more precise definition of "committed relation."
U	2	Appreciate the principle of spiritual discipline.
U	2	"Fruitfulness" needs to reflect explicitly the sacramental quality and nature of marriage. Part of the fruitfulness of a healthy "committed relationship" is that it embodies our participation in the life of God.
U	3	Excellent! Thank you!
U	4	Without "waving banners"
U	4	By attraction, not coercion.
U	4	Needs to be <u>and</u> appear to be work of a balanced SCLM and Task Forces in regard to membership and voices.
U	5	Embargo all material until HOB has received the material and before G.C.
V	1	To make a cogent and convincing theological case for the blessing of same gender relationships.
V	1	Address question, "Why are we doing this."

Fall 2010 House of Bishops Meeting,
 Table Conversation, September 18--Transcribed Notes

Table	Question	Comment
V	1	Address question about re envisioning Church's role in marriage.
V	1	Are we talking about an action or a reflection piece?
V	1	Resources to help General Convention debate and the church to discuss in the next triennium.
V	1	Some consistent pastoral guidelines for preparation, that are gay and lesbian specific.
V	1	Let's not resolve this too soon.
V	2	There are scriptural passages we are not addressing.
V	2	Passages discussing relationships were refreshing especially in light of progressive paper that came out. That was a helpful paper.
V	2	We need to do some scriptural hermeneutics.
V	3	Language can be graceful w/out being "snooty" or arcane.
V	3	List holy 1st--then literary etc.
V	3	Words of scripture need to be woven into text, as they are in our BCP.
V	3	Graceful w/out being elitist.
V	4	We need to provide mechanisms by which this can be discussed by the entire church in the next triennium.
V	4	Is it a rite / a sacrament? Let's explore this. The notion that the church by simple majority vote can expand (or change) a sacrament or sacramental rite is something we should approach with caution.
V	4	I hope "with pastoral generosity" stays in the conversation.
V	5	Make a report at March 2011 or September 2011 if more time needed.
V	5	Need to do a lot of work geared to Prov. synods. Summer 2011 report to synod would be helpful.
V	5	Please consult w/ media experts to help us communicate the work we are doing. Mackie?