

Scottish Episcopal Church

Agenda and Papers



General Synod 2015

Scottish Episcopal Church

GENERAL SYNOD 2015

Agenda and Papers

CONTENTS

1	Agenda and Programme for Synod	1
2	Preliminary Synod Business	11
	Minutes of General Synod Meeting 2014.....	13
	Elections to Provincial Bodies	40
3	Faith and Order Board	
	Marriage its Nature and Canonical Options	46
4	Committee on Canons	
	Alterations to Canons – Voting Procedures	51
	Canons for First Reading	
	Canon 52, Section 5	52
	Canon 57, Section 6	53
	Canon 60, Section 5	54
	Canon 63, Section 4	55
5	Doctrine Committee	
	Paper on the Theology of Marriage	56
6	Inter-Church Relations Committee	
	Response to <i>The Church: Towards a Common Vision</i>	93
	WCC Paper: <i>The Church: Towards a Common Vision</i>	99
7	Committee for the Protection of Children and Vulnerable Adults	
	Safe Church Charter.....	140
8	Liturgy Committee	
	A Service of the Word.....	144
	Notes to Accompany <i>A Service of the Word</i>	161
9	Mission and Ministry Board	
	Future Governance Structures.....	172
	Canon for Second Reading	
	Canon 52, Section 23	177
	Opinions from Dioceses on Canon for Second Reading.....	178
	Church in Society Committee: Background Paper.....	179

10 Pension Fund	
Paper regarding Actuarial Valuation	183
Paper regarding Payment of Pension Costs	186

11 Standing Committee	
Mission and Ministry Support Grants	187
Budgets 2015-2017	199
Code of Conduct	229
General Synod - Powers of Investment	235

12 Digest of Resolutions	
Text of proposed changes to Digest of Resolutions.....	236

PINK PAGES

13 Rules of Order	247
14 A Reflection on Morning and Evening Prayer	253
15 Social Media Guidelines	254
16 List of Synod Members.	256
17 List of SEC Representatives on Other Bodies	261
18 Attendance Slip	265
19 Travel and Meals Claim Form	267
20 Synod Comment Form	269

GENERAL SYNOD 2015 AGENDA AND PROGRAMME

UNLESS OTHERWISE INDICATED ALL MEETINGS WILL TAKE PLACE IN
ST PAUL'S & ST GEORGE'S CHURCH, YORK PLACE, EDINBURGH

A "Freshers' Meeting" will be held at 09:00 on Thursday 11 June for new members of Synod.

Thursday 11 June 2015

10:00 Coffee

10:30 Opening Eucharist at St Paul's & St George's Church, including Primus' Charge
Offering to support the work of the Scottish Episcopal Institute
Constitution of General Synod

SESSION ONE: THE MOST REV THE PRIMUS IN THE CHAIR

11:55 **Primus: Welcome to delegates and guests**

Preliminary Business (Page 11)

Minutes of General Synod 2014 (Page 13)

***Motion 1:** That this Synod approve the minutes of the meeting of the General Synod held on 12-14 June 2014.*

Elections: (Page 40)

Standing Committee Convenership
Administration Board Convenership
Mission [and Ministry] Board Convenership
Institute Council Convenership
Standing Committee Membership
Administration Board Membership
Institute Council Membership
Clergy Discipline Tribunal Membership
General Synod Trusteeship
Pension Fund Chair

12:20 **Standing Committee**

Accounts

***Motion 2:** That this Synod accept the Annual Report and Accounts of the General Synod of the Scottish Episcopal Church for the financial year ended 31 December 2014.*

SESSION TWO: THE RT REV THE BISHOP OF MORAY, ROSS AND CAITHNESS IN THE CHAIR

12:30 Faith and Order Board

Process for Discussing Marriage (Page 46)

Motion 3: *That this Synod agree to adopt the process for debating the nature of marriage and canonical options as recommended by the Faith and Order Board in the paper entitled “Marriage, its nature and canonical options: a process paper from the Faith and Order Board”.*

Motion 4: *That voting in relation to the motions numbered 9, 20, 23 and 24 on the agenda be conducted by ballot.*

13:00 Lunch

SESSION THREE: THE REV CANON DR ALISON PEDEN IN THE CHAIR

14:15 Faith and Order Board

Committee on Canons

Canons for First Reading

Canon 52, Section 5 – Of the General Synod (Page 52)

Motion 5: *That the amended text for Canon 52, Section 5 be read for the first time.*

Canon 57, Section 6 – Of Notices Provided for by this Code of Canons, and of the Interpretation of the Code (Page 53)

Motion 6: *That the amended text for Canon 57, Section 6 be read for the first time.*

Canon 60, Section 5 – Of Vestries (Page 54)

Motion 7: *That the text for section 5 of Canon 60 be read for the first time.*

Canon 63, Section 4 – Of the Office of Lay Representative (Page 55)

Motion 8: *That the amended text for Canon 63, Section 4 be read for the first time.*

14:35 **Faith and Order Board**

Doctrine Committee

Marriage – Paper from Doctrine Committee (Page 56)

Motion 9: *That this Synod receive the paper laying out the theology of marriage, thank the Doctrine Committee and recognise its work as providing material helpful to future discussion of possible canonical change.*

15:35 **Information and Communication Board**

15:50 Tea

SESSION FOUR: THE VERY REV ALISON SIMPSON IN THE CHAIR

16:15 **Faith and Order Board**

Doctrine Committee

Launch of Grosvenor Essay: *Towards an Integration of Theology and Science*

16:25 **Greetings from Ecumenical Delegate**

The Rt Rev Stephen Robson, Bishop of Dunkeld

16:35 **Faith and Order Board**

Inter-Church Relations Committee

Response to *The Church: Towards a Common Vision* (Page 93)

Motion 10: *That this Synod approve the response to the World Council of Churches document “The Church: Towards a Common Vision”.*

17:00 Evening Prayer

Friday 12 June 2015

SESSION FIVE: THE VERY REV SUSAN MACDONALD IN THE CHAIR

09:00 Morning Prayer

09:15 **Standing Committee**

Committee for the Protection of Children and Vulnerable Adults

Anglican Communion Safe Church Charter (Page 140)

Motion 11: That this Synod adopt the Safe Church Charter as commended by the Anglican Consultative Council and encourage the whole of the Scottish Episcopal Church including dioceses and congregations in developing a culture of safety.

Motion 12: That Section 2.2.9 of the Digest of Resolutions be altered by the inclusion of the words “and vulnerable adults” after the words “the protection of children and young adults” as set out in the paper included in the Synod Papers for this Synod.

9:35 **Faith and Order Board**

Liturgy Committee

Service of the Word (Page 144)

Motion 13: That, upon the recommendation of the Faith and Order Board, there be added to the Schedule to Canon 22 the Service of the Word (2015).

10:00 **College of Bishops**

Presentations on engagement with the wider Church

10:25 Coffee

SESSION SIX: THE RT REV THE BISHOP OF MORAY, ROSS AND CAITHNESS IN THE CHAIR

11:00 **Mission and Ministry Board**

Whole Church Mission and Ministry Policy

Future Governance Structures (Page 172)

Canon 52 - *Of the General Synod* (Page 177)

Motion 14: *That the amended text for Canon 52, Section 23 be read for the second time.*

Changes to Digest of Resolutions (Page 236)

Motion 15: *That the Digest of Resolutions be altered as follows:-*

- *That a new paragraph (h) be inserted at the end of section 2.1.2*
- *That section 2.2.1 be altered so that the first sentence of that section read:*

“The **Standing Committee** of the General Synod shall consist of a Lay Convener appointed by the General Synod, the Primus, a Bishop other than the Primus (appointed by the College of Bishops) and the Conveners of the Administration Board, the Mission Board, the Information and Communication Board and the Board of the Scottish Episcopal Institute.”

- *That section 2.3.1 be altered so that it read:*

“The **Administration Board** shall consist of a Convener appointed by the General Synod, a Bishop (appointed by the College of Bishops), a representative appointed by the Mission Board, three members appointed by the General Synod from its own membership, a representative of each Diocese as appointed by each Diocesan Synod and the Conveners of the pendant committees of the Board.”

- *That section 2.3.3(b) be altered so that it read:*

“the Finance Committee consisting of a Convener, a representative appointed by each Diocesan Synod and a representative appointed by the Mission Board;”

- *That section 2.4 be deleted in its entirety and replaced by the wording set out in the paper included in the Synod Papers for this Synod*
- *That at the end of section 2.5, a new section 2.6, as set out in the paper included in the Synod Papers for this Synod be inserted and that the existing sections 2.7 to 2.10 be renumbered as 2.8 to 2.11 respectively*

for the avoidance of doubt, all as set out in the paper included in the Synod Papers for this Synod.

11:20

Overseas Committee

Report on the 2015 Session of the UN Commission on the Status of Women

Report on visit to Israel/Palestine

Motion 16: *That this Synod encourage members of the Scottish Episcopal Church to join the Scottish ecumenical initiative, promoted by Christian Aid, in praying for Israel/Palestine on the 24th day of every month.*

11:55

Church in Society Committee

Background Paper (Page 179)

Motion 17: *That this Synod endorse:*

- *the actions being taken by Scottish Churches to influence Government so that the United Nations Climate Change Conference, to be held in Paris in December 2015, can result in firm and clear proposals to limit the rise in global mean surface temperature to no more than two degrees Centigrade;*
- *the following practical steps being taken by the Scottish Episcopal Church through the Church in Society Committee:*
 - *Encouraging congregations to join Eco-Congregation Scotland;*
 - *Working collaboratively with other concerned organisations.*

Motion 18: *That this Synod*

- *commend those Scottish Episcopal Church congregations which pay the Living Wage, including to part time and temporary staff, and urge all congregations to pay the Living Wage to all staff by 2016;*
- *further support the efforts of Scottish Churches to persuade all employers to pay the Living Wage as a basic tenet of their working ethos, recognising that it is important that all working members of our society should receive a financial reward which covers the costs of living.*

Motion 19: *That this Synod welcome the establishment of the Churches Mutual Credit Union (CMCU) in February of this year and urge member churches to support the CMCU by making its work and the financial support it offers known to members in parallel with continuing their support for local credit unions.*

SESSION SEVEN: THE REV PROF TREVOR HART IN THE CHAIR

12:35 **Faith and Order Board**

Marriage (Page 46)

Motion 20: *That this Synod proceed to debate the options for canonical change in relation to marriage as proposed by the Faith and Order Board.*

13:00 Lunch

SESSION SEVEN (Continued): THE REV PROF TREVOR HART IN THE CHAIR

14:15 **Faith and Order Board**

Marriage - discussion of canonical options (Page 46)

(If the motion before lunchtime is passed Synod members will be invited to indicate on a ballot paper their preferences in relation to the options provided by the Faith and Order Board)

15:45 Tea

SESSION EIGHT: THE RT REV THE BISHOP OF EDINBURGH IN THE CHAIR

16:15 Pension Fund Trustees

Actuarial Valuation report (Page 183)

Motion 21: *That the contribution rate in relation to serving clerical and staff members of the Scottish Episcopal Church Pension Fund be reduced with effect from 1 January 2016 to 32.2% of standard stipend and pensionable salary respectively.*

Standing Committee

Payment of Pension Costs (Page 186)

Motion 22: *That the Digest of Resolutions be altered by the insertion of a new section 6.11 after section 6.10 as set out in the paper included in the Synod Papers for this Synod.*

SESSION NINE: THE REV PROF TREVOR HART IN THE CHAIR

16:30 Faith and Order Board

Marriage (Page 46)

Motion 23: *That this Synod instruct the Faith and Order Board to instruct the Committee on Canons to prepare canonical material, reflecting the preference as to canonical options expressed by this Synod, so that a first reading of such canonical material can be considered by General Synod 2016.*

Civil Partnerships (Page 46)

Motion 24: *That this Synod instruct the Faith and Order Board to instruct the Committee on Canons to prepare canonical material to enable the registration of Civil Partnerships to be undertaken in the Scottish Episcopal Church, so that a first reading of such canonical material can be considered by General Synod 2016.*

17:00 Evening Prayer

19:30 Synod Dinner at the Caledonian Waldorf Astoria Hotel, Princes Street

Saturday 13 June 2015

SESSION TEN: THE RT REV THE BISHOP OF BRECHIN IN THE CHAIR

09:30 Morning Prayer

09:45 **Administration Board**

Investment Committee

Buildings Committee

Personnel Committee

10:10 **Scottish Episcopal Institute Council**

10:30 **Standing Committee**

Mission and Ministry Support Grants (Page 187)

Motion 25: That this Synod agree to the adoption of a block grant system of Mission and Ministry Support Grants as set out in the paper included in the Synod Papers for this Synod in place of the current Grants for Ministry system.

Motion 26: That the Digest of Resolutions be altered as follows:-

- That section 2.3.5 be altered by the deletion of the words “the Grants for Ministry Fund,”
- That sections 4.1 and 4.2 be altered as set out in the paper included in the Synod Papers for this Synod
- That a new section 4.3 as set out in the paper included in the Synod Papers for this Synod be inserted and that the existing sections 4.3 to 4.6 be renumbered as 4.4 to 4.7 respectively
- That the existing section 4.7 be deleted in its entirety
- That section 6.2.1 be deleted in its entirety and that sections 6.2.2 to 6.2.4 be renumbered 6.2.1 to 6.2.3 respectively
- That sections 7.5.2 and 7.6 be altered as set out in the paper included in the Synod Papers for this Synod

for the avoidance of doubt, all as set out in the paper included in the Synod Papers for this Synod.

11:00 Coffee

FINAL SESSION: THE MOST REV THE PRIMUS IN THE CHAIR

11:20 **Standing Committee**

Budget and Quota (Page 199)

Motion 27: *That this Synod, having examined the proposed budgets for the General Synod for the year 2016, agree to a quota figure of £698,960 for that year.*

Code of Conduct for Board/Committee members (Page 229)

Motion 28: *That the Digest of Resolutions be altered by the insertion of a new section 2.1.6 after section 2.1.5 as set out in the paper included in the Synod Papers for this Synod.*

Powers of Investment (Page 235)

Motion 29: *That the first sentence of section 1.6.1 of the Digest of Resolutions be altered to read as follows:-*

“Without prejudice to the provisions relating to the pooling of investments referred to below, the funds of the General Synod may be invested in the purchase of investments and securities and subject to the terms of any gift or bequest and in the investment of lands, buildings or other heritable or real property either in the United Kingdom or overseas.”

for the avoidance of doubt as set out in the paper included in the Synod Papers for this Synod.

Elections (Page 40)

Standing Committee Convenership
Administration Board Convenership
Mission [and Ministry] Board Convenership
Institute Council Convenership
Standing Committee Membership
Administration Board Membership
Institute Council Membership
Clergy Discipline Tribunal Membership
General Synod Trusteeship
Pension Fund Chair

12:00 Confirmation of Acts of Synod and close of meeting

PRELIMINARY BUSINESS

1 Welcome to Delegates from other Churches and Faiths

Lieut-Colonel Carol Bailey (Thursday only), Lieut-Colonel Jonathan Roberts (Friday and Saturday): Salvation Army
Rev Alan Berry: Baptist Union of Scotland
Rev Dr David Easton: Methodist Church in Scotland
Rev John S Bremner: United Reformed Church
Dr Satwant Singh Multani: Scottish Inter Faith Council
Rt Rev Stephen Robson: Roman Catholic Church
Rev Matthew Ross: Action of Churches Together in Scotland
Margaret Roy: Religious Society of Friends
Rev Dr Lindsay Schluter: Church of Scotland
United Free Church of Scotland: representative to be confirmed

Guests from outwith Scotland

Mrs Lis Perkins, Church in Wales

2 Prolocutors and Tellers

The Standing Committee recommends the following appointments:

Prolocutors:

Clerical Prolocutor:	Very Rev Nicki McNelly
Clerical Vice-Prolocutor:	Very Rev Jeremy Auld
Lay Prolocutor:	Mr Alex Stewart
Lay Vice-Prolocutor:	Dr Alistair Mason

Tellers:

Daphne Audsley
Malcolm Bett
Elspeth Davey
Mike Hull
Anne Tomlinson
Donald Urquhart

3 Assessor

The Primus has appointed Dr Joe Morrow, Advocate, as Assessor

4 Minutes of General Synod 2014

5 Any Matters Arising from Minutes

6 Elections

Standing Committee Convenership
Administration Board Convenership
Mission [and Ministry] Board Convenership
Institute Council Convenership
Standing Committee Membership
Administration Board Membership

Institute Council Membership
Clergy Discipline Tribunal Membership
General Synod Trusteeship
Pension Fund Chair

8 Housekeeping Matters

9 Roll Call

Please detach the attendance slip towards the end of this document and place it in the box.

DRAFT MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE GENERAL SYNOD OF THE SCOTTISH EPISCOPAL CHURCH HELD AT ST PAUL'S AND ST GEORGE'S CHURCH, EDINBURGH FROM 12–14 JUNE 2014

Freshers' Meeting

A meeting was held prior to the start of Synod to introduce new members to the programme and to the Synod's business procedures.

Opening Eucharist

The Synod was constituted at a celebration of the Eucharist in St Paul's and St George's Church, Edinburgh at 10.30am on Thursday 12 June 2014.

The Most Rev David Chillingworth, Primus, delivered his charge to the Synod during the Eucharist. The Primus reflected on Jesus' presence with his disciples. The Church was called to be a community of disciples and not an institution with members. Jesus breathed on the disciples the breath of the Spirit. Disciples were called to become a God-breathed group of people – forgiven and forgiving – whether at worship, in pastoral care, in mission and service, in vestry meetings and in General Synod.

The Primus highlighted three exciting current challenges in the life of the Scottish Episcopal Church. The first was the scale of the changes being proposed for the creation of a new Scottish Episcopal Institute and a new Mission Board. These were probably the most significant organisational changes for a generation and complemented one another. The Whole Church Mission and Ministry Policy placed the focus of missional energy in dioceses and congregations under the leadership of Bishops as leaders in mission. That was the Church for which the new Institute would train people with a view to the next generation. The training would be formation-led.

Secondly, less than 100 days remained before the Referendum on Scottish independence. That would be a hugely important choice for Scottish society. Since the question on the ballot paper would be political and constitutional, churches and faith groups had felt they should remain impartial. Within the Scottish Episcopal Church there were people on either side of the debate. Whether Scotland's future lay inside or outside the United Kingdom, the Scottish Episcopal Church would remain a Scottish Church. Whilst it might remain impartial on the Referendum question, the Church was not passive in its concern for the kind of society which Scotland would be in the years to come. The Church was part of the active debate going on about the place of faith in any new Scotland and about the place of faith in a written constitution. Churches and faith groups should act carefully in the debate. Referring to his Irish background, the Primus indicated that people tended to make assumptions that members of a particular church would have particular views on political or constitutional matters. That was why he was uncomfortable when the Scottish Episcopal Church was called "the English Church". It carried an implication that the Scottish Episcopal Church was less Scottish, or less Christian, than others when in fact the Church's desire was to serve the community and all its people whatever the Referendum outcome.

The passing of the Marriage and Civil Partnership (Scotland) Act 2014 had been a significant event. Rapid societal change was a challenge for all churches because they held within them a number of very different ways of looking at such issues. Those different ways honoured different approaches to the understanding of the authority of Scripture, a passion for justice and inclusion, understandings of holiness of life, and they honoured Jesus whose ministry included rather than excluded. The challenge for the Church was a spiritual one – to find out what it meant to live in its context faithfully and yet together. Whilst one was very aware of the diversity of the Anglican Communion, the Primus suggested that the first duty of the Scottish Episcopal Church was to explore and respond to its own diversity while staying in relationship as a community of disciples bound together in the love of God. The Pentecost season was the moment when anxious disciples were filled with the Spirit and became people of energy, courage and truth.

During the Eucharist, an offering was taken to support the work of Christian Aid in Syria. The offering amounted to £1,280.28 (excluding tax reclaims).

Session 1 – The Most Rev the Primus in the Chair

1.1 Welcome

The Primus welcomed all members of Synod including the following delegates representing other churches and faiths: –

The Rev Gary Barclay (United Free Church of Scotland), Major Alan Dixon (Salvation Army), the Rev Dr David Easton (Methodist Church in Scotland), the Rev Eder Goncalves (Baptist Union of Scotland), the Rev John Humphreys (United Reformed Church), Msgr Philip Kerr (Roman Catholic Church), the Very Rev Dr Sheilagh Kesting (Church of Scotland), the Rev Matthew Ross (Action of Churches Together in Scotland), Margaret Peacock (Religious Society of Friends), Astrid Bunne (Interfaith Scotland) and the Rev Tim Cole, Assistant Chaplain General.

The Venerable Christine Wilson (Church of England) was welcomed later during the meeting.

1.2 Election of Prolocutors

The Rev Canon Dr Scott Robertson and the Very Rev Nicki McNelly were elected as Clerical Prolocutor and Vice-Prolocutor respectively by the House of Clergy.

Mrs Helen Hood and Mr Alex Stewart were elected as Lay Prolocutor and Vice-Prolocutor respectively by the House of Laity.

1.3 Tellers

Dr Daphne Audsley, Mr Malcolm Bett, Mrs Elspeth Davey and Mr Donald Urquhart were appointed tellers for the meeting.

1.4 Assessor

The Primus announced that Dr Joe Morrow, Advocate, had been appointed as his Assessor. Dr Morrow was congratulated on his appointment as Lord Lyon.

1.5 Minutes of General Synod 2013

Mr Palmer (Convener, Standing Committee) proposed, and Mr Michael Lugton (Convener, Administration Board) seconded, the following motion: –

“That this Synod approve the minutes of the meeting of the General Synod held on 6-8 June 2013.”

The motion was put to the vote and passed.

1.6 Matters Arising

There were no matters arising from the minutes.

1.7 Matters Arising from New Venue for Synod

The Secretary General welcomed members to General Synod 2014, being held for the first time in St Paul's and St George's Church. He explained that a number of matters would be different from previous years including the fact that throughout Synod members would sit at discussion group tables. A number of procedural motions had also been included on the agenda to allow for Synod to meet in different modes. Flipcharts had been provided for the discussion tables and these would be collected at the end of Synod and typed up so that they could be made available along with the formal minutes of the meeting.

1.8 Elections

The Secretary General explained that the posts to be filled by General Synod in 2014 comprised the Convenership of the Information and Communication Board, one lay post on the Standing Committee, two vacancies for General Synod representatives on the Administration Board, three vacancies for General Synod representatives on the Mission and Ministry Board, vacancies on the Preliminary Proceedings Committee for one practising lawyer, a lay member, an alternate lay member and the Secretary and vacancies on the Clergy Discipline Tribunal for three practising lawyers, two clerics and three lay members. In addition, a motion would be proposed later in Synod for the extension of the Rev Canon Fay Lamont's Convenership of the Home Mission Committee for one year.

As was explained in the Synod papers, the Rev Christopher Mayo was nominated by the Standing Committee for the Convenership of the Information and Communication Board and nominations were also made by the Standing Committee in relation to all of the vacancies on the Preliminary Proceedings Committee and Clergy Discipline Tribunal. In relation to the nomination of the Rev Canon Dr Anne Tomlinson as a cleric on the Clergy Discipline Tribunal, in the light of her prospective appointment as the new Principal of the new Scottish Episcopal Institute, Dr Tomlinson had indicated she would resign from the Clergy Discipline Tribunal at the point of taking up office as Principal. The Standing Committee had power to fill vacancies arising during the year and so would be invited to fill the vacancy at that point.

The Secretary General reported that a nomination of Mr Jim Gibson had been received in relation to the vacancy for a lay member on the Standing Committee and a nomination of Mrs Nan Kennedy had been received in relation to one of the vacancies for General Synod members on the Administration Board.

He explained that, in the past, where there had been no competing nominations for vacancies, the practice of Synod had been to fill the vacancies by general acclaim. Synod confirmed that it would be willing to do so again at the current meeting.

1.9 Audio Streaming of Proceedings

The Secretary General indicated to Synod that, as had been done in previous years, the proceedings of Synod would be audio streamed through the provincial website.

1.10 Roll Call

The roll call of Synod members was taken by completion of attendance slips. A total of 137 members attended.

1.11 Permission to Speak

The Synod granted its permission for each of the following to speak during the course of the meeting: the Rev Bob Fyffe, Ms Ruth Jeffries, Mr Andrew November and the Rev Matthew Ross.

1.12 Doctrine Committee

Mr David Palmer (Convener, Standing Committee) proposed, and Mrs Anne Jones (member, Standing Committee) seconded, the following motion: –

"That the Synod meet in groups for informal discussion of this item under Rule 4 (c)."

The motion was put to the vote and passed.

The Rev Dr Harriet Harris (Convener, Doctrine Committee) introduced the most recent Grosvenor Essay which had been produced by the Doctrine Committee entitled *The Church and Scottish Identity*. The Grosvenor Essays were produced annually by the Committee and were intended for group or individual use to aid reflection on theological and social matters. The Committee hoped that the most recent Essay would have relevance for people before and after the Scottish independence Referendum. The idea for the Essay had begun with the Committee asking questions as to whether the Church, being by its nature both local and global, diverse, and in some ways divided, yet nevertheless still the body of Christ, and being in the world but not of it, could shape thinking about identity. She expressed thanks to those who had assisted the Committee in its task including the Primus, Dr John Reuben Davies, the Very Rev Dr Emsley Nimmo, the Very Rev Gerald Stranraer-Mull, the Rev Canon Dr Alison Peden, the Rt Rev Dr Gregor Duncan, the Rev Matthew Ross and Prof Will Storrar. Implicit in the Essay was a commitment to certain values, especially to peaceable and respectful relations. However, the Essay had been compiled as an invitation to its readers to draw out values and reflect further on the values they wished to see embedded in Scottish life. Shortly, the Synod would be invited to address certain questions in discussion groups and the comments recorded on flipcharts would be written up so that they could be reflected back to Synod.

Opportunity was given for questions but there were none.

The Synod then addressed the following questions in discussion groups: –

1. How does the forthcoming Referendum affect your thoughts about the role and identity of the Scottish Episcopal Church and what the SEC is able to offer?
2. What values do you most wish to see embedded in Scottish life?
3. What can we do to help embed these values?

Session 2 - The Very Rev Susan Macdonald in the Chair

2.1 Standing Committee

2.1.1 Annual Report and Accounts to 31 December 2013

Mr David Palmer (Convener, Standing Committee) presented the Annual Report and Accounts of the General Synod for the year ended 31 December 2013.

During the year, the Standing Committee had considered a wide range of issues. These had included maintaining an overview of the Whole Church Mission and Ministry Policy including the establishment of a series of networks across the Province; continued monitoring of the financial position of the Synod and the budgeting process; following up the Pension Fund debate which had taken place at Synod 2013 and the carrying out of the statutory consultation and implementation of recommendations approved by Synod 2013 with effect from January 2014; an overview of the steps taken by the Mission and Ministry Board following the external inspection report received in 2013 on TISEC; overseeing the planning and design of the 2013 Synod and taking account of the recommendations of the Organisation Review Committee which had included the recommendation that a new venue be considered for General Synod 2014; noting the progress made by the Information and Communication Board especially in relation to the development of the new provincial website.

Mr Palmer then commented on the Accounts contained in the Annual Report. The Standing Committee was committed to ensuring that the Synod operated within the financial resources available and it set budgets which, it hoped, would result in a break even position. In recent years, the Boards had been asked to review their budgets on a regular basis and to keep expenditure as tight as possible. In addition to a number of planned savings, the Standing Committee had encouraged Boards and other Committees to exercise restraint in their expenditure and the continuation of such restraint was one of the general contributory factors to there having been a surplus in 2013. The income on the General Fund had totalled over £1.7 million, comprising investment income and interest over £1 million and quota payments from dioceses of approximately £640,000. Overall income had been approximately £60,000 higher in 2013 than in 2012. It had also exceeded the budget projection by almost £30,000. This had been due to higher than budgeted investment income and higher than expected donations and legacies. Expenditure had been just under £1,517,000 and was £64,300 higher than in 2012 but nearly £134,000 below budget. This had produced a surplus of £237,490, more than £163,446 over budget. The Committee had not been deliberately trying to make a surplus, but as would be apparent when looking at the budget for 2015, that surplus would be very helpful. A number of factors had contributed to the surplus including: limited demand on Grants for Ministry resulting in an under-spend of £38,000; an under-spend by the Faith and Order Board of nearly £8,000; savings by the Information and Communication Board of over £15,000 partly because fewer editions of *inspires* had been produced; an under-spend by the Ministry Development Committee of £56,000 arising from the fact that the budget had contained provision for an additional staff member but appointment had been deferred pending the outcome of the review of TISEC; an under-spend by the Home Mission Committee of almost £9,000 due to reduced costs associated with the Glenalmond youth weeks and a saving of £7,500 by the Church in Society Committee arising

from a change in the way that ACTS' racial justice work was being undertaken. Mr Palmer thanked all of the Boards and Committees for their excellent work in operating within budgets.

Mr Palmer commented that the capital funds on the General Account had increased by over £2.6 million to £23.8 million, principally as a result of general increases in the stock market. Total capital resources were in excess of £35.4 million, as shown in the provincial balance sheet. Overall, the accounts showed a reasonably healthy financial position but there was still a need to budget carefully in future years to ensure that the Synod lived within the available funds.

Commenting on 2014, Mr Palmer drew attention to the fact that, as stated in the Annual Report, the Standing Committee would focus on: the need to address significant financial deficits projected for future years including whether it was feasible or desirable to reinstate the availability of substantial buildings grants; the need to ensure that resources were used efficiently and effectively; work in relation to the financial relationship between province and dioceses in order to underpin the diocesan-based emphasis of the Whole Church Mission and Ministry Policy (integral to this would be the role of the Grants for Ministry Fund and the phased discontinuation of funding previously made to dioceses for dispersed TISEC); follow-up to the TISEC review including, especially, the governance arrangements likely to arise and which would include alterations to the Board and Committee structure and the composition of Standing Committee itself.

Mr Palmer drew the attention of Synod members to the information included in the Synod Papers regarding the size of General Synod. He explained that the number of members of Synod was recalculated every 10 years in accordance with Resolution 8 under Canon 52. The number of diocesan representatives on General Synod had reduced from 140 to 124 as a result.

In closing, Mr Palmer thanked the Conveners and members of all of the Boards and Committees and the General Synod Office staff. He was willing to take any questions.

Mr Jim Gibson (Glasgow and Galloway) congratulated Mr Palmer and staff on the quality of the financial information which had been produced. At a time of financial pressure he noted from the figures contained in the Annual Report and Accounts that average giving appeared to be in the order of £5 per week. He asked who had responsibility for encouraging sacrificial Christian giving.

Mr Palmer responded that the issue was a very important one. The level of giving was very variable and there was a responsibility on province, dioceses and vestries, but, ultimately, the responsibility had to lie locally.

Mr Palmer then proposed, and Mr Michael Lugton (Convener, Administration Board) seconded, the following motion:
—

"That this Synod accept the Annual Report and Accounts of the General Synod of the Scottish Episcopal Church for the financial year ended 31 December 2013."

The motion was put to the vote and passed unanimously.

2.1.2 Budgets and Quota Overview

Mr Palmer turned to consider the budgets contained in the Synod Papers for the years 2014 to 2016. He explained that each year there was a detailed budgetary process undertaken by every Board and Committee whose proposals were then considered by the Standing Committee. Boards had again been asked by the Standing Committee critically to review their budget proposals for the years 2014–2016. In considering the proposals from the Boards, the Standing Committee had had, as always, two underlying principles in mind: that budgets should be set with a view to achieving a break even position on the General Fund and that large one-off receipts, such as legacies, ought to be capitalised by investing them in the Unit Trust Pool to provide future income rather than being used to fund current operating costs.

In 2009, investment income had fallen dramatically and pension costs had increased. As a result, it had been necessary to find significant savings in subsequent years. The Synod was heavily dependent upon investment income. Until 2008, such income had increased broadly in line with inflation. However, it had fallen by 15% in 2009 and there had been no increases in 2010 and 2012 and only small increases in 2011 and 2013. Market conditions continued to be volatile and it was difficult to predict what future rates of UTP distribution would be. The Investment Committee continued to work closely with its Fund Managers with a view to achieving modest growth in distribution rates. As a result, current investment income was estimated to be £1 million, as compared with £1.2 million had previous trends continued.

The reduction in investment income and the increase in pension costs had created a challenging financial situation. Savings had been made, mainly as a result of a reduction in staff at the General Synod Office and restraint in spending on the part of Boards and Committees. However, those savings had not been enough to eliminate the underlying deficit. Major cost reductions had been achieved by the moratorium on building grants but it was becoming clear that there was little prospect of anything other than modest increases in investment income in the short term. These actions had resulted in significant surpluses on the General Fund of £845,000 over the four-year period 2010–2013. These had helped to fund the lump sum of £2 million which had been needed for the Pension Fund and had avoided the need to sell investments which, in turn, would have further reduced income. It had also

been possible to increase investments by approximately £200,000 which in turn would produce future income. A number of legacies received had also been invested.

Current budgets reflected a phased reintroduction of building grants but that might not be possible given other financial pressures. Standing Committee recognised that there was understandable concern regarding the impact that a lack of provincial building grants support might have. However, such grants were one of the largest areas of discretionary spending within the budget. Mr Palmer was pleased that the Administration Board and the Conveners of the Finance and Buildings Committees were working together to consider how to deal with the fact that it might not be possible to reintroduce larger building grants.

A further area of financial pressure was the expected increase in the number of curates in the coming years. Budgets had been prepared on the assumption that five stipendiary curates would be appointed in 2014. Since preparing the budgets, one of those curates had in fact opted for a non-stipendiary curacy position but nevertheless the number of stipendiary curates was double the number appointed in any of the previous four years. This was a welcome and important addition to the life of the Church but had financial consequences. Also, the financial impact of the proposed changes recommended in the TISEC Review Working Party report could be significant.

Mr Palmer explained that a surplus of £28,781 was now budgeted for 2014. However, budgetary pressures were continuing and there were projected deficits for 2015 and 2016 on the General Fund of £69,085 and £180,197 respectively, albeit those figures were indicative only. As was noted in the budget report contained in the Synod papers, the indicative budgets did not include the likely costs associated with implementing some of the proposals emerging from the TISEC review. Had such costs been included, the budget deficits in 2015 and 2016 would have been in the region of £125,000 and £273,000 respectively. Synod would have the opportunity to hear more about the proposals later in the meeting. One of the key priorities for the Standing Committee in the coming year would be to review the priorities for expenditure. He emphasised that as outlined in the finance paper accompanying the TISEC Working Party Report, the changes being made in relation to training provision were broadly cost neutral. A number of the aspirations in the report, however, had significant cost implications and the Standing Committee would work with the College of Bishops and others to consider the most appropriate timescale for their implementation and the most suitable strategy for increasing income.

As far as the budget was concerned, the overall budget, including Miscellaneous and Restricted Funds showed a surplus of £56,621 for 2014 with deficits in 2015 and 2016 of £54,880 and £142,177 respectively. He emphasised that the 2015 and 2016 figures were indicative only and would be considered by the Standing Committee again in the autumn. As far as quota was concerned, it was proposed to increase Provincial quota to £678,602, an annual increase of £19,765 or 3%. That increase compared with RPI in April of 2.5% and CPI of 1.8%.

In closing, Mr Palmer explained that at General Synod 2013 there had been requests for a greater quantity of financial information to be provided. The Synod Papers contained such additional information which he hoped would be useful for members. There would also be an opportunity to discuss that information at a lunchtime meeting later in Synod.

Questions were invited but there were none.

2.1.3 Rules of Order

Mr Palmer explained that the Organisation Review Committee had recommended to the Standing Committee a couple of small alterations to the Rules of Order of Synod. At present, Rule 3 required members to stand and sit at various points. In the light of encouraging procedures which were as inclusive as possible of people with disabilities, the proposed change to Rule 3 would allow those who wished to speak simply to indicate this in a manner directed by the chairperson or by raising their hand. Similarly, the direction that a speaker should "sit down" when a point of order was raised would be altered such that the person speaking would be required simply to stop speaking until the question of order had been resolved.

Mr Palmer then proposed, and Mrs Anne Jones (member, Standing Committee) seconded, the following motion: –

"That Rule 3 of the Rules of Order be amended as follows:

- *by the substitution of the first sentence by the words*

"Members desiring to speak shall indicate their desire to do so in the manner directed by the person occupying the Chair, or in the absence of any other direction, by raising their hand."; and

- *by the substitution of the last sentence by the words*

"A member who is speaking when a question of order is raised shall stop speaking until the question of order has been decided by the person occupying the Chair.""

The motion was put to the vote and passed unanimously.

Mr Alan Rumble (Glasgow and Galloway) was concerned that in some places his Diocese was referred to in the Synod Papers as "Glasgow and Galloway" but in others simply as "Glasgow". He invited Standing Committee to address this and to ensure consistency.

Mr Palmer responded that this would be considered and apologised for instances where dioceses were not correctly designated.

The Chair expressed thanks to the Standing Committee for its work.

2.2 Rule 10 Motion

The Secretary General explained that a motion had been received under Rule 10 of the Rules of Order proposed by Dr Beth Routledge (Glasgow and Galloway), seconded by the Very Rev Andrew Swift (Argyll and the Isles) and signed by twelve other members of Synod. He further explained that under the Rules of Order, Dr Routledge was entitled to a maximum of two minutes to address Synod as to why the Synod ought to consider the motion. A two thirds majority of those present and voting was needed to enable the motion to be considered. If that majority was achieved, the substance of the motion would be debated later in Synod.

Dr Routledge then addressed Synod on the text of the following motion presented under Rule 10: –

This Synod notes:

- 1) *The recent passage of legislation which allows same-sex couples to marry in Scotland,*
- 2) *The principle which is now established in Scots law that no one should be forced to act against their conscience in this area,*
- 3) *That Scottish Episcopalians are not of one mind about these and other matters.*

This Synod resolves:

- 1) *For the wellbeing, peace, and mission of the Church, to endorse the principle that no one should be forced to act against their conscience in this area within the Church,*
- 2) *To request that the Faith and Order Board asks the Committee on Canons to draft an amendment to Canon 31 which will allow for the possibility of same-sex weddings taking place in the Scottish Episcopal Church whilst ensuring that no celebrant be compelled to act against their conscience in this area,*
- 3) *To consider such an amendment for First Reading at General Synod 2015, with consequent discussion in Diocesan Synods as an integral part of the Church's wider conversations within this area,*
- 4) *To notify dioceses immediately after this Synod as to how General Synod intends this matter to be considered.*

Dr Routledge explained that there had been a conversation on same-sex relationships in the Scottish Episcopal Church during the previous year through the Design Group and the Cascade Conversations which it had facilitated. The Conversations which had taken place in Pitlochry had been very positive experiences for many who were there, some of whom had signed the motion.

Whilst many Synod members might think that much time was already being spent at the current Synod talking about this very issue, she explained that Synod was not being given the opportunity to do so in open debate. The discussion planned for the following day was intended to be in the form of a presentation followed by table discussions only. If the Synod agreed to debate her motion on Saturday morning, that would be the only opportunity in the current year to talk about the issue together, as a whole Synod. The motion would allow the whole Church to take forward the positive things which had come out of the Cascade process.

Dr Routledge indicated that people had said to her to be patient and that the conversation would happen "next year, next year". However, the Church had not started talking the previous year with the commissioning of the Design Group - the Church had started talking about it long before the Scottish Government began to seek legislation for equal marriage. It was the case that people had been talking about the subject for years. There were Episcopalians who had been waiting for many years to be married, some of whom did not have a lot of "next years" left.

Dr Routledge said that there were Episcopalians of deep faith and good conscience who took a different view to her and who were frustrated and frightened by the Church's inability to talk openly about what might happen and what it might mean for them.

She was one of the youngest members of the Synod and was not an Episcopalian by birth but rather by choice. She had been proud to join the Church and call herself a member of it – of this Church with its rich history of synodical decision making, its long understanding that to accept more than one idea was to make the Church better and stronger and its deeply held tradition that all were welcome.

The Rt Rev Dr Bob Gillies (Bishop of Aberdeen and Orkney) requested that voting be by ballot.

The Chair called for a show of hands from the members of the houses of Synod. After a show of hands, the Chair declared that the requisite majority for conducting the vote by ballot had been achieved.

Ballot papers were distributed on whether the Synod should consider the Rule 10 motion. After a count, the Secretary General declared the results: 77 in favour, 54 against.

In the light of the fact that a two thirds majority of those present and voting was required, the Chair declared the motion not passed.

2.3 Faith and Order Board

2.3.1 Committee on Canons: Canons for Second Reading (Canon 63, Sections 1 and 4 – *Of the Office of Lay Representative*)

The Rt Rev Dr Gregor Duncan (Bishop of Glasgow and Galloway) explained that, as acting Convener of the Faith and Order Board, the Board determined policy and it was for the Committee on Canons to explain how proposed canonical changes implemented such policy. The policy in relation to Canon 63 was to tidy up the procedures for electing lay representatives and to make clear specifically who was entitled to vote in such elections.

The Rev Paul Romano (Convener, Committee on Canons) explained that the proposed alteration addressed two issues. In its current form, the Canon presupposed that there would always be a cleric in charge to oversee the election of a lay representative. The alteration addressed the situation where in fact there was no cleric in charge or where the cleric was unable, for whatever reason, to fulfil the necessary functions. The alterations also addressed the question as to whether or not a retired clergyperson could act as a lay representative. The answer was "no" and the alteration made clear that any lay communicant member was eligible to hold office as a lay representative or alternate lay representative.

Questions were invited but there were none.

The Bishop of Glasgow and Galloway then proposed, and Mr Romano seconded, the following motion: –

"That the amended text for Canon 63, Sections 1 and 4 be read for the second time."

The motion was then put to the vote in houses and passed by the requisite majorities as follows: –

House of Laity: passed unanimously
House of Clergy: passed unanimously
House of Bishops: passed unanimously

2.3.2 Liturgy Committee: Alterations to the Calendar

The Rt Rev Dr Gregor Duncan (Bishop of Glasgow and Galloway), as Acting Convener of the Faith and Order Board, explained that the policy of the Board in proposing a change to the Scottish Calendar of Saints was to make the Calendar as accurate as humanly possible.

The Rev Canon Ian Paton (Convener, Liturgy Committee) explained that he was retiring as Convener of the Committee at the current Synod. He then introduced the Rev Canon James Milne who had been appointed by the Faith and Order Board to succeed him as the Convener of the Liturgy Committee.

Canon Milne (Glasgow and Galloway) explained the proposed alteration to the Calendar. John Mason Neale had been a priest who had been very involved in the Oxford Movement and had translated many ancient hymns. He had died on 6 August which was the Feast of the Transfiguration and, therefore, could not be remembered on that day. The custom in such circumstances was to remember the individual on the closest available day. Most Anglican churches had chosen 7 August for that purpose. However, the Scottish Episcopal Church had not been able to remember him on that date because it had already been allocated to St Boisel. The previous year, the date for remembering St Boisel had been altered to the correct date, thereby freeing up 7 August. The proposed alteration was, therefore, to bring the Scottish Calendar into line with the rest of the Anglican Communion.

Canon Milne then proposed, and the Bishop of Glasgow and Galloway seconded, the following motion: –

"That the Scottish Calendar (1991) be amended such that the date of commemoration of John Mason Neale, Priest, 1866 be changed from 9 August to 7 August."

The motion was put to the vote and passed *nem con*, one abstention.

Canon Paton then reported on the work of the Liturgy Committee. In addition to the matters covered by the Committee's report in the Annual Report and Accounts for the year ended 31 December 2013, he explained that the experimental period for the Service of the Word had been extended by the College of Bishops until General Synod 2015. The Liturgy Committee was keen to receive feedback by the end of September 2014. There was a form available online and from the General Synod Office for people to provide feedback. Also, he informed Synod that the Eucharistic Prayer which had been used earlier in the day in the opening Eucharist had also been an experimental text. It had similarly been authorised for use until General Synod 2015 and feedback was also sought on it. It was based on the 1929 Scottish Prayer Book. For those who might wish to use it, it represented a bridge between the Church's Prayer Book tradition and the 1982 Liturgy.

As outgoing Convener, Canon Paton expressed his thanks to the Church for the opportunity to serve as Convener, and to members of the Committee and Elspeth Davey, its Secretary. There was currently much work ongoing in relation to pastoral rites. There was also work being done on collects and the Committee had been asked to think about work on the Eucharist in the future. One day, the question of a Scottish Prayer Book might be revisited. He wished the incoming Convener and the Committee all the best for the future. Liturgy was the heartbeat of the Scottish Episcopal Church, saving it from the tyranny of the "here and now".

Bishop Duncan thanked Canon Paton for all that he had done to help form the liturgical life of the Church. His contribution had been inestimable.

The Chair also expressed thanks to Canon Paton for his Convenership and to Bishop Duncan and all who served on the Faith and Order Board.

2.4 Information and Communication Board

The Very Rev Kelvin Holdsworth (Convener, Information and Communication Board) presented his final report as Convener. He explained that he had been involved in the life of the Board for most of the previous 16 years. As he now stood down from the Board, he reflected on how much the work of the Board had changed during that period. A whole information revolution had taken place. When he had first joined the Board, email had been something of a novelty and blogging was unheard of. The Board had generally been concerned with print medium and was, in effect, a small publishing house which produced a newspaper and a variety of small books, often local histories of one congregation or another. The Board also discussed the reprinting of Liturgies and this had now passed to the Liturgy Committee itself. As the world had changed, so had the work of the Board. The information produced in paper was now much less than that produced and distributed electronically.

One of the early developments during his own Convenership had been the production of *inspires online*. This was now a primary vehicle for communication within the Church. His expectation was that more narrowly targeted electronic publications would be coming. Throughout his Convenership the balance of what was produced online and what was produced in print had always been present. That issue would continue for the Board under a new Convener. He hoped that the collection of articles which constituted the printed version of *inspires* was a showcase for the Scottish Episcopal Church. As editor, he was in awe of those who wrote competently and speedily. While the quantity of printed material was less, he suggested that the quality of what was produced, for example in *inspires*, was rising. He was very grateful to those who used their imagination in the service of the Church.

Over the years, he had witnessed various incarnations of the Church's web presence. He recalled the time when through the website, the Church had offered an online prayer service. The facility had got a little out of hand when more than 400 prayer requests were being received each day. Earlier in the year, the latest incarnation of the website had been launched. A small team of members of the Board had worked under the leadership of the Rev Christopher Mayo to produce the new website. The Wordpress template which had been used for the website was owned by the Church and would be made available to congregations and dioceses who wished to have a site which looked similar. This would replace the template which Provost Holdsworth himself had produced a few years previously. In addition to the new website, the Board had also addressed a number of smaller matters. It had reviewed the heraldry of the Church. The "pub sign" had been digitised and the diocesan crests had been updated.

As he stepped down as Convener, he was very aware of how this area had become integral to the life of the Church. The lines of mission and communication were now more blurred than they had been previously. He suggested that in future mission and communication should be more closely linked.

In closing, he referred to his written report in the Annual Report and Accounts of the General Synod for the year ended 31 December 2013. He thanked all those who had been involved in this area of the Church's life. He had enjoyed being at its heart and working with other members of the Standing Committee. He offered his good wishes to all those who would carry on the work in the future.

Questions were invited but there were none.

The Chair thanked Provost Holdsworth for his report and for all that he had done as Convener of the Board and as a member of the Standing Committee.

2.5 College of Bishops

The Rt Rev Dr Nigel Peyton (Bishop of Brechin) and the Rt Rev Dr Bob Gillies (Bishop of Aberdeen and Orkney) made a joint presentation on what it meant to be a Bishop in mission, explaining that their presentation was intended to be personal rather than theoretical.

Both Bishops referred to the influences during their upbringing and training. Bishop Gillies had grown up within an elderly congregation but the vicar had instilled within him an appreciation of "holy ground". Bishop Peyton had grown up in a congregation in West London where new members simply seemed to arrive. "Mission" was seen as something which happened overseas. At seminary, Bishop Gillies had encountered clergy who gave him a sense of what it could mean to be part of a missionary Church. In curacies at Falkirk and Edinburgh he had also witnessed congregations which were growing in numbers. Bishop Peyton had trained at Coates Hall under Principal Alastair Haggart who had believed that the Scottish Episcopal Church could operate in all places throughout Scotland. Parish placements had allowed him to experience the breadth of Church life. He had left college in no doubt that clergy and congregations had to "read the context".

Bishop Gillies had been heartened over the years by the ways in which the Scottish Episcopal Church sought to do mission. However, he had also been disappointed in that whilst various initiatives had been adopted to enable the Church to become intentionally more missional, they had tended to last for three or four years and then been allowed to lapse. The Church had not shown a deliberate willingness to keep going with certain initiatives. There was a need to change a mindset within Church members deliberately to become intentionally missional. At a recent meeting, a Church member had asked "what is mission?". The answer to such a question was not in a definition but in the activity which arose when such a question was asked.

Bishop Peyton spoke of his work as a vicar in a deprived area in Nottingham. The ministry had been so demanding that the question of Church growth had not been "on the radar". However, around that time the Church of England had engaged in the Decade of Evangelism. This had had a profound effect by reminding him about the Mark of Mission regarding the proclaiming of the good news of the kingdom. It was important not to be shy of preaching the good news of Jesus Christ. It was possible to be a deeply liturgical and pastoral Church, as the Scottish Episcopal Church indeed was, whilst also proclaiming the good news. He was no longer prepared to accept that church was a shrinking entity, vacating public space. As a Bishop, he had encouraged his diocese to think about what it meant to grow in numbers and outreach. Many congregations did not really think about such questions.

Bishop Gillies said he liked to challenge the assertion that mission was "not about numbers". The more people who met to praise God and pray, the better. However, there was the question of how practically to achieve growth. For example, how could a congregation of only three grow? He suggested that all that was needed was for those three people to have a Transfiguration experience. That was the foundation for growth. The move from being disheartened to being confident was the beginnings of mission. Every congregation could do better in the future than it was doing at present. He accepted, however, that sometimes the Church's buildings did not aid mission. There was a case for reordering some buildings in the spirit of what had been done at St Paul's and St George's.

Bishop Peyton had given much thought to the use of buildings. In his own Diocese, Church buildings were not necessarily in the wrong place but thought needed to be given as to how and when such properties were used. Some congregations were small and struggling only if measured by attendance at Sunday morning services. Measuring life by the use of church halls would give a different picture. St Martin's in Dundee had attracted particular attention when the multi-storey flats on either side of it had been demolished. The city planners were now very interested in the area and he hoped that St Martin's could develop a fresh mission to the people of the Hilltown area.

Bishop Gillies acknowledged that congregations which wished to re-orientate their buildings could face resource questions. However, any congregation, however small, could learn to pray together – for example by introducing the Ministry of Healing. As a start towards intentional mission, he urged every Episcopalian to develop that sense of personal confidence so as to move into couples or triplets in prayer after a morning service. For Christians to pray together on God's grounding Church was a mark of growing confidence and could lead to the sharing of God's love with others.

Bishop Peyton asked what it meant to be a vestry in mission? Did vestry members attend meetings with an attitude to face challenges other than just buildings and maintenance? Did vestries study the Bible together and think spiritually together? The answers to such questions were a measure of the Church's missional intent.

The Chair expressed thanks to both Bishops for sharing their reflections and insights.

2.6 Thanks to the Rev Canon Dr Michael Fuller

The Primus paid tribute to the Rev Canon Dr Michael Fuller who would be leaving TISEC at the end of August 2014. There was a close connection between TISEC, (and its successor the Scottish Episcopal Institute) with the College of Bishops because, ultimately, it was members of the College who decided whether an individual was to be ordained. Changes impacted on people and in moving from TISEC to the new Scottish Episcopal Institute he was aware of the "heart and soul" commitment of many people involved in training and, in particular, Dr Fuller. Dr Fuller had shown immense goodwill and graciousness. The Primus expressed thanks to him for all he had done since joining TISEC in 2000. Whilst conscious of the partnership between clergy and laity, it was in the training of clergy, in particular, that the quality of the next generation of the Church was defined. Dr Fuller had worked unstintingly, with limited resources, to provide quality of training and had helped to shape a generation of clergy.

The Primus presented a gift to Dr Fuller.

Dr Fuller thanked the Primus for his words. It had been a great privilege to serve the Scottish Episcopal Church in TISEC for the previous 14 years. He offered heartfelt thanks to all those who had played a key role during that time. In particular, he thanked Professor Judith George, Dr Peter Smart and the Very Rev Susan Macdonald who had served as Conveners of the Ministry Development Committee, the central staff, in particular, Mrs Denise Brunton, all of the academic co-ordinators, including the Rev Canon Ian Paton, those in the dioceses who had co-ordinated the work of TISEC and all those who had been students and constituted the learning community. He joined with all of those individuals in offering his prayers and best wishes to those who would be involved in the work of the new Institute including the Rev Canon Dr Anne Tomlinson and others who would be appointed in future.

Session 3 - Mr David Palmer in the Chair

3.1 Greetings from Ecumenical Delegate

The Chair invited the Rev Matthew Ross, General Secretary of Action of Churches Together in Scotland, to address Synod.

Mr Ross expressed thanks, on behalf of the ecumenical delegates at Synod, for Synod's welcome, friendship and hospitality. It was a great joy to gather with brothers and sisters in Christ in taking seriously the prayer of Christ "that they may all be one".

He explained that 24 years previously nine of Scottish churches, including the Scottish Episcopal Church, had created Action of Churches Together in Scotland (ACTS). The model of being "churches together" was essential because ecumenical relationships could not be something which "someone else does" – everyone was in it together.

In April he had had the privilege of succeeding Brother Stephen Smyth as General Secretary. Previously he had served in parish ministry in Fife and Midlothian as well as spending six years working for the Conference of European Churches in Brussels. He had been touched by the Primus' letter to him upon appointment.

Shortly before his appointment, Mr Ross explained that ACTS had undergone some significant changes. The previous ACTS networks had been replaced by fixed term programme work. Underpinning all of this was a commitment to prioritising ecumenical work at local level. The Scottish Churches' National Sponsoring Body for Local Ecumenical Partnerships had been given a new name and an expanded remit – the "Ecumenical Development Group" was now a core part of ACTS and would give practical, theoretical and administrative support to local ecumenical partnerships and other local forms of co-operation. Organic growth towards unity and an emphasis on value for money might seem unspectacular but could prove crucial for many congregations. The churches of all denominations faced challenges in the years and decades ahead. Both human and financial resources were coming under considerable strain. Declining congregations were not confined to a single denomination and some church buildings were becoming problematic and unaffordable. Effective outreach and mission in Scotland was beyond the ability of any one denomination. In short, could the denominations share? Through effective co-operation, trust and good communication, resources could be maximised so that Christ's prayer of unity could be lived out.

Ecumenism had been treated with suspicion by some in the past, with unity becoming confused with uniformity. The heritage, presence and future witness of the Scottish Episcopal Church was vital to Christianity in Scotland and the other denominations would be diminished without the Scottish Episcopal Church. An example of this was the recent Grosvenor Essay on Scottish Identity to which he had been delighted to be asked to make a contribution. The Essay was a well-informed contribution to the current Scottish independence constitutional debate.

Mr Ross thanked all those from the Scottish Episcopal Church involved in the work of ACTS including Helen Hood, Elspeth Davey, the Rev Canon John Lindsay, the Bishop of Aberdeen and Orkney and the Primus. Ecumenical relations were as much about journeying together as arriving at a destination. He exhorted the Synod to enjoy journeying together.

Mr Ross indicated he was willing to answer questions.

Mrs Pat Boyd (Edinburgh) explained that she was an Episcopalian member on the Scottish Churches' Education Group. In that capacity, she had been asked to take part in a working group to produce Bible studies for churches to use in the run-up to the independence Referendum. She wondered whether the material had been disseminated.

Mrs Helen Hood (Edinburgh), speaking as the Convener of ACTS, explained that the material entitled *Values for Scotland* was available for downloading from the ACTS website. Limited hard copies had been produced and a small number had been provided to the General Synod Office. Mr Ross added that copies had been sent to all ACTS member churches. Also, he expected the ACTS website to be upgraded in the coming weeks.

The Rev Dr David Easton (Methodist Church in Scotland) mentioned that a Referendum conference had taken place earlier in the year. At that conference, it had been reported that material would be available for churches around the time of the Referendum. He asked that ACTS promote the material as far as possible. Mr Ross responded that the material would be available on the ACTS website during July in good time for use at the time of the Referendum.

The Chair expressed the thanks of Synod to Mr Ross.

3.2 Faith and Order Board: Inter-Church Relations Committee

The Rev Canon John Lindsay (Convener, Inter-Church Relations Committee) drew attention to the Committee report in the Annual Report and Accounts of the General Synod for the year ended 31 December 2013. He expressed a welcome to the Rev Matthew Ross as General Secretary of ACTS. Canon Lindsay also wished a fond farewell to Major Alan Dixon of the Salvation Army who would retire shortly.

Canon Lindsay reported that the Rev Sandy Montgomerie had accepted the invitation to represent the Scottish Episcopal Church on the new Ecumenical Development Group of ACTS. With the sanction of the Faith and Order Board, the Committee would explore the possible extension of existing ecumenical agreements to churches with parallel agreements – in particular in relation to Lutheran and Anglican churches in North America. This was known as "transitivity".

Questions were invited on the general work of the Committee but there were none.

3.2.1 10th Assembly of the World Council of Churches (WCC)

Canon Lindsay explained that three motions on the Synod agenda related to the World Council of Churches' Assembly in Busan which he and Elspeth Davey had attended on behalf of the Church. The Assembly had met in plenary and there had been a number of difficult business issues. The Assembly had produced four documents two of which came to the General Synod at its present meeting. The other two comprised a statement on mission which was being passed to the Mission and Ministry Board and *The Church: Towards a Common Vision* which was a sequel to *Baptism, Eucharist, Ministry*. Both were available from the WCC website and also the Church of Scotland website. He had been a member of the Church of Scotland Ecumenical Relations Committee for a number of years and it had been a godsend.

Canon Lindsay then proposed, and the Bishop of Glasgow and Galloway seconded, the following motion: –

"That this Synod receive and take note of the Message of the 10th World Council of Churches Assembly."

The motion was put to the vote and passed *nem con*, one abstention.

Canon Lindsay explained that a study guide had been produced by Scottish delegates who had attended the WCC assembly. He then proposed, and the Bishop of Glasgow and Galloway seconded, the following motion: –

"That this Synod receive the Unity Statement adopted by the 10th World Council of Churches Assembly and commend it for discussion to the Boards of the General Synod and to the dioceses and congregations of the Church."

Comment was invited but there was none.

The motion was put to the vote and passed by majority, two against, one abstention.

Canon Lindsay proposed, and the Bishop of Glasgow and Galloway seconded, the following motion: –

"That this Synod note the production of a Study Guide regarding the Unity Statement adopted by the 10th World Council of Churches Assembly and commend the Study Guide for use in dioceses and congregations of the Church."

Comment was invited but there was none.

The motion was put to the vote and passed by majority one against, two abstentions.

3.2.2 The Porvoo Communion of Churches

Canon Lindsay explained that from time to time it was necessary to alter the Schedule to Canon 15 which set out the list of Churches with whom the Scottish Episcopal Church regarded itself as being in full Communion. The Schedule already included the Churches of the Porvoo Communion. Two further Churches were about to sign the Porvoo Agreement and the motion which he would propose shortly was so that the Synod could consent to the addition of those Churches to the Schedule. The Churches in question were the Latvian Evangelical Lutheran Church Abroad and the Lutheran Church in Great Britain.

Canon Lindsay then proposed, and the Bishop of Glasgow and Galloway seconded, the following motion: –

"That this Synod consent to the Episcopal Synod adding to the list of Churches contained in the Schedule to Canon 15 each of the Latvian Evangelical Lutheran Church Abroad and the Lutheran Church in Great Britain, conditionally upon each of those churches signing their agreement to the Porvoo Declaration, so that following addition by the Episcopal Synod, the Schedule to Canon 15 would be altered by the deletion of the word "and" before the words "The Evangelical Lutheran Church in Denmark" and the addition at the end of the Schedule of the words "and the Latvian Evangelical Lutheran Church Abroad and the Lutheran Church in Great Britain"."

The Rev Markus Duenzkofer (Edinburgh) supported the motion but considered that it changed the character of the Porvoo Communion. That Communion had originally been set up on a geographical basis and the admission of the proposed additional Churches would alter that. He, therefore, wished clarity on the effect which the admission of the additional Churches would have upon overlapping jurisdictions. For example, in Edinburgh there was a church which belonged to the Lutheran Church in Great Britain and he wondered what the implications would be. Also, he wondered whether there had been any consultations with other full Communion partners in Europe about the proposed changes.

The Rt Rev Dr Nigel Peyton (Bishop of Brechin) wished to support the motion warmly. He explained that from time to time Lutheran clergy came to Scotland from North America. An individual who was a priest in the Lutheran Church in Canada would not be authorised under current Canons to minister in Scotland. However, if such an individual were a Lutheran minister in the Lutheran Church in Great Britain then such a person would become part of Porvoo.

The Very Rev Kelvin Holdsworth (Convener, Information and Communication Board) asked about the limits of transitivity. He wondered whether any Lutheran could join the Lutheran Church in Great Britain and thereby find themselves in full Communion with the Scottish Episcopal Church?

Canon Lindsay responded to the questions by explaining that the motion was to add two Churches which admittedly had not been part of the process which had led to the original Porvoo agreement. Initially in the life of the Porvoo Communion, it had been clear to the Contact Group and the Primates that only those churches which had been involved in the original discussions would be members of the Porvoo Communion. However, that door had been opened when the indigenous Anglican churches in Spain and Portugal had been admitted to Porvoo under the auspices of the Church of England's Diocese of Europe. He understood the concerns raised by Mr Duenzkofer but indicated that the Churches in question had gone through due process and the Primates of the Porvoo Communion had agreed to their admission.

Turning to the question of transitivity, Canon Lindsay indicated that this had been discussed at the Faith and Order Board which had agreed that further exploration should be conducted. It would involve looking carefully at the documentation which described the nature of other agreements. If the principle were adopted, it would only currently apply in relation to Anglicans and Lutherans. Apart from Porvoo, the only other full Communion agreements between Anglicans and Lutherans appeared to be in the USA, Canada and Tanzania. On the question of limits, Canon Lindsay said that matters were restricted to Anglicans and Lutherans. It would, therefore, be true that if the motion were adopted then there would be full interchangeability between members and clergy between the Scottish Episcopal Church and any churches which were members of the Lutheran Church in Great Britain.

The Rt Rev Dr Gregor Duncan (Bishop of Glasgow and Galloway) explained that the motion in question was not one about transitivity but was a distinct issue arising from the admission of the two additional Churches in question to Porvoo. It was important that Synod appreciated that. Transitivity was a hugely complex and distinct issue.

Mr Duenzkofer indicated that his second question about consultation had not been answered. In particular, he wondered whether there had been consultation with the Old Catholic Churches in Europe because he was aware that there had been some concern on their part about Anglicans entering into full Communion agreements with other churches on the continent. He suggested that overlapping jurisdictions might be counter-productive to the ecumenical movement. Canon Lindsay responded that the Old Catholics had been observers in the consultation leading to the original Porvoo agreement. He agreed that they had been upset by Anglicans moving towards full Communion arrangement with Lutherans. It was not a huge issue in Scotland because there were not many Old Catholics in Scotland.

The Rev Canon Dr Isaac Poobalan (Aberdeen and Orkney) commented that there were limitations to joint prayer in the ecumenical sphere. At the Roman Catholic Mass whilst a Bishop could turn the elements into the body and blood of Christ, he could not allow an Episcopalian to receive the Sacrament. It was, therefore, necessary to live with certain limitations.

The motion was then put to the vote and passed *nem con*, one abstention.

Session 4 - The Rt Rev the Bishop of Aberdeen and Orkney in the Chair

4.1 Committee for the Protection of Children and Vulnerable Adults

Mr Hugh Donald (Convener, Committee for the Protection of Children and Vulnerable Adults) referred to the report of his Committee appearing in the Annual Report and Accounts of the General Synod for the year ended 31 December 2013. Work on the implications for the Scottish Episcopal Church of the Anglican Consultative Council's Safe Church Charter was still ongoing. A specific item arising out of the Committee's work during the year had been to ensure that training received the necessary emphasis. This was being addressed in the current year and Mr Donald thanked the College of Bishops who had commended the undertaking of training. He encouraged people to take part in regional training events as they were organised and publicised.

In the previous year, there had been a heightening in society generally of awareness of historic abuse. The Church had procedures in place to address such matters. Also, considerable effort continued to be dedicated to retrospective admission of individuals to the Protection of Vulnerable Groups scheme. Unfortunately, the return rate of forms, owing to inaccuracies, was high and he encouraged Church members to bear with General Synod Office staff where they required to correct inaccuracies on forms which had been submitted to them. He expressed thanks to Donald Urquhart, Daphne Audsley and Betty Robertson for their work in the area of safeguarding.

Questions were invited.

The Rev Peter Harris (Edinburgh) asked why it appeared to be the case that if individuals were being admitted to the PVG scheme for roles in different organisations there appeared to be a need to pay the admission fee twice. Daphne Audsley, speaking with permission, indicated that the system was designed to operate so that only one payment was made. There ought to be an appropriate linking up where an individual undertook work in different organisations.

The Chair thanked Mr Donald for the work of his Committee.

4.2 Mission and Ministry Board

4.2.1 Whole Church Mission and Ministry Policy

Synod granted permission to speak to Mrs Gill Young and Mrs Lorraine Darlow. The Chair also explained that the procedural motion appearing in the agenda for the current session did not require to be put to Synod because the presentation to be given on behalf of the Home Mission Committee, as now proposed, would fall within the scope of the existing Rules of Order.

The Primus introduced the session. He indicated that the appointment of the Rev Canon Dr Anne Tomlinson as the Principal of the new Scottish Episcopal Institute had been greeted with immense pleasure across the Church. No one knew the Church better than she did and she was known for the rigour of her work and her generosity. The new Institute would equip the next generation of those in authorised ministry to provide leadership within the Church.

The Primus reported that the Church had now travelled a long way in its Whole Church Mission and Ministry Policy and this was linked to the movement from TISEC to the new Scottish Episcopal Institute. As part of that, the Mission and Ministry Board would in future become a Mission Board. The Policy articulated the principle of the diocese as the focus for mission, with Bishops acting as leaders in mission. This was no longer an aspiration but a reality. The Church had let go of the idea of central policy being delivered by provincial officers working across the Province. The challenge now was how to prevent seven different approaches and to ensure an acceptable level of coherence.

The Rev Canon Fay Lamont (Convener, Home Mission Committee) reminded Synod that the primacy of mission had been affirmed in the Whole Church Mission and Ministry Policy which recognised the diocese as the focus for mission and Diocesan Bishops as leaders in mission. Since Synod 2013, the Home Mission Committee had been working steadily towards establishing networks in the following areas: youth, children, mission initiatives, stewardship, spirituality, lay learning and rural issues. The networks would support inter-diocesan collaboration for the sharing of information, planning and good practice thereby helping to maximise the resources invested in mission and strengthen the work across the Province. It was important that they gathered together those from across the dioceses who were called and who were passionate about particular areas of mission and who also had the necessary skills and practitioner experience in order to maximise potential.

Canon Lamont hoped that this would bring a degree of provincial coherence to the Church's mission without imposing significant burdens of infrastructure. The networks would operate on a "light touch" basis and would not simply add a new layer of committees to existing structures. How the networks might operate had not been prescribed and it would be for each network to determine for itself its own means of working. It was hoped that contact would be easier, regular and cheaper, saving time, energy, travel miles and paper, by encouraging contact through the website, email, telephone or social media. The new provincial website would offer fresh possibilities for interactive communication. The province would maintain broad oversight in relation to the networks and the Home Mission Committee intended to bring the co-ordinators of the networks together and would do so from time to time to enable connections to be made between work being undertaken by different networks so that no single network would operate in isolation. It was envisaged that the new Mission Board would effectively be the appropriate provincial body to offer that oversight.

Canon Lamont introduced the Rev Tembu Rongong, Convener of the Youth Committee.

Mr Rongong, speaking with permission, explained that "life story" was the theme of Glenalmond 2014 – the life of Jesus and of everyone else. Bookings could still be accepted and details were available on the provincial website.

Canon Lamont indicated that she was currently the Co-ordinator of the Stewardship Network. Referring to the question asked earlier in the Synod about responsibility for stewardship, she suggested that dioceses had a responsibility to provide leadership. If Synod members knew of any person who was passionate about stewardship she would be pleased to hear from them.

Reporting that the Rev Lisa Eunson was the Co-ordinator of the Lay Learning Network and that the Rev Prof David Atkinson was the Co-ordinator of the Rural Issues Network, Canon Lamont introduced the Rev Canon Fred Tomlinson as the co-ordinator of the Spirituality Network.

Canon Tomlinson (Edinburgh) explained how he envisaged the Spirituality Network operating. For a number of years he had received reports from those in the dioceses responsible for organising retreats. Small grants were provided to dioceses by the Home Mission Committee for this. However, he had had a sense that more could be done together and was therefore encouraged when the idea of networks emerged. He had been struck by the idea of retreats being focused on different groups of people at different stages in life but, having had no direct experience of such retreats, wanted to find out from others who had such experience. He had therefore been pleased to hear from the Rev Paddy Allen.

The Rev Paddy Allen (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) said it had been good to have had the approach from Canon Tomlinson. Retreats were a very powerful mission tool. She spoke of her personal experience of retreats which had been profound and had enabled her to meet God in a more authentic way. Many people outside the Church went on retreats such as business or art retreats.

Canon Lamont then introduced Mrs Lorraine Darlow as the Co-ordinator of the Children's Network.

Mrs Darlow explained that the Network aimed to encourage dioceses and local churches to consider how their involvement with children might grow and develop. She commented on six areas. Nurturing spirituality meant affirming children as whole spiritual persons. They had innate spiritual sensitivity and had much to teach adults. Supporting the faith formation of children meant recognising that belonging to the family of faith was a key aspect for the faith formation of a child. However, some traditional models of discipleship among children had often looked to separate children from adults and segregate them by age ranges. The paradigm of ministry among children was shifting with a greater emphasis on modelling Christian life and worship. There was a huge amount of resources available to help equip the Church and parents for the discipling of children. Involving children in worship could be problematic for many churches and yet was a real priority. If gathered worship had the potential to be not only formational but transformational then there was a need to explore how the Church could engage children in the full worshipping life of a congregation, including Communion. Being child and family friendly meant making room for children and letting them know that they belonged and were free to participate. If that were to happen, there was a need seriously to reflect on how best to welcome and make provision for children and families.

Several denominations had invested in developing Child Friendly Church initiatives and awards and work had already taken place in at least one diocese in Scotland. The aim of this was to encourage churches to assess, develop and regularly review their practices in order to make church gatherings child and family friendly. Simple things such as ensuring that children could see what was happening during a service or considering the way words and images were used would help to include children. A CFC programme could provide mechanisms for a church to develop its provision as part of the mission of the congregation. The Network could help in the utilising of resources by sharing information as to what might be appropriate in terms of materials for different contexts. One example was *Godly Play* which was being used more and more with all ages, not just children. Finally, providing support and development for those working with children, whether clergy, paid workers or volunteers was important. One means of support was the provision of appropriate training. *Core Skills in Children's Work* was a foundational six session course developed by the Consultative Group on Ministry among Children (a network of Churches Together in Britain and Ireland). It covered topics such as child development, teamwork, programme planning, children and community, pastoral awareness, using the Bible with children and prayer. She encouraged people to join in the conversation through the Children's Network Facebook page.

Canon Lamont then introduced Mrs Gill Young, the Co-ordinator of the Mission Initiatives Network. Mrs Young suggested that the advent of the networks meant a change from a top-down approach to one that was horizontal across dioceses. Each diocese had its own way of organising its mission and all congregations had their own calling. She was in contact with people across the dioceses in the various diocesan initiatives for mission. Later that month, a meeting of mission action facilitators from the Dioceses of Glasgow and Galloway and St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane would take place. The networks were a means of encouraging informal communication. She encouraged diocesan Mission Officers to be in touch with her.

Canon Lamont thanked all of the Network Co-ordinators for their contributions. Questions were invited.

Dr Peter Kemp (Argyll and the Isles) welcomed the emphasis being placed on dioceses and charges in relation to mission. He was excited by the establishment of the networks but suggested that proposals in the Digest of Resolutions appeared to recreate the old structure. He believed that the future lay with the networks and that alterations to the Digest of Resolutions to be proposed the following year should include reference to the networks and invest them with appropriate authority.

4.2.2 TISEC Review

The Rt Rev Kevin Pearson (Bishop of Argyll and the Isles) reported as Convener of the Scottish Episcopal Institute Implementation Group and as a member of the TISEC Review Working Party. He explained that the Working Party had commenced its work under the Convenership of the Rev Canon Anne Dyer and when she had, unfortunately, had to withdraw for health reasons, Bishop Pearson had taken over the Convenership. He thanked Canon Dyer for her work and support throughout.

The Implementation Group had worked very hard to meet the deadlines dictated by meetings of the Mission and Ministry Board, the College of Bishops and the Standing Committee. He paid tribute to Dr Fuller without whose work and wisdom the Implementation Group would not have been able to complete its task. He wished to report under the headings mission, ministry and money.

As to mission, this was the context within which the reports were presented to Synod. The reports were contained in the Synod Papers and he wished to remind Synod of the ethos within which the work had been carried out. Mission was the gospel imperative. In terms of the Scottish Episcopal Church motto, "Evangelical Truth and Apostolic Order" it was the case that mission made real the Word of God as the Church sought his truth and apostolic order made real the sacramental hope of drawing closer to God. The reports and the recommendations within them had been made in the context of the real excitement that, in mission, the Scottish Episcopal Church had something to offer the whole community in Scotland. The holistic approach of the Whole Church Policy was working. The networks pointed to inter-diocesan co-operation which came out of a deep desire to preach the gospel and make God's love real. He did not subscribe to the view that the mission initiatives of the previous 35 years had been temporary enthusiasms which had disappeared. They had in fact made the Scottish Episcopal Church the Church which it was today. The insights of local collaborative ministry had shown that there were real benefits when the Province acted as a whole. Mission for Mission had reminded the Church that if it was not to retreat into cathedrals and leafy suburbs but to remain committed to the whole country, there was a need to grapple with real issues such as rural poverty.

As to ministry, Bishop Pearson said that ministry was that of the whole people of God in which some were called to the specific orders of bishops, priests and deacons. The Quality in Formation Panel report which had been received in 2013 had marked TISEC's coming of age and took up matters which had been on the agenda for some time, including governance, staffing and the placement of curates. The formation of those who exercised ordained ministry in the Church was crucial to the future health and growth of the Church's mission. Formation took prayer and the sacramental life as the basis for all theological reflection and encouraged the individual to seek God as a disciple. The false distinction between initial ministerial education and subsequent years was broken down in the reports. Theological reflection was the tool of ordained ministry which constantly needed use and renewal.

The adoption of the Common Awards validation procedure under the University of Durham was an exciting development in the context of theological study and formation. It would also give the Scottish Episcopal Church the chance to have its own customised validation approach and Dr Tomlinson would lead the process in ensuring that the Scottish Episcopal Church had a programme which suited its own needs. The fact that the report on formation referred to the role of Bishops was very important because it made clear that the role of the Bishop was not just a supervisory one but pointed to the fact that the Bishops were themselves involved in the formational process in their own ministries. The College of Bishops had embraced unanimously and enthusiastically the insights of the report. It was important to note that the Primus had taken the initiative earlier in the year to bring together ecumenical partners to discuss formational issues. TISEC had always worked closely with ecumenical colleagues and the new Institute would continue to do so. Also, at a training day organised by the Provincial Director of Ordinands earlier in the year, Church of England staff had made a major contribution. The same staff had visited the Church of Scotland the following day and explained how and why the recruitment and selection procedures worked so well in the Scottish Episcopal Church. In the United States, Anglican formational training was now seen as a paradigm of business leadership.

TISEC's coming of age could also be seen in relation to lay readership. Lay readers were an incredible asset in the Church and represented a theological resource in congregations which was why canonically they were authorised to preach. They too needed to spend time in a formational context together all of which could be done in the Institute. The reports enunciated an appreciation for that particular ministry.

The governance structures proposed for the new Institute reflected the Church's new confidence in mission. The 35, or more, bodies responsible to, for, or with TISEC were to be replaced by a single Institute Council.

As to money, Bishop Pearson explained that the financial paper included in the Synod Papers pointed to the fact that the training programme would in fact be cost neutral. The big questions arose in relation to full-time training grants and curacy grants which at the present time were aspirational. Over many years, Synod had acknowledged the need to invest more in theological training and formation. The aspirations for more ordinands and more curates could be met if every communicant member of the Church gave £10 extra each year for the sole purpose of ordination training. The College of Bishops had pledged that their individual Lent Appeals in 2015 (or in the Diocese of Aberdeen and Orkney in 2016) would be dedicated to the new training fund. Collections at ordinations would likewise be donated to that fund. It was a very small beginning but represented a pledge to and for the future.

Bishop Pearson commended the reports and the motions in the Synod Papers to Synod.

The Venerable Christine Wilson (Church of England), speaking with permission, indicated how excited she was by the powerful and confident report. She had worked as a vocations consultant and she was delighted that the report contained an emphasis on the formation of the whole people of God out of which ministerial formation emerged. She was excited by the sense of people being equipped for mission and evangelism and she intended to take the report back to the Church of England.

Bishop Pearson indicated that the Church of England had commended the Scottish Episcopal Church for the speed and quality of its response to the Quality in Formation Panel report of 2013.

He explained that the Synod would shortly be invited to go into group discussion and provide feedback on flipcharts and that during the forthcoming coffee break, the Rev Dean Fostekew would endeavour to extract common themes from the flipcharts. Also, during the coffee break, the Primus and he would be willing to answer detailed questions from any members of Synod arising from the material being presented to Synod.

Mr David Palmer (Convener, Standing Committee) then proposed, and Mrs Anne Jones (member, Standing Committee) seconded, the following motion: –

"That the Synod meet in groups for informal discussion of this item under Rule 4 (c)."

The motion was put to the vote and passed.

The Synod then discussed the following questions in groups: –

1. What qualities do you hope to see in your clergy?
2. Should ordination training be purely academic or practical as well?
3. What skills do clergy need in today's Church and society?
4. What is the best way of equipping those training for ministry to become effective ministers and leaders?

Following discussion in groups, questions were invited.

The Rev David McCarthy (Glasgow and Galloway) asked whether there were any plans to change current recruitment and selection procedures, which involved the use of Church of England Bishops' Advisory Panels, and in particular whether the Scottish Episcopal Church ought to think more independently.

Mr Kennedy Fraser (Glasgow and Galloway) noted from the report that whereas six pages were devoted to recruitment and selection for ordinands, lay readers received only half a page. The questions which the Synod discussion groups had been asked to consider related only to clergy. There was, therefore, a question as to how the Church viewed its readers. There was also the question of the recruitment of younger people into the reader ministry. He himself was the youngest reader in his diocese. At a recent provincial conference for readers, there had been discussion as to whether the demands of reader training were too much for those in their 20s, 30s and 40s.

The Rev Canon Dr Isaac Poobalan (Aberdeen and Orkney) said that today was a day of thanksgiving for the life of Henry Scougal, a Professor of Divinity in Aberdeen, who had died in the 17th century. Some of his work was available on Google books and he commended the speech made to the Diocesan Synod in 1674 which was entitled *Of the Importance and Difficulty of the Ministerial Function*.

Mr Gordon Aitken (Brechin) indicated from his experience of working with young people that many of them worried about job security. If the Church were to encourage younger people to enter the ministry there was a question as to whether or not the Church would be able to assure them that there would be a place available for them on completion of training.

The Rev Canon Ian Paton (Edinburgh) indicated that he had taught for many years within TISEC. He welcomed the report. It placed considerable emphasis on curacies but made no mention of placements as part of the training process. He wished to emphasise the importance of such placements. He suggested that thought needed to be given to how support was given to those who supervised placements or curacies.

The Rev Ruth Innes (Edinburgh) expressed thanks for the report and for Bishop Pearson's passion. She offered £10 to start the funding appeal at once instead of waiting until Lent 2015.

Dr Beth Routledge (Glasgow and Galloway) asked about post-ordination support. She worked for the NHS and following graduation medics were offered a two-year period of support from their higher education institution. This was important for individuals going into jobs where there were significant demands. She expressed enthusiasm for the notion of the Scottish Episcopal Institute taking on post-ordination support. She noted that the Rev Canon Malcolm Round had commented earlier in the year on the need for clergy support.

Mrs Kate Sainsbury (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) wondered whether there could be a wider way of viewing ministry that was not sharply differentiated between stipendiary and non-stipendiary but which would allow people "in the world" to remain in the world. Some financial support could help support such ministry.

The Rev Anne Haselhurst (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) indicated that she had a responsibility to look after the newly ordained and newly licensed readers. She wondered whether people directed to train as either readers or clergy were sufficiently clear about what their vocation was. There was a need for a clearer understanding of vocation.

The Rev Canon James Milne (Glasgow and Galloway) wondered whether, if stipendiary clergy were not "in the world", then where were they?

Prof Alan Werritty (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) said there was a vital need for continuing ministerial development. Post-ordination support had been touched upon but there was a need to take that further into areas of appraisal and continuing development.

Bishop Pearson responded to points raised.

He explained that there were no plans to change the current system of using Church of England Bishops' Advisory Panels. Such Panels happened on a regular basis (almost weekly) and provided an objective view. Speaking as a former Provincial Director of Ordinands, he explained that in the past Panel advisers had received threats of physical violence by non-recommended candidates. Whilst it was possible for the Scottish Episcopal Church to do much on its own the external objectivity provided by Bishops' Advisory Panels was very helpful. It was the case that there were Scottish selectors used as part of the Bishops' Advisory Panel system. He was also aware that the current Provincial Director of Ordinands was providing significant input to the Church of England processes. Whilst there were no plans to change, the question was kept under continuing review.

On the question of lay readership, Bishop Pearson accepted that the report was thin on that point. One of the reasons that lay readership was not recruiting younger people at the present time was because, for many years in the province, there had been a lack of clarity about the role of lay readers. The review report, however, appreciated the very distinctive nature of lay readership and acknowledged that lay readers were not clergy. There was a constant tension which needed to be acknowledged and made creative.

On the question of younger people, Bishop Pearson suggested that they were much more adventurous than they were given credit for. Their vocations were being nurtured in many ways and taken seriously. He confirmed that there would be a job at the end of the training process but he could not confirm the parameters within which that ministry would be exercised. The Church had changed significantly in the previous 35 years since his own ordination and patterns of ministry were evolving. New patterns of ministry were being explored. For example, Evening Prayer at Synod the previous day had been led by an intern at St Paul's and St George's.

In relation to curacies and placements, Bishop Pearson said that those who acted as supervisors were heroes because such supervisory work was hard work, and if it was not hard work, the job was not being done properly. A curate was not "an extra pair of hands". There was a need to ensure that students were placed with those who had the appropriate expertise.

On the question of fundraising, Bishop Pearson asked Synod not to despise the offer made by the Rev Ruth Innes. The hospice movement in Scotland had started in a similar way.

As to higher education and support, there were a number of questions. It was essential that continuing ministerial development included support for people in the field. Stipendiary clergy could feel very demoralised at times because other people did not seem to understand what it was like to sustain ministry week by week. However, it was important that clergy used the sources of expertise available. Appraisal and ministerial review were already available as tools for continuing ministry. He personally had found appraisal very helpful throughout his ministry.

On the question of clarity in vocation he agreed wholeheartedly - lay readership was not a consolation prize for those who were not recommended for ordination.

Bishop Pearson then proposed, and the Primus seconded, the following motion: –

"That the amended text for Canon 52, Section 23 be read for the first time."

The motion was then put to the vote in houses and passed by the requisite majorities as follows: –

House of Laity: passed *nem con*, one abstention

House of Clergy: passed by majority, one against, one abstention

House of Bishops: passed unanimously.

Bishop Pearson then proposed, and the Primus seconded, the following motion: –

"That for the period from General Synod 2014 until General Synod 2015, the role of the Ministry Development Committee be suspended and that all of its functions be undertaken by a body to be appointed by the Standing Committee and to comprise a convener and such other members as have appropriate skills and experience to manage the transition of the Theological Institute of the Scottish Episcopal Church into the Scottish Episcopal Institute."

The Rev Ken Webb (Edinburgh) spoke in favour of the motion. He asked that the new body should take account of the vast amount of experience which was already present among those involved in delivery of training "on the ground". The body should, therefore, include someone who had experience of "frontline" delivery in the dioceses. Also, would the body include ecumenical representation?

The Chair indicated that those comments were noted.

The motion was put to the vote and passed *nem con*, with two abstentions.

The Rev Markus Duenzkofer (Edinburgh) indicated that he would be happy to organise a collection during Evening Prayer later in the day to support the fundraising for training. The Chair noted that this raised a point of order which the Assessor would consider.

Session 5 - The Rt Rev the Bishop of Moray, Ross and Caithness in the Chair

5.1 Mission and Ministry Board

5.1 Mission and Ministry Board: TISEC review (continued)

The Bishop of Argyll and the Isles reported that the questions which he and his colleagues had been asked during the coffee break at the end of the previous session had been incredibly positive. Synod members had appeared "lit up" by what was going on. He suggested that this was a "Holy Spirit moment" in the life of the Scottish Episcopal Church. He reported that the Rev Dean Fostekew had reviewed the flipchart responses. Some of the issues mentioned had been the need for prophetic and challenging leadership, the need for training to be both practical and academic, the importance of reflective practice, the need for those in ministry to have good communication and people skills and for the different pathways available for training to be used. He thanked all Synod members for their engagement with the process.

5.2 Mission and Ministry Board (continued)

5.2.1 Ministry Development Committee

The Very Rev Susan Macdonald (Convener, Ministry Development Committee) referred to the written report of her Committee contained in the Annual Report and Accounts of General Synod for the year ended 31 December 2013. Since, as a result of the motion passed earlier, the Ministry Development Committee had been suspended, she had little to add to the written report. She offered thanks to all those who, in the course of the previous 14 years, had given a breadth and depth of expertise and commitment to the life of the Committee and the Board of Studies, underpinned as always by Denise Brunton in her role as Administrator. Earlier in Synod, the Primus had paid full tribute to the Rev Canon Dr Michael Fuller. The Committee also acknowledged and gave thanks for his service and wished him well for the future. Following in the illustrious footsteps of longer serving Committee Conveners Prof Judith George and Dr Peter Smart, Dean Macdonald said it had been an honour to serve as the Convener of the Committee over the previous year. During the year of review, the commitment to the students in training had not wavered and she echoed Dr Fuller's thanks earlier in Synod to those across the Province who currently acted, or who had acted in the past, in different roles in TISEC. On behalf of the Committee, she offered the new transitional Council blessings and support as it managed the transition of TISEC into the new Institute and also to the Rev Canon Dr Anne Tomlinson as she took up the post of Principal.

The Chair thanked Dean Macdonald for her work as Convener.

5.2.2 Overseas Committee

The Rev Val Nellist (Convener, Overseas Committee) explained she would update Synod on the work of the Committee since the time of its report contained in the Annual Report and Accounts for the General Synod for the year ended 31 December 2013.

The Mission and Ministry Board had asked that consideration be given to a name change for the Committee which would make more explicit the reciprocal nature of its relations with the Church in other parts of the world. It was intended, therefore, that the Committee would change its name to the "Global Partnerships Committee".

The Committee worked with partners, one of which was Christian Aid. With their Church and Community Worker Val Brown, the Committee had produced the Lent Cookbook. It had been a joy to work with her and Elspeth Davey, learning about the good things which were being done with lives being changed for the better. To the Committee's surprise, the entire print run of 5,000 had been taken up by study groups and individuals across Scotland and beyond. The Committee was now looking, with Christian Aid, at a reprint of a smaller number towards the end of the year. The publication was not year-specific. It was also available to download from the Christian Aid website.

In partnership with Christian Aid and the Episcopal Church in Brazil, the Committee was contributing to work aimed at combating violence against women in society and in the Church. The Episcopal Church in Brazil had produced a study guide for their own use but which would be applicable in other parts of the world and a good English translation was available. Mrs Nellist had already shared it with Dr Elaine Cameron of the International Anglican Women's Network and with the Diocese of Kolkata. She could provide an electronic copy if Synod members wished to be in touch with her via the General Synod Office.

The Committee had supported the attendance by Dr Elaine Cameron at the 58th session of the United Nations Commission on the Status of Women in New York in March 2014. She had been part of the Anglican delegation and the session had focused on challenges and achievements in the implementation of the Millennium Development Goals affecting women and girls. A full report was available in the May edition of the newsletter of the International Anglican Women's Network, of which Dr Cameron was the editor.

Mrs Nellist explained that the Anglican networks enabled the diversity of Anglican Churches to come together and to engage with common issues. Twenty years previously, Bob and Rachel Mash had gone from St Paul's and St George's to undertake a pioneer ministry in a shanty town in Cape Town. The now Rev Canon Dr Rachel Mash had become the Co-ordinator for the Environmental Network of the Anglican Church in Southern Africa. The Network's goals were to encourage churches to preach and pray about the environment, to encourage churches to work locally to reduce their carbon footprint and to be involved in advocacy and relief work. Canon Mash and her Archbishop had invited the Scottish Episcopal Church to become partners with them and the Committee had made a financial grant as a first step to enable participation in environmental theology training.

More widely across the continent of Africa, Mrs Nellist explained that the churches were facing the growth of Islamisation linked, in places, with extreme violence. At the same time there were divisions within the Anglican Church relating to the interpretation of Scripture. The Council of Anglican Provinces in Africa was aware of these problems and had launched a consultation for heads of Anglican theological institutions and universities. The Committee had been happy to provide some finance. The consultation would bring together 60 participants from across provinces in Africa including the chairs of provincial education boards and provincial secretaries.

South Sudan continued to be a place of open conflict. The Diocese of Wau had been investing in more efficient means of food production. Their most recent request to the Committee had been for funding for ox ploughs. The symbolism of beating swords into ploughshares had not been lost on the Committee. Stability in food production could lead to reduction in conflict.

The Committee had also supported church growth in the Diocese of Tarime in Tanzania where substantial progress had been made in building new churches. Much had been achieved in a short time including the construction of a school, a diocesan office, housing for clergy and, most importantly, growing lively congregations.

Finally, Mrs Nellist reported on companionship links. She reported on the visit of representatives of the Diocese of St Andrews Dunkeld and Dunblane to the Diocese of Kolkata where opportunity had been taken to share what it meant for each to be engaged in mission and ministry. On 15 November 2014 the Committee was organising a sharing day for all who were already, or who wished to become, part of a companionship link. This would take place at the St Paul's Centre in Perth. It would include sessions on starting a link, including youth involvement, healthcare links, sharing with the Church of Scotland on how to undertake real time Bible study and how to recognise when a link should be brought to an end. Invitations to the event would be sent out to dioceses shortly.

Questions were invited but there were none.

5.2.3 Church in Society Committee

The Rev Prof David Atkinson (Convener, Church in Society Committee) indicated that he had only recently taken up office as Convener of the Committee. The Committee's report in the Annual Report and Accounts of the General Synod for the year ended 31 December 2013 had been written by his predecessor, the Very Rev Ian Barcroft. Prof Atkinson thanked Dean Barcroft for his work and echoed the thanks which Dean Barcroft had himself expressed in the report.

Dean Barcroft had commented on the importance of partnership and this would be picked up on shortly since the Committee had invited Rev Bob Fyffe of Churches Together in Britain and Ireland to make a presentation on the Good Society project.

Prof Atkinson reminded Synod that the question of the Living Wage had been addressed at General Synod 2013. The Church in Society would shortly be following this up by asking dioceses what had happened as a result. The Committee had also decided that it would establish a small working group to address issues regarding credit unions. There was already work going on in the Church of England and Church of Scotland and there was a need to work out where the Scottish Episcopal Church became part of that picture. A further matter was that of the interrelation between matters of ethical investment and climate change. There was a question as to whether the Church was prepared to invest in companies whose businesses were primarily based on fossil fuels and he proposed to discuss this with the Investment Committee. The Committee was also considering how it should encourage discussion within congregations and dioceses on the question of the independence Referendum. However, the primary matter on the agenda was the question of how the Scottish Episcopal Church could make a positive contribution on issues related to poverty, particularly poverty exhibiting itself in relation to inability to pay for energy or food. The Committee therefore intended to undertake some serious work on those topics. The Committee continued to be ecumenical and included representation from the Methodist and United Reformed Churches. The Committee for Relations with People of Other Faiths was also a pendant Committee of the Church in Society Committee and it was recognised that issues of energy and food were interfaith concerns also.

Questions were invited but there were none.

5.2.4 Good Society Project

The Rev Bob Fyffe (General Secretary, Churches Together in Britain and Ireland) addressed Synod. He suggested that contrary to the view of the popular press, faith played a pivotal role in society. It was to be hoped that churches existed not as closed gatherings but rather as having a deep concern for their neighbourhoods. Against the background of the Big Society, seven pilot areas around the UK had been asked to consider "what does a good society mean to you?". What had emerged was a number of projects showing a dedication to others and a commitment to community building. A good society emerged as a place which rebuilt the spirit by offering hope, integrating different generations and faiths and modelled healthy ways of living. Faith groups and faith leaders were expected to stand for shared values and were asked to be voices of truth rather than holders of power. They were challenged to see their buildings as places of sanctuary. The *Good Society Project* listened to the voices of those who were rarely heard.

A short film capturing the voices emerging from the *Good Society Project* was shown.

Mr Fyffe spoke about the work undertaken by Tron St Mary's Church of Scotland whose parish encompassed the notorious Red Road flats. He suggested that a good society needed to have an ethical basis since one that was relativistic would find it difficult to pull together. CTBI was therefore encouraging a year of conversation. The report and brochure which had been provided to members of Synod gave guidance on how to undertake a conversation about good society. These resources could be downloaded from the CTBI or Good Society websites. CTBI hoped that many congregations in the coming year would take part in the suggested conversation.

The Synod then had discussion in table groups. Thereafter comments and questions were invited.

The Rev David Mumford (Brechin) was concerned that the project did not offer a socio-political analysis nor offer recommendations to the Church or Government. In considering the needs of people in Scotland, the Church needed to ask how it could make its love for neighbour effective. It was not just a question of offering individual solutions to problems that were essentially corporate and social. There was a need to ask why so many people

were living in poverty. There was a need to articulate transitional demands that would embed structures of justice in society. Apart from the Living Wage there were other matters such as full employment, adequate benefits, defending the NHS or valuing public service. There was indeed a question as to whether an independent Scotland might be better placed to deliver that. His question was whether, if the exercise were to be done again, would Mr Fyffe would change his views as to whether socio-political analysis and recommendations to Government ought to be included.

Mr Jim Gibson (Glasgow and Galloway) asked what would be done with the conversations once they had been had? Would there be a subsequent report or petition to Parliament?

The Rev Peter Harris (Edinburgh) recalled comments he had made at General Synod 2013 when it had been suggested that the Church was not active in its community. The kind of conversations to which Mr Fyffe had referred were already going on in local communities. The question was whether or not the Church was engaging with them. There were already neighbourhood planning groups in every council area across Scotland. Were churches involved at that level?

Mr Fyffe then responded to the comments which had been made. On the question of including socio-political analysis and recommendations to Government, he indicated that the project had been run by CTBI in partnership with Church Action on Poverty and so plenty of socio-political analysis was already available. The purpose of the exercise was to give a voice to those who normally had none. Provision of analysis at the outset would have prejudged the conversations which the project wished to encourage. A number of pilot locations had been considered but in a number of communities there had been difficulty in moving beyond contact with clergy because the clergy wanted to speak for their communities. What had emerged more often than not were the voices of people on the periphery. What was to happen following the conversations was up to the local church or diocese – that was not a role for CTBI. He hoped that the conversations would operate across different church and geographical communities. He cited an example from Cornwall where the need for a community laundry had been articulated. However, the Methodist minister had also been able to respond to a need for a breakfast club for young mothers after dropping children off at school. This had not resulted in a proposal to Government but nevertheless made a significant local difference. Mr Fyffe also agreed with the comment which had been made by Mr Harris. There was indeed already much going on and the project would give ideas which could be picked up in other places.

Prof Alan Werritty (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) wondered whether there was an opportunity to use the conversations being proposed by the Good Society Project to re-energise the mission endeavour in deprived areas of Scotland which had been the subject of the previous Million for Mission initiative. There might be a place for a network to link and nurture such conversations.

Prof Atkinson indicated that it would be very easy for the Synod to vote for the motion which he was about to propose but not do much about it. He urged Synod members only to vote in favour if they were clear that they wanted to do something about it. He recalled that at the March 2014 meeting of the Mission and Ministry Board, the Primus had spoken about the increasing confidence within the Scottish Episcopal Church and its moving to be an outward looking church and not one that simply provided a chaplaincy service. The motion was a means of the Church providing such leadership. The paper which had been given to Synod members already provided much information and it was an opportunity for congregations to become thoroughly involved in their communities. Much leadership also involved listening.

Prof Atkinson then proposed, and the Rt Rev Dr John Armes (Bishop of Edinburgh) seconded, the following motion:-

"That this Synod receive the Good Society report produced by Churches Together in Britain and Ireland and commend it to dioceses and congregations of the Church as they consider mission in their local communities."

The motion was put to the vote and passed *nem con*, 12 abstentions.

Session 6 - The Rt Rev the Bishop of Glasgow and Galloway in the Chair

6.1 Mission and Ministry Board: Same-sex Relationships Discussion Process

The Rt Rev Dr Nigel Peyton (Bishop of Brechin) explained that he was the Convener of the Design Group for discussing same-sex relationships established by the Mission and Ministry Board. Within the membership of the Group there was a range of views and it was committed to providing a Whole Church approach to topics which many found challenging. It had sought advice and made itself available to interest groups.

Members of the Group had visited Diocesan Synods earlier in the year, at some of which facilitated discussions had taken place and the Design Group had arranged the Cascade Conversation in Pitlochry at the end of April 2014 which had drawn together approximately 60 individuals invited by their respective Diocesan Bishops. Five "participants" had also been invited to Cascade, namely: Father Edward Hone (Roman Catholic Redemptorist priest, currently based in Luxembourg), Ms Ruth Jeffries (social worker and lay member of the Diocese of Moray, Ross and Caithness), the Rev Dr Marjory MacLean (former Depute Principal Clerk of the Church of Scotland and member of the General Assembly Theological Commission on Same-sex Relationships and the Ministry), the Rev Canon David Porter (Archbishop of Canterbury's Director for Reconciliation) and the Rt Rev Keith Sinclair (Bishop of Birkenhead and member of the Church of England House of Bishops' Working Group on Human Sexuality). Facilitated group discussion had been at the heart of the Cascade Conversation and

some impressions and outcomes had already been reported on in *inspires online*. Overall, the Conversation appeared to have been judged as more helpful than anything which had previously been attempted within the Scottish Episcopal Church and he expressed thanks to the Design Group and General Synod Office staff. There had been courageous, painful, moving and wise moments during the Conversation. In particular, many of those who had been there better understood the views of others and, in particular, there was a better appreciation of how the contemporary social challenge of same-sex marriage pressed upon the Church's theology and practice.

The cascading purpose, enabling as wide a Church discussion as possible, had already been taken up in dioceses. Those who had attended Pitlochry were communicating their experience in their own dioceses where further facilitated discussion opportunities were being arranged in the coming months, including within the College of Bishops. A video which brought to life the encounter between differing viewpoints had been filmed and would be available on the provincial website shortly after Synod as a discussion starter. Bishop Peyton expected the task of the Design Group would be completed by the autumn.

Bishop Peyton explained that from the outset, the Design Group had recognised that the current meeting of General Synod would provide a particular opportunity for facilitated discussion on the part of Synod members, in addition to any motions which Synod chose to debate. Earlier in the current meeting, Synod had expressed a view on whether it wished to debate a motion under Rule 10. However, all members of Synod were aware that there was much yet to be done to find a common mind while remaining within the same tent. Shortly, he would hand over to Mr Hugh Donald of *Place for Hope* who had generously provided assistance to shape the character and process of the facilitated discussions to date. It was proposed that initially Synod would listen in to a conversation and then Synod members would be asked to address questions in facilitated groups. At the end of the session the Rev Dean Fostekew would invite Synod members to express thoughts anonymously using sealed envelopes.

Before Synod was invited to consider a procedural motion, Dr Peyton invited questions but there were none.

Mr David Palmer (Convener, Standing Committee) proposed, and Mrs Anne Jones (member, Standing Committee) seconded, the following motion: –

"That the Rules of Order be temporarily suspended under Rule 15 to enable a series of short presentations regarding the Cascade Conversation held in Pitlochry in late April 2014, followed by group discussion."

Mrs Christine McIntosh (Argyll and the Isles) indicated she would speak against the motion. The subject matter in question was important business for the Church. Earlier in Synod, Synod had expressed, by a clear majority, the desire that it should be discussed in open debate as per the usual conduct of Synod business. She asked Synod to vote with her against the procedural motion so that Synod could revert to the usual Rules of Order to discuss together the presentation which was about to be received and the questions which would be put.

The motion was put to the vote and passed by the requisite majority with 93 in favour, 32 against, and four abstentions.

Mr Hugh Donald introduced the discussion process and facilitated a discussion among the Very Rev Jeremy Auld, the Rev Samantha Ferguson, Ms Ruth Jeffries and the Rev Canon Malcolm Round. Mr Donald explained that the purpose was to give Synod something of an insight into the Cascade Conversation which had taken place in Pitlochry. At the heart of that Conversation had been the building of relationships. It had also involved the taking of risk in undertaking respectful and honest conversation. Also, it had been about engendering a potential place of reconciliation. The four individuals then reflected with Mr Donald on the Cascade Conversation.

Thereafter, Synod members were invited to consider the following questions in discussion groups:

1. What did you see and hear in the conversation which has just taken place?
2. What has shaped your views about same-sex relationships over the years?
3. What considerations should the SEC take into account when exploring whether to incorporate same-sex marriage into its life?

The Primus addressed Synod. He explained that after the presentation which Synod had just received and following the debate regarding the Rule 10 motion earlier in Synod, he believed he should share some of his current thinking about how the Church should respond to the context in which it found itself in Scotland. Sharing his thinking was part of the leadership which he shared with the members of the College of Bishops. The decision of Synod not to debate the Rule 10 motion had been a decision of Synod. However, he believed that those who had brought the Rule 10 motion could be forgiven if they felt disappointed that it had not reached the Synod agenda. It would be a mistake to conclude that there was not a significant feeling in the Church that it should be moving on human sexuality issues. How far, and in what timescale, would be for the Synod to decide. However, he believed that the changed context arising from the passing of the Marriage and Civil Partnership Act made movement necessary and inevitable. The Church was aware of the rapidly changing social attitudes and which were particularly visible among young people.

Whilst the Church had been talking for a long time, it had not been about the issues which needed to be talked about. Discussion had been conducted on the Anglican Covenant when in fact the Church should have been talking about the underlying issues. The Covenant debate had encouraged churches, mistakenly he believed, to think that the conflict around human sexuality was primarily an inter-provincial matter within the Anglican Communion. Synod had firmly decided not to adopt the Anglican Covenant. What followed logically, as he had mentioned in his charge to Synod, was that the first focus now needed to be on the Scottish Episcopal Church's own internal diversity with the second focus being on the diversity of the Anglican Communion.

The Cascade Conversation had been highly successful and was becoming a model for others. A church-wide process was already underway in the dioceses. This was entirely within the mainstream of Anglican Communion life since provinces were realising that such issues would not be resolved by win/lose votes, at least not without creating winners and losers. Similar movements had been visible at the recent Church of Scotland General Assembly where the report of the Theological Forum had urged that Church to adopt a mixed economy. Interwoven strands of faith and life were carried within the life of the Scottish Episcopal Church. Those included different approaches to the understanding of the authority of Scripture; a passion for justice and inclusion; understandings of holiness of life; a picture of Jesus whose ministry included rather than excluded.

It was important to remember that the question was about more than same-sex marriage and whether clergy would celebrate such marriages in Scottish Episcopal churches. It was also about the situations which would arise when clergy who were in civil partnerships decided to enter a same-sex marriage or when a person who was already in a same-sex marriage presented themselves in the process of vocational discernment for ministry.

Reflecting on what ought now to happen, the Primus suggested that the Cascade process would run during the rest of 2014. At the end of it, it would be for the Mission and Ministry Board and the Faith and Order Board to discern what they could see of the "mind of the Church". He had also already been suggesting that while the Cascade process continued to run, he and one or two others ought to seek some quiet consultation with particular individuals and groups to explore possible approaches for the future. There was a need for some material for debate including some work on the theology of marriage from the Doctrine Committee. He indicated he would like to see a substantial discussion at General Synod 2015 in which all of those issues could be looked at in a way which would inform action in following years.

Finally, he suggested that churches should model to the world patterns of how to move forward together in relationship even where there was no agreement. He was uncomfortable with "mixed economies" if that actually meant "separate economies". As he had said at the General Assembly, he was happy with diversity but not if it was a diversity without engagement. If the Church were to move on these issues, he hoped that those who found it difficult to agree would be an honoured and respected part of that movement. Whilst such an aspiration was illogical, he reminded Synod that Christians were not members of an institution but Disciples of Jesus Christ.

At the close of the session, the Rev Dean Fostekew invited Synod members to complete a sheet articulating hopes, fears, aspirations and concerns about how the Scottish Episcopal Church responded to the subject of same-sex relationships. These were to be completed anonymously and placed in an envelope and would be available at the end of Evening Prayer for Synod members to take away so that they could pray for the person whose envelope they had taken.

The Chair thanked everyone who had taken part during the session.

Session 7: The Very Rev Alison Simpson in the Chair

7.1 Pension Fund Trustees

Mr Andrew November (Chair, Pension Fund Trustees) reported on behalf of the Pension Fund. He explained that a pension fund was composed of two components: liabilities and assets. The liabilities comprised the pensions which had to be paid out to those who had already retired, those who would become pensioners in the future and those who were deferred members (ie who had left the employment of the Church but would be entitled to a pension in the future). It was good that clergy and their spouses lived a long time but that was not quite so good for a pension fund since it meant that the liabilities of the fund were higher. The Pension Fund needed to pay such cash flows over a very long period of time, related to how long people lived. The required cash flows were funded from a pool of assets. Those assets comprised cash or other wealth-generating assets such as Government bonds or equities. The assets also included contributions paid on behalf of clergy by congregations. The overall intention was therefore to have a pool of assets which would be sufficient to pay all the cash flows required for the liabilities.

In 2008, there had been a deficit of £9 million when the assets and liabilities had been compared. The Trustees had set about a programme to improve that situation in order to return to a position closer to parity. Every three years a full analysis of the liabilities was carried out to work out what size the asset pool needed to be. By the time of the 2011 valuation, the deficit had reduced to £3 million. In addition to reducing the deficit, the Trustees had also managed to reduce the riskiness of the assets. At General Synod 2013, he had been able to report that the deficit had been further reduced to just over £500,000. By the end of 2013, he could report that the deficit had been approximately £200,000. All of this marked very good progress since 2008. Mr November accepted that contribution rates had been very high over that period of time and it had been necessary to reduce the benefits. This had helped the position of the Fund. During the previous year further steps had been taken to reduce exposure to risk in relation to the assets and the Trustees would continue to look for opportunities to do that. The next triennial valuation would be carried out at the end of 2014 by the Scheme Actuary. At that point it would be possible to review how the Trustees would continue to manage the Fund and also, potentially, the contribution rate.

Questions were invited.

Mr Brendan Grimley (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) indicated that in his workplace, his pension had been altered from a defined benefit to a defined contribution basis. The employer would therefore not guarantee what he would receive by way of pension. He wondered what kind of scheme the Church scheme was. Mr November explained that it was a defined benefit scheme. In 2013 changes had been made to reduce the level of benefits available under the scheme because of the overall cost. It had, however, been decided that the scheme would continue as a defined benefit one.

The Rev Peter Harris (Edinburgh) said that with small charges having to face significant contributions, he often had to remind vestries that he did not personally receive the contributions. Retired clergy were owed a debt of thanks for all they did throughout the dioceses including the support they provided to churches which did not always have stipendiary clergy. A contribution towards the Pension Fund, however, always appeared to be borne by those charges with stipendiary clergy. He wondered if there was a need to look at a more collective means of contribution.

The Rt Rev Mark Strange (Bishop of Moray, Ross and Caithness) indicated that in his diocese congregations which did not have stipendiary clergy did contribute towards pension costs.

Mr Jim Gibson (Glasgow and Galloway) said that his vestry had felt strongly that the Church should continue with a defined benefit scheme. He wondered whether there was any evidence that clergy lived longer than others. He understood that from surveys conducted south of the border, clergy were recorded as having high job satisfaction. Mr November confirmed that clergy did live longer than average.

The Very Rev Andrew Swift (Argyll and the Isles) asked whether contributions might be reduced if the next revaluation of the Fund showed a surplus. Mr November responded that the Trustees believed that the current level of contribution rates represented the maximum of what congregations could reasonably afford to pay. The Trustees would be willing to look, along with the Standing Committee, at whether any reduction would be possible. He suggested that it would be unlikely that a reduction would be possible in the foreseeable future unless there were to be a significant rise in interest rates.

The Chair thanked Mr November and the other Pension Fund Trustees for their work.

The Secretary General indicated that following the suggestions which had been made earlier in the day, opportunity would be made by way of a retiring collection at the end of Evening Prayer for Synod members to contribute to a fund to support the new training initiative within the Church.

Session 8 - The Rt Rev the Bishop of Edinburgh in the Chair

8.1 Administration Board

8.1.1 Board Report

Mr Michael Lugton (Convener, Administration Board) explained that the reports in the Annual Report and Accounts of the General Synod for the year ended 31 December 2013 set out comprehensively the range of issues on which all five pendant Committees of the Board had been working in the previous year. He wished to draw attention to two closely linked issues.

Firstly, despite a sound investment performance, the financial position of the Province remained challenging. Whilst the market value of the Unit Trust Pool had grown by over 13% to £47.3 million in the year 2013, the income from the fund at 4.5% of the unit value at the beginning of the year, had not been sufficient to fund fully the distribution necessary to meet all identified budgeted needs. Looking ahead, the budget report contained in the Synod Papers showed predicted budgetary deficits on the General Fund of nearly £70,000 in 2015 and £180,000 in 2016. Those figures assumed that total budgeted expenditure on buildings grants, which for 2014 was £65,000 would rise to £120,000 in 2015 and to £185,000 in 2016. Such increases would be difficult to sustain against the background of the rising budgeted deficits.

Against that background, consideration had been given to the future trajectory of the provincial buildings grants system. Set against the size of the Church's property estate across Scotland, the level of provincial support had never been more than peripheral (it had never been more than £170,000 in a single year). On the other hand, it was clear that even small grants could make a difference to charges which might be faced with unavoidable or unexpected expense. Accordingly, along with the Conveners of the Finance and Buildings Committees, the Treasurer and Mr Lugton had concluded that there was a need to understand better what impact provincial grants had had in the past, how they dovetailed with support from diocesan sources and what expertise was available within the Church for identifying other sources of support. Following consultation with dioceses, a questionnaire relating to buildings grants had been issued at the end of May. He thanked those vestries which had already completed and returned the questionnaire and encouraged others to take the time to do so. Thought was also being given to compiling better information on the extent of the Church's property holdings. That was a longer term task and it was possible that a survey might be piloted in one diocese before any wider exercise was launched.

8.1.2 Investment Committee

Mr Jeremy Burchill (Convener, Investment Committee) reported on behalf of his Committee. He noted that whilst it was true that past performance was not a guide to the future, consideration of past performance could be helpful in assessing what constituted a realistic expectation of return for the future. He had considered the pattern of historic returns on different asset classes. Looking at performance of a sample endowment type portfolio comprising two thirds equities and one third fixed interest, annualised real returns (after allowing for inflation) had been 6.4%, over 30 years, 4.3% over 20 years and 4.5% over 10 years. Those figures were gross of the costs of investment management and administration. If one allowed, say 0.7% for such costs, this would give a net annualised real return over 20 years of 3.6% and over the previous 10 years of 3.8%. A real return of approximately 4% (on the 31 December 2013 price) was required on the Unit Trust Pool to fund the current level of distribution.

Mr Burchill noted that in the current year, the unit price was up 2.01% to 31 May. The market in recent months had shown little sense of direction and the distribution for the year represented approximately 3.9% on the market value as at 31 May 2014. Consequently, the distribution was a little above what might be regarded as a legitimate expectation for future performance.

Baillie Gifford, as Fund Managers, had delivered strong performance since their mandate had been changed to a total return basis five years previously. The Investment Committee had considered whether to introduce additional asset classes - many charities held investments in assets such as property, hedge funds, etc. With the exception of property, the Committee was not currently attracted to other asset classes. However, Baillie Gifford was unable to offer investment in property. The Committee would be reluctant to change managers while performance continued to be strong but it was cognisant of the case for introducing property into the asset mix.

The Committee recognised the importance of increasing the distribution in line with inflation but it nevertheless believed that, for investors, it was critical that any increase in the distribution should be sustainable. The challenge would be to sustain the distribution when the market entered its next bear stage. Mr Burchill suggested that after a sustained bull run the market could arguably be approaching the end of its current bull phase.

Mr Jim Gibson (Glasgow and Galloway) asked whether it was the case that one wanted to avoid selling capital in order to fund ongoing expenditure in the budget. Mr Burchill responded that the income stream was approximately 35p per unit and so capital had been drawn down in order to fund the distribution. The management of the Fund had moved from being income-based to a total return basis. The focus on income had previously carried the risk of overexposure to the banking sector. Balance was therefore required and the Committee was considering the possibility of a protocol on how to address such issues but had not so far concluded its deliberations. He was keen that care should be taken not to introduce a level of volatility which could jeopardise the capital base of the Fund.

8.1.3 Buildings Committee

Mr Alex Stewart (Convener, Buildings Committee) referred to the fact that General Synod 2013 had asked the Committee to consider questions of energy efficiency within church buildings. The matter was a complex one but the Committee had been made aware that Eco-congregations Scotland had been addressing it and had produced a very good document which the Committee had commended to all charges. Improving energy efficiency was beneficial for both financial and ecological reasons.

On the question of buildings grants, he noted that when money was tight churches tended to cut expenditure. However, in relation to buildings, lack of proper care resulted in consequences over time. Provincial building grants had been subject to a moratorium but it was not known what effect that had had. He encouraged vestries to ensure the return of the survey which had been referred to earlier. Otherwise, decisions regarding the future of provincial buildings grants would require to be taken in a vacuum. On the question of buildings maintenance generally, he was aware that many in the Church carrying responsibility for such maintenance had no background in the subject. Consideration was therefore being given to devising a series of maintenance training sessions. He had had some contact with the Church of Scotland and if a joint endeavour were not possible, consideration would be given to arranging something specifically within the Scottish Episcopal Church.

Prof Alan Werritty (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) indicated that he represented the Church on the Board of Eco-congregations Scotland. He thanked Mr Stewart for commending the Eco-congregations document. It was also the case that grants were available from the Government's Climate Challenge Fund and details of this were referred to in the Eco-congregations guidance.

The Rev Peter Harris (Edinburgh) indicated that for a small congregation with a large building there was a dilemma as to whether resources were applied to the building or in the care of souls and mission. Sometimes there was a sense that the Province was not doing enough and he suggested the need to make available fundraising advice for charges.

Mr Stewart responded that Dalkeith (one of Mr Harris' charges) was a classic example of a congregation carrying responsibility for a large A-listed building. He had noted the comments.

In closing the session, Mr Lugton explained that the respective Conveners of the Personnel Committee, the Finance Committee and the Retirement Welfare Committee were present and available to respond to questions. There were none.

8.2 Motion from Diocese of Aberdeen and Orkney

The Rt Rev Dr Bob Gillies (Bishop of Aberdeen and Orkney) proposed the following motion: –

"That, recognising that our current annual statistical return does not measure the life and activity of our dioceses, Synod call on the College of Bishops to devise a return which better reflects current patterns of support and activity."

The Rev Prof David Atkinson seconded the motion. He suggested that the statistics which were collected by the Church tended to show a steady downward pattern. However, that was not the actual experience in practice. There was therefore an imbalance between the figures which were collected and local experience. He was aware that research carried out in relation to *Fresh Expressions* in the Church of England had shown that in 10 dioceses there had actually been an increase equivalent to the size of an 11th diocese. Broadening the collection of statistics would not only give the Church further confidence but

was linked to the discussions earlier in Synod regarding future training proposals. It was expected within the Church of England that 15% of activity in future would be in new forms of church life. If that was correct, future training needed to cater for those who could function in such other forms of ministry. The current Synod might be seen in future as having marked some very real changes in relation to training and the Church's relationship with secular society. Making such connections in the Diocese of Aberdeen and Orkney had meant recording actual activity on the ground. He commended the motion to Synod.

The Primus spoke in support of the motion. The task of collection of statistics was a difficult one and the challenge was to ensure consistency of collection over a period of time so that it could be measured and assessed. The existing pattern of statistical collection already appeared to result in some confusion but it was also the case that the Scottish Episcopal Church was not a "Sunday-only" Church. There was a diversity in ways of meeting and there was a need to find a new way of recording that.

The Rev Markus Duenzkofer (Edinburgh) supported the motion but wished to ask the College of Bishops to look at differentiation between communicant members and adherents. He suggested that if baptism were the entry to membership, then the distinction in the current statistics was not correct. The Rev Canon Malcolm Round (member, Standing Committee) explained that he had some concerns regarding a broadening of the statistical collection. It would be important not to lose the snapshot at a point in time which the current statistics provided. A significant broadening of the collection of the statistics was not tenable for larger churches. The mechanics of keeping such figures needed to be considered carefully. For churches with multiple meetings happening during the week the logistics of collecting figures could be very significant. The Very Rev Richard Kilgour (member, Standing Committee) suggested that the placing of the motion between the report of the Administration Board and consideration of the budget was appropriate. It was an opportunity to rethink who the stakeholders were who contributed to the stewardship of resources in the Church. The Rev Canon James Milne (Glasgow and Galloway) said he would welcome a change to the statistics. In his own congregation there were eight weekday services and it was the case that as many people attended during the week as did on Sunday. He suggested, however, that if statistics were gathered only in relation to *Fresh Expressions*, that would not catch the pattern of attendance in his own church.

Mrs Kate Sainsbury (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) spoke of the work carried out by the churches in the Killin area. This included a film club and work with mothers of pre-school children. She welcomed the motion but suggested she would like to see the statistics record the number of pastoral visits which were undertaken. Mr Neil Stewart (Edinburgh) expressed concern that any expansion of statistical collection would pose bureaucratic difficulties for larger churches. Mr Alan Rumble (Glasgow and Galloway) noted that reference had been made to collection of statistics in printed form. He suggested that thought be given to submitting statistics online. The Rev Simon Mackenzie (Argyll and the Isles) urged the need to maintain a sense of proportion. He had no intention of recording pastoral visits and was concerned that statistical collection could lead to a sense of boasting.

Mr James Gardner (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) supported the motion but wondered who would have the responsibility of recording the statistics. Mr Gordon Aitken (Breachin) suggested that it should be possible to collect the statistics with minimal effort for the various categories mentioned in the paper included in the Synod Papers. Dr Beth Routledge (Glasgow and Galloway) said it was important to obtain a snapshot of figures. There was, however, much going on in congregations which could not all be reduced to numbers. Ms Emily Alldritt (Moray, Ross and Caithness) indicated that her diocese was popular with tourists. Many people came to Scottish Episcopal churches in July and August and statistical returns might show a skewed result. The Rev Pam Shinkins (Moray, Ross and Caithness) suggested that guidance on how to complete the statistical return would be helpful.

The Very Rev Kelvin Holdsworth (Convener, Information and Communication Board) observed that online preaching reached many more people than were physically present in Church. Figures for such online viewing would be more useful than some others. He suggested that figures for attendance at a church art exhibition were not relevant. He thought it would be difficult for the College of Bishops to respond to some of the suggestions which had been made and asked that the exercise should not result in the imposition of too many additional burdens. The Rev Dave Richards (Edinburgh) thought the discussion was addressing two different issues. He suggested that it would be helpful to have a census every five years to gauge the overall scope of activity. That was different from questions of membership and attendance. It would be helpful to separate the two issues. Mr Kennedy Fraser (Glasgow and Galloway) indicated that there was a facility for identifying how many people listened to radio broadcasts. Mr Matthew Pemble (Edinburgh) suggested that those who would review the manner of collection should consider first what any statistics were to be used for. A clear purpose needed to be articulated. Mr Jim Gibson (Glasgow and Galloway) said that the Trustees' Report in the Annual Accounts provided a forum for recording Church activity. He wondered how many congregations took that facility seriously.

Bishop Gillies suspected that members of the College of Bishops, having heard the debate, might not be entirely content that the motion had been brought. He did not wish to respond to the individual comments made but the breadth and depth of response had indicated that the issue was a significant one. The record of the meeting would ensure that everyone's contribution would be taken into account.

The motion was then put to the vote and passed *nem con*, 10 abstentions.

The Chair thanked all who had contributed to the session.

Session 9 -The Most Rev the Primus in the Chair

9.1 Diaconate Working Group

The Rt Rev Dr John Armes (Convener, Diaconate Working Group) updated Synod on the work of the Group. It had met three times in the previous year (once by telephone) and had conducted a field visit to the Diocese of Moray, Ross and Caithness. The visit was referred to in his written report in the Synod Papers but he emphasised that it had been a very positive experience. Rather than talking about the diaconate, it had been a demonstration of people being diaconal in their daily lives. It had been clear to the Group that the diaconal calling belonged to the whole Church and that the vocation of an individual was deeply rooted in the relationship of the local church with its community. One distinctive deacon would commence training in the autumn. Others would embark on the discernment process during the year ahead. The deacon called the Church both to share, and be, good news. It was an outward-facing ministry – prophet, evangelist and servant. The deacon was, therefore, likely to make the Church feel uncomfortable at times. Prophecy needed first to be addressed to the faithful. When it came to evangelism, the Church was often bashful despite the fact that, as had been recognised in the current meeting, the Church needed to be more proactive. Earlier in the meeting, the Synod had heard of the Church being both servant and prophet in the context of the *Good Society Project*.

A short film was then shown of the work of General Practitioner and ordained deacon, the Rev Dr James Clark-Maxwell. Bishop Armes explained that it provided a good illustration of diaconal work.

Comment was invited but there was none.

9.2 Standing Committee: Budget and Quota

Mr David Palmer (Convener, Standing Committee) explained that the General Fund budgets for 2015 and 2016 showed deficits of £69,085 and £180,197 respectively. Work was currently in hand by the Standing Committee and other Boards and Committees to reduce the deficit. The budgets reflected a phased reintroduction of building grants and in due course it would be necessary to take into account any financial costs that might result from the review of TISEC and the discussion on building grants funds that had been mentioned previously. To some extent, the priorities for funding which flowed from those areas might determine future budgets. There would, therefore, be changes to the budgets and these would be made by the Standing Committee in the autumn. It might not be possible to eliminate the deficits entirely but every effort would be made to do so. If not, the surpluses built up in recent years could be made available. The recommendation of the Standing Committee was that provincial quota should be increased by 3% to £678,602 for 2015.

Comment was invited.

The Very Rev Richard Kilgour (member, Standing Committee) asked whether a vote on the motion about to be proposed meant acceptance of the proposals regarding curate funding contained in the TISEC review report. Mr Palmer responded that the additional funding of approximately £400,000 required to fully implement the recommendations in the review report were not included in the budget figures now under discussion. No decisions would be made on changes to introduce 100% curate grants until after the Standing Committee had had further discussion and appropriate resources had been identified.

Mr Palmer then proposed, and Mr Michael Lugton (Convener, Administration Board) seconded, the following motion: –

“That this Synod, having examined the proposed budgets for the General Synod for the year 2015, agree to a quota figure of £678,602 for that year.”

The motion was put to vote and passed *nem con*, three abstentions.

9.3 Elections

9.3.1 Information and Communication Board Convenership

There being no competing nominations, the Rev Christopher Mayo was elected as Convener of the Information and Communication Board by general acclaim.

9.3.2 Standing Committee Membership

There being no competing nominations, Mr Jim Gibson was elected as a lay member of General Synod to the Standing Committee by general acclaim.

9.3.3 Administration Board: General Synod Representatives

There being no competing nominations, Mrs Nan Kennedy was elected as a General Synod representative on the Administration Board by general acclaim.

9.3.4 Preliminary Proceedings Committee Membership

By general acclaim, the Synod appointed the following: –

Practising lawyer: Mr Derek Buchanan

Lay member: Mrs Mary Birch
Alternate lay member: Mr David Palmer
Secretary: Mr Graham Robertson.

9.3.5 Clergy Discipline Tribunal Membership

By general acclaim, the Synod appointed following: –

Three practising lawyers: Lord Bannatyne, Lord McEwan, Mr George MacWilliam

Two clerics: the Rev Canon Dr Anne Tomlinson and the Rev Canon Prof John Richardson

Three lay members: Mr Fraser Falconer, Mrs Sue Horne and Mr John Whittall.

9.3.6 Extension of Home Mission Committee Convenership

Mr David Palmer (Convener, Standing Committee) explained that the normal term of office for Conveners of Boards and Committees was five years. The Digest of Resolutions permitted extension of the term of a Convener for a specified period, on the recommendation of the Standing Committee. The proposed changes regarding provincial boards which had been the subject of discussion in the current meeting, would, if accepted, result in the Home Mission Committee being subsumed by a new Mission Board in 2015. There, therefore, seemed no point in appointing a new Convener to the Committee for just one year. The Mission and Ministry Board and the Standing Committee, therefore, recommended that the term of office of the Rev Canon Fay Lamont be extended by one year until General Synod 2015.

Mr Palmer then proposed, and the Rt Rev Kevin Pearson (Bishop of Argyll and the Isles) seconded, the following motion: –

“That the term of office of the Rev Canon Fay Lamont as Convener of the Home Mission Committee be extended until the conclusion of General Synod 2015.”

The motion was put to the vote and passed unanimously.

In concluding his remarks to Synod, Mr Palmer expressed the thanks of Synod to the Primus for his leadership during the previous year.

9.4 Vote of Thanks

The Primus expressed thanks to all members of Synod for their attendance and engagement; to those who had arranged the Eucharist and led worship during the meeting including the Cantor, organists and worship band; to retiring Conveners, the Very Rev Kelvin Holdsworth, Mrs Anne Jones, the Very Rev Susan Macdonald and the Rev Canon Ian Paton; to the representatives of other denominations and faiths; to those who had chaired sessions of Synod; to Dr Joe Morrow as Assessor; to those who had acted as table facilitators; to Kennedy Fraser, Paul Deponio and Alison Dines for operating the IT and audiovisual facilities; to the staff of St Paul's and St George's; and to the General Synod Office staff.

9.5 Confirmation of Acts of Synod

The Primus confirmed the acts of Synod and closed the meeting with the blessing at approximately 11.30am on Saturday 14 June 2014.

ELECTIONS TO PROVINCIAL BODIES

1. Standing Committee Convenership

David Palmer retires this year as Convener of the Standing Committee and General Synod is required to elect a successor.

Robert Gordon is nominated by Standing Committee as the prospective new convener.

Brief biographical details:

Robert Gordon CB was born in Aberdeen and after graduating in 1973 from the University of Aberdeen joined the civil service as a fast stream trainee and was assigned to the Scottish Office in Edinburgh.

After a series of developmental postings, he served as Principal (team leader) in land use planning and transport positions before becoming Principal Private Secretary to the Secretary of State for Scotland (George Younger and Malcolm Rifkind) from 1985 to 87.

He then moved to Agriculture taking charge of support for hill and upland farming and diversification measures before returning to the centre to head the organisational development and industrial relations activity. He was promoted to Director of Administrative Services charged with transforming support services and developing and implementing radically new accommodation and ICT strategies.

In 1997 he became Head of Constitution Group responsible for delivering the incoming new labour government's plans for a Scottish Parliament and Executive. In 1999 he took charge as a Head of Department (Director General) of the central secretariats and other support for the new Scottish Executive. In 2002, he was appointed by the Lord Advocate as the first Chief Executive of the Crown Office and Procurator Fiscal Service to implement a programme of modernisation and transformational change in the prosecution service.

In 2005 he was appointed Head of the Justice Department (later DG Justice and Communities) and again oversaw a programme of radical change and modernisation of most aspects of justice.

He left the Scottish Government on retirement in April 2010. He now undertakes a range of coaching and change consultancy work for a variety of clients in the public and voluntary sectors. He is an Associate with Kynesis the Glasgow based Coaching and Change consultancy.

He has acted in the past as Vestry Chair, and is currently Chair of the Resources and Staffing Groups, at St Paul's and St George's Church in Edinburgh, where he has been a member since 1985. He is also Chair of Bethany Christian Trust, Chair of Safe Families for Children Scotland (a new

charity supporting families in difficulty), a member of the board of Inspiring Scotland, a Warden of the Incorporation of Goldsmiths of the City of Edinburgh and a member of the Audit and Accountability Committee of the Police Investigations and Review Commissioner.

Nominations were invited in the letter of 20 March 2015 from the convener of the Standing Committee to General Synod members, with a closing date of 24 April 2015. No other nomination has been received.

2. Administration Board Convenership

Mr Michael Lugton retires this year as Convener of the Administration Board and General Synod is required to elect a successor.

Following consultation with the Administration Board, Dr John Ferguson Smith is nominated by Standing Committee as the prospective new convener.

Brief biographical details:

Dr John Ferguson-Smith has a long background within the Scottish Episcopal Church. He has served on the Provincial Administration Board, the Provincial Finance Committee and the Provincial Personnel Committee. At Synod, he relinquishes office after his term as convener of the Provincial Finance Committee.

In the Diocese of St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane, he is convener of the Diocesan Administration Board. He is a member of the Diocesan Standing Committee, the Diocesan Buildings Committee and attends ex-officio the Diocesan Mission Committee. He is currently interim Vestry chairman of the linked charges of St Kessog's, Auchterarder and St James', Muthill.

His professional background includes occupational and environmental health in a business setting.

Nominations were invited in the letter of 20 March 2015 from the convener of the Standing Committee to General Synod members, with a closing date of 24 April 2015. No other nomination has been received.

3. Mission Board Convenership

The Primus retires this year as Convener of the Mission and Ministry Board. As explained elsewhere in the Synod papers, Synod will be invited to give a second reading to Canon 52.23 which will replace the Mission and Ministry Board with an Institute Council (see below) and a new Mission Board. Assuming the passing of the canon and of the necessary changes to the Digest of Resolutions, General Synod will be required to elect a convener to the new Mission Board.

Following consultation with the Mission and Ministry Board, the Rev Jane Ross is nominated by Standing Committee as the prospective convener of the new Mission Board. In the event that a second reading of Canon 52.23 is not passed, the

nomination should be treated as one for the Convenership of the Mission and Ministry Board (which would remain in place).

Brief biographical details:

Jane Ross was brought up near the Lake District as an Anglican and joined the Scottish Episcopal Church in the 1980s while a student at St Andrew's University studying Maths and Physics. She spent a few years working as a Development Engineer for Ferranti in Edinburgh before training at Moray House College as a secondary school teacher of Maths and Physics. In 1987 she moved to Aberdeen where she worked within the education sector firstly as a Physics/Science teacher, then as a head of department and finally as head teacher at a small independent school for children from P3 to S6.

After some years of lay ministry (mainly with children and small groups) she was called to ordained ministry from her home church of St Ninian's in Seaton whilst under the leadership of the Bishop's Evangelist, a Church Army Captain. She trained with TISEC whilst working full time and then began full time ordained ministry as assistant curate at St Clement's in Mastrick in 2009. The church began to grow spiritually and numerically.

She was appointed Priest in Charge at St Clement's and in the autumn of 2012 graduated with a post graduate Masters degree in Practical Theology and Christian Ethics from Aberdeen University and followed God's call to Prestwick in Ayrshire.

She is currently Rector at St Ninian's in Prestwick and diocesan convenor of the Missional Leadership Development Team within Glasgow and Galloway's Mission Action Planning Initiative. She will be completing the Mission Shaped Ministry course this summer and her congregation hopes to investigate starting a Fresh Expression of church later in the year.

She has been married for 30 years and has three children. She says "Mission is a passion of mine which I find both challenging and yet enormously energising and fulfilling. I am excited about what the future holds for God's Church, and in particular the direction of our own Scottish Episcopal Church."

Nominations were invited in the letter of 20 March 2015 from the convener of the Standing Committee to General Synod members, with a closing date of 24 April 2015. No other nomination has been received.

4. Institute Council

As mentioned above, General Synod 2015 will be invited to give a second reading to Canon 52.23. As well as creating a new Mission Board, that will create an Institute Council, as the governing body for the Scottish Episcopal Institute. General Synod 2014 agreed to the appointment of a transitional Institute Council, pending completion of the process for canonical change. Assuming the passing of the canon and of the necessary changes to the Digest of Resolutions, the Council will comprise a Convener, who is to be a Bishop appointed by the General Synod on the nomination

of the Standing Committee, one other Bishop appointed by the College of Bishops, and up to ten additional members appointed by the General Synod on the nomination of Standing Committee (nominations to be made following consultation with the College of Bishops). Also, the Convener of the Board of Studies is to be an ex officio member of the Institute Council.

Following consultation with the College of Bishops, the Standing Committee nominates to Synod the members who have served on the transitional Institute Council since its establishment last year, namely:-

Convener: the Rt Rev Kevin Pearson, Bishop of Argyll and the Isles

Other Members: Mr Nigel Cook, the Rev Canon Anne Dyer, the Rev Dr Paul Foster, the Rev Prof David Jasper, the Rev James Jones, Mrs Nan Kennedy, Dr Jenny Wright (student representative), Mrs Zoe van Zwanenberg.

The Council will also include the Rt Rev Dr Bob Gillies, Bishop of Aberdeen and Orkney (as the second Bishop appointed by the College of Bishops) and the Rev Frances Burberry, ex officio, as convener of the Board of Studies.

5. Standing Committee Membership

Two vacancies arise for clerical members of Standing Committee to be elected by the House of Laity. The term of office is four years. The vacancies arise as a result of the Rev Richard Kilgour and the Rev Canon Malcolm Round completing their terms of office on the Committee.

Members of the Standing Committee constitute the Charity Trustees of the General Synod for the purposes of the Charities Act. The Committee has a number of functions. Under Canon 52, it is the body responsible for the issuing of the agenda for General Synod. Under the Digest of Resolutions, it has the general control and management of the administration of the General Synod and is empowered to exercise generally all financial powers vested in the General Synod. It is responsible for recommending to Synod the level of provincial quota and for presenting budgets to Synod.

Nominations must be received not later than the commencement of the meeting of General Synod (they should be submitted to the Secretary General who has a style of nomination form available on request). In the event of an election, only members of the House of Clergy will be entitled to vote.

Details of any nominations received will be advised to Synod members at General Synod.

Any person elected will be expected to sign declarations confirming that they are eligible to serve as a Charity Trustee and that they are a 'fit and proper person' as required by HM Revenue and Customs. Copies of the declarations are available on request to the Secretary General.

6. Administration Board: General Synod Representatives

In terms of the Digest of Resolutions, the membership of the Administration Board includes three members appointed by General Synod from its own membership. This year, one vacancy arises. The term of office is four years.

Details of any nominations received will be advised to Synod members at General Synod.

Nominations must be received not later than the commencement of the meeting of General Synod (they should be submitted to the Secretary General who has a style of nomination form available on request).

7. Membership: Clergy Discipline Tribunal (Canon 54)

Two vacancies for clergy arise this year on the Clergy Discipline Tribunal. One arises as a result of the resignation in 2014 of the Rev Canon Dr Anne Tomlinson from the Tribunal following her appointment as Principal of the Scottish Episcopal Institute. The Standing Committee appointed the Rev Maggie McTernan to fill that vacancy pending General Synod 2015. The other vacancy arises as a result of the Rev Richard Kilgour completing his term of office. Members serve for three years and are eligible to be re-appointed.

Under Canon 54, the Standing Committee is required to make nominations for the vacancies on the Tribunal. The Standing Committee makes the following nominations:-

The Rev Maggie McTernan
The Vey Rev Kenny Rathband

8. General Synod Trustees

Since the General Synod is an unincorporated association, it does not enjoy legal personality and cannot hold property in its own name. Accordingly, the Digest of Resolutions provides for the appointment of trustees as a means of enabling this. (The Digest also allows for the mechanism of a nominee company and Scottish Episcopal Church Nominees exists for this purpose and is now the usual means for the Synod to hold property (e.g. retirement housing)). Some property acquired at an earlier stage remains in the name of the trustees.

The current trustees are Lady Caroline Douglas-Home, Mr Martin Haldane, the Rt Rev Edward Luscombe, the Hon Lord McEwan and Sheriff Alexander Wilkinson. Until his death earlier this year, Mr Ivor Guild was also a trustee. Synod is invited to fill the vacancy arising from Mr Guild's passing. Standing Committee nominates Mr David Palmer.

Brief biographical details:-

Province: Convener Standing Committee (2010-2015), previously member, Standing Committee (2007-11); Member, Finance Committee (2007); Convener, Residential Homes Governance Group;

Edinburgh Diocese: Vice Convener, Standing Committee; Convener, Finance and Management Committee; Member, Personnel Committee; Diocesan Secretary.

St Michael and All Saints Church, Edinburgh: Lay Representative (2009-2010); Member, Edinburgh South Area Council (2009-2010).

Deputy Director of Finance for the Health Service in Scotland (1991-2006), Scottish Executive Health Department (Retired). Responsible for: the Health Service Budget of £9.3bn; preparation of the budget for the use of these funds; distribution and effective use of the funds; accountability for the funds to Health Ministers and the Scottish Parliament; management and training of staff; the provision of financial and accounting advice.

9. Pension Fund Trustees: Chair

Mr Andrew November steps down as chairman of the Pension Fund Trustees this year and General Synod is required to elect a successor. The Standing Committee nominates Mr Richard McIndoe.

Brief biographical details:-

Born 15th December 1962 in Inverness.

Educated at St Aloysius College, Glasgow; the University of Glasgow (M.A. in Modern Languages); and the University of Strathclyde (Postgraduate Diploma in Accounting).

Qualified as accountant member of Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy.

Has worked in local government since 1990 and at Glasgow City Council since 1996. Previously pension fund accountant, then chief investment officer. Currently, and since 2002, Head of Pensions with overall responsibility for management of the Strathclyde Pension Fund. The Fund has over 200,000 members from more than 200 different employers. Investment assets are around £15 billion.

Member of St Margaret's, Newlands since 1998. Vestry member 2000 to 2004 and 2011 to present. Short spell as Treasurer.

Married to Elaine since 1997. 4 children.

John F Stuart
Secretary General
April 2015

FAITH AND ORDER BOARD

Marriage, its nature and canonical options: a process paper from the Faith and Order Board

In the light of the discussion which took place at General Synod 2014 and the passing of the Marriage and Civil Partnership (Scotland) Act 2014, the Faith and Order Board has considered how best to enable the General Synod to discuss the subject of marriage and to determine whether a change in the Church's understanding of marriage is appropriate and if so what form such change might take. This paper sets out the process which the Board wishes to recommend to General Synod 2015.

Early in Synod an enabling motion will be proposed and debated. The aim of this is to ask Synod to commit to an agreed process. The motion will be:

*That this Synod agree to adopt the process for debating the nature of marriage and canonical options as recommended by the Faith and Order Board in the paper entitled **"Marriage, its nature and canonical options: a process paper from the Faith and Order Board"**.*

The Faith and Order Board invites General Synod to adopt the following process in its consideration of marriage, its nature and canonical options.

1. A debate on the floor of Synod on our Church's understanding of the nature of marriage, informed by the paper produced for Synod by the Doctrine Committee at the request of the Board. At the end of this debate the following motion will be proposed:

That this Synod receive the paper laying out the theology of marriage, thank the Doctrine Committee and recognise its work as providing material helpful to future discussion of possible canonical change.

2. Later in the Synod the following motion will be put:

That this Synod proceed to debate the options for canonical change in relation to marriage as proposed by the Faith and Order Board.

3. If the Synod votes in favour of this motion then a debate will take place on the following options:

Option A: Removal of section 1 of Canon 31

This option would remove section 1 from Canon 31 in its entirety so that the Canon was silent on the question of a doctrine of marriage.

Option B: as Option A with the addition of a conscience clause

This option is the same as option A above but would include a conscience clause saying that no cleric would be obliged to solemnise a marriage against their conscience.

Option C: Alteration of section 1 of Canon 31

This option would retain a doctrinal statement in Canon 31.1 but would alter the text to render the description of marriage as non-gender specific, e.g. by deleting “one man and one woman” and substituting therefor “two persons”.

Option D: as Option C with the addition of a conscience clause

This option is the same as option C above but would include a conscience clause saying that no cleric would be obliged to solemnise a marriage against their conscience.

Option E: Alteration of Canon 31 to include two expressions of marriage

After the doctrinal statement as in Option C above this option would add to Canon 31 a statement that within the church there are two expressions of marriage – one that it is between two people of the opposite sex and one that it is between two people irrespective of gender.

Option F: as Option E with the addition of a conscience clause

This option is the same as option E above but would include a conscience clause saying that no cleric would be obliged to solemnise a marriage against their conscience.

Depending on the outcome of Synod’s vote, any necessary canonical texts will be presented for First Reading at General Synod 2016, with a view to Second Reading at General Synod 2017. A motion to instruct the Faith and Order Board to have the Committee on Canons produce any necessary canonical texts will be proposed as follows:-

That this Synod instruct the Faith and Order Board to instruct the Committee on Canons to prepare canonical material, reflecting the preference as to canonical options expressed by this Synod, so that a first reading of such canonical material can be considered by General Synod 2016.

A motion will also be put inviting the Synod to instruct the Faith and Order Board to have the Committee on Canons produce a new canon to cover the **religious registration of Civil Partnerships** as follows:-

That this Synod instruct the Faith and Order Board to instruct the Committee on Canons to prepare canonical material to enable the registration of Civil Partnerships to be undertaken in the Scottish Episcopal Church, so that a first reading of such canonical material can be considered by General Synod 2016.

If Canons are adopted to enable the Church to solemnise marriages between people of the same gender or to register civil partnerships in a religious ceremony the Church will then be able to “opt-in” to the legislation. Under the 2014 Act, there are, essentially two ways in which a religious body, such as the Scottish Episcopal Church, could be authorised to marry same-sex couples:-

- To seek to be “prescribed” by the Government, the effect of which is that all clergy would automatically be authorised to solemnise same-sex marriage. That is the position which pertains currently in relation to marriage of people of different genders.
- To seek to be recognised as a “nominating body”, the effect of which would be that individual members of clergy who wish to solemnise marriages between people of the same gender would be nominated by the Church to the Registrar General who would then “register” such individuals, thereby authorising them to solemnise same-sex marriage.

The Faith and Order Board will give more detailed consideration to the opting-in procedures in due course. Indications from the Scottish Government have tended to suggest that it expects faith bodies in which there is a diversity of view on the subject of same sex marriage and which wish to opt in are likely to adopt the nominating route.

Notes on voting on the motions

1. The preliminary motion proposing the overall process will require a two thirds majority of the Synod (voting as one house) because the proposed expressing of preferences as to canonical options referred to above is not catered for in the Rules of Order of Synod and therefore the proposed process in effect amounts to a suspension of the Rules of Order for that purpose.
2. The expression of preferences in relation to canonical options is proposed to be dealt with by a ballot paper in which Synod members will be able to place “6” against their “most preferred” option, 5 against their next most preferred option, down to “1” for their least preferred option. There will be no obligation to express any preference and a ballot paper without any option completed will be treated as an abstention. Those who do not consider that there should be any change in the canons will be able to express that view by voting against the motion which proposes that the Synod should proceed to consider canonical options for change. (If that motion is not passed, the Synod will not proceed to consider the options for change.)
3. The Board is of the view that with the exception of the initial motion proposing the process the other motions should be by way of ballot. Under the Rules of Order voting must be by ballot on any particular motion if one third of the present and voting members of any house so wish. However, the Board considers it would be tidier and less confusing if Synod is invited to express a mind on this at the outset, hence the inclusion of a motion in the Synod agenda to that effect. This motion will require a two thirds majority of the whole of Synod because such a motion in effect amounts to a temporary suspension of the Rules of Order relating to ballots.

+Gregor
Acting Convener
Faith and Order Board

The text of Canon 31 is set out below for information

CANON THIRTY-ONE
OF THE SOLEMNISATION OF HOLY MATRIMONY

1. The Doctrine of this Church is that Marriage is a physical, spiritual and mystical union of one man and one woman created by their mutual consent of heart, mind and will thereto, and is a holy and lifelong estate instituted of God.
2. No cleric of this Church shall solemnise Matrimony except in accordance with the civil law of Scotland for the time being in force in relation to civil marriages and unless satisfied that compliance has been made with such preliminaries as are therein required for the Solemnising of Religious Marriages.
3. No cleric shall perform the Marriage Service, nor permit it to be performed in Church, for parties who are within the forbidden degrees, as specified in Appendix No.26. No cleric shall perform the Marriage Service, nor permit it to be performed in Church for parties, for one or both of whom a decree of Nullity of Marriage Ab Initio has been pronounced by a Civil Court, nor for parties, either of whom has had a previous marriage dissolved quoad civilia in a Civil Court, so long as the other spouse in the marriage so dissolved remains alive, unless that cleric shall have been given a Certificate of Authorisation on the grounds that there is no ecclesiastical impediment to the marriage in terms of Section 4.
4. In cases where a decree of Nullity of Marriage Ab Initio has been pronounced by a Civil Court, or in any case where either or both parties to a proposed marriage has, or have had, a previous marriage dissolved quoad civilia in a Civil Court, but the other spouse to that marriage remains alive, any cleric to whom an approach is made by or on behalf of either party with a view to the solemnising of such proposed marriage shall refer the matter to the Diocesan Bishop. Upon receiving such reference, the Diocesan Bishop shall make such enquiries into the circumstances of the case, and take such pastoral and legal advice, as shall seem appropriate, and thereafter may issue, or decline to issue, to an officiating cleric, a Certificate of Authorisation in terms of Appendix No.27 authorising and approving that cleric's officiating at the Solemnisation of Holy Matrimony of the parties concerned according to the Rites and Ceremonies and Canons of the Scottish Episcopal Church. No Bishop shall entertain an application which has already been before another Diocesan Bishop of the Scottish Episcopal Church without the agreement of the Bishop of that other Diocese and the Episcopal Synod.
5. A cleric may use the form of Benediction provided in the Scottish Book of Common Prayer (1929) to meet the case of those who ask for the benediction of the Church after an irregular marriage has been contracted or after a civil marriage has been legally entered into, provided only that the cleric be satisfied that the marriage is not contrary to Sections 3 and 4 of this Canon.
6. The solemnisation of Marriage shall take place in Church except with the written sanction of the Bishop.

Extract from the Doctrine Committee Paper on the Theology of Marriage set out below for information:-

The Canons

1. The SEC's official teaching on marriage is enshrined in Canon 31:1.

‘The Doctrine of the Church is that Marriage is a physical, spiritual and mystical union of one man and one woman created by their mutual consent of heart, mind and will thereto, and is a holy and lifelong estate instituted of God.’

2. This Canon, ‘On the Solemnization of Holy Matrimony’, was added to the Code of Canons in 1980, and reflects the mind of the Church as expressed by General Synod at the time. This Canon is unusual in the SEC canons in expressing a theological position which raises questions as to whether the Canons, rather than the Liturgy, are the documents in which doctrine is expounded in Anglicanism. It was added when Canon 31 was altered to allow for the remarriage of divorced persons in church, so that the principle of marriage as a lifelong union could be affirmed alongside the acknowledgement that a civil court might judge a marriage to have broken down irretrievably. The addition affirms that the SEC remains committed to the principle of marriage as lifelong. The phrase within the Canon that has since come under scrutiny, because of questions about same-sex marriage, is that marriage is a ‘union of one man and one woman’.

ALTERATIONS TO THE CODE OF CANONS

VOTING PROCEDURES – AN EXPLANATORY NOTE

The alteration of a Canon contained in the Code of Canons requires two “readings” in successive years at the General Synod. The voting procedure on each reading is different. An alteration, for these purposes, includes any modification or abrogation of any Canon, any addition to a Canon and the enacting of any new Canon. The process is set out in Canon 52, Section 17.

Canons for First Reading

A first reading requires a simple majority of the members of each house of Synod, present and voting. Voting is, therefore, in houses.

Canons for Second Reading

A second reading requires a two-thirds majority of the members of each house of Synod, present and voting. (Again, therefore, voting is in houses.) Before confirming any alterations at a second reading, the Synod must consider any opinions received from Diocesan Synods.

On a second reading, amendments may be incorporated provided they are not, in the judgement of the chair, irrelevant to, beyond the scope of or inconsistent with the general subject-matter and purport of the Canon as put to Diocesan Synods after the first reading. Such amendments must themselves receive a two-thirds majority.

Also, no amendment may be moved on a second reading which, in the judgement of the chair, does not substantially reflect an opinion communicated by a Diocesan Synod or is not merely a verbal or drafting amendment unless due notice has been given or the Chair grants leave to dispense with notice. Due notice, for this purpose, means that notice must have been received by the time limit stipulated for the receipt of resolutions when the notice convening the Synod is despatched (Canon 52, Resolution 10).

John F Stuart
Secretary General

CANON FIFTY TWO

OF THE GENERAL SYNOD

The current text of Canon 52, Section 5 is set out below for information. The text to be added is shown in italics and the text to be deleted is scored through.

5. QUALIFICATIONS FOR ELECTED MEMBERSHIP

The presbyters or deacons elected from each diocese shall, unless the General Synod determines otherwise, be elected from their own numbers by the clerical members of the Diocesan Synod, who in terms of Canon 50, Section 4, are entitled to vote and shall hold office only so long as they are members of the Synod of that Diocese.

The lay members elected from each diocese shall, unless the General Synod determines otherwise, be elected by the lay members of the Diocesan Synod as provided in Canon 50, Section 3. Lay members and alternates, as defined in Section 7 hereof, must have attained the age of ~~eighteen~~ *sixteen* years, ~~have been confirmed~~ and be communicant members of this Church, and have signed a declaration in terms of Appendix No.23. Those elected need not be members of the electing body but must be resident with the diocese, or communicant members of congregations within the diocese, or hold office within the diocese. Lay members of the General Synod are for their period of office members of the Diocesan Synod.

If the above alteration receives a second reading in 2016, it would be proposed that the text of Appendix 23 be amended as set out below:-

APPENDIX No. 23

FORM OF DECLARATION TO BE SIGNED BY LAY MEMBERS OF GENERAL SYNOD

I, _____, of _____, a lay member of the General Synod, hereby declare that I have attained the age of ~~18~~ *16* years, ~~that I have been confirmed~~, and that I am a communicant member of the Scottish Episcopal Church.

(Signature and date)

CANON FIFTY SEVEN

OF NOTICES PROVIDED FOR BY THIS CODE OF CANONS, AND OF THE INTERPRETATION OF THE CODE

The current text of Canon 57, Section 6 is set out below for information. The text to be added is shown in italics and the text to be deleted is scored through.

6. In this Code of Canons, unless the context otherwise requires, the following words shall have the following meanings:

Words in the plural shall include the singular and 'vice versa'.

Words in both the Canons and Ordinals importing the masculine gender shall include the equivalent words importing the feminine gender.

'Month' shall mean 'Calendar Month'.

'Primus', 'Bishop', 'Dean', 'Synod Clerk', and the like, shall include persons authorised to act and acting in these capacities.

'Senior Bishop' shall mean the Bishop, other than the Primus, senior by appointment to a diocese in this Church and capable of acting.

The 'College of Bishops' shall mean the Bishops of this Church acting in a corporate capacity.

'Episcopal Synod' shall mean the Bishops of this Church, assembled as a Synod duly convened and constituted.

'Instituted Clergy' shall mean those instituted in terms of Canon 13, and 'licensed' and 'commissioned' clergy shall mean those respectively licensed or commissioned in terms of Canon 14. Any reference to instituted clergy shall comprehend those collated in terms of Canon 13, Section 2, unless the context otherwise requires.

The term 'Rector' shall include any Priest-in-Charge of an Independent Congregation, appointed before 24th July 2008.

The term 'Vestry' shall include the managing body of a congregation by whatever name known.

'Canonical services' shall mean the services of Morning and Evening Prayer, Litany, and Holy Communion, and the Offices for Baptism, Confirmation, Matrimony and Burial.

'Communicant' or 'Communicant Member' shall mean a communicant whose name is on the Communicants' Roll of a congregation as defined by Canon 41.

'Adherents' shall mean all communicants and other persons (including children) who have such an attachment to a congregation as to receive the ministrations of the Church.

'Charge' shall mean 'Congregation', whether Incumbency, Independent Congregation or Dependent Congregation.

'Adult' or 'full age' shall mean a person who has attained the age of ~~eighteen~~ sixteen years.

'Resolution' means resolution of the General Synod passed in accordance with Canon 52.

CANON SIXTY

OF VESTRIES

The current text of Canon 60 is set out below for information. The text to be added is shown in italics.

1. The Vestry shall co-operate with and generally assist the Rector in all matters relating to the spiritual welfare of the congregation and the mission of the whole Church, subject always to the canonical rights and duties of the clergy.
2. With the Rector the Vestry shall, unless the duty is placed under the Constitution of the charge on Church Wardens or others, have the care of the property and fabric of the Church including the parsonage house or houses, halls, offices and any other properties acquired in connection with the Church and gifts and bequests, unless otherwise directed, accruing to the Church for whatever purpose, and shall see to the safe custody, maintenance, insurance, use and administration of the same.
3. The Vestry shall make such reports on and compile such inventories of the matters committed to its charge as may be prescribed by resolution, and shall take whatever steps it considers necessary or which shall be required by the Bishop in Synod for the safe custody and preservation of such reports and inventories.
4. All such reports and inventories shall be made available to the Bishop when required, or to the Dean as provided in Canon 42, or by resolution thereunder, or to any Diocesan Official upon the Bishop's instruction.
5. *Any communicant member having attained the age of sixteen years shall be entitled to stand for Vestry membership.*

CANON SIXTY-THREE

OF THE OFFICE OF LAY REPRESENTATIVE

The current text of Canon 63 is set out below for information. The text to be added is shown in italics and the text to be deleted is scored through.

1. In every Incumbency or Joint Incumbency and in private Chapels qualified under Canon 40 Section 4, in such Dependent Congregations as are qualified under Canon 39 Section 2, and in every body of communicants permitted under section 2 below to elect a Lay Representative, the cleric in charge or, in the event that there is a vacancy or no cleric in charge, such person as the Bishop shall direct, shall once in every year convene a meeting of the lay communicants of each congregation for the election of a Lay Representative to represent that congregation in the Diocesan Synod together with an Alternate Lay Representative who, in the absence of the Lay Representative from any meeting, shall be entitled to exercise all the powers of the Lay Representative. These office-bearers shall enter office immediately on election.
2. Where, for a continuous period of at least three years in any diocese, there has existed a body or bodies of lay communicant members of that diocese (not less than thirty in number) whether or not comprising a congregation for the purpose of the preceding section, who regularly worship together but have no right to elect a Lay Representative under any other provisions of the Canons, the Bishop may, subject to such conditions as may be prescribed by resolution, and the approval of the Diocesan Synod, sanction a scheme or schemes to enable the members of such a body or bodies to elect a Lay Representative and upon such a scheme being sanctioned the members of each such body may elect a Lay Representative. In the case of a religious community with a private chapel sanctioned under Canon 40, the requirement that the lay communicant members of the diocese belonging to that body number not less than thirty, shall not apply.
3. The Lay Representative shall, unless otherwise provided in the constitution of the congregation concerned, become a member ex officio of the Vestry of that congregation.
4. The Lay Representative and Alternate Lay Representative should be members of the congregation electing them, but any lay communicant member, not under ~~eighteen~~ *sixteen* years of age, of a congregation or body as specified in Section 2 above within the diocese and resident within the diocese is eligible to hold office.
5. No person shall hold office of Lay Representative or Alternate Lay Representative for more than one congregation or body, other than a linked charge, in the diocese at the same time.

DOCTRINE COMMITTEE

A paper laying out the theology of marriage as currently articulated through the Canons and Liturgy of the Scottish Episcopal Church, and exploring whether there is a case for change based on scripture, tradition and reason.

Prologue

With changes in civil law legislating for same-sex marriage, and same-sex couples seeking God's blessing upon their partnerships, the Church is reflecting on the theological, pastoral and liturgical implications of these developments. The SEC at this juncture is deciding whether to bring same-sex marriage into its life theologically and liturgically (pastorally already having same-sex married or engaged partners in its fold, and clergy being permitted to bless same-sex unions). If it were to do so, the SEC would need to agree some manner of change to Canon 31, the precise nature of which would be advised by the Committee on Canons. The Doctrine Committee has been asked to produce a paper for Faith and Order Board, laying out the theology of marriage as currently articulated through the Canons and Liturgy of the Scottish Episcopal Church, and exploring whether there is a case for change based on scripture, tradition and reason. The Committee has also been asked to include consideration of the theological implications of making provision for blessings (in contrast to marriage services) of same-sex partnerships, and to provide a paper that fairly reflects opposing views on these matters within the Church at this time.

The members of Doctrine Committee hold differing views on these questions. We have endeavoured to set out pertinent arguments to the best integrity of each position so as to aid the discernment process. We have not wanted to safeguard any position for the sake of, say, a 'high view' of Scripture, or a defence of human rights, or any other ideal that might impede our ability to hear what the Spirit is saying to the churches.

Executive Summary

The structure of the proceeding paper is set out below. Note a case made for two changes to Canon 31 regardless of issues around same-sex marriage (paras 14-16). Interpretation of Scripture runs throughout the paper, with more extended consideration of Scripture and the theology of marriage at paras 57ff.

Paras 1-13 Our theology of marriage in the Canons and Liturgy, showing developing changes of emphasis.

Paras 14-18 Raising a case for change, and two areas where change is recommended, aside from matters of same-sex marriage.

Paras 19-22 The Anglican appeal to Scripture, tradition and reason, and its outworking in debates about gender and sexuality.

Paras 23-29 Introducing three options:

Option A. no change to the canons, and hence maintaining a definition of marriage as a union of 'one man and one woman';

Option B. a change to the canons such as will enable the SEC to incorporate same-sex marriage;

Option C. moderate change or parallel provision, allowing for blessings of same-sex covenant partnerships.

Paras 30-116 Discussion of the four causes of marriage as reflected in historic and current marriage liturgies, with arguments for Options A and B set out accordingly. As the four causes of marriage are discussed, the arguments under Option A (no change) and Option B (change to incorporate same-sex marriage) work as counter-arguments to one another.

Paras 30-55 **Cause I. Marriage as for procreation**

Option A (no change)

- i. Procreation is the primary cause of marriage such that sexual differentiation is essential in marriage
- ii. Sexual differentiation is essential to becoming 'one-flesh'
- iii. Marriage would be diminished if same-sex partnerships could be defined as marriage
- iv. The healthy nurture and education of children requires sexual differentiation between parents

Option B (change to incorporate same-sex marriage)

- i. The social function of marriage is prior to the procreative function
- ii. A genital understanding of the 'one-flesh' union is reductive
- iii. Same-sex marriage enhances the heterosexual norm, and can be defended by arguments from nature
- iv. The healthy nurture and education of children does not depend on sexual differentiation between parents or carers

Paras 56-92 **Cause II. Marriage as a remedy against sin**

Paras 57-74 Sub-section, *Considerations from Scripture*

Option A (no change)

- i. Marriage sometimes promoted as a remedy for homosexuality
- ii. To solemnize same-sex marriage would be contrary to Scripture

Option B (change to incorporate same-sex marriage)

- i. Support for marriage as a remedy against sin

- ii. Marriage is diverse in Scripture and society; Biblical emphasis upon covenant faithfulness is a constant and can apply to same-sex marriage

Paras 93-99 **Cause III. Marriage as for mutual comfort and support**

Option A (no change)

- i. sexual differentiation is integral to mutuality within marriage
- ii. Male-female complementarity and difference is essential to marriage.

Option B (change to incorporate same-sex marriage)

- i. Whether male-female differentiation defines marriage is the very matter under dispute, and not all people can be categorized as 'male' or 'female'
- ii. Complementarity speaks not of essential male or female characteristics but of a dynamic within couples that exists regardless of sexual identity

Paras 100-16 **Cause IV Marriage as reflecting the very nature of God's character and love**

Option A (no change)

- i. As Christ gave his body to the Church, so do husband and wife give themselves to one another: sexual difference is significant
- ii. We would change our relationship to the Prayer Book if we changed our definition of marriage

Option B (change to incorporate same-sex marriage)

- i. Same-sex marriage can signify the mystical union between Christ and the Church
- ii. We can uphold the authority of the Prayer Book whilst developing our theology of marriage.

Paras 117-29 Discussion of Option C, provision for same-sex blessings

Para 130 Closing Remarks.

The theology of marriage as currently articulated through the Canons and Liturgy of the Scottish Episcopal Church

The Canons

1. The SEC's official teaching on marriage is enshrined in Canon 31:1.

'The Doctrine of the Church is that Marriage is a physical, spiritual and mystical union of one man and one woman created by their mutual consent of heart, mind and will thereto, and is a holy and lifelong estate instituted of God.'

2. This Canon, 'On the Solemnization of Holy Matrimony', was added to the Code of Canons in 1980, and reflects the mind of the Church as expressed by General Synod at the time. This Canon is unusual in the SEC canons in expressing a theological position which raises questions as to whether the Canons, rather than the Liturgy, are the documents in which doctrine is expounded in Anglicanism. It was added when Canon 31 was altered to allow for the remarriage of divorced persons in church, so that the principle of marriage as a lifelong union could be affirmed alongside the acknowledgement that a civil court might judge a marriage to have broken down irretrievably. The addition affirms that the SEC remains committed to the principle of marriage as lifelong. The phrase within the Canon that has since come under scrutiny, because of questions about same-sex marriage, is that marriage is a 'union of one man and one woman'.

Liturgy

3. There are two authorised marriage liturgies of the SEC: the 1929 Scottish Prayer Book Solemnization of Matrimony, and the 2007 Marriage Liturgy, which superseded a marriage liturgy produced in 1970.

4. Neither liturgy defines marriage as a mystical union of one man and one woman, as Canon 31.1 does, though both imply an understanding that marriage is between one man and one woman, and make reference at various points to 'husband' and 'wife'. Marriage itself is not described as a 'mystical union' in either liturgy; rather marriage is seen as signifying, albeit imperfectly, the mystical union between Christ and the Church. The Scottish Prayer Book speaks of joining together 'this man and this woman in Holy Matrimony', an estate which is 'instituted of God in the time of man's innocency, signifying unto us the mystical union that is betwixt Christ and his Church'. This succinct phrase directs us both to the good of creation, and to the present and future hope that we love as God loves us.

5. In addition, the Prayer Book mentions two 'causes for which Matrimony was ordained':

'for the increase of mankind according to the will of God, and that children might be brought up in the fear and nurture of the Lord, and to the praise of his holy Name;

'for the mutual society, help, and comfort that the one ought to have of the other, both in prosperity and adversity',

in short, for procreation and mutual support.

Scottish liturgies omit the 'remedy for sin'

6. Scottish Prayer Book thereby retains two out of the three causes for marriage named in the [Church of England*] 1662 Book of Common Prayer (BCP). The BCP's three causes for marriage are, first, procreation, second, as 'a remedy against sin', and third, for mutual, society, help and comfort. The Scottish Prayer Book removes all mention of sin or 'natural instincts'.

Modern Scottish liturgies de-emphasise pro-creation

7. From 1970 onwards, the SEC marriage liturgies reflect another shift in the Church's thinking: a move away from regarding procreation as the primary reason or cause for marriage, and an emphasis on other positive aspects of married life for the couple and for human flourishing. This development in no way diminishes the sanctity of procreation and parenthood, but recognizes that they are not integral to all marriages.

8. Other causes of marriage that the SEC liturgies bring to the fore include the social goods that can flow from the marriage union, and the deepening of love and of future hope because marriage is an expression of the character of divine love. The Liturgy of the Word section of the 2007 Marriage Liturgy offers seven different options or themes, only one of which, 4.G, brings 'Family' and children into focus, and even there the accompanying prayers do not presume a procreative marriage, but can imply children from previous unions, adopted and fostered children, and others: 'may they nurture, support and inspire the children with whom you may entrust them', 'Through the children whom you set in our midst may we discover the secret of your kingdom' (prayers, 4.G).

9. The de-emphasis on procreation, and the growing emphasis upon the love of God, are best seen in the three choices of Introduction provided in the SEC 2007 Marriage Liturgy. Introduction 2.C comes from the Alternative Service Book (ASB) of the Church of England, which was introduced in 1980, and which reversed the order of the purposes of marriage as they were given in the BCP and other Church of England marriage rites. The ASB, and thereby Introduction 2. C of the 2007 Marriage Liturgy, gives the order:

'that husband and wife may comfort and help each other'

'that with delight and tenderness they may know each other in love, and through the joy of their bodily union may strengthen the union of their hearts and lives'

'that they may have children and be blessed in caring for them'

Introduction 2.B makes no mention of procreation – only 'nurture' of children – and the final stated purpose is that through this marriage 'human dignity will flourish and deepen'. That is, marriage is not an end in itself but has a broad, indeed universal, social significance.

Modern Scottish liturgies place increasing emphasis upon marriage as reflecting the love and character of God

10. Introduction 2.B describes marriage as expressive of God's love in a way that is even more fundamental than signifying the mystical union between Christ and his Church; marriage is taken to 'reflect the very being of God'.

Marriage is a gift of God and a sign of God's grace. In the life-long union of marriage, we can know the love of God, who made us in the divine image, man and woman.

Marriage finds its origin in God's own being. God is Love, and so wife and husband, giving themselves to one another in love throughout their lives, reflect the very being of God.

Marriage cannot exist on its own. God's call of husband and wife to live faithfully together, to love one another with respect, tenderness and delight, is part of the call to love all people. This love empowers them to care for others [and to nurture children]. By this love human dignity will flourish and deepen.

11. Introduction 2.A is even more explicit about the way in which the covenant of marriage reveals the loving faithfulness of God, by suggesting that marriage reflects the loving relationships within the Godhead; the love between the three persons of the Trinity:

The great stories of God's people and the coming of Jesus proclaim the faithfulness of God's covenant and promise. God as Trinity (Father, Son and Holy Spirit) reveals to us the very nature of love in relationship. Relationships give human life its purpose and direction.

12. The Eucharistic Prayer given as an option at 10.D, Marriage Liturgy 2007, also invites analogies between our love for one another, as expressed in marriage, and God's pattern of Trinitarian love:

Creator, Redeemer, Sustainer, one God whose power is compassion, you invite us to share your own life, for love is your nature and your name.

13. The changes in the Marriage liturgy reflect a growing theological emphasis upon the ways which human love derives from, reflects and participates in divine love. This emphasis enables us to say that marital union enhances our communion with one another and with God, and that this is good for human flourishing and brings us closer to our future, eschatological hope.¹

¹ See from the 2007 Liturgy: 'By this love, human dignity will flourish and deepen', Introduction 2.B; 'to enjoy your blessing and to serve your world', 4.G); 'may we come to share the joy which you have prepared for all who love you', 2.A; 'Open our eyes to glimpse your beauty in all whom you give us to love, and guide our love to find its perfection in reflecting your compassion, your forgiveness', 4.B; 'that...we may raise our eyes and see beyond the Cross of suffering the joy of Resurrection feast', 4.F; 'may we discover the secret of your kingdom', 4.G.

Is there is a case for change based on scripture, tradition and reason?

14. Before embarking on our main discussion, there are two matters to address regarding Canon 31 aside from our consideration of the clause of 'one man and one woman'.

15. First, Canon 31 introduces its definition of marriage by asserting that what is to follow is 'The Doctrine of the Church'. We suggest that this phrase attributes an authority to this Canon that is not borne out by the historical practice of the SEC. Unlike the Church of Scotland (with its Westminster Confession), or the Roman Catholic Church (with its Catechism), Episcopalians have historically been reluctant to formulate binding bodies of doctrine and ordinance beyond the Canons and liturgies, all of which are open to revision by General Synod. Indeed, the Canons of the SEC make this point plain: in the forms of assent made by new bishops, clergy, and layreaders, they are to declare explicitly that they understand the 'doctrine of the Church' to be set forth within the liturgies. The liturgies contain the theological foundations of Christianity, such as the ancient creeds, and Scripture (by means of the Church's Lectionary). But if we were to ask, 'Where in the liturgies is the Doctrine of the SEC actually written down?', we will receive little by way of a clear answer until we realise that the SEC's doctrinal basis is to be found in its entire living practice of worship: in its ecclesial life, in its order, but most particularly in its diverse and evolving body of authorized liturgies. Our understanding of marriage, as reflected in our liturgies, is evolving in response to pastoral need, and 'the Doctrine of the Church' is no more and no less than what we embody in these liturgies. The phrase 'The Doctrine of the Church' as it currently sits within Canon 31, might be taken to suggest something that is fixed, even ossified, and independent of our changing liturgies. We regard the phrase as misleading and suggest that it be removed from Canon 31, regardless of where this current debate goes.

16. Second, we suggest that the statement in Canon 31 that marriage is a 'mystical union' is both misleading and theologically mistaken. The phrase 'mystical union' is related to the BCP teaching that marriage 'signifies the mystical union between Christ and his Church'. The word 'signifies' in the BCP is important. Marriage has never, in mainstream Christian tradition, been seen as a mystical union in and of itself, but as a sign of the mystery of the Church's union with Christ. The Church's union with Christ is both real and not yet fully realised. Christ's union with the Church points us to our future hope, whereas marriage is rooted in creation. As our liturgies show, marriage is understood as a 'gift of God in creation' (Option 2C, Marriage Liturgy 2007), 'instituted in the time of man's innocency' (Prayer Book). In other words, marriage itself is of the order of this creation. It is not of the order of the new creation, or of our eschatological future, but rather a pointer to it. Marriage is something that will pass away in the age to come, as Christ himself taught (Matt.22:30; see also para. 92, below). The mystical union between Christ and his Church, on the other hand, is that in which all things are made new, embodying the self-giving love of which marriage is a sign. The mystical union of Christ and his Church does not thereby render marriage itself a mystical union. We recommend that Canon 31 be changed so as not to make marriage out to be a 'mystical union'. That marriage is a creation ordinance is critical to our deliberations in considering whether or not we can recognise same-sex marriage.

17. The matter at hand is whether there is a case for changing the theology of marriage as articulated through the SEC Canons and Liturgy, in respect of bringing into the life

of the SEC a recognition of same-sex marriage. Such a change would not undo the current theology, that marriage is between one man and one woman, so much as it would extend it such that marriage may also be between two adults of the same sex. Arguments for and against change will be considered below, according to the Anglican principle of bringing scripture, tradition and reason to bear on the matters at hand, and seeking to do justice to the integrity of contrasting positions. If we are feeling despondent about the contrasting positions among us, it is helpful to consider that disagreement, even when it leads to conflict, has throughout the history of the Church been 'a God-given means of discovering what it is we actually believe'.² Bringing rigour and focus to bear on our contrasting positions helps us to clarify what we do and do not wish to affirm, and is for the purpose of moving us as people of God towards greater holiness. If we find ourselves lost in fine details or swept up by strong feelings it is worth reminding ourselves that our propensity for relationship and our sexuality are about our 'corporate holiness...the church as the community of those called to share in the Trinitarian life of God by the free gift of grace; ..seeking to articulate disciplined patterns of worship and holy life within that community.'³ A rich theological appreciation both of relationship and of sexuality takes us far beyond considerations of marriage, but is also articulated through the words of our marriage liturgies, where our love for one another is always begun, continued and ended in God's love.

18. The ways in which our current debates are framed are often too narrow. We leave people of intersex, transex and transgender conditions out of the picture: what does our theology of marriage say to people who are neither 'female' or 'male'? We overlook the fact that Anglican churches recognize polygynous marriages in various provinces, mainly in Africa, thus making a pastoral provision to converts from marriages in which men have several wives (see para 89). We forget that in some strands of Christian tradition we regard those taking religious vows as married to Christ and to one another in community; a form of marriage prized so highly that in most orders only a bishop is able to preside over the ceremony.⁴

The Anglican appeal to Scripture, tradition and reason, and its outworking in debates about gender and sexuality

19. We are asked to revisit our theology of marriage as it is currently articulated in our Canons and Liturgy, to see if in the light of Scripture, tradition and reason there is

² Rowan Williams, 'Article review, Eugene Rogers's *Sexuality and the Christian Body: Their Way into the Triune God*' *Scottish Journal of Theology* 2003, 56(1), pages 82-88, Abstract.

³ Ibid p.83

⁴ The language of 'marriage rite', 'betrothal', 'espousal', 'bride' and 'bridegroom' exists in Religious Profession in both Eastern and Western Monasticism, though not strongly encouraged post-Vatican II. Such language invites further reflection on the mystical union between Christ and the Church, which we use in our liturgies as a type for marriage. In religious profession, the focus is on the mystical marriage of the soul with Christ, and the Church with Christ. N. F Robinson writes: 'The end in view in the act of Monastic Profession is the mystical marriage of the soul with the heavenly bridegroom. The Office of the Little Habit is the mystical betrothal of the soul with Christ, the earnest and pledge of the marriage rite that is to follow, at the giving of the Great and Angelical Habit'. During the Order of the Great Habit, in Modern Hellenic and Slavonic services as described by Robinson, the following words are sung at the clothing; 'He hath put upon me a crown as upon a bridegroom, and as a bride hath he adorned me with an ornament'. N.F. Robinson, *Monasticism in the Orthodox Churches: Being an introduction to the study of modern Hellenic and Slavonic Monasticism and the Orthodox Profession Rites, together with a Greek dissertation on the Monastic Habit, done into English, with Notes* (London: Cope and Fenwick ad the Faith House, 1916), pp. 56-7, 115.

scope for recognizing same-sex marriage. The three-fold appeal to Scripture, tradition and reason has characterized the Anglican way of doing theology since the Sixteenth Century, in contrast to the *sola Scriptura* (Scripture alone) emphasis of other Reformation churches. At this time, the newly emerging English Church was finding its way of enfolding both those who were committed to the new Reformed religion, and those retaining the sensibilities of the old Catholicism. The scholarly priest Richard Hooker, in *the Laws of Ecclesiastical Piety* (I-IV 1593; V 1597; VI-VIII posthumously), balances a reformed theology of the primacy of scripture with a catholic understanding of the body of the church and the efficacy of the sacraments, and holds this balance within a Christian humanism that highly values human reason. Hooker holds that Scripture is primary but is read under the guiding light of reason and the understanding of the Church; no one of these voices eclipses the authority of the other two, and each is brought to its best expression when working with the best insights of the other two:

Be it in matter of the one kind or of the other, what Scripture doth plainly deliver, to that the first place both of credit and obedience is due; the next whereunto is whatsoever any man can necessarily conclude by force of reason; after this the Church succeedeth that which the Church by her ecclesiastical authority shall probably think and define to be true or good, must in congruity of reason overrule all other inferior judgments whatsoever. (Book V, 8:2)

20. Michael Ramsey (Archbishop of Canterbury 1961-74) warned against holding any one of these authorities out of balance with the other two:

Scripturalism is not the same thing as the appeal to Holy Scripture. Traditionalism is not the same thing as the intelligent appeal to tradition. And rationalism can be a very evil thing when it involves a worship of reason, and forgets that reason is concerned with great mysteries requiring awe, wonder, and even cleverness. Reason itself is a gift of God; its use can be corrupted if our dependence on God is forgotten. So we in our study of Anglican tradition must pursue the ways that the appeal to Scripture, Tradition, and Reason can still mutually enrich each other.⁵

21. We hope that our 'reason', as we try faithfully to work out our theology, embodies the continuing guidance of the Holy Spirit; a hope that is conveyed in the Committee Report to the 1948 Lambeth Conference:

Authority, as inherited by the Anglican Communion from the undivided Church of the early centuries of the Christian era, is single in that it is derived from a single Divine source, and reflects within itself the richness and historicity of the divine Revelation, the authority of the eternal Father, the incarnate Son, and the life-giving Spirit. It is distributed among Scripture, Tradition, Creeds, the Ministry of the Word and Sacraments, the witness of saints, and the *consensus fidelium*, which is the continuing experience of the Holy Spirit through His faithful people in the Church.⁶

22. The Virginia Report, produced in 1997 by the Inter-Anglican Theological and Doctrinal Commission, to reflect on Anglican unity in light of proposals to ordain women to the Episcopate, describes reason as 'the divine gift in virtue of which human

⁵ *The Anglican Spirit*, Dale Coleman, ed., Cowley Publications, Cambridge, 1991, pp. 26-33.

⁶ Report IV, The Lambeth Conference 1948. London: SPCK, 1948, pp. 84-85.

persons respond and act with awareness in relation to their world and to God, and are opened up to that which is true for every time and every place' (3.9). The Report adds that: 'Reason cannot be divorced either from Scripture or tradition, since neither is conceivable apart from the working of reason' (3.9). Pertinently for us, the Report goes on to say:

The characteristic Anglican way of living with a constant dynamic interplay of Scripture, tradition and reason means that the mind of God has constantly to be discerned afresh, not only in every age, but in each and every context. Moreover, the experience of the Church as it is lived in different places has something to contribute to the discernment of the mind of Christ for the Church. No one culture, no one period of history has a monopoly of insight into the truth of the Gospel. It is essential for the fullest apprehension of truth that context is in dialogue with context. Sometimes the lived experience of a particular community enables Christian truth to be perceived afresh for the whole community. At other times a desire for change or restatement of the faith in one place provokes a crisis within the whole Church (3.11)

23. It would be artificial and somewhat destructive to attempt to set out arguments as though some were solely drawn from Scripture, or solely from tradition or reason, when in our practice the three authorities inform us by informing each other, and they shape and are shaped by our experience. We cannot read Scripture without recourse to reason and tradition – beginning, for most people, with their dependence on Bible translators. Even when it comes to Biblical commands, which are just one way in which morality is taught through Scripture, and which might seem to be straightforward to understand, 'it is not *the commands the Bible contains* that we obey; it is *the purposes of God that those commands reveal*, taken in their context.'⁷ The process of discerning those purposes is often contentious, and in our endeavours we draw on our powers of reason and the understanding of God's people down the ages. Oliver O'Donovan writes that: 'The purposes of God are the ultimate reason why anything at all is good or evil to do. The Bible is authoritative for ethics because it speaks of those purposes and demonstrates them through God's acts in history' (O'Donovan, p. 75). Hence, Scripture is primary, but reason and tradition are always at play in our reading it, and in our attempts to develop a Scriptural understanding.⁸ :

24. At the same time, we can say of many lines of argument, that they have their provenance in tradition or reason. For an example of where tradition takes the lead, we can again quote Oliver O'Donovan: 'the claim that these categories [marriage or singleness] are mutually exclusive and comprehensive, covering the whole field of possibilities between them, is advanced on the authority of tradition, not of Scripture' (p. 109). If we are to broaden the range of possibilities beyond marriage or singleness, it will be reasoned reflection across a wide range of historical interpretations and cultural and personal experiences that will do the initial work, and in a way that listens to Scripture and tradition. O'Donovan criticizes those whom he calls 'Liberals' for stalling this process and resting too swiftly with a particular reading of tradition, when

⁷ Oliver O'Donovan, *Church in Crisis: the gay controversy and the Anglican Communion*, Eugene: Or: Cascade Books, 2008, p. 75, original emphasis.

⁸ Nicholas Taylor, "Some Observations on Theological Method, Biblical Interpretation, and Ecclesiastical Politics in current disputes in the Anglican Communion", *Theology* 111 (2008) 51-58
https://www.academia.edu/4049188/Some_Observations_on_Theological_method_bibilical_interpret.

there is still more work to do in understanding homosexual experience and how the Good News might bear upon it:

Stable conjugality is the point at which liberalism has made its own peace with the tradition. Or, to put it more unkindly, it is its characteristic form of prudishness. There is, of course, a lot to be said in favor of stable relationships; but before settling on this as the decisive point...is there something important in the roaming character of some gay relations? There is room here for a seriously interesting discussion among gay people which will be instructive to us all (p. 111).

Here O'Donovan is asking that the Church takes its time to 'reason' thoroughly, although he has not extended this to a consideration of the roaming character of some heterosexual relationships.

25. O'Donovan's work helps us to appreciate the diverse roles of Scripture, tradition and reason, and the extent to which reason must exercise its authority in the Church's deliberations over same-sex marriage. However, a call for more time to reason can sometimes be a way of stalling a process, as can arguments that the Church needs a longer period of 'Reception' for new ideas or practice. There is already a history of such reasoned conversation as O'Donovan asks for amongst gay and lesbian people. Michael Vasey famously argued in the 1990s from an evangelical viewpoint that there is no biblical blueprint for same-sex relations and, by implication, they need not assume the same pattern as heterosexual monogamy.⁹ Some lesbians, in particular, reject monogamous and covenantal relationships as inherently patriarchal and abusive.¹⁰ But increasingly arguments are forwarded by homosexual Christians for permanent, stable relationships on the grounds of the spiritual, emotional and physical health of those concerned, the stability of those around them, and the covenant quality of commitments to permanence, which mirror the love and faithfulness of God. What O'Donovan refers to as the 'roaming character' of some gay relationships, they count among the damaging effects that societal rejection has had upon people of same-sex attraction, including the difficulties involved in being able openly to develop a same-sex relationship.¹¹

26. In what follows, we will set out Scriptural, tradition-rich, and reasoned arguments, making a case, respectively, for:

Option A. no change to the canons, and hence maintaining a definition of marriage as a union of 'one man and one woman';

Option B. a change to the canons such as will enable the SEC to incorporate same-sex marriage.

⁹ Michael Vasey, *Evangelical Christians and Gay Rights*, Grove Books 1991, and *Strangers and Friends: A New Exploration of Homosexuality and the Bible* London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1995.

¹⁰ See especially Elizabeth Stuart's two books *Daring to Speak Love's Name*, London: Hamish Hamilton, 1992, and *Just Good Friends*, London, Picador, 1995.

¹¹ Jeffrey John, *Permanent, Faithful, Stable': Christian Same-Sex Marriage*, London: Darton, Longman and Todd, rev'd and updated edn 2012, pp. 35-49; Jim Cotter, ed., *Exploring Lifestyles: An Introduction to Services of Blessing of Gay Couples*, London: Gay Christian Movement, 1980; Jack Dominion, *Sexual Integrity*, London: Mowbray, 1987.

27. We will consider Options A. and B. under headings that reflect the three causes of marriage as featured in our liturgies, plus our developing insight into marriage as a reflection of the love of God, which could be regarded as a fourth cause. The headings are as follows:

I. Marriage as for procreation

II. Marriage as a remedy against sin

III. Marriage as for mutual comfort and support

IV Marriage as reflecting the very nature of God's character and love.

28. Options A. and B. speak directly to a theology of marriage, and therefore will be discussed under these four headings. We will thereafter consider a third option:

Option C. moderate change or parallel provision, allowing for blessings of same-sex covenant partnerships.

29. We have organised the material in this way not to lend support to any one option over another, but because it seems the clearest way to set out arguments and counter-arguments for and against change. Options A. and B. provide counter-arguments to one another, and option C. draws some logic from both A. and B, without satisfying either.

I. Marriage as for Procreation

30. Although the SEC has de-emphasised the potential for procreation as a cause for marriage within its marriage liturgies, we would not wish to suggest that it is an insignificant cause today, nor to play down its importance in the history of the institution of marriage.

31. The command to 'be fruitful and multiply', Genesis 1.28, sets out the potential for procreation. At that point in Scripture, the command to procreate is not specifically associated with marriage, but is the natural outcome of the fact that humans are created beings themselves: male and female, and 'in the image of God' (1.27).

32. The strong association between marriage and procreation is made on the basis of both Scripture and natural law. The biblical literature all originates in contexts in which heterosexual, procreative marriage, was not merely normative but expected. All cultures incarnate the imperative to regenerate the species, and even celibate sub-cultures depend upon the procreative cycle being maintained by the societies from which they recruit new members. Ancient societies required that regeneration be sustained not merely to continue the human life-cycle, but to defend human communities in the face of periodic famine, drought, and disease, and the constant threat of predatory animals and human enemies. Family life was structured to defend and to maximise the procreative potential of women, and sexual relations were regulated accordingly.

33. When the scholastics in the Middle Ages debated the nature of marriage, and developed detailed natural law arguments, they did so in the context of extensive

reforms of marriage in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, when there was significant movement towards young people choosing their own marriage partners. Jean Porter, an expert in Medieval theology and natural law writes that: 'Like the scholastics, we are living through a period of rapid social change and corresponding institutional breakdown and reformation, including extensive and far-reaching changes in the practice of marriage'. The scholastics, she says, saw marriage as 'not a necessary, organic expression of human nature but a complex and in many ways contested set of institutional practices', but they did regard the potential for procreation, including the education and nurture of the young, as its primary function.¹²

Option A (no change)

I.A.i Procreation is the primary cause of marriage such that sexual differentiation is essential in marriage

34. Procreation is a witness to the good of creation, and a sharing in God's joy in creation. It is a creaturely celebration of creation, for to procreate is something that angels cannot do.¹³ The potential for procreation is sometimes argued to be a defining feature in the uniqueness of the marital union between a man and a woman, as the House of Bishops and the Archbishops Council of the Church of England argue:

the uniqueness of marriage – and a further aspect of its virtuous nature – is that it embodies the underlying, objective, distinctiveness of men and women. This distinctiveness and complementarity are seen most explicitly in the biological union of man and woman which potentially brings to the relationship the fruitfulness of procreation. And, even where, for reasons of age, biology or simply choice, a marriage does not have issue, the distinctiveness of male and female is part of what gives marriage its unique social meaning.¹⁴

I.A.ii Sexual differentiation is essential to becoming 'one-flesh'

35. The Church has always recognized that not all marriages will be procreative, so there is no direct move from recognizing non-procreative marriages, to arguing that same-sex partnerships can be defined as 'marriage'. 'The Church in Wales and Same-Sex Partnerships' Report (March 2014) makes the point in this way (para. 69):

We cannot, certainly, always know that a particular union of a man and a woman will produce children, any more than we can guarantee that a particular marriage will succeed as a relationship. But that does not mean that the (non-procreative) sexual partnership of men with men or of women with women is essentially similar to the (non-procreative) marriage of an opposite-sex couple beyond the age for conception. An infertile union of a man and a woman is wholly different from the sexual partnership of a man with a man or a woman with a woman. Even if a man and a woman are, for instance, past the age for conceiving children, their union differs only in degree, not in kind, from the union of any male-female couple. When a man and a woman unite sexually, their

¹² Jean Porter, 'The Natural Law and Innovative Forms of Marriage: A Reconsideration', *Journal of the Society of Christian Ethics* 30, 2 (2010): 79-97, quotations, pp. 89 and 84.

¹³ Robert Song, *Covenant and Calling: Towards a Theology of Same-Sex Relationships*, London: SCM, 2014, p. 13.

¹⁴ <http://www.churchofengland.org/media/1478643/gs%20misc%201027%20government%20consultation%20on%20same%20sex%20marriage.pdf>

bodies form a whole which Genesis describes as 'one flesh', co-ordinated towards the common biological end of the generation of new life. This distinguishes the infertile opposite-sex couple from any two people of the same sex.

36. Here the 'one flesh' union is understood in primarily biological terms, in that penises fit into vaginas, as we see in the Church in Wales Report's use of the following quotation: "Bodily coordination is possible even when its end is not realized; so for a couple [of opposite sex], bodily union occurs in coitus even when conception does not. It is the coordination toward a single end that makes the union; achieving the end would deepen the union, but is not necessary for it." ¹⁵

37. Other interpretations of what it means to be one flesh will be considered below, (II.B.i, and II.B.ii). For now, the point being made is that no human relationship other than that between male and female, has the potential to generate new life, or stands under the blessing proclaimed by God in Gen. 1.28 (Church in Wales Report, para. 72).

I.A.iii Marriage would be diminished if same-sex partnerships could be defined as marriage

38. Concerns are sometimes voiced that same-sex marriage would undermine the institution of marriage, or would cause something to be 'lost' from traditional marriage. These concerns surface as a recurring theme, although people who raise them are not always able to articulate what they feel would be lost. The strongest argument in support of these concerns would seem to be that same-sex marriage might undermine the orientation of the institution of marriage towards procreation: the procreative purpose of marriage is 'the one purpose that must be successfully pursued if a society is to have any future at all', writes the Roman Catholic philosopher Jean Porter.¹⁶ In the teachings of the Catholic Church, 'the fundamental nature of the marriage act, while uniting husband and wife in the closest intimacy, also renders them capable of generating new life—and this as a result of laws written into the actual nature of man and of woman.' (*Humanae Vitae*, 11). Where marital union, the potential to create new life, and the fundamental nature of man and woman are held so tightly together, a reconfiguring of marriage that takes away procreative potential would seem to undermine also the unitive nature of marriage because this is predicated on our very nature as men and women.

39. Anglican theologian John Milbank expresses something of the loss that would be incurred from unpicking essential connection between sexual differentiation in marriage and procreation: 'Heterosexual exchange and reproduction has always been the very "grammar" of social relating as such', he writes, and he argues that to abandon this grammar would be to 'imply a society no longer primarily constituted by extended kinship, but rather by state control and merely monetary exchange and reproduction', because where reproduction is distanced from the union of sexual

¹⁵ Sherif Girgis, Ryan T Anderson, & Robert P. George 2012 *What is Marriage? Man and Woman: a Defence* New York/London: Encounter Books: p26

¹⁶ Jean Porter, 'The Natural Law and Innovative Forms of Marriage: A Reconsideration', *Journal of the Society of Christian Ethics* 30, 2 (2010): 79-97, quotation p. 90.

difference, even 'the natural children of heterosexual couples would then be legally their children if the state decided that they might be legally "adopted" by them'.¹⁷

40. By the same logic, Milbank rejects surrogate motherhood and sperm donation, preferring over these birth from a 'one-night stand'. He resists redefining birth as 'essentially artificial and disconnected from the sexual act – which by no mean implies that each and every sexual act must be open to the possibility of procreation, only that the link in general should not be severed' (ibid).

41. The notion of 'the link in general' is crucial: it means that non-procreative opposite sex-marriage is recognised, because there is a general link between male and female in all opposite-sex marriages, even though the link may not work procreatively in a specific union. Marriages between people of the opposite sex are not rendered less 'real' if they are non-procreative, for the unitive purpose is maintained even where the procreative potential is not realized, and the union is between two people - a man and a woman - who belong to a category of relationships that does in general procreate children. By contrast, 'a gay relationship', Milbank argues, 'cannot qualify as a marriage in terms of its orientation to having children, because the link between an interpersonal and a natural act is entirely crucial to the definition and character of marriage' (ibid).

I.A.iv The healthy nurture and education of children requires sexual differentiation between parents

42. The nurture and education of children, whether or not they are one's own biological children, is a valid extended understanding of the procreative cause of marriage. Non-procreative marriage between a man and a woman is traditionally recognized as able to participate in this procreative function of marriage. Some argue that on the same grounds, same-sex marriage can be recognised as participating in the procreative function of marriage, because the potential to nurture children is equally present (see I.B.iv). Here we consider the opposite view: that the nurturing of children is best exercised by parents of the opposite sex.

43. Two lines of argument need distinguishing here: a) arguments from sexual provenance; b) arguments from complementary influence in up-bringing.

- a) Arguments from sexual provenance apply where children are born in circumstances where they do not know who one or both of their biological parents are. Milbank applies concerns about sexual provenance to his overall argument against same-sex marriage: 'Increasingly, children resulting from anonymous artificial insemination are rightly demanding to know who their natural parents are, for they know that, in part, we indeed *are* our biology. But this request is in principle intolerable for donors who gave their sperm or wombs on the understanding that this was an anonymous donation for public benefit. The recipe for psychological confusion, family division and social conflict involved here is all too evident and cannot be averted' (ibid).
- b) A balanced up-bringing, it is sometimes believed, is most-likely achieved through parents of the opposite sex. Such arguments call upon notions that women generally have certain gifts, such as being good at understanding

¹⁷ ('The impossibility of gay marriage and the threat of biopolitical control', <http://www.abc.net.au/religion/articles/2013/04/23/3743531.htm>)

emotions and at multi-tasking, and men generally have different gifts, such as promoting independence, and that children flourish best with a complementary mix of such influences. More substantially it might be argued that sexual difference is so fundamental that it must be observed in such basic social institutions as marriage, for 'in the Lord woman is not independent of man, nor is man independent of woman' (I Cor. 11.11).

Option B (change to incorporate same-sex marriage)

44. That fact that the SEC has down-played the procreative potential of marriage in its current liturgies could be seen as paving the way for same-sex marriage in the life of the Church, and much of this paper contains reasons for de-emphasising procreation. It was not imagined either in biblical times or in subsequent Church teaching that sexual acts were morally legitimate only when spouses intended procreation. Paul understood this when he remarked that it is better to marry than to burn (I Cor.7-9); a remark that helped the Church towards seeing marriage not only as for procreation but also as a *remedium*, that is, a provision or remedy, for sexual satisfaction (as developed in discussion of cause II below). The Church also came to recognize other causes for marriage: for love and mutual support, as a sacramental bond between spouses, and as reflecting the love of God (see causes III and IV below). For now, however, we consider arguments that do emphasise the importance of procreation within marriage, and which nonetheless make a case for recognizing same-sex marriage.

I.B.i The social function of marriage is prior to the procreative function

45. While we often assume through a mixture of Scripture-reading and natural law, that a biblical argument from creation will point to procreation as the purpose of sex, in Genesis itself the primary reason why God provides a companion for Adam is not procreation but because 'God said, "It is not good for man to be alone"' (Gen 2.18). The initial imperative for the creation of the first woman was that 'there was not found a helper as his [the first man's] partner' (Gen 2.20-25). This is a *social* imperative. The Genesis narrative at this point makes no mention of procreation, but instead implies the existence of the sexual union between the man and the woman, by means of the metaphor of 'one flesh'. The one-flesh metaphor features prominently in the teaching of Jesus concerning marriage (e.g. Mark 10:8), and has influenced many marriage liturgies: 'Therefore a man leaves his father and his mother and clings to his wife, and they become one flesh' (2.24). Notably, while Jesus and Paul both refer to the creation story, and use the 'one flesh' motif (Mk 10.8; I Cor 6.16), they never mention procreation in the context of teaching about marriage. Instead, they emphasise sexual fidelity and indissoluble union. Even here, as Jeffrey John points out, 'the insistence on fidelity is never explained, as we might expect, with reference to practical reasons of child-bearing or domestic stability, but always with reference to the personal and spiritual implications of sexual union' (John, p. 20).

I.B.ii. A genital understanding of the 'one-flesh' union is reductive

46. The Church in Wales Report looks beyond the potential for procreation and purely physical action to the other purposes and meanings of sexual activity:

Indeed, the many ways in which people can, through their sexual activity, harm each other and themselves, or build each other up in love, are mostly predicated not on the relative form of their genitals but through the ways in which inner realities of motivation, understanding, love and purpose, and their absence, are given physical expression. It is the way people treat each other that counts, not the shape of the fleshly tools they use to express this. As we understand circumcision to be of the heart and not the penis, so the way in which we must treat each other sexually is dictated by the heart and the Spirit and not the genitals (para. 125).

47. the 'one-flesh' union brings more than physical pleasure and more than fertility, as Helen Oppenheimer emphasized in her writing on marriage over 40 years ago. She quotes 1 Samuel 1:8, Elkanah's care and concern for Hannah and his saying, 'Am I not more to you than ten sons?' She brings a highly transformational expectation to our understanding of sexual and familial relations:

Hard sayings [in the Gospels and Epistles] are not to be ignored, but it is defeatist to take them as harshly ascetic. Rather, they are reminders that neither sex nor family is absolute. The more the spirit of our age emphasizes the goodness of sexuality, the more the church needs to remember that it exists also for misfits, the awkward, the untypical, the solitary, the distinctively dedicated. The more we commend the family, the more we must acknowledge that no human institution can be translated straight into heaven. Resurrection needs death and rebirth. What we are led to expect is recognizable transformation of all we care about.¹⁸

48. Moreover, while procreation is a good of marriage that speaks to creation, non-procreative relationships populate God's new creation and our eschatological future: 'The first *adam* (the Hebrew word for 'human') may be created male and female, and thereby ordained and rendered able to procreate. But the last Adam, the one who unlike the first Adam does succeed in having all things placed under his feet, does so not by procreation. Jesus Christ, in whom creation is being renewed (cf. Col. 3.10-11), points the way to a different order in which marriage is to be fulfilled' (Song, pp. 17-18). Indeed, there is almost nothing in the New Testament that encourages us to have children. The order of marriage and procreation is passing away, as discussion of Scriptural texts at II.B.ii also shows. While the New Testament logic is in the direction of celibate relations, theologian Robert Song takes this as reason to argue that the time is ripe for us to discover what non-procreative covenant partnerships can show us of the kingdom of God.¹⁹

I.B.iii Same-sex marriage enhances the heterosexual norm, and can be defended by arguments from nature

49. Even where the potential for procreation is seen as the primary cause for marriage, same-sex partnerships can be seen as exceptions that enhance the norm. Andrew Sullivan has been influential in arguing this point: 'the homosexual person might be

¹⁸ Helen Oppenheimer, 'Theology of Marriage', in Alan Richardson and John Bowden, Eds, *A New Dictionary of Christian Theology*. (London: SCM, 1983), p. 346.

¹⁹ *Covenant and Calling*.

seen as a natural foil to the heterosexual norm, a variation that does not eclipse the theme, but resonates with it'.²⁰

50. Jean Porter develops Sullivan's suggestion that homosexual relations enhance the heterosexual norm. She does so in a way that both acknowledges and relativises the primacy of procreation, so that for many couples other reasons for marriage legitimately come to the fore. Porter points out that the scholastics, beginning with the monastic theologian Hugh of St. Victor, regarded the bodily union between spouses as a 'sacrament of the relation between Christ and the church', and the mutual consent to marry as 'a sacrament of the love between God and the soul' (Porter, p. 88). Therefore, 'the sex act potentially serves at least two purposes, namely to provide an occasion for obedience and virtue and to provide for the continuance of the species' (p. 88). Porter holds on theological and biological grounds that procreation is the primary function of marriage, and that to deny this is to 'completely discount that fact that we are mammals and complex social primates' (p. 89). But she also argues that the other purposes of marriage regarding the love that reflects the love of God, are secondary only from this biological, or natural law, point of view, which 'need not imply that they are secondary in the sense of being lesser in value or somehow less admirable or worthy' (p. 91). Indeed in some cases, the purposes of loving union may be 'more centrally important, desirable, and admirable than the primary purpose of procreation' (p. 91). What is more, these diverse range of purposes regarding loving union will in turn transform and enrich what it means to bring forth children and sustain a family system. In this way, same-sex marriage, and other non-procreative unions, can be exceptions that enhance rather than undermine the institution of marriage.

51. Our theology of marriage is rooted in a theology of creation. If, as increasingly seems to be the case, homosexual orientation among animals is natural, or to put it theologically, if homosexual orientation within creatures is part of God's creation, then we should find ways of being true to that. Being homosexual is natural for people who are homosexual, and therefore, Andrew Sullivan argues: 'Extinguishing - or prohibiting - homosexuality is, from this point of view, not a virtuous necessity, but the real crime against nature, a refusal to accept the variety of God's creation, a denial of the way in which the other need not threaten, but may give depth and contrast to the self' (Sullivan, p. 47).

52. Scientific research into sexual orientation is on-going. Whereas, at one time homosexuality was regarded as an illness or disorder that could be cured, it is now realized that sexual orientation is a natural 'given' and enduring disposition, not a choice. For further information in this area we refer readers to the Doctrine Committee's publication of Grosvenor Essay 8 'Marriage and Human Intimacy: Perspectives on same-sex relationships and the life of the church', 2012, pp. 28-31). In summary, the Grosvenor Essay reports findings that only 3-4% of men and 1-2% of women report being exclusively homosexual, and there are intriguing physiological differences between heterosexual and homosexual people (GE8 p. 28). Many early environmental explanations for sexual orientation have now been shown to be false, as has the suggestion that homosexuality is an arrested form of development (GE8 p. 29). Instead, three biological explanations have come to the fore: genetic, with sexual

²⁰ Andrew Sullivan, *Virtually Normal: An Argument about Homosexuality*, 2nd edn with new Afterword, London: Picador, 1996, pp. 19-55, quotations from p. 47.

orientation tending to run in families; differing brain structure; and hormone levels in the womb seemingly affecting sexual orientation (GE8, pp. 29-31).

53. While opponents of same-sex marriage have contested scientific findings in favour of regarding homosexual relations as 'natural', they have been able to argue only that no single theory (genes, environment or hormones) carries the full weight of explanation, and hence that we cannot assume 'that all homosexuals are inherently so from birth'.²¹ Whatever the mechanics of causation, and these may elude us in relation to much of who we are, homosexual orientation is regarded by healthcare professionals as a given or a natural aptitude. We do not need to have scientific certainty as to its cause in order to recognize that it is not a choice.

I.B.iv The healthy nurture and education of children does not depend on sexual differentiation between parents or carers

54. The nurture and education of children, whether or not they are one's own biological children, has always been recognized as a valid extended understanding of the procreative function of marriage, and is seen explicitly in step-parenting and foster-parenting situations. Same-sex marriage carries the potential to nurture children as equally as heterosexual marriage. It is now possible and accepted in law that same-sex couples can raise children, even those that are biologically theirs in the sense of having the egg or sperm from one of the partners. Questions arise then in respect of a) sexual provenance, and b) a balanced up-bringing.

a) Milbank warns that we are sleep-walking into unknown and unstable territory, psychologically and socially, by enabling people to be born such that they cannot discover the identity of their biological parents. We are not able to take a long view on this in terms of evidence gathered over time, in order to assess his fears one way or the other. However, his arguments are against anonymous artificial insemination, and therefore apply beyond the realm of same-sex marriage, and indeed apply to an increasing number of heterosexual marriages where, due to changing age-profile and perhaps environmental factors, significant numbers of married couples are unable to conceive 'naturally'. They apply to any situation, including heterosexual marriage and single-parenting, where sperm donors or surrogate mothers have facilitated procreation. They do not apply to all same-sex unions, nor to same-sex marriage per se. Milbank's assumption that a child born of a one-night stand would be more likely to feel that s/he issued from an interpersonal act of loving encounter, than would a child who had been lovingly planned within a stable and committed relationship is highly questionable.

b) It would appear that children of homosexual parents experience broadly similar outcomes than those of heterosexual parents, and that the quality of parenting is of greater significance than the sexual orientation of the parents.²² Complementarity is discovered and developed between couples

²¹ John Goldingay, Grant R. LeMarquand, George R. Sumner, Daniel A. Westberg, 'Same-Sex Marriage and Anglican Theology: A View from the Traditionalists', *Anglican Theological Review* 93.1: 1-50, quotation p. 35.

²² See e.g. Tasker F, 'Same-Sex Parenting and Child Development: Reviewing the Contribution of Parental Gender', *Journal of Marriage and Family* 72 (February 2010): 35 – 40, <http://www.famigliearcobaleno.org/public/documenti/file/Same-Sex-Parenting-and-ChildDevelopment.pdf>; 'Fond G et al, 'Homosexual parenthood and child development: Present data', *Encephale*, 2012 Feb;38(1):10-5, <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22381718>

as their relationship flourishes, whether these couples are of the same sex or opposite sex.

55. The Church in Wales Report argues, in light of stable family homes in which homosexual couples are successfully caring for children, that: 'Marriage would provide these couples with the security of public recognition and support; those who desire to enter into a committed, loving relationship would not be faced with a choice of committing either to celibacy or to a secular form of cohabitation' (para. 127). The writers of the Report reflect upon a particular scenario:

A Church in Wales cleric was approached for blessing by a lesbian couple. They were providing care for two children, one with physical and mental disabilities, the other of mixed race. Together this family bore many of the markers of biological division used to discriminate between people and divide the essential unity of humanity made in the image of God. But they are, each equally to the other, a source of joy and spring of love that transcends any physical or social barrier. That they should ask for the blessing of a Christian minister, after all that has been directed at them and their identities, is itself deeply humbling and speaks eloquently of the values of the Gospel evident through their union. That the cleric was ashamed to be able to offer only his own blessing and not the official sanction of the Church might indicate that the Gospel was being proclaimed in only one direction that day (para. 128).

II. Marriage as a remedy against sin

56. Marriage as a remedy against sin is omitted as a cause for marriage within SEC liturgies. 'Remedy against sin' is a negative way of expressing what could more positively be construed as a remedy or provision for sexual desire, such that sexual desire can be satisfied in a way that is lovingly ordered. The BCP's wording is that marriage '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.' This cause for marriage is resuming significance in debates over same-sex marriage.

Excursus: Considerations from Scripture

57. Discussion of sin is likely to raise in some people's minds the questions of whether homosexual acts are sinful, and whether it would be a sin on the part of the Church to solemnize same-sex marriage. These questions require some discussion of Scripture before separating considerations out into Options A and B.

58. Admittedly, very few texts in the Bible, five or so, seem to say anything about homosexual activity. Whether these texts speak to what we today recognize as consensual homosexual relations is under dispute. Most of the texts in question are considered below, as we endeavour to track themes for a theology of marriage from Scripture. For readers who would appreciate more detailed discussion, we give

suggestions for further reading in the footnote here.²³ More such references could readily be given, but as the Church of England Pilling Report (para 226) points out, while there has been much talk and writing about homosexuality and Scripture, none has significantly advanced the debate one way or another.

59. Debate is aided, however, by considering what Scripture teaches towards a theology of marriage. We will not find in Scripture clear moral teaching on marriage and sexual expression for our modern times, not least because the cultures out of which the biblical texts arose were so different from our own, and often polygynous, and with ritualistic laws and contractual arrangements that we barely recognize, but also because some teaching, particularly that on divorce, is contested within Scripture itself. What we do find, more profoundly, is a range of biblical themes concerning marriage, which must inform any endeavour to develop a theology of marriage. If you would like a summary of these themes at this stage, see para. 74.

60. We have already given mention of Genesis, with its emphasis upon the companionship of man and woman, and the use that Jesus and Paul make of the creation story in their emphasis upon the indissolubility of marriage (I.B.i).

61. Another element within Scripture is the strict purity laws of the Torah. Some of these laws pertain to marriage or to sexual relations. If a man rapes a woman who is neither engaged nor married, the man must pay her father fifty shekels and marry her, because 'he has violated her', i.e. made her unclean for any other man to marry (Deut. 22.29). Rape of a married or engaged woman is punishable by death (Deut. 22.25). Other offenses punishable by death include: a man having sex with his mother-in-law or daughter-in-law, bestiality (Lev. 20), sex between two men (Lev. 20.13; cf. Lev.18.22). The prohibition against sex between two men at Lev 20.13 follows a list of forbidden incestuous heterosexual acts, and it is at least probable that it refers specifically to the homosexual equivalents of the preceding, and is not a blanket prohibition. The singular form of the verb suggests a dominant or coercive act rather than a consensual relationship. The offense that stands out most starkly is adultery. Not only is adultery punishable by death (Lev. 20.10), but it becomes the paradigmatic sexual sin for illustrating Israel's faltering relationship with God (Hosea; Ezekiel 16). This becomes significant when considering the Biblical emphasis upon God's covenant with unfaithful Israel, a covenant which is described by means of the metaphor of marriage.

62. When we turn to the teachings of Jesus in the NT we find very little concerning marriage and sexual relationships, and what there is mostly concerns divorce, and it is in this context that Jesus uses the notion of 'one flesh' (Mark 10:2-12; Matthew 19:3-9). Such is the indissolubility of this union in God's eyes that, if a man divorces his wife

²³ The Pilling Report itself (https://www.churchofengland.org/media/1891063/pilling_report_gs_1929_web.pdf, para 220ff) provides many helpful references, and the Report includes two contrasting papers, both from an evangelical approach. See also 'A View from the Traditionalists' and 'The Traditionalist Response', *Anglican Theological Review* 93.1 (Winter 2011), esp., pp. 24-29, 94-97). Accessible discussion in favour of same-sex marriage is available at: 'Things gays are liable to read in the Bible', in *More Perfect Union? Understanding Same-Sex Marriage*, by Alan Wilson, Bishop of Buckingham, London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 2014, pp. 67-81); 'Is it Scriptural?' in *Permanent, Faithful, Stable: Christian Same Sex Marriage*, by Jeffery John, London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 2012 edn, pp. 6-22). The website of the Evangelical Fellowship for Lesbian and Gay Christians also contains resources, <http://www.lgcm.org.uk/groups/evangelical-fellowship/>.

and marries again, he commits adultery against his first wife. Matthew famously softens this point, allowing that divorce is permitted in the case of 'immorality' (5:32; 19:9), presumably meaning that divorce is allowed by an injured husband when the wife is unfaithful. (It is unlikely that an injured wife had equivalent rights against an unfaithful husband in Hebrew culture). On the face of it though, Jesus' teaching appears to make marriage transcend any kind of civil union into something which is unbreakable, and the significance of being 'one flesh' is not one of genital fit, but of indissoluble bond.

63. On the other hand, Jesus does not consider the marriage bond to be eternal, i.e. lasting beyond death even into the heavenly existence (Luke 20:34-36); it is a binding *terrestrial* institution. And even on earth, Jesus appears to suggest that marriage (and family) ties are not so strong that they might not be over-ruled by the demands of the kingdom of God. Jesus expects followers to choose him over against their families (Luke 14:26; 18:29-30), showing the degree of commitment which the kingdom requires. We might compare these (metaphorical?) sayings on separation from family with Jesus' curious statement, found in Matthew's version of the divorce passage, about those who make themselves 'eunuchs for the kingdom' (Matt.19:12). Again, we might think that this is hardly meant to be taken literally, but Origen, the great biblical scholar of the early church, famed for his eagerness to interpret the Bible symbolically, allegedly took it in all seriousness and made himself a eunuch. Metaphorical or not though, we have in these various passages another angle on marriage from the lips of Jesus himself, which suggest that marriage is not the only social context in which humans might best serve God.

64. Apart from this, the NT tells us almost nothing else about Jesus' attitude towards marriage and sexual relationships. When we turn to the letters of Paul though, we find more. Paul appears to know of Jesus' teaching on divorce, because he hints at it in his protracted discussion on marital relations in 1 Corinthians 7. But Paul's defining theological objective in this chapter is not harmonious relations so much as eschatology – the last things. 1 Cor. 7 contains one of the strongest statements in all of Paul's letters that Christ will return imminently: 'the appointed time has grown short; from now on, let even those who have wives be as though they had none...for the present form of this world is passing away' (vv.29, 31). This means that there is urgent work to be done, and married life is a distraction which is best avoided if possible: 'The unmarried man is anxious about the affairs of the Lord, how to please the Lord; but the married man is anxious about the affairs of the world, how to please his wife, and his interests are divided' (vv.32-34). So Paul allows that marriages may still take place between believers, especially if strong passions are involved (v.36), but it would be better to devote oneself entirely to the Christian life as a single person, especially considering the urgency of the times. In this, Paul's teaching is not unrelated to Jesus' comments above, about 'hating' father, mother, wife and children for the sake of the kingdom.

65. It is possible to interpret this theme as support for asceticism and for celibacy as Christian ideals, but it is arguable whether this is true to Paul's point. His concern is more that since the whole world – and marriage with it – is about to pass away imminently, it is better to remain in whatever situation one finds oneself, married or single, and to be faithful to Christ in that (vv.17, 20). The single state is no more holy

than marriage, but it is an easier situation in which to maintain an unswerving devotion to Christ, under the circumstances.

66. In 1 Corinthians 6, Paul appears to condemn ‘fornicators, idolators, adulterers, male prostitutes, sodomites...’ (1 Cor.6:9) according to the NRSV’s translation, though noting that there is considerable scholarly uncertainty over the correct meanings of the Greek terms which the NRSV translates as ‘male prostitutes’ and ‘sodomites’. Paul’s point in all this is to maintain purity, since ‘your body is a temple of the Holy Spirit within you’ (v.19). In other words, our bodies are not ours to do with as we will; rather, they belong to God, Paul suggests, and our sexual behavior should be mindful of this: ‘For you were bought with a price; therefore glorify God in your body’ (1Cor. 6:20). And as with Paul’s previous advice, this also has an eschatological dimension. Christ’s sacrifice (the ‘price’ which was paid) has transferred Christians from the old realm of enslavement to various vices (including sexual vices) into the freedom of a new realm with Christ. To return to those old vices is for Christians to place themselves back in the old realm, and to jeopardise their eschatological future come the Day of Judgement. In short, according to Paul, sex has a cosmic, eternal dimension.

67. The vices which Paul lists (1 Cor.6:9-10) are not specifically original to him, nor even specifically Christian. Instead, they point to a standard Jewish view of morality: Paul has taken Jewish ethical ideas of his day and applied them to the particular eschatological situation of urgency which the early church believed itself to be facing. His overriding concern is to maintain purity in the face of a cosmic irruption which would overturn all of the world’s standards and norms and impose new divine standards. And his standard of purity is gleaned mostly from his Jewish background.

68. Homosexual practice, and other sexual practices that deviate from the perpetuation of the family, were like idolatry, regarded by Jews of Paul’s time as characteristically Gentile sins. And so we get something of the same occurring in the famous passage in Romans 1 which condemns homosexual acts (and, uniquely, lesbian acts too, the only place in the Bible where they are mentioned) – Romans 1:26-27. In all of the intense discussion in modern Christian circles about this passage, and its potential application to the *modern* ethics of sexuality, its context in the letter of Romans – and its function in the letter’s overall argument – is not often taken into account. Having set out his thesis statement, that both Jews and Gentiles alike have access to God’s righteousness because of the power of the Christian gospel (1:16-17), Paul goes on to undermine any Jewish sense of superiority over Gentiles. It is clear that Romans was written at least partly to smooth over disputes between Jewish and Gentile Christians in the Roman church. And so Paul challenges his Jewish readers with a subtle ploy, drawing on their ready familiarity with Jewish morality. He does this by first developing a list of what might be regarded as typically Gentile sins (1:18-32), and the condemnations of same-sex activity fall second in the list after idolatry (vv.23-25), the most heinous of all Gentile crimes. The list then proceeds through sexual acts to other kinds of ‘wickedness’, including envy, murder, foolishness, faithlessness, and rebellion towards parents. It is apparent that Paul’s aim in reproducing this rather standard line in Jewish ethics is to lull his Jewish readers into a false sense of security (‘He’s talking about those disgusting Gentiles here’) in order to hammer home his thesis that *all* have sinned, Jew and Gentile alike. And it is apparent that his reasoning for adopting this tactic is to introduce the eschatological challenge again, the looming Day of Judgement: ‘Do you imagine, whoever you are,

that when you judge those who do such things and yet do them yourself, you will escape the judgment of God?' (Rom. 2:3).

69. The point of this discussion is not to 'explain away' or nullify Paul's condemnation of same-sex acts in 1 Corinthians 6 and Romans 1, but to point out the following considerations: 1. the condemnations arise from Paul's descriptions of conventional Jewish morality of his day; they have no specifically Christian content except that, 2. they serve Paul's wider purpose, to prepare the Christian community to face the forthcoming eschatological judgement, which is regarded as imminent in 1 Corinthians (and probably Romans too).

70. Hence, if we are to draw moral lessons about sexual relations from Paul's letters, we need to consider how these two considerations apply to the situation of modern Christianity before we apply Paul's condemnations in any kind of blanket sense. Paul's thinking was clearly informed by his Jewish moral background, as was that of Jesus in his own way. To what extent should it continue to inform ours, who do not possess the same kind of worldview based on rigid boundaries of clean and unclean? It is also worth considering that in Paul's day same-sex couples could not marry (nor undertake civil partnerships) in civil law, so such relationships would automatically be regarded as involving 'fornication' according to Jewish standards, and would therefore be illicit straightaway, without even taking into account OT laws which inform Paul's thinking. (Outside of Judaism, extra-marital sex was not necessarily illicit, unless property rights were thereby violated.)

71. A further important theme in biblical teaching on marriage is that of covenant. From the time of Hosea onwards (e.g. Hosea 2:19-23, Isaiah 54:5-6) the nature of God and of God's attitude towards Israel has been expressed in terms of marriage. God's love is foregrounded, refusing even to divorce Israel for Israel's adultery. The mutual knowledge of God and Israel is mirrored in the marriage relationship. In the NT the metaphor is transferred to Christ and his Church – in Mark 2:18-20, Jesus describes himself as the 'bridegroom' (cf. John 3:29). The kingdom is pictured as a marriage feast (e.g. Matt.22:2-22), and in Revelation, the Church is the Bride (Rev.19:7-9; 21:2, 9). Marriage is used as a metaphor to describe the relationship of God to Israel, and Christ to the Church, in ways that do not depend on sexual identity and differentiation.

72. In 2 Corinthians 11:2, Paul speaks of the church in Corinth as presented in marriage to one husband, 'as a chaste virgin to Christ'. Perhaps the most important passage is Ephesians 5:23-33, where actual marriage is defined with respect to the marriage between Christ and his church – just as the church (the wife) is subject to Christ (the husband) so wives must be subject to their husbands. Husbands must love their wives – as Christ loved the church. Here is an area where many in the SEC (and other churches) have moved away from the scriptural injunction of wives to submit to their husbands. The churches have done so while retaining the central point of the metaphor; that marriage is a self-giving relationship between the spouses, mirroring something of Christ's self-giving love for the Church.

73. In all this, marriage becomes a symbol which stands for God's covenant love and Christ's bond with the Church. Scripture makes the point that relations of human intimacy communicate something of God's relationship with humankind. And the converse is true: if God's love for humankind is revealed as a constant and unbending

commitment, then human relationships should reveal something of the same. To witness two faithful Christians living lives of faithful intimacy with each other should be to witness a vivid illustration of God's love for humankind.

74. The above discussion highlights a number of themes, including:

- marriage as companionship, with questions as to whether it is dissoluble or not;
- marriage as one area around which strict purity laws were taught at a period in Israel's history;
- sexual relations as an area where we are to be mindful of our bodies as temples of the Holy Spirit, and distinct from some 'Gentile' behaviours, i.e. behaviours of the surrounding culture (it is interesting to ask what might be equivalents today: pornography, prostitution, promiscuity and sex-trafficking might be contenders);
- marriage as a vocation, though not one to which all are called, and not one that is carried into our eschatological future;
- marriage as mirroring God's covenant faithfulness and Christ's self-giving love, such that as an ideal it is not dissoluble.

Option A (no change)

II.A.i Marriage sometimes promoted as a remedy for homosexuality

75. Some people regard homosexual acts as themselves sinful. Socially, marriage has sometimes been imposed or embarked upon as a remedy for the 'sin' of homosexuality.

II.A.ii To solemnize same-sex marriage would be contrary to Scripture

76. While we cannot be certain that there is any condemnation in the Bible of consenting, non-exploitative, homosexual relationships, neither is there any suggestion in Scripture that marriage is other than heterosexual.

77. Concern exists that to solemnize same-sex marriage would be to ordain something that is contrary to Scripture. The Church in Wales Report voices this concern thus:

Is this debate leading us to change our teaching and discipline in order to ensure personal fulfilment for our neighbours and avoid social disapproval for ourselves? Scripture and the consistent teaching of the Church over twenty centuries compel many to view the debate in terms of a choice between obedience to God or conformity to the world, a touchstone of authentic Christian life; and "We must obey God rather than men" (Acts 5.29). Would such radical obedience damage our witness to our society? A Church with an unpopular message certainly faces a challenge: but a Church which evades the challenge of obedience will have no life-changing message at all. Article 20 of the 39 Articles puts the issue succinctly: "it is not lawful for the Church to ordain any thing that is contrary to God's Word written." Yet that is precisely what we would be doing, if the Church were to presume to pronounce a blessing on same-sex marriages, or even on more broadly-defined partnerships of a similar nature (para. 76).

78. While the SEC removed its subscription from the 39 Articles in [date*], we would wish to concur with Article 20 in not ordaining anything contrary to God's Word.

79. The Church of England's Pilling Report (2013) contains a dissenting statement from the Bishop of Birkenhead which reasserts a definition of marriage as 'an institution lovingly created by God in which one man and one woman enter into an exclusive relationship for life, believing this to be the only form of partnership approved by God for sexual relations and thus the only form of sexual partnership that properly expresses love for God' (The Pilling Report §488 (c))

Option B (change to incorporate same-sex marriage)

II.B.i Support for marriage as a remedy against sin

80. In current debates, marriage as a remedy for sin is coming back into the picture, with some supporters of same-sex marriage describing marriage in precisely these terms.

81. The Dean of St Albans, Jeffrey John argues that 'the self-discipline and self-sacrifice which are required to make Christian marriage a way of holiness are equally required of a homosexual partnership which deserves the name Christian.'²⁴

82. In 'A View from the Liberals', authors on same-sex marriage for the *Anglican Theological Review* argue that 'the marriage rite initiates couples into an arduous discipline, a training in sanctification'. Their argument is not typically 'liberal, in the sense of advancing individual liberty or human rights, but is based on 'the embodied discipline of marriage by which God may transform longing into charity and dispositions to love into works of virtue'.²⁵ This argument is further developed in ways that take up the (1979 American) *Book of Common Prayer's* context for marriage as the union between Christ and his Church by which God reconciles the world to himself (pp. 51-2). Here is an argument for same-sex marriage that views marriage as a 'discipline', even a 'martyrdom' in a sense of a witness that is both suffering and joyful, to the life of Christ and to Christ's love for his body the Church.²⁶ The argument made is that 'God uses marital faithfulness to heal and perfect sinners' (p. 102).

83. The notion of avoiding homosexual activity by marrying homosexuals to members of the opposite sex is strongly resisted: 'The trouble with marrying people to members of the opposite sex, when the opposite sex is not apposite for them, is that it undermines marriage. It leads to lying of the body, adultery, and divorce, instead of the truthfulness of the body, faithfulness and constancy' ('A View from the Liberals', p. 105). Marriage is a remedy for sin, that is, a provision for well-ordered sexual desire, in that it 'must not bypass but, like the incarnation, take up the body in its movement of love' (p. 105).

84. This reasoning is in alignment with Andrew Sullivan's emphasis upon the naturalness of homosexuality for homosexual people. Jeffrey John provides discussion and statistics that bear this out: police reports, dating from times when such information was gathered, show that around half of those arrested for homosexual activity in public places were married men; promiscuous activity amongst gay men

²⁴ Jeffrey John, *Permanent, Faithful, Stable': Christian Same-Sex Marriage*, London: Darton, Longman and Todd, rev'd and updated edn 2012, p. 1.

²⁵ Dierdre J. Good, Willis J. Jenkins, Cynthia B. Kittredge, Eugene F. Rogers, Jr. 'A Theology of Marriage including Same-Sex Couples: A view from the Liberals', *Anglican theological Review* 93.1: 51-88, quotation, p. 52.

²⁶ See also 'A Response from Sarah Coakley', *Anglican Theological Review* 93.1, p. 112.

falls dramatically when gay men enter stable relationships. John thereby sees 'gay monogamy, no less than heterosexual marriage, effectively fulfil[ling] its Prayer Book function as a "remedy against sin"' (John, pp. 46-7).

II.B.ii Marriage is diverse in Scripture and society; Biblical emphasis upon covenant faithfulness is a constant and can apply to same-sex marriage

85. Whether same-sex marriage would be contrary to Scripture is in large part the task that General Synod needs to discern; a decision that SEC should solemnize same-sex marriages would properly be made on the understanding that such a decision is consistent with, and not contrary to, Scripture.

86. The Bishop of Birkenhead's dissenting statement in the Pilling Report, in which he defines marriage as an institution 'created by God in which one man and one woman enter into an exclusive relationship for life, believing this to be the only form of partnership approved by God for sexual relations and thus the only form of sexual partnership that properly expresses love for God' (The Pilling Report §488 (c)) is acknowledged. However, both in Scripture and in practice, marriage is sometimes polygynous, even in Christian and Anglican contexts (see para. 89), and therefore not exclusive to one man and one woman, and sometimes dissoluble, and therefore not always regarded as being 'for life'. We may think that a view of marriage as a lifelong union between one man and one woman is the 'traditional view', but marriage underwent many changes within biblical times and has undergone many other changes since.

87. Even within our own culture in recent history, marriage has changed from arranged to romantic choice, from male headship to mutual partnership, and from stigmatizing inter-racial marriage and remarriage of divorcees to accepting them. In the nineteenth century becoming a wife meant that a woman lost her identity under the doctrine of coverture and could not control property, enter contracts, or have the right to her own earnings. Marriage was a formal agreement, whose main aim was to provide children and heirs. Now the main aim is seen as companionship, love, support, stability, faithfulness, commitment, which applies equally to heterosexual and homosexual couples.

88. The question before us is whether we should now broaden the definition of marriage in line with society as a whole. The Church, in the world but not of it, needs continually to be aware of changes in society and to discern what of God is in them. Many gay or lesbian people feel rejected by the church and are harmed by that, and the Church is missing crucial opportunities to foster faithful, loving relationships.

89. The way in which the Anglican Communion has made provision for polygamy is interesting for our purposes. Here is a summary, from the Indaba process at the 2008 Lambeth Conference (significant too is the note about bishops of colour in the third paragraph):

There are examples of exceptions to the Church's moral teaching made for pastoral reasons. The African adaptation of the teaching on marriage so as to be able to incorporate polygamists and their wives is a good example. This exception also allows African Anglicans to teach the classic doctrine that

marriage is for one man, one woman. One could object that allowing polygamists into the church—at whatever level—is *de facto* an approval of adultery. That in fact was the initial objection, and on the face of it, polygamy (or polyandry, or its contemporary expression in the West, polyamory), is adulterous in nature. However, the overriding concerns of justice for the wives and children, and mercy for the polygamist, allow the exception to be made. From the biblical perspective, some evidence is found to allow polygamy, as the Mormons will tell you, even though the prophets and the church of the New Testament did not accept it. This ambiguity also gives the exception some sort of biblical backing.

On this basis an exception can be made, and it is clear that Anglicans everywhere now accept it. That the Lambeth Conference came into being to advise on the case of Bishop Colenso, deposed for, among other things, advocating this exception, is proof that this process of approval is by no means automatic or rapid.

However, while a province may make such exceptions, there are limits. Polygamists are not allowed to add more wives, for instance. In particular, when one makes a pastoral exception for a certain group of people, ordaining them to the ministry, and especially the episcopate, is unacceptable. It must be pointed out, however, that the first consecrations of bishops of color were justified as pastoral exceptions made for the sake of mission—while sinfully continuing to deny the equality of those first bishops with others, since they were themselves part of an “inferior race.”²⁷

90. In considering whether same-sex marriage would be contrary to Scripture, it is pertinent to ask: Are there non-negotiable characteristics that the Bible teaches about marriage? If so, do these constitute a lifelong ‘one man and one woman’ relationship? Arguably not, given non-contested polygynous relationships in Scripture and provision for some such polygynous marriages in the Christian world today, and the differences within Scripture itself as to the indissolubility of actual marriages.

91. Or is it that marriage is likened to a covenant, between God and Israel, and to the self-giving bond between Christ and the Church; characteristics that go uncontested within the pages of Scripture itself. If the latter, the pertinent questions that arise for us are 1. ‘Can such covenantal relationships be maintained faithfully between two persons, irrespective of gender?’ 2. ‘If both parties are of the same gender, what if anything distinguishes their covenanted union from ‘marriage’?’

92. Noting that the direction of Jesus’ and Paul’s thinking is towards the new creation in which marriage will have passed away, what does this mean for arguments today to extend the definition of marriage to include same-sex covenant partnerships? Theologically, though not culturally, we are living in the same ‘times’ as the NT ‘times’; the ‘times’ when the Kingdom is among us but is not fully realized. Therefore, we live out the goodness of creation, whilst also anticipating and seeing signs of the new

²⁷ ‘On polygamy, homosexuality, and generosity’, The Rt Revd Pierre W. Whalon, D.D., Bishop in Charge, Convocation of American Churches in Europe.
<http://anglicansonline.org/resources/essays/whalon/PGandH.html>

creation. So we live with the tension of recognizing that marriage is a good but that it is not a good that will continue into our eschatological future. That we are each to live out our calling (I Cor 7.17), is as true for us today as it was for the Christians in Corinth. Some of us are called to be married, some not, and the distinction does not fall according to our sexuality.²⁸

III. Mutual comfort and support

93. The SEC places greatest emphasis on mutual comfort and support as a cause of marriage. Same-sex partners can engage and grow in this purpose as much as opposite-sex partners. The question is whether this in itself makes same-sex covenant partnerships significantly the same as heterosexual marriage.

Option A (no change)

III.A.i Sexual differentiation is integral to mutuality within marriage

94. Just because two women or two men can give mutual comfort and support, and show the love of God to one another, does not mean that their relationships should be counted as marriage. By that reasoning, a case could be made for any relationship that schools people in the virtues of mutual comfort and support, and living out the love of God, to be counted as marriage. As The Church in Wales Report puts it: 'What makes marriage different from other types of relationship (such as friendship, kinship, partnership and so on) is not its subjective qualities, or its ability to be a school of virtue. Many types of relationship can help us develop in virtue. What makes marriage different and unique is that it brings together a woman and a man in a potentially procreative, publicly-acknowledged union which is lifelong and exclusive' (para. 59).

III.A.ii Male-female complementarity and difference is essential to marriage

95. The complementarity of men and women, because of their sexual difference, gives a unique significance to the kind of mutual comfort and support made possible in marriage between a man and a woman. No relationship between those of the same sex can equal the complementarity and difference between the sexes, nor can it create another human being.

Option B (change to incorporate same-sex marriage)

III.B.i Whether male-female differentiation defines marriage is the matter under dispute, and not all people can be categorized as 'male' or 'female'

96. Opposition as expressed in the quotation from the Church in Wales Report (para. 59) is becoming circular. Clearly, if marriage is defined as an exclusive lifelong relationship between one and one woman, same-sex partnerships will not count as marriage. But the matter under consideration is whether we are bound to that definition, or whether there is benefit in expanding it. Already we recognize that partnerships that are not exclusive or not lifelong are nonetheless 'marriages'. In contrast to the quotation in III.A.i, the Church in Wales Report also proposes this consideration (paras 104-5):

Although in tension with some interpretations of scripture and cultural traditions, marriage has evolved in ways that are consistent with the Gospel and with the

²⁸ Cf Song, *Covenant and Calling*, p. 21.

overall prophetic, Spirit-led direction of the development both of scripture and of its interpretation. The trend has been towards a vision of the equality, mutuality and character of the relationship, rather than of partners defined by their biological function.

To open marriage to same-sex couples would continue this trajectory of conforming the flesh to the Spirit and will strengthen, not weaken the ability of marriage to proclaim the heavenly realities of the Kingdom. Indeed, it may help to strengthen our understanding, moving away from a concept of marriage as a matter of fixed biological categories and roles, and towards one of marriage as a union of loving equals in the Spirit.

97. Furthermore, not all people can be neatly categorized as ‘man’ or ‘woman’ in biological terms (in terms, say, of chromosomes or reproductive organs). Some people regard themselves as intersex, or both male and female, or neither. Others, such as transsexual or transgendered people, may experience tension between their biological sex and their experienced sex or socially constructed gender. Is marriage also not possible for them? ‘Marriage that recognises without distinction a variety of gender and sexual orientations, as well as the experience and biology of intersex people, would avoid the need for binary categories such as "gay partnerships" and "straight marriages" which again force an essentialist definition upon creation’ (Church in Wales Report, 110).

98. The need for healing and for positive role-models is also high, given the negative messages that homosexual people have received from the Church and society. Jeffrey John makes this point, in lamenting the Church’s lack of support for clergy in gay relationships: ‘if there is a single group of people who desperately need an ideal and role-models..., it is gay people. ...it is the experience of many clergy in gay relationships who have allowed this to be known, that they rapidly draw a large clientele of other gay people who cannot find the kind of positive Christian counselling they need anywhere else. In this situation... the role-model of the priest really is indispensable and becomes a rock on which others can build’ (John, p. 51).

III.B.ii Complementarity speaks not of essential male or female characteristics but of a dynamic within couples that exists regardless of sexual identity

99. Complementarity arguments draw on essentialist notions that men are characteristically one way, and women another, with different but complementary strengths and weaknesses. Such arguments have sometimes been used to make a case for bringing women alongside men into classrooms, boardrooms and the house of clergy. But they have not been the strongest arguments for opening roles up to both sexes; the strongest arguments being the gifts and vocations of the persons concerned, not any supposed general characteristics of their sex. Arguments from complementarity and difference operate with over-generalised characterisations that can easily lead to type-casting, and for this reason complementarity arguments are often experienced as oppressive. Even if it could be established that women are generally better at reading emotions and men are generally better at reading maps, it would be hard to see how this might carry theological significance. Couples find themselves to complement one another, and to grow in complementing one another, as their relationship develops, regardless of their sex or sexuality.

IV. Marriage as reflecting the love of Christ for the Church and the very nature of God's character and love.

100. The Biblical basis for regarding marriage as reflecting Christ's love for the Church has been discussed under heading II, and it is a feature of the Prayer Book understanding of marriage. SEC liturgical material emphasizes ways in which the giving of spouses to one another reflect God's love, as for example in Option 2B of the Marriage Liturgy 2007: 'In the life-long union of marriage, we can know the love of God'; 'Marriage finds its origin in God's own being. God is Love, and so wife and husband, giving themselves to one another in love throughout their lives, reflect the very being of God'.

101. The question at this juncture is whether marriage as a reflection of God's love and of Christ's self-giving, must be between one man and one woman.

Option A (no change)

IV.A.i. As Christ gave his body to the Church, so do husband and wife give themselves to one another: sexual difference is significant

102. Marriage between man and woman is grounded in our created nature, and is a sign of God's faithful union with the created order. The liturgy describes marriage as a 'gift of God in creation' (Option 2C, Marriage Liturgy 2007); it is not clear that this could be said of same-sex marriage. The union between one man and one woman in marriage is a sign of the mystical union between Christ and his Church, which speaks of theological significance in our sexual differentiation, regarding the giving of husband and wife to each other in love, and the forms of union, including bodily union, which pattern Christ's giving of his body for the Church. Sexual intercourse is 'mutual generosity', as Timothy Radcliffe expresses it, in reflections captured in the Pilling Report. It is 'the complete gift of the body to the other person. 'When you have sexual intercourse with someone, then you say with your body, "I give myself to you and I receive you as a gift."'²⁹

103. So Option 2.C in the Marriage Liturgy 2007 includes the following words: 'It is God's purpose that, as husband and wife give themselves to each other in love throughout their lives, they shall be united in that love as Christ is united with his Church'; and marriage 'is given that with delight and tenderness they may know each other in love, and, through the joy of their bodily union, may strengthen the union of their hearts and lives'.

104. Relations within marriage have also often been understood to share the pattern of the Church's relation to Christ, with Christ as its head, and Christ giving himself for the life of the Church. This is the basis upon which older liturgies contained the words 'honour and obey' in the vows that the woman would speak to the man. We have moved away from this wording in modern liturgies, and many of us do not regard it as healthy for marriages to adhere to a pattern of wives submitting to their husbands. However, we acknowledge that the patterning of married life down the centuries has been based on the understanding of Christ's self-giving love for the Church, and the

²⁹ For theological reflection on the Eucharistic pattern of the giving of our bodies, see Timothy Radcliffe's observations in the Pilling Report, paras 257-69.
https://www.churchofengland.org/media/1891063/pilling_report_gs_1929_web.pdf

Church's love and obedience in return, and that the male-female nature of marriage has been part of that patterning.

IV.A.ii We would change our relationship to the Prayer Book if we changed our definition of marriage

105. In the Prayer Book liturgy for the Solemnization of Holy Matrimony, the congregation is told that it is gathered together 'to join together this man and this woman in Holy Matrimony; which is an honourable estate, instituted of God in the time of man's innocency, signifying unto us the mystical union that is betwixt Christ and his Church.' We are not at liberty to unpick this understanding, and to put other forms of relationship on a par with marriage between a man and woman, as reflecting that mystical union between Christ and the Church.

106. Canon 12. 1 requires that all clergy of the SEC, before assuming any office, subscribe, according to the form provided in Appendix 11, their "assent to the Scottish Book of Common Prayer and of the ordering of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, and to the other authorised liturgical formularies of this Church. I believe the doctrine of the Church as therein set forth to be agreeable to the Word of God."

Option B (change to incorporate same-sex marriage)

IV.B.i Same-sex marriage can also signify the mystical union between Christ and the Church

107. Marriage, and also its relation to procreation, is a sign of God's faithfulness to the created order, and of the good of creation. The mystical union between Christ and the Church is a sign of the new creation, in relation to which the time of marriage and procreation is passing away, and we look for the transformation of all things.

108. Same-sex partnerships, for reasons implied in III.B. above, can school its members in mutual love, comfort and support as well as can opposite-sex partnerships. Same-sex intercourse is also equally a giving of oneself to the other, in vulnerability and unconditionally, in that Eucharistic patterning that Timothy Radcliffe discusses in the Pilling Report. Fr. Radcliffe goes on to consider:

How does all this bear on the question of gay sexuality? We cannot begin with the question of whether it is permitted or forbidden! We must ask what it means, and how far it is Eucharistic. Certainly it can be generous, vulnerable, tender, mutual and non-violent. So in many ways I think it can be expressive of Christ's self-gift...We can also see how homosexuality can be expressive of mutual fidelity, a covenantal relationship in which two people bind themselves to each other for ever. But the proposed legislation for 'gay marriage' implies that it is not understood to be inherently unitive, a becoming one flesh. This is why no equivalence is proposed either for nonconsummation, the becoming one flesh, nor for adultery, which is the denial of that bond (Pilling Report, paras 266. 268).

109. A model of marriage that promotes the submission of wives to husbands on the grounds of the relation of Church to Christ, has been marked by dominance to such

an extent that some Christians have wished to reject marriage as an institution altogether, regarding it as incorrigibly patriarchal and oppressive.³⁰

110. We have also considered that the Godward direction towards the new creation is a direction towards non-procreative partnerships. A question remains therefore about sexually active non-procreative partnerships. Can these reflect the love of God in ways that suggest that same-sex marriage could mirror Christ's love for his Church, or God's covenant with Israel, or the love between the three persons of the Trinity?

111. Robert Song gives some reflection towards this possibility:

To be desired by another whom you yourself desire, to know that you are a joy for another who is in turn a joy for you, these are at the heart of erotic and so of sexual encounter: the intimacy of communion that one experiences with another is a foretaste of the intimacy of communion one will experience with God. Sexual relationship may thus become a glimpse into the inner life of God and focus for us the very reason for our creation, that we might participate in this' (Song, p. 60).

112. It was Rowan Williams's arguments along these lines, in the 1980s, that led people to think he would be actively supportive of clergy in same-sex relationships when he became Archbishop of Canterbury:

The whole story of creation, incarnation and our redemption into the fellowship of Christ's body tells us that God desires us, as if we were God, as if we were that unconditional response to God's giving that God's self makes in the life of the Trinity. We are created so that we may be caught up in this; so that we may grow into the wholehearted love of God by learning that God loves us as God loves God.³¹

IV.B.ii We can uphold the authority of the Prayer Book whilst developing our theology of marriage

113. The Scottish Book of Common Prayer was first published in 1929. Apart from the ill-fated Prayer Book of 1637, there had been no previous Book of Common Prayer in Scotland, except when that of the CoFE was in use. The 1929 SBCP has never been accorded the status that is ascribed to the 1662 BCP in England and in some other Provinces of the Anglican Communion, as the standard against which all theological and liturgical developments are measured. This is made clear in the Declaration of Assent, Appendix 12 to the Canons, in that assent to the SBCP is not to the exclusion of "the other authorised liturgical formularies of this Church". The SBCP is not accorded any privileged status or authority above other authorised liturgies, including any which may be promulgated in the future. Rather, the Declaration of Assent embraces development in the theology and liturgy of the SEC.

³⁰ E.g. Elizabeth Stuart's two books *Daring to Speak Love's Name*, London: Hamish Hamilton, 1992, and *Just Good Friends*, London, Picador, 1995

³¹ Rowan Williams, 'The Body's Grace', in Eugene F. Rogers Jr (ed.), *Theology and Sexuality: Classic and Contemporary Readings*, Oxford: Blackwell, 2002, pp. 309-21, quotation pp. 311-12.

114. Recent decades have seen significant developments in the liturgies of most, if not all, Anglican Provinces, as of other Christian denominations, and the SEC has been no exception. These liturgical reforms have reflected not only the liturgical archaeology which followed the discovery of several ancient liturgical texts, but also quite significant developments in Christian theology. This has been most conspicuously the case with the rites of Christian initiation. Until the latter part of the twentieth century, Baptism and Confirmation had for centuries been understood to be equally essential to the initiation process; reception of the Holy Spirit was associated primarily with the latter rite, which also conferred admission to Communion. This is the doctrine and discipline implicit in all Anglican liturgies, and those of other western Christian denominations before the last quarter of the twentieth century. The World Council of Churches Faith and Order Paper, *Baptism, Eucharist & Ministry*, published in 1982, reflects a radical and near universal transformation in Christian teaching on initiation into the Church, with Baptism recognised as the single and complete initiatory rite, through which the Holy Spirit is received and admission to Communion conferred (in principle if not in practice), while Confirmation is relegated to a subordinate role if retained at all. This is reflected in nearly all contemporary liturgies of Christian initiation, including the rite of Holy Baptism published by the SEC in 2006, and also implied in the title of Affirmation of Holy Baptism for Confirmation and Renewal, published the same year

115. Should Canon 31 be amended to extend to couples of the same sex the option of marriage in church, as provided by the Marriage Law of Scotland, and the authorised Christian Marriage liturgy of the SEC be amended accordingly, this would reflect a rather less fundamental development in the doctrine and liturgy of the SEC than those reflected in changes to the initiation rites. While these have been part of a global Anglican and ecumenical movement in a way which cannot be said of extending marriage to couples of the same sex, there are other examples. The earlier amendment of the marriage discipline of the SEC to permit the remarriage of divorcees has already been mentioned. It could also be noted that the Ordinal appended to the SBCP and equivalent Anglican rites before the latter part of the twentieth century presupposed that those ordained deacon, priest (presbyter), and bishop would be male. Consent to the ordination of women is by no means unanimous in the Anglican Communion or ecumenically, but the SEC has nonetheless found that neither the traditional Anglican formularies and liturgies, nor the absence of consensus in the Anglican Communion and ecumenically, has been an impediment to this significant development.

The same Canon which requires subscription to the SBCP and other authorised liturgies also enshrines the freedom of conscience of the clergy (12. 2). The parameters of this freedom regarding the solemnisation of matrimony are illustrated in the form of application for a Certificate of Authorization under Canon 31. 4. Clergy are not permitted to refuse to submit the application to the bishop on grounds of conscience, but they or the bishop may arrange for another cleric to officiate at the wedding. Similar provision could be made to protect the consciences of clergy unable to officiate at the marriages of couples of the same sex, viz. they, or if necessary their bishop could arrange for another cleric to do so, but they would not be permitted to impede the ceremony from taking place.

116. It is anyway not clear from the Prayer Book that marriage between a man and woman is the only form of relationship that can reflect the mystical union between

Christ and his Church. The compilers of the Prayer Book of course did not consider whether same-sex marriage might also reflect the union between Christ and the Church, and what it tells us of the love of God.

Option C, Provision for Same-Sex Blessings

117. Option C considers the case for some change that enables theological and liturgical recognition and blessing of same-sex partnerships, without counting these partnerships as 'marriage'. Such change may take the form of "parallel provision", i.e. a rite equivalent to marriage for same-sex partnerships, but called something else. Or there may be other practical options.

118. To offer blessings of same-sex partnerships would be to provide pastoral support, to celebrate the goodness of the partnerships, to see them as revelatory of divine love, to bind same-sex partners together in covenant partnership, and to see their relationship as expressive the covenant relationship of God with us.

119 The 2012 'I Will Bless You' Report from General Convention of The Episcopal Church (in America), explains:

When the Church gathers to bless the exchanging of sacred vows in a covenantal relationship, the blessing reflects a threefold action. First, the Church gives thanks for the presence of the Spirit discerned in the lives of the couple. Second, the Church prays for the divine grace and favor the couple will need to live into their commitment to each other with love, fidelity, and holiness of life. And third, the Church commissions the couple to participate in God's own mission in the world. This missional character of covenantal blessing, reflected in both Scripture and the historical traditions of the Church, deserves renewed attention today. While the Church gives thanks for God's presence and blessing, the public affirmation of the blessing of a covenantal relationship also sets that relationship apart for a sacred purpose: to bear witness to the creating, redeeming, and sustaining love of God. "

32

120. To offer blessings of same-sex partnerships would enable the SEC to leave our current theological understanding of marriage intact.

121. John Milbank argues in favour of church blessings for same-sex civil partnerships 'as the strongest possible theological statement of the view that it is possible to recognise the legitimacy of faithful homosexual union without conceding that this is tantamount to marriage'.³³ He regards the sexual union of man and woman as integral to Christian marriage, such that 'consummation' and 'adultery' are categories that apply to marriage, but not to same-sex partnerships, as is implied in legislation for civil partnerships (where non-consummation is not a legal ground for dissolution).

³² https://www.ctepiscopal.org/images/customer-files/I_Will_Bless_You_Corrected.pdf Standing Commission on Liturgy and Music 77th General Convention of The Episcopal Church, July 2012

³³ John Milbank ABC religion and ethics 13 March 2012 <http://www.abc.net.au/religion/>

122. Robert Song develops a theology that bases covenant partnerships not in creation but in the eschatological orientation made possible with the coming of Christ. If civil partnerships could be afforded a liturgical blessing in church, the Church could bless what it sees as good whilst also upholding a theological distinction between marriage and same-sex covenant partnership. This would be good for marriage, as a gift of God in creation, and good for non-marital covenant partnerships as offering and signifying something that is theologically distinct from marriage (Song, pp. 83-8).

123. However, to offer blessings and refuse marriage will seem to many people to fall short of what is hoped for, and to be a second-best offering. As Song recognises, before the law was changed to recognise same-sex marriage, civil partnerships were seen as ‘yet another way of ensuring that gay people are excluded from the full social recognition that is conferred by marriage (Song, pp. 85-6). If the Church offers blessings of civil partnerships, whilst denying marriage to same-sex couples, the church will seem to be giving a similar message of inequality and exclusion, and to be offering too little, too late.

124. One route, theologically and pastorally, that would speak directly to the charge of offering second-rate provision to same-sex couples, would be to transform our theology of marriage such that procreative marriage is one form of a covenant partnership. Robert Song asks: ‘Might it be that after the birth of Christ covenant partnership is the deeper and more embracing category, with procreative marriage now being the special case?’ (p. 89). This route would be highly consonant also with the increasing number of heterosexual marriages that are non-procreative. Song writes: ‘All covenant partnerships would be characterized by faithfulness, permanence and fruitfulness, but in some cases that fruitfulness would take the specific form of children from within the couple’s sexual relationship, in other cases it would take the form of any number of works of charity, including not least adopting and fostering (Song, pp. 89-90).

125. This approach would give a unified theological account of marriage and covenant partnership, showing how a creation ordinance is taken up and fulfilled eschatologically, without losing its grounding in creation. It would also ‘revivify the Christian understanding that marriages are *always* for something beyond themselves, not just for the personal fulfilment of the couple’ (original emphasis, p. 90). Song argues that this need not involve abandoning the language of ‘marriage’ for ‘covenant partnership’, for the proposal is one that reworks the theology of marriage from within, showing that marriage has become something new in Christ (pp. 90-91). It would be a significant move, which would involve reworking the liturgy to show the theological development from seeing marriage as ‘gift in creation’, to seeing it also as fulfilled and made new in Christ. If churches were to go down this route, Song says, they may also decide to retain a separate liturgy for ‘traditional’ marriage, that is, marriage as understood according to creation norms (p. 91). In the SEC the SBCP rite would remain available even if the 2007 rite were superseded.

126. Any type of provision under Option C will remain contentious for those who regard same-sex relations as falling outwith God’s will.

127. Pragmatically, however, it may be that the Church can unite around pastoral provision for blessings of same-sex partnerships, whereas same-sex marriage would

threaten a creation ordinance and divide the church. This is a consideration both within the SEC and more broadly for the Anglican Communion. It is also a consideration ecumenically, for we do not wish to divide the body of Christ more than it is already divided.

128. The introduction of the blessing of same-sex unions has been a regular feature of the Anglican Church of Canada since 2010, and is now considered part of the pastoral norm for that Church in many, but not all, dioceses. Similar arguments apply in the United States (the Episcopal Church) and unofficially there have been a small number of such blessings in the Church of England. This would appear to be the *de facto* position of the SEC also, as reflected most recently in the Bishops' Guidelines of December 2014, i.e. unofficial rites are permitted, but no official liturgy exists or has been mandated. The Pilling report commends provision of same-sex blessings, though not unanimously.

129. Option C would enable pastoral provision to be made to bless same-sex relationships while the theological question of whether Christian marriage is between only a man and a woman remains under consideration.

Closing remarks

130. The task of discernment before us is one of hearing, trusting and obeying. We are to proclaim and live out the Gospel in our particular time and place, and in this we are to test the spirits and see which are of God. As a number of theologians have argued, the biggest challenges to marriage and family life in our culture are the commodification of bodies, children and production, and the quest for personal fulfilment, forgetting that marriage should always point beyond itself, and that all desire should be judged in light of desire for God.³⁴ Such commodification and such forgetting are spirits to resist. The question immediately before us is whether calls for same-sex marriage should also be resisted, perhaps as symptomatic of the commodification of children and the quest for personal fulfilment, or whether they invite a rethinking of a theology of marriage as part of the on-going transformation of all things in Christ?

³⁴ See Milbank, Porter, Song, as cited above, Jessica Martin's 'Prologue' to the Pilling Report, and also Sarah Coakley, *God, Sexuality, and the Self: An Essay 'On the Trinity'*, Cambridge: CUP, 2013.

RESPONSE TO THE WCC FAITH AND ORDER PAPER NO. 214 *The Church: Towards a Common Vision*

The Scottish Episcopal Church (SEC) welcomes the publication of *The Church: Towards a Common Vision* (TCTCV), which it understands as a follow-up document to the WCC's 1982 Faith and Order Paper *Baptism – Eucharist – Ministry* (BEM), building on the reception of BEM, and seeking in the same way to foster and deepen the relationships between churches. SEC values the fact that TCTCV addresses some of the open questions left by BEM in the area of Ministry. The SEC particularly welcomes the emphasis on shared mission articulated in TCTCV, and the recognition that shared mission and theological conversation are essentially related and that both can contribute to a deepening of communion. The SEC welcomes too the way in which TCTCV identifies and articulates the ecclesiastical aspects of a number of key critical issues which affect all churches, including the definition of the local church, authority and primacy, and the extent to which ethics and moral theology are or are not church-dividing. The SEC values the opportunity to respond to TCTCV, which we do by addressing the questions raised by the WCC.

1. To what extent does this text reflect the ecclesiological understanding of your church?

The text is intended to be a convergence document, and for that reason the SEC can indeed affirm that its own ecclesiological understanding is reflected in it. Specifically, TCTCV clearly reflects the conviction, articulated in the first three articles of the Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral and reaffirmed in ecumenical agreements such as Porvoo and Reuilly, that the foundation for understanding and recognising the Church must be:

- a. The Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, “as containing all things necessary to salvation”, and as being the rule and ultimate standard of faith.
- b. The Apostles' Creed, as the baptismal symbol; and the Nicene Creed, as the sufficient statement of the Christian faith.
- c. The two sacraments ordained by Christ himself – Baptism and the Supper of the Lord – ministered with unfailing use of Christ's words of institution, and of the elements ordained by him.¹

That is, TCTCV affirms the biblical and credal foundation and the sacramental life of the churches as fundamental to their existence (e.g. §§ 5, 11-12, 22, 39, 40-44). The SEC welcomes this.

TCTCV also emphasises the need for an ordered ministry (see especially §§ 45-53). Indeed, the fourth article of the Lambeth quadrilateral, which affirms the importance of “The historic episcopate, locally adapted in the methods of its administration to the varying needs of the nations and peoples called of God into the unity of his Church,” is, to a perhaps surprising degree, reflected in TCTCV. We note particularly the question as to whether “the churches can achieve a consensus as to whether or not the threefold ministry is part of God's will for the Church in its realization of the unity which God wills” (comment following §47). The language of *episkopé* is not explicitly used in the context of this discussion,

¹ Lambeth conference 1888, resolution 11 (<http://www.lambethconference.org/resolutions/1888/1888-11.cfm>).

although the term is introduced in the context of the discussion of the ministry of oversight, which recognises that all churches have a means of by which continuity in apostolic faith and unity of life are maintained, local congregations held in communion, and the Church's role in bettering human life and the relief of suffering supported (§52). In the Porvoo agreement this proved a helpful insight: the shift of focus from the episcopate to *episkopé* provided the foundation upon which the Anglican understanding of the threefold ministry could be reconciled with the Lutheran concept of the one ministry in such a way as to enable a full interchangeability of ministry. The SEC has found it helpful to recognise that all ministry incorporates diaconal, presbyteral, and episcopal functions, and that all forms of ordained ministry are (as BEM found) exercised in personal, communal, and collegial ways.

In contrast, TCTCV's tentative exploration of the role of universal primacy (§§ 55-57), even though it concludes that "Christians do not agree that a universal ministry of primacy is necessary or even desirable", may go too far for some Anglicans and Episcopalians, as indicated by the very mixed reception of the ARCIC document *The Gift of Authority*. In this context, the question which follows §57, "how might a ministry that fosters and promotes the unity of the Church at the universal level be understood and exercised?" is an important one.

One of the strengths of TCTCV is its emphasis on the inter-relatedness of "God's Mission and the Unity of the Church" (chapter I), and on the role of the church "In and for the World" (chapter IV). The SEC recognises the "marks of mission" as central to its self-understanding:

- To proclaim the Good News of the Kingdom;
- To teach, baptise and nurture new believers;
- To respond to human need by loving service;
- To seek to transform unjust structures of society, to challenge violence of every kind and to pursue peace and reconciliation;
- To strive to safeguard the integrity of creation and sustain and renew the life of the earth.

These aspects of our church's life are reflected in TCTCV, and particularly in chapters I and IV.

The SEC thus recognises itself in the description of the Church encapsulated in the structure of TCTCV: the SEC hopes – and consciously seeks – to manifest the triune God in its engagement with the world and with other Christian churches. The SEC is committed to shared mission and witness, and to deepening our relationship with other churches and other Christians in Scotland and across the world. TCTCV makes a compelling case for the need for unity (especially §§8-10, 28-32), but it also offers an important reminder that identifying a common cause can deepen mutual understanding of each other and support unity (see §51). A section on mission was added to the Reuilly agreement (between the British and Irish Anglican churches and the French Lutheran and Reformed churches) for precisely this reason.

The SEC recognises that unity is revealed both when churches work together in their mission and ministry and when they engage in theological work relating to questions of faith and order. Such relationships also deepen self-understanding. Thus, the processes which led up to both the Porvoo and the Reuilly agreements

helped the SEC to clarify its own identity as well as deepening relationships between the churches involved, but also helped it to understand what areas of itself might be inessential or even sinful.

2. To what extent does this text offer a basis for growth in unity among the churches?

In their ecumenical relationships, Anglicans and Episcopalians have found it very helpful to enter into mutual affirmations in which they and their ecumenical partners recognise each other as churches. If it is widely received, TCTCV might well offer a basis which would enable churches which until now have been unable to enter into such mutual affirmations to do so. It will be particularly interesting to see how the Roman Catholic Church responds to TCTCV, but this statement may also prove helpful in resourcing discussions with black majority churches or charismatic/Pentecostal churches.

We note, however, that recognition is not the same as reconciliation. Reconciliation emerges from deeper relationships, and these emerge from processes which bring churches closer together locally. The SEC has experiences of Local Ecumenical Partnerships which are able to overcome differences to forge a new, joint identity, but also of congregations which exist alongside each other, for instance when sharing a building, but do not recognise each other as churches. We believe that on a more local level, TCTCV could be used in parish or ecumenical study groups to help Christians to engage more deeply with the lived reality of their churches and the theological underpinning of that reality. TCTCV might in this way stimulate theological discussion and deepening theological awareness.² This is important not only for our relationships with ecumenical partners, but also for deepening theological awareness within the SEC, and for stimulating discussion about (for instance) the relationship between local, national and international church structures. We applaud the way that TCTCV seeks to articulate the underlying issues, for instance the discussion as to whether sacraments are instrumental or expressive (§§40-44 and the following comment). We believe that TCTCV will encourage churches to look more generously at their differences. The questions at the end of each section challenge churches to consider how far we can go together.

The SEC finds it particularly helpful that the question of the legitimate limit of diversity is raised by the TCTCV (§30): “Christians are called not only to work untiringly to overcome divisions and heresies but also to preserve and treasure their legitimate differences of liturgy, custom and law and to foster legitimate diversities of spirituality, theological method and formulation in such a way that they contribute to the unity and catholicity of the Church as a whole.” This may help churches to frame discussions of the extent to which they are already living unity in diversity or reconciled diversity.

TCTCV may also help churches riven by deepening differences over moral questions to place these questions in a broader theological framework. For instance, we note that very wide differences of views about human sexuality are

² We welcome the ACC’s publication of a study guide offering a structure for such discussions: http://www.aco.org/ministry/ecumenical/commissions/iascufo/docs/common_vision_anglican_study_guide.pdf.

held within the SEC: despite the pain of our disagreements, our existence as a church somehow manages to transcend those differences, and TCTCV may be able to help us to understand why that is the case (§§30, 61-63).

We believe the TCTCV may also help Anglicans to think more deeply about the status of the Anglican Communion, and the extent to which it is – or is not—a church. In particular, TCTCV may, within the Anglican Communion, contribute to discussions of what it means to be a communion of churches, and of different ways in which church belonging is defined: as members of a congregation, of a diocese, of a regional or provincial church, as a member of a worldwide communion.

We note that in 1984, no-one could have judged the significance of BEM.

3. What adaptations or renewal in the life of your church does this statement challenge your church to work for?

TCTCV challenges the SEC to take its engagement in prophetic witness and service more seriously as a constituent part of its being a church. In particular, TCTCV offers a reminder of the imperative to engage with issues such as social justice, peace, and the environment. This imperative is recognised in the Anglican Five Marks of Mission: to engage in the *Missio Dei* is “to respond to human need by loving service,” and “to seek to transform unjust structures of society, to challenge violence of every kind, and to pursue peace and reconciliation.” The recent Jerusalem Report of the Anglican Lutheran International Commission focuses on the call to every Christian to engage in *diakonia*, not only as service but as prophetic engagement. The SEC will be engaging in the WCC’s pilgrimage for justice and peace not least through ecumenical social initiatives in Scotland, particularly those combatting poverty and deprivation.

TCTCV also challenges the SEC to engage in exploration with a wide range of partners to discern how we can better affirm how we are connected by being churches together, and how our common vision might take lived shape. This calls the SEC through its status as a member church of Action of Churches Together in Scotland (ACTS) to face the challenge of finding meaningful ways of engaging with churches which are not yet partners or members of ACTS. Here too we note that recognition, although important, is only a first step: accommodation/recognition needs to lead to reconciliation. The SEC hopes that it will be possible to call an early meeting of all the churches in Scotland who are invited to respond to TCTCV in order to begin this process. It is proposed that the SEC and Roman Catholic bishops might discuss TCTCV. The SEC also hopes to extend such engagement beyond the member churches of ACTS. The danger, however, is that churches continue to have conversations about having conversations rather than actually engaging with one another and seeking to affirm our shared mission.

As noted above, TCTCV raises the question of how churches might seek ecumenical agreement around to the exercise of universal authority. This could challenge the SEC to reflect more consciously on its own decision-making structures. TCTCV also poses questions about the definition of the local church and the relation of the local to the universal (§§31-32), offering a good expression

of the complex reality of the SEC's experience of the local church as congregational, diocesan, and national. Although the SEC's theology of unity is centred on the diocese, the experience of individuals tends to be centred on either the immediate worshipping community or the national church.

We note that many Christians in Scotland (and indeed some within the SEC) would see the Church as existing where two or three are gathered together in worship: this is a definition of church which does not appear in TCTCV. Rather, TCTCV challenges churches to think beyond the immediate worshipping community to the larger picture. At the same time, it respects the fact that the definition of ecclesiology needs to pay proper attention to sense of belonging and the ways in which people experience their ecclesiastical identity.

Finally, TCTCV might challenge the SEC to consider more carefully the place of synods in leading the Church, and particularly in helping it to come to a common mind. It may be necessary to move away from adversarial forms of debate towards more conversational, consultative decision making processes with a view to achieving consensus.

4. How far is your church able to form closer relationships in life and mission with those churches which can acknowledge in a positive way the account of the Church described in this statement?

The SEC seeks to work closely with other churches, but we remain conscious that the churches in our context still do much separately which they could do together. Our ecumenical experience suggests that historic structures of separation are not easily overcome even when mutual recognition is present.

The question of ministry – and particularly of threefold ministry, specifically episcopacy – remains one which separates the SEC from our ecumenical partners. In agreements such as Reuilly, Anglicans and Episcopalians have recognised churches which are not episcopally ordered as churches, and have affirmed their sacraments. However, although these agreements lead to eucharistic hospitality, they do not (as yet) lead to (full) communion in the sense of interchangeability of ministries. We will wait with interest to see how these aspects of TCTCV are received by our partner churches and the extent to which TCTCV offers a basis for further developments in these areas.

The SEC will be particularly interested to see whether TCTCV will find acceptance within the Roman Catholic Church, potentially enabling the SEC, other Anglican churches and other churches of the Reformation to enter into a relationship of mutual recognition with the Roman Catholic Church. We hope that TCTCV might stimulate the SEC to engage more deeply with the Anglican Communion's dialogues with the Roman Catholic Church, and especially with the documents produced by ARCIC 2 and IARRCUM.

Perhaps an equally interesting question is that of how the SEC relates to those bodies which do not recognise themselves as churches as defined in TCTCV, such as the Salvation Army, the Religious Society of Friends, and some of the emerging churches.

5. What aspects of the life of the Church could call for further discussion and what advice could your church offer for the ongoing work by Faith and Order in the area of ecclesiology?

As noted above, TCTCV raises the important question of the extent to which diversity is part of the richness of God's creation – and thus a gift to the church – or a detraction from the unity of the church. However, it leaves this question open: §30 asks what are the criteria for determining legitimate diversity, but gives no response to this central question. Earlier discussions of tradition of *adiaphora* may offer insights here; however, in the Scottish context, we are particularly aware that division can be caused by non-theological and well as theological questions, and by questions of order as well as questions of faith. The SEC also notes that it was the recognition of diversity in forms of *episkopé* which helped us to move forward in Porvoo.

The SEC has much to learn from the recognition that common mission should more actively inform theological convergence. We would also like to explore further the question of what kinds of diversity are such that they put us out of touch – or out of communion – with each other. This is clearly a question for on-going discussion and has implications for our understanding of what it means to pursue the vision of full visible unity.

WORLD COUNCIL OF CHURCHES

The Church: Towards a Common Vision

Faith and Order Commission, Penang/ Malaysia 2012.

[A] INTRODUCTION

“Thy will be done” are words that countless believers from all Christian churches pray every day. Jesus himself prayed similar words in the garden of Gethsemane shortly before his arrest (cf. Matt. 26:39-42; Mark 14:36; Luke 22:42). In John’s gospel, moreover, he revealed his will for the Church when he prayed to the Father that all of his disciples be one, so that the world may believe (cf. John 17:21). To pray that the Lord’s will be done thus necessarily requires a wholehearted endeavour to embrace his will for and gift of unity. The present text – *The Church: Towards a Common Vision* – addresses what many consider to be the most difficult issues facing the churches in overcoming any remaining obstacles to their living out the Lord’s gift of communion: our understanding of the nature of the Church itself. The great importance of that gift and goal highlights the significance of the issues to be treated in the pages that follow.

Our aim is to offer a convergence text, that is, a text which, while not expressing full consensus on all the issues considered, is much more than simply an instrument to stimulate further study. Rather, the following pages express how far Christian communities have come in their common understanding of the Church, showing the progress that has been made and indicating work that still needs to be done. The present text has been elaborated by the Faith and Order Commission, whose aim, like that of the World Council of Churches as a whole, is to serve the churches as they “call one another to visible unity in one faith and one eucharistic fellowship, expressed in worship and common life in Christ, through witness and service to the world, and to advance towards that unity in order that the world may believe.”¹ Such visible unity finds a most eloquent expression in the celebration of the eucharist, which glorifies the Triune God and enables the Church to participate in the mission of God for the transformation and salvation of the world. The present statement makes use of the responses of the churches to Faith and Order’s work on ecclesiology in recent years as well as earlier ecumenical documents which have sought convergence through common reflection upon God’s Word, in the hope that, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, the Lord’s gift of unity can be fully realized. Thus it is the result of dialogue at the multilateral level, especially the responses of the churches to *The Nature and Mission of the Church*, of the suggestions offered by the meeting of the Faith and Order plenary commission held in Crete in 2009 and of the contributions of the Orthodox consultation held in Cyprus in 2011. In addition, the text draws upon the progress registered in many bilateral dialogues that have taken up the theme of “Church” in recent decades.²

¹ L. N. Rivera-Pagán (ed.), *God in Your Grace: Official Report of the Ninth Assembly of the World Council of Churches*, Geneva, WCC, 2007, 448.

² For more details about this process, see the historical note which appears at the end of the text.

We hope that *The Church: Towards a Common Vision* will serve the churches in three ways: (1) by providing a synthesis of the results of ecumenical dialogue about important ecclesiological themes in recent decades; (2) by inviting them to appraise the results of this dialogue – confirming positive achievements, pointing out deficiencies and/or indicating areas that have not received sufficient attention; and (3) by providing an occasion for the churches to reflect upon their own understanding of the Lord's will so as to grow towards greater unity (cf. Eph. 4:12-16). Hopefully, such a process of information, reaction and growth, by confirming, enriching and challenging all of the churches, will make a substantial contribution and even enable some decisive steps towards the full realization of unity.

There is a structure to this text, based on the ecclesiological issues that we are addressing. *The Church: Towards a Common Vision* opens with a chapter exploring how the Christian community finds its origin in the mission of God for the saving transformation of the world. The Church is essentially missionary, and unity is essentially related to this mission. The second chapter sets out the salient features of an understanding of the Church as Communion, gathering the results of much common reflection both about how Scripture and subsequent tradition relate the Church to God and some of the consequences of this relation for the life and structure of the Church. The third chapter focuses upon the growth of the Church as the pilgrim people moving towards the kingdom of God, especially upon several difficult ecclesiological questions that have divided the churches in the past. It registers the progress towards greater convergence about some of these issues and clarifies points about which churches may need to seek further convergence. The fourth chapter develops several significant ways in which the Church relates to the world as a sign and agent of God's love, such as proclaiming Christ within an interreligious context, witnessing to the moral values of the Gospel and responding to human suffering and need.

The many official responses to Faith and Order's Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry, of 1982, showed that the process of reception that follows the publication of a convergence text can prove to be just as important as that which led to its production.³ So as to serve as an instrument for genuine dialogue about ecclesiology to which all may make a significant contribution, the churches are urgently requested not only to give serious consideration to *The Church: Towards a Common Vision* but also to submit an official response to the Faith and Order Commission, in the light of the following questions:

- To what extent does this text reflect the ecclesiological understanding of your church?
- To what extent does this text offer a basis for growth in unity among the churches?
- What adaptations or renewal in the life of your church does this statement challenge your church to work for?

³ M. Thurian (ed.), *Churches Respond to BEM: Official Responses to the "Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry" Text*, Geneva, World Council of Churches, vols. I-VI, 1986-1988; *Baptism, Eucharist & Ministry 1982-1990: Report on the Process and Responses*, Geneva, WCC, 1990.

- How far is your church able to form closer relationships in life and mission with those churches which can acknowledge in a positive way the account of the Church described in this statement?
- What aspects of the life of the Church could call for further discussion and what advice could your church offer for the on-going work by Faith and Order in the area of ecclesiology?

In addition to these general questions, readers will find, printed in italics and interspersed throughout the text, paragraphs about specific issues where divisions remain. These questions are intended to stimulate reflection and encourage further agreement among the churches on the path to unity.

[A] CHAPTER I

God's Mission and the Unity of the Church

[B] A. The Church in the Design of God

1. The Christian understanding of the Church and its mission is rooted in the vision of God's great design (or "economy") for all creation: The "kingdom" which was both promised by and manifested in Jesus Christ. According to the Bible, man and woman were created in God's image (cf. Gen. 1:26-27), so bearing an inherent capacity for communion (in Greek *koinonia*) with God and with one another. God's purpose in creation was thwarted by human sin and disobedience (cf. Gen. 3-4; Rom. 1:18-3:20), which damaged the relationship between God, human beings and the created order. But God persisted in faithfulness despite human sin and error. The dynamic history of God's restoration of *koinonia* found its irreversible achievement in the incarnation and paschal mystery of Jesus Christ. The Church, as the body of Christ, acts by the power of the Holy Spirit to continue his life-giving mission in prophetic and compassionate ministry and so participates in God's work of healing a broken world. Communion, whose source is the very life of the Holy Trinity, is both the gift by which the Church lives and, at the same time, the gift that God calls the Church to offer to a wounded and divided humanity in hope of reconciliation and healing.

2. During his earthly ministry, "Jesus went throughout all the cities and villages, teaching in their synagogues and proclaiming the gospel of the kingdom and healing every disease and every sickness. When he saw the crowds he had compassion for them..." (Matt. 9:35-36). The Church takes its mandate from the act and promise of Christ himself, who not only proclaimed the kingdom of God in word and deed but also called men and women and sent them out, empowered by the Holy Spirit (John 20:19-23). The Acts of the Apostles tell us that the last words Jesus addressed to the apostles before his ascension into heaven were: "You will receive power when the Holy Spirit has come upon you; and you will be my witnesses in Jerusalem, in all Judea and Samaria, and to the end of the earth" (Acts 1:8). Each of the four gospels closes with a missionary mandate; Matthew recounts: "And Jesus came and said to them, 'All authority in heaven and on earth has been given to me. Go therefore and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, teaching them to observe all that I have commanded you; and lo, I am with

you always, to the close of the age” (Matt. 28:18-20; see also Mark 16:15; Luke 24:45-49; John 20:19-21). This command by Jesus already hints at what he wanted his Church to be in order to carry out this mission. It was to be a community of witness, proclaiming the kingdom which Jesus had first proclaimed, inviting human beings from all nations to saving faith. It was to be a community of worship, initiating new members by baptism in the name of the Holy Trinity. It was to be a community of discipleship, in which the apostles, by proclaiming the Word, baptizing and celebrating the Lord’s Supper, were to guide new believers to observe all that Jesus himself had commanded.

3. The Holy Spirit came upon the disciples on the morning of Pentecost for the purpose of equipping them to begin the mission entrusted to them (cf. Acts 2:1-41). God’s plan to save the world (sometimes referred to with the Latin expression *missio Dei* or “the mission of God”), is carried out through the sending of the Son and the Holy Spirit. This saving activity of the Holy Trinity is essential to an adequate understanding of the Church. As the Faith and Order study document *Confessing the One Faith* pointed out: “Christians believe and confess with the Creed that there is an indissoluble link between the work of God in Jesus Christ through the Holy Spirit and the *reality* of the Church. This is the testimony of the Scriptures. The origin of the Church is rooted in the plan of the Triune God for humankind’s salvation.”¹

4. Jesus described his ministry as preaching the good news to the poor, releasing the captives, giving sight to the blind, liberating the oppressed and proclaiming the acceptable year of the Lord (cf. Luke 4:18-19, quoting Is. 61:1-2). “The mission of the Church ensues from the nature of the Church as the body of Christ, sharing in the ministry of Christ as Mediator between God and his creation. At the heart of the Church’s vocation in the world is the proclamation of the kingdom of God inaugurated in Jesus the Lord, crucified and risen. Through its internal life of eucharistic worship, thanksgiving, intercessory prayer, through planning for mission and evangelism, through a daily life-style of solidarity with the poor, through advocacy even to confrontation with the powers that oppress human beings, the churches are trying to fulfil this evangelistic vocation.”²

[B] B. The Mission of the Church in History

5. Since these origins, the Church has always been dedicated to proclaiming in word and deed the good news of salvation in Christ, celebrating the sacraments, especially the eucharist, and forming Christian communities. This effort has sometimes encountered bitter resistance; it has sometimes been hindered by opponents or even betrayed by the sinfulness of the messengers. In spite of such difficulties, this proclamation has produced great fruit (cf. Mark 4:8, 20, 26-32).

6. One challenge for the Church has been how to proclaim the Gospel of Christ in a way that awakens a response in the different contexts, languages and cultures of the people who hear that proclamation. St Paul’s preaching of Christ in the Areopagus at Athens (Acts 17:22-34), making use of local beliefs and literature, illustrates how the very first generation of Christians attempted to

¹ *Confessing the One Faith: An Ecumenical Explication of the Apostolic Faith as It Is Confessed in the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed (381)*, Geneva-Eugene, WCC- Wipf & Stock, 2010, §216.

² “Mission and Evangelism: An Ecumenical Affirmation,” §6, in J. Matthey (ed.), *You Are the Light of the World: Statements on Mission by the World Council of Churches*, Geneva, WCC, 2005, 8.

share the good news of Jesus' death and resurrection, drawing upon and, when necessary, transforming, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, the cultural heritage of their listeners and serving as a leaven to foster the well-being of the society in which they lived. Over the centuries, Christians have witnessed to the Gospel within ever increasing horizons, from Jerusalem to the ends of the earth (cf. Acts 1:8). Often their witness to Jesus resulted in martyrdom, but it also led to the spread of the faith and to the establishment of the Church in every corner of the earth. At times, the cultural and religious heritage of those to whom the Gospel was proclaimed was not given the respect it deserved, as when those engaging in evangelization were complicit in imperialistic colonization, which pillaged and even exterminated peoples unable to defend themselves from more powerful invading nations. Notwithstanding such tragic events, God's grace, more powerful than human sinfulness, was able to raise up true disciples and friends of Christ in many lands and establish the Church within the rich variety of many cultures. Such diversity within the unity of the one Christian community was understood by some early writers as an expression of the beauty which Scripture attributes to the bride of Christ (cf. Eph. 5:27 and Rev. 21:2).³ Today believers from churches which once welcomed foreign missionaries have been able to come to the assistance of churches by whose agency they first heard the Gospel.⁴

7. Today the proclamation of the kingdom of God continues throughout the world within rapidly changing circumstances. Some developments are particularly challenging to the Church's mission and self-understanding. The widely diffused awareness of religious pluralism challenges Christians to deepen their reflection about the relation between the proclamation that Jesus is the one and only Saviour of the world, on the one hand, and the claims of other faiths, on the other. The development of means of communication challenges the churches to seek new ways to proclaim the Gospel and to establish and maintain Christian communities. The "emerging churches," which propose a new way of being the Church, challenge other churches to find ways of responding to today's needs and interests in ways which are faithful to what has been received from the beginning. The advance of a global secular culture challenges the Church with a situation in which many question the very possibility of faith, believing that human life is sufficient unto itself, without any reference to God. In some places, the Church faces the challenge of a radical decline in membership and is perceived by many as no longer relevant to their lives, leading those who still believe to speak of the need for a re-evangelization. All churches share the task of evangelization in the face of these challenges and others that may arise within particular contexts.

[B] C. The Importance of Unity

8. The importance of Christian unity to the mission and nature of the Church was already evident in the New Testament. In Acts 15 and Galatians 1-2, it is clear that the mission to the Gentiles gave birth to tensions and threatened to create divisions between Christians. In a way, the contemporary ecumenical movement is reliving the experience of that first council of Jerusalem. The present text is

³ See, for example, Augustine, "Ennarrationes in Psalmos," 44, 24-25, in J. P. Migne, *Patrologia Latina* 36, 509-510.

⁴ Such solidarity of mutual assistance is to be clearly distinguished from proselytism, which wrongly considers other Christian communities as a legitimate field for conversion.

an invitation to the leaders, theologians and faithful of all churches to seek the unity for which Jesus prayed on the eve before he offered his life for the salvation of the world (cf. John 17:21).

9. Visible unity requires that churches be able to recognize in one another the authentic presence of what the Creed of Nicaea-Constantinople (381) calls the “one, holy, catholic, apostolic Church.” This recognition, in turn, may in some instances depend upon changes in doctrine, practice and ministry within any given community. This represents a significant challenge for churches in their journey towards unity.

10. Currently, some identify the Church of Christ exclusively with their own community, while others would acknowledge in communities other than their own a real but incomplete presence of the elements which make up the Church. Others have joined into various types of covenant relationships, which sometimes include the sharing of worship.⁵ Some believe that the Church of Christ is located in all communities that present a convincing claim to be Christian, while others maintain that Christ’s church is invisible and cannot be adequately identified during this earthly pilgrimage.

[C] Fundamental Issues on the Way to Unity

Ever since the Toronto Declaration of 1950, the WCC has challenged the churches to “recognize that the membership of the church of Christ is more inclusive than the membership of their own church body.” Moreover, mutual regard between churches and their members has been profoundly encouraged and advanced by ecumenical encounter. Nevertheless, differences on some basic questions remain and need to be faced together : “How can we identify the Church which the creed calls one, holy, catholic and apostolic?” “What is God’s will for the unity of this Church?” “What do we need to do to put God’s will into practice?” This text has been written in order to assist the churches as they reflect upon such questions, seeking common answers.⁶

⁵ Cf. the Anglican-Lutheran report “Growth in Communion,” in J. Gros, FSC, T.F. Best and L. F. Fuchs, SA (eds.), *Growth in Agreement III: International Dialogue Texts and Agreed Statements, 1998-2005*, Geneva-Grand Rapids, WCC- Eerdmans, 2007, 375-425, which refers to important Anglican-Lutheran regional covenants (Meissen, Reuilly, Waterloo, etc.).

⁶ Thus the present text hopes to build upon the unity statement of the Porto Alegre General Assembly of the World Council of Churches entitled “Called to Be One Church,” whose subtitle is “An Invitation to the Churches to Renew Their Commitment to the Search for Unity and to Deepen Their Dialogue,” in *Growth in Agreement III*, 606-610.

[A] CHAPTER II

The Church of the Triune God

[B] A. Discerning God's Will for the Church

11. All Christians share the conviction that Scripture is normative, therefore the biblical witness provides an irreplaceable source for acquiring greater agreement about the Church. Although the New Testament provides no systematic ecclesiology, it does offer accounts of the faith of the early communities, of their worship and practice of discipleship, of various roles of service and leadership, as well as images and metaphors used to express the identity of the Church. Subsequent interpretation within the Church, seeking always to be faithful to biblical teaching, has produced an additional wealth of ecclesiological insights over the course of history. The same Holy Spirit who guided the earliest communities in producing the inspired biblical text continues, from generation to generation, to guide later followers of Jesus as they strive to be faithful to the Gospel. This is what is understood by the "living Tradition" of the Church.¹ The great importance of Tradition has been acknowledged by most communities, but they vary in assessing how its authority relates to that of Scripture

12. A wide variety of ecclesiological insights can be found in the various books of the New Testament and in subsequent Tradition. The New Testament canon, by embracing this plurality, testifies to its compatibility with the unity of the Church, though without denying the limits to legitimate diversity.² Legitimate diversity is not accidental to the life of the Christian community but is rather an aspect of its catholicity, a quality that reflects the fact that it is part of the Father's design that salvation in Christ be incarnational and thus "take flesh" among the various peoples to whom the Gospel is proclaimed. An adequate approach to the mystery of the Church requires the use and interaction of a wide range of images and insights (people of God, body of Christ, temple of the Holy Spirit, vine, flock, bride, household, soldiers, friends and so forth). The present text seeks to draw upon the richness of the biblical witness, along with insights from the Tradition.

[B] B. The Church of the Triune God as *Koinonia*

¹ As the fourth World Conference on Faith and Order pointed out in its report "Scripture, Tradition and Traditions," "By the Tradition is meant the Gospel itself, transmitted from generation to generation in and by the Church, Christ himself present in the life of the Church. By tradition is meant the traditionary process. The term traditions is used ... to indicate both the diversity of forms of expression and also what we call confessional traditions...." P. C. Roger and L. Vischer (eds.), *The Fourth World Conference on Faith and Order : Montreal 1963*, London, SCM Press, 1964, 50. See also *A Treasure in Earthen Vessels: An Instrument for an Ecumenical Reflection on Hermeneutics*, Geneva, WCC, 1998, §§14-37, pages 14-26.

² This theme will be taken up in §§28-30 below.

[C] The Initiative of God, the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit

13. The Church is called into being by the God, who “so loved the world that he gave his only Son, so that everyone who believes in him may not perish, but may have eternal life” (John 3:16) and who sent the Holy Spirit to lead these believers into all truth, reminding them of all that Jesus taught (cf. John 14:26). In the Church, through life and unity of the Church. This quest presupposes that communion is not simply the union of existing churches in their current form. The noun *koinonia* (communion, participation, fellowship, sharing), which derives from a verb meaning “to have something in common,” “to share,” “to participate,” “to have part in” or “to act together,” appears in passages recounting the sharing in the Lord’s Supper (cf. 1 Cor. 10:16-17), the reconciliation of Paul with Peter, James and John (cf. Gal. 2:7-10), the collection for the poor (cf. Rom. 15:26; 2 Cor. 8:3-4) and the experience and witness of the Church (cf. Acts 2:42-45). As a divinely established communion, the Church belongs to God and does not exist for itself. It is by its very nature missionary, called and sent to witness in its own life to that communion which God intends for all humanity and for all creation in the kingdom.

14. The Church is centred and grounded in the Gospel, the proclamation of the Incarnate Word, Jesus Christ, Son of the Father. This is reflected in the New Testament affirmation, “You have been born anew, not of perishable but of imperishable seed, through the living and enduring word of God” (1 Pet. 1:23). Through the preaching of the Gospel (cf. Rom. 10:14-18) and under the power of the Holy Spirit (cf. 1 Cor. 12:3), human beings come to saving faith and, by sacramental means, are incorporated into the body of Christ (cf. Eph. 1:23). Some communities, following this teaching, would call the Church *creatura evangelii* or “creature of the Gospel.”³ A defining aspect of the Church’s life is the Holy Spirit, believers are united with Jesus Christ and thereby share a living relationship with the Father, who speaks to them and calls forth their trustful response. The biblical notion of *koinonia* has become central in the ecumenical quest for a common understanding of the to be a community that hears and proclaims the word of God. The Church draws life from the Gospel and discovers ever anew the direction for her journey.

15. The response of Mary, the Mother of God (*Theotokos*), to the angel’s message at the annunciation, “Let it be done with me according to your word” (Luke 1:38), has been seen as a symbol of and model for the Church and the individual Christian. The Faith and Order study document Church and World (1990) noted that Mary is “an important example for all who seek to understand the full dimensions of life in Christian community” in that she receives and responds to the Word of God (Luke 1:26-38); shares the joy of the good news with Elizabeth (Luke 1:46-55); meditates, suffers and strives to understand the events of the birth and childhood of Jesus (Matt.

³ See the section “The Church as ‘Creature of the Gospel’” in Lutheran- Roman Catholic Dialogue, “Church and Justification,” in J. Gros, FSC, H. Meyer and W. G. Rusch, (eds.), *Growth in Agreement II: Reports and Agreed Statements of Ecumenical Conversations on a World Level, 1982-1998*, Geneva- Grand Rapids, WCC-Eerdmans, 2000, 495-498, which refers to Martin Luther’s use of this expression in WA 2, 430, 6-7: “*Ecclesia enim creatura est evangelii*.” Some bilateral dialogues have used the Latin *creatura verbi* to express this same idea: see the section “Two Conceptions of the Church” (§§94-113), which describes the Church as “*creatura verbi*” and “sacrament of grace” in the Reformed-Roman Catholic Dialogue, “Towards a Common Understanding of the Church,” in *Growth in Agreement II*, 801-805. See also the statement “Called to Be the One Church,” cf. ch. 1n.6 above.

2:13-23; Luke 2:19, 41-51); seeks to comprehend the full implications of discipleship (Mark 3:31-35; Lk 18:19-20); stands by him under the cross and accompanies his body to the tomb (Matt. 27:55-61; John 19:25-27) and waits with the disciples and receives with them the Holy Spirit on Pentecost (Acts 1:12-14; 2:1-4).⁴

16. Christ prayed to the Father to send the Spirit on his disciples to guide them into all truth (John 15:26, 16:13), and it is the Spirit who not only bestows faith and other charisms upon individual believers but also equips the Church with its essential gifts, qualities and order. The Holy Spirit nourishes and enlivens the body of Christ through the living voice of the preached Gospel, through sacramental communion, especially in the Eucharist, and through ministries of service.

[C] The Prophetic, Priestly and Royal People of God

17. In the call of Abraham, God was choosing for himself a holy people. The prophets frequently recalled this election and vocation in the following powerful formulation: “I will be their God, and they shall be my people” (Jer. 31:33; Ezek. 37:27; echoed in 2 Cor. 6:16; Heb. 8:10). The covenant with Israel marked a decisive moment in the unfolding realization of the plan of salvation. Christians believe that in the ministry, death and resurrection of Jesus and the sending of the Holy Spirit, God established the new covenant for the purpose of uniting all human beings with himself and with one another. There is a genuine newness in the covenant initiated by Christ and yet the Church remains, in God’s design, profoundly related to the people of the first covenant, to whom God will always remain faithful (cf. Rom. 11:11-36).

18. In the Old Testament, the people of Israel are journeying towards the fulfilment of the promise that in Abraham all the nations of the earth shall be blessed. All those who turn to Christ find this promise fulfilled in him, when, on the cross, he broke down the dividing wall between Jew and Gentile (cf. Eph. 2:14). The Church is a “chosen race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, God’s own people” (1 Pet. 2:9-10). While acknowledging the unique priesthood of Jesus Christ, whose one sacrifice institutes the new covenant (cf. Heb. 9:15), believers are called to express by their lives the fact that they have been named a “royal priesthood,” offering themselves “as a living sacrifice, holy and acceptable to God” (Rom. 12:1). Every Christian receives gifts of the Holy Spirit for the upbuilding of the Church and for his or her part in the mission of Christ. These gifts are given for the common good (cf. 1 Cor. 12:7; Eph. 4:11-13) and place obligations of responsibility and mutual accountability on every individual and local community and on the Church as a whole at every level of its life. Strengthened by the Spirit, Christians are called to live out their discipleship in a variety of forms of service.

19. The whole people of God is called to be a prophetic people, bearing witness to God’s word; a priestly people, offering the sacrifice of a life lived in discipleship; and a royal people, serving as instruments for the establishment of God’s reign. All members of the Church share in this vocation.

⁴ See the Faith and Order report *Church and World: The Unity of the Church and the Renewal of Human Community*, Geneva, WCC, 1990, 64. See also the report of the Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission, “Mary: Grace and Hope in Christ,” *Growth in Agreement III*, 82-112; and the report of the Groupe des Dombes, *Mary in the Plan of God and in the Communion of Saints (1997-1998)*, Mahwah, N.J., Paulist Press, 2002.

In calling and sending the Twelve, Jesus laid foundations for the leadership of the community of his disciples in their on-going proclamation of the kingdom. Faithful to his example, from the earliest times some believers were chosen under the guidance of the Spirit and given specific authority and responsibility. Ordained ministers “assemble and build up the Body of Christ by proclaiming and teaching the Word of God, by celebrating the sacraments and by guiding the life of the community in its worship, its mission and its caring ministry.”⁵ All members of the body, ordained and lay, are interrelated members of God’s priestly people. Ordained ministers remind the community of its dependence on Jesus Christ, who is the source of its unity and mission, even as they understand their own ministry as dependent on him. At the same time, they can fulfil their calling only in and for the Church; they need its recognition, support and encouragement.

20. There is widespread agreement among churches of different traditions about the vital place of ministry. This was succinctly expressed in the Faith and Order document, *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry* (1982), which stated that “the Church has never been without persons holding specific authority and responsibility,” noting that, “Jesus chose and sent the disciples to be witnesses of the kingdom.”⁶ The mission which Jesus entrusted to the eleven in Matthew 28 entails “a ministry of word, sacrament and oversight given by Christ to the Church to be carried out by some of its members for the good of all. This triple function of the ministry equips the Church for its mission in the world.”⁷ Agreed statements are making it clear that the royal priesthood of the whole people of God (cf. 1 Pet. 2:9) and a special ordained ministry are both important aspects of the church, and not to be seen as mutually exclusive alternatives. At the same time, churches differ about who is competent to make final decisions for the community; for some that task is restricted to the ordained, while others see the laity as having a role in such decisions.

[C] Body of Christ and Temple of the Holy Spirit

21. Christ is the abiding head of his body the Church, guiding, purifying and healing it (cf. Eph. 5:26). At the same time, he is intimately united to it, giving life to the whole in the Spirit (Rom. 12:5; cf. 1 Cor. 12:12). Faith in Christ is fundamental to membership of the body (Rom. 10:9). According to the understanding of most traditions, it is also through the rites or sacraments of initiation that human beings become members of Christ and in the Lord’s Supper their participation in his body (cf. 1 Cor. 10:16) is renewed again and again. The Holy Spirit confers manifold gifts upon the members and

⁵ *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry*, Geneva, WCC, 1982, section on Ministry, §13.

⁶ *Ibid.*, section on Ministry, §9.

⁷ Reformed-Roman Catholic Dialogue, “Towards a Common Understanding of the Church,” §132, in *Growth in Agreement II*, 810. See also the Lutheran- Roman Catholic report “Ministry in the Church,” §17, in H. Meyer and L. Vischer (eds.), *Growth in Agreement: Reports and Agreed Statements of Ecumenical Conversations on a World Level*, Ramsey-Geneva, Paulist-WCC, 1984, 252-253: “The New Testament shows how there emerged from among the ministries a special ministry which was understood as standing in the succession of the apostles sent by Christ. Such a special ministry proved to be necessary for the sake of leadership in the communities. One can, therefore, say that according to the New Testament the ‘special ministry’ established by Jesus Christ through the calling and sending of the apostles ‘was essential then – it is essential in all times and circumstances.’” The Methodist-Roman Catholic “Toward a Statement on the Church” affirms that “the church has always needed a God-given ministry,” cf. *Growth in Agreement II*, 588, §29.

brings forth their unity for the building up of the body (cf. Rom. 12:4-8; 1 Cor. 12:4-30). He renews their hearts, equipping and calling them to good works,⁸ thus enabling them to serve the Lord in furthering the kingdom in the world. Thus the image of “body of Christ,” though explicitly and primarily referring the Church to Christ, also deeply implies a relation to the Holy Spirit, as witnessed to throughout the entire New Testament. A vivid example of this is the account of the descent of tongues of fire upon the disciples gathered in the upper room on the morning of Pentecost (cf. Acts 2:1-4). By the power of the Holy Spirit believers grow into “a holy temple in the Lord” (Eph. 2:21-22), into a “spiritual house” (1 Pet. 2:5). Filled with the Holy Spirit, they are called to lead a life worthy of their calling in worship, witness and service, eager to maintain the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace (cf. Eph. 4:1-3). The Holy Spirit enlivens and equips the Church to play its role in proclaiming and bringing about that general transformation for which all creation groans (cf. Rom. 8:22-23).

[C] The One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church

22. Since the time of the second ecumenical council, held at Constantinople in 381, most Christians have included in their liturgies the creed which professes the Church to be one, holy, catholic and apostolic. These attributes, which are not separate from one another but which inform one another and are mutually interrelated, are God’s gifts to the Church which believers, in all their human frailty, are constantly called to actualize.

- The Church is one because God is one (cf. John 17:11; 1 Tim. 2:5). In consequence, the apostolic faith is one; the new life in Christ is one; the hope of the Church is one.⁹ Jesus prayed that all his disciples be one so that the world might believe (cf. John 17:20-21) and sent the Spirit to form them into one body (cf. 1 Cor. 12:12-13). Current divisions within and between the churches stand in contrast to this oneness; “these must be overcome through the Spirit’s gifts of faith, hope, and love so that separation and exclusion do not have the last word.”¹⁰ Yet, in spite of all divisions, all the churches understand themselves as founded in the one Gospel (cf. Gal. 1:5-9), and they are united in many features of their lives (cf. Eph. 4:4-7).
- The Church is holy because God is holy (cf. Is. 6:3; Lev. 11:44-45). Jesus “loved the Church and gave himself up for her in order to make her holy by cleansing her with the washing of water by the word...so that she may be holy and without blemish.” (Eph. 5:26-27). The essential holiness of the Church is witnessed to in every generation by holy men and women and by the holy words and actions the Church proclaims and performs in the name of God, the All Holy. Nevertheless, sin, which contradicts this holiness and runs counter to the Church’s true nature and vocation, has again and again disfigured the lives of believers. For this reason, part of the holiness of the Church is its ministry of continually calling people to repentance, renewal and reform.

⁸ Cf. the *Lutheran-Roman Catholic Joint Declaration on the Doctrine of Justification*, Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 2000, §15.

⁹ Cf. “Called to Be the One Church,” §5, in *Growth in Agreement III*, 607.

¹⁰ Ibid.

- The Church is catholic because of the abundant goodness of God “who desires everyone to be saved and come to the knowledge of the truth” (1 Tim. 2:4). Through the life-giving power of God, the Church’s mission transcends all barriers and proclaims the Gospel to all peoples. Where the whole mystery of Christ is present, there too is the Church catholic (cf. Ignatius of Antioch, *Letter to the Smyrneans*, 6), as in the celebration of the eucharist. The essential catholicity of the Church is undermined when cultural and other differences are allowed to develop into division. Christians are called to remove all obstacles to the embodiment of this fullness of truth and life bestowed upon the Church by the power of the Holy Spirit.
- The Church is apostolic because the Father sent the Son to establish it. The Son, in turn, chose and sent the apostles and prophets, empowered with the gifts of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost, to serve as its foundation and to oversee its mission (cf. Eph. 2:20; Rev. 21:14; and Clement of Rome, *Letter to the Corinthians* 42). The Christian community is called to be ever faithful to these apostolic origins; infidelity in worship, witness or service contradicts the Church’s apostolicity. Apostolic succession in ministry, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, is intended to serve the apostolicity of the Church.¹¹

23. In the light of the previous paragraphs (13-22), it is clear that the Church is not merely the sum of individual believers among themselves. The Church is fundamentally a communion in the Triune God and, at the same time, a communion whose members partake together in the life and mission of God (cf. 2 Pet. 1:4), who, as Trinity, is the source and focus of all communions. Thus the Church is both a divine and a human reality.

24. While it is a common affirmation that the Church is a meeting place between the divine and the human, churches nonetheless have different sensitivities or even contrasting convictions concerning the way in which the Holy Spirit’s activity in the Church is related to institutional structures or ministerial order. Some see certain essential aspects of the Church’s order as willed and instituted by Christ himself for all time; therefore, in faithfulness to the Gospel, Christians would have no authority fundamentally to alter this divinely instituted structure. Some affirm that the ordering of the Church according to God’s calling can take more than one form while others affirm that no single institutional order can be attributed to the will of God. Some hold that faithfulness to the Gospel may at times require a break in institutional continuity, while others insist that such faithfulness can be maintained by resolving difficulties without breaks which lead to separation.

[C] How Continuity and Change in the Church Relate to God’s Will

Through their patient encounter, in a spirit of mutual respect and attention, many churches have come to a deeper understanding of these differing sensitivities and convictions regarding continuity and change in the Church. In that deeper understanding, it

¹¹ The World Council of Churches statement “Called to Be the One Church,” §3-7, offers a similar explanation of the creed’s profession that the Church is “one, holy, catholic and apostolic.” Cf. *Growth in Agreement III*, 607.

becomes clear that the same intent – to obey God’s will for the ordering of the Church – may, in some, inspire commitment to continuity and, in others, commitment to change. We invite the churches to recognize and honour each other’s commitment to seeking the will of God in the ordering of the Church. We further invite them to reflect together about the criteria which are employed in different churches for considering issues about continuity and change. How far are such criteria open to development in the light of the urgent call of Christ to reconciliation (cf. Matt. 5:23-24)? Could this be the time for a new approach?

[B] C. The Church as Sign and Servant of God’s De-Sign for the World

25. It is God’s design to gather humanity and all of creation into communion under the Lordship of Christ (cf. Eph. 1:10). The Church, as a reflection of the communion of the Triune God, is meant to serve this goal and is called to manifest God’s mercy to human beings, helping them to achieve the purpose for which they were created and in which their joy ultimately is found: to praise and glorify God together with all the heavenly hosts. This mission of the Church is fulfilled by its members through the witness of their lives and, when possible, through the open proclamation of the good news of Jesus Christ. The mission of the Church is to serve this purpose. Since God wills all people to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth (cf. 1 Tim. 2:4), Christians acknowledge that God reaches out to those who are not explicit members of the Church, in ways that may not be immediately evident to human eyes. While respecting the elements of truth and goodness that can be found in other religions and among those with no religion, the mission of the Church remains that of inviting, through witness and testimony, all men and women to come to know and love Christ Jesus.

26. Some New Testament passages use the term mystery (*mysterion*) to speak both of God’s design of salvation in Christ (cf. Eph. 1:9; 3:4-6) and of the intimate relation between Christ and the Church (cf. Eph. 5:32; Col. 1:24-28). This suggests that the Church enjoys a spiritual, transcendent quality which cannot be grasped simply by looking at its visible appearance. The earthly and spiritual dimensions of the Church cannot be separated. The organizational structures of the Christian community need to be seen and evaluated, for good or ill, in the light of God’s gifts of salvation in Christ, celebrated in the liturgy. The Church, embodying in its own life the mystery of salvation and the transfiguration of humanity, participates in the mission of Christ to reconcile all things to God and to one another through Christ (cf. 2 Cor. 5:18-21; Rom. 8:18-25).

27. While there is wide agreement that God established the Church as the privileged means for bringing about his universal design of salvation, some communities believe that this can be suitably expressed by speaking of the “Church as sacrament,” while others do not normally use such language or reject it outright. Those who use the expression “Church as sacrament” do so because they understand the Church as an effective sign and means (sometimes described by the word *instrument*) of the communion of human beings with one another through their communion in the Triune God.¹² Those who refrain from employing this expression believe that its use could obscure

¹² For example, the Catholic bishops at the Second Vatican Council stated that “the Church, in Christ, is in the nature of sacrament – a sign and instrument, that is, of communion with God and of unity among all men” (cf.

the distinction between the Church as a whole and the individual sacraments and that it may lead one to overlook the sinfulness still present among members of the community. All agree that God is the author of salvation; differences appear concerning the ways in which the various communities understand the nature and role of the Church and its rites in that saving activity.

[C] The Expression, “the Church as Sacrament”

Those who use the expression “the Church as sacrament” do not deny the unique “sacramentality” of the sacraments nor do they deny the frailty of human ministers. Those who reject this expression, on the other hand, do not deny that the Church is an effective sign of God’s presence and action. Might this, therefore, be seen as a question where legitimate differences of formulation are compatible and mutually acceptable?

[B] D. Communion in Unity and Diversity

28. Legitimate diversity in the life of communion is a gift from the Lord. The Holy Spirit bestows a variety of complementary gifts on the faithful for the common good (cf. 1 Cor. 12:4-7). The disciples are called to be fully united (cf. Acts 2:44-47; 4:32-37), while respectful of and enriched by their diversities (1 Cor 12:14-26). Cultural and historical factors contribute to the rich diversity within the Church. The Gospel needs to be proclaimed in languages, symbols and images that are relevant to particular times and contexts so as to be lived authentically in each time and place. Legitimate diversity is compromised whenever Christians consider their own cultural expressions of the Gospel as the only authentic ones, to be imposed upon Christians of other cultures.

29. At the same time, unity must not be surrendered. Through shared faith in Christ, expressed in the proclamation of the Word, the celebration of the sacraments and lives of service and witness, each local church is in communion with the local churches of all places and all times. A pastoral ministry for the service of unity and the upholding of diversity is one of the important means given to the Church in aiding those with different gifts and perspectives to remain mutually accountable to each other.

30. Issues concerning unity and diversity have been a principal concern since the Church discerned, with the aid of the Holy Spirit, that Gentiles were to be welcomed into communion (cf. Acts 15:1-29; 10:1-11:18). The letter addressed from the meeting in Jerusalem to the Christians in Antioch contains what might be called a fundamental principle governing unity and diversity: “For it has seemed good to the Holy Spirit and to us to impose on you no further burden than these essentials” (Acts 15:28). Later, the Ecumenical Councils provided further examples of such “essentials,” as when, at the first Ecumenical Council (Nicaea, 325), the bishops clearly taught that

the Dogmatic Constitution on the Church, *Lumen Gentium*, n. 1, where the word *instrument* is intended to convey in a positive way the “effectiveness” of the Church. Other Christians who strongly affirm the Church’s sacramental nature find inappropriate the use of the word *instrument* in reference to the Christian community. The rather wide reception of the idea that the Church is a sign is witnessed in the World Council of Churches report “The Holy Spirit and the Catholicity of the Church” from the Fourth General Assembly of the WCC held at Uppsala in 1968, which stated: “The Church is bold in speaking of itself as the sign of the coming unity of mankind.” Cf. N. Goodall (ed.), *The Uppsala Report*, Geneva, WCC, 1968, 17. For the Dogmatic Constitution *Lumen Gentium* see <http://www.vatican.va>.

communion in faith required the affirmation of the divinity of Christ. In more recent times, churches have joined together in enunciating firm ecclesial teachings which express the implications of such foundational doctrine, as in the condemnation of apartheid by many Christian communities.¹³ There are limits to legitimate diversity; when it goes beyond acceptable limits it can be destructive of the gift of unity. Within the Church, heresies and schisms, along with political conflicts and expressions of hatred, have threatened God's gift of communion. Christians are called not only to work untiringly to overcome divisions and heresies but also to preserve and treasure their legitimate differences of liturgy, custom and law and to foster legitimate diversities of spirituality, theological method and formulation in such a way that they contribute to the unity and catholicity of the Church as a whole.¹⁴

¹³ "World Council of Churches' Consultation with Member-Churches in South Africa - Cottesloe, Johannesburg, 7-14 December, 1960," in *The Ecumenical Review*, XIII(2), January 1961, 244-250; "Statement on Confessional Integrity," in *In Christ a New Community: The Proceedings of the Sixth Assembly of the Lutheran World Federation: Dar-es-Salaam, Tanzania, June 13-25, 1977*, Geneva, Lutheran World Federation, 1977, 179-180, 210-212; "Resolution on Racism and South Africa," in *Ottawa 82: Proceedings of the 21st General Council of the World Alliance of Reformed Churches (Presbyterian and Congregational) Held at Ottawa, Canada, August 17-27, 1982*, Geneva, Offices of the Alliance, 1983, 176-180; The Belhar Confession, <http://www.urcsa.org.za/documents/The%20Belhar%20Confession.pdf>.

¹⁴ Cf. the World Council of Churches statement "The Unity of the Church as *Koinonia*: Gift and Calling": "Diversities which are rooted in theological traditions, various cultural, ethnic or historical contacts are integral to the nature of communion; yet there are limits to diversity. Diversity is illegitimate when, for instance, it makes impossible the common confession of Jesus Christ as God and Saviour the same yesterday, today and forever (Heb. 13:8).... In communion diversities are brought together in harmony as gifts of the Holy Spirit, contributing to the richness and fullness of the church of God." In M. Kinnamon (ed.), *Signs of the Spirit: Official Report Seventh Assembly*, Geneva-Grand Rapids, WCC-Eerdmans, 1991, 173. Legitimate diversity is frequently treated in the international bilateral dialogues. The Anglican-Orthodox dialogue, for instance, notes the wide diversity in life of the local churches: "As long as their witness to the one faith remains unimpaired, such diversity is seen not as a deficiency or cause for division, but as a mark of the fullness of the one Spirit who distributes to each according to his will." *The Church of the Triune God: The Cyprus Statement Agreed by the International Commission for Anglican-Orthodox Dialogue 2006*, London, Anglican Communion Office, 2006, 91. See also: Lutheran-Roman Catholic Dialogue, *Facing Unity* (1984), §§5-7, 27-30, and especially 31-34, in *Growth in Agreement II*, 445-446, 449-450; Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission, *The Gift of Authority*, §§26-31, in *Growth in Agreement III*, 68-69; Methodist-Roman Catholic Dialogue, *Speaking the Truth in Love*, §50, in *Growth in Agreement III*, 154.

[C] Legitimate and Divisive Diversity

Ecumenical dialogue in search of the unity for which Christ prayed has, in large part, been an effort by representatives from various Christian churches to discern, with the help of the Holy Spirit, what is necessary for unity, according to the will of God, and what is properly understood as legitimate diversity. Though all churches have their own procedures for distinguishing legitimate from illegitimate diversity, it is clear that two things are lacking: (a) common criteria, or means of discernment, and (b) such mutually recognized structures as are needed to use these effectively. All churches seek to follow the will of the Lord yet they continue to disagree on some aspects of faith and order and, moreover, on whether such disagreements are Church-divisive or, instead, part of legitimate diversity. We invite the churches to consider: what positive steps can be taken to make common discernment possible?

[B] E. Communion of Local Churches

31. The ecclesiology of communion provides a helpful framework for considering the relation between the local church and the universal Church. Most Christians could agree that the local church is “a community of baptized believers in which the word of God is preached, the apostolic faith confessed, the sacraments are celebrated, the redemptive work of Christ for the world is witnessed to, and a ministry of episkopé exercised by bishops or other ministers in serving the community.”¹⁵ Culture, language and shared history all enter into the very fabric of the local church. At the same time, the Christian community in each place shares with all the other local communities all that is essential to the life of communion. Each local church contains within it the fullness of what it is to be the Church. It is wholly Church, but not the whole Church. Thus, the local church should not be seen in isolation from but in dynamic relation with other local churches. From the beginning communion was maintained between local churches by collections, exchanges of letters, visits, eucharistic hospitality and tangible expressions of solidarity (cf. 1 Cor. 16; 2 Cor. 8:1-9; Gal. 2:1-10). From time to time, during the first centuries, local churches assembled to take counsel together. All of these were ways of nurturing interdependence and maintaining communion. This communion of local churches is thus not an optional extra. The universal Church is the communion of all local churches united in faith and worship around the world.¹⁶ It is not merely the sum, federation or juxtaposition of local churches, but all of them together are the same Church present and acting in this world. Catholicity, as described in the baptismal catechesis of Cyril of Jerusalem, refers not

¹⁵ Cf. the report of the Joint Working Group of the World Council of Churches and the Roman Catholic Church, “The Church: Local and Universal,” §15, in *Growth in Agreement II*, 866. “Local” should not be confused with “denominational” in this description.

¹⁶ Cf. the unity statements of the New Delhi, Uppsala, and Nairobi assemblies of the World Council of Churches in W. A. Visser ‘t Hooft (ed.), *The New Delhi Report: The Third Assembly of the World Council of Churches 1961*, London, SCM, 1962, 116-134; N. Goodall (ed.), *The Uppsala Report 1968: Official Report of the Fourth Assembly of the World Council of Churches*, Geneva, WCC, 1968, 11-19; and D. M. Paton (ed.), *Breaking Barriers Nairobi 1975: The Official Report of the Fifth Assembly of the World Council of Churches*, London-Grand Rapids, SPCK-Eerdmans, 1976, 59-69.

simply to geographic extension but also to the manifold variety of local churches and their participation in the fullness of faith and life that unites them in the one *koinonia*.¹⁷

32. Within this shared understanding of the communion of the local churches in the universal Church, differences arise, not only about the geographical extent of the community intended by the expression “local church” but also in relation to the role of bishops. Some churches are convinced that the bishop, as a successor to the apostles, is essential to the structure and reality of the local church. Thus, in a strict sense, the local church is a diocese, comprised of a number of parishes. For others, having developed various forms of self-understanding, the expression “local church” is less common and not defined in reference to the ministry of a bishop. For some of those churches, the local church is simply the congregation of believers gathered in one place to hear the Word and celebrate the Sacraments. Both for those who see the bishop as essential and for those who do not, the expression “local church” has also at times been used to refer to a regional configuration of churches, gathered together in a synodal structure under a presidency. Finally there is not yet agreement about how local, regional and universal levels of ecclesial order relate to one another, although valuable steps in seeking convergence about those relations can be found in both multilateral and bilateral dialogues.¹⁸

[C] The Relationship between Local and Universal Church

Many churches can embrace a shared understanding of the fundamental relationship and communion of local churches within the universal Church. They share the understanding that the presence of Christ, by the will of the Father and the power of the Spirit, is truly manifested in the local church (it is “wholly Church”), and that this very presence of Christ impels the local church to be in communion with the universal Church (it is not “the whole Church”). Where this fundamental agreement is found, the expression “local church” may nonetheless be used in varying ways. In our common quest for closer unity, we invite the churches to seek more precise mutual understanding and agreement in this area: what is the appropriate relation between the various levels of life of a fully united Church and what specific ministries of leadership are needed to serve and foster those relations?

¹⁷ Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catechesis* 18, in J. P. Migne, *Patrologia Graeca* 33, 1044.

¹⁸ A good example at the multilateral level is the report of the Joint Working Group of the World Council of Churches and the Roman Catholic Church “The Church: Local and Universal,” in www.oikoumene.org/en/%20resources/documents/wcc-commissions/. Cf. also *Growth in Agreement II*, 862-875. From the bilateral dialogues, see “Ecclesial Communion – Communion of Churches” of the Lutheran-Roman Catholic “Church and Justification,” in *Growth in Agreement II*, 505-512; and especially the Orthodox-Roman Catholic statement on “Ecclesiological and Canonical Consequences of the Sacramental Nature of the Church: Ecclesial Communion, Conciliarity and Authority” (2007) at: www.vatican.va/roman_curia/pontifical_councils/chrstuni/ch_orthodox_docs/rc_pc_chrstuni_doc_20071013_documento-ravenna_en.html.

[A] CHAPTER III

The Church: Growing in Communion

[B] A. Already but Not Yet

33. The Church is an eschatological reality, already anticipating the kingdom, but not yet its full realization. The Holy Spirit is the principal agent in establishing the kingdom and in guiding the Church so that it can be a servant of God's work in this process. Only as we view the present in the light of the activity of the Holy Spirit, guiding the whole process of salvation history to its final recapitulation in Christ to the glory of the Father, do we begin to grasp something of the mystery of the Church.

34. On the one hand, as the communion of believers held in personal relationship with God, the Church is already the eschatological community God wills. Visible and tangible signs which express that this new life of communion has been effectively realized are: receiving and sharing the faith of the apostles, baptising, breaking and sharing the eucharistic bread, praying with and for one another and for the needs of the world, serving one another in love, participating in each other's joys and sorrows, giving material aid, proclaiming and witnessing to the good news in mission and working together for justice and peace. On the other hand, as an historical reality the Church is made up of human beings who are subject to the conditions of the world. One such condition is change,¹ either positive in the sense of growth and development or negative in the sense of decline and distortion. Other conditions include cultural and historical factors which can have either a positive or a negative impact on the Church's faith, life and witness.

35. As a pilgrim community the Church contends with the reality of sin. Ecumenical dialogue has shown that there are deep, commonly-held convictions behind what have sometimes been seen as conflicting views concerning the relation between the Church's holiness and human sin. There are significant differences in the way in which Christians articulate these common convictions. For some, their tradition affirms that the Church is sinless since, being the body of the sinless Christ, it cannot sin. Others consider that it is appropriate to refer to the Church as sinning, since sin may become systemic so as to affect the institution of the Church itself and, although sin is in contradiction to the true identity of the Church, it is nonetheless real. The different ways in which various communities understand sin itself, whether primarily as moral imperfection or primarily as a break in relationship, as well as whether and how sin may be systemic, can also have an impact upon this question.

36. The Church is the body of Christ; according to his promise, the gates of hell cannot prevail against it (cf. Matt. 16:18). Christ's victory over sin is complete and irreversible, and by Christ's promise and grace Christians have confidence that the Church will always share in the fruits of that victory. They also share the realization that, in this present age, believers are vulnerable to the power of sin, both individually and collectively. All churches acknowledge the fact of sin among believers and its often grievous impact. All recognize the continual need for Christian self-

¹ This condition of change is not meant to obscure the enduring meaning of Jesus Christ and his Gospel: "Jesus Christ is the same yesterday and today and forever" (Heb. 13:8).

examination, penitence, conversion (*metanoia*), reconciliation and renewal. Holiness and sin relate to the life of the Church in different and unequal ways. Holiness expresses the Church's identity according to the will of God, while sin stands in contradiction to this identity (cf. Rom. 6 :1-11).

[B] B. Growing in the Essential Elements of Communion: Faith, Sacraments, Ministry

37. The journey towards the full realization of God's gift of communion requires Christian communities to agree about the fundamental aspects of the life of the Church. "The ecclesial elements required for full communion within a visibly united church – the goal of the ecumenical movement – are communion in the fullness of apostolic faith; in sacramental life; in a truly one and mutually recognized ministry; in structures of conciliar relations and decision-making; and in common witness and service in the world."² These attributes serve as a necessary framework for maintaining unity in legitimate diversity. Moreover, the growth of churches towards the unity of the one Church is intimately related to their calling to promote the unity of the whole of humanity and of creation, since Christ, who is head of the Church, is the one in whom all are to be reconciled. Dialogue, such as that which accompanied the writing and reception of *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry*, has already registered significant progress in convergence about these essential elements of communion, though less on ministry than on the other two. It is not the intention of the present text to repeat those past achievements but rather to summarize them briefly and to indicate a few of the further steps forward that have been made in recent years.

[C] Faith

38. Regarding the first of these elements, there is widespread agreement that the Church is called to proclaim, in each generation, the faith "once for all entrusted to the saints" (Jude v. 3) and to remain steadfast in the teaching first handed on by the apostles. Faith is evoked by the Word of God, inspired by the grace of the Holy Spirit, attested in Scripture and transmitted through the living tradition of the Church. It is confessed in worship, life, service and mission. While it must be

² From "The Church: Local and Universal" (1990), §25, in *Growth in Agreement II*, 868. Paragraphs 10-11 and 28-32 of this text demonstrate with quotations and footnotes the fact that its presentation of communion has been drawn from a wide range of ecumenical dialogues involving Anglicans, Lutherans, Methodists, Orthodox, Reformed and Roman Catholics, as well as several statements on unity adopted at some of the Assemblies of the WCC (cf. footnote 16, ch. 2). The World Council of Churches statement, "The Unity of the Church as Koinonia: Gift and Calling," enhances the ministerial element by adding the word reconciled to recognized [M. Kinnamon (ed.), *Signs of the Spirit: Official Report Seventh Assembly*, Geneva, WCC, 1991, 173]. Similar configurations of the fundamental components of communion appear in the Lutheran-Roman Catholic document "Facing Unity," in *Growth in Agreement II*, 456-477, which presents the church as a community of faith, sacraments and service; and the Methodist-Roman Catholic text "The Apostolic Tradition," in *Growth in Agreement II*, 610-613, which describes the living body of the church in terms of faith, worship and ministry. The classic unity statements from the WCC general assemblies of New Delhi (1960), Nairobi (1975), Canberra (1990) and Porto Alegre (2005) also present the essential qualities of unity, as the following quotation from the last of these may serve to illustrate: "Our churches have affirmed that the unity for which we pray, hope, and work is "a *koinonia* given and expressed in the common confession of the apostolic faith; a common sacramental life entered by the one baptism and celebrated together in one eucharistic fellowship; a common life in which members and ministries are mutually recognized and reconciled; and a common mission witnessing to the gospel of God's grace to all people and serving the whole of creation." Such *koinonia* is to be expressed in each place, and through a conciliar relationship of churches in different places," in "Called to Be the One Church," §2, *Growth in Agreement III*, 606-607.

interpreted in the context of changing times and places, these interpretations must remain in continuity with the original witness and with its faithful explication throughout the ages. Faith has to be lived out in active response to the challenges of every age and place. It speaks to personal and social situations, including situations of injustice, of the violation of human dignity and of the degradation of creation.

39. Ecumenical dialogue has shown that, on many central aspects of Christian doctrine, there is a great deal that already unites believers.³ In 1991, the study text *Confessing the One Faith* not only succeeded in showing substantial agreement among Christians concerning the meaning of the Nicene Creed professed in the liturgies of most churches. It also explained how the faith of the creed is grounded in Scripture, confessed in the ecumenical symbol and has to be confessed afresh in relation to the challenges of the contemporary world. The intention was not only to help churches recognize fidelity to that faith in themselves and in others but also to provide a credible ecumenical tool for proclaiming the faith today. In 1998, *A Treasure in Earthen Vessels* explored the ongoing interpretation of Scripture and Tradition in handing on the faith, noting: “The Holy Spirit inspires and leads the churches each to rethink and reinterpret their tradition in conversation with each other, always aiming to embody the one Tradition in the unity of God’s Church.”⁴ While the churches generally agree as to the importance of Tradition in the generation and subsequent interpretation of scripture, more recent dialogue has tried to understand how the Christian community engages in such interpretation. Many bilateral dialogues have acknowledged that ecclesial interpretation of the contemporary meaning of the Word of God involves the faith experience of the whole people, the insights of theologians, and the discernment of the ordained ministry.⁵ The challenge today is for churches to agree on how these factors work together.

³ See, for example, the chapters “Fundamentals of Our Common Faith: Jesus Christ and the Holy Trinity” and “Salvation, Justification, Sanctification” of Walter Kasper’s, *Harvesting the Fruits: Basic Aspects of Christian Faith in Dialogue*, London-New York, Continuum, 2009, 10-47, which recounts convergence about these topics among Anglicans, Lutherans, Methodists, Reformed and Roman Catholics.

⁴ *A Treasure in Earthen Vessels*, Geneva, WCC, 1998, §32. Earlier, *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry*, section on Ministry, §34, had noted: “Apostolic tradition in the Church means continuity in the permanent characteristics of the Church of the apostles: witness to the apostolic faith, proclamation and fresh interpretation of the Gospel, celebration of baptism and the eucharist, the transmission of ministerial responsibilities, communion in prayer, love, joy and suffering, service to the sick and the needy, unity among the local Churches and sharing the gifts which the Lord has given to each”; in *Baptism, Eucharist, Ministry*, Geneva, WCC, 1982.

⁵ See, for example, the Lutheran-Orthodox statement “Scripture and Tradition,” in *Growth in Agreement II*, 224-225; the Methodist-Roman Catholic “The Word of Life,” §§62-72, describing the “Agents of Discernment,” in *Growth in Agreement I*, 632-634; the Anglican-Roman Catholic “Gift of Authority,” in *Growth in Agreement III*, 60-81; the Disciples-Roman Catholic “Receiving and Handing on the Faith: The Mission and Responsibility of the Church,” in *Growth in Agreement III*, 121-137; the Methodist-Roman Catholic “Speaking the Truth in Love: Teaching Authority among Catholics and Methodists,” in *Growth in Agreement III*, 138-176; and the Reformed-Oriental Orthodox “Report” (2001), §§22-28, describing “Tradition and Holy Scripture” and “The Role of the Theologian in the Christian Community,” in *Growth in Agreement III*, 43-44.

[C] Sacraments

40. Regarding the sacraments, the churches registered a significant degree of approval with the way in which *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry* (1982) described the meaning and celebration of baptism and eucharist.⁶ That text also suggested avenues seeking further convergence on what remained the most significant unresolved issues: who may be baptized, the presence of Christ in the eucharist and the relation of the eucharist to Christ's sacrifice on the cross. At the same time, while briefly commenting on chrismation or confirmation, *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry* did not address the other rites celebrated in many communities and considered by some as sacraments, nor was it designed to take into account the view of those communities who affirm that their vocation does not include the rites of baptism and the eucharist, while affirming that they share in the sacramental life of the Church.

41. The growing convergence among churches in their understanding of baptism may be summarized as follows.⁷ Through Baptism with water in the name of the Triune God, the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, Christians are united with Christ and with each other in the Church of every time and place. Baptism is the introduction to and celebration of new life in Christ and of participation in his baptism, life, death and resurrection (cf. Matt. 3:13-17; Rom. 6:3-5). It is "the water of rebirth and renewal by the Holy Spirit" (Titus 3,5) incorporating believers into the body of Christ and enabling them to share in the kingdom of God and the life of the world to come (cf. Eph 2:6). Baptism involves confession of sin, conversion of heart, pardoning, cleansing and sanctification; it consecrates the believer as a member of "a chosen race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation" (1 Pet. 2:9). Baptism is thus a basic bond of unity. Some churches see the gift of the Holy Spirit as given in a special way through chrismation or confirmation, which is considered by them as one of the sacraments of initiation. The general agreement about baptism has led some who are involved in the ecumenical movement to call for the mutual recognition of baptism.⁸

42. There is a dynamic and profound relation between baptism and the eucharist. The communion into which the newly initiated Christian enters is brought to fuller expression and nourished in the eucharist, which reaffirms baptismal faith and gives grace for the faithful living out of the Christian calling. The progress in agreement about the eucharist registered in ecumenical dialogue may be summarized as follows.⁹ The Lord's Supper is the celebration in which, gathered around his table, Christians receive the body and blood of Christ. It is a proclamation of the Gospel, a glorification of

⁶ Cf. *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry, 1982-1990: Report on the Process and Responses*, Geneva, WCC, 1990, 39, 55-56.

⁷ This paragraph recounts the material elaborated under the subtitle "II. The Meaning of Baptism," in *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry*, Section on Baptism, §§2-7. Very similar affirmations from four international bilateral dialogues are found in "Common Understanding of Baptism" of W. Kasper, *Harvesting the Fruits*, 164-168, as well as in the Faith and Order study text entitled *One Baptism: Towards Mutual Recognition*, Geneva, WCC, 2011.

⁸ An example of such mutual recognition of baptism was that achieved by eleven of the sixteen member communities of the Christian Council of Churches in Germany on April 29, 2007, which is recounted at www.ekd.de/english/mutual_recognition_of_baptism.html.

⁹ This summary draws upon "II. The Meaning of the Eucharist" in *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry*, section on Eucharist, §§2-26. For varying degrees of convergence between Anglicans, Lutherans, Methodists, Reformed and Roman Catholics, see "The Eucharist," in Kasper, *Harvesting the Fruits*, 168-90.

the Father for everything accomplished in creation, redemption and sanctification (doxologia); a memorial of the death and resurrection of Christ Jesus and what was accomplished once for all on the Cross (anamnesis); and an invocation of the Holy Spirit to transform both the elements of bread and wine and the participants themselves (*epiclesis*). Intercession is made for the needs of the Church and the world, the communion of the faithful is again deepened as an anticipation and foretaste of the kingdom to come, impelling them to go out and share Christ's mission of inaugurating that kingdom even now. St Paul highlights the connection between the Lord's Supper and the very life of the Church (cf. 1 Cor. 10:16-17; 11:17-33).

43. Just as the confession of faith and baptism are inseparable from a life of service and witness, so too the eucharist demands reconciliation and sharing by all those who are brothers and sisters in the one family of God. "Christians are called in the eucharist to be in solidarity with the outcast and to become signs of the love of Christ who lived and sacrificed himself for all and now gives himself in the eucharist.... The eucharist brings into the present age a new reality which transforms Christians into the image of Christ and therefore makes them his effective witnesses."¹⁰ The liturgical renewal among some churches may be seen in part as a reception of the convergences registered in ecumenical dialogue about the sacraments.

44. Different Christian traditions have diverged as to whether baptism, eucharist and other rites should be termed "sacraments" or "ordinances." The word *sacrament* (used to translate the Greek *mysterion*) indicates that God's saving work is communicated in the action of the rite, whilst the term ordinance emphasizes that the action of the rite is performed in obedience to Christ's word and example.¹¹ These two positions have often been seen as mutually opposed. However, as the Faith and Order study text *One Baptism* points out, "Most traditions, whether they use the term 'sacrament' or 'ordinance,' affirm that these events are both *instrumental* (in that God uses them to bring about a new reality), and *expressive* (of an already-existing reality). Some traditions emphasize the instrumental dimension.... Others emphasize the expressive dimension."¹² Might this difference then be more one of emphasis than of doctrinal disagreement? These rites express both the "institutional" and "charismatic" aspects of the Church. They are visible, effective actions instituted by Christ and, at the same time, are made effective by the action of the Holy Spirit who, by means of them, equips those who receive the sacraments with a variety of gifts for the edification of the Church and its mission in and for the world.

[C] *Sacraments and Ordinances*

In the light of the convergences on Baptism and Eucharist and of further reflection upon the historical roots and potential compatibility of the expressions "sacrament" and "ordinance," the churches are challenged to explore whether they are able to arrive at deeper agreement about that dimension of the life of the Church that involves these rites. Such convergence could lead them to consider several additional questions. Most churches celebrate other rites or sacraments, such as chrismations/confirmations, weddings and ordinations within their

¹⁰ From *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry*, §§24 and 26.

¹¹ The Latin term *sacramentum* denoted the oath that a recruit pronounced upon entering military service and was used by the first major theologian to write in the Latin language, Tertullian (160-220), in reference to baptism.

¹² *One Baptism: Towards Mutual Recognition*, §30.

liturgies and many also have rites for the forgiveness of sin and the blessing of the sick: to whether baptism, eucharist and other rites should be termed "sacraments" or "ordinances." The word sacrament may not the number and ecclesial status of these sacraments or ordinances be addressed in ecumenical dialogues? We also invite churches to consider whether they can now achieve closer convergence about who may receive baptism and who may preside at the Church's liturgical celebrations? Further, are there ways in which fuller mutual understanding can be established between the churches which celebrate these rites and those Christian communities convinced that the sharing of life in Christ does not require the celebration of sacraments or other rites?

[C] *Ministry within the Church*

[D] *Ordained Ministry*

45. All churches affirm the biblical teaching that, unlike the many priests of the Old Covenant (cf. Heb. 7:23), Jesus, our high priest (cf. Heb. 8:10), offered his redeeming sacrifice "once for all" (cf. Heb. 7:27; 9:12; 9:26; 10:10, 12-14). They differ on the implications they draw from these texts. *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry* noted that ordained ministers "may appropriately be called priests because they fulfil a particular priestly service by strengthening and building up the royal and prophetic priesthood of the faithful through word and sacraments, through their prayers of intercession, and through their pastoral guidance of the community."¹³ In line with that view, some churches hold that ordained ministry stands in a special relationship with the unique priesthood of Christ that it is distinct from, even if related to, that royal priesthood described in 1 Pet. 2:9. These churches believe that some persons are ordained to a particular priestly function through the sacrament of ordination.¹⁴ Others do not consider ordained ministers as "priests," nor do some understand ordination in sacramental terms. Christians disagree as well over the traditional restriction of ordination to the ministry of word and sacrament to men only.

[C] *Ordained Ministry*

Ecumenical dialogue has repeatedly shown that issues relating to ordained ministry constitute challenging obstacles on the path to unity. If differences such as those relating to the priesthood of the ordained prohibit full unity, it must continue to be an urgent priority for the churches to discover how they can be overcome.

46. There is no single pattern of ministry in the New Testament, though all churches would look to Scripture in seeking to follow the will of the Lord concerning how ordained ministry is to be understood, ordered and exercised. At times, the Spirit has guided the Church to adapt its ministries to contextual needs (cf. Acts 6:1-6). Various forms of ministry have been blessed with the gifts of the Spirit. Early writers, such as Ignatius of Antioch, insisted upon the threefold ministry of bishop,

¹³ *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry*, section on Ministry, §17.

¹⁴ See Anglican-Roman Catholic "Ministry and Ordination" and "Elucidation," in *Growth in Agreement I*, 78-87; and Orthodox-Roman Catholic Dialogue, "The Sacrament of Order in the Sacramental Structure of the Church," in *Growth in Agreement II*, 671-679.

presbyter and deacon.¹⁵ This pattern of three related ministries can be seen to have roots in the New Testament; eventually it became the generally accepted pattern and is still considered normative by many churches today. Some churches, since the time of the Reformation, have adopted different patterns of ministry.¹⁶ Among the several means for maintaining related to, the Church's apostolicity, such as the scriptural canon, dogma and liturgical order, ordained ministry has played an important role. Succession in ministry is meant to serve the apostolic continuity of the Church.

47. Almost all Christian communities today have a formal structure of ministry. Frequently this structure is diversified and reflects, more or less explicitly, the threefold pattern of *episkopos-presbyteros-diakonos*. Churches remain divided, however, as to whether or not the "historic episcopate" (meaning bishops ordained in apostolic succession back to the earliest generations of the Church), or the apostolic succession of ordained ministry more generally, is something intended by Christ for his community. Some believe that the threefold ministry of bishop, presbyter and deacon is a sign of continuing faithfulness to the Gospel and is vital to the apostolic continuity of the Church as a whole.¹⁷ In contrast, others do not view faithfulness to the Gospel as closely bound to succession in ministry, and some are wary of the historic episcopate because they see it as vulnerable to abuse and thus potentially harmful to the well-being of the community. *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry*, for its part, only affirmed that the threefold ministry "may serve today as an expression of the unity we seek and also as a means for achieving it."¹⁸

[C] The Threefold Ministry

Given the signs of growing agreement about the place of ordained ministry in the Church, we are led to ask if the churches can achieve a consensus as to whether or not the threefold ministry is part of God's will for the Church in its realization of the unity which God wills.

[D] The Gift of Authority in the Ministry of the Church

48. All authority in the Church comes from her Lord and head, Jesus Christ, whose authority, conveyed with the word *exousia* (power, delegated authority, moral authority, influence; literally "from out of one's being") in the New Testament, was exercised in his teaching (cf. Matt. 5:2; Luke

¹⁵ Cf. Ignatius of Antioch's *Letter to the Magnesians* 6 and 13; *Letter to the Trallians* 7; *Letter to the Philadelphians* 4; *Letter to the Smyrnaeans* 8.

¹⁶ Two insightful accounts of these Reformation developments are the Reformed-Roman Catholic text "Towards a Common Understanding of the Church," §§12-63, entitled "Toward a Reconciliation of Memories," in *GA II*, 781-795; and the Lutheran-Roman Catholic text, *The Apostolicity of the Church*, Minneapolis 2006, §§65-164, pages 40-71.

¹⁷ On this point, the Lutheran-Roman Catholic "Church and Justification" (1993), §185, states: "There is no contradiction between the doctrine of justification and the idea of an ordained ministry instituted by God and necessary for the church" (*Growth in Agreement II*, 529). Nevertheless, a few paragraphs later, the same text adds: "The difference between the Catholic and the Lutheran views on the theological and ecclesiological evaluation of the episcopate is thus not so radical that a Lutheran rejection or even indifference towards this ministry stands in opposition to the Catholic assertion of its ecclesial indispensability. The question is rather one of a clear gradation in the evaluation of this ministry, which can be and has been described on the Catholic side by predicates such as 'necessary' or 'indispensable', and on the Lutheran side as 'important', 'meaningful' and thus 'desirable'" (§197; (*Growth in Agreement II*, 532).

¹⁸ *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry*, section on Ministry, §22.

5:3), his performing of miracles (cf. Mark. 1:30-34; Matt. 14:35-36), his exorcisms (cf. Mark 1:27; Luke 4:35-36), his forgiveness of sins (cf. Mark 2:10; Luke 5:4) and his leading the disciples in the ways of salvation (cf. Matt. 16:24). Jesus' entire ministry was characterized by authority (Mark 1:27; Luke 4:36) which placed itself at the service of human beings. Having received "all authority in heaven and on earth" (Matt. 28:18), Jesus shared his authority with the apostles (cf. John 20:22). Their successors in the ministry of oversight (*episkopé*) exercised authority in the proclamation of the Gospel, in the celebration of the sacraments, particularly the eucharist, and in the pastoral guidance of believers.¹⁹

49. The distinctive nature of authority in the Church can be understood and exercised correctly only in the light of the authority of its head, the one who was crucified, who "emptied himself" and "obediently accepted even death, death on the cross" (Phil. 2:7-8). This authority is to be understood within Jesus' eschatological promise to guide the Church to fulfilment in the reign of heaven. Thus, the Church's authority is different from that of the world. When the disciples sought to exercise power over one another, Jesus corrected them, saying that he came not to be served but to serve, and to offer his life for others (cf. Mark 10:41-45; Luke 22:25). Authority within the Church must be understood as humble service, nourishing and building up the *koinonia* of the Church in faith, life and witness; it is exemplified in Jesus' action of washing the feet of the disciples (cf. John 13:1-17). It is a service (*diakonia*) of love, without any domination or coercion.

50. Thus, authority in the Church in its various forms and levels, must be distinguished from mere power. This authority comes from God the Father through the Son in the power of the Holy Spirit; as such it reflects the holiness of God. The sources of authority recognized in varying degrees by the churches such as Scripture, Tradition, worship, councils and synods, also reflect the holiness of the Triune God. Such authority is recognized wherever the truth which leads to holiness is expressed and the holiness of God is voiced "from the lips of children and infants" (Ps. 8:2; cf Matt. 21:16). Holiness means a greater authenticity in relationship with God, with others and with all creation. Throughout history the Church has recognized a certain authority in the lives of the saints, in the witness of monasticism and in various ways that groups of believers have lived out and expressed the truth of the gospel. Accordingly, a certain kind of authority may be recognized in the ecumenical dialogues and the agreed statements they produce, when they reflect a common search for and discovery of the truth in love (cf. Eph. 4:15), urge believers to seek the Lord's will for ecclesial communion, and invite on-going metanoia and holiness of life.

51. The authority which Jesus Christ, the one head of the Church, shares with those in ministries of leadership is neither only personal, nor only delegated by the community. It is a gift of the Holy Spirit destined for the service (*diakonia*) of the Church in love. Its exercise includes the participation of the whole community, whose sense of the faith (*sensus fidei*) contributes to the overall understanding of God's Word and whose reception of the guidance and teaching of the ordained ministers testifies to the authenticity of that leadership. A relation of mutual love and dialogue unites those who exercise authority and those who are subject to it. As a means of guiding the

¹⁹ This basic description of the authority of Jesus and its sharing with the Church closely paraphrases the description offered by the Orthodox- Roman Catholic Ravenna Statement (2007) concerning "Ecclesiological and Canonical Consequences of the Sacramental Nature of the Church: Ecclesial Communion, Conciliarity and Authority," §12; see above, ch. II, n.18.

Christian community in faith, worship and service with the exousia of the crucified and risen Lord, the exercise of authority can call for obedience, but such a call is meant to be welcomed with voluntary cooperation and consent since its aim is to assist believers in growing to full maturity in Christ (cf. Eph. 4:11-16).²⁰ The “sense” for the authentic meaning of the Gospel that is shared by the whole people of God, the insights of those dedicated in a special way to biblical and theological studies, and the guidance of those especially consecrated for the ministry of oversight, all collaborate in the discernment of God’s will for the community. Decision-making in the Church seeks and elicits the consensus of all and depends upon the guidance of the Holy Spirit, discerned in attentive listening to God’s Word and to one another. By the process of active reception over time, the Spirit resolves possible ambiguities in decisions. The ecumenical movement has made it possible for authoritative teaching by some Christian leaders to have an effect beyond the boundaries of their own communities, even now in our current state of division. For example, Archbishop Desmond Tutu’s leadership in declaring that “apartheid was too strong to be overcome by a divided Church,”²¹ the initiatives by the Ecumenical Patriarch Bartholomew to unite Christian leaders in the cause of ecology, the efforts by Popes John Paul II and Benedict XVI to invite Christians and leaders from other faiths to join together in praying for and promoting peace, and of the influence of Brother Roger Schutz as he inspired countless Christian believers, especially the young, to join together in common worship of the Triune God.

[C] Authority in the Church and Its Exercise

Significant steps towards convergence on authority and its exercise have been recorded in various bilateral dialogues.²² Differences continue to exist between churches, however, as to the relative weight to be accorded to the different sources of authority, as to how far and in what ways the Church has the means to arrive at a normative expression of its faith, and as to the role of ordained ministers in providing an authoritative interpretation of revelation. Yet all churches share the urgent concern that the Gospel be preached, interpreted and lived out in the world humbly, but with compelling authority. May not the seeking of ecumenical convergence on the way in which authority is recognized and exercised play a creative role in this missionary endeavour of the churches?

[D] The Ministry of Oversight (Episkopé)

52. The Church, as the body of Christ and the eschatological people of God, is built up by the Holy Spirit through a diversity of gifts or ministries. These gifts may enrich the whole Church, its unity and mission.²³ The faithful exercise of the ministry of *episkopé* under the Gospel by persons chosen and set aside for such ministry is a requirement of fundamental importance for the Church’s life and

²⁰ Cf. “Ecclesiological and Canonical Consequences of the Sacramental Nature of the Church: Ecclesial Communion, Conciliarity and Authority,” §§13-14; [see above ch. II, n.18](#).

²¹ Desmond Tutu, “Towards *Koinonia* in Faith, Life and Witness,” in T. Best and G. Gassmann (eds.), *On the Way to Fuller Koinonia*, Geneva, WCC, 1994, 96-97.

²² See, for example, the Anglican-Roman Catholic report “Authority in the Church” (1976) in *Growth in Agreement I*, 88-105; “Authority in the Church II” in *Growth in Agreement I*, 106-18; “The Gift of Authority” (1998), in *Growth in Agreement III*, 60-81; this is also echoed in §§83-84 of the Methodist-Roman Catholic document “Speaking the Truth in Love: Teaching Authority among Catholics and Methodists,” in *Growth in Agreement III*, 163-164.

²³ Cf. *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry*, section on Ministry, §23.

mission. The specific development of structures of *episkopé* varied in different times and places; but all communities, whether episcopally ordered or not, continued to see the need for a ministry of *episkopé*. In every case *episkopé* is in the service of maintaining continuity in apostolic faith and unity of life. In addition to preaching the Word and celebrating the Sacraments, a principal purpose of this ministry is faithfully to safeguard and hand on revealed truth, to hold the local congregations in communion, to give mutual support and to lead in witnessing to the Gospel. Such guidance includes the oversight of the various Christian service organizations dedicated to bettering human life and to the relief of suffering, aspects of the Church's service (*diakonia*) to the world to which we will return in the next chapter. All these functions, summed up in the term *episkopé* or oversight, are exercised by persons who relate to the faithful of their own communities as well as to those who exercise such a ministry in other local communities. This is what it means to affirm that the ministry of oversight, as all ministry in the Church, needs to be exercised in personal, collegial and communal ways.²⁴ These ways of exercise have been succinctly described in *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry* as follows: "It should be personal, because the presence of Christ among his people can most effectively be pointed to by the person ordained to proclaim the Gospel and to call the community to serve the Lord in unity of life and witness. It should also be collegial, for there is need for a college of ordained ministers sharing in the common task of representing the concerns of the community. Finally, the intimate relationship between the ordained ministry and the community should find expression in a communal dimension where the exercise of the ordained ministry is rooted in the life of the community and requires the community's effective participation in the discovery of God's will and the guidance of the Spirit."²⁵

53. One such exercise of oversight reflects that quality of the Church which might be termed "synodality" or "conciliarity." The word *synod* comes from the Greek terms *syn* (with) and *odos* (way) suggesting a "walking together." Both synodality and conciliarity signify that "each member of the Body of Christ, by virtue of baptism, has his or her place and proper responsibility" in the communion of the church.²⁶ Under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, the whole Church is synodal/conciliar, at all levels of ecclesial life: local, regional and universal. The quality of synodality or conciliarity reflects the mystery of the trinitarian life of God, and the structures of the Church express this quality so as to actualize the community's life as a communion. In the local Eucharistic community, this quality is experienced in the profound unity in love and truth between the members and their presiding minister. In crucial situations synods have come together to discern the apostolic faith in response to doctrinal or moral dangers or heresies, trusting in the guidance of the Holy Spirit, whom Jesus promised to send after his return to the Father (cf. John 16:7.12-14). Ecumenical synods enjoyed the participation of leaders from the entire Church; their decisions were received by all as an acknowledgment of the important service they played in fostering and maintaining communion

²⁴ Already at the first world conference on Faith and Order at Lausanne in 1927, the ordering of the churches in "episcopal," "presbyteral" and "congregational" systems was noted and the values underlying these three orders were "believed by many to be essential to the good order of the Church." In H. N. Bate (ed.), *Faith and Order Proceedings of the World Conference: Lausanne, August 3-21, 1927*, London, Student Christian Movement, 1927, 379. Fifty-five years later, *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry*, section on Ministry, Commentary on §26, cited this Lausanne text in justification of its affirmation that ordained ministry should be exercised in ways that are personal, collegial and communal.

²⁵ *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry*, §26.

²⁶ See Orthodox-Roman Catholic International Dialogue, "Ecclesial Communion, Conciliarity and Authority," §5, which notes that synodality may be taken as synonymous with conciliarity.

throughout the Church as a whole.²⁷ The churches currently have different views and practices about the participation and role of the laity in synods.

[C] *The Authority of Ecumenical Councils*

While most churches accept the doctrinal definitions of the early Ecumenical Councils as expressive of the teaching of the New Testament, some maintain that all post-biblical doctrinal decisions are open to revision, while others consider some doctrinal definitions to be normative and therefore irreformable expressions of the faith. Has ecumenical dialogue made possible a common assessment of the normativity of the teaching of the early Ecumenical Councils?

54. Wherever the Church comes together to take counsel and make important decisions, there is need for someone to summon and preside over the gathering for the sake of good order and to facilitate the process of promoting, discerning and articulating consensus. Those who preside are always to be at the service of those among whom they preside for the edification of the Church of God, in love and truth. It is the duty of the ones who preside to respect the integrity of local churches, to give voice to the voiceless and to uphold unity in diversity.

55. The word *primacy* refers to the custom and use, already recognized by the first ecumenical councils as an ancient practice, whereby the bishops of Alexandria, Rome and Antioch, and later Jerusalem and Constantinople, exercised a personal ministry of oversight over an area much wider than that of their individual ecclesiastical provinces. Such primatial oversight was not seen as opposed to synodality/conciliarity, which expresses more the collegial service to unity. Historically, forms of primacy have existed at various levels. According to canon 34 of the Apostolic Canons, which is expressive of the Church's self-understanding in the early centuries and is still held in honour by many, though not all, Christians today, the first among the bishops in each nation would only make a decision in agreement with the other bishops and the latter would make no important decision without the agreement of the first.²⁸ Even in the early centuries, the various ministries of primacy were plagued at times by competition between Church leaders. A primacy of decision-making (jurisdiction) and teaching authority, extending to the whole people of God, was gradually claimed by the Bishop of Rome on the basis of the relation of that local church to the apostles Peter and Paul. While acknowledged by many churches in the early centuries, its essential role and manner of exercise were matters of significant controversy. In recent years, the ecumenical movement has helped to create a more conciliatory climate in which a ministry in service to the unity of the whole Church has been discussed.

²⁷ An "ecumenical" council or synod would be one representing the whole Christian world. The first such council is universally recognized as that held at Nicaea in 325 to affirm the divinity of Christ in response to the new teaching of Arius, which denied the Son's equality with the Father. Churches differ on how many such councils have been held. On ecumenical councils and their authority, see, for example, the Lutheran-Orthodox "Authority in and of the Church: The Ecumenical Councils" (1993), in *Growth in Agreement III*, 12-14; the subsection "Councils and the Declaration of the Faith" of the Disciples-Roman Catholic, "Receiving and Handing on the Faith: The Mission and Responsibility of the Church," in *Growth in Agreement II*, 125-127; cf. also *Councils and the Ecumenical Movement*, Geneva, WCC, 1968.

²⁸ This canon can be found at www.newadvent.org/fathers/3820.htm.

56. Partly because of the progress already recorded in bilateral and multilateral dialogues, the Fifth World Conference on Faith and Order raised the question “of a universal ministry of Christian unity.”²⁹ In his encyclical *Ut Unum Sint*, Pope John Paul II quoted this text when he invited Church leaders and their theologians to “enter into patient and fraternal dialogue” with him concerning this ministry.³⁰ In subsequent discussion, despite continuing areas of disagreement, some members of other churches have expressed an openness to considering how such a ministry might foster the unity of local churches throughout the world and promote, not endanger, the distinctive features of their witness. Given the ecumenical sensitivity of this issue, it is important to distinguish between the essence of a ministry of primacy and any particular ways in which it has been or is currently being exercised. All would agree that any such personal primatial ministry would need to be exercised in communal and collegial ways.

57. There is still much work to be done to arrive at a convergence on this topic. At present Christians do not agree that a universal ministry of primacy is necessary or even desirable, although several bilateral dialogues have acknowledged the value of a ministry in service to the unity of the whole Christian community or even that such a ministry may be included in Christ’s will for his Church.³¹ The lack of agreement is not simply between certain families of churches but exists within some churches. There has been significant ecumenical discussion of New Testament evidence about a ministry serving the wider unity of the Church, such as those of St Peter or of St Paul. Nevertheless, disagreements remain about the significance of their ministries and what they may imply concerning God’s possible intention for some form of ministry in service to the unity and mission of the Church as a whole.

[C] A Universal Ministry of Unity

If, according to the will of Christ, current divisions are overcome, how might a ministry that fosters and promotes the unity of the Church at the universal level be understood and exercised?

²⁹ §31.2 of “Report of Section II: Confessing the One Faith to God’s Glory,” in T. F. Best and G. Gassmann (eds.), *On the Way to Fuller Koinonia*, Geneva, WCC, 1994, 243.

³⁰ John Paul II, *Ut Unum Sint*, London, Catholic Truth Society, 1995, §96. A report entitled “Petrine Ministry” presents a synthesis and analysis of the various ecumenical dialogues which, up to 2001, had taken up the question of a ministry of primacy, as well as the responses given to John Paul’s invitation to dialogue about this ministry. It grouped the central issues under four headings: scriptural foundations, *De iure divino* [whether such a ministry could be based upon God’s will], universal jurisdiction (the exercise of authority or power within the Church), and papal infallibility. This preliminary report can be found in *Information Service*, N. 109 (2002/I-II), 29-42, and shows that the assessment of a “petrine ministry” differs significantly according to the particular tradition to which a Christian community belongs.

³¹ See the Anglican-Roman Catholic report “The Gift of Authority,” in *Growth in Agreement III*, 60-81, and the Orthodox-Roman Catholic, “The Ecclesiological and Canonical Consequences of the Sacramental Nature of the Church.”

[A] CHAPTER IV

The Church: In and for the World

[B] A. God's Plan for Creation: The Kingdom

58. The reason for the mission of Jesus is succinctly expressed in the words, "God so loved the world that he gave his only Son" (John 3:16). Thus the first and foremost attitude of God towards the world is love, for every child, woman and man who has ever become part of human history and, indeed, for the whole of creation. The kingdom of God, which Jesus preached by revealing the Word of God in parables and inaugurated by his mighty deeds, especially by the paschal mystery of his death and resurrection, is the final destiny of the whole universe. The Church was intended by God, not for its own sake, but to serve the divine plan for the transformation of the world. Thus, service (*diakonia*) belongs to the very being of the Church. The study document *Church and World* described such service in the following way: "As the body of Christ, the Church participates in the divine mystery. As mystery, it reveals Christ to the world by proclaiming the Gospel, by celebrating the sacraments (which are themselves called 'mysteries'), and by manifesting the newness of life given by him, thus anticipating the Kingdom already present in him."¹

59. The Church's mission in the world is to proclaim to all people, in word and deed, the Good News of salvation in Jesus Christ (cf. Mk.16:15). Evangelization is thus one of the foremost tasks of the Church in obedience to the command of Jesus (cf. Matt. 28:18-20). The Church is called by Christ in the Holy Spirit to bear witness to the Father's reconciliation, healing and transformation of creation. Thus a constitutive aspect of evangelization is the promotion of justice and peace.

60. Today Christians are more aware of the wide array of different religions other than their own and of the positive truths and values they contain.² This occasions Christians to recall those gospel passages in which Jesus himself speaks positively about those who were "foreign" or "others" in relation to his listeners (cf. Matt. 8:11-12; Luke 7:9; 13:28-30). Christians acknowledge religious freedom as one of the fundamental dimensions of human dignity and, in the charity called for by Christ himself, they seek to respect that dignity and to dialogue with others, not only to share the riches of Christian faith but also to appreciate whatever elements of truth and goodness are present in other religions. In the past, when proclaiming the Gospel to those who had not yet heard it, due respect was not always given to their religions. Evangelization should always be respectful of those who hold other beliefs. Sharing the joyful news of the truth revealed in the New Testament and

¹ *Church and World: The Unity of the Church and the Renewal of Human Community*, Geneva, WCC, 1990, Chapter III, §21, page 27.

² On questions relating to this topic, see "Religious Plurality and Christian Self-Understanding" (2006), the result of a study process in response to suggestions made in 2002 at the WCC central committee to the three staff teams on Faith and Order, Inter-religious Relations, and Mission and Evangelism, available at: www.oikoumene.org/en/resources/%20documents/assembly/porto-alegre-2006/3-preparatory-and-background-%20documents/religious-plurality-and-christian-self-understanding.html. This statement follows the discussion of the relation between mission and world religions at the conference of the Commission on World Mission and Evangelism held in San Antonio in 1989. Because of its relevance to the general themes taken up in this chapter, some mention of interreligious relations will appear in each of its three sections.

inviting others to the fullness of life in Christ is an expression of respectful love.³ Within the contemporary context of increased awareness of religious pluralism, the possibility of salvation for those who do not explicitly believe in Christ and the relation between interreligious dialogue and the proclamation that Jesus is Lord have increasingly become topics of reflection and discussion among Christians.

[C] *Ecumenical Response to Religious Pluralism*

There remain serious disagreements within and between some churches concerning these issues. The New Testament teaches that God wills the salvation of all people (cf. 1 Tim. 2:4) and, at the same time, that Jesus is the one and only saviour of the world (cf. 1 Tim. 2:5 and Acts 4:12). What conclusions may be drawn from these biblical teachings regarding the possibility of salvation for those who do not believe in Christ? Some hold that, in ways known to God, salvation in Christ through the power of the Holy Spirit is possible for those who do not explicitly share Christian faith. Others do not see how such a view sufficiently corresponds to biblical passages about the necessity of faith and baptism for salvation. Differences on this question will have an impact upon how one understands and puts into practice the mission of the Church. Within today's context of increased awareness of the vitality of various religions throughout the world, how may the churches arrive at greater convergence about these issues and cooperate more effectively in witnessing to the Gospel in word and deed?

[B] B. The Moral Challenge of the Gospel

61. Christians are called to repent of their sins, to forgive others and to lead sacrificial lives of service: discipleship demands moral commitment. However, as St Paul so emphatically teaches, human beings are justified not through works of the law but by grace through faith (cf. Rom. 3:21-26; Gal. 2:19-21). Thus the Christian community lives within the sphere of divine forgiveness and grace, which calls forth and shapes the moral life of believers. It is of significant importance for the reestablishment of unity that the two communities whose separation marked the beginning of the Protestant Reformation have achieved consensus about the central aspects of the doctrine of justification by faith, the major focus of disagreement at the time of their division.⁴ It is on the basis of faith and grace that moral engagement and common action are possible and should be affirmed as intrinsic to the life and being of the Church.

³ The "Charta Oecumenica" (2001) of the Conference of European Churches (CEC) and the Council of European Episcopal Conferences (CCEE), §2, states: "We commit ourselves to recognise that every person can freely choose his or her religious and church affiliation as a matter of conscience, which means not inducing anyone to convert through moral pressure or material incentive, but also not hindering anyone from entering into conversion of his or her own free will. See also *et Christian Witness in a Multi-Religious World: Recommendations for Conduct*" of the Pontifical Council for Interreligious Dialogue, the World Council of Churches and the World Evangelical Alliance, approved on 28 January 2011, and available at: www.vatican.va/roman_curia/pontifical_councils/interelg/documents/rc_pc_interelg_doc_20111110_testimonianza-cristiana_en.html.

⁴ See the Lutheran-Roman Catholic *Joint Declaration on the Doctrine of Justification*, Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 2000.

62. The ethics of Christians as disciples are rooted in God, the creator and revealer, and take shape as the community seeks to understand God's will within the various circumstances of time and place. The Church does not stand in isolation from the moral struggles of humankind as a whole. Together with the adherents of other religions as well as with all persons of good will, Christians must promote not only those individual moral values which are essential to the authentic realization of the human person but also the social values of justice, peace and the protection of the environment, since the message of the Gospel extends to both the personal and the communal aspects of human existence. Thus *koinonia* includes not only the confession of the one faith and celebration of common worship, but also shared moral values, based upon the inspiration and insights of the Gospel. Notwithstanding their current state of division, the churches have come so far in fellowship with one another that they are aware that what one does affects the life of others, and, in consequence, are increasingly conscious of the need to be accountable to each other with respect to their ethical reflections and decisions. As churches engage in mutual questioning and affirmation, they give expression to what they share in Christ.

63. While tensions about moral issues have always been a concern for the Church, in the world of today, philosophical, social and cultural developments have led to the rethinking of many moral norms, causing new conflicts over moral principles and ethical questions to affect the unity of the churches. At the same time, moral questions are related to Christian anthropology, and priority is given to the Gospel in evaluating new developments in moral thinking. Individual Christians and churches sometimes find themselves divided into opposing opinions about what principles of personal or collective morality are in harmony with the Gospel of Jesus Christ. Moreover, some believe that moral questions are not of their nature "church-dividing," while others are firmly convinced that they are.

[C] *Moral Questions and the Unity of the Church*

Ecumenical dialogue at the multilateral and bilateral levels has begun to sketch out some of the parameters of the significance of moral doctrine and practice for Christian unity.⁵ If present and future ecumenical dialogue is to serve both the mission and the unity of the Church, it is important that this dialogue explicitly address the challenges to convergence represented by contemporary moral issues. We invite the churches to explore these issues in a spirit of mutual attentiveness and support. How might the churches, guided by the Spirit, discern together what it means today to understand and live in fidelity to the teaching and attitude of Jesus? How can the churches, as they engage together in this task of discernment, offer appropriate models of discourse and wise counsel to the societies in which they are called to serve?

⁵ For example, the Anglican-Roman Catholic statement "Life in Christ: Morals, Communion and the Church," in *Growth in Agreement II*, 344-370; and the study document of the Joint Working Group of the World Council of Churches and the Roman Catholic Church, "The Ecumenical Dialogue on Moral Issues: Potential Sources of Common Witness or of Divisions" (1995), in *The Ecumenical Review* 48(2), April 1996, 143-154. For recent work on "Moral Discernment in the Churches" see also *The Standing Commission on Faith and Order Meeting in Holy Etchmiadzin, Armenia*, Geneva, WCC, 2011, 9-10 and 18-20.

[B] C. The Church in Society

64. The world that “God so loved” is scarred with problems and tragedies which cry out for the compassionate engagement of Christians. The source of their passion for the transformation of the world lies in their communion with God in Jesus Christ. They believe that God, who is absolute love, mercy and justice, can work through them, in the power of the Holy Spirit. They live as disciples of the One who cared for the blind, the lame and the leper, who welcomed the poor and the outcast, and who challenged authorities who showed little regard for human dignity or the will of God. The Church needs to help those without power in society to be heard; at times it must become a voice for those who are voiceless. Precisely because of their faith, Christian communities cannot stand idly by in the face of natural disasters which affect their fellow human beings or threats to health such as the HIV and AIDS pandemic. Faith also impels them to work for a just social order, in which the goods of this earth may be shared equitably, the suffering of the poor eased and absolute destitution one day eliminated. The tremendous economic inequalities that plague the human family, such as those in our day that often differentiate the global North from the global South, need to be an abiding concern for all the churches. As followers of the “Prince of Peace,” Christians advocate peace, especially by seeking to overcome the causes of war (principal among which are economic injustice, racism, ethnic and religious hatred, exaggerated nationalism, oppression and the use of violence to resolve differences). Jesus said that he came so that human beings may have life in abundance (cf. John 10:10); his followers acknowledge their responsibility to defend human life and dignity. These are obligations on churches as much as on individual believers. Each context will provide its own clues to discern what is the appropriate Christian response within any particular set of circumstances. Even now, divided Christian communities can and do carry out such discernment together and have acted jointly to bring relief to suffering human beings and to help create a society that fosters human dignity.⁶ Christians will seek to promote the values of the kingdom of God by working together with adherents of other religions and even with those of no religious belief.

65. Many historical, cultural and demographic factors condition the relation between Church and state, and between Church and society. Various models of this relation based on contextual circumstances can be legitimate expressions of the Church’s catholicity. It is altogether appropriate for believers to play a positive role in civic life. However, Christians have at times colluded with secular authorities in ways that condoned or even abetted sinful and unjust activities. The explicit call of Jesus that his disciples be the “salt of the earth” and the “light of the world” (cf. Matt. 5:13-16) has led Christians to engage with political and economic authorities in order to promote the values of the kingdom of God, and to oppose policies and initiatives which contradict them. This entails critically analyzing and exposing unjust structures, and working for their transformation, but also supporting initiatives of the civil authorities that promote justice, peace, the protection of the environment and the care for the poor and the oppressed. In this way Christians are able to stand in the tradition of the prophets who proclaimed God’s judgment on all injustice. This will very likely expose them to persecution and suffering. The servanthood of Christ led to the offering of his

⁶ See, for example, the Reformed-Roman Catholic text “The Church as Community of Common Witness to the Kingdom of God,” whose second chapter narrates cooperation between these churches concerning aboriginal rights in Canada, apartheid in South Africa and peace in Northern Ireland and whose third chapter describes the patterns of discernment used in each community, in PCPCU, *Information Service* N. 125 (2007/III), 121-138, and *Reformed World* 57(2/3), June-September 2007, 105-207.

life on the cross and he himself foretold that his followers should expect a similar fate. The witness (*Martyria*) of the Church will entail, for both individuals and for the community, the way of the cross, even to the point of martyrdom (cf. Matt. 10:16-33).

66. The Church is comprised of all socio-economic classes; both rich and poor are in need of the salvation that only God can provide. After the example of Jesus, the Church is called and empowered in a special way to share the lot of those who suffer and to care for the needy and the marginalized. The Church proclaims the words of hope and comfort of the Gospel, engages in works of compassion and mercy (cf. Luke 4:18-19) and is commissioned to heal and reconcile broken human relationships and to serve God in the ministry of reconciling those divided by hatred or estrangement (cf. 2 Cor. 5:18-21). Together with all people of goodwill, the Church seeks to care for creation, which groans to share in the freedom of the children of God (cf. Rom. 8:20-22), by opposing the abuse and destruction of the earth and participating in God's healing of broken relationships between creation and humanity.

[A] CONCLUSION

67. The unity of the body of Christ consists in the gift of *koinonia* or communion that God graciously bestows upon human beings. There is a growing consensus that *koinonia*, as communion with the Holy Trinity, is manifested in three interrelated ways: unity in faith, unity in sacramental life, and unity in service (in all its forms, including ministry and mission). The liturgy, especially the celebration of the eucharist, serves as a dynamic paradigm for what such *koinonia* looks like in the present age. In the liturgy, the people of God experience communion with God and fellowship with Christians of all times and places. They gather with their presider, proclaim the Good News, confess their faith, pray, teach and learn, offer praise and thanksgiving, receive the Body and Blood of the Lord, and are sent out in mission.¹ St John Chrysostom spoke about two altars: one in the Church and the other among the poor, the suffering and those in distress.² Strengthened and nourished by the liturgy, the Church must continue the life-giving mission of Christ in prophetic and compassionate ministry to the world and in struggle against every form of injustice and oppression, mistrust and conflict created by human beings.

68. One blessing of the ecumenical movement has been the discovery of the many aspects of discipleship which churches share, even though they do not yet live in full communion. Our brokenness and division contradict Christ's will for the unity of his disciples and hinder the mission of the Church. This is why the restoration of unity between Christians, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, is such an urgent task. Growth in communion unfolds within that wider fellowship of believers that extends back into the past and forward into the future to include the entire communion of saints. The final destiny of the Church is to be caught up in the *koinonia*/communion of the Father,

¹ The previous sentences largely repeat and paraphrase the statement from the 9th Forum on Bilateral Dialogues, held in Breklum, Germany, in March 2008. For the statement drawn up by this forum, see *The Ecumenical Review* 61(3), October 2009, 343-347; see also www.oikoumene.org/fileadmin/files/wcc-main/documents/p2/breklum-statement.pdf

² St John Chrysostom, Homily 50, 3-4 on Matthew, in J. P. Migne, *Patrologia Graeca*, 58, 508-509.

the Son and the Holy Spirit, to be part of the new creation, praising and rejoicing in God forever (cf. Rev. 21:1-4; 22:1-5).

69. "God did not send the Son into the world to condemn the world, but in order that the world might be saved through him" (John 3:17). The New Testament ends with the vision of a new heaven and a new earth, transformed by the grace of God (cf. Rev. 21:1-22:5). This new cosmos is promised for the end of history but is already present in an anticipatory way even now as the Church, upheld by faith and hope in its pilgrimage through time, calls out in love and worship "Come, Lord Jesus" (Rev. 22:20). Christ loves the Church as the bridegroom loves his bride (cf. Eph. 5:25) and, until the wedding feast of the lamb in the kingdom of heaven (cf. Rev. 19:7), shares with her his mission of bringing light and healing to human beings until he comes again in glory.

[A] HISTORICAL NOTE**[B] The Process Leading to the Church: Towards a Common Vision**

The World Council of Churches describes itself as “a fellowship of churches which confess the Lord Jesus Christ as God and Savior according to the scriptures and therefore seek to fulfil together their common calling to the glory of the one God, Father, Son and Holy Spirit.”⁶⁷ This “common calling” impels the churches to seek together convergence and greater consensus on the ecclesiological issues that yet divide them: What is the Church? What is the Church’s role in God’s cosmic design of recapitulation of all things in Jesus Christ?

During the past centuries, the way Christian churches have answered these questions has been marked by the fact that they live and do theology in an abnormal situation of ecclesial division. Therefore it is not surprising that a strong emphasis on ecclesiology – the theological question about the Church – accompanies the history of the modern ecumenical movement.

Thus, the 1927 World Conference on Faith and Order focused on seven theological subjects.⁶⁸ One of them was dedicated to the nature of the Church; a second dealt with the relation between the one Church we confess and the divided churches we experience in history. Based on the churches’ responses to the findings of that meeting,⁶⁹ the organizers of the 1937 Second World Conference on Faith and Order proposed that the overarching theme for the next World Conference should be “The Church in the Purpose of God.”⁷⁰ While the Second World Conference did not abide specifically with this theme, two of its five sections addressed core ecclesiological issues: “The Church of Christ and the Word of God” and “The Communion of Saints.”⁷¹ The 1937 World Conference concluded with the conviction that questions about the nature of the Church were at the root of most of the remaining dividing issues.⁷²

In 1948 the recognition of oneness in Christ gave rise to a fellowship of still divided communions, made manifest in the establishment of the World Council of Churches. The report of that first WCC Assembly stated clearly that despite their oneness in Christ, the churches were fundamentally divided into two mutually inconsistent understandings of the Church, shaped by a more “active” or a

⁶⁷ “Constitution and Rules of the World Council of Churches,” in L. N. Rivera-Pagán (ed.), *God in Your Grace: Official Report of the Ninth Assembly of the World Council of Churches*, Geneva, WCC, 2007, 448.

⁶⁸ H. N. Bate (ed.), *Faith and Order : Proceedings of the World Conference – Lausanne, August 3-21, 1927*, New York, George H. Doran Co., 1927, esp. 463-466. *Reports of the World Conference on Faith and Order – Lausanne Switzerland August 3 to 21, 1927*, Boston, Faith and Order Secretariat, 1928, 19-24.

⁶⁹ For a selection of responses, see L. Hodgson (ed.), *Convictions: A Selection from the Responses of the Churches to the Report of the World Conference on Faith and Order, Held at Lausanne in 1927*, London, Student Christian Movement Press, 1934.

⁷⁰ L. Hodgson (ed.), *The Second World Conference on Faith and Order Held at Edinburgh, August 3-18, 1937*, London, Student Christian Movement Press, 1938, 5.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, 228-235, 236-238.

⁷² Cf. O. Tomkins, *The Church in the Purpose of God: An Introduction to the Work of the Commission on Faith and Order of the World Council of Churches*, Geneva, Faith and Order, 1950, 34.

more “passive” understanding of the role of the Church in God’s salvation of the world.⁷³ It was in this new, complex ecumenical context – in which convergence on a lived Christology was helping the churches to recognize in each other vestiges of the one Church while remaining ecclesially and ecclesialogically divided — that the World Council of Churches’ Commission on Faith and Order held its 1952 Third World Conference.

Unsurprisingly once again, the first of the three theological reports prepared for the Third World Conference⁷⁴ was based on a comprehensive exercise of comparative ecumenical ecclesiology. The fruits of this exercise were gathered in the book *The Nature of the Church*,⁷⁵ and this, in turn, issued in the third chapter of the Conference’s final report entitled “Christ and His Church.”⁷⁶ This was precisely the theme of the study report⁷⁷ presented, eleven years later, to the Section I of the 1963 Fourth World Conference on Faith and Order, called “The Church in the Purpose of God.”⁷⁸

The same emphasis on ecumenical ecclesiology has been demonstrated by the major statements about unity received by the assemblies of the WCC: The 1961 New Delhi statement on the unity of “all in each place”⁷⁹; the 1975 Nairobi statement on the one Church as a conciliar fellowship⁸⁰; the 1991 Canberra statement on the unity of the Church as *koinonia*/communion⁸¹; and the 2006 Porto Alegre statement “Called to Be the One Church.”⁸² All these have been cumulative steps towards convergence and greater consensus on ecclesiology.

Compelled by the ecumenical vision of “all in each place” brought by the Holy Spirit into full visible unity in the apostolic faith, sacramental life, ministry, and mission, the Commission on Faith and Order dedicated a significant amount of its work in the years following the 1961 New Delhi Assembly to a convergence text on *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry*.⁸³

⁷³ Cf. “The Universal Church in God’s Design,” in W. A. Visser ‘t Hooft (ed.), *The First Assembly of the World Council of Churches Held at Amsterdam August 22nd to September 4th, 1948*, London, SCM Press Ltd, 1949, 51-57.

⁷⁴ *The Church: A Report of a Theological Commission of the Faith and Order Commission of the World Council of Churches in Preparation for the Third World Conference on Faith and Order to Be Held at Lund, Sweden in 1952*, London, Faith and Order, 1951.

⁷⁵ R.N. Flew (ed.), *The Nature of the Church: Papers Presented to the Theological Commission Appointed by the Continuation Committee of the World Conference on Faith and Order*, London, SCM Press, 1952.

⁷⁶ *Report of the Third World Conference on Faith and Order, Lund, Sweden : August 15-28, 1952*, London, Faith and Order, 1952, 7-11.

⁷⁷ *Christ and the Church: Report of the Theological Commission for the Fourth World Conference on Faith and Order*, Geneva, WCC, 1963.

⁷⁸ P. C. Rodger and L. Vischer (eds.), *The Fourth World Conference on Faith and Order : Montreal, 1963*, New York, Association Press, 1964, 41-49.

⁷⁹ W. A. Visser ‘t Hooft (ed.), *The New Delhi Report: The Third Assembly of the World Council of Churches, 1961*, London, SCM Press, 1962, 116.

⁸⁰ D. M. Paton (ed.), *Breaking Barriers: Nairobi 1975 – The Official Report of the Fifth Assembly of the World Council of Churches, Nairobi, 23 November-10 December, 1975*, London-Grand Rapids, SPCK-Eerdmans, 1976, 60.

⁸¹ M. Kinnamon (ed.), *Signs of the Spirit: Official Report Seventh Assembly – Canberra, Australia, 7-20 February 1991*, Geneva-Grand Rapids, WCC- Eerdmans, 1991, 172-174.

⁸² L. N. Rivera-Pagán (ed.), *God, in your Grace: Official Report of the Ninth Assembly of the World Council of Churches, Geneva, WCC, 2007*, 255-261.

⁸³ *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry*, Geneva, WCC, 1982.

A significant moment in Faith and Order reflection on ecclesiology was the Fifth World Conference of 1993 at Santiago de Compostela, Spain. A number of factors shaped this World Conference with its theme “Towards *Koinonia* in Faith, Life and Witness.” The first factor was the interpretation of the churches’ responses to *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry*, with its six published volumes of official responses.⁸⁴ The careful analysis of the 186 responses to BEM concluded with a list of several major ecclesiological themes that were requested for further study: The role of the Church in God’s saving purpose; *koinonia*; the Church as a gift of the word of God (*creatura verbi*); the Church as mystery or sacrament of God’s love for the world; the Church as the pilgrim people of God; the Church as prophetic sign and servant of God’s coming kingdom.⁸⁵ The second factor shaping the 1993 Conference was the results of the Faith and Order study process “Towards the Common Expression of the Apostolic Faith Today,”⁸⁶ which demonstrated an encouraging convergence about the entire doctrinal content of the Creed, including what it professes regarding the Church. The third factor was the study process on “The Unity of the Church and the Renewal of Human Community,”⁸⁷ which underlined the nature of the Church as sign and instrument of God’s saving design for the world. And fourth were the ecclesiological challenges raised by the conciliar process on Justice, Peace and the Integrity of Creation.⁸⁸ As well, there was new ecumenical momentum created by the growing prominence of communion ecclesiology in the bilateral dialogues. These movements in the 1980s converged in the decision, taken by the Faith and Order Plenary Commission in 1989, to launch a new study on what was then called “The Nature and Mission of the Church – Ecumenical Perspectives on Ecclesiology.”⁸⁹ The very theme of the Fifth World Conference – “Towards *Koinonia* in Faith, Life and Witness” – reflected all these study processes of the 1980s. While *The Church: Towards a Common Vision* takes its place within this long trajectory of Faith and Order reflection on the Church, fresh impetus was given to this work at the Fifth World Conference in 1993.

After several years of Faith and Order study and dialogue, an initial result of the Ecclesiology study was published in 1998 under the title *The Nature and Purpose of the Church*.⁹⁰ Its status as a provisional text was expressed in the subtitle: A Stage on the Way to a Common Statement. It is a text of six chapters: “The Church of the Triune God,” “The Church in History,” “The Church as *Koinonia* (Communion),” “Life in Communion,” “Service in and for the World,” and “Following Our Calling: From Converging Understandings to Mutual Recognition.” Responses to this text were received from churches, ecumenical organizations, and regional councils of churches, academic

⁸⁴ Cf. *Churches Respond to BEM Geneva*, WCC, 1986-1988, volumes I-VI.

⁸⁵ Cf. *Baptism, Eucharist & Ministry, 1982-1990: Report on the Process and Responses*, Geneva, WCC, 1990, 147-151.

⁸⁶ Cf. *Confessing the One Faith: An Ecumenical Explication of the Apostolic Faith as it Is Confessed in the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed (381)*, Faith and Order Paper 153, Geneva-Eugene, WCC-Wipf & Stock, 2010.

⁸⁷ Cf. *Church and World: The Unity of the Church and the Renewal of Human Community*, Faith and Order Paper 151, Geneva, WCC, 1990.

⁸⁸ “Final Document: Entering into Covenant Solidarity for Justice, Peace and the Integrity of Creation,” in D.P. Niles (ed.), *Between the Flood and the Rainbow: Interpreting the Conciliar Process of Mutual Commitment (Covenant) to Justice, Peace and the Integrity of Creation*, Geneva, WCC, 1992, 164-190; cf. T. F. Best & M. Robra (eds.), *Ecclesiology and Ethics: Ecumenical Ethical Engagement, Moral Formation, and the Nature of the Church*. Geneva, WCC, 1997.

⁸⁹ Cf. G. Gassmann, “The Nature and Mission of the Church: Ecumenical Perspectives,” in T. F. Best (ed.), *Faith and Order 1985-1989: The Commission Meeting at Budapest 1989*, Geneva, WCC, 1990, esp. 202-204, 219.

⁹⁰ *The Nature and Purpose of the Church: A Stage on the Way to a Common Statement*, Geneva, WCC, 1998.

institutions and individuals. Many appreciative comments were complemented by some points of constructive criticism. For example, it seemed that *The Nature and Purpose of the Church* needed further integration: how could the theme of the Church as Communion be treated apart from the chapter on the Church of the Triune God? Furthermore, some issues were considered missing: for instance, there was no section on teaching authority and the topic of mission seemed to receive little attention. As well, the World Conference at Santiago had called for a study on “the question of a universal ministry of Christian unity,”⁹¹ which was not reflected in the text. Significantly, in his 1995 encyclical letter on commitment to ecumenism, *Ut Unum Sint*, inviting dialogue about the ministry of the Bishop of Rome, Pope John Paul II cited the Faith and Order recommendation from Santiago.⁹²

When sufficient time had been allowed for the responses to come in, the commission set out revising its ecclesiology text, producing a new draft entitled *The Nature and Mission of the Church*,⁹³ which was presented to the 2006 WCC Assembly held in Porto Alegre, Brazil. Seeking to incorporate the suggestions from the various responses, it comprises four chapters: “The Church of the Triune God,” “The Church in History,” “The Life of Communion in and for the World,” and “In and For the World.” The first chapter integrated much of the biblical material on the nature of the Church as people of God, body of Christ and temple of the Holy Spirit, with biblical insights on the church as communion (*koinonia*) and on the mission of the Church as servant of the Kingdom and with the creedal affirmation of the Church as One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic. The second chapter on history highlighted the problems that afflict the churches in their present division: how can diversity be harmonized with unity and what makes for legitimate diversity? How do the churches understand the local church and how is it related to all other churches? What are the historic and ongoing issues that divide Christians? The third chapter highlighted the elements necessary for communion between the churches, such as apostolic faith, baptism, eucharist, ministry, *episkopé*, councils and synods, with the themes of universal primacy and authority now included. A final chapter more briefly explored the Church’s service to the world in assisting those who suffer, defending the oppressed, witnessing to the moral message of the Gospel, working for justice, peace and the protection of the environment, and generally seeking to promote a human society more in keeping with the values of the Kingdom of God.

This revised text on ecclesiology was also subtitled “A Stage on the Way to a Common Statement,” and it too was sent to the churches for response. Over eighty responses were received, although only around thirty were specifically from the churches. Most of the responses from the churches, academic and ecumenical institutes, and significantly from missionary organizations, expressed satisfaction that the mission of the Church was given greater prominence, even having a place in the title. Other comments were concerned that the use of the two words – nature and mission – would obscure the fact that the Church is by its very nature missionary. To assist the Ecclesiology Working

⁹¹ T. F. Best and G. Gassmann (eds.), *On the Way to Fuller Koinonia: Official Report of the Fifth World Conference on Faith and Order*, Geneva, WCC, 1994, 243.

⁹² *Encyclical Letter Ut Unum Sint of the Holy Father, John Paul II, on Commitment to Ecumenism*, Rome, Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1995, §89.

⁹³ *The Nature and Mission of the Church: A Stage on the Way to a Common Statement*, Faith and Order Paper 198, WCC, Geneva, 2005.

Group in assessing the responses to *The Nature and Mission of the Church*, Faith and Order staff prepared detailed summaries and initial analyses of every response.

Three particularly significant steps were taken in evaluating *The Nature and Mission of the Church*. First, the Plenary Commission of Faith and Order, with its 120 members representing the various churches, held its meeting in Crete in October 2009. This gathering brought together many who were participating in Faith and Order for the first time and the meeting was structured in such a way as to maximize the input of the commissioners to the three study projects of Faith and Order, especially the ecclesiology study. A number of plenary sessions assessed *The Nature and Mission of the Church*.⁹⁴ A major direction from the Plenary Commission was to shorten the text and to make it more contextual, more reflective of the lives of the churches throughout the world, and more accessible to a wider readership. Twelve working groups discussed *The Nature and Mission of the Church*, and produced detailed evaluations on the text.⁹⁵

Second, in June 2010 at Holy Etchmiadzin, Armenia, the Faith and Order Standing Commission decided that after a careful examination of the responses to *The Nature and Mission of the Church*, and the evaluations of the text from the meeting of the Plenary Commission in Crete, the time was right to begin a final revision. A drafting committee was appointed with theologians coming from the Anglican, Catholic, Lutheran, Methodist, Orthodox, and Reformed traditions; the two co-moderators came from the Methodist and Orthodox traditions respectively.

Third, the commission was aware of a significant lacuna in the responses process: There was as yet no substantial response from the Eastern and Oriental Orthodox churches. Accordingly, a major inter-Orthodox consultation was held Aghia Napa, Cyprus, in the Holy Metropolitanate of Constantia, in March of 2011, which included 40 delegated theologians from ten Eastern Orthodox and three Oriental Orthodox churches. The consultation produced an extensive evaluation of *The Nature and Mission of the Church*. A major suggestion was to integrate more clearly the material on baptism, eucharist and ministry into the presentation of what is essential to the life of the Church. The consultation and its report became a significant component of the next meeting of the Ecclesiology Working Group, and hence played a unique role in the process that led to the new text.

Extensive analysis of the responses continued at the first meeting of the drafting committee in Geneva in late November, 2010. The process was given fresh impetus after the inter-Orthodox consultation in early March, 2011. A meeting of the Ecclesiology Working Group which took place in Columbus, Ohio, USA, later that month produced a new draft version of the text that was presented to the Standing Commission of Faith and Order in Gazzada, Italy, in July 2011. Many comments were received from the commissioners, mostly quite favorable but suggesting that the text needed to emphasize more clearly ways in which progress had been made towards greater convergence, especially on the ministry, and in particular in bilateral agreed statements, as well as recent Faith and Order work, such as the study text *One Baptism: Towards Mutual Recognition*.⁹⁶

⁹⁴ Cf. John Gibaut (ed.), *Called to Be the One Church: Faith and Order at Crete*, Geneva, WCC, 2012, 147-193.

⁹⁵ Cf. *ibid.* 207-231.

⁹⁶ *One Baptism: Towards Mutual Recognition*, Geneva, WCC, 2011.

This request was addressed by strengthening some of the formulations and supporting them with notes which substantiate the progress achieved towards convergence. Subsequently, another version was prepared by the drafting committee at the Bossey Ecumenical Institute in Switzerland, in December 2011. The drafting committee was much aided by reflections coming from staff of the WCC's Commission on World Mission and Evangelism. The resulting text was then submitted to four outside ecumenical experts for a fresh evaluation; their suggestions were evaluated and incorporated by the drafting committee and presented to the Ecclesiology Working Group in a meeting held in Freising, Germany, late March 2012. On the basis of the discussions and reactions to the text at the Freising meeting, the Ecclesiology Working Group arrived at a final draft to be presented to the Faith and Order Standing Commission.

In Penang, Malaysia, on 21 June 2012, the final text was presented to the Standing Commission, which unanimously approved it as a convergence statement with the title *The Church: Towards a Common Vision*. Thus the present text is not a stage on the way to a further common statement; it is the common statement to which its previous versions – *The Nature and Purpose of the Church* and *The Nature and Mission of the Church* – were directed. *The Church: Towards a Common Vision* brings to completion a particular stage of Faith and Order reflection on the Church. The commission believes that its reflection has reached such a level of maturity that it can be identified as a convergence text, that is, a text of the same status and character as the 1982 *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry*. As such, it is being sent to the churches as a common point of reference in order to test or discern their own ecclesiological convergences with one another, and so to serve their further pilgrimage towards the manifestation of that unity for which Christ prayed. The central committee of the World Council of Churches at its meeting in Crete, Greece, in early September, 2012, received *The Church: Towards a Common Vision* and commended it to the member churches for study and formal response.

COMMITTEE FOR THE PROTECTION OF CHILDREN AND VULNERABLE ADULTS

THE SCOTTISH EPISCOPAL CHURCH AND THE ‘SAFE CHURCH CHARTER’

INTRODUCTION

Synod will recall that the Anglican Consultative Council (ACC), at its meeting in Auckland in November 2012, received proposals regarding the possible adoption across the Churches of the Anglican Communion of a “*Safe Church Charter*”. In adopting the resolution, the ACC committed itself to promoting the physical, emotional and spiritual welfare and safety of all people, especially children, young people and vulnerable adults, within the member churches of the Anglican Communion, and called upon all member churches to adopt and implement the *Charter for the Safety of People within the Churches of the Anglican Communion*.

The resolution and promotion of the Charter articulates clearly for the Anglican Communion the seriousness of ensuring that all provinces have adequate measures and safeguards in place to give confidence to all, both within and outwith the Church, that matters of abuse are treated with the appropriate degree of competence and rigour. The aim of the Safe Church Charter is to manage risks to effective ministry in the context of personal and pastoral relationships and this will involve both Prevention and Response.

The existing approach of the Scottish Episcopal Church to the safeguarding of children, young people and vulnerable adults closely reflects the spirit of the Safe Church Charter and at General Synod in 2013, the Committee for the Protection of Children and Vulnerable Adults was asked to consider the provisions of the Charter and make any recommendations considered necessary for fully reflecting the principles of the Charter within the Scottish Episcopal Church.

The Charter and the Scottish Episcopal Church

The Charter outlines five areas where Churches require to have considered what arrangements, if any, they have in place to address areas of concern in respect of safeguarding members from harm and abuse. The text of the Charter is set out below and in relation to each of its five sections, the Provincial Committee has, in the paragraphs set out in italics, sought to summarise the arrangements that the Scottish Episcopal Church currently has in place in respect of these areas and what further action, if any, might be required to ensure that the SEC is appropriately placed and properly prepared to deal with the challenges that abusive behaviour presents with the Church.

1. Pastoral support where there is abuse

We will provide pastoral support for the abused, their families, and affected parishes and church organizations by:

- a. listening with patience and compassion to their experiences and concerns;
- b. offering spiritual assistance and other forms of pastoral care.

The Scottish Episcopal Church has developed guidance for clergy, staff and volunteers throughout the Province on how to respond to reports and incidents of abuse, regardless of its nature. This guidance focuses on the different ways in which disclosures of this nature might be made and to whom and emphasises the importance of listening to those who are disclosing and providing spiritual assistance and support to all of those involved or affected by such disclosures.

2. Effective responses to abuse

We will have and implement policies and procedures to respond properly to allegations of abuse against clergy and other church personnel that include:

- a. making known within churches the procedure for making complaints;
- b. arranging pastoral care for any person making a complaint of abuse;
- c. the impartial determination of allegations of abuse against clergy and other church personnel, and assessment of their suitability for future ministry;
- d. providing support for affected parishes and church organizations.

The Scottish Episcopal Church has had a range of policies and procedures in place to address this aspect of the Charter for a number of years and Canons 65 and 54 provide the canonical underpinning to it. The Provincial Committee recognises the need to keep policies under continual review and the Provincial Officers maintain a brief for this and report regularly on required policy updates to the Provincial Committee.

3. Practice of pastoral ministry

We will adopt and promote by education and training standards for the practice of pastoral ministry by clergy and other church personnel.

The Scottish Episcopal Church has educational and training programmes in place to provide the appropriate training and development of clergy and laity in regard to pastoral ministry and a programme of safeguarding training for other church personnel. Initial ministerial training for those entering authorised ministry includes

attention to safeguarding matters and, in addition, through the activities of the Provincial Officers, supported by the Diocesan Protection Officers and local coordinators, regular training events are provided for those involved at congregational level. The Provincial Committee acknowledges that there remains work to be done to ensure that all who require to attend this training are provided with the opportunity to access it and there is a commitment throughout the Church to actively participate in the training. Under the guidance and oversight of the Provincial Committee, the Provincial Officers have this work in hand.

4. Suitability for ministry

We will have and implement policies and procedures to assess the suitability of persons for ordination as clergy or appointment to positions of responsibility in the church including checking their background.

Under the oversight of the Provincial Director of Ordinands, established processes and procedures exist in relation to those testing a vocation to ordained ministry. Procedures also operate in relation to those seeking entry to lay reader ministry. Those entering ordained or lay reader ministry also require to become members of the PVG Scheme.

5. Culture of safety

We will promote a culture of safety in parishes and church organizations by education and training to help clergy, other church personnel and participants prevent the occurrence of abuse.

The Scottish Episcopal Church is committed at Provincial, Diocesan and Vestry level, to developing and ensuring a culture of safety so that our churches are a safe place for people to attend for worship and other related activities. This is recognised as being much more than written policies and procedures and must be a living and breathing commitment to all aspects of safety within the Church. The Provincial Committee recognises that there can be no room for complacency and the development of a culture of safety will require continual attention and re-emphasis. This will be an area that will remain an important focus for the Provincial Committee in its work in promoting a safe and protective environment for all children and vulnerable adults pursuing or undertaking activities within the Church.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee commends the ACC for inviting provinces to adopt the Safe Church Charter. Whilst a Charter cannot of itself make Church “safe” its existence acts as a reminder of the need for continued vigilance and of the commitment to ensure that all that can reasonably be done is done to protect the vulnerable in our midst.

The Committee, recognising the need for continued work in a number of areas, recommends that the General Synod adopt the Safe Church Charter and a motion is included in the Synod agenda to that end.

Hugh Donald
Convener
Committee for the Protection of Children and Vulnerable Adults

A SERVICE OF THE WORD

*The words in **bold** are said by all.*

PREPARATION

1 Hymn

2 GREETING

*Blessed be God: Father, Son, and Holy Spirit:
And blessed be God's kingdom, now and for ever. Amen.*

A brief introduction to the service may be given here using these or other words:

*We are gathered together as the family of God
(in our Father's presence)
to offer praise and thanksgiving
to ask forgiveness of our sins
to hear and receive God's holy Word
to pray for the needs of the world
and to seek God's grace
that through Jesus Christ our Lord
and in the power of the Holy Spirit
we may give ourselves to God's service.*

EITHER

The Lord be with you.
The Lord bless you.

(Ruth 2.4)

OR

*We meet in Christ's name.
Let us share his peace.*

3 PRAYERS OF PENITENCE AND FORGIVENESS

Return to the Lord, who will have mercy:
to our God, who will richly pardon.

(Isaiah 55.7)

A time of silence is kept, followed by

EITHER

3.1 *EITHER*

Have mercy on me, O God:
according to your loving-kindness.

I know my transgressions:
and my sin is ever before me.

Purge me from my sin and I shall be pure:
wash me and I shall be clean indeed.

Create in me a clean heart, O God:
and renew a right spirit within me.

(From Psalm 51, see Note)

OR

I confess my transgressions to you, Lord.
Then you forgive me the guilt of my sin:

Happy are they whose transgressions are forgiven:
and whose sin is put away.

I acknowledge my sin to you:
and do not conceal my guilt.

All the faithful will make their prayers to you in time of trouble:
when the great waters overflow, they shall not reach them.

(From Psalm 32, see Note)

OR

I confess my iniquity:
and am sorry for my sin.

In you, O Lord, have I fixed my hope:
You will answer me, O Lord my God.

O Lord, do not forsake me:
be not far from me, O my God.

Make haste to help me:
O Lord of my salvation.

(From Psalm 38, see Note)

OR

3.2 EITHER

Creator of the world, have mercy:
Lord have mercy (or Kyrie eleison etc.)

Source of all goodness, have mercy:

Lord have mercy.

Wash away our sins:

Lord have mercy.

Light of the world, have mercy:

Christ have mercy (or Christe eleison etc.)

Strength of the faithful, have mercy:

Christ have mercy.

Look on us, wounded by sin:

Christ have mercy.

Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, have mercy:

Lord have mercy (or Kyrie eleison etc.)

One God in three persons, have mercy:

Lord have mercy.

Renew your Spirit within us, and give us new life:

Lord have mercy.

(Based loosely on Orbis factor Kyrie from Sarum Missal)

OR

Creator of the world, have mercy:

Kyrie eleison.

Source of all goodness, have mercy:

Kyrie eleison.

Wash away our sins:

Kyrie eleison.

Light of the world, have mercy:

Christe eleison.

Strength of the faithful, have mercy:

Christe eleison.

Look on us, wounded by sin:

Christe eleison.

Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, have mercy:

Kyrie eleison.

One God in three persons, have mercy:

Kyrie eleison.

Renew your Spirit within us, and give us new life:

Kyrie eleison.

OR

*Creator of all, have mercy: **Kyrie eleison.***

*You blot out our offences, have mercy: **Kyrie eleison.***

*Hear us when we cry to you: **Kyrie eleison.***

*Only Son of the Father, have mercy: **Christe eleison.***

*Saviour of the world, have mercy: **Christe eleison.***

*Free us from our sins: **Christe eleison.***

*Gracious, life-giving Spirit, have mercy: **Kyrie eleison.***

*With the Father and the Son, have mercy: **Kyrie eleison.***

*Make us dead to sin and alive with you: **Kyrie eleison.***

(Based loosely on the Conditor Kyrie from Sarum missal)

OR (*Suitable for use in Advent*)

O Lord God of Hosts, restore us.
Kyrie eleison.
Kyrie eleison.

Show us the light of your countenance,
and we shall be saved.
Christe eleison.
Christe eleison.

O Lord, show us your mercy;
and grant us your salvation.
Kyrie eleison.
Kyrie eleison.

OR (*Suitable for use in Christmas*)

O Christ, Son of God, existing before time,
you came into the world to save us.
Lord, have mercy.
Lord, have mercy.

Sun of Righteousness, shining with the Father's love,
you illumine the whole universe.
Christ, have mercy.
Christ, have mercy.

Son of Mary: born a child, you shared our humanity.
Lord, have mercy.
Lord, have mercy.

OR (*Suitable for use in Epiphany*)

Son of David: born to rule,
you received gifts from the wise men.
Lord, have mercy.
Lord, have mercy.

Son of Man: baptized by John,
you saved us from ourselves.

Christ, have mercy.
Christ, have mercy.

Heavenly King:
you proclaimed the kingdom.
Lord, have mercy.
Lord, have mercy.

OR (*Suitable for use in Lent*)

Wash away all my iniquity
and cleanse me from my sin.
Lord, have mercy.
Lord, have mercy.

Against you, you only have I sinned
and done what is evil in your sight.
Christ, have mercy.
Christ, have mercy.

Create in me a pure heart, O God,
and renew a steadfast spirit within me.
Lord, have mercy.
Lord, have mercy.

(*Common Worship*)

OR (*Suitable for use in Lent*)

Lord Jesus, you wept over the sins of your city.
Lord, have mercy.
Lord, have mercy.

Lord Jesus, you heal the wounds of sin and division,
jealousy and bitterness.
Christ, have mercy.
Christ, have mercy.

Lord Jesus, you bring pardon and peace to the sinner.
Lord, have mercy.
Lord, have mercy.

(*Common Worship*)

OR (*Suitable for use in Passiontide*)

*Christ became obedient unto death for us,
Even death upon a cross:
Kyrie eleison.
Kyrie eleison.*

*He was pierced for our sins,
Bruised for no fault but ours:
Christe eleison.
Christe eleison.*

*His punishment has won our peace,
And by his wounds we are healed:
Kyrie eleison.
Kyrie eleison.*

(*Common Worship*)

OR (*Suitable for use in Easter*)

*Alleluia! Christ is risen.
The Lord is risen indeed. Alleluia!
Praise the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.
The Lord is risen indeed. Alleluia!
Rejoice, then, even in your distress.
The Lord is risen indeed. Alleluia!
He called us from our darkness into the light of his day.
The Lord is risen indeed. Alleluia!
Alleluia! Christ is risen.
The Lord is risen indeed. Alleluia!*

If this version is used the sentence at the beginning of Section 3 is omitted

OR (*Suitable for use on the Day of Pentecost*)

*You raise the dead to life in the Spirit.
Lord, have mercy.
Lord, have mercy.*

*You bring pardon and peace to the broken in heart.
Christ, have mercy.
Christ, have mercy.*

*You make one by your Spirit the torn and divided.
Lord, have mercy.
Lord, have mercy.*

(Common Worship)

OR

3.3

**God of mercy,
we acknowledge that we are sinners.
We turn from the wrong
that we have thought and said and done,
and are mindful of all that we have failed to do.
For the sake of Jesus, who died for us,
forgive us for all that is past,
and help us to live each day
in the light of Christ our Lord.
Amen**

(Common Worship)

3.4 EITHER

**May almighty God,
who sent his Son into the world to save sinners,
bring us his pardon and peace, now and for ever. Amen.**

(Common Worship)

OR

**May the God of love
bring us back to himself,
forgive us our sins,
and assure us of his eternal love
in Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.**

(Common Worship)

OR

*O Lord, all we long for is before you;
and our deep sighing is not hidden from you.*

*But we acknowledge our wickedness;
we are filled with sorrow at our sin.*

*Be pleased O Lord, to deliver us;
O Lord, make haste to help us.*

***May the Lord forgive what we have been,
help us to amend what we are
and direct what we shall be,
through Jesus Christ our Lord.
Amen.***

(SEC Daily Prayer)

3.5

Blessed is the Lord:
Who has heard the voice of our prayer.

Therefore shall our hearts dance for joy:
And in our song will we praise our God.

(From Psalm 28)

The Gloria OR Hymn OR Psalm of Praise

5 THE COLLECT OF THE DAY

*The president introduces a period of silent prayer with the words
'Let us pray' or a more specific bidding.
The Collect is said and all respond
Amen.*

PROCLAMATION OF THE WORD

6 READING(S) FROM HOLY SCRIPTURE

See Notes.

Readings are taken from the Lectionary. The set Psalm may be sung or read between readings.

7 SERMON OR other Exposition of the Word *(see Note)*

8 REFLECTION

A time of silence, which may be followed by music, such as an anthem, or a meditative congregational song.

9 AFFIRMATION OF FAITH

EITHER

9.1 Do you believe in God the Father?
**I believe in God, the Father almighty,
creator of heaven and earth.**

Do you believe in God the Son?
**I believe in Jesus Christ, God's only Son, our Lord,
who was conceived by the power of the Holy Spirit
and born of the Virgin Mary,
suffered under Pontius Pilate,
was crucified, died and was buried;
he descended to the dead.
On the third day he rose again;
he ascended into heaven,
he is seated at the right hand of the Father,
and he will come again to judge the living and the dead.**

Do you believe in God the Holy Spirit?

**I believe in the Holy Spirit,
the holy catholic Church,
the communion of saints,
the forgiveness of sins,
the resurrection of the body,
and the life everlasting. Amen.**

OR

9.2 Do you believe in God the Creator,
who made the world?

I believe.

Do you believe in God the Saviour,
who redeemed humanity?

I believe.

Do you believe in God the Sanctifier,
who gives life to God's people?

I believe.

OR

9.3

***We believe in God the Father,
God almighty, by whose plan
earth and heaven sprang to being,
all created things began.***

***We believe in Christ the Saviour,
Son of God in human frame,
virgin-born, the child of Mary
upon whom the Spirit came.***

***Christ, who on the cross forsaken,
like a lamb to slaughter led,
suffered under Pontius Pilate,
he descended to the dead.***

***We believe in Jesus risen,
heaven's king to rule and reign,
to the Father's side ascended
till as judge he comes again.***

***We believe in God the Spirit;
in one Church, below, above:
saints of God in one communion,
one in holiness and love.***

***So by faith, our sins forgiven,
Christ our Saviour, Lord and friend,
we shall rise with him in glory
to the life that knows no end.***

OR

9.4

Let this mind be in you which was in Christ Jesus:*
the divine nature was his from the first:
Yet he did not grasp at equality with God;*
he emptied himself and became like a slave.
Taking the nature of man he was revealed in human form;*
he humbled himself and became obedient
even to death, death on a cross.
Therefore God has raised him on high,*
and has given him a name above every other name;
So that in the name of Jesus every knee shall bow,*
in heaven, on earth, and in the depths;
And every tongue confess that Jesus Christ is Lord;*
to the glory of God the Father.

(from Philipians 2)

9.5 The Nicene Creed OR The Apostles' Creed *(see Appendix)*

PRAYERS

10 PRAYERS OF INTERCESSION

10.1 *Prayer is offered for the world and its people, for those who suffer and those in need, for the Church and its members. The prayers conclude with:*

10.2 *EITHER*

Lord, have mercy.
Christ, have mercy.
Lord, have mercy.

**Our Father in heaven,
hallowed be your name,
your kingdom come,
your will be done,
on earth as in heaven.
Give us today our daily bread.
Forgive us our sins
as we forgive those who sin against us.
Do not bring us to the time of trial
but deliver us from evil.
For the kingdom, the power
and the glory are yours, now and for ever.
Amen.**

OR

Lord, have mercy upon us.
Christ, have mercy upon us.
Lord, have mercy upon us.

**Our Father, who art in heaven,
hallowed be thy name;
thy kingdom come; thy will be done;
on earth as it is in heaven.
Give us this day our daily bread;
and forgive us our trespasses,
as we forgive those who trespass against us.**

**And lead us not into temptation,
but deliver us from evil.
For thine is the kingdom,
the power and the glory, for ever and ever.
Amen.**

10.3 *(If not used at 2)*

*We meet in Christ's name.
Let us share his peace.*

11 OFFERING

During a hymn, song, music, or silence, the people's offering may be collected, accepted in silence OR ~~and~~ the following prayer may then be said.

Generous God,
Accept the offering of your people
for the work of your Church,
through Jesus Christ our Lord.
Amen.

CONCLUSION

12 ACT OF DEDICATION

12.1 *A verse from one of the Readings of the Day is read.*

This is followed by

12.2

Either

*From age to age my mouth will proclaim your faithfulness; *
your love, O Lord, for ever will I sing.
**From age to age my mouth will proclaim your faithfulness; *
your love, O Lord, for ever will I sing.**
Righteousness and justice are the foundations of your throne;
love and truth go before your face.
Your love, O Lord, for ever will I sing.*

*Glory to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Spirit.
From age to age my mouth will proclaim your faithfulness; *
your love, O Lord, for ever will I sing.*

Or *(Suitable for use in Advent)*

*My soul waits for the Lord; *
in his word is my hope.
**My soul waits for the Lord; *
in his word is my hope.**
O Israel, wait for the Lord, for with the Lord there is mercy.
In his word is my hope.
Glory to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Spirit.
**My soul waits for the Lord; *
in his word is my hope.***

Or *(Suitable for use at Christmas)*

*His salvation is near those who fear him: *
his glory shall dwell in our land.
**His salvation is near those who fear him: *
his glory shall dwell in our land.**
I will listen to what the Lord God is saying,
for he speaks peace to his people
and to those who turn their hearts to him.
His glory shall dwell in our land.
Glory to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Spirit.
**His salvation is near to those who fear him; *
his glory shall dwell in our land.***

Or *(Suitable for use in Lent)*

*Incline your ear to me; *
make haste to answer when I call.
**Incline your ear to me; *
make haste to answer when I call.**
You will arise and have compassion on Zion,
for it is time to have pity upon her.
Make haste to answer when I call.
Glory to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Spirit.
Incline your ear to me; **

make haste to answer when I call.

Or *(Suitable for use at Passiontide)*

*Surely he has borne our griefs; *
he has carried our sorrows.*

***Surely he has borne our griefs; *
he has carried our sorrows.***

*His punishment has won our peace,
and by his wounds we are healed.*

He has carried our sorrows.

Glory to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Spirit.

***Surely he has borne our griefs; *
he has carried our sorrows.***

Or *(Suitable for use in Easter)*

*This is the day that the Lord has made; *
let us rejoice and be glad in it.*

***This is the day that the Lord has made; *
let us rejoice and be glad in it.***

*I shall not die, but I shall live,
and recount the deeds of the Lord.*

This is the day that the Lord has made.

Glory to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Spirit.

***This is the day that the Lord has made; *
let us rejoice and be glad in it.***

OR *(Suitable for use on the Day of Pentecost)*

*You send forth your Spirit, O Lord; *
you renew the face of the earth.*

***You send forth your Spirit, O Lord; *
you renew the face of the earth.***

*May the glory of the Lord endure for ever;
may the Lord rejoice in all his works.*

You renew the face of the earth.

Glory to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Spirit.

***You send forth your Spirit, O Lord; *
you renew the face of the earth.***

12.3

***Almighty God,
we thank you for the gift of your holy word:
May it be a lantern to our feet,
a light upon our paths,
and a strength to our lives.
Take us and use us
to love and serve all people
in the power of the Holy Spirit
and in the name of your Son,
Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.***

(Common Worship)

13 Gloria in Excelsis (*If not used at 4*), Te Deum (*see Appendix*)
OR Hymn

14 DISMISSAL

14.1 The Lord be with you.
The Lord bless you.

(Ruth 2.4)

14.2 Let us bless the Lord.
Thanks be to God. Alleluia

14.3 **The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ,
and the love of God,
and the fellowship of the Holy Spirit,
be with us all, evermore.
Amen.**

(2 Corinthians 13.14)

When presiding, a bishop or a priest may give a blessing in place of the Grace.

NOTES TO ACCOMPANY A SERVICE OF THE WORD

INTRODUCTORY NOTES

Modern – and Ancient

There are times when neither the Eucharist nor Morning Prayer meets the needs of a particular congregation's main act of worship on Sunday. *A Service of the Word* is now offered as a resource for use by congregations of the Scottish Episcopal Church, with the guidance of their bishop.

The origins of a *Service of the Word* lie in early Jewish Sabbath day worship. When Jesus worshipped in the synagogue, he joined in liturgy largely based on the reading and exposition of Scripture, and the saying or singing of Psalms – a 'Service of the Word'. Early Christian gatherings for worship were also based on this pattern, eventually combining with the Eucharist to provide the familiar shape of the Eucharistic liturgy of Word and Sacrament.

A Service of the Word

At the heart of the service is the Proclamation of the Word. This must not be so lightly treated as to appear insignificant compared with other parts of the service. As a *Service of the Word*, the liturgy uses texts from scripture such as the psalms as the basis for responses, prayers of penitence, praise, and other elements.

Presiding

Leadership of *A Service of the Word* may be by one person, or shared by two or more people, as appropriate. But it is helpful for the flow of a service if one person presides overall. Authorization, support and preparation may be required, and Rectors and Vestries should consult their Bishop before appointing people to this ministry.

Structure

The basic structure of *A Service of the Word* is given below.

Preparation	<i>Greeting</i> <i>Penitence and Forgiveness</i> <i>Praise</i> <i>Collect of the Day</i>
Proclamation of the Word	<i>Reading(s) from Scripture</i> <i>Sermon or other exposition of the Word</i> <i>Reflection</i> <i>Affirmation of Faith</i>
Prayers	<i>Intercessions</i> <i>Lord's Prayer</i> <i>Offering (Collection)</i>
Conclusion	<i>Act of Dedication</i> <i>Dismissal</i>

NOTES ON EACH SECTION, as numbered in the Liturgy

Preparation

1 Whenever it is possible, an Opening Hymn or Song helps to gather the people of God for worship. All kinds of congregational songs – traditional hymns, praise songs, reflective chants, responsorial psalms - can be used here and at other places in the Service.

2 'The Lord bless you' is the response of the harvesters to Boaz's greeting, 'The Lord be with you' (Ruth 2.4). Any introductory words that follow about the theme of the service should be very brief and clear. *The Peace may be shared here or following the Lord's Prayer (Section 10)*

3. The versicle and response from Isaiah 55 introduces the Prayers of Penitence and Forgiveness.

3.1 to 3.3 *Three differing forms of Prayers of Penitence are offered –*

- *Forms based on Penitential Psalms (3.1)*
- *Forms with a Kyrie response*
- *A traditional Prayer of Confession*

One form from one of these three section should be selected.

3.1 Three of the 'penitential psalms' form the basis of the Prayers of Penitence *in this section and are taken from the Scottish Psalter*. They can be used in a variety of ways. Other translations of the psalms could be used. They can be read together or by different voices or parts. One verse can be used as a congregational response between the other verses. For example, verse 1 of Psalm 38 could be the response, as follows:

Have mercy on me, O God,
according to your loving-kindness.

All: **Have mercy on me, O God,
according to your loving-kindness.**

Have mercy on me, O God:
according to your loving-kindness.
I know my transgressions:
and my sin is ever before me.

All: **Have mercy on me, O God,
according to your loving-kindness.**

Purge me from my sin and I shall be pure:
wash me and I shall be clean indeed.
Create in me a clean heart, O God:
and renew a right spirit within me.

All: **Have mercy on me, O God,
according to your loving-kindness.**

3.2 *A corporate prayer of forgiveness is said in place of an absolution. Three forms are offered*

3.3 The versicle and response from Psalm 28 provide a positive declaration of faith in God's loving mercy.

4 *A Song of Praise follows the Prayers of Penitence and Forgiveness.*

5 The Collect of the Day brings the Preparation to a close and leads into the Readings. The authorised Collects for the Sundays and Feast Days of the year are found in *Scottish Liturgy 1982 Propers* (online at <http://www.scotland.anglican.org/index.php/liturgy>), or from the *Scottish Prayer Book 1929* (online at <http://justus.anglican.org/resources/bcp/Scotland>).

The Collect is a link with all the other worship of the Church on that day. It may be introduced very briefly, for example, "As we prepare to use the Collect of this Sunday, let us in silence pray for God's guidance" (the central point of the particular collect). After a short period of silent prayer by all, the Collect is said by the president.

Proclamation of the Word

6

If the Service of the Word is the principal service on a Sunday then the Gospel must be read. The Gospel may be read in the same manner as the readings at the Daily Offices or as at the Eucharist using the usual responses.

The readings from Holy Scripture, and their exposition in address or sermon, are central to this Service, and, together with the liturgical season, may determine the theme of the rest of the worship. The readings for the Sundays and Feast Days of the year are found in the Scottish Episcopal Church *Calendar and Lectionary*, together with its annual Guide (online at <http://www.scotland.anglican.org/index.php/liturgy>). The Sunday Eucharistic readings for each Sunday provide an Old Testament, Psalm, New Testament, and Gospel passage. One, two or three of these may be used, according to need, with the Psalm said or sung between them.

7 A sermon may be preached in the normal way. The term 'other Exposition of the Word' includes less formal exposition, the use of drama, interviews, or discussion.

8 The time of Reflection is intended to offer a silent space for prayerful thought after the Proclamation of the Word.

9 This leads into the Affirmation of Faith as the liturgical expression of the community's response to the Proclamation of the Word.

9.1 and 9.2 The question and answer form of the Apostles' Creed, and the shorter alternative form, are from *Holy Baptism 2006*. Using them is a reminder that the response of faith begins with Baptism, and that Christian discipleship is a Baptismal calling.

9.3 *This metrical setting may be sung to any 87 87 or 87 87D tune.*

9.4 The Nicene Creed and The Apostles' Creed are the ancient forms of the Creed and are used in the worship of many churches. They are familiar to many Anglicans from the

Eucharist and from Morning or Evening Prayer. Contemporary and traditional versions are provided in the Appendix.

Prayers

10.1 The Prayers of Intercession follow the structure given, but can use many different forms, as considered appropriate for the community. Supportive preparation and training is desirable, to enable members of the congregation to lead the Prayers.

10.2 The Lord's Prayer is an appropriate conclusion to the Prayers of Intercession, drawing them together 'as our Saviour taught us.' It is provided in contemporary and traditional versions.

10.3 *The Peace may be shared here.*

11 The Offering of gifts for the work of the kingdom is linked with the offering of prayer for the needs of the world. When the Offering has been collected it may be received and the Prayer can be used, but actions such as presentation at the altar are unnecessary and should be avoided.

Conclusion

12 The Act of Dedication is intended to offer liturgical expression to a dedicated response to the call to faith and service proclaimed in the Word.

12.1 The person(s) who gave the Sermon or Exposition of the Word should select a verse from one of the Reading(s), as appropriate.

13 Two traditional canticles, Gloria in Excelsis and Te Deum, are offered as alternatives to a hymn. Contemporary and traditional versions are provided in the Appendix. Other versions or musical settings could be used.

14 The Dismissal is intended to be the final part of the service, and it should not be followed by any other hymn or prayer.

14.1 'The Lord bless you' is the response of the harvesters to Boaz's greeting, 'The Lord be with you' (Ruth 2.4).

14.2 The versicle and response are part of the traditional ending of Daily Prayer. We bless God, as God blesses us at the conclusion of worship.

14.4 As a traditional ending for Christian worship, the Grace enables *A Service of the Word* to end with the words of Holy Scripture. If preferred, when a priest or bishop is presiding, a Blessing may be used instead.

APPENDIX 1 – The Canticles

GLORIA IN EXCELSIS

Glory to God in the highest,
and peace to God's people on earth.
Lord God, heavenly King,
almighty God and Father,
(with God the Son, Jesus Christ,
and God the Holy Spirit,)
we worship you, we give you thanks,
we praise you for your glory.
Lord Jesus Christ, only Son of the Father,
Lord God, Lamb of God,
you take away the sin of the world;
have mercy on us;
you are seated at the right hand of the Father:
receive our prayer.
For you alone are the Holy One,
you alone are the Lord,
you alone are the Most High,
Jesus Christ,
with the Holy Spirit,
in the glory of God the Father. Amen.

OR

Scottish Prayer Book 1929 version:

Glory be to God in the highest,
and in earth peace, good will towards men.
We praise thee, we bless thee,
we worship thee, we glorify thee,
we give thanks to thee for thy great glory,
O Lord God, heavenly King, God the Father Almighty;
and to thee, O God, the only-begotten Son Jesu Christ;
and to thee, O God, the Holy Ghost.
O Lord, the only-begotten Son Jesu Christ;
O Lord God, Lamb of God, Son of the Father,
who takest away the sins of the world,
have mercy upon us.
Thou that takest away the sins of the world,
receive our prayer.
Thou that sittest at the right hand of God the Father,
have mercy upon us.
For thou only art holy, thou only art the Lord,
thou only, O Christ, with the Holy Ghost,
art most high in the glory of God the Father. Amen.

TE DEUM

We praise you, O God;
we acclaim you as Lord.
All creation worships you,
the Father everlasting.
To you all angels, all the powers of heaven,
the cherubim and seraphim, sing in endless praise:
Holy, holy, holy Lord, God of power and might:
heaven and earth are full of your glory.
The glorious company of apostles praise you,
the noble fellowship of prophets praise you.
The white-robed army of martyrs praise you.
Throughout the world the holy Church acclaims you:
Father, of majesty unbounded;
your true and only Son, worthy of all praise:
and the Holy Spirit, advocate and guide.
You, Christ, are the king of glory,
the eternal Son of the Father.
When you took our flesh to set us free
you humbly chose the Virgin's womb.
You overcame the sting of death
and opened the kingdom of heaven to all believers.
You are seated at God's right hand in glory.
We believe that you will come to be our judge.
Come then Lord and help your people,
bought with the price of your own blood,
And bring us with your saints
to glory everlasting.

OR

Alternative version

One voice or group of voices says verses marked a, another those marked b, all say verses in bold type.

a We praise you, O God;
we acclaim you as Lord.
b All creation worships you,
the Father everlasting.
a To you all angels, all the powers of heaven,
the cherubim and seraphim, sing in endless praise:

**Holy, holy, holy Lord, God of power and might:
heaven and earth are full of your glory.**

a The glorious company of apostles praise you,
the noble fellowship of prophets praise you.
b The white-robed army of martyrs praise you.
Throughout the world the holy Church acclaims you:

**Father, of majesty unbounded;
your true and only Son, worthy of all praise:
and the Holy Spirit, advocate and guide.**

- a* You, Christ, are the king of glory,
the eternal Son of the Father.
b When you took our flesh to set us free
you humbly chose the Virgin's womb.
a You overcame the sting of death
and opened the kingdom of heaven to all believers.
b You are seated at God's right hand in glory.
We believe that you will come to be our judge.

**Come then Lord and help your people,
bought with the price of your own blood,
and bring us with your saints
to glory everlasting.**

OR

Scottish Prayer Book 1929 version:

- 1 We praise thee, O God : we acknowledge thee to be the Lord.
- 2 All the earth doth worship thee : the Father everlasting.
- 3 To thee all Angels cry aloud : the heavens and all the powers therein.
- 4 To thee Cherubin and Seraphin : continually do cry,
- 5 Holy, Holy, Holy : Lord God of Sabaoth;
- 6 Heaven and earth are full of the Majesty : of thy glory.
- 7 The glorious company of the Apostles : praise thee.
- 8 The goodly fellowship of the Prophets : praise thee.
- 9 The noble army of Martyrs : praise thee.
- 10 The holy Church throughout all the world : doth acknowledge thee;
- 11 The Father : of an infinite Majesty;
- 12 Thine honourable, true : and only Son;
- 13 Also the Holy Ghost : the Comforter.
- 14 Thou art the King of Glory : O Christ.
- 15 Thou art the everlasting Son : of the Father.
- 16 When thou tookest upon thee to deliver man : thou didst not abhor the Virgin's womb.
- 17 When thou hadst overcome the sharpness of death : thou didst open the kingdom of heaven to all believers.
- 18 Thou sittest at the right hand of God : in the glory of the Father.
- 19 We believe that thou shalt come : to be our Judge.
- 20 We therefore pray thee, help thy servants : whom thou hast redeemed with thy precious blood.
- 21 Make them to be numbered with thy Saints : in glory everlasting.
- 22 O Lord, save thy people : and bless thine heritage.
- 23 Govern them : and lift them up for ever.
- 24 Day by day : we magnify thee;
- 25 And we worship thy Name ever world without end.
- 26 Vouchsafe, O Lord : to keep us this day without sin.
- 27 O Lord, have mercy upon us : have mercy upon us.

28 O Lord, let thy mercy lighten upon us : as our trust is in thee.

29 O Lord, in thee have I trusted : let me never be confounded.

APPENDIX 2 – The Creeds

THE NICENE CREED

We believe in one God,
the Father, the almighty,
maker of heaven and earth,
of all that is, seen and unseen.
We believe in one Lord, Jesus Christ,
the only Son of God,
eternally begotten of the Father,
God from God, Light from Light,
true God from true God,
begotten, not made,
of one substance with the Father.
Through him all things were made.
For us and for our salvation
he came down from heaven;
by the power of the Holy Spirit
he became incarnate of the Virgin Mary,
and was made man.
For our sake he was crucified under Pontius Pilate;
he suffered death and was buried.
On the third day he rose again
in accordance with the Scriptures;
he ascended into heaven
and is seated at the right hand of the Father.
He will come again in glory to judge the living and the dead,
and his kingdom will have no end.
We believe in the Holy Spirit, the Lord, the giver of life,
who proceeds from the Father.
With the Father and the Son, he is worshipped and glorified.
He has spoken through the prophets.
We believe in one holy catholic and apostolic Church.
We acknowledge one baptism for the forgiveness of sins.
We look for the resurrection of the dead,
and the life of the world to come. Amen.

OR

Responsive version:

We believe in one God,
the Father, the almighty,
**maker of heaven and earth,
of all that is, seen and unseen.**
We believe in one Lord, Jesus Christ,
the only Son of God,
eternally begotten of the Father,
**God from God, Light from Light,
true God from true God,**

begotten, not made,
of one substance with the Father.

Through him all things were made.

For us and for our salvation
he came down from heaven;
by the power of the Holy Spirit
he became incarnate of the Virgin Mary,
and was made man.

**For our sake he was crucified under Pontius Pilate;
he suffered death and was buried.**

On the third day he rose again
in accordance with the Scriptures;

**he ascended into heaven
and is seated at the right hand of the Father.**

**He will come again in glory to judge the living and the dead,
and his kingdom will have no end.**

We believe in the Holy Spirit,
the Lord, the giver of life,
who proceeds from the Father.

With the Father and the Son, he is worshipped and glorified.

He has spoken through the prophets.

We believe in one holy catholic and apostolic Church.

We acknowledge one baptism for the forgiveness of sins.

**We look for the resurrection of the dead,
and the life of the world to come. Amen.**

OR

Scottish Prayer Book 1929 version:

I believe in one God the Father Almighty,
Maker of heaven and earth, And of all things visible and invisible:
And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only-begotten Son of God,
Begotten of his Father before all worlds,
God of God, Light of Light, Very God of Very God,
Begotten, not made, Being of one substance with the Father,
By whom all things were made:
Who for us men, and for our salvation came down from heaven,
And was incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary,
And was made man,
And was crucified also for us under Pontius Pilate.
He suffered and was buried,
And the third day he rose again according to the Scriptures,
And ascended into heaven, And sitteth on the right hand of the Father. And he shall come
again with glory to judge both the quick and the dead: Whose kingdom shall have no end.
And I believe in the Holy Ghost, The Lord, The Giver of life,
Who proceedeth from the Father and the Son,
Who with the Father and the Son together is worshipped and glorified, Who spake by the
Prophets.
And I believe one Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church.
I acknowledge one Baptism for the remission of sins.
And I look for the Resurrection of the dead,

And the Life of the world to come. Amen.

THE APOSTLES' CREED

I believe in God, the Father almighty,
creator of heaven and earth.
I believe in Jesus Christ, God's only Son, our Lord,
who was conceived by the power of the Holy Spirit,
and born of the Virgin Mary,
suffered under Pontius Pilate,
was crucified, died, and was buried;
he descended to the dead.

On the third day he rose again;
he ascended into heaven,
he is seated at the right hand of the Father,
and he will come to judge the living and the dead.
I believe in the Holy Spirit,
the holy catholic Church,
the communion of saints,
the forgiveness of sins,
the resurrection of the body,
and the life everlasting. Amen.

OR

Scottish Prayer Book 1929 version:

I believe in God the Father Almighty,
Maker of heaven and earth:
And in Jesus Christ his only Son our Lord,
Who was conceived by the Holy Ghost,
Born of the Virgin Mary,
Suffered under Pontius Pilate,
Was crucified, dead, and buried:
He descended into hell;
The third day he rose again from the dead;
He ascended into heaven,
And sitteth on the right hand of God the Father Almighty;
From thence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead.
I believe in the Holy Ghost;
The holy Catholic Church;
The Communion of Saints;
The Forgiveness of sins;
The Resurrection of the body,
And the Life everlasting. Amen.

MISSION AND MINISTRY BOARD

Future Governance Structures

General Synod 2014 received a paper regarding the Whole Church Mission and Ministry Policy, Ministerial Formation and Governance structures. A copy of the 2014 paper follows on subsequent pages.

The Synod in 2014 approved a first reading of an alteration to Canon 52.23 to provide for the creation of an Institute Council to act as the governing body for the new Scottish Episcopal Institute, and for the creation of a new Mission Board to replace the current Mission and Ministry Board. The 2014 paper sets out the rationale for the proposed changes. The Synod in 2014 also agreed that the Standing Committee should appoint a “shadow” Institute Council for the transitional year to General Synod 2015. During the year that Council has agreed that it would be appropriate for its membership to include the convener of the Board of Studies ex officio and the changes being proposed in 2015 to the Digest of Resolutions reflect that.

At General Synod 2015, a second reading of the alteration to Canon 52.23 will be proposed. In addition, a number of resolutions will be proposed to alter that Digest of Resolutions in order to create the new committee structure to operate under the Mission Board and Institute Council. The Synod agenda sets out the text of motions to alter the Digest and a separate paper shows the detail of the changes to be proposed to the Digest.

As will be noted from the 2014 paper which follows, the Whole Church Networks play an important role in the operation of the Whole Church Policy. No specific mention is made of them in the proposed changes to the Digest in order to allow maximum flexibility for the composition and operation of the Networks.

The Most Rev David Chillingworth
Convener, Mission and Ministry Board

March 2015

Paper Presented to General Synod 2014

MISSION AND MINISTRY BOARD

Whole Church Mission and Ministry Policy, Ministerial Formation, and Future Governance Structures

General Synod 2014 sees the bringing together of two very significant strands of work in the life of the Mission and Ministry Board: the streamlining and empowering of provincial structures to provide support to the Whole Church Mission and Ministry policy and radical new steps regarding the formation of those training for authorised ministry in the Scottish Episcopal Church.

1. Whole Church Mission and Ministry Policy

In recent years, the Board has reported to General Synod on the steps taken to develop and further mission and ministry across the Province in a “whole church” manner. The Whole Church Policy affirmed the primacy of mission in the life of the Scottish Episcopal Church and, in particular, the recognition of the diocese as the focus for mission, with diocesan bishops acting as leaders in mission. The Board reported to Synod in 2013 on its proposals to establish a range of networks. Since then, the Home Mission Committee has been working towards establishing networks in the following areas: Youth, Children, Mission Action Planning, Stewardship, Spirituality and Rural Issues. It is intended that in future the role of the current Provincial Lay Learning Group would also take the form of a network. The networks are intended to support inter-diocesan collaboration, and the sharing of information, planning and good practice, thus helping to maximise the resources and strengthen the work across the Province. It is expected that they will comprise people with the necessary motivation, skills and practitioner experience from across the dioceses in order to maximise their potential.

The networks will be a means of bringing a degree of provincial coherence to such work, without imposing significant burdens of infrastructure. It is hoped that the networks will operate on a ‘light touch’ basis. In particular, it is not envisaged that the creation of networks will simply add a new layer of committees to existing structures. No particular paradigm of how such networks might operate is prescribed. For example, some might only gather annually – it would be for each network to determine for itself its own means of working. However, it might be expected that they would encourage a sharing of time, talents and resources which are found in the dioceses. They would communicate in whatever way they chose – probably by email/telephone/website - and possibly meeting up occasionally. It is hoped that the development of the new provincial website will offer fresh possibilities for interactive communication and enable greater inter-diocesan working.

The role of the Province in such a context essentially becomes one of broad oversight in relation to the networks, supporting inter-diocesan activity and communication. Bringing together the co-ordinators of the various networks, from time to time would enable connections to be made, where appropriate, between work being undertaken by different networks so that no single network would operate in isolation. It would, therefore, be appropriate for the networks to report regularly to an appropriate provincial body to enable effective oversight.

A further aspect of the emphasis on the role of the dioceses in the Whole Church Policy is the intention that block grant finance might be made available to dioceses in place of the current Grants for Ministry framework. Some preliminary work has already been undertaken on this and it is expected that specific proposals will be brought to General Synod 2015.

2. Theological Formation

In 2013, as was reported to General Synod that year, a report was received from the Ministry Division Quality in Formation Panel (QFP) of the Church of England of the inspection which

had been carried out during the autumn of 2012 of the Theological Institute of the Scottish Episcopal Church (TISEC). Following careful consideration of that report, the Mission and Ministry Board established a TISEC Review Working Party to undertake a review, focused on the areas of formation and governance, which had been highlighted by the QFP report. A copy of the Working Party report accompanies this paper. The recommendations in the report have been broadly accepted by the Mission and Ministry Board, the College of Bishops and the Standing Committee. A name for the new Institute envisaged by the report has been agreed as “The Scottish Episcopal Institute – Forming People for Ministry”. The Standing Committee also made some observations regarding the appointment of the proposed new governing body for the new Institute and these are reflected in the proposals now being brought to General Synod. The Mission and Ministry Board has also established an Implementation Group for the purposes of carrying forward the recommendations contained in the Working Party report.

The recommendations of the Working Party report carry certain financial implications. An accompanying paper sets out the financial position in greater detail. In broad terms, the cost of operating the new Institute, on the assumptions set out in that paper, are broadly equivalent to the current costs. The possibility of a significant increase in the amount of curate grant (currently, a grant is provided by the province to cover 50% of curate stipend, national insurance and pension costs – the accompanying finance paper envisages the possibility of curate grant being increased to 100% of such stipend, national insurance and pension contributions) and funding to support a number of full-time ordinands would, however, create a significant additional cost. The rationale for suggesting a significant increase in curate grants is to allow greater opportunity for curate placements. Curate housing normally needs to be provided locally and that need, taken together with the need to fund the remaining 50% of curate employment costs, restricts the number of places where curates can be placed. It is hoped that by increasing the amount of provincial grant, an increased number of good training locations will become a reality. Further consideration will need to be given to how such aspects, including the recommendation for an expanded role for the Provincial Director of Ordinands, are to be taken forward and how in the longer term balanced budgets might be achieved.

3. Governance Structures

The two developments above result in significant proposals for governance change. Put simply, the proposal is to abolish the existing Mission and Ministry Board and create two new boards.

a) Institute Governance Structures

The report of the TISEC Review Working Party recommends the creation of a new entity to act as the governing body for the new Institute. This follows on, in part, from the QFP report which recommended a review of governance to enable effective vision and strategy for the Institute, and clearer mechanisms for decision-making. The existing structures of TISEC are very complex, and its dispersed nature makes consistency and accountability difficult.

Creating a governing body which would be able to engender a vision, strategy and business plan for the Institute, and also ensure its implementation, was seen as an urgent task by the Inspectors. It was not thought that the Mission and Ministry Board or the Ministry Development Committee were in a place to fulfil this task, and the role of the Provincial Ministry Development Officer was unclear.

It was evident to the Working Party that a new governance structure had to be proposed in order to meet the concerns expressed. The proposals for a governing body are intended to ensure that such a body will have the breadth and skills to provide oversight and strategic planning, and will enable clear lines of responsibility and accountability from staff members. Lines of communication and accountability to the College of Bishops and (ultimately) to General Synod will ground the Institute in the life of the Church. The inclusion of the Provincial Director of Ordinands in the scheme of governance will ensure that formation for ministry begins from discernment (as recommended in the Inspection Report) and that there is continuity through the whole process of ministerial formation and training.

In the discussions of the Working Party report within the Mission and Ministry Board and Standing Committee, there has been general acceptance of the need to create a governing body with the status of a General Synod Board, the convener of which would also *ex officio* be a member of the Standing Committee. The Working Party report envisaged such a board being entirely appointed by the Standing Committee. Standing Committee itself considered that, whilst there was certainly a place for appointments to such a governing body being made on the basis of the necessary skills and experience (rather than on the basis of diocesan representation, as applies to other General Synod Boards), it was appropriate for General Synod itself to be involved in some way in the appointments process. Consequently, the proposals being brought to General Synod envisage appointments being made by the Synod, albeit with Standing Committee having a duty to make nominations (and also having power to fill vacancies arising between meetings of General Synod). Also, the Mission and Ministry Board considered that the term “Council”, rather than “Board”, might be more readily comprehensible within academic circles as terminology more readily in use in educational institutions. Consequently, the proposals envisage the creation of a body with the status of a General Synod Board but which would be known as the “Institute Council”.

The result of the creation of a new governing body is that the current Mission and Ministry Board would no longer have any responsibility for training and formation for authorised or “recognised” ministries and that the Ministry Development Committee, and other bodies associated with it, such as the Board of Studies, would cease to be part of the Mission and Ministry Board structure. (“Recognised” ministries, for these purposes, mean lay ministries for which training and formation would in some way be endorsed or “kite-marked” by the new Institute. Lay education, of a more general nature, would become one of the networks operating under a new Mission Board.)

b) Mission Governance Structures

The combination of the proposals for a new Institute and the Whole Church Policy developments referred to above, equally suggest the need for a new board structure for mission. The Mission and Ministry Board recommends that a new Mission Board be created with the following elements: –

1. The new Board would have responsibility for the strategic oversight of provincial mission work of the SEC within Scotland and internationally. It might appropriately be termed the “Mission Board” and would provide provincial oversight to the Whole Church networks.
2. The new Board would have pendant committees addressing issues of mission in the areas of “church in society” and “overseas”. Following consultation with the existing Overseas Committee, it is also suggested that that Committee might be given a new name to replace the somewhat outdated, and arguably somewhat colonialist-sounding, terminology of “overseas”. It is recommended that, in order to reflect better the actual function of the Committee, it be known in future as the “Global Partnerships Committee”.
3. Given the strategic role of the new Board and what would otherwise be an overlap with the role of the current Home Mission Committee, it is recommended that the Board itself take on the role of the Home Mission Committee with that latter committee disappearing from the structure. This would avoid duplication in terms of diocesan representation and also diocesan reporting.
4. The new Board would comprise: –
 - A Convener appointed by General Synod
 - A Bishop appointed by the College of Bishops.
 - The Conveners of the pendant committees of Church in Society, Global Partnerships and Youth (on the basis that all of those bodies carry individual budgets)
 - A representative from each diocese appointed by the diocese

- Up to three co-opted members appointed by the Board to bring skills and expertise to the Board in any particular areas which might otherwise be lacking. It is suggested that this is a more effective mechanism for bringing such additional skills onto the Board than having places for “General Synod Representatives” as the current Mission and Ministry Board does.

Liaison between the new Board and the networks would be vital. The Board could determine how best to achieve that. It is not intended that the manner of liaison between the Board the networks should be prescribed. The Board would doubtless wish to explore the best ways of working with the networks themselves. However, one might perhaps envisage occasional gatherings of the network co-ordinators with the Board, the provision of written reports from networks to Board meetings or inter-network conferences facilitated by the Board as a means of encouraging and supporting the work going on in dioceses. Interchange between the Board and the networks, and vice versa, would be important so that matters emerging within the networks which needed consideration within the formal provincial structures of the Church could be properly addressed and also so that matters identified within the Board could be fed into the networks, enabling a degree of cohesion across the dioceses. Similarly, means should be found for liaison between the Board and the new Institute Council so as to ensure that the work of training and formation for ministry is informed by developments in mission.

c) Procedural Matters

The process for achieving the above governance changes is a little complex. The creation of two new boards and the abolition of the Mission and Ministry Board require canonical change. Canonical change itself requires a two-year process of first and second readings. A motion for a first reading of the necessary canonical change to Canon 52.23 is set out in the Synod agenda.

The process for fleshing out the precise composition of the new boards, and creating the new committee structure, requires changes to the Digest of Resolutions. Changes to the Digest can be made by simple resolution of the Synod and do not require a two-reading process. Until the second reading of the necessary canonical change to establish the new boards has taken place, it would be premature to propose changes to the Digest of Resolutions. However, in order to give Synod members a picture of the proposals which it would be intended to bring to General Synod 2015, the text of the Digest changes expected to be proposed to Synod 2015 is set out below.

A consequence of the above is that the period between the General Synods of 2014 and 2015 is essentially one of transition. During that year, considerable work will require to be undertaken in relation to the implementation of the recommendations set out in the Working Party report. It is suggested that in order to prepare the way for the new arrangements, the transitional period between General Synods 2014 and 2015 be addressed by the creation of a “shadow” Institute Board, appointed by the Standing Committee. That “shadow” body would take the place of the existing Ministry Development Committee following General Synod 2014 and pave the way for the new arrangements formally taking effect from General Synod 2015. A motion to give authority to the proposed new “shadow” body is set out in the Synod agenda.

The Mission and Ministry Board commends to Synod the various proposals set out in this paper.

The Most Rev David Chillingworth
Convener, Mission and Ministry Board

April 2014

CANON FIFTY TWO

OF THE GENERAL SYNOD

The current text of Canon 52, Section 23 is set out below for information. The text to be added is shown underlined and the text to be deleted is scored through.

23 BOARDS AND COMMITTEES

Without prejudice to its right of appointment of Special Committees, the General Synod shall appoint with such duties as it sees fit, a Standing Committee, a Faith and Order Board, a Mission ~~and Ministry~~ Board, an Administration Board, an Information and Communication Board, a Board of the Scottish Episcopal Institute (to be known as the Institute Council), and the Provincial Buildings Committee as provided for under Canon 35, Section 1 and which shall include persons with expert knowledge of architecture, ecclesiastical artefacts and liturgy.

CANONS FOR SECOND READING

OPINIONS FROM DIOCESES

Canon 52, Section 23

Aberdeen and Orkney:

Approved unanimously

Argyll and the Isles:

House of Bishops, House of Laity: Approved unanimously

House of Clergy: Approved, *nem con*

Brechin:

Approved

Edinburgh:

Approved unanimously in both houses and by the Bishop

Glasgow and Galloway:

Approved unanimously

Moray, Ross and Caithness:

Approved unanimously

St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane:

Approved unanimously in houses

CHURCH IN SOCIETY COMMITTEE

BACKGROUND TO MOTIONS FOR GENERAL SYNOD

The Motions which Church in Society have brought before General Synod 2015 are rooted in our need to care for the entirety of God's Creation, and the practical actions which result from this view of Creation, that we think that our church should be taking at this time. The story of Creation given in the first chapters of Genesis remind us of the care which God took over creation, God's involvement with all aspects of that act of creation, and that despite the powers given to humanity, this power is to be exercised by remembering that humanity has been created in God's image. It is important that we remember that things have value because they are God's things, not ours. Because they are God's things, God values them. Whilst humankind bears enough of the *imago Dei* to make us distinct from the remainder of the natural world, we are accountable before God as part of and in service to the whole community of life, as stewards and trustees, as priests of creation, as nurturers, as co-creators. The care of creation is a duty not a choice. We are all called to work out in each generation exactly how we exercise our role as stewards, what possibilities in creation we should develop and what limits there should sensibly be. This is always been a matter of debate and discussion.

But what is clear is that over the last two hundred years, and increasingly over the last fifty years, we have released back into the atmosphere large amounts of carbon, which have been stored as fossil sources such as coal, oil or gas. This has greatly increased the concentration of carbon dioxide (levels that had been below 300 ppm for at least 400,000 years have increased by about a third to 400 in the last 75 years), and also methane, in the atmosphere of our planet. This is having the effect of increasing the ability of our atmosphere to retain the heat it receives from the sun, in the same way as the glass of a greenhouse. The impact of this is not simply an increasing mean planetary temperature, but it makes a significant change in the atmospheric systems, which govern both weather and overall climate.

Alongside the impact of the physics at the core of this environmental crisis, is a spiritual crisis in the form of a great divide between mind and body, between head and heart, between human and nature, which is so vast that the potential consequence on the environment could be catastrophic. So we need to cultivate what might be referred to as a 'deep seeing' and a 'deep listening'. Seeing and hearing by the depth of the soul, an intimacy with our Creator God. Deep seeing is appreciating not only what we see as nice, but recognizing the beauty or value of all creatures.

The changes in climate consequent on rising CO₂ concentrations are impacting on every country in the world, although some will be more adversely impacted than others. The communities of the world who are poorest and least able to adapt will suffer disproportionately from the emissions of the richer and more resilient. They will fall unevenly on genders in relation to their differing traditional roles in life. For all of us our weather will become more varied and less predictable, with more frequent extreme climatic events. Whereas some

communities will face raised sea levels due to ice melt, others will experience increased drought due to increased temperatures. Cultivation patterns will be altered, some arable lands will be reduced to desert, and fresh water will become more scarce. The effects will be massive and are likely to make some parts of the globe uninhabitable, which will disrupt whole regions, leading to widespread refugee issues, and potential conflicts over resources.

There is debate as to the extent to which human activity is responsible for all the changes which we are now experiencing; many of the hottest years on record have been during the past decade. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, made up of authoritative voices from across the planet, monitors climate change. It is clear that, while there are and will always be natural cycles of climate change, current changes are of a different nature to what has gone before in terms of speed of effect. They are however consistent with what would have been expected from rising levels of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere. These increasing levels of CO₂ are consistent with current and recent levels of fossil fuel use. In short human activity is an additional cause of the changes in our climate, which we are witnessing.

This being the case, it is abundantly clear that we have not cared for God's creation in the way that we should, and that it is now urgent that we should both take action to stop making the problem worse, and institute actions which might mitigate some of the negative impacts which will result from our presently far too high emissions CO₂ and other 'greenhouse gases'. Global climate change has been described as representing the greatest current physical threat to human flourishing and also likely to impact on large numbers of the other organisms with which we share God's creation.

Scotland has been proactive in planning actions aimed at both reducing impact and mitigating effects and we have, with essentially all political party agreement, one of the most far-reaching programmes in implementing a renewable electricity supply, and a programme to work towards low-carbon heating systems.

But just doing things here isn't enough and we need agreement on global actions. Many of the things, which need to be done, can only be achieved at an international level and so getting agreement through discussions led from the United Nations is vital. In particular, it is widely recognised that the UN climate negotiations in Paris in December 2015 will be especially crucial, with the potential at last to set actions, policies and targets across the globe which will restrict average global temperature rises. It matters that we should support this as an objective to urge on the Scottish Government and all world governments. The urgency of this is reflected in the motion put to the General Synod, as part of our responsibility as stewards of God's creation.

We are all citizens of the earth and bound up in the web of life where we must live out this deep connection. This means opening our senses more to the natural pleasures of life, exploring the great outdoors, choosing wholesome foods that bring us into contact with the earth, responding more to the seasons in our diets, looking to consume more things that are local. We should set

ecological standards for our institutions, our businesses, and our churches. When we become sensitive to God's world around us, we will grow more conscious also of God's world within us and our own place as human beings within nature.

If we are to take our responsibility to God's creation seriously we should go beyond urging others to take action and undertake actions which lie with us. Around 20 years ago Scotland's Churches came together to form Eco-Congregation Scotland, now an independent inter-denominational charity to which the SEC makes a significant contribution in terms of its running costs. Eco-Congregation Scotland is an organisation which provides information on the bigger picture across Scotland on a range of environmental issues. The recent Eco-Congregation Scotland AGM was focused on the impacts of global climate change which are already being felt in some of the world's poorest communities. Eco-Congregation Scotland also provides information on what we can do both as individuals and as church congregations to reduce our carbon footprints in terms of energy use in buildings and in our food consumption. Despite the importance of Care of Creation, only around 10% of Scotland's churches are registered with Eco-Congregation Scotland. It matters that more of us become active in Eco-Congregation Scotland so as to demonstrate the intentionality of our discipleship in the Care of Creation. In the run up to the Paris Conference, Eco-Congregation Scotland is organising a Climate Change baton relay, rather like the Olympic and Commonwealth Games torches, around Scotland. The baton will be coming to the General Synod as an important element in its journey prior to completing its travels by being taken to the Scottish Government delegation in Paris.

Churches are not the only bodies concerned about Environmental care. There are a large number of secular environmental charities such as WWF (formerly called the World Wildlife Fund) or with particular parts of creation such as Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB). In recent months the Church in Society Committee has been working with RSPB to explore ways in which the levels of awareness of environmental issues, the actions which might be taken and their theological basis might be better understood both in society as a whole, but particularly in faith bodies. It matters to remember that many in our churches find it easiest to connect to God when in the natural elements of creation such as forests, mountains or coasts rather than in a building. The reserves such as those run by organisations such as RSPB can function as important places of spiritual refreshment and encounter.

Care for Creation naturally leads to care for all in both global and local society. According to the Trussell Trust, 13 million people live below the poverty line in the UK and a million were helped by food banks. Furthermore, the Department of Energy's statistics reveal that around 17% of UK households struggle to meet their domestic energy needs. Income levels and the ability to access financial support at sustainable rates of interest is vital to the poorest members of our society. Surveys in our churches in recent months have shown that most of our churches pay those they employ above the living wage. But if we want to provide an exemplar for others, it matters that we are committed to paying a

living wage to all of those who work for the church in any capacity. Only when this is the case are we able to speak with authority to others in our society.

Access to financial support is important to most of us as part of our normal lives. Most of us are able to use the banks as the basis of our financial lives. This however is not the case for many of the less well remunerated in our society. As the recent debate about the rates of interest charged by payday lenders such as Wonga has shown there are many who find getting access to financial services is difficult. After a number of years of preparation in February 2015 the Churches' Mutual Credit Union (CMCU) was launched. The CMCU is owned by The Church of England, The Church of Scotland, The Methodist Church, The Church in Wales and ourselves.

Ultimately CMCU hopes to impact on the access to finance of the less well off in our church societies but there are a number of steps along the way. A perceived reason for the difficulty in the poorest accessing finance is that they are unable to use the same mechanisms as most of us. Credit unions are organisations, which are owned and run by their members. Members of a credit union need to share a common bond. Most commonly this is people in a single occupation, such as the police, or who live in a defined geographic region, such as Edinburgh. The common bond for CMCU is that all of its members must belong to one of its owning churches. As a new organisation with limited initial funds CMCU needs to be careful about to whom it lends as it has limited scope to cover bad debt.

Initially lending and membership is restricted to those who have a defined role within churches i.e. as employees of trustees. In the next three years it is expected that this will be widened so as to be more socially inclusive. Lending money to those in society who would otherwise find it hard to find reasonable credit is important. There is an important wider motive and that is publicizing that there is an alternative to the banks and that this is an option for all and not just for those with no alternative. CMCU sets out to be an exemplar for the role that credit unions can have and as an encourager for all involved in the Credit Union Movement.

In conclusion many of the things, which need to be done, can only be achieved at an international level. We are all citizens of the earth and bound up in the web of life where we must live out this deep connection. When we become sensitive to God's world around us, we will grow more conscious also of God's world within us and our own place as human beings within nature. This makes it important to act on both local and international scales to address these issues.

David Atkinson
Convener, Church in Society Committee

SCOTTISH EPISCOPAL CHURCH PENSION FUND

Actuarial Valuation 31 December 2014

1. Introduction

The Pension Fund Trustees and the Standing Committee have received the preliminary results of the actuarial valuation of the Scottish Episcopal Church Pension Fund as at 31 December 2014. Pension funds are required to carry out a triennial valuation for the purpose of assessing whether funding is adequate in relation to past liabilities (ie in relation to past service of their members) as well as ensuring that the contributions paid are adequate for projected future liabilities. The valuation will not be formally 'signed off' until later in the year but the results are now sufficiently clear for the matter to be reported upon to General Synod.

2. Background

The triennial valuation as at 31 December 2008 showed a deficit of approximately £8.8m in relation to past service. In relation to future service, the cost of benefit accrual was calculated at 26%. As required for any pension fund in deficit, a Recovery Plan to address the shortfall was agreed between the Trustees and the Church and submitted to the Pensions Regulator for comment. The Recovery Plan included a cash injection of £2m from provincial resources and an increase in the contribution rate from 25.3% to 34.9% of standard stipend/pensionable salary to cover not only the cost of future benefit accrual but also to eliminate the deficit for past service (8.9% represented deficit reduction contributions). The period of the Recovery Plan was agreed at 15 years.

A new investment strategy was put in place following the 2008 valuation in order to reduce the level of exposure to market volatility. By the time of the valuation as at 31 December 2011, the deficit of £8.8m had been reduced to £3m. Unfortunately, however, the cost of future benefit accrual had increased from 26% in 2008 to 32.2% as at the end of 2011. In the light of that, Synod agreed to maintain the contribution rate at 34.9% (of which, by that time, 2.7% represented deficit reduction contributions).

Following the 2011 valuation, aware of the financial burden on the Church resulting from the increase in contribution rate and the possibility of further rises in the cost of future benefit accrual, Standing Committee undertook an extensive consultation exercise in 2012 on questions of affordability and possible changes to benefits. The results of that consultation were reported to General Synod 2013. Approximately 50% of respondents to the consultation had suggested that 35% represented the limit of affordability in terms of contribution rate. In the light of this and of the possible options for benefit change, Synod 2013 agreed various changes to the benefits. In particular it agreed that, for service accrued from January 2014, normal retirement age for pension purposes would be increased to age 67 and future pensionable stipend/salary growth would be limited to no more than the increase in the Retail Prices Index.

3. 2014 Valuation

The Pension Fund Trustees and the Standing Committee are pleased to be able to report that the preliminary results of the 2014 valuation show an improvement in the funding position of the Scheme.

The value of the assets of the Pension Fund has increased from £35.8m in 2011 to £46m at the end of 2014. However, the value of the liabilities has also substantially increased from £38.8m in 2011 to £44.7m in 2014. Overall, the effect of this has been to turn the shortfall in 2011 into a surplus of £1.3m in 2014.

A further positive development is that the cost of future benefit accrual has fallen from 32.2% of standard stipend/pensionable salary in 2011 to 30.3% at the end of 2014. The main reason for this reduction is the change to the benefit structure referred to above from the beginning of 2014. The change to retirement age and to future growth in pensionable stipend/salary has, in effect, reduced the contribution rate by 6.1% of stipend/salary. In other words, without those changes having been made, the future contribution rate would now be of the order of 36.4% (above the 35% level which the responses to the 2012 consultation suggested was the limit of affordability).

4. Future Implications

The improvement in funding position of the Scheme for past service and the reduction in the costs of accruing for future service allow a little room for manoeuvre in terms of setting the future contribution rate and determining future investment strategy.

Now that the deficit for past service has been eliminated, the Recovery Plan previously submitted jointly by the Church and Trustees to the Pension Regulator comes to an end. Consideration could be given to reducing the contribution rate to around the 30.3% level mentioned above (which would represent a reduction of 4.6% from the current level). However, a key element of responding to the actuarial valuation is a consideration of the risks relating to funding, investment and the employer covenant, and how these various risks interact. The results of the valuation are sensitive to very small changes in the underlying conditions and assumptions and these could adversely affect the funding position and contribution rate for the future. In other words, the Trustees and Standing Committee need to strike a balance between reducing the contribution rate, maintaining a margin against future market movements and reducing risk, with the aim of achieving greater long-term stability in the contribution rate and funding levels. The de-risking protocol which was implemented in 2010 has already significantly reduced volatility in the Fund. Reducing investment risk, however, also reduces the future investment return which in turn adversely impacts on the contribution rate. The Trustees and Standing Committee recommend retaining a margin in order to potentially allow for further future de-risking and to maintain a margin against future adverse market movements. The Trustees have begun the process of reviewing the de-risking protocol in the light of current market conditions.

In the light of these considerations, the Trustees and Standing Committee consider that rather than reducing the contribution rate by as much as 4.6% of standard stipend/pensionable salary, it should be adjusted downwards by 2.7% (equivalent to the element of the current contribution rate which for the last three years has been

used to fund the deficit recovery plan). This would result in a new contribution rate, from 1 January 2016, of 32.2% of standard stipend/pensionable salary.

A motion is accordingly included in the Synod agenda to reduce the contribution rate to 32.2% of stipend/salary, with effect from the beginning of 2016.

David Palmer
Convener, Standing Committee

Andrew November
Chair, Pension Fund Trustees

April 2015

PAYMENT OF PENSION COSTS

Members of the Scottish Episcopal Church Pension Fund (SECPF) are permitted to become members of and contribute to other pension arrangements at the same time as contributions are paid on their behalf to the SECPF. Membership of the SECPF is not compulsory. Opting out of the SECPF is a personal choice offered to every cleric or staff employee who is eligible for membership.

The Scheme Handbook states that the Church will not make payments into another pension arrangement on behalf of a cleric or staff member. In effect this means that the Church (ie a vestry or other employer such as a diocese) cannot be required to pay into another pension arrangement, but there is nothing to prevent it from doing so if a private agreement between the employer and cleric is entered into.

As vestries find themselves under financial pressure, there may be a temptation to finance clergy appointments on restricted budgets (for example, by encouraging a cleric to opt out and instead paying alternative – and lower – pension contributions to a pension arrangement other than the SECPF). This could result in a future claim for equal benefits. (In a business situation where there is a single pension scheme it is a requirement that all employees receive equivalent benefits, and any employee who is offered less than his entitlement would have a case against the employer. For the purposes of pensions the SEC is treated as a single employer. The Church has a policy on clergy remuneration which includes a non-contributory final salary pension. It follows that SECPF membership must be offered to all eligible clergy and employees.)

A relatively small number of clergy do opt out of the SECPF as is their right to do. Opting out is not cost neutral for the SECPF. Members who opt out are still covered for 3 times stipend death in service benefit under the SECPF. The Trustees hold a group life insurance policy for the members with an annual premium paid from the Fund. The SECPF is therefore bearing a cost even in circumstances where a prospective member opts out. Also, if no contribution is paid on behalf of an individual cleric who has opted out the number of employers contributing to any recovery plan is reduced.

The Standing Committee considers that in cases where a cleric or staff member decides to opt out of the SECPF, there should nevertheless remain on the relevant employer (eg vestry or diocese) an obligation to pay an appropriate amount to cover the cost of life cover, administration costs of the Scheme and any deficit reduction contribution payable in the event that the SECPF is in deficit. This would mean that where a cleric or staff member decides to opt out, other employers in the Scheme are not financially disadvantaged by that decision.

The Synod agenda includes a motion to include provision in the Digest of Resolutions to cover this eventuality.

David Palmer
Convener, Standing Committee
April 2015

Whole Church Mission and Ministry Policy

Proposal for Mission and Ministry Support Grants

Executive Summary

This paper sets out the detailed proposals for the creation of a new system of Mission and Ministry Support Grants. Its main features are as follows: –

- In order to align provincial financial resourcing of dioceses with the Whole Church Mission and Ministry Policy, the current Grants for Ministry system would be replaced by a new block grant system. The new system would allow decisions regarding the provision of financial support within a diocese to be made by the diocese rather than the Province - embodying the principle of subsidiarity, namely that matters should be should be dealt with at the most immediate (or local) level consistent with their solution.
- The current Grants for Ministry system operates on the basis of applications being made to the Province for the funding of specific posts. Funding is subject to a number of restrictions (for example, a post can normally only be funded by Grants for Ministry up to a maximum of 50% of stipend, the balance having to be provided by the local charge or diocese). The proposed new system would allow a diocese much greater freedom in how the provincial grant is applied.
- The block grant would operate on a formula basis, thereby dispensing with the need for detailed annual applications by dioceses.
- Introduction of the block grant system would be phased over an initial period of four years to enable dioceses to adjust to the new level of funding which they would receive (under the new system, some dioceses would receive more, others less, than at present).
- The allocation of the block grant among dioceses, after the initial transitional period, would be reviewed every three years, allowing dioceses the certainty of “guaranteed” funding for such a three-year period. This would enable a degree of security for future planning.
- The separate grants currently provided by the Province in relation to retreats and youth work would also be discontinued and dioceses would be able to apply the block grant to such areas of activity, as they saw fit.
- Dioceses would be accountable to the Province for the way in which the block grant is spent, thereby allowing a degree of externality and the opportunity for identifying significant divergences in practice with a view to such matters being considered and discussed.

1 Introduction

In recent years, the Mission and Ministry Board has reported to General Synod on the steps taken to develop mission and ministry across the Province in a “whole church” manner. The Whole Church Policy affirms the primacy of mission in the life of the Scottish Episcopal Church and, in particular, the recognition of the diocese as the focus for mission, with diocesan bishops acting as leaders in mission.

Previous Synods have received reports and presentations about the work of the range of Networks established by the Board in areas such as youth, children, mission action planning, stewardship, spirituality, rural issues and lay learning. The Networks are intended to support inter-diocesan collaboration, and the sharing of information, planning and good practice, thus helping to maximise the resources and strengthen the work across the Province. They comprise people with the necessary motivation, skills and practitioner experience from across the dioceses to maximise potential.

The role of the Province in the context of the Whole Church Policy essentially becomes one of broad oversight in relation to the Networks, supporting inter-diocesan activity and communication. The proposed new Mission Board will exercise a “light touch” oversight to the Networks by reflecting back to dioceses the need for an acceptable degree of coherence across the Province if resources are to be put to the most effective use. The Mission Board will also have responsibility for provincial mission policy which will at some point involve reviewing the current Whole Church Policy.

A further aspect of the role of the Province under the Whole Church Policy is to ensure that financial resources available to the dioceses is aligned with the impetus of that Policy, in which dioceses are the locus for mission initiative.

As advised to General Synod 2014, work has been undertaken on a proposed new framework to bring together certain sources of provincial funding including, in particular, the Grants for Ministry Fund, so that finance in future would be made available to dioceses on a block grant basis. The effect of that, within an appropriate framework of accountability, would be to place financial resource in the hands of the dioceses so that it can be used by them in what they regard as the most effective manner locally. The Whole Church Policy recognises the situation which already pertains within dioceses, namely that each diocese already has its own mission strategy, tailored to its particular needs. The move to a block grant system will mean that dioceses are more easily able to direct funding in the way they consider most appropriate, that the level of paperwork required to be submitted by dioceses should reduce as compared with the current Grants for Ministry process and also that the Province need no longer be involved in making detailed determinations of funding for particular posts. In short, it will allow the principle of subsidiarity to operate more effectively.

In developing the proposed new framework, there has been extensive discussion within the College of Bishops, where members of the College have been able to speak as the leaders of mission for their respective dioceses. The provincial Finance Committee, the Mission and Ministry Board and the Administration Board have also been consulted during the process. The proposals are brought to Synod by the Standing Committee because they span the work of several existing bodies in the General Synod structure.

If the proposals are accepted by General Synod 2015, the new block grant system would take effect from the beginning of 2016. It is suggested that the new grant would be called the “Mission and Ministry Support Grant”. As part of the proposals, various changes to the Digest of Resolutions are needed and motions to that effect are included in the Synod agenda.

2 Principal Elements of the Proposed Mission and Ministry Support Grant

2.1 What would the Mission and Ministry Support Grant replace?

At present, the main source of provincial funding to dioceses is the Grants for Ministry Fund. Most of the Grants for Ministry Fund currently go to dioceses in the form of grants to support stipend or salary of clergy or lay workers or to provide local assistance in the form of travel grants. That element of the Grants for Ministry Fund would be included in the Mission and Ministry Support Grant.

It is proposed that the responsibility for payment of curate training grants, which are presently financed from the Grants for Ministry Fund be transferred to the newly established Institute Council, as curacies are regarded as an integral part of initial ministerial education. Curate grants are paid to dioceses to help fund the curate stipend and related costs. The placing of curates is discussed and agreed within the College of Bishops and the number of curates which a diocese might have at any one time can vary significantly. It, therefore, make sense for the allocation of curate grants to be retained by the Province and be paid to dioceses with curates outwith the proposed framework for block grants.

In addition to the Grants for Ministry Fund, there are some additional grants paid by the Province to dioceses which, because they are related to aspects of mission, ought sensibly to be included within the Mission and Ministry Support Grant allocation. These would comprise retreats grants (currently allocated by the Home Mission Committee) and grants to support youth work in the dioceses. (Provincial funds used to support the annual Glenalmond youth camp would be retained by the Province to enable the continuation of that work.) The Networks created as part of the Whole Church Mission and Ministry Policy would not have a grant-making function.

2.2 What would the Mission and Ministry Support Grant be used for?

It is proposed that dioceses would be able to use the Mission and Ministry Support Grant for the following purposes:—

- Stipend support, travel grants and related ministry costs
- Mission Development Officers or equivalent
- “Fresh Expressions”/mission development
- Youth work
- Retreats

Consideration has been given to whether or not use of the Mission and Ministry Support Grant should be limited to a percentage of the total costs related to a post (for example, 50% or 75% of stipend). However, some dioceses already experience difficulty under the current Grants for Ministry system because they do not have

resources available at local level to “match fund” or provide the remaining balance. Accordingly, the proposal is that the grant should not be limited to a particular percentage. Similarly, the proposal would allow flexibility so that if a diocese wished to use it to supplement a provincial curate grant by providing additional diocesan support, it could do so. Also, whilst it would be seen as exceptional, the Mission and Ministry Support Grant could be used to support payment of a bishop’s stipend or on-costs.

In accordance with the same general principle of flexibility, there would be no time limit on how long a particular post or project might be supported by application of the Mission and Ministry Support Grant. However, in cases where support exceeded five years, the diocese in question would be expected, in its accountability to the Province, to make clear why it considered such continuing support was appropriate.

2.3 How would the Mission and Ministry Support Grant be allocated to Dioceses?

It is proposed that the Mission and Ministry Support Grant would be allocated among dioceses by way of a formula. The advantage of a formula is that, once agreed, the need for a complicated application scheme (with the consequent time and energy required on the part of dioceses to draw up such applications) disappears. Also, year-on-year, the formula approach provides a greater level of guaranteed funding, thereby enabling dioceses a degree of certainty for their future planning (see further below).

Set out below are proposals regarding the suggested formula. These have been discussed at some length within the College of Bishops and other provincial bodies. It is suggested that the data used for inputting into the formula be reviewed on a three-year basis and updated as necessary.

2.3.1 Formula

A number of possible models for a formula allocation have been considered. The proposed approach takes into account two specific aspects considered relevant to a fair allocation of provincial resources to dioceses, namely:-

- the relative incomes of dioceses
- the number of stipendiary clergy posts required in each diocese.

A summary of its application in practice can be found at Appendix 1. A comparison of the formula based allocation of funds and the actual 2014 and estimated 2015 Grants for Ministry allocations is provided in Appendix 2.

2.3.1.1 Income based allocation

The proposed approach is to base an element of the allocation of funds to the shortfall in a diocese’s average income from the provincial average income. Any diocese with average income in excess of the provincial average would not have any Mission and Ministry Support Grant funds allocated under this element of the formula; those dioceses with average incomes less than the provincial average would benefit from Mission and Ministry Support Grant funds. (The greater a diocese’s shortfall from the provincial average the greater the allocation of funds.)

The measure of income proposed is that used in the assessment of provincial quota – namely the charge and diocesan quota assessable income averaged over a three year period. Given the delay in collating such information there will be a lag between the years to which the income figures relate and the Mission and Ministry Support Grant year for which they are used. (For example, if the formula approach is adopted in respect of 2016 the income figure used will be the income averaged over the period 2011 to 2013.) The averaged charge and diocesan income figure used in the formula is therefore already averaged over a three year period allowing a degree of smoothing of major fluctuations in income. The averaged charge and diocesan income figure is derived by dividing the total charge and diocesan income by the total number of relevant charges in order to provide a measure of the average income available to each charge. The provincial averaged diocesan and charge income figure is derived on the same basis and accounts for the income of all charges and all of the dioceses – it does not include any element of direct provincial income. (See Appendix 1 for illustration of the formula.)

The number of relevant charges in each diocese for inclusion in the formula would be agreed by the College of Bishops.

2.3.1.2 “Required posts” based allocation

Given that one of the aims of the block grant funding is to support stipendiary ministry it is suggested that an element of the available funding be allocated on the basis of the agreed number of stipendiary posts required in each diocese. The College of Bishops has already agreed the number of stipendiary clergy posts (including in some cases Mission Officer posts) deemed appropriate for each diocese.

2.3.2.3 Weighted allocation

The two elements in the formula (income based allocation and required posts based allocation) would be accorded a weighting to ensure that an appropriate focus is made on what is considered to be the most important element in determining those dioceses requiring most financial assistance. Of various possible models considered, members of the College of Bishops have agreed a weighting which they consider to be fair and equitable, namely, a 55% weighting to the income element and a 45% weighting to the number of required stipendiary posts.

3 Available funding

3.1 Total available to fund Mission and Ministry Support Grants

It is proposed that the initial sum to be available for distribution by way of the block grant would be £250,000. This sum is broadly equivalent to the sums allocated from the Grants for Ministry Fund at present.

Generally speaking, the total sum available will need to be determined in relation to overall provincial budgets and other competing priorities. Budgets currently forecast deficits and therefore decisions need to be made in terms of priorities. (It should also be noted that the budgets do not yet account for two of the aspirations detailed in the TISEC Review of 2014 – the funding of full time ordinands and increasing the level of curate training grant.) The actual, projected and budgeted expenditure in relation to

the various categories of grant to be replaced by the Mission and Ministry Support Grant are:

	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
	Actual	Actual	Budget	Budget	Budget
Grants for Ministry	231,775	241,330	293,448	296,670	301,670
Retreats	3,300	3,300	3,300	3,300	3,300
Youth	1,110	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500
Lay Learning (MDC Special Bids)	8,470	4,600	-	-	-
	244,655	250,730	298,248	301,470	306,470
Average GfM underspend against budget (2012-14)			(30,000)	(30,000)	(30,000)
			268,248	271,470	276,470

Whilst the budgeted grants are approximately £300,000 a year given that there tends to be an underspend against budgeted Grants for Ministry expenditure each year (due to vacancies occurring, posts remaining unfilled etc) the budget is likely to overstate the actual funding required. Also, the proposed sum of £250,000 to be available takes account of the fact that the future budgets for the Grants for Ministry Fund include provision for an annual grant of 30% stipend (approximately £7,400) in respect of the Waverley Care Chaplaincy. If the proposals are approved, this would not in future be funded from the block grant but would be transferred to the Church in Society Committee budget, as referred to below.

3.2 Guaranteed funding

Dioceses will need a degree of certainty in terms of the funding that they are likely to receive by way of Mission and Ministry Support Grant to enable them adequately to plan their expenditure. Within the current Grants for Ministry process dioceses are advised each year of the likely grant funding that they will receive in respect of each of the posts for which grant funding has been provided for a four year period. It is proposed that the Mission and Ministry Support Grant should operate on the basis that the total funding, and the data used in the formula, are fixed for a three year period after which the formula, and the total amount available for allocation, could be reviewed. Such an approach would reduce uncertainty in the early years of each cycle but inevitably there would be more uncertainty towards the end of such a period.

Given that Mission and Ministry Support Grants will be used mainly to fund stipend-related costs it is proposed that annual increases in the total amount to be distributed to dioceses should be linked to the rate of increase in Standard Stipend.

The question arises as to whether dioceses should be entitled to retain any unspent part of their block grant allocation as at the year end. Whilst recognising that to allow all unspent funds to be retained would give dioceses maximum flexibility, appropriate accountability in such circumstances might be difficult to exercise since it would be

likely to involve the Province in making observations and recommendations about specific diocesan proposals. That has been one of the criticisms previously levelled at the current Grants for Ministry system.

To provide dioceses with a degree of flexibility in dealing with vacancies, new projects etc as they occur it is therefore proposed that there be provision for dioceses to retain some unused funds for use in future years. It is proposed that a cumulative limit be applied and that dioceses be allowed to retain funds of up to 50% of their annual allocation. Any unused funds in excess of the agreed limit would be returned to the Province. Allowing partial retention in this way would address any concerns that dioceses are likely to have in terms of wide fluctuations in the level of Mission and Ministry Support Grant allocations.

4 Accountability

It will be evident from the proposals set out above that under the block grant system dioceses would enjoy considerable flexibility and discretion as to how the Mission and Ministry Support Grant is applied. It is recognised, however, that such flexibility needs to be matched with a due process of accountability to the Province. Such accountability would allow not only objective consideration of how the money has been spent but could also take account of the extent to which there were material inconsistencies in practice applied by different dioceses.

It is proposed that each diocese should provide an annual accountability statement to the Province setting out details of how the Mission and Ministry Support Grant had been spent, together with a rationale for its application, set within the mission and ministry strategy of the diocese as part of the provincial Whole Church Mission and Ministry Policy. Such a statement would also account for any unused but retained portion of the grant and explain how such unused funds were intended to be spent in future.

Consideration of the accountability statements from dioceses, at provincial level, would involve both a missional and fiscal aspect. It is proposed that accountability at provincial level primarily be located within the new Mission Board, as the body with overall oversight of the Whole Church Mission and Ministry Policy. The Board would be invited to establish a Grant Review Panel with a membership including expertise on financial/fiscal matters (possibly drawn from the provincial Administration Board) so that both missional and fiscal aspects could be considered. It is proposed that a formal remit for the role of the Grant Review Panel be adopted by the Mission Board with the agreement of the Standing Committee.

The Panel would annually prepare a report for the Mission Board which would also be provided for consideration to the Standing Committee and the College of Bishops. In the event that such a report raised any concerns regarding the use of the Mission and Ministry Support Grant, such concerns would be communicated to the diocese in question and would also be discussed, with a view to resolution, within the College of Bishops. (It is proposed that in the event of an episcopal vacancy the place of the diocesan bishop be taken by the dean of the diocese for this purpose.)

It is proposed that this relatively “light touch” accountability process apply rather than devising a system of more formal sanctions. The effectiveness of this accountability system would fall to be reviewed in the same three year review cycle as the allocation formula.

5 Transition

There will inevitably be “winners and losers” subsequent to the introduction of any formula-based allocation of grants and an appropriate means of managing the transition from the current levels of funding to those envisaged by the formula approach will be needed. On the assumption that a formula approach is to be introduced in respect of 2016 it is proposed that the starting point for any transition should be the estimated actual allocation of Grants for Ministry funds to dioceses in respect of 2015. (The estimated actual allocation would take into account anticipated unused grants to be returned by dioceses and any additional funds to be paid to them from the provision for new appointments. The estimate would be made in September 2015 based on information provided by dioceses in respect of their actual and anticipated vacancies and appointments in 2015. Given that they are relatively small, other grants being assumed into the Mission and Ministry Support Grants would be ignored.)

Following discussion within the College of Bishops it is proposed that transition to the new basis be phased over a four year period (this recognises that for some dioceses the alteration in funding is reasonably significant). This would operate as follows: 20% of the change introduced in the first year, 20% in year two, 30% in year three and 30% in the final year. By way of illustration, assuming that the Mission and Ministry Support Grant is to be introduced in 2016 at a fixed annual sum of £250,000 and using for this purpose an estimate of the likely 2015 Grants for Ministry allocation (assuming that not all grants awarded will be used) as the starting point the suggested phasing would be:

	Estimated Grants for Ministry 2015	2016	2017	2018	Target allocation based on formula 2019
Aberdeen	37,800	36,101	34,402	31,853	29,304
Argyll	62,415	59,992	57,570	53,936	50,302
Brechin	62,510	56,169	49,826	40,313	30,802
Edinburgh	19,105	21,550	23,996	27,664	31,332
Glasgow	32,085	31,363	30,642	29,560	28,477
Moray	28,420	30,891	33,362	37,069	40,775
St Andrews	17,665	21,934	26,202	32,605	39,008
Total	260,000	258,000	256,000	253,000	250,000

The annual increase / (reduction) in grant and total increase / (reduction) over the transition period would therefore be:

	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total Change
Aberdeen	(1,699)	(1,699)	(2,549)	(2,549)	(8,496)
Argyll	(2,423)	(2,422)	(3,634)	(3,634)	(12,113)
Brechin	(6,341)	(6,343)	(9,513)	(9,511)	(31,708)
Edinburgh	2,445	2,446	3,668	3,668	12,227
Glasgow	(722)	(721)	(1,082)	(1,083)	(3,608)
Moray	2,471	2,471	3,707	3,706	12,355
St Andrews	4,269	4,268	6,403	6,403	21,343
Total	(2,000)	(2,000)	(3,000)	(3,000)	(10,000)

It is hoped that such a phasing would provide sufficient time to those dioceses facing a reduction in their funding to adjust to the new grant levels.

6 Review of formula and process

It is proposed that the formula and process be subject to periodic review. Such a review would include the College of Bishops agreeing a revised list of required stipendiary posts and the number of relevant charges to be used in the formula. The opportunity could also be taken to review the rules and the extent to which the funds allocated to diocese have reflected their actual needs. It is suggested that an initial review be undertaken after three years, with a view to implementation at the end of the initial four year transitional period. (If agreed for use in allocating funds in 2016 the scheme would therefore operate for 2016, 2017, 2018 and 2019, the initial review being in 2019 for use in 2020 onwards.)

7 Other matters

The Grants for Ministry Fund currently finances grants paid directly to individuals in the form of Child Allowance and Resettlement Grants. It also allows for the possibility of payment of a Maternity Grant to a charge where its priest goes on maternity leave. Since these matters are relatively particular in nature, it is proposed that they be dealt with directly by the Province, rather than forming part of the Mission and Ministry Support Grant.

A further matter relates to the chaplaincy to Waverley Care which has received support from the Grants for Ministry Fund for a number of years. Given that the post is located within Diocese of Edinburgh it has formed part of that diocese's application to the Grants for Ministry Fund. The provincial nature of the post has however previously been acknowledged by the College of Bishops and it is proposed that that responsibility for continued funding of the post along with the appropriate budgetary allocation (30% stipend – approximately £7,400) be transferred to the Church in Society Committee.

David Palmer
Convener, Standing Committee, April 2015

Appendix 1

Suggested allocation formula

	<i>Income based allocation</i>				<i>Required posts based allocation</i>		<i>Weighted formula allocation</i>		
	Averaged Charge and Diocesan Income 2011-2013 £	Number of charges	Average charge / diocesan income per charge £	Shortfall from provincial average £	No of stipendiary posts required		Income based allocation	Required posts based allocation	Weighted allocation
Aberdeen	1,443,321	42	34,365	10,509	16.15		6.88%	4.84%	11.72%
Argyll	468,401	27	17,348	27,525	7		18.02%	2.10%	20.12%
Brechin	811,657	25	32,466	12,407	14		8.12%	4.20%	12.32%
Edinburgh	5,033,449	54	93,212	0	41.81		0.00%	12.53%	12.53%
Glasgow	2,955,068	61	48,444	0	38		0.00%	11.39%	11.39%
Moray	858,953	35	24,542	20,332	10		13.31%	3.00%	16.31%
St Andrews	1,487,364	47	31,646	13,228	23.16		8.66%	6.94%	15.60%
Total	13,058,213	291	44,874	84,001	150.12		55.00%	45.00%	100.00%

Notes

- 1 Averaged charge and diocesan incomes figures 2011-2013 are quota assessable income figures used in the allocation of provincial quota for 2016.
- 2 Number of required stipendiary posts per list agreed by bishops .
- 3 The suggested weighting is 55/45 income / required posts to ensure more funds allocated to those dioceses with smaller average incomes.
- 4 Tables might not add exactly due to rounding.

Appendix 2

Comparison of funds allocated using formula with estimated actual allocations

	Weighted allocation percentage	Allocation of £250,000	Actual grant 2014 £	Difference	Estimated maximum grant 2015 £	Difference from formula allocation of £250,000	Formula allocation of £316,096 £	Difference from formula allocation of £316,096
Aberdeen	11.72%	29,304	44,210	(14,906)	58,497	(29,193)	37,052	(21,445)
Argyll	20.12%	50,302	57,925	(7,623)	76,383	(26,081)	63,601	(12,782)
Brechin	12.32%	30,801	42,626	(11,825)	67,506	(36,705)	38,944	(28,562)
Edinburgh	12.53%	31,332	18,177	13,155	25,995	5,337	39,616	13,621
Glasgow	11.39%	28,477	44,530	(16,053)	36,330	(7,853)	36,006	(324)
Moray	16.31%	40,775	14,113	26,662	31,302	9,473	51,556	20,254
St Andrews	15.60%	39,008	19,749	19,259	20,083	18,925	49,321	29,238
Total	100.00%	250,000	241,330	8,670	316,096	(66,096)	316,096	0

Notes

- 1 Comparison is with Grants for Ministry grants (including travel) but excludes other grants (such as retreats, youth etc) that might be included in a block grant.
- 2 Amount to be allocated by way of Block Grant assumed to be £250,000.
- 3 Estimated maximum grant for 2015 assumes all grants awarded will be used in full (ie no vacancies occur during year and all posts vacant at time of application filled by start of 2015).
- 4 Two comparisons provided for 2015 - one assumes total funds limited to £250,000. The other assumes that funds equivalent to the maximum possible grant are allocated using the formula. The latter perhaps best illustrates the impact of the formula.
- 5 Glasgow, Aberdeen, Brechin and Argyll will all receive less as a result of the proposed formula and the other three dioceses will receive more.
- 6 Tables might not add exactly due to rounding.

This page is intentionally blank

Budget Report

Format

The summary of all Funds (page 206) details the 2014 actual figures in the first column and the 2015-2017 budget figures in the final three columns. The individual Fund/Committee budgets (pages 207-228) detail the 2014 budget, actual and variance figures in the first three columns and the 2015-2017 budget figures in the final three columns.

Budget setting process

Boards agree budgets each autumn for the subsequent year and indicative budgets for the following two years. The budgets and associated requests for funding from the General Fund are submitted to the Standing Committee for consideration at its November meeting each year.

In its oversight of the General Synod's finances the Standing Committee's focus is on the General Fund. The General Fund budget (which can be found at page 207) summarises all unrestricted income and its allocation to the Standing Committee and boards to fund their work. The budgeted allocations in effect represent the budgeted expenditure of each of the boards and therefore the General Fund statement provides a good overview of the overall financial position. In considering the budgets the Standing Committee is guided by two underlying principles:

- Budgets should be set with a view to achieving a breakeven position on the General Fund.
- Large one-off receipts (such as legacies) should be capitalised to provide future income rather than being used to fund current operating costs.

Recent budget history

The General Synod is heavily dependent on investment income. In 2008 approximately two-thirds of its annual income was investment income derived mainly from its investments held in the SEC Unit Trust Pool. In recent years this has fallen to 62% – not as a result of significant increases in other forms of income but as a consequence of reductions in investment income. Until 2008 investment income increased broadly in line with inflation each year. The rate of distribution paid by the UTP however fell by 15% in 2009 and whilst some recovery has been possible since then investment income has not yet returned to its former level. Although increases in the distribution rate since 2009 combined with further investment of substantial legacies and cash generated by recent surpluses have resulted in increasing investment income, at £1.02million the General Fund's 2014 UTP investment income is still approximately £80,000 less than that of 2008. Market conditions continue to be volatile and it is difficult to predict what future rates of UTP distribution will be. The

Investment Committee continues to work closely with the fund managers with a view to achieving modest growth in distribution rates where possible.

Notwithstanding the impact of such a significant change in income Standing Committee has been able to work with the boards and committees to ensure that expenditure was reduced and deficits avoided. A two year moratorium on all building grants from 2010 provided a major initial source of savings. Whilst some small savings were identified elsewhere (primarily resulting from the reduction in staff numbers in the General Synod Office) it has been necessary to continue the moratorium on larger building grants to ensure budget deficits are avoided.

There continues to be uncertainty over the level of investment income – what however appears to be becoming clearer is that there is little prospect of anything other than modest increases in such income in the short term.

It has not all been bad news. The combination of reductions in budgets to avoid budgeted deficits and further reductions in expenditure against those budgets (and some additional unbudgeted income) has resulted in substantial surpluses on the General Fund being generated in 2010 to 2014. (The total surplus for the five years being approximately £1.03million.) Whilst it is not Standing Committee's intention to generate such surpluses, they have been welcome and have helped fund the £2million lump sum payment to the Pension Fund agreed by General Synod in 2009. At the time the lump sum payment was agreed it was anticipated that there might be a requirement to sell investments to continue to fund the General Synod's ongoing activities. Standing Committee is pleased that recent surpluses have helped avoid the need to sell investments thus helping to safeguard future investment income. As previously mentioned the level of surpluses generated in recent years has enabled a further £200,000 to be added to the General Fund's investments. This, combined with the investment of a number of substantial legacies, will help mitigate the impact of continuing low rates of UTP distribution. The availability of such surpluses also means that the General Synod is well placed, in the short term, to address some of the financial issues it faces.

Impact of recommendations being made to General Synod

There are a number of specific recommendations being made to General Synod that will have an impact on budgets.

Pension Contributions

The budgets assume that pension contributions remain at the current rate of 34.9% of stipend / salary. Should the recommendation that the rate be reduced to 32.2% be accepted there will be annual saving from 2016 of approximately £9,750 and £2,100 in General Synod Office staff costs and Scottish Episcopal Institute staff costs respectively. The cost of curate training grants will also reduce by approximately £4,500 to £5,000 from 2016.

Block Grants

The budgets currently reflect the present method of allocating funds to charges and dioceses to support their mission and ministry – principally through the Grants for

Ministry Fund administered by the Administration Board's Finance Committee. Should the Mission and Ministry Support Grant proposals be accepted and funds are distributed by way of a Block Grant the budgets will need to be revised to reflect the funds being distributed through the Mission Board. Whilst it is anticipated that the total funds distributed by way of the Mission and Ministry Support Grant will be broadly equivalent to the actual funds allocated in recent years there is likely to be a saving of some £30,000 in budgeted expenditure. As explained in the paper at page 192 actual expenditure in the Grants for Ministry Fund is typically about £30,000 under budget each year. Given the increased flexibility inherent in the proposed Mission and Ministry Support Grant and the ability of dioceses to retain certain unused funds each year whilst it is unlikely that such underspends against budget will continue it will however be possible to reduce the annual budget by approximately £30,000 from 2016.

New Mission Board and mission networks

The proposals for a new Mission Board and associated changes detailed at page 172 are unlikely to have any significant impact on budgeted expenditure. Whilst the changes will require some reallocation of expenditure between budgets to reflect the change in structure it is not anticipated that there will be any change in the total budgeted expenditure.

Current budgetary pressures and uncertainties

There are a number of different areas of budgetary pressure and areas of uncertainty.

Building grants

It has not been possible to fully reintroduce the building grants programme following the moratorium of 2010 and 2011. Whilst there has been a phased reintroduction of the smaller grants the larger grants have not yet been reintroduced due to the impact that they would have on budgets. Current budgets reflect a phased reintroduction of such grants but, given the size of budget deficits and the other costs referred to below not included in the budgets, it is possible that this might need to be further deferred. Whilst there is some understandable concern regarding the impact that the lack of provincial grant support will have on the condition of the church's buildings such grants continue to be one of the largest areas of discretionary expenditure within the General Synod's budgets and therefore, in the absence of any alternative, the likely area of focus when any substantial cost savings are required. During the course of the last year the Administration Board and its Finance and Buildings Committees have continued working together to consider how best to respond to the possibility that it might not be feasible to reintroduce larger building grants. In an attempt to collate further information regarding the impact of the lack of provincial grants a survey was issued to charges during the year. Given the relatively low response rate to the initial survey a reminder was sent to charges in December. The Board and its committees will further consider the issue with a view to more clearly establishing whether there is a case for the reintroduction of larger building grants. (The total budgeted building grant expenditure is currently 2015 – £65,000; 2016 – £120,000; 2017 – £185,000.)

Curate funding

Following a period in which there have been a relatively small number of stipendiary curates in training there are now more curates in training and it is anticipated that there will be an increasing number in the next few years. Whilst this is a welcome and important addition to the life of the SEC it is not without its impact on provincial budgets (and those of the charges and dioceses involved in the training of curates). Expenditure on curate grants increased from £77,000 in 2013 to £101,000 in 2014. Current budgets forecast an increase to £169,000 in 2015 with further increases to £214,000 in 2016 and £239,000 in 2017. The budgets reflect the current funding arrangements (a grant of 50% of stipend and related pension and National Insurance contributions.) One of the aspirations detailed in the TISEC Working Party Review presented to General Synod in 2014 was that of increased provincial support being made available to dioceses and charges to help fund the costs of training curates. Work is ongoing in relation to establishing the case for increased funding and no decisions have yet been made in relation to any change in the funding arrangements. Clearly any increased funding would have significant budget implications. (For example an increase to 75% of stipend and related costs would add approximately £120,000 to the 2017 budget.)

Funding of full-time ordinands

Another of the aspirations arising from TISEC Working Part Review was that of funding full-time ordinands. The Institute Council is undertaking further work in relation to establishing the need and the potential cost of providing such training opportunities. Initial work undertaken in 2014 suggests that such costs could eventually be in the region of £75,000 - £80,000 per year.

General Fund budgeted deficits

The General Fund budgets agreed by Standing Committee result in the following budgeted deficits:

2015	Deficit of £20,783
2016	Deficit of £62,945
2017	Deficit of £101,386

As outlined above there are a number of factors that will require revision to budgets for 2016 onwards. Standing Committee remains committed to setting budgets that are broadly breakeven and will continue to work with boards and committees to reduce, as far as is possible, the deficits budgeted for 2016 and beyond. It recognises that, in the short term, it would however be possible to budget for deficits to allow sufficient time for plans to evolve without the added difficulty of immediate financial pressure. It recognises too that it may be necessary to identify additional sources of income to help fund some of the proposed changes in respect of training and the funding of curacies and will work with the College of Bishops as it considers the most suitable strategy to pursue in relation to the funding of these proposed developments.

Total budgeted deficits

The budgets for all the Boards and Committees, including miscellaneous and restricted funds are summarised on page 206. These indicate the following budgeted total revenue deficits:

2015	Deficit of £61,316
2016	Deficit of £12,684
2017	Deficit of £51,881

The total budgeted surpluses / deficits differ from those budgeted for the General Fund due to small surpluses / deficits budgeted for some of the miscellaneous and restricted funds. For example the Retirement Housing Fund is budgeted to produce a revenue surplus which is then used as required to fund the purchase of new retirement housing.

David J Palmer
Convener, Standing Committee
April 2015

QUOTA 2016

All quota received will be credited to the General Fund.

It is recommended that total quota requested be increased by 3% to £698,960.

The allocation between dioceses is based on dioceses' quota assessable income. The amount of provincial quota requested from each diocese will therefore vary according to relative changes in its income. The allocation will be:

	2016	2015	Change from 2015	
	£	£	£	
Aberdeen and Orkney	77,235	74,239	2,996	4.04%
Argyll and The Isles	25,093	24,769	324	1.31%
Brechin	43,475	42,073	1,402	3.33%
Edinburgh	269,378	260,787	8,591	3.29%
Glasgow and Galloway	158,175	152,753	5,422	3.55%
Moray, Ross and Caithness	45,992	45,127	865	1.92%
St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane	79,612	78,854	758	0.96%
	698,960	678,602	20,358	3.00%

This page is intentionally blank.

BUDGET SUMMARY – includes all revenue funds

Actual 2014 £			Revised Budget 2015 £	Budget 2016 £	Budget 2017 £
1,787,176	General Fund	Income	1,807,252	1,827,885	1,849,134
(1,596,380)		** Allocated to Boards	(1,828,035)	(1,890,830)	(1,950,520)
190,796		Surplus/(deficit)	(20,783)	(62,945)	(101,386)
1,099,684		Balance brought forward	1,090,480	1,069,697	1,006,752
(200,000)		Transfer (to)/from capital	-	-	-
1,090,480		Balance carried forward	1,069,697	1,006,752	905,366
828,635	Standing Committee	** Income (From General Fund)	805,730	818,860	838,470
-		Income (other)	-	-	-
(758,635)		Expenditure	(805,730)	(818,860)	(838,470)
70,000		Surplus/(deficit)	-	-	-
(70,000)		Transfer to IT Fund	-	-	-
-		Balance brought forward	-	-	-
-		Balance carried forward	-	-	-
377,803	Administration Board	** Income (From General Fund)	513,700	403,000	473,000
336,148		Income (other)	337,087	336,087	336,087
(665,153)		Expenditure	(880,758)	(678,271)	(749,036)
48,798		Surplus/(deficit)	(29,971)	60,816	60,051
(123,402)		Transfer (to)/from capital	(200,021)	(40,370)	(38,853)
70,000		Transfer from Std Cttee (IT Fund)	-	-	-
594,556		Balance brought forward	589,952	359,960	380,406
589,952		Balance carried forward	359,960	380,406	401,604
-	Institute Council	** Income (From General Fund)	355,770	525,240	491,870
-		Income (other)	2,850	2,850	2,850
-		Expenditure	(358,620)	(528,090)	(494,720)
-		Surplus/(deficit)	-	-	-
-		Balance brought forward	-	-	-
-		Balance carried forward	-	-	-
362,000	Mission & Ministry Board	** Income (From General Fund)	86,815	82,980	84,180
149,521		Income (other)	114,358	114,430	114,504
(489,622)		Expenditure	(211,735)	(207,965)	(209,230)
21,899		Surplus/(deficit)	(10,562)	(10,555)	(10,546)
(549)		Transfer (to)/from capital	(520)	(536)	(552)
134,798		Balance brought forward	156,148	145,066	133,975
156,148		Balance carried forward	145,066	133,975	122,877
15,184	Faith & Order Board	** Income (From General Fund)	26,920	21,550	23,700
1,027		Income (other)	-	-	-
(15,184)		Expenditure	(26,920)	(21,550)	(23,700)
1,027		Surplus/(deficit)	-	-	-
(70)		Balance brought forward	957	957	957
957		Balance carried forward	957	957	957
12,758	Inform & Comm Board	** Income (From General Fund)	39,100	39,200	39,300
7,063		Income (other)	-	-	-
(16,781)		Expenditure	(39,100)	(39,200)	(39,300)
3,040		Surplus/(deficit)	-	-	-
7,733		Balance brought forward	10,773	10,773	10,773
10,773		Balance carried forward	10,773	10,773	10,773
1,787,176	GRAND TOTAL	Income (From General Fund)	1,807,252	1,827,885	1,849,134
493,759		Income (other)	454,295	453,367	453,441
(1,945,375)		Expenditure	(2,322,863)	(2,293,936)	(2,354,456)
335,560		Surplus/(deficit)	(61,316)	(12,684)	(51,881)
(323,951)		Transfer (to)/from capital	(200,541)	(40,906)	(39,405)
1,836,701		Balance brought forward	1,848,310	1,586,453	1,532,863
1,848,310		Balance carried forward	1,586,453	1,532,863	1,441,577

General Fund

Budget 2014 £	Actual 2014 £	Variance fav/ (adv) £		Revised Budget 2015 £	Budget 2016 £	Budget 2017 £
			INCOME			
			<i>Investment Income</i>			
1,010,223	1,020,325	10,102	UTP income	1,020,325	1,020,325	1,020,325
6,000	8,585	2,585	Interest	6,000	6,000	6,000
21,101	21,101	-	Net investment property income	22,155	22,155	22,155
1,037,324	1,050,011	12,687		1,048,480	1,048,480	1,048,480
			<i>Administration fees</i>			
2,000	1,530	(470)	UTP / investment administration	2,000	2,000	2,000
27,500	27,500	-	Pension Fund administration	27,775	28,050	28,330
18,395	18,395	-	Restricted Funds	18,395	18,395	18,395
47,895	47,425	(470)		48,170	48,445	48,725
658,837	658,837	-	Quota	678,602	698,960	719,929
14,000	1,008	(12,992)	Inspires - subscriptions and advertising	14,000	14,000	14,000
18,000	29,795	11,795	Donations and legacies	18,000	18,000	18,000
-	100	100	Other	-	-	-
1,776,056	1,787,176	11,120	<i>Total Income</i>	1,807,252	1,827,885	1,849,134
			ALLOCATIONS			
796,250	828,635	(32,385)	Standing Committee	805,730	818,860	838,470
438,100	377,803	60,297	Administration Board	513,700	403,000	473,000
-	-	-	Institute Council	355,770	525,240	491,870
451,475	362,000	89,475	Mission and Ministry Board	86,815	82,980	84,180
22,450	15,184	7,266	Faith and Order Board	26,920	21,550	23,700
39,000	12,758	26,242	Information and Communication Board	39,100	39,200	39,300
1,747,275	1,596,380	150,895	<i>Total allocations</i>	1,828,035	1,890,830	1,950,520
			BALANCES			
28,781	190,796	162,015	Surplus/(deficit) for year	(20,783)	(62,945)	(101,386)
(200,000)	(200,000)	-	Transfer to capital	-	-	-
1,099,684	1,099,684		Balance brought forward	1,090,480	1,069,697	1,006,752
928,465	1,090,480	162,015	<i>Balance carried forward</i>	1,069,697	1,006,752	905,366
			Note			
			In addition to allocations from the General Fund some Boards / Committees receive income from other sources			

Standing Committee

Budget 2014 £	Actual 2014 £	Variance fav/ (adv) £			Revised Budget 2015 £	Budget 2016 £	Budget 2017 £
			INCOME				
796,250	828,635	32,385	Allocation from General Fund		805,730	818,860	838,470
796,250	828,635	32,385			805,730	818,860	838,470
			EXPENDITURE				
			A Costs of General Synod Office				
345,600	341,342	4,258	Employees	Salaries	350,500	358,500	366,500
34,500	32,555	1,945		N.I.C	35,000	35,600	36,500
120,000	115,752	4,248		Pension contributions	121,600	124,500	127,500
1,595	1,594	1		Pensions ex-staff-old scheme	1,650	1,700	1,751
4,250	1,330	2,920		Staff travel & subsistence	4,250	4,378	4,509
1,910	444	1,466		Staff training	1,910	1,967	2,026
3,500	4,321	(821)		Recruitment Costs	3,500	3,605	3,713
511,355	497,338	14,017		Sub-total	518,410	530,250	542,499
30,000	28,177	1,823	Premises	Building repairs & maint.	30,000	30,900	31,827
3,000	2,464	536		Rates	3,000	3,090	3,183
20,000	17,319	2,681		Light, heat & cleaning	20,000	20,595	21,191
7,000	7,008	(8)		Insurance	7,100	7,313	7,532
60,000	54,968	5,032		Sub-total	60,100	61,898	63,733
4,600	5,068	(468)	Administration	Telephone	5,000	5,150	5,305
8,000	6,146	1,854		Postage	7,000	7,210	7,426
5,000	4,366	634		Printing & stationery	5,000	5,150	5,305
12,500	11,056	1,444		Photocopier	12,500	12,875	13,261
11,500	14,148	(2,648)		Computing - Maintenance	14,000	14,420	14,853
2,000	1,235	765		- Equipment	2,000	2,000	2,000
5,800	4,938	862		Payroll Bureau processing costs	5,900	6,077	6,259
4,000	5,909	(1,909)		Miscellaneous	4,000	4,120	4,244
1,000	462	538		Office equipment & furniture	1,000	1,000	1,000
54,400	53,328	1,072		Sub-total	56,400	58,002	59,653
625,755	605,634	20,121	Total Costs of General Synod Office		634,910	650,150	665,885
			B Provincial Costs				
2,500	2,117	383	Office of Primus	Primus' expenses	2,600	2,678	2,758
10,895	10,895	-		Assistance to Diocese	11,110	11,443	11,786
5,500	12,837	(7,337)	College of Bishops		5,500	5,500	5,500
10,000	10,000	-	Election of Bishop		10,000	10,000	10,000
21,630	24,982	(3,352)	General Synod	Annual meeting	21,630	22,279	22,947
1,500	918	582		Annual report	1,500	1,545	1,591
3,200	3,100	100		Synod papers	3,200	3,296	3,395
2,000	2,148	(148)	Office for Protec'n of Children & Vulnerable Adults		2,000	2,000	2,000
2,000	462	1,538	Code of Canons		2,000	2,060	2,122
350	566	(216)	New Clergy Induction Day		350	361	372
4,350	4,244	106	Clergy Legal Expenses	Insurance	4,350	4,481	4,615
3,000	2,984	16	Trustee Liability Insurance		3,000	3,090	3,183
12,000	11,825	175	Professional fees	Audit	12,400	12,772	13,155
35,000	11,582	23,418		Legal / advisory	35,000	30,000	30,900
-	125	(125)	Immigration Sponsors	Licence	-	-	-
1,750	1,144	606	Subscriptions	Churches Main Committee etc	2,000	2,060	2,122
115,675	99,929	15,746	Total Provincial Costs		116,640	113,565	116,446

Standing Committee

Budget 2014 £	Actual 2014 £	Variance fav/ (adv) £		Revised Budget 2015 £	Budget 2016 £	Budget 2017 £
			C Committee Meeting Expenses			
2,000	1,415	585	Standing Committee	2,000	2,066	2,134
500	76	424	Organisation Review Committee	500	515	530
400	71	329	Cttee for Protec'n of Children & Vulnerable Adults	400	400	400
2,900	1,562	1,338	<i>Total Committee Meeting Expenses</i>	2,900	2,981	3,064
			D Subscriptions to church bodies			
3,300	2,890	410	World Council of Churches	3,300	3,300	3,300
5,000	5,000	-	Churches Together in Britain and Ireland	5,000	5,000	5,000
14,000	14,000	-	Action of Churches Together in Scotland	12,500	12,500	12,500
28,620	28,620	-	Anglican Consultative Council	29,480	30,364	31,275
50,920	50,510	410	<i>Total Subscriptions to church bodies</i>	50,280	51,164	52,075
			E Grants			
1,000	1,000	-	Primus discretionary	1,000	1,000	1,000
1,000	1,000	-	<i>Total Grants</i>	1,000	1,000	1,000
796,250	758,635	37,615	Total Expenditure	805,730	818,860	838,470
			BALANCES			
-	70,000	70,000	Surplus/(deficit) for year	-	-	-
	(70,000)		Transfer to IT Fund (Admin Brd misc)	-	-	-
-	-		Balance brought forward	-	-	-
-	-	70,000	<i>Balance carried forward</i>	-	-	-

Administration Board

Budget 2014 £	Actual 2014 £	Variance fav/ (adv) £		Revised Budget 2015 £	Budget 2016 £	Budget 2017 £
			INCOME			
438,100	377,803	(60,297)	Allocation from General Fund	513,700	403,000	473,000
438,100	377,803	(60,297)	<i>Total Income</i>	513,700	403,000	473,000
			EXPENDITURE			
			<i>Meeting Costs</i>			
1,010	528	482	Board	1,010	1,010	1,010
1,050	985	65	Finance Committee	1,050	1,050	1,050
100	192	(92)	Investment Committee	100	100	100
850	382	468	Retirement Welfare Committee	850	850	850
500	333	167	Buildings Committee	500	500	500
490	329	161	Personnel Committee	490	490	490
4,000	2,749	1,251	<i>Sub-total</i>	4,000	4,000	4,000
			<i>Allocation to Finance Committee funds</i>			
369,100	334,609	34,491	Grants for Ministry Fund	444,700	279,000	284,000
-	-	-	Maintenance & Development Fund	-	60,000	140,000
65,000	40,445	24,555	Dunderdale Building Fund	65,000	60,000	45,000
434,100	375,054	59,046	<i>Sub-total</i>	509,700	399,000	469,000
438,100	377,803	60,297	<i>Total Expenditure</i>	513,700	403,000	473,000
			BALANCES			
			Revenue			
-	-	-	Surplus/(deficit) for year	-	-	-
-	-	-	Balance brought forward	-	-	-
-	-	-	<i>Balance carried forward</i>	-	-	-

**Administration Board – Finance Committee
Grants for Ministry Fund**

Budget 2014 £	Actual 2014 £	Variance fav/ (adv) £		Revised Budget 2015 £	Budget 2016 £	Budget 2017 £
			INCOME			
369,100	334,609	(34,491)	Allocation from General Fund	444,700	279,000	284,000
10,000	10,337	337	Investment income	10,000	10,000	10,000
16,000	1,481	(14,519)	Legacies & donations	16,000	16,000	16,000
395,100	346,427	(48,673)	Total Net Income	470,700	305,000	310,000
			EXPENDITURE			
108,250	100,587	7,663	Curate grants	168,922	-	-
236,850	199,660	37,190	Stipend Support	251,778	255,000	260,000
6,000	6,000	-	Other	6,000	6,000	6,000
35,670	35,670	-	Travel / Island grants	35,670	35,670	35,670
5,000	3,300	1,700	Child Allowance	5,000	5,000	5,000
3,330	1,210	2,120	Resettlement grants	3,330	3,330	3,330
395,100	346,427	48,673	Total Expenditure	470,700	305,000	310,000
			BALANCES			
			Revenue			
-	-	-	Surplus/(deficit) for year	-	-	-
-	-	-	Balance brought forward	-	-	-
-	-	-	Balance carried forward	-	-	-
Note Assumed that responsibility for payment of Curate grants transferred to Institute Council from 2016						

**Administration Board – Finance Committee
Maintenance and Development Fund**

Budget 2014 £	Actual 2014 £	Variance fav/ (adv) £		Revised Budget 2015 £	Budget 2016 £	Budget 2017 £
			INCOME			
-	-	-	Allocation from General Fund	-	60,000	140,000
-	-	-	<i>Total Net Income</i>	-	60,000	140,000
			EXPENDITURE			
			Grants - Issued			
			- Earmarked			
-	-	-	<i>Total Expenditure</i>	-	60,000	140,000
			BALANCES			
			Revenue			
-	-	-	Surplus/(deficit) for year	-	-	-
-			Balance brought forward	-	-	-
-	-	-	<i>Balance carried forward</i>	-	-	-

**Administration Board – Finance Committee
Dunderdale Building Fund**

Budget 2014 £	Actual 2014 £	Variance fav/ (adv) £		Revised Budget 2015 £	Budget 2016 £	Budget 2017 £
			INCOME			
65,000	40,445	(24,555)	Allocation from General Fund	65,000	60,000	45,000
65,000	40,445	(24,555)	<i>Total Net Income</i>	65,000	60,000	45,000
			EXPENDITURE			
	34,683		Grants - Issued			
	5,762		- Earmarked			
65,000	40,445	(24,555)	<i>Total Expenditure</i>	65,000	60,000	45,000
			BALANCES			
			Revenue			
-	-	-	Surplus/(deficit) for year	-	-	-
-	-	-	Balance brought forward	-	-	-
-	-	-	<i>Balance carried forward</i>	-	-	-
			Note - Grants budget			
			"emergency"	25,000	15,000	-
			Normal	40,000	45,000	45,000
				65,000	60,000	45,000

**Administration Board – Finance Committee
Loans Fund**

Budget 2014 £	Actual 2014 £	Variance fav/ (adv) £		Revised Budget 2015 £	Budget 2016 £	Budget 2017 £
			INCOME			
3,000	12,655	9,655	Interest on loans	3,000	3,000	3,000
3,000	12,655	9,655	<i>Total Net Income</i>	3,000	3,000	3,000
			BALANCES			
			Revenue (liquid funds for advancement of loans)			
3,000	12,655	9,655	Surplus/(deficit) for year	3,000	3,000	3,000
(217,806)	(77,999)	139,807	Transfer (to)/from capital	(152,462)	(3,000)	(3,000)
234,806	234,806	-	Balance brought forward	169,462	20,000	20,000
20,000	169,462	149,462	<i>Balance carried forward</i>	20,000	20,000	20,000

**Administration Board – Finance Committee
Free and Open Church Association**

Budget 2014	Actual 2014	Variance fav/ (adv)		Revised Budget 2015	Budget 2016	Budget 2017
£	£	£		£	£	£
			INCOME			
797	805	8	Investment income - Unit Trust Pool	804	804	804
3	2	(1)	- Deposit interest	3	3	3
800	807	7	<i>Total Net Income</i>	807	807	807
			EXPENDITURE			
800	110	690	Grants issued	800	800	800
800	110	690	<i>Total Expenditure</i>	800	800	800
			BALANCES			
			Revenue			
-	697	697	Surplus/(deficit) for year	7	7	7
7,086	7,086		Balance brought forward	7,783	7,790	7,797
7,086	7,783	697	<i>Balance carried forward</i>	7,790	7,797	7,804
			Deposit	500	500	500

**Administration Board – Retirement Welfare Committee
Supplementary Fund**

Budget 2014 £	Actual 2014 £	Variance fav/ (adv) £		Revised Budget 2015 £	Budget 2016 £	Budget 2017 £
			INCOME			
36,232	36,594	362	Investment income	36,594	36,594	36,594
50	41	(9)	Interest - Deposit account	50	50	50
2,000	2,000	-	Cargill Trust - Widows and Orphans	2,000	2,000	2,000
-	1,375	1,375	Legacies & Donations	-	-	-
38,282	40,010	1,728	<i>Total Net Income</i>	38,644	38,644	38,644
			EXPENDITURE			
4,000	690	3,310	Grants - Clergy	4,000	4,120	4,244
4,000	500	3,500	- Widows & Orphans	4,000	4,120	4,244
30,000	31,700	(1,700)	- Christmas payment	28,000	26,000	24,000
1,200	1,303	(103)	- Yearbooks (retired clergy)	1,200	1,200	1,200
1,500	-	1,500	Pension Fund (CRBF) top up	1,500	1,500	1,500
120	109	11	Miscellaneous	120	120	120
6,145	6,145	-	GSO Administration charge	6,145	6,145	6,145
46,965	40,447	6,518	<i>Total Expenditure</i>	44,965	43,205	41,453
			BALANCES			
			Revenue			
(8,683)	(437)	8,246	Surplus/(deficit) for year	(6,321)	(4,561)	(2,809)
30,571	30,571		Balance brought forward	30,134	23,813	19,252
21,888	30,134	8,246	<i>Balance carried forward</i>	23,813	19,252	16,443
			Deposit Account balance	8,300	8,300	8,300

Administration Board – Retirement Welfare Committee Housing Fund

Budget 2014 £	Actual 2014 £	Variance fav/ (adv) £		Revised Budget 2015 £	Budget 2016 £	Budget 2017 £
			INCOME			
5,000	6,061	1,061	Interest - Deposit	5,000	3,000	2,000
22,844	23,193	349	Investment income	23,193	23,193	23,193
73,000	74,683	1,683	Rents	75,000	76,000	77,000
100,844	103,937	3,093	<i>Total Net Income</i>	103,193	102,193	102,193
			EXPENDITURE			
5,900	5,828	72	Insurance	6,100	6,283	6,471
35,000	25,444	9,556	Repairs	35,000	36,050	37,132
8,000	7,556	444	Gas appliance / electrical testing	8,000	8,240	8,487
2,500	492	2,008	Property surveys etc	2,500	2,500	2,500
11,750	11,750	-	GSO Administration charge	11,750	11,750	11,750
63,150	51,070	12,080	<i>Total Expenditure</i>	63,350	64,823	66,340
			BALANCES			
			Revenue			
37,694	52,867	15,173	Surplus/(deficit) for year	39,843	37,370	35,853
(37,946)	(45,403)	(7,457)	Transfers (to)/from capital	(47,559)	(37,370)	(35,853)
252	252		Balance brought forward	7,716	-	-
-	7,716	7,716	<i>Balance carried forward</i>	-	-	-
<hr/>						
			CAPITAL ACCOUNT			
			Additions to capital			
-	-	-	Profit on sale of property	30,000	-	-
-	177,247	177,247	Purchase of property	170,000	175,000	-
15,000		(15,000)	Capital repairs	15,000	15,000	15,000
22,946	45,403	22,457	Funds placed on deposit	71,559	-	20,853
37,946	222,650	184,704		286,559	190,000	35,853
			Disposals of capital			
-	-	-	Sale of property - book value	39,000	-	-
-	177,247	(177,247)	Funds from deposit account	170,000	152,630	-
-	177,247	(177,247)		209,000	152,630	-
37,946	45,403	7,457	<i>net additions (disposals) of capital</i>	77,559	37,370	35,853
4,072,809	4,072,809	-	Balance brought forward	4,118,212	4,195,771	4,233,141
4,110,755	4,118,212	7,457	<i>Balance carried forward</i>	4,195,771	4,233,141	4,268,994
			Funding of capital movement			
37,946	45,403	7,457	Funding required	77,559	37,370	35,853
-	-	-	Profit on sale of property	30,000	-	-
37,946	45,403	7,457	Transfer from/(to) revenue	47,559	37,370	35,853
-	-	-	<i>Funding shortfall</i>	-	-	-
	861,712		Deposit Account Balance	393,271	240,641	261,494
	(400,000)		Transferred to UTP			
461,712				393,271	240,641	261,494

Institute Council

	Budget 2015 £	Budget 2016 £	Budget 2017 £
INCOME			
Allocation from General Fund	355,770	525,240	491,870
Investment income	2,850	2,850	2,850
Total Income	358,620	528,090	494,720
EXPENDITURE			
A Board			
Meeting costs	3,250	3,250	3,250
Total Board	3,250	3,250	3,250
B Scottish Episcopal Institute			
Staff Costs			
Salaries, pensions etc	126,100	132,350	139,000
Travel expenses	2,000	2,000	2,000
Staff training / development	1,000	1,000	1,000
Total staff costs	129,100	135,350	142,000
Training costs			
Residential weekends	18,800	34,600	37,600
Placement costs	750	1,500	1,500
Local tutor / mentor costs	5,000	5,000	5,000
Module teaching staff	6,000	6,000	6,000
Course materials / moodle costs	4,000	4,000	4,000
Common Awards (YSJ)	15,000	15,000	15,000
Total training costs	49,550	66,100	69,100
Other costs			
Library	5,000	5,000	5,000
Admin / publicity	700	700	700
Total other costs	5,700	5,700	5,700
Total SEI costs	184,350	207,150	216,800
C Full Time ordinands (note 1)			
University fees	-	-	-
Maintenance grants / housing	-	-	-
Total full time ordinands	-	-	-

Institute Council

	Budget 2015 £	Budget 2016 £	Budget 2017 £
D Curate funding			
Curate grants (note 2)	-	214,300	238,900
Total curate funding	-	214,300	238,900
E Recruitment and Selection			
PDO stipend / salary	27,170	27,715	28,270
PDO expenses (travel etc)	2,000	2,000	2,000
Admin assistant	-	-	-
Provincial panels etc	4,000	4,000	4,000
Training	1,000	1,000	1,000
Materials etc	500	500	500
Total Recruitment and Selection	34,670	35,215	35,770
F Dispersed TISEC			
Grants to Dioceses (note 3)	136,350	68,175	-
Total Dispersed TISEC	136,350	68,175	-
Total Expenditure	358,620	528,090	494,720
BALANCES			
Revenue			
Surplus/(deficit) for year	-	-	-
Balance brought forward	-	-	-
<i>Balance carried forward</i>	-	-	-
Notes			
1 No budget yet provided for the funding of full time ordinands pending further discussion in relation to required funding and availability of funds.			
2 Curate grants to be funded from Grants for Ministry Fund in 2015. Assumed responsibility transferred to Institute Council from 2016			
3 Dispersed TISEC funding to be phased out over two year period.			

Mission and Ministry Board

Budget 2014 £	Actual 2014 £	Variance fav/ (adv) £		Revised Budget 2015 £	Budget 2016 £	Budget 2017 £
			INCOME			
451,475	362,000	(89,475)	Allocation from General Fund	86,815	82,980	84,180
451,475	362,000	(89,475)	<i>Total Net Income</i>	86,815	82,980	84,180
			EXPENDITURE			
2,840	2,862	(22)	Board expenses	2,925	3,010	3,100
200	-	200	Miscellaneous	200	200	200
500	-	500	Disability Awareness Working Group / Church for All	-	-	-
30,000	15,904	14,096	Discussion of Same-Sex Relationships	-	-	-
1,500	-	1,500	WCMMP implementation	5,000	-	-
35,040	18,766	16,274	<i>Sub-total</i>	8,125	3,210	3,300
			<i>Allocation to Committees</i>			
-	-	-	Overseas Committee	-	-	-
37,000	26,863	10,137	Home Mission Committee	41,190	42,270	43,380
37,500	28,168	9,332	Church in Society Committee	37,500	37,500	37,500
331,975	279,935	52,040	Ministry Development Committee	-	-	-
9,960	8,268	1,692	Recruitment and Selection	-	-	-
416,435	343,234	73,201	<i>Total allocated to committees</i>	78,690	79,770	80,880
451,475	362,000	89,475	<i>Total Expenditure</i>	86,815	82,980	84,180
			BALANCES			
			Revenue			
-	-	-	Surplus/(deficit) for year	-	-	-
-	-	-	Balance brought forward	-	-	-
-	-	-	<i>Balance carried forward</i>	-	-	-
Note						
Responsibility of funding work undertaken by Ministry Development Committee and Recruitment and Selection transferred to Institute Council from 2015.						

Mission and Ministry Board Overseas Committee

Budget 2014 £	Actual 2014 £	Variance fav/ (adv) £			Revised Budget 2015 £	Budget 2016 £	Budget 2017 £
			INCOME				
-	-	-	Allocation from General Fund		-	-	-
96,496	97,461	965	Investment income	Unit Trust Pool	97,461	97,461	97,461
-	22	22		Deposit account	-	-	-
6,433	6,497	64		Noel Phillips Trust	6,497	6,497	6,497
-	10,000	10,000		Legacy	-	-	-
102,929	113,980	11,051	<i>Total Net Income</i>		103,958	103,958	103,958
			EXPENDITURE				
40,000	58,968	(18,968)	Grants	Education	40,000	40,000	40,000
21,000	14,126	6,874		Africa	21,000	21,000	21,000
18,000	9,664	8,336		Asia (<i>inc Middle East</i>)	18,000	18,000	18,000
7,750	850	6,900		Small grants	7,750	7,750	7,750
10,500	2,531	7,969		Companion Relationships	10,500	10,500	10,500
17,000	5,100	11,900		Agency Support	17,000	17,000	17,000
-	14,602	(14,602)		Anglican Comm Network Support	-	-	-
-	6,000	(6,000)		South America			
1,250	1,791	(541)	MiDGies (formerly Justice, Peace and Creation Network)		1,250	1,250	1,250
3,000	1,041	1,959	Committee expenses	Travel / meetings	3,000	3,000	3,000
1,500	-	1,500		Publicity / correspondence	1,500	1,500	1,500
120,000	114,673	5,327	<i>Total Expenditure</i>		120,000	120,000	120,000
			BALANCES				
			Revenue				
(17,071)	(693)	16,378	Surplus/(deficit) for year		(16,042)	(16,042)	(16,042)
103,166	103,166		Balance brought forward		102,473	86,431	70,389
86,095	102,473	16,378	<i>Balance carried forward</i>		86,431	70,389	54,347

**Mission and Ministry Board
Home Mission Committee**

Budget 2014 £	Actual 2014 £	Variance fav/ (adv) £		Revised Budget 2015 £	Budget 2016 £	Budget 2017 £
			INCOME			
37,000	26,863	(10,137)	Allocation from General Fund	41,190	42,270	43,380
37,000	26,863	(10,137)	<i>Total Net Income</i>	41,190	42,270	43,380
			EXPENDITURE			
1,205	583	622	Committee expenses	1,240	1,280	1,319
-	(43)	43	LCM Booklets	-	-	-
550	-	550	Materials	-	-	-
875	1,224	(349)	Other Costs	900	927	955
-	100	(100)	Training	-	-	-
			Networks:			
-	-	-	Children	1,000	1,000	1,000
-	-	-	Lay Learning	2,400	2,472	2,546
1,090	-	1,090	Mission	1,120	1,154	1,189
1,120	1,346	(226)	Rural	1,155	1,190	1,226
			Spirituality			
3,935	3,300	635	Retreats - grants	3,300	3,300	3,300
-	30	(30)	Retreats - other costs	-	-	-
-	-	-	Stewardship	1,000	1,000	1,000
28,225	20,323	7,902	Youth	29,075	29,947	30,845
37,000	26,863	10,137	<i>Total Expenditure</i>	41,190	42,270	43,380
			BALANCES			
			Revenue			
-	-	-	Surplus/(deficit) for year	-	-	-
			Balance brought forward	-	-	-
-	-	-	<i>Balance carried forward</i>	-	-	-

**Mission and Ministry Board
Church in Society Committee**

Budget 2014 £	Actual 2014 £	Variance fav/ (adv) £		Revised Budget 2015 £	Budget 2016 £	Budget 2017 £
			INCOME			
37,500	28,168	(9,332)	Allocation from General Fund	37,500	37,500	37,500
-	1,482	1,482	Donations	-	-	-
37,500	29,650	(7,850)	<i>Total Net Income</i>	37,500	37,500	37,500
			EXPENDITURE			
34,000	27,196	6,804	Grants	33,500	33,500	33,500
1,500	941	559	CRPOF	1,500	1,500	1,500
2,000	1,513	487	Meeting costs / participating in consultations / conferences	2,500	2,500	2,500
37,500	29,650	7,850	<i>Total Expenditure</i>	37,500	37,500	37,500
			BALANCES			
			Revenue			
-	-	-	Surplus/(deficit) for year	-	-	-
-	-		Balance brought forward	-	-	-
-	-	-	<i>Balance carried forward</i>	-	-	-

**Mission and Ministry Board
Ministry Development Committee**

Budget 2014 £	Actual 2014 £	Variance fav/ (adv) £	
			INCOME
331,975	279,935	(52,040)	Allocation from General Fund
2,850	2,880	30	Investment income
-	1,000	1,000	Donations
4,400	3,650	(750)	Fees
-	10	10	Module / paper sales
339,225	287,475	(51,750)	<i>Total Net Income</i>
			EXPENDITURE
			Provincial Staff Costs
140,500	97,502	42,998	Salaries, pensions etc
1,150	506	644	Travel expenses
-	3,627	(3,627)	Recruitment Costs
1,000	1,052	(52)	Staff training / development
142,650	102,687	39,963	<i>Sub-total</i>
			Diocesan staff costs
146,350	140,950	5,400	Contribution to Diocesan costs
2,000	2,792	(792)	IME Staff training / development
875		875	Lay Learning training / development
149,225	143,742	5,483	
			Ecumenical Liaison
150	-	150	Meetings
250	-	250	Events
400	-	400	<i>Sub-total</i>
			General / shared administrative costs
500	476	24	Administrative expenses
200	-	200	Publicity
5,000	4,712	288	Library
			Meeting Costs
2,000	1,489	511	- Ministry Development Committee
500	-	500	- Diocesan Coordinators
750	569	181	- Board of Studies
8,950	7,246	1,704	<i>Sub-total</i>

**Mission and Ministry Board
Ministry Development Committee**

Budget 2014	Actual 2014	Variance fav/ (adv)	
£	£	£	
			Initial Ministerial Education
4,000	2,233	1,767	Course materials / e-learning facility
8,650	9,272	(622)	Residential weekends (net cost)
9,600	10,210	(610)	Module co-ordinators honoraria
800	783	17	Module Co-ordinators book grants
-	-	-	Miscellaneous
500	-	500	Graduation Costs
9,000	9,300	(300)	YSJU Validation costs
1,000	365	635	QFP Costs (Min Div Validation)
500	-	500	General Contingency
			Meeting Costs
300	168	132	- Module coordinators
250	-	250	- Quality Assurance and Enhancement Panel
500	390	110	- Assessment Panel
-	-	-	- Other
35,100	32,721	2,379	<i>Sub-total</i>
			Lay Learning
700	-	700	Support and materials
200	-	200	- Staff Costs / honoraria
500	-	500	General Contingency
		-	Meeting Costs
1,000	813	187	- Provincial Lay Learning Group
2,400	813	1,587	<i>Sub-total</i>
			Continuing Ministerial Development
500	266	234	Lay Readers' Conference
-	-	-	CMD 1-3
-	-	-	CMD 4+
500	266	234	<i>Sub-total</i>
339,225	287,475	51,750	<i>Total Expenditure</i>
			BALANCES
			Revenue
-	-	-	Surplus/(deficit) for year
-	-	-	Transfer (to)/from capital
-	-	-	Balance brought forward
-	-	-	<i>Balance carried forward</i>
Note			
Budget transferred to Institute Council from 2015.			

Mission and Ministry Board Recruitment and Selection

Budget 2014 £	Actual 2014 £	Variance fav/ (adv) £	
			INCOME
9,960	8,268	(1,692)	Allocation from General Fund
9,960	8,268	(1,692)	<i>Total Income</i>
			EXPENDITURE
			<i>Employees:</i>
5,825	5,823	2	PDO salary & pension contributions
1,475	327	1,148	Travel & subsistence
			<i>Administration:</i>
160	3	157	Telephone, postage, stationery, etc.
2,500	2,115	385	<i>Workshops</i>
9,960	8,268	1,692	<i>Total Expenditure</i>
			BALANCES
			Revenue
-	-	-	Surplus/(deficit) for year
-	-		Balance brought forward
-	-	-	<i>Balance carried forward</i>
Note			
Budget transferred to Institute Council from 2015.			

Faith and Order Board

Budget 2014 £	Actual 2014 £	Variance fav/ (adv) £		Revised Budget 2015 £	Budget 2016 £	Budget 2017 £
			INCOME			
22,450	15,184	(7,266)	Allocation from General Fund	26,920	21,550	23,700
22,450	15,184	(7,266)	<i>Total Net Income</i>	26,920	21,550	23,700
			EXPENDITURE			
6,695	3,002	3,693	Board expenses	6,900	7,108	7,324
2,120	1,841	279	Work of Liturgy Committee	3,685	2,251	3,819
1,525	297	1,228	Work of Committee on Canons	1,525	1,571	1,618
1,090	747	343	Work of Doctrine Committee	1,090	1,123	1,157
6,900	4,549	2,351	Inter-Church Relations Committee	11,100	7,313	7,532
2,120	4,737	(2,617)	Europe Group	2,120	2,184	2,250
1,000	11	989	Diaconate Working Group	500	-	-
1,000	-	-	WCC Assembly	-	-	-
22,450	15,184	6,266	<i>Total Expenditure</i>	26,920	21,550	23,700
			BALANCES			
			Revenue			
-	-	-	Surplus/(deficit) for year	-	-	-
-			Balance brought forward	-	-	-
-	-	-	<i>Balance carried forward</i>	-	-	-
<hr/>						
			PUBLICATIONS			
	1,027		Income	-	-	-
	-		Expenditure	-	-	-
	1,027		Surplus/(deficit) for year	-	-	-
	(70)		Balance brought forward	957	957	957
	957		<i>Balance carried forward</i>	957	957	957
<hr/>						
Note	No specific budget is set for publications income and expenditure in either Faith and Order Board or Information and Communications Board. It is assumed that total income and expenditure is such that over time it will be broadly break-even.					

Information and Communication Board

Budget 2014 £	Actual 2014 £	Variance fav/ (adv) £		Revised Budget 2015 £	Budget 2016 £	Budget 2017 £
			INCOME			
39,000	12,758	(26,242)	Allocation from General Fund	39,100	39,200	39,300
39,000	12,758	(26,242)	<i>Total Net Income</i>	39,100	39,200	39,300
			EXPENDITURE			
2,760	2,565	195	Board expenses	2,838	2,915	2,991
12,000	9,341	2,659	Website Development	12,000	12,000	12,000
740	432	308	anglican.org domain	762	785	809
4,000	-	4,000	Exhibitions / promotion / publicity	4,000	4,000	4,000
18,000	420	17,580	inspires publication / distribution costs	18,000	18,000	18,000
1,500	-	1,500	Miscellaneous projects	1,500	1,500	1,500
39,000	12,758	26,242	<i>Total Expenditure</i>	39,100	39,200	39,300
			BALANCES			
			Revenue			
-	-	-	Surplus/(deficit) for year	-	-	-
-			Balance brought forward	-	-	-
-	-	-	<i>Balance carried forward</i>	-	-	-
<hr/>						
			PUBLICATIONS			
	7,063		Income	-	-	-
	(4,023)		Expenditure	-	-	-
	3,040		Surplus/(deficit) for year	-	-	-
	7,733		Balance brought forward	10,773	10,773	10,773
	10,773		<i>Balance carried forward</i>	10,773	10,773	10,773
Note	No specific budget is set for publications income and expenditure in either Faith and Order Board or Information and Communications Board. It is assumed that total income and expenditure is such that over time it will be broadly break-even.					

CODE OF CONDUCT FOR CONVENERS AND MEMBERS OF BOARDS AND COMMITTEES OF THE GENERAL SYNOD

As part of Standing Committee's role as the charity trustee body for the General Synod, the Committee regularly reviews the risks to which the charity, represented by the General Synod, is exposed. A regular review is undertaken of the risk register maintained for the Synod.

Standing Committee is conscious that a wide range of matters are handled by the Synod's Boards and Committees during the year and, to a greater or lesser extent, all conveners and members of such Boards and Committees exercise aspects of governance. Standing Committee expresses its deep gratitude to such conveners and members for the time and energy which they devote to their roles.

Given the governance role which such conveners and members exercise, Standing Committee considers that it would be appropriate to adopt a Code of Conduct so that members accepting office can be aware of the standards of behaviour which might reasonably be expected of them in the exercise of their duties. Similarly, the adoption of such Code would also give confidence to the Synod in the ongoing governance of the charity. (It is emphasised that in proposing the adoption of a Code, Standing Committee does not wish to imply in any sense that current members of Boards or Committees are falling short of any such standards!)

Many charities have equivalent measures in place and the draft Code referred to below borrows on the content of a similar Code already in place within the Church of Scotland.

Standing Committee has also identified that whilst the Digest of Resolutions includes provisions relating to the appointment of individuals to provincial Boards and Committees, there is no provision for removal. Whilst the likelihood of needing to invoke provisions to remove a member of a Board or Committee seems remote, the lack of any provision enabling such a step represents a potential risk to good governance. The draft Code therefore includes provisions for dealing with breaches and this would include the possibility of suspension or removal from a Board or Committee.

In order to allow for flexibility in relation to changing the Code, if the need arises in future, Standing Committee proposes that the Digest of Resolutions should be altered to include a new power which would enable Standing Committee to adopt a Code of Conduct (and, therefore, also, to make changes to it, if necessary, in future).

The agenda for General Synod therefore includes a motion to adopt a new section 2.1.6 in the Digest of Resolutions. If that motion is accepted, Standing Committee would propose then to adopt the draft Code of Conduct set out on the following pages.

David Palmer
Convener, Standing Committee
April 2015

CODE OF CONDUCT FOR CONVENERS AND MEMBERS OF BOARDS AND COMMITTEES OF THE GENERAL SYNOD

1. Introduction

Individuals serving on Boards of Committees of the General Synod are appointed in a variety of ways. Some are appointed by their diocese to serve as a diocesan representative, others are elected by General Synod, others are appointed by Boards. Whilst, for the purposes of charities legislation, the members of the Standing Committee are regarded as the charity trustees of the General Synod, it is appropriate that all members of Boards or Committees adhere to the same general principles as are applicable specifically to charity trustees. This Code of Conduct is intended to provide guidance for those serving on Boards and Committees. References to “members” of such Boards or Committees include those who are appointed to serve as “conveners” of such bodies.

2. General Principles

Service

You have a duty to act in accordance with the interests of the Scottish Episcopal Church. This means you will be expected to devote an appropriate amount of time to the work of the Board or Committee to which you are appointed, including regular attendance at meetings.

Selflessness

You have a duty to take decisions solely in terms of the Church’s interests. You must not act for personal gain or financial or other material benefit (whether for yourself, family or friends).

Integrity and honesty

You must not place yourself under any financial, or other, obligation to any individual or organisation that might reasonably be thought to influence you in the performance of your duties. You must declare any private interests relating to your Church duties and take steps to resolve any conflicts in a way that protects the Church’s interests.

Accountability and Stewardship

You are accountable for your decisions and actions to the General Synod. You have a duty to consider issues on their merits, taking due account of the views of others, and must ensure that the Church uses its resources prudently and in accordance with the law.

Openness and confidentiality

You should be as open as possible about all the decisions and actions that you take. You should be prepared to give reasons for your decisions and restrict information only when the wider Church interest clearly demands this. When information has to be confidential, you are required to ensure that you respect this.

Leadership

You have a duty to promote and support these principles by leadership and example, and to maintain and strengthen trust and confidence in the integrity of the Church in the conduct of business.

3. Financial matters

Guidance on a variety of finance-related matters is provided for those serving on Boards or Committees (in the paper entitled Membership of Provincial Boards/Committees). That includes information regarding the reimbursement of expenses and also incorporates the General Synod's Anti-Bribery Policy, Fraud Policy, Fraud Response Plan and Register of Gifts and other Benefits. You are expected to familiarise yourself with those documents and act in accordance with them.

4. Confidentiality

In serving on a provincial Board or Committee, there will be times when you will be required to treat discussions, documents or other information in a confidential manner. You will often receive information of a private nature which is not yet public, or which perhaps would not be intended to be public. You must always respect and comply with any requirement to keep such information private; if you need further information or guidance on this, you can seek clarification from the Convener, the General Office Staff member who acts as the secretary to your Board or Committee or the Secretary General.

5. Other Organisations

You may be appointed by your Board or Committee as a member of another body or organisation. If so, you are bound by the rules of conduct of these organisations and should also observe the rules of this Code in carrying out the duties of that body. Members who are appointed as trustees of other charities as nominees of the Church will assume the full duties and liabilities of a charity trustee for that other body. It is possible that a decision or action of such a charity could conflict with Church policy and that perceived or actual conflicts of interest could therefore arise for Church-nominated trustees. You are strongly advised in any such cases to seek guidance on your responsibilities. The Secretary General may be able to assist but in some cases it may be necessary to take independent legal advice. In some cases, if a conflict of interest is irreconcilable, you may have to resign from one of the bodies.

You should also remember that where you are appointed as a member of another body or organisation, you are generally appointed as a representative of the Scottish Episcopal Church and, therefore, you should be aware that in expressing views or opinions you should endeavour to represent the views of the Church rather than simply your own personal views, or at least make clear where views you express are personal ones. This is, of course, subject to what is said above about any overriding duties owed as a charity trustee or in a similar capacity to the organisation in question.

6. Declaration of Interests

You must declare any personal interest you or close members of your family may have in a matter under discussion at a meeting, particularly where a conflict of interest could arise or might be seen to arise. This could be a financial interest, for example if you work for a company to which the possible awarding of a contract is being discussed. Similarly, conflict may arise in the awarding of a grant to another organisation with which you have some connection. Conveners should also be aware of their need to maintain impartiality when, for example, their Committee is considering a grant to the diocese or congregation to which the convener belongs. There may be other occasions where the interest is non-financial, for example where the matter for decision involves the employment of a friend. Other interests could relate to:

- employment or self-employment, whether remunerated or not
- holding of a relevant office
- holding a directorship, partnership or trusteeship of another body
- membership of a professional body
- ownership of or an interest in property or land under discussion
- ownership of shares or other assets in a company under discussion

If in doubt, you may find it helpful to ask yourself whether a member of the Church acting reasonably might consider any of the above interests could potentially affect your responsibilities to the General Synod, or could influence your actions, comments or decision-making. If in doubt, you must consult the Convener of your Board or Committee or the Secretary General.

Interests should be declared at the start of a meeting if you know in advance that an appropriate item is scheduled to arise. You should, however, declare an interest at any point in the meeting if it appears appropriate. In general, you may take part in a discussion even if you have declared an interest in an item but you must not unduly influence the discussion and you must not take part in any vote on the item. If your interest in an item is significant and material to the item under consideration, you must not take any part in the discussion, or vote, and you may, at the Convener's discretion, be asked to leave the meeting for that item.

7. Governance and Management

- 7.1 The principal function of provincial Boards and Committees is to provide appropriate governance in relation to their respective areas of responsibility and activity. Staff employed at the General Synod Office act as the secretariat to the Boards and Committees. They are not employed directly by the Boards and Committees they serve and the management of General Synod Office staff is a function of the Secretary General. Whilst Boards and Committees are responsible for establishing matters of general policy, it is not their role to act in a line management capacity. Members of staff themselves are required to act in a manner which is impartial and they ought not, therefore, to be asked to act in a way which unjustifiably favours or discriminates against particular individuals or interests. If matters arise which relate to the management of staff, these should be raised with the Secretary General.

- 7.2 At all times, members of Boards and Committees should conduct themselves in an appropriate manner. The General Synod Office has its own policy on bullying and harassment at work in relation to the conduct of staff. Conduct which constitutes bullying or harassment is unacceptable and will be treated seriously. Bullying may include offensive, intimidating, malicious or insulting behaviour, including the abuse or misuse of power intended to undermine, humiliate, denigrate or injure the recipient. Harassment is generally understood as unwanted conduct affecting the dignity of men and women which creates an intimidating, hostile, degrading, humiliating or offensive environment. It may be related to gender, sexual orientation, race, nationality, disability, religion, belief, age or any personal characteristic of the individual. The behaviour may be persistent, or an isolated incident. Conduct which amounts to bullying or harassment will be regarded as a breach of this Code of Conduct.

8. Breaches of this Code of Conduct

- 8.1 If it appears to the Convener of the Standing Committee that a member of a Board or Committee has breached a provision of this Code or if he or she receives a complaint from another member or interested party alleging such a breach, he or she shall arrange for a sub group ("the Sub-Group") comprising at least three members of the General Synod to deal with the complaint. Unless the Sub-Group decides that the complaint is vexatious, frivolous or without merit, namely that even if the complaint were proved it would not constitute a breach of the Code, the Sub-Group will arrange for the matter to be investigated. The member who is the subject of such an investigation will be informed of the complaint and will be interviewed to ascertain the facts. The member is required to give the investigators his/her fullest cooperation. The complaint and investigation will be handled in confidence as far as is practicable. Unless there are exceptional circumstances, the investigation will normally be completed within 56 days.
- 8.2 In the event that the Sub-Group considers that there has been a breach of the Code justifying action being taken, it will refer the matter to a panel comprising three members of the Standing Committee ("the Panel") to determine how the matter should be disposed of. In the deliberations of the Panel, the members of the Sub-Group may attend and make representations and the member shall also be entitled to attend and make representations in relation to the question of whether a breach has occurred and if it has, the appropriate action to be taken. Such action may include:
- censure
 - removal of the member from the Board or Committee in question either temporarily or permanently
 - suspension from membership of the Board or Committee in question.
- 8.3 Any member who is subject to such action will have the right of appeal to the Standing Committee against any penalty applied. The Standing Committee will determine how to handle any such appeal but any member of the Standing Committee who has served on the Panel will take no part in determining the appeal.

- 8.4 If the member whose conduct is the subject of a complaint under this Code is the convener or member of the Standing Committee, he or she will immediately withdraw from active membership of that Committee until the matter is resolved and the Standing Committee will make arrangements for another member to assume responsibility for the complaint. Similarly if the member whose conduct is the subject of a complaint under this Code is a member of a Board or Committee of the General Synod other than the Standing Committee, he or she shall immediately withdraw from active membership of the body in question pending resolution of the matter.

Acknowledgement: parts of the above document are drawn from a similar Code of Conduct in use within the Church of Scotland to whom thanks are expressed.

GENERAL SYNOD - POWERS OF INVESTMENT

Section 1.6.1 of the Digest of Resolutions sets out powers of investment on the part of the General Synod. That section includes reference to the Trustee Investments Act 1961. That legislation has now been repealed.

In its place, the Charities and Trustee Investments (Scotland) Act 2005 allows much wider powers of investment on the part of trustees, albeit imposing a legal duty on trustees to obtain and consider proper advice about how any power of investment should be exercised.

In order to update section 1.6.1 of the Digest, a motion is included in the Synod Agenda to remove reference to the former legislation.

David Palmer
Convener, Standing Committee
April 2015

CHANGES TO THE DIGEST OF RESOLUTIONS TO BE PROPOSED AT GENERAL SYNOD 2015

New material is shown as *underlined*. Material to be deleted is shown as ~~strikethrough~~.

1.6 Powers of Investment

- 1.6.1 Without prejudice to the provisions relating to the pooling of investments referred to below, the funds of the General Synod may be invested in the purchase of investments and securities, ~~both wider range and narrower range, and so that,~~ subject to the terms of any gift or bequest, ~~the restrictions contained in the Trustee Investments Act 1961 shall not apply and~~ in the investment of lands, buildings or other heritable or real property either in the United Kingdom or overseas. In the event of any property, heritable or moveable, real or personal of whatever nature, being gifted or bequeathed to the General Synod, the same may be accepted and retained unrealised for such time or times as may be deemed advisable, and in the case of shares, whether such shares are or are not fully paid, and in the case of other property whether the same may be burdened or unburdened. In relation to heritable property belonging to General Synod, whether held in feu, under lease, freehold or leasehold, the General Synod may exercise all the powers of management or improvement which could be exercised by an absolute owner holding the property beneficially.

2 THE BOARDS AND COMMITTEES OF THE GENERAL SYNOD

2.1.2 Appointment of Board Conveners

- (a) Conveners of Boards of the General Synod shall be appointed by the General Synod. Unless the Standing Committee proposes to recommend to the General Synod that the term of office of a Board Convener should be extended beyond the date on which he/she would otherwise demit office, the Secretary General shall, not later than three months before the date on which a Board Convener is due to demit office, so inform Diocesan Secretaries and invite nominations for the post to be submitted, in writing, to the Secretary General, accompanied by relevant biographical details of the nominee, by a date not earlier than three weeks after the date of such invitation.
- (b) Nominations may be submitted by Diocesan Synods or their respective Standing Committees (or equivalent) and by members of the General Synod save that in the case of a nomination from a member of General Synod, the nomination shall be signed by at least five members of General Synod.
- (c) The Standing Committee may make a nomination or recommend acceptance by General Synod of a nomination made by others.
- (d) The Board in question shall be entitled to make representations to the Standing Committee regarding the matter and any nomination or

recommendation by the Standing Committee shall be made following prior consultation with the Board in question.

- (e) Details of the nominations and of the Standing Committee's recommendation (if any) shall be circulated, if not earlier, to General Synod members present at the commencement of the meeting of General Synod at which the appointment is to be made.
- (f) In the event that General Synod fails to make an appointment to a particular convenership, or in the event of a casual vacancy arising at any time in the post of any Board Convenership, the Standing Committee shall be entitled to fill the vacancy save that the person appointed shall retire at the next meeting of the General Synod and the procedure set out above shall be repeated. A person appointed as Convener by the Standing Committee shall be eligible to be re-appointed at that next meeting of the General Synod but such appointment shall be for a period not exceeding four years.
- (g) The foregoing paragraphs (a), (b), (c), (e) and (f) shall apply to the appointment of the Convener of the Standing Committee as if references to the Convener of a Board were references to the Convener of the Standing Committee.
- (h) Notwithstanding the foregoing, the Convener of Board of the Scottish Episcopal Institute shall be a Bishop, nominated by Standing Committee to General Synod, and the provisions of paragraphs (b), (c) and (d) above shall not apply to the convenership of that Board.

.....

2.1.6 Code of Conduct for Conveners and Members of Boards and Committees

The Standing Committee shall have power to adopt from time to time a Code of Conduct setting out the principles of conduct and behaviour expected to be observed by conveners and members of Boards and Committees of the General Synod and setting out the consequences of any breach of such Code or how any complaint made under an such Code are to be handled. Any such Code shall be binding on such conveners and members, including any procedures contained in it regarding how breaches of such a Code or complaints under it shall be dealt with.

.....

2.2 Standing Committee and Pendant Committees

- 2.2.1** The **Standing Committee** of the General Synod shall consist of a Lay Convener appointed by the General Synod, the Primus, a Bishop other than the Primus (appointed by the College of Bishops) and the Conveners of the Administration Board, the Mission ~~and Ministry~~ Board, the Information and Communication Board and the Board of the Scottish Episcopal Institute. In addition, notwithstanding the provisions of Section 2.1.5(b), the House of Clergy of the General Synod shall elect two members and the House of Laity of the General Synod shall elect one member. No such elected persons shall be concurrent members of a General

Synod Board, any of their pendant committees or any other provincial body as determined from time to time by the Standing Committee. Unless the General Synod otherwise resolves, the period of office shall be four years (with the possibility of re-election for one additional such term). The Standing Committee itself may make nominations to the Synod in relation to the two clerical posts and the one lay post.

.....

- 2.2.9** The **Committee for the Protection of Children and Vulnerable Adults** shall monitor and, where necessary, develop the Child Protection Policy of the Church from time to time and oversee the provision of advice in connection with the protection of children and young people and vulnerable adults within the Church.
-

2.3 Administration Board and Pendant Committees

- 2.3.1** The **Administration Board** shall consist of a Convener appointed by the General Synod, a Bishop (appointed by the College of Bishops), ~~the Convener of the Home Mission Committee~~ a representative appointed by the Mission Board, three members appointed by the General Synod from its own membership, a representative of each Diocese as appointed by each Diocesan Synod and the Conveners of the pendant committees of the Board.

- 2.3.3** The Administration Board shall appoint the following pendant committees:-

- (a) the Investment Committee consisting of a Convener and up to six other members as determined by the Board;
 - (b) the Finance Committee consisting of a Convener, a representative appointed by each Diocesan Synod and a representative appointed by the Mission Board ~~the Convener of the Home Mission Committee~~;
 - (c) the Retirement Welfare Committee consisting of a Convener and up to six other members;
 - (d) the Buildings Committee as provided in Canon 52.23 consisting of a Convener and up to six other members with expert knowledge of architecture, ecclesiastical artefacts and liturgy, provided that, where an appeal is made to that Committee under the provisions of Canon 35, the College of Bishops shall appoint one of their number (not being the bishop of the diocese from which the appeal is made) who shall act as an additional member of the Committee but only in relation to the Committee's dealing with the appeal in question;
 - (e) the Personnel Committee consisting of a Convener and up to six other members as determined by the Board.
-

- 2.3.5** The **Finance Committee** shall make recommendations to the Administration Board on the level of clergy stipends and allowances, shall review diocesan accounts, and shall have responsibility, unless otherwise resolved by the Administration Board, for the oversight of ~~the Grants for Ministry Fund~~, the Dunderdale Fund for the Endowment of Charges, the Maintenance and Development Fund, the Dunderdale Building Fund, the Building Loans Fund and the Free and Open Churches Association Fund.
-

Section 2.4 of the Digest of Resolutions would be repealed in its entirety and be replaced by the following:-

2.4 Mission Board and Pendant Committees

- 2.4.1** The **Mission Board** shall consist of a Convener appointed by the General Synod, a Bishop appointed by the College of Bishops, one representative of each Diocese as appointed by each Diocesan Synod, the Conveners of its pendant Committees, and up to three further members co-opted by the Board.
- 2.4.2** The Mission Board shall have responsibility for the strategic oversight of the mission of the Church within Scotland, the United Kingdom and abroad.
- 2.4.3** The Mission Board shall appoint the following pendant committees each of which shall consist of a Convener and not more than six other members (not including ex officio members) as the Board shall determine (except that the composition and manner of appointment of the Youth Committee shall be determined by the Mission Board from time to time):-
- (a) the Church in Society Committee;
 - (b) the Global Partnerships Committee;
 - (c) the Youth Committee.

The Convener of the Committee for Relations with People of Other Faiths shall, ex officio, be a member of the Church in Society Committee.

Notwithstanding the foregoing power to appoint pendant committees, the Mission Board shall have power to appoint other working groups and to delegate such powers to any such group as it considers appropriate for the better facilitating of its work. With the consent of the Board, the Board's pendant Committees may likewise appoint working groups and delegate powers.

- 2.4.4** The Church in Society Committee shall appoint a sub-committee, the Committee for Relations with People of Other Faiths, consisting of a Convener and other members all as determined by the Church in Society Committee.
- 2.4.5** The **Church in Society Committee** shall have responsibility for the promotion of the mission of the Church in relation to social, economic and environmental issues and, unless otherwise resolved by the Mission Board, for the oversight of the Church in Society Committee Fund.

2.4.6 The **Global Partnerships Committee** shall have responsibility for the promotion, on behalf of the provincial Church, of mission, development projects overseas and companion partnerships and shall liaise with the Scottish Episcopal Church Mission Association (Links). It shall also have responsibility, unless otherwise resolved by the Mission Board, for the oversight of the Global Partnerships Committee Fund.

2.4.7 The **Committee for Relations with People of Other Faiths** shall have responsibility for the oversight of matters appertaining to relations with people of other faiths at provincial level.

.....

A new Section 2.6 of the Digest of Resolutions would be inserted as follows (and the existing sections 2.7 to 2.10 would be renumbered accordingly):-

2.6 Board of the Scottish Episcopal Institute and Pendant Committees

2.6.1 The **Board of the Scottish Episcopal Institute** (known as the Institute Council) shall consist of a Convener, being a Bishop appointed by the General Synod on the nomination of the Standing Committee, one other Bishop appointed by the College of Bishops, and up to ten additional members appointed by the General Synod on the nomination of Standing Committee (such nominations to be made following consultation with the College of Bishops) of whom up to two need not be communicant members of the Scottish Episcopal Church. Any member appointed as a student representative or external quality adviser or who is not a communicant member of the Church shall be entitled to speak but not vote. In addition to the foregoing membership, the Convener of the Board of Studies shall, ex officio, be a member of the Board of the Scottish Episcopal Institute.

In the event that General Synod fails to make an appointment to positions of membership on the Board of the Scottish Episcopal Institute, or in the event of a casual vacancy arising at any time in a position on the Board which would normally be filled by an appointment by the General Synod, the Standing Committee shall be entitled to fill the vacancy save that the person so appointed shall retire at the next meeting of the General Synod (and that person shall then be eligible to be appointed by the Synod but such appointment shall be for a period not exceeding three years).

2.6.2 The Board of the Scottish Episcopal Institute shall have responsibility for the strategic oversight of the Scottish Episcopal Institute and of the delivery of the formation and training for authorised ministry in the Scottish Episcopal Church and other ministries as may be recognized from time to time by the College of Bishops, shall act as its governing body and shall be responsible for the oversight of such funds as may be provided to it in terms of the budgets of the General Synod.

2.6.3 Unless the Convener of the Board of the Scottish Episcopal Institute shall otherwise require, the Principal and Director of Studies of the Scottish Episcopal Church Institute and the Provincial Director of Ordinands shall normally be in attendance at meetings of the Board.

2.6.4 The Board of the Scottish Episcopal Institute shall appoint a Board of Studies with such duties and such membership as are considered appropriate from time to time.

2.6.5 Responsibility for matters pertaining to the recruitment and selection of ordinands shall lie with the College of Bishops who shall be entitled to appoint a Provincial Director of Ordinands.

.....

4 PROVINCIAL GRANTS & LOANS AVAILABLE

4.1 General

Provincial grants and loans shall be available, subject to funding, in accordance with rules or policies adopted from time to time by the Board or Committee (or a Committee's parent Board) having charge of the fund in question to the extent that such rules or policies are not inconsistent with the other provisions hereof. For the avoidance of doubt a parent Board having charge of a fund may delegate its powers in relation to such fund to any of its pendant Committees or sub-Committees.

Listed below are the main Provincial grants and loans which are available:

4.1.1 Personnel Grants

Sources of Funding

Curate Grants	Institute Council Grants for Ministry Fund
Stipend Support Grants	Grants for Ministry Fund
Travel Grants	Grants for Ministry Fund
Island Allowances	Grants for Ministry Fund
Child Allowance	Administration Board Grants for Ministry Fund
Resettlement Grants	Administration Board Grants for Ministry Fund
Maternity or similar parental Grants	Administration Board Grants for Ministry Fund

4.1.2 Building Grants and Loans

Capital expenditure on church buildings	Maintenance/Development Fund
Repair and maintenance work	Dunderdale Building Fund
Loans for new development or repair work	Building Loans Fund

4.1.3 Other Grants

Hymn & prayer books	Free & Open Church Association
---------------------	--------------------------------

Overseas projects	Overseas <u>Global</u> <u>Partnerships</u> Committee
Ministerial training —(lay and ordained)	Mission and Ministry Board <u>Institute</u> <u>Council</u>
Retreats Community Projects	Home Mission Committee Church in Society Committee
Relief of Primary Poverty	Community Fund

4.1.4 Pensioners

Assistance with retirement housing	Housing Fund
Financial assistance	Supplementary Fund

4.2 Mission and Ministry Support Grant Grants for Ministry Fund

The Mission Board shall be entitled to pay an annual block grant, to be known as the Mission and Ministry Support Grant, to Dioceses for the purpose of supporting the Dioceses in their mission and ministry, such grant to be of such amount and to be allocated to Dioceses in such manner as the Standing Committee shall determine on the recommendation of the Mission Board. Such grant shall be payable subject to the recipient Diocese providing to the Mission Board an annual statement of accountability in such form as the Mission Board shall determine.

~~There shall be a Grants for Ministry Fund under the charge of the Administration Board, the resources of which shall be expended in payment of grants to dioceses, individuals, and congregation for the purposes stated below. The fund shall be administered in accordance with such rules or policies as the Administration Board may from time to time adopt (being not inconsistent with the following):-~~

~~4.2.1 Grants shall be paid to dioceses for the undernoted purposes in accordance with the allocations made by the Finance Committee:~~

~~(a) To assist in payment of stipend and related employers contributions to the SEC Pension Fund and National Insurance contributions of Curates in receipt of training in their first three years of ministry. Such grants shall not exceed one half of the total approved stipend and related pension/national insurance contributions payable to such Curate.~~

~~(b) To assist in payment of the declared standard stipend to licensed clergy. Such grants shall not exceed one half of standard stipend (or one half of Bishop's stipend if the application is in respect of assistance in payment of Bishop's stipend), except in the case of a congregation in an area of multiple deprivation, which shall be eligible for consideration for a grant in excess of one half of the standard stipend. Areas of multiple deprivation shall be those areas determined by the Finance Committee from time to time.~~

~~(c) — To assist in the payment of personnel related costs associated with the development of new ministries.~~

~~(d) — To assist in the payment of travel expenses of clergy and lay workers in categories (a) to (c) above.~~

~~(e) — To pay Island Allowances.~~

4.32.2 Other Personnel Grants

4.3.1 Grants shall be paid to dioceses in accordance with the allocations made by the Institute Council to assist in payment of stipend and related employers contributions to the SEC Pension Fund and National Insurance contributions of Curates in receipt of training in their first three years of ministry. Such grants shall not exceed one half of the total approved stipend and related pension/national insurance contributions payable to such Curate.

4.3.2 — Grants shall be paid to individual clergy for the undernoted purposes:

- (a) Child Allowances shall be paid annually at a rate set by the Administration Board on the recommendation of the Finance Committee. They shall be paid on behalf of all qualifying children of all qualifying stipendiary clergy of the Scottish Episcopal Church who apply for such allowances. The allowances shall be paid in February (or when claimed, if later) in the year following that to which they relate. Payment shall be made to the Paying Officer of the parent concerned. Qualifying children shall be those who are under 16, or, if in full-time education, under 21. Qualifying stipendiary clergy shall be such stipendiary clergy as meet criteria set from time to time by the Administration Board.
- (b) Resettlement Grants shall be paid to qualifying stipendiary clergy who apply by way of reimbursement of qualifying expenditure incurred in moving to a new charge in the Province. Such grants shall be payable at a rate and on such terms as are set by the Administration Board on the recommendation of the Finance Committee.

4.32.3 Maternity grants shall be paid to congregations that are paying the defined level of enhanced maternity pay to their clergywoman. Such grants shall be payable at a rate set by the Administration Board on the recommendation of the Finance Committee. The Administration Board shall have power to introduce provision of grants to congregations in relation to adoption leave.

~~**4.2.4** — Any balance of available income shall then be used in such manner as may be decided from time to time by the Administration Board.~~

[Existing Sections 4.3 to 4.6 to be renumbered 4.4 to 4.7 respectively]

4.7 — Mission and Ministry Funds

~~The funds administered by the former Mission Board and Board for Ministry respectively shall be under the charge of the Mission and Ministry Board and shall be administered, subject to any legal restrictions specifically attaching to them, in accordance with such rules or policies as the Mission and Ministry Board may from time to time adopt.~~

6 CLERGY STIPENDS AND ALLOWANCES

6.2 Payment of Clergy

~~6.2.1 The Diocesan Treasurer shall, unless otherwise agreed by the eligible congregation, remit, in not fewer than ten monthly instalments (and ideally in twelve equal such instalments), to the Treasurer of each eligible congregation any grant for stipend support from the Grants for Ministry Fund necessary to bring the stipend up to the standard for the year.~~

[Sections 6.2.2 to 6.2.4 to be renumbered 6.2.1 to 6.2.3 respectively.]

6.11 Pensions

In the event that any person who would otherwise be entitled to become a member of the Scottish Episcopal Church Pension Fund decides not to become such a member, the Diocese or congregation as the case may be who appoints such a person shall nevertheless pay to the Pension Fund such sums, as determined by the provincial Standing Committee, from time to time as represent those elements of the normal contribution rate payable in respect of members of the Pension Fund which relate to life insurance cover, administration and any deficit reduction as part of a pensions recovery plan in the event of the Pension Fund being in a deficit situation as regards past service.

7 DIOCESAN SYNODS AND CONGREGATIONS

7.5 Duty of Congregation to Raise Stipend

7.5.1 It is the duty of every congregation first to provide such standard stipend and allowances for its cleric as the General Synod shall from time to time determine or authorise the Provincial Administration Board to determine; and secondly, to contribute to the funds of the Diocese and of the General Synod.

7.5.2 It shall be the duty of the Vestry in each congregation to arrange for the collection of contributions to Diocesan and Provincial Quotas. Where a congregation receives a stipend support grant it shall make efforts to increase its contribution towards stipend. Failure to do so ~~shall be taken into account by the Provincial Finance Committee in any future application for stipend support and~~ shall be taken into account by Diocesan Treasurers in reckoning its assessments for Diocesan and Provincial Quotas.

7.6 Failure of Congregation to Meet Stipend, etc

Without prejudice to the power of the Bishop and Diocesan Synod to proceed in terms of Canon 36, Section 12, or the College of Bishops in terms of Canon 13, Section 9, if at any time a Diocese through its Standing Committee (or equivalent) considers that a congregation receiving ~~a~~-stipend support ~~grant~~-from its Diocese ~~the Grants for Ministry Fund~~ is failing to cooperate, neglects to provide information required by a Diocesan Board or Committee, or is not raising a reasonable sum for its local contribution towards stipend or for contributions to the Diocesan Funds, or because it has become reduced in numbers, the relevant Diocesan Board or Committee may, after consultation with the Bishop, recommend to the Diocesan Synod that the congregation be placed "Under Review". If this recommendation is approved by the Diocesan Synod, that Synod shall, at its meeting in the following year, deal with the congregation as it sees fit, and may exclude its name from future stipend support~~any benefit from the Grants for Ministry Fund~~.

This page is intentionally blank

RULES OF ORDER OF THE GENERAL SYNOD

(Amended 12 June 1997, 7 June 2012, 12 June 2014)

1 Application

These rules of order shall apply to the proceedings of the General Synod whether sitting as one body or in separate Houses of Bishops, other Clergy and Laity.

2 The Chair – Powers and Duties

Deference shall at all times be paid to the authority of the Chair. All points of order shall be addressed to the person occupying the Chair, stated briefly and audibly, and raised immediately the perceived irregularity occurs, otherwise the person occupying the Chair shall disallow them. Points of order shall not introduce new subject matter. Speeches shall not be allowed on points of order. Where, in the view of the person occupying the Chair, the matter raised does not constitute a point of order, the person occupying the Chair shall rule accordingly. On all points of order the ruling from the Chair shall be final and not open to discussion. When the person occupying the Chair rises to speak, any member of the Synod who is addressing the meeting shall sit down.

It shall be the responsibility of the person occupying the Chair to preserve order and secure that members obtain a fair hearing, to decide all matters of order arising at meetings of the Synod and to decide, if two or more members rise in their places, which to call to speak. In the event of disorder arising at any meeting of the Synod, the meeting may be adjourned by the person occupying the chair who shall also, then or subsequently, fix a time for its reconvening. Quitting the Chair in such circumstances shall, without further procedure, have the effect of a formal adjournment of the meeting.

3 Order of Debate

Members desiring to speak shall indicate their desire to do so in the manner directed by the person occupying the Chair, or in the absence of any other direction, by raising their hand. Those called upon to speak shall address the Chair. Speeches shall be directed to the motion or amendment being proposed, seconded or otherwise under discussion or to a question of order. No member shall be allowed to speak more often than once on any subject under discussion, save on a point of order or, with consent of the Chair, to make an explanation, but the mover of a motion shall have a right of reply. A member who is speaking when a question of order is raised shall stop speaking until the question of order has been decided by the person occupying the Chair.

4 Matters Taken in Private

The Synod may decide by a majority of those present and voting that:-

- (a) any business shall be taken in private;
- (b) the Synod shall go into Committee for the informal discussion of any subject;
- (c) the Synod shall go into groups for the informal discussion of any subject (in which case minutes of such informal discussion need not be taken).

Notwithstanding the foregoing, the Chair shall have power to direct that the Synod shall break into small groups, for a period not exceeding 10 minutes, for the informal discussion of any subject (in which case minutes of such informal discussion need not be taken).

5 Adjournment

- (a) Any meeting of the Synod may be adjourned to such other place, time or day and hour as may be set by the person occupying the Chair.
- (b) Any meeting of the Synod may be adjourned to a later time on the same day and such an adjournment may be made on the direction from the Chair, or failing such direction, on the motion of any member, the vote on which motion, on being seconded, shall without amendment or discussion be taken by a show of hands as one House.

6 Quorum

The Quorum of the Synod shall be one half of the eligible membership of the House of Clergy and of the House of Laity and not less than three members of the House of Bishops, but no business shall be invalid because transacted without a quorum being present, unless the attention of the Chair has been called to the absence of a quorum. The person occupying the chair shall then ascertain, in such a way as seems fit, that no quorum is present, and declare the fact. This shall be a responsibility of the person occupying the chair, whose declaration, whether or not a quorum is present, shall be final. If it has been declared from the Chair that no quorum is present, no business shall be transacted until a quorum is declared from the Chair to be present except: (a) the consideration of a motion to adjourn; (b) such non-contentious business as the meeting, with consent of the person occupying the chair, sees fit to transact. If, however, a division is challenged on any subject other than on a motion for adjournment, the same shall not be dealt with by the meeting. No motion for adjournment shall be submitted until at least fifteen minutes after the declaration from the Chair that a quorum is not present, except with the consent of the person occupying the Chair.

7 Obstructive or Offensive Conduct

- (a) In the event of any member at any Synod meeting disregarding the authority of the Chair, or being guilty of obstructive or offensive conduct, a motion may thereupon be moved and seconded to suspend

such member for the remainder of the sitting. The motion shall be put without discussion.

- (b) The person occupying the Chair shall warn any member of the public who interrupts the proceedings at any meeting. If that member of the public continues the interruption the person occupying the Chair shall order the person concerned to leave the meeting, and not return.

8 Duration of Speeches

The mover of a motion shall not speak for more than ten minutes except with the consent of Synod. All other speakers taking part in the discussion on the motion or amendment shall not normally speak for more than five minutes, subject to the discretion of the person occupying the Chair. The mover of the original motion shall have the right to speak for five minutes in reply, but shall not introduce any new matter into the debate. Thereafter the discussion shall be held closed and the question shall thereupon be put from the Chair.

9 Motions

- (a) The Synod shall consider only the following motions:-
 - (i) motions which have been included in the agenda and papers for that meeting;
 - (ii) motions which the Synod has agreed to consider in terms of Rule 10;
 - (iii) formal or procedural motions.
- (b) All motions and amendments shall be stated, immediately on their being proposed to the meeting, by the mover, before being spoken to. All motions under Rule 9 (a) (ii) and all amendments shall be submitted in writing, signed by the mover and seconder and delivered to the Secretary General immediately on being moved.
- (c) Every amendment shall be relevant to the motion on which it is moved. A motion may be amended by the mover with the consent of the meeting, which consent shall be by the majority of those present and voting. In the case of a motion emanating from a Diocesan Synod or from a Board or Committee of the General Synod, the mover of that motion shall have the power, unless specifically denied it by the body from which the motion has emanated, to accept the amendment to that motion, thus altering the text of the motion on which the Synod is asked to vote.
- (d) A motion or amendment may be withdrawn by the mover with the consent of the seconder of the motion or amendment, but the Synod shall have power by simple majority of those present and voting to refuse to allow such withdrawal, in which case the motion shall stand.

- (e) Motions or amendments which are not seconded shall not be discussed or inserted in the minutes.
- (f) If, in the opinion of the person occupying the chair, more than one motion deals with the same subject matter, only the motion first lodged with the Secretary General (whether by hand delivery or by post) shall be considered and if, in the opinion of the person occupying the chair, any motion deals with a matter already under consideration by a Board or Committee, that motion shall not be considered.
- (g) If a member who has submitted a notice of motion is not present to move the motion, the motion shall fall, unless Synod agrees that another member may move the motion.
- (h) No motion of any kind which involves a grant of money shall be competent unless it is printed in the programme of business with the observations of the Board or Committee within whose budget the grant would fall, with power to the Chair on special occasions to take the sense of the meeting with reference to matters appearing in the programme of business and, if satisfied, to dispense with the necessity of observations by the appropriate Board or Committee. Except as above provided, no motion (other than votes of thanks) shall be entertained unless notice has been given to the Secretary General in reasonable time to enable it to be entered in the programme of business, unless the person occupying the Chair sees fit to put the question to the meeting that want of notice shall be dispensed with and interprets it as the evident sense of the meeting that this be allowed. There shall be no poll on the question, but a show of hands may be taken to assist in coming to a decision.

10 Rule 10 Motions

- (a) Notice of Rule 10 motions should normally be given in writing (to the Secretary General) before Synod starts.
- (b) The motion shall be in writing, and signed by the mover and seconder, and supported by the signatures of twelve members (excluding the mover and seconder of the motion) of Synod who are present at the meeting.
- (c) The mover of a motion under this Rule shall be given the opportunity to address Synod briefly (maximum of two minutes) as to why the Synod should consider the motion at that time before a vote is taken on whether the Motion should be considered.
- (d) Subject to any contrary provision in the Code of Canons, in order for a Rule 10 motion to be considered by Synod, a two thirds majority of those present and voting shall vote in favour of its being considered.

11 Motion: “That the Question be now put”.

- (a) The amendment called “The previous question” shall not be allowed.
- (b) It shall be competent for any member who has not spoken on the question before the meeting to move “that the question be now put”. On this being seconded, if it seems to the person occupying the chair that the question before the meeting has been sufficiently discussed, a vote shall be taken, without amendment or discussion. If the motion is carried, the mover of the original motion shall have a right to reply, and the question under discussion shall then be put to the meeting. If the motion “that the question be now put” is not carried, a similar motion may be made after every three additional members have spoken.

12 Voting

- (a) After the question on which the vote is to be taken has been announced, and voting has commenced, no member shall be permitted to offer an opinion, or ask a question, except on a point of order, or otherwise interrupt the proceedings until the result of the vote has been intimated.
- (b) Save as otherwise provided, all motions and amendments shall be passed by a majority of the members of the Synod present and voting.
- (c) The person occupying the chair shall have a deliberative but not a casting vote. Where the matter which is the subject of the vote relates to the appointment of a member of the Synod to any particular office or committee, voting shall be by ballot.
- (d) When the question is put to the vote, tellers shall be named from the Chair and shall give in their report of each division taken. Except where otherwise stated in these Rules of Order, the vote may be taken in the first instance on a show of hands, the result, in the opinion of the person occupying the chair, being declared therefrom. In all cases of doubt the vote shall be taken by counting the hands held up. On any question, if one third of the present and voting members of any House so wish, voting shall be by ballot.
- (e) When voting by Houses, the Houses must meet separately if one third of the present and voting members of any House so wishes. When the Synod votes by Houses, the numbers of the vote in each House shall be recorded, and a majority of those present and voting shall be required in each House for the passing of the motion.
- (f) A challenge to the accuracy of the minutes shall be made by way of amendment to the motion that the minutes be approved. Only those members who were present at the previous meeting to which the minutes relate shall be entitled to vote on the said amendment.

13 Election, Selection or Appointment of Members to Office

In the case of election, selection or appointment by Synod of a member of the Synod or of any other person to any office where the number of candidates nominated exceeds the number of vacancies, the member or person to be elected, selected or appointed as the case may be shall be determined by a vote (or votes) by ballot in (each of) which members will be entitled to vote for as many candidates as there are vacancies. No member may record in the ballot more than one vote for any candidate. The candidate or candidates having the highest number of votes shall be declared duly elected. If there is equality of votes for the last vacancy, this shall be resolved by ballot or by a show of hands.

14 Assessor

The Standing Committee of the General Synod shall nominate an assessor, who may be a member of the Synod, but the assessor shall intervene as assessor only on the call of the Chair, without prejudice to the right of the assessor when a member of the Synod to speak and vote as such.

15 Suspension of Rules

The application of any or all of these Rules of Order may be temporarily suspended or amended by a majority amounting to two-thirds of those present and voting. Voting shall be as one House.

RULE 10 MOTIONS: PRACTICE NOTE

Before considering presenting a motion Synod members are encouraged to liaise with the Secretary General in order to consult with the Board to whom the matter will be delegated if the motion is passed. It is expected that in a majority of cases this will result in a co-operative response where the matter is taken on to the Board's agenda, and the need for a Rule 10 Motion will pass. Most matters can be dealt with using this process during the year through consultation with the relevant diocesan representative.

GENERAL SYNOD: A REFLECTION ON MORNING AND EVENING PRAYER

You make the dawn and the dusk to sing for joy (Psalm 65.8)

Within the daily rhythm of life, we become aware, when day breaks and when night falls, of moments of significance. A day begins and a day ends, never to return. Time has moved on during that day, and we have drawn a little nearer to whatever our end will be. Tomorrow will be another day, with a significance of its own. It will not be merely a repeat of today, no matter how many similarities there may be. Each day thus comes to us as a distinctive gift. We do not make it. We can only receive it. We may learn to receive it with gratitude and to return thanks for it to the God of creation, the giver of life.

*Every day will I bless you
and praise your name for ever and ever. (Psalm 145.2)*

Thus it is that human beings, whatever their religious persuasion, have instinctively offered prayer at each day's beginning and ending. At daybreak, prayer expresses gratitude for the passing of the night and for the gift of the new day. It offers to God all that is to be done and experienced as the day runs its course. At nightfall, prayer again expresses gratitude for what the day has brought and invites reflection on our use or perhaps misuse of it, entrusting our lives once again to God's care during the hours of darkness.

Father, hallowed be your name, your kingdom come. (Luke 11.2)

Prayer becomes part of the rhythm of life, of waking and sleeping, of working and resting. The sun and the moon, as time's markers, bring the further seasonal rhythms of winter and spring, summer and autumn. All these rhythms lead us to celebrate and reflect on the mystery of life itself, of our waking to life and of the coming sleep of death. Faith leads us further, to see in the passage from light to darkness and from night to morning an image of Christ's surrender to death and, with his being raised from death, the promise of a new creation, the goal towards which all our labours, as people of faith, are directed.

*Rejoice always, pray without ceasing, give thanks in all circumstances,
for this is the will of God in Christ Jesus. (1 Thessalonians 5.16f)*

Morning and Evening prayer thus form the frame within which the activities of each day take place. They are the beginning and the ending of each day's work. When, for example, the General Synod of our Church meets, Morning Prayer begins the day's business and Evening Prayer brings it to a conclusion. Both express the context of faith which informs the entire work of Synod. Both offer us the opportunity to draw deeply on the words of the sacred writings (psalms, canticles, readings and prayers) and allow them to become the voice of our own prayer.

"[The Psalms] are the bright mirror in which we become more deeply conscious of what is happening to us". (Cassian, conferences X,11)

Both Morning and Evening Prayer are there, not as optional extras for the piously inclined, but as the means by which we are reminded, as we begin and as we end the business of Synod, of the heart of the matter: the God through whom, in whom and for whom we exist.

"He prays unceasingly who combines prayer with necessary duties and duties with prayer. Only in this way can we find it practicable to fulfil the commandment to pray always. It consists in regarding the whole of Christian existence as a single great prayer. What we are accustomed to call prayer is only a part of it." (Origen, On Prayer)

Note: Copies of the most recent edition of *Daily Prayer* (which includes Morning and Evening Prayer, Night Prayer (Compline) and the Psalter) are available from the General Synod Office, Price £9.00.

SOCIAL MEDIA GUIDELINES FOR GENERAL SYNOD

Over the past two years, the business of General Synod has been shared in 'real time' through a Twitter Stream. The official 'twitterer' for General Synod tweets '@secsynod'. Members of Synod floor may also wish to use the hash tag #pisky to join in conversation and share the experience of Synod with those who watch from afar.

What is Twitter?

Twitter is a form of social networking that allows for very fast communication, through posts that are no longer than 140 characters. The brevity and speed of twitter allows for 'real time' conversation, as well as efficient sharing of information. By using 'hash tags' a group of people can form a shared conversation that is open to anyone who wishes to join. You can find the conversation by setting up a 'search' for a particular hashtag (e.g. #pisky) and you can join in the conversation by using the hash tag in your own posts.

Guidelines

The speed of twitter is both its delight and its danger. As with any form of communication, things can go wrong and misunderstandings can occur. The following guidelines are offered by the Information and Communications board to help us use Twitter well during General Synod.

1. Be Creative

- Twitter is a great way to share good news. If you are excited about being at Synod, impressed with the conversation, stimulated by new ideas, or delighted with the worship: tell people by using #pisky.
- Perhaps your gift is humour, or observation, or precision of thought. You may be able to help others stay focused, understand better, or share in debate by tweeting your perceptions of what is happening on Synod floor.
- Twitter is an easy way for people on the margins of the Church to 'watch' how Episcopalians communicate and relate. A good, fast, insightful, compassionate and amusing 'conversation' on Twitter might just be the encouragement someone needs to give the Church a try.

2. Be Responsible

- Twitter can help us engage more deeply with what is happening at Synod; but it can also be distracting. Please be aware of those around you and of your own responsibilities as a representative of your diocese.
- Twitter is a very public medium. Anyone, anywhere can see what you write using the #pisky hash tag. Therefore, please remember that your reputation and the reputation of the Church are at stake when you tweet.
- If you wouldn't say it aloud, then you shouldn't tweet it.

- Remember that it's hard to catch tone online, especially in 140 characters.
- Remember that you are a General Synod member and when you tweet on Twitter you are speaking in public.

3. Be Kind

- Twitter works well for offering praise, encouragement and support.
- It is not a helpful vehicle for criticism and complaint.
- Be kind to speakers: stay on topic, quote carefully.
- If something does go wrong, acknowledge it and let it go. If you make a mistake, apologize and move on. If someone else does, give them a chance to apologize and move on.

4. Be Yourself

- The reputation of the Church is as poorly served by over-restraint as by carelessness. We need to be seen to be human.
- It's OK to joke, to tease gently, to express what you are feeling; but remember not everyone will read things the same way.
- There's an old saying: 'God has something to say that can only be said through you.' Who knows? Maybe what God has to say can be shared in 140 characters or less.

Happy Tweeting!

April 2011

GENERAL SYNOD MEMBERS 2015

Most Rev David R Chillingworth
Rt Rev Dr John A Armes
Rt Rev Dr Gregor D Duncan
Rt Rev Dr Robert A Gillies
Rt Rev Kevin Pearson
Rt Rev Dr Nigel Peyton
Rt Rev Mark J Strange

Mr David Palmer
Mr Michael Lugton
Rev Canon Malcolm Round
Mr J N Gibson
Rev Christopher Mayo

Aberdeen Clergy

Rev Prof David Atkinson
Rev Captain Gerry Bowyer
Rev Neil Brice
Rev Alastair MacDonald
Very Rev Dr Emsley Nimmo
Rev Canon Dr Isaac Poobalan
Rev Paul Watson

Aberdeen Clergy Alternates

Rev Canon John Walker
Rev Canon Kenneth Gordon
Rev Canon Ian J Ferguson

Aberdeen Laity

Miss Mary Allardyce
Dr Alistair Mason
Miss Mary McKinnell
Rev Nicola Mills
Ms Lesley Platford
Mr Michael Price
Mrs Jane Selwyn Bailey

Aberdeen Laity Alternates

Mr John Palmer
Mr David R Crosley
Mrs Ginny Irvine-Fortescue

Argyll Clergy

Rev G Alexander Guinness
Rev Sister Clare Lockhart SC
Rev Simon Mackenzie
Very Rev Nicola McNelly
Very Rev Andrew Swift
Rev Terence Taggart

Argyll Laity

Ms Catriona Beel
Dr Geoff Headden
Dr Peter Kemp
Brig John Macfarlane
Mrs Christine McIntosh
Mr John Roberts

Argyll Laity Alternates

Dr Mac Armstrong
Ms Alison Clark
Mrs Maureen McKellar

Brechin Clergy

Very Rev Jeremy Auld
Very Rev Dr Francis Bridger
Rev Canon Fay Lamont
Rev David Mumford
Rev Canon Kirrilee A Reid
Rev Michael Turner

Brechin Clergy Alternate

Rev Samantha Ferguson

Brechin Laity

Mr Steven Cassells
Mr George Masson
Dr Cathy Mitchell
Mrs Judith Robinson
Mrs Vina Strachan
Mrs Karen Willey

Not attending 2015

Brechin Laity Alternate

Mr Gordon Aitken
Ms Lorne Heriot-Maitland

Attending 2015

Edinburgh Clergy

Rev Markus Duenzkofer
Rev Canon Anne C Dyer
Rev Canon Dean Fostekew
Rev Peter Harris
Rev Dr Stephen M Holmes
Rev Ruth Innes
Very Rev Susan Macdonald
Rev Canon Allan MacLean
Rev John M McLuckie
Rev David Richards
Rev Canon Prof John Richardson
Rev Willie Shaw
Rev Canon Fred Tomlinson
Rev Alison Wagstaff
Rev Dr Kenneth G Webb

Not attending 2015

Edinburgh Clergy Alternate

Rev Canon Ian Paton
Rev David McCarthy

Attending 2015

Attending 2015

Edinburgh Laity

Mrs Caroline Daye
Mrs Pamela Gordon
Mrs Pat Gordon
Mr Michael Green
Mrs Helen Hood
Mr Ian Kerry
Miss Sheila Kidney
Mrs Margaret Kieran
Mrs Ruth McGrath
Mrs Janet McKinnell
Mrs Rachel McLean
Mr Matthew Pemble
Mr Alex Stewart
Mr Neil Stewart
Mr Howard Thompson
Mrs Susan Ward

Not attending 2015

Not attending 2015

Edinburgh Laity Alternates

Mrs Pat Boyd
Ms Zoe van Zwanenberg

Attending 2015

Not attending 2015

Glasgow Clergy

Very Rev Ian D Barcroft
Rev Cedric Blakey
Rev Kirstin Freeman
Rev Paul Fletcher
Rev Dan Gafvert
Very Rev Kelvin Holdsworth
Rev John B M Macleod
Rev Canon Dr Scott Robertson
Rev Jane Ross
Rev Canon Drew Sheridan
Rev Dr Tom Wilson

Glasgow Clergy Alternates

Rev Canon Tom Montgomery
Rev Moira E Jamieson

Glasgow Laity

Mrs Lilian Bancroft
Mr Kennedy Fraser
Mr Jim Gibson
Mrs Margaret Hanley
Mr Graeme Hely
Mr Richard Horrell
Mrs Carol Lovett
Dr Beth Routledge
Mr Alan Rumble
Miss Jenny Whelan
Mrs Linda Whitby

Glasgow Laity Alternates

Miss Trudy Hill
Mrs Susi Cormack-Brown
Mrs Anne P Jones
Mr John Mitchell

Moray Clergy

Rev Christine Mylne
Rev Sarah Murray
Rev Canon Cliff Piper
Rev Pamela Shinkins
Rev Canon Alison Simpson
Rev Jenny Sclater

Moray Clergy Alternate

Rev Canon Kathy Collins

Attending 2015

Moray Laity

Mr Iain Foyers

Mr Colin Gregory

Mrs Norma Higgott

Mrs Jane McDowall

Not attending 2015

Mr Christopher Phillips

Mrs Jenna Shaw

Mr Grant Swain

Moray Laity Alternate

Mr Michael Campbell

Attending 2015

St Andrews Clergy

Rev Canon Paddy Allen

Very Rev Hunter Farquharson

Not attending 2015

Rev Christine Fraser

Rev Canon Richard Grosse

Rev Canon Dr Bob Harley

Rev Prof Trevor Hart

Rev Canon Dominic Ind

Rev Canon Alison Peden

Very Rev Kenneth Rathband

St Andrews Clergy Alternates

Rev David Mackenzie Mills

Rev Nick Green

St Andrews Laity

Mr Drew Corrigan

Mr James Gardner

Mr Brendan Grimley

Mrs Nan Kennedy

Not attending 2015

Mrs Shirley Mann

Mrs Ruth Warmer

Prof Alan Werritty

Mrs Sue White

St Andrews Laity Alternates

Mr Alastair Williamson

Mr Alan Thornton

Attending 2015

Mr David Stacey

SCOTTISH EPISCOPAL CHURCH

REPRESENTATION ON OTHER BODIES/ORGANISATIONS

There follows a list of current representatives appointed to represent the Scottish Episcopal Church on a variety of other bodies and organisations.

Most positions are held by volunteers but in a few cases the SEC is represented by staff members and the list is annotated to show this.

Vacancies arise from time to time in the positions in question and if you have an interest in serving in any of the areas in question, please make your interest known to the General Synod Office.

John F Stuart
Secretary General
April 2015

SCOTTISH EPISCOPAL CHURCH

REPRESENTATION ON OTHER BODIES/ORGANISATIONS - APRIL 2015

Body/Organisation	Representative	Appointing Body	Start Date* *No Fixed Term Date
ABERLOUR CHILDCARE TRUST	Vacant	Mission & Ministry Board	
ANGLICAN COMMUNION			
Anglican Consultative Council	John Stuart ¹	Standing Committee	2005-16
Anglican Communion Networks and Commissions: -			
Family Network	John Rea	Mission & Ministry Board	2007*
Environmental Network	Alan Werritty, Bishop of St Andrews (Episcopal Rep)	Mission & Ministry Board College of Bishops	2003* 2008*
International Refugee and Migrant Network	Rev Donald Reid	College of Bishops	2012*
Network for Interfaith Concerns and for the Anglican Communion	Vacant	CRPOF	
Peace and Justice Network	Angela Daye	Overseas Committee	2010*
Women's Network	Emily Alldritt	Mission & Ministry Board	2014*
Youth Network	Sarah Tomlinson	Provincial Youth Network	2004*
ACTS (Action of Churches Together in Scotland)			
Trustee Board	Helen Hood	Faith and Order Board	2008-15
Members' Meeting	Bishop of Aberdeen and Orkney Rev Canon John Lindsay (Alternate) Elspeth Davey ²	Faith and Order Board	2013 2013
Ecumenical Development Group	Rev Canon John Lindsay Elspeth Davey ³	Faith and Order Board	2011 2004*
Education	Mrs Pat Boyd	Church in Society	2005*
Finance Committee	Mr Nick Cooke	ACTS	2014*
Scottish Churches Racial Justice Group	Vacant	Church in Society	
Scottish Churches' Rural Group	Rev Prof David Atkinson (acting)	Home Mission Committee	2012
Working with Children in the Community Care Group	Ian Findlay	Home Mission Committee	2010
CAIRS (Churches Agency for Interfaith Relations in Scotland)	Vanessa Stark	CRPOF	2009*

¹ Standing Committee appointed the Secretary General on the recommendation of the previous representative.

² Church Relations Officer appointed as third SEC Representative. The position is non-voting. Officer presence helpful because of general overview of ecumenical relations.

³ Since this is the successor to the body which previously oversaw Local Ecumenical Partnerships throughout Scotland, it is appropriate that the Church Relations Officer, as the ecumenical officer for the SEC, should also participate in this. This is mirrored in appointments from other denominations.

Body/Organisation	Representative	Appointing Body	Start Date* *No Fixed Term Date
CEAS (formerly Scottish Sunday School Union)	Lorraine Darlow	Home Mission Committee	2015*
CHURCH OF ENGLAND/METHODIST CHURCH			
Joint Implementation Commission 2	Rev Canon Prof John Richardson	Faith and Order Board	2008*
CHRISTIAN AID SCOTTISH COMMITTEE	Elizabeth Doig	Mission & Ministry Board	2012*
CHURCH OF SCOTLAND			
Church Art and Architecture	Rebecca Cadie Alex Stewart (Alternate)	Buildings Committee	2008* 2005*
Church in Society Council	Vacant	Church in Society	
CTBI (Churches Together in Britain and Ireland)			
CRJN (Churches Racial Justice Network)	Rev Timothy Njuguna	Church in Society	2008*
Church and Society	Vacant	Church in Society	
Consultative Group on Ministry Among Children	Lorraine Darlow	Home Mission Committee	2013*
Senior Representatives Forum	John Stuart ⁴	ex officio Secretary General	2007
Global Mission Network	Rev Eileen Thompson	Overseas Committee	2008
FAITH IN COMMUNITY SCOTLAND	Very Rev Ian Barcroft	Mission & Ministry Board	2011*
FAITH IN COMMUNITY SCOTLAND ACTION FUND	Rev Canon Fay Lamont	Church in Society (annual reappointment)	2001
GLENALMOND COUNCIL	Primus Bishop of Glasgow and Galloway	ex officio College of Bishops	2014*
INTERFAITH GROUP ON DOMESTIC VIOLENCE	Rev Dr Elizabeth Koepping	Church in Society	2012
INTER-FAITH SCOTLAND	Rev John Conway	CRPOF	2014*
JOINT FAITHS ADVISORY BOARD ON CRIMINAL JUSTICE	Rev Paul Romano Rev Canon Duncan McCosh	Church in Society	2006* 2012*
MEISSEN COMMISSION (Celtic Churches Observer)	Currently held by Church in Wales	Inter-Church Relations Committee	
MISSION TO SEAFARERS	Bishop of Brechin	College of Bishops	2012*
NHS SPIRITUAL CARE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE	Rev Carrie Applegath Sister Clare Lockhart (Alternate)	College of Bishops	2004* 2006
PARTNERSHIP FOR WORLD MISSION	Gill Young	Overseas Committee	3 Years
PORVOO CONTACT GROUP	Elsbeth Davey ⁵	Inter-Church Relations Committee	2003*

⁴ The Forum comprises senior denominational officers *ex officio*.

⁵ Officer appointed on the recommendation of previous Contact Group representative. Officer well placed within the denomination to act as liaison point with the Porvoo Communion.

Body/Organisation	Representative	Appointing Body	Start Date* *No Fixed Term Date
REUILLY CONTACT GROUP	Very Rev Alexander Gordon	Inter-Church Relations Committee	2005*
SCOTLAND4PEACE STEERING GROUP	Very Rev David Mumford	Church in Society	2008*
SCOTTISH CHURCHES COMMITTEE	John Whittall John Stuart ⁶	Admin Board	2013* 1996*
SCOTTISH CHURCHES COMMITTEE SAFEGUARDING GROUP	Donald Urquhart/ Daphne Audsley	Ex officio	2007*
SCOTTISH CHURCHES HERITAGE RESEARCH	Richard Fawcett	Buildings Committee	2005*
SCOTTISH CHURCHES HOUSING ACTION	Joe Cassidy	Church in Society	2009*
SCHA Affordable Housing Group	Elliot Glen-esk	Buildings Committee	2012
SCOTTISH CHURCHES PARLIAMENTARY OFFICE			
Advisory Group	Elspeth Davey	Church in Society	2006*
SCOTTISH JOINT COMMITTEE FOR RELIGIOUS AND MORAL EDUCATION	Patricia Boyd	Church in Society	2003*
SCOTTISH PILGRIM ROUTES FORUM	Margaret Pedersen	Home Mission Committee	2013*
SCOTTISH STAINED GLASS SYMPOSIUM	Edwina Proudfoot	Building Committee	2012*
UNITY ENTERPRISE	Rev Les Ireland	Church in Society	2013*
US COUNCIL	Rev Eileen Thompson John Rea	Overseas Committee	2007 2008
WORLD COUNCIL OF CHURCHES ASSEMBLY	Elspeth Davey John Lindsay	Faith and Order Board	for 2013 Only
WORLD DAY OF PRAYER (Scottish Committee)	Rev Jeanette Allan	College of Bishops	2012
WORK PLACE CHAPLAINCY SCOTLAND	Vacant	Mission & Ministry Board	

⁶ Much of the agenda of the Committee deals with issues of a legal/regulatory nature. The two SEC representatives have traditionally comprised one officer and one other.

ATTENDANCE SLIP

GENERAL SYNOD 2015

Name: _____

Diocese: _____

PLEASE PUT THIS IN THE BOX PROVIDED AT THE SYNOD

GENERAL SYNOD 2015

TRAVEL AND MEALS CLAIM FORM

Travel:

£

_____ miles at 45p/mile
Public Transport (receipts must be attached)

Overnight Accommodation:

Bed and Breakfast only:

_____ nights at £_____ (up to max of £65 per night)
(receipts must be attached)

Dinner, Bed and Breakfast:

_____ nights at £_____ (up to a max of £75 per night)
(receipts must be attached)

TOTAL COSTS**Offset by:**

Synod Dinner (payable by all members attending the dinner) _____ (27.00)

Balance due to/from Scottish Episcopal Church (delete as necessary) _____

Name (please print): _____

Address: _____

Payment of any net sum due by Scottish Episcopal Church will be by cheque or electronic bank transfer. If you wish payment to be made by bank transfer, please indicate as follows:

Either: Use my bank details already provided to General Synod Office***Or:** Use the following bank details*:

* Delete as appropriate

Account in the name of: _____

Bank sort code: _____

Bank account number: _____

Email address: _____

Signed: _____

Date: _____

(see notes overleaf)

NOTES:

- 1 Please ensure that this form is returned to the General Synod Office, 21 Grosvenor Crescent, Edinburgh, EH12 5EE, with remittance (if due) no later than 1 July 2015. (Cheques should be made payable to the Scottish Episcopal Church).
- 2 If you have decided not to claim expenses, please return the form marked accordingly.
- 3 Please state if attending as an alternate.
- 4 Notification of payment of expenses made by electronic transfer will be sent by email.

GENERAL SYNOD 2015

FEEDBACK FORM

The Standing Committee values the comments of General Synod Members on the operation of the General Synod. If you have any comments, which you would like to have considered by the Standing Committee, you are invited to complete this Feedback Form and place it in the box at the exit when you leave after the final session of this General Synod. If you wish to make additional comments there is space at the end of the Feedback Form for that purpose. The Feedback Form can be submitted anonymously.

Please **CIRCLE** your multiple choice response and **PRINT** any other information

- | | | | |
|---|--------------|----------------|-----------------|
| 1. Sessions were generally chaired competently and clearly | AGREE | NEUTRAL | DISAGREE |
| 2. I would prefer more time in Synod to be given over to decision making rather than presentations of information | AGREE | NEUTRAL | DISAGREE |
| 3. I appreciated the worship at General Synod | AGREE | NEUTRAL | DISAGREE |
| 4. I liked the layout used for the Opening Eucharist | AGREE | NEUTRAL | DISAGREE |
| 5. I consider the Forum style meetings a good use of the lunchtime break | AGREE | NEUTRAL | DISAGREE |
| I attended a lunchtime Forum meeting | | YES | NO |
| Thursday | | YES | NO |
| Friday | | YES | NO |

6. I would have liked to have seen the following on the agenda:

7. If I could make *one change* to the way General Synod meets it would be:

8. I enjoyed the General Synod Dinner	YES	NO
9. My Diocese held a pre-Synod meeting	YES	NO
10. I attended my Diocese's pre-Synod meeting	YES	NO
11. I am a new member of General Synod	YES	NO
12. My Diocese allocated me a "Buddy"	YES	NO

I am from the Diocese of

- Aberdeen & Orkney
- Argyll & the Isles
- Brechin
- Edinburgh
- Glasgow & Galloway
- Moray, Ross & Caithness
- St Andrews, Dunkeld & Dunblane

I am a member of the House of

- Laity
- Clergy
- Bishops

If you would like to include your contact details: name, address, e-mail then please use the space below:

Thank you for completing the Feedback Form.
Please remember to put it in the box at the exit before you leave for home on Saturday.
If you have any further comments you wish to make please do so in the space below:

