Introduction

In Danish popular understanding, ‘saints’ are people who are already active in church and part of a tight community. In this understanding, we perceive ‘saints’ as special and stronger Christians. They are active in church and attend worship on Sundays. Most of both the English and the Danes visit church less often, if ever. Societies include both the minority active in close church communities, and the majority going from occasional use to no use of the church at all. This chapter discusses whether the old majority churches want to keep on being churches for all people in their societies, even those who might not feel related to church. The churches’ reactions to the public debates on same-sex marriages in church show which factors are crucial in determining the future course of an old majority church intertwined with society.

Citizens in the countries of Northern Europe are on average positive towards same-sex marriage (Lindberg 2016). Attitudes towards same-sex marriages have also changed in Britain. Siobhan McAndrew shows using British Social Attitudes data (1989–2014) that resistance towards same-sex marriages in Britain has fallen from 70 percent among people identifying with the Church of England in 1989, down to less than 30 percent in the same group. Among people identifying with ‘no religion,’ the same numbers have fallen from 50 percent resistance to 10 percent in the same period (British Religion in Numbers, 2017). In Denmark, 68 percent of the population supports same-sex marriages in church (YouGov/ Centre for Church Research 2015). The public debate on civil same-sex marriages in several countries (Bóasdóttir 2012) has raised a new complex of problems for churches. The gap between popular and official church understanding of human sexuality challenges the two old national churches of England and Denmark.

Since the Reformation, we see an intertwinement of these majority churches and their nation states (Christoffersen 2006). The churches are covering their countries through geographical parishes. The Church of England has a territorial presence through its 12,557
parishes and 16,000 parish churches. Likewise, the Danish folk church is an established church present in the whole country, having 2,123 parishes and 2,354 church buildings. Every parish in both countries has at least one parish church and most often a churchyard surrounding it. The parishes and their ministers serve the whole community. We call these churches by law established churches (Christoffersen 2006).

Given their embeddedness in nation states, one might expect the Church of England and the Danish folk church to adapt to societal changes. With same-sex marriages, the churches chose another path. The churches’ reactions reveal their view on how to be a proper church today; they reveal their ecclesiological identities. I place the churches on a continuum going from ecclesial to societal church, using sociologist of religion Linda Woodhead’s concepts of ecclesial and societal church. Woodhead’s concepts are helpful in explaining the consequences of the churches’ decisions on same-sex marriages. The processes described here show how the Church of England and the Danish folk church negotiate their ecclesiological identities, and who has the power to pull the church in an ecclesial or societal direction.

I work in a method combining Hegstad (2013), Percy (2010), and the new Nordic wave of ecclesiology and ethnography (Leth-Nissen 2018). Data for the analysis include qualitative source studies (2010–2016), as well as quantitative data on church attendance and lay engagement in church.

The Church of England reacted to civil same-sex marriages in the way Woodhead (2016) predicted, increasing a clerical and authoritarian identity. The responses and briefings of the church show how the Church of England is pulling in an ecclesial direction, thus widening the gap between the British society and the Church of England. The Danish folk church has negotiated same-sex marriages in church for decades, setting inner-church unity over the church–people relationship. Parliament functions as the formal Synod of the church and it settled the matter by introducing same-sex marriages in the church in 2012. The lengthy debate has most likely wounded the church’s relationship to the people.

Context, state-of-the-art, concepts, and methods

The Church of England: power structures and change

The gap between the Church of England and British society has been widening since the start of the 20th century. In 1917, a court judgement ruled that the law of England was not Christian. In 1919, Parliament made a partial disestablishment of the Church of England when it placed Church legislation (Canon Law) in the Church Assembly (Brown and Woodhead 2016, p. 51). The Church Assembly transformed into the General Synod in 1970 and has three Houses, the House of Bishops, the House of Clergy, and the House of Laity. Peers elect the bishops and clergy for the two clerical houses. However, Parliament kept control of canon law, as all three Houses of Parliament need to agree to pass new measures. Thus, Parliament is sovereign and works as the actual governing body.

The Anglican Communion is taking part in informal negotiations on change, too. The highest body of the Communion is the Primates meetings, comprising the ‘chiefs,’ the archbishops or equivalents from the 39 provinces of the Communion. Almost every decade, the Archbishop of the Church of England calls a Lambeth conference for discussion on church matters relevant to the whole Communion. The Primates meetings and the Lambeth conferences has no binding authority on member churches.
The debate on female ordination widened the gap even further. A 1975 report found that there were no theological constraints to female clergy. For years, Church of England preferred tradition and male headship to the equality for women, following developments in society. The Church of England accepted female deacons from 1987, and female ministers from 1992, with the first ordination in 1994 (Shaw 2014). The church accepted female bishops in 2014 (Encyclopedia Britannica 2017).

The debate on homosexuality widened the gap, too. A power struggle during the 1980s between the church parties of the liberals and the conservative Evangelicals left the conservatives in power. As a result, the Church of England continued to ignore the needs of homosexual people for recognition by the church (Brown and Woodhead 2016, p. 56). In 1991, the bishops used a new distinction in their own statement on homosexuality. Homosexuality was acceptable for lay people. However, active homosexual clergy was intolerable and only celibacy would make homosexual clergy able to stay in church (Shaw 2014, p. 348).

Table 11.1 shows how the values gap has widened between society and the Church of England.

During the same period, there has been a declining use of rites of passage. With baptism as the example, the English baptized half their children in the Church of England in around 1900. Today the figure is around 12 percent. Affiliation is down to 28 percent of the population, with 1.7 percent of the Electoral Roll as formal members. Sunday attendance is around 1.3 percent (Table 11.2).

These examples show that the relationship between English society and the Church of England is unstable. The power of changing the church’s direction lies with the General Synod of the Church of England and it has until now favored inter-church unity over staying a societal church. Within the Communion, a widening gap between liberal and traditionalist views of homosexuality is threatening to split the Communion. From 2008, alternative Anglican bodies claimed to represent the ‘true Anglicans’ who condemn homosexuality (Sachs 2017, p. 113).

**Table 11.1** Model of the gap between English society and the Church of England.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English society</th>
<th>Values in 1900</th>
<th>Values in 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Church of England</td>
<td>Conservative, patriarchal</td>
<td>Conservative, patriarchal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 11.2** Relationship between population, affiliates, and governing bodies of the Church of England.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Church of England</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General population</td>
<td>62,756,200</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliated to the Church of England</td>
<td>17,571,736</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electoral Roll members</td>
<td>1,044,400</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday attendance</td>
<td>827,200</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Danish folk church: power structures and change

In the Danish constitution of 1849, the church went from being the church of the King to being ‘the Danish folk church, governed by law’ (Christoffersen 2017). The Ministry of Church Affairs administers the daily business of the church and brings forward new developments. As church legislation is part of the Danish body of common laws, the Parliament initiates and passes new legislation for the church. Thus, the Danish folk church has no synod. When issues are strong in the public debate both inside and outside the church, the Minister of Church Affairs names a committee for a report on the matter, with members representing various church parties and other stakeholders as the clergy’s union, the bishops, university theologians, and the parish councils.

Through the 20th century, the folk church has followed the general developments of society. Parliament approved female ordination in 1947, and in 1948, the Danish folk church was the first church to ordain a female minister (Præstholm 2014, p. 93). However, the issue of homosexuality has haunted the Danish folk church for decades. Homosexual clergy experienced hardship, and the church has debated the issue in the open since the 1970s (Præstholm 2013). In 1989, Denmark became the world’s first country to approve legal civil partnerships. Then, the possibility of having same-sex marriages sparked a major debate among the three church parties, which has been going on ever since (Table 11.3).

The Danish folk church still has 77 percent of the population as formal members, with baptism as the ritual turning you into a member. Some 64 percent of infants are baptized (2015). The Danish folk church accepts that the people are not active in church and have no obligation of activity connected to membership. Church attendance is around 2 percent, around 114,000 per Sunday (Table 11.4).

The examples show that the relationship between the people and the church is rather stable in Denmark.

Method

I am inspired by the descriptive ecclesiology of theologian Harald Hegstad in his The Real Church (2013), seeking the ‘real church’ instead of the ‘ideal church.’ I follow theologian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 11.3 Model of the gap between Danish society and the Danish folk church.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Japanese society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservative, patriarchal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Danish folk church</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 11.4 Relationship between population, affiliates, and governing bodies of the Danish folk church.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Danish folk church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal members of the Danish folk church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday attendance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Martyn Percy’s pursuit of the *implicit theology* of the church (Percy 2010, p. 4). Percy argues that we must research ‘the hybridity of culture and theology’ within the church (2010, p. 7).

I conduct comparative ecclesiology as in many of the new approaches on ecclesiology and ethnography, using document sources, quantitative statistics, and survey data. The method in the field comprises a rather broad social sciences approach and makes room for experiments.\(^{15}\)

**Theory: the concepts of ecclesial and societal church**

For the analysis of the churches’ reactions to debates on same-sex marriages, I use Woodhead’s (forthcoming) concepts of *societal* and *ecclesial* church. Woodhead describes the churches as societal churches (forthcoming) in her analysis of the changes in the seven old majority churches of Northern Europe. Building on theologian and philosopher of religion Ernst Troeltsch’s (1911) concepts of ‘church type’ or ‘sectarian type’ of Christianity, Woodhead views church as a cultural institution in a national setting, and places churches on a continuum between societal and ecclesial church. A societal church focuses on being the salt of the earth, being present everywhere for everybody. It has a national presence in places, institutions, and, above all, in existentially open situations. Societal church wants the church to come to the people. In contrast, ecclesial church focuses on being the light of the world, and emphasizes *tradition*, *order*, a *congregational church*, and *church attendance*. Ecclesial church wants the people to come to the church (Woodhead forthcoming).

A societal church is tied to the state, the nation, and the society. Both the Church of England and the Danish folk church have exceptional positions in the states as the by-law established churches. By name they connect to the national identity as they are ‘of the nation’ (Church of England) or ‘of the people’ (Danish folk church). Earlier, being a citizen meant being baptized (Leth-Nissen 2018, p. 7; Woodhead forthcoming). The two churches connect to their societies through many ‘insertion points’ as chaplains in various sectors as prisons, military, schools, and health, or through a multitude of local community events having the local church as a driving force or participant (Woodhead forthcoming; Leth-Nissen 2018, p. 14). The Church of England has 1,415 chaplains (Report on Church of England chaplaincy 2014, p. 8). Chaplains make up 11 percent of all the clergy (2014).\(^{16}\) In Denmark, out of 2,200 full-time minister positions, one-sixth are chaplains in schools, hospitals, the army, and more (Leth-Nissen 2018, pp. 107–108).

With more pluralism, we gain a differentiation of cultural identities and a following de-differentiation of secular and religious spheres. Woodhead has described how the churches react to the individual-level tendency to mix religion, becoming ‘increasingly clerical and authoritarian’ (Woodhead 2016, p. 46). Woodhead concludes that societal churches who try to be ecclesial ‘end up alienating their core support’ (Woodhead forthcoming).

**Substantive discussion**

The question of same-sex marriages evoked heated debates within the organizations of both the Church of England and the Danish folk church.

**The Church of England: the price of inter-church unity**

In Britain, Parliament introduced civil partnership under Common Law in 2005, and in 2012, the government wanted to introduce equal access to marriage for same-sex couples. The British government consultation on same-sex marriages in 2012 stated that the
government did ‘not think that the ban on same-sex couples getting married should continue.’ A listening exercise had found that same-sex couples suffered in the then situation and this was the basis of the consultation (Equal marriage: a consultation 2012, p. 1). The Church of England responded, as did 228,000 others. This was the highest number of responses to a government consultation ever, and a majority of the responses wanted religious same-sex marriage to be possible, even though the consultation proposed only a civil same-sex marriage (Equal marriage: The Government’s response 2012, p. 6).

After discussions in the Archbishops’ council and the House of Bishops, the Church of England’s response came from the Archbishops, and it recommended that the government left the issue and stayed with civil partnership only (Church of England response 2012). In the response, the Church of England emphasized that there is no ban on same-sex marriages. The arguments of the response had ethical, biblical, judicial, and procreational aspects, the strongest argument being the judicial, as Canon Law cannot be in conflict with Common Law. In Canon Law, marriage is between a man and a woman (Canon B30). The Common Law (Marriage Act 1949) says all residents of a parish, ‘irrespective of his or her religious affiliation’ has the right to marry in the parish church (Church of England response 2012, p. 6). Canon Law cannot be contrary to the laws of the realm. Thus, a new law redefining marriage would force Canon Law to change. On top of this, the Church of England feared a court case on discrimination if the Bill passed in this manner. If same-sex marriage were to be allowed for all, then religious same-sex marriage would also be allowed for all (Church of England response 2012, p. 8). Thus, the Church of England argued, the proposal had to change to protect the church. The other arguments argued that this legislation would harm ‘the common good’ of society and that marriage is about complementarity and children.

Instead of rejecting equal marriage, the government drew up a bill for reading in the Houses of Parliament. The government’s response stated an explicit respect for Canon Law although the Parliament is sovereign to Canon Law. To protect the Church of England and other faith communities from conducting marriages against their theologies, the government introduced a ‘quadruple lock.’ The ‘lock’ has four elements:

A) No religious organizations or individual ministers can be compelled to conduct same-sex marriages or let these happen on their premises.
B) They can only do so if they expressly opt-in to the possibility of conducting same-sex marriages.
C) Amending the Equality Act of 2010 ensures that religious organisations are not discriminated.

The Church of England tried to influence the MPs of the House of Commons and House of Lords by directing briefings to the MPs before the second and the third Readings in the Houses (Church of England Third Reading Briefing 2013). The briefings insisted on the ‘quadruple lock’ in the legislation as crucial to protect the Church of England, but aimed at a full rejection of the bill. Church of England failed, and both Houses approved the bill on 16 July 2013. It received Royal Assent by the Queen the following day.

The whole process shows that the Church of England wants to prescribe how people should live their lives. The response and briefings contain arguments that date back to 1900.
By then, the Church of England was a major influencer. English society and the Church of England built on the same foundations of patriarchal values and paternalism. Thus, the Church of England was at ease with keeping up and celebrating the lives of the English people (Brown and Woodhead 2016, p. 69).

As ministers and bishops cannot be active homosexuals (because of the Higton motion), chances are that the share of homosexual clergy is lower than the average in the population. If so, a vote in favor of same-sex marriages in the General Synod may be even less likely.

The House of Laity comprises lay people who are all Church of England members on the Electoral Roll and are voted in by their local deanery synod. Thus, the House of Laity comprises the church’s active people and not the broad Anglican laity. For a comparison of the active laypeople and the broad laity, the share of lay members on governing boards of the Church of England amounts to 150,300 or 0.2 percent.

The connection between the Church of England and the people is not strong. Lay people have a low influence on the direction of the church. These lay people are special from the general population, since they are active in the church. The Church of England’s governing bodies have the power to change the church, but they only represent a small group of the affiliates and an even smaller share of the general population.

The responses and briefings on same-sex marriages from the Church of England show that the church still perceives itself as a major influencer. However, the government seems to have long seen that the church is not present in people’s lives anymore, and made their decisions in accordance with this. The ‘quadruple lock’ seemed like a way of silencing the Church of England.

The data on use of church, affiliation, and power structure show that the Church of England is becoming a more ecclesial church, providing activities for only a small faithful group of people. This takes all the power out of the ‘common good’ argument of the Church of England because of the contradiction between having ecclesial characteristics and caring for the common good of society. Here, the Church of England seems split between a previous societal identity and a still more ecclesial identity.

Although the Church of England moves in an ecclesial direction, the Anglican Communion still struggles with the issue of homosexuality. The Episcopal Church of USA issued a ritual for same-sex marriage in 2016. As a reaction, the Anglican Communion suspended the Episcopal Church at the Lambeth Primates conference in 2016. The suspension emphasizes the challenge of being a church in a Western context but part of a global communion.

*The Danish folk church: the price of inner-church unity*

Denmark has had a civil partnership act since 1989, and for years, the bishops and the church parties have debated the possibility of a blessing in church. The Danish bishops formed a committee in 1995 and produced a report in 1997 on blessings and civil partnerships. Here they state that civil partnership differs from marriage. An explicit argument against a church ritual for same-sex couples was the broad national and church resistance (Report of the committee of the Minister of Church Affairs on Danish folk church and civil partnership, 2010, p. 27). All organizations of the conservative church party ‘Inner Mission’ criticized the bishops’ committee and formed a counter-committee. Their counter report, also from 1997, found no biblical theological foundation for blessings or prayer for same-sex couples (ibid., p. 28). In 2005, the bishops still found no common agreement on the issue. A group of six bishops with the Bishop of Greenland issued
guidelines for blessings of civil partnerships. This group of bishops emphasized that after the harsh debate of the recent years the church had to speak up on this issue. With their issuing of the guidelines for blessings, they wanted to distance themselves and the church from condemnations of homosexuals (ibid., p. 27).

The discussion on same-sex marriage in church was an issue in Parliament from 2004. The political parties discussed whether to make a law for same-sex marriage in church before the church asked for it, or to wait for the church to ask (ibid., p. 29). In 2009, the Minister appointed members for a committee on same-sex marriages. He chose the members from amongst the largest stakeholders in the Danish folk church. The committee represented all church parties (Inner Mission, The Grundtvigians, and Tidelhverv). Besides these, members were theological advisers from Aarhus University and the University of Copenhagen, and representatives of the National Association of Parish Councils, the ministers’ association, and the bishops (ibid., p. 6). In their 2010 committee report, the arguments on the issue were several. Biblical interpretation supported the tradition that marriage is between a man and a woman. The committee acknowledged that the patterns of family life are changing (ibid., p. 32). A sociological argument was the increasing popular perception of same-sex couples, also among clergy of the Danish folk church (ibid., p. 34). The report discussed the theological aspects of the unity of the church. As the official creed of the Danish folk church, the Augsburg Confession states that the true unity of the church rests on ‘the gospel rightly preached and the sacraments duly administered’ (CA VII). Thus, a majority of the committee found that homosexuality falls outside the Confession. Thus, diverging stances on the issue will not harm church unity (ibid., p. 34). The majority declared that same-sex partnerships do not have a Christian past and tradition, but they would not declare homosexuality a sin. A same-sex partnership should be within the teachings of the Bible and be possible to integrate the theology and the church. The Bible and the tradition says that a marriage must be between a man and a woman. Thus, a gender-neutral ritual would harm the perception of marriage (ibid., p. 34).

The 12 members could not reach an end agreement. In the Ministerial report of 2010, nine members agreed that a blessing of a civil partnership should be possible in church. Six members wanted same-sex partnerships to be possible in church through a new ritual parallel to the marriage ritual. Eleven members agreed that marriage should still be between a man and a woman, while same-sex rituals should be partnerships (ibid., pp. 36–39). The following consultation showed that half of the bishops favored the church blessing, half a legal binding ritual. In March 2011, the Minister of Church Affairs from the political Conservative party prepared a bill based on the report. He aimed at a parallel ritual, not a change of the whole marriage law, since this was the wish of the church.

In October 2011, the power of Parliament changed to the Social Democrats, the Socialist Folk Party, and the Radical Party. The new government’s platform said, ‘The government will lift the ban on marriage of homosexuals in the Danish folk church.’ In parallel to the English case, the word ‘ban’ was controversial since it has never been a ban but just not a possibility. When the Minister of Church Affairs lined up a proposal, it was for a change of the whole marriage law and went beyond the report and consultations. On the proposal, he held a public consultation on the Parliaments’ promises. Following this, the Minister drew up a bill and on 12 June 2012 Parliament approved the law (Law no. 532 of 12/06/2012), together with new legislation guaranteeing the church ministers their individual freedom to refuse to perform the ritual. Four days after, eight out of ten bishops issued guidelines for rituals for both same-sex marriages and blessings (Præstholm 2014, p. 115).
The reluctance in taking a stand may have made many people lose their patience with the folk church. The withdrawals from church reached a new high in 2012 with over 21,000 members resigning. Some 12,000 of these left church before the approval of the law and they may have left in haste. It also disturbed the unity of the church although only seven ministers left the church after the new law. The process shows that Parliament has the power to keep the folk church societal. Lay people on the governing boards of the folk church amount to 12,922 or 0.2 percent of the general population and have no direct influence on the direction of the church.

Conclusion

This chapter has shown how issues on human sexuality challenge on one side, the unity of a global church community such as the Anglican Communion. On the other side, the issue challenges the bond between a national church and its population. The changing liberal attitudes towards homosexuality are at the core of this dilemma, as the changes are more evident in the Global North than in the Global South (Bóasdóttir 2012; Lindberg 2016).

In this case, the introduction of same-sex marriage in Britain caused a decade-long struggle between church parties in the Church of England. The British population favored the introduction of same-sex marriage and hoped for the church to introduce it, too. In the end, the Church of England chose to keep peace with the Anglican Communion and not challenge the member churches of the Global South. Instead, the Church of England further alienated the church from the British people and widened the already considerable gap between people and church. The Church of England pulls in an ecclesial direction, wanting the church to be the light of the people. There is a risk that the British population with this development has given up on the Church of England and ignores any light it might try to shine.

In Denmark, the Danish folk church is closely connected to Danish society, and has no formal bonds to other church communities outside Denmark. As in Britain, the Danish population favored the introduction of same-sex marriage in church. However, the bishops and the church parties favored inner-church unity over staying a societal church, and would not recommend establishing equal marriage. Thus, the folk church hesitated and harmed its relationship with the general population. In 2012, Parliament passed legislation making equal marriage possible in church and a majority of the bishops issued guidelines for same-sex marriage in church the following week.

Here, the absence of a church synod keeps the Danish folk church in line with Danish society as Parliament takes the heavy decisions on behalf of the church. Although inner-church discussions had been heated on the issue, things calmed down once the legislation had been passed by Parliament. The Danish folk church stayed a societal church, wanting to be the salt of the earth.

The case also shows that in high-profile issues, the Danish people have the power of the Danish folk church, as the synod is actually the Parliament. This makes sense, as 75 percent of the Danish population are members of the church.

On same-sex marriage, the theological arguments of the Church of England and the Danish folk church were the same during the processes of 2010 to 2013. The arguments said that marriage according to the Bible and tradition is between a man and a woman. Thus, the church cannot redefine marriage and same-sex couples should have a parallel ritual not called marriage.

In the end, it was not theology, but the difference in power structures and power of the church parties that turned same-sex marriage into a reality in the Danish folk church but not in the Church of England.
The Danish folk church is weak in relation to the people. This keeps its ties to the people strong. The Church of England is stronger in relation to the British people and chooses unity in church over unity with the people. This wears down its ties to the British people.

Further research on the issues of church identity and power structures should look into whether the Church of England is changing towards an ecclesial church. Because of a shift in power between the church parties, the General Synod was instrumental in stopping same-sex marriages in the Church of England, as it has directed the Church of England on the issue on homosexuality since 1987. Further perspectives to explain the power shift in the Church of England would include analyses of resolutions of the Lambeth conferences of 1978, 1988, 1998 and 2008 as well as an analysis on the cases of openly homosexual ministers Gene Robinson and Jeffrey Johns. It would be fruitful to examine also the issues of polygamy and divorce, which Lambeth agreed the member churches could treat as local issues.

At the same time, research into the agency of church ministers would add new aspects to our knowledge on the future of the Church of England. Within the 2012 debate on same-sex marriages, the actors were the Parliament, the General Synod, and the Anglican Communion. How do church ministers relate to the discussions and decisions, being the direct representatives of the church to the British people?

Because of the governance structure of the Danish folk church, the church parties did not have the power to stop a change in the marriage law. Further questions for research in the Danish folk church would clarify whether the folk church for the sake of inner-church unity pulls towards a more ecclesial church. Further research should analyse the 2015 committee report on governance models for the folk church and compare it to synodal governance models in the other Northern European majority churches.

Notes
3 The House of Commons, the House of Lords, and the House of Bishops.
5 Church activists took the House of Laity hostage. It then turned into the forum of a crucial debate on homosexuality. The Higton motion on homosexuality was passed, stating that sex can only be between a man and a woman, that homosexuality is a sin, and that church leadership should be exemplary in all matters including sexual morality (Brown and Woodhead 2016: 56). In 1989, the Osborne report was dismissed as being too liberal and was never published. It had only done what the resolutions of Lambeth 1978 and 1988 asked for (Shaw 2014: 348). But the Higton motion had changed the scene.
6 The document is called ‘Issues in Human Sexuality.’
skrivning [Accessed 12 March 2016]. Two% is 114,145.
befolkningsfremskrivning [Accessed 12 March 2016]. For a comparison of the different membership
models of the Church of England and the Danish folk church, see Friis Jensen and Leth-Nissen
(forthcoming).
15 For a thorough overview and discussion on ethnography and ecclesiology (see Leth-Nissen 2018,
pp. 53–54).
16 When you use figures of clergy full-, part-time-, and self-supporting clergy.
17 www.churchofengland.org/our-views/marriage,-family-and-sexuality-issues/same-sex-marriage/same-
18 ECtHR art. 12 on the right to marry and art. 14 on no discrimination.
19 Admission to the Roll is accepted for persons who are baptized, 16 years and up, residing in the
parish in question, and declaring to be a member of the Church of England. If not a resident of the
parish, being a regular worshipper in the parish church is an alternative way of admission. Being on
the Roll ensures eligibility as well as voting power for the Parochial Church Council. Church
church-representation-rules/part-i.aspx#ba2 [Accessed 22 March 2016].
20 2014. Calculation has been done with the kind help in both method and data of Bernard Silver-
man, Professor of Statistics, University of Oxford; Dr. Bev Botting, Head of Research and Statistics,
Archbishops’ Council; and Louise McFerran, senior statistical researcher at the Archbishops’ Coun-
cil. All details available from author.
21 www.archbishopofcanterbury.org//articles.php/5658/read-the-communique-from-the-primates-of-
the-anglican-communion [Accessed 29 February 2016].
22 Within the Danish folk church, views go from biblical literalism to a liberal and culture-open the-
2016].
25 Page 66 in Helle Thorning-Schmidt’s Government’s Platform: www.stm.dk/publikationer/Et_Dan
28 Statistics Denmark figures on withdrawals www.km.dk/folkekirken/kirkestatistik/ind-og-udmeldel
ser/arkiv/ [Accessed 18 November 2016]. The high number of withdrawals could also be because
in March the same year it became possible to withdraw via email.
29 2013. Homepage of National Association of Parochial Church Council Members www.menigheds
raad.dk/menighedsraadene/faqta-om-folkekirken/ [Accessed 4 March 2016].
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