

SPECIAL MEETING OF THE HOUSE OF BISHOPS 1972

adequately discharged. Again, the means for achieving this ultimate result must hinge on the personal style and strategy of each individual Presiding Bishop. Perhaps the person or small group mentioned above could assist in this regard.

ANNEX C

REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF BISHOPS, ON THE ORDINATION OF WOMEN

At the 1971 meeting of the House of Bishops, a resolution was presented by the Committee on Ministry (Bishop of Newark), in substance asking the House to state that it was "the mind of the House that it endorses the principle of the Ordination of Women to the Priesthood and of the Ordination and Consecration of Women to the Episcopate", and further asking the Committee on Canons to prepare the amendments necessary to establish this principle at the 1973 General Convention. After discussion, on motion, the matter was referred to a Special Committee of the House. It is now the privilege of that Committee to report.

We were not asked to make a specific proposal or proposals to the House for action, and we do not do so. A committee of seven Bishops is a small fraction of the House; and any attempt on our part to count our own noses and possibly emerge with some such verdict as "2 Yes/2 No/2 Wait/1 Undecided" would have been stultifying and useless to the House as a guide for action.

In our two meetings and in the various circulated drafts, we uncovered a surprising degree of unanimity among ourselves as to the considerations which seem to us the fundamental ones on which, in our judgment, the Church's decisions should be based. The differences among us as to the specific issues were clear; but we were in substantial agreement as to the main biblical and theological evidence which

must be considered in reaching any conclusion. We came to feel that our usefulness to the House might lie in a report which would sketch these fundamental considerations and thus perhaps provide a somewhat disciplined theater for debate and decision. In other words, what follows is mainly a discussion of the matters which all of us felt were the decisive elements in the debate. On these we were generally of one mind, even though we might differ quite sharply on what we should therefore do about the specific issues. The report is in four parts, dealing, respectively, with The Ministry; Scripture, Tradition and Images; Evangelism and Development; and A Penumbra of Practicalities.

I: The Ministry

A. The Diaconate is the one order of sacred ministers to which women are ordained, in our Church. That this is so no doubt reflects the fact that the diaconate, in the New Testament, seems clearly a ministry to which women were admitted (cf. Romans 16:1, Acts 9:36). By the time I Timothy (3:8-13) was written, the diaconate seems to be a recognized "holy order". St. Paul's use of the word *diakonos* for Phoebe may well not have echoed those more formalized overtones, but C. H. Dodd's comment is appropriate, that "we may fairly suppose that the order of deacons which emerges in the second century . . . had its origin in Paul's own time; and that it included women as well as men". (*The Epistle of Paul to the Romans*, p. 235).

The ministry of the deacon, as generally understood in the contemporary Church, is murky and confused. To some it is no more than a "one-armed priesthood"—a brief stepping-stone in a professional career. To others it seems almost indistinguishable from the ministry of a lay person, save for the privilege of reading the Gospel at public worship. Perhaps because of such confusion, the admission of women to this order has appeared to present few serious difficulties, particularly because the New Testament evidence supports it. The main exception to this is the resistance of some to the substitution of "deacon" for the

traditional "deaconess". In our mind, the fact that women are accepted as deacons is true to the New Testament evidence, and may well lead to a long-needed, fresh statement of the work of the ordained deacon. We think, however, that it bears only indirectly, if at all, on the present issue.

If the ordained diaconate is not merely a vestigial historical fragment, or an apprenticeship, it seems clearly to be a ministry of service. It may be distinguished from the service to which all Christians are called simply by intensity and by the authority and accountability conveyed in ordination, of which perhaps the liturgical privilege of reading the Gospel is a token. In Christian history, administration and teaching have been two ministries frequently associated with the diaconate. Further, the diaconate has also been closely associated with the Bishop. The liturgical aspects of the diaconate—baptism, administration of the Holy Communion, unction, *et al*—now tend to be blurred by the increasing participation of un-ordained persons in those functions. Should the diaconate be seen as primarily a work of advocacy of the poor, the sick, the dispossessed? All this enters into the Church's need for a fresh statement. But it is clear that the diaconate is a ministry for both men and women, with firm scriptural authority, which needs and deserves to be seen in its own unique terms, however they may be phrased. Yet we have not come to the core of the matter until we look at priesthood and episcopacy.

B. The Priesthood: What we say here about priesthood is a brief statement of a contemporary understanding of ordained priesthood which we generally share. The mystery of the priesthood far outruns any attempt to "describe" it. The New Testament seems to know of only one Priest, the Lord, in Whom the ancient High Priesthood of Israel culminates and is once for all fulfilled (Hebrews 5). The "Royal Priesthood" of I St. Peter 2:9 is derivative from Christ's High Priesthood—it refers to the ministry of loving service which all Christians share because of their inclusion, through baptism, in His Priestly Body. The word "priest" as applied to individual ministers seems not to have found its way

into the Church's vocabulary until the end of the second century. Any developed doctrine of ministerial priesthood is still slower to appear; indeed it may be said that the Church, in our time, is still unfolding the truths about the ministry of the ordained and the un-ordained, alike hidden in the mystery of priesthood.

Some things seem to have been securely learned. The ministry shared and exercised by those ordained as priests partakes in and expresses both the High Priesthood of Christ and also the Royal Priesthood into which Christians enter in baptism. Priesthood is also perceived in the way in which this reconciling act is mediated, generation after generation, in and through Christ's Body, the Church, and all its members share in that mediation. The ordained priest is deeply linked to both these perceptions. By ordination, certain members of the Body are called of God and authorized by the Body to speak and act for the High Priest toward the Church and the world. They also speak and act for the Church and the world in making offering for them, through the Son, to the Father. To say, as we do, that ordained priesthood is "representative" is to say that the priest is, in ways far beyond our understanding, acting for both the Lord and His Church. His priesthood is not derived from the Church nor has anyone a right to claim priesthood; the priest is called to receive a gift, in ordination, which comes from the Father. But his call and the gifts are alike recognized and ratified by the Church; he acts for them in receiving and exercising the gift. Thus the authority and accountability conveyed in ordination has a double reference. No man exercises priesthood in a vacuum.

The priest is not set "above" the *Laos*, or against it. He is rather within the *Laos* as a particular focus, or symbol, or effective means of Christ's action toward the Church and the world, and of the Church's thankful response, through Christ, to the Father. This duality in no way implies two separate authorities or credentials or accountabilities. There is only One Priest. In Fr. Hebert's words, "The whole meaning of priesthood and sacrifice in the Church is gathered up in the one Priesthood and Sacrifice of

SPECIAL MEETING OF THE HOUSE OF BISHOPS 1972

Christ. He is recorded to have committed to the leader of the apostles the keys of stewardship, and to have instituted a sacrificial and sacramental rite; but the Christian minister does not hold a separate and individual priesthood . . . In whatever sense the Church and its ministers are priestly, Christ must remain the one Priest . . . As He has once for all offered Himself up for us, so that same sacrificial oblation is continued in us . . ." (*The Apostolic Ministry*, p. 519).

In sum, we found ourselves often using the word "representative", in its two separate contexts, as expressive of part of the central mystery of priesthood. This duality of role, in quite different ways, seemed to several of us to pose the question whether representation implied or required male-ness as a necessary attribute. In Part II some further thoughts on this are recorded.

C. The Episcopate, again, and in still greater depth, seems to us marked by the mystery of representation. All that has been said of priesthood applies to the Bishop, of course. What is added is his peculiar ministry of continuity, of unity, of wholeness, of oversight. This ministry, shared with the clergy and laity, and fully collegial, is an incarnation of Christ's actions and qualities. The Bishop represents the Lord to His Body and the world. That is to say, it is the eternity of the Son which is the continuity mediated through ordination; it is the complex unity of the person of Jesus Christ—a unity of disciplined, single-minded obedience to mission—which is the source of the unity of the Church; it is the health and wholeness of the Incarnate Lord which is given in the whole state of His Church; it is Christ's compassionate and vigilant care which is mediated in the ministry of the overseer and the pastor. And in all this, the Bishop represents the Church and the world before the Father, in and through the Son. He is the called, authorized, accountable personification of these gifts of God in Christ, and of the Church's stewardship of them. More than one of us felt deeply that the accountability of the Bishop is a primary factor in keeping him faithful in the midst of the perplexities and demands he faces.

In the case of episcopacy as in that of priesthood, the suggestion of a duality of representative roles raised in some of our minds the question as to the significance of male-ness as a necessary attribute or characteristic of the Bishop. Perhaps even more than the priest, the episcopal Father-in-God imagery is that of a male figure, and none of us doubts the extraordinary tensions and problems which would confront the Church were women to be chosen to be Bishops. But the question remains, in some of our minds, whether it can be said that female-ness is a diriment impediment to their consecration as Bishops. We have recited these statements about the Church's ordained ministry simply to set down a broad outline of the understandings we all felt we shared and within which we approached the question of the ordination of women. Now we turn to that question.

II: Scripture, Tradition and Images

(N.B. Rather than attempting to conflate two divergent drafts on this theme, they are both included as clear statements of thoughtful points of view. In both cases, the Committee felt the statements presented arguments and evidences which had to be considered and faced. The two writers remain in full communion.)

The following material, to page 44 presents the position of an opponent to the ordination of women.)

The New Testament takes it for granted that men will usually exercise the ministry of bishop-presbyter or deacon. Romans 16:1-2 is an exception, where Phoebe is spoken of as *diakonos* of the church in Cencrea. In I Timothy 3:11, the writer may be speaking of female deacons, or of the deacons' wives. The use of *hōsautōs* ('even so') shows a close connection between the women and the deacons and suggests that a new class is being introduced, analogous to the preceding order of deacons. Another argument for this is that no special requirements have been mentioned for the wives of bishop-presbyters. Certainly, the solemnity of the requirement that these women shall be