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Introduction

The Lord has sworn and will not change his mind, “You are a priest forever according to the order of Melchizedek.” (Psalm 110:4)

This project is a history of General Convention resolutions concerning Title III canon law affecting the requirements for ordination to the priesthood in the Episcopal Church during the 1970s. These legislative changes are found in the triennial Constitution & Canons of the Episcopal Church in the United States (hereafter Constitution & Canons or “canons”).

I have chosen four subtopics for this thesis: Access to ordination, evaluation of postulants, education of candidates, and formation of presbyters with an emphasis on access to ordination as it is informed by these other requirements. The words postulant, candidate and formation are used for the stages of the process that a person who applies for or is nominated for Holy Orders is expected to achieve. As a postulant, the person pursuing ordination usually attends seminary, which is where the education takes place that enables the seminarian to attain the status of candidate. Formation is a more ambiguous term, which includes both the process of education during seminary but also the life-long experience of being a presbyter.

1 For this analysis, I will focus on the decade of the 1970s but at times use a somewhat larger time parameter looking back as far as the 1950s and into the present. This larger time frame on either side of the 1970s decade allows for a broader scope of study.

2 Constitution & Canons Together with the Rules of Order For the government of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America Otherwise Known as The Episcopal Church Adopted and Revised in General Convention, 1789-2015, (New York: The Episcopal Church), 2016.
The whole process is intended to discern the individual’s call, evaluate his or her\textsuperscript{3} aptitude and ability, and in the end develop a formed presbyter. This language comes from the canons themselves and has evolved throughout 78 triennial conventions. For example, Canon III.6.4 of the current canons states that “Candidacy is a time of education and formation in preparation for ordination to the Priesthood, established by a formal commitment by the Candidate, the Bishop, the Commission (on Ministry), the Standing Committee, and the congregation or other community of faith.”\textsuperscript{4} The use of all of these terms is found in multiple canons which have faced multiple changes since the first General Convention of 1789.

Other definitions include the use of the words aspirant, recruitment, postulant and candidate. Aspirant generally indicates a person who applies for or is recruited to begin the process of discernment. The word nominee has come to replace the word aspirant, particularly in the last three decades, though this term is only used in the canons of some dioceses and not in the overarching Title III. Changes in the use of the terms postulant and candidate will be detailed in Chapter 2.

Interviews with bishops and scholars old enough to remember this era of changes have produced a variety of responses. In response to the argument that the changes by General Convention in the Nineteen-seventies were specific to the ordination of women, Louis Weil responded with the opinion that the source of turbulence was a much broader

\textsuperscript{3} A note regarding inclusive language: masculine personal pronouns are used in historical contexts for times prior to the inclusion of women and inclusive language is used in later contexts when women were included.

\textsuperscript{4} Constitution & Canons, 2016, 81.
questioning of the effectiveness of the General Ordination Examination and theological education itself.

In my 53 years as a priest, I have seen the process abused in a variety of ways - from well before women came to be ordained. I have seen this entire process of “decomposition of the tradition” - and the consequences are lethal. . . . My point is that, in my observation, the ordination of women did not cause this disintegration - but was often victim of it.5

Weil went on to say that the variety of ways the ordination process had been abused included power abuse and political agendas and pointed to theological education as an equal offender in the problem.

Weil’s reference to cultural influences and power abuse accords with many opinions, as my review of the literature will show in Chapters Two and Three. Perspectives about the issues of cultural influences, professionalism and power abuse frequent the landscape of this discussion within this thesis and in the larger discussions found in scholarship on the topic. However, it was not an issue of power abuse, nor the ordination of women, that set the stage for these changes to canons addressing the ministry of the Episcopal Church. Rather, it was an understanding of the ministry in crisis and a need to reform theological education, training and formation of presbyters that was the catalyst.

The main focus of this project is the topic of access to ordination. There were many decisions made in the 1960s and 1970s by General Convention regarding who could be ordained. Previous to that, the simpler system of choosing and forming presbyters in the Episcopal Church based on their personal relationship with a bishop

---

5 Louis Weil, personal correspondence, October 2014.
gave access only to men, mainly white ones. With time General Convention began to respond to the demands of growth of membership and increased diversity. Convention moved from an aristocracy that relied on the episcopate toward a more democratic process that involved representatives from all four orders of ministry (laity, deacons, presbyters and bishops). This project is not aiming to name or analyze injustices, perceived or real in the discernment process, but rather to assess the historical evolution of recruitment, education and formation of presbyters.

In the past 50 years, there have been more than 300 changes to the canons specific to Title III regarding the four orders of ministry. This is not surprising when considering the self-adjusting nature of this organization. We change canon law significantly every three years when General Convention meets. Committees, task forces and House of Bishops gatherings between the triennial convention meetings inform and influence changes made by Convention. While most of these changes are minor and many relate to lay ministry or the ordination and ministry of deacons and bishops, the majority nevertheless address the ordination as presbyter of women and minorities: everything from inclusive language to fair treatment to accommodation for the disabled.

Changes to the canons were intended to clarify the expectations of all involved in the ordination process, however, too many changes and a piling on of new expectations have resulted in confusion. This confusion has left the church vulnerable to power abuse and political agendas. While there are many stories of individuals having had positive experiences with the process for becoming a presbyter, regardless of “yes and no”

---

6 Episcopal Archives, accessed 3-11-17, http://www.episcopalarchives.org/cgi-bin/digital_archives/DAsearch.pl
outcomes, many persons who present themselves to the process often end up feeling misunderstood, misrepresented, and/or dismissed without good reason. I believe this is because of a context of confusion of roles and frequently changing rules that has resulted in lost opportunities for true prayerful discernment of persons’ ministries.

There is a human experience that often goes overlooked for the aspirant navigating an abstract process. I know from many pastoral conversations with individuals in ordination processes in various dioceses of the Episcopal Church that the process is often experienced with difficulties that are deemed unhelpful, or worse, harmful. More than a dozen people were interviewed for this project who indicated such difficulties. Some were ordained, some were not, a few had good experiences with their processes, while others felt confused and several even stated they felt abused. This was not usable data for this project for two reasons. Primarily, it would be impossible to work with subjective narratives while maintaining confidentiality. Secondly, no one interviewed was willing to share their story publicly for fear of consequences, such as the potential for misunderstanding of search committees or bishops in future professional opportunities.

This is a history of canon law which has affected the outcome of such narratives. An evidence-based research paper using detailed and standardized interviewing of a random sample of presbyters would be both useful and an interesting comparison. Because personal and subjective narratives are difficult to track, scholarly theories about ordination have been reviewed for this thesis noting changes of such theories throughout the history of the Church.

Gary Macy points out that in the early church the entire process of becoming a
priest or deacon was called an ordination, while *ordo* (an ordering) and *ordinare* (to provide order) were words used to indicate a state of life. “Any job or vocation was called an *ordo*, and the process by which one was chosen and designated for that vocation was an ordination.”

What we refer to as ordination today is actually a liturgy, and one which we think of as the *culmination* of having successfully completed a qualifying process which we call discernment. What we call discernment today is thought of as a prayerful listening for the will of God in our decision making about those called to Holy Orders but has become a document driven professional evaluation. In the early church discernment was *a state of life*.


Historically speaking, the prevailing purpose of a seminary since its recent evolution as a post B.A. curriculum in theology (in the broad sense of the word) is *graduate education*. Since most theology faculties are trained in research, they tend toward this point of view. However, with the rise of professionalism among clergymen, under the leadership of those committed to pastoral care and clinical experience, there has emerged most recently the theory that a seminary is a place for *professional training*. Largely I think this is the feeling of the faculty in the practical areas and the majority of the clergy in the field. But in its ordinal Tridentine and Reformation development, a seminary was conceived primarily as a place for the *formation of priestly character* through discipline, prayer, and indoctrination.

---


Holmes went on to consider the possibility that these three perspectives, graduate education, professional training and formation were at the time all included in the expectations of a seminary completion by laity and clergy alike. The struggle to meet the expectations of uniting yet balancing all three of these categories has strained seminaries and diocesan governing bodies since Holmes named them in 1971. This tension has been noted by some scholars as a tension within each of these entities as well as between them. This will be discussed further in Chapter 5.

A more recent perspective on the presbyterate comes from Garry Wills, a practicing Catholic who attended a Jesuit seminary but did not become ordained. Wills lifts questions of the sustainability of the presbyterate in a post-Christian era. He asks, from a historical perspective, questions about an office that he believes was never meant to be and supports his argument with history and scripture. His concluding remarks include:

As priests shrink in numbers - in some cases dashing from parish to parish, to put in brief appearances for the supposedly “necessary” things no one else can do (administering the sacraments, saying Mass, hearing confessions, presiding at baptisms or weddings or funerals) - congregations do not have to feel they have lost all connection with the sacred just because the role of priests in their lives is contracting. If Peter and Paul had no need of priests to love and serve God, neither do we. If we need fellowship in belief - and we do - we have each other. If we need instruction in the Scriptures, or counsel, or support, we can get those in the same places that Protestants do.9

Wills goes on to suggest that the priesthood is dwindling while the Church thrives and that this is partly due to a loss of commitment to hierarchical ideas like the apostolic succession. Many voices challenge issues such as this or sequential ordination, which I

touch on in Chapter 4. But I contend that looking back at the recent history of problems associated with the ordination of presbyters is necessary prior to forming forward-looking, theories of the presbyterate.

The history with which this project is concerned is The Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America, referred to hereafter as the Episcopal Church or the American Church. The reference to this church as “American” is used mostly in reference to the early history of the Episcopal Church and to differentiate from the Church of England at that time. Further study of these phenomena in other parts of the Episcopal Church and larger Anglican Communion would require broader research.

Chapter 1 reviews the background to the ordination of presbyters in the Episcopal Church through a brief historical survey emphasizing three eras: early American, 1860-1960 and the 1960s. Chapter 2 identifies the actual changes to Title III during the 1970s that affected the process for ordination to the priesthood in the four areas of Access to Ordination; Evaluation of Postulants; Education of Candidates; and Formation of Presbyters. Though the emphasis of this thesis is on access to ordination, these subheadings will organize themes in the history of changes affecting access. Chapter 3 discusses details of the history of these four areas, examining access to ordination for three groups: women; lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender (LGBT) persons; and African Americans. Chapter 4 discusses situational challenges that have affected access to ordination. These include divorce, substance abuse, aspirants ordained in another
denomination and the problem of sequential ordination. Chapter 5 outlines solutions including the recommendation of training for diocesan bishops, commissions on ministry and standing committees.
Chapter One
A Brief Historical Survey of the Process Leading to the Ordination of Presbyters

To examine the background of the ordination of presbyters in the Episcopal Church, I begin with a brief historical survey, starting with the split from the Church of England and moving through the era affected by the American Civil War, with an emphasis on the context of the 1960s. It is imperative to review the major trends in the history of the Episcopal Church from her split with the Church of England forward as all of this history sets the context for the decisions made by General Convention in the 1960s and 1970s.

Early American Era

In the Church of England, prior to the American Revolution, the 1662 Book of Common Prayer restricted ordination to men meeting the minimum age (23 for deacons, 24 for priests) “of virtuous conversation, and without crime; … learned in the Latin tongue, and sufficiently instructed in Holy Scripture.” Ordination also depended upon availability of a cure. This heritage continued in subsequent canonical requirements of the Episcopal Church, with the notable addition of recommendations required from the standing committee.

---


After the revolutionary war, the Americans had to scramble to establish an independent church. Loyalists opposed such things as new American laws which prevented praying for English royalty and parliament. The effect on ordination was a shortage of presbyters, and bishops to ordain them. The number of Episcopal parishes fell from approximately 318 in 1774 to 259 in 1789.\footnote{Colin Podmore, “A Tale of Two Churches: The Ecclesiologies of The Episcopal Church and the Church of England Compared,” \textit{International Journal for the Study of the Christian Church}, 8/2 (2008): 124-154, at 127.}

After the famous pact with Scottish Episcopalians, the consecration of Bishop Seabury and subsequent consecrations of bishops White and Provoost, a new Book of Common Prayer and the establishment of General Convention, the tide began to change and the American Church showed signs of recovery. The first legislation of General Convention on the subject of candidates for ordination was Canon 6 of the convention of 1795, which read as follows:

Every candidate for the ministry shall give notice of his intention to the bishop, or to such body as the Church in the State in which the candidate resides, may have appointed to superintend the instruction of candidates for Holy Orders, at least one year before his ordination. And if there be a bishop within the State or district where the candidate resides, he shall apply to no other bishop for ordination, without the permission of the former. And the said candidate shall pass through the preparatory exercises which the bishop, or such body aforesaid, may appoint: such as composing of theses, homilies or sermons, one or more, to be delivered either publicly or privately, in his or their presence, at such time or times as may be appointed by the authority aforesaid.\footnote{White and Dykman, vol. 2, 500.}

The standing committee remained the deciding factor and the candidate’s relationship with his bishop was the status quo at the time. It is clear that well-educated and well-formed priests were being recruited. But for the next era of the American
church, the challenge remained not access for individuals to ordination nor education and formation of priests but the lack of available clergy in a rapidly growing nation and the lack of available bishops to ordain them.

The church was focused on organizing itself at this time, so while there was an expectation of well-trained priests to send forth, there was not much emphasis on how to train them. According to Robert Prichard:

At the close of the American Revolution, the Episcopal Church was ill prepared to minister to the rapidly expanding western migration. The Revolution had caused a rapid decline in the number of available clergy, a loss of important revenue sources, and a confusion about organization. The bishops and General Convention deputies may have adopted a constitution and a prayer book in 1789, but not until the 1840s would all of the original thirteen states have diocesan structures and diocesan bishops. 14

The process to ordination continued for a century as a relationship between the ordinand and his bishop. The early canons of General Convention made no provision for a status of postulancy, as there was only candidacy prior to 1832. Anyone wanting to be a priest simply made application by notifying the bishop of his intention. This relationship was to be a personal one and the bishop would guide him in his preparatory studies. This was done through a slow and arduous time of letter writing between aspirant and bishop. Usually there were large geographical distances involved. Eventually the applicant would meet with the standing committee and ask to be recommended for candidacy. But this step was perfunctory until General Convention of 1871 when “a standing committee,

acting as the ecclesiastical authority of a diocese was, for the first time, authorized to receive and do all assigned to a bishop in the matter of receiving postulants.”

Thus, the process of becoming a priest as we know it today actually began as a personal relationship with one’s bishop for the first 100 years. The standing committee was added and a process begun for the next 100 years, until 1970 when the commission on ministry was added.

The evolution of theological education has seen a similar progression of increasing complexity. Since the Episcopal Church had no established seminaries prior to 1832, the studies for preparation for ordination were undertaken individually, often under the tutelage of a parish priest of the diocese or a college professor of divinity. The material to be covered was a “Course of Ecclesiastical Studies” as set forth by the House of Bishops in 1804.

In 1808, however, a group of Congregationalists who were worried by the Unitarian leanings of Harvard divinity professor Henry Ware, established Andover Seminary as the first three-year, Protestant, postgraduate theological school. This new educational pattern was an immediate success. Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Baptists, Lutherans, and Reformed Christians soon created their own seminaries based on the Andover model.

---

16 White and Dykman, vol. 2, 499.
17 Prichard, A History of the Episcopal Church, 115-116.
In the 1820s, Episcopalians opened three seminaries: General in 1822, Virginia in 1823 and Bexley Hall in 1824. The new seminaries were capable of producing a larger number of candidates for the ministry than the older patterns of individual study. This rapidly replaced reading for orders as the primary path to ordination.\textsuperscript{18} The University of the South was founded as a place to train Southern clergy in 1857, but had to be re-founded after the Civil War.

1860-1960

The question of access to ordination was a theological split during the years leading up to the American Civil War. On one side were the “high church” Hobartians, who lived mostly in the North and were particularly centered about Bishop Hobart’s parish, Trinity Church, New York. The other side was that of the Evangelicals who were found in both North and South. This split was influenced by the Oxford Movement in England, though was not continuous with it.\textsuperscript{19}

General Seminary, the stalwart of high-church orientation, birthed three more institutions with shared values. Three General students from the class of 1841 founded four of these: Nashotah House, Berkeley; Trinity College (Hartford); and Seabury Western. The Evangelicals also founded new seminaries during the war years including Philadelphia Divinity School (1857) and the Episcopal Theological School in Cambridge.

\textsuperscript{18} Prichard, \textit{A History of the Episcopal Church}, 116.

(1867). Each of these schools have unique histories; later, there were mergers and closings.

Theological Education continued along the High Church - Evangelical split as both camps settled into their respective schools. The second half of the 19th century brought many changes to the American life and landscape. The Industrial Revolution brought urbanization and increased transportation via railroads. The population exploded. In the midst of this growth the Episcopal Church continued to struggle for uniformity and identity, and continued to struggle in the polar tension between the need for presbyters who were well-formed as spiritual pastors and those who were well-educated as teachers for parishes.

The nineteenth century, with its emphasis on the sciences and critical and objective thought, resulted in the founding of new universities such as the one in Berlin and in the reformation of other universities, so that all disciplines were to be subjected to the requirement of critical objectivity. In the field of theology, this led to theological studies that were more critical and rational, but also more distanced from the needs of preachers and pulpits.

The Evangelicals and the Anglo-Catholics continued to vie for control of the church for ecumenical, liturgical and canonical values through several Conventions. This tension continued until the Convention of 1871 voted on a prayer book revision, which would be the last standard edition prior to the full 1892 revision. According to Allen Guelzo, this culminated in the General Convention of 1886, which was not only significant for the adoption of the Chicago Quadrilateral which went on to Lambeth in

---

20 Prichard, 144-145.

1888, but also a significant crossroad between these two groups. According to Guelzo, it was at that Convention that the Evangelicals lost the battle.

On all three counts - ecumenical, liturgical, and canonical - the evangelicals had failed either to exclude anglo-catholic influence from the Episcopal Church, or obtain guarantees to protect themselves within it. "No liberty to Protestant principles - and no restraint on Ritualistic fooleries" - this was the spirit of the 1868 Convention. 22

While this may have begun to settle the heated tension between Evangelical and Anglo-Catholic, remnants of this split continue in the Church, at least in liturgical values. However, it was at this point that the understanding of the character of a priest began to evolve toward the ideal of the priest as professional. The century between 1870 and 1970 refined with fire the understanding of the priesthood. According to Glenn T. Miller, theological education during this century underwent an important shift in the “points of reference that determined the discussion.” These points of reference included the new specialized university, the historical critical approach to the Bible, the new sociology and psychology, and the dynamics of industrial capitalist society. As a result, “the master of the new America, ‘the professional,’ was the person who could blend the various elements of this new modern world into an effective and efficient presence in the world.” 23 This emphasis pulled the pendulum away from the priest-scholar and toward the priest-professional.

---


A Crisis of Ministry

During the 1960s and 1970s, the oft used phrase, “a crisis of ministry” emerged in association with Vatican II documents like the Decree on the Ministry and Life of Priests (Presbyterorum Ordinis) and the Decree on Priestly Training (Optatam Totius). But the phrase was mostly used in a broader sense to indicate the decline in the number of presbyters both in the Roman Church and the Episcopal Church. Though it is older, the phrase is also associated with perspectives indicated by scholars during the late 1960s and early 1970s that theological education was also waning.

Sumner Walters, in his Oxford D.Phil in 1955, said a crisis of ministry was caused by a lack of consensus about training. He focused on the lack of connection between bishops and seminaries as well as a lack of consensus among seminaries. He analyzed both the system in the Church of England and the American process. He suggested that the Church of England during World War I was full of grave weaknesses, “many of which had been scarcely noted until revealed by the stress of war,” and compared this to the American problems.

The chief criticism was that the intellectual training provided ordinands had not fitted them for relating their message to the problems of the day. It was acknowledged and indeed affirmed that theological colleges were admirably fulfilling their function of schooling men in devotion and pastoral zeal, but within the majority of them intellectual training was limited to what was necessary for students to pass the U.P.E. and a Bishop’s Examination. It was noted that there was demand for these a knowledge at once very detailed and very elementary, much concerned with facts and opinions, little with reasons or general ideas; that the average man crammed for them, and colleges acquiesced in a low
intellectual level, while a large part of the teaching consisted merely of dictation of elementary notes.\textsuperscript{24} The “U.P.E.” mentioned here was the Universities’ Preliminary Examination which was established in 1874 by a special council in the Church of England which also managed to test. The council was made up of professors and bishops. Not all bishops used the U.P.E. and those who did also added their own examination. It met two difficulties, including the lack of control for the bishops as well as the larger criticism that the common practice of cramming for the test made it useless.\textsuperscript{25}

Walters, quoting the American convention journal from 1901, analyzed the situation of the American theological education system at the turn of the twentieth century.

There were in practice great differences among the dioceses in their interpretation of them (examinations for priest’s orders). A special committee, appointed by the House of Bishops in 1898, reported in October of 1901 its discovery of wide variations in the character of examinations required of non-graduates who applied for admission to the three-year period of candidacy for Orders. The committee indicated its belief that equally great variations existed in the conduct of the three examinations required of those seeking ordination, and it noted that in some dioceses no written examination whatever was held. The committee recommended the appointment of a central board to prepare examination papers which could furnish at least a minimum standard for dioceses to require of all candidates, except as dispensations might be granted by individual bishops. Although the advantages of seminary education were affirmed, it was recommended that the course of studies should undergo thorough revision.\textsuperscript{26}


\textsuperscript{26} Walters, 64.
Beginning in 1962, Vatican II instigated a plethora of discussion about the ministry in the post WWII era. In the Episcopal Church, the question of the ordination of women began to trouble the waters and debates about sexuality emerged. In 1975, Presiding Bishop John Allin asked Robert E. Terwilliger (an Anglo-Catholic) and Urban T. Holmes (a liberal Catholic) to edit a collection of essays to “develop throughout the Church a clearer and more definitive understanding of the doctrine of Christian priesthood and a valid Christian concept of human sexuality.” Allin went on to say in his introduction to this collection that by the end of 1973 he was “convinced that the grave and potentially divisive issue of the ordination of women was one of those pastoral, theological and ecumenical problems which could not be resolved simply by voting”, thus the impetus for this book.27

Two things of note on what it means to be a priest are defined in this collection of essays. The first is the issue of the ordination of women and the emphasis on this as the root of the turmoil of the changes to ordination requirements in the 1970s. The second point is the frequent use of the phrase, “crisis of ministry.” In Terwilliger and Holmes’ introduction, both “sexuality as the problem” and the perceived “crisis of identity” about the ministry are identified as the starting place for the discussion.

At this moment in the history of the Church, attention is being focused intensely on the nature of the Christian ministry. This concern centers particularly on the ministerial priesthood and the episcopate. The immediate cause of this is, of course, the debate about the ordination of

---

women. There has also been the long-continuing ‘crisis in ministry’ with its anguished questions of identity and personal vocation.\(^{28}\)

This indicates that at the time the crisis of ministry for the Episcopal Church was primarily about the question of ordaining women, and women as sexual beings. The focus was not about the lack of congruency among seminaries and bishops, the tension between Evangelical and Anglo-Catholic values, the understanding of the character of the priest as professional versus scholar or pastor, or questions about the quality of theological education.

Yet another focus came into view at this time. The culture of the 1960s was influencing the church to become more worldly. In a review of a 1973 book by Charles E. Curran titled “Crisis in Ministry,” John F. O’Grady described the topic as superfluous already. O’Grady indicated that the author was merely repeating what the Roman Catholic Edward Schillebeeckx and his critics had already exhausted. His perfunctory conclusion was that “the failure of the sixties to appreciate the transcendence of God, thereby settling for immanentism, generated a group of priests who could not readily adapt to the failure of renewal and the general frustrations of the period after the Council (Vatican II).”\(^{29}\)

Thus, three criticisms of the evaluation and preparation of priests emerged during this era: 1) a general weakness in theological academics 2) a lack of consensus among and between seminaries and between bishops and seminaries (as well as loss of control by bishops) about the nature of theological education whether graduate education or

\(^{28}\) Terwilliger and Holmes, ix.

professional training; and 3) a decline in well done formation of priests that prepares them to work as representatives of the church in the world.

**Cultural Influence**

Chronologically, we think of cultural influence as the prominent issue in the 1960’s and after, but this aspect is actually older, dating back to the work of a group lead in part by Richard Niebuhr in 1956. The criticism of academic preparation and formation came later with the famous Pusey Report of 1967. Further criticism of formation comes into the discussion as late as 1970 when aspects such as field education and the commission on ministry were added to the canons.

The criticisms of theological education, professional training and formation of priests were not the only influences challenging the discernment process during the post-World War II era. There was a bigger picture of cultural upheaval to which the church was attempting to respond. According to Armentrout, the Episcopal Church was suffering the dissension of several splinter groups during this time. These groups left the Episcopal Church between 1963 and 1985. Most of them were formed prior to 1963 including The Reformed Episcopal Church, the African Orthodox Church, The Apostolic Episcopal Church and the Southern Episcopal Church among others. These schisms are various and related to multiple problems of dissent but the fact that there were so many leaving the church is indicative of the threat of these turbulent times.

In response to this turbulence in 1954, Niebuhr chaired a study of theological education initiated by the American Association of Theological Schools and funded by
the Carnegie Corporation. The project, written with Gustafson and Williams is an intensive study encompassing more than a hundred seminaries and divinity schools in the United States and Canada. The culmination of this work, which included many site visits and interviews, identified a grave disconnect between theological education and meeting the needs of the world. The reform of theological education was demanded in a comparison of reforms in other professional training at the time.

The thought is abroad among theological educators and students that in the course of apparent repetition of traditional functions they have so adjusted themselves day by day to new pressures in the changing environment that they have lost the form and direction of inherited educational policy, so that the curriculum no longer is a course of study but has become a series of studious jumps in various directions. At the same time many of them are oppressed by the feeling that theological study does not sufficiently consider the changes that have taken place in human thought and behavior in the course of a revolutionary century. They note that in both respects they face problems similar to those that have led educators in other fields to undertake more or less promising reformations. Such examples have encouraged them to look forward to comparable efforts in the theological schools.30

This report by Niebuhr’s group was widely read and set the tone for the emerging understanding of the crisis of ministry as a problem of the seminaries being out of touch with culture. It identified theological education as tedious, impervious to the needs of the world and recommended a need for professionalism. According to Jon Diefenthaler,

In 1956, Richard Niebuhr gave his famous analysis of American religious culture. “One aspect of it that he found especially disturbing was the fusion of Christianity with the ‘American way of life.’ To him, church attendance had become a way of avoiding suspicion of being a subversive influence; it attested not to a revival of

faith in God, but to the ‘survival’ ethic of a nation locked into a Cold War with the Soviet Union and its Communist allies.  

The Episcopal Church responded to these concerns in her own way. Presiding Bishop Hines appointed a select committee to conduct a “wide-ranging study” “in response to a growing interest and concern of the Church in Theological education.” What followed was the famous Pusey Report. 

The Pusey Report 

In the Episcopal Church, the “crisis of ministry” culminated in the General Convention of 1967, when the report of the Special Committee on Theological Education was presented. The news spread widely and quickly that the education and training of priests was outdated and needed to be fixed.

The Pusey Report, as it came to be known, was commissioned by the previous Convention (1964) as a relatively quick response to the rhetoric of the crisis of ministry from Vatican II. Bishop Hines appointed Nathan Pusey, then President of Harvard University to chair the committee but it was Charles Taylor, former professor of Old Testament and Dean of Episcopal Theological School at Cambridge, Massachusetts who did most of the actual writing of the report. Taylor was the first chair of the Association of Theological Schools during the time that Niebuhr’s group was conducting their study. “This document, formally titled ‘Ministry for Tomorrow,’ was critical of theological

---

education in the Episcopal Church, which was said to be unexpectedly remiss in its concern for education.”

Pusey was an educator but not a theologian. His years at Harvard were not without controversy. The student movements of anti-establishment were disrupting campuses everywhere. These outbursts as they often were centered chiefly on protests against the Vietnam War.

Harvard's expansion came to a head in 1969. Pusey took a dim view of student demonstrations and sit-ins and was regularly attacked by students and the Harvard Crimson. For Pusey, the ideals of reason and civility on campus were being threatened and had to be protected. In April 1969, when dozens of students took over University Hall to protest the presence of the Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC) on campus and forcibly evicted the Deans, Pusey engaged the police, wearing riot gear, to remove the protesters. The scene of the police battling students was broadcast on television and viewed around the world, drastically altering perceptions of Pusey's administration and overshadowing its many accomplishments. Pusey announced in February 1970 his intention to retire.

Pusey’s own words in the introduction to the report indicate his passion for the idea of educational reform. In pointing out that the report was in response to the crisis of ministry, he said, “The Episcopal Church as a whole has been unexpectedly remiss in its concern for theological education . . . at a time when it requires more vigorous leadership
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and increased strength if it is to contribute forcefully to meet the spiritual and social
needs of our troubled time.”

Pusey’s rhetoric seems different from that of Niebuhr. Pusey seems to have been cracking the whip when Niebuhr was pondering larger and more inclusive perspectives. Niebuhr described the solution as one that would develop seminaries and larger efforts of training and formation to inspire students of theology toward their own paths of contemplation and ministry. Niebuhr’s final words in his report (and it seems the promised second volume did not come to fruition, perhaps due to a lack of funding) indicate this almost ethereal vision.

[The problem of theological education] is an effort to understand in the moment, while the conversation in the Church continues, what are the intelligible outlines of the structure of theological study in the Protestant schools. A theological education which does not lead young men and women to embark on a continuous, ever-incomplete but ever-sustained effort to study and to understand the meanings of their work and of the situations in which they labor is neither theological nor education. Similarly, a theory of theological study which does not lead toward new endeavors toward better, more precise and more inclusive understanding of the nature of theological endeavor under the government of God is not a theory of theology but a dogmatic statement backed by no more than individual authority, that is, by no authority at all.

Nevertheless, while Pusey’s report (again, written by Taylor) seemed to insist on change with passion, the message was a similar call to get out of the classroom and into the world.

In a succinct description of the impact of the Pusey Report, Armentrout notes that
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scrambled to meet the recommendation of the Pusey Report to consolidate resources due to “deficiencies in the seminaries of the Episcopal Church.” The School of Theology took the suggestion seriously and examined the possibility of moving to Atlanta.37

According to Armentrout, Vice-Chancellor McCrady indicated that he was opposed to moving the seminary to Atlanta because “The University of the South needs a theological faculty for its own integrity and mental health for the same reasons that John Henry Newman thought a university without a theological faculty was no university at all.”38

The Pusey Report also called for a Board of Theological Education and Almus M. Thorp was the first Executive Director. Thorp, in a famous sermon at St. James, New York City called for the then eleven seminaries to be decreased to “five centers for theological Education in the Continental United States . . . to the end that our institutional resources for theological education may be deployed to minister more effectively to the needs of the world today and in the future.”39

It seems that all of the eleven seminaries at the time, to which Bishops were sending young men who had discerned a call, reacted with much activity. More committees were formed at each school and many major decisions were made in effort to corroborate with the Pusey report’s recommendations.

37 Armentrout, The Quest for the Informed Priest, The School of Theology, The University of the South, 1979, 366.
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A perusal of histories of these seminaries reveals a host of changes within the next decade. Episcopal Theological School merged with the 105-year-old Philadelphia Divinity School in 1967 to form Episcopal Divinity School in Cambridge. Bexley Hall disassociated with Kenyon in 1968 and moved to Rochester, N.Y., where it affiliated with Colgate Rochester Divinity School (now Colgate Rochester Crozer Divinity School). Berkley became associated with Yale in 1971. In 1970, Church Divinity School of the Pacific added field education to their offerings beginning a trend of similar efforts for increased formation.

General Convention’s approach to resolving the crisis of ministry was to develop committees, commissions, sub-committees and study groups to address these criticisms. The impact on Episcopal seminaries at the time was jarring. The impact on the canons was a huge surge of new policies and procedures to correct problems. The Board of Theological Education was formed by the 62nd Convention of 1967 and recommended the establishment of commissions on ministry and the restoration of the General Ordination Examination.

In 1970, the Convention adopted Proposal II of the report of the Board for Theological Education, creating diocesan commissions on ministry. In explanation of its proposals, the board had stated:

What is at stake in the following pages is not the question of a few changes in a book most people refer to only rarely. What seems to us at stake are such things as the creation of diocesan structures fashioned to help the Bishop express ever more adequately his pastoral concern for all engaged in professional ministry;...

---
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[and] the establishment of academic and pastoral examinations before ordination by especially gifted and sensitive examiners (Journal, p. 738).\textsuperscript{41}

And so in 1967 the many changes to the canons for ministry in Title III began. The next two decades would feel the shock waves of the decisions made by Convention in 1967. The issues of access, education, evaluation and formation of aspirants to ordination as presbyters would continue to be the focus of heated debate. The underlying issues of professionalism, apostolic succession, power struggles, control by bishops and accreditation of theological schools would continue. But the basic concern of training of presbyters for ministry within culture would prevail.

\textsuperscript{41} White and Dykman, vol. 2, 489-490.
Chapter 2
Changes to Title III Canons Specific to the Ordination of Presbyters
During the 1970s

Changes to Title III made by General Convention during the 1970s significantly affected the process for the ordination of presbyters. This is found in four areas: Access to Ordination, Evaluation of Postulants, Education of Candidates, and Formation of Presbyters.

The basic text used for this chapter is the annotated manual of the Constitution and Canons of The Episcopal Church known colloquially as “White and Dykman,” named after its earliest contributors, has been updated several times, most recently in 1997. In 1924, Edwin A. White first provided a “handbook brought together, for easy reference, materials required by students, historians, and all who were interested in the Church’s legislation.”

According to Fred Scribner, 1979 Chairman of the White and Dykman Committee in his forward to the 1985 edition, “The General Convention of 1937 authorized the appointment of a joint commission to procure a person or persons to revise Dr. White’s study.” Jackson A. Dykman took up the work in 1949, and the first annotated volume was published in 1952. The 1981 edition became two volumes, the second of which was not complete until 1985. There was a supplement published in 1989 and an update in 1997. The 1985 volume 2, known as the 1981 Edition, contains the information about the ordination canons under Title III.

42 White and Dykman, vol. 2, ix.
43 White and Dykman, vol. 1, ix.
The canons discussed here have been renumbered through the years. For the purpose of clarity, the most recent numbers (2015) are used unless otherwise indicated. The four canons (Figure 2.2, Appendix A) that are the specific discussion of this chapter are in Title III of the 2015 Constitution and Canons: III.2, III.3, III.8 and III.10. All other Title III canons are not addressed because they apply to deacons, bishops and licensed lay ministers though other canons are mentioned peripherally.

Access to Ordination

Three categories of persons who have historically had difficulty gaining access to ordination as presbyters in the Episcopal Church are identified in this section: women, Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender (LGBT) persons and African Americans. The two most significant changes to Title III related to access to ordination since 1970 are for women and LGBT persons. When the resolution to ordain women finally passed in 1976, Convention made major changes to Title III to accommodate. Convention has also passed several resolutions during and since the 1970s regarding the study of homosexuality that brought into focus the question of the ordination of homosexual persons. Access to ordination as a presbyter and bishop has been difficult for African Americans as well, though this history is older and has evolved differently than the changes for women and LGBT persons.

In the second half of the twentieth century, views on equality were evolving in both secular and religious settings. Calls for equal employment opportunity resulted from
changes in the work force and professional settings after WWII. In the United States, access to equal employment opportunities began by eliminating “discrimination based on race, color, religion, sex, or national origin” in the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

Over the next forty years, other groups suffering from discrimination came to be included, women and LGBT among them. The Church followed this development by eventually including the same changes in canon law. The changes to Title III since 1970 that have specifically allowed access to persons previously barred from ordination to the priesthood due to gender or sexual orientation are: I.7.5, III.1.2, III.4, III.6, III.8 and III.10 (see Figure 2.3, Appendix A).

African Americans

Until the 1960s (and arguably still today), the church was largely segregated between Whites and African Americans. Absalom Jones, ordained in 1804, was the first African American priest in the Episcopal Church. Other African American parishes became part of the Episcopal Church, but segregation remained a problem in the South until after the Civil War. Susan Grimm indicates that racial discrimination continued to affect African American parishes and clergy in the South during the Jim Crow years between 1865 and 1892. Grimm’s work is specific to the Diocese of Virginia, but is

---


indicative of trends in at least the Southern states if not all of the Episcopal Church at the time. She says that “while no African-American congregation was admitted to the annual Diocesan Council as a full member, African-American clergy were incorporated as they were ordained.”

Grimm goes on to prove that discriminatory practices limited African-American presbyters by requiring lengthy times as transitional deacons, allowing white bishops to have more control over African-American clergy. Grimm also indicates that seminaries remained segregated until the mid-20th century.

It was not until 1910 that the General Convention established the office of suffragan bishop as a way for African American priests to be elected bishop. But this also was a way to maintain the oppression of African-American clergy. In this case, it was a way to maintain control over African-American bishops.

**Women**

Early efforts to change the canons to allow women access to leadership began with the first discussion of seating women as lay deputies of General Convention in 1916. It was 1970 before a resolution allowing this concurred. Deaconesses were first approved in 1871, but were held to be a different order from male deacons. Women were first granted ordination as deacons, equal to men, in 1970, after the bishops of the Anglican

---
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Communion at the 1968 Lambeth Conference agreed that deaconesses were members of the diaconate. In 1971 the new Anglican Consultative Council (lay and clergy representatives from member churches) declared it “acceptable for a bishop to ordain a woman if his national church or province approves.”

The same year, Jane Hwang and Joyce Bennett were ordained to the priesthood by Bishop Gilbert Baker of Hong Kong. Further, the orders of Florence Li Tim-Oi (who was ordained presbyter during the Japanese occupation of Hong Kong in 1944) were recognized in absentia. Pressure on the Episcopal Church from within and without to ordain women as presbyters led General Convention to open ordination of women to all three orders in 1976. Barbara Harris and Jane Dixon were the first female bishops and, like the first African American bishops, they were suffragans. Mary Adelia McLeod (Vermont, 1993) was the first diocesan bishop.\footnote{Jan Nunley, “General Convention will Face 'the Limits of Ambiguity' on the Ordination of Women” The Episcopal News Service, 1994, accessed 3-16-17, http://www.episcopalarchives.org/cgi-bin/ENS/ENSsearch.pl}

**LGBT**

The timeline for openly lesbian, gay or bisexual persons to have access to ordination began in 1976 (1976-D058) when a resolution to study the ordination of homosexual persons was passed. Lesbian, gay and bisexual persons did not gain access until 1994 (1994-D007). Both Conventions of 1976 and 1979 passed resolutions to study sexuality generally. Convention of 1976 agreed to study human sexuality. This original resolution was amended by the House of Deputies to include the phrase, "including
homosexuality as it pertains to various aspects of life, particularly living styles, employment, housing, and education.” (1976-A068)

The 1979 Convention passed two significant resolutions. A resolution regarding the sexual orientation of ordinands was passed when it was agreed that “there should be no barrier to the ordination of qualified persons of either heterosexual or homosexual orientation whose behavior the Church considers wholesome” (1979-A053).

This resolution was clear in defining “wholesome” as someone who might be homosexual but would not practice extra-marital sex. It was clearly against gay marriage. Thus ordination was accessible to homosexual persons, but only if they were celibate.

The second resolution (1979-D107) implemented a decree to provide education for the entire Church toward understanding differing views and experiences of human sexuality.

The House of Bishops responded first to Report #28 from the Committee on Social and Urban Affairs and recommended a Substitute Resolution including the weighty phrase, “In the establishment of diocesan study programs, care should be taken that persons of differing attitudes, professional experience, and sexual orientation are appointed to insure a full spectrum of conviction.” The House of Deputies responded with more addendum including an outline of success in several diocese with increased awareness from the study called for by the 1976 Convention. The House of Deputies also included, within its acceptance of Report #28 the phrase, “in developing programs to enhance a mature understanding of sexuality and our Christian responsibility as faithful stewards in this regard.”
Transgendered persons gained access in 2012 with the addition to the Equal Employment Act language related to discrimination. Canon I.17.5 (Rights of Laity) and III.1.2 added the phrase “gender identity and expression” with the passing of resolution 2012-D002. This resolution had been rejected at the 2009 Convention.49

**Evaluation of Postulants**

The most significant element of change effecting access to ordination is the development of commissions on ministry in the 1970s. (See Appendix A, Figure 2.4.)

The early canons of the American Church did not address evaluation of aspirants for Holy Orders but continued to leave the matter in the hands of bishops. There was no set of stages except for a period of candidacy approved by the standing committee and minimal requirements about education: “In due time, the applicant would lay his application before the Standing Committee and ask to be recommended for candidacy, after which he would embark on his theological studies.”50

The first canonical provision on the preparation and evaluation of candidates for Holy Orders came in 1808. That Convention put forth a canon with language about candidates for orders which began to organize directives of ordination processes for the Episcopal Church at large. It is worth remembering that dioceses were at that stage contiguous with states. The wording of that canon was in part as follows:

---
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No person shall be considered as a candidate for orders in this Church, unless he shall have produced to the Bishop of the Diocese or State to whom he intends to apply for orders, a certificate from the Standing Committee of said Diocese or State, that they believe, from personal knowledge, or from testimonials laid before them, that he hath lived piously, soberly, and honestly; that he is attached to the doctrines, discipline, and worship of the Protestant Episcopal Church; and further, that in their opinion he possesses such qualifications as may render him apt and meet to exercise the ministry to the glory of God and the edifying of the Church.\textsuperscript{51}

Thus began the slow evolution toward a more church-wide process and away from the acts of bishops and standing committees alone. By 1832, seminaries had been established. Evaluation within and by their faculties was added to the budding process.

According to White and Dykman, the first use of the term \textit{postulant} was in 1871 when the first canon denoting a process was used.\textsuperscript{52} The Convention of 1892 used the first canon having the title, “General Provisions Concerning Candidates for Holy Orders” and the diocesan process as we now know it began to take shape. Minor changes to this canon occurred in 1904, 1943, 1970.\textsuperscript{53} The stage of postulancy was abolished in 1973 and reinstated in 1976 indicating continuing struggle for Convention to decide on the details of the process.\textsuperscript{54}

It was the development of commissions on ministry in the 1970s which significantly changed the process and requirements for ordination thereafter. While standing committees had been a part of the structure from the earliest constitution (1789),

\textsuperscript{51} White and Dykman, vol. 2, 532.

\textsuperscript{52} White and Dykman, vol. 2, 503-504.

\textsuperscript{53} White and Dykman, vol. 2, 499.

\textsuperscript{54} White and Dykman, vol. 2, 531.
the newly formed Board of Theological Education recommended to the 63rd Convention (1970) a separate commission which could collaborate with bishops in a way that standing committees, as law keepers with the whole Church in view, could not. Commissions on ministry could concentrate on the task of “recruitment, training, and authentication” on the diocesan level.\(^\text{55}\)

Canons for the various procedures of the process fluctuated with numerous canonical changes throughout this period of overhauling the process. This fluctuation settled in the 1980s after the last major changes were made in 1988 (1988-A122). Another overhaul occurred in 2006, though this was mostly a renumbering.

**Education of Candidates**

The educational preparation of aspirants for the priesthood has been of utmost importance throughout the history of the Church. While the Episcopal Church is no exception, the value of theological education and the measurement of candidates’ aptitude has fluctuated since the first Convention of 1789.

The first canon specific to the education of presbyters was number 7 of 17 of the first General Convention in Philadelphia in 1789.\(^\text{56}\) That canon read:

> No person shall be ordained in this Church until he shall have satisfied the Bishop and the two Presbyters, by whom he shall be examined, that he is sufficiently acquainted with the New Testament in the original Greek, and can give an account of his faith in the Latin tongue, either in writing or otherwise, as may be required.\(^\text{57}\)

\(^{55}\) White and Dykman, vol. 2, 492.
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While New Testament Greek continues as a foundational subject in theological education, the requirement of Latin has fallen by the wayside. The expectation that the aspirant for Holy Orders be fluent in Greek and Latin is reflective of a time when the priest was expected to be able to read scripture in the original Greek and read the Latin commentaries of those like Augustine, Calvin and Luther. Due to the desperation of a lack of priests and seminaries in which to educate them, many early American ordinands “read for orders” in independent study.

The first Constitution of 1789 included canons specific to the examination of candidates prior to ordination, but before 1871 the only thing examined was “being learned in Latin and Greek” and sometimes examiners required to hear a homily. 58

The first mention in the history of the canons of a college degree requirement was at the Convention of 1841. This particular canon allowed for exception to the requirement of a baccalaureate degree allowing “that, he must have sustained an examination in certain studies.” 59

In the first Constitution of the American Church was the original rule that a new priest could be ordained only after an approval of a Bishop and two presbyters. Article 7, unchanged until 1901, also indicated that the candidate must have exhibited “testimonials and other requisites.” The declaration made at ordination, which has remained relatively unchanged to date was also included in that canon: “I do believe the Holy Scriptures of


the Old and New Testament to be the Word of God, and to contain all things necessary to salvation: and I do solemnly engage to conform to the doctrines and worship of the Protestant Episcopal Church in these United States.60

The required subject areas for theological education, or “preparation for ordination” under current canon III.8.5, became more specific at the 1871 Convention which made a thorough revision of the canons of ordination. At that time, canonical requirements included oral and written examinations in Greek and Latin and added competency in the areas of Scripture, Christian Ethics, Systematic Divinity, Church History, Ecclesiastical Polity, and the Book of Common Prayer.61

Additions continued in subsequent conventions resulting in the list as we know it today (2015), which has been in place since 2006 after minor changes in 1988. Changes occurred in 2015 including the area previously listed under #5 and known as “studies in contemporary society” which was eliminated. A new area under #6 was added and called “practice of ministry.” This area incorporated areas from the previous area on contemporary society “including leadership, evangelism, stewardship, ecumenism, interfaith relations, mission theology, and the historical and contemporary experience of racial and minority groups.”62 That list currently comprises the following subjects per canon III.8.5.g:

60 White and Dykman, vol. 1, 111.

61 White and Dykman, vol. 2, 557.

(1) The Holy Scriptures.
(2) History of the Christian Church.
(3) Christian Theology.
(4) Christian Ethics and Moral Theology.
(5) Christian Worship according to the use of the Book of Common Prayer, the Hymnal, and authorized supplemental texts.
(6) The Practice of Ministry in contemporary society, including leadership, evangelism, stewardship, ecumenism, interfaith relations, mission theology, and the historical and contemporary experience of racial and minority groups.

The Board of Theological Education (BTE) was founded at the special Convention of 1969, which undertook a complete revision of Title III.63 As indicated in Chapter 1, the famous Pusey Report of 1967 charged the Convention to make changes to theological education including an overhaul of the seminaries.

By 1970, the BTE brought a detailed study of the Episcopal seminaries to the Convention. This study made seven specific proposals for canonical change including: the creation of diocesan commissions on ministry; an updating of the syllabus by which candidates who had not completed college were to demonstrate competence; and an expansion in the membership of the board from nine to fifteen. It also suggested the creation of a separate board for the creation of a national ordination examination. The members of this board would be the examining chaplains.64

The General Ordination Examination was founded in 1970 in order to develop a written examination to evaluate the proficiency of the candidate in the canonical areas of

63 White and Dykman, vol 2, 582-583.

study. Robert Prichard, who helped develop the examination in the 1980s and 1990s, writes of these areas:

The 1919 canons specified that the candidates for ordination were to be examined in eight specific areas: holy scripture, church history, christian missions, theology, ethics, liturgics, polity and canon law and ministration. The list was amended slightly in 1946: ministration was renamed practical theology, and canon law and missions were placed as sub-categories under church history. Thus the number of canonical areas was reduced to six. The 1919 canons also included a list of elective areas from which a candidate for ordination was to select one. This option was deleted by the General Convention of 1964.65

The General Ordination Examination has continued to evolve since 1970 and is discussed further in Chapter 3.

Formation of Presbyters

Canons regarding formation are now dispersed throughout the canons. However, there was not much in the canons that specifically addressed formation until 1988. Changes to Title III prior to 1988 only addressed postulancy and candidacy, which remain stages for ordinands (see Appendix A, Table 2.6). Formation has increasingly become a value of the spiritual development of presbyters.

The most basic value regarding formation is in current canon III.1.1.b which indicates “that all baptized persons are called to sustain their ministries through commitment to life-long Christian formation.” But this idea of the ministry of all the baptized is a recent addition, having been introduced with the 1979 prayer book, but not added to Title III canons until 1988 when there was a complete rewriting of Title III with
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an emphasis for the commission on ministry toward developing the ministry of the laity (1988-A122), and not again until Convention of 2006 which included this emphasis within a resolution (2006-D045) about inclusion of minorities in access to ordination.

Since 1970, Canon III.2 has outlined the duties of commissions on ministry who oversee formation of postulants. Prior to 1970, the formation of a presbyter was up to his bishop, who usually assigned him to a seasoned presbyter for mentoring. Since 1970, the role of the seminary in the formation as well as education of the presbyter has tended to follow trends created by committees, commissions, boards, and General Convention itself.

The first canons to address this stage of candidacy were in 1859. The term had been used in the Church of England before the American Church to denote the point in which an aspirant, having developed a relationship with his bishop, began his studies. Postulancy was first introduced in the American canons in 1892 to provide a pre-seminary period of discernment, although it has not always been seen as necessary:

The early legislation of the Church made no provision for a stage called postulancy. Qualified persons seeking ordination were accepted by the bishop as candidates. Following the adoption of the first canon on postulants in 1892, many of the provisions which formerly applied to candidacy were, in the process of time, transferred to the canon on postulancy. In 1973, however, the stage of postulancy was abolished, and a new canon III.2, “Of Candidates,” was adopted. This canon included many of the provisions that had formerly been made to apply to postulants. In 1976 this action was reversed, and the canon of 1973 was made a canon “Of Postulants.” As a result, all but two of the historic provisions regarding candidacy are now applied to postulants.67

67 White and Dykman, vol. 2, 531.
The 1976 changes went hand in hand with the new interest in the 1970s in forming priests rather than merely educating them. The pastoral care of those persons seeking orders was deemed important in this period as well.

In 1970, the General Convention adopted Proposal II of the report of the Board for Theological Education, creating diocesan commissions on ministry. In explanation of its proposals, the board had stated: “What is at stake in the following pages is not the question of a few changes in a book most people refer to only rarely. What seems to us at stake are such things as the creation of diocesan structures fashioned to help the Bishop express ever more adequately his pastoral concern for all engaged in professional ministry; ... [and] the establishment of academic and pastoral examinations before ordination by especially gifted and sensitive examiners.”

This was during a time when the number of priests was increasing. Thus the creation of the commission on ministry, a body of clergy and laity who could support the bishop in the sorting out of all these demands.

This chapter has outlined the changes since 1970 to canons under Title III that address access to ordination, evaluation of postulants, education of candidates, and formation of presbyters. Chapter 3 will discuss these changes with a more detailed discussion of the history of access to ordination for three groups: women, LGBT persons, and African Americans, as well as details of evaluation, education and formation of presbyters.

---
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Chapter Three  
Access, Evaluation, Education and Formation of Presbyters

This chapter will discuss the changes to Title III that affect the process of requirements for ordination of presbyters as outlined in Chapter 2. This is arranged using the same headings: Access to Ordination, Evaluation of Postulants, Education of Candidates, and Formation of Priests. Under the heading Access to Ordination, there are subsections which consider three groups of persons: African Americans, women and LGBT persons.

The section on the evaluation of postulants reviews the development of commissions on ministry and their relationship with standing committees and diocesan bishops. In the section on the education of candidates, there are two subsections on professional training and the General Ordination Examination. This chronicle of decisions by Convention will bring to light continuous problems with access to ordination as well as the evaluation, education and formation of presbyters.

Access to Ordination

African Americans

The study of the history of access to ordination in the Episcopal Church for African Americans is long and arduous. Much has been written about the relationship of Black and White Episcopalians during the history of the American Church and an exhaustive study specific to ordination within this relationship would be of interest. But it is sufficient for the auspices of this thesis to recognize that the struggle of African
American clergy in gaining access to ordination has been similar to the plight of women and LGBT persons, though of an earlier era and with a unique narrative.

In his 1974 essay on the topic, Robert Bennett claims that the Episcopal Church has historically been at odds with African Americans. He specifically says that “because of history and temperament the Black man and the Episcopal Church do not belong together.” He further described his position in this way:

In one of the first comprehensive histories of the Black Church, W. E. B. Dubois noted that the Episcopal Church had, “probably done less for the Black people than any other aggregation of Christians.” Subsequent historians of the Black Church have not been quite so candid, but they agree that the impact in and attraction for the Episcopal Church in the Black community have not been great. Several reasons have been suggested for this, such as the identification of the Episcopal Church with urban society and the upper class, quite distinct from the Black agrarian proletariat, or the intellectual sophistication required of its Prayer Book ritual as being unattractive to and allowing no opportunity for the emotional and unrestrained religious expression somehow associated with Black religion.  

Bennett goes on to elaborate on this perspective suggesting that non-Episcopalian African Americans have seen Black Episcopalians as “social climbers” and the “Black Bourgeoisie par excellence” and at times accused them of trying to leave the African American community or at least not be associated with it. But in spite of this perspective, true or not, many have stayed or joined the Episcopal Church and African American clergy have become a part of it as it moved away from the Colonial Church.

After the Civil War, The Episcopal Church in the south lost large numbers of freed slaves to the Baptist and Methodist churches.

---

At the General Convention of 1868, the southern dioceses reported major losses of African American communicants, with South Carolina reporting the departure of over ninety percent. “Of the four millions of African Americans upon our soil,” a report to the General Convention declared in 1877, “the mass is untouched by our church.”

Southern Black Episcopalians discovered they lacked the status and freedom they would have received in denominations founded and controlled by other African Americans. After the Civil War, the southern dioceses gradually refused full membership to African American congregations, and the Episcopal Church in the South became segregated.

In 1910, a group of integrationists exercised a clever use of canon law to resolve the problem of the segregated church. It was tolerable for segregationists to have African Americans in the seemingly inferior role of “suffragan bishops for colored work”, so Edward Demby and Henry Delany became the first African American bishops in 1918. It was not until 1970 that John Burgess became the first African American diocesan bishop.

He was consecrated Suffragan Bishop in Massachusetts in 1962. After the growth of the number of African American bishops the integration of the priesthood began to also grow.

**Women**

The ordination of women was not the reason for the Title III changes of the 1970s, yet the issue of sexism in relation to access to ordination continues. As recently as 2003 (quite recently considering Convention meets only every three years) the
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Convention rejected a resolution to continue addressing the issue because of the fact that three dioceses continued to refuse to ordain women.\textsuperscript{73} Those dioceses were Fort Worth, San Joaquin and Quincy.

Fort Worth split when the diocese left the Episcopal Church in 2008.\textsuperscript{74} The diocese of San Joaquin split in 2007 when a majority left the Episcopal Church and formed a separate church. Quincy survived a similar split by rejoining the Diocese of Springfield after 70 years as separate thriving dioceses.\textsuperscript{75} These diocesan schisms were based originally on the issue of the ordination of women and LGBT ordination and marriage.\textsuperscript{76}

It is a “problem of perspective,” according to Lloyd Patterson, whose musings in 1976 on how we view history from a modern perspective were profound then and remain


germane.\textsuperscript{77} Patterson points out the dangers of historical perspective regarding the understanding of ordination because of the differences in the very words used, but also in the complex differences of time and culture.

Within the year, the resolution to include women priests in the Episcopal Church passed, and Patterson used the problem of historical perspective to weaken arguments against the resolution. Patterson argued against three points: (1) The subordinate status of women because of Eve’s participation in original sin; (2) The maternal role of women distracting from leadership; and (3) The argument of the “priesthood of Christ” as a male image necessary for a celebrant of the Eucharist reflective of the \textit{In Persona Christi} argument of Vatican II. He pointed out that all of these arguments were anachronistic and based on social convention rather than theology or historical accuracy.\textsuperscript{78}

Sarah Coakley also argues that these are not theological but cultural reactions to the idea of women priests. Coakley, in response to the argument that the Church should be seen as the bride of Christ and the priest as the male Christ, argues that the societal expectations of women are erroneously superimposed onto doctrine and liturgy. This happens through unnecessary binary role assignments of male and female. Specifically, expectations of gender are projected onto various gestures the priest may use while celebrating the Eucharist. Coakley defines this as \textit{eisegesis}: the gestures are experienced in such a way as to introduce presuppositions, agendas, or biases into and onto the

\bibentry{Ibid., 37.}
Eucharist. She concludes that there is no basis for this sort of gender assignment, including sexual orientation in her argument as well. She concludes that a priest is a priest, regardless of gender or sexuality.\textsuperscript{79}

Fortunately, and due to many theological writings like these, the understanding of ordination has progressed. Particularly, it has evolved relevant to the ordination of women.

One example of this is the understanding of the argument against women deacons as foundational to the prohibition of the ordination of women as presbyters. Many believe that women gained the right to ordination in the 1970’s by first regaining the diaconate and then using the diaconate as a political spring-board under the guidance of certain bishops such as James Pike.

But it is not that simple.

In July of 1974, eleven women were irregularly ordained by three bishops who chose to take a stand with them for the cause of gaining the right for women to be ordained. General Convention voted to make the canonical changes necessary to allow the ordination of women by finally agreeing in 1976 that women deserve equal access to ordination. The same convention recognized the 1974 ordinations as canonically valid.

It remains a point of contention that while on the one hand the “Philadelphia Eleven,” as they have come to be called, were necessary pioneers much like the women of the Women’s Suffrage movement who fought politically for the right to vote in

\textsuperscript{79} Sarah Coakely, “A Woman at the Altar,” \textit{Anglican Theological Review}, (January 2004), 75-94.
elections in the United States, a cause that group won by the ratification of the Nineteenth Amendment in 1920. On the other hand, ordination is not a right, it is a sacred order.

Were the women pioneers in the Episcopal Church called to altars or to political acts? Did they go on to lead laity sacramentally or teach others how to continue the fight for the right to ordination? Certainly these pioneers did both, but the question of ordination as a right remains. Further, this evolution occurred over the whole of church history not merely in the era immediately after Vatican II.

A historical review of attitudes about the ordination of women requires a look at the changes in ordinals. Ordination rites were very simple in the early church, if any were used at all. This evolved to the gesture of a laying on of hands and praying. Later some secondary rites began to surface, including vestiture and an insignia of the order, and giving to the ordinand a Bible (or New Testament or a book of Gospels), and a chalice and paten. It also included the blessing of the hands.

In a discussion of these secondary rites of the ordination liturgy, Weil points out the general problem of clericalization.

At least in part, these secondary rites may be understood as signs of the gradual clericalization of the liturgy which began as early as the fourth century, but which had reached a very significant level by the ninth and tenth centuries. The celebration of the Eucharist, which had been experienced as the action of the entire assembly by the early Church, had gradually come to be seen as the private domain of the ordained priest, with the laity increasingly seen as, at best, passive and non-essential observers of the sacred actions of the ordained.80

---

The presbyterate became a symbol of power after the Middle Ages. Priests and bishops became elite in the Roman Church up to and after the Reformation. This power was not bestowed upon women who were considered weaker and of lower status than men. Simply put, ordination became a status symbol.

Religious orders were the role in which women were allowed to serve the church during the Middle Ages. This phenomenon was likely at play in the church of the Middle Ages as it gave sway to the cultural demands of the time, which for the most part was power driven and male dominated.

Gary Macy addresses the separation of males and females in religious orders. He says that:

During the twelfth century, as we have seen, the concept of sacramental ordination became limited to those who served at the altar, the diaconate and presbyterate. These roles were further limited to males. Concomitant with this redefinition was the establishment of the priest at the center of liturgical life. The new and greater power given to the priesthood meant that the powers left to female religious leaders were that much diminished. Innocent III, it should be remembered, broke new ground in forbidding abbesses to hear confessions, preach, and bless their own nuns. Once women were reduced to lay status, and most sacramental functions were concentrated in the hands of the proletariat, there was no official room left for women in the church.\(^8\)

This reality of combined clericalism and patriarchy had an adverse effect on the ordination of women during this era and also subsequently. As men became more powerful and the hierarchy became more established, women correlatively lost status in the church as in culture. In the early church, there were gradations of orders that many women held. By the 12th century, none of these orders were open to women. The ministry moved over time from a community of believers, each with unique gifts, which

---
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is the Pauline understanding of the body of Christ, to a hierarchy of male bishops, priests, and deacons.

In the nineteenth century, there was a revival of religious communities in the Church of England, in part due to the influence of the Oxford Movement.

Though deaconesses were around as early as 1850\(^8\) in the American church, the first religious community for women was established in 1865 as was the primitive order of deaconess which was first approved in 1871.\(^8\) White reflected in a 1924 comment on canon III.14 (then canon III.26) “On Religious Orders/Communities,” that the order of the deaconess was revived mostly due to the work of William Reed Huntington who

brought the matter before convention after convention until he secured the enactment of a canon on the subject by the Convention of 1889. The results have fully justified the wisdom of such a canon. Deaconesses are now working in various parishes and missions, both at home and abroad, and are of invaluable assistance to the clergy.\(^8\)

The 1889 Convention adopted then canon 10, “Of Deaconesses,” which, with amendments made from time to time, remained in effect until 1970. The 1964 Convention changed the canon on deaconesses to read "ordered" rather than "appointed" and added that they were now allowed to marry. The 1970 Convention repealed the canon and enacted in its place a canon “Of Women in the Diaconate.” In 1966 the House of Bishops received a report titled "The Proper Place of Women in the Ministry of the Church.” At the 1969 Lambeth, the primates agreed that women deaconesses are within

\(^8\) Episcopal Women’s Organizations, Episcopal Church Center, accessed 2-14-17, http://arc.episcopalchurch.org/women/two/25yearsagao.htm.

\(^8\) White and Dykman, vol. 2, 949.

\(^8\) White and Dykman, vol. 2, 950.
the diaconal order. The question then arose of whether this opened priestly orders to women as well. The era of the deaconess was coming to an end.

Over the next decade the full inclusion of women as priests in The Episcopal Church was the focus. But from the revival of deacon and deaconess, to deaconess turned deacon, to the expectation that a female deacon could become a priest, the journey was complex. Nor did the journey take place in a vacuum, but alongside other churches inside and outside the Anglican Communion. For instance, Vatican II, which addressed but did not accept the ordination of women as deacons in the Roman Church, held extensive studies and conversations on the relationship between the church and the modern world between 1962 and 1965. Mainline Protestant denominations also addressed the issue of women’s ordination in the 1970’s and all had the same set of theological issues at the foundation of the argument.

On December 16, 1973 at the Cathedral of St. John the Divine in New York, Bishop Paul Moore refused to ordain five women deacons who encroached an ordination liturgy by showing up vested, expecting to be ordained as presbyters. Bishop Moore did ordain five male deacons to the presbyterate in that service as had been planned.85

This watershed moment indicated the struggle for the ordination of women as presbyters and opened the door wider for pioneering women like the Philadelphia Eleven.

Women were allowed to pursue theological education in some instances prior to these decisions about the ordination of women. In the history of admitting women to

divinity degree programs, it is clear that protestant schools were ahead of the Episcopal seminaries. Hartford Seminary was the first to admit women beginning in 1889. The University of the South (Sewanee) first admitted women to the college in 1968 and decided to admit women to the seminary the same year, though there was not a female student until 1971. The other Episcopal seminaries had similar histories.

The matter of the ordination of women was eventually decided for the Episcopal Church at the 1976 General Convention, which, according to Prichard, was too slow for the Philadelphia Eleven who took the matter into their own hands.

These ordinations were undoubtedly a contributing factor in the decision of the bishops and deputies at the 1976 General Convention to alter the church canons to allow ordination of women to the priesthood and episcopate, but they also added to the dissatisfaction of more conservative church members.

In another example of culture instructing the church, the women’s liberation movement also included the issue of equality in the church. This premise brought about the ordination of feminists who were not necessarily called to be priests. This argument suggests that women fought for the rights of women to be ordained on principle, setting some on a path to ordination who did not have an inward call, or for that matter, an outward call. They were not ordained to a particular community that had lifted them up, but they were ordained just because of their gender.
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Lawrence Crumb argues that the action in Philadelphia polarized the supporters of women’s ordination into two distinct groups. One was represented by the National Coalition for the Ordination of Women, who developed resolutions for General Convention. Another was the Women’s Ordination Now who were more politically active in public. (The second group turned the word “Now” around to “Won” in their logo after the Convention of 1976.) Crumb suggests that this second group risked “a backlash that might set back the movement and postpone change beyond the next convention.”

Certainly, these women were pioneers, although it is possible that some of them were more interested in pioneering the cause than acting as priests. But it is also clear however it came to pass, that the open door to ordination brought women to the altar who were genuinely called, capable and qualified for the office.

To this day, sexism remains a problem in the church and continues to affect access to ordination if only in covert ways. We may have come a long way in resolving these issues, but more awareness needs to be gained, particularly by commissions on ministry, standing committees and diocesan bishops discerning with aspirants for Holy Orders.

---

LGBT

There were several significant national events that formed the gay rights movement of the 1960s. The Stonewall Riot in New York in 1969 has come to be known as the watershed event. But there were other incidents and riots in other cities prior to Stonewall. For example, the New Year’s Ball Raid in San Francisco in 1965, and the Black Cat Raid in Los Angeles in 1967 were among the police raids where gatherings at bars or events by and for homosexuals were raided by police. Those attending would be subject to the publication of pictures taken during the raids. These pictures led to losses of jobs and resistance grew to violence, beatings, and in some instances loss of life.⁹⁰

In this context, LGBT persons were discriminated against in culture and church alike. In 1967, it would have been improbable for an openly gay person to gain access to the ordination process in the Episcopal Church. For that matter, it was likely a person suspected of being secretly homosexual would likely have had difficulty. But by 1985, many Episcopal bishops were willing to ordain openly gay persons.

There are two ways to look at this change. First, the Episcopal Church simply reflected the trends in culture at large. Second, the Episcopal Church began to think theologically about individual human dignity relative to the hierarchical traditions of other parts of the Anglican Communion. Eventually, care of the experience of the individual gay or lesbian aspirant won out over discrimination but not by Convention, rather by one bishop at a time.

These trends are seen in the Episcopal News Service reporting on gay clergy. The earliest related news article available in the archives of the Episcopal Church describes a conference in 1973 in the Diocese of Newark in which an open discussion was held on topics including abortion, homosexuality, and extra-marital sex. Voices in favor of gay marriage were clearly heard in this discussion though there was no mention of the ordination of gay and lesbian persons.\(^91\)

Integrity USA was founded in 1974 by Louie Crew, a professor of English then teaching at Fort Valley University in rural Georgia. The first national meeting of Integrity was held on August 15, 1975 in Chicago. This organization was founded with the intention to support LGBT persons within the Episcopal Church and this still remains the group’s mission.\(^92\)

According to a statement released by Integrity USA in 2012, “the Episcopal Church ordained its first openly gay priest in 1977 and, in 1994, passed a resolution explicitly affirming that gay, lesbian and bisexual people could not be refused ordination in the Episcopal Church for that reason alone.”\(^93\) The canon quoted here is current Canon III.2.1 (III.4.1 in 1994) which added the phrase “or sexual orientation” to the Civil Rights Act language of inclusive employment discussed in Chapter 2. The phrase “gender

---


\(^93\) Integrity USA, accessed 1-7-17, http://www.integrityusa.org/integrity-s-impact.
identity” was added to this canon by the Convention in 2012 bringing the inclusion of transgendered persons. These phrases were added to the canon that is specific to inclusivity of persons for access to the ordination process.

Both church and civic organizations have supported LGBT persons throughout the era of the 1960s and 1970s. The evolution of gay rights in American culture has evolved alongside church decisions from the 1969 Stonewall Riots in New York\(^94\) to the 1978 assassination of Harvey Milk in San Francisco\(^95\) to the 2015 Supreme Court decision to legalize same sex marriage.

The history of inclusion of LGBT persons in the church may seem to have followed the evolution of the larger culture, but it was not that easy. The House of Bishops agreed by vote at a meeting in 1977 in Florida to explicitly stand against the ordination or marriage of LGBT persons partly in response to the ordination of Helena Barrett, an open lesbian who was ordained that year by Paul Moore, the Bishop of New York.\(^96\) Bishop Moore, who as noted above had previously refused to ordain women deacons as presbyters prior to the 1976 vote, abstained from this vote but responded when questioned about his decision.

"What is the crime?" questioned Bishop Moore. "Am I being criticized for the remarks attributed to one of my clergy, after ordination, based on hearsay, and

---


\(^{95}\) Randy Shilts, *The Mayor of Castro Street: The Life and Times of Harvey Milk*, (New York: St. Martin’s, 1982).

not made by me?" He said that if the House voted to disapprove the ordination, he would "feel that this House and I differ radically about what the meaning of this apostolic office is."

It is noteworthy that the argument at this 1977 House of Bishops meeting rejecting the ordination of LGBT persons is the same as the argument in the larger Anglican Communion since the 2003 consecration and ordination of Gene Robinson, who had been elected Bishop Coadjutor of New Hampshire.

Both arguments included three points: 1) ordaining LGBT persons is always a political move advocating homosexuality even though it is a sin; 2) the minority uses ordination as a means to overthrow the majority in beliefs about homosexuality; and 3) ordination of LGBT persons is used by the church “to institutionalize by liturgical action a relationship that violates its own teaching about sex.”

The Convention of 1979 excluded the ordination of LGBT persons in resolution 1979-A053. This was in response to the study called for at Convention of 1977 and the report of that committee. The concurring resolution, simply put, forbade the ordination of an openly gay person based on the belief that any person engaged in homosexual acts was not setting “a wholesome example” by committing an act of extra marital sex.

We re-affirm the traditional teaching of the Church on marriage, marital fidelity and sexual chastity as the standard of Christian sexual morality. Candidates for ordination are expected to conform to this standard. Therefore, we believe it is not appropriate for this Church to ordain a practicing homosexual, or any person who is engaged in heterosexual relations outside of marriage.

---
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Peter Steinfels argues this canon had more to do with extra marital sex than homosexual orientation. This was in the context of an article about a controversial ordination of a lesbian to the priesthood by Ronald Haines, then Bishop of Washington. In Steinfels wording, “The Episcopal Church has never prohibited the ordination of homosexuals but has expected them, like other unmarried candidates, to abide by the church's condemnation of homosexual activity or of having sex outside marriage.”

The article included the defense by Bishop John Spong, who was asked about his ordination of a gay man in 1989. In response, he said that the 1979 General Convention resolution was only advisory and that he was strictly bound only by the church's canon law, which gives local diocesan bishops ultimate authority over such decisions.

Indeed, the power of the bishop has prevailed since 1979 in many ordinations of openly gay men and lesbians when standing committees have refused them. This is indicative of the fact that many dioceses are “pro gay” while others remain “anti-gay” and each such diocese calls bishops who share their dominant views on human sexuality.

Since that time, many resolutions addressing marriage and sexuality of aspirants have been rejected by Convention, including: 1988-D008, 1991-D176, 1991-C032, and 1991-B003.

It is interesting to note that the first resolution to be passed in favor of gay leadership was by General Convention #73 in 2000. Resolution 2000-C031 was a recommendation that another organization, the Boys Scouts of America, allow their

---

highest leaders to be LGBT persons. This resolution referred to the original language of the 1976 resolution that "homosexual persons are children of God who have a full and equal claim with all other persons upon the love, acceptance, and pastoral concern and care of the Church."\(^{101}\) It seems it was easier at the time to apply this value to an outside organization than to decisions about LGBT leadership within the Episcopal Church.

Next, the controversy over the consecration of Bishop Robinson rose to an international level. This was a significant moment in the history of the Episcopal Church, and brought attention to the Church as it addressed this issue with both its supporters and detractors. Some maintained the belief of the 1979 House of Bishops decision to uphold marriage between a man and a woman and have since left the Episcopal Church. A majority remained who fully support ordination and marriage of LGBT persons.

Bishops and standing committees have continued to ordain LGBT deacons and presbyters with no trouble and the matter in the Episcopal Church seems to have settled. After all the long debates and wordy resolutions which were rejected, the only canonical footing for this is the simple addition of two phrases to Canon III.2.1, “sexual orientation” in 1994 and “gender identity in 2012.”

**Evaluation of Postulants**

The evaluation of persons for the priesthood comes down canonically to two items for discussion: the development of commissions on ministry, and the tensions that came out of this addition.

The addition of commissions on ministry was partly due to the greater recognition of the role of the laity that was a factor in the Liturgical Renewal Movement that shaped the 1979 Book of Common Prayer. Also influential was the increase of applicants for Holy Orders which resulted from the post-WWII growth of the church and continued in spite of the decrease in the number of Episcopalians from the 1960s.

A large departure of membership occurred in reaction to the church’s embrace of social justice issues including care of marginalized groups like African Americans and Hispanics during the 1960s. But some of these same fluctuations actually caused an increase in clergy in The Episcopal Church during this same decade.

Membership declined from the mid-1960s through the 1980s and gradually stabilized. At the same time - partially because of the smaller membership, partially because of the ordination of women, and partially because of the accession of many ex-Roman Catholic priests in the years following the Second Vatican Council - the number of clergy increased. A surplus of clergy and a shortage of positions resulted. … Confronted with an oversupply, bishops began to enforce increasingly rigorous standards for ordination.¹⁰²

Within this context, Convention created commissions on ministry who were to bring unification and clarity to the requirements for ordination. The intention of the resolution in 1970 was to meet the demands of increased numbers of aspirants for Holy Orders through shared work between commissions on ministry, bishops, and standing committees. The commission’s primary power was intended to be persuasive: “To the extent that the recommendations of the commission on ministry to the bishop are persuasive, that body may have a de facto controlling effect on the progress of any

¹⁰² David Holmes, 166-167.
aspirant to ordination.” Unfortunately, however, two committees and an elected executive (bishop) can result in diluted power and triangulation.

Daniel Stevik points out that the organizing of the Episcopal Church was based on the “checks and balances” of the American form of civil government which reflects a distrust of absolute power. Stevik indicates that this has been called a “secular Calvinism.”

This principle was carried into the fabric of the Episcopal Church. Very few things can be done by any person or any collective body without the consent of concurrence of some other person or body. Each diocesan bishop must work with an elected Standing Committee. The result is that often things move slowly, for concerted actions must grow from consensus.104

In 1986, the Council for the Development of Ministry, now the Standing Commission for Ministry Development (SCMD), provided a resource designed to help commissions on ministry and standing committees work out their differences. The effort was to clarify the three roles involved in the selection process as distinct and yet imperative for the overall outcome of evaluating and forming persons for the priesthood. This report, “The Bishop, The Commission on Ministry, and the Standing Committee,” outlined the original intentions of Convention from the 1970 resolutions and made recommendations.105

---
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The relationship between the three may be strained from time to time. Standing Committees and Commissions on Ministry may spend a great deal of time defending their turf as they deal with the Bishop, with each other, with canons, and with people engaged in the process leading toward selection and ordination. Canon Law is interpreted differently from place to place, and Bishops, Commissions, and Committees do not always see their own role as a unique part of the whole process. There is often a confusion of roles.\footnote{\textit{Ibid.}, 6.}

This advisory report from the Council for the Development of Ministry, adopted by the Convention of 1988, recommends role clarification and the awareness of actions by each of two committees and one bishop as a combined effort that takes place in a timeline. The report also clarifies the role of each party. The commission on ministry is charged to recruit and evaluate aspirants for Holy Orders and the standing committee is commissioned to assure that canon law is followed. The bishop has authority over all of the process. These are helpful tools for decreasing tensions and clarifying the process as a whole.

\textbf{Education of Candidates}

Dichotomies in theological education have emerged since the 19th-century split between the High Church and Evangelical parties that created seminaries which supported differing views and ways of ministry. Twentieth-century perspectives have to some extent moved away from the antebellum concerns of these two groups, not least with the impact of the Broad Church/liberal grouping. Vatican II helped reconceive the Church as a community more than a hierarchy: “The Church itself was now defined, following the council teaching, as the people of God, a community in which the clergy-
laity distinction was much less important. A priest’s distinctiveness now came from his spiritual and institutional leadership within the community, not just as a matter of ontological difference coming from holy orders.”  

By the 1960s, the Church wanted clergy who were “servant leaders.”

In the Episcopal Church, the culmination of these changes greatly affected decisions about the education of priests. The language of the Pusey Report, reflecting concerns culminated in Vatican II and General Convention of 1970 addressed concerns of priests who were thought to be both not academically prepared and not prepared to meet the demands of ministry “in the real world.”

Professionalism

In 1968, James Glasse published his controversial *Profession: Minister* in which he argues in favor of the concept of the ministry as a profession. Urban Holmes, and Charles Blaisdell argued against him that the ministry is different from other “professions” simply in that there is a component of transcendence that defines the priest.

---


Blaisdell indicates one way in which ministry is a profession:

There is, of course, an old and honorable definition of ‘professional’: one who ‘speaks for’ God, who, by his or her actions, calls all things into their right relation with God. For the medieval church, explains Westerhoff, ‘to be professed was to have acknowledged a special grace related to an intimate relational knowledge of God (faith), given by God (revelation), and calling one to a corresponding responsibility to live for the good of others (vocation), through some particular form of service (ministry).’ Thus, in this sense, ‘professional’ would describe a person’s being by a focus on his or her relation to the divine ground of that being.112

The indicators of a profession are: a full-time occupation, a training school, relationship with a university or specialty school, credence with a local and/or national association, a code of ethics, and licensure. As other professions developed these attributes, ministry both conformed to this definition and remained a unique vocation.

The second group of theologians (Urban Holmes, John Westerhoff and Edward Farley) sees the real ‘crisis of ministry’ as irremovably rooted in theology, not sociology, organization theory, ergonomics, or professionalism. In other words, authentic ministry is always rooted in who God is in relation to persons and their world.113 Holmes argues against Glasse’s notion of professionalism as functional. Holmes lists 5 qualifications Glasse indicates in his definition of professional: (1) educated in some body of knowledge, (2) possesses a cluster of skills, (3) has an institutional commitment, (4) is responsible to a set of standards, and (5) is dedicated.114 First, however, Holmes refuses to apply the concept of function to the ministry, indicating that the ministry cannot be

112 Charles R. Blaisdell, 43.
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confined to one profession and one role. Second, he argues that certain skills required of priests are innate more than learned. Using preaching and ritualizing as examples, he says they are “either endowed by heredity and environment or ‘catches.’ What can be taught is peripheral.” Third, unlike Gasse’s observations that professions must lobby for fair wages, to Holmes the priest neither can “earn a living anywhere comparable to ‘other professionals,’” nor should he. Fourth, “Professionalism tends to focus on the ‘here and now’ to the exclusion of transcendence.” Holmes argues that the priest practices ministry in a “liminality” that is unlike any comparable profession. Other professions practice a “numinous” sense of control. The priest is not in control but only God is.¹¹⁵

This language began to dominate the theology of ministry during the 1970s and the concept of the priest as a professional has been debated ever since.

There was consensus that some professionalism is expected in the daily behavior of a priest, but other traits expected of persons presenting themselves to discernment processes should lean toward the mysterious, liminal, and transcendent.

This argument between the two notions of seminaries preparing students as professionals or forming theologically grounded pastors is an old one. Two decisions by Convention during this era have worked toward reconciling this split. The first is the development of Field Education¹¹⁶ and the latter is the General Ordination

¹¹⁵ Ibid., 196-200.

Examinations. Field Education is discussed below under the heading Formation of Presbyters.

The General Ordination Examination

The General Board of Examining Chaplains has endured much debate. One specific debate is between qualifying and contextual types of examination for those pursuing ordination.

The newly constituted GBEC met in December 1970 and in April and October 1971 in order to prepare the new examination. Members of the committee did not initially share a common vision of what the examination was to be. Some wanted an English-style exam based upon a clear syllabus. Others wanted a special qualifying exam on the basis of which a small percentage of ordinands would be selected for distinction. Still others wanted a contextual exam that stressed the ability of students to coordinate and identify what they had learned in the various areas.

The contextual format won in the end. Prichard indicates that “although there was substantial support on the GBEC for a contextual examination, it was never unanimous. From the beginning a minority favored testing for mastery of knowledge in the seven canonical areas of study.”

Prichard uses Bishop C. FitzSimons Allison as an example to outline the evolution of the GOEs. Having begun his teaching at Virginia Theological Seminary in 1967, the year in which the Pusey Report appeared, Allison was a relatively new seminary faculty member. He had the rare experience of participating in these changes
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118 Ibid.
119 Ibid., 311.
both as faculty at VTS and as a long-term member of the Board of Theological Education (BTE).

As VTS began to incorporate the curriculum changes suggested by the Pusey Report, which included the addition of a field education program, reduction in the number of required courses, and creation of a number of pastoral theology electives that addressed contemporary problems, Allison “feared that an examination that tested only the ability to apply classroom knowledge to concrete ministerial situations missed the point; students were not acquiring the classroom knowledge in the first place.”¹²⁰

Allison used statistics and actual examples from early exams to convince boards and bishops that a more academic examination was in order. The eventual result was that deficiency rates increased.

By 1985, test scores were at an all-time low, particularly in the area of ethics. Also prevalent in the 1980s was an increase in the number of seminarians who had come to the Episcopal Church from other traditions increasing the need for Anglican Studies. This demographic did not score well on the larger examination. Seminaries responded with courses in areas with lowest test scores.¹²¹

The GOEs continued to evolve from the contextual test of the 1970s and the academic test of the 1980s into an examination that strives to be more broad and

¹²⁰ Ibid., 312.
¹²¹ Ibid., 316.
balanced. Warren Ramshaw, in a 1998 evaluation of the GOE reviews statistical findings that clarify this evolution.\textsuperscript{122}

As of 1998, the GOE had been taken by 7,092 Episcopal priests. Ramshaw points out that for the students the exam is a “one-time experience”, but the board’s desire is for continuing involvement with the process. Ramshaw indicates a decreased number of ordinands taking the exam. This means that bishops are requiring the examination less often.

Ramshaw’s analysis also shows scores decreasing. He writes:

The proportion of candidates certified as proficient in all seven canonical areas in the past 25 years has ranged from a high of 74% in 1974 to a low of 42% in 1994. On average, over this 25-year period, the overall proportion of those certified as proficient in all seven areas is 53.4%. In the ten years 1988-97, the average percent certified in seven canonical areas was 49.6%. The high in this period was 55.2% and the low 42%. The last decade has a slightly lower average proportion deemed proficient in all seven canonical areas than in the whole 25-year period 1972-1997.\textsuperscript{123}

Ramshaw believes these numbers indicate consistency in that these results have not fluctuated during this time period in which “the membership of the GBEC has changed four times over in this period, the readers have changed to some extent yearly, and the candidates are entirely new each year.”\textsuperscript{124}

While consistency may be a goal of the BTE, the test does not accurately measure the readiness for a person to begin a life of ministry as a priest, much less does the test in any way measure the call of that person or his/her depth of spiritual formation.


\textsuperscript{123} Ramshaw, 374.

\textsuperscript{124} Ramshaw, 375.
Formation of Presbyters:

Much has been written on the formation of presbyters with little consensus as to what formation actually means. Three components of theological education have been utilized though never in consensus. These are spiritual formation, field education, and Clinical Pastoral Education.

Some believe seminarians ought to have a monastic experience with more time in chapel learning liturgy as well as learning to pray. Others suggest that seminary is for academic education leaving spiritual formation to parishes and dioceses. The former opinion assumes that spiritual formation begun at seminary develop over the years to produce spiritual depth in the priest. The latter opinion assumes that seminarians were formed as Christians already in their home parishes and now need only clarity through study.

Vatican II helped create this confusion for the Roman seminaries as well. Foster, et. al. lift up The Society of the Divine Word an example of how to incorporate academics and praxis. Their description indicates the challenge as that of “how to live faithfully and fruitfully in contexts of cultural and religious pluralism.”125 They write:

In general, directors of the programs of religious formation across Catholic Theological Union told us that contemporary formation processes are ‘a total reversal’ from those they had experienced as students prior to Vatican II. At that time, processes of formation emphasized the candidates’ increasing conformation to the charism, structures, and institutions of their religious orders. Questions of personal discernment or a focus on individual experience were foreign. Now those

questions are emphasized and the processes are highly individualized, focusing on the gifts, needs, and growth of each seminarian.\textsuperscript{126} Foster goes on to indicate that this sort of emphasis on the individual stretched the expertise of seminary faculties and staff.

Decisions about the formation of priests, as indicated in Chapter Two, have not been thoroughly addressed by the canons or reports to the Convention. Soon after Vatican II, Taylor, (who as indicated in Chapter One was the writer of the 1967 Pusey Report) addressed the need for formation as did others in the 1970s, like Urban Holmes in \textit{Strangeness of Seminary}\textsuperscript{127} and David Kelsey in \textit{To Understand God Truly}.\textsuperscript{128}

The Pusey Report, leaning on the earlier report entitled \textit{The Advancement of Theological Education}, strongly supports the continuance of a monastic spirit and daily offices in traditional chapels. The report also identifies a growing conflict in seminaries at the time between students and teachers about liturgical practices on campus.

It is argued that the position of the altar or even the architecture of the chapel must be changed; the hour of service must be earlier or later; the music must be Gregorian or ‘jazz mass;’ one must stand instead of kneel; ‘pop’ prayers must take the place of the customary collects; such and such a version of the Bible must be used today, another tomorrow.\textsuperscript{129}

This list goes on and reflects not only theological schools but contemporary parishes. In the report Taylor specifically refutes the very word “chaos” as “too strong a word to describe the worship of Episcopal schools.” He attributes conflict about seminary
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chapel practices to the increasing diversity of students and increasing demands of faculty. He argues for a change in liturgical practices, consistent with the vote for the 1979 prayer book revisions.

In the end, the Pusey report’s recommendations about formation were for seminaries to work to create more congenial communities and ease tensions between students and faculties. This was thought to create an atmosphere where priests could be formed not spiritually but shaped in order to function more efficiently “in the real world.”

Ten years later, Holmes saw seminaries trying to return to monastic campus liturgical practices either in response to the report or more provocatively to show that monastic practice had never changed. Holmes noted the influence of the Roman monastic seminary model on Episcopal seminaries in the early 19th century. Claire Lofgren names the Oxford Movement’s influence on Nashotah House, founded in 1842, as the “most obvious” American model for this.

One could argue that the influence is not so much a direct Roman Catholic or monastic influence as it is an indirect influence via the Anglo-Catholic English theological colleges, some of which were monastic foundations, or of the English university colleges, their chapels and other traditions, which derive more anciently from monastic practice.

The influence of this model on the Episcopal Church is self-evident if one visits the chapels at Sewanee, General, Seabury-Western, as well as Nashotah House (and at

130 Pusey, 75-76.
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Philadelphia before it merged with the Episcopal Theological School at Cambridge). Their seating is arranged the same as at monastic foundations, with the faculty and the students sitting across from one another in choir. The seminary dean, either by ordinance or custom or both, was the abbot; his faculty the professed monks; and the students the novices. The abbatial model of seminary life was the basis for the belief that the primary task of theological education was to form the student into that pattern of life which the Church deemed the appropriate priest.\(^\text{133}\)

The answer to the plea for more formation in the 1970s was not a plea for more prayer, but also for more preparation for work in “the real world.” The response of seminaries was to add field education and Clinical Pastoral Education (CPE) to curricula.

The topic of field education was predominant in the Pusey Report, but it was not a new idea. Prior to WWII, the term was used in multiple Convention decisions about the educational subject of study called “Practical Theology.” This area of study was intended to prepare priests for work in the world with an emphasis on formation as “practical” rather than spiritual or functional.

Glenn Miller points out that early 20\(^\text{th}\)-century field education consisted of placing individual seminarians in small churches that would collaborate with seminaries in order to have a clerical presence they might otherwise not be able to afford. Students in turn are

able to benefit from a meager salary while in school. This changed after WWII when clinical education began to be used by seminaries. 134

The process for ordination in the Episcopal Church, due to this context formed a relationship with CPE in the 1970s that has evolved. Dating back to 1925,135 CPE had been around long before to the Pusey Report. Dioceses and seminaries tapped into CPE as a model for field education in the 1970s but this relationship has never really been consistent.

There are three reasons for this disconnect, according to Miller. To begin with, there has been a rift throughout the history of theological education between managers of field placements and seminary administrators. “Field educators . . . were seen by colleagues and administrators as essentially managers of an employment bureau.”136 The same reputation of clinical supervisors as not part of the seminary has left seminary administrators disinterested in CPE.

Second, clinical education was never fully appreciated or used because of changing trends from post-war emphases on psychological health and rising interest in social activism. While these trends initially invited the deeply reflective clinical model these trends did not last.137
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Thirdly, and theologically, there was always a suspicion of the clinical educators according to Miller who said that, “Since Kant, Protestant theologians had tended to translate ancient religious categories into social imperatives and to see Christianity as a cultural force. Any form of theological education that stressed internal states and private experience, hence, was suspect almost from the beginning.”\textsuperscript{138}

This chapter has reviewed the changes to Title III outlined in Chapter Two using the topics of access to ordination, evaluation of postulants, education of candidates, and formation of priests. Within the section on access to ordination this chapter examined groups of people who have suffered discrimination for parts of their personhood that they were born with and have no choice about such as gender, race and sexual orientation. Chapter Four will discuss situational issues: divorce; substance abuse; aspirants ordained in another denomination and the problem of sequential ordination as they have affected access to ordination. These issues come with some amount of choice or circumstance and therefore hold different experiences both for the individual and the decision processes of the Convention.

\textsuperscript{138} Ibid, 609-610.
This chapter discusses four situational challenges for ordinands: divorce; substance abuse; aspirants ordained in another church and the problem of sequential ordination, as these issues relate to access to the presbyterate in the Episcopal Church. These issues are examined from a historical perspective specific to changes to canon law through the review of reports and resolutions presented to Convention since 1976. These differ from the categories of persons discussed in Chapter Three. These are situational issues that come with some amount of choice, circumstance and cultural influence. Each of them is more complicated than discrimination against persons because of race, gender or sexual orientation. Therefore they each hold various experiences for the individual, the commissions on ministry, standing committees and bishop as well as the decision processes of the Convention.

**Divorce**

The earliest mention of divorce in the canons was from General Convention of 1808 under Title I.13 which evolved to Canons I.17 and I.18 in 1973. This was the result of “a compromise between those who desired that no remarriage of divorced persons, having a husband or wife still living from whom they were divorced, should be permitted by the Church, and those who desired that an exception should be made in the case of the so-called innocent party in a divorce for adultery.” This tension between those who
desired a strict rule against divorce and remarriage and those who favored softening the rule for “no fault” divorces evolved to an essentially unrestricted canon by 1973.\footnote{White and Dykman, Vol. 1, 398-415.}

The rising phenomenon of divorce raises questions of Scriptural teachings about marriage. Garry Wills points out that 1 Timothy 3:1-13 outlines the expectations in the early church of bishops and deacons that they be married only once. In Mark 10:6-9, Jesus reaffirms the words of Genesis 2:24 emphasizing that marriage is indissoluble with the words used since in the sacrament of matrimony, “what God has joined together, let no one separate.”

From the first century the church has struggled to reconcile this passage with Matthew 5:32 and 19:9, wherein Jesus pointed to the laws which allow a man (only a man, not a woman) to leave his wife if she is unfaithful. Wills goes on to point out the evolution of values about matrimony.

Given such uncertainties and the general agreement on marriage as a natural right, it is not surprising that there are no recorded early formulae for a specifically Christian matrimony. “Before the eleventh century there was no such thing as a Christian wedding ceremony in the Latin church, and throughout the Middle Ages there was no single church ritual for solemnizing marriage between Christians.” In fact, one of the earliest papal pronouncements on marriage came near the end of the fourth century, when Pope Siricius said that all clerics had to have their marriages solemnized by a priest: “Around the year 400, then, the only Latin Christians who had to receive an ecclesiastical blessing on their marriage were priests and deacons.”\footnote{Garry Wills, Why Priests? A Failed Tradition, Quoting Martos, (New York: Penguin Books, 2013), 229.}

Cultural trends for marriage and divorce have evolved from this early expectation that ecclesial marriage was something only clergy did to the nineteenth and early
twentieth centuries expectation that remarriage was something no one should to do to an expectation of anything goes by the mid-twentieth century.

Divorce and remarriage began to become common as early as the mid 1950s in American culture, and has affected persons seeking access to ordination in the Episcopal Church as well as those already ordained. A 2001 survey of clergy found significant numbers of divorce among their ranks at that time.

Eighty-one percent of the clergy are married, but behind that figure are some significant trends. Overall, 25.8 percent of clergy have experienced divorce at some point. While the proportion of married male clergy is higher, at almost 86 percent as compared to just 63 percent of female clergy, this gap is not driven primarily by a difference in divorce rates between male and female clergy. Male clerics have a higher level of remarriage after divorce and thus total divorce rates only differ by 5.4 percent for men and women. In the over-55 age category, one-third of clergy have been divorced. The proportion of clergy who have been divorced is higher for early-ordained male clergy than second-career male clergy, while for women clergy the pattern is significantly reversed, with early-ordained women clergy having the lowest rate of divorce of any group and women ordained over 40 years of age the highest.141

Of course clerical marriage was part of the Church of England’s teaching from 1552.142 In the Church of England canons of 1604 divorce was prohibited for anyone, although there was provision for Parliament to grant a (rather public) act of divorce. Divorce became a matter for civil rather than ecclesiastical courts only in 1857. But remarriage in a church was not permitted in the Church of England until 2002.


The Episcopal Church began following cultural norms regarding divorce from early on. Canon I.17 has addressed marriage and divorce both doctrinally and liturgically since 1808. In that early Convention, detail was added against remarriage “unless it be on the account of the other party having been guilty of adultery.” Since then this canon has maintained the rule that all decisions regarding Holy Matrimony must be in keeping with State and Federal law.\(^\text{143}\) While the topic of divorce and remarriage was discussed a great deal in the interim, the canon did not change much until 1973 when it was repealed and rewritten. The 1973 canon is strict in its insistence that couples are encouraged to stay married. There is no mention of remarriage in the canons until more than a decade later. In fact, 1988-D088 was a resolution requiring marriage counseling prior to divorce but was rejected by the Convention of 1988.

There are two possible reasons for the Church to liberalize its teaching on divorce. First, it is possible that the Church has been influenced by a cultural value that divorce is not immoral when at least one party has been wronged. Within this possibility is also the fact that “no-fault” divorce became legal in most states in the 1970s beginning with California in 1969.\(^\text{144}\) A second may involve the theology of forgiveness. Persons who have been divorced, even if for immoral reason, have been forgiven and may have subsequently been called by God to ordination.

\(^{143}\) White and Dykman, vol. 1, 398.
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However, to date, the Episcopal Church has not addressed in its canons any limits on the number of divorces for clergy or aspirants though details of how priests and bishops are to work with lay couples prior to marriage, remarriage and divorce have been addressed by multiple Conventions. The Episcopal Church has left such matters to the dioceses which were originally aligned with each state. The early American Church was quite strict about divorce and it was rare for a divorced person to become a priest. With changes in society have come changes in diocesan canons, such as this one from the Diocese of California where clergy are allowed to be divorced, but no more than twice.

Domestic Stability. The life of an ordained person is stressful, and the ability to form enduring marital bonds is important for the health and welfare of the clergy and the congregations they serve. For this reason, it is the policy of the Diocese of California that no one who has been married/legally partnered and divorced three times will be accepted into the ordination process. Clergy who obtain a third divorce are required to resign their posts.\footnote{Diocese of California Ordination Manual, “Discerning Your Call to Ministry: Lay, Religious and Ordained Ministry in the Church,” August 2011, accessed 1-11-17 http://diocal.org/sites/default/files/media/PDF%20Docs/discerning_your_call.pdf.}

One phenomenon that might explain the lack of canonical response to the growing numbers of divorced clergy is that the legal status of divorce has been left up to the state law rather than federal law. It is only the morality and call of the aspirant that should concern commissions on ministry. Legal matters around divorce, such as the expectation that the aspirant has kept to legal requirements about divorce, such as in matters of child custody, should be left to the standing committees to address.

A major change to the canons regarding the dissolution of a marriage happened at General Convention #64 in 1973 when the legality of the previous Canon, under which
the invalidity of the prior marriage was measured against the list of canonical barriers. This was replaced by a pastoral attitude under which a ministry to the needs of those with failed marriages would take precedence. The list of canonical impediments was then deleted from the Canons.\footnote{E. A. White and J. A. Dykman, J. A., Annotated Constitution and Canons for the Government of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America, Otherwise Known as The Episcopal Church, 1989 supplement to vol. 1. (New York, 1989), accessed 09-28-16, \url{http://www.episcopalarches.org/sites/default/files/publications/WD_1989_Supp.pdf}.}

Another resolution that breached the subject was at Convention of 1976 with 1976-C026, which called for pension benefits to be awarded to spouses of deceased clergy at the time of death even when divorce preceded death. This resolution was tabled for study and while there were several resolutions asking for increased pension and insurance coverage of surviving spouses of clergy, the request for divorced spouses seems to have gone by the wayside.

The only concrete statement the Episcopal Church has made about divorce appears in a section of Episcopal Canon Law on remarriage, which states that a clergy member cannot perform a ceremony of remarriage if one member of the couple being married has failed to have their previous marriage annulled or dissolved civilly, and if the bishop of the diocese in which the couple is being married has not approved of the marriage (Canon I.19.3). If a couple has been remarried outside of the Episcopal Church they nevertheless are fully welcomed into the church.

Commissions on Ministry and bishops are left to discern without definitive rules about the divorce and remarriage of aspirants. On the one hand this is challenging as it leaves much more work to do in answering questions of morality and psychological and
Spiritual wellness of aspirants. On the other hand, it is good in that it does not screen out with a sort of rubber stamp aspirants who are qualified, capable and called. Further it is fitting with Episcopalian tradition that diocesan bishops are left with the final decision.

**Substance Abuse**

This section discusses the effects that attitudes regarding substance abuse have had on the ordination process, which have changed significantly since 1979.

The Convention of 1979 passed a resolution to form a “Committee on Alcoholism” in each diocese which would develop resources for education and policy writing. This included a request for each diocese to provide a “policy on alcoholism.” (1979-B122) Before then, an aspirant would likely have had great difficulty if suspected of substance abuse, or even an open participant of Alcoholics Anonymous (founded in 1935)\(^\text{147}\) or Narcotics Anonymous (founded in 1953).\(^\text{148}\) Attitudes about addiction evolved to more openness and appreciation of persons involved in 12 Step programs by the 1980s. Recent activity at Convention, however, has resulted in new restrictions on alcohol use.

Values about alcohol use in the Episcopal Church have mirrored those in Great Britain throughout much of the history of the American church. The exception to this are waves of temperance, particularly in the era of the 1920s. There is an anthropological

---


understanding of values about alcohol use that is historically behind contemporary norms indicated by colloquial phrases like “Whiskeypalian” and “wherever three or four Episcopalians are gathered, there is a fifth.” These are more than just jokes as they indicate values of alcohol use within the Episcopal Church that, I would argue, bear resemblance to values in the United Kingdom. Interestingly, in Britain this view of alcohol applies in the law courts:

Defendants in court often plead for mitigation on the basis that they were intoxicated at the time of the offense. Perhaps surprisingly, British courts often accept such pleading, arguing that the behaviour was ‘out of character’ - a standard metaphor for disinhibition. In more informal social contexts, excuses such as "it was the drink talking" are even more likely to be accepted.149

In the 1980s, addiction treatment soared because of third party payer incentives. Private insurance companies were paying for inpatient and outpatient treatment because of a new understanding in healthcare of addiction as a disease. The General Convention of the Episcopal Church responded during this decade with many resolutions affirming prevention and treatment of alcoholism and addiction.

In 2010, Heather Cook drove her car with a blood alcohol level of .27, more than three times the legal limit, was arrested and charged with Driving While Intoxicated and pleaded guilty. That information was not disclosed when Cook was elected a suffragan bishop of Maryland in May of 2014. In December of the same year, Cook again drove drunk. This time, she struck and killed a cyclist named Thomas Palermo, a 41 year-old husband and father of two.

At the 2015 Convention, Gay Clark Jennings, president of the House of Deputies, appointed a committee to review the church’s policies on alcohol and drug abuse and to propose new resolutions to be considered. The only policies prior to 2015 dated back to 1985 and did not address preparation for ordination nor disciplinary canons for the life of presbyters as found in Title IV.

“They are discussing how addiction is handled and whether the church itself was in any way culpable in the death of cyclist Thomas Palermo,” said Jennings. It was not until this incident and this call for action at the 2015 Convention that resolutions were passed regarding substance abuse which affected the ordination process. This Convention passed three resolutions on the matter encouraging education, resourcing and requiring diocesan policies on alcohol use. The resolution about ordination, 2015-D014, “Evaluate Individuals in the Ordination Process for Addiction Concerns” reads in part:

That Vestries, Commissions on Ministry and Standing Committees interviewing aspirants for ordination ask one or more questions regarding substance use. . . Resolved, the foregoing shall not be construed to prevent those with the disease of alcoholism or addiction to other drugs from access to the process for ordination.  

The resolution also included recommendations for increased awareness.

The screening of aspirants for alcoholism or addiction has historically been left up to the parish from which the aspirant is nominated assuming the home parish would know

---


the aspirant well enough to at least raise suspicions about traits of this disease. It is within the scope of the responsibilities of the commission on ministry to address such concerns, if they are known. But it is not an easy disease to diagnose, even for healthcare professionals with expertise, like addictionologists. Clearly, the commission on ministry and parish leadership alike are limited in their ability to screen for this disease and so the burden falls on the psychiatric and psychological examinations. And it is difficult for even these experts to identify traits of the disease in one evaluation where the person evaluated may be in denial and hide traits that are best identified over long term observation and communication with his or her family members.

Linda Bennett studies trends of alcohol consumption in the Episcopal Church in response to these resolutions. In her chapter, “Alcohol Writ Accountable: The Episcopal Diocese of Washington, D.C.”, Bennett does not assume the Diocese of Washington is representative of all Episcopal dioceses or parishes, nor does her study claim to address all alcohol-related problems in the Episcopal Church. Nonetheless, in the outline for her study she identifies at least two components to the problem at large. She says that alcohol is a “natural component in the ritual and social life of the Church” and that there are “no strict rules against the social use of alcohol either on or off church premises.”

It is within this context that bishops, commissions on ministry, and standing committees face the challenge of addressing mental and physical wellness of aspirants for Holy Orders. It is a difficult and important task to screen aspirants in order to prevent

---

problems with addiction among ordained persons that have occurred in the past. It is nevertheless important not to focus so much on screening that discernment is thwarted.

**Access for Those Coming from Another Church**

Individuals who aspire to ordination as priests in the Episcopal Church who have been ordained in another tradition have also affected Title III. Should they start over with discerning their call to ministry? Should they obtain a second Master of Divinity degree from an Episcopal seminary? How will they be formed as Episcopalian priests? The challenges are obvious and the process of receiving these clergy, examining them, and re-ordaining them invites criticism.

The reference to the ordination rites by the White and Dykman writer here regards the history of current Canon III.10.3.h. and includes prefaces specifically created for the ordinand coming from another church.

Finally, the provisions for receiving ministers of other Churches were simple and rarely necessary in the early American Church, when an application from a minister of another church was rare. In 1804, a canon was added specifying that this matter was left to the discretion of the bishop. This left open the practice of allowing immediate ordination of such previously ordained ministers while other candidates were required to wait.\(^{153}\) A new canon in 1841 required a certificate signed by two presbyters of the

Church, “stating that his desire to leave his former communion was not because of any circumstance unfavorable to his moral or religious character.”

Not until 1904 were the provisions amended to require satisfactory evidence of character and theological attainments, and a promise to submit himself in all things to the discipline of this Church without recourse to any foreign jurisdiction, civil or ecclesiastical.\textsuperscript{155}

The constitutional statement “I do believe the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament to be the Word of God, and to contain all things necessary to salvation: and I do solemnly engage to conform to the doctrines and worship of the Protestant Episcopal Church in these United States,” went on to address “persons who are admitted to officiate as ministers of this Church, but who have already been ordained by a foreign bishop, or by a bishop not in communion with this Church.”\textsuperscript{156}

Current Canon III.10 addresses these provisions and has changed very little since 1961. The process required was essentially the same as that required of other postulants and candidates for Holy Orders. Under the present canon, all ministers of other traditions seeking ordination in the Episcopal Church must meet the same requirements, take the same examinations, and be subject to a similar timeframe. There is some difference in terminology of postulancy and candidacy however:

It will be observed that such ministers are not classified as postulants and candidates but as applicants, and remain such for six months; that the period between the diaconate and the priesthood is shortened to four months; and that in the case of non-Catholic ministers, and ministers in dubious Catholic orders,

\textsuperscript{154} White and Dykman, vol. 2, 681.
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appropriate prologues to the service are provided. This is not provided in the case of ministers clearly ordained in the historic succession, since there an act of reception is prescribed, rather than ordination, thus affirming their existing orders.\footnote{White and Dykman, vol. 2, 681.}

The phrase “dubious Catholic orders” refers to any person whose ordination is in doubt as to whether or not it is within the historic succession. The emphasis seems to be on historic succession but the interpretation of Canon III.10 leaves bishops having to provide standing committees with appropriate proof of the background of applicants.

On the question of dubious baptism, if there is any doubt, then conditional baptism is performed using the formula: “If you are not already baptized, N., I baptize you in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit”.\footnote{Book of Common Prayer, 1979, 313.} But the Episcopal Church does not have a special preface for, nor does it practice, “conditional ordination.”

The traditions from which candidates may come that are not seen as dubious are:

(i) those duly constituted Dioceses, Provinces, and regional Churches in communion with the See of Canterbury,
(ii) the Old Catholic Churches of the Union of Utrecht,
(iii) the Philippine Independent Church, and
(iv) the Mar Thoma Syrian Church of Malabar, and
(v) the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America.

One practice has been to require a year of Anglican studies at an Episcopalian seminary to satisfy canonical requirements of testing the applicant in Episcopal polity, but this is not specifically required by canon law. A bishop may prove equivalency through transcripts or oral examinations. Still the difficulty for already ordained clergy who are called, qualified and capable remains ambiguous.
Sequential Ordination

Another challenge for formation and it could be argued, access, is the confusion in the church regarding deacons. Resolution 88 of the 1958 Lambeth Conference states: “The Conference recommends that each province of the Anglican Communion shall consider whether the office of deacon shall be restored to its place as a distinctive order in the Church, instead of being regarded as a probationary period for the priesthood.”\(^{159}\)

The 1968 Lambeth Conference made further strides with the restoration of the diaconate. In Resolution 32, the bishops recommended that the diaconate be open to men and women and to full-time church workers, in addition to candidates for the presbyterate. The same resolution also directed that the ordination rites of the Anglican Communion be revised to take into account the new role of the diaconate, to remove references to the diaconate as an “inferior office,” and to emphasize the continuing element of diakonia in the ministries of presbyters and bishops.\(^{160}\)

Throughout the history of the church, there has been a question about sequential ordination. At times the diaconate has been seen as distinctive, at other times as an inferior rank to pass through, a valuation that goes back to the Roman society in which the hierarchy of the Church was developed.

The argument in the Church today is whether the loss of the transitional diaconate would be detrimental to the presbyterate as an important stage for formation. James


Barnett, on the other hand says, “The use of the diaconate as a transitional office on the way to the presbyterate was in all probability the single most important factor in bringing about its decline, and even then it took centuries to reduce the order to one of “inferior” status.”

The presbyterate of the past has aptly been called the “omnivorous priesthood,” having become all-encompassing, although not so much by intention as by an unintentional evolution over the centuries. Its tendency to be perpetuated both by the ordained and the laity is certainly natural in an institution that rightly holds its tradition in high esteem. However, the renewal and vitality of the Church in our time requires that its subtle encroachments on other ministries be recognized and abandoned.

The writers of the exposition of this canon in White and Dykman (then III.12) point out two discrepancies, one related to demeaning the diaconate and the other about the ordinal rite.

There are two questions which must be raised with respect to this canon in the light of the revision of the Prayer Book in 1979. The first has to do with the propriety of receiving clerics first as deacons, and later as priests. It is contended by some that this practice is reflective of the view of the 1928 Prayer Book that the diaconate is an “inferior office,” and is not congruent with the teaching of the revised book. The second pertains to the prefaces to the service of ordination contained in clauses (b) and (c) of Section 5. In form, style, and content, these were designed to fit the rites of ordination of the 1928 book. Should such forms still be desired, they should be recast in a style appropriate to the new rites, and a suitable place for their inclusion in the service established.

Viewing the diaconate as distinctive rather than inferior occurred during the decade just prior to Vatican II. The confusion about the vocational deacon continues to perplex the Church at large and those most closely connected to the discernment process.
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Conclusion

An aspirant for Holy Orders enters the discernment process through the gate of this context. There are many struggles with discernment and challenges for the aspirant who is expected to articulate not only a call to ministry but aptitude and ability within a moral lifestyle. The four topics discussed above remain as challenges. If the aspirant has been divorced, the topic may or may not be approached by the standing committee, the commission on ministry, or the bishop. But the aspirant, if divorced, must be prepared to prove legal and emotional resolution. If an aspirant is in recovery from the disease of addiction, and is open about his or her recovery story, this may impact the decision of the commission on ministry. It may be more difficult for the aspirant to move through the process. If an aspirant has already been trained and educated in another church, starting over is a waste of time and too much of a burden while the imperative remains that any Episcopal presbyter should be knowledgeable of Anglican history and doctrine and be formed as well into Anglican values.

But what does this really mean? It may happen that these situational issues cause so much confusion for those leading the process that the diaconate is offered as a consolation prize of sorts. Suggesting that an aspirant for the presbyterate should “stay” a deacon is not only demeaning to the diaconate but unfinished discernment with the aspirant for the presbyterate. While there is no report of this practice, it certainly has happened. Still, most commissions on ministry and bishops are well aware of these challenges and work to develop open, caring and flexible settings which provide realistic and spiritually based processes for individuals who are called to Holy Orders.
This chapter has examined four situational issues that sometimes have impeded access to ordination for those who aspire to the presbyterate. These are: divorce, substance abuse, having been previously ordained in another church and the problem of sequential ordination. Chapter Five will provide some recommendations for solutions to these problems.
Chapter Five
The Qualities of a Presbyter: Spiritual, Professional, Intellectual

This chapter evaluates the Title III changes since 1970 that affect the process for the ordination of presbyters, in the Episcopal Church, arguing that this evolution of canonical requirements has left the Episcopal Church with a lack of agreement between seminaries and dioceses regarding the spiritual, professional and intellectual qualities of a presbyter. This chapter also makes recommendations for moving forward by recapitulating two documents evidenced in previous chapters and introducing a survey I have conducted of thirty-two diocesan commissions on ministry. This culminates in the recommendation of a comprehensive training for all dioceses in the Episcopal Church.

The final decision of who is ordained a presbyter starts and ends with the diocesan bishop, but a host of experts is required by the canons in the evaluation, education and formation of postulants and candidates. The confusion of roles among diocesan bodies will also become clear.

The Introduction cited “Formation or Education or Training” in the 1971 book The Future Shape of Ministry by Urban T. Holmes164 as an example of the vast writings in the 1970s on the topic of the crisis of ministry. Holmes specifies three categories of expectations for seminaries: graduate education, professional training and formation of priestly character. Holmes indicates that these categories have been an “overlapping troika” of expectations of seminaries and that one or another has been foremost in different eras of church history. He explains that in its original Tridentine and

Reformation development, a seminary was conceived primarily as a place for the formation of a priest and that the expectation of graduate level education was a more recent evolution. Holmes concludes that the seminary of the 1970s was becoming one in which professional training was expected. Theological education has been attempting to maintain this troika in the more than four decades since Holmes suggested these categories.

Robert MacSwain, professor of theology at an Episcopal seminary, addresses the ongoing split between the seminary and the diocesan commission on ministry. Specifically, in the context of a question about his support of the Scholar-Priest Initiative and the Society of Scholar-Priests, two organizations working to bridge this split, MacSwain says about the scholar-priest, or lack thereof: "for decades academically minded individuals have been actively discouraged from pursuing ordained ministry in the Episcopal Church — I guess on the grounds that we don’t want smart, well-educated, and learned parish priests."165 He continues,

At the same time, and perhaps correlatively, we’ve seen some Episcopal seminaries reduce or eliminate their residential degree programs and some Episcopal colleges diminish or question their affiliation to the Church, all of which weakens the institutional contexts in which much of our scholarship has traditionally flourished. But intellectual health cannot be divorced from institutional health, and so we desperately need strong institutions of higher education and theological formation in the Episcopal Church if we want our distinctive form of Christianity to survive in this country. That doesn’t just happen automatically but must be protected and nourished.166
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This recalls Holmes’ argument that the split between intellectual training, professional training and the formation of a priestly character continues to be a problem for both the seminary and the diocesan entities recruiting and preparing persons for the presbyterate.

Chapters Three and Four provided a chronological review of types of persons and situations from which an individual comes when seeking discernment for ordination as a presbyter. Holmes’ categories indicate at least one way in which seminaries have struggled to educate, train and form their students into the kind of presbyter that is best for the ministry. Yet there is some lack of unity between seminaries and the national Church on the nature of the presbyter. This is indicated in part by the very fact that Convention continues to amend Title III. The more than three hundred changes to these particular canons over the course of the past forty-five years indicate either a split between seminaries and the diocesan bodies implementing ordination processes, or that all of these changes seek to fix a system that has simply become overwhelmed.

If there is a split between seminaries and diocesan bodies, it began prior to Holmes’ 1971 theory of three categories of the expectations of theological education and prior to the ordination of women. The historic review of this thesis contends this split began with Vatican II and the Pusey Report designating a crisis of ministry. The effort to fix an overwhelmed system came later and in response to this initial motivator for change. Convention began to form new and ever changing committees, commissions and rules while seminaries began to respond to Convention with more efforts in all three of Holmes’ categories. Yet continuing to change the rules or to add rules on top of rules does not seem to have resolved the problems.
The Process in History

A brief review of Convention decisions made in the era since 1970 will indicate that the evolution of the commission on ministry in the American Church has been problematic, and has recently created role confusion that makes the system vulnerable to abuses of power and political agendas. Standing committees originated in 1789 for the reason of advising bishops on the qualifications of those seeking Holy Orders. The American Church developed standing committees to advise the bishop on this and other business due to the travel demands of large geographical areas of “the large and sparsely settled dioceses of our Church.” But through the years, standing committees became needed for many other decisions and advice, so that prior to the 1970s bishops tended to inform standing committees of decisions about whom to ordain. The changes to Title III in the 1970s aimed to create a uniform canon by General Convention rather than leaving decisions about the ordination process to diocesan bishops alone.

Commissions on ministry were developed in the 1970s for reasons less tangible. At this time there was an effort to address the growing numbers of aspirants for Holy Orders. There was also a general “lifting of the laity” that sought not only a certain equality of the four orders of ministry but a check and balance system in support of the bishop. As the writers of White and Dykman indicate:

Like most new developments, commissions on ministry have had their successes and failures, and reservations were expressed about them when they were first proposed in 1970. Many bishops find the assistance of commissions on ministry and the involvement of lay persons in the process of recruitment, training, and authentication to be a helpful way of sharing responsibility, especially during a

167 White and Dykman, vol.1, 82.
time when there are many applicants. The time and concern which many lay and ordained persons have spent in service on such commissions are impressive. On the other hand, critics have noted that the system often has an excessive number of judgmental points which applicants have to pass, where arbitrary and occasionally premature standards are set, and that the system often seems to reward conformity and persistence from applicants, rather than growth and authentication. A striking number of candidates have found their experience with commissions on ministry to be arbitrary and negative.\textsuperscript{168}

This sets forth the two problems of role confusion and of potential power abuse, intentional or not.

Another problem that has challenged the process and left it vulnerable to power abuse is a certain vagueness of wording in the Title III canons. The language of the canons is intentionally left vague in order to allow room for diocesan bishops to address needs specific to cultural, geographic and economic demands. Examples of vagueness can be found throughout the canons as questions of hierarchical authority have been delineated through the years. Such is the nature of any legislation. All laws are amended with regularity. Vagueness in any type of civil law is a common problem in spite of its inevitability. According to legal scholar Timothy Endicott,

\begin{quote}
Vagueness is a feature of law, and not merely of legal language: the linguistic and non-linguistic resources of the law are commonly vague. These claims have consequences that have seemed unacceptable to many legal theorists. Because law is vague, judges cannot always decide cases by giving effect to the legal rights and obligations of the parties. Judges cannot always treat like cases alike. The ideal of the rule of law seems to be unattainable.\textsuperscript{169}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{168} White and Dykman, vol. 2, 491.

Indeterminacy, the branch of civil law under which this school of thought is examined, indicates the inevitability of vagueness of law but also its benefits.

The history of English and American law includes indication that canon law resided alongside civil law in medieval England and perhaps preceded it.\textsuperscript{170} The authority of bishops has survived much back and forth along the way. However, the basic value of the authority of bishops within canon law goes back to the value at the time of the Reformation of reclaiming local law away from papist authority. “Englishmen have, in all ages, shown a firm determination that neither the national Church nor the national law should be subject to the papal legislation or jurisdiction.”\textsuperscript{171}

Long before America was colonized, the Church of England learned that local customs had a flexibility that canon law did not. Many meetings and Conventions have been fraught with the challenge of finding a balance between canon law and local needs. The Episcopal Church left plenty of room in the canons for diocesan bishops to address such needs. Most use words like “may” in order to create canons that are more recommendations than inviolable rules. This nuanced use of language is how the power of bishops has been maintained in the context of seeking more equality among the four orders of ministry. Ultimate authority still remains with the bishop. But this nuanced language has also left the Church vulnerable to power abuse and political agendas to
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emerge among members of commissions on ministry, standing committees and diocesan staffs.

Specific to changes to the Title III canons examined here, authority of the bishop to decide who shall be ordained is a value that has survived in the American Church as well. In order to not tie the diocesan bishop’s hands, canons have been worded toward this value. One example is in canon III.2 “Of Commissions on Ministry.” Canon III.2 denotes the institution of Commissions on Ministry in 1970. As previously indicated, (see page 24), COMs were developed to aid the diocesan bishop with recommendations about aspirants for Holy Orders in an increasingly overwhelmed system.

But this vagueness of authority is nowhere else in the canons so prominent than with the wording of canon III.2 [previous to 1988 (A121) this was canon III.1].

It is interesting to note that all of the ordination canons apply uniformly throughout this Church to all parties in interest, except for diocesan commissions on ministry. Canon III.1.1 leaves the establishment of such commissions to the several dioceses, while Canon III.1.2 permits each such commission to establish its own administrative and ministerial rules and patterns.\textsuperscript{172}

The intention of Convention was that the original canon defining commissions as overseeing matters of recruitment, training and authentication were to be considered on a local level. Each commission was given freedom in the canons to procure their own organizing as long as they kept the national canons. In this way diocesan bishops were given some leeway, assumedly in order to meet local needs particular to things such as time, money and long travel distance.

\textsuperscript{172} White and Dykman, vol. 2, 491.
Cultural pressures also could be balanced with the freedom created by this vagueness. Dan Edwards, Bishop of the Diocese of Nevada, tells the story of Native American Reynelda James, a Paiute Elder having difficulty getting ordained, in spite of the fact that every entity involved approved and all canons had been met.

“It was not that the Commission on Ministry or three successive bishops did not want to see her ordained. It was a cultural disconnect between ‘the process’ and Native culture. The prescribed steps of papers filed in sequence are just not the Paiute way of being in the world,” Edwards wrote.

And so for a lack of completed paper work, this much needed and appreciated deacon was kept marginalized from her role for years. “The canons were followed. Their spirit was fulfilled. Deacon James did not receive the same training as Anglo deacons, but it was not a watered down course. Her training was different, not less.”

In the end the vagueness of the canons allowed this particular process to get unstuck and this community of Episcopalians finally moved forward well served by Deacon Reynelda James.173

Additional canons to attempt to spell out how to ordain Native Americans, or those coming from another denomination or vocational deacons with a subsequent call to the presbyterate would only clog the system with more steps. The open language of canons that use words like “may” allow bishops and commissions on ministry room to

---

work with persons like Deacon James who are capable, called and qualified to be trained, educated and formed.

While deacons, priests and bishops have been educated in the history of the Episcopal Church, theology of ministry and have been through a process for their own ordinations, the lay members of commissions on ministry and standing committees may not have the expertise of clergy. Further, no one in the room is an expert on the theology of ministry or canon law, often not even the bishop. Some training would be helpful to not only fill in omissions in knowledge about the history of the theology of ministry, but to get everyone on the same page.

In response to the changes to ordination requirements of the 1970s, General Convention created committees and commissions, to provide resources for the continued development of commissions on ministry. The Church-wide commission that has sustained this work is the Council for the Development of Ministry, renamed the Standing Commission for Ministry Development (SCMD) when combined with the Board of Theological Education (BTE) in 1997. This Council/Commission has continued the work of supporting diocesan commissions on ministry and standing committees since then with multiple conferences annually on a range of topics.

A review of Council/Commission reports to Convention in the 1970s indicates trends during this time emphasizing various topics. These topics range from early organizing in 1970 and 1973 to an emphasis on mission and shared ministry in 1979. The 1982 report summed up this evolution:

As the report of the 1979 General Convention stated, the Council for the Development of Ministry has moved away from its original emphasis,
coordinating ministry-serving agencies of the Church, towards assisting and supporting the development of ministry, both lay and ordained. "Perhaps what is most notable to the Council is the shift that is taking place, from maintenance concerns on the part of the Church and in the Council, to recapturing a sense of mission and subsequently the development of Total Ministry to further that mission" (1979 Journal of the General Convention, p. 105).  

This indicates an overhaul in the first decade at only the third Convention since its beginning. It also indicates a shift from the original vision of the commission on ministry as an advisory committee to the bishop regarding the recruitment, training and authentication of clergy to a broader vision of the role of the commission on ministry of the development of lay ministry as well. This broadening, while in keeping with the theology of the ministry of all baptized persons that emerged in the 1970s and culminated in the 1979 prayer book revision, may have been too much for commissions on ministry to take on therefore increasing a confusion of role and responsibility to the process for the ordination of clergy. Or perhaps demands to focus on a complicated ordination process have distracted commissions on ministry from the effort to develop lay ministry and oversee the formation of Christians.

But this was only the beginning of the confusion, as the Church has continued to be distracted and reactive in its resources for commissions on ministry. One example of this sort of resourcing is the short report the Council for the Development of Ministry (later SCMD) provided in 1988, “The Bishop, The Commission on Ministry, and The

---

Standing Committee.” This advisory report recommended role clarification, as indicated in Chapter Three, also recommended a joint meeting of these three entities to be held at least every two years in order to clarify roles, to educate commissions on ministry and standing committees on canonical procedures, and to clarify the bishop’s preferences where indicated. The report further recommended that a consultant from outside the diocese be engaged to facilitate this meeting.

On one hand this further recommendation proves the confusion of roles among commissions on ministry, standing committees, bishops and seminaries. On the other hand, it was the one recommendation that stands out from this period as possibly helpful, though it seems to have been discarded.

A review of Journals of General Convention from 1979 to 1997 indicates that the then Council for the Development of Ministry (now SCDM) was active during this era in examining the many facets of ministry in the Episcopal Church. Each triennial report includes short reports from each province as well as sub-committees and survey results that indicate a very long list of resources for commissions on ministry (COMs). The end result seems to be a chaotic state of too much information and not enough structure and focus. For example, in 1981 a survey was conducted by the CDM of every diocese in all nine provinces. This was in follow-up to a previous survey that resulted in no response. The second effort brought a larger response. The reason for the survey was because:

---

After ten years, many believed that COMs had come to the end of a natural life cycle and (the CDM) wanted to examine closely their past and future work. An evaluation instrument, entitled Commission on Ministry After One Decade: A Resource for Evaluation, was designed by a joint committee of the CDM and the BTE for the use of diocesan COMs. Training sessions were held in each province to train COMs in the use of A Resource for Evaluation. The purpose of the review was to gain a greater understanding of the current experiences of COM's in order to carry on their responsibilities for strengthening ministry throughout the Church in the future. COMs were asked to report on the issues that were identified in the process in order to help the CDM and the BTE provide better support and resources for COM's.  

In 1999 the Standing Commission on Ministry Development conducted a survey of all dioceses in order to prepare a report for General Convention but only received 5 responses. An additional survey was distributed, and 32 responses were tabulated. They developed a pilot project for bishops and dioceses to explore a model for setting standards for continuing education for clergy and lay professionals. In the fall of 1999, 19 bishops responded enthusiastically to this invitation and plans for proceeding with this project in the next triennium were presented at the March 2000 meeting of the House of Bishops.  

The result of the survey listed so many resources and ideas for the training of the laity that a veritable library would be necessary to hold them and few of these had anything to do with helping the lay members of Commissions on Ministry. Some dioceses reported that they were using Education For Ministry, ALPHA, Cathedral Institute for Lay Studies, School for Ministry, Total Ministry Initiatives, Lay Eucharistic Ministry training, “To Equip the Saints,” and Cursillo to name just a few. The report concluded that “coordination with Ministry in Daily Life groups [an offshoot of the SCDM] within the

---

Episcopal Church has been difficult, as the search for such bodies on the national level located no central organization.”

These are examples of the chaotic nature of the SCDM which seems to have taken on either too many and varied agendas for the development of ministry for the church or has been distracted by the issues of the day. The SCDM report of 2000 indicates the intention to rewrite Title III and report to the 2003 Convention. These efforts did not come to fruition due to being overshadowed by the controversy over the ordination of Gene Robinson which took the forefront at the 2003 Convention. Each of the changes we have seen shows that Title III changes were reactions to problems. In 1967 Title III changes were based on concerns about the education of priests. In 1976 it was the ordination of women and minorities, in 2003 and 2006 it was the dwindling numbers of clergy, and in 2015 it was alcoholism.

The Process Today

The base problem of the ordination process continues to be that there are too many experts presiding over different sorts of evaluations and too little training of commissions on ministry, particularly of the lay members of commissions on ministry and standing committees, on how to understand not only these tools of evaluation but also the history of their task.

Consider the list of persons involved in the evaluation of aspirants, postulants and candidates for the presbyterate: the diocesan bishop, the commission on ministry, the standing committee, the seminary faculty, the field education supervisor, the CPE
supervisory, the physician/psychiatrist/psychologist, the rector/spiritual director, the vestry/parish committee, and to some extent the diocesan staff. There is also the use of many documents: CPE evaluations, seminary evaluations, field education evaluations, medical evaluations, psychological evaluations, and GOE evaluations. Other documents include the aspirant’s application which is usually a lengthy combination of spiritual biography, financial disclosures and certificates of baptism and confirmation to name a few.

It is assumed that bishops and clergy members of commissions on ministry have some understanding of the process, having gone through it. But lay members and clergy are limited in their understanding of all of these roles and variety of types of formats of evaluation and language of expertise from these various fields. The result is that the commission on ministry has been overwhelmed and disempowered by these three problems: 1) role confusion with the standing committee, 2) the expectation that parishes will discern the aspirant’s call and 3) the expectation that experts will evaluate the aspirant’s medical, psychological, clinical aptitude, academic ability, intelligence, and any number of other descriptions of professional competence.

Due to this overwhelming task, commissions on ministry tend to lose their role of listening in prayerful discernment and leave this to the rector, vestry and committee of the home parish. Various interpretations of “discernment” abound from contemplative prayer to parish committees. But this is recently changing as many dioceses are moving away from parish committees to regional committees with an emphasis on the
commission on ministry having the role of discernment, not the rector, vestry, parish or spiritual director. For example, here is the practice as described by one diocesan manual:

In many congregations, considering a member’s sense of call to ordained ministry is an unfamiliar task. A Local Reflection Group (LRG) of about six people will be assembled under the direction of the COM. It will consist of members of the faith community, a person who knows the aspirant in a different context from the parish, and a diocesan member who does not know the aspirant. Members of the LRG are NOT discerning whether or not that aspirant is called to ordained ministry in the Church. That is the work of the bishop in concert with the COM and the Standing Committee. Rather, the work of the LRG is to be the listening place where a person may begin to articulate the stirrings of a call to ordained life that God’s Holy Spirit may be initiating.\footnote{Diocese of Southwestern Virginia, \textit{The Discernment Process in the Episcopal Diocese of Southwestern Virginia}, October 2015.}

It is an interesting development that actual discernment is moving away from the parish and into the diocesan office where the risk is bureaucracy. The problem is not that the parish sends aspirants on without challenging or admitting concerns, though this may be true. The problem is that commissions on ministry are not equipped to discern the many aspects that are looked for in a person pursuing Holy Orders. Further, there has been little effort to provide trainings for commissions on ministry, standing committees and bishops on the clarification of these roles, the long list of documents and check lists combined with the expertise of everyone involved from spiritual directors to psychiatrists and the many nuances specific to each diocese.

In order to examine this assumption, I surveyed the chairs of commissions on ministry of 32 dioceses in 8 provinces. (See Appendix B) The result is that more than half of the 26 respondents train new members of commissions on ministry only through acclimation: that is to say new members attend meetings and are expected to catch on to
canonical requirements, time lines and diocesan canons as they go. Of the 26 respondents, 9 offer annual or biennial training of more than 2 hours, 3 offer annual or biennial training of less than 2 hrs and 14 train through one on one meetings, emails, and phone conferences with the Chair of the Commission on Ministry and/or Co-Chair and sometimes also the diocesan bishop.

A narrative was collected of other varieties of responses to this survey. Of the 27 respondents to this survey, those who offer longer trainings sometimes combine other committees and delegates to diocesan council/convention in these trainings and sometimes include other required trainings such as anti-racism and prevention of sexual exploitation. These additions to full agendas at such trainings risks distracting members of commissions on ministry further from an already long list of tasks.

Of most interest to this survey, however, is that 13 of the 27 respondents added an unsolicited note in their response indicating an interest in receiving more information or help in the development of trainings for the Commission on Ministry in their diocese. Only one respondent indicated an already existing training in continuing education with an outside keynote speaker.

Rather than another resolution to change or add to Title III requirements, a comprehensive training is needed for all commissions on ministry in the Episcopal Church. Canon III.2.5 requires that commissions “ensure that the members of the Commission and its committees receive ongoing education and training for their work.”179
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The survey indicates three problems in meeting this requirement: 1) a lack of consensus regarding this requirement, 2) a call for help as indicated by the random sample of respondents who have asked for help and 3) the problem that little of the limited training for discernment done at the diocesan level trickles down to the parish from whence aspirants come whether we use parish discernment committees or not. Yet Canon III.3.1 requires: “The Bishop and Commission shall provide encouragement, training, and necessary resources to assist each congregation in developing an ongoing process of community discernment appropriate to the cultural background, age, and life experiences of all persons seeking direction in their call to ministry.”\(^{180}\)

The only indication of an effort toward offering training like this in a review of journals from Convention is a resolution (1997-A134) concurred by both houses at Convention in 1997 which reads:

Resolved, That consistent with the provisions of Title III, Canon 1 (Of the Ministry of All Baptized Persons), the Council for the Development of Ministry, or other agency of the Executive Council as may be properly accountable for education of the laity, shall conduct a survey of all Dioceses every three years, which will describe the programs and budgets employed for the preparation and training of the laity for the exercise of their ministries; and be it further Resolved, That prior to each General Convention a consolidated report of survey findings shall be prepared by the Council for the Development of Ministry or other appropriate agency and distributed to all Bishops and Deputies to the General Convention, to the Chairperson of each Diocesan Commission on Ministry, and to the Director of each training program identified in the survey.\(^{181}\)

\(^{180}\) Canons 2015, 68.

This resolution is indicative of efforts to create comprehensive communication about trainings, particularly of the laity. Such trainings could be varied and may or may not include training for the lay members of the Commission on Ministry. More collaboration among and for all dioceses could benefit the laity of commissions on ministry as well as the overarching effort of providing a clear process for ordination of presbyters under Title III canons as well as clarity about access to that process.

Such training would bring more clarity for members of commissions on ministry, bishops and standing committees which covers the history of Title III changes as indicated in this thesis. Commissions on ministry could benefit greatly from increased awareness of the history of the theology of ministry and whom the church historically has called to the presbyterate. This training should be offered annually or at least biennially in each diocese as indicated by canon III.2.5. The training should review the original expectations of commissions on ministry as developed via Title III canons. Under access to ordination, it should include a history of the access to the presbyterate for groups reviewed in this thesis: women, LGBT persons, and African Americans. Under evaluation the training should cover tools that have been used during this era including GOEs, psychological evaluations, CPE evaluations and seminary evaluations.

This training should also review evolving perspectives about issues like divorce, substance abuse, the problems of those already ordained in another tradition and the problem of sequential ordination. Such training could provide a brief review of the history of theological education in the Episcopal Church using Holmes’ trifold expectations of seminaries as graduate school, professional school and formation of
priestly character. Finally, it could also include a review of aids to listening with others in discernment, such as “Listening Hearts.”

The training should include clarity of the roles and responsibilities of each entity as indicated in Title III canons and could collaborate with experts like Clinical Pastoral Education Supervisors and used as “outside consultants” to teach members of commissions on ministry and standing committees the essence of the various evaluations and how best to utilize these.

Title III changes since 1970 that affect the process for the ordination of presbyters have left the Episcopal Church with a lack of agreement between seminaries and dioceses regarding the spiritual, professional and intellectual qualities of presbyters. The survey included in this chapter indicates the need for help on the diocesan level to decrease confusion about roles and expectations of diocesan bodies.

I recommend a comprehensive training for all dioceses in the Episcopal Church that clarifies roles, informs members of commissions on ministry and standing committees of the history and spirit of the canons they are charged to implement as well as create new ways of considering prayerful discernment with persons who present themselves for the process for admission as a candidate for the presbyterate.

---

Conclusion

In any conversation about the discernment process among clergy in the Episcopal Church, agreement is often found that this system has problems. The conclusion of this thesis is found in the identification of three foundational problems in this system that have evolved since Vatican II, and a recommendation toward solutions. The three problems are: 1) there have been too many changes to the canon requirements in Title III since 1970 and a continuous addition of new and amended canons in a failed effort to solve these problems, 2) throughout this era there has been confusion about roles and responsibilities among commissions on ministry, bishops and standing committees and a lack of continuing education to clarify this confusion, and 3) there has been a variety of perspectives among these diocesan bodies as to what type of person should become a priest and how to measure preferred aspects of aptitude and character in aspirants.

There are two reasons for this first problem. One is that there has been concerted effort to clarify the process through added resolutions and reports to Convention. While it is a good thing that this organization uses this triennial gathering to better itself with attention to canon laws that need amendment, continually changing and adding rules to the ordination process has caused confusion and perhaps more work than is doable among volunteers who lack expertise in understanding the many forms of evaluation of postulants.

The second reason we have so many changes has been due to an effort to compromise differing perspectives regarding access to ordination for minorities like women and LGBT persons. While the canon changes that allow access to ordination to
the presbyterate for these groups have by now been resolved, agendas about these differences continue to find their way into the system due to a certain vagueness intended to maintain episcopate power yet at times abused by diocesan bodies, staffs and bishops themselves. The power abuse I mean here is that the vagueness of language of certain canons on ordination have been identified in this thesis as intended for bishops to work with indigenous groups like Native Americans or Latinos but have created vulnerabilities that have been used instead against groups like women and LGBT persons.

The second problem identified in this thesis is that of role confusion among the diocesan bodies of commissions on ministry and standing committees and how these bodies work with bishops. Historical research has identified reports to Convention that have offered advice on how to resolve tensions between these entities caused by role confusion as well as a large host of resources for commissions on ministry that seem to go unused. The survey I have conducted proves that commissions on ministry are overwhelmed with the task of orienting new members to the canons themselves within challenges of and geographical demands for travel and time constraints and have little time to tend to bigger picture issues like what the standing committee does that is different from the commission on ministry, how best to provide actual prayerful discernment with individual aspirants or how to understand various types of evaluation.

The third problem is that of varied perspectives of identifying best qualities of candidates for the presbyterate. In order to focus on this problem, this thesis has used Urban T. Holmes’ three categories of theological education: how should a presbyter function professionally, is a presbyter also a scholar, and how is the formed character of a
presbyter defined? These three categories have helped to delineate the need for a balance between seminaries and diocesan bodies in educating, training and forming presbyters.

In short, we face a diversity of perspective about what type of person should become a priest and we are confused about how best to choose qualified, capable and called candidates for the presbyterate. We also are at odds about how to provide theological education, professional training and priestly formation. Theology schools have created a menu of opportunities for students to be educated, trained and formed, but commissions on ministry, standing committees and their work with diocesan bishops is not in sync with the seminaries, or with each other. Further, there is a lack of primary formation of persons to the faith, the catechesis of persons to lay ministry, which must come prior to any recruitment to Holy Orders.

The solution I recommend is in the training I outline in Chapter 5. It is one that I will develop and offer to each diocese in the Episcopal Church. It will address the problems listed here and share the knowledge I have gained from this project about the historical evolution of perspectives, decisions and amendments of the canons of Title III. It will also provide practical information shared between all persons involved regarding the responsibilities, roles and best practices that have come out of these 45 years of this process which was developed beginning in 1970 in response to the context of the 1960s.

It is my hope that this training will grow and take on a life of its own in which I can develop other trainers and simple, applicable resources that will aid commissions on ministry, standing committees, bishops and seminaries to better the already good work
they do to provide the capable, qualified, and called persons that the Holy Spirit sends us for the life of the church through the personhood, work and faith of presbyters.
Appendix A

Figure 2.2 The Four Areas by 2015 Canon Number

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Canons</th>
<th>Topics Addressed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>III.2 on Commissions On Ministry</td>
<td>Access and Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.3 on Discernment</td>
<td>Access and Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.8 on the Ordination of Priests</td>
<td>Evaluation, Education, and Formation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.10 on Clergy from other Churches</td>
<td>Access</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2.3 Canons Regarding Access to Ordination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Canon</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>First Introduced to GC</th>
<th>GC First Passed</th>
<th>GC Changed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.17.5</td>
<td>Women as Lay Deputies</td>
<td>1916</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.1.2</td>
<td>Ordination of Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Persons</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.1.2</td>
<td>Ordination of Transgender Persons</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.4</td>
<td>Women as Lay Readers and Lay Chalice Bearers</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.6</td>
<td>Women as Deacons</td>
<td>1871</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.8</td>
<td>Women as Priests</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.10</td>
<td>Persons Ordained in Another Church</td>
<td>1804</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>1979, 1988, 2006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2.4 Canons Regarding Evaluation of Postulants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Canon</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>First Introduced to GC</th>
<th>GC passed</th>
<th>GC Changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>III.8.1</td>
<td>Procedures</td>
<td>1892</td>
<td></td>
<td>1988</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Figure 2.5 Canons Regarding Education of Candidates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Canon</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>First Introduced to GC</th>
<th>GC passed</th>
<th>GC Changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>III.8.5.b</td>
<td>Pre-theological education</td>
<td>1841</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.8.5.g</td>
<td>Subject areas required</td>
<td>1789</td>
<td>1871</td>
<td>1904, 1919, 1943, 1970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.15</td>
<td>Board of Theological Education</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>1969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.15</td>
<td>General Board of Examining Chaplains</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Figure 2.6 Canons Regarding Formation of Presbyters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Canon</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>First Introduced to GC</th>
<th>GC passed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>III.8.5</td>
<td>Formation</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix B

Survey of 32 Diocesan Chairs of COMs regarding COM Trainings

*Does the Commission on Ministry in your diocese train new members? Is this done in the form of a retreat that last at least 2 hours either annually or biennially? If not, in what way do new COM members get trained?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Parishes in Diocese</th>
<th>&gt; 2 Hour Training</th>
<th>&lt; 2 Hour Training</th>
<th>Training by Acclimation</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>One-on-ones with chair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New training; Chancellor’s and Bp.’s expectations; include alcohol policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Biennial retreat for community building but mostly training by acclimation and one-on-ones with chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Attempted 2 + hr training but not successful it is assumed due to low attendance; also one-on-ones with chair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Use “Listening Hearts” and also outside consultants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>One-on-ones with chair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>2 COMs Priest and Deacon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>One-on-ones with chair. 3-4 hr trainings in past and as needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>One-on-ones and groups of new members with chair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>3-4 hrs talking about process at 1st mtg and one-on-ones with chair.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>2+hr training and retreat, plus one-on-ones with chair.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Currently revamping process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>One-on-ones with chair and bishop.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Shadow current members and get one-on-ones with chair.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>4 hr orientation is new. Use Trello system.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Document driven, occasional 1 hr orientation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1st mtg orientation is new and document driven.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Annual one day training for combined COM.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Retreat every 2-3 years. Travel challenges in widespread geography.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>One-on-ones and annual review with bishop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Annual 4 hr training. Bp. attends 1 hr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>One-on-ones with chair. Use of email and creative adaptations to long distances.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTALS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of responding dioceses</th>
<th>&gt; 2 Hour Training</th>
<th>&lt; 2 Hour Training</th>
<th>Training by Acclimation</th>
<th>One on One training with Chair of COM and/or Bishop</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 27 respondents out of 32 diocesan commissions on ministry surveyed.
- 9 offer annual or biennial training of more than 2 hours
- 3 offer annual or biennial training of less than 2 hrs
- 15 train by acclimation
- 14 train with “one on ones” with chair of commission on ministry or bishop
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