

CONTENTS

	Page
Foreword	1
Introduction	3
Statement of Significance and of Need	7
The Options	13
The Office of Archbishop	23
Getting There	29
Transitional and Financial Arrangements	33
Summary of Principal Conclusions	39
Appendix 1: Transferred Episcopal Arrangements: An Illustrative Summary of Possible Provisions	41
Appendix 2: Sacramental Assurance: Note by the Chairman	43
Appendix 3: The Oath of Obedience: Note by the Legal Adviser	45
Appendix 4: Juridical Implications of a Third Province: Note by the Chairman	47
Appendix 5: Non Territorial Oversight and Cultural Episcopacy: Note by the Chairman	49
Appendix 6: Peculiars: Note by the Chairman	55
Appendix 7: Ordination of Women Resolutions and Petitions: 1999 and 2004	56

FOREWORD

In January 2005 the House of Bishops discussed the recently published report *Women Bishops in the Church of England* (the ‘Rochester report’) and decided to establish a working group to look further at the options for facilitating the consecration of women as bishops in the Church of England. The July Synod motion invited the House to secure the completion of this assessment in January 2006.

The working group, chaired by the Bishop of Guildford, has worked under heavy pressure of time and we wish to congratulate its members for completing their task so efficiently within the tight timetable imposed. This has not been a full-scale consultative exercise, but extensive soundings have been taken and submissions received.

The following is the text of the working group’s report to the House. We believe that it meets the request of Synod for a considered assessment of the various options and offer it to the Synod for debate.

As will be clear from what follows, the group was firmly of the view that, of the options identified, their preference was for a procedure that offered structural provision for the future of those who, for a variety of reasons, were conscience-bound to dissent from any legislation in favour of women bishops. The form of this structural provision is set out as a scheme of ‘Transferred Episcopal Arrangements’ (TEA), which would in due course replace all present provisions of the existing legislation and the Act of Synod.

Such a solution was deemed preferable by the working group to either a single-clause or a third/free-province Measure for reasons set out in the text. They believed that TEA would require some embodiment in a Measure, together with an enforceable Code of Practice, the precise balance between what was in Measure and what in Code of Practice to be considered further during the preparation of draft legislation.

There continues to be a range of views within the House itself, as within the Synod and the wider Church, about whether, and if so how, women should be admitted to the episcopate. The House is not of one mind about the working group’s preferred option. A majority of us do, however, believe that an approach along the lines of TEA could help maintain the highest possible degree of communion within the Church of England in the event that women be admitted to the episcopate. In our view, therefore, it merits further exploration before the basis on which any legislation is prepared is determined.

+ROWAN CANTUAR:
January 2006

+SENTAMU EBOR:

INTRODUCTION

1. In November 2004 the Report of the House of Bishops' Working Party (chaired by the Bishop of Rochester) on Women in the Episcopate¹ was published. That comprehensive report focussed on the theological issues that needed to be addressed in connection with the possible admission of women to the episcopate in the Church of England. Towards the end of the Rochester Report there was an examination of different options for the appointment of women bishops in the Church of England². The Report, however, did not make any recommendations.
2. When the House of Bishops met in January 2005 to consider the onward process following the publication of the Rochester Report, it recognised that it would itself need "...to offer the General Synod its own considered assessment of where, out of the range of theoretical options, the real choice lay"³. It accordingly set up a small group for this purpose under the chairmanship of the Right Reverend Christopher Hill, Bishop of Guildford. The other members were:
 - The Right Reverend Pete Broadbent, Bishop of Willesden
 - The Right Reverend Nicholas Reade, Bishop of Blackburn
 - The Right Reverend Dr John Saxbee, Bishop of Lincoln
 - The Venerable Dr Joy Tetley, Archdeacon of Worcester.The group was supported in its task by William Fittall (the Secretary General), Stephen Slack (the Legal Adviser), and Jonathan Neil-Smith and Adrian Vincent from the House of Bishops' Secretariat.
3. The group first met in February 2005, shortly after the General Synod's 'take note' debate on the Rochester Report and its agreement to the House's proposal for the handling of the onward process⁴. It met on a further nine occasions in the course of the year. The motion passed by the General Synod in July 2005 to 'set in train the process for removing the legal obstacles to the ordination of women to the episcopate'⁵ has served to focus the group's task and, as a result of an amendment successfully moved by the Archdeacon of Berkshire, amplify it in one respect. The relevant part of the motion (with the amendment italicised):

'invited the House of Bishops, in consultation with the Archbishops' Council, to complete by January 2006, and report to Synod, the assessment which it is making of the various options for achieving [the ordination of women to the episcopate], *and ask that it give specific attention to the issues of canonical obedience and the universal validity of orders throughout the Church of England as it would affect*

¹ *Women Bishops in the Church of England? A Report of the House of Bishops' Working Party on Women in the Episcopate*, Church House Publishing, 2004 [GS 1557].

² *Women Bishops in the Church of England?* section 7.3 – pp.205-227.

³ HB(05)12, para 4.

⁴ *Women in the Episcopate: A Report from the House of Bishops*, Jan 2005 [GS 1568].

⁵ The motion was passed in the House of Bishops by 41-6, in the House of Clergy by 167-46 and in the House of Laity by 159-75.

clergy and laity who cannot accept the ordination of women to the episcopate on theological grounds.'

4. The Group took as its starting point the work undertaken by the Bishop of Rochester's Working Party, on which two of its members served. As that group had consulted extensively, and met various delegations representing a range of viewpoints⁶, this group – conscious also of the tight timescale for its work – did not seek to embark on another exercise of that kind. It did however meet separately with the Archbishop of Canterbury, its chairman also engaged with the House's Theological Group and the Provincial Episcopal Visitors, and individual members engaged informally with diocesan colleagues and others. The chairman also received considerable correspondence about the options under discussion⁷.
5. The membership of the Group encompasses a range of viewpoints. When we started, we did not know whether we would be able to produce an agreed assessment of the options. But the process of working and praying together has brought us closer to each other. It has also enabled us to identify a way forward which, we believe, has the potential both to permit the admission of women to the episcopate and preserve the maximum degree of communion across the Church of England. Whatever the views of the General Synod on our suggested option, the Rochester Report has provided resources for the theological reflection that will continue in relation to these issues.
6. We do not minimise the difficulty of the choices now facing the Church. There is no course of action, including the status quo, that is free of pain and risk. Our prayer is that the journey of exploration and discernment that we have experienced together will serve as an encouragement to the House and the Synod as they seek the mind of Christ for our Church.

Ecumenical Responses to the Rochester Report

7. At the time of the completion of our Report three ecumenical responses to the Rochester Report have been received; from the Methodist Church, the United Reformed Church and the Roman Catholic Bishops' Conference of England and Wales, together with a letter from the Baptist Union of Great Britain.⁸ The House of Bishops Women Bishops Group have received and noted these reports but we have consciously refrained from extended comment upon them in our report because they are responses to the Rochester Report and ought to be taken with that Report as it is discussed alongside whatever follows debate in General Synod upon our Report in February 2006.
8. Our explicit mandate (cf para 3) from the July 2005 meeting of the Synod was not to discuss the Rochester Report or any responses to it but rather to assess the various options for achieving the ordination of women to the episcopate. Our task was not to discuss the issue in principle but to ponder and report on future options in the light of the decision by General Synod to 'set in train' the

⁶ *Women Bishops in the Church of England?* Annex 4, pp.249-262.

⁷ As at 14.12.05, 488 letters had been received.

⁸ See *Women Bishops in the Church of England? Ecumenical Responses* GS Misc 807

process for removing the legal obstacles to the ordination of women to the episcopate. We have understood the Synod's mind to be that the undoubted anthropological, theological, ecclesiological and ecumenical issues raised in the Rochester Report in relation to the ordination of women to the episcopate should be discussed *alongside* process questions because any legislative process, whatever its eventual outcome, would be by no means hasty or short.

9. Our Group believes an excellent beginning was made to this theological reflection by the 'seminar' mode procedure adopted at the November 2005 Synod. Though strictly not our business, we express the hope that the important Ecumenical Responses to the Rochester Report might be handled in a similar way while noting that ecumenical reflection on our own discussion of options as clarified by the Synod would also be very welcome. In as much as our ecumenical partners *have* touched on the options for the way forward in their Responses to the Rochester Report we particularly draw attention to the Methodist reflection on consequences for the Covenant ⁹, the United Reformed Church's discussion of ecumenical implications ¹⁰ and the Roman Catholic consideration of Anglican ecclesiology.¹¹

⁹ GS Misc 807, p.8

¹⁰ GS Misc 807, p.16-17

¹¹ GS Misc 807, p.33-37

STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE AND OF NEED

Statement of Significance

An issue of primary theological importance

10. In considering the question of ordaining women to the episcopate within the Church of England, we are acutely conscious that many of the issues raised carry a critical significance. That, of course, applies *par excellence* to the substantive decision itself. Whether or not women should be admitted to the episcopate is for many a question of primary theological and ecclesiological importance. For many, it flows as a natural corollary of the decision taken in 1992 to admit women to the presbyterate, but it is also a decision to be taken in its own right given the distinctiveness of the episcopate. The outworking of a decision to proceed to the consecration of women would inevitably have significant implications.

A mission issue

11. What the Church of England is dealing with here matters profoundly. It involves issues on which Anglicans hold different and yet equally sincerely held and argued convictions. As has been set out in the Rochester Report, the admission or non-admission of women to the episcopate can each be seen as a theological imperative, deriving from the word of God and the character of God's Gospel. From those differing core perspectives come a range of interpretative understandings of consequent vital concerns – so, for example, issues of ecclesiology, unity, ecumenism, integrity, justice and mission. The latter must surely be very high on the agenda.
12. The Church of England “is part of the one, holy, catholic and apostolic Church” and is called, in Christ, to carry forward God's mission in the world, thus proclaiming the Gospel afresh in each generation.¹² Our internal debates and structures must always be put under the searchlight of this calling. Jesus, the incarnation of God's character (*cf* Hebrews 1:3) was both a person of his time and place *and* disturbingly counter-cultural. Always, the purpose of his mission was to break through with the grace of God. How this can be done now, in England, is a challenge which needs to inform all our prayer, our discussions and our decisions on the issue of women in the episcopate.

The right time

13. There is a timeliness, indeed an urgency about this matter, both in terms of the Church and of the world in which it is set. Whatever the precise outcomes, this is a *kairos* moment in the Church of England's vocation and mission. It would also mark a significant moment in the process of reception of the decision to admit women to the presbyterate and the episcopate by the Church as a whole¹³. How we respond to it is not a ‘matter indifferent’.

¹² See Preface to the Declaration of Assent, *The Canons of the Church of England*, Canon C15.

¹³ For our understanding of the theological meaning of reception, see *Women Bishops in the Church of England?* Paras 3.6.1-3.6.38. See also *Women in the Episcopate* [the Eames Report], Anglican Book Centre 1998, p.26 & 115; *The Ordination of Women to the Priesthood: A Second Report from the House of Bishops* GS 829, 1988, pp.108-9; *Bonds of Peace*, paras 2-3 [from the House of Bishops' Report to General Synod, GS 1074, June 1993].

Unity in Christ

14. In this light, how can we best live out in our contemporary context the truth that, in Christ, all things hold together in all their blending and clashing diversity? How can we demonstrate in our ecclesial life the reality of Christ's gospel of reconciliation? How can we say "not only with our lips but in our lives" that, even with our strong differences, we are able not only to acknowledge one another as "loyal Anglicans"¹⁴ but also to rejoice in our fundamental communion in Christ? We have all been baptized into Christ – that Christ who is the mystery of God and therefore beyond all our attempts at exclusive packaging. In all our rich variety and in our disputing, we all belong to Christ, and we are all constrained by the sacrificial graciousness of God's love (cf Galatians 3:27-28; 2 Corinthians 5:14-15). In a fractious and often brutal world, that lived-out message is of crucial significance.

The way of the Cross

15. The way of Christ is the way of the Cross. The way of the Cross is the way of painful passion – and unexpected alleluias. Even, pray God, in respect of that particular part of the journey in which we now struggle together. In this context the words of *Being in Communion*, written at the time of the decision to ordain women to the presbyterate, are still relevant,

"....Giving space to one another, and remaining in the highest possible degree of communion in spite of difference are crucial, as we strive to be open to the insights of the wider Christian community. Though some of the means by which communion is expressed may be strained, or broken, the need for courtesy, tolerance, mutual respect, prayer for one another, and a continuing desire to know one another, remain binding on us as Christians, no less within our own Church as in our ecumenical relations..¹⁵

Statement of Need and its Evaluation.

16. Before considering the legislative options for the Church of England in the light of the General Synod's initial decision to set in train the process for removing the legal obstacles to the ordination of women to the episcopate, the Church will need to consider what it actually needs in the light of that decision and the general tenor of the debate. Before a detailed debate on a focussed range of options (somewhat smaller than the broad band sketched out in the Rochester Report¹⁶) four questions need to be asked:
- *What is needed to enable women to be fully accepted in the three-fold ministry of deacons, priests and bishops?*
 - *What do those who disagree with the introduction of women bishops say they would need in order to remain within the Church of England?*

¹⁴ *The Official Report of the Lambeth Conference 1998*, Morehouse Publishing 1999, Resolution III.2

¹⁵ *Being in Communion*, GS Misc 418, June 1993, para 21 – also incorporated in para 3 of *Bonds of Peace*, GS 1074

¹⁶ *Women Bishops in the Church of England?* Chapter Seven and Annex 4.

- *How far do the identified options sufficiently meet the stated need?*
- *Would some or all of the options be acceptable ecclesologically for the sake of the highest possible degree of communion, or would they so compromise our ecclesiology or our concept of justice as to be unacceptable?*

Women's Ministry in the Church of England

17. The development of women's ministry in the Church of England has been documented elsewhere¹⁷, but it is noteworthy that following the General Synod's decision to admit women to the diaconate in 1986, and to the priesthood in 1992, women now account for 16% of all full-time diocesan clergy¹⁸. It was in this context and the extensive pastoral experience of women's ministry that the General Synod decided in July 2005 to set in train the process of removing the legal obstacles to their ordination to the episcopate. It will be for the legislative drafting group to work on the detail of removing those legal impediments; our task has been to consider the ecclesiological implications of such a step, and the enabling options under which provision could be made not only for the maximum possible acceptance of the ministry of women within the Church of England but also for those opposed to their priestly and episcopal ministry.

The Arguments

18. The Rochester Report carefully lays out the arguments for introducing women bishops in to the Church of England¹⁹: these stem from new ways of looking at biblical material (with fresh perspectives on headship and alternative interpretations of 1 Corinthians and 1 Timothy); the overall trajectory of scripture; the evidence for women's ministry in the Early Church; a dynamic view of tradition; the need for both men and women to represent Christ; the Church of England's authority to develop its own ministerial order; the significance of the 1992 decision to ordain women priests; and the missiological need for women bishops.
19. The arguments against the ordination of women to the episcopate were also carefully rehearsed in the Rochester Report. From a catholic Anglican perspective these included mission; Scripture and Tradition; the givenness of human sexual differentiation; the maleness of Christ; the ecumenical objection; sacramental assurance and the focus of unity. Similar arguments are put forward in *Consecrated Women?*²⁰ From a Conservative Evangelical perspective the Rochester Report included the argument that not all was decided at the ordination of women to the presbyterate; 'functional subordination' (ie. headship); Galatians 3:28 not being a general statement about equality; a woman could not be an 'icon' of the Father; the inappropriateness of a woman exercising Episcopal authority; lack of consensus; ordaining women bishops contrary to the principle of reception; and the 'feminisation'

¹⁷ *Women Bishops in the Church of England?*, section 4.2 ff; and Ian Jones *Women and the Priesthood: Ten Years On*, CHP, 2004

¹⁸ *Statistics for Licensed Ministers 2004*

¹⁹ *Women Bishops in the Church of England?* Especially chapter 5.

²⁰ *Consecrated Women? A Contribution to the Women Bishops Debate*, ed. Jonathan Baker, Canterbury Press 2004, Part I esp. chapter 10

of the church.

Acknowledging a woman bishop?

20. To understand the convictions of those who are opposed it is important to focus on the particular issue of women in the episcopate; and why, for them, maintaining the present provisions of the Episcopal Ministry Act of Synod would not suffice. In addition to a general rejection of the ordination of women to the presbyterate and the episcopate, the matter becomes particularly acute for those, in a diocese where a woman diocesan bishop has been nominated, who are opposed to such a development. This is because the diocesan bishop is the chief pastor and principal minister within the diocese, a reality expressed in a number of ways such as ordinations, confirmations, institutions, the issue of licences to minister, and in episcopal visitations.²¹ These ecclesologically *episcopal* actions are central. For those who are opposed who wish to maintain the present position because they cannot recognise a woman bishop, and do not feel able to accept the authenticity of her orders as a bishop in the catholic church²², any provision for their continuing inclusion within the Church of England must centre on achieving an acceptable way of accommodating differing convictions on these matters.
21. The central issue for many of those unable to acknowledge a woman as a bishop is the question of what some would term sacramental assurance²³. That is to say their uncertainty as to the authenticity of sacraments celebrated by women bishops, and priests, and also by any male priests ordained by a woman bishop²⁴. For others the central issue is headship. There is, however, no overall agreed Anglican position on either of these theological concepts. This makes for another difficulty in the ongoing dialogue and debate about this question.
22. In either case, the theological issue flows inevitably into the question of jurisdiction. Even a male bishop acting under the authority or commission of a woman bishop would be impossible to accept for those opposed because this would entail acceptance of the woman bishop's jurisdiction and thus the acceptance of women bishops. For these reasons it is clear that those who are opposed would not find the continuance, perhaps with modifications, of the Act of Synod sufficient. It would mean that clergy remained licensed and under the canonical authority of the diocesan bishop, even if episcopal care and extended oversight were offered by the Provincial Episcopal Visitor (or another suffragan bishop from within or outside their diocese).
23. There would also be some who would be opposed to women bishops in principle, to the extent that they would consider themselves in a state of impaired communion with the House of Bishops upon the consecration of the first woman bishop (and who indeed count themselves as already in a state of impaired communion with the House over the ordination of women to the

²¹ See Canon C18 esp. 1,2 and 4

²² See *Consecrated Women?* Chapter 10 3.19-3.21

²³ See Chairman's note at Appendix 2

²⁴ Ecumenical Responses, GS Misc 807, pp.28-30.

presbyterate). If the Church of England wishes to try to include as many as possible of those who are opposed, these issues must be addressed.

24. The future inclusion of women bishops in a House (or College) of Bishops which continued to include bishops who could not recognise their episcopal orders would also raise fresh issues concerning the collegiality of bishops²⁵ (although these have already been faced to an extent within the 1998 Lambeth Conference). Collegiality is a particular expression of communion as it touches upon the inter-relationship of those exercising oversight within the communion of the Body of Christ. Collegiality is manifested in a number of ways but it finds liturgical expression when an Archbishop is assisted by other bishops from his Province in the consecration of a new bishop, wherein is manifested the communion of their churches with the church for which the new bishop is being ordained.
25. It would not be right to minimize the seriousness of the problem the diminishment of collegiality entailed in the inability of a bishop to recognize another member of the episcopal college; a potential situation the Rochester Report noted as ‘extremely grave’.²⁶ Nevertheless, some observations from the Eames Report are of continued relevance in this context:

“...From the ecumenical movement we are slowly learning that our baptismal unity has never been destroyed and that a degree of true communion has always existed and is now deepened through common prayer, theological dialogue and pastoral and missionary collaboration. Even when ministries are not reconciled we recognise the fruitfulness of the ministries of other Christian communities....what we have in common is more substantial than what divides us. We are not ‘out of communion’ but share a very real degree of communion, even when that communion is not sustained by all the bonds of visible communion and even when it is not manifested in eucharistic communion.”²⁷

26. Even where there is impaired communion, the pain of this experience can paradoxically be an expression of communion in another register. This has been experienced in courteous but frank dialogue; for example, at the last Lambeth Conference between a woman bishop from elsewhere in the Anglican Communion and bishops opposed to the ordination of women to the Episcopate. Such suffering together can reflect the ‘communion of (Christ’s) sufferings’ in which there is the potential ‘to know the power of His resurrection’ (Philippians 3.10). Moreover, in addition to our continuing

²⁵ Collegiality has been expressed in a variety of different ways in the history of the Church: for example, the ‘college’ of clergy with their bishop in a diocese. Episcopal collegiality in the Roman Catholic Church since Vatican II has been used to emphasise the balance between the Bishop of Rome and the universal ‘college’ of bishops. For Anglicans it expresses, among other things, the communion of local, diocesan churches with each other, the reality of which consists of a mutual sharing in Scripture, Sacraments, witness and a common ecclesial life. There is a question as to what extent the content of this communion, expressed in episcopal collegiality, is vitiated in the absence of a bishop, during a vacancy in a See or when the episcopate of one bishop is not recognised by others.

²⁶ *Women Bishops in the Church of England?*, p.208

²⁷ *Women in the Anglican Episcopate* [The Eames Report], Anglican Book Centre, 1998, para 155, p.75.

baptismal unity, the House (and College) of Bishops would also be able to build on a common history of episcopal succession and pastoral oversight. Furthermore, it can be recognised that in spite of our differences there is a continuing common intention to ordain ministers to the threefold order of the Church. While episcopal collegiality may, in future, be of some decreased intensity, real bonds of fellowship and community would remain and thus a genuine degree of collegiality could be maintained.

27. Further work on collegiality is required as the process continues. This could include an exploration of matters already touched upon in the Rochester Report: namely; the collegiality of the Anglican Communion; the wider collegiality shared with churches with which the Church of England is in communion; and informal recognition of collegiality even where bishops are not in formal communion.²⁸ In addition, episcopal collegiality needs to be explored in relation to conciliarity and synodality in the light of Anglican experience of priests and people representing their church in synodical structures. Given that there is also a presbyteral collegiality in each diocese, there may also be some value in exploring the fact that a significant number of clergy who do not recognise women priests nevertheless attend chapters and synods and work alongside women colleagues in all but sacramental functions. Is this an analogous model for impaired episcopal collegiality?

²⁸ *Women Bishops in the Church of England?*, p.58.

THE OPTIONS

28. Chapter 7 of the Rochester Report set out a range of options as to how the Church of England might wish to proceed, ranging from maintaining the status quo to a third province. Among these options was, for instance, the suggestion that women should only be ordained suffragan bishops or be ordained for mixed episcopal teams. We believe that this would not only fail to address the problem of difficulty in recognizing a woman as principal minister of the diocese, it would also continue to embody sexual discrimination²⁹ throughout the whole body of the Church of England. It also runs counter to the long Anglican tradition of a single bishop *assisted* by suffragans. Such proposed solutions are firmly opposed on both sides of the debate for good reason and we see no reason for the further exploration of clearly unacceptable options.³⁰
29. In this chapter we have therefore decided to examine in some depth what we consider to be the three main options: ‘single clause’ measure with a code of practice; transferred episcopal arrangements; and a third province. In terms of the latter, we recognise that this could take various forms but have deliberately decided to analyse the version promulgated by Forward-in-Faith in *Consecrated Women*³¹ as this is the most fully worked up model that we have seen.

A ‘Single Clause’ Measure

Proponents of a ‘single clause Measure’ describe it as a legal provision along the lines of “It shall be lawful for a woman to be consecrated to the office of bishop”, with the consequential deletion of Canon C2(5) and the relevant section of the Priests (Ordination of Women) Measure 1993. Those arguing for this option include those who propose a Code of Practice agreed by the House of Bishops to provide safeguards for those opposed. This could include a Statement of Intent to be agreed by bishops, with an appropriate mechanism (such as an independent commission) for overseeing it³².

30. The ecclesiological clarity of a so-called Single Clause Measure with a Code of Practice has the merit of simplicity and coherence. It would eliminate an ambiguity in the formal recognition of ministries arising from the Episcopal Ministry Act of Synod 1993. Any special provisions would not need to be embodied in legislation. It would be another step towards the removal of any sexual discrimination in all three orders of ministry in the Church of England, though parishes would retain the statutory right to decline to have a woman priest as celebrant or incumbent unless it were separately decided to repeal Part 2 of the Priests (Ordination of Women) Measure 1993.

²⁹ The term ‘discrimination’ here and elsewhere is not used in a loaded way but simply to reflect the impact of the provisions of the Priests (Ordination of Women) Measure 1993 and the Episcopal Ministry Act of Synod 1993.

³⁰ See *Consecrated Women?* 4.7 – 4.9 and WATCH *Briefing Notes for the Debate on Women Bishops* C3

³¹ *Consecrated Women?* Ed J Baker, Canterbury Press, 2004

³² See www.watchwomen.com

31. What this option would not be able to do is resolve the major dilemma for those opposed. A woman diocesan would not be recognized by them as a bishop despite being canonically ordained. For clergy and lay workers the oath of canonical obedience would therefore be problematic. Precisely because a Code of Practice cannot effect primary legislation it does not address the issue of jurisdiction and the oath of canonical obedience; a matter the Synod Resolution as amended specifically requested us to address.
32. There is an argument that the provision of pastoral and sacramental care could be achieved without having to address the oath of canonical obedience if it were accepted that the oath is made to the office not to the person; and that a priest who did not recognize the episcopal orders of a woman bishop could still recognize her as the lawful office holder. The majority of the group, however, took the view that the clergy's duty of obedience derived from the inherent relationship between a bishop and his clergy and that the case for separating out the bishop's exercise of jurisdiction from the sacramental role was not sustainable. This issue is explored in more depth in Appendix 3.
33. A further issue arising in connection with a Code of Practice is the uncertainty as to its enforceability: a breach of it would not form a basis for disciplinary proceedings and might not provide a basis for proceedings in the civil courts by way of judicial review or for an injunction. There are ways in which, by referring to it appropriately in the Measure, a Code of Practice could be given a greater degree of enforceability under ecclesiastical law, including by means of disciplinary process (see paragraph 88). However, the real doubt is not so much as to the enforceability of a Code of Practice but as to whether it really answers the perceived need of those who are opposed to the admission of women to the episcopate, given that it cannot by definition deal with questions of jurisdiction and canonical obedience. If it does not, and those opposed seem unanimous that it does not, we believe the Church of England must examine other options and then ask whether or not they are an acceptable compromise or anomaly in terms of both ecclesiology and justice.
34. Advantages:
- Full recognition, without discrimination, of women's episcopal orders;
 - Relative simplicity; and
 - Ecclesiological coherence.
35. Disadvantages:
- A Code of Practice even with enforceable provisions would still be regarded as an insufficient safeguard by many of those opposed to women bishops;
 - There would be those who would find it impossible to accept that they owed a duty of canonical obedience to a woman bishop;

- Provision by Code rather than by legislation might increase pressure for financial provision for those clergy who might feel that they had to resign their orders on grounds of conscience [see paragraphs 108ff];
- While there is much to be said for not requiring formal Synodical approval for everything, the Church of England as a legally ordered Church has traditionally proceeded by legislation for the sake of clarity and to safeguard rights.

A Third (or Free) Province³³?

Proponents of a Third Province include those who propose the creation of a body not unlike the Church in Wales, which would have a defined and distinct geographical identity, alongside the Provinces of Canterbury and York but not overlapped by it (though its parts would not necessarily be contiguous with one another). The new province would not have women bishops, women priests or male priests ordained by a woman bishop officiating in it (nor would bishops from the Provinces of Canterbury and York take part in its ordinations). It would have its own provisions for selecting, training and ordaining ministers; its own synodical structures and governance; and freedom of ecumenical manoeuvre. Parishes that had already petitioned for extended episcopal ministry would automatically transfer to the new Province; other parishes could join by means of a PCC resolution³⁴.

36. The case for a Third Province has been set out in some detail in *Consecrated Women?*³⁵. This form of independent structural solution is put forward as a means of catering for those who could not accept the ministry of women bishops. The new province would not only not have women bishops or women priests serving within it, but neither would it include male priests ordained by a woman bishop. Such a province – as outlined in *Consecrated Women?* – would have its own presiding bishop; its own legislative jurisdiction (and relationship with the Ecclesiastical Committee of Parliament) through its Provincial Synod; and its own administrative support, with a Board of Finance and Board of Education.
37. The conviction that a structural solution (of which a proposed Third Province is only one example) ought to be considered by the Church precisely to deal with conscientious reticence in the recognition of a woman diocesan does not mean that everything has to be covered by legislation. In the ecclesiological balance between clarity and charity it is essential that the Church of England does not over-legislate. The extensive draft of legislative material for the provision of an additional province of the Church of England proposed in *Consecrated Women?* indicates the profound extent of separation envisaged in a Third Province (some would argue this is tantamount to legislative schism)³⁶: indeed, the whole notion of an independent province raises many

³³ Those advocating such an arrangement refer to it variously as Third or Free Province: we use the former description in subsequent references.

³⁴ See www.forwardinfaith.com; and *Consecrated Women?*

³⁵ *Consecrated Women?* Ed J Baker [Canterbury Press, 2004]

³⁶ *Consecrated Women?* pp. 131-153

difficulties and ambiguities that are explored further in Appendix 4. The Rochester Report summarized other arguments against this option³⁷: those opposed would still need to be in communion with Canterbury to be Anglican and it would set precedents for separate jurisdictions on other issues. Nor would there be room for permeable borders and mutual learning within a continuing process of reception and impaired but real communion. Its very administrative complexity would also entail considerable expense. The question must be asked (in Ockham fashion): is legislation about (for example) a separate Board of Education really necessary? It is here that concentration on what are the *essential* needs of those who are opposed is important. Legislation should cover only what is essential. Other matters may indeed be answered by a Code of Practice which is bound to be necessary in any case.

38. Advantages:

- Ecclesiological clarity;
- Meets the stated need for adequate safeguards;
- Removes discriminatory provisions against women from the main body of the Church of England.

39. Disadvantages:

- It could represent a major schism within the Church of England, with less possibility of the two sides growing together, potentially allowing for the possibility of the new Province declaring itself out of communion with the Provinces of Canterbury and York;
- It would to all intents and purposes amount to a competing provincial jurisdiction which has so far run counter to Lambeth Conference Resolutions;³⁸
- It would be fundamentally unhealthy to establish a province solely on the grounds of opposition to women bishops;
- There would be a risk of it becoming another ‘continuing Anglican Church’;
- It would be primarily designed to meet the needs of those within the catholic tradition of the Church of England and might not so easily meet the needs of those primarily concerned with issues of headship;
- The separate administrative structures that it would entail means that it would undoubtedly be more costly;

³⁷ *Women Bishops in the Church of England?* Annex 2

³⁸ eg the 1920 Lambeth Conference resolution on the development of provinces clearly envisaged that new provinces would not overlap geographically with other provinces.

- There must be the political risk that Parliamentary approval might not be forthcoming (even if the requisite legislation passed through the General Synod), not least in relation to the proposed legislative powers of the new Provincial Synod.

Transferred Episcopal Arrangements

Transferred Episcopal Arrangements represent a newly developed proposal under which parishes opposed to women priests and women bishops could opt to come under an arrangement whereby a Provincial Regional Bishop³⁹ exercised pastoral and sacramental functions (on behalf of the Archbishop of the Province), while otherwise remaining part of the geographical diocese in which they were situated. Following the expiry – perhaps after some years - of transitional arrangements for parishes where existing resolutions were in place, non-TEA parishes would be free of discriminatory provisions with respect to women priests.

40. If the Church of England/General Synod accepts the argument that there should be a proper balance between ecclesiological clarity and charity, and that this cannot wholly for the foreseeable future be achieved by a ‘One Clause Measure’ with Code of Practice, however enforceable, because it cannot address the central issue of the conscientious non-recognition of a woman bishop; *and* if it also accepts the argument that a Third Province would be unacceptable both ecclesiological and administratively: the Church faces a stark choice.
41. One option would be to conclude, notwithstanding the Synod motion of July 2005, that the legislative process to permit the admission of women to the episcopate cannot be pursued further for some considerable time to come. The other, which we believe is worthy of serious consideration would be something akin to the present London Plan⁴⁰ on a Provincial level⁴¹. We have therefore considered at some length the scope for building upon this but in such a way that episcopal jurisdiction was transferred to the Metropolitan, along the lines of that considered by the Eames Commission Report *Women in the Anglican Episcopate*⁴². We set out in Appendix 1 how such a scheme might work.

³⁹ Bishops operating in a distinctive province with regional, trans-diocesan oversight.

⁴⁰ A Declaration made by the bishops within the Diocese of London relating to the Priests (Ordination of Women) Measure 1993, the Episcopal Ministry Act of Synod 1993 and Code of Practice January 1994, originally made on 24 February 1994, and superseded by a further Declaration dated 30 May 1997 and 9 June 2001.

⁴¹ Since the preliminary discussion of options in the Rochester Report, some interest has been expressed by both catholic and evangelical scholars in what are historically called ‘Peculiarities’; that is to say churches either detached from episcopal jurisdiction altogether (such as Westminster Abbey) or churches (or even deaneries) geographically within one diocese but jurisdictionally under another bishop. Our exploration of Transferred Episcopal Arrangements has some similarities with the detached jurisdictions of the old Peculiarities, as well as differences. Perhaps the main value for our present debate is that they illustrate the fact that historically the dioceses of the Church of England were neither tidy jurisdictionally, nor territorially wholly intact. See Appendix 6 for the Chairman’s Note on Peculiarities

⁴² See *Women in the Anglican Episcopate* [Anglican Book Centre, 1998], pp.64-5

42. The crucial point from the perspective of those opposed is that sacramental assurance and headship – and, therefore, jurisdiction -stems from a bishop they can recognise, namely a male bishop. The essence of Transferred Episcopal Arrangements [TEA] is that the diocesan bishop would request the Archbishop (with special arrangements in the event that, at some future date an Archbishop was female) to arrange for episcopal ministry to be provided, to those parishes⁴³ that requested it, by a Provincial Regional Bishop [PRB]. The PRB would exercise jurisdiction on certain matters (defined in a way not dissimilar to the functions which an area bishop may exercise on behalf of a diocesan), while the diocesan bishop would continue to exercise jurisdiction on others. The division of functions would need to be consistent but in the interests of simplicity and flexibility is perhaps best not embodied in the Measure: instead, standardised arrangements would need to be agreed between diocesan bishops and the Archbishop, possibly as part of an enforceable Code of Practice.
43. Thus the PRB would be authorised to act in relation to pastoral care (including ministerial review), sacramental and disciplinary matters, to act on behalf of the diocesan in respect of the exercise of patronage and other aspects of the role of the bishop in appointments, and in relation to ordinands. In relation to Pastoral Measure issues, the PRB would have the power to initiate proposals for parishes where he had pastoral oversight, and have the right of full consultation and voting participation in all matters relating to the pastoral reorganisation of such parishes. Equally, the PRB would have the duty to co-operate with a diocese in any constructive planning for mission and pastoral care in a changing church⁴⁴. In other respects, however, the parish would continue to be subject to the normal diocesan structures and procedures, including the faculty jurisdiction⁴⁵. The parishes concerned would thus remain for administrative purposes as part of the geographical diocese.
44. Though complicated, such arrangements would reflect a sense of *shared* jurisdiction on the analogy of the share in the cure of souls articulated at an Incumbent's institution. Though pastoral care, sacramental life and jurisdictional governance belong together and should never be wholly severed, this does not mean that all these aspects of Christian life need to be delivered by the same minister: as we are already familiar with in Area Schemes or less formal arrangements for sharing episcopal ministry within dioceses. In the case of TEA, we would have a form of *shared* episcopal ministry between Diocesan, the Metropolitan and the PRB.
45. TEA would combine Resolutions A & B from the Priests (Ordination of Women) Measure 1993 with the provision for a PRB. An important consequence would therefore be the abolition – subject to transitional

⁴³ The group recognises the evolution of church structures in the light of the report *Mission Shaped Church*, but has based its work on the current pattern. Future legislation would need to take account of other units of the local church that may come into being.

⁴⁴ The PRB's role vis-à-vis the Pastoral Measure would need to be one of the matters covered in an accompanying Code of Practice.

⁴⁵ The group has not had time to consider the detailed relationship between clergy and laity in TEA parishes – and PRBs – to the Synodical structures of the Church of England, and such matters as their implications for sector ministry.

arrangements - of the *present* provision for parishes to pass resolutions A and B (together with all other discriminatory provision in Part II of the present Measure)⁴⁶. What this means is that, in all the parishes except those in TEA, the possibility of legislative discrimination on the very wide scale that potentially exists where a woman priest is not now in post would no longer obtain. While necessarily quite complex and raising new ecclesiological issues⁴⁷, we believe that such a scheme of Transferred Episcopal Arrangements [TEA] satisfies our desire to maintain the maximum possible degree of ecclesial unity. TEA would require some embodiment in a Measure but it would also require an enforceable Code of Practice. **The precise balance, within TEA, between what is included in a Measure and what is covered by a Code of Practice would be a matter for further discussion and debate during the preparation and consideration of draft legislation.**

46. Advantages:

- Substantially meets the essential needs of those who could not accept that women should be bishops and in consequence could not accept the authority of a woman diocesan bishop;
- Avoids the creation of a new jurisdiction, diocese or province;
- Maintains existing diocesan administrative structures, and thereby keeps boundaries between those with differing convictions on women bishops permeable;
- Ensures that legislative discrimination against women clergy is restricted to those parishes opting into TEA;
- Consistency with past patterns of cultural episcopacy (see Appendix 5)

47. Disadvantages:

- Relative complexity of the new arrangements in separating out different aspects of episcopal function;
- Breach with usual ecclesiology in that the diocesan bishop would no longer be the Ordinary for all parishes in the geographical diocese;
- Special arrangements would be needed should either Archbishop be a woman (see Chapter 4);
- Those who could not accept the ministry of women bishops might feel that parishes were not sufficiently safeguarded, as TEA might be regarded as not

⁴⁶ See para 105.

⁴⁷ For a further exploration of related ecclesiological issues in relation to territoriality and cultural episcopacy see Appendix 5 .

dealing sufficiently with their concern that ‘impairment’ of communion in their view necessitates the creation of a separate ecclesial structure.

- Supporters of the ordination of women might view TEA as perpetuating the ‘unjust’ provisions of the Episcopal Ministry Act of Synod.
48. In the light of the Archdeacon of Berkshire’s amendment to the July 2005 General Synod motion (see paragraph 3), we have considered the issue of the universal validity of orders in relation to proposed transferred episcopal arrangements, touching as it does on the issue of sacramental assurance (which we flagged up in paragraph 21)⁴⁸. Some have argued that any provision for those opposed to women bishops should recognise that they would not be able to recognise priests, both male and female, who have been ordained by a woman bishop as truly priests of the Church of God. While we recognise that there are those whose convictions preclude them from recognising women bishops and those ordained by them, we wish to emphasise the importance of the common *intention* of those on both sides of this divide that those who are ordained according to the use of the Ordinals of the Church of England, are to be truly bishops, priests and deacons, as expressed in Canon A4. Though such universal recognition of Orders has been qualified since 1993 by Part 2 of the Priests (Ordination of Women) Measure and the Act of Synod 1993, we do not believe the Church of England should further discriminate between those ordained by duly consecrated bishops of the Church, whether male or female.

Conclusion

49. The Rochester Report listed for the sake of completeness a number of possible options, but debate within the Church has, up to now, focused on the choice between, on the one hand, a “Single Clause Measure” and on the other the creation of a “third province”. Both have been extensively described and advocated elsewhere and, as a result, we have confined ourselves in this report to trying to identify their main advantages and disadvantages. Where we have focused much of our attention is on the possibility of a different approach which would go beyond the single clause approach in terms of providing structural safeguards for those who cannot accept the ministry of women as priests and bishops, while stopping short of the institutional separation of the third province option.
50. We have identified such an approach, which we have termed “Transferred Episcopal Arrangements (TEA)”. We believe that it would enable the main body of the Church to proceed without any discriminatory provisions against women’s ministry and that it would offer the most satisfactory way of providing adequate safeguards for those opposed to the ordination of women bishops. We have devoted some space to an illustrative description to how it might work. The details would be for further consideration during the preparation of legislation and its passage through Synod.

⁴⁸ See Chairman’s note at Appendix 2.

51. The question for now – and it is a very big one, on which we invite the whole Church to reflect carefully – is whether its undoubted disadvantages are outweighed by the potential which we believe it offers, of admitting women to the episcopate in a way which will secure the maximum possible degree of communion. It is not where any of us in the group started. But as we have discussed and prayed together, **we have come to the conclusion that it is an option which could be made to work and merits serious consideration by the General Synod as representing the most realistic way forward.**

52. In essence TEA recognise that communion in the Church always falls short of that fullness which will come only with the fullness of the Kingdom. It is complicated and untidy. But we believe this is how the Church really is. TEA is an honest acknowledgement of our frailty and division in this hugely significant area of our life. We believe TEA is the most inclusive and realistic way forward. It will allow a continuing inter-relationship between those for and against women bishops: at the same time, in its attempt to hold together as many as possible in the highest possible degree of communion, it does not compound the sin of schism.

THE OFFICE OF ARCHBISHOP

The dilemma

53. In seeking to make provision for those who could not accept women bishops, such as the arrangements for Transferred Episcopal Arrangements set out in Appendix 1 it is necessary that the source of that transferred jurisdiction should be male. This therefore touches on the office of each Archbishop.

The participation of Archbishops in episcopal ordinations

54. Both the Archbishops of Canterbury and York have traditionally presided as the chief consecrator at the Ordination of Bishops within their respective Provinces. The Canonical requirement, however, is that a minimum of three bishops take part ‘of whom one shall be the archbishop of the province or a bishop appointed to act on his behalf’⁴⁹.
55. The involvement of either Archbishop in the consecration of women bishops would of course be seen as highly significant, both for those who would see the symbolic importance of their personal imprimatur for women’s episcopal ministry, and for those for whom it might impair their own communion with the Archbishop (which might in turn impact upon the means of effecting any Transferred Episcopal Arrangements).
56. This is not a matter on which it seems right to make any recommendation, since any decision, whether to consecrate or take a self-denying ordinance not to, must ultimately be a matter for each Archbishop to take nearer the time. It is sufficient now simply to note the point.

Transferred Archiepiscopal Functions

57. In the event of either Archbishop being a woman, the Group examined ways in which archiepiscopal functions could be undertaken by another (male) bishop within the Province, should this be necessary for a system of transferred jurisdiction to function. The Archbishop could either nominate a diocesan bishop in the Province, or observe an established procedure for precedence⁵⁰.

Archbishops’ Supervisory Jurisdiction

58. At first sight, the proposed transfer of legal jurisdiction may seem inconsistent with the normal position under canon law, under which the diocesan bishop is the ‘Ordinary’ in relation to his diocese - ie the person having ordinary jurisdiction in ecclesiastical causes. (In this context ‘ordinary’ jurisdiction means a jurisdiction enjoyed by the bishop in his own right and not by way of deputation or delegation.) However, alongside the jurisdiction of the bishop as Ordinary, the archbishop enjoys a supervisory jurisdiction. Paragraph 2 of Canon C 17 describes it as follows:

⁴⁹ Canon C 2.1. See also para 57 for one instance in which the Archbishop might appoint a bishop to act on his behalf.

⁵⁰ The group’s attention was drawn to the Provincial Chapter of the Province of Canterbury, comprising: the Bishops of London (Dean), Winchester (Chancellor), Salisbury (Precentor), Rochester (Cross-Bearer), and Lincoln (Vice-Chancellor). The group noted this established order of precedence as a means by which archiepiscopal jurisdiction could, if necessary, be transferred if it was necessary for such jurisdiction to be exercised by a male bishop.

59. *“The archbishop has throughout his province at all times metropolitan jurisdiction, as superintendent of all ecclesiastical matters therein, to correct and supply the defects of other bishops, and, during the time of his metropolitan visitation, jurisdiction as Ordinary, except in places and over persons exempt by law or custom”.*
60. Paragraph 1 of Canon G 5, speaking of visitation generally, states that the person performing a visitation may *“perform all such acts as by law and custom are assigned to his charge in that behalf for the edifying and well-governing of Christ’s flock, that means may be taken thereby for the supply of such things as are lacking and the correction of such things as are amiss”.*
61. Against this background, a statutory arrangement whereby the diocesan bishop and the archbishop agreed that the latter should act as the Ordinary in relation to clergy who cannot in conscience accept a woman in the episcopate and as a result as their diocesan bishop could be seen as an extension of the archbishop’s existing power to take remedial action where difficulties have arisen in the life of a diocese.
- The Archbishop of Canterbury**
62. The office of the Archbishop of Canterbury is unique. The Archbishop is the diocesan bishop of Canterbury, Metropolitan of the Province of Canterbury, Primate of All England, and one of the four instruments of unity within the Anglican Communion⁵¹. If the Church of England decides that there should be women bishops, it will continue to include those who remain opposed to the admission of women to the priesthood or the episcopate. There are also bound to be some provinces of the Anglican Communion where women may not be bishops, indeed that is the position at the moment in the majority of provinces⁵².
63. There are very strong arguments that, once women are admitted to the episcopate, they should be eligible for consideration on an equal basis, and without any discrimination, for any see which becomes vacant within the Church of England. Nevertheless, given the role which the Archbishop of Canterbury is expected to play, both here and in the wider Communion, there is a real question which has to be faced as to whether a woman could be appointed to the See of Canterbury for so long as female episcopal ministry was not accepted by many in England and by many Anglican provinces

⁵¹ See *To Lead and Serve: The Report of the Review of the See of Canterbury*, Church House Publishing 2001, & *The Windsor Report: The Lambeth Commission on Communion*, Anglican Communion Office 2004 paras 97-99.

⁵² See GS 1557, Annex 1, p.237-8.

around the world⁵³. Being in communion with the See of Canterbury is generally regarded as being a necessary part of being an Anglican⁵⁴.

The legal backdrop

64. At present there are no provisions in Measures or Canons which set out any specific requirements for appointment to the See of Canterbury. The process for filling the vacancy is substantially the same as for the appointment of the Archbishop of York or any other diocesan bishop. The exceptions are that, under the General Synod's Standing Order 122: the chair of the Crown Nominations Commission (CNC) is appointed by the Prime Minister and; the Commission is attended by a Primate of the Anglican Communion and its Secretary General (the former as a voting and the latter as a non-voting member).
65. There is also the law in relation to sex discrimination to be taken into account. Under the revised section 19 of the Sex Discrimination Act 1975 (in force from 1 October 2005) it remains a defence to a claim of discrimination where a requirement to be of a particular sex is applied '(i) so as to comply with the doctrines of the religion or (ii) because of the nature of the employment and the context in which it is carried out, so as to avoid conflicting with the strongly-held religious convictions of a significant number of the religion's followers.'
66. If the Church of England decides to admit women to the episcopate a defence under (i) would no longer be possible if it were claimed, in a particular case, that the CNC had excluded a female candidate on grounds of gender. Whether a defence under (ii) might be possible would depend on the circumstances. What must surely be beyond dispute, however, is that in relation to the See of Canterbury it would leave the CNC in an impossible position if there were some uncertainty - and the risk of legal challenge - over the extent to which it could take gender into account.

The options

67. Against that background there are in principle three possible approaches:
- i. to make express provision in the Measure authorising the admission of women to the episcopate that, uniquely, the See of Canterbury was still reserved to a man.
 - ii. to make no such provision. In that case all episcopal appointments (with the exception of PRBs) would immediately be open equally to men and women. Given the Sex Discrimination Act the only safe

⁵³ The group recognises that the Church restricting the office of Archbishop of Canterbury to a man, and even more to a man who does not ordain women as bishops, would have possible particular implications for the relationship of the Diocese of Canterbury to the Archbishop, and the future role of the Bishop of Dover.

⁵⁴ The 1930 Lambeth Conference (Resolution 49) began its definition of Anglicanism thus: "The Anglican Communion is a fellowship, within the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church, of those duly constituted dioceses, provinces or regional churches in communion with the See of Canterbury..."

course for the CNC would be to consider candidates, including for the See of Canterbury, without regard to gender;

- iii. to open the episcopate and all episcopal offices (except PRBs) to women but to give the CNC specific statutory authority in relation only to the See of Canterbury to take into account the acceptability at that point, across the Church of England and the Anglican Communion, of a woman archbishop.
68. There are strong arguments against (i). Enshrining such a stark limitation in legislation would cut across the general objective of ensuring that, subject to making adequate arrangements for those who cannot in conscience accept women bishops or priests, all posts should be open to men and women. If such arrangements were not possible if the Primate of All England were a woman, that would be a powerful argument for option (i). But there are ways in which a transferred episcopal arrangements could be made to work even if one or both Archbishops were women. It seems undesirable, therefore, to create by legislation what would be seen as a new, glass ceiling, requiring yet further legislation (with a two thirds majority in each House) if it were to be removed at some later date.
 69. The second option has the merit of simplicity, ecclesiological coherence and transparent equality. But the Church of England would need to be absolutely clear that the consequences of moving in one step to an entirely gender neutral approach were acceptable both for itself and the wider Anglican Communion. Given the degree of contention which remains about the admission of women to presbyteral and episcopal orders, there must be doubts whether this is likely to be so within the next few years.
 70. **Option three may, therefore, provide a sensible way forward.** It would immediately, as a matter of law, open all episcopal offices, *including the See of Canterbury*, to women. But it would give the CNC the lawful authority, notwithstanding the Sex Discrimination Act, to weigh up the circumstances at the time of the vacancy and reach a view whether the moment had come when, for the first time, a woman could be appointed. It would need to be satisfied that she would be able to exercise effectively the full range of the office's responsibilities within the Church of England and the Anglican Communion. It might be sensible to include a requirement for the CNC to consult other persons or bodies before it took such a decision. Such a residual glass ceiling would remain hurtful to some, but might be regarded as a price to be paid for removing a more substantial glass ceiling, and would in due course be removable without recourse to further legislation.
 71. It is perhaps worth adding that, inevitably, the question whether a woman could for the first time become Archbishop of Canterbury is likely to attract particular attention, given its importance, actual and symbolic. If the day comes when a woman is installed on the throne of St Augustine, it would indeed be a notable day in church history, and the continuing life of the Church Universal in mission.

72. It would be a pity if debate about this issue were to assume disproportionate importance at this stage. It is quite likely to be some time after the admission of women to the episcopate before there would be both a vacancy and a female candidate for the primacy. Vacancies do not arise very often (in the whole of the twentieth century there were just nine). While, therefore, the issue will need to be addressed in the legislation, there is much to be said for a solution which does not unhelpfully and prematurely cause further polarisation.

GETTING THERE

73. The report has, thus far, concentrated on the key choices facing the Church of England over the arrangements that should apply once women have been admitted to the episcopate. This chapter focuses on what will need to be done to get from where we are now to where we decide we want to be.
74. Inevitably this raises a number of questions of process and practicality which may, at first sight, seem somewhat different in character from the deeper theological questions covered in the previous chapters. Principles do, however, have to be clothed in procedure and practice if they are to have practical application. We make no apology, therefore, for trying to map out with some care the journey that will have to be followed in order to reach the desired destination.

The starting point

75. The merits of the settlement reached in the early 1990s over the introduction of women priests remain contested, and it is acknowledged that pain and hurt has been experienced by many on both sides of the issue. Nevertheless, the arrangements themselves have operated on a day-to-day basis for more than a decade now, and a sort of equilibrium has been established.
76. The challenge facing the Church is whether it can find a way of admitting women to the episcopate which will enable a new equilibrium to be established with the minimum distress and turbulence. There is bound to be some. Such a significant process of change cannot avoid creating dilemmas and uncertainties for those opposed to or uncertain of the wisdom of consecrating women bishops, as also for those who would strongly prefer the Church to be wholly without discrimination on grounds of gender. But if as a Church we are committed to maintaining the highest possible degree of communion within the Body of Christ, it is incumbent on us to try and ensure that the change is delivered in as eirenic and thoughtful a manner as possible.
77. The present position is as follows. Under the Priests (Ordination of Women) Measure 1993 PCCs currently have a statutory right to pass:
- resolution A, which has the effect of preventing any woman presiding at Holy Communion or pronouncing the Absolution; and/or
 - resolution B, which has the effect of preventing any woman being the incumbent, priest-in-charge or team vicar for the benefice.
78. Separately, under the Episcopal Ministry Act of Synod 1993 PCCs who have passed either resolution may in addition petition the diocesan bishop ‘to the effect that appropriate episcopal duties in the parish should be carried out in accordance with this Act of Synod’. These arrangements for extended episcopal oversight may be organised within a diocese, or regionally between two or more dioceses in a province, or on a provincial basis (up to two provincial episcopal visitors – ‘PEVs’, sometimes known as ‘flying bishops’ – may be appointed for the Canterbury province and one for York).

79. PCCs may pass resolutions and petitions or subsequently revoke them at any time, provided that at least four weeks' notice of the meeting has been given. At least half of the members of the Council must be present. In the case of resolutions A and B a simple majority of those voting suffices. In the case of a petition under the Act of Synod the diocesan bishop is not required to act on it (though may still choose to do so) unless it has been passed by two thirds of the PCC present and voting and has the minister's support.
80. As of 31 March 2004, resolution A was in force in 810 parishes, that is 6.1% of the total of 13,181. The number of resolution B parishes stood at 1,002, some 7.6%⁵⁵. The total for parishes who have petitioned under the Act of Synod (315, representing 2.4% of all parishes) understates the underlying reality. This is because in some dioceses – for example Chichester – parishes have been able to receive what is, to them, acceptable oversight without petitioning under the Act of Synod.
81. Within these overall totals there is wide geographical variation in the proportion of parishes not fully open to the ministry of women. There are ten dioceses where more than 10% of parishes have passed one or other of the resolutions. Of these the top five are Blackburn – 32.7%, Sheffield – 21.4%, London – 17.9%, Manchester – 16.4% and Durham – 16.1%.
82. Interestingly it is by and large the more rural dioceses which are most open to the ministry of women. There are eleven dioceses where fewer than 5.0% of parishes have passed one or other motion: Oxford, Salisbury, Winchester, Guildford, Sodor and Man, Bath and Wells, Norwich, Ely, St Edmundsbury and Ipswich, Worcester and Hereford. In Hereford just two parishes (0.6%) have passed resolutions A and B.
83. This geographical variation is relevant to the dynamics of the challenge facing the Church. In a significant number of dioceses women priests are already very largely accepted. The entry of women into the episcopate is already felt by many to be a sensible working through of a decision which they believe already made in principle when it was agreed to ordain women to the presbyterate. Many in these dioceses are likely to be surprised and frustrated at any notion that the change should be other than straightforward. By contrast, in those dioceses where between a third and a tenth of parishes have passed one of the present resolutions – and particularly in the 315 parishes which have petitioned for extended episcopal ministry (and in others sympathetic to them) - there is likely to be much more apprehension about and indeed outright opposition to managing the transition.

Establishing a new framework

84. It will be for the Synod, guided by the House of Bishops, to determine both the shape of the new framework and the legal vehicles for creating it. As a minimum there will need to be a Measure to make it lawful for the Synod to

⁵⁵ See Appendix 7 for a full breakdown of these figures.

make provision by Canon for enabling a woman to be ordained to the office of bishop. Amendments to the Canons will also need to be drafted in parallel.

85. How much detail to put in the Measure itself and how much to leave to secondary legislation (Canons, Statutory Instruments), Acts of Synod and/or codes of practice needs to be determined in the light of which option is adopted and of a careful assessment of the conflicting considerations, both legal and political.
86. The key point about the provisions of any Measure is that, like Acts of Parliament, they are part of the law of the land and as such legally binding on the bishops, the clergy and laity of the Church. They can thus create rights and responsibilities which are enforceable in law. Secondary legislation has the same potency, though it has to be made within the limits of the specific enabling authority conferred by the parent Measure.
87. An Act of Synod or Act of Convocation is not secondary legislation and while having 'great moral force' within the Church⁵⁶ is not a sure basis for creating enforceable rights. Similarly, codes of practice do not in general create directly enforceable rights, even though it is possible to give them some added weight by creating a statutory basis for them. Thus the Church of England (Miscellaneous Provisions) Measure 2005 empowers the Church Commissioners to offer advice – which would take the form of a code of practice – to which pastoral committees, boards of finance etc have to 'have regard'.
88. What this boils down to is that:
 - to the extent that there is a need to provide reassurance that certain rights are safeguarded and enforceable, the surest course is to include them in the Measure itself;
 - it would be possible to make some supplementary provision by way of code of practice and, if desired, to provide in an enabling provision in the Measure that breach of the code constituted an offence against the laws ecclesiastical for which proceedings might be taken under the Clergy Discipline Measure;
 - if not strengthened in this way, a Code of Practice would not provide a secure basis for seeking a remedy through the civil courts.
89. If Synod is able to come to a view on the broad shape of the arrangements it wants put in place, a legislative drafting group will need to be established. Once the Measure (and necessary consequential legislation and liturgical business) has been considered and, as necessary, revised it will need to secure the assent of at least half of the diocesan synods⁵⁷ before returning to the

⁵⁶ To quote the judgement in *Bland versus Archdeacon of Cheltenham* [1972] 1 All ER 1012,1018.

⁵⁷ This would be Article 8 business, under which business falling within it has to be approved "by the majority of the dioceses at meetings of their Diocesan Synods, or, in the case of the Diocese of Europe, of the bishop's council and standing committee of the diocese". Rule 34(1)(e) of the Church

General Synod for Article 7 references to the House of Bishops, Convocations and the House of Laity and then for final approval by a two-thirds majority in each house. Each of these stages will have to be completed whatever the shape and size of the legislation. The amount of time required is likely to turn more on the extent of consensus achieved by then on the overall arrangements than on the length of the legislation.

90. It is too early to offer firm predictions. If the Synod decided on a particular option and voted to establish a legislative drafting group in February 2006, it would in principle be possible for final synodical approval to the Measure to be achieved by the time of the final group of sessions of the quinquennium in July 2010, though much would depend on decisions reached at various points in the legislative process. Parliamentary approval and the promulgating of the Canons would be required after final approval by Synod. The earliest date at which the first episcopal appointment might be open to a woman is probably, therefore, 2012.
91. There is one further point to note about the preparation and passage of the legislation and any associated provisions. One of the striking features of the ordination of women to the priesthood is that the Act of Synod was prepared and agreed after the legislation itself – including the separate Measure on financial provisions – had received final approval. Given the uncertainties and concerns of the time it may be that no other process would have been achievable. But there is much to be said now for the framework for the admission of women to the episcopate to be conceived and considered as a single package. To the extent that there are judgements to be reached about the need for safeguards of one kind or another they need to be seen in the round.

Representation Rules, governing the contents of the standing orders of diocesan synods, effectively requires that nothing is to be deemed to have the diocesan synod's assent unless approved in all three houses; and whereas the diocesan bishop can make his personal assent a requirement if the house of bishops is to be taken to have given its assent, that possibility is excluded in the case of Article 8 references. Thus the diocesan does not have a right of veto in the case of Article 8 business.

TRANSITIONAL AND FINANCIAL ARRANGEMENTS

92. What, then, should the legislation (and any associated code) provide by way of transitional arrangements? Clearly there would need to be an orderly migration path from the present world of resolutions A and B and the Act of Synod to the new dispensation. In this chapter we look in some detail at how this might work in relation to a move to TEA. If the decision were to be for a single clause measure or a third province solution, the transitional arrangements would be different, though many of the issues in this chapter would still arise. We have not worked them through at this stage .

The new scheme

93. To recap, TEA would involve the following:
- the 1993 Measure and the Act of Synod are repealed;
 - every post in the Church is open to men and women equally except where parishes have resolved otherwise on grounds of conviction related to women in the priesthood and the episcopate;
 - where parishes etc have so resolved, a woman would not be able to exercise priestly ministry or episcopal oversight for them;
 - transferred episcopal arrangements would be provided as set out in Appendix 1 (unless the diocesan bishop had himself formally indicated that he did not intend to ordain women as priests and bishops)
94. The group recognised that there is a further set of issues as to whether any declaration by the diocesan bishop should also extend to him undertaking not to have a woman exercising episcopal authority in his diocese. Given the current procedures for appointing bishops, the group considers that it would be highly unlikely that where the diocesan had indicated, on the grounds of his conscientious opposition, he would not ordain women priests nor take part in the consecration of women bishops, that a woman suffragan would be appointed in a diocese. Similarly the group thinks it unlikely that a diocesan holding to such a position would be appointed to the see when a woman suffragan was already in post.
- ### **Suddenly or gradually?**
95. One possible approach would be to try and move from the status quo to the new dispensation in a single, church-wide step. There could, for example, be a provision in the Measure that appointed a day for the rest of the Measure to come into force. On that appointed day the 1993 Measure (and the Act of Synod) would lapse with the result that resolutions A and B and any petitions under the Act of Synod would cease to have effect. Between the coming into force of the ‘trigger’ provision and the appointed day there would be a short window, probably of a few months at most, when it would be open to parishes

to pass a new style resolution. This would need to be in the duly prescribed form⁵⁸.

96. An argument can certainly be made for some defining moment of this kind. It is, however, at the every least questionable whether such a ‘big bang’ approach would really be in the best interests of the Church, particularly if the choice was not immutable.
97. There is much to be said for parishes not having to see the choice as a once for all opportunity. At the moment parishes that have passed one of the existing resolutions or petitioned for extended episcopal ministry are free to change their mind at any time. Similarly parishes that have not are free to do so at any time. **It seems right that the new arrangements should continue to provide for a two-way valve between the two parts of the Church of England.**
98. If there is, therefore, to be such permeability, the case for a decisive early moment when every parish has to place itself under one set of arrangements or the other seems less than compelling. Indeed, there are obvious downsides to having a single, defining moment. What will instead be needed are some sunset arrangements for the resolutions under the 1993 Measure and the Act of Synod petition. There will be a balance to strike between an orderly transition that is not so protracted as to be confusing and something so sharp and brisk that it further polarises opinion at a time of uncertainty and insecurity. The details would be for further consideration during the drafting of the necessary Measure, and subsequent consideration in General Synod, but we illustrate a possible way through as follows.

The transition

99. Any parish, whether or not it had previously passed a resolution, would be entitled, as soon as the legislation came into force, to give four weeks’ notice and convene a special parochial church meeting to consider passing a motion. The effect of the motion would be that the parish was not, on grounds of conviction, able to accept the priestly and/or episcopal ministry of a woman. If the motion passed, the diocesan bishop (unless he had declared himself not to be someone who ordains women as priests or bishops) would be required, provided he was satisfied that the right process had been followed, to trigger the provision of transferred episcopal arrangements by the Archbishop. The parish would, however, have the option of delaying the coming into effect of transferred episcopal arrangements until such time as a woman diocesan was appointed. The parish would be free subsequently to rescind the motion, in the same way at any time. Motions would not be time-limited in their effect, though there would be a requirement to review them every five years and at every vacancy.

⁵⁸ The group was of the view that the Special Parochial Church Meeting, and not the PCC, was the appropriate body to make such a decision on the grounds that for a parish to request to transfer jurisdiction from the diocesan to another jurisdiction would be of such significance as to require the consent of SPCM. Nevertheless we recognise that there would need to further discussion on the merits of either the SPCM or PCC taking this decision.

100. There is a question whether (apart from the notice period) there should be any restrictions on the circumstances in which a parish could pass such a motion. At present, there is a provision in section 3(3) of the 1993 Measure which prevents a parish from passing resolution A where it has a woman priest in post. Interestingly there is no equivalent prohibition in relation to resolution B; if such a resolution were passed when a woman was in post as incumbent it would have no immediate practical effect since she would remain in post.
101. It would not be practicable to have a provision in the new legislation that simply replicated section 3(3). Nevertheless, it would be important to ensure that a parish could not pass a motion that had the effect of limiting the ministry of a woman priest already in office in that parish. There is also a case for avoiding the difficult situation that would arise if, as is conceivable, a parish with a female incumbent passed a motion in an attempt to preclude oversight by a woman bishop. Difficulties of a different kind would arise if a parish that had opted for transferred episcopal arrangements subsequently revoked its decision, thereby opening itself to female episcopal oversight contrary to the convictions of its male incumbent.
102. The simplest solution to these potential problems would be to provide that:
- a motion passed where a woman priest was already in office in the parish would not restrict her ministry there;
 - a motion passed (or subsequently rescinded) otherwise than during a vacancy in the incumbency would not trigger any change to the status quo in the provision of episcopal oversight without the incumbent's consent⁵⁹.
103. A particular set of questions arises in relation to those parishes where resolution A or B, and in some cases an Act of Synod petition, are in place at the moment the new arrangements come into force. As argued above, there is much to be said for avoiding a single church-wide defining moment.
104. Nevertheless the resolutions and Act of Synod petitions, some of which will by then have been made more than fifteen years previously, cannot simply be left to remain in force indefinitely. Apart from anything else it would not be sensible to have a situation in which a woman was, by virtue of resolution A, still not able to preside at Holy Communion in a parish church for which, in the absence of a duly passed motion under the new legislation, she was able to provide episcopal oversight.
105. The solution may be to provide in the new legislation either that:
- **any resolutions lapse after a set number of years as provided in the legislation ; or**

⁵⁹ The group recognise that there are further issues relating to team and group ministries that will need to be considered at a later stage in the process, as indeed is also the case in relation to the balance of influence as between the laity and the incumbent in the process.

- **any resolutions lapse at a date as Synod may subsequently determine .**

106. Again, this is a point for the legislative drafting group. Our initial thought was that quite a short ‘sunset period’ should be set for the old resolutions – say, three years after the coming into force of the legislation. But there is a counter-argument that the shorter the period, the greater the number of resolution A and B parishes that would be quickly forced to choose whether to go for the all-embracing arrangements of TEA or abandon their previous positions. There might therefore be a case for leaving the transitional period in the legislation and giving Synod a power to set it later or alternatively to provide in the legislation a much longer ‘sunset clause’.
107. In relation to parishes with a petition in force under the Act of Synod on the day the new legislation comes into effect, there is an argument for extending the principle set out above (which applies to the passing or rescinding of motions under the new legislation contrary to the wishes of the serving incumbent) to such parishes. The group recognises that there will be a need to address the issue of safeguarding the conscience of the incumbent in circumstances in which the parish declined to pass a new motion but he remained opposed to women in the priesthood or episcopate, but we make no specific recommendation.

Financial Arrangements

108. The Ordination of Women (Financial Provisions) Measure 1993 created a series of entitlements for those who left the ordained ministry out of opposition to the ordination of women as priests. Clergy had ten years, until 21 February 2004, in which they could resign and seek financial assistance. In all, 441 people took advantage of the arrangements.
109. The financial package was devised in the late 1980s and funded by the Church Commissioners at a cost of £27.4m. The financial position of the Commissioners and the wider Church is now very different, not least because of the greatly increased burden of funding clergy pensions.
110. The question inevitably arises, however, whether some financial assistance would be justified for those who are similarly unable to accept the ordination of women bishops. The preamble to the 1993 Financial Provisions Measure - approved by Synod in 1992 before it had knowledge of the arrangements subsequently embodied in the Episcopal Ministry Act of Synod - spoke of making ‘provision as to the relief of hardship’ and it can be argued that the Church should be no less sensitive now to such an objective.
111. The group acknowledged that there may be a small number of genuinely hard cases where some discretionary support may be appropriate. It considered, however, that the case for creating any fresh set of entitlements to financial assistance would be substantially lessened if, as envisaged in this report, the Church is willing to go a long way to make space for those who cannot accept the full ministry of women.

112. The group believes that the pastoral arrangements envisaged in this report do go a long way to creating the necessary space and would therefore caution against any automatic assumption that similar provisions to those agreed in 1993 would necessarily be justified this time round. This is nevertheless an issue which the General Synod will need to consider in due course in the light of input on resource considerations from the Archbishops' Council.

SUMMARY OF PRINCIPAL CONCLUSIONS

- Of the three main options considered – ‘Single Clause’ Measure; Third Province; and Transferred Episcopal Arrangements [TEA] – we have come to the conclusion that TEA is an option which could be made to work and merits serious consideration by the General Synod as representing the most realistic way forward (para. 51; Appendix 1)
- It is envisaged that Transferred Episcopal Arrangements would need to be provided for in a Measure which would replace part 2 of the Priests (Ordination of Women) Measure 1993 and the Episcopal Ministry Act of Synod 1993, which would – subject to transitional arrangements - be repealed. This would have the consequence of abolishing discrimination against women in all parishes outside TEA (para. 93 and Appendix 1), though the precise balance within TEA between what is included in a Measure and what is covered by a Code of Practice would be a matter for further discussion and debate during the preparation and consideration of draft legislation (para 45).
- There would need to be transitional arrangements under which any resolutions either lapsed after a set number of years as provided in the legislation or lapsed at a date as Synod may subsequently determine. There is a judgement as to whether this transitional period should be relatively short – say three years - or much longer (para. 105).
- Parishes that have passed one of the existing resolutions or petitioned for extended episcopal ministry should be free to change their mind at any time (para. 97).
- As far as the office of Archbishop of Canterbury was concerned, the group supported the giving the CNC specific statutory authority in relation only to the See of Canterbury to take into account the acceptability at that point, across the Church of England and the Anglican Communion, of a woman archbishop (paras. 67 & 70).

**TRANSFERRED EPISCOPAL ARRANGEMENTS:
AN ILLUSTRATIVE SUMMARY OF POSSIBLE PROVISIONS**

113. A majority of a Special Parochial Church could pass one or more of the following resolutions:
- "That this parish:
- (a) would not accept a woman
- (i) as the minister who presides or celebrates at Holy Communion or pronounces the Absolution in the parish,
and / or
 - (ii) as the incumbent of the parish,
and / or
 - (iii) as a bishop exercising ordinary jurisdiction in the diocese;
- and
- (b) consequently requests that,
- either
 - (i) transferred episcopal arrangements be made immediately for the parish, in the absence of any declaration by the bishop of the diocese for the time being that he would take part neither in the ordination of women priests or the consecration of women bishops;
 - or
 - (ii) transferred episcopal arrangements be made for the parish in the event of a woman being appointed as bishop of the diocese."

114. The Diocesan Bishop having checked that the correct process had been followed should forward the request to the Archbishop of the Province;

115. The Archbishop - if a woman - would forward the request to a male diocesan bishop in the Province⁶⁰;

116. The Archbishop (subject to para 115) would be required to delegate his functions as the Ordinary in relation to the parish by authorising a Provincial Regional Bishop to exercise pastoral care, sacramental and disciplinary functions in relation to it, and by delegating all other functions back to the diocesan.;

117. Such a parish petition would be reviewable by a Special Parochial Church Meeting every five years;

118. The parish would remain part of the diocesan administration in respect of finance, church schools etc;

⁶⁰ See para 57

119. Provision would also be made for the church and churchyard of the parish to continue to be subject to the faculty jurisdiction of the consistory court of the diocese;
120. Where the diocesan bishop acted as patron in respect of appointments, this responsibility would be passed to the PRB.
121. Clergy in such a parish would make oaths of canonical obedience to the Archbishop of the Province (subject to para 115) through the PRB, who would administer the oath and personally exercise this special jurisdiction;
122. The PRB would be responsible for the ministerial review (and capability procedure) of clergy from such parishes and for their ecclesiastical discipline;
123. PRBs would be acting directly on behalf of the Archbishop of the Province (subject to para 115);
124. PRBs would be sponsoring bishops for the selection of ordinands, and would ordain deacons and priests opposed to the ordination of women as priests and bishops: such ordinands would otherwise be part of the national system of selection and training in the usual way;
125. The Archbishop would make special arrangements for the consecration of PRBs;
126. This arrangement would supersede part 2 of the Priests (Ordination of Women) Measure 1993 – subject to transitional arrangements⁶¹ - and the Episcopal Ministry Act of Synod 1993.

⁶¹ See Chapter 6

SACRAMENTAL ASSURANCE – Note by the Chairman

127. The term ‘sacramental assurance’ is not a familiar one to every Anglican. It is touched upon in the Rochester Report.⁶² In essence it is the principle that where sacraments are concerned the Church is obliged to take the least doubtful course of action in order that there need be no doubt in the conscience of the faithful recipient that they are truly receiving the grace instrumental to that sacrament. In the context of *our* discussion, from the perspective of those who cannot accept that a woman can be a bishop, the issue is that even a male priest ordained by a woman bishop would be impossible for those opposed to accept. Not being, as they would see it, a ‘true’ bishop her ordinations must be in doubt and consequently all the sacramental acts of those (male or female) ordained by her. The principle of sacramental assurance, on this understanding, is that the Church should avoid such doubt. This, it is argued, constitutes a case against the ordination of women to the episcopate or an argument for a clear ‘demarcation’ of clergy ordained by a woman bishop for those who hold this position.
128. While the problems raised under the heading of ‘sacramental assurance’ are real and must be weighed carefully as the church comes to a decision to ordain women to the episcopate, it can be argued that the problem is one of degree because the doubt already arises for those who cannot accept that women can be ordained to the priesthood. But there is a further reason why it is important that the church as a whole does not endorse an acceptance of a ‘doubtful’ women’s priesthood or episcopate. The sacraments (I use sacramental language for ordination here without prejudice to the long-standing debate in the Church of England as to the number of sacraments etc) are as the Prayer Book Catechism teaches ‘outward and visible signs’ a ‘means’ and ‘a pledge’ to ‘*assure*’ us of Christ’s grace. Article XXV speaks similarly of the sacraments as ‘not only badges or tokens . . . but rather they be *certain* and *sure* witnesses, and effectual signs of grace. . .’
129. This sense of certainty and sureness is common to all Anglican traditions and to the earlier and general Western tradition of sacramental theology. This certainty about the sacraments, of course including the necessity of faithful response for their fruitfulness, is ensured by the corporate action of the Church in response to the mandate of Jesus Christ as recorded in scripture. In ordination we can have assurance because we know that the ordinand is the subject of the prayer of the church for the Holy Spirit and is given the sign of the laying on of hands by the bishop who has led the ordination prayer of the church. Assurance is given because this sacramental ministry does not depend upon personal feelings or individual dispositions but on the corporate, formal, act of the Church. This is the theological intention of Canon A4, albeit somewhat qualified by the provision for non-acceptance of women’s ministry as priests in current legislation.

⁶² *Women Bishops in the Church of England?*, p. 143-4, in a quotation from a paper by Father David Houlding, also quoted approvingly by the Roman Catholic Bishops’ conference of England and Wales response to the Rochester Report, GS Misc 807, p.29

130. Whatever private reservations some may feel obliged to take in relation to women bishops and those ordained by them, the proper provision and space the church should make for those who are opposed must fall short of *officially* raising doubt about any ordinations in the Church. To enshrine such doubt at an official level would be in danger of compromising that very sense of trust in Christ's grace, of certainty and assurance which is the hallmark of sacramental actions. If we are to move forward in relation to the question of 'assurance' we need to find an irenic way of making clear the Church of England's intention that *all* who are ordained according to its ordinals are indeed *intended* to be truly bishops, priests and deacons. This should be upheld by all. This would leave room for the *pastoral* recognition of the reality that some are not able to recognize the actual ministry of women bishops including their ordinations.

THE OATH OF OBEDIENCE – Note by the Legal Adviser

131. It has been suggested that there may be a distinction between order and office and that there cannot be any doubt that a woman bishop would hold office – with the consequence that clergy could reasonably be expected to swear obedience to a woman diocesan bishop even if they did not recognise her orders. This argument seems to be based on two considerations:
- a. the fact that in some cases a person may briefly hold the office of diocesan bishop without being in episcopal orders and yet clergy are required to swear an oath of obedience to him; and
 - b. the form of the oath of obedience stipulated by Canon C 14 is such as to require a cleric to pay canonical obedience to the diocesan bishop “*and his successors*” – from it has been asserted that “*the Oath is not personal – it is made to present and subsequent holders of the office*”.
132. As regards the first of these considerations, the state of affairs described is temporary and, normally, very brief, the holder of the office of bishop having to be consecrated bishop as soon as possible. (Under s.4 of the Appointment of Bishops Act 1533 the Archbishop is required to consecrate a bishop who has been confirmed in office, and to do so “*with all spede and seleritie*”.) Thus in so far as the clergy are in the position of owing obedience to someone who is in not in episcopal orders it is for a brief, transitional period and in the knowledge that the law requires episcopal orders to be conferred if the bishop is to continue to hold office. On the basis that the law looks to substance rather than form and will see as done that which is required to be done, the fact that this somewhat anomalous position may exist does not provide a strong basis for the argument that there is generally a distinction between the office of the bishop and the orders of the holder of that office.
133. On the second point, relating to the form of the oath of obedience, this again turns on form rather than substance. It is contended that the oath is made to the holder of the office in an abstract sense and that therefore the cleric making it can properly (and, by implication, should) make the oath without any regard to whether or not they recognise the orders of the holder of that office and their ability to perform sacramental acts. However, this argument assumes that it is the oath that brings a duty of obedience into existence when, in fact, the oath simply reflects a duty which exists anyway. As Professor Norman Doe has written “*the oath amounts to a promise to fulfil a pre-existing obligation to obey episcopal directions arising by operation of Canon C 1.3; the oath has merely symbolic significance*”⁶³. (Canon C 1.3 of course states that “*According to the ancient law and usage of this Church and Realm of England, the inferior clergy who have received authority to minister in any diocese owe canonical obedience in all things lawful and honest to the bishop of the same ...*”.)

⁶³ Norman Doe, *the Legal Framework of the Church of England*, page 213

134. In view of this, rather than indicating that the oath is made to the abstract holder of an office, the reference in the oath to the bishop's "*successors*" simply indicates that, even though the oath may be made to a particular bishop, obedience will be owed to successor bishops as well even if no further oaths are made to them direct.
135. Against this background, the form of the oath does not provide any real evidence for the view that there is a distinction between office and order. Nor, it seems to me, does canon law support the assertion that "*the oath is not personal*": in the light of Canon C 1.3 it seems hard to say that no obligation of obedience is owed personally to the holder of the office from time to time.
136. Similarly, it is not clear that canon law provides any real support for the suggestion that a distinction can be made between the exercise by a bishop of jurisdiction and the performance of sacramental acts, such that even if a cleric questions a woman bishop's ability to perform sacramental acts he can still reasonably be required to owe obedience to the bishop in terms of respecting the exercise of her jurisdiction. Canon C 1.3 seems to make it plain that the duty of obedience arises from the inherent nature of the relationship between a bishop and his clergy. If it be asked what it is about that relationship which can have that effect, surely it is the bishop's role as chief pastor and father in God to his clergy in the most general sense – an important part of which is his sacramental and pastoral ministry? (See Canon C 18, which begins its description of the role of diocesan bishops with the statement that "*Every bishop is the chief pastor of all that are within his diocese, as well laity as clergy, and their father in God ...* ".) If so, then if a cleric cannot recognise their bishop as chief pastor and father in God because they question their episcopal orders and thus their sacramental and pastoral ministry, surely there is from their point of view an understandable difficulty about accepting that they should owe the duty of obedience which would otherwise arise?

JURIDICAL IMPLICATIONS OF A THIRD PROVINCE – Note by the Chairman

137. The term ‘Third Province’ can encompass a number of very different juridical understandings. In the history of the Church a province can mean either an administrative subdivision of a wider (usually national or regional) jurisdiction/church under a distinct metropolitan archbishop but otherwise sharing in an identical ethos, liturgy, canon law and synodical/conciliar system. So the Provinces of Canterbury and York within the Church of England, Armagh and Dublin for the Church of Ireland, the nine internal provinces of the Episcopal Church of the USA or the ten of Nigeria. Similarly the internal provinces of the Anglican Church of Canada, and the Anglican Church of Australia – though the original Australian provinces were more autonomous by reason of the federal origins of present Australia.
138. On the other hand a ‘province’ can mean an essentially *autonomous* church such as the Church of Wales, the Church of the Province of Southern Africa and many other Anglican ‘Provinces’. Here *each* province has its own ethos, law and liturgy. The differentiated Anglican tradition of provinces itself reflects different historical traditions within the history of the patristic and mediaeval Western Church.
139. The contemporary Roman Catholic Church has a comparatively weak canonical expression of the ecclesiastical province as compared with the more recent emergence of national Episcopal Conferences. There are currently five Roman Catholic ecclesiastical provinces in England and Wales within the single Episcopal Conference but canon law and liturgy is universal to the ‘Latin’ Roman Catholic Church. The major Roman Catholic religious orders are also divided into provinces. [The Eastern Churches developed a different tradition of Patriarchs, each with their own tradition of ‘auto-cephaly’, that is to say their own separate juridical, liturgical and ethnic tradition.]
140. It is the range of possible juridical implications in the term ‘Third Province’ which causes ambiguity and difficulty. Even in its weakest usage a ‘province’ implies a distinct juridical head, an archbishop with metropolitan jurisdiction to whom, for example, canonical appeal can be made in disciplinary matters above the diocesan. The stronger senses of province have further implications: a separate synod and constitution with autonomy in terms of liturgy and canon law. In Anglican Communion terms such a province would be a distinct church. Such a province would be autonomous (literally having its own law) and ‘autocephalus’ (literally having its own head i.e. primate).
141. Churches have either recognized or themselves established such ‘sister’ churches on grounds of mission in new geographical territories as the Church and Gospel have expanded over the globe. For this reason the establishment of a third province *within the same territory* seems tantamount to a form of institutionalized schism. When the Roman Catholic Church decided to re-establish the hierarchy in England and Wales in 1850 in contradistinction from

the provinces of Canterbury and York, it was felt by Anglicans to be schismatic, understandable enough as it was pastorally for English Roman Catholics. The conscious duplication of territorial provinces is therefore debatable, not least where there would be capacity and probability of the new 'province' declaring itself out of communion with its elder sister.

142. In addition the Western tradition generally and within the history of the Anglican Communion the term 'province' heretofore has always implied a distinct *territorial* area or geographical region. Non-territorial episcopacy has a long, pastoral and defensible history but its several expressions have never been described by the term province.

**NON TERRITORIAL OVERSIGHT AND CULTURAL EPISCOPACY – Note
by the Chairman**

143. The Churches of the Anglican Communion have been ambivalent in their attitude towards either overlapping episcopal jurisdiction or non-territorial oversight. Repeating sentiments often expressed before, the Lambeth Conference of 1988 expressed the ideal of one bishop in each place in words consciously echoing the Lambeth Conference of 1908. Yet the Conference also affirmed cultural diversity and the ‘experimental’ appointment of cultural, ethnic or non-territorial bishoprics. It went on to quote the Lambeth Conference of 1968 which recognized that special circumstances might justify ‘overlapping communities in the same area, for a greater or lesser time’.⁶⁴
144. There are non-territorial dioceses in several parts of the Anglican Communion. The Order of Ethiopia was once an ‘independent/ pentecostal/ black-led’ church of ‘catholic’ tradition; it became the Ethiopian Episcopal Church and received the episcopate through the Church of the Province of Southern Africa, with which it is in full communion, though autonomous. The Diocese of Aotearoa in New Zealand offers oversight and pastoral care to those of Maori ethnic background all over the Province of Aotearoa, New Zealand and Polynesia through four bishops. In the Episcopal Church of the USA there is the Navajoland Area Mission (a tribal diocese). In North Queensland, in Australia, there are two assistant bishops with ‘cultural’ oversight: the bishop for the Torres Straits Island peoples and the National Aboriginal Bishop.⁶⁵
145. In spite of regular laments over parallel Anglican jurisdictions in Europe, there remain four Anglican jurisdictions: the Diocese in Europe; the Convocation of the American Churches in Europe of the Episcopal Church of the USA; the Spanish Episcopal Reformed Church and the Lusitanian Church. In addition we are in full communion with the Old Catholic Churches of the Union of Utrecht and through the *Porvoo Agreement* share communion with the Nordic and Baltic Churches.
146. Cultural *episcopate* is not new to the Church. In the Western Christian tradition it has been argued that the episcopate of the Celtic Churches was less conscious of geographical boundaries than the later Latin tradition. What is more certain is that missionary bishops in the Saxon Church in England were consecrated or commissioned for particular races or tribes: Aidan for the ‘race of the Angles’; Cedd for the East Saxons and Chad for the Mercians and people of Lindsey.⁶⁶ Territorial location was incidental to a consecration whose focus was cultural and centered on a people rather than a precisely

⁶⁴ See Lambeth Conference 1988, *Ecumenical Relations*, 40, 41 and 42.

⁶⁵ See *Cultural Episcopacy & Ecumenism: Representative Ministry in Church History from the Age of Ignatius of Antioch to the Reformation*, Allen Brent, E. J. Brill, Leiden, 1992 which was researched and written as a serious ecclesiological undergirding for Australian ‘cultural’ episcopacy. It challenges the strictly territorial and jurisdictional view of episcopacy in Anglicanism as late Mediaeval.

⁶⁶ Bede H. E. III.3

defined territory.⁶⁷ By the time of the Crusades *The Assizes of Jerusalem* (1197 onwards) show that laws followed the particular cultural customs of individual races in the multicultural context of the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem and ecclesiastical jurisdiction following secular practice. Sovereignty over geographical territory was a later development of sovereignty over peoples. Multiculturalism was not unknown in later Mediaeval Europe because of the migration of Christian populations from Asia Minor, North Africa, the Balkans and Greece from the eighth and ninth centuries as dioceses and bishops were displaced by the Islamic invasions. This is the origin of ‘titular’ bishops in the West, the *episcopi in partibus infidelium*. By 1215 the Ninth Constitution of the IVth Lateran Council under Innocent III attempted to deal with the pastoral problems associated with this movement of peoples. Its title and full text are worthy of note:

147. *On different rites within the same faith*

“Since in many places people of different languages live within the same city or diocese, having one faith but different rites and customs, we therefore strictly order bishops of such cities and dioceses to provide suitable men who will do the following in the various rites and languages: celebrate the divine services for them, administer the church’s sacraments, and instruct them by word and example. We altogether forbid one and the same city of diocese to have more than one bishop, as if it were a body with several heads like a monster. But if for the aforesaid reasons urgent necessity demands it, the bishop of the place may appoint, after careful deliberation, a catholic bishop who is appropriate for the nations in question and who will be his vicar in the aforesaid matters and will be obedient and subject to him in all things. If any such person behaves otherwise, let him know that he has been struck by the sword of excommunication and if he does not return to his senses let him be deposed from every ministry in the church, with the secular arm being called in if necessary to quell such great insolence.”⁶⁸

148. From the above it will be clear that such a ‘cultural’ bishop still owed canonical obedience to the local ordinary. And the last sentence indicates that canonical obedience was actually expected, enforceable by the civil power if necessary! As time went on the Ninth Constitution was interpreted as permitting diocesan bishops to commission bishops not only for culturally and linguistically distinct communities but also for the more normal pastoral duties if the diocesan was otherwise too busy properly to fulfil his pastoral duties in his diocese. This would have been the case for bishops on crusade, for bishops who were ministers of the crown or who attended parliament, or who were in diplomatic service to the Papacy. The bishops who supplied this extra episcopal ministry were originally recruited from among the significant pool of bishops who had been displaced from their sees by Islam. They are the forebears of our suffragan bishops, though the term suffragan was not used of them in the earlier canon law, this being reserved, strictly speaking, for the diocesan bishop in relation to the metropolitan of the Province. This usage is still the case in the Roman Catholic Church.

⁶⁷ See *Cultural Episcopacy*, p.177

⁶⁸ *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils Volume I (Nicaea I – Lateran V)*, Ed. Norman Tanner S.J. , Sheed & Ward and Georgetown University Press, 1990, p.239

149. It has been argued that ‘cultural episcopacy’ reflects an understanding of bishops as distinctive signs of their particular communities, exemplified in the teachings of Ignatius of Antioch. Such an argument has been further developed with reference to what the sociologist Durkheim described as the contrast between two kinds of unity: ‘organic solidarity’ as opposed to ‘mechanical solidarity’.⁶⁹ The latter is represented as reflected in a strictly territorial-jurisdictional understanding of episcopacy. Nevertheless, this argument ought not to be over-emphasized for Ignatius and Cyprian as well as other Doctors of the pre-Nicene Church also argued for one bishop in each place. Canon Eight of the Council of Nicaea (325) had decreed in relation to the ‘so-called Cathars’ that there should not be two bishops in a city.
150. Other models of cultural episcopacy can be found within the Roman Catholic Church, again with their origins in the multi-culturalism which emerged in many places following either Islamic invasion or Christian crusade. When the Maronite Church in Syria united with Rome in 1182 and 1216 following the precedent of the Melchite church which had remained in communion with Rome after the ‘Great Schism’ between East and West in 1054, Rome treated such churches as ‘cultural’ churches wherever their faithful were found in the ‘Latin’ West. The further history of the so-called Uniate Churches is complex and ambiguous; nevertheless, at the Second Vatican Council in the decree *Orientalium Ecclesiarum* catholic diversity within the unity of communion was definitively affirmed. A diocese can refer to a culture over which there is *episcopate*. As Karl Rahner has argued, it is impossible to divide up the Church *exclusively* on a territorial basis.⁷⁰
151. Contemporary Roman Catholic Canon Law for the ‘Latin’ rite also furnishes examples of non-territorial *episcopate*. Canon 383.2 is the modern Roman Catholic equivalent of IV Lateran 9. ‘If (the diocesan bishop) has faithful of a different rite in his dioceses, he is to provide for their spiritual needs either by means of priests or parishes of the same rite, or by an episcopal Vicar.’ In canons 475 and 476 it is provided that an episcopal vicar has ‘ordinary power’ and can perform all administrative acts except those reserved by the bishop or which by canon law require a special mandate. An episcopal vicar can also be an auxiliary bishop. The competence of an episcopal vicar is however limited to either a particular part of the diocese or (non-territorially) ‘to a specific type of activity’, ‘to the faithful of a particular rite’ or ‘to certain groups of people’. (There are obvious Anglican parallels here with the ordinary jurisdiction of an archdeacon and the delegated jurisdiction of a suffragan’s commission or an area bishop.) Canon 569 provides that chaplains to the armed forces ‘are governed by special laws’. In effect this results in what is called the military ordinariates. Each Episcopal Conference where there are military chaplains has an ordinary (i.e. quasi-diocesan) for the forces. (In a similar way the Archbishop of Canterbury has an Episcopal commissary to the forces, though this is governed by custom rather than canon. Licences are issued by the Archbishop through the episcopal commissary.)

⁶⁹ See *Cultural Episcopacy*, pp.29ff

⁷⁰ See Karl Rahner, *Theological Investigations Volume VI*, Darton, Longman and Todd, London, 1971, p.328

152. Canon 372 establishes the norm of territorial dioceses. But 372.2 allows (by the Pope in consultation with the relevant Episcopal Conference) the establishment ‘in a given territory (of) particular Churches distinguished by the rite of the faithful or by some other similar quality’. We have here therefore provision for non-territorial *episcopate*, but only in consultation with the *other* bishops of the Episcopal Conference.
153. Finally, there is a ‘title’ on Personal Prelatures which includes canons 294-297. A personal prelate may be established by the Roman See only after consultation with the relevant Episcopal Conference. They are not religious communities but their purpose is to carry out special pastoral or missionary tasks or to serve ‘different groups’. Statutes govern the relation between the prelate and ‘the local Ordinaries in whose particular Churches (i.e. dioceses) the prelate, with the prior consent of the diocesan Bishop, exercises or wishes to exercise its pastoral or missionary activity’. Commentators on the Code of Canon Law are somewhat hesitant about the application of this Canon.⁷¹
154. This brief examination of forms of non-territorial or cultural *episcopate* has necessarily been largely restricted to the Western Church. The Eastern and Oriental tradition also gives strong affirmation to ethnicity and jurisdiction, though this is not without its internal Orthodox critics. Modern developments within the Coptic Orthodox Church, where certain ‘sector ministry’ bishoprics have been created are also of relevance. But more important is the traditional Orthodox doctrine of ‘economy’, cited approvingly by the 1930 Lambeth Conference Report on the Unity of the Church in relation to anomalies on the way to unity for the future Church of South India. ‘Economy’ is there defined as a technical term representing administrative action to meet a temporary situation without prejudice to any principle of ecclesiastical order.⁷² This principle is used, for example, in Orthodoxy to defend ethnic jurisdictions.
155. A legitimate case can therefore be made for ‘cultural episcopacy’. Indeed the Lambeth Conference 1920, while recognizing the norm of a territorial episcopate, also recognized the need for cultural episcopacy according to the wisdom of each Anglican Province.⁷³ Nevertheless, to apply this principle either to ecumenical developments or to questions of internal unity within the Anglican Communion or within individual Anglican Churches is a further step. It entails an understanding that different groups can and do form legitimate ‘sub-cultures’. In a more neutral context this could well be defended for different Christian traditions and could have relevance, for example, to our continuing discussion with the Methodist Church in relation to episcopacy. It is a yet further – and perhaps problematic - step, though not impossible sociologically, to argue for a particular *episcopate* on the basis of an identity formed by opposition to women in the presbyterate and episcopate. A

⁷¹ For comment and explanation of all these Canons see, *New Commentary on the Code of Canon Law*, Eds John P. Beal, James A. Coriden, Thomas J. Green, Paulist Press, New York, 2000.

⁷² Report of the Lambeth Conference, 1930, SPCK, London, p.128

⁷³ *The Six Lambeth Conferences 1867-1920*, SPCK, London, 1929. Lambeth Conference 1920 Resolution 35, p.36

positive rationale might be provided by a stress on reticence for the sake of eventual unity in relation to the Roman Catholic and Orthodox Churches.

156. There is, however, an important ecclesiological caveat to discussion about non-territorial, cultural episcopacy. Where such forms of *episcopate* have developed there has continued to be a bond of communion between the Churches expressed through their bishops, whether territorial or cultural. In real terms *degrees* of communion and interchangeability have varied according to the cultural and historical and political circumstances. Ultimately, 'full communion' is an eschatological reality. Nevertheless, in all the examples of 'cultural episcopacy' there has always been an acknowledgment of diversity *within* communion. If recourse is had to past examples of non-territorial episcopacy in developing a way forward for those who oppose the development of women in the episcopate this must be borne in mind. The official language of any arrangements, *whichever* option is followed, should not be such as to encourage personalised statements about being 'out of communion'. Only within communion – even a restricted but real communion – can such arrangements have ecclesial legitimacy in terms of the history of 'cultural episcopacy' as briefly examined in this appendix, whether within the Anglican Communion, the Roman Catholic Church or the earlier undivided Church Universal. 'Cultural episcopacy' powerfully expresses genuine diversity within real communion.

PECULIARS – Note by the Chairman

157. A Peculiar is or was a church or ecclesiastical jurisdiction exempt from the normal diocesan structures. The word derives from the Latin *peculium*, meaning a private property. They developed coincidentally to mediaeval canonical theories that increasingly separated the bishop's sacramental and jurisdictional roles; this has administrative advantage (the role of lay Chancellors is a continuing good example) but it also led to theological complications and a good theology and ecclesiology will not allow the separation of the sacramental and governmental roles of the church to be wholly severed. Anglo-Saxon minsters, monasteries, royal and episcopal foundations, and colleges all developed their separate patterns of peculiar jurisdiction and generalizations have to be treated with caution!
158. Broadly speaking three categories emerged during the pre-Reformation era: episcopal peculiars which included what can be thought of as a detached part of a diocese geographically within another diocese; archiepiscopal peculiars which though not part of the local diocese were part of the Province under the Archbishop; and royal peculiars outside the jurisdiction of the Province.
159. It is the archiepiscopal peculiar which has some resemblance (though also differences) with the TEA model we propose for discussion. Their 'ordinary' was the equivalent of a diocesan bishop but was often corporate as in a chapter or college and could be described as 'like a mini-diocese'.⁷⁴ Most peculiar jurisdictions were abolished by Orders in Council made between 1836 and 1852 under the Ecclesiastical Commissioners Acts 1836 and 1850. Cathedrals as peculiars and Oxford and Cambridge Colleges were not affected, nor royal residences.
160. The application of the law, as with the actual practice of the Peculiars has not been without problems. A scholarly estimate of the approximate numbers of peculiars (mostly now abolished) suggests the possibility of four figures consequent upon further legal and historical research. They were not uncommon. Their existence however, now largely forgotten, does indicate that the view that it is either un-catholic or un-Anglican for one bishop to operate – where there is legitimate jurisdiction – within the geographical territory of another is historically not the case. Should the Church of England, after careful consideration, decide to explore a Provincial solution to the problem of episcopal care for those not able to accept the ordination of women to the episcopate, which is not a Third Province but under the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, some aspects of the peculiars offer historical – if untidy – precedent.

⁷⁴ So Paul Barber in *What is a Peculiar?*, from which part of this Note is derived, Ecclesiastical Law Journal Vol 3, No.16

ORDINATION OF WOMEN RESOLUTIONS / PETITIONS
30 September 1999

Diocese	Nos of Parishes	Resn A	Resn B	Petitions for extended episcopal ministry	Arrangements: Diocesan / Regional / Provincial	How Provided
Bath & Wells	481	15	16	6	Provincial	+ Ebbsfleet
Birmingham	165	15	15	7	Provincial	+ Ebbsfleet
Blackburn	247	53	53	4	Diocesan	+ Burnley
Bradford	133	9	13	2	Provincial	+ Beverley
Bristol	167	9	9	3	Provincial	+ Ebbsfleet
Canterbury	267	13	20	5	Provincial	+ Richborough
Carlisle	271	16	28	1	(Regional)	+ Sodor & Man
Chelmsford	489	38	43	15	Provincial	+ Richborough
Chester	282	17	32	7	Diocesan / Provincial	+ Hon Asst / Beverley
Chichester	389	28	29	1	(Regional)	N/A
Coventry	195	10	11	5	Provincial	+ Ebbsfleet
Derby	248	19	22	10	Provincial	+ Ebbsfleet
Durham	254	38	41	20	Provincial	+ Beverley
Ely	310	9	12	2	Provincial	+ Richborough
Exeter	504	16	27	31	Provincial	+ Ebbsfleet
Gloucester	325	19	20	3	Provincial	+ Ebbsfleet
Guildford	162	8	7	4	Regional	+ Horsham
Hereford	353	5	4	0	Provincial	+ Ebbsfleet
Leicester	245	15	15	2	Provincial	+ Richborough
Lichfield	424	39	42	11	Provincial	+ Ebbsfleet
Lincoln	533	24	28	4	Provincial	+ Richborough
Liverpool	206	17	20	1	Provincial	+ Beverley
London	396	66	66	24	Diocesan	+ Fulham
Manchester	310	29	33	20	Provincial	+ Beverley
Newcastle	174	20	27	0	Diocesan	Asst Bisshop
Norwich	580	14	17	1	Diocesan / Provincial	+ Ret'd Bps / Richborough
Oxford	631	14	23	7	Provincial	+ Ebbsfleet
Peterborough	357	16	20	4	Provincial	+ Richborough
Portsmouth	138	13	15	5	Regional / Provincial	+ Basingstoke / Richborough
Ripon & Leeds	157	10	10	2	Provincial	+ Beverley
Rochester	216	15	17	10	Regional	+ Fulham
St Albans	332	17	19	10	Provincial	+ Richborough
St Edms & Ipswich	453	12	14	7	Provincial (& Diocesan)	+ Richborough
Salisbury	453	11	17	1	Provincial (& Regional)	+ Ebbsfleet (+ Basingstoke + C James)
Sheffield	178	29	32	14	Provincial	+ Beverley
Sodor and Man	27	1	1	0	Regional	+ Carlisle
Southwark	302	27	34	15	Regional	+ Fulham
Southwell	256	6	15	5	Provincial	+ Beverley
Truro	225	23	22	4	Provincial	+ Ebbsfleet
Wakefield	189	17	17	8	Diocesan / Provincial	+ A Genders & Beverley
Winchester	304	14	17	5	Diocesan	+ Basingstoke
Worcester	196	4	5	2	Provincial	+ Ebbsfleet
York	475	40	41	8	Diocesan (& Provincial)	+ Whitby / Beverley
Europe	220	6	11	0	Diocesan	N/A
Total	13,219	836	980	296		
Percentage of parishes		6.3%	7.4%	2.2%		

ORDINATION OF WOMEN RESOLUTIONS / PETITIONS
31 March 2004

Diocese	Nos of Parishes	Resn A	Resn B	Petitions for extended episcopal ministry	Arrangements: Diocesan / Regional / Provincial	How Provided
Bath & Wells	477	16	16	7	Provincial	+ Ebbsfleet
Birmingham	162	11	13	7	Provincial	+ Ebbsfleet
Blackburn	211	49	69	4	Diocesan	+ Burnley
Bradford	132	7	8	2	Provincial	+ Beverley
Bristol	167	9	9	3	Provincial	+ Ebbsfleet
Canterbury	267	13	20	3	Provincial	+ Richborough
Carlisle	267	14	25	2	Regional	+ Burnley
Chelmsford	482	38	45	16	Provincial	+ Richborough
Chester	275	15	29	8	Diocesan / Provincial	+ Hon Asst / Beverley
Chichester	391	32	35	1	Diocesan	N/A
Coventry	199	12	16	6	Provincial	+ Ebbsfleet
Derby	255	17	19	11	Provincial	+ Ebbsfleet
Durham	249	39	40	19	Provincial	+ Beverley
Ely	309	8	10	5	Provincial	+ Richborough
Exeter	498	12	22	31	Provincial	+ Ebbsfleet
Gloucester	323	19	20	2	Provincial	+ Ebbsfleet
Guildford	168	5	6	3	Regional	+ Horsham
Hereford	347	2	2	0	Provincial	+ Ebbsfleet
Leicester	234	14	14	2	Provincial	+ Richborough
Lichfield	429	38	38	8	Provincial	+ Ebbsfleet
Lincoln	515	23	26	4	Provincial	+ Richborough
Liverpool	211	13	18	2	Provincial	+ Beverley
London	407	70	73	30	Diocesan	+ Fulham
Manchester	292	39	48	18	Provincial	+ Beverley
Newcastle	177	21	25	0	Diocesan	Asst Bishop
Norwich	567	15	19	2	Provincial	+ Richborough
Oxford	624	19	28	10	Provincial	+ Ebbsfleet
Peterborough	352	14	19	2	Provincial	+ Richborough
Portsmouth	142	12	17	5	Provincial	+ Richborough
Ripon & Leeds	161	7	9	3	Provincial	+ Beverley
Rochester	218	15	17	10	Regional	+ Fulham
St Albans	335	14	17	7	Provincial	+ Richborough
St Edms & Ipswich	446	12	14	6	Provincial (& Diocesan)	+ Richborough
Salisbury	459	8	20	2	Provincial	+ Ebbsfleet
Sheffield	173	34	37	20	Provincial	+ Beverley
Sodor and Man	28	1	1	1	Provincial	+ Beverley
Southwark	300	21	33	17	Regional	+ Fulham
Southwell	266	7	14	5	Provincial	+ Beverley
Truro	225	23	22	4	Provincial	+ Ebbsfleet
Wakefield	188	18	18	9	Diocesan / Provincial	+ Pontefract / Beverley
Winchester	306	9	13	5	Provincial	+ Richborough
Worcester	180	5	5	3	Provincial	+ Ebbsfleet
York	472	31	37	10	Diocesan / Provincial	+ Whitby / Beverley
Europe	295	9	16	0	Diocesan	N/A
Total	13,181	810	1,002	315		
Percentage of parishes		6.1%	7.6%	2.4%		