

1 ***I. Introduction***

2 The Episcopal Church (TEC) appreciates the work of the Covenant Design Group
3 (CDG) in offering the St. Andrew's Draft. We extend our thanks for the process of
4 consultation. It is clearly evident to us that the CDG valued our contributions to
5 the Nassau Draft. The Episcopal Church remains committed to the Communion-
6 wide process of conversation toward an Anglican Covenant. At the same time,
7 TEC wants to emphasize that matters of moral authority and interdependence
8 amongst the churches result from mutuality, not from regulation. The relational
9 voice found in "A Lambeth Commentary" changes the tone of conversation and is
10 very helpful.

11 The 2006 General Convention passed resolution *A166: Anglican Covenant*
12 *Development Process* which "[s]upports the process of the development of an
13 Anglican Covenant, directs International Concerns Committee (INC) of the
14 Executive Council to follow the development process and report to Council"
15 (found in the Appendix to this document). The Episcopal Church invited church-
16 wide contributions to its response to the first post-Windsor draft, now called the
17 Nassau Draft and, through a committee appointed by the presiding officers of
18 Executive Council, wrote the response requested of each Province to the CDG.

19 Following the publication of the St. Andrew's Draft in February 2008, the
20 Anglican Covenant task force published that same month a short study document
21 to assist bishops in considering the St. Andrew's Draft (c.f., Appendix). Executive
22 Council approved this study guide and it was distributed to the bishops and made
23 publicly available. That study guide is attached at the end of this response.

24 The President of the House of Deputies, Dr. Bonnie Anderson, in a letter of 21
25 April 2008, requested that the diocesan deputations to General Convention meet,
26 including other diocesan leadership as might be useful, and review the St.
27 Andrew's Draft. These meetings were intended to inform their bishop(s) as to
28 their thoughts on the Anglican Covenant in preparation for discussions thereof at
29 Lambeth Conference 2008. It was also seen that the deputations' responses
30 would be of help to the Anglican Covenant task force as it prepared Executive
31 Council's response to the St. Andrew's draft.

32 The task force received thirty-one responses from deputations, some of which
33 had conversations with their bishops. None of the responses were from dioceses
34 belonging to the Network of Anglican Communion Parishes and Dioceses, also
35 known as the Anglican Communion Network.

36 This document, "A Response from the Executive Council of The Episcopal Church
37 to the Saint Andrew's Draft" serves as the response of The Episcopal Church to
38 the continued work of forming an Anglican covenant. This document draws on
39 responses from these deputations, taking into consideration the work of "A
40 Lambeth Commentary."

41 The Joint Standing Committee of the Primates and the Anglican Consultative
42 Council has invited all the Provinces to answer three questions posed by them
43 and to provide a formal evaluation of the St. Andrew's Draft by March 9, 2009.

44 We underscore that this response is a provincial response. The covenant can only
45 be embraced on the provincial level, that is, The Episcopal Church, and not on a
46 diocesan level.

47

48 ***II. Concerns of the Task Force with respect to the development of an***
49 ***Anglican covenant***

50 The effort to forge an Anglican Covenant is the results of two strands of recent
51 Anglican Communion history:

52 (a) Over the last three decades, it has become evident that the Anglican
53 Communion lacks a unified expectation of what could be expected from the
54 churches in the Anglican Communion. Disparities in practice among Anglican
55 Communion churches, e.g. marriage and divorce and the ordination of women,
56 made some ecumenical conversations difficult.

57 (b) The Windsor Report of 2004 was written in response to the reality that some
58 Provinces had taken offense to the actions of others, primarily those of The
59 Episcopal Church and the Anglican Church of Canada. It sought to recommend
60 ways to repair relationships. Among those was the suggestion that a covenant be
61 developed that would define the basis for, and limitations of, Communion status.
62 The Primates requested that work on a covenant go forward and the Archbishop
63 of Canterbury responded by establishing a Covenant Design Group (CDG) and
64 naming its members and chair. They were charged to produce both a text and a
65 process for perfecting that text.

66 It is important to note that the driving concerns are both ecumenical and inter-
67 Anglican. The covenant is being proposed as a way to define better just what it
68 means to be part of the Anglican Communion and what others and we can expect.
69 The CDG expressed the hope for a text that was definitive but not regulatory. (In
70 the Lambeth Commentary as offered by the CDG, question 1 on the covenant
71 concept, the CDG affirms, "A covenant may well have contractual elements but
72 while a contract can be fulfilled or completed and a declaration become outdated,
73 a covenant is a dynamic concept which speaks of ongoing relationship and
74 generous attitude.") None the less, from its inception, the Anglican Covenant
75 project has included, in every proposed covenant text beginning with the
76 appendix to the Windsor Report, matters that are juridical, calling for the
77 beginnings of inter-Anglican canon law or, if not that, inter-Anglican processes
78 for negotiations and settlement of disputes and concerns.

79 The development of the Anglican Covenant draft texts has provided the context
 80 for Communion-wide discussions of the theological and ecclesial “markers” of
 81 Anglican Communion identity. It has also given rise to difficult questions
 82 concerning the autonomy of the churches. The Windsor Report spoke of
 83 subsidiarity and the limits of autonomy. Interdependence, a notion that originally
 84 arose from the 1963 Anglican Congress vision of “mutual responsibility and
 85 interdependence in the body of Christ,” has begun to be used as a call for
 86 submission to a “moral authority” on Communion-wide concerns.

87 The Anglican Covenant idea thus is linked with both the hopes of our ecumenical
 88 partners that we might better speak as one and the hopes within the churches of
 89 the Anglican Communion that we might speak with authority to one another as
 90 Anglicans. The burdens this places on any such text are enormous. Care needs to
 91 be taken that our conversations around an Anglican covenant do not draw us
 92 necessarily toward a hierarchical model of a church union or even the perception
 93 of Anglicanism as a singular global church.

94

95 ***III. Response to the Joint Standing Committee’s Questions***

96 1. Is the Province able to give an “in principle” commitment to the Covenant
 97 process at this time (without committing itself to the details of any text)?

98 Yes. TEC, by resolution of the General Convention 2006 A166 cited above, has
 99 committed itself to the covenant process.

100 Furthermore, the October 2007 response of the Executive Council to the Nassau
 101 Draft said:

102 “We are prepared to consider a covenant that says who we are, what we
 103 wish to be for the world, and how we will model mutual responsibility and
 104 interdependence in the body of Christ. We believe we must be open to
 105 God’s doing a new thing among us; therefore, we remain open to explore
 106 such new possibilities in our common life while honoring established
 107 understandings.”

108 These commitments stand. At the same time, we want to be clear that it is
 109 impossible to commit to an idea of a covenant separate from a specific text. The
 110 text is the reality of the covenant; the idea is not. In other words, TEC commits
 111 itself to the process but this commitment does not implicitly commit TEC to
 112 ultimate approval of a covenant.

113 2. Is it possible to give some indication of any synodical process which would
 114 have to be undertaken in order to adopt the Covenant in the fullness of time?

115 Yes. The only body that has the authority to respond on behalf of Episcopalians to
 116 the draft of an Anglican Covenant is the triennial meeting of the General
 117 Convention. In order for TEC to engage fully in its expression of synodical
 118 process, the triennial General Convention, the following timeline might be
 119 envisioned.

120 First, General Convention meeting in July 2009 could pass an enabling
 121 resolution, similar to that of GC-2006 A166, that would commit TEC, through its
 122 Executive Council, to continue monitoring and responding to a draft, if advanced,
 123 by the Anglican Consultative Council in May 2009. These three years of
 124 discussion would prayerfully engage the faithful in all the dioceses of The
 125 Episcopal Church as to their discernment in respect to the covenant. During the
 126 2009-2012 triennium, TEC would be assisted in its discernment of the Anglican
 127 Covenant by listening to the voices of other provinces of the Anglican
 128 Communion as they discuss and wrestle with the generalities and particularities
 129 of an Anglican covenant.

130 If it is perceived that the Anglican Covenant forwarded by ACC does not require
 131 constitutional changes, the 2012 General Convention could take up the matter
 132 and vote on the covenant. However, if an Anglican covenant suggests
 133 constitutional changes, then final consideration would have to wait for the 2015
 134 General Convention for a final reading and passage.

135 Again, if TEC had to postpone a second vote on a proposed covenant until 2015
 136 because of constitutional changes, the delay would provide a fruitful opportunity
 137 for TEC to hear the voices of other members of the Anglican Communion as they
 138 discuss future drafts.

139 3. In considering the St Andrew's Draft for an Anglican Covenant, are there any
 140 elements which would need extensive change in order to make the process of
 141 synodical adoption viable?

142 While the particularities of the Saint Andrew's draft will be discussed in more
 143 depth in the following section of this document, we would like to note the
 144 following observations raised generally by diocesan deputations.

145 There is some concern about the clarity of the Introduction to the Saint Andrew's
 146 draft covenant. For example, questions arose with respect to how the "covenant
 147 emerges out of communion" and "also serves communion." One deputation
 148 noted, "It places enormous emphasis on the 'communion' or 'unity' of the church
 149 but this goal is attained at the expense of justice and righteousness. This goal is
 150 laudable but it cannot become a false unity that comes at the expense of essential
 151 biblical justice and love."

152 The vast majority of diocesan deputations had significant concern about Section
 153 3.2.5 and following. The concern focused on what was perceived as an embrace of
 154 binding arbitration, mediation and evaluation, as well as "moral authority." This
 155 section was perceived as being overly juridical in its process: e.g., while 3.2.5.e

156 affirms autonomy, it also affirms the force of binding decisions, including “a
 157 relinquishment by that Church of the force and meaning of the covenant’s
 158 purpose....”

159 The inclusion of the appendix, though intended not to be a part of the covenant,
 160 cannot be ignored specifically because it is consistently referred to in 3.2.5.a-e.
 161 Those deputations who did mention the appendix found it to be highly
 162 problematic because of its embrace of juridical process for resolving disputes in
 163 the Anglican Communion.

164

165 ***IV. Discussion of Text***

166 We turn now to a discussion of specific observations and possible changes
 167 recommended by some of the readers. While many of these comments of the text
 168 are critical but hopefully constructive, we begin by observing that we have
 169 significant appreciation for the work that has been done in this draft.

170 Introduction

171 The second paragraph describes our salvation story, setting the idea of covenant
 172 within the context of Noah and David as well as describing Jesus as the new
 173 covenant. Some have raised concerns that the covenant in Jesus Christ is a
 174 different sort than those covenants with Israel described in the Hebrew
 175 Scriptures. The former covenants were not sealed with the blood of an innocent.

176 Paragraph 4 rightly signals our communion as a “special charism” that comes
 177 from God. Missiologically, the last sentence of this paragraph should emphasize
 178 the focus of our participation in *God’s* mission in the world, rather than “our”
 179 mission.

180 Concern was raised that unity not be seen as uniformity as suggested in
 181 paragraph 6 (“through a common voice”). As one deputation stated, “Achieving
 182 unity in diversity is never finished business and it is often messy.” Response to
 183 the needs of people everywhere, through solidarity of prayer and action, joins us
 184 as Anglicans across cultures and nations.

185 The Introduction conveys a solid theology of God’s mission and the Anglican
 186 Communion’s place in it. This Introduction is an aid to understanding the
 187 theological context in which the covenant is proposed. It is not part of the
 188 covenant itself and would not be a determining factor in acceptance or rejection
 189 of a covenant.

190 Preamble

191 Deputations did not engage in much discussion or critique of this part.

192 We have observed and appreciated the new format that begins each section with
 193 affirmations followed by specific commitments. This is a helpful framework that
 194 works for the first two Sections of the draft. The nature of affirmations and
 195 commitments seem to be different in Sections One and Two from those in Section
 196 Three. In particular, we note that the voice changes in the introduction of each
 197 affirmation and commitment in Section Three, which we do not find helpful. We
 198 will discuss this further below.

199 Section One: Our Inheritance of Faith

200 1.1.1: Reference to the Preface to the Declaration of Assent, Canon C15, does not
 201 elucidate the statement. If such a reference is made, then the corresponding text
 202 should be provided. Further, why does the covenant reference only the Preface to
 203 the Declaration of Assent of the Church of England in footnotes 2, 5 and 6? Such
 204 a Preface does not apply to all provinces of the communion and, therefore, should
 205 be eliminated.

206 1.1.2: Again, referencing only the historical formularies of the Church of England
 207 leaves out the other members of the communion. While other members of the
 208 Anglican Communion have declarations of assent, they may not have the same
 209 wording.

210 1.1.5: The CDG, in preparing the Saint Andrew's Draft, recognized the centrality
 211 of liturgy, and this is a welcome inclusion.

212 1.1.6: The CDG also added the importance of ecumenical concerns. The church
 213 participates in God's mission in the apostolic vocation as the whole people of God
 214 and is shared with other churches. This addition opens up the conversation to
 215 include all of the people of God, not just bishops. We suggest that "vocation" be
 216 substituted for the word, "mission," because the focus is on our response and not
 217 on God's action (*missio Dei*).

218 1.2.1: We appreciate that the commitment here is both to the primacy of Scripture
 219 and the valuing of the tradition of the church. We note that adding "reason" after
 220 "Scripture" would bring this into line with Hooker's formularies. Only with the
 221 moderating voice of reason do we arrive at the Anglican ethos of balance between
 222 Scripture and tradition.

223 We recommend, therefore, that the word, "reason," be inserted after the word,
 224 "Scripture." The wording of this statement would be clearer if it read, "to uphold
 225 Scripture, reason and the catholic faith, order and tradition, and act in continuity
 226 with these."

227 1.2.2: Generally, deputations appreciated the change of wording away from
 228 "biblically derived moral values" to "moral reasoning and discipline that is rooted
 229 in and answerable to the teaching of Holy Scripture and the catholic tradition...."
 230 This said, there still remains concern as to who determines what constitutes
 231 "moral reasoning and discipline."

232 1.2.4: Concern was raised as to the presentation that the truth of the biblical text
 233 is revealed “primarily through the teaching and initiative of bishops and synods.”
 234 The reading of scripture in our personal and corporate lives by the whole people
 235 of God (in liturgy) has historically been the way by which Anglicans engage in
 236 biblical interpretation. We suggest “the teaching and initiative of bishops and
 237 synods” be deleted and the words “corporate prayer and individual study
 238 informed by rigorous scholarship” be inserted (*Lex orandi, lex credendi*).

239 1.2.6: Deputations raised the question if it is possible to discern once and for all
 240 God’s Truth? This presupposes that churches in the communion can know fully
 241 what God is doing in Jesus Christ by the power of the Holy Spirit. We recommend
 242 that the words “to discern the Truth” be deleted so that this sentence will read,
 243 “to pursue a common pilgrimage that enables people from all nations to be set
 244 free to receive the new and abundant life in Jesus Christ.”

245 Section Two: The Life We Share with Others: Our Anglican Vocation

246 2.1.1: Comments from some diocesan deputations asked why Ireland was
 247 included in this historical summary. An explanatory footnote would be helpful.
 248 The sentence, “shaped by the Reformation,” should be expanded to include after
 249 this reference, “impelled by the experiences of British and American imperialism
 250 and redeemed by the selfless missionary work of the church.”

251 2.1.3: The sentence should begin, “Our common vocation in God’s mission is
 252 shared....” Once again, this gives primacy to God’s mission, not our mission.

253 2.2.1: “Evangelism” is the process of sharing the Good News of God in Christ;
 254 replace “evangelisation” with “evangelism.” The quotation, “for our blessed but
 255 broken, hurting and fallen world,” comes directly from IASCOME report to ACC
 256 13, “Communion in Mission” and should be noted as such.

257 2.2.2: It is noted that participating in God’s mission is a blessing rather than an
 258 action of the church. We suggest substituting the word “undertakes” with “is
 259 blessed.” We recommend deleting “the Mission of Christ” because it implies that
 260 the five marks of mission are a comprehensive presentation of all that God is
 261 doing in Jesus Christ.

262 Overall, there was vast affirmation by deputations for Section 2 as representing a
 263 covenant for the Anglican Communion. Many deputations wished that the
 264 covenant ended with these missiological affirmations and a few deputations
 265 stated that Section 2 itself was sufficient to stand for the whole covenant. They
 266 referenced the IASCOME’s “A Covenant for Communion in Mission.”

267 Section Three: Our Unity and Common Life

268 By far, most of the responses from deputations (with two exceptions) express
 269 concern and uneasiness with this section. By and large Part 3.2 is the most
 270 problematic section. Recommendations from the deputations as to how to handle

271 Section 3 fall under three categories: a) delete the entire section; b) stop at the
 272 end of 3.2.5 without adding any of the “a-e”; c) maintain it all but excise any
 273 reference to an appendix schedule. One or two deputations state that they do not
 274 like that any one instrument of communion could initiate proceedings. One
 275 deputation says, “We are trying to fix a mystery, treating it like a problem when
 276 in actuality it is revelation.”

277 3.1.1: “Ministry” should be added to “Baptism and Eucharist,” as the primary
 278 marks of faith and order as affirmed by the Ecumenical Movement (as per the
 279 Lima text of 1982). “The body of Jesus Christ, the Church” clarifies the language
 280 so that it is clear the document is not referring to the “Church of Christ,” a
 281 specific denomination here in the United States.

282 3.1.2: Add to the second sentence “therefore described as autonomous-in
 283 communion” the words “as is described in the Windsor Report.” Several
 284 deputations’ comments note that the Instruments of Communion do not
 285 necessarily give us “a common mind.” As one deputation recommends, the
 286 sentence would be clearer if it read, “to affirm our common life facilitated by
 287 instruments of communion which our Churches establish in order to develop a
 288 common mind.”

289 3.1.3: Here is an excellent place to make clear the primacy of the baptized and a
 290 theology of Baptism. A deputation offered this constructive rewrite of all of 3.1.3:
 291 “... the primacy of Baptism for participation in God’s mission and the central role
 292 of bishops as guardians and teachers of faith, leaders in mission, and as a visible
 293 sign of unity. The historic threefold ordained ministry of bishops, priests and
 294 deacons called to serve the Church of God, as they call all the baptized into the
 295 mission and ministry of Christ. These ministries are exercised personally,
 296 collegially and within and for the Eucharistic community.”

297 3.1.4: Many deputations note that Anglicans come together in God’s mission in
 298 many important ways beyond the four Instruments of Communion. We suggest
 299 that this statement emphasize first the participation of all God’s people, the
 300 baptized, in God’s mission, through such entities as companion diocese
 301 relationships, Mother’s Union, missionaries, relief and development agencies and
 302 even Anglican congresses. With respect to the Instruments of Communion we
 303 believe: 1) the description of the Archbishop of Canterbury is accurate; 2) the
 304 Lambeth Conference does not “guard the faith and unity of the Communion” —
 305 we suggest that the words “expresses episcopal collegiality worldwide, gathers the
 306 bishops for common counsel, consultation and encouragement and equips
 307 bishops as leaders in God’s mission” be substituted; 3) the ACC represents the
 308 Provinces of the Anglican Communion and not the provincial synods and 4) the
 309 description of the Primates’ Meeting is accurate.

310 3.2.1: We are called to support all the agencies of the Anglican Communion and
 311 not simply the Instruments of Communion. We suggest adding the words “the
 312 Anglican Communion Office” before the words “the Instruments of Communion.”

313 3.2.2: This point would present a good opportunity to reference “Mutual
 314 Responsibility and Interdependence in the Body of Christ” (Anglican Congress
 315 1963) rather than simply the Dar es Salaam Communiqué of February 2007. We
 316 recommend changing the sentence to read, “while upholding mutual
 317 responsibility and interdependence amongst the Churches” and footnote MRI.
 318 We further recommend the sentence end here.

319 3.2.3: There is appreciation for the need to consult widely in our discernment in
 320 the leading of the Holy Spirit in our various contexts; yet concern is raised as to
 321 how that might be “tested by shared discernment.” We thus recommend that the
 322 post colon clause, “all therefore...” be deleted.

323 3.2.4: Our churches have canon laws; there is not one set of canon law for the
 324 whole Anglican Communion. We recommend that the final clause read, “canon
 325 laws.”

326 3.2.5: Many deputations (those who fall under Group B as above) suggest that
 327 the document end with “credibility of its service to God’s mission” and delete the
 328 rest.

329 The few deputations that retain 3.2.5 collectively want to delete the two
 330 references that say, “according to such procedures as appended to this covenant”
 331 and excise the appendix.

332 They further have the following suggestions:

333 • 3.2.5.b: excise this statement or change to “accept the legitimate concern of the
 334 Instruments of Communion.”

335 • 3.2.5.c: End with the word, “conflict.”

336 • 3.2.5.d: “moral authority” is nebulous in its use. End this sentence with the
 337 word, “articulated” — the instruments do not sustain our life, nor they do not
 338 create communion. They are “bodies by which our common life is articulated.”

339 • 3.2.5.e: If this paragraph is not excised entirely, the first sentence should be
 340 eliminated. Neither the Primates’ Meeting nor the most recent Lambeth
 341 Conference has passed resolutions. The Instruments of Communion can invite
 342 churches voluntarily not to participate with respect to their own body. Questions
 343 to the church’s participation in each particular instrument are left up to the
 344 policies and procedures of each instrument. We suggest the following rewrite,
 345 “Should a church not accept the particular course of action suggested by an
 346 Instrument of Communion, that decision may be understood by the church itself,
 347 or by other members of the Communion as a relinquishment by that church of
 348 the force and meaning of the covenant.”

349 3.2.6: What is the “highest degree of communion” other than table fellowship,
350 which is both more inclusive and embodied than what this document would
351 suggest.

352 Declaration

353 Members of The Episcopal Church will recognize use of the Easter blessing from
354 1979 Book of Common Prayer at the end of this document as most fitting because
355 it looks to new hope in the resurrected body of Christ.

356

357 ***V. Summation***

358 The Saint Andrew’s Draft is a substantial development to the literature of the
359 Anglican Communion and deserves education and prayerful response from all
360 members of the Anglican Communion. For this reason, we believe that it is
361 important to have the full triennium period to digest fully the document following
362 the meeting of the Anglican Consultative Council meeting in May 2009.

363 TEC is committed to a continuation of a covenant process but withholds
364 commitment to the final document until it is perfected and received by the
365 Anglican Consultative Council. As a final question, TEC asks, “How does the
366 covenant help us look like Christ?” How does a covenant reflect the idea that
367 communion is founded on the mutual recognition that each church sees in the
368 other evidence of our communion in Christ?

369

370

Appendix A

370

371

372 General Convention 2006 A166

373 *Resolved*, That the 75th General Convention of The Episcopal Church, as a
374 demonstration of our commitment to mutual responsibility and interdependence
375 in the Anglican Communion, support the process of the development of an
376 Anglican Covenant that underscores our unity in faith, order, and common life in
377 the service of God's mission; and be it further

378 *Resolved*, That the 75th General Convention direct the International Concerns
379 Standing Committee of the Executive Council and The Episcopal Church's
380 members of the Anglican Consultative Council to follow the development
381 processes of an Anglican Covenant in the Communion, and report regularly to the
382 Executive Council as well as to the 76th General Convention; and be it further

383 *Resolved*, That the 75th General Convention report these actions supporting the
384 Anglican Covenant development process, noting such missiological and
385 theological resources as the Standing Commission on World Mission and the
386 House of Bishops' Theology Committee to the Archbishop of Canterbury, the
387 Joint Standing Committee of the Anglican Consultative Council and the Primates,
388 and the Secretary General of the Anglican Communion; and that the Presiding
389 Bishop of the Episcopal Church report the same to the Primates of the churches
390 of the Anglican Communion.

391 [http://gc2006.org/legislation/view_leg_detail.aspx?id=207&type=CURRENT]

Appendix B

392

393

394

395

**Study Resource for Considering the
Draft Anglican Covenant (known as the St. Andrew's Draft)**

396 The Executive Council is charged by General Convention to follow and respond to
397 the development of a draft Anglican Covenant. The International Concerns
398 Committee (INC) #021 Task Force of Executive Council facilitates and
399 coordinates this process. The INC #021 Task Force thus has prepared this
400 resource to assist the Bishops and their dioceses to consider the new draft of the
401 Proposed Anglican Covenant (known as the St. Andrew's Draft) in preparation
402 for discussion at the 2008 Lambeth Conference.

403 This resource offers three levels of engagement with the St. Andrew's Draft
404 Covenant, each digging deeper into the text and issues raised by the draft. This
405 resource is offered for your use in your diocese and does not presuppose that your
406 diocese need make any formal response to the INC #021 Task Force. It is thus an
407 offering from the Executive Council to assist you in your ministry.

408 I. First Level of Engagement with the Text

409 Read the Saint Andrew's Draft Covenant in its entirety: Introduction, Covenant,
410 and Appendix.¹ After reading, consider the following initial questions:

- 411 • What in the document did you find compelling? What resonated with
412 you and why?
- 413 • What in the document caused you the most concern and why?
- 414 • What in the document surprised you the most and why?

415 II. Second Level of Engagement with the Text

416 This level offers a brief introduction to each major section of the Draft Covenant
417 and then poses more in-depth questions for discussion:

418 *Section 1:* The document begins with four affirmations based on the Chicago-
419 Lambeth Quadrilateral and then makes two affirmations based on liturgy and
420 ecumenism.

- 421 • Do you find these affirmations a sufficient statement that describes the
422 inheritance of our faith?

423 *Section 1.2:* This section describes how the above historical affirmations are
424 lived out in various contexts. It also speaks about the nature of authority at
425 various levels.

¹http://www.anglicancommunion.org/commission/covenant/docs/st_andrews_documents_2008.pdf

- 426 • Does this section appropriately describe how you understand a) the
 427 authority of the Bible, and b) the exercise of episcopate in The Episcopal
 428 Church?

429 *Section 2:* This section focuses on our vocation in the world as Anglicans in
 430 service to the mission of God.

- 431 • Is this description of the history of the Anglican Communion faithful to
 432 your understanding of God's mission in the world?

433 *Section 2.2:* This section describes our vocation as Anglicans in service to God's
 434 mission in the world through the five marks of mission.

- 435 • How does your diocese live into the five marks of mission and are they
 436 essential elements of our Anglican vocation?

437 *Section 3:* This section describes some of the elements of our common life
 438 together in baptism, Eucharist and ministry and moves to elaborate more recent
 439 understandings of our life in the Anglican Communion. It identifies ways by
 440 which the Anglican Communion comes together and then describes the four
 441 Instruments of Communion in their appropriate historical development.

- 442 • What meaning and impact do the four Instruments of Communion have
 443 for you in your diocese?

444 *Section 3.2:* Here the covenant focuses on challenges to the Anglican
 445 Communion. The voice changes from descriptive of our common life to
 446 proscriptive direction of how to proceed when our common life is threatened.

- 447 • Do you think it is necessary to articulate processes when communion is
 448 threatened and, if so, do you find these processes of consultation and
 449 conversation as outlined in 3.2 useful?

450 *Appendix:* Section 3.2.5 b & c of the Draft Covenant assume a schedule of
 451 procedures that are intended to accompany the Covenant. The Appendix provides
 452 a draft framework outlining procedures for the resolution of disagreement.

- 453 • Should our possible agreement to a Covenant be contingent on
 454 subscribing to a set of procedures for addressing disagreements in the
 455 Anglican Communion. If so, is this draft framework (the Appendix)
 456 helpful?

- 457 • Do you see an emerging set of canons for the Anglican Communion in
 458 this Appendix? If so, is this beneficial or not to the Anglican
 459 Communion at this time?

460 **III. Third Level of Engagement with the Text**

461 To enter into a deeper conversation with this text of the Anglican Covenant and
 462 earlier drafts,

- 463 1) Read the first draft of the Anglican Covenant (“Nassau draft”)²
464 2) Read the response to the Nassau Draft from the Episcopal Church as
465 prepared by the INC #021 Task Force and agreed to by the Executive
466 Council in October 2007.³
467 3) Reread the St. Andrews’s Draft Covenant and then:
468 • Compare and contrast the first and second versions of the draft
469 Covenant in light of the recommendations from Executive Council.
470

²http://www.anglicancommunion.org/commission/covenant/docs/Draft_Covenant_Text_20070504.pdf

³ http://www.episcopalchurch.org/79901_91392_ENG_HTM.htm