

The Challenges of Covenant and Canons for the Future of a *Ius Commune Anglicanae*

By The Reverend Kevin Francis Donlon, Ph.D., LL.M

As Anglicanism faces a “reformation” that is decently and in order, conciliar understanding of covenant and canons are a significant tool if there is to be a reordering of this communion as an expression of the historic faith.

The categories are simply framed in this manner: *Canons* are historically a rule adopted by a council and comes from the κανών meaning for rule, standard, or measure. Conversely, the basic understanding of **covenant** is that it is a formal agreement between two parties in which the parties are bound by mutual obligations or, minimally, mutual expectations. These can be either conditional or absolute and both impact the intentions behind a covenant.

Covenants in Anglicanism range from the foundational Baptismal Covenant (e.g. absolute) to the Covenant/Moratorium by the ECUSA House of Bishops Covenant Statement of 2005¹ (which is conditional). Both types illustrate that the faithful are not called to blind subservience or legalistic observance of an inordinate conglomeration of rules irrespective of the relation it may have to the purposes of salvation. At the very least covenants suggest norms to be established to promote a common life (e.g. Baptismal Covenant) or to safeguard the church from arbitrary decisions of individuals or groups apart from the good of the Body of Christ (e.g. The Windsor Report).

It is from the earliest biblical times² that covenants and canons were developed in response to the needs of the ecclesiastical community. Throughout church history, they have been rendered to adapt to the circumstances throughout the generations.³ As the church is an institution of divine purpose composed of

¹ Secretary of the House of Bishops of the Episcopal Church USA, *A Covenant Statement*, (New York: The Episcopal News Service, 2005)
http://www.episcopalchurch.org/3577_60016_ENG_HTM.htm

² cf. Judith H. Newman., “From monarch to bishop: Covenant, Torah, and community formation in the Old Testament and the Anglican Communion” *Anglican Theological Review*, Fall 2003, Vol.65, No.2.

³ Kevin E. McKenna., *The Ministry of Law in the Church Today*. (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1999), Chap. I

imperfect human beings, canons and covenants reflect a certain imperfection and can be revisited as they offered to guide the Body of Christ in matters pertaining to salvation of the individual and the good order of those individuals set forth as a community.

The Anglican Communion is faced with the challenge of whether it can be a *communio ecclesiae sui iuris* in 21st Century. As a communion of *sui iuris* churches it has richness in its ecclesiology, spirituality, liturgy, and identity. Often, the church has relied on covenants as a basis for communal identity and has employed canons for the needs of the local church to guide the faithful on the path to salvation and create a common order. Absent of universal codification, Anglicanism has given great importance to covenants in the hopes that they can create deeper *bonds of affection* for each *sui iuris* community of faith. As the events leading up to Lambeth have demonstrated, the bonds are frayed and the question looms as to how to best repair them.

“Pressures on those bonds have come from many directions down through the years but of late have greatly increased. When communion meant identifying with each other as agreeing partners who all thought alike, bonds of affection were adequate. But with rapid growth in size, growth of cultural difference and search for structure their inadequacies and limitations became obvious. They were a basis rather than a working entity. They were adequate when there were identifiable aims and common purpose. They were happily used and embraced when the Anglican Communion wanted the religious world to see and indeed envy a cohesive family led by an Archbishop of Canterbury. They were adequate when agreement existed simply because there was no division. But they proved inadequate when pressures built up. As divisive issues surfaced they became what bound together only those Provinces, which agreed with each other.”⁴

Archbishop Eames describes the dilemma of living in the dynamic tension of being a church covenanted universally but governed locally by canon. Would a solution be a universal code such as the Roman Code of 1983? Should acceptance of a local Church's custom as law be acceptable providing it allows for the spiritual well-being of the members? Can a strengthened covenant build the bridge between these polemics?

⁴ Robin Eames., “*The Anglican Communion A Growing Reality*”. **Ministry Matters**. (Toronto: The Anglican Church of Canada,) Vol.2, Winter 2006.

As a church that has adapted well to Canon 39 (“For our God-bearing fathers also declared that the customs of each church should be preserve”)⁵ of the Quinisext Synod/Synod of Trullo recognizing the right of any local church to have its own regulations, these are difficult questions. This canon has created a customary based on the maxim “*In necessariis unitas In dubiis libertas, In omnibus autem caritas*” (literally translated as “*In essentials unity, In doubtful things liberty, But in all things love*”). A theology rooted in the New Testament when Paul calls for a distinction between things necessary to be believed and things indifferent not to.

HOW IS THIS PRINCIPLE INCARNATED?

For Anglicans the “unity” has been rooted not in canonical norms or doctrinal statements but in a foundational customary of (*lex-orandi-lex credendi*). That unity in Anglicanism has primarily focused on how people in various ages and places could best serve and worship God and has fostered a “spirituality of worship” to be the identifying mark of the ecclesial community not by law but by the customary supported by the Book of Common Prayer. While this customary has received the support of canon, it has done so because it “can obtain the force of law only if it is reasonable.”⁶ Covenant and Canon, which reflect the evolutions of customaries within Anglicanism are promoted and bear the mark of a norm when a majority of the community associate themselves with such customs, without regard to their individual authority. This is a canonicity adapted from the community as opposed to being imposed upon the community by a body such as a “magisterium”.

Moreover, it should also be stated that it must not be supposed that any local custom automatically establishes itself as part of the canonical tradition. For that to occur it must evolve with the conviction of the ecclesiastical community expressing a long and steady practice of the custom recognizing that in that practice there is a consensus of that takes on the force of law. Additionally for Anglicans in order for

⁵ Hamilton Hess., **The Early Development of Canon Law and the Council of Serdica** (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002) p. 60

⁶ I.D.Willcock., “A Civil Lawyer Looks at The Canon Law” :**The International Comparative Law, Quarterly**, Vol. 11, No. 1, 1962) p.104

custom to be accepted as a source of the canonical tradition, it must be consistent with scripture, tradition and reason.⁷

Customary evolves within the context of the *sui iuris churches* and it is the local Church, which is foundational in Anglican ecclesiology. The dynamic tension canonically for Anglicanism is the desire to balance the norms of *ius universalis* and the customary *ius particulare* when it comes to ordering the church. This is compounded by the Anglican reality whereby covenant and canon have an inter relationship (this has some correlation to norms of process found in Eastern Orthodoxy). In both ecclesiology, the goal is to ensure the *ius commune*, enhances the “*communio anglicanae in loco parens*” as an expression of the one, holy catholic and apostolic faith.⁸

The possibility of a universal approach to canons has not been received well in Anglicanism and has been placed in deference to the idea of covenants. It seems the reasons are many, but the most visceral is because of past fears that an uncompromising devotion to canonical structure will damage the Spirit’s guidance to new models of *anglicanae ecclesiae*. Conversely, there is a posture holding that the present crisis of “*anglicanae communio*” lies in the fact that Anglicanism has consistently failed to embrace a clear set of universal norms and as such this has paralyzed its ability to witness to the truth of the gospel. The resolution of the tension between canons and covenants amidst such conflicts is “essentially contested and undecidable, particularly if the *consensus fidelium* is important in the determination”⁹.

This value of autonomy has been a secondary category in this crisis of ordering. It is a shared value in many aspects of Anglican ecclesiology and does have a place in the canonical and conciliar tradition. This value for autonomy stresses both covenant and canon for Anglicans that unity and authority is not to be concentrated

⁷ cf. Kuriakose Bharanikulangara., **Particular Law of the Eastern Catholic Churches**. (Brooklyn: St. Maron Publications, 1996) Chap 1.

⁸ Secretary General of the Anglican Consultative Council., **The Official Report of the Lambeth Conference, 1998**., Harrisburg: Morehouse Publishing, 1999) Chap IV of the Virginia Report

⁹ Stephen Pickard. , *Innovation and Undecidability: Some Implications for the Koinonia of the Anglican Church*. **Journal of Anglican Studies, Volume 2.2, December 2004**. pg.93

in a single center but rather across a plurality of persons exercising various degrees of authority¹⁰ who would govern according to the distinctions of gifts and roles. This has served Anglicanism well as it laid the groundwork for the first Lambeth Conference. This spirit is continued in the Windsor Covenant, which seeks to incorporate the spirit of the conciliar tradition as a matter of covenant rather than canon.¹¹

The Windsor Covenant while seeking reconciliation and unity also highlights the dynamic tension created by the value of ecclesial autonomy. This value finds a heritage in the Patristic church when Cyprian affirmed “that each local church, sacramentally realized as the Body of Christ in the Eucharistic celebration of bishop, clergy and people, joined the universal or "catholic" communion of churches by mutual hospitality and mutual assurances of continuity in the faith of the Apostles, and that communion in faith and charity with the household of bishops was an indispensable criterion for achieving that universal bond”.¹²

This tension of the *ius ecclesiae particulare* versus the *ius ecclesiae universalis* as incarnated in covenants versus canons now poses a profound challenge to the Anglican Communion as it seeks fulfill of the Commitments of Communion in the Covenant. This covenant was born out of an ecclesiological crisis that polarized a need for the conciliar tradition to be honored and a desire to see if current innovations could stand the test of time to be a customary. Professor Orsy states that the church cannot have “internal harmony and operational integrity unless its perception of values is followed by the practical effort to appropriate them. The precept to uphold this unity can be rightly called “*the principle of integration*”. ***If it ever should be missing, the internal life of the church would be fragmented and its capacity to witness impaired***”¹³

It would seem that in order to maintain communion as Anglicans, those in

¹⁰ Ibid., **The Official Report of the Lambeth Conference, 1998.**, p.53

¹¹ (N.B. Part III of the Windsor Covenant and the outline for Commitments of Communion or the obligations of *communio anglicanae* by covenant rather than canon!).

¹² Maurice Bevenot., (trans.), **St. Cyprian: The Lapsed and The Unity of the Catholic Church.**, (New York: Newman Press, 1956) Chapters 3-5.

¹³ Ladislav Orsy., **Theology and Canon Law: New Horizons for Legislation and Interpretation** (Collegeville: Michael Glazier Books/The Liturgical Press,1992) p.103

Apostolic leadership must seek to become an integrated hierarchical community whereby the common values of catholicity establish the communal integrity from which the a covenant could flow. If that is not possible, canonical conciliar action is how the church has historically had to resolve such crises.

This is not inconsistent with the Windsor Covenant seems as it calls the church to “uphold and act compatibly with the catholic and apostolic faith, order and tradition”¹⁴ Should the direction and tenor of the Covenant have more than the mutuality that covenants afford? Should it have canonical weight? Roman Canonist James Kaselyn offers a set of criteria for authentic *communio* and this criterion can be applied as a tool to assess if Windsor norms applied can have the desired strength such as a canon, providing they have a customary within *anglicanae ecclesiae*.

These norms should reflect:

- 1) Divine Origin (The Trinity)
- 2) An External Expression (i.e. juridical form)
- 3) A Dynamic versus Static Reality
- 4) Various Levels ¹⁵

CAN THE WINDSOR COVENANT HAVE THE CANONICAL FORCE OF A NORM *FOR IUS COMMUNE ANGLICANAE*?

Given the assessment of these canonist, one must ask if the struggle for *authentic communio* is perhaps more than the Windsor Covenant can offer? It appears that the legitimacy and subsequent decisions for *communio* falls upon the affirmation and adherence to the core values that should have the longevity of customary. While the Covenant is designed to maintain the Communion, authentic *communio* demands that there be values affirmed for their own sake, not simply to avoid a breach in the bonds.

¹⁴The Lambeth Commission on Communion, **The Windsor Report 2004** (London: The Anglican Communion Office, 2004), Part III, Article 10.

¹⁵ Robert J. Kaslyn., **Communion with the Church and the Code of Canon Law: An Analysis of the Foundation and Implications of Canonical Obligation to Maintain Communion with the Catholic Church.** (Lewiston: The Edward Mellen Press, 1994) pgs. 132-136

Moreover, for a covenant to be unconditional there should be uncompromising commitment to refrain from any concrete and particular features in the covenant that are outside the bounds of the conciliar tradition of the catholic faith. Canonist James Coriden states that by its very nature "*communio*" is polysemous in character, which is the filter by which a covenant need to be assessed, and its Articles interpreted. Coriden's words demand further reflection particularly on Articles 7-13 of the Covenant proposal

"In the light of these considerations, it is nevertheless clear that a covenant could serve a number of important and timely positive ends given the current needs of the Communion. These goals are broadly relational, educational and institutional.

8. *Relational*: The formulation and adoption of a covenant, while unable to resolve our current difficulties, could assist the process of reconciliation post-Windsor. It would do so by focusing us on that which unites us, reaffirming our commitment to one another, and thereby helping to heal and strengthen the bonds of affection that have been damaged in recent years.

9. *Educational*: It could also become a significant educational tool within the Communion, enabling Anglicans worldwide to understand and deepen their commitment to the beliefs, history and practices they share in common and their development of these as they engage together in God's mission in the world.

10. *Institutional*: Any covenant also has the potential of providing what is currently lacking - an agreed framework for common discernment, and the prevention and resolution of conflict. It could do this by bringing together and making explicit much that until now has been a matter of convention within the Communion's common life.

11. Although there is danger in viewing the covenant as a panacea for the Communion, these are all important goals to be sought in producing a covenant. The covenant will serve the unity, stability and growth of the Communion as it becomes a genuinely global communion of interdependent autonomous churches.

12. The length, structure and content of any covenant will depend in part on the relative weight given to these three different purposes.

The Background of Covenant

13. While the word 'covenant' is used to translate and describe the nature of a wide variety of relationships in the Old Testament, its most frequent use is when a divine initiative is met with a human response. The covenant holds

out a promise by God which is fulfilled in the faithful response of his people. When there is a failure in faithfulness, a re-commitment is made. In the New Testament, Christians claimed to be in a new covenant relationship with God through the death and resurrection of Jesus, and in the gift of the Spirit. It is striking that covenants most frequently originate in the initiative of God, and elicit the costly sacrifice of faithful response by his covenant people to his work.

The covenant relationship with God generates a covenantal relationship between his people. We do not underestimate the cost that being in covenant may exact on the churches of the Communion.”¹⁶

Will the cost of such a covenant calls for a mutual agreement that will ask the *collegium episcopos* to embrace something between a vague disposition (as is presently the case) and an organic reality (a future hope).¹⁷ The challenge to implement a covenant to maintain Communion will necessarily be contextual as the mission of the church is not an abstract ideal subject to theological insight and canonical avoidance. The choice to embrace covenant and canon calls for a praxis that has evolved since the early days of the church, which was rooted in the experience of being “*ecclesiae particulare et universalis*” while eventually offering theological reflection on that experience¹⁸ resulting in the paradox of praxis.

The Covenant is an attempt to resolve the crisis of identity and the larger demand of seeking to fulfill the obligations of *communio*. Given the non-binding nature of Lambeth Conferences, Anglicans have no recent conciliar statements to promote rights and obligations. The *anglicanae ius commune* lays claim to a tradition of episcopacy and conciliarity in its identity as an expression of the church catholic and is in need of a path to promote the rights and obligations at an apostolic leadership level. Perhaps a two tiered system of covenant may offer a way to maintain the catholic and apostolic faith, order and tradition based upon the three levels that *communio* functions under:

- a) *fideliium*
- b) *ecclesiarium*
- c) *hierarchia*¹⁹

¹⁶ Joint Standing Committee '**Towards an Anglican Covenant**' A Consultation Paper on the Covenant Proposal of the Windsor Report (London: Anglican Consultative Council, 2005)

¹⁷ James A. Coriden., **Canon Law as Ministry: Freedom and Good Order for the Church.**, (New York: Paulist Press, 2000) pgs. 41-43

¹⁸ cf. L.Hertling ., **Communio: Church and Papacy in Early Christianity**, (trans. J.Wicks)., (Chicago: Loyola University Press,1972.)

¹⁹ J. Corriden., **Canon Law as Ministry.** pg. 46

This type of conciliar three-fold chord could be a path to bridge the tension between covenant and canon and the paradox of autonomy and catholicity that presently exist. The commitment to *fideliūm*, *ecclesiarium* and *hierachia* calls the Primates and bishops of the Anglican Communion to embrace a historic model that regards customary as both covenantal and canonical as it illustrates that only in faith can the order prescribed be justified – *ordo iustificatus* -providing that what is ordered is an embodiment of both “*ius divinum positivum*” and “*ius divinum naturale*.”²⁰. A covenant that commits to an ordering reflecting *ius divinum positivum*, *ius divinum naturale* along with the inheritance of the conciliar and canonical tradition, perhaps could offer a renewed system to facilitate the obligations to maintain the order of the “*anglicanae ecclesiae ius commune*”.

ESTABLISHING A VIA MEDIA FOR COVENANTS AND CANONS

Anglicanism at the Provincial and Diocesan levels shares in the canonical tradition of “*ius divinum*” which is a *fontes* for oversight and governance. The suggestions for strengthening the Windsor Covenant could have its basis in *fontes cognitionis*, calling upon the texts containing the customs and laws of the Church in various forms to be applied. These *fontes* include collections of *decretums*²¹, as well as laws promulgated by Church councils,²² both ecumenical, (and therefore universal), or provincial, and therefore applying only to a particular ecclesiastical province.

The strengths lie in *ius particulare* at provincial and diocesan levels but for authentic communion the *ius particulare* must be affirmed and at the same time reinforced within the context of the *communio ecclesiastica*. Certainly, this amplification of “*fontes*” is a factor in the development of *The Principles of Canon Law Common to the Churches of the Anglican Communion*²³ by Professor Norman

²⁰ Constant Van de Wiel, **History of Canon Law**. (Louvain: Peeters Press, 1991) Chap. 1

²¹ Anders Winroth., **The Making of Gratian's Decretum**., (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000)

²² cf. Philip Hughes, **The Church in Crisis: A History of the General Councils, 325-1870**. (Garden City: Hanover House, 1961)

²³ cf. The Anglican Communion **Legal Advisers Report** (London: The Anglican Communion Office,2002) <http://www.acclawnet.co.uk>

Doe and should be assessed in relation to the conciliar and canonical tradition not just within Anglicanism but in the larger framework of catholicity.

The discovery, implementation and development of “*fontes*” at times requires a review of a separate body of “sources,” to expand the study of *ius commune* as a discipline *sui iuris* as well as and also as one related to other branches of the catholic faith. The *fontes exemplars* that would be helpful in strengthening the Windsor Covenant are laws and customs from the Oriental traditions, which Anglicanism shares a some common features with. The *ius commune ecclesiarum Orientalum* tends to be corrective in nature (responding to a situation once it has occurred) and not prescriptive as great importance is attached to the local legislation of each autonomous jurisdiction. This would be a value *ius commune anglicanae* could embrace

An example from a Byzantine source could be found in the **Codex Canonum Ecclesiarum Orientalum**. In this codex from the Oriental Rite here applied to Anglicanism, common law designates laws and lawful customs that would be common to all Anglican churches. This is opposed to a particular law, which designates laws, lawful customs, statutes and norms not common to the whole communion or to all provinces. The strength of this *fontes* from the Oriental Code for Anglicanism is that it allows for three levels of law to express the faith both locally and universally with a structure of governance that could be a support system to the Covenant honoring both the principles of catholicity and subsidiarity.²⁴.

- 1) That which is common to the church catholic,
- 2) That which is common to all Anglican Churches
- 3) Particular laws of a *sui iuris provincialis ecclesiae*

These two principles of catholicity and subsidiarity are valued claims to Anglican identity but the slowly maturing Anglican canonical tradition has been challenged by recent events because of the absence of a universal codification binding upon all self-governing provinces and dioceses of the Communion. Anglicans have long recognized the right of a local Church to have its own special laws or regulations and

²⁴ cf. **Codex Canonum Ecclesiarum Orientalum**., Canons 1493, <http://www.jgray.org/codes/cceo90eng.html>

have invoked aspects of the canonical and conciliar declaring that the customs and territory of each local church should be preserved providing they honor the Church's universal law ("*ius divinum positivum*" and "*ius divinum naturale*").²⁵ Without a universal set of norms as part of this ecclesiology, it will be difficult for Anglicanism to mature in establishing how it is to order itself. This will necessarily demand the leadership struggle as to how to integrate local custom, established by covenant while canonically committing to norms that reflect the Church's canonical tradition.

Anglicanism must order itself in concert with its established norms of scripture, tradition and reason/ doctrine. A "process of codification" calling for a provincial series of canons to support the Windsor Covenant is an approach that could complement Anglican governance ensuring a *ius commune anglicanae* and can enhance the "*communio anglicanae*" as an expression of the one, holy catholic and apostolic faith through two tiers of governance covenant and canon.

This calls for a different ecclesiology that goes beyond autonomy and is framed ecclesologically through the doctrine of the Trinity:

"The Trinitarian principle replaces the principle of power by the principle of concord. Authority and obedience are replaced by dialogue, consensus and harmony. . . The presbyteral and synodal church order and the leadership based on brotherly advice are forms of organization that best correspond to the doctrine of the Trinity"²⁶

The principle that Dr. Moltmann offers for the purposes of church order is that of a hierarchy of relationship which proffers a complete communion of persons and yet distinctions of roles as Creator, Redeemer and Counselor. The implication of how hierarchical persons relate as a hierarchical communion should be fashioned by the experience of total communion in the wake of distinction of persons and roles which would be clearly established canonically on a provincial level. The Trinitarian model shows distinctive person having his or her own integrity and purpose yet functioning in *communio*.

²⁵ Francis John Marini, **The Power of the Patriarch - Patriarchal Jurisdiction on the Verge of the Third Millennium** (Staten Island: St. Maron Publications, 1998) p.44-50

²⁶ Jurgen Moltmann., **The Trinity and the Kingdom**, (San Francisco: Harper, 1991) p.202

Ecclesiastically in terms of governance this has implications for the Principles of Subsidiarity and the orthodox Concept of Economy. As expressed in the Virginia Report, the call is for authority not to be concentrated in a single center but rather across a plurality of persons exercising various degrees of authority²⁷ which would be governed according to the distinctions of gifts and roles. This complements a participatory hierarchy whereby such role differentiations would exist in the church, with varying tasks and authorities afforded to those roles. Influence would flow freely among roles fully, but in a way appropriate to their function or office, for the good of the common life. This contributes to a *ius commune* but at the same time allows for the concept of *Economy/οικονόμια* to be applied to the community which recognizes that such an application is always an exception to the general rule. From this accord, the legal consequences following the violation of the law are lifted by the competent hierarchical person; who while being a competent ecclesiastical authority acts not necessarily due to urgency as compassion. What kind of unity and authority does one find for church order law and governance in a participatory hierarchy that would be bound in both covenant and canon? Professor Terrence Nichols offers the following perspective based on the conciliar tradition:

There emerges a model of unity, obedience and authority and the unity to be sought is not a command unity, which tends to produce uniformity (but also rebellion and schism), or an egalitarian unity which also tends to produce uniformity (to be different is to be unequal, so differences are leveled out) It is not a democratic unity in which the majority imposes its will on a minority. The unity of the church, insofar as possible, ought to be based on participation and a consensus in core matters, which allows for diversity in non-essential matters. Hierarchy allows for subsidiary units to express a religion in many different rites, so that such a unity need not be uniformity but reconciled diversity."²⁸

This two tiered approach would complement the Anglican Communion as a church *sui iuris*, that is " a community of the Christian faithful, which is joined together by a hierarchy according to the norm of law and which is expressly or tacitly recognized as *sui iuris* by *επισχκοπε* in authority of the Church"²⁹. This model for governance

²⁷ Secretary General of the Anglican Consultative Council., **The Official Report of the Lambeth Conference, 1998.**, (Harrisburg: Morehouse Publishing,1999) p.53

²⁸ T. Nichols., **That All May Be One: Hierarchy and Participation in the Church** p. 314

²⁹ cf. **Codex Canonum Ecclesiarum Orientalum.** Canon 27 is the basis for this Anglican adaptation. <http://www.jgray.org/codes/cceo90eng.html>

establishing provincial canons held universally by covenant affirms an '*anglicanae sui iuris*' and the relative autonomy each Province (with juridical nuances).

These nuances will affirm the autonomous nature of each province and other elements will demand the question of catholicity be re-examined. In this participative model the call for a restructuring of the Covenant and eventually the Anglican Instruments of Unity is in accord with what would be considered the original and most ancient model of the Church (i.e. the Patriarchate and Metropolitan Church).

CONCLUSION

The Covenant as an instrument by itself fails to address the fullness of the conciliar tradition that needs to be regained by Anglicans. A church rooted in the catholic heritage is called to be church rooted in the claims a deposit of faith that includes a canonical and conciliar tradition that is one of the marks of the church since the Apostolic Period. Anglicanism abandoned a conciliar and canonical understanding of the church when Henry Tudor ascribed all legislative responsibility to the Parliament at the Reformation. A draft of a Covenant without a canonical and conciliar structure illustrates once again that Anglican leaders seem unable to grasp the conciliar nature of the Church. A new model for a new day is required where conversations about Canons and Covenants are not simply the speculation of non-binding conferences that insure autonomy over and above authority. The blending of covenant and canon is a way to embrace the conciliar model where matters of faith and practice at all levels of the Church come into an expression of praxis that is framed in a theology of the church that is biblical, Christological, salvific historical and ecclesiological in character consistent for the ages.