

Zeitschrift: Revue internationale de théologie = Internationale theologische Zeitschrift = International theological review

Band: 6 (1898)

Heft: 24

Artikel: Esra und sein Kanon

Autor: Barry, Alfred

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-403427>

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften auf E-Periodica. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Zeitschriften und ist nicht verantwortlich für deren Inhalte. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern beziehungsweise den externen Rechteinhabern. Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen sowie auf Social Media-Kanälen oder Webseiten ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. [Mehr erfahren](#)

Conditions d'utilisation

L'ETH Library est le fournisseur des revues numérisées. Elle ne détient aucun droit d'auteur sur les revues et n'est pas responsable de leur contenu. En règle générale, les droits sont détenus par les éditeurs ou les détenteurs de droits externes. La reproduction d'images dans des publications imprimées ou en ligne ainsi que sur des canaux de médias sociaux ou des sites web n'est autorisée qu'avec l'accord préalable des détenteurs des droits. [En savoir plus](#)

Terms of use

The ETH Library is the provider of the digitised journals. It does not own any copyrights to the journals and is not responsible for their content. The rights usually lie with the publishers or the external rights holders. Publishing images in print and online publications, as well as on social media channels or websites, is only permitted with the prior consent of the rights holders. [Find out more](#)

Download PDF: 22.02.2026

ETH-Bibliothek Zürich, E-Periodica, <https://www.e-periodica.ch>

ESRA UND SEIN KANON.

Der Unterschied zwischen Juden und Samaritern war allerdings ein grosser, denn diese nahmen nur die Thora als Buch der Offenbarung an und nannten dabei von jeher den Ozair *einen Bibelfälscher und Lügner*. *Abulfatch*, ihr gelehrter Scholiast aus dem Mittelalter, legt Esra namentlich die Umschreibung der Kapitel über den jüdischen Tempelberg zur Last, um dem Garizim die Ehre zu nehmen. In der That ist der Moria kein Berg, geschweige von ferne sichtbar, auch nicht drei Tagereisen von Bersaba entfernt; auch ist die Deutung, Gen. 22, 14: „Der Herr sieht“ eine künstliche. Josephus kennt nicht einmal den Namen. Hierin dürften die Samariter recht haben; ruft doch schon *Jeremias* 8, 8, seinen Zeitgenossen zu: „Was saget ihr, wir sind weise, denn das Gesetz Jehovas ist bei uns? Fürwahr, sehet, *der trügerische Stift der Schriftgelehrten hat es verfälscht*.“ Auch die ersten Christen, die *Nazaräer*, behaupteten, der Pentateuch habe früher anders gelautet (Epiphan. hær. 18, 1). Die hauptsächliche Textänderung ging erst nach dem Exil vor sich, eben durch *Esra*, welchen die Rabbiner (J. Megilla, f. 71, 2) den *zweiten Moses* nennen, der verdient hätte, dem ersten zuvorkommen, weil er den Kanon hergestellt, nachdem die heiligen Bücher bei der Zerstörung Jerusalems durch die Chaldäer und im Laufe der Gefangenschaft teilweise zu Verlust gegangen.

Die biblischen Urkunden unterscheiden zu wenig zwischen Geschichte und Legende, und Esra selbst benennt zum Teil die *Apokryphen*, woraus er geschöpft. Apokryph sind die Strafwunder Mosis und anticipieren bereits die Schrecken des jüngsten Gerichtes. Der Nil soll sein Wasser in Blut verwandelt haben, — ohne dass Menschen und Tiere darüber zu Grunde gingen! Wer kann glauben, spricht schon vor tausend Jahren *Agobard*,

der Erzbischof von Lyon, der gescheiteste Mann und tonangebende Gelehrte seiner Zeit, wer kann glauben, dass *Gott die Herrschaft über die Natur je einem sterblichen Menschen abgetreten habe?* Dass der jüdische Gesetzgeber seinen Stab erhebend *Wetter gemacht*, hat in den Hexenprozessen Tausende das Leben auf dem Scheiterhaufen gekostet, indem die Richter sich immer auf die Bibel beriefen, um die Möglichkeit zu erhärten. Der Redaktor nennt selbst seine Quellen, z. B. Num. 21, 14: „*Milchamoth Jehova, von den Kriegen des Herrn*,“ welchen die Wunder des Wüstenzuges und bei der Einnahme Kanaans entnommen sind. Ferner Josua 10, 12: „*Sepher Jaschar, das Buch der Rechten*,“ woraus das Mirakel vom Sonnenstillstand stammt, nämlich, dass auf Befehl des jüdischen Heerführers das himmlische Uhrwerk stillegestanden, damit er bei verlängertem Tage sein Rachewerk an den Kananäern vollenden konnte. Es ist eine *poetische Hyperbel*, welche wir schon beim Siegeszug des *Sesostris* oder Ramses III. im XV. Jahrhundert vor Christus lesen, wo Champollion beim siebenten Triumphbild in Theben entziffert: „Ich habe bekämpft alle Länder der Erde, die Welt ist stillegestanden vor mir.“ Ja schon im Märchen aus dem XVII. Jahrhundert hält Phra, der Sonnengott, in seinem Laufe inne, als der Pharao zum Kampfe wider Kados auszieht. Das Bild ist vom ägyptischen Homer, *Pentour*, auch in die Gesänge des hellenischen übergegangen, wo Ilias II, 412, *Agamemnon* gegen Troja den Olymp anfleht: „Nicht, o Zeus, lass sinken die Sonn' und das Dunkel heraufzieh'n, Bis ich hinab von der Höhe gestürzt des Priamus Wohnung“ — anderseits aber *Here* XVIII, 239 f., zu gunsten der mit zweifelhaftem Erfolge streitenden Hellenen, ihrer Lieblinge, die Sonne früher untergehen lässt. Ebenso weilt, Odyss. XXIII, 241 f., *auf Athenes Geheiss* die Sonne länger über dem Horizont, damit Odysseus zur Ermordung seiner Nebenbuhler Zeit gewinne! (sic!) Jesus selbst klärt uns darüber auf, indem er Joh. 6, 49 spricht: „Eure Väter haben wohl Manna in der Wüste gegessen, ich aber bin wahrlich das Brot, das vom Himmel kam.“ *Paulus* schreibt, wieder einer Legende folgend, I. Kor. 10, 1 f.: „Unsere Väter sind mit der Wolke durch's Meer gegangen und auf Moses getauft. Sie haben alle einerlei geistliche Speise gegessen und geistlichen Wein getrunken aus dem mitfolgenden Fels, welcher Christus war.“

Dieser Befehl, an die Sonne gerichtet, wiederholt sich in den Legenden der Perser und Araber, Juden wie Christen. Vgl. „Revision des Bibelkanons“, Kap. V, „Das Buch Exodus“. Augustinus rügt vor allem die Scene Lots mit seinen Töchtern als unmöglich — wir sehen darin eine Lästerung gegen die feindseligen Nachbarn; wenn auch Jesus, Lk. 17, 32, spricht: „*Denket an Lots Weib,*“ so warnt er vielmehr, Mt. 24, 17 f., beim Her einbruch der Katastrophe nicht zurückzublicken, um noch etwas aus dem Hause zu holen. Die Versteinerung gehört, wie in allen ähnlichen Fällen, der lokalen Mythe an. Derartige Mirakeldichtungen sind gut für Künstler, und haben durch malerische Darstellungen am meisten Eingang und Glauben gefunden; sie dienen aber nicht als Lehrthema für den *Religionsunterricht in der Schule*, weil sie die kindliche Phantasie mit ausschweifenden Vorstellungen erfüllen, und dem gesunden Ver stande zum Trotz lebenslang für wahre Thatsachen gelten. Nicht umsonst hat die Kirche den Laien die Schrift lieber vorenthalten. Abt *Haneberg* schrieb 1870 die Warnung nach Rom, das Konzil möge die Erklärung unterlassen, sie sei wie mit Gottes Finger geschrieben; er verwies nur auf die Bücher der Makka bär! Auf dem Bazar von Kairo beachtet der Reisende leicht das aus der Tarfastaude oder Tamariske ausgeschwitzte Man, das die Towara-Beduinen in Ledertaschen zum Kaufe anbieten.

Esra ist der Wiederhersteller des Tempels und Gründer des hohen Synedriums, wie der hl. Schrift des alten Bundes; so steht beglaubigt im vierten Buche 14, 1 f.: „Weil das Gesetzbuch in Rauch aufgegangen und die Thaten Gottes in Vergessenheit gerathen wollten, habe er Jehova um den hl. Geist gebeten, alles wieder aufzuzeichnen, worauf ihm der Herr fünf Männer zugesellte und befahl, Tafeln von Buchsbaumholz bereit zu halten.“ Die Kompilation ist augenscheinlich, indem das Meiste als Eintrag aus späterer Zeit sich erweist, z. B. Gen. 19, 37, der Eintrag: „bis auf den heutigen Tag“, oder die edomitische Geschlechtstafel, Gen. 36, 31, die bis auf Saul herabgeht, ist von Esras Hand, doch wurde der alttestamentliche Kanon erst durch den Hohenpriester *Onias* († 292 v. Chr.) geschlossen. Die Samariter protestierten gegen diese Weiterungen, besonders aber gegen ihre Ausschliessung und den von „Ozair“ über sie verhängten Bann. In der That hat kaum ein Sterblicher *bedenklicheren Einfluss auf die Religionsgeschichte* ge-

übt, als dieser Sekretär des Nehemias durch die Aufnahme der unglaublichesten Wundergeschichten aus den wie immer ihm zugängigen, historisch unreinen Quellen. Die Samariter waren bei ihrer Ablehnung im vollen Rechte, zogen sich aber den bittersten Hass der Juden zu, der noch im letzten Synodalbeschluss unter R. Jehuda Hakadosch in Tiberias sich kundgiebt, worin sie den Heiden gleich geachtet, und wie durch Esra sich gebannt und verflucht sahen. Was wollte das sagen, als dass sie gesellschaftlich förmlich *boykottiert* waren! Der Talmud ereifert sich, *Fanhed*, f. 5, 2: „Ist nicht Heidenland so unrein, wie das Grab?“ und f. 12, 1, wird sogar die Einfuhr von Gemüse beanstandet wegen des möglicherweise daran hafftenden Staubes. Heisst es doch, *J. Sabbat*, f. 8, 4: „Der Staub, welcher aus heidnischen Gebieten nach Palästina gelangt, verliert damit seine verunreinigende Wirkung keineswegs.“ *Maimonides und Bartenora*, die berühmten Gesetzeslehrer, bekräftigen dies; da aber eine Menge Syrer und Phönizier im *Galiläa der Heiden* mit Israeliten zusammenwohnten (bell. 3, 3, 5), konnte die strenge Regel nicht eingehalten werden. Deshalb erklärt B. *Gittin*, f. 8, 1, 2, wer nach Syrien reise, könne dies ohne Verunreinigung thun. Dennoch bestimmt der Kanonist Mose ben Maimon in *Okoloth*, c. 17, 7: „Der Staub Syriens gilt für so unrein, wie der Staub ausserisraelitischer Länder.“ Dabei bietet er die geographische Einteilung, *Nilc. Trumoth*, c. 1, 6: „Der ganze Erdkreis zerfällt nach Meinung der Rabbiner in drei Teile, das Land Israel, Syrien und die Länder ausserhalb.“

Jesus hebt den Unterschied zwischen reinen und unreinen Ländern auf und erklärt *Mt. 10, 5, 14*, im Gegenteil bei der Aussendung seiner Jünger ins Land Israel: „Nimmt man euch in einer Stadt nicht auf, so schüttelt den Staub von euern Füssen zum Zeugnis wider sie. Wahrlich, dem Lande Sodom und Gomorrha wird es am Tage des Gerichtes erträglicher ergehen, als solch einer Stadt.“ Er machte die Unreinheit vom sittlichen Wandel abhängig. Ihre Religiosität hieng mit dem Glauben an die patriarchalische Heiligkeit des Garizim zusammen. Wir lesen, *Beresch. 2, 32*, R. Jonathan kam auf der Wallfahrt nach Jerusalem am Garizim vorbei. Da sprach ein Samarit, warum willst du nicht lieber auf diesem gesegneten Berge anbeten? „Woher gesegnet?“ Weil ihn die Sündflut nicht

überschwemmte. Die Samariter haben neun und zehn als Ein Gebot, und als zehntes die Errichtung eines Altars auf ihrem heiligen Berge.

Noch heute träumen die von aller Welt Verlassenen von Volksresten, ihren Stammesbrüdern in der Ferne, und warten auf ihre Zurückführung. Mit dem Verlangen nach fremder Hülfe und nach den Klagen über die Anfeindung der Juden und ihren fälschlich unterstellten, abrahamitischen Opferaltar auf Moria sprach der Nachkomme so vieler Hohenpriester dieses absterbenden Volksrestes beim Abschiede zu uns:

Der jüdische Nationalgott und der Vater im Himmel.

Die ursprüngliche Menschheit nannte Gott nur den Allvater im Himmel. Dewa, div ergiebt deus, divus, subdio und Jupiter ist wie *Ζεὺς πατήρ* der einfache Ausdruck des hebräischen Jahve oder „Ich bin, der ich bin“, orphisch *Ζεὺς ἦν*, *Ζεὺς ἔστι*, *Ζεὺς ἔσσεται*, ist schon mehr ein philosophischer Begriff. Von der Einheit Gottes giebt *Seneca* Zeugnis mit den Worten, de benef. 2, 7, 8: „Du magst dem Urheber der Dinge verschiedene Namen geben, wie Donnerer, Erhalter, Schicksal, es können ihrer so viele sein, als seine Kraftäusserungen: Liber, Herkules, Merkur — alle sind nur Benennungen desselben göttlichen Wesens in anderen Eigenschaften gedacht.“ Dasselbe Bekenntnis legt Plutarch, de Iside, ab: „Es giebt keine verschiedenen Götter der Griechen und Barbaren, der Nord- und Südländer, denn gleich wie Sonne und Mond, Himmel und Erde überall dieselben sind, aber von anderen anders genannt werden, so wird der allgemeine Weltgeist verschiedentlich gefeiert, und von diesen so, von den andern anders ausgesprochen.“

Jahve ist Nationalgott, und es scheint, als hätten die Juden etwas von ihren Eigenschaften ihm beigelegt, da die übrige Menschheit ihm verhasst war und er die Goi dem Verderben preisgibt. Auffallend sind sie in der Folge von ihm abgegangen und beten dafür zum „*Herrn der Welten*“. *Marcion*, der 143 bis 144 in Rom auftrat und um 170 starb, ging so weit, zu lehren, Christus habe die Herrschaft des rächenden und strafenden Judengottes gebrochen und dafür den Allgütigen, Allerhöchsten verkündet (Iren. I, 25). Anderseits geht *Martin*, der Übersetzer des Josephus Flavius, zu weit, wenn er, Ant. 15, 11, 2, die Note

beifügt: „Der Gott des jüdischen Volkes ist nicht nur der höchste, sondern auch der einzige wahre Gott.“ Mitglieder der Synagoge klagen, Apostelgesch. 6, 11, den Stephanus an, dass er „Moses und Gott selber lästere“ — etwa im Sinne Marcions wider das Alte Testament sich erklärte? Bei uns fehlt allerdings die Erkenntnis, dass Christus den Mosaismus aufgehoben und völlig Neues geschaffen hat; ja, dass selbst alle zehn Gebote für uns nicht mehr (Mk. 2, 21, 22) Gültigkeit haben. Christus lehrt uns abermals, zum Vater im Himmel zu beten.

Prof. Dr. SEPP.

THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION

AS IT IS,

ITS GROWTH AND CONSTITUTION.

The Anglican Communion as it now is.

The object of this paper is to give a brief sketch of the present extent and constitution of that Branch of the Catholic Church, which is known as the Anglican Communion. There are some members of that Communion itself, who have but vague and inadequate ideas on this subject. It is, of course, likely that to many of those who belong to other Branches of the Church, it may be to a great extent an unknown subject. There may, therefore, be some interest, in an attempt to show how that Communion has grown to be what it is now, and what possibilities seem, under God's blessing, to lie before it in the future.

(I) It may perhaps be taken for granted that most of the readers of this Review are acquainted, both with the causes, which led in the 16th century to the assumption of an independent position by the Church of England (under appeal to a General Council freely chosen) and with the real character of that position:—Throwing off the usurped Papal Supremacy, and asserting the right independence of National Churches—resolving to remove the Mediæval accretions, which under that Supremacy had overgrown the primitive doctrine and order of the Church of Christ,—recognising, under the right authority of the Church, the individual freedom and responsibility, of which the Reformation was everywhere the assertion. She yet declared

authoritative (in 1533) that the English Church and Nation “endeavored not to decline or vary from the Congregation of Christ’s “Church in things concerning the Catholic faith of Christendom”, and she maintained that declaration through all the succeeding religious and ecclesiastical movements up to the final settlement of 1662. Of the truth of this assertion of catholicity, in spite of the irregularities, the errors, the vicissitudes, which belong to every period of revolution, her Prayer Book, and, though perhaps with less clearness, her Articles bear conclusive witness. Its significance is more and more clearly understood year by year, both by our own members and by those of other religious Communions.

I may perhaps make the same assumption as to the true nature of the “Establishment” of the Church of England—that is its recognition as the organ of National Christianity. It is known now that no formal act of such Establishment ever took place either before or during the 16th century; nor did any one ever dream of supposing that there was then any foundation of a new Church. In fact the Nation and the Church were at that time considered as coextensive; all Englishmen were born into the unity of the Nation; all, as a matter of course, were born again into the higher unity of the Church. The Nation, indeed, claimed its place in Christendom, simply because in their spiritual relations all its citizens became members of the Catholic Church of Christ. The Reformation was considered, not only as making no breach in the continuity of this order, but rather as a reassertion of it, against usurpation, which might overbear it, and corruptions which might obscure it. Even the Royal Supremacy of the Tudor period, although it was often exaggerated and tyrannical, yet always professed to be no new thing, but only a continuation and development of that which had from time immemorial belonged to the English Crown. The very title of “Head of the Church”—utterly objectionable as it was, and repudiated once for all by Elisabeth—showed clearly that the Supremacy was claimed for the Sovereign, simply as representation of the whole body of the Church, and accordingly it was by the combined action of clergy and laity under the Crown—the clergy in their Convocation, the laity in Parliament—that all the steps were taken which determined the ecclesiastical position of England. Even the endowments of the

Church were by no way created by any National act. They were inherited from the munificence of the past; in some degree they suffered unrighteous spoliation; in a far greater degree their distribution was regulated and altered. But, like the National character of the Church from which they flowed, they were in no respect new things, nor were they (as was once ignorantly supposed) transferred from one body to another. The time was, indeed, to come hereafter, when by recognition of freedom of Non-Conformity, the Church of England was seen to be no longer the Church of all England, while yet she was still acknowledged as the organ of National Christianity, covering the whole land by her parochial system, having in all religious matters a spiritual leadership, and retaining her ancient endowments. Such acknowledgment might be called a virtual Establishment by the State, now viewed as a distinct body. But, even then, it was never formally made. The National position of the Church was taken for granted; and many of the traditions, belonging properly to the earlier condition of things, were still retained. There was in all this recognition, not creation, of Church authority.

The true historical view of these questions has been brought out in our own times, partly, no doubt, by fuller study of Church principles, but partly also, and indeed largely, by the growth of the Anglican Communion at which it is the object of this Article to glance. The effect of this growth has been to exchange the position of comparative isolation—forced upon the Church of England in the 16th century, and perhaps too readily acquiesced by her in after times—for larger and deeper ideas of Church life and of Church Communion; and therefore to distinguish more clearly between the Church, as a spiritual body, and the Establishment, which depended not indeed for its beginning but for its continuance on deliberate National action.

(II) The very title of this paper is significant. We speak no longer of “the English Church”, but of “the Anglican Communion”. Yet this latter phrase is but recent in familiar use. For the growth of the Anglican Communion beyond the shores of England mainly belongs to the present century, during which it has been, especially of late years, a rapid, because a natural and inevitable growth. In part it has followed the extension

of the dominion and influence of Great Britain as a nation; in part it has been due to the extension, beyond even that wide sphere, of Missionary zeal and enterprise, seeking to plant in regions absolutely heathen and in great degree uncivilized, the Cross of the Lord Jesus Christ. The remarkable spiritual revival, which, through the various religious movements of the century, God has granted to the Church of England at home, has naturally overflowed in its effect to all the daughter and sister Churches which in different degrees owe their origination to her, and which although in themselves wholly or largely independent, are still living members of the Anglican Communion. The result is that a Church, once supposed to be merely insular, incapable of any large development, and dependent for its inexistence on that National recognition, which is called "Establishment", has visibly grown into a great Communion, not only world-wide in its extent, but singularly varied in its character and constitution. If growth be a sign of vitality, and if variety implies freedom of organisation: it is clear that the Anglican Communion has in it the inherent life, which demands and enjoys "the glorious liberty of the children of God".

This growth has shown itself, first, in the rapid extension of full Ecclesiastical Organisation. Up to nearly the end of the eighteenth century the Church of England, by an inexcusable and disastrous error, of which she still feels the consequences, absolutely declined to plant that organisation abroad in completeness and independence. When the sphere of English influence began to enlarge itself, by the planting of her earliest Colonies, and the acquisition of dominion in the West Indies, the Church, of course, followed her children with her religious Ministration; but by the refusal, or acquiescence in the refusal, of any extension of the Episcopate beyond the shores of England, she kept then new religious Communities as mere dependencies, incapable of deeply rooting themselves in their native soil and still more incapable of that free growth of spiritual life, which meets new conditions by new developments. The Anglican Church of these days might well have been held to deserve the reproach of "insularity"; it might easily have seemed incapable of any large expansion; it might perhaps have been thought to be supported only by Establishment, and to be content to purchase that support by the loss of free elas-

ticity and independence. Even when she entered on a truer and wiser policy, the steps of advance were slow. It was not till 1784 that the first Anglican Bishop was consecrated in which had then become the American Republic; it was only in 1787 that this example was followed in British North America; it was not till 1813 that a Bishop was sent to our great Empire in India, it was not till 1824 that the Episcopate began in the West Indies. Even at the beginning of the reign of Queen Victoria (in 1837), there were but seven Bishoprics in the whole of our Colonial and Indian Empire, two in North America, two in the West Indies, one in Australia, and two in India; and the daughter Church in the United States, although somewhat swifter in expansion, had only created sixteen sees in that vast territory. But from that time onward the advance, once begun, has been extraordinarily rapid. There are at this moment in the British possessions and in independent Missions, begun from home or from the Colonial Churches, no less than 87 Bishoprics, and the Church of the United States has some 75 sees, at home and abroad. It must be noted that, not only in theory, but in actual fact, every new Bishopric created is a new centre of ecclesiastical and spiritual life, showing itself in increase of ministering clergy, in the building up of an independent Christianity, in fuller pastoral care of our own people abroad and in conversion of heathen races. It must also be noted that every one of the daughter Churches, so founded, is free and self-governed; it has neither the advantages, nor the drawbacks of State recognition and State support; every new diocese rules itself through Synodical Organisation of the Bishop, the clergy, and the representatives of the laity; the various dioceses are, in almost all cases, drawn together in Provinces under a Metropolitan and in aggregation of Provinces under Primatial Authority; and, as they gain strength themselves, almost invariably send out new off-shoots, both to follow the extension of the English-speaking race and to attempt the conversion of their heathen neighbours. It has been said with perfect truth that the Missionary Expansion of the Church of Christ in the present century bears comparison with that of any period in the history of the Church, since the Apostolic age. In that expansion the Church of England has borne, as by God's Providence she was bound to bear, a leading part,

and the result of her labour under God's blessing is the Anglican Communion of to-day.

(III) But hardly less notable than the rapid growth of that Communion is the remarkable variety of its composition as represented, for example, in the Lambeth Conference. There is, of course, firstly, the Mother Church of England, once (as has been said) in theory coextensive with the whole nation; still recognised by the State as the National Church, the exponent (that is) of National Christianity; still the leading spiritual force in the Christian Civilisation of England, and by universal acknowledgment advancing in these days rapidly in strength and influence. Her establishment by the State is undoubtedly the cause of some difficulties and impediments to this advance; it interferes, although it need not and ought not to interfere, injuriously with her self-government. But certainly on the whole it gives the great advantage of spiritual leadership to the Church, and is of incalculable benefit to the Christianity of the Nation. The Church would fight, and fight with the support of preponderating public opinion, against any attempt to rob her of it. Then side by side with the Church of England, there are three Sister Churches. There is the old Episcopal Church of Scotland, in point of members only a small part of the population, but in education and culture and sacred influence far more considerable, and growing of late years rapidly in presence of a dominant Presbyterianism. There is the old Church of Ireland, once absolutely united with the Church of England in one establishment, now, since its disestablishment in 1869, an independent and self-governed Church—again a minority, although a peaceful and influential minority, in the presence of a Roman Catholicism, which includes at least two thirds of the people of Ireland. There is the younger but more powerful Communion of the "Protestant Episcopal Church" in America. It is not, indeed, even now, one of the most numerous religious Communions in the United States; for it has never entirely recovered from the disadvantage inflicted by the false policy of the Church of England in old times. But it is more and more becoming a leading influence over the thought and culture and religion of the great Republic; certainly it manifests no little vigour and enterprise; and it has clearly a far

greater future before it. These three Churches are also lately independent of the Church of England; and they have shown that independence in ecclesiastical and liturgical development. But they are really sister Churches, united substantially with her in doctrine, worship and discipline. Of them the old classical saying is true—

“Facies non omnibus una,
Nec diversa tamen; qualem decet esse sororum.”

Then, next, in a somewhat different relation, come the Colonial Churches, chiefly in the three great groups of English Colonies in British North America and the West Indies, in Australia, and in South Africa, membering some 65 sees. These again are entirely self-governed. They have their Synodical organisation, diocesan, provincial, primatial; they are themselves becoming new centres of Church expansion, and have in different degrees to deal, not only with the English colonists but (especially in the West Indies and South Africa) with the subject races. But universally by their own free act, they have bound themselves to make no changes in doctrine, discipline and worship, except in harmony with the Church in England. So far (like the Colonies themselves), they have a self-chosen dependence and a special closeness of connection with the old Ecclesiastical home.

But, beyond these, and again in a wholly different relation, are what we usually call the “Native Churches”—in older times the West Indian Churches of the Negro race—now the Churches founded by English hands, partly in connection with the Colonial Churches as in Australasia and South Africa, partly in the great Empire of India, in China and in Japan, partly in Africa, within and beyond the “sphere of English influence” and in the islands of the Polynesian Archipelago. These Churches are composed of men in race and character wholly different from those of the English or, indeed, the Western world, some of ancient and advanced civilisation, some uncultivated, and in various degrees needing to be civilized and christianized at once. They are (with the exception of the West Indian Negro Churches) comparatively of recent origin. They represent only the beginnings of a christianization of the heathen races; sometimes having to deal with great organized

religions, such as Hinduism, Mohammedanism, Buddhism, Confucianism; sometimes with only the most rudimentary and superstitious forms of religious development. It is clear that, while in the fundamental elements of Gospel truth and Church Order they are in unity with the Church of England, and therefore members of the Anglican Communion, yet as to the lesser developments of truth, they must have independence and even diversity. It is equally clear, that, while for a time (which will vary in duration in different cases) they must look for English leadership, direction and support, yet eventually they must be really "native Churches" with their native Ministry and Episcopate. For, if these races are to be christianized, it must be ultimately by men of their own blood, their own character, their own habits of thought and life. It would be an absurd and fatal error to expect from the native Churches that close adhesion, almost an identity, which is natural in the Colonial Churches. In some cases soon, in others after a longer time, they must shew independent developments of their own. It is enough for the Church of England to have sown and watered the spiritual seed; it must grow freely as God's Providence and grace shall determine.

(IV) This growth and variety of Constitution have been strikingly indicated in the Lambeth Conference. That Conference is itself a growth. The idea of it arose out of what was felt to be a practical necessity in 1867, originated at the request of one of the Colonial Churches, in reference to difficulties, which were troubling another. In the first instance it was adopted with some hesitation. Of 144 Bishops summoned only 76 attended; the Archbishop of York and other leading English Prelates were absent; the Churches in India and Australia were unrepresented; public Church opinion was divided in the subject. But by degrees it proved its value and efficiency; it secured at each meeting a larger adhesion; it won its way to universal confidence and even reverence; its resolutions assumed greater authority and greater definiteness. In 1877, 173 Bishops were invited; 108 accepted the invitation, and all Branches of the Anglican Communion were represented. In 1888, 200 Bishops were invited, and 145 attended. Finally in 1897—the year being chosen as the 1300th Anniversary of the

landing in England of St. Augustine of Canterbury—the number of Bishops invited was 250, and of these 193 actually met at Lambeth. By this time the Conference had assumed its true dignity. It had its solemn inauguration at Canterbury, and its great services at the beginning and close of its Session at Westminster Abbey and St. Paul's Cathedral; it symbolized the continuity of the life of the Church by visits to the landing-place of St. Augustine, and to Glastonbury, the representative of the earlier British Christianity; it was formally and graciously received by the Queen at Windsor; and its resolutions were eagerly and respectfully welcomed by public opinion. Its utterances to the world—in the Encyclical Letter, in the formal Resolutions passed (no less than 63), and in a body of interesting Reports of Committees, generally approved by the Conference—were full and authoritative. Without claiming to be formally a Supreme Synod it spoke with a supreme moral authority; for it was virtually a General Council of the whole Anglican Communion.

It should be noted, moreover, that, while its Resolutions provided for the fuller organisation of the Anglican Communion itself, for meeting its Liturgical needs, for the development of Church life and Theological Education in its Colonial Branches, yet they indicated still more clearly the relinquishment of the old “insularity” of idea by dealing largely with its relation to other Christian Communions. Declaring that “every opportunity “should be taken to emphasize the Divine purpose of visible “unity amongst Christians as a fact of Divine Revelation”, the Conference went on to consider in detail how far any approach could be made in different directions towards the drawing more closely together of the now divided Communions of Christendom. Towards these Communions which have separated themselves from the old Church in days gone by, and which now include so much of the religious faith and energy of the English-speaking race there was (as in 1888) a strong desire to initiate on the part of the Church herself some earnest attempt towards reunion. It was resolved that the Bishops of the several Churches of the Anglican Communion be urged to appoint Committees of Bishops, where they have not been already appointed, to watch for opportunities of united prayer and mutual conference between representatives of different Christian bodies, and to give counsel

where counsel may be asked in this matter; that these Committees confer with and assist each other, and regard themselves as responsible for reporting to the next Lambeth Conference what has been accomplished in this respect.

The task thus set before the Church is one of formidable difficulty; but it is at least significant that it should be attempted, and pressed upon her as a wish of paramount and urgent duty. In relation to the Roman Communion in its present condition the Conference could hold out no prospect of Reunion "being painfully aware that it would be entertained by the "authorities of that Church only on condition of a complete "submission to its claim of absolute authority and an accep- "tance of its errors in doctrine and discipline". But in relation to the great Churches of the East, with which the position of England as a great Oriental power brings the English Church into friendly contact, the Conference desired to invite communication with a view to secure, if possible, greater mutual knowledge and closer relations. In respect of the Moravian and Scandinavian Churches, steps were recommended towards what might be hereafter fuller intercommunion. In relation to the Old Catholic movement in Germany and Switzerland the attitude of the Conference was one of emphatic respect and cordiality, as is seen by the following Resolution:

"That in accordance with the sentiments expressed by the Bishops who met in the last Conference, we regard it as our duty to maintain and promote friendly relations with the Old Catholic Community in Germany, and with the Christian Catholic Church in Switzerland, assuring them of our sympathy, of our thankfulness to God Who has held them steadfast in their efforts for the preservation of the Primitive Faith and Order, and Who, through all discouragements, difficulties, and temptations, has given them the assurance of His blessing, in the maintenance of their principles, in the enlargement of their congregations, and in the increase of their Churches. We continue the offer of the religious privileges by which the Clergy and faithful Laity may be admitted to Holy Communion on the same conditions as our own Communicants."

With the movements towards the formation of independent Episcopal Communions in Mexico, Brazil, France, Italy, Spain

and Portugal, which are as yet only tentative and somewhat indefinite, the Conference desired to express a decided sympathy while not yet able to consider the question of Inter-Communion. In all these directions it is evident how remarkably the Anglican Communion of the present day is awakened to the need and blessing of a larger Christian unity. But this greater expansiveness of idea is brought out, perhaps even more strikingly, in the stress laid upon the work of Foreign Missions as that to which under the Providence of God the Anglican Communion is especially called and which as yet has been but inadequately done. The Encyclical Letter says emphatically:

“We have especial reasons to be thankful to God for the “awakened and increasing zeal of our whole Communion for “this primary work of the Church, the work for which the “Church was commissioned by our Lord. For some centuries “it may be said we have slumbered. The duty has not been “quite forgotten, but it has been remembered only by individuals “and Societies; the body as a whole has taken no part. “We are beginning, though only beginning, to see what “the Lord would have us do. He is opening the whole world “to our easy access, and as He opens the way He is opening “our eyes to see it, and to see His beckoning hand.”

Accordingly the Resolutions and Report examine the relation of Christianity to Judaism, Mohammedanism and the great heathen religions of the world; they recognise the need of unity on the substantials of the faith and large variety of development in native Churches; they see clearly that, as soon as possible, these should advance to freedom and self-dependence; they urge the duty of frank recognition of other Missionary Agencies. In all this the Conference of 1897 seems to mark a new departure in the idea and practice of the Anglican Communion.

(V) The ideal clearly set forth is that of a free Federation of Churches, under the Supreme Headship of Our Lord Jesus Christ, and with as much as possible of intercommunion with one another. Within the Anglican Communion that ideal expresses itself, at once in the Synodical Organisation of its

various Branches, and in the Conference itself, as virtually, although not formally, a General Council of a Patriarchal type. In relation to other Communions all that can yet be done is to endeavour to draw nearer together, always in friendly sympathy and brotherly communication and in intercommunion, where possible. The future is in God's hands. But the effect to an *Œcumical* Council freely chosen, which the English Reformation of the sixteenth century made, seems now to be assuming a greater importance and a greater reality. On the simple basis of unity laid down—in the acceptance of Holy Scripture as the Rule of Faith, of the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds, of the Two Great Sacraments of the Gospel, and the "Historic Episcopate"—it is more and more clearly seen that the superstructure raised must be of large freedom and variety.

It is obvious that this Ideal stands out in strong contrast with that of an universal spiritual Empire, centered in one Infallible head, which is now more than ever since the Vatican Council the ideal of the Roman Communion. This latter ideal has, like all despotism, its compactness and apparent simplicity. But no one who studies the progress of humanity under the Providence of God can doubt that with the larger and freer ideal lies the destiny of the future. If, not from any merits of its own, but from the position and constitution which the Providence of God has given it, the Anglican Communion can have any share in what has been called "the Ministry of Reconciliation", it is certain that it will be hailed as a priceless privilege by her leaders and the great body of her members. The progress towards it will not be the less sure, if, in accordance with general English traditions, it is attempted gradually, and in detail, wherever the way seems to open itself. For any reunion of Christendom must be a growth rather than an artificial creation, and in most true growth some slowness and irregularity are the price—and a cheap price—which must be paid for real vitality. But at the same time the true Ideal must be distinctly recognised, and right caution in advance towards it must not be exaggerated into that timidity, which, daring nothing, will achieve nothing of great and noble enterprise.

This growth, moreover, of the Anglican Communion, while it naturally produces a higher conception of its own character

and mission, tends at the same time to break down in the minds of its members that self-complacent idea of its own perfection, which was perhaps natural in its period of mere insularity. Happily this is being replaced by a larger and truer idea of the necessary variety of the Branches of a really Catholic Church—each having its own excellencies and defects—each its own mission for God and its own adaptations in order to fulfil that mission. This is the spirit of true Brotherhood in Christ. Only by such Brotherhood, under the Supreme Headship of Christ and Supreme Fatherhood of God, can therefore be any hope of reunion of these divided Communions, which ought to be one.

Bishop ALFRED BARRY,
formerly Bishop of Sidney and Primate of Australia.
