

referred to the many cases of contrivance in Nature which exist on every side. On the contrary, I have indicated great principles and arrangements, running through the course of Creation, which seem to point to a grand purpose, and to an ever-present design. The facts are undoubted; it is our duty to consider what conclusion is to be drawn from them. We have presented to us a vast series of harmonies, adjustments, and combinations, all of which manifestly worked together towards a special end; while through the long ages of Creation's course there are no signs whatever of confusion or disorganization.

The countless changes in the earth's physical condition in the past all led up to a state of permanent stability, general quietude, and fully-developed beauty; and the myriads of its living creatures from the beginning of Creation did not swarm over land and sea in confused and disarranged millions, but were grouped into regular divisions, linked together by special resemblances, and guided in their developments towards special ends. All these combinations indicate a plan, originating in a profound thought. But there cannot be thought without a *thinker*, and as a thinker must necessarily be a *person*, we reach the conclusion that Creation had its origin in the mind of an almighty Person, while it received its development from the hand of the same omnipotent Agent. Thus far does physical nature testify to the existence of a Great First Cause, and then the moral nature of man takes up the argument, and by revealing to us through conscience that we are each responsible to One above who loves goodness and hates evil, tells us that we recognise no mere blind energy, but One whom it is our blessed privilege to call "Our Father which art in heaven."

D. GATH WHITLEY.

PROFESSOR BURY'S "LIFE OF ST. PATRICK."

FEW, if any, countries hold the missionary who first brought Christianity to their shores in such honour as Ireland does St. Patrick. The complete success of his efforts, the length of time he was enabled to labour in the land, the romantic circumstances of his early association with the country, combine to win for him a unique place among national saints. Other elements, too, have contributed to bring about the affectionate veneration, touched with a sort

of humorous pride, with which Irishmen regard his memory. We must ascribe the grounds of this lasting "popularity" to certain traits in the Saint's personal character. It may be the modern conception of his personality is coloured by the reflection of national characteristics. Yet there is authentication for attributing to him a fine impulsiveness, an engaging simplicity, a ready sympathy, and a capacity for embarking on bold and dashing enterprises. Furthermore, it is questionable if any missionary of the Cross has so profoundly marked the local place names. Ireland is studded with places which bear Patrick's name, and are reminiscent of his activity. Innumerable are the popular legends of his mighty and even whimsical achievements.

Notwithstanding the devotion of the "sea-divided Gael" to St. Patrick's memory, the sources of this hero-worship are not always such as would satisfy the analytical soul of a modern historical investigator. The trouble is that there are too many "Lives" of St. Patrick. The fervent imagination of his admirers has revelled in depicting the opulence of his wonder-working powers. Some writers have sought to solve the problem by admitting another figure of the same name to share the honours; while recently the German writer Zimmer has ventured the assertion that there was no St. Patrick; that he was a sort of legendary Irish Prester John.

In this disturbing state of things it is reassuring to find the Regius Professor of Modern History at Cambridge—himself an Irishman—producing a volume of four hundred pages in explication of St. Patrick's life and place in history. The Professor is a leader of the straitest school of historical research. He is skilled in sounding his way through the fogs and shoals of conflicting records. And he entertains not a shadow of doubt either of the historicity of St. Patrick or of the genuineness of the writings ascribed to him—the Confession, and the Denunciation of Coroticus. Zimmer's higher critical negations are lightly brushed aside. His theory of "the origin of the Patrick legend" is styled the purest speculation. Evidently it is not only in Biblical matters that the dissolvent tendencies of Teutonic criticism are given play.

The supreme value of this biography may be expressed in a word—it is scientific. Professor Bury took up the task feeling the original materials had never been scientifically sifted. The subject was "wrapt in obscurity, and this obscurity was encircled with an atmosphere of controversy and conjecture." Perhaps he is too hard on his predecessors here. His examination does not revolutionize the status of the sources. (We shall have something to say later on con-

cerning his own dealings in "conjecture.") The important thing is that the searchlight of brilliant and dispassionate scholarship has not dissipated the accepted ideas of St. Patrick's work. The valuable appendices furnish examples of patient thoroughness given to the elucidation of minute and possibly uncongenial points. A further distinction of this study is the varied information Professor Bury, from the richness of his historical equipment, is able to impart on several details of St. Patrick's story. Take, for instance, the well-known fact that St. Patrick's father was a Roman Decurion and a Deacon in the Church. Our author tells us much that is interesting about the municipal organization of the period: the unenviable position of Decurions in being responsible for the local share of the then crushing taxation—how they sometimes sought to evade the penalties of civic rank by entering Holy Orders. The general effect of such co-ordinations of facts is to give a presentation of Patrick remarkable for its vividness. For this our thanks are due.

Space does not permit to dwell on the story of the boy, dragged by freebooters from his home, sold into slavery in a foreign land, coming back in after-years to proclaim the Gospel to his captors. Deeply touching is his own account of the yearning that would not let him rest when restored to the home of his family. We are reminded of St. Paul by the shores of the *Ægean Sea* as we read of the man who came to Patrick in a vision and gave him a letter containing "the voice of the Irish. And as I read the beginning of it I fancied that I heard the voice of the folk who were near the wood of Fochlad, nigh to the Western Sea. And this was the cry: 'We pray thee, holy youth, to come and again walk amongst us as before.' I was pierced to the heart, and could read no more, and thereupon I awoke."

His work in Ireland may be definitely fixed, as lying between A.D. 432 and A.D. 461. In the latter year he finished his course in Saul, his first Christian establishment in Ireland, by the shores of Strangford Lough. The years between these dates were full of dangers and labours and glorious accomplishment. With dauntless enthusiasm he ceaselessly traversed the country, confronting paganism in its most imposing strongholds, attaching to himself and his cause many men of high rank and strong personality. Christianity was known in the land before his coming, but had made little impression. At his death Ireland was a Christian island. The foundations of the Church were well and truly laid.

The early Celtic Church organization was strongly tribal and monastic. Patrick's training in the great foundations of Gaul account for this latter feature. Such complications, as

a dual succession to the abbacies, resulted from the unique stress given to the hereditary rights of the tribe.

Another peculiar characteristic was the position of the Episcopate. That St. Patrick established diocesan episcopacy Professor Bury is positive. "It is not credible that he was not guided by geographical considerations in his ordination of Bishops" (p. 375). The Bishops' districts, it is true, must have been small. This was conditioned by the tribal arrangements. Patrick is said to have consecrated between 350 and 450 bishops. Soon monasteries insisted on having practically each its own Bishop. But our Presbyterian friends fall into a curious mistake when they see here an argument against the rights of the Episcopate. It more correctly represents an unduly high opinion of its indispensability. The only question is concerning the diocesan jurisdiction, and not at all about the functions of the Episcopate as a separate order, with power of ordaining.

The remainder of this notice must be given to criticism of a few points :

1. The author's tone is rather superior. Thus, he charges Dr. Todd, who wrote the standard "Life of St. Patrick," with "ecclesiastical bias," and continues: "For one whose interest in the subject is purely intellectual, it was a matter of un-mixed indifference what answer might be found to any one of the vexed questions." This is a cavalier mode of utterance for the son of an Irish parsonage. There may be intellectual bias, as well as ecclesiastical. It is more regrettable to notice the disdainful aloofness the young Professor adopts in speaking of "emotions intelligible to the children of reason who do not understand the need of 'saints' for fasting and prayer." Pelagius is eulogized for having "attempted to rescue the dignity of human nature oppressed with the doctrine of sin." Peculiar sympathy is claimed for him "who dared to say that before Jesus sinless men had lived upon earth" (p. 46). Scrupulous fairness, of course, is found in this book; but sympathetic appreciation of St. Patrick's aims and inspirations is outside the scope of Professor Bury's qualifications. He is more at home as an interpreter of Gibbon.

2. One or two new theories are adopted without, apparently, sufficient proof. Dumbarton as the birthplace of St. Patrick is discarded in favour of a vague locality in the regions of the lower Severn. The scene of his captivity is removed from Slemish to Croagh Patrick, in Connaught. This startling change is based chiefly on one word—*adhuc*—in the message of the people of Fochlad ("walk *still* among us"). There are less drastic explanations than the repudiation of the two

oldest biographers—Tirechan and Muirchu—and of the most firmly fixed of local traditions.¹ The correspondence of Muirchu's narrative with the physical features of the country and the present-day names for these spots is striking. Scholars like Todd and Reeves endorse the story. Professor Gwynn not only gives his high authority to it, but believes that Muirchu wrote from an intimate personal knowledge of the locality. Since Professor Bury rejects the return visit to Dalariadia, where St. Patrick's old master, Miliuce, is said to have lived, he is left without an adequate reason to assign for the Saint's original journey so far north as Strangford Lough. The difficulties are increased for his theory by the fact that Miliuce was a historical character, whose son Gosact is admitted to have been a convert of Patrick's. We do not anticipate that many will follow Professor Bury in severing the ties that connect Patrick's memory with the valley of the Braid.

3. The most controversial question relating to St. Patrick is his alleged connection with Rome. Professor Bury is evidently very anxious to represent him as deeply influenced by the greatness of the empire and its religion. Even if we were to allow the prestige claimed for the Roman Church in the fifth century, it does not follow from such *à priori* grounds that Patrick actually visited Rome, or held its commission, or prescribed appeals thereto. We have seen the Professor objecting to other writers' "conjectures" about Patrick. His own book bristles with copious "conjectures." The manner in which trivial points are cherished and magnified if they tend to connect Patrick with Rome, shows that even those who exalt their impartiality are as liable to the distorting effects of a favourite theory as ordinary mortals. Thus we are told: "We may be sure he was brought up to feel a deep reverence for the empire . . . and to regard Rome as the mighty bulwark of the world" (pp. 23, 24). Patrick's reference to Ireland as "the ultimate places of the earth" makes the Professor straightway moralize "how thoroughly, how touchingly, Roman was Patrick's geographical view." We wonder if a politician could deduce anything from the words as to St. Patrick's touching Home Rule views! The conjecture that "we may be sure some overture or message had come from the Christian bodies in Ireland" prior to Pope Celestine consecrating Palladius, is made the basis of a formidable series of reconstructions of history. Celestine did

¹ "Few places retain more vivid traditions concerning the sojourns and actions of our Saint."—Professor G. T. Stokes, "Ireland and the Celtic Church," p. 54.

not consecrate Patrick, but once he was asked to choose a Bishop for Ireland, "it was a matter of indifference who consecrated his successor." Ecclesiastical writers can scarcely surpass this for special pleading and building on an unproven hypothesis. Did the Saxons send an overture to Gregory before Augustine's consecration? The section of the book headed "Visit to Rome," begins ominously as follows: "It is possible that Patrick had intended in earlier years to visit Rome long before he began his labours in Ireland. If he entertained such a thought it would seem that circumstances hindered him from realizing it. But it would not have been unnatural if he continued to cherish the idea of repairing to the centre of Western Christendom. And we might expect," etc. Professor Bury's name has not hitherto been identified with this sort of supposition weaving. Even the very motives of his visit to Rome are arrived at—by surmise. "It is possible he may have had a more particular motive." "It is not a very daring conjecture to suppose that Patrick may have wished to consult the Roman Bishop concerning this design"—viz., the founding of Armagh.

The authorities for the visit are two: (a) An entry in the annals of Ulster recording that Leo was made Bishop of Rome, and that Patrick was "approved in the Catholic faith" (Probatus est in fide Catolica). Is it not far fetched to read so much into so innocent and vague a note of a late annalist? (b) The other source is Tirechan, who in the same sentence makes an obviously impossible statement connecting the visit with a thirty years' course of foreign study. Notwithstanding such reasoning, we cannot help being amazed when we find the Professor declaring: "No less than Augustine, no less than Boniface, he" (Patrick) "was the bearer of the *Roman idea*" (p. 221).

Against all this there is the one simple fact that Patrick in his writings makes not the slightest reference to Rome or its authority. Nor is it a mere argument from silence. The Confession is somewhat in the nature of an Apologia. There is a clear note of bitterness in both writings. He speaks as if he had to justify himself against the envy and injustice of jealous detractors. Now, if St. Patrick held a commission from Rome, and if he felt the supposed reverence for that See, is it possible that, when on his defence, he would not have urged his commission, instead of falling back on his unselfish motives, and apologizing for his lack of literary training? The very point of intrusion seems to have been charged against him.

The Church which he founded came soon into dire conflict with the Church of Rome. In the seventh century Ireland

was convulsed by the efforts made to impose the Roman tonsure and method of computing Easter on the people. Mutual accusations of heresy were rife, and even re-ordination ordered by an English Council for those who had Irish orders. Colman left his Bishopric at Lindisfarne rather than submit to Rome. If St. Patrick instituted obedience to Rome, how are we to account for such indignant repudiation of her behests? St. Columba was born within sixty-one years and St. Columbanus within eighty-two years of Patrick's death. This period is altogether too short for such a revolution of the founder's organization.

Muirchu, the biographer of St. Patrick, was an adherent of the Roman side in the controversy. It would have been his interest then to have identified St. Patrick with Rome. He does not do so, even to the extent of recording the visit to Rome.

There is a canon—considered Patrician by Professor Bury—sanctioning appeals to Rome in matters of dispute. Cummian, an ardent and erudite Romanizer of the seventh century, does not refer to it. Professor Bury ingenuously suggests "it is quite possible that he was not aware of the canon." It is incredible that Cummian, who cites profusely foreign ecclesiastics and councils, should not have known of genuine decrees issued by Patrick, Auxilius, and Iserninus to all the Irish clergy.

It should be remembered that our position as a Church is in no way invalidated, even if it was the case that Patrick held the commission of Rome. Professor Bury is careful to show that the Roman idea he imputes to Patrick "belonged to days when the Church was still closely bound to the empire, and owed her high prestige to the older institution. . . . The Pope had not yet become a spiritual Cæsar Augustus as he is at the present day. . . . The Roman idea at this stage meant, not the idea of subjection to the Roman See, but of Christianity, as the religion of the Roman Empire" (p. 221). Does he not go too far, however, when he claims that the Roman Church was regarded in Ireland as the highest authority in Christendom? How about St. Columbanus's words to Pope Boniface IV., whom he addresses as head of the Churches of *Europe*: "Rome is the head of the Churches of the world, saving the singular prerogative of the place of the Lord's Resurrection."

It is surprising that Professor Bury has not recognised more fully the traces of Eastern Christianity in the Celtic Church. When St. Patrick was at Lerins he was in the centre of Eastern influences. That monastery was founded on the Eastern model by St. Honoratus, who had himself

made a pilgrimage towards the Orient. Here we may have a cause of St. Patrick's independence of the Roman Church, which should not be ignored in estimating his place in history.

W. S. KERR.

THE ESSENTIAL ELEMENT IN SACRIFICE AMONG THE SEMITES.

I.

THAT the question as to what the essential element in sacrifice originally was, is not merely academic, has, it is hoped, been shown in a previous article.¹ For those who maintain that there is a basis for the belief in the evolution of religious conceptions, who are convinced of the eternal existence and omnipotence of God, and who believe that in all ages God's love for His creation has been manifested, the importance of considering what have been the conceptions of the relationship between God and man (*i.e.*, the central core of all religion) in the early history of mankind, so far as this is known, will be obvious. For this relationship, or man's varying conceptions of it, has in all times been outwardly manifested by sacrifice. Both the form and the meaning of sacrifice have gone through different stages during the religious history of mankind, from the earliest ages up to the present day; but one thing has been common to man from the beginning, namely, that sacrifice was the visible expression, on the part of man, of his belief in the relationship between himself and his God.

Moreover, be the primitive conceptions of sacrifice what they may, the adequate study of the most spiritual forms of sacrifice in the Christian Church is impossible without a reference to them; for the fundamental truths (or, at least, the adumbration of the fundamental truths) which they contain are indelibly marked upon all subsequent conceptions of sacrifice.

There are, indeed, few things which more forcibly tend to strengthen belief, not only in a "Final Cause," not only in a Creator of the world, but also in an Eternal Father, who both created and loved His children, than this *fact* of an irresistible longing on the part of man, throughout all ages, of effecting that closer union between himself and his God which, directly or indirectly, lies at the bottom of all conceptions of sacrifice,

¹ CHURCHMAN, June, 1905: "Sacrifice: a Study in Comparative Religion."