

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php

ARTICLE V.

THE CONNECTION BETWEEN THE MOSAIC AND PAGAN SACRIFICES.¹

A COMPARISON of the Mosaic ritual with pagan superstitions, with particular reference to the subject of sacrifices, would seem to promise some aid towards a more correct view of the import of Jewish sacrifices. In entering, as it is now proposed to do, on such a comparison, one has to lament that the materials for it are not more abundant; or rather, that they do not exist in such a form that the most advantageous use can be made of them. Without promising, however, any thing like a complete description of the almost endlessly diverse and complicated systems of pagan worship, we will venture on this comparison.

The idea of sacrifice seems to be more prominent, and to have assumed a more precise and definite shape, among the Hindoos than among any other Oriental people. The Hindoo worship is rich in sacrificial rites to an almost unexampled degree; but we are spared the necessity of an enumeration and comparison of the nearly countless parts of this ritual, by the fact that one species of sacrifice in use among the Hindoos has a prominence superior to all others; so much so, as to render a reference to these others superfluous. The sacrifice we have now in view, is that one which is spoken of in the religious books of the Hindoos as the *king of sacrifices*, and to which they give the name of *Aswamehda*, or sacrifice of horses. All others rank as subordinate to this, are of altogether inferior importance and efficacy. It may, therefore,

¹ Bähr's *Symbolik*, Vol. ii. pp. 217-266, has furnished the material for this Article, and it is hoped that no reader will fail to observe that Bähr alone is responsible for the theories set forth in it. As some inconvenience has already been occasioned by the forgetfulness of this fact, special attention to it is now asked.

be justly supposed to embody in itself, in the purest and most complete form, the Hindoo conception of sacrifice. It is consequently a matter of special moment to gain, if possible, a proper idea of its nature.

We are fortunately not left to gather the nature and import of this sacrifice by inference from the ritual with which it is connected. On the contrary, we find in the sacred books of the Hindoos positive statements in regard to it, sufficiently ample and explicit to remove all ambiguity.

According to the sacred books, then, the horse, which in the Aswamehda is offered in sacrifice, is the Viradsch, that is, the life principle pervading the whole universe, and in which the Divine Being reveals himself. For this reason the name Viradsch is sometimes translated, as, for instance, by Von Hanmer, "the universally revealed original Being." Every part of the horse symbolizes some particular component of the world as existing in space and time. The head is the symbol of the morning; the eye, of the sun; the open mouth represents fire, or the natural heat which pervades the whole world; the breath is the symbol of the atmosphere; the body, considered as a whole, of the year; the individual limbs are the months; the feet are the sign of day and night; the bones of the fixed stars; while the neighing of the horse is the symbol of human speech. In the sacrifice of the horse, the gushing forth of the blood was meant to signify the development of the divine life-principle, the manifestation of the Divine Being in the creation, the giving to the world his own life; in other words, a revelation of the Divine Being. This sacrifice, then, may be regarded as a symbolical representation of the cosmogony.

In agreement with this statement, we find the creation of the world set forth in the Hindoo books as a sacrifice, in which each of the gods takes part, and each receives as his share a portion of the sacrificed victim. The divinity, in the act of creation, completes himself; the ideal becomes the real; the divinity allows the unity of its essence to be divided, just as a sacrifice is divided, and to be distributed into as many por-

tions as there are individuals to be created. Thus surrendering, as it were, the infinity of its own being in its manifestation under the form of a finite existence, the divinity may be said to sacrifice itself. The gods, by whose direct agency this sacrifice is performed, and who, as has been said, distribute among themselves the parts into which the victim, *the original being*, is divided, are the real finite existences, the individual substances of which the universe is made up.

According to Hindoo conceptions, therefore, as may be plainly enough inferred from what has just been said, the origin and first appointment of sacrifices are to be traced to Brahma, who, in the original act of creation, gave the first example of sacrifice. In the religious pictures and sculptures of the Hindoos, Brahma is represented in the act of sacrificing; his wife, Sarasvati, the personified wisdom of the world, by whom its various parts are skilfully adjusted to each other, aids in the service. With a similar significance, life is sometimes represented as issuing forth from Siva; that is to say, Siva is sacrificing himself. The libations which accompanied the great sacrifice already described, were meant to be symbolical of this same act. The Hindoos, then, as we judge, regarded sacrifice, on the one hand, as the passing of the universal life into the individual and finite; and on the other hand, as the absorption of the individual into the universal life, the original ground of all being. The finite, in thus surrendering its life to the divinity, does, in that very act, and in the highest possible sense, receive life. The original ground of all being then only attains to an actual existence when it produces finite beings, thus imparting to them a portion of itself; and the finite, when its existence in that form terminates, is only absorbed into the infinite, and in that change reaches the highest form of life of which it is capable. Hence men, animals, plants — whatever is used in sacrifice — do, by virtue of that act, reach the highest possible form of existence. They thereby become identified with the gods.

It is not unworthy of special note here, that the sacrifice in which, as we have seen, the Hindoos are wont to represent

the act of creation is spoken of as a species of sin-offering. And the taking away of sin is reckoned as one of the chief effects of the Aswamehda, the great sacrifice. It is evident, however, that the sin which is thus described as being taken away, is not of a moral, but merely of a cosmical character ; the sacrifice by means of which this removal of sin is effected consisting only in the accomplishment of a union of the individual with the universal life, of the limited with the unlimited, of the transient with the eternal.

We repeat, then, the fundamental idea of sacrifice, according to Hindoo modes of thinking, is nothing but the transfusion of the life of one being into another. It is a form of self-abnegation. The Brahmins teach that the horse which is sacrificed in the Aswamehda passes away, to abide forever in the limitless world-sea. They mean, in this way of expressing themselves, to inculcate the doctrine, that all individual self-subsistence is destined to be at length absorbed into the great world-spirit. As an illustration, we may take notice that among the five sacrifices enjoined in the laws of Menu on every Brahmin, the Ahuta, or the study of the Vedas, is the chief. The Vedas are the word, the revelation of Brahma, flowing from his own lips. To read and meditate upon these demands the absorption of one's own thought in that of the divinity. It is the surrender of the soul to the divine inspiration, and the soul, by virtue of this, comes into union with him who is manifested in the Vedas.

Coming now to a more particular consideration of Hindoo sacrifices, we encounter, first of all, the familiar distinction in use among them of the bloody and the bloodless. Both of these classes of sacrifices are equally ancient, but the former is referred to in the Vedas more frequently, and with greater definiteness. As, however, the Hindoo cultus has a more particular reference to Vishnu and Siva, — Brahma, in this point of view, standing in the back-ground, — two classes of sacrifices are offered respectively to these two divinities ; the bloody to Siva and the bloodless to Vishnu. This distinction is, in the estimation of the Hindoos, of such importance as to

have given rise to two sects of religionists, each deriving its name from one or the other of these two gods; each regarding the other with a degree of hostility that has at times occasioned even bloody contests.

The distinction of Hindoo sacrifices into the two classes just specified, has its origin in the different natures of the divinities to which they are offered. Vishnu is the preserving, the nourishing principle, begotten of water, and giving birth to other productions in that element. His wife is Lakshmi, the goddess of fruitfulness. All growth and all productions being conditioned on the presence of moisture, belong to Vishnu, are his workmanship and offspring. The moon, among the Hindoos, and indeed among most nations of antiquity, being supposed to have a special agency in the processes of vegetation, is for this reason viewed as sacred to Vishnu and Siva. To Vishnu, consequently, are offered in sacrifice all those things in which his life and nature are conceived to be represented. This is wholly in accordance with the view already set forth, of the fundamental idea of sacrifice, as being the absorption of the individual into the universal life.

Siva, on the other hand, is the principle of destruction, and of reproduction as its consequence. His essence is absolute motion. The element in which he resides is not water, but fire. He is the god especially of animal and organic life. His nature, consequently, is represented not in the processes of vegetation, but in that form of life which exists through the agency of blood, and whose essence is warmth and motion. Bloody sacrifices, therefore, have a close correspondence to the nature of Siva. The ritual prescribed for the sacrifices to Siva, for this reason, recognizes the blood as the essential element. The Hindoo book which contains the precepts relative to sacrifices to Siva bears the name of *Caput sanguinarium*, in evident allusion to the peculiar characteristic of these sacrifices. After the victim offered in sacrifice has been killed, his blood is solemnly borne into the presence of Siva, and yielded up to him.

It is not possible to dwell with any great degree of minuteness on the peculiar characteristics or accompaniments of Hindoo sacrifices. One feature of them, however, may be alluded to, for the sake of illustrating their cosmical rather than ethical character. The appropriate place for the sacrifice about to be performed was an apartment perfectly square; within this apartment a line was to be drawn towards the east; from one end of this line, and towards the right hand angle of the room, another line is to be drawn, somewhat longer than the first, towards the north; from this again proceed three other lines, parallel with the first; the first of these lines is to be of a white color, and is sacred to the earth; the second red, and is sacred to the element of fire; the third black, and is sacred to Brahma; the fourth blue, and is sacred to heaven or India; the fifth white, and is sacred to the moon. In this representation, those numbers to which the Hindoos attached the most importance — three, four, five — are combined, and are meant to refer to certain cosmical relations. A special significance was supposed to attach to the direction of these lines towards the right; the matter to which the sacrifice particularly referred being thus, as it were, symbolically carried around along with the sacrifice itself, and following the direction of the sun, or else really carried seven times around the sacrifice. These rites, at first view trivial and unmeaning, appear to have had special reference to the motions of the planets around the sun. The whole ceremony is a very ancient one, and altogether peculiar to the Hindoo worship, and is supposed to indicate, in some way, those emotions of surprise, admiration, reverence, with which the divinity and his works should ever be regarded.

The worship of the ancient Persians was in general characterized by great simplicity. Its sacrificial ritual, especially, was far less rich and complicated than that of the Hindoos. Yet in the Persian worship, sacrifice occupied a very prominent, indeed a central place. In attempting to ascertain what were the notions entertained by the ancient Persians of the nature of sacrifice, it is important to keep in mind, that

in their view, the divinity required nothing more of the animal sacrificed than the soul, the *Psyche*. After the victim had been put to death and cut in pieces, the worshippers were allowed to take away the flesh, and use it for such purposes as they pleased. It was not, consequently, the animal as a whole which was devoted to the divine being in sacrifice, but only the principle of life. This was the *sacrifice* properly and distinctively, and this was supposed to be offered in the effusion of the blood; the principle of life, in the mind of the Persians, residing in the blood. It was for this reason that the officiating priest allowed his hand to rest on the animal sacrificed until it had expired, and the blood had entirely passed out. We see, then, that in the estimation of the Persians the essential idea of sacrifice consisted in the offering up of the soul, the life, to the divinity.

This conception of the import of sacrifice is brought to view in the circumstance that as among the Hindoos the study of the Vedas is considered as a species of sacrifice, so in the Persian ritual, the study of the "Law"¹ forms the second essential element of sacrifice; that study being regarded as an offering to the original word, of which the law was thought to be the incarnation. As the mind allows itself to be absorbed in this revelation, this word of life, it enters, by virtue of this, into vital union with this original word, which is nothing less than the divinity revealing itself. And this absorption of the soul into the law is the condition of the reception on its part, and the permanent possession of a new life.

One may perhaps gain a better understanding of the Persian idea of sacrifice by taking a more particular notice of

¹ We are to understand by the term "Law," that portion of the *Zend-Avesta* to which the name *Vendidad* is given. It was the work of Zoroaster, who claims, however, that he received it from Ormuzd. The *Vendidad* is the law imparted to Zoroaster by Ormuzd, much as the Sinaic law was given to Moses by Jehovah. Among the means of purification enjoined on all worshippers, we find as the second, the reading of the *Vendidad* or the word, the law of Ormuzd. It was to be read daily by the priest in the public religious service, and by the people in private. — Rhode *Die Heilige Sage*, pp. 27, 417 (Compiler).

what were, in their view, the two most important varieties of sacrifices, that of the horse and of the ox. The horse was sacrificed to the sun, as being in a special sense sacred to it. In keeping with this idea, the chariot of the sun was represented as drawn by four horses. The neighing of the horse on certain occasions was looked upon as the result of a divine inspiration and a manifestation of the divine will.¹ The horse, according to Persian views, was in the highest sense "the animal," and his vital power was identical with the vital power of the sun; he was regarded, indeed, as the incarnation of the sun. When, consequently, the vital principle of the victim was, in the act of sacrifice, devoted to the divinity, it was considered as equivalent to the surrender of the individual to the universal life from which it had originally gone forth; and this sentiment was supposed to be in the mind of the worshipper, and to give to the act of sacrificing its religious character, namely, that in it himself, his soul, was virtually surrendered to the divinity, the original source of all life.

The other variety of sacrifice above alluded to, that of the ox, ranked in importance higher than that of the horse. Like the *Aswamehda* of the Hindoos, it was styled the king of sacrifices. It becomes, then, a point of special moment to ascertain its meaning. And in making the attempt to do this, we are to bear in mind that this sacrifice was offered to Mithra, concerning whom Porphyry asserts, that he was in the form of an ox, the creator, the divinity whose prerogative it was to preside over all the processes of production. According to the conception of the Persians, this ox carried hidden within himself all forms of created life. From him, whatever has life proceeds; and yet in order to give life, he must himself die. His death imparts life to the world, as being made up of countless individual existences. Hence he is represented, while in the act of dying, as uttering the exclamation: "Behold in my death that which must take place in order

¹ See the account given by Herodotus (Book iii. Chaps. 85, 86), of the use made by Darius Hystaspes of the neighing of his horse for the purpose of securing to himself the Persian crown. (Compiler).

that animals may live." This creative death is symbolically set forth in the well-known sacrifice represented so often in the monuments of Mithra, in which he offers an ox on the altar. In this act Mithra stands in the place of Ormuzd ; he is the lord of the ox, and the ox becomes his symbol. But the ox, which is thus sacred to Mithra, presents to view his own proper essence, As Mithra, the sacrificer of the ox, stands in the place of Ormuzd, the supreme god, self-active in the work of creation, so the sacrificed victim, from whose opened body the seeds of all existences flow forth, becomes in this death the created world itself ; it is the divine essence becoming passive in the substantive, finite, created nature.

It was, therefore, wholly in keeping with the idea of the sacrifice now under consideration, that it should be performed usually at the entrance of a cave or grotto, a fit image of the created world. It should not be overlooked, as we contemplate this sacrifice, that it was viewed by the Persians as a species of atonement. Mithra is mediator between Ormuzd and Ahriman, the principles respectively of good and evil ; and this sacrifice is offered for the removal of the *original sin* committed by Ahriman. Ahriman is set forth as having struck the creative ox, so that he died ; but from this death all the life of nature results. So that the atonement meant to be effected in this act was fundamentally of a cosmical rather than of an ethical character. The sin of Ahriman is natural evil ; as in it the finite becomes united with the infinite, the transient with the eternal.

It is scarcely necessary to remind the reader that the sacrifices of the ancient Persians, so far as we are enabled to ascertain their significance, seem all quite analogous to those of the Hindoos, and one can scarcely avoid the conclusion that one was derived from the other, or that they have to be traced to a common original.

On account of the somewhat special relation in which Moses had stood to the Egyptians, and of the thoroughly Egyptian culture which he had received,— he being learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians,— and the consequent affinity which might

be conjectured to exist between the Hebrew and the Egyptian worship, the consideration of Egyptian sacrifices has a peculiar importance. It is, in some respects, unfortunate that the only authorities to which we can have recourse in the attempt to ascertain the nature of Egyptian sacrifices are Greek and Roman writers. These are not altogether trustworthy. We can place the most confidence in Herodotus, and shall, therefore, make the most use of the information given by him.

Herodotus imparts information especially concerning a sacrificial festival, the most important held among the Egyptians, and in honor of that one who among all their divinities occupied the most elevated rank. This great sacrifice was to the Egyptians what the sacrifice of the horse was to the Hindoos, and that of the ox to the Persians. We shall in the present discussion, therefore, dwell first upon this.

The animal employed in it was the ox; the god to whom it was sacrificed was Isis, and the place where the solemnity was held was Busiris; the chief temple of Isis, of which now only the ruins remain, having stood in Busiris. The sacrifice is said to have been attended by vast numbers, some of them coming from places not less remote than Caria in Asia Minor.

After the ox had been killed, its skin was removed, the entrails were taken out, but the other intestines, with the fat, were replaced in the body. The hoofs, the shanks, and the neck were then cut off, and what remained of the carcass having been filled with bread, honey, frankincense, myrrh, and other spices, and a large quantity of oil having been poured over it, was then burned. A fast is said to have uniformly preceded this festival-sacrifice; and during its continuance both the Egyptians and the foreigners who were present cut themselves with knives. After the burning of the body, such parts of it as had been previously cut off were eaten.

The remark appended by Herodotus to his account of these ceremonies, may give us aid in trying to ascertain their significance. He tells us, that the Egyptians sacrificed only

oxen, abstaining from sacrificing cows, because they were sacred to Isis, whose image is uniformly adorned with cows' horns. The ox, on the other hand, is sacred to Osiris, and is employed as the victim on this occasion, on this account. This sacrifice is not offered to Isis in her character as the wife of Osiris, but when, as in this sacrifice, she is represented as the chief divinity, it is because she is considered as identical with Athos; that is to say, the obscure, invisible ground of all being, from which all nature, and all the productive forces of nature, proceed, and to which they are to return. In this point of view Isis ranks above Osiris, in whom the soul and the body of nature is personified. When, therefore, the ox, the image of Osiris, is offered up to Isis as the same with Athos, we are to regard it as nothing else than a symbolic representation of the fact that all life emanates from Isis, has its home in her, and is to return to her.

All the rites connected with this sacrifice illustrate the correctness of the explanation just given; the place in which it is performed, where the ox is put to death, is named Busiris, that is to say, the grove of Osiris. The varied and precious productions of nature, with which the body before it was burned is said to have been filled, are to be taken as representatives of all the products which lie hidden in the womb of nature.

The division of the ox into parts, so prominent a rite in this sacrifice, and which is never performed in any other, reminds one directly of the well-known myth of the division of the body of Osiris into parts; and the more, that these were not burned, but distributed to those present, and eaten. We are told also in the mythology of the Greeks that Dionysus, to whose identity with Osiris, Plutarch bears unqualified testimony, was thus divided; an act which represents confessedly the division of the body of nature into its individual portions or elements. On this account Dionysus is denominated *ισοδαίτης*, "he who at feasts divides and distributes in grand portions the meat," to indicate that the real, the phenomenal, world is nothing but the ground of all being —

that which underlies and in effect constitutes all separate existences — divided, and thereby made apparent. As in the Hindoo cosmogonical sacrifice, which all the gods and demi-gods present to Brahma, the original creator, each of the attendant divinities takes his own share, and, according to the Grecian myth, the gods all celebrate a joint feast, so in this Egyptian sacrifice, the victim is divided into parts, which are distributed and consumed as at a feast; of this division, however, of the sacred ox, its death is the necessary antecedent. The ox must die, before its parts can be distributed and eaten; the division of the actually existent being is thus linked with, and is equivalent to, a surrender of itself to death; but this surrender of itself to death is the impartation of life to the individual parts and creatures of which the phenomenal world is composed. This is the necessary condition of their life and their preservation. The death of the ox — the representative of Osiris — is consequently the most important part of the festival-sacrifice. Prominence is given to this act by the fast by which the sacrifice is preceded, by the blows and wounds inflicted on themselves by the spectators, all which are to be considered as signs of grief in view of the death of the ox. Ceremonies of an altogether similar character took place at the festival of Adonis or Tammuz, in Hither Asia, referring to the sufferings and death of that god, and the new life which resulted from them.

The feast, which followed immediately upon the death of the ox, and the grief which it occasioned, was designed to be typical of the life whereof that death was the condition. The annual repetition of this festival grew out of the belief, that Osiris was the impersonation of the productive power of nature, and likewise the impersonation of the solar year. He reappears, consequently, at the beginning of each year, and repeats, in his own death, at once the decay of these powers and their resurrection to renewed life and energy. The festival may as a whole be regarded as a nature-festival, a joyful commemoration of the renewal of the year, and the consequent renewal of the face of the earth. It was replete with

allusions to the ideas common to all forms of nature-religion, and especially to the Egyptian conceptions of that religion. To what degree such symbolic representations of the doctrines of nature-religion were favorite forms of worship with the Egyptians, was shown in the mysteries periodically observed at Sais; of which dramatic exhibitions of the sufferings and death of Osiris formed, as we are distinctly assured by Herodotus, a conspicuous part.

Not less worthy of notice is another sacrifice of which Herodotus gives us an account. It was observed especially in the Thebais, and consisted in offering a ram to Jupiter Ammon, to whose worship the inhabitants of the Thebais were specially addicted. The skin of the victim was taken off, and suspended upon the statue of the god, and an image of Hercules was then placed in close proximity to it. The spectators then inflicted blows and wounds upon themselves, and afterwards buried the body of the ram in a consecrated sarcophagus. The occasion for these ceremonies is traced to the following myth: Hercules was particularly desirous of seeing Jupiter, who for a long time would not allow himself to be looked at. But at length, at the importunate entreaties of Hercules, he showed himself enveloped in the skin of a ram. The sacrifice now under consideration was a dramatic exhibition of this myth, which by quite general confession is of astronomical import. Ammon, the ram, began the Egyptian year, and he was the symbol of the opening spring. Hercules, Sem, was the sun as he shines in the spring with his full power. The ram, consequently, was the symbol common to both. We may see, then, in this festival a commemoration of the opening spring; as the period in which the vivifying, fructifying power begins to be again sensibly felt. The ram, as we have said, was the symbol of Ammon; and, inasmuch as the beginning of a new year presupposes the end of the preceding year, and as the opening of the spring, or the revival of nature, could not take place but on the condition of a winter going before, a cessation more or less complete of the unifying power of the sun, so the ram was repre-

sented as being dead and buried, and the usual signs of mourning are exhibited by the bereaved spectators; as if by no other means than death, life and animation can anywhere exist.

Still another sacrifice, according to the accounts of Herodotus, was presented at the full moon, when the sun having entered Taurus was in conjunction with the moon. The animal offered in this sacrifice was a swine; which animal being unclean could be used only in this particular sacrifice, and even then only as an offering to the two divinities, Selene (Isis) and Dionysus (Osiris); certain parts of the animal, especially the fat, were cast into the fire. The remaining parts were allowed to be eaten; but they could be eaten only on the day of the full moon. According to Plutarch, this sacrifice occurred at the commencement of spring. It was intended to be significant of the ascent of Osiris to the moon, because, according to the prevalent belief, Osiris impregnated Isis at that time, who then, as the moon, wandered through space, scattering everywhere in the air productive matter; thus infusing life and activity into the entire vegetable kingdom.

It is quite apparent from this account of the matter why a swine was selected as the victim in this sacrifice. To this animal the ancients ascribed the strongest productive power. No other animal gave birth to young in such large numbers, and at intervals so short. No animal accumulated in itself so much fat. The Egyptian attached pre-eminent value to the swine relatively to vegetation, and the promotion of the fertility of the soil. It was made use of especially at the time of sowing as helping to mix with the soil the fertilizing Nile-deposit the more perfectly.

In no sacrifice, perhaps, is the fact of eating the flesh of the victim of so easy explanation as in this, notwithstanding the Egyptians usually cherished the greatest abhorrence for the swine; never allowing themselves to eat it. But here we are to regard the swine as a symbol of productive power, and the eating of it, as significant of the nutritive and strengthen-

ing influence of that power. It is to be considered likewise as a species of worship, at least of grateful, if not religious recognition of that power.

One cannot but notice particularly in this instance, and indeed in regard to nearly all pagan sacrifices, that they are of a cosmical rather than an ethical character. They have scarcely any feature akin to those which among Christian nations are regarded as religious ceremonies. The evils, of whose removal they are either the symbol or the means, are in nearly all cases physical. With sin or with holiness, as these terms are used in the New Testament, they have no connection.

Quite a numerous class of sacrifices existed in the Egyptian worship, wholly distinct from these more important ones, and in which the idea of sacrifices presents itself in a different shape. We must here make the preliminary remark that the worship of the Egyptians consisted very much in the adoration of animals; in forms, indeed, it may be, less gross and disgusting than those observable among ruder and less cultivated nations. The animal world below was looked upon by them as the image of the celestial animals; the stars, as the collective divinities. Each Egyptian Nome had its particular sacred animal, which was an object with the people of peculiar veneration as an incarnation of a divinity. These different gods constituted a system of divinities. The chief divinities, indeed, such as Osiris and Isis, received worship in every district of the kingdom in the same manner. Oxen and cows were sacred in all the Nomes. But to these benignant divinities there stood opposed an evil god, Typhon, in whom was personified whatever interrupted or checked the salutary operation of natural forces. The essence of this malicious divinity the Egyptians conceived to be personified in various animals—different aspects of its hurtful energies being represented by different ones. Considered as the personification of the fierce heat, under whose baleful power the fertile valley of the Nile became a parched wilderness, Typhon was regarded as of a red color; and all animals of a similar hue

were looked upon on this account as sacred to him. In like manner, those animals were sacred to Typhon which were characterized by a peculiar wildness or stubbornness, or any other remarkably hurtful quality.

From all this, it is an easy inference that the Egyptians would not allow themselves, except on some extraordinary occasion, to kill any of those animals which were held to be sacred to a benevolent deity. The Typhonic animals on the contrary they did not hesitate, nay were eager, to put to death. They viewed it as an act of veneration and grateful acknowledgement of these divinities, to try to gain their favor by the slaughter of such animals as were hostile to them; by this means restraining and counteracting the influence of the malicious divinities. Thus Herodotus relates, that after one of these Typhonic animals had been put to death, and its head removed, an imprecation was uttered over it in these words: "May the evil now hanging over the sacrificer, or over the whole land of Egypt, alight upon this head." Afterwards, in order that the threatened calamity might the more surely and completely be averted from the kingdom or the individual, the head was cast into the Nile, and carried by it into the sea. It is plain, alike from the testimony of Plutarch and from the nature of the case, that the animals, by means of whose death threatened evils were averted, were Typhonic animals exclusively; as it would be wrong to suppose that to pronounce a curse on the head of an animal sacred to a benevolent deity would be viewed as a token of religious homage to that deity. In the slaughter of hurtful animals, Typhon was meant to be affronted, and Osiris and Isis to be worshipped; and the act, in this way, had somewhat of the nature and effect of an expiatory sacrifice, because it was the condition of averting misfortunes from the sacrificer. Moreover, whenever harmless or useful beasts, such as were sacred to Osiris or Isis, were sacrificed, their heads were wont to be placed on the statues of these gods, with whom they were thus in a sense identified. No curse, therefore, would ever have been pronounced upon them; as it would

have been justly regarded as among the grossest insults to which those deities could have been subjected.

Instances of such sacrifices might be cited in great numbers, interesting because of their expiatory quality. An ox that was wholly or even partially red, might be used as a victim. On the contrary, it is asserted that in case even a single dark hair was visible the ox could not be offered, because animals of a dark hue were sacred to Osiris. At times, as when the heat of the sun was specially severe, the Egyptians even went so far as to procure human sacrifices, choosing as victims men whose hair was red; red being, as we have seen, the appropriate color of Typhon. On the festival instituted in honor of the return of Isis from Phenicia, whither she had gone in search of the mutilated remains of Osiris, cakes were used in the service on which was stamped the image of the sea-horse, a Typhonic animal, bound with chains; a symbolical representation, very evidently, of Typhon, the malicious god, restrained by the benevolent divinity.

We have an illustration in these sacrifices of Typhonic animals of the shape in which the idea of atonement lay in the mind of the ancient Egyptians. Atonement with them was little, if anything, more than an attempt to win by means of sacrifice the favor of a personified power of nature; the animal selected for the purpose being uniformly one which was considered as a symbol of the malicious god from whose power they were suffering evil. During the continuance of a calamity that had come suddenly upon the land, which was specially severe or protracted, and when all other means of averting it had proved ineffectual, we are told that even such animals as were sacred to the benevolent gods were offered in sacrifice; as if to inflict a species of punishment upon these inexorable divinities.

We close this branch of our subject by a single allusion to the notions entertained by the Egyptians as to the blood of their sacrificial victims. In this hieroglyphical phraseology the soul was represented by a hawk, on the ground that the hawk fed principally on blood; and hence it is to be inferred

that they supposed the soul to reside in the blood, or the blood to be the life-principle of the animal. With them, as with the Hebrews, the sacrifice consisted essentially in the treatment of the blood, in the surrender of the life of the victim to a higher power, in the shedding of the blood.

Our knowledge of the sacrificial observances of the nations of Central and Hither Asia is very incomplete. We know enough, however, to be certain that these observances were very closely related to the ideas prevalent among these nations of the nature of God, and to the consequent peculiarities of the worship of nature as it was practised among them.

Our first inquiry, then, must be in regard to these. The various religious systems in vogue among these nations had this common element, that the relation of sex was supposed to exist in the nature of the gods; the divinity was male and female. "The sun as a divinity," says Creuzer, "was the active principle, the ruler of heaven, a powerful, energetic producer. In connection with him we have the moon-goddess, the female principle, the receiver; whose proper symbol would be the earth, made fruitful by the rays of the sun." Sometimes, however, this dualism is conceived of as combined in one being, a hermaphrodite. At other times, one sex is considered as predominating over the other; the male sex ordinarily being the more prominent of the two. The sacrificial rites, which were practised among the nations were not a little modified by these peculiar conceptions of the divine nature.

It is first to be observed in reference to these observances, that vegetable offerings, and especially those of incense, were greatly in excess relatively to bloody offerings. They greatly exceeded in number the offerings of this class which we find in other systems of religion. They were not only in all cases co-ordinate in number and importance with the bloody sacrifices, but in not a few cases entirely superseded these. This statement has an impressive illustration in the fact, that in the Old Testament to burn incense is sometimes the same as to sacrifice. Isaiah speaks of a people, probably the

Babylonians, who burned incense upon every brick. Two altars were erected in the great temple of Belus in Babylon, on one of which were sacrificed two young animals, and on the other as many adult animals; but at the annual feast of the sun, on the larger of these altars more than a thousand talents of incense were burned. The goddess who stood in the relation of wife to Belus, called by Herodotus Mylitta, the productive, shared this sanctuary with her husband, as was likewise the case in the cities of Syria, such as Heliopolis. She had also her separate temple in Babylon. On her altar no blood was allowed to flow. Only incense could be burned on it. The same restriction was in force in the temple of the goddess Venus at Paphos. The ground of this rule we are to seek in the relation which it was supposed the sun and moon bore to the created world. The moon was thought to have a peculiarly close connection with the vegetable world. All growth was attributed to lunar influence. There was supposed to be a community of life between the moon and plants; the moist, cool essence of the moon, reappearing on the plants. According to Eastern modes of thought, the vital principle in plants, as in animals, is the soul, the fragrance of the plants being regarded as its manifestations. As now, on the altars of the gods, and particularly those of the females, incense — a vegetable product — was burned, the process was viewed as an exhalation of the soul, which had been originally given to the plant as its animating principle by the goddess who presided over the vegetable kingdom. It was a development of the sentiment, so widely prevalent in antiquity, that sacrifice was the surrender of the individual to the universal life. It is an illustration of the truth, that in this service the significance of the incense-burning did not lie in the diffusion of an agreeable odor; but rather in what we have just set forth, that the custom prevailed in Syria, and particularly in Hieropolis, at the return of spring, when life begins again to pervade the vegetable world, of bringing great numbers of living trees and consuming them in the courts of the temples.

We now come to a consideration of the sacrifices offered to

the sun. The essential nature of the sun as contrasted with that of the moon, is fire, warmth. It is typified, not in the vegetable, but the animal world, whose vital principle or soul resides in the warm blood. It was required, therefore, that bloody sacrifices, that is, of course, animals, should be offered to the sun, rather than vegetables; and there was manifested here, the same idea of the significance of sacrifice as a giving up of the life of the individual to the original ground of all being, regarded either as manifesting himself in two distinct forms, male and female, or as combining both sexes in one form. It should be noted also, that in the case of the bloody sacrifices, the chief significance was supposed to be attached to the blood; just as in the case of vegetable offerings, it was attached to the fragrance, the incense. All this was entirely in keeping with the view entertained by the Persians, that no part of the victim was really offered to the divinities except the blood; and also with the custom observed by the Hindoos of calling upon the divinity to drink the blood of the victim. And in the same spirit, the Zabians, as we are told, while refusing most strongly to drink blood on any ordinary occasion, still allowed themselves to drink the sacrificial blood; thinking that in this act, they brought themselves into special connection with the divinity, and derived from it a higher spiritual power. In a certain temple consecrated to Apollo, women were in the habit of uttering oracles, having acquired the power of foretelling future events, and revealing that which had been unknown, by drinking the blood of a lamb that had been sacrificed. The priests of the ancient Slavonians in the same manner accustomed themselves to drink the blood of their enemies whom they had sacrificed to the gods, in the expectation of gaining by the means, the gift of prophesy. It was a prevalent custom among the ancients to mix sacrificial blood with red wine; a mixture which the Romans denominated *vinum assiratum*. Catiline is said to have done this on the eve of his conspiracy, regarding the act in the light of a specially solemn oath. A similar theory is ascribed to Hannibal; thereby countenancing the notion, that it was a

Carthaginian or rather a Phœnician custom. All these statements are made for the purpose of illustrating the truth, that the blood was esteemed the essential element of the sacrifice. That end which, in general, sacrifice was meant to effect, — a living union, fellowship on the part of the worshipper with the divinity, — was supposed to be effected in a more precise and definite manner, by means of the blood. The true force of the sacrifice was conceived to lie in the blood, which, as being the seat of that life of which the divinity is the original source and principle, was regarded as itself, in a very important sense, divine, and was therefore given back to its great source in the act of sacrifice; and by means of drinking this blood men hoped to enter into a peculiarly close relation to the divinity — to become related to him by blood.¹

The custom of human sacrifices, so prevalent among the nations of Middle and Upper Asia, merits a somewhat extended notice; a mode of sacrifices if not peculiar to these tribes yet practised by them to a greater degree than was usual among the nations of antiquity. Every reader will be likely to call to mind here the inhuman manner in which these sacrifices were performed by the Phœnicians, particularly to the god Moloch. They were wont to choose as victims boys noted for their beauty, and belonging to the noblest and most distinguished families; though at a later period they took children, whose parents were poor. The custom of human sacrifices, as we might expect, would be transmitted by the Phœnicians to the Carthaginians. We are told that at the time when Agathocles, the tyrant of Syracuse,

¹ When Cyaxares the king of Media was about to enter into a treaty with Alyattes king of Lydia, the two monarchs, we are told, having come together and repeated the words of the customary formula, punctured their own arms, and then sealed their contract by each sucking from the wound a portion of the other's blood. A similar custom is said to have prevailed among the ancient Scythians, and in Armenia, and to exist still in South Africa. It has been suggested by Dr. Livingstone that the two parties to a covenant suppose themselves by drinking each other's blood to become perpetual friends and relations; as if, inasmuch as the soul, the life, is in the blood, the mingling of the blood were equivalent to a transfusion into each other of the souls of the parties. — Rawlinson's *Ancient Monarchies*, Vol. iii. p. 212. (Compiler).

had inflicted a disastrous defeat on the Carthaginians in the neighborhood of their capital, and when the city was filled with terror and despondency, they conceived that they could in no other way appease the anger of the gods than by the sacrifice of an unusually large number of children. Not less than two hundred children, selected from the most illustrious families were offered up; and in addition, three hundred other parents voluntarily put their children to death on this occasion; as if believing such a spontaneous surrender would be more certain to avert the anger of heaven than a compulsory sacrifice.

We refrain from any further account of human sacrifices, for the reason that they are represented as having to do with physical rather than moral relations, and consequently are suggestive of little that can have any important bearing on the purpose of the present Article.

This survey of the sacrificial customs which prevailed in Upper Asia, we merely remark, indicates very plainly that the fundamental idea of sacrifice was conceived to be the surrender to the deity of that which was judged by the sacrificer his best and dearest possession, the giving up of the life at its different stages to the deity regarded as the great source of all life, that thereby one might come into vital union with him. Yet this fundamental idea, which acquires the more importance in this discussion because of the intimate relation borne by the Israelites at different periods to the nations of Upper Asia, we must not forget is altogether of a physical character. This idea as it existed among these nations was of a grosser form than we find it wearing among any other people. The atonement which was meant to be effected, instead of referring to the anger of a divinity justly incensed on account of sin in his worshippers, seems to have been merely designed to avert some sore physical evil from which men were suffering through the agency of one of the great powers of nature. Of any characteristics of an ethical nature we can detect in these sacrifices no traces.

We must glance, though briefly, at the sacrifices of the Chinese. It is plain that among the Chinese, as among pagans generally, the blood was looked upon as constituting the chief element of the sacrifice. They were wont, we are told, to cut off the head of the victim, and allow the warm blood to run down over the hands and feet of the statue of the god. They were in the habit, also, of sprinkling with the blood the objects on account of which the sacrifice was presented. As, for example, if the end designed in the sacrifice was to procure for the mariner a prosperous voyage, they offered sacrifice to the god of the sea and sprinkled the ship with the blood of the victim. They attached, therefore, the highest importance to the blood. This was the divine element in the sacrifice by whose means was procured a fellowship with the god; if he were offended it procured a restoration to his favor.

The more important of the sacrifices in use among the Chinese were those which were offered by the emperor himself. These we are informed were presented on four mountain peaks which lay near to the boundaries of the kingdom, one in the direction of each of the four points of the compass. At the vernal equinox, the emperor, proceeding to the mountain which lay towards the east, would there offer a sacrifice, whose specific purpose was to move the heavenly powers to watch over the seed which had been deposited in the earth, and which had just begun to germinate. At the summer solstice, a sacrifice would be offered on the mountain which lay towards the south, in order that no unpropitious weather might be allowed to check the productive activity of the earth. A sacrifice would be performed at the autumnal equinox on a mountain peak in the west, in order that no insects, nor other noxious animals might hurt the ripened grain, nor rude storms interfere with the gathering of the harvest. The sacrifice performed on the northern mountain at the winter solstice was to be a thank-offering, in view of the good which the departing year had dispensed, and as a species of supplication for the continuance of the favor of

heaven. The animals chosen for these different sacrifices were meant to correspond, in color and other qualities, to the season of the year in which they were presented.

A very important sacrifice among the Chinese was one offered at the opening of spring. It is thus described. On the day selected by the proper authorities, in the temple consecrated to the Earth, a cow was sacrificed; and on the same day, in several of the provinces of the empire, a procession, composed of farmers, with whom were mingled, however, many of the highest officers of the government, bore an image of a cow, formed out of earth, her horns and hoofs being gilded and decked with ribbons. After the worshippers had prostrated themselves at different places, and laid the sacrificial contribution on the altar, the image was broken in pieces and scattered among the people. On the occasion of this sacrifice the emperor was wont to go through with the ceremony of holding the plough, having devoted the three days preceding to solemn religious exercises, with the view of preparing himself for the fit performance of this rite. One can hardly fail to be reminded by these rites of the Egyptian sacrifice of the ox, which, after being slain, was divided and distributed among the people as an emblem of the dismembered body of Osiris. In this sacrifice the cow is the emblem of the earth, which, in the act of giving forth her various products for the use of men, may be said to offer herself in sacrifice. The physical element in this sacrifice very evidently predominates altogether over the ethical.

Coming, now, to a description of the sacrifices practised among the Greeks, to which those in use among the Romans bore a very close resemblance, we are compelled, in view of their great number and variety, to restrict ourselves to such as developed most clearly the fundamental idea of sacrifices. In this point of view, the notices left us of the bloody sacrifices are to be esteemed of special importance. In the Greek language the phrase "to stain with blood" is equivalent in signification to sacrifice; and this usage could hardly have become so prevalent unless, in the mind of the Greeks, the treatment

of the blood of the sacrificial victim was viewed as the central point in the service. And, in harmony with this view, Philo was wont to speak of sacrifice as an offering of the soul, on the ground that the pouring out of the blood was the pouring out of the life, or the soul. Just so it was a current opinion among the Greek philosophers of all schools, that the blood was the seat of the life. And among the Romans, the phrase "animam litare" was the technical expression for denoting the act of sacrificing, and was employed in a sense altogether the same as "sanguinem litare."

A knowledge of the views entertained by the Greeks and Romans of the nature of the gods, closely related as these views must necessarily be to the doctrine of sacrifices as practised by them, will greatly aid one in the attempt to learn the form which this doctrine took in their minds. These views were to no small extent similar to those which prevailed among the Oriental nations. The gods were regarded as identical with the world and nature. The idea of the unity of God, which with the Orientals was a prominent idea, though forced into harmony with pantheistic conceptions, was among the Greeks and Romans cast more into the background. The divine essence was conceived of as split up into an almost endless multiplicity of beings. Their conceptions of the divinity were wholly polytheistic. The gods were little else than personified powers of nature. Their notions, however, were far less gross than those of the Egyptians, among whom the animal world was considered as the reflex of the divine essence. The Greeks and Romans, on the contrary, conceived of the gods as wearing the human form. Their ideas were anthropomorphic. The doctrine of sacrifices, therefore, as it lay in their minds was shaped in accordance with these two peculiarities of their ideas of the divine nature. The multiplicity of the gods gave rise to a multiplicity of sacrifices; and on account of the anthropomorphic character of their views of the gods, the physical, or cosmical, element was far less prominent in their sacrifices than was the case with those of the Eastern nations.

One general principle running through the whole Greek doctrine of sacrifice may be enunciated in the language of Porphyry, that like delights in like. Hence the rule laid down in the Twelve Tables, that such victims were to be provided as were most grateful to each divinity; in other words, each victim was to correspond to the special nature and functions of the divinity to which it was to be offered. Great, now, as was the multiplicity of the gods, they were yet divisible into but two general classes—the superior or Olympic gods, the gods of the upper world; and the chthonic gods, those of the lower world. In this division, originated a division of sacrifices into two correspondent orders. Every part of the sacrificial ritual, even the most minute, depended as to its form upon the question to which of the two classes of divinities it was to be offered, whether to the superior or the inferior order. Thus in regard to the material of the sacrifice, to the superior gods, animals of a white hue were judged to be appropriate; while in sacrifices to the lower gods animals of a black color might be used. To the former class of gods, the rule required that an odd number of animals should be offered; to the latter class, an even number. *Three* altars were erected for the superior gods, *two* for the inferior. *Three* times the former were invoked in the service; while the latter were addressed but *twice*. On a similar principle the place for the sacrifice was determined. Sacrifices were performed in honor of the superior gods in high places; those meant for the inferior gods might be offered in dark caves. Different names were given to the altars on the same ground; one class being denominated *βώμοι* or high places; the other *ἑσχαράς* or hearths. Sacrifices to the gods of the upper world were to be performed in the day-time; those to the gods of the lower world by night. The treatment, the manipulation of the material, was different in different cases. In the one case, the head of the animal was to be cut off by a stroke from below in an upward direction; in the other case, the reverse. In the one case, the blood of the victim was to be received into a vessel and

poured out upon the altar ; in the other, it was allowed to run into a hole prepared for the purpose. In sacrifices to the upper gods, the hands of the worshipper were to be lifted up towards heaven ; in those to the lower gods, the hands were allowed to hang downwards.

The rule, which we have cited from Porphyry, applies not only to the two general classes into which the gods were supposed to be divided, but also to the individual gods constituting each class. The animal selected for sacrifice was to possess qualities corresponding to the particular divinity in whose honor it was to be slain. We are not, indeed, to suppose that any one animal was exclusively appropriate to one divinity. Nevertheless, there was always to be an analogy in one or more respects on the part of the victim to the predominant characteristics or functions of the divinity which was meant to be honored. Thus, in general, it was required that there should be a similarity of sex ; and yet, in certain cases, other points of agreement were sought for more carefully, and the consideration of sex was neglected. A likeness of nature was more carefully observed. To Proserpina, conceived of as the productive power of nature, yet converted, in consequence of being carried off to the lower regions, into a dead, unproductive power, a barren cow was offered. To Minerva, the chaste virgin, a calf was offered. A like rule was observed in all cases.

The inference which we are to draw from all that has now been said of the Grecian doctrine of sacrifices would seem to be that, universally there was sought a likeness, an analogy, between the life, the essence of the divinity, and the sacrifice which was offered to him. The victim is to be conceived of, not as a symbol, a representative of the sacrificer, so much as a symbol of the divinity to whose nature it was supposed more or less exactly to correspond. And yet, in all cases, there was a quite close relation to the sacrificer. He was the one who performed the act of surrender. The victim belonged to him, and was presented by him. It was this two-fold relation in which the victim stood ; on the one hand,

to the divinity to whom it corresponded in nature, on the other, to the sacrificer by whom it was presented, which fitted it for its office as mediator, or an agent for effecting a fellowship on the part of the sacrificer with the god. This mediation, however, was in reality less of a moral than a cosmical nature. That division of the gods into superior and inferior orders, which we have said underlies the whole Grecian doctrine of sacrifices, coincides with the partition of the universe into the upper and the under world, heaven and earth; and the divine essence was thought to correspond to this same partition. The same cosmical element shows itself in the selection of victims to be offered to individual gods who were regarded as little else than personified powers of nature.

Let us, now, with a view to exhibit somewhat more fully the notions which the Greeks and Romans associated with sacrifices, advert to certain particular sacrificial observances which they were in the habit of practising. We shall choose for special notice such sacrifices as had a public character, such as were in use at annual solemn festivals, or which had been practised from the most ancient period; because it is from these that the most satisfactory conclusions can be drawn as to the ideas of the nature of sacrifice which were cherished by these nations.

We shall describe in the first place a sacrifice which was offered annually in the city of Athens, as being, at the same time, one of the most ancient and most significant. It was offered to Jupiter, regarded as the ruler of the gods, on the day of the great festival called *βουφόνια* and *Διοσπόλια*. The animal offered was an ox. The rites accompanying the sacrifice are described very minutely. We shall give them here with some degree of particularity. The officiating priests, at the outset, placed cakes made of different kinds of meal on the brazen head of the statue of Jupiter. A number of oxen were then led up to the statue, and that one of the number, which seized and ate the cakes was chosen as the victim. Certain selected virgins then brought forward water.

By the help of this water the implements were made ready with which to put the ox to death. This act was made the duty of certain persons carefully chosen. One of these handed a knife to the second, who with it struck the ox, while a third completed the act of killing. The skin of the victim was then removed, and its flesh distributed among those present to be eaten. The skin was afterwards drawn together and stuffed with hay, and this effigy was attached to a plough as if for the purpose of performing one of its usual labors. After all this, it is said, every one who had taken any part in the act of killing the animal was arraigned before the appointed tribunal to answer for what was pretended to be a criminal deed in putting the ox to death. The virgins who had brought the water, laid the guilt upon the persons who had sharpened the knife, and these in their turn laid it on the knife; and, as if actually guilty of the deed, the knife was sunk in the sea. The persons who had been active in the deed were called *βουύτροι* or ox-slayers, and *δίαυροι* or dividers of the flesh. The explanation of these apparently frivolous observances is said to be found in the following myth:

In Athens once dwelt a cultivator of the soil, though not a native of the country, bearing the name of Diomus or Thaulon. This man, on a certain day, observed an ox quit the work in which he was engaged, go to the sacred table and devour the sacrificial bread which had been laid upon it; scattering about such fragments as he did not actually eat. In his surprise and anger, the man seized a sharp knife from the hand of a neighbor and put the ox to death. Such a deed, however, was denominated murder, and was to be punished as such. Conscious of his guilt, the man buried the ox and hastily fled to the island of Crete. A severe drought and consequent famine now ravaging Attica as the effect of this sacrilegious act, the oracle was consulted and an answer received to the effect that the crime could be expiated only by this means, that the man who had killed the ox should restore him to life.

Of this myth it is by no means easy to give an explanation that shall be altogether clear, so far, at least, as its individual features are concerned. Its general drift, however, is too clear to be mistaken. It has an obvious reference to agriculture, to the processes of production and physical life. The ox that was slain was engaged in the act of ploughing; he takes and eats the bread; that is to say, he absorbs into himself what he had just spent his labor in producing. He then dies upon the altar, and with his own flesh nourishes those among whom it was distributed. Yet does he not finally and completely pass away in death; he again comes back to life, returns to the labor of ploughing, thus renewing his productive activity. Here, as almost everywhere in the old religions, the ox is the emblem of the productive, life-giving forces of nature. And in this, as we conceive, is to be found the explanation of the sacrificial rites which we have described.

The reader will be reminded by all this of the Persian "original ox" and its symbol, the sacrifice of Mithras; of the ox, the emblem of Osiris, which was offered at the feast of Isis, and of the Hindoo Aswamehda; the more, as in the latter sacrifice, the horse offered up was cut in pieces, and the parts distributed. The idea which, as we have seen already, underlies so many ancient sacrificial observances, that death is the beginning, the necessary condition, of a new and higher form of life; the end of the old year, amid the dreariness of winter the condition of the coming forward of the spring in all its freshness; this idea reappears in this Athenian sacrifice. The conspicuous part which the water plays in these rites should not be lost sight of. It was the means of fitting the knife for the act of putting the ox to death; and as such it had to bear its part of the guilt of that act. The element of moisture absorbs into itself all material substances, while it, in its turn, is derived from them.

Obvious as we conceive the reference in this sacrifice to agricultural processes, and more generally to the life-giving forces of nature, we must associate with the truth already stated the fact that, according to Grecian modes of thought,

the proper emblem or reflex of the divinity is man and human properties, rather than the lower orders of creation. Man, the driver of the ox, the great agent of cultivation, returns, like the ox, to the earth whose fruits he partakes of, as does the ox. This, and doctrines kindred to this, we conceive to have constituted the matter of the mysteries of antiquity, and especially the Eleusinian mysteries of Ceres, with which the great sacrifice, that we have described so minutely, stood in very close connection.

It is worth while to take particular notice of the shape in which the idea of guilt is set forth in this sacrifice. The sin does not originate in the human will; it is more the act of the water and the knife than of the man. It was not in reality sin. It had no moral quality. It was merely natural evil. It lay only in the essential finiteness of nature, in the inevitable necessity of death as the means of life.

As to the Roman sacrifices, in distinction from the Grecian, the first to be spoken of is the one denominated *Fordicidia*. It was performed on the fifteenth of April, during the festival of the *Cerealia*. The victim sacrificed was a pregnant cow. From this circumstance, coupled with the fact of its being observed in the spring of the year, the significance of this ceremony cannot easily be doubted. The cow was a designed emblem of the earth, pregnant with nutritious fruits; and as the earth was an object of worship with the title of Ceres or *Tellus*, the cow may be regarded as a symbol of that goddess. The loss of life on the part of the cow, signified the giving forth by the earth of its strength, its life, in the form of nutritious products. As so often observed before, death is the necessary forerunner of life in a higher and nobler form.

Another sacrifice in use among the Romans was that of a swine. This is stated by Roman antiquarians to be the most ancient of all their sacrificial observances; and, as it occurred much more frequently than was common, it may be safely regarded as one of the most important. It was offered at times to Venus and to Bacchus; yet most frequently to Ceres. It may be said to have been, indeed, peculiar to the worship of

this latter divinity. It was considered the sacrifice most appropriate to a wedding. It was also wont to be practised at the conclusion of treaties. The victim employed in this sacrifice was the symbol of fruitfulness and plenty; and thus was a sacrifice appropriate to the worship of Ceres. This goddess is conceived of as hiding within herself every production fit for the subsistence of men. She was the originator of agriculture, and at the same time of the marriage union. She was the organizing divinity, gathering men into societies, teaching the various processes by which sustenance is procured, without the knowledge of which communities of men must cease to be. Moreover, as Creuzer says, the fundamental idea of the religion of Ceres is closely related to the antithesis of peace and war, to the contest between matter and spirit. That contest, indeed all contests by which men are divided from each other, she aims to adjust. For this reason, the sacrifice to Ceres which we have now described was fitly performed at weddings, the most important union into which individuals of the human race ever enter; so, also, on the occasion of the conclusion of treaties, the restoration of tranquillity and harmony. Yet it is very evident that physical rather than moral relations were had in view in this, as well as in most heathen sacrifices; that the prevalent conceptions of sin and its consequences, of the need of its forgiveness and suppression, were altogether inadequate.

We shall now notice, though quite briefly, the sacrifices of the Northmen and the Germans. It is conceived that the idea of the blood's constituting the essential element of sacrifice is nowhere brought out so prominently, as among these tribes. The word most commonly employed to denote a sacrifice, means simply blood (*blot*, *blut*). To sacrifice is *bloten*; priests, on whom devolves the duty of offering sacrifice, are denominated *blot-modur* or blood-men. In conformity with this prevalent notion, sacrifice was supposed to embody in itself, the whole significance of worship; and bloody sacrifices, were thought to be the only ones to which that name could properly be given; or, if at any time, blood-

less offerings were presented, they were assigned an altogether inferior rank. The essential idea of sacrifice was represented completely and fully only in the bloody. The blood was considered as the seat of the soul, and as the vital principle. From the blood of Odin, which falls on the earth, arise, in the following spring, flowers and plants; it gives life and freshness and fertility to the earth; the blood of the victim, as a thing which had been specially consecrated, and had gained thereby a peculiar sanctity, was supposed to give life and sensibility to that which before had been dead and inert.

Were we to enter here into a more particular description of the sacrificial rites practised among these nations, it would be made apparent that the same ideas underlie them as we found to be associated with pagan sacrifices in general. Physical, rather than moral, relations are contemplated in them. Natural evil, rather than sin, is attempted to be removed by means of them. For this reason we shall abstain from any such description—the ideas likely to be suggested by it having already been made very prominent in the progress of these remarks. We shall pass on to a statement of the results to which, as we conceive, this discussion properly leads.

1. Everywhere, from China to Iceland, the blood is viewed as the chief element in the sacrifice. It is that by which the sacrifice accomplishes its end. The same is the case with the Mosaic sacrifices. In this respect Mosaicism and heathenism are altogether harmonious. We can rightly understand neither the one religious system nor the other, unless we adhere persistently to the idea that the whole efficacy of sacrifice hinges on the treatment of the blood.

2. Everywhere this importance is attached to the blood, because the blood is viewed as the seat of the soul, of the vital principle. The idea of sacrifice, then, is closely associated with that of life; its surrender on the one hand, its restoration on the other, in some more exalted form. When the blood is shed, life is poured out; it is offered up to the divinity to whom the sacrifice is presented. This surrender involves,

however, as an invariable accompaniment, the reception of life from the divinity. The general result of sacrifice, therefore, is, that it brings about a vital fellowship between the divinity and the worshipper. But the idea of life is, in the outset, altogether general and indeterminate. It becomes definite and precise only when correct conceptions are entertained of the life, the essence, of the divinity as related to that of men. And it is exactly at this point that Mosaic and pagan sacrifices begin to exhibit a contrariety to each other. In the conceptions of the pagans, the life and essence of the divinity are identified with the world, with nature: heathenism is nature-religion. The vital union with the gods, therefore, which pagan sacrifices aim to secure to the worshipper, is entirely of a physical character. On the contrary, in the Mosaic religion, the utter unlikeness of the life and essence of God to that of men is made as prominent as possible. The divinity is a personal being, in distinction from the impersonal universe. As personality lies essentially in the will, and still more in the absolutely perfect will, the vital union which the Mosaic sacrifices strive to generate is not of a physical nature. It is wholly ethical holiness, and, as its necessary result, true well-being, salvation in its noblest meaning, is their exclusive object and aim. This is the grand difference between the Mosaic and pagan sacrifices.

3. We notice, again, the different meaning attached in the two systems of religion to the word "atonement." The idea of atonement is always inseparable from that of sacrifice; yet there is always a very distinct reference to what we may call the negative aspect of atonement; that is to say, the very notion of the restoration of fellowship with God, effected by means of sacrifice, pre-supposes a pre-going negation of that fellowship—a separation of the two parties from each other; and the atonement consists in the removal of this. As a means of restoring a lost fellowship with God, every sacrifice is, in a general sense, of an atoning character. Though atonement may seem to be prominent only in connection with one kind of sacrifice, and in the others to be more obscure, it can

be wholly wanting in none. But the ideas of atonement, characterizing respectively the Mosaic religion and paganism, are wholly different from each other. In the Mosaic religion, the separation between God and man, which it is the purpose of atonement to annihilate, is of a strictly moral nature; it lies in the complete unlikeness between a holy God and a sinful man; and atonement consists in the removal of sin.¹

In the realm of paganism, however, there is no conception of absolute holiness as forming, so to speak, the essence of the divinity; and as a matter of necessity, therefore, no adequate conception of its opposite, sin. As paganism, in the last analysis, identifies the Creator with the thing created, so the life of the individual is identified, at last, with that of the universe, and this at length, with that of the divinity; and thus the separation between the two consists only in the contrast between the individual and the aggregate of all things; between the limited and the boundless, the finite with the eternal. The sin which exists in the world is whatever is limited, individualized; and sin is taken away or expiated, when the individual is lost in the great whole, the finite united with the infinite. The ethics of paganism rest upon the idea of the ultimate absorption of all individual beings into the deity. At no time and in no place has there existed in paganism the thought of removing sin or moral evil by means of sacrifice.

There is still another point of unlikeness between the pagan and Mosaic conceptions of atonement which is deserving of notice. In the former, the object of atonement is conceived to be the divinity himself; something in him, his anger, is to be removed, by means of atonement. On the contrary, in the Mosaic religion, atonement has for its object, the sacrificer, or rather the sin in him; it is never God himself, nor any thing characterizing him.¹ It consists in the

¹ It is hoped that all readers will bear in mind, that for the ideas advanced in this paragraph, Bähr alone is responsible. All that the present writer undertakes to do, is to exhibit them. The contrast between Bähr's views of the atonement, as here given, and the Scriptural views is too obvious to require any remarks. (Compiler).

covering up of that which is sinful in men, its removal from the sight of Jehovah. Atonement, therefore, cannot be supposed to refer to Jehovah; for it is a blasphemous, not to say an absurd, supposition that there can be in Jehovah aught which can require to be hidden from view. Pagan atonements have for their end, the removal of physical evil, the restoration of harmony between conflicting forces. This end is gained by sacrificing to the divinity, a life which either corresponds or is opposed to it; it being, in both cases, the intention to produce an effect on the divinity himself; in the one case, the broken harmony is restored, by means of a being standing in a real vital union with a divinity; in the other case, by means of a being standing in the same connection with the opposing powers. As the Mosaic religion, then, necessarily excludes the possibility of the divinity himself being the object of atonement, this, on the contrary, is one of the natural and inevitable results of the principles of paganism.

4. There is a wide contrast in the two religious systems, in regard to the relation in which the sacrifice stands, on the one hand, to the sacrificer, on the other, to the divinity. In heathenism, we have seen that its relation to the divinity, has a prominence given to it altogether greater than its relation to the sacrificer, and therefore it was sought to have the nature of the divinity, in one way or another, reflected in the victim sacrificed. The victim was almost uniformly regarded as being more or less directly symbolical of the god to whom it was offered; sacrifices of this character, at least, being uniformly esteemed the more important and significant. But in the Mosaic institute, no traces of this can be detected, the victim is never looked upon as an emblem or symbol of Jehovah, or of any of his attributes.

This contrast between the two systems grows out of the fact, that in paganism the life of created things is identical with that of the divinity, and thus the divinity may be said to live in the animal, and may therefore act as the representative and symbol of the divinity. On the contrary, all created

objects are most sharply distinguished by Moses from the essence of Jehovah. They do, indeed, give testimony to the divine attributes, but they are in no sense to be confounded with them. Jehovah alone is the I AM. Outside of him nothing is like him; no created object or being can be a symbol of him. There lies, indeed, at the foundation of all pagan sacrifices, in which the divinity himself is represented as the victim, the profound, and in some aspects beautiful, idea of a devotion on the part of the divinity to death, that thereby he may become the life of the world. It is in this form that the creation and preservation of the world are set forth. When the divinity sacrifices himself, or yields up his life to another, that other in this act begins to exist. In common with the whole universe, he becomes a manifestation of the deity. And since the manifestation of the deity in this form is so far forth a negation of his independent being, he may not unfitly be represented as suffering and dying.

This is wholly diverse from the genius of the religion of Moses. Creation and preservation are never represented as a manifestation of the Divinity in any literal sense, as an act of suffering on the part of God; but, on the contrary, as the voluntary, unforced working of his power. The relation of the universe to Jehovah, is one of contrast, of dependence. The universe is not Jehovah, nor any symbol of him. It is merely his work; deriving, indeed, its life from him, while at the same time, that life is by no means identical with his. Any dramatic representation of the forces of creation, by means such as we have observed in India, Persia, and Egypt, is wholly abhorrent to the genius of the Mosaic religion. The sacrificial blood appears not as something essentially divine, but as the instrumentality, freely ordained by a holy God, to whom belongs, in the highest sense, a personal, sovereign will, by which atonement for sin is effected. In the victim sacrificed there is no essential, but only a typical, likeness to the great sacrifice, that of Christ. The sacrifice is wholly of a moral nature and has nothing in common with the heathen

notion of the death of the divinity as the condition of the physical life of the world.

As to the relation of the sacrifice to the sacrificer, paganism represents this, in contrast with the Mosaic teachings, as altogether indirect. The victim represents directly the deity; and yet it has an important relation to the sacrificer, not only as it is presented by him, but also as being kindred to him in essence. It is by virtue of this likeness, that a connection between the two becomes possible, and also that it is rendered a fit agent for effecting the needed union between the sacrificer and the god; seeing that, according to pagan modes of thought, his essence is identical with that of the divinity as well as with that of the sacrificer. In the view of Moses, on the other hand, no likeness exists between the victim and Jehovah: there is no analogy between the two. There is, however, a likeness to man, in the kindred nature of the vital principle existent in them both; a likeness, however, which is essentially symbolic. For, in reference to atoning sacrifices, man is considered merely in his moral relations; no other end being sought in these sacrifices than the recovery of that divine favor which he has lost as the effect of his sin