

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



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

Digitized by Google

ARTICLE V.

THE EXPIATORY SACRIFICES OF THE GREEKS AND ROMANS, AND
THEIR RELATION TO THE ONE SACRIFICE UPON GOLGOTHA.

By Ernst von Lasaulx, Professor of Classical Literature in the Julius-Maximilian University, Wuerzburg, Bavaria. Translated by Rev. Henry B. Smith, West Amesbury, Mass.

INTRODUCTORY NOTE BY THE TRANSLATOR.

[The following dissertation is called by its author a Contribution to the Philosophy of Religion. It is thought, that it presents the subject of heathen sacrifices, and of their connection with the one offering of Christ, in some points of view deserving our consideration.

That there is a connection, and a close connection, between the heathen sacrifices and the sacrifice of our blessed Lord, can hardly be contested. That the fundamental ideas of the one must be found in the other, is only a plain inference from language and from history. The early Christians could say: "*De vestris sumus; fiunt, non nascuntur Christiani.*" Even Tertullian calls Christ "the true Prometheus." The Jewish sacrifices were consummated in Christ's oblation; were not the heathen sacrifices also? Did not heathenism, as well as Judaism, pass over into Christianity? If the grace of God led on the Hebrews, did not the providence of God lead on the heathen? With a proper understanding of the phrase, heathenism as well as Judaism may be said to have a prophetic character in relation to Christianity. There are two books, by German authors, upon the Christian Elements in Plato's Philosophy; and one, upon the Christian Elements in the works of Tacitus. And though the titles may sound paradoxical, and be open to the charge of anachronism, yet is there not a profound truth involved in them? Does not the providential theory of history force us to the conclusion, that in heathenism there was a preparation for Christianity? Was not the God of the Jews, also the God of the gods of paganism? And the sacrifices offered to them—did they not, as well as the Jewish, (to use the words of archbishop Magee,) "terminate in that one grand and comprehensive offering, which was the primary object and the final consummation of the sacrificial institution?" And if

we were required to seek that conservative element in the heathen superstitions, which kept them so long in being,—that article of faith which constituted the link between them and Christianity, where can we find it so clearly as in their views of the nature and necessity of a propitiatory sacrifice?

The sacrifices of the Jews, the sacrifices of the heathen, the sacrifice of Christ—there is a connection between them all. The sacrifices of the Jews were divinely instituted; the sacrifice of Christ was divinely appointed; have the heathen sacrifices, also, in any sense, an origination from God? The current orthodox theory refers all sacrifice to divine appointment, as the only mode of explaining what otherwise would seem so unnatural; and thus, by implication, would make the heathen sacrifices, to some extent, prefigure and foreshadow, to use a phrase of Warburton, be a “scenic representation” of the sacrifice of the cross. And this view is not inconsistent with the one mainly advocated in the following pages. For though the author seeks a basis in man’s soul for this universal system of sacrifices; though he would represent them as the fitting expression of the consciousness of guilt, and of the conviction that an expiatory substitution was needed; yet they may still, by a primitive appointment, have been the ordained means of meeting this feeling of guilt, and of momentarily appeasing, as well as of keeping alive, this longing for expiation and atonement. And the very highest view of a divine appointment is surely not inconsistent, but rather best consists with the supposition that such an appointment is fitted for man’s wants and needs.

Though the origin of heathen sacrifices be traced to God, yet the question would still remain, whether they retain any traces of their divine original? Let the answer be made in the words of De Maistre, in a treatise upon sacrifices, appended to his *Soirées de Saint Pétersbourg*. “Paganism sparkles with truths, but so changed and displaced, that I entirely agree with the theosophist of our own times, who says, that *idolatry is a putrefaction*. But when it is more closely considered, it will be seen, that among all its absurd, indecent and most atrocious opinions, and among its monstrous practices, so dishonorable to the human race, there is not one, from which we may not be able (through grace and wisdom given us) to remove the admixture of evil, so that the residuum of divine truth may be seen.” With suitable limitations, this position may be found correct. If idolatry be a putrefaction—what is it that is putrefied? Or, if some heathen observances be

caricatures, (as v. Lasaulx maintains,) of what are they the caricatures? What is there underneath the putrefaction and underneath the caricature? And in application to our present subject, what is there that is true, in the unnatural, monstrous system of sacrifices the world over? The following essay may assist us in answering these questions; and, perhaps its most valuable part, is the elimination of the leading ideas involved in heathen sacrifices, and, inferentially, in all proper sacrifice.

Of Ernst von Lasaulx, we are not able to give much more information than is found in the title to this article. He is the author of two other pamphlets, written much in the same spirit, the "Pelagic Oracle of Zeus at Dodona," and the "Mythus of Œdipus."

May the translator offer a criticism upon this production? The chief difficulty he feels in relation to it is, that the application of the heathen sacrifices to the oblation of Christ is kept too much within the region of flesh and blood; that the material, visible portion of the sacrifice is made too prominent. In this respect our author resembles De Maistre in the Essay already cited. In this respect, perhaps, he is faithful to his Roman Catholic sympathies, which in one or two passages are not to be mistaken. That portion of the dissertation which relates to the connection between the heathen offerings and the sacrifice upon Golgotha, is the least satisfactory, and is most open to the charge of obscurity. Nor do we find any clear statement of the mode by which the life of Christ is communicated to a fallen race. The introductory page may also seem liable to the same accusation of the want of clearness. And it is not to be denied, that many things which look clear in German, sound strangely in English; that what in German is announced as a principle, in English would scarcely pass current as a figure of speech; and that what really, in the midst of German speculation, has a substantive value, to the English mind possesses hardly an adjective importance. In reference to such passages and phrases, the translator believes that he has done his duty, so far as was consistent with even the semblance of a translation; unless it should be pronounced his duty, to have omitted them altogether.

An eminent reviewer of this essay, Göschel, in the "Berlin Annals of Science," suggested, that the transition from heathenism to Golgotha should have been made through the Hebrew rites and sacrificial system. The work of Bähr, cited in the second note, contains a most masterly development of the whole Jewish sacri-

fices; and, in a land of critics and theologians, has contributed to a much higher estimate of the Old Testament economy.

We will venture to interpose only one more criticism between the reader and the article. It would almost seem as if the author supposed the eating of the flesh of the victims, to be the culmination-point of all heathen sacrifices, in order to make out a parallelism with the Roman Catholic views of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. An emphasis, not warranted by facts, is laid upon this point. Whatever truth there may be in the conception, is unquestionably presented, in better accordance with the data, by Cudworth, in his well-known tract upon the "True Notion of the Lord's Supper," (Vol. II. p. 500—542, Andover edition); where the analogy is confined to the point that both the heathen and the Christian observances are to be considered as an "epulum sacrificiale," a sacrificial feast—I mean a feast upon sacrifice; or, "Epulum ex oblatiis," a feast upon things offered up to God. (p. 508, comp. 540.) Only the most material view of this sacrament would admit of comparing the eating the flesh of human victims in horrible heathen rites, with the reception, in the Christian symbols, of the body and blood of Christ.

Throughout the translation, the Greek names of Grecian deities have been retained, in preference to the current Latin forms. A more thorough study of the difference between the Greek and Roman Mythologies, would make such a distinction essential to intelligibility. Zeus is not Jupiter, nor is Artemis Diana, nor Dionysus Bacchus. Zeus is not so much the Greek Jupiter, as is Jupiter the Roman Zeus.—TR.]

If the history of the world is not the work of man, but of God by means of man, and *one* almighty will rules the whole; if, as Aristotle teaches,¹ that which is in its birth the later is in its idea and substance the earlier, and the whole process of things be only for the sake of some predetermined end, so that the purpose revealed at the end, has from the beginning been the moving cause of all things; then we might expect that all past history, in its inmost principles and laws, would only be as it were a prefiguration of what is to come, a type of what is to be fulfilled. Each past era, containing in itself the germs of the subsequent historical development, will be a kind of prophetic annunciation of what is to follow. Hence, in ancient history, we may be able to discern some

¹ Aristoteles de Anima, II. 3. p. 414 col. b, 29. Metaph. VIII. 8. p. 1050 col. a. 4 seq. Bekker.

intimation and foreshadowing of truths that were afterwards fully revealed. And, if one omnipotent will preside over the course of history, then the history of all people will be essentially but one history, will form, as it were, one life. The histories of particular nations will be parts or members of one organized whole. And the history of all nations will form one continuous series, in which the member, relatively the last, will ever comprise in itself the substance of all that has gone before. Since, however, all history, in its last analysis, is the history of religion, Christianity, being a universal religion, intended for the whole world, must from its very nature have adopted, and must contain, all that is true in all the antecedent religions of the different nations. And there is scarcely a truth enunciated in Christianity, of which we may not find the germ or substance in the systems that previously prevailed. In the following pages we intend to illustrate this position in respect to the idea of expiatory sacrifice, which will be found to be the centre of all the forms of religious faith, that have had a positive character or an historical influence.¹

Prayer and sacrifice are the most ancient and universal mode of the worship of God. Both are found, wherever there is a definite consciousness of religious truth. We may perhaps say, that the first word of primitive man was a prayer, and the first act of fallen man a sacrifice. The Mosaic Genesis carries the origin of sacrifices back to the earliest history of the race, to Cain and Abel. Grecian story refers them to Prometheus,² and Chiron the Centaur,³ or to the most ancient kings, Melisseus,⁴ Phoroneus and Cecrops.⁵

One of the most difficult problems of the philosophy of religion, is the determination of the meaning and original signification of sacrifice. History gives us no tradition respecting it; and language, from which in many cases the original idea may be deduced, offers no solution of the problem. The Greek word, ῥέζω,

¹ Among the later works, treating of this subject, Franz Baader's *Theorie der Opfer*, Münster, 1836, is the most original and suggestive; but its results cannot be maintained, since they are deduced from an imperfect knowledge of the data. The Old Testament sacrifices are profoundly discussed by Baehr, in his *Symbolik, des Mos. Cultus* II. 189—453. De Maistre, with a happy instinct, has felt out some of the most important points, in his *Soirées de Saint Pétersbourg*, II. 216—264.

² Hesiodi Th. 535 seq. and Aesch. Prom. 491 seq.

³ The author of the cyclical Titanomachy in Clemens Alex. Strom. I. 15. p. 361. Potter.

⁴ Didymus in Lactantius, I. 22. p. 146. Walch.

⁵ Clemens Alex. Cohort. p. 38. 27 seq.

in the Boeotian dialect $\rho\acute{\epsilon}\delta\delta\omega$,¹ by transposition and change of δ and ζ , $\epsilon\rho\delta\omega$, is and means nothing more than $\epsilon\rho\gamma\omega$,² *work*. In the same way, $\delta\rho\acute{\alpha}\nu$,³ as well as the Latin terms for sacrifice, *facere*⁴ and *operari*,⁵ has only the general signification of *act, do*; since sacrifice was especially considered as an effective act, and to kill a living animal was looked upon as an important deed.⁶ The word $\sigma\phi\acute{\alpha}\zeta\omega$, $\sigma\phi\acute{\alpha}\gamma\omega$, is connected with $\phi\acute{\alpha}\gamma\omega$, and signifies *separate into parts, cleave, slaughter*.⁷ In Homer, the word $\theta\acute{\nu}\omega$ is still only used for the burning of vegetable oblations;⁸ it is the same word with the Latin *fo*, which is retained in *suffio*, and means *kindle, fumigate*. The words $\sigma\pi\acute{\epsilon}\nu\delta\omega$ and $\lambda\epsilon\acute{\iota}\beta\omega$, used for drink-offerings, etymologically signify, as does *libare*, nothing more than *pour out*.⁹ The German word *opfern*, is manifestly formed from the Latin *offerre*, and designates every offering.¹⁰ But all these conceptions are so external and material, that the religious and fundamental idea of sacrifice can hardly be recognized in them. Since language, then, gives us no solution of the problem, and history no tradition, we must endeavor to find some basis in the mind of man, in his religious sentiments, for the origin of sacrifices, and thus determine their primitive signification.

The ground and origin of sacrifices, in man's soul, seems to me to be as follows. The whole nature and consciousness of man, in his primitive estate, was most intimately and directly connected with God. The creature was as essentially allied to the Creator, in the whole substance of his being, as is the child to its mother. And as a created being, he knew it to be his duty to consecrate all that he had and all that he was, to the service of his Creator. To the will of God he owed his existence; he felt himself every-

¹ Eustathius to Il. XIV. 261.

² Eustathius to Il. II. 305, and IV. 29.

³ Athenæus XIV. 79. Eustathius to Od. X. 349. Hesychius vv. $\delta\rho\acute{\alpha}\nu$ and $\delta\rho\acute{\alpha}\sigma\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ Tom. I. 1030, 1031. Alberti.

⁴ Cato de re rust. 134. 139. porco piaculo facito. Columella II. 22. 4. Catulo facere. Virgil. Ecl. III. 77. facere vitula pro frugibus. Tibul. IV. 6, 14. ter tibi fit libo, ter, dea casta, mero. Cicero pro Mur. 41, 90. Junoni . . . omnes consules facere necesse est.

⁵ Operari, the same as, operam dare rei divinæ, Nonius Marcellus XII. 21. Virg. Ge. I. 339. Propertius III. 29, 2. Tac. Ann. II. 14. — *Operari sacris*, Liv. I. 31, 8. *Operari deo* Tibul. II. 1, 9. 5, 95. *Operari Libero Patri* Cælius VIII. 10, 17.

⁶ $\acute{\omega}\varsigma\ \tau\iota\ \mu\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\alpha\ \delta\rho\acute{\omega}\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma\ \tau\acute{\omicron}\ \theta\acute{\nu}\epsilon\iota\nu\ \epsilon\mu\psi\upsilon\chi\omicron\nu$ Plutarch. Mor. p. 729. F. Sylb.

⁷ Eustathius to Il. I. 459 and to Od. XII. 385. Comp. Ammonius de Diff. p. 71.

⁸ Athenæus XIV. 79. Scholia antiqua ad Od. XIV. 446.

⁹ Isidor. Orig. V. 19, 32.

¹⁰ J. Grimm's—Deutsche Mythologie, p. 22.

where in his presence, and surrounded by his works; his own will was perfectly consonant with the will of his Maker; the will of God was predominant. So long as this originally-established union of the subjective will of man with the objective will of God subsisted, there would be no conception of anything like a sacrifice. The affiliation between the parties was too intimate. The lowest view of any kind of sacrificial oblation would be the offering up to God of a *part* of what man might possess; but where total union of will exists, where *all* that belongs to man belongs to God, there were no need of the special consecration of any part. But this originally constituted union of the human with the divine will did not have a long duration. A breach between man and God occurred. The union was severed. Man was originally endowed with freedom of will, the possibility of willing otherwise. This possibility was realized. By sin, his will was made different from the will of God, and opposed to it. But though he had revolted, man could not set aside the constant feeling, that he ought still to be united with God; nor the conviction of his duty to consecrate to him, without reserve, all his powers and possessions. But he could not fulfil these duties, he could not bring himself back to this state of union with God, nor to the harmonious and united action of the powers of his soul, now that he was dissevered from his source of life, now that his mind was dissipated among many objects. And the life, which by sin he had forfeited, he now sought to make good, to make an expiation for, by the voluntary giving up of life, in some form. Hence all sacrifices, being a consequence of sin, are in their very nature expiatory. The form which they necessarily assume is that of substitution—they are vicarious; since by the offering up of something that belongs to his external life, man seeks to integrate or to make good the partial and defective consecration of his inward self to God.¹ Now,

¹ Compare Tholuck, Commentary to Hebrews, Supplement 11. "Sacrifice is, originally, a gift to some divine being; and, more specifically, a gift by means of which man strives to make good the ever imperfect consecration of himself to God." p. 69. That the expiatory sacrifices of the Old Testament were in their nature vicarious, he proves from the following positions, established by Scholl in the "Studien der Württemberg. Geistl." I. B. 2 H. IV. B. 1. H. V. B. I. H. (1) "The idea of the substitution of a sacrificed animal for the guilty, prevailed in all ancient nations. (2) It is conceded, that among the Jews, the death of *men* was considered vicarious (2 Sam. 12: 15 seq. 24: 10. Is. 53: 4. Especially Dan. 11: 35); allied to this is a substitution by means of animals. (3) The ritual favors this view; only in the expiatory sacrifices is the animal unclean. Ex. 29: 14. Lev. 4: 11, 12, 21. 6: 27, 28. 16: 28. The remains of it were burnt outside of the camp; Lev. 16: 27. Ex. 29: 14. Lev. 4: 21; and

among all the people of antiquity, the blood was considered as the seat and source of life. Blood and life were to them identical. "The life [soul] of the flesh is in the blood," are the words of Jehovah to Moses, "and I have given it to you upon [for] the altar to make an atonement for your souls; for the blood maketh an atonement for [by means of] the soul."¹ The apostle to the Gentiles repeats the same position, "And almost all things are by the law purged with blood; and without shedding of blood is no remission."² So taught the Egyptians,³ and Persians,⁴ the old Roman pontifical books,⁵ and all the physiologists of ancient times,

as is expressly said in Ex. 29: 14, because "it is a sin-offering." And, Lev. 16: 23, "he that burneth them shall wash his clothes and bathe his flesh in water, and afterward he shall come into the camp." (4) Substitution may be inferred from Lev. 17: 11, where the blood is called an atonement, "because the life is in the blood." (5) The same, from Deut. 21: 1—9; the guilt is chargeable upon the whole people, if it be not known who slew the man; and by the washing of the hands, the guilt is transferred to the sacrifice. (6) The substantive קָדַשׁ, ransom, *pretium expiationis*, would lead us to the inference that קָדַשׁ, *expiate*, includes the idea of a substitution. (7) The solemn rites of the yearly feast of the expiations, with the scape-goat (*hircus emissarius*), bring us to the same result. The goat that was killed was the sin-offering, by which the sin was expiated; the sin was laid upon the one that was sent away into the wilderness, in order by this most weighty act of expiation to make a more visible manifestation of the taking away of the guilt by means of the expiation. p. 78, 79. Compare with this, Winer's *Biblisches Realwörterbuch*, under the word *Sahnopfer*.—Ta.

¹ Lev. 17: 11 (comp. Gen. 9: 4, 5. Deut. 12: 16 seq.) according to the interpretation of Baehr, *Symbol. d. heb. Cultus* II. 199. 206 seq. [Baehr's translation of the passage where it deviates from the English version, is given within the brackets of the text. His commentary upon this passage, which he looks upon as the key to the whole theory of the Jewish sacrifices, covers some fifteen pages of his great work. The chief points he seeks to establish, are: that the central point of the sacrifice is not the killing of the animal, but the procedure with the blood; that the end of the sacrifice was expiation or atonement; that it is Jehovah from whom the atonement proceeds ("I have given it"), and that the atonement is for man ("for your souls"); and that the blood makes an atonement, because the soul is in the blood, the atoning power does not reside in the material blood, but in the soul that is in the blood—שָׁמַיִם, "by means of the soul." There is a substitution of the soul of the animal for the soul of man; yet only a symbolical substitution. The sacrifice has also a sacramental character, so far as the blood is the means, ordained by God, of bringing the soul of man into connection with himself. Winer, in his *Real-W. B.* II. 631, says, that "the parallelism of the soul of the animal with the souls of the persons who offered it, is assuredly not without significancy."—Ta.

² Heb. 9: 22. Καὶ σφῆδὸν ἐν αἵματι πάντα καθαρῆται κατὰ τὸν νόμον, καὶ χωρὶς αἱματεκχυσίας οὐ γίνεται ἄφεσις.

³ Horapollo I. 7.

⁴ Strabo XV. p. 503, 504. Casaub. 1587.

⁵ Servius ad Æn. II, 118.

Pythagoras,¹ Empedocles,² Hippocrates,³ Critias,⁴ Galen.⁵ But if the blood is in the life, then it is not the shedding of the blood which effects the atonement, but the life itself, or the soul which in the blood is offered up as a sacrifice. And this is precisely what Philo declares when he speaks of the pouring out of the blood as a libation of the soul.⁶

If these positions be correct, we shall be able, in the expiatory sacrifices which were made by means of the shedding of blood, to distinguish a three-fold succession of ideas and acts: 1. the sin-

¹ Pythag. in Diog. L. VIII. 30. *τρέφουσι τὴν ψυχὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵματος.*

² Emped. fr. 315. Sturz. and Cicero Tusc. I. 9.

³ Hippocrates de Corde T. I. 490. de Flatibus T. I. 583. de Morbis T. II. 209. Kühn.

⁴ Critias in Aristot. de Anima I. 2. p. 405. b.

⁵ Galen. de plac. Hipp. et Plat. II. 8. T. V. 233. Kühn. With this idea of the blood is also connected the ancient popular superstition, that a bath or draught of fresh human blood is the only remedy for certain otherwise incurable diseases, particularly for leprosy and epilepsy. See Aretæus de curatione morborum diuturnorum I. p. 312. Kühn. Celsus III. 23. Plin. XXVI. I. XXVIII. 1, 4. Tertull. Apol. 9. Minucius Fel. Octav. 30, 5. The Pseudo-Jonathan's Chaldee paraphrase of Ex. 2: 23, and Midrasch Rabbah to Ex. 2: 1. Paraschah p. 119 col. 3. And it is still a popular superstition, that the drinking of the blood of condemned criminals is a cure for epilepsy. Comp. Feuerbach's Actenmäßige Darstellung merkw. Verbrechen I. 271 seq.

⁶ Philonis Opera T. II. 242, 10. Mangey: *ψυχῆς γὰρ, κυρίως εἶπεν, ἐστὶ σπονδὴ τὸ αἷμα.* The belief in the purifying and atoning power of blood, is most conspicuously seen in the sacrifice of bulls and rams (Taurobolium and Criobolium) in the worship of the Phrygian divinities. The person who was to be consecrated was put into a pit; over him was laid a platform perforated like a sieve, and upon it the sacrificial bull or ram slaughtered. Like a rain, through the thousand pores, dropped down the blood upon the forehead, brow, cheeks, eyes, lips and tongue, and over the whole body of the penitent, who believed himself to be perfectly purified and regenerated by this baptism of blood. See Prudentii Peristeph. X. 1011 seq. and Orelli Corpus Inscript. No. 2352: taurobolio criobolioque in aeternum renatus. Compare van Dale de oraculis p. 159 seq. [The passage from Prudentius is quoted in De Maistre, Soirées de St. Pétersbourg, II. 235, as follows:

“Tum per frequentes mille rimarum vias
Illapsus imber tabidum rorem pluit;
Defossus intus quem sacerdos excipit,
Guttas ad omnes turpe subjectum caput
Et veste et omni putrefactus corpore,
Quia os supinat, obvias offert genas;
Supponit aures; labra, nares objicit,
Oculos et ipsos proluit liquoribus:
Nec jam palato parcat, et linguam rigat
Donec cruorem totus atrum combatat.]

ner voluntarily offers up his own life as a sacrifice ; 2. instead of the guilty, another, an innocent person, suffers or takes upon himself the sacrificial death : and, finally, instead of a man, an animal is substituted and sacrificed. These three points we will now illustrate psychologically and historically.

I. The first religious idea which lies at the basis of the sacrifices, is the following. Since life is a gift of God to man, on the condition that man fulfil his commands, every sinner against God has, in strict justice, forfeited his life. It is an old saying, that the sinner, so far as in him lies, is a murderer of the divine will. Death, however, can only be expiated by the death of the guilty ; blood shed demands blood again.¹ In Plato, an aboriginal saying of the priests teaches, " that the avenging justice (*Δίκη*) never leaves a murder committed upon a blood-relation unavenged, but he that has shed such blood must, without fail, give for it his own blood ; so that, he who has killed his father will suffer the like violent death from his own children ; he that may have taken the life of his mother, must come again into the world as a woman, and one of his own children will then take from him this second life ; since there is no other purification for the shedding of the blood of consanguinity, than that the soul expiate the committed murder by the suffering of a like murder."² The consciousness of the guilt of blood, from its very nature creates a remorse, which is often so excessive as to impose the moral necessity of a voluntary self-sacrifice. " Mine iniquity is greater than that it may be forgiven," cried Cain when he had slain his brother, (Gen. 4: 13 ; marginal reading of the English version) ; and that other Cain, Judas Iscariot, was driven, by the same consciousness of guilt, to hang himself. And even now, it is a notorious fact in criminal history, that great transgressors give themselves up to justice, and ask for their own death, which they consider as an expiation of the crimes they have committed.³ Similar instances are found in heathen antiquity, and they seem to me to express the psychological idea which lies at the foundation of expiatory sacrifice.

¹ Compare Euripides El. 631. *αἷμα δ' αἵματος πικρὸς θανεῖσμός ἤλθε τῷ θανόντι.* Ovid. Metam. VIII, 483. *mors morte pianda est.* Caesar de b. G. IV. 16 : *pro hominis vita nisi hominis vita reddatur, non posse aliter deorum immortalium numen placari arbitrantur.*

² Plato de Legg. IX. p. 156, 157. Bekker. *πρὶν φόνον φόνος ὁμοίος ὁμοίον ἢ δρῶσασα ψυχὴ τίση.*

³ Feuerbach, as above cited, I. 249. II. 473 and 479 seq. (F. misjudges the first instance, in contradiction with himself, comp. S. 275.)

Thus Herodotus¹ and Diodorus² relate, that a Phrygian of regal lineage, Adrastus by name, whose hands were stained with the blood of a brother, whom he had inadvertently killed, came to Croesus, king of the Lydians, praying for a purifying expiation. Croesus granted it to the unhappy man, and retained him, and exhorted him to bear his fate with patience. In a wild boar hunt, the king committed to him the care of his son Atys; but in the chase, Adrastus, aiming at the boar, missed the animal and killed Atys. "And then Adrastus, who had first slain his brother, and afterwards the son of his benefactor, called himself the most unfortunate of men, and after he became calm, went and killed himself upon the grave of Atys." Similar is the story of Althaemenes, son of Creteus, the king of Crete. Hearing that either he or one of his brothers were to be their father's murderer, he fled to Rhodes to avoid becoming a parricide. Creteus, after the death of his other sons, went to Rhodes, to see his son Althaemenes. When he landed, the inhabitants attacked him in the night, supposing him to be an enemy, and he was killed by the hand of his own son. When Althaemenes knew what he had done, "he could not endure the burden of his misery; he departed from the sight and society of men into the wild deserts, and grieved himself to death, wandering about like one insane."³ The same idea, though in a broken form, and in the transition-state to the second stage of expiatory sacrifices, is expressed in the following narration, which carries us back to the oldest times. "Hercules had maliciously killed Iphitus, by throwing him down from a tower. For this murder, he was smitten with a severe sickness. On that account, he went to Neleus, at Pylos, and prayed him to purify him from the guilt of blood. Neleus refused. Hereupon he applied to Deiphobus, the son of Hippolytus, who was persuaded to attempt the expiation of the murder. But since Hercules did not get rid of the disorder, he asked the oracle at Delphi the means of cure; and the oracle replied, that he would be healed, when he should sell himself, and pay the price of his purchase to the children of Iphitus. He sailed over to Asia and sold himself to Omphale, queen of Maeonia, sent the purchase money to the children of Iphitus, and was restored to health."⁴ Here also we indubitably have expressed the conviction, that murder must be

¹ Herodotus I. 34—45.

² Diodori fr. p. 553. T. IV. 79. Dindorf.

³ Diodorus V. 59. According to Apollodor. III. 2. 2, he prayed the gods to remove him; and the earth immediately opened and swallowed him up.

⁴ Apollodorus II. 6, 2. Diodorus IV. 31.

expiated by the death of the murderer; only, instead of the actual, physical death, we have the civil or moral substituted, the death of personal freedom.

II. The religious consciousness advanced one step further. The true view of man, is not that which considers him to be only an isolated individual. He is a member of a race. His individual life is connected with the life of the whole race. And men are bound, not only individually but collectively, to the service and worship of God. The race as a whole, if we may so express ourselves, as one solid, compact, living, organic whole, has duties to God. On account of this connection of each individual with the whole race, since man, as man, has generic as well as specific qualities; it is possible that one individual stand as a representative for others; it is possible, that one be put for another, be both given, accepted; it is possible, that one be sacrificed for another, or sacrifice himself for another; in short, it is possible that one be offered or offer himself as an expiatory sacrifice instead of others. This idea will, be found to pervade all the ancient religions. And especially was the *voluntary* sacrifice of the innocent thought to be effectual and pleasing to the gods, in proportion to the purity of will, of him who thus offered himself for others. "A pure soul, when voluntarily offered up, is surely in a condition to make satisfaction for thousands;"¹ are the words, we find in Sophocles, addressed to Œdipus, the sufferer, when about to be glorified. And in the Sohar we read, "the death of the just expiates the sins of the world."² In Grecian Mythology, I find no earlier example of such a voluntary, expiatory death, than that of Chiron in the story of Prometheus. As a punishment for stealing the fire from heaven, Prometheus was chained to the Caucasian mountains, by order of Zeus, where an eagle was ever to devour his ever growing liver. Through many generations of men he endured these torments, until at last Hercules, in his wanderings through Asia, killed the bird of prey; and Chiron, the Centaur, who ruled over the mountainous regions, voluntarily offered himself to death instead of Prometheus.³ In history we find similar instances. When once the plague was spreading through all Aonia, the Gortynian Apollo proclaimed, that the pestilence would be stayed, when the infernal gods, Hades and Persephone, should be

¹ Soph. Œdipus. C. 498 seq.

² Sohar to Levit. p. 100: mors justorum est expiatio saeculi. Comp. Gfrörers's Philo II. 196, and Jahr. des Heils II. 133.

³ Apollod. II. 5, 4, 11.

appeased by two virgins, offering themselves up, of their own free will, as an expiatory sacrifice. The daughters of Orion, Metioche and Menippe, consecrated themselves to death for their fellow-citizens, and the pest ceased. To these virgins, the Aonians erected a splendid temple, in the Boeotian Orchomenus, and thither boys and maidens brought to them thank-offerings every year.¹ In Attica, the daughters of Erectheus, the Hyacinthians, and the daughters of Leos, voluntarily suffered a sacrificial death for their father-land; and in later times, the grateful Athenians brought to them public libations.² Known to all is the voluntary death of Codrus for his people. The prophet Tiresias in Thebes, proclaimed victory to the Cadmeans, in case the son of the king should give himself to be slain for a sacrifice. When Menocœus heard this, he offered himself up to death before the gates of the city.³ Such voluntary, sacrificial deaths (*θῦσαι*) were carefully distinguished from suicide, and from the killing of another (*φονεῦσαι*); and only the first were deemed pious.⁴ In the first Messenian war, a Delphic, oracular declaration announced to the hard-pressed Messenians, that they would obtain redemption from their miseries, if an immaculate virgin, of royal dignity, of the blood of Aegyptus, and chosen by lot, were sacrificed to the infernal deities; and should she in any way escape the sacrifice, then they must take some other, who might voluntarily (*ἑκουσίως*) consecrate herself to this object. Aristodemus, offered his own daughter; and when her suitor protested against it, (falsely denying her virginity), in his rage her father slew her with his own hand. And now, some other must give up a daughter, since Aristodemus had not offered his to the gods, but had murdered her. Yet the other Aegyptidae succeeded in making it appear, that the death of one maiden should suffice.⁵ When the priest Epimenides of Crete was called upon by the Athenians, about the forty-sixth Olympiad, 596 years before Christ, to perform a sacred lustration for their city, on account of the guilt they had incurred by the death of Cylon, (who was persuaded to leave the sanctuary of Minerva, under a promise that his life should not be forfeited, but was afterwards killed), he declared that the blood

¹ Antoninus Liberalis c. 25.

² Demosthenes Epitaph. 27, 2^o, p. 587. seq. Bek. Apollod. III. 15, 4. Diod. XVII. 15. Aelian. V. H. XII. 28. Cicero Tusc. I. 43 and N. D. III. 19 seq.

³ Apollod. III. 6, 7. Eurip. Phœn. 913 seq. Statii Theb. X. 6 10 seq. Juv. XIV. 240.

⁴ Paus. IV. 9. 5.

⁵ Paus. IV. 9.

of a man was needed for this; the Athenian youth Cratinus offered himself as a voluntary sacrifice; and thus was the expiation completed.¹ One other remarkable fact deserves to be adduced. The priestess Cometho with her paramour Melanippus once desecrated the temple of Artemis Triclarina in Achaia. The wrathful goddess brought sterility and infection upon the whole land, and the Delphian oracle declared, that they should not only sacrifice to Artemis both the guilty ones, but every year bring to her the sacrifice of a beautiful virgin and youth, until upon a time, a foreign king should come into the land, and teach them the worship of another God.²

Afterwards, when voluntary sacrifices became more infrequent, as would naturally be the case in process of time and under the gradual deliverance of the religious consciousness from the tyranny of a fearful superstition, there grew up even in Athens the horrible custom, of nourishing every year, at cost of the State, two poor, forsaken persons, male and female; and then, at the festival of Thargelia, of putting them to death for the expiation of the people, as though they had assumed their sins. Hung about with figs, and scourged with rods of the fig-tree,³ these *φαρμακοί*, to the sound of an ancient melody, called *κράδιος*, were led in solemn procession out of the city to their sacrificial death, and then, either hurled down from the rocks,⁴ or burned, and their ashes cast into the sea.⁵ The same expiatory custom existed in the Phocæan colony, Massilia. As often as the plague prevailed, they were wont to lead through the city a poor creature, adorned with wreaths and festive garments, who a year long had been fed at the public expense, to imprecate upon his head all the calamities of the people, and afterwards to cast him down from the rocks.⁶

¹ Herodotus V. 71. Thucydides I. 126. Ulrici's *Gesch. der Hellen.* Poesie I. 458 seq II. 235 seq.

² Paus. VII. 19.

³ The fig-tree is famed for its sweetness. By figs, it would then seem, is here to be implied, that the sacrifice was sweet. On this account the fig was an *ἐπιβαθμιον* of all sacrifices. It was also reputed to be an antidote against every poison. Julian. *Epist.* 24. p. 391 seq.

⁴ Aristoph. *Ran.* 733 and *Eq.* 1133, with the Scholia. Helladius in Photius *Cod.* CCLXXIX. p. 534. col. A. Bek. and Photii *Lex.* p. 533. Harpocration p. 179. Ammonius de *Diff.* p. 136. Suidas t. III. 5 81. Hesychius v. *κράδιος νόμος* p. 337. and v. *φαρμακοί* p. 1494.

⁵ Tzetzes *Chil.* v. 23, 735. *Oracula Sibyll.* III. 361. Gallæus.

⁶ Petronii *Satiricon* c. 141 extr. and Servius ad *Ae.* III. 57.

Upon the island Leucas, a man was thrown every year into the sea, for the absolution of the people.¹ In like manner, at Rhodes upon the sixth of the month Metagitnion, a man was sacrificed to Chronos. This custom was afterwards so changed, that any one condemned to death was kept till the festival of Chronos, and then strangled outside the gates, opposite the temple of Artemis *ἀριστοβούλη*, after they had given him wine to drink.² So in Cyprus, in the cities Amathus and Salamis, a man was every year sacrificed to Zeus;³ in the latter city, in the month Aphrodisios, one to Agraulus, and in later times to Diomedes. The one appointed for the sacrifice, led by youths, ran three times around the altar, the priest then thrust a lance into his throat, and burned him whole upon a funeral pile, *ἀλοκαυτίζεν*. Diphilus, king of the Cyprians in the times of Seleucus the Theologian, first abolished this custom, by substituting the sacrifice of bulls for that of men.⁴ At Laodicea in Syria, a virgin was yearly sacrificed to Athena; instead thereof, in later times, a hind was offered.⁵ In general it may with certainty be assumed, that human expiatory sacrifices prevailed in all parts of Greece; among no other people are there found more or more various accounts of such offerings, than among the Hellenists. In the Pelasgian Arcadia, from the first periods till the Roman imperial times, men were sacrificed to the Lycaean Zeus:⁶ he that went into the Lyceon no longer cast a shadow.⁷ At Halus in Thessaly, all the descendants of Athamas that entered the sanctuary of Zeus Laphystius, were offered in sacrifice.⁸ Upon the island Lemnos, virgins⁹ were sacrificed to Artemis Orthia; upon Tenedos to Palaemon;¹⁰ upon Crete, children¹¹ to Chronos and to Zeus; and Theseus was the first that abolished the tribute brought every year to the Minotaur.¹² Upon the islands Lesbos, Chios and Tenedos, human sacrifices were offered to Dionysos *Ὠμάδιος*; and in Lacedaemon to Ares.¹³ The Locrian Ajax, son of

¹ Strabo X. 2. p. 332.² Porph. de Abst. II. 54.³ Ovid. Metam. X. 224 seq. Lactantius I. 21.⁴ Porph. de Abst. II. 54, 55.⁵ Id. II. 56.⁶ Plato Min. p. 254. Theophrastus in Porph. de Abst. II. 27. Pausan. VIII. 2, 38. Varr. fr. p. 361 seq. Bip.⁷ Plut. Mor. p. 300.⁸ Herod. VII. 197. Plato Min. as cited.⁹ Steph. Byz. v. *Ἀῆμος* p. 183. Müller's Orchom. p. 310.¹⁰ Lycophron 229 with Tzetzes.¹¹ Istrus in Porph. de Abst. II. 56. Plutarchus Thes. p. 6, D.¹² Isocrates Encom. Hel. 27. p. 234. Bekker.¹³ Dosidas in Clemens Alex. Cohort. p. 36. Porph. de Abst. II. 54. Euseb.

Oileus, after the taking of Troy, dishonored Cassandra, daughter of Priam, priestess of Athena. The goddess avenged the outrage not only upon the criminal, who in his voyage back was shipwrecked, but also upon all the Locrians, whom she visited with general public calamities. They consulted the oracle, and received for answer, that for a thousand years, they must each year send two virgins to Troy, to serve in the temple of Athena, and this they did till the so-called holy war.¹ The virgins were burned, and their ashes cast into the sea from mount Traron.² Achilles, the noblest of Grecian heroes, sacrificed twelve Trojan youths to the manes of Patroclus;³ Neoptolemus immolated Polyxena to the memory of his father Achilles.⁴ Menelaus, detained in Egypt by adverse winds, sacrificed two boys.⁵ In the midst of the proper historic period of Greece, Themistocles, before the battle of Salamis, brought three Persian prisoners⁶ to the altar of Dionysos the Feroxious, *Διόνυσος ὀμηστῆς*; in accordance, as Phylarchus maintains, with an ancient custom, that all Greeks, ere they went to war, must offer human sacrifices.⁷

The same religious ideas were the basis of the like sacrifices in ancient Rome.⁸ As in Athens, Codrus and the daughters of Erectheus voluntarily offered themselves; so in Rome, out of many examples to adduce one, P. Decius, the consul in the Latin war, consecrated himself for the sake of his legions, of his own free will to a sacrificial death.⁹ Prisoners were afterwards substituted for these voluntary sacrifices. In the year of the city 397, three hundred and seven Roman prisoners were immolated at one time, by the Etruscan Tarquinius, with Punic cruelty.¹⁰ As often as any great and general calamity threatened the existence of the Roman State, by order of the books of fate, human victims

Praep. ev. IV. 16. and de Laud. Const. 13. 4 seq. Other instances of human sacrifices are adduced in Clem. Alex. Cohort. 3, p. 36 seq. and Cyrill. adv. Julianum, p. 128.

¹ Plut. Moral. p. 557, D. and Schol. Lycophr. 1135.

² Callim. fr. p. 564 Ern. and Tzetzes Chil. V. 23, 738.

³ Il. XXI. 27 seq. In like mode Æneas in Virgil X. 517 seq.

⁴ Eurip. Hec. 37 seq. 104 seq. 215 seq. 516 seq. Ovid. Metam. XIII. 441 seq.

⁵ Herod. II. 119.

⁶ Plut. Themist. p. 119, A. Aristid. p. 323 seq.

⁷ Phylarchus in Porph. de Abst. II. 56.

⁸ Upon the old Italian human sacrifices, and that Hercules was the first who attempted to abolish them, see Dionysius I. 38. Ovid. Fast. V. 621 seq. Macrobius Sat. I. 7. p. 240 seq. Zeune. Lactantius I. 21. Minucius Felix Octav. 30. Arnobius II. p. 91.

⁹ Liv. VIII. 9, 10.

¹⁰ Liv. VII. 15.

were sacrificed. A man and woman of the Gauls, a man and woman of the Greeks, or natives of whatever country threatened them with danger, were buried alive in the cattle-market,¹ with magical forms of prayer repeated by the president of the College of the Fifteen, who had charge of the Sibylline books.² It was not until the year 657 of the city, or 97 years before Christ, that the senate issued a decree forbidding human sacrifices.³ But in spite of this we read, that the dictator J. Caesar, A. U. 708, or 46 years before Christ, commanded a sacrifice of two men, with the traditionary solemnities, upon the Campus Martius, by the Pontifices and the Flamen Martis.⁴ And Augustus, after the defeat of L. Antonius, immolated four hundred senators and knights upon the altar of the deified Julius, at the Ides of March 713, or 43 years before Christ.⁵ Even in the times of Hadrian, the beautiful Antinous died a voluntary sacrifice for the emperor;⁶ and the annual immolation of men to Jupiter Latiaris, upon the Alban mount, is said to have continued even into the third century of our era.⁷

As it was in Greece and Rome, so it was among almost all the oriental and occidental nations. Nowhere are to be found more bloody and fearful human sacrifices, than among the idolatrous descendants of Shem, especially in ancient Canaan, in Phoenicia and Carthage. Here, perhaps, we find human sacrifices in their primitive form. Not any and every human being was immolated, but the innocent children were selected; and among these, the preference was given to the only child or to the first-born.⁸ A king of the Moabites, whom the three united kings of Israel, Judah and Edom had driven back into his principal city, takes his first-born son, and slays him upon the wall for a burnt-offering; and the three kings, indignant at this barbarity, returned to their own

¹ Plin. XXVIII. 2, 12.

² Liv. XXII. 57. Plut. Marc. p. 299, C. and Mor. p. 283 seq.

³ Plin. XXX 1, 12.

⁴ Dio Cass. XLIII. 24.

⁵ Dio Cass. XLVIII. 14. Suet. Octav. 15. Seneca de Clem. I. 11. Sextus Pomp. had not only horses but men thrown into the sea, as a sacrifice to Neptune. Dio Cass. XLVIII. 48.

⁶ Xiphilinus p. 356, 21. Sylb. Ael. Spartianus Hadriano 14. Aur. Victor de Caesaribus 14.

⁷ Porph. de Abst. II. 56. Just. Martyr Apol. II. p. 100, D. Theophilus ad Autol. III. p. 412, E. Tatian. adv. Graecos p. 284, B. Euseb. de Laud. Const. 13, 5. 1198. Zimmerm. Tertul. Apol. 8. and Scorp. adv. Gnost. 7. Minucius Fel. Octav. 21, 15. 30, 4. Lactantius I. 21, 30. Prudentius adv. Symmach. 1. 380.

⁸ Euseb. de Laud. Const. 13, 4 *τὰ μονογενῆ καὶ ἀγαπητὰ τῶν τέκνων κατασφάζειν.*

land.¹ The Sepharvites burnt their children in fire to Adrammelech and Anammelech.² The valley of Hinnom is especially designated as the place of abominations, where children were immolated to the Moloch of the Ammonites.³ The Phœnician history is full of such sacrifices. In all great calamities, in war or general sterility, in plague or famine, they believed that they could appease the wrath of Baal, who inflicted these punishments, by offering to him the dearest child as a piacular sacrifice.⁴ At Carthage there was a metallic statue of Chronos, in a bending posture, with hands stretched out and raised upwards. This statue was heated, till it glowed, by a kiln beneath; into its arms were placed the children destined for sacrifice; from its arms they fell into the gulf of fire beneath, dying in convulsions, which were said to be of laughter.⁵ The childless were wont to buy children of the poor. "The mother," says Plutarch, "stands by, without shedding a tear or uttering a sigh; should sigh or tear be observed, the money is lost, yet the child is sacrificed: around the image of the god, all resounds with the noise of kettle-drums and flutes, that the crying and wailing be not heard."⁶ Another author informs us, that the tears of the children were stifled by caresses: *ne flebilis hostia imoletur.*⁷ It is evident that every attempt was made, to have at least the semblance of a voluntary sacrifice. When the Sicilian king Agathocles appeared before the walls of Carthage, the besieged, to repel the invaders, immolated upon the altar of Chronos two hundred boys of the noblest families; and three hundred more were voluntarily offered to a like sacrifice;⁸ and after the defeat of Agathocles, the best and most beautiful prisoners were slain as a thank-offering to the gods.⁹ Gelon had, indeed, (Ol. 75, 1,) when he conquered the Carthaginians at Himera, granted them peace only on condition that they, from that time forth, should sacrifice no more children to Chronos;¹⁰ but the

¹ 2 Kings 3: 27. [The English version reads, "indignation *against* Israel;" but the original is *בְּ*, super.]

² 2 Kings 17: 31.

³ 2 Chron. 28: 3. 33: 6. Is. 57: 5. Jer. 7: 32. 19: 2, 4 seq. Ex. 16: 20 seq. 23: 37 seq.

⁴ Sanchoniathon in Porph. de Abst. II. 56 and in Euseb. pr. ev. I. 10. IV. 16.

⁵ Clitarchus in the Schol. Plat. p. 396. Bekker. Diod. XX. 14.

⁶ Plut. Mor. p. 171, B.

⁷ Min. Felix Octav. 30, 3. Tertul. Apol. 9.

⁸ Diod. XX. 14 and Pescennius Festus in Lactant. I. 21. p. 132.

⁹ Diod. XX. 65.

¹⁰ Plut. Mor. p. 175, A. 552, A. Comp. Just. 19, I. 33*

agreement had no duration. The old and fearful superstition maintained its validity, until, under the reign of Tiberius, the public immolation of children ceased, but in secret it still continued.¹

Among the gloomy and austere Egyptians, the existence of human sacrifices cannot be denied. Manetho testifies, that in the city Eileithya, every year in the dog-days, some so-called Typhonian (i. e. red-haired) men, were burnt alive, and their ashes thrown into the air with winnowing-shovels;² and like persons were sacrificed by the kings at the grave of Osiris.³ Milder was the custom of the religious Ethiopians. Every twentieth generation, or every sixth hundredth year, there was a general purification of the land by two men, usually foreigners. They were put into a small boat, with provisions for two months, and commanded to sail towards the South, where they would arrive at a happy island, inhabited by just men.⁴ The Persians buried alive the men who were to be sacrificed;⁵ and it would seem to have been a custom amongst them, as with the Greeks, before a battle to slay prisoners.⁶ The Dumatians in Arabia sacrificed a boy every year, and buried him under the altar;⁷ the Arabians, in garments sprinkled with blood, offered regularly to Mars a warrior, and every Thursday to Jupiter a sucking child.⁸ The same human sacrifices, in fine, are found among the Northern nations; among the

¹ Tertul. Apol. 9. From a passage in Porph. de Abst. II. 27, it would seem that children were still sacrificed there in his times, 300 years after Christ. For a more full view of the Punic human sacrifices, see Fr. Münter, Religion d. Karthager, S. 17 ff.

² Plut. Mor. p. 380, C. D.

³ Diodorus I. 88. The grave of Osiris is called, by the Egyptians, Busiris. Hence, the well known Grecian fable, that Busiris was an Egyptian king, who sacrificed foreigners and devoured their flesh, till Hercules put an end to the enormity. Pherecydes in the Schol. Apoll. Rh. IV. 1396. Apollod. II. 5. 11. Panyasis in Athen. IV. 72. Virg. Ge. III. 5. Ovid. de Arte am. I. 649. Met. IX. 182. Trist. III. 11, 39. This fable was adequately refuted, even among the ancients, by Herod. II. 45. Isoc. Busir. 5. 36, 37 and Diod. I. 88. Compare Creuzer, Symb. und Mythol. I. 352 seq.

⁴ Diodorus II. 55. When, on account of the wrath of Poseidon, Ethiopia was inundated, and was laid waste by a sea-monster, the oracle of Ammon declared, that the land would be delivered from the disaster, if Andromeda, the daughter of the king, should be cast out to this monster of the deep. The virgin was chained to a rock, but released by Perseus, and carried home as his bride. Apollod. II. 4, 3 and Heyne's Observ. p. 126.

⁵ Herod. VII. 114, with Wesseling's Comment.

⁶ Herod. VII. 180.

⁷ Porph. de Abst. II. 56.

⁸ Stühr's Religion der heidn. Völker des Orients, p. 407.

Scythians, the Getae and the Thracians;¹ among the Russians on the Dnieper,² the Swedes and the Danes;³ among the Germans,⁴ the Gauls,⁵ the Britons⁶ and the Celts.⁷ I will adduce only one additional instance, found among the Albans, from which it is made very clear, that those who offered it, sought by contact with the sacrifice to become partakers of its expiatory virtue. After the man was slain, the body was carried to another place, where all, for the sake of the purification, touched it with the foot, *ἐπιβαίνουσιν ἅπαντες καθαρσίῳ χρώμενοι*.⁸

These historical proofs may suffice to establish the positions, that the necessity of purification and of the reconciliation of sinful man with God, was most strongly and universally impressed upon the religious systems, and experienced in the religious convictions, of all the nations of antiquity; and that it was believed that the means of such an absolution were to be found in the shedding of human blood. Even where a milder feeling struggled against actual human sacrifices, the religious faith in its necessity was still so strong, that there was at least a constant longing for the shedding of the blood of man. Hence, facts like the following: the priests of Baal tore their flesh till the blood flowed, and limped around the altar of their god;⁹ the priests of the Phrygian mother of the gods danced their bloody weapon-dances, wounded themselves in the arms and feet, and castrated themselves;¹⁰ the priests of Hercules at Gades in Spain daily sprinkled the altar of the god with blood;¹¹ the priests of Bellona, in feigned insanity, lacerated their shoulders and arms with knives in the

¹ Herod. IV. 62. 71, 72. V. 5. Plut. Mor. p. 171, B. Porph. as above. Ovid. ex Ponto IV. 9, 84. Lucian. de Sacrif. 13. The human sacrifices offered to the Taurian Artemis are known through all the world, comp. Diod. IV. 44, 45. Ovid. Trist. IV. 4, 61 seq. and ex Ponto III. 2, 45 seq. Lactan. I. 21 and A.

² Solinus 15, 2.

³ La Cerda advers. sacra c. 43. Mone Gesch. d. Heidenthums I. 261, 270. Grimm, deutsche. Myth. p. 29.

⁴ Tac. Germ. 9. 33. Grimm, deutsche. Myth. p. 26 seq.

⁵ Caesar B. G. VI. 16. Just. XXVI. 2. Diod. V. 31, 32. Strabo IV. 4. p. 319. Lactan. I. 21. Min. Felix Octav. 30 and Plac. Lactan. in Statii Theb. X. 788.

⁶ Caesar B. G. VI. 13. Tac. Agr. 11.

⁷ Lucanus I. 444. Zeuss, die Deutschen und die Nachbarstämme, p. 32.

⁸ Strab. XI. 4. p. 417.

⁹ 1 Kings 18: 26 seq.

¹⁰ Lactan. I. 21. p. 133. August. C. D. VII. 26. Creuzer, Symb. und Myth. II. 39 seq. Comp. Aretaeus de causis et signis diurn. morb. I. 6, p. 84. Kühn.

¹¹ Porph. de Abst. I. 25. p. 37.

temple of the goddess;¹ after human sacrifices at the graves had actually ceased, the Roman women, despite the prohibition of the Twelve Tables,² tore the flesh from their cheeks, in order, by the show of blood, to make satisfaction to the deities of the infernal regions.³ At the festival of Artemis Brauronia in Attica, which was appointed in commemoration of the sufferings and deliverance of Orestes, instead of the human sacrifice, a man must offer the back part of his neck to the sword, and at least some human blood be shed.⁴ To the same series of facts, belong the scourging of the Spartan boys at the altar of Artemis Orthia;⁵ and the scourging of the Arcadian women at Alea in the Dionysian festival *Συέρεα*.⁶ In these cases, fresh human blood, drawn by violence, is manifestly substituted for the actual offering up of the life. The Semitic nations, that burnt their children upon the funeral pyre, when they would spare their lives, let them pass through the fire.⁷

In connection with these attempts to avoid the religious claim of the sacrifice of the whole life, another mode of effecting this object had already established itself. When once the primitive idea of the giving up of life itself, had been exchanged for the giving up of that which represents and sustains life, viz. the blood that was shed, then the next step would be, as follows under our third division.

III. Since that which constitutes the substance of all life, the blood, or the soul in the blood, (so to speak, the blood-soul,) is the same in all living beings; then the *ánima vicaria* of the life of an animal, may be substituted, a soul for a soul, an *ἀντίψυχο*⁸ for

¹ Hor. Sat. II. 3, 223 and Heindorf on the passage p. 318. Tibull. I. 6, 45. with Dissem's Comment. p. 137 seq. Tertul. Apol. 9. Lactan. I. 21, p. 133.

² Mulieres genas ne redunto, neve lessum funeris ergo habento. Cic. de Legg. II. 23. Servius ad Ae. XII. 606.

³ Varro in Serv. ad Ae. III. 67. mulieres in exequiis et lactu ideo solitas ora lacerare, ut sanguine ostenso inferis satisfaciant.

⁴ Eurip. Iph. T. 1424 seq.

⁵ Pausan. III. 16, 6 seq. Plut. Mor. p. 239. C. Sextus Empir. III. 208. Malier's Dorier I. 382 seq.

⁶ Pausan. VIII. 23, 1.

⁷ Lev. 18: 21. 2 Kings 16: 3. 17: 17. 23: 10. 2 Chron. 28: 3.

⁸ Lucian. Lexiphane 10. T. II. 333. Reitz. and Eusebius Demonstr. ev. I. 10. p. 35, B. ed. Paris, 1628. ἀντὶ τῆς οἰκίας ψυχῆς τὴν διὰ τῶν ἀλόγων ζώων προσῆγον θύσιαν, τῆς σφῶν ψυχῆς ἀντίψυχα προσκομίζοντες. Comp. Joh. Chrysostomus adv. Judaeos VIII. 9. T. I. p. 688, A. Montf. [It was believed, as it always will be believed, that the innocent could pay for the

the more valuable life of man, and be offered to the gods by way of reconciliation or expiation.¹ This vicarious character of animal sacrifices, this substitution of them for human sacrifices, is very clearly expressed in an Egyptian custom. Upon the sacrificial bulls that were found to be without blemish, a seal was branded, which represented a man kneeling, with his hands bound behind him, and a sword placed at his throat.² We also find this transition from human to animal sacrifices unequivocally expressed in the Grecian traditions. At Orchomenos in Boeotia, from immemorial times, a malediction had rested upon the race of Athamas, in consequence of which the first-born son must die as a piacular sacrifice for the people.³ Phryxus, the son of king Athamas was about to be immolated. As his father was leading him to the altar, his mother sent him a ram with a golden fleece, which Hermes had given her. The golden ram carried away Phryxus and his sister Helle through the air, over land and sea. Helle fell into the sea, and gave to that part of it, where she died, the name of Hellespont; Phryxus reached the far land of Aea, there sacrificed the ram to Zeus Laphystius, and gave the golden fleece to king Æetes. The king fastened the fleece to an oak tree in the grove of Ares, and a sleepless dragon guarded it. A brother's son of Athamas, by name Aeson, was king of Jolchos in Thessaly; and his son was Jason, which name signifies a saviour.⁴ This Jason, with the help of Athena, prepared the ship Argo, assembled the most famous heroes of his times, and sailed to Colchis. Assisted by the sorceress Medea, who became his wife, Jason recovered the gold-

guilty; and, hence, the conclusion was drawn, that man, having forfeited his life, a life less precious might be offered and accepted. The blood of animals was offered; the blood was held to be the seat of the soul; and this soul, offered instead of a soul, was called by the ancients *antipsychoi* (*ἀντιψυχοί*) a vicarious soul; as if one should say, a soul for a soul, a substituted soul." — De Maistre II. 253.]

¹ Ovid. Fast. VI. 161. Cor pro corde, precor, pro fibris accipe fibras. Hanc animam vobis pro meliore damus. In the passage in Virgil *Æt.* V. 483, the expression "*melior anima*" does not mean, (as O. Müller, *Etrusk.* II. 179 seq. will have it) a vicarious animal life, in an absolute sense; but it refers to the "*melior hostia succidanea*," as is proved by the parallel passage, *Æt.* XII, 296.

² Castor in *Plut. Mor.* p. 363, B. *Comp. Herodotus* II. 38, 39.

³ Herod. VII. 197.

⁴ Ancient authors thus interpret it by bringing the names Aison and Jason into connection with *iaōs*, the act of healing. So that the name Jason etymologically expresses the same conception as the names Joshua and Jesus. *Schol. Pind. Pyth.* IV. 211. *Joseph. Flav. A. J.* XII. 5. 1. *Matt.* 1:21. *Cyril. Hier. Lect. catech.* X. 13. and *Joh. Chrys. T.* VII. p. 23, B.

en fleece and brought it back to Greece.¹ Athamas, his son Phryxus, and the ram, strikingly remind us of the account in the Old Testament, of Abraham's sacrifice, and the mysterious ram by which Isaac was saved.² If we consider, as does the Scripture, this mystic ram, by which the reconciling God prevents the dreadful sacrifice of Isaac, as a symbol of the Lamb, who was to be offered up for the sins of the world; then Jason, and his heroic expedition after the golden fleece, may have a higher significancy, and appear like a wondrous foreshadowing of the coming of Him, who brought to men the true redemption. The same idea, in respect of the sacrifice of animals, is contained in the well-known tale of Agamemnon and his daughter Iphigenia, where the deity interferes and sends and accepts a hind instead of human life.³ The inhabitants of Potniae in Boeotia had once, in wild debauch, killed the priest of Dionysos. Hardly was the crime committed, when the plague fell upon them, and the Delphian oracle declared, they must every year sacrifice a blooming boy to Dionysos; in later times they were allowed to substitute a goat for the child.⁴ When the plague was raging in Lacedaemon, the oracle, being consulted, returned for answer, that the pestilence would cease if a virgin, of noble family, were every year offered in sacrifice. As once the lot fell upon the beautiful Helena, and she was led adorned to the altar, an eagle of Zeus, rushing down from the heavens, seized the sacrificial sword, carried it to the herds, and laid it upon a young cow; and from this time forward, the immolation of virgins ceased.⁵ Also, that most ancient custom in Rome and Athens, that in case of unintentional murder, the relatives, the bounden avengers of blood, might accept the substitution of a ram for the head of the murderer,⁶ does not permit us to doubt respecting the original meaning of animal sacrifices, that they were substituted for human (*loco hominis*). This point is further illustrated by the account of the origin of the Tarentine

¹ Apollod. l. 9. Pausan. l. 24, 2. IX. 34, 4. Müller's Orchom. p. 258 seq.

² Philo, in his work de Abrahamo, has instituted a comparison of this sacrifice with analogous ones in heathenism. See Gfrörer's Philo l. 469 seq. [For a singular resemblance to Abraham's sacrifice of Isaac, in the mystical sacrifice of the Phoenicians, see Magee on the Atonement, l. 266, 277.]

³ As the Cyprians relate in Proclus ap. Photium, p. 319. Pausan. IX. 19, 5. Antoninus Liberalis 27. Ov. Met. XII. 23 seq.

⁴ Pausan. IX. 8, 1.

⁵ Plut. Mor. p. 314, C. Joh. Lydus de mens. p. 113. Bekker.

⁶ Festus v. subijci, p. 265, 267 Lindem. Serv. ad Ecl. 4, 43. Comp. Lev. 3: 19: 21. Num. 5: 8. Ezra 10: 19.

games (*ludi Tarentini*). Valesius wished to redeem the lives of his two children, who were smitten with mortal sickness, at first by giving up his own and his wife's life, but he actually redeemed them by the vicarious offering of two sacrificed animals, their souls, represented by the blood, being substituted for the souls of the children.¹

There was now an advance upon this position. According to the maxim, "in sacris etiam simulata pro veris haberi,"² since the *will* is the essential and fundamental point, in the whole matter of sacrifices, we find the principle of substitution still further carried out and developed. At Heliopolis, in Egypt, it was the custom to sacrifice, every day, three men to Hera. King Amosis abolished this; and, instead thereof, commanded the oblation of as many wax figures.³ In Rome every year, after the vernal equinox, in the Ides of May, three or four and twenty so-called *Argei*, that is, images of men made of rushes, were cast down from the Sublician bridge into the Tiber, by the priests and vestal virgins, for the expiation of the people. Hercules is said to have introduced this custom by teaching, that the images of men were to be substituted for human victims.⁴ In like manner, at the festival of the *Compitalia*, to the *Lares* of the cross-ways, instead of the original sacrifices of children, dolls and skeins of wool were afterwards hung up; and the consul Brutus ordered, that the heads of the poppy and onion should be offered instead of human heads, in order to satisfy the letter of the law, *ut pro capitibus capitibus supplicaretur*.⁵ The city *Cyzicus* was sacred to *Persephone*; at her festival a black cow was sacrificed. When in the second *Mithridatic* war, at the siege of the city, this had become impossible, they made of wheat-meal an image of a cow.⁶ The

¹ Zos. Hist. II. 1 seq. and Val. Maximus II. 4, 5. The same primitive signification of animal sacrifices, as being "*loco hominis*," lies at the foundation of the Roman federal and votive sacrifices. Here, the killing of the sacrificial animal, and the going through the herds among the limbs of the beast, cut up and scattered round, was significant of the fate of the perjured one. Liv. I. 24, 32. IX. 5). This is made very clear by a comparison of a similar Persian and Grecian custom, as found in Herodotus VII. 39 and Apollodor. III. 13. 7.

² Serv. ad *Ae* II. 116. and Mythogr. Vat. III. 6, 30. p. 193, 18.

³ Porph. de Abst. II. 55.

⁴ Varro de L. L. VII. 44. Ov. Fast. V. 621. Dionys. I. 38. Plut. Mor. p. 172, A.

⁵ Macrob. Sat. I. 7. Festus, p. 91 and p. 207.

⁶ But the goddess then sent a black cow over the sea, that of its own accord

poor were generally wont to sacrifice these cows made of meal instead of the actual animal.¹ The Locrians made small bulls even of wood, as a substitute for the real creature;² and at the festival of the Boeotian Hercules, apples were offered instead of sheep, because both are called $\mu\tilde{\eta}\lambda\alpha$.³

Through such transition-stages, in the historical development of expiatory sacrifices, men gradually returned to the idea which lies at the basis of them all, the consecration of the will. And as the prophets of the Old Testament tell us that the Lord has more pleasure in those that do justly and love mercy, and that truly know God, than in all sacrifices and burnt-offerings;⁴ (in accordance with which declaration the Essenes would seem to have acted);⁵ so heathen poets and philosophers also declare, "that it is of no avail for men, whose souls are grovelling in the earth, and are void and sterile of all things heavenly, with such sentiments to go to the temples, and out of the depths of their sinful lives to bring their gifts to the gods."⁶ Cicero (*de Legg.* II. 8. 9.) exhorts, "let them come to the gods with pure hearts; let them bring piety, let them take away wealth; whoever does otherwise, god himself will be the avenger; . . . let not the impious man dare to appease the anger of the gods by gifts." To the same effect he speaks in his work on the Nature of the Gods: (II. 28. 71) "the worship of the gods is more excellent than all things else; it is most chaste, most sacred, most full of piety. Ever should we venerate them with a pure, sincere and uncorrupt mind and voice." And Seneca (*de Benef.* I. 6.) tells us, "the honor of the gods is not in victims, though these be most

ran into the temple, and stood still by the altar. *Plut. Lucullo*, p. 498, A. *App. de bello Mith.* 75. and *Porph. de Abst.* I. 25.

¹ Suidas v. $\beta\omicron\nu\tilde{\nu}\varsigma$ $\tilde{\epsilon}\beta\delta\omicron\mu\omicron\varsigma$ T. I. p. 443 seq. In like manner acted Empedocles after the precedence of Pythagoras. See *Athenaeus* I. 5. and *Philostratus* V. *Apoll.* I. 1.

² *Zenobius* V. 5. and *Leutsch* on the passage.

³ *Pollux* I. 30, 31.

⁴ *Micah* 6: 7 seq. *Hosea* 6: 6 *Comp.* *Psalm* 50: 8 seq. *Isa.* 1: 11 seq.

⁵ *Gfrörer's Philo* II. 341.

⁶ *Persius* II. 61 seq *Comp.* *Plautus Rud. prol.* 22 seq. *Atque hoc scelesti in animum inducunt suum,*

Jovem se placare posse donis, hostiis :
Et operam et sumptum perdunt : id eo fit, quia
Nihil ei acceptum est a perjuri supplicii.
Facilius, si qui pius est, a dis supplicans,
Quam qui scelestus est, inveniet veniam sibi.

excellent and glittering with gold, but in the pious and upright will of the worshippers: the good are religious even when they offer only corn and pap; the evil do not avoid the charge of impiety, although they make the altars flow with blood." "The sacrifices of the foolish do but feed the fire; and the consecrated offerings give occasion to the robbery of temples; only he is a true priest, who brings himself as a sacrifice, and dedicates his soul to a temple of God, since God has upon earth no more fitting abode than a human soul made pure;¹ we ought to be pure not alone outwardly, but also to be chaste and holy within;² and true and right ideas respecting the gods are more pleasing to them than all sacrifices and ceremonies."³

These declarations, and such as these, are, however, only exceptions; as it were, in anticipation of the truth. In the rule, in the heathen as in the Jewish worship, we everywhere find sacrifices of animals. The oblation of vegetable substances, in particular cases, accompanied them. And not only for expiation of sin, were sacrifices offered, but also in all the most important actions and periods of life, where man needed the help of the gods, at the beginning and end of every weighty transaction, in order to make manifest and to keep alive the continuous connection of men with God.

The aboriginal, patriarchal precepts of Hesiod,⁴ command every one, "when the morning breaks and when the day declines, with holy sprinkling and well-pleasing incense to reconcile the gods, so that their hearts may be inclined to us in complacency and peace." In family life, at birth, marriage, and death, sacrifices were made. The Cretans, who looked upon the marriage of men as a figure of the heavenly union of Zeus and Hera, brought their consecrated offerings, especially on such occasions, to these gods.⁵ When in Athens a man would marry, he brought first of all to the three original sources of life (the so-called Tritopatores) his prayers and sacrifices for the prosperous procreation of children,⁶ since without god there is no birth. Even at marriage there were sacrifices;⁷ and the gall of the animal was thrown behind the al-

¹ Pythag. in Stob. Floril. IV. 109. and Hierocl. p. 25. Compare Zaleucus in Diod. XII. 20. and Paul in Rom. 12: 1.

² Pythag. in Diod. fr. p. 555. T. IV. p. 82.

³ Plut. Mor. p. 355, C.

⁴ Hes. Op. et D. 335 seq.

⁵ Diod. V. 72, 73.

⁶ *ὑπὲρ γενέσεως παιδῶν* Suidas v. *τριτοπάτορες* and Lobeck Agl. p. 754 seq.

⁷ Poll. III. 38.

tar, to signify that no bitterness should ever make the union to be like gall.¹ In addition to this, in Athens, a sacrifice was offered when the bride was conducted to the family of her husband.² In Sparta, mothers at the marriage of their daughters, were accustomed to bring an oblation to Aphrodite Hera, the goddess of marriage love;³ the Boeotians and Locrians to Artemis Euclea;⁴ and the maidens of Haliartus, according to the usage of their ancestors, made a sacrifice preliminary to marriage to the nymphs at the spring of Cissoessa.⁵ Were the marriage blessed by a child, on the seventh or tenth day after its birth an oblation was made for it, and afterwards its name given to it.⁶ And at death, sacrifices were again offered for the repose of the departed soul, as well by individuals as by the State.⁷ The grave-stones were anointed, and wreathed with flowers; funeral piles were made, and victims sacrificed upon them; or, at least, various kinds of food thrown into the flames; pits were dug in the ground, and an oblation of wine, milk, and honey poured into them.⁸ Only for children none of these sacrifices for the dead were offered; because, being as yet unstained by the contact with earthly things, they needed no expiation.⁹

In like manner, they were accustomed to offer the first fruits of all that the bounty of the gods had given them; the firstlings of the flock, the first fruits of the field,¹⁰ of the vintage, of the or-

¹ Plut. Mor. p. 141, E.

² τὴν γαμηλίαν θύοιαν εἰσφέρειν. See Wachsmuth, Hellen. Alterthüm. I. 237.

³ Pausan. III. 13, 6.

⁴ Plut. Aristid. p. 331, E.

⁵ Plut. Mor. p. 772, B.

⁶ δευτέρην θύειν Aristoph. Av. 494. 922. with the Schol. and Aristot. Hist. An. VII. 12. For the Roman custom, Festus v. lustrici dies, p. 90.

⁷ According to Plato, de Rep. II. p. 71, it was an Orphic doctrine, that there were certain redemptions and purifications (λύσεις τε καὶ καθαρμοί) even for the dead; that is, by means of certain sacrifices even the dead could be redeemed; this is in striking analogy with the Roman Catholic doctrine of masses for the soul, which also reposes upon the belief in the continuity of existence, and the unceasing communion of those united by religion.

⁸ Comp. Soph. Ant. 431. Eurip. El. 115. Joh. Lydus de mens. IV. 26. Lucian. Char. 22. Plut. in Arist. p. 332. describes the great public sacrifice for the dead, which the Plataeans, to the latest times, offered for those that fell in the battle against the Persians. Comp. Thuc. III. 58.

⁹ Plut. Mor. p. 612, A.

¹⁰ Hence, e. g. in Mycalessus, the first of the fruits were every year offered to Hercules, who was there revered as one of the Idaean Dactyli (Paus. IX. 19, 4). In the Attic Thargelia and Pyanepsia, fruits were offered to Apollo and the Heroes, especially the εἰρεσιβότη, which may be compared with our

chard,¹ the first of the drink and the first of the food.² Aristotle looks upon the offering of the first fruits of the field as the most ancient form of sacrifice.³ A Roman author, Censorinus, expresses himself, with great beauty upon this subject. "Since our forefathers lived in the belief that all their means of life, that their country, yes, that life itself, was a gift of the gods, they were accustomed to sacrifice to them something of all they had, rather to show their thankfulness than because they believed that the gods needed it. Hence, ere they had partaken of the fresh fruits of the field, they consecrated a part to the gods. And since they possessed the country and the cities only as stewards of the gods, to them they consecrated a part for temples and chapels. Some were wont, in order to preserve the health of the rest of the body, to offer the topmost part thereof, the hair of their heads."⁴ For the expiation of the sins committed in the family, the fathers brought a sacrifice every month to Hecate. Certain kinds of food were prepared, the dishes carried through the whole house, to banish into them the curse that rested upon the evil deeds that had been committed, and then were put at midnight in a cross-way. Whoever ate of them, they believed that with the food he ate the curse also; only dogs, and men like dogs, partook thereof.⁵

Not less were sacrifices conjoined with all the weighty trans-

harvest wreaths, (Schol. Aristoph. Eq. 739. Plut. 1055). Such first-fruits were also left in the public roads, for the refreshment of travellers, who were supposed to be under the protection of Hermes, Etymol. M. v. "Ἐρμῆος and Demosth. adv. Mid. 52. p. 477 seq. Compare also Horat. Epist. II. 1. 139 seq. and Tibull. I. 1, 11 seq.

¹ *Ἰνδορυγία*, Plut. Moral. p. 655, E. The Roman calpar, Festus p. 50 with the remarks p. 304.

² Porph. de Abst. II. 20.

³ Arist. Eth. Nic. VIII. 11 extr. Some of the ancient writers maintain, that the *bloodless* sacrifices were the oldest, and that in primitive times only fruits and cakes were offered, (Plato de Legg. VI. p. 471 and Porph. de Abst. II. 5, 6. 7, 27), and for proof of this they rely upon the alleged tradition, that Cecrops first taught the worship of Zeus as the *ἕκτατος*, and sacrificed to him nothing that had life, but only cakes made of meal and honey, (Pausan. I. 26, 6. VIII. 2, 11. Upon the *πέλανος*, see Harpocration p. 145. Suidas s. v. Pollux VI. 76. Photius Lex. p. 350 seq.). This view does not seem to me to be based upon facts, but to be a mere philosophical speculation. The oldest of books, Genesis, looks upon bloody and bloodless sacrifices as alike ancient, but manifestly gives the preference to the former.

⁴ Censorinus de die natali I. 9, 10.

⁵ Plut. Mor. p. 708. F. Schol. Aesch. Choeph. 95. Schol. Aristoph. Plut. 504. Demosth. adv. Conon. 39. p. 479. Hemsterhusius ad Lucian. t. I. p. 330.

actions of political life. A preliminary sacrifice (*προτέλεια*) preceded every important act of the State, to enlist the favor of the gods.¹ At Athens, before every meeting of the people, from the consciousness that all were stained with sin, and that sinful men could not give wholesome counsel, a sacrifice of the young of swine was made, and their blood was sprinkled upon the seats of the assembly for their purification.² Then the priest carried the stones of the sacrificed animal through the congregation, and banished their sins into these *ὄρχεις*.³ When this was done, incense was scattered, and the same priest went around with the vessel of consecrated water, and pronounced a blessing upon the purified people for the act which they were about to perform.⁴ After this, the herald prayed the prayers of their fathers,⁵ and then first began the deliberations. Similar were the preliminary sacrifices of the senate, of the Prytanes, and of several of the public officers.⁶ Sacrifices preceded the sessions of the courts, and all taking of oaths.⁷ In war, no important measure was undertaken, before the sacrifices were auspicious and announced success.⁸ At the departure of the army from home,⁹ when they crossed rivers and boundaries of nations,¹⁰ when they made an advance,¹¹ when they embarked and sailed away,¹² when they landed,¹³ before they assaulted a besieged city,¹⁴ before the battle,¹⁵ and after

¹ Wachsmuth, *Hellen. Alt.* IV. 287 seq.

² Schol. Aristoph. *Acharn.* 44. *Eccles.* 128. *Suidas* v. *προτελαιοσ*. This was concisely called *ἐκαλητοσαν καθάρσιον*, *Aeschin. de falsa leg.* 158.

³ *Demosth. adv. Cononem* 39.

⁴ *Aeschin. adv. Timarch.* 21, p. 256.

⁵ *Aesch.* *adv. Timarch.* 23.

⁶ *Demosth. de falsa leg. adv. Aeschin.* 100, p. 362. *Thucyd.* VIII. 70. *Suidas* v. *εἰσιτήρια*.

⁷ Compare, as one example of many, *Aeschin. de leg. sua adv. Demosth.* 87, and *Demosth. adv. Aristocrat.* 67 seq.

⁸ *πρὶν καλλιερεῖν* or *καλλιερήσαι* *Aeschin. adv. Ctesiph.* 131. *Dio Cass.* 47, 38. *Porti Lex. Herod.* s. v. *Suidas* et *Etymol. M.* s. v.

⁹ *ἔξιτήρια, ἐπεξόδια* *Herod.* IX. 19. *Xen. Anab.* VI. 3, 2.

¹⁰ *διαβατήρια* *Herod.* VI. 76. VII. 113, 114. *Thucyd.* V. 54, 55, 116. *Xen. Hell.* III. 4, 3. 5, 7. IV. 7, 2. V. 1, 33, 4, 37, 47. VI. 4, 19. *Plut. Lucul.* p. 507, E.

¹¹ *ἐπὶ προόδῳ* *Xen. Hell.* III. 4, 15.

¹² *ἐπιβατήρια* *Herod.* IX. 92, 96. *Thucyd.* VI. 32. *Xenoph. Hell.* V. 1, 18. *Apoll. Rh.* I. 421. IV. 1593 seq.

¹³ *ἀποβατήρια* *Steph. Byz. v. Βουθρωτός*, p. 81.

¹⁴ *Xen. Hell.* III. 1, 17 seq.

¹⁵ *S. not.* 168. *Herod.* IX. 33, 36, 37, 38, 45, 61, 62. *Xen. Hell.* IV. 2, 18, 20. VII. 2, 21.

the victory,¹ sacrifices were offered to the gods. The Athenian generals especially invoked, by sacrifice, the guidance of Hermes Ἡρημόιος.² All truces, treaties of peace, leagues and contracts were accompanied by sacrificial acts.³ Plato will have it, that on every day of the year the magistrate make an offering to a god or demon for the city, and its inhabitants, for their goods and chattels.⁴ The shedding of blood was everywhere the means of the union of men with one another and with the deity.

The facts are so well known, that it would seem superfluous to give detailed accounts of the sacrifices of animals. I shall, therefore, restrict myself to those characteristic features, in which the original idea is clearly expressed, and the inward connection of the religious conceptions is distinctly seen. At first only domestic animals, which, as such, participated in the daily life of man,⁵ were offered in expiatory sacrifice; such as swine,⁶ bulls, horses,⁷ sheep,⁸ goats, geese, fowls, doves.⁹ Every animal was not sacri-

¹ ἐπιβία or ἐπ' εὐτυχίᾳ σπένδω. Plato Conviv. p. 370, 14. Xen. Hell. IV. 3, 14. VII. 2, 23.

² Schol. Aristoph. Plut. 1160. Boeckh's Staatshaush. II. 254.

³ Thucyd. IV. 118. V. 19, 47. Liv. I. 24, 32. IX. 5.

⁴ Plato de Legg. VIII. p. 74.

⁵ De Maistre, II. 234.

⁶ Among the animal sacrifices that of swine is said to be the most ancient, (prima putatur hostia sus meruisse mori, Ovid. Metam. XV. 111). It was even asserted that swine, ἴς, *sus*, had its name from θύω, Athen. IX. 64 and Varro de re rust. II. 4, 9. The intestines of swine have, as is well known, a great similarity with those of man. Might this have been the ground that they were sacrificed instead of man? The passage we have cited from Varro, and Athen. IX. 17, 18 seems to favor this view. To the Jews swine were the object of aversion, not only in opposition to the heathen view of sacrifices, as Spencer maintains, but also because pork hurts the humors of the system and predisposes to leprosy.

⁷ Among the Romans sacrificed only to Neptune and Mars, Festi Exc. v. equus p. 61. v. October equus p. 111, and v. panibus p. 120; and by the Massagetæ to the sun, "because to the swiftest of gods must be offered the swiftest of animals." Herod. I. 216.

⁸ The lamb, on account of his gentleness (placidum pecus, Ov. Met. XV. 116) was considered the most excellent of expiatory sacrifices, hostia maxima (Virg. Ge. 3, 486 seq.) and could be neither more nor less than two years old. Gellius XVI. 6. Macrobius VI. 9. Serv. ad Ae. IV. 57. The most solemn of the expiatory sacrifices in Rome consisted of a swine, a sheep and a bull, suovetaurilia. Cato de re rust. 141. Varro de re rust. II. 1, 10. Liv. I. 44. Dionys. IV. 22.

⁹ Sacrifices like those of the emperor Balbinus, who once offered 100 eagles, 100 lions, and as many other beasts, (Jul. Capitolinus v. Balbini, 11), had their basis only in the folly of the emperor.

ficed to every god, but according as the animal was conceived to have some relation to the most prominent attributes of the god.¹ For Zeus, bulls were preferred, especially such as were white,² and rams. To Poseidon were offered black bulls and horses, adorned with sea-green bands,³ and sometimes fishes as a thank-offering;⁴ to the gods and heroes of the lower world only black beasts, with a libation of milk, honey and wine;⁵ to the virginal Athena, young, never-yoked cows;⁶ doves to Aphrodite, the goddess of love;⁷ a bull and two white goats to Apollo,⁸ to the huntress Artemis stags, does and, in general, beasts of the chase;⁹ to Hermes, young lambs and kids, and of the members of these animals, especially the tongues, as the organs of speech, to the *θεὸς λόγιος*;¹⁰ to the prolific mother of the earth Demeter and Tellus matter, fat and pregnant swine;¹¹ and a sterile cow to the barren queen Persephone.¹² Only the ploughing ox, (*βοῦς ἀροτήρ, bos arator*), might not in ancient times be sacrificed, being the fellow-laborer of man.¹³ To the heavenly gods victims were sacrificed by day, to the infernal at the going down of the sun.¹⁴ All sacri-

¹ Arnobius VII. p. 223 seq. Serv. ad Ge. II. 380. Ae. III. 118.

² Virg. Ge. II. 146, and Cerda to the passage p. 312, 313. Festi Exc. v. Albion, p. 4. Arnobius II. p. 91. Ovidius ex Ponto IV. 4, 31. Trist. IV. 2, 5. Juv. X. 66.

³ Val. Flacc. I. 189.

⁴ Athen. VII. 50, 51.

⁵ Il. III. 103. Blomfield gl. ad Aeschyl. Pers. 616. Luc. III. 52. Virg. Ae. VI. 153. Tibull. III. 5, 33 seq. Seneca Oed. 563 seq. Arnobius VII. p. 225 seq. 249.

⁶ Il. X. 292. Od. III. 382. Ovid. Met. IV. 754. XII. 151. Arnobius VII. p. 227; *Minervae virgini virgo caeditur vitula, nullis unquam stimulis, nullius operis excitata conatu.* Comp. Numbers 19: 2.

⁷ Propert. IV. 5, 63.

⁸ Liv. XXV. 12, 13. Macrobius Sat. I. 17. p. 300. Ovid. Met. VII. 244 seq. XII. 151. Winckelmann's Werke II. 579.

⁹ Pausan. VII. 18. 7. Ovid. Fast. I. 388.

¹⁰ Od. XIX. 398. Ath. I. 28. Schol. Aristoph. Plut. 1111.

¹¹ Phurnutus de nat. deor. p. 211. Gale, Macrobius Sat. I. 12. p. 267. Arnobius VII. p. 228. Comp. Festi Exc. v. praecidanea agna, p. 122 and the remark on it, p. 581.

¹² Virg. Ae. VI. 251. Od. XI. 30, *στειραν βοῦν.*

¹³ Ael. V. H. V. 14. H. A. XII. 34. Aratus Phaen. 132. Varr. de re rust. II. 5, 3. Plin. VIII. 45, 180. In later times this prohibition was not observed. Comp. Ov. Met. XV. 122 seq. and Lucian. de sacrificiis 12. *προδογῶσαι . . . βοῦν μὲν ἀροτήρα ὁ γεωργός, ἄγνα δὲ ὁ ποιμήν.*

¹⁴ Virg. Ae. VI. 252, and Cerda on the passage.

ficial animals, as with the Jews, must be without blemish and unhurt, *τέλεια καὶ ὅλα*, *integrae et illaesae*), and of these, the most beautiful were selected.¹ Nor in respect to the number were they niggardly. Well known are the hecatombs of bulls, lambs and goats, in Homer. Pindar says it is Grecian custom, to sacrifice all, up to a hundred, (*πάντα θύειν ἑκατόν*).² And in Athens, in later times, we find sacrificial festivals in which three hundred oxen were immolated, at the public cost.³

The sacrificial rites and ceremonies were most solemn; all the ceremonies seemed to express that the offering was made with freedom and joy. Those that brought oblations to the gods of heaven, wore white garments,⁴ and had garlands upon the head and in the hands;⁵ he that sacrificed to the gods of the lower world was clad in black.⁶ The sacrificial beast was also adorned with garlands and bands, and on solemn occasions the horns were gilded; it was led by a loose rope, so that it might seem to follow of its own accord.⁷ Should the animal escape, it was an inauspicious omen; it must still be slaughtered, but might not again be brought to the altar.⁸ First of all, before touching the sacrificial utensils,⁹ the hands were washed, that

¹ Arist. in Ath. XV. 16. p. 674, F. Plut. Mor. p. 437, A. Pollux 1. 29.

² Pind. Fr. 154, Boeckh.

³ Isocr. Areop. 29. p. 163, Bekker, Boeckh's Staats. d. Ath. I. 226 seq. II. 165, 229. Croesus, to secure the favor of the Delphian god, once immolated some 3000 animals, Herod. I. 50; Xerxes to the Ilian Athena 1000 bullocks, Herod. VII. 43; Solomon and the people of Israel, at the dedication of the temple, 22,000 oxen and 120,000 sheep, 1 Kings 8: 63.

⁴ Casaubon. ad Theoph. ch. 21. p. 212. Fischer.

⁵ The garlands of those that made the sacrifice were woven from the foliage of the tree that was sacred to the god. To Jupiter the oak was consecrated, to Apollo the laurel, to Minerva the olive, the myrtle to Venus, the mallow to Hercules, Plin. XII. 1. 3. Those that sacrificed to Ceres bore wreaths of the ears of corn; garlands of the pine-tree were for Neptune and Vulcan, of the ivy for Bacchus, of the yew-tree for the infernal deities.

⁶ Il. X. 202. Od. III. 384. Arist. Nub. 256. Liv. XXV. 12, 13. Tibul. IV. 1, 15. Ov. Met. VII. 161. XV. 131. Plin. XXXIII. 3, 39.

⁷ Virg. Ge. II. 395. Ae. V. 773. Juven. XII. 5 and the commentators.

⁸ Liv. XXI. 63 extr. Macrobius Sat. III. 5. p. 425. The animal brought, instead of such a *victima effugia*, was called *hostia succidanea*, Servius ad Ae. II. 140. Gell. IV. 6. Festus p. 129, 142, 212, 243.

⁹ A concise description of the customary sacrificial acts is given in Eurip. El. 795 seq. Arist. Pax. 948 seq. Lucian. de sacrif. 12 seq. and Dionys. VII. 72.; the latter with the remark, that the Grecian and Roman usages were similar.

what was sacred might not be handled by the unclean.¹ Then the consecrated barley, coarsely bruised, and mixed with salt,² and the sacrificial knife, were brought in a basket, and carried around the altar;³ a twig of the laurel or the olive-tree,⁴ symbols of purification and of peace, was dipped into the consecrated vessel, and the by-standers besprinkled with it.⁴ Even the holy water was consecrated by prayers, and by the dipping into it of a fire-brand from the altar.⁵ Silence was then enjoined, the profane were removed,⁶ the herald cried with a loud voice, "Who is here?" (*εἰς ἑῷδη;*) those that were present answered, "Many worshippers." (*πολλοὶ κἀγαθοί.*)⁷ Then began the special sacrificial prayer, for the gracious acceptance of the oblation.⁸ After the animal was proved to be sound and without blemish,⁹ in order to see if it were itself willing, the back of the sacrificial knife was drawn from the head to the tail,¹⁰ and the mixture of barley and salt poured over the neck, until by bowing its head, it had, as it were, consented to the offering.¹¹ After other prayers, the priest took a goblet of red wine, tasted it, and let those present drink therefrom, and poured what was left between the horns of the animal.¹² The

¹ In all religions, washing with fresh water is considered an image of purity of soul, comp. Heb. 10: 22, and the custom of the Essenes in Porph. de Abst. IV. 12.

² *οὔλαι, οὐλοχίται, κάραρμα*, mola salsa, far pium. Without salt no sacrifice was offered, as among the Jews. Plin. XXXI. 7, 89. Lev. 2: 13. Salt was especially considered as the federal symbol, on account of its purifying and conservative virtues, its prevention of death and decay. Comp. Plut. Mor. p. 668 seq. and 684 seq. Diog. L. VIII. 35. Eustath. to Il. I. 449. IX. 214. and Baehr's Symb. II. 324 seq.

³ Aristoph. Pax. 956 seq.

⁴ Ovid. Fast. V. 679. Virg. Aen. VI. 230. and Cerda's comments p. 634. Synesius Epist. 121. p. 258, B. Sozomenes hist. eccles. VI. 5. p. 644, D.

⁵ Eurip. Herc. F. 908. Arist. Pax 559. Athen. IX. 76.

⁶ Lobeck Agl. p. 14 seq. Euripid. Herc. F. 527: *αιγῶτε, αἶγα πᾶς ἔστω λαός, οἶγα, οἰώπα*. Arist. Pax 434: *εὐφημῶτε, εὐφημῶτε*. Thesmoph. 39: *εὐφημος πᾶς ἔστω λαός στόμα συγκλίσεας*. Favete linguis, Horat. Od. III. 1, 2.

⁷ Arist. Pax. 968. Schol.

⁸ Such a prayer is given in Arist. as above cited: another by Menander in Athen. XIV. 78.

⁹ *εἰ ἐντελής εἶη*, Lucian. de sacrif. 12. comp. Soph. Trach. 762.

¹⁰ Servius ad Aen. XII. 172: obliquum etiam cultrum a fronte usque ad caudam ante immolationem ducere consueverunt.

¹¹ Plut. Mor. p. 435, C. 437, 729, E. and Schol. Apoll. Rh. I. 425.

¹² Ov. Met. VII. 593 seq. and Fast. I. 357 seq. after the Greek epigram of Euenos in the Anthol. Pal. IX. 75. Compare the Jewish custom as given in Sirach 50, 16.

hairs of the forehead were first cut off and thrown into the fire,¹ the incense was kindled;² and the rest of the consecrated mixture of barley and salt poured upon the altar. At last, with the music of fifes and flutes, that no inauspicious word might be heard during the sacred act, and, when the sacrifice was especially solemn, with the singing of chorus songs, and with circular dancing, the animal was struck with the axe, and its throat cut with the knife;³ when it was offered to the gods of the upper world, with its head raised to heaven;⁴ when to the gods of the lower world, bowed down to earth.⁵ The blood was then received into a basin,⁶ and in part poured around upon the altar,⁷ a part sprinkled upon those standing by, that they might be absolved from their sins.⁸ All who would participate in the sacrifice must touch the sacrificial animal, and the sacrificial vessels.⁹ The most ancient custom was to burn the whole of the animal;¹⁰ in later periods only particular parts, the head and feet (the extremities instead of the whole), the intestines,¹¹ as the seat of the passions,¹² the thighs as

¹ Od. XIV. 422 with Eustathius, Virg. Aë. VI. 246. Eurip. El. 815 seq.

² Ovid. Fast. II. 573.

³ Plin. XXVIII. 3. Heindorf on Plato's Cratylus § 73. Santen ad Terent. p. 62.

⁴ Lucian. de sacrificiis 16. p. 227. and the passages collected in Bode, Gesch. der Hellen. D. II. 313. The Jews also, in their solemn days and the new moons, were accustomed to blow with trumpets over the burnt-offerings and the peace-offerings. Num. 10: 10.

⁵ Orphei Arg. 316. II. I. 459 with Eustathius p. 110, 27 seq. Lips. Virgil. Ge. III. 492. Aë. VI. 248, and the commentators.

⁶ Schol. Antiqua and Eustathius upon Od. III. 444. Suidas s. vv. ἄμμιον and σφάγιον. Comp. Ex. 24: 6.

⁷ Lucian. de Sacrificiis 13: αἷμα τῶ βωμῶ τερχέειν. Eustathius on Od. III. 445: αἷμα τῶ βωμῶ ἐπέχεον.

⁸ Schol. Arist. Acharn. 44. Eccles. 128. Apoll. Rh. IV. 704 seq. As with the blood of the covenant in the Hebrew sacrifices: Ex. 24: 8. Lev. 1: 5, 11. 7: 2. 16: 18 seq. Heb. 12: 24.

⁹ συνεφαπτόμενος τῶν ἱερῶν, Aeschin. de Leg. sua adv. Demosth. 84: χερσὶ βῶν καὶ κατῶν ἀφόμενον Demost. adv. Androt. 78: ἀπτόμενος θύλων Apoll. Rh. II. 717.

¹⁰ Hyginus Poet. Astron. II. 15: antiqui quum maxima caerimonia deorum immortalium sacrificia administrarent, soliti sunt totas hostias in sacrorum consumere flamma. Hence ἱερεῖον ὀλοκαύταιν Xen. Cyrop. VIII. 3, 24. Anab. VII. 8, 5. Porph. de Abst. II. 54, 55; as in the Hebrew burnt-offering and sin-offering. Lev. 4: 12. 6: 30. 16: 27.

¹¹ Dionys. VII. 72. p. 478, 48. Sylburg.

¹² Eustath. on Il. I. 461. p. 110, 42 and Tzetzes on Hes. Op. et D. 335

representatives of strength, the fat as the choicest portion.¹ Red, unmixed wine was also poured into the flames.² The rest of the flesh, as with the Hebrew peace-offerings, was eaten by those that presented the sacrifice, at a sacred festival,³ (as from the most ancient times had been the custom), after the completion of the sacrificial acts; and the gods were originally supposed to be present as guests at this feast.⁴ By this common participation in the pure flesh of the sacrifice, this communion of the flesh immolated to god (*κρέα θεόθυσια*),⁵ the substance of a new life was supposed to be, at the same time, imparted to the participants;⁶ for all that eat of one sacrifice are *one* body.⁷

There are found traces of a primitive custom, of eating the flesh and blood even of human victims, especially of sacrificed children. Here I seem to discern indications of a fearful mystery. Not only is it reported of the Scythian races, the Massagetæ, the Issedoni, the Bassari and the Tauri, that they ate the flesh of immolated men,⁸ and that it was Orpheus who first abolished these hideous feasts;⁹ but in respect to the Lycean human sacrifices in Arcadia, it is testified, that the father tasted the sacrificed flesh of his own son. "More exactly to determine the nature of these sacrifices," said Pausanius, "is not within the province of my inquiries: let the circumstances be as they are, and as they have

¹ Baehr's Symb. II. 381. — Herod. (II. 39) gives it as a custom peculiar to the Egyptians that they cursed the head of the victim, and imprecated upon it all the calamities which the people or the land were to experience.

² Lev. 7: 16 seq. Baehr, Symb. II. 372 seq.

³ In the maledictory sacrifices alone, the flesh was not eaten, lest they should become partakers of the sin and the curse; as it were, eat in the curse. II XIX. 267. Apoll. Rh. III. 1033. Porph. de Abst. II. 44. Pausan. III. 20, 9. V. 24. 2.

⁴ Comp. II. 1. 423 seq. II. 420 seq. Od. VII. 201 seq. Virg. Aë. IV. 206 seq. Ex. 34: 15. Ezek. 18: 6.

⁵ Pollux I. 29.

⁶ De Maistre II. 286.

⁷ 1 Cor. 10: 17. Hence the stiff-necked opposition of the early Christians to eating the flesh of the heathen victims. — At the end of the sacrificial feast, as it appears, the herald dismissed the assembly with the words: *λαοῖς ἀφέσις*, *ite missa est*. Apulei. Metam. XI. p. 267. Bip.

⁸ Pythagoreorum fr. in Gale's Opusc. Mythol. p. 713. Herod. I. 216. IV. 18, 26. Aristot. Eth. Nic. VII. 6. p. 1148. Sext. Emp. III. 207. Porph. de Abst. II. 8. p. 116.

⁹ Orphei fr. in Sext. Emp. II. 31. IX. 15. Arist. Ran. 1032. Hor. A. P. 391. seq.

been from the beginning."¹ Porphyry testifies, that, in his own times, the same custom was still observed.²

From these facts, certain very logical reasoners would draw the inference, that the Greeks were originally cannibals; human flesh tasted so good to them, that they served it up for their gods.³ After what has already been said, it will hardly be necessary to refute this most insipid and absurd notion. Between the bestiality of those tribes where cannibalism is known to exist, and which are actually severed from all direct and living influence upon the development of the human race—and this most awful and unnatural mystery, the eating the flesh of sacrificed children, there is a broad distinction, an immense difference. In the one case, there is the extreme of the savage state; in the other, the most frightful caricature of a religious mystery, the true form of which is known to every Christian. It seems to me, that just this point is fitted to disclose to us, a thorough and conclusive understanding of the heathen piacular sacrifices.

Here, as in all investigations upon the philosophy of religion, the final question must be, not only whether any doctrine be truly contained in any particular religious system, but whether the doctrine itself be true?

I believe, that I may assert the theory which has been here presented to be logical and closely linked together in all its parts; and that it is nothing more than a fair induction from the facts, reduced to the form of a doctrine. But if it be so *and* is based upon correct premises, then it must be objectively true, that is, be true not only for the heathen, but also for us. But that it is not; no one now-a-days would maintain the monstrous position, that real expiation and atonement could be effected by human sacrifices. Wherein, now, is the flaw, in this theory in other re-

¹ This addition seems to be only an imitation of Herod. I. 140. II. 28.

² Pausan. VIII. 2, 3. 38, 5. Porph. de Abst. II. 27. Varr. in Plin. VIII. 22, 82. and in Augustin. C. D. XVIII. 17. Ovid. Metam. I. 165 and Ibis 431. Here belong the well known narrative of the Phocian women in Daulis, who placed before the Thracian Tereus, the flesh of his own son, (Pausan. X. 4, 6. Comp. I. 41, 8. and Ov. Met. VI. 635 seq.); and the abominable banquets of Atreus and Thyestes, with which Herod. (I. 119) compares the Persian king Astyages, who slew the son of Harpagus, and served parts of the body at the table to his father. See, also, what Herod. III. 11 relates of the Greek mercenary soldiers in the service of the Egyptians; and Dio Cass. (68, 32) of the Jews in Cyrene, and (71, 1) of the so called Bucoli in Egypt.

³ So F. A. Wolf in his superficial treatise on the origin of sacrifices, in his *Miscellanea litter.* p. 270 seq.

spects so accordant with facts? If a system be constructed according to the laws of a sound logic, and yet be false in its results, the error must lie in the first proposition. Let us, then, recur to the first terms of our theory; which were as follows. Since life is only a gift of God to man, on the condition, that his commandments be obeyed, every transgressor, in strictness of justice, has forfeited his life to God. But though the sinner deserves death, yet an indestructible feeling gives him the hope, that his sins may be expiated, his debt paid, his life saved, if an *innocent* person would *voluntarily* suffer death instead of him and for him. It is the universal faith of the ancient world, that the life of the guiltless, voluntarily sacrificed, has power to redeem the life of the guilty, which were otherwise necessarily lost. And thus far, the substance and purport of those religious feelings, which in heathenism gave birth to the expiatory sacrifices, are universally and perfectly true. The inmost centre of all the ancient religious systems, is the consciousness of the need of redemption, and that this redemption is possible only through and by means of an innocent person; and this, too, is perfectly true. The problem was recognized, but not, therefore, correctly solved. The disease they had indeed experienced and also in their inmost soul they knew, that for the disease there was a remedy, and of what nature this remedy ought to be. But the true remedy they did not, they could not know.

Only he that has, can give; only he that is good, can make good. To pay, something must be possessed; or else, debt is added to debt. It is, then, perfectly true, that only an innocent person can make satisfaction for the guilty; it being presupposed that he is guiltless and in a condition, to discharge the whole debt. But here lies the prime falsehood (the *πρώτη ψεύδος*) of all the heathen sacrifices. For, *where is this innocent person*, that he may by the voluntary sacrifice of his immaculate life atone for the forfeited life of the guilty? Scripture assures us, "that the imagination of man's heart is evil from his youth."¹—"Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean?"—"They are all gone out of the way, they are together become unprofitable; there is none that doeth good, no, not one. Both Jews and Gentiles, they are all under sin."² Even the most perfect man escapes not sin, if he be but born into the world."³ Ever since the great catastrophe of the human soul, at the beginning of our history, no one of all man-

¹ Gen. 8: 21.

² Job 14: 4.

³ Rom. 3: 9 seq. comp. Psalm xiii. and liii.

⁴ Philo II. 249 extr.

kind has been innocent; in the first man all men sinned; there is absolutely no one that is pure, not even one. Hence all heathen sacrifices, in the sight of a holy God, are insufficient; hence they were ever repeated, because all are only means of palliation, and none effect a real and radical cure. And even if an expiation for sin could be made, that were not enough, if to the sinner were not, at the same time, given a new and pure basis for the acts of his will. For that primeval fall not only disturbed the primitive relation of the human will to the divine; it also, necessarily, vitiated the whole normal condition of man, alienated his mental as well as his physical powers. For the restitution of the original relation of the creature and the Creator, there was indeed need of an expiation for human sins, in order to effect a reconciliation of man with God; but there was also, no less imperatively, needed an actual, inward restoration of the human will to its original estate; the morbid affections of the soul must be overcome, and the harmonious action of all its powers, be reestablished. Not only must guilt be atoned for, but that which sin had wrecked must be again made whole. But that could be effected in no other way, than by a renewed, actual implanting of the original principle of life. If we consider the human race as one huge organism, in which a diseased life has been generated, and has permeated all the parts, the intellect and will, as well as the body; then, to carry out the figure, this diseased affection cannot be otherwise extirpated, than by the introduction of a new, original principle of life into the morbid organism, which by means of its inherent virtue, shall be ever-growing, diffusing itself through all the members, assimilating to itself, (so to speak, by a dynamic process), all that is foreign to it in the whole system; for even that which is now foreign, was at first of the same nature. Or if we look at the human race under the figure of a work of art, which has been defaced and corroded; the work cannot restore itself, the artist must do it—the Creator must restore the creature.

Without my having expressed it, every one will feel the connection of these positions with the incarnation of the Son of God, and his atoning death upon Golgotha. Only, by this was both effected; the atonement for sin effecting the reconciliation of all who desire it with God, *and*, at the same time the possibility of an inward regeneration of the human race. That Christ made an expiatory sacrifice is clear from Scripture. The Holy One of God, "bore our griefs and carried our sorrows;" He was stricken with

all the sufferings of the world ;¹ " He was obedient even to the death of the cross." " He gave himself for us an offering and a sacrifice to God." " He is the propitiation for our sins ; by him we have received the atonement."² " He is the true and real soul substituted and offered for all (*ἀντίψυχον*).³ Athanasius says, " The Logos of God fitly brought the temple of his own body as a substitution and deliverance for the souls of all (*ἀντίψυχον*), and was obedient even unto death."⁴ Hence Augustin (c. Faustum XXII, 17) maintains, that there is only one true, universal sacrifice, which is offered to the one only true God by Christ, the mediator of God and men ; and it was fitting that promissive types of this sacrifice should be celebrated in animal victims, in order to commend the flesh and blood of that one victim, by whom the remission of the sins of flesh and blood should be effected. Hence as the Hebrews celebrated the religious types and foreshadowings of the true sacrifice, so did the Gentiles the sacrilegious counterfeits : for as the apostle says, (1 Cor. 10: 20) " the things which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to devils and not to God." " An ancient thing is this predicted immolation of blood, testifying, from the beginning of the race, to the future passion of the Mediator."

Further elucidation is needed for the second point, viz. that an introduction and implanting of the original principle of life, into the disordered nature of man, was effected by the incarnation of the Word of God. Irenaeus⁵ calls it, " an ingrafting of the Word, (Logos) by which men return to their pristine nature." The incarnation of the Logos must inevitably be considered as a reimplanting of the primitive principle of life into the individuals and the race, that had forfeited and lost it ; as a reëtrance of the original ground of life into a fallen world. When Christ is called, the second Adam, it is not to be forgotten, that *originally he was the first* ; for if he were, in himself considered, only a second Adam, how could his influence reach backward to the first ? The whole of the race fell in Adam ; it could be raised up and redeemed only by one higher than Adam, and before him ; by the heaven-

¹ Is. 53: 4.

² Phil. 2: 8. John 1: 29. Ephes. 5: 2. Heb. 7: 27. 1 John 2: 2. 4: 10. Rom. 8: 22. 5: 11. 2 Cor. 5: 21.

³ Euseb. de Laud. Const. 15, 6. p. 1213 seq. Zimmerm.

⁴ Athanas. de Incarn. Verbi t. I. p. 54. E. Bened. ; and again, *ὡς πρόβατον ὑπὲρ τῆς πάντων σωτηρίας ἀντίψυχον τὸ ἑαυτοῦ σῶμα εἰς θάνατον παραδούς.*

⁵ Iren. adv. Haeres. V. 10, 1. p. 302.

ly Adam, of whom the earthly is but the figure; by the true Demiurge, by Him who is the first-born of all creatures, as is Adam of all men.

Let us look more closely at the logical connection of the Christian doctrine upon this point. The only Son of God, generated from eternity, is, at the same time, so to speak, the transition to creation; and, hence, in reference to this, is declared to be the beginning, and the first-born of all creatures.¹ From the Word, or Logos, originally proceeds all created life. In the Logos was ideally contained all the fulness of life, revealed in creation;² so that the actual creation is only an evolution or unfolding (explicatio) of that which in the Logos was (implicite) enfolded and conceived from all eternity.³ If, now, the Logos be the prototype of all creation, and in him all that exists have its eternal ground of being; if from him all creation proceeded; then, in the incarnation of the Logos in Christ, we should expect an actual reëntrance of the original creative life into the race of which he became a member and which had degenerated from its destination, and become subject to the law of sin and death.⁴ The Logos, as the Creator of men, was the source of life to them all; becoming a man, he imparts a new life to all who will receive it. Therefore we read, that Wisdom "is a tree of life to them that lay hold upon her, and happy is every one that receiveth her."⁵

Such is the Christian doctrine, in its most condensed statement.

¹ ἡ ἀρχὴ τῆς κτίσεως τοῦ θεοῦ Apoc. 3: 14 and ὁ πρωτότοκος πλάσις κτίσεως Col. 1: 15, 18. Rom. 8: 29.

² John 1: 3, 4 ὃ γέγονεν ἐν αὐτῷ ζωὴ ἦν: quod factum est, in ipso vita erat. Thus should this passage be punctuated, against the received text, with Iren., Origen, Augustine and others. Apart from the logical connection, which absolutely demands this, the external articulation of the phrases, where each subsequent member begins with the word with which the preceding ended, proves that this punctuation is the only correct one.

³ Thomas Aq. Summa adv. Gentes IV. 42, 2: omnes creaturae nihil aliud sunt, quam realis quaedam expressio et repræsentatio eorum, quæ in conceptione divini verbi comprehenduntur. Comp. G. Postellus de ult. mediatoris nativitate. p. 72, 73.

⁴ Johannes Scotus Erigena de Div. Nat. V. p. 252.

⁵ Prov. 3:18. This wisdom, σοφία, is only, so to speak, the feminine aspect of the Logos. Comp. Apoc. II. 7. and August. Civ. Dei XIII. 20. [Compare with the above view, the phraseology of John: Christ "giveth life unto the world;" he is "the bread of life;" he "gives his flesh for the life of the world," (6: 33, 35, 51, 53); those that believe "have life through his name," (20: 31). Paul also speaks of the "law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus, (Rom. 8: 2) and of "Christ, as our life," Col. 3: 4.]

Forced to adopt it, is no one, for the truth depends not on the belief of man. It is offered to man; and if he will, if he have the heart and courage, he may dare to receive this greatest of truths—and those that do it, know, that faith is all-powerful, and that the truth makes them free, and that this freedom is bliss. He that adopts the doctrines of Christianity finds in them a satisfactory answer to every reasonable question, and a key to the understanding of history, of the *gesta Dei per homines*. In respect to the bloody expiatory sacrifices of the heathen, it is clear to me, that this frightful immolation of children (*τεκνοθυσία*) must continue, until in the true and highest sacrifice of the Son (*υιοθυσία*) upon the Golgotha of the old world, an objective and valid expiation and redemption were effected.¹ The reason for this continuance is also clear. And in that awful mystery, the eating the flesh of the immolated children, is only expressed the truth, which the church and the faithful daily celebrate in the Sacrament of the Altar, in which there is an inseparable union of both parts of our redemption, the continual presentation of the expiatory sacrifice, and the continual gift of the new life.

ARTICLE VI.

PUBLICATIONS ON ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY.

Bibliotheca Patrum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum Selecta, ad optimorum librorum fidem edita, curante E. G. Gersdorf. voll. 1—10, 12mo. Lipsiae, 1838—1842.

THIS select library of the Latin fathers is to be reckoned among the best literary projects of the times. The study of the early ecclesiastical writers has been limited to a few scholars, partly in-

¹ The first prohibition of human sacrifices was by the Roman senate 97 B. C.; and it was repeated by Augustus and Tiberius. Plin. XXX. 1, 12. Sueton. v. Claudii, 25. But only after the great atoning sacrifice of Christ upon Golgotha, in the time of Hadrian, did these sacrifices generally cease, as is testified by Porph. de Abst. II. 56. and after him by Euseb. de Laud. Const. 16, 7. and Praep. Ev. IV. 17. The Jewish theology also maintains, that with the Messiah, the sacrifices of animals will cease, for he will perfectly fulfil the whole intent of these sacrifices; "he will give himself and pour out his soul unto death, and his blood will make expiation for the people of God," as is said in a Rabbinical Treatise in Eisenmenger II. 721.