

has not clearly seen the principles for which the word Evangelical stands, until he asks himself why he should support a Society belonging to his own school of thought rather than another Society which is connected with a different school. The need for some justification of his preference compels him to sort his ideas and set in order his convictions.

And what shall be said of Societies as means for consecrating and employing party enthusiasm for the highest ends? When we take the case of the laborious efforts of the Committee of "King Edward's Hospital Fund," aided by the powerful leadership of H.R.H. the Prince of Wales, and supported by England's nobility and merchant princes and the press, to raise an income of £100,000 a year, and then take the case of a Society like the C.M.S., which raises close upon £400,000 a year without the aid of royalty or the leaders of the money-world, and in spite of the indifference of the secular press, we see what party enthusiasm can do when the Holy Spirit of God is in it, and when real missionary feeling is at the back of it.

The difference is indeed great. But does the Church realize it? Is she conscious of what she owes to Societies? Does she ever make an articulate acknowledgment of the fact that half of her practical work is done by these Societies? We do not think so. Occasionally an empty canonry or prebendaryship is spared for the chief secretary of a missionary Society. Sometimes a Bishop will preside at the anniversary meeting, or allow his name to be set down as one of the vice-presidents of a Society. Beyond these, very little recognition is made by the Church of the enormous debt which the Church owes to the institutions which, begun two centuries ago in the face of much ecclesiastical opposition, are now more actually and powerfully in touch with the real life of mankind than the Episcopate itself.

HENRY LEWIS.

SACRIFICE: A STUDY IN COMPARATIVE RELIGION.

IT would need a treatise of very considerable bulk to trace out, even in an approximately adequate manner, the evolution of man's conceptions regarding sacrifice. For sacrifice presupposes the existence of a god, or superior power, of some kind; therefore man's conceptions of sacrifice will vary according to his different ideas regarding this higher power. For an adequate treatment, therefore, of this subject it would be necessary to deal with four great stages of religious evolution—namely, Animism, Polytheism, Monotheism, and Chris-

tianity—and each of these would require to be treated under various sub-heads. This paper must therefore be concerned mainly with generalizations. Its chief object will be to try and show that, broadly speaking, there are two fundamental conceptions in the offering of sacrifice which are common to man, whether primitive or modern,¹ and that the most spiritual idea of sacrifice is the evolution of a conception which is to be found in the beliefs of primitive man, so far as these are known to us.

I.

In the religion of primitive man, as well as among the great polytheistic religions of Greece and Rome, it will be found that sacrifices were offered—

1. As a means of communion with the god.

2. As a means of securing the favour of the god.

1. The examples which could be given to show that sacrifice was a means of communion with the god are many in number. A few typical instances will suffice here. The Todas of Southern India sacramentally kill and eat a young male buffalo once a year. The buffalo is a sacred animal among the Todas, representing a god. The solemn eating of its flesh once a year is for the purpose of effecting a union between their god and themselves.² The Aztecs in May and December made an image of the great Mexican god Huitzilopochtli. This image was made of dough. It was broken in pieces and then solemnly eaten by the worshippers, who thus believed themselves to be united physically with their god.³ But they obtained, as they believed, even closer union with the living god by devouring the flesh of a real man. This man impersonated another Mexican god, Tetzcatlipoca. Usually a captive, and, if possible, of handsome appearance and high birth, he was brought to the foot of a sacred pyramid, on the top of which he was to die. Then he was led to the summit, and here five of his worshippers seized him and laid him on the sacrificial stone. The high-priest, first bowing to the god he was going to kill, cut open his breast and tore out his heart. Afterwards the body of the dead god was carried down, his flesh was chopped up into small pieces, and distributed as holy food amongst his worshippers.⁴ The sacrifices in some of the Hellenic cults

¹ It is, of course, not meant to imply that other elements do not exist.

² Marshall, "Travels amongst the Todas," pp. 80 *et seq.*, 129 *et seq.*

³ Frazer, "Golden Bough," ii. 337.

⁴ Brasseur de Bourbourg, "Hist. des Nations civilisées du Mexique et de l'Amérique Centrale," iii. 510 *et seq.*, quoted by Frazer, *op. cit.*, ii. 342 *et seq.*

point unmistakably to the same conception. In the Dionysiac ritual, for example, the bull which was offered to the god and eaten by the worshippers was believed to be the body of the god, which they partook of in order to effect a close union with the deity. In the words of Decharme ("Mythologie de la Grèce"): "Comme le taureau est un des formes de Dionysos, c'était le corps du dieu dont se repaissaient les initiés, c'était son sang dont ils s'abreuyaient dans ce banquet mystique."¹ Again, at the Thesmophoria (an autumn festival celebrated by women in honour of Demeter) pigs were sacrificed and eaten. The pig was holy to Demeter, and therefore identified with her. The worshippers did this in order to become united with their goddess. The same was probably the case at the annual sacrifice of a goat to Athena, as well as that of a ram to the god Ammon, in Thebes, by the Egyptians. Indeed, it seems highly probable that the whole conception underlying the sacrifice of totem animals (on the rare occasions that this took place) was that of effecting a close union between the god and his worshippers.

These few examples, taken quite at random out of immense numbers which are available, must suffice here to show that sacrifices were offered up as a means of communion with the god.

2. Secondly, sacrifices were offered as a means of securing the favour of the god—*i.e.*, propitiatory sacrifice; but it will be seen at once that another element necessarily enters in here, for this form of sacrifice obviously implies in the mind of the worshipper a belief in the power of his god to do him a good turn. But all gods are not benevolent; so what shall the worshipper do when a god is, for some supposed reason or other, evilly disposed towards him? He must appease the god by means of sacrifice. In the one case sacrifice is offered for the purpose of seeking a favour, in the other for averting wrath. Further, when once the idea arose of a god being evilly disposed or angry, men would soon begin to inquire the reason of his anger; and it is not difficult to realize that man would before long come to the conviction that some act of his own had occasioned the anger of his god; and in order to make good this offence in the sight of the god, the worshipper would offer up a sacrifice of appeasement. Thus would arise expiatory sacrifice, which would atone for the shortcoming² of the worshipper. This is not a distinction without a difference, for in the one case sacrifices of appeasement would be

¹ Quoted by A. Lang in "Myth, Ritual, and Religion," ii. 251.

² It would be an anachronism to use the word *sin* here, for the conception of sinfulness belongs to a later stage.

offered to a god who was supposed to be vindictively disposed towards man *ab initio*; in the other case, some act of man, whether of commission or omission, required a sacrifice for appeasing the anger of the god which had been aroused, but which would not have existed without cause. These two divisions of sacrifice, propitiatory and expiatory, both belong to the category of those which are offered as a means of securing the favour of the god. They, too, could be illustrated by numberless examples from the records which exist concerning the beliefs and practices of early man. We must content ourselves here with a few typical ones. "The hill tribe Kudulu, near Vizagapatam, in the Bombay Presidency, offered human sacrifices to the god Yankari for the purpose of obtaining good crops. . . . On the appointed day the victim was carried before the idol drunk, and when one of the villagers had cut a hole in his stomach and smeared blood on the idol, the crowds from the neighbouring villages rushed upon him and cut him to pieces. All who were fortunate enough to secure morsels of his flesh carried them away and presented them to their village gods."¹ According to Adam of Bremen (iv. 27), sacrifice was offered by the Swedes to Othin on the approach of war: "Si pestis et formis Thor ydolo libatur, si bellum Wodani."² An invocation to Indra runs: "Here is butter; give us cows." Among the Brahmans sacrifices are considered so necessary that without them there would be neither sunshine nor rain.³ "On October 15 in each year a chariot race was run on the field of Mars. Stabbed with a spear, the right-hand horse of the victorious team was then sacrificed to Mars for the purpose of securing good crops, and its head was cut off and adorned with a string of loaves."⁴ Even at the present day in the central and south-western provinces of Russia the peasants at the commencement of summer gather food from each household in the neighbouring villages and bury it in a deep pit in the fields. It is a gift or sacrifice for the purpose of propitiating God, and thus insuring good crops for the coming season. Then, with regard to expiatory sacrifice, in Athens it was the custom for depraved individuals to be kept by the State as scape-goats, to be offered as an atonement at the time of any great calamity. Such calamity was regarded as a visible proof of the anger of the deity, which required to be appeased. So, again, in the city of Abdera in Thrace, one of the burghers

¹ *North Indian Notes and Queries*, i., p. 4, § 15, quoted by Frazer, *op. cit.*, ii. 241.

² Quoted by H. M. Chadwick, "The Cult of Othin," p. 6.

³ See A. S. Geden, "Studies in Eastern Religions," p. 64 *et seq.*

⁴ Frazer, *op. cit.*, p. 315 *et seq.*

was annually sacrificed for the purpose of purifying the city.¹ "At Onitsha, on the Niger, two human beings used to be annually sacrificed to take away the sins of the land."² Connected with expiatory sacrifices, though to a certain extent distinct, are those of substitution, such as are found, for example, in the Norse religion. A man could prolong his life, as was believed, by substituting another life in his stead. Thus, King Aun sacrificed his son to Othin, by which means he prolonged his own life. The underlying idea in sacrifice to Othin was that of substitution.³

These are but a very few examples, taken, it will be noticed, from peoples widely separated in every sense of the word; but to multiply examples would unnecessarily increase the bulk of this article; moreover, they can be found to almost any extent in the writings of travellers and anthropologists.

We have seen, therefore, so far, that among barbarous and semi-barbarous peoples (even among such as were, apart from religion, highly civilized) two conceptions of sacrifice were universal: Sacrifice was offered as a means of communion with the deity; sacrifice was also offered in order to secure divine favour, and from this latter belief there followed naturally that type which we call expiatory. There are, to be sure, numberless gradations in the upward advance towards more spiritual conceptions of sacrifice, but we cannot attempt here to trace, even in outline, the general course of these. We must take a big step forward, and see how these two essential conceptions of sacrifice were held by that race in which the religious faculty was more fully developed than in any other pre-Christian race—namely, the Semitic; and here, while not ignoring altogether the other branches, we must deal mainly with the Hebrew branch.

II.

Apart from exceptional forms of sacrifice offered for special purposes and at special times, there were two forms of ordinary sacrifice—at all events, in the earlier period of Israelite history—which practically summed up the sacrificial conceptions of the Hebrews. These were (1) the *zēbah* (זֶבַח) and (2) the *minḥa* (מִנְחָה).

1. The *zēbah*, "animal sacrifice," was by far the most important form of sacrifice among all the Semites. Among

¹ Frazer, *op. cit.*, iii., p. 125 *et seq.*

² *Ibid.*, p. 109; for examples, see Frazer, *op. cit.*, iii., § 15.

³ Chadwick, *op. cit.*, p. 26 *et seq.*

these, whenever an animal was slain, it meant that a sacrifice was offered: all slaughter was sacrifice.¹ The *zebah* was therefore, in the first place, a sacrificial meal, at which the worshippers were the guests of the deity; both, however, the god as well as the worshippers, partook of the meal. It was an ancient Hebrew conception, to which the Old Testament bears unmistakable testimony, that Jehovah consumed His share of the sacrificial meal. This is distinctly implied in the phrase *לֶחֶם אֱלֹהִים*, "the food of God" (Lev. xxi. 6, 17, xxii. 25; Num. xxviii. 1, 2). Significant, too, in this connection are the protesting words of the Psalmist: "*Will I eat the flesh of bulls, or drink the blood of goats? Offer unto God the sacrifice of thanksgiving. . . .*" (Ps. l. 13, 14). The object of this sacred banquet was that, by being admitted to eat of the same holy flesh, of which part was laid upon the altar to be consumed by God, the worshippers accomplished an act of communion between themselves and the Deity. It is therein that the central significance of the *zebah* lies. In the words of Robertson Smith: "The leading idea in the animal sacrifices of the Semites was not that of a gift made over to the god, but of an act of communion in which the god and his worshippers unite by partaking together of the flesh and blood of a sacred victim."² That this was the belief among all Semites, including the Hebrews, will be universally acknowledged. As Lagrange remarks: "Tout le monde admet que le sacrifice comprend une communion, l'homme et le dieu mangeant à la même table."³ How this communion was conceived of as being brought about is a further question upon which scholars are not agreed. Robertson Smith bases his argument on the theory that the victim in the sacrifice was a totem animal—*i.e.*, that the worshippers ate the god, and thus became physically united with him. It is supported by a most brilliant argument, and the analogy among all primitive races goes far to justify his theory. Marti⁴ believes that the union was effected by the enjoyment of the same food on the part of the god and his worshippers. It is, however, difficult to believe that this can have been the original conception—an advance upon it, probably enough—just as the belief that the food for the deity must be etherialized by burning his food and letting it ascend upwards in the form

¹ Cf. Robertson Smith, "Religion of the Semites," new ed., p. 240. Wellhausen, "Reste arabischen Heidenthums," 2nd ed., p. 114. Lagrange, "Études sur les Rel. Sem.," p. 254. Moore in "Encycl. Bibl.," art. "Sacrifice."

² *Op. cit.*, p. 226.

³ *Op. cit.*, p. 246.

⁴ "Geschichte der Isr. Rel.," p. 103.

of smoke¹ is an advance on the earlier belief that he ate the food just as man did. But in the earlier mental stages one looks for simpler and more crass beliefs. The conviction that a union with the god takes place is more easily gained when the worshipper sees the actual god before him, and eats part of him, than when it is only a question of eating together of the same animal. Lagrange, again, objects that if the god is eaten he cannot take part in the feast;² but if every animal in question is holy, which of course it is, the god is seen in each, and he cannot therefore have been absorbed or annihilated by *one* of his "holy" animals being eaten. Besides this, the very last thing one looks for in primitive thought is logic, in the modern sense of the word.³ At any rate, whatever its cause, the fact of the belief is unquestioned. The *zebah* was a sacrificial meal, the central significance of which was that it constituted an act of communion between the worshippers and God.

2. The *minha* need not detain us long; its use in the Old Testament shows plainly enough what it implied. In Gen. xxxii. 13, 18, xxxiii. 10, it is used of a gift intended to dispose Esau kindly towards Jacob. Much the same idea is seen in Gen. xliii. 11, where it is used of a present to Joseph in order to secure his favour on behalf of Jacob's sons (see also 1 Sam. x. 27; 1 Kings x. 25; etc.); so that *minha* has "strictly the character of a tribute paid by the worshipper to his god."⁴ As among other races so among the Hebrews, the conception of appeasement, atonement, sacrifices for sin and the like, is a later development. To quote our greatest authority on this subject once more: "In the last days of the kingdom of Judah, and still more after the Exile, piacular sacrifices and holocausts acquired a prominence which they did not possess in ancient times. The old history knows nothing of the Levitical sin-offering."⁵ So, too, Buchanan Gray: "In early times 'burnt-offering and sacrifice' or 'burnt-offerings and peace-offerings' was an exhaustive classification of animal sacrifices. Later, special forms of the burnt-offering became distinguished as the sin-offering (חטאת) and the guilt-offering (עוון)." ⁶

¹ Cf. the Babylonian conception: "The gods snuffed the pleasant odour; the gods, like flies, swarmed above the sacrificer"—Chaldean story of the Flood (Ball, "Light from the East," p. 40).

² *Op cit.*, p. 247.

³ See, for a further objection (which, however, does not seem very strong), Hastings' "Bible Dict.," iv. 332b.

⁴ Robertson Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 224.

⁵ *Ibid.*, *op. cit.*, p. 237.

⁶ "Commentary on the Book of Numbers," p. 173.

It will therefore be seen that the *zebah* and the *minhah* correspond to the two conceptions of sacrifice which were held by men in a very primitive stage of culture, the conceptions, namely, of sacrifice being a means of communion with the god, and of sacrifice being a means of securing the favour of the god.

III.

We take one more step in this very cursory survey. Christianity is the offspring of Judaism, and the *germs* of all Christian doctrine are to be found in the Jewish religion. This is only another way of saying that the New Testament and the Old Testament are inseparable. Without following out the various gradations, which would require a treatise for itself, it may be affirmed that the early Old Testament conceptions of sacrifice being on the one hand a means of communion with God, and on the other a means of propitiation, have their counterpart, their *spiritual* counterpart, in Christian belief. As regards the first conception—that sacrifice is a means of communion with God—when we turn to the English Liturgy, the “sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving,” we find in the prayer of Humble Access these words: “Grant us, therefore, gracious Lord, so to eat the flesh of Thy dear Son, Jesus Christ, and to drink His blood, that our sinful bodies may be made clean by His body, and our souls washed through His most precious blood, and that we may evermore dwell in Him, and He in us.” The conception of communion with God could scarcely be more beautifully expressed. The same thought is found here as is found in our Lord’s words in St. John xv. 4: “*Abide in Me, and I in you. As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, except it abide in the vine; so neither can ye, except ye abide in Me.*” That Christ may “dwell in us” is the yearning of every Christian; and the Church certainly teaches that her sacramental system, as ordained by Christ, is the chief means whereby this communion is to be achieved and maintained.

As regards the second point—that sacrifice is a means for securing the favour of God—it was pointed out that this was a conception which, from the very nature of the case, soon (comparatively speaking) acquired a modified form. The idea of sacrifice being an atonement follows naturally from that of seeking God’s favour (this has been referred to already, and the argument need not be repeated). When we turn to the Prayer of Consecration in the English Liturgy, we read that the sacrifice of Christ upon the cross was “a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world.” We have here, therefore, the highest spiritual

development of a conception the germ of which existed already in the mind of the primitive savage.

The thoughts to which attention has been directed have necessarily been hinted at rather than worked out. The main purpose, in view of many indisputable facts which the study of comparative religion has brought to light, has been to try and show that, broadly speaking, there are two fundamental conceptions in sacrifice which are common to mankind, whether primitive or modern, and that the most spiritual idea of sacrifice is the evolution of a conception which is to be found in the beliefs of primitive man, so far as these are known to us.

* * * * *

It will be asked: If our most holy and cherished beliefs are only the natural evolution of savage superstitions—if the sacrifice of Christ, the God-Man, upon the cross is only a late instance of a barbarous rite instituted by primitive, uncivilized man—how can this be reconciled with a belief in revealed religion?

The reply is this: “*Art not Thou from everlasting, O Lord my God, mine Holy One?*”¹ To the prophet there was no doubt about the answer. If our belief in God includes that of His having existed before all time, of His being omniscient, merciful, loving, and long-suffering, then we must believe, too, that He was there untold ages ago, when primitive man first began to look upward; then we must believe, too, that He knew what was in the heart of man when he was yearning for that higher power of whose existence he was convinced, but whose nature he could not yet apprehend; then we must believe, too, that He did not expect more from man than man was capable of giving; then we must believe, too, that His love for primitive man was as great as it is for us, and that because He was long-suffering and patient He could wait for many millenniums. God’s self-revelation to man was accorded in proportion to man’s capacity for apprehension. When St. Paul was in Athens, and saw the altar to the unknown god, his words to the Athenians were: “*Whom therefore ye ignorantly worship, Him I declare unto you.*”² And a little later, speaking to them of God, he says: “*He is not far from every one of us.*”³ Now, we know well enough what kind of worship that of the Athenians was; it was little, if at all, removed from that of savages. If St. Paul could assert that they were worshipping God in ignorance, we may well assert the same of far less civilized men who were seeking for an unknown power in their dark and helpless way. We cannot conceive of such

¹ Hab. i. 12.

² Acts xvii. 23.

³ Acts xvii. 27.

a thing as the inactivity of Christ, and therefore He, who is the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever, was active among His creation when as yet they were but children in understanding. Who shall say when revealed religion began? It has been there from all time, for how can the presence of God in the universe be ineffective? *Τοὺς μὲν οὖν χρόνους τῆς ἀγνοίας ὑπεριδὼν ὁ Θεός.*

[It will have been noticed by those who are conversant with the subject that in dealing with the essential elements of sacrifice the writer has not taken into consideration the theory recently put forth by the late lamented Professor S. I. Curtiss. Professor Curtiss maintains that the essential element in sacrifice is the "bursting forth" of blood. He bases his theory on certain observations made during three journeys in Syria and the Sinaitic Peninsula. The writer hopes, in a subsequent article, to deal somewhat in detail with the two theories championed respectively by Professor W. Robertson Smith and Professor Curtiss. It must suffice at present to say that there is reason for regarding both theories as correct; they do not exclude one another; the facts support both, and it may well turn out that each theory witnesses to the truth, and that they are complementary. It should be mentioned that Professor Curtiss' theory does not affect the general argument of the above article; this will be clear when we deal with it more fully.]

W. O. E. OESTERLEY.



THE ARCHBISHOPS OF CANTERBURY AND THEIR CONNECTIONS WITH SUSSEX.

PART IV.

BETWEEN the death of Archbishop Peckham and the consecration of his successor, ROBERT WINCHELSEY, an interregnum of some length intervened, in which South Malling was the scene of various encroachments on the rights of the see on the part of the Lord of Lewes. The temporalities of Canterbury being in the King's hands, proceedings were taken against these infringements of the rights and trespasses on the property of a manor so large and important to its possessor as South Malling, and the Crown therefore initiated a suit which the records call "longum placitum in jure archiepiscopatus." In this suit "touching the liberties of the Lord Archbishop as well in the riparian fishery of South Malling as in the chace there, and in a certain place called Stanmerfirth," it appears that the