offering for the blessings of the past year. But in respect of the ἀρτοφέρας, of the firstfruits of the harvest and vintage, another motive, belonging to a different order of ideas, may be discerned or surmised. On the day called the Pithia, the 'opening of the wine-casks'—the first day of the Attic Anthesteria, the crucial day for drinking—the citizens bore a mixture of the sweet wine to Dionysos 'in the marshes' before they ventured to drink themselves.1 We may regard this as a religious rite instituted for the purpose of removing the tabu from the new vintage; and, as there is abundant evidence of the belief that a religious sanctity conserves and enhances the value of the gods who belong to the growths of the field before they are fit for the use of man, we may suppose that the ἀρτοφέρας of corn had originally this significance. The most conspicuous example of these was the ἀρτοφέρας sent from a great part of the Greek world to the goddesses at Eleusis; but a detailed inscription of the 5th cent. revives that they were to be regarded as mere tributes or thank-offerings, and a certain residue of them were sold in the market, the price being devoted to the purchase of ἀρτοφέρας.2

4. Blood-sacrifices and the gift theory.—The blood-sacrifices have now to be considered. It is to these rather than to those of the former type that certain ideas which may be called mystic will be found to attach. Before considering any general theory about them, we must first examine the facts. The first question is whether any general principle is discoverable governing the choice of animals. The choice was certainly a wide one, including land and sea creatures, birds, even fish, and all the wild beasts of the chase. The domesticated animals are nearly always those that form the ordinary food of man. The only exceptions were occasionally offered to Hekate, Ares, and Eileithyia,3 horses offered to Helios and Poseidon,4 and aseae to Apollo and the winds.5 The animal offered by one of the Ptolemaeans on a single occasion, which excited so much popular disapproval that it was not repeated.

Apart from these exceptions, the facts at first sight seem to be sufficiently explained by the gift theory, namely, that the meat-offerings were tributes paid to the deity for favours received in the past or expected in the future, or to depreciate his anger. And such a rite reveals the working of the primitive idea that the deity is not of his own nature immortal and self-existing, but is dependent on beneficence; that a deity was not its own sustenance, but was dependent on man for his subsistence in the afterworld—a result, it may be, not only of the continual nourishment for his sustenance, but also of the idea that he was a necessary soul, that he was utterly repugnant to ancient Hellenic thought and feeling that an animal should be chosen for sacrifice which was not naturally detrimental to the divinity. On the contrary, evidence can be given establishing a mysterious connexion or sympathy between the victim and the divine power to whom it is consecrated on the altar, and it is this that converts us in certain forms of sacrifice, to regard the gift theory as inadequate.

5. Sanctity of the altar.—It is now necessary to consider those forms for which the earliest evidence is afforded by certain passages in the Homeric poems. By combining some of them we can present a typical Homeric sacrifice, as offered by a tribe or a group of men.

1 See above, § 6
2 See above, § 6
3 ἔστος τών ἐπίθετον τῆς Χαλκιδᾶς, ἐπὶ τῶν τῆς Κυκλάδων πάντων, τῶν ἐπίθετον τῆς Ἀιαλίας.
4 Arist. fr. 129 (Athenaeus, 674 a); for curious examples to this rule see Sel. Νάτ. 3, 2. 5. 6. 7
5 Pott-Zahn, Loga Stromm. 32
6 See above, § 1
7 See above, § 6
8 Arist. fr. 129 (Athenaeus, 674 a); for curious examples to this rule see Sel. Νάτ. 3, 2. 5. 6. 7
9 Luc. Bapt. Frat. 1, 45.
The victim, one or many, was brought near the altar, holy gifts, barley-stalks in a basket, and a vessel for catching the blood were held in readiness; the sacrificers purified themselves with the holy water and formally raised up in their hands the barley-stalks, which had been sanctified by some preliminary rite; then the chief officiant— the king or chieftain or, more rarely, the priest— cut in one piece the victim's hair and threw it into the holy fire, at the same time or immediately afterwards uttering the prayer to the deity for blessing or special aid. At this point the sacrificers 'throw forward the shrouded barley (or barley-stalks);' the victim, if a powerful one like an ox or a bull, whose struggles would be embarrassing, was smitten with an axe in such a way as to render it impotent; then, if women were present, they raised the αὐναρία, which was an auspicious appeal to the deity by name to grace the ritual with his or her presence; the animal, if the obligation was to the Olympians, was lifted off the ground. Its head was then lifted up so that its face was turned to the sky, and its throat cut; the blood was probably caught in the sacred vessel, though we do not know for what purpose; the disemboweling of the carcases began, the thighs were cut away and wrapped in fat, and, with portions of meat cut probably from every part of the victim, were placed on the altar and roasted, while a libation of wine was poured over them. While these were roasting, the worshippers ceremonially partook of the inward parts—aνδομία, which had been cooked at the sacrificial feast, the other parts of the victim were cut up and roasted on spits and provided a common feast for the sacrificers; the feast was followed by a wine-drink, the divinity was libated to the deity, and in certain cases the rite might close with religious dances and singing? There is much here that needs skilled interpretation. Homer is not an expositor of ritual; much of his account is stereotyped and has the quality of shorthand. One point of importance is obvious: the victim is not one of the gods for their own exclusive use much have waxed only that portion of it belongs to them which is burnt on the altar; the rest serves as a feast for the people, in which they may be supposed to be feasting with their divinities, so that the typical Homeric sacrifice may best be described, not as a tribute or bribe, but rather as a communal meal in which the people strengthened their sense of fellowship with the god or goddess. But is there any trace of the idea that the victim is in itself divine? Nowhere in the Homeric poems is there any hint of such a character attaching to it before it has been brought into touch with the sacrificial ritual, which was may discern in part of the ritual the intention to sanctify the animal, to fill it with the divine spirit; and, as the altar was the centre to which the divine spirit was attracted, this altar lay, in some degree at least, to establish a rapport between the deity represented by the altar and the victim. Such might well have been the intention of throwing its hair into the altar-fire before the immolation, for by a well-known law the sanctification of the part means the sanctification of the whole. There is reason for thinking that this was also the intention and use of the αὐναρία, though careful consideration is needed before arriving at any definite view of these. The acts expressed by αὐναρία and αὐναρία are well described in the initial part called αὐναρίες, which preceded the central act of sacrifice and of which the purpose was the sanctification of the victim and the worshippers. A comparison of many later authorities suggests the following interpretation: the barley-stalks, which had been sanctified, become charged with its spirit, as does everything that touches them; they are then solemnly taken up and 'thrown forward' so as to strike the victim or the altar, and the spirit of the divinity passes into it. When, elsewhere, the Achaeans have no barley at hand, they use leaves, and we know that in later ages leaves were strown on altars. There is no hint that barley or any other cereal had this mystic power, independently of contact with the altar. Thus charged, the victim is no longer, as it had been hitherto, a merely secular being, but becomes holy; and those who partake of it are filled with the divine spirit and enter into mystic fellowship with their deity, however faintly this may have been realized by the poet and his contemporaries. This idea will also explain the ceremonial tasting of the σάρκαρια before the communal feast begins; and it is in the Homeric evidence concerning this part of the whole rite that the sacramental concept emerges most clearly.

Such is the general type of sacrifice familiar to Homer, and another that we may call the oath-sacrifice; this, which was known to Homer and the later periods, presents special characterization and will be discussed below. The communal sacrifice familiar to Homer, which was the generation of an advanced religion. It may have inspired Homeric and his vision of a golden age, when immortals and mortal men had fellowship in the banquet and sat together. And, although in the later periods the sense of inner fellowship and union with the divine was retained, the σάρκαρια, or olive oil, or holy water, was sanctified by a brand from the altar, which was being dipped in it; the ξύλα or baskets containing cereals, were sanctified by being taken in solemn procession round the altar; and, thus charged, the same was taken and the sacrifice continued to be steeped in the altar and used for the sanctification of the victim and even perhaps the bystanders; the κάφια, or holy water, was sanctified by a brand from the altar and used for the sanctification of the victim and even perhaps bystanders; the κάφια, or holy water, was sanctified by a brand from the altar, and used for the sanctification of the victim and even perhaps bystanders; the κάφια, or holy water, was sanctified by a brand from the altar and used for the sanctification of the victim and even perhaps bystanders; the κάφια, or holy water, was sanctified by a brand from the altar and used for the sanctification of the victim and even perhaps bystanders. The σάρκαρια, or olive oil, or holy water, was sanctified by a brand from the altar, which was being dipped in it; the ξύλα or baskets containing cereals, were sanctified by being taken in solemn procession round the altar; and, thus charged, the same was taken and the sacrifice continued to be steeped in the altar and used for the sanctification of the victim and even perhaps bystanders; the κάφια, or holy water, was sanctified by a brand from the altar, and used for the sanctification of the victim and even perhaps bystanders; the κάφια, or holy water, was sanctified by a brand from the altar, and used for the sanctification of the victim and even perhaps bystanders; the κάφια, or holy water, was sanctified by a brand from the altar, and used for the sanctification of the victim and even perhaps bystanders.
SACRIFICE (Greek)

treasure and theorizing. 1 The sacred character of the ox in this ceremony is shown in slender and impressive ways: he dedicates himself to the god by voluntarily approaching the altar and entire body thrown upon it; the priest who slaughters him for the 'holy' into feigned exile, a solemn trial is held for his murder, and the axe of sacrifice is adjudged guilty and cast into the sea. All portions of his flesh, and the consecrated resurrection of the ox is to the official, procured by sewing his hide together, filling it with hay, and yoking it to the plough. This ox has been interpreted by Robertson Smith as a totemic animal, and the name 'theanthropos' has been applied to him; but the theory of totemism breaks down here when critically examined, and the name 'theanthropos' has to be applied to it. There is much more to be said for Pezer's theory that this ox is the vegetation spirit; but the theory is not essential to explain the facts. What emerges clearly from the records of the ritual and the legends is that the ox has immense and independent sanctity of his own; this quality enters into him only after his contact with the altar, wherein he is called by the god; hence forth he is charged with the god's spirit, and the slaying of him is felt to be an awful deal, though necessary; and the eating of his flesh is felt to be a sacrament, whereby the Cretan stranger who in the legend performs the ceremony becomes of one blood with the citizen and is admitted evidently to receive here and ship. The feigned resurrection may be an apology to the spirit of the ox. Similar ideas are discernible in the ritual of Zeus Sospoios of Magnesia, as recorded by a famous inscription of the latter part of the 5th cent. B.C. 1 At the beginning of the agricultural year the finest bull that could be procured was solemnly dedicated to Zeus, his 'Saviour of the City,' in a ceremony called the σάρκασις; we are not told, but we may suppose, that the consecration took place by the altar of the god towards the close of the year, when the harvest was ripe, the bull, having been treated with great reverence and care all through the months, was led in a solemn procession and sacrificed to Zeus, and his flesh was distributed among those who took part in the procession. There is no reason to suppose that the bull possessed any independent sanctity previous to his dedication; but by that ceremony the spirit of Zeus, who was undoubtedly a god of fertility in Magnesia, became temporarily incarnate in the bull, and those who ate the sacrificial meat would be in communion with him if they ate it in a communal meal round the altar, the concluding act of the ritual would be exactly parallel to the old Homeric sacrificial feast. And that this was a common practice in the State sacrifices is indicated by such not infrequent formulas as ὁ κάτωθι, ὁ μενελείων, or οἶος ὁμοιός ὄνειρος, 'let not the flesh be taken away' from the neighborhood of the altar,' 'let them know the sacred. If there it is' (around the altar) 1—rules which show that the flesh was considered too holy to be removed with safety into private dwellings, and that the full virtue of the sacrifice could be maintained only if the worshippers ate the sacred flesh in the presence of their deity. 2 Moreover, the mystic power that the animal

1 Pezer, u. c. 43; Pezer, de ab. 15, u. c. 20 (from Theophrastus): OS 181, 869; Robertson Smith, Rel. Soc., p. 269; pl. 24, 25; Blagg, Religious Festivals, p. 14. 2 G. Kern, Die Inschriften von Magnesia am Maeander, Berlin, 1861, no. 983, line 18. 3 See examples in Add. Thommen, 'Der Zug des Prometheus,' d. RKF xii. (1800) 407. 4 That this type of sacrifice and this view of it were rare in her paganism is proved by St. Paul's phrase, καθά παραλήμφενον. (Gal 1:10).
Originally there were no acts of sacrifice, but acts of wild ecstatic communion, enacted without fire or altar. But in a more civilized Hellenic form the sacrifice appeared in a unique ritual practically in the same late period in Thessaly.—The citizens selected a pregnant cow and treated it with great respect until the calf was born; the latter they dressed up in thin, quinsy-like pieces, such as the donkey of Dionysos—and sacrificed it to the god, but pelted the sacrificer with stones and drove him into exile for a time. Here both animals are semi-divine, not through any contact with the altar; but the presence of the god for and his immanence in the new-born calf are quite evident and picturesquely displayed; therefore by those who devoted its flesh—and we must suppose that it was the intention of the sacrifice—the idea of sacramental communion must have been vividly realized.

8. Underworld sacrifices.—There is another type of Greek sacrifice, essentially distinct from the above, wherein none of the worshippers partook of the food, but all was made over to the divine or semidivine sacrificer. The simplest form of it, where the gift was offered directly without an altar, have been already considered. In other cases the victim was wholly burned on the altar, and no sacrificial axes were allowed to follow. We find this rule most frequently, though not exclusively, in the ritual associated with the lower world, the cults of the chthonian deities, heroes, and souls of the dead. In these cases the blood was usually poured down through an opening into the styx, the grave or the earth-hollow, and the flesh of the victim was wholly consumed in the altar fire. The underlying motive was, no doubt, the desire to avoid communion with the lower world lest its contagion should stain the higher world. The animal offered was sacrificed to Hekate, the ghost-goddess, at the cross-roads. Nevertheless, it is interesting to note that this fear of the contagion of death did not so far possess the imagination of the later Greeks that they would not be tempted to the Homeric world as to prevent their desire at times to enter into communion with the kindly powers of the lower world by means of a sacrificial feast of Homeric type. An inscription recorded by the Eumenides, the sacrifice at Mykonos to Zeus of the underworld and Ge of the underworld, in which a communion-meal was held round the altar and eaten by all, could not be, and a similar rite was held to all of them, occurred in the cult of the Ceremon, undoubtedly chthonian god in Lobris. We have more than one example of communion-feasts between the spirits and the human sacrificer, and it is clear evidence of a family meal taken with the departed spirit.

On the other hand, in the case of the ἀργυρεύοντας θυσίας, sacrifices to assert evils and to assuage the wrath of Ἀνάμνος, vaguely conceived powers of revenge and pestilence, it was an absolute rule that the offerings must not be tasted and even that the sacrifice must be burnt in the open air before returning to the society of men; and the victim chosen for these rites of 'aversion' or 'riddance' was often an animal unfit for human use, such as the donkey. A similar custom to the 'apoprotropic' rites are the 'cathartics' which were intended to purify from stain, and especially the stain of bloodshed. Much of the latter ritual does not concern sacrifice at all; but, when it was performed at an altar, as was sometimes the case, it is probable that a purificative victim was sacrificed upon it. Any thought of a sacrificial meal would be repugnant here; but the animal's blood or skin would be used in the purification; the blood of the pig, the familiar animal of the lower-world powers, was specially efficacious in the case of homicide; and we hear of the 'fleece of god,' the skin of the ram offered to Zeus Meilichios, being used for the same purpose. In these instances the person to be 'purified' was brought into spiritual contact with the immanent sanctity of the sacrificial animal, with the offended divine powers. Therefore, though there is no question of a sacrificial meal, we can sympathise with the possibility that the idea of divine communion underlies some of the ritual of Greek ἀργυρεύοντας θυσίας.

9. The sacrifice.—Again, in the type of ritual which may be called the oaths-sacrifice, if the ratification of the oath was accomplished by the slaying of an animal, the flesh was never eaten, but was burnt in the altar fire, a ritual which was taunted, because the slaying was the ostensible cause of a conditional curse against oneself. The animal was consecrated to a divinity only in order that the divine power might be present at the oath-taking; and these swearing put themselves into communion with the deity by touching a portion of the victim; this contact ensured dangerous consequences in the event of perjury. The gift-theory of sacrifice has no meaning here.

10. 'Sober' and wine offerings.—Another special distinction in Greek sacrifices is between those that were called 'sober' (γάλακτος) offerings of, or with, non-intoxicating liquids and those that were accompanied with wine. The scholiast on Sophokles declares that the former were offered to Mnemosyne, the Muses, Eos, Helios, Selene, the Nymphs, Aphrodite Ourania; we have other evidence that enables us to add to this list Zeus Meilichios, Poseidon, and even Dionysos. Merely looking at the variety of this list of names, we see that the latter are more closely associated with each other than the former. The cheerless powers of the dark world might refuse wine, yet it was offered generally to the god and to the heroes. Nor can we suppose that wine was always introduced to the sacrifices before the introduction of wine; for these cults are by no means all united among the ancient Greeks. In some centres of worship the rule might be explained by the date of the

1 PLAUT. In Festus III. 155, xer. 257. 2 Aesch. Pers. 691, xer. 33. 3 Plato, Cratylus, p. 391 a, xer. 23. 4 Ichthyoc. La. 132. 5 Dio. Ch. 22. 6 Aeschylus, Hecuba, 768, xer. 67. 7 Plato, Cratylus, p. 391 a, xer. 23. 8 Aeschylus, Agamemnon, 768, xer. 67. 9 Sophocles, Oedipus, 768, xer. 67.
not always let him take advantage of the indulgence. Similarly, it was not thought proper to drink the milk of the sheep-camels during the pilgrimage, except under special circumstances. Thus the pilgrim was anxious that the sheep-camels should be well treated and not allowed to suffer. The food of the pilgrim was also carefully watched and "summarized." Indeed, the pilgrim did not eat the whole of his food, but was careful to keep some of it for the journey back home. The food was thus carefully husbanded, and the money was spent with great care. The pilgrim was thus well provided for during the journey, and was careful to keep some of his food for the journey back home.
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1. Occasion of sacrifice.—One of the most satisfactory classifications of sacrifices available is that which divides them into (a) periodic, and (b) occasional or occasional. To the former belong sacrifices on feast-days recurring at certain seasons or days of the year; to the latter belong sacrifices offered on special occasions, as at the birth of a son, the foundation of a building, the inauguration of some public enterprise, etc.

(a) Periodic sacrifices may be daily, monthly, or seasonal. In Egypt part of the daily temple services consisted in clothing and decorating a figure of the deity, and then setting before it an offering of food—bread, lees, wine, and water. These, after standing a while before the god, were probably appropriated by the priests (cf. the story of Bel and the Dragon). The dead were supposed to partake of this daily banquet.

At certain great festivals—the, the anniversary of the birthday of the god, or of his mighty deeds—there were increased offerings, which the worshippers shared in a common feast.

In the fully developed sacrificial ritual of the Hebrew we read a variety of periodic sacrifices—
(a) the daily burnt-offering (Nu 28:1);
(b) the weekly offering on the Sabbath, double in number of the monthly offerings (28:3);
(c) the monthly sacrifice, at the new moon (28:34); and
(d) annual sacrifices on the days of the Passover (full moon of first month), the day of the firstfruits, the beginning of the second half of the year (first day of seventh month), and the feast of Tabernacles (Le 23).

In Arab heathendom the annual sacrifices of the month Rajab must be mentioned; this was perhaps the most important ceremonial event of the pre-Mahomedan religion.

Examples of periodic sacrifice might be multiplied from the other branches of the Semitic world, but these will suffice. It is obvious that they all depend on the motions or phenomena of the heavenly bodies (sun, moon, planet Venus, etc.), or on the annual recurrence of seed-time and harvest, or on the increase of flocks. They are such as would naturally arise in the regular unbroken existence of a pastoral or an agricultural community.

(b) Non-periodic sacrifices are more of a personal nature. They take place on the occasions which break the monotony of the existence of such a community, or of individual members thereof. The birth and circumcision of a son; the beginning of a military or other enterprise, and its successful conclusion—all these are events celebrated by sacrifice. Moreover, by sacrifice an individual seeks to obtain some desired boon from the gods—the health of a sick relative, purification from the sense of consequence on; and, like a few examples may be cited in illustration.

(2) Birth.—Among the Arabs the child must be taken on a pilgrimage to the shrine to which the deity of the tribe belongs, and there sacrificed. The child is anointed with oil, and is slain under a roof or outside over the threshold. The child is anointed with oil, and an incision is made into the neck of the victim. The Hebrews do not appear to have had a special sacrifice to celebrate a birth, but the same offering was prescribed (Le 12:2–8) with a money payment of five shekels.

(b) Children.—The modern Arabs offer sacrifices for a child (mance small), if there is any fear that it may not live. It is also customary to offer sacrifices at circumcisions. In sacrificing for a child, the sacrifice must be made according to custom; not to break one of the animal's bones, but a similar injury is inflicted on a child.

(c) Foundation of a building.—A tablet given by Zimmern apparently records a sacrifice at a new house. In various passages, especially those of foundation-offerings of one kind or another, they have been found. Among the modern Arabs a sheep is sacrificed when a new building is begun.

1. Sacrifice of a bull.—In Egypt, the bull began his reign with a sacrifice to Mne, the god of fertility, in the presence of the statue of his servants. A priest presented him with one of the royal bullocks, with which he slew a chees of corn; he then caused the bull's body to be eaten by the Egyptians, symbolizing the offering of the firstfruits of the year. He then offered incense before the statue of the god, while the priests recited from the mysterious book of the "dances of Mne".

2. Cf. the sacrifice of a bull on the feast of Dedication (1 Macc. 5:31).

3. Cf. the dedication of a building.—Archeologists have discovered a temple of Zebulun in Canaan with pillars and altar.

4. Cf. the temple of the Temple of Jericho at Jerusalem (1 K 9:9).

5. Cf. a sacrifice.—Curtius writes a very elaborate of sacrifice, and there is a possibility that the sacrifice was offered to a deity which appears on some one. The sacrifice is offered to the god, and it is given to the poor.

6. Cf. the sacrifice of a bull on the feast of Dedication (1 Macc. 5:31).

7. Cf. the temple of the Temple of Jericho at Jerusalem (1 K 9:9).

8. Cf. a sacrifice.—Curtius writes an elaborate of sacrifice, and there is a possibility that the sacrifice was offered to a deity which appears on some one. The sacrifice is offered to the god, and it is given to the poor.

9. Cf. the temple of the Temple of Jericho at Jerusalem (1 K 9:9).

10. Cf. a sacrifice.—Curtius writes an elaborate of sacrifice, and there is a possibility that the sacrifice was offered to a deity which appears on some one. The sacrifice is offered to the god, and it is given to the poor.

11. Cf. a sacrifice.—Curtius writes an elaborate of sacrifice, and there is a possibility that the sacrifice was offered to a deity which appears on some one. The sacrifice is offered to the god, and it is given to the poor.

12. Cf. a sacrifice.—Curtius writes an elaborate of sacrifice, and there is a possibility that the sacrifice was offered to a deity which appears on some one. The sacrifice is offered to the god, and it is given to the poor.
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As by design, the animal kingdom is unproperly divided by tribes into certain distinct species which may, and beasts which may not, be sacrificed. According to the totemistic theory of the origin of sacrifice (see below), the totem-animals would in the beginning be the normal, if not the only admissible, victims; and the purpose of the rites of totemism in the sacrifices of swine, dogs, and mice approved by the second Isaiah. The sacrifice of the totem-animal had already in prehistoric times given place to the practice of sacrificing the animals normally used as food, especially of the cow and sheep kind. Besides the Hebrews the Mesopotamians sacrificed goats, cattle-doves, and pigeons. Fish, though eaten, was not sacrificed, nor were wild beasts. The Arabs added to these permissible animals the camel and gazelle (as a substitute for a sheep). The same animals—cow, sheep, goat, and fowl—as well as some kind of domestic bird (cock and hen) are enumerated on the Mesopotamian and Canaanite sacrificial tablets. The Babylonians added fish and cream to the list. Human sacrifice is discussed under its own heading and need not be referred to here.

The vegetable offerings were inanimate objects and are often broken, to liberate their spiritual essence; and excavation in Palestine and elsewhere has shown that this is the case in the Semitic world as well as elsewhere. Offerings are also given, perhaps, as E. S. Hartland has ingeniously suggested, that the shade may not be compelled by hunger to eat of the food in the other world, and so obliged to return, in accordance with an ancient and widespread belief. In Egypt offerings to the dead were often endowed, an attendant being paid to keep the tomb in order and supplied with relays of gifts. In special cases, from an early time, the endowment was granted by the king himself, and the prayer: 'Let the king give an offering' begins almost every funerary inscription in Egypt. The specific purpose of the various kinds of Semitic sacrifice can, however, be more conveniently considered in connexion with the ritual observed, to which we now turn.

4. The method of sacrifice.—(a) The place.

Sacrifice must be offered at an appointed holy place. The killing of a sacrificial animal otherwise

Vol. xli. — 3
where is a murder, to be expiated as such (Lv 17:4). Even in patriarchal times, as a rule, sacrifice took place on a spot bowed by a theophany (Gen 18). The former word, it is probably indeed a mere accident when specific mention of the theophany is omitted (4:3 8). Moses cannot allow his followers to sacrifice to the Lord in Egypt; he must conduct them to places "three days journey into the wilderness" for the purpose (Ex 30). The "camp of the wandering families," owing to the presence of the Ark, is to be a "holy place," and therefore anything that defiles, such as the burning of the sin-offering (20:14), the bodies of the sacrilegious Nadab and Abihu (Lev 10:1), a "laver" (30:1), the execution of a criminal (21:1), must not profane the sacred precinct. The same ideas are to be traced among the Arab tribes. 1

(b) The altar.—This has already been described, 1 so that few words are necessary here. The necessity for the altar arose from two requirements—the need of something visible and tangible to which to apply a gift supposed to be made to a physically invisible and intangible deity, and the need of something to prevent the sanctity of the holy blood falling on the level earth. 2 For this purpose a heap of stones (such as we may presume, the altar that Abraham built (Gen 15:3), a bank or mound of earth consecrated for the purpose (Ex 20:13), or a large stone (Is 14:9) would serve. According to the Book of the Covenant, a stone altar was not to be profaned with the touch of new-fangled metal tools (Ex 20:25), though doubtless this rule was not universally observed—e.g., by Ahaz (2 K 16:14). An altar, however, was not absolutely necessary; Gideon (Jg 6:24) offers his sacrifice on a rock (which may, however, have been an altar-like mass or boss of rock). The altar of Elijah (1 K 18) was apparently a cairn of stones surrounded by a circle of twelve monoliths outside which was a trench; it is the most completely described "high place" altar mentioned in Hebrew history.

Among the Arabs the sacred stone (muqab) served the purpose of an altar. It was, however, more than an altar; rather was it a representation of the divinity, sometimes indeed hewn into a form to represent him. 4 A curious series of rock-cuttings found some years ago at Petra 5 may perhaps be a late Arabean or Nabataean place of sacrifice, as has been supposed. But the rocks of Palestine are cut about in all sorts of ways, with quarries, wine-presses, tombs, etc.; and, unless evidence were found confirming the explanation of the Petra cuttings as a kind of sanctuary, it would be rash to build very much upon them. For Egyptian altars, and the few facts known about altars of the other Semitic peoples, reference may be made to the art. ALTAR.

(c) The ritual.—This naturally varied according to the character of the sacrifice. In the primitive communal sacrifice the animal was slaughtered, usually by having its throat cut (with an ancient form of knife), 6 and the blood was allowed to fall over the altar; 7 this was the share of the deity, and its application to the sacred stone was equivalent to feeding the deity upon it. In the official Hebrew legislation sacrifice could be offered only by the house of Levi, but in the earlier history Jethro (Ex 18:11) and Balaam (Nu 23:19) offer sacrifices to Jehovah. The flesh of the animal was divided among the priests and eaten by them; thus they shared in the meal with their deity. Such a sacrifice is known in the Hebrew Scriptures as "k2; or "gy2; translated "sacrifice of the peace-offering" 1 and "peace-offering" respectively in the RV. The etymology on which the latter translation is based is certain. The former word, like the modern Arabic 3 , includes the slaying of animals for food, after such an action had ceased to have any ritual significance. The chief occasions for such a sacrifice, besides the periodic feasts, were numerous—any time of rejoicing, such as the end of a successful war (1 S 11), the consecration of a priest (2 S 24:19), and a family gathering (1 S 25). A preliminary sanctification was obligatory on the worshipper, with lustrations, incense, and, change of garments (Ex 19:11). When the animal was slaughtered, the blood and the fat—the portion assigned to the deity—were consumed on the altar, and the rest was divided between the priests and the worshipper. Hopini and Philæb us in their great voiced more than their share, before the portion meant for the deity had been set aside (1 S 28:6). With the offering was unleavened bread. The flesh was boiled—Hopini and Philæb us offered the people's religious feelings by requiring it to be roasted. Similarly, Curtiss tells us, 8 the ministers of some [modern Arab] shrines are inclined to drown upon the custom of preparing the sacrificial meal away from the shrine.

On occasions when the joyful feast of the Ky 9 was inappropiate the proper sacrifice was the 10 . In time of war, doubt, or difficulty the animal was slain beside the altar and there wholly consumed. The sacrifiers did not in this case partake of it; the whole was, as it were, volatilised and placed at the service of the deity.

While in Hebrew and Arab theory the animal thus offered seemed to have been regarded as a tribute, Babylonians preserve for us an older stage of the development which may well be totemistic in origin. Here the idea of tribute is secondary. The primary purpose of sacrifice, so far as the sacrifiers are concerned, is divination, especially by markings upon the animal's liver (interpreted as modern charlatans interpret the markings on the back of the hand). This form of divination is referred to in Ezk 21. The sacrificial animal seems to have been considered as having partaken of the divine nature, just as an animal whose flesh has been eaten by a man enters his organism and henceforth partakes of his nature; the various parts of its organism are therefore essentially corresponding parts of the deity, in tangible form; and on them are written the signs of the divine foreknowledge. This is conspicuously the case of the liver, which is regarded as the seat of the soul.

The treatment of offerings other than animal victims (cereals, meal, etc.) was presumably similar to that of animal victims. Under the Levitical code the portion was consumed by the altar-fire, and the other part was at the disposal of the priests (Lv 6:13). Under the Levitical régime a sacred fire (perhaps kept burning perpetually from a flame supposed to have been miraculously kindled) was used for these ritual purposes. To use other fire was sacrilege (Lv 10). The Arabs, on the other hand, sacrificially offered fire-sacrifices at

---

1 A more general term for gifts or offerings is ḫinna, which in the later books denotes more specifically offerings of cereals. The general term in the later books is ḫinna is a "sacrifice." 2 See W. F. Smith, p. 227. 3 See Jer. 11:4, L. 4 The Ky is properly speaking, to have originally meant the part of a sacrifice burnt. "A whole burnt-offering," in which the entire animal is burnt, was ḥa' (Nowack, Archologie, II p. 210). 5 See Jacob, Rel. Belief in Reb. and Assyr. p. 127 ff.; also his Reb. Bel. and Assyr., passim, esp. p. 215 ff.
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The altar was Wellhausen's. It is not a heathen; no fire burned on it. After mentioning the few doubtful exceptions he added:

The normal Ass. altar of burning consisted essentially of an altar of thin stone set on four legs, with a depression for the ashes at the rear.

Among the Babylonians, however, fire was essential for sacrifice. By fire the offering was brought to the presence of the god, and fire signifies the intercession between the worshipper and the deity. Owing to this fact the fire-god Marduk (a conflation of two ancient fire-god phrases) was present at every sacrifice.

For a discussion of some of the minutiae of the various ritual forms, such as the cemeteries of Israelites and the Adoration, no article would be complete without a review of the Hebrew language and its use in the Bible. In this connection, see also Jastrow, Vol. I, p. 557.

(a) The first of these is the sacrifice of the sacrifice (Lev. 16:4). In this very primitive rite, on the Day of Atonement, two goats were laid on the altar and sacrificed. The sinner was cleansed from sin by the death of the goat and the sins of the people were covered by its death.

(b) Another form of sacrifice involving the libration of an animal is recorded from Arabia in which a camel, stallion, etc., was the animal to be sacrificed and the milk of the dedicated animal could only be used by the poor and by guests.

(c) Libations. — David's water libation is recorded in a number of ancient nations, except in the present functionary.

Smith cites libations of blood and milk. He might have added coffee, of which the modern Arab libations are poured at feasts in honor of the dead, being called id-dibil. In the foundation, presumably of wine and oil, was poured on the stone at Bethel (Gen 31:49); and elsewhere. Among the OT we find passages which indicate that libations among the Heb. were wine to be drunk for circumcised material for 'drink-offerings,' and a regular accompaniment of animal-sacrifice—e.g., Ex 29:40, Nu 28:15, and De 33:8. From these we learn

that 1 & 2 (about 3 pints) of wine were the proper drink-offering to accompany a lamb, 1 & 2 (2 quarts) of wine and a ram, and 1 & 3 (3 quarts) of wine and a bullock. Drink-offerings of blood are common in Ps 16:5 as heathenish, but on the other hand a wine-offering to the deity Meni is referred to in Is 53:1. The actual ritual is nowhere described, presumably the West was the last to polish off the Egyptian over or beside the altar.

The heathenish rites of the Israelites, who worshipped the 'Queen

1 Jastrow, Bib. Bibl. and Am. 1, 357, 497.
2 Wellhausen, p. 132.
3 Jb. p. 112.
4 W. H. Bratton, p. 225.

18. It is not quite correct to speak of libations as occurring 'quite a secondary place in the more advanced Semitic ritual.' Certainly in Meso-

20. In Rhaman's translation, the Hebrew equivalent of the heathenish, a week's food set before the god. The name of this offering would perhaps be better and more intelligibly translated 'feast of the people,' for it was a feast and a stone trench or basin into which the food was thrown. The heathen ritual was probably secret, and arranged to keep up among the ummity nations the fact that the god himself partook of the banquet. In the Hebrew rite, however, the food was openly eaten by the priests of the temple, and the same days of laying out offerings could even be given by them to laymen (Lev 21:1). The same or a similar rite was observed by heathenish Israelites. Is 66:3 speaks of people preparing a table for God, doubtless a god.

(c) The Passover, though ostensibly a memorial feast commemorative of the Exodus, is probably one of the most primitive of the religious rites which the Hebrew ritual preserved, belonging in fact, like the sheep-shearing festival of 1 Kings 2, to the time when the ancestors of the Hebrews were nomad shepherds. The special characteristics of the Passover are (1) that it took place on the first day of the vernal equinox (Ex 13:18, 14:19), (2) that it was a lamb or kid (Ex 12:4), and in its first year; (5) that, unlike the other sacrifices, this was a domestic celebration, the lamb being sacrificed by the head of the house, not at any special sanctuary, and not by any special functionary (Ex 12, though this is modified in the Deuteronomical legislation 16:6-11); (4) that the entire lamb was to be roasted, not boiled in other sacrifices (see above), and eaten by the whole family, and that the meat was distributed among the foreign guests, and even to the unprejudiced foreigners (Ex 13:9-10); (6) that, when the animal was slaughtered, the blood was smeared on the door-posts and lintels of the house. The feast was followed by a period of a week in which no leavened bread was to be used; but it seems to be a doubtful point whether the bread was prohibited, or whether it was an intrinsic part of the Passover ceremony or whether the proximity of the two ceremonies in the calendar is not merely accidental. The events said to be commemorated in the Passover sacrifice was the last of the Egyptian plagues, when the first-born in the land of Egypt was smitten except in those houses on which the paschal blood was smeared; (ii) the last departure of the people from the land. The original
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Sacriic is, however, probably much older, and the connexion with the Exodus only became more explicit and etiological. Kellersmann 1 and J. Miller 2 see in the Bible a survival of an ancient pastoral feast, where the best male of the flock were sacrificed (as in the sacrifice of Ail before). The 'sacrifice of the firstborn' in the wilderness,' which was the ostensible motive of the sacrifice, was, in fact, the Passover; and the king of Egypt, by preventing this, urged the wrath of Jehovah, to accept sacrifice of a calf. To himself the first-born of Egypt. The domestic nature of the rite certainly favours its origin among a simple and primitive pastoral organization; but the peculiar details of the rite—the rapid devouring of the whole animal and the smoking of the water with the blood—show that it is in its nature something more than a mere offering of primitive. With regard to the form, we are irresistibly reminded of the famous Arab camel-sacrifice described by Nissen, to which isoahout, and by the writers who follow him; and the analogy suggests that the haste with which the animal was to be eaten was primarily inspired by a similar cause—a ceremonial necessity for the gift or bribe to be disposed of before some (astronomical?) occurrence had taken place. The doorpost rite indicates that the ceremony belonged to the numerous blood and threshold covenants (on which see the works of Trumbull). The wholesomeness of the chance sacrifice in any form, to which allusion has already been made, is specially to be noticed in the Passover rite.

(f) The red heifer sacrifice. This singular rite is described in Ex 13. A red cow (note the sex, which is the opposite to that of most sacrificial victims) which was without blemish and had never been used in a yoke was to be taken 'without the camp' i.e. outside the temple hill—by a substitute priest (the high-priest could not risk the contamination of the rite). A second official slaughtered the animal, and the first priest dipped his finger seven times in the blood, sprinkling it towards the temple. A yoke having been erected, the body of the heifer was to be placed upon it and reduced wholly to ashes, sweet-smelling wood being thrown on the fire during the ceremony. A third official was to gather the ashes of the heifer and of the pyre together and deposit them 'without the camp' in a clean place, where they were to be preserved. The three officials involved in the rites were made uncle after the ceremony till the evening, when by washing they recovered their normal condition. The heifer was then dried and preserved to be used in later sacrifices necessitated by the uncleanness involved in contact with a dead body or any part thereof (such as a bone), some of the ashes being placed in a vessel and thinning running water poured over them, which was then sprinkled on the person or thing requiring to be cleansed. During the rite, though the description of it is preserved in a comparatively late document, it is probable in its origin of very great antiquity. The red colour of the cow, and the scarlet cloth burnt on the pyre with the aromatic wood, are associated with this rite, but are components of a later stage; the significance of the colour is not specified, which, like the red heifer, is a symbol of purification. The village elders were to lead the animal to a rough valley and to break its neck, probably by precipitating it over a high rock. Over the elders were then to take an oath of compurgation.

5. Origin of sacrifice among the Semites. It may be taken as a universal rule that no system of sacrifice, or of specific sacrifices, is to be gleaned from those who themselves perform the ceremonies. In every case they give us etiological myths of other than historic interest. Thus it is necessary in considering the development, and especially the origin, of sacrifice among any people to apply the comparative method and to draw our conclusions from a large number of related examples. In an article like the present it is not possible to give more than the conclusions, with references which will enable the reader to follow out for himself the premises and arguments of the authors quoted.

E. B. Thirwell 4 was the first to endeavour to give a scientific explanation of sacrifice. He regarded the gift rite as father. The domestic gifts of each of the divinities, precisely analogous to the gift or bribe that might be offered to an Oriental potentate, and for analogous reasons—to secure favour or to avert anger. As the gods recede from man, the gift becomes more and more an act of homage and self-abnegation. This theory, as Hubert and Manouvrier say, describes rather the moral development of the rites than its actual machinery; and, while it doubtless contains an element of truth, is little more than a restatement, in definite scientific language, of the vague pre-scientific etiological myths.

W. R. Smith 5 showed that the problem was much more complicated, and involved a variety of conditions. His theories, which are now in full, have been widely accepted. The main idea in the primitive notion of life is the solidarity and unity of the clan is an essential feature. Its members are bound by a tie of common bond with one another and with the god of the tribe to some extent shared in this community, at least inasmuch as they are the tribal guests, and have the privilege of adoption conferred on them by those who are the lords of the household. When the god is angry, his favour can be restored by an act of communion between him and his worshippers; and the victim is the non-human member of the household, the god being present at the meal, the meat is poured over the victim, which is then sprinkled with this pan or thing requiring to be cleansed. The rite, though the description of it is preserved in a comparatively late document, it is probable in its origin of very great antiquity. The red colour of the cow, and the scarlet cloth burnt on the pyre with the aromatic wood, are associated with this rite, but are components of a later stage; the significance of the colour is not specified, which, like the red heifer, is a symbol of purification. The village elders were to lead the animal to a rough valley and to break its neck, probably by precipitating it over a high rock. Over the elders were then to take an oath of compurgation.

For the peculiar method of slaughtering the animal the expression of effusion of blood was avoided (see W. R. Smith, pp. 321, 329).

2 Rathbone, Vergleich der Homo- und der einheitlichen Entstehung der Persische und Mesopotamischen, Bonn, 1903, esp. 64-66.
3 See art. Sacerdos.
4 See art. Sacerdos.
5 See art. Sacerdos.
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Sacrificed by the smoke. The deity is thus satisfied by the 'sweet savour' of the offering. The temper of a master is more doubtful than that of a father, so that the worshippers are uncertain whether he is satisfied. In the stress of恒大, human victims are offered, and finally victims were offered unclean and therefore exceptionally immorality. W.R. Smith seems to have been the first to insist on the importance of distinguishing as to the kind of sacrifice the communion form, in which the god and his people were communions; the offering form, an expression for sin—essentially unclean, as the (tenth) animal being slain, as a substitute for the guilty tribesman, and the mystical form, in which the god himself, in bodily form, is supposed to be slain by his worshippers and ceremonially eaten by them.

A covenant-sacrifice is the most obvious illustration of the communion-nature of the rite. When Moses commanded Abraham and Isaac, he made a covenant, and God, typified by a torch, passed between them in a cloud. When Moses made a covenant with God on behalf of the people, he poured half the blood of the victims on the altar and sprinkled the people with the other half (Ex. 24:11).

That offerings are regarded as literally the food of the god is illustrated by numerous texts. In one of the Babylonian penitential hymns, restored from a fragmentary tablet by Jastrow, the sinner confesses to having eaten and drunk unknowingly of the food and drink of his god, and to having eaten what was unclean and sacrilegious (Ex 24:11) to her; and Tabtut-bel, king in Nippur, speaks of troubles having fallen upon him 'as though he had eaten of his god's food, and neglected to bring drink to his goddess.' Another tablet speaks of offerings as 'the pure heavenly food.'

Frazier suggests that the work on the following conclusions, but in some points carries it further. Especially with regard to the last-named point, he differs from the comparison of an enormous number of related rites from all parts of the world that the human sacrifice is a divination of distinguishing as to the kind of sacrifice the communion form, in which the god and his people are communions; the offering form, an expression for sin—essentially unclean, as the (tenth) animal being slain, as a substitute for the guilty tribesman, and the mystical form, in which the god himself, in bodily form, is supposed to be slain by his worshippers and ceremonially eaten by them.

These theories have not gone unchallenged. M. J. Lagrange, following Smend, objects to Smith's theory, while doing full justice to the value of his masterly work, that totemism is assumed rather than proved for the Semitic tribes, and substitutes for his view of the origin of sacrifice among these people the theory that sacrifice is essentially an act, not of consecration, but of deconsecration. Starting from an erron, whereby the savage sees a spirit in everything, he argues that, if a savage wished to make use of anything—say, an animal whose flesh he desired to eat—the presence of the spirit would make it taboo. By sacrificing the animal, he would destroy the object; by leaving a part of it (e.g., the blood) as the share of the spirit who would obtain the food for himself. By offering the firstfruits of his flocks and his crops, and even of his own family, he exerts the right to secure the remainder of the produce to himself. The newly-planted tree (Lev. 1:1) remains 'uncircumcised' (i.e., tabu) for three years; 1 Jastrow, Rei. Bib. and Assy. ii. 193, 195. 2 Jastrow, Rei. Bib. and Assy. ii. 26, n. 4. 3 For the references see the bibliography at the end. 4 Laufis for des religieux semitiques, Paris, 1909, ch. vi. 5 Lachmann, Geschichte der alttestamentlichen religiösen denkmale, p. 128.

1 See esp. pp. 234 ff. 2 On which see W. R. Smith, p. 418.