

with that of the Greek victory over the invading Persians: the heritage of Jewish monotheism, it is assumed, is as precious as the heritage of Hellene literature, philosophy, and art.¹ If, however, there is to be any rational comparative appraisal of cults, it must be in terms of their service either to ethics or to science, including philosophy; and the service to ethics must finally be gauged in terms of human happiness and freedom. Now, we have seen that in the last pages of the Old Testament canon the religion of the Jews is tribal, trivial, narrow;² and it is the historic fact that to the day of the final fall of Jerusalem it remained tribalist and localist; a gospel of racial privilege and a practice of barbaric sacrifice; a law of taboo and punctilio, proclaiming a God of ritual and ceremonial, dwelling unseen in a chosen house, with much concern about its furniture and its commissariat. There is no ethical principle in its whole literature that is not to be found in the sacerdotal literatures of Egypt, Persia, India, or in the non-sacerdotal literature of China and Greece. And with the Hebrew ethic there is almost constantly bound up the ethic-destroying concept of the One God as the patron of one people, who only through them consents to recognise the rest of the human race.

It matters little whether, on the other hand, we think of the pantheistic or monotheistic element in the Egyptian and other systems as effective:³ the question is whether either polytheism or monotheism lifted morals and promoted science and civilisation. Now, the polytheistic empires and the Hebrew State alike failed to reach any

¹ So Huxley in his essay on "The Evolution of Theology," in *Nineteenth Century*, April, 1886, p. 502; rep. in *Essays*, vol. iv, pp. 363-4.

² "Their universalism continues particularist" (Tiele, *Outlines*, p. 89).

³ For the affirmative view as to Egypt see Brugsch, *Religion und Mythologie der alten Aegypter*, I. Hälfte, 1884, pp. 90-99. His many citations prove that some at least of the priests had a monotheistic philosophy. Cp. Le Page Renouf, *Hibbert Lectures*, 2nd ed. pp. 215-216, 218-230; Tiele, *Egypt. Rel.*, pp. 82, 152, 156-7, 216, 222. But, on the other hand, uniqueness was predicated of many local Gods singly, and there was no universalist cult popularly accepted as such. See the views of Maspero and others, cited by Mr. Lang, *Myth, Ritual, and Religion*, 2nd ed. ii, 111 sq.; and compare Renouf (*Hibbert Lectures*, p. 230), who, however, puts it that the Egyptian doctrines "stopped short in Pantheism."

principle of international reciprocity, so that on that score they availed nothing against the fatal egoism of race; and as regards moral reciprocity within the State, any discoverable difference of code is rather in favour of the polytheists.¹ The every-day code of the Egyptian funerary ritual² supplies the main practical ethic of the Gospels, and is closely echoed in the probably non-Hebraic book of Job;³ but while a similar social spirit is incidentally met with in the psalms and the prophets, the outstanding and emphasised ethic of the Hebrew historical and prophetic books is really that national and regal righteousness consist in worshipping the Hebrew God and renouncing the others, while to worship them is to commit the sin of sins. The abstractly pietistic sentiment of the Hebrew books, of which the most important element is the sense of contrition, belongs to the psalmodic literature of the Babylonians and the Egyptians alike.⁴

In one respect, indeed, the Hebrew ethic is distinctly more refined than that of the other creeds, that is to say, in its relation to the principle of sex; but here, it is quite clear, the general elevation is post-exilic, seeing that every form of sexual vice is constantly asserted to have prevailed in and around the cult of Yahweh before the Captivity. It thus appears that either the Israelites

¹ Professor Huxley, after asserting that the Hebrews "created the first consistent, remorseless, naked monotheism which, so far as history records, appeared in the world," affirms that "they inseparably united therewith an ethical code which for its purity and for its efficiency as a bond of social life was and is unsurpassed" (Essay cited, p. 501: *Essays*, iv, 363). Of these propositions not an atom of proof is offered. It is much to be regretted that professed men of science should thus adopt the method of blank asseveration which is the special mark of unscientific thinking. In his eulogy of the Bible as a school book, Professor Huxley gave an equally gratuitous certificate to the popular creed, with very unfortunate results. Arnold's panegyric of Hebrew ethics was in keeping with his traditionalist and æsthetic attitude; and his naïveté made it more transparent. Cp. the author's *Modern Humanists*, pp. 151-159.

² *Book of the Dead*, ch. cxxv. Cp. Matt. xxv.

³ Ch. xxxi.

⁴ Cp. Hommel, *Die Semitischen Völker und Sprachen*, pp. 316-322; Jastrow, *Religion of Babylonia and Assyria*, pp. 313-327, 694; Sayce, *Hibbert Lectures*, pp. 348-352, and App. V.; Boscawen in *Religious Systems of the World*, 2nd ed., p. 19; *Book of the Dead*, cc. xiv, clxxi; Tiele, *Egyptian Religion*, p. 228.

acquired their purer ethic among the Babylonians, where an ideal of purity certainly co-existed with a practice of sanctified licence,¹ or developed such an ethic as the result of the post-exilic struggle against the seductions and competition of the neighbouring cults. And from this doctrinal evolution, finally, there resulted, apart from the abolition of licentious worship as such, no betterment of the position of women² or the practice of men in Jewry as compared with Greece and Rome. Not only did normal sexual vice subsist as elsewhere;³ but the Hebrew code of divorce was iniquitous, and the law for the special punishment of women offenders remained at least formally barbarous down to the Christian era.⁴

§ 5.

The true judgment on the comparative merits of religions is to be reached by noting the manner of their evolution; and when this is impartially done the student is led, not to any racial palm-giving on the score of "religious genius," but to a new sense of the significance of social and political factors, and a compassionate realisation of the ill-fortune of all high aspirations among men. Genius for moral and philosophical thought as distinguished from literary expression is to be recognised here and there in all the old religious literatures; and even as regards literary genius there is little weight in estimates which appreciate the Hebrew books on the one hand in an enthusiastically eloquent translation and on the other dimly divine the Gentile literatures through the cerecloths of dead scripts.

¹ Cp. Kuenen, *Religion of Israel*, Eng. tr. i, 91; Tiele, *Hist. comparée des anciennes religions*, trad. Fr., pp. 206, 209, 318-319; Sayce, *Hibbert Lectures*, pp. 129, 133, 267-8; Menzies, *History of Religion*, 1895, pp. 159, 168-171; Robertson Smith, *Religion of the Semites*, p. 458; J. M. R., *Short History of Freethought*, p. 53.

² Cp. Hershon, *Genesis with a Talmudical Commentary*, 1883, pp. 122, 125, 126, 168; and, as to the higher status of women in old Akkadia and Babylon, Sayce, *Hibbert Lectures*, p. 176; Jastrow, *Religion of Babylonia and Assyria*, p. 694.

³ See art. TALMUD in McClintock and Strong's *Biblical Cyclopædia*, x, 174, as to the tone of the Talmud in sexual matters.

⁴ Cp. *Christianity and Mythology*, p. 458.

What is common to all is the fatality by which the "general deed of man" determines the general thought.

In ancient Babylonia, the scholars are now agreed, there was a highly evolved yet not highly imperialised State, ruled by an enlightened Akkado-Babylonian king named Hammurabi,¹ two thousand three hundred years before our era, and long ages before historic Hellas was so named. This polity failed and fell, and on its ruins there rose successively the terrible and tyrannous empires of Assyria and later Babylon, wherein no doctrine of civil freedom could survive. Under such rule, whatever flower of moral genius might bloom in high or cloistered places, men in the mass could not be aught but fixedly superstitious, morally short-sighted, good only in virtue of their temperaments and the varying pressure of crude law and cruder custom. Whether they worshipped one God or many, a Most High or a Mediator, a Mother Goddess or a Trinity, their ethic was unalterably narrow and their usage stamped with primeval grossness; for wherever the life of fortuitous peace bred a gentler humanity and a higher civilisation, the Nemesis of empire and conquest hurled a new barbarism on its prey, only to adopt anew the old cults, the old lore, the old delusions. So, on the bases of civilisation laid by the old Sumer-Akkadians, the Babylonian and the Assyrian wrestled and overthrew each other time and again till the Persian overthrew the Babylonian; and all the while the nameless mass from generation to generation dreamed the old dreams, with some changes of God-names and usages, but no transformation of life, and no transfiguration of its sinister battlefield.

In no ancient State, certainly not in pre-exilic Jewry, did men think and brood more over religion, in theory and practice;² and in such a hotbed "religious genius" must be presumed to have arisen. But while it could leave its traces in higher doctrine, and join hands fruitfully with

¹ Winckler, *Gesch. Babyloniens und Assyriens*, 1892, pp. 64-65; Jastrow, *The Religion of Babylonia and Assyria*, pp. 38-39. Cp. Miss Simcox's *Primitive Civilisations*, 1894, i, 282-3.

² Jastrow, *Religion of Babylonia and Assyria*, pp. 245-8; Tiele, *Hist. comparée*, pp. 243-247.

nascent science, it could never restore the freer polity of Sumer-Akkadia, though it could humbly cherish the Akkadian dream that Hammurabi would come again,¹ as Messiah, to begin a new age. On the broad fields of sword-ruled ignorance there could thrive only such vain hopes and the rank growths of superstition. Better Gods were not to be set up on a worsening earth. As in Egypt and in Hindostan, religion was of necessity determined in the main by the life conditions of the mass; and to the mass, or to powerful classes, priesthoods must always minister.

What Mesopotamian civilisation finally yielded to the common stream of human betterment was the impulse of its cosmogony and its esoteric pantheism to science and philosophy in the new life of unimperialised Greece, and the concrete store of its astronomical knowledge, alloyed with its astrology. Its current ethic was doubtless abreast of the Ten Commandments and the Egyptian ritual of the judgment day; and its commerce seems to have evolved an adequate working system of law; but a civilisation which itself failed to reach popular well-being and international equity could pass on no important moral ideal to posterity. On the contrary, it bequeathed the fatal lust of empire, so that on the new imperial growth of Persia there followed, by way of emulation, that of Macedonia, to be followed by that of Rome, which ended in the paralysis and prostration of the whole civilisation of the Mediterranean world. And in the last stages of that decadence we find arising a nominally new religion which is but a fresh adaptation of practices and principles as old as Akkadia, and which is beset by heresies of the same derivation.

§ 6.

At this point the Mesopotamian succession is seen to mingle with that of Judæa, which in turn falls to be conceived and appraised, as a total evolution, in terms of the

¹ Jastrow, pp. 532-3.

conditions. As has been briefly noted above, Judaic monotheism was equally with Mesopotamian polytheism a result of political circumstances. The national history as contained in the sacred books is demonstrably a vast fiction to one half of its extent, as tested by the admissions of the other; and the fiction was a gradual construction of its priests and prophets in the interest of the cult which finally triumphed.

From the more ancient memories or documents which are preserved among the priestly fictions—records such as are included in the closing chapters of the book of Judges—we realise that after the alleged deliverance from Egypt and the fabulous Mosaic legislation in the wilderness the religion of Israel in Canaan was one of local cults, with no priesthood apart from the local functioning of single “Levites,” presumably members of a previous race of inhabitants who knew “the manner of the God of the land.”¹ Even in this primitive stage, when the only general political organisation was an occasional confederation of tribes for a given purpose,² some had already developed the abnormal vices associated with corrupt civilisations.³ It is not unlikely that the beginnings of a centralised system occurred at a shrine answering to the description of that of Shiloh in the book of Samuel; but the legend of that “prophet” is more likely to be an Evemerised version of the fact that the God of the shrine was Samu-El, a form of the Sem or Samas of the Samaritans and other Semites, who is further Evemerised as Samson in the book of Judges. At this stage we find the priests of the shrine notoriously licentious, and their methods primitively barbaric;⁴ and the only semblance of a national or even tribal religion is the institution of the movable ark, a kind of palladium, containing amulets or a sacred stone, which might be kept by any chief or group strong enough to retain it⁵ and able to keep a Levite for its service.

Even on the face of the official and myth-loaded history,

¹ 2 Kings xvii, 26.

² Jud. xx.

³ Jud. xix, 22.

⁴ 1 Sam. ii, 13-16, 22.

⁵ 1 Sam. vii, 1-2.

it was by a band of ferocious filibusters at this level of religion that an Israelite kingdom or principality was first set up, and a shrine of Yah or Yahweh instituted in the captured Jebusite stronghold of Zion, where a going worship must already have existed. From such a point forward the kingdom, waxing and shrinking by fortune of war, would tend to develop commercially and otherwise on the general lines of Semitic culture, assimilating the higher Syrian civilisation wherever it met with it. The art of writing by means of the alphabet, received either from the kindred Phœnicians or direct from Babylon,¹ would be early acquired in the course of the traffic between the coast cities and the inland States; and with such culture would come the religious ideas of the neighbouring peoples.

It is impossible to construct any save a speculative narrative of the religious evolution out of the mass of late pseudo-history, in which names known to have been those of Gods are assigned to patriarchs,² heroes, kings, and miracle-working prophets, all in turn made subservient to Yahweh of Israel. But from the long series of invectives against other cults in the pseudo-historical and prophetic books, the contradictory fiats as to local worships in the Pentateuch,³ and the bare fact of the existence of Yahweh's temple at Jerusalem, we can gather clearly enough that that particular worship at that place was aggrandised by a few kings of Israel or of Judah, and relatively slighted by many others; that its priests did their utmost, but in vain, by vaticination, literary fraud, and malediction, to terrorise kings and people into suppressing the rival shrines and cults; that all the while their own had the degraded features of the rest;⁴ and that their "monotheism" was merely of the kind ascribed by Flaubert to the sun-priests at Carthage, who derided their own brethren of the cult of the moon—though rage rather than derision is the normal note of the

¹ L. Geiger, *Development of the Human Race*, Eng. tr. 1880, p. 67.

² Cp. Hugo Winckler, *Geschichte Israels*, Theil II, 1900; E. Meyer, *Geschichte des Alterthums*, i, § 309.

³ Cp. Deut. xii. and xv. 20, with Ex. xx. 24-26.

⁴ 2 Kings xxiii. 7.

priests of Yahweh. The main motives of their separatism are visibly their perquisites and their monopoly.

There is a certain presumption that the story of the reforms of King Josiah—a movement which compares with that of Chuenaten in Egypt—is founded on fact, seeing that the record confesses Josiah to have died miserably, where the general burden of the history required him to prosper signally, as a reward for his Yahvism. It may well have been that the hostility he evoked among his subjects wrought his ruin. In any case it may be taken as certain that even had he prospered, his effort to abolish the multitude of cults would have failed as Chuenaten's did; and there is finally no disguise of the fact of its failure. Neither in Israel nor in Judah had even the merely monopolist monotheism of the Yahwist priests made popular headway; and if at this stage there did exist monotheists of a higher type, prophets whose aim was just government, wise policy, and decent living, they stood not a better but a worse chance of converting kings or commoners, rich or poor. The popular religion was determined by the popular culture-stage and life-conditions.

In Babylon, however, while many doubtless went over bodily to the native cults, the stauncher Yahwists would tend to be made more zealous by their very contact with the image-using systems; and the state of critical consciousness thus set up¹ would tend to give a certain new definiteness to the former less-reasoned hostility to the rival worships. The conception of Yahweh as incapable of being imaged would promote a kind of speculation such as had already occurred among the "idolatrous" priesthods themselves; and that intercourse took place between the Yahwists and some Babylonian teachers is proved by their now giving a new significance to the Sabbath,² and developing their whole ceremonial and temple law on Mesopotamian lines.³ Indeed,

¹ Cp. the special denunciations of idols in Ezekiel xx.

² Cp. Sack, *Die Altjüdische Religion im Uebergange vom Bibelthume zum Talmudismus*, 1889, p. 22; Sayce, *Hibbert Lectures*, pp. 76-77.

³ Jastrow, pp. 610-611, 696-8; Sayce, pp. 77-78.

the simple fact that from this time forward the spoken language of Judea became Aramaic or "Chaldee" is evidence that their Babylonian sojourn affected their whole culture.

With the anti-idolatrous Persian conquerors of Babylon, again, a Jewish sympathy would naturally subsist; and the favourable conditions provided for the captives by Cyrus may explain the apparent feebleness of the first Return movement. However that may be, it is clear that to the intervention of Cyrus is due the very existence of the later historic Judaism, and of the great bulk of the Hebrew Bible. Had he not conquered Babylon, Hebrew "monotheism" would in all likelihood have disappeared like the other monotheisms of Palestine, absorbed by the mass of Semitic polytheism in the Semitic empire; for even when the Return began the monotheistic ideal had no great force. It is clear that, despite the preliminary refusal to join hands with the Samaritans and other populations around,¹ the immigrants gradually mixed more and more with the surrounding Semitic tribes, whose cults were singly of the same order as the Yahwist; and the old polytheism would thus have re-arisen but for the coming, a century later, of new zealots, whose sense of racial and religious separateness may have been sharpened at Babylon by competition, as well as by concourse, with the Mazdean cult. The alternation of the Persian phrase "God of heaven" with "God of Jerusalem"² in the books of Ezra and Nehemiah, with the final predominance of the former title in the latter book, suggests a new process of challenge and definition, which, however, would concern the majority of Yahwists much less than it did their theologians. What all could appreciate was the consideration that if the cult were not kept separate it would lose its revenue-drawing power.

When once the laxer elements had been eliminated, or at least sacerdotally discountenanced, the social conditions

¹ Cp. Robertson Smith, *The Old Testament in the Jewish Church*, 2nd ed. p. 278.

² Cp. Ezra, i, 2, 3; iii, 1; iv, 1; vii, 6, 12, 15-19, 21.

were vitally different from the pre-exilic. Gathered together on the traditional site for the very purpose of instituting the cult of Yahweh and no other, the recruited and purged remnant gave their priests such an opportunity for building up a hierocracy as had never before been in that region; and the need and the opportunity together wrought the evolution. To speak of the doctrine thus instituted as the product of a unique order of religious consciousness is to substitute occult forces for natural laws. Insofar as it had any philosophic content, any breadth of cosmic conception, it borrowed from the inductive monotheism or pantheism (the conceptions constantly and inevitably shade into each other) of the deeper thinkers of Babylon¹ or its Persian conquerors; and such a content was precisely that element in the creed which counted for least in its institution. What drew or held the votaries together was the concept of a God dwelling in the temple of Jerusalem and there only; and conferring special favours in the matter of rainfall and healing on those who brought gifts to his shrine. The worshippers were no more transcendentalist than their priests. They were but hypnotised by the unexampled series of literary fabrications on which the creed was refounded—a body of written sacrosanct lore such as had never before been brought within the reach of any save priestly students.

We are in danger, perhaps, of unduly stigmatising the Hebrew forgers when we consider their work by itself, keeping in mind the enormous burden of delusion and deceit that it has so long laid upon mankind. In their mode of procedure there was really nothing abnormal; they did but exploit the art of writing—first acquired by the race for commercial purposes—on the lines of immemorial priestly invention; and we must not pass upon them a censure that is not laid on the mythologists and scribes of Egypt or the theologers and poets of India and Greece. Our business is to understand, not to blame, save insofar as

¹ As to these cp. Hommel, *Die Semitischen Völker und Sprachen*, i, 315–316; Jastrow, *Religion of Babylonia and Assyria*, pp. 147, 437–442; Sayce, *Hibbert Lectures*, pp. 108, 142, 191–2, 215, 305, 346.

a sophistic praise still compels demur. And the historical process may be sufficiently realised in noting, without binding ourselves to, the conclusions broadly reached by scholars a generation ago, to the effect that the first collected edition of the pretended Mosaic law, comprised in the Pentateuch and the book of Joshua, contained some eighty chapters; and the second, over a century later, a hundred and twenty; ninety more being added afterwards.¹

Such a literary usage, indeed, gave a unique opportunity to literary and religious genius, and it was variously availed of. Lyrics of religious emotion, commonly ascribed to the semi-mythic David, to whose legend apparently accrued the lyric attributes of the God of that name;² sententious and proverbial wisdom, similarly fathered on Solomon; dramatic discussion of the ethical dilemma of all theism, in the singularly isolated and foreign-seeming book of Job; and express argumentation against the fanatical racial separatism of the post-exilic theocracy, in the hardly less isolated romances of Ruth and Jonah—all this goes with the mass of pseudo-history, cosmology, and prophecy, to make up the library which we call the Hebrew Bible. It may be taken as certain that a body of students familiar with the whole range of such a literature had from it an amount of intellectual stimulation not theretofore paralleled in the Semitic world; and from the rabbinical life of centuries we might reasonably expect some fine fruit of ethical and philosophic thought. But again, on close inquiry, we become sadly aware of the fatality of the evolutionary process, in little Jewry as in the great States that decayed around.

§ 7.

If we look first to the vogue of Biblical Judaism in

¹ Kuenen, *Lecture on The Five Books of Moses*, Eng. tr. 1870, pp. 13-14. Later criticism tends to date everything later. Cp. Kuenen's *Hexateuch*, Eng. tr. pp. 299, 307, 315; Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*, Eng. tr. p. 9. We are not here concerned, however, to work out the details of the documentary problem.

² Cp. Winckler, *Geschichte Israels*, ii, 170, sq; and refs. in *A Short History of Freethought*, pp. 72-3.

Palestine, we have to note that from the consummation of the Return the cult was jealously closed not only to the people of Samaria, who presumed to worship a Yahweh on their own sacred hill, but to the country people around who had been left behind by the Assyrian conqueror.¹ The sociological conditions were thus such that, when the first force of the new conditions was spent, intellectual anchylosis was bound to set in. The learned class, devotedly absorbed in a literature regarded as divinely inspired, must rapidly become incapable of new thought; and their religious philosophy could of itself make no further progress. This is what is seen to take place. But for their traditional rejection of images—a principle in which they had been encouraged by the Mazdeans whom they had met at Babylon—they would even have reverted by that path to normal polytheism. As it was, remaining peculiar in this respect, they did but think of their God as an imageless yet anthropomorphic being who made his home in their temple and either ignored or detested the neighbour nations which had idols. Save for higher speculations which could not appeal to the majority even of the student class, they made no progress towards a consistent and comprehensive monotheism.

What extension of speculative thought occurred was rather in the direction of dualism. The doctrine of the Adversary, developed either from the Persian Ahriman or the Babylonian figure of the Goat-God,² or else from both, begins to figure in the later writings; and, once dramatically installed in the brilliant book of Job, was sure to figure more and more in the general consciousness. All the while, the normal eastern ideas of multitudinous angels and evil spirits had never been absent, though they were denounced when associated with other cults; and in point of general superstition there can have been little to choose

¹ 2 Kings xxiv, 14; xxv, 11-12.

² Cp. *Christianity and Mythology*, Part III, Div. i, § 10. The vision of the high-priest Joshua (Zech. iii, 1, 2) standing before "the angel of the Lord" (originally, no doubt, "the Lord," as in v. 2) with "the Satan" (= the Accuser or Adversary) on the right hand to accuse him, seems to me clearly Babylonian and not Persian.

between Jew and Gentile.¹ On the side of the belief in angels, again, the very desire to spiritualise and elevate the deity of the older traditions led to the imagining of new divine beings. Among the Samaritans, who, setting out with a Pentateuch, developed quite as much zeal as had the Judeans for the God of Israel, the expression "angel of God" or "angels of God" was frequently substituted for "God" or "Gods" in Genesis; and the Chaldee paraphrasts did as much, at times adding further "the word of the Lord" or "the Shekinah" as a compromise where "angel" seemed inadequate.² Similarly the later Jews read "angels of God" where their sacred books inconveniently spoke of "Gods."³ In the book of Nehemiah, yet again, we have mention of the "Good Spirit" of God,⁴ an idea apparently derived from Mazdeism,⁵ and sure to set up a special divine concept. Such conceptions in all likelihood grew up by way of analogy from the phenomena of monarchical government⁶ in which the "word" or "hands" or "eye" of the autocrat became names for his chief functionaries or representatives.

It would be hard to show that a "monotheism" which really accepted, as absolutely as any polytheism, a vast plurality of divine beings, had any moral or spiritual efficacy in virtue of merely setting forth a tyranny of a Supreme God over hosts of angels, with a rebel party included, rather than a kind of feudal family oligarchy like that of Olympus, in which the Chief God is partially thwarted by the others. The difference is much more one of political habit and outlook than of either ethic or philosophy. The Jews derived from Babylon the idea of a Creator-God;⁷ and if that be the valuable principle in monotheism their polytheistic kindred are entitled to the

¹ See refs. in *A Short History of Freethought*, p. 88.

² G. L. Bauer, *Theology of the Old Testament*, Eng. tr. 1837, p. 5.

³ Cp. Ps. xcvi, 7, 9, and Heb. i. 6.

⁴ Neh. ix, 20.

⁵ See below, Part III. § 5.

⁶ Cp. Jastrow, *Religion of Babylonia and Assyria*, p. 433.

⁷ Cp. Jastrow, pp. 433-4, 441-2; Sayce, pp. 142, 205. "The knowledge that there is a supreme spiritual Being, unique in his nature, Creator and upholder of all things, is wholly wanting to ancient Israel" (Stade, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, p. 428).

credit. So with the idea of a Supreme-God:¹ the Hebrew specialty lay solely in putting a greater distance between God and Angels than did the Mesopotamian, and in rejecting (for the time being) the notions of triads and of a divine family. So little difference was there between the two states of mind that the Christian Fathers freely applied the term "Gods" to the Angels of the Judæo-Christian system.² For the rest, it is significant that the beginnings alike of rational science and of rational ethics were made, not among the Hebrew monotheists, but among Babylonian and Greek polytheists, who went far in cosmic and moral philosophy while the post-exilic Jews were devotees of a God whose passionate and capricious will took the place of both natural and moral law.

A "consistent, remorseless, naked monotheism," in short, never prevailed among the Jews any more than in any other people. Such a concept, save in the case of scattered thinkers, as often Gentiles as Jews, has never doctrinally or conceptually flourished till the rise of modern Deism, Islam having in turn capitulated to the notion of inferior good and evil spirits. Some small and isolated communities in antiquity probably approached nearer than the Jews ever did to the bare notion of a single (tribal) God, without "sons," or angels, or a Chosen One, and without an Adversary; and the ancient pantheists, tending as pantheism usually does to repass into theism, at times reached in that way a far purer form of monotheism³ than that of the Hebrew books.

While the creed, despite its rooted traditionalism, was thus of its own nature lapsing into new indirect forms of polytheism, the secular problem of political life was no more being solved in Jewry than elsewhere. In the day of the Restoration we already find the rich taking usury

¹ Sayce, pp. 122-129, 187.

² See the point fully set forth in Mr. J. A. Farrer's *Paganism and Christianity*, ch. i. Cp. *Supernatural Religion*, ed. 1902, pp. 71-80.

³ Le Page Renouf, while pronouncing that the Egyptian doctrine of the one and only God "stopped short in Pantheism" (Hibbert Lectures, p. 230), admits that Egyptian monotheistic doctrine better meets the definition of Cardinal Newman than any other (*Id.* pp. 215-216).

from the poor ;¹ and in the last of the canonical prophets we find crudely indicated the pressure of that deep doubt as to the God's good government which makes the theme of the book of Job. That the faithful deceive the deity and each other, and that many despair of Yahweh's rule²—such are the testimonies of the closing pages of the Old Testament. Only the cohesive power of ceremonialism, the unchanging pressure of popular superstition, and—last, but certainly not least—the economic importance of the shrine, maintained the priestly State. There had presumably now begun among the dispersed Jews the rule of sending gifts to the temple, a practice which in a later age made an economic basis for a whole order of rabbins and scribes ; and on the same basis there would be partly maintained a considerable population of pauper devotees. Under such circumstances the high-priest, another Babylonian adaptation, was practically what the king had been in the past ; and the post was intrigued for, and at a pinch murdered for,³ like any other eastern throne.

One indirect result of the priestly policy was the development of the faculty of the Jews for prospering in other lands. Placed as they were, a small community among great States, it behoved them, like the Dutch of to-day, to be linguists for the sake of their commerce ; and when the post-exilic priesthood, like that of post-Reformation Scotland, found their account in teaching their people to read the sacred books, they were at once preparing them to succeed among the less-schooled populations around and creating an abnormal tie between the dispersed ones and the sacred city.

But, on the other hand, the surrounding cultures could not but affect the Jewish. On the Persian overlordship followed the Macedonian ; and where the similar Persian creed had failed to do more than modify the Jewish, the manifold Greek culture which spread under the Seleucids and the Ptolemies penetrated Syrian life in all directions. In that world of chronic strife and deteriorating character,

¹ Neh. v, 6.

² Malachi i, 7-8, 14 ; ii, 8-10, 17 ; iii, 5, 8-14.

³ Josephus, *Antiq.* xi, c. vii, § 1.

where already all men had attained the fatal temper, seen later at large in decadent Rome, of acquiescence in the rule of the most successful commander as such, the tranquil cynicism of Greek cosmopolitan culture was as appropriate in Jewry as elsewhere. So far did the assimilation go that the hierarchy at length was definitely faced by a Hellenizing party, convinced of the futility of the tribal religion, even as the pre-exilic Yahwists had been; and high-priests were found to take the bribes and do the work of heathenism. There was, as we have seen, no moral or philosophic elevation in the Judaic cult to countervail intellectually such a movement; and had not Antiochus Epiphanes, in a spirit of fanaticism wholly alien to the general policy of the Diadochi, proceeded to coerce and outrage the zealots of Jerusalem, their worship would have dwindled very much as it did in the old time. But that act elicited the singular genius of the Maccabean family, under whom the desperate tenacity of the most devoted part of the race at length triumphed over its foes to the point of re-establishing a State in which the king was priest, as previously the priest had been king. In the face of such a consummation, all the promises and pretensions of the old cult seemed newly justified; and a newly exultant faith emerged.

§ 8.

Thus for a second time was a Yahwist remnant selected, the bulk of the educated class passing over to the neighbouring polities, and their place being taken by new popular material of a more zealous order. Judaism was in fact the product not of a racial bias but of a socio-political selection, such as might have taken place under similar conditions in any race whatever; and ever since the Dispersion the same selective process has continued, the unzealous Jews always tending to be absorbed in the populations among whom they live. Something similar has actually occurred among the Parsees. Even, however, if the Jewish evolution were as unique as it is conventionally represented to have been, the special case would no more be

an exception to universal sociological law than is the phenomenon of marsupials to biological law. There has simply been survival in the Judaic case, chiefly in virtue of the fact of Sacred Books, where similar creed-tendencies were usually annihilated under the ancient regimen of tyrannous violence. One result of the desperate frequency of bloodshed and massacre in the Jewish sphere was a passion for fecundity, as against the need for restraint of numbers that was felt in the City States of Greece in their progressive period; and the Jews thus abounded, and carried their religion with them, where other creeds died out.

Irresistible, however, is the law of strife among unenlightened men, and no less so the law of change among all. In the stress of the Maccabean struggle we find the doctrine of the Messiah already so far developed that a secondary God is the due result. The Christ of the Book of Enoch is substantially a deity: "before the sun and the signs were created, before the stars of heaven were made, his name was called before the Lord of the Spirits;"¹ he is at once Chosen One, Son of God and Son of Man; he is judge at the Day of Judgment;² and as "Son of the Woman"³ he clearly relates to the Babylonian myth in the Book of Revelation. And seeing that "in him dwells the Spirit of Wisdom" he is in effect at once the *Sophia* and the *Logos* of the Apocrypha and of the Platonising Philo Judæus.

But the evolution did not end there. Under the new Asmonean dynasty there broke out in due course all the violences native to the hereditary monarchy of the ancient world; and once again the play of outside influences, which the feuds of competitors for the throne brought to bear, affected the hereditary creed within its central sphere. The Greek translation of the sacred books became the normal version; and to that version were added books not admitted into the Hebrew canon, some of them elaborating

¹ Schodde's trans. xlvi, 3, 6. As to the date of the book, see pp. 26, 41-43, 237, 239.

² Cp. Schodde's Introd., pp. 52, 54, 134.

³ Enoch lxii, 4, 5.

new theological conceptions. As the Jewish State came more and more into the whirl of the battling empires of Seleucids and Ptolemies, soon to be crushed by Rome, the dynasty of king-priests passed away before the energy of new competitors; and once more kings, not even Jewish by descent, subsisted beside high-priests of their own choosing. At length, under the Idumean Herod the Great, a man born to rule amid plots and feuds, to drown rebellions in blood and to outwit enemies by outgoing them in audacity, Eastern craft exploited at once Greek culture and Roman power with such address that Hellenism gained ground against the utmost stress of organised conservatism; while among the common people, conscious of an evil fate, movements of quietism and asceticism and Mahdism undermined the ancient prestige of the temple-cult. Once again the tribal faith was being disintegrated.

One of the movements emerging though not originating at this time is the cult associated with the quasi-historic name of Jesus. As organised Yahwism had been retrospectively fathered on the fictitious legislation of Moses, so the Jesuine cult is in turn fathered on Jesus in a set of narratives stamped with myth, and incapable of historical corroboration even when stripped of their supernaturalism. To the eye of comparative science the central feature in the cult as it appears in the oldest documents is the eucharist, an institution common to many surrounding religions, and known to have been in ancient and secret usage among sections of the Jews.¹ Descending perhaps from totemistic times, it invariably involved some rite or symbolism of theophagy, or eating of a divine victim; and a sacrificed God-man was the natural mythic complement of the ritual.

In the case of the Jesuine cult, an actual historic person may or may not have been connected with the doctrine; and for such a connection there is a quasi-historic basis in a Jesus who appears to have been put to death by stoning and hanging about a century before the death of Herod.²

¹ See below, Part II. ch. i.

² Cp. *Christianity and Mythology*, pp. 308, 321, 325, and *A Short History of Christianity*, pp. 8, 14, 402-3. Also below, Part II. ch. i.

On the other hand the name in its Hebrew and Aramaic forms had probably an ancient divine status, being borne by the mythic Deliverer Joshua, and again by the quasi-Messianic high-priest of the Restoration. It was thus in every aspect fitted to be the name of a new Demigod who should combine in himself the qualities of the Akkadian Deliverer-Messiah and the Sacrificed God of the most popular cults of the Græco-Roman, Egyptian, and west-Asiatic world. In this aspect only is it to be historically understood. But before considering it in its type, we have to consider it in its genetic relation to Judaism, and so complete our estimate of the evolution of that cult to the moment of its definite arrest.

That the cult of Jesus the Christ was being pushed in rivalry with that of pure Judaism among the Jews of the Dispersion before the destruction of the Temple appears from the nature of the oldest documents as well as from the tradition. Such competition was the more easy because the life of the synagogue was largely independent of that of the central temple, and craved both rites and teaching which should make up for the sacrificial usages which were the chief institutions at Jerusalem. But that Jesuism could have successfully dispensed with the main cult among either Jews or Gentiles while the Temple remained standing is inconceivable. When it did begin to make substantial progress late in the second century of its own era, its main prestige undoubtedly came from the Jewish sacred books; and had the temple been allowed to remain in active existence, that prestige would have accrued to it as of old. Conceivably, however, there might have happened a development of Jesuism *under* Judaism, the new cult exploiting the old and being tolerated or adopted by it. In that case there would have occurred yet once more a disintegration of a quasi-monotheism in terms of a virtual polytheism. And towards such disintegration marked progress had been made under the ægis of Judaism.

Note has already been taken of the entrance of new and practically polytheistic ideas into the cult at the very moment of its ostensible purgation of polytheistic

tendencies; and in the course of four centuries these ideas had been much developed. To the "Good Spirit" of Nehemiah and the *Logos* or "Word" of intermediate writers had been added the personified *Sophia* or "Wisdom" of the books of Proverbs and Ecclesiasticus and Enoch; and while the Samaritans seem to have conceived, on old Semitic lines, of a female Holy Spirit, symbolised like several Gods and Goddesses by a dove,¹ the Jews proper who came into contact with Greek thought developed with the help of the Platonists the originally eastern notion of the *Logos* into a new Jewish deity.² In their anxiety to avoid Goddess-worship, they even represented the Deity as generating the Son out of himself (*ἐκ γαστρὸς*);³ and those who later made Jesus speak of "My Mother the Holy Spirit"⁴ were unable to prevail against the old prejudice. It was thus on Judaically laid lines that Jesuism ultimately completed its theology. But had not the Temple been overthrown, either the Judaic evolution would have kept the Jewish *Logos* in organic relation to the Yahwist worship and sacred books, or the movement would have been overshadowed.

All would have depended on its economic sustenance. Had it promised a useful reinforcement to the Jewish high-priest's powers of attracting proselytes and revenue,⁵ it would doubtless have been exploited in the name of

¹ As to the Samaritan cultus of a sacred dove, see Reland, *Dissert. de Monte Garizim*, § 13 (*Diss. Misc.*, 1706, i, 147). Schürer (*Hist. of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ*, 2nd Div. Eng. tr. i, 8, note) says: "The assertion that the Samaritans worshipped the image of a dove is a slander first appearing in the Talmud"; but that it was for them a divine symbol is another proposition. The Samaritan symbol may or may not have been borrowed from Egypt, where Amun, as the spirit of life, was represented as a bird hovering above the body of Osiris when he is about to resume life. Being thus "the usual symbol of the soul and of new life" (Tiele, *Egypt. Rel.*, p. 150) it would readily apply to the idea of the God's baptism (Matt. iii, 16). As to the ancient symbolism of Dove, Wind, Life, and Holy Ghost, see Gubernatis, *Lecture sopra la mitologia vedica*, 1874, p. 145, sq; and as to the belief that the Gods entered into birds cp. Ellis, *Polynesian Researches*, 2nd ed. i, 323, 366.

² See below, Part II. ch. ii.

³ Septuagint version of Ps. cx, 3 (cix in Sept.).

⁴ Origen, Comm. on John iii, § 63. Other heretics made the Holy Spirit the Sister of Jesus. Epiphanius, *Haeres.* liii.

⁵ Cp. *Christianity and Mythology*, p. 377.

Judaism, very much as it was by the early Christists; and in view of the historic facts it is reasonable to say that had their system survived, the temple-priests would so have exploited it. Inasmuch, finally, as the element of Messianism, reduced to a form of purely theological Soterism, was actually exploited by the Christists without specially calling forth the wrath of Rome, the temple priesthood might have done as much. It was in fact the catastrophe of the destruction of Jerusalem, provoked by the desperate courage of the zealots of the old faith, that alone made possible the separate rise of Christism and its ultimate erection into the State religion of the declining Roman empire.

To say this, however, is to say that Jewish monotheism so-called—in reality a tribal system using a monotheistic terminology—was from first to last an unstable doctrine, always running risk of dissolution into polytheism, avowed or sophisticated; that it was so dissolving at the time of the destruction of its temple; and that its offshoot, Christism, is a resultant of the process. If then monotheism is as such intrinsically superior to other forms of religion, Christianity is one of the inferior faiths, representing as it does the dissolvent process in question. To the eye of science, of course, it is neither inferior nor superior save in respect of its ethical and intellectual reactions; and towards an estimate of these we proceed by a comparative study of the religious principles on which Christism is built up.

Meantime, while the Hebrew literature obviously plays a large part in the intellectual colouring of the new Christist world, it would be difficult to show that Judaism made for higher life in the post-Roman world. So far as it made proselytes, it was by appealing to normal superstition, to belief in the mysterious potency of a particular God-name, and of the rites of his cult.¹ To scientific and philosophical thought it passed on no moralising and unifying conception of life, for it had none such to give. Moslem monotheism,

¹ Cp. *A Short History of Freethought*, pp. 88-89.

in furnishing a temporary habitat for scientific thought,¹ did more for civilisation both directly and indirectly; but Moslem thought had to be fertilised by the re-discovered philosophy of Greece before it could attain to anything. And insofar as a philosophical and scientific monotheism arose in the medieval period, it inherits far more from Greek thought—which indeed had early undergone Semitic influences—than from Hebrew dogma.

As for the direct influence of Judaism on life, the most favourable view is to be reached by noting that the most applauded moral teaching of the Gospels is either Judaic or a Judaic adaptation of other codes. The first Gospel-makers did but put in the mouth of the demigod sayings and ideals long current in Jewry. But this again amounts to saying that men with ideals in Jewry were glad to turn to a new movement in which their ideals might have a place, finding the established cult sunk in ceremonialism. And when we contemplate the mass of its ceremonial law, the endless complex of taboo and sacrifice and traditionary custom and superstition, we can but say that if men were good under such a regimen it was in spite of and not in virtue of it. Moral reason is there outraged at every turn; and the anti-sacrificial doctrines of the prophets were stedfastly disregarded to the end. If it be suggested that in such a system religion has got rid of the irrational element in taboo, and left only what is "essential to religion and morals," we can but recall the classic case of the Briton's verdict on the folly of the French nation in making the uniforms of its army "white, which is absurd, and blue, which is only fit for the artillery and the blue-horse."

We come within sight of the truth when we listen to Renan's dictum that of the Jewish race we may say the very best and the very worst without fear of error, since it presents both extremes. Therein the Jewish race is simply

¹ Réville (*Prolegomènes*, p. 313) admits the nullity of Judaism on the scientific side. He seems to imply that it made an end of the notion of planetary deities; but it really held by planetary angels all along, and passed on the idea to Kepler.

on all fours with all others, as Renan might easily have realised if he could once have got rid of the racial pre-supposition in his moral estimates. Judaism, in short, wrought no abnormal development in thought or life; and its very failure was on the lines of the failures of the systems and civilisations around it. The champion of the current creed, though an expert in Greek lore, resorts to the conventional judgment¹ that "the Greek with his joyous nature had no abiding sense of sin." It is the dictum also of Renan: "A profound sentiment of human destiny was always lacking to the Greeks": they had "no *arrière pensée* of social disquietude or melancholy": their childlike serenity was "always satisfied with itself": "gaiety has always characterised the true Hellene."² A closer student of Greek religion than Renan, and one perhaps more sympathetic than Mr. Jevons, declares of this doctrine: "It is the absolute contrary of the facts I seek to set forth."³ And two of the Germans who have studied Greece most closely and most independently have agreed in the verdict that "The Greeks were less happy than most men think."⁴ Their verdict is likely to cancel the conventional formula for those who will weigh both in critical balances. It was the Greeks, when all is said, who passed on to Christianity its type of torturing fiend:⁵ it was the Greek adoption of Christianity, "the religion of sorrow," that preserved to the world that growth from a pagan germ on Judaic soil; and it was "the Greek," finally, who constructed the Christian creed.

N.B.

§ 9.

There has thus emerged from a survey of the comparative evolution of religions the conclusion that not only do

¹ Jevons, *Introduction*, p. 334.

² *Les Apôtres*, ed. 1866, pp. 324, 328, 329.

³ J. Girard, *Le Sentiment religieux en Grèce*, p. 7.

⁴ Burckhardt, *Griechische Culturgeschichte*, i, 11, citing Boeckh.

⁵ Eurynomos, "who according to the antiquarians at Delphi is a daimon in Hades, and eats the flesh of the dead clean to the bones. . . . His colour is a blueish-black, like that of the flies that infest meat, and he shows his fangs." Pausanias, x, 28.

all undergo change in spite of the special religious aversion to change, but all evolve by the same laws, their differences being invariably reducible to effects of environment. Of this the decisive proof is the fact that, under the very roof of a professed monotheism, there arose as aforesaid a secondary God-idea on the lines of a normal process of polytheism. The law of the process is everywhere an interposition of a new God, evolved by later psychosis, between the worshippers and the earlier God, so long as the God-idea remains a psychic need. Only the violent rupture with Christism, and the ensuing feud, prevented Judaism from obeying the law in the normal manner: what happened was that on the severance of the new cult from the old, the older deity was himself modified, with, for a time, somewhat grotesque results.¹ But for Christists the new God stands to the old in the convenient relation that was normal in the original environment—that of son. Even as Apollo, and Athenê, and Attis, and Herakles, and Dionysos, had to become sons of Zeus, and Merodach the son of Ea, and Khonsu the son of Amun at Thebes, and Mithra the son of Ahura-Mazda, the Judæo-Greek Logos had to be the son of Yahweh, the anti-Judaic animus of the Gnostics failing to oust the already formed myth.²

Such an evolution stands in all cases alike for the simple need of the worshipper who has ceased to relate fully to the old environment, and is appealed to by a cult coming from an environment like his own, or adapts his old God to a new moral climate. In the oldest systems known to us such modifications are seen taking place. Already in the Vedas, Indra, originally a God of thunder and storm, has been “touched with emotion” till he becomes of the order of the Beloved Gods, giving and receiving the love of men;³ and still his cult was in its own sphere largely superseded by that of Krishna,⁴ who could better be made to play the part.

¹ Cp. Hershon, *Genesis with a Talmudical Commentary*, 1883, pp. 1, 45, 60, 98, 121, 124, 236, 258, 297, 330, 358, 368.

² Cp. *A Short History of Christianity*, pp. 113–117.

³ Muir, *Sanskrit Texts*, v. 103 sq.

⁴ *Vishnu Purâna*, B. v. cc. 10, 11, 12, 30 (Wilson's trans. 1840, pp. 522–8, 588). Cp. Muir, *Texts*, iv, ch. ii, § 5.

In Egypt, again, Osiris is visibly made to meet the need for a "nearer God" by assuming new characteristics from age to age;¹ and yet, after millenniums of possession, he seems to have waned before Serapis, who in turn ceded, not without force, to Jesus.²

In the so-called "Aryan" religions the process is essentially the same. Apollo had to supervene on Zeus, as Zeus had done on Kronos; and "that father lost, lost his," in a sufficiently primitive myth. Where new culture-contacts follow each other rapidly, and the rites of one accredited Son-God fail to meet the newest psychic needs, another is given him as a brother; and so Dionysos, grouped in another triad, stands alongside of Apollo. This is accomplished in spite of the most furious resistance of kings and men who see in the new cult only evil and madness; till in time the priests of Apollo, who can have been no less resentful, give it a place in their chief temple.³ In all such developments, the new God partially supersedes the older,⁴ whatever formalities be maintained; and no further explanation is needed for the fact, so fallaciously stressed in some recent propaganda, that many savages recognise a Supreme God or Creator to whom they do not sacrifice or pray.⁵ The Supreme God, so to speak, has retired from business, in virtue not of any superiority of character but of the law of divine superannuation.

Nor is there any limit to the process of substitution save in the cessation of the need. All heresy, all dissent, is but a subsidiary phase of the process which in old time evolved new Gods. The early Church could live down the manifold imaginations of Gnosticism, because they were framed for

¹ Cp. Tiele, *Egyptian Religion*, Eng. tr. pp. 118-120, 139, 140, 167, 168, 185, etc.

² The Egyptian cults were forcibly abolished by Theodosius in 381.

³ Plutarch, *De Ei ap. Delphi*, ix. Cp. Girard, *Le Sentiment religieux en Grèce*, 1869, p. 240.

⁴ Cp. Sayce, *Hibbert Lectures*, p. 103.; Maspero, *Hist. ancienne*, pp. 286-7; Jastrow, p. 118; Tiele, *Egypt. Rel.* p. 155.

⁵ Cp. *A Short History of Freethought*, p. 66; *Christianity and Mythology*, pp. 53-57; T. Williams, *Fiji and the Fijians*, 1858, i, 217; Ellis, *Polynesian Researches*, i, 324; Mariner, *Tonga Islands*, ii, 105-6; and cases cited by Krasinski, *Sketch of the Religious History of the Slavonic Nations*, ed. 1851, p. 13, and by Büchner, *Force and Matter*, Eng. tr. p. 393.

the speculative minds, and such minds tended to disappear as the intellectual decadence continued; but only after long convulsions, desperate persecution, and much exhaustion, could it live down its more intimate heresies; and when Arianism and Manichæism seemed at length destroyed, it was only to arise again in new forms, philosophic on the one side, popular on the other.

And the Gods survive in the ratio of their capacity to meet either order of need, or rather of the adaptive skill and economic address of their priests. Without such adaptation they are insalvable. In the orthodox Christian trinity, framed under Judaic restrictions, the Holy Spirit has been from first to last, technically speaking, a failure, being for all practical purposes superseded by the Virgin Mother, and for all philosophic purposes merged in the Logos on the one hand and in the Father-God on the other. But just as Jesus tended to supersede Yahweh, so Mary in large measure tended to supersede Jesus, who is seen to have become more inaccessible and supernal as his Mother was made in her turn to play the part of Mediator. There are even traces in later medieval art of a tendency to make Mary's mother, Saint Anna, take the place of the Father in a new trinity; and the similar tendency to create a secondary trinity out of the human father and mother and son, Joseph and Mary and Jesus, is not yet exhausted.¹ It depends upon the total fortunes of civilisation whether that tendency is realised, or is arrested by the culture-forces which are at present disintegrating all theistic thought.

In fine, Christ-making is but a form or stage of God-making, the Christs or Son-Gods being but secondary Gods. Of necessity they are evolved out of prior material—the material, it may be, of primitive cults to which men reverted in times of distress and despair of help from the Gods in nominal power; but when the reversion persists the old material is transformed, and the result is a new God who, Antæus-like, has fresh vitality through contact with the primary sources of religious emotion, but

¹ Cp. *A Short History of Christianity*, pp. 235-6.

is turned to the account of new phases of emotion, moral and other. Thus in the Hellenised cult of Bacchus, out of the very riot of savagery, the reek of blood and of living flesh torn by the hands and teeth of wine-maddened Mœnads, there arises the dream of absorption in the God, and of utter devotion to his will, even as we meet it in the suicide-seeking transports of the early Christians.¹ In the understanding of this secondary process lies the comprehension of the history of what may be conveniently termed "culture-religion" as distinguished from the "Nature religion" studied under the head of anthropology. In terms of this distinction we may say that hierology proper begins with the typically secondary Gods, where anthropology in the ordinary sense ends.² But it is essential to a scientific view that we remember there has been no break in the evolution, no supernatural or enigmatic interposition; and this will be sufficiently clear when we study the evolution of the secondary Gods in detail.

¹ Cp. Girard, *Le Sentiment religieux en Grèce*, pp. 396-402.

² Cp. Tiele, *Outlines*, p. 6.

PART II.

SECONDARY GOD-MAKING

CHAPTER I.—THE SACRIFICED SAVIOUR-GOD

§ 1.—*Totemism and Sacraments.*

THERE is a fairly strong case for the view that the belief in a dying and re-arising Saviour-God, seen anciently in the cults of Adonis, Attis, Herakles, Osiris, and Dionysos, originated obscurely on one line in the totem-sacraments of savages, who ate a sacred animal in order to preserve their identity of species with it,¹ and on another line in the practice of sacrificing by way of sympathetic magic a victim who, as such, became a God, but was not supposed to rise again in his own person.² It is not necessary, however, for a rational comparison and appreciation of the historic cults, to establish these derivations, any more than to assume that either excludes the other. We should profit little by our knowledge of the manifold God-making powers of early man if we supposed that any given Saviour-cult could originate only in such a line or lines of descent; and in point of fact the proposal to hark back to totemism seems to overlook the fact that a sacramental meal ostensibly can originate apart from totemism.

It is not plausible to suppose, for instance, that the

¹ Cp. Durkheim, *Sur le totemisme*, in *L'Année Sociologique*, 5e Année, 1902, pp. 114, 117; F. B. Jevons, *Introduction to the History of Religion*, 1896, p. 154. A clear case of totem-sacrament was said to be lacking till the discovery of that of the Aruntas, discussed by M. Durkheim, and by Mr. Frazer in the preface to his second edition. But a case of the same order, apparently, is noted by J. G. Müller from the testimony of a traveller among the redskins in Arkansas. *Geschichte der Amerikanischen Urreligionen*, 2te Aufl., pp. 606-7. See also that cited by Robertson Smith, *Relig. of the Semites*, p. 277, note.

² Cp. Frazer, *Golden Bough*, 2nd ed. vol. iii, ch. iii, §§ 15, 16.

eating of bread in a primitive eucharist implied that the partakers originally had the corn for their special totem;¹ or (supposing the God Dionysos to have been a simple deification of the sacramental Soma or Haoma, as Agni was of the sacrificial fire),² to conclude that the first Soma-drinkers made their ritual beverage on the score that they were of the grape or any analogous totem. Both inductively and deductively we seem rather led to conclude that totems might or might not be sacramentally eaten; and that animals like men might be sacramentally eaten without any reference to totemism. It is apt to be forgotten that at bottom the word "sacred" (*hieros*) = "taboo"; and that an animal might be made taboo for a variety of reasons—as being too valuable to kill, or as being unwholesome, or as being for occasional killing only.

On the difficult subject of totemism, the suggestion may here be incidentally offered that the totem was in origin merely the group's way of *naming* itself. Such group-names were as necessary as individual names; and while a person could readily be labelled from the place of his birth or any family incident at that period, or by a physical or moral peculiarity, clans of the same stock could with difficulty be distinguished in the nomadic state save by arbitrary names, which could best be drawn from the list of natural objects. Indeed, it is hard to conceive how otherwise nomadic clans could first name themselves. What other vocables were available? Mr. Spencer's suggestion that totemism originated in misinterpretation of *nicknames*³ raises the difficulty that nicknames presuppose *names*. Mr. Spencer fully realises this in the case of individuals, but overlooks it in the case of the *group*, since he apparently supposes the tribal totem-name to

¹ Mr. Jevons, however, appears to argue (pp. 115-117) that the first agriculturists were so only in virtue of having made totems of the cereals they cultivated. He explicitly suggests that the agricultural comes later than the pastoral stage "because animal preceded plant totems." On this view men of the bear or wolf or eagle totem could have neither crops nor herds.

² Cp. Mr. Spencer's chapter (xxiii) on Plant Worship in *Principles of Sociology*, vol. i.

³ *Principles of Sociology*, 3rd ed. vol. i, § 172, p. 327.

come through the nickname of an already-named individual. When we realise that for sheer lack of other words the early group could hardly have any name whatever save from a natural object, and when we so recast the explanation, the objection which meets the first form of the nickname theory—that it ascribes too much latitude to verbal misunderstanding¹—falls to the ground. In the primitive state, we must presume, objects and actions were first named by onomatopœia, or else, sensations and actions being first so named, objects were metaphorically named from sensations and actions;² and so with attributes. A definite doctrine as to beginnings is hard to justify, and is not here essential: it suffices to realise that objects would be somehow named before individuals and groups were, whether or not individuals were named before groups. And while persons might readily be named or nicknamed Tall or Short, Straight or Crooked, Quick or Slow, tribes could only in rare instances be so distinguished; while nothing would be more easy than for one clan to say to another, you are the Wolves, we the Bears; you the Trees, we the Birds, and so on.

Some such agreement would be necessary; for the mere bestowal of names of whim or derision by *groups or clans* on each other—sometimes suggested as an explanation of the phenomenon—would yield a multitude of names for each group. The same difficulty meets Mr. Spencer's theory that the belief in animal descent came through a nickname, and the totem symbol from that. Mr. Spencer, I repeat, has not fully considered the special conditions of the naming of *groups*. His correction of common assumptions as to the naming of individuals³ is important, though it is perhaps precarious in respect of the assumption that contemporary savage ways of naming children were primordial; but there is a clear hiatus between his doctrine of individual names and nicknames, and his suggestion as to

¹ Frazer, *Totemism*, p. 95.

² Cp. Geiger, *Contributions to the History of the Development of the Human Race*, Eng. tr. 1880, pp. 24, 28-29.

³ § 170, p. 333.

tribal totem-names. He merely rejects other explanations without justifying his own. "Why," he asks,¹ "did there occur so *purely gratuitous* an act as that of fixing on a symbol for the tribe? That by one tribe out of multitudes *so strange a whim* might be displayed is credible. But that by tribes unallied in type and scattered throughout the world, there should have been independently adopted *so odd a practice*, is incredible." Now, the naming of groups is no more gratuitous or strange than the naming of individuals: groups needed to name themselves and each other as such, just as individuals did; and as Mr. Spencer admits animal-nicknames to be natural,² he cannot well deny animal names to be natural in the case of clans or tribes. If there is anything certain about early man it is that he regarded animals as on a level with him, and all objects as possibly animate. For tribal purposes, then, these *were* the natural names. In no other way could groups speak about each other, at least when they became numerous. And until fixed dwellings or towns did away with the need, the expedient would subsist for the reason for which it began.

This period, however, would be immensely long, and the memory of the genesis would infallibly be lost. Given the original circumstances, "verbal misunderstanding" was thus inevitable. When, that is to say, the comparatively early savage learned that he was "a Bear," and that his father and grandfather and forefathers were so before him, it was really impossible that, after ages in which totem names thus passed current, he should fail to assume that his folk were descended from a bear. The belief was inevitable precisely because the totem was *not* a nickname, but a name antecedent to nicknames; and because descent from an animal was the easiest way of explaining or conceiving a "beginning" of men. And while some totem names might conceivably have been chosen by way of striking up a helpful alliance with an animal family,³ the

¹ Note to § 176, p. 346.

² §§ 170, 181.

³ So Mr. Jevons, *Introd. to the Hist. of Religion*, pp. 101-104. "The *fundamental principle* of totemism," he finally asserts (p. 120) "is the alliance of a clan with an animal species."

fact that the list of totems includes sand, sparrows, pigeons, bats, and so on, is hardly open to that interpretation; while the principle of simply naming *from an already-named object* seems to meet all cases alike.

It would be distinctly difficult, on the other hand, to conceive that a sacramental eating of the totem was originally a matter of course. To say nothing of the normal veto on the eating of one's own kin, the people whose totem was the sand, or the hot wind, for instance, must have been hard put to it to conform to the principle; and while those of the centipede might contrive to accept it, the folk of the lion-totem must have found their sacrament precarious. While, again, in virtue of the primeval logic which regarded interfusion of blood as a creation of kinship, and the eating of lion as a way of becoming brave, the belief in the totemic descent, once set up, *might* at times lead to the practice of eating the totem, the eating of a lamb sacrament, on the other hand, is not plausibly to be so accounted for. There is, however, no difficulty in understanding how the totem animal might come to be at once revered and shunned, or regarded as "unlucky" when met. For instance, a Basuto of the crocodile totem, who did not often see crocodiles, might naturally feel when he met one as "civilised" people have been known to feel when they see an ancestor in a dream—he might take the meeting, that is, as a warning that trouble or death was about to overtake him. On the totem name had inevitably followed the belief in the totem ancestry, and the prohibition of the totem animal as food; and to both concepts attached all the hallucinations that early clustered around names.

When, however, we come to deal with religions as distinguished from religion, we are at a stage far removed from simple totemism, though many of the early hallucinations still remain in possession, as in the animal-Gods of Egypt and the animal-angels of Judaism. For our purpose of comparison and comprehension, then, we may fitly take up the conception of the slain Saviour-God as it existed, on the one hand, in the ancient cults amid which Christianity arose, and as it has been found, on the other

hand, elsewhere and in later times in cults of a primitive cast.

§ 2.—*Theory and Ritual of Human Sacrifice.*

The most remarkable of the Man-God-slaying cults which have come under what may be termed scientific observation while actually in force, is that which prevailed till fifty or sixty years ago among the mountaineer Khonds¹ of Orissa. The first observer, Major Macpherson, was a man abnormally qualified in his day both for the study of the sacrificial rite and for its peaceful abolition; and science owes him on the former head nearly as much as civilisation does on the latter. It would be hard to find an anthropological research before his day more marked by the scientific spirit.

On the face of his report, there are various reasons for regarding the Khonds as a Dravidian race² driven to the hills (where they subjugated other aborigines) by invading Oriyas; and one of several grounds for surmising that their religion derives from ancient Central-Asiatic sources is the fact that, like the Chinese, they show great respect for parents and ancestors. One of their boasts is, or was, "that they reverence their fathers and mothers, while the Hindus treat theirs with contempt."³ Another reason is their rejection alike of temples and images. "They regard the making, setting-up, and worshipping of images of the Gods as the most signal proof of conscious removal to a hopeless distance from communion with them; a confession of utter despair of being permitted to make any direct approach to the deity: a sense of debarment which they themselves have never felt."⁴ Yet another reason is the

¹ The name is now often spelt Kandh or Khand.

² Cp. Elie Reclus, *Primitive Folk*, pp. 247-8; Tylor, *Primitive Culture*, 3rd ed. ii, 271. Dalton, *Ethnography of Bengal*, p. 243, classes the Khonds as certainly Dravidian.

³ *Memorials of Service in India*. From the Correspondence of the late Major S. C. Macpherson, C.B. Edited by his brother, William Macpherson. London, 1865, p. 67.

⁴ *Id.* p. 103. It is open to question whether the psychological analysis here does not partly stand for the thought of the observer. Lack of art, and of permanent dwellings, may be the true explanation. See above, Pt. I,

fact that they had no official priesthood, the function being open to anyone who felt called to assume it, and went through the normal preliminary symptoms of a state of trance.

Politically they were governed in general by patriarchs, patriarchal councils, and popular assemblies; and there was no trace of Christian influences—the very existence of the tribes having been unknown to the Government before 1835. Their religious system was a normal polytheism, with a Supreme Creator God, known as Boora Pennu¹ or Light God, at the head. Under him were Tari Pennu, the Earth Goddess, and certain second-class deities of natural or social forces, as rain, vegetation, increase, hunting, war, and boundaries. Next came the deified sinless men of the first age, who were the tutelary Gods of tribes and septs; and under these ranked a multitude of local spirits, all named Gods, who presided over villages, houses, hills, fountains, streams, forests, and so forth. With the second order of Gods was ranked Dinga, the judge of the dead and allotter of retribution, who has some appearance of being taken over from another cult.

It was to Tari, the Earth Goddess, that human sacrifices were offered; and from the fact that they occurred only among certain tribes, who theoretically admitted the inferiority of Tari to Boora, but gave her their chief devotion and credited her as the Boora-worshippers did Boora with raising fallen man from misery and introducing civilisation, it may be inferred that the cults were originally independent. To the last, the sect of Boora regarded human sacrifice “with the utmost abhorrence as the consummation of human guilt, and believed it to have been adopted under monstrous delusions devised by Tari as the

ch. ii, and cp. the *Memorials*, p. 106, n., as to similar phenomena among mountaineers in Siam. See also Lubbock, *Origin of Civilisation*, 5th ed. p. 374, as to the lack of temples and images among the Malagasy, the wild tribes of Cambodia, the Toorkmans, and other races of Siberia; and Turner, *Nineteen Years in Polynesia*, 1861, p. 88, as to the primitive Tannese, who “have no idols.”

¹ Dr. John Shortt, “Contribn. to the Ethnology of Jeypore” in *Trans. of Ethnol. Soc. N.S.* vol. vi. (1868), p. 271, gives the names of the two deities in another district as Bona Peimu and Tari Peimu.

mother of falsehood, with a view solely to the final destruction of her followers."¹ It is told of Boora, too, that he interfered, through a minor God, to substitute a buffalo for a man as an oblation to Tari.²

The common relationship of exogamous tribes, who are constantly at war yet habitually intermarry,³ is the apparent explanation of such a permanent schism. But it seems not impossible that the sacrificial cult was originally that of a conquered race; and that a section of the Khonds adopted it from them, as so often happens where a primitive rite or mystery practised by aborigines is able to appeal to later comers.⁴ It was from an apparently subject race who participated in the cult that the Tari-worshipping Khonds purchased their human victims.⁵

As normally practised, the rite was not totemistic,⁶ but of the nature of "sympathetic magic," and the purpose was to promote agricultural fertility; but it was also resorted to as a special means of propitiation in the case of a pestilence or other sign of divine displeasure, such as a calamity in the family of a chief; and individual families similarly made propitiation for individual disaster. The victim, called the *meriah*, or *tokki*, or *keddi*,⁷ was in all cases either purchased from the procuring caste (who at times kidnapped children from the plains for the purpose) or bred as a hereditary victim, a number of families being set apart and cherished for the purpose, so that he—or she, for it was often a woman—was either personally willing to

¹ Macpherson, p. 98. Cp. p. 131, and Shortt, as cited, p. 271.

² Macpherson, pp. 108, 109; Shortt, as cited.

³ Macpherson, p. 69.

⁴ See *Memorials*, p. 124. The Sect of Boora represent that the Tari-worshippers, debased by her tuition, lived like savages "until by intercourse with us, as in receiving wives, they became civilised" (p. 110). But tribes of the Boora-worshippers practised female infanticide (p. 113).

⁵ *Id.* pp. 65, 114, 115.

⁶ In one case, where an Elephant-God was worshipped, the victim was fastened to and swung by the proboscis of a wooden elephant, and thus identified with the God (Campbell, as cited below, pp. 51, 126). This rite may have been totemistic; but where the Earth-Goddess was figured as a bird, and the Earth-God as a peacock, these creatures were not sacrificed (*Id.* pp. 51, 54).

⁷ *Meriah* is the Oriya word; the others are Khond terms. The former probably means "messenger"—the victim being a messenger to the deity. Dalton, *Ethnography of Bengal*, 1872, p. 29.

be slain on religious grounds or was the property of the sacrificers. As it was the universal conviction that the *meriah* became a God by the act of sacrifice, there was no difficulty in keeping up the supply; and in times of famine Khonds would sell their own children as victims, considering the sacrificial death a highly honourable one.

The special religio-ethical feature of the rite was the universally accepted doctrine that the victim must be "bought with a price,"¹ and died "for all mankind," not merely for the Khonds;² and this view was set forth in the ritual, though it also expressed distinctly the local demand for greater wealth. An odd feature of it was that, although the flesh of the slain victim was cut up into shreds so that a piece might be buried in every field, the recited myth told that Tari demanded blood because when the earth was soft mud she made it firm by the blood she dropped when she cut her finger.³ And there was put in her mouth the injunction: "Behold the good change! *cut up my body to complete it.*"⁴ It thus appears that originally the victim had represented the Earth Goddess herself; and it may be that the pretence of drying up the soft mud was a magical device to put the evil spirits of drought on a false scent.

The sacrificial rite lasted three or five days. On the first, the *meriah's* hair, previously kept long, was shaved off—save in cases where it had been shorn ten or twelve days before—and the people passed the night in a licentious revel.⁵ On the second, he was carefully bathed and newly clothed, taken in procession to the sacred (and *taboo*) Meriah grove, where he was fastened to a stake,⁶ seated, and anointed with ghee, oil, and turmeric (red dye), decorated with flowers, and worshipped during the day by the assembly, who again

¹ Shortt, as cited, p. 273; Campbell, p. 52.

² Macpherson, pp. 98, 115, 116, 117, 122.

³ Shortt, p. 271; Macpherson, pp. 121, 124.

⁴ Macpherson, p. 121; Shortt, p. 271. M. Elie Reclus (*Primitive Folk*, pp. 312-313, 316-317) makes the doctrine more explicit, saying that according to the Khond legend "Tari had intended *each time* to submit to the sacrifice in her own person," saying, "I am the *meriah*: I come to be immolated," and that her worshippers in each case persuaded her to accept a proxy.

⁵ Macpherson, pp. 107, 117, 118; Shortt, as cited.

⁶ Sometimes placed between two shrubs. Macpherson, p. 118.

spent the night in debauchery. On the third day he was given milk to drink, and the final act of ritual and sacrifice began. At this stage we are struck by the importance of the priest: "a great and fitly instructed priest alone can officiate"; and it is to be gathered from the accounts of the *Jauni*, as well as from the ritual, (1) that he was traditionally a celibate and recluse, parading his auterities and securing sanctity by personal uncleanness; (2) that it was primarily his function to brave the curse of the sacrificed and deified victim; and (3) that it was thus the priestly influence that maintained the sacrifice. Four days after the sacrifice of the *meriah* there was sacrificed a buffalo, of which the remains were left for the *meriah's* spirit—apparently a surrogate for the human sacrifice,¹ which on this view had been re-established after having been abandoned. The ritual, however, was so framed as to distribute the responsibility over the village headman or patriarch and the body of the people. On the one hand, the victim reproached his slayers while avowing the belief that he was made a God by the act; on the other hand, the priest and the headman, pleading this, defended themselves by reciting the circumstances under which he was purchased and dedicated, he consenting as a child. The idea seems to have been to set forth thoroughly both points of view, so that there should be no misunderstanding about the religious nature of the act, and the responsibility of the entire community for it; but whether by way of sympathetic imagination on the part of some ritual-making priest, or by simple adoption of the actual language of some past sufferer, the victim in one form of the ritual was made to invoke a curse upon the priest, while the latter declared that it was he, as minister of the Creator God, who gave the death its virtue, and threatened to deprive the resisting one of a place among the Gods.² Finally, he was placed in the cleft or split made in a long branch of a green tree, which was made

¹ Macpherson, p. 130. Cp. p. 108, as to the buffalo sacrifice to Boora Pennu.

² Macpherson, pp. 120-7. An abbreviated account of the ritual is given in J. M. Ludlow's *British India, its Races and its History*, 1858, i, 25-30.

to grasp his neck or chest, the open ends being closed and tightly tied so as to imprison him in the wood, and make as it were a cross, of which he was the upright; and it appears to have been at this stage that there occurred one of the most significant acts in the entire ritual. It being essential that the victim should finally *not resist*, his arms and legs, or, where the arms were sufficiently secured, the legs only, were broken, save in cases where the end was attained by drugging him with opium or datura.¹ This accomplished, the priest slightly wounded the victim with an axe, and the crowd instantly cut him to pieces, leaving untouched the head and intestines. These, after being carefully watched in the interim, were next day, in some cases, burned to ashes with a whole sheep; and the ashes were spread over the fields, or laid as a paste over the houses and granaries. In the same spirit, the portions of flesh were solemnly carried to the participating villages, religiously divided among the people, and buried in the fields, each man placing his piece in the earth "behind his back without looking."

Upon this ritual there were many local variations. Major-General Campbell, who had followed Macpherson in the Khond agency, tells of a form of the rite in which the victim was *first* drugged, then taken to the place of execution, where his head and neck were placed in the cleft of a strong split-bamboo, the ends of which were secured and held; whereafter the priest with his axe broke the joints of the legs and arms, and the sacrifice was consummated by the people in the usual frightful way.² In yet other cases, according to M. Elie Reclus, the two methods of preventing the victim's struggles were combined. "She must not die in her bonds, since she dies voluntarily, of her own freewill, as they say. He [the priest] loosens her from the stake, stupefies her by making her gulp down a portion of opium and datura, then breaks her elbows and

¹ Shortt, p. 274; Macpherson, p. 119. The main details are confirmed by Major-General Campbell (*Narrative of Thirteen Years' Service among the Wild Tribes of Khondistan*, 1864) who, following the report of Mr. Russell, describes the victims as being "stupefied with toddy" (pp. 54-5).

² *Narrative* cited, pp. 112-113.

knees with the back of the hatchet."¹ Other variations are noted in the use of the drug;² and in different districts the entire sacrifice varied. Thus among the Kotaya hill tribes the victim was taken before the image of the Earth Goddess, and rice, coloured (red) with turmeric, was thrown on his hair, while he was kept under the influence of opium. In this case the victim had enjoyed special privileges for an unspecified period, all his wishes being granted, and every woman in the village being at his command as a concubine. No quasi-crucifixion is specified, the victim being simply stabbed "in the stomach," and the blood used to bathe the idol, whereafter he was cut to pieces by the crowd.³ In yet another case (at Ramgherry and Lutchampore) the victim was placed in irons, new clothed, made drunk with arrack, and forced into the "temple" of the Goddess, a hole three feet deep. There his throat was cut and his head cut off; the remains being covered with earth and with a pile of stones. When the next victim was to be sacrificed, the hole was cleared out afresh for the purpose.

In this district occurred yet another variation. Every third year two victims were sacrificed in honour of the Goddess; and, whether thus triennially or annually, at Bundair in Jeypore there were sacrificed to the Sun-God at one festival *three* victims, "one at the east, one at the west, and the third in the centre of the village."⁴ In this case each victim was tied by the hair to a post near his grave, over which he was suspended horizontally with the face downwards, his legs and arms being held outstretched by the assistants.⁵ He was then beheaded, and the head,

¹ Elie Reclus, *Primitive Folk*, Eng. tr. p. 319. In the matter of references M. Reclus is notably careless, and I have been unable to trace all of his authorities. His own special studies, however, give his synopsis a measure of authority. The poverty of our English works of reference in regard to India is more surprising than the laxities of M. Reclus.

² H. B. Rowney (*Wild Tribes of India*, 1882, p. 105), following Russell's report (cited by Campbell, pp. 54-55), says: "On the day before the rite he [the victim] was stupefied with toddy and bound at the bottom of a post"; and that on the day of sacrifice he was *again* intoxicated and *anointed with oil*, which those present wiped off and put on their own heads. See p. 106 as to the method of suffocation.

³ Shortt, pp. 274-5.

⁴ Shortt, p. 275.

⁵ On this method cp. Dalton, *Ethnography of Bengal*, 1872, p. 292.

stuck on the stake, was there left to decay. A further variation was in the direction of the principle that the infliction of pain made the sacrifice specially efficacious. In some districts the victim, after being exposed on a couch, and led in procession round the place of sacrifice, was put to death by slow burning, or by applying hot brands to the body on a sloping pyre, and tortured as long as possible, "it being believed that the favour of the Earth Goddess, especially in respect of the supply of rain, will be in proportion to the quantity of tears which may be extracted."¹ It is needless to recapitulate the further variants at any length. "Victims were stoned, beaten to death with tomahawks or heavy iron rings.....; they were strangled; they were crushed between two planks;² they were drowned in a pool in the jungle, or in a trough filled with pig's blood..... Sometimes the victim was slowly roasted.....; sometimes he was despatched by a blow to the heart, and the priest plunged a wooden image into the gaping wound, that the mannikin might be gorged with blood."³ All that is constant is the principle of a redemptory bloody sacrifice. But by way of synopsis it may be noted that there prevail certain principles of procedure and symbolism, especially (1) that of stupefying or laming the victim to secure apparent acquiescence; (2) the counter-principle of the need either for suffering as such or for such suffering as shall cause the victim to weep much—a conception belonging to sympathetic magic; (3) the anointing, and the consequent sanctification of the oil; (4) the deification of the victim; (5) the according to him of remarkable privileges, sexual and social; and (6) a certain propensity to the symbol of the cross. The use of an intoxicating drug, it should be added, is again specified in the case of the old sacrifice of a youth by the Brahman tribe called Karhâda to the Sakti Goddess.⁴ It need hardly be added

¹ Macpherson, pp. 118, 130; Shortt, p. 274.

² For this see Campbell, as cited, pp. 57-58.

³ Reclus, *Primitive Folk*, pp. 319-320. M. Reclus always speaks of the single victim as a woman, but either sex served.

⁴ W. Crooke, *The Popular Religion and Folklore of Northern India*, 1896, ii, 170-1, citing Sir J. Malcolm.

that human sacrifices were at one time fairly common in India among the Aryan as well as the Dravidian races;¹ and that there occurred elsewhere *voluntary* sacrifices of men as well as of women.² On the other hand, however, we note that, while the destined child victim among the Khonds went about freely, in some cases at least the adult victim was kept fettered, though well fed, in the house of the village patriarch.³

§ 3.—*The Christian Crucifixion.*

To those who have not realised how all religion has been evolved from savage beginnings, it will seem extravagant to suggest that the story of the Christian crucifixion has been evolved from a practice such as those above described. And yet the grounds for inferring such a derivation are extremely strong. Some doubt has been cast, not quite unjustly, upon such inferences in general, as a result of criticism of Mr. Frazer's ingenious guess that the gospel crucifixion incidentally reproduced the features of the sacrifice of a mock-king in the Perso-Babylonian feast of the Sacæa. The vital difficulty of such a theory is that it takes the episode as historical on the strength of detailed narratives which give no hint of such a coincidence as is surmised, and which, if true narratives, could not conceivably omit to record it had it occurred.

But scientific hierology is not held down to that theory, which, in any case, seeks to account only for certain features of the crucifixion story, notably the mock-crowning and the scourging. These features are indeed probably to be explained through the analogies to which Mr. Frazer points,

¹ Cp. Crooke, ii, 167, 320, and his authorities, with essay by Prof. H. H. Wilson in *Jour. of Roy. Asiat. Soc.*, vol. xiii (1852), pp. 96-107.

² Malcolm, *Central India*, ii, 210, cited by Crooke.

³ Hunter, *Orissa*, ii, 97; Shortt, as cited, p. 273. Major-General Campbell, whose attempts to discredit some of Macpherson's statements recoiled badly on himself, states first (p. 53) that meriahs "are seldom subjected to any restraint," and again that "when of age to understand for what purpose they are intended *they are chained*; two had been years in chains; one so long that he could not recollect ever having been at liberty" (p. 57).

though not on his assumption of a historical episode; but there are other features, such as the cross itself, and the resurrection, to which the clues lie, unemphasised, in other sections of Mr. Frazer's survey; and there are yet others which he has not ostensibly studied. Some of these are illuminated by the rite of human sacrifice among the Khonds. Their placing of the victim, for instance, in a cleft bough in such a way as to make a living cross,¹ wherein the God is as it were part of the living tree, is a singularly suggestive parallel. But no less so is the detail as to the breaking of the victim's arms and legs, to make him seem unresisting, and the substitution of opium as being less cruel.

This last principle is found to have been acted on by the Karhāda Brahmans of Bombay. In their secret human sacrifice, described by Sir John Malcolm, the unsuspecting victim—often a stranger long hospitably entertained for the purpose—was drugged; and in his drugged state was led three times round the idol of the Goddess, whereafter his throat was cut.² Yet again, the same principle is found so far away as Mexico, where, in one annual sacrifice to the Fire-God, the victims were painted red like the Khond *meriah*, and a narcotic powder was thrown in their faces. They too were subjected to special suffering, being thrown into the fire before being sacrificed with the knife in the usual way.³ And in the Mexican sacrifice, also, the God was expressly represented by a tree, stripped of bark and branches, but covered with painted paper.

Let us now take the Christian parallels.

In the fourth gospel it is told that after the death of Jesus on the cross, in order "that the bodies might not stay on the cross on the Sabbath," the Jews "asked of Pilate that their legs might be broken and they might be taken away." But the soldiers broke only the legs of the "two others," these not being yet dead: Jesus they spared,

¹ This detail is preserved in a surrogate sacrifice of a pig in Polynesia. See below, § 8.

² Crooke, *Popular Religion and Folklore of Northern India*, 1896, ii, 170-1.

³ Clavigero, *History of Mexico*, Eng. tr. ed. 1807, B. vi, § 34 (i, 306-7).

piercing his heart with a lance, "that the scripture might be fulfilled: A bone of him shall not be broken." The other gospels say nothing on this point; but all four tell of the offering of a drink, and the first two synoptics mention it both before and after the act of crucifying. In Matthew, "vinegar mixed with gall" is offered beforehand, and refused after tasting; and a sponge of vinegar is offered, apparently in sympathy, after the cry of *Eli, Eli*. In the first passage the text has evidently been tampered with; for the Vulgate and Ethiopic versions, the Sinaitic, Vatican, and Bezan codices, and many old MSS., read *wine* for *vinegar*, while the Arabic version reads *myrrh* for *gall*.¹ In Mark, more significantly, the first drink becomes "wine spiced with myrrh," and is refused without tasting; and here the commentators recognise that the purpose was presumably to cause stupefaction, and so lighten the suffering.² In Luke, this detail entirely disappears, and the vinegar offered on the cross is given in mockery. In John also, only the drink offered on the cross is mentioned; and of this it is said that "When Jesus had received the vinegar he said, It is finished." Then follows the detail as to the breaking of the legs.

It is needless here to challenge afresh the historical value of the conflicting records, wherein a slight detail, of no historical importance, enters only to take varying forms for symbolical reasons. What we are concerned with is the source of the symbolism. One compiler clearly knows of a drink offered before the crucifixion, and implies that it was intended to cause euthanasia, for he notes that it was

¹ Cp. Varior. Bible, Alford's Greek N.T., Blackader's N.T., McClellan's N.T., and Gill's Exposition on Mt. xxvii, 34.

² According to several Talmudic passages, the Jews gave to *any* man about to be executed "a grain of frankincense in a cup of wine," and the tradition runs that the ladies of Jerusalem gave this to the doomed ones. Gill's Expos. on Mk. xv, 23, citing T. Bab. Sanhedrin, fol. 43, 1; Bemdbar Rabba, sect. 10, fol. 198, 4, etc. Cp. Hershon, *Genesis with a Talmudical Commentary*, 1883, p. 150, note 10. But if this were so, the practice was *extended to executions from sacrifices*. It cannot have originated as an amelioration of a punishment of which the first purpose was to cause suffering. [In any case, there is no suggestion that any drink was offered to the two thieves: here we are dealing with a sacrificial ritual in which only the central victim is a true sacrifice.] See below, § 9.

refused. The divine victim must be a conscious sufferer. A later compiler ignores altogether this detail, and notes only that the slayers tormented the victim with a drink of vinegar. Both details alike are un-Roman,¹ for the torment was trivial, while the narcotic would be inconsistent with what was meant to be an exemplary punishment. The theologising fourth gospel, in turn, makes the victim accept the drink of vinegar as the last symbolic act of sufferance;² but then suddenly alludes to a detail not specified by the others—a *concluding* act of limb-breaking, from which the divine victim escapes for dogmatic reasons, the fact of his death being made certain by a lance-thrust in the side. We must infer that the limb-breaking was *known to occur* in certain circumstances, and that the writer or an interpolator of the fourth gospel saw need to make it clear that the bones of the Messiah remained unbroken. He being, according to the fourth gospel, the true paschal sacrifice, it was important that the law as to the Passover should in him be fulfilled.³

On what data, then, did the different evangelists proceed? What had they under notice? Not an original narrative: their dissidence is almost complete. Not a known official practice in Roman crucifixions; for the third gospel treats as an act of mockery what the first and second do not so regard; and the fourth describes the act of limb-breaking as done to meet a Jewish demand, which in the synoptic narrative could not arise. Mere breaking of the legs, besides, would be at once a laborious and an inadequate way of making sure that the victims were dead;⁴ the spear-

¹ Josephus indeed tells (*Wars*, v, 11, § 1) that during the siege of Jerusalem the Romans crucified vast multitudes of the Jews who sought to escape, first scourging them, and then torturing them in different ways; but this is expressly declared to be an act at once of military vengeance and of terrorism, whereas the drink of vinegar was either a mere trifling insult or an act of relief.

² Psalm lxix, 21, would lead Jews so to regard such a draught.

³ Exodus xii, 46; Num. ix, 12 (cp. Ps. xxxiv, 20, where "the righteous" would be held to apply to the Messiah). This very law points to memories of the act of limb-breaking in sacrifice.

⁴ The statement of Lactantius (*Div. Inst.* iv, 26) that it was usual for the executioners to break the bones of those crucified is without foundation, and is confuted by the absence of the detail from the synoptics. The *crurifragium*, or punishment by limb-breaking, was quite a different thing.

thrust would be the natural and the sufficient act; yet only one victim is speared. Only one hypothesis will meet the whole case. The different narratives testify to the existence of a *ritual or rituals* of crucifixion or quasi-crucifixion, in variants of which there had figured the two procedures of breaking the legs of the victim and giving him a narcotic. Of these procedures neither is understood by the evangelists, though by some of them the latter is partly comprehended; and they accordingly proceed to turn both, in different fashions, to dogmatic account. Their conflict is thus insoluble, and their testimony alike unhistorical. But we find the psychological clue in the hypothesis of a known ritual of a crucified Saviour-God, who had for universally-recognised reasons to appear to suffer as a willing victim. Being crucified—that is, hung by the hands or wrists to a tree or post, and supported not by his feet but by a bar between his thighs—he would tend to struggle (unlike the Khond victim, whose arms were free) chiefly with his legs; and if he were to be prevented from struggling, it would have to be either by breaking the legs or by stupefying him with a drug. The Khonds, we have seen, used anciently the former horrible method, but learned to use the latter also. Finally, the detail of the spear-thrust in the side, bestowed only on the ostensibly divine victim, suggests that in some similar ritual that may have been the mode of ceremonial slaying. We have but to recognise that among some of the more civilised peoples of the Mediterranean similar processes had been sometimes gone through about two thousand years ago, and we have the conditions which may account for the varying Gospel narratives.

§ 4.—*Vogue of Human Sacrifice.*

Given the *prima facie* fitness of the hypothesis, however, there at once arises the question, What positive evidence have we for the existence in the Mediterranean world of any such man-sacrificing ritual about the beginning of the Christian era?

Let us first take the direct contemporary or other ancient testimony. Broadly speaking, it shows the practice of human sacrifice to have been at no distant time universal. Lusitanians,¹ Gauls,² and Teutons³ alike, at the period of their contact with the Romans, normally sacrificed to their Gods captives and prisoners, sometimes by burning,⁴ sometimes by hanging,⁵ sometimes by crucifying,⁶ sometimes by throat-cutting or other letting of blood.⁷ Among some tribes of the more easterly Galatæ⁸ and the Massagetæ⁹ and other Scythians¹⁰ the same usages were reported; and while human sacrifices had in the time of Herodotus long ceased to be offered in Egypt,¹¹ the memory of them was, to say the least, sufficiently fresh among the Greeks and Romans.¹² The stories of King Athamas, called upon by the Delphic oracle to sacrifice his firstborn son Phryxos,¹³ and of King Lycaon who sacrificed a child to Zeus,¹⁴ tell of a once recognised conception and practice; and those of the sacrificing of three Persian boys to Dionysos Oméstês at the battle of Salamis,¹⁵ and of seven children by the Persians to the God of the Underworld when they were entering Greece,¹⁶ are equally significant. Among the Eretrians and Magnesians, again, sacrifices of human firstlings were said to have been anciently offered.¹⁷

Such practices gradually died out, and are held to have

¹ Strabo, iii, 3, §§ 6, 7.

² Cicero, *pro. M. Fonteio*, xiv; Cæsar, *De Bello Gallico*, vi, 16; Lactantius, *Div. Inst.* i, 21; Strabo, iv, 4, § 5; Dionysius Halicarn. i, 38; Pomponius Mela, iii, 2; Lucan, i, 444-5; Tertullian, *Apologeticus*, ix.

³ Strabo, vii, 2, § 3; Tacitus, *Germania*, ix, xxxix; Procopius, *Bell. Goth.* ii, 15. Other testimonies are collected by Grimm, *Teutonic Mythology*, Eng. tr. i, 44-6.

⁴ *E.g.*, among the Gauls, as described by Cæsar.

⁵ Paulus Orosius, v, 16; Procopius, as cited.

⁶ Among the Gauls. Strabo, iv, 4, § 5.

⁷ Among the Cimbri (Strabo, vii, 2, § 3) and Scythians (Herodotus, iv, 62).

⁸ Diodorus, v, 32.

⁹ Herod. iv, 94.

¹⁰ Herod. iv, 103.

¹¹ Herod. ii, 45, 119. Cp. however, Diodorus, i, 88; Plutarch, *Isis and Osiris*, xxxi; and Ghillany, *Die Menschenopfer der alten Hebräer*, 1842, pp. 116-117.

¹² Cp. Ovid, *Fasti*, v, 621, 629; Lactantius, *Div. Inst.* i, 21; *Aeneid*, x, 517, 520; Macrobius, *Saturnalia*, i, 7; Plutarch, *Quæst. Roman.* 83.

¹³ Apollodorus, i, 9, §§ 1, 2; Herodotus, vii, 197; Pausanias, ix, 34.

¹⁴ Pausanias, viii, 2. Cp. iv, 9.

¹⁵ Plutarch, *Themistocles*, xiii. They were said to be nephews of Xerxes.

¹⁶ Herodotus, vii, 114.

¹⁷ Plutarch, *De Pyth. Orac.* xvi.

subsisted latterly in only one or two places in the civilised parts of the Roman Empire;¹ but it is on record that only in the time of Hadrian was the annual human sacrifice to Zeus abolished at Salamis in Cyprus;² and the possibility of either secret or open survivals in Asia Minor in the first century would thus seem to be considerable.

To begin with, we have Strabo's account of human sacrifice as being practised in his time by the primitive Albanians, who lived south of the Caucasian mountains and west of the Caspian Sea, in the land watered by the Cyrus and the Araxes. Under the high-priest of the Moon-Goddess were a number of "sacred" slaves (*hierodouloi*); and when one of these became divinely possessed and wandered alone in the woods he was seized, bound with sacred fetters, and maintained sumptuously for a year. When the festival day came he was *anointed* with a fragrant ointment, and slain by being *pierced to the heart with a sacred lance through the side*. Auguries were then drawn from the manner of his fall, and the body was carried away to a certain spot and ceremonially trampled upon by all as a means of purification.³ Here we have a sacrifice corresponding in one notable detail to one of the gospel narratives, and having other marked features in common with other well-known rites of human sacrifice. In the annual spring sacrifice at Salamis, again, the victim was led thrice round the altar (as in the rite of the Karhâda Brahmans), then pierced by the priest with a lance, and the corpse was finally burned on a pyre.⁴

Later testimony brings us closer to civilisation in the same period. Tertullian is not the best of witnesses, and when he asserts that children are secretly sacrificed by non-Christians in Carthage in his own day,⁵ he is but doing what he denounces the pagans for doing as against his own sect—publishing a rumour which had never been investigated. But when he tells that children were publicly sacrificed to Saturn as late as the proconsulship of Tiberius,

¹ Cp. Grote, Part i, c. 6 (i, 119, *note*, ed. 1888).

² Lactantius, as cited; Porphyry, *De Abstin.* ii, 56.

³ Strabo, xi, 4, § 7.

⁴ Eusebius, *Præp. Evang.* iv, 16.

⁵ *Apologeticus*, ix.

important
detail

who therefore "crucified" a number of priests on the sacred trees beside their temple, he is saying something that squares with a good deal of testimony as to Semitic practices. Thus we have the explicit record¹ that Hamilcar sacrificed his own son at the siege of Agrigentum, 407 B.C., and the many testimonies² as to wholesale sacrifices of children among the Carthaginians. There is good evidence that an annual sacrifice of a boy to Kronos had anciently taken place at Tyre, but that it was given up, the citizens refusing to renew it when the city was besieged by Alexander; and the writer who records this also asserts that the Carthaginians maintained the practice of one annual sacrifice till the destruction of their city.³ To the same effect, Pliny alleges⁴ that the victim was annually sacrificed before the image of Hercules—that is, Melkarth. Even the lack of agreement as to dates of cessation is a proof that such usages could subsist without exciting much concern in the more civilised sections of the Roman empire—not an astonishing thing when there is reason to suspect that they are not wholly extinct in sequestered places in British India.⁵ Among the Arabs, it seems certain, human sacrifices subsisted in the generation before Mohammed.⁶

In view of the importance of this point to our inquiry, it has to be remarked, first, that there is no clear record of the date of cessation of the human sacrifices in the Thargelia at Athens. The historians pass over these matters with no apparent sense of the social and moral significance of such a problem. Grote does not so much as mention the Thargelia in connection with the practice of human sacrifice; and even Mr. Frazer⁷ remarks that "the Athenians regularly maintained" a number of possible victims, without suggesting any period for the usage. Professor Mahaffy,

¹ Diodorus, xiii, 86.

² Cited above, p. 59. Cp. Varro, in Augustine, *De Civ. Dei*, vii, 19.

³ Quintus Curtius, iv, 3, § 38.

⁴ *Hist. Nat.* xxxiv, 4, § 26.

⁵ Crooke, *Popular Religion and Folklore of Northern India*, 1896, ii, 171.

⁶ Cp. Weil, *Biblical Legends of the Mussulmans*, Eng. tr. 1846, p. 63; Curtiss, *Primitive Semitic Religion To-day*, 1902, p. 209 and context.

⁷ *G. B.* iii, 125.

on whom as a culture-historian the problem pressed, makes a notable admission. "I think," he writes, "that Aristophanes alludes to this custom as bygone, though the scholiasts do not think so; but its very familiarity to his audience shows a disregard of human life strange enough in so advanced a legal system as that of Athens."¹ The fact seems to have been that where criminals were concerned no notion of humanity or illegality came into play. The horror of Themistocles at the demand that he should sacrifice captives of princely blood at Salamis² is really no ground for thinking, as does Professor Mahaffy, that he or any other Athenian would wince at putting a criminal to death by religious rites; and such usages, ceasing to be *called* human sacrifices, may have subsisted long after the Periclean period.

Secondly, there is reason to infer from the uneasy language of Pausanias³ that human sacrifice to Lycaean Zeus was still performed in his time during periods of prolonged drought; and, as we shall see, there are more explicit albeit doubtful assertions as to its continuance at Rome at a still later period.

Among the barbarians, too, there were cannibal sacraments. Herodotus tells that his "Androphagoi" were the only people among the Scythians who ate human flesh;⁴ but he also asserts that "when a Scythian overthrows his first enemy he drinks his blood"; that when the Scythians make solemn covenants they mix their blood with wine and drink thereof;⁵ that the Massagetæ sacrifice their aged kinsmen and eat their flesh;⁶ and that the Issedones eat the flesh of their dead fathers, mingled with animal flesh, at a grand banquet.⁷ Of the "Indian" Callatians and Padæans he gives similar accounts.⁸ From such testimony it appears that an anthropophagous sacrament could subsist among a people not generally given to cannibalism; nor does it

¹ *Social Life in Greece*, 3rd ed. p. 239, citing the *Ranae*, 732; Hipponax, *Fr.* 4-9, ed. Bergk; Archilochus, *Fr.* 113; Ister, *Fr.* 33, ed. Müller.

² Cp. Plutarch's stories concerning Pelopidas (cc. 20-26) and Agesilaus (c. 6).

³ vii. 38. Cp. Augustine, *De civ. Dei*, xviii, 17, and Frazer, *G.B.* iii, 149, note.

⁶ i, 216.

⁴ iv, 106.

⁵ iv, 70.

⁷ iv, 26.

⁸ iii, 38, 99.

appear from Herodotus that even the Androphagoi were at all shunned by other tribes. Substantially following Herodotus, Pomponius Mela, in the chapter in which he mentions the Androphagoi and Sacæ, tells of some in their region who hold it best to slay nothing, and of some who, when a near relative is growing weak through age or sickness, slay him as a sacrifice and hold it *fas et maxime pium* to eat of their bodies.¹ Pomponius' geography is certainly of the wildest; but it is sufficient to note that he locates these sacramentalists in the region of Nysia, of mount Meros, sacred to Jove, and of the cave in which was nourished Father Liber. As there is no doubt that the ancient Akkadians and later Babylonians sacrificed their first-born children,² there need be none as to similar practices among later Asiatic barbarians.

Returning to the civilised pale, we have the terse testimony of Pliny that among the Druidical rites suppressed by Tiberius had been one in which *hominem occidere religiosissimum erat, mandî vero etiam saluberrimum*.³ On this Pliny declaims, in the imperialistic manner, that *nec satis æstimari potest, quantum Romanis debeatur* for ending such horrors. Yet we have not only the record of the early burying alive of four alien men and women in the Forum Boarium of Rome, 216 B.C.;⁴ we have also Pliny's own avowals that only in the year 657 of Rome (97 B.C.) was there passed a *senatus-consultus* forbidding human sacrifices;⁵ and that despite this there had been seen in his own time (*etiam nostra ætas vidit*) such a sacrifice,⁶ in the form of the burying alive of two aliens of a nation with whom Rome was at war. We have also the inuendoes of Horace⁷ and Juvenal⁸ to the effect that even in their own day ancient savageries, such as the sacrifice of boys by slow starvation, could be performed in private, as well as the records of the sacrifice of two soldiers of

¹ *De situ orbis*, iii, 7. Cp. Strabo, xi, § 6; vii, 3, § 9.

² Tiele, *Hist. comparée des anciennes religions*, trad. Fr. p. 247; Sayce, Hibbert Lectures, p. 78.

³ *Hist. Nat.*, xxx, 4.

⁴ Livy, xxii, 57.

⁵ *Hist. Nat.* xxx, 3.

⁶ *Id.* xxviii, 3.

⁷ *Epod.* v, 12, 32-39.

⁸ *Sat.* vi, 548-552.

Julius Cæsar to Mars,¹ and of the slaying of three hundred of the enemies of Augustus as a sacrifice to the deified Julius.² Lastly, Suetonius explicitly asserts that the dreadful rites of the Druids, which Pliny declares to have been abolished by Tiberius, were not put down till the time of Claudius, and in this connection he adds that only under Augustus were those rites forbidden to the citizens of Rome.³ Here, again, the divergence of the testimony tells of indefinite possibilities of survival for bloody rites, even near the centre of government.⁴

On the general question, for the rest, we have from Porphyry, without dates, a list of cases of human sacrifices formerly practised by the Greeks, as in Rhodes, Chios, Tenedos, Salamis, Crete, Athens, and Sparta, no less than by Egyptians, Arabs, and Phœnicians.⁵ And not only Porphyry, but Eusebius⁶ and Lactantius⁷ speak of the sacrifice of a man to Latiarian Jove as being still practised in their time. Of the eating of sacrificed human victims Porphyry gives no cases, merely speaking of the act as abhorrent; but Tertullian is again more explicit and, at the same time, very circumstantial. "At this day," he writes, "among ourselves (*isthic*) blood consecrated to Bellona, taken in the palm from a punctured thigh, is given to her sealed ones"—*i.e.*, her initiates.⁸ His further allusion to the practice of drinking the blood of slain gladiators as a remedy for epilepsy, suggests many further possibilities of the same kind.

¹ Dio Cassius, xlii, 24.

² Suetonius, *Aug.* xv.

³ Suetonius, *Claudius*, xxv.

⁴ The late resort to human sacrifices by Elagabalus (Lamprid. *Heliogab.* cc. 7, 8) is spoken of as an innovation, and is not further traced; but its toleration suggests that the principle had not become obsolete. The story preserved by Eusebius (*Hist. Eccles.* vii, 10) that Valerian was led by the "chief of the Egyptian magi" to resort to child sacrifice is clearly a pious fiction. The story against Nero (Sueton. 36) is more probable.

⁵ *De Abstinencia*, ii, 54-57. Cp. cc. 8, 27, 51.

⁶ *In laude Constantini*, c. 13; *Praep. Evang.* iv, 16.

⁷ Lactantius, i, 21, says only *sanguine humano colitur*. Porphyry (56) says they slay a man (*σφαζόμενον ἄνθρωπον*). The victim was probably a criminal, dying as a gladiator. Cp. Tertullian, *Apologeticus*, ix, and Ghillany, *Die Menschenopfer der alten Hebräer*, 1842, pp. 112-113, *note*. The shrine was of Etruscan foundation.

⁸ *Apologeticus*, ix.

§ 5.—*The Divinity of the Victim.*

On the classic side there is thus abundant evidence as to the practice of human sacrifice, and some as to sacramental cannibalism, in the historic period; but what the theory finally requires is either the sacrifice of a victim who, as being specifically divine, is the subject of a eucharist, or the proof that such a eucharist could be combined with the sacrifice of a divine victim. Of the former conception we have already seen a clear trace in the sacrifices of the Albanians to the Moon-Goddess; and for fuller light we turn first to the cult of Dionysos. Not only is there the story of the substitution of a goat for a boy in the sacrifice to Dionysos at Potniae,¹ but there is the combined significance of (a) the myth of the rending of the divine boy Dionysos, in the form of a bull, by the Titans;² (b) the fact that in the ritual-mystery the worshippers tore a live bull to pieces with their teeth;³ (c) the peculiar Dionysiak ritual at Tenedos, where a gravid cow was treated as a woman in labour, and her calf, devoted to the God, was made to wear the tragic *cothurni*, while the slayer was formally pursued with stones and had to fly into the sea;⁴ (d) the actual rending of men as Dionysiak sacrifices at Chios and Tenedos;⁵ and (e) the peculiar procedure in the Athenian *Bouphonia* or religious "murder of the ox,"⁶ where the ceremonial flight of the slayers, their repudiation of guilt, and the solemn trial and condemnation of the weapons used as being the guilty things, all go to show that the ox represented either a divinity or a human victim, or the former by development from the latter.⁷

¹ Pausanias, ix, 8.

² Pausanias, viii, 37; Nonnus, *Dionysiaca*, vi, 205.

³ Firmicus Maternus, *De errore profan. relig.* vii. Lactantius, *Div. Inst.* i, 21; Clemens Alexandr. *Protrept.* ii; Plutarch, *De Ei*, ix; *Isis and Osiris*, xxxv. See the whole mythology collected by Mr. Frazer, *G. B.* ii, 160, sq.

⁴ Aelian, *De nat. animal.* xii, 34. Cp. Robertson Smith, *Relig. of the Semites*, p. 455; 2nd ed. p. 300.

⁵ Porphyry, *De Abstinencia*, ii, 55.

⁶ Pausanias, i, 24, 28; Porphyry, *De Abstin.* ii, 29-30.

⁷ See the argument of Mr. Frazer, *G. B.* ii, 294-5; and the remarks of MM. Hubert et Mauss, *Essai sur le sacrifice*, in *L'Année Sociologique*, 2e Année, 1899, pp. 68-69.

From another side we see the same principle at work in the old Theban sacrifice to Amun,¹ wherein the ram, the symbolic and sacred animal of the God, never otherwise sacrificed, was on the annual festival-day of the God offered up to him, the skin being placed on the God's statue. As Herodotus tells the story, there was then brought beside the image of Amun an image of "Herakles," presumably Khonsu, the Son of the God in the Theban Trinity;² whereafter "all who are in the temple beat themselves in mourning for the ram, and then bury him in a holy sepulchre." Whatever may have been the parts played by father and son respectively in this rite, it is clear that the slaying of the ram—presumptively a lamb—represented the death of the God, whose resurrection would necessarily follow, like that of Osiris. Another rite practised in the worship of the Syrian Goddess indicates in a different way the original connection of an animal sacrifice with a human sacrifice and a sacrament. In the Syrian ritual, the stranger who came to sacrifice had to offer up a sheep, of which he partook, on whose skin he knelt, and whose head he placed on his in the act of supplication.³ The symbolism is here fairly complete. And in yet another rite, that of the sacrifice and sacramental eating of a camel among the Sinaitic Arabs of the fourth century,⁴ it was clearly avowed that the young white camel was a substitute for a human sacrifice, young and beautiful captives being the preferred victims. In this case the blood of the wounded camel was drunk by the tribesmen, and the animal was cut to pieces and instantly devoured raw. That at a remote period the human victim was so eaten, it is difficult to doubt.⁵

Proceeding on the maxim that the myth is always long

¹ Herodotus, ii, 42.

² Cp. Wilkinson's note in Rawlinson's Herodotus, vol. ii, p. 78. The identification, however, is not certain. Osiris was "the child" at Thebes (Renouf, Hibbert Lectures, 2nd ed. p. 84); and Horus has Heraklean features (Tiele, *Egypt. Rel.* p. 42).

³ Lucian, *Dea Syria*, lv. Cp. Robertson Smith, *Rel. of the Semites*, p. 455.

⁴ See the story of Nilus as given by Prof. Robertson Smith, *Religion of the Semites*, pp. 263, 320, 342 sq.

⁵ The argument of Prof. Robertson Smith to the contrary (p. 345) is quite inconclusive. That the human sacrifice was not eaten in the fourth century is no proof that in more savage times it was not eaten.

posterior to the rite which it pretends to explain, we must suppose that before the composition of the legends concerning the Titans and the birth, death, and rebirth of Dionysos, such a primitive rite as the legend describes had actually been performed. Between a ritual in which the victim is torn to pieces for burial in the fields, and one in which the victim is eaten by the worshippers, there is a process of development to be accounted for. Two hypotheses are open. The Khond rite may be a modification of an original ritual of cannibalism; or the ancient Dionysiak rite may stand for a transformation of the typical rite, in which, an animal having been substituted for a human victim, the eating of it became a means to communion with the God whom the animal mystically represented. Broadly speaking, one process is as likely as the other; and both have evidently taken place. While the Khonds did not eat their human sacrifice, the Gonds, a kindred Dravidian race, actually did; and many medieval and modern instances of kin-eating and other ritual cannibalism are on record.¹ We may therefore conclude that anciently the human sacrifice was normally eaten, as it was by the semi-civilised Mexicans at the time of the Spanish conquest. It is in fact certain that anthropophagy has been practised in all parts of the world in the savage and semi-civilised stages;² and it is highly probable that cannibalism persisted long in its religious form after it had ceased to be a normal practice: the rationale of the act being, not that men to the last offered the Gods that which they commonly liked for themselves, but that they held it a sacred experience to continue to eat what they believed the God to eat.³ On the other hand,

¹ Frazer, *G. B.* ii, 241; Hartland, *Legend of Perseus*, ii, 245-6 and ch. 13.

² Cp. Prof. Joly, *Man before Animals*, Eng. tr. 1883, pp. 341-351; Letourneau, *Sociology*, Eng. tr. B. iii, ch. 12; Spencer, *Principles of Sociology*, 3d ed. i, 265; A. Réville, *Prolegomènes*, p. 183; J. G. Müller, *Amerikan. Urreligionen*, p. 629; Maury, *La Terre et l'Homme*, 4e éd. pp. 751-2; Lubbock, *Prehistoric Times*, 5th ed. p. 177; Peschel, *The Races of Man*, Eng. tr. 1876, pp. 161-4.

³ J. G. Müller, as cited, p. 632. See W. Schneider, *Die Naturvölker*, 1885, i. 195-200, for the theory that religious cannibalism began as an imitation of the supposed practice of the Gods. Cp. Peschel, as cited, p. 164.

the recoil from cannibalism which everywhere marks the rise of humanity would, in the more civilised Asiatic states, lead on one hand to the setting apart of criminals for the human sacrifices, and on the other to the substitution of an animal, which, partly in virtue of survivals of totemism and partly in virtue of the current conception of all sacrifice,¹ could pass as the representative and incarnation of the God, and would at the same time serve for the typical sacramental meal, but no longer in a totemistic sense.²

A certain difficulty arises as to the use of criminals for sacrificial purposes. In view of the nearly universal principle³ that the sacrifice must be pure and without blemish, a criminal would seem to be the last man to suit the part; and among the Mesopotamian Semites a genuine and precious sacrifice was anciently insisted on.⁴ But it is found that in primitive communities the act of execution "constantly assumes sacrificial forms";⁵ and it is told of the Battaks of Sumatra that they ate all their executed criminals, without any other resort to cannibalism, the relatives of the executed man being entitled to the best pieces.⁶ Here there would seem to be a clear survival of an anthropophagous sacrament, as it can hardly be supposed

Prof. Robertson Smith similarly argues that Arab sacrifices were neither gifts to the Gods nor—even in the sacrifice of first-born sons—offerings of what was most precious to the sacrificer, but offerings of the most sacred kind of victim, as the sacred blood of the species there flows purest and strongest (*Rel. of Semites*, 2nd ed. note E, p. 465).

¹ MM. Hubert et Mauss, in their valuable *Essai sur le sacrifice* (*L'Année Sociologique*, 2e Année, 1899), seem to argue that sanctity was in all cases wholly conferred on the victim by the ritual. This was certainly the rule, but there were exceptions, notably in the case of human victims. The essential point is that every victim had something divine (*Id.* p. 127).

² Cp. Frazer, *G. B.* ii, 438-9, as to the sacrament of the sacred ram among the Kalmucks.

³ The Spartans seem to have made a partial exception. Plato, *Alcib.* ii. Cp. as to the later attitude, Athenæus, viii, 67; Malachi, i, 7, 8, 13.

⁴ Sayce, *Hibbert Lectures*, p. 78; Tiele, *Hist. comparée*, p. 247; Smith, *Relig. of the Semites*, p. 343.

⁵ Robertson Smith, *Religion of the Semites*, p. 351, note. Cp. Macrobius, *Saturnalia*, iii, 7; Dionys. Halicarn. ii, 10; K. O. Müller, *Dorians*, Eng. tr. i, 354-5, and Ramsay, *Rom. Antiq.* 1851, p. 309. It seems clear that the barbaric mind regarded the executed criminal very much as it did the enemy in battle; and the "devoting" of captured enemies as sacrifices is anciently common to Hebrews, Teutons (above, § 4), American indigenes (below, Part IV, § 5), and Romans (Livy, viii, 10).

⁶ Maury, *La Terre et l'Homme*, 4e édit. pp. 751-2.

that people not otherwise cannibalistic would desire to devour an executed relative for the sheer pleasure of eating human flesh. The view that the criminal was a proper sacrifice, in fact, might readily grow out of the fact that the earlier victims had been normally captives. If an enemy of the tribe from without could suffice, so, it might be argued, would an enemy of the tribal law from within, he being, besides, one of the God's own people. And among the Aztecs, accordingly, we find the law decreeing that thieves who had stolen gold and silver—thieves *par excellence*, so to speak—were annually sacrificed with the regular victims to the God Xipe, patron of the goldsmiths. Like many other victims, they were flayed, and the priest wore their skins, thus figuring as the God in their persons.¹

We have, again, the record of Cæsar that in the wholesale human sacrifices of the Gauls the offering up of those who had committed thefts or other crimes was considered “*more grateful to the immortal Gods*”; but that “when the supply of that species fell short, they *descended* to sacrifices of the innocent.”² And there is reason to think, with M. de Belloguet,³ that the peculiar sacrifices in question (in which numbers of men were burned alive in large *simulacra*) were derived from some early Carthaginian or other Phœnician cult.

Finally, we have the express statement of Porphyry that in the annual sacrifice of a man to the ancient Semitic deity Kronos at Rhodes, a prisoner condemned to death was selected and kept till the Kronian festival, when he was led outside the city gates and, *having been given wine to drink*, put to death.⁴ Here we have at length a close parallel in the Mediterranean world to what we have seen reason to regard as a typical detail in the gospel mystery-play.⁵ The Kronian victim at Rhodes we know cannot

¹ Clavigero, *History of Mexico*, Eng. tr. ed. 1807, B. vi, § 30 (i, 297).

² *De Bello Gallico*, vi, 16. ³ *Génie gaulois*, pp. 190, 203.

⁴ *De Abſtinentia*, ii, 54. Mr. Frazer, (*G. B.* iii, 149) reads “made him drunk with wine,” which goes somewhat beyond the Greek, *οἴνου ποτίσαντες*; but it is clear that some degree of stupefaction is understood.

⁵ In the Arab sacrifice described by Nilus, the sacrificers drank wine with the victim (Smith, p. 344, *note*), but this act may have had another significance.

have been originally a criminal; and it is much more likely than not that he originally personated either the God Kronos,¹ or, as seems most probable, the "only-begotten son" Ieoud, whom in a Phœnician myth² Kronos is said to have sacrificed after dressing him in royal robes. To this clue we shall return after a further survey. In the meantime, we may take it as established that the original purpose of the rite was not held to be defeated by the selection for sacrifice of a prisoner sentenced to death.

Thus, though it does not seem to be clearly proved that the victims put to death in the Thargelia festival at Athens were latterly criminals,³ it is highly probable that they were. Early religion looked to the physical side of sacrifice; and if the criminal were whole, no question of his fitness would arise for primitive worshippers.⁴ In one Greek sacrifice, indeed, that performed at Leucadia, an "ugly or deformed person" seems to have been chosen as the victim.⁵ When, again, the developing religious consciousness became capable of shrinking from the anomaly of calling a criminal "sacred," there was, as we shall see later, a symbolical way out of the difficulty.

Symbolism, too, would further the modification of the sacrificial meal. Long before the more civilised peoples revolted from the act of human sacrifice, they would recoil, we must suppose, from the act of anthropophagy; and in regard to many rites of human sacrifice we find stories of substitution of animals and of waxen images by order of humane kings.⁶ For the rest, the turn of mind which made myths out of the misunderstood survivals of totemism

¹ So Mr. Frazer, *G. B.*, iii, 149-150.

² Preserved by Eusebius from Philo of Byblos, *Praeparatio Evangelica*, iv, 16.

³ Cp. Frazer, *G. B.* iii, 125, and art. *Thargelia* in Smith's *Dict. of Antiq.* The victim "cast out" at Massilia in a similar rite is expressly described as a poor man who sold himself for a year's keep (Petronius ap. Serv. in *Virg. Æn.*, iii, 57); and as poor men can be thus bought to undergo the death penalty in China to-day, they may have been so purchaseable at Athens.

⁴ One exception will be found noted below, Part II, ch. ii, § 14.

⁵ Frazer, as last cited. Cp. Schömann, *Griechische Alterthümer*, ii, 225, as to the resort to criminals for human sacrifices.

⁶ Porphyry, *De Abst.* ii, 55. Above, p. 56. And cp. Macrobius, *Saturnalia*, i, 7.

would have no difficulty in finding reasons for eating any given animal in the worship of any given God. Thus the worshippers of Dionysos could feel they were commemorating the dismemberment of the God when they ate the raw flesh of a bull or a kid; other devotees ate a young dog;¹ and further symbolic modification easily followed, on lines common to many pagan cults.

§ 6.—*The Cannibal Sacrament.*

Given such a modification, however, we have to reckon with a tendency that is seen to have been chronic in religious history—the tendency, namely, to revert to a foreign or archaic form of sacrifice or mystery in times of national disaster and uncertainty.² It is expressed alike in the Roman resort to eastern and Egyptian Gods in times of desperate war, in the revival or preservation of the cults of subdued races,³ in the multiplication of magical rites for decaying civilisations, and in the chronic reversion during times of excitement to palmistry and other modes of fortune-telling.⁴ And that the *idea* of religious anthropophagy prevailed in the early Christian world is obvious from the central ritual of the cult, where the formulas: “Take eat, this is my body”; “Drink ye all of it, for this is my blood,” cannot conceivably be other than adaptations from a mystery ritual in which a sacrificed God so spoke

¹ Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* xxix, 14. Cp. Robertson Smith, *Rel. of Semites*, p. 273. In a dog-sacrifice by hill tribes in India, the victim is first drugged with spirits and hemp, then killed with sticks and stones. So elsewhere with a buffalo. Crooke, *Popular Religion and Folklore of Northern India*, 1896, i, 173. In such cases there is a strong presumption that the animal is a surrogate for a human being.

² Cp. Robertson Smith, *Semites*, p. 339; Granger, *The Worship of the Romans*, 1895, p. 300; Gibbon, ch. ii, Bohn ed. i, 41; ch. xxxiv (iii, 554); Boissier, *La Fin du Paganisme*, i, 31; Mariner, *Tonga Islands*, 3rd ed. i, 190, 300; J. Williams, *Narrative of Missionary Enterprises*, 1837, p. 549; Rhys, *Celtic Britain*, 2nd ed. p. 69; and above, p. 59.

³ Cp. K. O. Müller, *Introd. to Mythology*, Eng. tr. pp. 169, 193-4; 2 Kings xvii, 26; Herodotus, ii, 171.

⁴ Such a revival was noted among upper-class people in England in connection with the extensive volunteering for service in South Africa in 1899-1900; and there are clear traces of it in every age.

by the mouth of his priest.¹ In the fourth gospel we have an amplification in the same sense, the act of symbolical anthropophagy or theophagy being made the means to immortality:—

“I am the bread of life.....I am that living bread, which came down out of heaven; if any man eat of this bread he shall live for ever; yea, and the bread which I will give is my flesh, *for the life of the world.*Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink his blood, ye have not life in yourselves. He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life; *and I will raise him up at the last day.* For my flesh is true meat, and my blood is true drink. *He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood abideth in me and I in him.*”²

The very repetitions are ritualistic; we have them in the ritual of the Khonds, and in the ritual of the pre-Christian Mexicans.³

Now, the eucharist stands both in the myth and in the nature of the cult in the closest relation to the act of human sacrifice; and to explain the latter without reference to the former is to miss part of the problem. For the compilers of the fourth gospel, as we have noted, the Crucified One is the final and universal paschal sacrifice, being slain at the time of the paschal lamb-eating, whereas in the synoptics he had previously partaken thereof. And that this conception existed among the Judæo-Christists before the gospels were written is clear from the book of Revelation, where we have a Judaic writer of the early days of the Gentile schism⁴ identifying Jesus with the Alpha and the Omega = the Almighty, and at the same time with “the Lamb that was slain,” and that has seven horns and eyes, like the symbol of Mithra, the slain God actually appearing as a Lamb in the vision. Thus in the Jesuine eucharist, as in so many others, there is embodied the

¹ See Mr. Frazer, *G. B.*, 2nd ed. ii, 134, and refs., as to the priests of Attis at Pessinus and Rome. The usage was widespread, being found among the aboriginal magicians of California, and in several of the cults of pre-Christian Mexico. See J. G. Müller, *Amerikanische Urreligionen*, pp. 77, 493, 577.

² John vi, 48-56.

³ Cp. Sahagun, *passim*.

⁴ Cp. Rev. ii, 9; iii, 9.

primitive countersense of the God eating himself, in that the sacred or sacrificial animal which he eats is his own manifestation. There could not well occur in respect of the lamb the further myth-evolution seen in some other cults, as in that of the goat-eating Dionysos, where "we have the strange spectacle of a God sacrificed to himself on the ground that he is his own enemy." But the primary principle is the same: whether through totemism or through an early application of the zodiacal principle, making the spring sacrifice consist in a lamb because the Sun is then in the constellation of the Ram-Lamb, the lamb stands for the God; and "as the God is supposed to partake of the victim offered to him, it follows that, when the victim is the God's old self, the God eats of his own flesh."¹ In the gospel legend this happens by a double necessity, inasmuch as the God must found his own eucharist before his death.

It was doubtless by way of refining upon the earlier practice of flesh-eating that in the synoptics the God is made to call the bread his flesh; though in the course of the supper he presumptively ate of the prescribed flesh of his special symbol and representative, the lamb. In the same way the Mithraists, whose God was symbolised by both the bull and the lamb, had a sacred meal of bread and wine and one of bread and water, though the God is normally figured as slaying the bull, and a lamb was at certain times eaten in the mysteries.² So in the mystical eucharist of the Egyptians, wherein the divine beings "eat the God Bah [God of the water-flood] and drink the drink offerings,"³ the "cakes and ale" so constantly mentioned in the funeral ritual clearly stand for bread and wine as symbolising flesh and blood, the cakes being made of white grain, and the ale from red grain.⁴ The worshippers of Dionysos inferribly did the same when his worship was linked to that of Demeter or Ceres, the Corn-Goddess, and in his cult in turn the wine was mixed with water.⁵ But it

¹ Frazer, *G. B.* ii, 167.

² See below, Part III, *Mithraism*, §§ 6, 9.

³ *Book of the Dead*, ch. lxxv, Budge's tr. pp. 120, 156.

⁴ *Id.* ch. cxxiv, tr. p. 187.

⁵ *Christianity and Mythology*, p. 392.

is on record that though some Christian worshippers in the second century and later, whether imitating the Mithraists or proceeding on general ascetic principles, substituted water for wine in the normal sacrament (a mixture of wine and water being the common usage),¹ an actual lamb was in many churches anciently sacrificed and eaten at Easter, and that when that usage ceased a baked image of a lamb was substituted.² And vestiges of both customs survive to this day in the practice of the Catholics of Italy, wherein an actual body of a lamb as well as a confectionery image is blessed by the priest, with the Easter eggs, and sometimes bread.³

There were in reality two ideals in the early Church: that set forth by a number of the Fathers down to Augustine, according to which the ritual of the Holy Supper is purely mystical;⁴ and another, resting on the natural feeling that the ritual language was gratuitously fantastic if taken as wholly mystical. This, the realistic view, founds on the whole historical analogy of sacrifice, which always meant a communion with the God in partaking of a common meal, and often, further, a partaking *of* the God under the form of his animal or human representative—this after the principle of totemism, if ever present in the particular cult, had been long overlaid by a later mysticism.

In short, if men ate the paschal sacrament of the Lamb by way of eating the God, they were doing what was pleasing to the God; and if they further regarded the God as incarnate in human shape, they were equally entitled or committed to eating him in that form. But are we then to suppose that in any Mediterranean population about the beginning of the Christian era a religious sect could sacrifice

¹ Bingham, *Antiq. of the Christian Church*, B. xv, ch. ii, §§ 5, 7.

² Hatch, *Hibbert Lectures*, p. 300.

³ *Order of Divine Service for Easter, according to the use of the Church of Rome* (Art and Book Company: London), 1899, p. 99. The offices of "Blessing of the Houses—the Lamb—the Eggs" are *not* given in the official *Office of Holy Week according to the Roman Rite*, published by Washbourne, London, 1896.

⁴ Augustine, *De Doctr. Chr.* iii, 16, § 24; Justin Martyr, *Dialogue with Trypho*, xli; Clemens Alexandr. *Pædagogus*, i, 6; Tertullian, *Against Marcion*, iv, 40.

a human being and afterwards sacramentally eat of the flesh? In the records of the man-sacrifice of the Babylonian Sacæa or Zakmuk, to which Mr. Frazer looks for the original of a rite copied by the Jews in their Purim feast and incidentally applied to the execution of a historic Jesus, there is no trace of a subsequent anthropophagous or other sacrament; any more than of a rite of resurrection. Yet such a sacrament would seem to be primordial; and the idea of resurrection, developed as a doctrine of individual immortality from the primary conception of the annual revival of vegetation, had become part of the mystery rituals of Osiris and Dionysos, and of the Eleusinia, long before the Christian era.

It is the same doctrine that we find in pre-Christian Mexico, particularly in the worship of Huitzilopochtli, concerning which a discerning mythologist of the last generation noted that the practice of making from dough and seeds and children's blood small images of the God, which were treated like human victims and eaten, signified his death and the eating of his body:—

“Whereas the God dies, it must be religiously and as a sacrifice; and whereas the anthropomorphic God dies, he dies as a human sacrifice according to the established usages.....his heart is cut out and his body eaten as was done in every human sacrifice. Was the thought thereby signified that the God, when his body was eaten, became part thereof, and so communicated himself? Doubtless, but not abstractly, metaphysically, or at all Christianly or morally, but simply on his Nature side, which is the essence of the Feast-God. In seeds he gives his body to nourish his worshippers.....Broadly, the God entertains the sacrificer at the sacrifice through the sacrificial meal; and when the slave, as so often happens, represents the God to whom he is sacrificed, the eating of his flesh is an eating of the God's.”¹

¹ J. G. Müller, *Geschichte der amerikanischen Urreligionen*, 2te Aufl. 1867, p. 606.

§ 7.—*The Semitic Antecedents.*

In view of such an evolution, which may or may not have a historical connection with the old Asiatic rite seen surviving among the Khonds and Gonds, we may perhaps infer where we cannot trace the development that preceded the reduction of the Jesus myth to its present form. An important light is also thrown on the problem by the speculation of Mr. Frazer, inasmuch as it indicates clues which are not affected by the miscarriage of his actual theorem; and to these we may profitably turn.

Mr. Frazer's hypothesis is that the "mockeries" of the crucifixion represent the application to the case of Jesus of the usages of the Perso-Babylonian festival of the Sacæa,¹ which he is disposed to identify with the very ancient New Year festival known as the Zakmuk or Zagmuku.² From this he holds the Jews to have derived their (certainly post-exilic) feast of Purim, of the origin of which such a fictitious account is given in the book of Esther, whereof the Esther and Mordecai strongly suggest the God-names Ishtar and Merodach. Purim, in its main features, resembles alike the accounts given of the Sacæa and those given of Zakmuk; and the suggestion is that the Jews, in borrowing the festival, may have copied from the Babylonians the Sacæa practice of putting to death at that date "a malefactor, who, after masquerading as Mordecai, in a crown and royal robe, was hanged or crucified in the character of Haman." This in itself is not incredible; nor is it unlikely that the fast which precedes the feasting of Purim was, in Babylon, a ceremonial mourning for a God or demigod who died like Tammuz or Adonis, and like him rose again on the third day. Then comes the suggestion that Jesus was crucified in the character of Haman.

Now arises, however, the problem as to dates. Purim

¹ Mentioned by Berosus, as cited in Athenæus, xiv, 44 (p. 639 C.); and by Dio Chrysostom, Orat. iv, p. 6 (Ed. Dindorf, vol. i, p. 76).

² Mentioned in recently recovered cuneiform inscriptions. See Sayce, Hibbert Lectures, pp. 64-68.

occurred in the middle of the lunar month of Adar, the last of the Jewish sacred year, which, says Mr. Frazer, "corresponds roughly to March." In Conder's Handbook, as it happens, it is made to run from January 28th to February 25th, leaving (for us) an interval of eleven days unaccounted for between the end of the year and the beginning of the next, which sets out with 1st Nisan=8th March. What the Jews did to round the cycle was to insert a thirteenth lunar month seven times in nineteen years. This intercalary month was presumptively placed at the end of the year, with the effect of retarding the New Year and making Nisan (also called Abib=ripe ears) run into our April. The practical point for us, then, is that there were several weeks between Purim and the Babylonian Zakmuk, which fell "early" in Nisan. Doubtless the Jews put Purim earlier to prevent its clashing with their Passover, which was originally a spring festival of the same order. But then the Sacæa, according to Berossus, fell in the Babylonian month of Lous, which answers to July;¹ and Jesus, again, is crucified at the Passover, which occurs in the middle of Nisan, the lamb being set apart on the 10th, while "unleavened bread" began on the 15th. Thus none of the dates fit, Jesus being crucified, according to the story, a month after the Jewish festival in which Haman figures, and months before that of the Sacæa in which a mock king was hanged or crucified.

Of these difficulties, which Mr. Frazer avows, Mr. Lang makes the most.² Mr. Frazer's suggested solutions are—(1) that Berossus may be wrong about the date of the Sacæa; (2) that Jesus may really have been crucified in Adar, at the feast of Purim, and not in Nisan, at the feast of the Passover—Christian sentiment preferring the latter date, and making the change in tradition; (3) that the Jews may

¹ Or may possibly be as late as September. Lang, *Magic and Religion*, p. 145.

² Sometimes very amusingly, but with unwonted diffuseness and repetition, in *Magic and Religion*, pp. 123-204. As Mr. Lang shows (p. 138, etc.), Mr. Frazer has left in his text (ii, 254, note; iii, 152-3) contradictory surmises as to dates. The immense mass of details in his book may well excuse such an oversight; but Mr. Lang undoubtedly shows his theory to be otherwise inharmonious in detail.

sometimes (cp. Esther iii. 7) have put Purim alongside of the Passover. For the rest, he suggests that Barabbas was the Mordecai of the year; and cites from Philo the story of Carabbas,¹ who was made to play the part of a mock king at Alexandria, by way of burlesquing King Agrippa. The name Carabbas, it is suggested, may be a copyist's error for Barabbas, which, Mr. Frazer thinks, may have been the standing name for a figure in a mock sacrifice, since it means "Son of the Father," and points to the old Semitic cults in which king's sons were sacrificed by or for their fathers.

Now, the mere difficulty about dates would not be fatal to Mr. Frazer's very interesting and ingenious theory if that were otherwise on a sound footing. That there were two calendar usages in regard to the Sacæa becomes probable when we note (1) that the Jews, under Babylonian influence, had separated their ecclesiastical from their civil year—their ecclesiastical new year (the older) being in autumn, while the civil year began in spring,² and (2) that they had a second or little Passover, a month after the first, for those who could not keep that.³ Under the changing dynasties of Mesopotamia there might easily be such a duplicating of the Sacæa; and as a matter of fact Zakmuk was a festival day in many Babylonian cults.⁴ On the other hand, the Jews would readily antedate their Purim to separate it from the Passover; and Christian tradition might very well falsify a date of which it had no documentary record. But this last consideration calls up a far more serious objection to the form of Mr. Frazer's proposition—the above-noted objection, namely, that he is accepting the historic actuality of the crucifixion, the inscriptions on the cross, the "of Nazareth," the mockery by the soldiers, the

¹ Mr. Frazer states (iii, 193, *note*) that "the first to call attention to this passage" in Philo was Mr. P. Wendland, in *Hermes*, in 1898. This, I may mention, is a mistake. I myself discussed the Carabbas story in the *National Reformer* so long ago as March 3rd, 1889, and certainly some previous writer—I think Rabbi Wise—had called *my* attention to it.

² Wellhausen, *Prolegomena*, Eng. tr. pp. 108-9; cp. Exodus xii, 2. Cp. Max Müller, *Natural Religion*.

³ Num. ix, 10, 11.

⁴ See Jastrow, *Index* under *Zagmuk*.

utterances of Pilate, the episode of Barabbas, and all the rest of it. To a critic who accepts all this the critical answer obviously is: If you thus take for granted the genuineness of such a highly detailed narrative, how can you possibly account for its absolute omission of any shadow of allusion to the Haman-and-Mordecai show of which you suppose the crucifixion to have accidentally become part? This objection Mr. Frazer does not try to meet; and I confess I do not see how he could meet it.

A thorough inquiry, surely, must take account of all aspects of the gospel problem, not merely of ostensible parallels in pagan usage to one aspect of the crucifixion story. The whole documentary problem, surely, must be taken into account; and the historical criticism of the entire legend reckoned with. We are not dealing with a generally credible and corroborated narrative in which a single episode raises surmise of extraneous factors not recognised in the text, but with one which begins and ends in absolute and immemorial myth and is stamped with supernaturalism in every sentence. By Mr. Frazer's own repeated avowal, we ought not to look to the current narrative of the origin of a rite for the historical fact, but to the rite for the origin of the narrative. If this law does not hold of the Christian eucharist it holds of nothing; and the eucharist is the keystone of the arch built over the death of the God in the gospels.

Doubtless Mr. Frazer proceeds on the common assumption that the teachings of the Gospel Jesus constitute an indubitable personality. But that view, so natural at first sight, has reached its lowest degree of credit among special students precisely at the moment of Mr. Frazer's unquestioning acceptance of it.¹ Anthropology and hierology cannot afford thus to ignore the special historical problems of the very creed on which confessedly their results must finally come to bear. Several of Mr. Frazer's remarks, however, suggest that in the very act of bringing his invaluable research into relation with the creeds of his contem-

¹ See hereinafter, Pt. II, ch. ii, §§ 4-6.

poraries he had regarded as outside his field of study some of the most significant and best-established facts as to the doctrinal evolution of Christism among the Jews.¹

§ 8.—*The Judaic Evolution.*

Rejecting, then, as not merely unwarranted but excluded by the evidence, Mr. Frazer's assumption of the historicity of the crucifixion, we have to note carefully the inferences which his research really warrants. When these are drawn it will be found that his notable hypothesis does not fall to the ground in its essentials. He has really added signally to his former great services by bringing together the evidences for the existence of a mock-kingly sacrifice among the Semites before the Christian era, and by skilfully elucidating the whole primitive psychology of such rituals. It needs only that his procedure be freed, on the principles of scientific mythology, from the difficulty set up by accepting one set of palpable myths as history. When criticism has done its worst against his manipulation of the Sacæa, Zakmuk, and Purim, it will be found that there remains clearly open the inference that certain details of the crucifixion myth are drawn from some old Semitic rite resembling the Sacæa, not by way of Purim in its Evemerized Jewish form, but in a simpler form, in which there was no Ishtar or Merodach.²

Precisely because the practice of human sacrifice to the Vegetation-God was so nearly universal as Mr. Frazer has shown it to be, it is unnecessary to assume that the Jews owed their variant of it solely to a late contact with another

¹ *E.g.* his note (ii, p. 3, n. 3) on the anticipations of the Christian doctrine of the Trinity in Philo Judæus.

² Much of Mr. Lang's criticism of Mr. Frazer's theory turns on the fact that it seeks to combine a great many disparate sacrificial motives. This is not absolutely an effective objection, inasmuch as religion is full of inconsistencies; but Mr. Frazer imputes too much power of combination to a given cult. *Popular* sacrifice must clearly subsist on a simple basis. And there may have been forced changes, as the Sacæa is said by Strabo to have been founded by Cyrus, after his victory over the Sacæ, though Sacæa is also given as the name of a Persian Goddess (Strabo, xi, 8, § 5). Cp. Selden, *De Diis Syris*, ed. 1680, pp. 269-270.

nation. The Athenians had in their Thargelia, which like the Passover was a feast of first fruits,¹ a usage of human sacrifice which as we have seen corresponded at points with the Babylonian, inasmuch as the victims were maintained in potentially riotous ease, and were latterly chosen from the criminal class, though they cannot originally have been so. The sacrifice, indeed, does not seem to have belonged to the earlier worship of Apollo at all,² and the calling of the victims *pharmakoi*, "medicine," suggests an adaptation of a West-Asiatic usage, the more so as quasi-Semitic sacrifices were in use among the Eretrians and Magnesians.³ In all likelihood this was the very sacrifice of purification said to have been prescribed to the plague-stricken Athenians by the Cretan Epimenides,⁴ when two youths voluntarily gave themselves as victims.⁵ But if the Athenians could take such a rite from Crete or Asia Minor, there is reason to suppose that it was known in Palestine, in a simpler form than the Babylonian, before the exile. That there were such forms is to be inferred from both early and late evidence.

Firstly, we have the whole tradition of the Passover, with which, and not with Purim, the crucifixion myth comes chronologically in touch on the face of the case. Among the aspects of the gospel myth which the analogy of the Sacæa leaves untouched are (1) the mourning for the victim; (2) his alleged divinity and his titles of Son of God and Son of Man; (3) his participation in a sacramental meal in which his flesh is mystically eaten; (4) his execution along with two criminals; (5) his resurrection; (6) his subsequent status as Messiah or Christos. Now, the first three of those characteristics are as cognate with the paschal rite as they are alien to Purim; the fourth can be shown historically to

¹ Preller, *Griech. Mythol.* 2d. ed. i, 202, note; Frazer, iii, 127 and refs.; Meyer, *Gesch. des Alterthums*, ii, § 74.

² K. F. Hermann, *Gottesdienst. Alterth.* § 60; *Culturgesch. der Griechen und Römer*, 1857, i, 54.

³ Plutarch, *De Pyth. Orac.* xvi.

⁴ Diogenes Laërtius, i, 110 (I, x, 4); Athenæus, xiii, 78.

⁵ As no mention is made either of any later voluntary sacrifice or of any selection of innocent victims, the inference seems clear that they were latterly bought, or condemned criminals.

connect with paschal usage; and the others develop naturally from the preceding. That there is no need to go to Purim for an actual killing or sacrificing of quasi-royal victims or malefactors in connection with a sacrificial festival appears from the legend of the hanging of seven king's sons "before the Lord," an event which happens according to the narrative at the barley harvest, that is, at the time of the passover.¹

In the face of this familiar record it is obliviously asserted by Mr. Lang that "sacrificed victims are not hanged."² He has given thirteen cases of human sacrifice in which victims were *not* hanged, but has apparently not consulted his Bible.³ Now, the expressions "before the Lord" and "unto the Lord" mean sacrifice or nothing; and that the hanging of Saul's sons was by way of propitiation is clear from the remark in the context that "after that, God was intreated for the land."⁴ Further, hanging is the mode not only in the sacrificing of Saul's sons but in the offering up "unto the Lord" of the heads of the people as described in Numbers xxv, 4. Equally sacrificial, in spirit and in occasion, though the usual formula is not applied to it, is the hanging of the five kings by Joshua in the pseudo-history; and in the case of his hanging of the king of Ai, where the procedure is exactly the same, it is explicitly told, in the Hebrew, that he "devoted" all the people of Ai, as he had done those of

¹ Cp. 2 Sam. xxi, 6-9, with Deut. xvi, 9; Lev. xxiii, 10-14; and see Robertson Smith, *Religion of the Semites*, p. 398. Cp. Ghillany, p. 544, and Tract Sanhedrin, f. 89, 1, there cited, as to the custom of executing criminals during the festival. The barley harvest, it should be noted, began in the Jericho plain and Jordan valley at passover time, and became general in the uplands in the next month, wheat ripening later. In Egypt the harvests are still earlier, flax and barley being harvested in March, and wheat in April. Mr. Lang (*Magic and Religion*, pp. 116-117) has overlooked the fact that a feast could thus be at once a harvest feast and "vernal." The Thargelia in May was in similar case.

² *Magic and Religion*, pp. 131, 132, 174.

³ Neither has he noted the testimony of Ellis (*Polynesian Researches*, 2nd ed. ii, 129) that in certain cases in Tahiti the slain victim was "suspended from the sacred tree"; nor the Mexican rite in which six victims were hanged to trees before being slain (Below, Part IV, § 8).

⁴ 2 Sam. xxi, 14. In the same way the stoning and burning of Achan and his family and cattle is clearly a sacrificial act. Josh. vii, 24-26.

Jericho.¹ As Ai is an imaginary city,² we must conclude that the legend points to a customary rite. Finally, a comparison of a passage in Deuteronomy in which *every* hanged man is declared to be "the curse of God,"³ with the passages cited from the book of Joshua, proves that "the curse of God" meant "devoted to God," since in the former the course prescribed is precisely that followed in the pseudo-history, namely, the taking down and burying of the victim within the day. Thus *all* hanged men were in ancient Jewry sacrifices to the Sun-God,⁴ and the Pauline epistle unconsciously clinches the point in citing the misunderstood text.⁵ It may in fact be taken as historically certain that human sacrifice was a regular part of all Hebrew religion down till the Exile.⁶

Semitic usage is all that need be proved in the present connection; but it may be noted (1) that animal victims were hanged to a tree in the cult of the Syrian Goddess in the second century of our era;⁷ (2) that human victims were bound or hanged to trees in the sacrificial rites of the pre-Christian Mexicans;⁸ and (3) that human victims were frequently if not habitually hanged in sacrifice to Odin,⁹ as well as to other Teutonic deities.¹⁰ It is noteworthy that among the early Odin-worshippers, as among Greeks and Semites, king's sons were sacrificed in substitution for their fathers; and that latterly slaves and criminals were substituted in such rites.¹¹ From the nature of the case, too, it is probable that the victim was hanged not by the neck

¹ Josh. viii, 24-29; x, 15-26.

² Winckler, *Geschichte Israels*, ii, 110.

³ Deut. xxi, 23, *margin*.

⁴ Cp. Robertson Smith, *Rel. of the Semites*, p. 264, as to the principle that the sacrifice should be seen only by the God or planet propitiated. On p. 342 (2nd ed. p. 361) Smith argues that early executions for infamous crimes were not sacrifices; but as already noted he says later (p. 351, *note*) that all executions became sacrificial.

⁵ Gal. iii, 13.

⁶ Cp. Ghillany, *Die Menschenopfer der alten Hebräer*, 1842, and Daumer *Der Feuer und Molochdienst der alten Hebräer*, 1842, *passim*.

⁷ Lucian, *De Dea Syria*, xlix.

⁸ See below, Part IV, § 8.

⁹ See H. M. Chadwick, *The Cult of Othin*, 1899, pp. 15-20, 32, 37, 53, 73-74.

¹⁰ See above, p. 119.

¹¹ *Id.* p. 27. The Teutons also "devoted" whole armies of their enemies to the God.

but by the hands.¹ In some of the Scandinavian cases the victim was wounded with a javelin as well as hanged; and one myth specifies a hanging which lasted nine nights.² In any case, hanging by the wrists was the normal mode of ancient "crucifixion" so-called.³

But, further, it is clear that the Passover rite, of which the narrative in Exodus is a fictitious account, was originally one of sacrifice of firstlings,⁴ including the first-born sons; and the conflicting laws on the subject prove that only with difficulty was the substitution of lambs for children carried out.⁵ To this day, at least among continental Jews,⁶ the principle of "redemption" is ritually recognised, in the festival ceremony of *Pidyen Haben*. A month after the birth of a first son, a friendly Cohen is selected to officiate, who sacerdotally asks certain questions of the mother, one being, "Is this child the *first* fruit of your womb?" If he be poor, he receives a small fee;⁷ if not, the mother throws a small gold chain round his neck; and he in return, during certain prayers, puts it round the neck of the child, who is thus "redeemed." And that the first-born were at one time set apart as a victim-class,⁸ liable

¹ Tal. Jer. *Sanhedrin*, Schwab's French tr. ch. vi, 7 (9) vol. x, p. 282; Tal. Bab. fol. 46, col. 1, Eng. tr. by Hershon, *Genesis with a Talmudical Commentary*, p. 436, n. 6.

² This has been regarded as an echo of Christian doctrine. But even if it were, the fact of sacrificial hanging would remain certain.

³ See H. Fulda, *Das Kreuz und die Kreuzigung*, Breslau, 1878, §§ 34-36 and Tab. 1; and cp. Ghillany, as cited, pp. 531-2, note.

⁴ Cp. Robertson Smith, *Relig. of the Semites*, p. 445; Wellhausen, as there cited; and Ghillany, pp. 518-552.

⁵ Compare Ex. xiii, 2; xxii, 29; xxxiv, 20; Lev. xxvii, 28, 29; Num. xviii, 15; Micah vi, 7. Mr. Lang (*Magic and Religion*, p. 53) will not admit that *any* people ever practised such a yearly massacre of first-born children as Mr. Frazer infers. But Mr. Lang pays no heed to the conflicting laws here specified, some of which insist on the "devoting" of all first-born males, human as well as animals, while the others prescribe that the human males shall be "redeemed." Both sets of laws are utterly inexplicable save on the theory of an original practice of child-sacrifice. Cp. the admissions of A. Réville, *Prolegomènes*, p. 185; and Kuenen, ii, 30, 90-94. For other cases of systematic child-sacrifice in races of Asiatic derivation see J. G. Müller, *Amerikan. Urreligionen*, pp. 58, 212, 214, 325.

⁶ A number keep up the practice after coming to England. Cp. J. Low, *Die Lebensalter in der jüdischen Literatur*, 1875, pp. 110-118, cited by Frazer, *G. B.* ii, 50

⁷ Generally 15s., I am privately informed.

⁸ It is noteworthy that among the Tahitians, when a victim was taken from any family, the rest were held to be "devoted"—a conception partly analogous to that of the Khonds. J. Williams, *Narrative of Missionary Enterprises*, 1837, p. 554.

either to be sacrificed or to be employed as *hierodouloi*, appears from the announcement of Yahweh in the priestly code: "I have taken the Levites from among the children of Israel instead of all the first-born.....and the Levites shall be mine; for all the first-born are mine."¹

As regards the private continuance of the practice after the Levites had been set apart as a specific tribe, we can only inferentially trace the evolution. Certainly the priesthood did not of itself set up the movement against child sacrifice: such reforms always begin through rulers or lay reformers, never through the priestly organisation, save when a new cult supersedes an old.² Circumcision, a rite of sacrifice with the same significance, seems to have been introduced, or at least stressed, comparatively late,³ for the same purpose; and as an official Yahwistic feast the pass-over seems also late;⁴ though the manner of its enactment in the first redaction of the law indicates that it was in some form already a standing practice.⁵ It doubtless needed the late myths of Abraham and Isaac⁶ and of the Exodus to persuade even Yahwists to drop the child sacrifice; and in the rival cults the practice seems to have been common.⁷ It is in this connection that there presumptively occurred the usage first of breaking the victims' limbs, and later of drugging them, to prevent the struggles which were usually held to make a sacrifice inauspicious; and the manner in which the caveat against breaking the bones of the paschal lamb is introduced—an apparent interpolation made at the close of the original narrative of the exodus⁸—indicates it to be either a late provision against a practice which definitely recalled the rite of human sacrifice, or a specific assertion of the principle that the victim must be without blemish, as against the practice of a human sacrifice in

¹ Num. iii, 12. There are, however, some grounds for supposing that the first Levites were members of a conquered race.

² See above, p. 56, and below, Part IV, § 5.

³ Gen. xvii. is part of the late priestly code. E. J. Fripp, *Composition of the Book of Genesis*, 1892, p. 164.

⁴ 2 Kings xxiii, 23.

⁵ Deut. xvi, 2.

⁶ Gen. xxii, 1-13.

⁷ Cp. 2 Kings xvi, 3; 2 Chron. xxviii, 3; Ps. cvi, 37, 38.

⁸ Ex. xii, 42-51. The clause in v. 46 may even be an addition to the interpolation.

which the victim had to be either maimed or drugged in order to make him seem willing.

We are faced again by the difficult problem of the historic transmission of such practices. In certain South Sea Islands in modern times, when the practices of human sacrifice and cannibalism had latterly dwindled,¹ the first missionaries found in use forms of animal sacrifice which seem to affiliate at many points to the ritual we have seen in operation among Khonds and westerly Semites. Thus the pig set apart for sacrifice² at certain temples, "when presented alive, received the sacred mark, and ranged the district at liberty; when slain, they were exceedingly anxious to avoid breaking a bone, or disfiguring the animal. One method of killing them was by holding the pig upright on its legs, placing a strong stick horizontally under its throat, and another across upon its neck, and then pressing them together until the animal was strangled."³ Here we have (1) the common Asiatic and American usage of leaving the doomed victim for a time at liberty;⁴ (2) the avoidance of bone-breaking,⁵ as in the case of the paschal lamb; (3) the preservation of the cross-figure as seen in the Khond sacrifice; and (4) the evident imitation of human sacrifice in the posture of the victim.⁶ Seeing, further, that only a portion of the pig thus sacrificed was eaten, and that only by "the priests and other sacred persons who were privileged to eat of the sacrifices," the remainder being left on the God's altar till it decomposed, we may fairly surmise that it was a surrogate for a sacrificed human being, formerly eaten as a sacrament in the Aztec fashion.

¹ Ellis, *Polynesian Researches*, 2nd ed. i, 357.

² Mr. Jevons argues (p. 161) that human sacrifice *arose* in Polynesia because of *lack* of domestic animals, there being only pigs and rats. But the pigs could have sufficed in early times as well as late. And why did not Australians, lacking domestic animals, set up human sacrifices? Because *men* were scarce, probably.

³ Ellis, *Polynesian Researches*, 2nd ed. i, 345.

⁴ Above, pp. 113-114; below, § 13; and Part IV, §§ 3, 5.

⁵ In the Tonga Islands, the occasional child-sacrifices were also by strangulation (Mariner's *Tonga Islands*, 3rd ed. i, 190, 300). See also Ellis, iv, 151, as to other cases of avoidance of mangling; and cp. Moerenhaut, *Voyage aux Iles du Grand Ocean*, 1837, i. 508.

⁶ Long pig, it will be remembered, was a name among Polynesian cannibals for their human victims.

Yet again, there is a solitary testimony that in the human sacrifices offered by the Algonkins at the beginning of the hunting season it was a rule that not a bone of the victim must be broken.¹ Seeing that other redskins observed the principle of the Semites, that at the sacrificial feast the victim "must be all eaten, and nothing left,"² there would thus seem to be not merely an ancient racial affinity between the aborigines of America and some race or races of Asia, but a direct heredity in the matter of special primitive rites. But even if we waive the latter presumption, we can infer the probable line of movement all round in the matter of the usages under notice. As thus:—

1. Seeking a "willing" sacrifice, the sacrificers first broke the limbs of the human victim.

2. Feeling (on some reformer's urging) that such a mangled victim was an unseemly sacrifice, they resorted to narcotics.

3. Being persuaded that the stupefied victim in turn was either an unseemly or an inefficacious because non-suffering sacrifice, or being on other grounds inclined to abandon human sacrifice, they substituted the sacrifice of an animal, giving it in certain cases some of the privileges formerly accorded to the *taboo* human victim. In the case of the animal it was not felt necessary either to break bones or to use narcotics. But reformers would stress the avoidance of bone-breaking by way of showing the superiority of the new sacrifice; hence the need for a veto on imitations of the old practice.³ Such an evolution might conceivably take place independently in different communities. It is true indeed that in the redemptory sacrifices offered by modern Semites for boys, care is taken not to break a bone, "because they fear that if a bone of the sacrifice should be broken, the child's bones would be broken too";⁴ but that

¹ Tanner's *Narrative*, cited by Lubbock, *Origin of Civ.* 5th ed. p. 367.

² Lubbock, last cit. quoting Schoolcraft.

³ What looks like a reminiscence of the old sacrificial practice is described by Ellis (i, 310) as occurring after battles, when the legs and arms of the dead bodies of defeated warriors were broken and the bodies hung by the neck, and moved up and down "for the amusement of the spectators."

⁴ Curtiss, *Primitive Semitic Religion To-day*, 1902, pp. 177-8.

appears to be a theory formed subsequent to and not antecedent to a reform.

It is of the nature of such reforms, however, to be introduced with difficulty and to be rebelled against and reverted from; and even without the above-cited evidence of a slowly-wrought transformation in Hebrew usage, it is certain, from the whole drift of religious history, that the practice of child-slaying, which was systematically legislated against only after the exile, would be revived in times of trouble by Jews, as we know it to have been by Carthaginians. It is through reversions of this kind to old and terrible rites, then, that we must suppose the ancient mode of sacrifice to have been kept in men's knowledge. Such a doctrine rested on the most obvious and therefore the most fully developed side of the conception of sacrifice—the offering to the God of a peculiarly precious gift, representing a maximum of self-deprivation in the sacrificer.

Meanwhile, though it is not certain that the mode of "hanging before the Lord" by the wrists ever placed the victim in the form of a cross, it would appear that the rite of the Passover was closely associated with the cross sign.¹ That is the "mark" specified in Ezekiel² for the saving of the elect from a general massacre; and the blood mark placed on the doorposts and lintels at the Passover³ is inferentially the same,⁴ as is the "seal" on the foreheads of the saved in the Apocalypse. To this day, the Arabs make the *tau*-mark with sacrificial blood on at least one Moslem shrine.⁵ In any case, the pre-Christian use of the Cross as a symbol of the Sun-God and as a sign of "immortal

¹ There is a passage in Justin Martyr (*Dial. with Trypho*, xl) which seems to assert that the paschal lamb was "roasted and dressed in the form of the cross"; whence it would follow that the original human victim had been crucified, or bound somewhat in the manner of the Khond sacrifice. It is not known, however, whether roasted lambs in general may not have been dressed in the same fashion.

² Ezek. ix, 4, 6. Cp. Heb. and Varior. Bible.

³ Exod. xii, 7, 13, 29.

⁴ Cp. Didron, *Christian Iconography*, Eng. tr. i, 371, *note*, where also is noted the tradition that the "two sticks" of the widow of Zarepta were a cross. The prophet's miracle implies the same figure (1 Kings, xvii, 12, 22).

⁵ Curtiss, as cited, pp. 192-3. Different forms of the cross are made by Hindus on the shrines of Ganesa. See the photograph in Crooke's *Popular Religion and Folklore of Northern India*, ed. 1896, i. 110.

life" is undisputed, and we shall see reason to infer that the form of slaying represented in the Christian crucifix—which does not appear in Christian art till about the seventh century¹—was conceived from certain rites in which the initiate extended his arms upon a tree or cross,² probably in reminiscence of some such mode of treating the sacrificed victim as we have seen described in the case of the Khonds.

§ 9.—*Specific Survivals in Judaism.*

Apart from definite revivals, the memory of human sacrifice is clearly stamped not only on the Passover but on the two other typical sacrificial feasts of the Jews—the indeterminate sacrifice of the Red Heifer, loosely said to have been performed only eight times since Moses, and the annual sacrifice of a scape-goat on the Day of Atonement. In the case of the former, which was prescribed to take place on the Mount of Olives, the high priest, his eldest son, and the *Messiah Milchama*—the deputy High Priest anointed for war—were all anointed with holy oil, the mark of a cross being made with it on their foreheads. But further, in one of the two Talmudic accounts, "in anticipation of the performance of the rite, a pregnant woman was brought into one of the chambers of the temple, which was set apart for the purpose, and kept there till her child was born. The child so born was brought up within the sacred precincts, and protected from any chance of incurring ceremonial pollution. When the time for the rite arrived, this child was seated on a wooden litter borne by bullocks, and conducted to the fountain of Siloah. There the child descended, and drew water from the spring in an earthen vessel, bearing which, he was reconducted, as he came, to the Temple."³ But by another account "pregnant women" were brought to Jerusalem, and placed in courts built on the rock, *with an excavation underneath*, and they and their

¹ Rev. St. John Tyrwhitt, *Art Teaching of the Primitive Church*, S.P.C.K., pp. 232, 234.

² See below, § 15.

³ Conder, *Bible Handbook*, 1880, pp. 105-107.

children were there kept "for the use of the red heifer"¹ till the children were seven or eight years old, when they ceased to be held ceremonially pure. Here it becomes fairly clear that a regular supply of children-victims had anciently been provided for sacrifice, and that the heifer was the child's representative. Some trace of the knowledge is preserved in the Talmud, in the saying that "as the red heifer atones for sin so also does the death of the righteous atone for sin."² Being sacrificed with her face to the south and her head to the west,³ she was presumably dedicated either to the setting or winter sun or to the Moon-Goddess.⁴

By an equally clear clue in the ritual, we can reach the original character of the sacrifice of the scapegoat, which in its official form is clearly post-exilic.⁵ In the preparation for that, the high priest was removed from his own house to the council-chamber seven days in advance, and at the same time a *sagan* or deputy was appointed who should take his place in case of his being incapacitated. On the night before the day of sacrifice he was not allowed to eat meat, or to sleep, being watched by the younger priests. At that stage, "the elders of the great Sanhedrin handed him over to the seniors of the priestly order, who escorted him to the *upper chamber* of the house of Abtinas,⁶ and

¹ Hershon, *Genesis with a Talmudical Commentary*, 1883, p. 40, citing Tal. Bab. Tract *Succah*, fol. 21, col. 1, and *Parah*, ch. iii, 2, 3. As to the authority of Tract *Parah*, cp. Conder, p. 106.

² Tal. Bab. *Moed Katon*, fol. 28, col. 1, cited by Hershon, *Treasures*, p. 103; *Genesis*, p. 198.

³ Conder, *Handbook to the Bible*, 1880, p. 107.

⁴ In *Christianity and Mythology*, p. 349, I connected the sacrifice of the red heifer with the Egyptian sacrifice of a red ox to Typhon (Plutarch, *I. and O.* 31—ref. wrong in *C. and M.*). But though that also was clearly a substitution for a human sacrifice, the sacrifice of a red *heifer* was on the whole more likely to belong originally to a Goddess-cult, and in Egypt all she-calves were sacred to Isis (Herod. ii, 41). On the whole problem cp. Spencer, *De Legibus Hebræorum*, l. ii, c. 15.

⁵ The dogmatic assertion of Bleek (*Einleit. in das alte Test.*, ed. Wellhausen, 1878, § 55) as to the clearly Mosaic authorship of Lev. i-vii, xi-xvi, is a sample of the fashion in which criticism of the Pentateuch was so long darkened. All critics now place Leviticus in the Priestly Code; and ch. xvi is no exception. Cp. Driver, *Introd. c. i*, § 3; Kuenen, *The Hexateuch*, Eng. tr. pp. 86, 312; and the Kautzsch Bible. If Lev. xvi be pre-exilic, why is there no trace of it in Deuteronomy?

⁶ A family who prepared the sacred incense. See *Yoma*, ch. iii, 9. Schwab's trans. vol. v, pp. 199-200.

there they swore him in, and after bidding him farewell, departed. In administering the oath, they said "My lord high priest, we are ambassadors of the Sanhedrin, thou art ambassador of the Sanhedrin, and our ambassador also. We adjure thee by Him who causes his name to dwell in this house, that thou deviate not from anything we have rehearsed to thee. Then they parted company, both he and they weeping."¹ An absurd Talmudical explanation is given for the weeping: "He wept because they suspected he was a Sadducee; and they wept because the penalty for false suspicion is scourging."² Whatever may have been the historical fact concealed by the last phrase, it is sufficiently clear that the rite was originally one of human sacrifice in which either the priest or his deputy, the *Sagan* or *Segan*, was put to death as "ambassador" of the people to the God or Gods,³ that is, as scapegoat for their sins. And in this *Sagan* we probably have the true interpretation of the Græcised term *Zoganes*⁴ applied to the mock victim of the *Sacæa*. He was simply the deputy⁵ of the originally due victim, the priest, who must thus have solved his personal problem at a very early date.⁶

¹ Tract *Yoma*, Schwab's Fr. tr. vol. v, pp. 161-2, 163-4, 165, 169, 170, 172; Tal. Bab. fol. 18 A and B, fol. 19 B, Eng. trans. by Hershon, *Treasures of the Talmud*, 1882, p. 90. The last detail is not given by Conder, who probably did not see its significance.

² Schwab seeks to make the passage more plausible by the rendering (p. 170) that he wept at being supposed capable of unfaithfulness to his instructions, they because of the painful necessity of adjuring him to be faithful. Hershon's translation is the more faithful.

³ This was clearly the idea in the sacrifice of a man to Zamolxis by the Massagetæ. Herod. iv, 94, 95. See above, p. 108, note, as to the Khonds, and below, ch. ii, § 15.

⁴ Athenæus, xiv, 44.

⁵ Cp. Selden, *De Diis Syris*, Syntag. ii, c. 13, and refs. in Schürer, *Jewish People in the time of Christ*, Div. II, Eng. tr. i, 257. Schürer, recognising no problem as to the special function of the *segan* in the sacrifice, decides that he must have been the *στρατηγὸς τοῦ ἱεροῦ* or "captain of the temple," (p. 258). But this identification would not exclude the origin above argued for.

⁶ As to the Babylonian God Azazel, see *Christianity and Mythology*, pp. 345-6. Standing for the Goat-God = Capricorn, he probably represented the winter-sun. For the Jews of the Maccabean period he was simply a Satan. *Book of Enoch*, Schodde's trans., cc. viii, 1; ix, 6; x, 4, 6; liv, 5. In all likelihood the Hebrews had practised this particular rite long before the Captivity. It is hard to say whether there is any historical significance in the Rabbinical saying that it is lawful to slay an *Amhaaretz* (rustic in the Rabbinical saying that it is lawful to slay an *Amhaaretz* (rustic "pagan," non-Israelite) on the Day of Atonement. Tr. *Pesachim*, fol. 49 B cited by Hershon, *Treasures*, p. 95.

The modified sacrifice of the scape-goat, then, was but another variant of the primordial principle of human sacrifice for the good of the people, and is in many respects the complement of the Passover. The Passover victim was set apart on the tenth day of the civil New Year, which dated from spring; the Day of Atonement was the tenth day from the ecclesiastical New Year, which as we have seen began in autumn. It is probable that the latter is the older of the two; but both hold their ground in reference to the sun's progress, the spring festival standing for his youth and waxing period, the autumn for his maturity and waning. That they had a common principle in the sacrifice of a pure victim appears from the detail that in both cases the victim before sacrifice is put in an "upper chamber," the idea being to provide that no contamination should arise from a grave beneath.¹ And both festivals, it is to be noted, could be celebrated apart from the Temple, the Passover being a domestic as well as a temple-feast, and the Day of Atonement being celebrated in Babylon as well as at Jerusalem.²

It is important to note this circumstance in view of the theoretic universalism of the traditional rite of sacrifice, which even the Khonds declared to be for "mankind," and on which the Gentilising Christians founded their gospel. Jewish sacrifices were strictly national; but in their later contacts with other races they were constantly being attracted towards more cosmopolitan ideals. It sufficed that they had as basis the communal idea, and that it was capable of development on popular lines. In the legend of the slaying of Saul's seven sons they preserved the belief (seen in force among the Moabites, and at the same time in Israel³) that a king's son, offered up by and for his father, was an irresistibly potent sacrifice; and among some sections of the Semitic race, as we have seen,

¹ Cp. Hershon, *Genesis with a Talmudical Commentary*, pp. 40, 41.

² *Yoma*, fol. 66, A and B. Ext. in Hershon, *Treasures of the Talmud*, p. 93.

³ 2 Kings iii, 27. The meaning of the sentence is that the Israelites felt the king's sacrifice of his son must be efficacious, and so gave up the contest in despair. Compare the story (above, p. 121) of Hamilcar's sacrifice of his son.

there was current the myth preserved by Eusebius from Philo of Byblos, that Kronos, "whom the Phœnicians call Israel," adorned his son called Ieoud, "the only," with emblems of royalty, and sacrificed him. Always it is a typically divine or racial "father"—Kronos, Israel, Abraham—who figures in these myths of son-sacrifice;¹ and when it is remembered that the God-name Tammuz signified in its original Accadian form "the son of life," and was by the Semites interpreted to mean "the offspring" or "only son,"² we are led to conclude that this conception, bound up with that of the God's death and resurrection, had a general and strong hold on both non-Semitic and Semitic races; for a Hebrew cult of the dying and re-arising Tammuz was in the period before the exile carried on in the very temple of Yahweh.³

§ 10.—*The Pre-Christian Jesus-God.*

We are thus prepared to interpret the crux set up for Christian commentators by the ancient reading "Jesus Barabbas" in Matt. xxvii, 16, 17. That this was long the accepted reading in the ancient church is to be gathered from Origen;⁴ and the problem has always been reckoned a puzzling one. Had Mr. Frazer noted it, he might have seen cause to look deeper for his solution of the problem of the simple name Barabbas in the Gospel story and in Philo. Is not the proper presumption this, that the preservation of the name "Jesus Barabbas" tells of the common association of those names in some such rite as must be held to underlie the Gospel myth—that, in short, a "Jesus the Son of the Father" was a figure in an old Semitic ritual of sacrifice before the Christian era? The Syrian form of the name, Yeschu, closely resembles the Hebrew name

¹ See cit. from Varro in Lactantius, *Div. Inst.* i, 21, and Macrobius, *Saturnalia*, i, 7, for the legend of a Greek oracle commanding to "send a man to the Father"—i.e. Kronos.

² Sayce, *Hibbert Lectures*, p. 232, citing *W. A. I.* ii, 36, 54.

³ Ezek. viii, 14.

⁴ See Nicholson, *The Gospel According to the Hebrews*, 1879, pp. 141-2.

Yishak, which we read Isaac; and that Isaac was in earlier myth sacrificed by his father is a fair presumption. We have here the inferrible norm of an ancient God-sacrifice, Abraham's original Godhood being tolerably certain, like that of Israel.¹ In Arab legend, Ishmael is sacrificed by his father, though apparently the sacrifice is commuted for a ram in the manner of the story in Genesis.²

As a hypothesis the proposed solution must for the present stand; but the grounds for surmising a pre-Christian cult of a Jesus or Joshua may here be noted. The first is the fact that the Joshua (Jesus) of the book so named is quite certainly unhistorical,³ and that the narrative concerning him is a late fabrication. We can but divine from it that, having several attributes of the Sun-God,⁴ he is like Samson and Moses an ancient deity, latterly reduced to human status; and as Jewish tradition has it that he began his work of deliverance on the day fixed for the choosing of the paschal lamb, and concluded it at the passover,⁵ it is inferrible that his name was anciently associated with the rite and the symbol, as well as with the similarly significant rite of circumcision, which is connected with the passover in the pseudo-history of Joshua.⁶ That he, who is never mentioned by the psalmists or prophets, should not only be put on a level with Moses as an institutor of the prime ordinances of the passover rite and circumcision, but should be credited with the miracle of staying the course of the sun and moon—a prodigy beyond any ascribed to Moses—is not to be explained save on the view that he held divine status in the previous myth.⁷

¹ Refs. above, p. 79.

² Weil, *Biblical Legends of the Mussulmans*, Eng. tr. pp. 62-66; Curtiss, *Primitive Semitic Religion To-day*, 1902, p. 175.

³ Cp. Stade, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, 1881, pp. 64-65; art. *Joshua* in *Encyclopædia Biblica*; Winckler, *Geschichte Israels*, ii, 101-2, 107-9; Robertson Smith, *Old Testament in the Jewish Church*, 2nd ed. p. 131.

⁴ E.g., his crossing of the water dryshod (iii, 13, 17), and his selection of twelve who function with him (iv, 4).

⁵ Josh. v, 10.

⁶ Cp. Josh. v, 2-10.

⁷ As his name was held in special reverence among the Samaritans, who preserve a late book ascribing to him many feats not given in the Jewish record, the probability is that he was an Ephraimite deity, analogous to

No less clear is the inference from the pseudo-prediction inserted in a list of priestly vetoes in the book of Exodus.¹ It is there promised that an Angel, in or on whom is the "name" of Yahweh, shall lead Israel to triumph against the Amorites, the Hittites, and the Perizzites, and the Canaanites, the Hivites, and the Jebusites. This is the very list (lacking one) put in Joshua's mouth as that of the conquests effected by the Lord through him,² so that he is pseudo-historically identified with the promised Angel. That personage, again, in virtue of his possession of the magical "name,"³ is in the Talmud identified with the mystic Metatron, who is in turn identifiable with the Logos.⁴ Thus the name Joshua=Jesus is already in the Pentateuch associated with the conceptions of Logos, Son of God, and Messiah; and it is in view of such knowledge that the pseudo-prediction is framed. Only the hypothesis that in some Palestinian quarters Joshua had the status of a deity, can meet the case.

To the nature of that status we have certain clues which have never been considered in correlation, Jews and Christians alike being led by their presuppositions either to ignore or to misconceive them. One clue is, as already noted, the evidently Judaic and pre-Christian character of the Lamb-God Jesus in the Apocalypse. The slain God is there identified not only with the *Logos*,⁵ before the appearance of the Fourth Gospel, and with the Mithraic or Babylonian symbols of the Seven Spirits, but with the Alpha and the Omega; and the accessories are markedly Semitic and Judaistic. Thus the four-and-twenty elders play a foremost part; the twelve apostles are present only in an interpolation;⁶ and the saved are pre-eminently Jewish.⁷ Not only, in short, is the Child-God of the

Joseph, whose legend has such close resemblances to the myth of Tammuz-Adonis. The statement in Josh. ix, 22, 27, suggests a trace of a Joshua cult among the Hebrews. Stade (as cited, p. 65) pronounced the Joshua saga wholly Ephraimitish.

¹ Ex. xxiii, 20-23.

² Josh. xxiv, 11.

³ See hereinafter, Pt. II, ch. ii, § 2.

⁴ Below, Pt. III, § 8.

⁵ iii, 14, 15; xix, 13.

⁶ xxii, 14. Cp. *A Short History of Christianity*, p. 17.

⁷ vii, 5-9. Cp. xxii, 16.

dragon-story, in the twelfth chapter, not the Christian Jesus:¹ the Jesus of the whole book is pre-Christian, the book being in fact a Jewish Apocalypse slightly edited for Christian purposes.² So much is now admitted by many students; and it is the failure to learn this and other lessons of the documents that still permits of wrong hypotheses to account for the Messianic doctrine in the Book of Enoch, a distinctly pre-Christian work.³

But the same problem arises in connection with that crucial document, "The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles." Not only are the first six chapters of that book wholly Judaic, without mention of any divinity save "God," "the Lord," "the Father," unless "the Spirit" be taken to stand for a second deity; but even the formula of baptism in the seventh chapter, which belongs to a secondary stratum in the compilation, is not clearly Christian; and the eucharistic formula in the ninth is clearly non-Christian. It runs: "We thank thee, our Father, for the holy vine of David thy servant, which thou hast made known to us by Jesus thy servant,"⁴ an expression quite irreconcilable with the accepted Christian narrative and liturgy. Nor is there a single allusion in the entire document, whether in the late or the early portions, to the death of Jesus by crucifixion or otherwise. Thus it appears that not only was the nucleus of the document a teaching of twelve monotheistic *Jewish* apostles—the apostles of the High Priest to the Dispersion⁵—but even the earlier Jesuist additions were made by Judaic Jesuists who had not the Christian doctrine of a divine sacrifice, whether or not they already had the trinitarian doctrine set forth in the baptismal formula of the seventh chapter. Thus the allusion to the "gospel of the Lord" in the eighth chapter is presumptively an interpolation, occurring as it does in a

¹ Gunkel, *Schöpfung und Chaos*, p. 173; Eberhard Vischer, as there cited.

² Gunkel, p. 19. Cp. Davidson, *Introd. to N. T.* 2nd ed. i, 253, 263, 267-9; Martineau, *Seat of Authority in Religion*, pp. 224-5.

³ Cp. Schodde's introd. to his translation, 1882, pp. 46-58.

⁴ The reading "thy son," given by some clerical translators, is indefensible. The same word, *παῖός*, is applied to David and Jesus.

⁵ Cp. *Christianity and Mythology*, pp. 373, 448, 455; *A Short History of Christianity*, pp. 17-21, 83, and refs. pp. 403-4.

document in which hitherto "the Lord" had always meant Yahweh; and even at that, the reference is presumptively to the inferred primary form of the first gospel, which had no account of the crucifixion and resurrection¹—a gospel, in short, which had grown up solely by way of sayings and doings ascribed to the mythical Jesus, without the existing birth legend, and without *his* twelve apostles. Here again the theological critics recognize the Judaic character of the matter,² but fail to draw the obvious inferences.

There remains to be considered in the same connection (3) the fact that in the Jewish liturgy for the ecclesiastical New Year there is or was mention of Joshua (*Jeschu* = Jesus) as "the Prince of the Presence."³ This is of course interpreted as a title signifying Joshua's relation to Moses; but in the light of the Apocalypse it seems to have quite another significance. After the deletions effected in the pseudo-history,⁴ the matter is sufficiently obscure; but the clues left, when colligated, tell of something very different from the written word. Tentatively, we may surmise that as the Day of Atonement, which comes ten days after the New Year, is the consummation of the annual Day of Judgment,⁵ Joshua in the liturgy played very much the same part as the Judaic Jesus in the Apocalypse.

Finally, we have to note (a) the remarkable Arab tradition which makes Joshua the Son of Miriam,⁶ whose death day in the Jewish calendar is that of the beginning of his work, the tenth of Nisan, whereon was chosen the paschal

¹ Cp. *The Synoptic Problem for English Readers*, by A. J. Jolley, 1893—giving the conclusions of the school of Bernhard Weiss.

² Cp. the admissions of Mr. Rendel Harris, in his edition of *The Teaching*, p. 89; of Dr. C. Taylor in his lectures on it, 1886; of the American editors, Hitchcock and Brown, in their edition; of Canon Spence in his (1885, pp. 37, 90-91); of the Rev. J. Heron in his (*Church of the Sub-Apostolic Age*, p. 57), and of Dr. Salmon, as there cited (p. 58).

³ Tal. Bab. Tract. *Yevamoth*, fol. 16, col. 2, *Josephoth*, cited by Hershon, *Genesis with a Talm. Comm.*, p. 24, note j.

⁴ Cp. Winckler, *Geschichte Israels*, ii, 102.

⁵ "All things are judged on the New Year's Day," said Rabbi Meir, "and their sentences are sealed on the Day of Atonement." Other Rabbis agreed on the first head, but not on the second. *Rosh Hashannah*, fol. 16 A, cited by Hershon, *Treasures of the Talmud*, pp. 98-99.

⁶ *Christianity and Mythology*, p. 83.

lamb; and (b) the fact that according to some Jews the "Week of the Son" (circumcision and redemption of the first born male child) was called the rite of "Jesus the Son."¹ Whether or not we have here the true origination of the myth which makes the Gospel Jesus the Son of Mariam, there is a fair presumption from mythological analogy that the Miriam of the Pentateuch, who dies and is buried at Kadesh,² "the holy" city, is a Goddess Evemerised, and that the day of Joshua's setting out on his fictitious march was in the original myth the day either of his birth or of some act of popular salvation wrought by him. If he were originally a variant of Tammuz, and Miriam a variant of Ishtar, if male infants were circumcised in his honour, and if he *died* to save men at the passover, the details to that effect would certainly be excluded by the later Yahwists from any narrative they preserved or framed concerning him. As it is, we may at least argue for a connection between the Judaic "Jesus the Son" and the traditional "Jesus the Son of the Father."

Beyond conjectures we cannot at present go; but the significance given to the name of Jeshua, the high-priest of the Return, in the book of Zechariah,³ at a time when the book of Joshua did not exist, tells of a Messianic idea so associated when Messianism was but beginning among the Jews. And as the Messianic idea seems to have come to them, as it fittingly might, during their exile, perhaps from the old Akkadian source of the myth of Hammurabi, or from the later Mazdean doctrine that the Saviour Saoshyant, the yet unborn Son of Zarathustra, is at the end of time to raise the dead and destroy Ahriman,⁴ it may have had many divine associations such as later orthodox Judaism would sedulously obliterate.

What is specially important in this connection is the fact that the doctrine of a *suffering* Messiah gradually developed among the Jews, for the most part outside the canonical

¹ Tal. Bab. Tract. *Baba-Bathra*, fol. 60, col. 2, cited by Hershon, *Genesis with a Talm. Comm.*, p. 26.

² Num. xx, 1.

³ Zech. iii, 1-9; v, 10-12.

⁴ Zendavesta, *Vendidad*, Fargard xix, 1.

literature. For the doctrine that "the Christ must needs have suffered"¹ can be scripturally supported only from passages like the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah, where our A. V. alters the past tense into the present, thus making a description of Israel's past sufferings serve as a mystic type. Cyrus, who is called Messiah in deutero-Isaiah, was reputed to have been crucified, but not in his Messianic capacity.² The presumption then is that the doctrine was extra-canonical, and was set up by Gentile example. Even in the Book of Enoch, where the Messianic doctrine is much developed, the Messiah does not "suffer." The first clear trace of that conception in Judaic literature appears to be in the doctrine that of the *two* promised Messiahs,³ Ben Joseph and Ben David, Ben Joseph is to be slain.⁴ Whence came that theorem, it is for the present impossible to say; but it is presumptively foreign,⁵ and there are clear Gentile parallels.

An obvious precedent to begin with lay in the Greek myth of the crucified Prometheus;⁶ but on the whole the most likely pagan prototype is to be seen in the slain and resurgent Dionysos, one of whose chief names is *Eleuthereos*, the Liberator,⁷ who was specially signalised as the God "born again." As the Jewish Messiah was to be primarily a "deliverer," like the series of legendary national heroes in the book of Judges, a popular God so entitled was most likely to impress the imagination of the dispersed Jews and their proselytes. The same epithet, indeed, may well have attached to ancient deities such as Samson, who is a variant of the deliverer Herakles, and was one of the "deliverers" of the pseudo-history, as well as to the original Jesus whose myth is Evemerised in Joshua.

¹ Acts xvii, 3; xxvi, 23. Cp. Luke xxvi, 26, 46.

² Diod. Sic. ii, 44.

³ Cp. *Christianity and Mythology*, pp. 326-7.

⁴ Reichardt, *Relations of the Jewish Christians to the Jews*, p. 37; Bousset, *The Antichrist Legend*, Eng. tr. p. 107.

⁵ Bousset, as cited. And see below, Pt. II, ch. ii, § 15.

⁶ That Prometheus was crucified is not only implied in his traditional posture, but asserted by Lucian, and shown in ancient art. Cp. *Christianity and Mythology*, pp. 404-5, and Hochart, *Etudes d'histoire religieuse*, 1890, p. 345.

⁷ He bore also the equivalent name *Lysios*; and in Latin he is best known as *Liber*. Twice-born is one of his common epithets.

Samson, too, like Dionysos, was "only-begotten."¹ But in any case a proximate motive is needed to account for the post-exilic or post-Maccabean revival of such conceptions in a cult form; and it is to be found in the prevailing religious conceptions of the surrounding Hellenistic civilization, where, next to Zeus, the Gods most in evidence were Dionysos and Herakles, and the Son-sacrificing Kronos.²

§ 11.—*Private Jewish Eucharists.*

There arises thus the further presumption that such a cult as we are tracing may have flourished in a Jewish community elsewhere than in Jerusalem. Mr. Frazer, in surmising a celebration of Purim with a real victim at Jerusalem, does not take account of the fact that the bulk of the Jews deported to Babylon had remained and flourished there, many remaining Yahwists; that there then began the institution of the synagogue, permissible to any group of Jews in any place; and that wherever in the East there was a Jewish synagogue outside of Judea there was an opening for usages not recognised at Jerusalem. But the existence of many such synagogues is clearly an important condition of the problem; and precisely because there were no regular sacrificial rites, apart from the Passover, for expatriated Jews, there is a likelihood that among them in particular would revive rites of sacrifice and sacrament which had a great tradition behind them, but were not latterly practised at the temple. This craving for a sacrifice in which they could participate is the special note of the Epistle to the Hebrews; and indeed the habit and doctrine of sacrifice were far too deeply rooted to permit of a contented submission of all the myriads of scattered Jews to a complete deprivation of the practice.³

¹ This title is applied in the Orphic Hymns to Persephone, Athene, and Demeter as well as to Dionysos (xxix, 2; xxxii, 1; xl, 16).

² Schürer, 2nd Div. i, 22.

³ As to the avowed Jewish craving for sacrifices, cp. Hershon, *Genesis with a Talmudical Commentary*, pp. 167, 285. Even in modern times, it is usual for the heads of Jewish families to sacrifice a white cock as a kind of "scape-goat" on the eve of *Yom Kippur*, the Day of Atonement. Significantly enough

By reviving such mysteries, those of the Dispersion could in a measure compensate themselves for their exclusion from the orthodox sacrifices, which were a monopoly of the holy city. And when we find the later Christists unquestionably adopting rites from the mysteries of pagan deities such as Mithra and Dionysos, we cannot well doubt that Jews in the large eastern cities would be at times inclined to resort to mysteries of sacrament sacrifice for which they had a precedent in their own traditions. The story of the "Karabbas" episode at Alexandria, in fact, is an item of positive evidence not yet matched by any in regard to Jerusalem; unless it be the story to the effect that Antiochus Epiphanes found in the temple at Jerusalem a Greek captive who was to be sacrificed and sacramentally eaten.¹ In view of all the clues, we cannot pronounce that story incredible; and the retort of Josephus, that one victim could not supply a meal to the multitude of worshippers, is at once disposed of by the principle that "sin-offerings were too holy to be eaten except by the priests."² Nor can we reject the theorem of Ghillany, that there was an element of actual ritual cannibalism in the paschal meal of the Jews in the pre-exilic period, though the proof is incomplete.³ It suffices, however, to note that when revived rites of sacrament were seen to flourish among the Dispersion, there would be a tendency at Jerusalem to recognise them for economic reasons. The more we study the history of Judaism, the more clearly we realise that it was never immune from change, never long a triumphant fixed cult realising the ideal of its sacred books. Even in the

the Hebrew word *Gever* stands for both "a cock" and "a man." Hershon, *Treasures of the Talmud*, p. 105. Cp. the authorities cited by J. M. Wheeler, *Footsteps of the Past*, p. 142. I have recently seen an illustrated post-card, made for the use of German Jews, whereon is represented a Jew in hat and long coat, holding a white cock, and standing before a table with a book on it. Below is the Hebrew text (Job xxxiii, 24), "Deliver him from going down to the pit: I have found a ransom," with the addition: "May you be inscribed for a prosperous year," and afterwards, in German, the greeting "Hearty good wishes for the New Year."

¹ Josephus, *Against Apion*, ii, 8.

² Smith, *Semites*, p. 369.

³ *Menschenopfer*, pp. 518, 525, 533-4.

immediate sphere of the temple itself, then, revived or innovating rites could make their way.

Such an acceptance would require only one condition—that the innovating rites were professedly Yahwistic. In the exilic period there had been many resorts to “unclean” sacraments, such as the mystical eating of dogs, mice, and swine,¹ men desperately seeking help from alien rites when their own God had wholly failed to help them; and our ablest Hebraist, while noting that “the causes which produced a *resuscitation of obsolete mysteries* among the Jews were at work at the same period among all the northern Semites,” decides that the rites in question “mark the *first* appearance in Semitic history of the tendency to found religious societies on voluntary association and mystic initiation, instead of natural kinship and nationality.”² Whatever may have been the origins, it suffices that the alleged “first appearance” was not the last. However the tendency may have been held in check at Jerusalem, it cannot have been equally repressed among the dispersed Jews, who saw all around them attractive mystical cults emanating from their own Semitic kindred; and who had in their own sacred books pretexts enough for “clean” sacraments in honour of Yahweh. For in all the orthodox sacrifices, it is to be remembered, an eating and drinking with the Deity, a sitting at his table as his guest, even as one would sit at a great banquet, was the essential notion, the ideal for the laity as well as the priesthood.³ It would be strange indeed if the dispersed myriads wholly renounced such an experience.

The law permitted at the temple of Jerusalem private as well as public sacrifices of all kinds; and in the case of the peace- or thank- offerings “only the fat was burned on the altar, while the flesh was used by the owner of the sacrifice himself as material for a jocund sacrificial feast.”⁴ And

¹ Isa. lxxv, 4-5; lxxvi, 3, 17.

² Robertson Smith, *Religion of the Semites*, p. 339.

³ Cp. Spencer, *De Legibus Hebræorum*, ed. 1686, ii, 76; Smith, *Relig. of Semites*, p. 206 sq.; Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*, Eng. tr. p. 71 and refs.; Bähr, *Symbolik des Mosaischen Cultus*, 1835, i, 433-4.

⁴ Schürer, *Hist. of the Jewish People in the time of Jesus Christ*, 2nd Div. Eng. tr. i, 279.

“as was only natural, it was the numerous private offerings of so many different kinds that constituted the bulk of the sacrifices.” Their number was in fact “so vast as to be well-nigh inconceivable.”¹ That is to say, the private proclivity to sacrifice was the predominant religious factor. At a time, then, when movements of dissent and innovation and even of “anti-clericalism”² were being set up by a variety of forces, new and old, it is not to be supposed that the multitudes of Jews distributed through the Hellenistic world submitted passively to a monopoly which deprived them of most of the normal sensations of religion.

The obscurest side of the problem, perhaps, is that of the weekly eucharist, the “Holy Supper” of bread and wine, which in the later Jesuit cult we find in such close connection with the sacrifice of the God, but in the earlier form of the “Teaching of the Twelve Apostles” does not appear to be so connected. Yet the very phenomenon of the Teaching points to what we have other reasons for surmising—a weekly rite of old standing among the Jews of the Dispersion. The Passover came but once a year; and any act of real or simulated human sacrifice would be no more frequent. Would the dispersed Jews then forego all such weekly rites as occurred among the Gentiles? If normally they abstained from “drink offerings of blood” presented to other Gods,³ had they no permissible libation? That there was a weekly eucharist among the Mithraists is practically certain: the Fathers who mention the Mithraic bread-and-wine or bread-and-water sacrament never speak of it as less frequent than the Christian;⁴ and the Pauline allusion to the “table of daimons,” with its “cup,” implies that that was as habitual as the Christian rite,⁵ which was certainly solemnised weekly in the early Church. And that this weekly rite, again, is not originally Mithraic, but one of the ancient Asiatic usages which could reach the Jews either by way of Babylon or before the

¹ *Id.* p. 299.

² Cp. Schürer, as cited, pp. 222, 230.

³ Ps. xvi, 4. Cp. verse 5. In Clemens Alexandrinus (*Pædagogus*, ii, 2) the grape is “the Logos,” and its juice is “His blood.”

⁴ See below, Part III, § 7.

⁵ 1 Cor. x, 16, 21; xi, 26.

Captivity, is to be inferred from the fact that the Brahmanic *Upavasatha*, the fast-day previous to the sacrament of the Soma, occurred four times in each lunar month;¹ and was thus closely analogous to the Sabbath, which was originally a lunar feast.² As the Soma feast was connected with the worship of the moon, it would be a "supper" on the night of the day before moon-day, that is, on the night of the Sunday, which was clearly "Lord's Day" long before the Christian era. That the Sumerians or Akkadians, who had the seven-day week, were the source of the weekly bread and wine supper for both the Hindus and the Persians, seems the natural hypothesis.

§ 12.—*The Eucharist in Orthodox Judaism.*

That there were both orthodox and heterodox forms of a quasi-Mithraic bread-and-wine ritual among the Jews is to be gathered even from the sacred books. In the legend of the Exodus, Aaron and the elders of Israel "eat bread with Moses' father-in-law before God"³—that is, twelve elders and the Anointed One eat a bread sacrament with a presumptive ancient deity, Moses himself being such. And wine would not be wanting. In the so-called Song of Moses, which repudiates a hostile God, "their Rock in which they trusted, which did eat the fat of their sacrifices, and drank the wine of their drink-offering," Yahweh also is called "our Rock"; and in an obscure passage *his* wine seems to be extolled.⁴ Even if the Rock in such allusions were originally the actual tombstone or altar on which sacrifices were laid and libations poured, there would be no difficulty about making it into a God *with* whom the worshipper ate and drank;⁵ and such an adaptation was as natural for Semites as for Aryans.

But there are clearer clues. Of the legend of Melchizedek, who gave to Abraham a sacramental meal of bread and wine, and who was "King of Peace" and "priest of El

¹ Rhys Davids, *Buddhism*, pp. 140-1.

² Wellhausen, *Prolegomena*, Eng. tr. pp. 111-112.

³ Exod. xviii, 12.

⁴ Deut. xxxii, 31-33, 37-39.

⁵ Cp. Jevons, *Introd. to Hist. of Relig.* pp. 291, 295.

Elyon,"¹ we know that it was a subject of both canonical² and extra-canonical tradition. He was fabled to have been "without father, without mother, without genealogy, having neither beginning of days nor end of life, but made like unto the Son of God."³ As the name meant King of Righteousness, and El Elyon was a Phœnician deity, the legend that Abraham paid him tithes tells simply of one more extra-Yahwistic cult among the Israelites; and the description cited must originally have applied to the Most High God himself. "Self-made" was a title of the Sun-Gods,⁴ and King of Righteousness a title of many Gods (not to mention Buddha) as well as of Yahweh and Jesus.⁵ It is vain to ask whether the bread-and-wine ritual was connected directly with the solar worship,⁶ or with that of a King of Peace who stood for the moon, or both moon and sun; but it suffices that an extra-Israelitish myth connected with such a ritual was cherished among the dispersed Jews of the Hellenistic period. And the use made of the story of Melchizedek by Justin Martyr⁷ and Tertullian,⁸ as proving that a man could be a priest of the true God without being circumcised or observing the Jewish law, would certainly be made of it by earlier Jews of the more cosmopolitan sort.

Further, the denunciations of the prophets against the drink-offerings to other Gods did not veto a eucharist eaten and drunk in the name of Yahweh. Those denunciations to start with are a proof of the commonness of eucharists among the Jews about the exilic period. Jeremiah tells of a usage, specially popular with women, of incense-

¹ Gen. xiv, 18.

² Cp. Ps. cx, 4.

³ Heb. vii, 3. Cp. v, 6, 10; and vii, 11, 17.

⁴ *E.g.*, Helios and Herakles in the *Orphica*, viii, 3; xii, 9. Nature also is "autopator" and "without father." *Id.* x, 10. A Talmudic writer identifies Melchizedek with Shem (*Encyc. Bib. s.v. Melchisedek*).

⁵ Ps. xlv, 6, 7; Heb. i, 8.

⁶ According to one account, wine was never offered in the Greek worship of the Sun-God (Athenæus, xv, 48); but in the assimilation of the cults of Apollo and Dionysos this rule was probably got over, just as in the assimilation of those of Dionysos and Demeter wine was used, though that was originally *nefas* in the worship of the Corn-Goddess. Cp. Servius on Virgil, *Georg.* i, 344, and the discussion in Alexander ab Alexandro, *Genial. Dier.* ed. 1673, i, 695-6, 705-6.

⁷ *Dialogue with Trypho*, c. 19.

⁸ *Adversus Judæos*, cc. 2, 3.

burnings and drink-offerings to the Queen of Heaven.¹ This, as a nocturnal rite, would be a "Holy Supper." And in the last chapters of the Deutero-Isaiah² we have first a combined charge of child-sacrifice and of unlawful drink-offerings against the polytheistic Israelites, and again a denunciation of those who "prepare a table for Gad, and that fill up mingled wine unto Meni."³ Now, Meni, translated "Destiny," is in all likelihood simply Mên the Asiatic Moon-God, who is virtually identified with Selênê-Mênê the Moon-Goddess in the Orphic hymns, and like her was held to be twy-sexed.⁴ In that case Meni is only another aspect of the Queen of Heaven, the wine-eucharist being, as before remarked, a lunar rite. Whether or not this Deus Lunus was then, as later, identified with Mithra, we cannot divine. It suffices that the sacrament in question was extremely widespread.⁵

The allusion to the "mingled wine" apparently implies an objection such as we know existed in Greece to any dilution of the wine devoted to the Wine-God. There the practice was to keep unmixed the cup to the "Good Deity" (*agathos daimon*) Dionysos,⁶ but to mix with water that which was drunk to Zeus the Saviour, he being the rain-

¹ Jer. xliv, 17, 18, 25. Cp. xix, 13; xxxii, 29.

² Isa. lvii, 5-6.

³ Isa. lxxv, 11 (marg.).

⁴ *Orphica*, ix, 1-3; Athenæus, xiii, 71 (v. 15); Gerhard, *Griechische Mythologie*, 1854, § 481, Anh. § 1001 L; Lenormant, *Chaldean Magic*, p. 133; Foucart, *Des Associations religieuses chez les Grecs*, pp. 26, 119; K. O. Müller, *Manual of Ancient Art*, Eng. tr. p. 532. See also below, Pt. III, *Mithraism*, § 5. The Hebraists apparently refuse the identification because the traditional vocalisation of the word in its solitary mention in Isaiah is Mênî—a very insufficient reason as against the implications of Mên and Mênê. Dr. Cheyne (*Encyc. Bib.* art. FORTUNE AND DESTINY) suggests the old Arabic deity Manah or Manât (Koran, Sura liii, 20), as to whom see Sale, *Prelim. Discourse*, ed. 1833, i, 40, 41. The sex of Manah is not clear, but the God seems to have been associated with bloody sacrifices, and to connect with the place Mina, still the valley of sacrifices for Moslems. There is finally a possibility that such a Manah may connect with the mythic "manna," "the bread which the Lord hath given you to eat" (Ex. xvi, 15). The Revised Version and the Kautzsch version not very plausibly decide for the reading "What is it?" as against the alternatives "It is manna" or "It is a portion," on the theory that mân is a contracted Aramaic particle=What? Sayce and Lenormant tell of an Assyrian God of Destiny, Manah, but he seems a bare name.

⁵ Cp. Jerome *in loc.*; Spencer, *De legibus Hebræorum*, ed. 1686, ii, 138-9; Selden, *De Diis Syris*, ed. 1680, pp. 6-8.

⁶ Athenæus, ii, 7, p. 38; xv, 47, 48, pp. 692-3. This had to be merely tasted, by reason of the strength of the unmixed wine of the ancients.

giver.¹ In the worship of Yahweh, whether or not he were originally a variant of Dionysos,² the priests would naturally stipulate for a drink-offering of unmixed wine, since in all likelihood they themselves consumed it,³ though there is a suggestion in the code that it sweetened the burnt-offering.⁴ In Philo Judæus there is a passage which notably combines the idea of the virtue of unmixed wine with that of its mystical connection with human sacrifice:—"Who then is the chief butler of God? The priest who offers libations to him, the truly great high priest who, having received a draught of everlasting graces, offers himself in return, pouring in an entire libation of unmixed wine."⁵ Here, as so often elsewhere in Philo, the conception of sacrifice has become mystical; but his identification of the sacrifice with the Logos, which "pours a portion of blood" for the purposes of the bodily life;⁶ and his comparison of the celestial food of the soul to manna, which the Logos "divides in equal portions among all who are to use it, caring greatly for equality,"⁷ tells of a more concrete interpretation of texts among the more normally religious.

On the other hand, as Yahweh like Zeus was the rain-giver, and good sense vetoed much drinking of the strong unmixed wine, there was no solid reason why in the Hebrew cult also the wine should not be diluted; and in the Talmud we find the act in a measure prescribed,⁸ the practice of the Ebionites and the early Christians⁹ being thus anticipated. In any case, we find the drink-offering of wine expressly connected in one—apparently interpolated

¹ *Id.* ii, 7; xv, 17, p. 675; Diodorus Siculus, iv, 3.

² Cp. *Christianity and Mythology*, pp. 83-84.

³ It was poured out at the base of the altar (Josephus, *Antiq.* iii, 9, § 3: cp. Smith, *Rel. of Semites*, p. 213 and *note*); and it is extremely unlikely that the enormous quantity of wine offered in libations was allowed to drain away as mere sewage. Cp. the tone of Joel, i, 9, 13.

⁴ Num. xv, 7, 10. But cp. v, 24; xxviii, 7; Ex. xxix, 40. Presumably a little of the wine would be thrown on the fire or on the sacrifice.

⁵ *De Somniis*, ii, 27; Yonge's translation.

⁶ *Quis haeres rer. div.* c. 28.

⁷ *Ib.* c. 39.

⁸ "No blessing is to be pronounced over the cup of wine, unless water has first been mixed with it. Such are the words of Rabbi Eleezer (1st c.). But the wise men are not particular." *Berachoth*, fol. 50, col. 1, cited by Hershon, *Genesis*, p. 231, n. 26.

⁹ Cp. Justin Martyr, *Apol.* i, 55-57.

—section of the priestly code¹ with the passover feast of first-fruits and the firstling lamb; and here it is stipulated that no bread shall be eaten till the oblation has been made. Thus both as an orthodoxy and as a heresy a Holy Supper of bread and wine in connection with a symbolic sacrifice of a firstling lamb was known among the pre-Christian Israelites.

What bearing, finally, the practice may have had on the use of the sacred shew-bread of the temple remains problematic; but that the shew-bread stood for some quasi-sacramental meal is the only explanation we have of it.² Concerning the twelve cakes or loaves of fine flour which were placed every sabbath day “upon the holy table before the Lord,” the code prescribed that “it shall be for Aaron and his sons; and they shall eat it in a holy place; for it is most holy unto him of the offerings of the Lord.”³ A sacrament is implied in the description. And when we remember that the oxen sacrificed at the temple of Yahweh wore crowns and had their horns gilt⁴ exactly like those sacrificed by the pagans,⁵ we are entitled to doubt whether the temple-priests did not in most other respects conform to common pagan practice.⁶ Priestly sacramental banquets of flesh and cakes we know to have been usual in Rome.⁷ Even on Judaic principles, however, the priests were likely to make of their sacred loaves—or a few of them, for they were large—a Banquet for Twelve.⁸ According to Maimonides, the daily

¹ Lev. xxiii, 9-14. Verses 8 and 15 appear to have been originally in context.

² Cp. Robertson Smith, *Religion of the Semites*, pp. 207-8; Bähr, *Symbolik des Mosaischen Cultus*, 1835, i, 425-438. Gesenius (*Comm. über den Jesaja*, ii, 287, cited by Bähr) decides that the table of shewbread was simply a *Lectisternium*.

³ Lev. xxiv, 5-9. Cp. Philo Judæus, *De Victimis*, 3.

⁴ Schürer, *Hist. of the Jewish People in the time of Jesus Christ*, 2nd Div. Eng. tr. i, 237.

⁵ Porphyry, *De Abstinencia*, ii, 15, 60.

⁶ On pagan *Lectisternia* and “shewbread” in general, cp. Bähr, as cited.

⁷ Suetonius, *Claudius*, 33; *Vitellius*, 13.

⁸ Cp. Bähr, as cited, p. 430. The fact that Philo (*De Victimis*, 3) and Josephus (*Wars*, v, 5, § 5) refer the number of loaves respectively to the months and to the signs of the zodiac, suggests the presence of the same symbols in other cults; and as the twelve stones on the breastplate of the high-priest stood for the signs of the zodiac (Clem. Alex. *Stromata*, i, 5;

sacrifice required thirteen priests for its performance;¹ and on the principle that the bread and wine constituted a sacrifice, the presiding priest and twelve others would be the fit consumers. We know further that there was a dispute between the school of Shamai and that of Hillel as to the meal on the Sabbath-evening, wherein wine was drunk, the Shamaites holding that a blessing should first be asked on the day, the Hillelites putting first the wine, *which consecrated the day*.² If, then, the loaves and the wine were eaten on the evening following the Sabbath, it would represent a pre-Christian bread-and-wine eucharist or Holy Supper of thirteen priestly persons on the Day of the Sun. In this, as in all sacraments, the God mystically joined; and if the High Priest presided there was in his person a Christos or Anointed One.³

Now, we know (1) that the High Priest officiated on the sabbaths;⁴ (2) that the retiring course of priests received six of the loaves and the incoming one the other six;⁵ and (3) that they were eaten stale, each sabbath's supply being consumed on the next sabbath.⁶ Here then was an apparent necessity for an eating of the sacred bread by the priests in the company of the High Priest, as representing Aaron; and inasmuch as wine was forbidden to all during their period of service⁷ there is an implication that they were free to drink it when their service was over,⁸ that is, on the sabbath day, after the high priest had officiated.⁹

Of course the number may not have been twelve; it may have been twenty-four, the number of the courses of the

Philo, *De Mose*, iii, 12; *De Monarchia*, ii, 5—cp. *De Profugis*, 14, where the patriarchs are divided in two ranks like the signs) there is a strong presumption that the detail came directly from Babylon, where the twelve signs represented twelve Gods (Jastrow, pp. 434, 462-3).

¹ Cited by Conder, *Handbook to the Bible*, p. 109.

² Hershon, *Genesis with a Talm. Comm.* p. 230, n. 11, citing *Succah*, fol. 56, col. 1; and Maimonides, *Hilch. Shabbath*, Sect. 29, *Halachah* 7.

³ Schürer, as cited, pp. 215-216.

⁴ Josephus, *Wars*, v, 5, § 7.

⁵ Schürer, as cited, p. 236, *note*, ref. to *Succah*, v, 7, 8. In the same way there were always six lambs ready for sacrifice. Conder, p. 110.

⁶ Josephus, *Antiq.* iii, 10, § 7.

Ezek. xliv, 21; Lev. x, 8. Cp. Schürer, p. 278.

This is clearly implied by Josephus, *Wars*, v, 5, § 7.

Schürer, pp. 273-4, and refs.

priests¹ and of the heavenly band of "elders" in the Judæo-Christian Apocalypse;² and the bread may have been eaten not with wine but with water. Either way, at least, there was a sacrament very much on the later Christian lines; and this suffices for our theory, which does not require that we should find in the very temple a close Judaic precedent for the Christian weekly supper of bread and wine. Indeed there is a presumption that it originated, as before suggested, outside of the immediate sphere of the temple priesthood. But the fact that there was a certain precedent in the priestly practice would be a point in favour of an outside rite, which might conceivably be specialised among the Twelve Apostles of the High Priest, whose official function is the real basis of the myth of the Twelve Apostles of Jesus.³ Even this hypothesis, in turn, is not essential to our theory of sacramental evolution. It suffices that beyond all question there were many Gentile precedents for the eucharist, and that its connection with the Lord's Day⁴ was quite independent of the myth of the Lord's resurrection on the first day of the week; the rite being so fixed in both its solar and its lunar connection, which was implicit in the cults of Dionysos and Mithra, both of them two-formed, and both combining the attributes of sun and moon.⁵ And as the myth of the sacrifice of the God-Man as king, and the kindred sacrament of the Lamb-God, were derived through Judaic channels, there is a presumption that the habitual rites of the first Christists came in the same way. On that view it remains to trace further the Judaic evolution.

¹ *Id.*, pp. 219, 275. Cp. Conder, p. 108.

² Rev. iv, 10, etc. This number probably came from the twenty-four "counsellor-Gods" of the Babylonian religion (Tiele, *Hist. comp.*, p. 249), where the golden tables of Bel (Herod. i, 181, 183) may have served for a lectisternium. Cp. Bähr, *Symbolik des Mosaischen Cultus*, i, 438.

³ *Christianity and Mythology*, p. 370.

⁴ That the word *Kyriakos* is not a Christian coinage is now fully established. See Deismann in *Encyc. Bib.* s.v. LORD'S DAY, citing his own *Neue Bibelstudien*, 1897, p. 44, sq.

⁵ Below, Part III, § 5; *Orphica*, xxx, 2, 3; xlii, 4. The double sex of Dionysos in the mysteries is often ignored by the mythologists. *E.g.*, Preller does not give his epithets *διφύης* and *διμορφος*; and Gerhard (§ 451, 1) makes the latter term apply to his different ages and animal shapes.

§ 13.—*Special Features of the Crucifixion Myth.*

Of the evolution of the Jewish religion between the closing of the Hebrew canon and the rise of Jesuism we know, broadly, that it consisted in (1) the establishment of the doctrine of a future life, in despite of its complete absence from the Mosaic law; (2) the development of the belief in a Messiah who should either restore the temporal power of Jewry or bring in a new religious world; (3) the growth of the idea of an only begotten Son of God, otherwise the Word, who is alternately the nation of Israel and a God who represents it;¹ and (4) the growth of independent sects or movements, such as that of the Essenes. Of the historical circumstances we know more. They included, as we have seen, a recurrent paganisation of portions of the priesthood; an interlude of absolute pagan domination; and finally, after a period of triumph for the traditional faith, the advent of an Idumean dynasty, far from zealous for orthodox Judaism.

During centuries of this evolution, the Jewish people tasted many times the bitterness of despair, the profound doubt denounced by the last of the prophets; and in periods in which many went openly over to Hellenism it could not be but that ancient rites of the Semitic race were revived, as some are declared to have been in earlier times of trouble. Among the rites of expiation and propitiation, as we have seen, none stood traditionally higher than the sacrifice of a king or a king's son; and such an act the Jews saw as it were performed for them when the Romans under Antony, at Herod's wish, scourged and crucified Antigonus, the last of the Asmonean priest-kings, in the year 37 B.C.² In a reign in which two king's sons were slain by their own father, the idea would not disappear; but in so far as it held its ground as a religious doctrine it would in all likelihood do so by being reduced to ritual

¹ Ps. ii, 6, 7, 12; lxxxix, 26, 27; Heb. i, 2-12.

² Dio Cassius, xlix, 23. Cp. note in *Christianity and Mythology*, p. 396. It is almost certain that Josephus would suppress such a detail if he knew it; but if the detail in Dio be doubted on the score of his lateness, it would still point to a tradition of king-crucifying.

form, like the leading worships of the surrounding Gentile world. In the case of nearly every God who mythically died and rose again—as Osiris, Dionysos, Attis, Adonis, and Mithra—the creed of the God's power to give immortal life was maintained by a ritual sacrament, generally developed into a mystery-drama. Such a mystery-drama, however, would be at bottom a perpetuation of the latest form of the primitive rite as it had been publicly performed; and as we have seen in the Gospel myth the clear trace of the ancient usage of disabling or drugging the victim to make him seem a willing sufferer, so we may infer from it that the latest public form of the human sacrifice in some Syrian communities was the sacrificing of *three* criminals together.

Of a sacrifice of this special number the explanation may very well be the great and then growing vogue of the number three in eastern mysticism. Among the Dravidians of India we have seen three victims sacrificed to the Sun-God.¹ In the legendary sacrifice of Saul's sons there figured the sacred and planetary number seven, which appears also in the special "restoration feast" of the Hervey and other South Sea islanders;² in the legendary sacrifice of the kings by Joshua we have the older planetary number, five; and in western as in eastern Asia the number three might naturally have its votaries, in respect of trinitarian concepts as well as of the primary notion of "the heavens, the earth, and the underworld," with their respective Gods.³ There is even a hint of such possible developments in the single sacrifice of the Khonds to the Earth-Goddess, wherein the victim was kept for three days bound to a post which was often placed between two shrubs, before being finally sacrificed at a post around which were usually set up four larger posts.⁴ But there is an explanation

¹ Above, p. 112.

² J. Williams, *Narrative of Missionary Enterprises*, 1837, p. 549. The feast in question was one of re-sanctification, after an invasion.

³ Thus the Assyrian temples had sometimes three terraces, for the Gods of the "three worlds"; sometimes five, for the five planets; and sometimes seven, for the planets and sun and moon. Tiele, *Outlines*, p. 75.

⁴ Macpherson, *Memorials*, pp. 118, 127.

lying in the nature and purpose of the sacrifice, which was probably the determining cause of the detail in the Syrian rite.

The tradition, we have seen, called for a king or a king's son; but a victim of royal blood was normally out of the question; and whether by consent of latitudinarian kings or high-priests, or by way of simple popular licence, the natural evolution would be that which took place in a similar connection elsewhere—the sacrificing of condemned criminals in the capacity of kings or kings' first-born sons. But, as has been already remarked, though this substitution was quite acceptable to the average mind, there was something repugnant to the higher doctrine of sacrifice in the selection of a criminal, who was morally the analogue of the blemished animal, rejected by nearly all sacrificial rituals. How then could the compulsion of such a choice be best reconciled with the purpose and spirit of the rite? By a device framed in the spirit of "sympathetic magic," which was in fact the spirit of all such rites. The sacrificers could by their ritual of mock-crowning and robing distinguish one of the malefactors from his fellows; and by calling the others what they were, while he was paraded as king, they would attain the semblance of a truly august sacrifice. If in any Jewish community, or in the Jewish quarter of any eastern city, the central figure in this rite were customarily called Jesus Barabbas, "Jesus the Son of the Father"—whether or not in virtue of an old cultus of a God Jesus who had died annually like Attis and Tammuz—we should have the basis for the tradition so long preserved in many MSS. of the first gospel, and at the same time a basis for the whole gospel myth of the crucifixion. And when we remember how the common attitude towards criminals permitted the strange survival of human sacrifice in the Thargelia at Athens, we can hardly doubt that eastern cities could on the same pretext be as conservative of ancient usage.

That such a victim should be at times chosen and freed in advance, and permitted a measure of sexual licence as well as a semblance of royal state, is quite conceivable.

The usage of a year's dedication or respite seems to have been general in connection with such sacrifices, alike among Asiatics, Greeks, Polynesians, and American aborigines; we have seen it among Strabo's Albanians; and there are clear traces of it among the Arabs just before the time of Mohammed.¹ At an early stage of civilisation, indulgence to a victim so situated would be a matter of course on many grounds. Perhaps the most suggestive of all is the case of the *Asvamedha*² or horse-sacrifice among the ancient Hindus. Concerning this the doctrine runs that kings who received from a Brahman a certain special anointing and "made the sacrifice of the horse" were thereby enabled to attain boundless conquests.³ With regard to the horse so sacrificed it was stipulated in the ritual that during an entire year beforehand it must be left free to wander at its will, carefully protected the while by guards set to the task.⁴ As this horse is further clearly identified with the sun,⁵ there can be little doubt that it was a substitute for a more ancient human sacrifice to the Sun-God, and was on that account regarded as of overwhelming efficacy.⁶

We are now prepared to understand that the freedom permitted to the Babylonian mock-king before the *Sacæa* originated, not, as has been suggested,⁷ by way of making the mock-king commit the act of technical high treason, entering the harem, but as a result of the contingent divinity of the

¹ Pococke, *Specimen Histor. Arab.*, 1650, p. 72, citing Al Meidani and Ahmed Ebn Yusef; Sale, *Preliminary Discourse to the Koran*, 1883, pp. 44-45. Cp. Robertson Smith, *Rel. of the Semites*, pp. 343-4, as to the experience of Nilus among the Sinaitic Arabs in the fourth century. A variation in respect of time occurs among the Khonds in the sacrifice of the buffalo to Boora Pennu as a divinely ordained surrogate for the human victim. It is "consecrated at its birth and allowed to range at will over all fields and pastures until five or six years old." When it is to be sacrificed, a crowd of men fasten ropes to its neck and hind legs and rush about with it till it is brought exhausted to the sacrificial tree, "when the priest declares its submission to be a miracle." Macpherson, *Memorials*, p. 108. Cp. Crooke, *Folk-Lore of N. W. India*, i, 173, as to drugged animal victims.

² Otherwise the *Ashummeed Jugg*. See an account of a late form of the rite in Halhed's *Code of Gentoo Laws*, ed. 1777, ch. iii, sect. ix, p. 112.

³ Senart, *Essai sur la légende de Buddha*, 2e édit. p. 66.

⁴ *Id.* p. 69.

⁵ *Id.* pp. 72-73.

⁶ In the *Mahābhārata* (ii, 524 sq. cited by Senart, pp. 66-67) there is mention of a tyrant who, like Joshua, sacrifices *kings* to the Supreme God.

⁷ By Mr. Lang, *Magic and Religion*, p. 198.