

B. T. 9

A N

E S S A Y *R*

ON THE

NATURE, DESIGN, and
ORIGIN,

OF

SACRIFICES.

By W. Sykes.



L O N D O N :

Printed for J. and P. KNAPTON, at the *Crowns*
in *Ludgate-Street*. M DCC XLVIII.

THE
P R E F A C E.

SACRIFICES are known to have been in Use generally all over the World, from the earliest days to the time when Christianity had made great Progress in it: And the Heathen treated *Christians* at first, as *Atheists*, and *Impious*, because They refused to comply with the usual religious Customs of the Country in which They lived. The way which the *Christians* took to vindicate themselves for *refusing to sacrifice*, was, partly to shew the *Weakness* and *Absurdity* of the Heathen way of Worship; and partly to produce *Authorities* from their *Philosophers* and *Wise Men*, who had in their Writings condemned *all Animal Sacrifices*, or had given Reasons to shew

that such a Service could not make men acceptable to God. On these points the Cause seems chiefly to have rested; and the Fathers thought that They had done enough to justify Themselves for embracing a Religion in which *no Sacrifices* were offered but the spiritual ones of *Prayer*, and *Praise*, and *Thanksgiving*, when they had cited the Authorities of the Wisest and Ablest Heathens, who had expressly declared against all other Service or Worship but that of the Mind.

Thus, *e. g.* Because *Porphyry* had confessed, * “ That you ought not to *burn*
 “ *Incense*, or to *sacrifice*, to the God of
 “ all; nor ought you to imagine Those
 “ to be Gods who take pleasure in the
 “ *Sacrifice of Animals* ” : That “ it is
 “ the most *unrighteous* thing in the world
 “ to *Sacrifice Living Creatures* : ” That
 “ it is *impious*, and *detestable*, and *preju-*
 “ *dicial*, and therefore it cannot be pleasing

* Ὁμολογεῖ μὴ δεῖν τὸ καθόλου μηδὲν μῆτε θυσιᾶν, μῆτε θυεῖν τῷ ἐπὶ πᾶσι θεῶν.—μὴ χρῆναι—θεὸς ὑπολαμβάνειν τοὺς τῶν ζώων θυσίαις χαίροντας. Ἔστι γὰρ φησὶ πάντων ἀδικώτατον τὸ ζωοθυεῖν, καὶ ἀνόσιον, καὶ μυσσαρὸν, καὶ βλαβερὸν, καὶ οὐκ οὐδὲν μηδὲ θεοῖς προσφιλὲς. *Euseb. Præp. Evang.* l. iv. c. 10.

“ to the Gods ” to offer Sacrifice ; —
 Because, I say, He had made this Con-
 fession, The *Christian Apologist* readily
 laid hold of This to justify the Wor-
 ship of the One God and Father of all *
 “ with a *Mind* free from all Malice ; and
 “ with a *Body* adorned with the Orna-
 “ ment of *Chastity* and *Temperance* ; and
 “ with the *holding of right Notions*, wor-
 “ thy of God and suitable to his Nature ;
 “ and above all these,” says he, “ we
 “ pray that we may with a *right Dispo-*
 “ *sition* keep up and maintain that *Godli-*
 “ *ness* which our Saviour commanded,
 “ even unto Death.” And no doubt
 so far he reasoned right from his Adver-
 sary’s confessions,—That if it was *detest-*
able and *impious* to sacrifice *living crea-*
tures, it could not be blameable to abstain
 from such a Worship, or to use That only
 of an *upright Heart* and a *pure Mind*.

Eusebius goes on to cite from *Porphyry*

» Νῶν πάσης κεκαθαρισμένῳ κακίας, καὶ σώματι τὸν ἐξ ἀγ-
 ρείας καὶ ἰσχυροσύνης κόσμον — περιβεβλημένῳ, δόγμασι τε
 ὀρθαῖς καὶ θεοπρεπέσι, καὶ ἐπὶ πᾶσι τέτοις, διαθήσει γνησίᾳ τῆς
 ὑπὸ τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν παραδοθεῖσας εὐσέβειαν μεχρὶ καὶ θά-
 νάτῃ φυλάττειν εὐχόμεθα. *Ibid.*

a passage in which he says, that * “ no-
 “ thing material can be otherwise than
 “ 'impure to an immaterial Being.” And
 at length he concludes, that since *Por-*
phyry acknowledges, † “ that They are
 “ no Gods who *take pleasure in Sacri-*
 “ *fices*, therefore neither the Aerial, nor
 “ Cœlestial, nor Ætherial, nor Subterres-
 “ trial Deities, were Gods ; no nor *Apollo*
 “ himself, who had by his Oracle com-
 “ manded Sacrifice.” *Porphyry*, who had
 pleaded for all these Sorts of Deities, could
 not with any pretence evade the force of
 this reasoning : And the *Christians* could
 not but triumph over their Adversaries and
 Calumniators.

But still a difficulty remained, which
Eusebius did not meddle with ; and That
 was in relation to the *Jewish Sacrifices*.
Porphyry's Arguments were levelled against
 all *Animal Sacrifices* : and consequently
 They might be urged very justly by *Chris-*

* Οὐδέν ἔνυλον ὁ μὴ τῷ αὐτῷ ἑυθὺς ἐστὶ ἀκάθαρτον. c. 11.

† Οὐκ ἦν ἄρα Θεός, ἔθ' ἂν τις ἀψευδὴς καὶ ἀγαθὸς δαίμων,
 ὁ τὰς δι' αἱμάτων λοιπὰς τε καὶ κνίσας μικρῶ πρόσθεν ἐισ-
 πραττόμενος χρησμῶδες· οὐδ' ἐκεῖνοι πάντες, οἷς ὁ χρησμὸς
 δεινὸν ζῶν παρεκελεύσατο. Πλάτων ἄρα καὶ ἀπατεῶνα—
 προσταξάντα μὴ μόνον τοῖς χθονίοις, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς οὐρανίοις—
 ζωαῖν. c. 14.

tians in Justification of themselves; who used no Sacrifices. But then, if His reasoning was good, “ That they to whom “ the Heathen sacrificed were not Gods, “ because They commanded *Animal Sa-* “ *crifices*”, must it not follow, that He that commanded the *Jews* to offer up *Animal Sacrifices* could not be God? But *Eusebius* entered not into this Question, but only answered *ad hominem*; and justified Himself, and refuted his Adversary’s Arguments so far only as *Christians* were immediately concerned, without speaking to the Reason of this mode of Worship.


In the following Papers I have endeavoured to shew what I take to have been the ground of this Practice. It may appear to *Us* very *disagreeable*, and *odd*, to offer up *Animal Sacrifices* unto God: But the universal practice of the world shews that it did not appear so to them of old. If one can assign a *rational* ground of this way of worship, that is all I aim at: And since all agree, that there is no *express* Assertion in the Sacred Writings, that this Mode of Religious
Worship

Worship was instituted or appointed by God at the beginning, I cannot think that They argue right, who infer from the *Disagreeableness*, or the *Oddness*, or even * *our not being able to understand the Reason or Usefulness* of Sacrificing, that therefore it must have been originally a *Divine Institution*. But as the *Rationale* of Sacrifices is dark, and has never been duly considered as it deserves, (at least it does not appear to me to have been so) I have endeavoured to throw some Light upon this Subject; and I shall only add,

———— *Si quid novisti rectius istis
Candidus imperti: Si non his utere mecum.*

* Maimonides mentions some that argued— Si ratio et Utilitas illarum [Legum] non possit intelligi, tum extra omne dubium esse, quod a Deo Originem suam trahant, cum ratione humana non possint intelligi. *More Nevoc.* l. iii. c. 31.

E R R A T A.

- P. 31. l. 22. for, *in all*, r. *in almost all*.
 56. l. 16. for, *Woman*, r. *Women*.
 p. 102. l. 2. for, *Six*, r. *Five*.
 p. 112. l. 18. for, *Construction*, r. *Observation*.
 p. 257. l. 8. for, *be*, r. *by*.
 p. 309. l. 9. r. 
 p. 288. *Note*, for, *Cætu*, r. *cætui*.

A N

E S S A Y

O N T H E

N A T U R E, D E S I G N, & c.

AS a right Notion of the Nature and Design of Sacrifices is of great consequence to the right Understanding of many passages of Scripture, and the manner of Religious Worship by them appears to have been in use from the earliest Antiquity, and the Reasonableness of such a Worship seems not very clear, it may be worth while to enquire into the Origin and Design of such a Practice. It seems indeed very strange, that when true Religion consists in the worship of God *in Spirit and in Truth*, a manner of Worship should uni-
B versally

versally prevail in the world, which consisted in the Slaughter of Animals, or in consuming the good things which God had given to Mankind, by throwing them into the flames, or otherwise destroying them : And it is as strange to conceive that God himself (who is a Spirit, and should be treated as a Spiritual Being) should enjoin, or institute, or require such a seemingly unnatural manner of worship. Or if it be said that Men invented it, or fell into it thro' Folly, or Superstition, or Ignorance of the nature of God, it is as hard to conceive that God by a Positive Institution should command, or even allow to his own People such a strange Invention of Men. Were Sacrifices deemed the *Food* of God? Was he thought to take pleasure in the *Fumes* or *Smoak* of them? Or were they offered to induce him to lay aside Anger, and become Merciful, Good, and Kind? Whence could such a Notion arise? Or what Connexion is there between *Burning* an *Animal*, and removing *Displeasure*, that *Blood*, in such a particular manner offered, should be conceived a possible means to such an

End?

End? Or is it reasonable to suppose that when any *Man* had sinn'd, an innocent Ox, or a Sheep, that never had offended, could be made his *Substitute*; or that its Blood would be accepted as an Equivalent, or a Satisfaction for a real Criminal? *Arnobius* has urged These, and several other Objections against the *Heathen* Sacrifices, with a great deal of Wit and Spirit, with a Beauty and Strength that is very uncommon: But had his Adversaries applied to the *Jewish* Sacrifices the same Difficulties which he had objected to the *Heathen*, it does not appear so certain and clear, How He would have removed them, or got rid of what they might have resorted upon Him.

It is certainly true, that the *Reason* of this way of Worship has not been so fully considered as it ought. And even where the Command of this Practice is so express, and the Practice it self was so customary, yet the *Ground* of it is rarely mentioned. Hence perhaps it may be thought impossible to discover the *Reason*, or to determine any thing about the *Origin* of this Mode of Worship: Or perhaps it

may be looked upon by some as a mere matter of Curiosity to concern one's self in such Enquiries. But every one must be left to judge for Himself; and as I for my Part think it a matter of Importance, I shall endeavour to trace it from its Origin: And if one cannot arrive at *absolute Certainty* in so obscure and difficult a point, we must be content with *Probability*: or if one cannot be *sure* of the *Ground* of a Custom, by reason of its very remote Antiquity, one ought not to reject the Light one may have, because one has not the Brightness of the Mid-day Sun.

To begin then with defining what I mean by the word *Sacrifice*. Whatever is given or offered in a Solemn manner immediately to God, so as that Part of it, or the Whole is consumed, is what is meant by the Word *Sacrifice*. Whether it be upon an Altar, or what is used instead of an Altar; whether it be by Fire, or in any other manner, is not material: But there must be a *Gift*, or *Oblation* of it, whatever the Subject, or Matter may be; and

and it must be offered to *God* ; and there must be a *Consumption* of it. If a heap of Stones, or the common Earth, or a private *Hearth* was used to burn a piece of Flesh on, That makes no difference : Or if a Libation was made, and the Wine, or whatever it was, was poured upon the Earth, or into the Sea : Or if the Entrails of an Animal were cast into the Sea, as an Oblation to the Gods of the Sea, it was a proper Sacrifice, provided the Oblation was consumed in the proper manner.

Thus when *Virgil* says,
Dii, quibus imperium est pelagi, quorum
æquora curro,
Vobis lætus ego hoc candentem in littore
Taurum
Constituan ante aras, voti reus, Extaque
Salsos
Porriciam in fluctus, et vina liquentia
fundam.

Æn. l. v. 235, &c.

The Sea was the proper place on which the Entrails were given and consumed.

*Macrobius** has justly observed that the word *porriciam*, is here the proper Sacrificial term. For whenever they of Old laid any Entrails upon their Altars, or what was the *proper place* to put them on, be it Sea or Land, Water or Earth, *That* was the Term by which they expressed that Action: and consequently, *Porriciam*, not *Projiciam*, is the true Reading. When therefore Sacrifice was made to the Sea Gods, they cast the Entrails, or the Flesh of the Animal into the Sea; and that was the proper place for offering to the Sea Gods, on which their part of the thing sacrificed was *consumed*. In short there was always to be such a *Consumption* of the thing offered to God, that the Proprietor could never have or enjoy the whole again for his own use. Now whatever it is that in this manner is offered immediately to God, and in part or in whole is *consumed* in a proper manner, is what I call a *Sacrifice*.

There is certainly much difference, in the use of the *Latin* word, *Sacrificium*, among old Writers. They often under-

* *Macrobius, Saturn. l. iii. c. 2.*

stood by that word, not the *thing offered* to any of their Gods, but the *whole religious ceremonies* which were observed; the *ἱεργυία*; their whole religious Rites which consisted of many parts, whether any Victim was offered or not. *Plautus* makes *Rem divinam facere*, and *sacrificare*, to be the same. *Amphit.* Act. iii. Sc. 3. *Rudens.* Act. i. Sc. 2. *Ovid* has used that word for the Oblation of a *Victim* to God.

Bos arietem, ignavam Sacrificate Suem.

Fast. iv. lin. 415.

Lactantius has used the Word for * a *Victim*, and whatever things are burnt upon an *Altar*.

There are those who think that by the word *Sacrifice*, among the *Jews*, is meant, “ Whatever will come under the
“ general Word, *Corban*, i. e. a *Sacred*
“ *Gift*. And this they divide into Two
“ general Classes, *Bloody Sacrifices*, and
“ *unbloody ones*, or *Sacrifices of inani-*
“ *mate things*.” Thus does the learned

* *Sacrificium est Victima, et quæcunque in ara cremantur.* *Lact.* l. vi. cap. ult.

L'enfant in his † Preface to the New Testament speak : and as he has limited what he is saying, to Sacrifices “ *properly so called*”, it is not amiss. But the general word, *Corban*, in their customary Language takes in *all* Sorts of *Gifts to God* : And therefore Things that are not Sacrifices, as well as Those which are so, may be comprehended under that word. It seems therefore to me more accurate to distinguish between the *Gifts*, or Offerings made to God, that were *not consumed*, nor designed to be so, and such *Gifts* as were *consumed*. The Children of Israel made an Offering unto the Lord of Gold, and Silver, and Brass, and Blue, and Purple—and Rams Skins died red, and Badger Skins, and Shittim Wood and Oil, &c. Exod. xxxv. 5—9. These were a *Sacred Gift*, a proper *Gift* to God, as they were designed for his Tabernacle. But yet they do not come under the Notion of *Sacrifices*, because tho’ they were

† A l’égard des Sacrifices *proprement ainsi nommes*, et connus sous le nom general de *Corban*, c’est a dire, don Sacré, on les peut partager en deux Classes generales, en Sacrifices sanglants, et en Sacrifices non sanglants, ou Sacrifices de choses inanimees. *L'enfant Preface General*, p. 96.

offered to God, yet they were not any way *consumed*, nor designed to be so. They were, or might have been, what the *Greeks* called, Ἀναθήματα, or by a more general word Δῶρον, or Ἀφάιρεμα; i. e. *Presents*, or *Gifts*, or what a man *parted with* out of his Substance, towards the Building of, or for an Ornament for, or to be repositèd in, the Temple or Tabernacle: But they were not *Sacrifices*, because there was no *Consumption* of them: Nor were they designed for the purpose of *Sacrifices*, tho' they were properly *Corbanoth*, or *sacred Gifts*.

They who make, *Sacrifice*, and *Gift to God*, the same, may seem to have the Authority of the Best Writers to justify their Notion. *Virgil* certainly was a most exact and accurate Observer of the *Jus Pontificium*, and he may be thought to have made use of the word, *Gifts*, general as it is, for *Sacrifices*.

—————*Huc dona Sacerdos*

*Cum tulit, et cæsarum ovium, sub nocte
 silenti*

Pellibus incubuit stratis—————

Æn. vii.

But

But this passage will by no means prove *Gifts to God*, and *Sacrifices*, to be the same; but only that *Sacrifices* might come under the denomination of *Gifts*. The most accurate Writers always, I think, confine the word *Sacrifice*, to such Gifts as are *consumed*; and if at any time they use another form of Expression, the circumstances of what they are speaking about will determine their Meaning. When *Virgil* here used the general word, *Gifts*, He tells us of the *slain Sheep*, and of their *Skins* on which *the Priests lay all night* in order to know the Will of God: which evidently shews what Sorts of *Gifts* he is speaking of. Accordingly *Lactantius* in the place before cited justly distinguished between *Gift*, and *Sacrifice*. By *Gift* says he * is meant, “ Whatever is made
 “ of Gold or Silver, or wove of Purple
 “ and Silk: a *Sacrifice* signifies a Vic-
 “ tim and whatever is *burnt* upon an
 “ Altar.”

* Donum est, quicquid Auro Argentoque fabricatur; Sacrificium est victima, et quæcunque in Ara cremantur. *Lact.* lib vi. c. ult.

Reland has observed, not with his usual Accuracy, “ That † All Oblations which
 “ were consecrated to God by certain Rites
 “ appointed by him, and were *consumed*,
 “ are called by the general name of *Cor-*
 “ *banoth*. These when they consisted of
 “ Animals, or of Meal, or Oil, Wine,
 “ and Frankincense, are divided into Two
 “ Species, *viz.* Bloody Oblations, which
 “ has commonly obtained the name of
 “ *Sacrifices*; the unbloody ones are called
 “ Meat or Drink Offerings.”

It is certainly true, that the general word, *Corban*, comprehends Both these Species of Oblations. See *Lev.* i. 1. — ii. 1. But then it is true too, that *Corban* sometimes signifies at large, *a Gift*, such a one as is spoken of *Mark* vii. 11. where it extends to many other things besides *Sacrifices*. Use had made it signify a

† Omnes Oblationes quæ secundum Voluntatem Dei certis ritibus ei sacratæ consumebantur, generali nomine *Corbanoth* appellabantur. Hæ cum vel ex Animalibus consistunt, vel ex farina, Oleo, Vino et Thure, in duas species discedunt; quarum illa, scilicet cruentæ Oblationes, *Sacrificiorum* nomen vulgo accepit; hæc vero scilicet incruentæ, Fertorum et Libaminum. *Reland Antiq.* p. 278.

Sacred Gift, or a *Gift to God* : and tho' it be rendered by a general word Δῶρον, or *Gift* ; yet the circumstances of the Passages where it so occurs shew, that it means only such Gifts as belong to God. In like manner there were *Persons* who *
 “ voluntarily devoted themselves to the
 “ Service of God, and called themselves
 “ *Corban*. These if they desired to be
 “ discharged from that Ministry, whether
 “ they were Men or Women, were to
 “ pay a certain price ; a Woman Thirty,
 “ a Man Fifty Sicles.” So *Josephus* ;
 who observes that *Corban* signifies Δῶρον
 in Greek. And so *St. Mark* : *If a Man*
shall say to his Father or Mother, it is
Corban, that is to say a Gift, by whatso-
ever thou mayest be profited, c. vii. 11.
 He alludes to a common practice among
 the *Jews* of consecrating, or giving to
 the use of the Temple, *Gifts* or *Dona-*
tions, which might have been serviceable
 to their indigent Parents, had they not

* Καὶ οἱ Κορβᾶν αὐτὸς ὀνομάζονται τῷ Θεῷ Δῶρον δὲ
 τὸτο σημαίνει καὶ ἑλλήνων γλώττιαν. Εὐλομένους ἀφίεσθαι
 τῆς λειτουργίας τοῖς ἱερεῦσι καταβάλλειν ἀργύριον, γυναῖκα μὲν
 τριάκοντα σίκλους, ἄνδρα δὲ πενήκοντα. *Josep. Ant. l. iv. c. 4.*

obliged

obliged themselves by Vows or Promise to part with them for holy Uses; and under this Cover they too, often excused themselves from succouring Father or Mother. But this only shews that *Corban* is not properly Δῶρον, but ἱερὸν δῶρον, or a *Sacred Gift*; a word of much larger Extent than what is meant by *Sacrifice*.

Another General word made use of by the *Jews* for *Sacrifices* is נָתַתָּה, which signifies properly *Gifts*, and is as general as the *English* word, *Gift*. Accordingly it is used for *Gifts* given by God to Men, or by Men to God, or by Men to one another. Thus, *Unto the Sons of the Concubines which Abraham had, Abraham gave Gifts, Gen. xxv. 6.* It is applied to the *Heave Offerings* and *Wave Offerings* of the Children of *Israel*, *Numb. xviii. 11.* and these are called their *Gift*. In *Ecclesiastes c. iii. 13.* it is used for the Gift of God to Man—*Every man should eat and drink, and enjoy the good of all his Labours, it is the Gift of God.* This word then is of a much greater Extent, and more comprehensive than *Corban*, and is interpreted by the LXX. Δόμα, and

and sometimes Δῶρον : and means any Gift, in general ; whereas *Corban* is only applied to a *Gift to God*.

There is a Third word, which is almost always applied to certain *Gifts to God*, yet not so universally but that it sometimes means *Gifts to Men*. It is תְּרוּמָה, *Therumah*. The *first Gifts* which the *Children of Israel* presented unto God in the *Wilderness*, and which were designed for the Use or Ornament of the *Tabernacle*, as well as for the Building of it, whether they were of *Metals*, or *precious Stones*, or *Skins of Beasts*, or *curious Colours*, whatever was proper for this purpose that was offered willingly, went under this name. It is highly probable, that they had this name from their being *moved upwards and downwards* at their donation to the Lord of all. The *LXX.* have translated this word by ἀπαρχὴς, *First - fruits*, *Exod. xxv. 2, 3.* The Things that were given, *Gold and Silver*, and *Brass*, and *Blue*, and *Purple*, and *Scarlet*, and *fine linnen*, and *Goats-hair*, &c. shew plainly, that this Offering to the Lord was not the *First-fruits* of
of

of the *Earth*, (which ἀπαρχὰι usually signifies) but it was the *beginning of the Jews Oblations* to God, and from thence it had that name. Sometimes this word is translated by Ἐισφορά, a *Tribute* to the Lord. *A half Shekel shall be the Offering of the Lord*, Exod. xxx. 13. i. e. a *Tribute* which every one of the children of *Israel*, that passeth among those that are numbered, was to pay unto the Lord. At other times it is translated ἀφαίρεμα, and ἀφόρισμα; we render it a *Wave Offering*. The LXX. keep to the Idea, not so much of a *Gift*, as of what is *separated* or *taken* from mens own Property; without regarding the design of such Separation. In the Book of *Proverbs* we find this word used in the Sense of a *Tribute*, tho' we translate it, *Gifts*. *The King by Judgment stablisheth the Land, but he that receiveth Gifts (it is the Original, A man, Therumoth) overthroweth it*, Exod. xxix. 4. The Wise man means, a great *Exactor of Tributes*, a King that is a rigid *Exactor of Tributes*, destroys a Nation.

By this we may judge of the general Names of Sacrifices. *Every Gift to God*
 was

was not a *Sacrifice* : Every Offering was not a *Sacrifice*. Nothing was a *Sacrifice*, but what was brought and offered immediate to God, and *consumed* in part or whole. But when any thing was given to God, and was kept *entire*, or if it was consumed upon the Altar, yet was not given immediate to God, but was designed to serve some other Use (*e. g.* the *Wood* which was placed upon the Altar in order to consume the Flesh, or the Meat and Drink Offering) — This was not a *Sacrifice*, tho' perhaps a *Gift to the Altar* ; and it is possible in given cases it might be called *Corban*; or a *Therumah*. And hence it was, as Dr. *Outram* has well observed, * “ That neither the *Levites*, nor the
 “ *Vessels* for Sacred Uses, tho' they were
 “ offered unto God, are wont to be
 “ reckoned *Sacrifices*. And the same is
 “ to be said of the *Scape Goat*, which
 “ being offered to God before the Altar,

* Quo factum est, ut nec Levitæ, neque Ministerii sacri vasa, etiamsi Deo offerrentur, Sacrificiis accenseri solent. Quod idem quoque Statuendum de Hirco isto qui Deo ante aram oblatus, in desertum *vivus* abducebatur. *Outram. de Sacrificiis*, p. 82.

“ was carried away alive into the Wilder-
 “ nefs.” He then goes on to define Sa-
 crifices very rightly,— “ Such things as
 “ were offered to God so as to be *rite*
 “ *consumenda*, to be consumed in the
 “ solemn manner appointed.”

The usual distinction of Sacrifices is into *Bloody* and *Unbloody*. The Former of these are called *Zebachim*, the Latter *Minchoth*. But this Distinction is not so constant as never to admit of Exception. For *Cain* and *Abel's* Sacrifices, tho' one was *Bloody*, and the Other *Unbloody*, were Both called by the word, *Mincha*. And it is certain that *Mincha* is a general word for a *Present*, Gen. xxxii. 13. Later Use has pretty much confined this word to Oblations of Flower, or Meal; and in this it differ'd from the *Zebachim*, which implied such Oblations as were *slain*. *Abarbinel* tells us, that * the “ word “ *Zebach*, and the word *Corban* were not

* Verbum *Zebach* et Verbum *Corban* non sunt Synonoma, ut semper idem Significant. Omne *Zebach* est *Corban*, at vero non convertitur ut omne *Corban* sit *Zebach*. Nam *Zebach* dicitur de Vivis immolatis et quæ tum adolebantur in Ara. Nam Immolatio seu *Zebicha* est jugulatio. *Abarb. Exord. Comment in Levit. c. i.*

“ Synonomous, so as that you might use
 “ the one or the other for the same thing.
 “ Every *Zebach* was a *Corban*; but the
 “ reverse was not true, that every *Corban*
 “ was a *Zebach*. For the Term *Zebach*,
 “ was applied only to such *living* things,
 “ as had their Throats cut, and were
 “ offered upon the Altar.” For the Truth
 of this Observation he cites *Deut. xii. 21.*
 And then he goes on to observe, “ * Every
 “ *Zebach* was a *Corban*, a Gift offered
 “ upon the Altar : But there is a *Corban*
 “ [i. e. a Gift] which is not a *Zebach*,
 “ e. g. The *Corban* of a *Bird*, because
 “ in that case there is no *cutting the*
 “ *Throat*; and likewise the *Mincha* [or
 “ Meat Offering] was called a *Corban*.”
 According therefore to Him the word
Zebach relates only to the Gifts or Ob-
 lations of *Bullocks*, *Sheep*, and *Goats*, in
 their respective Species; and does not take
 in *Birds*. But whether the word *Zebach*,
 which signifies to *slay*, be only to be ap-

* Omne *Zebach* est *Corban*, quod adolebatur in ara.
 Verum est *Corban* quod non est *Zebach*, e. g. Oblatio
 Volucris, quoniam in eâ non est jugulatio; et *Mincha* etiam
 vocatur *Corban*. *Abarb. Exor. Comment. in Levit. c. i.*

plied to all other Animals, and not to Birds, is not very material. The taking away the Life of a Bird in order to sacrifice it, was deem'd among the *Jews* a great piece of Art, and Nicety: but as Birds were consumed upon the Altar, as well as other Animals, they properly were *Sacrifices*, and were included in the general words, *Corban*, or *Mattenoth*, which comprehended all and every Oblation to God.

Thus much may be necessary to clear up the Idea annexed to the word, *Sacrifice*; and to shew what That was. It was a *Gift*, or Oblation, solemnly made to God, and in part, or in whole, *consumed*. From the word *We* may now pass a Step further, and observe,

Secondly, That *Sacrifices* offered without *Moral Virtues* were always looked upon by God as of no worth, or value: But when they were accompanied with an upright heart, and there was a Mind rightly disposed towards God in him that brought his *Sacrifices*, Then they were such as God esteemed; such as He commanded, required, and expected. This is

so plain from many passages in the Scripture, particularly in the Prophets, that no one can doubt of its Truth. *Vide Esaiab* i. 11—18. — *lxvi.* 3. *Jeremiab* vi. 20. *Amos* vi. 20. *Hoseab* vi. 6. And how the Best and Wisest Heathens looked upon this matter, one may judge from *Plato*, who says*, “It would be a terrible thing indeed, if the Gods were to have regard to our Gifts and Sacrifices, and not to the Mind, whether a Man be holy and righteous or not.”

Thirdly, As Obedience to Moral Duties, and Rectitude of Mind was always the primary thing required by God, so it is observable that in Offering Sacrifices such Rites and Ceremonies always attended them as implied or manifested the Moral Disposition of the Mind.

It is needless at large to prove the former part of this proposition: it is sufficient to cite, *Prov.* xxi. 3. *To do Judgment and*

* Καὶ γὰρ ἂν δεῖν ἔη εἰ πρὸς τὰ σῶμα καὶ τὰς θυσίας ἐποβλήσων ἡμῶν οἱ θεοί, ἀλλὰ μὴ πρὸς τὴν ψυχὴν, ἂν τις ἔσται τῷ δίκαιος ὡς τυγχάνη. *Plat. Alcib.* 2.

Justice is more acceptable to the Lord than Sacrifice. And our Saviour's determination is express, and more than once declared, *I will have Mercy, and not Sacrifice.*

As to the Other part, it is certain that such Rites and Ceremonies attended all Sacrifice as implied or manifested the Moral Disposition of the Offerer. Every thing was so ordered, as would naturally raise a right disposition or Sentiment, in him that made his Offering.

I. When *Aaron* and his Sons went into the Tabernacle of the Congregation, they were to wash with Water, that they die not: Or when they came near to the Altar to minister, to burn Offering made by fire unto the Lord, They were to wash their hands and their feet, that they die not, *Exod. xxx. 19—21.* This was to be a Statute to them for ever, even to him and to his Seed throughout their Generations. Accordingly this was so strictly observed, that the Jewish Priests always washed their hands and feet, before they cleared the Altar, or took away the Cin-

ders from it *. He that had a mind to do this Office was obliged to *rise early in the Morning, and sanctify himself*: Nor was he allowed to touch any Vessel before he had washed his Hands and Feet. They did not indeed wash themselves between every particular Office; but every day they were obliged to wash: And it was a general Rule that no man was permitted to do any part of the Priest's Office before he had washed his Hands and Feet.

The *Levites* too, that bare the Vessels of the Lord, were obliged to be all *clean*: nor could they go in to do the Service of the Tabernacle of the Congregation, till after they had *purified themselves, and washed their cloaths*, Numb. viii. 7—21.

This was all done by the Institution of the Law of *Moses*: But afterwards when the Temple was built, the Priests observed a much more nice and curious cleansing of themselves, and they washed

* Unusquisque qui volebat purgare Altare, surgebat mane, et lavabat se antequam venisset Præfectus. *Mishna, De Sacrificio Jugi*. Vol. V. p. 286

Qui dignus habebatur ad purgandum Altare ille purgabat Altare. Illi autem dixerunt ipsi, Caveto ne forte attingas instrumentum aliquod, antequam sanctificaveris Manus et pedes tuos ex libro. *Ibid.* p. 288.

their

their whole Bodies. * This was done, not merely with a view of having their Bodies clean, or to wash away all dirt ; but with a design to put them all in mind of That Purity of Life, which alone could make them acceptable unto God. How these Purifications, (simple and plain at first) came by degrees amongst the Gentiles to degenerate into the most senseless Superstitions, is foreign to my purpose. But certain it is, that the Heathen world were come to that degree of Stupidity, as to imagine that Murder, and Perjury, and Incest, and every Crime of the deepest Die, might be expiated, or washed away by Lustral Waters.

2. Every man was to bring his Victim to the Door of the Tabernacle, or (after the Temple at *Jerusalem* was built) to the Altar, and there to present, or offer it Himself. And hence it was that any Sacrifice had the name of קרבן, *Corban*,

* Ritus ille quo corporis sordes abstergebantur, Vitæ puritatem tam clare significavit, quod illius mentem et scopum quisvis intelligeret, et illius usus solennis quemvis, Deo præsertim et sacris vacaturum, ad seipsum ab omni carnis et spiritus inquinamento Mundandum, excitare possit. *Spencer De Leg. Hebr. Lib iii. c. 2. p. 781.*

from the persons *making it approach*, or *bringing it*, as commanded, whatever it was, to the Altar or to the House of God. If it were an Animal that was offered, it was to be free from all Lameness, Bruise, or Imperfections: it was to be fit and proper to be presented unto God. And this could not but raise in the Offerer's Mind a due sense of the Obligation to *Moral Perfections*, if *natural Imperfections* were so strictly prohibited to be brought before God; and he must think that all *Moral Imperfections* were highly disagreeable, if natural ones could not be accepted by an All-perfect Being.

3. He that brought his Sacrifice to the Tabernacle to offer it, was, before it was slain, to *put his hands upon the Head* of it. The Person who made the Offering, alone was obliged to do this: He *shall put his hand upon the Head of the Burnt Offering, and it shall be accepted for him to make Atonement for him*, Lev. i. 4. The Meaning of this passage is, That the man that brought his Offering was to put his hands upon its head; and This would be acceptable, or highly pleasing to God,
so

so as to induce him to pardon him that offered it.

It was made then a point of absolute necessity for every man that brought his Sacrifice to *lay his hand* upon the Head of it. If it was a *Burnt Offering*, the Command about That has just been mentioned. If it were the *Sin Offering* of any *Private Man*, and a Bullock was to be offered, (as it is commanded, *Levit. iv. 4.*) Or if the Sin was of the whole Congregation; — in the first case the *Private Man* himself; in the other case, the Elders as Representatives of the whole Congregation, were to *lay their Hands* upon the Head of the Bullock, before the Lord, *Lev. iv. 15, 24, 29.*

Moses has not expressly told us the meaning of this Rite; but having said, *Levit. xvi. 21, Aaron shall lay Both his Hands upon the head of the Live Goat, and confess all the Iniquities of the Children of Israel, and all their Transgressions in all their Sins, putting them upon the head of the Goat,*—hence it is usually inferred, that Imposition of hands was designed to signify a transferring of Sins from the
Offender

Offender upon the Head of the Sacrifice. But This cannot be the meaning of this Ceremony, because the same thing was done when Confession of Sins was not made: For it was not only in *Piacular* Cases that this Rite was used, but in *Eucharistical* Sacrifices where Praise and Thanksgiving were used, and where Translation of Guilt was not thought of. It is true what *Maimonides* tells us, “ * That
 “ Sinners and Trespassers, when they bring
 “ their Offerings for either Sins or Tres-
 “ passes, are not expiated by their Sacri-
 “ fices, unless They first repent, and re-
 “ peat the Form of Confession.” And *Repentance*, and *Confession of Sins*, always accompanied this Rite in *Piacular* instances. But as Other Acts of Religion, e. g. *Praise*, accompanied it in other Cases, it is as just to say that this Rite signified *Praise*, as *Confession*; or any thing else as well as Translation of Guilt.

Philo, I think has much mistaken the meaning of this Rite, and has interpreted

* Peccatores et Rei, cum Oblationes suas pro Peccatis vel per Errorem vel per Contumaciam commissis adducunt, per Sacrificia non expiantur, nisi prius pœnitentiam agant, et Confessionis formam repetant. *Maimon de Pœnitentia. Cap. 1.*

it in such a manner, as it by no means can signify. He says, “ * That *Hands* “ *laid upon the Head* of the Animal were “ a manifest *Token of Innocence* and of “ a Life that could not have any thing “ laid to its charge : that Life had been “ spent agreeably to the *Laws of nature* “ and the *Divine Commandments.*” He might have said, (and it would have appeared much more probable,) that it was an indication of *Sin*, not of *Innocence* ; of past *Actions justly censurable*, not of *Actions unblameable* ; and that it implied that the Offender was determined for the future, to behave better. But even That would not have been exact. He goes on †,

“ God desires in the first place, that the

* τὰς δ' ἐπιτεθειμένας τῇ τῷ ζῷ κεφαλῇ χειρῶν, δῆγμα σαφέστατον εἶναι συμβεβηκε πράξεων ἀνπαιτίων, καὶ βίῃ μηδὲν ἐπιφερομένῃ τῶν εἰς κατηγορίαν, ἀλλὰ τοῖς τῆς φύσεως νόμοις καὶ θεόμοις συνάδοντος. Philo de Victim. p. 838.

† Βλέπεται γὰρ τῷ θεῷ πρῶτον μὲν τὸν ἄνθρωπον ὡσιῶσθαι, γνώμῃσι ἀγαθῇσι καὶ συμφερούσαις ἐνασκέμενον ἑπειὶα δὲ τὸν βίον ἐξ ἀρίστων συνεστάναι πράξεων, ὡς ἅμα τῇ τῶν χειρῶν ἐπιθέσει δύνασθαι τινα παρρησιασάμενον, ἐκ καθαρῶ τῷ στυειδῶτος τοιαῦτα εἰπεῖν, Αἱ χεῖρες αὐταὶ ἔτε δῶρον ἐπ' ἀδικοῖς ἔλαβον, ἔθ' αἵματος ἀθάου προσήψατο, ἔ πρῶσιν, ἐυχ' ὕβριν, ἔ τραῦμα, ἔ βίαν ἐργάσατο — ἀλλ' ὑποδίακονοι πάντων ἐγένοντο καλῶν καὶ συμφερότων, ἅπερ τῇ σοφίᾳ, καὶ νόμοις καὶ καλῆσι καὶ νομίμοις ἀρεταῖσι τετίμηται. Ibid. p. 839.

“ Mind

“ Mind of him that offers a Sacrifice
 “ should be pure, exercised in good and
 “ useful Notions ; then, that it should
 “ be well versed in good Actions ; So
 “ that at the same time when a man *lays*
 “ *his hands* on his Sacrifice he may be
 “ able to say with a good Conscience,
 “ These hands have neither taken any
 “ reward for Injustice, nor have been
 “ polluted with innocent Blood, nor have
 “ wounded, injured, or done violence
 “ to any one, but have been ready to
 “ do whatever is good and just, or is ap-
 “ proved by Wisdom, and by the Laws,
 “ and by virtuous and honest Men.”

It is true, that God wills and desires a
 pure and holy Mind ; and for any one to
 be able justly to make such a declaration,
 cannot but be agreeable to the divine
 Mind. But the Intention in Laying Hands
 on the head of the Sacrifice did not
 imply *Purity*, or that the Person who
 brought the Victim to the Tabernacle
 had been guilty of *no Offence*, but if it
 signified either *Innocence* or *Offence*, it was
 rather that He had been guilty of some
 Trespas or other : For it was a Rite at-
 tended

tended in some cases with *Confession of Sin*, and a declaration that the Sinner was now become a true Penitent, and was returned to a right State of Mind.

4. But besides the laying on of hands on the head of the Beast, There were certain Forms of *Prayer* used, as the case required, either implying *Confession of Sin*, or *Thanksgiving* for Mercies received, or *Petitions* for future Favours.

5. There was among the *Jews* in some cases, a *Waving* of some parts of the Victim Upwards and Downwards, to the Right hand and to the Left, in acknowledgment of the *Omnipresence* of God, who fills all places, and is present not only in Heaven above, but in Earth beneath, and in all places under the Earth.

These Rites, and indeed all others that were enjoin'd, imply sufficiently the *Moral Disposition* of Him that brought his Sacrifice. The Solemnity with which it was offered, and the whole Process, were to put the Offerer in mind of a Right Disposition of Heart, and to keep up such a Temper as would make him acceptable unto the great Governor of all.

But

But as I have mentioned the Ceremony of laying hands upon the head of the Victim, it will not be improper here to explain more at large that solemn Act.

This Ceremony was not the Act by which the Victim was first *presented* or *devoted* unto God : for the bringing the Animal, and placing it before the Altar was the proper Designation or Destination of the Sacrifice ; and this was done before any Hands were laid upon its head. Now That could not be designed as a Mark of devoting a thing to God, which had already been actually presented to him. What then was the meaning of this Ceremony ? It was certainly used on many and different Occasions— in Recommending Persons to God ; in begging a Blessing on Persons, or (which is the same) in Praying Good to them ; in setting apart a Person to any Office ; in conveying Spiritual Powers, Gifts, Graces ; and in Bearing Testimony. When it was used in cases of Sacrifices, it was always accompanied with either Confession of Sins, or Praise, or Thanksgiving to God, as the Nature of the Sacrifice was. There
must

must be then Something in *common* to all these cases, which led men to use the same Rite upon so many different Occasions.

Now there seems to be nothing but the *particular pointing out* of the Person or Thing, which is *common* to all these: And therefore when any one laid his hand upon the Head of his Sacrifice, it was by that Act to deliver it absolutely and in form to God, and to the Uses intended by Sacrifice. There was indeed a *prior Oblation* made, when the Sacrifice was brought to the Tabernacle: But This other, when Hands were laid upon it, seems to be the formal Act by which the Offerer transferred his Property, to the Use of the Altar. And when a man did this, it would be, as *Moses* has express'd it, *Levit. i. 4. Acceptable unto God, to give pardon to him, viz. that offered it.* And for this reason in *all* Sacrifices *Imposition of Hands* was required, because by this solemn Act the Victim was *delivered* out of the power of the Proprietor to the Uses intended by Sacrifice.

Whilst

Whilst the Offerer had his Hands upon the Head of the Sacrifice, he *confessed his Sins*, and prayed to God to pardon them, or he *praised* him, or he gave him *Thanks*, or he *petitioned* for future favours, as the circumstances were; and by this he declared the Intent and Design of the particular Sacrifice then offered unto God.

We may now look into the Practice of the *Jews*, and see what That was.

They observe *, “ That in the case of
 “ Sacrifices of the Congregation, none
 “ require *Imposition of Hands* except the
 “ Bullock which was offered on account
 “ of the Congregation’s having done
 “ something against some of the Com-
 “ mandments which should not have been
 “ done, and the Scape Goat. *R. Simeon*
 “ says, They should lay hands likewise
 “ upon the Goat to be offered for Idola-
 “ try. But all Sacrifices of *Private Per-*

* Nulla Sacrificia publica requirunt Impositionem Manuum, Juvenco excepto qui offertur pro omnibus præceptis; et Hirco Emissario. R. Simeon dicit, etiam Hirco pro Idololatria offerendo manus imponuntur. Omnia Sacrificia privata requirunt Manuum Impositionem, Primogenito, Decimis, Paschate excepto. *Mishna. Tit. Minchatb. Vol. V. p. 96.*

sons require Imposition of hands; except the *First Born*, *Tithes*, and the *Passover*.”

To understand this rule it must be observed that the Law was, *If the whole Congregation of Israel sin through ignorance, and the thing be hid from the Eyes of the Assembly, and they do somewhat against any one of the Commandments of the Lord, which they should not do, and are guilty; then the Elders of the Congregation shall lay their hands upon the head of the Bullock before the Lord, Lev. iv. 13, 15. So too it was expressly ordered in the case of the Scape-Goat, Lev. xvi. 21. Aaron shall lay Both his hands upon the head of the live Goat, and confess over him all the Iniquities of the children of Israel. But then besides these Two cases, (which are the cases refer'd to in the Mishnah,) there is a Third, mentioned in Numbers, in these words, c. xv. 22—26. If ye have erred, and not observed all these commandments, even all that the Lord hath commanded,—Then it shall be, if aught be committed by Ignorance without the Knowledge of the congregation, that all the Congregation*

D tion

tion shall offer one young Bullock for a Burnt Offering for a sweet Savour unto the Lord with his Meat Offering and Drink Offering, according to the manner, and one kid of the Goats for a Sin Offering—And it shall be forgiven all the congregation of the Children of Israel, and the Stranger that sojourneth among them, seeing all the people were in ignorance. No mention is here made of Imposition of Hands; and therefore the Question arose, Whether Hands were to be laid upon the Head of this Goat?

The first of these cases relates to an Offence against *some one* of the commandments through Ignorance: This Last implies *greater* fault, and consists in a *great* or *general* Neglect, arising through Ignorance likewise: And accordingly different Sacrifices were appointed to the Congregation. In the first case the Congregation was to bring only a *Bullock* for a *Sin Offering*, Levit. iv. 13, 14. In this latter case, All the Congregation were to offer one young Bullock for a *Burnt Offering* with his Meat and Drink Offering, and one *Kid of the Goats* for a *Sin Offering*.

The

The Case may easily be put, and the *Jews* interpret this Law as relating to *False Worship*, or *Idolatry*: And they tell us, that this relates to the case of the people's falling into a general Neglect of the Commandments through Idolatry. Suppose then the Elders to have taught Idolatry, and the People to have followed them by Ignorance; The Congregation is to bring the appointed Sacrifice: And tho' the Rule in the *Mishna* be, that the Elders were not to lay hands on the *Goat for a Sin Offering*, yet I should think *Rab. Simeon* to be right in his Determination, that "they were obliged to lay hands
 " on the Goat that was to be offered
 " for Idolatry." The Laying on of hands in case of Sacrifice was always attended with its proper concomitants; and in the present case there could not but be *Confession of Sin*, since Idolatry was so expressly forbidden, and so severely condemned. Besides, the Goat was for a *Sin Offering*; and That required always Imposition of Hands, in a *Ruler*, and in the *common-people*, Lev. iv. 24, 29. But what determines this point is, that it

is expressly said, 2 Chron. xxix. 23, *They brought forth the He Goats for the Sin Offering, before the King and the Congregation, and they laid their Hands upon them.*

But whatever the Practice might be in this particular case, it is generally imagined that something more was intended by this Rite, than the Designation of the Victim to God. The *Egyptians* had certainly a farther Intention in their Sacrifices. “ They were wont * to deprecate Evil
“ from themselves that sacrificed, and
“ from all *Egypt* ; and to desire that it
“ might fall upon the *Head* of their Sa-
“ crifice.” And This Custom had such an Influence upon them, that no *Egyptian* would so much as † *taste the Head* of any Animal ; but either they sold them to any *Greeks* that would buy them, or they *threw them away into the River.*

This indeed was the Notion and the Practice of the *Egyptians* ; but there was

* Κατατρέφονται δὲ τὰδε λέγοντες τῆσι κεφαλῆσι, ἢτε μέλλοι, ἢ σφίσι τῆσι θυσι, ἢ Αἰγύπτῳ τῇ συναπάσῃ κακὸν γενέσθαι, ἢ κεφαλὴν ταύτην τραπέσθαι. Herodot. l. ii. c. 39.

† Οὐδὲ ἄλλως ἑστὸς ἐμπύχῃ κεφαλῆς γέυσεται Αἰγυπτίων ἔθις. Ibid.

nothing

nothing like it among the *Jews*; For the *Head* was burnt upon the Altar, with the *Fat*, by the *Jewish* Priests. But what is remarkable here is, that in the case where the Sins of the Children of *Israel* were put upon the *Head* of an Animal, that Animal was deemed so polluted, as to pollute the person that carried it away. *He that let go the Goat for the Scape Goat, shall wash his cloaths, and bathe his flesh in water, and afterward come into the camp, Lev. xvi. 26.* Would they offer unto God what they knew to be polluted? It was not then to transfer Sins upon the Sacrifice, that in even *piacular* Sacrifices they laid their Hands upon the Head of the Victim; (and much less was it so in other cases;) but it was by that Rite to give up the Animal to the Uses intended. Just as when among the *Old Romans* a Slave was to be made free, the Master was to hold him in his hand, and declare the intent of that Act, by saying, *I will that this man be free*: As * *Bochart* has observed. Or, what is

* Quomodo prisca Romani servum in libertatem afferendum manu tenebant, dicentes, *Hunc hominem liberum esse volo.* *Bochart. de Animal. Vol. I. p. 657.*

more to the present point †, The Master was wont to hold him by the *Head*, and then pronouncing the *Solemn words, Verba Solemnia*, as they are called, he let him go out of his hand. See *Briffonius de Formulis*.

But if Imposition of Hands was required in other Cases, why not in the Case of the *First-Born, Tithes*, and the *Passover*? the reason of which may now without much difficulty be assigned.

The case of the *First-born* was, *No man was to sanctify that, whether it be Ox or Sheep, it is the Lord's already, Levit. xxvii. 26.* And if it were the *First-born* of an *unclean Beast*, then it was to be redeemed according to its Estimation. *All the First-born, whatsoever openeth the womb among the children of Israel, both of man, and beast, were taken unto God as his own, Exod. xiii. 2, 12, 13. Numb. iii. 13, — xviii. 17.* and therefore were either to be brought to the Altar, or redeemed,

† Manumitti servus dicebatur cum Dominus ejus, aut Caput aut aliud Membrum tenens dicebat, *Hunc hominem liberum esse volo; et mittebat eum e manu.* *Briffonius de Formul. l. viii. e Fests*

according as it was appointed. In this Oblation therefore there was no Room for *Imposition of Hands*, because the Person who brought this Victim only brought to the Lord what was the Lord's already. Here was no Act whereby Property was to be alienated, nothing that was voluntary, or that implied Design or Intention, Fault or no Fault, but the mere act of bringing what belonged to Another to its proper place; and consequently *Imposition of hands* could not be required in this case.

Just so it was in relation to *Tithes*. They were to be brought to the *Levites*; and they paid Tithe to the Priest, and thus each had their respective Portions, of which they were to eat: And when they offered an Heave-Offering of them unto the Lord, that was reckoned to them as if it had been the Corn of their own Growth, *Numb. xviii.* Here likewise was no *Imposition of hands*, because the *Tithes* were to be delivered only to the persons to whom they were given by God, and the Prayer prescribed, *Deut. xxvi. 13.* was to be used.

But then as to the *Passover* it may seem more strange, that no *Imposition of hands* should be used. But perhaps the reason of its Institution may help us to the Solution of this difficulty. It is certain that it was designed only for a Memorial of the Children of *Israel's* Escape, when *the Lord slew all the First-born in the Land of Egypt, both the First-born of man, and the First-born of Beast*; and they were to keep it as a *Festival*, whereon the whole nation were constantly to commemorate, in one Evening, their deliverance. A Company was to join, if any one Family were too small; and as a whole House, or more, were concern'd in the same Lamb, He that brought it to the Temple, and killed it, had nothing farther to do than to take care that the Priest received the Blood, and conveyed it to the Altar, so as to have it poured out there. No Prayer, no Confession, was to be made; but the whole was performed whilst the Priests Sung the *Hallel*; and he that brought the Lamb carried it back with him to rejoice with his Family, or Neighbours, or Both.

Some

Some therefore have questioned, whether the Paschal Lamb ought to be deemed a *Sacrifice*, since it differs so much from all other Sacrifices, as being *all* the *Proprietor's*, and having none of the Forms used over it that other Sacrifices had: No Salt; no Meat Offering, nor any Drink Offering was added to it; and he that brought it to the Temple slew it. But notwithstanding the want of these circumstances, this does not alter the nature of the thing, or make the *Passover* not to be a proper Sacrifice, Since it was brought to the Temple, and the *blood* was poured out, and the *inwards* burnt upon the Altar. The Paschal Lamb was the Sacrifice of a Company; and where a Company are concern'd, no one can act for the whole, unless there be a proper *Representative*, as the Elders of a Congregation are for the Congregation, or persons deputed are for those who depute them; or Governors may be for their People. In this case therefore there was no Imposition of Hands; no such Rite was commanded; the Lamb was only to be brought to the Temple; and as it was, what the *Jews* call

call one of the lesser or lighter Hólies, it was slain any where in the Court, and not as Other Sacrifices were.

These are, or may be, the Reasons why no Imposition of Hands was admitted in the cases of the *First-born*, *Tithes* and the *Passover*. But even in Cases where Laying on of Hands was required, there were certain Persons who were never admitted to perform this Ceremony. The *Jews* have a Rule, that* “ All can lay
“ on hands except a Deaf man, a Fool, a
“ Minor, a Blind man, a Gentile, a Slave,
“ or a Deputy, and a Woman.” The reason why the Three first are excepted is, because they *want sufficient understanding*. This reason *Maimonides* † assigns; and so does || *R. Obadiab de Bartenora*. And the reason is good; For they that “ *want Un-
“ derstanding*” are not competent Judges of what they are doing; or of what is

* Omnes manus imponere possunt, excepto Surdo, Stulto, et Minorenni, cæco, gentili, legato, et Muliere. *Mishnab*. Vol. V. p. 96.

† Surdus, Stultus, et minorennis non imponunt manus, quia non pollent intellectu. *Maim. in loc.*

|| Quia ii intellectu haud præditi sunt. *Bartenora. iz
lec.*

the Intention of the Ceremony. The Law was exprefs and clear, that the man that made the Burnt Offering was to *lay his own hand* upon the Head of it, *Lev. i. 4.* And when he did fo, *He* was, for *Himself*, to confefs his *own Sins*: and therefore * no “ *Substitute*, no *Servant*, no “ not a man’s *wife*, could poffibly do this “ for Him.” So that the Reason of the thing excluded all others, as well as the very Letter of the Law, from being *Deputies* or *Substitutes*, in the performance of this Rite.

By why is a *Deaf* man fupposed to want understanding enough to lay hands on his Sacrifice? This Sort of Men are commonly join’d with *Fools* and *Minors* by the *Jews*, and are deem’d exempted from the Observation of the Law, in moft, if not all the affirmative Precepts. They understood therefore by the word מִזְרֵם, one that was *dumb* as well as *deaf*; one fo incapacitated, that he could not fpeak,

* Ex eo quod dicitur, *et imponet manum suam*, concludunt [Sapientes,] quod ipfius Domini Sacrificii manus imponendæ funt, et non manus Servi, nec Legati, nec Mulieris ipfius. *Maim. in loc.*

much less declare the design of his Sacrifice : and then indeed the Reason of their Rule will hold good, because all Sacrifice was attended with a certain form of words, which could not here be pronounced : Not but that they sometimes used this word in a more restrained Sense, and meant * “ one that had the power of Speaking, “ tho’ he had lost the faculty of Hearing “ in either Both or one Ear only.”

The Reason why the Rabbi’s have excluded *Blind* men from *laying on their Hands* is very strange. It seems, that none of the Sanhedrim, or Elders of the Congregation was ever *Blind* : † and “ it was deem’d an unworthy thing that “ any of the Sanhedrim should be Blind, “ From hence they gathered, that be- “ cause in the case of *Publick Sacrifices* “ no *Blind* man ever *laid on hands*, there-

* Quivis igitur *Surdus*, tametsi loqui poterat, immo et aurium altera captus, præcepto apparendi solutus erat. *Maimon. De Sacris Solemnibus. c. 2.*

† Indignum erat ut in Synedrio quisquam esset Senator cæcus.—Colligimus porro autem manuum Impositionem Sacrificiorum privatorum ab impositione manuum publicorum Sacrificiorum, nempe, quemadmodum in uno non fit per cæcum, ita nec in altero. *Maimon in Mishn. De Muneribus. Vol. V. p. 97.*

“ fore in *Private Sacrifices* ” (i. e. such as were offered by Private persons) “ none that were blind should lay on their hands.” This shews what strange Inferences can be made, when the Reasons of Things are neglected or disregarded. The Rabbi’s constantly teach, that no *Expiation* was made without *Imposition of hands*: Why therefore a *Blind* man, that repented of his Sins, and desired to be in favour with God, should not reap the benefit of his Sacrifice as well and as much as one that could see, is impossible to shew.

There is indeed one case allowed in the *Jewish* Practice, where One man might lay on hands for Another, and that is, * “ *That an Heir may lay on hands, and bring his Meat and Drink Offering, and change.*” What is meant by this, is, That if a man had promised, or vowed any particular Beast for a Sacrifice, either an Holocaust, or Peace Offering, and died before he had performed his Promise, then the Heir was

* Hæres etiam manus suas imponat, libamina offerat, et commutet. *Miss. Minchoth. c. 9. § 7.*

obliged

obliged to bring the Sacrifice, and in his Father's name to *lay on hands*, and to do what his Father had promised. Or if he had a mind to *change* one Beast for another, (*e. g.* Supposing he did not conceive the promised Beast good enough, and had a mind to give another for the purpose intended,) *Both* were then considered as *consecrated*, and *Both* were to be offered, as if the Father himself had *changed*. So *Bartenora*. In this case the Heir represented another, and transfer'd the property which the Other had designed, to the same Uses and for the same purposes which had been intended, had not Death intervened.

Thus the matter stood in relation to the *Burnt Offerings* of all, Private as well as Public: And all agree that if any one brought a *Sin Offering*, if he did not *repent* and *confess* his Sins, he was not forgiven by God, nor was any Expiation made, more than if he had not brought his Sacrifice to the Altar.

There was still another sort of Sacrifices, besides those I have already mentioned, and which usually accompanied
Holo-

Holocausts, which were called *Peace Offerings*. These were so called, because They were offered either in Acknowledgment of good things already received, or when Men prayed and hoped to receive such things from God. The Former were properly *Eucharistic*, or *Thanksgiving Offerings*; The Latter were call'd *Free Will offerings* or *Vows*. *Burnt Offerings* were sometimes *Free Will Offerings*: But the Ceremony of Imposition of hands on *Them* has been already considered. I am now speaking of *Peace Offerings* as distinct from *Burnt Offerings*; and in these too, if made by *Private Persons*, Imposition of Hands was necessary. The Law is, *Levit. ii. 2, 8, 13. He shall lay his hand upon the Head of his Offering*. By this Rite, in these cases, was meant the same as in the *Burnt Offerings*, *Trespas*s, and *Sin Offerings*; but then these were always attended with *Prayer* or *Thanksgiving* or *Praise*: The Offerer expressing himself, when his Hands were on the head of the Beast, in such a manner as manifested what his particular intention was.

Dif-

Different Ceremonies might be occasionally used to express the same thing: There is in the *Mishnah* a Rule laid down*, “ The Peace Offerings of a Private Person require *Imposition of Hands* whilst the Animal is alive; — The Peace Offerings of the *Congregation* are to be *waved*, both when they are alive, and after they are slain; but there is no *Imposition of hands* upon them.” The *Waving* answered the same End. The way of *Waving* an Offering, when dead, was, after it was cut in pieces, the Priest took the right Shoulder, and the Breast, and the Inwards, and put them into the Owner’s hands: Then the Priest put his own hands under the hands of him that brought the Sacrifice, and waved or *moved them upwards and downwards*, in acknowledgment of the presence of God, who is not only in Heaven above, but in Earth beneath. And this will sufficiently explain the manner and reason of *Waving* the Sacrifice

* Sacrificia pacifica Privati requirunt Impositionem manuum dum vivunt—Pacifica cœtus agitari debent viva et mactata; at in iis non obtinet manuum Impositio. *Mishn.* Vol. V. p 81.

whilst

whilst it was alive. The Peace Offerings then of the Congregation, being the Oblation for many join'd together, was *waved*, tho' it had not Imposition of hands; A Ceremony which signified the general sense of the Offerers Being in the presence of God, and in Consequence of their desire to be acceptable to him.

The Moral Disposition of men being intended to be shewn by the Significant Ceremonies made use of in Sacrificing, it is very natural to observe, that * “ if
 “ a man were *wicked* and *unjust*, his Sa-
 “ crifices were of no more consequence
 “ or avail, than if he had offered none;
 “ his Holy Services were unhallowed;
 “ and his Prayers and Vows returned not
 “ only not answered, but brought all
 “ kind of Ruin and Destruction on him
 “ that offered them. They were so far
 “ from procuring an Abolition of Sin in
 “ the sight of God, that on the contrary

* Εἰ μὲν γὰρ ἀγνώμων καὶ ἀδίκος, ἄθυτοι θυσίαι, καὶ ἀνίεροί ἱερουργίαι, καὶ εὐχαὶ παλίμφοροι παντέλῃ φθορὰν ἐνδεχόμεναι. Καὶ γὰρ ὅποτε γίνεσθαι δοκῶσιν, εἰ λύσιν ἁμαρτημάτων, ἀλλ' ὑπόμνησιν ἐργάζονται. Εἰ δ' ὅσιος καὶ δίκαιος, μένει βέβαιος ἡ θυσία, καὶ τὰ κρέα δαπανηθῆ· μάλλον δὲ καὶ εἰ τὸ παράπαν μηδὲν προσάγοιτο ἱερεῖον. *Philo. Vit. Mos. p. 669.*

“ they caused a Remembrance of it :
 “ But if the Person was *Holy* and *Just*,
 “ and what he ought to be, his Obia-
 “ tion continued in Being and remained
 “ ratified, tho’ the flesh of it was con-
 “ sumed and gone; or still further, his
 “ request would have been granted, even
 “ tho’ he had brought no Victim at all.”

It appears, I think, sufficiently, what
 Notion the *Jews* had of laying on of
 hands. They understood the Ceremonies
 used to be expressive of a Mind rightly
 disposed. *Repentance*, *Prayer*, or *Praise*,
 and a due sense of the *Presence* of that
 Great Being who governs all things, al-
 ways accompanied their *Laying of Hands*
 on the Head of the Victim, and their
waving it. It may not be improper to
 consider a little what Notions prevailed in
 the *Heathen* world on the like Occasions.

The *Romans* had their Religious Rites
 from the *Greeks*, and Sacrificed so much
 in the same manner that in the Account
 of one, one gives in effect an Account of
 the other. The Rites they made use of
 were expressive of a right Disposition of
 mind, and were attended with Prayers, or
 asking

asking pardon for what had been done amiss, or with Thanks for favours receiv'd. The manner of their *sacrificing* is largely described by *Dionysius Halicarnassensis*, * “ Their *Hands* being washed, “ says he, and the *Victims* being *purified* “ with *clear Water*, and having sprinkled “ upon their *Heads* the fruits of *Ceres*, “ [*i. e.* the *Salted Meal*,] then having “ *Prayed*, they at last ordered the proper “ Officers to slay the *Sacrifice*.” Every thing here is significant, or expressive of *Purity* and *Goodness*. Their *Hands* were to be *clean washed* in token of *Honesty* and *Uncorruptedness*, that they would take no *Reward* for *Justice*, nor would they offer violence to any man. The *Sacrifice* itself was to be *purified*; and they were to offer up their *Prayers*. *Dionysius* justly observes, that these *Ceremonies* were derived from the *Greeks*; and he shews that the *Heroes* in *Homer* observed the same *Rites* in † “ *washing* their *Hands*

* Χερνιψόμενοι γὰρ αὐτοί, καὶ τὰ ἱερά καθαρῶ περιεργνίσαντες ὕδατι, καὶ Δήμητρος καρπὸς ἐπιρρῆάναντες αὐτῶν ταῖς κεφαλαῖς, ἔπειτα κατευξόμενοι, θύειν τότε τοῖς ὑπέρτασις αὐτὰ ἐκέλευον. *Dionys. Halic.* l vii.

† Χερνιψάντο δ' ἔπειτα καὶ ἐλοχύτασ ἀνέλαντο. *Homer.* p *Sim.*

“ and sprinkling Barley Meal upon their
“ Sacrifices ” : The meaning of which
will be explained more largely hereafter.

Lucian has mentioned the Ceremonies
which attended Sacrifices very particularly.
He first observes that several Sorts of
men brought their respective Sacrifices,
according to their Professions : † “ The
“ Husbandman, says he, brought an Ox
“ that worked at the Plough ; the Shep-
“ herd brought a Lamb ; the Goat-herd
“ brought a Goat : Some offered Incense,
“ or only a Cake. But as to the Poor,
“ they appeased God by kissing only his
“ Right-hand.” He then takes notice,
that the Table which gave notice of what
was to be done, declared || “ that no one
“ of impure hands should be within the
“ place where the Holy Vessels were.”
The Public Crier called upon all that were
present, and bad them, *favete Linguis,*
take care of their Words, and not say any

† Βῆν μὲν ἀροῖῆραι ὁ γεωργός, ἄρνα δὲ ὁ ποιμὴν, καὶ αἶγα ὁ
ἀιπόλος : Ὁ δὲ τις λιβάωνιον ἢ πόπανον. Ὁ δὲ πένης ἰλάσατο
τὸν θεὸν φιλισας μόνον τὴν αὐτῆς δεξιάν. *Lucian. de Sacri-*
ficiis

|| Καὶ τὸ πρόγραμμα φησὶ, μὴ παρίεναι ἕισα περιρρέοντιν,
ἕως μὴ καθάρως ἔσσι τὰς χεῖρας. *Ibid.*

thing

thing that was *ominous* or bad. The Old Glossary interprets this phrase, εὐφημίαι; and we shall see instances hereafter, where the Sacrificers, or the People that were present, are forbid so much as to name such words as might seem *ominous*. When the Priest was going to do his Office, all *profane* people were bid to depart. *Virgil* expresses it by, *Procul este Profani*. *Lucian* has it, Συρὰς βέβηλοι. When none but such as were *lustrated* or *purified* were present, the Priest went to Prayers, and he that offered the Sacrifice * repeated the words put into his Mouth by the Priest.

Another Rite among the *Romans* was, that He that made the Sacrifice was to *lay hold of the Altar*; nor did they think that they should, *litare*, succeed in their *Sacrificial Requests*, unless they did so. To *lay hold of the Altar*, was to signify their dependance on, and expectation of help from Him to whom they applied: it signified a giving themselves up to his Protection whose Altar they held so fast.

* ————— Dictaque verba
Protulit, ut mos est. —————

Juven. Sat. vi. l. 390.

Virgil has mentioned this Custom several times.

*Talibus orantem dictis, Arasque tenentem
Audiit omnipotens.*—————

Æn. iv. l. 219.

Talibus orabat dictis, arasque tenebat.

Æn. vi. l. 124. †

And *Servius* tells us * “ This was the manner of making requests to the Gods, by “ *laying hold of the Altars.*” Every thing then concurr’d to make Sacrifices as solemn as was possible, and to shew Him who offered them to be rightly disposed to Moral Honesty. The *Washing* of the Hands ; the command to all *profane* people to be gone ; the *laying hold* of the Altar ; the Solemnity of *Prayer* ; *pure* Garments, *pure* Vessels,—These were all Indications of an Upright good Behaviour, agreeable to the nature of things, and to what those ought to be who appeared in the presence of God.

It may not be perhaps amiss, if here I digress a little, to try to explain another

* Rogabant enim Deos ararum ansas tenentes. *Servius* in *Virg.* Æn. vi. And upon the other place of the *Æneid*, Necessè enim erat a Sacrificantibus teneri, [aras] quod si non fieret, diis Sacrificatio grata non esset. *Servius.*

Custom

Custom which was not unusual among the Romans. *Propertius* tells us of a *Woollen Crown*, or *Circle*, that went thrice about the *Hearth* or *Altar*.

Terque focum circa laneus Orbis eat.

Prop. l. iv. Eleg. 6.

Passeratius interprets this of a *woollen Fillet* that was drawn round the *Altar*; a Custom which *Scaliger* owns he knows nothing of, as I find it taken notice of by * *Janus Broukhusius*, who has not likewise attempted to account for this Custom. *Virgil*, if I mistake not, seems to have alluded to this practice, when he says,

— *Molli cinge hæc Altaria Vitta.*

Eclog. ix.

That is, says *Servius*, *Laneá*, with a *Woollen Fillet*. And so likewise, when speaking of the *Temple* where *Sichæus's* Image was kept, he says it was

Velleribus niveis, et festa fronde revinctum.

Æn. iv. l. 459.

* *Passeratius* vittam laneam in orbem circumactam exponit, quâ ara fuerit circumcincta. *Scaliger* hunc sibi ritum esse penitus incognitum fatetur. *Broukhusius* in loc.

Surrounded with white Fleeces of Wool;
 He means, *Fillets made of Wool*, and with
 Garlands made with boughs. *Vittis, Co-*
ronisque, as *Tacitus* speaks. *Servius* tells
 us, “ that *Wool* is under the Protection of
 “ *Minerva*, who * is the great promoter
 “ and encourager of *Peace* as well as
 “ *War.*” He enters into the nature and
 reason of the thing, when he adds, “ that
 “ a Sheep is a *mild and quiet* Animal,
 “ and all those who enter into *Covenants*
 “ or *Friendships* should be as *quiet* and
 “ *peaceable* as Sheep.” *Pliny* tells us,
 † “ that the old *Romans* paid even a re-
 “ *ligious* regard to *Wool*, commanding
 “ the New-married Woman to tye *Wool*
 “ about the Posts of their Houses.” He
 alludes to its being the known Symbol of
Peace and *Quiet*. *Plutarch* too mentions
 the same Custom, and tells us that || “ the

* Quæ Pacis Bellique sit cultrix. Aut quia mite et
 quietum Animal sit Ovis; cujus quietem habere debent,
 qui in sœdus et Amicitiam coeunt. *Servius*. in *Æneid.*
 lib. v. iii. l. 128.

† Lanis Authoritatem veteres Romani etiam religiosam
 habuere. Postes a Nubentibus attingi [l. accingi] juben-
 tes. *Plin.* lib. xxix. c. 2.

|| Ἐπί τῶν τῶν θυγατρὶ περιπέσει τῶ ἀνδρῶς. *Plut. Quæst. Roman.*

————— Necte coronam

Postibus, et densos per limina tende corymbos.

Juv. Sat. vi. l. 52.

“ New

“ New married woman was to bind *wool*
 “ about the Door of her Husband.” This
 Custom is interpreted by some as if it had
 been a Symbol of *Industry*, and as it were
 a Promise of the Care and Diligence she
 would use in her new Habitation. But
 it is much more likely that it signified
Peace, and the preservation of *Domestic*
Quiet; it was a Sign or Symbol that she
 would observe and keep the Mildness and
 Innocence of the *Lamb*, and not that she
 would be constantly *Spinning*, and at
 work in the house. *Festus* tells us that
 this Custom was derived from an old one
 of another sort, *viz.* * “ That the new
 “ married woman was wont to sit down
 “ on a Skin with the Wool on, either for
 “ the sake of an old Fashion that an-
 “ tiently Men were cloathed in Skin; or
 “ to assure her Husband, that she would
 “ mind the work of carding and comb-
 “ ing, and Spinning.” *Servius* has ano-
 ther fancy which has as little foundation,

* In pelle lanata nova nupta confidere solet, vel propter
 morem vetustum, quia antiquitus homines pellibus erant
 induti, vel quod testetur lanificii officium se præstiturum
 viro. *Festus. v. Lana.*

Or less than that of *Festus*. He says *
 “ that married Women as soon as they
 “ came to the Threshold of their Hus-
 “ band’s House, before they enter’d it,
 “ adorned the Posts of it with *woollen-*
 “ *fillets*, as a good omen of *Chastity*.”
 And hence he accounts for that passage in
Virgil I just now cited. *White* indeed
 may be the Symbol of *Purity* : But *Wool*
 was the Symbol of *Peaceableness*, of *Quiet*,
 of *Mildness*. And when a Temple or an
 Altar was surrounded with it, it was to
 signify that there was to be all *Peace* and
Friendship, and that no Force or Vio-
 lence was to be used to that place, which
 was separated, and as it were consecrated,
 by being surrounded with the *Symbol of*
Peace.

Enough has been said to shew how the
Moral Disposition was designed to be in-
 timated by all the Sacrificial Rites and
 Ceremonies. I now proceed a Step fur-
 ther, and observe

* Nubentes puellæ simul cum venissent ad limen mariti,
 Postes, antequam ingrederentur, propter auspiciam casti-
 tatis, ornarent laneis vittis. Unde ait, *Velleribus niveis*, &c.
Servius in Virgil. Æn. iv. l. 459.

Fourthly,

Fourthly, That Sacrifices were not only attended with *Repentance*, and *Confession*, and *Address* to God by Prayer, as being in his presence, but they were *Fæderal Rites*, and implied mens entering into *Friendship* with God; or if they had violated *Friendship* with God by violating the Stipulation entered into, then Sacrifice implied a *Renewal of Friendship*, or a *Reconciliation* with him, or a *Return* to that State from which the Offender had departed.

As this is a point upon which much that follows will depend, I shall endeavour to prove it more at large.

When the men of old contracted *Leagues*, or engaged in *Friendships* with one another, they did it by *Eating* and *Drinking* together. This appears from the Instances of *Isaac* and *Abimeleck*, *Jacob* and *Laban*, the *Hebrews* and the *Gibeonites*, Gen. xxvi. 30, 31. — xxxi. 46. *Josh.* ix. 14. And the Breach of Covenants thus confirmed was deemed as * gross

* Σχέτλιος, ἔθ' εἰ θεῶν ὄπιν ἠδέσασατ', ἐυθε ΤΡΑΨΕΖΑΝ
Τὴν δὲ οἱ παρέθηκεν ἔπειτα δὲ πέφιν: καὶ αὐτόν.

Hom. Ody. φ'. l. 28.

a Viola-

a Violation of *Friendship* as any one could be guilty of. Thus *David* complains, that his *own familiar Friend, in whom he trusted, which did eat of his Bread, had lifted up his heel against him*, Psalm xli. 9. And our Saviour applied this passage of the Psalmist to the Traitor *Judas*,— *He that eateth Bread with me hath lift up his Heel against me*. When *Ismael the Son of Nethaniah*, and the Ten men that were with Him, treacherously slew *Gedaliah the Son of Abikam*, to whom *Nebuzaradan* had committed the people that remained in *Mispah*, it is said that He and his Companions came to *Mispah*, and there they did eat bread together, i. e. There they bound themselves together in the strongest Band of *Confederacy* to murder *Gedaliah*, which they accordingly effected. Or if they did eat Bread together with *Gedaliah*, their Treachery was so much the grosser, and their infamous Behaviour was so much the more to be detested. Vide *Jerem. xli. 1*. The Prophet *Obadiab* has alluded to the same Custom, and made use of the very same Expression with the Psalmist, *The men that were at Peace with thee have deceived*

deceived thee,—*They that eat thy Bread have laid a Wound under thee, v. 7.*

This was so well understood by the Antients, that whenever any one offered a Sacrifice to God, or to any Idol whatsoever, it was looked upon as an actual Engagement either in *Covenant* or *Friendship* with him to whom the Sacrifice was made. And hence it is, that to *eat* of any *Sacrifice* offered to God, is the same as to be in *Friendship* with God: as likewise to eat of a Sacrifice offered to any Idol, is to be in *friendship* with that Idol. It was This that made the Psalmist say *Gather my Saints together unto me, Those that have made a Covenant with me by Sacrifice, Psalm l. 5.* And when the *Moabites* are said to *call the people of Israel unto the Sacrifices of their Gods, the people did eat, and bowed down to their Gods*; it immediately follows,—*and Israel joined himself unto Baal Peor, Numb. xxv. 2, 3.* This Practice was so well understood, and was so common in those days, that when the *Israelites* were forbid to make any *Covenant* with the Inhabitants of the land of *Canaan*, it is expressed thus—

thus—*Lest when the Canaanites did sacrifice unto their Gods, and one call thee, and thou eat of his Sacrifice, Exod. xxxiv. 15, 16. i. e. engage in covenant, or Friendship with their Gods. So again, They joined themselves also to Baal Peor, and ate the Offerings of the Dead, i. e. They entered into a State of Friendship with Gods that were no more than Dead Men. And hence it was, that when the First-born of Egypt were threatened with destruction, that God by Moses instituted the Passover, by which a Covenant was made betwixt Him and the Children of Israel. A Lamb for every house, (or if the Household was too small, then a Man and his Neighbour next unto him were to join in procuring a Lamb) — A Lamb was to be taken; and as there was no Altar, the Blood was to be struck upon the Lintell, and the Two Side Posts of the door, which served instead of an Altar. And Then, the Lord on his part engaged that he would not suffer the Destroyer to come into any of their houses, Exod. xii. 23. The Children of Israel were to eat the flesh of the Lamb with one another; and this was an Ordinance*

nance

nance to be kept for ever. The Blood upon this occasion was given as God's share: and then immediately the people were under his Protection.

From hence it is, that one may easily explain what *St. Paul* says, *1 Cor. x. 21.* *Ye cannot drink the Cup of the Lord, and the Cup of Devils: Ye cannot be partakers of the Lord's Table, and of the Table of Devils.* He had been urging the *Corinthians* to *flee from Idolatry*; and was shewing them that if they did eat of the *Sacrifices* offered unto Idols, They by that Act professed themselves to be in a State of *Friendship* with them. The *Jews*, by eating the *Sacrifices* offer'd unto God, *partook of the Altar, or Table of God*; and by that were deemed to be in a State of *Friendship* with him: The *Gentiles*, by eating of the things offered to their Gods were for the same reason in a State of *Friendship* with them. Now it is impossible, as the *Apostle* argues, to be in *Covenant or Friendship* with Two such contrary Masters; and consequently, the *Corinthians* ought not, could not *partake*
of

of the Table of the Lord, and of the Table of Devils, or Dæmons, i. e. Idols.

Sometimes this manner of engaging in *Friendship* was expressed by nothing more than *Drinking*, without any *Eating* together. The Prophet *Jeremiah* says, *The Chaldæans that fight against this City, shall come and set fire on this City, and burn it with the Houses upon whose Roofs they have offered Incense unto Baal, and poured out Drink-offerings unto other Gods, to provoke me to Anger, ch. xxxii. 29.* In another Place he speaks of the People of *Jerusalem*, as having burnt Incense unto all the Host of Heaven, and having poured out Drink Offerings unto other Gods, c. xix. 13. His meaning is, They by this engaged themselves in *Friendship* with, and obliged themselves to serve the *Host of Heaven*, or *Baal*, or whatever God they worshipped, just as if they had enter'd into an *Express Covenant* with them.

This known Custom of engaging in *Friendship* by *Eating* and *Drinking* together, will help us to understand a passage in *Isaiab*, c. xxx. 1. which we translate, *to Cover with a Covering, but not*
of

of my Spirit. The whole verse is, *Woe to the rebellious Children, saith the Lord, that take counsel, but not of me, and that cover with a covering, but not of my Spirit, that they may add Sin to Sin.* He is speaking of the *Jews* as trusting in the Shadow of *Egypt*, and engaging in Friendship with, by making *Libations* to, the Gods of that Country. The original words are, וְלִנְסוּךְ, מִמִּכָּה וְלֹא רָוִי and that pour out a Libation, but not after my Mind. The *LXX* rightly render it, ἐποιήσατε συνθήκας, ye have made covenants with *Egypt*, and have not taken Counsel of me; i. e. ye have engaged in Friendship with *Pharaoh*, and endeavoured to strengthen yourselves against the King of *Assyria* by the Aid of *Pharaoh*, and have not asked at my mouth. It is certain that *Massechab* comes from the Original *Nasac*: and *Isaiab* uses *Mimsac* (as it is now pointed) for a Libation: and *Massac* is to the same effect, and may signify the same thing; and the meaning of the place requires this Sense. *Libations*, or *Drink Offerings*, were poured out at or upon the Altars of the Gods, or upon the Sacrifices that were offered to

the Gods. - And as by this means *Covenants* and *Friendships* were usually contracted, (and hence the *Greeks* made use of the word, *Σπώνδας*, for *Leagues*, because they used *Libations* in contracting Leagues) hence it is easy thus to interpret this passage of the Prophet:

It will be worth while to see how this matter stood in the *Gentile* world.

Virgil, who as I said before, nicely observed the *Jus Pontificium*, has fully described the manner how *Æneas* and *Evander* entered into League together, and revived their *Old Friendship*; and how the *Latins* invited the *Trojans* to the anniversary Sacrifice which *Evander* and his People were then about to celebrate.

—*Sacra hæc, quando huc venistis Amici,
Annua, quæ differre nefas, celebrate fa-
ventes*

*Nobiscum, et jam nunc Sociorum assuescite
mensis.*

Æn. viii. l. 172.

They were invited to join with them in the Sacred Rites, and partake of the
Tables

Tables of them who professed themselves their *Friends* and *Allies*. As soon as this Invitation was made and accepted, the Poet tells us that *Evander* commanded the *Flesh of the Sacrifices*, and the *Wine* to be brought back, and set again upon the Table: For the *Latins* had been frightened from what they were doing, by seeing the *Trojan Fleet* coming upon their Coasts.

—— *Dapes jubet, et sublata reponi
Pocula* —————

He does not mean by *Dapes*, good eatables, or *Dainties*, as that word usually signifies; but those Eatables which had been offered to the Gods. It is a Sacrificial Term, and signifies * “ the proper “ and peculiar Meat at the Feast or Banquet of the Gods; *Jove's Supper*”, as *Servius* explains it. What these *Dapes* were, the Poet tells us in the immediate following Lines,

*Viscera tosta ferunt taurorum, onerantque
danistris*

*Dona laboratæ Cereris, Bacchumque mi-
nistrant.*

* *Dapes*, *Epulæ Deorum propriæ*, ut *Jovis cœna*, *Servius. in Loc.*

“ They brought the roasted or broiled
 “ *Flesh of the Bullocks*, and gave them
 “ *Bread and Wine.*” For, *Viscera* does
 not here signify * *Entrails*, or the *Inwards*
 of the Bullock, but the *Flesh* of it, *all*
that lies under the Skin; for All That was
 called the *Viscera*. Accordingly we find,

Vescitur Æneas, simul et Trojana Juventus
Perpetui tergo bovis, et lustralibus Extis.

Æneas and the *Trojans* eat of the Sa-
 crifice of the *Latins*, and thus a *League*
 was made betwixt the Two people.
Æneas, being a *Foreigner*, could not have
 been permitted to partake of these Sacred
 Rites, which *Evander* was now celebra-
 ting; for † “ it was not lawful to admit
 “ *Strangers to partake*” of them, unless
 they were *Friends*. When therefore in
 the present case, old *Friendships* were re-
 vived, and *Æneas* was received as an *Ally*
 and *Friend*, then the *God*, of whose

* *Viscera* non tantum *Intestina* dicimus, sed quicquid
 sub *Corio* est. Ut, In *Albano* *Latinis* *Visceratio* dabatur,
 id est, *Caro*. *Servius. Æn.* l. i. l. 215.

† *Extraneos* ad *facra* non licebat adhibere. *Servius.*
Æn. viii. l. 172.

Sacrifice he partook, was looked upon as a *Common God*, equally a Friend to both Parties. And therefore *Evander* says,

——— *Pocula porgite dextris*
Communemque vocate Deum, et date Vina
volentes.

l. 274.

He does not mean by this, “ Invoke “ the God that is common to all ” ; as *Mars* was the common God of Battle, or *Hercules* was common to all for destroying Monsters : But invoke the same particular God that I do, who is now *common* to us Both, to your People and to my People, since we are now *Friends* engaged to Him, and He to us, by eating at his Table of his Sacrifices.

This will help us to explain an Observation which is made by *Gellius* * “ That
 “ *Roman*

* In veteribus Scriptis, neque Mulieres Romanæ per Herculem, dejurant, neque Viri per Castorem. Sed cur illæ non juraverint Herculem non obscurum est ; Nam Herculaneo Sacrificio abstinent. — Nunquam igitur scriptum invenire est apud idoneos quidem Scriptores, aut *Mehercle* fœminam dicere, aut *Mecastor* Virum. *Ædepol* autem, quod Jusjurandum est per *Pollucem* et *Vio* et Fœminæ commune est. *Gellius Noc. Att. l. xi. c. 6.*

“ *Roman Women* never swore by *Hercules*.
 “ The Reason, says he, why the Women
 “ never swore by *Hercules* is plain enough;
 “ They abstained from all Sacrifice offered
 “ to *Hercules*.” *Hercules*, it seems, when
 he drove *Geryon's* Bullocks through *Italy*,
 was very thirsty, and asked a Woman for
 some Water. She answered him, that
 she could not give him any, because it
 was a festival of the Goddesses of Women,
 and it was not allowed that any Man
 should taste of what was prepared on
 that occasion. *Hercules* thereupon de-
 tested the presence of Women, and or-
 der'd *Potitius* and *Pinarius* never to suffer
 any women to be present at his Sacrifices.
 Thus *Macrobius* tells the Story, *Sat.* 1. i.

This Observation of Gellius, “ that you can never find
 “ in Good Writers a Man swearing by Castor, or a Woman
 “ swearing by Hercules”, is certainly without foundation.
 In Plautus alone there are instances of Women using the
 word, *Hercle*, which is the same as *Mehercle*, and of
 Men saying *Mecastor*. *Crocotium* in the *Stichus* says to the
 Parasite *Gelasimus*, Imo *Hercle*, ut abs te mutuum nobis
 dares. *Act.* i. *Sc.* 3. l. 100. In the *Cistellaria*, *Gym-*
nasium, says, Equidem *Hercle* addam operam sedulo. *Act.* i.
Sc. 1. And the Parasite in the *Asinaria* says, *Mecastor*
dignus est. *Act.* v. *Sc.* 3 l. 46.

c. 12; and *Propertius* in much the same manner, says,

*Hæc nullis unquam pateat veneranda Puellis;
Herculis eximii ne sit inulta sitis.*

l. iv. Eleg. ix.

Women then being thus forced to keep away from his Altars, could not partake of the common Symbols of *Friendship* with him, and therefore never could invoke him, nor could they consistently Swear by Him. And this is the reason, that Both in *Plautus* and *Terence* the Women are introduced so frequently using the Terms *Ædepol*, and *Mecastor*, and so very rarely saying *Mebercle*, or *Hercle*.

It cannot be amiss here to observe, that one of the ways of Marriage among the *Romans* was called *Confarreatio*, and was a very strong evidence of the Opinion they had of the Contracts made by *Eating* together: The Ceremony was; *
“ The Man and the Woman were joined

* Tribus modis apud veteres Nuptiæ fiebant — Farre, cum per Pontificem Maximum et Dialem Flaminem per Fruges et Molam Salsam conjungebantur, unde *Confarreatio* appellabatur; ex quibus nuptiis patrimi et matrimi nascebantur. *Serv. in Georg.* l. i l. 31.

“ together by the chief Priest, and the
 “ *Flamen Dialis*, by *Fruits and Salted*
 “ *Meal.*” *Ulpian* has explained this sort
 of Marriage, telling us, * “ that it was
 “ performed by a solemn form of Words,
 “ in the presence of Ten Witnesses, and
 “ a Solemn Sacrifice was made, in which
 “ a Cake made of bread Corn was used.”
 The Man and Woman were affianced by
 thus *eating* together; and I must add that
 at this day one part of the Marriage in
 the *Greek Churches* is, that “ after the
 “ Epistle and Gospel and several Prayers
 “ are read, the New-married Couple *drink*
 “ *out of the same cup* which the Priest had
 “ blessed in *Sign and Token of Love, Agree-*
 “ *ment, and Joy*, and as a Pledge of their
 “ mutual Conversation, and of their Right
 “ to one another’s Estates and Fortunes.”
 So *Dr. Smith* in his Account of the *Greek*
Church, p. 190. And so when *Dionysius*
Halicarnassensis is speaking of the Old
 manner of Marriage instituted by *Romulus*,

* Farre conveniebatur in manum certis verbis, et testi-
 bus decem presentibus, et solenni sacrificio facto, in quo
 panis quoque Farreus adhibetur. *Ulpian. Tit. ix.*

He observes, that * “this Manner of
 “ marrying by eating together of bread-
 “ corn took its name from the Corn so
 “ eaten, and implied a necessary bond of
 “ *indissoluble friendship*, and nothing could
 “ dissolve these marriages.” And from
 this Old custom of marriages by *Confar-*
reation invented and instituted thus by
Romulus, is derived the present Custom of
 having a *Bride Cake*, to intimate the mu-
 tual *Friendship* contracted, not only of
 the Parties married together, but likewise
 of all those who partake of it, as a Sign
 of Love and *Friendship* with the married
 couple, as *Dr. Cudworth* has observed.

Supposing now that Eating and Drink-
 ing together were the known ordinary
 Symbols of *Friendship*, and were the
 usual Rites of engaging in Covenants and
 Leagues, and of renewing and ratifying
Friendships, it will not be difficult to ac-
 count from hence for the Origin of Sacri-
 fices. The Fact is certain, that to *Eat*
 and *Drink* together was the Antient man-
 ner of Mens engaging [in *Friendship* with

* Τὸ δὴ κοινωνοῦς τῆς ἱερῶιάτης τε καὶ πρώτης τροφῆς γενέσθαι
 γυναῖκας ἀνδράσι, — τὴν μὲν ἐπίκλησιν τῆς κοινωνίας τῆ ΦΑΨΡΟΣ
 εἶχεν, εἰς σύδεσμον δ' ἀναγκάσιον ἀικειότητος ἔφερον ἀδιαλύτου,
 καὶ τὸ διαίρησον τοὺς γάμους τέτους οὐδὲν ἦν. *Dion. Halic.* l. ii.

one Another ; and therefore it is natural to conceive that they should take the same Method, and observe the same Rite in engaging in *Friendship* with God : And if they imagined that the Gods did *eat* with Them, as well as they did *Eat* with the Gods, they would make the same Rites serve for Amity and *Friendship* with Them, as They did with one Another.

Let us then enquire How this matter stood among them.

Homer tells us, that *Jupiter* went to a *Feast* among the Pious *Ethiopians*.

Zeus γὰρ ἐπὶ ὠκεανὸν μετ' ἀμύμονας Αἰθιοπῆδας
 Χθιζὸς ἔβη μετὰ Δαῖτα, —————

Ilias α'. l. 424.

Those blameless good people *sacrificing* at that time to him ; and he was supposed to be *Feasting* with Them.

You have a more express Testimony of *Homer's*, cited by *Plato* in his *Alcibiades* 2^{us}. which is more full to our purpose. He is speaking of the *Trojans* offering an *Hecatombe* to the Gods ; and says, “ That the
 “ sweet Savour of it went up, but that
 “ the Blessed Gods did not EAT of it,
 “ nor

“ nor would they ; For *Troy* was hateful
 “ to them, and so was *Priamus*, and the
 “ People of *Priamus*.”

—Τῆς δ' ἔτι θεοὺς μάκαρας ΔΑΤΕ'ΕΣΘΑΙ
 Οὐδ' ἐθέλειν, μάλα γάρ σφιν ἀπήχθετο Ἴλιος ἶρη.

The Gods *eating* therefore of the Sacrifice is made the mark or Sign of their being in *Friendship* with those that offered it ; As their *refusing to eat* of it was a Sign of their Hatred and Dislike. Agreeable to this Custom *Maximus Tyrius* tells us of a Practice among the *Persians* when They Sacrificed to the *Sun* : They used this Form of Words, * “ Bringing to
 “ him as it were the Meat of Fire, O
 “ LORD FIRE EAT.” And the Heathen had their ways of judging whether the Sacrifice was accepted by the God to whom it was offered, or not, either by the manner of the † *Smok's ascending*, and carrying the Savour of the Sacrifice with it,

Κνίαση δ' ἔρανον ἴκεν ἑλαιομένη περὶ καπνῶ.

Il. α. 315.

* Θύσσι Πέρσαι πυρὶ, ἐπιφορῶντες αὐτῶ τὴν πυρὸς τροφήν, ἐπιλέγοντες, Πῦρ Δεσπότα, ἔσθιε. *Max. Tyr. Ser.* xxxviii.

† Vid. *Peucerum de Divinatione.* p 223.

or by its being *beat down*; or by other Observations to which their Fancy or Imagination led them. But to return.

The Oracle of *Apollo* cited by *Eusebius* in his *Præparatio Evangelica*, l. iv. c. 9. orders,

— Ταδε γυια θεοις εϋ δασι προειδαι,

“ to give the Members of the Animal
 “ sacrificed for a Banquet to the Gods.”
 And hence came the custom of offering Sacrifice even to the *deceased*. For the Gentile world always conceived their Great Men, or Heroes to be alive, and to have Power, in a future State; and that they were ready, and willing to assist the Persons that invoked them. This therefore made their Devotees so willing to shew and keep up their *Friendship* with them, and to pay them the Honour of Sacrificing to them. We see *Æneas* resolving to keep up an Anniversary Memorial of *Anchises's* Death; and to shew him Honour, and to obtain Favours from him, He offered him Libations of *Wine*, and *Milk*, and *Blood*, pouring Some of Each upon the Ground to
 Him,

Him, in order to beg, and to get, a prosperous Wind of him.

—*Duo rite mero libans carchesia Baccho
Fundit humi, duo Lacte novo, duo Sanguine
Sacro.*

Æn. iii. l. 75.

And *Homer* tells us, that the *Athenians* were wont to make *Eretheus* propitious to them by the Sacrifice of *Bulls and Lambs,*

Εὐθαδέ μιν τάυροις καὶ ἀρνείοις ἱλάονται
Κῆροι Ἀθηναίων. —————

Il. β. 550.

The *Athenians* endeavouring to keep up a State of *Friendship* with their Hero and Founder.

This Language, so common among the Heathen, of the Gods *eating* of the Sacrifices offered to them, is very similar to that of the Sacred Writings; where Sacrifices are called the *Bread,* or the *Food,* of God. Thus *Lev. xxi. 6, 8.* The Priests are to be *holy unto their God,* and not to profane the name of their God,
for

for the Offerings of the Lord made by fire, and the Bread of their God they do offer.— Thou shalt sanctify him, for he offereth the Bread of thy God. And in the same chapter it is expressly ordered, that *no man that hath a Blemish, of the Seed of Aaron the Priest, shall come nigh to offer the Offerings of the Lord made by fire— he shall not come nigh to offer the Bread of his God, v. 21. He might himself eat the bread of God, v. 22. tho' he was not to come nigh unto the Altar.*

What in this chapter is called the *Bread of God* is not to be confined to the *Mincha*, or to what is called the *Meat Offering*; but it signifies whatever was burnt upon the Altar. Thus the Peace Offering of the *Flock* made by Fire, consisting of a Lamb, the *Fat* and *Inwards*, and *Rump* of which was burnt upon the Altar, is called, *The Food of the Offering made by Fire unto the Lord, Lev. iii. 11.* The Prophet *Ezekiel* interprets the *Bread of God* to be *the Fat and the Blood*; c. xliv. 7. And the Prophet *Malachi* understood it in the same manner— *ye offer polluted Bread upon mine Altar, c. i. 7.*

By

By which he means Offerings that were *torn and lame, and sick*, v. 13, Offerings highly improper to be put upon the Lord's Table. vid. *Lev. xxii. 24, 25*. God himself likewise speaks in the same Manner—*Command the Children of Israel, and say unto them, My Offering, My Bread for my Sacrifices made by Fire for a sweet Savour unto me shall ye observe to offer unto me in their due Season*, Numb. xxviii. 2. All Eatables are called in Scripture *Bread*; and as all Sacrifices made by Fire are deem'd the *Bread*, or the *Food of God*, What was consumed upon the Altar was conceived to be God's Share or Portion; and the Rest was the Priest's or the Owner's Share: And thus they all did *Eat* at the same Table.

Eating then of a Sacrifice implied a State of *Friendship* betwixt the Offerer and God; and agreeably to the same manner, or custom, the *Temple* or *Tabernacle* was God's *House*, the *Palace* of the Great King: the Priests that ministred to him, were his Servants, who went between Him and his People. The Altar is called *the Table of the Lord*, Mal. i. 12. And the Offerings

Offerings are called, *The Bread of God*. To *eat* therefore of the *Sacrifices* offered to God, was to eat at his *Table*, and of his *Bread*. Now the Owners of all *Peace Offerings* having a certain Share for themselves to eat, at the same time that other parts were consumed upon *God's Table* as it were by Him,—Hence those who offered these *Sacrifices* were looked upon as in a State of *Friendship* with God, and as partaking of the known Symbols of *Friendship*, and thus in *Peace* with him. The Nature and Reason of the other Sorts of *Sacrifices* will be explained hereafter.

But it will be proper to enter into a more particular consideration of this *Affair*. And here

First, Nothing was offered unto God, but what was deem'd *Clean*: and by *Clean* was meant what was usually eaten by Men, and what by Experience they had found to be not disagreeable to their Stomachs or Palates. These might vary much in different Countries; nor can perhaps a good reason be assigned, why That which was deemed a *Dainty* by one People, should be the *Aversion* of Another. Why are
Frogs

Frogs so much valued and eaten in *France*, whilst in *England*, they are never touched, much less reckoned a Dainty? Whatever then was deem'd in the East in any Nation *proper for Food*, That was reckoned *Clean*, whilst all other Animals were treated as *Unclean*. Mankind in general seem agreed that carnivorous Animals are unfit for Food; and where Politeness and more refined Manners have prevailed, there even some Species of creatures that live on the Herbs and Fruits of the Earth have been ever look'd upon, as coarse, improper, diet. Experience soon had taught Mankind the difference betwixt Animals that divided, or did not divide the Hoof; those that did, or did not chew the Cud; And these were * *Signs*, in general, to them, by which they distinguish'd one Species of Creatures from another, as what were fitter for Food, or were better to eat than

* *Signa illa*—Ruminationis Cibi, et fissionis Ungularum in Bestiis, Pinnarumque et Squammarum in Piscibus—non esse causas propter quas sint licitæ et permissæ; Sicuti nec defectus illorum, Causas cur prohibeantur; Sed Signa tantum, unde nobilis et insignis aliqua Species, ab alia minus præstantiore et noxia potest discerni. *Maimon. More Nivoch. l. iii. c. 48.*

Others were : And they offered in Sacrifice not only such as were *clean*, but the *Best* of such as they conceiv'd to be *fit for Food*; and because all were concern'd to Sacrifice, what was common to be had by all, was appointed for all. And therefore one cannot but remark, that under the *Mosaic Law*, not Every thing that was eaten by the People was burnt upon the Altar, but only three Species of clean Animals, viz. *Bullocks, Sheep, and Goats*; And Two Species of Birds, viz. *Turtle Doves* and young *Pidgeons*, were allowed to be offered as Sacrifices.

When the Sacrifice was thus prepared, of a *clean Species*, it was a ruled case all over the world, that the Sacrificer was to have * *pure Hands, pure Garments, pure Vessels, a pure Victim, and pure Wine*. Of all which *Briffonius* has produced Variety of Instances. And these were designed as Rites significant of the Moral Disposition of the Mind.

† In sacris puras Manus,—puras Vestes, et pura Vasa, et puram Hostiam, et purum Vinum desiderabant. *Briffonius de Formis, p. 9.*

Secondly,

Secondly, *Salt* was the known Symbol of *Friendship*; and because it was something *fixed* made out of a *fluid*, and that it preserved Meat from Corruption, it came to be particularly applied to all such things as were designed to be *durable*. For this reason, when it was declared in the Law, that such and such things were to be given to the Sons of *Aaron* and to his Daughters *by a Statute for ever*, Numb. xviii. 19, it is thus expressed in the Original *, *It is a Covenant of Salt for ever, before the Lord to thee, and to thy Seed with thee.* And so again, *Ought you not to know that the Lord God of Israel gave the Kingdom of Israel to David for ever, even to him, and to his Sons by a Covenant of Salt?* 2 Chron. xiii. 5. i. e. by a Covenant that should surely last, or by a very *durable* Covenant. And it is more than barely probable that the *Pillar of Salt*, Gen. xix. 26, ought to be understood in the same manner; Not, that

* This is rendered in the LXX, Δίδωκά σοι καὶ ταῖς υἱαῖς σου, καὶ ταῖς θυγατέράσι σου μετὰ σοῦ, νόμιμον αἰώνιον. Διαθήκη αἰλὸς αἰώνιος ἔστιν ἐναντὶ Κυρίου, σοὶ καὶ τῷ σπέρματί σου μετὰ σοῦ. *It is a Covenant of everlasting Salt before the Lord, to thee, and to thy Seed after thee,* Numb. xviii. 19.

Lot's Wife was turned into a real *Pillar of Salt*, but that She was a *lasting instance*, or memorial, of *Disobedience*; who when She was so expressly forbidden to * *look behind her*, yet could not, or would not, forbear doing what she ought not; and died in the common misfortune of those unhappy people of *Sodom* and *Gomorrhah*. Vid. *Le Clerc's Dissertation* on this Passage of Scripture.

I took notice that *Salt* was the common Symbol of *Friendship*: and let me observe, that *Erasmus* in explaining the Proverb, *Salem et Mensam ne prætereas*, Ἄλλα καὶ τράπεζαν μὴ παραβαίνειν, has produced several passages from *Theocritus*, *Euripides*, *Laertius*, *Origen*, and *Q. Curtius*, to shew what a Crime it was deemed to

* One cannot help remembering, on this Occasion, how elegantly *Virgil* has painted *Orpheus* looking back on his *Euridice*.

Redditaque Euridice superas veniebat ad Auras
 Pone Sequens: Namque hanc dederat Proserpina legem,
 Cum subita incautum dementia cepit amantem,
 Ignoscenda quidem, scirent si ignoscere Manes.
 Respexit, Euridicemque suam jam luce sub ipsa
 Inmemor heu! victusque animi respexit.—

Virg. Geor. iv. 485.

transgress

transgress, or violate *Friendship* contracted by Eating *Salt*, or by eating *Bread* together. From this general Opinion every where prevailing it is that we express *long Friendships* by our having *ate a Bushel of Salt* together: The *Latins* expressed it by eating *many Bushels*; *Multos modios Salis simul edendos esse*. Cicero de Amicit. There is a Passage in *Ezra*, which in the Original stands thus,—*Now because we are salted with the Salt of the Palace, it was not meet for us to see the King's dishonour*, Ezra iv. 14. The meaning is not as we translate it, *Because we have maintenance from the King's Palace*; But, because we are strongly engaged in firm *Friendship* to the King, *it was not meet for us to see the King's dishonour*. It was indeed the *Persian* Custom to have Meat sent from the King's Table to such as He honoured with eminent Marks of his Favour: And *Josephus* in his *Antiquities*, l. x. c. 11. and *Heliodorus*, l. vii. mentions this Custom: And from them *Briffonius* in his Book *de Regno Persico*, l. i. has observed it. And the *Grand Seignior* at this day uses something of the same Custom. For

when He is disposed to shew * “ singular
 “ Grace and especial Favour to any one
 “ of his *Aghas* who wait on him at his
 “ Meals, he throws Him a *Loaf of Bread*
 “ from his own Table.” But This has no
 Relation to the custom alluded to in *Ezra*.
 The *Vulgate* renders it, *Memores Salis quod*
in Palatio comedimus. The *Complutense*
 Edition has it, Καὶ νῦν ἐν καθὼς ἄλας τῆ.
 Ναῖ ἡλισάμεθα, *As we have been salted with*
the Salt of the Temple. The Persons who
 are here mentioned were such as *dwelt in*
Samaria, far enough from the King’s
 Palace, *Ezra* iv. 17. who therefore de-
 clare themselves so much concerned for
 the King’s Honour, *because they were*
salted with the Salt of the Temple. What
Temple do they mean? No doubt the
King’s. They meant therefore to say,
 That they were *firm Friends* to the King,
 and to his *Religion*, and in consequence
 Enemies to the *Temple* that was building
 at *Jerusalem* to the Lord God.

Hence it is easy to give the reason of
 that Law of *Moses*—*Every Oblation of thy*

* *Vide* Withers’s Account of the Grand Seignior’s Se-
 raglio, c. ix.

Meat Offering shalt thou season with Salt; nor shalt thou suffer the Salt of the Covenant of thy God to be lacking from thy meat offering: With all thine Offerings thou shalt offer Salt, *Levit. ii. 13.* The Jewish Doctors tell us, that if any Oblation was made without Salt, it was deem'd polluted: But when *Maimonides* asserts that * the “ Idolaters did not use Salt in their
 “ Sacrifices, and that That was the reason
 “ why God commanded Salt to be used
 “ in all Oblations to him”, it is evident how much He mistook the intent of this command. For the Heathen World had such a Notion of the meaning and intent of Salt, that They constantly made use of it, in their Sacrifices; it being the ordinary Symbol of *Friendship*. Hence in *Virgil*

———— *Mibi Sacra parari*
Et Salsæ fruges —————

Æn. ii. l. 132.

* Quia Idololatræ—Sale in illis [Oblationibus] non utebantur, ideo Deus—Sale in omnibus Sacrificiis uti serio præcepit. *Maim. More Nev. l. iii. c. 46.*

And *Homer* calls it *Θείον*, *divine*, from its being used in all Sacrifices. It is certainly true, what the *Scholiast* on *Homer* observed, * That “ Salt preserves things “ sprinkled with it from corruption.” When this is added to the Notion, that it conciliates *Friendship*, or is the Symbol of *Friendship*, the use of it in Sacrifice is plain; — It was to intimate a *lasting Friendship* with the Deity. And therefore *Eustathius* assigns this Reason of the practice of mixing *Salt* with their *Meal* in their Sacrifices † “ Because *Salt* was “ the *Symbol of Friendship*.” He goes on, “ For which reason they were wont “ to set *Salt* before they brought other “ Meat to such as they received with “ Hospitality, either because it implied the “ return and stability of *Friendship*, (for “ *Salt* is the Cause of Duration and In- “ corruption to many things) or they did

* Διὰ τὰ ἄσηπτα τηρεῖν τὰ φαθόντα. *Ili.* ἰ. 1. 214. Ἡ, ὅτι τὰ ἐλίπασα διαρμένει ἢ ὅτι τὰς φιλίας συνάγει. *Ibid.*

† Διότι φιλίας οἱ ἄλς σύμβολον. Διὸ καὶ τοῖς ἐπιξενουμένοις παρετίθεντο πρὸ τῶν ἄλλων βραμάτων, ἢ διὰ τὸ τῆς φιλίας νόσιμον καὶ παρῆμον (παρῆμονῆς γὰρ αἴτιος πολλοῖς τῶν σαμῶτων καὶ ὁ ἄλς) ἢ καὶ εἰς σύμβολον τῆς κατὰ φιλίαν ἐνώσεως. *Eust. in Hom.* II. Α΄.

“ it as the *Symbol of Unity in Friendship.*”
 Most probably it was done, not for either of these Reasons alone, but for Both of them united.

Of what necessity the *Romans* thought the Use of *Salt* in Sacrifice is plain from a Story told by *Livy*. *Rome* was in great distress, through want of Money to fit out a Fleet; and they had none at all in their Treasury. *Lævinus* the Consul therefore proposed, that all the Senators*
 “ should bring in their Gold, and Silver;
 “ and all their Brass Money; and none
 “ should retain for himself, his Wife and
 “ Children, more than their Rings.—And
 “ that They that had borne a Curule
 “ Office, should keep the Silver Orna-
 “ ments of their Horses, and a pound
 “ weight besides for *Sacred Uses*, viz.
 “ That they might have a *Saltcellar*, and a
 “ *Cup* for the worship of the Gods.” The Vessel to put the *Salt* in, was as requisite,

* Aurum, Argentum, Æs signatum omnes Senatores— in publicum conferamus, ita ut Annulos sibi quisque et conjugii et liberis—relinquant. Argenti qui curuli sella sederunt, equi Ornamenta et libras pondo, ut *Salinum*, *Patellamque* Deorum causa habere possint. *Levius*. l. xxvi.

as the *Patera*, or Cup to put the Wine in : And Both were so constantly used, that in the times of this great distress, very little more was allowed to these chief Men at Rome.

Thirdly, As nothing was Sacrificed to God, but what was commonly used for Food among Men ; so in the *Jewish Law*, They were all of the *Tame* kind of Animals that were burnt upon the Altar ; Bullocks, Sheep, Goats, Pidgeons, Turtles : And if we look into the *Meat Offerings*, They were made of *Fine Flower, Oil*— Things that were in common Use, when Men eat and drink together as *Friends*. Where a Table was furnished out with Meat, it was necessary that *Bread* should likewise be prepared : And accordingly the *Meat Offerings* of Flower were constantly attendant upon the Sacrifices of Animals.

The Law of *Moses* is, *If any one shall offer קורבן מנחה, the Oblation of a Mincha to the Lord, his Offering shall be of Fine Flower ; and he shall pour Oil upon it, and put Frankincense thereon, Lev. ii. 1.* The Least Offering that any one could make, even those who were so poor as
not

not to be able to bring a couple of Turtles, or Pidgeons, was to be the Tenth part of an Epha of *fine Flower*, i. e. an *Omer*, or about *Six Pints*. To this quantity of Flower there was to be a *Log* of Oil, *Lev. xiv. 10, i. e.* Half a Pint; and there was to be a Handful of Frankincense to all those Meat Offerings which had Oil and Frankincense appointed: (For in the Meat Offerings of the *Sinner*, mentioned *Lev. v. 11.* and in the *Offering of Jealousy*, mentioned *Numb. v. 15,* there was to be no Oil, nor Frankincense, used.) But in general, He that brought his Mincha, be the Quantity more or less, he brought a proportion of Oil suited to it, to mingle them; and he brought Incense likewise proportionable. When the Flower and Oil were mixed, *the Priest carried it to the Altar—and removing all the Frankincense unto the one side, he took up a handful of the Flower and Oil mixed, and put that handful into a ministring Vessel, and sanctified it therein. Then gathering up all the Frankincense, he put it upon the handful in the Vessel, and set it upon the Altars, and salted it, and put it out of the*

Ministring

Ministring Vessel upon the Fire. Thus *Ainsworth* (from *Maimonides*) upon *Levit.* ii. 2.

But what sort of an Offering was this, made up of Flower and Oil; or how comes such an Offering to be in use? The Answer is, It was customary in the East to mix up these two Ingredients, and thus to make a *Bread* which was their ordinary food. The *Persian Maza* was Barley Flower mixed with Oil and Water, and was Their *daily Diet*. * So *Strabo*, lib. xv. Now *Maza*, according to *Hesychius*, was † *Barley Flower mixed with Water and Oil*; and from hence came Oil to be used in Meat Offerings, because it was an usual Ingredient to be mixed with Flower to make a Sort of Bread.

There were other things usually mixed by the Heathen with their Flower, and particularly *Honey*, to make their Cakes which they offered on their Altars. But all such were expressly forbidden to the *Jews*, as not being an ingredient in their common

* 'Η δὲ καθ' ἡμέραν δαίτα, ἄριστος μετὰ τὸ γυμνάσιον, καὶ μάζα—*Strabo*, p. 1067.

† Ἄλφιλα περιφρμένα ὕδατι καὶ ἐλαίῳ. *Hesyc.*

Bread.

Bread. Such things as made the common food of Man were the things appointed to be Sacrificed ; and as *Bread* was used where *Flesh* was used, it was proper that a Meat Offering, *i. e.* *Bread* should be joined to the Sacrifice of *Flesh* ; and where through Poverty or other means a Man could not bring to the Altar any Animal, an Offering of *Flower* mixed with *Oil* should be accepted.

The *Mincha's*, or *Meat Offerings*, among the *Jews* were either Public or Private. The Public ones consisted, 1. Of an Oblation of Barley, a Handful of which was always offered on the second day of the *Passover* ; and with this there was always burnt some *Incense* ; and the rest was eaten by the *Priests*. 2. Two Loaves made of *Wheat*, offered at the *Pentecost*. And 3. the *Shew-Bread*, which the *Priests* did eat every *Sabbath-day*. To this *Shew-Bread* was always added *Incense* ; which being a thing improper for *Food*, the words of *Moses* ought to be explained. The Command is given, *Levit. xxiv. 5—9*, *Thou shalt take fine flower, and bake Twelve Loaves, two tenth deals shall be*
in

in one Cake; and thou shalt set them in two Rows, Six on a Row, upon the pure Table before the Lord: and thou shalt put pure Frankincense UPON each Row, that it may be ON the Bread for a Memorial, even an Offering made by Fire unto the Lord. It may seem by this as if the *Frankincense* were some how or other put UPON each Row of *Bread*, and thus the *Bread* would be unfit for eating: Nor can one say, from the manner of Expression here used, Whether the *Bread*, or the *Incense*, or the *Bread and Incense* was an Offering made by Fire unto the Lord. But it is well known that *David* did eat of the *Shew Bread*; and it was ordered that *Aaron* and his Sons should eat it in the Holy place, *Levit. xxiv. 9.* The Truth is, the *Frankincense* was put, not UPON, but BY the Loaves in Vessels proper for that purpose. And thus the *Jews* of old explained it: “ They set by the
“ side of each Row a Vessel, wherein
“ was a Handful of Frankincense, and
“ the Vessel was called *Bezik*, [a Cup or
“ Phial.] So that there were two hand-
“ fulls of Frankincense in two Cups, and
“ the

“ the cups had Verges that they might
 “ rest on the Table.” So *Ainsworth* upon
 this place translates *Maimonides*.

The Private Mincha's were of *Nine*
 several Sorts ; but all agreed in this, that
 after a Pugil was burnt upon the Altar,
 the rest was eaten by the Priests, except a
 particular case or two where the whole
 was burnt upon the Altar ; vid. *Lev. vi.*
23. So that in the case of the *Meat*
Offering, where Frankincense was requi-
 red, the Frankincense was to be burnt,
 the better to consume the Offering ; and
 nothing was done that might interfere
 with the great End of all Sacrifices, which
 was to make *Friends* with God by Eating
his Bread. Numb. xxviii. 2.

The Heathen World had their several
 Sorts of *Cakes*, . or *Bread*, which they
 made use of in their various Sacrifices to
 their Gods : Some had one Sort, Some
 Another ; and scarce was any Sacrifice
 made, in which there was not an Obla-
 tion of *Corn* in some Shape or other ad-
 ded to the *Flesh* given to the God. When
 any one went to consult the Oracle of
Trophonius, he carried with him into the
 Den,

Den, * μάζας, *cakes in his hands*. The true meaning of which was, that He might be upon Terms of *Friendship* with the God, as *eating with him*. *Maximus Tyrius* tells us this Fact, *Dissert. xxvi*. And so does *Pausanias* : and *Julius Polux* says that his particular Sort of *Cake* was call'd Μελιτῆστα. The Practice was founded on good reason, as implying mutual *Friendship*, or a Desire of having it, between the God and him that consulted him. The Scholiast indeed upon *Aristophanes* has found out another Use for these *Cakes*, viz. † that “ They were
 “ given to *Snakes* and *Serpents* that were
 “ in the *Cave*, and by that means the
 “ Person that entered the *Cave* was un-
 “ hurt by them.” But *Pausanias* who consulted this Oracle himself, mentions no such use of them ; and it seems to be a mere invention in order to account for the practice ; the reason of which was lost or forgot. The Learned *Spanheim*

* Μάζας ἐν χερσὶν ἔχων. *Max. Tyr. Diss. xxvi.*

† Ἐισήρχοντο ἐν ἐνὸς οἱ χρυσάμειοι, ἔχοντες ἐν ταῖς χερσὶν κόπανα, ἵνα τοῖς ἐμφιλοχωρῶσιν ὄφεισι διδόντες, μηδὲν ὑπ' αὐτῶν ἐν χειρὶ πάσχωσιν. *Scol. in Arist. Nub. v. 508.*

has produced several instances of persons going into *Trophonius's* Cave, and carrying with them always, *μάζας μεμαγμένας μέλιτι*, cakes kneaded with Honey. And by this he accounts for * several antient Coins, on which the Goddess, *Health*, is represented, as offering a piece of *Cake* to a *Serpent*, “ it being it seems a Sort of
 “ Food that That Animal is highly de-
 “ lighted with.” But the Satyre of the Poet lay in quite a different thing. *Spanheim* observes, that † “ *Strepsiades* being
 “ ordered to follow *Socrates* going into his
 “ House, as if he were ordered to go into
 “ *Trophonius's* Cave, as it follows in the
 “ next line, he pleasantly desires that He
 “ might have a *Horned Cake* first given
 “ him, to fortify himself against any *Evil*
 “ *Spirit* he might meet with, which was

* Unde illustrantur tot veteres Nummi, in quibus Dea Salus, seu Ὑγίεια offam Serpenti tanquam cibum, quo id reptilis genus delectaretur, porrigit. *Spanhem. Not. in Nubes Aristophanis. v. 507.*

† Socratem domicilium suum adeuntem jussus sequi *Strepsiades*, quasi *Trophonii* Antrum ut de eo sequenti versu, ingressurus esset, fessive mellitam id genus placentam sibi prius dari postulat, quo se adversus occursum forte infectum quempiam Genium, vulgo per serpentem seu draconem designatum, præmuniret. *Spanh. ibid.*

“ commonly represented by a Serpent.” The best way of fortifying one’s self against this Evil Genius was by being in a State of *Friendship* with him; and the presenting him with the *Cake*, was giving him the Symbol of *Friendship*: And *Strepfiades* need not have been afraid of *Socrates’s* House, if he could have been in *Friendship* with the Evil Genius of it, his Wife.

But supposing the Oblation of a *Mincha* might have been with a View to the Great End of Sacrifice, *viz.* the obtaining, or the entering into *Friendship* with God, yet why was *Incense* added, a thing not proper for *Food*, and therefore foreign to the nature of Sacrifice, how frequently soever it was used for that purpose?

Incense was certainly what would make an agreeable Smell: And when Sacrifices of Animals became numerous in any one place, * “ it was very requisite to prevent or cure all disagreeable Smells arising from the Altar.” *Maimonides* has

* Elegitque ad eam Thus, propter bonitatem Odoris fumi ipsius in illis locis ubi sctor est ex carnibus combustis. *Maim More Neco.* l. iii. c. 46.

observed, * “ that because they killed
 “ a great number of Beasts, and cut them
 “ in pieces and washed and burn’d the
 “ inwards, the Stink would have been
 “ just like that of a Shambles: that
 “ therefore it was necessary that Incense
 “ should be burn’d twice aday, to make
 “ the smell of the place, and of the cloths
 “ of those that ministred in the Temple,
 “ not disagreeable.” It is found too in
 Experience that Frankincense had a pecu-
 liar Efficacy in driving away, or in de-
 stroying *Flies*; and by that means was of
 signal Use in Temples, where there was
 much burning of Flesh. So that what
 is said in the Law concerning *Incense* does
 not interfere with what I have observed
 about the Original intention of Sacrifices.

Fourthly, Besides the Meat Offering,
 there was always a *Drink Offering* to be
 made: And This is a strong Confirmation
 of what I said about the original Inten-

* Quia quotidie in Sanctuario magnum numerum Bestiarum macerabant, carnes ibi in frustra scindebant, intestina item et crura lavabant et comburebant, Odor ejus, si in hoc statu illud reliquissent, sine dubio instar macelli alicujus fuisset; ideo præcepit Deus ut bis quotidie suffitus in eo fiat—ad gratam reddendum odorem ejus, et odorem Vestimentorum Ministrorum ejus. *Maim ibid. c. 45.*

tion of Sacrifices, which was to keep up a *Friendship* with God, by *Eating* and *drinking* at his Table.

The Law about *Drink Offerings* is given, *Numb. xv.* And by the Instances there mentioned it appears that Meat Offerings and Drink Offerings were not annexed to *all* Sacrifices, but only to *Burnt Offerings* and *Peace Offerings*, of the Flock and Herd. Accordingly *Maimonides* observes, that * “ when a Sin Offering or a Trespass Offering were made, then there was no Oblation of a Meat Offering, except in the case of the Sin or Trespass Offering of the Leper.” And a Question has been moved among the Rabbi’s, † “ whether an

* Neque Sacrificium pro peccato, neque Sacrificium pro reatu, requirunt Munus Libaminum. *Maimonides. Præfat. Menuchoth. apud Mishnah, Vol. V. p. 62.*

Omnia e jumento holocausta, omniaque pacifica requirunt libamina, sive sint Sacrificia pro cœtu, sive pro privatis: Sed Sacrificium pro peccato et pro reatu non requirit libamina, præter Sacrificium pro peccato leprosi, vel pro ejusdem reatu. *Ibid.*

† In *Siphri* quæritur, an holocaustum ex Ave indigeat libamine? Et respondetur quod non indiget, quia in principio Levitici dicitur מן חבקה ומן חבקה. quæ phraîs quoque extat *Num. xv. 3.* ubi de libaminibus. *Maim. ibid.*

“ Holo-

“ Holocaust of a *Bird* required a Meat
 “ Offering? And the Determination has
 “ been in the Negative, because in the
 “ beginning of *Leviticus* the Phrase is,
 “ *of the Herd or of the Flock*; and the
 “ same Expression is used *Numb. xv. 3.*”

The Reason why there was to be no *Meat*
 or *Drink Offering*, when either a Sin or
 Trespas Offering were to be made, will
 be shewn hereafter. At present I am en-
 quiring what was the design and intent of
 Sacrifices in general.

I would observe, that among the *Jews*
 the Quantity of *Wine* to be offered for a
 Drink Offering was always exactly the
 same as the Quantity of *Oil* used in the
 Meat Offering. When a Fourth part of
 a Hin of Oil was ordered to be mixed
 with the Flower for a Meat Offering,
 then the Fourth part of a Hin of Wine
 was commanded to be prepared for a
 Drink Offering: When a Third part of
 a Hin of Oil was required, then there
 was to be a third part of a Hin of Wine:
 And where Half a Hin of Oil was enjoined,
 there was to be Half a Hin of Wine,

Numb. xv. 4—10. *N. B.* a Hin is much about Six Quarts.

2. Tho' a Drink Offering was required in the *Jewish* Law, yet the Priests were not allowed to taste it, but it was to be poured out at the South-West corner of the Altar. The Son of *Sirach* alludes to this,— *He stretched out his hand to the Cup, and poured of the blood of the Grape; he poured out at the Foot of the Altar a sweet smelling Savour unto the most high King of all, Eccclus. c. l. 15.* He is speaking of *Simon* the High Priest the Son of *Onias*, who in his life repaired the Temple. *Josephus* says, * “ That they poured the Wine about the Altar.” This pouring out of *Wine* at the Altar, was giving to God his Portion; and was owing to the Reason for which Sacrifices were intended, *viz.* to engage in solemn *Friendship* with God, according to the ordinary well known Customs of Men, who were wont by these very means to contract *Friendships* with one Another. And hence it was that the Heathen

* Σπένδουσι περὶ τὸν βωμὸν τὸν ἅγιον. *Joseph. Antiq.* l. iii. c. 10.

brought

brought to their Altars *Pure Wine*, and never would suffer sophisticated, foul, bad Wine to be applied to such uses; and therefore That which had Water mix'd with it, or *Must* before it had fermented, or that * “proceeded from Grapes that “had been pressed with sore feet, or from “a Vine blasted with Lightning”, and some other cases which *Pliny* mentions, was deem'd improper for Sacrifice: Improper to treat a *Friend* with, and much more to give to one with whom one desired to contract *Friendship*.

Maimonides could not imagine what the Reason was, † “Why God would order “*Wine* to be offered, since Idolaters all “over the world did the same.” His Notion of things being commanded, merely in contradiction to Idolaters, was what

* Prohibere diis nefastum habetur vina, præter impunitatæ vitis, fulmine tactæ, quamque juxta hominis mors laqueo pependerit, aut vulneratis pedibus calcata, et quod circumcisus vinaceis profluxerit, aut superne deciduo immundiore lapsu aliquo polluto. Item Græcæ, quoniam aquam habeant. *Plin* l. xiv. c. 19

† De Oblatione autem Vini perplexus sum in hodiernum usque diem, Cur illud offerri voluerit? Nam Idolatræ quoque illud offerre Solent. *Maim. More Nevo*. l. iii. c. 46.

led him into his Perplexity. Whereas a Table, by means of which a *Friendship* was to be engaged in, or if it had been broke, was to be re-established, would not have been properly furnished, if something which was usual to *drink* had not been annexed to the Flesh and Mincha prepared. The Wine among the *Jews* was poured out about the Altar, and thus was consumed: and the Offerer did not taste of it in the Temple any more than the Priests did. But amongst the Heathen, it was customary for the Priest to *taste the Wine*, and then to give the Cup about to those who stood near to do the like, before he poured it on the Beast; And this was properly called *Propinatio*. This was done in token of *Friendship*, and strict Engagement together. And therefore when *Sallust* was describing the manner which *Cataline* used most effectually to bind his Associates to Fidelity, He tells us, * “ that he took Human Blood “ mixed with Wine, which when all had

* Cum omnes degustavissent, sicuti in SOLEMNIBUS SACRIS fieri consuevit. *Sallust. De Bello Catali. c. xxiii.*

“ tasted,

“ tasted, *in the same manner as is usual*
 “ *in Solemn Sacrifices*, he disclosed his
 “ Design.”

The *Jewish* Custom was, in cases where the Owner of the Sacrifice had his Share, to carry home his Part of the Sacrifice, and to invite his Friends to the Feast, and then to eat of what had been offered unto God ; and thus he partook of the Table on which the Flesh and Wine had been offered. But then there was this difference betwixt their Custom and the Customs of the Heathen, (I mean the *Greeks* and *Romans*,) that whereas according to the Law of *Moses*, the Wine was poured *about the Altar*, according to the Customs of the Other, the Wine was poured upon either the *Head* of the Victim, or upon the several Parts of it as they were burning. Of the Former Rite there needs no other proof than this of *Ovid*,

Rode caper vitem, tamen hinc cum stabis
ad Aras

In tua quod fundi cornua possit erit.

Fast. i.

And

And again,

— *Dum Vota Sacerdos*

*Concipit, et fundit purum inter cornua
Vinum.*

Metam. l. vii. l. 593.

And *Virgil*,

— *Dido*

Candentis Vaccæ media inter cornua fundit.

Æne. iv.

Of the latter Rite, *viz.* the pouring Wine upon the Parts of the Victim whilst it was burning, *Homer* in his Description of *Nestor's* Sacrifice says,

Καίε δ' ἐπὶ χίζης ὁ γέρον· ἐπὶ δ' αἶθοπα οἶνον
Λεῖβε. —————

Ody. γ'. l. 459, 60. Il. α'. 463.

Again,

— ἔχε δὲ χρύσειον ἄλεισον
Σπένδων αἶθοπα οἶνον ἐπ' αἶθομένοις ἱερωῖσι.

Il. λ'. 774.

One

One cannot but observe How *Arnobius* has treated the Heathen Use of Wine in their Sacrifices. He challenges to* “ assign
 “ a reason why they poured Wine upon
 “ their Altars.” † “ What has God to
 “ do with Wine ” ? || “ Do their Bodies
 “ feel *Thirst*, or are their Drougths to be
 “ tempered with any Moisture ? Bring
 “ out your Cups, Pots, Flagons, and
 “ give to the immortal Gods, that they
 “ may drink ; and because they have
 “ stuffed themselves with the Flesh of
 “ Bulls, and feasts of Fat things, and
 “ high Foods, and their ill-digested Meat
 “ sticks in their Stomachs, up, make
 “ haste, give to *Jupiter* some Wine, lest
 “ he should be choaked,” &c. This and

* *Aperite, monstrate, liquor iste cur detur, id est Vinum superfundatur Altaribus? Arnob. l. vii. p. 235.*

† *Quid est enim Deo cum Vino? — Quid inquam Deo cum Vino est? Veneri is re proxima, &c. Ibid p. 236.*

|| *Num quid enim Numinum corpora sitim sentiunt aridam, et eorum necesse est Siccitates humore aliquo temperari? — Date quæso immortalibus Diis bibant; Scyphos, Brias, Pateras, Sympuviave depromite: Et quoniam Tauris, pinguibusque se dapibus, atque opimis inferciunt escis, ne quod in Stomachi tramite male transvortatum subsisterit Viscus, succurrite, properate, Jovi Optimo Maximo merum, ne præfocetur, date, &c. Ibid. p. 235.*

much

much more is said with great Scoffing and Derision ; which might have been applied to the Drink Offering of the *Jews*, had his Adversaries thought fit to have retorted such Ridicule. But if the true End of Sacrifices had been kept in view, neither would *Arnobius* have used such Insults ; nor would the Heathen have minded such false Arguments. For some Sort of Liquor being always required as an Ingredient at all Entertainments, This was the reason Why it was used at all Sacrifices : And for the same End in Both Cases, *viz.* The keeping up a State of *Friendship* by eating and drinking together.

There were no doubt particular Reasons for the Rites made use of in all the Heathen Sacrifices : and tho' these Rites varied much, yet the Reason of them may generally be assigned. Some Sort of Liquor was always used in Sacrifice : *Wine*, pure and unmixed was common ; *Wine and Water*, was rarely used, if ever. If it was used at all, it was to *Mercury*, * and

* Τῷ Ἑρμῇ μόνῳ ἔθουσ κεκραμμένην σπόνδιον, διὰ τὸ ζώτων καὶ τετελευτηκότων ἄρχων. *Suidas.* υ. Κύλιξ, et κεκραμμένη σπόνδιον.

to him “ *alone*, as having Power over the *Living* and the *Dead*, and receiving Honour from *Both*.” *Water* mixed with *Honey* was not uncommon ; and where this was offered, * the Sacrifices were called Νηφάλιοι, *Sober*. But sometimes they offered † *Wine and Honey* ; then *Wine alone* ; and afterwards *Water*, at the same Sacrifice. Whatever Liquor it was that was *poured out*, or given to the Gods, it was not done with that ridiculous view, that *Arnobius* suggested ; but it was to use the Symbols of *Friendship*, and to declare a desire of being upon good terms with the Deity sacrificed unto. If the Sacrifice was offered by way of *Thanks* for Favours received ; or if it was designed to avert Anger, or to ask for any future Good, the general means were the same ; and all tended to promote, or to continue, or to renew Amity, by this common Method of *making or continuing Friends* with one another.

* Νηφάλιοι θυσίαι, ἐν αἷσι οἶνος ἔσπενδεται, ἀλλὰ ὕδατος μελίκρατον. Suid. v Νηφάλιοι θυσίαι.

† Πρῶτα μελικρητῶν, μετέπειτα δὲ ἕδει ἔινω
Τὸ τρίτον αὐθ' ὕδατι,——

Hom. Odyss. κ'. l. 520.

Some-

Sometimes Libations were made of *Milk* only : Sometimes of *Milk, Honey, and Wine*, to this or that particular God or Goddess. When *Virgil* was describing the *Ambervale Sacrificium*, He tells us that they offered to *Ceres*, Milk, Honey and Wine, with the Victim.

*Cui tu Lacte, Favos, et miti dilue Baccho :
Terque novas circum fœlix eat Hostia fruges.*

Geor. i. l. 344.

The reason was, the Goddess of the Fruits of the Earth was to be made a *Friend* by the Oblation of such things as were conceived to be her immediate Care. She first taught, as they imagined, all kind of Agriculture ; and therefore in worshipping Her as Goddess of Agriculture, it was thought proper to offer to her Milk and Honey as well as Wine. When *Ceres* was worshipped in another Capacity, as on occasion of a *Wedding*, She had no Wine offered to her, because it was deem'd a Crime to make use of Wine to Her on such Occasions.

This

This passage of *Virgil*, wherein he speaks of Wine offered to *Ceres*, has long ago been objected to, as contrary to Religious Rites. And there have not been wanting those who justified this charge against *Virgil* by producing this Passage from *Plautus*.

ST. Cererine, Strobile, has facturi Nuptias?

STR. Qui? ST, Quia Temeti nihil allatum intelligo.

Aulul. Act. ii. Sc. 6.

But *Servius* assures us, that * “ *the Sacred Books* no where forbid the Offer-

* Superfluum est, quod quidam dicunt, contra religionem dixisse Virgilium, licere de Vino Sacrificare. Pontificales namque hoc non vetant libri. Quod autem Plautus in *Aulularia*, cujus ipsi utuntur exemplo—*Cererine nuptias facturi esses? Qui? Quia temeti nihil allatum intelligo.*—Non est huic loco contrarium. Nam aliud est Sacrificium, aliud Nuptias Cereri celebrare: In quibus revera Vinum adhiberi nefas erat, quæ *Orci Nuptiæ* dicebantur, quas præsentia sui Pontifices ingenti solennitate celebrabant. *Servius in Virgil. Georg. l. i. v. 344.*

That the Romans and Arcadians too did in some cases not offer Wine to Ceres, is plain from a Passage in Dionysius Halicarnassensis: Ἱερὸς αὖτο δὲ καὶ Δήμητρος ἱερὸν, καὶ τὰς θυσίας αὐτῆ δια γυναικῶν τε καὶ ΝΗΦΑΛΙΟΥΣ ἐθύσαν, ὡς Ἑλλήσιν νόμος. Lib. i p 26. Edit. Francof. 1636.

“ ing

“ ing Wine to *Ceres*.” He adds, “ It is
 “ one thing to celebrate a Sacrifice to
 “ *Ceres*; it is another to celebrate Nup-
 “ tials to her. That in the one it was
 “ lawful to use Wine; in the Other, not.”
 And he tells us of another construction of
 this Verse likewise that naturally gets rid
 of the difficulty,— Cui, et miti Baccho
 favos lacte dilue; *To whom and to Bacchus,*
offer Honey and Milk. But I must ob-
 serve, that when *Cato* so particularly de-
 scribes the same Sacrifice (and we shall
 have occasion to mention it particularly
 hereafter) He names only *Janus*, *Jupiter*,
 and *Ceres*, and does not name *Bacchus*:
 and He orders *Wine* to be given to *Ceres*.
 And it is right to add, what may confirm
Servius’s construction, That when *Tibullus*
 so elegantly described the same Sacrifice,
 He mentions Both *Bacchus* and *Ceres*;
 and speaks of Wine offered, without any
 Exception of it to *Ceres*.

It may seem somewhat strange, that
 since the Heathen were wont to offer
Honey, and Cakes made with Honey, and
 Wine and Honey mixed together, to their
 Gods, that this Practice should be so ex-
 pressly

pressly forbidden by God. *No Meat Offering shall be made with Leaven, for ye shall burn no Leaven, nor Honey in any Offering of the Lord made by Fire, Lev. ii.*

11. Honey was certainly a common eatable, and used by the Great as well as by meaner People; and was deemed a great prolonger of life to them that used it. It was set upon the Table by *Hecamede* to treat *Nestor* with, in *Homer, Il. λ'*. and it was brought forth among the Eleganter things, as most agreeable to all. Whence comes it then that a *common eatable*, a thing so common at Entertainments, and in course a thing so fitted to the End of Sacrifices, should be so expressly forbidden in the *Jewish Law*.

It is not, I think, to be doubted, but that when Worship by way of Sacrifice was instituted by God, and the Law given by *Moses* was ordained, the great Reason of the Rites enjoined was not to recede from a Mode of Service which then prevailed all over the world: a Service which the Children of *Israel* had been educated in, and which could not have been broke off, without the utmost Confusion. The Peo-

ple had been always used to this kind of Worship; and they knew that their Fathers and Ancestors, quite from the days of *Noah*, had practised the Same: And what inveterate Practice had rooted in their minds, and all their Neighbours round about them daily used, was not instantly to be relinquished; nor were the people, so habituated, to be at once removed to a pure Spiritual Worship. The most rational method of proceeding was to institute and appoint things in such a manner as would best preserve the *Jews* from falling into the ways of the Idolaters round about them; and still to preserve the Worship of the One God and Father of all, by keeping up in the *customary* manner a *Friendship* with him, and thus to carry on the great Scenes of Providence in the world. Now whereas their Neighbours made use of *Honey* and *Leaven* in their Sacrifices, God prohibited such in his Service, as unnecessary; and only retain'd what was necessary to carry on the great End design'd by Sacrifice, *viz.* the Furniture of an Ordinary Table, with which the Poorest might easily comply.

Maimonides

Maimonides assigns this reason, (and it seems a very natural one,) * “ Because, “ says he, Idolaters made use in their “ Oblations of only *leavened* Bread, and “ chose *sweet* things for those purposes, “ and were wont to anoint or smear them “ over with *Honey*, therefore God pro- “ hibited us [*Jews*] to offer *Leaven* or “ *Honey*.” Nor does it follow that be- cause God forbid the Use of *Honey* in his Sacrifices, only for this reason because it was used by the Idolaters in their Sacrifices, that therefore He should have *forbidden* *Salt* or *Wine*, or every thing else which they offered, Since his Design was to retain whatever was necessary to the keep- ing up of *Friendship*, Symbolically inti- mated in the use of such things as were the ordinary Signs of *Friendship*, at the same time that he rejected what was superfluous, or Superstitious, from his Insti- tutions.

* Quia Idololatræ panem fermentatum solum offerebant, ac res dulces ad oblationes suas eligebant, easque melle inungere consueverant—ideo prohibuit Deus Nobis panem fermentatum, vel Mel offerre. *Maimon. More Nevoc.* lib. iii. c. 46.

It is well known, that *Honey* was not only used to make a *Drink* of, and that the mixture of *Honey and Wine* was common among the Antients, but that *pure Honey* was likewise burnt upon the Altars to the Heathen Gods. Nay * “ there
 “ were scarce any of the Gods, if any
 “ at all, who had not Honey burnt to
 “ them in Sacrifice.” This might have been sufficient reason to prohibit it in the Sacrifices of God’s Appointment, where the great design was to keep the *Jews* a separate People, and not to let them intermix with Idolaters in things unnecessary to the End of this Service. But then I do not conceive that this Prohibition was made † “ for this sole reason, Because the
 “ Use of Honey was almost *constant* in
 “ the Sacred Rites of Dæmons, that there-
 “ fore it was deemed by God *impure*, and

* Sed ut doceamus simul et Semel *Nullum* fuisse *Deorum* qui *Melle* gaudere non crederetur, legendus est Pausanias in *Eliaicis Prioribus*, &c. *Bochart De Animal. Pars. II. l. iv. c. 12.*

† Tantum addo, Deum, ob id ipsum, quod in Dæmonum sacris Mellis usus pene perpetuus fuerit, pro impuro id habuisse, et in suis Sacrificiis offerri noluisse. *Bochart. ibid.*

“ refused

“ refused to be admitted to his Altars.” Neither Lambs, nor Calves, neither Sheep, nor Bullocks, nor Goats, must have been permitted to be sacrificed to God, if it was reason sufficient to prohibit an Oblation, only because it was *almost perpetually in use* amongst Idolaters in their Sacred Rites. But the Truth is, what I just before observed, that the Sacrifices appointed by God were ordered so as to preserve and keep up the End for which they were originally intended; and all such things were prohibited, as Fancy, or Superstition had introduced, and which were not necessary to the design of Sacrifices.

Perhaps it may not be thought an useless Digression, if I describe the antient manner of Sacrificing among the *Greeks*. They did not always carry their Sacrifices to any Temple or Public place: nor did they always raise even an *Altar* to sacrifice on; but they sometimes burnt it upon their *Hearth*s in their own Houses. Nor was any particular Person necessary to kill the Victim, or appropriated to that purpose. The *Hogherds* brought a fat Porker to *Eumæus*, in *Homer*; and They ἐξήσαν

ἐπ' ἐσχάρῃ, *placed it upon or at the Hearth;*
and there *Eumæus*, the Keeper of the Hogs
killed it, first *Praying* to the Gods. *Hom.*
Odyss. ζ'. v. 420.

Sometimes they gathered an Heap of
Stones together, and upon these they laid
a good many large Sticks of Olive Tree,
or other good burning wood; and they
brought the Bullock to this as an Altar.
Whilst he stood there, Basins were brought
that all might * “*wash their Hands:*”
and so were the ἐλόχυται, or *Baskets*,
which contained every thing necessary for
the Sacrifice.. Some will have the Ὀυλό-
χυται to be the same with κριθὰς, the
salted Flower with which the Victim was
“*sprinkled, after they had purified it*
“*with clean water.*” And so it signi-
fies sometimes. Then was some of the
† “*Hair of the Forehead cut off and cast*
“*into the Fire.*” Then *Prayer* was made
to the God to whom the Sacrifice was

* Χερσὶ ψάμενοι τε καὶ αὐτοὶ, καὶ τὰ ἱερά περὶ αὐγνίσαντες ὕδατι,
καὶ Δήμητρος καρπὸς ἐπιρράνοντες αὐτῶν ταῖς κεφαλῆς, ἐπειὴ
κατενέχμενοι *Dionys. Halicarn.* l. vii.

† Τριχοτομῶντας ἀπὸ τῆς κεφαλῆς τὰς τρίχας, καὶ τιθέντας
ἐπὶ τὸ πῦρ ὡς γράφων, νῆζ. *Homerus.*

Ἄλλ' ὅγ' ἐπαρχόμενος κεφαλῆς τρίχας, ἐν πυρὶ βάλλεν. *Ibid.*

offered;

offered ; and as soon as that was ended, the *Salted Meal* was put upon the Head of the Victim. Then the Victim was knocked down ; its Throat cut ; its Blood let out ; it was skinned, and cut into pieces : These Pieces were covered over with Fat, and burnt upon the Wood ; and *Wine* was poured on them as they burnt. The *Altars* too had the ελόχυται, or *salted Meat*, put upon them, as *Eustathius* observes, *Il. α.* The Rites and Ceremonies made use of in this way of Worship were significant and Symbolical. The Sacrificers, αὐ ἐρύσαν, turned the head of the Sacrifice so as to make it look to the God to whom it was offered. They cut the *Thighs* in pieces, and wrapped them up in Fat, δίπτυχα ποιῆντες, and took care that the pieces offered to, and designed for, the God, should be wholly consumed, making the Fire clear for good luck's sake : Nor did they think that they did καλλιερῆιν, make a successful Sacrifice, if the pieces that were wrapt up in Fat, split from one another. They cut out likewise small pieces from other Parts of the Victim, and laid them upon the

δίπλυχα, the parts of the Thighs that were wrapt in fat ; and this they called ὠμοθετεῖν. When the Thighs were burnt, then they divided the *Bowels*, or *Inwards*, among themselves, *viz.* the *Heart*, the *Liver*, and the *Melt* ; and put these on Spits, and held them over the Fire, and roasted, or broiled them ; as appears from *Homer*.* And with these they made a *Feast*, and treated their Friends, having first *engaged* the God they Sacrificed unto, by eating with him Bread and Wine, and Salt and Flesh, and thus entering into *Friendship* with him. But to proceed from this Digression.

The nature and intent of Sacrifices being this, *To eat and drink* with God, as it were at his Table, and in consequence of That to be in a State of *Friendship* with him, by Repentance and Confession of Sins, What foundation is there for the Notion, that Sacrifices were designed as *Vicarious Substitutions* for the Offender ? Was the Life of the Animal given *in lieu of the Life* of the Sinner ? Or was the

* Σπλάγγνα δ' ἄρ' ἐμπείρατες ὑπεύροχον ἠφαιστοῖο. *Il. β'*
426.

taking away the Life of the One designed to put the other in mind of his Demerits? No doubt of it, This has been a commonly received Notion; and many instances may be produced that confirm this Opinion. *Ovid* has well expressed it, when he says,

*Cor pro corde precor, pro Fibris sumite
Fibras*

Hanc animam vobis pro meliore damus.

Fast. l. vi.

He plainly supposes the Animal to be given as a *Vicarious Substitute*, and the several *parts* of it to be offered either as *Equivalents*—*Heart for Heart*,— Or if not *Equivalents*, yet what (it was hoped) would graciously be accepted in lieu of him that offered it, tho' it was not so good and valuable as the life of a Man was.

Abarbinel, and many Others before as well as since him, have espoused the same Notion; and have applied to the *Jewish* Sacrifices, what was common enough among the Heathens, in order to account
for

for this early Custom. * “ The Person,
 “ says he, that put his hand upon the
 “ Head of the Beast by this Rite confes-
 “ sed the *Desert* of his Sins, and declared
 “ the blood of the Animal to be shed *in*
 “ *lieu of his own*, and that it was just and
 “ right that the Offender’s *life* should be
 “ taken away as was That of the Beast
 “ brought to the Altar.” He applies in-
 deed his Observation only to the *Burnt*
Offering, the *Sacrum Solidum*; But whe-
 ther *Imposition of hands* was for the End
 which *Abarbinel* here mentions has already
 been considered; and whether the Victim
 was slain in lieu of the Offerer, or its Life
 given instead of the Offerers Life, may
 deserve consideration. For,

1. It is not any where *expressly* said,
 no nor so much as hinted at in the Old
 Testament, that the Victim’s life was given
in lieu of, or as a *vicarious Substitute* for,
 the *Life* of him that offered it. This
 indeed was a Notion that prevailed in after

* Porro homo manus imponebat capiti animantis quo
 conficiebat Sacrum solidum, ut fateretur Victimam illam
vicem obire suam, pro se mactari, et illius Sanguinem in-
 spergi Altaribus ubi *Sanguinem et Vitam suam profundi jus*
erat. Abarb. Comment. in Levit. p. 301.

Ages ; and by degrees it grew to be a commonly received Opinion, and it might seem to account for a practice, the Origin of which was forgot or mistaken : But as it is not expressly declared either before, or under the Law of *Moses* to be intended for this End ; nor is it so declared by any of the *Prophets*, who in after times knew the Mind and Intention of God, one may reasonably deny that This was the Original Design or End of the practice of Offering Animal Sacrifices, either in *Burnt Offerings*, or in any Other where a proper *Atonement* was made.

2. The Offering Life for Life, or the giving the Life of the Animal instead, or in the place, of the Life of the Offender, was not required by God as necessary in *all* cases to make *Atonement*. And if *Atonement* was made without the giving any Life, as well as with it, one cannot argue that the Life of the Animal was given in lieu of the Offender's Life, unless it were expressly declared to be so. And the reason is plain ; because the *Atonement* might be made where an Animal was not Sacrificed, as well as where
it

it was Sacrificed; and in course it cannot be proved that the Life of the Animal was necessary to be substituted in lieu of the Offender's Life. It is certain that there were some sorts of Sacrifices appointed, which cannot possibly imply a *Substitution* of one thing for another; nor can they convey any notion of the forfeiture of Life for Offence: and yet These were as properly *Piacular Sacrifices* as any others, and produced all the same effects that any other Sacrifice did or could produce. The Sacrifice I mean was the *Mincha*, or an Offering of *Fine Flower* only. Now if This, in given cases, produced *Atonement*, and every good effect that the Sacrifice of an Animal did, and a *Mincha* always accompanied a Burnt Offering, then it cannot be inferr'd that any *vicarious Substitution* was necessary, or that Life must be given for Life, in order to make God propitious. In the Law of *Moses*, a handfull of *fine Flower* only, in some cases, was required to be burnt upon the Altar: And in these cases *the Priest made Atonement for the Offender as touching the Sin that he had sinned,*

finned, as well as if a Lamb, or a Kid of the Goats, or a Bullock had been offered; *Lev. v. 13.* Now whatever was peculiar to a Piacular Sacrifice, *as such*, must be common to all Piacular Sacrifices: and consequently *Life* not being required to a Poor person's Piacular Sacrifice, the remission of Sin was attainable without shedding of blood; and therefore Piacular Sacrifice did not imply the having forfeited, or the necessity of giving Life for Life.

Did then *Life* atone for *Life* only in case of a *Rich* man's Sin? Or was a man of Substance to produce an Animal's Life in lieu of his own, whilst a *Poor* man might be cleansed from Sin without any Oblation of Life at all? It is certain that Atonement was in fact made for the one without any thing that could be deem'd a *vicarious Substitution*, unless the burning a handful of Flower may be look'd on as an Equivalent for a Poor man; or that' such a one's life was to be estimated at no higher a price than such a trifle. Whereas if the true intent and design of Sacrifices be understood, the reason will be manifest why the Poor man's Mite would produce the
same

same effect and be as acceptable to God, as the grandest Oblation that the Rich man could offer : Both being equally desirous of being in a State of *Friendship* with God, and Both doing in their respective ways, what was expressive of their *Friendship*.

3. Had the design of Animal Sacrifice been to give *Life for Life*, or to desire of God that He would accept the life of the Animal in *lieu* of the life of the Offender, Maſtation alone would have been required ; For that alone would have contained the giving Life for Life. But much more was necessary to be done. I do not speak of *Prayer*, or *Confession* of Sins ; But of such things as were necessary, essentially necessary, after the Beast was slain. The whole Flesh of the Animal was to be consumed upon the Altar, Or some part of it always, where the whole was not : There was to be an Oblation of Bread and Wine : There was a Necessity of *Salt* ; for it is expressly commanded, *With all thine offerings thou shalt offer Salt, Lev. xi. 13.* Sometimes the Priests were to have a certain Share or Portion of the

Animal,

Animal, and the Proprietor none : Sometimes the Proprietor, or Person who brought his Offering unto the Lord was to offer it at the door of the Tabernacle of the Congregation before the Lord ; And he had his Share of it to eat, and to treat his Friends. Had the design been to offer Life for Life, what Occasion had there been for the concomitants of Wine, a Meat Offering, and Salt ? What Occasion was there for more to be done, than to slay the Animal, and pray to God for his Acceptance of the Offering ? But when so many other things were to be offered, and the Sacrifice of the Beast was not sufficient without them, it is certain that something else was intended by this Practice, and not the giving the Life of the Animal for the Life of the Offender.

It is true, that Some Nations are said * “ not to give any part of the flesh of “ the Animal Sacrificed unto the Gods.” And in this case it may be thought that their Notion was not, that they partook with their Gods as at their Table, since

* Τῶν θεῶν οὐδὲν ἀπορρίπταντες μέρος. Strabo, l. xv. p 1065.

no part of the Animal was given to them. But this account of the *Persians* (for it is of them my Author speaks) is contradicted by other Writers, as *Strabo* himself owns, who tells us that * “ Some say “ they did put a little of the Caul upon “ the Fire.” Or if they did not, “ They “ imagined that the God wanted no other “ part of the Sacrifice but the *Soul* of the “ Animal ”; and whilst that was pure and worthy of God, and the proper part for him, they took the Flesh to themselves, and thus they did *eat* with their God, and were in Friendship with him. .

It may be said, that the *Killing* the Animal was not deemed the giving *Life for Life*, but the *presenting* the *Blood* which was the *Life* unto God. It is commanded expressly, that *whatsoever man there be of the House of Israel, or of the Strangers that sojourn among you, that eateth any manner of Blood, I will even set my face against that Soul that eateth Blood, and will cut him off from among*

* Τῆς γὰρ ψυχῆς φασὶ τὸ ἱερεῖα δεῖσθαι τὸν θεόν, ἄλλου δὲ οὐδενός. Ὅμως δὲ τὸ ἐπίπλασ τὸ μικρὸν, ὡς λέγουσιν οἱ τινες, ἐπὶ τὸ πῦρ. *Strabo. ibid.*

his people. For the Life of the Flesh is in the blood; and I have given to you upon the Altar to make an Atonement for your Souls, for it is the blood that maketh Atonement for the Soul, Lev. xvii. 10, 11. The Life then of the Animal being in the Blood; the Slaying the Animal before God, and with design to give it to him, was not; or would not be deemed; the giving *Life for Life*, but it was the pouring the Blood; which is the Life; upon the Altar, which made the Atonement; and was properly the giving Life for Life. And accordingly it is said in many places that the *Blood* is the *Life* of Animals, Gen. ix. 4. Deut. xii. 23.

The Blood indeed is called the Life; and it has been observed by * *Grotius*, and others; that the Heathens used the Terms Blood and Life as similar: But this is no reply to the difficulty. For let the Life of an Animal be *in* the *Blood*, or be it *the Blood itself*, Other things were necessary to a Sacrifice more and besides the Life of the Animal: And what was the reason of

* *Vid.* Grotium in Lev. xvii. et Gen. ix. 4.

those *additional* Oblations, if the intent of Sacrifice was only to give *Life for Life*? Supposing it therefore ever so hard to account for the meaning of the Text in *Leviticus*, yet it is easy to see what it does not mean; and that the sense is not to assert that the intent of Animal Sacrifice was to give the Life of the Animal for That of the Offender.

There are Two reasons given in Scripture why men should not *eat Blood*. The one is, *Ye shall eat the Blood of no manner of Flesh, for the Life of all flesh is the Blood thereof*, Lev. xvii. 14. And the same Law is repeated, *Deut. xii. 23, Be sure that thou eat not the Blood; for the Blood is the Life, and thou mayest not eat the Life with the Flesh*. The other reason is—*I have given it to you upon the Altar to make an Atonement for your Souls*: The first Law therefore prohibiting the *eating blood*, was with design to keep men from all Cruelty, and Barbarity, and to deter them from all Immanity, by commanding them to take away the Lives of Animals in the gentlest and mildest manner possible, and not to put creatures to

Pain

Pain and Misery, or to mangle them, but to pour out the Blood ; and not to be in haste to eat the Flesh, before the Life was quite gone. This then has no relation to *Sacrifice*, but to what was to be done in *common life* ; and in course implies nothing of giving Life instead of Life.

The other Law was designed to guard the *Jews* from the Idolatry, or rather, Idolatrous Customs, of those parts of the World, practised by the *Zabii*. These Idolaters * “ when they Sacrificed an
 “ Animal were wont to collect the Blood
 “ in some Hole in the ground; and sit-
 “ ting round about that to eat the flesh;
 “ imagining that whilst they were eating
 “ the Flesh, the Dæmons did eat the
 “ Blood, and thus they *contracted Friend-
 “ ship together as eating at the same Table.*”
 Thus *Maimonides*. As to the making a

* Hi maſtantes Beſtiam aliquam, Sanguinemꝛ ejus accipiebant, et in vaſe vel foſſula aliqua colligebant; Carnem verò maſtatam circa illum Sanguinem in circulo ſedentes comedebant, imaginantes ſibi in hoc opere, ipſis carnem comedentibus Dæmones illum ſanguinem comedere, et hunc ipſorum eſſe Cibum; hocque medio *Amicitiam Fraternitatem et Familiaritatem* inter ipſos *contrahi*, quia omnes in una menſa edunt, et uno conſeſſu accumbunt.
Maimon. More Nevoc. p. 484.

Hole, and pouring the *Blood* and other *Libations* into it, *Homer* * is a full Evidence, where he describes *Ulysses's* Sacrifice, and tells us how “ the Souls of the dead “ gathered about to drink the blood”, and how by this means he consulted the dead. This Notion then in fact prevailing in the world in the Oldest times, will confirm what *Maimonides* has observed about the *Zabii*.

The Law of *Moses* then prohibited the eating of Blood, because it was appointed to be poured out upon the *Altar* to make *Atonement* for their Souls. Had it been, because the Blood or Life of the Animal was given or substituted in lieu of the Blood or Life of the Offerer, it would no doubt have been said : But it is said to be appointed for another, and that a different purpose ; ׀ַבַּבֵּל, ׀ַזִּילָאֶסְכַּעֶשׂוּ, to make

* Βόθρον ὄρυζα ὅσον τε πυγέσιον ἔνθα κῆ ἔνθα
 Ἀμφ' αὐτῷ δε χόας χέομεν πᾶσι νεκύεσσιν.

Ody. λ'. 25.

_____ αἱ δ' ἐγέροντο

ψυχὰι ὑπ' ἐξ Ἐρέβους νεκῶν κατατεθνηϊώτων. *Ibid.* 36.

Οἱ πολλοὶ περὶ βόθρον ἐφοίτων ἄλλοθεν ἄλλος. *Ibid.* 42.

Αἱ δ' ἀμφ' αἶμα κελαινὸν ἀολλέες ἠγερέθοντο. *Ibid.* 227.

Οὐκ ἴστω πινέειν αἶμα πάσας αἶμα κελαινὸν. *Ibid.* 231.

atonement

atonement for your Souls, *Lev. xvii. 11.* Now what was appropriated to be the means of making God and Man friends, and by that to make God propitious, That was not permitted to be *eaten*; but was prohibited under a certain penalty, even in cases where no Suspicion of giving Life for Life could possibly happen.

But it may be thought, that the true construction of the words is, that *Blood* and *Life* being the same thing, when it is said that *Blood* is to *make atonement for Souls*, that is the same as for *Lives*; for *Souls* may signify *Lives*, and to *make Atonement* for them may signify to prevent their being taken away, or cut off, for any Sins which men might have been guilty of. And then the meaning of this passage is— “ No one shall eat any manner of Blood, for I have given the Blood to the Altar, so as to shew that the Life of the Animal is given in lieu of the life of the Offerer, and by that means he is saved from any Evils which may be the consequences of the Sin he has committed.”

The Truth is, Blood was deemed so sacred a thing, that it was in no case to be eaten. *If any one hunted and caught any Beast or Fowle that may be eaten, he shall even pour out the blood thereof, and cover it with Dust,* Lev. xvii. 13. It was the part of the Animal so appropriated to be pour'd out or sprinkled upon the Altar, that it was not to be applied to any other use. Not that it was given in lieu of the Life of him that offered it, but it was sacred by being prohibited to be eaten, and was appropriated to the Altar of God.

4. It may seem somewhat strange, if the Life of an Animal was given in lieu of the life of the Offerer, that no where in the Books which particularly mention the Institution of Sacrifices, or so largely treat about them, or in the *Version* of them, They should ever be called λύτρα, or ἀντίλυτρα, or ἀντίψυχα; *Equivalents, Compensations, Exchanges, Substitutes*, or by some word that implies the giving Life for Life: but that it should be left intirely to Inference from words which do not necessarily imply such a Notion. For certainly
the

the *Hebrew* Word, קָדַשׁ, or the *Greek* ones, καθαρίζειν, or ἐξιλάσκεσθαι, do not signify to give *Life for Life*, but *expiate*, or *atone*, or *propitiate*, whatever the means were by which this was done. Nor do any other words used by the Sacred Writers convey to us such Idea, by which we can infer that this was the Idea in the Sacred Writers Mind.

5. It is certain, that *Atonement* was required to be made in some cases where there was no *Crime* committed; and Animals were in these cases to be offered, and their Lives to be taken from them. Now here there could not be a giving of Life in lieu of Life that had been forfeited, but the creature was offered, and its life taken away with some other view. Where there was no *crime* committed, no life could be *forfeited*: If therefore in such case the life of the Animal was not given for the Life of the Offerer, neither can it be infer'd to be given in other cases; unless it be expressly said so to be. A Woman after Childbirth is expressly commanded to bring a *Lamb*, or if not able to do That, She was to bring Two Turtles or Two young Pidgeons,

Pidgeons, the one for a *Burnt Offering*, the other for a *Sin Offering*; and *the Priest shall make an Atonement for her*, Lev. xii. 8. Here could be no *Vicarious Punishment* intended, because no crime had been committed: And where there is no Crime, no Punishment can be justly inflicted. Nor could there be *vicarious Death*, because nothing had been done in this case to forfeit Life, or to deserve Death: And therefore these Sacrifices were not designed as Intimations that the Offerer should think of a Life given for Life.

But tho' in *these cases* it be true that Life was not given for Life, yet was not That the notion designed to be conveyed by *Piacular Sacrifices*, where it is certain there was *crime* committed, and the Intention of the Offerer was to *expiate* them? I do not apprehend, that even in these cases That was the design of the Sacrifice. Every Animal Sacrifice was necessarily to be killed in order that God might have his Share of it at his Table: And *after* the Animal was slain the Atonement was to be made with its Blood. Or if a *Mincha* of fine Flower alone was offered,
That

That was to be burnt upon the Altar. Previous to the Burning of the Sacrifice, or to even the Killing of the Victim, was Confession of Sin, and a Declaration of Repentance, and a desire expressed of being reconciled to God : And as this Temper was professed in and by the presenting the Sacrifice to God, the Displeasure of God was removed, Atonement was made, and the party offending was restored to favour, and accepted by him who was offended. Not by the giving the Life of the Animal for the Life of him who had been guilty of Misdemeanour, as if that were an Equivalent, or Substitute to be accepted in his Stead, but as a penitent humbly desiring Reconciliation, and to be admitted into a State of Friendship with God, and taking all proper Steps for that purpose.

That the Notion of giving Life for Life in some Sort of Sacrifices has prevailed in the world is indisputable ; and a thousand instances may be produced in later Ages in confirmation of it : But I am enquiring whether, and how far, the Scriptures teach us such a Notion. And here I must observe

I. That

1. That such a Notion is not designed to be conveyed by some Sorts of Animal Sacrifices. In the case of *Peace Offerings*, (which were all either Precatory for Favours, or Thanksgivings for Mercies, or designed as mere voluntary Acts of Devotion,) there were no circumstances in the Solemnity which signified such design; and therefore there could be no design in these to intimate a giving Life for Life. For *Peace Offerings* were frequently offered by Themselves, without the addition of *Burnt Offerings*, or *Trespass Offerings*; and in course without any confession of Sin or Demerit in him that offered them. The Life of the Animal was taken away, and its blood was sprinkled on the Altar, and the Proprietor offered with it his *Prayers* or *Thanks*, and had his Share of it to eat, and to treat his Friends. But in all this there was no Intimation, no Acknowledgment of any thought of having *forfeited* Life; and in course no Notion of offering to God a Life in lieu of an Offender's Life.

2. If Sacrifices were offered to God where there was no *crime* committed, nor
any

any thought of Life's being any ways *forfeited*,—in these cases likewise it is not easily to be conceived that the Life of the Animal was given in lieu of the Life of him that offered it. To instance in the case of the *Nazirite* who was not to come near any *dead* body: Yet if any man happened to die very suddenly by him, He was to bring a Lamb of the first year for his *Trespas Offering*. Did the *Nazirite* *forfeit* his own Life, or could he be supposed to forfeit it, or to have any *Guilt* or *Sin*, or *Demerit* in himself, because another accidentally *died* by him, and whose *Death* he could not any ways guard against? And yet this unhappy *Nazirite* was to sacrifice a Lamb: And upon Supposition of the Notion that in Animal Sacrifices Life was given for Life, he must acknowledge Some *Crime* in himself by which his Life was forfeited. *Num. vi. 12.*

So again in case of the *Leper* that was to be cleansed. The *Priest that maketh him clean shall present the man that is to be made clean, and shall take one He Lamb for a Trespas Offering,—and wave them for a Wave Offering before the Lord,*
Levit.

Levit. xiv. 11, 12. And this was to be done to *make Atonement for him*, ver. 21. Here could be no such thing as Sin, but Misfortune : A Misfortune indeed that made him unfit to appear in the presence of his King before he was made clean ; but not any *Crime* that could imply forfeiture of Life, or his giving the Life of the Animal in lieu of his own.

But further still ; The unhappy Leper, if he were able, was to bring not only a *Trespass Offering*, but a *Sin Offering*, and a *Burnt Offering* with a *Meat Offering*, in order to his being cleansed, or to have *Atonement* made for him. *The Priest shall offer the Sin Offering, and make an Atonement for him that is to be cleansed from his Uncleanness ; and afterward he shall kill the Burnt Offering ; and the Priest shall offer the Burnt Offering, and the Meat Offering upon the Altar.* Levit. xiv. 19, 20.

So too a Woman, after Puerpery, was to bring a Lamb of the First year for a Burnt Offering. *And if she were not able to bring a Lamb, then she shall bring Two Turtles or Two young Pidgeons, the one for*

for the Burnt Offering, the other for a Sin Offering: And the Priest shall make an Atonement for her. Levit. xii. 6, 8.

All that I would infer from these instances, (which are of every one of the Sorts of Sacrifices mentioned in the *Mosaic Law*,) is this, That in none of the cases mentioned can any one conclude, that the End of Animal Sacrifices was the giving Life for Life; or that They implied any Forfeiture of Life; or that God was desired to accept the Life of the Animal instead of the Life of the Offerer. It is certain that Peace Offerings, Sin Offerings, Trespass Offerings and Burnt Offerings were made; and Atonement was likewise made for the Party offering; and yet Life was not given for Life in any of the Instances before mentioned: No Forfeiture of life was acknowledged, No Sin confessed in some of them; and consequently the Offerer could not intend to say—*Hanc Animam pro meliore*—or that he gave the Life of the Animal in lieu of his own, or instead of his own. The particular *End* of Each of these Sacrifices will be hereafter shewn distinctly: Here
I would

It would only shew what was not their Intent.

I am not insensible that many Instances have been produced as well from the Sacred Writers as from Others to shew that the Great Design of Animal Sacrifices, (at least of *Piacular* Sacrifices,) was a vicarious Substitution of an Animal for a Man, and the giving or offering the Life of the one for the Life of the other. It will be worth while particularly to examine two or three of the Passages produced from the Old Testament in proof of this Notion.

The First is, *Deut. xxi.* *If a man be found slain in the land—and it be not known who hath slain him, the Elders of the City which is next unto the slain man shall take a Heifer which hath not been wrought—and shall wash their hands over the Heifer that is beheaded in the Valley; And they shall answer and say, Our hands have not shed this blood, neither have our Eyes seen it. Be merciful O Lord unto thy people whom thou hast redeemed, and lay not innocent blood to thy people of Israel's charge. And the blood shall be forgiven them,*

them, Deut. xxi. 1—8. The Law of Moses would allow no Satisfaction for the life of a Murderer, but insisted that the Murderer should be put to death at all events, *for blood defileth the land, and the land cannot be cleansed of the blood that is shed therein but by the blood of him that shed it*, Numb. xxxv. 30—33. In case then that a man was found dead, and it was not known who had slain him, there was to be a public declaration of Innocency made by those who were nearest, and therefore most likely to have been the persons guilty : And there was to be a *Heifer*, not sacrificed, not offered to God, but whose *Head* was to be *struck off in the valley* adjacent, with a public request to God not to *lay innocent blood* to the people's charge. And upon this, the City which lay next to the slain man was acquitted of his blood.

Here the case is, a *Heifer* has its *Head* struck off instead of the Murderer who can't be found. But then, Here is no *Piacular* Sacrifice, indeed no Sacrifice of any sort at all, is mentioned : Here is no presenting or offering any part or the whole

Heifer

Heifer to God ; no consuming any of it on any Altar. The ceremony was purely symbolical ; to declare by that act of cutting off the Heifer's Head, that so the Murderer ought, had he been known, to have been treated. Admitting therefore here a *Vicarious Substitution*, yet it has nothing to do with any Sort of *Sacrifice* ; whereas in Truth it was not a vicarious Substitution, but a manner of clearing themselves from all suspicion of Guilt, with a Declaration how the Murderer ought to have been treated by the Law of the Land.

A second Instance is taken from *Lev. x. 17*. It is there said, that the *Sin Offering* is *most holy, and God hath given it you to bear the Iniquity of the Congregation, to make Atonement for them before the Lord*. The thing to be proved from this place is, that the *Sin Offering* was designed as a *Substitution* in lieu of the Congregation. To *bear the Iniquity* of the Congregation, is certainly to *remove it, to carry it away, to bear it off*. The *Sin Offering* therefore that made the Atonement for the Congregation, *took away their*

their Iniquity, or all Punishment due unto them. But How was this done? Not by offering Life for Life; nor by any Transfer of Crime or Punishment upon the Animal that was offered: but by such a *Repentance* and *Obedience* as was required. The Original word which we translate to *bear*, נָשָׂא, is a word of perhaps the greatest *Uncertainty* of meaning in the whole *Hebrew* tongue: and in course it is hard to fix its sense in particular places. The *Vulgate* here render it, *ut portetis*, *that ye may carry*: The LXX. ἵνα ἀφέλητε, *that ye may take away*; understanding it of the *Priests*, not of the *Sin Offering*; And so the *Arabic*, and the *Samaritan*. In other places this phrase, *to bear Sin*, signifies the direct contrary to what it does here, viz. *to bring upon themselves Sin*. Thus *Exod. xxviii. 43. Linnen Breeches shall be upon Aaron, and his Sons, when they come in unto the Tabernacle of the Congregation, that they bear not Iniquity, and die*, וְהָיוּ עָלָיו וְעַל בָּנָיו לְבָשֵׁת כִּנְיָוִת וְהָיוּ עָלֵיהֶם לְבָשֵׁת כִּנְיָוִת וְהָיוּ עָלֵיהֶם לְבָשֵׁת כִּנְיָוִת. Here the *Vulgate* very rightly render it, *ne iniquitatis rei moriantur*: and the LXX, καὶ οὐκ ἐπάξονται πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς ἁμαρτιῶν, *They shall*
L not

not bring upon themselves Sin. In another place, to *bear Iniquity*, signifies to *bear the punishment* of it. Thus *Lev. v. 1.* *If a Soul sin, and hear the Voice of Swearing, and is a witness, whether he hath seen or known of it, if he do not utter it, then he shall bear his Iniquity,* וְנִשָּׂא נֶפְשׁוֹ. The LXX. render it, ἀλήψεται τὴν ἁμαρτίαν, *He shall take or receive his Iniquity,* i. e. the *Punishment* of it. And so the *Targum* of *Onkelos* וְקִבֵּל, *accipiet, recipiet.* And indeed in general, to *bear Iniquity*, seems to be to *bear Punishment* for Iniquity, in most places where the phrase occurs, (vid. *Lev. xix. 8. — xx. 17, &c.*) but not to signify any *vicarious Substitution*. No *Sacrifice* at all was ever appointed for the cases last mentioned, such as *Incest*, or not *eating* the *Peace Offering* within the time appointed by the *Law*: and therefore the words, *shall bear his Iniquity*, must mean, *shall bear the consequences of his Sin.*

But, tho' to *bear*, to *carry*, to *take*, to *take away*, *Iniquity*, may be ambiguous, or do not imply *vicarious Substitution*, yet to *bear*, or, *take the Iniquity* of
another

another may be clear and determinate. It may be said so indeed : but the evidence is just the contrary to what is affirmed. When *Pharaoh* said to *Moses* 'תִּנְחַן עָלַי אֶשְׁמָךְ, *take my Sin, or, take away my Sin,* He could not mean to desire Him to take it upon himself as his Substitute, but to *remove* it quite ; He desir'd him to *pray unto the Lord his God, that he would take away from him this death.* Exod. x. 17.

3. The seemingly strongest instance produced by those who plead for a vicarious Substitution in Sacrifices, is that of the *Scape Goat*, which had *the Sins, Transgressions, and Iniquities of the Children of Israel* put upon its head. It is added, *And the Goat shall bear upon him all their Iniquities unto a Land not inhabited.* וְשָׂא עָלָיו אֶת־כָּל־עֲוֹנוֹתָם. Here the LXX. render it, λήψεται ὁ χίμαρος ἐφ' ἑαυτῷ τὰς ἀδικίας αὐτῶν. The Goat that was not sacrificed, was appointed to *take, or, bear away,* the Sins of the People : and he had them *laid* upon his head by a confession made over him, and thus did he *carry them away.* But then, as the

Scape Goat was not a *Sacrifice*, This instance will not prove, that Sacrifices of Animals were originally designed to be Substitutes for Offenders, or that the Life of the Beast was given for the Life of him that offered it. The whole Action in this case (*like that of cleansing the Leprous House*, in which one of the Birds was ordered to be let fly, Levit. xiv. 53.) seems to have been *parabolical*: And so *Maimonides* understood it, *viz.* * “ as
 “ designed to raise a Fear in the minds of
 “ men, and to work a Conversion, as if
 “ they had said, We are freed from all
 “ our Transgressions, and have cast them
 “ behind us, and banished them to the
 “ utmost parts of the Earth.” The point is not whether, in general, there may not be *vicarious Substitutes*, (which cannot be disputed) but whether *Sacrifices* were such, or whether *piacular* Sacrifices were such? And this, the case of the *Scape*

* Erant iste Actiones omnes parabolicæ, ad timorem animis hominum incutiendum, et conversionem hoc medio operandam, q. d. Immunes sumus ab omnibus nostris Transgressionibus; post tergum nostrum illa projecimus, et ad extremas terræ oras relegavimus. *Maim. More Nivoc.* l. iii. c. 46.

Goat cannot determine, unless it can be proved that that was a proper *Sacrifice* : or that its *Life* was *taken away* ; which it was not.

It certainly has been a commonly received Opinion, and the *Jewish Rabbi's* are particularly cited for it by Dr. *Outram*, that * “ the Blood of the Sinner in Equity
“ ought to have been poured out, and his
“ Body burnt, as was the blood of the
“ Victim poured out, and its body burnt ;”
And “ that God in his Mercy and Good-
“ nefs took the victim *instead of*, and an
“ *Expiation* for the Offender.” Some have expressed this by—“ Blood for Blood,
“ and Soul for Soul.” They understood a Translation of Sin upon the head of the Victim, and likewise of the punishment due to the Offender : And this, says the Doctor, appears from the words they

* *Æquum erat, ut suus Sanguis funderetur, et ut cremaretur corpus suum. Moses Ben Nachman. Cum Sors ipse dignus esset cujus Sanguis profunderetur ut Sanguis Victimæ, corpusque ut Victimæ corpus cremaretur. Cumque Deus hanc victimam ut rem vicariam et λύτρον ejus ab eo acciperet, vide quanta in eum Benevolentia Dei fuit. Rab. Bechai. These and several others are cited by Dr. Outram, De Sacrificiis, p. 274—277.*

used, כָּפַר, and תְּמִירָה, p. 274—277. But this *Rabbinical* Notion, however approved by that very learned Writer, is like many others of their's, without foundation in the Scriptures, whatever it may have in Fancy. For,

1. Tho' the Word תְּמִירָה is used in Scripture for *Change* or *Commutation*, yet it is never once said that any Sacrifice (piacular or not) is a *Change* or *Commutation* for a Man. A command is indeed given, that *the Tithe of the Herd, or of the Flock, shall not be changed; and if he change it at all, then Both it and the Change thereof shall be holy*, Levit. xxvii. 33. But as the *Change* of one thing *for* another is not the *Oblation* of one thing *instead* of another, for this is always forbidden, (for in cases where a *Change* of Sacrifices was made, *Both* were Holy, and *Both* were to be offered) so it is impossible to infer that a Victim was an *Oblation for* or *instead* of a Man, from the use of this word, which is never once applied to express such Notion.

2. The other word therefore, כָּפַר, is much more likely to be depended on; for
That

That is commonly used about Sacrifices, and nothing is more frequent than the Application of this term to them. But This, no more than the former, will convey to us the Idea of the Animal's blood being shed *in lieu* of our blood, or that its Life was given as *λύτρον*, a *Redemption*, of ours. For supposing this to have been the case, the Oblation (By which I mean the taking away the life and the pouring out the blood at or upon the Altar) would have made the Expiation. But the Jews themselves will not say this. *Maimonides* justly observes * “ *that Sinners and Trespassers* “ *at the time when they bring their Obla-* “ *tions for Errors, or for sins with an* “ *high hand, are not expiated by their* “ *Sacrifices, until they have actually re-* “ *pented, and have confessed in form, as* “ *it is said, Levit. v. 5. He shall confess* “ *in that he hath sinned.”* The word *מתוּבַר*, *expiated*, here used by *Maimonides*,

* Hinc fit quod peccatores et rei, cum Oblationes suas pro peccatis vel per Errorem, vel per Contumaciam commissis, adducunt, per Sacrificia non expiantur, nisi prius *pœnitentiam* agant, et Confessionis formulam repetant, sicut dictum est, *Confitebuntur id in quo peccavit.* *Maimon. de Pœnitentia, cap. i. § 3.*

signifies the causing God's displeasure to be removed. The word originally signifies to *cover*, or *cover over*, in general; and thence it is particularly applied for *covering*, or *causing to cover*, i. e. to *remove* or *take away* Anger or Offence, by so covering it that it may not appear: And hence when it is applied to *God*, it signifies his *covering Sin*, which is the same as not imputing it, or pardoning it; i. e. his being propitious, or not angry. And hence the *Mercy Seat*, which was the *Cover* of the Ark, is called כַּפֶּרֶת. When therefore a Sacrifice was offered to God as was commanded, with the constant attendants on it, Repentance and Confession, it did remove the Anger or Displeasure of God conceived against the Sinner, and caused him to *cover* it. But then it is not said, nor implied in this word, that Life was given for Life, or Blood for Blood: Nor indeed *How* God was made propitious, but only a fact is asserted that this effect was produced in God.

3. The word כַּפֶּרֶת is commonly used where there can be no such thing possible as a Supposition of Life for Life. It is a
Rule

Rule laid down by the Rabbi's, * " that
 " where any one is to be punished with
 " Death, or whipping, by the Authority
 " of the *Sanhedrim*, his Death or whip-
 " ping will not expiate his Crime, unless
 " he *Repents* and *confesses*." So too †
 " if any one hurts his Neighbour in his
 " Person or Property, even tho' he makes
 " him amends in whatever it is for which
 " he is responsible to him, he is not to
 " be absolved unless he *repents* and *con-*
 " *fesses*, and ceases to do so any more."
 Again, It is a Maxim, ‖ " that Repen-
 " tance is an Expiation for all Transgres-
 " sions." It *covers*, or *causes* all Sins to
be covered : Not sure, by any Supposition
 of giving Life for Life, but by making
 peace with God, and by Application to
 him as Merciful, Good, and Kind ; by

* Quicumque autoritate Synedrii morti addicitur, aut Flagellatione est puniendus, non *expiabitur*, מתכפר, aut morte aut flagellatione, nisi prius pœnitentiam egerit, et peccata confessus fuerit. *Maimon. ibid.*

† Item qui proximum suum lædit, aut facultatibus ejus damnum infert, etiamsi damnum plene rependat, non tamen Absolvitur priusquam confessus fuerit, et talia perpetrare omnino cessaverit. *Maimon. ibid.*

‖ Pœnitentia expiat [מתכפר] omnes Transgressiones. *Maimon. ibid.* § 6.

endeavouring

endeavouring to restore or to recover that *Friendship* that had been lost or lessened; and by that means making that past Sins should not be remembered or imputed.

4. I have observed already that the Scape Goat was not a *Sacrifice*; and yet *Maimonides* observes that That did *expiate*, or cause the Sins of all *Israel* to be covered. His words are * “ It expiates for
 “ all *Israel*: ” and he observes, that †
 “ because it made that the Sins of *Israel*
 “ were removed or covered from the Sight
 “ of God, therefore the High Priest con-
 “ fessed over it Sins in the name of all
 “ *Israel*.” When the High Priest made or used the Form of Confession on this occasion, he laid his Hands upon the Scape Goat, and said, || “ I beseech thee, O

* הוא כפרה על כל ישראל.

† Ea de causa super eum Pontifex peccata in nomine totius Israelis confessus fuerit. *Maimon. ibid. § 4.*

|| Obsecro, Domine, deliquerunt, rebelles fuerunt, et peccaverunt coram te Populus tuus Domus Israel. Obsecro Domine, remitte nunc delicta et rebelliones et peccata quæ deliquerunt et in quibus rebelles fuerunt, et quæ peccaverunt coram te populus tuus Domus Israel, sicut Scriptum est in lege Moïsi servi tui dicendo, Quia in die hoc expiabit Super vos ad mundandum vos ab omnibus peccatis vestris coram Domino, et mundi eritis. *Mishna. Vol. II. p. 239.*

“ Lord,

“ Lord, Thy people the House of *Israel*
 “ hath Sinned, hath done Iniquity, hath
 “ transgressed before thee. I beseech thee,
 “ O Lord, כָּפַר, cover now the Sins and
 “ the Iniquities and the Transgressions
 “ which thy People the House of *Israel*
 “ hath sinned, done Iniquity, and trans-
 “ gressed before thee. As it is written
 “ in the Law of *Moses* thy Servant, say-
 “ ing—On that day יִכָּפֵר, *shall an Atone-*
 “ *ment be made for you to cleanse you*
 “ *from all your Sins.*” *Lev. xvi. 30.* Here
 then the word, כָּפַר, was used twice, tho’
 no Life was offered for Life : and there-
 fore if the same word be used in cases
 where a Victim was *slain*, no one can in-
 fer from thence that the *Life* of the Ani-
 mal was given for the *Life* of him that
 offered it. Expiation was indeed made
 by Sacrifice ; but since it was made in
 cases where no life was offered, as well as
 where Life was offered, what was owing
 to *the Sacrifice*, should not be imputed to
 one particular *circumstance* of the Sacrifice,
 but to the whole.

5. But perhaps the Other Form or
 Forms of Confession over the Bullock that
was

was slain the same day may help us to some light in this matter. *Aaron* was to offer his Bullock for a Sin Offering for himself, and make Atonement for himself and for his house, *Levit. xvi. 6.* His confession on this occasion was in the same words as when he confessed the Sins of the Nation, putting only *, “ *I and my Family*”, instead of, “ thy people the House of *Israel.*” And when He confessed the Sins of the Sons of *Aaron*, the same form was used, only putting in the words, “ I and my Family and the Sons of *Aaron* thy holy people.”

Here then a Bullock was slain, and God was prayed to *cover*, or remove away the displeasure which might justly have arisen from their Sins: But not a word to desire of God to accept this Bullock as their *Substitute*, or *in lieu* of them. Could the High Priest have failed to use some word that would have implied this *Substitution*? Would he not have used

* Tribus vicibus in die Expiationis confessionem edidit [Pontifex Maximus] Prima pro se: Secunda pro fratribus Sacerdotibus; et ultima hac vice, pro universo cœtu. *Sheringham in loc. vid. Mishna. ibid.*

some term or other which after ages found out? Would he not have said as the later Rabbins have said,—“ *Let his Blood be for my blood, his Soul or Life in lieu of mine.*”
 “ יהי דמו חַחַת דְּבִי, נַפְשׁ חַחַת נַפְשִׁי. But this was a Notion of later times, when the Original Ideas of Sacrifices had been changed, and men’s Imaginations or Inventions had supplied the place of Facts.

6. It may perhaps be thought, that tho’ the *High Priest* did not use such a Form as implied a *Substitution* of the Victim in the place or stead of the Offerer, yet the Form of Confession made by a *private person* when he offered his Sacrifice, may be full to the purpose. And so indeed it may seem. His Form was—* “ I beseech thee O Lord, I have sinned, I have done Iniquity, I have transgressed, have done so and so” [here a particular mention of his Sins was made] “ and I have returned by Repentance, and This

* Obsecro Domine, peccavi, deliqui, rebellavi, hoc et illud feci; nunc autem poenitentiam ago, Sitque Hostia hæc Expiatio mea *Dr. Outram cites this Form from Maimonides in Maase Corban. c. 3. Outram, p. 170.*

“ Victim

“ Victim is, or, Let This Victim be my
 “ Expiation.” The Remark which the
 Learned Dr. *Outram* makes on this is—
 * “ These last words signify, as the *Jews*
 “ tell us, *Let this Victim be substituted in*
 “ my place, *that the Evil which I have*
 “ *deserved may fall upon the head of this*
 “ *Sacrifice.*” The *Jews* may tell us this,
 but the words—*Let this Victim be my*
Expiation—mean no more than This—
Let this Victim remove all displeasure of
God from me ; Let this be my cleansing.
 Repentance would always cover Sins, and
 make them not be remembered or imputed
 to the Sinner : and a Sacrifice attended
 with Repentance would always produce
 the same effect ; and without Repentance
 ten thousand Sacrifices would never cause
 that Sin should not be remembered. When
 therefore a Sacrifice was offered as it ought
 to be, with a right mind, and with a
 hearty desire to return into favour with

* Quæ vero verba formulam claudunt, *Sitque hæc Ex-*
piatio mea, hostiam ipsam designabant offerentis manibus
 jam subjectam ; ac quidem, ut *Judæi* docent, hujusmodi
 significationem habent, *Sit Hostia hæc meum in locum*
substituta, ut quod ipse malum merui, id in hostiæ meæ
 caput recidat. *Outram. ibid.*

God,

God, the Offerer might well say, as he did in the Form just mentioned—*Let this Victim be the means of my pardon, and make mine Iniquities be remembered no more*—without any Notion of the Victim's being a *Substitute*, and without any Prayer to God *that the Evils which the Sinner deserved might fall on the Head of an innocent, harmless, Creature.*

The Nature and Intent of Sacrifices being thus considered, it will be not improper to make some further Observations upon this Practice. *Burnt Offerings* were certainly the most antient of all that are mentioned since the *Flood*. *Noah* took of every clean Beast, and of every clean Fowl, and offered *Burnt Offerings on the Altar which he had built*, Gen. viii. 20. This was done very soon after he went out of the Ark : For as soon as he had made his Sacrifice, God declar'd that he *would not again curse the Ground any more for man's sake*. Now it is certain that *Noah* was not the *Inventer* of Sacrifices ; and by his offering *Burnt Offerings of Beasts and Birds*, He seems to have observed what was practis'd before the *Flood*, when every

every man was his own Priest, and offered Sacrifices for Himself. Every man, or at least every Father of every Family, seems to have brought his own Sacrifice to such place as he thought proper; possibly (as it was in much later times) to his own *Hearth*; And he brought of the fruits of the Earth, or his Cattle, or what he was Master of, and with them He made his Prayer, or he returned his Thanks, and thus endeavoured to be, or continue, in a State of *Friendship* with God. It is probable, I should think, that he built an *Altar* wherever he thought fit, as the Patriarchs in after times did; And if we may judge of others by the Sacrifices of *Cain* and *Abel*, it is very likely, as *Lucian* has observed *, that “the Farmer offered an Ox, the Shepherd a Lamb, and some a Cake only.”

It is certain that *Abel* was a *Keeper of Sheep*, but *Cain* was a *Tiller of the ground*: And suitably to their respective Occupations, *Cain* brought of the *Fruit of the Ground an Offering unto the Lord*; and

*—Βῆν μὲν ἀροῖτρας ὁ γεωργός, ἄρνα δὲ ὁ ποιμὴν—ὁ δὲ τις σπόγγον. *Lucian. de Sacrificiis.*

Abel brought of the Firstlings of his Flock, and of the Fat thereof. The Former was properly what was afterwards call'd a *Mincha*, or *Meat Offering* made of the Fruits of the Earth: *Abel's* was a Sacrifice of the *Best of his Flock*, called likewise here by *Moses*, a *Mincha*, as was *Cain's*. It is certain that one of these Sacrifices was accepted; the other not: And interpreters have been not a little perplexed to find out the Reason. The Author of the Epistle to the *Hebrews* says, *By Faith Abel offered unto God* $\omega\lambda\epsilon\acute{\iota}\omicron\nu\alpha$ $\theta\upsilon\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha\nu$; we render it, *a more excellent Sacrifice than Cain*, Heb. xi. 4. It is rather *a more ample, a more plentiful, a more copious Sacrifice*. But the *Largeness*, or the *Quantity* of the Sacrifice seems not the Reason of Acceptance or Non-acceptance: It might indeed in certain cases be an Intimation of the Donor's mind, and in that respect a ground of Esteem or Regard; but the *Largeness*, considered in itself, was no reason why God should have regard to the One, and not to the Other. The LXX. have rendred the place in

M *Moses,—*

Moses,— * *If you should make a right Oblation, Or, If you should rightly offer, and yet not rightly divide, would you not Sin? As if Cain's fault had consisted in not giving to God the Best parts, or the proper parts of the Sacrifice; Or perhaps in not bringing the very best he had, but only in bringing what came first to hand. For of Abel it is said, He brought of the Firstlings of his Flock, and of the Fat thereof, i. e. He brought of the fattest and Best of his Firstlings: Whereas of Cain it is only said, He brought of the Fruit of the Ground; not as if he concerned himself about, or chose the Best in its Sort to offer unto God.*

The Emperor *Julian* once asked —
 “ What was *Cain's* fault in not *dividing*
 “ *right* ” ? And he tells us, “ that the
 “ person he asked was not able to give
 “ him any satisfactory Answer.” But *St. Cyril* replies, † “ That *Cain's* fault did

* Ὅτι, εἰν ὀρθῶς προσενέγκης, ὀρθῶς δὲ μὴ διέλῃς, ἥμαρτες; Gen. iv. 7.

† Ὅτι γὰρ ὅτι μὴ τίθειεν ἀμύγας, εἰς ἀμώμητος ἦν τὸ θύειν αὐτῶν, ἀλλ' ὅτι τῶν ἀρίμων οὐκ ἀπολέγον ἐξελάν τὰ ἐξαιρέτα προσεκόμισεν τῷ θεῷ. Cyril. c. Julian. lib. x.

“ not lie in this, that he did not sacrifice
 “ *Lambs* ; but that he did not *choose out*
 “ and offer the *Best* of the Fruits of the
 “ Earth.” For as he goes on, * “ God
 “ ought to be honoured by us, not by
 “ giving him the *worst* things we have,
 “ but the *Best* and *choicest*.” Had either
Julian or *Cyril* consulted the Original,
 the One could not have wanted Satisfac-
 tion to a point not in the Book of *Moses* ;
 nor could the other have given the Answer
 he did, *viz.* That *Cain* did not *choose out*
the Best : For the words in *Moses* relate
 to a quite different thing, and tell us
 what would be the effect of *Cain*’s doing
 what was right for him to do, *viz.* that
Abel would be subject to him, and that
 he then might rule over him. *If you do*
good, Exaltation, if you do not Good, Sin,
i. e. the punishment of Sin, is at the door.
 Be quiet, ἡσυχασον, ῥ217. (so the LXX.
 read it in their copy, in the Imperative
 mood) *Be quiet, and his Obedience will*
be to thee, and thou shalt rule over him.

* Κρῖναι δὲ φησὶ πρὸς ἡμῶν τιμαῖθαι θεόν, ἐχ’ ὧν ἔχομεν
 τὰ χεῖρω δεχόμενον, ἀλλὰ τὰ πάντων κρείτιστα καὶ ἐξαιρέτα.
Ibid.

But be the meaning of this passage as the learned Reader judges. As great differences have arisen concerning the Sacrifice which *Abel* offered, as there are about the passage I have been considering. The Question is, Whether *Abel's* Offering was of the *Bloody* kind or not? Whether his Sacrifice consisted in the Oblation of an Animal itself, or whether it was only of the *Wool*, or the *Milk* of an Animal? The Commentators of the Best repute, such as *Grotius* and *Le Clerc*, have thought the words which we render, *The Firstlings of his Flock*, may signify only what was the *Best* and *Finest*; and that this may relate only to the *Wool*, which as is well known was offered in later Times to the Gods: And what we Translate, *The Fat thereof*, may mean only their *Milk*. And it is certain that the LXX. often translate the word *בָּשָׂר*, *Fat*, by *γάλα*, which is *Milk*. But the main foundation of this Interpretation is founded upon the Supposition that *Animal Food* was not in use before the Flood.

There

There are several things which may be objected to this Notion, which may deserve Consideration. As

1. The Sacred Writer tells us, that *Abel* was a *Keeper* or *Feeder of Sheep*. To what End was this remark made, unless it were to introduce what follows about his Sacrificing what He fed? Or why did he employ himself in this occupation, unless it were that He might *eat* of the flesh of the Animals he kept and fed, just as those who kept and fed those Animals in after times did? Did any in after ages keep a Flock of Sheep only for the sake of their *Wool* and *Milk*? And if none were wont to do so in *Moses's* days, would he not naturally have spoken of the difference of customs, (which he might have expressed in two words) had it not been as customary to *eat* of the flock they kept in *Abel's* days, as it was afterwards.

2. *Abel* is said to bring his Gift to God, מִבְּכֹרֵי, of the *First-born*. I do not find that this word is used either of *Men* or *Beasts*, to signify any thing else, but the *First-born*. The word indeed is used for *premature Fruit*, or for *hasty fruit*

before the Summer, Isai. xxviii. 4. But it is easily seen how this is derived from the natural Signification of *First-born*. Should it be used any where in a figurative manner for any thing *remarkably beautiful or fine*, (of which I do not recollect a single instance,) yet when the circumstances of a place shew, that a *Sacrifice* is spoken of, and *Cattle* fit for that purpose are the Subject, one cannot but understand the word in its natural and usual Signification, of *First-born*.

3. The distinction between *Clean* and *Unclean* Animals was in use before the Flood : For *Noah* was to take with him into the Ark of *every clean Beast by Sevens* —but of *Beasts that are not clean by Two only*, Gen. vii. 2. Now by, *clean*, and, *unclean*, were meant only such Animals as were usually eaten, or not eaten, by men : and it is clear that Sacrifices were made to God only of such Animals as were deem'd *clean*. When *Noah* went out of the Ark, he took of *every clean Beast, and of every clean Fowl, and offered Burnt Offerings upon the Altar*, Gen. viii. 20. The Distinction between *clean* and *unclean* Animals
in

in those early days would have been quite unaccountable, if no Flesh had been eaten before the Flood : And it is not easily conceivable, that *Abel* should have sacrificed to God, what he did not *eat* himself ; Since all Sacrifice was made with a design to partake of God's Table by *eating* at it.

4. Tho' the word, *בָּלֵן*, without any Vowels, may be rendred either *Milk* or *Fat*, yet when it is joined with the other word, *Becorim*, it never is used for *Milk*. And

Lastly, *Moses* has never mentioned such an Offering to God as *Milk*, except this one single passage should be forced into that Interpretation.

But, as I said, the great Support of what *Grotius*, and since him *Le Clerc*, has urged on this occasion, is founded upon a Supposition that Animal Food was not in use before the Flood. They think that the express Grant of Animal food made *after* the Flood is sufficient proof that it was not in use *before* the Flood. It will be necessary therefore to enquire into the meaning of the Two Grants,

That to *Adam*, and That to *Noah*, distinctly.

It was said to *Adam*, *Behold I have given You every Herb bearing Seed, which is upon the face of all the Earth, and every Tree in the which is the fruit of a Tree, bearing Seed, to You it shall be for Meat, and to every Beast of the Earth, and to every Fowl of the Air, and to every thing that creepeth upon the Earth, wherein there is Life, I have given every green Herb for Meat, Gen. i. 29, 30.* Afterwards, upon the Restoration of the Earth after the Flood, God said unto *Noah*,—*Every moving thing that liveth shall be Meat for you, even as the Green Herb have I given you all things, Gen. ix. 3.* In the *first* of These there is an express Grant of only *every green Herb, and Every Tree bearing Seed, to Men, and Beasts, and Fowls*: In the *Second*, *Every moving thing that liveth, is given for Meat.*

Now it is not easy to determine the precise meaning or Extent of either of these Grants. For

1. EVERY Herb seems to be given equally to Man, and Beasts, and Fowls, and Creeping things, for *Meat*, in the First Grant. But this cannot be understood in the full extent of the words; because *Some* Herbs are very noxious, and very unfit for Meat for *Man*, as others are noxious to other Animals. They may indeed be, and without all question they are, *All* useful; Some to one Sort of Creatures, Others to Others. But all Creatures were not made nor designed, to live upon *green Herbs*, or *Trees*, if one may judge of what was to be their Food, from their present Dispositions, and Parts. Some are now Beasts of Prey, and armed with peculiar Parts, adapted to catch, and to devour other Animals. Some Sorts of Plants are directly poisonous to our Species, and therefore could not be intended for Human food: and tho' there is in other Animals a strange Sagacity or Instinct, by which they can generally tell what Herbs are noxious, and what are useful or beneficial and proper for their Nourishment, yet it is not so with Man. From whence I think it highly probable, that

that this First Grant is not to be understood universally of *Every* Green Herb, how universal soever the Expression may be: And tho' it be said,—*To You it shall be for Meat*;—yet This can mean no more than that in general, *some Herbs* should be eaten by man.

It may indeed be said, That no Herbs were noxious before the Fall of *Adam*; and that whatever Harm there is in nature, it is all owing to the curse inflicted on the Ground, *Gen. iii. 17, 18.* But This is all Hypothesis: it is not said expressly; nor is it to be inferr'd from what is said, that the nature of many Plants and Herbs and Trees was changed from what they were originally. The *ground* indeed was to *bring forth Thorns and Thistles*; but still man was to *eat the herb of the field*, v. 18. and if he was debarr'd eating every thing that is not mentioned, He was now by the Curse debarr'd from eating the *Fruits* of the *Trees*, and confined only to *Herbs*.

But, I own, I think the Words of this first Grant are to be understood with proper Limitations; and that the Meaning
is

is no more than a general Declaration; that when God had finished all his works, He had in his good Providence taken care for the Support and Sustainance of all the Creatures he had made, by ordering and contriving the produce of the Earth in such a manner, that all and every Species of Creatures might eat of it and live. It was not to say, that This or That Food was prohibited, or not to be eaten by Man; but to declare how well God had, in his infinite Wisdom, provided for the numerous Species of creatures which he had created.

But let us suppose *Every* Herb, and *Every* Tree granted to man for meat, This does not exclude all or any other Sort of Food which was proper for Man. And therefore the Stress is laid chiefly on the other Passage—*Every moving thing that is living shall be meat for you, even as the green herb have I given you all things. But Flesh with the life thereof shall you not eat. Gen. ix. 3, 4.*

That here was something said in This that was not so expressly said in the former Grant, is certainly true. But that *Sheep,*
or

of Oxen, or Goats, or in Short all Animal Food is here *first* granted, will require further proof. The words are, *Every* שׂרָץ, or *Creeping thing*; *πάν ἐπίγειον*; as the LXX. render it very justly, *is given for meat to man*. Now that Sort of Animals which goes under the name of שׂרָץ, or *Creeping thing*, is distinguish'd from the *Beasts of the Earth*, and from the *Fowls of Heaven*, in the *first* Grant, *Gen. i. 30*. And so it is *Gen. i. 28*. And therefore, how a Grant to feed on *Creeping things*, so distinguish'd as they are from Other Animals, contains a Grant to feed on *all* or *any* other *Animals*, will be hard to say. In the Account of the Creation, *Gen. i. 21*, it is said, that *God created every living creature that moveth*; and in the next verse, *God created great Whales and every living creature that moveth*, רִמְשֵׁי. Here the word is applied to *Fish*, gliding along in the waters. In the following verses, the same word is applied to things that *creep upon the earth*, as distinguish'd from the rest of the Animal Creation. *Have dominion*, saith God, *over the fish of the Sea, and over the fowls*
of

of the Air, and over the Cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth, v. 26. And thus it is in the very verse preceding this Second Grant,— *The fear of you, and the dread of you shall be upon every Beast of the Earth, and upon every Fowl of the Air; upon all רמשׁ, that moveth upon the Earth, and upon the Fishes of the Sea, into your hand they are delivered.* Here the word is translated by the general word in English, *moving thing*: But this Signification seems to be too much extended: for throughout the Law of *Moses* it is certain that it never takes in, or includes, *Beasts* of the Earth, or *Birds* of the Air; but a Third Species of Animals, whatever they were, different from the Other Two, and contradistinguished from them. And if one may guess from the Use of it, it comprehends a *Third* Species of Animals, viz. all such, either *Fish* or *Reptiles*; that not having Feet, glide along. Thus, when in the Law of *Moses*, certain rules are laid down concerning the various Sorts of Animals that might, or might not be eaten, it is said, *This is the Law of the*
Beasts,

Beasts, and of the Fowl, and of every living creature that moveth in the waters, *הַרְמִישִׁת*, Levit. xi. 46. And in verse 44. *Neither shall ye defile yourselves with any manner of creeping thing הַרְמִישׁ הַיָּרֵץ*, that creepeth upon the Earth. Whatever therefore is the meaning of the Grant here made to *Noah*, it cannot take in *all Animal Food*, but only something different from *Beasts* and *Birds*. For had the word, *הַרְמִישׁ*, comprehended *Sheep*, and such Sorts of Animals, it would not constantly have been used for Some *third Species* of Animals, which are not the *Beasts* of the Earth, or *Fowls* of the Air. And we find in the New Testament, when *St. Peter* saw the *Heavens* opened, and a certain vessel descending unto him—wherein were all manner of four-footed *Beasts of the Earth*, and wild *Beasts*, and, *τὰ ἐρπετὰ*, creeping things, and *Fowls of the Air*,—it is certain that the *Creeping things*, were very different creatures from either the *four-footed Beasts* of the Earth, or the *Fowls of the Air*.

Supposing now that only *Herbs* and *Fruits* were allowed to be eaten by the
 Anti-

Antidiluvian people, This Grant to *Noah* cannot in any Sense be admitted to be a general Grant of *Animal Food*; but it must be of such Food only as the Word *שׂמך*, i. e. *Creeping* things, implies. And it cannot be in general, *Animal Food*; but such things only as are not to be contain'd under the words, *Beasts*, and *Fowls*: and consequently, whatever is the meaning of this Grant, it may be consistent with Men's eating *Sheep* and *Bullocks* and other Animals, from the beginning.

The Rabbi's tell us, that the word, *Ramas*, however wrote, with a *Samech* or a *Sin*, signifies to *tread*, or to *walk*. And let it be so: yet there must be some limitations still to so general a word as is here supposed. All *moving*, or *creeping*, or *Swimming* Animals are not proper for Food; And tho' some Nations are known to eat *Serpents* and Some other *Reptiles*, yet there are some *moving* Animals that we never read that they were eaten, or were proper for Food. So that the Grant of *Every moving thing that liveth shall be Meat for you*, is not a Grant to eat *Animal Food*, nor is intended for that purpose,

purpose, since *every living* thing is not fit for food : and as the thing here given is contradistinguished from *Beasts* and *Fowls*, which have always made up the usual Diet of Men, another meaning must be thought of, or one cannot, I apprehend, make sense of the Scriptures.

Suppose then, that *Animal Food* was or was not in practice before the Flood, These words were, I think, intended only as a general Prohibition to eat any things that die *of themselves* ; and then the sense will be this : “ You may eat of every
 “ thing that is duely killed, or that has
 “ its life taken away ; but you shall not
 “ eat of such things as die of them-
 “ selves. Every *Living* Animal shall be
 “ food for you, but not if it dies of it-
 “ self ; you shall not eat it alive, or be-
 “ fore it is killed ; For *Flesh with the*
 “ *life thereof, which is the blood thereof*
 “ *shall you not eat.*” This I take to be the true meaning of these words, consistent with propriety, and universal practice : And thus they have nothing to do with, nor have they any relation to, any permission or grant to Eat *Animal Food*.

“ The

“ The fear and dread of You shall be upon
 “ every beast of the Earth, and upon every
 “ fowl of the Air, upon all that moveth,
 “ *וְכָל חַי הָאָרֶץ*, upon the Earth, and upon all
 “ the Fishes of the Sea, Every moving
 “ thing in which is life shall be meat for
 “ you, just as the green herb is, But ye
 “ shall first kill it, Flesh with the Life
 “ thereof, shall ye not eat.”

The Grant then here given to *Noah*, is not to eat *Animal Food*, But it is a Right with a strict Prohibition annexed: They were always to *kill* before they did eat any flesh, of any Sort, whether Beasts or Fowls, or Fishes, or any thing that had life that would not come under those general classes. It was a general Law now given to mankind, not at all containing any *New Grant*, but directing them how to use the power they had over the Creatures which God had subjected to them. The *First Grant* to *Adam* was no more than a general Declaration of a sufficient Provision for all Creatures: This *Second* to *Noah* is not a Grant of Animal Food, which before was not eaten, but it is a command to *slay* before they did eat any *flesh*:

for *Flesh* appears to have been used for food long before the flood, as well from the use of *Sacrifices* in those early days, as from the distinction of *Clean* and *Unclean* Animals, then well known.

To return now to the Antediluvian Sacrifices.

Abel offered to God what he did eat himself, of the *Firstlings of his Flock*, and did not sacrifice the *Wool* and the *Milk* of his flock only : and as Both He and his Brother are said to *bring* their respective Offerings, we must not imagine that this implies any thing like a *Temple*, or so much as a fix'd place of Worship ; (for nothing tending to that is said, nor does any thing like a *Temple* appear to have been till very many hundred of years *after* the flood, which yet would probably have been built by *Noah*, had there been such *Fabricks* before the Flood :) Their *Bringing* their offerings, I say, does not imply any *Temple* in those early days ; but *Cain* and *Abel* made to come, i. e. brought to the Altar they had raised, or to what they used for an Altar, or to the Fire they had kindled, or perhaps to
the

the place where God had appeared to them, their respective Oblations; and there *Abel* Sacrificed the Animals to God, as *Cain* did his fruits of the Earth; and there they Both did partake or *eat* of them.

It is usually said, (and no small or inconsiderable Vouchers are brought for it) that the *first Sacrifices* were little else but *Herbs* and *Salt*, or *Fruits of Trees*; and that *afterwards Frankincense* and *Animal Sacrifices* were introduced. And had we no Better Books, or Older History, than what is contained or related in *Heathen Writers*, this might be admitted as a rational Scheme, full of Probability. But we know from *Moses*, (whatever may be suggested against *Abel's Sacrifice*) that *Noah took of every clean Beast, and of every clean Fowl, and offered Burnt Offerings on the Altar he had built*, Gen. viii. 20. So that *Animal Sacrifices* were at least as *Old* as any other; and if *Roots*, or *Herbs*, or any *Vegetables* can be proved in any particular Country to have been sacrificed, prior to *Animals*, no more will follow than that This was the case, *e. g.* in *Greece* or *Italy*, or wherever that Custom obtained;

not that such were really the *Oldest* Sacrifices that were in the world. The Notion was formed from a Supposition that Men once lived upon *Acorns*, and the *Fruits* of the Earth, and what they did eat themselves, That they gave unto the Gods. A Right Inference ! from a fact which can never be proved to have been.

When Sacrifices first were used, Every man seems to have been his own *Priest*, and to have offered without the Aid or Assistance of any body else. When a Plurality of Gods came to be the Religion of the world, Every one seems to have been at Liberty * “ to invoke what God “ or Goddes he had a mind to have propitious to him.” *Noah*, the common Parent of all, *built an Altar unto the Lord, and offered Burnt Offerings on the Altar.* It is probable therefore that *Altars* were in use before the Flood, since one was erected so soon after it. Ten Generations after, *Abraham* of *Chaldea* built Altars to God ; and so did *Job* in *Arabia* four or five Generations after *Abra-*

* Deam sibi invocet quam libebit propitiam. *Plaut. Aſin. Act. iv. Sc. 1.*

ham,

ban, and *They* offered Sacrifices on them. Among the *Israelites*, Every one seems to have had a right to offer unto God his Sacrifice, till by a particular Law the Priesthood was confined to the family of *Aaron*. The First-born in every Family were wont to sacrifice Burnt Offerings and Peace Offerings to the Lord, *Exod.* xxiv. 5, till the *Levites* were taken in their stead, and a peculiar Priesthood was confined to a particular family in that Tribe, *Numb.* iii. 12, 45. The Occasion of this was owing to a particular circumstance, mentioned *Exodus* xxxii. 26, 29. And when once the Priesthood was thus annexed to a particular Tribe and Family, it became a crime in that Country for any one else to do the Priest's Office; and an exemplary punishment was inflicted on all such as transgressed this positive Law.

There certainly was a particular, and a very good reason for confining the Priesthood to one set of men among the *Jews*, and for not permitting any body to sacrifice but the Priests appointed. Idolatry was guarded against most effectually, by restraining and confining the Priesthood to

one Family, as the Learned Dr. *Spencer* has fully proved in his excellent Treatise *De Legib. Hebræor.* lib. i. c. 8. § 2. . . . But in Other Nations the modes of Worship were different. They had in some Nations, Public Gods, and Private ones; and tho' They had established Public Priests for their public Worship, and These were to sacrifice to the Public Gods, yet Every man was a Priest to his *Penates*, or *Household Gods*, and could himself do the whole office of Sacrifice to them. Where *Family Sacrifices* were made, and all of the same Family who had the same Gods met together at their Anniversary Festival, the *Public Priest* seems to have done the Service. But when any private person was disposed to sacrifice for himself, He might be his own Priest, and do the Service to the God whom he desired to invoke. We have a remarkable Direction of this Sort in *Cato*. He advises that whenever any person goes to his *Villa*, or *Country Seat*, * he " should salute his Household God ",

* *Pater familias, ubi ad villam venit, ubi Larem familiarem salutavit, fundum eodem die, si potest circum-*
eat. Cato. de R. Ruf. c. 2.

i. e. ask a blessing from him. This indeed implies no Sacrifice : But then in another place he describes the manner of *Private* Sacrifices at large. * “ Before
 “ you begin to cut down your Corn, in
 “ this manner should you Sacrifice a
 “ *Porker*. You are in this manner to
 “ offer the *Porker* that is to be sacrificed
 “ before you cut down your Corn : it
 “ must be a female *Porker* to *Ceres* be-

* Priusquam Messem facias Porcam præcidaneam hoc modo fieri oportet. Cereri porca præcidanea, Porco foemina, Priusquam hæc fruges condantur [l. condas] far, triticum, ordeum, fabam, Semen rapieium. Thure, Vino, Jano, Jovi, Junoni, præfato. Priusquam porcum foeminam immolabis, Jano struem commoveto sic ; Jane pater, te hac strue commovenda bonas preces precor, uti sis volens propitius mihi liberisque meis, domo familiæque meæ. Ferctum Jovi moveto, et maectato sic : Jupiter, te hoc fercto obmovendo bonas preces precor, uti sis volens propitius mihi, liberisque meis, Domo, Familiæque meæ, maectus hoc fercto. Postea vinum dato Jano sic : Jane pater, uti te strue commovenda bonas preces bene precatus sum, ejusdem rei ergo maecte vino inferio esto. Postea Jovi sic : Jupiter maecte fercto esto, maecte vino inferio esto. Postea Porcam Præcidaneam immolato. Ubi Extæ profecta erunt, Jano Struem commoveto, maectatoque item uti prius obmoveris. Jovi ferctum obmoveto, maectatoque uti prius feceras. Itẽm Jano vinum dato, et Jovi vinum dato, ita uti prius datum ob struem obmovendam, et ferctum libandum. Postea Cereri Extæ et Vinum dato. *Cato de Re Rust.* c. 134.

“ fore Harvest ; a Female Porker, before
 “ you lay up in your Barns or Granaries
 “ any of these Fruits, *viz.* Bread-corn,
 “ Wheat, Barley, Beans, Rape Seed.
 “ Address your Self to *Janus* and to
 “ *Jupiter*, and *Juno* with an Oblation
 “ of Frankincense and Wine. Before you
 “ put the Salted Meal upon the Porker;
 “ offer to *Janus* a Cake, [Strues] and
 “ say, *Father Janus in offering to you*
 “ *this Cake I humbly beg that you would*
 “ *readily be propitious and kind to me, my*
 “ *Children, my House, and Family.* Pre-
 “ sent to *Jupiter* a Cake made of Meal
 “ and Wine, and Frankincense, and say,
 “ O *Jupiter*, *By my giving you this Cake*
 “ *I beg that you would be readily propitious*
 “ *to Me, and my Children, my House and*
 “ *Family.* Afterwards give wine to *Janus*,
 “ and say, *Father Janus, as I have offer-*
 “ *ed you a Cake, and have asked a Blessing*
 “ *of you, for the same purpose be thou*
 “ *pleased to accept this Wine that is now*
 “ *offered to you.* Then say to *Jupiter*,
 “ *Be thou pleased to accept this Cake, and*
 “ *this Wine now brought and offered to*
 “ *you.* Then Sacrifice the præcidaneous
 “ Porker.

“Porker. As soon as the Entrails are
 “cut in pieces, Wave the Cake to *Janus*
 “and give it to him, praying in the same
 “manner as when you first gave it to
 “him. Do the same with *Jupiter’s*
 “Cake, and give it to him, praying as
 “before. Then give Wine to *Janus*,
 “and give Wine to *Jupiter* in the Same
 “manner as you gave it when you pre-
 “sented the respective Cakes. After-
 “wards give the *Entrails*, and *Wine* to
 “*Ceres*.”

There are in this passage many Sacrificial Terms and Customs which it cannot be amiss to explain. And

1. I must observe that these directions are not given to any Public *Priest*, or *Curio*, but to a *Private* Person, and contain an Instruction How he was to *Pray*, and How He was to proceed in the whole Form of his Sacrifice. This was, as *Livy*, calls it, *Ars Sacrificandi conscripta*, a written Form of Sacrificing, which any or every Private man might follow for Himself, and for his Family, in order to obtain the kind Assistance of his Gods, without employing any Priest.

2. *Cato*

2. *Cato* advises, that “ before you lay “ up in your Repositories ” the things he mentions, you are to offer *Wine* and *Frankincense* to *Janus*, *Jupiter*, and *Juno*. But in the course of the Directions given, there is not one word said of *Juno*, nor any orders given How to address her. The word, *Junoni*, therefore should be struck out; since no Oblation was here to be made unto Her.

3. *Cakes* and *Wine* were offered to *Janus* and to *Jupiter*: and a Drink Offering of *Wine* was annexed to the Sacrifice made to *Ceres*. This was all founded on the Original Intention and Nature of Sacrifice, which was to engage in *Friendship* by eating and drinking as it were at the Tables of, or with, the Gods.

4. The Porker here offered unto *Ceres* was to be of the *Female* kind; the Emblem of *Plenty* or of *Encrease*: And it was This Animal rather than a *Sheep* or *Cow*, because it brings forth *so often* in a year, and *so many more* than other Animals. It was called *Porca præcidanea*, because it was to be sacrificed, *præ cædere*, before the Corn was cut down. The Term, *præcidanea*,

præcidanea, is applied to other Sacrifices, and in different Senses. When to a *Lamb*, * “ it signified the Lamb killed before “ others.” On the same ground, when a Victim was called † *Succidanea*, it was

* *Præcidanea* *Agna* vocabatur quæ ante alias cædebatur: *Festus*. *Dacier observes, that præcidanæ et succidanæ Hostiæ non a præcidendo et succidendo dictæ sunt, sed a præcedendo et succedendo. But this is contrary to the formation of the word. If præcidanea or succidanea were derived from præcedendo, or succedendo, it would be præcedanea and succedanea, with an e, not with an i. When the word præcidanæ is applied to Feriæ, the meaning is, Festivals appointed when the præcidanea Hostia was to be slain. The word therefore is form'd not from cedendo, but from cædendo, from whence cecidi, and thence the i long comes.*

† *Succidanea* *Hostia* dicebatur, quæ secundo loco cædebatur. Sic appellata est a *succedendo* [l. *succidendo*]. *Festus*. *When Plautus says,*

Men' piacularem oportet fieri ob Stultitiam tuam
Ut meum tergum stultitiæ tuæ subdas Succidaneum.

Epid. Act. i. Sc. 2.

He says a much stronger thing than if he had used any other Expression. Subdere Succidaneum, is to bring a Second Victim to be slain, if the first did not prove prosperous. A. Gellius justly observes, that Victims were called Succidanæ quasi succedanæ, quoniam si primis Hostiis litatum non erat, aliæ post easdem ductæ Hostiæ cædebantur, quæ quasi prioribus jam cæsis, luendi piaculi gratia, subdebantur, et succidebantur; ob id succidanæ nominatæ. Gellius, l. iv. c. 6.

“ what

“ what was *killed* in the Second place ”; not because it succeeded the first Victim. But for the further use of this Form, see *Festus*, and *Gellius*, l. iv. c. 6.

5. *Janus* had a certain sort of *Cakes*, called *Strues*, offered to him; *Jano struem commoveto*, *Move*, or *wave the Strues to Janus*. They were piled up, and made * “ not much unlike a Man’s fingers when “ they are close joined together.” They were not flat, but long and roundish, and like our present long Biscuits. This fashioned Cakes were to be presented to *Janus*, with a form of *Prayer* for his Assistance, Protection, and Kindness to all the Family.

The words imply, or seem to do so, a Sort of *waving*, or *moving* the Cakes, in a manner not unlike to that sort of Action which was practised among the *Jews*, and by them called *תְּנוּפָה*, or *תְּרוּמָה*. This last ceremony seems to have been in Acknowledgment of the presence of God every where; The Wave Offering being moved

* *Strues* genera liborum sunt, digitorum conjunctorum non dissimilia, qui superjecta panicula in transversum continentur. *Festus*.

about every way to all the four Corners of the Earth. The Former, or the *Therumab*, was an Elevation of the Sacrifice upwards, in acknowledgment of God who dwells on high. The *Romans* in like manner by the Expression, *commovendo Struem*, seem to mean an Acknowledgment of the presence of *Janus*, to whom they did *admovere* or *obmovere*, (for these two words signify the same thing) *present* and *offer* the Cakes, intreating him to be ready and kind to him who made the Sacrifice, and to all his Family.

6. The Cake that was prepared, and given to *Jupiter* was *moved* or *waved* in like manner; and for the same reason as was the Cake to *Janus*, in acknowledgment of his presence and power.

7. Besides the Cakes, which were a Species of *Bread*, prepared in a particular and more delicate manner, *Wine* was offered not only to *Janus* and *Jupiter*, but likewise to *Ceres*. Wherever there was a Sacrifice, and either *Flesh* or *Cakes* were given, there was always some *potable* offered: And sometimes there seems to be nothing else but *Wine* given to the Deity.

One

One cannot but observe that *Strobilus* in *Plautus* promises to the Goddess, *Fides*, nothing else but a pitcher of *Wine*.

—————*Si repperero, O Fides*

Mulsi congialem plenam faciam tibi fideliam.

Aulul. Act. iv. Sc. 2.

The great end in all Sacrifices being to be in a State of *Friendship* with the God or Goddess they had occasion to address, They promised, or They offered, what might shew or make them *Friends*.

In the present Sacrifice to *Janus* and *Jupiter*, the *Wine* was offered to them in the same Form of *Wods*,—*Maſte vino inferio esto*. The *Bread* had been offered first to each God separately and apart; and a *Prayer* that the God would be propitious to the Offerer and his Family, had been made. When the *Wine* was brought and offered, (which was not done once only, but was again and again poured out during the Solemn sacred Action,) a *Prayer* was likewise offered, that the God whom they addressed would accept the *Wine*, and be propitious. It is very
hard

hard to express in any other language, what the *Romans* meant by those words—*Maete vino inferio esto*. The Grammarians tell us, that * *maeto*, is *magis augeo*; and *maete* signifies *magis auete*. For say they, † “as often as Wine or Frankincense was poured out, or put upon the Victim, they said *Maetus est taurus vino vel thure*, i. e. The Victim was more increased, or, something additional to, or more and besides the Animal, was offered.” In like manner when *Janus* or *Jupiter* had the Wine given to them, after the Cake had been presented, the Sacrificer justly said, O *Janus* or *Jupiter*, Accept this *additional* Offering of *Wine* now brought hither to you.

But still this manner of Expression is not cleared up. The Wine offered is called *Inferium*: By this word they de-

* *Maetant*, verbum Sacrorum κατ' εὐφημισμὸν dictum, quasi magis auctum.— Nam *maetare* est proprie magis augere. *Servius in Virg. Æn. iv. et Æn. vi.*

† *Maete* magis auete.— Et est Sermo tractus a Sacris. Quoties enim aut Thus aut Vinum super Victimam fundebatur, dicebant, *Maetus est Taurus Vino vel Thure*; hoc est, cumulata est hostia, et magis aueta. *Servius, Æneid. ix.*

signed

signed to limit and distinguish the Wine that was offered to the God from That which remained at home in their Cellars. For had they not used this term, All the Wine that was at home, at least all that was in the Cask from whence the Wine for the Sacrifice had been drawn, would have been consecrated to the God whom they addressed, and they could not have used it for their common or private Uses. *Arnobius* has produced the Authority of *Trebatius* to explain this form.

* “ The word *Inferio*, says he, is added for this reason, and is therefore pronounced, lest all the Wine which is laid up in the Vaults and Cellars, from which This that is offered is drawn, should become Sacred; and be no longer for the common Use of Men. This word then being added, That alone is Sacred which is *brought*,

* *Inferio*, inquit Trebatius, verbum ea causa est additum, eaque ratione profertur, ne Vinum omne omnino, quod in Cellis atque Apothecis est conditum, ex quibus illud quod effunditur promptum est, esse Sacrum incipiat, et ex usibus eripiatur humanis. Addito ergo hoc verbo, Solum erit quod *inferetur* Sacrum nec religione obligatur cæterum. *Arnob.* lib. vii. p. 236.

“ and

“ and the remainder is quite free to be
 “ used as common.”

Thus much for this passage of *Cato*. I was observing, that Private Persons might, if they thought fit, offer up to the Gods their own Sacrifices. The Master of the Family might perform the whole Service, without the Assistance of any Priest; and in the particular passage I have been considering, the directions given by *Cato* are such as every Master of the Family was to observe when he offered this Sacrifice. And the higher we go in Antiquity, the more clear is this point. We find *Dido* in *Virgil* doing such Acts as afterwards belonged to the Priest's Office. *She*, and her Sister

—*Maestant lectas de more Bidentes.*

Æne. iv. l. 57.

Sacrifice choice Sheep of two years old according to the usual Rites. And She Herself poured the Wine upon the Heifer's head.

*Ipsa tenens dextra pateram pulcherrima
 Dido*

Candenti vaccæ media inter cornua fudit.

Ibid. l. 60.

O

And

And *She* acted as a Priest in examining *the Entrails* in order to know what they prognosticated,

————— *Pecudumque reclusis
Pectoribus inhians Spirantia consulit exta:*

Ibid l. 64.

And *She* laid the Gifts upon the Altar ; and *She* observed the ill omens ;

*Vidit thuricremis cum dona imponeret Aris,
Horrendum dictu, latices nigrescere sacros,
Fusaque in obscœnum se vertere vina cru-
orem.*

Ibid. l. 453.

Æneas too when he met his Mother and did not know her, promises that he *would* with his own hands kill a great many Victims to Her.

*Multa tibi ante aras nostra cadet Hostia
Dextra.*

Æn. i. 338.

Whatever was the Office of Priests in later days, in those early times the *Offering* or the *Slaying* of the Beast and all the ceremonies

ceremonies of Sacrificing were perform'd by any private man that was religiously disposed. The Customs of the *Greeks* are so particularly described by *Homer*, that one cannot easily mistake them. *Nestor* had Six Sons ; and when he went to sacrifice, Each of them performed some part or Office in it as well as He himself : nor is any one of them mentioned as *chosen* out, or appointed to that Office, as *Laocoon* in *Virgil*, *Æn.* ii. or *Theano* in *Homer*, *Il.* ξ. was. *Stratius* and *Echepron* led the Ox by the Horns : *Aretus* brought the Water in a Pot to wash their hands : This he brought in one hand ; in the other the *Barley meal*, ἄλας, in a Basket. The warlike *Thrasymedes* stood with a sharp Hatchet in his hand ready to kill the Ox. *Perseus* held the ἀμνίον, the Vessel to catch the Blood. *Nestor* himself began first to use the *Water*, and the *Salted Meal*, and began to pray, and threw the *Hair* into the Fire. Then *Thrasymedes* cut the Neck ; and *Pisistratus*, the Throat, σφάζεν ; and instantly cut it in pieces ; then *Nestor* burnt them, and poured the

Wine upon the Sacrifice. See *Homer*.
Odyss. l. iii. 439—460.

It may be perhaps suggested, that *Nestor* was a *King*, and a *Priest* too; and that in this latter capacity He did the several Offices he did, just as *Anius* in *Virgil*, was at the same time,

Rex idem hominum Phœbique Sacerdos.

Not only King, but likewise, Priest of Apollo. But

1. This would be gratis said: And were it true, yet

2. *Homer* has described the Sacrifice made by *Eumæus*, the *Hogherd*, exactly in the same manner as he did that of King *Nestor*; so as to shew that Private Persons, and not Priests, performed the whole Service. *Eumæus* bids, οἷς ἐτάροισιν, his companions, to bring him the BEST of his Hogs: He cleft the wood himself; and whilst he was doing That, They brought a fat Hog, five years old, and placed it at the Hearth. *Eumæus* threw the Hair into the Fire, (a circumstance which always attended these Sacrifices) and then He prayed to all the Gods, that
Ulysses

Ulysses might return home safe : Then He killed the Hog with a Club, and They [his Companions, the under people, whom he ordered to fetch the Hog] τοὶ δ' ἔσφαξαν τε καὶ ἔυσαν, *These cut the Throat, and burnt it, and presently divided it. But Eumæus* the Hogherd took the pieces,

Καὶ τὰ μὲν ἐν πυρὶ βάλλε, παλύνσας ἀλφίτῃ ἀκίῃ,

and having covered them with meal, cast them into the fire. It was He, who, σπείσας δ' αἰθοπα ὄνον, that made the *Libation of wine*, and indeed perform'd the whole * sacrificial Service. So that no doubt can be made, but that every body that would, performed this Office in those days.

The same manner is fully described in *Apollonius Rhodius*. *Jason's* Herdsmen brought a Couple of Bullocks, which the Younger of his Companions led to the Altar : “ Then they set the *Basons* and “ the *Salted Meal*, and *Jason* prayed to “ *Apollo* ; and as he prayed he cast the

* *Homer. Odyss. xiv. v. 418—447.*

“ *προχύτας*”, i. e. *the Meal*, as some say, or *Water*, into the Ears of the Victim, as Others. “ Then *Hercules* knocked down with his Club the Ox ; and *Anceus* cut the Muscles of the Neck : “ Then the * *Companions* cut its Throat, “ and flayed it, and cut it in pieces, and “ divided it, and cut the thighs, and “ covering them with fat, they burnt “ them ; and *Jason* himself made the “ Libation of Wine.”

The same too was the usual practice for every one to sacrifice among the *Romans*. When a Sacrifice was offer'd to the *Lares*, the Master of the House, or whoever it was, threw whatever it was that he offered, into the Fire, upon his Hearth, which was called the *Focus*. And hence came the Proverbial Expression, *Pro Aris et Focis pugnare* ; By which is meant, not to fight for the maintenance

* Τῆς δ' ἑταροὶ σφάζοντε θοῶς, δέϊραν τε βοΐας
 Κόπλον δαιτρευόντε, καὶ ἱερεῖ μῆρ' ἐτάμοστο,
 Καδδ' ἄμυδις τάγε πᾶσι καλύψαντες πύκα δημῶ
 Κᾶεν ἐπὶ σχίζουσιν. Ὅδ' ἀκρήτους χέε λοιβᾶς
 Αἰσωνίβης.

Apollon. Rhod. l. i. 432, &c.

of Religious and *Civil* Rights, or for *private Property*, but it wholly relates to Religion, *Public* and *Private*. And as This comprehended every thing that was deem'd worthy an Honest man's regard, hence it came to be applied to such cases, where a man thought himself obliged to exert his utmost ; His Religion being the chief Object of his Care.

Every Country man, whether he were a Slave or a Freeman, could make the following Address to *Mars Sylvanus* for the preservation of his Cattle *. He
 “ was to go into a Wood, in the day
 “ time ; and to take a certain quantity,
 “ e. g. Three pound of Barley Meal,
 “ Four pound and half of Bacon ; four
 “ pound and half of mere flesh without
 “ Bones ; and near Four Pints of Wine.

* *Votum pro bubus ut valeant sic facito. Marti sylvano in sylva interdus in capita singula boum votum facito farris adorei libras tres, et Lardi P. iv. s. et Pulpæ P. iv. s. Vini Sextarios iii. Id in unum vas liceto conjicere ; et vinum item in unum vas liceto conjicere. Eam rem divinam vel Servus vel Liber licebit faciat. Ubi res divina facta erit, statim ibidem consumito. Mulier ad eam rem divinam ne adsit, neve videat quomodo fiat. Cato. de R. R. c. 84.*

“ Wine. He was to put the Solids into
 “ a Vessel ; and the Wine likewise into a
 “ Vessel. As soon as this religious Act
 “ was done, This was all upon the Spot
 “ immediately to be consumed. No wo-
 “ man was to be present at this, nor see
 “ how it was done.” I know not whe-
 ther this ridiculous superstitious Whimsy
 may be reckoned as a *Sacrifice*, or whe-
 ther it may not come under the Notion of
 a *Charm*. It was plainly deem'd a sort of
 Sacred Act, join'd to a certain address to
Mars Sylvanus for his preservation of the
 Herd.

But tho' *Women* were prohibited either
 to be present at, or to see That Solemnity,
 be it called by what name you please, yet
 They could Sacrifice to their *Lares*, as
 well as the Men. This the *Lar* himself
 tells us in *Plautus*,

Huic *filiq* una est, ea mihi *cotidie*
 Aut *Thure*, aut *Vino*, aut aliqui semper
 supplicat.

Aul. Prol. v. 23.

And it is certain that religious persons
 at *Rome* did not only offer *Incense*, and
Wine,

Wine, but Salt, New Corn, and Flesh too.
Horace is a sufficient Evidence for this;

Cælo supinas si tuleris manus,—

Si Thure placaris et horna

Fruge Lares avidaque porca.

Lib. iii. Od. 23.

And again in the same Ode,

Mollibit averfos Penates

Farre pio et saliente Mica.

He elsewhere alludes to the custom of
Sacrificing a *Hog* to the *Lares*,

—*Immolet æquis*

His porcum Laribus.

Lib. ii. Sat. iii. l. 164.

And *Plautus* speaks not only of a *Hog*,
but of *Lambs* too, sacrificed to the *Lares*
who had encreased a Family. Thus
Dæmones bids his Wife go and dress her-
self in her best Attire,

—*Ut rem divinam, cum intro advenero*
Laribus familiaribus, cum auxerunt nos-
tram familiam.

Sunt domi Agni et porci sacres.

Rudens. Act iv. Sc. 6.

And

And by his having these *Lambs* and *Hogs* design'd for Sacred uses, it should seem as tho' he Sacrificed not unfrequent.

But notwithstanding Every man could thus Sacrifice for Himself, yet he could not I think come to the *Public* Altars and use them, nor to the *Public* Temples and Sacrifice there Himself; but he was obliged to use the proper Priest: Nor could all persons be admitted to all Temples. *

“ Some were open but once a year: To
 “ some only Men could be admitted; to
 “ others only Women ”: And the Customs were so very various, that I shall not attempt to mention them.

It may be asked, If every man could sacrifice, *i. e.* kill and offer up what He was disposed to offer, on his *own* *Hearth*, or on his *Private* Altar, What was the Use of the *Priests*? If every man could make a Libation, or could burn the Flesh, or cast into the Fire what was deemed an Offering to the Gods, to what purpose

* Quædam fana semel anno adire permittunt.—Est quo *Viro* non licet, et nonnulla absque fœminis sacra sunt. *Minut. Fœlix.* p. 225. Edit. Amst. 1672.

were the *Priests*, of several Degrees, Ranks and Offices, appointed?

As to the *Jews*, it must be observed, that every man that brought his Sacrifice, might, if he pleased, *kill* his own Sacrifice. It is expressly said of the *Burnt Offering*, *If any man of you bring an Offering—if his Offering be a Burnt Sacrifice of the Herd—He shall kill the Bullock before the Lord*, Lev. i. 5. And so again; *If it be of the Flocks, namely, of the Sheep or of the Goats for a Burnt Sacrifice,—He shall kill it on the side of the Altar northward before the Lord*, v. 10, 11. The Law was the same in relation to the *Peace Offerings*. *If his Oblation be a Sacrifice of Peace Offering—He shall lay his hand upon the head of his Offering, and kill it at the door of the Tabernacle of the congregation*, Lev. iii. 1, 2. And so it was in relation to the *Sin Offering*; The person that brought it was to lay his hand upon its head, and *kill* it, Lev. iv. 24, 29, 33. This original practice altered, as Niceties were introduced about the *Killing*: But the Person that brought his Sacrifice was empowered by the Law of
Moses,

Moses, to lay on his hands, to kill, to flay, to cut in pieces, and to wash the Inwards and Legs, Levit. i. The Sons of Aaron had their five parts likewise appointed to them : They were to take the Blood, to sprinkle it round about the Altar, to lay the pieces in order upon the wood, to put fire upon the Altar, and to lay the wood in order upon the Fire, Lev. i. 7, 8, 11, 13. Thus were the Offices of him that brought his Sacrifice, and of the Priest, distinct.

The person that brought his Sacrifice was never dispensed with from *laying on* his hands on the head of the Sacrifice. But as to the other Rites, killing, flaying, cutting it in pieces, and washing the Inwards—These in process of time became a matter of Art and Skill ; and Every one was not deem'd sufficiently qualified to do them. Accordingly the Books themselves, I mean the LXX, and the *Samaritan*, represent matters, as if the *Priests* were to do every thing which according to the Original Law of *Moses* the *Offerer himself* was to do, except only *Imposition of hands*. The LXX. speak always in the
Plural

Plural Number, σφάξουσιν, — καὶ ἐκδείραντες — μελιῶσιν, τὰ δὲ ἐγκοίλια καὶ τὰς πόδας πλυῖσιν, Lev. i. 5, 6, 9. They shall kill, and slay, and cut in pieces, and wash the inwards and the Feet; as if the Sons of Aaron were to do all these things. But the Original Hebrew, the Chaldee Paraphrase, the Arabic, and the Syriac, are express that the Offerer, and not the Sons of Aaron, were to do all those Acts, which in those Versions are attributed to the Priests.

It must be owned that the *Septuagint Version* seems to receive some confirmation from what is said, 2 Chron. xxix. 24, 34. In the former passage it is said, that *the Priests killed the Sin Offering*: And in the latter, *The Priests were too few, so that They could not slay the Burnt Offerings: Wherefore their Brethren the Levites did help them till the work was ended.* And in the case of *Josiah's Passover* it is said, *The Priests stood in their place, and the Levites in their courses—and they killed the Passover, and the Priests sprinkled the Blood from their hands, and the Levites flayed them.* 2 Chron. xxxv. 10, 11.

That

That the Priests in *Josiah's* time did usually *kill* the Sacrifices, and *flay* them, and do all the preparatory Offices as well as what was properly their own, except the Imposition of hands, is certainly true. But even in times when They did this, that any one else that knew how to kill and flay his Sacrifice, might do it himself, is agreed on all hands. It was a Rule among the Rabbi's, "that the Killing of Holy things may lawfully be done by Strangers", [*i. e.* such as are not of *Aaron's* Seed] "even of the most holy things, whether they be the Holy things of a particular person, or of the congregation." For this Mr. *Ainsworth* cites *Maimonides* in *Biath Hamikdash*, ch. ix. § 6. Vid. *Ainsworth* in *Levit.* c. i. 5. The *Mishnah* lays it down for a Maxim, " * The *Slaying* done by all *Profane* persons", [*i. e.* persons that are not Priests] " is lawful, because *Slay-*

* Omnium reproborum qui maclant Maclatio bona est, quia maclatio legitima est per peregrinos, mulieres, Servos, atque impuros, etiam in Sanctis Sanctorum, modo non tetigerint immundi carnem. *Mishn. de Sacrificiis.* Vol. V. p. 15.

“ *ing* is lawfully done by Strangers, Wo-
 “ men, Servants, and Unclean, even in
 “ the most Holy things, provided the
 “ Unclean do not touch the flesh.” *Bar-*
tenora here observes *, that the *Mishna*
 “ here teaches us that *Slaying* of a Sa-
 “ crifice may be performed by one that
 “ is not a Priest.” And *Maimonides* says
 † that “ in the Law, *Leviticus* i. 5. no
 “ mention is made of the Sons of *Aaron*
 “ in relation to *Maſtation*, but it has left
 “ That to Every one’s own pleasure. But
 “ then as to taking the Blood, the *Priest*
 “ is necessary : for our wise men have
 “ determined that the *Sacerdotal Office*
 “ begins at the receiving the Blood.—You
 “ must know therefore that at the begin-

* *Maſtationem per eum qui non eſt Sacerdos, vel qui illegitimus eſt ad ſacra, peragi poſſe docet. Bartenora in loc. ibid.*

† Scriptum eſt, *Leviticus* i. 5. וְשָׂחַט אֹתוֹ בֶּן הַבְּקָר. לְפָנַי יְהוָה וְהִקְרִיבוּ בְנֵי אֱהֲרֹן. In maſtatione Lex non memoravit filios Aaronis, ſed eam cujuſvis arbitrio reliquit. In ſanguine vero excipiendo requiritur perſona Sacerdotis, nam Sapientes dixerunt, ab exceptione Sanguinis et deinceps miniſterium Sacerdotale incipit.—Scias itaque quod ab initio permiſſum ſit extraneo ſive cuilibet Iſraelitæ et ſceminæ atque Servo ut maſtaret Sacrificia. *Maimon. in Miſhn. Vol. V. p. 15.*

“ *ning*

“ning, it was permitted to any one not
 “ a Priest, or to any *Israelite* Man or
 “ Woman, and to Servants, to kill their
 “ Sacrifice.” The *Mishna* itself in ano-
 ther place lays down much the same de-
 termination. * “ All may kill their Sa-
 “ crifice, and their *Maḥtation* is lawful, ex-
 “ cept a deaf man, a fool, and a Minor.”
 But as Custom had brought things to that
 pass, that a great deal of Art and Skill
 was necessary ; and he that kill’d the Sa-
 crifice was obliged to understand the cus-
 tomary Rules of *Slaying* the Animal,
 hence the Priests came to do it as in
 course, or as if it were their peculiar
 Province. For their *Rabbi’s* had laid it
 down for a Rule, that there were Five
 cases in which the *Maḥtation* was rendered
 void, or in which the whole Act was
 spoiled. But these it is † needless to ex-
 plain.

* Omnes maclare possunt, et maclatio ipsorum recta est, surdo, stulto et minorenni excepto. *Mishn. Tit. de Profanis.* Vol. V. p. 114.

† The five things were, Tardatio, Conculcatio, Occul-
 tatio, Aberratio, et Eradicatio. The Reader may see all
 these explained by Maimonides in *Mishn. Vol. V. p. 114.*

From the antient practices of the *Jews* we may pass to those of the *Gentiles*. It seems not to have been the practice among them in the earliest times to have had *Priests* to *slay* their victims; but if at any time they called in to their Assistance any *ἱερεὺς*, or *Priest*, it was to *consult* them, who were supposed by their Skill, or Observation, or by some means or other, to be able to *interpret*, or to *prognosticate*, as circumstances were. The Interpretation of Dreams, or the flight of Birds, or the Look of Entrails, or the manner of Smoak's ascending, or the Burning of Fire, or in short something of Divination from Sacrifices seems to have been their Business. Whenever *Homer* mentions an *ἱερεὺς*, it is always with a view to some or other of these purposes, and not with a view to *killing* the Victim, or ordering it upon the Altar. When *Hecuba* would have dissuaded *Priamus* from going to *Achilles*, the Old man tells her, "that she should never hinder him from going. For, says he, "if any *Mortal* had bid me go, whether they were *Prophets*, *Consulters* of Entrails, or *Priests*, I should have

P

" thought

“ thought they had imposed upon me.”
 But as he had heard and seen the Goddess, viz. *Iris*, He was resolved to go. He would not have gone, had those who persuaded him, been,

Ἡ οἱ μάντιές εἰσι θυόσκοοι, ἢ ἱερεῖες.

Iliad. ω. 221.

By *Μάντις*, he means one that could judge of good or bad success from Dreams or Flight of Birds, or Omens, or Oracles. It was a general word, of which the others were Species. The *Θυόσκοοι* were such as divined by Smoak, either that of Incense, or any other thing that burned: The *ἱερεῖες* divined from the Burning of Sacrifices, or the parts of it, as far as one may conjecture from the use of this Term in *Homer*. Thus when *Achilles* moved to know the cause of *Apollo's* Anger, He proposed to enquire of some *Μάντις*, or *ἱερεῖες*, or Interpreter of Dreams, that He might tell the cause of the Evil the *Greeks* laboured under.

Ἄλλ' ἄγε δὴ τινα μάντιν ἐρείομεν, ἢ ἱερεῖα
 Ἡ καὶ Ὀνειροπόλου

Iliad. α. v. 62.

Eustathius

Eustathius observes, that by 'Ονειροπόλον, he means * “ one conversant about *Dreams*, “ and thence foreknowing what was to “ happen. By ἱερῆα, one well acquainted “ with the manner of Sacrificing, and “ divining by the parts cut in pieces.” He goes on to observe, † “ that it was “ the same thing to say ἱερέα, i. e. a *Priest*, “ and one that had Experience in things “ offered by fire, or frequently conversant “ in things offered by Fire.” So that *Homer* does not mean by the word ἱερεῦς, or *Priest*, One that offered or killed a Victim, but quite a different thing : Nor is there one instance in Him that I recollect, where the ἱερεῦς or ἱερέα, *Priest* or *Priestess*, was concerned in the *Mactation* of any Animal ; but the *Offerer* himself always killed it, and burnt it, and prayed, and did all that was proper for him to do. He takes occasion to mention several ἱερεῖς, or *Priests* and *Priestesses*, such as *Chryses*,

* Ὀνειροπόλον μὲν λέγει, τὸν περὶ ὀνείρους σρεφόμενον, καὶ χεῖβει τὸ μέλλον προειδόμενα διὰ τοῦ κρίνειν ὀνείρους. ἱερῆα δὲ τὸν τὴν θυτικὴν ἔιπτον ἱερατικὴν μετιόσια, καὶ δι' ἐντόμων μαντεύομενον, ἢ γὰρ ἱερίων σφαγίων. *Eustath. in Hom. p 47.*

† Ταυτίον ἔστιν ἱερέα ἔπειν καὶ ἐμπύρων γευόμενον καὶ ἐμπύροις χρώμενον. *Ibid.*

and *Dares*, and *Hypsenor*, and *Theano* ; and he takes occasion to speak much in favour of *Maron* the Priest of *Apollo* in the ixth *Odyssee* ; but yet he never mentions his Sacrificing to his God ; or that He, or any other *Priest*, slew the Victim.

The Priests of old, as I have already observed, did not make it their business, nor was it deemed their Office, to perform Sacrifice, *i. e.* to *slay* the Animal, or distribute its parts upon the Altar, but They were skilled in Divinations of various Sorts. The famous *Orpheus* is described by *Onomacritus* as * “ knowing
 “ the various *ways* of *Beasts* and *Birds*,
 “ and the *position* of the *Entrails*, and
 “ what *Dreams* portend, and the *Solu-*
 “ *tions* of *Signs* and *Prodigies*, and the
 “ *Course* of the *Stars*, and *Purifications*,
 “ and the *Appeasement* of the Gods, and
 “ the various *Gifts* of Men ” : but not a

* Ἀμφὶ δὲ μαυλείης ἑδάην, πολυπείρονας ὄρνυες
 Θηρῶν, οἰωνῶν τε, καὶ ἡ σπλάγχχνων θεσίς ἐστίν.
 Ἡδ' ὅσα θεσπίζουσιν ὄνειροπόλοισιν ἀταρπῆς
 Ψυχᾶι ἐφημερίων, ὑπὸ βεβολημέναι ἦτορ,
 Σηωείων τεράτων τε λύσεις, ἄσρων τε ποσειας,
 Ἄγριοπόλον τε καθαρμὸν, ἐπιχθονίοις μέγ' ὄνειαρ,
 Ἰλασμός τε θεῶν, φθιμένων τ' ἐπιμήχυστα δῶρα.

Orphæi Argon. l. 33, &c.

word .

word is said of his *Sacrificing*, or *Slaying* Victims, or his pouring out or *offering* the *Blood*, or *burning* the parts of the Animal, to any of the Gods. And *Umbro* the Priest is made famous by *Virgil* because he could make “ *Vipers* of all sorts “ and *Water-snakes* sleep, and could *tame* “ them, and *cure* their *Bites*, and make “ them Harmless:

Vipereo generi et graviter Spirantibus hydri-
dris

Spargere qui somnos cantuque manuque so-
lebat,

Mulcebatque iras, et morsus arte levabat.

Æneid. vii. 753.

But when I say this, I would not be understood to mean, as if *Priests* never were concerned in any *Maçtation*. On certain solemn Anniversary Occasions the Priests performed the Office. Thus *Laocoon*, the Priest of *Thymbrean Apollo*, was chosen by Lot to be the Priest of *Neptune*; and He

Solennes taurum ingentem maçtabat ad
aras.

Æn. ii. 202.

Slew a large Bullock at the Altars dedicated or appointed for this Solemn Sacrifice. And *Orpheus* is described as performing the *whole Sacrificial Service*, when the *Argonauts* were to take the Oath of Fidelity to *Jason*, and engaged themselves to act in Obedience to him. It was He * that “killed the Beast, and cut him up, and poured the Blood upon the Altar”; and it was He that † made up “the Mixture” for them all to drink of; and it was he that *Prayed* for their good Success and safe return. But this was only at particular Solemn Times, and not as their Office or common Practice on all Occasions. On making Leagues, and such like Occasions, the *Priest* sometimes

* Καὶ τότε δὴ κραντῆρα βοῶν περιμύχρα τᾶυρον
Σφάζον, ἀνακλίνας κεφαλὴν εἰς αἰθέρα δῖαν
Ζωοτάμνων, περὶ δ' ἄιμα πυρὶ χέον.——

Orphci Argon. l. 311.

† As this *Κυκεῶν*, or Mixture, is very different from that in *Hesychius*, it may be proper to mention them Both. *Orpheus's* is thus described; He took an Earthen Vessel, and mingled Flower, and the Blood of the Bull, and Sea Water, And then pouring this out of a Pitcher into a Gold Cup, he gave it to each of them to taste. *Hesychius's* *Κυκεῶν* was Wine and Honey and Water and Flower mingled together. Vid. *Eschenbachius* in *Orph. Argon.*

only

only brought the Victims to the Altars, and seems to have done no more.

————— *Sacerdos*

*Sætigeræ fœtum suis, intonsamque bidentem
Attulit, admovitque pecus flagrantibus aris.*

Æneid. xii.

But *Turnus* and *Æneas*, after Each had taken a solemn Oath, cut the Throats of the Victims, and laid them on the Altars, and took out the Entrails, &c.

————— *rite sacratas*

*In flammam jugulant pecudes, et viscera vivis
Eripiunt, cumulantque oneratis lancibus
aras*

Æn. xii. 170—215.

The Priests were certainly, in time, the most expert in the business of Sacrifices, and by degrees had introduced a thousand Niceties about the Victim, and about the Forms to be used in such and such Oblations. One Sort of Animal was to be offered to This God or Goddes, Another to Another: And there were infinite Purifications to be made in Order to be ac-

ceptable to the Deity, whose displeasure was to be averted, or from whom favours were expected. No good was to be hoped for, whilst the Offerer thought himself at *Enmity* with the God, whose Assistance he desired. To return therefore into favour, a great variety of means were invented by one and another: All the little circumstances of the Victims approach to the Altar; whether it came willingly or with reluctance; whether it broke loose; what was the manner of its dying, and an infinite variety of Forms were to be observed: And this in course would create by degrees a change of Customs, and make the whole of Sacrificing fall to the *Priest's* Share. It was thus among the *Jews*, where except in one case, He that made the Offering very rarely *killed* it; tho' by the Law of *Moses*, He was to slay and slay his Offering, and to cut it in pieces. And thus by degrees the Customs altered among the *Greeks*: Every One at first did the whole Office of Sacrifice, without Assistance or direction of any Priest, unless he were occasionally consulted; how much soever the Priest did every thing in
later

later times: And therefore I will add to the other Instances I have already mentioned, that *Hesiod*, when he advised his Brother *Perses* to offer Sacrifice, never mentions a Priest, but bids *Him himself**
 “ Do the Sacred Offices to the Gods with
 “ a pure Mind and clean Body.” He bids
 “ Him burn the Thighs, and make the
 “ Gods propitious by Libations and Sa-
 “ crifices every night and every morning.”
 And as this was so common among the
Greeks, no wonder that a *Greek* takes notice of it as something *strange*, when he comes into a foreign country, and sees a different Practice. Accordingly *Herodotus* observes it as something very peculiar and odd, that among the *Persians* † “ it was
 “ not lawful for them to sacrifice with-
 “ out a Magus or Priest.”

* Κἀδδύναμιν δ' ἔρδειν ἱερ' ἀθανάτοισι θεοῖσιν
 ἄγνως κὴ καθαρῶς, ἐπὶ δ' ἄγλαα μηρία καίειν.
 Ἄλλοτε δὴ σπονδῆσι θυέσσι τε ἰλάσκεισθαι
 Ἦμεν ὅτ' εὐνάζη, κὴ ὅταν φάος ἱεροῦ ἔλθῃ.

Hesiod. l. i. 334.

† Ἄνευ γὰρ δὴ μάγου ἔσφι νόμος ἐστὶ θυσίας ποιέεσθαι.

Herod. l. i. c. 132.

The antient Practice among the *Greeks* sufficiently appears: It may be worth while to take some notice how this affair stood amongst the *Romans*, where they had Public Priests, and a regular Institution of a *Priesthood*. Besides their *Temples* which were consecrated by their *Pontifex* or *High Priest*, and which had their *Areas* fixed by their *Augurs*, They had not only several Species of Sacred Houses, but they had besides private Rooms in their own houses made use of for Acts of Religion, which yet did not come under the Denomination of properly *Sacred* places. For what was called or deemed *Sacred* among them, was only * “ what was in solemn form dedicated “ by the Pontifices to the Gods.” They had their *Lararia*, or Rooms where they placed their *Lares*, and where they worshipped them, and prayed to them for the safety and security of their Houses; and in which they frequently, if not daily, offered Incense, or Wine, or Animal Sacrifices. The Places or Rooms thus set

* *Sacræ res sunt, quæ rite per Pontifices Deo consecratæ sunt. Justinian. Instit. L. ii. Tit. 1.*

apart by private people were not regarded as *Sacred*, as I just before observed. And even the Oblations made to the *Lares* in these Apartments, were rather looked upon as *not Sacrifices*, than *Sacrifices*. For a Public Priest was deemed necessary to perform Sacrifices. But this is a mere verbal difference.

Romulus divided the whole *Roman* people into *Three Tribes*, to which *Servius Tullus* added a Fourth. These Three Tribes of *Romulus* were divided into Thirty *Curia*. So that each Tribe contained Ten *Curia*, and each *Curia* had Two Priests, as *Dionysius* of *Halicarnassus* observes, *lib. ii.* to perform the common Sacred rites of each *Curia* or district. Besides these, *Romulus* appointed * One *Μάντις*, or *Priest*, out of each *Tribe*, who was to be present at their Sacred Offices. He was called, *Aruspex*; and his business was to *inspect the Victims*, and declare whether such or such were

* Ἐταξε Μάντιν ἐξ ἐκάστης φυλῆς ἕνα παρῆναι τοῖς ἱεροῖς, ὃν ἡμεῖς μὲν ἱεροσκοπὸν καλεῖμεν, Ρώμαιοι δὲ— Ἀρῦσπικα.

Dionys. Halicar. l. ii. p. 32.

acceptable

acceptable to the God. These *Curia* had their Gods and Dæmons appointed which they were constantly to worship; and the Expences, whatever they were, were allowed them out of the public Moneys. They were * to meet together with their Priests upon the Festival days at the *Curial Fire*, and there to feast together: For there was a certain public common Fire to *each* Curia, or District, prepared: as likewise one common to all the Curia, like the *Greek Prytaneia*. † These particular *Fire places* were called *Curia*, as well as the Districts themselves. These *Curia* were distinguished from each Other by the Parts or Streets of the City wherein the People dwelt; and they had certain common religious Rites and Ceremonies which their Priests, (called their *Curiones*) directed; and they officiated in all Acts of Public Worship in

* Συνέθουον τοῖς ἱερεῦσιν αἱ φράτραι εἰς τὰς ἀπομεριαθεῖσας αὐτοῖς θυσίας, καὶ συνεσιῶντο κατὰ τὰς ἐορὰς ἐπὶ τῆς φρατρίας εἰσίας. Ἐσιατόριον γὰρ ἦν κατεσκευασμένον ἐκάστη φράτρη. Καὶ σὺν αὐτῷ καθυστάτω τις, ὡσπερ ἐν τοῖς Ἑλληνικοῖς πρυτανείαις, εἰσία κοινὴ τῶν φρατριῶν. *Ibid.*

† Ὀνομα δὲ τοῖς Ἐσιατορίαις ἦν ὅπερ ταῖς φρατρίαις, Κυρία. *Ibid.*

their

their districts. *Numa* afterwards regulated the Religious Affairs of the people, and created a *Chief Priest*, whose business it was, to * “ determine every thing that
 “ related to Sacrifices, What Sort they
 “ were to be ; on what days they were
 “ to be made ; to what Temples they
 “ were to be brought and offered, and
 “ whence Money should be had for these
 “ sacred uses.” He likewise † “ subjected
 “ to the Determination of the Chief
 “ Priest all Disputes about both Public
 “ and Private Sacred Rites, in order to
 “ guard against Innovations, or Neglect
 “ of the Customs of their own Country,
 “ or the bringing in religious Customs
 “ from abroad.”

By the power with which the Pontifex was thus vested, his Business was to teach all who came to consult him, the order

* Pontificem— ex patribus legit, eique sacra omnia scripta exsignataque attribuit : Quibus Hostiis, quibus diebus, ad quæ Tempia sacra fierent, atque unde in eos sumptus pecunia erogaretur. *Livius*. l. i.

† Cætera quoque omnia publica privataque Sacra Pontificis Scitis subjecit, ut esset quo consultum plebs veniret ; nequid divini juris negligendo patrios Ritus, peregrinosque asciscendo turbaretur. *Ibid.*

and

and manner of their Sacrifices ; to appoint the Holidays ; to determine all Controversies * “ relating to Sacred things between
 “ Private persons, or Magistrates, or the
 “ Ministers of the Gods : They could
 “ make Laws in relation to such points as
 “ were not wrote down, or by Use were
 “ not received ; judging and determining
 “ what appeared to them to be proper to
 “ be made into Laws, or received as Cus-
 “ toms : They had a power of examin-
 “ ing all those Officers and Priests to
 “ whom the Right of Sacrificing, or the
 “ Service of the Gods, was commit-
 “ ted ; Their Servants and Officers that
 “ they used in their Sacred Rites, whether
 “ they observed, or did not observe, the

* Δικάζουσι οὗτοι τὰς ἱεράς δίκας ἀπάσας ἰδιώταις τε καὶ ἀρχουσι καὶ λειτουργοῖς θεῶν· καὶ νομοθετοῦσιν ὅσα τῶν ἱερῶν ἀγγραφα ὄνια καὶ ἀνέθισα, κρίσεις αἱ ἂν ἐπιτήδεια τυγχάνειν αὐτοῖς φανεῖν νόμων τὲ καὶ ἐθισμῶν· τὰς τε ἀρχὰς ἀπάσας ὅσαις θυσίαι τε καὶ θεραπεῖαι θεῶν ἀνάκειται, καὶ τοὺς ἱερεῖς ἀπαντας ἐξετάζουσιν· ὑπερέτας τὲ αὐτῶν καὶ λειτουργὰς οἷς χρῶνται πρὸς τὰ ἱερά, ἕτοι φυλάττουσι μηδὲν ἐξαμαρτάνειν παρὰ τοὺς ἱεροὺς νόμους· τοῖς τὲ ἰδιώταις ἐπόσει μὴ ἴσασι τοὺς περὶ τὰ θεῖα ἢ δαιμόνια σεβασμῶν, ἐξηγηταὶ γίνονται καὶ προφήται· καὶ εἰ τινας αἰσθάνται, μὴ πειθομένους τῶν ἐπιταγῶν αὐτῶν, ζημιῶσι πρὸς ἕκασον χρεῖμα ὀρωῖτες· εἰσὶ τε ἀνυπέθυτοι πάσης δίκης τὲ καὶ ζημίας, ἕτε βυλῆ λόγον ἀποδιδόντες, ἕτε δήμου. *Dionysius Halicar.* l. ii.

“ Sacred

“ Sacred Laws : They were to instruct
 “ Private people who did not know the
 “ proper manner of worshipping the
 “ Gods : and if they found any that did
 “ not obey their Directions or Commands,
 “ they had a power of mulcting them :
 “ whilst they themselves were not ac-
 “ countable either to the Senate or the
 “ People.” They were Judges of what
 related to Vows, or to Sepulchres : They
 were to take care that none should trans-
 gress or neglect their own Country Rites,
 or introduce New ones : They had a strict
 care committed to them of the Vestal
 Rites, and the Vestal Fire, and the Ves-
 tal Virgins : and they were to take cog-
 nizance of their faults, and to punish
 them, if they were any ways delinquents,
 or neglected their duties : They were to
 instruct the people in the nature of *Pro-*
digies, and how they were to be expiated ;
 and how the Gods were to be consulted
 about them : and lastly, they were to be
 present at the Dedications of Temples.

In this disposition of things, the Vestal
 Virgins most carefully kept up the Fire
 for the whole City ; the Sixty Curio's
 kept

kept up the *public Fires* of their respective Districts; In every Village the Priests that belonged to it kept up a *Fire* in it; and by this means public Sacrifice, and the Established Forms of Public worship was carried on. But then besides all this, there was a Private Religion carried on at home, allowed, and well known, wherein they worshipped their *Lares*. Now these Private Acts, their Forms of Prayer, their manner of Worship, what sorts of Sacrifices they were to use, at what Times they were to sacrifice, or what they did in their *Lararia*, seem not to have been under the direction of the *Pontifex*, or any one else. Private Persons might, if they pleased, consult their *Curio*, or any other public Priest, and take in his Assistance: But if any one were disposed to beg a Blessing on his Farm, or Cattle, he was not obliged to go to the *Fratres Arvales*, or to get them to sacrifice for him; but if he thought himself skilled sufficiently in these matters, He might *kill* his own Victims, and make his own prayers, and burn his own Sacrifice, without the help of those Priests.

Those

Those that were disposed to make use of the *Fratres Arvales* might do it, and very often did it, and we have instances remaining of the Sacrifices perform'd by them ; but there does not seem to have been any Obligation to apply to them. The Public sacred Rites were maintain'd at the Public Charge ; and the Public worship was for the Public Emolument : But the Private Rites were for private Ends, for the good of Private Persons, and private Families, and therefore might be performed by any body that understood how to perform them.

In this Situation did *Numa* leave the Affair of Religion. But notwithstanding his Care to keep out Foreign Rites, and his Appointment of a *Pontifex Maximus* for this purpose,—yet *New Gods* and *New Rites* of Worship were introduced by Foreigners who dwelt at *Rome* : And this, in such a degree, that the State thought itself obliged to interpose more than once or twice, and to condemn such practices.

The first time that mention is made of these Innovations is about the year of

Q

Rome

Rome 325, when * “ a great many New
 “ Customs had prevailed, which *those*
 “ *who knew how to make a gain* of such
 “ as were *Superstitious*, had introduced
 “ into Houses : They taught the People
 “ New Rites in Sacrificing and Divining ;
 “ till at last the public Shame came to
 “ the knowledge of the Chief men of
 “ the State, who saw in all the Streets
 “ and little Chapels *foreign and unusual*
 “ Methods of Expiation used. Upon
 “ this the *Ædiles* were authorized to see
 “ that none but the *Roman Gods* should
 “ be worshipped ; and Those, only ac-
 “ cording to their own Country manners.”
 A second Affair of this Sort happened
 whilst *Hannibal* was in *Italy*, when the
Roman Rites were not only neglected,
 but † “ contemned, not only in private

* *Novos ritus Sacrificando, Vaticinando, inferentibus in domos quibus quæstui sunt capti superstitione animi, donec publicus jam pudor ad primores civitatis pervenit, cernentes in omnibus vicis Sacellisque peregrina atque insolita piacula Pacis Deum exposcendæ. Datum inde Negotium Ædilibus ut animadverterent ne qui, nisi Romani Dei, neu quo alio more quam patrio colerentur. Livius l. iv.*

† *Nec jam in secreto modo atque intra parietes ac postes contemnebantur Romani ritus, sed in publico etiam ac foro Capitolioque multarum turba erat, nec sacrificantium nec precantium Deos patrio more. Livius, l. xxv.*

“ Houses,

“ Houses, but in the Forum, and the
 “ Capital itself, where Crowds of Wo-
 “ men were worshipping and praying to
 “ the Gods, not according to the *Ro-*
 “ *man* Customs.” It is certain that they
 had * “ Divining Books, and Forms of
 “ Prayer, and the Art of Sacrificing wrote
 “ down ” : by which seems to be meant,
 that they had a Sort of Ritual how to per-
 form the Sacred Offices. *Æmylius*, or
 rather *Atilius* (for *Atilius* was City Prætor
 that year, as *Sigonius* observes) by order
 of the Senate commanded, “ that Every
 “ body should bring in to him whatever
 “ Books of Divination, Forms of Prayer,
 “ or Art of Sacrificing, they had in
 “ writing : and that no one should use in
 “ any Public, or in any consecrated place,
 “ any New or foreign Rites.”

We meet with a stronger instance still,
 when the Affair of the *Bacchanals*, and
 the scandalous Practices therein used, came
 to be discovered, about the year of *Rome*

* Quicumque libros vaticinos, precationesque, aut artem
 Sacrificandi conscriptam haberent, eos libros omnes Lite-
 rasque ad se—deferret ; Neu quis in publico sacrove loco,
 novo aut externo ritu sacrificaret. *Ibid.*

567 or 568. The Consul *Posthumius* takes notice of the frequent * “ Pro-
 “ hibitions of Foreign Rites ; of the
 “ forbidding Priests and Prophets to ex-
 “ ercise their Offices in the Forum, the
 “ Circus, or the City. He mentions the
 “ Command to get together and to Burn
 “ the divining Books that the people had
 “ got ; and the Abolition of all the Ri-
 “ tuals of Sacrificing, except what were
 “ done after the *Roman Customs* : And
 he observes, that † “ the Ablest and
 “ most judicious men were of Opinion,
 “ that nothing tended so much to the
 “ Destruction of all Religion, as the wor-
 “ shipping not after their own Country
 “ Customs, but foreign ones.”

But these Passages relate to the *Public* Religion, and to the condemnation of Sacred Rites which Priests had *craftily*

* Quoties hoc patrum avorumque ætate negotium Magistratibus datum, ut sacra externa fieri vetarent ? Sacrificulos Vatesque foro, circo, urbe prohiberent ? Vaticinos Libros conquirerent comburerentque ? Omnem disciplinam Sacrificandi præterquam more Romano abolerent ? *Liv.* l. xxxix.

† Judicabant enim prudentissimi viri omnis divini humanique Juris, nihil æque dissolvendæ religionis esse, quam ubi non patrio sed externo ritu sacrificaretur. *Ibid.*

introduced to make a penny of the People. They had brought in their Innovations into *Private Houses*; and thence by degrees they had spread into Public places; and at length they were thought so dangerous, that the Senate and the chief Magistrates thought it high time to interpose, and to stop the progress of the Evil. But still the *Private Sacred Customs*, whether those of whole Families, or those of particular Persons, remained untouched. Such and such Families had their peculiar and proper Festivals which they kept anniversary: And they had their proper worship of the Gods at such times: and if any one were *adopted* into any family, he was obliged to leave his own Sacred Rites, and to use those of the family into which he was adopted. And it was one part of the High Priest's care, to see that the Sacred Rites should go with the Estate; and not be lost through any division of Lands, or Monies, or by any Frauds, or Tricks.

These things being settled and fixed by the Magistrate, he did not concern himself with what was done *intra parietes et*

postes, or within doors. It was ordered that none should use foreign Rites in *Public*: at the same time it was well known that people used their private Sacred Rites in their own manner, and Sacrificed as they thought proper. Accordingly *Cicero*, when he was making Laws for his Common-wealth, and forming his Plan as much as he well could upon the Old Laws of *Rome*, — He would not allow * “ *New Gods*; nor would he suffer foreign Rites to be publicly practised, unless they were by *Public Authority* admitted”: at the same time he allowed † “ *Places* for the Household Gods, and the *private* Rites used by any Family, and by their Ancestors.” He thought it an unreasonable thing, that Men should make to themselves *New Gods*, (as *Tertullian* || tells us of *Æmylius*, that he made for himself the God *Albūr-*

* Separatim nemo habesit Deos, neve Novos: Sed ne Advenas, nisi publice adscitos privatim colunto. *De Legibus*, c. ii

† Larum Sedes, ritus familie, patrumque. *Ibid.*

|| Vetus erat decretum, ne qui Deus ab Imperatore consecraretur nisi a Senatu probatus. Scit *M. Æmylius* de Deo suo Alburno. *Tertullian. Apolog* c. v.

mus :) Nor would he allow the Introduction of *Foreign Gods*, unless they were appointed by the Government, because that would introduce Confusion and unusual ceremonies; and perhaps make the people contemn or neglect the Gods established by Law. But notwithstanding That, Private people might practise what was usual with them, observing their own Rites at home, but following the Rites of their Country in Public.

But it is time to return to the consideration of the earliest Sacrifices of which we have any Records. I have already spoken to *Cain's* and *Abel's* Sacrifices, which are both called *Mincha's* or *Gifts*; and therefore they may seem to have been of the *Eucharistic* Kind. The next that is mentioned is That of *Noah*, which is expressly called a *Burnt Offering*, and is the First that is mentioned by That Name. Whether this Sacrifice was for *deprecating* God's Anger, or was of the *Thanksgiving* kind, to acknowledge the favour received in being preserved with his Wife and Sons and Daughters from the Waters, can only be collected from the general nature of

Holocausts. I should think it most probable to have been deprecatory, not only from the nature of the Holocaust, but because the *Eucharistic* Sacrifices were usually distinguished from the *Holocausts* in Scripture *. The *Eucharistic*, the *Vow*, and the *Free-will Offering* are always in Scripture deem'd *Peace Offerings*. And since the *Peace Offering* was distinguished, as it ought to be, into these Three Sorts, it is probable that the *Burnt Offering*, mentioned as this is, was not an *Eucharistic* Sacrifice; tho' it must be owned that in some cases it was so.

The Holocaust was entirely consumed upon the Altar: And as the Owner had no part or share of it for his *own Eating*, He did not think himself *worthy* to be *admitted to eat* of what was in this manner offered unto God. He confessed his Sins, and desired readmittance into favour; deeming himself unworthy of it. And therefore usually *Peace Offerings* were joined to *Burnt Offerings*, that when all

* Eucharisticum, Votum, et Voluntarium, non nisi Sacris Salutaribus in sacris literis tribui solet. *Outram. de Sacrificiis*, p. 108.

deprecation of Anger had been made by the One, the Offerer partook of the Other as restored to a State of *Friendship*. But here, no mention being made of any other Oblation, except the *Burnt Offering*, it may be conceived that *Noah's* design was only to *Deprecate* all Anger.

When we come lower to the Sacrifices offered up by *Abraham*, we have no intimation given us of what kind they were. He *built an Altar, and called upon the name of the Lord*, Gen. xii. 8. — xiii. 4. And again, *he built in the plain of Mamre an Altar unto the Lord*, v. 18. And as he pitched his Tent there where He built his Altars, it should seem that this way of Worship by Sacrifice was frequent, and it is possible it might be *daily*: And hence he is called *Φιλοθύτης, a Lover of Sacrificing*, by *Cyril*, l. x. con. *Julian*: and by the Sacred Writer, *the Friend of God*, (James ii. 23.) from his constant renewal, or confirming, *Friendship* with God by Sacrifice.

There was something very particular in the manner of that Sacrifice described, *Gen. xv.* It seems to have been a form of
of

of entering into Covenant ; which as it is the earliest of its kind, and we find it practised with some little variations in much later times, it may be worth while to consider it. *Take me*, says God, *an Heifer of three years old, and a She Goat of three years old, and a Ram of three years old, and a Turtle Dove and a young Pidgeon. And he took unto him all these, and divided them in the midst, and laid one piece against another, but the Birds divided he not. And it came to pass, that when the Sun went down, and it was dark, behold a Smoaking furnace, and a burning Lamp that passed between those pieces, v. 9, 10, 17.* The Targum has it, *Offer to me*, instead of, *Take me*; and, *He offered to him all these*; for, *he took unto him all these*. But enough is not said to determine here, whether this was any more than a Form or Manner of engaging in a Covenant ; Nor is it called by any of those names by which a Sacrifice is expressed.

The Prophet *Jeremiah* has mentioned this manner of engaging in a solemn Covenant ; and has told us that *the Princes of Judah,*

Judah, and the Princes of Jerusalem thus made a Covenant with God : But he has not hinted at the time when they did it. Thus saith the Lord,— I will give the Men that have transgressed the Covenant, which have not performed the words of the Covenant which they had made before me, when they cut the Calf in twain and passed between the parts thereof. The Princes of Judah, and the Princes of Jerusalem, the Eunuchs and the Priests, and all the people of the Land, which passed between the parts of the Calf, I will even give them into the hand of their Enemies, and into the hand of them that seek their life. Jer. xxxiv. 18, 19, 20.

What the Fact was that *Jeremiah* speaks of, is not to be determined absolutely from any circumstance left us in History. It is very probable that it relates to some solemn Engagement made after the days of *Solomon*. He speaks of the *Princes of Judah, and Jerusalem, and the people of the Land*, as engaging in this Covenant: And therefore it was *after* the division of the Two Kingdoms. It is certain that it was, after *Israel* had rebelled against the
House

House of *David*, and *Jeroboam* had set up the Calves in *Dan* and *Bethel*, that *Judah* enter'd into this Covenant with God: And the Ceremony made use of in *passing between the parts of* the Heifer, implied an Imprecation upon themselves, that *they* might be *divided and cut in pieces*, as the Heifer was, *through the parts of which they passed*, if they did not adhere firm to the *Covenant* they were engaged in. Probably it refers to the *Covenant* which *Asa* entered into to seek the Lord God of his Fathers, so solemnly ratified as that was, 2 *Chron.* xv. 12—14, tho' the Ceremony by which the Covenant was ratified, is not mentioned in the History.

If Customs alter in some particular respects, and different Ceremonies arise, yet from the general Similitude of circumstances, it is easy to judge of the Intention of the Agents. *Abraham* made a Covenant with God, by passing between the parts of a divided Heifer. * “ It was

* Ἦν ἐν ἔθει χαλδαίσις τὴς ἀσφαλεστέρας ποιῆσθαι τῶν ὀρκῶν, διὰ μέσων ἰῦσι τῶν διχομημάτων, καὶ νόμοις αὐτοῖς ἐγκωρίσις ἐθεεταίου [αἰ. ἐθεεταῖο] τὸ χρῆμα. Cyril. c. Jul. l. x.

“ customary

“ customary among the *Chaldeans* (says
 “ *Cyril*) to establish their Oaths, or to
 “ make them more solemn and obli-
 “ gatory, by passing between things cut
 “ in two.” So that what the Patriarch
 did, was only in Consequence of his own
 Country Customs. As a proof of this *Cyril*
 argues from the words of *Moses*—*Take*
me an Heifer of three years old, and a
She Goat of three years old, and a Ram
of three years old, and a Turtle Dove and
a Pidgeon. The Command was only to
 TAKE these things : But as to the *Di-*
vision of them, or what was to be done
 with them, no mention is made : *Cyril*
 therefore goes on, * “ The divine *Abra-*
 “ *ham* well understood what was to be
 “ done with them ; for God only com-
 “ manding to *take* the things, He added
 “ all the rest, and according to the cus-
 “ tom of confirming an Oath, having
 “ cut in two the slain Animals, He laid
 “ the pieces over-against one another, God

* Ὁ δὲ καὶ ἔτι μάλιστά συνείη ὁ Θεοπέσιος Ἀβραάμ· καίτοι
 Θεὸς μόνον τὸ χρέμα λαβεῖν προστάξαντος, αὐτὸς τὰ λοιπὰ
 προστιθείς, καὶ κατὰ γὰρ τῆς ὀρκωσιᾶς τὸν νόμον, εἰς δύο
 τεμνῶν τὰ κατεσφαγμένα σιχηθὸν ἐτίθη, ὡς αὐτίκα δὴ μάλιστά
 διὰ μέσων διείη μελλόντος Θεοῦ. *Cyril. ibid.*

“ being

“ being soon to pass betwixt them.”
 He then proceeds to make good the Truth
 of his Observation, that This was the
 custom not only of later Times, but like-
 wise of *Early* ones, to *confirm an Oath* :
 and he produces a couple of Lines from
Sophocles, wherein * “ a Messenger is in-
 “ troduced as saying to *Creon*, That *They*
 “ were ready to take up in their hands red
 “ hot bars of Iron; and to go through Fire,
 “ and to swear by cutting asunder an
 “ Animal, in proof of their Innocence.”
 His Remark upon this is, † “ That they
 “ confirmed their Oaths by going through
 “ Fire, and by taking red hot Iron in
 “ their Hands.” When *St. Cyril* had
 made these Observations, he returns to
 the affair of *Abraham's* dividing the Ani-

* Ἰδοὶ δ' ἂν τις καὶ εἰς δέυρο τοιούτους τινὰς ὄρκους συντιθεμέ-
 νους παρὰ βαρβάρους, ἢ καὶ παρὰ τισὶ τῶν ἀρχαιοτέρων. Σοφο-
 κλῆς γὰρ ἐν Ἀντιγόνη εἰσκηκόμικε τινὰ τῶν Ἀγγέλων, οἱ δὲ καὶ
 τετάχατο τὸ Πολυνείκουσ σῶμα τηρεῖν τῷ τῶ Θεῶν ἰθύνοσι
 κράτη λέγοντα· Κρέων ἕτος ἦν.

Ἔμην δ' ἔτοιμοι καὶ μύθους ἄρσιν χερῶν
 Καὶ πυρὸς δέριπαι, καὶ θεῶσ ὀρκωτομεῖν.

Soph. Antig. l. 276. *Cyril.* *ibid.*

† Διὸ μέσου γὰρ ἰστίεσ πυρὸσ καὶ μύθους ἐλόντες χερσῶν ἔποι-
 ῶσι τὰσ ὀρκωσασίας. *Ibid.*

mals,

mals, and tells us, that || “ God, the great
 “ Governor of the Universe, condescend-
 “ ed to the weakness of the good Old
 “ man, and ratified the Oath according
 “ to the usual Solemnities among the
 “ *Chaldæans*.”

In this Solemnity then the Party that swore was to pass through the divided Animal. And in compliance with this Custom, *Moses* tells us, that *when the Sun went down, and the evening came on, behold a smoking furnace, and a Lamp of Fire passed between the pieces, i. e. God, who made his Appearance in Fire, passed through them; and thus was the Covenant ratified with Abraham.*

There is a Solemnity mentioned, *1 Sam. xi. 7.* which may help us to understand what has been said. *Saul took a yoke of Oxen, and hewed them in pieces, and sent them through all the Coasts of Israel by the hands of Messengers, saying, Whosoever cometh not forth after Saul, and after Samuel, so shall it be done unto his Oxen.*

|| Συγκαθίσταται δὴ ἐν—ταῖς τῆς πρῆστυς μικροψυχίαις ὁ τῶν ὄλων Θεός, καὶ κατὰ γε τὸ ἐντριβὲς χυλδαίοις συνετίθει τὸν ἕρκος ὀγκογομικῶς. *Ibid.*

This

This was not carried to the length that it might have been, to threaten the *people themselves* that they should be cut to pieces as was that Yoke of Oxen, but only to shew them how they should be affected in their *Cattle*. The Affair was carried much further, when the *Roman people* and the *Albans* made a League together. A Por-ker was placed before them; and then the *Fæcialis*, or *Herald*, said * “ If the
 “ *Roman* people either by Public Council,
 “ or by any Private Fraud or Trick what-
 “ ever, do break this League, Do You,
 “ O *Jupiter*, instantly so strike the *Ro-*
 “ *man people* as I now strike this Hog :
 “ And do you do it so much stronger,
 “ as you have greater Strength, and are
 “ more able.”

The custom of engaging in Covenants, and laying the strongest obligations possible upon Parties, by *passing between the parts of a divided Animal*, was so well known, and so much practised in the

* Si prior defexit publico Consilio, dolo malo, Tu illo die Jupiter, populum Romanum sic ferito, ut Ego hunc porcum hic hodie feriam : tantoque magis ferito, quanto magis potes pollesque. *Liv.* l. i. c. 24.

East, that the ordinary language is formed upon it. Moses says, *Ye stand this day all of you before the Lord your God—that thou shouldest enter into Covenant with the Lord thy God, and into his Oath which the Lord thy God maketh with thee this day*, Deut. xxix. 10, 12. To enter into Covenant is in the Original, לְעַבְרָהּ בְּבְרִית, *to pass, to go through, the Covenant*. The LXX. render it παρελθεῖν. And what we here translate,—*which the Lord thy God maketh with thee*, is, כָּרַת, *cutteth with thee*. And perhaps the same Rite is alluded to, when it is said, *They entered into Covenant to seek the Lord God of their Fathers*; 2 Chron. xv. 12. It is in the Original וַיָּבֹאוּ בְּבְרִית. The LXX. render it, Διαλθον ἐν διαθήκη, *They passed through in a Covenant*.

But the other manner of Expression, taken from the *Cutting* of an Animal, and *dividing* it, is much more frequent in Scripture; where to *cut a League* or *Covenant* signifies to *make a League*: and it is used near *Fifty* times in the sense of *entring* into or *engaging* in a Covenant.

R

Vid.

Vid. *Deut.* xxix. 1, 12, 25, &c. Here the word כרת is used, from the *Eastern Customs*, just as a *Roman* would have said to *strike* a League, *icere fœdus*, from their Custom of *Striking* a Porcher with a Flint, when they engaged in any Covenant. And it is from them, and their Customs, that we have borrowed the Expression of *Striking* a Bargain.

The *Greeks* used the same manner of Expression as the *Jews* did; and they derived the language from the *East* when they said,

Ὅρκια πικρὰ τὰ μόντες.

Hom. Il. β'.

Cutting a League made by Oath, i. e. making a League confirmed by Oath. *Dionysius Halicarnassensis* has explained this fully, when giving an Account of the Expulsion of the Last King of *Rome* by *Junius Brutus* and *Tarquinius Collatinus*, he says, * “ After this, having lustrated

* Μετὰ τῆτο καθαρμῶν τῆς πόλεως ποιησάμενοι, καὶ ὄρκια τὰ μόντες, αὐτοὶ τε πρῶτοι πάντες ἐπὶ τῶν τομῶν, ὤμοσαν, &c. *Dionys. Halicar. l. v.*

“ the

“ the City, and having *cut in pieces the*
 “ *Victims* proper for the Contract, and
 “ themselves first standing upon the *parts*
 “ *cut*, they sware.” This *Chaldean* Custom was brought *westward* by such nations as came or were derived from the *East*, and particularly from *Phœnicia*. *Plutarch*, in his *Roman Questions* says, that the *Bœotians* in their *Lustrations* having divided a Bitch asunder, *went between the Parts*. Now the *Bœotians* descended from the *Phœnicians*. Vid. *Grotius in Genes.* c. xv. 9. The Intent and Design of this *Bœotian* Custom was plainly the same as the *Chaldean* was, tho’ they used a different Sort of Animal, to pass between its parts.

And this will explain to us that cruel inhuman Act of *Xerxes*; who when he was upon his Expedition into *Greece*, and had with him *Pythius* the *Lydian’s* five Sons, the generous Old man (who had treated *Xerxes* and all his Army) begg’d that the King would permit his Eldest Son to be left with him, to comfort him in his old Age, and take care of his affairs. The insolent Monarch not only refused his request,

quest, but caused his Son to be * *cut asunder*, and one half of him to be placed on the right-hand of the way, the Other half on the left, and the Army to *pass between them*. This was saying in Effect, “ Thus shall every man be served, that “ desires to be excused, or that shall “ desire to excuse another, from going “ with the King.”

But to return to the History of the Antient Sacrifices.

The next instance we meet with of Sacrifice is that famous one in *Genesis*, c. xxii. God said unto *Abraham*, *Take now thy Son, thine only Son Isaac, whom thou lovest, and get thee into the land of Moriah, and offer him there for a Burnt Offering upon one of the mountains, which I will tell thee of*. Abraham upon this took Isaac his Son, and clave the Wood for a Burnt Offering: And on the third day he took the Wood of the Burnt Offering, and laid it upon Isaac his Son, and he took the fire in his hand, and a knife,

* Μέσον διαταμῆν. Διαταμώντας δὲ τὰ ἡρώτομα διαθεῖναι, τὸ μὲν ἐπὶ τὰ δεξιὰ τῆς ὁδοῦ, τὸ δὲ ἐπ’ ἀριστερά. Καὶ ταύτῃ ἐκτίθειν τὸν σφατόν. Herodot. l vii. c 36.

Gen. xxii. 2, 3, 6. As *Isaac* was to be a *Burnt Offering* (as *Abraham* conceived) the Apparatus must necessarily be such as would answer that design : The *Wood* must be sufficient to consume what was here to be consumed ; and “ it was no “ small quantity of wood, says Mr. *Ainsworth*, that would suffice to burn to “ Ashes, a man grown.” *Isaac* was now at least twenty-five, some say, thirty-three years, old : and if his whole Body was to be consumed, or burnt to Ashes, it would have required more *wood* than could have been *laid upon* him to carry, especially to any considerable distance. The Discourse between *Abraham* and *Isaac* was about a *Lamb for a Burnt Offering* ; v. 7, 8. and at last a *Ram caught by his Horns in a Thicket* was taken and offered up for a *Burnt Offering* instead of *Isaac* ; ver. 13. Had *Isaac* therefore been offered up, it could have been in no other manner than for a *Burnt Offering* ; and that was done by consuming the whole Body. Accordingly the LXX. translate the word $\eta\lambda\gamma$, $\acute{o}\lambda\omicron\kappa\acute{\alpha}\rho\pi\omega\sigma\iota\tau$; a word which signifies that God

was to have the *whole fruit* of this Sacrifice to himself. The *wood* therefore *carried* might not be *all* that was intended to be used; or if it were, only some part of *Isaac's* Body might be designed to be burnt: But of this let the Reader judge.

Isaac seems to have lived in the same religious manner that his Father *Abraham* did; and where he pitched his Tent, there *he built an Altar, and called upon the name of the Lord*, Gen. xxvi. 25. It is not said what sort of Sacrifice he offered; but it may be observed, that the word which we translate *Altar*, is in the Original מִזְבֵּחַ, a thing on which Sacrifices of *Slain* Animals were offered. It is true that this term is applied to That on which *Incense* alone was offered, *Exod.* xxx. 1. But yet where the word *Altar*, occurs alone; and the word implies something *slain*, it may much more probably be understood of That on which *slain animals* were offered, (especially where it was the known practice to offer such Sacrifices,) than to imagine it the place of Prayer or Thanksgiving, or any such
meta-

metaphorical Sacrifice, as some very ingenious men have done.

The next instance of a Sacrifice is that of *Jacob*, Gen. xxxi. 54. And in this the Language is altered; for it is not called, as all have hitherto been called עֹלָה, or מִנְחָה, a Burnt Offering, or a Gift, but זֶבַח, which implies a *Victim*, or an *Animal slain*. In every Sacrifice where Animals were slain, a distinction was afterwards made from the *Total*, or from the *partial* consumption of it upon the Altar, whether it was an Holocaust or Burnt Offering, or whether it were of the Eucharistic kind. But nothing can be gathered from the Victim's being called a זֶבַח, what sort of Sacrifice it was. However, it seems very probable from other circumstances here mentioned, that this Sacrifice was not, like those of *Noah's* or *Abraham's*, a *Burnt Offering*; but it was a proper *Peace Offering*, or of the *Eucharistic* kind. For it is said, that *Jacob offered Sacrifice upon the Mount, and called his Brethren to eat Bread, and they did eat Bread*. The *Hebrews*, as Rabbi Solo-

mon Farchi here observes, * “under the
 “ term *Bread* understand all eatables” ;
 and the Sacrifices offered to God are called,
 as I have already observed, the *Bread of God*.
Laban therefore and his Followers did most
 probably eat of this Sacrifice, and thus engaged
 in a Solemn Covenant of Friendship with *Jacob*.

If the Book of *Job* be of that Antiquity
 which is usually supposed, it appears that in
 his time Holocausts were used as *Deprecations*
 of Wrath. *Job* himself must have lived much
 about the time of *Moses* : And it appears from
 some Expressions in that Book, that it was
 wrote by a Worshipper of the true God, who
 thought the Law of *Moses*, (in some parts at
 least) highly fit and right : for He talks of
 the worship of the Sun and Moon as an
Iniquity to be punished by the Judge, and
 as a denial of the God above, c. xxxi. 28.
 But whoever was the Author of it, he mentions
 no other Sacrifices besides *Burnt Offerings*,
 which *Job*

* כל דבר מאכל קרוי לחם. Omnem rem cibi
 vocant panem. R. Sal. Farch. in loc.

offered

offered when the days of his Sons Feasting were over, according to the number of them : *For Job said, It may be that my Sons have sinned, and cursed God in their hearts, c. i. 5.* It must be observed that *Job* was his own Priest, and offered himself his own Sacrifices ; and by them deprecated the wrath of God against his children, if in their merriments they had been guilty of any *Sins*, or had *bid adieu* to God in *their hearts*, whilst they were feasting together. And so *Job's* Friends were commanded to offer for themselves Seven Bullocks and Seven Rams for a *Burnt Offering* ; and *Job* was to pray for them, in order to their being accepted, *lest God should deal with them after their Folly, in that they had not spoken of God right, c. xlii. 8.*

Again ; where a person was supposed to have been guilty of Offence, and the wrath of God was to be removed, and as it were to be *transfer'd* upon Another who was imagined then to be in a State of *Enmity* with God ; (as in the case of *Balaam*, who, after having deprecated the Sins of *Midian*, was to draw down the

Anger

Anger of God upon the Children of *Israel* for invading a man's Country who had made his *peace* with God,) When This, I say, was the Case, then a Burnt Offering or an Holocaust was offered. Nor does there seem to be any instance of an *Holocaust's* being offered, before the days of *Moses*, where it was not to *deprecate* Anger; and by that means to restore *lost Friendship*. Whether any *Peace Offerings* in those days were constantly offered with the *Burnt Offerings*, does not appear. The first time that mention is made expressly of such a Custom, is there where *Moses* says unto *Pharaoh*, *Thou must give us also Sacrifices and Burnt Offerings, that we may sacrifice unto the Lord*, *Exod. x. 25*. By the word, *Sacrifices*, זָבָח, he means *Peace Offerings*, or such as the Proprietor partook of; whereas of the *Burnt Offerings* no one had any Share, but all was consumed upon the Altar: And therefore it is worth notice, that when this same Expression occurs, *Exod. xviii. 12*, *Jethro took a Burnt Offering and Sacrifices for God*, it is instantly added—*Aaron came and all the Elders of Israel to eat Bread with Moses's Father-*

Father-

Father-in-Law before God. Had not *Aaron* and the rest partook of the *Sacrifices offered to God*, but only been entertained by *Jethro* in the common manner, it would not have been said that they came to *eat Bread* before God. But as this circumstance is so particularly mentioned, it is evident that *Jethro* offered *Peace Offerings* with his *Burnt Offerings*; or in other words, such *Sacrifices* as all partook of.

From this Account of all the Instances of *Sacrifices* mention'd before the Times of *Moses*, we may observe

1. That tho' it be true, that we meet with no express mention of *Peace Offerings* before the Law, and it may seem strange that we have no account of them, when *Holocausts* are so often mentioned; Yet this is no Argument to prove that there were no such things in practice. In a History of Two thousand two hundred years or more, there is no notice taken of any *Sacrifice* at all, above five or six times: And in so concise and short an Account of Facts, one must not wonder if no mention is made of the several *Sorts* of

of Sacrifices, or the *various Rites* used on such Occasions.

2. From the circumstances of one of those that are mentioned, I mean *Jacob's Sacrifice*, when his Father-in-Law *Laban* was entertain'd by him, it seems plain, that what were afterwards called, *Peace Offerings*, were then in practice. And if one may argue from what was in use under the *Mosaic Institution*, to the customs *before* that time, one may reasonably conclude that *Peace Offerings* were always annexed to *Burnt Offerings*, even from the beginning. The reason of the thing will speak for this Notion. For *Holocausts* were to deprecate the wrath of God; and *Peace Offerings* were, after a Reconciliation with God was made, to *eat* as at *God's Table*, and to be in a State of *Friendship* with him. And this is the reason why they were regularly, and, I think, constantly, joined together in all *private* Sacrifices under the *Mosaic Dispensation*. In the Offering the One there was always a *Confession* of Sin actually made: In Offering the Other, there was a form of *Prayer* or *Thanksgiving*: and these

these last were stiled, *שלמי*, or *Peace Offerings*, because they were used when men were at *Peace* and in *Friendship* with God. As to the Other sorts, *viz.* the *Sin Offering* and the *Trespass Offering*, They were additional to the Antient Sacrifices, and were instituted for particular Occasions mentioned in the Law; and therefore their Use and Intent is only to be learnt from thence.

We may now pass on to some Other things observable about Sacrifices; and particularly Those that are mentioned in the Law of *Moses*. And here,

1. There was always an *Imposition of hands* on all Burnt Offerings; and on all Peace Offerings, as I have already observed. And in the one case, Confession of Sins was actually made, whilst the person that made this Oblation was laying his Hands on the Head of the Animal: In the other case, Prayer or Praise was used, according to the Intention of the Offerer.

2. Prayer of one Sort or Other was almost always used, when a Sacrifice was offered. Nor was this peculiar to the *Jews*, but all Nations seem to have used it

it on such Occasions. They considered what they wanted, and what they desired; and they addressed their God in as suitable a manner as they could think of. The *Romans*, e. g. when they offered any Sacrifice, made use of a solemn form of *Prayer*, suited to the occasion, in which they expressed their earnest desire, that whatever Offence or Crime they might have been, or were likely by any action to be, guilty of, the God to whom they sacrificed would pardon it. Suppose, e. g. they wanted to *cut off any Boughs* that obstructed the Light from falling into a Grove, or other place they wanted to let Light into,—a Hog was to be offered in Sacrifice, and this Form of words was directed to be used: * “ If you are a
“ God, if you are a Goddess, to whom

* Lucum conlucare Romano more sic oportet. Porco piaculo facito. Sic verba concipito. Si Deus, Si Dea, es, quojum illud sacrum est, uti tibi jus Siet porco piaculo facere illiusce sacri coercendi ergo. Harumce rerum ergo, sive Ego, sive quis jussu meo fecerit, uti recte factum fiet. Ejus rei ergo te hoc porco piaculo immolando bonas preces precor uti sies volens propitius mihi Domo Familiæque meæ Liberisque meis. Harumce rerum ergo maeste hoc porco piaculo immolando Esto. *Cato de Re Ruf.* c. 139.

“ this

“ this is Sacred, may it be lawful and
 “ right for me to sacrifice this Hog to
 “ you, to avert your *displeasure* for my
 “ confining these Trees, by cutting off
 “ these luxuriant Branches, sacred to you.
 “ For this reason, whether I do it my-
 “ self, or any one else does it by my or-
 “ der, may it be done rightly. On this
 “ account, and for this purpose, by sa-
 “ crificing this Hog as an Expiation, I
 “ beg that you will be readily kind and
 “ propitious to me, my House, and Fami-
 “ ly, and Children. For the Sake of all
 “ these things accept this Hog now to be
 “ offered to you as an Expiation.”

When This, or any other Form of
 Words was used on such Solemn Occa-
 sions, He that had a Priest's Assistance in
 Offering up his Sacrifice, was not allow-
 ed to pronounce them by Himself, as if
 it were *memoriter*, or by rote, to speak
 them ; But the Priest was first to pro-
 nounce them ; And He that brought his
 Sacrifice was to repeat them after him,
 not unlike the manner in which we take
 the Oaths in our Courts of Justice. Care
 was taken that none of the words which
 ought

ought to be spoken, were omitted; nothing said wrong; no words but such as were * *dictated* by the Priest, were uttered. Now because in many cases the *Romans* were not able to say, Who or What, the God-Protector of such or such place was, or whether it was under the Tuition of a God or Goddess, who had taken it under their more immediate Patronage, They began their Form of Prayer with— † “ If you are a God, If you “ are a Goddess, to whom This is Sacred”; And in like manner when they besieged any *City* or *Place*, They did *evocare*, humbly desire its tutelar Deity to come out of it, using the same form of Expression.

It is plain, that the great business was to secure the Favour and Protection of the Deity to whom they Sacrificed. They therefore took care not to *give Offence* in

* ——— Stetit ante aram, nec turpe putavit
Pro cithara velare caput, *dictataque verba*
Protulit, ut mos est. ———

Juven. Sat. vi. l. 393.

† Si Deus, Si Dea es,

Macrob. Saturn. l. iii. c. 9.

the first place : But if by any act they should happen to offend, as, *e. g. in cutting down any Tree or Branches of a Tree,* which obstructed the Light, and was thought Sacred to any God or Goddesses *, [*conlucando,*] then they were to make the Deity their *Friend* by Prayer, by Vow, by Deprecation, by Expiation, by Sacrifice performed with the accustomed Rites. A solemn *Prayer* was always used by the Party that sacrificed, and They always did eat of the Sacrifice.

Whilst I am speaking concerning the Form of Prayer offered to the Gods when they made their Sacrifices, I will digress so far as to recite and explain their manner of proceeding in their Lustrations of a Farm, or what Private Persons usually did on such Occasions. It is well known, that there was a General Purification made after every Five years Solemnity, when the Cense was made, † “ and a Bull, a

* Conlucare dicebant, cum profanæ Sylvæ Rami deciderentur Officientes Lumini. *Festus.*

† Καθαρισμὸν αὐτῶν ἐποίσατο, ταύρου καὶ κριῶ καὶ τράγου. Τὰ δὲ ἱερῆα ταῦτα τρεῖς περιεχθῆναι περὶ τὸ στρατόπεδον κελεύσας, ἔθυσεν τῷ κατέχοντι τὸ πεδῖον Ἄρει. *Dionys. Halic. l. iv. p. 225.*

“ Ram, and a Goat, were thrice led round
 “ the *Campus Martius*, and then sacri-
 “ ficed to *Mars*.” But I shall speak only
 of a Private Lustration made by the Mas-
 ter of an Estate, wherein a private Sa-
 crifice was offered. Perhaps the Public
 Great one might have been the Plan from
 whence the Private one was taken ; but
 as the private one is particularly described,
 and the Form of Prayer is set down, This
 will be most suitable to my purpose. *
 “ Command, says *Cato*, a Sow-Pig, a
 “ Lamb,

* Impera Suovetaurilia circumagi. Cum Diis volenti-
 bus, quodque bene eveniat, mando tibi Mani, uti illace
 Suovetaurilia fundum, agrum, terramque meam quota ex
 parte sive circumagi, sive circumferenda censeas, uti cures
 lustrare. Janum Jovemque vino præfamino, sic dicito.
 Marspater te precor, quæsoque, uti sis volens propitius
 mihi, domo, familiæque nostræ, quojus rei ergo, agrum,
 terram, fundumque meum, suovetaurilia circumagi jussi, uti
 tu morbos visos invisosque, Viduertatem, vastitudinemque,
 Calamitates, Intemperiasque, prohibeassis, defendas, averrun-
 casque. Utique tu fruges, frumenta, Vineta, Virgultaque
 grandire, beneque evenire sinas. Pastores, Pecuaque salva
 servassis, duique bonam Salutem, Valetudinemque, Mihi,
 Domo, Familiæque nostræ. Harumce rerum ergo, Fundi,
 Terræ, Agrique mei lustrandi, lustrique faciendi ergo,
 sicuti dixi, mactæ hisce suovetaurilibus lactendis immolandis
 esto. Marspater, ejusdem rei ergo, mactæ hisce suovetau-
 rilibus lactentibus esto. Item Cultro facito Struem, et Ser-

“ Lamb, and a young Calf to be led
 “ round the Farm. With the good-will
 “ and liking of the Gods, and in hopes
 “ of good Success, I order you, *Manius*
 “ that whether you think proper to drive,
 “ or to have these Animals carried about
 “ my Farm, Field, Land, or some part
 “ of it, that you take care to *purify* it.
 “ When you taste the Wine, before you
 “ address *Janus* or *Jupiter*, say thus,
 “ *Marspater, I pray and beg of you, that*
 “ *you would be ready and kind to me, my*
 “ *house, and our Family : On which ac-*
 “ *count I have commanded this Pig, Lamb,*
 “ *and Calf to be drove round my field, land,*
 “ *farm : That you would keep off, defend*
 “ *from, and avert all Diseases visible or*
 “ *invisible, all Barrenness, Destruction,*
 “ *Calamities, and ill Seasons : That you*

tum uti adfiet. Inde Obmoveto. Ubi porcum immolabis,
 Agnum Vitulumque Sic oportet, ejusque rei ergo, Maeste
 hisce Suovetaurilibus immolandis esto. Nominare vetat
 [l. veta] Martem, neque Agnum, Vitulumque. Si minus
 in omnes litabit sic verba concipito. Marspater, Si quid
 tibi in hisce suovetaurilibus laetentibus neque Satisfactum
 est, te hisce suovetaurilibus piaculo. Si uno duobusve du-
 bitaverit, sic verba concipito ; Marspater, quod tibi illic
 porco, neque Satisfactum est, te hoc porco piaculo. *Cato*
de R. R. c 141.

“ *make the Fruits, Corn, Vineyards, Shoots,*
 “ *to thrive and grow full and large, and*
 “ *all good to happen to them : That you*
 “ *would keep safe the Shepherds and their*
 “ *flocks : and give good health, and free-*
 “ *dom from all Illness to me, our House,*
 “ *and family. To the End that I may ob-*
 “ *tain these things, My Farms, Lands,*
 “ *and Fields are now to be purified ; and*
 “ *that they may be purified, as I said, be*
 “ *pleased to accept this Sacrifice of a Pig,*
 “ *Lamb and Calf, now to be offered. O*
 “ *Marspater, that I may obtain these things,*
 “ *Accept these three Sucklings. Then*
 “ *with a Knife make a Strues”* [*i. e.* a
 Cake like our little Biscuits; long and
 roundish] and a Chaplet of Flowers, that
 it may be ready ; then offer them. “ As
 “ soon as you kill the Pig, Lamb, and
 “ Calf, you must say thus—*Accept these*
 “ *Oblations now to be offered. Do not*
 “ *name the Words Mars, nor Agnus,*
 “ *[Lamb] nor Vitulus [Calf]. If there*
 “ *be any Signs which bode ill in the*
 “ *three Animals, then say thus—Mars-*
 “ *pater, if there be any thing in these*
 “ *Sucklings that did not please you, I*
 “ *hope*

“ *hope to expiate all my Offences, with*
 “ *These fresh ones.* If it be dubious whe-
 “ ther all be right in One or Two of the
 “ Animals, then say, *Marspater*, since I
 “ did not remove your displeasure with
 “ that Pig, I hope I have done it with
 “ this.”

Here are several things in this passage which may deserve a particular Explication, and which will confirm the general nature of Sacrifices. As

1. We have an account here of what the *Romans* called a *Lustrum*, or *Lustration* of their Lands. The Word *Lustrum* with a Short *ŭ*, is a very different word from *Lustrum* with a long *ŭ*.* *Lustrum*,

* *Lustra* significant *lacunas* lutosas quæ sunt in sylvis, aprorum cubilia. A qua similitudine ii qui in abditis locis et fordidis, ventri et desidiæ operam dant, dicuntur in *Lustris* vitam agere. Et [1. at] cum ejusdem Vocabuli prima syllaba producitur, significat nunc tempus quinquennale, nunc populi lustrationem. *Festus*.

Scaliger here for *lacunas* would read *lamas*. But there is no occasion for Alteration. There is indeed a verse of *Ennius*, in which there is *Lamas lutosas*,

Sylvarum Saltus, latebras, Lamasque lutosas.

But *Lama* signifies a Muddy place; and so does *lacuna lutofa*.

or in the plural *Lūstra*, signifies a *Slough*, or *muddy place* : But when it has *ū* long, it signifies either the Space of *Five years*, at the End of which a Lustration of the people was made, or else it is used for the *Lustration of the People*. Indeed this Remark is founded on the Etymology of the Word : For *Lūstrum* is from *Lūtum*, from *λύω*, where the *u* is short, as

Pinguia crura lūto————

Juv. Sat. iii, l. 247.

Et meliore lūto finxit præcordia Titan.

Sat. xiv. 35.

Whereas *Lūstrum* comes from *λύω*, where the *u* is in sound a Diphthong, and is to be pronounced as if it were *Loustrum*. And so *Dionysius Halicarnassensis* rightly reads it.*

“ With this Sort of *Purification*, says he,
 “ the *Romans* are now in my time puri-
 “ fied at the end of the Cense, by those
 “ that are the Chief in sacred matters,

* Τῆτον τὸν καθαρμὸν ἕως κατ’ ἐμὲ χρόνων Ῥωμῆοι καθαι-
 ρονται μετὰ τὴν συντέλειαν τῶν τιμῶσεων ὑπὸ τῶν ἐχόντων τὴν
 ἱερῶτάτην ἀρχήν, ΛΟΥΣΤΡΟΝ ὀνομαζόντες. *Dion. Halicar.*
 l. iv. p. 225.

“ calling

“ calling this Solemnity *λοῦτρον*.” The people, both in public and in private Lustrations, were to *wash* their hands, and purify themselves, and the Victims, with clean Water; then they were to put the Salted meal on the heads of the Animals; then they were to *pray*, and then to sacrifice or kill the Victims.

2. There was to be in This, as in all Sacrifices, *Wine* of some sort made use of. *Cato* calls it *Vinum præfaminum*. I take it to be the *Wine* which the party tasted of when first he addressed the Gods, or before it was poured upon the head of the Victim. Some would interpret the word, *præfamino*, as if it were a Verb; and signified the same as *præfatio* or *præfator*: But then it should be *præfaminator*, not *præfamino*.

3. They drank *Wine* more than once or twice, in some at least of their Sacrifices. The *Jews*, neither Priests nor People, tasted of the *Wine* that was brought to the Altar; to guard no doubt against all possibility of Excess in the immediate presence, or at the Table of God. But the *Romans*, before they slew their Vic-

tims, * offered wine to their Gods; and thence the Wine was called, *præfaminum*. After they had presented the Cakes, they drank Wine again; And when the Victim was slain, then a third time was Wine poured out to the God, upon the second Giving the Cakes.

4. The great End of Sacrifices was constantly kept up by having the full Apparatus of a Table, Bread and Wine, and Flesh and Salt, as often as they made any Sacrifice. There was not only † the Salted Meal, but an Actual Cake made, sometimes of one Shape, sometimes of another; sometimes with one Ingredient, sometimes with another, just as they thought most proper or agreeable to the God to whom they offered. It was a *Strues*, or a long roundish Cake that was offered to *Janus*: *Jupiter* had a *Fertum*, a flat cake mixt up with Wine and Incense.

* Thure, *Vino*, *Jano*, *Jovi*, *præfato*. *Cato. de Re R.* c. 134.

† ——— *cereale Sacerdos*
Imposuit *Libum*, mixtaque *farra Sale*.

Ovid. *Fast.* l. i.

Some

Sometimes they put Honey in their Cakes; and sometimes none.

5. One cannot but observe how superstitiously cautious they were not to name a word, which Fancy might make a man imagine to be ominous, or to portend ill luck. One sees here a particular Prohibition not to name, *Mars, Agnus, Vitulus*, tho' *Marspater*, or *Porcus* might be safely named. There is no End of Superstitious Folly; and when once the Seeds of it are sown in a weak mind, it will take such deep Root, and thrive so fast, and every fibre of it will shoot so strong, that it will be almost impossible ever to get the Soil clear of the poisonous weed. The mention of *Mars* was unlucky. Why? Because *Mars* was the God of War and Devastation: But then *Marspiter* or *Marspater*, i. e. *Father Mars*, was of no such ill boding aspect, but that it might safely be named. *Agnus* implied in it, as *Turnebus* guesses, * *nomen non nascendi*; as *Vitulus* had something of *Vis*. Perhaps *Vitulus* and *Vitium* had something alike

* *Turnebus. Adversaria. l. xv. c. 14.*

in the Sound of the first Syllable; and *Vitium* might be interpreted to imply a *Fault* in what they were about. And so * *Agnus* and *Anus* were too much alike, and signified *Folly* and *Absurdity*; or might be so unluckily interpreted, in their Sacrifices. But there is no End of such Superstitious Follies or Imaginations; nor is there any account to be given of their Effects, when Once they have taken possession of a Mind tinctured with such Notions.

6. In their Sacrifices, They made use of what They called, *Good Prayers*, i. e. Solemn Prayers, wishing for, and asking all good things; and in order to obtain them, they gave to the Deity what they thought might make him *Friendly* and propitious. If the Sacrifice appeared to the Priest, or to him that offered it, or to him who understood and interpreted the Appearances, (according to their several Rites and Customs,) not such as they ought to be, Then they added still fresh victims, till they

* *Anus* dicta est—quod jam sit sine sensu, qui [l. quod] græce dicitur ἀνῆς. *Festus*.

happened on such as were exact, as they ought to be; or else they desisted from their designs, concluding that they should not succeed, or be prosperous in them. Thus *Juvenal*,

Et aperta palluit Agna.

Sat. vi. l. 392.

She dreaded for fear lest the Entrails should indicate ill Success. If the Sacrificer brought a Second Victim, and in That all was found to be right, and no ill portended, then it was concluded that the God was propitious, and that he shewed himself no longer displeas'd; but fully reconciled to him that brought the Sacrifice.

7. The *Fratres Arvales*, it is certain, were sometimes employed in *lustrating* people's Lands. But yet *Countrymen* themselves, who understood what was to be done, made these Prayers, and these Sacrifices without them. It was true of them, what *Horace* speaks on Another occasion,

Agricolæ

*Agricolæ prisci, fortes, parvoque beati,
 Condita post frumenta, levantes tempore festo
 Corpora, et ipsum animum spe finis dura fe-
 rentem,*

*Cum sociis operum et pueris, et conjuge fida,
 Tellurem porco, Sylvanum lacte piabant,
 Floribus et Vino genium.——*

Hor. 1 Ep. l. ii.

So here the direction is given by *Cato* to the Master of the Family; and he is made to deliver it to his Steward; and he is to take care that every thing is done punctually. See *Tibullus*, who has likewise elegantly described the *Ambervale Sacrificium*.

Lastly, It is remarkable that the Sacrifices were, in general, of such Animals as were thought to be most agreeable to the God, or most likely to make or to keep Him propitious and kind. *Bacchus* was the God-Protector of *Vines*: Now because a Goat by its Bite of the Vine did irretrievable mischief to it,

*Non aliam ob causam Baccho Caper omni-
 bus Aris*

Cœditur,———

Virg. Georg. l. ii. v. 380.

For

For this reason That Animal was Sacrificed to him. The people were ready on his Altars to * kill an Animal, that was pernicious to that Tree which that God had discovered to be so useful to Mankind. They had other reasons, why they never would sacrifice † a Goat to *Minerva*, notwithstanding the Bite of a Goat was as destructive to the *Olive Tree*, as it was to a *Vine*. It would have been an Affront to that *Maiden Deity* to have offered her such a Sacrifice.

To return now from this digression.

There were from the earliest times, even from the Flood, *Burnt Offerings* : and probably *Peace Offerings* were added to them. For as the *Burnt Offerings* were

* Sic factum ut Libero patri, Repertori Vitis, Hirci immolarentur, proinde ut Capite darent pœnas. *Varro de R. R.*

Baccho,—————

————— Lanceſque et liba feremus

Et ductus cornu ſtabit ſacer hircus ad Aram.

Virg. Georg. l. ii. 394

† Contra ut *Minervæ* caprini generis nihil immolarent propter *Oleam*, quod eam quam læſerit fieri dicunt ſterilem. Ejus enim *Salivam* eſſe fructui venenum. *Varro. ibid.*

totally

totally consumed, the party sacrificing could not *eat* of them: They joined therefore to them, or had in use as early as *Jacob's* days at least; Sacrifices, of which they partook, and thus did *eat* with God. When we descend a little lower, to the Times of *Moses*, there were not only Burnt Offerings and Peace Offerings, but there were added Two other Sorts of Sacrifices, *viz.* Sin Offerings and Trespas Offerings. And * “besides
 “these *Four*, there was no other, either
 “Public, or Private.” It is plain from hence that they ranked the *Passeover* under the genus of *Peace Offerings*, however it might in some circumstances differ from what was generally called so. I shall therefore now enquire into the nature of each of these Sacrifices. And,

First, The *Passeover* seems to be the *reverse* of the Burnt Offering, since the

* Præter hæc quatuor nullum licet in nostra lege reperire Sacrificium, neque publicum neque privatum. *Abarb. in Levit. Exordium. c. 2.*

Maimonides says the same. Præter hæc quatuor nullum aliud in tota lege occurrit Sacrificii genus, sive in privatum, sive in publicum offeratur commodum. *Præfat. Mishnæ. de Sacrificiis.*

whole Lamb was carried home, and eat by the Owner; whereas in the Holocaust no one part was carried away, nor eaten by the Owner, nor by any one else. It differed likewise from the Peace Offerings in this, that the Breast and the Right Shoulder of the Peace Offerings were waved; and they had a Drink Offering and a Meat Offering: Whereas in the Passeeover there was no Meat or Drink Offering, nor no waving any part of it. In the Peace Offerings too, the Priests had a certain Share; but in the Passeeover They had none. In the Peace Offerings there was Imposition of Hands; in the Passeeover there was none. What then can be the reason why this Sacrifice should be reckoned among the *Peace Offerings*, when it varied from them in so many respects? It only was, because the *Owner* eat of it; tho' as to eating one part, or another, or the whole, (except what was burnt upon the Altar) that made no manner of difference. That which made the Passeeover a Sacrifice, was, that the *Blood* and the *Inwards* were consumed upon the Altar. In this particular Sacrifice the Custom was

pre-

preserved that every private person *slew* his Lamb, and not the Priests: The Priests performed their Office by so ranging themselves on this Occasion as to be able to take the blood, caught in a proper Vessel, and to hand it from one to another, till at last he that stood next the Altar, poured it at the basis of the Altar; whilst they burn'd the *Inwards* upon the Altar. The Owners carrying away the Animal, the Blood and Inwards of which were God's portion consumed upon the Altar, They partook of the Lord's Table by eating their Share of what had been offered unto God.

There was not on this particular occasion, as I observed before, any Meat or Drink Offering, nor any of those things which usually accompanied other Peace Offerings. But the reason of this seems to have been, That This was a Commemoration of their departure out of *Egypt*, when the Angel of the Lord smote all the First-born of *Egypt*; And the Ceremonies were all appointed with a View to That. When they killed the Lamb in *Egypt*, They were ordered for a particular reason

son, to *strike the Lintell and the Two Side-Posts of their doors with the Blood*, *Exod. xii. 23.* They were to eat the Lamb with *their Loins girded, and their Shoes on their Feet, and their Staves in their hands*; and they were to eat it *in haste*: But These ceremonies were peculiar to the first Passover, and are no where mentioned as practised afterwards. There was no other Animal appointed for the Passover but *Lambs or Kids*: But yet if any one was disposed to sacrifice any other Beast, he might add them, whether they were Sheep or *Bullocks*, according to his pleasure; but still he was obliged to offer either a *Lamb* or a *Kid*. The Law of *Moses* in *Deuteronomy*, c. xvi. 2, may seem directly to contradict the original Institution, as it is laid down in *Exodus*, c. xii. 5. For in this last place, the Command is to take the Passover *out from the Sheep, or from the Goats*: But in the Law in *Deut.* it is said, *Thou shalt sacrifice the Passover unto the Lord thy God, of the flock and the Herd*; — as if a *Bullock* might have been offered for the Passover as well as a *Lamb*, or a *Kid*,

or might be joined as a Paschal Sacrifice. And so where a particular Account is given of *Josiah's* Passover, 2 Chron. xxxv. 7, 8. *Josiah gave to the people of the Flock, Lambs and Kids, all for the Passover Offerings for all that were present, to the number of Thirty Thousand, and Three Thousand Bullocks. And his Princes gave willingly unto the people, to the Priests, and to the Levites: Hilkiah, and Zachariah, and Jehiel, rulers of the house of God, gave unto the Priests, two thousand and Six hundred small cattle, and three hundred Oxen.—The chief of the Levites too gave unto the Levites for Passover Offerings Five thousand small cattle, and five hundred Oxen.* Here is very near an exact proportion observed between the *Small cattle* and the *Oxen* given; and therefore one might be tempted to imagine that they Sacrificed of the *Herd* as well as of the *Flock*, at the Passover, for the Paschal Sacrifice.

But the meaning of *Moses* is clear enough. The Passover was to be only of *Small cattle*. The *Oxen*, or what is called, *of the herd*, was not designed to be

be

be a part, or the whole, of the *Passeover*; but was what the *Jews* call the *Chagiga*, or *Feast Offering*. It was an *Addition* to the *Passeover*; and every one might add as he pleased, either of the *Flock* or of the *Herd*, great or small, males or females; all which were *Peace Offerings*, and were to be considered as such. Notwithstanding therefore the *Passeover* had no *Drink Offerings* or *Meat Offerings*, yet the *Chagiga* had, when That was offered: And it is That alone that *Moses* speaks of when he says, *Thou shalt sacrifice the Passeover unto the Lord thy God, of the flock, and the Herd, in the place which the Lord shall choose to place his name in.* The true construction therefore of this verse is, *Thou shalt Sacrifice the Passeover and all other Sacrifices only in the place which the Lord shall choose: Thou shalt there only sacrifice the Passeover; and There shalt thou sacrifice of the Flock; and There shalt thou sacrifice of the Herd.* And thus the whole will be consistent.

Secondly, When a *Burnt Offering* was made, the *whole* was consumed upon the *Altar*: In the *Passeover* the *Owner* had

the Whole to Himself. But in the *Trespass Offering*, and the *Sin Offering* there was a Sort of Medium ; Part was burnt, and the rest the Priests had, and the Owner had nothing : In the Peace Offerings, Part was burnt ; Part was eat by the Priests ; and the remainder the Owner had for his own use, to entertain himself or his friends, as he pleased.

Again ; * “ when a man offered a
 “ Burnt Offering or a Peace Offering, a
 “ Meat and Drink Offering was made
 “ likewise : But when a Sin Offering or
 “ a Trespass Offering was made, there
 “ never was any Oblation of Fine Flower,
 “ no Wine, no Oil, no Frankincense.”

Lastly, when a Sin Offering or a Trespass Offering were brought, they always brought a Burnt Offering with it. It may be worth while to try to find out the reason of these differences.

* Præterea est videre, Sacrificio tam solido quam pacifico conjungi fertum e Simila Oleo subacta, Thus et Vinum ad libandum ; nec omnino sine fertu libaminum unquam fieri sacrificium solidum aut pacificum ; Rursumque tum Sacrificium Piaculare, tum Sacrificium pro delicto fieri semper nec ullo adhibito fertu libaminum. Planius dicam ; Semper sine Simila, sine Thure, Sine Vino, sine Oleo. *Abarbinel Comment. in Levii. p. 299.*

1. When a *Burnt Offering* was brought, the Person that offered it, looked upon himself as in a State of Offence; or that God, who had been his Friend, was now displeas'd with him: The party had been guilty of Sin, and he was desirous to recover the favour and good-liking which he had lost. Whilst he continued in Sin, He was unworthy the common Marks of *Friendship* with God, and therefore he could have no grounds to hope for Blessings from him. He could not then under these circumstances presume to *eat* as a *Friend with God*, till he had made Confession, and had declared himself a sincere Penitent. Here therefore an Holocaust was to be offered, and a *Meat and Drink Offering* accompanied it: But the Offender considering himself as guilty, acted as under a Sense of Guilt; He only apply'd to be restored to favour, and did not partake of that Offering. But then,

When he had made this Offering, and expressed his Repentance, He join'd to the Burnt Offering his Peace Offering. By the First there was a Deprecation of all Anger, and a Desire of Reconciliation:

The Latter was considered as a Reconciliation made, and a Restoration to Favour; and a partaking of the Lord's Table, and an eating at it as *Friends*. For the Altar is considered as, and is expressly called, *The Lord's Table*; and what was offered on it is called the *Lord's Meat*. Malachi i. 12, Numb. xxviii. 2.

2. Every Victim was offered with *Prayer* or *Praise*, according to the design of the Sacrifice: The Holocaust with Confession, the Other Sacrifices with *Thanks*, or *Requests*: And it is universally acknowledged by all the *Jews*, that without Repentance there could be no Remission of Sins. The Reason therefore why a Meat and Drink Offering were always annexed to these Two kinds of Sacrifices is, The Symbols of *Friendship* were offered; and when Confession had been made, and the desire of Re-admission to favour had been expressed, God was considered as Good, gracious, merciful, and kind, and as readmitting the penitent to *Friendship*. And thus it was that the Sacrifice was a *Sweet Savour* unto God, as the Sinner returned
from

from his evil ways, and became what he ought to be, a Hater of all Evil.

This will help us to understand a passage in the Prophet *Hoseah*, which wants some Illustration. *They sacrifice Flesh for the Sacrifices of mine Offerings, and eat it: But the Lord accepteth them not; Now will he remember their Iniquity, and visit their Sins*, Hoseah viii. 13. The Original words are, זָבַחַי תְּבַהֲבִי יִזְבְּחוּ בֶּשֶׂר וַיֹּאכְלוּ, i. e. *The Sacrifices of my Roast-meats have they sacrificed the Flesh, and have eaten it, but the Lord accepteth them not: So R. Solomon, and Kimchi understood this place. Vid. Buxtorf's Lexicon Heb. The LXX. have rendred it thus, Διό ἕαν θυσιῶσι θυσίαν, καὶ φάγωσι κρέα Κύριος οὐ προσδέξεται αὐτὰ. For tho' they offer a Sacrifice, and eat the flesh, God will not accept it, i. e. such an Oblation. The meaning is, " Tho' the Jews offered Sacrifices " and did eat the Flesh, and by that pre- " tended to be in a State of Friendship " with God, yet the Lord, לֹא יִזְכֶּנּוּ, " would not be pleased with them, would " not be friends with them, but would*

“remember their Iniquities, and visit their Sins.” The *Jews* in those times did *eat* the flesh of their Sacrifices, and fain would seem *Friends* with God : But that would not prevent their punishment. They were grossly wicked, notwithstanding they presumed to *eat* at God’s Table, and imagined themselves in a State of *Friendship* with him. But that should not prevent their Punishment, nor avert the Anger of God. This I take to be the full meaning of these words : And if one Letter were omitted, as I find it in the *Syriac* and *Arabic*, viz. the ך before the word אֲכָלִי, the whole passage would be clear. But to return.

3. When a *Sin Offering* was brought it was usual to bring a *Burnt Offering* with it. For the Practice, see *Levit.* ix. 8, 12, 15, 16.—xii. 6.—xiv. 19, 20. xvi. 24, 25. *Numb.* vi. 10, 11. —vii. 15, 16. The *Sin Offering* was appointed for *particular Crimes* specified in the Law; whereas the *Burnt Offering* was for Sins *in general*, for all such as might any way be an Obstacle to the favour of God.

Thus,

Thus, *e. g.* Job offered Burnt Offerings, according to the Number of his Sons ; for Job said, *it may be that my Sons have sinned, and cursed God in their hearts,* Job i. 5. It was not for any particular Sin, that he knew his Sons had been guilty of ; but for fear they should have been some how or other guilty, that he offered this Sacrifice. And so when any one had been guilty of any particular Offence for which a Sin Offering was appointed, That particular fault was to be confessed ; and when the Burnt Offering was annexed, That was on account of *all others* which a man might have committed, in order to obtain a full Reconciliation with God.

4. The Sin Offering, and the Trespass Offering had no Meat Offering nor Drink Offering accompanying them : And tho' there was an Imposition of hands on the Head of the Beasts thus offered, accompanied with a Confession of Sins, yet the *Owner* did not partake of any of these Sacrifices, but the Priests had their Portions, and the rest was burnt. The Offering these Sacrifices was in Acknowledgment

ledgment of some *Legal Offence*; *i. e.* of some *Crime* forbidden and condemned by the Law, and for which these Sacrifices were expressly commanded. Neither of these ever proceeded from any *Voluntariness* in the Gift, or from any *Vow* of the Offerer. So * *Abarbinel* has observed: and Dr. *Outram* has done the same from *Maimonides*, p. 146. Now Sin and Trefpafs Offerings, not proceeding from any *Vow* or *Voluntary Gift*, are not charged with any Meat or Drink Offering. These were appointed in cases where there was *no Moral Guilt*, such as *Leprosy*, *Unclean-ness* of several Sorts, *Child-birth*, &c. as well as where there was actual Sin committed. In the former cases, the Offerers were deemed improper to appear in the immediate presence of their King, or to *eat as at his Table*, before they had *purified* themselves, and made themselves fit and decent. In the other cases, there was always an Unfitness to appear in his presence who was of purer Eyes than to behold Iniquity. Therefore

* *Abarbinel. Comment. in Levit. p 247.*

5. What could not be *vowed* to God, nor was the Effect of *Free-will* in the Giver, but was a Demand made upon him for Some Offence, or for Some Impropriety, could not any ways, in part or in whole, be taken back, as if the Owner had any Property in it; nor could it be any way with-held. It was *all due* to another, and therefore the person that offered, or presented it, could have no share or portion in it. In *Sin* and *Trespass Offerings* therefore the Offerer could have no pretence to any Share in them; for that would have been in effect a Drawback upon what by the Law was given for particular Services.

6. Therefore no Sacrifice that was offered on account of Guilt for Offences actually committed; nor no Sacrifice offered for Offences which men imagined or thought themselves guilty of, could be eaten of by the Owner. The Offender was too much a Criminal, in his own Opinion, to be admitted to *God's Table* immediately. What therefore he offered to God was, the beginning of *Reconciliation*: He laid his hands upon the Sacrifice:

rice : He confessed his Sin ; He promised and professed Repentance ; but till all this was done and over, He was an improper person to partake of the *Table* of God, who was justly conceived to be displeased, or at least to have a Right to shew Displeasure to such Objects.

7. Hence too may we see the reason why a Sin Offering being made, they offered a Burnt Offering with it, with its Meat and Drink Offering. The *first* was to remove the Offence given by some particular Crime ; the *other* was to shew a Desire of *Reconciliation* by renouncing all Sin that a man might have been guilty of : And when to these was afterwards added a *Peace Offering*, This implied an *Actual Reconciliation* by partaking of the same *common Table*.

There remains, I think, but one thing more to be adjusted, and that is the difference betwixt the *Sin* and the *Trespass Offering*, which seems to be no small difficulty.

The Two Sacrifices, *peculiar* to the *Mosaic* Institution were these. The *Greek* Interpreters render the word חטאת, or *Sin Offering*

Offering by Ἀμαρτία, or *περὶ ἀμαρτίας*: They render חַטָּאת , or *Trespass Offering* by *πλημμέλεια*. But these words give us no insight into, or distinct Ideas of the nature or reason of these Sacrifices. It is certain however,

1. These Sacrifices themselves were different; e.g. *If the Priest that is anointed, [i. e. the High Priest] do sin according to the Sin of the people [i. e. in the same manner as the ordinary people do,] then let him bring for his Sin which he hath sinned a young Bullock, without blemish unto the Lord for a Sin Offering, Lev. iv. 3.* The same sort of Animal was to be offered, and in the same manner, *if the whole Congregation of Israel sinned.* But if a *Ruler* had sinned, he was to bring a *Kid of the Goats*, a Male, without blemish, v. 23. And if any one of the common people Sin,—He was to bring a *Kid of the Goats*, a Female, without blemish, v. 28. or else a Female *Lamb*, v. 32.

But then in the case of a *Trespass Offering*, it was to be a *Ram* without blemish for every *common man*, Lev. vi. 6. —v. 15, 18. It was always to be a *Male*, never

never * a *Female* for a *common man*. What^r ever therefore be the way of reconciling what is said, *Numbers xv. 24.* (where a *Kid of the Goats* is ordered for a *Sin Offering* for the Congregation) with what is said in *Leviticus*, where a *young Bullock* is commanded, yet still it is a *Female* for a *Sin Offering* for all *Common persons*, and never a *Male*.

The difficulty arising from the comparison of these Two places is, That in *Numbers, c. xv. 24.* The Law appoints, that the Congregation should *offer a young Bullock for a Burnt Offering, with its*

* Servius upon Virgil's viiith *Æneid*, observes,—In omnibus Sacris fœminini generis plus valere victimas. Denique si per marem litare non poterant, Succidanea dabatur fœmina; Si autem per fœminam non litassent, Succidanea adhiberi non poterat. There seems to be no certain Rule among the Antients, whether Males or Females, should be offered to their Gods or Goddesses; tho' in general, the rule was to offer a Male to a God, and a Female to a Goddess. But, as Father Mountfacon observes, in his rebus, ut et in aliis profanorum ritibus, Temporum omnium Locorumque consensum frustra quæsieris. Consuetudinum enim diversitas non modo diversis in locis, sed etiam in iisdem, at diversis temporibus, magna fuisse deprehenditur.—Hujusmodi erat ille Sacrificandi Diis Masculos, Deabusque Fœminas. Sed his contraria tam frequenter occurrunt, ut nesciam utrum Exceptiones Regulam superent. *Montfacon. Antiq. Tom. II. Par. I. p. 157.*

Mat

Meat Offering and Drink Offering, and one Kid of the Goats for a Sin Offering, if ought be committed by Ignorance, without the knowledge of the Congregation. But then in Leviticus, c. iv. the Law is —If the whole Congregation sin through Ignorance, then the Congregation shall offer a Young Bullock for the Sin, v. 14. In the one place the Bullock is for a Burnt Offering, and a Goat is for the Sin Offering : In the Other, no notice is taken of the Goat ; but the Bullock is for the Sin Offering. Which way could the Congregation know, what it was to offer, when Two different Animals were appointed for the Sin Offering in the same case of Ignorance ? The Resolution of this is easy from the words of the Text : The passage in Leviticus relates to a Case when the Congregation had done somewhat against, פָּשָׁע, one, of the Commandments of the Lord. In this case a Sin Offering was regularly to be offered. In the Other, the case is put, of not having observed all the commandments which the Lord hath spoken by Moses. Here then was a Burnt Offering to be offered for the general

Omission

Omission or Non Observance of the Law, and a Goat for a Sin-Offering for any particular, Offence.

2. The *whole congregation* was obliged at times to offer *Sin Offerings*, * whereas none but *single Persons* ever offered *Trespas Offerings*. The difference therefore between these Two Sorts of Offerings must consist in something which might concern the whole Congregation, since the whole Congregation was never required to offer the one, tho' they were the other.

3. It was usual for Persons, or for the whole congregation to annex *Sin Offerings* to their *Burnt Offerings*, but never to join *Trespas Offerings* to *Burnt Offerings*. Thus, *Numbers* vii. Each of the Princes of *Israel* offered a *Burnt Offering*, a *Sin Offering*, and a *Peace Offering*. In *Numb.* xv. there is a particular Command, that *if ought be committed by Ignorance, without the knowledge of the congregation, that all the Congregation shall offer one*

* *Sacra pro peccato dicta universo Judæorum cœtu imperata Essent; at nulli, nisi singuli homines, alia illa facere jussi erant, quæ sacra pro noxa dici solent. Outram. de Sacrif. p. 146.*

young bullock for a Burnt Offering, and one Kid of the Goats for a Sin Offering. Maimonides* tells us, that there has been a constant Oral Tradition, that the Law in *Numbers* relates to *Idolatry*, and to the Judges ignorantly sinning and teaching it : Whereas the Law in *Leviticus* relates to any other Transgression that they ignorantly fell into, and taught ; And then every Tribe brought a *Bullock* for a *Sin Offering*. But whatever foundation there may be for this Traditional Interpretation, it does not account for the Expression of the Law, which commands a *Bullock* for a *Burnt Offering*, and a *Kid* for a *Sin Offering*. But I have already spoken to this.

4. It is observable, that where a Person was too Poor to bring a *Lamb* for his *Trespass Offering*, He was to bring for his *Trespass* which he had sinned, *Two Turtle Doves*, or *Two Young Pidgeons* ; and then One of them was to be for a *Sin Offering*, and One for a *Burnt Offering*. And in this case, the *Sin Offering* was to be of-

* Maimonides. *Treatise of Errors*, c. xii. § 1.

ferred *first*, and *afterwards* the *Burnt Offering*, Lev. v. 9, 10. And supposing that a person could not attain to Two Turtles or Pidgeons, then he was to bring the Tenth part of an *Ephab* of Fine Flower for a *Sin Offering*. The very Poorest therefore, did not bring a *Trespafs Offering* for the same Offences for which Others brought them, but they brought a *Sin Offering* in its Stead. And in persons not the very poorest, a *Sin Offering* and a *Burnt Offering* were equal to a *Trespafs Offering*.

5. When a *Sin Offering* was made by the Priest that is anointed, or by the whole Congregation, for *Sin through Ignorance against any of the Commandments of the Lord concerning things which ought not to be done*, i. e. by doing any thing that is prohibited, a Bullock was to be brought; the Fat of the Inwards and the Kidneys, and the Fat about them, and the Caule above the Liver, was to be burnt; but the whole Bullock besides, was to be carried without the Camp, or the City, and there to be burnt. But if a Ruler, or any one of the Common people

people sinned in like manner, their Sin Offering was to be burnt in part only, and the remainder was to be eaten by the Priests, *Lev. vi. 25—30.*

Now in case of the *Trespass Offering* the Priests had the same parts to eat as in the *Sin Offering* : But then all *Trespass Offerings* were alike consumed upon the Altar ; and no part at any time was carried out of the Camp or City to be burnt. When therefore it is said—*As the Sin Offering is, so is the Trespass Offering ; there is one Law for them, Lev. vii. 7,* That relates only to the parts to be burnt, or eaten, and to what Share the Priest that offered it was to have ; and not to cases where the High Priest, or the whole Congregation sinned, and the Rites in those points to be used.

Lastly, There was some difference in the Rites to be used on These Occasions. In the *Trespass Offering*, the Blood was to be Sprinkled *round about upon the Altar*, just as the Blood of the *Burnt Offerings* and *Peace Offerings* was sprinkled, *Lev. vii. 3.* But in the case of a *Sin Offering* for the common people, the Priest was

to take of the Blood, and put it upon the Horns of the Altar of Burnt Offering, and to pour out the blood at the bottom of the Altar of Burnt Offering.

The Difference then between the Sin Offering and the Trespass Offering being such, we may reasonably conclude the Design of Each to be This. The *Sin Offering* was appointed for cases of pure Ignorance of, or mere accidental Offences against the Law, or for Uncleanesses, which made persons improper to appear before God as their King. The *Trespass Offering* was brought, either when real Guilt was contracted by an *intended known* Violation of the Law; or, if a man were under *doubt* whether he had offended or not; and likewise when he did come to know at last what he had only doubted of for some time. Both the *Sin* and the *Trespass Offering* implied at least an Acknowledgment of great *Carelessness* and *Negligence*; and the *Trespass Offering*, an open known Violation of the Law. In Both Cases there was an Acknowledgment of *Unfitness* to appear before, or to approach the Great God and *King*, who had vouchsafed to choose

choose them for his People and Subjects :
And therefore the Offenders did not *eat*
of these Sacrifices.

But why was the *whole Congregation* obliged to offer * *Sin Offerings*, and not to offer *Trespass Offerings* ? The whole Congregation is usually the same as the People with their Judges and Magistrates ; and you are to suppose the case of the Magistrates offering in the name of all the People. Now where this was to be done, Some Act must have been, in which the whole People were concerned. Such were cases of *pure Ignorance* of what was fit and right to be done ; which might be *general*, as arising from the people's obeying their Superiors in what was contrary to the Law. Here therefore a *Sin Offering* was to be offered, because the whole Congregation was infected. But it is not conceivable that the whole Congregation should be concern'd in a *presumptuous intended* Violation of the Law ; *e.g.* in *lying* unto Neighbours ; in finding that

* Nulli, nisi singuli homines, alia illa facere jussi erant, quæ sacra pro noxa dici solent. *Outram*, p. 146.

which was lost, and Lying concerning it; in swearing falsely; in taking away by Violence, &c. Now These being the Cases, where a Trespass Offering was to be made, the *whole Congregation* could not be guilty of them; and therefore the whole Congregation could not be obliged to bring a *Trespass Offering*. Particular persons might be guilty of great Offences: They might *lie with a Bond-woman that is betrothed*, and therefore be obliged to *bring their Trespass Offering*. *Levit. xix, 21.* but this could not be the case of the Congregation. And so in another instance for which a *Trespass Offering* is commanded,—*if he Sin through ignorance in the Holy things of the Lord*—*Lev. v. 15.* by eating what he ought not to eat, or by doing such things as are forbidden to be done—The Congregation could not be guilty, tho' particular persons might; and therefore the *Congregation* never had a *Trespass Offering* enjoined.

It may be said, that a *Trespass Offering* is to be brought for some Offences done through *ignorance*; and therefore it cannot

not

not be right to make the *Sin Offering* to relate to cases of *Ignorance*, and by That to distinguish them from *Trespafs Offerings*, since These are ordered in cases of *Ignorance* as well as the other. *If a Soul commit a Trespafs, and sin through ignorance in the Holy things of the Lord, then he shall bring for his Trespafs unto the Lord, a Ram without blemish, Levit. v. 15.*

It is certainly true that the words which we translate *Sin*, and, *Trespafs*, are used sometimes in the same sense, and signify sometimes the same thing : but yet one may see that the word $\square\psi\aleph$, *Trespafs*, is particularly applied to such crimes as consist in concealing what one knows to be true ; or in touching an unclean thing unwittingly, and afterwards coming to the knowledge of it ; or in rash swearing ; or in ignorantly offending in Holy Things ; or in doing any of those things which are forbidden to be done against our Neighbour. Whereas the Other Term, $\eta\aleph\aleph$, or, *Sin*, relates to matters of *pure Ignorance*, or the doing what ought not to be done by reason of its Prohibition. If

therefore the word *Trespafs* does in fact relate to a Case of *Ignorance*, it is only to offending in *Holy things* : which is rated at the Price of a *Trespafs Offering*, whether a man did it knowingly or not.

Should it be suggested, as perhaps it may, that the words are the same about these Two sorts of Offerings, and that therefore the Things are the same : That in the Command about the *Sin Offering* it is—*If a Soul shall sin through ignorance against any of the Commandments of the Lord concerning things which ought not to be done, and shall do against any of them*—then a *Sin Offering* was to be brought, *Levit. iv. 2* : And it is just the same in the command about the *Trespafs Offering*—*If a Soul sin, and commit any of these things which are forbidden to be done by the commandments of the Lord, tho' he wist not, yet is he guilty, and shall bear his Iniquity ; he shall bring a Ram—for a Trespafs Offering, and the Priest shall make an Atonement for him concerning his ignorance wherein he erred, and wist it not, Lev. v. 17, 18.* They Both offended *through ignorance* ; and both
offended

offended against the Law forbidding something to be done : and yet They were to bring different Sacrifices, and the Offence of the One was greater than That of the Other, if one were to judge from the nature of the Sacrifice.

But the Solution of the difficulty seems to me to be thus. In this last place it is commanded, that *Ignorance of Trespasses in Holy things* should be expiated by a peculiar and proper Sacrifice : and that this Sort of Offences should be ranked among the grosser faults, such as come under the denomination of חַטָּאת, or *Trespasses*. Moses had been speaking concerning *Ignorance in the Holy things of the Lord* ; and he had said, that the Offender was to *make amends for the harm he had done in the Holy thing*, by adding a fifth part thereto ; and then the Priest was to make Atonement for him with the *Ram of the Trespass Offering*, and it should be forgiven him, v. 15, 16. And then it immediately follows— *If a Soul Sin and commit any of these things which are forbidden to be done by the commandments of the Lord, tho' he wist it not, yet he is guilty.*

guilty. What now are these Things forbidden, but what he was speaking about in the immediate preceding words, *viz.* *ignorance of Holy things*? Whereas if you make a New Law to begin at *ver.* 17, relating to the ignorant commission of *any thing* forbidden in the Law, it would be confounding different things, and making it very difficult, if not impossible to know, when a Trespafs Offering, and when a Sin Offering was to be made for faults committed in ignorance.

Hitherto I have been shewing the true nature and design of Sacrifices : it will be necessary in the next place to consider some mistaken Representations of them.

It has been thought, that Sacrifices were
* “ External Signs by which the desires of
“ people were expressed, and had a view

* Eodem spectasse Sacrificia, quo preces ore enuntiatæ gratiarumque actiones pertinent. Illud tamen interfuisse, quod ejusdem utique voluntatis alia in precibus enuntiatæ, atque etiam in gratiarum Actionibus, alia autem in Sacrificiis signa Externa adhiberentur. In illis scilicet explicata Verba, in his sacri quidam ritus; quibus tamen eadem desideria, quæ verbis explicatis subjecta erant. *Outram. de Sacrif.* p. 108. Vide etiam, p. 237—240.

“ to the same End as Prayers openly pro-
 “ nounced, or Thanksgivings had: They
 “ were Sacred Rites by which people ex-
 “ pressed their desires, and had the same
 “ End in view as when they pronounced
 “ openly their Prayers or their Thanks”,
i. e. it was the same thing as Prayer or
 Thanksgiving, only expressed by external
 Signs instead of Words.

Abarbinel had this Notion, when he
 observed, “ That the *meaning* of the
 “ *daily Sacrifices* was *Prayer to God*,
 “ that he would remember his Mercies
 “ to *Israel* in the Morning and in the
 “ Evening, and that he would bless their
 “ Corn and Wine, and Oil. That it was
 “ on this account, that the Meat and
 “ Drink Offerings were added to them.”
 Dr. *Outram* * has cited this and other
 passages from him, to shew that the *Jews*
 thought their Sacrifices to be a sort of
 Symbolical Prayers to God for Pardon, or
 for Blessings.

Nor was this Notion unknown among
 the Heathens. In that beautiful Fable

* *Outram de Sacrificiis*, p. 238, 239.]

of *Aristæus*, as *Virgil* has dressed it up,
Cyrene bids her Son to offer Sacrifices to
the Nymphs, and assures him that they
would remit their Anger.

——— *Tu munera Supplex*
Tende petens pacem, et faciles venerare
Napæas;
Namque dabunt veniam votis irasque re-
mittent.

Geor. l. iv.

Then She tells him *the manner* in which
he was to *pray*,

Sed modus Orandi qui sit prius ordine
dicam;
Quatuor Eximios præstanti corpore tau-
ros, &c.

|Ibid.

And this was to *sacrifice* such and such
Animals ; as if *Sacrifice* were properly a
Mode of Prayer.

But This is neither a just, nor a full
representation of the fact. Sacrifices were
always accompanied with Prayers or
Thanksgivings ; and therefore were not
External

External Rites by which Prayer or Thanks were intended to be signified, or the Desires of the People were intended to be expressed. They were indeed significant Rites; and they expressed in their way what was principally intended, which was *Friendship* and Reconciliation to God by *eating* at his Table. The Addition therefore of the *Meat* and *Drink Offering* to the *Jewish* Sacrifices, was not to beg a Blessing upon the Corn, and Wine, and Oil; nor was it to give thanks to God for the fruits of the Earth: For this was done at peculiar times in particular Forms of Prayer. But it was furnishing out the Apparatus of a Table: and the Sacrifice was the *Dapes*, the *Epulæ*, which the Offerer partook of when he was deemed worthy to be admitted to a State of Friendship; but never partook of, when he look'd upon himself as an Offender, and on that account in a State of Enmity to God. The daily Sacrifice therefore being a Burnt Offering, was offered as a Symbolical Acknowledgment of Unfitness to be admitted through Sin into Favour or Friendship; and this was always the true State
of

of that wicked people : And therefore they could not eat of those daily Sacrifices, tho' there was the full Apparatus of a Table.

A Second thing which has chiefly contributed to a wrong Representation is, that They were instituted as Expiations for Sins : That the Rite of laying hands on the Head of the Victim was to imply a real and true *Translati*on of Sin upon the Substitute : And it has been said, that the People understood this to be the meaning and intent of their Sacrifices, and accordingly said when they made their Oblation, *זֶה כִּפְּרֹתִי*, *let this be*, or *This is my Expiation* ; “ Let the Evil that I may have “ deserved fall upon the head of this Vic- “ tim, and let me escape.”

But tho' the weak or the ignorant, might imagine something of an actual Transla- tion of Guilt from the Offender to the Victim, or that the Victim bore the Of- fences of the Criminal, or that it was an Equivalent, or a Compensation, for the Crimes of the Offender, yet when this notion prevailed among the *Jews*, and they offered Sacrifices under such a Mis- take,

take, we find the Prophets severely condemning them, and reproaching them with their false Opinions about the design of the Law. Whilst they adhered to that Moral Disposition which was intended primarily to be kept up, all was right and proper. But the instant they departed from That, and depended on an external Service, and imagined That to have been instituted by God as a means of pleasing him, They left the End and Design of Sacrifices, and *established a Righteousness of their own*, but did not submit to the *Righteousness of God.*

It is certainly true that the prevailing Notion among mankind was, that Sacrifices did in themselves expiate Sins: They were *Equivalents*, or at least a sort of *Compensations* tho' not of full and equal value, given to the Gods as Atonements for the crimes that any one had committed. They were things that *appeased* an *angry* God, and made him propitious and kind. And hence it was that weak people imagined that the Priest made a proper Atonement for the Sins of such or such Offenders, or for the People, or for them-

4

selves,

selves, by these External Rites: And hence it is that we so frequently meet with *Expiations, Lustrations*, and all those ceremonies which were deem'd to *purge, to cleanse, to purify*, to make free from Guilt, and from the Punishment due to Crimes.

That God is always displeas'd with Sin, is certainly true; and so long as the Sinner continues in a State of Sin, so long there must be an Enmity betwixt Him and God. Now it must be the Sinner that must change, and make himself the proper Object of God's Favour; because God is always the same, Good, Just, Merciful, disapproving Sin, but always ready to accept the returning Offender. When therefore a Sinner at any time repented, and confessed his Sin, and offer'd his proper Sacrifice, He was then admitted to *eat* at God's Table, as being in a State of Friendship with God; *i. e.* He was taken into favour, and the Sin which he had been guilty of was pardon'd: Not because he had offer'd up his Sacrifice, but because he had returned to his Duty, and had declared his return by this open Testimony

mony of Sorrow for Sin. The imputing to Sacrifices, and to external Rites, what was wholly owing to the Moral Disposition of the Mind, is so much inconsistent with the reason of the thing, that we find in Scripture, Sacrifices sometimes treated as if they had never been required or commanded by God. The people imagined that they had done their duties when they had brought their Sacrifices to the Altar, and had there presented them to God; and They never thought of That Rectitude of mind, which is of eternal and immutable obligation, and without which Sacrifices were an empty groundless Ceremony. Vid. 1 *Sam.* xv. 22. *Esaiab* i. 11, &c. *Jerem.* vii. 22, 23. *Pf.* l. 8, 9. This is so very manifest, that the *Jews* had an Observation, that * “ He that applies
 “ himself close to the Study of the Law,
 “ has no occasion for any piacular Sacri-
 “ fice, either Burnt Offering, or Sin Of-
 “ fering, or Trespas Offering, nor for
 “ any Meat Offering.”

* Qui animum adjungit ad Legis Studium, is non indiget nec Sacrificio piaculari, nec solido, neque porro Hostia pro delicto, neque ferto. *Abarb. in Levit* p. 287.

What then is the meaning of those words, *Expiation*, *Atonement*, *Propitiation*, and such-like terms, usually annexed to Sacrifices, and which seem to imply an effect produced in God by means of Sacrifice? Or what is the meaning of those places which occur so frequent, that the *Priest* shall make an *Atonement* for such or such Offenders? Why does not the Offender himself make an *Atonement* by his Repentance and Return to a right State of Mind? In order to explain this, I would observe,

That to *make Atonement* for Sins is to do something by means of which a man obtains pardon of them: And in case This be done by the Oblation of a Sacrifice, then is atonement made by Sacrifice. But then Pardon was never obtained by Sacrifice alone, but as it was attended with a right disposition of Mind; and Pardon may be, and has been obtained by a right Disposition of Mind alone, without the concurrence of a Sacrifice. What then was the Use or Design of the *Sacrifice*? The true Answer to this is, That Sacrifice was designed as a Mode of engaging in *Friendship*, or as a desire

fire

fire to be reinstated in *Friendship*. But then, unless it was attended with such circumstances as shewed a Right disposition of mind, conformable to the mind of him who loves Truth in the inward parts, it was impossible that the Offerer could become a Friend of God. The Victim therefore, or the Blood of the Victim, or Millions of Hecatombs, or ten Thousands of Rivers of Oil, can never of themselves make an Atonement; but it must be, as the Sacrifices constantly were to be, attended with their proper Concomitants, which will indeed make in the strictest Sense an *Atonement*.

One great design of the Law of *Moses* was to recognize God as the King of the *Jews*: and He is represented as *displeased* or angry with Both *Persons* and *Things*. With *Persons*, if they acted contrary to the Law or Rule of their Actions; With *Things*, if they were applied to other Uses than those to which He had appropriated them. And he is represented as laying aside his Anger, when either *Persons* or *Things* become what They ought to be. There were certain Rites by which Both Men and Things were purified, cleansed, X 2 expiated;

expiated; which the *Latins* expressed by the words, *piare, expiare, lustrare, februare*, and the *Greeks* by ἀγνίζειν, ἀγίζειν, καθαίρειν, καθαρίζειν, ὀσιῶν, λείειν, &c. All which are taken either from the *means* used, or the *End* intended, by removing whatever it was that was supposed to be disagreeable to, or to cause the Anger of the Gods. So, to *make an Atonement*, is applied to *Things* as well as *Persons*; and signifies to *cleanse*, to *purify*, to remove whatever is disagreeable; and when this *End* is obtained, God is said to be rendered *propitious*, or to be *appeased*. Whatever it is by which displeasure was removed, or rather *Things* were restored to their proper place, an *Expiation* or an *Atonement* was said to be made, even where there was no *Sacrifice*, no *Victim*, no *Blood* shed. Thus you have an *Instance of Atonement* made, by the payment of a *Half Shekel* whenever the people were numbered. The Law was—*When thou takest the Summ of the Children of Israel after their Number, then shall they give every man a Ransom, כֶּפֶר, for his Soul unto the Lord,—Every man that passeth among them that are num-*
bred,

bred, from Twenty years old and above; shall give an Offering, תְּרוּמָה, unto the Lord. The Rich shall not give more, and the poor shall not give less than half a Shekel, when they give an Offering, תְּרוּמָה, unto the Lord, to make an Atonement לְכַפֵּר for your Souls, Exod. xxx. 12—15. This Money is called The Atonement-Money, or Money of Atonements, כֶּסֶף הַכִּפּוּרִים and was to be employed for the Service of the Tabernacle of the Congregation, and was for a Memorial to the Lord, to make an Atonement for their Souls. This Offering is called by the LXX. εἰσφορά, a Tribute to the Lord; and is said ἐξιλάσασθαι περὶ τῶν ψυχῶν, as if it had been an Expiatory Sacrifice, or there had been Effusion of Blood. The meaning of the Law is, that when this Tribute was paid, the Law was observed, and the Dominion of their God and King was recognized; and He on his part engaged, that there should be no plague among them, Exod. xxx. 12. So when the Altar, or the Holy Place, was cleansed or purified— This was called making Atonement for them, Exod. xxix. 36, 37. Levit. xvi.

16. i. e. Every thing offensive or disagreeable was removed from them.

It is easy hence to see the meaning of *making an Atonement*. But then if Prayer, or Confession of Sins, or the good Moral Disposition of Men, be the thing that makes God propitious, whence is it that the Law imputes so much to Blood? *The Life of the Flesh is in the Blood; and I have given it to you upon the Altar, to make an Atonement for your Souls, for it is the Blood that maketh an Atonement for the Soul, Levit. xvii. 11.* Here the *Atonement* is imputed not to the *Morals* of the man, but to the *Blood* of the Victim; as if nothing else could answer that End, That being given for the purpose of *Atonement*. And indeed it was not peculiar to the *Jewish Law*: The Heathen world had the same notion. *Virgil* has frequently spoken of the Blood of Victims as appeasing the Gods, and making them propitious.

*Sanguine placastis Ventos et virgine cæsa—
Sanguine quærendi reditus, animaque li-
tandum*

Argolica—————

Virgil. *Æne. ii.*

Just as if the Gods would not be induced to be favourable, unless *Blood* was offered to them. And it seems to be a common Observation, or rather a proverbial Speech, that is cited by the Author of the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, *Without Shedding of blood is no Remission*, c. ix. 22.

But whatever Notions of this kind have been at times inculcated, yet it must never be given up, that Sacrifice without a Right Temper of mind was of any Avail. The Wisest men in all ages saw, that it was not by any Rites or Ceremonies, or any External Services, that the Gods were rendered propitious, but by a pure mind, and upright Behaviour, and such a disposition of Heart, as became reasonable Beings. *Plautus* has a fine passage, which I cannot forbear setting down.

—*Hoc Scelesti in animum inducunt suum,
Jovem se placare posse Donis, Hostiis.
Et operam et Sumptum perdunt: ideo fit,
quia
Nihil ei acceptum est a perjuriis Supplicii.
Facilius, si qui pius est, a Diis Suppli-
cans*

*Quam qui scelestus est, inveniet veniam sibi.
Idcirco moneo vos ego hæc ; qui estis boni,
Quique ætatem agitis cum pietate, et cum
fide,*

Retinete porro : post factum ut lætemini.

Plaut. Prolog. ad Rudent.

And *Cicero* tells us, * “ That the Best,
“ and most pure worship of the Gods
“ is, to worship them with an upright,
“ chaste, and uncorrupt mind and heart.”

Persius's † Opinion is much to the same effect ; And many Others have said the same thing. Now as Sacrifice was the customary external visible Mode by which the internal Acts of the Mind were expressed, hence that was imputed to Sacrifice, which was owing to what Sacrifice signified. The Customs of the World had made Sacrifice the ordinary way of ad-

* Cultum Deorum esse optimum eundemque castissimum, ut eos semper pura, integra, incorrupta et Mente et voce veneremur. *Cic. Nat. Deor.* l. ii.

† Compositum jus fasque animo, sanctosque recessus
Mentis, et incoctum generoso pectus honesto
Hæc cedo ut admoveam templis et farre litabo.

Sat. iii.

dressing

addressing God : it put the Offerer in mind of Confessing his Sins ; and upon desiring Reconciliation with God, and being restored to his favour ; or of being admitted into Friendship with him. No wonder then that That was imputed commonly to the Blood of the Victim, which was the real effect of Solemn Prayer and a purified heart, since the One was the External and Visible Sign of the Other.

Where a Custom was Universal, as it was to offer Sacrifices, and a Law was given suited to such Custom, and by that means Sacrifices were established, the people would go on to sacrifice ; and they would express their Repentance and their desire of Pardon and Favour with God in Terms suited to the established Way of Worship. And as this Custom of Sacrificing was spread every where, God in his Wisdom would not abolish this manner of Worship, but laid hold of it to keep his people a Holy People, separate from the Rest of Mankind, and free from the Superstitions of the world : And this he did in such a manner as would most certainly have its
due

due effect. The Jews therefore were * permitted in a certain measure to use such Customs as were universal; and at the same time, by having a peculiar Institution different from their Neighbours, they were kept from their Idolatries, and were made to serve the great Ends of Providence in the world. It would therefore be the natural language to say that *Blood maketh Atonement*; and where the general form of Worship was by *shedding Blood*, to say, that *without Blood shedding there is no Remission*. But then These Expressions are not to be taken absolutely and exclusive of the real means, but

* Usitata tum in mundo consuetudo erat, cui omnes assueti, et cultus *Universalis* in quo omnes erant educati, ut variæ Animalium Species in Templis illis in quibus Imagines collocabant, offerantur; coram illis procumberent, et adoleretur— Ideo noluit Sapiencia et Providencia Dei— mandare, ut cultus illi omnes derelinquantur aut aboleantur. Hujus enim rei cor humanum, quod perpetuo inclinatur ad id cui est assuetum, naturaliter non fuisset capax— Propter hanc itaque causam retinuit Deus adhuc Cultus, eosque a rebus creatis— ad Nomen suum venerandum transfudit; et præcepit nobis ut illos exhibeamus illi. *Maimon. More Nevoch. l. iii. c. 32.*

He goes on to observe, that thence came the Command to build a Temple, and Altar, and that Sacrifices should be offered to God.

with

with proper limitations. When the Author of the Epistle to the *Hebrews* made use of this Language, He did not, he could not, intend that his words should be taken strictly, but that the limitation which himself had used in the preceding part of the verse, should be repeated; or applied to This likewise. His words are, *And almost all things are by the Law purged with Blood; and without shedding of blood is no remission: There is scarce any; almost none.* For it is certainly true, that in some cases mentioned in the Law, *Remission* was to be had where *no blood* was shed. E. g. where any person was too poor to bring two *Turtle Doves*, or two young *Pidgeons*, he was to bring for his Offering the tenth part of an *Ephah* of fine flower—*And the Priest shall take his handfull of it—and burn it on the Altar—it is a Sin Offering; and the Priest shall make an Atonement for him as touching the Sin that he hath Sinned, and it shall be forgiven him,* Lev. v. 11, 12, 13. Here then was *Forgiveness*, or *Remission*, where there was *no Blood-shedding*. But because
the

the Shedding of Blood was the *usual* and *general*, the *ordinary*, and *common* means of Atonement, or of expressing a right mind, without which no Reconciliation could be made, therefore this Language came to be the common Language of all the world that used Sacrifices, and no one spoke otherwise, unless where they spoke philosophically and strictly, and with intent to express the Exact Truth of Things.

It may be said, that the Language of Sacrifices supposes an Alteration somehow or other made by them in God. He is to be *appeased* : He is to be rendred *propitious* : His *Anger* is to be *removed*. And therefore the Priest is said, by his oblation of a Sin Offering, either for the Congregation, or for any private man, to make an *Atonement* ; and then it was to be forgiven him, *Lev. iv. 20, 26, 31, 35.* How could the *Priest* make an Atonement ? Must not a Change be made in God by the means of the Sacrifice ? And did not the Priest, *i. e.* a Person different from the Offender, make God *propitious* ? Now if the change in the Offender was sufficient, or if his Repentance would
make

make him be accepted, the Priest and the Sacrifice were Both unnecessary and useless: whereas it seems They were Both necessary to the Pardon of the Sinner; it was the Sacrifice that covered his Sin, and averted the Anger of God.

But this Difficulty is owing to either wrong or partial conceptions of the Deity. God is always the same, unchangeable in his nature, ever good, ever approving right Action, and ever disapproving wrong. When therefore a Sinner is guilty of what is wrong, he makes himself the Object of God's Displeasure: When he repents and changes his Life, and *doth that which is lawful and right*, he makes himself the proper Object of Pardon and Favour; and will certainly be treated as Such. Whatever therefore is fitted to produce this effect, or to make favour to be shewn, is in common language said to *appease* God, or to *propitiate* him. An Offender, *e.g.* brought his Sacrifice to the Altar, and laid his hands upon the Head of it, and confessed his Sins, and declared his Resolution to amend—This was doing an acceptable Act to God, because it was
 doing

doing what was right. He therefore that before was the Object of Punishment was now become the Object of Mercy and Kindness; and the means made use of may be justly said to make God *propitious*, to *appease* Him, to avert his Anger. Not that the *Sacrifice* or *Victim*, or the *Blood* of the *Victim*, produced this Effect; but the proper means were used whereby the Offender expressed the Change of his Life: And the Priest was the Ministerial Agent; and the *Sacrifice* is said לִכְפֹּר, and so is the *Priest* said לִכְפֹּר, ἐξιλάσαι, to *make an Atonement for*, or to *expiate*, or *cover* Sins. Thus the *Scape Goat* is said, to *make an Atonement*, Lev. xvi. 10. by carrying away with him the Sins of the people into the desert. He was to have the Sins of the People *confessed over him*, and *put upon his head*; and he was to bear them away; And by that means He *made an Atonement*: i. e. he made it, that God would not visit their Iniquities and Transgressions so acknowledged, confessed, and repented of.

A third Notion, which has contributed not a little to mislead men in their consideration

sideration of the *Jewish* Sacrifices is, That they think They were appointed merely in Opposition to the Practices of their Neighbours.

But there seems to be no foundation for this Opinion in Scripture ; nor would such a Notion have been thought of, had the Intent and Design of Sacrifices been considered. The Materials of which Sacrifices were made, were all of *Tame* Animals, as has been already observed : They * “ were
 “ either of the Quadruped kind, Bullocks,
 “ Sheep, Goats ; or of the Fowl kind, such
 “ were Turtles and young Pidgeons ; or of
 “ the Fruits of the Earth, as Bread, Wine,
 “ Oil ; and for certain purposes, Frankin-
 “ cense.” Sacrifices were all of such things as were usually eaten by the *Jews*, and were in common practice for the purposes of making or restoring *Friendships* : And

* Jam divina lege commemoratur universe, Sacrificiorum aliqua Bestiis vicuribus esse facienda ; et ista quidem his tribus Quadrupedum generibus, Bobus, Ovibus et Capris : Aliqua Volucris ; et hæc Turturibus modò Columbarumque Pullis : Nonnulla Terræ frugibus atque fructibus ; atque hæc ea sunt quæ Festa dicuntur. In his tria inerant rerum genera, Panis, Vinum, et Oleum, quæ etiam Thure augebantur. *Abarb. Com in Levit.* p. 235.

there-

therefore they were applied to keep up *Friendship* betwixt God and Men, as they were applied for that purpose betwixt Man and Man.

- *Maimonides*, the First of the *Jews* that wrote like a man of Sense, and began to search into the true reason of their Law, tells us, that * “ Some of the *Zabii* who
 “ worshipped Demons, and thought that
 “ They were wont to appear in the Shape
 “ of *Goats*, and therefore had the name
 “ of *Seirim*, i. e. *Goats*, would not allow
 “ the Eating of *Goats*, but expressly pro-
 “ hibited it.” And so too for the Sacrifice of *Bullocks*; He resolves it into the same reason. † “ The greatest part of the *Ido-*

* Ad hunc modum ex *Zabiis* quidam fuerunt qui *Dæmones* colebant, et existimabant quod formam *Hircorum* habeant: Unde etiam *Dæmones Seirim*, h. e. *Hircos* appellabant. Quæ opinio *Mosis* tempore jam longe lateque in *Orbe* diffusa fuit. — Et hinc apud illud hominum genus prohibitus quoque erat *Esus Hircorum*. *Maim. A. or. Nev.* Pars iii. c. 46.

† Jumentorum autem *Maclationem* maxima pars *Idolatrarum* abominata est semper, omnesque hanc *irrationabilium Animantium* speciem maximi fecerunt. Hinc in hodiernum usque diem in *India* reperies homines, qui illa nunquam maclare solent, et quidem in illis etiam locis ubi pecudes maclare consueverunt. *Maimon. ibid.*

“ latters

18th later always abominated the sacrificing
 “ of *Bullocks*, and all had this species of
 “ Animals in the highest Esteem. Hence
 “ even to this day will you find men in
 “ *India* who never will sacrifice them ;
 “ No not even in those places where they
 “ are wont to sacrifice Sheep and small
 “ Cattle.” He goes on ; * “ That there-
 “ fore the memory of those Erroneous
 “ Opinions might be blotted out of the
 “ minds of men, God commanded us
 “ [*Jews*] that we should offer none but
 “ these three Species of Beasts in our Sa-
 “ crifices—that That which They looked
 “ upon as the greatest of Sins to do, we
 “ should offer to God, and expiate our
 “ Sins by that very means.” And this
 Notion led *Dr. Spencer* into an Imagina-
 tion, that God ordered the Scape Goat,
 and Goats in particular, to be at times of-

* Ut ergo memoria Erronearum istarum Opinionum ex
 animis hominum deleteretur, præcepit nobis, ut has tres
 bestiarum species, (Arietes scil. Hircos et Boves) solum in
 Sacrificiis nostris offeramus—ita ut illud quod ipsi pro sum-
 mo peccato habebant, Deo offerri debeat, illoque peccata
 nostra expianda sint. *Ibid.*

ferred; that * “ he might by that means
 “ bring those Animals into contempt, and
 “ root out the practice of worshipping
 “ *Living Creatures*.

But there is no Occasion; nor indeed any Ground for this Notion. God is not wont to contradict for Contradiction-fake: nor does it appear in fact that the *Jews* ever abstained from, or ever had in Contempt, *Goats* or *Kids* of *Goats*. But the plain and natural reason was, That these Three Species of Animals made up the usual ordinary Food of Mankind; and therefore they were used in Sacrifice to God; because by eating these Animals, and by drinking together, it was customary for men to contract *Friendships* together.

It is true, that Superstitious Folly was carried very far, and Animals not fit to be eaten, were sacrificed in some parts of the Heathen World. *Horses* were sacrificed to

* Ut hoc pacto Bestias eas [Hircos] in contemptum traheret, et generis cujuscunque ζωλατρίας e populi moribus extirparet. *Spencer de Legibus Hebræo*. p. 1062.

the *Sun*; *Wolves* to *Mars*; *Asses* to *Priapus*; and *Dogs* to *Hecate*. But These were *rare*, and only ἐν τισι τελετικαῖς θυσίαις, upon occasion of, or at certain *Initiations*, that these *Sacrifices* were offered, as the Emperor *Julian* has observed, *Orat.* 5. p. 176. Whatever use therefore was made of these, (which seem to be *Symbolical*, and to represent the Nature of the Gods, or what would please them,) This has nothing to do with the *Jewish* *Sacrifices*, which were design'd for other purposes. And if in particular circumstances These were so ordered as to differ from their Neighbours the *Egyptians*, or from the *Arabians*, or the people of the Land of *Canaan*, it was in order to keep the people of *Israel* a distinct people, and to prevent *Their* running into the *Idolatries* of the Nations around them.

A *Fourth* thing which has led men into mistakes about the Nature of *Sacrifices* is, that they have considered them as *Mullets* or *Fines* at which Sins were rated. It has been said, and very learned and judicious Men have maintained it, that

God * : “ intended to punish the *Jews*
 “ by *mulcting* them, or taking away a
 “ part of their Goods, that They might
 “ take the more care for the future not
 “ to sin, or be guilty of any Crime.”

This Notion *Abarbinel* espoused; and since his time Some very able men have gone into this Opinion. But

i. It is very observable, that Sacrifices are never called by That Name, nor are they in Scripture represented as *Mulcts*. The *Jews* had their words by which they were wont to express, *Amercements*, or *Mulcts*; but yet they never are applied in Scripture to Sacrifices, either in general, or to any particular Species of them; neither to Burnt Offerings, nor Sin Offerings, nor Trespass Offerings. If a man was guilty of Slandering his Wife in any extraordinary manner, the Elders of the City were to take the man and chastise him, and were to AMERCE him in a hundred Shekels of Silver. The same word

* Deus voluit illos diminutione bonorum multari; qua multa animi atque mentes eorum commoverentur sic ut deinceps studiosissime curarent nequid per errorem delinquerent. *Abarb. Exord. Com. in Levit.* p. 313.

is made use of, when *Pharaoh Necho* took *Jeboahaz*, and turned him out of his Kingdom, and put the land to a Tribute, or set a Mulct upon *the Land of a hundred Talents of Silver*, 2 Kings xxiii. 33. Had Sacrifices therefore, all or any Species of them, been deemed as *Mulcts* set for Sin, it must seem very strange that the proper term should never be given them, nor should they once be represented as such, when they are so often spoken of.

2. Had they been designed as *Mulcts*, it is probable they would have been levied in some other manner. For where a Crime is estimated at a certain price, if the Price be paid, the man is acquitted; and as soon as the Penalty is paid, the Offender is cleared. But in the case of Sacrifice there was a great deal of Solemnity used: and That not only by the Person that brought the Sacrifice, but by the Priests. The Lamb, or Goat, or Bullock, or whatever it was that was offered, was not only a *lessning of the Goods* of the Sinner, (on which account, if that were all, it might have been considered as a *Mulct*) but there were certain Solemn

Rites to be performed ; Some by those that brought the Offerings ; Some by the Priests ; and others that might have been performed by *any* person that was *clean*. He that offered the Sacrifice was to bring it to the Altar ; he was to put his hands upon the head of it, and to make Confession of his Sin. All this, it may be said, was the form of paying the *Mulet*, and made thus solemn in order to deter men from Sin. But supposing it to be a *Peace Offering* that was offered, the Solemnity was *Prayer* or *Thanksgiving*, and no *Confession* of Sin : And consequently, tho' here was a *diminution* of a man's Goods, yet there was nothing done that had relation to paying a *Mulet*, or that could be taken for paying an Equivalent, or a Compensation for an Offence.

But should it be insisted on that God might require these or such-like Solemn Rites to be used in paying *Mulets* to Him ; That we are not to enquire into the Reason of what he commands ; That the Sinner being a Debtor to him, He may impose upon him not only the *Payment*, but the *Manner* of Payment ; That the
 Confession

Confession of Sin was only on Acknowledgment that the *Mulct* was just and due: Should any one assert this, then I say,

3. The Supposition of a *Mulct* or *Fine* supposes some *Crime* or *Fault* for which it is laid upon a Man. Supposing therefore Sacrifices are required in cases where there was *no Fault*, but only mere accidental Misfortunes, and Those such as could not be avoided,—it would then be unjust to demand a *Mulct*, or what may come under the denomination of any sort of Punishment. Now in the case of a *Nazarite*, as well as in many other cases, it was impossible for the most cautious or prudent person to avoid such Accidents as would oblige him to bring a *Sin*, or a *Trespass Offering*. Suppose a *Nazarite*, *Numbers vi.* obliged not to make himself unclean for any his nearest Relations when they die, yet if a man die very suddenly by him, he was *polluted*; and he was to bring both a *Sin Offering* and a *Burnt Offering*, and *the Priest was to make an Atonement for him, for that he sinned by the dead.* The meaning is,

He failed in going through what he had vowed, by being defiled by the dead. But why should he be obliged to bring a *Sin Offering*, if That is to be considered as a *Mulct*; since no *Crime*, no *Fault*, could be laid to his charge? Why is He to be condemned, and forced to suffer in the loss or deprivation of his Goods, for what was not in his Power to prevent or avoid?

So in another case: Every Woman that brought forth either Son or Daughter, was obliged to bring both a Burnt Offering and a Sin Offering to the door of the Tabernacle, and the Priest was to make an Atonement for her. Were These Sacrifices *Mulcts* or *Fines* set on her? For what Crime? Or under what Denomination of *Fault* could This be imposed? To make either meer unavoidable Accidents, or the Natural Course of Things, the Subjects of *Mulcts*, is a Rigour not to be imputed to a Good and Merciful Being. Whereas, if *Uncleanness* be considered only as what may make a Person unfit to appear in the Presence of a Sovereign, before *Purification*, Then
 may

may such persons be commanded to *purify* themselves before they approach the *Table* of their King. Accordingly the *Uncleanneses* here mentioned were considered as *Indecencies*, or *Improprieties*; and therefore were to be removed when persons laboured under them, before they could be admitted as into the presence of their King.

4. Sometimes the Law appointed certain fixed Penalties, and did not add any Sacrifice, but only ordered Satisfaction to be made to the injured Party. E. g. *If a man shall steal an Ox or a Sheep, and kill it, or sell it, he shall restore five Oxen for an Ox, and four Sheep for a Sheep*, Exod: xxii. 1. No Sacrifice is here enjoined for these Crimes, but the Person from whom the Cattle were stolen, was thus to be made Amends for his losses.

Sometimes again, when a Man had *defrauded* or *cheated his Neighbour*, or had *taken away a thing by violence*, or had *sworn falsely*, He was to *restore the principal*, and to *add a fifth part more thereto*, and to *give it to him to whom it appertained*; And he was to *bring his Trespass Offering*,

Offering, in order that his Sin should be forgiven him. It is plain that *the Fifth part* was to make the Owner Amends for the Time and Use of his Property, of which he had been deprived; and likewise to prevent and discourage such injurious Treatment for the future. Now if *the Trespass Offering* were a *Mulct* set upon the Offender, why was it not in *Both* these cases equally? Or why was not the Stealing an Ox or a Sheep to be fined by Sacrifice as much as any other Act of Injustice or Violence done to a Neighbour? If it be replied, that this was owing to the arbitrary Will of the Legislator, who might appoint what *Mulcts* He thought fit; Then I must add,

5. Many of the Sacrifices offered by the Jews were *Vows*, and *Voluntary Offerings*; and therefore they could not come under the Notion of *Mulcts*. Their Eucharistic Sacrifices were given to God, as the Fountain of all Good, as the Giver of all things; and whether the Offerer begg'd of God to grant him what he wanted and desired, or thanked him for what he had receiv'd, the Sacrifice he offered proceeded

proceeded from his own Choice, and free Gift. Any man could make a Voluntary Sacrifice: He could make a Vow either to give an *Holocaust* (for *Holocausts* might be offered both to ask favours, and to commemorate favours received, as well as for other reasons, in which cases they were considered as instances of the greatest Submission and Humility) or to offer other kinds of Sacrifices, as the Offerer thought fit. These therefore that proceeded from *Free-will*, and were properly *Free-will Offerings*, could not possibly come under the Notion of *Mulcts* or *Fines*.

6. Some Sacrifices that were expressly enjoined, cannot possibly be considered as *Mulcts*. The *Passover* was as properly a Sacrifice as any other; and it was not a *Free-will Offering*, but commanded, to be observed for an Ordinance to thee and to thy Sons for ever; *Exod. xii. 24.* It was designed to be commemorative of the Lord's *Passover*, who passed over the houses of the Children of Israel in Egypt, when he smote the Egyptians, but delivered the Israelites and their Houses. Now This could not be required as a *Mulct*,

Mule, since it was the Commemoration of a general Deliverance; and instituted to keep up a Remembrance of a Mercy bestowed upon, or shewed to the Nation of the *Jews*.

Lastly; As some Sacrifices were expressly appointed for a certain End, as the *Passover*, and Others were *Free-will Offerings*; So Others still were brought, where there was not so much as *Error*, nor *Accidental Misfortune*, much less was there any *Fault*, or *Crime*, in the Offerer. The *Firstlings of a Cow*, or the *Firstling of a Sheep*, or the *Firstling of a Goat*, was not to be redeemed, but was to be sacrificed, and *its blood to be sprinkled upon the Altar*, and the *Fat was to be burnt for an Offering made by Fire*, Numb. xviii. 17. The *First-Fruits* likewise were to be brought and offered unto the Lord. Not that any of these were *forfeited* unto God; but *on the day that God smote all the First-born of Egypt*, he hallowed to himself all the *First-born of Israel*, both *Man and Beast*; Numb. iii. 13.

Supposing now that it may be imagined that the *Sin and Trespass Offering* may possibly

possibly be considered as *Mulcts* or *Amercements* for certain Sins; yet it is impossible to argue in general, that *All* Sacrifices were designed as *Mulcts*. For there are *more* Sacrifices that are purely *Free-will Offerings*, than what can be deemed in any view as *Mulcts*; and if possibly these Two may be considered in that manner, yet there will remain *Seven* or *Eight* Sorts of Sacrifices that cannot be treated as Penalties: And surely the Nature and Design of any general Practice is to be deduced from what the major part agree in; and not contrariwise from what may be the *possible* intent of one or two instances. The Eucharistic Sacrifices were of several Sorts; the *Votive*; the *Free-will Offering*; the *Nazarite's Lamb*, when the days of his Separation were fulfilled; the *Chagiga*; the *Peace Offerings*; the *Passeover*; the *First-born*; and the *First-fruits*. These *Eight* could never be deemed or considered as *Mulcts*, because there was no Crime, or Fault, or Misbehaviour, for which a *Mulct* could be imposed: And as to the Other Two, *viz.* the *Sin Offering* and *Trespas Offering*, though They
 may

may possibly be considered in themselves as *Fines*, yet if any Account of them can be assigned consistent with the nature of Sacrifices in general, it cannot be right to frame an Hypothesis only to solve the reason of their Injunction.

Enough has been said about the Nature and Design of Sacrifices. There remains One point to be cleared up, And That is, How it could possibly come into Men's Heads or Hearts to offer up Things to God by *Fire* ?

It must be owned, that we know nothing with any certainty about the Origin of Sacrifices : And in course, as *Moses*, and the Holy men of Old who lived before, or followed after him, have said nothing positive about this Affair, We must be contented with Probabilities, and leave every man to abound in his own Sense, and to embrace what appears to Him most likely. No doubt, All men would be willing, and Good men more particularly would desire, to be upon Terms of *Friendship* with God. Natural Reason would suggest that there was, and could not but be, a Being, Powerful, Wise, and

and Good, the Maker and the Governor of all, the Benefactor of all, the Source and Fountain of all the Good things we have, or can receive. Prayer therefore would be offered to Him for what was wanted ; and Thanks for what was received ; and Every man would be desirous to be in a State of Friendship with Him. Every man felt what Guilt was ; and every man would want to be reconciled to him ; and Every man was conscious to Himself, that whilst he sinned and acted contrary to Right and Truth, He must be under his Displeasure, and he must be willing to remove it.

This must be admitted upon all Schemes ; and it must likewise be admitted, That *Eating* and *Drinking* together was the known Method of Old of engaging in *Friendship*, and of making *Covenants* and *Leagues* ; and if at any time men had forfeited their Engagements, or had broke them, they were in fact reconciled by the same means by which they were at first engaged together. Now it seems very natural for men who were desirous to make or renew their

Friendship

Friendship with God, to pursue the same means and practices as they did with one another; nor could they more naturally express their desire of *Friendship* or of *Reconciliation* with God, than by the means by which They were wont to engage in *Friendship* with one another. All the world has agreed in This, that whatever is esteemed the greatest Mark of Respect among any People, with That they approach God. Standing, Kneeling, Prostration, Covering the Head, or Uncovering it, Pulling off Shoes, Bowing, Kissing the Hand, Touching the Forehead, Smiting the Breast; in short, whatever is the Mark of the profoundest Respect amongst men, That is applied by them to God. And for the same reason, whatever was the Method by which the Men of old engaged in Covenants, or whatever were the *Fæderal Rites* they used, or by which they endeavoured to establish the securest *Friendships* with one another, That would naturally be the means of entering into *Friendship* with God. *Eating* therefore and *Drinking* at His *Table* would be as natural a Sign of *Friendship*

4

with

with God, as it was with any of their own Species.

But supposing all this, How could it come into their Heads, that the Offering things in *Fire*, or the *Burning* them, was the same as presenting them on God's *Table*, or *eating* with Him? How could they imagine, that the Blood of Victims, or the Limbs of them, could ever be agreeable to God; Or that He would accept Them, or their Offerings of innocent Animals, as an Expiation, or Atonement for the Faults of Reasonable Creatures?

The Appearance of God to Mortals seems always to have been in *Brightness* and great *Glory*, whether He was Angry and in Displeasure, or benign and kind. These Appearances are often mentioned in Scripture. When God appeared on Mount *Sinai*, it is said, *The Lord descended upon it in Fire*, Exod. xix. 18. And when *Moses* repeats the History of This to the Children of *Israel*, he says, *The Lord spake unto you out of the midst of the Fire*, Deut. iv. 12. So it was when the *Angel of the Lord* appeared to *Moses* in a *Flame of Fire out of the midst of the Bush*;

Bush; *the Bush* burned with Fire, *and the bush was not consumed*, *Exod. iii. 3.* The Appearances of the Angel of God's presence, or that Divine Person who represented God, being always in *Brightness*; or in other words, the Shechinah being surrounded with Glory, This seems to have given Occasion to those of Old to imagine * *Fire* to be what God dwelt in.

Whether it was that any *Fire* proceeded from God, and *burnt* up the Oblation in the *first* Sacrifices, as Some ingenious men have conjectured, we know not. It is certain that in after Ages This was the case. We are sure that *a Fire from the Lord consumed upon the Altar the Burnt Offering of Aaron*, *Lev. ix. 27.* And so it did the Sacrifice of *Gideon*, *both the Flesh and the unleavened Cakes*, *Judges vi. 21.* When *David* built an Altar unto the Lord, and offered *Burnt Offerings and Peace Offerings*, and called upon the Lord,

* Ipse [Darius] Solem Mithren, sacrumque et æternum invocans IGNEM, ut illis dignam veteri Gloria majoremque monumentis fortitudinem inspirarent. *Q. Curtius*, l. iv. c. 13.

He answered him from Heaven, by Fire upon the Altar of Burnt Offerings, 1 Chron. xxi. 26. The same thing happened at the Dedication of Solomon's Temple,—The Fire came down from Heaven, and consumed the Burnt Offering and the Sacrifices, and the Glory of the Lord filled the House, 2 Chron. vii. 1. And much about a Hundred years afterwards, when Elijah made that extraordinary Sacrifice in proof that Baal was no God, The Fire of the Lord fell and consumed the Burnt Sacrifice, and the Wood, and the Stones, and the Dust, and licked up the Water that was in the Trench, 1 Kings xviii. 38. And if we go back long before the Times of Moses, as early as Abraham's days, we meet with an instance of the same Sort. It came to pass, that when the Sun went down, and it was dark, behold a smoking Furnace, and a Burning Lamp, that passed between these pieces; Gen. xv. 17.

The First Appearances of God then being in *Glory*, or which is the same thing, in *Light*, or *Fire*; and He shewing his Acceptance of Sacrifices in so many instances by consuming them with *Fire*,

Hence it was that the Eastern people; and particularly the *Persians*, fell into the Worship of *Fire* itself, or rather they conceived *Fire* to be the Symbol of God's presence, and they worshipped God in or by *Fire*. From the *Assyrians*, or *Chaldeans*, or *Persians*, this worship was propagated Southward amongst the *Egyptians*, and Westward among the *Greeks*; and by them it was brought into *Italy*. The *Greeks* were wont to meet together to worship in their *Prytaneia*; and there They consulted for the Public Good; and There was a constant *Fire* kept upon the *Hearth*, which was called * *Vesta* by Some: The *Fire* itself was properly *Vesta*; and so *Ovid*,

*Nec tu aliud Vestam, quam vivam intel-
lige Flammam.*

Fast. l. vi.

The *Prytaneia* were Courts wherein a *Fire* was kept, that was never suffered to go out; and *Vesta* was worshipped in

* Ἑστία, ἔτιοι γὰρ ἕτως ἀνομάκασιν· ἕτω δ' ἂν κυριώταται καλοῖσθαι τὴν ἐν Πρυτανείῳ, ἐφ' ἧς τὸ πῦρ τὸ ἄσβεστον ἀνάπλεται.
Julius Pollux. l. i. c. 1.

them.

them. It was in these Courts that Ambassadors were entertain'd, as in the presence of a common God and Friend: And in them such as were fed at the Public Charge; and publicly honoured with their constant food, were entertained as at a Feast with their Gods. It is certain that *Vesta* was worshipped at *Troy*; and *Æneas* brought her into *Italy*.

—*Manibus Vittas, Vestamque potentem,
Æternumque adytis effert Penetralibus Ig-
nem.*

Æne. l. ii. 296.

And *Numa* settled an Order of Virgin Priestesses, whose business and Care it was constantly to maintain the *Holy Fire*: And long before *Numa's* days we find it not only * “ customary, but honourable
“ among the *Albans*, to appoint the Best
“ born Virgins to be Priestesses of *Vesta*,”
and to † “ keep up the constant unex-
“ tinguished Fire.”

* Ἐν ἔθει τοῖς Ἀλβάνοις καὶ ἐν καλῷ ὄν, τὰς ἐυγενεστάτας ἀποδείκνυσθαι τῆς Ἑσίας ἀροπόλους. *Dionys. Halic. l. i. p. 62.*

† Αἷς ἀνατίθεται ἰτῆτε ἀσέεσθ πυρὸς ἢ φυλακῆ. *Ibid. p. 62.*

When *Virgil* spoke of *Jarbas* in *Africa* as building a Hundred Temples and an hundred Altars, he says,

— *Vigilemque Sacra verat Ignem,*
Excubias Divum æternas—

Æn. iv.

That he had consecrated a Fire that never went out ; and he calls these Temples and this Fire the perpetual Watches of the Gods, i. e. Places and Things that They constantly protected, and guarded, were present at and watched over, and therefore They were sure to be met with, where the Fire was continually kept up. So that the Custom seems to have been general from the earliest Antiquity, to maintain a constant Fire, as conceiving the Gods present there : and This was not only the Opinion of the Inhabitants in *Judæa*, but it extended all over *Persia*, *Greece*, *Italy*, *Egypt*, and most other Nations of the World.

Porphyry imagined that the reason why the Antientest Mortals kept up a constant ever-burning Fire in honour of the immortal

mortal Gods, was, *Because Fire was most like the Gods.* But *Porphyry* talks as people do that have an Hypothesis to serve, without knowing the Facts which should support it. He says, * “ That Trees
 “ were produced by the Earth long after
 “ Herbs, and that the Antients gathering
 “ them, burnt the Roots and Leaves, and
 “ all the Branches ; and with This Sa-
 “ crifice they entertain’d the heavenly
 “ Deities, which appeared to them, and
 “ immortalized to them the Honours of
 “ *Fire.* To them likewise they kept an
 “ *unextinguished Fire* in their Temples,
 “ as being *most like them.*” *Fire* was
 not *like* the Gods ; but it was what They
 appeared in to Mortals. And so the true
 God always appeared in *Brightness* and
Glory ; yet no one would say that *Bright-*
ness was *most like* the true God, but was
most like the *Shechinah* in which God ap-
 peared. And hence the custom arose of

* Ἡς δερπόμενοι φύλλα καὶ ῥίζας, καὶ ὅλους τῆς φύσεως αὐτῶν
 βλαστὸς κατέκαιον ταύτη τὰς φαινομένους ἑρηνίους θεοὺς τῆ
 θυσίᾳ δεξιόμενοι, καὶ τοῦ πυρὸς ἀπαθανατίζοντες αὐτοῖς τὰς
 τιμὰς. Τέτοις γὰρ καὶ τὸ πῦρ ἐφύλαττον ἀθάνατον ἐν τοῖς
 ἱεροῖς, ὡς ὃν μάλιστα αὐτοῖς ὁμοιότατον. Apud Euseb. Præf.
 Evang. p. 28.

keeping up an *unextinguished Fire* in their Temples.

It is a common Weakness in all people to give false Accounts of the Etymology of their words : The *Latins* were fond of deriving words that were plainly *Oriental*, from their *own* Language : And so were the *Greeks*, as if their Language was an Original Language, and they were not beholden to Other People for their Words. *Ovid* has given us a ridiculous *Latin* Etymology of the word *Vesta*, as if it were derived from *Vi stando* ; first making *Vesta* the same with the *Earth*,

Stat vi terra sua, vi stando Vesta vocatur,

And then making it an Original *Latin* word. *Plurnius* has equally absurdly derived the *Greek* word Ἑστία from ἐστάναι, to stand : And He too has made *Vesta* the same with the *Earth*. Whereas *Vesta* is properly an *Oriental* Word, derived from *ἕν*, *Fire*. It was the *πῦρ ἀσβεστόν*, the *æternus ignis*, the *perpetual Fire* itself. And Ἡφαίστος, or *Vulcan*, was derived

derived from the same Original word : And They that worshipped either *Vesta*, or *Vulcan*, were properly *Fire Worshipers*. And so the word Πυρῶναιον, which signifies the Court or Place where the *Continual Fire* was kept, is no *Greek* word, as the *Greeks* would have it, as if it signified Πυρὸς or Πυρὸς ταμῆιον, the place where *Fire*, or as Others, where *Provision* was kept ; But it is a *Persian*, or a *Chaldean* Word, פַּרְתִּימִי. *Partemim*, signifies in that Country Language *Grandees*, or Great Men, Great Princes, (we translate it *Nobles*, Esther i. 3.) From thence comes the word Πρωτάνεις, the *Chief Men* or *Rulers* ; and thence Πρωτῶναιον, signifies the *place* where these Πρωτάνεις, *Rulers*, met ; and where the *constant Fire* was kept, and where they worshipped jointly.

God then being wont to appear in *Fire*, and being conceived to dwell in *Fire*, the Notion spread universally and was universally admitted. First then, It was not at all out of the way to think of engaging in *Friendship* with God by the same means as they contracted *Friendship*

Ship with one another : And since they to whom God appeared, saw him appear in *Fire*, and they acquainted Others with such his Appearances, Hence He was conceived to *dwell* in *Fire* ; and Hence it was that They gave to Him his Share or Portion of *Meat* and *Drink* in the *Fire* : And This they would naturally do with such a Disposition of Mind as became such as were conscious of having offended, or were afraid lest they had offended. This would be a good Foundation for *Confession of Sins*, and for *Repentance*, upon such Occasions. And as it happens seldom that right Practices continue long pure and uncorrupted, without Additions, or Contrivances of men to exceed one another in what they hope may please the Deity, hence by degrees the world came to be over curious in the *Fire* that was *constantly* to be kept up, and in Things to be sacrificed : And hence they proceeded from one Step to another, till at length they filled up the measure of Follies and Niceties, in order to express their sincerest desires and endeavours to make themselves

selves acceptable to what they worshipped. And hence it was that even *Human Sacrifices* came to be offered to the Deities, in many parts of the world, particularly in *Phœnicia*, and in the Colonies derived from thence into *Africa* and other places : And hence were *Children* sacrificed by their *Parents*, as being the Best and Dearest Oblations that could be made ; and the strongest Arguments that nothing ought to be withheld from God, with whom there was the sincerest desire at all Events to be in a State of Friendship. The Offerers in all these cases retained the original Intent, and indeed the *Design* of Sacrifices, which was to be in *Friendship with God* ; but fell into such Follies and Superstitions in their Practices, as have covered the Doctrine of Sacrifices with an almost impenetrable Darkness.

Having thus considered the Nature and Origin of Sacrifices, it may be not improper to examine into the Meaning of some passages of Scripture, wherein they seem to be asserted not to have been instituted by God, even under the *Mosaic*
Dis-

Dispensation itself. The *Psalmist* in one place says, *Sacrifice and Offering thou didst not desire— Burnt Offering and Sin Offering hast thou not required, Ps. xl. 6.* In another place— *Thou desirest not Sacrifice, else would I give it ; thou delightest not in Burnt Offering : The Sacrifices of God are a broken Spirit ; a broken and contrite heart, O God, thou wilt not despise.* Did not God require *Sin Offering*, when it was a peculiar Sacrifice of the *Mosaic Law*, and never used before it was commanded in and by That Institution ? The Prophets too are frequent in declaring against Sacrifices. *To what purpose is the Multitude of your Sacrifices unto me, saith the Lord— when ye come to appear before me, who hath required this at your hands, Isaiah i. 11, 12.* Again, *He that killeth an Ox, as if he slew a Man ; he that Sacrificeth a Lamb, as if he cut off a Dog's neck ; he that offereth an Oblation, as if he offered Swine's blood ; he that burneth Incense, as if he blessed an Idol.* *Hoseab* expresses it thus ; *I desired Mercy and not Sacrifice :* As if God himself had never instituted or appointed Sacrifices

crifices among the *Jews*. And *Jeremiah* still more explicitly— *I spake not unto your Fathers, nor commanded them in the day that I brought them out of the land of Egypt concerning Burnt Offerings or Sacrifices; but this thing I commanded them, saying, Obey my Voice, and I will be your God, and ye shall be my People,* ch. vii. 22, 23. And Lastly, *Amos* says, *I hate, I despise your Feast-days, and I will not smell in your solemn Assemblies. Though you offer me Burnt Offerings and your Meat Offerings, I will not accept them, neither will I regard the Peace Offerings of fat beasts,* Amos v. 21, 22. Which way are all these Declarations of the Prophets to be reconciled with the known Command in the Law of *Moses*? Are not *Sin Offerings* and *Trespas Offerings* peculiarly commanded in the Law? How frequent are Burnt Offerings, and all the various forms of Sacrifices enjoined? Are not all the *Rites* and *Ceremonies* particularly set down? Are not the Offices of the *Priests*, as well as those of Him that brings his Oblation, described? And was there not a frequent interposition

sition of God himself to punish such as any ways violated, or transgressed the Law of Sacrifices? How was *Nadab* and *Abihu* punished for offering only Strange Fire, *Levit. x. 1.* And did not *Korah*, *Dathan*, and *Abihu*, go down alive into the pit; and were they not swallowed up, for presuming to offer incense, contrary to God's Appointment?

In order to remove this difficulty, let it be observed,

1. That Sacrifices were the visible external Expressions of *Friendship* with God; and consequently of *Repentance*, and renouncing whatever was inconsistent with that Temper of Mind that was necessary to such a State. If therefore Sacrifices were not attended with that *Moral Disposition* of the Mind which they implied, and were always to be accompanied with, then they justly became *Abominations* to God; and it was literally true, that he that killed an Ox was no more acceptable to God than if he slew a *man*, since the true Sacrifices of God were at all times a *broken Spirit, and a contrite heart*. When
Therefore

2. It

2. It was said by the Prophet—*I will have Mercy and not Sacrifice*,—This is a known manner by which the *Jews* are wont to express a *Comparison*. “ I desire
 “ One more than the Other ; I prefer the
 “ One to the Other ; I will have the
 “ thing more or rather than that which
 “ was significative only ” of it.

3. The Principal thing intended by *Sacrifice*, being a strict Observation of what is pleasing to God, when Sacrifice was not attended with Rectitude of Mind, it became *hateful, despicable*, not to be valued or *esteemed*, whatever Care or Costliness might accompany it : nor was the mere Slaying of Animals the Thing that God *commanded* or *required*, how solicitous soever the *Jews* might be to bring those Gifts to the Altar.

4. When *Jeremiah* says, that *God spake not unto their Fathers, nor commanded them in the day that he brought them out of Egypt, concerning Burnt Offerings or Sacrifices*, but only commanded *Obedience*— This is true. You are not so to take this Expression as if God did not *afterwards* command them to offer
 Sacrifices,

Sacrifices; but that *at first* when they came out of *Egypt*, he gave no such command. When they first were redeemed from that Bondage which they had so long laboured under, They had no Law given them but the *Decalogue*, or *Ten Commandments*; —all of them Precepts of the Moral Law, and All of them such to which constant uniform *Obedience* was expected: And upon This a Promise was given, that if They would observe them, *God would be Their God; and They should be his People.* Immediately after this, the *Political* Laws, mentioned *Exodus* xxi, xxii, xxiii, were given. But as to the *Rites* and *Ceremonies* relative to Burnt Offerings and the Other Sacrifices, They were not commanded till after the *Affair* of the *Golden Calf* had shewn, how prone that People was to Idolatry, and to the Religious practices of *Egypt*. And This will help us to understand that dark passage of *Ezekiel*, *Wherefore I gave them also Statutes that were not good, and Judgments whereby they should not live. And I polluted them in their own gifts, in that they caused to pass*

pass through the fire all that openeth the womb, that I might make them desolate, to the end that they might know that I am the Lord, c. xx. 25, 26. The Statutes that were not good, were what contained the ceremonial Law; Statutes, not of a Moral nature, such as are intrinsically good; but such only as would keep them a distinct separate People, and answer certain temporal Ends. And I polluted them in their own Gifts: The LXX. render it, Καὶ μανῶ ἀυλοῦς ἐν τοῖς δόγμασι αὐτῶν. It should be, δόμασι, Gifts, not δόγμασι, which signifies Notions. The meaning is, “ I held them polluted in their Gifts: “ I looked upon them and treated them “ as polluted notwithstanding all their “ Gifts, and I shewed this manifestly by “ passing by all the *First-born*, and taking “ the *Levites* in their place; that I might “ make them wonder and be surpris’d, “ and know that I am the Lord.”

I do not, *at present*, design to enter into any Consequences which may follow, or seem to follow, from what has been said. The Subject certainly has its Difficulties; and if what is here said should

give the Reader any light; or should assist him in the Understanding the Scriptures, (the Book, which of all Books, ought the most to be studied without prejudice, and which is too often read with the strongest byas in favour of pre-conceived Opinions;) If the Reader, I say, receives any Assistance from what has been said towards understanding the Scriptures, let him use it to the Glory of God, and the Good of Mankind.



F I N I S.

BOOKS Printed for J. and P. KNAPTON,
at the Crown in *Ludgate-Street*.

A Vindication of the Account of the Double Doctrine of the Ancients. In Answer to a Critical Enquiry into the Practices of the Antient Philosophers. Price 6*d*.

The Rational Communicant: Or, A Plain Account of the Nature, Ends, and Benefits, of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. Suited to the meanest Capacities. The Third Edition. Price 4*d*. or 100 for 1*l*. 4*s*.

A Brief Discourse concerning the Credibility of Miracles and Revelation. To which is added, a Postscript, in Answer to the Lord Bishop of *Lichfield's* Charge to his Clergy. By *Arthur Ashley Sykes*, D. D.

An Examination of Mr. *Warburton's* Account of the Conduct of the Antient Legislators, of the Double Doctrine of the Old Philosophers of the Theocracy of the *Jews*, and of Sir *Isaac Newton's* Chronology. By *Arthur Ashley Sykes*, D. D.

A Defence of the Examination of Mr. *Warburton's* Account of the Theocracy of the *Jews*: Being an Answer to his Remarks, so far as they concern Dr. *Sykes*. By *Arthur Ashley Sykes*, D. D. Price 1*s*. 6*d*.

An Enquiry how far *Papists* ought to be treated *here* as good Subjects; and how far They are chargeable with the Tenets commonly imputed to Them. Price 6*d*.

The Reasonableness of Mending and Executing the Laws against *Papists*. Humbly offered to the Consideration of all that have a Regard for the Dignity of our Sovereign, and the Liberty of *Great Britain*. Price 6*d*.

The Principles and Connection of Natural and Revealed Religion distinctly considered. By *Arthur Ashley Sykes*, D. D.

An Enquiry into the Meaning of *Demoniacs* in the New Testament. The Second Edition, Corrected and Amended. Price 1*s*.

A Dissertation on the Eclipse mentioned by *Phlegon*. Or, an Enquiry whether that Eclipse had any Relation to the Darkness which happened at our Saviour's Passion: By *Arthur Ashley Sykes*, D. D.

A De.

BOOKS printed for, &c.

A Defence of the Dissertation on the Eclipse mentioned by *Phlegon*. Wherein is further shewn, That that Eclipse had no Relation to the Darkness which happened at our Saviour's Passion. And Mr. *Whiston's* Observations are particularly considered. By *Arthur Ashley Sykes, D. D.* Price 1 s.

A Second Defence of the Dissertation upon the Eclipse mentioned by *Phlegon*; wherein Mr. *Chapman's* Objections; and Those of the A. of the Letter to Dr. *Sykes*, are particularly considered. By *Arthur Ashley Sykes, D. D.* Price 1 s.

A Sermon preached in the Cathedral Church of *Winchester*, on the 9th Day of *October*, 1746; being the Day appointed for a General Thanksgiving to Almighty God for the Suppression of the late Unnatural Rebellion. By *Arthur Ashley Sykes, D. D.* Prebendary of *Winchester*. Published at the Request of the *Mayor and Corporation*.

The Innocency of Error asserted and vindicated. The third Edition, very much corrected and improved, by the Author. Price 6 d.

A Vindication of the Innocency of Error, &c. from the Misrepresentation of the Lord Bishop of *Oxford*. Price 6 d.

An Essay upon the Truth of the Christian Religion: Wherein its real Foundation upon the Old Testament is shewn. Occasioned by the Discourse of the Grounds of the Christian Religion. By *Arthur Ashley Sykes, D. D.*

The True Grounds of the Expectation of the Messiah. In Two Letters: One printed in the *London Journal*; the other in Vindication of it; Being a Reply to the Answer published at the End of a late Letter to Dr. *Rogers*. By *Philalethes*. Price 1 s.

A Defence of Christianity from the Prophecies of the Old Testament, in Answer to a late Discourse of the Grounds and Reasons of the Christian Religion: And a Vindication of the Defence of Christianity; in Answer to the Scheme of Literal Prophecy considered. By the Right Reverend *Edward*, Lord Bishop of *Durham*. 3 Vols. 8vo.

A Vindication of the Miracles of our Blessed Saviour. In Answer to Mr. *Woolston's* Six Discourses. By the Right Reverend *Richard*, Lord Bishop of *Lichfield and Coventry*. 2 Vols. 8vo.