ceſſity for mentioning explicitly the early inſtitution of them. It was ſufficient that they knew the divine in­ſtitution of their own ſacriſices, and the purpoſes for which they were offered. Beſides this, there is reaſon to believe, that, in order to guard the Hebrews from the infections of the heathen, the rite of ſacrificing was loaded with many additional ceremonies at its ſecond in- ſtitution under Moſes. It might, therefore, be impro­per to relate its original ſimplicity to a rebellious people, who would think themſelves ill-uſed by any additional burdens of trouble or expence, however really neceſſary to their happineſs. Biſhop Warburton ſees clearly the neceſſity of concealing from the Jews the ſpiritual and refined nature of the Chriſtian diſpenſation, left ſuch a backſliding people ſhould, from the contemplation of it, have held in contempt their own economy. This, he thinks, is the reaſon why the prophets, ſpeaking of the reign of the Meſſiah, borrow their images from the Moſaic diſpenſation, that the people living under that diſpen­ſation might not deſpiſe it from perceiving its end; and we think the reaſon will hold equally good for their law­giver concealing from them the ſimplicity of the firſt ſacriſices, left they ſhould be tempted to murmur at their own multifarious ritual.

But his lordſhip thinks that ſacriſices had their ori­gin from the light of natural reaſon. We ſhould be glad to know what light natural reaſon can throw upon ſuch a ſubject. That ignorant pagans, adoring as gods departed heroes, who ſtill retained their ſenſual appetites, might naturally think of appeaſing ſuch be­ings with the fat of fed beaſts, and the perfumes of the altar, we have already admitted; but that Cain and Abel, who knew that the God whom they adored has neither body, parts, nor paſſions; that he created and ſuſtains the univerſe; and that from his very nature he muſt will the happineſs of all his creatures, ſhould be led by the light of natural reaſon to think of appea­ſing him, or obtaining favours from him, by putting to death harmleſs animals, is a poiition which no argu­ments of his lordſhip can ever compel us to admit. That Abel’s ſacriſice was indeed accepted, we know; but it was not accepted becauſe it proceeded from the move­ments of the human mind, and the deficiency of the original language, but becauſe it was offered through *faith.* The light of natural reaſon, however, does not generate faith, but ſcience; and when it fails of that, its offspring is abſurdity. “Faith is the ſubſtance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not ſeen, ” and comes not by reaſoning but by hearing. What things then were they of which Abel had heard, for which he hoped, and in the faith of which he offered ſacriſice? Undoubtedly it was a reſtoration to that immortality which was forfeited by the tranſgreſſion of his parents. Of ſuch redemption an obſcure intimation had been given to Adam, in the promiſe that the ſeed of the wo­man ſhould bruiſe the head of the ſerpent; and it was doubtleſs to impreſs upon his mind in more ſtriking co­lours the manner in which this was to be done, that bloody ſacriſices were firſt inſtituted@@†. As long as the import of ſuch rites was thus underſtood, they conſti- tuted a perfectly rational worſhip, as they fhowed the people that the wages of ſin is death; but when men ſunk into idolatry, and loſt all hopes of a reſurrection from the dead, the ſlaughtering of animals to appeaſe their deities was a practice groſsly ſuperſtitious. It reſt-

ed in itſelf without pointing to any farther end, and the grovelling worſhippers believed that by their ſacriſices they purchaſed the favour of their deities. When once this notion was entertained, human ſacriſices were ſoon in­troduced; for it naturally occurred to thoſe who offered them, that what they moſt valued themſelves would be moſt acceptable to their offended gods, (ſee the next article). By the Jewiſh law, theſe abominable offer­ings were ſtrictly forbidden, and the whole ritual of ſacrifice reſtored to its original purity, though not ſimplicity.

All Chriſtian churches, the Socinian, if it can be called a church, not excepted, have till very lately agreed in believing that the Jewiſh ſacriſices ſerved, amongſt other uſes, for types of the death of Chriſt and the Chriſtian worſhip, (fee Type. ) In this belief all ſober Chriſtians agree ſtill, whilſt many are of opi­nion that they were likewiſe foederal rites, as they cer­tainly were conſidered by the ancient Romans @@\*.

Of the various kinds of Jewiſh ſacriſices, and the ſubordinate cuds for which they were offered, a full ac­count is given in the books of Moſes. When an Iſraelite offered a loaf or a cake, the prieſt broke it in two parts; and ſetting aſide that half which he reſerved for himſelf, broke the other into crumbs, poured oil, wine, incenſe, and ſalt upon it, and ſpread the whole upon the fire of the altar. If theſe offerings were ac­companied with the ſacriſice of an animal, they were thrown upon the victim to be confirmed along with it. If the offerings were of the ears of new corn, they were parched at the fire, rubbed in the hand, and then of­fered to the prieſt in a veſſel, over which he poured oil, incenſe, wine, and ſalt, and then burnt it upon the al­tar, having firſt taken as much of it as of right belong­ed to himſelf.

The principal ſacriſices among the Hebrews confid­ed of bullocks, ſheep, and goats; but doves and turtles were accepted from thoſe who were not able to bring the other: theſe beaſts were to be perfect, and without blemiſh. The rites of ſacrificing were various; all of which are very minutely deſcribed in the books of Moſes.

The manner of ſacrificing among the Greeks aud Romans was as follows. In the choice of the victim, they took care that it was without blemiſh or imper­fection; its tail was not to be too ſmall at the end; the tongue not black, nor the ears cleft; and that the bull was one that had never been yoked. The victim being pitched upon, they gilt his forehead and horns, eſpecially if a bull, heifer, or cow. The head they alſo adorned with a garland of flowers, a woollen in­fula or holy fillet, whence hung two rows of chaplets with twiſted ribands; and on the middle of the body a kind of ſtole, pretty large, hung down on each fide: the leſſer victims were only adorned with garlands and bundles of flowers, together with white tuſts or wreaths.

The victims thus prepared were brought before the altar; the leſſer being driven to the place, and the greater led by an halter; when, if they made any ſtruggle, or refuſed to go, the reſiſtance was taken for an ill omen, and the ſacriſice frequently ſet aſide. The victim thus brought was carefully exarhined, to ſee that there was no defect in it; then the prieſt, clad in his ſacerdotal habit, and accompanied with the ſacriſicers and other attendants, and being waſhed and purified ac-

@@@ † [m] See Prophesy

@@@\* [m] Tit. Liv. lib. 21. cap. 45.