such as have published or held erroneous doctrines of the sacrament of the Lord’s Supper. The term is chiefly ap­plied among Roman Catholics, by way of reproach to the Lutherans, Calvinists, and other Protestants.

SACRAMENTARY, an ancient Catholic church-book, which contains all the prayers and ceremonies practised at the celebration of the sacraments. It was written by Pope Gelasius, and afterwards revised, corrected, and abridged, by St Gregory.

SACRED, something holy, or that is solemnly offered and consecrated to God, with benedictions, unctions, and the like. Kings, prelates, and priests, are reckoned sacred persons ; abbots are only blessed. The deaconhood, sub- deaconhood, and priesthood, are all sacred orders, and are said to impress an indelible character. The custom of con­secrating kings with holy oil is derived, says Gutlingius, from the Hebrews, amongst whom, he agrees with Grotius, it was never used but to kings who had not an evident right by succession. He adds, that the Christian emperors never used it before Justin the younger.

Sacred is also applied to things belonging to God and the church. Church-lands and ornaments are held sacred. The sacred college is that of the cardinals.

*Sacred Majesty* is applied to the emperor, and to the king of England.

SACRIFICE, an offering made to God on an altar, by means of a regular minister, as an acknowledgment of his power, and a payment of homage. Sacrifices, though the term is sometimes used for all the offerings made to God, or in any way devoted to his service and honour, differ from mere oblations in this, that in a sacrifice there is a real destruction or change of the thing offered ; whereas an ob­lation is only a simple offering or gift, without any such change at all. Thus, all sorts of tithes and first fruits, and whatever of men’s worldly substance is consecrated to God, for the support of his worship and the maintenance of his ministers, are offerings or oblations ; and these, un­der the Jewish law, were either of living creatures or other things; but sacrifices, in the more peculiar sense of the term, were either wholly or in part consumed by fire. They have by divines been divided into bloody and un­bloody. Bloody sacrifices were made of living creatures ; unbloody, of the fruits of the earth. They have also been divided into expiatory, impetratory, and eucharistical. The first kind were offered to obtain of God forgiveness of sins; the second to procure some favour ; and the third to ex­press thankfulness for favours already received. Under one or other of these heads may all sacrifices be arranged ; though we are told that the Egyptians had six hundred and sixty-six different kinds, a number surpassing all credibility.

Concerning the origin of sacrifices very various opinions have been held. By many, the Phoenicians are supposed to have been the authors of them, though Porphyry attri­butes their invention to the Egyptians ; and Ovid imagines, from the import of the terms *victim* and *hostia,* that no bloody sacrifices were offered until wars prevailed in the world, and nations obtained victories over their enemies. These are mere hypotheses, contradicted by the most au­thentic records of antiquity, and entitled to no regard.

By modern dcists, sacrifices are said to have had their ori­gin in superstition, which operates much in the same way in every country. It is therefore weak, according to these men, to derive this practice from any particular people, since the same mode of reasoning would lead various nations, without any intercourse with each other, to entertain the same opi­nions respecting the nature of their gods, and the proper means of appeasing their anger. Men of gross conceptions imagine their deities to be, like themselves, covetous and

cruel. They are accustomed to appease an injured neigh­bour by a composition in money ; and they endeavour to compound in the same manner with their gods, by rich offerings to their temples and to their priests. The most valuable property of a simple people is their cattle. These offered in sacrifice are supposed to be fed upon by the di­vinity, and are actually fed upon by his priests. If a crime is committed which requires the punishment of death, it is accounted perfectly fair to appease the deity by offering one life for another; because, by savages, punishment is consi­dered as a debt, for which a man may compound in the best way that he can, and which one man may pay for another. Hence, it is said, arose the absurd notions of imputed guilt and vicarious atonement. Among the Egyp­tians a white bull was chosen as an expiatory sacrifice to their god Apis. After being killed at the altar, his head was cut off and cast into the river, with the following exe­cration : “ May all the evils impending over those who per­form this sacrifice, or over the Egyptians in general, be avert­ed on this head.”@@1

Had sacrifice never prevailed in the world but among such gross idolaters as worshipped departed heroes, who were supposed to retain in their state of deification all the passions and appetites of their mortal state, this account of the origin of that mode of worship would have been to us perfectly satisfactory. We readily admit that such mean notions of their gods may have actually led far distant tribes, who could not derive any thing from each other through the channel of tradition, to imagine that beings of human passions and appetites might be appeased or bribed by costly offerings. But we know, from the most incon­trovertible authority, that sacrifices of the three kinds that we have mentioned were in use among people who wor­shipped the true God, and who must have had very correct notions of his attributes. Now we think it impossible that such notions could have led any man to fancy that the tak­ing away of the life of a harmless animal, or the burning of a cake or other fruits of the earth in the fire, would be ac­ceptable to a Being self-existent, omnipotent, and omni­scient, who can neither be injured by the crimes of his creatures, nor receive any accession of happiness from a thousand worlds.

Sensible of the force of such reasoning as this, some per­sons of great name, who admit the authenticity of the Jew­ish and Christian Scriptures, and firmly rely on the atone­ment made by Christ, arc yet unwilling to allow that sa­crifices were originally instituted by God. Of this way of thinking were St Chrysostom, Spencer, Grotius, and War­burton, as were likewise the Jews Maimonides, R. Levi, Ben Gcrson, and Abarbanel. The greater part of these writers maintain that sacrifices were at first a human in­stitution ; and that God, in order to prevent their being of­fered to idols, introduced them into his service, though he did not approve of them as good in themselves, or as pro­per rites of worship. That the infinitely wise and good God should introduce into his service improper rites of worship, appears to us so extremely improbable, that we cannot but wonder how such an opinion should ever have found its way into the minds of such men as those who held it Warburton’s theory of sacrifice is much more plau­sible, and worthy of particular examination.

According to this ingenious prelate, sacrifices had their origin in the sentiments of the human heart, and in the an­cient mode of conversing by action in aid of words. Gra­titude to God' for benefits received is natural to the mind of man, as well as his bounden duty. “ This duty,” says the bishop,@@8 “ was in the most early times discharged in ex­pressive actions, the least equivocal of which was the of-

@@@1 Herodotus, lib. ii.

@@@2 Divine Legation of Moses demonstrated, b. ix. c. ii.