

OF MEAT AND SOCIETY, SACRIFICE AND CREATION, BUTCHERS AND PHILOSOPHY

Bruce Lincoln
University of Minnesota

Meat and society

Of all human behaviors, there is none more conducive to the integration of society than the sharing of food, particularly a highly valued food such as meat. For commensality, a specialized form of gift exchange, facilitates the formation of *societas* by establishing a bond of sentiment and obligation among those who share a meal, while also drawing a rigid boundary between them and those outsiders with whom they do not or emphatically will not eat.

There is more to society than the simple distinction insiders/outsideers, with internal solidarity among the latter, however. In addition there is also a system of semi-permeable borders which organizes the dealings of separate sub-categories of insiders with one another: that is to say, society is characterized by hierarchy as well as solidarity. This point emerges clearly when one considers a society in which the attempt was made to foster solidarity while denying hierarchy: I have in mind an obscure British gentlemen's club which came to my attention quite by accident, which went by the name "The Sublime Society of Beef Steaks" (1). Founded in 1735, the "Sublime Society" endured until 1866, consisting always of twenty-four elected members, who assembled for dinner every Saturday between November and June for the expressed purpose of eating meat, the bylaws stating: «That Beef Steaks shall be the only meat for dinner» (2).

Although it had its beginnings among artists and theatrical people, by the end of the 18th century the «Sublime Society of Beef Steaks» had become a fashionable club for the upper social strata. Of the hundred and fifty-three members elected after 1770,

forty-four were of the nobility, twenty-two were members of Parliament, and twelve were high ranking military officers. Yet among this company there continued to be found painters, merchants, and theatrical managers as well (3).

The "Sublime Society" was thus a group in which members of different external station gathered to eat together. But within this commensal fraternity, members claimed to be equals, and there is no reason to doubt their sincerity. Certainly the workings of the group were designed to foster a spirit of egalitarianism. Members dressed in uniform (with buttons bearing the motto «Beef and liberty»), and always called one another «brother.» Offices circulated at each meeting, and the chief duty of officers was to serve as the butt of jokes, joking behavior being one of the chief ways in which members were reduced to a common level. Finally, "rules" and "customs" existed in such complexity and profusion that members might be judged guilty of an infraction at any moment, whereupon they were subjected to a ritual of public humiliation and comic rebuke (4).

All of these mechanisms — uniform costume, pseudo-familial address, status inversions, and joking behavior — are well-known means of obliterating differential status and creating a spirit of common belonging (5). As Brother Walter Arnold — to whom we owe the chief surviving account of the "Sublime Society" — nostalgically put it, «the friendly equality that existed among the members of the Sublime Society of Beef Steaks, tempered always by good breeding, constituted one of its principal charms» (6).

This egalitarian spirit, to which Arnold returns time and again, was nowhere better expressed than in the "Sublime Society's" menu, which was central to the group's self-understanding, as evidenced by its very name. Two factors must here be stressed. First, by insisting on expensive steaks as their "sole" fare (consumed in obscene abundance) (7), members defined themselves as an elite (8). Second, by insisting on steaks as their "common" fare, they sought to define themselves as social equals. Not only did they eat together, but all partook of the same, equally valued dishes.

That this exercise in egalitarianism was imperfect, however, is implied in Arnold's qualification that "friendly equality" was "tempered by good breeding", a qualification amplified elsewhere in his account (9). In practice, deference was always shown to titled and prestigious members, as might only be expected in

class-bound English society. Joking songs, for instance, display a consistent structure, in which members are sequentially mocked, the sequence always culminating in praise of the upper nobility, in contrast to the ridicule directed at others (10). Again, visitors were always introduced to titled members first, and when Arnold attempts to explain the "Sublime Society's" demise the first thing he mentions is the loss of the royal family with the retirement of H.R.H. the Duke of Sussex in 1839. He writes: «It is needless to say that the presence of Royalty enhanced [the Sublime Society's] celebrity, and the absence of so distinguished an element affected its prosperity» (11).

Most striking of all is to find the egalitarian title "Brother" ludicrously conjoined to hierarchic titles, as in Arnold's slavish references to "Brother the Duke of York", "Brother the Duke of Leinster", or even "Brother H.R.H. the Prince of Wales, afterwards George IV". Evidently the "Sublime Society" sought to trade on both its egalitarian spirit "and" the distinction of certain members, without ever acknowledging or resolving this inherent contradiction. For a hundred and thirty-two years, members officially denied that there was any difference in their statuses, while unofficially recognizing such difference in countless ways. Finally, unable to maintain the contradiction any longer, they ceased to eat their steaks together and the "Sublime Society" was dissolved.

Egalitarian menus, like social egalitarianism - or even pseudo-egalitarianism - are relatively rare. Given that all societies are either implicitly or explicitly hierarchic, when patterns of food distribution fail to reflect social hierarchy, contradiction and a certain instability are the inevitable results. Much more common than the egalitarian culinary code of the "Sublime Society" is a situation in which dietary inequities re-present the broader inequities of a differentiated social order.

Where a "free market" will not automatically produce a distribution of meat that accurately mirrors social order, it is ritual distributions of meat that produce this effect. Thus, for instance, in a Nupe sacrifice for rain (*fitakū*) reported by S.F. Nadel, the order in which participants eat is strictly governed by rule: first the priest who has performed the offering may taste of the victim's flesh, then others follow in order of rank and age (12). The same procedure is followed at the Gonja "Day of the Great Porridge", where meat from a sacrificed cow is publicly consumed. As Jack Goody describes it:

«The Spokesman or Linguist (*dogte* or *nsawwura*) for the division holds up portions of the meat and calls for representatives of the various sub-divisions to step forward and take their share. Not only does he call out the names of the various social divisions but also those of certain specialist occupations and other roles, including “witches”, “thieves” and “rapists”. Everyone in the division shares in the meal, even the anti-social elements. The whole community partakes willy nilly in the commensality. It is a joint meal with clear political overtones, or rather a mixture of political and communal components, since participation reinforces the position of the ruling estate...»(13).

Here, radical social integration is achieved through commensality, while the demands of hierarchy are also satisfied. For while everyone eats the same food together, they do not all eat at the same time, the order in which portions are passed out replicating the order of prestige and power. Another system in which the conflicting demands of integration and hierarchy are resolved is found in Dinka sacrifice, as described by Godfrey Lienhardt. At one point, Lienhardt presents what appears to be a butcher's chart showing the different pieces of an ox – these being unequal in value – which are assigned to different social groups: the right hind leg to the maternal kin of the sacrificer, the right front leg to the men of his patrilineage, the head to the old people of the village, and so forth (14). The “butcher's chart” is thus simultaneously a guide for the sacrificial distribution of meat and a diagram of significant social statuses, a fact which is not lost on the Dinka themselves. As one Dinka chief observed, «the people are put together, as a bull is put together», and Lienhardt elaborated: «Since every bull or ox is destined ultimately for sacrifice, each one demonstrates, potentially, the ordered social relationships of the sacrificing group, the members of which are indeed “put together” in each beast and represented in their precise relations to each other in the meat which it provides» (15).

Whereas the Nupe and Gonja social orders are replicated in the rigid sequence imposed on the ceremonial consumption of meat, Dinka society replicates itself through the distribution of differential portions. In both instances, however, the ritualized division of meat provides a means for talking about and acting upon the social order. In none of these examples, however – which I have treated all too briefly – is there any myth attached to the ritual: rather, praxis appears to float free of any explicit ideological grounding. But in the materials which I shall consider

next (and at greater length), drawn from the Indo-European world, the division of meat was intimately connected with an important myth, a myth which recounted the creation of society and the cosmos as a result of the first sacrifice.

Sacrifice and creation

The Proto-Indo-European myth of creation, as I have tried to reconstruct it elsewhere, tells how the first priest (named **Manu* "man") performed the first sacrifice, in which his brother, the first king (**Yemo* "twin") and the first bovine were victims (16).

For the sake of brevity, I will not discuss the fate of the bovine here, but will only note that while the ideal sacrifice ought to include a human and an animal victim, as did the first sacrifice, an animal could - and usually did - do service for both.

The fate of the first king, however, is of major interest to us, for it was from his body that the world was made. Nor was it only the physical universe that was so formed - sun from his eyes, sea from his blood, earth from his flesh, etc. - but the social order had the same origin: the class of priests or sovereigns from his head, that of warriors from his chest and arms, and that of commoners from his lower body.

Two reflexes preserve this conjunction of cosmogony and sociogony with particular clarity. The first is well known: the celebrated *Puruṣasūkta* of the *R̥g Veda*, dating perhaps to 900 B.C., which reads in part:

sociogony	{	When they divided Puruṣa, how many pieces did they prepare?
		What are his mouth, arms, thighs, and feet called?
		The priest was his mouth, the warrior was made from his arms;
		His thighs were the commoner, and the servant was born from his feet.
cosmogony	{	The moon born of his mind; of his eye, the sun was born;
		From his mouth, Indra and fire; from his breath, wind was born.
		From his navel there was the atmosphere; from his head, heaven was rolled together;
		From his feet, the earth; from his ear, the cardinal directions.
		Thus the gods caused the worlds to be created.

(RV 10.90.11-14) (17).

The second reflex is the Old Russian "Poem on the Dove King" (*Stič o golubinoj knigŭ*), mentioned as early as the 13th century, but known now from twenty-some variants collected orally during the 19th century (18). In four of these variants, cosmogony and sociogony appear together, although the former is attributed to God and the latter to the first man, as in the following:

- | | | |
|-----------|---|--|
| cosmogony | } | Our bright light comes from the Lord, |
| | | The red sun from the face of God, |
| | | The young shining moon from his breast, |
| | | The bright dawn from the eyes of God, |
| | | The sparkling stars from his vestements, |
| sociogony | } | The wild winds from the Holy Spirit. |
| | | From this our little Czars are on earth - |
| | | From the holy head of Adam; |
| | | From this princes and heroes come into being - |
| | | From the holy bones of Adam; |
| | | From this are the orthodox peasants - |
| | | From the holy knee of Adam (19). |

In what follows, I shall argue that the myth from which these and other reflexes derive served as a charter for the Indo-European practice of sacrifice. Conversely, whatever other significances might have been included, each I-E sacrifice was nothing less than a repetition of creation, whereby society and cosmos alike were renewed (20).

Let us begin by examining certain Roman data: first, the widespread story of Romulus's murder by the first Senators, as told by Plutarch and others.

«(Some people) conjecture that the Senators rose up against him and dismembered him in the temple of Hephaistos, distributing his body (among themselves), and each one putting a piece in the folds of his robes in order to carry them away» (21).

Now, Walter Burkert has - quite brilliantly, in my opinion - interpreted this story as a myth of the creation of Roman society, preserving important elements of the I-E creation account (29). In particular, he has called attention to the distribution of Romulus's bodily parts to each Senator, noting that while the family of

Romulus played no appreciable role in the later history of Rome, it was the patrician families founded by the first Senators - who were themselves called the *patres* of the city - which thereafter constituted Roman society. Thus, while Romulus lived, it was he alone who incarnated Roman totality, but upon his death - a quasi-sacrificial death, marked by bloody dismemberment within the confines of a temple - that totality was shattered, and individual families assumed varied roles as the differentiated limbs (speaking quite literally) of the state.

So much for myth. But Burkert's analysis went further, comparing the story of Romulus's dismemberment to several rituals, among them the *Feriae Latinae*, one of the most ancient Italic sacrifices. Dionysius of Halicarnassus 4.49 gives the fullest account, although he wrongly considers the ritual an innovation of Tarquin (23).

«Planning for his agreements with these cities to stand firm for all time, Tarquin thought to designate a common temple for the Romans, the Latins, the Hernicians, and those Volscians who had entered his alliance, in order that they might come together each year at the appointed place to congregate, feast together, and take part in common rituals.

When all had accepted this happily, he designated the place where they would make the assembly: a high mountain, lying just about in the middle of the peoples, overlooking the city of the Albans. And he set down laws that they would hold assemblies here each year, while there would be truces among all of them, and they would jointly perform common sacrifices to that deity called Jupiter Latiaris («Jupiter of the Latin peoples»), and they would feast together. And he ranked what each city needed to provide for the rites and the portion which each one ought to receive.

The cities taking part in the festival and the sacrifices were forty seven in number. And the Romans celebrate these festivals and these sacrifices down to this day, calling them the *Latinae* («the Latin rites»). And of the cities which share in these rites, some bring lambs, some cheeses, some a portion of milk, some anything similar, like a sacrificial cake. And each one receives its ranked portion of the one bull which is sacrificed in common. And they sacrifice for all, and the Romans possess hegemony over the rites» (24).

The *Feriae Latinae* was thus a ritual of solidarity and hierarchy, in which were celebrated both the cohesion of the Latin

League and the unequal status of its members. Moreover, these central themes found expression in the foods which were consumed. Thus, the representatives of each city brought different, graded portions of food - «some lambs, some cheeses, some a portion of milk» - to the common feast, and differential portions were also distributed, particularly of the meat from the sacrificial bull. Large, powerful cities received large, prestigious cuts of meat, while small portions were allotted the lesser members of the federation, even to the point that when a city shrunk to insignificance, it was denied a portion at all (25). Given its sociopolitical importance, the distribution of meat was scrutinized carefully, and any mistake in the assignment of portions - i.e., any violation of proper hierarchy - could force the repetition of the entire ritual (26), as could the failure of any participant to pray for the welfare of the whole Roman people (27).

In both the *Feriae Latinae* and the myth of Romulus's dismemberment, similar motifs are found. In both, a body is cut into pieces, just as a society is divided into segmentary parts. Yet there is no explicit testimony which links this ritual and this myth together: the connection, while fully justified in my opinion, remains a scholar's construct. Such is not the case, however, with one of the earliest and best described Germanic sacrifices, a sacrifice quite like the *Feriae Latinae* in many ways: that of the Semnones as reported by Tacitus, *Germania* 39 (28). Following L.L. Hammerich, I translate as follows:

«They say that the Semnones are the oldest and most noble of the Suebi. This belief is confirmed in a religious ceremony of ancient times. At a fixed time, all the people of the same blood come together by legations in a wood that is consecrated by the signs of their ancestors and by an ancient dread. Barbaric rites celebrate the horrific origins, through the sacrifice (*caeso*, lit. "dismemberment") of a man for the public good....

There the belief of all looks backward (to the primordial past), as if from that spot there were the origins of the race. The god who is ruler of all things is there. Others (gods? peoples? places?) are inferior and subservient.

The good fortune of the Semnones adds to their authority. One hundred cantons are inhabited for them, and this great body causes them to believe themselves to be the head of the Suebi» (29).

Before we consider the details of this rite, it is necessary to say a bit about the nature of the Suebian confederation, of which the Semnones were “the oldest and most noble part”. In *Germania* 38, Tacitus states that numerous sub-tribes existed, all of which considered themselves part of the Suebi, and these in turn were part of the Herminones, one of the three great divisions of the Germani (30). Moreover the Suebian sub-tribes felt themselves to be connected to one another by bonds of (fictive) kinship derived from a mythic genealogy, reminding themselves of these bonds and renewing their sense of solidarity at rituals such as that described above, in which “all the people of the same blood” (*omnes eiusdem sanguinis populi*) came together. Although we are not given the details of the Suebian mythic genealogy, it is in all likelihood a continuation of that given in *Germania* 2:

«(The Germans) celebrate in ancient songs – which are their only means of remembrance or recording the past – an earth-born god, Tuisto. His son Mannus was the origin of their race and their founder. They assign three sons to Mannus, and from their names they call those close to the ocean Ingaevones; those in the middle, Herminones; and all the rest, Istaevones» (31).

Now, this myth – which Genzmer showed to be of ancient Germanic origin (32) – is a somewhat transformed version of the I-E sociogony. Rather than the first king’s body being divided into three social classes, it is his kingdom that is distributed to three sons, each of whom incarnates one social class (33). Thus, the three tribal divisions – Herminones, Istaevones, and Ingaevones – all take their names from sons of Mannus: Irmin (= Old Norse *Jǫrmunr*), a sovereign god; *Istu, presumably a warrior god; and Ingwi (= ON *Yngvi Freyr*), a god of the commoners (34).

Moreover, the names *Mannus* and *Tuisto* mean nothing other than “Man” and “Twin”, as do those of their P-I-E counterparts, **Manu* and **Yemo*, although *Tuisto* (< **Dwis-to* “doubled”) is only a semantic match to **Yemo* (“geminate”), and not a cognate. A reflex of **Yemo* in both phonetics and semantics is preserved elsewhere in Germanic myth, however, as in *Vafþrúðnismál* 21:

From Ymir’s (< **Yemo*) flesh the earth was made
and mountains from his bones;
Heaven from the skull of the rime-cold giant,
and from his blood, the sea (35).

Consider again the Semnones' sacrifice, in which a human victim was dismembered (*caesoque...homine*), and Tacitus tells us why this was done, saying that these «barbaric rites celebrate the horrific origins» (*celebrant barbari ritus [pl. nom.] horrenda primordia*), i.e., they repeat the creation of the world from the dismembered body of the ill-fated "Twin", renewing cosmos and society in the process.

The various groups of the Suebi who gathered for this sacrifice were not equal, however: above all in prestige were the Semnones (*vetustissimos se nobilissimosque Sueborum*), and Tacitus tells us that one of the main effects of the ritual was to ratify their supremacy (*fides antiquitatis religione firmatur*). Unfortunately, we are not told how this was done or what became of the pieces from the sacrificial victim, although one must wonder if the last sentence in Tacitus' account is metaphoric only, or if it hints at patterns in the distribution of meat, for he states that the Semnones «believe themselves to be the head of the Suebi» (*se Sueborum caput credant*), of which the other tribes were the bodily trunk (*magnoque corpore*) (36).

If the *Feriae Latinae* dwelt on the sociogonic side of creation, the Semnones' sacrifice thus seems to have included sociogony and cosmogony alike in its re-presentation of the "horrific origins". In contrast, it is the cosmogonic side which predominated in Indo-Iranian rituals. One of the clearest examples is found in *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa* 2.6, where instructions are given for the ritual dismemberment of victims in animal sacrifice (37). What interests us most here are the sacred formulae which accompany and inform the dismembering, for these are powerfully reminiscent of the cosmogonic verses of the *Puruṣasūkta* (RV 10.90.13-14). Those formulae (*mantras*) are:

«Lay its feet down to the north. Cause its eye to go to the sun; send forth its breath to the wind; its life-force to the atmosphere; its ear to the cardinal points; its flesh to the earth.' Thus, (the dismemberer) places this (animal) in these worlds» (38).

It is great merit of Marijan Molé to have demonstrated that the view of sacrifice expressed within this, and countless other Brāhmaṇic passages - i.e., that sacrifice repeats creation, securing the continued existence of the universe - was also central to Zoroastrian sacrifice (39). The most telling Iranian datum,

however, is not the Zoroastrian *yasna*, but the ritual of the Magi described by Herodotos 1.131-32 (40).

«I know the customs used by the Persians to be these. It is not their custom to establish statues, temples, and altars, and they hold those who build them to be foolish, I suppose, because they never believed the gods to be anthropomorphic, as do the Greeks. They do honor to Zeus on the highest of mountains, ascending them to offer sacrifice, and calling the entire rim of heaven "Zeus". They sacrifice to the sun, and also to the moon, and to earth and to fire and to water and to the winds....

And this is the sacrifice of these Persians with regard to the aforesaid gods. They build no altars, and kindle no fires when thinking to sacrifice, nor do they indulge in libations, flutes, fillets, or barley. And whoever wishes to sacrifice to one (of the gods), he leads the victim to a purified place, and he calls the god, being wreathed with a tiara chiefly of myrtle. Now in truth, they do not pray for blessings for the sacrificer himself, but pray for good to come to all Persians and to the King, for (the sacrificer) thinks himself to be among all the Persians. Then, having cut the victim into pieces limb from limb, boiled the flesh, and strewn the softest grass, particularly clover, he then arranges all the flesh on top of this. When this is arranged, a man – a Magus – standing beside him, sings a theogony, as it is not their custom to perform sacrifices without a Magus. Having waited a little while, the sacrificer carries away the flesh, and uses it as he pleases» (41).

It is particularly significant that the Magus is said to intone a theogony while performing the sacrifice, for as Schaefer convincingly argued, Herodotos meant by this term a creation account and not merely a genealogy of the gods (42). In fact, Herodotos's use of the term *theos* in this passage is itself quite extraordinary, for in spite of the abundant evidence to the contrary available to him, the historian asserted that the "gods" (*tous theous*) of the Persians were not worshipped in anthropomorphic form (*ouk anthrōpophueas*). Moreover, the list of "gods" which he offers is not a usual list of Iranian deities at all, nor are any of these "deities" anthropomorphic: Heaven, Sun, Moon, Earth, Fire, Water, and the Winds. Rather, these are the constituent elements of the macrocosm, and the birth of such "gods" as these would amount to nothing less than a cosmogony.

Moreover, numerous Iranian sources preserve reflexes of the

myth of creation through sacrificial dismemberment: the sociogenic dismemberment of Yīma (< *Yemo, the mythic first king), the creation of metals (perhaps associated with celestial spheres) and races of man from Gayōmard, and the creation of foodstuffs and animals from the Primordial Ox (43). Among the most concise reflexes is a Manichaean variant, in which (predictably!) the base material world is formed from the body of a demon, *Škend Gumānīg Wizār* 16.11-13:

«The sky is from the skin, the earth is from the flesh, the mountains are from the bone, and the plants are from the hair of the demon Kūnī (lit. "Anus")» (44).

A song of creation such as this, Herodotos tells us, was sung at the moment when the dismembered pieces of the victim had been properly set out, and Herodotos uses the verb *dia-tithēmi* rather than the simple *tithēmi*, to mark the care with which each piece was separated from the others and laid in its proper place, care which was necessary because - as Cristiano Grottanelli, who first recognized the significance of this verb, pointed out to me - through ritual dismemberment and deposition of the victim's bodily members, the Magus was doing nothing less than recreating the cosmos (45).

Butchers and philosophy

The materials which we have just considered - to which others could well be added (46) - convince me that among Indo-Europeans sacrifice was understood to be a ritual repetition of creation, cosmogony and sociogony alike. Within this ritual, victims - sometimes human, sometimes animal, sometimes both - were killed and dismembered, their bodies being carved up with the greatest of care. Some of the victim's bodily members were distributed to humans and were eaten, the differential value and prestige of various cuts of meat re-presenting the hierarchic position of the individual or group who received them. Other bodily members were dispersed to the cosmos - most often through the medium of fire - as a means of translating material substance from microcosm to macrocosm.

Twentieth century views of cosmic processes have led us to be a bit skeptical regarding the claim of Brāhmins and others to re-create the universe with each sacrifice. But conversely,

twentieth century views of social processes force us to acknowledge that with every sacrifice the social order was indeed replicated, sacrifice - like other rituals - being a tremendously powerful mechanism for the maintenance of society (47). Toward this end, the division of meat is extremely important, not just as an index of differential statuses, but also as part of the broader social rhythms that are dramatized in sacrifice. On this point, Lienhardt's description of Dinka sacrifice is again most instructive:

«It is at the moment immediately preceding the physical death of the beast, as the last invocation reaches its climax with more vigorous thrusts of the spear, that those attending the ceremony are most palpably members of a single undifferentiated body, looking towards a single common end. After the victim has been killed, their individual characters, their private and family differences, and various claims and rights according to their status, become apparent once more.

In the account of the role of cattle, I mentioned the Dinkas' way of figuring the unity and diversity of kin-groups in the unity of the bull or ox and in the customary division of its flesh. Similarly in a sacrifice, whilst the victim is still a living whole, all members of a gathering are least differentiated from each other in their common interest in that whole victim. With its death, interest turns towards the customary rights of different participating groups in the division of its flesh... Sacrifice thus includes a re-creation of the basis of local corporate life, in the full sense of those words. The whole victim corresponds to the unitary solidarity of human beings in their common relationship to the divine, while the division of the flesh corresponds to the social differentiation of the groups taking part» (48).

Although he does not use these terms, Lienhardt has here described - masterfully, in my opinion - the phases of aggregation and segmentation which mark most ritual. As is particularly clear in the accounts of the *Feriae Latinae* and the Semnones' sacrifice, individuals and groups gather together for the performance of a ritual in which they gradually surrender their sense of separate identity as they come to feel part of a broader social totality united by bonds of kinship, polity, commensality, and/or common purpose. Later, toward the end of the proceedings, the social

totality which has been ritually (re-)created breaks into its constituent parts again, only to be re-united at the next sacrifice. And as Lienhardt recognized, the moment at which the phase of aggregation ends and that of segmentation begins, is the moment in which the victim is killed and its flesh divided.

Social segmentation thus coincides with the sacrificial division of meat, while aggregation correlates to a victim that is whole: a victim that contains within its body the potential to be cut into differentiated pieces. The I-E sociogony preserves similar ideas, for it tells how the first king contained within him the three social classes, these taking on separate existence only when his body was dismembered. Similarly, the cosmogony portrayed the first sacrificial victims (human and animal) as possessing within their bodies the whole universe *in potentia*, the universe coming into existence with their dismemberment. A natural enough question is how this total cosmic potentiality came to reside within them, to which *Atharva Veda*, 9.5.20-21 offered an answer, speaking of the sacrificial goat.

Truly, the goat strode through this world in the beginning.

This (earth) became its breast; heaven, its back.

The atmosphere, its middle; the cardinal points, its sides; the oceans, its bellies.

Truth and Right, its eyes; all truth and faith, its breath; the Virāj (metre), its head.

Truly, this is a sacrifice without limits: the goat accompanied by five grain-offerings! (49)

The solution is as simple as it is elegant. The victim can become the cosmos because at some earlier moment, the cosmos became the victim, the three cosmic regions of earth, atmosphere, and heaven having entered its underbelly, innards, and back respectively. And to the question which naturally follows - where did the cosmos come from, such that it could enter into the first goat - the answer is: from a sacrifice performed earlier still. For the "first" goat, the "first" ox, the "first" man, and so on, are not "first" in any absolute sense, but only within a given world-age, before which something else preceded. Such reasoning can be - and was - pursued *ad infinitum*, leading to a vision of endless cycles of sacrifice and creation, in which there is no absolute beginning or end, only the perpetual flow of matter from microcosm to macrocosm and back again, world without end.

It is clear that in India sacrificial practice led directly to

speculation on the nature of the universe, time and eternity, change and changelessness: issues which have since been subsumed by what we now call metaphysics or philosophy. At the other end of the Indo-European world, sacrifice and "philosophical" speculation also went hand in hand, both being the proper concern of the fabled Druids, a state of affairs that has struck many modern authorities as inconceivable (50). Thus, in one of the best works on the Druids in recent decades, their claims to higher intellectual activity are minimized and ridiculed, while in a competing work of equal merit, the attempt is made to exculpate them of any connection to the practice of sacrifice (51). Yet far from being antithetic, sacrifice and philosophy were inseparable, the former being *fons et origo* of the latter. This is apparent, for instance, in the description of the Druids given by Pomponius Mela 3.2, following Posidonius.

«These people are arrogant and superstitious, and at one time they were so savage that they believed a man to be the best and most pleasing sacrificial victim for the gods. Vestiges of their past ferocity remain, so that while they refrain from the final dismemberments (*ultimis caedibus*), nonetheless they take away a little portion (from the victim) when leading the consecrated ones to the altars. Still, they have their own eloquence and their masters of wisdom, the Druids. They profess to know the size and form of the universe and of earth, the motion of sky and stars, and what the gods desire» (52).

The juxtaposition is clear: reflection on the nature of time (*motus coeli ac siderum*) and cosmos (*terrae mundique magnitudinem et formam*) follows directly on and originates from the practice of sacrificial dismemberment. Nor, given the cardinal importance of the I-E myth in which the world is created through sacrifice, should this come as any surprise. Dismemberment of the victim reveals the nature of society and the universe in this myth and in its ritual re-presentation, for indeed all that exists was thought to be «put together, as a bull is put together», to borrow the formulation of Lienhardt's Dinka priest.

Greek philosophy too owes more to I-E myth and sacrificial practice than has generally been recognized, although there are others more qualified than I to discuss this in detail. I would, however, note that for all his anti-sacrificial polemic, Empedokles was deeply indebted to P-I-E myth and ritual in his view of cosmic processes, for the two fundamental forces which he

posited - Strife, which tears all things apart, and Love, which joins all things together - are only abstract re-formulations of dismemberment and re-constitution or segmentation and aggregation as they appear in sacrifice. For that matter, one must make the same observation regarding the familiar Aristotelian methods of "analysis" and "synthesis", whereby ideas are dismembered and put back together, just like a sacrificial ox.

Notes

1. Information on the society is all taken from Walter Arnold, *The life and death of the Sublime Society of Steaks* (London: Bradbury, Evans, & Co., 1871).
 2. *Ibid.*, p. xiv.
 3. A list of the original members is contained in Arnold, pp. xi-xii, and of all succeeding members on pp. xvii-xxiv. Certain of the Society's songs, such as those reproduced on pp. 81-88 and 96-99 give clear indications of the members' social stations.
 4. Note, for instance, the remarks made in a description of the "Sublime Society" which appeared in *Fraser's Magazine* for July 1833, cited in Arnold, p. 22 (in the Scots' dialect in which it was written): «It is a club in which nae man can ken whether he is doing right or wrong; the kindest action may be counted an offence; but always the more *outré* a man's behaviour is, the better». A fascinating account of an occasion on which the Duke of Sussex was so punished is given in Arnold, pp. 12-14.
 5. See, inter alia, Victor Turner, *The ritual process* (Chicago: Aldine, 1969), pp. 94-130; *Idem*, *The forest of symbols* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1967), pp. 93-102; Barbara Babcock, ed., *The reversible world: symbolic inversion in art and society* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1978).
 6. Arnold, p. 16.
 7. Dinners were spaced out over three hours or more so that members could continually re-order steaks, eating six or more as a rule. At an average meeting, the twenty-four members and their guests would consume three rumps of beef (Arnold, pp. 21 and 34; see also p. 6).
 8. Note again the account from *Fraser's Magazine*, quoted in Arnold, pp. 20-23. The author, having stated that he could never hope to join the Society, «as they are a' far aboon my sphere» (p. 20), is asked by an interlocutor within the article «And what is it that delighted you so much? Do they actually dine on Beef-steaks?» to which he answers «Solely on Beef-steaks - and what glorious Beef-steaks!» (p. 21).
- That members understood themselves as an elite is evident from remarks such as Arnold's observation (p. 24 f.) that election to the Society was a distinction «coveted by many, but of necessity conferred on few». Architectural symbolism, as well as dietary, helped establish the boundary between this elite and their inferiors, for the central feature of the room in which the "Sublime Society" dined was a huge iron grating in the form of a gridiron, which separated the kitchen, where servants cooked the steaks, from the dining room in which members consumed them (Arnold, p. 5).

9. Note his account of "the charge" given new members upon initiation to the Society (p. 9):

«"The charge" was then delivered by the Recorder. In it he dwelt on the solemnity of the obligations the new member was about to take on himself. He was made to understand in tones alternately serious and gay, the true Brotherly spirit of the Sublime Society of Beef Steaks; that while a perfect equality existed among the Brethren, such equality never should be permitted to degenerate into undue familiarity; that while badinage was encouraged in the freest sense of the word, such badinage must never approach to a personality; and that good fellowship must be united with good breeding...»

10. See, for instance, the songs which appear in Arnold, pp. 81-84, 96-99, or 143-47.

11. Arnold, p. 24.

12. S.F. Nadel, *Nupe religion* (New York: Schocken, 1970), pp. 73-74.

13. J. Goody, *Cooking, cuisine, and class* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), p. 91.

14. Godfrey Lienhardt, *Divinity and Experience: The religion of the Dinka* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1961), p. 24. See also the fuller discussion of pp. 23-24, and 233-34.

15. *Ibid.*, p. 23.

16. Bruce Lincoln, "The Indo-European myth of creation", *History of Religions* 15 (1975): 121-45; *Idem, Priests, warriors, and cattle: a study in the ecology of religions* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1981), 69-95. Most recently, see my discussion in *Myth, cosmos and society: Indo-European themes of creation and destruction*, (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1986). The groundbreaking work on this topic remains Hermann Güntert, *Der arische Weltkönig und Heiland* (Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1923), pp. 315-94.

17. yát púruṣam vy ádadhuḥ kaṭidhá vy ákalpayan /
múkham kím asya kaú bāhú ká ūrú pádā ucyete //
brāhmaṇò 'sya múkham āsid bāhú rājanyaḥ krtáḥ /
ūrú tát asya yád vaiśyah padbhyām śúdró ajāyata //
candrāmā mánaso jātás cākṣoḥ sūryo ajāyata /
múkhād índraś cāgnís ca prāṇād vāyúr ajāyata //
nābhya āsid antárikṣam śirṣṇó dyaúḥ sám avartata /
padbhyām bhūmir díśaḥ śrōtrāt táthā lokān alkalpayan //

18. The text is discussed in Stanislas Schayer, "A note on the old Russian variant of the Purushasūkta", *Archiv Orientalní* 7 (1935): 319-23; and V.N. Toporov, "O strukture nekotoryx arxaičeskix tekstov, sootrosimyx s koncepciej 'Mirovogo Dereva'", *Trudy po Znakovym Sistemam* 5 (1971): 9-62, esp. pp. 43-46.

19. U našŭ bělyj světŭ vzjatŭ otŭ Gospoda,
Solnce krasnoe otŭ lica Božija,
Mladŭ světeliŭ mėsjačŭ otŭ grudej ego,
zori bělyja otŭ očej Božiiŭ
zvězdy častyja to otŭ rizŭ ego,
větry bujnyja otŭ Svjata Duxa.
ottogo u našŭ vŭ zemlě cari pošli
otŭ svjatoj glavy, otŭ Adamovoj;

otogo začalisi knjaziĭa-bojary
otŭ svjatyxŭ mošcej, otŭ Adamovyxŭ

otogo krestijany pravoslavnye

otŭ svjata kolĕna, otŭ Adamova.

Text from Schayer, "A note on the old Russian variant", p. 320. Another version in which cosmogony and sociogony appear together is found in Toporov, "O strukture", p. 44.

20. On the relation of sacrificial ritual and creation mythology, see in particular Adolf E. Jensen, *Die getötete Gottheit: Weltbild einer frühen Kultur* (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1966), esp. pp. 125-37; Mircea Eliade, *The myth of the eternal return* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1954), esp. pp. 21-27; and Cristiano Grottanelli, "Cosmogonia e sacrificio, I e II", *Studi Storico-Religiosi* 4 (1980): 207-35 and 5 (1981): 173-96.

21. ἄλλ' οἱ μὲν εἴκαζον ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τοῦ Ἡφαίστου τοὺς βουλευτὰς ἐπαναστάντας αὐτῷ καὶ διαφθειράντας, νείμαντας τὸ σῶμα καὶ μέρος ἕκαστον ἐνθήμερον εἰς τὸν κόλπον ἐξενεργεῖν.
Life of Romulus, 27.

22. Walter Burkert, "Caesar und Romulus-Quirinus", *Historia* 11 (1962): 356-76, esp. pp. 365-68. See also Jean Puhvel, «Remus et Frater,» *History of Religions* 15 (1975): 146-57; and Bernadette Liou-Gille, *Cultes "heroïques" romains: les fondateurs* (Paris: Les belles lettres, 1980), pp. 175-78.

23. On the *Feriae Latinae*, see: H.H. Scullard, *Festivals and ceremonies of the Roman Republic* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1981), pp. 111-15; Pierangelo Catalano, *Linee del sistema sovranazionale romano* (Turin: G. Giappichelli, 1965), pp. 168-73; Jean Bayet, *Histoire politique et psychologique de la religion romaine* (Paris: Payot, 1957), p. 20 f.; W. Warde Fowler, *Roman festivals of the period of the Republic* (London: Macmillan, 1908); Burkert discusses it in "Caesar and Romulus-Quirinus", p. 368.

24. τοῦ δὲ μένειν εἰς ἅπαντα χρόνον τὰ συγκείμενα ταῖς πόλεσι πρόνοιαν ὁ Ταρκύνιος λαμβάνων ἱερὸν ἔγνω κοινὸν ἀποδειξάι Ῥωμαίων τε καὶ Λατίνων καὶ Ἑρῳϊκῶν καὶ Οὐλοῦσκῶν τῶν ἐγγαγραφαμένων εἰς τὴν συμμαχίαν, ἵνα συνερχόμενοι καθ' ἕκαστον ἐνιαυτὸν εἰς τὸν ἀποδειχθέντα τόπον πανηγυρίζωσι καὶ συνεσιῶνται καὶ κοινῶν ἱερῶν μεταλαμβάνωσιν. ἀγαπητῶς δὲ πάντων τὸ πρᾶγμα δεξαμένων τόπον μὲν ἀπέδειξεν ἔνθα ποιήσονται τὴν σύνοδον ἐν μέσῳ μάλιστα τῶν ἐθνῶν κείμενον ὄρος ὑψηλόν, ὃ τῆς Ἀλβανῶν ὑπέρεκειται πόλεως, ἐν ᾧ πανηγύρεις τ' ἀνὰ πᾶν ἔτος ἀγεσθαὶ καὶ ἐκεχειρίας εἶναι πᾶσι πρὸς πάντας ἐνομοθέτησε θυσίας τε συντελεῖσθαι κοινὰς τῷ καλουμένῳ Λατιαρίῳ Διὶ καὶ συνεσιῶσεις, τάξας ἃ δεῖ παρέχειν ἕκαστην πόλιν εἰς τὰ ἱερά, καὶ μοῖραν ἦν ἕκαστην δεήσει λαμβάνειν. αἱ δὲ μετασχούσαι τῆς ἑορτῆς τε καὶ τῆς θυσίας πόλεις τριῶν δέουσαι πενήκοντα ἐγένοντο. ταύτας τὰς ἑορτὰς τε καὶ τὰς θυσίας μέχρι τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς χρόνων ἐπιτελοῦσι Ῥωμαῖοι Λατῖνας καλοῦντες, καὶ φέρουσιν εἰς αὐτὰς αἱ μετέχουσαι τῶν ἱερῶν πόλεις αἱ μὲν ἄρνας, αἱ δὲ τυρούς, αἱ δὲ γάλακτός τι μέτρον, αἱ δὲ ὁμοίον τι τούτοις πελάνου γένος· ἐνὸς δὲ ταύρου κοινῶς ὑπὸ πασῶν θυομένου μέρος ἕκαστη τὸ τεταγμένον λαμβάνει. θύουσι δ' ὑπὲρ ἁπάντων καὶ τὴν ἡγεμονίαν τῶν ἱερῶν ἔχουσι Ῥωμαῖοι.

25. The Scholium to Cicero, *Pro Plancio* 23 states: «The adjacent (small) states receive small portions (*portiunculas*) of meat from the victim on the Alban Mount, following the ancient belief. But truly, there are so few men in these (other) cities that they have ceased to be sent the meat (which they) demanded in solemn fashion.» (... *hostia civitates adjacentes portiunculas carnis acciperent ex Albano monte secundum veterem superstitionem. Verum tam exiguum in illis civitatibus numerum hominum significat, ut desint etiam, qui carnem petitum de sollempni more mittantur*). Text in Paul Hildebrandt, ed., *Scholia in Ciceronis*

Orationes Bobiensia (Leipzig: B.G. Teubner, 1907). That portions were hierarchically ranked also emerges from the use of the verb *tassō* in Dionysius of Halicarnassus 4.49, a term which has as its primary sense the setting up of an army in military formation, thus "to rank", "to order". Here it is applied to the specific provisions which each city was expected to bring to the *Feriae Latinae* (*taksas ha dei parekhein hekastēn eis ta hiera*) and to the specific portion which each city received (*meros hekastē to tetagmenon lambanei*).

26. Livy 37.3.4 and 32.1.9.

27. Livy 41.16.1-2.

28. On this passage, see above all, L. L. Hammerich, "Horrenda Primordia: Zur 'Germania' c. 39", *Germanisch-Romanische Monatsschrift* 33 (1952): 228-33, Karl Hauck, "Lebensnormen und Kultmythen in germanischen Stammes- und Herrschergenealogien", *Saeculum* 6 (1955): 186-223, esp. pp. 193-95; Idem, "Carmina Antiqua", *Zeitschrift für bayerische Landesgeschichte* 27 (1964): 1-33, esp. pp. 17-20; and Alfred Ebenbauer, "Ursprungsglaube, Herrschergott und Menschenopfer. Beobachtungen zum Semnonenkult (Germania c. 39)", in M. Mayrhofer, et al., eds., *Antiquitates Indogermanicae: Gedenkschrift für Hermann Güntert* (Innsbruck: Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft, 1974), pp. 233-49. The commentary of Rudolf Much, *Die Germania des Tacitus*, 3rd ed. (Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1967), pp. 43-40, is also of value.

29. *Vetustissimos se nobilissimosque Sueborum Semnones memorant; fides antiquitatis religione firmatur, stato tempore in silvam auguriis patrum et prisca formidine sacram omnes eiusdem sanguinis populi legationibus coeunt caesoque publice homine celebrant barbari ritus horrenda primordia.... eoque omnis superstitio respicit, tamquam inde initia gentis, ibi regnator omnium deus, cetera subjecta atque parentia. adicit auctoritatem fortuna Semnonum: centum pagi iis habitantur, magnoque corpore efficitur ut se Sueborum caput credant.*

30. These last details are found in Pliny, *Natural History* 4.99, and Tacitus, *Germania* 2.

31. Celebrant carminibus antiquis, quod unum apud illos memoriae et annalium genus est, Tuistonem deum terra editum. ei filium Mannum, originem gentis conditoremque, Manno tres filios assignant, e quorum nominibus proximi Oceano Ingaevones, medii Herminones, ceteri Istaevones vocantur.

32. Felix Genzmer, "Ein germanisches Gedicht aus der Hallstattzeit", *Germanische-Romanische Monatsschrift* 24 (1936): 14-21.

33. Certain other reflexes of the sociogony also bear this "dynastic" structure rather than the "sacrificial" structure evident in the *Puruṣasūkta* or the "Poem on the Dove King". Among these are the Greek myth of Ion's sons, the Skythian myth of Targitaos's sons (Herodotos 4.6), and the Iranian myth of Frēdōn's sons (*Ayādgar i Jāmāspīg* 4.39-41).

34. See the discussion in Genzmer, "Ein germanisches Gedicht", pp. 14-21; Much, *Die Germania des Tacitus*, pp. 53-55; Jan de Vries, "Sur quelques glissements fonctionnels de divinités dans la religion germanique", in *Hommages à Georges Dumézil* (Brussels: Collection Latomus, 1960), pp. 89-95; and Richard Hünnerkopf, "Die Söhne des Mannus", *Gymnasium* 61 (1954): 542-54.

35. Ór Ymis holdi var jorð um sköpuð,
enn ór beinum björg,
himinn ór hausi ins hrímkalda jötuns,
enn ór sveita sjör.

36. The entire last sentence is extremely suggestive, for if *iis* is taken as a proper dative, as I have translated it here, rather than an instrumental usage of the dative (as it is more usually rendered), then it appears that the other Suebi inhabit one hundred cantons as a service "for the Semnones" (*iis*), and thus form the "great body" (*magnoque corpore*) of which the Semnones are the head (*Sueborum caput*) with possible reference to division of the victim's body. Caesar, *De Bello Gallico* 1.37 and 4.1, in fact, does attribute the possession of one hundred cantons to the Suebi rather than to the Semnones, which argues against a translation using *iis* as an instrumental (e.g. «One hundred cantons are inhabited by them ...»).

37. Perhaps the most famous passage in which the sacrificial victim is homologized to the cosmos and the sacrifice discussed as a repetition of cosmogony is the opening of the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad*, where the esoteric significance of the sacrificial horse is discussed. Such theories are already attested, however, in sources much earlier in date, such as *R̥g Veda* 1.162 (particularly verses 18-20), or *Atharva Veda* 9.4.12-16, 9.5.20-21, 9.7.1-18, and 10.10.20-21.

On the Indian sacrifice, see in particular: Sylvain Lévi, *La doctrine du sacrifice dans les Brāhmaṇas* (Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1898), esp. pp. 13-35 and 77-151; Betty Heimann, "The supra-personal process of sacrifice", *Rivista degli Studi Orientali* 32 (1957): 731-39; Jan Gonda, *Die Religionen Indiens*, Vol. 1 (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1960), pp. 104-9 and 138-97; and Madeleine Biardeau and Charles Malamoud, *Le sacrifice dans l'Inde ancienne* (Paris: PUF, 1976), esp. pp. 14-31. Also of value is Kasten Rönnow, "Zur Erklärung des Pravargya, des Agnicayana und der Sautrāmaṇī", *Le Monde Oriental* 23 (1929): 113-73, which is brilliant at points but tentative at others.

38. udīcīnām asya pado nidhattāt sūryam cakṣur gamayatad // vātam prāṇam anvasṛjatād // antarikṣam asuṃ // disaḥ śrotram // pṛthivīm śarīrām ity // eṣv evainam tal lokeṣv ādadhāti //

39. Molé's position is most fully spelled out in *Culte, mythe et cosmologie dans l'Iran ancien* (Paris: PUF, 1963), pp. 85-147 being most important for the topic of sacrifice.

40. On this important text, see: Emile Benveniste, *The Persian religion according to the chief Greek texts* (Paris: Paul Geuthner, 1929), pp. 22-32, and Molé, *Culte, mythe et cosmologie*, pp. 74-81.

41. Πέρσας δὲ οἶδα νόμοισι τοιοῖσιδε χρωμένους, ἀγάλματα μὲν καὶ νηοὺς καὶ βωμοὺς οὐκ ἐν νόμῳ ποιευμένους ἰδρῦσθαι, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖσι ποιεῦσι μωρίην ἐπιφέρουσι, ὥς μὲν ἐμοὶ δοκέειν, ὅτι οὐκ ἀνθρωποφυέας ἐνόμισαν τοὺς θεοὺς κατὰ περ οἱ Ἕλληνες εἶναι· οἱ δὲ νομίζουσι Διὶ μὲν ἐπὶ τὰ ὑψηλότατα τῶν ὀρέων ἀναβαίνοντες θυσίας ἔρδειν, τὸν κύκλον πάντα τοῦ οὐρανοῦ Δία καλέοντες· θύουσι δὲ ἧλψ τε καὶ σελήνη καὶ γῆ καὶ πυρὶ καὶ ὕδατι καὶ ἀνέμοισι....

θυσίη δὲ τοῖσι Πέρσῃσι περὶ τοὺς εἰρημένους θεοὺς ἦδε κατέστηκε· οὔτε βωμοὺς ποιεῦνται οὔτε πῦρ ἀνακαίουσι μέλλοντες θύειν, οὐ σπονδὴν χρέωνται, οὐκ αὐλῶ, οὐ στέμμασι, οὐκ οὐλῆσι· τῶν δὲ ὡς ἐκάστῳ θύειν θέλη, ἐς χώρον καθαρὰ ἀγαγὼν τὸ κτήνος καλεῖ τὸν θεόν, ἔστεφανωμένος τὸν τιάραν μωρίην μάλιστα. ἐνωτῶ μὲν δὴ τῷ θύοντι ἰδίῃ μόνῳ οὐ οἱ ἐγγίνεται ἀρᾶσθαι ἀγαθὰ, ὁ δὲ τοῖσι πᾶσι Πέρσῃσι κατεῦχεται εὐ γίνεσθαι καὶ τῷ βασιλεῖ· ἐν γὰρ δὴ τοῖσι ἅπασιν Πέρσῃσι καὶ αὐτὸς γίνεται. ἐπεὰν δὲ διαμοστύλας κατὰ μέλας τὸ ἱρῆον ἐψησῆ τὰ κρέα, ὑποπάσας ποιῆν ὡς ἀπαλωτάτην, μάλιστα δὲ τὸ τρίφυλλον, ἐπὶ ταύτης ἔθηκε ὦν πάντα τὰ κρέα. διαθέντος δὲ αὐτοῦ Μάγου ἀνήρ παρεστῶς ἐπαεῖδει θεογονίην, οἶην δὴ Μάγου οὐ σφι νόμος ἐστὶ θυσίας ποιέεσθαι. ἐπισχῶν δὲ ὀλίγον χρόνον ἀποφέρεται ὁ θύσας τὰ κρέα καὶ χραῖται ὁ τι μιν λόγος αἰρέει.

42. H.H. Schaeder, "Ein indogermanischer Liedtypus in den Gathas", *Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 94 (1940): 399-408, esp. pp. 407 f. See also Molé, *Culte, mythe, et cosmologie*, p. 77 and n. 4.

43. See Lincoln, *Priests, warriors, and cattle*, pp. 72-73, 76-79, and 82-84.

44. asmān az pōst, ud zamīg az gōšt, und kōf az ast, ud urwar az wars i Kūni dēw.

45. Private communication, 23 April 1983.

46. See the discussion in Chapter Two of *Myth, cosmos and society*, from which portions of the present paper are taken.

47. On the crucial importance of sacrifice in the maintenance of social structures in India and Greece respectively, see Madeleine Biardeau in *Le sacrifice dans l'Inde ancienne*, pp. 26-27; and Walter Burkert, *Homo Necans: Interpretation altgriechischer Opferriten und Mythen* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1972), pp. 45-48. On ritual in general in this regard, see the essays collected in Max Gluckman, ed., *Essays on the ritual of social relations* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1962).

48. Lienhardt, *Divinity and experience*, pp. 233-34.

49. ajo vā idam agre vyakramata tasyora iyam abhavat dyauḥ pṛṣṭham / antarikṣam madhyaṃ diśaḥ pārśve samudrau kukṣī //
satyam ca ṛtaṃ ca cakṣuṣī viśvaṃ satyaṃ śraddhā praṇo virāt śiraḥ //
eṣa vā aparimito yajño yad ajaḥ pañcaudanaḥ //

50. The former position is that of Tierney, "The Celtic ethnography of Posidonius", *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy*, Vol. 60, Section C, Number 5 (1960), esp. pp. 222-23. The latter view is that of Nora K. Chadwick, *The Druids* (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1966), which was intended to be a rebuttal of Tierney on this very point. See esp. pp. 45-46, 56-68, and 84-92. Conclusions similar to mine are drawn by Mircea Eliade, "Druids, astronomers, and head-hunters", in *Perennitas: Studi in onore di Angelo Brelich* (Rome: Ateneo, 1980), pp. 173-83.

51. On the connection of the Druids to sacrifice, see Strabo 4.4.5; Diodoros Sikelos 5.31.4; Caesar, *De Bello Gallico* 6.13; Lucan, *Pharsalia* 1.447 ff.; and elsewhere. On their philosophical endeavors, see Strabo 4.4.4; Diodoros Sikelos 5.31.2; Caesar, *De Bello Gallico* 6.14; and the writers of the Alexandrian school such as Hippolytos, *Philosophoumena* 1.22; and Clement of Alexandria, *Stromateis* 1.15.71.

52. Gentes superbae, superstitiosae, aliquando etiam immanes adeo, ut hominem optimam et gratissimam diis victimam crederent. Manent vestigia feritatis iam abolitae, atque ut ab ultimis caedibus temperant, ita nihilominus, ubi devotos altaribus admovere, delibant. Habent tamen et facundiam suam magistrosque sapientiae druidas. Hi terrae mundique magnitudinem et formam, motus coeli ac siderum, et quid dii velint scire profitentur.

Mela is here undoubtedly drawing on Posidonius, to judge from the similarity of this passage to the mention of human sacrifice as the highest ritual of the Druids in Pliny, *Natural History* 30.4, and the list of topics taught by the Druids in Caesar, *Bello Gallico* 6.14.