

MBS TEXTE 91



5. Jahrgang
2008

Thomas Schirrmacher

**Cannibalism and Human
Sacrifice Vinticated?**



Pro mundis

Pro mundis

Table of Contents

Inhaltsverzeichnis

1 Common human knowledge.....	3
2 Is cannibalism a myth?.....	4
3 Nobel Prize winners “offside”	5
4 The researches of Erwin Frank an example.....	7
5 Vindication of cannibalism?	8
6 Cannibalism in the Old Testament?	11
7 Sources for evidence of cannibalism	12
8 Cannibalism and evolution: cannibalism in pre-humans and early humans	13
9 Human sacrifice vindicated?.....	15
10 The widespread incidence of human sacrifice.....	16
11 Christian human sacrifices?	20
Annotation.....	24
The Author.....	30
Impressum	31

Nachdruck aus “Cannibalism and Human Sacrifice Vindicated?”. Christianity and Society 10 (2000) Heft 1, S. 11-17 + Heft 2, S. 4-9, Download unter www.kuyper.org/main/uploads/volume_10_no_1.pdf und www.kuyper.org/main/uploads/volume_10_no_2.pdf

Cannibalism and Human Sacrifice Vindicated?^{1 2}

Thomas Schirrmacher

I Common human knowledge

As far as many are concerned it goes without saying that cannibalism is widespread among so-called primitive people, that early human beings, Teutons and Aztecs similarly fed upon those of their own species, and that cannibalism still exists today. The charge of cannibalism against foreigners is universal and goes back to antiquity.

Of course the charge of cannibalism is not in itself any proof of its existence. Thus, for instance, the African explorer and missionary David Livingstone discovered that almost all blacks were convinced that whites were man-eaters,³ a charge that the first explorers of the River Gambia had countered as early as 1455.⁴ Similarly, the first Christians were suspected by the Romans of being cannibals,⁵ as were the Irish by the Roman historian Strabo and the Scythians by the Greek historian Herodotus.⁶ There are numerous other teachings and assumptions concerning cannibalism, and it is even suggested that cannibalism and war might have accelerated the extinction of peoples involved in them.⁷

But what is cannibalism? The Taschenwörterbuch der Ethnologie [Pocket Dictionary of Ethnology] defines “can-

nibalism” thus: “Ritual consumption of human flesh. Sometimes, but very seldom, cannibalism appears to have been practised with the sole aim of providing sustenance, whether from necessity (cannibalism through hunger) or inclination (sometimes called ‘gastronomic cannibalism’).”⁸

The *Encyclopaedia Britannica* states further:

Cannibalism, also called anthropophagy, is the eating of human flesh by men. The term is derived from a Spanish form of the language of the Carib, a West Indies tribe who were well-known for their practice of cannibalism. A widespread custom going back into early human history, it has been found among peoples on most continents.

Though many early accounts of cannibalism probably were exaggerated or in error, cannibalism is still practiced [sic] in interior New Guinea. It prevailed until recently in parts of West and Central Africa, Melanesia (especially Fiji), Australia, among the Maoris of New Zealand, in some of the islands of Polynesia, among tribes of Sumatra, and in various tribes of North and South America.⁹

Thus the ethnological understanding of cannibalism is not individual cases such as occur from time to time following an accident, when the surviving victims eat the bodies of their dead companions. Still more infrequent are cases in which the victim has actually been murdered for that purpose, as was the case in a spectacular trial in England in 1884.¹⁰

The knowledge of what cannibalism is, and the belief that it is practised by “primitive” tribes throughout the world, is taken for granted by our society. In the scientific field, too, cannibalism seems not to be questioned. Scientific surveys both ancient¹¹ and modern¹² verify the worldwide incidence of this phenomenon.

2 Is cannibalism a myth?

When, in 1979, the New York professor of anthropology William Arens in his book, *The Man-Eating Myth*, presented the public with his view that there had never been such a thing as habitual cannibalism, it seemed at first that this was the untenable opinion of an outsider.

Since then anthropologists and ethnologists have been changing sides in ever increasing numbers, as shown last month in an investigative article in the US journal Science. But the debate about consumption of one's own kind continues. "I believe Arens is right," declared the anthropologist Lyle Stead-

man of Arizona State University, suggesting the reason why the scholar continued to be opposed by those in his own discipline: "He is a real danger to a whole number of anthropologists."¹³

Arens had been asked by his students whether he could not sometimes go into more interesting subjects, such as witchcraft or cannibalism.

Consequently, in preparing for a lecture, I turned to the study of man-eaters, which was eventually transformed into this study of the myth of man-eating. I mention this to make it clear to readers that, like themselves, when I began to think about the subject I was already of the opinion that cannibalism in the past and present was a fairly common phenomenon. The essay which follows is the result of a conversion process.¹⁴

Arens' thesis could not be expressed more plainly: “I am dubious about the actual existence of this act as an accepted practice for any time or place. Recourse to cannibalism under survival conditions or as a rare instance of anti-social behavior is not denied for any culture.”¹⁵

Thus Arens does not rule out the possibility that under certain unusual circumstances humans have eaten human flesh. This is something which he considers possible in any culture. But he fundamentally denies that there are proven incidences of habitual cannibalism, i.e. cannibalism which might have been accepted as an integral part of religion,

culture, warfare or social custom. As a scientist, moreover, he points out that no anthropologist can ever confirm that a practice has never taken place. He can only confirm that there is no proof of its occurrence. And this is also the case with cannibalism.¹⁶ As far as he is concerned all the evidence is inconclusive, so that cannibalism remains unproven. In the light of the fact that thousands of scientists have assumed and continue to assume that there is thousand-fold evidence of cannibalism, this is a very far-reaching thesis to put forward.

Arens sees cannibalism as a myth which in almost all cultures has provided an excuse for blaming other peoples. It is to be found in the case of Herodotus with regard to the barbarians, and similarly Columbus with regard to the Indians, the Spaniards with regard to the Aztecs, colonialists with regard to the “natives” and the latter with regard to whites. Almost everywhere cannibalism constitutes the high point of the moral reprehensibility of the enemy. It gives grounds for a mixture of hatred and fear.

As early as 1874 the African explorer, anthropologist and prominent missionary *David Livingstone* came to a similar conclusion concerning Africa. He travelled through large parts of Africa, among other things in order to find evidence of cannibalism. To his surprise he discovered that there was no evidence which would stand up in a Scottish court, but that on the other hand the blacks were convinced that white men were cannibals.¹⁷ However, Livingstone

was the only missionary to hold this view.¹⁸

Arens has made an exhaustive survey of the sources of cannibalism:

*This conclusion is based on the fact that, excluding survival conditions, I have been unable to uncover adequate documentation of cannibalism as a custom in any form for any society. Rumors, suspicions, fears and accusations abound, but no satisfactory first-hand accounts. Learned essays by professionals are unending, but the sustaining ethnography is lacking. The argument that a critical re-examination is both a necessary and a profitable exercise is based on the premise that cannibalism by definition is an observable phenomenon.*¹⁹

3 Nobel Prize winners “offside”

It should be pointed out here that the fact that different peoples accuse each other of cannibalism is no argument against the existence of cannibalism. A worldwide phenomenon²⁰ can naturally also be used as a worldwide accusation. Back in 1932 a specialist was able to write:

... though the present range of the practice is somewhat restricted, it was much more widespread within even recent times, and there is every probability that all races have, at one period or another, passed through a cannibalistic

*stage, which survived occasionally in ritual or in folk custom, or was remembered in legend or folk tale.*²¹

Even those many examples where the charge of cannibalism is falsely laid mean nothing. Many nations also accuse one another of murder. Does that disprove the existence of murder and genocide?

In Germany *Der Spiegel* has taken upon itself the rôle of spokesman for those who deny the existence of cannibalism:

It would be "beneath his dignity" to involve himself in scientific controversy, angrily stated the American doctor D. Carleton Gadjusek, who had received a Nobel Prize in 1976 for his work on kuru, a brain disease occurring in New Guinea. Gadjusek claimed that the virus, which caused fits of shaking, was located in the victim's brain, and was transmitted through cannibalistic eating habits. Gadjusek had come across the allegedly cannibalistic roots of this disease in the 1950s among the Fore, a tribe native to the mountains of New Guinea. 20 years later, in 1977, Science published photographs from Gadjusek's Nobel Prize dissertation, which were intended to confirm his thesis of systematic consumption of human flesh on the Pacific island. One of the pictures portrayed a victim of this fatal shaking disease. The photo also showed members of the Fore tribe preparing a large amount of meat for a meal. According to the conclusion stated on the caption,

the kuru victim would end up in the hungry stomach of his comrades. The US doctor reacted angrily to scholars who questioned his claim, stating that "the whole of Australia" knew that the Fore were cannibals. Anthropologists who criticized his theory were accused by him of being bound to their desks. If they "got up off their behinds and went to New Guinea," he brusquely informed the doubters, they would be able to find evidence of ritual cannibalism "in hundreds of cases." However, those explorers who followed the Nobel Prize winner's advice came back empty-handed. Lyle Seaman, for example, stayed with the Fore for two years. He was constantly hearing reports of cannibalistic eating rituals, but none of them was reliable. At the end the results drawn by the scientist from his investigations were unequivocal: "There is no trace of man-eating in New Guinea." Gadjusek's own proofs also showed themselves to be untenable. The Fore men in the Science photo who were sitting in front of a mountain of meat were in fact, as the doctor had to admit when questioned, feasting on a pig. On the other hand Gadjusek would not on any account produce authentic photos of a cannibal feast. The reason he gave for his strict ban on this was that members of the tribe would be discriminated against on account of the explosive nature of the material. Since Gadjusek's reports of the alleged cannibalistic practices of the Fore first appeared scientists from numerous countries have made the very difficult journey to research in the

*mountains of New Guinea. It is astonishing enough that, as the Neue Zürcher Zeitung ironically remarked, not one of them concluded his field studies by becoming a meal. It is clear that the idea that human beings could eat their own kind not only in cases of necessity, but as a matter of routine, is universally held as an ineradicable legend about those uncivilised, barbarian "others."*²²

4 The researches of Erwin Frank an example

In 1987 Erwin Frank presented an investigation of sources on the subject of cannibalism in a specific region for the first time in the German language.²³ Frank investigates the sources for the accusation of cannibalism with regard to 14 or 16 peoples of all kinds of languages. He traces every scientific or popular assertion back into the sources, until there is a source which names no other, or even a source which itself turns out to be an eyewitness account. It would take us too long to go over the individual examples. Frank comes across eyewitnesses who were still in Europe at the time of the alleged incident, eyewitnesses who had heard reports in languages which they had never learned, and most of all misinterpretations. Thus it was evident to him that many rituals were the drinking of the cremated ashes of the dead or interment in pots. Both these might have led eyewitnesses to believe they were seeing cannibalism. Frank categorises 5 of the

60 resulting sources as unquestionable. But they refer only to these practices. He categorises 25 sources as totally worthless, while the remaining range between "uncertain" and "extremely doubtful."²⁴

Frank further accuses the explorers and missionaries of always only finding what they had already determined to find.²⁵ In conclusion Frank emphasises: "We must hold on to the fact that with regard to both exocannibalism and endocannibalistic consumption of meat there is only one credible eyewitness account, and only two or three dubious indirect indications of the existence of the latter practice (self-accusation of those involved)."²⁶

In explanation of these facts he writes:

Cannibals who in the light of concrete experience over a period of time turned out to be non-cannibalistic were then more likely to be given as an example of the healthy effect of the contact of these "savages" with their Christian conquerors than evidence that cannibals did not exist. Cannibalism remained an assured element of the generally accepted "knowledge" irrespective of any contemporary experience of an individual case. As a logical possibility cannibalism is ... too compelling to allow space for the hypothesis that the certainty with which we usually regard this practice as an existing (or formerly existing) behaviour pattern of other peoples might lack a basis in fact. But it is possibly the very powerful appeal

*of cannibalism as a logical alternative to non-cannibalism, which cannot actually be proved ... which has made it into a universal theme of not only European fantasy, into an ideal metaphor for being "different," a negative self-definition.*²⁷

In a later article in the anthology *Authentizität und Betrug in der Ethnologie [Authenticity and Deception in Ethnology]* Frank, in a similar way to W. Arens although with completely different arguments, substantiated his thesis that so far no indubitably historical sources of cannibalism have been produced,²⁸ referring to Latin American scientists who had for a long time maintained this thesis. In this Frank again goes over the question of which rituals were misinterpreted as cannibalism by outsiders. It is well-known that these included the Lord's Supper of the first Christians, which many Romans could not understand in any other way. In addition he refers to the political aspect of the accusation of cannibalism. Was not the horror of cannibalism the reason for many a crusade and many a colonial war? He asks: "How many peoples of Central and South America probably owe their reputation of once having been man-eaters ... to the well-known fact that the Spanish crown allowed their overseas governors to engage in hunting free Indians as slaves only if these were cannibals?"²⁹

5 Vindication of cannibalism?

It is certainly salutary if those cases can be revealed in which peoples of this earth have been unjustly charged with cannibalism. It must be questioned, however, whether such examples go so far as to prove that there was never any such thing as habitual cannibalism.

It is also evident in too many places that the criticism of Arens and Frank is essentially linked with their view of Christian mission. Since a majority of the sources stems from the writing of Christian missionaries, and it was taken as read that in many places cannibalism was driven back by Christian influence, the battle against the credibility of the countless sources is predominantly a battle against Christianity.³⁰

It is puzzling that the aforementioned ethnologists and many of their colleagues above all reproach others, in particular Christians and missionaries, for rejecting cannibalism lock, stock and barrel. Instead they try to explain cannibalism, and in so doing to excuse it. As far as they are concerned cannibalism has nothing to do with murder, and no mention is made of the human rights of the victim. It is made out as if the only men to be eaten were those who had already died of themselves, although in most cases of cannibalism the victims are killed, or rather murdered, for the sole purpose of eating them.

Hans Helfritz writes, for instance: "Cannibalism, which of all people the cruel Spanish conquerors described as

‘most extremely horrible’ and regarded as the consequence of the Indians’ heathenism, has long been radically divested by modern psychology of its horror and incomprehensibility.”³¹

Just in order that another religion should not be criticised, it is also absolutely excluded that cannibalism should be called into question. Thus Nigel Davies writes about another researcher: “Ewald Volhard stresses that if there was any such thing as non-ritual cannibalism, then it was an inferior type of ritual man-eating. Therefore such a practice cannot be condemned out of hand without at the same time damning the religion whose rituals were based on it.”³²

Also typical are the vast variety of attempts to explain cannibalism. Michael Harner was right to point out that the Aztec human sacrifices are the focus of interest, while the parallel incidence of cannibalism is seldom mentioned or investigated.³³ It is well-known that the hearts of the victims were cut out and sacrificed to the sun god. It is less well-known what happened to the rest of the body. On the basis of contemporary Spanish sources Harner comes to the conclusion that as a rule arms and legs were eaten.³⁴

But the explanation which Michael Harner has to offer for Aztec cannibalism is both terrible and wrong. Harner, who has made himself a name as an ethnologist,³⁵ has formulated the thesis that human sacrifices are the consequence of population density and lack of protein because of the absence

of domestic animals.³⁶ This is typically evolutionary.

On the other hand it seems that it is thought to be a good thing that cannibalism is in the process of dying out. Christianity is attacked because of its anti-cannibalistic attitude. But it is generally not mentioned that it was this very attitude which caused the retreat of cannibalism.

We find a typical example as long ago as 1932 in J. A. MacCulloch. In dealing with the question of why cannibalism has declined in many places, he discusses every possible theory,³⁷ mentions “the presence of a higher civilization, and especially of a higher religion”,³⁸ refers to the fact that Islam brought an end to cannibalism in North and East Africa, and only at the end, almost in passing, states that: “Christianity, together with other European civilizing influences, has also put an end to it in many parts of S. America, in New Zealand, and many islands of the South Seas, once hotbeds of cannibalism, as well as in large tracts of the African continent.”³⁹

In line with this there is little in the way of memories of cannibalism. In 1977 in New Guinea Queen Elizabeth II received a framework of skulls (an “ariba”) which came from the Goariba Islands, “the only place of which it is known that missionaries there fell victim to cannibals. In 1901 the pastor James Chalmers, his assistant preacher and eleven young Papuan converts were slain.”⁴⁰ The Queen accepted the present without protest,⁴¹ and presented the

framework with its two human skulls to the British Museum in London.⁴² There was never any mention of the fact that this object was clear evidence of murder.

The intervention of the missionaries against cannibalism, human sacrifice and headhunting was in those days considered to be an intervention in support of human rights. Nowadays it is regarded by so-called human rights organizations as being a violation of human rights. Then the rights of the victim were considered most important, now it is the rights of the perpetrator.

Some authors even want to turn things on their head. Thus we read the following in a book by a journalist and an ethnologist, which is striking in its hatred for Christian mission:

*In any case, it was missions which began the process of cultural decline in the primitive peoples ... This is true not only in the breaking of their ancestral chain of succession ... but also in their prohibition of headhunting and cannibalism, a prohibition which to us too seems obvious and humane. But even the prohibition of the inhuman can have effects which are themselves inhuman. Thus in 1950 in her book *Sex and Temperament in Three Primitive Societies* the well-known American anthropologist Margaret Mead reported concerning the Mundugumor, a Papuan tribe of New Guinea, that the prohibition of head-hunting and cannibalism had completely destroyed the essential character of the life of the tribe, "like*

a watch with a broken spring." Thus the incomprehensible nature of such a prohibition for the cannibals and head-hunters stems not only from their own imagination as if someone suddenly forbade us to slaughter and eat pigs and cattle but also from their own experience of us white people.⁴³

So forbidding the slaughter of cattle would be the same as forbidding the slaughter of human beings! What do these ethnologists actually think about the victims? In any case, it was established a long time ago that Mead's researches were nothing but wishful thinking. Mead found what she wanted to find, and in so doing completely misunderstood the harsh reality of the tribe she was studying.⁴⁴

Accordingly the authors agree with the decision of an Australian judge who acquitted headhunters, when they pointed out to him that there was no difference between tribal feuds and the wars of the western world.⁴⁵ How right they are! And since the authors would probably condemn any war of aggression, they ought also condemn and punish tribal feuds. Will the next thing be the justification of murder before a court, by reference to the existence of wars? Would the authors also have been minded to maintain National Socialism in existence, because the Nazi culture would be destroyed if they were forbidden to kill Jews and other opponents? A culture which makes murder essential to its existence will, according to biblical teaching, inevitably die. "For all they

that take the sword shall perish with the sword" (Mt. 26:52).

But back to the book we have chosen as our example:

It was, however, only in the nineteenth century that the inhabitants of the Fiji archipelago gained the dubious reputation of being particularly terrible cannibals. This reputation was spread by missionaries, who were not exactly delighted by the persistent resistance of the islanders to the scarcely convincing examples of Christian "gentleness and tolerance." However we know also, dating from the year 1847, the statement of an old Fijian chief that the bloody wars and constant cannibalism were recent, and had not been known to such an extent in the time of his youth. The sacral cannibalism of ancient times had turned, as a result of the campaigns to eradicate the tribes, into unrestrained man-eating that was the observation and conclusion of contemporaries on the spot.⁴⁶

What sort of argument is that? Nineteenth century cannibalism was not so bad, because earlier it was not so widespread and had a religious basis! Not only that, but an example like this contradicts the evolutionary view of cannibalism. Cannibalism is not necessarily the early stage of a culture, but can also take shape only at a much later stage.

There was also human sacrifice and cannibalism after the Second World War.⁴⁷ In New Guinea the cannibalism described by Fredrik Barth⁴⁸ did not come to an end until Australian police

patrols occupied the inaccessible areas in the interior of the islands in 1964.⁴⁹

6 Cannibalism in the Old Testament?

In this connection every Bible-believing Christian will naturally be interested in the question of whether cannibalism is known to the Old Testament, or at least whether it speaks of such peoples. The answer to this question is surprising:

(1) Cannibalism is known to the Old Testament. But nowhere is another nation blamed for this cannibalism, as we have discovered throughout history. It is always the nation of the Jews itself which is the target. The Old Testament does not need to ascribe to other nations things which they have not done or at least reject.

(2) Cannibalism is never regarded as normal or right, but is always seen as the worst kind of transgression. This is the view even of apostate kings:

In Lev. 26:29 (see vv. 27–29) and Dt. 28:53 and 57 (see vv. 53–57) one of the high points of God's judgment on the people's transgression of the law is declared to be that women will eat the flesh of their own children. The fulfillment of both declarations is to be found in Lam. 2:20 and 4:10 and in 2 Kings 6:28f. (see vv. 25–30). Here, too, it is only a matter of mothers eating their children in the course of a dramatic famine. In 2 Kings 6:25–30 even the

king, who himself does not keep the law, is terrified when he learns of it. In Ezk. 5:10 we are told that as a judgment “the fathers shall eat the sons” and “the sons shall eat their fathers,” which could however also be understood as a general description of mutual killing. In Jer. 19:9 similarly there is a general description: “And I will cause them to eat the flesh of their sons and the flesh of their daughters, and they shall eat every one the flesh of his friend in the siege ...”

In Ezk. 36:13f we read about Israel restored by the Spirit: “Thus saith the Lord God: Because they say unto you, Thou land devourest up men, and hast bereaved thy nations; Therefore thou shalt devour men no more, neither bereave thy nations any more, saith the Lord God.” It is not clear whether the text is to be understood figuratively or not. In any case, here as always in the Old Testament cannibalism is linked to those belonging to its own people. This is significant in the light of the previously described situation where cannibalism was always an accusation made by one nation against another.

So in the Old Testament cannibalism is not tolerated, but features as one of the principal characteristics of a perverse society. It is always the people themselves who are involved in such transgression in circumstances of most severe famine. It is typical of the Old Testament, which condemns other nations in the sharpest terms and places them under the judgment of God, that it directs the charge of cannibalism,

and we do not mean cannibalism that is encouraged and approved, only against its own people.⁵⁰

7 Sources for evidence of cannibalism

Astrid Wendt, in the first part of her Tübingen ethnological dissertation on the historical sources for cannibalism in Brazil,⁵¹ examines the portrayal of the ritual cannibalism of the Brazilian Indians in Italian, Portuguese, German, English and Dutch sources from the period from 1500 to 1654. The writer brings out clearly the varying interests of the different European nations, but (rightly) considers the numerous records of and references to cannibalism to be fundamentally credible.

Particularly interesting is the second part of the study, dealing with allegorical portrayals of America in carvings, atlases and travelogues of the same period, with illustrations reproduced in a comprehensive appendix. It is evident that the portrayal of cannibalism was part of the archetypal European portrayal of America.

Compared with the excellent portrayal of the actual material, the introduction and conclusion, which deal with the problem of cannibalism in general, seem to me to be weak, only referring to what every ethnologist must and does know about cannibalism. (Incidentally, to assume a “relationship in terms of ideas” between cannibalism

and Eucharist,⁵² without going into it any further, seems to me to be somewhat out of place.)

Wendt's final verdict entirely contradicts that of Arens and Frank:⁵³

The fact that ritual cannibalism is mentioned and in some cases described in detail by all the writers, whatever their nationality, status, or relationship to the indigenous people, leads to the conclusion that this sort of anthropophagy did indeed exist. This is all the more probable when even those authors whose aim it was to portray the way of life of the Brazilians as an example to be followed (even for Europeans) describe cannibalistic rites of this sort.⁵⁴

The most significant German source is undoubtedly the account of 1556–1557 by Hans Staden,⁵⁵ who gives an eye-witness description “in sensational richness of detail of the events which eventually reached their climax in the consumption of the slain.”⁵⁶ So it is that D. Forsyth made use of Staden as a powerful argument against William Arens, and produced a detailed rejection of Arens' criticism of Staden.⁵⁷

Staden, a peasant from Hessen⁵⁸ who was born between 1525 and 1528, served under Portuguese and Spaniards throughout the world. In about 1553 in Brazil he was captured by the Tupinamba. Before being ransomed over a year later by some Frenchmen, he had the opportunity to witness at first hand every aspect of the ritual of cannibalism. All attempts to discredit this witness⁵⁹

may be regarded as having failed.⁶⁰ In addition, Astrid Wendt has pointed out that Staden, although a convinced Protestant, was not in the position of a spiritual or colonial leader (he was, after all, a German peasant) who had an interest in portraying the Indians in a particularly negative light.⁶¹ On the contrary, he was surprised by the kind treatment he received as a prisoner:

First he had to submit to the ritual which was required of him as a future human sacrifice. It was only by feigning toothache that he succeeded in escaping the jaws of death. This prevented him from eating, and made him too skinny to be worth putting in the cookpot. He went on to make some shrewd predictions, and in this way attained the status of a tribal oracle, and from then on was too valuable to be killed.⁶²

8 Cannibalism and evolution: cannibalism in pre-humans and early humans

Anyone venturing to say anything about cannibalism will also be required to say something about the cannibalism of the alleged pre-humans and early humans.⁶³ Cannibalism in pre- and early humans or the links between animal and human is, for many, something which goes without saying.⁶⁴ Yet all the discoveries can either only verify the fact that those of the same species died or were killed, or else that the flesh of those who had just been killed was

cut off. The prominent prehistorian and evolutionary scholar K. J. Narr emphatically rejects these assertions:

These findings have in part been connected with cannibalism; but such an assumption can neither be directly deduced from the findings, nor be supported by ethnological analogies taken from cultures which are in some way structurally comparable ... And other putative instances of man-eating are at best ambiguous. That applies not least to findings relating to “Australopithecines,” to whom at the same time cannibalism and a “particular interest in the skull” were ascribed, although it is more likely that the smashing up and distribution of skeletal parts was the work of predatory and scavenging animals. Cannibalism as a “distinguishing” characteristic of early man which elevates him above the animals together with the consequent anthropological conclusions about the removal of inhibitions etc. remains, despite its constant repetition, a conjecture without any real foundation.⁶⁵

He goes on to explain in detail the most often quoted discoveries:

The question of cannibalism is linked with that of intentional killing; but “intra-species killing” does not constitute proof of anthropophagy. The discovery of Chukutien, where Peking Man was found, cannot be regarded as evidence, because there it was almost entirely skull-tops which were discovered (four of them in a stratum which contains almost nothing else: there

seems to be no secular explanation of their being set down there). If it was a matter of remains of a meal, then the victims must have been consumed elsewhere and their skulls brought later to this store-place: the assumption of cannibalism in this case is arbitrary and unnecessary. The incompleteness of the skeletons, a feature which is mentioned with enthusiasm in respect of other sites, can be ascribed to the activities of predatory or scavenging animals; and the fairly frequent occurrence of individual skulls or parts of skulls can be explained either in this way or by other reasons for their being deposited. (The best evidence is a skull from a cave in Italy, which lay inside a circle of stones and bones.) The most ancient showpiece of Old Stone Age man-eating is the discoveries made in Krapina (Croatia), where fragments of skulls and other bones together with the remains of animals lay, partly burned and randomly distributed, in the stratum, something which can be entirely explained by digging-up of graves, biting into pieces by scavenging animals, penetration into new excavation strata, and the like.⁶⁶

In parentheses Narr adds the real reason for the attempt to discover cannibalism in evolutionary precursors to man: “It is basically older than the discoveries and essentially relies upon an outdated evolutionary reconstruction of the history of civilization.”⁶⁷

Here we might draw attention to the real problem, which is that Narr merely substitutes another evolutionary recon-

struction for the old one, whereas I see in this problem a general criticism of any attempt at evolutionary reconstruction. The quest for primitive man, occupying a lower level of culture, provided fruitful ground for every rumour of cannibalism. By going on to assume that the “primitive” tribes of the world occupied the same level as pre-humans and early humans, it was possible with the aid of ethnological investigations to reconstruct the everyday scene of early man. (This gains popular expression in such sensational reports as “With the Stone Age men of Brazil.”) It was a short step from this to the cannibalism of pre-humans and early humans. Even if this comparison was only openly shared by a few, its results are still often encountered at an unconscious level.

In fact, however, there is not only no proof of the evolution of mankind, but also no special connection between the evolution of man and cannibalism. J. A. MacCulloch points out that “the worst forms of cannibalism”⁶⁸ are to be found not among the people on the lowest cultural level, but among people “with a certain amount of culture.”⁶⁹

9 Human sacrifice vindicated?

The phenomenon to which we have already referred, whereby the bias against the Christian religion not only rejects out of hand as incredible innumerable Christian sources—and which

sources until the century before last were not in some measure Christian?—but also in consequence takes under its wing cannibalism as something which is not reprehensible and which can be explained in terms of religion and culture,⁷⁰ becomes much more evident in dealing with the example of human sacrifice.

Let us take an example. According to the ethnologist Michelle Zimbalist, among the Ingolots of New Guinea the last beheading in the context of head-hunting took place in 1972.⁷¹ Nigel Davies comments: “The anthropologist declares that the killing was of a purely ritual nature, and not influenced by politics.”⁷² So a ritual, religious killing is not bad, whereas a political one would be. The ethical system capable of making judgments of this nature is not revealed to us.

Friedrich Schwenn writes similarly concerning the ancient human sacrifices, for which he puts forward many explanations,⁷³ “that the human sacrifices were by no means the result of cruelty or anthropophagy.”⁷⁴

Against this view, the folklorist K. Beth objects:

The fact that human sacrifices may be the result of sheer cruelty is adequately witnessed by such incidences of cruel slaughter of human beings as those carried out by Nero. But in general they are so strongly linked to a ritual religious observance that both their origin and their continuance find their psycho-

*logical explanation in the most diverse forms of heathen religion which share a particular attitude to faith.*⁷⁵

The professor of ethnology Hanns J. Prem writes: “Meanwhile the view of life which motivates human sacrifices has been increasingly understood.”⁷⁶

In this “understanding,” naturally the theory of evolution plays an important rôle.⁷⁷

This understanding constantly leads to special treatment of Indian tribes and other groups when it is a question of deeds of violence. This is true of the once very warlike Kaiapos in Brazil. Chief Paulinhi Paiacan, formerly a shining example for the Brazilian Indians and the environmentalists, lost his reputation first through his involvement in multi-million-pound industries in mahogany, gold and chestnut oil, and finally as a result of his rape of an 18-year-old girl.⁷⁸ He refuses to give himself up to the authorities. He said, “I despise the law of the white man,”⁷⁹ and because of this he does not consider them to apply to him. His tribe, the Kaiapos, supports him, so that the government is undecided what it should do. Finally, the tribe is known to be very warlike, and in 1981 was responsible for the massacre of twenty farmworkers. Anyone who does not lend his support to Paiacan is regarded as having antiquated ideas. But the fact is constantly overlooked that this is a matter of a violent crime, and protection is enjoyed only by the surviving protagonists, not their victims. And it has long

been proved that these victims suffer, fight for their rights, and have need of state protection just as much as in other cultures.⁸⁰

10 The widespread incidence of human sacrifice

Let us now turn briefly to the distribution of incidences of human sacrifice. Human sacrifices were spread throughout the world.⁸¹ This is especially true of the particular form of the sacrifice of human beings on the occasion of the laying of a foundation stone: “The building sacrifice is a custom to be found throughout the whole world, and among people of every stage of culture ... Doubtless the original building sacrifices were men who were entombed alive in the foundations of the building. In this case the sacrifice of children is remarkably common.”⁸²

Unlike cannibalism, human sacrifice is widespread, and not restricted to particular cultures. “There are only a few races and a few religions with a history which is free of human sacrifices.”⁸³

At the same time its existence is constantly covered up. “It is an essential feature of religious historical writing that mention of human sacrifices is suppressed. Nonetheless the fact that they frequently took place is undisputed.”⁸⁴

The world-wide incidence of human sacrifice can be demonstrated by a number of examples from history.

Greeks and Romans: We may begin our collection of examples with the human

sacrifices of the Greeks⁸⁵ and Romans:⁸⁶ “When we take into account all the works of art of our literature which deal with human sacrifices, together with the sagas of classical antiquity, human sacrifices constitute a relatively not insignificant proportion of our intellectual property.”⁸⁷

In the case of the Romans it was only the spread of Christianity which brought an end to human sacrifices: “Cæsar Commodus (180–192 a.d.), for instance, killed human beings in rites which belonged to the cult of Mithras. This had become very popular in Rome, before Christianity became the official religion.”⁸⁸

Certain human sacrifices were forbidden for the first time by the Roman Senate in 97 b.c., but it is not clear which human sacrifices these were. Cæsar Augustus forbade Roman citizens to take part in human sacrifices. Not until Cæsar Claudius was the ban made universal. Then under later emperors it was included in the *corpus iuris*, the imperial legal code.⁸⁹ “But it was difficult to get rid of something which had once been a living faith.”⁹⁰

America: A well-attested example is that of the “human sacrifices of the Skidi-Pawnees, formerly inhabitants of Nebraska.”⁹¹ The last human sacrifice took place in 1838.⁹² The sacrifices were well-known, because in 1817 and 1818 a chieftain and his son Petalesharro prevented two human sacrifices.⁹³ In 1827 an Indian agent succeeded in obtaining the freedom of a captured Cheyenne girl.⁹⁴ In 1838 for the last time men

lost their lives in trying to escape from sacrifice at the hands of the Skidi-Pawnees.⁹⁵

In the case of North America it is, however, essentially true that “Among North American Indian cultures evidence of human sacrifices is less easy to find.”⁹⁶

Africa: In Africa human sacrifices were specially widespread in connection with the burial of kings. Just to give one example: “The Barundi slaughtered vast numbers of men, so that the spirit of the king should not seek vengeance; even many a leading Barundi was killed in order to calm down the king’s courtiers.”⁹⁷

China: At the death of many Chinese emperors various servants, wives and concubines, soldiers or members of the royal household had also to die.⁹⁸

Incas: The sun maidens were chosen throughout the whole kingdom at the age of ten years. They were brought up in their own convents, either to become brides of the sun god, or else to become wives and concubines of the officials. The Inca was the only man allowed to enter the convent at any time, in order to select concubines for his harem. It was also he alone who decided whom they should marry, presenting the sun maidens as a mark of honour to officials, artists and others.⁹⁹ “Human sacrifices were much more rare among the Incas than among their well-known contemporaries in Mexico, the Aztecs. In Tahuanti-suyu humans were sacrificed above all when the health of the ruler or the success of a military cam-

paign was at stake, or with a view to averting an epidemic and driving it out of the country.”¹⁰⁰

*Aztecs:*¹⁰¹ The best-known human sacrifices in history are doubtless the human sacrifices of the Aztecs, which we have already referred to in connection with cannibalism.

*The scale of human sacrifice is appalling. Some 70–80,000 victims were sacrificed at the dedication of the main pyramid in Tenochtitlan in 1487. Whereas earlier estimates had pointed to an average annual sacrifice of about 15,000 human victims in central Mexico (out of a population of two million), recent population estimates push the total as high as 25 million, and suggest that as many as 250,000, one percent of the total population were sacrificed each year.*¹⁰²

This involved above all the offering of the heart: “The Mesoamerican human sacrifices were mainly carried out by the excision of the heart.”¹⁰³

The Latin-Americanologist and journalist Patrick Tierney underwent great dangers to unearth contemporary evidence for human sacrifice in the Andes.¹⁰⁴ He states that the authorities and judiciary seek to ignore the problem.

Teutons:¹⁰⁵ In the case of the Teutons, human sacrifices were the highest sacrifices offered to almost all the important gods: “So the most important and highest sacrifices are human sacrifices: there are numerous testimonies to their being offered to Zeus, Woden, Donar, Odin,

Thor, Freyr, Foiste, Thorgerd and Hölgabrud.”¹⁰⁶

First of all by way of evidence we have archaeological discoveries. The well-known marsh corpses may well, for instance, have been closely connected with human sacrifices.¹⁰⁷ In addition there are many descriptions by Roman and other authors. Friedrich Schwenn summarises the report of Tacitus, generally regarded as reliable, in his *Germania*:¹⁰⁸ “Among the Teutons in spring-time the priest of the Nerthus would drive the goddess’s carriage, bedecked with hangings, through the land, and everywhere there were joyful feasts in the amphictyony. After that the carriage was washed in the holy lake, and the servants who had been involved in the ceremony were drowned.”¹⁰⁹

R. L. M. Derolez outlines Strabo’s reliable account:

For which god the extremely gruesome human sacrifice was intended, which Strabo ascribes to the Cimri, this author does not tell us. But he gives a precise account of the ceremony: “The women who went into battle with the men were led by priestesses who could foretell the future. These priestesses were grey-haired women robed in white garments ... With sword in hand they marched through the camp towards the prisoners of war, crowned them with wreaths, and led them to a bronze cauldron with a capacity of about twenty bucketsful. By the side of this cauldron there stood a ladder. They climbed up it, cut the throat of each prisoner of war

as he was passed up to them. According to the way in which the blood flowed into the cauldron, they prophesied the future. Others cut up the bodies of the prisoners of war, and after examining their entrails declared in a loud voice that their people would win the victory.”¹¹⁰

Wolfgang Golther mentions another Teutonic custom which lacks none of the cruelty of the Aztecs’ practice of excising the heart: “The cruel Nordic custom of the cutting of the blood eagle, whereby the victor would cleave his opponent’s ribs asunder with his sword the length of the spine, and remove the lungs through the opening thus formed, was a cultic act.”¹¹¹

Sometimes the victims could be prominent people, even though it was mainly prisoners of war and criminals who were sacrificed by the Teutons: “Thus the Swedes sacrificed Olaf, their king, to Odin in order to obtain a good year.”¹¹²

In 743 at the Synod of Liftinae (Belgium), presided over by Boniface, the still performed practice of human sacrifice was forbidden.¹¹³ But for a long time after that building sacrifices and the walling up of children remained common practice.¹¹⁴ In Oldenburg children were offered in building sacrifices as late as the seventeenth century.¹¹⁵

It is always the introduction of Christianity which spells the end for human sacrifices. Thus it is stated of the Normans: “The practice of human sacrifice continued unabated among the Nor-

mans, until in the tenth century they were converted to Christianity.”¹¹⁶

And concerning Iceland we are told: “On the occasion of the introduction of Christianity to Iceland, at the Althing in the year 1000, the heathen offered to their idols two men from each quarter of the country. In contrast the Christians decided to dedicate the same number of men of excellence and ability to the service of the Lord.”¹¹⁷

However, this rôle of Christianity is not always appreciated. Thus Nigel Davies writes quite “neutrally”: “Human sacrifice in the conventional sense will doubtless disappear, as forms of Western culture penetrate to every corner of the world.”¹¹⁸

In reality the abolition of human sacrifices was mostly the result of the courageous intervention by men wishing to introduce Christian standards or justice and order. Anyone who criticises this once again forgets about the countless innocent victims, only for the sake of not offending some religion and culture. But something which is based on human sacrifices and murder has no right to exist, however religious and respectable the justification for it may be made out to be. This is something which everyone, even down to the researcher, will at last realise when he is himself cast in the rôle of the victim.

From the thirteenth century a.d. at the latest, when for the first time a Sultan had a thousand of them incarcerated in Delhi, the Thugs (“stranglers”) in India offered sacrificial victims to the cruel goddess Kali, whereby they were

throttled (strangled) in an extensive ritual involving a noose. The thousands of victims were hunted down in a series of raids. It was not until 1799 that the British became suspicious, but despite this very few “stranglers” were captured before 1830. Eventually Captain William Sleeman was commissioned to put an end to the evil which continued to claim thousands of innocent victims each year. By 1837 Sleeman had captured 8,000 of the about 10,000 “stranglers,” each of whom had killed up to 250 people. When in 1876 the future King Edward VII visited India Thuggerly had been destroyed, and all he could do was speak to an old Thug in prison.¹¹⁹

The burning of widows (called “suttee,” literally “faithful wife”), i.e. the cremation of wives on the occasion of their husband’s death, in India was also gradually restricted by the English. It is true that they at first tolerated this ritual, which Alexander the Great had discovered in the Punjab in 326 b.c., contenting themselves with official registration of the cases, but they finally made up their minds in 1829 to forbid the burning of widows. But in those regions of India not directly under the control of the English the importance of the prince continued to be measured by the number of wives who were cremated at his burial.¹²⁰

In contrast to this there were always those researchers and ethnologists who spoke out against the abolition of human sacrifices, for the sake of maintaining the previously existing culture.

The English explorer Sir Richard Burton was opposed to the abolition of a mass sacrifice which took place in an annual ceremony involving 500 to 1,000 victims in order to produce a medicine in Dahomey (West Africa), because this would amount to destroying the land.¹²¹ Is the maintenance of the culture more important than the protection of human life? Ought one equally to have maintained at any price the National Socialist culture, which similarly cast its spell over millions of people?

II Christian human sacrifices?

The main Old Testament report concerns the heathen human and child sacrifices to Moloch, if one leaves out of account the fact that the king of the Moabites sacrificed his son before the eyes of the Israelites, at which the Israelites were so infuriated and shocked that they immediately departed from the battlefield (2 Kings 3:27).

The word Moloch (or Melech, Melek, Malik) meaning king, is a misvocalization of the name of a pagan, the consonants of king being retained and the vowels of shame used. Human sacrifices were made to this god, who is identified with the god of Ammon in 1 Kings 11:7, 33. There are references to Moloch in Jeremiah 49:1, 3; Amos 1:13–15; Zephaniah 1:5; Leviticus 18:21; 20:2–5; II Kings 23:10; Jeremiah 32:35, etc., and

the location of Moloch worship in Israel was the Valley of Hinnom (Jer. 32:35; II Kings 23:10). Moloch worship was not limited to Ammon.

Moloch is “the king” or “kingship.” The name of Moloch is also given as Milcom (I Kings 11:5, 7, 33) and Malmam (Jer. 49:1, 3, RV; Zeph. 1:5). Moloch was an aspect of Baal (Jer. 32:35), Baal meaning lord. Under the name of Melcarth, king of Tyre, Baal was worshipped with human sacrifices at Tyre.¹²²

Children passed through the fire,¹²³ which resulted in their death (2 Kings 16:3; 21:6; Ezk. 16:20f). This happened especially in the Valley of Ben Hinnom (Jer. 7:31; 19:5) near Jerusalem, which consequently became a name for hell (Heb. “gehenna”). Named as the gods which received these child sacrifices were Moloch (Lev. 18:32; 20:2; 2 Kings 23:10; Jer. 32:35; 1 Kings 11:7; Zeph. 1:5), “Baal” (Jer. 19:5; 32:35), and “idols” in general (Ezk. 23:37; 16:20f). To make children pass through the fire counted as a particularly reprehensible combination of murder and idolatry, which was therefore subject to the death penalty (Dt. 18:10; Lev. 20:2–5).

It has long become the practice to “discover” numerous human sacrifices by the Israelites themselves, with the obvious purpose of undermining the idea that the biblical faith has contributed throughout the world to the stemming of the practice of human sacrifice.¹²⁴ In connection with the human sacrifices in the Andes Patrick Tierney

refers to alleged parallels to be found in the Old Testament and in Christendom.¹²⁵ Moloch, the offering of Isaac, various prophecies and not least the Supper instituted by Jesus are made to serve as evidence of the suppressed desire for human sacrifice. Moloch? Yes, Moloch, however unlikely that sounds. Tierney writes: “It is true that Moloch has been stylized as one of the greatest demons of Judaeo-Christian literature, but there are conclusive proofs that this Moloch was in fact far from being a demon, but simply the name for child sacrifices to Yahweh.”¹²⁶

It is biblical criticism which makes this possible! Moloch, the embodiment of all that is evil, whose place of sacrifice near Jerusalem became the source of the biblical concept of “hell,” was allegedly none other than the Creator God Yahweh himself. Sometimes one has the feeling that historical-critical research means nothing other than that everything was exactly the opposite of what it appears to be. In reality, Tierney’s observation constitutes nothing less than the worst of blasphemies, uttered in the name of science.

Paul Volz¹²⁷ includes under the heading of human sacrifices in the Old Testament the redemption of the first-born in Ex. 34:19; 13:12f; etc.; the offering of Isaac in Gen. 22; the offering of Jephthah’s daughter in Judg. 11:34f; as well as 2 Sam. 21:9; 1 Kings 16:34; Ps. 106:37; Mic. 6:7; and mixes these up together with the human sacrifices to Baal and other heathen gods in Jer. 3:24; Ps. 106:38; 2 Kings 3:27.

Undoubtedly the favourite parallels are those of the redemption of the first-born¹²⁸ and the offering of Isaac, which from the viewpoint of the biblical critics allegedly naturally had its origin in an actual human sacrifice.¹²⁹

Friedrich Schwenn even understands the crucifixion as a human sacrifice: "This is how a practice of heathenism or of unenlightened Jewish religion was spiritualized."¹³⁰ But he has to go on: "Since then there has been no more offering of animal, or indeed human, sacrifices anywhere where faith in Christ really influenced the whole of a nation. But the spiritual powers which it sought to suppress all too often remained clandestinely alive, and often enough Christianity was only outwardly the victor."¹³¹

There has been a long tradition of anti-Semitism, according to which the Jews were allegedly "committed to ritual murder"¹³² on the basis of the law. Even the Romans accused both Jews¹³³ and Christians¹³⁴ of offering human sacrifices, which in fact they themselves practised.

But let us now turn to the particular texts and accounts which are put forward in support of human sacrifices in the Old Testament.

In 1 Kings 16:34 it is merely stated that, in fulfilment of Joshua's curse in Jos. 6:26, that anyone who rebuilt Jerusalem would lose his oldest and youngest son, and in fact two sons of Hiel did die. There is no question of human sacrifices, even if it had involved a Canaanite sacrifice. For Hiel to lose

his sons through human sacrifice would probably not have been understood as a curse, whereas the undesired loss of his children was.

In Mic. 6:7f. God replies to the question whether human sacrifice would be acceptable (Mic. 6:7), that man knows what is good and is required, i.e. to practise justice, mercy and humility (Mic. 6:8). Jer. 7:31; 19:5 *state expressly that God has never commanded that the first-born should be actually sacrificed.*

In Ps. 106:37 it is reported that the Israelites sacrificed their children "to demons," because they worshipped the idols of the heathen. Here the divine criticism of human sacrifices is clearly spelt out. In 2 Sam. 21:9 we have only the report of the carrying out of the death penalty. It is only by importing a mysterious background that any human sacrifice can be suspected here.

It is often questioned whether the judge Jephthah in Judg. 11:31–39 is described as actually having sacrificed and killed his daughter. In Judg. 11:31 Jephthah makes a vow that if victory is obtained the first person who then meets him "shall surely be the Lord's, and I will offer it up as a burnt offering." In the event the first to meet him after the victory is his only child, his daughter (Judg. 11:34), and he says to her: "You have brought me very low. You are among those who trouble me!" (Judg. 11:35). The result was that his family had to become extinct. The daughter keeps the vow made by her father, and consequently a lament is sung for her each year (Judg. 11:39f). But she asks

for “two months” to “bewail [her] virginity” (Judg. 11:37, repeated in Judg. 11:38). Judg. 11:39 goes on to report the fulfilment of the vow: “and he carried out his vow with her *which he had vowed. She knew no man.*” Does this mean that he offered his daughter as a “burnt offering”? That this was not the case is indicated¹³⁵ by the fact that the text speaks of a burnt offering before the Lord, which would have been a sacrifice on the altar of the Tabernacle. In addition the Tabernacle was in Shiloh, in the territory of the Ephraimites, with whom Jephthah was in dispute, so he would have been unable to go to Shiloh. But above all, the fulfilment of the vow excludes its being understood as a sacrifice of the daughter on the altar of Yahweh. How would the vow then be fulfilled? The text states: “and he carried out his vow with her *which he had vowed. She knew no man*” (Judg. 11:39). Thus the vow involved the daughter not knowing a man throughout her lifetime, thus remaining celibate and being entirely consecrated to the Lord (“*shall surely be the Lord’s*”). That makes sense of the daughter wanting to bewail her “virginity.” You don’t bewail your virginity because you are to die as a virgin, but because you have to live as a virgin. In addition, Jephthah was a God-fearing man (Judg. 11:11), who knew the books of Moses (Judg. 11:15–18). For this military campaign and this vow “*the Spirit of the Lord came upon*” him (Judg. 11:29). All this makes it unlikely that here he commits one of the greatest crimes of Israelite history, which is what the sacrifice of a child to the Lord

would have been. James Jordan makes the assumption that Jephthah wanted to set up a hereditary royal dynasty in opposition to the will of God, and this God prevented through the vow, whereby his daughter did not marry and therefore could not bear an heir to the throne.¹³⁶

In the case of the *offering of Isaac*, which was commanded by God (Gen. 22:1–19), it must be very clearly emphasised that it did not in fact take place, which is evidenced by the fact that the historical figure of Isaac continued the history of Israel. The “offering of Isaac” was indeed a foreshadowing of the sacrifice of Jesus, the only Son of God. Isaac could not have taken away the guilt of mankind, which only the later descendant (“seed”) of Abraham, Jesus Christ, was able to do.

*The only actual sacrifice of a human being according to the will of God is the death of Jesus.*¹³⁷ And this does not apply to the Lord’s Supper, which is not a repetition of the sacrifice, but a remembrance of it. In the first place it must certainly be established that Jesus was killed by those who opposed him, who on that account rendered themselves liable to punishment. No human being is, or ever will be, called upon to offer human sacrifice. God used the death of his Son at the hands of his enemies in a way which cannot be explained to provide atonement for sin. By human sacrifice we normally understand something quite different, i.e. that human beings sacrifice a human being to God. Even in the case of the crucifixion, there can be no question of that. C&S

Annotation

Anmerkungen

¹ Translated from the German by Peter Beale.

² Reprint of “Ehrenrettung von Kannibalismus und Menschenopfer? 1. Teil,” *Factum* 6/1994: pp. 46–50 and “Ehrenrettung von Kannibalismus und Menschenopfer? 2. Teil,” *Factum* 7 and 8/1994: pp. 36–41. This contribution represents a thoroughgoing revision of my partly retracted article “Die Kannibalen: Mythen der Wissenschaft 1,” *Factum* 5/1988: pp. 184–188.

³ Cf. David Livingstone, *The Last Journal of David Livingstone in Central Africa from 1865 to his Death*, ed. Horace Waller, vol. 2 (London: John Murray).

⁴ Charles Verlinden, Eberhard Schmitt (ed.), *Die mittelalterlichen Ursprünge der europäischen Expansion*, Dokumente zur Geschichte der europäischen Expansion 1 (Munich: C.H. Beck, 1986), pp. 300–303.

⁵ Cf. Friedrich Schwenn, *Die Menschenopfer bei den Griechen und Römern*, Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten 15/3 (Giessen: A. Töpelmann, 1915), pp. 193–195; Hans Dieter Stöver, *Christenverfolgung im Römischen Reich: Ihr Hintergründe und Folgen* (Düsseldorf: Econ, 1982), p. 86 et passim. Cf. also the examples below of ethnologists bracketting together cannibalism and the Lord’s Supper, thereby indirectly removing blame from antiquity.

⁶ Cf. the examples given by Erwin Frank. “Sie fressen Menschen, wie ihr scheußliches Aussehen beweist ...” (“*They eat human beings, as their hideous appearance indicates ...*”): Kritische Überlegungen zu Zeugen und Quellen der Menschenfresserei,” pp. 199–224 in: Hans Peter Duerr (ed.), *Authentizität und Betrug in der Ethnologie* (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1987), pp. 200–203.

⁷ Contrary to this e.g. Herbert Tischner (ed.), *Völkerkunde*, Das Fischer Lexicon 13 (Frankfurt: Fischer Taschenbuch-Verlag, 1959), p. 282.

⁸ Michel Panoff, Michel Perrin, *Taschenwörterbuch der Ethnologie* (Berlin: Dietrich Reimer Verlag, 19822), p. 155.

⁹ “Cannibalism,” p. 511f. in *Encyclopedia Britannica*, vol. II (of 30 vols) (Chicago/London: Encyclopedia Britannica Inc., 198215) (9th Edition).

¹⁰ A.W. Brian Simpson, *Cannibalism and the Common Law: The Story of the Tragic Last Voyage of the Mignonette and the Strange Legal Proceedings to Which it Gave Rise* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984).

¹¹ E.g. Richard Andree, *Die Anthropologie: Eine ethnographische Studie* (Leipzig: Verlag von Veit, 1887); P. Bergemann, *Die Verbreitung der Anthropologie über die Erde und Ermittlung einiger Wesenszüge dieses Brauches: Eine ethnographisch-ethnologische Studie* (Bunzlau: G. Kreuschmer, 1893); Rudolf S. Steinmetz, “Endokannibalismus,” *Mitteilungen der Anthropologischen Gesellschaft in Wien* 26/NF16 (1896), pp. 1–60; Ewald Volhard, *Kannibalismus*, Studien zur Kulturkunde 5 (Stuttgart: Strecker und Schröder, 1939) (although he has the remarkable theory that cannibalism stems from “identification with the plants” [p. 485]); as well as from the years 1884/1887 (see Erwin Frank ... y se lo comen: *Kritische Studie der Schriftquellen zum Kannibalismus der panosprachiger Indianer Ost-Perus und Brasiliens*, *Mundus Reihe Ethnologie* 7 (Bonn: Mundus, 1987) XXVIII), or from the year 1939 (see Annegret Nippa, “Nahrung,” pp. 145–149 in Bernhard Streck [ed.], *Wörterbuch der Ethnologie* [Cologne: Du Mont Buchverlag, 1987], p. 146).

¹² E.g. Peggy Reeves Sanday, *Divine Hunger: Cannibalism as a Cultural System* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986); Reay Tannahill, *Fleisch und Blut: Eine Kulturgeschichte des Kannibalismus* (Munich: W. Goldmann, 1979); Christian Spiel, *Menschen essen Menschen: Die Welt der Kannibalen* (Munich: C. Bertelsmann, 1972); Garry Hogg, *Cannibalism and Human Sacrifice* (London: Robert Hale, 1958); cf. also Ioan M. Lewis, Schamanen, Hexer, *Kannibalen: die Realität des Religiösen* (Frankfurt: Athenäum, 1989), esp. pp. 93–104; and from the year 1983 P. Brown, D. Tuzin (ed.), *The Ethnography of Cannibalism* (Washington, 1983).

¹³“Kannibalismus Zäher Mythos,” *Der Spiegel* (Hamburg) 28/1986, pp. 154–156.

¹⁴William Arens, *The Man-Eating Myth: Anthropology and Anthropophagy* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1979), p. v.

¹⁵*Ibid.*, p. 9.

¹⁶*Ibid.*, p. 180f.

¹⁷David Livingstone, *The Last Journal of David Livingstone ...*, *op. cit.*, vol. 2, p. 98 and elsewhere; cf. William Arens, *The Man-Eating Myth*, *op. cit.*, pp. 85–87, and “Kannibalismus Zäher Mythos,” *Der Spiegel*, *op. cit.*, p. 55.

¹⁸As a modern evangelical counterexample to Livingstone the account of the missionary Don Richardson (also the subject of a film), *Das Friedenskind* (“The Peace Child”), *Wandlung einer Dschungelkultur grausamer Tücke in Neuguinea* (Bad Liebenzell: Verlag der Liebenzeller Mission, 1979) is often put forward. Without wishing to doubt the existence of cannibalism in the tribe where Richardson was a missionary, this must be treated with some reservation. Don Richardson, who is known to me personally and whose foundational book *Eternity in Their Hearts* I was responsible for publishing through the same publishing house, does believe the tribe successfully evangelised by him to have been formerly cannibalistic, but has not been an eye-witness to cannibalism, and does not refer to any eye-witnesses, but portrays cannibalism as something which had ceased before his time. Typical are p. 170f, where he records how astonished he was, in a society which he thought to be characterised entirely by headhunting and man-eating, to become acquainted with the peaceful implement of a child of peace.

¹⁹William Arens, *The Man-Eating Myth*, *op. cit.*, p. 21.

²⁰Cf. Paula Brown, “Cannibalism,” pp. 60–62 in Mircea Eliade (ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Religion* (New York: Macmillan, 1987), vol. 3; J.A. MacCulloch, “Cannibalism,” pp. 194–209 in James Hastings (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1937), vol. 6.

²¹J.A. MacCulloch, “Cannibalism,” *op. cit.*, p. 194.

²²“Kannibalismus Zäher Mythos,” *Der Spiegel*, *op. cit.*, p. 154.

²³Erwin Frank, ... *y se lo comen*, *op. cit.*

²⁴*Ibid.*, p. 178.

²⁵Frank further concludes that cannibalism, if he came to be convinced of it, would not be a matter of dishonour (*ibid.*, p. 166). He is thus free of any suspicion, even now in reversing his conclusion, of wishing to save the honour of the people he is investigating, although this motive still keeps coming to the surface. It would have been good to have a comprehensive consideration of the international discussion. Also, although in 1979 Arens’ work was only available in manuscript, it would by 1987 have been possible to quote extensively from it, cf. *ibid.*, p. XXVIII. Again, it would have been useful to discover whether Frank was the student extensively referred to by William Arens (*The Man-Eating Myth*, *op. cit.*, p. 173f), who with his finals dissertation stood by his professor in the face of sharp criticism. Although I am familiar with the Bonn Ethnological Seminary, where Frank studied, I have not so far been able to ascertain this.

²⁶Erwin Frank, ... *y se lo comen*, *op. cit.*, p. 180f.

²⁷*Ibid.*, p. 190f.

²⁸Erwin Frank, “Sie fressen Menschen, wie ihr scheußliches Aussehen beweist ...,” *op. cit.*

²⁹*Ibid.*, p. 205.

³⁰Roger M. Keesing, *Cultural Anthropology: A Contemporary Perspective* (New York: CBS Publishing Japan, 19812), p. 154, criticises Arens’ position, appealing to the eye-witness account by his great-grandfather, also an ethnologist, of a cannibal feast in the islands of Fiji. Arens’ view is also rejected by Ioan M. Lewis, *Schamanen, Hexer, Kannibalen*, *op. cit.*, p. 100f, although in many cases he does not regard the accusation of cannibalism as being historically tenable, and is cautious because he was himself once thought to be a cannibal (*ibid.*, p. 94).

³¹Hans Helfritz, *Amerika: Inka, Maya und Azteken* (Vienna: Ueberreuter, 1979), p. 259 (on the cannibalism of the ancient Indian tribes in the Cauca Valley, in what is now Colombia).

³²Nigel Davies, *Opfertod und Menschenopfer: Glaube, Liebe und Verzweiflung in der Geschichte*

der Menschheit (Düsseldorf: Econ, 1981), p. 192f, referring to Ewald Volhard, *Kannibalismus* (Stuttgart: Stricker und Schröder, 1951).

³³ Michael Harner, "The Ecological Basis for Aztec Sacrifice," *Ethnology* 4 (1977), pp. 117–135.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 120.

³⁵ Especially through his book on the Jivaro, their head-hunting and their famous shrunken heads: Michael J. Harner, *The Jivaro* (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1973); cf. Nigel Davies, *Opfertod und Menschenopfer*, pp. 313–316.

³⁶ Michael Harner, "The Ecological Basis for Aztec Sacrifice," *op. cit.* His thesis is supported by: Marvin Harris, *Kannibalen und Könige: Aufstieg und Niedergang der Menschheitskulturen* (Frankfurt, 1978), pp. 153–159 (in English: Marvin Harris, *Cannibals and Kings* [New York: Random House, 1977]). His thesis is rejected by: B.R. Ortiz de Montellano, "Aztec Cannibalism: An Ecological Necessity?," *Science* 200 (1978), pp. 611–617; M. Sahlins, "Reply to Marvin Harris," *New York Review of Books* 28 (1979), June: p. 52f.; Nigel B. Davies, *Opfertod und Menschenopfer*, pp. 9, 262–267; G.W. Conrad, A.A. Demarest, *Religion and Empire: The Dynamics of Aztec and Inca Expansionism* (Cambridge, 1984), pp. 165–170; Peggy Reeves Sanday, *Divine Hunger, op. cit.*, pp. 15–20; W. Hebephrenia, "Das Hochtal von Mexico," pp. 19–86 in *Glanz und Untergang des Alten Mexico: Die Azteken und ihre Vorläufer* (Mainz, 1986), here pp. 80–82.

³⁷ J.A. MacCulloch, "Cannibalism," *op. cit.*, p. 206.

³⁸ *Ibid.*

³⁹ *Ibid.*

⁴⁰ Nigel Davies, *Opfertod und Menschenopfer*, p. 318.

⁴¹ In contrast to this, right up to the present century missionaries were still profoundly shocked by such phenomena. A classic example of this is Wilson S. Naylor, *Daybreak in the Dark Continent*, The Forward Mission Study Course (New York: Laymen's Missionary Movement, 1908), p. 90f. (human sacrifice) and p. 92f. (cannibalism).

⁴² Nigel Davies, *Opfertod und Menschenopfer*, p. 318.

⁴³ Peter Baumann, Helmut Uhlig, *Kein Platz für "wilde" Menschen: Das Schicksal der letzten Naturvölker* (Vienna: Molden, 1974), p. 220.

⁴⁴ Thus especially Derek Freeman, *Liebe ohne Aggression: Margaret Meads Legende von der Friedfertigkeit der Naturvölker* (Munich, 1983).

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 220f.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 121.

⁴⁷ Nigel Davies, *Opfertod und Menschenopfer, op. cit.*, pp. 312–323.

⁴⁸ Fredrik Barth, *Ritual and Knowledge among the Baktaman of New Guinea* (Newhaven [USA]: Yale University Press, 1975).

⁴⁹ Thus Nigel Davies, *Opfertod und Menschenopfer, op. cit.*, p. 316.

⁵⁰ For further study, cf. the commentaries of Carl F. Keil and Franz Delitzsch in their series of commentaries on the relevant texts.

⁵¹ Astrid Wendt, *Kannibalismus in Brasilien: Eine Analyse europäischer Reiseberichte und Amerika-Darstellungen für die Zeit zwischen 1500 und 1654*, Europäische Hochschulschriften XIX B (Ethnologie) 15 (Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1989).

⁵² *Ibid.*, p. 6. Also Ioan M. Lewis, *Schamanen, Hexer, Kannibalen, op. cit.*, p. 101f. sees in ritual cannibalism "a special form of communion" (*ibid.*, p. 101), like that to be found in the eucharist.

⁵³ The discussion of William Arens and his pupils consists unfortunately only of remarks made in passing (*ibid.*, pp. 79, 219) and brief disparaging comments. Here one might have expected a thorough discussion of the matter. Wendt does, however, counter Arens by appealing to Donald W. Forsyth, "Three Cheers for Hans Staden: The Case for Brazilian Cannibalism," *Ethnohistory* 32 (1985) 1, pp. 17–36.

⁵⁴ Astrid Wendt, *Kannibalismus in Brasilien, op. cit.*, p. 152. (On pp. 227–230 there is an excellent table setting out what details of cannibalistic rites have been recorded from which sources between 1500 and 1654.)

⁵⁵ Hans Staden, *Brasilien: Die wahrhaftige Historie der wilden, nackten, grimmigen Menschenfresser-Leute* (Tübingen: G. Faber, 1982).

⁵⁶ Astrid Wendt, *Kannibalismus in Brasilien*, *op. cit.*, p. 75.

⁵⁷ Donald W. Forsyth, “Three Cheers for Hans Staden,” *op. cit.*

⁵⁸ Cf. Astrid Wendt, *Kannibalismus in Brasilien*, *op. cit.*, p. 74f.

⁵⁹ Especially William Arens, *The Man-Eating Myth*, *op. cit.*, p. 25f.

⁶⁰ Cf. especially D. Forsyth, “Three Cheers for Hans Staden,” *op. cit.*; cf. Astrid Wendt, *Kannibalismus in Brasilien*, *op. cit.*, pp. 79–81.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, p. 81.

⁶² Nigel Davies, *Opfertod und Menschenopfer*, *op. cit.*, p. 303.

⁶³ Critical of this is William Arens, *The Man-Eating Myth*, *op. cit.*, pp. 116–136; Erwin Frank, “Sie fressen Menschen, wie ihr scheußliches Aussehen beweist...,” *op. cit.*, p. 205f.

⁶⁴ E.g. *Encyclopedia Britannica*, *op. cit.*, vol. 8, p. 1034 declares the cannibalism of homo erectus; *ibid.*, vol. 14, p. 985 the cannibalism of the neolithic and paleolithic ages,

⁶⁵ K.J. Narr, “Beiträge der Urgeschichte zur Kenntnis der Menschennatur,” pp. 3–62 in Hans-Georg Gadamer, Paul Vogler (ed.), *Kultur- und Ethnologie*, Neue Anthropologie 4 (Munich: Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag and Stuttgart: Georg Thieme Verlag, 1973), this quotation p. 32.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*; cf. also the critique of cannibalism in Cro-Magnon Man in H. Helmut, “Kannibalismus in Paläoanthropologie und Ethnologie,” *Ethnographisch-Archäologische Zeitschrift* (1968) 5, pp. 101–119, this quotation p. 101f., and Gunther Pilz, Hugo Moesch, *Der Mensch und die Graugans* (Frankfurt: Umschau Verlag, 1975), p. 159f.

⁶⁸ J.A. MacCulloch, “Cannibalism,” *op. cit.*, p. 205.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*

⁷⁰ Explanations of and excuses for cannibalism are discussed by Christian Spiel, *Menschen essen Menschen*, *op. cit.*, pp. 201–212, 217f.

⁷¹ Michelle Zimbalist Ronaldo, “Skulls and Causality,” *Man* (London) 12 (1977) 1, p. 168f.

⁷² Nigel Davies, *Opfertod und Menschenopfer*, *op. cit.*, p. 319.

⁷³ Friedrich Schwenn, *Die Menschenopfer bei den Griechen und Römern*, *op. cit.*, p. 317

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 5, summarizing the convictions of Euaristus Mader.

⁷⁵ K. Beth, “Menschenopfer,” columns 156–174 in Hanns Bächthold Stäubli (ed.), *Handwörterbuch des deutschen Aberglaubens*, vol. 6 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1987 [reprint from 1935]); this quotation col. 158.

⁷⁶ Hanns J. Prem, “Geschichte Altamerikas,” *Oldenbourg Grundriss der Geschichte* 23 (Munich: E. Oldenbourg, 1989), p. 172. His principal reference is to M. León-Portilla, “Die Religion,” pp. 236–258 in Hanns J. Prem, U. Dycerhoff (ed.), *Das Alte Mexiko* (Munich, 1986).

⁷⁷ Particularly blatant in A.A. Demarest, “Overview: Mesoamerican Human Sacrifice in Evolutionary Perspectives,” pp. 227–243 in E.H. Boone (ed.), *Ritual human sacrifice in Mesoamerica* (Washington, 1984).

⁷⁸ According to *Die Welt* No. 140 (18/6/1992), p. 3.

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*

⁸⁰ Cf. especially Derek Freeman, *Liebe ohne Aggression: Margaret Meads Legende von der Friedfertigkeit der Naturvölker*, *op. cit.*

⁸¹ Nigel Davies, *Opfertod und Menschenopfer*, *op. cit.*; Kay A. Read, “Human Sacrifice,” p. 515f. in Mircea Eliade (ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Religion* (New York: Macmillan, 1987) vol. 6; A.E. Crawley et al., “Human Sacrifice,” pp. 840–867 in James Hastings (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*, vol. 6 (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1937); Karl Bruno Leder, *Todesstrafe* (Munich: Deutscher Taschenbuch-Verlag, 1986), pp. 49–56 (although this includes some disputed Old Testament examples).

⁸² Stübe, “Bauopfer,” sec. 962–964 in Hanns Bächthold Stäubli (ed.), *Handwörterbuch des deutschen Aberglaubens*, vol. 1 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1987 [reprint from 1927]), this quotation sec. 962 (along with further literature).

⁸³ A.E. Crawley, “Human Sacrifice (Introductory and Primitive),” pp. 840–845 in James Hastings (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*, vol. 6

(Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1937), this quotation p. 840.

⁸⁴ Patrick Tierney, *Zu Ehren der Götter: Menschenopfer in den Anden* (Munich: Droemer Knauer, 1989), p. 13. (Sadly, by this Tierney means, as we shall see, also the Bible.)

⁸⁵ Friedrich Schwenn, *Die Menschenopfer bei den Griechen und Römern*, op. cit., pp. 18–139; A.C. Pearson, “Human Sacrifice (Greek),” pp. 847–849 in James Hastings (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*, vol. 6 (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1937).

⁸⁶ Friedrich Schwenn, *Die Menschenopfer bei den Griechen und Römern*, op. cit., pp. 140–196; R. Wünc, “Human Sacrifice (Roman),” pp. 858–862 in James Hastings (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*, vol. 6 (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1937).

⁸⁷ Friedrich Schwenn, *Die Menschenopfer bei den Griechen und Römern*, op. cit., p. 2.

⁸⁸ Nigel Davies, *Opfertod und Menschenopfer*, op. cit., p. 52.

⁸⁹ In all cases sources in Nigel Davies, *Opfertod und Menschenopfer*, p. 186f.

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 187; examples *ibid.*, pp. 188–193.

⁹¹ Sonja Brigitte Ross, *Das Menschenopfer der Skidi-Pawnee*, *Völkerkundliche Arbeiten* 1 (Bonn: Hols, 1989), p. 7. The whole of the book discusses the evidence, sources and background of individual cases.

⁹² *Ibid.*, p. 7.

⁹³ *Ibid.*, p. 8f.

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 10f.

⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 11.

⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 7.

⁹⁷ K. Beth, “Menschenopfer,” op. cit., col. 160.

⁹⁸ Nigel Davies, *Opfertod und Menschenopfer*, pp. 37–40; J. Dyer Ball, “Human Sacrifice (Chinese),” pp. 845–847 in James Hastings (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*, vol. 6 (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1937).

⁹⁹ Cf. the excellent short brief study by my teacher, Wilfried Westphal, *Unter den Schwüngen des Kondor: Das Reich der Inka Gestern und Heute* (Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1985), pp.

85–88 (with further literature and sources), and also Miloslav Stingl, *Inka: Ruhm und Untergang der Sonnensöhne* (Leipzig: Urania-Verlag, 19892), pp. 197–199.

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 197. Cf. on the human sacrifices of the Maya: Klaus Helfreich, *Menschenopfer und Tötungsrituale im Kult der Maya*, *Monumenta Americana* 9 (Berlin: Gebr. Mann, 1973); Wilfried Westphal, *Die Maya: Volk im Schatten seiner Vater* (Herrsching: Manfred Pawlak, 1986) (reprinted by C. Bertelsmann, Gütersloh [Mayas, see Register p. 398]); Paul deParrie, *Mary Pride, Ancient Empires of the New Age* (Westchester: Crossway Books, 1989), pp. 103–120.

¹⁰¹ Cf. on human sacrifice in ancient Mexico, especially the Aztecs, the standard work by Y. González Torres, *El sacrificio humano entre los Mexicas* (Mexico, 1985). Intelligible to all is Nigel B. Davies, *Opfertod und Menschenopfer* (Düsseldorf: Econ, 1981); cf. also Hanns J. Prem, *Geschichte Altamerikas*, Oldenbourg Grundriss der Geschichte 23 (Munich: E. Oldenbourg, 1989), p. 172f.; Michael Harner, “The Ecological Basis for Aztec Sacrifice,” op. cit.; M. Harris, *Kannibalen und Könige: Aufstieg und Niedergang der Menschheitskulturen* (Frankfurt: 1978) (English version *Cannibals and Kings* [New York: Random House, 1977]); David Carrasco, “Human Sacrifice: Aztec Rites,” pp. 516–523 in Mircea Eliade (ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Religion* (New York: Macmillan, 1987), vol. 6. On cannibalism of the descendants of the Incas, Aztecs, etc., i.e. of the South American Indians, cf. Alfred Métraux, “Warfare, Cannibalism, and Human Trophies,” pp. 383–410 in Julian H. Steward (ed.), *Handbook of South American Indians*, vol. 5: “The Comparative Ethnology of South American Indians,” Smithsonian Institution: Bureau of American Ethnology: Bulletin 143 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1949) (with bibliography).

¹⁰² Roger M. Keesing, *Cultural Anthropology: A Contemporary Perspective* (New York: CBS Publishing Japan, 19812), p. 153, referring to Michael Harner, “The Ecological Basis for Aztec Sacrifice,” *Ethnology* 4 (1977), pp. 117–135. The older estimate comes from S.F. Cook, “Human sacrifice and warfare as factors in the demography of pre-colonial Mexico,” *Human Biology* 18

(1946), pp. 81–102. The later estimate by Harner refers to Borah. Hanns J. Prem, *Geschichte Altamerikas*, *op. cit.*, p. 273, refers to a letter from Borah stating that Harner's interpretation is a mistaken one.¹⁰³

¹⁰³ Hanns J. Prem, *Geschichte Altamerikas*, *op. cit.*, p. 173. Cf. the contribution by a heart surgeon, F. Robicsek Hales, "Maya Heart Sacrifice, Cultural Perspective and Surgical Technique," pp. 49–90 in E.H. Boone (ed.), *Ritual Human Sacrifice in Mesoamerica* (Washington, 1984).

¹⁰⁴ Patrick Tierney, *Zu Ehren der Götter*, *op. cit.*

¹⁰⁵ Cf. Eugen Mogk, *Menschenopfer bei den Germanen*, *Abhandlungen der Königlich-Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften*, Philologisch-historische Klasse 27 (1909), pp. 601–643 (= No. 17, pp. 1–43); R.L.M. Derolez, *Götter und Mythen der Germanen* (Wiesbaden: VMA, n.d. [reprinted Einsiedeln: Benzinger, 1963]), pp. 103, 105, 149, 193, 226–228, 236–239, 242–243, 249; Wolfgang Golther, *Handbuch der germanischen Mythologie* (Kettwig: Magnus, 1985 [reprint of 1908 edition]), pp. 561–565; K. Beth, "Menschenopfer," *op. cit.* (with further literature); Eugen Mogk, "Human Sacrifice (Teutonic)," pp. 865–867 in James Hastings (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*, vol. 6 (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1937).

¹⁰⁶ Wolfgang Golther, *Handbuch der germanischen Mythologie*, *op. cit.*, p. 561 (examples for sources, *ibid.*, pp. 561–565). As the oldest compilation of such sacrifices Golther cites P.G. Schütze, *De cruentis Germanorum gentium victimis humanis* (Leipzig, 1743).

¹⁰⁷ Cf. especially the famous marsh corpse Tolland (Jutland), depicted e.g. in R.L.M. Derolez, *Götter und Mythen der Germanen*, *op. cit.*, plate 28 (next to p. 241).

¹⁰⁸ Friedrich Schwenn, *Die Menschenopfer bei den Griechen und Römern*, *op. cit.*, p. 32 (p. 32f. note 2, also Latin text from Germania 40).

¹⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 32.

¹¹⁰ R.M.L. Derolez, *Götter und Mythen der Germanen*, *op. cit.*, p. 227f. Derolez considers that the sacrifice was intended for Woden.

¹¹¹ Wolfgang Golther, *Handbuch der germanischen Mythologie*, *op. cit.*, p. 562.

¹¹² M. Beth, "Kinderopfer," col. 1361–1364 in Hanns Bächtold Stäubli (ed.), *Handwörterbuch des deutschen Aberglaubens*, vol. 4 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1987 [reprint of 1932 edition]), this quotation col. 1361. On the saga of the Swedish King Aun, who sacrificed his sons, cf. R.L.M. Derolez, *Götter und Mythen der Germanen*, *op. cit.*, p. 104f.

¹¹³ K. Beth, "Menschenopfer," *op. cit.*, col. 161.

¹¹⁴ *Ibid.*, col. 166.

¹¹⁵ Eugen Mogk, "Human Sacrifice (Teutonic)," *op. cit.*, p. 867, referring to L. Strackerjan.

¹¹⁶ Nigel Davies, *Opfertod und Menschenopfer*, p. 44.

¹¹⁷ Wolfgang Golther, *Handbuch der germanischen Mythologie*, *op. cit.*, p. 563.

¹¹⁸ Nigel Davies, *Opfertod und Menschenopfer*, p. 312.

¹¹⁹ All *ibid.*, pp. 104–15, 91, 93, 96, 159, 134.

¹²⁰ Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 133–141.

¹²¹ Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 173–178, esp. p. 176.

¹²² Rousas J. Rushdoony, *Institutes of Biblical Law* (Philipsburg: Presbyterian & Reformed, 1973), p. 32.

¹²³ Cf. Paul Volz, *Die Biblischen Altertümer* (Wiesbaden: Fourier, 1989 [reprint of 1914 edition]), p. 180f.

¹²⁴ Z.B. Reay Tannahill, *Fleisch und Blut*, *op. cit.*, pp. 31–41.

¹²⁵ Patrick Tierney, *Zur Ehren der Götter*, *op. cit.*, pp. 360–445.

¹²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 391.

¹²⁷ Paul Volz, *Die Biblischen Altertümer*, *op. cit.*, pp. 177–181.

¹²⁸ M. Beth, "Kinderopfer," *op. cit.*, col. 1363.

¹²⁹ Thus Patrick Tierney, *Zu Ehren der Götter*, *op. cit.*, p. 368, referring to Rabbi Hyam Maccoby.

¹³⁰ Friedrich Schwenn, *Die Menschenopfer bei den Griechen und Römern*, *op. cit.*, p. 1.

¹³¹ *Ibid.* Cf. the rejection of such accusations in Hermann L. Strack, *Der Blutaberglaube in der Menschheit, Blutmorde und Blutritus*, Schriften des Institutum Judaicum in Berlin 14 (Munich: C.H. Beck, 1892).

¹³²Friedrich Schwenn, *Die Menschenopfer bei den Griechen und Römern*, *op. cit.*, p. 3. Schwenn rejects this viewpoint, but names proponents from the nineteenth and twentieth century (*ibid.*, p. 3, note 3) and opponents (*ibid.*, p. 4, note 1).

¹³³This accusation was known to Josephus, *Contra Apion*, II, 8, 95; cf. Friedrich Schwenn, *Die Menschenopfer bei den Griechen und Römern*, *op. cit.*, p. 193.

¹³⁴*Ibid.*, pp. 193–195.

¹³⁵Thus especially Carl Friedrich Keil, *Biblischer Commentaar über die Prophetischen Geschichtsbücher des Alten Testaments*, vol. 1: Josua, Richter und Ruth (Biblischer Commentaar über das

Alte Testament, Leipzig: Dörffling und Franke, 1863), pp. 293–301; Robert Jamieson, “Judges,” pp. 70–127 in Robert Jamieson, A.R. Fausset, David Brown, *A Commentary, Critical, Experimental, and Practical, on the Old and New Testament*, 3 vols. (Grand Rapids (MI): Wm B. Eerdmans, 1990), vol. 1, part 2, this reference pp. 103–105; James B. Jordan, *Judges: God’s War Against Humanism* (Tyler (TX): Geneva Ministries, 1985), pp. 199–204, 190–192.

¹³⁶James B. Jordan, *Judges*, *op. cit.*, pp. 199–204, 190–192, 329–334.

¹³⁷Thus also Rousas J. Rushdoony, *Institutes of Biblical*

The Author

Über den Autor



Thomas Schirmacher earned his doctorates in Theology (Dr. theol, 1985, Netherlands) in Cultural Anthropology (PhD, 1989, USA) and in Ethics (ThD, 1996, USA) and received a honorary doctorate (DD) in 1997. He is president of Martin Bucer Theological Seminary with campuses in Bonn, Berlin, Hamburg, Vienna, Innsbruck, Prague and Istanbul and holds chairs in ethics, world religions and international development in Germany, USA and India. He is also president of Gebende Hände GmbH (Giving Hands), an internationally active relief organisation, as well as owner of a publishing house and coowner of a consulting company. He is Secretary of the Commission for Religions Freedom of the German and Austrian Evangelical Alliance and member of the same commission of the World Evangelical Fellowship. He has written and edited 74 books. He is married with Dr. Christine Schirmacher, who holds a chair in the Science of Islam, and is father of a son (14) and a daughter (11).

Martin Bucer Seminar

Berlin • Bonn • Chemnitz • Hamburg • Pforzheim
Ankara • Innsbruck • Prag • Zlin • Zürich

Studienzentrum Berlin

Martin Bucer Seminar, Breite Straße 39B, 13187 Berlin
E-Mail: berlin@bucer.de

Studienzentrum Bonn

Martin Bucer Seminar, Friedrichstr. 38, 53111 Bonn
E-Mail: bonn@bucer.de

Studienzentrum Chemnitz:

Martin Bucer Seminar, Mittelbacher Str. 6, 09224 Chemnitz
E-Mail: chemnitz@bucer.de

Studienzentrum Hamburg

Martin Bucer Seminar, c/o ARCHE,
Doerriesweg 7, 22525 Hamburg
E-Mail: hamburg@bucer.de

Studienzentrum Pforzheim

Martin Bucer Seminar, Bleichstraße 59, 75173 Pforzheim
E-Mail: pforzheim@bucer.de

Website: www.bucer.de
E-Mail: info@bucer.de

Studycenters outside Germany:

Studienzentrum Ankara: ankara@bucer.org
Studienzentrum Innsbruck: innsbruck@bucer.de
Studienzentrum Prag: prag@bucer.de
Studienzentrum Zlin: zlin@bucer.de
Studienzentrum Zürich: zuerich@bucer.de

Martin Bucer Seminary offers part- and fulltime theological education leading to American and international degrees (B.Th.; M.Th.; Th.D.; Ph.D.). Much of the teaching is by means of Saturday seminars, evening courses, extension courses, independent study, and internships. Courses from other schools can often be transferred to MBS.

The work of the seminary is largely supported by the contributions of donors. North American supporters may send contributions to our American partner organization, The International Institute for Christian Studies. Checks should be made out to IICS, with a note mentioning MBS and sent to:

The International Institute for Christian Studies:

P.O. Box 12147, Overland Park, KS 66282-2147, USA

EU:

IBAN DE52 3701 0050 0244 3705 07
BIC PBNKDEFF



Publisher:

Thomas Schirmacher,
Prof. Dr. phil., Dr. theol., DD.

Editor: Ron Kubsch

Editorial Committee:

Thomas Kinker, Titus Vogt,

Contact:

mbsmaterialien@bucer.de
www.bucer.de

MBS-TEXTE (MBS-TEXTS)

Pro Mundis

Es erscheinen außerdem folgende Reihen:

(The following series of MBS
Texts are also being published:)

Reformiertes Forum
(Reformed Forum)

Theologische Akzente
(Theological Accents)

Geistliche Impulse
(Spiritual Impulses)

Hope for Europe

Ergänzungen zur Ethik
(Ethics)

Philosophische Anstöße
(Philosophical Initiatives)

Vorarbeiten zur Dogmatik
(Preliminaries for a Systematic
Theology)