

TEOTL AND \*IXIPLATLI



TEOTL  
AND \*IXIPTLATLI

SOME CENTRAL CONCEPTIONS IN  
ANCIENT MEXICAN RELIGION

WITH A GENERAL INTRODUCTION  
ON CULT AND MYTH

BY  
ARILD HVIDTFELDT

*Munksgaard*

---

COPENHAGEN 1958

*Denne afhandling er af det filosofiske fakultet ved Københavns Universitet antaget til offentlig at forsvares for den filosofiske doktorgrad.*

*København, den 25. september 1958.*

*Aksel E. Christensen  
h. a. dec.*

## CONTENTS

Preface .....	7
<b>Part I. GENERAL INTRODUCTION</b>	
a. On Cult and Myth .....	11
b. Some Formal Classifications .....	65
<b>Part II. ASPECTS OF AZTEC RELIGION</b>	
a. The Mexican Text Material .....	70
b. <i>Teotl</i> and <i>*Ixiptlatli</i> .....	76
c. Type 0 (of Group A) .....	100
d. Type I (of Group A) .....	105
e. Type II (of Group B) .....	118
f. Type III (of Group E) Panquetzaliztli and Uitzilopochtli .....	123
Conclusion .....	140
Danish Summary .....	143
<i>Literature.</i>	
Part I. References cited, except for the Mexican field. <i>Alphabetically</i> .....	157
Part II. References cited, and some background reading, for the Mexican field. <i>Chronologically</i> under each sub-heading .....	165
<i>Grammars</i> , p. 165. <i>Dictionaries</i> , p. 165. <i>Nabuatl generally</i> , etc., p. 165 f. <i>Texts</i> , quoted or cited, p. 166 f. ( <i>Sabagún</i> , p. 166. <i>On Sabagún</i> , etc., p. 166 f. <i>Other texts</i> , p. 167). For Introduction: <i>Archaeology</i> , etc., p. 167 f. <i>Religion</i> , p. 169.	
<i>Indexes.</i>	
Authors cited .....	171
Subject Index .....	174
Aztec Index .....	180



## PREFACE

Within almost every scientific discipline the history of research has regularly alternated between periods characterized by formations of comprehensive theories and periods characterized by collection of material and the working up of this within narrowly restricted fields, – so it might be maintained.

A sophisticated commentator from one of the last-mentioned periods, however, might justly point out that this assertion, indeed, must spiritually belong to one of the former periods. True to the codex of his own period he might group the assertion with the other, too sweeping generalizations.

Perhaps it may, however, in our epoch on the whole be agreed that extensive and intensive points of view are not equally appreciated. Research-workers taking a special interest in similarities have always lived side by side with research-workers taking a special interest in differences; research-workers mainly interested in general points of view have presumably always lived side by side with research-workers mainly interested in special points of view; research-workers especially interested in historical relations in time and space between certain abstracted phenomena have presumably always lived alongside of research-workers especially interested in structural relations between phenomena differently abstracted. But sometimes one of these types has been dominant, creating a vogue, sometimes another.

As regards certain psychological features, the rules of the fluctuations in scientific propriety hardly differ from the rules of other fashionable currents, as might be elaborated by research-workers with a sense of similarities, – to the breaking-point where the generalization compromises itself and reaction sets in with grave and careful pointing out of differences.

One of these differences is that alternations in the dominant attitude within the sciences presumably are mainly determined by changing rational needs. If, within a certain discipline, one good theory (or twenty bad ones) is (are) prominent, there is a rational need for collecting fresh material and for

research of details. If, in another period, there are enormous, accumulated stores of rapidly collected, detailed material, there is a rational need for a critical sorting, for an arrangement – perhaps a rearrangement – of the material, and for an appraisal of it. Speculations without relevance to observable phenomena are not science, but the mere accumulation of material, without aim and purpose, is not science, either.

In fact the various periods of research and types of research-workers are of course completely interdependent. No doubt it is generally recognized at present that one cannot reasonably set up theories without a thorough knowledge of the details of the material and that it is not at all possible to generalize without giving up individual traits. But to the same degree it ought to be realized that it is no more possible – reasonably – to collect details, still less to arrange them and appraise them, without some explicit or implicit theory. Even the most extremist and most unsystematic hoarder of curiosities must know the general in order to distinguish the special.

★

The present study falls into two parts, Part I being labelled an Introduction. In it it is tried in a concentrated form to report some of the results arrived at by historians of religion since the subject was constituted as a particular discipline (with tacit exclusion of the fields not relevant to Part II of the study). The purpose of this report is in advance to comply with Mexicanists' reasonable claim for an orientation as to the basis of the subsequent treatment of the Aztec texts, a treatment to which these texts have not previously been exposed. Furthermore, it has been tried to incorporate the results of general religio-historical research – which within some fields has hitherto appeared as disparate special sections and observations of details – in a connected whole. A number of factors in this way become considerably less fragmentary in character.

As appears from the work itself, the author in the case of this part is to no small degree indebted to his teacher, Dr. Svend Pallis, Professor of History of Religions, whose sober, far-sighted guidance has been utilized by and whose independent points of view have had an inspiring influence upon the author, just as the nobler parts of the legacy of his predecessor, the late Professor Vilh. Grønbech, have been passed on by him. In this place it will also be right to mention with veneration the late Dr. Egill Rostrup, who many years ago aroused the author's interest in the discipline.

In Part II, after which the thesis has been named, an intensive investigation into certain central conceptions and complexes of conceptions in ancient Mexican religion has been made on the basis of texts in the original language.



The method used is the semantic and idiomatic analysis, which has become second nature during Professor Pallis's lectures and which was introduced into Danish religio-historical research by Professor Vilh. Grønbech, but actually belongs to the good – old as well as new – general philological traditions.

For the introduction into the study of Aztec I am indebted to Lecturer Ernst Mengin, Ph. D., who by his removal to Denmark in the middle of the thirties carried from Berlin to Copenhagen the solid fund of knowledge of Mexican and Central American languages which, besides by his own name, is marked by the names of his teachers Eduard Seler and K. Th. Preuss.

Part II presumably – at least in plan and intention – meets the demands of our epoch to the students of the subject for thorough special analyses within a strictly demarcated individual culture.

If a later period, however, should again shift the main interest from the specific to the general, the author will raise no objections if at that time it is preferred to consider Part II mainly as a contribution to the building up of a religio-historical general view.

\*

The translation of the author's Danish manuscript has been made by Niels Haislund, M. A., to whom I am indebted for his care and patient discussion of many details, not least in connexion with the translation into English of the Aztec texts.

*Arild Hvidtfeldt.*



Part I  
GENERAL INTRODUCTION

a. ON CULT AND MYTH

Without regarding it as necessary to make a research-historical survey we shall introductorily remind of the fact that among religious historians proper since the time of Robertson Smith there has been a tendency towards considering the cult as primary in relation to the myth.

The fact that the myths earlier in the history of research were considered primary was presumably mainly connected with the material available to students of comparative religion almost exclusively consisting of myths, indeed only more or less literarily blurred "mythologies", the unravelment of which in their constituents would at first require sufficient work. Descriptions of cults from e.g. the classical or the Scandinavian domain, are extremely few in number, and these few are on the whole of very meagre contents. Furthermore, preconceived opinions prevented research-workers from discovering the value of a large material which actually occurred e.g. in the Indian domain, where very instructive ritual books were left unheeded as "priests' speculations" of no value.<sup>1</sup>

Another view of the facts was adopted after a large European folkloristic material had been adduced,<sup>2</sup> and this new view was strengthened when the folkloristic material was supplemented with a rich ethnographical material, gradually from the four quarters of the globe. The ritual then was placed in the centre, consciously and generally since the time of Robertson Smith, and the point of view has proved its legitimacy through an immense amount

---

<sup>1</sup> *Hillebrandt* 1897, p. 1: "Lange Zeit hindurch – und diese Meinung hat wohl jetzt noch die meisten Vertreter – sind darin mit Vorliebe Spekulationen einer müssigen Priesterschaft gesehen worden, die zur Befestigung ihrer Herrschaft das Leben des Hindu mit einer Kette von Ceremonien umgab, die seinen Geist in Knechtschaft hielten." Cf. *Oldenberg* 1905, p. 66.

<sup>2</sup> Epoch-making *Mannhardt* 1875–77 and 1884.

of special studies which either incontestably emphasize the connexion between the facts or which – in cases in which the defectiveness of the material gives a hypothetical character to the results – have thrown new light on and offered a possibility of a better understanding of facts which otherwise had been left unexplained in isolated oddity.

The main argument in favour of the above-mentioned view of the facts must be said to be the results which have been reached by its application to a very comprehensive material from many different cultures. And the *results* certainly seem to be the most important basis of Robertson Smith's views already at their first publication. On close inspection it will be noted that there are surprisingly few theoretical considerations in his epoch-making *Lectures on the Religion of the Semites* (1889). His theoretical remarks nearly all assume the form of postulates, indeed of aphorisms, and it is presumably these aphoristically pointed assertions – scattered on every page – which have given the book its great effectiveness.

The problem of cult and myth is only subjected to a formulated theoretical treatment on pp. 17–23 in the book, and strictly only one argument proper is adduced there. The first time it runs as follows: "No doubt men will not habitually follow certain practices without attaching a meaning to them; but as a rule we find that while the practice was rigorously fixed, the meaning attached to it was extremely vague, and the same rite was explained by different people in different ways, without any question of orthodoxy or heterodoxy arising in consequence."<sup>1</sup> The argument is also adduced in the inverse sequence of thoughts: "Belief in a certain series of myths was neither obligatory as a part of true religion, nor was it supposed that, by believing, a man acquired religious merit and conciliated the favour of the gods. What was obligatory or meritorious was the exact performance of certain sacred acts prescribed by religious tradition."<sup>2</sup> And immediately afterwards follows – for the first time – the conclusion: "This being so, it follows that mythology ought not to take the prominent place that is too often assigned to it in the scientific study of ancient faiths. So far as myths consist of explanations of ritual their value is altogether secondary, and it may be affirmed with confidence that in almost every case the myth was derived from the ritual, and not the ritual from the myth; . . ." After which the argument follows once more: ". . . ; for the ritual was fixed and the myth was variable, the ritual was obligatory and faith in the myth was at the discretion of the worshipper."<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 18.

<sup>2</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 19.

<sup>3</sup> *Loc. cit.*

In between the passages quoted and on the other pages mentioned the same train of thought is, or parts of it are quoted in varied form and with a few explanatory additions. There is no reason to adduce more of the variants here, but out of the explanatory additions – which in part serve to elaborate the point of view – the following is to be emphasized as particularly important: “Indeed the explanations offered would not have been of a kind to stir any strong feeling; for in most cases they would have been merely different stories as to the circumstances under which the rite first came to be established, by the command or by the direct example of the god.”<sup>1</sup> To which may be added the following passage from a page later: “. . . ; and ordinarily it is such an explanation as could not have arisen till the original sense of the usage had more or less fallen into oblivion.”<sup>2</sup> From here we are taken immediately into the statement of the method: “As a rule the myth is no explanation of the origin of the ritual to any one who does not believe it to be a narrative of real occurrences, and the boldest mythologist will not believe that. But, if it be not true, the myth itself requires to be explained, and every principle of philosophy and common sense demands that the explanation be sought, not in arbitrary allegorical theories, but in the actual facts of ritual or religious custom to which the myth attaches.”<sup>3</sup>

By cursory soundings I have not succeeded in finding any clues to a closer determination of the outward or inward origin of the point of view in Robertson Smith, nor hints of discussions which may have contributed to giving a final form to it. His biographers<sup>4</sup> make no statements about this question. Closer investigations, presumably especially in connexion with McLennan and Frazer, perhaps may give information; but it seems that it was totemistic problems which loomed large among their common interests. Possible material left by Black perhaps also ought to be drawn into the limelight.<sup>5</sup>

It is of interest to note the biographers' evaluation of the new view: “In a word, Smith's title to be regarded as a founder of the new science of comparative religion which is based on the study of social anthropology, is everywhere recognised. Of the exponents of this science, there are more schools than one which disagree among themselves as to the prominence to be given to Smith's postulates (1) that ritual is everywhere to be taken as the ultimate fact, and that the explanations or myths attached to ritual are

<sup>1</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 18.

<sup>2</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 19.

<sup>3</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 19 f.

<sup>4</sup> Black and Chrystal 1912.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. *Robertson Smith* 1889, Preface p. X, where he thanks his friend “Mr. J. S. Black, who has kindly read the whole book in proof, and made many valuable suggestions.”

at the best only secondary, and (2) that it is the community and not the individual man that in all cases has to be regarded as the religious unit. On these points the discussion is not yet closed; but the event has shown that those friendly and enthusiastic critics who in 1889 spoke of the work as "brilliant" and "epoch-making" did not exaggerate its value and importance."<sup>1</sup> We fasten upon the term "postulates", to which we shall return below.

The many results which, as mentioned above, especially serve to support the correctness of the view, have been produced by the application of the view to material from the domains of specific, but many different religions, but only an attempt at listing the titles of works belonging here, or only the more important works, about special religions would carry us too far. As far as my orientation goes – but it is of course slight in proportion to the enormous number of treatises – I am under an impression that these works within the special fields still will not normally afford further argumentation of a general character. As is only natural, their argumentation will be based on the special material of their special field, and do so in such a way that as a rule it will presumably be adequate to denote it as the "application of the view to a certain material." In this connexion we shall again expressly state that the material in many places is of such a kind that it strengthens the correctness of the view to perfection, or, in other words, "proves" it as regards the field in question.

Theoretical discussions, and perhaps an expansion of the general argumentation in favour of the prevalent view, on the other hand, ought to be expected in surveys of comparative religion, in introductions, and similar works of a more comprehensive character. But strangely enough, the commonest fact is that they are silent on this point.<sup>2</sup> In so far as they share Robertson Smith's view, they generally content themselves with rendering results of its application, and some few of them furthermore repeat Robertson Smith's fundamental assertion, sometimes slightly varied – perhaps even so richly

---

<sup>1</sup> *Black and Chrystal* 1912, p. 520.

<sup>2</sup> E.g. *Orelli* (1899), 1911–13<sup>2</sup>, *Tiele* 1899–1901, *Jastrow* 1901, *Jessen* 1904, *Farnell* 1905, *Ehrenreich* 1910, *Thomsen* 1911, *Nilsson* 1912, *Beth* 1914, *Hartland* 1914, *James* 1917, *Jeremias* 1918, *Lehmann* 1920, *Bousset* 1920, *Perry* 1923, *Danzel* 1924, *Lehmann* 1924, *Chantepie de la Saussaye* 1925<sup>4</sup>, *Lehmann* 1926, *Clemen* 1927, *Karsten* 1928 (tr. 1935), *Logren* 1930, *Reinach* 1931 (1909), *Tiele-Söderblom* 1931, *Leeuw* 1933, *Lowie* 1934, *Prampolini* 1937, *Radin* 1937, *Wallis* 1939, *Ferm* 1945, *Bouquet* 1945, *Gorce et Mortier* 1947–48, *Lowie* 1948 (1924), *Briem* 1948, *Waterhouse* 1948, *Micklem* 1948, *Howells* 1948, *Noss* 1949, *Jensen* 1951, *Murphy* (1949) 1952<sup>2</sup>, *King* 1954, *Glasenapp* 1957, *Ringgren och Ström* 1957. – As regards some of these authors *Robertson Smith* even wrote in vain, in so far as they – but they, too, without argumentation – still voice the most naive view of the relation.

varied as in V. Grønbech –; but the argumentation proper is practically not expanded.<sup>1</sup>

In order to avoid being misunderstood, it is perhaps necessary to emphasize that we are exclusively thinking of the *form* when trying to distinguish between “argumentation” and “postulate”; for it is obviously not really for any of the investigators a question of an a priori postulate. It is evidently a comprehensive formulation of a large amount of experiences, which, however, in our cases mostly take the form of postulates. Black and Chrystal ought not in the quotation adduced<sup>2</sup> to have said “postulates”; they ought to have said “statements”; and furthermore they even overlook the fact that Robertson Smith actually advanced one argument in favour of his view as to cult and myth.

But the situation involves that the prevalent view mainly can only be motivated by the fact that it is the prevalent view, which – it may be added – within a large number of special fields has given excellent results that corroborate this view, and finally that it all goes back to Robertson Smith’s epoch-making results, and that these again, logically, are based on his one argument adduced.

It seems to us that this position has some weak points, and in practice it will be possible to demonstrate its weak points, as it were, every time a religious historian gets into touch with research-workers in other domains who completely or in part deal with the same source material as he himself. It therefore, furthermore, seems to us well-motivated to attempt a somewhat broader formulation of the foundation on which we are standing. The formulation should sum up what research-workers agree about, or presumably ought to agree about today, even though perhaps it has not previously

---

<sup>1</sup> Discussions of considerable extent and high value are found partly in investigations of the French school of sociologists, partly in investigations of the English school of functionalists, but here, too, it is, if anything, a question of a further elaboration on the basis of Robertson Smith’s view and of its application to a material from special religions, e.g. Durkheim 1912, Malinowski (1926) (1948) 1954, Lévy-Bruhl 1935, Boas 1938, p. 617, Chapple and Coon 1947, p. 558 f., Piddington 1950, pp. 369–74, *Notes and Queries* 1951<sup>6</sup>, p. 205 f. Among the followers of these schools there seems, however, in recent times to be a tendency towards weakening what is essential from the religio-historical point of view. – Discussions which involve modifications are furthermore found e.g. in Toy 1913, especially pp. 371–74, Hopkins 1923, pp. 226–45, Widengren 1945, particularly pp. 134–61, Wach 1947, pp. 26–28. – Among examples of applications that lay the main stress on the *interplay* between ritual and myth, special regard should be paid to Hocart 1927, Grønbech 1931, especially II, pp. 216–340, Hooke 1933 and 1935, Kluckhohn 1942, Widengren 1945, and Buschardt 1945. – The modifications indicated in the case of some authors are towards a vaguer view, which in our opinion is due to insufficiently clear systematics. Cf. below, Part I b.

<sup>2</sup> *Op. cit.* p. 520.

been expressed in these very words. And the formulation thus should outline the general assumptions from which we proceed to the discussion of the Mexican material.

First, it is to be stated that from a certain point of view it might be assumed that the problem of cult and myth were of the same kind as the problem whether the hen came before the egg or the egg before the hen; but indeed this philosophical question can be attacked from the point of view of biology as well as of the history of evolution.

Next, it should be stated that under all circumstances it must be allowable for a science in its presentment of the material sovereignly to decide on the order in which the material is presented, thus to decide whether it wants first to describe "the hen" or "the egg". At any rate a research-worker must be permitted sovereignly to decide whether he wants first to describe the ritual and then the myths, or first the myths and then the ritual. It should only be claimed that he does not without further assumptions or remarks, only because of the order of the presentment, induce upon himself or others the view that the order shows anything at all but his own estimate of the most practical procedure at the presentment and thus does not involve e.g. a corresponding historical order, or e.g. the order of cause-effect, or the order of foundation-superstructure, or the order of primary-secondary. For that matter it is remarkable that Robertson Smith's above-mentioned theoretical reflections conclude in remarks which are nothing but a maintenance of this scientific principle of sovereignty, as it may be termed: "When we study the political structure of an early society, we do not begin by asking what is recorded of the first legislators, or what theory men advanced as to the reason of their institutions; we try to understand what the institutions were, and how they shaped men's lives. In like manner, in the study of Semitic religion, we must not begin by asking what was told about the gods, but what the working religious institutions were, and how they shaped the lives of the worshippers."<sup>1</sup> Apparently he wants to adduce another argument in favour of the primacy of the ritual, but actually only adduces reasons for *describing* the ritual first. At the same time he terms it a conclusion "as to the method of our investigation", but no premises were necessary for this conclusion. The method might with perfect justice have been applied quite arbitrarily.

A moderate and balanced view will hardly contest the fact that there are cases in which the myth obviously was primary and formed the ritual, or

---

<sup>1</sup> Robertson Smith 1889, p. 23.



that at least there are cases which can only with difficulty be explained in any other way.

Nor will it deny the fact which above all has been contributory to veiling the connexion, viz. that the ritual normally to a certain religious community's own members will stand as a rendering and repetition of the action the model or perhaps even the institution of which the myth tells about. People act in such and such a way, it is said, *because* the myth tells that such and such a person acted like this in the past. Our formulation here, for that matter, is consciously broader than in Robertson Smith, who in this connexion only mentions "all the antique religions" and "stories about the gods."<sup>1</sup>

Finally, there is presumably nobody who wants to challenge European onlookers', research-workers', and readers' right according to attitude and temperament personally to take an interest in one or the other aspect of the matter, thus either to take the greatest interest in the ritual or the myths. In the case of research-workers it should only, here, too, be claimed that a possible one-sided interest does not in the research-worker himself or others produce misleading ideas about fundamental questions.

But there are weighty reasons in favour of the view that people *generally*, i.e. in the majority of cases, ought to be prepared to consider the ritual as the primary element and the myths as something accessory, if they want to obtain a well-founded view of the various religio-historical entities. We prefer to term the myths "accessory" in relation to the ritual, to terming them "secondary", because the latter word may have a connotation which suggests an evaluation e.g. as regards quality or interest or historical importance. Robertson Smith says: "So far as myths consist of explanations of ritual their value is altogether secondary, . . .," viz. their value "for the scientific study of ancient faiths."<sup>2</sup> And later he says about "certain myths which are not mere explanations of traditional practices, but exhibit the beginnings of larger religious speculation, or of an attempt at systematising and reducing to order the motley variety of local worships and beliefs" that "in this case the secondary character of the myths is still more clearly marked."<sup>3</sup>

In support Robertson Smith's argument may be cited in a somewhat more universal form, viz. that what is demanded in a large number of religious communities is *not* that people are to "believe" in the myths, but exclusively that they are to perform the rituals in the way prescribed. Apart from the individual-religions it is generally a completely subordinate question what

---

<sup>1</sup> *Op. cit.* p. 18.

<sup>2</sup> *Op. cit.* p. 19.

<sup>3</sup> *Op. cit.* p. 20.

people “believe” or do not “believe”; the only thing in which the community takes an interest is what they do.

Robertson Smith in his argument emphasizes that “the same rite was explained by different people in different ways,”<sup>1</sup> with which, as appears from the context, he refers to the fact that a given ritual may be “explained” with different myths by different people in one and the same community at one and the same time.<sup>2</sup>

Therefore, it may as a further argument in favour of the view be stated that time and again it appears that a ritual through the times may survive unchanged from one religion to another, indeed, even through several successive changes of religion, but in the way that the mythical explanation or the mythical motivation is changed successively as occasion required. Robertson Smith discusses instances of this kind,<sup>3</sup> but as far as I am aware, he does not use them in his fundamental argumentation. Cases of this type are numerous, and not least in such cases it must be considered justifiable for outside observers to characterize the ritual as primary and the myths as accessory.<sup>4</sup>

In the introduction to Robertson Smith’s declaration about method<sup>5</sup> it says: “As a rule the myth is no explanation of the origin of the ritual to any one who does not believe it to be a narrative of real occurrences, and the boldest mythologist will not believe that.” To which, however, it must be added that actually such “bold mythologists” occur far and wide as soon as we leave the Greek-Roman domain and as soon as we leave what we have termed the prevalent view in the science of comparative religion proper.

We shall therefore, by shifting our attention from the myths to the rituals, add a third argument, which seems to us to be completely decisive: It may be stated that extremely many ritual acts will appear actually to be quite simple manipulations of quite an elementary character, i.e. of such a character that the corresponding acts outside the cult are of an everyday occurrence, but of a practical and expedient, perhaps vital importance, such as eating,

---

<sup>1</sup> *Op. cit.* p. 18 (above, p. 12).

<sup>2</sup> An Indian example from modern times, *Wilkins* 1887, p. 290: “... and at night the three images, represented by small gold idols, are put to bed for four months. Some say it is to represent Vishnu’s descent to Pātāla; others that it is to commemorate his sleep upon the ocean.” – *Williams* 1936, p. 196 f.

<sup>3</sup> E.g. *op. cit.* p. 303.

<sup>4</sup> Cf., e.g., *Curtiss* (1902) tr. 1903, *Wellhausen* (1887) 1927<sup>2r</sup>, *Aurelius* 1925, *Gorce et Mortier* 1947–48, I, p. 300–01. Besides, the phenomenon has been touched on in practically all treatments of Islām. Furthermore e.g. *Soltau* 1906, *Wulf* 1910, pp. 496–511, *Pfister* 1909–12, *Jacobsen* 1913, 1919, 1914–20, *Clemen* 1916, *Carpenter* 1916, *Tallqvist* 1920, *Dyggve* 1941 and 1943, *L’Orange* 1943, 1949, tr. 1953. The phenomenon has also been touched on in practically all treatments of Germanic religion.

<sup>5</sup> As quoted above, p. 13.

drinking, coition, hunting, sowing, harvesting, etc.<sup>1</sup> To us outside observers it would be unreasonable to accept the richly varied mythical “explanations” and “motivations” of *such* acts as causal explanations in our sense. We must necessarily consider the varied mythical explanations as outcomes of the rich play of the imaginations on a comparatively small number of given themes.

The essential thing is that the everyday acts on certain occasions are transferred to the religious sphere, often so that it is the first act of a kind that is performed in this solemn and particularly significant sphere, such as the first meal from the quarry, the first killing of the lambs of the year, the sowing of the first fields, the first fire-drilling of the year, the broaching of the first cask of wine; and in primitive religions this first act, performed in the religious sphere, at the same time becomes a creative act, because like produces like.<sup>2</sup>

This reasoning has taken us to a circumstance more which is in favour of maintaining the points of view advanced. Robertson Smith obviously did not know the concept of mana, or at any rate did not succeed in considering it before his death.<sup>3</sup> But the discovery of the concept of mana has given us a possibility of obtaining a coherent view of a number of phenomena within comparative religion which are of importance for our subject, among them, that is, a number of phenomena which no longer themselves imply mana conceptions proper. Or, expressed still more sharply: the discovery of the mana conceptions have given us a possibility of obtaining a profounder as well as a more comprehensive understanding of the problem of cult and myth in all its aspects.

We shall therefore in some detail state how and to what extent we on the basis of our knowledge of the conceptions of mana are led to consider the ritual as primary and the myths as accessory. This will be done with use of

---

<sup>1</sup> *Grönbech* 1931, II, p. 263: “ritual ceremonies are nothing but the functions of ordinary life: eating, drinking, working, hunting, ploughing, fighting, exalted by the festival into eternal prototypically pregnant act; in fact, every act performed during the sacred period necessarily turns into a rite.”

<sup>2</sup> See below, p. 24. – *Spencer* 1914, p. 187: “The mere performance of the ceremony is supposed to bring about the desired result.”

<sup>3</sup> The concept was already mentioned (by Cook, and) by *Maning* 1863, but this mention did not influence research. Codrington’s observations were first mentioned in a letter to Max Müller, quoted by the latter in his Hibbert Lectures (*Max Müller* 1878, p. 53 f.; cf. *Codrington* 1891, p. 118, note 1); but this mention is very short. *Lectures on the Religion of the Semites* was published in 1889, Codrington’s *The Melanesians* was not published until 1891. Robertson Smith died in 1894. Marett’s *The Conception of Mana* was submitted to the Third International Congress for the History of Religions in Oxford 1908 (*Transactions* 1908, I, pp. 46–57) and was published in *The Threshold of Religion* 1909. Thus there is nothing remarkable in the fact that Robertson Smith showed no knowledge of the concept. – (*Codrington* 1881 did not emphasize the concept of mana.)

very few illustrative examples<sup>1</sup> and with express and respectful acknowledgment of the indebtedness of my account to guidance as well as inspiration drawn from the lectures of my teacher, Professor Svend Pallis, Ph. D.

“The Melanesian mind is entirely possessed by the belief in a supernatural power or influence, called almost universally *mana*. This is what works to effect everything which is beyond the ordinary power of men, outside the common processes of nature; it is present in the atmosphere of life, attaches itself to persons and to things, and is manifested by results which can only be ascribed to its operation. When one has got it he can use it and direct it, but its force may break forth at some new point; the presence of it is ascertained by proof.” So it says in the first full description of the concept of *mana*. “It is a power or influence, not physical, and in a way supernatural; but it shews itself in physical force, or in any kind of power or excellence which a man possesses,” it further says there. This “*mana*” is not fixed in anything, and can be conveyed in almost anything. In a certain case a human being is said to *have* *mana*, while objects replete with *mana* are said to *be* “*mana*”. “A man comes by chance upon a stone which takes his fancy; its shape is singular, it is like something, it is certainly not a common stone, there must be *mana* in it.” A test “shews that he is right, the stone is *mana*, has that power in it. Having that power it is a vehicle to convey *mana* to other stones. In the same way certain forms of words, generally in the form of a song, have power for certain purposes;” such words are also *mana*. All remarkable luck is evidence that a man has *mana*. If he becomes a chief, it is because he has *mana*; a man’s political and social power and influence is his *mana*. If he is victorious in fight, it is because he has *mana*. If his swine multiply and his gardens abound in fruits, it is due to *mana*. The yam will not grow much without *mana*, a canoe will not become a fast canoe without *mana*, a net will not catch many fish and an arrow will not inflict a mortal wound without *mana*.<sup>2</sup>

The word has been adopted by research as a technical term; for after attention had been called to the phenomenon, it was soon discovered that similar conceptions occurred in many other places. In numerous cases, however, such

---

<sup>1</sup> Although this author does not work with the concept of *mana*, reference may be made once for all to the almost inexhaustible collection of material in *Frazer* 1911–15<sup>3</sup>. Further literature will in most cases be indicated in the works to which reference is made, as well as in the ordinary standard works, encyclopedias, and handbooks. Americanists who might not be at home in general comparative religion, will in what follows as a rule find references to a few important summaries, and historians of religion will now and then find the familiar “classical” material supplemented by a few, particularly illustrative examples.

<sup>2</sup> *Codrington* 1891, pp. 118–20.

conceptions of mana had previously been misunderstood and the term in the languages in question been erroneously translated, now by “souls”, now by “spirits”, now by “god” or “the Great Spirit”, in the case of the American Indians as a rule by the word “medicine”.<sup>1</sup> Furthermore it has been found that there are many different kinds of “mana”. Each class of things, each species of animals and plants, each kinship group of people have their quite special form of mana, characteristic just of this and only this class, species, or kinship group. The qualities which are characteristic of a definite class of things, of a definite species of animals or plants, or of a definite human kinship group belong to their mana; and when an individual thing, a stone, a tree, an individual animal or plant, or an individual human being possesses the characteristic qualities of its species to a particularly high degree, it is said that it has a great mana.

In some connexions the conceptions correspond rather closely to the popular idea covered by us by means of the word “power”. If, as explanation of the fact that the knife will cut extraordinarily well, we say that it will do so because it has a great “cutting power”, this would be a sham explanation,

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *Toy* 1913, pp. 101–03. – *Lowie* 1937, *Brock-Utne* 1938, *Numelin* 1947. – The more important works in which the further ramifications of the discussion also can be traced, are: *King* 1892, *Hubert et Mauss* 1904, *Marett* 1908, 1909, *Durkheim* 1912, tr. 1954, *Grønbech* 1913, *Söderblom* (1914) (tr. 1916), tr. 1921, *Lehmann* 1916, 1922, *Cassirer* 1925, *Arbman* 1931, *Lehmann* 1939. See furthermore the highly polemical *Widengren* 1945 b and the countering in *Kock* 1951. – *Pinard de la Boullaye* 1929<sup>b</sup> is quite insufficient on this subject. – Some of the contributions to the discussion outside the main current indicated seem to have been provoked by lack of ability to conquer established European conceptions, perhaps by aversion to doing so. Thus, in our opinion this applies to the polemical – often almost passionate – attempts at ascribing to *mana* a “personal” rather than an “impersonal” character, as well as the attempts in this connexion, at any cost, at ascribing to the foreign cultures a concept of “soul”, too. Much of that which has been stated to that effect is literally without any sense, without any real contents. – The discussion, however, is also in part due to the fact that the statements on *mana* in Codrington’s work, if considered as an entity, are not quite unambiguous and hardly quite free of contradiction. But it has not been sufficiently realized (1) that Codrington himself came to Melanesia with the European qualifications of his own time, so that we must be prepared for the possibility that he sporadically may revert to European reasoning and usage, and (2) that Codrington’s material originates from heterogeneous sources, as, in the case of some groups of islands, he obtained his material indirectly, through informants who had been under European (Christian) influence (*Codrington* 1891, pp. V–VI), and that it is obviously the very information given by these informants which gives rise to the confusion. The conceptions may, indeed, notoriously have been different in the various geographical areas; but note, e.g., the fact that the word *mana* is not mentioned *op. cit.* pp. 134–44, which in return teem with “spirits”. – Future discussions presumably ought to make a nice distinction between (a) the question of Codrington’s view of the conception of mana, and (b) the question of the semantic contents of the word *mana* in the various groups of peoples in Melanesia and Polynesia (A peculiar interpretation of the meaning of the word in New Zealand is found in *Johansen* 1954, pp. 84–99), and (c) the question of the semantic contents of mana-like conceptions in each people in all other cases. – In what follows the word is used as a religio-historical technical term.

and we should be very close to a conception of mana. Cutting is the characteristic of knives, and a knife which will cut particularly well, will do so because it has a great mana. What in everyday speech we ascribe to the "growing power" of plants, we might instead ascribe to their *mana*.

As mana is the essence of the characteristic qualities of a species, mana is not in itself more closely qualified as anything but "high potency".<sup>1</sup> The mana of the lion is strength, that of the hare is speed; in our country its mana would be timidity. In itself mana has no moral qualities, thus it is not in itself good or evil. But mana can be used so that it is beneficial, and it may be used so that it becomes detrimental. If one does not understand how to deal with it in the right way, one may come to cause terrible disasters.

About human beings it may be said that woman's mana is beauty, but especially her "power" to bear children. The man's mana is bravery, strength, virility, wealth, high esteem, luck in great and small matters, fame, honour, happiness, but also to him: good looks.<sup>2</sup> The kinship group also belongs to a man's mana; a noble family gives a man great mana, low extraction little mana. As mentioned above, the mana is attached to the kinship group and only through the kinship group attached to the individual. Families of blacksmiths have the mana which makes them competent blacksmiths. Families of priests have the mana, the "power", and the "knowledge" which make it possible for them to cure sick people and to make rain at the right time and in the right amount. Families of chiefs have rulers' mana. Furthermore the name belongs to the mana.<sup>3</sup> And the treasures<sup>4</sup> of the kinship group: a famous sword as in many Scandinavian sagas, the sword of victory, a heavy golden arm-ring, perhaps a royal crown.

But mana includes still more. All the near surroundings, all the normal, characteristic environs belong to it. For the sake of continuity the *locus classicus* of Danish religious historians is to be quoted once more.<sup>5</sup> Among the

---

<sup>1</sup> Or 'concentrate', 'intense presence'; sometimes the conception approaches to what might be termed the 'idea' of things, or their 'actual, inmost essence'; the word is also tinged with the meaning of 'energy' and therefore of 'life'.

<sup>2</sup> *Gronbech* 1909-12, I, p. 155 ff., tr. 1931, I, p. 135 ff. With an intensification of the passage in the Danish original it says on p. 136: "Tall, handsome, brave, skilful, generous, these words indicate the totality of virtues which no king could do without; lacking one quality he would lack all."

<sup>3</sup> Research-workers therefore ought to be extremely cautious as regards speaking about "puns" and "false etymologies" in the texts of primitive and urban religions. If the name belongs to the being of a thing, then things with identical names must have a uniform being.

<sup>4</sup> *Gronbech* 1909-12, III, pp. 1-42, tr. 1931, II, pp. 5-41. *Eggers* 1932.

<sup>5</sup> *McClintock* 1910, p. 82 and p. 84. Utilized by *Gronbech* 1915, p. 22 and p. 42 f., and by *Pallis* 1926, p. 289 f., with correction of McClintock's translation "medicine (power)" to 'mana'. See also *Gronbech, op. cit.* pp. 5-7, 24.

Blackfoot Indians, Mad Wolf with his fellows sang during a ceremony in his tent:

The Buffalo likes to live in the mountains during the autumn.  
He comes down from the mountains to the plains.  
The mountains are his *mana*.

And alone he later sang the two Crow songs:

1. I fly high in the air.  
My *mana* is very strong.  
The wind is my *mana*.
2. The Buffalo is my *mana*.  
He is a very strong *mana*.  
The trees are my *mana*.  
When I am among them  
I walk around my own *mana*.

The wide scope of the *mana* involves that many things in foreign communities have quite a different look from the one in our community. By “translation” to the modern European train of thought we must therefore be aware of some further ways of conception, which are closely connected with the conception of *mana* and on this assumption are fully logical.<sup>1</sup> Or in other words: On the whole it is only on the basis of the modern train of thought – which builds upon other categories – that it is necessary to call special attention to these further “ways of conception”. We learn at the primary school that we may only add up quantities with a common denomin-

---

<sup>1</sup> Lévy-Bruhl's theory about primitive people's “prelogical” mental life has been opposed from many quarters and is hardly upheld by anybody; but the opponents perhaps have not everywhere been aware of the peculiarity that Lévy-Bruhl himself, as regards his “logic” does not so much think of the rules for relations between premisses and conclusions as of what he terms “our logical classification” of the phenomena of the outside world. *Lévy Bruhl* 1910, tr. 1926, passim. – In his criticism of Lévy-Bruhl, *Penniman* 1952<sup>2</sup>, p. 288 f., rightly concentrates on the question of classification, but says: “The reasoning differs in degree rather than in kind, and the false collection of unrelated things in categories may be compared with our own progress in the sciences, where we are constantly revising our categories. Consider, for example, the category *Primates* in Linnæus, and today. Some creatures have been taken out, and others put in, with an increased knowledge of facts.” (p. 289). This is undoubtedly meant as an attempt to save face for the primitive people, but a stressing of the decisive fact is still missing, viz. that it is only in *our* view that it is a “false collection”, and that to the community in question it is *not* a question of “unrelated things”. – Even in the quite modern, scientific sphere it seems to me that the question of a “correct” classification must always be determined by a purpose; the “correct” thing must always depend on the purpose to be served by the classification.

ator; but if we do not agree what things have the common denominator, we shall in spite of correct use of the rules of arithmetic obtain highly different results. The great difference between primitive thinking and ours, is not particularly due to the fact that one party thinks more logically than the other. In both places there are some people whose thinking is sharply logical and others whose thinking is less sharp. Only the view of *what* has a common denominator is very different in the two parties, as appears from the account of the scope of mana.

The “ways of conception” to which we must furthermore be attentive when on the basis of our own thinking we consider primitive cultures, may roughly be comprised in the well-known sentences thus formulated by Durkheim: “The part is equal to the whole”<sup>1</sup> and “Like produces like,”<sup>2</sup> to which may be added the third: “The past is equal to the present and equal to the future.”<sup>3</sup> In order once more to emphasize that this, on the basis of the conception of mana, is quite logical and coherent, we shall briefly look at each of these “ways of conception” apart, before looking at the consequences in a more comprehensive interplay.

In many cases we shall be inclined to see the primitive view as if it makes part of a whole “represent” this whole, but this will hardly be sufficient. The view is presumably as a rule to be understood in the way that part of

---

<sup>1</sup> Durkheim 1912, p. 328: “la partie vaut le tout”; *idem*: “la partie rappelle le tout”, with reference to the “*totum ex parte* des alchimistes” (tr. 1954, p. 229).

<sup>2</sup> Durkheim 1912, p. 508: “le semblable produit le semblable”, with reference to Frazer 1905, p. 37 ff. and Hubert et Mauss 1904, p. 61 ff. (tr. 1954, p. 356). – Frazer 1905, p. 37: “. . . like produces like, or . . . an effect resembles its cause; . . .” See further Frazer 1911–15<sup>3</sup>, I, p. 52 note 1 and p. 54 note 1, where it says: “It has been ingeniously suggested by Mr. Y. Hirn that magic by similarity may be reduced to a case of magic by contact. The connecting link, on this hypothesis, is the old doctrine of emanations, according to which everything is continually sending out in all directions copies of itself in the shape of thin membranes, which appear to the senses not only as shadows, reflections, and so forth, but also as sounds and names. See Y. Hirn, *Origins of Art* (London, 1900), pp. 293 *sqq.* This hypothesis certainly furnishes a point of union for the two apparently distinct sides of sympathetic magic, but whether it is one that would occur to the savage mind be doubted.” The objection to Hirn’s view in so far is justifiable, but Frazer’s lack of understanding of the conceptions of mana here proves fatal. He ought to be able to see how close to something essential Hirn was. Cf. below, p. 25 f.

<sup>3</sup> As a popular “theorem” (mnemonic rule) on a line with the two preceding ones probably first formulated by Pallis for use in lectures introductory to the study. – From one point of view the phenomenon was already touched on by Gunkel 1895. From another point of view it was mentioned by Gronbeck 1915, p. 25: “These myths are not speculations on what may have happened once at the beginning of time, but are a simple rendering of what the child of nature constantly experiences. He is fully familiar with the thought that the sun and the earth can go astray.” From a more central and essential point of view the treatment of the phenomenon is developed in Gronbeck 1931, II, e.g. pp. 262 f., 266, 268, 332 f., 338.



a whole is simply identical with this – that it is the same mana which penetrates the whole as well as all its parts. Therefore we find the widely distributed conscientious care of cut-off hair and nails; therefore it may be strictly inadmissible to tread on somebody else's shadow, and therefore the farmer is to take care not to hit his own shadow with his mattock; therefore the African or North American natives who are out hunting, pour glowing ashes on the tracks of the beasts they are pursuing, or they may prod at the track with a pointed stick in order to paralyse the quarry; and therefore we may everywhere find instances of people doing what they could to keep names secret to which for some reason or other they have attached special importance.<sup>1</sup> The view that the part is equal to the whole also applies to the individual in relation to the group, so that in the case of each collective we might formulate the supplementary sentence: one is equal to all. But we have already pointed out that each species has its own particular mana, and that the individual shares in the mana of its species, so that nothing new is stated in this sentence.<sup>2</sup> But one is equal to all; therefore a battle between two large armies can be decided without the rank and file of the armies raising a weapon; the two commanders may decide the battle between them by single combat.

The sentence that “like produces like” is only a supplement to the preceding principal sentence, a supplement which is only necessary when we are to “translate” into our own train of thought. Things comprised by the same mana will not always by *us*, too, be conceived as parts of a whole, and the way of conception must therefore from our train of thought be expressed by this supplementary sentence. What happens is that *we* in this way transfer our attention from the things to the acts performed with them. Let us, to

---

<sup>1</sup> *Frazer* 1911–15<sup>3</sup>, I, pp. 207–12 (footprints). *Jevons* 1904<sup>3</sup>, Index. Some amusing examples of a well-known type are found in *Winstedt* 1925, pp. 64–70. Furthermore, e.g. *Williams* 1936, p. 183 note 2 (footprints), pp. 71 f., 310 f., 326–29 (secret name). (None of these authors use the concept of *mana*). – *Macrob. Saturn.* III, 9, 1–2. *Serv. Aen.* I, 277. *Plin. N. H.* III, 9, XXVIII, 4 (on the secret name of Rome), treated by *Jacobsen* 1914–20, II, pp. 291–96. Cf. *Brelich* 1949.

<sup>2</sup> A graphic and extremely pointed instance is known from the Omaha Indians, *Fletcher* and *La Flesche* 1911, p. 188: When the growing corn was infested by grasshoppers . . . a young man was dispatched to the threatened field of corn with instructions to catch one of the grasshoppers. On his return he handed the captured insect to the leader, “who removed one of its wings and broke off a bit from the tip, which he dropped into the vessel containing the food about to be eaten.” “This latter act exemplified the belief in the living connection of a part with its whole; consequently, the bit of wing was thought to have a vital relation to all the insects that were feeding on the maize, and its severance and destruction to have a like effect on all its kind.” The example was adduced by *Gronbeck* 1915, p. 9. It illustrates both variants: the tip of the wing as part of the whole grasshopper, and the latter as one individual of the whole species.

illustrate this, take a well-known example as our starting-point: a man wants to revenge himself on a rival; so he makes a small doll which he names by the name of his rival, after which he stabs the doll with a dagger in full assurance that the rival will be killed in this way. This phenomenon is known from numerous, widely distributed accounts,<sup>1</sup> and a modern psychological explanation, according to which the act should represent a mental release of thirst for revenge or the like, is insufficient.<sup>2</sup> The matter is considered a reality by the man himself as well as his enemy and the whole community in which he is living. If the manipulations are discovered, the man will be punished as a murderer, and if anybody dies without any visible cause, his family, or the official legal authorities of the community, if such a stage of development has been reached, will search for the murderer until they find a person who confesses having committed the homicide as described.<sup>3</sup> For to the murderer and his community the doll with the enemy's name is part of the enemy himself and therefore identical with him. We, on the other hand, do not consider the dummy as part of the rival and consequently cannot in our train of thought refer the phenomenon to the sentence that "the part is equal to the whole". We fix our attention on the act and see that according to the foreign way of conception "like (event) will produce like (event)."<sup>4</sup>

The sentence that "the past is equal to the present and to the future" is based on conditions at the cult-place, and only there it is valid to its full extent.<sup>5</sup> Our own view of events in the lapse of time resembles pearls which have been strung, while in many cultures events are conceived as a heap of pearls, from which you may take now one now another, lift it up for contemplation, turn it about in the light, and then return it to the heap. Year in and year out the same pearl is taken out at the same festival, so that

<sup>1</sup> Frazer 1911-15<sup>3</sup>, I, pp. 55-70. - Thurston 1912, pp. 248-54.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Toy 1913, p. 394 f., Webster 1948, p. 85.

<sup>3</sup> Lyall (1882) 1899<sup>2</sup>, I, p. 117: "But early in this century the life of the Nizam of Dekhan was attempted by this diabolical invention; and, as the ladies of the harem were said to be at the bottom of the plot, a scandal was caused not unlike that for which the Duchess of Gloucester had to do penance, after conspiring with sorcerers to remove Henry VI. by this very trick of an infernal doll shaped in the likeness of majesty." Further, e.g. Dubois 1899<sup>2</sup>, p. 393, with Note 1, Thurston 1912, pp. 224-36, Rivers 1924, Hopkins 1928, p. 206 ff., Deacon 1934, pp. 676-89, Williams 1936, pp. 338 ff., 357 f. See also the Anglo-Saxon laws: II Athelstan § 6 (cf. II Canute § 4). An interesting instance of 'survivals': *Man* LV (May 1955) No. 80 (p. 72) (*I. Schapera*). - Cf. Lévy-Brühl 1910, tr. 1926, and 1931, tr. 1936, pp. 153-96.

<sup>4</sup> E.g. Williams 1936, p. 269 ff. (preparation for hunting).

<sup>5</sup> Harrison 1912, p. XI: "The *dromenon* in its sacral sense is, not merely a thing done, but a thing *re-done*, or *pre-done* with magical intent." - Grønbech 1931, II, p. 262 f., Eliade 1957.

the great events become timeless, because they are perpetually repeated. History there is something of the past, indeed something of primeval times, but it is also something of the present, for it is lived and relived in the cult, with its drama and its myth, and history is something future as well, for it will be lived again till the end of time. And the world in each single case is the world of *this* people, only this people. Outside are cold, dark, water, the chaos monster, brutes, inhuman wretches ("non-humans").<sup>1</sup> It seems that every human community is egocentric. If the people perish, the world will perish. Past, present, and future will be annihilated, chaos will engulf the cosmos.

We have looked at the *scope* of mana and seen that the sphere comprised by it would by us be conceived as a number of scattered elements belonging to widely different categories. Furthermore, we have seen that this difference in the classification of phenomena involves that we must be aware of the occurrence of another three special "ways of conception" when we are to make "translations" into our own usual train of thought. Then we shall in more detail consider some of the ordinary *qualities* of mana; for regardless of the fact that – as mentioned above – there are many different kinds of mana, each with its special qualities, it is possible to establish the occurrence of certain elementary qualities which may roughly be attributed to mana in general. It is a question of qualities with the most thorough consequences for the form of religions.

*Mana* is in a certain way something material, in so far as it has weight, has heaviness in a material sense. In the first great description from Melanesia it is told that men of high rank on a certain occasion advance, carrying on their shoulders wooden poles decorated with leaves and flowers, and that during this procedure they walk as if the poles were very heavy. The decorated poles are heavy with mana.<sup>2</sup> On another occasion some men come along carrying the bones of a dead man, his betel-nuts, his betel-nut box, and his conch trumpet. They are all stooping as if carrying a heavy burden, again weighed down by the weight of mana.<sup>3</sup> Mana may be transferred by rubbing, by stroking, or by a still lighter touch. The more vigorous the mana is, the easier will the transfer take place. Sometimes the ideas can best be

<sup>1</sup> "non-human": RV. X, 22 (848),s: *á-mānusab*. The word occurs elsewhere, too, but at any rate here about a being that we should call human.

<sup>2</sup> *Codrington* 1891, p. 108; cf. p. 107 and p. 111.

<sup>3</sup> *Op. cit.* p. 126. – The "material" aspect of the mana also manifests itself in a different way. *McClintock* 1910, p. 54: "When our people finally killed him, they discovered that the grizzly bear was his medicine. He had a grizzly claw tied in his front hair. The Blackfeet were so afraid that some of his power might escape, that they built a fire and burned A-koch-kit-ope's body. If a spark or coal flew out, they carefully threw it back into the fire, to prevent the possible escape of any of his power."

apprehended by comparing them with our own ideas of electricity, sometimes we are, if anything, reminded of our ideas of contagion, and sometimes it also seems as if mana were an invisible, viscous substance. Finally we must in some cases resort to considering the transfer as having taken place in accordance with the way of conception of "like produces like". Great practical importance is attributed to rubbings and strokings with objects replete with mana for the conscious purpose of provoking a transfer of mana in order to benefit by it. Thus strokings with a stone may transfer the strength of the stone to a sick person and cure him.<sup>1</sup> Sometimes touch is not even necessary for the transfer, the mere sight of the person or object full of mana may be useful or dangerous. Or it may be the mana-filled person's own glance which offers danger and which must therefore be guarded.<sup>2</sup>

In some cases transfer of mana may take place without the mana in the originally mana-filled person or object losing any of its power whatever by it. In other cases the transfer may be made in such a way or by such means that the person or object originally replete with mana is completely exhausted of his or its mana. In such cases the interest is not as a rule concentrated on the thing to which the mana is transferred, but on the object from which mana is removed. To us it will frequently seem as if it is especially the "mana of illness" or the "mana of death" which it is wanted to remove in this way, and this impression is not completely wrong, either. But then it must be kept in mind that all powerful mana under certain circumstances can provoke illness or death. Illness, mutilations, bodily defects, wounds, and death are "infectious", but people who will never or at certain times will not tolerate contact with powerful mana of a given type, are "infected" as well and as fatally by contact with menstruating women, returning warriors, certain kinds of food, priests, kings, cult objects, sacred places, and whatever dangerous things might otherwise be found. The means and methods by which in a given community the mana is removed, will very often be the same regardless of the origin of the unwanted mana.

Some mana is easily removed, with a stroking only – as when dust is wiped off with a rag –; in other cases mana may be washed off with ordinary water, in other cases, again, more desperate remedies are needed, and sometimes the removal requires extremely complicated processes. In many cases the removal can hardly be considered purely mechanical, the people in

<sup>1</sup> E.g. *Winstedt* 1925, p. 74.

<sup>2</sup> *Jevons* 1904<sup>3</sup>, p. 59 f. *Max Müller* 1867–75, II, p. 352: "In Malabar a Nayadi defiles a Brahman at a distance of seventy-four paces; ..." *Thurston* 1912, p. 119 note: "The Nāyādis are a polluting class, whose approach within 300 feet is said to contaminate a Brāhman." Cf. *Hutton* 1946, p. 70, p. 193, and a number of other examples, just as in *Thurston op. cit.* pp. 109–20.

question obviously imagine a kind of neutralization of the harmful mana by means of the special ceremony of purification. But simple washing or bathing are of very frequent occurrence. Furthermore, it belongs to the same sphere of conceptions when persons replete with mana under certain circumstances must *not* wash in a normal way.<sup>1</sup> The mana would be washed away. If the mana-filled state is supposed to be of limited duration – as in mourners, women in labour, and initiates – this is corroborated by the fact that the mana-filled period is very often just finished by such a washing-off.

All concentrated mana is dangerous. It is to be handled with extreme skill and care, so it appears, careful precautions being taken, metaphorically speaking, for the same reasons as those which in our countries cause high-voltage technicians and surgeons to work with rubber gloves. Doubly dangerous is the powerful mana to the inexperienced, to which will mostly belong all other groups than just the one which is itself comprised by this mana. As in our countries reasonable people therefore completely refrain from tampering with high-voltage plants or dabbling in more serious surgical operations. And as in our countries the authorities support reason by means of well locked enclosures, warning signs, prohibitions, and punishments.<sup>2</sup>

The Polynesian word 'taboo' (*tapu*) has within comparative religion become a technical term for the prohibitions connected with the conceptions of mana as a consequence of the dangerousness of mana.<sup>3</sup> We may find

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf. the priests of Zeus in Dodonē, *Il.* XVI, 235: (Σελλοί) ... ἀνιπτόποδες ... (the Selli) ... with unwashed feet'. With support in the scholiasts *Segestedt* 1906, p. 58 f., offers the following comment: "It is evident that the impurity in question is of a ritual kind. ... The Selli, who never left the premises of the temple, thus always trod on holy ground, had never any occasion to wash off the holiness. They had to remain unwashed." – The priestess and priest of Artemis Hymnias do not either follow the same bathing customs as other people; *Paus.* VIII, 13, 1.

<sup>2</sup> *Jevons* 1904<sup>3</sup>, p. 66, p. 72. – *Streblow* 1907–20, II, p. 78: "Die Todesstrafe wurde sogar an einer Frau vollzogen, die eine tjurunga zufällig gefunden hatte." – *Deacon* 1934, p. 440 note 1: "The 'stepping across' tabu applies to sacred objects used in other ceremonies, and in one of these I unwittingly committed the offence referred to above. At once everything was confusion, the ceremony was abandoned and I found myself the centre of a tense and rather unnerving situation. I got out of it at the cost of a compensation-pig lent me by one of the principal men on the spot, but I learnt afterwards that a considerable section of the members, the older men especially, wanted to shoot." – Cf. the warning inscription before the inner court in the temple of Jerusalem, in which the death penalty is fixed for non-Jews who might cross the barrier. *Schürer* 1901–09<sup>4</sup>, II, p. 329, *Deissmann* 1923<sup>4</sup>, p. 62 f. (with references, text, and picture).

<sup>3</sup> *Marett* was the first to show the connexion between the two concepts, in *Marett* 1907 and more thoroughly in *Marett* 1908, both reprinted in *Marett* 1909. – *Frazer* 1911–15<sup>3</sup>, III. *Crawley* 1927<sup>2</sup>. Practically every handbook of comparative religion deals with the phenomenon, and practically every ethnographical description contains examples. – For a historical survey of research a general reference may be made to *Steiner* 1956. See also *Lehmann* 1930, *Radcliffe-Brown* (1939) 1952, pp. 133–52, *Webster* 1942, *Johansen* 1954, pp. 185–213.

practically completely homogeneous rules of taboo for kings, sick persons, mourners, outcasts, warriors in the field, and women in confinement, because the rules regulating the intercourse with persons replete with mana are in principle homogeneous, without regard to the question how we European onlookers will classify these persons. It is common to the rules that they impose upon both the tabooed persons and the other members of the community a considerably restricted freedom of movement and freedom of action. Obviously this first of all takes place out of consideration for the other members of the community, but it is another aspect of the same phenomenon that persons highly replete with mana, also out of consideration to themselves, are to be cautious as regards the persons or things with which they come into contact. Otherwise their mana might flow away from them. Or they might appear to be particularly sensitive to outside mana, or might be particularly easily injured by it. Or their mana may be so useful to the community that for this reason it must be carefully guarded so that it can be preserved.

Here obviously further belongs the frequently occurring phenomenon that two different kinds of mana must not be mixed. If they are of fairly equal strength it seems that they may both be spoilt, or mana of a new kind may arise, which must be withheld from profane life.

The phenomenon is well-known, but as its fundamental importance probably has not so far been completely realized, we shall for the sake of the following facts dwell on it in some detail. In the Old Testament we have some instances of direct prohibition of such mixtures. They are of the type: "thou shalt nor sow thy field with mingled seed: neither shall a garment mingled of linen and woollen come upon thee."<sup>1</sup> The well-known prohibition: "Thou shalt not seethe a kid in its mother's milk"<sup>2</sup> is presumably based on the same view. For this rule fits closely into a very comprehensive and widely distributed set of ideas which puts the contact of meat with milk under an inviolable taboo.

On the one hand the prohibition is connected with the rules followed by late Judaism and which are just founded on the taboo rule from the Old Testament.<sup>3</sup> If somebody has eaten meat, or a dish made of meat, e.g. soup,

---

<sup>1</sup> See in more detail *Lev.* 19,19 and *Deut.* 22,9-11.

<sup>2</sup> *Ex.* 23,19. 34,26. *Deut.* 14,21.

<sup>3</sup> The following account is based on *Davidsohn* 1931. The author was a Danish(-Jewish) sociologist who was a whole-hearted follower of the French school of sociologists. He does not use the term of *mana*. About his method he states: "In order not to become dependent on memory, we have made a collection of precepts our basis and by means of a card-index registered each relevant case with statement of the name of the quality, the reason for its rise, transfer, or cease, the nature of the object, special circumstances, etc. But before that each rule

he must not eat e.g. cheese or something else made of milk for a certain time following; an hour is indicated, but it is better waiting for six hours. It is not only what *we* should term meat and milk, thus only the food in a literal sense, which should be kept separated. As all other kinds of mana the essence of meat or milk may be transferred by contact, with the consequence that in the household it is necessary to keep two complete sets of cooking utensils, dishes, and dinner-sets, etc., one for meat courses and one for milk courses. Furthermore, two sets of knives, one for carving meat and one for cutting cheese and fish. Meat and milk must not be cooked in the same oven, either, or put on the table at the same time, indeed, not even on the same tablecloth. A contact of meat mana with milk mana, direct or after one or more successive transfers, taboos the food as such. Bread which is to be used for a milk course thus must not be cut with a knife which has been in contact with meat, and onions which are to be used for a meat course must not be cut with a knife which has been in contact with cheese.

But this is not all. It is necessary to have a particular meat service and a particular milk service for use at Easter, thus four dinner services in all. In the Easter all that is "leavened", i.e. all that is fermented, is taboo. With the exception of the "unleavened bread", the baking of which is particularly closely watched, the prohibition applies in practice to all grain, because one cannot see whether grain has begun fermenting. A chicken which has been boiled together with a grain of wheat therefore must be declared taboo as food. The same applies even though there has only been a grain in the water before the chicken was put into it; the "leavened" mana of the grain has already been transferred to the water, and as usual the mana is transferred further by contact. "All vessels, lids, spoons etc., and all food which later has been mixed with parts of the hen – e. g. fried in its dripping and all the vessels, etc., which, again, have been in contact with these victuals, are unfit for use."<sup>1</sup>

On the other hand the prohibition of contact between meat and milk fits into a large network of similar prohibitions among other peoples than the

---

is compared with actual life and only included in the collection in so far as and to the extent to which it renders an undoubtedly existing practice." (*op. cit.* p. 18). "The first task then will be that of finding the collection of precepts which commands the greatest authority and whose agreement with fact therefore is greatest. The expert will hardly be in doubt that only one definite work can be considered: Schulchân åruch (the "table ready laid") composed by Joseph Karo in the 16th century, with the usual additions. Going through the sections of the collection to be considered, we thus in the case of each precept ask the question whether it actually constitutes part of Jewish life, whether it is actually the question of a fact known to any Jew and which without further consideration can be acknowledged as correct and obvious." (*op. cit.* p. 61). – Cf. *Bischoff* 1941<sup>3</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> *Davidsohn* 1931, pp. 24 f., 28, 29–34, 67, 73–78. Cf. *Frazer* 1918, III, p. 153 f.

Jews. It applies to cattle-breeding tribes, as tribes of Israel were before the conquest of Canaan, and among these cattle-breeding peoples, e.g. in large parts of Africa, the prohibition of contact between meat and milk furthermore fits into a whole set of taboo rules, which obviously are based on *milk* as the chief motif, viz. because the mana of milk is identical with the mana of cattle.

Amongst other things, we see<sup>1</sup> that the whole of the usual number of persons with a dangerous mana are kept away from milk in order that they should not injure the cattle. Menstruating women must not drink milk for that reason, and must not approach to the cattle. In many places women must not perform the milking at all. Women in confinement must not drink milk. Wounded men must not drink milk. As usual it is obviously blood which ought to be feared. Mourners must not drink milk. Persons from a village which has been struck by lightning must not drink milk. Sexual intercourse may be prohibited during the time when the cattle are at pasture. It may be prohibited to boil the milk. The material of which the milk pails is made, may have an influence on the cattle. In some places milk pails must not be washed with water but only with the cattle's own urine. The prohibition of washing with water may also apply to the tribesmen, and it may be connected with an injunction about cleaning by means of butter. In the regions of the Masai and other peoples in East Africa milk must not touch meat, nor must milk be poured into a pot in which meat has been boiled, or meat be put into a vessel which has contained milk. Therefore, they keep two distinct sets of pots and saucepans and vessels. There they also strictly provide that there is no mixing of the two kinds of food in the stomach. They live for some ten days on a milk diet then for another ten days on a meat diet, then again on a milk diet, and so on. And before each change of diet the stomach is thoroughly purged with purgatives and emetics. Not for the sake of the people's own health, but everything expressly for the sake of the cattle, which would yield less milk, get inflamed udders, or be attacked by other diseases if the rules were not kept. In quite the same way vegetables, peas, beans, etc., must in many places be kept separate from the milk through a considerable interval between the consumptions of the two kinds of food, and here again exclusively for the sake of the health of the cattle. In the most rigorous cattle-breeding tribes the products of agriculture are completely taboo as food, and the mere participation in the tilling of the soil would injure the cattle. Finally eating wild beasts is often prohibited, again in

---

<sup>1</sup> *Frazer* 1918, III, pp. 111–64. – But see *Hooke* 1938, pp. 35, 43, which cannot, however, affect the continuity of the present account.



order to avoid injuring the cattle. Among some peoples certain animals must only be eaten in an emergency, e. g. waterbuck, zebra, elephant, rhinoceros; but after only a single meal on a wild animal touching milk will be prohibited for several months. In some places the prohibition includes such good things as goats, sheep, poultry, and all kinds of fish.

After adducing this large number of instances of prohibitions of mingling manas we shall remind of the fact that the validity of taboo rules may be restricted to certain definite calendar days or short calendar periods. Thus prescriptions about a "fasting period" are tantamount to a set of taboo rules which have a limited temporal validity. We have just seen that the strict Hebrew taboo rules for "leavened" food are only in force in the Easter.<sup>1</sup>

European technical usage, for that matter, is somewhat vague in this field. Scholars unsystematically mention "tabooed persons" not only when the persons in question are "taboo" to others, but also when they themselves are forced to observe taboo rules. When certain actions are taboo within limited periods, people will just as unsystematically mention "tabooed days". Indeed, it should be fully realized that if the word "taboo" or "tabooed" is used about actions, it means, if anything, 'prohibited'. If it is used about places or objects or words, it means, if anything, 'must not be stepped on or entered', 'must not be touched', 'must not be spoken', – 'prohibited to step on or enter', 'prohibited to touch', 'prohibited to speak', respectively. If used about persons, it sometimes means (as seen from the point of view of others) 'untouchable', 'prohibited to touch', sometimes (as seen from the person's own point of view) 'subject to taboo rules', 'subject to prohibitions of certain acts'. If it is used about periods, it means 'period for the validity of certain taboo rules'. In practice there is not often any possibility of misunderstanding, actual uncertainty being caused almost only by the inconsistent use of the term of "tabooed persons"; but even here it is of no great importance, because there will mostly be a relation of mutuality. If other people are subject to special taboo rules in relation to a certain person, this person will also himself generally be subject to special taboo rules. It is the mana of the person in question which is dangerous, and the taboo rules are intended to protect all parties as well as possible.<sup>2</sup>

All taboo rules can, however, – as shown above – be expressed in the way that they apply to *actions*. Whatever business a taboo rule applies to, whether a prohibition of entering a place, touching a person or an object, speaking a word, or performing an act, it is a duty towards the community to observe

---

<sup>1</sup> See above, p. 31.

<sup>2</sup> Hutton 1946, p. 162 f. adduces some examples with a wide perspective.

a taboo; for the man who breaks it, will inflict the dangerous mana upon himself and transfer it to everything and everybody he gets into contact with. The community therefore has an immediate and vital interest in demanding that each member observes the taboo rules.<sup>1</sup> On the other hand it is of equally great interest for the individual person to omit performing tabooed actions, because the effects of the mana will first and most fatally affect himself. The individual's interests and welfare thus exactly coincide with the interests and welfare of the whole community. Inversely: the welfare of the community exactly coincides with the welfare of the individual.<sup>2</sup>

This takes us further to the fact, so immensely significant to the form of the religions, that special measures out of consideration to security are required whenever an individual moves between two spheres with essentially different manas. The requirement for such special measures apply locally, e.g. to movements to or from a cult-place, but also e.g. to movements to or from a foreign country. And the requirement applies in connexion with performance of many special actions, thus it applies to the introduction to or the conclusion of participation in a cult festival,<sup>3</sup> but also e.g. to the entrance to or return from war or hunting. Furthermore the requirement applies in connexion with the beginning and expiry of certain specially defined periods, e.g. to the beginning and expiry of a common ritual festival time, but also to the beginning and expiry of important phases of the individual person's life.

We have used the term "spheres with essentially different manas" in such a way that the term can cover both places, actions, and periods. It will be realized that it will often be difficult to decide whether it is actually the place, the action, or the period which is the essential factor. In most peoples outside modern civilization they e.g. went to war in a definite season, and reasonably endeavoured to wage war in a foreign country, on enemy territory. Is it then the entrance into the period in question, the beginning of the war-like expedition as such, or the invasion of the enemy's country which constitutes the special state which invariably requires careful ceremonies of "initiation" in advance, and equally careful ceremonies of "cleansing" afterwards? In many cases the question can without disadvantage be left unanswered; but owing to various circumstances it can at least be characterized

---

<sup>1</sup> This is one of the few points on which two so different authors as Marett and Jevons agree; see *Marett* (1907) 1909, p. 92 f., p. 106 f., and *Jevons* 1904<sup>3</sup>, p. 87. – Cf. – from other points of view – *Frazer* 1909 and *Radcliffe-Brown* (1939) 1952, pp. 133–52.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *Jevons loc. cit.*

<sup>3</sup> The chief point was seen already by *Robertson Smith* 1889, p. 405: "And so we find that the ancients used purificatory rites after as well as before holy functions."

as expedient for a total understanding to consider the *actions* as the essential factors, but, it should be noted, it is actions which involve contact with mana-filled places, objects, or persons.

Furthermore, it should be noted that the special measures required in such cases are intended partly to remove the mana from the sphere which is to be left, partly to prepare the individual for being influenced by the mana from the sphere which he is to enter. This is well-known. But consequently we can view the phenomenon as further development – a logical consequence – of the ideas which, as mentioned above, often involve demands for quite *everyday* prohibitions of mixture of manas.<sup>1</sup>

The means used for the removal of mana may be different at the entrance and the leaving of a sphere, and they may be different on unequal occasions. But the means are often stereotyped, and even in the case of survivals in forms of religion which can no longer be termed primitive, and in which the ceremonies have been made the object of considerable reinterpretations, the original mana-removing character can often clearly be traced, e.g. because the use of the same means on apparently quite different occasions only make sense with this character as its basis.

From a European point of view we may be inclined to interpret some of the ceremonies which are performed at the transition from one sphere of mana to another, as “initiations”, viz. to the extraordinary, to the non-everyday, new state. Other ceremonies performed at transition from one sphere of mana to another we shall, from a European point of view, rather be inclined to interpret as “purifications”, viz. from the unfavourably extraordinary state or from the poorer or only the everyday state or simply from the previous state. In a very large number of the cases such a distinction, however, will be artificial and even from the European train of thought actually without any sense. Do the warriors “purify” themselves from the everyday state or do they “initiate” themselves into the war before they leave? Do they “purify” themselves from the warlike expedition or do they “initiate” themselves again into everyday life when they have returned?

The measures which it is necessary to take at the transition from one sphere of mana to another, can technically and generally be termed “rites de passage”, i.e. rites of transition. As mentioned above, they can be felt as connected with a place, with a definite action, or with a definite period.

Here thus belong all the actions which must be performed – or the performance of which must be omitted – before entering a cult-place, e.g. taking off one’s footwear, putting on special garments, sprinkling with water, ab-

---

<sup>1</sup> See above, p. 30 ff.

stention from eating or drinking certain kinds of food or drink, sexual continence, assuming certain attitudes with the body or hands; as well as all the actions which must be performed when the cult-place is left. Here furthermore belong all actions which must be performed or omitted before the start – and after the conclusion – of certain kinds of business – war, hunting, participation in festivals, ploughing, sowing, harvest, felling of trees, house building, etc., etc. – to which actions the above-mentioned examples also apply, but to which might be added a large number of special ceremonies varying from community to community, although often with remarkably homogeneous principal features. Here also belong all actions which must be performed or omitted at the beginning or end of certain periods, e.g. at the beginning or expiry of festival periods, mourning periods, fasting periods (but not the ceremonies within the period, unless these may in themselves be considered a “transition” from one sphere to another). Particularly great practical importance can be attributed to the beginning and expiry of the normally several years long periods delimited by the important natural turning points in man’s existence: birth, puberty, wedding, death. Ceremonies in connexion with these great boundaries are especially what is considered “rites of transition” in the strict sense of the term.<sup>1</sup>

In the rites of transition the special care of the hair is given full play. At the transition from one sphere of mana to another it will often occur that the head of hair must be renewed. One may cut off the hair at the entrance into the tabooed state or inversely let it grow in order to remove it at the expiry of the taboo period. In some form or other such a consideration for the special qualities of the hair as a bearer of mana can almost be said to be universal. People in mourning all over the world, Indian “holy men”, and many others must let their hair grow from the moment when they enter the special state; mourners in other communities all over the world, the Egyptian priests of antiquity, Buddhist and Christian monks and nuns as well as many others have been obliged to and must still adopt the tonsure on their entry into the special state. And in all the cases in which the taboo state can again cease, the normal, great or small, hair splendour used in the respective communities is adopted again.

At the transition from sphere to sphere it is furthermore often considered that quite a new name for the person in question is required. Initiation into

---

<sup>1</sup> With *van Gennep* 1909. – Collections of material: *Schurtz* 1902 [cf. *Schlesier* 1953] (age-groups), *Crawley* 1927<sup>2</sup> (puberty and wedding), *Hartland* 1914, pp. 235–65, *Frazer* 1913–24, *Frazer* 1933–36 (death). Detailed descriptions of individual rites of transition, e.g. *Spencer and Gillen* 1899, pp. 212–386 (puberty), *La Flesche* 1939 (war), *Wirz* 1928 (death).

a religious community, into a priesthood, or into a monastic order may require a change of names. A king's consecration on his accession to the throne may require that he, too, is given another name. The ceremonies at puberty may include the change of the boy's or girl's name with a man's or woman's name. The wedding may involve a change of names to one of the partners, the man or the woman. In all these cases the name from the previous state may become absolutely tabooed, and such a taboo may also be applied to the name borne by a deceased person when alive, even so far-reaching that all words in which the dead person's name enters must be cancelled from the language.<sup>1</sup>

On this background there can be nothing surprising in the fact that transition to another sphere of mana furthermore generally requires an exchange of clothes.<sup>2</sup> We may go through the same series of examples as that above: initiation into a priesthood or monastic order, an accession to the throne, a ceremony of birth or naming, initiation into the world of the adults, a wedding, and a death, – all of them require a change into a special garment, which marks the new state, either during the transitional rites or for ever.

If the transition into another sphere of mana is only temporary and of rather short duration, the person in question will after return to the original sphere again put on the ordinary garments of this sphere. If the extraordinary sphere of mana is e.g. a sacred place or a festival period, the special garments put on during the visit to the sacred place or for the duration of the festival period, will then get the character of a special ceremonial dress. Such a ceremonial dress will as a rule consist of objects and materials which in themselves bear an immediate connexion with the sphere of mana in which the dress is to be used,<sup>3</sup> and because of the extraordinarily great con-

---

<sup>1</sup> *Jevons* 1904<sup>3</sup>, p. 61. *Fuchs* 1910, p. 111, *Donner* 1915, p. 124. – Although we are here moving in an urban culture, it is surprising that it is possible in a religio-historical work to find such sentences as the following ones, in *Erman* 1934, p. 116, the reference being to the upheavals in the Amarna period: "Wie immer bei solche Torheiten fehlt dann auch die lächerliche Seite nicht. Es berührt uns komisch, wenn wir sehen, dass der gelehrte Schreiber des Königs in seinem Archiv auch in den keilschriftlichen Briefen der asiatischen Könige nachgesehen hat, ob irgendwo das Wort Amon zu tilgen wäre, obgleich dies doch gewiss niemand ausser ihm selbst lesen konnte. Und nicht minder komisch wirkt es, wenn in einer Inschrift irgend ein harmloses Wort, das dem Namen Amon ähnlich sieht, dem Fanatismus zum Opfer gefallen ist."

<sup>2</sup> *Crawley* 1931, especially pp. 69–111, 117–26, 133–65.

<sup>3</sup> *Spencer and Gillen* 1899, p. 174 f. (the *Udnirringita* or Witchetty Grub totem ceremonies: "Hair string is tied round their heads, and *Chilara* or forehead bands are put on, beneath which twigs of the *Udnirringa*<sup>1</sup> bush are fixed so that they hang downwards." "1 The totemic animal takes its name from this shrub, on which the grub feeds."), pp. 181, 182, 183 (the *Erlia* or Emu totem ceremonies: "During the night three large wooden Churinga,

servatism which informs all religion such ceremonial dresses will retain archaic features far down through the ages, even under considerably changed social states and considerably changed other cultural conditions.<sup>1</sup>

Here presumably also belongs the widely distributed phenomenon that certain participants in religious ceremonies appear in masks. Movement in a highly mana-filled sphere requires special measures, as we know. It requires careful preparations, requires the assumption of a special dress, perhaps a special manner of dressing the hair and a special paint; in many cases, it may be added, it obviously requires the wearing of a mask as well. There are places which are only entered and dances or other acts which are only performed in the mask determined for this purpose.

The purpose of the assumption of the dancing mask seems everywhere to be the concentration of a very high intensity of mana in the dancer and at the same time to make him capable of controlling it. The forming of the individual mask therefore will depend on the question what kind of mana it is wanted to concentrate in the given case. As a rule it will be possible clearly to establish the connexion between the mask and the kind of mana in question; for the connexion will generally appear – also to us – either from the outward form or from the material of which it is made.

---

each about four feet in length, were decorated with series of concentric circles of red and yellow ochre and of white pipe clay, and tipped with bunches of emu feathers and the red-barred tail feathers of the black cockatoo." "At daylight the decorated Churinga were fixed on the heads . . ." ". . . the Churinga on the head with its tuft of feathers being intended to represent the long neck and small head of the bird."), p. 296 (an eagle-hawk locality ceremony: "Into the hair-girdle behind was fixed a large bunch of the black feathers of the eagle-hawk, and into the top of each man's headdress were fixed three Churinga, decorated with close rows of down coloured alternately red and white, each Churinga being about three feet in length and decorated at its end with a tuft of eagle-hawk feathers."), etc. etc.; but it should be expressly stated that the connexion between the full dress and the mana sphere in question – in our view – is very often merely "symbolic", and not necessarily, as in the examples adduced here, also to us immediately obvious. A final example, from another culture, *Donner* 1933, p. 235 f.: "Already on the Ket river the Shamans have caps of quite another type. They partly look like crowns with reindeer antlers of iron, partly consist of the bear's cut-off nose with parts of the scalp attached to it. On the river itself the natives, who say that they are descended from the bear, explain that these objects represent their ancestor or the so-called totem animal. I have heard similar explanations near the river Tas, where the Samoyeds say that they are descended from the swan and some other animals. Such statements also occur among their neighbours, the Yenisei Ostiaks." Note that the cap is the essential thing about the Shaman dress, *op. cit.* p. 235: "A Shaman by the Tym river declared to me that his cap was his most important garment. Without his head-gear his shamanic acts were valueless. Therefore it is a custom that when shamanic acts are performed at the request of Russians, the shaman performs them without wearing a cap."

<sup>1</sup> E.g. *Iuperci*, only dressed in goats' skins at the Lupercalia, which were celebrated in Rome as late as the time of Gelasius, 492–96. – Even in our time it is a custom to decorate brides with myrtles although the association of the Greeks *μύρτος-μύρτον* has been forgotten.

The appearance of some masks resembles the species whose mana they are to concentrate. From our European points of view this type of masks may be termed "naturalistic". They are particularly widely distributed in the form of animal masks, so that naturalistic masks are known of practically all more important mammals, birds, and fishes; but their effect is rarely exclusively based on the principle of the like; very often the principle that the part is equal to the whole will be involved as well, as at the making of the mask at least a single small "genuine" part of the animal species the mana of which is to be concentrated is used: the horn of the ox, the antlers of the stag, a fin of the shark, a bear's tooth, a tiger's claw, a tuft of tail-feathers, or whatever it may be.

As another important group of the naturalistic type we may set up the masks which are to concentrate the mana of deceased people. From this type we know masks which render the features of the deceased as they were or were supposed to be when he was alive, masks which reproduce the features immediately after death, and masks which render the skeleton-naked skull. Furthermore we know masks which represent people who have actually lived, and masks which represent people who in all probability are only imagined to have lived. In all cases we may here, too, sometimes find a "genuine" small part being used, but now from the sphere of death, in the shape of a tooth or a piece of a bone, and not rarely even in the way that the whole basic substance of the mask is a real skull.

From our European points of view other masks may be called amimetic, because this type according to our conceptions does not "represent" anything, does not "resemble" or "render" anything at all.<sup>1</sup> As a rule the connexion, also to us, appears from the material which enters in the mask at its making. The material will generally, completely or partially, originate from the sphere the mana of which is to be concentrated.<sup>2</sup> Actually it only seems to be a question of a further development of the fact that the festival dress, indeed, consists of objects and materials which are connected with the sphere of mana within which the dress is to be used. At the moment when some of the festival dress covers the face, the mask appears. It may then be amimetic or naturalistic – this division is due to European categories. At all events it is apparently decisive that the mask is mana-bearing, either because it consists of parts taken from a whole, or because of resemblance to this whole. But the problem of the masks is extremely difficult, and no adequate, full

---

<sup>1</sup> *Rostrup* 1921, p. 81, tr. 1923, p. 88, only considers this type.

<sup>2</sup> But just as it was noted about full dress (p. 37 Note 4) it should be expressly stated that the association between the mask and the mana sphere in question – in our view – is very often merely "symbolic" and is not necessarily to us immediately evident.

unravelment of the complicated facts is available. The present account therefore must be considered merely sketchy.<sup>1</sup>

It is characteristic of the masked performers of cults that they always move about dancing. They have been transferred from the sphere of everyday life and therefore cannot move at the pace of everyday life.<sup>2</sup> They dance with their feet, with their bodies, and often in extremely sublime forms with their hands.<sup>3</sup> Everything closely follows tradition, each step, each movement, each position of the fingers are studied to the last detail, and one

---

<sup>1</sup> The small and large illustrated works on masks in general as a rule do not give sufficiently detailed information for our purpose. As to the material of which a certain mask is made, only the very basis, wood, leather, bark, etc., is mentioned, not the detailed decoration, which in this connexion is of decisive importance. Now and then, however, the details appear sufficiently clearly from the illustration. The information about the concrete function of the mask in question in these works is mostly quite insufficient for our purpose. (But good, representative illustrations, which can give a general impression of the richly varied multitude of the masks are found e.g. in *Gregor* 1936, *Hausenstein* 1923<sup>2</sup>, *Sydow* 1938<sup>4</sup>, *Gorce et Mortier* 1947–48 I, *Riley* 1955. Furthermore, e.g. *Davis* 1949, *Douglas* and *d'Harnoncourt* 1948<sup>2</sup>, *Griaule* 1950 (note also the text pp. 61–81), *Kennard* 1938, *Uttinger* n. d., *Wissler* (1928) 1938). Nor do the general accounts of the primitive drama give the information wanted for our purpose. There we get more or less good information about its function, but not at the same time detailed information about its construction (e.g. *Ridgeway* 1915, *Have-meyer* 1916, *Rostrup* 1921, tr. 1923). The detailed demonstration of the statements set forth above therefore had to take the form of an independent working up of the material in the ethnographical monographs and museum catalogues; but I hope that the sketchy account will not meet with opposition. – Two early attempts at systematic treatment: *Dall* 1884 (who, in passing, also makes interesting contributions to the discussion, now of great current interest, about cultural connexions across the Pacific), and *Andree* (1886) 1889, pp. 107–65. – Good examples of transitional forms between “full dress” and “mask” are found in *Eberle* 1955. – A very fine collection of mainly amimetic masks from a single locality: *Fewkes* 1903 (as well as elsewhere in *BAE-AR*). – An extremely pointed example of the mana effect of a special mask was quoted by *Douglas* and *d'Harnoncourt* (1941) 1948<sup>2</sup>, p. 112 (from *BAE-AR* 47, not 43, as stated), – and from them by *Riley* 1955, p. 52 –, from *Bunzel* 1932, p. 962: “He has one long horn (whence his name, “long horn”), on the right side, “because he brings long life to all his people.” His eyes are long, too. But on the right side his eye is small. That is for the witch people, so that they may not live long, but on the left side his eye is long for the people of one heart, “so that they may have long life.””

<sup>2</sup> There are numerous descriptions in the monographs. Quite elementary in *Spencer and Gillen* 1899, p. 164: “the *Inwurra* party came on at a trot, with the curious high knee action always adopted by the natives when engaged in performing ceremonies.” Furthermore, p. 285: “. . . he adopts a kind of stage walk with a remarkable high knee action, the foot being always lifted at least twelve inches above the ground, and the knee bent so as to approach, and, indeed, often to touch the stomach, as the body is bent forward at each step.”

<sup>3</sup> See *Rostrup* 1921, pp. 103–05, tr. 1923, pp. 111–14. Cf. *Coomaraswamy* and *Duggirala* (tr. s) 1917, *Kat Angelino* 1923, *Gopal* and *Dadachanji* 1951, *Venkatachalam* n. d., pp. 125–31, *Zoete* and *Spies* 1938, *Cuisinier* 1951, *Zoete* 1952, *Ivyer* 1956, *Zoete* 1957. – *Rostrup* 1921, p. 151, tr. 1923, p. 165: “. . . the praise ever bestowed on the hypocrites refers to *μεγαλοφωνία* and *χειρονομία*, a tremendous voice and hand dancing.” (Cf. *Haigh* 1898<sup>2</sup> (pp. 308–11) pp. 348–56, *Pickard-Cambridge* 1953 (pp. 169–74) pp. 251–62, but these two authors blot out the essential element by mentioning the “hand dance” in sections about the chorus). – See further e.g. *Ridgeway* 1915, *Oesterley* 1923, *Niessen* 1953, *Hunningber* 1955.



single small mistake can make the whole ritual invalid so that the ceremony must be stopped and everything be repeated, – if, indeed, the mistake does not bring about still more serious consequences.<sup>1</sup> The dance also concentrates mana, which often appears clearly to everybody, viz. in the ecstasy of the dancer, and when the masked dancer performs the dance correctly, he will be able to control the mana and direct it towards the purpose aimed at by the cult. The drama which is danced in the cult-place will create the same reality in the world outside the cult-place, rain dances will create rain, hunting dances will make the game willing to be hunted, war dances will secure victory over the enemies, corn dances will make the grain germinate and grow.

In spite of a multitude of variants according to purpose, cultural level, place, and people, certain general features may be outlined:<sup>2</sup> the typical ritual dance is performed by one or a few masked dancers, whose drama, i.e. 'action', is accompanied by the singing and rhythmic beats of a chorus of old or at any rate adult men, while the actions of the central individual dancers are supported and supplemented by one or more dancing choruses consisting of boys or youths or women. The chorus of singers are unmasked. The chorus of boys, youths, or women may be unmasked. However, they frequently wear masks which are similar to each other, but different from those of the individual dancers.

The dancer accumulates concentrated mana in him, and with a very slight shifting of the view one gets the conception that the mana is *personified* in the masked dancer. Thus he may be viewed as a personification of the animal species he represents in his dancing, or as a personification of rain, or of the war, or of the corn – if it is "rain", "war", or "corn" he dances – or of his own human kinship group or the whole tribe or a single group within it, e.g. the men or warriors. The relation between the masked dancer and the animal, the rain, the war, the corn, etc., is in the character of identity. It is not something which he represents or performs like an actor, – he *is* it. He contains its mana, and things with the same mana are identical.

---

<sup>1</sup> An unobtrusive correction of a wrongly performed ritual act: *McClintock* 1910, p. 96 (noted by *Pallis* 1926, p. 286 f.). – Repetition of *feriae Latinae*: *Liv.* 32,1. 37,3 (a town not receiving its share), 40,45 (a gale), 41,16 (Lanuvium makes a mistake); cf. *Fowler* 1899, p. 96. – *Rostrup* 1921, p. 75, tr. 1923, p. 80, refers to *Matthews* 1902, p. 145, who is quoted below, p. 43 Note 2, and to *Havemeyer* 1916, p. 38, where there is a further reference to *Tregear* 1904, p. 451 (= 1926, p. 451). – Furthermore, *Rostrup* 1921, p. 90, tr. 1923, p. 97, with reference to *Webster* 1908, p. 166 Note 5, p. 180, *Schurtz* 1902, p. 363, and *Moerenhout*, *Voyages aux Îles du Grand Ocean* (Paris 1837) I, p. 561 f. But almost every monograph can yield examples.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *Rostrup* 1921, tr. 1923.

In the cult songs which accompany the dancing there is therefore no distinction between the masked dancer and the kind of mana he is dancing.<sup>1</sup> If he is a deer dancer, it means that he is *both* a man and a deer.<sup>2</sup> In a deer mask, with a hundred or more dew claws of deer hanging in strings from his belt, with jingling bells about his calves, and with a rattling instrument in each hand the Cáhita Indian will dance his deer dance in Northwestern Mexico. Constantly dancing he will slowly move about, now and then he will stand still as a browsing deer, raise his head backwards, look about him, and then continue dancing. A chorus of three or four other Cáhitas will accompany the dancing with singing to the rhythm of a water drum and rasping sticks. They sing, – we may say they sing to the deer:

“Go, step, my little brother,  
Now the sun is rising,  
Travelling beneath the sun  
Throwing flowers on the way  
While dancing with all your heart.  
How beautiful.”

And a moment later the song is sung to – we may say to the dancer:

“Deer, deer, deer,  
Coyote is hunting you.  
Place yourself in the water.  
No harm will he do you.”

Just as the future may be created by a single fateful act, so the future may also be created by the fateful word. The solemnly pronounced word remains and cannot be retracted, because it *has* already formed the future, as is well-known from the tale in Genesis 27. Although Jacob secured his father Isaac's blessing by deceit, it could not be changed, could not be annihilated, could not be altered and given to Esau, to whom it was rightly due and to whom Isaac thought that he had given it. Esau besought his father to give him his blessing as well, but this was impossible. The future had already been created when Isaac pronounced his blessing on Jacob. From the same scope of ideas spring the phenomena which can later assume the character of “prayer” and

---

<sup>1</sup> See *Grønbech* 1915, p. 32, who calls attention to *Strehlow* 1907–20 III,1, pp. 37–39 and pp. 31–33 (cf. also I, p. 68–69).

<sup>2</sup> The following example for illustration of this fundamental point has been adduced from *Beals* 1945, p. 124 f., where it is given without any comment.

“prophecy”,<sup>1</sup> and to the same scope of ideas also belongs cult singing. The song which is sung by the men’s chorus while the masked dancer is acting, is mana-filled and fateful just as the dance.<sup>2</sup> The dancing – the creative action – and the cult singing – the creative word – are equally vital in the cult, and just as the dancer does not move with the steps and rhythm of everyday life because he has been removed from the sphere of everyday life, so the cult-singing does not move in the words and rhythms of everyday language. Cult songs all over the world are full of archaic or archaizing words, arbitrarily coined terms, cult-technical terms, and with detached syllables which in everyday language are without any meaning. Furthermore, the cult songs are presented in a rhythm that shatters the normal linguistic structure of the words, moreover with an accentuation which runs counter to that of everyday language. Instances of this can perpetually be found where it is possible to compare the text and tune of the songs.<sup>3</sup>

Other general features are that the drama which is danced in the cult-place and the cult-song belonging to it cannot immediately be understood by the participants in the ceremony who attend it for the first time, and that the ritual therefore is accompanied by an explanation, the myth, which pretends to describe in more detail what is happening. And this explanatory *description*, the myth, has always at the same time the character of a *motivation* of the performance of the ritual.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Wellhausen* (1887) 1897<sup>2</sup>, p. 142 remarks: “das Gebet ist der Zweck oder die Interpretation des Opfers, die Begriffe liegen nahe bei einander;” the word, “welches im Arabischen vorzugsweise für die Ragaopfer gebraucht wird, hat im Hebräischen die Bedeutung Gebet.” Cf. *Marett* (1904) 1909, pp. 33–84, *Farnell* 1905, pp. 163–231, *Mensching* 1937, *Reichard* 1944, *Webster* 1948, pp. 92–120. – The effect of mana through the spoken word is also viewed rather “materially” (cf. above, p. 27 ff.). *Wellhausen* 1897<sup>2</sup>, p. 139 Note 4: “Chubaib rief kurz vor seiner Hinrichtung über die ihn umgebenden Mekkaner hin: o Gott, zähle sie genau und töte jeden einzeln und vergiss keinen! Sofort warf Abu Sufian seinen damals noch jungen Sohn Muävia, den späteren Chalifen, platt auf die Erde, damit der Fluch über ihn weggehe . . .” *Glasesnapp* 1922, p. 85: “Als besonders gefährlich gelten die Geister von Enthaupteten; sie sind schwer zu bannen, da sie keine Ohren haben und deshalb die gegen sie angewandten Beschwörungsformeln nicht hören können.”

<sup>2</sup> Therefore it also applies here that even the smallest error may be fatal. *Matthews* 1902, p. 145: “The song sung on this occasion, although it consists mostly of meaningless syllables, is, perhaps, the most important of the whole ceremony. The singers are drilled long and thoroughly in private before they are allowed to sing in public. It is said that, if a single syllable is omitted or misplaced, the ceremony terminates at once; all the preceding work of nine days is considered valueless and the participators and spectators may return, at once, to their homes.”

<sup>3</sup> Thus in the large number of collections of Indian music published by *Frances Densmore* in the BAE Bulletins. Cf. *Densmore* 1942, *Nettl* 1953, 1954, and 1956, pp. 21–25. See also *Strehlow* 1947, p. XX, and the example quoted there. – Cf. *Rostrup* 1921, p. 89, tr. 1923, p. 96 f., with reference to *Webster* 1908, p. 42 f., *Spencer* 1914, p. 189 (which does not seem quite relevant to me), and *Strehlow* 1907–20, III,1, p. 6.

<sup>4</sup> *Rostrup* 1921, p. 84 ff., tr. 1923, p. 90 ff.

It is done like this now because some time in the past this was done e.g. by the ancestor of the kinship group. But it is also now again the ancestor of the kinship group who again performs the same act, for the ancestor is identical with the kinship group, and the dancer is identical with the kinship group and the ancestor. The act once produced a definite result, and in order always to create this result the act must constantly be repeated, i.e. in the sense that to the performers it is always the same, original, first act that is performed. The masked dancer every time performs the creative drama for the first time, the drama which is constantly repeated because it was established like this in the beginning of time.<sup>1</sup> In the cult-place the past is equal to the present and to the future. Hence, to us the acts become timeless. To the participants they are always overwhelmingly intense present time, with a tremendous background of past time and an equally tremendous view of the future. If an animal species is danced, the myth tells about the ancestor's connexion with this animal. Often the great ancestor will himself be both the great animal and the great man. In the myths he changes form from one to the other of the two, or he is both at the same time, – because the masked dancer *is* what he is dancing as well as the man who is dancing.

The character of motivation of the myth thus implies that it refers to – and tells about – the first performance of the ritual act in the past, and the character of description of the myth implies that it *also* tells about what is at present happening in the cult-place, because the ritual act of the past and the present time is the same.

As will be seen, what has hitherto been set out refers to communities and only such communities as are actually controlled by ideas of 'mana'. 'Mana' thus has been used as a technical term, though provided that the ideas may vary a little from community to community: the 'mana' may within the individual culture have a slightly greater or slightly smaller "scope" (as it has been termed by us), and its "qualities" may vary a little from one re-

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *Robertson Smith* 1889, p. 390 f.: "... the rite was simply taken as an established thing, sufficiently explained when the circumstances had been related under which the sacrifice was first instituted." – *Spencer and Gillen* 1899, p. 228: "... certain dances, the important and common feature of which is that they represent the actions of special totemic animals," "... each performer represents an ancestral individual who lived in the Alcheringa."; p. 282: "All that the men could tell us was that it [a long, narrow ceremonial earthen elevation] had always been made so during the Engwura – their fathers had made it and therefore they did – and that it was always made to run north and south, because in the Alcheringa the wild cat people marched in that direction." (Engwura: puberty ceremonies. Alcheringa: the mythical beginning of time). *Spencer* 1914, p. 188: "All that the men could tell us was that their old ancestors had always performed their ceremonies and that, after they had done so, the animals and plants had always multiplied."

ligion to the other; but we may say that the ideas as a whole are characteristic of the religions of the primitive peoples.

In this survey<sup>1</sup> we have nowhere used the term "gods". Presumably it will always be questionable when to use the term "gods" about the contents of the conceptions which we come across and which in the nature of things are sliding and impalpable, but if the word is used in the usual, everyday sense, it can at least be established, on the one hand, that they are not found in the religions of the primitive peoples, and that, on the other hand, they are found in the urban religions. In the urban religions, at any rate, we have the proper conceptions of gods before us as facts. The figures are so distinctly personified and so clearly distinct from a possible previous mana-bearing basis that the difference between these conceptions and those of more primitive stages as a rule stand out unmistakably. The mythical characters now, as it were, live their own independent life in the conceptions. Now the people also begin to tell stories about the mythical figures, – in another way and in another sense than before.

It is one of Professor Pallis's merits as the first to have emphasized the sharp distinction between the religions of the primitive peoples and the urban religions. He did so as early as in "The Babylonian Akitu Festival",<sup>2</sup> but in print perhaps most concisely in the essay "Religionsvidenskab".<sup>3</sup> There it says: "All forms of religion which are known and which have existed, can be systematically divided into two groups: the religions of the primitive peoples and the urban religions. . . . These two groups represent forms of religion which are mutually different in kind, whereas all the religions which belong to one or the other of these two groups are specifically related and identical in their fundamental characters." "The abysmal gulf between these two groups of religions is due to the relation to nature. Gatherers, hunters, cattle breeders and nomads and primitive agriculturists live in direct contact with nature, whereas all the people of the urban religions live in urban communities, from the smallest forms of dwelling together by way of the village and the town to the metropolis, and without direct contact with nature."<sup>4</sup> And later: "The gods are the inmost con-

<sup>1</sup> From p. 20.    <sup>2</sup> Pallis 1926, passim.    <sup>3</sup> Pallis 1944.

<sup>4</sup> Pallis 1944, p. 412: "Samtlige Religionsformer, som kendes og som har eksisteret, kan systematisk deles i to Grupper: Naturfolkernes Religioner og Byreligionerne. – – – Disse to Grupper repræsenterer indbyrdes artsforskellige Religionsformer, hvorimod alle de Religioner, som tilhører den ene eller den anden af disse to Grupper, er artsbeslægtede og i deres Grundpræg identiske." "Det afgrundsdybe Svælg mellem disse to Grupper af Religioner beror paa Forholdet til Naturen. Samlere, Jægere, Kvægavlere og Nomader og primitive Agerbrugere lever i en direkte Kontakt med denne, hvorimod alle Byreligionernes Mennesker lever i By-samfund, fra 'de mindste Former af Samboen over Landsbyen og Købstaden til Storbyen, og uden direkte Føling med Naturen."

sequence of urban culture. In this culture people have let go their hold on nature, while at the same time differentiation has split them up into mutually unconnected groups, and as furthermore they are now without direct contact with nature, which on the whole has passed on to being only an article for everyday use which no more belongs to culture, man himself becomes the only standard of value, the starting-point for all valuation and comparison.”<sup>1</sup>

Before we go on, it should be emphasized that I am aware of another important statement in this essay: “An explanation of the question how gods arise has always been in great demand. . . . But gods do not arise from this or that small and modest beginning, which then develops to what we understand by gods. Such a train of thought is only a transfer to a special point of an already existing evolutionist tendency.”<sup>2</sup> It is not clear to me whether it is only the form of the essay that has given rise to a special sharpness of the formulation in this place, or there may be a change of Professor Pallis’s views of the facts during the period between 1926 and 1944 so that he may no longer wish to answer for certain formulations from 1926. My view of the facts is that certain formulations from the much larger and far more elaborate Akîtu treatise, which is to be quoted now, ought to be retained, *and* that the passage from the 1944 paper just quoted need *not* be at variance with it.

First the quotations. “The agriculturist introduces anthropomorphism; the *manas* of the hunting community, each having its own distinct character, each determined by its “environment”, are conceived as human. Here we meet with a stage in the development towards the fixed deities of the urban culture. The cosmos is conceived as being in three stories, heaven, earth, and below the earth; down below dwell the gods of fertility, often conceived as gods of the realm of the dead. The cosmos of the agriculturist has for its main pillars sun, rain, wind, and storms, these are the powers that govern the growth of the field, and the soil and the forces therein. Into all this, anthropomorphism is introduced, and the variations are great from country to

<sup>1</sup> *Op. cit.* p. 415: “Guderne er Bykulturens inderste Konsekvens. I denne Kultur har Menneskene sluppet deres Magtgreb om Naturen, samtidig med at Differentieringen har splittet dem i indbyrdes uforbundne Grupper. Og da Menneskene endvidere nu er uden direkte Kontakt med Naturen, som stort taget glider ud til blot at blive en Bruggenstand, der ikke mere tilhører Kulturen, bliver Mennesket selv eneste Værdimaaler, Udgangspunktet for al Vurdering og Sammenligning.”

<sup>2</sup> *Op. cit.* p. 414: “Der har altid været en livlig Efterspørgsel efter en Forklaring paa, hvorledes Guder opstaar. — — Men Guder opstaar ikke af denne eller hin ringe og beskedne Begyndelse, som saa udvikler sig til det, vi nu forstaar ved Guder. En saadan Tankegang er blot en Omsætning paa et specielt Punkt af en i Forvejen tilstedeværende evolutionistisk Tendens.”

country.”<sup>1</sup> “Man identifies himself ritually with the powers of the cosmos (in the hunting community these are *manas* determined by their “environment”, in the agricultural community they are anthropomorphic deities), . . .”<sup>2</sup> – For the sake of clarity in the present context the following passage has been omitted from the quotation: “. . . ( . . . ), men are gods, and in consequence they can create anew each time all the possibilities of the year;” for of course this is to be understood like this: “Among the primitive peoples there are no gods; if we are to use this term from urban culture, we may figuratively say, that the participants in the cult are the gods, but not the profane clan member of everyday life.”<sup>3</sup> – In continuation of the train of thought quoted above it says on the same page: “The development of anthropomorphic deities, in particular, denotes a new departure, though in principle the performance of the two dramas is the same.”<sup>4</sup> And in this connexion a third quotation: “Presumably the primitive agriculturist introduced anthropomorphism; he thought of everything in the cosmos as human, and all the *manas* of the cosmos assumed human characteristics; in the cult drama men identified themselves with the gods. But he [ø: man] did not know our conception of fixed deities, it was merely latent in him. In the urban culture, on the other hand, the idea of a deity becomes firmly established, it is animated and differentiated; we get one god for war, one for death, for fire, water, thunder, rain, etc., corresponding to the differentiation of life. And these gods are represented pictorially in various ways; the relation between the god and his image is most frequently conceived as a relation of identity, and it is only the reflection of a later age that looks behind the wooden image and the marble and speaks vaguely of it representing, but not being, the god.”<sup>5</sup>

It seems evident to me that these formulations of 1926 actually leave a possibility open for a both theoretically and practically fruitful work from a view which in a certain sense counts on a “development”, viz. by using the terms (1) “the development of anthropomorphic deities” and (2) “a stage in the development towards the fixed deities of the urban culture.” And it seems to me that it is hardly necessary that the formulation of 1944 should be understood as a dissociation from these terms, for the word “development” hardly needs to imply an evolutionist tendency; it is difficult for the

---

<sup>1</sup> *Pallis* 1926, p. 294.

<sup>2</sup> *Op. cit.* p. 295.

<sup>3</sup> *Pallis* 1944, p. 413: “Hos Naturfolkene findes ingen Guder; skal vi bruge denne rent bykulturelle Betegnelse, kan vi overført sige, at Kultdeltagerne er Guderne, men ikke det daglige profane Klansmedlem.”

<sup>4</sup> *Pallis* 1926, p. 295.

<sup>5</sup> *Op. cit.* p. 304 f.

word to avoid assuming an evolutionist shade, but in English (and Danish as well) a development may, indeed, be for the worse, perhaps even end in disaster, and it may take place by leaps and bounds. If “development” in (1) is to be understood as, or be replaced by, ‘rise’, and in (2) to be understood as, or be replaced by ‘connected course’, it would seem impossible to read any evolutionist tendency into the word.

The fact that the points of view from 1926, with the more explicit formulations above, presumably should be retained, is especially due to three reasons. (a) The sociological frame indicated for the forms of religion is in principle based on a historical “development”, with a view to time a ‘connected course’, from the smallest forms of dwelling together by way of the village and the market town to the metropolis. We may then a priori expect that – and at least ought to investigate whether – it is possible among the forms of the religious conceptions to establish a corresponding ‘connected course’ (a corresponding “historical development”). (b) At every given time it will be possible to establish that there is a closer or looser relation of contact between any given urban culture and some relatively pure agricultural culture, loosest for the metropolises, for the towns after the industrial revolution, for towns in more extensive connected industrial areas, closest for the villages, closest for the villages before the industrial revolution, closest for villages in more extensive connected agricultural areas; but even in towns proper in antiquity as well as the Middle Ages in such a way that the citizens of towns might very well be agriculturists at the same time. The existence and influence of agricultural culture therefore are of a greater extent in the economic and general sociological sphere than appears if e.g. the rise of the towns is used as line of demarcation, which ought to strengthen our expectation as well as the request for investigating the possibility of establishing ‘connected courses’ in the sphere of religion. (c) Even the well-known fact that in the urban religions there are ‘survivals’ of numerous kinds seems to me *eo ipso* to show that indeed it *can* only be a question of a ‘connected course’ also in the case of the religious conceptions at different times; for without regard to the question how “fossilized” and “isolated” these ‘survivals’ may seem to us and perhaps may have seemed to the people in question themselves, they have *still* been transferred to the new cultural forms, not as newly discovered geological finds from the past, but by living people who, in spite of a new cultural whole, *still* have continued performing certain acts, pronouncing certain words, or whatever it may be.

The whole great treatise about the Akîtu festival indeed is evidence that the author of the treatise takes it for granted that possibilities of the kind mentioned may have been present, and later lectures on Greek religion have



without reservation given the impression that the view has been preserved. It is another matter that *we* are unable for each time to state exactly how far “the development” had advanced, – and the people of the community in question as well were presumably unable to do so.<sup>1</sup>

Here we are presumably also on a subject of central importance for the special problem of “the gods”. We might be faced with a demand for a more exact statement of what type or size a town is to be in order that we shall change our term from “anthropomorphic deities” to “gods”. But to satisfy this demand it would obviously in the first place be necessary to work out much specified definitions of the two terms, which I for one should not like to try; secondly, it would be necessary that we had at our disposal some equally greatly specified material on which the definitions might be tested, which probably would not be the case, and thirdly, it would be necessary that we could be sure that the view of the members of the community in question was in complete agreement with our scientific definitions, and the probability of that would be zero.

*For these reasons* I think we must content ourselves by laying down that we shall use the word “gods” in such a way that it covers the general contents of the word in everyday language, with the addition that these contents only apply to the conceptions in the urban religions. But we are unable to make any detailed statement as to the question when – or at what stage in the course – these conceptions of “gods” arise and suddenly “are there”. We can only say that *when* the conceptions are there, there is a shifting of the view, of a fundamental character and with very radical effects.

If any importance is ascribed to the statements made under (a), (b), and (c), we should not, on the other hand – if only on grounds of principle – a priori leave the conceptions of “gods” out of consideration. Time and again we can see how people have transferred religious usage and conceptions from one social state to the other, sometimes as isolated “survivals” which appear without any organic connexion with the new states, but sometimes closely inserted in a continued series of new connexions, – and then under always new sets of reinterpretations. The non-evolutionist aspect of this view is implied in the very concept ‘reinterpretation’, in the fact that the reinterpreted element is inserted into quite new connexions in quite a new cultural whole on the basis of quite a new outlook in the people, and the possibility of still establishing a ‘connected course’ is implied in the fact that the new cultural whole *still* is rooted in the past, that the new connexions and the new outlook *still* appear through a longer or shorter period in

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *Pallis* 1926, p. 302 ff.

living communities and in the minds of living people, and that there is *still* some available material which is the very object of the reinterpretations.

At the transition to new social states the reinterpretations of previous concepts of mana set in on many points. Thus it may occur that the injurious effects of definite kinds of mana are stressed so much that these kinds of mana assume the character of “uncleanness” in the religious sense of this word, while the favourable effects of certain other kinds of mana at the same time assume a character which by way of contrast must be given the special name of “sacredness” or “holiness”. To this type of cases belongs, as something of particularly frequent occurrence, the fact that the mana of foreign, especially enemy tribes must be conceived as “unclean”, because this foreign mana, as we have seen, is injurious in advance. Therefore it may be seen that what is “unclean” in one people, is “sacred” or “holy” in another people in the neighbourhood, but in such a way that the objects in question in both peoples may be found to be surrounded by practically absolutely like taboo conceptions. Corresponding phenomena may also be found in the relation between conquerors and conquered people, and then as a rule in the way that the taboos attached to the mana-filled objects of the original inhabitants are interpreted by the conquerors as consequences of “uncleanness”, whether this is due to ignorance or arrogance or a conscious policy. Furthermore such reinterpretations may occur in cases of change of religion without ethnic contrasts necessarily being involved.<sup>1</sup> In this connexion the rise of the urban religions is also of great practical importance. This reinterpretation of the mana-filled element to being “sacred” or “unclean”<sup>2</sup> set in in all spheres, both as regards persons, objects, and periods, often in such a way that nobody really know what is actually the matter with the things in question.<sup>3</sup> Sometimes it is therefore left in abeyance, but sometimes we can see that great efforts have been made to construct a plaus-

---

<sup>1</sup> Well-known e.g. in North European religions, where it is discussed in practically all treatments. – Readers who have some knowledge of Danish, are referred to the description in Troels Lund’s Book Five of the fate of the horse after the introduction of Christianity. Unfortunately it is too long to be quoted in English translation.

<sup>2</sup> For a non-Semitic example showing that “uncleanness” can be transferred through several links see *Manu* V, 85.

<sup>3</sup> E.g. *Luc., de dea Syria* 54. – It may give trouble to scholars of our time as well; see e.g. *Smith and Dawson* 1924, p. 37 and Note 2. Quoting H. E. Winlock, “A little chamber had been provided for them near the tomb because they had been in contact with the dead man’s body and therefore contained some of the essence of his being, but outside of the courtyard because all that appertained to embalming was essentially impure.”, the authors comment: “We cannot agree with this interpretation, as all the facts as well as the Egyptian texts, seem to prove just the reverse. The emanations of the corpse, being assimilated to Osiris, were the essence of the god himself, which were therefore doubly sacred and abundantly treated as such in innumerable religious texts.”

ible explanation. A contact with the mana-filled objects is highly dangerous. This applies continually even if they are called "sacred" and the sacredness is connected with a god, but then there is no longer any understanding of the fact that a contact with the sacred things is *immediately* fatal. The fatal effect is conceived as a consequence of a god's punishing intervention in case of offence. On the background of the primitive conceptions we, however, understand why in such cases it no use that the offence does not take place in order to do harm, indeed that the terrible consequences of a contact do not even fail to appear even if is done with the very best intentions.<sup>1</sup>

Handling of vigorous mana requires careful measures for the avoidance of disasters, and we have previously seen that it may be necessary e.g. to assume a special dress which under no circumstances must get into contact with the profane sphere. Therefore it is consistent that sacredness, too, clings to the garments so that they must be kept isolated, as it is enjoined on the priests to do in the Old Testament.<sup>2</sup>

The distinction between "initiations" and "purifications"<sup>3</sup> also appears in the urban religions together with the other reinterpretations, and here, too, the original character of the phenomenon causes the reinterpretations to give the most confuse results. Many processes removing mana which are conceived as "purifications" are now reinterpreted as purifications for "sin". In primitive communities people perform their rituals "because it has always been done like this." This answer has been given to inquiring Europeans again and again; it is done because the first ancestor did so. Therefore it may sometimes be a question of only quite a small shift to the conception that it is done because the first ancestor *enjoined* it, and from there again there is only a very small shift to the view that it was a "god" who did so, viz. when the conceptions of gods have made their appearance. Infringements of the rules of taboo, which previously and in themselves would result in grave consequences, then become infringements of a god's prohibition, become "sin" against these prescriptions or against the god, and this becomes something which involves the god's active, punishing intervention, of which we have just seen an instance. It is notorious that it is a question of reinterpretations as appears from the fact that the conception of a "sin" in the connexion in question from the points of view of the urban religion itself is

---

<sup>1</sup> See 2 *Sam.* 6,6-7; cf. 1 *Chron.* 13,9-10. – In his mention of this episode *Nyström* 1946, p. 53, expressly states: "Ausserordentlich stark kommt das *mana*-Moment der Lade in der Erzählung von Ussa zum Ausdruck, der seine Hand ausstreckt, um die Lade des Herrn anzufassen, als die Ochsen straucheln, und der durch die kraftgeladene Lade getötet wird."

<sup>2</sup> *Ezek.* 44,17-19. Cf. *Robertson Smith* 1889, p. 405 (the handling of the Scriptures defiles the hands, i.e. entails a ceremonial washing); pp. 427-34.

<sup>3</sup> See above, p. 35.

often completely absurd, as in our instance. It may also appear from the fact that people often do not know what "sin" they have committed or what god they have "sinned" against.<sup>1</sup>

In order to get closer to the conceptions of "gods" we shall here especially dwell on the transitional period in which the reinterpretation take place and the new conceptions are developed, and which obviously coincides with the period in which the village becomes a town and a city state. But the time limits, as has several times been pointed out, are not sharply defined; transitional phenomena occur far down into flourishing urban religions, and it is just on the basis of this material that we find it possible to establish what is happening.

Among other things it may happen that certain mana-filled objects slowly in the course of time are transformed – in form as well as functionally – into idols. In the case of several communities we can follow the historical development (the connected course) and establish how employment gradually passed from unhewn stones or living trees to statues. The stone or tree was hung with a mask and with garments at the ceremonies; later a head was shaped in the material, perhaps, another important part of the body as well, a hand, the genitals, or the feet; and still later fully shaped statues were created. The development can be traced in the case of e.g. Dionysos or Hermes in any fairly large history of Greek art.<sup>2</sup> Frequently we even find two types of idols side by side, both of them being conceived as the god in question "himself". One type of idol is the large, often colossal,

<sup>1</sup> See "Lament in 65 lines to any god", IV R 10, i.e. *Rawlinson* 1861–84, Vol. IV (1875), Plate X. Included in a number of collections of translated texts, thus: *Zimmern* 1885, no. IV, pp. 61–74, *Schrader* 1903<sup>3</sup>, p. 611 f., *Zimmern* 1905, p. 22 ff., *Jastrow* 1905–12, II, p. 101 ff., *Weber* 1907, p. 145 ff., *Söderblom* 1908, III, p. 184 f., *Fenger* 1919, p. 35 f., *Ungnad* 1921, p. 224 ff., *Gressmann* 1926<sup>2</sup>, p. 261 f., *Langdon* 1927, pp. 39–44, *Pritchard* 1950, p. 391 f., *Tallqvist* 1953, p. 142 ff., *Falkenstein* u. *Soden* 1953, p. 225 ff. – In texts like the Babylonian *Šurpu* II20-83 (*Zimmern* 1896, transl. e.g. *Jastrow* 1905–12, I, p. 325 f.) and the Egyptian Book of the Dead, Ch. 125, we may find long catalogues of "sins" some of which it is in our time customary to denote as ethical, with an addition as that made by *Vold* 1925, p. 250 f.: "But these sins of an ethical character are completely paralleled to sorcery and witchcraft, to transgression of taboo rules and ritual commandments." The contents of the above-mentioned catalogues of sins, so varied to us, however, rather ought to produce reflections as to whether this use of the word "ethical" is not determined by the question which taboo rules and ritual commandments in our time are recognized as valid norms. – Cf. *Frazer* (1888) 1931, p. 86, and *Frazer* 1909.

<sup>2</sup> Or see *Rumpf* 1928 (*Haas* 13/14) Nos. 15–17, 29, 30, 32, 67, 70; cf. Nos. 57, 63–65, 69, 71–73, 168, 188. *Frickenhans* 1912. *Gorce* et *Mortimer* 1947–48, II, pp. 44, 47, 69, 213. Cf. *Havell* 1905, p. 168: "The idol, as is frequently the case in Benares temples, is nothing but a metal mask and a collection of gaudy draperies." – Cf. *Donner* 1915, p. 113 and p. 123 (a picture of a face carved into the trunk of a living tree and denoted as the "forest god"), p. 119 (an almost unshaped stone idol, dressed). – Cf. *Robertson Smith* 1889, p. 191 f.

stationary statue in the temple, the other type is the considerably smaller, often quite small cult idol which is carried in processions in pomp and circumstance, but which also has its fixed place in the temple, where it is every morning awaked, dressed, and decorated, and where throughout the day it is treated to food and drink and done homage to with great honours.<sup>1</sup> Even at this stage there are still quite unshaped “idols”, especially of the type which have been termed cult idols, e.g. in the form of an unhewn stone.<sup>2</sup> When such absolutely unshaped cult idols occur side by side with a picture proper – in our sense of the word, i. e. as a statue – of the same god, it will not, normally, be the shaped statue, but the unshaped cult idol which is the centre of the ritual, in which way it is emphasized that this is the original, mana-filled cult object.

Furthermore, the view of the masked dancers and the mythical figures connected with them to an ever higher degree tends towards assuming a final form as conceptions of “gods”;<sup>3</sup> while at the same time the dancing masks themselves mark these conceptions. The anthropomorphous features of many gods seem mainly to originate from the masked dancers. Thus “gods” of

<sup>1</sup> E.g. *Dubois* tr. 1899<sup>2</sup>, pp. 589, 591 f., 595, 598 f., 602 f., 609, 611. *Ward* 1815–18<sup>2</sup>, II, pp. 234 ff., 239 f., 272–75. *Wilkins* 1887, pp. 212 f., 223, 275 f., 277, 281 f., 284, 286–91, 293–97. *Monier-Williams* 1891<sup>4</sup>, pp. 69 f., 93 f., 144 f., 153, 442 f., 449, 575. *Havell* 1905, pp. 160 f., 166, 174–76, 193. *Thomas* n. d., p. 32 f. *Morgan* 1953, pp. 167, 185–88. *Diebl* 1956. – The cult idol is the god himself. See further *Cic., Div. in Caec.* 1,3, adduced by *Jacobsen* 1914–20, II, p. 59. The gods (the cult idols) may go on a visit to one another, e.g. *Pallis* 1926, pp. 74–76, 122 f., 132–39; also a number of examples from India, see references above; the gods (the cult idols) may contract a fever, e.g. *Wilkins* 1887, pp. 223, 288, and the gods (the cult idols) may be lent, e.g. *Amarna* Letter No. 20, ed. *Winckler* 1896, = No. 23, ed. *Knudtzon* 1915 (cf. p. 1050 f.), = No. 23, ed. *Mercer* 1939; cf. *Erman* 1934, p. 151. Or they may be given away, like the Magna Mater (*Wissowa* 1902, p. 263, with references).

<sup>2</sup> *Monier-Williams* 1891<sup>4</sup>, p. 69 f. – *Wellhausen* (1887) 1897<sup>2</sup>, p. 25 (Manāt, “ein grosser Stein”), p. 29 (alLāt, “ein viereckiger Felsblock”), p. 36 (al ‘Uzzā, “drei Samurabäume”), p. 39 (“der heilige Stein”), p. 45 (Dhu lChalaça, “ein weisser Stein”), p. 46 (“Heutzutage ist Dhu lChalaça die (steinerne) Türschwelle der Moschee von Tabāla”), p. 49 (Dhu lScharā, “Sein Idol in Petra, in einem kostbaren Tempel, war ein schwarzer viereckiger unbehauener Stein, vier Fuss hoch und zwei breit”), p. 51 f. (alFals, “ein roter Vorsprung in der Mitte des (sonst schwarzen . .) Berges Aga, von menschenähnlichem Aussehen”), p. 54 (alGalsad, “er sah aus wie ein sehr grosser Mannesrumpf, von weissem Stein, mit einer Art Kopf, der schwarz war; wenn man denselben aufmerksam betrachtete, sah man daran etwas wie ein Menschengesicht”), p. 59 (Sa’d, “ein hoher Steinblock”), p. 74 (“Der schwarze Stein war das eigentliche Heiligtum und blieb es auch, nachdem ein künstliches Gottesbild hinzugekommen und im Inneren der Ka’ba ausgestellt war”), etc. As well-known by some scholars, *Wellhausen* based his account on *Jaqu’t*’s extract from *Ibn al-Kalbi*’s *Kitāb al Aṣ-ṣ-nām*, which however, has later been found and published in translation as *The Book of Idols*, tr. 1952, to which reference is made for details. – *Wissowa* 1902, p. 263, with references (*Magna Mater*).

<sup>3</sup> Cf. *Rostrup* 1921, p. 91, tr. 1923, p. 98, *idem* 1921, p. 136, tr. 1923, p. 147: “Deities are created by the cult δρωμενα.”

human form and e.g. with an animal head very often on close inspection prove quite clearly to be *masked* human beings.<sup>1</sup> But also cult performers with another ritual function than the dance may give a basis of conceptions of gods.<sup>2</sup>

From the urban religions of antiquity we have a number of instances of the gods being able to appear in many forms, even at one and the same ceremony. It occurred especially frequently that a god participated in the form of an idol as well as in the form of the king, such as Marduk at the New Year's festival in Babylon.<sup>3</sup> Furthermore the god may also appear in the form of a cult object, e.g. a stone, a wheat-ear, or a bunch of grapes,<sup>4</sup> and at an Egyptian harvest festival we may find the god Min in a procession as portrait pictures of previous kings, as a white bull, as the king, and as a cult idol;<sup>5</sup>) but if in such cases we always said that the god "manifested" himself, now in the statue, now in the cult idol, now in a human being, it would often only be thrusting our own conceptions upon foreign cultures. A conception of "manifestations" in such cases presupposes that a "god" has already been abstracted and that such an abstraction has been made the primary factor, as people are no longer able to conceive cult idols, kings, etc., as gods "proper".<sup>6</sup> Numerous texts from many different com-

---

<sup>1</sup> A large material collected in *Klingbeil* 1935. – A completely perverse view is expressed in *Erman* 1934, p. 152: "Zwar, dass dem Amon ein Widder heilig war, können wir noch verstehen, trug doch die eine Form dieses Gottes einen Widderkopf."

<sup>2</sup> E.g. TS. V, 2, 1,1: ("in that he strides the strides of Viṣṇu, the sacrificer becoming Viṣṇu wins finally these worlds," tr. *Keith* 1914, II, p. 403. Cf. *op. cit.* I, p. cxxvii.

<sup>3</sup> E.g. *Pallis* 1926, p. 138 and p. 141; cf. p. 305. – Aton in Tell Amarna "tritt . . . in drei Gestalten auf," *Erman* 1934, p. 124: "Die dritte Gestalt, in der sich die Gottheit offenbart, ist dann der König selbst, . . ." cf. p. 447: "Alle drei stehen nebeneinander auf den Türen der Gräber II<sub>5</sub>; VI<sub>32</sub> und auf der Grenzstele Amarna V Taf. 27."

<sup>4</sup> Cf. p. 53 Note 2. – *Glaserapp* 1922, p. 137: "Manasā, die Schwester des Schlangenkönigs Shesha, wird unter dem Bilde einer auf einer Schlange stehenden und von Schlangen umringten Frau vorgestellt, zumeist aber unter dem Symbol eines Zweiges, eines Wassertopfes oder einer künstlichen Schlange angebetet." – *Grønbech* tr. 1931, II, p. 265 f.: ". . . no line can be drawn between ritual actors and ritual implements. The god may be impersonated by a man, but it is no less probable that he will make his appearance in the form of a skull, a ram's head or horn or any other object resting [in] the sacrificial place, and in this guise play his part as well as by means of the acts and gestures of the sacrificers."

<sup>5</sup> *Lepsius* 1849–59, Bd. VI (Dritte Abtheilung), Blatt 162–63 (Ramses II), *Wilkinson* 1841, Suppl., Plate 76 (Ramses III), *Nelson* 1940, Pls. 196–217, *Nelson* 1936, I, Pls. 17–20. Cf. *Lieblein* 1883–85, II, pp. 149–51, *Gardiner* 1915, *Blackman* 1923, p. 179 ff., *Lange* 1927, *Gauthier* 1931, p. 194, p. 235, etc., *Hooke* 1933, pp. 27–29, *Jacobsohn* 1939, pp. 29–40, *Frankfort* 1948, p. 188 ff., p. 390, *Bleeker* 1956. – Min perhaps further appeared in the form of the lettuce plant; cf. *Frankfort op. cit.* p. 188, p. 390 Note 23.

<sup>6</sup> E.g. *Erman* 1934, p. 185: "Beruht doch der Staat auf der Fiktion, dass der König ein Gott ist. Und auf derselben Fiktion beruht nun auch der gesamte Kultus; auch er setzt voraus, dass der König in unmittelbarem Verkehr mit den Göttern steht. So erklärt sich die Ungeheuerlichkeit, dass in allen Tempeln der König allein an die Stelle des Volkes tritt."

munities, however, show such a usage of the “god’s names” that only the context can decide whether *we* in the place in question should have considered the thing denoted by the name as a sacred object, as a mythical figure, as a shaped idol of wood or stone, or as a human being in a dancing mask, and often not even the context can show us this.<sup>1</sup> During the cult the object of the same designation will not rarely change from one moment to another, often so discontinuously that it is difficult for us to follow the incessant semantic change.<sup>2</sup> The reason is that we classify things differently, it is only to us that there is a semantic change. For the cultures which we are discussing things with the same name are not only in some respect uniform, they are identical.

Add to this another fact which may also be supposed to be of decisive importance for the explanation of the problem of the large number of shapes of the gods and the discontinuous semantic change. If we consider the “gods” as the primary factor, it may often be rather incomprehensible to us why a “god” in a certain ritual at one moment is to be “represented” by a sacred object, and at the next moment be “represented” by a human being, and then again a moment later by a large statue, then by a small cult idol, and then again perhaps by the human being and the sacred object at the same time. But indeed, what we are doing in the case of this view, is again only seeing the myths as the primary factor. The tendency to do so is for that matter so ingrained that it is frequently possible to find serious unravelments of the question how some god “actually is” in contrast to that which is “only a popular belief” about him, or inversely, in contrast to that which is “only priests’ speculations”.<sup>3</sup> However, we have previously seen good reasons for not normally considering the myths as the primary factor in the interplay between ritual and myth, and through recognizing the ritual as the primary factor, the present problem will, indeed, be considerably

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *Pallis* 1926, p. 136 f. – *Gronbech* 1931, II, p. 265: “... no line can be drawn between ritual actors and ritual implements.”

<sup>2</sup> E.g. *Pedersen* 1926–40, III–IV, p. 269: “In several passages it is not even possible to decide whether the words apply to the Ark or to Yahweh (*1 Sam.* 6, 3.5.8.20).”

<sup>3</sup> Cf. above, p. 11 Note 1. – *Erman* 1934, p. 98 f.: “Mit derselben Sorgsamkeit hat man [i.e. die Priester] denn auch die Göttersagen behandelt, natürlich nicht zu ihrem Vorteil. Was volkstümlich in ihnen war, ist durch törichte Einfälle und Spekulationen zurückgedrängt. Besonders sucht man dabei zu wissen, wie dieses oder jenes, was den Priestern wichtig erschien, entstanden war und woher es seinen Namen erhalten hatte. Den Grund fand man immer in irgend etwas, was der Gott getan oder gesagt haben sollte.“ How perverse this view of the facts is, is emphasized by such a passage as this (*op. cit.* p. 61): „Die Sagen sind uns nun in sehr verschiedener Gestalt überliefert. Da ist die eine Gestalt, die rezipierte der offiziellen Religion, einfach aber verkürzt und daher nicht immer klar. Eine andere Gestalt hat ihr volkstümliches Aussehen bewahrt, doch ist uns gerade diese meist nur aus späterer Zeit erhalten.“

simpler. It will then be reduced to being a question why the same mythical figure is used to explain a continuous series of ritual acts, – the dance, manipulations with objects, cult idols, etc. But for this it is obviously sufficient that it is a question of a mythical figure which is popular in the circles where the explanation of the ritual is formed or is of particular importance, perhaps of particular political importance to them.<sup>1</sup> Somewhat more pointedly it may be said that the great gods are mythical figures which are used for more and more ritual explanations.

People with the view that the myths are the primary factors for that matter, as is well-known, have already in antiquity wondered why the Romans imagined a “god” for each separate act in agriculture. In modern times these Roman gods have been designated as “momentary gods”, and it has been established that gods of this type are found in many places. As a rule the names of such “gods” are derived from the act to which they are attached.<sup>2</sup> If and where all these “momentary gods” are reinterpreted to become one god, we can see a great god of agriculture rise before our eyes, and, as is well-known, the process may in many cases be traced because the names of the original “momentary gods” continually appear as epithets of the unified, greater god.<sup>3</sup> Thus in this way, too, we arrive at the same result as before. Great gods are mythical figures who enter into the explanation of a large number of rituals.

And the sentence is also valid in the sense that great gods are mythical figures who are used for the explanation of more and more local cults.<sup>4</sup>

But still more happens.<sup>5</sup> The gods in the urban religions so to say begin living their own life. The mythical tales are reduced to a system, that is a new system, no longer with the ritual, but with the mythical figures as the objects of the main interest. Mythical episodes which originally were (and actually are) completely disconnected, isolated “explanations” and “motivations” of single acts in a ritual or in completely different rituals, are

---

<sup>1</sup> A large material from Hellas concerning politically inspired myths has been collected in *Nilsson* 1951. – A voluminous work on religious polemics in mythical form might be written on the basis of Indian texts.

<sup>2</sup> *Servius ad Georg.* I, 21. *Preller-Jordan* 1881–83<sup>3</sup>, II, pp. 223–26, *Usener* 1896, p. 76 f. (In the Danish translation, *Fenger* 1919, p. 169 f., “Redarator” should be ‘Reparator’ and “Sarritor” should be ‘Saritor’).

<sup>3</sup> For the whole of this section see *Usener* 1896. – I have not, like Usener, made a distinction between “Sondergötter” and “Augenblicksgötter”.

<sup>4</sup> Examples and remarks in connexion with the immediately preceding sections, i.a. *Wellhausen* (1887) 1897<sup>2</sup>, pp. 25, 33, 60, 209, 217, *Robertson Smith* 1889, p. 39, *Fowler* 1899, pp. 67, 73 Note 6, 80 Note 1, 226 f., *Segerstedt* 1903, p. 101, *Farnell* 1905, p. 42, etc., *Bertholet* 1933, *Bertholet* 1934 (including examples of some intelligible confusion with regard to the sex of the “gods”). – See also *Bloesch* 1943.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. *Pallis* 1926, p. 254.



brought together in an attempt at creating a continuous tale about one or more figures from these mythical episodes. Sometimes also what is now apparently gaps in the constructed continuous tale is filled up. Sometimes the filling is done with borrowed material, sometimes with pure invention, i.e. with narration which is free in the sense that it is no longer bound to the ritual. In this way the life history of the god arises, or at any rate considerable parts of it. Such connected tales of gods may perhaps secondarily produce new ritual acts. Or great poets may take the tales in hand and the recital of the new poetical works be incorporated as parts of religious ceremonies which perhaps have nothing at all to do with the ceremonies from which the original myths were derived.<sup>1</sup> Or the adapters may be driven by learned antiquarian interest so that we get a mythology, a theory of myths, which from some areas unfortunately is almost the only thing handed down to us.

Some few remarks about a disputed question must be inserted here before we continue the main line of the presentation. Doctors disagree about the position of certain figures. It is a question especially about figures which in tales appear as creators of the world ("creator gods") and about figures who in tales appear as bringers of culture ("culture heroes"), e.g. the hero who gave the fire to man. In a large number of cases such figures will be closely attached to a ritual, viz. respectively to the annual drama of creation in the cult-place and – in our example – to the ritual fire-drilling. In such a case there will be nothing in particular to observe beyond what has already been stated above. But it seems that in some cases we may find such figures in tales without any corresponding ritual being known, either of an ordinary and expected type or of any other kind. If – as frequently – these figures are denoted as "gods", we get, in other words, a phenomenon which may be called "gods without worship". Previously in research such a "god" was termed a *deus otiosus*, 'an idle god', i.e. a "god" who was related once to have created the world, but of whom later nothing was seen or heard, and who was still less the object of any active interest in religion. Later, however, certain scholars who for some reason consider "creator gods" particularly distinguished, have introduced the term "high-gods"<sup>2</sup> to denote a large

---

<sup>1</sup> *Pseudo-Plato, Hipparchus* 228 b: Hipparchus, son of Peisistratus, introduced recitation of the Iliad and the Odyssey at the Panathenaic festival.

<sup>2</sup> According to Lang 1898. As appears from his account, and as expressly stated e.g. pp. 207 and 209, Lang, however, still only mentioned "the high Gods", – which figures by his successors have been elevated to being "the High Gods". Nor did his successors listen to Lang's warnings, *op. cit.* p. 187: "The missionary who does not see in every alien god a devil is apt to welcome traces of an original supernatural revelation, darkened by all peoples but the Jews." And: "It may be needful, too, to point out once again another weak point in all reasoning about savage religion, namely that we cannot always tell what may have been borrowed from Europeans."

number of heterogeneous figures in widely different cultures, though in such a way that the figures here mentioned constitute the core of the collection. In our view the problems thus arising may to a considerable extent be reduced to a question of terminology. The question is not whether somewhere in the world there are “idle gods” or not; the question is what we onlookers understand by the word when we denote a figure as a “god”. It seems confusing to us to talk about “gods” before the rise of the urban religions, and it seems unreasonable to us to denote figures as “gods” if they are not “worshipped”, i.e. if they have no religious cult. This formulation should emphasize that it is a question of terminology, but it is also a question of facts in so far as the terminology at least ought to help giving a clear understanding of the phenomena and a clear survey of the material of facts.

To return to the reinterpretations: when the conception of gods makes its appearance, it will happen as a consequence that a number of acts are reinterpreted so that they are considered an “offering” to a god, without it being necessary that this concept of “offering” should always be quite clarified. Frequently it is, to tell the truth, on the contrary very hazy.<sup>1</sup> People then sometimes manage with such specifications as “gift offering”, “sin offering”, “sacramental offering”, “first fruit offering”, which terms, however, cause a stressing of the differences rather than the similarities between the phenomena which have now been pooled.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> And in many cases translations have made the confusion still greater. In the history of research a great part of the struggle for a clarification of these concepts has been a struggle against difficulties of the scholars' own making. – As may be demonstrated in more detail (but it will not be so in the present work), one word (*miquia*) is in Aztec used indiscriminately about ‘dying’ in general and about ‘dying (ritually)’; and another word (*tlalia*) is used indiscriminately about ‘laying down, laying, putting’ in quite an everyday meaning and about ‘laying down, laying, putting (ritually)’, e.g. in front of an idol. By first translating the terms for the two above-mentioned, completely heterogeneous phenomena – ‘to die (ritually)’ and ‘to lay down, lay, put (ritually)’ – uniformly with “to be offered” and “to offer”, respectively “to be sacrificed” and “to sacrifice”, one might afterwards cause oneself a lot of trouble by elucidating the actual character of the Aztec “concepts of sacrifice” and give great joy to one's readers by following the method by which the difficulties are overcome. But such a procedure has actually been followed as regards a great many religions.

<sup>2</sup> Specifications of this kind, e.g. *Chantepie de la Saussaye* 1924<sup>4</sup>, I, pp. 90–93, *Widengren* 1945 a, pp. 204–48 (and in several of the works mentioned in the rest of this note). – Some more important monographs and collections of material for what follows: *Tylor* (1871) 1903<sup>4</sup>, II, pp. 375–410, etc., *Mannhardt* 1875–77 and 1884, *Jahn* 1884, *Robertson Smith* 1889, pp. 196 ff., *Oldenberg* (1894) 1923<sup>4</sup>, pp. 307–410, etc., *Hillebrandt* 1897, *Hubert et Mauss* (1898) 1909, pp. 1–130 (but see the critical remarks *Toy* 1913, p. 503 f.), *Stengel* 1898<sup>2</sup>, p. 86 ff., *Rouse* 1902, *Wissowa* 1902, pp. 344–65, *Curtiss* (1902) tr. 1903, *Harrison* (1903) 1908<sup>2</sup>, p. 162, etc., *Dieterich* 1903, pp. 100–08, *Jevons* 1904<sup>3</sup> Index, *Gruppe* 1906, II, pp. 719–38 and Index, *Reuterskiöld* (1908) tr. 1912, *Grønbech* 1909–12, IV, p. 14 ff., tr. 1931, II, pp. 144–259 (in extended form), *Stengel* 1910, *Frazer* 1911–18<sup>3</sup> Index, *Harri-*

A survey of the character of the various types of “offering” is probably obtained in the best way by examining which types of acts are most frequently reinterpreted as “offerings”.

An element of a *mana-removing* act may be viewed as an “offering”. This may apply to a haircut, to the laying down of an object in a definite place, or it may apply to a slaughtering. The ways in which mana is removed are numerous, but in general it may probably be stated that when an element of a *mana-removing* act is reinterpreted as an “offering”, it will – more definitely – as a rule be considered either a “gift offering” or a “sin offering”. The objects used for the removal of the mana, are either considered a gift to the god or a penance to him. Next it becomes the task of the myths to give grounds for the “gift” or the “penance”, which, however, has not always a very convincing effect on us outsiders. And when the re-interpretation has actually been carried through, the “offering” obviously by analogy may come to include a considerable amount of different objects beside the original one, as people may begin to lay down other objects side by side with the original ones, or to lay them down in other places than those in which alone it originally made any sense to lay them down.

Furthermore, an element of a *mana-adding* act may be considered an “offering”. This may e.g. apply to a ritual meal on the game killed or the cattle or the grain, or a ritual drinking of blood or water or mead, beer, wine, or another intoxicating drink. The ways in which mana is added are numerous, as the kinds of mana are numerous, but as above, it may probably in general be stated that when an element of an act adding mana is reinterpreted as an “offering”, it will be conceived as an offering of a specific type, in this case either as a “first fruit offering” or as a “sacramental offering”. The objects which produce addition of mana, are either considered a tribute to the god, a tribute, it is true, with which people then may regale themselves, – but the enjoyment at this stage will often be limited to the priests –, or they are considered parts of the god himself, perhaps as quite identical with the god. The latter cases are examples of the “sacramental offering”, which thus involves that the god is consumed by eating or drinking. Offerings which are based on acts adding mana can then also be extended by analogy, e.g. by the fact that people eat and drink other substances besides or as substitutes of those which originally alone made sense.

---

*son* 1912, p. xii, pp. 118–57, 372–76, etc., *Thurston* 1912, pp. 199–223, *Toy* 1913, pp. 484–507, etc., *Tresp* 1914, *Eitrem* 1915, *Schwenn* 1915, *Schütte* 1916, *Frazer* 1918 Index, *Eitrem* 1920, pp. 1–108, *Loisy* 1920, *Cabén* 1921, *Hopkins* 1923, pp. 151–79, *Gray* 1925, *Pedersen* (1920–34) tr. 1926–40, III–IV, pp. 299–476, etc., *Gronbech* 1931, II, pp. 260–340, *James* 1933, *Schur* 1933 a, *Schur* 1933 b, *Hooke* 1938, pp. 63–68, *Ström* 1942, *Yerkes* 1953.

We have here seen respectively the removal and addition in relation to the acting people; but if the act adding mana is intended to increase the mana in a definite place, or e.g. in the case of a species of animal or plant (without the process involving immediate conveyance of mana to the acting people), it will be possible to interpret this, too, as a "gift-offering" or a "sin-offering".

In primitive religions the ritual killing of an animal which originally was considered as belonging to one's own kin, may be treated as a killing of a human relation, and even if the act has been reinterpreted as an "offering" to a god, the offering of the animal may continually require exactly the same "cleansings" as the killing of a human being. The origin of the offering ritual in the concept of mana is, indeed, often traced in the shyness characteristic of many killings of victims.<sup>1</sup> The offering is necessary, but it is dangerous. Therefore it is necessary to take careful measures for the protection of those who perform this act of public utility. Among other things it may be done with long, ceremonial excuses to the animal which is to be sacrificed, for the purpose of convincing it that the offering is done also for its own good.<sup>2</sup> Or it may be done as at the Boughnía festival in Athens.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> E.g. *Robertson Smith* 1889, p. 397 Note 2: "The blood that calls for vengeance is blood that falls on the ground (Gen. iv. 10). . . . And so we often find the idea that a death in which no blood is shed, or none falls upon the ground, does not call for vengeance. . . . Applications of this principle to sacrifices of sacrosanct and kindred animals are frequent; they are strangled or killed with a blunt instrument (. . .), or at least no drop of their blood must fall on the ground (. . .)." Cf. p. 325 Note 2, and the same principle applied to executions p. 398 f.

<sup>2</sup> Especially well-known and often mentioned in connexion with the bear offering, e.g. among Ainus. — *Batchelor* 1901, p. 487: "He prays pardon for what they are about to do, hopes it will not be angry, tells it what an honour is about to be conferred upon it, and comforts it with the consolation that a large number of *inao* [cult sticks] and plenty of wine, cakes, and other good cheer will be sent along with it. — The last address I heard of ran thus: 'O thou divine one, thou wast sent into the world for us to hunt. O thou precious little divinity, we worship thee; pray hear our prayer. We have nourished thee and brought thee up with a deal of pains and trouble, all because we love thee so. Now, as thou hast grown big, we are about to send thee to thy father and mother. When thou comest to them please speak well of us, and tell them how kind we have been; please come to us again and we will sacrifice thee' "

<sup>3</sup> *Porphyr. De Abstin.* II,29-30. An ox was sacrificed, and everybody participated in the meal of its meat. After the killing of the ox a whole trial was made, those who had carried water for the grinding of the pole-axe and the butcher's knife laying the blame on those who did the grinding, these again on the man who had passed on the butchering implements, he on the man who knocked down the ox, he on the man who cut its throat, and he finally on the butcher's knife. And as the butcher's knife could not protest, it got the blame for the killing. After which it was thrown into the sea. — Cf. *Paus.* I, 24,4 and *Robertson Smith* 1889, p. 286 ff.

It may be appropriate in this connexion to add some remarks especially about the "sacrifice" of human beings, because such sacrifices in a particularly high degree force themselves upon modern Europeans' attention. We may then remind of the fact that the classification of types of offerings made above is not based on the kind of the victim or its quality, apart from its character of bearing mana. Any one of the types set up therefore may include "human sacrifices". "The sacrifice" of a human being thus may be conceived as a "gift offering", and the god in question then by modern Europeans will probably be considered extremely bloodthirsty, as it may often be seen in print. Or the sacrifice may be conceived as a "sin offering", which in some cases, but far from all, takes the form that it is the "sinner" in person who is sacrificed, the case thus assuming the character of a penal execution. It is, however, commonest that the victim is a complete outsider, a prisoner of war or a slave. Most "human sacrifices" of these types presumably originally were based on concepts of acts removing mana, just as the majority of the other sacrifices of these types; but it should be kept in mind that extensions of the sphere of offering may have taken place after the re-interpretation, and so in some cases it is perhaps only the analogical extensions which have included human beings among the local "gift offerings" or "sin offerings". The sacrifice of a human being may furthermore be conceived as a "first fruit offering", which re-interpretation naturally and readily may be applied to the acts increasing mana, which include the killing of infants. Or the sacrifice may be conceived as a "sacramental offering", viz. in the cases when it is a human being which is identified with the god, and this god as usual is completely or partly eaten or drunk. Most "human sacrifices" of the latter two types will presumably be based on more original concepts of acts increasing mana, but here, too, we cannot completely exclude the possibility of "human sacrifices" which are due to analogical extensions.<sup>1</sup>

It is uncertain to what extent we can demonstrate ritual traces of previous human sacrifices which have been replaced by other forms. We know a number of examples of sacrifices of animals or of dummies which are dressed

---

<sup>1</sup> As it is a widespread opinion among research-workers that "human sacrifices" to a wide extent have been replaced by "animal sacrifices" or other substitutes, it is of interest to see that the possibility of the opposite process of development has been noted by *Jevons* 1904<sup>3</sup>, p. 156: "Indeed, the horrible human sacrifices of the semi-civilized peoples of Central America are due, I conjecture, to the fact that in their nomad period they sacrificed wild animals; and in their settled, city life they could get little game, and had not domesticated animals to provide the blood which was essential for the sacrificial rite." *Jevons* does not state the reasons for his conjecture in more detail, but it might be supported by the ritual act performed at the end of the festival *Quecholli*; cf. below, p. 105.

in human garments and addressed and treated as human beings before the sacrifice, and there has been a tendency towards always in this procedure seeing a substitution for a previously occurring actual human sacrifice. Indeed, it is highly possible, and in many cases perhaps even probable that we have actually such substitute sacrifices before us; but it is by no means certain.<sup>1</sup> The ideas of identity of mankind and species of animals, or of man and dummy must be able to cut both ways. None of us believe that the kangaroo dances of the Australian aborigines should ever have been danced by what *we* understand by real kangaroos. We should no more feel sure that sacrifices of animals or dummies treated as human beings should ever have been performed with what *we* call human beings.

On the preceding pages a number of spheres of conceptions have been mentioned on which the reinterpretations may concentrate. The reinterpretations are not carried through all at once everywhere, and it is perhaps especially the different degrees of accomplishment on the large number of different points which convey to the urban religions their extremely variegated appearance.<sup>2</sup>

But any reinterpretation can produce a new myth. The new myth may be produced by the fact that a previously self-evident act by the reinterpretation becomes absurd and therefore requires a special "explanation" and "motivation".<sup>3</sup> And if in advance a myth is available as "explanation" and "motivation", the reinterpretation of the act will produce a recolouring of the myth, most frequently in such a way that it is this very recolouring which involves and therefore to us demonstrates the reinterpretation.

Man is conservative, most conservative in his courses of action, and the very most conservative in the courses of action which have become ritual. Primitive technical procedures are kept as survivals in the ritual, primitive

---

<sup>1</sup> References and treatment e.g. *Robertson Smith* 1889, p. 346 f., who clearly repudiates the current substitution interpretation, which, indeed, dates right back to antiquity and in some cases already was contained in genuine mythical "explanations" of ritual. – *Fowler* 1899, p. 296 and p. 315, also keeps aloof from current substitution interpretations. – A controllable, actual substitution is mentioned *Curtis* (1902) tr. 1903, p. 243 f.

<sup>2</sup> The concepts of death and the ethical leaven which are especially emphasized by *Pallis* 1944, p. 416 f., are included in these remarks.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. *Robertson Smith* 1889, p. 391: "Originally, the death of the god was nothing else than the death of the theanthropic victim; but, when this ceased to be understood, it was thought that the piacular sacrifice represented an historical tragedy, in which the god was killed."; p. 392 Note: "Adonis, in short, is the Swine-god, and in this, as in many other cases, the sacred victim has been changed by false interpretation into the enemy of the god." – See also *Jevons* 1904<sup>3</sup>, pp. 249–69.

tools, stone axes, stone knives, primitive types of garments are kept as survivals in the cult.<sup>1</sup> Indeed, great parts of the history of religions are played through millenia in the same old sacred places,<sup>2</sup> where generation after generation perform the same old rituals, often simple acts originating in the needs of everyday life. Only the interpretation changes. It changes with the development of economic culture, with conquests and other external vicissitudes, but it is the same set of actions, comparatively limited in number, which are constantly reinterpreted. Gods perish, but rituals persist. During the reinterpretations the general circumstances of society leave their stamp on the form of the religious conceptions.<sup>3</sup> The organization of society is projected into cosmos,<sup>4</sup> its social system is reflected in mythology. The imagination of man may seem uninhibited, but it is by no means free; it must work with the material of conceptions which are available in advance. The complete sum of experiences of people leaves its stamp on their world of religious conceptions, and their experiences depend on the system of the community in which they live. Therefore phenomena which by us may be considered quite homogeneous, may be interpreted in a widely different way by people in other, different communities. This applies to the actions we have been discussing, and it also applies if we look at psychological experiences from the point of view of the single individual. Experiences which to us apparently are quite homogeneous, will be interpreted differently by individuals in different religions, under unconscious influence of the com-

---

<sup>1</sup> *Ex.* 20,25 *Deut.* 27,5 *Josh.* 8,31 *1 Kings* 6,7 *1 Macc.* 4,47 (altar to be built without use of iron tools), *Liv.* I, 24,9 (stone knife), *Cat.* LXIII,6 (flint knife), *Thurston* 1912, pp. 150–52 (skirt of leaves), etc. etc.

<sup>2</sup> An example in a merry version *Curtiss* (1902) tr. 1903, p. XVII Note 3.

<sup>3</sup> *Wellhausen* (1887) 1897<sup>2</sup>, p. 51: “Die Religion verändert sich mit der Cultur.” – *Robertson Smith* 1889, p. 22: “Strictly speaking, indeed, I understate the case when I say that the oldest religious and political institutions present a close analogy. It would be more correct to say that they were parts of one whole of social custom.” *Reuterskiöld* 1908, p. 22: “. . . as, indeed, religious and social at a primitive stage are only to be considered different views of the same matter, . . .;” p. 128 Note 1: “. . . the gods, who first of all owe their origin to changes in the social life of the men.” – The point of view maintained in a wider connexion in *Meinhof* 1926 and especially *Murphy* (1949) 1952<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>4</sup> This point of view, later so often fully developed, was also found in *Robertson Smith* 1889, p. 118 f.: “In the system of totemism men have relations not with individual powers of nature, i.e. with gods, but with certain classes of natural agents. The idea is that nature, like mankind, is divided into groups or societies of things, analogous to the groups or kindreds of human society.”; p. 74: “What is often described as the natural tendency of Semitic religion towards ethical monotheism, is in the main nothing more than a consequence of the alliance of religion with monarchy.” Cf. *Segerstedt* 1903, p. 43: “The community of the gods is arranged according to the same principles as that of men.” – Of course, *Durkheim* 1912 is epoch-making.

munity in which they are living, its historical basis, and the general, prevalent world of conceptions.<sup>1</sup>

In all religions the various individuals interpret their experiences under a psychological compulsion exercised by the total world of conceptions of their religion.

The possibility of adopting such a general view of the phenomena is in favour of maintaining Robertson Smith's view of the relation between ritual and myth. In this way it does not become an isolated "postulate", but an integrating element of an organic general view.<sup>2</sup>

The possibility that certain ritual actions may be secondary in relation to a myth, is not, however, completely excluded by the reflections developed here. We have introductorily used the formulation "*generally*, i.e. in the majority of cases."<sup>3</sup> The methodical consequence of this formulation should be that no particular account need be given in all the cases in which the ritual without further circumstances can be seen as primary in relation to one or more accessory myths. Or, in other words, it is methodically correct to maintain that if a myth can immediately be conceived as an "explanation" and "motivation" of a ritual, it does not itself require any other explanation,<sup>4</sup> and a further methodical consequence must be that the burden of proof lies with the person who in a certain case will maintain the primacy of a myth in relation to a ritual act. In such a case we should expect an explanation of the origin of the myth in the form of reasonable and motivated suppositions; indeed, we can rarely get any farther. Thus it is imaginable that the myth has been borrowed into the community in question and secondarily has given rise to a ritual which has no relation to the ritual to which it originally belonged, and this connexion then must as far as possible be unravelled. Furthermore, it should be emphasized that it would be desirable if in accounts of the "migrations" of a myth it was always stated

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf. now the apt formulation in *Lowie* 1956, p. 1010: "...; if different Crow Indians repeatedly experience the same kind of visions while Ojibwa regularly see different things on their fasts, such psychological phenomena can be neither typical of the human species as a whole nor of single individuals, but of cultures. However important may be the individual's psyche, his psychological manifestations are at least co-determined by social standards."

<sup>2</sup> Which can be developed further to include also the later stages of the urban religions and – if we want to draw a new line – their successors, mystery religions and individual religions (salvation religions).

<sup>3</sup> See above, p. 17; cf. p. 16.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. *Robertson Smith* 1889, p. 20.



whether it is supposed that it is "borrowed" and has "migrated" *together with* the ritual or been detached from the latter.<sup>1</sup>

Again, reference is to be made to the formulation<sup>2</sup> in the case of urban religions: "Such connected tales of gods may perhaps secondarily produce new ritual acts." If our attention is concentrated on the mythical figures which have the character of "gods", it is imaginable that there are inserted in the ritual "imitations" of the actions of these gods in sections of myths which are not based on original mythical episodes explaining the ritual. And the mere existence of the very conception of god may give rise to an elaborate, daily ritual of waiting on the god.

The question to what extent it is allowable on the whole of this background to draw conclusions from an existing myth to a non-substantiated ritual, is of great practical importance, but a decision must be based on the particular circumstances of each case.

A support of the estimate is afforded by the material from the religions in which there are notoriously connected descriptions of rituals and texts of myths. Still more thorough investigations of such material from different cultures would increase the certainty with which the estimate might be made. It would be of special value to obtain a still surer view of possibilities and conditions of variation for the myths in relation to a certain ritual, and in close – logical as well as practical – connexion with this it would also be of particular value to obtain a still surer view of the essential 'contact points' between a ritual and the myth(s) belonging to it.

#### b. SOME FORMAL CLASSIFICATIONS

Most systematizations of myths in research during the last century and a half are based on a setting up of types with the contents of the tales as criteria, most consistent in the classification of the folklorists according to "motifs" and their "motif-index", which is applied to myths as well as fairytales and other material.<sup>3</sup>

From points of view of comparative religion this systematism is insufficient and for several purposes direct apt to lead astray. The same applies

---

<sup>1</sup> Controllable cases of ritual "loans" are known by the hundred, e.g. in North America. *McClintock* 1910, pp. 409, 449, 452. Almost all recent treatments of the Sun Dance have examples. – Note also *Grønbech* 1931, II, p. 337: "Where agriculture appeared it carried its rites along with the implements of husbandry; . . . ."

<sup>2</sup> Above, p. 57.

<sup>3</sup> *Aarne* 1910, *Stith Thompson* 1928, and 1955-. Cf. *Boberg* 1953, pp. 173, 326. – An attempt at extended application: *Elwin* 1955, pp. 513–29.

to a sociologico-psychological treatment like that of Malinowski,<sup>1</sup> although in many ways it denotes considerable progress from folkloristic classification and perhaps may be profitably used for further developments on a religio-historical basis.

Historians of religion of course in practice have operated with different groups of myths, arranged according to religio-historically pertinent criteria, but the terminology in such cases unfortunately changes from author to author. It is even rare that a research-worker gives an account of his own usage.<sup>2</sup>

On the basis of what has been stated above and with consideration to my predecessors' as well as my own empirical material, I shall set up a more specified typology using quite neutral terms. At a first glance it may perhaps seem schematic and pedantic, but, as stated above, it has been set up with close consideration to actually existing material, the only purpose being that of creating a practically usable instrument.

*Type 0:* Includes short statements on rituals – rarely more than a single sentence or a period –, which according to the modern European conception is a “sober”, “rationalist”, brief description or denotation of what is happening. Descriptions and denotations of this kind will not by us modern Europeans be conceived as “myths” because they agree with our own world of concepts; we have therefore chosen to denote them by the symbol “0”. On the other hand we find it necessary to include this type, because some material suggests that the members of the cultures investigated have not themselves distinguished between this type and the one immediately following; the two types appear among each other on an apparently completely equal footing in certain texts.

*Type I:* Includes short statements on rituals – rarely more than a single sentence or a period –, which according to the modern European conception is a “mythical” explanation or description or motivation. It may apply to a single ritual act or a greater continuous ritual, as well as a whole, complicated festival. We shall term the conceptual contents of the statements a “mythical episode”. In research there has been a tendency towards considering these “mythical episodes” as “allusions” to “lost” or “otherwise unknown” myths of greater extent; but in our opinion this view is completely upside down.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Malinowski 1926; cf. *idem* 1936, and (1922) 1950<sup>3</sup>, pp. 298–305, 326–30. Cf. Preuss 1933.

<sup>2</sup> As done in Pallis 1926, p. 254, etc.

<sup>3</sup> Indian ritual books contain many examples of this type, thus e.g. Caland 1953 is quite a manual of ‘mythical episodes’.

*Type II:* Differs from the preceding type only by the length of the explanation, description, or motivation, for which no upward limitation is made, and by the fact that we shall only include explanations, descriptions, and motivations which are attached to a single ritual act or at least to a comparatively narrow and close part of the ritual at a greater festival.

*Type III:* Includes longer “mythical” explanations, descriptions, or motivations which are attached to a complete, greater and complex composite ritual in such a way that myths of this type – theoretically – *can* be divided into subsections which fulfil the criteria of Type II, respectively I or 0.<sup>1</sup>

*Type IV:* Includes the results of the processes described above, p. 56 f., and of the processes described by Pallis (1926) p. 254, lines 12 to 2 from the bottom.<sup>2</sup> We repeat the main features of our own formulation: “The mythical tales are reduced to a system . . . with the mythical figures as the objects of the main interest. Mythical episodes which were (and actually are) completely disconnected, isolated “explanations” and “motivations” of single acts in a ritual or in completely different rituals, are brought together in an attempt at creating a continuous tale about one or more figures from these mythical episodes. Sometimes also what is now apparently gaps in the constructed continuous tale is filled up. Sometimes the filling is done with borrowed material, sometimes with pure invention, i.e. with narration which is free in the sense that it is no longer bound to the ritual. In this way the life history of the god arises, or at any rate considerable parts of it.” Which passage may be supplemented by the statement that the mythical tale (Pallis: the cult text) “is expanded theologically and poetically, the similes are made more elaborate and often consciously artistic, and connecting links serving to explain and interpret cult acts which have now become unintelligible, are inserted in the text.”<sup>3</sup>

*Type V:* Includes the mainly free poetry about mythical figures, without any connexion with an original ritual and without any intention of explaining ritual, to which, however, material of the preceding types may have inspired the poet.<sup>4</sup>

*Type VI:* Includes antiquarians’ learned adaptation of material which may originate from material of all the preceding types.<sup>5</sup>

★

For several purposes it may, furthermore, be expedient to have at one’s

---

<sup>1</sup> Types I, II, and III together – presumably – cover what Pallis 1926, p. 254, denotes as ‘cult texts’.

<sup>2</sup> And – in the next line – denoted as “cult myths” and “cult legends”.

<sup>3</sup> Pallis, *loc. cit.* Cf. further what was said above, p. 62, third paragraph.

<sup>4</sup> Example: *The Iliad* (cf. above, p. 57, with Note 1).

<sup>5</sup> Examples: *Apoll. Bibl. Myth.*, *Plut. de Is. et Osir.*, *Snorra Edda*.

disposal another classification, which is based on purely formal criteria, in that we start from the research-worker's own situation in relation to the material. The necessity of this classification is self-evident to a historian, but as far as I know its importance has not previously been emphasized.

We shall arrange the material in two main groups, each of them with two subgroups, respectively (A and B) and (D and E). The former main group includes all myths the attachment of which to a certain ritual appears direct from the text of one and the same source. The latter main group includes all myths the attachment of which to a certain ritual can only be based on a combination of information from several, different textual sources (even if these may occur in the same collection of sources).

The groups are further arranged as follows:

*Group A:* Includes in principle lengthy descriptions of rituals with short "mythical" "explanations" interlarded.

*Group B:* Includes in principle lengthy myths with short references to rituals interlarded.

In practice the material, if it belongs to the main group, will nearly always be easy to place in one or the other of these two subgroups. But if the arrangement on rare occasions should cause difficulties, we may use the labels: (Group A and B) or (Group A or B).

*Group D:* Includes myths whose textual connexion with a ritual can exclusively be based on material adduced from different sources, and in such a way that between the ritual and myth in question only a single or a very few points of contact can be established. The interrelations within this group thus will always to a certain extent be hypothetical, and the degree of probability must be due to the particular circumstances in each case, as seen on a background of our general knowledge.

*Group E:* Likewise includes myths the textual connexion of which to a certain ritual can exclusively be based on material adduced from different sources, but so that here it is possible to establish a lengthy series of points of contact between a long description of a ritual and a long myth.

As regards sources Groups D and E are quite different from Groups A and B, and from an abstract point of view it will only be a question of differences in degree between Groups D and E. But in practice the difference in degree – the longer series of points of contact – will often be of an almost qualitative character and of great importance for the evaluation of the hypothetical relation.

The possibility that the description of a great, continuous ritual with a long, continuous myth (of Type III) belonging to it should occur in the same text of sources is also imaginable, and therefore we have for this possibility reserved a *Group C*, which thus will belong to the first main group.<sup>1</sup>

The two classifications, into “types” (according to the type of the myth, as stated) and into “groups” (according to conditions of sources), are otherwise related to one another as follows:

Group A will by definition only include Types 0 and I.

Group B will by definition only include Type II.

Group C will by definition only include Type III.

Groups D and E will include all types (0–VI).

\*

For the clarification of the terminology we shall finally suggest the term ‘primary rituals’ for rituals the existence of which is based on available or previously available concepts of mana. We shall suggest the term ‘secondary rituals’ for rituals the existence of which is *solely* based on mythical conception, thus e. g. rituals of waiting on idols, etc. (unless these can especially be shown to be ‘primary’ in the sense just indicated).

And we suggest the term ‘conditioned’ for ‘primary rituals’ the existence of which can only be understood from certain mythical conceptions. Thus there are Mexican examples of sacrificial killings by way of substitutes – in detail clearly a ‘primary ritual’ –, but in such a context that the only purpose can be to secure the person who is represented by another, a way of death the desirability of which can only be understood on a background of the existing mythical conceptions of the realms of death (which latter conceptions presumably are based on the burial rituals).<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> But we remember no well-known example of this kind outside Mexico. An Aztec text like *Sab.* III App. 1–3 (etc.) might be referred to here. *Seler* 1927, pp. 293–302 (A–D 4, 1952, pp. 39–48). *Seler* 1927, pp. 302–05.

<sup>2</sup> The above-mentioned examples of ‘conditioned’ rituals will not be discussed in what follows; but see *Sab.* II, 21. *Seler* 1899, p. 174 f., *Seler* 1927, p. 65. (A–D 3, 1951, p. 48).

Part II  
ASPECTS OF AZTEC RELIGION

a. THE MEXICAN TEXT MATERIAL

It is not intended in what follows to illustrate all elements of what has been discussed above with examples from the Mexican sphere. This might, amongst other things, produce an impression that the general, above mentioned reflections should especially be based on a Mexican material, which is by no means the case. What has previously been discussed is on the contrary general considerations based on the general experiences of comparative religion and expressing how these experiences presumably can be synthesized today. Thus they express the basis with which we arrive at the Mexican material.

Only in a single, but centrally situated, field we shall in some detail illustrate what has been discussed above by means of examples drawn from Mexican original texts.

Examples from this cultural area are for several reasons of special interest. In the first place the general religio-historical view is in the main based partly on material from the cultures of Antiquity, partly on material from primitive cultures, and the Mexican field does not belong to any of these groups, so that the material at any rate will be supplementary.

In the second place, we are with the Mexican material taken right into a community which is found at the stage of which we are most of all in need of getting close information, viz. the stage which is characterized by agriculture and an incipient urbanization, without, however, it being possible so far to talk about city states of the same type as that found in the Near East and the Mediterranean countries of Antiquity. It is difficult to indicate the differences with a brief formulation, so we shall content ourselves by declaring that the pre-Columbian Mexican communities make a more primitive impression than the city states of the ancient world. (In the purely

economic field we shall only refer to the fact that the Mexican communities had no stock-breeding and therefore had no draught animals or beasts of burden). The stage with which we are faced, should be able to throw light on some of the problems which it has otherwise been necessary to answer exclusively on the basis of theoretical reflections, so to say by interpolations from both sides of the stage in question.

In the third place, the religio-historical material from the Mexican field is unusually rich. Indeed, considering that the bulk of it originates from the 16th cent., it is absolutely unique. Apart from texts belonging to religions which are still alive – we are especially thinking of India –, so detailed ritual descriptions have hardly been recorded anywhere in the world until modern times, and even now it is extremely limited what has elsewhere been recorded in the way of ritual descriptions in the language of the natives in question. At most, we get the myths presented in the original language, but in most cases the ritual descriptions are given in the investigator's European language, an establishment of the connexion thus always being made difficult and often impossible. Time and again one must therefore catch oneself wondering at a character like Bernardino de Sahagún and his achievement as a research-worker, which places him 400 years ahead of his time. Or more than that: for even if nowadays we have reached the same comprehensive collection of material, a consistent collection in the original language – as mentioned above – is only exceptionally practised.

The Mexican religion which is described in the texts is the result of various blendings of peoples and tribes, but only in a few fields it has been unravelled in its ethnic components. It is considered fundamentally possible to come to grips with these problems by a systematic analysis of the material, but the present occasion is not suitable for this. We shall content ourselves by establishing the fact and besides take the festivals as they exist, i.e. as the result which existed in the capital of the realm after about three centuries of Aztec supremacy.

In a slightly different way the same fact becomes of importance for our attitude towards Maya texts on the present occasion. A few of the questions we shall touch on, may be further illustrated by the adducement of texts in Maya languages, especially of course from the large connected texts in Yucatán-Maya, Quiché, and Cakchiquel, but also from later ethnographical material. Briefly, it may be said that this is due to the generally assumed position of Toltec culture. It is assumed, on the one hand, to be a substratum in Central Mexico overlaid by Aztec culture (by conquest), while on the

other hand – almost at the same time or somewhat earlier – it has itself overlaid parts of the Maya culture (by conquest). Furthermore, it is generally assumed to be associated with, i.a., the Quetzalcoatl cult. But it will be understood that the religio-historical reflections of these conditions produce a complicated picture in the texts, and that an unravelment will be complicated, too. We shall therefore on the present occasion as a rule leave the Maya texts out of consideration.<sup>1</sup>

As to the text material, we shall of course to the widest extent base the treatment on the foundation laid by the extremely skilful editors and translators of the texts. Through life-long diligence and innumerable investigations of details they have created a solid basis of deep penetration into facts in one or another special field.

What has been said here does not least apply to Seler's enormous production; but where he embarks on synthesizing religio-historical considerations, this is done from points of view which have long been obsolete. Thus he uses the material for harmonizations. Descriptions of cults and variants of myths are laid side by side as if they were historical sources of the life of some "god". In agreement with the fashionable German movement of his time he furthermore had a predilection for astral-mythological interpretations, which in a few places gives even quite grotesque results.<sup>2</sup> As some excuse for him, however, serves the fact that a certain part of our Central American sources are certainly, or with great probability, of an astrological character. But not even the fact that a "god"'s ceremony is regulated in an astronomico-calendric way, does in itself justify the conclusion that the "god" is identical with the regulator in question.

As to the general view – perhaps rather: the approach to the material – two others are in considerably closer agreement with recent religio-historical views. One of them is I. G. Müller.<sup>3</sup> Especially his great presentation (1855) is astonishingly good and shows astonishingly modern points of view. The weakness is that it is almost completely based on Spanish sources and, when going further, only on translations. The other author is Lewis Spence.<sup>4</sup> He has published a good deal more, of unequal quality, but in the work mentioned here (1923) he has given a manual which is excellent

---

<sup>1</sup> For an introductory survey of the archaeologico-historical background, as well as of economic and general cultural conditions see e.g. *Spinden* 1943<sup>3</sup>, *Vaillant* (1941) 1950<sup>2</sup>, *Disselhoff* 1953, or *Krickeberg* 1956, and further *Soustelle* 1955, tr. 1956.

<sup>2</sup> See e.g. *Seler* 1902–23 IV, pp. 120, 129, 130, 131.

<sup>3</sup> *Müller* 1847, *Müller* 1855.

<sup>4</sup> *Spence* 1923.



in many respects, with many fine, independent observations. Its weak points are mainly due to a lack of knowledge of the language so that the author must build on others' translations, which are coloured by their different starting-points, with the consequence that often he only by glimpses suspects connexions which on the basis of the original texts are evident.

We shall, however, in what follows consistently omit taking up previously stated views for discussion (where they do not concern the linguistic interpretation proper) and keep strictly to the mere text material.<sup>1</sup>

For a survey of conditions of manuscripts and of the provenance of the material reference is made to the introductions or prefaces of the text editions in question, and to the introductions to the facsimile editions listed in the Bibliography.<sup>2</sup>

As the relations of the Sahagún texts are a little complicated, the strictly necessary orientation will, however, be given.

Sahagún was a Franciscan who came to Mexico in 1529 and died there in 1590. His huge material was collected from the most expert, leading natives whom he could find, often in such a way that the information was given after careful consultation between several expert chiefs and priests and often so that Sahagún obtained accounts of the same matter from different persons and different localities. As a main rule his informants seem neither to have been able to speak nor to understand Spanish. It seems that the recording of the accounts was made by himself and a group of natives who had learnt to write. The written language is adapted phonetically, with

---

<sup>1</sup> The cult songs have not been adduced. They have been commented on in detail by *Seler* 1902–23 II, pp. 961–1107. (cf. *Peñafiel* 1905, and *Schulze Jena* 1957). (*Brinton* 1890 is of very little value, and readers who are ignorant of Aztec are strongly dissuaded from using his work). Cf. *Sab.* II, App. A–D 3, 1951, pp. 207–14. – The cult songs closely correspond to the description given above, p. 43. Altogether considerable groups of the total source material have on principle been excluded from the present investigations because they are considered to be irrelevant to the narrowly text-analytical task which we have found it most urgent to tackle. Among primary sources (besides the cult songs) this applies to the archaeological material and the picture codices, and among secondary sources the Spanish reports, as well as later ethnological material, all of which of course should be adduced in a wider, proper *account* of the ancient Mexican religion, – apart from the fact that Sahagún contains much more material than that which we shall utilize here. – The total source material, including the pictorial material, is fairly well registered and summarized in *Spence* 1923.

<sup>2</sup> For Sahagún see further *Seler* 1899, p. 67 f., *Seler* 1902–23 II, p. 420 f., *Weber* 1911, pp. 140–45, *Anderson* 1945 and 1946, *Saignes* 1946, *D'Olwer* 1952, and *Garibay* 1953–54 II, pp. 63–88. Cf. below, p. 76 Note 1.

use of the phonetic values of the Spanish written language of the time.<sup>1</sup> The number of Spanish vocables in the texts is negligible.<sup>2</sup>

The oldest known form of his work is manuscripts which are kept in two libraries in Madrid.<sup>3</sup> But the volume, contents, and other circumstances of the Sahagún MSS. have only in part been brought to light. We shall return to this question below.

However, he recast his material, abridged, concentrated, and rewrote the Aztec text, not very much, but still to a certain extent, and at the same time he added a Spanish translation. This recension (Cod. Flor.) is kept at Florence. It contains the Aztec text and a Spanish translation parallelly in two columns, but so that the Spanish version sometimes offers more than the parallel Aztec text, while in other places it only summarizes the Aztec text.

Torquemada (died 1624) had an opportunity to use parts of Sahagún's material, these parts thus having flowed into the early history of research; but both from Christian-religious and from Spanish-political motives Sahagún's own work met with so great resistance, in his lifetime as well as after his death, that an edition – of his Spanish translation – could not be published until 1829–30 (Bustamante) and 1831 (Kingsborough). Later the Spanish version has been published several times, and it has been further translated into several languages. A facsimile edition of parts of the Madrid MSS. was published in Madrid in 1905–07 (del Paso y Troncoso).

Sections of the Sahagún MSS. in Madrid have not been printed until Selser's editions in recent time supplemented by other sections edited by Schultze Jena. The editions we shall need in what follows are especially the following:

Selser (1899):<sup>4</sup> The edition includes the first five annual festivals, with German translation and thorough commentary; pp. 67–167 are commentary,

---

<sup>1</sup> An approximately correct pronunciation therefore ought not to give any difficulties. The vowels of course have the "continental" value. Furthermore, note especially *-x-*, pronounced approximately as English *-sh-*. The accent is regularly on the penultimate, except in the vocative, which is stressed on the last syllable (*-é*). For details, see the grammars. Accent: *Molina* (1571) Segunda Parte, cap. IX; 1886, p. 217 f. *Rincon* (1595) Libro V, cap. I–IV; 1888, pp. 264–71 (cf. *Grasserie* 1903, pp. 14–20.) *Carochi* (1645) Lib. I, cap. I, §§ 2–3, Lib. V, cap. ult.; 1892, p. 402 f., pp. 530–33. *Garibay* 1940, § 13, p. 28. *W'horf* 1946, p. 369 f. *Schoembs* 1949, §§ 13–15, p. 18 (cf. p. 71), § 153, p. 47.

<sup>2</sup> One is *anima*, another is *dios*. Most frequent is *capitulo*.

<sup>3</sup> Biblioteca del Palacio and Biblioteca de la Academia de la Historia.

<sup>4</sup> *Eduard Selser*, *Altmexikanische Studien* II. (Veröffentlichungen aus dem Königlichen Museum für Völkerkunde. VI. Band, 2./4. Heft) 2°. Berlin 1899. In this work: Die achtzehn Jahresfeste der Mexikaner, pp. 67–204 [should be 224]. On the title-page with the addition (Erste Hälfte).

pp. 168–209 contain the Aztec text with German translation, the rest is additions and index (with wrong numbering of pages).

Seler (1927):<sup>1</sup> This edition was after Seler's death prepared by Walter Lehmann. It includes text and translation for the first annual festivals from Seler (1899) (but not the commentary), with a very few and insignificant corrections. Besides, the edition includes text and translation for the rest of the annual festivals, and several other sections. In some places the translation is due to Lehmann. The edition contains some scattered notes, but no actual commentary.

In what follows the text as regards the first five annual festivals will be quoted from Seler (1899). References will also, however, be made to the corresponding passage in Seler (1927).

The other annual festivals and all other material found in Seler (1927) will be quoted from this edition.

Furthermore references will be made to the parallel passage in Cod. Flor. with use of

A-D 2 ff. (1950) ff.:<sup>2</sup> As the numbers of volumes in this edition do not follow the division into books in Sahagún, but everywhere are shifted by one unit, the number of volume of the edition is indicated by Arabic numerals: "Part II" of the edition is indicated as "A-D 2" (and contains Sahagún's Book I). Where a section of the text has not been published from the Sahagún MSS. of Madrid, the Cod. Flor. is quoted from this edition. (Aztec text with English translation).

Furthermore the division into books and chapters in the Cod. Flor. is indicated in the usual way in order to facilitate the orientation as regards contents and context, both things in a wide sense. All editions and translations of the two text versions in the Cod. Flor. use this division. Thus "Sah. II, 29" means: Book II, Ch. 29 of Cod. Flor., Aztec and Spanish version.

Where a passage or a number of passages in the text have been adduced from the description of an annual festival, the name of the festival, finally, is introductorily indicated, followed by a Roman numeral in parenthesis to mark its place in the traditional sequence.<sup>3</sup>

As will be understood, it is the Sahagún MSS. in Madrid which are the

---

<sup>1</sup> *Eduard Seler*, *Einige Kapitel aus dem Geschichtswerk des Fray Bernadino de Sahagun* ... 574 pp. Ill. 2°. Stuttgart 1927.

<sup>2</sup> *Arthur J. O. Anderson and Charles E. Dibble*, *Florentine Codex. Part II ff. Santa Fé, New Mexico 1950 ff.*

<sup>3</sup> An easily accessible survey of these festivals is found in *Vaillant 1950*<sup>2</sup>, pp. 196–97 (Penguin 1950, pp. 192–93). However, in some places he uses other names than the most current ones. Also in *Soustelle 1955*, pp. 277–78, tr. 1956, pp. 293–95. – Cf. *Ramírez 1903*.

primary material of sources. There is not, however, any systematic investigation of the intern text relations of the Aztec material available, although of course scholars have long been aware of the remarkably heterogeneous spelling in the various parts of the work. The different spelling *may* – but *need not* – cover dialectal differences, as indeed it is a question of an adapted “phonetic spelling” on the basis of the Spanish phonetic value of the signs, and the recorders then may have used slightly divergent, individual systems. But the different spelling in the sections at any rate covers either different recorders or different periods of recording, and the existence of detailed investigations of this problem would in several respects have been useful.<sup>1</sup>

As to the other texts there are no such complications as regards the editions. We shall therefore only refer to the list in the Bibliography.

The translations given in what follows will on many points deviate slightly from previous translations without this being especially noted. The deviations are particularly due to the fact that I have endeavoured to offer a rather literal translation, with special watchfulness about smuggling of views which are not expressly authenticated in the passage itself or in the nearest context, and therefore it is considered that the deviations only in more important cases require a special statement of reasons.

#### b. *TEOTL* AND \**IXIPLATLI*

We shall first investigate the fundamental problem of the relation – in the very strictest sense – between certain ritual objects, certain ritual persons, and the mythical figures, respectively the “gods”. This will be done through an account of the use in the ritual texts of the words *teotl* and \**ixiptlatli*, and of the names of the gods. A division into three sections corresponding to these three subjects might perhaps have been preferable for systematic reasons, but as the material of examples is in part the same for all the three groups, it is considered most practical to treat them together.

As far as I know, no systematic investigation of the names of the Aztec gods and the onomastic components entering in them has been made. My own provisional collections of material seem to indicate that a thorough investigation will be of great value and may contribute to throwing light on

---

<sup>1</sup> But see *Jiménez Moreno* 1938, *Garibay* 1943 and 1953. Cf. above, p. 73, Note 2.

several important problems of various kinds. But we shall here content ourselves by very briefly mentioning the most important types of names, in arbitrary order:

There are *quite individual* names, among them the names of so prominent figures as Uitzilopochtli, Tezcatlipoca, and Xipe.

There are names containing the element *-coatl* 'serpent' (etc.), e.g. Quetzalcoatl, Chicome coatl, Ciuacoatl, Mixcoatl, Coatlicue, Coatlantonan.

Names with the element *-tecutli* 'lord', e.g. Tonacatecutli, Ometecutli, Tlaltecuctli, Ilamatecutli, Xiuhtecutli, Mictlantecutli, Yacatecutli, Oton tecutli, (Xipe) Totec.

Names with the element *-ciuatl* 'woman', e.g. Tonacaciuatl, Ome ciuatl, Quauhciuatl, Yaociuatl, Uixtociuatl, Mictecaciuatl, Ciuacoatl, and quite indefinite in the plural: Ciuateteo, Ciuapipiltin.

Names with the element *-pilli* 'prince', e.g. Xochipilli, Xippilli, Nauapilli, Ciuapipiltin.

Names with the element *-xochitl* 'flower', e.g. Macuilxochitl, Xochipilli, Xochiquetzal.

Names with the element *-quetzalli* 'feather of the quetzal bird' e.g. Xochiquetzal, Quetzalcoatl.

Names with the element *-teotl* 'god', e.g. Tlazolteotl, Cinteotl, Mazateotl, Auiateotl, Ueueteotl, Ciuateteo, Teteo Innan.

The names adduced in each group are only examples, none of the lists is exhaustive. Some of the figures are mutually identified, criss-cross through the groups without any apparent consideration to the types of names. A few names are listed in two groups, as generally no importance is attached to the question whether the element enters as a first or last component, – which, by the way, I think is wrong. But we must disregard that. In this connexion we have only wanted to call attention to the fact that the component *-teotl* in the names of the gods is only a single second component among a good number. And text passages quoted below will show that the view of the gods in certain fundamental respects is rather homogeneous without consideration to type of name.

*Teotl* is normally, as above, translated by 'god'. Furthermore the word may mean 'sun', also in compounds such as *teotlac* 'at sunset'. (The commonest word for 'sun' is *Tonatiuh*, literally 'the bright, warming, beaming one', as a rule, however, personified as 'god'. But we shall not hear much about that in what follows). Furthermore *teotl* and some of the compounds into which it enters seem to have associations with conceptions of the dead, which may be connected with the meaning just mentioned, as certain of the dead were supposed to live with the sun. As a rule we see the translation

“god’s” used for the most frequent compounds, and according to circumstances it is not inadmissible, e.g. *teocalli* ‘god’s house, temple.’ But in a number of cases it would be more accurate to use the translation ‘sacred, sacral, or ritual’, e.g. *teopan* ‘sacred place’, *teomiltl* ‘sacral arrow’, *teoque-miltl* ‘ritual garment’ (or in another combination). Finally, it is presumably possible in a number of compounds to establish the occurrence of traces of a meaning of ‘mana’, but some of the compounds are so peculiar that rather comprehensive unravelments would be required.<sup>1</sup> We shall therefore provisionally content ourselves with leaving it as a possibility. The examples following below should show that such a basis of meaning is an overwhelming possibility.

To my knowledge a full treatment of the word and concept of *\*ixiptlatli* is not available either.

We have nowhere in the texts found any clearly unprefixated form, neither in the singular nor in the plural; Molina does not give any unprefixated form either.

The form *ixiptla-tl* has, in part as a head-word, been constructed by Siméon, Schoembs, and Schultze Jena,<sup>2</sup> but this traditionally assumed determination *-tl*, thus is only a construction here, and in our opinion is little probable; for with a possessive prefix substantives in *-tl*, in the singular will normally and in the great majority of cases get the ending *-uh*,<sup>3</sup> e.g. *tetl* ‘stone’, *iteuh* ‘his stone’, *xocotl* ‘fruit’, *ixocouh* ‘his fruit’; but we always find *iixiptla*, (*i-*)*ixiptla*, *teixiptla*, etc., thus without the *-uh*, which was to be expected if the determinative was *-tl*.

With the existing form of the prefixated singular the predominant assumption must be for a determined form in *-tli*; for with a possessive prefix this ending is dropped in the singular without any other ending replacing it,<sup>4</sup> e.g. *tilmatli* ‘cloak’, *itilma* ‘his cloak’, *nantli* ‘mother’, *inan* ‘his mother’, *tatli* ‘father’, *ita* ‘his father’. A form *\*ixiptla-tli* would quite regularly give *i-ixiptla*, *teixiptla*, etc.

<sup>1</sup> In many cases *teo-* at least clearly and incontestably involves the semantic aspect of ‘high potency, intensification, excellence’ – as can be seen if only by means of a dictionary. (Cf. above, p. 22, with Note 1). – The elder views, *Robelo* 1951<sup>2</sup>, pp. 315–18.

<sup>2</sup> *Siméon* 1885 p. 194, *Schoembs* 1949 p. 152, *Schultze Jena* 1950 p. 152. – *Garibay* 1940 p. 226 has, as a head-word, *ixiptla*.

<sup>3</sup> *Olmos* (1547) *Primera Parte*, cap. VI, *Primera Regla*; 1885 p. 17. *Molina* (1571) *Primera Parte*, cap. I; 1886 p. 138. *Rincon* (1595) *Lib. IV*, cap. IV; 1888 p. 261. *Guzmán* (1642) *Lib. I*, cap. VII § 5, 1a *Regla*; 1890 p. 309 f. *Carochi* (1645) *Lib. I*, cap. IV § 1, cf. *Lib. IV*, cap. IV; 1892 p. 410, cf. p. 486. *Schoembs* 1949, § 30, p. 22 f.

<sup>4</sup> *Olmos*, *loc. cit.*, *Quarta Regla*; 1885 p. 18. *Molina*, *loc. cit.* *Guzmán*, *loc. cit.*, 2a *Regla*; 1890 p. 310. *Ramírez* 1903 p. 508. *Schoembs*, *op. cit.*, § 31, p. 23.

Although the assumption of the determinative *-tli* thus is the most obvious, some further remarks must be offered; for the rule is that the determinative *-tl* follows after a vowel, while *-tli* normally follows after a consonant. As appears from the examples just adduced (*tilmatli*, *tatli*), *-tli*, however, may also occur after a vowel, so this is not a decisive objection to the assumption of the form *\*ixiptla-tli*. On the other hand, the objection must be adduced because our considerations have all the time referred to the “normal”, the “regular”, the “expected”. As to the vocalic combinations with *-tli* it is, for that matter, explained, presumably correctly, that the vowel has the “saltillo” (marked *tilmàtli*, *tàtli*), which suggest loss of consonant.<sup>1</sup> The demonstration of a marked *-ixiptlà-* with or without a prefix and/or suffix therefore would decisively support the assumption of the determinative *-tli*; but the texts (and Molina) practically never indicate accents.

Furthermore, also *-i* plus the determinative *-tl* when the substantive is connected with a possessive prefix can be dropped in the singular without any other ending appearing instead.<sup>2</sup> The main rule is that *-i-tl* is changed into *-ub*, and the exception mentioned here seems to be commonest when *-i-tl* comes after a consonant, especially after *-m*, *-n*, and *-x*; but the exception also occurs after a vowel, e.g. *mailt* ‘hand’, *ima* ‘his hand’, *tocaitl* ‘name’, *itoca* ‘his name’. So presumably we cannot completely exclude the formal possibility that *i-ixiptla*, *teixiptla*, etc., in the texts might be a form based on *\*ixiptla-i-tl*.

If, furthermore, we consider the determinative *-tl*, it should unfortunately be noted that the main rule still is not without exceptions. There are words in *-tl* which drop this suffix in the case of possessive prefixion without (in the singular) adding any other ending. Among these there are also words in which *-tl* comes after a vowel, among them, again, many with the vowel *-a*, which must especially interest us.<sup>3</sup> The general rule here is that the vowel is also dropped, as in *petlatl* ‘mat’, *ipetl* ‘his mat’, *matlatl* ‘net’, *imatl* ‘his net’ (but we nowhere find a form *ixiptl*). In other cases *-a* is changed into *-i*, as in *cozcatl* ‘necklace, ornament’, *icozqui* ‘his necklace, ornament’, *maxtlatl* ‘loincloth’, *imaxtli* ‘his loincloth’ (but we do not find a form *ixiptli*, either). However, we find *cochiatl* ‘eyelid’, *icochia* ‘his eyelid’ and *cemmatl* ‘arm’s length, embrace’, *icemma* (beside *icemmaub*) ‘his embrace’.<sup>4</sup> In this way

<sup>1</sup> *Carochi* (1645) Lib. I, cap. II § 2, cf. Lib. IV, cap. IV; 1892 p. 404 f., cf. p. 487. *Schoembs*, *op. cit.*, § 16, p. 19, cf. § 13, p. 18.

<sup>2</sup> *Olmos* (1547) Primera Parte, cap. VI, Segunda Regla; 1885 p. 18. *Molina*, *loc. cit.* *Rincon*, *loc. cit.* *Carochi* (1645) Lib. IV, cap. IV; 1892 p. 486. *Ramírez*, *op. cit.*, p. 503 f. *Schoembs*, *op. cit.*, § 30, p. 23.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. above, p. 78, Note 3.

<sup>4</sup> *Olmos* (1547) Primera Parte, cap. VI, Primera Regla; 1885 p. 17.

a formal – but very slight – possibility of the occurrence of a form \*ixiptla-il is opened up, too.

Other possible determinations cannot be brought into agreement with the forms found in the texts. Complete absence of determination (without prefixion) is extremely rare, mainly occurring as expressive of contempt and disgust. Furthermore, *-tla* considered as a suffix is improbable as this ending denotes a ‘place where there is abundance of’ that denoted by the stem, e.g., *tetl* ‘stone’, *tetla* ‘stony place’, *quauitl* ‘tree’, *quaubtla* ‘small wood, grove’. The prefixed plural in *-huan* does not give any information, nor does the form of the verb in *-ti*.

Thus it must be established that if the word is to be given in the determined form, the normal form to be expected will be \*ixiptlatli, but the endings *-i-tl* and *-tl* are also formally possible, though with highly decreasing probability, the last one even practically zero.

This fact, that the determined form apparently never occurs in the texts – in spite of many favourable opportunities – may, however, be due to more than fortuitousness and our misfortune. *It may be due to the possibility that the word could not at all be, or at least was not, used in the determined form.* Even though the phenomenon should have been quite isolated we should not be troubled to take cognizance of the fact that a word like *ixiptla-?* (\*ixiptlatli) could only be used with a possessive prefix which made it bear a concrete relation to somebody or something.

The phenomenon, however, is not isolated. A number of words are known – particularly kinship terms or terms of parts of the body, but others, too –, which can only be used with a possessive prefix.<sup>1</sup> Even the word for ‘house, residence, home’ only occurs with a possessive prefix, e.g. *ichan* ‘his residence’ (as against *calli* ‘house, building’).<sup>2</sup>

Therefore we are reluctant to introduce the determined form \*ixiptla-tli, perhaps never used and even difficult, in the following translations and commentaries. When the word is to be quoted isolatedly, we shall in accordance with well authenticated Aztec usage use the prefixed form *teixiptla*, which means ‘an \*ixiptla-tli of somebody’, ‘somebody’s \*ixiptla-tli’, and when the word occurs with statement of the concrete relation, we shall as “loan-word” use the authenticated stem, while the prefixion as usual is con-

<sup>1</sup> Olmos (1547) Primera Parte, cap. V; 1885 p. 15 f. (“Estos no se dizen, pero algunos si en otro sentido”: ...). Grasserie 1903 p. 70. Schoembs, *op. cit.*, § 52, p. 29. (“Gewisse Substantiva, besonders die, die Körperteile, Verwandtschaft, Götter, Wohnung bezeichnen, sind so fest mit dem Possessiv verbunden, dass sie ohne dies nicht oder fast nicht vorkommen.”)

<sup>2</sup> Olmos, *loc. cit.* Schoembs, *loc. cit.*: “So kann man aus *ichan*, *nochban* (seine, meine Wohnung), *chantli* (Haus) nur erschliessen; ...”



verted into our genitival construction, so that we write 'So-and-So's *ixiptla*', 'his *ixiptla*', etc. (Other words, on the other hand, are taken with their authenticated determinative).

Editors and translators understand the word correctly and render it correctly according to circumstances, but they do not seem to have been aware of the enormous religio-historical interest implied in this word. The concept is of so central importance and the meaning of the word appears so unambiguously from the changing contexts that it would be possible to use the vocable as a religio-historical technical term.

Seler mostly translates the word as 'Abbild'. Anderson-Dibble according to the context translate the word by 'image' or 'impersonator'. This has already offered an indication of the use of the word. It seems to have been derived from *ixtli* 'face', etc.

After these scantily orientating remarks we shall proceed to the examples.

From Tlacaxipeualiztli (II):<sup>1</sup>

Niman ye yc valquiça  
 valmoyacatia valmoteचना  
 yn ixquichtin, teyxiptlavan  
 yn impatillovan yn ixquichtin teteu.  
 motocayotiaya tepatiuhti tepatillovan.  
 teyxiptlati.

Then arrive  
 in order, in file  
 all the *teixiptlas*,  
 the representatives of all the *teotls*.  
 They were called deputies, representatives,  
*teixiptlas* (literally: 'those  
 who *ixiptla* (verb) somebody').

From these lines it is strictly not possible to see whether to us it is human beings or idols that are covered by the word *teixiptla*. On the other hand, the prefix *te-* shows that it is a question of *ixiptlas* of 'somebody'; of 'something' would have been indicated by the prefix *tila-*. Furthermore it is seen that the *teixiptlas* are conceived as animate beings, for otherwise the plural forms could not have been used. This also applies to the *teotls*. In the following lines we are informed that the *teixiptlas* in question come down from a certain temple and that, after reaching the ground, they walk round the round (sacrificial) stone. After which follows:

yn oconyavaloque,  
 motlatlalia tecpantoque,  
 ypan veuey. ycpalli

After they have walked round it,  
 they seat themselves, in a row,  
 on large chairs

It appears from this that 'they' must be human beings, for otherwise the reflexive *mo-* would not have been used.

<sup>1</sup> *Sab.* II, 21. Seler 1899, p. 177, 1927, p. 68. (A-D 3, 1951, p. 50).

About the same beings it is said somewhat later in the description of the ceremony:<sup>1</sup>

niman yc mitotia,  
quiyavaloa, yn temalacatl  
yn ixquichtin teyixiplati.

then dance,  
walk round the round stone,  
all the *teixiptlas* (literally: 'those who  
*ixiptla* (verb) somebody').

From Toçoztontli (III):<sup>2</sup>

auh ynaca oc concholotliaya.  
  
yn iqueztepol malli,  
yoan mecaxicolli.  
aztapatlactontli ytech pilcac  
  
auh yn queztepolli. amatica  
quiquimiloaya,  
quixayacatiaya.  
auh ynin motocayotiaya. malteotl.

and he removed the flesh which was  
still left  
on the captive's hip-bone,  
and (took) a string-coat  
to which was fastened a small heron  
plume.  
And the hip-bone he thoroughly wound  
with paper,  
provided it with a mask.  
And this was called (a) captive-*teotl*.

For the hip-bone originated from a captive he had taken and who had been sacrificed.

Molina: Queztepulli. chueca del cuadril, adonde juegan los huesos, 'the bend of the hip, where the legs move', thus the hip-joint, the socket. As to the translation of the last words of the quotation it should be noted that Aztec has no indefinite article proper and that the numeral *ce* 'one', which is sometimes used as the article, does not occur here.

On a general religio-historical assumption it seems evident that the treatment described is based on concepts of 'mana'. It seems that *malteotl* originally must have meant 'captive's mana'. And if *teotl* has become connected with concepts of "god" we have here an exact description of the character of this "god" in question.

From Vey toçoztli (IV):<sup>3</sup>

niman yc ompepeva, yn immilpan  
cinteoanazque,  
yn yzquican, mani ynmil.  
  
yn itech, yn ipan cecentetl milli,

Then they proceed to their fields  
in order to fetch Cinteotl (maize-*teotl*).  
In every place where they have their  
fields,  
in each and every field

<sup>1</sup> *Seler* 1899, p. 181, 1927, p. 73. (A-D 3, 1951, p. 53).

<sup>2</sup> *Sab.* II, 22. *Seler* 1899, p. 187, 1927, p. 81. (A-D 3, 1951, p. 57).

<sup>3</sup> *Sab.* II, 23. *Seler* 1899, p. 189 f., 1927, p. 85. (A-D 3, 1951, p. 60).

cecen cantivi yn toctli  
...  
quivalitqui yn inchachan,  
quixoxochictia, yn incinteovan.

they each fetch a maize plant.  
...  
They take it to their houses,  
they greet it as their *Cinteotls*  
(maize-teotls).

The translation of the first word in the last line follows that of Seler's, but with great hesitation. The adjectival formation in *-c* with the following (compulsive) verbal ending *-tia* is strange. It would give the translation 'they make it flowered, they flowered-make it', conceived in a figurative sense by Seler. But *qui-* (singular) does not agree with the following plural form *incinteovan*. Cod. Flor.<sup>1</sup> very simply has: *qujnxoxochiotia* 'they decorate them with flowers'.

What interests us is, however, that a *teotl* here is a *toctli*, a fresh, green maize plant. And we have again *teotl* in the plural. (The form in *-van* (*-huan*) is due to the preposed possessive pronoun *in-* 'their').

Furthermore it is told that they erect them, dress them, and place food before them. People said "there is a rest in all the houses"

ye hyca. ca çan caly, çan techachan  
yn maviztitiloya. cicinteo  
auh yye teotlac,  
ompa quimoncacava, cinteopan.  
yn iteopan chicomecoatl

because only in the houses, only in the  
homes,  
the *Cinteotls* were honoured.  
And after sunset  
they carried them to *Cinteopan*,  
the sacred place of *Chicome Coatl*.

There the people beat each other with them, and this was called "it is strewn wide".

"maviztitiloya" should be *maviztililoya*.<sup>2</sup> Cod. Flor.<sup>3</sup> correctly has *mauiz tililoia*.

*Mauiztilia*. nite. honrar y respectar a otro (Molina). It is used in the text both with reference to human beings and *teotls*.

*Cinteopan* is derived with a locative suffix from *Cinteotl*. *Chicome Coatl* means 'Seven Serpent'.

The text continues immediately afterwards:

auh no yoan, yn cintli, xinachtli yez.

And also the maize which was to be  
sown (be seed, be made seed)

ompa conitquiyá, cinteopan  
yn iteopan chicome coatl

was taken to *Cinteopan*,  
the sacred place of *Chicome Coatl*.

<sup>1</sup> A-D 3, loc. cit.

<sup>2</sup> Corrected below, p. 101.

<sup>3</sup> A-D 3, loc. cit.

quimmamaltia, ychpopuchti  
.....  
chichicon, ollotl yn quihlpia  
yehoatl yn ocholli catca

Young girls carry them (on their backs),  
.....  
seven cobs are tied together,  
this constituted the bundle (or: of that  
which was bundled maize).

It is wound in paper, which is painted, and the young girls are also painted and pasted with red feathers.

Then follows:<sup>1</sup>

niman ye yc quinvica yn ychpopuchti  
quimamativi, y cintli.  
no cinteotl, motocayotiaya

Then are accompanied the young girls  
who carry the maize,  
also *Cinteotl* it was called  
(also called C.)

And later:<sup>2</sup>

auh yn quimamativi yncicinteouh  
yn oquitquia, yteopan chicome coatl  
tlayollotl mochiva.  
yn cuezcomayollouh mochiva  
cuezcomac contema  
auh yniquac totoca,  
yn ye toquizpan,  
yehoatl quitócaya  
quixinachivaya quixinachoa.

And the *Cinteotls* which they carry  
(on their backs),  
after they have been taken to the sacred  
place of *Chicome Coatl*,  
they are made "heart",  
they are made their granary-"heart",  
they are laid down in the granary.  
And when it became seed-time  
when it became time for sowing,  
this was sown,  
was made seed, was sown

On general religio-historical assumptions it seems evident that the acts described are based on concepts of 'mana'. It seems that *cinteotl* originally must have meant 'maize mana', contained as well in the fresh, green maize plants, as in the maize which was kept to be used for seed. And if *teotl* was connected with concepts of "god", we have also here an accurate description of the character of this "god" in question. However, it is most probable that the reinterpretation had hardly yet taken place here; for the personified *Cinteotl* is otherwise conceived and represented as a youth, but immediately after the passage quoted last another interpretation follows, obviously associated with the seven corncobs tied together:

auh ynin, quilhviltaltia  
quilhvilchivilia yn. Chicome coatl.

And she whom they fêted,  
whom they celebrated, *Chicome Coatl*,

<sup>1</sup> *Seler* 1899, p. 191, 1927, p. 86 f. (A-D 3, 1951, p. 61).

<sup>2</sup> *Seler* 1899, p. 192, 1927, p. 88. (A-D 3, 1951, p. 62).

yuhquin cioatl quitlaliaya yxiptla.  
quitoaya  
ca vel yehoatl yn tonacayotl

like a woman they shaped her *ixiptla*.  
They said about her:  
she is our victuals (the sum of our vic-  
tuals, she is our sustenance).

*tonacayotl* is an abstract noun derived from *nacatl* 'flesh, body' (-*yotl* corresponds to English *-hood, -ship*), so that it actually means 'the sum or essence of our flesh, of our body', but it is nearly always used in the meaning of 'victuals'. This usage is explained in more detail in the following lines, where it says that he who does not eat bread will become weak and fall down and starve to death. It is not stated what her *ixiptla* consisted of, but *tlalia* implies that it was made of something material. The word is frequently used in the meaning 'lay, put' e. g. votive offerings in front of an idol, and it is also frequently used in the meaning 'lay, shape, form', e. g. a figure of dough. Molina has: *Tlalia. nitla. componer, poner algo en alguna parte, o hazer estatutos y ordenanças*. Further particulars are not given in the short account of festivals in MS. Bibl. del Pal. (MS. b)<sup>1</sup> either. But in Cod. Flor.<sup>2</sup> Sahagún in the corresponding passage in his Spanish text says: "Hazian de masa (que llaman tzoalli) la ymagen desta diosa, . . .," 'they made of dough (which they call *tzoalli*) the image of this goddess, . . .'

In the principal text it then says:<sup>3</sup>

yoan mitoa  
ca yyehoatl chicome coatl.  
ca quichiva yn ixquich tonacayotl.

And it is said:  
this *Chicome Coatl*  
creates all the victuals,

after which the text enumerates nearly a score of different kinds of maize, half a score of different kinds of beans, and as many other plants with edible grains and seeds. All this was also placed in front of her *ixiptla*, and the decoration and painting finally is described in more detail. Amongst other things she holds in each hand a double corncob.

We shall later meet with *Chicome Coatl* "in a different shape".

From *Toxcatl* (V):<sup>4</sup>

ytzin vel yveylhuiah catca  
yn tezcatlipoca,  
oncan tlatatia oncan moquetzaya,

Its (*Toxcatl*'s) beginning was  
*Tezcatlipoca*'s great festival,  
there was born (shaped), there was  
erected

<sup>1</sup> *Seler* 1899, p. 101, 1927, p. 82 f.

<sup>2</sup> A-D 3, 1951, p. 7.

<sup>3</sup> *Seler* 1899, p. 193, 1927, p. 89. (A-D 3, 1951, p. 62).

<sup>4</sup> *Sab.* II, 24. *Seler* 1899, p. 194, 1927, p. 91 f. (A-D 3, 1951, p. 64).

ypampa ca oncan miqvia,  
 yn ixiptla yn cexiuhtica onen.  
 yoan yquac niman noce, oncan  
 mixquetzaya. yxiptla,  
 yn oc noce xiuhtica nemiz.  
 ca miequintin yn nemia, teyxiptlavan,  
 yn quinpiaya, yn quinnemitiaya.  
 cacalpixque.  
 aço quen matlactli yn nemy.  
 yyehoantin hyn. ca mamalti,  
 tlaquixtilti,  
 quixtiloya. yniquac valaxitiloya  
 mamalti

in order to die there,  
 his *ixiptla*, which had lived (as such)  
 for a year,  
 and there then again his *ixiptla* was  
 erected,  
 which again was to live for a year.  
 There are many *teixiptlas*,  
 the stewards guarded them, gave them  
 support,  
 about ten there are perhaps,  
 namely captives, selected ones,  
 selected when the captives were  
 brought in,

And a little later:<sup>1</sup>

yn aqui n pepenaloia, yn teyxiptla  
 atle, yayoca.

and he who was selected, the *teixiptla*,  
 had no faults,

after which it is enumerated in about ninety items how the various parts of his body should be constituted, and especially how they might not be.<sup>2</sup> Great importance was attached to the training of these captives, especially with a view to teaching them fine manners. They should be able to play the flute, to smoke with dignity, and gracefully enjoy the fragrance of the flowers which must always be worn by them when they became *teixiptlas*. Importance was also attached to a refinement of speech, so that they could speak with exquisite politeness and greet people in a fitting manner if they met with somebody on the road.

Then follows:<sup>3</sup>

ypampa ca cenca maviztililoya.  
 yniquac oyxnez yn ye teixiptla  
 ynic yxiptlati titlacavan  
 ca totecuyo ypan machoya  
 netecuiyotilo,  
 tlatlauhtilo, yca elciciova  
 yxpan, nepechteco.  
 yxpan ontalqua yn macevaltztintli

For greatly he was honoured,  
 when he was shown as a *teixiptla*,  
 because he *ixiptlas* (verb) *Titlacahuan*,  
 i. e. he was looked at as our lord,  
 was treated as lord,  
 people asked for favours from him,  
 with sighing,  
 before him they prostrated themselves,  
 before him people kissed the ground  
 (literally: 'ate earth').

<sup>1</sup> *Seler* 1899, p. 195, 1927, p. 92.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. the well-known rules according to which priests are to be bodily faultless, e. g. *Lev.* 21,18-20, just as the victim is to be without blemish, e. g. *Lev.* 22,21-22, 24.

<sup>3</sup> *Seler* 1899, p. 197, 1927, p. 95. (A-D 3, 1951, p. 66).

*Titlacabuan* is generally recognized as another name for *Tezcatlipoca*. The former is generally interpreted as “We (are) his slaves”, the latter as “Smoking Mirror”. *teculli* ‘lord’ and *totecuyo* ‘our lord’ is used in texts about distinguished people as well as *teotls*.

The verb is authenticated in Molina: Ixiptlati. nite. asistir en lugar de otro, o representar persona en farsa. Pret. oniteixiptlatic.

A little farther down it says:

auh ce xiuitl yn nemia  
ypan toxcatl yn ixnecia.  
auh yquac miqúi. ce tlacatl,  
yn oteyxiptlatic ce xiuitl.

....

ça çan yc mopatlaviya,  
yn ixquetzaloya,  
yn ixquichtin quimpiaya, yn  
quinnemitiaya cacalpixque.

And for one year he lives,  
in *Toxcatl* he is shown.  
And when he dies, a man  
who has *ixiptlaed* (verb) for one year,

....

then he was at once replaced,  
one was selected  
among all those whom the stewards  
guarded, whom they gave sustenance.

Here *oteyxiptlatic* can only be the verb in the regular perfect tense in *o-...-c*. And, as previously stated, the prefix *te-* implies that he *ixiptlaes* “somebody”, not “something”.

It is then described how he walks about playing the flute, and we are told that he is accompanied by eight young men, the four of whom have engaged to “fast” for a year, for which reason they appear with their hair cut as that of the slaves, while four others are warriors. Then follows:<sup>1</sup>

yquac vel quicencava, quicecencava.  
yn motecuçoma,  
quitlamamaca quichichiva, quiyeyec-  
quetza.  
mochi tlaçotlanqui ynitech quitlalilia  
ypampa ca nel ye ytlaçoteouh ypan  
quimati.

Well, then Motecuçoma equips him,  
gives him equipment,  
gives him presents, clothes him,  
decorates him,  
all precious equipment he puts on him,  
for he considers him fully surely his  
precious *teotl*.

If a number of different words are translated as “god” or only without reserve are conceived in this sense, even though variations are given in the translation – for the sake of variety – all lines will be blurred. However, we note that the *teixiptla* in this case is said to be considered and treated as ‘our lord’ by the common people (*maceualli*),<sup>2</sup> i.e. in quite the same way as the people consider and treat the human lords of the country, especially the King. Whereas the King, Motecuçoma, himself is said to con-

<sup>1</sup> *Seler* 1899, p. 198, 1927, p. 96. (A-D 3, 1951, p. 66).

<sup>2</sup> See above, p. 86.

sider the *teixiptla* his *tlaçoteotl*, his 'precious, beloved *teotl*'.<sup>1</sup> Furthermore, we keep in mind that previous examples suggest that *teotl* originally was connected with concepts of mana, and we shall see why it is of importance to keep this in mind, here, too.

Immediately before the beginning of the 20 days' "month" Toxcatl the *teixiptla* is given four women in marriage, and at the same time he discards his previous equipment in order to be dressed and equipped as a war chief. He is given four women to "sleep with" – this is also the Aztec expression<sup>2</sup> – four women who have also been kept in custody for a year by the steward:<sup>3</sup>

yce ytoca xochiquetzal  
yn ic ome xilonen  
yn ic ey atlatonan  
yn ic navi vixtociuatl.

The first is called *Xochiquetzal*,  
the second *Xilonen*,  
the third *Atlatonan*,  
the fourth *Uixtociuatl*.

All the four names are conceived as names of "goddesses" and we shall meet three of them again in other connexions.

The text passes on immediately to relating that five days before the actual festival day Toxcatl (which falls on the last day of the 20 days' period) the people begin to sing, and in this connexion some remarkable lines are inserted:

...  
ym peva cuicuica.  
yniquac hyn, yn yzqui ilvitl, hyn  
aocmo onmachiztia yn motecuçoma  
  
oc yeh ycenvic catca  
tetlacualtia, tetlauhtia.  
yn ic cemilhvitol cuicuica ytocayocan  
tecamma.  
..., etc.

...  
they begin singing.  
At that time, in these days,  
nothing is known about Motecuçoma  
(Motecuçoma does not appear at all),  
those who had been his companions,  
give feedings, give favours.  
The first day they sing in the place  
which is called Teccaman.  
..., etc.

It is not evident *whose* companions are referred to. A–D insert a parenthesis in the translation: "those who had been (the impersonator's) companions," but in the text the reference is rather to Motecuçoma. As far as he is concerned, we have not, however, heard anything about any companions. In the context it seems as if it is suddenly the *teixiptla* who is designated as

<sup>1</sup> *tlaçotli* 'precious object'. *nimitztlaçotla* 'I love you'. *Molina*: Tlaçotli. cosa preciosa, o cara, Tlaçotla. nite. amar a otro.

<sup>2</sup> *oncivacohtinemi* (Cod. Flor.: *oncioacuchtinemi*). *Molina*: Cochi. ni. dormir.

<sup>3</sup> *Seler* 1899, p. 200, 1927, p. 98 f. (A–D 3, 1951, p. 67 f.).



Motecuçoma. This word, Motecuçoma, is normally interpreted as a proper name, but it is used in several passages in the text almost as a title.<sup>1</sup> The continuity would seem most natural if it is the *teixiptla* on whom the title of king is suddenly conferred. Seler translates: "weiss man nichts mehr vom König," which, indeed, will fit best into the context, if the reference is to *teixiptla*. But it does not say so clearly and incontestably in the text. The other possibility, therefore, is that it is the actual King, Motecuçoma, who does not appear in these days, but this, too, again suggests a very close connexion between the King and the *teixiptla*. It suggests again that "his *teotl*" may have been conceived as "his 'mana'"; for what happens to the *teixiptla* in those days is that he is conducted from place to place in order finally to be sacrificially killed in a small temple outside the town. And if this was supposed to take place as regards the King's 'mana', it would be natural that the King himself did not appear in those days, either. Analogous phenomena are not unknown.

The text does not, however, give definite information. Nor can we determine the possible 'mana' more specifically. We should expect a word-formation parallel to *malteotl* 'captive's mana' and *cinteotl* 'maize mana'. But *tlaçoteotl* can hardly mean anything but 'precious *teotl*', formed completely as *tlaçotetl* 'precious stone, gem'. Molina: Tlaçotetl, piedra preciosa. Or as *tlaçopilli*. Molina: Tlaçopilli. hijo o hija legitimos. There is a slight possibility that the associations are in the direction of legitimacy, as we twice, at the description of an election of a king, find it emphasized that it is a *tlaçopilli* who is appointed;<sup>2</sup> but the possibility is but slight, even very slight, for whether *tlaçopilli* is here interpreted as 'legitimate son' or as 'distinguished prince', the meaning is based on the 'costly, precious' which we know in advance, and the possibility that the associations are in the direction of *tlaçotla* 'to love' is also very slight, in spite of the marriage with the four women, for this meaning, too, is based on 'costly, precious', whereas there are other expressions for 'love' in an erotic sense. *nimitztlaçotla* 'I love you' is based on the meaning 'esteem you highly'.

But at any rate, the King considered this prisoner of war, who had become *teixiptla*, as his *teotl*.

From Xocotl uetzi (X):<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Cf. the editor's (Lehmann's) remark, Seler 1927, p. 64, Note 2: „(Der Name des letzten aztekischen Herrschers steht im Sahagun-Text gewöhnlich für „König“ im allgemeinen. D. H.)“

<sup>2</sup> *Sab.* VIII, 18. A-D 9, 1954, p. 61.

<sup>3</sup> *Sab.* II, 29. Seler 1927, p. 163. (A-D 3, 1951, p. 105).

Auh yn ixiptla xocotl  
yn quinacayotia  
michiuauhtzoual(l)i quitlaliaya  
ça cemiztac yn amatl yn quimamaca

And Xocotl's *ixiptla*  
they incarnate,  
from a dough made of the seed of the  
"fish herb", they formed it,  
with quite white paper they equip it,

and the full decoration is described as usual.

*tzoalli* is a dough made of seeds from plants of the amaranth genus. Later it says once more:<sup>1</sup>

yn xocotl yxiptla çan tzoalli

Xocotl's *ixiptla*, actually dough made of  
amaranth seeds,

and it is told that this dough in small fragments is strewn on the assembled crowd of onlookers.

From Ochpaniztli (XI):<sup>2</sup>

auh yn ye yatiuitz  
niman ic quiualnamiqui yn  
chichicomecoa  
auh yn oquiualnamicque  
niman ic (qui)uallayaualoa

And then suddenly come,  
then meet her the *Chicomecoatsls*,

and after they have met her,  
they form a circle (round her)

Later it says again:<sup>3</sup>

yn iquac ye teotl ac  
mec ualquiça yn chichicome coa  
yn imixiptlauan no tototecti

when the sun is setting  
then the *Chicomecoatsls* come  
and also the *ixiptlas* of the *Totecs*

Seler's translation, which is followed by A–D, is also justifiable; he connects the two lines: 'then come the *Chicomecoatsls*, who are also the *ixiptlas* of the *Totecs*'. Finally the lines may be connected like this: 'then the *ixiptlas* of the *Chicomecoatsls* come, and also the *Totecs*'. Aztec syntax has not been studied so intensively that I dare make a decision. But the sense must necessarily depend on the position of *no*, and the functions which must be ascribed to the difficult particle *yn*. This will decide the factual question whether *Chicomecoatsls* and *Totecs* are identical in this passage.

What interests us in this connexion is, however, that the *Chicomecoatsls* at any rate seem to be human beings here. (*Totec* 'Our Lord' is the "god" Xipe Totec, who, amongst other things, but especially is represented by

<sup>1</sup> Seler 1927, p. 169. (A–D 3, 1951, p. 109).

<sup>2</sup> *Sab.* II, 30. Seler 1927, p. 174. (A–D 3, 1951, p. 111).

<sup>3</sup> Seler 1927, p. 181. (A–D 3, 1951, p. 116).

human beings who have arrayed themselves in the skins of flayed captives killed at sacrifices). For it is further related about the *Chicomecoatl*s that they strew maize on the people.

Seler considers these *Chicomecoatl*s “die (Priester der) Chicome coua”, as also A–D: “(the priests of) Chicome coatl”. But it seems to me that this is inserting an element two much. This appears particularly clearly from the following passage of the text:<sup>1</sup>

auh yn ichpopochti yn intech poui  
 chichicome coua  
 moteneua ciotlamacazque  
 quimomamaltiaya yn cintli  
 chichicoom olotl  
 oltica quixxaxauaya yn cintli  
 yuan amatica yn quinquimiloaya  
  
 yuan tlaçotilmatica  
 yn quimmama yn ciuatlamacazque  
  
 moxauaya mopotoniaya  
  
 no cuicatiui  
 quincuicacatitui yn chichicome coa  
 auh yee yuhqui  
 yn oxxinachpixoco  
 niman ye yc ui ym motlatizque

And the young women who are  
 dedicated to the *Chicomecoatl*s  
 are called priestesses,  
 they carried maize on their backs,  
 each seven cobs,  
 with gum they smeared the maize  
 and wound them (the cobs)  
 thoroughly with paper,  
 and in precious mantles  
 they carry them on their backs,  
 the priestesses,  
 they smeared themselves with gum and  
 pasted themselves with feathers,  
 and they also chant,  
 chant to the *Chicomecoatl*s.  
 And then,  
 after the maize has been strewn,  
 (then) they go to hide themselves  
 (withdraw).

The first line is translated as follows by Seler: “Und die Jungfrauen, die zu den (Priestern der) Chicome coua gehörten”, and by A–D: “And the maidens who belonged among (the priests of) Chicome coatl.” The last line but three is translated by Seler as follows: “die (Priester der) Chicome coua stimmen für sie den Gesang an,” and is so unreservedly followed by A–D that they forget to bracket the supposed priests: “the priests of Chicome coatl intoned the chant for them.” Seler and A–D thus here consider the *Chicomecoatl*s to be priests, different from the young women mentioned, and consider that it is the priests who chant to the young women. But in the first place it does not say so in the text, secondly it is unnecessary to make this bracketed addition to understand the text, and thirdly it goes against what is otherwise known about the matter; it is natural to conceive *Chicomecoatl* ‘Seven Serpent’ as identical with the seven corncobs which occur here and at the previously mentioned festival Uei toçoztli (IV), respectively as

<sup>1</sup> Seler 1927, p. 182. (A–D 3, 1951, p. 116).

the seven corncobs plus the young woman who carries them on her back. The context is also understood most probably in the way that it is the young women who chant, viz. to the corncobs, to the *Chicomecoatl*s. But in the mention of the forming of a circle and the strewing of maize, the term must furthermore cover the young women themselves.

At this festival a *Cinteotl* similarly appears in such a context that most probably he must be considered an acting human being, but this is not expressly stated, so we shall not touch on this question.

We have already seen that a *teixiptla* can be a figure made of dough. Such figures of dough are also made at the *Tepeilhuitl* 'the Mountain Festival', but there the figures are called *tetepe* 'mountains', sing. *tepetl*. They are decorated with clothes of paper and with feathers, and are placed on round mats, after which maize bread, chili sauce, dog's meat, or turkey is placed before them, and incense is burnt before them.

The fact that these figures may also be called *teixiptlas* appears from the following two parallel passages from *Tepeilhuitl* (XIII):<sup>1</sup>

Auh no quitepetlaliaya  
 yn açaca atlam mic  
 yn ilaquilo yn anoce viteco

And they also shaped "mountains"  
 for the one who had died in the water,  
 drowned, or to the one who had been  
 struck by lightning

....  
 no tepetl ypan quiquixtiaya  
 çam moch tzoalli yn quinchichiuaya

....  
 also he was pictured as a "mountain",  
 they were all made of dough of  
 amaranth seed

as compared with:<sup>2</sup>

yn atlam miquia  
 çan yaualco yn quintlaliaya yn  
 imixiptla<sup>3</sup>  
 tzoalli yn quinchichiuaya

Those who die in the water,  
 their *ixiptlas* were placed on round  
 mats,  
 were made of dough of amaranth seed.

But soon afterwards it says:<sup>4</sup>

Auh yn ipan in ylhuitl  
 miquia cequintin ciua  
 yn ixiptlauan tetepe  
 yn ic ce ytoca tepoxoch  
 yn ic ome \*matlalcueie

On the festival day  
 some women die,  
 the *ixiptlas* of the "mountains".  
 The first is called *Tepoxoch*,  
 the second \**Matlalcueie*,

<sup>1</sup> *Sab.* II, 32. *Seler* 1927, p. 190. (A-D 3, 1951, p. 121).

<sup>2</sup> *Seler* 1927, p. 191. (A-D 3, 1951, p. 122).

<sup>3</sup> *imixiptla-huan* ought to be expected.

<sup>4</sup> *Seler* 1927, p. 192. (A-D 3, 1951, p. 122).

yn iquey xochtecatl  
yn ic naui mayauel  
yxiptla n metl  
yn ic macuilli ytoca milnauatl  
yn in oquichtli yxiptla n coatl

the third Xochtecatl,  
the fourth Mayauel,  
the *ixiptla* of the agave,  
the fifth is called Milnauatl,  
who is a man, the *ixiptla* of the serpent.

The name \*Matlalcueie is due to Seler's correction from Matlalquae, which, however, also occurs in Cod. Flor.

In the third line *yn ixiptlauan* in the translation has been interpreted as *yn-ixiptlauan*. Thus also by Seler who has: "als die Abbilder der Berge." This form is found in Cod. Flor. (*imjxiptlaoan*).

The word *tetepel* is used in such a way that we shall only from the context – but not always – be able to decide whether the reference is to a "real" mountain or to a "mountain" made of dough, and the word *teixiptla* is used partly about the figures made of dough, partly about human beings who are called "the *ixiptlas* of the mountains", two of them furthermore being denoted as "the *ixiptla* of the agave" and "the *ixiptla* of the serpent", respectively.

*tetepe* and *teixiptlauan*, mountains, "mountains", figures of dough and human beings enter a close ideology in this account, which can only make sense if the ideas – in our terminology – are based on the concept of 'mana', so that e.g. the *ixiptla* of the agave is always the bearer of agave 'mana' without regard of the question whether we see the *teixiptla* as figure of dough or as a human being or something else.

Therefore one more possibility must be taken into consideration. The second and third line in the passage quoted might be interpreted like this: some "women" die, (viz.) the *ixiptlas* of the mountains, i. e. "mountains", figures of dough. With this sense we should, however, rather have expected the insertion of an explanatory *çan*: 'actually, only', which frequently occurs in similar contexts.

The very first translation quoted must be considered the one which most probably covers the sense of the text. Only the quotation marks of the word "the mountains" are a little doubtful, but they have been used because *tetepe* in the whole of the preceding text is exclusively used in the sense 'figures of dough', thus "mountains".

About the four female and the one male *teixiptla* it is furthermore told that they are carried round in a ring in sedan-chairs until the time approaches when they are to die. Then the chairs are put down and the *teixiptlas* are conducted up to the temple Tlalocan, where they are laid down on the sacrificial stone and their chest as usual ripped open. After they have died,

they are rolled down the steps to Tzompantitlan, where their heads are cut off and placed in the usual way, after which the bodies are taken to the district sanctuaries.

If – against our assumption – the fact is that the four female *teixiptlas* and the male one were figures of dough, there would not in the whole of this continued account be anything to support it. The description is exactly as it would be if the *teixiptlas* were human beings. But if – against our assumption – it is still a question of figures of dough, we should here have an instance showing that *teixiptlas* made of dough might be treated and mentioned exactly in the same way as human *teixiptlas*, not only be carried round in chairs, but also be conducted to the Tlaloc temple, be put on the sacrificial stone, have their chests cut up, die, be rolled down the steps, have their heads cut off and have them placed on Tzompantitlan.

As emphasized, this is against our assumption, which is based on the previously stated considerations in connexion with the decisive passage in the text. On the basis of what has previously been stated, we must consider it most probable that the four particularly mentioned female *teixiptlas* and the male one are human beings, and it is to be expected that those killed at the sacrifice, as on other, similar occasions, are cut up and eaten (ritually) after being placed in the district sanctuary.

But things with the same ‘mana’ are identical. We shall quote the end of the section summarized and then continue:<sup>1</sup>

auh yn oquimonquehcotonque	And after the heads have been severed from
yn intlac niman yc quiuica	the bodies, they carry them to their
yn incacalpolco	district sanctuaries.
Auh yn imoztlayoc	And the next day
yn ouallatuic	at dawn
ym mitoaya texinilo texixitinilo	they said, “They are cut up”, “They are cut to pieces.”
niman ye yc quixitinia yn tzoalli	Then they cut op the dough of amaranth seed.
Auh yn oquixixitinique	And after they have cut it up,
niman ic tlapanco quitlecavia	they carry it on to the flat roof,
ompa vaqui qua(u)uaqui tepivaqui	where it is dried in the sun, dried to be edible, dried to be baked through.
achchi concuitiui yn quiqua	They take small pieces of it, eat it,
caniuh quitlamia	gradually they finish it.

*ximi* properly means ‘breaks down’, e.g. about a wall. It may also be used in the meaning ‘dismember’. The prefix *te-* shows that it is used here with reference to persons, animate beings.

<sup>1</sup> Seler 1927, p. 193. (A–D 3, 1951, p. 123).

From Tititl (XVII):<sup>1</sup>

yn ipan i ylhuitl ce tlatatl miquia  
ytoca ylamatecutli  
yxiptla tlaaltilli

At this ceremony a human being dies,  
named Ilamatecutli's  
*ixiptla*, a bathed one.

The ritual bathing was a preparation for the sacrificial killing, and *tlaaltilli* 'one who has been bathed' is commonly used about "one who is destined to be killed at a sacrifice."

It is expressly stated that the *teixiptla* is a human being, as is also corroborated by the statement that it is "a bathed one". This is strengthened in what follows, where it is related that she is decorated with mussel-shells which rattle when she is walking. Furthermore, it is told that she dances and then her being sacrificed is described, at which more *teixiptlas* come into the picture as well:<sup>2</sup>

yn iquac nenemi  
cenca xaxamaca . . .

When she walks  
there is much rattling

....

Auh yn ayamo miqiu mitotiaya

....

And before she died, she danced

....

auh yn iquac mitotiaya  
uel mochoquiliaya yuan elciciui

....

and while dancing  
she wept much and sighed

....

niman ye yc quitlecauia  
yn teocaltipac  
quitzitzitziui quitocatiui

....

then they conduct her up  
to the top of the temple.  
Immediately after her, following  
her come

yn ixquichtin yn ixiptlauan diablome  
cempantitui  
teyacantuih yn occeppa yxiptla

all the *ixiptlas* of the diablome  
walking in file.

yn uel quimoteotia tlalticpac

At the head once more walks her  
*ixiptla*,

can tlatatl yn quichichiuaya

whom they verily make a *teotl* for  
themselves on earth,  
but actually a human being whom they  
decorated.

auh yn oconaxitique

And after they have got up there  
with her,

niman ic coneltequi  
auh yn ommomiquili  
niman ic quivalquechcotona  
auh yn itzonteco(n)  
quivalmaca yn teyacantuih

they cut open her chest.  
And when she has died,  
they cut her throat.  
And her head  
they give to the man who is walking  
in front.

<sup>1</sup> *Sab.* II, 36. *Seler* 1927, p. 224. (A-D 3, 1951, p. 143).

<sup>2</sup> *Seler* 1927, p. 225 f. (A-D 3, 1951, p. 143 f).

ytlan conana ymayauhcampa  
 yn quitzitzquitiuh mitotitiuh  
  
 y contlayyauhtiuh yn tzontecomatl  
  
 ymixpan icatiuh quinyacantiuh  
 yn ixquichtin ymixiptlauan yn  
 impatillouan diablome  
 quiualyaualoa yn teocalli  
 niman ic ualtemo  
 çanno yui motecpantiuitze  
 cempantitiuitze  
 ....  
 auh yn teyxiptla  
 yn ixiptla ylamatecutli  
 ynic mitotiaya  
 ....

He takes it in his right hand,  
 holding it firm while he walks,  
 dancing,  
 making dancing movements with the  
 (cut-off) head,  
 standing before them, leading them,  
 all the *ixiptlas*, deputies, of the  
 diablome.  
 They walk round the temple,  
 then they descend,  
 likewise walking in file,  
 walking in file.  
 ....  
 And the *teixiptla*,  
 Ilamatecutli's *ixiptla*  
 danced like this:  
 ....

*diablome* is of course Spanish 'diablo' with the Aztec plural ending. Besides 'capitulo' it is almost the only Spanish loanword which occurs in the texts, and fairly rarely. The sentence: *yn uel quimoteotia tlaticpac* is translated as follows by Seler: "die sie in diesem Lande hoch verehren," and by A-D: "one whom they verily thought a god(dess) on earth," which approaches more closely to the sense. But the central *quimoteotia* is quite clear and derived completely regularly from *teotl*, with the compulsive suffix *-tia*, *teotia* 'makes into (a) teotl', with the reflexive prefix *mo-*, here: 'for themselves', and with the object reference *qui-* to *ixiptla*.

The sentence: *y contlayyauhtiuh yn tzontecomatl* is translated as follows by Seler: "er hebt den Kopf weihend empor" (as if the text had *coniavilia* 'raise it (ritually)'), and by A-D: "marking the dance rythm with the head", which in itself is correct, but which makes a somewhat substantial impression. Molina has: Tlayaua. ni. hazer ciertos ademanes elque baila o dança.

The statement that Ilamatecutli dances, thus in the beginning refers to the first *teixiptla*, a human being who is to be sacrificially killed, and then the term immediately passes on to applying to the second *teixiptla* (a priest), who now is dancing with the cut-off head of the first *teixiptla* in his right hand, still under the description: Ilamatecutli's *ixiptla* is dancing. And about this *teixiptla* it is declared that it is a *teotl* to them.

From Izcalli (XVIII):<sup>1</sup>

. . . n tota yeuatl yn tletl  
 quitlaliaya yxiptla

. . . our father, the fire.  
 They formed his *ixiptla*,

<sup>1</sup> *Sab.* II, 37. Seler 1927, p. 231 f. (A-D 3, 1951, p. 147).



çan colotli yn quichiuaya  
quixayacatiaya

only a wooden frame they made,  
provided it with a mask

.....

auh yn yeuatl xiuhtecutli  
yxpan ca tlecuilli

.....

And this Xiuhtecutli  
is in front of the fireplace.

Ten days later the ceremony is repeated, but now another name is used:<sup>1</sup>

.... yn tota milintoc  
çan no ye tletl  
no quitlaliaya yxiptla çanno colotli  
yn quichiuaya  
conaquia yxayac

.... our father Milintoc  
– this is likewise the fire.  
They also shaped his *ixiptla*, they like-  
wise only made a wooden frame,  
to which they fasten his mask

.....

auh yn oquitlali que milintoc  
mec tlamanalo yxpan

.....

And after they have shaped Milintoc,  
gifts are laid in front of him

And every fourth year the following ceremony also takes place:<sup>2</sup>

yn iquac miquia yn ixcoçauhque  
yn ixiptlauan xiuhtecutli tlaaltiti  
yn quemman miequintin ym miquia  
yn quemman amo miequintin

then the Ixcoçauhquis die,  
the *ixiptlas* of Xiuhtecutli, bathed;  
sometimes many die,  
sometimes not many

Further:<sup>3</sup>

auh ynic mochichiua  
yuin mochichiua yxcoçauhqui

and they are adorned  
as Ixcoçauhqui is adorned.

And later:<sup>4</sup>

yn omicque mamalti  
niman yeuan yn tlaaltiti  
yn ixcoçauhque

and when the captives are dead,  
then the bathed ones (are killed),  
the Ixcoçauhquis.

(“the captives” and “the bathed ones” here are not identical, as clearly appears from the context).

We have seen that a *teixiptla* may be a human being, a figure of dough, or a wooden frame provided with a mask. We have seen that the word – to us – may change without notice from one to another of such objects,

---

<sup>1</sup> *Seler* 1927, p. 234 f. (A–D 3, 1951, p. 148 f).

<sup>2</sup> *Seler* 1927, p. 236. (A–D 3, 1951, p. 150).

<sup>3</sup> *Seler* 1927, p. 237. (A–D 3, 1951, p. 150).

<sup>4</sup> *Seler* 1927, p. 238. (A–D 3, 1951, p. 151)

and we have seen that the word in a few passages is simply defined as 'deputy, representative'.<sup>1</sup>

This meaning logically presupposes that something exists which the deputies can represent, and we have seen that the "represented" one may be designated as *teotl* or by a "god's" name.

Still it would seem precarious unreservedly to declare a *teixiptla* the "representative" of a "god" (in the form of a human being, a figure of dough, a wooden frame with a mask fastened to it). In the first place, we have seen that no less a person than Motecuçoma considers a *teixiptla* itself as direct being a *teotl*. Secondly, we have seen that *teixiptlas* may appear, so to say, at several stages. If we leave out of consideration the somewhat doubtful example with the "mountains",<sup>2</sup> there is at least the example with 'our father, the fire', whose *ixiptla*, a wooden frame with a mask, is called Xiuhtecutli (Milintoc), after which we furthermore hear about the 'Ixcoçauhquis, Xiuhtecutli's *ixiptlas*, "bathed".<sup>3</sup> But here it is just Xiuhtecutli, Milintoc, and Ixcoçauhqui who are conceived as the "god", so that actually the „god" should again directly be the *teixiptla*. A continuous "representation" or "deputizing" at several subsequent stages is not either in itself very probable; it must be assumed that the basis is a simple identification.

The most decisive feature, however, seems to be that the names of "gods" are everywhere used directly about *teixiptlas*, whether these are human beings, figures of dough, or wooden frames with masks. The names of "gods" are simply cult names, special cultic terms denoting the persons and objects acting or dealt with in the rituals. The omission of attributing the meaning of "deputy, representative" to the word *teixiptla* when the word occurs in original, religious contexts will presumably have a clarifying effect on our own conceptions. If anything the meaning of 'image' should be stressed (as generally in the translators: "Abbild", "image"), but indeed with the important addition that it is the 'image' itself, the *teixiptla*, which constitutes the "god". And especially we ought in our minds to have the meaning 'image' be coloured by the meaning 'mask, masked raiment', for it seems everywhere to be the dressing, painting, and adornment which constitutes a given *teixiptla*, respectively a given "god". It is not accidental that these garments, paintings, and adornments – almost every time when occasion offers itself

---

<sup>1</sup> In Molina we may even find: Obispo ytecutlatocauh. Prouisor de obispo. Obispo ixiptla. idem.

<sup>2</sup> Above, p. 93.

<sup>3</sup> Above, p. 97.

– is carefully described, right down to the smallest details.<sup>1</sup> Physically a *teixiptla* can be a number of things; its name is determined by raiment, painting, and other adornment.

In order to avoid overloading we have not included duplicates of texts when they do not throw further light on that which it is wanted to exemplify. This especially applies to material from the unarranged additions to the description of the Izcalli festival, but the passages omitted are very few, and qualitatively they are without importance in the present connexion.

Furthermore, a few passages have been omitted in which the word *teixiptla* occurs, but in such a way that it is not possible to decide what the *teixiptla* is – to us – in the context in question. Finally passages have not been included which will be discussed below, in subsequent sections.

As to the word *teotl* the examples adduced are probably exhaustive as regards the texts of rituals. However, passages which will be discussed below have also been omitted here. A few passages in which it does not appear what the *teotl* is (to us) have also been omitted. The latter passages in the nature of things may be adduced in support of the translation “god”. According to all that is otherwise known about the ceremonies, it seems, however, most probable that here, too, it is a question of different forms of *teixiptlas*, not of mere abstractions; but as nothing is expressly stated we have disregarded these passages. Finally, as previously stated,<sup>2</sup> we have for reasons of space been obliged to renounce including investigations of compounds with *teo-*.

Fairly few examples are left which give information about the meaning of the word *teotl*; but these examples show that the word – to us – may have extraordinarily concrete and material semantic contents, in so far as it can be used about a bone,<sup>3</sup> a maize plant,<sup>4</sup> seven corncobs tied together,<sup>5</sup> and about human beings.<sup>6</sup>

From a linguistic point of view the word has not been thoroughly investi-

---

<sup>1</sup> Such descriptions occur so frequently that a long list of references is considered superfluous in this connexion. A great number of Seler's works include collected or scattered commentaries on dress and adornment, but also a long list of references to these is considered superfluous here. – For introduction: *Seler* 1890 (a text from MS. in Bibl. del Pal. (b), not included in Cod. Flor.; with German translation and thorough commentary), *Seler* 1902–23 II, pp. 420–508 (the same paper as the preceding one), *Seler* 1927, p. 33–53 (text and translation as the preceding ones, but without the commentary). Cf. *Sab.* I,1–22 (24): *Seler* 1927, pp. 1–32 (text from MS. in Bibl. del Pal. (a), with German translation), A–D 2, 1950, pp. 1–24 (Cod. Flor.). – See also *Seler* 1902–23 II, pp. 509–619.

<sup>2</sup> Above, p. 78.

<sup>3</sup> Above, p. 82.

<sup>4</sup> Above, p. 82 f.

<sup>5</sup> Above, p. 84.

<sup>6</sup> Above, pp. 87, (92), 95.

gated, but from the factual point of view we have established usages which must be supposed to be based on concepts of 'mana', and in such a way that the word *teotl* itself must be assumed still to have – or at least to have had – a meaning which corresponds to the meaning 'mana'.

With regard to the names of "gods" it should finally be emphasized that only a rather small selection of relevant passages has been included, viz. only such passages as have naturally fallen under the treatment of the words *teotl* and *\*ixiptlatli*; but this small selection is extremely representative, which assertion for that matter can be supported by a reference to the fact that indeed examples have been adduced from nine of the eighteen annual festivals. The selection is representative, the names of "gods" are in the descriptions of rituals used quite ordinarily directly about objects and persons with the same characteristics as the objects and persons which we can find as being designated by the words *teotl* or *teixiptla*.

In so far as the names of "gods" are conceived as names of mythical figures, we have therefore got an impression of the closest relation of the figures to ritual objects and ritual persons, and this has already thrown light on a narrow, but central part of the problem of the relation between cult and myth.

As about these "mythical figures" so far nothing in particular is stated apart from the fact that they are cult names of such or such objects and persons, we shall, however, prefer conceptually to keep the phenomena dealt with here separate from "myths" in a strict sense of the word. For the same reason we shall in what follows omit including other mere cult names, e. g. of objects (although in themselves they constitute mythical elements) if no particular statement is made about them on the mythical plane.

So far we have only looked on the central part of the problem: the character of the units – certain cult names, certain cultic designations – which will occur in the myths.

We shall now consider the relation between cult and myth in a wider sense.

c. TYPE 0 (OF GROUP A)

From Tlacaxipeualiztli (II):<sup>1</sup>

mochinti. cecentel yntlan caana,

yn intzontecon yn mamalti,

Everybody, each of them, seizes them in order to dance with them, the heads of the captives (which had been cut off),

<sup>1</sup> *Sab.* II, 21. *Seler* 1899, p. 181, 1927, p. 73. (A-D 3, 1951, p. 53).

vauanti	those of "the striped ones" (i. e. those of the sacrificed ones),
yc mitotitivi,	with them they dance.
mitoa motzontecomaytotiyá	It is said, "They dance with heads."

And this, in our view as well, is just what they did. Molina: Ana. tita. trauarse o asirsevnos a otros delas manos para dançar. Prete. otitaanque.

Two examples have been quoted above,<sup>1</sup> viz.  
from Vey toçoztli (IV):<sup>2</sup>

auh yn iquac hy	And when this happens,
moteneva. calonovac, caly onovac.	it is called <i>calonovac</i> , "there is rest in the houses,"
ye hyca. ca çan caly, çan techachan	because only in the houses, only in the homes,
yn maviztililoya, cicinteo	the <i>Cinteotls</i> were honoured.

After sunset the maize plants – as we should see the *Cinteotls* mentioned – were carried up to *Cinteopan*, and there the people enjoyed themselves by beating each other with them,

mitoa tepixolo	It is said, "It is strewn."
----------------	-----------------------------

As indeed, in our opinion, must be assumed to happen by such treatment.

From Toxcatl (V).<sup>3</sup> About the *teixiptla* which Motecuçoma equips and adorns, it is said:

yc mitoa, motlilçava	It is said, "He fasts, painted black,"
mixtililpopotztinenca.	his face is painted with a thick layer of black colour,

after which the rest of his adornment is described.

About another part of the Toxcatl festival it says:<sup>4</sup>

auh yn tlamacazque, no mihtotia	And the priests, they also dance.
mitoa toxcachocholoa	It is said, "They Toxcatl-leap" (-dance).

<sup>1</sup> Above, p. 83.

<sup>2</sup> *Sab.* II, 23. *Seler* 1899, p. 190, 1927, p. 86. (A-D 3, 1951, p. 60).

<sup>3</sup> *Sab.* II, 24. *Seler* 1899, p. 198, 1927, p. 96. (A-D 3, 1951, p. 66).

<sup>4</sup> *Seler* 1899, p. 206, 1927, p. 106. (A-D 3, 1951, p. 72).

From Ochpaniztli (XI):<sup>1</sup>

auh yniquiuh yau  
in moteneua çacàcali  
ye yca ca çacatl ca popotl  
yn immac tetentiuh  
heço tlaezvilli  
auh yn ynic quintoca  
çam momoyaua cecemmani  
cenca momauhtia

And when they walk like this,  
it is called, "They fight with grass  
(-brooms),"  
because it is (brooms of) grass, it is  
(brooms of) straw,  
which they carry in their hands,  
bloody, blood-stained.  
And those whom they pursue,  
disperse, run apart,  
they are very scared.

The rendering of *çacàcali* follows the current translations, which obviously interpret the word as a compound of *çacatl* 'grass' and *icali* with assimilated *i-*. Molina: Icali. nin. escaramuçar, o batallar. Icali. nite. pelear contra otros.

From Quecholli (XIV):<sup>2</sup>

niman ye yc mochiua yn mitl  
mitoaya tlatati yn tlaochtli  
anoço yyahuayo  
\*\*\*\*  
Auh yn iquac tlatatia mitl  
(etc.)

Then arrows are made.  
It was said, "Spears (or: arrows)  
are shaped (or: born)  
or their (heads of) oak."  
\*\*\*\*  
And when arrows are shaped (or:  
born)  
(etc.)

From Tititl (XVII):<sup>3</sup>

niman ye yqu-eua yn tlamacazque  
cenca motlaloa  
yuhquim mopapanauitiui  
moteneua motocayotia xochipayna  
quitlecauia yn teocalli  
ompa caca xochitl  
ytoca teoxochitl

Then the priests depart,  
they run fast,  
as if to be the first at a foot-race.  
It is called, it is termed "flower-race".  
They ascend the temple,  
there a flower is placed,  
it is called *teotl*-flower

In connexion with the shaping of "mountains" it is stated that the figures of dough are placed on mats of reeds, after which articles of food are placed in front of them. Then follows

<sup>1</sup> *Sab.* II, 30. *Seler* 1927, p. 176. (A-D 3, 1951, p. 112).

<sup>2</sup> *Sab.* II, 33. *Seler* 1927, p. 196. (A-D 3, 1951, p. 124).

<sup>3</sup> *Sab.* II, 36. *Seler* 1927, p. 227. (A-D 3, 1951, p. 145).

from Tepeilhuitl (XIII):<sup>1</sup>

auh yn iquaqu-in moteneua  
cal(1)i onoac

And when this (happens), it is called,  
"They are placed in the houses"  
("They have been moved in")

Literally: "putting (or: moving in) has taken place", but the reference is to the "mountains". If a cult name had been used so that it might also be interpreted as the name of a mythical figure, we should have classed the passage under Type I.

A little farther down it says about some other *ixiptlas* of mountains:<sup>2</sup>

youatzinco yn quimpeualtia  
yn quinnapalotinemi tlapechtica  
  
moteneua quintlatlapechua

At dawn they begin  
to carry them on their backs by means  
of chairs,  
This is called, "They carry them in  
chairs."

And still farther down it is said about the "mountains", the figures of dough:<sup>3</sup>

ym mitoaya texinilo texixitinilo  
  
niman ye yc quixitinia yn tzoalli

It was said, "They are cut up,"  
"they are cut to pieces."  
Then they cut up the dough of  
amaranth seeds.

From Quecholli (XIV):<sup>4</sup>

Auh yn ic chiquacen tlamantli  
moteneua  
çacapan quixoua  
auh ynic moteneua çacapan quixoua  
  
motzetzeloaya çacatl  
yeuatl yn ocoçacatl  
oncan motecpana yn ilamatque

And the sixth part (of the ceremony)  
is called,  
"They get out on the grass."  
And therefore it is called, "They get out  
on the grass:"  
They strewed grass,  
namely "pine-grass",  
there the old women sat down in a row

Molina: Ocoçacatl. paja particular para hazer bohíos, o casas de paja.

From Izcalli (XVIII):<sup>5</sup>

niman ye yc quimuiuca  
yn quinchichinozque pipiltotonti

Then they bring  
the small children in order to  
"sing" them.

<sup>1</sup> *Sab.* II, 32. *Seler* 1927, p. 191. (A-D 3, 1951, p. 122).

<sup>2</sup> *Seler* 1927, p. 192. (A-D 3, 1951, p. 122).

<sup>3</sup> *Seler* 1927, p. 193. (A-D 3, 1951, p. 123). Cf. above, p. 94.

<sup>4</sup> *Sab.* II, 33. *Seler* 1927, p. 198. (A-D 3, 1951, p. 126).

<sup>5</sup> *Sab.* II, 37. *Seler* 1927, p. 240. (A-D 3, 1951, p. 152). - Cf. *Frazier* 1931, p. 167 f.

quitlalia tletl tletlaliaya  
uel miec yn copalli contepeua tleco  
auh ynic moteneua techichinolo

yn calpolueuetque  
quimualantimani ym pipiltotonti  
tleco quimoniauhtimani

They make a fire, a fire was made.  
They strew very much copal on the fire.  
And therefore it is called,  
"They are singed,"  
the old men of the district temple  
take the small children  
and pass them over the fire.

A little farther down it is said about the same children:<sup>1</sup>

auh mochintin quintlauantiaya  
ym pipiltotonti  
ye ynic moteneua pillauano

And everybody gave the small children  
wine to drink  
therefore it is called "Child wine  
drinking".

From Quecholli (XIV):<sup>2</sup>

quitequi yn innacaz  
yn ime(z)ço compatzca  
yncanauacan conalaua  
mitoaya momaçayço

quinneçauiliaya ym mamaça  
ynic amiuaz

They cut their ears,  
squeezed out their blood,  
smearred their foreheads with it,  
they said, "They deer-blood-tap  
themselves,"  
"they fasted for the deer,  
in order that they might be hunted."

A-D translates: "It was said: "The deer are (anointed) with blood"." If this were what is said in the text, we should have an explanation of Type I. Selser translates: "das nannte man "für die Hirsche sich Blut entziehen"." Which presumably is a paraphrase of the literal translation given above. Actually we have here only a cultic term, and the reason for this term is given in the following two lines, in which the purpose of the cult act is stated. The translation "fasted" is used only for want of a better word. The Aztec word mainly covers various forms of the mortification of the flesh, but it is not a question of passive procedures; the object reference *quin-* shows that the concepts imply an active influence on *ym mamaça* 'the deer'. as is also expressly stated in the last line quoted. We are faced with concepts of mana, but the explanation given cannot be called "mythical", so we class it as Type 0.

The same applies to an explanation which is connected with a ritual act towards the end of this festival:<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Selser 1927, p. 247. (A-D 3, 1951, p. 153).

<sup>2</sup> *Sab.* II, 33. Selser 1927, p. 195. (A-D 3, 1951, p. 124).

<sup>3</sup> Selser 1927, p. 201 f. (A-D 3, 1951, p. 128 f.).



yacattui yn mamalti miqiu nauintin  
 apetlac yn quimiylpilia yn icxi yuan  
 ymma  
 mec quintlecauia quinnanauhcauia  
 quintitilnilitiui yn imma yn icxi  
 haaquetztiui tlalchi ualpipilcatiuh yn  
 intzontecon  
 auh yn oquimonaxitique  
 mec quimonteca yn techcac  
 oncan quimommictia  
 Auh yniqu-iuh quintlecauia  
 yn quil mach yc quimmaçapoloa  
 quintlayeecaluia yn mamaça  
 yn iuh miqiu

At the head four captives die,  
 in Apetlac (the terrace at foot of the  
 steps of the pyramid) they tie their  
 feet and hands  
 and carry them up, four and four carry  
 them,  
 (carry them) extended by hands and  
 feet,  
 face upwards and heads down towards  
 the ground.  
 And after they have carried them (up)  
 they place them on the sacrificial stone,  
 kill them there.  
 And the fact that they carry them up  
 like this,  
 is called "In this way they are killed  
 like deer,"  
 they imitate the deer,  
 as these die.

The act is based on concepts of mana, and although we do not share these concepts, it must be said that the explanation finally given is in itself "sober" and "rationalist" also according to our notions, and thus is not of a "mythical" character.

#### d. TYPE I (OF GROUP A)

##### From Tlacaxipeualixtli (II):<sup>1</sup>

auh yn inyollo mamalti  
 quitocayotia quauhnochtli, tlaçotli.  
 coniaivilia yn tonatiuh  
 xippilli, quauhtleuanitl  
 quitlamaca, quizcaltia.  
 auh yn ouentic,  
 quauhxiccalco contlalia,  
 quauhxiccalco contlalitivi.  
 auh yyevantin miquia mamalti,  
 quintocayotiaya cuauhtecá.

And the hearts of the captives  
 are called "nopal fruit ("eagle-cactus"),  
 precious object".  
 It is held (ritually) to the sun,  
 Xippilli, Quauhtleuanitl,  
 they hand it to him, nourish him  
 with it.  
 And after it has been given as a gift  
 ("sacrificed"),  
 it is placed in the "eagle bowl",  
 put into the "eagle bowl".  
 And the captives who are dead  
 were called "eagle men" (men from the  
 eagle country).

<sup>1</sup> *Sab.* II, 21. *Seler* 1899, p. 173, 1927, p. 63 f. (A-D 3, 1951, p. 47). – For *quauhxicalli* see further *Seler* 1902–23 II, p. 704–16.

The two minor names of the sun are left untranslated because I highly doubt the correctness of the current interpretation. *Xippilli* is a compound of *xiuitl* and *pilli*. The latter component partly means 'boy', partly 'prince', and there is no disagreement as to its being interpreted as 'prince' here. But as is well-known from many uncompounded and compounded occurrences, *xiuitl* can mean either 'year' or 'turquoise' or 'green herb' or (rarer) 'comet'. Molina: *Xiuitl. año, cometa, turquesa e yerua*. The choice of the meaning 'turquoise' – here as well as in the name of the "fire-god" *Xiubteculli* – seems to me to be purely arbitrary and not even the most natural one. Selser has "zu dem Türkisprinzen (dem jungen Feuergott)", A–D accept this with "the turquoise prince".

The second minor name is translated by Selser as "zu . . . dem aufsteigenden Adler", in which he is followed by A–D with "the soaring eagle", although there is here a slight change of meaning. The translation shows that the starting-point is *eua* 'to rise', etc.; but the form is not obvious. *-nitl* is odd, and *quaubtl-* in a compound is also strange; it ought to be *quaub-*. Cod. Flor. has *quatleuanjtl*, in which the first syllable might be *qua* 'eats', or be derived from *quaitl* 'head', etc., but still without giving any reasonable meaning, and still with the rest of the word left unexplained. Indeed, A–D say, "probably *quaubtleuanitl* is meant", and translate as Selser.

The word also occurs in the following context in Bustamante:<sup>1</sup> "ya ha salido el sol, que se llama tonametl xiuhpiltontli quauhtleoamitl," but thus here with an *m*, the last element becoming the well-known *mitl* 'arrow'. Jourdanet accepts this form in his French translation:<sup>2</sup> ". . . le soleil, qu'on appelle tonametl xiuhpiltontli quauhtleuamitl (aigle à flèches de feu)." The word here must be interpreted as composed of *quaubtli* 'eagle', *tletl* 'fire', with the possessive suffix *-hua*, and *mitl* 'arrow'. The compound thus at least would consist of well-known components; but the compound as a whole is still, to say the least of it, peculiar. "Eagle-fireowner-arrow" would hardly have had a less strange ring in Aztec than in English.<sup>3</sup>

Still, we must of course accept the name if it occurred in the text. It does not do so, however. The decisive *m* only occurs in the Spanish version – at the most – and is either a misreading, a misprint, or a conjecture. Or: the decisive *m* is due to Bustamante, – and is either a misreading, a misprint, or a conjecture.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Sab.* II, App. ed. *Bustamante* 1829 I, p. 224. (cf. ed. *Robredo* 1938 I, p. 241). – (ed. *Saignes* 1946 I, p. 270: *quaubtleomitl*).

<sup>2</sup> *Sab.*, *loc. cit.*, tr. *Jourdanet* 1880, p. 193.

<sup>3</sup> "aigle à flèches de feu" should presumably be *\*quaubtleminua* or in an emergency *\*quaubmitleua*.

<sup>4</sup> ed. *Kingsborough* (VII) 1831, p. 100 reads: *Xiuhpiltontliquaubtleoanitl*.

The Aztec text in the passage discussed last is rendered by A–D as:<sup>1</sup> . . . *in tonatiub, in tonametl, xiuhpiltontli, in quauhilevanjtl*. The form with *n* thus is authenticated in two (Aztec) passages in Cod. Flor. and has furthermore by Selser been read in the Madrid MS. And I cannot either in the two passages read anything but an *n* in the facsimile edition.<sup>2</sup>

I should feel most inclined to dissolve the compound like this: (1) *quaub-*, which, as is well-known, may either be derived from Molina: Quauhtli. aguila., or from Molina: Quauhtl. arbol, madero o palo. (2) *-ilevan-*, derived from Molina: Tletl. fuego., with the suffix *-huan*, which indicates the meaning ‘with’ or ‘accompanied by’. (3) A euphonic *-i-* in order to avoid the combination *-ntl*. (4) The normal determinative *-tl*. Thus “the eagle with fire” or “the tree with fire”, respectively “the eagle” or “the tree”, “which is accompanied by fire”.

However, this is not quite satisfactory, either, for the ending *-itl* would actually in this case be superfluous. It can only be understood if the intention is to give an extra substantivization, perhaps to be interpreted as a personification. A thorough-going investigation would require the adducement of a good deal of more material, which, however, would lead us astray in this place.<sup>3</sup>

In the present context we have only wanted to see what a *quauhitecatl* ‘eagle man’ is, viz. for the sake of the following quotation, in which it is described what is done to the captives the night before they are to be sacrificed:<sup>4</sup>

ocnoceppa, no quintzoncui  
yovalnepantla

For the second time they then take their  
hair (cut it off in order to keep it)  
about midnight.

yc mitoaya  
on acoquixtilo, yn quauhitecatl  
ye yca. ca yaomiqui  
yxco yauh. yxcopa yztziuh  
yxco monoltitoc yn tonatiuh

It was said,  
“The eagle man is sent up.”  
For: he who dies the death of a warrior,  
goes before, goes to be with,  
in order to stay with the sun,

<sup>1</sup> A–D 3, 1951, p. 202.

<sup>2</sup> ed. *del Paso y Troncoso*, 7 (1906), p. 57, the third and the second line from bottom: *yntonatiub | xippilli, quauhilevaniitl* (The *-ub-* in *quaub-* is blotted out, which explains the *quauhilevanjtl* read by A–D in Cod. Flor.). *Op. cit.*, 6 (1905), p. 44 (Primeros Memoriales, Cap. 1 § 11° Ritos Diarios á Horas Fijas), the fifth to the seventh line of the clear text: *into | natiub yntonametl, xiuhpiltontli, y | quaub ilevanjtl*: (With a marked space in the last word, as indicated).

<sup>3</sup> Certain ritual and mythical evidence suggests *ilevaniitl* ‘The Fire Driller’ (?); cf. *Molina*: Tleuauana. ni. atizar el fuego, . . . ; *-itl* occurs as a regular personal name ending. (e. g. Don Diego *Vaniitl*; *Sab.* VIII, 1. A–D 9, 1954, p. 5).

<sup>4</sup> *Selser* 1899, p. 175, 1927, p. 65. (A–D 3, 1951, p. 48).

q. n. amo mictlan yauh

i. e. he does not go to *Mictlan* ('the deadman's land', which is the underground region of the dead).

Nor is it possible here to enter upon a detailed comment. What has been quoted is only to be considered an example of a "mythical" explanation of ritual of our Type I.

The type appears in quite a short form in the following example:<sup>1</sup>

yoan oco ce tlatatl, tlamacazqui  
conitqui, quappiaztlī:  
yelpān contilquetza ym malli  
  
yn oncan ocatca yyollo.  
conezcotiyá vel eztitlan compolactia.  
  
niman no yc coniavilīa yn tonatīuh  
  
mitoa, yc caltitiyá.

And another man, a priest,  
brings the "eagle suction reed",  
introduces it into the chest of the  
captive,  
where his heart has been,  
fills it with blood, steeps it thoroughly  
in blood.  
Then he (ritually) holds it, too, up to  
the sun.  
It is said, "It was bathed with it."

Instead of *caltitiya* 'bathed it' Cod. Flor.<sup>2</sup> has *calitīa* 'he gives it to drink', which must be assumed to be the correct form, partly because in this case we keep the tense (the present), partly because the continuation of the description state how a number of stone idols are given the blood of the captive *piasztica*, – by means of a *piasztli* 'a suction reed'.

From Uei tecuilhuitl (VIII):<sup>3</sup>

yn iquac tlamatlactli  
yquac miquia yn Xilonen ciuatl  
....<sup>4</sup>  
nauhcampā yn aquia anoço xalaquia  
  
ynic mitoa xalaqui  
  
yc quimachiltia  
yn imiquiz yn imiquiz moztla

On the tenth (day)  
when the woman Xilonen dies,  
.....  
in four directions she arrives or she  
arrives at sand,  
therefore it is said, "She arrives at  
sand,"  
because in this way it is shown  
that she is to die, that she is to die the  
next day.

A–D have the following note on this passage: "Entering the sand was evidently a ceremony literally enacted, and logical in view of the attributes of the deities whose festivities were honored by it. The explanation in both

<sup>1</sup> *Seler* 1899, p. 180, 1927, p. 71. (A–D 3, 1951, p. 52).

<sup>2</sup> A–D, *loc. cit.*

<sup>3</sup> *Sab.* II, 27. *Seler* 1927, p. 149 f. (A–D 3, 1951, p. 97).

<sup>4</sup> Eleven lines omitted (about Xilonen's garment and adornment).

Sahagún's Spanish text and the Aztec column is not explicit. The four places in which Xilonen entered the sand may be identified in modern Mexico City and are associated with water and sand. *Aquia* is probably an assimilation of *aaquia*. – Angel María Garibay, personal communication." With acceptance of the assimilation mentioned, we shall get: 'in four directions she arrives at water or she arrives at sand.' The place-names are stated in the following lines, and some of them appear elsewhere in the texts in such a way that it is seen that they must be situated near the water. The description thus must be assumed to be classed as belonging to Type 0.

But the enumeration of the four place-names is followed by an explanation belonging to Type I:<sup>1</sup>

çan quitoctiaya  
çan quiuicaltiaya

y nauhtetl xiuhtonalli  
yn acatl yn tecpatl yn calli yn tochtli  
ynic tlayualotiuh  
ynic momalacachotiuh

yn xiuhtonalli

But in this way they tied together,  
in this way they made follow after each  
other  
the four year symbols ("year bearers"),  
Reed, Flint, House, Rabbit,  
therefore they walk round,  
therefore they walk in circles (and  
return),  
the year symbols (the "year bearers").

Seler translates the first line as follows: "(Damit) pflanzte sie fest ein." A–D translate this line like this: "(For) these were part of". But Molina has: Toctia. nitla. doblar cordel, (etc.), so that we have here simply an impression of the well-known idea that the years (respectively the year symbols, viz. the four "year bearers") are "tied together". Cf. Sah. VIII, 9:<sup>2</sup>

in mitoa, toximmolpili,  
anoço inic molpilia xiuhtl:  
yn icoac matlatlacpa omeexpa otlaucac,

yn inauhteixti cecentetl xippoalli:  
inic onaci vmpoalxiuhtl ipan  
matlacxiuhtl omume,

It is said, "Our year tying"  
or "when the years are tied,"  
when they thirteen times have  
"carried",  
all the four year tellers, each apart,  
the 52nd year has come.

But otherwise Xilonen and the month of Uei tecuilhuitl have nothing whatever to do with this.

However, the phrase 'to arrive at sand' can hardly always be understood in the way stated by A–D. We shall quote a few passages in which the phrase occurs.

<sup>1</sup> Seler 1927, p. 150. (A–D 3, 1951, p. 98).

<sup>2</sup> A–D 8, 1953, p. 25.

From Quecholli (XIV):<sup>1</sup>

oncan xalacoa  
oncan xalacui ym miquizque

ommotzcalo yn tonatiuh  
mec quinuica yn ompa miquizque  
quimonyaualohtia yn techcatl

motecpantiui  
auh yn oconyaualo  
niman ye yc ualtemo

Then they walk (up) "into sand",  
then "they arrive at sand", those who  
are to die.

When the sun is setting,  
they conduct there those who are to die,  
make them walk round the sacrificial  
stone  
in file,  
and after they have walked round it,  
then they descend.

In the latter part of the description it is clearly a question of the people who are to be killed sacrificially being conducted on to a pyramid, round the sacrificial stone, and then down again. It might then perhaps be maintained that the *teixiptlas* – who are those concerned – first "arrive at sand" in the above-mentioned, "rationalist" way, and then are taken on to the pyramid. If so, it would not be expressly stated that they are conducted up, but, indeed, it might have been omitted. But the possibility cannot be disregarded that there is semantic continuity in the whole passage.

From Panquetzalitzli (XV):<sup>2</sup>

niman ye yc quinuica yn tlaaltiti  
xalaquizque

yn onacique tlacatecoltl yteopan

mec tleco yn teocalticpac  
yn opanuetzito  
mec quiualyaualoa yn techcatl  
can ic ualtemotimani centlapal

Then they bring "the bathed ones",  
those who "are to arrive at sand"  
(or: in order to make them arrive at  
sand).

After they have arrived at the sacred  
place of the "man owl",  
they ascend the temple.  
After they have got up there,  
they walk round the sacrificial stone  
and descend down the other side.

*tlacatecoltl* 'man owl' is traditionally translated as "demon".

As to the question about the continuity of the passage, the same applies as was said about the preceding quotation.

From Izcalli (XVIII):<sup>3</sup>

yn tlaaltiti oxalacui  
quimoxxalacui yn ompa tzommolco

"The bathed ones" "arrive at sand,"  
they are made to "arrive at sand" there  
at Tzonmolco.

<sup>1</sup> *Sab.* II, 33. *Seler* 1927, p. 200. (A-D 3, 1951, p. 127).

<sup>2</sup> *Sab.* II, 34. *Seler* 1927, p. 209. (A-D 3, 1951, p. 133).

<sup>3</sup> *Sab.* II, 37. *Seler* 1927, p. 236 f. (A-D 3, 1951, p. 150).

....<sup>1</sup>

niman ye yc tleco yn tzommolco  
tecpantiui  
auh yn opanuetzito  
niman ye yc quiualyualoa yn techcatl  
niman ic noceppa ualtemo  
no motecpantiuitze

....

then they ascend Tzonmolco in files,  
  
and after they have got up there,  
they walk round the sacrificial stone.  
Then they descend again,  
likewise walking in files.

The fourteen lines left out only deal with the adornment of “the bathed ones”, and so we may make the same comments on this context as on the preceding quotations.

The rationalist connexion with water and sand assumed by A–D cannot be supported by the fact that in some cases “bathed ones” are mentioned, for they have been bathed before the “sand” is involved.

It would then seem remarkable and significant that the mention of the “sand” in the three passages quoted last is followed almost literally by the description of quite uniform ceremonies: the ascent of a pyramid, the circumambulation of the sacrificial stone, and the descent, all made in files.

The festivals and the mythical figures, as regards the three passages just quoted, do not either in any way seem associated with water, as assumed in A–D’s explanation. Quecholli is a hunting festival mainly connected with Mixcoatl. Panquetzaliztli is connected with Uitzilopochtli. The section from Izcalli has reference to a fire festival connected with Xiuhtecuitli and his variants, with which also the temple Tzonmolco is connected.

Apparently no “sand” occurs on these occasions, but it does not seem possible to derive *xal-* from anything else, and so we must leave it unexplained. At any rate it is impossible to fall back on A–D’s “rationalist” explanation in the face of the definite statement *yn ompa tzommolco* ‘there at Tzonmolco’, in the temple of the “fire-god” Xiuhtecuitli.

On the other hand the view offered by the three passages quoted last can hardly be applied to the very first passage quoted, in which the “rationalist” view was advanced. In the detailed description there, there is no ascent, no circumambulation of the sacrificial stone, and no descent in files.

Seler<sup>2</sup> is of opinion that the term covers “das Präsentieren nach den vier Himmelsrichtungen”, about which, however, nothing whatever is stated in the text he is annotating, except in his own parenthetical additions in the translation.<sup>3</sup> The explanation is pure guesswork and does not help us here, because it neither explains the significance of the “sand” nor gives any

<sup>1</sup> Fourteen lines omitted.

<sup>2</sup> Seler 1899, p. 73 f.

<sup>3</sup> *Op. cit.* p. 68.

reason why the word in Quecholli (XIV), Panquetzaliztli (XV), and Izcalli (XVIII) apparently covers another ceremony than that described in Uei tecuilhuitl (VIII).

We are not in a position to get nearer to an understanding and shall therefore conclude with a remark that *xalaquia* can also be translated by 'go (up) into sand' or 'fix in sand' or 'put into sand'. 'Arrive at sand' has been used provisionally because the more specialized meaning can only appear from the actual circumstances, which are unknown to us.

Therefore we cannot make a general decision to which of our types the term belongs, either, in so far as it is considered a "description" of a ritual act. It is of no importance in the present connexion that we are inclined to suppose that it belongs to Type 0. Only for the example from Uei tecuilhuitl (VIII) a "rationalist" sense seems fairly secured.

Perhaps there is a connexion with the *coaxalpan* 'serpent-sandplace' which is found in Uitzilopochtli's temple,<sup>1</sup> and to the same sphere of ideas presumably also belongs the *xalli itepeubya* 'the place where sand is strewn', which is mentioned in Yacatecutli's song and which is there identified with Tlalocan (*xallitepeubya*. id est. *tlalocan*).<sup>2</sup>

#### From Tititl (XVII):<sup>3</sup>

auh yn teyxiptla	And the <i>teixiptla</i> ,
yn ixiptla ylamatecutli	Ilamatecutli's <i>ixiptla</i> ,
ynic mitotiaya	danced like this,
tzitzintlacça ytzintlampa yn coniaua	he moves backwards, kicks up his feet,
ycxi	
yuan yc motlatlaquechituih ytopil	supporting himself on his staff,
otlatl yn iyacac	the end of a solid reed,
yn iquac yexcan ym maxaltic	the upper end of which is split into
	three parts
yuhquim minacachalli	like a bird's dart,
motocayotia yyotlautizil	called "her reed-staff thorn".
auh yn iuh mitotiaya y mitoa	And when he danced like this, it is said,
motzineua yn ilamatecutli	"Ilamatecutli sets out backwards."

The change in the translation between 'he' and 'her' is due to the fact that Ilamatecutli is mythically a female being, while her *ixiptla* is a male dancer.

About the last line of the quotation it should be noted that in itself it contains a "rationalist" description of the ritual act, only with use of the dancer's cult name; but as at the same time it thus contains a statement about

<sup>1</sup> Cf. below, p. 135.

<sup>2</sup> *Seler* 1902-23 II, pp. 1104, 1107.

<sup>3</sup> *Sab.* II, 36. *Seler* 1927, p. 226. (A-D 3, 1951, p. 144).



a mythical figure, we must class it under Type I and thus consider the contents as a "mythical episode".

Immediately afterwards, in seven lines, follows a description of the dancer's mask, and then it says:<sup>1</sup>

yuan yniquaqu-in no moteneua	And when this happens, it is also called
ycuezcon tlatla	"Her granary is burning".
yn icuezcon quichichiuaya ocoquauitl	They made her "granary" of deal,
yn quinenepanoaya	which they joined together,
yuhquin colotli yc quitlaliaya	making, as it were, a wooden frame
	of it,
camaquimiloa	wound it with paper,
camapepechoa	filled it with paper,
oncan quiquetza yn quauhxiclco	erected it there in the "eagle bowl".

Somewhat farther down it is told that the device is set on fire:<sup>2</sup>

niman quitlemina quitlecauia yn	then they kindle, set fire to the
cuezcomatl	"granary",

and still farther down it says:<sup>3</sup>

yn oncan quauhxiclco	there in the "eagle bowl",
yn oncan tlatla cuezcomatl	there where the "granary" is burning.

Again we have, in a way, a "rationalist" description of the ritual act, only with use of a cult name of the object in question; but as we do not conceive this object as a real granary, it is to us a description of Type I, the contents of which may be termed a "mythical episode".

From Izcalli (XVIII).<sup>4</sup>

yn izcalli tlamatlacti	At the tenth of Izcalli
yn qualoya uauhquiltamalli	herb maize-cake was eaten.
moteneua mitoaya	This is called, they said,
motlaxquia n tota yeuatl yn tletl	"He is baking something for himself,
	our father, the fire."

The herb maize-cakes mentioned and the general consumption of them are one prominent feature about the feast, as appears from the later rather detailed description; but another prominent feature is that birds, scorpions, fish, lizards, crabs, frogs, etc., are gathered and all these animals thrown

<sup>1</sup> *Seler* 1927, p. 227. (A-D 3, 1951, p. 144).

<sup>2</sup> *Seler, loc. cit.* (A-D 3, 1951, p. 145).

<sup>3</sup> *Seler* 1927, p. 228. (A-D 3, 1951, p. 145).

<sup>4</sup> *Sab.* II, 37. *Seler* 1927, p. 231. (A-D 3, 1951, p. 147).

into the fire. Seler (and after him A–D) presumably imagine that the designation of the feast refers to the latter feature. Nothing is expressly stated about it, but I cannot see any other explanation of a translation that introduces an artificial distinction between the second and third line of the passage quoted above. Seler translates 1.3 like this: “Man nannte (den Tag):” And A–D in this respect follows him with the translation: “(On this day) it was maintained and said, . . .” This view of the sense is not in itself unwarrantable, but it does not cover the most obvious, immediate understanding of the text.

The feast is connected with the fire “god” Xiuhtecutli, whose *ixiptla* is erected. Ten days later a second feast is held which is very similar to the first. Here, too, an *ixiptla* of a fire “god” is erected, here, too, a special kind of maize-cake is baked and eaten (but a different kind), and here, too, small animals are thrown into the fire (but now snakes are particularly mentioned). As introduction to this section it says:<sup>1</sup>

Auh yn oacic yzcalli yn iquac  
tlacempoalti  
yquac motlaxquiaya yn tota milintoc  
çan no ye tletl

And when Izcalli had come, when  
twenty (days) had passed,  
he baked himself something, our father  
Milintoc,  
– that is also the fire.

For the understanding of the first line it should be noted that the names of the “months” partly denote the whole of the period of 20 days, partly, and especially, the actual festival day after which the “month” has been named and which regularly falls on the last, i. e. the 20th day.

The passage does not throw any light on the situation referred to by the phrase “He baked something for himself,” and the following description of the feast does not do so, either; for as mentioned above, the feast includes both a baking of maize-cake and the fact that small animals are thrown into the fire. It is, of course, imaginable that the phrase referred to both sets of acts, but it will be the correct thing to take one’s stand on what is expressly stated in the passage about the 10th of Izcalli first quoted, in which the reference is only to the maize-cakes. That these should be considered the central feature is, indeed, indicated by the last lines of the description of the events which took place on the 10th of Izcalli, in which it says:<sup>2</sup>

nican tlami yc tzonquiça  
yn uauhquiltamalli qualo

Thus ends, thus concludes  
“Herb maize-cake is eaten.”

<sup>1</sup> Seler 1927, p. 234. (A–D 3, 1951, p. 148).

<sup>2</sup> Seler 1927, p. 234. (A–D 3, 1951, p. 148).

The baking of certain maize-cakes thus is described by the phrases "He bakes something for himself, our father, the fire" and "He baked himself something, our father Milintoc (that is also the fire)." The description belongs to Type I, and its contents are a mythical episode. Or rather, *two* mythical episodes, for in one case the *teixiptla* of the ceremony is called Xiuhtecutli, and in the other case, at the ceremony ten days later, the fire and its *ixiptla* are called Milintoc.

The two ceremonies in Izcalli offer another set of examples of Type I:<sup>1</sup>

Auh yn ye yuhqui yn ontlatlaqualoc	And then, when everything has been eaten,
niman ye yc tlauano	they drink wine,
mitoa texcalceuilo	it is said, "the oven is put out,"
texcalceua yn ueuetque yn ompa	"they put out the oven," the old ones
yteopan Xiuhtecutli	there in Xiuhtecutli's sacred place.
auh ynic texcalceua	And like this "they put out the oven,"
octli tlauantoque cuicatoque	with wine, they drink, they sing,
çan iuh youa	until night comes on.

And in the same way after the second ceremony:<sup>2</sup>

auh yn ye yuhqui	And then,
yn onqualoc macuextlaxcalli	when the wreath-shaped loaves have been eaten,
niman ye yc texcalceuilo	then "the oven is put out,"
texcalceua yn ueuetque	"they put out the oven," the old ones,
yn oncan yteopan yn icalpolco milintoc	there in Milintoc's sacred place, in his district sanctuary.
....	....
auh tlauantoque yn ueuetque	And they drink wine, the old ones,
texcalceuitoque amo yvinti	"they put out the oven," they do not get intoxicated.

It should be emphasized that "the oven is put out" is not a set, purely figurative phrase denoting drinking. Its emerging here is obviously due to association of ideas with baking in the two sections of the feast. First we establish the occurrence of ritual baking, then of ritual drinking of wine, which mythically is described as "the oven is put out" (Type I); and quite the same is the case at the duplicate of the feast ten days later.

The fact that it is not a question of a merely figurative phrase and that the "explanation" of the ritual act is based on associations of ideas with another, but closely associated, ritual act, is corroborated by the following example:

<sup>1</sup> Selser 1927, p. 233 f. (A-D 3, 1951, p. 148).

<sup>2</sup> Selser 1927, p. 235 f. (A-D 3, 1951, p. 149).

From Teotl heco (III):<sup>1</sup>

auh yn iquac ye yo(u)a  
mec tlatlauano tlatlauanalo  
yn ueuentzitzin yn ilamatzitzin

yn iuh quitoaya quil mach  
quicxipaca.

And when night comes on,  
they drink wine, wine is drunk  
(by) the honourable old men and the  
honourable old women.

They called it, it is called  
“They bathe his foot.”

We find here an explanation of ritual (of Type I), which is quite different from the explanation given of the corresponding ritual act – the old men’s drinking of wine – in Izcalli. But the explanation here also derives its motif from another ritual act in a very near context. Five days after the drinking of wine mentioned here comes the actual festival day Teotl heco, when a densely compressed disk is made of corn meal and is placed on a mat. An old priest keeps a close watch on this disk of compressed corn meal in order to establish when the phenomenon takes place which at this ceremony is called “the *teotls* are coming”. Then it says:<sup>2</sup>

yn coniytta yotextli moteneua yxci

He watches the corn meal called  
“his foot”.

And this is explained in detail (but it does not appear what *teotl* is).

What is of interest to us here is only that the cult name of the compressed corn meal, “his foot”, gives a motif for the “explanation” of a ritual act which has taken place five days before, viz. the old men’s drinking of wine, which is denoted as “They bathe his foot”, without the “foot”, for that matter, in any way appearing on that occasion.

The longest explanation of ritual of Type I (and Group A) which occurs in our texts, occurs in the introduction to the description of the seventh annual festival. It includes about a dozen lines while the presentment of the ritual includes about twenty times as much. After the introduction the ar-  
raying and painting of the *teotl* is as usual described in detail. Here it is a woman with the cult name Uixtociuatl. After ten days of singing and dancing some captives are first killed sacrificially in the temple of Tlaloc (“the rain god”), and then Uixtociuatl is killed by priests who are called Uixtos. Her heart is torn out, is held up (ritually), and is placed in a green bowl called the “emerald bowl”. At the end of the festival people hold feasts to each other in their houses and the old men and women drink wine (but here without any special name for the drinking of wine). Several times it is expressly stated that those participating in the festival were solely those

<sup>1</sup> *Sab.* II, 31. *Seler* 1927, p. 186. (A–D 3, 1951, p. 119).

<sup>2</sup> *Seler* 1927, p. 187. (A–D 3, 1951, p. 119).

people who lived by making salt. All this is introductorily motivated as follows:

From Tecuilhuitontli (VII):<sup>1</sup>

oncan teomiquia yn vixtociuatl  
yn inteouh yztatlaca yztachiuhque

ynin vixtociuatl yuh mitoa  
quil mach ynueltiuh catca yn tlaloque

yuan quil mach yyoquichtiuan yn  
tlaloque  
centlamantli ic quinqualani yc  
quiyolitlaco  
ynca mocayauh yn ioquichtiuan  
auh niman ic quitotocaque yn inueltiuh  
ompa yn iztapan

ompa quinextito yn iztatl  
yn iuh yoli yn iuh tlatati

yn iuh mochiua yztacomitl yuan  
yztaxalli  
auh yn ipampa y cenca quimauiztiliaya  
yn iztapaneca yn iztapanlaca

There (then) *teotl*-dies Uixtociuatl,  
the *teotl* of the salt people, the  
salt-makers.

This Uixtociuatl, so it is said,  
it is told that she was an elder sister of  
the Tlalocs,  
and it is told that the Tlalocs were her  
brothers,  
whom she vexed and exasperated with  
one thing,  
namely by teasing her brothers.  
And then they pursued (drove away)  
their elder sister there to the salt  
beds.

There she discovered the salt,  
how it comes into existence, how it is  
created,  
how blocks and grains of salt are made,

and therefore they honoured her much,  
those from the salt beds, the people  
from the salt beds.

The connexion with the ritual as regards contents is the slightest possible one. The only points of contact is the name of Uixtociuatl used about the woman who is sacrificed in the ritual and about the elder sister in the mythical episode, respectively, and the name of Tlaloc, which enters into the name of the cult place in question (the temple Tlalocan) and appears in the plural as the name of the brothers in the mythical episode. The central element in the mythical episode is its "motivation" of the fact that the salt people especially honour Uixtociuatl, viz. because it is she who discovered the salt. Then it is further described how this happened.

In relation to the ritual, the course of which is described in outline above, this "explanation" must be said to be accessory, if anything. It will especially be seen – if we try to turn the relation the other way about – that the ritual does not in any way "render" or "imitate" the mythical episode. On the other hand the ritual includes a number of single acts which closely resemble ritual single acts performed at a number of other festivals at which other cult names are attached to them and where they are either given quite a different "explanation" or "motivation" or – mostly – no explanation at all.

<sup>1</sup> *Sab.* II, 26. *Seler* 1927, p. 131. (A–D 3, 1951, p. 86).

e. TYPE II (OF GROUP B)

The "Historia de los Reynos", the "Historia Tolteca-Chichimeca", and other similar works have the form of chronological historiography and have indeed to a rather considerable extent been conceived as such by modern scholars; but they contain a wealth of mythical material, of which especially the material from the first-mentioned work to a considerable extent seems suitable for a combination with well-known rituals (the myths in question belong to Types II and III and Groups D and E). In order that this may have a fully convincing effect on scholars who are not historians of religion, it will presumably be necessary first of all to do a comprehensive work of clearing of a more general character, which would take us too far. We shall content ourselves by adducing a few examples of Type II (of Group B) from these works, especially quoting such examples as directly, without any further analysis, show relations to well-known, fairly long descriptions of ritual.

We shall, however, begin with some examples which throw further light on the ritual basis of the so-called "gods".

Hist. de los Reynos, § 3:<sup>1</sup>

auh ynuquac yn oantlaminato	And when you (plur.) have shot your arrows,
ye ymac yn xiuhteuctli	in the hand of Xiuhtecutli,
yn huehue teotl xiquitlalican	the old <i>teotl</i> , you must leave it (the game),
yn quipiazque eyntin –	three are to guard it:
Mixcoatl – tozpan – yhuítl	Mixcoatl, Tozpan, Ihuítl.
yehuantin yntotoca yn tenamaztli ètème	These are the names of the three stones of the fireplace.
yhuínin yn quinmacthi chichimeca yn ytzpapalotl.	Like this Itzpapalotl taught it to the Chichimecs.

Lehmann makes the *qui-* of the fourth line refer to Xiuhtecutli, which is, indeed, formally possible (thus: 'which three are to guard'); but it seems to me to be idiomatically most correct if the *qui-* of the third and fourth line both refer to the same object, thus that which has been shot.

Itzpapalotl ('Obsidian Butterfly') is normally considered a "goddess".

Tozpan ('Yellow vane of parrot's feather') and Ihuítl ('Feather') are not familiar as proper names.

Mixcoatl ('Cloud Serpent'), on the other hand, is a well-known "god"'s name, and what interests us is the fact that it is adduced here as the name of one of the three hearth stones.

<sup>1</sup> Lehmann 1938, p. 51 f.

From Hist. de los Reynos, § 1539:<sup>1</sup>

niman ye cuecueponi  
in yancuica(n) cuepon xoxouhqui  
tecpatl  
inic o(p)pa cuepon iztac tecpatl  
  
auh niman conanque in iztac  
niman ye quiquimilohua.  
auh inic expa cuepon coçauhqui tecpatl  
  
àmno no conanque çan conit)taque  
  
auh inic nauhpa cuepon tlatlahuqui  
tecpatl  
amo no conanque  
inic macuilpa cuepon yayauhqui tecpatl  
  
amo no conanque  
auh in iztac tecpatl niman ye  
quimoteotia in mixcohuatl  
  
niman quiquimiloque niman ye  
quimama

Then crop up (break through):  
First a bluish-green flint stone crops up.  
  
The second time a white flint stone  
crops up.  
Then they seize the white one,  
and they wrap it up thoroughly.  
And the third time a yellow flint stone  
crops up.  
This one they do not seize, they only  
look at it.  
And the fourth time a red flint stone  
crops up.  
They do not seize that either.  
The fifth time a dark grey (blackish)  
flint stone crops up.  
They do not seize that either.  
But the white flint stone they then  
make into a *teotl* for themselves (as)  
Mixcoatl,  
then they wrap it up, then they carry it  
on their backs.

We see that a white flint stone, wrapped up to be carried on the back (in a sacral bundle), is here “explained” and “described” as Mixcoatl, which mythical figure is the subject of the rest of the tale.

From Chimalpàin, 5. Relacion, §§ 101, 103, 104:<sup>2</sup>

... ynic yahca huehue tziuhtlacauhqui  
yaopol quihuica ca quimamatia yn  
iteouh yn itoca mixcohuatl.

The first (who arrives is)  
Huehue Tziuhtlacauhqui Yaopol. He  
conveys, that is: he carries on his  
back his *teotl*, named Mixcoatl.

He comes to Citlan, the inhabitants of which ask him:

auh tle ytoca ymoteuh y motlaquimilol  
yn ticmama yn tiquallhuica

And what is the name of your *teotl*, of  
your sacral bundle, which you carry  
on your back, which you carry with  
you?

auh niman quimilhui ca ytoca  
mixcohuatl

And then he answers them: Its name is  
Mixcoatl.

<sup>1</sup> Lebmann 1938, p. 361 f.

<sup>2</sup> Mengin 1950, p. 31.

Thus here again we find a *tlaquimilolli* '(sacral) bundle' which is described by the "god"'s name of Mixcoatl, and we may assume that its contents were a white flint stone. It is expressly denoted as *teotl*, which here, from ordinary points of view of comparative religion, must necessarily be considered 'something filled with mana'.

The continuation is not without interest, either:

auh niman quilhuique yn citeca  
 yn axcan nican ye tictocamaca  
 y moteuh aocmo ytoca mixcohuatl  
 ye ytoca citecatl  
 yc ticuepillia yn itoca  
 ynic neciz yn citlan  
 oti mocuepaco oncan in quicuepillique  
 yn itoca  
 yn iteouh yn itlaquimilol  
 yn huehue tziuhltacauhqui yaopol  
 ca achtopa ytoca catca Mixcohuatl

And then the Citecas say to him:  
 So now here we give him his name.  
 His name is not Mixcoatl.  
 Now his name is Citecatl.  
 For we change his name,  
 so that Citlan appears,  
 after it has been changed. -- There  
 they changed the name  
 of Huehue Tziuhltacauhqui Yaopol's  
*teotl*, sacral bundle, whose name was  
 first Mixcoatl.

We have here an example which clearly shows that the essential thing about the *teotl* is the sacral bundle itself; it is the sacral bundle that is *teotl*. Its name, on the other hand, may be changed at pleasure. The mythical figure which through the name is connected with the mana-filled sacral bundle, is accessory.

Hist. de los Reynos, §§ 179, 180, 181:<sup>1</sup>

catca chiconxiuhmayanaliztli  
 yn oncan in yn çenca yc tlatollinia  
  
 yn yc tlatlatia mayanaliztli  
 niman yc oncan yn tlatlacatecollo  
 quimitlanque  
 yn itlaçopilhuan vemac  
 ompa quincahuato yn xochiquetzal  
 y yapan yhuā huitzcoc yhuan xicococ  
  
 yn ic yca moxtlahuato pipiltzintin  
  
 yancuican ompa tzintic yn tlaca-  
 teteuhmictiliztli  
 yn omochiuhtimanca

It was a seven years' famine.  
 They then, because of it, suffer great  
 privations,  
 for the hunger burns.  
 Then the "human owls" demand  
 Uemac's princely children.  
 They were then taken to Xochiquetzal's  
 water and to Huitzcotl and to  
 Xicocotl (two mountains).  
 In this way people once paid their debts  
 with small children,  
 only then they founded the "human  
 sacrifice-paper" killing,  
 which has been in use ever since.

<sup>1</sup> *Lehmann* 1938, p. 99 f.



“Human sacrifice-paper” is the cult name of the small children who are killed at sacrifices – in order to cause rain – at the annual festival Quauitl eua (I). As we know from the detailed description in Sahagún, children were killed at sacrifices in many different places, partly near the water, in the middle of the lake, partly on a number of different mountains, some of which are situated by the lake, among them a mountain which is called Quetzalcoch, thus with the same two name components as above, only inverted. Another of the mountains mentioned in the ritual description is called Cocotl, with which the Xicocotl mentioned above may be compared.

Uemac is a mythical figure who appears in several contexts, but whose position we cannot discuss here.

The ritual at the annual festival Quauitl eua (I) thus in the passage quoted is motivated by the fact that once there was a great famine which resulted in the ritual in question for the first time being carried out with the children of the mythical figure Uemac.

The event is in the text placed in a year 7 Tochtli (7 Rabbit), which by Lehmann is even identified with the year 1018 A. D. But this is by the way.

It is of greater importance to note that the sacrificial killings take place near water, in the middle of the lake, or on the mountains where the clouds – it is to be hoped – will gather. The fact that the ritual is performed in a community which is governed by concepts of mana is forcibly emphasized by the following example of the sentence saying that like produces like,

from Quauitl eua (I):<sup>1</sup>

auh yn pipiltitzinti, yntla chocatiui.	And the small children, if they walk weeping,
yntla ymixayo totocatiuh.	if their tears rush down,
yntla ymixayo pipilcatiuh.	if their tears pour down,
mitoaya. motenevaya.	it was said, it was called:
ca quiyaviz.	“It will rain.”
yn imixayo quinezcayotiaya yn quiyavitl.	Their tears meant rain,
yc papacoaya yc teyollomotlaliaya	therefore they felt glad, therefore they were satisfied.
yuh quitoa	They say like this:
ca ye moquetzatz, yn quiyavitl	“It will soon come, the rain,
ca ye tiquiyavilozque	we shall soon have rain.”

*moquetzatz* in the last line but one must be a clerical error or a “misspelling” for *moquetzaz* (fut.), which, indeed, occurs in Cod. Flor.

<sup>1</sup> *Sab.* II, 20. *Seler* 1899, p. 170, 1927, p. 58. (A–D 3, 1951, p. 44).

About the word translated by 'meant' Molina says: *Nezcayotia. nitla. denotar, figurar o significar algo.*

There is another myth which presumably is also connected with this ritual,<sup>1</sup> but as this is not expressly stated, it does not belong to the present section. We must class it as Type II, Group D, thus the group in which relationships are most hypothetical. Still it offers considerably more and clearer points of contact with a known ritual than is common e. g. in the material from Greece, Rome, or Ancient Scandinavia. Like the myth quoted above, it deals with a famine, with Uemac, with (one of) his children, with the mountain Xicocotl, with a certain Quetzalxochtzin, which is here said to be the name of Uemac's daughter and which in the ritual is the name of one of the children sacrificially killed, – and with Pantitlan, the eddy in the middle of the lake, where Uemac's small daughter in the myth is said to have been sacrificially killed, and where in the ritual a sacrificial killing is made (but of a child with another cult name), and finally it deals with the Tlalocs, (the rain "gods"), to whom the ritual is also expressly stated to apply. The myth ends with the rain pouring down so that all herbs, the maize, and everything green shoots up from the soil, yielding twentyfold and fortyfold of fruit.

From *Hist. de los Reynos*, §§ 199–201:<sup>2</sup>

auh nimā no contzinti conpehualti  
yn tlacaxipehualiztli  
yquac yn cuicamanaya texcallapan

oncan yancuican çe tlacatl  
çihuatl otomitl tlaçimaya yn atoyac

oncan conan yn quixipeuh  
niman conaqui ynn ehuatl  
yn itoca xiuhocozcatl tolteca  
yancuicā oncan tzintic yn totec ehuatl  
quimaquiaya

And then he also institutes, begins  
the "Human Flaying",  
when he sang and sacrificed in  
Texcallapan.

There for the first time. A human  
being, a woman, an Otomí, washed  
out agave threads by the river,  
there he seizes her, flays her,  
and then draws the skin  
on a person called Xiuhocozcatl Tolteca.  
Only there it was instituted that some-  
body drew the Totec skin on him.

Tlacaxipehualiztli (II) – 'Human Flaying' – is the well-known annual festival during which any one who puts on one of the human skins flayed off is denoted as a *Totec* 'Our Lord', or as a *Xipe*, which names also enter into the "god"'s name of the corresponding mythical figure: *Xipe Totec*.

<sup>1</sup> *Hist. de los Reynos*, §§ 1601–43. *Lehmann* 1938, pp. 375–82.

<sup>2</sup> *Lehmann* 1938, p. 103.

On the other hand, the other names mentioned here do not occur in the description of the ritual.

But the passage quoted thus offers a motivation of origin of the annual festival.

The "he" who institutes the festival, has immediately before been called "diablo", but his name is stated to be Yaotl ('Warrior'), which is a stock byname of the "god" Tezcatlipoca.

In the text the event is placed in a year 13 Acatl (13 Reed), which by Lehmann is identified with the year 1063 A. D. This, again, is only by the way.

f. TYPE III (OF GROUP E)

*Panquetzaliztli and Uitzilopochtli.*

The two most important rituals to which the name of Uitzilopochtli is attached occur in Toxcatl (V) and Panquetzaliztli (XV). Besides in the descriptions of these festivals (varied and shorter) descriptions of the rituals are given in Sah. III, 1, 2-4. And furthermore the description of his raiment and many scattered references occur elsewhere.

A continuous myth with Uitzilopochtli as the central figure is found in Sah. III, 1, 1.

There exist certain problems with regard to the interrelations of the rituals at the two festivals, as well as with regard to relations between the descriptions in Book III and the main description of the festivals in Book II, but they are outside the scope of the present chapter. A common feature of the festivals is that Uitzilopochtli is shaped of dough, which on one occasion is described as follows,

under Toxcatl (V):<sup>1</sup>

Auh yn nican mexico  
yniquac toxcatl,  
motlalia, motlacatlalia un vitzilopuchtli.

oncan yn vitznavac teocalco  
ycalpulco.  
coatlapechco, contlaliaya,

And here in Mexico  
in Toxcatl  
is shaped, is formed as a human being  
Uitzilopochtli  
there in Uitznauac, the temple, his  
district sanctuary.  
On the "serpent-chair" they shaped it.

<sup>1</sup> *Sab.* II, 24. *Seler* 1899, p. 202 f., 1927, p. 100 f. (A-D 3, 1951, p. 68 f.).

ynin coatlapechtli. quavitl yn  
 tlaxixintli.  
 yuhquin cocoa navintin,  
 yn motzinnamicoque.  
 nauhcampa caca, yn intzontecon.  
 michivaltzovalli,  
 ynic quipepechoaya yn imizquio.  
  
 ca mizquiquavitl, yn tlaxixintli yn  
 ixiptla mochipa catca.  
 yn oquipepechoque,  
  
 niman ye yc quimamaca yn itlatqui.

This "serpent chair" was (of) wood,  
 carved  
 like four serpents  
 with their tails towards each other  
 and with their heads in four directions.  
 With dough of amaranth seeds  
 they immured his mesquite-wood  
 frame:  
 his *ixiptla* was always of carved  
 mesquite wood.  
 After they have immured it (the  
 wooden frame with dough),  
 they give him his garment.

*tlapechtli* properly is a 'hand-barrow', a 'litter', but both English words would have a false ring in this connexion. The device was a flat, rather long carrying-chair with four, short legs and the handles carved as serpent's heads.<sup>1</sup>

Figures of dough made of "fish-herb" seeds, amaranth seeds, are well-known from examples quoted above. It should be noted that in the third line quoted it says directly: 'is shaped . . . Uitzilopochtli', who thus is conceived as identical with the *teixiptla*.

In what follows his raiment is described in more detail. It consists of a sleeveless doublet painted with (loosely placed, cut-off) human limbs (*yn ixicol, tlacuaquallo ynic tlacuillo*). This is covered by his "nettle mantle". Furthermore a paper crown adorned with feathers and called *anecuiotl*, which name we should make a note of. On it a "flint knife" is placed, which is also made of feathers, half of it (with oblique division) being of a blood-red colour. Then they dress him in a *teoquemil*, a *teotl* mantle, made of precious feathers, and with a red 'eye' edging, an ornamental edging with a red ringed pattern made of feathers from the red spoonbill. In the middle (either on his mantle, or, rather, on his chest) there is a gold disk or a golden disk. After this description it says again:

auh yn iomiyo, mochivaya, michi-  
 vauhtzovalli

And they made his bones of dough of  
 amaranth seeds.

A few more details are mentioned, but we shall not need them and shall therefore content ourselves with the information from Toxcatl summarized above.

In the special section about the raiment and adornment of the "gods"

<sup>1</sup> Often depicted, e.g. *Seler* 1899, p. 160, *Seler* 1902–23, II, p. 411, with references to sources.

(which is not found in Cod. Flor.) it says, amongst other things, about Uitz-  
ilopochtli:<sup>1</sup>

yixtlan tla(a)ntiac in ipan ixayac	His face is painted with stripes, it is his mask,
.....	.....
yxihcoanaval yyanecuyouh in quimamaticac	his <i>xiuhcoatl</i> disguise, his <i>anecuiotl</i> , he carries on his back,
.....	.....
motexovava (n) in icxic tztizilli oyoalli in icxic catqui	his legs are with blue stripes, small bells, jingles, are on his legs,
.....	.....
teuevelli in ichimal tlaoaçomalli in ipan temi chimalli	<i>Teuevelli</i> is his shield, a sheaf of blunt darts are placed beside the shield,
ycoatopil yn imac icac çentlapal	he holds his serpent staff in one hand.

This section about the raiment of the “god” was first published by Seler with a detailed commentary,<sup>2</sup> and for a further description and analysis of the details of the raiment reference is made to Seler’s commentary as this aspect of the matter does not concern us here. It should only be noted that in relation to the description of the raiment previously quoted there are partly some additions, partly some discrepancies. Thus the name *anecuiotl* obviously covers another object than before – but it is the object which we have come across latest, the one which is carried on the back, which we shall meet with farther on in this exposition.

The discrepancies are obviously due to the different provenance of the texts. Seler<sup>3</sup> is of opinion that the section about the raiment and adornment included in Cod. Flor. belong to the material originating from Tepeapulco, the province of Tezcoco, whereas the material elaborated in more detail originates from Tlatelolco.

Before we leave this passage it should be noted that it is also here stated that he wears his *Expitzalli* on his forehead, as we shall later find this object in another context.<sup>4</sup>

Other descriptions of raiment do not offer anything further of importance.

In the main description of the festival Panquetzaliztli (XV), Sah. II, 34, the shaping of the figure of dough and its adornment are not mentioned in detail and we do not learn anything about what finally happens to the figure. As will be quoted later, it is only very briefly mentioned that the

<sup>1</sup> Seler 1927, p. 33.

<sup>2</sup> Seler 1890, Seler 1902–23 II, pp. 420–508.

<sup>3</sup> Seler 1902–23 II, p. 420 f.

<sup>4</sup> See below, p. 128.

*teixiptla* is made of the dough of amaranth seeds, but it may be assumed that it is shaped and adorned in accordance with the main features of customs mentioned elsewhere. In Sahagún's Book III, which otherwise mainly contains myths, we furthermore find the following statement:<sup>1</sup>

In ic ume parrapho uncan moteneua  
 in quenin qujmauiztiliaia uitzilobuchtli  
 injc qujmoteutiaia  
 Auh in uitzilobuchtli iniquac tlatatia in  
 jnacaio  
 in qujtlatatiliaia in jlhujuh ipan  
 in iquac panquetzalitzli  
 in quichioaia tzoalli

The second section. There it is told  
 how they honoured Uitzilopochtli,  
 made him into a *teotl* for themselves.  
 And when they shaped Uitzilopochtli's  
 body,  
 they shaped it on his festival day,  
 namely when it was Panquetzalitzli,  
 they made it of the dough of amaranth  
 seeds,

and it is further described that it is ground so pure and soft as the finest ointment, as down.

The next morning it further says here, 'Uitzilopochtli's body dies' (*in miqia in uitzilobuchtili in jnacaio*), it is killed by means of a dart with a flint head, which is stuck into its heart (*conaquiliaia yollopan*).<sup>2</sup>

Auh in omjc njman ie ic  
 quixitinja in inacaio in tzoalli

And after he has died,  
 they break up his body, the dough.

The heart falls to Motecuçoma, and the other, round parts, which, as it were, constitute his bones, are distributed according to definite rules. They are distributed to two districts, and are broken up there into still smaller pieces for distribution among the young warriors:

auh in qujmomamacaia in jnacaio in  
 tzovalli  
 cenca çan achiton çan tepitoton  
 piztlatoto  
 iehoan in telpopuchtli in quiquaia  
 auh injn quiquaia mjtoa teucualo  
 auh in ie oquiquaque moteneva teupia

And they distributed among them his  
 body, the dough,  
 into very small pieces, tiny pieces,  
 which the young warriors ate.  
 And this, that they ate it, is called  
 "teotl eating".  
 And those who have eaten it, are called  
 "teotl keepers".

Thus we are still moving in the world of ideas which is well-known from examples quoted above. The people who at such a festival were *teuquaque* 'teotl eaters'<sup>3</sup> were then for a year obliged to perform special cult practices,

<sup>1</sup> *Sab.* III, 1,2. *Seler* 1927, p. 258. (A-D 4, 1952, p. 5).

<sup>2</sup> *Seler* 1927, p. 259 f. (A-D 4, 1952, p. 6).

<sup>3</sup> *Seler* 1927, p. 262. (A-D 4, 1952, p. 8).

which are described in detail. In this connexion there is also *ce tlacatl mochichioaia in ixiptla in uitzilobuchtli* 'a person who adorned himself as Uitzilopochtli's *ixiptla* (or: as his *ixiptla*, as Uitzilopochtli)<sup>1</sup> – continued in the well-known world of ideas.

These details and the important information about the *teotl* eating, however, as has already been emphasized, do not occur in the main account of Panquetzaliztli, to which we shall now turn.

Sah. II, 34:2

A great many in themselves interesting details which do not concern our subject in a strict sense must be left out of consideration; but nine days before the festival proper some captives were *teotl*-bathed (*moteoaltiaya*). This was done with water from the spring *Uitzilatl*: 'the *uitzil* water', from the place *Uitzilopochco*, which is derived directly from the personal name Uitzilopochtli, only with a locative ending (or vice versa!). This water is sprinkled upon the captives 'at the foot of Uitzilopochtli('s temple)', and in the same place they are equipped with the paper array in which they are to die, and are painted with blue longitudinal stripes from foot to knee and from hand to elbow, just as their faces are painted with transverse stripes in two colours, pale blue and yellow.

During the following days a number of ceremonies are performed, among them dances, which we shall skip here. (But it is difficult to omit a remark that the "bathed ones", at a time when they come to the houses which are owned by those who "bathed" the captives, dip their hands into blue dye or black dye or red dye, in order then to make their hand-print on the doorpost or the lintel).<sup>3</sup> It is also these "bathed ones" who "arrive at sand" in the example quoted above,<sup>4</sup> and this happens on the actual festival day, on the twentieth day.

On that day they also ate (bread of) amaranth seeds,<sup>5</sup>

cenuetzi yn nouian maceualpan

all at the same time, everywhere among  
the people,

ayac ym maca tzoalqua

nobody omitted eating (bread of)  
amaranth seeds.

Which would seem to throw a certain light on the significance of Uitzilopochtli and *in inacaio in tzoalli* 'his body, the dough of amaranth seeds' and

<sup>1</sup> Seler 1927, p. 261. (A-D 4, 1952, p. 7).

<sup>2</sup> Seler 1927, p. 204 ff. (A-D 3, 1951, p. 130 ff.).

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Curtiss (1902) tr. 1903, p. 216 ff., Thurston 1912, p. 119.

<sup>4</sup> See p. 110.

<sup>5</sup> Seler 1927, p. 209. (A-D 3, 1951, p. 133).

the eating of this *teotl*. It is obviously a question of amaranth seeds of a particularly high potency, an amaranth ‘mana’.

In what follows we shall hear a good deal about a figure called Paynal, and it seems most practical first of all to explain his position. We find in Molina: Payna. ni. correr ligeramente. Thus *Paynal*: ‘the fast runner’. In the section with the descriptions of raiment<sup>1</sup> his adornment shows similarity to that of Uitzilopochtli’s on the one point that he also wears an *Expitzalli*, which in a marginal note is explained as *yuitzitzilnaual* ‘his humming-bird disguise’ (which object is well-known from pictures),<sup>2</sup> and in Sahagún’s Book I, in the survey of the “gods”, it is also mentioned that he wears a humming-bird disguise’, but here we get some further particulars:

Sah. I, 2:3

Paynal motepatillotiani  
 motexiptlatiani  
 tepan mixevani  
 ye hyca ca quimixiptlatiaya yn  
 vitzilupuchtli  
 yn iquac tlayaualoaya motocayotia  
 Paynal  
 ypampa ca çenca quipaynaltiaya  
 quitototzaya quimotlalochtiaya

Paynal made himself a deputy,  
 made himself *teixiptla*,  
 played a part as somebody,  
 that is: he made himself *ixiptla* to  
 Uitzilopochtli (or U.’s *ixiptla*),  
 when they made the circular race. He is  
 called Paynal  
 because they instigated him much to run  
 fast, they encouraged him to advance,  
 they made him hurry

....  
 Auh ce tlatatl quinapalotiviya

....  
 And a man carried him on his arms.

Molina: Ixeua. nite. representar persona en farsa.

Molina: Yaualoa. nitla. andar en procession, o al rededor o rodear.  
*quitototzaya* is, if anything, “they cried Hep! Hep! to him.”

As to the factual aspect, we see that Paynal is Uitzilopochtli’s *ixiptla* and that the term covers both a human being and a figure – as we must assume – which this human being carries in his arms. Immediately after this passage follows the description of “his” adornment without it being possible to decide whether the reference is especially to the man or to the assumed figure.

We shall then return to the main description.<sup>4</sup> Early the next morning, when it is not yet quite light, Paynal comes down from Uitzilopochtli’s

<sup>1</sup> Seler 1927, p. 34.

<sup>2</sup> E.g. Seler 1902–23 II, p. 379, fig. 23, p. 380, fig. 25 a and b, with references to sources.

<sup>3</sup> Seler 1927, p. 1 f. (A–D 2, 1950, p. 1 f.).

<sup>4</sup> Sab. II, 34. Seler 1927, p. 210 f. (A–D 3, 1951, p. 133 f.).



temple. He goes at once to the place which is called Teotlachco (a compound of *teotl* and *tlachco* 'ball ground, playing-field for the ritual ball game'), where he kills four victims and afterwards drags them across the ball ground, 'as it were, paints it with their blood'. 'And then he, as it were, flies away, runs very fast'. As may be traced on a map of Mexico City and its environs,<sup>1</sup> he runs in a large semicircle through the western environs of the city, roughly starting from the north-south axis, first towards the north, then towards the west, towards the south, and towards the east, until the axis is reached again: He arrives at Tlatelolco, then at Nonoalco. 'There he (presumably the runner) fetches the one who is called *Quauill icac* ("Upright Tree"), his helper, his elder brother. His adornment is the same, only that he wears white stripes made with chalk. And after he has fetched him, they go.' They turn towards Tlaxotlan, then further to Popotlan. 'There they also very quickly kill some, very quickly.' Then further in the direction of Chapoltepetl, just past this mountain, and when they have arrived at the river, at a place which is called Izquitlan, they kill there some one who is called Izquitecatl. Then they hurry on to Tepetocan, on the outskirts of Coyouacan, then to Maçatlan, where he turns – the change from the plural to the singular is in accordance with the text – and then he arrives at Acachinanco on the southern outskirts of Mexico City.

When he has arrived there, a fighting drama stops, which bears the odd name "Wrap-in-paper" and which began when Paynal started his semicircular race:<sup>2</sup>

auh ynic tlaaamauiaya  
yn tlaaltiti nonqua mani

yn uitznaua nonqua mani

quimpaleuia cequintin tiacauan  
quimmacaya yn motecuçoma  
ychcauipilli coztic  
yuan chimalli cuitlach-ixxo  
çan ocoquauitl yn immac onoc  
auh yn uitznaua quimpaleuia

tlatzontectli ynic tlayecoa

And like this "they wrapped in paper":  
The "bathed ones" are found in one  
group.

The Uitznauas ("the Southern Ones" or  
"Those from Uitznauac") are found  
in another group;  
some warriors help them;  
Motecuçoma gives them  
yellow cotton armours  
and shields with a wolf's-eye pattern,  
but only pine clubs were in their hands.  
And those (the warriors) who help the  
Uitznauas  
fight with darts with a jagged wooden  
head

<sup>1</sup> E.g. *Seler* 1902–23 II, p. 41. *Linné* 1948, Mapa (cf. II, V, VI, and XII).

<sup>2</sup> *Seler* 1927, p. 211. (A–D 3, 1951, p. 134 f.). – Picture of an *uitznauatl*: *Seler* 1902–23 II, p. 548, fig. 59.

yn quitlaça  
 auh yn tlaaltilti quinnamiqui  
 çan totomitl yn quitlaça yacatecpayo  
  
 uel yaoyotl ym mochiuaya  
 uel micovaya  
 yn tlapaleuia yn quimpaleuia uitznaua  
  
 yntla ce axiua çanno miquiz  
  
 uel iyoma quimictia yn tlaaltilti  
  
 çan teponaztli yn ipan coneltequi  
  
 auh'yn tlachixqui yn onittac yn  
   oconittac  
 yn ye uitz paynal  
 mec tzatzi quitoa  
 mexicaye ca ye uitz  
 ca ye mouicatz yn tlatcatl  
 ma yxquich  
 auh yn oquicacque  
 mec quintoca tlaaltilti  
  
 oncan xixitini tlaxitini viui  
 yn otepaleuiaya  
  
 yn otlahaamauiaya

which they throw.  
 And the “bathed ones” fight them  
 only with bird’s arrows with flint heads  
   which they fling.  
 But they made real war,  
 some were actually killed.  
 And the helpers who assist the  
   Uitznauas,  
 if some one is captured, then he also  
   dies.  
 Really, indeed, the “bathed ones” kill  
   him,  
 on a *teponaztli* (a horizontal bitoned  
   wooden drum) they cut up his chest.  
 And the scout who is on the look-out  
   when he has seen  
 that now Paynal is coming,  
 then he shouts, saying:  
 Mexicans! Now he is coming!  
 The Lord is approaching!  
 Let it be enough!  
 And when they have heard it,  
 the “bathed ones” drive them away  
   (the Uitznauas).  
 Then they disperse, part, leave,  
 those who had helped (the warriors  
   who had helped the Uitznauas),  
 those who “had wrapped in paper”.

Then Paynal comes. In front of him run two small boys with two cult implements called *tlachieloni* “implements with which to see”, namely disks made of feathers and with a hole in the middle.<sup>1</sup> By and by the disks of feathers are taken over by two fast-running warriors, then by two others, then again by others, – thus in a relay race. At the “Eagle Gate”, the entrance to the temple, the changes of runners cease and the last two runners hurry upwards to Uitzilopochtli. Then:<sup>2</sup>

yn uel yacattiuh yn opanuetzito  
 yn tlachieloni ypan contlaça  
 yn ixiptla uitzilopochtli yn tzoalli

He who gets up first,  
 throws the *tlachieloni* on  
 Uitzilopochtli’s *ixiptla*, the dough of  
   amaranth seeds.

The runners fall down exhausted, with the sweat pouring down them in

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *Seler* 1902–23 II, pp. 432, 434. Pictures e.g. pp. 431, 459, 495, 504. A–D 2, 1950, fig. 3, A–D 3, 1951, figs. 15, 16, 20, 48.

<sup>2</sup> *Seler* 1927, p. 212. (A–D 3, 1951, p. 135).

large drops, so that a priest must make a cut into their ears in order that they may recover. And after they have recovered they descend.

quitquitze yn oacique tzoualli

They carry with them the dough of  
amaranth seeds which they have won,  
take it home with them,  
for it is really their captive, they eat it,  
share it with their families  
and their neighbours in the street,  
eat it together.

quimotquilia yn inchan  
ca nel ymmal quiqua  
quimmamaca yn inua(y)yolque  
yuan yn tlaxilacaleque  
quicencqua

Elsewhere we have learnt that this is called *teotl*-eating.<sup>1</sup>

As an introduction to the sacrificial killings of both the captives and the  
"bathed ones" the following events take place in the temple:<sup>2</sup>

niman ye yc quiualtemouia  
yn teteppoalli  
ce tlacatl yn quiualtemouia  
yn ocaxitico tlalchi  
nauhcampa-n coniaua

Then they bring down  
one score (a bunch) of sacrificial paper,  
a man brings it down.  
After he has come down with it,  
he holds it up (ritually) in four direc-  
tions (towards the four points of the  
sky),

mec commana yn oncan moteneua  
quauhxiccalco

then he puts it down there, into what is  
called the "eagle bowl" (where the  
hearts of those killed at sacrifices are  
placed on other occasions).

niman ye yc no ualtemo yn xihucoatl  
can iuhqui yn ocopilli  
cueçalin yn inenepil mochiua  
tlatlatiuh yn ocopilli  
auh yn icuitlapil amatl  
aço ommatl anoço yematl ynic uiac  
ynic ualtemo  
yuhquimma nelli coatl nenepil(l)otiuitz  
yuhquim mocuecuelotiuitz  
auh yn ocaxitico tlatzintlan

Then also the *Xiuhcoatl* comes down,  
like a pine-wood torch,  
its tongue is made of red arara feathers,  
a flaming pine-wood torch,  
and its tail is made of paper,  
two or three arm's lengths long.  
When it comes down (at the descent)  
it plays with the tongue as a real snake,  
it comes twisting like these.  
And after he has come down to the  
ground with it,

ompa tlamattiuh yn quauhxiccalco  
mec tleco no nauhcampa yn coniaua

he goes to the "eagle bowl",  
ascends (to the bowl) and also holds it  
(the "serpent") up in four directions  
(holds it up ritually).

yn oconiauh mec commayau

After he has held it up (ritually),  
he throws it  
on the bunch of sacrificial paper.  
Then it is burning.

yn ipan teteppoalli  
mec tlatla

<sup>1</sup> See above, p. 126.

<sup>2</sup> *Seler* 1927, p. 212 f. (A-D 3, 1951, p. 136).

He ascends to the temple again, and when he has reached the top, the conch-shells are blown.

niman ye yc ualtemo yn paynal  
yn ixiptla uitzilopochtli  
cenca quiualmotlalochtia  
auh yn otlaltitech caxitico

yxpan quiquixtia yn quauhxicalli  
ynixpan quiztiquiça yn mamalti yuan yn  
tlaaltiti  
yuhquin quinalyacana  
mec tleco

Then Paynal comes down,  
Uitzilopochtli's *ixiptla*,  
very fast he comes with him,  
and after he has come down to the  
ground with him,  
he carries him before the "eagle bowl",  
walks fast in front of the captives and  
the "bathed ones",  
as it were, leading them.  
Then he ascends.

Up there the captives are first sacrificially killed, then the "bathed ones".<sup>1</sup> Furthermore it says:<sup>2</sup>

auh no micao yn uitznauac  
çanioque yn miqui uitznauaca  
çam mixcauia

And also in Uitznauac some are killed.  
The Uitznauas die alone,  
only they,

viz. not together with the "bathed ones", as the other captives mentioned.

The phrase *yn ixiptla uitzilopochtli* in all probability can only be interpreted as being appositional to *yn paynal*.

*Uitznauac* is expressly authenticated as a temple:<sup>3</sup>

In vitznaoac teucalli:  
vncan mjquja, in jntoca centzon-  
vitznaoa,  
yoan mjiec malli vncan mjquja:  
auh ipan in panquetzaliztli muchioaia,  
yoan cexiuhlica

The Uitznauac temple:  
There they die, those named  
Centzonuitznaua,  
and many captives die there.  
And this was done in Panquetzaliztli,  
and annually.

What is of interest to us is the express corroboration of the statement that Uitznauac is a temple.

The whole festival consists of a number of ritual acts, some of which obviously have or have had the purpose of increasing 'mana', in the same way as completely corresponding ritual acts are known from other Mexican festivals, including the drama of fighting, which in changing forms, but especially with changing cult names of the participants, occur on various occasions,

<sup>1</sup> According to the Spanish text the captives were not [really] killed.

<sup>2</sup> *Seler* 1927, p. 214. (A-D 3, 1951, p. 136).

<sup>3</sup> *Sab.* II, App. A-D 3, 1951, p. 169 (cf. pp. 170, 178). - Cf. above, p. 123.

in the same way as a drama of fighting occurs all over the world in innumerable other agricultural religions.<sup>1</sup>

Obviously connected with this festival we find the introductorily mentioned, lengthy myth in Sah. III, 1. The connexion is established through a lengthy number of 'points of contact'. The myth may be divided into sections which "explain", "describe", or "motivate" sections of the ritual, but the sections of the myth do not follow each other in the same order as the sections of the ritual. The myth appears as a connected tale about figures whose names in the case of some of them are cult names in the ritual. It might be called a fantasia inspired by motifs from the ritual.

From Sah. III, 1:<sup>2</sup>

Auh yn iuhqui matia huehuetque

yn uitzilopochtli

yn cenca quimauiztiliaya yn mexica

ynin yn quimatia yn itzintiliz

yn ipeualiz ca yn couatepec

yuicpa yn tollan

Cemilhuitl quitztica ompa nenca ciuatl

ytoca couatlycue

ynnan centzonuitznaua

auh ce inueltiuh ytoca coyolxauh

And the following (like this:) is known  
by the old about

Uitzilopochtli,

whom the Mexicans honoured much,

they know this about his rise:

his origin is on *Coatepeil* (the "Serpent  
Mountain")

opposite to Tollan.

One day it was visited by a woman  
who lived there,

named *Coatlicue*,

the mother of *Centzon Uitznaua*

and an elder sister of those who is  
named *Coyolxauh*.

A–D translate the seventh line like this: "(At Coatepec) . . . there always had dwelt and lived a woman . . . (named, etc.)." This "had dwelt" I cannot explain. Furthermore the translation of *cemilhuitl* as "always" is hardly tenable, as we have the following express authentication:

Molina: Cemilhuitl. vn dia. "All days" (respectively "all nights") would be: Molina: Todos los dias y todas las noches. cecemilhuitl. cecenyoual. Thus with a marked plural. Seler has the correct translation: „Eines Tages besuchte diesen eine dort wohnende Frau." *quitztica* is derived from the verb *itta*. Molina: Itta. nonte. yr avisitar a otro, o mirar a otro.

<sup>1</sup> As might be expected in a farming culture, traces of sexually stressed cult drama are not missing in the Mexican field. We hope that we shall be able to treat this subject in another connexion.

<sup>2</sup> Seler 1927, p. 253 ff. (A–D 4, 1952, p. 1 ff.).

pre. ononteittac. [avisitar, *read* a visitar]. The difficulty is due to the fact that this verb in compounds has an irregular form.<sup>1</sup>

*iubqui matia* in the first line I have translated as if the reading was *iub quimatia*. The meaning is almost the same, but the latter reading involves a more fluent sentence structure in the introductory four or five lines. Furthermore, the reading is supported by Cod. Flor., which has: *aub in jub qujmatia vevetque*.

*Coatlicue* ("Serpents are her skirt") is a well-known "goddess", who is presented as indicated by the name.

*Centzon Uitznaua* ("400 (or: "many") Uitznauas" or "Southerners" or "people from Uitznauac").

*Coyolxauh* ("Painted with bells").

As to *Tollan* the whole Tula problem cannot, of course, be unfolded here; but we may remind of the fact that *Tollan* besides being the name of several towns and besides being a frequently occurring place-name in the myths, is also the name of a temple in Mexico City.<sup>2</sup>

This *Coatlicue*, it further says, performed cult, mortifications, swept the floor, did sacral duty on *Coatepetl*, on the "Serpent Mountain".

Auh ceppa yniquac tlachpanaya yn  
couatlycue  
ypan ualtemoc yuitl  
yuhquin ihuitelotli  
niman concuitiuetz yn couatlycue  
yxillan contlali  
Auh yn ontlachpan  
niman concuizquia yn iuitl  
yn ixillan oquitlalica  
  
aocle quittac  
niman ic otztic yn couatlycue

And once when *Coatlicue* was sweeping  
the floor,  
feathers fell down upon her,  
something like a lump of feathers.  
Then *Coatlicue* rapidly seized it,  
put it on (into?) her abdomen.  
And when she had finished sweeping,  
she wanted to take the feathers,  
which she had put on (into?) her  
abdomen,  
but she found nothing.  
Then *Coatlicue* became pregnant.

This feature is presumably based on the cult objects of feathers which in the ritual are thrown upon the *teixiptla*;<sup>3</sup> but there is no common cult name to secure the connexion. We only know that in both cases it is a question of some round objects, made of feathers.

<sup>1</sup> *Rincon* (1595) Lib. IV, cap. II; 1888, p. 258. *Carochi* (1645) Lib. III, cap. XIII § 2, Lib. IV, cap. II § 2; (1759, pp. 76, 95) 1892, pp. 465 f., 481 (1910, pp. 54, 66). *Torres* 1887, § 164, p. 58. *Grasserie* 1903, p. 29. *Schoembs* 1949, § 11, p. 16, cf. p. 150, and § 119, p. 41.

<sup>2</sup> *Sab.* II, App. A-D 3, 1951, p. 201.

<sup>3</sup> See above, p. 130.

The myth further tells how the Centzon Uitznauas grew very angry when they saw that their mother was pregnant. They said:

ac oquichiuli  
yn aquin ocotzti ac ocotzti  
techaulquixtia techpinauhtia

Who has got her with child?  
Who has made her pregnant?  
She has brought disgrace and dishonour  
upon us!

Their elder sister Coyolxauh (“Painted with bells”) further incited them and urged upon them that they should kill their mother together. When Coatlicue heard about this she got much scared, but the child that was in her womb, comforted her and told her not to be afraid, for he knew what was to be done, and this calmed her. The Centzonuitznauas, however, arrayed themselves for war; but there was a man named *Quauitl icac* (whom we know from the ritual);<sup>1</sup> he “brought speech both ways”. He informed Uitzilopochtli of the Centzonuitznauas’ statements. The Centzonuitznauas started, with Coyolxauhqui (“The one painted with bells”, as she from here on is more correctly named) at the head of the party. They were arrayed in their paper raiment, with *anecuiotl*, and with small bells called *oyoualli* (*ynin coyolli mitouaya oyoualli* ‘these bells were called *oyoalli*’) like the bells in the description of Uitzilopochtli’s raiment,<sup>2</sup> and with darts with jagged wooden heads (*yan yn inmiub tlatzontectli* ‘and their darts with jagged heads’) as the fighting Uitznauas in the ritual, or more exactly: like the warriors who help the Uitznauas.<sup>3</sup> Quauitl icac now runs fast to Uitzilopochtli and all the time keeps him informed how far the party of warriors have gone.

The place-names mentioned are localities in Uitzilopochtli’s temple: *Tzom̄pantiitlan* ‘the Place of Skulls’, where the cut-off heads of those killed at sacrifices are placed on a grating, *Couaxalpan* ‘the Serpent-Sand Place’, which perhaps is connected with the ceremony “to arrive at sand”,<sup>4</sup> *Apetlac* ‘the foremost terrace of the temple’, and finally halfway up the slope.

We note that the Centzonuitznauas in the myth are in part adorned with objects which otherwise are known as Uitzilopochtli’s ornaments, and we shall hear more about this below. Furthermore, we note the mention in the myth of temple localities, which are always sure points of contact with a ritual. Uitzilopochtli in the myth must be at the top of the temple, hence *Coatepetl* ‘the Serpent Mountain’ must also be localized. And we keep in

---

<sup>1</sup> See above, p. 129.

<sup>2</sup> See above, p. 125.

<sup>3</sup> See above, p. 129.

<sup>4</sup> See above, pp. 108–12.

mind that Uitzilopochtli in the ritual was shaped on a *coatlapechtli* 'serpent carrying-chair'.<sup>1</sup> Furthermore, we remember what happened when the runners reached the top of the temple.<sup>2</sup>

In the myth the following happens:

niman ic conilui yn quauilt ycac  
ca yequene ualpanuetzi yequene ualaci  
teyacantiuitz yn coyolxauhqui  
Auh yn uitzilopochtli niman ic ualtlacat

Then Quauilt icac says to him:  
They have finally come here, they have  
finally arrived,  
as the first come Coyolxauhqui!  
And then Uitzilopochtli was born.

Immediately afterwards his raiment is described:

yn ichimal teueuelli yuan yn imiuh  
yoan yiatlahu xoxoctic mitoa xiuatlatl  
yoan yc yxtlan tlatlaan yc ommichiuuh  
yn iconecuilt mitoaya ypilnechiual  
.....  
yoan quitexouauan yn imetz omexti  
yoan omexti yn iacal

His shield *Teueuelli* and his spear  
and his blue spear-thrower, called  
*xiuatlatl* ("turquoise spear thrower"),  
and his face painted with transverse  
stripes,  
his "baby cack", it was called „his baby  
painting”  
.....  
and both of his thighs are painted with  
blue stripes  
and both of his upper arms.<sup>3</sup>

It seems as if the throwing of feathers in the ritual, and the making pregnant and birth in the myth are merged, but so that the gap between the making pregnant and the birth in the myth is filled by the long tale, parts of which have derived their motif from ritual acts prior to the throwing of feathers. We have already among the examples of myths of Type I seen that an "explanation" of a ritual act may derive its motif from another, associated ritual act within the same greater ritual.<sup>4</sup> Here we have obviously one more example of this phenomenon, only in an extended and highly artificial form.

The myth continues:

Auh ce ytoca tochanalqui  
contlati yn xihucouatl quivalnauati yn  
uitzilopochtli  
niman ic quixil yn coyolxauhqui

And one by the name of *Tochanalqui*  
("Our Servant")  
sets fire to the *Xihucouatl*, Uitzilopochtli  
orders him to do so.  
Then he cuts up Coyolxauhqui

<sup>1</sup> See above, p. 123 f.

<sup>2</sup> See above, p. 130.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. above, p. 125 and p. 127.

<sup>4</sup> See above, p. 115 f.



auh niman quechcotontiuetz  
 yn itzontecon ompa ommocauh  
 yn itenpa couatepetl  
 auh yn itlac tlatzintla uetzico  
 tetextituietz  
 cececan ueuetz yn ima yn icxi yoan  
 ytlac

and quickly cuts off her head.  
 Her head laid itself there,  
 on the edge of the Serpent Mountain.  
 And her body fell down, fell down in  
 small pieces,  
 in different places fell her arms, her  
 legs, and her body.

We know what the *Xiuhcoatl* is in the ritual, we know that it is thrown into the “eagle bowl” and burns there together with a sheaf of sacrificial paper,<sup>1</sup> – really or fictitiously. If it actually burns, there is a possibility that Coyolxauhqui’s scattered limbs in the myth refer to the burning sacrificial paper in the ritual, the burning paper which rises in the air and falls down in small pieces in different places. There is also a possibility that the severed arms and legs are to “explain” why Uitzilopochtli’s doublet is painted with such severed limbs.<sup>2</sup>

We have not, however, heard anything about Coyolxauhqui in the ritual; but in Mexico City a colossal head of stone has been found, about two metres tall, representing a person painted with small bells, and thus presumably “The One Painted with Bells”, i. e. Coyolxauhqui. It has been surmised that this stone head stood at the edge of the top of the temple.<sup>3</sup>

The myth concludes by stating that Uitzilopochtli rises and pursues the Centzonuitznauas, chases them down from the Serpent Mountain and four times round it, while they, in vain, rattle their rattling instruments and, in vain, beat their shields, he puts them to flight and annihilates them. ‘They begged him urgently, they said to him, Let it be enough!’ (*cenca quitla-tlaubtiaya quiluiaya ma ixquich*). Thus the same request to cease the fight as given to the two fighting parties in the ritual when they see Paynal, Uitzilopochtli’s *ixiptla*, coming, – after which the Uitznauas are driven away by the “bathed ones”.<sup>4</sup> In the myth Uitzilopochtli beats them, and having cooled his anger,

quincuil yn itlatqui yn innechichiual  
 yn anecuyotl  
 quimotlatquiti quimaxcati  
 quimotonalti yuhquin quimotlauizti

he took their raiment, their array, the  
*anecuiotl*,  
 dressed himself in it, assumed it,  
 took it as his symbol, as his device.

<sup>1</sup> See above, p. 131.

<sup>2</sup> See above, p. 124.

<sup>3</sup> See *Seler* 1902–23 II, pp. 767–904, especially on pp. 813–16. The identification is that of Seler’s, who adds: “Als eine Stütze, eine Art indirekten Beweises für diese meine Annahme kann ich anführen, dass dieser Kolossalkopf nicht etwa der abgeschlagene Kopf einer Figur ist, sondern als Einzelgebilde, als blosser Kopf gearbeitet ist. Denn er trägt auf seiner Unterfläche ein Relief.“ (viz. the symbols of “war”, “blood”, and “sacrifice”). – Summarily *Spence* 1923, p. 67. Often depicted, besides by the two authors mentioned, e. g. *Vaillant* 1950<sup>2</sup>, Pl. 56 (Penguin 1950, Pl. 56).

<sup>4</sup> See above, p. 130.

In this way this part of his array is “explained” and “motivated”.

Auh yn yeuatl yn tlamauztililiztli  
ocatca  
ca ompa tlaantli yn couatepec  
  
yniuh mochiui  
ca ye uecauh ye yxquich

And the honour (shown to  
Uitzilopochtli)  
originates from the Serpent Mountain  
there,  
as it is done,  
so it is from of old.

With these final words the myth motivates a ritual – not particularly identified – which, however, can hardly be anything but the ritual in Panquetzaliztli.

We shall then turn to one more account of the Panquetzaliztli festival. This is no longer the great, full description in Sah. II, 34, but some supplementary and confirmatory information can be derived from the catalogue of the temples, from which we shall adduce a few features with direct reference to our subject. It is mentioned that Uitzilopochtli during the Panquetzaliztli is conducted to the top of the temple pyramid:<sup>1</sup>

Auh ynic qujtlecaujaja  
in iehoatl vitzilobuchtli ixiptla,  
vel ixqujch in tlamacazquj,  
in telpuchtli in qujnapaloaia:

auh yn ixiptla catca vitzilobuchtli,  
çan tzoalli,  
cenca vey, cennequetzalli.

And like this they carried it up,  
this Uitzilopochtli's *ixiptla*,  
all the priests  
and the youths carried it up on their  
arms.

And Uitzilopochtli's *ixiptla* was  
actually the dough of amaranth seeds,  
very large in size.

Somewhat farther below we find:

Auh yn otlatujç, niman ie ic  
oalqujça, in paynaltzin,  
in çan no ie yxiptla Vitzilobuchtli,  
qujnapaloa:  
auh yn ixiptla paynal,  
çan quaujtl tlaca ietiuh:  
auh in qujnapaloa,  
itoca topiltzin Quetzalcoatli:

And when it has become morning,  
then the honoured Paynal comes,  
who himself is Uitzilopochtli's *ixiptla*,  
they carry him clasped in their arms.  
And Paynal's *ixiptla*  
is actually shaped of wood.  
And he who carries it,  
his name is our honoured prince  
Quetzalcoatli.

The two High Priests of Mexico both bore the name of Quetzalcoatli, and one of them was dedicated to Uitzilopochtli.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Sab.* II, App. 1. A–D 3, 1951, p. 161 f.

<sup>2</sup> *Sab.* III, App. 9. A–D 4, 1952, p. 67. – It should be kept in mind that *coatli* besides 'serpent' also means 'twin'. *Molina*: Coatli culebra, mellizo, o lombriz del estomago. *Molina*: Mellizo. coatli.

The account continues with a short description of Paynal's array:<sup>1</sup>

auh yn ixiptla paynal  
ynjc muchichioaia,  
yvitzitzilnaoal,  
... , etc.

And Paynal's *ixiptla*  
was arrayed like this:  
(with) his humming-bird disguise,  
... etc.

Then there is a concentrated description of the circular race, which also secures the identity with the festival described in more detail in the quotation above. And finally one more piece of important information is given, a piece of information which definitively attaches the above-mentioned myth to the ritual described:

njman ie ic tleco,  
yn jcpac coatepetl:  
in vmpa ca vitzilobuchtli:

Then they ascend  
to the top of *Coatepetl* ("the Serpent  
Mountain").  
There is *Uitzilopochtli*.

We emphasize that it is a question of a pure description of ritual which occurs during the mention of *Uitzilopochtli*'s temple.<sup>2</sup> Into the bargain it may be stated that this section in Sahagún bears the headline: *Vitzilobuchtli iteucal coatepetl* 'Uitzilopochtli's temple, the Serpent Mountain'.

And then: *ma ixquich* 'let it be enough!'

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf. above, p. 128.

<sup>2</sup> The term is also frequently used in this way by Tezozomoc; as noted by *Seler* 1902-23 II, p. 814, p. 1007.

## CONCLUSION

We have seen that *teotl* is used immediately about material objects and persons. It is used in such a way that we must, for the usage of the word, assume a foundation of concepts of 'mana' which often seem still to be fully alive. In quite the same way a large number of cult names are used immediately about material objects and about persons whose actions are described in a purely rationalist way, only with use of the special cult name in the account.

A personification process, however, is already far advanced. It seems mainly to be the raiment and other array of the objects and persons which "makes" them into that which is denoted by the cult names. And to the extent to which the cult names are conceived as names of mythical figures with a life of their own, we are faced with conceptions of "gods" in the usual sense of the word; but if we mention e. g. the "god" Tezcatlipoca, it should always be kept in mind that this Tezcatlipoca amongst other things was a captive who in the flesh walked about streets and lanes until after a year he was sacrificially killed, but only to be replaced by another captive who was then made Tezcatlipoca.

Furthermore, we have seen that in the accounts of the rituals at the eighteen annual festivals there is a certain number, a relatively small number, it is true, of explanations, descriptions, and motivations of Type 0 as well as of Type I, – for that matter almost the same number of each type, as the number of examples discussed probably is fairly exhaustive. The difference between Types 0 and I is that one type of explanations of rituals is by us considered "rationalist", while the other type is viewed by us as "mythical"; but we have seen that in some cases it may be difficult to decide whether the explanation given is "rationalist" or "mythical". As the distinction between Types 0 and I is based on our own concepts, extended knowledge of the actual facts might involve that a classing under Type I must be changed

to a classing under Type 0. And a reclassing in the opposite direction is just as imaginable. In the example above,<sup>1</sup> the sentence “the eagle man is sent up”, if occurring alone, might very well be understood in a purely rationalist way, e. g. to the effect that he is sent up to the temple; but when the following lines are included, there is a “mythical” explanation. Possibly it was actually first a case of giving one explanation, of Type 0, and afterwards another, of Type I.<sup>2</sup>

Both types are generally introduced in the texts with one of the terms *mitoa*, *moteneua*, *quitocayotia*, and *quil mach* ‘it is said’, ‘it is called’. The terms are introduced in so uniform a way that we must get an impression that the two types of explanations have been considered exactly equally good, or in other words, that no difference was felt between them (it being always kept in mind, that the classification into types is ours), which impression is corroborated by the fact that the two types occur pell-mell without any system.

When these twice a dozen “explanations” are viewed on a background of the accounts of the rituals, which run to many thousand lines, it must be justifiable to characterize the “explanations” as accessory, and then it is even only half of them which may be termed “mythical”. Indeed, we may go still farther and say about the “explanations” that they are accidental in so far as it seems completely accidental what element in a ritual is provided with an “explanation”, just as it seems completely accidental which “explanations” become – to us – “rationalist” and which of them become “mythical”.

Furthermore, it appears from the dozen of examples which occurs in Type I, that a “mythical episode” in certain cases is nothing but a “rationalist” description of the ritual, only with cult names of persons and objects inserted in the description instead of profane names and designations,

It is seen that one and the same everyday action, when transferred to the ritual sphere, on different occasions may have completely different mythical explanations, descriptions, or motivations attached to it,

And it is seen that the mythical “explanations” (etc.) attached to a ritual action in certain cases derive their motifs from other, associated parts of a greater ritual to which the ritual action in question belongs; the explanation of one action plays on loose associations of ideas with another action within the same greater ritual.

Finally it has been possible in an example to bring together a myth of Type III (and Group E) with a ritual to which it seems attached through

---

<sup>1</sup> See above, p. 107.

<sup>2</sup> As in the example above, p. 108 f.

a good number of points of contact.<sup>1</sup> From this example it further appears, That the various sections of the myth continually bear the character of accessory explanations, descriptions, or motivations of ritual actions,

While these ritual actions themselves continually completely move in a world of ideas governed by concepts of mana,

And that the points of contact between the ritual actions and the myth attached to them are constituted by short descriptions of actions concentrated on the cult names – the special cultic designations of objects and persons co-operating in the ritual – so that the myth is constituted by the exchange, in a ritual explanation, of the profane term with the cultic one,

But that it is possible to trace a tendency towards giving a free rein to one's imagination on the mythical plane, obviously because one feels a necessity of adding still more explanations, descriptions, and motivations, now no more of the ritual action, but of the mythical episode attached to it. Compare under Type I the example with Uixtociuatl, in which it is first to be explained that she is honoured by the salt people because she has discovered the salt, after which it must further be explained how she happened to discover it.<sup>2</sup>

And we have seen that there is a tendency on the mythical plane to arrange the episodes in a new succession which no longer necessarily follows the order of the ritual actions, but aims at creating a connected tale about one or more mythical figures.

Still longer connected tales then can be created by joining myths from several different rituals, from separate festivals held for widely different purposes.

The material freely fits into the previously described general view, and the examples from the Mexican original texts thus may be considered a corroboration of the applicability of the general view.

The examples furthermore show the special importance for the general view that the material leads us right into a stage of the 'connected course', where all that was mentioned above on pp. 51–57 has just happened or is happening or is just going to happen.

This important stage in the 'connected course' – and this important element of the general view – in the case of the Mexican field is not a hypothesis, but a fact.

---

<sup>1</sup> Several examples of this type can be pointed out, thus especially  
Type III (Group C): Burial ritual – realms of the dead,  
Type III (Group E): Burial ritual – Quetzalcoatl;  
but they are best suited for treatment in another connexion.

<sup>2</sup> See above, p. 116 f.

## DANISH SUMMARY

### *I a. Om kult og mytbe.*

I introduktionen (afhandlingens Part I) drøftes spørgsmålet om forholdet mellem kult og mytbe. Med udgang fra Robertson Smith's formuleringer påvises det, at disse formuleringer kan generaliseres og indføjes i et religionshistorisk helhedssyn, som det er muligt at anlægge på basis af vort kendskab til *mana*-forestillingerne.

Skønt man ikke bør bestride, at der forekommer tilfælde, hvor det er mythen, der har været primær og ritualdannende, og skønt ritualet normalt for et givet religionssamfunds egne medlemmer vil stå som en gengivelse og en gentagelse af den handling, hvis forbillede, eller måske ligefrem indstiftelse, mythen fortæller om, taler vægtige grunde dog for, at man i almindelighed – d. v. s. i det overvejende antal af tilfælde – betragter ritualet som det primære og mytherne som noget accessorisk, hvis man ønsker at få en velfunderet opfattelse af de større religionshistoriske sammenhæng. Det, der stilles krav om i en lang række religionssamfund, er ikke, at folk skal "tro" på mytherne, men udelukkende at de skal udføre ritualerne på den foreskrevne måde. Et givet ritual kan af forskellige mennesker i eet og samme samfund på een og samme tid "forklares" med forskellige myther. Yderligere viser det sig gang på gang, at et ritual igennem tiderne kan leve videre, uændret fra een religion til en anden, ja endda gennem flere på hinanden følgende religionsskifter, men således at den mythiske forklaring eller den mythiske motivering ændres successive, efter behov. Og endelig kan det anføres, at overordentlig mange rituelle handlinger er ganske simple manipulationer af helt elementær karakter, spisen, drikken, samleje, jagt, såning, høst o. s. v., og at det for os udenforstående iagttagere ville være urimeligt at godtage de rigt varierende mythiske "forklaringer" på og "motiveringer" for sådanne handlinger som årsagsforklaringer i vor forstand. Vi må nødvendigvis se de varierende mythiske forklaringer som udslag af fantasiernes rige spil over nogle forholdsvis få, givne temaer.

Det essentielle er, at de dagligdags handlinger ved visse lejligheder overflyttes til den religiøse sfære, ofte sådan at det er den første handling af en art, der udføres i denne højtidelige og særligt betydningsfulde sfære, hvor førstehandlingen samtidig bliver en skabende handling, fordi ligearartet fremkalder ligearartet. (pp. 11–19).

Da Robertson Smith øjensynligt ikke kendte mana-begrebet, angives det nærmere, hvordan og i hvilken udstrækning vi ud fra kendskabet til mana-forestillingerne ledes til at betragte ritualen som primært og mytherne som accessoriske.

Mana-begrebet og diskussionen om det drøftes. Det anvendes i det følgende som fagudtryk og dets indhold søges beskrevet, væsentligt under indflydelse af Grønbech, modificeret af Pallis, og under hensyntagen til såvel den forskningshistoriske debat som til egne overvejelser. Codringtons beskrivelse af de melanesiske mana-forestillinger anføres, og det bemærkes, at man efter at være blevet opmærksom på fænomenet hurtigt opdagede, at ganske tilsvarende forestillinger forekom mange andre steder. Man har endvidere opdaget, at der findes mange forskellige slags "mana". Hver klasse af ting, hver art af dyr og planter, hver slægt af mennesker har sin ganske specielle form af mana, karakteristisk just for denne klasse, art eller slægt. De egenskaber, der er særlig karakteristiske for en bestemt klasse af ting, for en bestemt dyre- eller planteart, eller for en bestemt menneskelig slægt, hører med til deres mana, og når et enkelt individ i særlig høj grad har sin arts karakteristiske egenskaber, siger man, at det har stor mana. I nogle sammenhæng svarer forestillingerne ret nøje til den populære forestilling, der dækkes hos os med brugen af ordet "-evne" i visse forbindelser. Hvis vi som forklaring på, at en kniv skærer usædvanlig godt, sagde, at det er fordi den har "stor skæreevne", ville det være en skinforklaring, og vi ville være meget nær ved en mana-forestilling. Hvad vi hos os i daglig tale tilskriver planternes "spireevne" og "grokraft", kunne vi også i stedet for tilskrive deres "mana". Da mana er essensen af de karakteristiske egenskaber hos en art, er mana i sig selv ikke nærmere kvalificeret som andet end "høj potens". Mana har i sig selv især ingen moralske kvalifikationer, men mana kan bruges, så det bliver til gavn, og den kan bruges, så det bliver til skade. Og hvis man ikke forstår at omgås den på ret måde, kan man komme til at anrette frygtelige ulykker.

En arts mana fylder imidlertid endnu mere end det, som efter vor opfattelse udgør arten. Alle de nærmeste omgivelser, hele det normale, karakteristiske milieu hører med til den, og manaens store omfang medfører, at vi ved "oversættelse" til den moderne europæiske tankegang må være opmærksom på yderligere nogle forestillingsmåder, der hænger nøje sammen med



mana-forestillingen, og med denne som forudsætning er fuldtud logiske. De bekendte sætninger "Delen er lig helheden", "Ligeartet fremkalder ligeartet", og "Fortid er lig nutid og lig fremtid" drøftes, og det påvises, at det kun er udfra den moderne tankegang – som bygger på andre kategorier –, at det er nødvendigt særskilt at gøre opmærksom på disse forestillingsmåder. Vi lærer i underskolen, at man kun må sammenlægge ensbenævnte størrelser; men hvis vi ikke også er enige om, hvilke ting der er ensbenævnte, vil vi trods ret anvendelse af regnereglerne alligevel nå til højst forskellige facit. (pp. 19–27)

Efter manaens *omfang*, betragtes nogle af manaens almindelige *egenskaber*. Uden hensyn til, at der findes mange forskellige slags mana med hver deres særlige kvaliteter, kan der konstateres visse elementære egenskaber, som groft kan tillægges mana i al almindelighed. Det drejer sig herved om egenskaber med de mest indgribende konsekvenser for religionernes form. Mana er på en vis måde noget materielt, for såvidt som den i materiel forstand har vægt, har tyngde. Endvidere kan mana overføres fra en genstand til en anden, ved gnidning, ved strygning, eller ved en endnu lettere berøring. Jo kraftigere manaen er, des lettere sker overførslen. Sommetider kan vi bedst opfatte forestillingerne ved at sammenligne med vore egne forestillinger om elektricitet, sommetider må vi snarere tænke på vore forestillinger om smitte, og sommetider virker det, som om mana var et usynligt, klæbrigt stof. Sommetider er end ikke berøring nødvendig, kraftig mana kan virke på lang afstand. I nogle tilfælde kan overførelse af mana ske, uden at manaen hos den oprindeligt mana-fyldte person eller genstand taber noget-somhelst af sin kraft derved. I andre tilfælde kan overførslen foretages på en sådan måde, at den oprindeligt mana-fyldte person eller genstand helt udtømmes for sin mana. I de sidstnævnte tilfælde er interessen som regel samlet om det objekt, hvorfra manaen fjernes, og for os vil det hyppigt se ud, som om det specielt er "sygdoms-mana" eller "dødens mana", der ønskes fjernet i disse tilfælde, men det må da erindres, at *al* kraftig mana under visse omstændigheder kan fremkalde sygdom eller død. Al koncentreret mana er farlig, den skal omgås med den yderste kyndighed og påpasselighed. Udenforstående og fuskere kommer næsten uvægerligt galt afsted og anretter blot ulykker på sig selv og andre.

Ordet *tabu* benyttes som religionshistorisk fagudtryk for de forbud, der er knyttet til mana-forestillingerne som en konsekvens af manaens farlighed. Ind i denne sammenhæng hører åbenbart det hyppigt forekommende fænomen, at to forskellige slags mana ikke må blandes. Hvis de er nogenlunde lige stærke, kan de – som det synes – begge blive spoleret derved; eller der kan opstå en mana af ny art, som må unddrages det profane liv. Det bemær-

kes, at taburegler kan være tidsmæssigt begrænsede, og det bemærkes, at alle taburegler kan udtrykkes således, at de har relevans til *handlinger*. Videre bemærkes samfundets og det enkelte individs fælles, og gensidige, interesse i, at tabureglerne overholdes. Dette fører os til den for religionernes form så umådeligt betydningsfulde kendsgerning, at der – af hensyn til sikkerheden – kræves særlige foranstaltninger, hver gang et individ ved særlige lejligheder bevæger sig frem eller tilbage mellem to sfærer med væsentligt forskellig mana, – udtrykket brugt således, at betegnelsen kan dække både steder, handlinger og perioder, men med henvisning til hensigtsmæssigheden af at betragte handlingerne som det essentielle. De særlige foranstaltninger, der kræves i sådanne tilfælde, har dels til formål at fjerne manaen fra den sfære som forlades, dels til formål at forberede individet til at stå under indflydelse af manaen fra den sfære, som det indtræder i. Dette er velkendt, men vi kan følgelig opfatte fænomenet som en videreudvikling, en logisk konsekvens, af de tidligere omtalte forestillinger, der ofte medfører krav om ganske *dagligdags* forbud mod blanding af mana. (pp. 27–35)

Eksempler på midler, der benyttes til mana-fjernelse ved overgang fra sfære til sfære (overgangs-riter, "rites de passage") refereres summarisk, med særlig fremdragen af omsorgen for håret, navneskifte og udskiften af klæderne, enten for bestandig eller blot midlertidigt. En midlertidigt anlagt dragt kan på denne måde f. eks. antage karakter af sørgedragt, eller den kan efter omstændighederne antage karakter af festdragt. En sådan festdragt vil som regel bestå af genstande og materialer, som i sig selv har umiddelbar tilknytning til den mana-sfære, dragten skal bruges i; og på grund af den overordentlig stærke konservatisme, der præger al religion, vil sådanne festdragter bevare archaiske træk langt ned gennem tiderne, selv under betydeligt ændrede samfundstilstande og væsentligt ændrede øvrige kulturforhold.

Ind i denne sammenhæng hører formentlig det vidt udbredte fænomen, at visse deltagere i religiøse fester optræder i maske. Bevægelse i en stærkt manafyldt sfære kræver særlige forholdsregler, det kræver anlæggelse af en særlig klædedragt, i mange tilfælde kræver det åbenbart også iførelsen af en maske. Der er steder, som kun betrædes, danse eller andre handlinger, som kun udføres i den dertil bestemte maske. Formålet med anlæggelsen af dansemasken synes overalt at være at koncentrere en meget høj potens af mana i danseren og samtidig gøre ham i stand til at tåle denne mana, såvel som at gøre ham i stand til at beherske den. Udformningen af den enkelte maske vil derfor være afhængig af, hvilken art mana det er, der i det givne tilfælde ønskes koncentreret. Og sammenhængen mellem masken og den på-

gældende art mana vil, også for os, som regel fremgå enten af maskens ydre form, eller af det materiale, hvorfra den fremstilles. Nogle masker kan vi kalde "naturalistiske", andre kan vi kalde "amimetiske", men inddelingen beror på europæiske kategorier. Afgørende er det tilsyneladende, at masken er mana-bærende, enten fordi den består af dele hentet fra en helhed, eller på grund af lighed med denne helhed. Karakteristisk for de maskerede kultudøvere er det, at de altid bevæger sig dansende, og også dansen samler mana i koncentration, som det ofte viser sig tydeligt for enhver: i danserens ekstase. Med en let forskydning i opfattelsen kan den forestilling fås, at manaen *personificeres* i maskedanseren, men således at forstå, at han er *identisk* med den mana-art, han danser. I de kultsange, der ledsager dansen, skelnes der derfor ikke mellem maskedanseren og den mana-art, han danser. Er han hjorte-danser, betyder det, at han *både* er mand og hjort. Det drama, der danses på kultpladsen, vil skabe samme virkelighed i verden, men lige så central som dansen, – den skabende handling –, er kultsangen, – det skabende ord. Og ligesom danseren ikke bevæger sig i hverdagens trin og rytme, fordi han er flyttet ud af hverdagens sfære, bevæger kultsangen sig heller ikke i hverdagssprogets ord og rytmer. Hverken dansen eller den tilhørende kultsang er umiddelbart forståelige for festdeltagere, der oplever dem for første gang.

Til de generelle træk hører derfor, at ritualet ledsages af en forklaring – mythen –, som foregiver nærmere at beskrive, hvad der sker. Og denne forklarende *beskrivelse* – mythen – har stedse samtidig karakter af en *motivering* for ritualets udførelse. Man gør sådan nu, hedder det, fordi dette engang i fortiden er blevet gjort f. eks. af slægtens forfader. Men for udøverne er det altid den samme, oprindelige, altid den første handling, der udføres. Danses en dyreart, fortæller mythen om dyret, og om forfaderens forbindelse med dette dyr, tit sådan at den store forfader selv er både det store dyr og den store mand. I mytherne skifter han skikkelse fra det ene til det andet af de to, eller han er begge dele på een gang, – fordi maskedanseren *er* den han danser, såvel som han er manden, der danser. (pp. 35–44)

Som det fremgår af selve fremstillingen, tager det hidtil udviklede (p. 19 ff.) sigte på samfund, og kun på sådanne, som faktisk er behersket af 'mana'-forestillinger, hvilke forestillinger naturligvis fra samfund til samfund kan variere lidt med hensyn til manaens „omfang“ eller „egenskaber“. Udtrykket „guder“ er ikke benyttet noget sted i denne del. Opfattelsen slutter sig fuldtud til Pallis' fremhævelse af det markante skel mellem naturfolkernes religioner og „byreligionerne“, som især har fundet udtryk i to formuleringer, henholdsvis i 1926 og i 1944. Disse formuleringer citeres og

drøftes relativt indgående i et forsøg på at nå til en yderligere afklaring, idet der særligt henvises til fundamentale historiske og sociologiske sammenhæng, som nødvendigvis må foreligge, uden hensyn til, at vi nutidige måske ikke er i stand til at følge det sammenhængende forløb i enkeltheder i hvert specielt tilfælde.

Gang på gang kan vi se, hvorledes mennesker har ført religiøse brug og forestillinger med over fra een samfundstilstand til en anden, sommetider som isolerede 'levn', der optræder uden organisk sammenhæng med de nye tilstande, men sommetider nøje indføjjet i en fortsat række af nye sammenhæng, og i så fald under stadigt nye sæt af omtolkninger. Det ikke-evolutionistiske i denne betragtningsmåde ligger i selve begrebet 'omtolkning', – deri at det omtolkede føres ind i helt nye sammenhæng i en helt ny kulturhelhed udfra en helt ny indstilling hos menneskene. Og muligheden for alligevel at kunne konstatere et 'sammenhængende forløb' ligger deri, at den nye kulturhelhed *dog* har rod i fortiden, at de nye sammenhæng og den nye indstilling *dog* fremkommer over en længere eller kortere periode i levende samfund og i levende menneskers sind, og at der *dog* foreligger et forhåndenværende stof, som er genstand for omtolkningerne. (pp. 44–50)

Ved overgangen til nye samfundstilstande sætter omtolkningerne af tidligere mana-forestillinger ind på mange punkter, og en række velkendte eksempler indføjjes i denne sammenhæng. Det forekommer blandt andet, at de skadelige virkninger af bestemte slags mana betones så stærkt, at disse arter af mana får karakter af „urenhed“ i dette ords religiøse betydning, mens de gunstige virkninger af visse andre slags mana samtidig hermed får en karakter, der modsætningsvis må have speciel betegnelse som „hellighed“. Omtolkningerne sætter ind både overfor personer, genstande og perioder, men ofte sådan at ingen rigtig veed, hvad det egentlig er, der skulle være fat med de pågældende ting, eller sådan at der konstrueres anstrengte, nye „forklaringer“. Den omtalte overgang til nye samfundstilstande opfattes med helt generel mening, men overgangen til bysamfund har særlig stor praktisk betydning, og særlig betydning i forbindelse med det udviklede. Også sondringen mellem „indvielser“ og „renselse“ dukker op i byreligionerne, og også her medfører fænomenets oprindelige karakter, at omtolkningerne kan give de mest konfuse resultater.

Med hensyn til forestillingerne om „guder“ forekommer overgangsfænomener langt ned i tiden i blomstrende byreligioner, og just på grundlag af dette materiale mener vi at kunne konstatere hovedtrækkene af det 'sammenhængende forløb'. Der sker blandt andet det, at visse manafyldte genstande langsomt igennem tiden omdannes – i form, såvel som af funktion – til gudebilleder. Endvidere sker der det, at opfattelsen af maskedanserne, og de

mythiske skikkelser der er knyttet til dem, i stadig højere grad tenderer imod at antage endelig form som forestillinger om „guder“, samtidig med at dansemaskerne selv præger disse forestillinger. Mange guders antropomorfe træk synes hovedsagelig at stamme fra maskedanserne, men også kultudøvere med anden rituel funktion end dansen kan afgive grundlag for gude-forestillinger. Endelig sker der øjensynligt det, at visse mythiske skikkelser bruges til flere og flere ritual-forklaringer, både funktionelt i en enkelt lokalitet og geografisk over et større område. Lidt tilspidset kan man sige, at store guder er mythiske skikkelser, som bliver brugt til flere og flere ritual-forklaringer.

Men dertil kommer, at guderne i byreligionerne så at sige begynder at leve deres eget liv. Man sætter de mythiske fortællinger i system, ikke længere med ritualen, men med de mythiske skikkelser som genstand for hovedinteressen. Mythiske episoder, som oprindeligt har været (og egentlig er) fuldstændig usammenhængende, isolerede „forklaringer“ på og „motiveringer“ for enkelte handlinger i et ritual, eller i helt forskellige ritualer, sammenføres under forsøg på at skabe en fortløbende fortælling om en eller flere skikkelser fra disse mythiske episoder. Snart udfylder man også det, som nu tilsyneladende er „huller“ i den konstruerede fortløbende fortælling, og så har man gudens livshistorie, eller dog betydelige dele af den (Type IV, nedenfor). (Sådanne sammenhængende gudfortællinger kan muligvis sekundært fremkalde nye rituelle handlinger.) Eller store digtere kan tage sig af fortællingerne (Type V, nedenfor), og de nye digterværkers foredragelse blive indlagt som led i religiøse fester, der eventuelt intetsomhelst har at gøre med de fester, hvorfra de oprindelige myther stammede. Eller lærde antikvarer kan samle stoffet til en mytologi, en mythe-lære (Type VI, nedenfor). (pp. 50–57)

Når forestillingen om guder kommer ind, sker der som en konsekvens heraf fremdeles det, at en række handlinger omtolkes, sådan at de opfattes som et „offer“ til en gud, men også her sådan at det nye begreb ofte er særdeles uafklaret. De forskellige „offer“-typers karakter undersøges, idet der gives en skitse af de typer af handlinger, der hyppigst omtolkes som „ofre“, nemlig dels *mana-fjernende* handlinger, og dels *mana-tilførende* handlinger. Særskilt diskuteres „ofring“ af mennesker, og såkaldte substitutions-ofre. (pp. 58–62)

Omtolkningerne gennemføres ikke med eet slag over hele linien, og det er især den forskellige grad af gennemførelse på de mange forskellige punkter, som giver byreligionerne deres overordentligt brogede udseende. Men enhver omtolkning kan fremkalde en ny mythe, eller en omfarvning af en allerede eksisterende mythe, hyppigst således at det er selve denne omfarv-

ning der indebærer og derfor for os demonstrerer omtolkningen. Under omtolkningerne sætter samfundets almindelige vilkår deres præg på de religiøse forestillingers form, som veksler med erhvervskulturens udvikling, med erobringer og andre ydre omskiftelser. Samfundets organisation projiceres ud i kosmos, dets sociale orden afspejler sig i gudeverdenen, men det er samme, i antal forholdsvis begrænsede sæt af handlinger, der stadig omtolkes. Menneskets fantasi kan synes uhæmmet, men den er ingenlunde fri, den må arbejde med det stof af forestillinger som i forvejen står til rådighed.

Muligheden af at anlægge et sådant helhedssyn på fænomenerne taler til gunst for at fastholde Robertson Smith's opfattelse af forholdet mellem ritual og mythe. Den bliver herved ikke et isoleret postulat, men et integrerende led i en organisk helhedsopfattelse. Og som en konsekvens af det udviklede må det være methodisk rigtigt at fastholde, at en mythe, der umiddelbart kan opfattes som en „forklaring“ på og en „motivering“ for et ritual, ikke selv behøver nogen anden forklaring. Bevisbyrden påhviler den, som i et givet tilfælde vil hævde en mythes primat overfor en rituel handling. I denne forbindelse understreges det ønskelige i, at fremstillinger af en mythes „vandringer“ også måtte redegøre for, om man tænker sig, at mythen er „lånt“ og „vandret“ *sammen med* ritualet, eller løst fra dette. Sekundært, men markeret, fremhæves det, at når opmærksomheden koncentrerer sig om de mythiske skikkelser, der har karakter af „guder“, vil det kunne tænkes, at man i ritualet indføjer „efterligninger“ af disse guders handlinger i mythe-afsnit, som ikke bygger på oprindelige, ritualforklarende mythiske episoder, og det fremhæves, at selve gude-forestillingens eksistens kan fremkalde et udpenslet, dagligt opvarnings-ritual. (pp. 62–65)

### *I b. Nogle formelle klassifikationer.*

De almindelige systematiseringer af myther bygger på en opstilling af typer med fortællingernes *indhold* som kriterium, mest gennemført i folkloristernes „motiv-index“, der bringes i anvendelse på myther såvel som på eventyr, med videre. Udfra religionshistoriske synspunkter er denne systematik utilstrækkelig og ofte vildledende, og religionshistorikere har da også i praksis arbejdet med grupper af myther, opstillet efter religionshistorisk saglige kriterier. Terminologien herved er dog desværre højest uensartet fra forfatter til forfatter.

På basis af det tidligere udviklede og med hensyntagen til forgængeres og eget materiale opstilles en mere specificeret typologi under brug af helt neutrale termer, nemlig betegnelserne Type 0, Type I, etc. til Type VI,

hvorved ikke indholdet, men rent formelle kriterier lægges til grund, fremfor alt mythens tilknytning (eller mangel på tilknytning) til rituallet.

For flere formål skønnes det desuden hensigtsmæssigt at råde over en anden gruppering, idet vi går ud fra forskningens egen situation i forhold til materialet. Herved omfatter første hovedgruppe (med undergrupperne A, B og C) alle myther, hvis tilknytning til et vist ritual fremgår direkte af teksten i een og samme kilde. Mens anden hovedgruppe (med undergrupperne D og E) omfatter alle myther, hvis tilknytning til et vist ritual alene kan bygges på en kombination af oplysninger fra flere forskellige tekstkilder. Nødvendigheden af en skelnen mellem disse grupper er indlysende for en historiker, men har vistnok ikke tidligere været skænket tilstrækkelig opmærksomhed.

Til afklaring af terminologien foreslås endelig betegnelsen 'primære ritualer' for ritualer, hvis eksistens hviler på forekommende eller tidligere forekommende 'mana'-forestillinger, mens betegnelsen 'sekundære ritualer' foreslås for ritualer, hvis eksistens *alene* hviler på mythiske forestillinger, således f. eks. opvarnings-ritualer etc. overfor „gude“-billeder. Og for primære ritualer, hvis eksistens kun kan forstås med visse mythiske forestillinger som forudsætning, foreslås betegnelsen 'betingede ritualer'. (pp. 65-69)

## *II a. Det mexicanske tekstmateriale.*

Introduktionen har til formål at skitsere de forudsætninger, hvormed vi går til undersøgelsen af det mexicanske tekstmateriale, som næppe kan siges tidligere at være blevet benyttet efter fortjeneste af forskere med en almindelig, nyere religionshistorisk baggrundsviden. Det er dog ikke hensigten at illustrere alle led i det foran udviklede med mexicanske eksempler, afhandlingen sigter kun på at belyse et enkelt, men centralt beliggende område ved hjælp af eksempler hentet fra mexicanske originaltekster.

Eksempler fra dette kulturområde har af flere grunde en særlig interesse, ikke mindst fordi vi med det mexicanske materiale føres midt ind i samfund, der befinder sig i det stadium, som vi har allermost behov for at få nøjere underretning om, nemlig det stadium, der er karakteriseret af agerbrug og en begyndende bydannelse. Dertil kommer, at det religionshistoriske materiale fra Mexico er usædvanlig rigt, ja, i betragtning af, at dets hovedmasse stammer fra det 16. århundrede, fuldkommen enestående. Sahagún var 400 år eller mere forud for sin tid. Særlig vigtigt er det, at *både* ritualbeskrivelser *og* myther foreligger optegnet på det pågældende folks eget sprog.

Afgrænsningerne for materialets benyttelse her angives, og tekstforhold m. m. beskrives i hovedtræk. (pp. 70–76)

## II b. *Teotl* og \**Ixiptlatli*.

Ordet *teotl* oversættes normalt med 'gud', og i sammensætninger med „gude-“, men i en række tilfælde ville det være mere præcist at oversætte med 'hellig-', 'sakral-' eller 'ritual-'. Endvidere kan der formentlig i en del sammensætninger konstateres spor af en ren 'mana'-betydning. Ordet \**ixiptlatli* oversættes efter omstændighederne normalt snart med „billede“, snart med „repræsentant“ e. l.

Af en række fremdragne eksempler fremgår det, at en *teixiptla* blandt andet kan være et menneske, en dejgfigur eller et træstel forsynet med en maske. Det fremgår endvidere, at ordet – for os – kan skifte betydning ganske uformidlet fra det ene til det andet af sådanne objekter. Og det fremgår, at betegnelsen *teixiptla*, betegnelsen *teotl* og såkaldte „gudenavne“ kan bruges i flæng om sådanne personer og genstande, så at man må antage, at der foreligger en absolut identificering. „Gude“-navnene er ret og slet kultnavne, særlige kultiske betegnelser på de personer og genstande, der handler og handles med i ritualerne. Man bør formentlig undlade at indlægge betydningen „stedfortræder“, „repræsentant“, i ordet *teixiptla*, når det forekommer i oprindelige, religiøse sammenhæng. Snarere bør betydningen 'billede' betones, men rigtignok med den vigtige tilføjelse, at det er selve 'billedet', *teixiptla*'en, der udgør „guden“. Og allersnarest bør man lade betydningen billede blive farvet af betydningen 'maske', 'maskedragt', thi det synes overalt at være ikklædningen, bemalingen og udsmykningen, der konstituerer en given *teixiptla*, henholdsvis en given „gud“. En *teixiptla* kan fysisk set være adskilligt; dens navn bestemmes af dragt, bemaling og øvrige udsmykning.

Om ordet *teotl* påvises det, at ordet – i vore øjne – kan have et overordentlig konkret og materielt betydningsindhold, for så vidt som det kan bruges om en knogle, en majsplante, syv sammenbundne majscolber og om mennesker. Set fra den sproglige side er ordet ikke gennemarbejdet her, men set fra den saglige side konstateres anvendelser, som må antages at hvile på 'mana'-forestillinger, og hvile på en sådan måde at selve ordet *teotl* må antages endnu at have – eller i det mindste at have haft – en betydning, der svarer til betydningen 'mana'.

Om „gude“-navnene gælder det, at de i ritualbeskrivelserne ganske almindeligt bruges direkte om genstande og personer med samme karakteristika som de genstande og personer, vi også kan finde betegnet med ordene



*teotl* eller *teixiptla*. Forsåvidt „gude“-navnene opfattes som navne på mythiske skikkelser, har vi derfor samtidig fået et indtryk af de mythiske skikkelseres snævraste forhold til rituelle genstande og rituelle personer. I eksemplerne udsiges foreløbig intet særligt om disse „mythiske skikkelser“, udover at de er kultiske navne på disse og hine genstande og personer. (pp. 76–100)

#### *II c. Type O (af Gruppe A).*

I den tidligere opstillede klassifikation omfatter Gruppe A: 'længere ritualbeskrivelser med korte „mythiske“ „forklaringer“ indstrøet'.

Og Type 0: 'omfatter korte udtalelser om ritualer – sjældent mere end en enkelt sætning eller en periode –, som efter moderne europæisk opfattelse er en „nøgttern“, „rationalistisk“, kortfattet beskrivelse af eller betegnelse på det, der foregår'. 'Betegnelser og beskrivelser af denne art vil af os moderne europæere ikke blive opfattet som „myther“, fordi de stemmer med vor egen begrebsverden; vi har derfor valgt at give dem signaturen „0“. På den anden side finder vi det nødvendigt at medtage denne type, fordi en del materiale tyder på, at de undersøgte kulturers egne medlemmer ikke har skelnet imellem denne type og den næst følgende; de to typer optræder omkring imellem hinanden på tilsyneladende helt lige fod i visse tekster.'

Azteciske eksempler. (pp. 100–05)

#### *II d. Type I (af Gruppe A).*

I den tidligere klassifikation hedder det om Type I: 'Omfatter korte udtalelser om ritualer – sjældent mere end en enkelt sætning eller en periode –, som efter moderne europæisk opfattelse er en „mythisk“ forklaring eller beskrivelse eller motivering. Den kan gælde en enkelt rituel handling eller et større sammenhængende ritual, såvel som en hel, kompliceret fest. Udtalelsernes forestillingsmæssige indhold vil vi kalde en „mythisk episode“. I forskningen har man været tilbøjelig til at opfatte disse „mythiske episoder“ som „hentydninger“ til „tabte“ eller „ellers ukendte“ myther af større omfang; men vi må mene, at denne opfattelse er ganske bagvendt.'

Azteciske eksempler på typen. (pp. 105–17)

#### *II e. Type II (af Gruppe B).*

I klassifikationen omfatter Gruppe B: 'længere myther med korte ritualhenvisninger indstrøet'.

Og Type II: 'adskiller sig kun fra den foregående type (I) ved forklaringens, beskrivelsens eller motiveringens længde, for hvilken der ikke sættes nogen begrænsning opad, samt derved, at vi herunder blot vil medtage forklaringer, beskrivelser og motiveringer, der knytter sig til en enkelt rituel handling eller dog til en relativt snæver og sluttet del af ritualet ved en større fest.'

Azteciske eksempler, hvoriblandt et, der fortæller om en hvid flintsten, som gøres til *teotl* under navnet Mixcoatl (et „gudenavn“) og indsvøbes i en sakralbylt. Og et andet eksempel, fra en anden tekst, der fortæller om en mand, som på ryggen bærer sin *teotl*, kaldet Mixcoatl. Han kommer til Citlan, hvis indbyggere spørger ham: Hvad hedder din *teotl*, din sakralbylt, som du bærer på ryggen? Han svarer dem: Dens navn er Mixcoatl. Hvorpå folkene fra Citlan ændrer dens navn til Citecatl, for at Citlans navn kan fremtræde i det. Eksemplet viser en sakralbylt betegnet 'direkte som *teotl* – 'noget mana-fyldt' –, og eksemplet viser klart, at dens navn kan ændres efter for-godtbefindende. Den mythiske skikkelse, som gennem navnet knyttes til den manafyldte sakralbylt, er accessorisk. (pp. 118–23)

## II f. Type III (af Gruppe E).

I klassifikationen omfatter Gruppe E: 'myther, hvis tilknytningsforhold til et vist ritual tekstmæssigt udelukkende kan baseres på sammenført materiale fra forskellige kilder, men således at der imellem en større ritualbeskrivelse og en større mythe kan konstateres en længere række af kontaktpunkter.'

Og Type III: 'omfatter længere „mythiske“ forklaringer, beskrivelser eller motiveringer, som knytter sig til et helt, større og sammensat, ritual på en sådan måde, at myther af denne type – theoretisk – *kan* opdeles i underafsnit, der opfylder kriterierne for type II, henholdsvis I eller 0.'

Som eksempel benyttes festen Panquetzalitzli og en mythe om Uitzilopochtli. (pp. 123–39)

## Slutning.

Typerne 0 og I indføres almindeligvis i ritualbeskrivelserne med et 'man siger', 'det kaldes' eller 'det hedder'. De indføres så aldeles ensartet, at vi må få det indtryk, at man ikke har følt nogen forskel imellem dem (det må jo stadig erindres, at typeinddelingen er vor), hvilket indtryk bestyrkes af, at de to typer forekommer ganske regelløst imellem hinanden. Når de

fremdragne to gange en halv snes „forklaringer“ af disse typer da ses på baggrund af mange tusind linjers fremstilling af ritualerne, må det være berettiget at betegne „forklaringerne“ som accessoriske, – og så er det endda kun halvdelen af dem (Type I), vi kan kalde „mythiske“. Ja, på grundlag af materialet kan vi gå endnu videre og sige, at de er tilfældige, forsåvidt som det synes fuldkommen tilfældigt, hvilke led i et ritual, der forsynes med en „forklaring“, ligesom det synes fuldkommen tilfældigt, hvilke „forklaringer“ der bliver – i vore øjne – „rationalistiske“, og hvilke der bliver „mythiske“.

Af den halve snes eksempler, der forekommer på Type I, ses det desuden, at en „mythisk episode“ i visse tilfælde ikke er andet end en „rationalistisk“ beskrivelse af ritualet, blot med kulnavne på personer og genstande indsat i beskrivelsen i stedet for profane navne og betegnelser,

det ses, at een og samme dagligdags handling, når den overføres til den rituelle sfære, ved forskellige lejligheder kan få helt forskellige mythiske forklaringer, beskrivelser eller motiveringer knyttet til sig,

og det ses, at de mythiske „forklaringer“ (etc.), der knyttes til en rituel handling, i visse tilfælde henter deres motiver fra andre, nærliggende dele af det større ritual, hvortil den givne rituelle handling hører; forklaringen af een handling spiller på løse idéassociationer til en anden handling indenfor samme større ritual.

Det har dernæst været muligt at sammenføre en mythe af Type III (og Gruppe E) med et ritual, hvortil den synes knyttet gennem en længere række af kontaktpunkter, og af dette eksempel ses det videre,

at mythens enkelte afsnit fortsat har karakter af accessoriske forklaringer på, beskrivelser af eller motiveringer for rituelle handlinger,

mens disse rituelle handlinger selv fortsat helt bevæger sig i en begrebsverden, der beherskes af mana-forestillinger,

og at kontaktpunkterne mellem de rituelle handlinger og de dertil knyttede myther udgøres af korte handlingsbeskrivelser, koncentreret omkring kulnavnene – de specielt kultiske betegnelser på genstande og personer, der medvirker i ritualet – således at mythen konstitueres ved udskiftningen, i en ritualforklaring, af den profane betegnelse med den kultiske,

men at der kan spores en tendens til selvstændig fabuleringen i det mythiske plan, åbenbart fordi man føler en nødvendighed af at tilføje stadig flere forklaringer, motiveringer og beskrivelser, nu ikke længere af den rituelle handling, men af den mythiske episode der er knyttet dertil,

og det ses, at der er en tendens til i det mythiske plan at ordne episoderne i en ny rækkefølge, som ikke længere nødvendigvis følger de rituelle hand-

lingers orden, men sigter på at skabe en sammenhængende fortælling om een eller flere mythiske skikkelser.

Materialet indfører sig utvungent i den tidligere skildrede helhedsopfattelse, og eksemplerne fra de azteciske tekster kan således ses som en bekræftelse på helhedsopfattelsens anvendelighed. Eksemplerne har endvidere den særlige betydning for helhedsopfattelsen, at materialet fører os midt ind i et stadium af det 'sammenhængende forløb', hvor alt det, som vi har omtalt kort foran i resuméet p. 148 f., netop er sket, eller er ved at ske, eller er lige ved at ske. I afhandlingens Part I har vi kun kunnet nærme os dette stadium gennem theoretiske overvejelser, så at sige ved hjælp af interpolationer fra begge sider af det pågældende stadium. Af Part II fremgår det, at dette vigtige stadium i det 'sammenhængende forløb' – og dette vigtige led i helhedsopfattelsen – for det mexicanske områdes vedkommende ikke er en hypotese, men en kendsgerning. (pp. 140–42)

## LITERATURE

### PART I.

References cited, except for the Mexican field.

*Alphabetically*

- Aarne, Antti*: Verzeichnis der Märchentypen, . . . (FFC 3). Helsinki 1910.
- Andree, Richard*: Die Masken in der Völkerkunde. (*Archiv für Anthropologie*, 16. Band, pp. 477–506.) Braunsch. 1886.
- Ethnographische Parallelen und Vergleiche. Lpz. 1889.
- Arbman, Ernst*: Seele und Mana. (*Archiv für Religionswissenschaft*, 29, pp. 293–394. 1931.
- Aurelius, Erik*: En synkretistisk företeelse i palestinsk folkro. (Jacobsen, Johannes (ed.): Studier tilegnede Professor, Dr. phil & theol. Frants Buhl . . . , pp. 1–13.) Kbh. 1925.
- BAE-AR = Smithsonian Institution. Bureau of American Ethnology. Annual Reports . . . , 1–48. Wash. 1881–1933.
- BAE-Bull. = Smithsonian Institution. Bureau of American Ethnology. Bulletin 1 ff. Wash. 1887 ff.
- Batchelor, John*: The Ainu and Their Folklore. Lond. 1901.
- Beals, Ralph L.*: The Contemporary Culture of the Cáhita Indians. (BAE-Bull. 142.) Wash. 1945.
- Bertholet, Alfred*: Götterspaltung und Göttervereinigung. Tüb. 1933.
- Das Geschlecht der Gottheit. Tüb. 1934.
- Beth, Karl*: Religion und Magie bei den Naturvölkern. Lpz./Berl. 1914.
- Bischoff, E.* (ed.): Das Buch von Schulchan aruch. Lpz. 1941<sup>3</sup>.
- Black, John Sutherland* and *George Chrystal*: The Life of William Robertson Smith. Lond. 1912.
- Blackman, A. M.*: Luxor and its Temples. Lond. 1923.
- Bleeker, C. Jouco*: Die Geburt eines Gottes. Eine Studie über den ägyptischen Gott Min und sein Fest. Leiden 1956.
- Bloesch, Hansjörg*: Agalma. Kleinod, Weigeschenk, Götterbild. Bern 1943.
- Boas, F.* (ed.): General Anthropology. Boston 1938.
- Boberg, Inger M.*: Folkeminddeforskningens historie i Mellem- og Nordeuropa. Kbh. 1953.
- Bouquet, A. C.*: Comparative Religion. Hamm. 1945.
- Bousset, D. Wilhelm*: Das Wesen der Religion. Tüb. 1920.
- Brellich, Angelo*: Die geheime Schutzgottheit von Rom. Zür. 1949.
- Briem, Efraim*: På trons tröskel. Studier i primitiv religion. Sth. 1948.

---

ed. = edition, editor, edited by.

tr. = translation, translator, translated by.

Kbh. = København (Copenhagen).

Years in parenthesis denote editions other than those used by the author.

- Brock-Utne, Albert*: Studiet av primitive folk. Oslo 1938.
- Bunzel, Ruth L.*: Zūñi Katcinas.. (BAE-AR 47, pp. 837–1086.) Wash. 1932.
- Buschardt, Leo*: Vrtra. Det rituelle Dæmondrab i den vediske Somakult. Kbh. 1945.
- Cabén, Maurice*: Études sur le vocabulaire religieux du vieux-scandinave. La libation. Paris 1921.
- Caland, W.* (tr.): Śāṅkhāyana-Śrautasūtra. Nagpur 1953.
- Carpenter, J. Estlin*: Phases of Early Christianity. N. Y. 1916.
- Cassirer, Ernst*: Sprache und Mythos. Ein Beitrag zum Problem der Götternamen. Lpz./Berl. 1925.
- Chantepie de la Saussaye*: Lehrbuch der Religionsgeschichte. 1–2. Tüb. 1925<sup>4</sup>.
- Chapple, Eliot Dismore and Carleton Stevens Coon*: Principles of Anthropology. Lond. 1947.
- Chrystal, George*, see *Black, John Sutherland*.
- Clemen, Carl*: Die Reste der primitiven Religion im ältesten Christentum. Giessen 1916.
- Die Religionen der Erde. Münch. (1927).
- Codrington, Robert Henry*: Religious Beliefs and Practices in Melanesia. (*The Journ. of the Anthropol. Institute of Great Britain and Ireland*, X, pp. 261–315. Discussion, p. 315 f.) Lond. 1881.
- The Melanesians. Oxf. 1891.
- Congress of the History of Religions, Transactions of the Third International*. 1–2. Oxf. 1908.
- Coomaraswamy, Ananda and Gopala Kristnayya Duggirala* (tr.): The Mirror of Gesture, being the Abhinaya Darpaṇa of Nandikeśvara. Camb. (Mass.) 1917.
- Coon, Carleton Stevens*, see *Chapple, Eliot Dismore*.
- Crawley, Ernest*: The Mystic Rose. 1–2. Lond. (1902) 1927<sup>2</sup>.
- Dress, Drinks and Drums. Lond. 1931.
- Cuisinier, Jeanne*: La danse sacrée en Indochine et en Indonésie. Paris 1951.
- Curtiss, Samuel Ives*: Ursemitische Religion im Volksleben des heutigen Orients. (Chic. 1902) Lpz. 1903.
- Dadachanji, Serozh*, see *Gopal, Ram*.
- Dall, William H.*: On Masks, Labrets, and Certain Aboriginal Customs. (BAE-AR 3, pp. 73–203.) Wash. 1884.
- Danzel, Theodor-Wilhelm*: Kultur und Religion des primitiven Menschen. Stuttg. 1924.
- Davidsohn, Joseph*: Participations-Studier. Kbh. 1931.
- Davis, Robert Tyler*: Native Arts of the Pacific Northwest. Stanf. 1949.
- Dawson, Warren R.*, see *Smith, G. Elliot*.
- Deacon, A. Bernard*: Malekula. Lond. 1934.
- Deissmann, Adolf*: Licht vom Osten. Tüb. 1923<sup>4</sup>.
- Densmore, Frances*: The Use of Meaning-less Syllables in Indian Songs. (*Amer. Anthropologist*, n. s. XLV, pp. 160–62) 1942.
- d'Harnoncourt, René*, see *Douglas, Frederic H.*
- Diehl, Carl Gustav*: Instrument and Purpose. Studies on Rites and Rituals in South India. Lund 1956.
- Dieterich, Albrecht*: Eine Mithrasliturgie. Lpz. 1903.
- Donner, Kai*: Bland samojeder i Sibirien åren 1911–13, 1914. Helsf. 1915.
- Sibirien. Folk och forntid. Helsf. 1933.
- Douglas, Frederic H. and René d'Harnoncourt*: Indian Art of the United States. N. Y. (1941) 1948<sup>2</sup>.
- Dubois, J. A.*: Hindu Manners, Customs and Ceremonies. Oxf. 1899<sup>2</sup>.
- Duggirala, Gopala Kristnayya*, see *Coomaraswamy, Ananda*.
- Durkheim, Émile*: Les formes élémentaires de la vie religieuse. Paris 1912 (1925<sup>2</sup>).
- The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life. Translated from the French by Joseph Ward Swain. Glencoe (Ill.) 1954.

- Dyggve, Ejnar*: Gravkirken i Jerusalem. Kbh. 1941.  
 – Dødekult, kejserkult og basilika. Kbh. 1943.
- Eberle, Oskar*: Cenalora. Leben, Glaube, Tanz und Theater der Urvölker. Freib. 1955.
- Eggers, Hans Jürgen*: Die magischen Gegenstände der altisländischen Prosaliteratur. Lpz. 1932.
- Ehrenreich, Paul*: Die allgemeine Mythologie und ihre ethnologischen Grundlagen. Lpz. 1910.
- Eitrem, S.*: Opferritus und Voropfer der Griechen und Römer. Krist. 1915.  
 – Beiträge zur griechischen Religionsgeschichte. III. Krist. 1920.
- Eliade, Mircea*: Das Heilige und das Profane. Vom Wesen des Religiösen. Hamb. 1957.
- Elwin, Verrier*: The Religion of an Indian Tribe. Lond. 1955.
- Erman, Adolf*: Die Religion der Ägypter. Berl./Lpz. 1934.
- Falkenstein, A. und W. von Soden* (tr.s): Sumerische und akkadische Hymnen und Gebete. Zür./Stuttg. 1953.
- Farnell, L. R.*: The Evolution of Religion. Lond. 1905.
- Fenger, Sven* (ed.): Religionshistoriske tekster. Kbh. 1919.
- Ferm, Vergilius* (ed.): An Encyclopedia of Religion. N. Y. 1945.
- Fewkes, Jesse Walter*: Hopi katchinas, drawn by native artists. (BAE-AR 21, pp. 3–126, 62 pls.) Wash. 1903.
- Fletcher, Alice C. and Francis La Flesche*: The Omaha Tribe. (BAE-AR 27.) Wash. 1911.
- Fowler, W. Warde*: The Roman Festivals of the Period of the Republic. Lond. 1899.
- Frankfort, Henri*: Kingship and the Gods. Chic. 1948.
- Frazer, James George*: Lectures on the Early History of the Kingship. Lond. 1905.  
 – Psyche's Task. Lond. 1909.  
 – The Golden Bough. 1–12. Lond. 1911–15<sup>3</sup>.  
 – The Belief in Immortality and the Worship of the Dead. 1–3. Lond. 1913–24.  
 – Folk-lore in the Old Testament. 1–3. Lond. 1918.  
 – Garnered Sheaves. Lond. 1931.  
 – The Fear of the Dead in Primitive Religion. 1–3. Lond. 1933–36.
- Frickenhans, August*: Lenäenvasen. Berl. 1912.
- Fuchs, Hanns*: Sagen, Mythen und Sitten der Masai. Jena 1910.
- Gardiner, Alan H.*: [rec. of Frazer: Adonis, Attis, Osiris I–II (1914)] (*The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology*, II, p. 125.) Lond. 1915.
- Gauthier, Henri*: Les Fêtes du dieu Min. Cairo 1931.
- Gennep, Arnold van*: Les rites de passage. Paris 1909.
- Gillen, F. J.*, see *Spencer, Baldwin*.
- Glaserapp, Helmuth von*: Der Hinduismus. Religion und Gesellschaft im heutigen Indien. Münch. 1922.  
 – Die nichtchristlichen Religionen. Fr. a. M. 1957.
- Gopal, Ram, and Serozb Dadachanji*: Indian Dancing. Lond. 1951.
- Gorce, Maxime et Raoul Mortier*: Histoire Générale des Religions. 1–4. Paris 1947–48.
- Gray, George Buchanan*: Sacrifice in the Old Testament. Oxf. 1925.
- Gregor, Joseph*: Die Masken der Erde. Münch. 1936.
- Gressmann, Hugo*: Altorientalische Texte zum Alten Testament. Berl. 1926<sup>2</sup>.
- Griaule, Marcel*: Arts of the African Native. Lond. 1950.
- Gruppe, O.*: Griechische Mythologie und Religionsgeschichte. 1–2. Münch. 1906.
- Gronbech, Vilh.*: Vor folkæt i oldtiden. 1–4. Kbh. 1909–12.  
 – Soul or Mana. Kbh. 1913.  
 – Primitiv religion. Sth. 1915.  
 [cf. *Pedersen* (ed.) 1948, pp. 13–74.]  
 – The Culture of the Teutons. I–III. (2 vols.) Kbh. 1931.
- Gunkel, Hermann*: Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit. Gött. 1895.
- Haas, Hans*: Bilderatlas zur Religionsgeschichte. 1–17. Lpz. 1924–33.

- Haigh, A. E.*: The Attic Theatre. Oxf. (1889) 1898<sup>2</sup>.
- Harrison, Jane Ellen*: Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion. Cambr. (1903) 1908<sup>2</sup>.  
– Themis. Cambr. 1912.
- Hartland, Edwin Sidney*: Ritual and Belief. Studies in the History of Religion. Lond. 1914.
- Hausenstein, Wilhelm*: Barbaren und Klassiker. Münch. 1923<sup>2</sup>.
- Havell, E. B.*: Benares, The Sacred City. Lond. 1905.
- Havemeyer, Loomis*: The Drama of Savage Peoples. N. Hav. 1916.
- Hillebrandt, Alfred*: Ritual-Litteratur. Vedische Opfer und Zauber. Strassb. 1897.
- Hocart, A. M.*: Kingship. Lond. 1927.
- Hooke, S. H.* (ed.): Myth and Ritual. Lond. 1933.  
– (ed.): The Labyrinth. Lond. 1935.  
– The Origins of Early Semitic Ritual. Lond. 1938.
- Hopkins, A. I.*: In the Isles of King Solomon. Lond. 1928.
- Hopkins, E. Washburn*: Origin and Evolution of Religion. N. Hav. 1923.
- Howells, William*: The Heathens. Primitive Man and his Religions. N. Y. 1948.
- Hubert, Henri et Marcel Mauss*: Esquisse d'une Théorie Générale de la Magie. (*L'année sociologique*, VII (1902–1903), pp. 1–146. [pp. 108–22: Le Mana, pp. 122–42: Les états collectifs et les forces collectives, pp. 143–46: Conclusion.] Paris 1904.  
– Mélanges d'histoire des religions. [pp. I–XVII: Le sacrifice, pp. 1–130: Essai sur la nature et la fonction sociale du sacrifice. (= *L'année sociologique*, II (1899), pp. 29–138.)] Paris 1909.
- Hunningher, B.*: The Origin of the Theater. Hague 1955.
- Hutton, J. H.*: Caste in India. Cambr. 1946, (1952<sup>2</sup>).
- Iyer, K. Bharatha*: Kathakali. Lond. 1956.
- Jacobsen, J. P.*: Heros og Helgen. Kbh. 1913.  
– Manes. 1–3. Kbh. 1914–20.  
– Afhandlingler og Artikler. Kbh. 1919.
- Jacobsen, Helmuth*: Die dogmatische Stellung des Königs in der Theologie der alten Ägypter. Glückst./Hamb./N. Y. 1939.
- Jahn, Ulrich*: Die Deutschen Opfergebräuche bei Ackerbau und Viehzucht. Breslau 1884.
- James, E. O.*: Primitive Ritual and Belief. An anthropological essay. Lond. 1917.  
– Origins of Sacrifice. Lond. 1933.
- Jastrow, Morris*: The Study of Religion. Lond. 1901.  
– Die Religion Babyioniens und Assyriens. I–II<sub>1-2</sub>. Giessen 1905–12.
- Jensen, A. E.*: Mythos und Kult bei Naturvölkern. Wiesbaden 1951.
- Jeremias, Alfred*: Allgemeine Religions-Geschichte. Münch. 1918.
- Jessen, E.*: Oversigt over religiøse Illusioners Historie. Kbh. 1904.
- Jevons, Frank Byron*: An Introduction to the History of Religion. Lond. (1896) 1904<sup>3</sup>.
- Johansen, J. Prytz*: The Maori and His Religion in its non-ritualistic aspects. Kbh. 1954.
- Kalbi, Hishām Ibn-al-*: Kitāb al-Aṣnām, ... (transl. by Nabih Amin Faris: The Book of Idols.) Princ. 1952.
- Karsten, Rafael*: Inledning till religionsvetenskapen. Sth. 1928.  
– The Origins of Religion. (tr.) Lond. 1935.
- Kat Angelino, P. de und Tyra de Kleen*: Mudras auf Bali. Darmst. 1923.
- Keith, Arthur Berriedale* (tr.): Taittiriya Sanhita. 1–2. Cambr. (Mass.) 1914.
- Kennard, Edward A.*: Hopi Kachinas. N. Y. 1938.
- King, John H.*: The Supernatural: Its Origin, Nature, and Evolution. 1–2. Lond./N. Y. 1892.
- King, Winston L.*: Introduction to Religion. N. Y. 1954.
- Kleen, Tyra de*, see *Kat Angelino, P. de*.
- Klingbeil, Waldemar*: Kopf-, Masken- und Maskierungszauber. Berl. 1935.
- Kluckhohn, Clyde*: Myths and Rituals: A General Theory. (*Harvard Theological Review*, Vol. 35, pp. 45–79.) Cambr. (Mass.) 1942.



- Knudtzon, Jørgens Alexander*: Die El-Amarna-Tafeln. 1–2. (Vorderasiatische Bibliothek II,1-2.) Lpz. 1915.
- Kock, Gösta*: Die evolutionistische Manatheorie und ihre Kritik. (*Ethnos*, XVI, pp. 83–92.) Sth. 1951.
- La Flesche, Francis*: War Ceremony and Peace Ceremony of the Osage Indians. (BAE-Bull. 101.) Wash. 1939.
- see *Fletcher, Alice C.*
- Lang, Andrew*: The Making of Religion. Lond. 1898.
- Langdon, S.*: Babylonian Penitential Psalms . . . . (Oxford Editions of Cuneiform Texts, VI.) Paris 1927.
- Lange, H. O.*: Ein liturgisches Lied an Min. (*Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, Phil.-Hist. Kl., 1927, pp. 331–38.) Berl. 1927.
- Leeuw, G. van der*: Phänomenologie der Religion. Tüb. 1933 (1955<sup>2</sup>).
- Lehmann, Edv.*: Religionerne. Kbh. 1920.
- (ed.): Illustreret Religionshistorie. Kbh. 1924.
- Religionens värld. Sth. 1926.
- Lehmann, Friedr. Rudolf*: Mana. Eine begriffsgeschichtliche Untersuchung auf ethnologischer Grundlage. Lpz. 1915.
- Mana. Der Begriff des „ausserordentlich wirkungsvollen“ bei Südseevölkern. (2. völlig umgearb. u. erweit. Ausg.) Lpz. 1922.
- Die polynesischen Tabusitten. Eine ethno-sociologische und religionswissenschaftliche Untersuchung. Lpz. 1930.
- Die gegenwärtige Lage der Mana-Forschung. (Kultur und Rasse. Otto Reche zum 60. Geburtstag. Hrsg. v. M. Hesch u. G. Spannaus, pp. 375–85.) Münch./Berl. 1939.
- Lepsius, C. R.*: Denkmäler aus Ägypten und Äthiopien . . . , I–XII. Berl. 1849–59.
- Lévy-Bruhl, L.*: Les fonctions mentales dans les Sociétés Inférieures. Paris 1910.
- How Natives Think. [= 1910] (tr.) Lond. 1926.
- Le surnaturel et la nature dans la mentalité primitive. Paris 1931.
- La mythologie primitive. Le monde mythique des Australiens et des Papous. Paris 1935.
- Primitives and the Supernatural. [= 1931] (tr.) Lond. 1936.
- Lieblein, J.*: Gammelægyptisk religion. 1–3. Krist. 1883–85.
- Logren, Ernst*: I religionsforskningens förgård. Sth. 1930.
- Loisy, Alfred*: Essai historique sur Le Sacrifice. Paris 1920.
- L'Orange, H. P.*: Fra antikk til middelalder: fra legeme til symbol. Oslo (1943).
- Keiseren på himmeltronen. Oslo 1949.
- Studies on the Iconography of Cosmic Kingship in the Ancient World. [= 1949] (tr.) Oslo/Lond. 1953.
- Lowie, Robert H.*: Primitive Religion. N. Y. (1924) 1948.
- An Introduction to Cultural Anthropology. N. Y. 1934.
- The History of Ethnological Theory. N. Y. 1937.
- Reminiscences of Anthropological Currents in America Half a Century Ago. (*American Anthropologist*, Vol. 58, pp. 995–1016.) 1956.
- Lyall, Alfred C.*: Asiatic Studies, Religious and Social. 1–2. Lond. (1882) 1899<sup>2</sup>.
- McClintock, Walter*: The Old North Trail. Lond. 1910.
- Malinowski, Bronislaw*: Argonauts of the Western Pacific. Lond. (1922) 1950<sup>3</sup>.
- Myth in Primitive Psychology. [Reprinted in “Magic, Science and Religion”, 1948 and 1954.] Lond./N. Y. 1926.
- Foundations of Faith and Morals; . . . (Riddell Memorial Lectures, 7th Series.) 1936.
- [*Maning, Frederick Edward*]: Old New Zealand. . . . By A Pakeha Maori. (1863) (1876<sup>2</sup>.) Lond. 1887.
- Rejse til en gammel verden. (tr.) Kbh. 1953.
- Mannhardt, Wilhelm*: Wald- und Feldkulte. 1–2. Berl. (1875–77) 1904–05<sup>2</sup>.
- Mythologische Forschungen . . . Strassb. 1884.

- Marett, R. R.*: The Conception of Mana. (Transactions of the Third International Congress for the History of Religions, I, pp. 46–57. Oxf. 1908.
- The Treshold of Religion. [Pre-Animistic Religion (1900), From Spell to Prayer (1904), Is Taboo a Negative Magic (1907), The Conception of Mana (1908), A Sociological View of Comparative Religion (1908)] Lond. 1909.
  - The Taboo-mana Formula as a Minimum Definition of Religion. (*Archiv für Religionswissenschaft*, 12, pp. 186–94.) Lpz. 1909 (b).
- Mathews, Washington*: The Night Chant, a Navaho Ceremony. N. Y. 1902.
- Mauss, Marcel*, see *Hubert, Henri*.
- Meinhof, Carl*: Die Religionen der Afrikaner in ihrem Zusammenhang mit dem Wirtschaftsleben. Oslo 1926.
- Mensching, G.*: Das heilige Wort. Eine religionsphänomenologische Untersuchung. Bonn 1937.
- Mercer, Samuel A. B.*: The Tell el-Amarna tablets. 1–2. Toronto 1939.
- Mickletham, Nathaniel*: Religion. Lond. 1948.
- Monier-Williams, Monier*: Brāhmanism and Hinduism; . . . Lond. 1891<sup>4</sup>.
- Morgan, Kenneth W.* (ed.): The Religion of the Hindus. N. Y. 1953.
- Mortier, Raoul*, see *Gorce, Maxime*.
- Müller, F. Max*: Chips from a German Workshop. 1–4. Lond. 1867–75.
- Lectures on the Origin and Growth of Religion as illustrated by the Religions of India. Lond. 1878<sup>2</sup>.
- Murphy, John*: The Origins and History of Religions. Manch. (1949) 1952<sup>2</sup>.
- Nelson, Harold Hayden* (ed): Reliefs and Inscriptions at Karnak. 1–2. (Oriental Inst. Publ., Vols. 25 and 35.) Chic. 1936.
- (ed.): Festival Scenes of Ramses III. (Medinet Habu. IV) (Orient. Inst. Publ., Vol. 51.) Chic. 1940.
- Nettl, Bruno*: Observations on Meaningless Peyote Song Texts. (*Journ. of Amer. Folklore*, 66, pp. 161–64.) Philad. 1953.
- Text-Music Relationships in Arapaho Songs. (*Southwestern Journ. of Anthropology*, X, pp. 192–99.) Albuquerque 1954.
  - Music in Primitive Culture. Cambr. (Mass.) 1956.
- Niessen, Carl*: Handbuch der Theater-Wissenschaft. I,2: Ursprung des asiatischen und griechischen Dramas aus dem Toten- und Ahnenkult. Emsdetten 1953.
- Nilsson, Martin P:n*: Primitiv Religion. Kbh. 1912.
- Cults, Myths, Oracles, and Politics in Ancient Greece. Lund 1951.
- Noss, John B.*: Man's Religions. N. Y. 1949.
- Notes and Queries on Anthropology*. Lond. 1951<sup>6</sup>.
- Numelin, Ragnar*: Fältforskare och kammarlärde. Sth. 1947.
- Nyström, Samuel*: Beduintentum und Jahwismus. Lund 1946.
- Oesterley, W. O. E.*: The Sacred Dance. A study in comparative folklore. Cambr. 1923.
- Oldenberg, Hermann*: Die Religion des Veda. Stuttg./Berl. (1894) 1923<sup>4</sup>.
- Vedaforschung. Stuttg./Berl. 1905.
- Orelli, Conrad von*: Allgemeine Religionsgeschichte. Bonn 1899 (1911–13<sup>2</sup>).
- Pallis, Svend Aage*: The Babylonian Akitu Festival. Kbh. 1926.
- Religionsvidenskab. (Frithiof Brandt og Kaj Linderstrøm-Lang (ed.s): Videnskaben i Dag, pp. 403–18.) Kbh. 1944.
- Pedersen, Jobs.*: Israel. 1–4. Kbh. 1920–34.
- Israel. Its Life and Culture. I–II. (tr.) Kbh. 1926–40.
  - (ed.): Illustreret Religionshistorie. Kbh. 1948.
- Penniman, T. K.*: A Hundred Years of Anthropology. Lond. (1935) 1952<sup>2</sup>.
- Perry, W. J.*: The Origin of Magic and Religion. . . . Lond. 1923.
- Pfister, Friedrich*: Der Reliquienkult im Altertum. (1–2). Giessen 1909–12.
- Pickard-Cambridge, Arthur*: The Dramatic Festivals of Athens. Oxf. 1953.

- Piddington, Ralph*: An Introduction to Social Anthropology. I. Lond. 1950.
- Pinard de la Boullaye, H.*: L'Étude comparée des religions. I-II. Paris 1929<sup>5</sup>.
- Prampolini, Giacomo*: La Mitologia nella Vita dei Popoli. I-II. Milano 1937.
- Preller, L.*: Römische Mythologie. 1-2. Berl. 1881-83<sup>3</sup>.
- Preuss, K. Th.*: Der religiöse Gehalt der Mythen. Tüb. 1933.
- Pritchard, James B.*: Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament. Princ. 1950.
- Radcliffe-Brown, A. R.*: Structure and Function in Primitive Society. Glencoe (Ill.) 1952.
- Radin, Paul*: Primitive Religion. Its Nature and Origin. N. Y. 1937.
- Rawlinson, H. C.*: The Cuneiform Inscriptions of Western Asia. I-V. Lond. 1861-84.
- Reichard, Gladys A.*: Prayer: The Compulsive Word. N. Y. 1944.
- Reinach, Salomon*: Orpheus. Histoire générale des religions. Paris 1909.
- Orpheus. (tr.) Lond. 1931.
- Reuterskiöld, Edgar*: Die Entstehung der Speisesakramente. (Sth. 1908) (tr.) Heidelb. 1912.
- Ridgeway, William*: The Dramas and Dramatic Dances of Non-European Races ...  
Cambr. 1915.
- Riley, Olive L.*: Masks and Magic. N. Y. 1955.
- Ringgren, Helmer – Åke V. Ström*: Religionerna i historia och nutid. Sth. 1957.
- Rivers, W. H. R.*: Medicine, Magic, and Religion. Lond. 1924.
- Rostrup, Egill*: Den attiske tragoidia i theaterhistorisk belysning. Kbh. 1921.
- Attic tragedy in the light of theatrical history. (tr.) Kbh. 1923.
- Rouse, William Henry Denham*: Greek Votive Offerings. Cambr. 1902.
- Rumpf, A.*: Die Religion der Griechen. (= Haas, Bilderatlas ... 13/14) Lpz. 1928.
- Schlesier, Erhardt*: Die Erscheinungsformen des Männerhauses und das Klubwesen in Mikronesien ... 's Grävnhage 1953.
- Schrader, Eberhard*: Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament. Berl. (1872) 1903<sup>3</sup>.
- Schürer, Emil*: Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi. 1-3. Lpz. 1901-09<sup>4</sup>.
- Schütte, Gudmund*: Gudedræbning i nordisk Offerskik. (*Tilskueren* 1916, pp. 319-36.)  
Kbh. 1916.
- Schur, Israel*: Versöhnungstag und Sündenbock. Helsf. (1933).
- Jüdische Erntebräuche im Altertum. Helsf. (1933).
- Schurtz, Heinrich*: Altersklassen und Männerbünde. Berl. 1902.
- Schwenn, Friedrich*: Die Menschenopfer bei den Griechen und Römern. Giessen 1915.
- Segerstedt, Torgny*: Till frågan om polyteismens uppkomst. Sth. 1903.
- Ekguden i Dodona. (Univ. Årsskr., N. F., Afd. 1, Bd. 1, Nr. 1) Lund 1906.
- Smith, G. Elliot and Warren R. Dawson*: Egyptian Mummies. Lond. 1924.
- Smith, W. Robertson*: Lectures on the Religion of the Semites. Edinb. 1889, (1927<sup>3</sup>).
- Soden, W. von*, see *Falkenstein, A.*
- Soltau, Wilhelm*: Das Fortleben des Heidentums in der altchristlichen Kirche. Berl. 1906.
- Spencer, Baldwin*: Native Tribes of the Northern Territory of Australia. Lond. 1914.
- and *F. J. Gillen*: The Native Tribes of Central Australia. Lond. 1899.
- Spies, Walter*, see *Zoete, Beryl de.*
- Steiner, Franz*: Taboo. Lond. 1956.
- Stengel, Paul*: Die griechischen Kultusaltertümer. Münch. 1898.<sup>2</sup>
- Opferbräuche der Griechen. Lpz./Berl. 1910.
- Strehlow, Carl*: Die Aranda- und Loritja-Stämme in Zentral-Australien. I-V.  
Fr. a. M. 1907-20.
- Strehlow, T. G. H.*: Aranda Traditions. Melb. 1947.
- Ström, Folke*: On the Sacral Origin of the German Death Penalties. Sth. 1942.
- Ström, Åke V.*, see *Ringgren, Helmer.*
- Sydow, Eckart von*: Die Kunst der Naturvölker und der Vorzeit. Berl. 1938<sup>4</sup>.
- Söderblom, Nathan*: Gudstroens uppkomst. Sth. 1914.
- Das Werden des Gottesglaubens; Untersuchungen über die Anfänge der Religion. (tr.)  
Lpz. 1916.
- Gudstroens Oprindelse. (tr.) Kbh. 1921.

- Söderblom, Nathan* (ed.): Främmande religionsurkunder. I–III. Sth. 1908.  
 – (ed.): Tiele-Söderbloms Kompendium der Religionsgeschichte. Berl. 1931.
- Tallqvist, Knut*: Madonnas förhistoria. Helsingfors. 1920.  
 – (tr.): Babyloniska hymner och böner. Helsingfors. 1953.
- Thomas, P.*: Hindu Religion Customs and Manners. Bombay (w. y.).
- Thompson, Stith*: The Types of the Folk-tale. . . . (FFC 74) Helsingfors. 1928.  
 – Motif-Index of Folk Literature. I– Kbh. 1955–
- Thomsen, Anton*: Religion og Religionsvidenskab. Kbh. 1911.
- Thurston, Edgar*: Omens and Superstitions of Southern India. Lond. 1912.
- Tiele, C. P.*: Einleitung in die Religionswissenschaft. 1–2. Gotha 1899–1901.  
 – see *Söderblom, Nathan*.
- Toy, Crawford Howell*: Introduction to the History of Religions. Boston 1913.
- Tregear, Edward*: The Maori Race. Wanganui, N. Z. (1904) 1926.
- Tresp, Alois*: Die Fragmente der griechischen Kultschriftsteller. Giessen 1914.
- Tylor, Edward B.*: Primitive Culture. 1–2. Lond. (1871) 1903<sup>4</sup>.
- Ungnad, Arthur* (tr.): Die Religion der Babylonier und Assyrer. Jena 1921.
- Usener, Hermann*: Götternamen. Bonn 1896.
- Uttinger, Rudolf*: Masken. Berl. (w. y.).
- Venkatachalam, G.*: Dance in India. Bombay (w. y.).
- Vold, Karl*: Den babylonisk-assyriske religion. Oslo 1925.
- Wach, Joachim*: Sociology of Religion. Lond. 1947.
- Wallis, Wilson D.*: Religion in Primitive Society. N. Y. 1939.
- Ward, W.*: A View of the History, Literature, and Mythology, of the Hindoos: . . . 1–2. Serampore 1815–18<sup>2</sup>.
- Waterhouse, Eric S.*: The Dawn of Religion. Lond. (1936) 1948.
- Weber, Otto*: Die Literatur der Babylonier und Assyrer. Lpz. 1907.
- Webster, Hutton*: Primitive Secret Societies. N. Y. 1908.  
 – Taboo. A sociological study. N. Y. 1942.  
 – Magic. A sociological study. Stanf./Lond. 1948.
- Wellhausen, J.*: Reste arabischen Heidentums. Berl. (1887) 1897<sup>2</sup>.
- Widengren, Geo*: Religionens värld. Sth. 1945 (a).  
 – Evolutionism and the Problem of the Origin of Religion. (*Ethnos*, X, pp. 57–96.) Sth. 1945 (b).
- Wilkins, W. J.*: Modern Hinduism. Lond. 1887.
- Wilkinson, J. Gardner*: A Second Series of the Manners and Customs of the Ancient Egyptians, . . . I–II + Suppl. Lond. 1841.
- Williams, F. E.*: Papuans of the Trans-Fly. Oxf. 1936.
- Winckler, Hugo*: Die Thontafeln von Tell-el-Amarna. (Keilinschr. Bibl., V.) Berl. 1896.
- Winstedt, R. O.*: Shaman Saiva and Sufi. Lond. 1925 (1951<sup>2</sup>).
- Wirz, Paul*: Der Totenkult auf Bali. Stuttg. 1928.
- Wissler, Clark*: Masks. N. Y. 1938.
- Wissowa, Georg*: Religion und Kultus der Römer. Münch. 1902.
- Wulff, Max von*: Über Heilige und Heiligenverehrung in den ersten christlichen Jahrhunderten. Lpz. 1910.
- Yerkes, Royden Keith*: Sacrifice in Greek and Roman Religions and Early Judaism. Lond. 1953.
- Zimmern, Heinrich*: Babylonische Busspsalmen. (Assyr. Bibl., hrsgg. v. Delitzsch und Haupt, VI.) Lpz. 1885.  
 – Beiträge zur Kenntnis der babylonischen Religion. . . . (Assyr. Bibl., hrsgg. v. Delitzsch u. Haupt, XII.) Lpz. 1896–1901.  
 – Babylonische Hymnen und Gebete in Auswahl. (AO VII, 3.) Lpz. 1905.
- Zoete, Beryl de*: The Other Mind. A study of Dance and Life in South India. Lond. 1953.  
 – Dance and Magic Drama in Ceylon. Lond. 1957.  
 – and *Walter Spiess*: Dance and Drama in Bali. Lond. 1938 (1952<sup>2</sup>).

## PART II.

References cited, and some background reading, for the Mexican field.  
*Chronologically* under each sub-heading.

### Grammars.

- Olmos, Andrés de*: Arte para aprender La Lengva Mexicana. (*Anales del Museo Nacional de Mexico*. Gramaticas de la Lengua Mexicana. I. (1885-92), pp. 1-125.) (1547) Mex. 1885.
- (*Olmos, André de*): Grammaire de La Langue Nahuatl ou Mexicaine, . . . publiée avec notes, éclaircissements, etc. par Rémi Siméon. (1547) Paris 1875.
- Molina, Alonso de*: Arte de La Lengua Mexicana y Castellana, . . . (*Anales del Mus. Nac. de Mex.*, IV, 1, pp. 129-223.) (1571) (1576<sup>2</sup>) Mex. 1886.
- Arte de la Lengua Mexicana y Castellana, . . . (1571) (facs.) Madr. 1945.
- Rincon, Antonio del*: Arte Mexicana. (ed. Antonio Peñafiel 1885). (*Anales del Mus. Nac. de Mex.*, IV, 3, pp. 227-80.) (1595) Méx. 1888.
- Guzmán, Diego de Galdo*: Arte Mexicano. (*Anales del Mus. Nac. de Mex.*, IV, 7, pp. 283-394.) (1642) Méx. 1890.
- Carochi, Horacio*: Arte de La Lengva Mexicana, . . . (ed. Ignacio de Paredes 1759). (*Anales del Mus. Nac. de Mex.*, IV, 8, pp. 397-536.) (1645) Méx. 1892.
- Torres, Macario*: Estudios Gramaticales sobre el "Nahuatl". Leon 1887.
- Grasserie, Raoul de la*: Le Nahuatl. . . (Bibl. Ling. Amér., XXV.) Paris 1903.
- Ramírez, José Fernando*: Estudio sobre las partículas nahuas. (*Anales del Mus. Nac. de Mex.*, VII, pp. 195-208, 336-52, 390-400, 417-24, 462-519.) Méx. 1903.
- Cárdenas, Juan Luna*: Compendio de Gramatica Nahuatl. Mex. 1939<sup>2</sup>.
- Garibay, Angel María*: Llave del Náhuatl. Otumba 1940.
- Whorf, Benjamin Lee*: The Milpa Alta Dialect of Aztec. With Notes on the Classical and the Tezoztlán Dialects. (Viking Fund Publ.s in Anthr., 6, Harry Hoijer (and others): Linguistic Structures of Native America, pp. 367-97.) N. Y. 1946.
- Schoembs, Jakob*: Aztekische Schriftsprache. Heidelb. 1949.
- Mengin, Ernst*: Mexicansk Grammatik. (MS.) (Kbh. 1949).

### Dictionaries.

- Molina, Alonso de*: Vocabulario en Lengva Castellana y Mexicana. Vocabulario en Lengva Mexicana y Castellana (Mex. 1571) (facs.) Madr. 1944.
- Biondelli, Bernardini*: Glossarium Azteco-Latinum et Latino-Aztecum. Mediolani 1869.
- Siméon, Rémi*: Dictionnaire de la Langue Nahuatl ou Mexicaine. Paris 1885.

### Nahuatl generally, etc.

- Buschmann, Job. Carl Ed.*: Die Spuren der aztekischen Sprache im nördlichen Mexico und höheren amerikanischen Norden. . . (Abhandlungen der Kgl. Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin. Aus dem Jahre 1854. Zweiter Supplement-Band.) Berl. 1859.
- Orozco y Berra, Manuel*: Geografía de las lenguas y Carta Etnográfica de México precedidas de un ensayo de clasificación de las mismas lenguas y de apuntes para las inmigraciones de las tribus. Méx. 1864.
- Pimentel, Francisco*: Cuadro descriptivo y comparativo de las Lenguas Indígenas de México, . . . 1-3. Méx. 1874-75<sup>2</sup>.
- Müller, Friedrich*: Grundriss der Sprachwissenschaft. II. Band, I. Abtheilung (2), pp. 181-439. (C. Die Sprachen der amerikanischen Rasse.) Wien 1882.
- Powell, J. W.*: Indian linguistic families of America north of Mexico. (BAE-AR 7 (1885-86), pp. 1-142.) Wash. 1891.

- Thomas, Cyrus*: Numeral systems of Mexico and Central America. (BAE-AR 19 (1897–98) Part 2, pp. 853–955.) Wash. 1900.
- León, Nicolás*: Familias lingüísticas de México. (*Anales del Mus. Nac. de Méx.*, VII, pp. 279–335.) Méx. 1903.
- Thomas, Cyrus and John R. Swanton*: Indian Languages of Mexico and Central America and Their Geographical Distribution. (BAE-Bull. 44.) Wash. 1911.
- Lehmann, Walter*: Zentral-Amerika. Teil I. Die Sprachen Zentral-Amerikas in ihren Beziehungen zueinander sowie zu Süd-Amerika und Mexico. (In zwei Bänden.) Berl. 1920.
- Kroeber, A. L.*: Uto-Aztec Languages of Mexico. (Univ. of Calif., Ibero-Americana 8.) Berkeley 1934.
- Whorf, Benjamin Lee*: The Comparative Linguistics of Uto-Aztec. (*Amer. Anthr.*, n.s., 37, pp. 600–08.) 1935.

Texts, quoted or cited.

*Sahagún*.<sup>1</sup>

- Sahagún, Bernardino de*: Historia general de las cosas de Nueva España. I–IV. (ed. *Carlos María de Bustamante*.) Méx. 1829–30.
- Historia general de las cosas de Nueva España. (ed. *Kingsborough*: Antiquities of Mexico, VII.) Lond. 1831.
  - Histoire générale des Choses de la Nouvelle-Espagne. Traduite et annotée par *D. Jourdanet* et par *Rémi Siméon*. Paris 1880.
  - *Brinton, Daniel G.*: Rig Veda Americanus. Sacred Songs of the Ancient Mexicans, with a Gloss in Nahuatl. Edited, with a Paraphrase, Notes and Vocabulary, ... (Brinton's Library of Aboriginal American Literature. Number VIII.) Philad. 1890.
  - *Seler, Eduard*: Altmexikanische Studien II. 1. ... 2. ... 3. Die achtzehn Jahresfeste der Mexikaner (Erste Hälfte). (Veröff. aus dem Königl. Mus. f. Völk., VI, 2-4, pp. 67–224.) Berl. 1899.
  - *Seler, Eduard*: Die religiösen Gesänge der alten Mexikaner. (Ges. Abh. 1902–23, II, pp. 961–1107.) Berl. 1904.
  - Historia general de las cosas de Nueva España, Edición parcial en facsímile de los códices Matritenses en lengua Mexicana que se custodian en las bibliotecas del Palacio Real y de la Real Academia de la historia. (ed. *Francisco del Paso y Troncoso*.) 4 vols. (Vol. 5, 6, 2-3, 7, 8.) [Vol. 5 printed in Florence.] (facs.) Madrid 1905–07.
  - *Seler, Eduard*: Einige Kapitel aus dem Geschichtswerk des Fray Bernardino de Sahagun aus dem Aztekischen übersetzt ... Stuttg. 1927.
  - Historia general de las cosas de Nueva España. 1–5. (ed. *Robredo*.) Méx. 1938.
  - Historia general de las cosas de Nueva España. 1–3. (ed. *Saignes*.) Méx. 1946.
  - *Schulze Jena, Leonhard*: Wahrsagerei, Himmelskunde und Kalender der alten Azteken. Aus dem aztekischen Urtext Bernardino de Sahaguns übersetzt und erläutert. Stuttg. 1950.
  - *Schulze Jena, Leonhard*: Gliederung des Alt-Aztekischen Volks in Familie, Stand und Beruf aus dem aztekischen Urtext Bernardino de Sahaguns. Stuttg. 1952.
  - *Anderson, Arthur J. O.* and *Charles E. Dibble*: Florentine Codex. II ff. Santa Fé (N. M.) 1950 ff.

On *Sahagún*, etc.

*Weber, Friedrich*: Beiträge zur Charakteristik der älteren Geschichtsschreiber über Spanish-Amerika. Lpz. 1911.

*Radin, Paul*: The Sources and Authenticity of the History of the Ancient Mexicans. (Univ. of Calif. Publ.s in Amer. Arch. and Ethnol., Vol. 17, 1, pp. 1–150.) Berkeley 1920.

<sup>1</sup> On the system of quotation see above, p. 74 ff.

- Jiménez Moreno, Wigberto*: Fr. Bernardino de Sahagún y su obra. (*Sab. Hist.*, ed. Robredo, I, pp. XIII–LXXXIV.) Méx. 1938.
- Garibay, Angel María*: Paralipómenos de Sahagún. (*Tlalocan*, I, p. 307 ff.) Berkeley 1943.
- Anderson, Arthur J. O.*: The Earliest Americanists. (*El Palacio*, 52, pp. 83–97.) Santa Fé (N. M.) 1945.
- The Earliest Literate Indians of Mexico. (*El Palacio*, 53, pp. 143–51.) Santa Fé (N. M.) 1946.
- Saignes, Miguel Acosta*: Noticia preliminar. (*Sab. Hist.*, ed. Saignes, I, pp. I–X). Guía para estudiar a Sahagún (*op. cit.*, III, pp. 91–197.) Méx. 1946.
- d'Olwer, Luis Nicolau*: Fray Bernardino de Sahagún, 1499–1590. Méx. 1952.
- Garibay, Angel María*: Fr. Bernardino de Sahagún, Relación de los textos que no aprovechó en su obra. (Aportaciones a la Investigación Folklórica, n° 2.) Méx. 1953.
- Historia de la Literatura Nahuatl. 1–2. Méx. 1953–54.

*Other texts.*

- Peñafiel, Antonio* (ed.): Cantares en idioma Mexicano. (facs.) Méx. 1905.
- Lehmann, Walter*: Die Geschichte der Königreiche von Colhuacan und Mexico. Stuttg./Berl. 1938.
- Mengin, Ernst* (ed.): Corpus codicum americanorum medii ævi. [I ff., 1942 ff.] III,1-3: "Diferentes historias originales de los reynos de Culhuacan, y Mexico, y de otras provincias." (facs.) Havniæ 1949–52.
- Diferentes Historias Originales de los Reynos de Culhuacan, y Mexico, y de otras provincias . . . Chimalpân . . . 5. Relacion. (Mitteilungen aus dem Museum für Völkerkunde in Hamburg. XXII.) Hamb. 1950.
- Schultze Jena, Leonbard*: Alt-aztekische Gesänge nach einer in der Biblioteca Nacional von Mexiko aufbewahrten Handschrift. Übers. und erläutert von Leonhard Schultze Jena. Hrsg. von Gerdt Kutscher. Stuttg. 1957.

Archæology, etc.

FOR INTRODUCTION:

- Kutscher, Gerdt*: Bibliography. Mexican Codices (Facsimiles and Commentaries). (in *Cottie A. Burland*: The Selden Roll. (Monumenta Americana II), pp. 44–51.) Berl. 1955.
- Vázquez de Espinosa, Antonio*: Compendium and Description of the West Indies. Transl. by Charles Upson Clark. (Smithsonian Miscellaneous Collections. Vol. 102.) Wash. 1942.
- Linné, S.*: El Valle y la Ciudad de Mexico en 1550. (Statens Etnografiska Museum, n. s., Publ. No. 9.) Sth. 1948.
- Hernandez, Francisco*: Historia de las Plantas de Nueva España. 1–3. (Mex. 1615.) Mex. 1942–46.
- Maldonado Koerdell, Manuel*: La Botánica Azteca. (*Boletín Bibliográfico de Antropología Americana*, 6, pp. 62–74.) Méx. 1942.
- Goldman, Edward Alphonso*: Biological Investigations in Mexico. (Smiths. Misc. Coll., Vol. 115.) Wash. 1951.
- Lehmann, Walter*: Methods and Results in Mexican Research. Paris 1909. (tr. = *Archiv für Anthropologie*, VI, pp. 113–68, Braunschweig 1907).
- Spence, Lewis*: The Civilization of Ancient Mexico. Lond. 1911.
- Joyce, Thomas Athol*: Mexican Archaeology. Lond. 1914.
- Central American and West Indies Archaeology. Lond. 1916.
- Holmes, W. H.*: Handbook of Aboriginal American Antiquities. Part I. Introductory. The Lithic Industries. (BAE-Bull. 60.) Wash. 1919.
- Eriksson, J. V.*: Montezumas Mexiko. En indiansk storstad. (*Ymer*, 39, pp. 4–33.) Sth. 1919.
- Lehmann, Walter*: Altmexikanische Kunstgeschichte. Ein Entwurf in Umrissen. (Orbis Pictus, Bd. 8.) Berl. 1922.

- Thord-Gray, I.*: Från Mexicos forntid. Sth. 1923.
- Gamio, Manuel*, The Sequence of Cultures in Mexico. (*Amer. Anthr.*, n. s. Vol. 26, pp. 307–22.) Menasha 1924.
- Nuttall, Zelia*: The Aztecs and their Predecessors in the Valley of Mexico. (*Amer. Philos. Soc., Proc.*, Vol. 65, pp. 242–55.) Philad. 1926.
- Joyce, Thomas Athol*: Maya and Mexican Art. Lond. 1927.
- Lehmann, W.*: Aus den Pyramidenstädten in Alt-Mexico. Berl. 1933.
- Thompson, J. Eric S.*: Mexico before Cortes. N. Y./Lond. 1933.
- Staub, Walter*: Zur Übereinanderschichtung der Völker und Kulturen an der Ostküste von Mexico. (*Mitt. der Geogr.-Ethn. Ges. in Zürich*, Bd. 33, pp. 3–26.) Zürich 1933.
- Linné, S.*: Archaeological Researches at Teotihuacan, Mexico. (*The Ethn. Mus. of Sweden*, n. s., Publ. No. 1.) Sth. 1934.
- Wegner, Richard N.*: Indianer-Rassen und vergangene Kulturen. Stuttg. 1934.
- Montell, Gösta*: Mexikanskt. Indianliv i forntid och nutid. Sth. 1936.
- Danzel, Theodor-Wilhelm*: Handbuch der präkolumbischen Kulturen in Lateinamerika. (1936?) Hamb. (w. y.).
- Zingg, Robert Mowry*: A Reconstruction of Uto-Aztekan History. Chic. 1937.
- Vaillant, George C.*: A Correlation of Archaeological and Historical Sequences in the Valley of Mexico. (*Amer. Anthr.*, n. s., Vol. 40, pp. 535–73.) Menasha 1938.
- Linné, S.*: Zapotecan Antiquities ... (*The Ethn. Mus. of Sweden*, n. s., Publ. No. 4.) Sth. 1938.
- Gallop, Rodney*: Mexican Mosaic. Lond. 1939.
- Twenty Centuries of Mexican Art. (*The Museum of Modern Art*) N. Y. 1940.
- Linné, S.*: Mexican Highland Cultures. Sth. 1942.
- Spinden, Herbert J.*: Ancient Civilizations of Mexico and Central America. (*Amer. Mus. of Natural History. Handbook Series No. 3.*) N. Y. 1943<sup>3</sup>.
- Vaillant, George C.*: Artists and Craftsmen in Ancient Central America. (*Amer. Mus. of Natural History. Science Guide No. 88.*) N. Y. 1945.
- Kelemen, Pál*: Medieval American Art. I–II. N. Y. 1946, 1957<sup>2</sup>.
- Steward, Julian H.* (ed.): Handbook of South American Indians. Vol. 4. The Circum-Caribbean Tribes. (*BAE-Bull.* 143.) Wash. 1948.
- Burland, C. A.*: Art and Life in Ancient Mexico. Oxf. 1948.
- Linné, S.*: El Valle y la Ciudad de Mexico en 1550. (*Statens Etnografiska Museum*, n. s., Publ. No. 9.) Sth. 1948.
- Vaillant, George C.*: Aztecs of Mexico. (1944) N. Y. 1950.
- The Aztecs of Mexico. With a Postscript by C. A. Burland. (Penguin) Harm. 1950.
- Tax, Sol* (ed.): The Civilizations of Ancient America. (Selected Papers of the 29th International Congress of Americanists.) Chic. 1951.
- Marquina, Ignazio*: Arquitectura Prehispánica. Méx. 1951.
- Gibson, Charles*: Tlaxcala in the Sixteenth Century. N. Haven 1952.
- Art Mexicain du précolombien a nos jours. I. (Musée National d'Art Moderne.) Paris 1952.
- Disselhoff, Hans Dietrich*: Geschichte der altamerikanischen Kulturen. Münch. 1953.
- Feuchtwanger, Franz*: Kunst im alten Mexiko. Zürich 1953.
- Rivet, Paul*: Mexique précolombien. Paris 1954.
- Soustelle, Jacques*: La Vie Quotidienne des Aztèques. Paris 1955.
- So lebten die Azteken am Vorabend der spanischen Eroberung. (tr.) Stuttgart. 1956.
- Linné, Sigvald*: Treasures of Mexican Art. Sth. 1956.
- Krickeberg, Walter*: Altmexikanische Kulturen. Berl. 1956.
- Lothrop, S. K.* (et al.): Pre-Columbian Art. The Robert Woods Bliss Collection. N. Y. 1957.
- Spinden, Herbert Joseph*: Maya Art and Civilization. (1913 + 1928). Indian Hills 1957.



## Religion.

- Müller, I. G.: Der Mexikanische Nationalgott Huitzilopochtli. Basel 1847.  
– Geschichte der Amerikanischen Urreligionen. Basel 1855. (Berl. 1867<sup>2</sup>).
- Brinton, Daniel Garrison: American Hero Myths. Philad. 1882.
- Réville, Albert: Origin and Growth of Religion as Illustrated by the Native Religions of Mexico and Peru. Lond. 1884.  
– Les Religions du Mexique, de l'Amérique Centrale et du Pérou. Paris 1885.
- Brinton, Daniel Garrison: The Myths of the New World. (1868.) Philad. 1896<sup>3</sup>.
- Seler, Eduard: Altmexikanische Studien II. 1. Zauberei und Zauberer im alten Mexico. 2. Die bildlichen Darstellungen der mexikanischen Jahresfeste. 3. ... (Veröff. aus dem Königl. Mus. f. Völk., VI, 2-4, pp. 27-66.) Berl. 1899.
- Haebler, Konrad: Die Religion des mittleren Amerika. Münster 1899.
- Seler, Eduard: Gesammelte Abhandlungen zur Amerikanischen Sprach- und Alterthumskunde. I-V. Berl. 1902-23.
- Ramírez, José Fernando: Apuntes de la Cronología de Sahagún. (*Anales del Mus. Nac. de Méx.*, VII, pp. 137-66, cf. pp. 167-94, Cronología de Boturini.) Méx. 1903.
- Preuss, K. Tb.: Die Feuergötter als Ausgangspunkt zum Verständnis der mexikanischen Religion in ihrem Zusammenhange. (*Mitt. der Anthropol. Ges. in Wien*, XXXIII, pp. 129-233.) Wien 1903.
- Mexican and Central American Antiquities, Calendar Systems, and History. Twenty-four Papers by Eduard Seler, E. Förstemann, Paul Schellhas, Carl Sapper and E. P. Dieseldorff. Translated from the German under the supervision of Charles P. Bowditch. (BAE-Bull. 28.) Wash. 1904.
- Robelo, Cecilio A.: Diccionario de mitología Nahoá. (*Anales del Mus. Nac. de Méx.*, segunda época, II-V.) Méx. (1905-11) 1951<sup>2</sup>.
- Génin, Auguste: Notes on the Dances, Music, and Songs of the Ancient and Modern Mexicans. (SI-AR 1920, pp. 657-77, i. e. Annual Report of . . . . the Smithsonian Institution . . . for the year ending June 30 1920) (tr. from *Revue d'Ethnographie et de Sociologie*, Paris 1913.) (1913) Wash. 1922.
- Spence, Lewis: The Myths of Mexico and Peru. Lond. 1913.  
– The Myths of Mexico and Peru. Lond. 1917.
- Alexander, Hartley Burr: Latin-American [Mythology]. (Louis Herbert Gray (ed.): The Mythology of all Races. XI.) Boston 1920.
- Spence, Lewis: The Gods of Mexico. Lond. 1923.
- Krickeberg, W.: Märchen der Azteken und Inkaperuaner Maya und Muisca. Jena 1928.
- Preuss, K. Tb.: Mexikanische Religion. (*Haas, Bilderatlas*, 16.) Lpz. 1930.
- Caso, Alfonso: La Religión de los Aztecas. Méx. 1936.
- Soustelle, Jacques: La Pensée cosmologique des anciens Mexicains. Paris 1940.
- Spence, Lewis: The Religion of Ancient Mexico. Lond. 1945.
- Toor, Frances: A Treasury of Mexican Folkways. N. Y. 1947.
- Soustelle, Jacques: La Religion des Aztèques. (*Gorce, Maxime et Raoul Mortier* (eds.): Histoire Générale des Religions. I, pp. 183-88.) Paris 1948.
- Krickeberg, Walter: Bauform und Weltbild im alten Mexico. (*Paideuma* 4.) Bamberg 1950.
- Hatt, Gudmund: The Corn Mother in America and in Indonesia. (*Anthropos*, XLVI, pp. 853-914.) Fribourg 1951.
- Caso, Alfonso: El Pueblo del Sol. Méx. 1953.
- Sejourné, Laurette: Burning Water. Thought and Religion in Ancient Mexico. Lond./N. Y. [1957].



## INDEXES

### AUTHORS CITED

- Aarne, 65, 157  
Anderson, 73, 167  
Anderson and Dibble, 75, 81, 88, 90, 91, 96, 104, 106, 108 f., 111, 114, 133, (81-139, *passim*), 166  
Andree, 40, 157  
Apollodorus, 67  
Arbman, 21, 157  
Aurelius, 18, 157
- Batchelor, 60, 157  
Beals, 42, 157  
Bertholet, 56, 157  
Beth, 14, 157  
Bischoff, 30 f., 157  
Black, 13, 14, 15, 157  
Blackman, 54, 157  
Bleeker, 54, 157  
Bloesch, 56, 157  
Boas, 15, 157  
Boberg, 65, 157  
Bouquet, 14, 157  
Bousset, 14, 157  
Brelich, 25, 157  
Briem, 14, 157  
Brinton (ed., tr.), 73, 166  
Brock-Utne, 21, 158  
Bunzel, 40, 158  
Buschardt, 15, 158  
Bustamante (ed.), 74, 106, 166
- Cahen, 58 f., 158  
Caland, 66, 158  
Carochi, 74, 78, 79, 134, 165  
Carpenter, 18, 158  
Cassirer, 21, 158  
Catullus, 63
- Chantepie de la Saussaye, 14, 58, 158  
Chapple, 15, 158  
Chrystal, *see* Black  
Cicero, 53  
Clemen, 14, 18, 158  
Codrington, 19, 20, 21, 27, 144, 158  
Coomaraswamy, 40, 158  
Coon, *see* Chapple  
Crawley, 29, 36, 37, 158  
Cuisinier, 40, 158  
Curtiss, 18, 58, 62, 63, 127, 158
- Dadachanji, *see* Gopal  
Dall, 40, 158  
Danzel, 14, 158  
Davidsohn, 30, 31, 158  
Davis, 40, 158  
Dawson, *see* Smith, G. Elliott  
Deacon, 26, 29, 158  
Deissmann, 29, 158  
Densmore, 43, 158  
d'Harnoncourt, *see* Douglas  
Dibble, *see* Anderson  
Diehl, 53, 158  
Dieterich, 58, 158  
Disselhoff, 72, 168  
d'Olwer, 73, 167  
Donner, 37 f., 52, 158  
Douglas, 40, 158  
Dubois, 26, 53, 158  
Duggirala, *see* Coomaraswamy  
Durkheim, 15, 21, 24, 63, 158  
Dyggve, 18, 159
- Eberle, 40, 159  
Eggers, 22, 159  
Ehrenreich, 14, 159

- Eitrem, 58 f., 159  
 Eliade, 26, 159  
 Elwin, 65, 159  
 Erman, 37, 53, 54, 55, 159
- Falkenstein, 52, 159  
 Farnell, 14, 43, 56, 159  
 Fenger, 52, 56, 159  
 Ferm, 14, 159  
 Fewkes, 40, 159  
 Fletcher, 25, 159  
 Fowler, 41, 56, 62, 159  
 Frankfort, 54, 159  
 Frazer, 13, 20, 24, 25, 26, 29, 31, 32, 34,  
 36, 52, 58 f., 103, 159  
 Frickenhaus, 52, 159  
 Fuchs, 37, 159
- Gardiner, 54, 159  
 Garibay, 73, 74, 76, 78, 109, 165, 167  
 Gauthier, 54, 159  
 Genep, 36, 159  
 Gillen, *see* Spencer  
 Glasenapp, 14, 43, 54, 159  
 Gopal, 40, 159  
 Gorce, 14, 18, 40, 52, 159  
 Grasserie, 74, 80, 134, 165  
 Gray, 58 f., 159  
 Gregor, 40, 159  
 Gressmann, 52, 159  
 Griaule, 40, 159  
 Gruppe, 58, 159  
 Grønbech, 8, 15, 19, 21, 22, 24, 25, 26, 42,  
 54, 55, 58 f., 65, 144, 159  
 Gunkel, 24, 159  
 Guzmán, 78, 165
- Haas, 52, 159  
 Haigh, 40, 160  
 Harrison, 26, 58 f., 160  
 Hartland, 14, 36, 160  
 Hausenstein, 40, 160  
 Havell, 52, 53, 160  
 Havemeyer, 40, 41, 160  
 Hillebrandt, 11, 58, 160  
 Hirn, 24  
 Hocart, 15, 160  
 Homerus, 29, 57, 67  
 Hooke, 15, 32, 54, 58 f., 160  
 Hopkins, A. I., 26, 160  
 Hopkins, E. Washburn, 15, 58 f., 160  
 Howells, 14, 160  
 Hubert, 21, 24, 58, 160
- Hunningher, 40, 160  
 Hutton, 28, 33, 160
- Iyer, 40, 160
- Jacobsen, 18, 25, 53, 160  
 Jacobsohn, 54, 160  
 Jahn, 58, 160  
 James, 14, 58 f., 160  
 Jastrow, 14, 52, 160  
 Jensen, A. E., 14, 160  
 Jeremias, 14, 160  
 Jessen, 14, 160  
 Jevons, 25, 28, 29, 34, 37, 58, 61, 62, 160  
 Jiménez Moreno, 76, 167  
 Johansen, 21, 29; 160  
 Joseph Karo, 31  
 Jourdanet (ed.), 106, 166
- Kalbi, 53, 160  
 Karsten, 14, 160  
 Kat Angelino, 40, 160  
 Keith, 54, 160  
 Kennard, 40, 160  
 King, John H., 21, 160  
 King, Winston L., 14, 160  
 Kingsborough (ed.), 74, 106, 166  
 Kleen, Tyra de, *see* Kat Angelino  
 Klingbeil, 54, 160  
 Kluckhohn, 15, 160  
 Knudtzon, 53, 161  
 Kock, 21, 161  
 Krickeberg, 72, 168
- La Flesche, 25, 36, 161  
 Lang, 57, 161  
 Langdon, 52, 161  
 Lange, 54, 161  
 Leeuw, 14, 161  
 Lehmann, Edv., 14, 161  
 Lehmann, Friedr. Rudolf, 21, 29, 161  
 Lehmann, Walter, 75, 89, 118–23, 167  
 Lepsius, 54, 161  
 Lévy-Bruhl, 15, 23, 26, 161  
 Lieblein, 54, 161  
 Linné, 129, 167, 168  
 Livius, 41, 63  
 Logren, 14, 161  
 Loisy, 58 f., 161  
 L'Orange, 18, 161  
 Lowie, 14, 21, 64, 161  
 Lucianus, 50  
 Lund, Troels, 50  
 Lyall, 26, 161

- McClinock, 22, 27, 41, 65, 161  
 Macrobius, 25  
 Malinowski, 15, 66, 161  
 Maning, 19, 161  
 Mannhardt, 11, 58, 161  
 Marett, 19, 21, 29, 34, 43, 162  
 Marthews, 41, 43, 162  
 Maus, *see* Hubert  
 Max Müller, F., *see* Müller, F. Max  
 Meinhof, 63, 162  
 Mengin, 9, 43, 119, 165, 167  
 Mensching, 43, 162  
 Mercer, 53, 162  
 Micklem, 14, 162  
 Moerenhout, 41  
 Molina, 74, 78, 79, 165  
 Monier-Williams, 53, 162  
 Morgan, 53, 162  
 Mortier, *see* Gorce  
 Müller, F. Max, 19, 28, 162  
 Müller, I. G., 72, 169  
 Murphy, 14, 63, 162  
 Nelson, 54, 162  
 Nettl, 43, 162  
 Niessen, 40, 162  
 Nilsson, 14, 56, 162  
 Noss, 14, 162  
 Notes and Queries, 15, 162  
 Numelin, 21, 162  
 Nyström, 51, 162  
 Oesterley, 40, 162  
 Oldenberg, 11, 58, 162  
 Olmos, 78, 79, 80, 165  
 Orelli, 14, 162  
 Pallis, 8, 20, 22, 24, 41, 45-49, 53-56, 62, 66, 67, 144, 147, 162  
 Paso y Troncoso, del (ed.), 74, 107, 166  
 Pausanius, 29, 60  
 Pedersen, 55, 58 f., 159, 162  
 Peñafiel, 73, 167  
 Penniman, 23, 162  
 Perry, 14, 162  
 Pfister, 18, 162  
 Pickard-Cambridge, 40, 162  
 Piddington, 15, 163  
 Pinard de la Boullaye, 21, 163  
 Plato (Pseudo-), 57  
 Pliny, 25  
 Plurarch, 67  
 Porphyrius, 60  
 Soden, *see* Falkenstein  
 Soltau, 18, 163  
 Soustelle, 72, 75, 168  
 Spence, 72 f., 73, 137, 169  
 Prampolini, 14, 163  
 Preuss, 9, 66, 163  
 Pritchard, 52, 163  
 Radcliffe-Brown, 29, 34, 163  
 Radin, 14, 163  
 Ramirez, 75, 78, 79, 165  
 Rawlinson, 52, 163  
 Reichard, 43, 163  
 Reinach, 14, 163  
 Reuterskiöld, 58, 63, 163  
 Ridgeway, 40, 163  
 Riley, 40, 163  
 Rincon, 74, 78, 79, 134, 165  
 Ringgren, 14, 163  
 Rivers, 26, 163  
 Robelo, 78, 169  
 Robertson Smith, *see* Smith, W. Robertson  
 Robredo (ed.), 106, 166, 167  
 Rostup, 8, 39, 40, 41, 43, 53, 163  
 Rouse, 58, 163  
 Rumpf, 52, 163  
 Sahagún, 69, 71, 73-76, 81-117, 121, 123-39, 151, 166 f.  
 Saigues, 73, 106, 166, 167  
 Schapera, 26  
 Schlesier, 36, 163  
 Schoenbs, 74, 78, 79, 80, 134, 165  
 Schrader, 52, 163  
 Schürer, 29, 163  
 Schütte, 58 f., 163  
 Schulze Jena, 73, 74, 78, 166, 167  
 Schur, 58 f., 163  
 Schurtz, 36, 41, 163  
 Schwenn, 58 f., 163  
 Segerstedt, 29, 56, 63, 163  
 Selier, 9, 72, 73, 74, 75, 81, 83, 89, 90, 91, 93, 96, 99, 104, 105, 106, 109, 111, 114, 125, 133, 137, (81-139, *passim*), 166, 169  
 Servius, 25, 56  
 Simón, 78, 165, 166  
 Smith, G. Elliot, 50, 163  
 Smith, W. Robertson, 11-19, 34, 44, 51, 52, 56, 58, 60, 62, 63, 64, 143, 144, 150, 163  
 Snorre, 67  
 Snorre, 67  
 Soustelle, 72, 75, 168  
 Soltau, 18, 163  
 Spence, 72 f., 73, 137, 169

Spencer, 19, 36, 37, 40, 43, 44, 163  
 Spies, *see* Zoete  
 Spinden, 72, 168  
 Steiner, 29, 163  
 Stengel, 58, 163  
 Stith Thompson, *see* Thompson  
 Strehlow, Carl, 29, 42, 43, 163  
 Strehlow, T. G. H., 43, 163  
 Ström, Folke, 58 f., 163  
 Ström, Åke V., *see* Ringgren  
 Sydow, 40, 163  
 Söderblom, 14, 21, 52, 163 f.

Tallqvist, 18, 52, 164  
 Thomas, 53, 164  
 Thompson, Stith, 65, 164  
 Thomsen, 14, 164  
 Thurston, 26, 28, 58 f., 63, 127, 164  
 Tiele, 14, 164  
 Torres, 134, 165  
 Toy, 15, 21, 26, 58 f., 164  
 Tregear, 41, 164  
 Tresp, 58 f., 164  
 Tylor, 58, 164

Ungnad, 52, 164  
 Usener, 56, 164  
 Utzinger, 40, 164

Vaillant, 72, 75, 137, 168  
 Venkatachalam, 40, 164  
 Vold, 52, 164

Wach, 15, 164  
 Wallis, 14, 164  
 Ward, 53, 164  
 Waterhouse, 14, 164  
 Weber, Friedrich, 73, 166  
 Weber, Otto, 52, 164  
 Webster, 26, 29, 41, 43, 164  
 Wellhausen, 18, 43, 53, 56, 63, 164  
 Whorf, 74, 165  
 Widengren, 15, 21, 58, 164  
 Wilkins, 18, 53, 164  
 Wilkinson, 54, 164  
 Williams, 18, 25, 26, 164  
 Winckler, 53, 164  
 Winstedt, 25, 28, 164  
 Wirz, 36, 164  
 Wissler, 40, 164  
 Wissowa, 53, 58, 164  
 Wulf, 18, 164

Yerkes, 58 f., 164

Zimmern, 52, 164  
 Zoete, 40, 164

## SUBJECT INDEX

Actions as the essential factor, 33–36,  
 41, 62 f.  
*cf.* Dancing  
 Acts as 'survivals', 48  
 Acts, ritual, *see* Ritual  
 Adonis, 62  
 Africa, cattle-breeding tribes of, 32 f.  
 Agriculture, Agriculturists, 45–48, 56,  
 65, 70 f.  
*cf.* Plants  
 Ainu, 60  
 Akitu Festival, 54  
*cf.* Pallis 1926  
 A-koch-kit-ope; 27  
 Alcheringa, *see* Primeval Times  
 Amaranth seeds, dough of, *see* Aztec Index,  
*s. v.* *izoalli*  
 Amen, Amon, 37, 54  
 Analogy, offerings extended by, 59, 61  
 Ancestors, 37 f., 44 f., 51

Anglo-Saxon laws, 26  
 Animal-headed "gods", 53 f.  
 Animals, 21 f., 32 f., 37 f., 39, 40–44,  
 59–62, 71, 86  
*amiptópodes, Selloi*, 29  
 Anthropomorphism, 46 f., 49, 53 f.  
 Arabia, 43, 53  
 Aranda, 37, 40, 43, 44, 62  
 Archaic words in cult songs, 43  
 Ark of the Covenant, 51, 55  
 Artemis Hymnias, priests of, 29  
 Arunta, *see* Aranda  
 Astral-mythological interpretations, 72  
 Aten, Aton, 54  
 Attitudes of body or hands, 36, 40  
*cf.* Dancing  
 "Augenblicksgötter", 56  
 Australian aborigines, *see* Aranda  
 Aztec, written, 73 f.

- Babylon, 52, 53, 54  
 Bathing, *see* Washing, 'a Bathed one,'  
*see* Aztec Index, s. v. *laatlilli*  
 Bear, 27, 38, 60  
 Bells, 42, 125, 135  
 Below the Earth, 46  
 Birth, 36 f.  
 Blackfoot, 23, 27  
 Blessings, 42  
 Blood, 32, 59, 61, 104, 108, 129  
 "Borrowings" of myths and of rituals, 57,  
 64 f., 67  
 Bosphonia Festival, 60  
 Bread, rules of taboo for, 31, 33  
 Brides, *see* Wedding  
 Buffalo, 23  
 Bull, the god Min as a white, 54  
 Burial Rituals, 69, 142
- Cáhita, 42  
 Cakchiquel, 71  
 Cap of Shaman, 38  
 Captives, 81, 82, 86, 89, 91, 97, 100, 105,  
 107, 108, 116, 127, 131, 132, 140  
 Cattle, 32 f., 45, 59, 71  
 Changes of Religion, 18, 50, 62 f.  
 Chaos, 27  
*cheironomia*, 40  
 Chiefs, 20, 22, 73  
*cf.* Kings. *cf.* Aztec Index, s.v. *teculli*  
 Children, 103 f.  
 sacrifice of, 61, 120–22  
 Choruses, 41–43  
 Churinga, *tjurunga*, 29, 37 f.  
 Circumambulation, *see* Aztec Index,  
 s.v. *tlayaualoa*  
 Classification of phenomena, difference in  
 the, 23–26, 30, 38 f., 55  
 Classification  
 of types of offerings, 58–62  
 of myths, 65–69  
 of rituals, 69  
 Clothes, Clothing, 37 f.  
*cf.* Garments  
*Cod. Flor.*, 74, 75  
 Coition as a ritual act, 19  
*cf.* Sexual Intercourse  
 Community, 16, 27, 29, 33 f., 63 f.  
*cf.* Agriculture, Hunting Communities,  
 Urban Communities, Religious Com-  
 munities  
 Compulsion, psychological, 64
- "Conception, ways of", connected with the  
 conception of mana, 24–27  
 'Conditioned Rituals', the term, 69  
 'Connected Course' used as a term, 48,  
 49, 52  
 Conquests,  
 relation of religion to, 50, 63  
 in Mexico, 71 f.  
 'Contact Points' used as a term, 65, 68, 98–  
 100, 117, 122, 132 f., 135 f., 139, 141 f.  
*(et passim)*  
 Corn, 41  
*cf.* Grain. *cf.* Aztec Index, s.v. v. *cintli*,  
*Cinteotl*, *Chicome Coatl*, *ollotl*, *toctli*,  
*xinacbil*, *yotextli*  
 Cosmos, 46 f., 63  
 Coyote, 42  
 Creation, annual drama of, 57  
 "Creator Gods", 57 f.  
 Crow, 23, 64  
 Cult objects may be dangerous, 28  
 Cult-place, 26 f., 34, 35 f., 40 f., 43, 44  
*cf.* Sacred Places  
 Cult-technical terms  
 in songs, 43  
 constitute mythical elements, 98, 100,  
 140, 141, 142  
 Cults, local, 56  
*cf.* Ritual  
 Culture Heroes, 57  
 Curses, 43
- Dances, Dancing, 40–44, 56, 62  
*cf.* Aztec Index, s.v. *itotia*  
 Dead, the, 27, 37, 39, 50, 69, 77, 107 f.  
 Death, 28, 36, 37, 47, 62  
 realms of, 46, 69, 77, 107 f., 142  
*cf.* Transition  
 Deer, 42, 61, 104 f.  
 Deities, anthropomorphic, 46 f., 49  
 Departmental gods, 47  
*Deus otiosus*, 57 f.  
 Development  
 as a term, 47 ff.  
*cf.* 'Connected Course'  
 of idols, 52 f.  
 Diffusion of myths and of rituals, 57,  
 64 f., 67  
 Dionysos, 52  
 District Sanctuaries, *see* Aztec Index,  
 s.v. *calpulli*  
 Dodona, 29

- Dolls, Dummies, 25 f., 61 f.  
 Dough, figures of, 85, 90, 92–94, 97 f.,  
 102 f., 123–26, 127, 130 f., 138  
 Drama, 27, 40 f., 43, 47, 57  
*cf.* Dancing, Masks  
 Drinking, 19, 59, 61  
*cf.* Food
- Ear of corn, 54  
*cf.* Aztec Index, s.v. *ollotl*
- Earth, 46  
 Earth, Below the, 46  
 Easter, rules of taboo in the, 31, 33  
 Eating, 18, 59, 61  
*cf.* Food. *cf.* Aztec Index, s.v. *teucualo*  
 (teoqualo)
- Economic culture, relation of religion to, 63  
*cf.* Agriculture, Hunting Communities,  
 Urban Communities
- Ecstasy, 41  
 Egypt, 36, 37, 50, 52, 53, 54  
 Episodes, mythical, 56 f., 65, 67, 141 f.  
 the term, 66  
*cf.* Type I
- Esau, 42  
 “Ethical”, the term, 52, 62  
 Ethnographical material, use of, 11, 71  
 “Etymologies, false”, 22  
 Evolutionism, Evolutionist Tendencies,  
 46, 47 f.  
*cf.* Development, ‘Connected Course’,  
 Reinterpretations
- Excuses, ceremonial, 60  
 “Explanation” of ritual, the myth as an,  
 12, 13, 17, 18, 43 f., 56, 57, 59, 62 f.,  
 65–68, 115 f., 133 ff., 135 ff., 140–42  
*cf.* “Motivation” of ritual, the myth as a
- “False Etymologies”, 22  
 Fasting, Fasting Periods, 32 f., 36, 87,  
 101, 104  
 Faultlessness, bodily, required for ritual  
 purpose, 86,  
 Feathers, use of, for ceremonial dressing,  
 38, 82, 84, 91, 92, 124  
*Feriae Latinae*, repetition of, 41  
 Fertility, gods of, 46  
 Festivals, ritual, 26 f., 34, 36, 37, 66  
 Mexican, 71, 74–76  
 Fields, 30, 46, 82 f.  
 Fighting, ritual, 102, 129 f., 132 f., 137  
 Figures, mythical, 45, 53, 56, 65, 67, 76 f.,  
 100, 140, 142
- Fire, 19, 27, 47, 57  
*cf.* Aztec Index, s.v. v. *ileil*, *Ixcoçaubqui*,  
*Milintoc*, *Xiubtecutli*.
- First act of a kind, 19  
 “First Fruit Offering”, 58–61  
*cf.* Offering.
- Florentine Codex, 74, 75  
 Flowers, 42, 83, 86, 102  
 Folk-lore, Folkloristic material, 65  
 Food,  
 rules of taboo for, 28, 30–33, 36  
 cult idols being treated to, 53  
 food placed before *teixiptlas*, 83, 85, 92,  
 102  
 Foot-races, ritual, 102, 128 f., 130 f., 139  
 Footwear to be taken off, 35  
 Foreign Countries, Foreigners, 34, 50
- Garments, 30, 35 f., 37 f., 39, 51, 52, 61 f.,  
 63, 83, 98 f.
- Germanic Religion, 18  
*cf.* Scandinavia  
 “Gift Offering”, 58–61  
*cf.* Offering.
- Gods, 21, 45–62, 65, 67, 72, 84, 97–100,  
 140  
 Mexican, 76 ff.  
*cf.* Aztec Index, s. vv. *\*ixiptlatli*, *teotl*.
- Grain, 31, 33, 41, 59, 83, 91  
*cf.* Corn, Food
- Granary, the, in Aztec ritual, 84, 113  
 Grasshopper, ceremony of the, 25  
 Great Mother, 53  
 Greece, 29, 52, 56, 57, 122  
 Grouping of myths, 68 f.  
 Group A, 68 f., 100–17  
 Group B, 68 f., 118–23  
 Group C, 69, 142  
 Group D, 68 f., 118, 122  
 Group E, 68 f., 118, 123–38, 141 f.
- Hair, 25, 36, 59, 87, 107  
 “Hand Dancing”, 40  
 Harvesting, 19, 36, 54  
 Heaven, 46  
 Hebrews, 32  
*cf.* Jews, Old Testament  
 Hellas, 29, 52, 56, 57, 122  
 “Hen” and “egg”, 16  
 Hermes, 52  
 “High-Gods”, 57 f.  
 “History”, tribal, 26 f.



- "Holy", "Holiness", 50 f.  
*cf.* "Sacred", "Sacredness"  
 Horse, 50  
 Human Sacrifices, 61 f.  
   in Mexico, 82, 86 f., 87, 88, 91, (93 f.),  
   95 f., 97, 100 f., 105, 107–11, 116 f.,  
   120–23, 129 f., 132, 140  
 Hunting, Hunting Communities, 19, 25, 26,  
   34, 41, 45, 46, 47, 59 f., 61, 104 f.
- Identification, ritual, 47  
 "Idle Gods", 57 f.  
 Idols, 18, 52–56, 69  
*cf.* Images  
 Iliad, 57, 67  
 Illness, 28  
 Images, 18, 47, 53 f., *cf.* 97–100  
*cf.* Idols  
 India, 11, 18, 26, 27, 36, 52 f., 56, 66, 71  
 Individual Religions, 64  
 "Initiation", 29, 34 ff., 51  
*cf.* Transition  
 Interpretation of phenomena, difference in,  
   63  
*cf.* Reinterpretations  
 Intoxicating Drinks, *see* Wine  
 Isaac, 42  
 Islām, 18  
*cf.* Arabia  
 Israel, 32  
*cf.* Old Testament
- Jacob, 42  
 Jews, Judaism, 30–32, 33  
*cf.* Old Testament
- Ka'ba, 53  
 Kid, 30  
 Killing, 19, 26, 59–62, 69  
*cf.* Sacrifices  
 Kin, Kinship Group, 22, 25, 28, 41, 44,  
   60, 63  
*cf.* Species  
 Kings, 22, 28, 30, 37, 54  
*cf.* Aztec Index, s.v. *Motecuçoma*
- Lightning, places or people struck by, 32,  
   92  
 'Like produces like', 19, 25 f., 38 f., 121  
 Logic, "primitive", 23, 24, 25  
 Luck, 20, 22  
 Lupercalia, Luperci, 38
- Mad Wolf, 23  
 Madrid, Sahagún MSS. in, 74–76  
 Magna Mater, 53  
 Maize,  
*cf.* Corn, Food, *cf.* Aztec Index, s. vv.  
*cinli, Cinteotl, Chicome Coatl, ollotl,*  
*toctli, xinachtili, yotextli.*  
 Mana, 19, 20–44, 46 f., 50–55, 58–62, 69,  
*et passim.*  
*cf.* Aztec Index, s. v. *teotl*  
 "Manifestations" of "gods", 47, 54  
 Manuscripts, conditions of, 73 f., 75 f.  
 Marduk, 54  
 Marriage, *see* Wedding  
 Masai, 32 f.  
 Masks, Masked Dancers, 38–44, 52, 53 f.,  
   *cf.* 97–100  
*cf.* Aztec Index, s. vv. *\*ixiptlatli, teotl,*  
*xayacal.*  
 Maya, 71 f.  
 Meals, ritual, 18 f., 59  
 Meat, contact of, with milk prohibited,  
   30–32  
 "Medicine", 21, 22, 27  
 Melanesia, 19, 21, 27  
 Methodical consequences discussed, 64 f.  
 Mexico, 42, 58, 61, 69, 70 ff.  
 "Migrations" of myths and of rituals, 64 f.  
 Milieu, relation of, to mana, 22 f., 46 f.  
 Milk, rules of taboo for, 30–32  
 Min, 54  
 Mingling different kinds of mana, prohibi-  
   tions of, 30–33, 35  
 "Momentary Gods", 56  
 Monks, Monastic Orders, 36, 37  
 Monotheism, 63  
 Moral qualities, mana has no, 22  
 "Motifs", folkloristic, 65  
*cf.* "Explanation" of ritual, the myth  
   as an  
 "Motivation" of ritual, the myth as a, 13,  
   17–19, 43 f., 56 f., 58, 62–64, 65–67,  
   140–42  
*cf.* "Explanation" of ritual, the myth  
   as an
- Mountains, mana of the buffalo, 23  
*cf.* Aztec Index, s. v. *tepetl*  
 Mourners, Mourning, 30, 32, 36  
 Movements between spheres with different  
   manas, 34–38  
*cf.* Transition  
 Murder, doll used for, 26

- Myrtles, *mýrtos* – *mýrton*, 38
- Mystery Religions, 64
- Mythical Episodes, 56 f., 65, 67, 141 f.  
the term, 66  
*cf.* Type I.
- Mythical Figures, 45, 53–57, 65, 67, 76,  
100, 140, 142
- Mythology, “Mythologies”, 11, 13, 57, 67
- Myths, 11–19, 43–45, 53–58, 62–69, 72,  
76, 97–100, 117, 122, 133 ff., 140–42,  
*et passim*.  
‘types’ of, 66 f., 69  
‘groups’ of, 68 f.
- Nails, care of cut-off, 25
- Name, proper names, 22, 25, 36 f., 55  
of gods, 53–56, 77, 98–100, 119 f.
- Nature, relation of man to, 45 f.
- Nāyādi, 28
- Objects, mana-filled, 33 f., 35  
reinterpretation of mana, 50, 52–56,  
58 ff.  
ritual, 76, 97–100  
*cf.* Aztec Index, s.vv. *teo-*
- Odyssey, 57
- “Offering”, 58–62
- Ojibwa, 64
- Omaha, 25
- ‘One is equal to all’, 25
- Osiris, 50
- Outcasts, rules of taboo for, 30
- Paint, Painting, 38, 84, 85, 98, 101, 116,  
125, 127, 129, 136
- Panathenaic festival, 57
- Paper, use of, in Mexican rituals, 82, 84,  
90, 91, 92, 113, 127, 130, 131, 135, 137
- ‘Part, the, is equal to the whole’, 24–26,  
38, 39
- ‘Past, the, is equal to the present and equal  
to the future’, 24, 26 f., 43 f.  
*cf.* Dancing, Drama
- “Penance” for “sin”, 59
- Periods, special rules, 19, 33–37  
reinterpretation of mana, 50
- Personification, 41, 45, 140  
*cf.* Identification
- Persons, mana-filled, 33, 35, 76, 97  
reinterpretation of mana, 50, 55
- Phases of life, 34, 36 f.  
*cf.* Transition
- Places, mana-filled, 28, 33–35, 37  
reinterpretation of mana, 58 f., 63
- Plants, 20, 21, 32, 37 f., 54, 59 f.  
agave, 93, 122  
*cf.* Corn, Dough, Maize
- Ploughing, 19
- Plural forms in Aztec, as indicating animate  
beings, 81, 83
- Poets, use of myths by, 57, 67
- ‘Points of Contact’, 65, 68, 97–100, 117,  
122, 133, 135, 139, 142
- Polemics, religious, in mythical form, 56
- Poles, decorated, heavy with mana, 27
- Polynesia, 21, 29
- “Power”-explanations, 21 f.
- Prayers, 42 f., 60
- Priests, 11, 22, 28, 36 f., 51, 55, 59, 73, 86  
*cf.* Aztec Index, s. v. *ilamacazqui*
- ‘Primary Rituals’, the term, 69
- Primeval times, 24, 26 f., 44
- Processions, 53, 81, 95 f., 110 f.
- Prohibitions, 29, 30, 51  
*cf.* Taboo
- Pronunciation of Aztec words, 74, 76
- Prophecy, 42 f.
- Psychological Compulsion, 64
- Puberty, 36, 37  
*cf.* Aranda, Transition
- Punishments, 26, 29, 51, 61
- “Purification,” 28 f., 34, 35, 51, 60  
*cf.* Transition
- Qualities, characteristic, of a species, 21 f.  
mana has no moral, 22  
ordinary, of mana in general, 27–29
- Quiché, 71
- Rain, 22, 41, 46 f., 120–22  
*cf.* Aztec Index, s. v. *Tlaloc*
- Recolouring of myths, reinterpretations de-  
monstrated by, 62
- Reinterpretations, 35, 50–56, 58–62
- Religious Communities, initiation into, 37
- Removal, *see* Transfer
- “Representations” of “gods”, 98  
*cf.* “Manifestations” of “gods”
- Rites de passage*, 35 ff.
- Ritual, 11–19, 40 ff., 55 f., 62–65, 68 f., 71,  
72, 76, 97–100, *et passim*.  
terminology, 69  
*cf.* Dance, Drama
- Rome, 25, 38, 41, 53, 56, 122

- Sacral Bundle, *see* Aztec Index s.v. *tlaquimilolli*
- "Sacramental Offering", 58–61  
*cf.* "Offering"
- Sacred Places, 28  
*cf.* Aztec Index, s. v. *teopan*
- "Sacred", "Sacredness", 50 f.  
*cf.* Aztec Index, s. vv. *teo-*
- Sacrifices, 54, 58–62, 69, 82–132 *passim*, 140
- Sacrificial Meal, 59  
*cf.* Aztec Index, s.v. *teucualo* (teoqualo)
- Sacrificial Stone, *see* Aztec Index, s. vv. *tecbcatl*, *temalacatl*
- Salvation Religions, 64
- Scandinavia, 22, 50, 122
- Schulchân åruch, 30 f.
- Scope of mana, 22–27, 44
- 'Secondary Rituals', the term, 69
- Secrecy of names, 25
- Selli, the, 29
- Serpents, relation of, to Manasã, 54  
*cf.* Aztec Index, s. v. *coatl*
- Sexual Intercourse, rules of taboo on, 32  
*cf.* Coition.
- Shadow, 25
- Shamans, 38
- Siberian Aborigines, 38
- Sick, the, Sick People, 22, 28, 30
- "Sin", 51 f., 59
- "Sin Offering", 58–61  
*cf.* "Offering"
- Singing, *see* Songs
- Slaughtering, 59
- Slaves as victims, 61
- Snakes, *see* Serpents
- Social Obligation and taboo, 30, 33 f.
- Society, relation of religion to the organization of, 63  
*cf.* Community
- Soil, 32, 46
- "Sondergötter", 56
- Songs, 20, 41–43, 73, 88, 91, 115, 116
- Sorcerers, dolls manipulated by, 26
- Souls, 21
- Source Material, relation of the, to the question of ritual and myth, 68 f.
- Sowing, 19, 30, 36, 83 ff.
- Species, 21, 22, 24 f., 29, 39, 63
- Spelling of the Aztec texts, 74, 76
- Spheres with different manas, moving between, 34 f., 37 ff.  
*cf.* Transition
- Spirits, 21, 43
- Statues, 52–55
- Stones, 20, 28, 52–55, 63, 118–20
- Sun, 24, 46, 77  
*cf.* Aztec Index, s. v. *Tonatiuh*
- Substitution, sacrificial, 61 f., 69
- 'Survivals', 26, 35, 38, 48 f., 62 f.
- Swine, 50, 62
- Sword of Victory, 22
- Taboo, rules of, 29–34, 36 f.  
reinterpretation of, 50–52
- Temples, 29, 52 f.  
*cf.* Cult-place, Sacred Places  
*cf.* Aztec Index, s. v. *teocalli*
- Terminology, 66–69
- Thunder gods, 47
- Tjurunga, churinga, 29, 37 f.
- Toltec culture, 71 f.
- Tonsure, 36
- Totem Ceremonies, dress of the Aranda, 37 f.  
*cf.* Ancestors, Animals, Plants, Species
- Towns, *see* Urban communities
- Tracks, 25
- Transfer of mana, 27–35  
reinterpretations of acts involving, 51 f., 58–62
- Transformation of stones or trees into idols, 52 f.
- Transition from one sphere of mana to another, 34 f.  
rites of, 35–39  
of communities to new social states, 48–50, 51 f.  
reinterpretations of rites of, 51 f.
- Treasures of the kinship group, 22
- Trees, 23, 36, 52 f.
- 'Types' of Myths, 66 f., 69  
Type 0, 66, 69, 100–05, 109, 112, 140 f.  
Type I, 66, 69, 105–117, 140–42  
Type II, 67, 69, 118–23  
Type III, 67, 69, 118, 123–39, 141 f.  
Type IV, 67, 69  
Type V, 67, 69  
Type VI, 67, 69
- "Uncleanness", 50
- Unleavened Bread, 31, 33
- Urban Communities, 45 ff., 70 f.
- Urban Religions, 45 ff.
- Victory and mana, 20, 22, 41
- Victuals, *see* Food, *cf.* Aztec Index, s. v. *tonacayotl*

Villages, 45 f., 48, 52  
*cf.* Urban Communities  
 Vishnu, 18, 54

War, Warriors, 19, 28, 30, 32, 34, 35, 36,  
 41, 47, 61, 87, 88, 107, 126, 129–31,  
 135  
*cf.* Transition

Washing, 28 f., 32  
*cf.* “Purification”

Water, 28 f., 31, 32, 35, 59, 127  
 “Ways of conception” connected with the  
 conception of mana, 24–27

Wedding, 36, 37  
*cf.* Transition

Wine, 19, 54, 59, 104, 115 f.

Women, 22, 28, 29, 32, 41, 84, 88, 91,  
 92–94, 95 f., 103, 108, 116 f.

Words, 33, 36 f., 43, 48, 60  
*cf.* Names

Yahweh, 55

Yucatán, 71 f.

Zeus, priests of, 29

## AZTEC INDEX

Acachinanco, 129  
 ana, 100 f.  
 anecuiotl, 124, 125, 135, 137  
 Apetlac, 105, 135  
 Atlatonan, 88

calpulli, 94, 104, 115, 123  
 çan, 93  
 cemilhuitl, 133  
 Centzon Uitznaua, 132–37  
 Chapoltepetl, 129  
 Chicome Coatl, 77, 83–85, 90–92  
 Cinteopan, 83  
 Cinteotl, 77, 82–84, 89, 92, 101  
 cintli, 83 f., 91  
 Citecatl, 120  
 Citlan, 119 f.  
 ciuatlamacazqui, 91  
 Coatepetl, 133–35, 137–39  
 coatl, 77, 93, 124, 131, 138  
 coatlapechtli, 123 f., 136  
 Coatlicue, 77, 133–35  
 Coaxalpan, 112, 135  
 Cocotl, 121  
 Coyolxauhqui, 133–37  
 Coyouacan, 129  
 cuezcomatl, 113  
 cuezcomayollotl, 84

Ezpitalli, 125, 128

Huehue Tziuhltlacauhqui Yaopol, 119 f.  
 Huitzcotl, 120

Ihuitl, 118  
 Ilamatecutli, 77, 95 f., 112

itotia, 82, 95 f., 101, 112  
 itta, 133 f.  
 Itzpapalotl, 118  
 Ixcoçauhqui, 97 f.  
 ixexa, 128  
 \*ixiptla-tli, 78–81, 97–100, *et passim*  
 Izcalli, 96 f., 99, 103 f., 119 ff., 113–15  
 Izquitecatl, 129  
 Izquitlan, 129

Maçatlan, 129  
 maceualli, 86, 87, 127  
 malteotl, 82, 89  
 Matlalcueie, Matlalquae, 92 f.  
 Mayauel, 93  
 mictia, 58  
 Mictlan, 108  
 Milintoc, 97 f., 114 f.  
 Milnauatl, 93  
 Mixcoatl, 77, 111, 118–20  
 Motecuçoma, 87–89, 101, 126, 129  
 nezçayotia, 121 f.  
 Nonoalco, 129

Ochpaniztli, 90–92, 102  
 ollotl, 84, (85), 91 f.  
 oyoalli, 125, 135

Panquetzaliztli, 110, 111 f., 123–39  
 Pantitlan, 121 f.  
 Paynal, 128–32, 137–39  
 Popotlan, 129

quatleuanjtl, 106, 107 Note 2  
 quauhnochtli, 105  
 quauhtecatli, 105, 107 f., (141)

- quauhlevanitl, 105–07  
 quauhxicalli, 105, 113, 131, 132, (137)  
 Quauitl eua, 121  
 Quauitl icac, 129, 135 f.  
 Quecholli, 61, 102, 103, 104 f., 110, 111 f.  
 Quetzalcoatl, 72, 77, 138, 142  
 Quetzalxoch, 121  
 Quetzalxochtzin, 122  
 quinņeçauiliaya ym mamaça, 104  
 quitztica, *see* itta
- te-, 81, 87, 94  
 techcatl, 105, 110, 111  
 Teccama(n), 88  
 tecpatl, 130  
 Tecuilhuitontli, 117  
 tecutli, 77, 87  
 teixiptla, *see* \*ixiptlatli  
 temalacatl, 82  
 teoaltia, 127  
 teocalli, 78, 95, 96, 102, 110, 123, 132, 139  
 teomiquia, 117  
 teomitl, 78  
 teopan, 78, 83, 84, 110, 115  
 teopia, 126  
 teoqualo, 126, (131)  
 teoquemitl, 78, 124  
 teotia, 95 f., 119, 126  
 teotl, 77 f., 97–100, *et passim*  
 Teotl heco, 116  
 teotlac, 77, 83, 90  
 Teotlachco, 129  
 teoxochitl, 102  
 Tepeilhuitl, 92–94, 103  
 Tepeopulco, 125  
 tepetl, 92–94, 102 f.  
 Tepetocan, 129  
 Tepoxoch, 92  
 teteppoalli, 131, (137)  
 teu-, *cf.* teo-  
 teucualo, 126, (131)  
 Teueuelli, 125, 136  
 teupia, 126  
 teuquaque, 126  
 Texcallapan, 122  
 Tezcatlipoca, 77, 85, 87, 123, 140  
 Tezcoco, 125  
 Tititl, 95 f., 102, 112 f.  
 Titlacahuan, 86 f.  
 tlaaamauia, 129 f.  
 tlaaltilli, 95, 97, 110, 129 f., 132  
 tlacatecolotl, 110, 120  
 tlacateuhmictiliztli, 120 f.  
 Tlacaxipeualiztli, 81 f., 100 f., 105–08,  
 122 f.  
 tlachieloni, 130, (134)  
 tlaçopilli, 89, 120  
 tlaçoteotl, 87 f., 89  
 tlaçotetl, 89  
 tlaçotla, 88 f.  
 tlaçotli, 88, 105  
 tllalia, 58  
 Tlaloc, 94, 117, 122  
 Tlalocan, 93 f., 112, 116 f.  
 tlamacazqui, 101, 102, 108, (131), 138  
 tlapechtli, 124  
 tlaquimilolli, 119, 120  
 Tlatelolco, 125, 129  
 Tlaxotlan, 129  
 tlayaua, 96  
 tlayaualoa, 81, 82, 90, 96, 109, 110, 111,  
 128  
 tletl, 96 f., 104, 105–07, 113 f.  
 tleuauana, 107  
 Tochancalqui, 136  
 Toçoztontli, 82  
 toctia, 109  
 toctli, 83  
 Tollan, 133 f.  
 tonacayotl, 85  
 Tonatiuh, 77, 105, 107, 110  
 Totec, 77, 90, 122  
 Toxcatl, 85–89, 101, 123 f.  
 Tozpan, 118  
 Tula, 133 f.  
 tzoalli, 85, 90, 92, 94, 103, 124, 126, 127,  
 130 f., 138  
 Tzompantitlan, 94, 135  
 Tzommolco, Tzonmolco, 110 f.
- uauanti, 101  
 Uei tecuilhuitl, 108 f., 112  
 Uei toçoztli, 82, 91, 101  
 Uemac, 120–22  
 Uitzilatl, 127  
 Uitzilopochco, 127  
 Uitzilopochtli, 77, 111, 112, 123–39  
 uitzitzilnaualli, 128, 139  
 Uitznauac, 123, 132  
 Uitznauatl, 129, 132, 135, 137  
 Uixtoti, 116  
 Uixtociuatl, 77, 88, 116 f., 142
- xalaquia, 108–12  
 xalli itepeuhya, 112  
 xayacatl, 82, 97, 125

Xicocotl, 120–22  
Xilonen, 88, 108 f.  
xinachtli, 83, 84, 91  
Xipe, 77, 90, 122  
Xippilli, 77, 105 f.  
xippoalli, 109  
xiuhcoanauali, 125  
Xiuhcoatl, 131, 136 f.  
Xiuhcozcatl Tolteca, 122  
Xiuhpiltontli, 106 f.  
Xiuhtecutli, 77, 97 f., 106, 111, 114 f., 118

xiuhtonalli, 109  
xiuitl, 106  
xochipayna, 102  
Xochiquetzal, 77, 88, 120 f.  
Xochtecatl, 93  
Xocotl, 90  
Xocotl uetzi, 90

Yacatecutli, 77, 112  
Yaotl, 123  
yotextli, 116

---