

HERE, THERE, AND ANYWHERE

Jonathan Z. Smith

The editors of this volume have presented me with a double rhetorical task. According to their initial formulation, I was to write for both an interested public and for an international group of experts. The formulation of the general topic drew upon the specialized knowledge of nine academic units of the University of Washington. It contemplates a geographical range of more than two and a half million square miles of land, "from Iran and Mesopotamia in the East to Canaan, Egypt, and the Aegean in the West."¹ Concealed in these boundaries is the intense interactivity of these various cultures across the entire southern Eurasian continent: for example, Sumer and the Indus valley in trade relations in the third millennium (B.C.E.);² F. J. Teggert's calculation that, of the forty occasions of war in the western Roman empire, between 58 B.C.E. and 107 C.E., twenty-seven were directly traceable to changes in the commercial policy of the Han Chinese government.³ The invitation projects a literate time-span of some 3,800 years as it considers religious phenomena within this broad region in their "Ancient, Classical and Late Antique forms." It defines "religion" comprehensively as the "manifold techniques, both communal and individual, by which men and women . . . sought to gain access to divine power." I would revise only the last

1. I cite here the formulations of the original conference document. The general assumptions parallel an important contemporary redescription of the ancient Mediterranean world as an interactive site of transformative contact as well as divisive conflict. See, e.g., the Melammu initiative of the Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project devoted to "the intellectual heritage of Babylonia and Assyria in East and West," in Sanno Aro and R. M. Whiting, eds., *The Heirs of Assyria: Proceedings of the Opening Symposium of the Assyrian and Babylonian Intellectual Heritage Project Held in Tvärminne, Finland, October 8-11, 1998*, Melammu Symposia, 1 (Helsinki: Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project, 2000).

2. See, e.g., David Potts, *The Arabian Gulf in Antiquity*, vol. 1 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990); E. C. L. During-Caspers, "Harappan Trade in the Arabian Gulf in the Third Millennium BC," *Mesopotamia* 7 (1972): 167-91; S. Ratnagar, *Encounters: The Westerly Trade of the Harappa Civilization* (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1981).

3. F. J. Teggart, *Rome and China: A Study of Correlations in Historical Events* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1939), vii-viii, et passim.

clause, substituting “sought to gain access to, or avoidance of, culturally imagined divine power by culturally patterned means.”⁴

As the recent turn of the millennium has resulted in much celebratory rhetoric concerning the duration of one new late antique religion—one of five new late antique religions to continue into modern times⁵—it is worth recalling that our assigned region and time-span encompass a set of religious traditions most of which have had two- or three-millennia-old histories. To understand these phenomena is to think through the dynamics of religious persistence, reinterpretation, and change—to think through the ways in which a given group at a given time chose this or that mode of interpreting their traditions as they related themselves to their historical past and to their social and political present.

In fulfilling my assigned task, there are only two stratagems available to me, either to focus, in thick detail, on a particular instance as exemplary of the whole, or to generalize, recognizing that generalization falls between particularity and universality and, therefore, is always both partial and corrigible. In this presentation, I will take the latter tack, and I will do so in the form of a topography.

I have signaled this intent with my title, which I owe to Dr. Seuss’s character Sam and his canonical rejection of green eggs and ham by means of a formula that recurs some half dozen times in the Seuss work with only a change of verb. To cite just one occurrence:

I will not eat them here or there,
I will not eat them anywhere.⁶

My confidence in this tripartite division of every place was strengthened when Dr. Seuss’s doggerel brought to mind Robert Orsi’s important 1991 article “The Center Out There, In Here, and Everywhere Else: The Nature of Pilgrimage to the Shrine of Saint Jude, 1929–1965.” In this study, Orsi seeks to answer a quite particular question:

4. As is readily recognizable, I adapt here Melford Spiro’s definition of religion as “an institution consisting of culturally patterned interaction with culturally postulated superhuman beings,” specifying the interactions in terms of access and avoidance in keeping with the conference’s announced theme. See Melford Spiro, “Religion: Problems of Definition and Explanation,” in M. Banton, ed., *Anthropological Approaches to the Study of Religion*, Association of Social Anthropologists of the Commonwealth Monographs, 3 (London: Tavistock, 1966), 96.

5. I include as the five new late antique religions surviving to modern times Judaism, Samaritanism, Christianity, Mandaeanism, and, depending on how one dates the Iranian formations, the Parsis (as well as the Gabars).

6. Dr. Seuss, *Green Eggs and Ham* (New York: Random House, 1960), n.p. It is important to my topography that “anywhere” not be read as “everywhere.”

A peculiar anomaly has characterized the National Shrine of Saint Jude Thaddeus, patron saint of hopeless causes and lost causes, since its founding by . . . a Spanish order of missionaries in Chicago in 1929. On the one hand, Jude's shrine was seen by both the saint's devout and the clerical caretakers of the site as a specific and special place of power, desire and hope, which is how such locations have always been imagined in the Catholic tradition; on the other hand, the devout were never encouraged nor did they feel compelled to go to that place in order to secure the benefits they sought from the saint.⁷

Orsi proposes that the solution to this "spatial decentering" was the formation of a voluntary association, the League of Saint Jude, which communicated with the shrine by writing. Through this association a "center out there" was established and maintained by means of "writing as going." This transformed a local shrine into a national one. Equally important, this transformation shifted attention from a notion of space "as the primary focus of devotional life to time"—a late antique strategy I have explored at some length in *To Take Place*.⁸

In this essay I should like to propose a topography for this volume's expansive topic in terms of three spatial categories: (1) the "here" of domestic religion, located primarily in the home and in burial sites; (2) the "there" of public, civic, and state religions, largely based in temple constructions; and (3) the "anywhere" of a rich diversity of religious formations that occupy an interstitial space between these other two loci, including a variety of religious entrepreneurs, and ranging from groups we term "associations" to activities we label "magic."

While modes of access to and means of protection from imaginations of divine power differ in all three of these loci, I would locate one significant difference between the ancient/classical and late antique forms of the Mediterranean religions under review as being the expansion and relative prominence of the third locus (the religions of "anywhere") in late antiquity over against, and sometimes at the expense of, the persistence and transformations of the first two loci (the religions of "here" and "there").⁹

7. Robert Orsi, "The Center out There, in Here, and Everywhere Else: The Nature of Pilgrimage to the Shrine of Saint Jude, 1929–1965," *Journal of Social History* 25 (1991): 213–32.

8. Jonathan Z. Smith, *To Take Place: Toward Theory in Ritual*, Chicago Studies in the History of Judaism (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987), 86–95, et passim.

9. While the topographical strategy remains constant, I would not wish this scheme to be identified with the distinction "locative/utopian" developed, among other applications, to explore continuities, revaluations, and differences in archaic and late antique Mediterranean religions in Jonathan Z. Smith, *Map Is Not Territory: Studies in the History of Religions*, Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity, 23 (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1978), xi–xv, 100–103, 130–42, 147–51, 160–66, 169–71, 185–89, 291–94, 308–9, as well as in subsequent publications.

I. "HERE": THE SPHERE OF DOMESTIC RELIGION

Considered globally, domestic religion is the most widespread form of religious activity; perhaps due to its very ubiquity, it is also the least studied. This is especially true of domestic religion of the past. Being largely nondramatic in nature, and largely oral in transmission, domestic religion does not present itself to us as marked off as "religious" in any forceful manner. Its artifacts, if any, are small-scale and often of common materials, resulting in what one scholar has termed an archaeology of clay rather than of gold. Such artifacts tend to fill up museum basements rather than display cases. While their interpretation remains insecure, I need only refer to the decades-old debate between scholars of ancient Mediterranean religions as to whether the common small clay nude female figurines associated with household sites are dolls for children or goddesses for ritual to make the point.¹⁰ The domestic realm, "here," precisely because it is not "there," because it is not situated in separated sacred space, invites ambiguity as to significance. This ambiguity is only increased when such artifacts are assigned to the dubious place-holding category of "popular religion." For these reasons, one can only applaud important recent works, such as the study by Karel van der Toorn, *Family Religion in Babylonia, Syria, and Israel* (1996), that begin to redress the imbalance.¹¹

Domestic religion, focused on an extended family, is supremely local. It is concerned with the endurance of the family as a social and biological entity, as a community, as well as with the relations of that community to its wider social and natural environs. While no doubt pressing the matter to an extreme, one thinks of Fustel's insistence that each family, in classical Greek and Roman tradition, constituted a separate "religion."¹²

While the parallel is remote from the cultures this volume treats, and therefore serves as an analogy, I have been most helped in imagining the category of domestic religion by Marcel Granet's portrait of a rural Chinese peasant household.¹³

10. For a summary of these debates, see P. J. Ucko, *Anthropomorphic Figurines of Predynastic Egypt and Neolithic Crete with Comparative Material from the Prehistoric Near East and Mainland Greece*, Royal Anthropological Institute, Occasional Paper, 24 (London: A. Szmidla, 1968).

11. Karel van der Toorn, *Family Religion in Babylonia, Syria, and Israel: Continuity and Change in the Forms of Religious Life*, Studies in the History and Culture of the Ancient Near East, 7 (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1996).

12. Numa Denis Fustel de Coulanges, *The Ancient City: A Study of the Religion, Laws, and Institutions of Greece and Rome* (Boston: Lee & Shepard, 1896), 41, 46–48, et passim. This usage is especially dominant in Fustel's description of the marriage rituals (pp. 53–60).

13. Marcel Granet, *La civilisation chinoise: La vie publique et la vie privée*, L'évolution de l'humanité: Synthèse historique, 25 (Paris: La Renaissance du Livre, 1929), 205; idem, *La religion des Chinois*, 2d ed. (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1951), 21–25.

Several feet below the ground is buried a receptacle containing the bones or relics of ancestors. Directly above this is a subterranean storage vessel containing next year's seed rice. Placed above this, on the surface of the ground, is the bed of the primary householder couple. These three loci interact through symmetrical relations of exchange. The power of the ancestors enlivens the seed rice and the conjugal bed. The rice feeds both the ancestors and the householders. The sexual activity of the husband and wife quickens the seed rice and the ancestors. There is no apparent distance to be overcome. Relations are intimate; their continuity is expressed in terms of circulation and exchange.

Although the idiom differs within and between the religions of the regions we have under review, an analogous set of symmetrical relations pertain. It is a continuity that remains as long as the familial community is itself maintained. Extinction is its most obvious threat—whether by war, disaster, disease, or demonic attack. While the religious avoidance of these general traumas remains primarily an affair of civic or national modes of religion, the presence in many domestic sites of small divine figurines with apotropaic inscriptions suggests similar concerns with avoidance within the sphere of household religion.¹⁴

For domestic religion, dislocation is another sort of threat bearing a similar religious value. While scholars have tended to focus their attention on the civic and national implications of exiles and diasporas, forced distance from hearth, home, and, especially, the familial burial site is a profound rupture of the presumed endless accessibility of the ancestors that stands at the heart of domestic religion. One needs only to recall the solemn oath Joseph made the Israelites in Egypt swear, "When God comes to you, you shall carry up my bones from here" (Gen. 50:25), and the narration of the fulfillment of that promise by Moses at the time of the Exodus from Egypt (Exod. 13:19), the bones finally being reburied at a familial site: "The bones of Joseph, which Israel had brought up from Egypt, were buried at Shechem, in the portion of ground that Jacob bought . . . it became an inheritance of the descendants of Joseph" (Josh. 24:32). If, from the temple-centered perspective of the religions of "there," the dead constitute a pollution, interfering with sacred transactions, in the religions of "here," the dead are an indispensable medium for such transactions.¹⁵

Finally, to any list of threats to domestic continuity must be added the danger of forgetfulness; hence, the importance of formal and informal genealogies as well as family sagas. This latter threat raises, as well, a different set of poten-

14. See, e.g., the inscriptions cited in D. Rittig, *Assyrisch-babylonische Kleinplastik magischer Bedeutung vom 13.-6. Jh. v. Chr.* (Munich: Verlag Uni-Druck, 1977), 185–208.

15. For a suggestive attempt to account for the historical reasons for this shift in archaic and classical Greek religion, see I. Morris, "Attitudes Toward Death in Archaic Greece," *Classical Antiquity* 8 (1987): 296–320.

tial interruptions to the community and continuity of the family. As both Emile Durkheim and Arnold van Gennep already perceived,¹⁶ these are the issues addressed by those life-crisis rituals surrounding birth, puberty, marriage, and death, with their attendant dilemma of increasing or decreasing the community. Such entrances and exits, such incorporations and dissolutions, require social/ritual markings and memorializations. While van Gennep's overreliance on the metaphor of "threshold" may require revision, for domestic religion the *limen* is central inasmuch as it highlights issues of external, rather than familial, relations. The threshold separates those who belong, or who are welcome through complex codes of hospitality, from those who are not. It separates those who are received by a host (in the sense of one who provides food) from those who are repelled by a host (in the sense of armed force). The central locus of this difference, expressed as inclusion or exclusion, and, therefore, the most elaborated form of the domestic religion of "here," is the familial meal, with its attendant ethos of commensality.

The meal might be routinely marked as "religious" by verbal formulae or through ritual business with food—although almost always these employ ordinary domestic utensils or common fire, and consist of small elaborations of quotidian acts of eating, drinking, cooking, serving, pouring—but its prime mode of domestic sacrality consists in acknowledging who is there, both the familial living and the familial dead. The latter present something of a paradox. It is, on the one hand, crucial that the dead remain in the sphere of the dead. Ghosts, the undead, the resurrected constitute, from this perspective, a threat to be protected against, while protecting them against others. On the other hand, it is equally crucial that there be controlled contact with the dead, that there be a continuity of relationship and appropriate modes of the dead's presence. Hence practices that range from memorializing the dead at meals to sharing food with the dead or eating with the dead, often at burial sites.¹⁷ (In the latter case, there is archaeological evidence at selected sites for *refrigeria*, often by holes drilled in tombs or tomb-

16. Emile Durkheim, *The Elementary Forms of Religious Life* (New York: Free Press, 1995), esp. 405; Arnold van Gennep, *The Rites of Passage* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1960), 41–165.

17. See my treatment of these themes in Jonathan Z. Smith, *Drudgery Divine: On the Comparison of Early Christianities and the Religions of Late Antiquity*, Jordan Lectures in Comparative Religion, School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London, 14; and Chicago Studies in the History of Judaism (London: School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990), 122–32. There have been a number of important specialized studies of some of these themes, ranging from Jo Ann Scurlock, "Magical Means of Dealing with Ghosts in Ancient Mesopotamia" (Ph.D. diss., University of Chicago, 1988), to T. J. Lewis, *Cults of the Dead in Ancient Israel and Ugarit*, Harvard Semitic Monographs 39 (Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1989); Jean Bottéro, *Mesopotamia: Writing, Reasoning, and the Gods* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992), 279–84, offers a set of subtle generalizations concerning the familial dead.

stones through which foodstuffs and drink could be introduced.)¹⁸ The appropriate form of the presence of the dead is expressed, as well, in general categories such as "blessing," as well as in their oracular or intercessory roles within familial settings.¹⁹

2. "THERE": THE SPHERE OF CIVIC AND NATIONAL RELIGION

It is possible to be briefer in describing the religion of "there," as this is what most of us think of first when we imagine ancient religion: the dominant deities and their attendant mythologies and liturgies; the impressive constructions associated with temple, court, and public square. Wherever one's domicile, these latter locales are someplace else, are "over there" in relation to one's homeplace. To some degree, access to such constructions is difficult, as expressed in the architectural language of walls and gates, of zones and nested interiors.²⁰

The religion of "there" appears, cross-culturally, as the result of the co-occurrence of at least six elements, although causal priority cannot be ascribed to any one member of the nexus: urbanism, sacred kingship, temple, hereditary priesthood (as well as other religious specialists often organized as craft guilds),

18. The starting point for any analysis remains André Parrot, *Le "refrigerium" dans l'au delà* (Paris: Librairie E. Leroux, 1937). See further CAD A/2, 324, s.v. *arātu*. For a rare Greek example, see Martin P. Nilsson, *Geschichte der griechischen Religion: 1, Die Religion Griechenlands bis auf die griechische Weltherrschaft*, Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft, 5. Abt., 2. Teil (Munich: C. H. Beck, 1976), 177 and n. 1. For these traditions in late antiquity, see, among others, G. F. Snyder, *Ante Pacem: Archaeological Evidence of Church Life Before Constantine* (Macon, Ga.: Mercer, 1985), 172, s.v. "meal for the dead," and compare the use of Snyder in Smith, *Drudgery Divine*, 129–32. For later, North African Christian *refrigeria*, largely associated with martyria, see J. Quasten, "Vetus Superstitio et Nova Religio: The Problem of Refrigerium in the Ancient Church of North Africa," *HTR* 33 (1940): 253–66.

19. The oracular materials are often subsumed under the broader category of necromancy (a term of enormous fluidity, as, for example, in Josef Tropper, *Nekromantie: Totenbefragung im Alten Orient und Alten Testament*, *Alter Orient und Altes Testament*, 223 [Kevelaer: Butzon & Bercker; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1989]). See, among others, the significant recent studies by I. L. Finkel, "Necromancy in Ancient Mesopotamia," *AfO* 29–30 (1983–84): 1–17; Karel van der Toorn, "The Nature of the Biblical Teraphim in the Light of the Cuneiform Evidence," *CBQ* 52 (1990): 203–22; B. B. Schmidt, *Israel's Beneficent Dead: Ancestor Cult and Necromancy in Ancient Israelite Religion and Tradition*, *Forschungen zum Alten Testament*, 11 (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1994). See also the shrewd comments on oracular dreams of the dead in a Melanesian context in Kenelm Burridge, *Mambu: A Study of Melanesian Cargo Movements and Their Social and Ideological Background* (London: Methuen, 1960), 252–53; idem, *Tangu Traditions: A Study of the Way of Life, Mythology, and Developing Experience of a New Guinea People* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969), 164–66.

20. Smith, *To Take Place*, 48–73. Compare the recent remarkable work by S. M. Olyan, *Rites and Rank: Hierarchy in Biblical Representations of Cult* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000).

sacrifice, and writing.²¹ As this list suggests, the religion of “there” has to do primarily with relations of power. These relations are expressed, religiously, through modes of replication and rectification, characteristically employing the dual idioms of sacred/profane, pure/impure, permitted/forbidden.²² Skill in the strategic deployment of these relations requires complex specialized knowledge (rather than largely oral, familial knowledge), as well as the mastery of intricate modes of interpretation ranging from the technologies of divination to the devices of casuistry.²³

Central to these “imperial” religious formations is a principle first enunciated by the so-called Pan-Babylonian school, who understood their early reading of cuneiform texts to reveal a worldview dominated by the equivalence “as above, so below.”²⁴ Rather than the immediate and symmetrical reciprocities of the religion of “here,” the religion of “there” postulates a distance between the realm of the gods and the human realm. This distance is a relative one. Unlike today’s all-but-infinite cosmos, the ancient calculation of distance was a matter of hundreds of feet (the distance at which the smoke of sacrifice disappears from view). Nevertheless, this distance was mediated by structures such as kingship and temple, in which the “above” served, ideologically, as a template for the “below,” in which a variety of human activities served to bring the “below” ever closer to the “above” through ritual works of repetition and, when breaches occurred, through ritual works of rectification.

This essentially imperial cosmology is concerned with defending both the center and the periphery. These are frequently first established as the result of a cosmogony through combat in which a new king of the gods overthrows the previous king, thereby gaining the right to reorganize the world according to his like. (Note that, despite many scholars’ formulations, this is a movement not from chaos to order but rather from a previous system of order to a new system of order.) Typically, parts of the predecessor’s cosmos are recycled and re-placed in the new order, thus introducing a potentially destabilizing element if the new or-

21. This complex has been best adumbrated by Paul Wheatley’s work on “urban genesis,” especially *The Pivot of the Four Quarters: A Preliminary Enquiry into the Origins and Character of the Ancient Chinese City* (Chicago: Aldine Pub. Co., 1971). See further the bibliography of Wheatley in Smith, *To Take Place*, 149 n. 16, as well as my comments on Wheatley, 50–54.

22. These three systems, while often parallel, ought not to be confused, as they are in the classic work by Mary Douglas, *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of Concepts of Pollution and Taboo* (New York: Praeger, 1966).

23. See Smith, *Map Is Not Territory*, 70–72; idem, *Imagining Religion: From Babylon to Jonestown*, Chicago Studies in the History of Judaism (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982), 48–49.

24. On the Pan-Babylonian school, see Smith, *Imagining Religion*, 23–29; idem, “Mythos und Geschichte,” in Hans Peter Duerr, ed., *Alcheringa oder die beginnende Zeit: Studien zu Mythologie, Schamanismus und Religion* (Frankfurt: Qumran, 1983), 36–41.

der is not scrupulously maintained. (Another mode of destabilization is the possibility, inherent in royal combat, of a new challenger.) Following the victory and coronation of the king of the gods, through an essentially bureaucratic taxonomy, the various parts of the cosmos, both celestial and terrestrial, are assigned their stations, have their roles and honors established, their names pronounced, their powers placed, and their destinies fixed.²⁵ For human activity to be successful in achieving replication and rectification, the intricacies of this order must be known—a knowledge that implies both an initial difficulty of discovery and an evidence, once discovered, that is celebrated in genres ranging from wisdom texts to omens, from law-codes to mythic and historical narratives. In each of these kinds of texts, individually acquired insight is rendered into public discourse through the mediation of precedent.

Rather than commensality among an extended family with ordinary foodstuff, the central ritual of the religion of “there” is the sacrifice, a meal among unequals, often coded in complex hierarchies (as, for example, in the division of the corpse and the distribution of the meat), with at least one, usually sacerdotal, figure serving not as the presence but rather as the representative of the god(s), with concern for transporting the meat (itself not a usual item of diet) to the divine realm, which is “over there.”²⁶ Sacrifice is primarily food for the god(s), but it becomes, as well, linked with complex systems of sacred/profane, purity/

25. This summarizes both the Divine Combat Myth and the Kingship in Heaven Myth, which are widely distributed throughout the Mediterranean. See, among others, C. Scott Littleton, “The ‘Kingship in Heaven’ Theme,” in Jaan Puhvel, ed., *Myth and Law Among the Indo-Europeans* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1970), 83–121; John Day, *God’s Conflict with the Dragon and the Sea in the Old Testament* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985); Neil Forsyth, *The Old Enemy: Satan and the Combat Myth* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987); B. F. Batto, *Slaying the Dragon: Mythmaking in the Biblical Tradition* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1992); H. R. Page, *The Myth of Cosmic Rebellion: A Study of Its Reflexes in Ugaritic and Biblical Literature*, VTSup, 65 (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1996).

26. I draw here on Claude Lévi-Strauss, *The Savage Mind* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1966), 32, and his valuable contrast between games and rituals: “Games thus appear to have a disjunctive effect. . . . Ritual, on the other hand, is the exact reverse; it conjoins, for it brings about a union (one might even say communion in this context) or in any case an organic relation between two initially separate groups. . . . [In ritual] there is an asymmetry which is postulated in advance between profane and sacred, faithful and officiating, dead and living, initiated and uninitiated, etc.” Compare the view of sacrifice as communication in Henri Hubert and Marcel Mauss, *Sacrifice: Its Nature and Function* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964), 97–98. I have presented an account of sacrifice in Jonathan Z. Smith, “The Domestication of Sacrifice,” in R. G. Hamerton-Kelly, ed., *Violent Origins: Ritual Killing and Cultural Formation: Conversations Between W. Burkert, R. Girard, and J. Z. Smith* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1987), 278–304. On the division of meat, see both Marcel Detienne, “Culinary Practices and the Spirit of Sacrifice,” in Marcel Detienne and Jean-Pierre Vernant, eds., *The Cuisine of Sacrifice Among the Greeks* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989), 13, and J.-L. Durand, “Greek Animals: Toward a Topology of Edible Bodies,” in *ibid.*, 87–118.

impurity, permitted/forbidden. As such, sacrificial praxis invites learned exegesis and complex systematics unthinkable apart from writing. While I do not share the implications they draw, I commend the observation of some scholars that sacrifice is "as much a textual enterprise as one of actual practice; the sacrifice system begins to develop a level of significance independent, though not inseparable, from cultic practice."²⁷

3. THE RELIGION OF "ANYWHERE"

At times more closely related to the familial model characteristic of the religions of "here," at other times closer to the imperial model characteristic of the religions of "there," there is a third pattern of religion, which takes many forms but has in common the element that it is tied to no particular place. It is, in the strict sense, "neither here nor there." It can be anywhere. In archaic or classical formations, religions of "anywhere" include religious clubs and other forms of associations, entrepreneurial religious figures (often depicted as wandering), and religious practitioners not officially recognized by centers of power.²⁸ In many cases, to use an old sociological distinction, they are associations or figures of status, but not of rank. What they offer are means of access to, or avoidance of, modes of culturally imagined divine power not encompassed by the religions of "here" and "there." At times they may imitate, at other times they may reverse, aspects of these two other dominant forms of religion.

What has interested me for much of my scholarly career is the fact that, throughout the Mediterranean world, in the period of late antiquity, these religions of "anywhere" rise to relative prominence, although the religions of "here" and "there" continue, often in revised forms.²⁹ Much energy by several generations of scholars has been devoted to accounting for this change.³⁰ While the explanations have been highly variegated, reflecting, no doubt, that we are treating with a multicausal phenomenon, I would lift out three elements as especially relevant to our theme: a new geography, a new cosmography, and a new polity.

27. G. A. Anderson, "Sacrifice and Sacrificial Offerings," in *ABD* 5:873. For a similar perception of what Anderson calls "sacrifice as a textual phenomenon," see Hubert and Mauss, *Sacrifice*, 16.

28. See, e.g., Walter Burkert, "Craft Versus Sect: The Problem of Orphics and Pythagoreans," in B. F. Meyer and E. P. Sanders, eds., *Self-Definition in the Graeco-Roman World*, Jewish and Christian Self-Definition, 3 (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1982), 1–22.

29. See note 9 above.

30. Smith, *Map Is Not Territory*, 143.

1. First, the New Geography

While there were experiments in imperialisms from Sumer on, and dislocations due to invasions or colonizations, there is a difference in disruptive scale resulting from the newer imperialisms ranging from the Persian and Macedonian to the Roman. An anthology of texts could be gathered that expresses both the positive and negative evaluations of displacement, of being a citizen of no place. But if, as for many, the extended family, the homeplace, as well as the burial place of the honored dead are no longer coextensive *topoi*, then the religion of "here" has been detached from its roots.

In such a situation, the religion of "here" must be transmuted in such a way as to overcome this dislocation. One solution will be sociological, the association as a socially constructed replacement for the family.³¹ The other solution will be mythological. In these traditions dislocation is cosmologized by a new, vertical myth that overlies the horizontal reality (much as in Philo, where the terrestrial migrations of the Israelitic ancestors have been revalued as celestial ascents). In some forms, humans are depicted as dispersed, as exiled from their heavenly home, as having been mis-placed into bodies. Through death, or by undergoing rituals that are deathlike, individuals may ascend, back, to their true home, "on high," thus overcoming distance. Locale, having been dis-placed, is now re-placed.³² These transformations give comparative advantage to religions of "anywhere."

2. Second, the New Cosmography

While not without elaboration, the archaic two-story cosmos (above/below) or three-story (above/earth/underworld) cosmos allowed for points of mediation between strata imagined as being relatively adjacent. Communication was largely unimpeded.³³ Each realm could have the other always in its sight. (Hence, archaic

31. See the important collection of studies in J. S. Kloppenborg and S. G. Wilson, eds., *Voluntary Associations in the Graeco-Roman World* (London: Routledge, 1996), and the brilliant overview of the state of the question by R. S. Ascough, *What Are They Saying About the Formation of Pauline Churches?* (New York: Paulist Press, 1998).

32. Smith, *Map Is Not Territory*, xii-xv, et passim.

33. The issue of the communication between the realms as well as the dilemma of the blockage of communication between the upper and lower worlds has led to J. Rudhardt's important revisionary understanding of the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter* in "À propos de l'hymne homérique à Déméter," *Museum Helveticum* 35 (1978): 1-17, now available in a slightly abridged English translation in H. P. Foley, ed., *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter: Translation, Commentary, and Interpretive Essays* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994), 198-211. See also J. S. Clay, *The Politics of Olympus: Form*

structures such as covenant). Each displayed its appropriate order to the other, an order that was to be affirmed and replicated, an order that could be rectified if breached. The cosmos, as the Greek implies (Gk. *kosmos*, lit. "order"), was essentially good and beautiful because its elements were in their appropriate place. These were the essential presuppositions for the religions of "there."³⁴

The new late antique cosmography, articulated from Eudoxus (390–340 B.C.E.) to Ptolemy (fl. 127–48 C.E.), proposed a far different picture. The earth was now conceived as a sphere, surrounded by the circular orbits of other planetary spheres, which either comprised or were transcended by divine realms.³⁵ In a common literary topos, the view back from the vast expanse of celestial space rendered the earth small; the human activities on its surface were seen as minuscule, as insignificant.³⁶ As the planets revolved around the earth, they spent much of their time period out of sight. We can't see them; they can't see us. What are they up to? Do they know what we're up to? How is the elevation of the food of sacrifice possible with such a remote and movable target? (The dilemma is not unlike that of the Houston Space Center which can fire a rocket only when there is a "window of opportunity.") Transcendence of earth, both as an experience and as a source of knowledge, becomes a goal—giving comparative advantage to a religion of "anywhere." (It is important, in the understanding of these traditions and their transcendental horizon, not to substitute the notion of "everywhere" for that of "anywhere.")

To give but one example: It is one thing to observe the movements of the heavenly bodies and discern from them knowledge both of the regularities of the cosmos and of the destinies of terrestrial affairs, the collection of which remains, especially in the vast Mesopotamian omen series, one of the chief intellectual achievements associated with the religions of "there." It is quite another matter to claim experience of having ascended to the stars or through the planetary spheres, and to assert one's kinship with them, in order either to obtain celestial knowledge directly or to press past them to reach even higher realms and even more hidden divine knowledge.

and *Meaning in the Major Homeric Hymns* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989), 202–66, esp. 208–13, 219, 220–21, 256–57, 260–66.

34. Compare the essay by Jean Bottéro, "The Religious System," in *Mesopotamia*, 201–31, esp. 218–31.

35. See, among others, Martin P. Nilsson, "The New Conception of the Universe in Late Greek Paganism," *Eranos* 44 (1946): 20–27; cf. idem, *Geschichte der griechischen Religion*; 2, *Die hellenistische und römische Zeit*, 4th ed., *Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft*, 5. Abt., 2. Teil (Munich: C. H. Beck, 1988), 702–11; idem, *Greek Piety* (New York: Norton, 1969), 96–103.

36. See the treatment of this topos in E. R. Dodds, *Pagan and Christian in an Age of Anxiety*, The Wiles Lectures, 1963 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968), 7–8.

3. Third, the New Polity

The creation of new political ideologies, post-Alexander (356–323 B.C.E.), are the result of the total cessation of native kingship.³⁷ The unique, mediating role of the king was one of the foundations of the religion of “there.” His removal from the scene was decentering. In some late antique traditions, the old forms of kingship became idealized objects of nostalgia, as in messianism. At the same time, archaic combat myths were re-visioned as resistance myths to foreign kings, resulting in new religious formations such as apocalypticism and millenarianism.³⁸ Other traditions appear to have pressed the logic of archaic sacred kingship even further. If the king was the image of the deity, and if the wrong king, that is to say, the foreign or illegitimate king, now sat on the throne, then there must be a wrong, or counterfeit, king of the gods on high, a concomitant variation explored in gnosticizing reinterpretations of archaic traditions.³⁹

The new mode of kingship, post-Alexander, was not only foreign, it was remote. Positively, as Eric Petersen has suggested, the model of the distant emperor, mediated by satraps, governors, or vassal kings, played a significant role in the elaboration of the new formations of monotheism, along with the king-god’s ubiquitous attendant subordinate and secondary divinities, principalities, and powers.⁴⁰ All of these actors were capable of being readily assimilated to the new, expanded cosmography. Similarly, there could be claimed experiences of celestial journeys to, or the receipt of messages from, the true king of the gods, who was above, or antagonistic to, the king-god of this world.⁴¹

In illustrating the effects of these three new elements, I have largely confined myself to examples from the mythological response to the new geography, cosmog-

37. See, in general, S. K. Eddy, *The King Is Dead: Studies in the Near Eastern Resistance to Hellenism, 334–31 B.C.* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1961), a pioneering work on the consequences of the cessation of native kingship.

38. On these themes, see Smith, *Map Is Not Territory*, 67–87. For the Egyptian materials there cited, see now the superb treatment by D. Frankfurter, *Elijah in Upper Egypt: The Apocalypse of Elijah and Early Egyptian Christianity*, Studies in Antiquity and Christianity (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993), 159–238.

39. I have persistently maintained that rather than thinking of “gnosticism” as a separate religious entity, it should be viewed as a structural possibility within religious traditions, analogous to categories such as mysticism or asceticism, and needs to be seen in relation to exegetical, reinterpretative practices. The wrong-king/wrong-god element discussed in the text should be compared to M. A. Williams’s category of “biblical demiurgical” in his important work *Rethinking “Gnosticism”: An Argument for Dismantling a Dubious Category* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996), 51–53, et passim.

40. E. Petersen, *Der Monotheismus als politisches Problem: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der politischen Theologie im Imperium Romanum* (Leipzig: Hegner, 1935).

41. Cf. Forsyth, *Old Enemy*.

raphy, and polity. Let me turn, now, to the social, with respect to two formations, one of which, while common, does not appear to figure largely in this volume, that of associations. The other, which is discussed at length elsewhere in this collection, is magic. In so doing, I will highlight reconfigurations and reinterpretations of elements characteristic of the religions of "here" and "there."

Associations, as religions of "anywhere," may be understood primarily as replacements of the religion of "here" in modes appropriate to the new world order. They do so, at least in part, by adapting elements more characteristic of the religions of "there." Responding to the experience of dislocation, they provide a new, predominantly urban, social location. Some were formed first as immigrant societies, initially retaining strong bonds to the homeplace. Others associate around divine figures, gods and goddesses, usually, but not exclusively, of the sort more characteristic of the civic and state religions of "there." The archaic domestic preoccupation with familial relations of inclusion/exclusion is here translated into a concern for boundaries that enclose a restricted and tested membership. While entire households may join such a club, the primary relations are between individuals as members of a fictive kin group, addressing one another as "brother" and "sister." This apparent egalitarianism stands in notable contrast to the hierarchical ordering of members, bearing an often bewildering diversity of titles, some of which echo those in the highly organized bureaucracy of the religions of "there."⁴² Kinship is forged by rituals of acceptance, of initiation and expulsion, as well as legalistically by the formal acceptance of rules, the taking of oaths, the paying of dues. In this sense, group identity is not genealogical, but, rather, contractual. Indeed, some groups are chartered by the state; all are subject, at least in principle, to government regulation.⁴³

The meal shared by these "brothers" and "sisters" continues to be the prime repetitive ritual for expressing their relations, now undertaken in the setting of a privately owned cult place or burial site, at times with hieratic practices that reflect priestly concerns characteristic of the religions of "there" (as, for example, in the Pharisaic *havurah*).⁴⁴

In some associations, rather than forgetfulness representing a threat to the maintenance of the community, disclosure now menaces the group. Secrecy, with respect to those outside, has become an important value.

42. See Th. Schmeller, *Hierarchie und Egalität: Eine sozial-geschichtliche Untersuchung paulinischer Gemeinden und griechisch-römischer Vereine*, Stuttgarter Bibelstudien, 162 (Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1995).

43. See the literature cited in note 31 above.

44. Jacob Neusner, *From Politics to Piety: The Emergence of Pharisaic Judaism* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1973), 83–90.

Finally, I should note that these associations have the potential of working at cross-purposes to the older conceptualizations of family in the religions of "here," as when differing memberships divide genealogical siblings while, at the same time, establishing new, intimate relations and loyalties among their socially created fellow "brothers" and "sisters."

I have written elsewhere on the problematics of magic, and shall, therefore, not rehearse that here.⁴⁵ For the purposes of this essay, it is sufficient only to note that late antique magic, often conceptualized as a religion of "anywhere," represents, among other things, a fascinating and creative combination and re-formation of elements characteristic of both the religion of "here" and of "there." Like the religion of "here," its prime space is domestic, its rituals are small-scale. It may seek relations with the dead, or with exceedingly local divinities. But, just as frequently, it treats with the sorts of deities more commonly associated with the religions of "there." In either case, it does so in the insistent idiom of oracle and sacrifice. Finally, as is characteristic of the religions of "there," magic is a learned profession, presupposing both written texts and complex techniques for their interpretation.⁴⁶

From another perspective, however, late antique magic is primarily a religion of "anywhere." As is the case with associations, it deploys ritual distinctions, especially initiations, with a highly developed sense of inclusion/exclusion. As with associations, its greatest threat is the divulging of its secrets.⁴⁷ As is characteristic of religions of "anywhere," it places great value on direct experience of transcendent beings, both as a demonstration of power and as a means of gaining esoteric knowledge.

In the vast panorama of religions this volume encompasses, it is possible to propose a final taxonomic generalization, one that depends on contrastive world-views and their attendant soteriologies. We may distinguish between religions of "sanctification," which celebrate the present ordered world, having as their goal its maintenance and repair, and religions of "salvation," which seek to escape the structures and strictures of this world through activities having as their goal a con-

45. Smith, *Map Is Not Territory*, 172–89; idem, "Towards Interpreting Demonic Powers in Hellenistic and Roman Antiquity," in ANRW (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1978), 16.1:425–39; idem, "Trading Places," in Marvin Meyer and Paul Mirecki, eds., *Ancient Magic and Ritual Power*, Religions in the Graeco-Roman World, 129 (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1995), 13–27.

46. Hans Dieter Betz, "The Formation of Authoritative Tradition in the Greek Magical Papyri," in Meyer and Sanders, *Self-Definition in the Graeco-Roman World*, 161–70.

47. See, among others, Hans Dieter Betz, "Secrecy in the Greek Magical Papyri," in Hans G. Kippenberg and G. G. Stroumsa, eds., *Secrecy and Concealment: Studies in the History of Mediterranean and Near Eastern Religions*, Numen Book Series, 65 (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1995), 153–75.

stant working towards transcendence. While perhaps having an apparent affinity with one or the other, the religions of “here,” “there,” and “anywhere,” have been adapted to either worldview. The contestations, permutations, and combinations generated by these two ethoi, whether within or between any particular tradition, constitute what we take to be the history of religions.