

Jews and Christians in the First and Second Centuries: How to Write Their History

Edited by

Peter J. Tomson
Joshua Schwartz



BRILL

LEIDEN | BOSTON

Contents

List of Contributors IX

Introduction 1

PART 1

Varieties of Judaism and Christianity in Late Second Temple Times

How Later Contexts Affect Pauline Content, or: Retrospect is the Mother of Anachronism 17

Paula Fredriksen

Flourishing before the Crisis: Mapping Judaeans Society in the First Century CE 52

Eyal Regev

The Carabas Affair (in Flacc 36–39): An Incident Emblematic of Philo's Political Philosophy 70

Baudouin Decharneux

The Jewishness of Jude–James–Hebrews in Light of Purity 80

Huub van de Sandt

PART 2

The Period of the Revolts 66–135 CE

Animal Sacrifice and Political Identity in Rome and Judaea 105

James B. Rives

Why Did Judaeans Go to War with Rome in 66–67 CE? Realist-Regional Perspectives 126

Steve Mason

'Men Casually Armed against Fully Equipped Regulars': The Roman Military Response to Jewish Insurgence 63 BCE–135 CE 207

Adrian Goldsworthy

Yavne Revisited: Jewish 'Survival' in the Wake of the War of Destruction 238

Joshua Schwartz

The Destruction of the Temple and the Conformation of Judaism and Christianity 253

J. Andrew Overman

Socio-Economic and Cultural Developments in the Galilee from the Late First to the Early Third Century CE 278

Ze'ev Safrai

PART 3

Post-Revolt Jewish and Christian Identities

'Jews' and 'Christians' in the Eyes of Roman Authors c. 100 CE 313

John M.G. Barclay

The *Fiscus Judaicus*: Its Social and Legal Impact and a Possible Relation with Josephus' Antiquities 327

Marius Heemstra

The Didache, Matthew, and Barnabas as Sources for Early Second Century Jewish and Christian History 348

Peter J. Tomson

Beyond Naming: Laws of *Minim* in Tannaic Literature and the Early Rabbinic Discourse of *Minut* 383

Adiel Schremer

The Rule of the Martian in the Ancient Diaspora: Celsus and His Jew 398

Albert I. Baumgarten

***Yetser Ha-Ra and Daimones: A Shared Ancient Jewish and Christian
Discourse*** 431

Ishay Rosen-Zvi

Abbreviations 455

Bibliography 458

Index of Ancient Sources 511

Index of Names 535

Animal Sacrifice and Political Identity in Rome and Judaea

James B. Rives

Josephus, in describing the buildup to the Judaeen revolt against Rome, pauses at one point to single out two particular incidents: first, a group of insurgents attacked the fortress of Masada, slaying the Roman garrison and installing their own men in its place; secondly, the captain of the Temple in Jerusalem persuaded the officiating priests to accept no gift or sacrifice from a foreigner, with the result that the sacrifices performed on behalf of the Emperor and the Roman people ceased to be offered. A reader unfamiliar with Josephus might reasonably expect him to have highlighted the former of these two episodes, since it obviously constituted the outbreak of actual hostilities between Judaeans and Romans; yet it is in fact the latter that he chose to emphasize, elaborating on it at length and presenting it as ‘the foundation of the war against the Romans’.¹ My purpose in this paper² is not so much to argue that Josephus’ assessment of this incident was correct, but rather to explore the cultural context that allowed him to make such an assessment at all.

Animal sacrifice, I propose, provides a very useful lens through which to examine the complex process of religious, cultural, and political negotiation between Judaeans and non-Judaeans, especially Roman authorities.³ I shall first argue that in the Graeco-Roman world animal sacrifice played an important part in organizing social and political relationships, and even in

¹ War 2:408f; for the elaboration, see 410–417.

² I owe thanks to the other participants in the colloquium for their comments and discussion, especially Peter Tomson and Paula Fredriksen, who provided me with much valuable feedback, and also to the editors, for their helpful suggestions on the final draft.

³ Whether Greek *Ioudaios* / Latin *Judaicus* is best translated as ‘Jew’ or ‘Judaeen’ is a much debated question; it seems to me that there is no single correct answer, but that the choice of translation is determined in part by one’s particular project. Since my own project is largely one of trying to recreate the ancient Graeco-Roman perspective, in which identity was more familiarly conceived in ethnic/geographical rather than religious terms, I tend to find the term ‘Judaeen’ helpful. For more detailed discussion, see, e.g., Cohen, *Beginnings*, 69–106; Mason, ‘Jews, Judeans’; and Schwartz, “‘Judaeen’ or ‘Jew’?”

constructing 'Graeco-Roman' culture itself. I shall then sketch out some of the key differences between Judaeian sacrificial practice and Graeco-Roman practice, in order to assess the ways that animal sacrifice did and did not contribute to the integration of Judaeians into the Graeco-Roman world. Lastly, I shall close with some very brief remarks about developments after the end of the war in 70 CE.

Animal Sacrifice in the Graeco-Roman World

The social and political significance of animal sacrifice in the Graeco-Roman world was anchored in some basic economic realities: the typical sacrificial victims (pigs, sheep, and bovines) were valuable resources that most people could not afford to consume on a regular basis. As a way of demonstrating piety towards the gods, animal sacrifice was thus intrinsically geared towards the wealthy. I do not wish to imply that people of more modest means never offered animal sacrifices; undoubtedly they did. But by and large it was only the wealthy who could afford to sacrifice animals on a regular basis, to sacrifice more prestigious victims (for example, adult rather than young animals and bovines rather than smaller species), and to observe with more care the rules governing the choice of victim (for example, that animals be unblemished and in perfect condition, and that in certain cases they meet particular requirements as to sex, color, age, or fertility). The observation of such rules implies the ability to select from a reasonably large pool of animals, something that people of modest means would often not be able to do. In Greek literary and artistic sources, of course, animal sacrifice is regularly presented as the chief expression of piety to the gods; one might easily conclude from reading Homer or Sophocles or from studying vase paintings or votive reliefs that any respectable Greek regularly sacrificed adult bovines or at least pigs or sheep. But all these sources, I would argue, reflect a deliberate ideological agenda as much as they do actual historical realities: the constant representation of animal sacrifice as the best type of offering to the gods also served as a demonstration of the superior piety of the elite. Moreover, because the normal form of animal sacrifice involved the consumption of the edible parts by the participants, it also allowed the wealthy to bestow largesse on those of lower status by providing them with a luxury, a good meal featuring meat.⁴

4 On economic aspects of Greek animal sacrifice, see in general Jameson, 'Sacrifice and Animal Husbandry'; van Straten, 'Sacrificial Representations'; Howe, *Pastoral Politics*, especially 118–122.

The ideological significance of this nexus between wealth, piety, and socio-economic status is perhaps most obvious in the case of classical Athens, where there was a deliberate attempt to disrupt that nexus for political/ideological reasons. The city itself sponsored a number of large-scale public sacrifices, in which at least some of the meat from the sacrificial victims was consumed by citizens at large. The funding for these sacrifices came from the regular annual budget of the polis rather than individual private benefactors. As Robert Parker has observed, 'the great patron, which arrogated the gratitude traditionally due to individuals, was now the democracy itself'.⁵ Athens was of course extraordinary both in the extent of its resources and in the rigor of its egalitarian ethos, but some degree of egalitarian ethos seems to have been typical of the classical polis in general, and it was accordingly also typical that public sacrifices were paid for with public funds. Starting in the Hellenistic period, however, the economic elite began to reassert its primacy, and the nexus between wealth, piety, and socio-economic status reemerged in a new form, the system of exchange that in modern scholarship is usually labeled *euergetism*.

In the *euergetic* system, which dominated civic life from at least the second century BCE to the second century CE, local elites expended their private resources on public benefactions in return for public recognition of their superior status within the community and control over public affairs.⁶ These benefactions took many forms, but one of the most ideologically potent was the sponsorship of a public festival in honor of the city's patron deity; these typically involved athletic and/or musical competitions and climaxed with the ritual sequence of procession, sacrifice, and public banquet over which the benefactor would preside in person. The role of the *euergetes* as officiant at such sacrifices effectively encapsulated his relationship with his fellow citizens: it was his wealth, embodied quite literally in the animals over whose slaughter he presided, that established on the one hand his importance in mediating between the community and its gods, and on the other his benevolence to his fellow citizens, who in many cases would have derived a very direct benefit from the ritual by participating in the banquet that followed.⁷

But the role of animal sacrifice in the construction of social and political hierarchies was not limited to the issue of who paid for and presided over it; there was also the issue of its recipient. Originally, of course, animal sacrifice

5 See in general Rosivach, *System of Public Sacrifice*, and Parker, *Athenian Religion*, 75–79 and 127–129 (quotation on 129).

6 On *euergetism*, see in general Veyne, *Le pain et le cirque*; Gauthier, *Les cités grecques*; Quass, *Honoratienschicht*; Domingo Gygas, 'Euergetismus', 'Origines' and 'Intercambio'.

7 See in general Gordon, 'Veil of Power', especially 224–230.

was offered only to beings conceived of as vastly more powerful than humans, that is, the gods. Beginning in the late fourth century BCE, however, animal sacrifice and other ‘honors equivalent to those of the gods’ (*timai isotheoi*) began to be offered to humans, notably the successors of Alexander the Great, whose power over other mortals was felt to be on a level with that of the gods. We have evidence for such sacrifices first for Hellenistic rulers, then for outstanding local benefactors, and finally for the Roman Emperors.

The loose amalgam of imagery and cult practices that goes by the shorthand name of ‘imperial cult’ in fact provides an exemplary summary of the multiple and complex ways that animal sacrifice functioned to structure socio-political hierarchies in the Roman Empire. In some cases, the Emperor was the recipient of animal sacrifices, a role that served to define his relationship to the people of the Empire as equivalent to that of a god. At the same time, the Emperor was regularly presented on reliefs and coins as the paradigmatic sacrificant, the supreme benefactor who mediated between his people and the gods. At the same time again, sacrifices were offered to the gods on the Emperor’s behalf, as well as to the Emperor himself, and the people who presided over these sacrifices were naturally those same local benefactors whom I have already discussed; just as the Emperor mediated between the Empire and the gods, so they mediated between local communities and the gods, including the god-like Emperor. And this entire complex of hierarchical social and political relationships was enacted through the ritual of animal sacrifice, which manifested them in a very immediate and vivid form.⁸

Yet there is more to the social and cultural significance of animal sacrifice even than this. I have several times referred to ‘the Graeco-Roman world’ and ‘the Graeco-Roman perspective’. The phrase ‘Graeco-Roman’ is in certain respects problematic, but it also serves as an effective shorthand for summing up one of the most important cultural developments of the Roman period, namely, the forging of a set of cultural norms that bound together the elite throughout the entire Empire. This set of norms resulted from a complex and ongoing process of negotiation between Roman/Italic tradition and Greek tradition and was made possible by the fact that the two traditions shared from the start a certain number of cultural practices. Among these shared practices, I would argue that animal sacrifice had a particularly important place: as an important religious ritual, it was both a familiar part of life and simultaneously

8 Sacrifices offered to rulers and benefactors: Gauthier, *Les cités grecques*, 46–53; Price, *Rituals and Power*, 222–225. Emperor as sacrificant: Gordon, ‘Veil of Power’, 202–219. On sacrifice in imperial cult, see in general Price, *Rituals and Power*, 207–233; Friesen, *Twice Neokoros*, 146–152; Gradel, *Emperor Worship*, 15–26.

imbued with special significance; because it was not clearly marked as either Greek or Roman in origin, it seemed universal, and thus 'natural', in a way that many other cultural practices did not; because it consisted primarily in a set of actions, it did not depend on language and did not require translation. Animal sacrifice thus constituted a 'Graeco-Roman' practice *par excellence*, one that apparently transcended ethnic distinctions and so could readily be regarded as a cross-cultural marker of civilization; it was accepted, for the most part without question, as the normal and natural way to express piety towards the gods.

This fact had important implications on the level both of discourse and of policy. On the level of discourse, the characterization of a person or group's sacrificial practice also functioned to characterize their cultural status. Stories about deviant sacrificial practice, such as the use of inappropriate victims, human victims above all, served to mark off groups and individuals who were thought to lack or be opposed to the normal standards of civilization: barbarians, witches, conspirators, tyrants. The Judaeans themselves were sometimes marked off in this way.⁹ The implications on the level of policy I have already discussed: it was in part because animal sacrifice was taken for granted as a normative cross-cultural practice that it could work to tie together the socio-political hierarchies throughout the Empire as a whole. Since some form of ritualized slaughter in honor of the gods was already practiced among many of the peoples over whom the Romans established hegemony, it was readily available as a tool for cultural and political integration. In all these ways the practice of animal sacrifice formed part of the basic common cultural vocabulary that helped unite the disparate ethnic and religious traditions of the Empire.

The core of my argument is that Judaeon tradition was one of these; that animal sacrifice, as a cultic practice central to both Judaeon and Graeco-Roman religious tradition, played an important role in integrating Judaeans into the Graeco-Roman world. It is true that sacrificial practice in Judaeon tradition differed from that in Graeco-Roman tradition in a number of important ways: it required the participation of men who belonged to an hereditary priestly class, it could take place only in one sanctuary, and most importantly it could be offered only to one deity. Although these distinctive characteristics were the result of particular historical developments, some of which may even have been relatively recent, by the time Judaea was integrated politically into the sphere of Roman hegemony, they seem to have been firmly accepted by most

9 See in general Rives, 'Human Sacrifice'; on the Judaeans, see Josephus, *Ag Ap* 2:89–96, with Bickerman, 'Ritualmord', and Schäfer, *Judeophobia*, 62–65.

Judaeans as core elements of their ancestral tradition, mandated by the laws which their god – according to the tradition codified in their sacred writings – had given them at the originary moment of their national history. I will now briefly survey the most important similarities and differences between Judaeans and Graeco-Roman sacrificial practice, so that we may see more clearly the precise ways in which animal sacrifice could and could not serve to integrate Judaeans into the Graeco-Roman world.

The Specific Character of Judaeans Sacrificial Cult

The most fundamental difference between Judaeans and Graeco-Roman sacrificial practice was the fact that Judaeans refused to participate in sacrifices to gods other than their own. This was of course simply one facet of the general Judaeans rejection of all alien worship, and it is not clear that in this context animal sacrifice constituted an area of particular concern. Later rabbinic opinion would suggest that it did not: thus, for example, according to the Mishna, “The idolater” [is culpable] no matter whether he worships or sacrifices or burns incense or pours out a libation or bows himself down to it or accepts it as his god or says to it “Thou are my god”.¹⁰ A particular anxiety over food offered to idols does emerge among followers of Jesus, but I know of only slight traces of this anxiety in later rabbinic opinion; it seems likely that the particular issue of sacrificial meat became important to Christians because non-Christian Judaeans were already insulated from it by more general prohibitions against gentile food.¹¹ The Damascus Document specifically forbids the sale of clean animals to gentiles ‘lest they offer them in sacrifice’; but this is only one of several kinds of prohibited commercial interactions with gentiles, and in later rabbinic tradition a concern with selling gentiles animals that could be sacrificed is not particularly prominent.¹² Likewise, although the refusal of Judaeans

10 mSan 7:4. Here and elsewhere in this study, Danby’s translation is followed.

11 Followers of Jesus: 1 Cor 8–10; Acts 15:20, 29 and 21:25; Rev 2:14, 20; Did 6:3; Justin, Dial 34:8, and 35; Irenaeus, Adv haer 1.6.3; for further references in Christian texts up to the fourth century CE, see Böckenhoff, *Speisegesetz*, 33–70, and Cheung, *Idol Food*, 165–295. Rabbinic opinion: e.g., R. Akiva at mAZ 2:3, R. Shimon at mAv 3:3. See further the detailed discussion of this issue by Tomson, *Paul and the Jewish Law*, 151–220. On Judaeans prohibitions against gentile food, see especially Freidenreich, *Foreigners and Their Food*, 29–84, and also Rosenblum, *Food and Identity*, 36–58.

12 CD 12:9–10, ET Vermes. Rabbinic views on this issue seems to have been much less strict than that found in the Qumran texts; two passages in the Mishna that are sometimes

to participate in the worship of other gods was one of the chief objections that their non-Judaeans neighbors brought against them, I find little evidence for a concern with the refusal to sacrifice in particular. The limitation of sacrifice to only one god, although a highly distinctive feature of Judaeans sacrificial practice from the point of view of Judaeans and non-Judaeans alike, was thus simply one aspect of the more fundamental issue of the Judaeans rejection of alien worship.

Equally distinctive, from the Graeco-Roman point of view, was the fact that in Judaeans tradition, at least by the Roman period, sacrifices could take place in only one location, the Temple in Jerusalem. In the Graeco-Roman tradition, a person could offer a sacrifice more or less anywhere; to offer a sacrifice to Jupiter Optimus Maximus, for example, one did not need to go to his chief temple on the Capitoline Hill in Rome, or even to one of the many other temples dedicated to him. The fact that Judaeans who wanted to offer a sacrifice to their god had to go to the single temple in Jerusalem must have struck non-Judaeans observers as peculiar. There is, to be sure, some slight and uncertain evidence that some Judaeans of the diaspora may in fact have performed sacrifices, especially the Passover lamb, at locations other than the Temple: Philo writes of the Passover celebration in a way that could be

interpreted as evidence for a specific concern with gentile sacrifice seem to me to suggest the reverse. First, mAZ 1:5: 'These things it is forbidden to sell to the gentiles: fir-cones, white figs with their stalks, frankincense, or a white cock. R. Judah says: One may sell a gentile a white cock among other cocks, or, if it is by itself, cut off its spur and sell it to him, because they do not sacrifice to an idol what is defective. All other things, if [any idolatrous use is] not specified, are permitted to be sold; but if [any idolatrous use is] specified, they are forbidden'. Second, mAZ 1:6: 'Where the custom is to sell small cattle to gentiles, they may sell them; where the custom is not to sell them, they may not sell them. And nowhere may they sell them large cattle, calves, or foals, whole or maimed. R. Judah permits a maimed beast [to be sold] and Ben Bathyra permits a horse'. In both passages, R. Yehuda demonstrates a clear concern with gentile sacrifice in particular, for reasons made explicit in 1:5 and implied in 1:6; the same is possibly also true of Ben Batira, since in Graeco-Roman tradition horses were rarely sacrificed. Yet the same cannot be said of the majority opinion in either passage: 'small cattle' were probably sacrificed more often than large ones, inasmuch as they were more affordable, and although all the items in 1:5 might well have figured among Graeco-Roman offerings, none of them apart from frankincense had a particularly prominent place. If these prescriptions were indeed meant to prohibit Judaeans from selling gentiles items that could be used in sacrifices, as suggested by Schiffman, 'Legislation', 385–387, and, more tentatively, Porton, 'Forbidden Transactions', 321–324, they would have done a remarkably poor job at achieving their goal.

read to imply that the Judaeans of Alexandria sacrificed Passover lambs in their homes, and a decree of the city council of Sardis in Asia Minor recorded by Josephus refers to sacrifices offered in the Judaeans' community assembly hall.¹³ Set against this, however, is the much more abundant evidence that all Judaeans sacrificed, including that for Passover, took place in the Jerusalem Temple. Certainly that was what Judaeans law required, and the huge number of pilgrims who poured into Jerusalem for Passover suggests that that was what most Judaeans did.¹⁴ Significant negative evidence lies in the fact that Judaeans assembly halls were virtually never described as 'temples', by either Judaeans or non-Judaeans, which is what we would expect if sacrifices regularly took place there; they were instead called 'prayer-houses', *proseuchai*, or 'assembly halls', *synagôgai*.¹⁵ Lastly, the one definite exception appears to prove the rule. The Judaeans Temple founded in Leontopolis in Egypt by the high priest Onias in about 160 BCE housed a regular sacrificial cult until it was finally closed by order of Vespasian in 73 CE. Yet none of the abundant Judaeans literature produced in Alexandria so much refers to it, and later rabbinic sources accord it only a grudging and very limited recognition.¹⁶

-
- 13 Philo: Mos 2:224, Decal 159, Spec leg 2:145, with Sanders, *Practice and Belief*, 133f; cf Petropoulou, *Animal Sacrifice*, 183–185; note that Colautti, *Passover*, 231f, argues that Josephus, like Philo, assumes that Judaeans could celebrate the Passover sacrifice elsewhere than at the Temple. Decree of Sardis: Josephus, Ant 14:259–261; many commentators conclude that the formulator of the decree either used the term loosely of 'rites' in general or simply assumed that Judaeans, like other peoples, offered sacrifices as part of their ancestral rites: see, e.g., Gruen, *Diaspora*, 117, and Pucci ben Zeev, *Jewish Rights*, 221 and 223; for arguments that we should understand the phrase literally, see Cohen, 'Pagan and Christian Evidence', 165f. It is also possible that the Essenes performed sacrifices elsewhere than at the Temple: Josephus, Ant 18:18f, with the note of Feldman ad loc. in the Loeb edition.
- 14 Judaeans law: e.g., Lev 17:3–9 and Deut 12, with Deut 16:1–8 on Passover; cf (on Passover) Jub 49:16–21; mPes 5:5–10 and 7:9, 12; Justin, Dial 46:2. Pilgrim feasts: e.g., Josephus, War 2:10 = Ant 17:213f and War 6:423–425 on Passover in 4 BCE and 66 CE respectively. On the numbers of pilgrims, see further n17 below.
- 15 *Proseuchê* is the earlier term: evidence collected at Schürer et al., *History*, 2: 425f n4 and 439f n61; *synagogê* is the preferred term in NT texts: evidence collected at BDAG s.v. and Schürer, *History*, 2: 439 n60; see further Barclay, *Mediterranean Diaspora*, 26, and Schwartz, *Imperialism*, 217f.
- 16 On the temple of Onias, see in general Schürer, *History* 3: 47f, 145–147; Josephus is the only Judaeans writing in Greek to mention it. The only reference in the Mishna is at mMen 13:10: '[If he said,] "I pledge myself to offer a Whole-offering", he must offer it in the Temple. And if he offered it in the House of Onias he has not fulfilled his obligation. [If he said,] "I will offer it in the House of Onias", he should offer it in the Temple, but if he offered it in the House of Onias he has fulfilled his obligation. R. Simeon says: Such is not accounted a

The requirement that sacrifice take place only in the Jerusalem Temple meant that for some Judaeans it was a much less regular part of their cultic lives than for many people in the Graeco-Roman tradition. This is an important point, although I do not want to press it too hard. For Judaeans who lived in relatively close proximity to Jerusalem and were thus able to go there for the major pilgrim feasts, animal sacrifice was perhaps as regular an event as it was for most non-Judaeans; as I have already suggested, it is likely that most people in the Graeco-Roman tradition would have participated in an animal sacrifice only a few times a year at most. Judaeans in the diaspora, on the other hand, would have experienced animal sacrifice only in the context of visits to Jerusalem; for most people this would no doubt have been a once-in-a-lifetime event, like a pilgrimage to Mecca or Rome, something that even the wealthy would not have done frequently.¹⁷ A further corollary is that for many Judaeans, especially those in the diaspora, the experience of eating meat would have been more dissociated from the ritual of animal sacrifice than it was in the Graeco-Roman tradition; indeed, Judaeans specifically sanctioned the slaughter of animals solely for alimentary purposes.¹⁸ This is again a point that I do not want to press too hard; although it has often been said that in the Graeco-Roman world all edible meat came from sacrificial victims, so that the acts of eating meat and sacrificing animals always occurred together, recent scholarship has rightly challenged such a strictly formulated model.¹⁹ Nevertheless, it remains true that Judaeans went much further than Graeco-Roman tradition in dissociating the consumption of meat from sacrificial practice.

Whole-offering ... If priests have ministered in the House of Onias they may not minister in the Temple in Jerusalem'.

- 17 See the thorough survey of evidence in Safrai, *Wallfahrt*, 45–65 (on pilgrimage from Judaea) and 65–93 (on pilgrimage from the diaspora). He concludes (93–97) that ancient reports on the numbers of pilgrims are wildly exaggerated, and that we can estimate no more exact figure than in the tens of thousands. Although there is no reason to disbelieve the ancient evidence that Judaeans from throughout the diaspora made pilgrimages to Jerusalem, the realities of travel in the ancient world (see, e.g., Casson, *Travel*) suggest that they would have constituted only a fraction of the total.
- 18 Deut 12:13–16 and 20–27 (in apparent contrast to Lev 17:3–7); although the slaughter of animals for alimentary purposes was carefully regulated and to that extent ritualized (see mHull), it was nevertheless clearly distinguished from a sacrifice.
- 19 For assumptions about 'the absolute coincidence of meat-eating and sacrificial practice' in Greek tradition, see especially Detienne and Vernant, *Cuisine of Sacrifice* (quotation on p3); for criticism, see Naiden, *Smoke Signals*. On the Roman tradition, see the essays in Van Andringa, *Sacrifices*.

Just as sacrifices could be offered only in one place, so too only one strictly defined group of people, the hereditary clan of Aaronide priests, could offer them. This statement requires some nuancing, since it seems that any adult male Israelite, with certain exceptions, was ritually able to slaughter a victim. Only priests, however, could perform the essential acts of splashing the blood on the altar, flaying and cutting up the carcass, and burning the appropriate parts on the altar. It was thus only priests who could actually act as sacrificants.²⁰ In some ways this parallels Greek and Roman tradition, in so far as in both cases the sacrificant did not always perform the actual slaughter himself; in the Graeco-Roman tradition the sacrificant often delegated that job to a specialized and typically lower status assistant.²¹ The key difference is that in Graeco-Roman tradition there were no ritual restrictions on who could act as a sacrificant: that was determined by social rather than ritual considerations. To offer a sacrifice on behalf of a group was to claim a position of authority within that group; hence in families the person who did so was normally the head of the household and in cities, a public official. But if in Graeco-Roman tradition a person's ritual role in a sacrifice derived from his or her social position, in Judaeen tradition the role of sacrificant was determined solely by ritual considerations, i.e., membership in the hereditary clan of priests.

I have already briefly noted the relative dissociation of meat consumption from animal sacrifice in Judaeen tradition; a related issue, and one more significant for the role of Judaeen sacrifice in the Graeco-Roman world, is that there were no large-scale public sacrifices followed by public feasts, a sequence that as we have seen was very common in the Graeco-Roman world, especially in the Greek cities of the eastern Empire. The vast majority of the sacrifices offered on behalf of the Judaeen people as a whole were burnt-offerings, equivalent to Greek holocausts, in which the entire animal was burnt on the altar; these were accompanied by smaller-scale 'sin-offerings', the meat of which was consumed by the priests within the Temple. Individuals of course also offered a range of sacrifices on their own behalf, many of which were also burnt-offerings

20 See in general the regulations for sacrificial procedure at Lev 1–7, which clearly include slaughtering among the actions performed by the man who brings the sacrifice; so too Josephus (*Ant* 3:226f) and rabbinic tradition (see especially *mZeb* 3:1 and *mMen* 9:8), although Philo (*Spec leg* 1:198f) states that priests did the slaughtering; on the relative unimportance of the act of slaughter within the sacrificial ritual, see Marx, 'Tuer, donner', 4f.

21 In contrast to Judaeen tradition, however, this assistant (called a *mageiros* in Greek tradition, a *victimarius* or *popa* in Roman) normally also did the flaying and butchering.

and sin-offerings.²² Thus only a few sacrifices actually produced meat that ordinary Judaeans could eat, of which the main types were the 'peace-offering' or thank-offering and the Passover sacrifice; Josephus in fact characterizes the former as given 'on account of a feast for those who have sacrificed'. These sacrificial feasts, however, seem to have been limited to a fairly small circle of family and/or friends, such as the group of Jesus and his twelve followers that we find in the synoptic accounts of the Last Supper; Josephus assumes some ten to twenty people shared a Passover lamb.²³ Judaeans, then, at least in the Hellenistic and early Roman periods, did not provide any occasion for large-scale public sacrifices with associated feasts.

Lastly, for the funding of its public sacrifices, the Jerusalem Temple could draw on sources of revenue that far surpassed those on which most Graeco-Roman civic cults depended. In addition to various other tithes and contributions, every male Israelite over the age of twenty was required to make an annual contribution of a half-shekel (interpreted as two drachmas in Greek currency) to the Temple's funds; these funds were used first and foremost to purchase the victims and other materials needed for the regular public sacrifices.²⁴ They were collected not only in Judaea and surrounding regions, but from the entire diaspora: we have specific evidence for Alexandria, Cyrene, various cities in Asia Minor, Rome, and even the territory beyond the Euphrates. The sums collected were sufficient to attract the ill-will of these Judaeans' communities'

22 See in general the classification of sacrifices in Philo (Spec leg 1:194–197), Josephus (Ant 3:224–232), and the Mishna (mZeb 5:1–7), with the discussion of Sanders, *Practice and Belief*, 103–118. For public sacrifices consisting of burnt-offerings and sin-offerings, see especially Num 28f; cf. 11QT cols 13–29; Philo, Spec leg 1:190; Josephus, Ant 3:237–254; for priests eating the meat from sin-offerings, see also Lev 6:26, 6:29f, 7:6f, and Philo, Spec leg 1:239f. Public peace-offerings did exist, but the meat from them was also eaten by the priests, not by the wider community (Lev 23:19f; mZeb 5:5). The fact that Judaeans did not habitually eat the meat from their sacrifices struck some observers as noteworthy, e.g., Theophrastus as cited by Porphyry, Abst 4.26.2 (= Stern, *GLAJJ*, no. 4).

23 Quotation from Josephus, Ant 3:225 (LCL); cf Philo, Spec leg 1:212. Last Supper: Matt 26:17–20, Mark 14:12–17, Luke 22:7–16; ten to twenty people per Passover lamb: Josephus, War 6:423.

24 Philo, Spec leg 1:77f; Josephus, War 7:218, Ant 18:312; Matt 17:24; mShek 4:1; see further Safrai, *Wallfahrt*, 70f. The origin of the custom was referred back to Exod 30:11–16 (cf Josephus, Ant 3:194–196), even though that passage seems to describe something rather different. The period in which the annual tax became established is uncertain: many scholars have dated it to the start of the Second Temple period (cf Neh 10:32f), although Liver, 'Half-Shekel Offering', has argued strongly that it does not antedate the late Hasmonean period. See further n28 below.

non-Judaeen neighbors, who resented the fact that so much wealth was being shipped off to a distant region; both Philo and Josephus attest that Roman authorities had to intervene repeatedly in order to uphold the rights of Judaeans to collect these funds and send them to Jerusalem, although on occasion it was the Roman authorities themselves who prevented the money from being sent.²⁵ This Temple tax meant that money was never lacking to fund the public sacrifices of the Judaeen people.

These distinctive features of Judaeen tradition meant that animal sacrifice could not serve to construct social and political hierarchies in quite the same ways as it did in Graeco-Roman tradition. Most obviously, because it could never be offered to any human being, alive or dead, it could not be used to distinguish individuals perceived as having power superior to those of ordinary people; there were no 'honors equivalent to those of a god' in Judaeen tradition. This was a point that the Emperor Gaius, according to Philo, found particularly galling.²⁶ Somewhat less obviously, but equally importantly, animal sacrifice in the Judaeen tradition did not offer the same possibilities for euergetism as it did in Graeco-Roman tradition.²⁷ On the one hand, there were simply no opportunities for the kind of combined public sacrifice and public feast that was so common in the Graeco-Roman tradition, and so nothing over which a potential *euergetes* could preside. On the other, the revenue provided by the Temple tax meant that there was never any need for a private benefactor to step in and make good any lack of funds; in that respect, the funding of public sacrifices in Judaeen tradition was more rigorously egalitarian than it had been even in classical Athens.²⁸

25 Alexandria: Philo, *Spec leg* 1:77f. Cyrene: Josephus, *Ant* 16:169f. Asia Minor: Cicero, *Flac* 68 (= Stern, *GLAJJ*, no. 68); Philo, *Leg* 315; Josephus, *Ant* 16:167–173. Rome: Philo, *Leg* 156f (with Smallwood, *Legatio*, 237–239). Beyond the Euphrates: Philo, *Leg* 216; Josephus, *Ant* 18:312. Support of Roman authorities: Philo, *Leg* 312–315; Josephus, *Ant* 16:28 and 45; 16:162–173; opposition: Cicero, *Flac* 66–69.

26 Philo, *Leg* 357.

27 A point already made by Petropoulou, *Animal Sacrifice*, 119–122.

28 This may have been a relatively late development: see above n24. Later rabbinic tradition held that the Sadducees argued that individuals could fund the daily offerings of the Temple, but that the opposite opinion of the 'sages' (Pharisees?), who insisted that they be funded by the community, eventually prevailed: bMen 65a and the scholion to Megillat Taanit (Lichtenstein, 'Fastenrolle', 323); see further Lichtenstein, 'Fastenrolle', 290–292, and Liver, 'Half Shekel Offering', 188f. If this tradition has any historical basis, one may speculate whether the insistence on communal funding and the institution of the annual Temple tax was a deliberate strategy meant to obviate opportunities for sacrificial euergetism.

In theory, individual sacrifices such as thank-offerings and the Passover sacrifice could have provided an opportunity for wealthy benefactors to feast significant numbers of people. For example, the author of Chronicles imagines the Passover celebrated by Josiah in the late seventh century BCE in exactly these terms, claiming that Josiah provided 30,000 rams and goats and 3,000 bulls out of his own resources, with other leading men following suit, and that they feasted the people on their bounty.²⁹ If the author meant to provide a model for contemporary and later Judaeian leaders to follow, however, it seems that few if any of them actually did so. Josephus claims that Herod celebrated the completion of his work on the Temple by sacrificing 300 oxen, but since he does not say anything about feasts, we are perhaps meant to infer that these sacrifices were holocausts. Moreover, Herod is somewhat of an anomalous figure in the later Second Temple period, since in many respects he seems to have emulated Graeco-Roman models of euergetism. It is also important to note that, since Herod was not a priest, he would not have been able to preside over his sacrifices in person; even priests, who could preside over sacrifices, could do so only in the inner courtyard of the Temple; the public display of the benefactor as sacrificial, so common in Graeco-Roman tradition, was accordingly impossible within Judaeian tradition. In this respect, the social location of animal sacrifice in the two traditions provides a perfect illustration of what Seth Schwartz has recently argued is a broad and fundamental difference in ideology between Judaeian and Graeco-Roman culture, with the egalitarian solidarity espoused by the former in tension with the institutionalized reciprocity characteristic of the latter.³⁰

On the whole, however, although the differences in sacrificial practice between the Judaeian and Graeco-Roman traditions were both numerous and significant, I would argue that they must nevertheless have been outweighed by the similarities. Many of these are so obvious as to escape notice, and for that reason are worth enumerating. There is first of all the mere fact that in both traditions ritualized slaughter was a central act of worship, something that was not necessarily true of all cultures that came within the Graeco-Roman ambit.³¹

29 2 Chron 35:7–13, followed by 1 Esd 1:7–13; the earlier account of Josiah's Passover in 2 Kgs 23:21–23 does not even hint at this kind of benefaction. See also 2 Chron 30:24 on Hezekiah.

30 Jos Ant 15:422f; on Herod as *euergetes*, see Schwartz, *Mediterranean Society*, 99–102, and, on Judaeian egalitarian solidarity in tension with Graeco-Roman institutionalized reciprocity, 7–20 and 166–175.

31 For example, animal sacrifice of the sort common to the Graeco-Roman and Judaeian traditions had at best a marginal place in Egyptian tradition: see, e.g., Bouanich, 'Mise à mort', and Frankfurter, 'Egyptian Religion'.

Second, the class of victims was essentially the same in both traditions, edible domestic animals that had to be unblemished and free of imperfections. There were of course differences in detail: most obviously, Judaeen tradition prohibited pigs absolutely and apparently placed more emphasis on particular types of birds; similarly, sacrifices in which the entire animal was burnt on the altar were regular in Judaeen tradition, but exceptional in Graeco-Roman tradition.³² Yet in Graeco-Roman tradition it was a widely accepted principle that every cult and indeed every sanctuary might have its own specific regulations about what victims were to be offered and in what way. Such variation in detail was thus well within the normal range of Graeco-Roman sacrificial practice. Third, sacrificial procedures in the two traditions were very similar: the animals were presented at an altar, had their throats cut, were flayed and butchered, and then partly or wholly burned on the altar; the parts that were not burned were eaten. We can even identify similarities in specific details, such as the fact that in both Judaeen and Greek tradition it was very important that blood be splashed on the altar, although most non-Judaeans would probably not have been aware of this.³³

Sacrificial Cult and Political Relations

I would argue that the similarities between sacrificial practice in the Judaeen and Graeco-Roman traditions were close enough that people accustomed to one tradition could readily recognize the sacrificial practices of the other as in effect the 'same' as their own. The possibility for this kind of mutual recognition was important: in a situation where both Judaeans and people in the Graeco-Roman mainstream not infrequently regarded each other with bafflement, suspicion, and distaste, the practice of animal sacrifice provided a common point of reference and a potential basis for accommodation.³⁴ It is worth

32 The latter difference is noted by Theophrastus (*apud* Porphyry, *Abst.* 2.26 = Stern, *GLAJJ*, no. 4), although in a form that is exaggerated and misinterpreted to suit his argument.

33 For brief descriptions of Greek and Roman sacrificial practice, see the entries on 'sacrifice, Greek' and 'sacrifice, Roman' by R.C.T. Parker and J. Scheid, respectively, in *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*³ (1995); on the splashing of blood in Greek tradition, see especially Ekroth, 'Blood on the Altars?'

34 It is impossible to quantify tensions between Judaeans and non-Judaeans. As Paula Fredriksen rightly insists in her contribution to this volume, there is ample evidence for a variety of amicable relations, including both non-Judaeen interest in Judaeen tradition and Judaeen participation in the civic life of Graeco-Roman cities; for further discussion,

noting that, despite the considerable evidence that survives for both Graeco-Roman criticism of Judaeian tradition and Judaeian criticism of gentile worship, almost nowhere in either body of material do we find criticisms of the practice of animal sacrifice. Non-Judaeians resented the Judaeian refusal to worship other gods and more generally their tendency to hold themselves aloof from their neighbors; they mocked their abstention from pork and found the practice of circumcision repulsive.³⁵ On the Judaeian side, there was a long established tradition, extending back at least to the time of the Babylonian exile, of deriding the gods of gentiles as mere idols, man-made objects of wood and stone and metal that had no power for good or evil. Later texts built on this foundation by emphasizing the fundamental error of worshipping the creation rather than the creator and by identifying idolatry as the cause of all immorality.³⁶

Notably absent from all these diatribes, however, is any reference to animal sacrifice, a practice that both sides apparently took for granted as an appropriate mode of worship.³⁷ The only real exception known to me also provides some of the best evidence for this accord. Apion, in his attack on the Judaeians, apparently did in some way criticize their practice of animal sacrifice; Josephus tartly responds by pointing out that this was a custom that Judaeians held in common with all the rest of humanity and that Apion's criticism is simply

see, e.g., Feldman, *Jew and Gentile*, 57–69 and 342–382; Barclay, *Mediterranean Diaspora*, 103–124 and 320–335; Harland, *Associations, Synagogues, and Congregations*, 200–210 and 219–228. At the same time, there is also ample evidence for tensions of a sort that are not so easily documented for other groups: see, e.g., Feldman, *Jew and Gentile*, 107–123; Barclay, *Mediterranean Diaspora*, 48–81; Schäfer, *Judeophobia*, 163–195. On the whole, the evidence suggests to me that tensions between Judaeians and mainstream Graeco-Roman society were liable to be both more frequent and more serious than for other distinctive groups.

35 See Feldman, *Jew and Gentile*, 123–176, and, in general, Schäfer, *Judeophobia*.

36 The classic versions of this critique come from Second Isaiah (especially 44:6–20; cf. 40:18–20 and 46:6f) and Jeremiah (10:1–16); later elaborations include Wisdom of Solomon 13–15, the 'letter of Jeremiah' (= Bar 6), and Philo, Decal 52–69; see further Hadas-Lebel, *Jerusalem against Rome*, 305–523.

37 A particularly instructive passage in this respect is Sib Or 3:545–600, which attacks the Greeks for sacrificing to idols (547–549) but praises the Judaeians (presumably) 'who fully honor the Temple of the great God/ with drink offering and burnt offering and sacred hecatombs,/ sacrifices of well-fed bulls, unblemished rams,/ and firstborn sheep, offering as holocausts fat flocks of lambs/ on a great altar, in holy manner' (575–579, ET Collins); the author foretells that the Greeks too will one day offer holocausts of oxen at the Temple of the great God (564–570).

further proof of his own status as an Egyptian and thus a cultural outsider.³⁸ We can appreciate the lack of polemic over animal sacrifice more readily when we contrast Christian attacks on Graeco-Roman religion, which frequently single out animal sacrifice in strongly negative terms.³⁹

The fact that animal sacrifice provided some common ground between two otherwise very different religious traditions meant that it was able to play an important role in forging and maintaining relations between Judaeans and non-Judaeans. Non-Judaeans, for example, were welcome to offer sacrifices at the Temple in Jerusalem. For non-Judaeans, of course, 'offering sacrifice' effectively meant little more than 'paying for sacrifice', since they obviously could not preside over it nor, it seems, eat the meat from it nor even be present at its performance.⁴⁰ Nevertheless, animal sacrifice provided non-Judaeans with an opportunity to worship the Judaeans god in a way that was meaningful to everyone involved. Although it is impossible to determine how frequently non-Judaeans took advantage of this opportunity, passages in both Josephus and the Mishna suggest that it was not uncommon.⁴¹ Animal sacrifice seems to have had particular importance in maintaining good relationships between Judaeans and their non-Judaeans overlords; there is a range of examples, in texts

38 Josephus, *Ag Ap* 2:137f; Barclay, *Against Apion*, 240 n499, points out that Apion is unlikely to have criticized animal sacrifice *tout court* and plausibly suggests that his criticisms may have been more like those levelled by Tacitus, *Hist* 5.4.2, who claims that Judaeans sacrifice bulls and rams as an insult to Apis and Ammon respectively.

39 See for example Justin, 2 *Apol* 5.3–5; Athenagoras, *Leg* 26.1; Tertullian, *Apol* 22.6 and 23.14; Minucius Felix, *Oct* 27.2; Origen, *Mart* 45. The context for these negative references to animal sacrifice is the Christian characterization of Graeco-Roman cult as the worship of demons, on which see, e.g., Pagels, *Origin of Satan*, 112–148. See further below, n52.

40 Non-Judaeans were explicitly prohibited from sharing in the Passover offering (*Exod* 12:43–49); according to rabbinic tradition, they could make vow-offerings and freewill-offerings (*mShek* 1:5), but these presumably could only have taken the form of burnt-offerings (cf *mShek* 7:6), since gentiles would have been prevented from eating the meat from shared-offerings by the requirement that those who do so be ritually clean (*Lev* 7:19–21, 22:1–6), an impossibility for gentiles; see Schürer, *History* 2: 309f. See further Schwartz, 'Sacrifice by Gentiles', who argues that victims supplied by gentiles were not even regarded as sacrifices, but merely as gifts. On the exclusion of gentiles from the immediate vicinity of the Temple, see Philo, *Leg* 212; Josephus, *War* 5:193f and 6:124–126, *Ant* 15:417; *Acts* 21:28f; *mKel* 1:8; in addition, two copies of the warning inscription mentioned by Josephus survive: *OGIS* 598 and *SEG* 8.169, with discussion most recently in Llewelyn and van Beek, 'Reading the Temple Warning'.

41 Josephus, *War* 2:409–416 and 5:15–18; *mShek* 1:5 and 7:6; see further Safrai, *Wallfahrt*, 107–111.

ranging from the biblical book of Ezra to Josephus, both of non-Judaeen rulers demonstrating their respect for the Judaeen god by sponsoring sacrifices, either in absentia or in person, and of Judaeans demonstrating their respect for their non-Judaeen rulers by offering sacrifices on their behalf.⁴² Although some of these episodes are certainly not historical, for the purposes of my argument their historicity matters less than the insight they provide into Judaeen ideas about the role of animal sacrifice in constructing positive relationships with gentile rulers. Three specific passages can usefully illustrate the range of possibilities.

The first comes from the book of Ezra, which quotes what purports to be a letter of the Persian king Darius. In it, Darius confirms a decree previously issued by Cyrus, granting the Judaeans the right to rebuild their Temple and promising to subsidize the work with particular tax revenues. Darius augments these directives by instructing his governors to 'let them have daily without fail whatever they want, young bulls, rams, or lambs as whole-offerings for the God of heaven, or wheat, salt, wine, or oil, as the priests in Jerusalem demand, so that they may offer soothing sacrifices to the God of heaven, and pray for the life of the king and his sons'.⁴³ In this account, all the movement come from the gentile overlord, who not only bestows benefactions on the Temple but also acknowledges the power of the Judaeen god and the privileged role of the Judaeen people by requesting that they offer sacrifices and prayers on his behalf. A very different pattern is found in the opening chapter of Baruch, in which the exiled Judaeans in Babylon are said to have collected money to send to the high priest in Jerusalem with the following instructions: 'We are sending you money to buy whole-offerings, sin-offerings, and incense; provide a grain-offering, and offer them all upon the altar of the Lord our God; and pray for Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon, and for his son Belshazzar, that their life on earth may last as long as the heavens. So the Lord will give us strength, and light to walk by, and we shall live under the protection of Nebuchadnezzar

42 For a brief overview see Schürer, *History* 2: 309–313; much of the evidence comes from Josephus, who had a particular interest in documenting examples of gentile rulers who showed proper respect for Judaeen tradition: see Cohen, 'Respect', 412–415.

43 Letter of Darius: Ezra 6:6–12, with quotation from 6:9f (NEB); cf. 1 Esd 6:27–33, Josephus, *Ant* 11:12–17, 99–103 (note that Josephus attributes the directive regarding sacrifices to the original letter of Cyrus). On the historicity of these documents, see Grabbe, *History*, vol 1, who concludes that although they are likely to be heavily reworked versions of genuine documents (76–78), the pledges of financial support that they record are unlikely to be historical (209–216). Ezra was certainly composed in Israel; its date is uncertain, but is generally thought to be fourth century BCE.

king of Babylon, and of Belshazzar his son; we shall give them long service and gain their favour'. In this case, all the movement lies with the Judaeans, who demonstrate their loyalty to their ruler by offering sacrifices on his behalf and hope thereby to gain his goodwill.⁴⁴ Lastly, in the Letter of Aristeas these two patterns are combined, so that an initiative from the ruler meets with an appropriate response from the ruled. Here, Ptolemy II writes to the high priest in Jerusalem to announce various benefactions, request men to translate the scriptures, and send a hundred talents of silver for sacrifices; in his response, the high priest reports that the Judaeans have 'offered sacrifices without delay for you, your sister, your children, and your friends. The whole multitude made supplication that it should come to pass for you entirely as you desire, and that God the ruler of all should preserve your kingdom in peace and glory'.⁴⁵

Although none of these texts is easy to date, none is likely to be later than the second century BCE; we can thus say that at least by the mid-Hellenistic period the role of animal sacrifice in forging good relationships with gentile overlords was a familiar idea to Judaeans both in Judaea itself and in the diaspora. It was an idea, moreover, that was certainly put into practice, even if none of these particular episodes was historical.⁴⁶

Given this earlier background, it is not surprising that in the Roman period the animal sacrifices of the Temple came to play a large part in maintaining good relations between Judaeans and their Roman rulers. At least some Roman authorities offered sacrifice at the Temple in person, such as Marcus Agrippa in 15 BCE and the governor Vitellius in 37 CE.⁴⁷ Most famously, and most impor-

44 Bar 1:10–12 (NEB); the events described here are widely acknowledged not to be historical. The text's date and provenance are very uncertain; Schürer, *History* 3: 735f, concludes that this section (1:1–14) was originally composed in Hebrew (and thus probably in Judaea), and that the whole first half (1:1–3:8) was probably translated into Greek at the same time as Jeremiah and thus before the translation of Ben Sira in 116 BCE.

45 Let Aris 35–46, with quotation from 45, ET Shutt. The content of the book is widely accepted as legendary; the author was almost certainly a Judaeans resident in Alexandria, working sometime in the second century BCE: see further Schürer, *History* 3: 679–684.

46 For other episodes that are possibly or probably historical, see Josephus, *Ag Ap* 2:48 on Ptolemy III offering sacrifice in 241 BCE; Josephus, *Ant* 12:138–144, with Grabbe, *History* vol 2, 324–326, for a letter of Antiochus III from shortly after his conquest of Jerusalem in 200 BCE promising funding for the Temple cult; 2 Macc 3:2f on Seleucus IV Philopator (187–175 BCE) providing funding; 1 Macc 7:33, with Schürer, *History* 1: 168–170, for sacrifices on behalf of Demetrius I Soter in 161 BCE; and Josephus, *Ant* 13:241–244, with Schürer, *History* 1: 202–204, for Antiochus VII Sidetes providing victims for a sacrifice in the 130s BCE (while in the process of besieging Jerusalem, no less!).

47 Agrippa: Josephus, *Ant* 16:12–15, with Schürer, *History* 1: 292; cf Philo, *Leg* 291, 294–297,

tantly, the Judaeans offered a daily (or even twice daily) sacrifice on behalf of the Emperor and the Roman people, a practice that according to Philo was instituted in the reign of Augustus. The sources contradict each other as regards the funding of these sacrifices: Philo says explicitly that Augustus paid for them out of his own revenues, whereas Josephus says equally explicitly that they were provided at the expense of the Judaeian community, although he elsewhere implies that the funding came from Roman sources; as we have seen, both patterns are attested in earlier literature. Although it is possible that the funds derived from provincial taxes, which might reasonably be described as either Judaeian or imperial, it is perhaps slightly more likely that Josephus was massaging the facts when he claimed that the Judaeians provided the funding.⁴⁸ In addition to these daily sacrifices, additional sacrifices were offered on special occasions; when the Alexandrian ambassador to Gaius accused the Judaeians of disloyalty, they were quick to respond that they had offered hecatombs on three occasions: at his accession, after his recovery from illness, and before his expedition to Germania. Josephus responds in a very similar vein to Apion's charge of disloyalty, arguing that rather than blaming the Judaeians he should admire 'the magnanimity and moderation of the Romans, since they do not compel their subjects to transgress their ancestral laws, but accept such honors as it is pious and legitimate for their donors to offer'. Gaius' peevish response to the Judaeian ambassadors, that whatever they might have done they had not sacrificed to him, shows that there could be exceptions to Roman magnanimity and moderation, but Gaius was of course exceptional in many respects.⁴⁹ In general, the demonstrations of mutual respect that the practice of animal sacrifice afforded both Judaeians and Romans seem to have worked reasonably well to maintain good relations.⁵⁰

although he does not mention sacrifice. Vitellius: Josephus, *Ant* 18:122, with Schürer, *History* 1: 350.

48 Philo, *Leg* 157, 317; see Smallwood, *Legatio*, 240f for the suggestion about provincial taxes. Josephus at *Ag Ap* 2:77 says that the sacrifices were offered 'at the common expense of all Judaeians'; at *War* 2:409f, however, he implies that the funding came from Roman sources, since it was the decision to accept no gift from strangers that resulted in ending the sacrifices on behalf of the Emperor; see also *War* 2:197 for the twice daily sacrifice, where Judaeian funding is again implied. For the suggestion that Josephus' claim in *Ag Ap* is not accurate, see Barclay, *Against Apion*, 210f n268.

49 Philo, *Leg* 355–357; Josephus, *Ag Ap* 2:72–7, with the quotation from 2:73, ET Barclay.

50 Bennet, *Kaisererkult*, has argued on the contrary that the lack of an imperial cult along Graeco-Roman lines was a constant source of tension between Roman authorities and the Judaeians; for a brief but cogent response, see Mason, *Judean War* 2, 164 n1240.

Conclusion

All of this, then, needs to be kept in mind as the background for the passage that I cited at the start of my paper, Josephus' account of the decision no longer to accept offerings from non-Judaeans and his assessment of the consequence, the cessation of sacrifices on behalf of the Emperor, as tantamount to a declaration of revolt. As I have argued, the practice of animal sacrifice had long played a key role in structuring socio-political relationships and cultural identity in the Graeco-Roman world. Moreover, it constituted a significant point of convergence between Graeco-Roman and Judaeans religious tradition, a practice that both Judaeans and people in the Graeco-Roman mainstream could understand and accept. It thus provided an important context for establishing and maintaining good relations between Judaeans and their non-Judaeans overlords, one that was well established already in the Hellenistic period. Accordingly, although we cannot know for certain whether Roman authorities at the time viewed the cessation of sacrifices on behalf of the Emperor in the same way that Josephus later did, the overall social and political significance attached to animal sacrifice in this period would suggest that they may very well have done so.

With the destruction of the Temple and the concomitant end of Judaeans sacrificial cult, animal sacrifice ceased to play an active role in shaping relations between Judaeans and non-Judaeans.⁵¹ I would suggest, however, that its significance did not come to a complete end. Many Judaeans continued to refuse to sacrifice to other gods, and since they could no longer sacrifice to their own god, they, like Christians, did not sacrifice at all. Christians, however, many of whom seem to have associated animal sacrifice primarily with the worship of demons, tended to regard the practice of animal sacrifice as intrinsically bad, to the point that some Christian thinkers even condemned the Judaeans tradition of animal sacrifice, which they could hardly deny had been ordained by God, as merely a concession to the weakness of the Judaeans.⁵² In striking contrast, Judaeans long retained a positive view of sacrifice as a cultic practice, attested not only by the detailed discussions in rabbinic sources but by other sources

51 It is not certain that sacrificial cult came to an end with the destruction of the Temple, although majority opinion holds that it did: see, e.g., Schürer, *History* 1: 521–523; contra, Colautti, *Passover*, 229–235, 240f.

52 Justin, *Trypho* 19 and 22; I owe thanks to Paula Fredriksen for calling this point to my attention. The same argument occurs in Tertullian, *Adv Marc* 2.18f, 22, although other early Christian writers take very different positions; for the variety and complexity of early Christian ideas about sacrifice, see Ullucci, *Christian Rejection*, especially 65–136.

such as the paintings from the synagogue in Dura Europos.⁵³ Indeed, the rabbis went so far as to allow that, although Judaeans could not sacrifice anywhere but the Temple in Jerusalem, non-Judaeans were not bound by this obligation and so could erect altars and sacrifice to God even after the destruction of the Temple.⁵⁴ Christian rejection of animal sacrifice was thus much more absolute and comprehensive, while Judaeans rejection was merely conditional. It was perhaps for this reason that the Christian refusal to sacrifice was a central issue in Roman hostility to Christians, whereas the Judaeans refusal, so far as we know, had no repercussions. Indeed, the Emperor Julian, in arguing that Judaeans religion had more in common with Greek religion than it did with Christianity, gave pride of place to the Judaeans tradition of animal sacrifice; according to later Christian accounts, it was his desire to see the Judaeans revive their sacrificial cult that led him to order the restoration of the Jerusalem Temple.⁵⁵ Julian was of course in his own way as exceptional as Gaius, but in this matter he perhaps saw something that many later observers have not.

53 Mishna: e.g., mZev and mTam. Scenes of animal sacrifice occur in the Dura Europos synagogue in the depiction of the consecration of the tabernacle and in the Elijah sequence; see most recently Hachlili, *Ancient Jewish Art*, 117f with plate 111-11 and 131-133, 149f with plates 111-23, 24, respectively.

54 mZev 4:5 and, more explicitly, bZev 116b; for discussion and further references, see Reynolds and Tannenbaum, *Jews and Godfearers*, 64f; I am indebted to Paula Fredriksen for this reference. See also n37 above.

55 Julian, *Contra Christianos* 299A-C and 305B-306B (= Stern, *GLAJJ*, no. 481a); later accounts: Sozomen 5.22.4, Socrates 3.20.3f, Theodoret 3.15. Porphyry evidently made a similar point (*apud* Augustine, Ep 102.16 = Stern, *GLAJJ*, no. 465i).