

“When Mr. Lamb Took Ms. Jerusalem To Be His Loftily Wedded Wife:”

Marriage, Slave-Trading, and Violent Justice
in Revelation 17-22

Eliza Rosenberg
Faculty of Religious Studies, McGill University, Montreal
December 2014 (final)

A thesis submitted to McGill University in partial fulfillment of the
requirements of the degree of Ph.D.

Table of Contents

| | |
|--------------------------------------|-----|
| Abstract | 4 |
| Résumé | 5 |
| Acknowledgments | 6 |
| Abbreviations | 8 |
| Preface | II |
| Scholarship to date | 12 |
| Approach and methods | 18 |
| Considering slavery | 20 |
| Recent research | 35 |
| Practical contexts | 38 |
| Modern sources | 55 |
| Introduction | 55 |
| Situating Revelation | 59 |
| Overview | 64 |
| Chapter One: Marriage | 71 |
| Unequal partners | 72 |
| Ideal wives | 80 |
| Home economics | 89 |
| “ <i>Domiseda lanam fecit</i> ” | 93 |
| “Who can find one?” | 98 |
| The end of marriage or its metaphors | 103 |
| The queen city | 113 |
| Chapter Two: Weddings | 119 |
| Weddings in outline | 121 |
| The image of the wedding | 127 |

| | |
|-----------------------------------|---------|
| Nuptial economies | 135 |
| Private beginnings: betrothal | 137 |
| Prenuptial observances | 141 |
| Attendants and guests | 145 |
| Immediate preparations | 146 |
| Crowns | 151 |
| Veils and colour | 153 |
| Procession | 155 |
| Torches | 156 |
| The bride's arrival | 157 |
| The bridal chamber | 160 |
| Postnuptial proceedings | 162 |
| Chapter Three: Babylon | 164 |
| "The choice between two cities" | 164 |
| <i>Domiseda. Lanam fecit?</i> | 170 |
| The spoils of "Babylon" | 196 |
| The Bodies and Souls of Men | 203 |
| Spectacular fireworks | 213 |
| Chapter Four: Jerusalem | 221 |
| Dissonance and irony | 223 |
| Close relatives | 225 |
| "Alienated and dishonoured" | 229 |
| Indulgence | 239 |
| Building the hive | 241 |
| Waiting for the bridegroom | 250 |
| Conclusion | 260 |
| Bibliography | |
| Primary works consulted (ancient) | 265 |
| Primary works consulted (modern) | 270 |
| Secondary works consulted | 273 |

ABSTRACT

The book of Revelation concludes by contrasting the figures of “Babylon” (Rome) and the “new Jerusalem” (the followers of Christ). “Babylon” is portrayed as a rich, violent, and idolatrous prostitute and slave trader who has persecuted the faithful. In a turn of poetic justice, she is sentenced to die in a gladiatorial spectacle, a quintessentially Roman punishment and entertainment. Jerusalem, in contrast, appears as a restored, urban Eden whose reward is to become the wife of the Lamb (Christ, resurrected and glorified). This imagery reflects not only theological ideas and literary traditions, but also social realities on which the text reflects. Patriarchal norms of gender and sexuality, evolving ideals of marriage, systems of slavery, and the connections between them are fundamental to this vision. Understanding them is crucial for the interpretation of Revelation. The text’s interweaving of these ideas and images generates a conclusion in which weddings, marriage, and freedom (all of which are simultaneously real phenomena and metaphors for true worship) triumph in an appropriately violent denouement over prostitution, adultery, and slave trading (also metaphors for idolatry). Cautious use of comparative evidence for slavery illuminates the connections between these phenomena and suggests new directions for future research.

RÉSUMÉ

L'Apocalypse de St-Jean se conclut en comparant les figures de «Babylone» (Rome) et la «nouvelle Jérusalem» (les disciples du Christ). Il dépeint «Babylone» comme un prostituée et marchande d'esclaves riche, violente, et idolâtre et aussi comme quelqu'une qui a persécuté les fidèles. Dans une tournure de la justice poétique, elle est condamnée à mourir pour ses crimes dans le «spectacle» ou «jeux» de gladiateurs, une punition et divertissement typiquement romain. Mais la «Jérusalem» apparaît comme un nouveau Eden urbaine. Sa récompense est de devenir la femme de «l'Agneau» (Jesus Christ, ressuscité et glorifié). Cette image ne reflète pas seulement des idées théologiques et les traditions littéraires, mais aussi des réalités sociales sur lesquelles le texte reflète. Normes patriarcales du genre et de la sexualité, l'évolution des idéaux du mariage, et les systèmes d'esclavage sont essentiels à cette vision. L'imbrication du texte de ces idées et images génère une conclusion dans laquelle les mariages — et le mariage en général — et la liberté (qui sont tous simultanément des phénomènes réels et des métaphores pour la devotion authentique) triomphe approprié violemment sur la prostitution, l'adultère et l'esclavage (également des métaphores de l'idolâtrie). L'utilisation d'études comparatives de l'esclavage éclaire les liens entre ces phénomènes et suggère des nouvelles possibilités pour la recherche.

Acknowledgements

This dissertation would not have been possible without the help and generosity of many people. Thanks are due to all the teachers who have guided me along the way, but especially to Fabian Udoh of the University of Notre Dame, who pushed, prodded, and challenged me as I thought through issues of slavery in the book of Revelation. I am afraid that I have not done full credit to his instruction, but those sections of the dissertation would have been much weaker without his help. I also owe debts of gratitude to a number of colleagues and friends in the Faculty of Religious Studies at McGill. Drew Billings provided feedback at every stage of the process, from initial thinking through to final editing. He also suggested the title before the project even reached the proposal stage. Meredith Warren, Shayna Sheinfeld, and Stéphanie Machabée all offered me their insight as I worked through issues of ritual and representation. Andrew Kenoti Lairenge and Cory Labrecque alerted me to a range of considerations that have strengthened my analysis and that otherwise never would have occurred to me. Jeff Keiser and Sean and Annie Ross were far more patient than I had any right to expect as they helped me navigate considerations of method.

A team of librarians were equally patient as they helped me track down even the most recalcitrant citations and inter-library loans. Alan Youster at the Birks Reading Room deserves special commendation. Also at Birks, Francesca Maniaci has been a rock through everything and may in fact be responsible for keeping the entire university running. Peggy Roger, Debbie McSorley, Sami Khan, and Shelly-Anne Soares have provided more logistical support and general encouragement than I had any right to expect. Luvana Di Francesco continually amazes every one of us.

My parents, Paul and Megs Rosenberg, have provided emotional, intellectual, and material support at every stage of my education. I could have accomplished nothing without their generosity and encouragement. Dad has been, as always, an excellent proofreader, and Mom has spurred me through any number of doubts. My sister, Nell, has been a source of strength and a voice of sanity throughout this process. Additional thanks for emotional sustenance go to Victoria Creel, Wu Nawen, Afra Tucker, Geoff Duerden, Abi Cromanty, Julian Menezes, Anika Haque, Emily Bamforth, Ian and Julia Pattenden, Erle Holgersen, Beth Reed, and Julie Zhang.

Thanks go above all else to my advisor, Ellen Bradshaw Aitken, who died two months before this project was completed. If I have produced anything that would have made her proud, it will be the least of what she has missed.

ABBREVIATIONS

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| A & Ph Clas. | Aris & Phillips Classical Texts |
| <i>ABR</i> | <i>Australian Biblical Review</i> |
| ABRL | Anchor Bible Reference Library |
| ACCS | Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture |
| ACT | Ancient Christian Texts |
| <i>Afr St Rev</i> | <i>African Studies Review</i> |
| <i>AJS Rev</i> | <i>American Jewish Studies Review</i> |
| Am. | American |
| <i>Am. Anthr</i> | <i>American Anthropologist</i> |
| <i>Am. Ethnol</i> | <i>American Ethnologist</i> |
| <i>Am Sociol. Rev.</i> | <i>American Sociological Review</i> |
| ANE | ancient Near East |
| anth. | anthropology |
| arch. | archaeology |
| ASLP | Antislavery Literature Project (Arizona State U, Dep't. English) |
| <i>ATR</i> | <i>Anglican Theological Review</i> |
| AW: CH | Ancient World: Comparative Histories |
| <i>BBR</i> | <i>Bulletin for Biblical Research</i> |
| BCAW | Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World |
| BEFAR | Bibliothèque des écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome |
| BHGNT | Baylor Handbook on the Greek New Testament |
| Bib. Int. | Biblical Interpretation (series) |
| <i>Bibl Interp</i> | <i>Biblical Interpretation</i> (journal) |
| <i>Bibl. Res.</i> | <i>Biblical Research</i> |
| Bible & Lit. | Bible and Literature series |
| BJS | Brown Judaic Studies |
| <i>BSO(A)S</i> | <i>Bulletin of the School of Oriental (and African) Studies</i> |
| <i>BZAW</i> | <i>Beihfte zur Zeitschrift für alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</i> |
| Can. | Canadian |
| <i>CBQ</i> | <i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i> |
| CCSR | Canadian Corporation for Studies in Religion/Corporation Canadienne des Sciences Religieuses |
| CGTC | Cambridge Greek Testament Commentary |
| cl. | classical |
| <i>Cl Philol</i> | <i>Classical Philology</i> |
| comp. | comparative |
| contemp. | contemporary |
| CSSCA | Cambridge Studies in Social and Cultural Anthropology |
| cul.; cult. | culture; cultural |
| <i>CWHS</i> | <i>Cambridge World History of Slavery</i> , v. 1, ed. Bradley and Cartledge |
| <i>D. Oaks Pap.</i> | <i>Dumbarton Oaks Papers</i> |
| DCLS | Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature Studies |
| DMOA | Documenta et Monumenta Orientis Antiqui |
| DocSouth | Documenting the American South (archive), U North Carolina |
| EC; EJ | early Christian; early Jewish |
| ECNT | Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament |
| <i>EMC/CV</i> | <i>Échoes du Monde classique/Classical Views</i> |
| ESCJ | Études sur le christianisme et le judaïsme |
| <i>Ethn. fr.</i> | <i>Ethnologie française</i> |
| <i>G & R</i> | <i>Greece & Rome</i> |
| <i>GBT</i> | <i>Horizons in Biblical Theology</i> |

| | |
|--------------------|--|
| <i>Hesp Sup</i> | <i>Hesperia</i> Supplements |
| his.; hist. | history; historical |
| <i>Historia</i> | <i>Historia: Zeitschrift für alte Geschichte</i> |
| <i>HJAS</i> | <i>Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies</i> |
| <i>HR/RH</i> | <i>Historical Review & Revues d'histoire</i> |
| <i>HTR</i> | <i>Harvard Theological Review</i> |
| (N)ICC | (New) International Critical Commentary |
| IGSK | Inscriptionen griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien |
| IVP | Inter-Varsity Press |
| <i>J Rel Afr</i> | <i>Journal of Religion in Africa</i> |
| <i>JAAH</i> | <i>Journal of African-American History</i> |
| <i>JAOS</i> | <i>Journal of the American Oriental Society</i> |
| <i>JBL</i> | <i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i> |
| <i>JESHO</i> | <i>Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient</i> |
| <i>JFSR</i> | <i>Journal of Feminist Studies in Religion</i> |
| <i>JHS</i> | <i>Journal of the History of Sexuality</i> |
| <i>JWE</i> | <i>Jewish Inscriptions of Western Europe</i> |
| <i>JJRS</i> | <i>Japanese Journal of Religious Studies</i> |
| <i>JLAS</i> | <i>Jewish Law Association Studies</i> |
| <i>JMF</i> | <i>Journal of Marriage and Family</i> |
| <i>JMMS</i> | <i>Journal of Men, Masculinities, and Spirituality</i> |
| <i>JNES</i> | <i>Journal of Near Eastern Studies</i> |
| <i>JQR</i> | <i>Jewish Quarterly Review</i> |
| JPICL | Joan Palevsky Imprint in Classical Literature |
| <i>JRAI</i> | <i>Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute</i> |
| <i>JRAS</i> | <i>Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland</i> |
| <i>JSNT</i> | <i>Journal for the Study of the New Testament</i> |
| <i>JSJ</i> | <i>J for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Greek, and Hellenistic Periods</i> |
| <i>JSOT</i> | <i>Journal for the Study of the Old Testament</i> |
| <i>JSPs</i> | <i>Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha</i> |
| <i>JSSR</i> | <i>Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion</i> |
| <i>JWAG</i> | <i>Journal of the Walters Art Gallery</i> |
| <i>JWMF</i> | Jeannie Willis Memorial Fund |
| LCL | Loeb Classical Library |
| LTPM | Louvain Theological and Pastoral Monographs |
| <i>MAAR</i> | <i>Memoirs of the American Academy of Rome</i> |
| May Col. | Samuel J. May Anti-Slavery Collection (archive), Cornell U |
| MGR | Monumenta Graeca et Romana |
| mon. | monograph |
| <i>Nag Hammadi</i> | J.M. Robinson, <i>The Nag Hammadi Library in English</i> |
| NAWLD | North American Women's Letters and Diaries, U Chicago (archive) |
| NHMS | Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies |
| NIGTC | New Int'l. Greek Testament Commentary |
| <i>Nov Test</i> | <i>Novum Testamentum</i> |
| NT Lib. | New Testament Library |
| NTS | <i>New Testament Studies</i> |
| OECS | Oxford Early Christian Studies |
| OSCC | Oklahoma Series in Classical Culture |
| OSHT | Oxford Studies in Historical Theology |
| OSSCA | Oxford Studies in Social and Cultural Anthropology |
| <i>OTP</i> | <i>Old Testament Pseudepigrapha</i> , ed. J. Charlesworth |
| <i>P & Pr</i> | <i>Past & Present</i> |
| <i>PAAJR</i> | <i>Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research</i> |
| philol. | philology, philological |

| | |
|---------------|---|
| QUCC | <i>Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica</i> |
| rel.; relig. | religion; religious |
| res. | research |
| Rev. | <i>Review</i> |
| Rev Bíb | <i>Revista Bíblica</i> |
| RIBLA | <i>Revista de Interpretación Bíblica Latinoamericana</i> |
| RRBS | Recent Research in Biblical Studies |
| RRJ | <i>Review of Rabbinic Judaism</i> |
| RRR | <i>Review of Religious Research</i> |
| RSR | <i>Revue des Sciences Religieuses</i> |
| S & A | <i>Slavery & Abolition</i> |
| SAFPC | Studies in Ancient Folklore and Popular Culture |
| SBEC | Studies in Bible and Early Christianity |
| SBL | Society of Biblical Literature |
| SBL SP | Society for Biblical Literature Seminar Papers |
| SCLG | Studies in Classical Literature and Gender |
| Scr Tb | <i>Scripta Theologica</i> |
| SCR | Studies in Comparative Religion |
| SCSC | Social and Cultural Studies Collection |
| ser. | series |
| SHGR | Studies in the History of Greece and Rome |
| soc.; socs. | social; society, societies |
| SP | Sacra Pagina |
| SSER | <i>Slavonic and East European Review</i> |
| st. | studies |
| St. Ecum. | <i>Studia Ecumenici</i> |
| STDJ | Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah |
| sup. | supplement |
| SVTQ | <i>St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly</i> |
| TAPA | <i>Transactions of the American Philological Association</i> |
| theo.; theol. | theology, theological |
| TPAPA | <i>Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association</i> |
| TSAJ | Texte und Studien zum Antiken Judentum |
| USQR | <i>Union Seminary Quarterly Review</i> |
| Vig Chr | <i>Vigiliae Christianae</i> |
| VT | <i>Vetus Testamentum</i> |
| WAW | Women of the Ancient World |
| WBC | Word Biblical Commentary |
| WjJ | <i>Women in Judaism</i> |
| WISC | Wisconsin Studies in Classics |
| WPA Narr. | U.S. Works Progress Admin., slave narrative (Fed. Writers Project) |
| YJS | Yale Judaica Series |
| ZPE | <i>Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik</i> |
| ZWKK | <i>Z. für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche</i> |

PREFACE

Rev. 17-22's culmination of apparently diffuse images anchors itself in part in the juxtaposition of Babylon the πόρνη and Jerusalem the νύμφη. The dichotomy itself, as Barbara Rossing has explored, is an instance of the classical "two-ways" trope wherein alternatives are represented as allegorical women who inversely reflect one another.¹ The pair in Revelation express its vision of justice by establishing what each partner has earned for herself and what each duly receives. Brian Blount, Craig Koester, and Clarice Martin have emphasized the importance of Babylon's association with the slave trade,² and I draw on their work in exploring the involvements of Babylon and Jerusalem. This dichotomy is also a constituent part of what Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza describes as the book's "vision of justice and judgment." My goal is to offer a fuller understanding of the judgment that

¹ Barbara Rossing, *The Choice between Two Cities* (Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Trinity P Int'l., 1999) and "City Visions, Feminine Figures and Economic Critique," in *Conflicted Boundaries in Wisdom and Apocalyptic* (ed. B.G. Wright and L.M. Willis; Atlanta: SBL, 2005) 181-196; cf. Adela Yarbro Collins, "Feminine Symbolism in the Book of Revelation," *Bibl. Interp.* 1 (1993): 20-33; see also Edith McEwan Humphrey, *The Ladies and the Cities: Transformation and Apocalyptic Identity* (Sheffield: Sheffield Ac. P, 1995) and "A Tale of Two Cities and (at Least) Three Women" in *Reading the Book of Revelation* (ed. David L. Barr; Atlanta: SBL, 2003), 81-96; Gordon Zerbe, "Revelation's Exposé of Two Cities: Babylon and New Jerusalem," *Direction* 32 (2003): 47-60; Gordon Campbell, "Antithetical Feminine-Urban Imagery and a Tale of Two Women-Cities in the Book of Revelation," *Tyndale Bul.* 55 (2004): 81-109, as well as Claudia Camp, *Wisdom and the Feminine in the Book of Proverbs* (Sheffield: Almond P, 1985); Sidnie White Crawford, "Lady Wisdom and Dame Folly at Qumran," *Dead Sea Discoveries* 5 (1998): 355-366; Stuart Weeks, *Instruction and Imagery in Proverbs 1-9* (Oxford: Oxford U P, 2007). For broader discussions of the trope, see M. Jack Suggs, "The Christian Two Ways Tradition," in *Studies in the New Testament and Early Christian Literature* (ed. David E. Aune; Leiden: Brill, 1972), 60-74; Léonie Archer, "The Virgin and the Harlot in the Writings of Formative Judaism," *Hist. Workshop* 24 (1987): 1-16; Phyllis Silverman Kramer, "Biblical Women that Come in Pairs," in *Genesis* (ed. Athalya Brenner; Sheffield: Sheffield Ac. P, 1998), 218-232; Robert A. Kraft, "Early Developments of the 'Two-Ways' Tradition(s) in Retrospect," in *Fora Later Generation* (ed. R.A. Argall et al.; Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Trinity P Int'l., 2000), 136-143; Carol Fontaine, *Smooth Words: Women, Proverbs, and Performance in Biblical Wisdom* (Sheffield: Sheffield Ac. P, 2002); Emma Stafford, "Vice or Virtue?" in *Herakles and the art of allegory* (ed. Louis Rawlings and Hugh Bowden; Swansea: Cl. P Wales, 2005), 71-96.

² Brian K. Blount, *Can I Get a Witness? Reading Revelation through African-American Culture* (Louisville, Kentucky: WJK P, 2005) and *Revelation: A Commentary* (Louisville: WJK P, 2009), both *passim*; Clarice M. Martin, "Polishing the Unclouded Mirror: A Womanist Reading of Rev. 18:13," in *From Every People and Nation* (ed. David Rhoads; Minneapolis: Fortress P, 2005), 82-109; Craig Koester, "Roman Slave Trade and the Critique of Babylon in Rev. 18," *CBQ* 70 (2008): 766-786.

Revelation describes. Modern scholarship rightly eschews sitting in judgment of the practices and values of antiquity, aiming instead to understand them. Judgment of the existing social orders, however, is an integral part of Revelation and such judgments were in fact part of social orders themselves. This does not necessarily mean concurring with the judgments that Revelation offers, but it does mean engaging with them.

I do not attempt to consider every judgment that the text presents or describes. Instead, I focus on the juxtaposition of Babylon and Jerusalem around the images of slavery and of the wedding, which in the Roman imperial world was a highly gendered affair that was equally “about” status (slave/freed/free). I argue that Revelation’s culminating judgment has as much to do with the slave trade and the realities of free and slave status as it does with gender, and indeed that gender as a category is inseparable from status. Rather than attempt to address gender as an isolated category, I proceed from the fact that Revelation *does*, in Lynn Huber’s (2013) words, “think with women” or use the image of women to convey a range of other ideas. I focus on the association of this imagery with that of slavery. I also argue that the way in which many discussions of gender in Revelation elide the slave-trading charge against Babylon relates to the legacies of modern slavery.

SCHOLARSHIP TO DATE

Research around this constellation of issues in Revelation is very limited. More research exists on each of them singly, although in varying quantities. For example, while most commentaries discuss the nuptial imagery in light of biblical marriage metaphors or of the Roman politics of marriage, very few authors address the wedding in its own right. The major exception is Lynn Huber, who has analyzed this aspect of Revelation’s conclusion in

light of its hostility toward Rome and Octavian's controversial marriage legislation. Her work is proving to be an important contribution to the scholarship: imperial and counter-imperial politics of marriage are an important context for contemporaneous weddings.

Huber's work joins a handful of articles published in the last twenty years in constituting nearly all the existing research on Revelation's wedding. Some very thorough analysts have even operated under the impression that no wedding occurs at all.³ This would seem to be an artifact of unfamiliarity with ancient Mediterranean weddings, for which, unlike ancient South or East Asian weddings, no liturgy seems to have existed. Recent publications have marshalled scattered evidence into systematic descriptions, with several book-length studies emerging as standard references. John Oakley and Rebecca Hague Sinos' description of Athenian weddings and Karen Hersch's of Roman ones are the foremost examples. Examinations of weddings' cultural deployments, such as Rush Rehm's on funerals and Kirk Ormand's on socioeconomics, have also contributed to a stronger understanding. So too have a number of dedicated chapters in many of the books on

³ For example, Barbara Rossing finds it "surprising that in Revelation 21-22 the anticipated wedding between the bride and the lamb never unfolds. Rather, the bridal figure of Revelation 19 is transformed into a city (πόλις) coming down from heaven, with God's throne in its midst" (Rossing, *Choice between Two Women*, 144), and Chris Frilingos says that "...the wedding of the Lamb is announced, but the wedding itself does not materialize, nor is the marriage consummated," in *Spectacles of Empire* (Philadelphia: U Pennsylvania P, 2005), 87. Oliver Nwachukwu's assessment, "John does not describe the marriage supper as such but announces its arrival and declares the blessedness of those invited to it" is more accurate, though not entirely so: Revelation simply devotes less attention to the marriage supper than to the bride's appearance. See Nwachukwu, *Beyond Vengeance and Protest: A Reflection on the Macarisms in the Revelation*. (New York: Peter Lang, 2005), 164.

ancient marriage, families, gender roles, and rituals that have appeared in recent decades.⁴ Such research has enabled a few topical studies of Revelation's nuptial themes. Donal McIlraith has recently provided exegeses of Rev. 19-21 as a detailed wedding narrative, a conclusion that I largely share and attempt to explore in further detail. Ruben Zimmerman has analyzed the main vision report in a similar vein, arguing that it uses extensive nuptial imagery. I do not follow Zimmerman's conclusion that the images he identifies are necessarily nuptial, or even primarily so, but I do argue that certain repeated images build to a nuptial conclusion. A few other studies detail the situation of Revelation's wedding in relation to specific OT texts and to contemporaneous practices, usefully expanding on the brief discussions that some commentaries provide.⁵ Another handful of articles examine the

⁴ John Howard Oakley and Rebecca Hague Sinos, *The Wedding in Ancient Athens* (Madison: U Wisconsin P, 1993); Karen R. Hersch, *The Roman Wedding: Ritual and Meaning in Antiquity* (Cambridge: Cambridge U P, 2010); Rehm, *Marriage to Death: The Conflation of Wedding and Funeral Rituals in Greek Tragedy* (Princeton: Princeton U P, 1994); Kirk Ormand, *Exchange and the Maiden: Marriage in Sophoclean Tragedy* (Austin: U Texas P, 1999). Among the earliest major chapters is the one in Claude Vatin's *Recherches sur le mariage et la condition de la femme mariée à l'époque hellénistique* (Paris: E. de Boccard, 1970). More recent examples include chapters in Léonie Archer, *Her Price is Beyond Rubies: The Jewish Woman in Greco-Roman Palestine* (Sheffield: JSOT, 1990); Anne-Marie Vérilhac and Calude Vial, *Le mariage grec du VI^e siècle avant Jésus-Christ à l'époque d'Auguste* (Athens: École française d'Athènes, 1998); Michael Satlow, *Jewish Marriage in Antiquity* (Princeton: Princeton U P, 2001), and Tracy Lemos, *Marriage Gifts and Social Change in Ancient Palestine* (Cambridge: Cambridge U P, 2010).

⁵ e.g., Mathias Rissi, *The Future of the World: An Exegetical Study of Revelation 19.11-22.15* (London: SCM, 1972) 41-51; William W. Reader, "The Twelve Jewels of Revelation 21:19-20: Tradition History and Modern Interpretations," *JBL* 100 (1981), 435-448; Celia Deutsch, "Transformation of Symbols: The New Jerusalem in Rv 21:1 - 22:5," *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 78 (1987), 110-113; Lee Pilchan, *The New Jerusalem in the Book of Revelation*. (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001), 267-301; David Mathewson, "Isaiah in Revelation" in *Isaiah in the New Testament*. (ed. Steve Moyise and Maarten J.J. Menken; London: T & T Clark, 2005), 201-209.

issue in relation to Revelation's notions of ἐκκλησία and προσκυνήσις,⁶ as do a few exegeses of specific passages.⁷

If the scholarship on the imagery weddings in Revelation is limited, that on gender in connection to chs. 17-22 is not. Lynn Huber provides a superb review of this literature that I do not presume to recapitulate.⁸ Gender-focused, often feminist, analyses of Revelation are of course relevant here, and many of these analyses are detailed critiques of what they argue, often persuasively, are the ways in which Revelation deploys received assumptions about gender that are at best problematic and at worst misogynistic. Elizabeth Cady Stanton, a prominent nineteenth-century U.S., advocate of women's rights (that is, white women's rights) was a foundational exponent of the latter view. In the 1890s, she gathered a committee of women (all of them white) to make recommendations for a non-misogynistic

⁶ Donal McIlraith examines concepts related to worship in "The Nuptial Response to Christ in the Apocalypse," *Pacific J Theol.* 21 (1999): 26-38 and "For the Fine Linen is the Righteous Deeds of the Saints," *CBQ* 61 (1999): 512-529. The chapter on the new Jerusalem in Felise Tavo, *Woman, Mother and Bride: An Exegetical Investigation into the "Ecclesial" Notions of the Apocalypse* (Leuven: Peeters, 2007), 295-344, details the ecclesiology of the bride image; see also André Feuillet, "Visión de conjunto de la mística nupcial en el apocalipsis," *Scripta Theologica* 18 (1986): 407-431.

⁷ Hans J. Lundager Jensen notes points of contact between Rev. 21-22 and multiple episodes in the first nineteen chapters of Genesis in his essay, "The Cosmic Wedding and the Brief Life on Earth," in *In the Last Days* (ed. Knud Jeppesen et al; Aarhus: Aarhus U P, 1994), 136-157. Karin Syreeni examines the relationships between Revelations' nuptial imagery and the gospels' in "From the Bridegroom's Time to the Wedding of the Lamb: Nuptial Imagery in the Gospels and the Book of Revelation" in *Sacred Marriages: The Divine-Human Sexual Metaphor from Sumer to Early Christianity* (ed. Martti Nissinen and Uro Risto; Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 2008), 343-369. See also Jan Fekkes, "His Bride Has Prepared Herself": Rev. 19-21 and Isaian Nuptial Imagery," *JBL* 109 (1990): 269-287; Edouard Cothenet, "L'Église, épouse du Christ (Eph 5; Apoc 19 et 21)," in *L'Église dans la liturgie* (ed. A.M. Triacca and A. pistoia; Rome: CLV Edizioni Liturgiche, 1980), 81-106.

⁸ Lynn Huber, *Like a Bride Adorned: Reading Metaphor in John's Apocalypse* (New York: T & T Clark, 2007), 15-44 and "Unveiling the Bride: Revelation 19.1-8 and Roman Social Discourse," *A Feminist Companion to the Apocalypse of John* (ed. Amy-Jill Levine; Cleveland: Pilgrim P, 2009), 159-62. For further discussions of gender-focused reading strategies for these texts, see Alison Jack, "Out of the Wilderness: Feminist Perspectives on the Book of Revelation," in *Studies in the Book of Revelation* (ed. Steve Moyise; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2001), 149-162; Barbara Green, "Pregnant Passion: Gender, Sex, and Violence in the Bible," in the book of the same title (ed. Cheryl A. Kirk-Duggan; Atlanta: SBL, 2003), 221-233 and in the same volume Susan Hylen, "The Power and Problem of Revelation 18," 205-209; Blount, *Can I Get a Witness?* 26-32; Hanna Stenström, "Feminists in Search for [sic] a Usable Future: Feminist Reception of the Book of Revelation," in *The Way the World Ends? The Apocalypse of John in Culture and Ideology* (ed. William John Lyons and Jorunn Økland; Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix P, 2009), 240-266.

edition of the Bible. The result was *The Woman's Bible*, which Cady Stanton opens with an inscription on the title page that “The Bible in its teachings degrades Woman from Genesis to Revelations [*sic*]” and concludes with reference to Revelation’s female figures:

...the woman was decked in the brightest colors, in gold and jewels. No one can describe the pomp, splendor and magnificence of the Church of Rome [*sic*]. The cup in the woman's hand contained potions to intoxicate her victims. It was the custom at that time for public women to have their names on their foreheads, and as they represented the abominations of social life, they were often named after cities. The writers of the Bible are prone to make woman the standard for all kinds of abominations; and even motherhood, which should be held most sacred, is used to illustrate the most revolting crimes... Why so many different revising committees of bishops and clergymen should have retained this book as holy and inspiring to the ordinary reader, is a mystery. It does not seem possible that the Divine John could have painted these dark pictures of the struggles of humanity with the Spirit of Evil. Verily, we need an expurgated edition of the Old and the New Testaments before they are fit to be placed in the hands of our youth to be read in the public schools and in theological seminaries, especially if we wish to inspire our children with proper love and respect for the Mothers of the Race.⁹

The Woman's Bible was controversial; the first edition of it included an appendix containing a repudiation of it from the National-American Woman Suffrage Association. But controversy brings attention, and the book has proven historically important enough to merit a place in most discussions of women’s bible interpretations that cover the nineteenth- and twentieth-century West.

While many aspects of Cady Stanton’s interpretation of Revelation have been discarded by more recent scholarship, others continue to find supporters. Tina Pippin has been perhaps the most vocal proponent of a reading of Revelation that accords with Cady Stanton’s. Pippin writes of Revelation’s women that “the Bride is made into polis, city, the Whore gang raped and burned and eaten... What is positive about this vision?”¹⁰ This is a reading that I join others in contesting. A bride is not “made into” a city in Revelation; a city is described as a bride. Pippin asserts without arguing the point that Babylon is “gang

⁹ Elizabeth Cady Stanton, *The Woman's Bible, Part II: Comments on the Old and New Testaments from Joshua to Revelation*. (New York: European Publishing Co., 1898), 185.

¹⁰ Tina Pippin, *Apocalyptic Bodies: The Biblical End of the World in Text and Image* (London: Routledge, 1999), 119.

raped” despite a lack of any textual indication to this effect, an assertion that Barbara Rossing has critiqued in detail (*Choice between Two Cities*, 87-97); to the best of my knowledge, Pippin has never directly addressed Rossing’s critique. Although her subsequent publications have not reiterated the claim of gang rape, Pippin does argue elsewhere on the basis of Rev. 14:4-5 that the New Jerusalem in Rev. 21-22 is devoid of female believers: “[t]he utopia (no place) for men is an atopia (not a place) for women. Women have historically been excluded from many areas of culture, but here they have even been excluded from the New Jerusalem!”¹¹ The assertion that the 144,000 not exclusively female virgins of Rev. 14:4-5 constitute the entirety of the “elect” population, or can be seen as coterminous with the inhabitants of the New Jerusalem, is not a reading that finds support or even mention elsewhere in the scholarship or in biblical theology.¹²

Pippin is an original and prolific author on Revelation, and her gender analysis is therefore quite prominent in the scholarship; the entries on Revelation in the *Women’s Bible Commentary*, *The Queer Bible Commentary*, and Schüssler Fiorenza’s *Searching the Scriptures*, for example, are all by her (see bibliography). Interpreters such as Paul Duff and Caroline Vander Stichele reach conclusions similar to Pippin’s. Vander Stichele even titles her essay on the figure of Babylon “Re-membering the Whore,” establishing a premise that “Babylon” is dismembered in the first place (she is not). Thus there is a continuing argument in the scholarship that violent misogyny is a central part and a flaw, perhaps an irremediable one, of Revelation’s rhetoric and argument. Other gender-focused and feminist analyses, however, read the text otherwise. Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, Adele Yarbro Collins,

¹¹ Tina Pippin, “The Heroine and the Whore: The *Apocalypse of John* in Feminist Perspective,” in *From Every People and Nation* (ed. David Rhoades; Minneapolis, Minnesota: Augsburg Fortress P, 2005), 143.

¹² The exception would be in Jehovah’s Witness biblical interpretation, but Pippin does not mention this tradition.

Barbara Rossing, and Lynn Huber are among the most prominent such interpreters who agree that Revelation may be problematic in terms of gender but do not see it as irretrievably or uniformly misogynistic. The development of these contrasting readings is a well-studied topic in its own right, with Susan Hylen, Allison Jack, Brian Blount, and Hanna Stenstöm all contributing dedicated analyses of it in the past decade.¹³

APPROACH AND METHODS

I proceed from a position that is more congruent with the ones expressed by Schüssler Fiorenza et al. Although gender is an important factor in my analysis, I do not consider it either an independent variable or as more important than others, such as status (i.e., free/freed/enslaved). I aim to further discussions of gender and slavery in Revelation by focusing on the operation of gender and status ideals in its violent nuptial imagery. I focus on the richest free women (i.e., those to whom the image of Babylon refers) and the female slaves who served them personally, using cloth production and clothing, a motif in Revelation, as a special locus of exploration. My reading emphasizes the violence and the commercial aspects inherent and endemic to slavery, both of which involved free women as well as free men. It is also informed by the feared and real violence undertaken in opposition to slave-trading, which in Revelation is co-manifest with empire. Negotiating Revelation's violent imagery has been a persistent theme in the book's interpretation, and most theological readings of it in published in the last fifty or so years have been predicated on a preference for non-violence. However, some interpreters, especially those reading from perspectives of colonization, have argued that arguments for non-violence that proceed

¹³ Hylen, "The Power and Problem;" Jack, "Out of the Wilderness;" Blount, *Can I Get a Witness?* 26-31; Barr, "Women in Myth and History."

from unexamined locations of socio-political privilege in practice support continued violence inflicted by the powerful by failing to consider the necessities of confronting it. This discussion is a subject unto itself; Brian Blount and Paul Decock both provide useful, case-study-driven synopses of it,¹⁴ highlighting the influential biblical theology of South African anti-apartheid activist Allan Boesak.¹⁵ Boesak and most other proponents of this argument agree that Revelation does not issue a call to arms to believers on earth. Instead, they advocate granting serious consideration to its presentation of eschatological divine violence as just.

In keeping with such reading strategies, I accept the legitimacy of Revelation's violent theodicy and seek to explore it accordingly. Placing the analysis of gender in this context is not to dismiss the reams of research on the ways in which the ancient cultural trend of typifying evil as a bad *woman* expresses misogyny. Many conclusions of that research have been informative. But my interest lies in the representation of an elite, slave-controlling woman as *bad*. This is an embedded representation whose exploration is inextricable from an interpreter's own position in a society historically shaped by racialized slavery and affected by its legacies. This approach does not dictate accepting Revelation as an anti-slavery text in historical terms. Indeed, its frequent lauding of the δούλοι of Christ is an example of the common Roman-era metaphor of "positive" enslavement to an abstract virtue of an owner. Many uses of this metaphor turn on the idea, most explicitly discussed

¹⁴ Blount, *Can I Get a Witness?*, 31-36; Paul B. Decock, "Hostility against the Wealth of Babylon: Revelation 17:1-19:10," in *Animosity, the Bible, and Us: Some European, North American, and South African Perspectives* (ed. John T. Fitzgerald et al.; Atlanta: SBL, 2009) 263-286.

¹⁵ Allan A. Boesak, *Comfort and Protest: Reflections on the Apocalypse of John of Patmos* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1987); see also Michael N. Jagessar, "Unending the Bible: The Book of Revelation through the Optics of Anancy and Rastafari," in *Black Theology, Slavery and Contemporary Christianity* (ed. Anthony G. Reddie; Farnham, Surrey: Ashgate, 2010), 81-94.

by Stoic authors, that all good men are “truly” free, whereas bad ones are the “real” slaves, in thrall as they are to vice,¹⁶ and it is no coincidence that they are the work of wealthy freeborn authors. It is impossible to guess how slaves received their use of the metaphor — not all in the same way, presumably — but one might venture a guess that their reactions were often different from the freeborn’s. Revelation consummates this metaphor in an eschatological manumission.

CONSIDERING SLAVERY

In examining the realities of the slave society on which Revelation reflects, I follow many historians of the last thirty years in benefiting from the formulation of slavery as “the permanent, violent domination of natally alienated and generally dishonoured persons”¹⁷ in Orlando Patterson’s interpretation of the global history of slavery. This idea has been tremendously influential; nearly every major study of slavery in any historical context

¹⁶ On slavery metaphors in ancient literature, see David Brion Davis, *The Problem of Slavery in Western Culture* (Ithaca, New York: Cornell U P, 1966), 62–68, 75–90; Dale B. Martin, *Slavery as Salvation: The Metaphor of Slavery in Pauline Christianity* (New Haven, Connecticut: Yale U P, 1990); Peter Garnsey, *Ideas of Slavery from Aristotle to Augustine* (Cambridge: Cambridge U P, 1996) 16–19; Ian H. Combes, *The Metaphor of Slavery in the Writings of the Early Church* (Sheffield: Sheffield Ac. P, 1998); William Fitzgerald, *Slavery and the Roman Literary Imagination* (Cambridge: Cambridge U P, 2000), 69–77; John Byron, *Slavery Metaphors in Early Judaism and Pauline Christianity* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003); Jennifer Glancy, *Slavery in Early Christianity* (New York: New York U P, 2003) 29–38; Catherine Hezser, “The Impact of Household Slaves on the Jewish Family,” in *Rabbinic Law in its Roman and Near Eastern Context* (ed. Hezser; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003), 418–422 and *Jewish Slavery in Antiquity* (Oxford: Oxford U P, 2005) 327–45; Vasilis I. Anastasiadis, “Charmidès et Phéaulas: Possession et renoncement aux biens chez Xénophon,” in *Esclavage antique et discriminations socio-culturelles* (ed. Anastasiadis and Panagiotis Doukelli; Bern: Peter Lang, 2005), 77–90; Roger Brock, “Figurative Slavery in Greek Thought,” 209–215 in *Peur de l’esclave — Peur de l’esclavage en Méditerranée ancienne* (ed. Anastasia Serghidou; Besançon: Presses Universitaires de Franche-Comté, 2007); J. Albert Harrill, *Slaves in the New Testament: Literary, Social, and Moral Dimensions* (Minneapolis: Fortress P, 2006) *passim*; and in *CWHS*, Peter Hunt, “Slaves in Greek Literary Culture,” 23–25, 44–45. See also J. Lorand Matory, “Free to Be a Slave: Slavery as Metaphor in the Afro-Atlantic Religions,” *J. Rel. Afr.* 37 (2007): 398–425. On the Stoic idea of “true” freedom, see Orlando Patterson, *Freedom in the Making of Western Culture* (New York: BasicBooks, 1991), 191–99, 265–90. His discussion of Paul’s use of the metaphor and its aftermath (325–44, 377–86), although not necessarily in keeping with NT studies, is interesting.

¹⁷ Orlando Patterson, *Slavery and Social Death* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard U P, 1982), 13.

published since 1982 has referred to it. It has also been controversial. Patterson is a sociologist rather than an historian, and historians of specific periods and eras have critiqued various aspects of his work as well as its sheer breadth of scope and claims. His arguments for the importance of social over legal and economic aspects of slavery aspects of slavery have also been subject to debate. His basic formulation, however, is accurate and insightful for slavery in the Roman empire, which is in fact one of his major sources of evidence. Another fast foundation of his argument is the slave system of the antebellum United States, which in a few key respects was legally and culturally indebted to that of the Roman empire (see below).

It is with Patterson's work and its influence in mind that I deliberately compare certain aspects of the slavery of the high Roman empire with that of the antebellum United States. This is part of what has become standard practice, not a radical strategy. Measured comparison of different slave systems has proven extremely fruitful since the publication of Patterson's initial work and leading up to it.¹⁸ It has proven a valuable tool for historians of

¹⁸ Some of the largest relevant treatments (all *passim*) include Moses Finley, *Ancient Slavery and Modern Ideology* (Princeton: Princeton U P, 1980); Orlando Patterson, *Social Death*; Peter Kolchin, *Unfree Labor: American Slavery and Russian Serfdom*. (Belknap P, 1987); James Oakes, *Slavery and Freedom*. (New York: Knopf, 1990) 3-39; Stanley L. Engerman, *Terms of Labor* (Stanford: Stanford U P, 1999); C.S.M. Wickramasinghe, *Slavery from Known to Unknown: A Comparative Study of Slavery in the Ancient Greek Poleis and Ancient Sri Lanka* (Oxbow, 2005). For focused discussions of the method itself and case studies, see Arnold Sio, "Interpretations of Slavery: The Interpretation of Slave Status in the Americas," *Comp. St. in Soc. & His.* 7 (1965): 289-308; Stefano Fenoaltea, "Slavery and Supervision in Comparative Perspective," *J Econ. His.* 44 (1984): 635-668; Keith Bradley, "Servus oneris: Roman Law and the Troublesome Slave," *S & A* 11 (1990): 135-158 and "'The Regular, Daily Traffic in Slaves': Roman History and Contemporary History," *Cl. J* 87 (1991): 125-138. David Brion Davis, "Looking at Slavery from Broader Perspectives," *Am. Hist. Rev.* 105 (2000) 452-466; the Dec. 2008 special issue of *Archaeological Dialogues* (15:2); Jane S. Webster, "A Distant Diaspora: Thinking Comparatively about Origins, Migrations, and Roman Slavery," African Diaspora Arch. Network Newsletter, n.p. [March 2010], <http://www.diaspora.illinois.edu/news0310/news0310.html>.

ancient slavery,¹⁹ partly for technical reasons. The violent and rather abrupt end of U.S. slavery after the Civil War produced social upheavals that lay bare aspects of slavery to which many free (and thus most literate) people could otherwise have remained oblivious.²⁰ This very difference, what Eugene Genovese calls the “moment of truth” (*Roll, Jordan*, 97-112) that slaveholders faced, makes comparison illuminating. Examining the modern throws into relief what is unknown about the ancient. It does not answer questions, but it does raise them.

The historical connections between ancient and Atlantic have not always been apparent to historians of only one or the other. In broad terms, classical Greece, much of the Roman empire, and the European-ruled Atlantic were all what historian Moses Finley categorizes as slave societies, i.e., each was “an institutionalized system of large-scale employment of slave labour in both the countryside [agricultural production] and the cities [crafts, services, and industrial production]” (*Ancient Slavery* 67; cf. 72-92). This set them apart from “societies with slaves,” where the slavery was legal and present but slaves did not perform a great disproportion of the labour. Finley’s scheme is not without its critics, but for present purposes I find it useful for making clear the scope of slavery in the specific

¹⁹ This synopsis draws broadly on Keith Hopkins, *Conquerors* (Cambridge: Cambridge U P, 1978); Finley, *Ancient Slavery*; Orlando Patterson, *Social Death and Freedom*; Keith Bradley, *Slavery and Society at Rome* (Cambridge: Cambridge U P, 1994); Garnsey, *Ideas of Slavery*; Eugene D. Genovese and Elizabeth Fox-Genovese, *The Mind of the Master Class: History and Faith in the Southern Slaveholders’ Worldview* (New York: Cambridge U P, 2005); Jean Andraeu and Raymond Descat, *The Slave in Greece and Rome* (2006, tr. Marion Leopold; Madison: U Wisconsin P, 2011); David Brion Davis, *Inhuman Bondage: The Rise and Fall of Slavery in the New World* (Oxford: Oxford U P, 2006); Niall McKeown, *The Invention of Ancient Slavery?* (London: Duckworth, 2006); Sandra R. Joshel, *Slavery in the Roman World* (Cambridge: Cambridge U P, 2010); Kyle Harper, *Slavery in the Late Roman World, AD 275-425* (Cambridge: Cambridge U P, 2011).

²⁰ The war is a relevant context for this discussion, but an overview of the politics of slavery and its attendant issues in provoking and prosecuting it is beyond the present scope. Some useful histories of the conflict are James McPherson, *Battle Cry of Freedom* (New York: Oxford U P, 1988) and *Drawn with the Sword* (New York: Oxford U P, 1996); Robert Paton and Louis Ferleger, *Slavery, Secession, and Southern History* (Charlottesville: U Virginia P, 2000); and Scott Nelson and Carol Sheriff, *People at War* (New York: Oxford U P, 2007).

periods under discussion. Since I will be focusing on some of slavery's economic contexts, such an understanding of scale is useful, and Finley's, while not perfect, is practically grounded and thorough.

In Finley's scheme, biblical Israel, early Greece, archaic Rome, and non-free northern North American jurisdictions, which until 1777 was all of them,²¹ were all examples of societies with slaves. By the classical period, however, slavery's role in Greece had expanded to the point of the emergence of what Finley categorizes as a slave society, as also occurred in the development of Rome from the archaic to the late republican period and beyond.²² Late Second Temple and early rabbinic writings similarly reflect a system of slavery much closer to that in contemporaneous Greco-Roman world than in the late Iron Age Near

²¹ Canada's ban on slavery was adopted in 1833 and became effective the next year. The first northern American jurisdiction to begin abolition was Vermont in 1777, with most of the other northern states following by 1804. Slavery was usually allowed to persist for transitory periods, which could last for decades. It was legal in four Union states (Delaware, Kentucky, Maryland, and Missouri) when the Civil War began and economically significant in all but the first. Maryland and Missouri banned slavery during the war.

²² One very interesting early postwar analysis of the development of the Roman slave system is Cedric A. Yeo, "The Development of the Roman Plantation and Marketing of Farm Products," *FinanzArchiv* 13 (1951): 321-343. Research has since expanded considerably. See Orlando Patterson, *Freedom*, 48-58, 69-76; in Yuge, *Monde*, Yuge, "Le monde méditerranéen et l'empire romain," 27-32, and Ôta Hidemichi, "Les différents aspects de l'esclave et de l'esclavage," 103-112; N.R.E. Fisher, *Slavery in Classical Greece* (Bristol: Bristol Cl. P, 1995), 10-21, 34-36; Garnsey, *Ideas of slavery*, 1-6; Paul Cartledge, "Greek civilisation and slavery," in *Classics in progress* (ed. Thomas P. Wiseman; Oxford: Oxford U P, 2002), 247-262; Peter Temin, "The Labor Market of the Early Roman Empire," *J Interdisciplinary His.* 34 (2004): 513-538; Andreau and Descat, *The Slave*, 46-52; Walter Scheidel, "The comparative economics of slavery in the Greco-Roman world," in *Systems* (ed. Dal Lago and Katsari), 105-126; Joshel, *Slavery*, 7-9, 48-57; in *CWHs* (ed. Bradley and Cartledge), T.E. Rihill, "Classical Athens," 48-51, 61-72; Keith Bradley, "Slavery in the Roman Republic," 241-251; Neville Morley, "Slavery under the Principate," 265-279. On the early development, see Timothy Taylor, "Believing the Ancients: Quantitative and Qualitative Dimensions of the Slave Trade in Later Prehistoric Eurasia," *World Arch.* 33 (2001): 27-43.

Eastern world of biblical Israel.²³ One major component of the distinction between the classical slave societies and the societies with slavery from which they evolved was demographic. In most of the classical world and the antebellum south, slaves constituted large minorities (but not majorities, as in the European-ruled Caribbean) of the population, anywhere from 10% to about 35%. Figures are harder to estimate for biblical Israel or early Greece, but free people seem to have done most of the labour in economies that were overwhelmingly agricultural, with most slaves employed either in service to wealthy families or in heavy industries that formed only a small sector of the economy. In the northern Americas, for which more data are available, slaves were generally less than 5% of the total population,²⁴ as they were in many European societies of the Middle Ages, Renaissance, and the early modern period.

But while none of the European colonial powers had been slave societies in the millennium before their global expansion, slaves had been present in all of them. Dal Lago and Katsari, surveying the literature on the subject, observe that whether scholars agree or disagree over whether Atlantic slavery “constituted a sharp break with a tradition that

²³ For slavery in the OT and ANE, see Bernard Jackson, “Biblical Laws of Slavery,” in *Slavery and Other Forms of Unfree Labour* (ed. Léonie Archer; New York: Routledge, 1988), 86-101; Raymond Westbrook, “Slave and Master in Ancient Near Eastern Law,” *Chicago-Kent Law Rev.* 70 (1994): 1631-1676; H.D. Baker, “Degrees of Freedom: Slavery in Mid-First Millennium BC Babylonia,” *World Arch.* 33 (2001): 18-26. On Second Temple and early rabbinic situations, see Dean A. Miller, “Biblical and Rabbinic Contributions to an Understanding of the Slave,” in *Approaches to Ancient Judaism* (ed. W.S. Green; Missoula, Montana: Scholars P, 1976), 189-199; Paul Flesher, “Slaves, Israelites, and the System of the Mishnah,” in *New Perspectives on Ancient Judaism*, v. 4 (ed. A.J. Avery-Peck; Lanham, Maryland: U P America, 1989), 101-110; Benjamin Wright, “Δούλος and Παις as Translations of *‘ebd*,” in *IX Cong. Int’l. Org. LXX Cog. St.* (ed. B.A. Taylor; Atlanta: SBL, 1997), 263-277; Hezser, “Slaves and Slavery,” “The Impact of Household Slaves on the Jewish Family in Roman Palestine,” *JStJ* 34 (2003), 377-385, and *Jewish Slavery*, 149-178, 212-214, 380-392.

²⁴ On the making of a slave society in the English Atlantic, especially what became the U.S., see Winthrop D. Jordan, *White over Black: American Attitudes toward the Negro, 1550-1812* (Chapel: U North Carolina P, 1968), 45-56, 63-66, 71-91; Oakes, *Slavery and Freedom*, 80-84; John D. Boles, *Black Southerners 1619-1869* (Louisville: U P Kentucky, 1983), 3-10; Robert William Fogel, *Without Consent or Contract* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1989), 17-23, 34-43; Vincent Rosivach, “Agricultural Slavery in the Northern Colonies and in Classical Athens,” *Comp. St. Soc. & His.* 35 (1993): 551-567.

stretched all the way to the classical past” and the timing, causes, and nature of any such break,

there is no doubt that, until then, the elements of continuity with the ancient Mediterranean [first explicitly] identified by Marquese and Joly [in their study of classical influence on the running of Jesuit sugar plantations in early Brazil] had played an important part in... the making of “slave system” of the modern Atlantic... at the very least as a powerful background to the modern practices of slavery, stood an awareness articulated by masters and intellectuals of walking in the footsteps of individuals who had trodden that path before, or at least some of it, and who had left important clues on how to negotiate it for those who came after them.²⁵

Laws of slavery were part of this modern synthesis. Slave systems then as in antiquity depended on protection from effective governments. In both settings the statutory law of slavery tended to follow customary law, i.e., to respond to existing circumstances, to evolve constantly, and apparently to arise frequently as a matter of judgment before the relevant authorities (e.g., magistrates).²⁶ Even Christian Spain and Portugal, which had had slaves and slave codes from at least the twelfth century, adapted them to the New World plantation system rather than exporting them in their entirety.

In addition to these factors, cross-pollination also characterized the laws governing slavery in different European colonies. France, the Netherlands, Portugal, and Spain

²⁵ Dal Lago and Katsari, *Slave Systems*, 24. On historical continuities in Western slavery, see Winthrop Jordan, *White over Black*, 56-63; Orlando Patterson, *Social Death*, 150-160, and *Freedom in the Making*, 340-362; William D. Phillips, *Slavery from Roman Times to the Early Transatlantic Trade* (Minneapolis: U Minnesota P, 1985) 35-39; Hugh Thomas, *The Slave Trade* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1997), 33-45. On the broad intellectual legacies of ancient slavery, see David Brion Davis, *Problem of Slavery*, 62-90 and *Inhuman Bondage*, 27-47.

²⁶ Ancient slave law is well documented and has long been well understood, or at least well known. See especially Alan Watson, *The Law of Persons in the Later Roman Republic* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1967), 173-184; “Roman Slave Law,” *Cardozo Law Rev.* 18 (1996): 591-598; “Thinking Property at Rome,” in *Slavery & the Law* (ed. Paul Finkelman; Madison: Madison House, 1997), 419-435. Cf. Edgar S. Shumway, “Freedom and Slavery in Roman Law,” *Am. Law Register* 49 (1901): 636-653; W.W. Buckland, *The Roman Law of Slavery* (Cambridge: Cambridge U P, 1908, repr. 1970); Keith Bradley, “Roman Slavery and Roman Law,” *HR/RH* 15 (1988): 477-495; in *CWHS* (ed. Bradley and Cartledge), Jane F. Gardner, “Slavery and Roman Law,” 414-436. Catherine Hezser discusses in detail rabbinic laws of slavery and their relationship to Greco-Roman law and to the OT in “Slaves and Slavery.” Extant classical Greek slave law forms a smaller corpus but is not unknown. Glenn Morrow’s *Plato’s Law of Slavery in Its Relation to Greek Law* (Urbana: U Illinois P, 1939) takes the “benign” view characteristic of prewar scholarship and is dated in some other respects as well but still offers insight into this relationship between ideals, society, and laws. See also N.R.E. Fisher, *Slavery*, 58-65.

brought to their laws that were descendants, sometimes direct ones, of the Roman civil code. It is in part based on this that Alan Watson observes, “Roman [slave law] to a great extent was transplanted to Spain, especially in the form of Las Siete Partidas, and from there to the New World... The longevity of much of the law is also in evidence[, as in] the survival of many ancient Roman rules in the second half of the nineteenth century in Brazil” (1989: 125).²⁷ Some scholars have disputed Watson’s conclusions about the extent to which Roman influenced Atlantic slave law, and in any case civil law had undergone more than a millennium of change. French and Dutch civil codes had shed slavery centuries earlier and re-incorporated it. English common law had never explicitly acknowledged slavery at all, although there had been slaves in England. But whatever the historical relationships between the Atlantic laws of slavery, all of them drew on a variety of

²⁷ For example, in many of these colonies (all of which were Catholic), slaves’ marriages had church and therefore state recognition. Separation by sale of spouses and children was often restricted, and sometimes slaves had legally recognized fathers and specific mothers. In some areas the *peculium* had developed into a legal right for slaves to work toward manumission. These protections could be honoured as much in the breach as in the observance, of course, and slavery in the Iberian and French Caribbean included some of the most horrific situations in history. In particular, many planters found it less efficient to import slaves of both sexes and allow the formation of families than to import only male slaves, work them to death before their value diminished with age, and then import more. European as well as African women were very rare in most of the early Caribbean and South American colonies, so male colonists got wives and heirs by freeing and marrying female slaves (they were rare, not absent). This, in turn, affected the “racial” composition of the free class, which had ongoing consequences for the comparative development of ideas about race.

contemporaneous and historical precedents.²⁸ Some Euro-Atlantic jurists turned directly to ancient Roman law and Greek political theory. Their curricula, unlike most present-day ones, acquainted them closely with Roman jurisprudence. This is a subject that Watson explores in some depth with respect to seventeenth-century European jurists and the law of slavery. While some scholars disagree with Watson's conclusion about the importance of Roman slave law for U.S. slave law, his work in the area of its influence on legal education in the formative period of colonial law has few parallels. For present purposes, the salient issue is not the precise chain of legal influence but rather what Watson describes as

the “baggage” that some jurists of the seventeenth century themselves brought to the task of framing their opinions. Scholars do not develop their theories just as they like, in isolation: they are also bound y what they know and what they do not know, by what they have read and what they cannot read, by the intellectual cultural tradition in which they work, and by the outside world... what the jurists of the time had in common [was among other things a Roman-rooted] common, European, legal heritage (“Seventeenth-Century Jurists,” 1343-1344).

While the degrees of dependence between Roman law, early modern jurists, and New World laws of slavery remain contested, those in legal authority in New World slave systems undeniably possessed at least some awareness of Roman slavery. This does not mean that Roman slave law was the “source” of their thought, but they did have some awareness of it and were invested in a self-image as heirs to the tradition. Thomas Morris explores the use

²⁸ Watson's was not the first post-abolition work on the issue; see Buckland and McNair, *Roman Law*, 25-31; Sio, “Interpretations,” 289-308. It is, however, some of the most extensive; see *Slave Law in the Americas* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins U P, 1989) 1-21, 116-33; “Seventeenth-Century Jurists, Roman Law, and the Law of Slavery,” *Chicago-Kent Law Rev.* 68; “Legal Transplants and European Private Law,” *Electronic J Comp. Law* 4, n.p. [Dec. 2000]; cf. Bradley, “Roman Slavery and Roman Law,” and “*Servus Onerosus*: Roman law and the troublesome slave,” *S & A* 11 (1990); Bradley Nicholson, “Legal Borrowing and the Origins of Slave Law in the British Colonies,” *Am. J Leg. His.* (1994); Jacob Corré, “Thinking Property at Memphis [Tennessee],” in *Slavery and the Law* (ed. Finkelman), 437-451; John Cairns, “Slavery and the Roman Law of Evidence in Eighteenth-Century Scotland,” in Andrew Burrows and Alan Rodger, *Mapping the Law: Essays in Memory of Peter Birks* (Oxford: Oxford U P, 2006), 599-617. For varying perspectives, see Jonathan A. Bush, “Free to Enslave: The Foundations of Colonial American Slave Law,” *Yale J Law & Humanities* 5 (1993); Terrence Kiely, “The Hollow Words: An Experiment in Legal Historical Methods as Applied to the Institution of Slavery,” *DePaul Law Rev.* 25 (1975); William Fisher III, “Ideology and Imagery in the Law of Slavery,” *Chicago-Kent Law Rev.* 68 (1992). On different instances of direct quotation, see also Andrew Fede, *People without Rights* (New York: Garland, 1992), 29-44; Fisher, “Ideology and Imagery,” 847-59; Thomas Morris, *Southern Slavery*, 37-57; Natalie Dessens, *Myths of the Plantation Society* (Gainesville: U Florida P, 2003), 55-65.

of citations of Roman law as what he calls a “political” legitimization strategy in some influential appellate cases.²⁹ Jurists referred to Roman law as a precedent especially often with respect to maternal inheritance of slave status. U.S. jurists, who were heirs to a common law tradition rather than a Roman one, even referred to this principle with a legal neologism that they believed was as old as the principle itself: *partus sequitur ventrem*, which was understood along the lines of “the offspring follows [the condition of] the mother”³⁰ and was in force in every slaveholding jurisdiction of the pre-1865 United States and its predecessor colonies. Thomas Morris observes that the operation of this principle in the U.S. involved some blurring of legal categories:

As Blackstone put the matter about the mid-eighteenth century, ‘Of all tame and domestic animals, the brood belongs to the owner of the dam or mother; the English law agreeing with the civil, that *partus sequitur ventrem* in the brute creation, though for the most part in the human species it disallows the maxim.’ Blackstone, at this point in the work, treated the Latin phrase not as a rule that determined the status of someone, but as a rule that determined the ownership of something (*Southern Slavery*, 45).

In terms of practical experience, however, whether *partus sequitur ventrem* was a rule of status or a rule of property was irrelevant. To be the property of anyone *was* status, slave status. Virginia’s influential 1662 legal code neatly illustrates the situation and its racialization:

Negro womens children to serve according to the condition of the mother. Whereas some doubts have arisen whether children got by any Englishman upon a negro woman shall be slave or ffree, *Be it therefore enacted and declared by this present grand assembly*, that all children borne in this country shalbe held bond or free only according to the condition of the mother, *And* that if any christian shall committ ffornication with a negro man or woman, hee or shee soe offending shall pay double the ffines imposed by the former act.³¹

²⁹ He notes especially *Guardian of Sally, a Negro, v. Beaty* (South Carolina, 1792), which confirmed owner’s control over the *peculium*; *State v. Boon* (North Carolina, 1801), confirming an owner’s legal authority to kill a slave; and *Bryan v. Walton* (Georgia, 1853), denying legal marriage to slaves (Morris, *Southern Slavery*, 49–52).

³⁰ It literally means “the bairn follows the belly,” a construction of pregnancy that would mark the phrase as un-Roman even if the SVO order did not. On its history, see Morris, *Southern Slavery*, 44–49.

³¹ Virginia *Statutes* 2:170, Act XII [1662]; Catherine and J. Richard Lewis (ed.), *Women and Slavery in America: A Documentary History* (Fayetteville: U Arkansas P, 2011), 6.

This was in contradiction to the usual operation of civil and common law alike: legitimate children's are linked to their fathers', not their mothers'. Slaves have no paternal claims, not even the few limited ones available to bastards (e.g., for support), and thus the paternal component of their "natal alienation" is inscribed in law (see ch. 4 for further discussion). So too is their exact position in the ruling community: human livestock.

The commercial law of slavery enacted the same principle by tending to apply the principle of *caveat venditor* to slave sales. This was true throughout the slaveholding states; Jenny Wahl observes that while

antebellum judges North and South respected express agreements no matter what the object of sale, but slave transactions generated greater scrutiny of sales contracts, bills of sale, and buyer behavior. In addition, nineteenth-century courts tended to apply the doctrine of *caveat emptor* to nonslave sales that lacked express agreements, whereas southern courts resolved disputes in slave sales by looking at prices, representations made by sellers, and knowledge that sellers and buyers had or should have had. In slave cases, judges also generally required disclosure of known flaws...³²

William Fischer remarks similarly that "w]hen dealing with sales of slaves, courts throughout the South eschewed the doctrine of *caveat emptor* that was coming to dominate commercial law in the [predominantly free] North; if a purchaser could show that a slave was defective (for example, ill, insane, or prone to running away) at the time of sale, he could secure rescission of the transaction" ("Ideology," 1051-2). None of this sounds dissimilar to the Roman commercial law of slavery,³³ and while the parallels cannot be termed necessarily causal in origin, neither are they superficial. A genetic relationship is perhaps most apparent in the case of Louisiana, where civil code rather than common law remained (and remains)

³² Jenny Wahl, "The Jurisprudence of American Slave Sales," *J Economic His.* 56 (1996), 146.

³³ See Buckland, *Roman Law*, 41-53; Alan Watson, *Roman Slave Law*, 47-53; Keith Bradley, "Regular, Daily Traffic," 126-129; Hezser, "Slaves and Slavery," 134-139; Jean Strauss, *L'Achat et la vente des esclaves dans l'Égypte Romaine* (Münich: K.G. Saur, 2004), *passim*; Harrill, *Slaves in the NT*, 124-129; in *CWHS* (ed. Bradley and Cartledge), Jane F. Gardner, "Slavery and Roman Law," in *CWHS* (ed. Bradley and Cartledge), 415-419.

in force owing to its legacy as a Spanish and a French territory.³⁴ But even in the rest of the country, judges explicitly cited Roman laws of slavery in their rulings on individual status, just as legislators did ancient political theory. Most crucially for our purposes, jurists repeatedly and explicitly invoked it as grounds for denial of legal marriage to slaves and for the maternal inheritance of slave status (see ch. 4).

Investment in classical, and especially Roman, culture was not unique to lawyers. The classics were in vogue in Anglo-American politics and culture in the mid-eighteenth through mid-nineteenth centuries,³⁵ and there was particular interest in them connected to debates over slavery, with abolitionists and slavery defenders alike claiming Greek and Roman political philosophy as support for their positions. This has received less attention from scholars than the religious foundations of pro- and anti-slavery positions. Biblical exegesis alone is the subject of a considerable literature,³⁶ although Revelation almost never

³⁴ On the special case of Louisiana and the history of its laws' interactions with those of other U.S. jurisdictions, see Hans Baade, "The Bifurcated Romanist Tradition of Slavery in Louisiana," *Tulane Law Rev.*, 70 (1995): 1481-1499; Shael Herman, "The Contribution of Roman Law to the Jurisprudence of Antebellum Louisiana," *Louisiana Law Rev.* 56 (1995): 257-315; Judith K. Schafer, "Roman Roots of the Louisiana Law of Slavery," *Louisiana Law Rev.* 56 (1995): 409-422; R.H. Helmholz, "The Law of Slavery and the European *Ius Commune*," in *The Legal Understanding of Slavery* (ed. Jean Allain; Oxford: Oxford U P 2003), 17-39; B.K. Vetter, "Another Legal Transplant," *Fundamina* 11 (2005): 375-384; Vernon Valentine Palmer, *Through the Codes Darkly: Slave Law and Civil Law in Louisiana* (Clark, New Jersey: Lawbook Exchange, 2012), 141-161.

³⁵ See, e.g., Meyer Reinhold, *Classica Americana* (Detroit: Wayne State U P, 1984) and Peter S. Onuf and Nicholas P. Cole (ed.), *Thomas Jefferson, the Classical World, and Early America* (Charlottesville: U Virginia P, 2011). For classicism in abolitionist art and letters, see Patrice D. Rankine, *Ulysses in Black* (Madison: U Wisconsin P, 2006); Richard Alston et al., *Ancient Slavery and Abolition: From Hobbes to Hollywood* (Oxford: Oxford U P, 2011); Carl J. Richard, *The Golden Age of the Classics in America* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard, 2009), 193-201. Caroline Winter discusses African- and European-American women's abolitionist classicism in *The Mirror of Antiquity: American Women and the Classical Tradition, 1750-1900* (Ithaca, New York: Cornell U P, 2007), 165-190.

³⁶ There is no shortage of insightful discussions of pro- and anti-slavery biblical hermeneutics. See David Brion Davis, *Problem of Slavery, passim*; Mark Noll, "The Bible and Slavery," in *Religion and the American Civil War* (ed. Randall Miller; New York: Oxford U P, 1998), 43-73; John Saillant, "Origins of African-American Biblical Hermeneutics in Eighteenth-Century Black Opposition to the Slave Trade and Slavery," in *African-Americans and the Bible* (ed. Vincent Wimbush; New York: Continuum, 2000), 237-250; the Genoveses' *Mind of the Master Class*, 505-527; Harrill, *Slaves in the NT*, 165-192; Richard A. Burrige, "Being Biblical? Slavery, sexuality, and the inclusive community," *HTS* 64:1 (2008): 155-174; Molly Oshatz, *Slavery and Sin: The Fight against Slavery and the Rise of Liberal Protestantism*. (New York: Oxford U P, 2011).

appears as a proof text;³⁷ New Testament household codes, gospel parables, patriarchal narratives, deuteronomic laws, and racialized interpretations of Genesis 9 were all much more prominent.³⁸ But while biblical interpretation was a core issue in nineteenth-century debates over slavery, classical culture (generally understood as pre-Christian classical culture) played a secondary role that was neither insignificant nor intellectually removed from that of the Bible. Some abolitionists, for example, understood ancient slavery as comparatively benign and the modern version as debauched, while others saw modern slavery as a continuation of ancient brutality. Advocates of slavery had similarly varying evaluations: some saw modern slavery as continuing a venerable precedent, others as a Christianized redemption of heathen barbarity in slaveholding. Despite the differences among these visions, plantation slaveowning culture tended to be especially invested in a neo-classical self-image. Bertram Wyatt-Brown observes that

[e]asy reference to Homer, Plato, Horace, and Livy assured Southern gentlemen of one another's trustworthiness, but only so long as the quotations and allusions were familiar. What would the Southern funeral orator have done without a reference as a last wreath to fling upon the bier of a "polished statesman"? No encomium to Southern womankind was complete without a reminder of Sparta's brave mothers. To justify nearly any act of self-defense or vengeance, Hannibal's dying words to son Hamilcar or some choice thoughts about Thermopylae always seemed appropriate. It did not take a scholar to report what Cicero had to say about a policy of honour and immortal fame in immediate war as opposed to strategies of peace, wise expediency, and careful military preparation... Even gamblers named their horses Bucephelas and hunters called their dogs Scipio (1982: 34).

While Wyatt-Brown is correct in noting that the cultural identity of classicism did not depend on extensive knowledge of the classics (generally understood as the pre-Christian classics), many upper-class whites, women as well as men, did possess it. Diaries, personal

³⁷ This is not to say that it played no role in the larger biblical theology. See John Lovell, Jr., *Black Song: The Forge and the Flame* (New York: Macmillan, 1972), 223-232, 252-255, 271-313 *passim*; Jack Maddex, "Proslavery Millennialism: Social Eschatology in Antebellum Southern Calvinism," *Am. Q.* 31 (1979), 49-60; Gayraud Wilmore, *Pragmatic Spirituality: The Christian Faith through an Africentric Lens* (New York: NYU P, 2004), 167-184.

³⁸ For specific examples, see especially Haynes, *Noah's Curse*, and Byron, *Recent Research*, both *passim*.

letters, school and university curricula, moral advice, sermons, and political rhetoric all evince acquaintance not only with classical authors and rhetoric. Practical texts such as plantation manuals and agricultural periodicals demonstrate familiarity with the agrarian writers, not only the luminary *rheto*rs.³⁹ Classicist ideas about the οἶκος and *familia* and their relation to wider society, also present in contemporaneous non-slaveholding political discourse, took on their own form in plantation culture, while toponyms, architectural style, and Roman names bestowed on slaves lent to an impression of a literally re-created classical world.⁴⁰ This does not mean that the people who created it had an accurate historical understanding of classical societies, but neither did they have an historical-critical understanding of the Bible and no one would deny its influence on their thought. Furthermore, as rulers of a slave society themselves, they may have been able to appreciate aspects of classical texts — the writings of rulers of a slave society — that are more opaque to inhabitants of a world where legal slavery is almost uniformly disavowed.⁴¹

³⁹ On pro-slavery classicism, see Harvey Wish, “Aristotle, Plato, and the Mason-Dixon Line,” *J His. Ideas* 10 (1949): 254-266; Edwin A. Miles, “The Old South and the Classical World,” *North Carolina Hist. Rev.* 48 (1971): 258-275; Susan Ford Wiltshire, “Jefferson, Calhoun, and the Slavery Debate: The Classics and the Two Minds of the South,” *Southern Humanities Rev.* (1977): 33-40; Clarence Gohdes, “Old Virginia Georgics,” *Southern Literary J* 11 (1978): 44-53; J. Drew Harrington, “Classical antiquity and the proslavery argument,” *S & A* 10 (1989): 60-72; Robert I. Curtis, “Confederate Classical Textbooks,” *Int’l. J Classical Tradition* 3 (1997): 433-457; the Genoveses’ *Mind of the Master Class* 249-303, 383-385; Peter Thompson, “Aristotle and King Alfred in America,” in Onuf and Cole, *Thomas Jefferson*, 193-218. Winterer addresses pro-slavery women’s classicist discourse in *Mirror of Antiquity*, 41-67; cf. Reinhold, *Classica Americana*, 26-38. For ancient and Atlantic plantation management literature, see Ruef and Harness, “Agrarian Origins,” 589-607; and in *Slave Systems* (ed. Dal Lago and Katsari), the editors’ “Ideal models of slave management in the Roman world and in the ante-bellum American South,” 187-213.

⁴⁰ On the deployment of *oikos* and *familia* concepts in the antebellum south, see Fox-Genovese, “Antebellum Southern Households: A New Perspective on a Familiar Question,” *Fernand Braudel Ctr. Rev.* 7 (1983): 215-253; and Genovese, “Our Family, White and Black,” in *In Joy and In Sorrow* (ed. Caroline Bleser; New York: Oxford U P, 1991), 69-87.

⁴¹ See Joshel, *Slavery*, 6-7. Legal slavery is not gone from living memory: the last jurisdiction to ban it, Mauritania, did so in 1981 and had to reiterate its ban in 2007.

The research on American slavery is extensive, and work that has emerged from the 1960s onward has been instructive for historians of antiquity (and vice versa). The seminal works of this scholarship include ambitious analyses of large subjects, such as David Brion Davis' work on the development of Atlantic slavery; Winthrop Jordan's on that of modern conceptions of race and their consequences; Eugene Genovese's and John Boles' on the functioning of slave communities; and Bertram Wyatt-Brown's and James Oakes' on slaveholders.⁴² Robert William Fogel and Stanley L. Engerman's economic analysis of slavery also had important consequences for scholarship in establishing serious, detailed inquiry into the operation of the slave trade, although very few of their conclusions proved accurate.⁴³ These foundational studies are now decades old and any scholarly book subsequently written about slavery will discuss their impact, draw on their insights, and critique aspects of them that have proven unsound, insufficient, inaccurate, or otherwise problematic (e.g., Genovese's overestimation of paternalist ideology, Finley's doctrinaire Marxism). The more recent books, with some notable exceptions (including later work by the same authors), tend toward more detailed depth and necessarily somewhat less breadth, a complementary approach.

It is this body of scholarship that has that ancient historians have so usefully brought to bear on their own research. The cross-pollination becomes evident in contemporaneous investigations that have yielded more robust descriptions of ancient slavery, with major

⁴² David Brion Davis, *Problem*; Jordan, *White over Black*; Genovese, *Roll, Jordan*; Boles, *Black Southerners*; James Oakes, *The Ruling Race: A History of American Slaveholders* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1982); Bertram Wyatt-Brown, *Southern Honor: Ethics and Behavior in the Old South* (New York: Oxford U P, 1982).

⁴³ Robert William Fogel and Stanley L. Engerman, *Time on the Cross: The Economics of American Negro Slavery* (Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1974). In a bit of irony, Frederic Bancroft's 1931 *Slave Trading in the Old South*, which Fogel and Engerman critiqued, has actually emerged as more accurate, though obviously dated. Michael Tadman provided supplementary material for a subsequent republication in the Southern Classics series (Columbia: U South Carolina P, 1989).

studies exploring slavery and its representations in antiquity broadly,⁴⁴ in the Greek and Hellenistic world,⁴⁵ and in the Roman empire.⁴⁶ Many critique earlier, more benign descriptions,⁴⁷ and they make clear that early Christian and/or Jewish slaveowners were guilty of no less or more than their pagan contemporaries.⁴⁸ Neil McKeown's *Invention of Ancient Slavery*, a constructive critique of these descriptions and argument for caution against overcorrecting for the earlier view, has made this body of research more useful still.

Although the foundational major studies of modern and ancient slavery, like the recent ones, have different strengths and weaknesses, they share the problem of devoting early all their discussion to male slaves and slaveowners without accounting for it in their analysis, which is generally presented as being comprehensive. This is most notable in the scholarship on modern slavery, where information about female slaves and slaveowners is much more abundant. Gender-oriented studies of modern history critiqued this approach beginning in the 1970s and began to account for the experiences of female slaves and users

⁴⁴ Notably Finley, *Ancient Slavery*; Orlando Patterson, *Social Death and Freedom in the Making*; Garnsey, *Ideas of Slavery*; Joshel and Murnaghan (ed.), *Women and Slaves in Greco-Roman Culture: Differential Equations* (London: Routledge, 1998); Andreau and Descat, *The Slave*; Dal Lago and Katsari (ed.), *Systems*; Theresa Urbainczyk, *Slave Revolts in Antiquity* (Durham: Acumen, 2008); Miriam Eliav-Feldon et al. (ed.), *The Origins of Racism in the West* (New York: Cambridge U P, 2009).

⁴⁵ Notably Jean-Pierre Vernant and Pierre Vidal-Naquet, *Travail et esclavage en Grèce ancienne* (1985; Paris: Éditions Complexe, 1988); Fisher, *Slavery in Classical Greece*; Page DuBois, *Slavery: Antiquity and Its Legacy* (London: I.B. Tauris, 2010), among her many works; and Kelly Wrenhaven, *Reconstructing the Slave: The Image of the Slave in Ancient Greece* (Bristol: Bristol Cl. P, 2012).

⁴⁶ See Keith Bradley, *Slavery and Society*; Keith Hopkins, *Conquers and Slaves* (Cambridge: Cambridge U P, 1978) and *Death and Renewal* (Cambridge: Cambridge U P, 1983); Alan Watson, *Roman Slave Law*; Richard Saller, *Patriarchy, Property, and Death in the Roman Family* (Cambridge: Cambridge U P, 1994); Fitzgerald, *Roman Literary Imagination*; Ulrike Roth, *Thinking Tools: Agricultural Slavery between Evidence and Models* (London: Inst. Cl. St., 2007); Joshel, *Slavery in the Roman World*; Harper, *Slavery in the Late Roman World*.

⁴⁷ See especially Finley, *Ancient Slavery*, 11–66 for a thorough overview of modern scholarship on ancient slavery, much of which displays this tendency. The most commonly cited more recent example of it is probably Joseph Vogt's *Ancient Slavery and the Ideal of Man* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1974).

⁴⁸ See, e.g., Glancy, *Slavery in Early Christianity*; Hezser, *Jewish Slavery in Antiquity*; Harrill, *Slaves in the NT*.

of slave labour. The same questions have emerged in ancient history, resulting in dedicated studies and a tendency visible for the last decade or two for many publications about gender (and other subjects) to include substantial discussions of slavery and vice versa. But the limitations of evidence remain, and what little exists on domestic service by mostly female slaves to wealthy free women is almost entirely the output of wealthy free men. This was one of the areas of labour in which the imaginary of slave and wife had the most potential to overlap, and it is at this point that careful comparison can provoke insight-yielding considerations — *not* direct correlations — about ancient slavery. Bernadette Brooten's and Kelly Wrenhaven's work are particularly enlightening in this regard.⁴⁹

RECENT RESEARCH

The wealth of this comparative evidence requires selection in use. I have consulted texts from a limited range of categories: first, pre-abolition long-form narratives of freed and escaped slaves; second, contemporaneous shorter writings (e.g., letters) of established provenance by slaves and former slaves; third, post-abolition memoirs and interviews of former slaves; fourth, female-authored anti- and pro-slavery literature, including white women's propaganda novels,⁵⁰ most dating to the middle third of the nineteenth century; fifth, letters and diaries written by mostly planter-class slaveholding women, as well as a handful of men's diaries, between about 1840 and 1870; and sixth, published post-emancipation memoirs by women formerly of the planter class. Within these limits, I have

⁴⁹ Bernadette Brooten (ed.), *Beyond Slavery: Overcoming Its Religious and Sexual Legacies* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010); Wrenhaven, *Reconstructing*.

⁵⁰ I use "propaganda" in the classical sense of deliberately promoting a position. All of the propaganda novels published in the antebellum period were written by whites. These indicate much more about attitudes than they necessarily do about real practice.

only consulted texts that were published as books or in established periodicals, thus excluding ephemera, or are in archives that universities and governments have published electronically. The University of North Carolina's Documenting the American South is the largest dedicated one, containing materials from the entire south and providing complete scans of all original MSS. Page numbers of original editions refer to this archive unless otherwise specified. I have also focused on the texts that are most illuminating for the issues of listed above and have not proposed any conclusions about the modern period.

The last three decades' secondary research on these sources is vital. Catherine Clinton, following the work of her mentor Ann Firor Scott, was instrumental in establishing that planter-class women were thoroughly integrated into the operation of plantations. She and Scott both, however, may have accepted their subjects' perspectives somewhat over-readily, a tendency that Clinton has critiqued in her own subsequent work.⁵¹ Discussion of the experiences of female slaves became established slightly later, for reasons that should be unpleasantly clear. They can be seen as having expanded from foundational works such as

⁵¹ Catherine Clinton, *The Plantation Mistress: Woman's World in the Old South* (New York: Pantheon, 1982). Subsequent topical studies of importance here include Jane Turner Censer, *North Carolina Planters and Their Children, 1800-1860* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State U P, 1984) 135-49; Louis B. Gimelli, "Louisa Maxwell Cocke: An Evangelical Plantation Mistress in the Antebellum South," *J Early Republic* 9 (1989): 53-71; Stephanie McCurry, "The Two Faces of Republicanism: Gender and Proslavery Politics in Antebellum South Carolina," *J Am. His.* 78 (1992): 1245-1264; H. Beckles, "White Women and Slavery in the Caribbean," *His. Workshop* 36 (1993): 66-82; L. Atkins, "High Cotton: The Antebellum Alabama Plantation Mistress and the Cotton Culture," *Agricultural His.* 68 (1994): 92-104; J. Cashin, "'Decidedly Opposed to the Union': Women's Culture, Marriage, and Politics in Antebellum South Carolina," *Georgia Hist.* 278 (1994): 735-759; Laura F. Edwards, *Gendered Strife & Confusion: The Political Culture of Reconstruction* (Urbana: U Illinois P, 1997) and *Scarlett Doesn't Live Here Anymore: Southern Women in the Civil War Era* (Urbana: U Illinois P, 2000); Drew Gilpin Faust, *Mothers of Invention: Women of the Slaveholding South in the American Civil War* (1996; New York: Vintage, 1998); in Robert Paquette and Louis Ferleger (ed.), *Slavery, Secession, and Southern History* (Charlottesville: U Virginia P, 2000), Faust, "Moment of Truth: A Woman of the Master Class in the Confederate South," 140-59 and Thavolia Glymph, "African-American Women in the Literary Imagination of Mary Boykin Chesnut," 120-39; J.T. Censer, *The Reconstruction of White Southern Womanhood 1865-1895* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State U P, 2003); Giselle Roberts, "The Confederate Belle: The Belle Ideal, Patriotic Womanhood, and Wartime Reality in Louisiana and Mississippi," *Louisiana His.* 43 (2003): 189-214; Kirsten E. Wood, *Masterful Women: Slaveholding Widows from the American Revolution through the Civil War* (Chapel Hill: U North Carolina P, 2004); Inge Dornan, "Masterful Women: Colonial Women Slaveholders in the Urban Low Country," *J. Am. St.* 39 (2005): 383-402.

Deborah Gray White's *Ar'n't I a Woman?*, and here as in non-gender-focused and male-focused work, case and area studies have predominated in the more recent resulting scholarship.⁵² Most works of both types focus on the vast majority of female slaves whose labour was primarily agricultural. It was, however, the small, disproportionately female minority of slaves involved in domestic labour who had the most direct contact with upper-class women, and vice versa. The subsets of research that focus on either necessarily consider the other. Subject studies of their interactions, notably those of Elizabeth Fox-Genovese and Thavolia Glymph, have been instructive.⁵³

This body of work is also part of a much larger scholarship on the history of interaction between U.S. feminism, which as a public movement has been dominated by white women, and racism. It discusses the ongoing problem of mostly-white feminist leaders construing "women" as a monolithic category or construing "women" and "African-Americans" as if they were mutually exclusive. In both cases white feminists have

⁵² Deborah Gray White, *Ar'n't I a Woman? Female Slaves in the Plantation South* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1985, rev. 1998). Major works that followed in this vein include James Oliver Horton, "Freedom's Yoke: Gender Conventions among Antebellum Free Blacks," *Feminist St.* 12 (1986): 51-76; Virginia Gould, "'The House that was never a home': Slave family and household organization in New Orleans, 1820-50," *S & A* 18 (1997): 90-103; Leslie Schwalm, *A Hard Fight for We: Women's Transition from Slavery to Freedom in South Carolina* (Urbana: U Illinois P, 1997); Joan M. Martin, *More Than Chains and Toil: A Christian Work Ethic of Enslaved Women* (Louisville: WJK, 2000); Wilma Dunaway, *The African-American Family in Slavery and Emancipation* (New York: Cambridge U P, 2003); Emily West, *Chains of Love: Slave Couples in Antebellum South Carolina* (Urbana: U Illinois P, 2004); Pamela Scully and Diane Paton, *Gender and Slave Emancipation in the Atlantic World* (Durham, North Carolina: Duke U P, 2005); Diana R. Berry, "Swing the Sickle for the Harvest Is Ripe: Gender and Slavery in Antebellum Georgia" (Urbana: U Illinois P, 2007).

⁵³ Elizabeth Fox-Genovese, *Within the Plantation Household: Black and White Women of the Old South* (Chapel Hill: U North Carolina P, 1988); Thavolia Glymph, *Out of the House of Bondage: The Transformation of the Plantation Household* (New York: Cambridge U P, 2008). See also Brenda Stevenson, *Life in Black and White: Family and Community in the Slave South* (Cary, North Carolina: Oxford U P, 1996); Martha Hodes, *White Women/Black Men: Illicit Sex in the Nineteenth-Century South* (New Haven, Connecticut: Yale U P, 1997); Cynthia Kennedy, *Braided Relations, Entwined Lives: The Women of Charleston's Urban Slave Society* (Bloomington: Indiana U P, 2005); also Kathleen M. Brown, *Good Wives, Nasty Wenches, and Anxious Patriarchs: Gender, Race, and Power in Colonial Virginia* (Chapel Hill: U North Carolina P, 1996) 290-306; Marli F. Weiner, *Mistresses and Slaves: Plantation Women in South Carolina, 1830-80* (Urbana: U Illinois P, 1998); Cecily Jones, *Engendering Whiteness: White women and colonialism in Barbados and North Carolina, 1627-1865* (Manchester: Manchester U P, 2008); Amy Morsman, *The Big House after Slavery* (Charlottesville: U Virginia P, 2010), *passim*. See also preceding notes.

advocated, implicitly or explicitly and often successfully, the interests of “women” (i.e., white women) by opposing them to those of (usually male) “African-Americans.”⁵⁴ Different critics have described this tendency in different ways e.g., as “white feminism” or “white women’s rights;” I employ Emeka Aniagolu’s term “co-whites.” One case in point of such a perspective is Elizabeth Cady Stanton, one of the original feminist Bible commentators and a foundational critic of Revelation as misogynistic on the basis of its depiction of “Babylon.” Cady Stanton devoted the latter part of her career to advancing the claims of white women (the only women she usually mentioned) at the direct expense of African-American men (the only African-Americans she usually mentioned). Entrenched and often unconscious “co-whites” perspectives, as critics of them amply document, loom over discussions of race/slavery and/or gender. I have made every effort to avoid them but do not imagine that I have succeeded wholly.

PRACTICAL CONTEXTS

Since ancient and modern historians do not have exhaustive backgrounds in one another’s areas, and since the details of U.S. slavery are most familiar in the U.S., a review of the salient similarities and differences between the two slave systems under comparison seems in order. Chapters one, three, and four explore in detail aspects related to marriage, gender, and sexuality, so here I mention them only briefly.

⁵⁴ See, e.g., Ruth Frankenberg, *White Women, Race Matters: The Social Construction of Whiteness* (Minneapolis: U Minnesota P, 1993); Orlando Patterson, “Blacklash,” *Transition* 62 (1993): 4-26; Louise Michele Newman, *White Women’s Rights: The Racial Origins of Feminism in the United States* (New York: Oxford U P, 1999); Benita Roth, *Separate Roads to Feminism: Black, Chicana, and White Feminist Movements in America’s Second Wave* (New York: Cambridge U P, 2004); Emeka Aniagolu, *Co-Whites: How and Why White Women “Betrayed” the Struggle for Racial Equality in the United States* (Lanham, Maryland: U P America, 2011).

While most slaveowners in both the classical world and the antebellum south, like most of those in the earlier ancient world and the northern Americas, owned ten or fewer slaves, the largest slaveowners in both held the majority of slaves. Slaves still provided most of the labour in dangerous sectors and in domestic service to the upper class, but the majority of them worked to raise cash crops on plantations. The same combination of sources sustained both these slave societies' labour pools: first, initial importation supplemented by natality, which shifted to natality supplemented by importation (see ch. 3, 4);⁵⁵ second, kidnapping of free people into slavery; and third, enslavement by self-sale,⁵⁶ judicial penalty, or familial abandonment. In the antebellum south, international sources of slaves were legally unavailable after 1808, resulting in a thriving interstate slave trade from the Chesapeake and Appalachian regions to those further south and west, where there was a demand for labour on sugar, rice, and especially cotton plantations in the warmer and more humid environments.

Atlantic and Roman slavery were both chattel systems: slaves were bought, owned, and sold in the same way as any other kind of movable property or, in rural antiquity, as a component of real property. Slaveholders explicitly grouped them with draught animals

⁵⁵ Importation might be of war captives and ostensible war captives, including those from wars provoked to obtain slaves; tribute demands on conquered peoples or other disempowered communities; or systematic kidnapping. See Orlando Patterson, *Social Death*, 106-124; Keith Bradley, "On the Roman Slave Supply and Slavebreeding," *S & A* 8 (1987): 42-64; Watson, *Roman Slave Law*, 7-22; in Yuge, *Monde*, Ôta, "Différents aspects" 97-103; Nicholas Rauh, *The Sacred Bonds of Commerce: Religion, Economy, and Trade Society at Hellenistic Roman Delos, 166-87 B.C.* (Amsterdam: J.C. Gieben, 1993), 42-53; William V. Harris, "Demography, Geography, and the Sources of Roman Slaves," *J Rom. St.* 89 (1999): 62-75; Glancy, *Slavery*, 72-85; F. Hugh Thompson, *Archaeology*, 46; Andreau and Descat, *The Slave*, 52-63; Joshel, *Slavery*, 65-69, 81-87; in *CWHS*, David Braund, "The Slave Supply in Classical Greece," 112-127 and Walter Scheidel, "The Roman Slave Supply," 287-300. On the modern period, see Boles, *Black Southerners*, 25-35.

⁵⁶ It was much easier in antiquity than in North America for freeborn people to sell themselves into slavery. Although this was a small minority of the ancient slave supply, in North America the practice was so rare that no regular legal procedures existed for it and only a handful of documented cases are known. See Orlando Patterson, *Social Death*, 124-131; Morris, *Southern Slavery*, 31-36.

(usually oxen in antiquity and horses in the Atlantic), a likening was that considered inherently degrading. Karl Jacoby observes that this association has deep historical roots that are based in part on common ways of physically dominated and marking human and non-human draught property.⁵⁷ Slaves, like these creatures, were deemed deficient in reason, morality, and personality, legally defined primarily by their physical being and not by their personalities. Critics of slavery extended the comparison to large non-draught animals, i.e., those whose value was in being butchered. Slaveholders themselves made the same extension in criticizing professional slave traders, who were often depicted as hated and dishonourable. In both cases, as chapter three discusses, the reality was that even the most respectable slaveholders engaged in at least some slave-trading themselves. J. Albert Harrill, noting that “condemnation of unscrupulous slave traders... did not imply a moral condemnation of [slavery]” (2006: 126), proposes a modern analogy:

Ancient slave dealers enjoyed a reputation similar to that of used-car sellers today: although the used-car seller functions as a standard example of an untrustworthy and unsavory person, users of the example do not mean to condemn the selling of used cars in general or even to suggest that *all* used-car sellers are so bad. Still, extreme caution in dealing with such unscrupulous people is warranted (ibid).

An analogy that might hold for both societies would be that of a butcher. Notorious criminals and dictators are termed “butchers” or their activities “butchery,” and in modern parlance the sites of their acts may be termed an “abattoir” (itself a euphemism). In neither setting is butchering a status profession. But most of the people who use this language and have this attitude create demand for butchery (i.e., consume its products) without hesitation. That is, many people view those who make a profession of killing and cutting up other animals (or dealing in used cars, or in other humans being) as dishonest individuals

⁵⁷ See Karl Jacoby, “Slaves by nature?” *S & A* 15 (1994); Keith Bradley, “Animalizing the Slave: The Truth of Fiction,” *J Roman St.* (2000): 110-125; Jordan, *White over Black*, 228-234; Wahl, “Jurisprudence,” 143-169.

who chose to immerse themselves in inherently unpleasant or at least corrupting work. This does not indicate any intention of stopping eating carcasses (or trying to maximize their own benefit in the buying and selling of used cars, or of other human beings). I do not mean to imply that these activities are morally equivalent, but it is necessary to understand that many slaveholders felt that they were. Many of them might have seen the slave trade as the most unpleasant of the three, but just as that: the assumed necessity whose management they enjoyed the least.

They remained mindful, however, that their slaves, unlike their vehicles or their oxen, were possessed of human communication and reason (in this slaves were considered deficient, not devoid). This meant that they were capable of deliberate action against their owners, whether individual action such as poisoning or arson or collective action such as revolt. Fears to this effect flourished out of all proportion with reality;⁵⁸ and Moses Finley could be speaking as much for the antebellum U.S. as for ancient Rome in saying that “fugitive slaves are almost an obsession in the sources” (1980: 111), despite the difficulty and rarity of permanent flight. One consequence of these fears, although it is better evinced for the Atlantic than ancient slavery;⁵⁹ was the enactment of “slave codes.” These governed the conduct of slaves while not on their owners’ premises and sometimes made demands of how owners, hirers, and managers regulated their slaves. Enforcement of these codes and

⁵⁸ J. Albert Harrill offers a focused discussion of this and related theme in Christian literature in “The Domestic Enemy” and in *Slaves in the NT*, 145-164. In *Peur* (ed. Serghidou), see Richard Gamauf, “*Cum aliter nulla domus tuta esse possit...*: Fear of Slaves and Roman Law,” 145-164; Ilias Arnaoutoglou, “Fear of Slaves in Ancient Greek Legal Texts,” 133-144, and Niall McKeown, “The Sound of John Henderson Laughing: Pliny 3.14 and Roman Slaveowners’ Fear of their Slaves,” 265-279. For their iterations in U.S. history, see Jordan, *White over Black*, 386-402; Genovese, *Roll, Jordan*, 587-598.

⁵⁹ Slave codes did exist in antiquity; there is just less record of them. See Sophia Zoumbaki, “The Collective Definition of Slaves and the Limits to their activities,” in *Esclavage* (ed. Anastasiadis and Doukellis), 217-231.

apprehension of runaway slaves were duties incumbent on military or police forces and on the general public, making the operation of slavery a state concern.

The Greek, Roman, and southern states were less concerned with slaves themselves. Slaves were property rather than persons and thus had no rights or standing before the law. They could still be prosecuted and sentenced for contravening slave codes or other statutory laws, and if they were convicted, the law subjected them to penalties against most of which free people were immune.⁶⁰ But they had no recourse of their own, and there were few or no constraints on how slaveowners could punish their slaves privately.⁶¹ The standard repertoire of such punishments began with whipping, burning, and treadmills and extended to collars, branding, castration, and hanging. Subjecting a free person to any of these, barring judicial execution by hanging, was usually illegal or at least anomalous. Immunity from more severe forms of corporal punishment was a privilege of the free, and there was no general acceptance of milder forms of domestic violence against free subordinates (e.g., husbands slapping wives or parents beating children; see ch. 1). They still occurred, of course, but this was rarer and the victims had far more opportunities for legal and social redress.

⁶⁰ See Finley, *Ancient Slavery* 93-95, 117-118; Orlando Patterson, *Social Death* 18-27, 196-200; Paul Cartledge, "Like a Worm i' the Bud? A Heterology of Classical Greek Slavery," *G & R* 40 (1993), 173-177; F.H. Thompson, *Archaeology of Greek and Roman Slavery* 217-240, 242-244; Andreau and Descat, *The Slave*, 108-114; Wrenhaven, *Reconstructing*, 63-71. For the U.S., see Mark Tushnet, *The American Law of Slavery 1810-1860: Considerations of Humanity and Interest* (Princeton: Princeton U P, 1981) 121-137; Betty Wood, *Slavery in Colonial Georgia 1730-1755* (Athens: U Georgia P, 1984), 110-130, 188-190; Alan Watson, *Roman Slave Law*, 46-65; Andrew Fede, *People Without Rights: An Interpretation of the Fundamentals of the Law of Slavery in the U.S. South* (New York: Garland, 1992), 29-37; Ariela Gross, *Double Character: Slavery and Mastery in the Antebellum Southern Courtroom* (Princeton: Princeton U P, 2000) 105-136.

⁶¹ Patterson, *Social Death*, 192-93; Andrew Fede, "Legitimized Violent Slave Abuse in the American South, 1619-1865," *Am. J. Legal His.* 29 (1985): 93-150; Alan Watson, *Roman Slave Law* 115-130; N.R.E. Fisher, *Slavery* 70-77; Andréas Helmis, "La mort de l'esclave et le droit dans l'Antiquité grecque," in, *Esclavage* (ed. Anastasiadis and Doukellis), 91-105; William G. Thalmann, "Despotic Authority, Fear and Ideology of Slavery," in *Peur* (ed. Serghidou), 193-205.

The ideal of upward mobility for free people can also be seen as having characterized both the antebellum U.S. and the Roman imperial slave societies. The articulations of this ideal of course differed even within these cultures, to say nothing of between them, but in both, poor free people could and did aspire to slave ownership and small slaveowners to becoming larger ones. Owning more slaves meant needing to do less work, which free people in all these societies saw as servile and degrading. Their denigration of labour was integrated into the honour/shame systems of their societies, as Bertram Wyatt-Brown has notably explored in the case of the antebellum South.⁶² Both societies restricted honour to the free and made its maintenance or increase a matter of “parasitism,” in Orlando Patterson’s terms,⁶³ at the expense of slaves. Even the poorest free people could and did define themselves through superiority to slaves. Both societies also related honour to ideals of sexual propriety that involved free female chastity and free male marital respectability, the latter of which tended to tolerate a certain degree of sexual license. Vulnerability to sexual exploitation was a component of slaves’ “natal alienation and general dishonour.” Slaves in both systems were also denied legal marriage and its entitlements, as chapter four

⁶² Wyatt-Brown, *Southern Honor*, 92-100, 111-14; cf. Ariela Gross, *Double Character*, 47-57; Haynes, *Noah’s Curse*, 65-76. On antiquity, see Vernant and Vidal-Naquet, *Travail & esclavage*, *passim*; cf. in *Esclavage* (ed. Anastasis & Doukellis) Dimitris J. Kyrtatas, “The Competition of Slave and Free Labour in the Classical Greek World,” 69-76; and Anastasia Serghidou, “Autour de la table: Hiérarchies sociales, identités culturelles et exclusion dans Athénée,” 287-303.

⁶³ Patterson, *Social Death*, 334-342. He provides broad discussions of this type of class/honour stratification in *Freedom*, 64-81, 95-99, 134-139, 205-212; cf. Ôta Hidemichi, “Esclavage et société esclavagiste,” in Yuge, *Monde*; Peter Garnsey, “Legal Privilege in the Roman Empire,” *P & P* 41 (1968): 3-24; Wm. Fitzgerald, *Roman Literary*, 69-86; Joshel, *Slavery*, 30-38. For the plantation south, see Eugene Genovese, “Yeoman Farmers in a Slaveholders’ Democracy,” *Agricultural His.* 29 (1975): 331-342 and “The Chivalric Tradition in the Old South,” *Sewanee Rev.* 108 (2000): 188-205; Oakes, *Ruling Race*, 37-43, 123 and *Slavery and Freedom*, 107-132; Boles, *Black Southerners*, 46-49, 73-78, 106-114; Betty Wood, *Colonial Georgia*, 198-204; Bruce Collins, *White Society in the Antebellum South* (London: Longman, 1985), 15-23, 59-66; Harry L. Watson, “Conflict and Collaboration: Yeomen, Slaveholders, and Politics in the Antebellum South,” *Soc. His.* 10 (1985): 273-298; Fox-Genovese, *Plantation Household*, 196-202; Fede, *People Without Rights*, 48-53; Jeff Forret, “Slave-Poor White Violence in the Antebellum Carolinas,” *North Carolina Hist. Rev.* 81 (2004): 199-167.

details. Understandings of marriage were therefore connected to those of freedom and defined it, in part, as opposite to slavery.

For all these similarities, though, the antebellum plantation world was not the Roman empire. The difference that nearly all scholars identify as the most important is the presence or absence of a racial basis for slavery.⁶⁴ Race was the bedrock of Atlantic slavery. In antiquity, no innate heritable characteristic distinguished the classes of free and enslaved people. Orlando Patterson's reminder that "[i]t is not true... as is so often claimed, that race was not an issue in the classical world"⁶⁵ is salutary. Ancient Mediterranean literature and visual art do sometimes caricature the physical differences of people, especially slaves, whose origins were obviously "exotic," and associations between blackness and slave status were beginning to emerge at the close of the fifth century CE. But race as related to ancient slavery was a collection of issues, none of which were consistently foundational to the institution itself.

⁶⁴ For the role of racism in shaping different systems of slavery, see David Wiesen, "The Contribution of Antiquity to American Racial Thought," in *Classical Traditions in Early America* (ed. J.W. Eadie; Ann Arbor: U Michigan P, 1976), 191-212; Audrey Smedley, *Race in North America: Origin and Evolution of a Worldview* (Boulder, Colorado: Westview, 1993; 3rd ed. 2007), 123-160; James Walvin, *Questioning Slavery* (New York: Routledge, 1996), 72-95; Robin Blackburn, *The Making of New World Slavery* (London: Verso, 1997), 65-76; and Eliav-Feldman et al.'s introduction to their *Origins of Racism in the West*, 1-31.

⁶⁵ Patterson, *Social Death*, 176. Texts and plastic arts do bear witness to the presence of some dark-complexioned African slaves in Mediterranean societies even from early antiquity. Greek slave onomastics also suggest an association between visible ethnic difference and slave status with the commonness of names like Xanthius and Pyrrhus. But again, there was no one heritable feature (or set of features) that consistently indicated slave status. For discussions of "racial"-like ideas in antiquity, see Patterson, *Social Death*, 176-179; Lloyd Thompson, "Roman Perceptions of Blacks," *Electronic Antiquity* 1 (1993) [n.p.]; Vincent Rosivach, "Enslaving *Barbaroi* and the Athenian Ideology of Slavery," *Historia* 48 (1999): 551-567; Marla Harris, "Not Black and/or White: Reading Racial Difference in Heliodorus's *Ethiopica* and Pauline Hopkins's *Of One Blood*," *Afr. Am. Rev.* 35 (2001): 375-390; Denise Kimber Buell, "Race and Universalism in Early Christianity," *JECs* 10 (2002): 429-468; in Eliav-Feldon, *Origins*, Eliav-Feldon "Early Christian universalism and modern forms of racism," 109-131, David Goldenberg, "Racism, color symbolism, and color prejudice," 88-108, and Benjamin Isaac, "Racism: a rationalization of prejudice in Greek and Rome" (32-56); Michael Bakaoukas, "Tribalism and Racism among the Ancient Greeks," *Anistorion* 7 9 (2005) [n.p.]; David Brion Davis, *Inhuman Bondage*, 48-69; Harrill, *Slaves in the NT*, 37-53; Wrenhaven, *Reconstructing*, 44-52.

It is also true that the equation between blackness and slavery in North America could be more problematic than it is often presented in history curricula, especially in the seventeenth and early eighteenth century. The issue remained as vexed in Louisiana as it did Brazil and much of the Caribbean.⁶⁶ Some characteristic elements of U.S. racism actually became more entrenched after the Civil War, when racist whites were eager to maintain status distinctions that slavery had ensured previously. But again, racial basis was a consistent, defining characteristic of North American slavery (and indeed much of modern slavery) and underlay the inferior legal and social status of non-white free people, while it was absent from slave systems of the Roman empire. There, the primary physical indicators of enslavement were tonsure, clothing, and the marks of violence. These also distinguished slaves in the antebellum U.S.,⁶⁷ but race was far more important. One consequence of racial disparity in status was that “obviously white” Americans were unlikely to become enslaved, whereas in antiquity any free person in principle could become enslaved as a result of kidnapping or piracy. The symbiosis of racialism and inherent slave status was largely a modern phenomenon.

⁶⁶ Jordan’s exhaustive *White over Black* remains a valuable resource, detailing dozens of facets of this history. See also Tushnet, *American Law*, 139-156; Boles, *Black Southerners*, 10-20; Smedley, *Race in North America*, 95-122; Kathleen Brown, *Good Wives*, 212-248; Peter Wallenstein, *Tell the Court I Love My Wife: Race, Marriage, and Law — An American History* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002), 13-29; Anthony Parent, *Foul Means: The Formation of a Slave Society in Virginia, 1660-1740* (Chapel Hill: U North Carolina P, 2003), 105-134; David Brion Davis, *In the Image of God*, 77-102.

⁶⁷ Non-racial marks seem to have been important status indicators in antiquity: see David Miller, “Biblical and Rabbinic Contributions,” Orlando Patterson, *Social Death*, 58-62; Bradley, “Roman Slavery and Roman Law,” 477-481; F.H. Thompson, *Archaeology of Slavery*, 241-242; Athina Chatzidimitriou, “Distinguishing Features in the Rendering of Craftsmen, Professionals and Slaves in Archaic and Classical Vase Painting,” in *Esclavage* (ed. Anastasiadis & Doukellis), 131-145; Wrenhaven, *Reconstructing*, 77-86. Similar factors could exist in antebellum slavery in communities where there were free as well as enslaved African-Americans. See, e.g., Shane and Graham White, “Slave Hair and African-American Culture in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries,” *J Southern His.* 61 (1995): 45-67; Amani Marshall, “‘They Will Endeavor to Pass for Free’: Enslaved Runaways’ Performances of Freedom in Antebellum South Carolina,” *S & A* 31 (2010): 161-180.

The fact that permanent slave status *did* become entwined with African ancestry led Euro-Atlantic defenders of slavery to argue that it *should* have done so. They did so with the argument that slavery was a “positive good,” per John Calhoun, that benefitted slaves as well as their owners.⁶⁸ This argument was the centrepiece of anti-abolition rhetoric by about 1830. It had little precedent in antiquity. A few ancient writers such as Aristotle do argue that enslavement is beneficial for “naturally inferior” people who would be protected and improved by virtuous owners. Educated Atlantic slaveholders knew this and racialized it; Harvey Wish observes that “defenders of the peculiar institution found [Aristotle] next to the Bible itself a deep source of inspiration”⁶⁹ for their position. In the main, however, ancient freeborn writers present slavery as an unfortunate but inevitable reality, or something that some people deserved even though it might be regrettable. This may be related to the fact that antebellum plantation society, unlike much of the Roman world, was intensely aware of the existence of societies and economies that functioned without slaves. Most 1830s-1860s U.S. writings about slavery have an obvious and specific political perspective on the issue; they are clearly pro- or anti-slavery and proclaim themselves as such. Ancient writings, however, tend to assume that slavery is unpleasant but inevitable

⁶⁸ For the “necessary evil” understanding that the “positive good” argument displaced, see Lacy Ford, *Deliver Us from Evil: The Slavery Question in the Old South* (New York: Oxford UP, 2009), 19-48. The Genoveses detail the evolution of the argument in *Mind of the Master Class*, 73ff. Chad Vanderford examines the use of ancient political philosophy in “positive good” arguments in “Proslavery Professors: Classic Natural Right and the Positive Good Argument in Antebellum Virginia,” *Civil War His.* 55 (2009): 5-30; cf. Drew Gilpin Faust, “A Southern Stewardship: The Intellectual and the Proslavery Argument,” *Am. Q.* 31 (1979): 63-80.

⁶⁹ Wish, “Aristotle, Plato,” 254. These two were the most influential authors on slavery in antiquity. Morrow’s *Plato’s Law*, though dated, is nevertheless a thoughtful analysis. Paul Millett offers a related, more current perspective in “Aristotle and Slavery in Athens,” *G & R* 54 (2007); cf. David Brion Davis, *Problem*, 67-72; Orlando Patterson, *Freedom*, 155-164, 173-178; Cartledge, “Like a Worm i’ the Bud?” 168-173; N.R.E. Fisher, *Slavery*, 91-98; Garnsey, *Ideas*, 9-15, 238-243; Julián Gallego, “*Doûlos katà nómon* y la idea de hombre en la Grecia clásica,” in *Peur* (ed. Serghidou), 75-88; Andreau and Descat, *The Slave*, 128-136; Wrenhaven, *Reconstructing*, 139-149. For the use of classical political philosophy in U.S. defenses of slavery, see also Mavis Campbell, “Aristotle and Black Slavery: A Study in Race Prejudice,” *Race & Class* 15 (1974): 283-301; Wiesen, “Contribution of Antiquity,” *Classical Traditions in Early Am.* (ed. Eadie).

and beneficial to the free, from whose ranks nearly all authors came. However, opposition to and moral qualms about slavery did exist in antiquity and for that matter in the early (and later) church, even if pro-slavery views more often prevailed. They were also evident, as they were in Atlantic slavery, in debates between slaveholders over why slavery was acceptable, whether it was merely acceptable or actually good, and the moral intricacies of slaveowners' exercising their effectively unlimited power over their slaves.

Both the "positive good" ideology" and racialization related to the rarity of manumission in later U.S. slavery. Romans traced their origins to former slaves, and manumission and self-purchase were common enough that *liberti* constituted a distinct socio-legal group. They could and often did own slaves and their descendants could become assimilated into the free population. This remained true even after legal constraints were placed on manumission and marriage-related social boundaries hardened, most systematically under Octavian's and Constantine's legal programs.⁷⁰ Even the more restrictive system of classical Athens allowed for distinct classes of people who, while not

⁷⁰ On laws of marriage and the social strata, see Frank, "Augustus' Legislation," 46-50; Villers, "Le mariage envisagé," 295-298, 300; David Cherry, "The Minician Law: Marriage and the Roman Citizenship," *Phoenix* 44 (1990); Evans Grubbs, "'Pagan' and 'Christian' Marriage" and *Law and Family*, *passim*; Milnor, *Gender, Domesticity*, 142-151.

citizens, had a socially recognized position and were free.⁷¹ The racial basis of American slavery, in contrast, prevented assimilation, and unlike in Brazil and the Caribbean, few freed people or their descendants owned slaves. By the late antebellum period, few even existed for that possibility to occur. Thousands of free African-Americans were kidnapped into slavery in the nineteenth century, and few ever escaped it. Those who remained free were stripped of many of their rights by state legislatures and courts. Manumission and self-purchase had become nearly unheard of and in some jurisdictions legally impossible.⁷² The situation was worlds away from even the most robust ancient attempts to limit manumission and harden class boundaries. This difference, however, should not mislead us into thinking that any but the most favoured personal slaves of the Roman world had realistic hopes of becoming free. There as in the U.S., the usual way out of slavery was death.

The gendered dimensions of slavery also differed. Both imperial Rome and the antebellum south were patriarchies in the literal sense, but this was true to a greater extent

⁷¹ For a detailed studies of manumission and freedman in antiquity, see Georges Fabre, *Libertus* (Rome: École Française, 1981) Rachel Zelnick-Abramovitz, *Not Wholly Free: The Concept of Manumission and the Status of Manumitted Slaves in the Ancient Greek World* (Leiden: Brill, 2005); See also Alan Watson, *Law of Persons*, 185-200 and *Slave Law in the Americas*, 22-39; Orlando Patterson, *Social Death*, 240-244, 252-254, 300-308 and *Freedom*, 133-37, 214-216, 228-230, 235-237; C. Wayne Tucker, "Women in the Manumission Inscriptions at Delphi," *TAPA* 112 (1982); in Serghidou, *Peur*, Antonio Gonzales, "Peur des affranchis impériaux et compassion envers les affranchis privés dans l'œuvre de Pline le Jeune," 207-324, Pedro López Barja de Quiroga, "Fear of Freedmen, Roman Republican Laws on Voting Procedure," 125-131, and Georgios A. Zachos, "The Interference of the City in the Elateian Manumissions," 115-124; Antonio Gonzales, "Esclaves et affranchis dans le cercle intellectuel de Pline le Jeune," 269-285 in *Esclavage* (ed. Anastasiadis & Doukellis); Kelly Wrenhaven, "The Identity of the 'Wool-Workers' in the Attic Manumission Inscriptions," *Hesperia* 78 (2009): 367-386; Joshel, *Slavery*, 41-47, 128-129; Paul Bradley, "Slavery in the Roman Republic," in *CWHS*, 253-262; Bassir Amiri, "The Apollo of Slaves and Freedmen," in *Slaves and Religions in Graeco-Roman Antiquity and Modern Brazil* (ed. Stephen Hodgkinson and Dick Geary; Newcastle-upon-Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publ., 2012), 195-205, and in the same volume, Deborah Kamen, "Manumission, Social Rebirth, and Healing Gods in Ancient Greece," 174-194.

⁷² See Jordan, *White over Black*, 402-422; Genovese, *Roll, Jordan*, 50-52, 398-413; Ira Berlin, "The Structure of the Free Negro Caste in the Antebellum United States," *J Soc. His.* 9 (1976): 297-318; Orlando Patterson, *Social Death*, 245-247, 255-262; Boles, *Black Southerners*, 132-139; Bruce Collins, *White Society*, 54-59; Stephen Whitman, "Diverse Good Causes: Manumission and the Transformation of Urban Slavery," *Soc. Sci. His.* 19 (1995): 333-370. On the rare cases of free African-American slaveowners (other than those who bought but could not manumit relatives), see Larry Koger, *Black Slaveowners: Free Black Slave Masters in South Carolina, 1790-1860* (Columbia: U South Carolina P, 1985).

in Rome. By the imperial period, Roman women remained under paternal or paternally designated power all their lives (unless they were freed from *tutela* entirely) and never came into the legal power of their husbands. Wives retained full control over their dowries and owned and managed their own property. The ban on large gifts between spouses in principle prevented their husbands from interfering with it. Even in classical Athens and other areas where women had fewer legal rights, their natal family remained entitled to their dowries' return, as ch. 1 discusses. In the antebellum U.S., in contrast, the legal doctrine of coverture meant that wives' property and in some respects legal personality were subsumed in their husbands'. This had obvious implications for slaveholding practices, although the differences were not as stark as they might appear. Most slaveholding states enacted laws in the early nineteenth century that prevented husbands from alienating their wives' dower property, often giving special protection to human property. Premarital agreements between a woman's father or guardian and her husband-to-be could also reserve certain property to the wife's sole ownership. These agreements were common among wealthy families and again often involved human property.⁷³ Furthermore, despite the subordination of their authority to their husbands', U.S. slaveholders' wives' had command of all the slaves their husbands owned. These women's writings and those of their husbands, children, and former slaves consistently reveal that slaveholders' wives exercised this authority. The buying and selling at least of domestic slaves was usually their decision, even if their husbands effected the transaction, and they could be further involved with their marital

⁷³ Most discussions of gender and U.S. slaveholding published in since the 1970s discuss this subject at least intermittently. Laurel A. Clark's 2010 area study, "The Rights of a Florida Wife: Slavery, U.S. Expansion, and Married Women's Property Laws," *J Women's His.* 22 (2010): 39-63, argues that the expansion of slavery to newly acquired territories was a primary motivation for the adoption of "married women's property acts" in most U.S. states in the first half of the nineteenth century.

households' slave trading as well. They assisted their husbands with plantation management and often assumed primary responsibility for it when their husbands were absent or indisposed, and they could inherit it fully as widows. Even when plantation owners were alive, well, and present, it was often their wives who organized slave labour in and around the house. They were also often involved with ordering the family lives of other slaves, chose domestically tasked slaves from among their number, and banished unsatisfactory houseworkers to the fields again. They bestowed rewards (e.g., candies, ribbon, and coins) and inflicted physical punishments within their supposed or actual strength.⁷⁴

While reproductive exploitation of slaves seems to have been similar and been seen similarly between the two systems, ideologies surrounding the sexual exploitation of slaves differed. Racialization and disapproval of what was then called “amalgamation” contributed to an understanding in the antebellum U.S. that free men as well as free women should avoid sexual contact with slaves (the sources only acknowledge heterosexual varieties), whereas sexual access inhered to a male slaveowner's authority in antiquity. The prevailing social mores of the U.S. were honoured, it would seem, almost solely in the breach; defenders of slavery simply refused to acknowledge a reality that was obvious to everyone. Antebellum slaveholding culture imputed inherent promiscuity to *Black* women, rather than *enslaved* women as in antique cultures, thus racializing the stereotype that enabled free men to escape criticism for fathering slaves. Although slaveholding authors in both periods devoted less attention to enslaved men's than enslaved women's sexuality, the discrepancy was far more pronounced in the record of antebellum U.S. apologists for slavery. The cultural logic

⁷⁴ These included, for example, manual injuries (slapping, scratching, pinching), kitchen burns, switching, and hand-whipping. Hanging, branding, and repetitive wielding of horse whips (which are meant to cue horses, not flog them) and cattle whips required more upper body strength and were usually inflicted by men.

is obvious, although sexual abuse doubtless involved male as well as female slaves (and female as well as male slaveowners).⁷⁵ Another distinction between the systems under comparison, as chapter three explores, is that most prostitutes in the antebellum south were white and thus free, whereas prostitution was almost synonymous with slavery in antiquity.

As important as these themes were in distinguishing Atlantic from ancient slavery, practical aspects of slavery, as Orlando Patterson (1982: 173-76, 179-81) notably observes, were not necessarily less important in defining systems. One such practical distinction was that while most slavery in imperial Rome, like classical Greece, was agricultural and rural, the evidence is disproportionately urban.⁷⁶ Rome around 100 CE was probably home to about one million inhabitants, Alexandria at least half as many, Ephesus perhaps little less impressive, and many cities throughout the empire, including some in western Asia Minor, had populations well over 150,000. These cities were densely concentrated and easily connected by the Mediterranean sea. The antebellum South had nothing like Rome or even anything like the cities of Revelation, even the earthly ones. Larger distances separated many of its cities, and large-scale transportation between them was much less efficient. The cities were smaller as well as fewer. In 1860, just before the outbreak of the Civil War, the largest slaveholding cities in the U.S. were Baltimore, New Orleans, and St. Louis, each with

⁷⁵ The “myth of the black rapist,” to use Angela Davis’ term, became far more prevalent after abolition than it had been earlier; see Diana M. Sommerville, “The Rape Myth in the Old South Reconsidered,” *J Southern His.* 61 (1995): 451-518; Hodes, *White Women | Black Men*, 159-208. See also Thomas Foster, “The Sexual Abuse of Black Men under American Slavery,” *J His. Sexuality* 20 (2011): 445-464.

⁷⁶ F.H. Thompson provides extensive discussions of agricultural slavery in chs. 2-4 of his *Archaeology of Greek and Roman Slavery* (2002), as does Ulrike Roth in “Inscribed Meaning: The *Vilica* and the Villa Economy,” *PBSR* 72 (2004): 101-124 and *Thinking Tools*, *passim*. See also Orlando Patterson, *Freedom*, 68-71, 213-214; Masaoki, “Révoltes serviles et problèmes agraires: L’exemple sicilien,” in *Monde* (ed. Yuge), 133-145; N. Fisher, *Slavery*, 37-47; Walter Scheidel, “The Most Silent Women of Greece and Rome: Rural Labour and Women’s Life in the Ancient World,” *G & R* 42 (1995): 202-217, which also discusses free women, and “Human Mobility in Roman Italy, II: The Slave Population,” *J Roman St.* 95 (2005), 67-71; Sarah Morris, “The Architecture of Inequality in Ancient Greece,” in *Esclavage* (ed. Anastasiadis and Doukellis), 147-155; Joshel, *Roman World*, 195-214.

a total population between 160,000 and 215,000. Only two others, Louisville and Washington, had more than 50,000. Nevertheless, the cities, especially New Orleans, were the retail centres of the slave trade, as they had been antiquity. Slave labour was also a presence in them, even beyond the domestic workforce than constituted a higher proportion of urban slave populations than rural ones. Urban experiences of slavery were hardly separate from rural ones, even if they were different, tending to afford slaves less supervision and more likely access to a *peculium*.⁷⁷ But most urban slaves were rural-born and had extensive social and familial contacts, however disrupted by slavery, rurally. The situation in antiquity is unlikely to have been completely different, especially because of the Roman preference for raising all enslaved children on rural estates.

Whether urban or rural, the largest slaveholdings in antiquity were much more substantial than the largest in North America. While most slaveholders in both systems owned fewer than twenty slaves, large-scale slaveowners in antiquity often owned multiple *latifundi* and hundreds or even thousands of slaves. The planter class for the antebellum U.S. is defined throughout the literature as those households or individuals owning twenty or more slaves, whose primary tasks were usually in the production of cash crops. The wealthiest households in Rome seem regularly to have employed more slaves than this in

⁷⁷ Fifty years after it was first published, Richard C. Wade's *Slavery in the Cities: The South 1820-1860* (New York: NYU P, 1964) remains one of the most important books on the subject, and one of the only ones dedicated to the subject as a whole. The few joining it include Claudia Goldin, *Urban Slavery in the American South 1820-1860: A Quantitative History* (Chicago: U Chicago P, 1976) and Frank Towers, *The Urban South and the Coming of the Civil War* (Charlottesville: U Virginia P, 2004). See also Jane Wilkie, "The Black Urban Population of the Pre-Civil War South," *Phylon* 37 (1976): 250-262, and John Vlach, "Without Recourse to Owners: The Architecture of Urban Slavery in the American South," *Perspectives in Vernacular Architecture* 6 (1997): 150-160. Histories of particular cities, in contrast, are abundant, e.g., Takagi Midori, *Rearing Wolves to Our Own Destruction: Slavery in Richmond, Virginia, 1782-1865* (Charlottesville: U Virginia P, 1999); Cynthia Kennedy, *Braided Relations, Entwined Lives*; Amrita Myers, *Forging Freedom: Black Women and the Pursuit of Liberty in Antebellum Charleston* (Chapel Hill: U North Carolina P, 2011); Leslie Harris and Daina Ramey Berry (ed.), *Slavery and Freedom in Savannah* (Athens: U Georgia P, 2013); and Lawrence Powell, *The Accidental City: Improvising New Orleans* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard U P, 2012) ch. 8-11.

domestic roles alone. Only a very small minority of the small planter class in the antebellum U.S. (those with twenty or more slaves) owned more than one plantation or one hundred human beings. (Here again the Brazilian and Caribbean experiences more closely resemble the Roman one.) Part of the reason for this discrepancy lies in technology: far more human labourers were necessary to produce large agricultural surpluses in the ancient Mediterranean than in modern North America. Plow types and techniques, draught animal breeds and harnesses, different crops, different climates, and innovations in tools were critical to this, as was the development of steam power (known to but not used by the Romans).⁷⁸ The economic consequences of the relationship between the mechanical and human property used in production, with reliance on the latter, were not lost on those who used them or their critics (see ch. 3).

Finally, the Roman empire's slave society declined over a period of centuries into multiple societies with slavery and some effectively without, while new slave systems emerged in what had once been its southern and eastern reaches. A slow decline occurred in the northern Americas as well (see above), but the slave society of the southern U.S., like that of Saint-Domingue, came to a rapid and violent end. But even here there are similarities among the differences. "Large-scale, violent conflict involving slavery" describes the Servile Wars as well as the Haitian Revolution or the U.S. Civil War, and in this respect what distinguishes the latter conflicts is that the slaveholders' partisans lost. The slaveholders' governments' victories have joined the smaller relative scales of the ancient conflicts among the reasons for their subsequent categorization as

⁷⁸ Desmond Lee, "Science, Philosophy, and Technology the Greco-Roman World: I," *G & R* 20 (1973): 65-78; K.D. White, *Greek and Roman Technology* (Ithaca, New York: Cornell, 1984); W.H. Manning, "Industrial Growth," in *The Roman World*, v. 2 (ed. J.S. Wachter; London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1987), 586-605; Helmuth Schneider, "Technology," in *CEHGR* (ed. Scheidel et al.), 144-171.

rebellions or uprisings rather than “true wars,” although Spartacus’ uprising and even the helots’ may have represented realistic threats to the ruling order.⁷⁹ Similarly, unsuccessful anti-slavery uprisings and other violence had severe repercussions in Saint-Domingue and in the antebellum U.S.⁸⁰

Attending to these uprisings and the wars that followed them (chronologically if not causally) can lay bare something that present-day discussions about the history of slavery often do not emphasize: Defeating legal slaveholders and their interests has often required violence. It is in this light that I consider the destruction of Babylon and the desolation of her vassal kings in Revelation 17-19. Revelation’s attitude toward slavery may be inconsistent at best and its core conflict with Rome may be over idolatry. But slave trading is emphasized as one of the most egregious aspects of “Babylon’s” idolatrous reign, and slaves consummate the list of goods in which she is burned for facilitating trade. To examine this representation in historical perspective requires an appreciation of the fact that enforcing judgment against those involved with the slave trade often is not a matter of ethical persuasion, social opprobrium, economic alternatives, or legislation in its own right. However rarely it occurred, it was one of slave mutiny or judicial execution: lethal main force or hanging by the neck until dead. Extrapolating this to a systematic level has often

⁷⁹ See Urbainczyk, *Slave Revolts*; also Finley, *Ancient Slavery*, 114-18; in *Monde* (ed. Yuge), Masaoki, “Révoltes serviles” and “Luttes de classes à la fin de la république romaine: Caractère de la révolte de Spartacus,” 147-168; F.H. Thompson, *Archaeology*, 249-266; in *Peur* (ed. Serghidou), Ricardo Martínez Lacy, “Fear as a Factor in Slave Revolts,” (35-38), Théodoros Mavrojanis, “Rébellions d’esclaves et réactions politiques de 137 à 88 av. J.-C.,” 423-434, Violaine Sebillotte Cuchet, “Habiter quelque part : le lien à terre et la menace de l’esclavage,” 395-403; Joshel, *Roman World*, 57-65, 152-53; Bradley, “Slavery in the Roman Republic,” in *CHWS*, 364-368.

⁸⁰ See Jordan, *White over Black* 380-402; McPherson, *Battle Cry*, 145-169; Scott Reynolds Nelson and Carol Sheriff, *A People at War: Civilians and Soldiers in America’s Civil War* (New York: Oxford U P, 2008), 3-37; Edward Rugemer, *The Problem of Emancipation* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State U P, 2008); Matthew Clavin, *Toussaint: Louverture and the American Civil War* (Philadelphia: U Pennsylvania P, 2011). Britain banned slavery in all its territories in 1834 without any large-scale military conflict, but slavery-related violence was not irrelevant political considerations there, especially with respect its Atlantic colonies after the Haitian revolution.

been a matter of military enforcement or successful armed rebellion: killing slaveowners. Wars waged on different grounds and plagues can also destabilize a slave society enough to transform it; in the late Roman empire, they seem to have done just that, and they did not discriminate based on status or ideology.

MODERN SOURCES

One of the areas of this undertaking requiring special vigilance in this respect is in consideration of the modern primary sources, whose limitations receive abundant discussion in the secondary literature. They are probably most obvious as they pertain to the writings of planter-class women, who shared with their menfolk the “positive good” ideology of slavery and were surprised to learn upon emancipation that their slaves hated them. These writers’ publications rarely consider slaves’ lives outside their immediate effects on the authors’, and while we must understand the perspectives that these texts represent, I see no reason to accept them. Furthermore, many elite women wrote their diaries and letters with a view toward their being shared posthumously. They wrote their post-abolition memoirs in veins selective, apologetic, and romanticizing. Planter-class women present themselves and their peers as benevolent toward slaves, put upon, devout, conscientious, modest, and pleasant (with occasional exceptions acknowledged to prove the rule) and as models to be emulated. They present their slaves as simple, contented, promiscuous, and in need of guidance and protection from the whites who owned them.⁸¹

⁸¹ See especially Fox-Genovese, *Plantation Household*, *passim*; Genovese, “Our Family, White and Black,” 77-81; Sarah Gardner, *Blood and Irony: Southern White Women’s Narratives of the Civil War, 1861-1937* (Chapel Hill: U North Carolina P, 2004), *passim*; Tess Chakkalakal, *Novel Bondage: Slavery, Marriage, and Freedom in Nineteenth-Century America* (Urbana: U Illinois P, 2011), *passim*. On ancient attitudes, see especially J. Albert Harrill, “The Domestic Enemy: Moral Polarity of Household Slaves in Early Christian Apologies and Martyrdoms,” in Balch and Osiek, *Early Christian Families*, 231-254.

Former slaves' words accessible to us have their own limitations, as the literature notes. The mostly white interviewers of illiterate slaves and former slaves, for example, despite opposing slavery were not infrequently racists, and their prejudices could inform their work. In addition, the single largest body of interviews with former slaves is the U.S. Work Progress Administration's from the 1930s. This means that all the more than 2,000 subjects became free as young adults, adolescents, children, and in a few cases future children and few experienced slavery as mature adults or as parents. The seventy-year gap could also affect what they remembered. The memoirs of literate former slaves, meanwhile, even after abolition were often edited by whites in ways that were designed to flatter rather than offend other whites. One example of this effect is the trope, with very debatable basis in reality, of the slave's carefree early life with a kindly, beloved slaveowner who is legally or economically forced to sell slaves by rapacious outsiders, or who has his or her beneficent testamentary provisions for slaves disregarded by such. Also present, for related reasons, is the almost uniform tendency to portray slaves as industrious and forbearing, never as engaging in the acts of "*petite resistance*" (e.g., "stealing" or destroying their owners' inanimate property, malingering, economic deception, and, during the Civil War, perhaps arson) that characterized the routine of slavery. Similarly, to counter stereotypes of "African promiscuity," these documents tend to portray slaves as having heroically chaste characters that slavery violently tore from them. The depiction's latter part was accurate, but there is reason to suspect implications that all African-Americans would otherwise be paragons of the white bourgeois Victorian family morality, which was practiced so imperfectly by the white bourgeois Victorian families who espoused it. Former slaves' accounts also had the potential to represent the absolute worst aspects of slavery as being more prevalent than

was actually the case. Much more often they softened them to preserve the credulity of whites who had little direct experience of slavery.

The nineteenth and twentieth-century convention of representing dialects phonetically also requires accounting, as nearly any book drawing on them published in the last thirty or forty years will discuss. Many primary documents mark the speech of African-Americans but not of whites in an exaggerated fashion. Most present caricatures rather than accurately represent dialectical differences. Racist writers and editors used the conventions of this caricature to depict African-Americans as unintelligent and uncivilized, not unlike the way classical authors treated the speech of enslaved “barbarians” (see, Wrenhaven, *Reconstructing*, 23-31). The same conventions occur in the writings of anti-slavery whites (many of whom were also racists) and sometimes African-American writers, who might employ them to emphasize the denial of education and literacy to slaves. In both circumstances, the result was the reification and distortion of African-American dialects, to the point that some words (e.g., *-s*, *-tion*, *-’ve*, *a*, *buy*, *daughter*, *enough*, *know*, *laugh*, *love*, *of*, *said*, *talk*, *thought*, *through*, *water*) were represented phonetically when attributed to African-American speakers. Others might deliberately be misspelled without indicating any phonetic change (e.g., *bucket*). Rather than replicate these problems in total, I have regularized spelling (although I have retained errors from letters and diaries). This does risk obscuring the racism that these conventions record in multiple ways, but the pseudo-phoneticism makes many texts almost unintelligible for those not familiar with the conventions. It also comes at the cost of concealing non-rhotic dialects, the substitution of the stops /t, d/ for interdental fricatives /θ, ð/, and other real features. I have, however, retained the documents’ grammar. While there are distortions here too, they injure

comprehension less and are sometimes accurate (e.g., common person and number for some auxiliary verbs and regular conjugation of some stem-changing verbs). Finally, there is certain racial language that, however problematic the alternatives, I see no need to repeat. Where it is present in quoted materials, I will substitute in italics either the word “slave” or the Spanish loan-word of origin, historically an ostensibly (though never actually) neutral descriptor rather than the same kind of slur. To present-day readers, however, it does not obscure the character of the material quoted.

INTRODUCTION

The book of Revelation concludes in tones nuptial and violent. The lament (18:17b-24) and taunt (19:1-5) over the destruction of Babylon, queen of the slave traders (18:13), segue into an announcement of the triumphant Lamb's wedding (19:6-9). Later, a detailed description of the bride Jerusalem (21:1-2:6) follows the narration of Christ's ultimate, martial victory (19:11-20:15). Almost at the very end of the book comes a reiteration of the wedding invitation (22:17), accompanied by a warning of the punishment that awaits those who are not guests. This conclusion unifies the images of weddings, metaphors of slavery, and visions of violent justice that recur over the course of the book, images that may be hidden from modern readers in ways that they were not from ancient audiences. Revelation constructs a metaphorical complex around weddings and slavery to articulate its vision of eschatological fulfillment, a vision that emerges in light of the social realities to which its metaphors refer.

SITUATING REVELATION

Understanding these social realities requires an appreciation of Revelation's own immediate context. In this I concur with the consensus that has prevailed since R.H.

Charles' synopsis.⁸² Charles' conclusions, which remain widely accepted,⁸³ are that Revelation probably dates to late during or immediately after the reign of Domitian (c. 81-96 CE). It probably also incorporates some Neronian-era material but is substantially cohesive.⁸⁴ Its environs in urban western Asia Minor are no more controversial than its date, and neither are its communities' ethnically diverse but mostly Gentile constituencies. These communities probably did include, though, some minority of Jewish believers, and the communities had disputes with God-fearers, possibly in non-Jesus-following Jewish communities. Few of their members are likely to have been of the highest economic or social positions, even the Laodiceans (Rev. 3:17). Roman citizens would have been a minority for at least another century, until Caracalla's edict of 212. Although mostly lacking Roman

⁸² R.H. Charles, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Revelation of St John*, v. 1 (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1920), xxix-l, xci-xcvii. There has been debate over the extent of the persecution that the churches of Asia Minor had suffered, with most scholars in recent decades agreeing that Charles overestimated it. In the main, however, his conclusions have proven sound. That said, a change in consensus would be only minimally relevant here. Marriage ideology, wedding customs, and the slave system were stable across the plausible date range, i.e., from Nero's reign to Justin Martyr's death.

⁸³ There is no lack of discussions of Revelation's authorship, date, etc.; nearly all of them endorse most of Charles' conclusions. David E. Aune, *Revelation*, (3 vol.; Dallas: Word Books, 1997; Word Biblical Commentary), has more recently examined the issues in light of subsequent research; his conclusions (xlvi-cxxii) are largely similar to Charles', as are those of Gregory Beale, *The Book of Revelation*, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), 4-36, 70-107. The most significant major discussion of these themes since Charles has been Adela Yarbro Collins, *Crisis and Catharsis: The Power of the Apocalypse*, (Philadelphia: Westminster P, which devotes its first three chapters to exploring them as they relate to the interpretation of Revelation. Major explorations of these questions in commentaries almost uniformly concur with them; e.g., J.P.M. Sweet, "Maintaining the testimony of Jesus: the suffering of Christians in the Revelation of John," in *Suffering and Martyrdom in the New Testament*, (ed. W. Horbury and B. McNeil; Cambridge: Cambridge U P, 1981), 21-42; Austin Farrer, *The Revelation of St. John the Divine: Commentary on the English Text*, (Oxford: Clarendon P, 1964), 32-51, although he favours a slightly earlier date; Robert Mounce, *The Book of Revelation*, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977; rev. 1998), 8-21; Ben Witherington, *Revelation*, (Cambridge: Cambridge U P, 2003), 1-10. For a dissenting view, see Leon Morris, *The Book of Revelation: An Introduction and Commentary*, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987), 25-40. Topical studies with discussions of Rev.'s setting also tend to share the majority view; e.g., Robert Royalty, *The Streets of Heaven: The Ideology of Wealth in the Apocalypse of John*, (Macon, Georgia: Mercer U P, 1999), 15-21; Friesen, *Imperial Cults and the Apocalypse*, 136-146, 148-151; Stephen Pattemore, *The People of God in the Apocalypse*, (Cambridge: Cambridge U P, 2004), 51-60.

⁸⁴ Citations of biblical and classical texts are from the standard MSS (see bibliography), but I have not uniformly retained the modern punctuation that recent editors have added. I have rendered biblical texts with reference to the NRSV but have usually differed in the exact translation.

citizenship, the congregants were inhabitants of busy urban ports in an international empire that was permeated with Roman culture. Rigid distinctions between “Roman,” “Hellenistic,” “Near Eastern” culture, etc., fail in this context and in certain respects in this period: “Greek” identity or culture did not mean the same thing as it did in the classical period or the Hellenistic period, for example, and “Roman-ness” was far from a fixed category. Such categories were live in the cultures of the Roman empire (as manifest, for example, Plutarch’s *Greek Questions* and *Roman Questions*; in references to ethnicity in private legal documents in Egypt; in constructions of nationality such as those found in NT epistles, etc.) without being consistently defined. My use of terms such as “Greek” and “Roman” for this period accords with this looser understanding rather than specific designation of, e.g., specific citizenship and residency. But however the members of the communities that John of Patmos addresses categorized themselves, the physical and temporal world that they inhabited is not the one that Revelation presents as the divinely completed order.

“John of Patmos” itself seems no more problematic a designation for the author than any proposed alternative. Whoever this person (probably this man) was, the scholarship has assumed, usually tacitly, that he was free; nearly all identifiable ancient authors were. If he actually was exiled as a form of judicial punishment, he was almost certainly free; a crime that earned a free person exile usually drew execution or mining for a slave. The text also evinces little consciousness of real status, assumes its author’s respected position in the addressed communities without referring to any *patron*-, and deploys the metaphor of slavery as an expression of virtue and fidelity (see preceding discussion). Assuming that John of Patmos was a free man, and this is probably safer than almost any other to make about

him, Jennifer Glancy's discussion of an earlier itinerant prophet's work in Asia Minor applies equally well to him:

As Paul traveled from city to city... he would have found it impossible to avoid contact with slaves. When he went to the marketplace to find other craftspeople or to purchase food for dinner he would have mingled with both male and female slaves.... when he accepted hospitality from a slaveholder, domestic slaves would have tended to his needs, from washing his feet upon entering the household to preparing the food for communal meals (*Slavery*, 43, 46).

Whoever John of Patmos was, it is unlikely (although not impossible) that he was an abolitionist by our recognition, despite his vitriol toward slave trading. This was a common attitude: condemnations of slave trading, as we shall see, were as plentiful and ardent as they were intellectually inconsistent.

In addition to being free, John of Patmos was also almost certainly Jewish, natively Aramaic-speaking, and familiar with Hebrew scriptures, albeit not ones fully identical with the MT. He seems to have been conversant with some of the traditions that appear in the Gospel of John. Revelation shares undeniable similarities with it, although the texts must have separate authors and can hardly be dependent. As well as this has been established, we

can be even more confident that Revelation uses “Babylon” to designate Rome.⁸⁵ The identification of imperial women (and men) with the city of Rome and divine protectresses such as Minerva, Juno, Vesta, and Dea Roma in imperial imagery strengthens the association between the personification of the city and the richest, highest-status women (and men) in it.⁸⁶ Revelation’s view of all this is thoroughly hostile, and I use “hate” to designate it. This is not only an emic concept, but one that applies to “Babylon” herself: “the beast will hate the whore” (τὸ θηρίον οὗτοι μισήσουσιν τὴν πόρνην, Rev. 17:16).⁸⁷ As much as Revelation hates Rome, though, I cannot see that it envisions any political program or aligns with an identifiable faction. What it does do is express this hate in the very terms of the imperial

⁸⁵ The condemnation of Babylon does also criticize the earthly Jerusalem’s pre-70 CE religious complex. Arguments that it designates Jerusalem more than or to the exclusion of Rome, however, are untenable. There are extensive discussions of this issue in the research on Revelation’s composition history, gender and wealth imagery, and on anti-colonial and related readings (see prior notes). For other sustained discussion of the issue, see Richard Bauckham, *The Theology of the Book of Revelation* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1993), 126-29, 135-36; Duff, *Who Rides?* 61-70; Bruce W. Longenecker, “Rome, Provincial Cities and the Seven Churches of Revelation 2-3,” in *The New Testament in Its First-Century Setting* (ed. P.J. Williams; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004), 281-291; Christopher Frilingos, *Spectacles of Empire* (Philadelphia: U Pennsylvania P, 2005), *passim*. There are also useful treatments in the commentaries of Henry Swete, *The Apocalypse of St. John* (London: Macmillan, 1906; 3rd ed. 1922), 216-42; Farrer, *Revelation*, 183-91; Jacques Ellul, *Apocalypse: The Book of Revelation* (tr. G.W. Schreiner; New York: Seabury P, 1977), 187-97; Sweet, “Maintaining the Testimony;” Pierre Prigent, *L’Apocalypse de saint Jean* (Lausanne: Delachaux et Niestlé, 1981), 252-76; Eugene Boring, *Revelation* (Louisville: John Knox P, 1989), 179-84; Wilfrid Harrington, *Revelation* (Collegeville, Minnesota: Liturgical P, 1993) 173-95; Aune, *Revelation*, 914-1014; Beale, *Book of Revelation*, 850-930; Craig Koester, *Revelation and the End of All Things* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001), 156-61; Grant Osborne, *Revelation* (Grand Rapids: Baker Ac., 2002), 606-660; Witherington, *Revelation*, 216-39; Ian Boxall, *The Revelation of Saint John* (Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson, 2006), 239-64; Blount, *Revelation*, 308-38; David deSilva, *Seeing Things John’s Way: The Rhetoric of the Book of Revelation* (Louisville: WJK, 2009), 37-48, 160-62, 203-15; James Resseguie, *The Revelation of John: A Narrative Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Baker Ac., 2009), 218-31. For other views, see Stephen Smalley, *The Revelation to John* (Downers Grove, Illinois: IVP, 2005), 424-67, who argues that this is a critique of worldly order in general to which Rome is only incidentally significant, and Edmondo Lupieri, *A Commentary on the Apocalypse of John* (1999; tr., Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006), 248-295, who argues that “Babylon” is Jerusalem and not Rome.

⁸⁶ In addition to the discussions cited in the previous note, see Brian Jones, “Some Thoughts on the Propaganda of Vespasian and Domitian,” *Cl. J* 66 (Feb. 1971), 251; Lesław Morawiecki, “Symbolism of Minerva on the Coins of Domitianus,” *Klio* 59 (1977): 186-193; S. Friesen, *Imperial Cults*, *passim*; Eve D’Ambra, “Nudity and Adornment in Female Portrait Sculpture of the Second Century AD,” in *I, Claudia II: Women in Roman Art and Society* (ed. Diana Kleiner and Susan Matheson; Austin: U Texas P, 2000), 101-114; Eric R. Varner, “Transcending Gender: Assimilation, Identity, and Roman Imperial Portraits,” *MAAR* Sup. 7 (2008): 185-205; Huber, “Unveiling,” 162-65, and *Thinking and Seeing*, 117-120.

⁸⁷ Revelation also has God communicate to the Ephesians that “you have this for yourselves: you hate (μισεῖς) the works of the Nicolaitans, which I also hate (μισῶ)” (2:6).

imagery of Roman triumph and conquest, vindicating Christ's claim to true, universal rule and confirming the Roman one as an idolatrous delusion. Revelation's sustained, detailed parodies of Roman public ceremonies such as triumphs sharpens the contrast for the new creation:

As in contemporary imperial cults, so in Revelation there was relatively little interest in reopening the accepted cosmogonic narratives to introduce new characters... imperial cult evidence manifests at least two strategies used to make limited connections between the emperors and cosmogonic stories. One strategy (and I do not use the term in a deprecatory fashion)... was to portray the emperors, especially Augustus, as the mythic founder of a new world order and to assert that the present structures of existence came into being through the deeds of the deified emperors. Both strategies parallel Revelation's explanations of the importance of the deified Jesus... [albeit] Revelation obviously did not attempt to connect Jesus with the Olympian deities.⁸⁸

It was the Roman emperor who proclaimed himself triumphant, of course, who effected the persecution that Revelation's communities seem genuinely to have met. These were probably isolated instances; there is no evidence for an organized mass persecution of Jesus-followers Revelation's setting. But isolated instances, perhaps combined with memory or rumors of ones further afield (e.g., Nero's), may have been enough to create the perception or at least the fear of a larger crisis. The standard torture and execution of troublemakers usually escaped imperial annals, but it might well have unsettled the survivors. This seems the most likely situation to underlie Revelation's ethos of simultaneously valorizing martyrdom and hating the authority that effected it.

⁸⁸ Stephen Friesen, *Imperial Cults and the Apocalypse of John: Reading Revelation in the Ruins* (New York: Oxford U P, 2001), 198-199, cf. 145-147; see also Larry Kreitzer, "Sibylline Oracles 8, the Roman Imperial Adventus Coinage of Hadrian and the Apocalypse of John," *JSP* 2 (1989), 80-83; Jörg Frey, "The Relevance of the Roman Imperial Cult for the Book of Revelation," in *The New Testament and Early Christian Literature in Greco-Roman Context: Studies in Honor of David E. Aune* (ed. John Fotopoulos; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 236-249; Joe Luceford, *Parody and Counterimaging in the Apocalypse* (Eugene, Oregon: Wipf and Stock, 2009), *passim*; Several discussions focus on the conquered/conquering lamb imagery, e.g., Chris Frilingos, "Sexing the Lamb," in *New Testament Masculinities* (ed. Stephen Moore and Janice Anderson; Atlanta: SBL, 2003), 306-316; Colleen Conway, *Behold the Man: Jesus and Greco-Roman Masculinity* (New York: Oxford U P, 2008), 159-174; Stephen D. Moore, "Metonymies of Empire: Sexual Humiliation and Gender Masquerade in the Book of Revelation," in *Postcolonial Interventions* (ed. Liew Tat-Siong and R.S. Sugirtharajah; Sheffield: Phoenix P, 2009), 73-86.

OVERVIEW

With these foundations in mind, chapter one examines marriage, a state initiated by weddings and reserved for the free, in the world of Revelation. Marriage was at once a lived reality, a legal and socio-economic institution, a political issue, and an ideal that lent itself to metaphor. A coherent shared understanding of marriage also included characteristic virtues and benefits. This subject has become well researched in the last forty or so years, and I emphasize only a few areas of special relevance here. One of them is the OT metaphor of marriage for the covenant between God and Israel, which features in some of the prophetic texts on which Revelation draws most heavily and that it shares with some extra-canonical and non-Jewish texts. Another focus is the economics (in the classical sense) of marriage and the longstanding rhetorical association of marriage with household, household with political order, woman with land, wife with house, and, by extension, woman with city. One image that could unite these disparate themes was cloth production, an image that Revelation deploys extensively and that receives special attention in chapter one.

Chapter two examines Revelation's nuptial imagery in the light of weddings, both as actual events and as represented in literature and visual art. Wedding practices, especially the purpose-designated clothing that figured so prominently, are of primary importance in the argument that Revelation relies on culturally familiar cues for a full wedding ceremony. This imagery is not solely or necessarily nuptial but does include nuptial associations that the book's conclusion unifies. It draws on the complex social and cultural associations of weddings, which included wealth, social position and honour-based public reputation, all of which were seen as appropriate to free people and categorically denied to those in slavery.

Weddings also often involved a great deal of labour of many types, labour that wealthier free people hosting the weddings assigned largely to slaves.

Chapter three explores the details of Revelation's deployment of the "choice between two women" dichotomy in its juxtaposition of Babylon and Jerusalem. It situates the description of Babylon as a prostitute in the context of OT metaphors of idolatry as adultery and of Revelation's hatred toward Rome. The contrast between Babylon's meretricious trade and Jerusalem's virtuous works is at the nexus of the contrast, an issue that Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, Barbara Rossing, Robert Royalty, Greg Carey, and most recently Mark Mathews have notably explored.⁸⁹ Here I focus on the slave trade, which, being inextricable from slavery, is at the core of all Babylon's trade. This is, once again, consistent with contemporaneous criticisms of the slave trade that were no less ardent for not being systematic or internally consistent. In this vein, where Revelation's condemnation of *luxuria* is inseparable from that of idolatry, the rhetoric it employs characteristically identifies "excessive" cruelty to slaves or "over"-reliance on their labour as a manifestation of the disease.

Chapter three specifically examines Revelation's critique in light of the assigning of slaves to textile work. It also explores the ways in which Revelation, by describing "Babylon" as a luxuriant πόρνη, represents Rome not only as a slave trader but as a slave. Slavery was all but a prerequisite for prostitution in antiquity, and Revelation's implied depiction of Rome as a "slave to vice" and "(enslaved) prostitute" raises many legitimate qualms. Nevertheless, I also take issue with the reading of Babylon as solely a victim of

⁸⁹ Royalty, *Streets of Heaven*, *passim*; Greg Carey, "A Man's Choice: Wealth Imagery and the Two Cities in the Book of Revelation," in *A Feminist Companion to the Apocalypse* (ed. Levine), 147-58; Mark Mathews, *Riches, Poverty, and the Faithful: Perspectives on Wealth in the Second Temple Period and the Apocalypse of John* (Cambridge: Cambridge U P, 2013) *passim*.

gender-based violence without acknowledging the roles of status and wealth. The complexity of these issues becomes more apparent with an examination of Babylon's spectacular (in the classical sense) destruction, given the depth of involvement between the games, which seem to have been the venue in which martyrs were killed, and slavery and slave trading. It is in light of this that Babylon is given a taste of her own medicine, while Jerusalem, Babylon's inverted mirror image, offers "the healing of nations."

Where chapter three focuses on the punishment of Babylon, chapter four examines the rewarding of Jerusalem. The believers, described throughout Revelation as "slaves" of God, finally join the Lamb in marriage, a state denied to slaves. That is, they attain free status, marked in part by their clothing, as they are incorporated into the new Jerusalem. In this they gain the respect accorded to a married or marriageable woman — i.e., a free woman — and the dishonour inherent to the status of male and female slaves. The connected contrast likely would have been apparent to John's audience, inhabiting as they did a world in which recognized marriage was an assumed privilege of the free and a prized estate of the freed. So too would have been Jerusalem's cloth-producing "righteous deeds," characteristic of a good wife, and their contrast with Babylon's trade and excess. I also argue that there is some evidence at least for literary representation of marriage ceremonies doubling as manumission ceremonies, and perhaps for their serving this function in reality as well.

Chapters three and four exist in dialogue with many gender-focused analyses of Rev. 17-19. Many that designate themselves as feminist and primarily or only as feminist construe Babylon as a wronged party, partly on the basis of this fate, and Caroline Vander Stichele charges that "commentary on [Rev. 17-19] often displays a disturbing tendency to explain

away or justify their more troubling aspects” (“Re-membering the Whore,” 106). This is true, but it is also the case that much feminist commentary does not so much as mention her slave-trading, despite exploring her activities and fate in detail. It is difficult to miss an allusion in Vander Stichele’s title (see previous discussion) to the fate of the Levite’s concubine, who is cast to a hostile crowd by her husband, gang-raped, and then dismembered and her corpse distributed by said husband (Jdg. 19). She and the Jezebel of the court history (2 Kg. 9), to whom Rev. 2 explicitly alludes, are undeniably both women whose bodies are dismembered after death (unlike “Babylon”). They are not, however, interchangeable figures. The nameless concubine is a silent victim. She is simply thrown to an angry mob whose intentions are perfectly clear to the husband who casts her out voluntarily and then chops her corpse into twelve. Jezebel, in contrast, wields political power, has orchestrated more than a hundred murders (those of the prophets and the landowner) and is trampled to death by war-horses in a conflict that she incited. Her corpse’s fate, unlike the Levite’s concubine’s, is natural. The text casts no blame on the feral dogs for scavenging, and it is difficult to see why anyone else should. Similarly, it is difficult to read the choices of a wealthy, corrupt, violent monarch (which the Jezebel of the court history is portrayed as being) as meriting exemption from unpleasant consequences if the monarch is female. Babylon’s ultimate fate is much like Jezebel’s. The angel tells the seer that “the ten horns that you saw and the beast, they will hate the whore; they will make her desolate and bare; they will devour her flesh and burn her up with fire.”⁹⁰ Babylon will be devoured by animals, as was Jezebel, and likewise this will occur after her former servants turn against her. Recent scholarship has rightly emphasized that these gloated-over public

⁹⁰ τὰ δέκα κέρατα ἃ εἶδες καὶ τὸ θηρίον οὗτοι μισήσουσιν τὴν πόρνην καὶ ἡρμωμένην ποιήσουσιν αὐτὴν καὶ γυμνὴν καὶ τὰς σάρκας αὐτῆς φάγονται καὶ αὐτὴν κατακαύσουσιν ἐν πυρὶ (Rev. 17:16).

deaths, like a disproportion of those that the prophetic texts describe, are those of what might be called plutocratic *women*. They are, however, equally the gloated-over public deaths of *plutocratic* women.

Although many gender analyses of Revelation draw attention to the description of Babylon, only Clarice Martin's discusses at any length her involvement in slave trading. This is despite the text's drawing attention to it: the list of condemned trade goods in Rev. 18 culminates with slaves and singles only them out by repetition: "the bodies of human beings, and their souls" (σωμάτων καὶ ψυχὰς ἀνθρώπων, 18:13).⁹¹ Slave-trading is emphasized as a source of Babylon's wealth and a locus of her power as queen. The homage that she receives from traders, including slave traders, reflects the fact that it is Babylon that enables, authorizes, and generates trade. While some gender-focused analyses of Rev. 17-19 mention this item on the indictment, many overlook it, even if they read the text closely. For example, Vander Stichele argues without irony that Babylon's destruction is an example of "[how] women are used and abused as slaves" ("Just a Whore," 11) but never mentions that Babylon is condemned for involvement with *trading slaves*. Paul Duff's chapter to critiquing Rev. 18's condemnation of wealthy traders similarly makes no mention of what they are actually trading. John Marshall directly cites Rev. 18:6-7, 21-24 to argue that "the punishment [of Babylon] exceeds the crime"⁹² and omits 18:13 entirely from the consideration of her crimes. Pippin herself asserts without citation that (apparently all) "sex workers in the

⁹¹ Fabian Udoh has reminded me in private communication that slaves are also simply one more item on the list, and that the placing of a list's most important item at its end is a habit of Anglo-American rhetoric. I still read Revelation as using the same rhetorical device here, both because its entire structure is one of "building up" and because of the emphatic repetition. The language here indicates all slave traders, not only those who kidnap freeborn people and sell them into slavery (e.g., ἀνδραποδιστῆς, 1 Tim. 1:10), but it is difficult to know whether this is a difference in substance or only in word choice.

⁹² John Marshall, "Gender and Empire: Sexualized Violence in John's Anti-Imperial Apocalypse," in *A Feminist Companion to the Apocalypse* (ed. Levine), 30.

United States identify with the Whore of Babylon... [who] is a prostitute like them and a victim of male violence” but does not acknowledge the violence that Babylon has inflicted.⁹³

Gender-focused analysis is not unique in overlooking the issue; most other kinds and many commentaries pay Revelation’s slave imagery equally little notice. No examination of gender has an obligation to consider any other given aspect of the text. But gender-focused scholarship is one of the types that devotes the most attention to Babylon and her fate. In contrast, economically focused and anti-colonial readings, as well as readings that centre a perspective that is not implicitly white, often do give it attention. But these are the exception to a rule that held for “mainstream” biblical scholarship from the late 1860s to the mid-1990s, despite the central role that disputes over the slavery in the Bible had in establishing modern biblical studies.⁹⁴ It was so fundamental that to engage in biblical scholarship is to practice a discipline that controversies over slavery generated and nurtured. In the same vein, to discuss biblical slavery at this point in history is unavoidably to discuss, be influenced by, and contribute to the evolving (mis)understanding of the roots, effects, and legacies, of modern slavery. This means that any such discussion is fraught with problems, and I make no claim to an exception.

⁹³ Pippin, “Revelation/Apocalypse,” 630. The only published work on this subject of which I am aware is the chapter in Ipsen’s *Sex Working*, which does not aim to be comprehensive and makes more nuanced claims about U.S. sex workers’ largely negative responses to Revelation’s depiction of Babylon. Ipsen’s book is an important contribution to the reception history of a number of biblical texts. It is also a useful corrective to feminist literature’s and advocacy’s often-critiqued history of taking an under-informed and paternalistic view of sex work. I have deliberately bracketed this issue because emerging perspectives such as Ipsen’s, for very sound reasons, often centre the experiences of people who at least to some degree have chosen to work in the sex industry. Most sex workers in the Roman world did not fall into this category but were instead “prostituted women” (and men), a construction that present-day sex worker advocates often reject as misleading. It seems more accurate than any proposed alternative for the Roman situation, in which foundling infants and child slaves were raised for the specific purpose of being used in sex work, with no choice in the matter.

⁹⁴ See especially Haynes, *Noah’s Curse*, *passim*; Harrill, *Slaves in the NT*, 165-192; Oshatz, *Slavery and Sin*, *passim*.

Chapter One: Marriage

Weddings were not necessary to establish a marriage in antiquity, but establishing marriage was the immediate motivation for weddings. Real and imagined marriage are thus the context for nuptial imagery such as Revelation's. The evidence for ancient marriage is abundant and comes from nearly every form of expression extant; I make no attempt to treat it comprehensively.⁹⁵ In particular, Lynn Huber has explored its political resonances in connection with Revelation.⁹⁶ A few other aspects of ancient marriage, however, do bear some mention in this context.

⁹⁵ See, e.g., Sarah Pomeroy, *Goddesses, Whores, Wives, and Slaves* (Chapel Hill: U North Carolina P, 1975; 2nd ed. 1995); Beryl Rawson, *The Family in Ancient Rome* (Ithaca, New York: Cornell, 1986), *Marriage, Divorce, and Children in Ancient Rome* (Canberra: Humanities Res. Ctr., 1991), and *Companion to Families in the Greek and Roman Worlds* (Malden, Massachusetts: Blackwell, 2011); Léonie Archer, *Her Price Is beyond Rubies* (Sheffield: JSOT P, 1990); Raphael Sealy, *Women and Law in Classical Greece* (Chapel Hill: U North Carolina P, 1990); Susan Treggiari, *Roman Marriage* (Oxford: Clarendon P, 1991); Suzanne Dixon, *The Roman Family* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins U P, 1992); Saller, *Patriarchy, Property, and Death*; Judith Evans-Grubbs, *Law and Family in Late Antiquity* (Oxford: Clarendon P, 1995); Tal Ilan, *Jewish Women in Greco-Roman Palestine* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1995); Tikva Frymer-Kensky, *Gender and Law in the Hebrew Bible and the Ancient Near East* (Sheffield: Sheffield Ac. P, 1998); Cynthia Patterson, *The Family in Greek History* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard U P, 1998); Anne-Marie Vérilhac and Claud Vial, *Le mariage grec du VII^e siècle à l'époque d'Auguste* (Athens: École française, 1998); Kleiner and Matheson, *I, Claudia*, v. 2; Satlow, *Jewish Marriage*; Hennie Marsman, *Women in Ugarit and Israel* (Leiden: Brill, 2003); Uri Yiftach-Firanko, *Marriage and Marital Arrangement* (Munich: C.H. Beck, 2003); John Bodel and Saul Olyan, *Household and Family Religion in Antiquity* (Malden, Massachusetts: Blackwell, 2008); Tracy Lemos, *Marriage Gifts and Social Change in Ancient Palestine* (Cambridge: Cambridge U P, 2010).

⁹⁶ Huber, *Like a Bride*, 113-127; "Sexually Explicit? Re-reading Rev.'s 144,000 Virgins as a Response to Roman Discourses," *JMMS* 2 (2008): 3-28; *Thinking and Seeing*, 37-50. On the theme more broadly, see Richard I. Frank, "Augustus' Legislation on Marriage and Children," *California St. Cl. Antiquity* 8 (1975): 41-52; Robert Villers, "Le mariage envisagé comme institution d'Etat dans le droit classique de Rome," *ANRW II* 14 (1982), 294-300; Richard Bauman, *Women and Politics in Ancient Rome* (London: Routledge, 1992); Mireille Corbier, "Male power and legitimacy through women: the *domus Augusta* under the Julio-Claudians," in *Women in Antiquity: New Assessments* (ed. Richard Hawley and Barbara Levick; London: Routledge, 1995), 178-193; Beth Severy, *Augustus and the Family at the Birth of the Roman Empire* (New York: Routledge, 2003), *passim*; Adam Kemezis, "Augustus the Ironic Paradigm: Cassius Dio's Portrayal of the *Lex Julia* and *Lex Papia Poppaea*," *Phoenix* 61 (2007): 270-285; Natalie Kampen, *Family Fictions in Roman Art* (Cambridge: Cambridge U P, 2009), 23-27. Although imperial Rome was arguably the apex of this theme, it was not its only context. See Robin Osborne, *Studies in Ancient Greek and Roman Society* (Cambridge: Cambridge U P, 2004), especially the chapter "Law, the democratic citizen and the representation of women in classical Athens;" Riet van Bremen, "Family Structures," in *A Companion to the Hellenistic World* (ed. A. Erskine; Malden, Massachusetts: Blackwell, 2003), 322-326; Dorothy Thompson, "The Hellenistic Family," in *Cambridge Companion to the Hellenistic World* (ed. G.R. Bugh; Cambridge: Cambridge U P, 2006), 96-98; George Tsouvala, "Integrating Marriage and *Homonoia*," in *The Unity of Plutarch's Work* (ed. A.D. Nikolaidis; Berlin: De Gruyter, 2008), 701-718.

Ancient marriage was not a static phenomenon. It changed along with the societies that practiced it, and variations existed, especially in Egypt. Nevertheless, with respect to the high Roman empire, it is possible to speak, with due caution, of a dynamic shared understanding whose evolution was more in the model of classical Darwinism than punctuated equilibrium. This pattern of slow, calm change is consistent with how little, it has become clear, distinguished Israelite and Jewish and Christian marriage ideology and practice from non-Israelite, non-Jewish, and/or non-Christian.⁹⁷

UNEQUAL PARTNERS

The socio-legal fact of marriage in antiquity was premised on innate gender inequality. From Bronze Age Mesopotamia to the ruins of the western Roman empire, the sexes were considered different in more ways than the obviously biological. Men were understood as the “default” human beings; women were an adaptation of men and were considered “less” than men in a variety of different ways and “greater” than them in few. The most common template for marriage that the literary sources present is thus one of *only* one free male adult’s being responsible for *at least* one younger, free female co-national of

⁹⁷ It is true that biblical Hebrew did not have an exclusive term to designate “marriage” *per se*. However, the vocabulary of “taking a woman/wife” is consistent, and biblical texts refer to economic exchanges of the kind that are classically termed “bride price,” concepts of legitimate and illegitimate parentage, observances to mark the beginning of unions that could lead to legitimate children, expectations of premarital virginity and marital monandry for respectable females, etc. On marriage in early Judaism, see Satlow, *Jewish Marriage*, *passim*; Hannah Cotton, “Women and Law in the Documents from the Judaean Desert,” in *Le rôle et le statut de la femme en Egypte hellénistique, romaine et byzantine* (ed. H. Melaerts and L. Mooren; Paris: Peeters, 2002), 128-139; Margaret Williams, “Image and Text in the Jewish Epitaphs of Late Ancient Rome,” *JStJ* 42 (2011): 328-350. Similarly, Greek γάμος could designate any sexual union or the wedding ceremony. As we will see, however, Greek authors distinguished durable, socially recognized unions, and it is usually clear when “marriage ceremony” as opposed to “marriage” is meant. On early gentile Christians and marriage, see, e.g., Judith Evans-Grubbs, *Law and Family in Late Antiquity* (Oxford: Clarendon P, 1995) 65-90; Balch and Osiek, *Early Christian Families*, *passim*.

equal or lesser social rank.⁹⁸ Richard Saller's exhaustive study of western epitaphs has revealed that most Roman girls married for the first time around age twenty and men six to ten years later. In the contemporaneous east, average age at first marriage seems to have been slightly younger for both sexes, but most grooms were still several years older than their brides, who tended to be in their late teens.⁹⁹

Such unions' offspring would have socially and legally recognized mutual ties to their fathers, whereas children born outside wedlock had strong socio-legal ties only to their mothers. Revelation's marriage imagery does not emphasize either biological or socio-ethnic reproduction. The concluding image of all the nations gathering together in the same city would make the latter a difficult fit. The neglect of the former probably relates in part to an eschatologically tinted ideal of celibacy (Rev. 14:1-5) that the text shares with several other texts in the NT alone (e.g., Mt. 19:10-12, Lk. 23:27-31, 1 Cor. 7:1, 8-9) and a

⁹⁸ Every study of ancient marriage published in the last fifty years or so has devoted substantial this aspect of it. Consensus has largely emerged that some early studies overstated the case and some subsequent ones overcorrected for this tendency. Useful analyses here include Mary Lefkowitz, "Wives and Husbands," *G & R* 30 (1983): 31-47; David Cohen, "Seclusion, Separation, and the Status of Women in Classical Athens," *G & R* 36 (1989): 3-15; Marilyn Katz, "Ideology and 'the status of women' in ancient Greece," in *Assessments* (ed. Hawley and Levick), 21-43; Deborah Lyons, "Dangerous Gifts: Ideologies of Marriage and Exchange in Ancient Greece," *Cl. Antiquity* 22 (2003): 93-134.

⁹⁹ Saller, "Men's Age at Marriage and Its Consequences in the Roman Family," *Cl. Philol.* 82 (1987): 21-34 and *Patriarchy, Property, and Death*, 12-43; see also Brent Shaw, "The Age of Roman Girls at Marriage: Some Reconsiderations," *J Roman St.* 77 (1987): 30-46; Walter Scheidel, "Roman Funerary Commemoration and the Age at First Marriage," *Cl. Philol.* 102 (2007): 389-402; Bruce Frier, "Roman Demography," in *Life, Death, and Entertainment in the Roman Empire* (ed. David Mattingly and D.S. Potter; Ann Arbor: U Michigan P, 1995, rev. 2010), 85-94. For the ANE, see Martha Roth, "Age at Marriage and the Household: A Study of Neo-Babylonian and Neo-Assyrian Forms," *Comp. St. Soc. His.* 29 (1987): 715-747. Some of the major discussions of marriage also consider this issue; e.g., Vêrilhac and Vial, *Mariage grec*, 271-273; Satlow, *Jewish Marriage*, 105-109.

whole range from the deuterocanons and apocrypha.¹⁰⁰ Its vision of a renewed Eden in which deathlessness will replace procreation is also a likely contributing factor, as Hans Jensen has argued.¹⁰¹

The received rubric is that on attaining maturity, men entered their own legal power (often marrying after this point), while women left their fathers' legal power and entered their husbands'. This is an oversimplification: a living father usually retained at least some authority over a son of any age, and a married woman retained legal connections to her father and his heirs. By the imperial period in Rome, living fathers could retain complete legal authority over all legitimate offspring, including married daughters, and wives did not come under the authority of their husbands. But woman remained the "weaker vessel," and a married woman's property, lineage, legal interests, and social identity were overshadowed by her husband's to a greater degree (e.g., classical Athens) or a lesser (e.g., imperial Rome). Thus after a wedding in Athens, for example,

[t]he bride was now a member of her husband's house and her children were members of his kindred. They belonged to the *anchisteia hierôn kai hoisôn*, those "closely related in matters sacred and profane." The *anchisteia* joined those linked by descent and by legitimate marriage, out to the degree of children of first cousins. It defined those who could inherit and as such

¹⁰⁰ On the theme of eschatological celibacy in a wide range of non-canonical texts, see Daniel Launderville, *Celibacy in the Ancient World*, (Collegeville, Minnesota: Liturgical P, 2010) and William Loader, *The Pseudepigrapha on Sexuality* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2011), *passim*. On eschatological celibacy in Revelation, see Yarbrow Collins, *Crisis and Catharsis*, 127-131; Aune, *Revelation*, 810-822; Beale, *Book of Revelation*, 737-744; Osborne, *Revelation*, 527-532, 768-777; Witherington, *Revelation*, 185-186, 272-273; Smalley, *Revelation*, 357-358; Huber, "Sexually Explicit?"; Stenström, "They have not defiled," in *FC Apoc. John*; Louise Fuller Dow, *Images of Zion: Biblical Antecedents for the New Jerusalem*, (Sheffield: Phoenix P, 2010), 193-196. For eschatological celibacy outside Revelation, see David Hunter, *Marriage, Celibacy, and Heresy in Ancient Christianity* (Oxford: Oxford U P, 1997), 87-91; in Halvor Moxnes (ed.), *Constructing Early Christian Families: Family As Social Reality and Metaphor* (London: Routledge, 1997), Dale Martin, "Paul without Passion: On Paul's rejection of desire in sex and marriage," 201-215 and Risto Uro, "Asceticism and Anti-Familial Language in the Gospel of Thomas," 216-243; Naomi Koltun-Fromm, "Sexuality and Holiness: Semitic Christian and Jewish Conceptualizations of Sexual Behavior," *Vig. Chr.* 54 (2000): 375-395; Elizabeth Clark, "The Celibate Bridegroom and His Virginal Brides," *Church His.* 77 (2008): 1-25.

¹⁰¹ Jensen, "Cosmic Wedding," 136-157; cf. Ellul, *Apocalypse*, 227-231; Prigent, *L'apocalypse*, 342-347; Aune, *Revelation*, 1175f; Beale, *Revelation*, 1087f; Lee Pilchan, *New Jerusalem*, 267-274; Osborne, *Revelation*, 768-777; Smalley, *Revelation*, 561-565.

included females, since it was possible for a male to inherit through his mother. The *anchisteia* also defined the group obligated to avenge a homicide and bury the kindred dead. Perhaps they shared other ritual rights and obligations, although we know nothing of these (Redfield 2003: 41).¹⁰²

Wives joined the lineage and the household cults¹⁰³ of their husbands, although they were not completely separated from those of their natal households; the reverse never occurred. They were more fully incorporated into their marital households with the birth of legitimate children. Still, they had some standing even immediately after their marriages, as ch. 4 explores. Theano, for example, counsels Callisto that although young wives need advice from experienced matrons such as herself, nonetheless “authority to rule the household is granted by the law to you younger women as soon as you are married... and the primary area of authority in the house for wives is over its slaves.”¹⁰⁴

Legality, as Theano observes, was an important aspect of marriage and the establishment of household property, including human property. Much of the earliest written evidence for marriage comes from law codes, which remain an important source of

¹⁰² James Redfield, *The Locrian Maidens: Love and Death at Troy* (Princeton: Princeton U P, 2003), *passim*. See also Dixon, *Roman Family*, 36-60; D'Ambra, “Mourning and the Making of Ancestors...”; Sarah Pomeroy, “Women’s identity and the family in the classical *polis*,” in *Assessments* (ed. Hawley and Levick), 111-121; Cheryl Ann Cox, *Household Interests* (Princeton: Princeton U P, 1998) 92-155; Jane Gardner, *Family and Familia in Roman Law and Life* (Oxford: Clarendon P, 1998), 209-220. On the development of this system, see Robin Osborne, “Law, the democratic citizen.”

¹⁰³ S. Safrai and M. Stern, *The Jewish People in the First Century*, v. 2 (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976), 728-792; Daniel Harmon, “The Family Festivals of Rome,” *ANRW II* 16.2 (1978); D'Ambra, “Mourning and the Making of Ancestors;” Lin Foxhall, “Women’s ritual and men’s work in ancient Athens,” in *Assessments* (ed. Hawley and Levick), 97-110; John Barclay, “The Family as the Bearer of Religion in Judaism and Early Christianity,” in *Constructing* (ed. Moxnes), 65-77; Barbara Goff, *Citizen Bacchae: Women’s Ritual Practice in Ancient Greece* (Berkeley: U California P, 2004), 160-226; Celia Schultz, *Women’s Religious Activity in the Roman Republic* (Chapel Hill: U North Carolina P, 2006) 121-150; in *Companion* (ed. James and Dillon), Lora Holland, “Women and Roman Religion,” 204-214 and Eva Stehle, “Women and Religion in Greece,” 191-203; Carol Meyers, *Rediscovering Eve: Ancient Israelite Women in Context* (New York: Oxford U P, 2012), 156-170.

¹⁰⁴ Theano 605.6.25-31, ad. I.M. Plant 72; Ταῖς νεωτέραις ὑμῖν ἡ μὲν ἐξουσία παρὰ τοῦ νόμου δέδοται τῶν οἰκετῶν ἄρχειν ἅμα τῷ γήμασθαι... ἀρχὴ δὲ ἐστὶν οἴκου πρῶτῃ γυναιξὶν ἀρχὴ θεραπαινῶν. Lest these *therapai* be mistaken for free employees, she continues “and, my friend, the most important thing is the slaves’ good will. For this is not purchased as a possession along with their bodies, but wise mistresses create it in the fulness of time” (l. 32-34, ad. *ibid*); ἐστὶ δὲ ὧ φίλῃ μέγιστον ἐπὶ δουλείᾳ εὐνοία; αὕτη γὰρ οὐ συναγοράζεται τοῖς σύμασιν ἢ κτήσις ἀλλ’ ἐξ ὑστέρου γεννώσιν αὐτὴν οἱ συνετοὶ δεσπόται.

information.¹⁰⁵ Legal education exercises (e.g., Seneca Maior's *Controversiae*), marriage contracts, divorce agreements, property deeds and transfers, testaments, inheritance suits, and petitions and rescripts (relating, e.g., to status or citizenship) attest to the importance of marriage's legal aspects at all socio-economic levels and from ANE to the late Roman period.¹⁰⁶ Matrimonial law seems largely to have responded to practice, as is common; formal law was enacted as was felt necessary for clarification. Civil authority neither established nor authorized marriages, a situation that did not change until after the

¹⁰⁵ For legal situations in early Judaism, see Tal Ilan, "Premarital Cohabitation in Ancient Judea: The Evidence of the Babatha Archive and the Mishnah (*Ketubbot* 1.4)," *HTR* 86 (1993): 247-267 and *Jewish Women in Greco-Roman Palestine* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1995), 88-94. On Greek law, see Cynthia Patterson, "Marriage and the Married Woman in Athenian Law," in *Women's History and Ancient History* (ed. Sarah Pomeroy; Chapel Hill: U North Carolina P, 1991), 8-72. For Roman law, see Villers, "Le mariage envisagé," 286-293; Dixon, *Roman Family*, 36-60; Evans Grubbs, *Law and Family*, *passim*. For explorations of sub-topics, see Frank, "Augustus' Legislation;" David Cherry, "The Minician Law: Marriage and the Roman Citizenship," *Phoenix* 4 (1990): 244-266; Laura Abrahamsen, "Roman Marriage Law and the Conflict of Seneca's *Medea*," *QUCC* 62 (1999): 107-121; Josiah Osgood, "*Nuptiae Iure Civili Congruae*: Apuleius's Story of Cupid and Psyche and the Roman Law of Marriage," *TAPA* 6 (2006): 415-444.

¹⁰⁶ Such legal evidence abounds among clay and papyrus records from the eastern Mediterranean. On a more systematic level, Mesopotamian codes attempt to regulate dowry obligations, procreative duties, spousal maintenance, prosecution of adultery charges, and divorce, among other subjects. Meanwhile, among biblical texts, Leviticus and Deuteronomy enumerate rules on many aspects of marriage, while other writings (e.g., Ezra and Nehemiah) inveigh against perceived widespread violation of those rules. Six of the Talmud's tractates are traditionally understood as the "laws of women," and each of these tractates focuses primarily or substantially on marriage in particular, rather than on women in general. Greek rhetors treat at length and in juridical contexts the subjects of dowry, legitimate inheritance, household, and adultery, while the rules of marital conduct and constitution are a perennial topic in Roman jurisprudence. Augustus' marriage legislation is one of the points of his rule most remarked upon in classical writings. The controversy surrounding this legislation ensured the vitality of the topic, and subsequent major legal reforms (e.g., those of Caracalla, Diocletian, Constantine, and Justinian) continued the precedent.

Reformation.¹⁰⁷ In antiquity, most of the many encounters between law and marriage arose from property disputes, all of which were disagreements over case details in a shared, implicit understanding of marriage that was flexible enough to account for considerable variation in the realities that it encompassed.

Marriage was the special province of women; it was also seen as a *telos* or fulfillment in their lives but as only one aspect of men's. Wedding practices reflected this understanding, as discussed in ch. 2; here we can note simply the broader application of James Redfield's description of classical Athenian rhetoric that reaches its apex in Demosthenes 30.33: "A free woman was supposed to marry and have children. Those who did not were said to grow old — *katagēskein* — with connotations of wasting away... The unmarried state was intolerable... it is thought totally implausible that a woman whose brother had property (for a dowry) and who was herself 'of an age' (that is, fairly young) should live alone, unmarried" (2003: 44). Roman culture had similar understandings. Catullus, for example, likens a virgin girl to a properly untouched flower and her maturation to that of a flower into fruit. These are enduring and widespread themes of which the Song of Solomon provides extended examples; Catullus places them in an explicitly nuptial context:

If a vine unfurls in a bare field, it never

¹⁰⁷ The concept of marriage was flexible, and definitions of it were largely absent, as they often are today. Indeed, to the best of my knowledge, the first extant Western definition of marriage, legal or otherwise, comes from the 3rd-cen. CE jurist Modestinus: "Marriage is the joining of male and female in a partnership for all of life, a sharing of divine and human law" (D.23.2.1 Judith Evans-Grubbs, *Women and the Law in the Roman Empire: A sourcebook on marriage, divorce, and widowhood* [London: Routledge, 2002], 81). This postdates the first known laws of marriage (those in the *Laws of Ur-Nammu*, ca. 2100 BCE) by 2,350 years, more time than separates this study from Revelation. Marriage changed continuously over this time (e.g., there were variations in whether it was available to slaves, whose consent it required, how it could be dissolved, how many parties it could have, and how they could be related to each other). Yet there never seems to be much impetus to clarify "what marriage is." What is consistent is that it is an *a priori* category; "everyone knows" what it involves. Laws exist to clarify which irregularities are excluded from it, moral and philosophical treatises aim to improve an existing institution, etc.

finds its beauty or yields a good grape,
but bends down under the weight of its thin body
and so almost touches its root with its tallest tendril.
Neither farmers nor bullocks have tended it.
Yet if this same one is joined to an elm as a husband,
many farmers and bullocks have tended it.
So it is with a virgin. While she remains untouched, she grows old with neglect.
When she is well disposed in marriage at the right time, she is
dearer to her man and less begrudged by her parents (ad. Godwin 44-45).¹⁰⁸

It was bad enough to become an old maid and just as bad to die as a young virgin. As I have explored elsewhere,¹⁰⁹ commemorations for girls were much likelier than those for youths to lament that their subjects died before they could marry. This is despite the fact that males' higher average and median age at first marriage made it likelier that they than females would in fact do so. The idea that girls who died unmarried were specially deprived also resounds in the story of Jephthah's daughter (Jdg. 11:34-40) and its later reception, as well as in some archaic and early classical traditions that Ken Dowden, Jennifer Larson, and James Redfield have notably explored.¹¹⁰

Just as marriage was a *telos* for women more than for men, the ideal of a single, enduring lifetime marriage¹¹¹ likewise focused on wives more than husbands. Valerius

¹⁰⁸ *ut vidua in nudo vitis quae nascitur arvo
numquam se extollit numquam mitem educat uvam.
sed tenerum prono deflectens pondere corpus
iam iam contingit summum radice flagellum.
hanc nulli agricolae nulli coluere iuvenci
at si forte eadem est ulmo coniuncta marito
multi illam agricolae multi coluere iuvenci
sic virgo dum intacta manet dum inculta senescit.
cum par conubium aturo tempore adepta est.
cara viro magis et minus est invisa parenti* (Catul., *Carm.* 62.49-58).

¹⁰⁹ "Weddings and the Return to Life in the Book of Revelation," to be published in the proceedings of the conference "Coming Back to Life" (Montreal, 8-11 May 2014).

¹¹⁰ Ken Dowden, *Death and the Maiden: Girls' Initiation Rites in Greek Mythology* (London: Routledge, 1989); Larson, *Greek Heroine Cults* (Madison: U Wisconsin P, 1995); Redfield, *Locrian Maidens*.

¹¹¹ See Majorie Lightman and William Zeisel, "Univira: An Example of Continuity and Change in Roman Society," *Church His.* 46 (1977): 19-32; Olankunbi Olasope, "Univira: The Ideal Roman *Matrona*," *Lumina* 20 (2009) [n.p.].

Maximus, for example, lamented that in Rome's earliest days "women who had been content with a single marriage would be honoured with a crown of chastity. For they thought that a *matrona* had the most loyal character and was uncorrupted if she did not consider leaving bed on which she had surrendered her virginity, believing that the trial of many marriages was as it were the sign of a legalized incontinence."¹¹² The NT contains the most famous inversion of the formula with the rule that "a bishop must be irreproachable, a one-woman man" (τὸν ἐπίσκοπον ἀνεπίλημpton εἶναι μιᾷς γυναικὸς ἄνδρα, 1 Tim. 3:2); a Roman widower in the early first century BCE similarly commemorated the freedwoman he married as "my only wife" (*coniunx una meo*). In the main, though, the person lauded for a single, enduring lifetime marriage was a woman. This was not only an upper-class literary ideal; modest epitaphs as well as grand ones frequently praise the female deceased as "one-man women." A Roman Jewish epitaph from the first or second century CE, for example, states only that it is dedicated "to Rufina, [wife] of one husband, loved her children" (Ρουφείναι μονάνδρου τῇ φιλοτέκνῳ), while an undated but probably pre-Christian Syrian stele commemorates "Julitta, self-controlled, good, a bride once, in her youth" (Ιουλίττα σώφρων ἀγαθὴ καὶ παῖς μονόνυμφος).¹¹³ The convention also inspired parody as well, as in one of Martial's mock epigraphs: "My marriage bed was a rare glory: my modesty knew a single prick."¹¹⁴

¹¹² *Fac. et Dic.* 2.1.3, ad. D.R. Shackleton Bailey (2000) 131; *Quae uno contentae matrimonio fuerant corona pudicitiae honorabantur: existimabant enim eum praecipue matronae sincera fide incorruptum esse animum qui depositae virginitatis cubile egredi nesciret multorum matrimoniorum experientiam quasi legitimae cuiusdam intemperantiae signum esse credentes*. Note how he imagines that even in the good old days, *univirae* were not taken for granted.

¹¹³ *GLI* 139; Greek text as suggested by W.K. Prentice (1908) 147; "my only wife," *CIL* 1221; Warmington 53 4.22-23).

¹¹⁴ *...thalami mihi gloria rara fuitque/una pudicitiae mentula nota meae*, Martial, *Ep.* 10.63; see Sullivan and Whigham 384-385.

The virtue that defines a matron's *pudicitiae* becomes obscene in its own right. Yet the very nature of the obscenity also makes it a “glory” that the poem declares to be uncommon enough to merit attention. Here Martial, while shocking conventions, does not necessarily depart from reality: as Susan Dixon observes, the *univira* ideal endured in part *because* it operated “against a reality of divorce and a predictable level of widowhood” (1991, 32-33) and as part of the idea of degeneration from the *mos maiorum*. But while remarriage after divorce and widowing seem to have been generally tolerated — they would have to have been, given the demographic pattern — second marriages were less festive occasions than first ones,¹¹⁵ and unwarranted divorce and “too many” lifetime marriages, however defined, earned disapproval (see following discussion). Women more frequently receive such opprobrium, but men are not immune from it. The NT texts that touch on the subject exhibit stronger versions of these views.¹¹⁶

¹¹⁵ For example, Plutarch observes that Roman brides' first marriage ceremonies did not occur on public holidays (when potential celebrants might be otherwise occupied) while widows' were (*Quaes. Rom.* 105; ἐν ταῖς δημοσίαις ἔθος οὐκ ἔστι γαμεῖσθαι παρθένους αἱ δὲ χῆραι γαμοῦνται). He suggests as a possible reason that ζηλωτὸς γὰρ ὁ πρῶτος γάμος ὁ δὲ δεύτερος ἀπευκταῖος αἰσχύνονται γὰρ ἂν ζώντων τῶν προτέρων ἐτέρους λαμβάνωσιν ὀδύρονται δὲ ἂν ἀποθανόντων (“A first marriage is desirable, but a second goes against hope, because taking another husband is disgraceful if the first is living, and brings sadness if he is dead,” 105.3).

¹¹⁶ Paul advises the Corinthians that celibacy after widowing is ideal but remarriage is permissible (1 Cor. 7:39-40). In the synoptic gospels (Mk. 12:18-25 = Mt. 22:23-30, Lk. 20:27-35), the Sadducees appear in a negative light when they use serial widowing as pretext to force Jesus to contradict his own teachings about the resurrection. That is, the Sadducees' question is presented as an attempt to entrap Jesus rather than a request for information. H. Benedict Green, commenting on Matthew, argues that “[t]his question comes under the technical heading of *boruth* (vulgarity), i.e. it is a mocking question, designed to ridicule the beliefs of the rabbi questioned” (Green, *Gospel According to Matthew* [Oxford: Clarendon P, 1975], 183), an opinion that many commentators share. This view was equally current among ancient interpreters. John Chrysostom, for example, posits that “To avoid censure for the fact that the seven brothers had one wife, [the Sadducees] refer to Moses' authority. However, I believe that their whole story was just a fiction. For the third would not have taken her when he saw the two bridegrooms dead... such is the custom of the Jews. If they now still have this resistance, how much more did they have it then? They often avoided marrying under these circumstances, even when the law was constraining them” (*Homilies on Matthew* 70.2; M. Simoenetti, 153). The point is most perhaps most obvious in the pericope of the Samaritan women (Jn. 4), for which see ch. 2.

Differing expectations for spousal conduct extended into the private domain as well. Just as the literary record contains far more information about the ideal wife than the ideal husband, its marital advice genre¹¹⁷ has far more instructions for wives than for husbands: “...a good wife has the greater glory in proportion as a bad wife is the more to blame,” as Tacitus would have it.¹¹⁸ Thirty-seven of the forty-eight traditional divisions of Plutarch’s *Conj.* advise wives on how to conduct themselves or husbands on how to lead their wives; only three (8, 15, and 24) advise husbands in other ways and eight (3, 4, 13, 21, 34, 38, 39, and 42) advise both spouses. This at least complicates his claim that “the sins of wives are more often forgotten by the many than are sins against them.”¹¹⁹ “Socrates” claim in the *Oeconomicus* that “if a wife properly taught by her husband does badly, then the wife should be judged the cause of the problem” (*Oec.* 11, ad. Marchant 387; τῆς δὲ γυναικός εἰ μὲν διδασκομένη ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς τὰ γαθὰ κακοποιεῖ ἴσως δικαίως ἂν ἡ γυνὴ τὴν αἰτίαν ἔχοι) provides similar leeway. The ensuing dialogue is about what a husband should teach his wife, a subject that Emily Helelrijk (1999: 31-36) observes became popular in the first century CE, and devotes little attention to the husband’s own conduct. The fragmentary writings of female Greek writers (e.g., Theano, Perictone, Phintys, and Melissa) also advise

¹¹⁷ On this genre, see A.C. van Geytenbeek, *Musonius Rufus and Greek Diatribe* (Assen: van Gorcum, 1963), *passim*; Michel Foucault, *A History of Sexuality* vol. 1 (1978; tr., New York: Vintage, 1986), 147-164; Cynthia Patterson, “Plutarch’s Advice on Marriage,” *ANWR II* 33.6 (1992), 4709-4723; Anthony Gini, “The Manly Intellect of His Wife: Xenophon, *Oeconomicus* Ch. 7,” *Cl. World* 86 (1993), 483-486; Daniel Garrison, *Sexual Culture in Ancient Greece* (Norman: U Oklahoma P, 2000), 250f.; Annette Huizenga, “Advice to the Bride,” in Craig Evans & H. Zacharias, *Jewish and Christian Scripture as Artifact and Canon* (London: T & T Clark, 2006), 223-247; Meriel Jones, *Playing the Man: Performing Masculinities in the Ancient Greek Novel* (Oxford: Oxford U P, 2012), 32-40.

¹¹⁸ Tacitus, *Agricola* 6.1, ad. Hutton and Ogilvie 35; *nisi quod in bona uxore tanto maior laus quanto in mala plus culpa est.*

¹¹⁹ *Conj.* 43, ad. *Selected Essays* (1993) 294; μᾶλλον γὰρ ἔοικε τὰ τῶν γυναικῶν ἢ τὰ πρὸς γυναῖκας αἰμαρτήματα λανθάνειν τοὺς πολλούς.

women to improve their marriages by advancing or at least tolerating their husbands' interests rather than asserting their own. Complaints about bad wives are a part of the Greek, Roman, and rabbinic literary repertoires, but there are few discussions of bad husbands.

Expectations of marital fidelity were also unequal. Plural marriage was rare by the early common era, although it is documented in the eastern empire.¹²⁰ Even in the west, however, polygyny was not alien. Greek and Roman historians and geographers write without comment of its being practiced outside their "here and now." Jewish and Christian authors are similarly aware of some OT notables' plural marriages, even if they are critical of them.¹²¹ Within the monogamous system, women were expected to limit sexual activity to marriage and avoid lending any impression to the contrary. Their conformity to this norm was a critical component of family honour and has remained one to the present day. The good married woman was an icon of chastity and virtue. Emily Hemelrijk notes that

¹²⁰ Polygamy did occur in the east, e.g., in Hellenistic royal families but also among commoners. It was nonetheless the exception rather than the rule, despite the probability that, Tal Ilan argues, "multiple marriage was not [widely considered] an ethical issue. Those groups who did object to polygamy on moral grounds (such as the Dead Sea Sect [*sic*]) forbade it by law. The main issue in polygamy was rather economic, and thus we find bigamous and polygamous marriages mainly among the well-to-do" (*Jewish Woman*, 88). Husbands were legally and socially bound to provide for their wives, and few had the means to support more than one (see Hayim Lapin, "Maintenance of Wives and Children in Early Rabbinic and Documentary Texts from Roman Palestine," 177-198 in Hezser, *Rabbinic Law* 2003). The result was that although polygamy persisted at the margins of the east, legal templates assumed or demanded monogamy. The Talmud devotes some attention to co-wives, but it seems to be an academic issue.

¹²¹ For example, Isaac instructs Jacob to marry *a woman*, singular, of Laban's daughters, implying that this is a better course of action than marrying multiple women, as Esau has (Gen. 28). Jacob, the favoured son, seems intent on following his father's advice and only winds up with multiple wives through trickery. Of his two (or four) marriages, the text emphasizes that the intended first marriage, to Rachel, is the happiest (Gen. 29:30-30:24). Rachel's sons are Jacob's least numerous but most loved. It is Rachel, rightfully the first and meant to be the only wife, who connives to steal Laban's household gods (Gen. 31:19, 33-35); Rachel who Jacob keeps beside him (Gen. 33:1-2); and Rachel whose death the text notes (Gen. 35:16-20). Post-patriarchal figures have only one wife at a time, as do most minor figures of repute. Indeed, the only post-patriarchal polygamists, David and Solomon, fall into sin precisely because of their numerous wives. The ideal wife of Prov. 31:10-31 also seems to be a sole wife; indeed, it is difficult enough to find even one such woman (v. 10).

[b]esides her role as a wife and mother in the private sphere of the house, an upper-class woman was known as a *matrona* in relation to the outside world. This term not only indicated her married state and her (potential) motherhood, but was also closely bound up with the traditional female virtues of chastity, modesty, simplicity, frugality, reticence and domesticity.¹²²

This was a publicly proclaimed image, not only one inferred from epigraphy. Literary depictions of citizen wives, however unrealistic in other respects, operate on the assumption of their monandry. Thus David Konstan observes that even in literary genres that relish deviation from sexual norms, married women remain within the confines of expected behaviour. The boldest elegiac poets stop short of explicitly represent their *dominae* as married (i.e., to other men), and however much license the romances take with propriety, what their freeborn heroines want and seek is to marry the desirable citizen youths their parents have chosen for them. That least respectable of literary genres, New Comedy, exhibits the same reticence about impugning matrons' chastity. Konstan notes that although

[its poets], and especially, perhaps, Menander, found ways to represent women as free moral persons, who entered marriage because of love and remained loyal to their husbands in the face of misfortune... the comic tradition [still] enshrined the distinction between citizen women, who were perceived as proper but passive partners in an arranged marriage, and noncitizen women, who were represented as objects of passionate desire... Married women might defend their commitment to their husbands. Under no circumstances, however, are they ever represented as unfaithful in new comedy.¹²³

¹²² Emily Hemelrijk, *Matrona Docta: Educated women in the Roman elite from Cornelia to Julia Domna* (London: Routledge, 1994), 14. On the *sophrosyne* and presumed chastity of matrons, see Helen North, *Sophrosyne: Self-Knowledge and Self-Restraint in Greek Literature* (Ithaca, New York: Cornell U P, 1966), *passim*. and "The Mare, the Vixen, and the Bee: *Sophrosyne* as the Virtue of Women in Antiquity," *Illinois Cl. St.* 2 (1977): 35-48; P.G.M.C. Brown, "Love and Marriage in Greek New Comedy," *Cl. Q.* 43 (1993): 189-205; Douglas Cairns, *Aidōs: The Psychology and Ethics of Honour and Shame in Ancient Greek Literature* (Oxford: Clarendon P, 1993), 306-340; Suzanne Dixon, "Sex and the Married Woman in Ancient Rome," in *Early Christian Families* (ed. Balch and Osiek), 111-139 in Balch & Osiek, *ECFC*; Christos Tsagalis, *Inscribing Sorrow: Fourth-Century Attic Funerary Epigrams* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2008), 144-160.

¹²³ David Konstan, *Sexual Symmetry: Love in the Ancient Novel* (Princeton: Princeton U P, 1994), 148; cf. 144-159. He does note that Greek mime and Roman satire defy these conventions (159-167).

The *matrona* as an icon of chastity is perhaps most apparent in literature that parodies the convention. One of the clearest examples comes from the so-called “Priapus poems,” a collection assembled from scattered verses associated with apotropaic statues of the hyper-endowed protector of agriculture. One of them dating from the first century BCE or CE warns,

Chaste matrons, it’s proper to go away;
it’s unfitting for you to read immodest words.
They don’t care worth a cent; they go right on.
Of course they know, and even matrons
happily look at a big dick.¹²⁴

The protestations of decency are probably ironic; hollow bronze Priapi were standard Roman door knockers. The salient point here is the identification of *matronae* as the parties who should look away. The caution is not addressed to *virgines*, who were supposed to be innocent, or *puellae*, from whom curiosity might be expected (door-knockers aside), nor to generic *feminae* or *mulieres castae*. To be sure, none of these has the same metric quantity as *matrona*, but poetry has surmounted greater obstacles. It is the married citizen woman who serves as the archetype of decency that might be offended.

The trait that these *matrone* were most supposed to embody was *castitas* or σωφροσύνη; the verb σωφρονεῖν, though also commended to men in various contexts “sums up the whole duty of the married woman, including, of course, fidelity to her husband, but much more as well. Ischomachus responds that man and wife must both be *sôphrones* — must, that is, behave in such a way as to preserve and add to their property, when they can do so with justice ([Xenophon, *Oec.*] 7. 14-15).” (North, *Sophrosyne*, 128). Σωφροσύνη, like

¹²⁴ *Matronae procul hinc abite castae*
turpe est vos legere impudica verba.
Non assis faciunt eunque recta
nimirum sapiunt videntque magnam
matronae quoque mentulam libenter (text: Hopper, *Priap.* 8).

castitas, was, as North observes, “the primary virtue of women in Greek inscriptions” and literature, as *castitas* and its synonyms were in Latin literature (e.g., *pudor*, σωφροσύνη).¹²⁵ Unlike *castitas* and *pudor*, σωφροσύνη is commended as much for men as it is for women; it is thus gendered in a different way. However, most other Greek personal virtues are primarily associated with men, so that σωφροσύνη was in some senses a “feminine” virtue. *Pudor*, *castitas*, and female σωφροσύνη were also united in that they depended on monandry. Monandry alone, however, was a foundation without a house built on it. On respectable female sexual exclusivity were based frugality, industrious, orthodox piety, familial devotion, and good social conduct. Thus Phintys holds that

...it is necessary for a woman, while she is being educated, to learn about *sophrosyne*: from what kinds and numbers of things this virtue comes to a woman. I myself say that it comes from five things: first from her devotion and reverence of her marriage bed; secondly from the orderliness of her body; thirdly from the occasions when she goes out from her own house; fourthly from her not participating in secret and Cybeline ritual; fifthly in her being devout and fair in her sacrificing to the divine.... Women of high status must leave the house to make sacrifices to the founding god of the city on behalf of themselves, their husbands, and their whole households. They do not leave the house when it is dark, nor in the evening, for some festival or to buy something for the house, but when the market is running and it is light,

¹²⁵ North, *Sophrosyne*, 252. Thus “it is possible to find in Roman literature, from the second century B.C. to the end of antiquity, repeated attempts to transplant this exotic, and to a remarkable extent, here and there, it took root. The variety of connotations possessed by the word *sophrosyne* enabled the Romans to select those that most nearly corresponded to traditional values among the *mores antiqui* — notably the frugality, self-control, and feminine chastity which ancient observers, both Greek and Roman, were wont to regard as virtues of the early Republic” (259); “The words *castus*, *pudens* (or *pudicus*), *frugi*, and *fidus* described qualities that could be attributed to both men and women; and while the simplicity of the earliest epitaphs gives way to elaborate detail during the imperial age, these *priscae virtutes* continue to be celebrated. Thus the famous conclusion to the epitaph of Claudia, around 135-120 B.C. — *domum servavit, lanam fecit*. (CIL I. 1211) — is echoed in later and longer inscriptions, such as the *Laudatio Murdiae*, which lists among the virtues *modestia*, *probitas*, *pudicitia*, *opsequium*. [sic], *lanificium*, *diligentia*, and *fides*. The epitaphs of women are not unlike those of their Greek counterparts, although the Roman inscriptions show a greater emphasis on domestic skills. As *sophrosyne* is the dominant virtue of women in Greek inscriptions, so *pudicitia* and *castitas* are most often ascribed to women in Roman epitaphs... Nothing points more reliably to the respect for the virtues of restraint and self-control in Roman popular morality than the prominence of *pudens* and *frugi* in such inscriptions” (260-261).

accompanied decorously by one female servant or two at most... The mistress of the house must be *sophrone* and untouched with respect to everything, even when supervising at home.¹²⁶

Monandry comes first and Phintys emphasizes that it is the most important, but it is far from the only component of σωφροσύνη or *castitas*. Rather, σωφροσύνη and *castitas* refer to a suite of virtues whose most important, but not only or majority component is monandry. Few authors articulate this in as much detail as Phintys, but the idea is expansive, as encomia to ideal wives suggest.¹²⁷ Such encomia might be literary or, more briefly but also more plentifully, epigraphic; they “attest to the qualities felt most important in a married woman: *pudicitia* (modesty, particularly in regard to female sexual behavior), *castitas*... marriage to one man, and industriousness in household duties, exemplified by the quintessentially feminine task of wool-working.”¹²⁸

Matrons’ *pudicitia* might have been drawn into question by their reaction to priapic statues, but its putative existence was reinforced by characteristic clothing and, in Rome, hairstyles that set them apart from the crowd (see chs. 2-4). Lloyd Llewelyn-Jones argues on the basis of visual and literary evidence that veils that did not entirely cover the hair and

¹²⁶ Phintys, “On the Chastity of Women” 152.18-154.6, ad. I.M. Plant 85-86; διὸ δεῖ περὶ σωφροσύνας παιδευομένην γνωρίζεν ἐκ πόσων τινῶν καὶ ποίων τοῦτο τάγαθόν τῃ γυναικὶ παραγίνεται. φαμὶ δὴ ἐκ πέντε τούτων· πρῶτον μὲν ἐκ τῆς περὶ τὰν εὐνὴν ὁσιότητός τε καὶ εὐσεβείας; δεύτερον δὲ ἐκ τῷ κόσμῳ τῷ περὶ τὸ σῶμα· τρίτον δ’ ἐκ τῶν ἐξόδων τῶν ἐκ τῆς ἰδίας οἰκίας; τέταρτον δ’ ἐκ τῷ μὴ χρέεσθαι τοῖς ὀργιασμοῖς καὶ ματρῶασμοῖς; πέμπτον δ’ ἐν τῇ θυσίᾳ τῇ πρὸς τὸ θεῖον εὐλαβέᾳ ἡμεν καὶ μετρίαν... τὰς δὲ ἐξόδους ἐκ τῆς οἰκίας ποιεῖσθαι τὰς γυναῖκας τὰς δαμοτελέας θυηπολούςας τῷ ἀρχαγέτῃ θεῷ τὰς πόλιος ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν καὶ τῷ ἀνδρὶ καὶ τῷ παντὸς οἴκῳ; ἔπειτα μὴτε ὀρφνας ἀνισταμένας μὴτε ἐσπέρας ἀλλὰ πλαθυούσας ἀγορᾶς καταφανέας γινομένην τὴν ἐξοδὸν ποιεῖσθαι θεωρίας ἐνεκά τινος ἢ ἀγορασμῶ οἰκῇ μετὰ θεραπαίνας μιᾶς ἢ κατὰ πλεῖστον δύο εὐκόσμως χειραγωγουμένην... τὰν δ’ οἰκοδεσποιναν καὶ προκαθεζομένην οἴκῳ δεῖ σῶφρονα καὶ ἀνέπαφον ποτὶ πάντα ἡμεν.

¹²⁷ e.g., Prov. 31; Ovid, *Tristia* 1.6, 4.3, 5.5, 5.14; Seneca Maior, *Ad Helviam* 16, 19; Plutarch’s *Valour of Women*; Pliny Minor, *Ep.* 3.16, 4.19, 7.19. See also Elizabeth Forbis, “Women’s Public Image in Italian Honorary Inscriptions,” *Am. J. Philol.* 111 (1990): 493-512; Voula Lambropoulou, “Some Pythagorean female virtues,” in *Assessments* (ed. Hawley and Levick), 131-134; Werner Reiss, “*Rari exempli femina*: Female Virtues on Roman Funerary Inscriptions,” in *CWAW* (ed. James and Dillon), 291-301.

¹²⁸ Judith Evans-Grubbs, “*Pagan*” and “*Christian*” Marriage: *The State of the Question*. (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins U P, 1995), 56-57.

neck were a common element of this dress. Although married citizen women do not seem to have worn them on all public occasions, they were considered proper to matrons but not to young girls or to slaves (which does not mean that they were not worn by them). While Athenians of both sexes and many ages and classes habitually wore the *himation* cloak, literary sources suggest that some types were considered appropriate for married citizen women and others inappropriate, albeit the difference is not visible archaeologically. Roman statuary makes the special garment of the matron, the *stola*, much easier to reconstruct, although her distinctive headband remains mysterious. The *stola* was so closely linked with the inviolate person of the *matrona* that, as Emily Hemelrijk (1999: 15) observes, it could be used as a synecdoche: *stola* = *stola*-wearer = *matrona*. Valerius Maximus claims that in the good old days when the *mores maiorum* prevailed, “in order that a matron’s honour might be the safer with the protection that respect accords, they did not allow a page summoning her to court to touch her. For the *stola* of a matron should remain inviolate from an alien hand.”¹²⁹ This may not record history accurately, but it does illustrate the connection between *stola* and inviolate matron that existed in Roman culture.

If decent free women — matrons, matrons-to-be, and widowed matrons — were expected to be chaste to the point that their clothes proclaimed their chastity, no parallel expectation existed for men. Men were permitted or even expected to be sexually active

¹²⁹ See Hemelrijk, *Matrona Docta*, 14-15; Valerius Maximus, *Fac. ac Dic.* 2.1.5a, ad. D.R. Shackleton Bailey 131 (*Sed quo matronale decus verecundiae munimento tutius esset in ius vocanti matronam corpus eius attingere non permiserunt ut inviolata manus alienae tactu stola relinqueretur*). See also Judith Lynn Sebesta, “Symbolism in the Costume of the Roman Woman,” in *The World of Roman Costume* (ed. Sebesta and Larissa Bonfante; Madison: U Wisconsin P, 2001), 46-53; Douglas Cairns, “The meaning of the veil in ancient Greek culture,” in *Women’s Dress in the Ancient Greek World* (ed. Lloyd Llewellyn-Jones and Sue Blundell; London: Duckworth, 2002), 73-94; Daniel Ogden’s “Controlling Women’s Dress,” in the same volume, 203-225; Llewellyn-Jones, *Aphrodite’s Tortoise: The Veiled Woman of Ancient Greece* (Cardiff: Cl. P Wales, 2003), *passim*; Mary Harlow, “Dressing to Please Themselves,” in *Dress and Identity* (ed. Harlow; Oxford: Archaeopress, 2012), 37-45; Mireille Lee, “Maternity and Miasma,” in Lauren Petersen and Patricia Salzman-Mitchell, *Mothering and Motherhood in Ancient Greece and Rome* (Austin: U Texas P, 2012), 23-42.

before, outside, and after marriage, and different kinds of women were suitable for the heterosexual iterations of each. A citizen girl or woman was by nature honourable and was therefore an acceptable sexual partner only for her husband. If a man wanted sex with a woman other than his wife, he had to look outside this demographic. As Pseudo-Demosthenes famously put it,

“Living with a woman” means, after all, that a man has children with her and introduces his sons to the phratry and deme, and he gives his daughters away to be married, presenting them as his own. We have *betairai* for the sake of pleasure, concubines for meeting our bodily needs day-by-day, but wives for having legitimate children and to be trustworthy guardians of our household.¹³⁰

The orator does not need to specify that courtesans were honourless, concubines less honoured, and wives honourable as long as their chastity was assured. These were prevailing assumptions; husbands were to be reasonably discreet, wives generally tolerant. The goddesses of marriage are paradigmatic: Hera and Juno are absolutely faithful to Zeus and Jupiter respectively, to the point that when Hera wants a child but is angry at Zeus she resorts to parthenogenesis without considering adultery. Zeus has no other wife concurrently with Hera and Jupiter has no wife other than Juno, but both of them have a series of lovers they try to conceal in order to avoid angering their wives. But when Hera and Juno inevitably discover the affairs, they blame their husbands' lovers, not their husbands themselves. Real wives could react differently, sometimes to the dismay of men, as in an epigram of Martial: “You set spies on your husband while you lead a free life./ That’s taking, dear Polla, a husband to wife.”¹³¹ Occasional dissenters such as Musonius Rufus

¹³⁰ *Against Neaira* 122, ad. V. Bers 191; τὸ γὰρ συνοικεῖν τοῦτ’ ἔστιν ὃς ἂν παιδοποιῇται καὶ εἰσάγῃ εἰς τε τοὺς φράτερας καὶ δημότας τοὺς υἱεῖς καὶ τὰς θυγατέρας ἐκδιδῶ ὥς αὐτοῦ οὕσας τοῖς ἀνδράσιν. τὰς μὲν γὰρ ἐταίρας ἡδονῆς ἕνεκ’ ἔχομεν τὰς δὲ παλλακὰς τῆς καθ’ ἡμέραν θεραπείας τοῦ σώματος τὰς δὲ γυναῖκας τοῦ παιδοποιεῖσθαι γνησίως καὶ τῶν ἔνδον θύλακα πιστὴν ἔχειν.

¹³¹ Martial, *Ep.* 10.69, ad. Sullivan and Whigham 389.

make sustained arguments for husbands as well as wives to confine their sexual activity to marriage, but most authors urge simply moderation and reasonable discretion on the part of husbands, to be reciprocated by forbearance from their wives.¹³² Sexual jealousy is not the only cause of the anger that wives are counseled to avoid. Criticisms of male philandering, whether in philosophical texts, dramas, or epics, also focus on wives' concern that straying husbands will disgrace the family's reputation and waste the family's social and economic capital on his mistress and bastards, to the harm of his wife and heirs.

HOME ECONOMICS

These economic aspects of marriage and the legitimacy that it entails receive frank acknowledgement in ancient sources, in contrast to the post-Victorian idea that marriage is “not supposed” to be about money. The norm of marriage involved financially significant transfers of property, although documents attest that the reality could be different for poor couples. Legal literature of all kinds, however, attests that dowry was part and parcel of marriage, and that a woman's kinsmen had an obligation to provide her with one commensurate with their family's economic circumstances.¹³³ The dowries of the richest brides could include hundreds of thousands of sesterces in cash or the equivalent value in

¹³² See, e.g. Theano, *Ep. Nicostrate*; Perictone, *On the Harmony of Women*; Plutarch, *Praec. Conj.* 16, 44.

¹³³ On ANE and biblical-era dowries, see Stephanie Dalley, “Old Babylonian Dowries,” *Iraq* 42 (1980): 53-74; Jonathan Paradise, “A Daughter and Her Father's Property at Nuzi,” *J Cuneiform St.* 32 (1980), 189-207; Lemos, *Marriage Gifts*, 20-61. For early Jewish and rabbinic dowries, see Lapin, “Maintenance of Wives and Children;” Gail Labovitz, *Marriage and Metaphor: Constructions of Gender in Rabbinic Literature* (Lanham, Maryland: Lexington, Rowman & Littlefield, 2009), 202-234; Lemos, *Marriage Gifts*, 62-80. On Greek dowries, see David Schaps, *Economic Rights of Women in Ancient Greece* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh U P, 1979), 74-88; Cox, *Household Interests, passim*; Vêrilhac and Vial, *Marriage grec*, 155f.; Joseph Roisman, *The Rhetoric of Manhood: Masculinity in the Attic Orators* (Berkeley: U California P, 2005) 26-32; ; Beate Wagner-Hasel, “Marriage Gifts in Ancient Greece,” in *The Gift in Antiquity* (ed. Michael Satlow; New York: John Wiley & Sons, 2013), 158-172. On Roman dowries: Suzanne Dixon, “Polybius on Roman Women and Property,” *Am. J. Philol.* 106 (1985): 147-170; Saller, *Patriarchy, Property, and Death*, 204-224.

precious metals and entire rural estates. Clothing and jewelry were also important components of many dowries, including the richest ones. The wealthiest bestowers and recipients scrupulously recorded items of apparel, even when they were of little value compared to the rest of the property transferred. For example, in 66 CE, for example, a Persian groom received 100 silver drachmas and about seven and a quarter acres (or three hectares) of land along with fifteen different articles of clothing and jewelry and some durable goods.¹³⁴ In 127 CE, Sarapion son of Serapion

[gave] in marriage his daughter Thais... to Sarapion son of Eudaemon... who has received from Sarapion, the father and giver of the bride, a pair of... weighing three minae 14.5 quarters, a brooch of eight quarters, a... of 6 quarters, a chain with three green... of stone, the gold weighing 0.5 quarters, making altogether on the standard of Oxyrhynchus 5 minae... quarters, also two dresses, 2 girdles, one red the other rose-coloured, a... and a mantle, together worth 560 silver drachmae, and 1860 silver drachmae, the total value of the whole dowry being 4100 drachmae of silver of the Imperial coinage... ¹³⁵

The *phrene*, a postnuptial gift of feminine accoutrements to the bride from her parents, could also be valuable in its own right. One from 157/58 CE associated with a dowry that

¹³⁴ *P. Ryl.* 154, "...a hundred drachmae of coined silver and as *parapherna* a pair of gold earrings weighing four quarters, a gold crescent of three quarters, two gold rings of two quarters, a pair of silver armlets weighing forty-four drachmae of uncoined metal, two bracelets weighing sixteen drachmae of uncoined metal; clothing consisting of two robes, one white and one narcissus, and five mantles; copper vessels and a basin, weighing in all four minae, two copper [*lacuna*] unweighed, and five minae of tin... [and] ten and three-quarters arurae [of land] owned by Sisois [the bride's father]... (ad. Hunt and Edgar 13; ... ἀργυρίου ἐπισήμου δραχμὰς ἑκατὸν καὶ παραφέρνων ἐνωτίων χρυσῶν ζεύγος τεταρτῶν τεσσάρων καὶ μηνίσκον χρυσῶν τεταρτῶν τριῶν καὶ δακτύλια χρυσᾶ δύο τεταρτῶν δύο καὶ ψελίων ἀργυρῶν ζεύγος ὀλκῆς ἀσήμου δραχμῶν τεσσαράκοντα τεσσάρων καὶ κλάλια δύο ὀλκῆς ἀσήμου δραχμῶν δεκάξ καὶ ἱματίων στολᾶς δύο λευκῇ μία ναρκισσίνη μία καὶ πάλλια πέντε καὶ χαλκῶματα καὶ ἐκλουτρίδιον ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ μνῶν τεσσάρων καὶ ἀνευ σταθμοῦ ἐδρυσ... χαλκαὶ δύο καὶ κασιτέρου μναὶ πέντε... ὑπάρχοντα αὐτῷ Σισοίτι περὶ Βακχιάδα κλήρον κατοικικὸν ἀρουρῶν δέκα ἡμίους τετάρτου...).

¹³⁵ *P. Oxy.* 496, ad. Grenfell and Hunt 210-211; ... πόλεως τὴν ἑαυτοῦ θυγατέρα Θαΐδα... Σαραπίωνι Εὐδαίμονος... ἀπεχεῖ δε ὁ γαμῶν παρὰ Σαραπίωνος τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ ἐκδότου... τιῶν ζεύγος μναιαίων τριῶν καὶ τετάρτων δέκα τεσσάρων ἡμίους περνείδιον τετάρτων ὀκτώ... τετάρτων ἐξ ἀλυσείδιον ἔχον χλωροῦς χ... τοῦ λίθου τοῦ χρυσίου ἄγοντος τετάρτα... ἡμισὺ ὡς εἶναι ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ χρυσίου σταθμῷ Ὁ ξυρυγγεῖτη μναιαία πέντε καὶ τετάρτα καὶ ἱματίων συνθέσεις δύο ζώνας δύο σανδουκίνη ῥοδίνην ... αἰον πάλλιο Υ Πεννσφλανιάντα δε ἐν συντιμήσει ἀργυρίου δραχμῶν πεντακοσίων ἐξήκοντα καὶ ἀργυρίου δραχμῶν χιλίας ὀκτακοσίας ἐξήκοντα ὡς εἶναι ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ τὴν ὅλην φερνὴν [ἀργυρίου] Σεβαστοῦ νομίματος δραχμῶν τετρακισχιλίας ἑκατόν καὶ ἡ [τῆς] γαμουμένης μάμμη... δίδωσι τῇ αὐτῇ Θαΐδι... Καλλιτύχης καὶ τῶν ἐσομένων ἐξ αὐτῆς ἐγόνων...

contains an estate clause was probably worth at least 2000 drachmas in its own right,¹³⁶ and another from 260 CE is worth a respectable 620 drachmas.¹³⁷ The modest dowries that non-wealthy women offered on their own behalf tended to consist primarily of clothes and jewelry, the amounts and types of which varied according to the widow's degree of non-

¹³⁶ *P. Oxy.* 3491, “the bridegroom has received at the time of their marriage, first, from the [bride’s] father Heracleides as dowry, one talent of money and an armlet and a [*lacuna*], both of gold, of two mnaeia by the Oxyrhynchite standard, valued at six hundred drachmas, and clothing valued at three hundred drachmas... and second, from the [bride’s] mother Dionysia as paraphernalia [*sic*], a pair of golden earrings of one quarter of a mnaieion, a dyed cloak, fifteen minas by weight of wrought tin, a statuette of Aphrodite, a jar, an inlaid(?) mirror of two leaves, chair(s?) [*lacuna*], a wooden unguent-box, [*lacuna*], women’s chair’s... (ad. Bülow-Jacobsen et al. 195; ὁ γαμῶν ἄμα τῇ συνελεύσει παρὰ μὲν τοῦ πατρὸς Ἡρακλείδου ἐν φερνῇ ἀργυρίου τάλαντον α καὶ χεροψέλιον καὶ... ἀμφοτέρω χρυσοῦ σταθμῷ Ὀξυρυγχίτῃ μναϊαίων β ἐν συντειμήσει δραχμῶν χ καὶ ἱμάτια ἐν συντειμήσει δραχμῶν τ γείνονται ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ τῆς φερνῆς τάλαντον α καὶ δραχμαί... παρὰ δὲ τῆς μητρὸς Διονυσίας ἐν παραφέρνοις ἐνωτίων χρυσῶν ζεύγος τετάρτης... καὶ πάλλιον χρωμάτινον κασσιτέρου ἐνεργοῦ ὀλκῆς μνάς ιε ζώδιον Ἀφροδίτης στάμνον κάτοπτρον δίπτυχον κασιωτικόν... μυροθήκην ξυλίνην... δίφρονος γυναικείους...).

¹³⁷ *P. Oxy.* 1273; the *phrene* was “in common gold on the Oxyrhynchite standard a necklace of the kind called *maniaces*, having a stone and weighing apart from the stone thirteen quarters, a brooch(?) with five stones set in gold, weighing apart from the stones four quarters, a pair of earrings with ten pearls weighing apart from the pearls three quarters, a small ring weighing one-half quarter, and in clothing at a valuation a silvery striped Dalmatian veil worth 260 drachmae, a white, single, tasselled, striped frock worth 160 drachmae, a turquoise-coloured Dalmatian veil worth 100 drachmae, another white Dalmatian veil with a purple border worth 100 drachmae, making the total of the whole dowry one mina four and one-half quarters of common gold, and for the valuation of the clothing 620 drachmae” (ad. Grenfell and Hunt 209; ἐν φερνῇ χρυσοῦ κοινοῦ σταθμῷ Ὀξυρυγχιτικῷ περιτπαχήλιον μανιάκην καλούμενον ἔχον λίθον ὀλκῆς χωρὶς τοῦ λίθου τετάρτων δεκατριῶν ἀπτώδιον ἔχον λίθους πέντε περικεχρυσωμένους ὀλκῆς χωρὶς τῶν λίθων τετάρτων πεσσάρων ἐνωτίων ζεύγος ἔχον πείνας δέκα ὀλκῆς χωρὶς τῶν πεινῶν τετάρτων τριῶν δακτυλίδιον μικρὸν τετάρταις ἡμισυ καὶ ἐν ἱματίοις ἐν συντειμήσει δελματικομαφόρτην ἀργέντινον ἔνσημον δραχμῶν διακοσίων ἐξήκοντα χιτῶνιον λευκὸν μοναχὸν κροσσωτὸν ἔνσημον δραχμῶν ἑκατὸν ἐξήκοντα δελματικομαφόρτην καλλαίνον δραχμῶν ἑκατὸν ἕτερον δελματικομαφόρτην λευκὸν προπόρφυρος δραχμῶν ἑκατὸν ὥς εἶναι ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ τὴν ὅλην φερνὴν χρυσοῦ κοινοῦ μναγιαίων ἐν τετάρτας τέσσαρας ἡμισυ καὶ συντειμήσεως ἱματίων δραχμὰς ἑξακοσίας εἰκοσι).

wealth.¹³⁸ Some were comprised of such articles alone rather than their cash value, as in a 143 CE contract between Greeks in Egypt where the groom acknowledges that “he has received from Chaeremonis a dowry upon herself of forty silver drachmae and twenty drachmae of a white chiton. And they will live together with each other, Pasion supplying her with all that is necessary and with clothing as befits a married woman in proportion to his means.”¹³⁹ His means are likely to have been small if he settled for this dowry, but it still secures the parties’ agree that they must specifically supply clothing deemed appropriate for a certain social status, i.e., a respectable and free one.

None of this means that money and status were the only important factors in arranging a marriage, or that marriage itself was based on oppression or misogyny. The margins of NT-era elite literature and the content of contemporaneous legal documents from across the socio-economic and geographical spectra indicate that wives often maintained their own economic affairs, managed businesses, engaged in trades, pursued

¹³⁸ For example, an Alexandrian contract of 13 BCE records the groom’s acknowledging “[receiving from the bride] Thermion by hand from the house a dowry of a pair of gold earrings weighing three quarters and [lacuna] silver drachmae” (*BGU* 1052, ad. Hunt and Edgar 11; ὁ δὲ αὐτὸς Ἀπολλώνιος Πτολεμαίου εἰληφέναι παρὰ τῆς Θερμίου διὰ χιρὸς ἐξ οἴκου φερνάριον ἐνωτίων χρυσῶν ζεύγος τεταρτῶν τριῶν καὶ ἀργυρίου δραχμᾶς). In 36 CE, an ethnic Persian groom named Tryphon acknowledged that his bride-to-be Saraeus had given him “forty silver drachmae of the Imperial and Ptolemaic coinage, and for the value of one pair of gold earrings, twenty drachmae of silver, and for a milk-white robe, twelve drachmae of silver, making a total sum of seventy-two drachmae of silver... in consideration of which I have consented [to our marriage]” (*P. Oxy.* 267, ad. Grenfell and Hunt 247; Σεβαστοῦ καὶ Πτολεμαικοῦ νομίσματος δραχμᾶς δέκα δύο ὥστ’ εἶναι ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ ἀργυρίου δραχμᾶς ἐβδομήκοντα δύο ἀποδώσω σοι τῇ τριακάδι τοῦ Φαῶφι τοῦ ἰσιόντος δευτέρου... χωρὶς πάσης ὑπερθέσεως...). In the second century CE, a somewhat better off thirty-nine-year-old Roman divorcée with two living sons records that “she has promised and has given to [her new husband] as her dowry clothing by valuation and cash in counted coin [eight hundred and] two drachmas” (*P. Mich.* 4703, ad. Sanders 62; *deditque in aestimio vestis et in numerato praesens oct[...].as duas dracmas quam dotem.*).

¹³⁹ *P. Mich.* 6551 ad. P.J. Sijpesteijn (1979) 121; ...αὐτὸν παρὰ τῆς Χαίρημον[ιδος] [φερ]νὴν [ἐφ’] ἑαυτῇ ἄργ(υρίου) (δραχμᾶς) τεσσαράκοντα [καὶ] κιτῶνος λευκοῦ δραχμᾶς εἴκοσι· κ[αὶ] [συμ]βιώσουσι ἀλλήλοις τοῦ πασίωνος ἐπιχορη[γο]ύντος αὐτῇ τὰ δέοντα πάντα κα [ὶ] τὸν ἴμα[τισ]μὸν ὡς ἐπὶ [γ]υναικὶ γαμε[τ]ῇ κατὰ δύναμιν τοῦ β[ι]ίου.

claims, and exercised contract rights independently of their husbands.¹⁴⁰ Matrons also had their own crucial roles in public religious observances, and a city's well-being depended in part on their fulfilling their ritual duties to maintain a harmonious relationship with the gods.¹⁴¹ All of this consistently goes unremarked; it seems to have been part of the fabric of ancient society. So too was desire for partnership and mutual affection in marriage that are evident in the earliest texts and throughout the centuries. Cynthia Patterson argues that the “[ideal of marriage as] a partnership of body, soul and property, and a union of two ‘like-minded’ people, would seem to be as old as the *Odyssey*... By the time of Xenophon and Aristotle, that might even be said to be a commonplace — re-enunciated once again [*sic*] by later Stoic moralists.” (1992: 4713). It was likewise the case in Rome that “from the late Republic on, it is possible to discern a sentimental ideal of family life [that included] affection within marriage and the appreciation of young and youthful children... literature, art (especially funerary art), and inscriptions show that the *ideal* of the affectionate, welcoming family unit” was pervasive.¹⁴²

“DOMISEDALANAM FECIT”

The description of a wife beloved for her virtue and that of a wife who brings prosperity are united in emphasizing her role in textile productions. The importance of

¹⁴⁰ e.g., Cotton, “Women and the Law;” Shulamit Valler, “Business Women in the Mishnaic and Talmudic period,” *Wif* 2 (2001) [n.p.]; Lemos, *Marriage Gifts*, 62-80.

¹⁴¹ See Ross Kraemer, *Her Share of the Blessings* (New York: Oxford U P, 1992,) 50-70; Goff, *Citizen Bacchae*, 160-370; Rebecca Flemming, “Festus and the Role of Women in Roman Religion,” *Bul. Inst. Cl. St.* 50 (2007): 87-108.

¹⁴² Suzanne Dixon, “The Sentimental Ideal of the Roman Family,” in *Marriage, Divorce, and Children in Ancient Rome* (ed. Beryl Rawson; Canberra: Humanities Res. Ctr., 1991), 99, citing Martial, *Ep.* 10.63; Plutarch, *Eroticus* 6f. (*Moralia* 752f.); Valerius Maximus, *Fac. ad Dic.* 2.6; See also Foucault, *History of Sexuality*, vol. 3, 72-80, 160-185; Susan Treggiari, *Roman Marriages* (Oxford: Clarendon P, 1991), 104-108; Satlow, *Jewish Marriage*, 237-243.

textiles in dowries (see above) reflects their practical and symbolic importance accords economically with their scarcity, value, and production patterns. The prominence of clothes deemed suitable for wives and of women's jewelry, however, also accords with the associations that we have seen clothes could carry, distinguished as they did married free and/or citizen women from all other women. The reality of these two facts generated its own economy of metaphor, one in which

...the spindle is considered a particularly apt symbol of femininity... it reappears in biblical and rabbinic literature: when female work is described, it is often woolwork... Also in Greek and Roman literary and iconographic remnants, women are often described and depicted with spindles. A woman with a spindle was a metaphor for a good, productive and chaste woman and wife. In Roman-period Judaism, the ancient Israelite icon of the spindle has met the Greek and Roman metaphors of woolwork. and it has further developed into a specific Roman-period *Jewish* icon (Teugels 135-6).¹⁴³

Penelope, the archetypal good wife, occupies herself entirely with weaving and in fact uses it as a stratagem to preserve her chastity. Similarly, as Lena Larsson Lovén observes of Livy, "The story of Lucretia is certainly not about spinning, but the spinning of wool... is an essential element in demonstrating her industriousness and her pure character. The same associations are... evoked by epitaphs where women are described as *lanifica* or by *lanam fecit*, and by images in funerary art where women are presented with implements of spinning."¹⁴⁴ The image of faithful Lucretia weaving into the night might resonate with that of the capable wife of Proverbs 31:10. The first specific action attributed to her is that "she seeks wool and flax and sets her hands to work with pleasure" (v. 13) She also "sends her

¹⁴³ See Lieve Teugels, "Unraveling the Rabbis' Web: A Response to Miriam Peskowitz," in *Families and Family Relations as Represented in Early Judaism and Early Christianity* (ed. J.W. van Henten and Athalya Brenner; Leiden: Deo, 2000), 135-142, and in the same volume Peskowitz, "Domesticity and the Spindle." See also Daniela Cottica, "Spinning in the Roman World: From Everyday Craft to Metaphor of Destiny," in *Ancient Textiles: Production, Craft and Society* (ed. Carole Gillis and Marie-Louise Nosch; Oxford: Oxbow, 2007), 220-228, and in the same volume Lena Larsson Lovén, "Wool Work as a Gender Symbol in Ancient Rome," 229-236. Eve D'Ambra, "The Cult of Virtues and the Funerary Relief of Ulpia Epigone," *Latomus* 48 (1989): 392-400, is a useful case study.

¹⁴⁴ Lovén, "Wool Work," 234.

hands to the distaff and her hands to hold the spindle” (v. 19). Her industry produces a surplus that contributes to the household income when “she makes luxury cloth and sells it; she supplies the Canaanites [i.e., merchants]” (v. 24) and her success manifests simultaneously her bodily modesty and her economic success: “She makes herself coverings, her clothing is purple linen” (v. 22) This is her physical clothing, of course; in conventional language (v. 25) that resonates in Revelation, “strength and honour are her clothing,” hence Queen Mother Lemuel’s exhortation: “Give to her from the fruit of her hands and let her shine before the gate for her deeds” (v. 31). This woman would seem a familiar figure for the New Jerusalem.

Classical literature praises wifely wool-working extensively. It was recounted, for example, that “Theano, the wife of Pythagoras, when asked how she would be held in high honour, said, ‘By plying my loom and resisting my bed.’”¹⁴⁵ Xenophon of Athens has Ischomachus exhort his wife, “Don’t sit about all the time like a slave, but by the gods, try to behave like a mistress: stand before the loom and be ready to instruct those who know less than you, and learn from those who know more.”¹⁴⁶ Managing the weaving, in his view, distinguishes the free wife’s role and character from those of the lazy female slave (see ch. 3). In the *Memorabilia*, he has Socrates advise that free women should employ the spinning and weaving skills they learned in childhood rather than be idle: “To be sure, if they were going to do something disgraceful [to earn a living], death would be a better fate. But in point of fact the work they [already] understand is... the work

¹⁴⁵ Theano, *Apophthegms* 3, tr. I.M. Plant, *Women Writers*, 70.

¹⁴⁶ Xenophon, *Oec.* 9.14-15, ad. E.C. Marchant (1923) 443; συνεβούλευον αὐτῇ μὴ δουλικῶς ἀεὶ καθῆσθαι ἀλλὰ σὺν τοῖς θεοῖς πειρᾶσθαι δεσποτικῶς πρὸς μὲν τὸν ἴστον προστάσαν ὅτι μὲν βέλτιον ἄλλου ἐπίσταιτο ἐπιδιδάξαι.

considered the most honourable and the most suitable for a woman; and the work that is understood is always done with greatest ease, speed, pride and pleasure.”¹⁴⁷ Livy purports to recount a famous incident in which, while “the daughters-in-law of the king... [were holding] a luxurious banquet, whiling away the time with their young friends, Lucretia, though it was late at night, was busily engaged upon her wool, while her maidens toiled about her in the lamplight as she sat in the hall of her house. The prize of this contest in womanly virtues fell to Lucretia.”¹⁴⁸ Musonius Rufus anticipates and refutes the argument “that women who associate with philosophers are bound to be arrogant for the most part and presumptuous, in that abandoning their own households and turning to the company of men they practice speeches... when they ought to be sitting at home spinning.”¹⁴⁹ Ovid recounts that an exceptionally skilled weaver expressed her *hubris* by boasting that her work was better than that of Minerva, who like Athena was charged with weaving.¹⁵⁰ The Talmud recounts that “R. Yose came upon Elijah. He said to him, ‘It is written, “I will make him a help” — how does a woman help a man?’ [Elijah] said to him, ‘If a man brings home wheat, does he chew it? If he brings home flax, does he wear

¹⁴⁷ *Mem.* 2.7.9-10, ad. E.C. Marchant 153, 155; εἰ μὲν τοίνυν αἰσχρὸν τι ἔμελλον ἐργάσεσθαι θάνατον ἄντ’ αὐτοῦ προαιρετέον ἦν· νῦν δὲ ἃ μὲν δοκεῖ κάλλιστα καὶ πρεπωδέστατα γυναιξὶν εἶναι ἐπίστανται ὥς ἔοικε. πάντες δὲ ἃ ἐπίστανται ῥᾶστα τε καὶ τάχιστα καὶ κάλλιστα καὶ ἥδιστα ἐργάζονται.

¹⁴⁸ *His. Rom.* 1.57.9, ad. B. Foster 199; *ubi Lucretiam haudquaquam ut regias nurus quas in convivio luxuque cum aequalibus viderant tempus terentes sed nocte sera deditam lanae inter lucubrantes ancillas in medio aedium sedentem inveniunt. Muliebris certaminis laus penes Lucretiam fuit.*

¹⁴⁹ Musonius Rufus 3.54-8, tr. Lutz 43 (ὅτι αὐθάδεις ὥς ἐπὶ πολὺ καὶ θρασεΐας εἶναι ἀνάγκη τὰς προσιούσας τοῖς φιλοσόφοις γυναῖκας ὅταν ἀφήμεναι τοῦ οἴκουρεῖν ἐν μέσοις ἀναστρέφονται τοῖς ἀνδράσι καὶ μελετῶσι λόγους... δεόν οἶκοι καθημέναις ταλασιουργεῖν). See E. Hemelrijk (1999) 60-64.

¹⁵⁰ Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 6.1-145. This is a typical Ovidian tale of a genuinely extraordinary human become excessively proud and receive punishment accordingly. The most similar example is the story that immediately follows Ariadne’s, Niobe’s (6.146-312). Vergil alludes to the same story (*aut dirum tiniae genus aut invisa Minervae & laxos in foribus suspendit aranea casset*, *Geor.* 4.246-7), as does Pliny Maior (*Aegyptii textilia, inficere lanas Sardibus Lydi, fusos in lanificio Closter filius Arachnae, linum et retia Arachne, fulloniam artem Nicias Megarensis, sutrinam Tychius Boeotius*, *His. Nat.* 7.196). Aelian also seems familiar with this story but rejects its validity, observing that spiders do not need clothes (*Var. His.* 1.2).

flax? Doesn't she bring light to his eyes and set him on his feet?" (*B. Yeb.* 6.3.16, ad. Neusner).

Here again the literary record coincides with the archaeological ones. Latin funerary inscriptions conventionally use textile production as an emblem of a good wife. In the *laudatio Turiae*, one of the most famous examples, the late Turia's husband praises her "domestic virtues: You were chaste, obedient, amiable, wool-working, devout without being superstitious, well put together without drawing attention to yourself by it" (*domestica bona pudicitiae opsequi comitatis facilitatis lanificii studii religionis sine superstitione ornatus non conspiciendi cultus modici*).¹⁵¹ One Claudia, who died in Rome, around the 120s BCE, "loved her husband with all her heart... She was charming in her words, and also decorous in bearing. She kept house, she worked wool. I have spoken. Go."¹⁵² Wiedemann and Gardner also note the epitaph of "Marcus' excellent and most beautiful wife Amymone, [who was] wool-working, *pious*, modest, frugal, chaste, and house-settled" (*Hic sita est Amymone Marci optima et pulcherrima lanifica pia pudica frugi casta domiseda*)¹⁵³ among the scores of surviving inscriptions that praise wives in these terms. These are of a piece with visual evidence; as Daniela Cottica observes, "In Roman funerary contexts the expression *lanam fecit* may occur explicitly in the form of an inscription carrying the message or implicitly [through] the representation of spinning tools on funerary monuments [and/or by i]ncluding one or more spinning tools among [the grave goods]" (222). While the verbal phrase and its cognates are confined to Latin

¹⁵¹ *Laud. Tur.* 1.30-1, ad. Thomas Wiedemann and Jane F. Gardner, *The Roman Household* (London: Routledge, 1991), 50.

¹⁵² *CIL* 1211.4-8, ad. E.H. Warmington, *Remains*, 12 (*Suom mareitom corde deilexit souo... Sermone lepidio tum autem. incessu commodo. Domum servavit lanam fecit. Dixi. Abei.*)

¹⁵³ *ILS* 8402 = *CIL* VI, 11602 (Rome).

contexts, she continues, in the eastern empire iconographies of the “distaff, spindle and *calathos* [wool basket] are firmly attested on numerous tombstones in Anatolia (from the late Hellenistic period to the 3rd century AD), the Aegean region and Syria... Numerous tombstones [from Roman Palmyra] depict the deceased woman with [markers of wealth and holding] in her hand one or more objects of clear symbolic value: a child, a key, a spindle and distaff” (ibid, 223-24; cf. Lovén 234-5).

“WHO CAN FIND ONE?”

But a good woman was hard to find, as Queen Mother Lemuel laments. In addition to moral virtue and domestic skill, beauty and wealth were desirable traits for a bride in any setting.¹⁵⁴ Young men embarking on the journey of marriage were not left to their own devices to look for them; neither, frequently, were older widowers and divorcés. Even the most industrious of matrons would combine their spinning and weaving (both potentially social activities; see ch. 3) with marriage arranging. Men were also involved, but an informed reading of the texts suggests that much of the work was women’s. Susan Treggiari, among others, could be speaking of many societies and eras in observing of Rome that, while

¹⁵⁴ For example, Proverbs 31’s collection of ideal traits idealized probably is not unique to Israelite culture in this period. Victor Hurowitz, comparing it to a Mesopotamian marriage inquiry text, observes that “...what a Mesopotamian man looks for in a wife resembles the qualities recommended [in Prov. 31]. The favorable Mesopotamian woman and the [Woman of Valor] share many of the same blessings in life and offer them to their potential husbands.... Although they share some themes and purposes, there is certainly no genetic relationship between [them]” (Hurowitz, “The Woman of Valor and A Woman Large of Head: Matchmaking in the ANE,” in *Seeking Out the Wisdom of the Ancients* [ed. R.L. Troxel et al.; Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 2005], 229-230). Similarly, rabbinic texts describe an ideal wife not unlike the one found in contemporaneous non-Jewish literature: beautiful, chaste, discreet, and well spoken. See Satlow, *Jewish marriage*, 226-233, 257-258; Judith Baskin, *Midrashic Women: Formations of the Feminine in Rabbinic Literature* (Hanover, New Hampshire: U P New England, 2002), 100-105, 109-114. These are values that Roman and Greek authors share; see, e.g., Lambropoulou, “Some Pythagorean female virtues,” 122-134; Vêrilhac and Vial, *Mariage grec*, 223f.; Stephen Hinds, “First among Women: Ovid, *Tristia* 1.6 and the Traditions of the ‘Exemplary’ Catalogue,” in *Amor: Roma* (ed. S.M. Braund and R. Mayer; Cambridge: Cambridge Philol. Soc., 1999) 129-138; Jacqueline Carlon, *Pliny’s Women: Constructing Virtue and Creating Identity in the Roman World* (Cambridge: Cambridge U P, 2009), 156-182.

“[*collocare filiam*...], finding the right man for his daughter was one of the most important and difficult jobs which a [male] Roman of the upper classes ever had to face” (1984: 419), he had to rely heavily on women to accomplish it:

When a man sought a bride, particularly a virgin, his female relatives were best placed to advise him... adult men probably had little occasion to meet young girls, except the daughters of intimate friends. But mothers of sons, visiting other women, were well placed to review nubile daughters. A mother would also receive cautious advances from mothers of daughters and other interested matrons [see *Minor Declamations* 306.27-28, 360.1]... Aunts, married elder sisters, and matrons who were friends of the family could help a virtuous adolescent to be noticed by other women and recommended to suitable *partis* or to appear where she might attract suitors. Boys and girls met at dinners and on religious occasions, and girls had elder brothers who would know most of their contemporaries in the city upper class... [e.g., *Nepos, Att.* 5.3].¹⁵⁵

The most sustained direct evidence is Roman, coming from Cicero’s correspondence about his daughter Tullia’s three marriages. His letters reflect the involvement of his wife Terentia in the arrangements for all three. After the first had been settled, when Tullia was a young girl, Cicero wrote to his friend Atticus, “we have betrothed little Tullia to Gaius Piso, Lucius Frugus’ son” (*Tulliolam C. Pisoni L. f. Frugi despondimus*).¹⁵⁶ After that marriage ended within Piso’s death, Cicero informed his brother that “as for our Tullia — by Hercules, I see how she adores you! — we have made a match with Crassipes” (*de nostra Tullia tui me hercule amantissima spero cum Crassipede nos confecisse*; *Q. fr.* 2.4.2). The extent of women’s roles is more apparent in documents concerning the third, which was arranged while Cicero was away from Rome and had to rely more on correspondence. He wrote to Atticus, “I approve the same [candidate] as you, namely Postumia’s son, since Pontidia is not being serious. But I

¹⁵⁵ Treggiari, *Roman Marriages*, 98; cf. Brent Shaw and Richard Saller, “Close-Kin Marriage in Roman Society?” *Man.* 19 (1984), 432-444; Susan Treggiari, “Ideals and Practicalities in Matchmaking in Ancient Rome,” in *The Family in Italy from Antiquity to the Present* (ed. David Kertzer and Richard Saller; New Haven, Connecticut: Yale U P, 1991), 91-108; Alison Keith, “Women’s Networks in Vergil’s *Aeneid*,” *Dictynna* 3 (2006) [n.p.]; and Cristiana Sogno, “Roman Matchmaking,” *From the Tetrarchs to the Theodosians: Later Roman History and Culture, 285-450 CE* (ed. Sogno; New York: Cambridge U P, 2010), 55-71.

¹⁵⁶ *Att.* 1.3.3; the diminutive is affectionate and habitual. He means that he and Terentia betrothed her; the “royal ‘we’” is alien to Cicero and indeed to contemporary Latin.

wish you were at hand” (*probo idem quod tu Postumiae filio quoniam Pontidia nugatur sed vellem adesses*; *Att.* 5.21.14). His words reveal an apparently unremarkable situation that actively involves both men and women. It would seem that the candidates for Tullia’s hand were put forward by their mothers, possibly because they did not have living fathers (a demographic commonplace) or because Cicero wanted to avoid implicating any powerful man before the matter was settled, as with the first match. In any event, identifying respectable men (i.e., legitimate citizens) by their mothers’ names is almost unheard of in Roman or Greek literature. It passes without comment, however, in the ongoing correspondence about possible husbands for Tullia. Cicero tells Atticus in a subsequent letter that

I agree with what you say about my Tullia, and have written to her and to Terentia to say that I approve. You had already written to me, “but I wish you had gone back to your old gang.” Once the Memmius letter was corrected there was no difficulty, for I much prefer Pontidia’s candidate to Servilia’s. So please enlist the aid of our man Saufeium, someone who has always loved me (ad. Bailey 116-117).

Persuading Terentia, not only Tullia, seems to be Cicero’s first priority, and he does not appear confident in his efforts (cf. *Att.* 6.8.1). His worries were confirmed when he subsequently received the news, via a letter of congratulations from another friend, of Tullia’s marriage to Dolabella, whose suit Cicero had rejected and who was then prosecuting Cicero’s patron. His affection for Tullia, whose nuptials Terentia apparently facilitated, continues unabated in all his subsequent correspondence, but he and Terentia, whose marriage had endured for more than three decades, were divorced within the year.¹⁵⁷

Cicero’s family provides a late republican Roman illustration of women’s involvement in arranging marriages, but further ones can be found in other contexts. OT marriage

¹⁵⁷ For a more detailed examination of the situation, see John H. Collins, “Tullia’s Engagement and Marriage to Dolabella,” *Cl. J.* 47 (1952), 164-168; Jo-Marie Claassen, “Documents of a Crumbling Marriage: The Case of Cicero and Terentia,” *Phoenix* 50 (1996): 208-232.

narratives at least hint at a similar situation for biblical Israel,¹⁵⁸ and other texts confirm the impression. The most famous example is Prov. 31, probably the best known example of this literature on wife selection, is usually assumed to have been written by a man, but is attributed to a woman, the mother of King Lemuel (Prov. 31:1). Rabbinic texts tend to speak of fathers' being responsible for their daughters' betrothals, but they also hint at considerable female involvement. Michael Satlow, drawing on Susan Treggiari's work, suggests that "[a]lthough the father has the ultimate legal right to betroth his daughter, mothers could also be actively engaged in securing matches for their children... The literature might marginalize the role of mothers in this process but, again, such a marginalization does not reflect reality as much as it protects the honour of the father" (Satlow 2000: 114).¹⁵⁹ Perhaps the best known rabbinic depiction of women's arranging marriages comes from *Genesis Rabbah*:

Matrona [a stock figure] asked R. Yosi, "How many days did it take the Holy One, blessed be He, to create the world?" He said to her, "Six days." [She said,] "What has he been doing since then?" He said to her, "He sits and makes matches, a man to a woman and a woman to a man." She said to him, "Is this so hard? I can do that! She went and made matches, and gave this one to that one and that one to this one."¹⁶⁰

¹⁵⁸ In Genesis, for example, Abraham is the only example of exclusively paternal marriage initiation, which he pursues immediately after Sarah's death (Gen. 23:1-24:15, 26-27, 34-49). The text indicates that the two are related: "Then Isaac brought [Rebekah] into his mother Sarah's tent. He took Rebekah, and she became his wife, and he loved her. So Isaac was given to after his mother's death" (Gen. 24:67). Ishmael marries while his mother is still living, and the text specifies that "his mother got a wife for him from the land of Egypt" (Gen. 21:21). Abraham does not seem to be involved. In the next generation, Esau's Hittite wives "were bitter to Isaac and Rebekah" (Gen. 26:35), but it is their mother-in-law who complains: "Rebekah said to Isaac, 'I am weary of my life because of the Hittite women. If Jacob marries one of the Hittite women such as these, one of the women of the land, what good will my life be to me?'" (Gen. 27:46). Only after this does "Isaac [call] Jacob and [bless] him, and [instruct] him, 'You shall not marry one of the Canaanite women. Go now to your mother's father; and take as wife from there one of the daughters of Laban, your mother's brother'" (Gen. 29:1-2). It is Isaac who gives Jacob the instructions, but "Jacob [obeyed] his father *and mother*" (Gen. 28:7). One result is that "Esau saw that the Canaanite women did not please his father Isaac" (Gen. 28:8). Here the text foregrounds the parent who favours Esau (Gen. 25:28; cf. 27:5-17).

¹⁵⁹ See Tal Ilan, "Matrona and Rabbi Jose: An Alternative Interpretation," *JSh* 24 (1994): 18-51; Satlow, *Jewish Marriage*, 111-132.

¹⁶⁰ *Gen. Rab.* 68:3-4, ad. Satlow, *Jewish Marriage*, 115. Matrona's matches are not entirely successful.

The marriages of Matrona's arranging prove less than successful.

The situation appears much the same in Athens, where husbands' annoyance at their wives' marital scheming (e.g., on behalf of their children) is a staple of comedy. Female professionals or semi-professionals, and only female ones, seem to have been available for consultation.¹⁶¹ David Noy, providing the most detailed and to date one of the only examinations of these figures, observes that

Greek writers from the first three centuries A.D. refer to the *promnêstria*, using only the feminine term... Herodian, the second century grammarian, defines *promnêstria* [*Philetaerus* 148] as 'she who courts the woman' [which accords with other usage]... cf. Dio Chrysostom, *Or.* 7.79-80; Philostratus. *Vit. Soph.* ii.25 = 610; Lucian, *Herodotus* 6 and *Iud. Dea.* 16; Chariton, *Callirhoe* vi. 1. 11]... There are also a few references to *promnêstriaî* in classical Athenian literature... Strepsiades curses the matchmaker who persuaded him to marry his wife [Aristophanes, *Clouds* 41-2; cf. Euripides, *Hippolytus* 589]. Socrates is quoted by Plato as saying that midwives made the best matchmakers (and in fact the only proper ones) because they knew which marriages would produce the best children; however, despite being proud of their talent for it, they avoided matchmaking because they did not want to be accused of pandering (*proagôgia*)... Socrates also quoted an aphorism of Aspasia, that good matchmakers only carried true reports in their negotiations, because the victims of deception would hate each other and the matchmaker too — he used this to justify his own determination not to use false praise.

They and other parties did consider the groom's suitability as well as the brides. Christine Sogno observes that Pliny's *Ep.* 1.14 "is especially interesting for the idealized portrayal of the groom that it offers and for the ideals of marriage that it addresses... [A] carefully arranged marriage, based upon the equality of the moral qualities and social standing of the partners, would ensure the continuity of the family and produce heirs morally and socially worthy of their ancestors" (Sogno 58).

¹⁶¹ David Noy, "Matchmakers and marriage-markets in antiquity," *EMC/CV* 34 (1990), 384-385. Noy cites as uses according with Herodian's definition, Dio Chrysostom, *Or.* 7.79-80; Philostratus. *Vit. Soph.* ii.25 (610); Lucian, *Herodotus* 6 and *Iud. Dea.* 16; and Chariton, *Callirhoe* vi. 1. 11.

THE END OF MARRIAGE OR ITS METAPHORS

This ideal was also part of a dialectic with a competing one of celibacy for the purposes of health or devotion to study. Judith Evans Grubbs neatly summarizes its scope:

...there was precedent among non-Christians for refusal to marry or remarry, though it was confined to a much narrower segment of society than that at which Christian advocates of celibacy aimed. Sexual renunciation for religious reasons was being practiced by some Jews [e.g., Essenes] in the time of Jesus. Several schools of Greek and Roman philosophy declared that marriage impeded the proper pursuit of wisdom (a view that Musonius Rufus tried to refute), and medical writers recommended abstinence for health reasons... [Soranus] even concluded that it was better for women's health if they remained virgins permanently, and... Galen was impressed by the lifelong sexual self-control he had observed being practised by both male and female Christians.¹⁶²

Musonius Rufus was only the most comprehensive among the philosophers who addressed what they perceived as a crisis of celibacy. Plutarch's *Eroticus*, for example, is a defense of companionate marriage, and the Jovianist controversy of the fourth century was only the best known Christian conflict over whether celibacy or marriage should be the ideal.¹⁶³

Daniel Boyarin and Michael Satlow have both argued that mishnaic and talmudic encomia to the benefits and necessity of marriage are also a response to a perceived problem of men foregoing marriage in order to devote themselves to philosophy, in this case Torah study.¹⁶⁴

Regardless of whether there was any such crisis, it is not what is taken for granted that prompts statements such as the one attributed to R. Ḥama b. Ḥanina: "As soon as a man takes his wife his sins are buried; for it is said: *Whoso findeth a wife findeth a great good and obtaineth favour of the Lord* [Prov. 18:22]." (*T. Yeb.* 63b, Slotki 423). This could connect with ideas on primordial marriage, as in the midrash on Gen. 2:18:

¹⁶² Evans Grubbs, *Law and Family*, 69. See also Garrison, *Sexual Culture*, 250f.; Warren Smith, *Satiric Advice on Women and Marriage: From Plautus to Chaucer* (Ann Arbor: U Michigan P, 2010) 71-91, as well as prior notes.

¹⁶³ On the background of the Jovianist controversy, see David Hunter, *Marriage, Celibacy, and Heresy in Ancient Christianity: The Jovianist Controversy* (New York: Oxford U P, 2007), 87-97.

¹⁶⁴ Daniel Boyarin, *Carnal Israel: Reading Sex in Talmudic Culture* (Berkeley: U California P, 1993) 134-166; Satlow, *Jewish Marriage*, 3-41.

“It is not good.” It has been taught on Tannaite authority: Whoever has no wife lives without good, without help, without joy, without blessing, without atonement. Without good: “It is not good for a man to be alone.” Without help: “I will make him a helper fit for him (Gen. 2:18). Without joy: “And you shall rejoice, you and your household” (Gen. 14:26). Without blessing: “That a blessing may rest on your house” (Ezek. 44:30). Without atonement: “And he shall make atonement for himself and for his house” (Lev. 16:11). R. Simon in the name of R. Joshua b. Levi: “Also without peace, as it is said, ‘And peace be to your house’ (1 Sam. 25:6). R. Joshua of Sikhnin in the name of R. Levi: “Also without life, as it is written, ‘Enjoy life with the wife whom you love’ (Qoh. 9:9).” R. Hiyya bar Gomed said, “Also he is not a complete man: ‘And he blessed them and called their name Adam’ (Gen. 5:2).” And some say, “Such a person diminishes the image of God: ‘For in the image of God made he man’ (Gen. 9:6), after with it is written: ‘And you, be fruitful and multiply’ (Gen. 9:7)” (*Gen. Rab.* 2:18, Neusner 179-180).

It is this context of fundamental inequality and mutual benefit that situates the Hebrew Bible’s use of marriage as a metaphor for the relationship between God and the people of Israel. The metaphor is a familiar one, although it is “by no means the only or even the most common way of describing the relationship between God and Israel;”¹⁶⁵ shepherd/flock and king/subjects both occur more frequently, and parent/child imagery also has its place. All of these had to reflect social reality in order to function as metaphors; in this case, “[a]s the relationship between God and Israel is covenantal, specifying mutual obligations, so too should human marriage be reciprocal. But within this reciprocal relationship, the male partner (God or the husband) holds the upper hand.”¹⁶⁶ It might be more accurate to reverse the causality (i.e., the covenant character of marriage precedes the metaphor), but the observation holds. The idea is distinctive: while different ideas of divine marriage, *hieros gamos*, existed in many settings, the corporate identification of

¹⁶⁵ Satlow, *Jewish Marriage*, 16, cf. 1-62, and “The Metaphor of Marriage in Early Judaism,” in *Families* (ed. van Henten and Brenner), 13-17.

¹⁶⁶ Satlow, “Metaphor,” 15-17. He expands this discussion in *Jewish Marriage* and offers some additional reasons for the rejection of the metaphor in the Second Temple period and afterwards: (1) A shift among Jews to an *oikos* model of marriage that centred parent/child rather than husband/wife relationships; (2) evolution from the Biblical view of idolatry as corresponding to fornication to a Hellenistic view of both fornication and idolatry as products of a loss of self-control; (3) an increasingly transcendent theology in which the metaphor was uncomfortably intimate; (4) pervasive Greco-Roman political marriage metaphors accompanied by strained (at best) relationships between Jewish communities and the imperial order (46-50).

humans as a wife to the deity's husband was not. D.L. d'Avray observes that while literal sexual unions between deities and specific humans are common elsewhere, "[t]he ancient Greek stories in which gods and humans mate do not on the whole look like symbols of non-sexual love between the divine and the human."¹⁶⁷ Such liaisons have only a marginal presence in the Hebrew Bible (e.g., Gen. 6:1-4), where, like in the more detailed pseudepigrapha, they are portrayed negatively.

As distinctive as the OT metaphor was in the larger ANE world, the comparison was clearly viable in biblical Israel. Marriage-related metaphors recur in the earlier prophets (e.g., Isa. 47, 49, 50, 51, 53, 54, 57, 61, 62; Jer. 2-4, 5, 9, 19, 23, 31; Lam. 1; Ezek. 16, 23; Hos.

¹⁶⁷ See D.L. d'Avray, *Medieval Marriage: Symbolism and Society* (Oxford: Oxford U P, 2005), 4; see also the discussions in Nissinen and Uro, *Sacred Marriages*, 1-172.

1-5),¹⁶⁸ and other texts use the same language for other subjects; e.g., worship as a royal wedding (e.g., Ps. 19:4b-6, 45; Cant. 3:6-11) or the covenant as a marriage agreement.

Catherine Winiarski draws attention to the way in which

[t]he second commandment (or the second part of the first, according to some traditions) more explicitly constructs Israel as the bride of God. [It] further secures his exclusive status as husband of Israel, securing him both from the lure of nature as a potential object of worship and from the lure of human art... Yahweh's stated rationale for prohibiting image manufacture and worship is his jealous nature, the quality of a human husband: "for I the

¹⁶⁸ In addition to Michael Satlow's work, see John Willis, "The Genre of Isaiah 5:1-7," *JBL* 96 (1977), 354-350, 358-362; Mark Vander Hart, "Preparing the City-Bride for Her Lord: An Exegetical Exposition of Isaiah 62:1-12," *Mid-Am. J. Theol.* 1 (1985); T. David Anderson, "Renaming and Wedding Imagery in Isaiah 62," *Biblica* 62 (1986); Moshe Greenberg, "Ezekiel 16," in *Love and Death in the Ancient Near East* (ed. J.H. Marks; Guilford: Four Corners, 1987); Renita Weems, "Gomer: Victim of Violence or Victim of Metaphor," *Semeia* 47 (1989): 87-104; Irene Rallis, "Nuptial Imagery in the Book of Hosea," *SVTQ* 34 (1990); Julie Galambush, *Jerusalem in the Book of Ezekiel* (Atlanta: Scholars P, 1992), *passim*; M.G. Swanepoel, "Ezekiel 16: Abandoned Child, Bride Adorned or Unfaithful Wife?" in *Among the Prophets* (ed. P.R. Davis and David J.A. Clines; Sheffield: JSOT P, 1993), 84-104; Yair Hoffman, "Isn't the Bride Too Beautiful? The Case of Jeremiah 6.16-21," *JSOT* 64 (1994): 103-120; Mary Shields, "Circumcision of the Prostitute: Gender, Sexuality, and the Call to Repentance in Jeremiah 3:1-4:4," *Bibl. Interp.* 3 (1995): 61-75 and "Multiple Exposures: Body Rhetoric and Gender Characterization in Ezekiel 16," *JFSR* 14 (1998): 5-18; Moshe Zipor, "'Scenes from a Marriage' — according to Jeremiah," *JSOT* 65 (1995): 83-91; Daniel Block, *The Book of Ezekiel: Chapters 1-24* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 470-522; Klaus Baltzer, *Deutero-Isaiah: A Commentary on Isaiah 40-55* (1999; tr., Minneapolis: Fortress P, 2001), 321f; Angela Bauer, *Gender in the Book of Jeremiah: A Feminist-Literary Reading* (New York: Peter Lang, 1999), *passim*; A.R. Pete Diamond and Kathleen O'Connor, "Unfaithful Passions: Coding Women Coding Men in Jeremiah 2-3 (4:2)," in *Troubling Jeremiah* (ed. Diamond; Sheffield: Sheffield Ac. P, 1999), 123-145; Peggy Day, "Adulterous Jerusalem's Imagined Demise: Death of a Metaphor in Ezekiel XVI," *Vet. Test.* 50 (2000) and "Yahweh's Broken Marriages as Metaphoric Vehicle in the Hebrew Bible Prophets," in *Sacred Marriages* (ed. Nissinen and Uro), 219-242; H.G.M. Williamson, "Isaiah 62:4 and the Problem of Inner-Biblical Allusions," *JBL* 119 (2000); Brevard Childs, *Isaiah: A Commentary* (Louisville: WJK, 2001), 391f.; Kathryn Darr, "'Alas, She Has Become a Harlot,' but Who's to Blame? Unfaithful-Female Imagery in Isaiah's Vision," in *Passion, Vitality, and Foment* (ed. Luker), 55-76; Wong Ka Leung, *The Idea of Retribution in the Book of Ezekiel* (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 32-57, 212-230; Gale Yee, "'She Is Not My Wife and I Am Not Her Husband: A Materialist Analysis of Hosea 1-2,'" *Bibl. Interp.* 9 (2001): 345-383; S. Tamar Kamionkowski, *Gender Reversal and Cosmic Chaos: A Study on the Book of Ezekiel* (Sheffield: Sheffield U P, 2003), 92-133; Geraldine Baumann, *Love and Violence: Marriage as a Metaphor the Relationship between YHWH and Israel in the Prophetic Books* (2000; tr., Collegeville, Minnesota: Liturgical P, 2003) *passim*; Ehud Ben Zvi, *Hosea* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 61-76; Karin Adams, "Metaphor and Dissonance: A Reinterpretation of Hosea 4:13-14," *JBL* 127 (2008); Leslie Allen, *Jeremiah: A Commentary* (Louisville: WJK, 2008), 31f; Carol Meyers, "Engendering Ezekiel: Female Figures Reconsidered," in *Birkat Shalom* (ed. C. Cohen et al.; Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 2008), 281-297; Liang Wang-Huei, "Is She Not My Wife, and Am I Not Her Husband?" *HBT* 31 (2009): 1-11; Gary Yates, "Jeremiah's Message of Judgment and Hope for God's Unfaithful 'Wife,'" *Bibl. Sac.* 167 (2010); Amy Kalmanofsky, "The Dangerous Sisters of Jeremiah and Ezekiel," *JBL* 130 (2011), all offer extended discussions of this imagery.

Lord thy God am a jealous (Hebrew: *qanna'*) God" (Exod. 20.4). Here we may observe erotic passion animating the *quid pro quo* legalism of the contract.¹⁶⁹

Whether or not Winiarski's larger conclusions are sustainable, there is at the least textual support for a wide continuity of understanding. Good or bad, the totality of Israel's relationship to its God is like a wife's to her husband. Psalms extends this metaphor, simultaneously likening God to a king and to a bridegroom and his people to brides whom he desires:

...God, your god, has anointed you beyond your companions with the oil of gladness; your robes are all fragrant with myrrh and aloes and cassia.
From ivory palaces stringed instruments gladden you;
the daughters of kings are among your attendants,
and the queen of Ophir, decked in gold, stands at your right hand.
Hear, O daughter, consider and incline your ear; forget your people and your father's house,
and the king will desire your beauty..
The princess is decked in her chamber with gold-woven robes in many-coloured robes she is led to the king; behind her the virgins, her companions, follow.
With joy and gladness they are led along as they enter the palace of the king.
In the place of ancestors you, O king, will have sons, and you will make them princes of all the earth (Ps. 45:8-17).

This imagery is consonant with that of the Song of Solomon; if we read its eroticism allegorically, as early Jews and Christians did, it is a much more detailed example of the same motif. Some authors have drawn attention likewise to the persistent biblical association

¹⁶⁹ Catherine Winiarski, "Adultery, Idolatry, and the Subject of Monotheism," *Rel. & Lit.* 38 (2006). Cf. Satlow, *Jewish Marriage*, 41f. See also Baruch Margulis, "Of Brides and Birds," *JANE St.* (1972); Robert Gordis, *The Song of Songs and Lamentations* (1954; rev. New York: Ktav, 1978), 84-86, 94-101; Jonathan Glass, "Some Observations on Psalm 19," 147-159 *The Listening Heart*, (ed. Glass et al., Sheffield: Sheffield Ac. P, 1987); Erhard Gerstenberger, *Psalms, Part I* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988), 100-103, 186-190; Athalya Brenner, *The Song of Songs* (Sheffield: JSOT P, 1989), 74-85; Roland Murphy, *The Song of Songs* (Minneapolis: Fortress P, 1990), 67-74, 191-199; Robert Couffignal, "Les structures figuratives du Psaume 45," *ZAW* 113 (2001); Nancy Bowen, "A Fairy Tale Wedding?" in *A God So Near* (ed. Bowen and Brent Strawn; Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 2003), 53-71; J. Cheryl Exum, "Seeing Solomon's Palanquin," *Bibl. Interp.* 113 (2003) and "The Little Sister and Solomon's Vineyard," in *Seeking Out*, (ed. Troxel et al.), 269-282; in *Sacred Marriages* (ed. Nissinen and Uro), Nissinen's "Song of Songs and Sacred Marriage," 173-218, and Ruben Zimmerman, "The Love Triangle of Lady Wisdom," 243-258.

between wife and well-watered vine and argued for a marital connotation in texts where it might not be as easily apparent to a modern audience.¹⁷⁰

The reasons for this situation are beyond the present scope; the salient point here is the biblical concept of God as a husband or a rejoicing bridegroom to Israel's faithful and virtuous wife or a splendidly arrayed bride. This, at least, is the way it should be; since all is frequently not as it should be, the adulterous wife-idolatrous nation emerges the perverse mirror image of the desirable bride&beloved wife-faithful nation. The two emerge from one another, and the thematic concerns that they express can lend themselves more to extended marital rather than specifically nuptial imagery. Ehud Ben Zvi notes that

...the relationship between husband and wife is not a one time event; its recounting involves the creation of a narrative [that in the texts] was interwoven with that of the relationship between the deity and Israel... Since (1) the basic construction of monarchic Israel in the prophetic books was that of a sinful nation that deserved a divine judgment that was already experienced, and (2) the books conveyed hope and expectation for an ideal, future world, then (3) the marital narrative, to be useful for these purposes, had to include an account of a period in which the wife is reported to have grievously sinned and been punished... as well as another period pointing to a future reconciliation between husband and wife. In many cases, the narrative would also include a 'good period' or even ideal period of 'first love' prior to the wife's sin. This is consistent with the tendency to imagine ideal futures in terms of a restoration, which in turn shapes images of a golden period that in this case develops into a first time of endearment, love and engagement.¹⁷¹

Hosea, probably the earliest text to use the metaphor, is a case in point. It employs the negative shadings in some detail, as do other prophetic texts: when Israel worships other deities, she becomes a wanton adulteress and prostitute, decked out in the finery with which lovers have courted or clients paid her. Present or threatened future bad circumstances are the penalty for this behaviour. A military-political enemy, often allegorized as a luxury-

¹⁷⁰ Helmer Ringgren, for example, draws attention to running imagery in the Song of Solomon and to the "Song of the Vineyard" in Isa. 5:1-7; Ringgren, "The Marriage Motif in Israelite Religion," in *Ancient Israelite Religion* (ed. S.D. McBride et al.; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987), 421-428). See also Moshe Weinfeld, "Feminine Features in the Imagery of God in Israel," *Vet. Test.* 46 (1996): 515-529.

¹⁷¹ Ben Zvi, "Observations on the Marital Metaphor," 368-369.

glutted, adulterous city-queen, often inflicts the punishment and makes Israel like a desolate widow or deprived bride.

But Israel's suffering will not be eternal: once the punishment is complete, the enemy will receive poetic justice and God the husband will not divorce Israel the wife but forgive her, as he always does, and delight to receive her again as a finely dressed, jewel-laden bride and prosperous spouse. In Hosea, the positive and negative aspects depend on one another. as in the vision of Israel's abandoning idolatry and returning to true worship (2:16): "The LORD says, 'On that day, you will call my "My husband;" you will no longer call me "My lord"' (see ch. 4). Anticipation of this future day marks some of the OT's few uses of a nuptial rather than a marital metaphor, as in Isaiah's picture of a restored and forgiven people (Isa. 62:4-5): "You will no longer be termed Forsaken and your land will no more be termed Desolate, but you will be called My Delight Is in Her and your land Married; for the LORD delights in you, and your land shall be married. For as a youth marries a maiden, so will your maker marry you; and as the bridegroom rejoices over a bride, so shall your God rejoice over you." The desolation, the ill-gotten gains that provoked it, and the nuptial finery that preceded it and will follow it all receive detailed description.

These passages' connections to Rev. 17-22 are plain and well studied.¹⁷² The negative aspects of the metaphor inform the condemnation of Babylon and have become the subject of a considerable body of research in recent decades, while the positive uses have received less attention. I shall return to these aspects in chapter three; for now, the relevant point is that they and the positive aspects work in tandem. Revelation, looking to an eschatological future, uses the OT metaphor but casts it in entirely nuptial terms. Its imagery is part of a tradition of explicitly religious marriage metaphors that were intelligible because they functioned within received understandings of literal marriage. This is the rationale that Satlow observes as operating behind the OT marriage metaphor: Israel is the first and highest-ranked wife, but this does not imply that God/the husband is insensible to all other nations/women. Indeed, the very texts using the marriage metaphor explicitly attribute to God involvement with nations other than Israel, and there seems to be no conflict over this as there is over kingship, for example. Early Jesus followers, of course, quickly became a predominantly gentile group, and here this aspect of the metaphor proved advantageous from a variety of perspectives. It could be and was read in supercessionist terms to indicate that the church was now the true bride of God, along the lines of Esther displacing Vashti. Here might be inference that divorce was quite permissible (in principle) under the old

¹⁷² See Huber, *Bride Adorned*, 24-31, 89-100, 193-112, and *Thinking and Seeing*, 56-88; Rissi, *Future*, 41-51; Yarbrow Collins, *Crisis and Catharsis*, 121-124; Deutsch, "Transformation of Symbols," Bauckham, *Theology*, 132-138; Iain Provan, "Foul Spirits, Fornication and Finance: Revelation 18 from an OT Perspective," *JNTS* 64 (1996): 81-100; Andrea Spatafora, *From the «Temple of God» to God as Temple* (Rome: Gregorian Pontifical U, 1997), 267-276; Royalty, *Streets*, 59-65, 71-80, 194-197, 227-234; Rossing, *Choice*, 63-133 and "City Visions," 181-196; Lee Pilchan, *New Jerusalem*, 268-293; Steve Moyise, *The Old Testament in the New Testament* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2001) 117-127; Mathewson, "Isaiah in Revelation," 189-210; Tavo, *Woman, Mother and Bride*, 297-333; Mathews, *Riches, Poverty*, 204-214. Most commentaries discuss correlations between specific passages or verses in detail; the most thorough treatments include Mounce, *Book of Revelation*, 308-312, 318-347, 382-401; J.P.M. Sweet, *Revelation* (London: Pelican, 1979), 252-276, 301-318; Prigent, *L'Apocalypse*, 256-273, 337-347; Aune, *Revelation*, 928-940, 983f., 1024-1029, 1120-1122, 1150f.; Beale, *Revelation*, 76-98, 848f., 938f.; Osborne, *Apocalypse*, 607-614, 634-659 689f.; Smalley, *Revelation to John*, 426-431, 445-466, 479-485, 536f.; Boxall, *Revelation of Saint John*, 254-269, 279-312; Blount, *Revelation*, 325-339, 385-397.

covenant but severely restricted (in principle) according to Christian teachings. In quite the opposite way, it could read that Israel and/or the Jewish church was God's first and first-ranked wife and the gentile church a junior co-wife or a licit extramarital partner (a real possibility in terms of slave metaphors, as chapter four discusses). It could also work in terms of assimilation: the gentile church has been grafted onto the tree of Israel, which remains God's wife. This reading might be especially possible with nuptial imagery, given weddings' being rites of passage. It may also bear remembering that while Ahasuerus replaces Vashti with Esther, God is only envisioned as forgiving and restoring Israel after a period of punishment, never as choosing another nation-wife in Israel's place. Such a reading resonates especially with the renewal motifs of Rev. 21.

As important as this imagery is in earlier texts, though, Revelation is not drawing on a history of consistent usage. It is more a part of a reinvention of the root metaphor, which had evolved into other forms in the Second Temple period. By the Hellenistic era, the God:Israel::husband:wife form of it was so rare, Michael Satlow argues, that apart from Jesus followers "no Jew writing in Greek uses this metaphor [even though they] do use marriage as a metaphor... that describes other things" (1995: 17). Satlow posits several reasons for this change, noting that

[f]rom a theological perspective, this metaphor contains three potential problems. First, it gives God the right of divorce... Second, it gives God the right to take other nations as "co-wives"... Finally, it implies a degree of intimacy between God and Israel that is not always compatible with an asexual and transcendent understanding of God (ibid, 16-17).

It may be partly because of concerns such as these that even in rabbinic writings that postdate the revival of the metaphor, it "appears very infrequently" (2001: 50) and at a distance from its original form. The echoes avoid most of the original meaning:

...the midrashim tend to use the marital metaphor to illustrate God marrying off a son or daughter rather than God actually marrying... A few parables advance the metaphor that

Israel [masc.] “married” God’s daughter, Torah... In the very few places outside the later homiletical works that the image of God’s “marriage” to Israel does appear, it is transformed. A midrash on Hos. 2:18, for example, changes [its] meaning... into a teaching about the conduct of a human couple... The Babylonian Talmud presents a series of exegeses of [Hosea’s wife’s] name (Gomer) that emphasize her promiscuity, but do so in a fashion that completely obliterates the fact that she represents Israel.... God has become Israel’s *father* rather than *husband*... [and] Israel is the child of adultery rather than the adulteress.¹⁷³

Satlow likewise notes that in Second Temple writings the metaphor is not always discarded but also sometimes literalized, drawing special attention to Sirach. This text, of course, concerns itself with the woes that unchaste women bring but does not directly address idolatry or failure to uphold the covenant. Thus, Satlow notes, the author in 26:10-14 “writes in uncomfortable detail of the adulterous wife. Although he uses different metaphors, Ben Sira evokes Ezek. 16:25. Yet whereas Ezekiel only uses such language to denote Israel’s betrayal of God, Ben Sira refers literally to an adulterous woman... He has totally leveled the metaphor” (2001: 47). This discomfort was not unique to Second Temple Judaism. The same “levelling” appears in Eph. 5:21-33, where Christ’s love for the church is invoked as a template for relationships between husbands and wives, rather than the reverse.¹⁷⁴ Other writings from the emerging church, though, mitigate the problems that Satlow identifies in different ways than those he enumerates for slightly later rabbinic texts (which he argues may be trying to distinguish themselves), e.g., by “obviating the possibility

¹⁷³ Ibid 50-1; 290 n. 57-66; cf. “One source passingly compares God coming from Sinai to a groom coming toward a bride [n. 51]. A second midrash appears in the Tosepta and asks about the difference between the two sets of tablets that Moses brought down... ‘To what is the matter similar? To a human king who betrothed a woman...’ [n. 53]... God is compared to the husband, Israel to the wife, the Torah is the contract, and Moses lurks in the background as a scribe” (2000: 50, 289 n. 51-290 n. 53). Some patristic writers share this understanding; see Noy, “Matchmakers.”

¹⁷⁴ While the contents of Ephesians’ household code are similar to those in other NT epistles (i.e., Col. 3:18-19, 1 Peter 3:1-7), the reasoning is unique. On Ephesians’ unusual reading of the metaphor, see Annette Merz, “Why Did the Pure Bride of Christ (2 Cor. 11.2) Become a Wedded Wife (Eph. 5.22-33)?” *JNT* 79 (2000), 7. Some more recent commentaries on Ephesians also provide discussions; e.g. Andrew Lincoln’s *Ephesians* (Waco, Texas: Word Books, 1990), 352-355, 361-365; John Muddiman, *Ephesians*, (Continuum, 2001), 263-271; Harold Hoehner, *Ephesians* (Grand Rapids: Baker Ac., 2002), 748-770.

of divorce”¹⁷⁵ and idealizing celibate spiritual marriage, as Revelation seems to do. Both sets of traditions, however, deploy the enduring metaphor of Adam and Eve’s primordial, foundational marriage,¹⁷⁶ and deploy it in ways that are congruent with (problems of category aside) non-Jewish, especially Stoic, philosophical understandings of marriage as expressing a “natural order” with which harmony was desirable.¹⁷⁷

THE QUEEN CITY

Revelation’s equation of bride and city interacts with another interlocked set of metaphors, one in which specific, real or abstracted human females and specific, real or abstracted physical spaces represented one another. This is a chain of associations rather than a single one: the earth/land is a wife/mother; a wife/mother and a tract of land are one another; the house is woman’s realm; a woman is a house; city = land + buildings, i.e.,

¹⁷⁵ “[T]he comparison of the relationship of God and Israel — or the church in this case — [to marriage] has some potentially thorny ramifications [based] on marital practices, primarily divorce. For the metaphor to work, it should obviate the possibility of divorce: should a couple be allowed to divorce, the logic of the metaphor leads to the possibility that God can divorce His people, a theological nightmare. It is significant, and in my view related to their use of the marital metaphor, that early Christians foreclosed this human possibility. Jesus, apparently, cited both Gen. 1:27 and 2:24 in his prohibition of divorce [Mk. 10:1-12 = Mt. 19:1-12]. Paul too subscribes to this prohibition [1 Cor. 7:10-11]” (Satlow, “Metaphor,” 26-27; cf. Satlow, *Jewish Marriage*, 49).

¹⁷⁶ Thus Satlow: “Unlike the biblical metaphor of marriage, the biblical myth of the first marriage is relatively well attested among Jewish writers in the Second Temple period. The myth appears in Aramaic, Greek, and Hebrew sources from this period. In each, it is adapted in accord with its author’s broader ideological understanding of marriage. The clearest and perhaps the first extrabiblical text to link contemporary marital practice with the primal marriage of Adam and Eve is Tobit [8:58].... [Sirach 36:24/25] refers to a man’s wife as a “help” using the same language as Gen. 2:18... [4QMMT B 40] uses the phrase “become one bone” as a synonym for marriage, clearly echoing Gen. 2:23. Nonsectarian sapiential texts found at Qumran use the phrase “one flesh” (Gen. 2:24) for marriage [e.g., 4Q416 2 iv 4=4Q418 10 6]” (*Jewish Marriage*, 58-59).

¹⁷⁷ On “nature,” see especially Garrison’s discussion of Platonism and Stoicism in *Sexual Culture*: ““Living according to nature was a central goal of the fourth century and Hellenistic philosophers, and nature’s only use for sex was procreation. Here too Plato seems to have anticipated the movement toward sexual fundamentalism modeled after a sentimentalized conception of nature.... This [attitude], absorbed into Christian doctrine, had lasting consequences, with a continued appeal to ‘nature’” (254).

feminine abstraction.¹⁷⁸ Gail Labovitz, exploring at length the metaphorical association between “dwelling place” and “wife” that exists in biblical and rabbinic literature, notes that that “the word ‘house’... may clearly substitute for ‘wife’... ‘House,’ ‘woman,’ ‘one who is of his house’... It is an association easily found and frequently encountered in rabbinic literature” and identifies at least a dozen examples.¹⁷⁹ *Ruth Rabbah* is one of the most explicit examples, reporting as it does R. Yose b. Halfta’s saying “In my whole life I never called my wife ‘my wife,’ or my house ‘my house,’ but I called my wife ‘my house’ and my house ‘my wife’” (1:3); ‘...each of you in the house of her husband’ [Ruth 1:9]... proves that a woman has satisfaction only in the house of her husband.”¹⁸⁰ Labovitz further notes that “in the rabbinic imagination, woman’s very creation is an act of architecture and construction, resulting in a building... The metaphor of the woman’s house-body... is extended to include [specific] rooms” (122-123),¹⁸¹ as in *T. Yeb.* 62b:

In the West it was stated: Without Torah and without a [protecting] wall. “Without Torah,” for it is written, *Is it that I have no help in me, and that sound wisdom is driven quite from me.* “Without a [protecting] wall,” for it is written, *A woman shall encompass a man.* Raba b. ‘Ulla said: Without peace, for it is written, *And thou shalt know that thy tent is in peace; and thou shalt visit thy habitation and shalt miss nothing.*¹⁸²

¹⁷⁸ Labovitz, *Marriage and Metaphor*, 116. For further discussion of these interpretations and the texts on which they are based, see Schüssler Fiorenza, *Book of Revelation*, 219-226; Humphrey, *The Ladies and the Cities*, *passim*; Silvia Schroer, *Wisdom Has Built Her House* (1996; tr. Minneapolis: Liturgical P, 2000), *passim*; Rossing, *Choice*, 2-6, “City Visions,” 182-183, 191-192; Tavo, *Woman, Mother and Bride*, *passim*.

¹⁷⁹ The examples she sites include *b. Yoma* 3b-4a, 13a, b; *b. Shabbat* 118b, *b. Gittin* 52a, *y. Shabbat* 1:3, *Gen. R.* 17:1, *m. Yoma* 1:1, *Sifra Aḥarei Mot*, *perek* 8:6, *t. Yoma* 1:1, *b. Mo’ed Katan* 15b, *b. Beitzah* 5a, and *b. Sanhedrin* 58b (118-121).

¹⁸⁰ tr. Neusner 58, 70. Cf. *Gen. Rabbah* 17:2; tractates *Mo’ed Katan* 9b, *Baba Bathra* 48b, 144a, *Sanhedrin* 38a; *Eruvin* 21a.

¹⁸¹ Here the examples include *m. Mikva’ot* 8:4; *b. Niddah* 17b, 18a, 31a; *m. Niddah* 2:1, 2:5, 5:1; *t. Niddah* 3:9; *y. Niddah* 18a.

¹⁸² I.W. Slotki 418. The prooftexts are, in the order cited, Deut. 14:26, Ezek. 44:30, Gen. 2:18, Job 6:13, Jer. 31:22, and Job 5:24 (see Epstein 418n. 3-5, 10, 11, 13).

Rabbinic tradition could extrapolate this to the cosmic level as well, e.g., the attribution to R. Eleazar of a saying that “Any man who has no wife is not a proper man; for it is said, *Male and female He created them and called their name Adam*... Any man who owns no land is not a proper man; for it is said, *The heavens are the heavens of the Lord; but the earth hath he given to the children of men* [Ps. 115:16].” (T. Yeb. 63a; *ibid*, 419).

Although Revelation’s apocalyptic thought is in many ways different from rabbinic exegesis, a similar economy (or, better, ecology) of metaphor is at work. It is not unique in the NT; a less obviously gendered may be visible in a less obviously gendered form in Paul’s exhortation to sexual morality: “Flee from debauchery! Every sin a person commits is outside the body, but fornicating is a sin against your own body. Or do you not know that your body is a temple of the holy spirit within you, which you have from God?” (1 Cor. 6:18-19). Revelation’s use of it, however, is the most sustained, running from ch. 16 through the end of the book. It is also the most explicit, e.g., “I saw the holy city, the new Jerusalem, coming down out of heaven from God, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband. And I heard a loud voice from the throne saying, ‘See, the tabernacle of God is among human beings. He will share his tent with them; they will be his peoples, and God himself will be theirs’” (Rev. 21:2-3).¹⁸³ This is a quotation of “My dwelling place will be with them; and I shall be their God, and they will be my people” (Ezek. 37:27), but Revelation places it in an explicitly nuptial context.

¹⁸³ καὶ τὴν πόλιν τὴν ἁγίαν Ἰερουσαλὴμ καινὴν εἶδον καταβαίνουσαν ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ ἡ τοιμασμένην ὡς νύμφην κεκοσμημένην τῷ ἀνδρὶ αὐτῆς. καὶ ἤκουσα φωνῆς μεγάλης ἐκ τοῦ θρόνου λεγούσης Ἰδοὺ ἡ σκηνὴ τοῦ θεοῦ μετὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων καὶ σκηνώσει μετ’ αὐτῶν καὶ αὐτοὶ λαοὶ αὐτοῦ ἔσονται καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ θεὸς μετ’ αὐτῶν ἔσται.

Literature outside the biblical orbit also draws fundamental connections between wife and house.¹⁸⁴ Wives and household are linked in the widespread ancient equivalence drawn between vegetal and mammalian fertility, wherein the ground that produced plants was associated with the fixed plot of land (i.e., domicile) and with bearing (maternity) and the sky with the outside world (i.e., public space) and fertilization (paternity). This appears in the understanding of domestic space as the domain of wives and their children and public space as that of husbands, an understanding that Jorunn Økland terms “not describing but gendering the spaces of the city” (131).¹⁸⁵ That is, the idea persisted in the culture despite real circumstances’ being notably different. The evidence indicates repeatedly that all but the most elite of women routinely left the inner house to buy and sell goods and to perform a wide range of tasks, and that even the most secluded elite women visited female relatives and made religious observances outside the home. Indeed, as Økland notes,

The problem then is not that non-domestic spaces in a city are labelled ‘public’ *per se*, or that ancient Greeks and Romans perceived public space as male space. There is a problem if *we* take ancient texts at face value and believe that ‘male’ space was a space for male bodies only, because then we are prevented from systematizing our scattered knowledge about the presence also of female bodies in public space. Although they had no access to most positions that conferred political power and formal responsibilities... many women had to move around and be visible in the streets and market-places although it was at times not regarded as proper, simply in order to do their duties — working, shopping, praying etc... Through festivals and other religious tasks, women of all ranks were seen as exercising their powers for the well-being of the whole city: i.e. they performed important public functions (137).

In this model, then, the residential space, the land holding and the house built on it, are the individual wife. The city, being an aggregate of land holdings and houses built on them, can

¹⁸⁴ See Foucault, *History of Sexuality* v. 2, 166-184; J. Roy, “*Polis* and *Oikos* in Classical Athens,” *G & R* 46 (1999); Sarah Pearce, “Jerusalem as ‘Mother-City’ in the Writings of Philo of Alexandria,” in *Negotiating Diaspora* (ed. John Barclay; London: T & Clark Int’l., 2004), 31-36; Madeleine Henry and Sharon James, “Woman, City, State,” in *CWAW* (ed. James and Dillon), 84-95.

¹⁸⁵ See Økland, “*In Publicum Procurrendi*: Women in the Public Space of Roman Greece,” in *Aspects of Women in Antiquity* (ed. Lena Larsson Lovén and Agneta Strömberg; Jonsered: P. Åströms, 1998); Xenophon, *Oec.* 20-25; Plutarch, *Præ. Conj.* 9. See also Cohen, “Seclusion, Separation;” J. Roy, “An Alternative Sexual Morality for Classical Athenians,” *G & R* 44 (1997); Monika Trümper, “Gender and Space, ‘Public’ and ‘Private,’” in *CWAW* (ed. James and Dillon), 288-303.

thus be understood as a collective wife. This is most explicit in the prophetic literature, but the city/woman equation is pervasive. Athens is the city of Athena, and her patronage is important enough to generate traditions that explain its origins and consequences, and those in explicitly gendered terms. It may be worth noting that her rival for the city's top honours is Poseidon — a male deity, as the text stresses, but also the god of the uncontrollable sea and of wild horses. His gender, the narrative implies, would seem to make him a preferable candidate, but his domains would seem to make him a decidedly odd choice for a city patron. Athena's, in contrast, are eminently suitable. Likewise, Rome's imperial cult linked the emperor's *nous* and the city's glory with *Dea Roma*, not with two-faced Janus whose official cult was so prominent in the city itself.

Women's spinning and weaving retained their symbolic importance in the most explicitly political and public contexts. "Social fabric" was a live metaphor, as Elizabeth Barber notes; the fact that the city protectress and guardian of civilization was also the goddess of weaving was not lost on Athenians or on Domitian, whose propaganda (in the classical sense) linked the patronage of Minerva with his efforts to remake Rome and its empire.¹⁸⁶ Real women as well as goddesses were praised for cloth production (see above), which was considered so important that the same upper-class ideology that held that respectable women should not be looked at by the public was practically contradicted by the execution of this task. All indications are that even (or especially) wealthy households' looms were set up in direct view of or actually inside the most public parts of the house.

¹⁸⁶ Elizabeth Barber, "Weaving the Social Fabric" in *Textiles* (ed. Gillis and Nosch); Sheramy Bundrick, "The Fabric of the City: Imaging Textile Production in Classical Athens," *Hesperia* 77 (2008). On weaving goddesses as guardians of civilization, see Brian Jones, "Some Thoughts on the Propaganda," 251; Morawiecki, "The Symbolism of Minerva; Varner, "Transcending Gender;" Javier Andrés Pérez, "Aproximación a la iconografía de *Roma Aeterna* como vía de transmisión de un mito," *El Futuro del Pasado* 1 (2010).

“By tradition female work... was primarily to take place in a domestic setting. However, spinning and weaving were to be done not in seclusion but in the most public space of the Roman house, the atrium. This was the traditional location of the loom, and the housewife’s work by the loom should likewise be exposed to visitors.”¹⁸⁷ Other instances focus equally on linking the boundary between the house and the outside world with that between a wife’s body and men outside her family, e.g., the boundary established by clothing that shielded her from touch and improper view. This was nowhere more apparent than in the use and symbolism of that most bridal of garments, the veil.¹⁸⁸

¹⁸⁷ Lena Larsson Lovén, “Wool Work as a Gender Symbol,” in *Textiles* (ed. Gillis and Nosch), 230. Sheramy Bundrick notes likewise that “Looms were set up in well-lit rooms directly accessible to the inner courtyard or adjacent to some other light source. Alternatively (although apparently less commonly), looms could be placed in the courtyard itself or in the adjoining *pastas*... Cahill estimates that of those spaces that appear to have been used for weaving at the time of Olynthos’s abandonment, about a quarter (at most) are courtyards and *pastades* with the rest being enclosed or semienclosed rooms adjoining the courtyard or some other space (including the *pastas*). Working in rooms that in some cases may have had windows opening into the courtyard, allowing for light, seems to have been the preference... Cahill concludes, however, that this distribution “does not seem to result from a desire to restrict this activity to a more private or secluded part of the house,” noting that some of the are as used for weaving were “conspicuously close” to the main entrance. Once looms were set up and weaving begun, it would have been difficult to move them” (“Fabric of the City,” 313-314).

¹⁸⁸ See Llewellyn-Jones, *Aphrodite’s Tortoise*, 189-214 and “House and veil in ancient Greece,” *BSAS* 15 (2007), 251-258; John Stephenson, “Veiling the Late Roman House,” *Textile His.* 45 (2014).

Chapter Two: Weddings

Revelation closes with a wedding celebration. The seer narrates hearing a proclamation that “the marriage of the lamb has come, and his bride has made herself ready” (ὅτι ἦλθεν ὁ γάμος τοῦ ἀρνίου καὶ ἡ γυνὴ αὐτοῦ ἡτοίμασεν ἑαυτὴν, 19:7). An angel subsequently commands him, “Write this: blessed are those who are invited to the marriage supper of the Lamb” (Μακάριοι οἱ εἰς τὸ δεῖπνον τοῦ γάμου τοῦ ἀρνίου κεκλημένοι τῷ ἀνδρὶ αὐτῆς, 19:9). The new Jerusalem comes “down out of heaven from God, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband” (καταβαίνουσιν ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ ἡ ἑτοίμασμένην ὡς νύμφην κεκοσμημένην τῷ ἀνδρὶ αὐτῆς, 21:2). At the conclusion of the prophecy, “the Spirit and the bride say, ‘Come’” (τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ ἡ νύμφη λέγουσιν Ἔρχου, 22:17).

Focusing on the wedding itself is congenial not only to Revelation’s vision but also to those of other NT texts. This is notable in the narrative texts, each of which, as Kari Syreeni observes, uses it in different but related ways.¹⁸⁹ For example, Marianne Blickenstaff has detailed the ways in which Matthew participates in the epic-tragic literary tradition of connecting the bridegroom with mass violence,¹⁹⁰ while Joyce McWhirter explores the

¹⁸⁹ Syreeni, “From the Bridegroom’s Time,” 343-369.

¹⁹⁰ Marianne Blickenstaff, *While the Bridegroom Is with Them: Marriage, Family, Gender and Violence in the Gospel of Matthew* (London: T & T Clark, 2005); cf. Syreeni, “From the Bridegroom’s Time” 348-350. See also Karl Paul Donfried, “The Allegory of the Ten Virgins (Matt 25:1-13 as a Summary of Matthean Theology),” *JBL* 93 (1974): 415-428; Simon Légasse, “La parabole des dix vierges,” in *Les paraboles évangéliques* (ed. J. Delore; Paris: Éd. du Cerf, 1989) 349-360; Jan Lambrecht, S.J., *Out of the Treasure: The Parables in the Gospel of Matthew* (Louvain: Peeters, 1991), 127-142, 199-215; John Nolland, *The Gospel of Matthew* (Bletchley: Paternoster, 2005), 882-892.

image of the bridegroom in John's messianism.¹⁹¹ One common thread is future-oriented eschatology: like Revelation, the gospels do not consider their audiences' immediate, observed worlds to be the same as the redeemed or completed final order. All see the events or nature of Jesus' earthly life as initiating (or at least demonstrating anticipation of) this order, which will enter maturity at his return or *parousia*. The shared economy of the metaphor is one in which his life is a betrothal and his return a wedding. Weddings initiate marriage, and because of their inherent connection to it, they allow the initial event (literally a wedding or substantially the *parousia*) to indicate the entire condition (literally marriage or substantially eschatological fulfillment) without delineating its yet-unknown entirety. The transformational character that Arnold van Genep noted of wedding observances¹⁹² lends itself to this scheme.

Kari Syreeni describes the gospel of John and the book of Revelation as “particularly involved in a progressive nuptial symbolism” (Nissinen and Uro 343) that is more deeply integrated into these texts than is often apparent to modern audiences. It can be seen as present in the entirety of Revelation, including the epistolary prologue; Hanna Stenström observes that “those whom chs 2-3 describe as being ‘inside’ the community are presented in virtually the same way as those ‘inside’ the new Jerusalem in chs 21-22 [i.e., the bride and/or

¹⁹¹ Joyce McWhirter, *The Bridegroom Messiah and the People of God* (Cambridge: Cambridge U P, 2006); cf. Syreeni, “From the Bridegroom’s Time,” 352-363. See also Jo-Ann Brant, “Husband Hunting: Characterization and Narrative Art in the Gospel of John,” *Bibl. Interp.* 4 (1996): 205-223 and *Dialogue and Drama: Elements of Greek Tragedy in the Fourth Gospel* (Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson, 2004), 233-255; Adeline Fehribach, “The ‘Birthing’ Bridegroom: The Portrayal of Jesus in the Fourth Gospel,” in *A Feminist Companion to John*, v. 2 (ed. Amy-Jill Levine; Cleveland: Pilgrim P, 2003), 104-129, and in the same volume Jennifer K.B. Maclean, “The Divine Trickster: A Tale of Two Weddings in John,” 48-77; Jean-Bosco Matand Bulembat, “Head-Waiter and Bridegroom of the Wedding at Cana,” *JSNT* 30 (2007): 55-73.

¹⁹² That is, the bride enters as girl — a *betulah*, παρθένος, or *virgo* and *filiafamilias* — and emerges as a woman who will be the mother of legitimate children, a *materfamilias*. Van Genep’s *Rites of Passage* was originally published in 1909, but its basic thesis and the interpretation of Greco-Roman evidence on which it is based have proven durable.

wedding guests]. The lines around the community... seem to coincide with the lines dividing the cosmos, the New Jerusalem, from the horrors Outside” (46). Ruben Zimmerman has argued some of the main visionary report’s motifs, especially that of crowns, carries nuptial connotations given the prominence of crowns in ancient wedding observances. While I neither follow his conclusion that crowns and other images in chs. 4-17 are *necessarily* nuptial nor argue that they are “more” nuptial than they are anything else, I agree that such motifs’ in a climactically nuptial text lends them a nuptial cast.

But if a groom’s wearing a crown, e.g., was *de rigueur* in antiquity, a lamb’s marrying a city was not. The fact that the lamb is Jesus and the city is a group of people does not provide much clarity. After all, other NT texts, including John, use a plain marriage metaphor. Turning a (son of) man into a warrior-lamb for his wedding seems at once unnecessary and rather below the poetic bar of crowned scarlet hydras and and six-winged creatures full of eyes. Likewise, however dense the root bundle of the city/woman equation (see ch. 1), a geometrically impossible metropolis so adorned as to put Pandora, Eden, and the Temple all to shame at once is on a different order of magnitude. Making sense of this strange nuptial climax calls for situating it among contemporary representations of weddings.

WEDDINGS IN OUTLINE

Not all weddings were the same, and few if any real weddings are likely to have included every possible component of a script. But scripts for weddings were mutually intelligible between many cultures, and representations of them remained identifiable over centuries. This broad intelligibility facilitated the consistent interest in what might be

called the ethnography of “foreign” variations and in domestic antiquarianism.¹⁹³ The mutual intelligibility also enabled authors, including John of Patmos, to convey a larger nuptial sense by choosing only a few elements of weddings to invoke. The iconography of weddings similarly relies on certain key elements of the proceedings. This leaves historians to reconstruct full scripts from scattered evidence. This evidence is, however, abundant and does include a few passages that serve as summaries of a kind. Epithalamia sometimes delineate the upper-class weddings for which they were composed; Catullus’ *Carmen* 61 is the most detailed.¹⁹⁴ Briefer synopses also occur in other genres; Chartion includes one for each of the eponymous heroine’s three weddings in the *Callirhoe*.¹⁹⁵ Menander’s *Samia* has recurring allusions within a seventy-line segment, e.g., “Your wedding’s on — the wine is being mixed, incense smokes, rites have begun, the meat is lit by fire god’s flame... [Your friends have] been waiting for ages for *you*! Why now delay to fetch the bride?”;¹⁹⁶

¹⁹³ For example, Oakley and Sinos draw attention to the fact that “[b]oth Plutarch and Pausanias mention many local wedding customs, sometimes with explanations of their origin or meaning. Lexicographers from the period of the Roman Empire and later give explanations of [relevant] terms from the classical period... A similar source of evidence are the scholia from manuscripts... from the Hellenistic period through the Byzantine era” (*Wedding in Ancient Athens*, 5).

¹⁹⁴ The strict distinction between the two had collapses by the NT period; I use “epithalamia” for wedding songs generally, as do writers of this period. On hymns in the classical Greek sense and epithalamia, see E. Faye Wilson, “Pastoral and Epithalamium in Latin Literature,” *Speculum* 23 (1948); Zoja Pavlovskis, “Statius and the Late Latin Epithalamia,” *Cl. Philol.* 60 (1965); Virginia Tufte, “‘High Wedlock Then Be Honored’: Rhetoric and the Epithalamium,” *Pacific Coast Philol.* 1 (1966); R. Drew Griffith, “In Praise of the Bride: Sappho Fr. 105(A) L-P, Voigt,” *TAPA* 119 (1989); Michael Roberts, “The Use of Myth in Latin Epithalamia from Statius to Venantius Fortunatus” (*TAPA*, 1989); Ole Thomsen, *Ritual and Desire: Catullus 61 and 62 and Other Ancient Documents on Wedding and Marriage* (Aarhus: Aarhus U P, 1992) *passim*; Too Yun Lee, “Alcman’s *Partheneion*: The Maidens Dance the City,” *QUCC* 56 (1997); J.C.B. Petropoulos, *Eroticism in Ancient and Medieval Greek Poetry* (London: Duckworth, 2003) *passim*; Marie-France Gineste, “Poésie, pouvoir et rhétorique à la fin du 4^e siècle après J.-C.,” *Rhetorica* (2004); Marilyn Skinner ed., *A Companion to Catullus* (Malden, Massachusetts: Blackwell, 2007), *passim*; Eric Dodson-Robinson, “Helen’s ‘Judgment of Paris’ and Greek Wedding Ritual in Sappho 16,” *Arethusa* 41 (2010).

¹⁹⁵ Chariton, *Callirhoe* 1.1.12-13, 3.2.15-17, 8.1.11-13.

¹⁹⁶ Menan., *Samia* 672-676 (Arnott, 169); ποῶσι γάρ σοι τοὺς γάμους· κεράννυται/θυμιάτ’ ἐνῆρκτ’ ἀνῆπτται θύμαθ’ Ἡφαίστου φλογί/...σὲ γάρ σὲ περιμένουσ’ οὔτοι πάλα.

“Everything’s *done*! Baths. First rites. The wedding. So if that fellow ever turns up, he can take his bride away!”;¹⁹⁷ “We must fetch the sacred water. Chrysis, send the women, the bearer, and the piper, and someone give us torches and garlands so we can escort [the bride] home... Now crown your head[, Moschion] and put on your best clothes!”¹⁹⁸

Reading Revelation in light of wedding scripts allows its cohesive nuptial vision to emerge. The explicit mentions of weddings — γαμός (19:8, 9), νύμφη (21:2, 9; 22:17) and therefore ἀνὴρ (21:2), γύνῃ (19:7; 21:9) — are not isolated references but culminate the reiteration of motifs that would not necessarily have nuptial associations in a text that did not mention weddings, especially if they occurred singly. Crowns, processions, and special clothes, for example, are all equally appropriate to athletic and military victories. I make no argument that they or other elements lack such associations in Revelation, or that the nuptial resonances are stronger ones. What bears emphasis is that here they occur in concert, and that the evitability of their nuptial resonances does not argue against hearing them in a text that does contain a wedding and explicitly and repeatedly associates them.

The scripts that informed ancient authors, visual artists, and audiences were not only mutually intelligible but also relatively stable. Wedding practices changed across time and space, but core elements of them remained consistent as well. Then as often now, they were notably conservative — not inflexible or static, but conservative nonetheless. S.M. Baugh notes, for example, that

...Homer and Plutarch are separated by eight or nine centuries, but both present the same essential elements of the wedding day. The wedding guests were treated to a grand feast and

¹⁹⁷ Ibid 711-712, (169); ...πάντα γέγονε· λουτρά προτέλει' οἱ γάμοι' / ὥστ' ἐκεῖνος ἂν ποτ' ἔλθῃ τὴν κόρην ἃ πεισ' ἔχων.

¹⁹⁸ Ibid 729-733 (183, 185); τὸ λοιπὸν ἐστὶ λουτρά μετέναι. / Χρυσὶ πέμπε τὰς γυναῖκας λουτροφόρον αὐ λητρίδα. / δεῦρο δ' ἡμῖν ἐκδότω τις δᾶδα καὶ στεφάνους ἵνα / συμπροπέμπωμεν... πύκαλε σὺ κράτα καὶ κόσμει σεαυτὸν.

to the dancing of elaborate folk dances... the friends of the bride and others, in some cases under the supervision of the groom himself or of his deputy, would join in a procession to escort the bride to her [*thalamos*], which the groom had prepared... The bridal procession often included the bride riding with the groom on an ox-cart or in a chariot surrounded by the revelers.... [torches] appear again and again in our sources... as essential elements in the bridal procession. The [*hymenaios*] also appears repeatedly as a part of the procession. Indeed, this traditional song was so identified with Greek marriage that it was used much like wedding bells might be used today (114).¹⁹⁹

This accords with the conclusions that James Redfield, Aphrodite Avagianou, Oakley and Sinos, Cynthia Patterson, Rush Rehm, V rilhac and Vial, Kirk Ormand, and Amy C. Smith have drawn from the same body of evidence.²⁰⁰ Plutarch's very questions about the differences between what he represents as Greek and Roman weddings (see following discussion) demonstrate their commonalities. The visual evidence for weddings in and around Rome is less and is very different from that for those in and around Athens, ones but it does exist, and considering it along with literary and archaeological evidence has Daniel Harmon, Ole Thomsen, Vassiliki Panoussi, Shawn O'Bryhim, and Karen Hersch to reconstruct detailed, consistent scripts for the Roman wedding.²⁰¹ "Greek" weddings and scripts, moreover, were not rigidly separated from "Roman" ones, and they were not radically removed from the "Jewish" ones that L onie Archer and Michael Satlow offer.

¹⁹⁹ On the varieties of ancient wedding observances, see Kenneth Campbell (ed.), *Marriage and Family in the Biblical World* (Downer's Grove, Illinois: IVP, 2003), *passim*. On the history of weddings and their depiction, see Oakley and Sinos, *Wedding*, 3-8. On post-classical traditions, see J.K. Campbell, *Honour, Family and Patronage* (Oxford: Clarendon P, 1964) 59-69, 124-140; Rebecca Hague (maiden name; Rebecca Sinos), "Ancient Greek Wedding Songs," *J Folklore Res.* 20 (1983); Vassos Argyrou, *Tradition and Modernity in the Mediterranean: The wedding as symbolic struggle* (Cambridge: Cambridge U P, 1996), 60-78.

²⁰⁰ James Redfield, "Notes on the Greek Wedding," *Arethusa* 15 (1982); Aphrodite Avagianou, *Sacred Marriages in the Rituals of Greek Religion* (New York: Peter Lang, 1991), 1-16; Cynthia Patterson, "Marriage and the Married Woman," 54-56; Oakley and Sinos, *The Wedding*, *passim*; Rehm, *Marriage to Death*, *passim*; V rilhac and Vial, *Marriage grec*, 281-366; Ormand, *Exchange and the Maiden*, *passim*; Gloria Ferrari, "What Kind of Rite of Passage Was the Ancient Greek Wedding?" in *Initiation in Ancient Greek Rituals and Narratives* (ed. Christopher Faraone and D.B. Dodd; London: Routledge, 2003); Amy C. Smith, "The politics of weddings at Athens," *Leeds Int'l. Cl. St.* 40 (2005), 3-7.

²⁰¹ Harmon, "Family Festivals," 1598-1600; Thomsen, *Ritual and Desire*, *passim*; Vassiliki Panoussi, "Sexuality and Ritual: Catullus' Wedding Poems," in *Companion to Catullus* (ed. Skinner), 276-292; Shawn O'Bryhim, "Myrrha's 'Wedding' (Ov. *Met.* 10. 446-470)," *Cl.* 258 (2008), 190-192; Hersch, *Roman Wedding*, *passim*.

Early Jewish weddings existed in a continuum not only with contemporary non-Jewish ones but also with earlier ANE and biblical and later rabbinic ones. The schema of the wedding as envisioned by early rabbis is illuminating:

Safrai summarizes rabbinic teaching on the marriage ceremony as a fourfold process. First, the bride prepared by bathing, perfuming and adorning herself. Second, she was conveyed from her father's house to the groom's in a carriage with a wreath while people sang and danced — often this occurred in the evening with a torch processional. Third, the groom went out to receive the bride into his house (or into the *chuppah* structure inside the house). Fourth, the festival in the home consisted of blessings (requiring ten men present) and a week-long feast.²⁰²

This rabbinic model has an obvious continuity with the ones that Archer and Satlow posit for early Judaism, as well as Karel van der Toorn's for biblical Israel. Throughout antiquity, the forms of Jews' weddings largely resembled those of their neighbours.²⁰³ The Gentiles who quickly became the majority of Jesus-followers and then Christians followed this pattern, and while rabbinic communities eventually sought to develop distinctively Jewish wedding practices,

[t]he ancient Roman marriage rites were taken over by the Christian Church with very few changes. The auspices of the augurs, of course, were abolished, and the *sacrificium nuptiale*, the nuptial sacrifice of wine or incense, was eventually "converted" and became a nuptial mass. But the legal and ceremonial aspects, namely the reading of the marriage consent from the *tabulae nuptiales* and its signing, the handing over of the dowry, the *dextrarum iunctio* or clasping of the right hands, and the cooperation of the deity confirming the legal action and protecting the marriage, *dea pronuba* or *deus pronubus* — all of these underwent few changes, or changes only with regard to the tutelary deity. In pre-imperial and early imperial times... *Juno pronuba* was shown standing between the young couple with her hands on the shoulders of groom and bride who were performing the *dextrarum iunctio*; at least the archeologists would

²⁰² David Chapman, "Marriage and Family in Second Temple Judaism" in *Marriage and Family* (ed. Campbell), 206; Archer, *Her Price*, 189-205; van der Toorn, *From Her Cradle to Her Grave: The Role of Religion in the Life of the Israelite and the Babylonian Woman* (Sheffield: JSOT P, 1994), 59-76; Satlow, *Jewish Marriage*, 163-180.

²⁰³ The antecedents of recognizably Jewish weddings as they now exist did not appear widely until the early middle ages or become developed until the high. See Ze'ev Falk, *Jewish Matrimonial Law in the Middle Ages* (Oxford: Oxford U P, 1966), 37-51, 88-90; Ranon Katzoff, "Greek and Jewish Marriage Formulas," in *Classical Studies in Honor of David Sohlberg* (ed. Katzoff; Ramat Gan: Bar-Ilan U P, 1996); Satlow, *Jewish Marriage*, 68-80.

usually call this deity a *Juno pronuba* when she appears— as she does quite frequently — on sarcophagi.²⁰⁴

The rabbinic Jewish wedding that began developing in late antiquity, then, was as much distinct from “Greco-Roman” or “pagan” weddings as from Christian ones: they were formally the same thing. Outside rabbinic Judaism, however, nuptial practices evolved slowly, enduring major religious and social changes and resisting formal innovation.

Epithalamia and related texts are a case in point; they are almost reactionary. Rebecca Hague observes that

[t]he similarity of the imagery of Greek wedding songs to love songs of New Kingdom Egypt, and to the Biblical Song of Songs and the *wasf* or description which is a staple of Syrian love and wedding songs was noticed by Franz Dornseiff [in 1936]. The emphasis of these songs is also on the appearance of the couple, which is praised, as in the Greek songs, through the technique of comparison... The similarity of these songs and the Greek songs, all focusing on the praise of the appearance of the bride and groom by means of comparison, suggests that there was a very old tradition of wedding songs common to many people of the Eastern Mediterranean. The tradition is very tenacious. There are modern Palestinian parallels to the Song of Songs, and modern Greek wedding songs preserve the comparisons of the ancient songs (138-139).

These traditions, or what was understood as traditional, had a special cultural status.

The constellations of disparate elements that constituted weddings did not have any discrete, fixed meaning for the people who practiced them or for the cultures in which they were situated. They could mean anything or nothing, like many modern western practices;

²⁰⁴ Ernst Kantorowicz, “On the Golden Marriage Belt and the Marriage Rings of the Dumbarton Oaks Collection,” *D. Oaks Pap.* 14 (1960), 4. Michael Roberts, “Use of Myth,” similarly notes of literary nuptial imagery that after the time of Constantine, ““mythology, especially in a stylized context like the epithalamium, had long been deprived of all substantial pagan belief. The process of secularization is already complete in Statius. It was this detachment of artistic representations of the pagan gods from any system of religious belief that furnished, at least among the cultural elite, the conditions for the reappropriation of mythical schemata as an encoded model of human relations. Although rigorous Christians might object to any use of mythical imagery, for many more flexible members of the educated classes such images must have seemed religiously neutral and aesthetically attractive... The analogy between art and literature is striking. In both, mythical imagery is neutralized as aesthetic ornamentation and deemed appropriate to pagan and Christian alike. The mid-fourth century Casket of Projecta... is a case in point” (335-336). See also Falk, *Jewish Matrimonial Law*, 65-90, 104-111; John Meyendorff, “Christian Marriage in Byzantium,” *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 34 (1990), 99-106; Michael Sheehan, *Marriage, Family, and Law in Medieval Europe* (Toronto: U Toronto P, 1996), 278-291; David Hunter, “Augustine and the Making of Marriage in Roman North Africa,” *J ECS* 11 (2003); Srđan Šarkić, “The Concept of Marriage in Roman, Byzantine and Serbian Mediaeval Law,” *Recueil des travaux de l’Inst. d’études byzantines* 41 (2004).

e.g., just as many Anglo-Western brides feel that it is “traditional” and auspicious to wear “something old, something new, something borrowed, and something blue” on their wedding day, although no one is quite sure why;²⁰⁵ ancient weddings might include cries of *Talassio!*, vows of *Ubi te Gaius, ego Gaia*, or other elements whose meaning was unclear to the people practicing them. Likewise, the commonalities do not mean that all the similar observances descend from the same *Ur*-wedding or depend on each other, or that they always carry the same meanings (or lack of meaning). But the similarities do result from common understandings and practices rather than coincidences. Some of them would be difficult to avoid; for example, ancient marriage usually involved establishing co-residence, so the frequency of a nuptial procession to it is not surprising.

THE IMAGE OF THE WEDDING

Weddings enjoyed a high cultural profile throughout much of antiquity. Revelation's climactic presentation of the wedding is consistent with the contemporary prominence of weddings in the arts. Specific points in the ceremony (e.g., bridal bathing, adornment, procession, and veil gestures) constitute a far higher proportion of activities depicted on classical Athenian pottery than they could have in lived reality. These scenes are especially popular on *loutrophoroi*, ewers designated specially for the bridal bath and thereafter displayed in the home, much like a couples' and their parents' and children's wedding portraits in modern domestic displays. *Loutrophoroi* were often buried with women and with

²⁰⁵ This is not an isolated example; the idea that the bride and groom should not see each other before the ceremony on the wedding day, that the groom should not see the bride's dress before the wedding, the bouquet toss, and the garter ceremony have all persisted in the same wedding script without being “understood.” Some versions of the old rhyme's ending with “and a silver sixpence in her shoe” have generated a literal cottage trade in the historical coins, which are bought and sold for modest amounts of money that are nonetheless well above their adjusted face value.

girls who died παρθένοι. Roman paintings have not yet been studied as intensively as Greek ceramics, but there too they seem to be a popular subject. Funerary reliefs commonly depict married couples forming the nuptial handclasp, the *dextrarum iunctio*, in the presence of Juno Pronuba, the goddess acting in the role of the honoured matron who presided at this part of the ceremony.²⁰⁶

This prominence in the cultural repertoire was longstanding. So-called “bridal songs” abound in some of the ANE’s earliest poetic corpora, those from the Fertile Crescent, and remain popular through the end of classical antiquity. Some of the earliest Greek literature uses the image of the wedding to communicate social cohesion. Thus Cynthia Patterson, discussing Homer’s description of the scenes on Achilles’ shield, notes that

[t]he public character of the ancient Greek *gamos* is clear in the first description we have in the social life of the polis. In book 18 of the *Iliad* Homer describes the city at peace which Hephaistos fashioned on the new shield he made for Achilles, and in this city *gamoí* are the first event noted... One indication of the importance in Athens of this celebration — carried out by family, friends, and kin but clearly meant to engage the attention of the community as a whole — is the frequency with which scenes from the *gamos* appear on Athenian pottery (1991: 53-54).

Weddings were popular in drama as well, as they are today. Then as now, the play (or film or program) does not represent a complete wedding any more than a vase did so. Instead, playwrights selected a few visible features to convey the impression. Comedies proverbially end with weddings as social order is restored, as in New Comedy and early Roman plays.

Tragedies often end with the bride and occasionally also the groom dying just as the

²⁰⁶ On visual representations of weddings, see especially Oakley and Sinos, *Wedding*, 43-47; Amy C. Smith, “Politics,” Hersch, *Roman Wedding*, 205-211. See also Elizabeth Pemberton, “The Name Vase of the Peleus Painter,” *J Walters Art Gallery* 36 (1977); Erika Simon, “The Diptych of the Symmachi and Nicomachi,” *G & R* 39 (1992); E.A. Mackay, “Narrative Tradition in Early Greek Oral Poetry and Vase-Painting,” *Oral Trad.* 10 (1995), 297-300; Eva Parisinou, “‘Lighting’ the World of Women,” *G & R* 47 (2000), 28-34; Ross Kilpatrick, “The Early Augustan ‘Aldobrandini Wedding’ Fresco,” *MAAR* 47 (2002); G. Deschodt, “Images et mariage, une question de méthode: le geste d’anakalypsis,” *Cahiers «Mondes anciens»* 2 (2011) [n.p.]; Victoria Sabetai, “Eros Reins Supreme: Dionysos’ Wedding on a New Krater by the Dinos Painter,” in *A Different God? Dionysus and Ancient Polytheism* (ed. R. Schlesier; Berlin: De Gruyter, 2011), 137-160.

wedding was about to take place. In these cases, similarities between wedding and funeral observances — bathing the body, anointing it with oil, dressing and covering it specially, and bringing it in a song-accompanied procession to a new bed — enhance dramatic irony. Tragedies also often connect this disruption of familial to a disruption of the greater social order that affects all the households in the city (e.g., as in the *Antigone*.) Fifth-century Attic dramas and their literary descendants are especially fond of these motifs.²⁰⁷

Histories, epics, and romances can all feature wedding narratives, with the latter genres sometimes placing them in a civic context.²⁰⁸ In this they departed from reality. Although actual weddings were deliberately visible affairs that sought the maximum spectatorship (see below), they were not the same kind of political programming as were state funerals, commemorative games, or triumphs. Neither were they civic holidays, components of festival calendars, etc. Imagined weddings, though, could be these things, as Cynthia Patterson notes (see above). Epics often use this to tragic effect, as in the *Iliad* or the *Aeneid*, while romances have a special fondness for taking it in a happier direction. In *Joseph and Aseneth*, Pharaoh, acting *in loco parentis*, “gave a marriage feast... He called together all the chiefs of the land of Egypt and all the kings of the nations and proclaimed to the whole land of Egypt, saying, ‘Every man who works during the seven days of Joseph and Aseneth’s wedding shall surely die.’”²⁰⁹ This is a public holiday on a grand scale. The

²⁰⁷ See especially Richard Seaford, “The Tragic Wedding,” *J Hellenic St.* 107 (1987); Dowden, *Death and the Maiden*; Rehm, *Marriage to Death*. Cf. Ormand, *Exchange and the Maiden*.

²⁰⁸ See Sophia Papaioannou, “Charite’s Rape, Psyche on the Rock and the Parallel Function of Marriage in Apuleius’ *Metamorphoses*,” *Mnemosyne* 51 (1998); Stavros Frangoulidis, “*Scaena Feralium Nuptiarum*,” *Am. J Philol.* 120 (1999); S. Panayotakis, “The Knot and the Hymen,” *Mnemosyne* 53 (2000); O’Byrhim, “Myrrha’s ‘Wedding;’” Robert Cowan, “Thrasymennus’ Wanton Wedding: Etymology, Genre, and *Virtus* in Silius Italicus, *Punica*,” *Cl. Q.* 59 (2009).

²⁰⁹ *Jos. As.* 21:8, ad. Charles Burchard, *OTP* 2.236.

heroine's weddings in the *Callirhoe* are less dramatic, but “the marriage hymn sounded throughout the city... and the doorways were sprinkled with wine and perfume. The Syracusans celebrated the day more joyfully than that of their victory over the Athenians.”²¹⁰ Chariton specifies full civic participation and explicitly connects the wedding to a public holiday as traditionally understood.

This public aspect of imagined weddings accords with tendencies in the depiction of real ones to liken the bridegroom to an athletic victor, a ruler, or conquerer.²¹¹ Marriage often follows a man's victory in narratives: David's marriages to both Michal and Abigail and Aeneas' to Lavinia, for example, are predicated on military success, while Theseus, Perseus, and Samson all secure brides (albeit abortively in the latter cases) by performing feats of strength. Atalanta's hand goes to the winner of a foot race, and many of Pindar's victory odes connect athletic triumph to marriage. Grooms and brides alike were “recipients of songs and gifts that in most rituals belong to the gods” (Oakley and Sinos 44); among mortals, “only victors in battles and or in the Panhellenic games received similar honours, and in fact, the wreaths and fillets brought by winged Erotes to crown the couple in red-figure scenes link wedding scenes to scenes of victors in the games, who also received such symbols of divine favor” (ibid). E.A. Mackay draws attention to Athenian iconography in which scene of a victory goddess driving a hero's chariot is almost indistinguishable from one of a bridegroom driving a wedding chariot: “the overriding image could be defined as a

²¹⁰ Chariton, *Callirhoe*, 1.13, ad. 35; ὑμέναιος ἦδετο κατὰ πᾶσαν τὴν πόλιν· μεσταὶ δὲ αἱ ῥῦμαι στεφάνων λαμπάδων· ἐρραίνετο τὰ πρόθυρα οἶνω καὶ μύροις. ἦδιον ταύτην τὴν ἡμέραν ἡγάγον οἱ Συρακόσιοι τῆς τῶν ἐπινικίων.

²¹¹ Schear, “Semonides fr. 7.” For more general discussions, see Glass, “Some Observations,” 151-154; Archer, *Her Price*, 194; Satlow, *Jewish Marriage*, 163-164; Kenneth Campbell, *Marriage and Family*, 110-11; David Brodsky, *A Bride without a Blessing: A Study in the Redaction and Content of Massekhet Kallah and Its Gemara* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006), 91-103; Hersch, *Roman Weddings*, 114-122.

male and a female in a chariot; that their roles are reversed, in that the female holds the reins, serves to draw attention to the unusual circumstances, and to the fact that this is no wedding.”²¹²

The connections between the Bride’s appearance and the Lamb’s victory in Revelation become clearer in this setting. The Lamb’s triumph is certainly martial as much as marital, as Steven Friesen, Jörg Frey, Chris Frilingos, John Marshall, and Robert Seesengood have all discussed in detail.²¹³ Rome’s empire is a false, idolatrous one; Christ is the true *imperator* who will triumph in the eschaton. Indeed, David Aune argues that

[s]everal features of [Rev. 19:11-21] suggest that the author has incorporated image from the Roman triumph... (1) the prominence of [white horses], (2) the diadems worn by the rider, (3) the name or title inscribed on the rider, (4) the posthumous character of the rider suggested by his robe dipped in blood, (5) the armies accompanying the rider and the predominantly military imagery, which reflects a decisive victory. The major feature missing is the quadriga... yet this is explicable since the setting here is not the celebration of victory but the preparation for a final battle.²¹⁴

It may be a piece of Revelation’s irony that enslaved war captives were a major feature of triumphs and victory celebrations, especially given that this conquerer wins his ultimate victory immediately after the bride’s appearance and immediately before the wedding feast (see ch. 4). The juxtaposition is neither coincidental nor unprecedented. As Kevin Miller and Lynn Huber both detail and Donal McIlraith observes in summary, while

most commentaries focus on the war imagery [of Rev. 19:11-16] and do not take the marriage context into account, war and wedding are found together in Ps 45, a royal wedding song. Some commentators have noticed that this passage seems to allude to this psalm. The focus here is on the bridegroom, Christ... the tradition in the Church of seeing [the blood in which Christ’s robe is dipped as his own] seems to make better sense of the passage. His wedding robe, then, consists of his righteous deed, and symbolizes the victory he has already achieved and by which he “freed us from our sins by his blood” (1:6). He is decked, as every bridegroom

²¹² Mackay, “Narrative Tradition,” 300.

²¹³ Friesen, *Imperial Cults*, 197-201; Frilingos, “Sexing the Lamb,” 309-316; Marshall, “Who’s on the Throne?”; Frey, “Relevance of the Roman Imperial Cult,” 247-253; Seesengood, *Competing Identities*, 67-84.

²¹⁴ Aune, *Revelation*, 1050-1051; cf. Sweet, *Revelation*, 281-284; Osborne, *Revelation*, 678-697; Witherington, *Revelation*, 241-246; Boxall, *Revelation*, 371f.; Blount, *Revelation*, 349f.

should [be], with a diadem. In fact he has “many diadems” (19:12). The army that follows him is dressed in the same bridal robe that we saw on the wife in 19:8. How can this not be the bridal procession?²¹⁵

Athletic/military and nuptial imagery thus coalesce at the conclusion of Revelation. There is no need to decide whether the crowns/wreaths, the special clothes, the public processions, etc. are “about” victory (whether the Lamb’s, the martyrs’, or both), eschatological union, or community identity in God’s reign. They, like other images, are simultaneously “about” all of these things and more. Speaking of crowns, for example, Gregory Stevens provides a reminder that “the primary meanings attaching to the gold wreath were victory, royal authority, divine glory, and honour; yet it was not the case that the crown had to express one of these to the exclusion of the other... [and there are many] examples of how the wreath could express more than one association in a given context... [as with] victory or honorary wreaths which are then dedicated to the deity” (269). Reading the crowns as nuptial does not mean that they are less or non-athletic, martial, or theological, or that all crowns have a nuptial meaning. If they occurred with the same frequency in the otherwise unaltered gospel of Luke, which minimizes bridegroom imagery, they would carry many fewer and much weaker nuptial associations. But they occur in Revelation, and this lends them a nuptial tone, in much the same way that Jesus’ crucifixion is what gives most of the meaning to the Fourth Gospel’s repeated references to the Son of Man’s being “lifted up.” It is with reference to the matrix of meaning that Ruben Zimmerman connects both victory-martyrdom and eternity to the nuptial sense of Revelation’s many wreaths/crowns:

...[LAB] should be referred to, for here the bridal wreath is mentioned in close connection to an upcoming death. [Jephthah’s daughter] laments... “I have not been satisfied on my bridal bed and was not granted the wreathes of my wedding... And over time the flowers of the wreath that my nurse has woven will wilt” (LAB 49,6)... If the “wreath of life” in Rev. is also

²¹⁵ McIlraith, SSC, “Nuptial Response,” 29-31 cf. Miller, “Nuptial Eschatology;” Huber, *Like a Bride*, 137-178 and *Thinking and Seeing*, 76-88.

used specifically as an image of hope against death (martyrdom), the formulation does not only have to be understandable within the image of the "martyr as athlete" but also retains its meaning within the scope of the wedding. This shows up not least in the later depiction of the martyr Blandina whose death, described in detail, is depicted as a wedding. Her death is union (κοινωνία) with Christ (155-156).

The divine sphere could also be invoked directly in connection with representations of human weddings. The gods' weddings are a popular subject for vase paintings from the archaic period onward, and the archetypal *hieros gamos* was that of Zeus and Hera, as Aphrodite Avagianou details. Athenian civic religion included an annual reenactment of its inception in which the city's matrons bathed, adorned, and processed cult statues of Hera; the *fasti* included a similar observance for Juno (Ovid, *Met.* 4.133-154).²¹⁶

The deities of the Greek and Roman civic pantheons could also be depicted as interacting with mortal weddings in more ways than providing templates or blessing. Goddesses such as Hera (or Juno) and Aphrodite (or Venus, either one alone or accompanied by her son) also appear in visual art, often acting as παρόνυμφοι or *pronubae*, part of the heroic or divinizing depiction of mortal brides and grooms (see above). This can be obvious in visual art when brides or grooms appear with heroic or divine attributes; it also occurs in literature, e.g., "...Junia is coming to marry Manlius, just like Idalium's denizen: Venus, when she went to her Phrygian judge, a good virgin with auspicious omens."²¹⁷ Jewish tradition had little that was quite analogous to this divinization, although it shared the likening to royalty (e.g., by using crowns and litters), as Susan Marks details and Michael Satlow summarizes:

²¹⁶ Avagianou, *Sacred Marriage*, *passim*, and "Hieros Gamos in Ancient Greek Religion," in *Sacred Marriages* (ed. Nissinen and Uro), 145-171; cf. Gwendolyn Leick, *Sex and Eroticism in Mesopotamian Literature* (London: Routledge, 1994) 64-79.

²¹⁷ Catullus, *Carmen* 61.16-20, ad. J. Godwin 35; *namque Iunia Manlio/ qualis Idalium colens/ venit ad Phrygium/ Venus/ iudicem bona cum bona// nubet alite virgo*.

The adornments, garlands, and procession in a litter... imply a link between marriage and royal coronation: the couple becomes “royalty for a day.” “Garlands” or crowns are often mentioned in the Bible as royal crowns, a use continued in rabbinic literature... Similarly, the litter, *’apiryon*, connotes royalty and raised status. The word *’apiryon*, [sic] occurs in the Bible only at Song 3:9, in loose proximity to the mention of garlands (3:11): “King Solomon made him an *’apiryon* of wood from Lebanon.” Rabbinic literature both mentions it incidentally as the litter that bore the bride and interprets it as referring to the Tent of Meeting or the ark for a Torah scroll.²¹⁸

There was also some idea of a divine template for marriage in the understanding of Eve’s creation as her wedding to Adam, which Satlow details (2001, 56-67). Rabbinic sources also use the divine wedding metaphor for brides they found less troubling than Israel. Thus speaking of the first creation narrative, “Geniba said, ‘The matter may be compared to the case of a king who made a marriage canopy for himself. He plastered it, painted it, and decorated it. And what was the marriage canopy lacking? Only a bride to come into it. So too what did the world lack? It was the Sabbath’” (*Gen. Rab.* 10.2B; Neusner 107).

Zeus’ marriage to Hera was one gone perfectly right, at least as far as Zeus is concerned; God’s to the Sabbath is no less perfect in R. Geniba’s view. Weddings gone wrong, however, were no less popular a theme. Persephone’s in the underworld and Eurydice’s and Orpheus’ peri-nuptial descents also served as religiously foundational nuptial disasters. Both were the foci of cult observances, rather grand ones in Persephone’s case. In Ezekiel, God’s adorned and beloved bride turns to whoredom; in Genesis, Jacob is deceived; and in Judges, Samson’s wedding is a debacle of impressive proportions. Perhaps the most important biblical foundering, however, is the corruption of what subsequent interpreters saw as the first and foundational human marriage, the relationship between Adam and Eve (see above). It is this that Revelation corrects in the eschatological fulfillment, as Edith Humphrey suggests: “Here is a ‘bride’ of radiance juxtaposed with an enormous metropolis,

²¹⁸ Satlow, *Jewish Marriage*, 172; Marks, “History vs. Ritual.”

described in terms of maternal and fertility imagery... Just as the imagery of 22:1-3 recalls Eden, a reverse Eve (and, perhaps, Adam) is suggested by the removal of ‘every curse.’”²¹⁹

NUPTIAL ECONOMIES

Literary and visual depictions of weddings, of course, were the outgrowth of lived reality. Weddings were prominent in cultural representations because they had some prominence in ordinary society. But although real weddings could be very noticeable, they were rarely criticized for being economically wasteful or ideologically objectionable, as they are today. Critiques of *luxuria* were a rhetorical commonplace in the NT world, as sumptuary laws were a legal one, but weddings were rarely a target of either.²²⁰ These critiques of *luxuria* and attempts to curb it often target the clothes and jewelry of rich women, and figure the vice as an idle and immoral woman or effeminate man whose extensive collection of expensive clothes, jewelry, accoutrements, and feminine or effeminate amusements proclaim guilt. This figure, however, is not a bride, and for all the restrictions that various sumptuary laws place on women’s apparel, wedding dress rarely, if ever, appears among them. Dowries and other marital gifts could be part of this critique, but weddings themselves were not. The ceremonies that most often drew censure for

²¹⁹ Humphrey, *The Ladies and the Cities*, 94. She also notes that “The ch. 12 woman stands on the moon, is clothed with the sun, and wears a crown of 12 stars; the holy city has no need of sun or moon, since her δόξα and φωστήρ (21.11) are from God (or are God), and she has 12 gates supervised by 12 angels. Farrer [*Revelation*, 215] comments that the crown of the heavenly lady has become the “battlemented crown” of the city, a commonplace in ancient iconography. The first woman labours under childbirth, the penalty of Genesis 3, giving a loud cry, while with the second woman every κατόθεμα is gone, and there are no more tears or crying. Occasional help is given to the first woman *in extremis* by heaven and earth; the second woman is pictured in an intimate and permanent connection with God and the rejuvenated earth” (ibid, 110).

²²⁰ On sumptuary laws, see Phyllis Culham, “The *Lex Oppia*,” *Latomus* 41 (1982): 786-793; Peter Wyetzner, “Sulla’s Law on Prices and the Roman Definition of Luxury,” in *Speculum Iuris* (ed. 15-33 in J.-J. Aubert and B. Sirks; Ann Arbor: U Michigan P, 2002), 15-33; Vincent Rosivach, “The *Lex Fannia Sumptuaria* of 161 BC,” *Cl. J.* 102 (2006): 1-15; Emanuela Zanda, *Fighting Hydra-Like Luxury: Sumptuary Regulation in the Roman Republic* (Bristol: Bristol Cl. P, 2011), 49-69. See also Ogden, “Controlling Women’s Dress.”

excesses were banquets, but restrictions on them rarely mention wedding feasts.

Considering how specific sumptuary legislation becomes, this is telling. A variety of other feasts, which the sources are probably accurate in usually depicting as being hosted and attended by men, come in for most of the criticism. Funeral excesses are also a target, but the most elaborate funerals tended to be for male decedents.

This is not to say that weddings could not be expensive. Making the bride as queenlike as possible cost money; so did impressing the guests. *P. Oxy.* 3313 attests to an order of 2,000 roses and 2,000 additional flowers for a wedding in a family that does not appear exceptionally wealthy. It is thus no surprise that male complaints about the fuss around weddings are a staple of ancient as well as modern comedies. The miserly host, the domineering housewife, the lazy slave, the clever slave, and the prodigal son all appear in this context in Greek and Roman plays. The fathers of the bride and groom are particularly inclined to complain about the expense and trouble that wedding involves. This is the main punch line of Plautus' *Aulularia* and a smaller theme in many other comedies, e.g., Terence's

Brothers:

AESCHINUS (*to himself*): They're killing me with the fuss they're making about the wedding ceremony. They're taking the whole day to prepare...

DEMEA: ...why don't you go and fetch your bride?

AESCHINUS: I want to. But we're waiting for the piper and the choir...

DEMEA: Forget about all that, wedding hymns, congregations, torches, pipers. Get that garden wall knocked down as soon as you can. Fetch her across that way, unite the two families, bring the mother and the whole household over to us... (*aside*) My brother's house will become a thoroughfare... and it'll cost him a lot (ad. Barsby 353, 355).

"When a man marries off his daughter and pays off the expense of her wedding," says *Gen.*

Rab. 26.3F, "he says to her, 'May you never come back here [i.e., divorced or

widowed]" (Neusner 281). Pliny the Younger speaks of "what was to have been spent [by the bride's father] on clothes, pearls, and jewels" (*Ep.* 5.16.7, *quod in vestes margarita gemmas fuerat*.

erogaturus), implying some financial planning. Still, weddings did not tend to be oversized items in the profile of event spending. Their legal and socioeconomic implications (see following discussion) were also such that devoting resources to them might have seemed a worthwhile investment. The earliest extant sustained critique of weddings as “luxurious” seems to be John Chrysostom’s,²²¹ and it postdates the first Greek sumptuary laws on non-civic rituals and women’s adornment by at least 900 years.

PRIVATE BEGINNINGS: BETROTHAL

Marriage ceremonies began before the wedding, with set observances for negotiating the union. These tended to involve the prospective groom approaching the father or guardian of the desired bride, either directly or through intermediaries (Gen. 24, 29; Exod. 2:15b-22, 3:1). Neglecting these observances could be understood as a gross violation, as in Gen. 34; as George Coats observes, “[t]he marriage tradition... emphasizes the relationship between the bridegroom and his father-in-law, not the relationship between the bridegroom and his wife” (1973: 5). Pre-exilic biblical texts prescribe bridewealth, which may also have characterized the marital economy of archaic Greece and Rome.²²² HB narratives depict

²²¹ In *Hom. in Gen.* 56.2, commenting on Gen. 29:23, Chrysostom asks, “Do you see with how much solemnity they conducted weddings in ancient times? Listen, you who are swept up in the excitement of satanic rituals and besmirch the solemnity of marriage at its very beginnings. Surely there’s no place for flutes? Surely there’s no place for cymbals? Surely there’s no place for satanic dances? Why is it, tell me, that you introduce such a nuisance into the house and call in people from the state and the theatre so as to undermine the girl’s *sophrosyne* and make the boy shameless with this regrettable expenditure?” (ad. M. Sheridan, 196; Εἶδες τὸ παλαιὸν μεθ’ ὅσης σεμνότητος τοὺς γάμους ἐπετίλουν Ἀκούσατε οἱ περὶ τὰς σατανικὰς πομπὰς ἐπτοημένοι καὶ ἐξ αὐτῶν τῶν προοιμίῶν τὰ σεμνὰ τοῦ γάμου καταισχύνοντες. Μὴ τοῦ αὐλοῦ μὴ τοῦ κύμβαλα μὴ τοῦ χορεῖαι σατανικά. Τίνος γὰρ ἕνεκεν εἶπέ μοι τοσαύτην λύμην εὐθὺς ἐπεισάγεις εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν καὶ τοὺς ἀπὸ τῆς σκηνῆς καὶ τῆς ὀρχήστρας καλεῖς ἵνα μετὰ τῆς ἀκαίρου δαπάνης καὶ τὴν τῆς κόρης λυμήνη σωφροσύνην καὶ τὸν νέον ἀναισχυντότερον ἐργάσῃ). This is consistent with his criticisms of luxury in general and female luxury in particular. It is also a revealing bit of interpretation, misunderstanding as it does what Genesis actually narrates.

²²² See Roth, “Marriage and Matrimonial Prestations;” Archer, *Her Price*, 159-162.

young men (or occasionally young women) gaining permission for marriage and then residing with the bride's father (or the groom's family) and laboring for his household for months or years before actually marrying (e.g., Jacob, Gen. 29; Moses, Exod. 2:15b-22, 3:1; Ruth). Representatives of the prospective groom's family may also do the negotiating (e.g., Abraham's slave on Isaac's behalf in Gen. 24) and movable property can replace service as bridewealth (Gen. 29; Jdg. 14:10-14).²²³ John 4 echoes the OT type scene in some detail and with no small degree of irony (i.e., Jesus directly approaches a much-married and morally dubious woman).²²⁴ This is itself consistent with practices in the greater ANE, where ceremony in the form of food and drink exchanges, gift presentations, anointing, and

²²³ One of the first detailed discussions of the theme, Hermann Gunkel's in his 1910 commentary on Genesis, is dated in several respects but still offers foundational insights (*Genesis*; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, tr. 1977), 241-256, 318-321, 357-359). See also Wolfgang Roth, "The Wooing of Rebekah," *CBQ* 34 (1972): 177-97; George Coats, "Moses in Midian," (1973), 4-6; Esther Fuchs, "Structure and Patriarchal Functions in the Biblical Betrothal Type-Scene," *JFSR* 3 (1987), 9-13, and *Sexual Politics in the Biblical Narrative: Reading the Hebrew Bible as a Woman* (Sheffield: JSOT P, 2000), 91-115; Gila Ramras-Rauch, "Fathers and Daughters: Two Biblical Narratives," in *Mappings of the Biblical Terrain* (ed. Vincent Tollers and John Maier; Cranbury, New Jersey: Associated U Ps, 1990), 160-164; Geoffrey Miller, "Contracts of Genesis," *J Legal St.* 22 (1993), 31-33, 39-42; Lieve Teugels, "A Strong Woman, Who Can Find? A Study of Characterization in Genesis 24," *JSOT* 63 (1994): 89-104 and "The Anonymous Matchmaker: An Enquiry into the Characterization of the Servant [*sic*] of Abraham in Genesis 24," *JSOT* 65 (1995): 13-23; Aldina da Silva, "The Condition of Women in Mesopotamian and Biblical Literature," in *Women Also Journeyed with Him* (ed. Gérald Caron et al., 1993; tr., Collegeville, Minnesota: Liturgical P, 1995), 55-58; Carey Moore, *Tobit* (Garden City, New York: 1996; Anchor Bible), 225-233; Joan Cook, "Wells, Women, and Faith," *Proc. E. Great Lakes and Midwest Bibl. Socs.* 17 (1997), 14-17; Hennie Marsman, *Women in Ugarit and Israel* (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 101-106; Tobias Nicklas, "Marriage in the Book of Tobit: A Synoptic Approach," in *The Book of Tobit* (ed. Géza Xeravitz and József Zsengellér; Leiden: Brill, 2005); Pnina Galpaz-Feller, *Samson: The Hero and the Man* (Bern: Peter Lang, 2006), 77-92; Michael Martin, "Betrothal Journey Narratives" (*CBQ* 2008); Susan Niditch, *Judges* (Louisville: WJK, 2008; OT Library), 155-8; Calum Carmichael, *Sex and Religion in the Bible* (New Haven, Connecticut: Yale U P, 2010), 56-63; Labovitz, *Marriage and Metaphor*, 205-207; Lemos, *Marriage Gifts*, 62-69; Loader, *Pseudepigrapha on Sexuality*, 172-175; Geoffrey Miller, *Marriage in the Book of Tobit* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2011), 93-116.

²²⁴ See Antonio García-Moreno, "Adorar al Padre en Espíritu y Verdad," *Scripta Theologica* 23 (1991), 788-797; Ben Witherington, *John's Wisdom: A Commentary on the Fourth Gospel* (Louisville: WJK, 1995), 417-420; Brant, "Husband Hunting," 212-219; Ellen Bradshaw Aitken, "At the Well of Living Water: Jacob Traditions in John 4," in *Scripture in Early Judaism and Early Christianity* (ed. Craig Evans; Sheffield: Sheffield Ac. P, 2001), 342-352; Jennifer Berenson "The Divine Trickster: A Tale of Two Weddings in John," in *Feminist Companion to John* (ed. Levine); Fehribach, "The 'Birthing' Bridegroom," 106-108; Craig Keener, *The Gospel of John: A Commentary*, vol. 1 (Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson, 2003), 590-609; Andrew Lincoln, *The Gospel According to Saint John* (London: Continuum, 2005; Black's NT Commentaries) 170-182; Herman Waetjen, *The Gospel of the Beloved Disciple: A Work in Two Editions* (New York: T & T Clark, 2005), 159-177; Susan Hylen, *Imperfect Believers: Ambiguous Characters in the Gospel of John* (Louisville: WJK, 2009), 47-52; Carmichael, *Sex and Religion*, 29-36; J. Ramsay Michaels, *The Gospel of John* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010; NIC NT), 237-258.

clothing codes surrounded the negotiation of union and marriage payments and the beginning and end of the groom's temporary residence in his father-in-law's house.²²⁵

The marital economy had shifted to one of dowry by the Hellenistic era, resulting in the evolution of these exchanges into a token payment. Historical Greece and Rome were always dowry economies, as were Palestine and Babylonia by the NT period. Nevertheless, there is some evidence that in Athens, too, the asking of permission may have been, if not ritualized *per se*, then at least a special occasion. Verbal formulae exchanged between the prospective bride's father and the prospective groom established the betrothal.

Menander, among others, brings this to stage: in the *Samia*, the bride's father bids the groom and his father, "Come forward, please. Before these witnesses I give this girl to you as your wife, to sow legitimate children," to which the groom replies, "Thus I hold, take, and cherish her."²²⁶ This *engye* signified in customary law the basis for a valid marriage and could be critical in distinguishing between lawful wife, who would be a mother of legitimate heirs, and a so-designated or *de facto* concubine, who would not. This is what the bride's fathers formulaic condition of betrothal and the groom's acceptance of it establishes.

...although there is in discussions of Athenian marriage a tendency to treat the *enguē* as an official and public transaction, it is clear that this was a private contract made between two adult males — very likely in the *andrōn* (male or "public" room of the house) of either the groom or the father of the bride. It was *kata nomon* and legally valid like other contracts; but, again like such contracts or agreements, there was neither public registration nor any required witnesses. The origin of the belief in a more public, official character for the *enguē* transaction may lie in the frequency with which it is mentioned or appealed to in courtroom oratory... In contrast, the actual *gamoī* or marriage ceremonies are rarely mentioned [in these sources].²²⁷

²²⁵ See da Silva, "Condition of Women" (1995) 53-55; Marsman, *Women in Ugarit and Israel*, 84-90; Vincent Matthews, "Marriage and Family in the ANE," in *Marriage and Family* (ed. Campbell), 8-11.

²²⁶ Menan., *Samia* 725-728 (ad. Arnott 173); ...πρόαγε δὴ σὺ μοι./ μαρτύρων ἐναντίον σοι πῆνδ' ἐγὼ δίδωμ' ἔχειν/ γυναικῶν παίδων; ...ἔχω λαμβάνω στέργω.

²²⁷ Cynthia Patterson, "Marriage and the Married Woman," 51.

The significance of this private event accords with the ceremonialism, limited though it was, that could surround it. Oakley and Sinos, for example, note that

[e]ngye means something placed “in the hand”; in the context of the wedding the *engye* is the promise made by the bride’s father to the groom and then sealed by a handshake [as depicted on *loutrophoros-amphora* Boston 03.802, which has a bridal procession on one side and on the other] two male figures. On the left is a bearded man dressed in a *chiton* and mantle, holding a striped staff in his left hand, while with the other he shakes the hand of a young man dressed in traveler’s attire — a broad-brimmed hat (*petasos*), tunic (*chitoniskos*), cloak (*chlamys*), sandals, and spear. Over the young man’s tunic is a patterned tunic, the *ependytes*, a special garment...²²⁸

This agreement might be invoked at the wedding itself; Catullus, for example, reminds a bride that she has only a one-third stake in her own virginity: “Do not fight against the two [of your parents] who have given their son-in-law their own rights [to your virginity] along with the dowry.”²²⁹ In any event, the form persisted to the point of that the handshake and the scroll of the marriage document are both popular themes in visual art such as vase paintings. In Rome, grooms’ giving their fiancée’s rings seems to have been a common custom. Jewish practice appears to have included at this stage a formal blessing of the union and celebratory meals, the latter observance being widespread. Betrothal itself had some legal force in most contexts,²³⁰ establishing what “inchoate marriage” such as Mary is

²²⁸ Oakley and Sinos, *Wedding*, 9-10; Hersch, *Roman Wedding*, 39-43.

²²⁹ Catul., *Carm.* 62.64-65, ad. J. Godwin 45; ...*noli pugnare duobus/ qui genero sua iura simul cum dote dederunt.*

²³⁰ In addition to Cynthia Patterson (discussion above), see Boaz Cohen, “On the Theme of Betrothal in Jewish and Roman Law,” *PAJR* 18 (1948); Redfield, “Notes,” 186-188; Martha Roth, “Marriage and Matrimonial Prestations,” Archer, *Price beyond Rubies*, 151-66; Oakley and Sinos, *Wedding*, 11-13; van der Toorn, *From Her Cradle*, 64-66; da Silva, “Condition of Women,” 52-57; Ilan, *Jewish Women*, 88-94; Satlow, *Jewish Marriage*, 164-168; Ferrari, “What Kind of Rite of Passage,” 28-31; Matthews (ed.), *Marriage and Family*, 8-10; Hersch, *Roman Wedding*, 39-43, 123-131.

suspected of having betrayed in Mt. 1:18-25.²³¹ The legitimizing of a marriage arrangement was also constituted by the negotiation of a dowry, which was often recorded in a legal document that also specified the spouses' rights and obligations to one another. Extant documents are formulaic; elaborations such as the the distinctively Jewish *ketubah*, for example, only emerged in the rabbinic era.

PRENUPTIAL OBSERVANCES

After the betrothal but before the wedding, brides-elect marked their transition out of childhood in various ways, often with sacrifices. Greek girls dedicated toys, locks of hair, and/or childhood clothes to Artemis and/or at the shrines of heroic maidens or, occasionally, youths who died on the verge of marriage. Pausanias, for example, reports that in Attica “they say [Iphinoë] died a virgin. It is customary for [Megarian] girls to bring libations to the tomb and offer her a lock of hair before wedding, just as the Delian girls once cut their hair for Hecaërgē and Ophis.”²³² Judges 11 hints at a similar annual observance, although it may have become obsolete by the NT period. Grooms elect, being older, seem to have transitioned out of childhood years before they contemplated marriage, ceremonially

²³¹ On the origin of the term in G.R. Miles' and J.C. Davies' work on Mesopotamian law, see Ze'ev Falk, *Jewish Matrimonial Law*, 38-42 and 45-47. See also David Daube, “Historical Aspects of Informal Marriage,” *Revue internationale des droits de l'antiquité* 25 (1978); Geoffrey Miller, “Contracts of Genesis,” 31-32, 36-37; Katzoff, “Greek and Jewish Marriage Formulas;” Judith Evans-Grubbs, “Marrying and Its Documentation in Later Roman Law,” in *To Have and To Hold* (ed. Philip Reynolds and John Witte; Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2012), esp. 85-86; Helena Zlotnick, *Dinah's Daughters: Gender and Judaism from the Hebrew Bible to Late Antiquity* (Philadelphia: U Pennsylvania P, 2002), 45-48; Louis Feldman, “Philo, Pseudo-Philo, Josephus, and Theodotus on the Rape of Dinah,” *Jewish Q Rev.* 94 (2004); Yiftach-Firanko, *Marriage and Marital Arrangements*, ch. 3; Labovitz, *Marriage and Metaphor* (2009) ch. 3. Matthew Marohl explores some implications of this understanding in *Joseph's Dilemma: “Honor Killing” in the Birth Narrative of Matthew* (Eugene, Oregon: Cascade, Wipf and Stock, 2008).

²³² Pausanias, *Attica* 43.4, ad. Jones 233; ἀποθανεῖν δὲ αὐτὴν φασιν ἔτι παρθένον. καθέστηκε δὲ ταῖς κόραις χοὰς πρὸς τὸ τῆς Ἰφινόης μνήμα προσφέρειν πρὸ γάμου καὶ ἀπάρχεσθαι τῶν τριχῶν καθὰ καὶ τῇ Ἑκαέρῃ καὶ Ὀπίδι αἱ θυγατέρες ποτὲ ἀπεκείροντο αἱ Δηλίων; cf. *Corinth* 32.1.

receiving adult haircuts and clothing and being introduced to paternal societies. A variety of other pre-wedding sacrifices could also take place after the betrothal.²³³ Also after it, hosts chose an auspicious date for the wedding festivities. Athenians, at least, preferred to marry in January; Romans considered June lucky and May unlucky, and public holidays suitable for widows' weddings but not for virgins'. Similar observances were *de rigueur* by the rabbinic period, with the Talmud having to supply an apparently fictitious explanation for the accepted practice of virgins' marrying on Wednesday and widows' on Thursday.²³⁴

Once the date was set, guests could be invited. Some invitations were written, a few of which have survived in physical form, e.g., "Herais asks you to dine in the Great Thoereum on the occasion of her son's wedding tomorrow, the 26th [of the month], from the ninth hour on" and "Diosorous invites you to dine at the wedding of her son on the fourteenth of [the Egyptian month of] Mesore in the temple of Sabazius from the ninth

²³³ See Falk, *Jewish Matrimonial Law*, 40-44; Julian Morgenstern, *Rites of Birth, Marriage, Death and Kindred Occasions Among the Semites* (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College, 1966), 89-105; Susan Cole, "The Social Function of Rituals of Maturation," *ZPE* 45 (1984); Steven Lonsdale, *Dance and Ritual Play in Greek Religion* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins U P, 1993), 169-177, 193-202; Oakley and Sinos, *Wedding*, 13-14; Larson, *Greek Heroine Cults*, *passim*; Froma Zeitlin, *Playing the Other: Gender and Society in Classical Greek Literature* (Chicago: U Chicago P, 1995), *passim*; Deborah Lyons, *Gender and Immortality: Heroines in Ancient Greek Myth and Cult* (Princeton: Princeton U P, 1997), *passim*; Vêrilhac and Vial, *Mariage grec*, 287-293; in *Initiation* (ed. Faraone and Dodd), Ferrari's "What Kind of Rite of Passage?", David Leitao, "Adolescent Hair-Growing and Hair-Cutting Rituals in Ancient Greece," and Faraone, "Playing the bear and the fawn for Artemis;" Hersch, *Roman Wedding*, 65-68, 115-123. See also Israel Mehlman, "Jephthah's Daughter" (1962), *JBQ* 25 (1997), 73-78; J. Albert Harrill, "Coming of Age and Putting on Christ: The *Toga Virilis* Ceremony, Its Paraenesis, and Paul's Interpretation of Baptism in Galatians," *Nov. Test.* 44 (2002); Mary Ann Beavis, "A Daughter in Israel: Celebrating *Bat Jephthah* (Judg. 11.39d-40)," *Feminist Theology* 13 (2004); Dolores Kamrada, "The Sacrifice of Jephthah's Daughter and the Notion of *Hērem*," in *With Wisdom as a Robe* (ed. K.D. Dobos and M. Kőszeghy; Sheffield: Phoenix P, 2009), 76-84.

²³⁴ See S. Davis, "The May Tabu on Roman Marriage and a Parallel," *Man.* 56 (1956); L. Archer *Her Price*, 189-193, 205-206; Oakley and Sinos, *The Wedding*, 10; Satlow, *Jewish Marriage*, 168-170; Kenneth Campbell, *Marriage and Family*, 112; Hersch, *Roman Wedding*, 138-140.

hour.”²³⁵ Pliny says of Minicia Marcella’s betrothal that “a wedding day was chosen and we were called [to attend]” (*Ep.* 5.16.6, *iam electus nuptiarum dies iam nos vocati*). The invitation could have been verbal or written; Matthew may hint at a combination of the two at least in imagined upper-class weddings:

The kingdom of heaven is like a king who hosted a wedding for his son. He sent his slaves to call those who had been invited to the wedding, but they would not come. Again he sent other slaves... [Later] he said to his slaves, ‘The wedding is ready, but those who were invited were not worthy. Go into the city streets and invite everyone you find to the wedding.’ The slaves went out into the streets and gathered everyone they found, good and bad alike, so the hall of the wedding was filled with guests” (Mt. 22:1-10; cf. *Ev. Th.* logion 64).

The guests who are called (καλέσαι) may have been invited (κεκλημένους) by mouth or by letter. They were, in any event, invited, as are those blessed in Rev. 19:9 (Μακάριοι οἱ εἰς τὸ δεῖπνον τοῦ γάμου τοῦ ἀρνίου κεκλημένοι). Oliver Nwachukwu bids readers to

Notice that the benediction is not pronounced on the Bride or the Bridegroom but on the guests... to be a guest at a marriage festival of the Lamb is an honour reserved for the ‘conquerors’ who will eat bread in the kingdom of God... Revelation’s marriage feast is the celebration of the church’s integration into the Lamb’s rulership... The Gospel [Mt. 22:1-14] blesses those who are invited and are chosen. Revelation assumes the character of those invited, blesses them and says nothing about their response to the invitation... the Gospel states that not all who were invited who came, and not all who came were chosen. Revelation presumes an absolute compliance of the invitees and blesses them (165-166).

Revelation has its own perspective not only on the invitees but also on the inviters, a perspective that complicates arguments that its bridal figure is passive or silent. Scores of ancient texts, from comedies to letters to novels to papyri, narrate (or constitute) hosts issuing wedding invitations. The bride’s parents were most likely to do the issuing, but the groom’s parents could host wedding celebrations and invite guests as well. Outside parties could at least be depicted as acting in this capacity, as Pharaoh does in *Joseph and Aseneth*, or sponsoring the festivities, as seems to be the case of Chloe’s foster parents in Longus’

²³⁵ Herais’ invitation: *P. Oxy.* 5057, ca. 2nd-3rd cen. CE, ad. Grenfell & Hunt; ἐρωτᾷ σε Ἡραῖς δειπνήσαι εἰς γάμους τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτῆς ἐν τῷ μεγάλῳ Θοηρείῳ αὐρίον ἧτις ἐστὶν κς ἀπὸ ὥρας θ. Dioscorus: *P. Oxy.* 2678, ca. 3rd cen. CE, ad. *ibid*; ἐρωτᾷ σε Διοσκοροῦς δειπνήσαι εἰς γάμους τοῦ υἱοῦ τῇ ιδ τοῦ Μεσορή ἐν τῷ Σαβαζείῳ ἀπὸ ὥρας θ).

Daphnis and Chloe and of various outside parties in other romances. Grooms themselves hosted at least some wedding festivities, such as a banquet introducing the bride to his *deme* in classical Athens. But I am unaware of any instance in which the bride extends the invitation. Perhaps brides-to-be asked other maidens, widows, or divorcées with whom they conversed to attend their weddings; perhaps not. Yet almost the last words in Revelation, are “The spirit and the bride say, ‘Come’” (22:17, τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ ἡ νύμφη λέγουσιν ἔρχου). The bride seems to be bidding the groom, not the guests, to come to the wedding, but in epithalamia and other songs, this bidding is the guests’ and the singers’ responsibility. The bride is never depicted as inviting the groom in (post-)Second Temple-era or classical texts; Revelation is centuries removed from the ANE and biblical texts in which this was acceptable even for an allegorical bride to communicate to a divine bridegroom. This is one short and to us rather ordinary-seeming phrase in a book that is full of phrases that are neither short nor ordinary to us, but to the text’s own implied audience, a bride’s asking her groom to come to her in front in the hearing of a mixed audience of cosmic proportions may have been little more ordinary than a great red dragon and a woman clothed in sun.²³⁶

²³⁶ The wedding at Cana also features some procedural oddities beyond the transformation of water into wine. It is also strange that the steward (ὁ ἀρχιτρίκλινος) addresses his query about the wine to the bridegroom (τὸν νυμφίον). All the available evidence suggests that bridegrooms were ees at their own wedding feasts, never the hosts of them. All the sources indicate the hosts of ancient weddings, i.e., the ones who would be responsible for overseeing these, arrangements, were the bride’s or groom’s parents, not the brides or grooms themselves. Its being the bridegroom’s responsibility distinguishes this case almost as much as Jesus’ fulfillment of it when it is not even time for his own wedding: “my hour has not yet come.” Jesus’ being “lifted up,” then, is a kind of wedding.

Also prior to the wedding were selected attendants to the parties, whose roles the gospels emphasize in the parable of the ten virgins and in the bridegroom sayings.²³⁷ There was a *promuba* to join the couple's hands a Roman wedding and a παρανύμφος to guide the bride in a Greek one. Catullus speaks of a "praetextate page-boy" he bids at the right moment to "release [the bride's] arm."²³⁸ John the Baptist affirms that Jesus and not he is the messiah with "Whoever has the bride is the bridegroom. Whoever is waiting and listening to rejoice at the sound of the bridegroom's voice is a friend of the bridegroom" (ὁ ἔχων τὴν νύμφην νυμφίος ἐστίν· ὁ δὲ φίλος τοῦ νυμφίου ὁ ἐστηκὼς καὶ ἀκούων αὐτοῦ χαρὰ χαίρει διὰ τὴν φωνὴν τοῦ νυμφίου, Jn. 3:29). This formulation may echo elsewhere in the gospel, as, for example, if G.M. Lee is correct in observing of 15:13-14 that "[a] king would not be expected to lay down his life for his friend: here we have to do with friends in a private station... there may also be an allusion to the 'friend of the bridegroom' — our 'best man' — who would be no mere ceremonial figure but would have to stand by his friend through" potential ordeals (260).

²³⁷ See A. van Selms, "The Best Man and the Bride — From Sumer to St. John," *JNES* 9 (1950) and "The Origin of the Title 'The King's Friend,'" *JNES* 16 (1957); Kantorowicz, "On the Golden Marriage Belt;" Ernst Dick, "The Bridesman in the Indo-European Tradition: Ritual and Myth in Marriage Ceremonies," *JAF* 79 (1966); Margulis, "Of Brides and Birds;" Meir Malul, "*Susapinnu*: The Mesopotamian Paranymp and His Role," *JESHO* 32 (1989); Légasse, "La parabole des dix vierges;" Brodie, *Gospel According to John*, 201-202, 205-206; Oakley and Sinos, *Wedding*, 16-21, 26-34; Etienne Trocmé, "Jean 3, 29 et le thème de l'époux dans la tradition préévangélique," *RSR* 69 (1995); Vêrilhac and Vial, *Mariage grec* 357-363; Satlow, *Jewish Marriage*, 174-175; Keener, *Gospel of John*, v. 1, 578-581; Blickenstaff, "While the Bridegroom is with them," 97-109, 126-131; Lincoln, *Gospel According to Saint John*, 160-161; John Nolland, *The Gospel of Matthew: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 1004-1010; Galpaz Feller, *Samson*, 99-100; Rachel Rosenzweig, *Worshipping Aphrodite: Art and Cult in Classical Athens* (Ann Arbor: U Michigan P, 2006), 21-24; R.T. France, *Gospel of Matthew* (NIC, 2007), 946-950; Mylène Kempter, "La signification eschatologique de Jean 3,29," *NTS* 54 (2008); Annalisa Guida, "From *Parabolē* to *Sēmeion*: The Nuptial Imagery in Mark and John," in *Between Author and Audience in Mark* (ed. Elizabeth Struthers Malbon; Sheffield: Phoenix P, 2009); Hersch, *Roman Wedding*, 159-162, 167-171, 190-199, 206-208; J. Ramsey Michaels, *Gospel of John*, 219-220.

²³⁸ Catullus, *Carmen* 61.174-175, ad. J. Godwin 41; *mitte brachiolum teres/ praetextate puellula*.

Attending a wedding banquet, as opposed to witnessing the procession only, was an act of witnessing: guests could be called on to attest to the bride's identity, the valid intentions of the parties involved, and thus the legitimacy and citizen status of the union's children. These issues could become concerns in standing for political office, property claims, and other legal affairs. Guests were expected to dress in a way that was appropriate to the seriousness of this responsibility, an expectation on which Matthew's gospel builds: "When the king came in to greet the guests, he saw there a man who was not wearing a wedding garment, and he said to him, 'Friend [ἐταίρε], how did you get in here without a wedding garment [ἐνδυμα γάμου]?' And he was speechless. Then the king said to the attendants, 'Bind him hand and foot, and throw him into the outer darkness'" (22:11-13).²³⁹ This is not an attempt to represent an ordinary situation, but the parable does depend on the understanding that it is appropriate to wear special clothes when attending a wedding banquet and offensive not to do so. There may be an echo here of Judges,²⁴⁰ in which Samson sets one linen and one festal garment apiece as the stakes in a bet with his thirty Philistine-appointed groomsmen over whether they can solve his riddle (14:11-13). When they do so by cheating, "the spirit of the Lord rushed on him, and he went down to Ashkelon, where he killed thirty townsmen. He took their spoil and gave the festal garments to those who had explained the riddle" (Judg. 14:19). The wedding guests' reaction does not seem to be positive; immediately after this, "Samson's wife was given to his best man [lit. 'his companion who had accompanied him']" (14:20).

²³⁹ Marianne Blickenstaff details the context and implications and of this passage in "*While the Bridegroom Is with Them*" (T & T Clark, 2005), 67-76, as does David Sim in "The Man without the Wedding Garment" (*Heythrop J.*, 1990)

²⁴⁰ On this see Galpaz-Feller, *Samson*, 96-100.

IMMEDIATE PREPARATIONS

The bride's and groom's house were decorated just before the wedding itself, an apparently widespread custom that has persisted in India.²⁴¹ Juvenal speaks of "the doors so recently decked, the house with its coloured drapings, and the boughs still fresh and green over the doorway" after a wedding.²⁴² Catullus imagines it on a grand scale for a hero's wedding:

...[Peneus] brought high trees,
roots and all: beech and tall, straight-trunked laurel
(not without its companion the nodding plane), and Phaethon's supple
sister who was consumed by flame, and lofty cypress.
He put these, woven together, far and wide around the house,
so that the forecourt was green, clothed in soft boughs.²⁴³

There might be meals hosted for each party, including a kind of "bachelor party" for the groom; Leslie Schear has argued plausibly that such events were the setting for performances of poetry such as Semonides'.²⁴⁴ Immediately before the public proceedings,

²⁴¹ For an overview of the evidence, see Oakley and Sinos, *Wedding*, 31; Vêrilhac and Vial, *Mariage grec*, 302-303; Hersch, *Roman Wedding*, 114-115, 139;

²⁴² Juvenal, *Sat.* 6.228-229, ad. Braund; *ornatas paulo ante fores pendentia linquit/vela domus...*

²⁴³ Ad. J. Godwin 69; Catul., *Carm.* 64.288-293:

...ille tulit radicatus altus
fagos ac recto proceras stipite laurus
non sine nuptanti platano lentaque sorore
flammati Phaethontis et aerea cupressu.
haec circum sedes late contexta locavit.
vestibulum ut molli velatum fronde vireret.

²⁴⁴ Schear, "Semonides Fr. 7."

the bride, and in the east sometimes the groom, bathed ceremonially,²⁴⁵ to which Ephesians alludes: “Husbands, love your wives, just as Christ loved the church and gave himself up for her, in order to make her holy by cleansing her with the washing of water by the word, so as to present the church to himself in splendor, without a spot or wrinkle or anything of the kind — yes, so that she may be holy and without blemish” (Eph. 5:25-27). Both bride and groom were anointed with aromatics. Catullus addresses the “anointed husband” (*Car.* 61.135, *unguentate... marite*) and reminds him that it is his wedding day with “now the barber shaves your cheek.”²⁴⁶

Despite these preparations, the groom at his wedding did not differ in appearance from the male guests. He may have worn a more elaborate crown than most of them, but the distinction is limited. The bride, in contrast, was dressed in clothes that distinguished her as such. This difference was one of the most visible ways in which the wedding was the bride’s occasion and, albeit coincidentally, is identical to the scenario of modern Western weddings. In ancient ones too

The simplicity of the groom’s costume stands in contrast to the elaborate detail and symbolism of the bride’s... while Vergil tells us that the Trojan blood brought to Italians shores was almost exclusively brought by men, the groom’s garments did not commemorate this Trojan contribution [as the bride’s did the female Sabine and Etruscan]. When Roman authors mention the appearance of the groom, their descriptions imply that [his] garb differs little from that which he would wear on any other day; to my knowledge, detailed descriptions of the groom’s actual dress are unattested in Roman literature. We assume that a

²⁴⁵ On the bridal bath, see Oakley and Sinos, *Wedding*, 15-16. For biblical texts, see Walther Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Ezekiel, Chapters 1-24* (1969; tr. Philadelphia: Fortress P, 1979), 340; Lincoln, *Ephesians*, 375-378; Vêrilhac and Vial, *Mariage grec*, 293-297; Muddiman, *Commentary on the Epistle to the Ephesians*, 62-266 and “The So-Called Bridal Bath at Ezekiel 16:9 and Ephesians 5:26,” in *The Book of Ezekiel and Its Influence* (ed. H.J. de Jonge and J. Tromp; Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007); Hoehner, *Ephesians*, 753-761; Kenneth Matthews (ed.), *Marriage and Family*, 111; Galpez-Feller, *Samson*, 94-96; Robin Jensen, “*Mater Ecclesia* and *Fons Aeterna*: The Church and her Womb in Ancient Christian Tradition,” in *A Feminist Companion to Patristic Literature* (ed. Amy-Jill Levine; Cleveland: Pilgrim P, 2008), 140-148; Sébastien Dalmon, “Les Nymphes dans les rites du mariage,” *Cahiers «Mondes anciens»* 2 (2011); Fowl, *Ephesians*, 189-190.

²⁴⁶ Catul., *Carm.* 61.131-132, ad. J. Godwin 37; *nunc tuum cinerarius/ tondet os...*

groom, perfumed and garlanded, would likely wear the cleanest toga that he could afford....
Roman grooms on sarcophagi from the classical period are routinely togate.²⁴⁷

The situation was similar throughout the empire. The bride's clothes maintained their ability to communicate bridal status in part because they displayed the same conservatism as other wedding practices.²⁴⁸ Among the Romans, the bride's hair was dressed in a specific, recognizable style that only they and Vestal virgins wore. A spear was used as a styling implement; Festus claimed that it should be a spear that had killed a gladiator, although this is contentious.²⁴⁹ Many brides also wore a knotted belt that the groom would have a puzzle of untying. Thus Catullus, for example, praises Hymen with "for you do maidens loosen the *zona* from the fold of their dress" and mocks an impotent groom by saying that "they had to look elsewhere to find stiffer stuff to loosen the virginal *zona*."²⁵⁰ The bride was decked with no inconsiderable amount of jewelry, so that in effect she was wearing either part of her dowry or something that evoked it unmistakably.²⁵¹

²⁴⁷ Karen Hersch, "Ethnicity and the costume of the Roman bride," in *Gender and Identity in Italy in the First Millennium BC*, (ed. E. Herring and K. Lomas; Oxford: Archaeopress, 2009), 135; cf. Hersch, *Roman Wedding*, 137-138; Oakley and Sinos, *The Wedding*, 16.

²⁴⁸ For example, Laetitia La Follette in her schema of Roman bridal attire and adornment concludes that "much of the basic nuptial scheme... would have been recognized by aristocratic Romans from the late republic through the third century A.D." (54) and, unless the smaller amount of evidence available is misleading, before and after this period as well. (La Follette, "The Costume of the Roman Bride," in *The World of Roman Costume* (ed. Sebesta and Bonfante), 54-65.

²⁴⁹ Hersch, *Roman Wedding*, 73-89 provides an extensive discussion of Roman bridal hairstyles, and considers the issue of spear specifically (80-82).

²⁵⁰ Catul., *Car.* 61.53-54, ad. J. Godwin 33; ...*tibi virgines/ zonula solvunt sinus* and 67.27-28, *ibid* 89, *ut quaerendum unde foret nervosius illud/ quod posset zonam solvere virgineam*.. See St. Panayotakis, "The Knot and the Hymen," Hersch, *Roman Wedding*, 109-112.

²⁵¹ On ancient bridal attire in general, see Pierre Grimal, *Love in Ancient Rome* (1978; tr., Norman: U Oklahoma P, 1986), 55; Falk, *Jewish Matrimony*, 64-65; Hersch, "Ethnicity," and *Roman Wedding*, 69-94, 106-114, 137-138, 162-164; Archer, *Her Price*, 192-3; Oakley and Sinos, *Wedding*, 16-21; La Follette, "Costume;" Emma Stafford, "A Wedding Scene? Notes on Akropolis 6471," *J Hellenic St.* 117 (1997); Vêrilhac and Vial, *Mariage grec*, 297-299; Jacqueline Clarke, *Imagery of Colour and Shining in Catullus, Propertius, and Horace* (New York: Peter Lang, 2003) 175-193; R. Sklenář, "How to Dress (For) an Epyllion: The Fabrics of Catullus 64," *Hermes* 134 (2006); Sue Blundell and Nancy Rabinowitz, "Women's Bonds, Women's Pots: Adornment Scenes in Attic Vase-Painting," *Phoenix* 62 (2008); Hersch, "Ethnicity" and *Roman Wedding*, 137-138.

The looking on, cloth covering, covenant, bathing, anointing, clothing, adornment, and food and cloth provision are a standard ANE marriage sequence. The events in Rev. 19, 21-22 occur against this background, as many commentators have noted.²⁵² The likening of God's attention to the faithful to the adornment of bride, moreover, has an explicit antecedent in Ezekiel. There the prophet receives the command to say on God's behalf to Jerusalem

I came upon you again and looked on you; you were at the age for love. I spread the edge of my cloak over you and covered your nakedness well. I was sworn to you and came into your covenant, said the LORD God, and you were mine. I washed you with water and rinsed your blood off you, and anointed you with oil. I clothed you with embroidered cloth and with fine leather sandals; I bound you in fine linen and covered you with rich fabric. I adorned you with ornaments: I put bracelets on your arms, a chain on your neck, a ring on your nose, a hoop on your ear, and a crown of glory your head. You were adorned with gold and silver, and variegated fine fabric was your clothing. Fine flour and honey and oil were yours. You were beautiful in great abundance, and you ran to be queen. You had choice flour and honey and oil for food. You grew exceedingly beautiful, fit to be a queen (Ezek. 16:8-13).

Some references to Israel's, Zion's, and especially Jerusalem's being adorned as a bride or made a wife (e.g., Isa. 54:4-12, 61:10-62:5;²⁵³ Jer. 2:1-2, 32;²⁵⁴ Hos. 2:14-23) are analogous.²⁵⁵ It is not only in Revelation that the metaphor is live; *Joseph and Aseneth* also makes extensive use of it. Indeed, the Isaian image is a common thread between these texts, as David Aune

²⁵² Most notably Wong Ka Leung, *Ideas of Retribution*, 38-46; cf. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel*, v. 1, 334-341; Galambush, *Jerusalem in the Book of Ezekiel*, 94-95; Swanepoel, "Ezekiel 16," 87-88; Block, *Book of Ezekiel*, 482-486; Kamionkowski, *Gender Reversal*, 104-110; Baumann, *Love and Violence*, 143-154; Bowen, *Ezekiel*, 84-86; Dale Launderville, *Celibacy*, 9-12.

²⁵³ See John Willis, "Genre of Isaiah 5:1-7," 344-349; Vander Hart, "Preparing the City-Bride;" T.D. Anderson, "Renaming and Wedding Imagery;" Baruch Halpern, "The New Names of Isaiah 62:4," *JBL* 117 (1998), 624-28, 637-41; H.G.M. Williamson, "Isaiah 62:4," 738-9; Mathewson, "Isaiah in Revelation," 202-203.

²⁵⁴ See Robert Carroll, *The Book of Jeremiah* (Louisville: WJK, 1986; OT Lib.), 118-120; Bauer, *Gender in the Book of Jeremiah*, 16-24; Leslie Allen, *Jeremiah*, 33-35.

²⁵⁵ Brad Kelle discusses this especially insightfully in *Hosea 2: Metaphor and Rhetoric in Historical Perspective* (Atlanta: SBL, 2005), 266-287). See also Henry McKeating, *The Books of Amos, Hosea and Micah* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1971; Cam. Bibl. Comm.; 1971), 87-89; Rallis, "Nuptial Imagery," 205-12; Bruce Birch, *Hosea, Joel, and Amos* (Louisville: WJK, 1997; Westminster Bible Companion) 35-38; A.A. MacIntosh, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Hosea* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1997; New ICC), 69-91; J. Andrew Dearman, *The Book of Hosea* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010; NIC OT), 121-28.

emphasizes.²⁵⁶ This wedding finery was supposed to be produced by the bride and her peers, under her mother's instruction. Weddings thus demonstrated her acquisition of vital wifely skills, which wedding imagery reinforced. In classical and later Greek visual culture, "[t]he *kalathos* or wool-basket, a container exclusively associated with women, became a metaphor for wifehood... [It was also] a common bridal gift. Because it represented a bride's diligence and skill in textile production, it is almost invariably shown at her feet or near her in scenes that depict the bride's toilette;"²⁵⁷ Roman brides seem to have carried something similar, as well as spindle.

CROWNS

The bride and the groom, as noted previously, each wore a crown. In Greece and Rome this was a vegetal one, and guests in Rome exchanged flower garlands (as was

²⁵⁶ "Isa 61:10 uses the simile of the bride adorned with jewels for the returning Jewish exiles. In Rev. 21:18-21 the description of the New Jerusalem is a combined image of the adorned bride and a description of a utopian city. Note that the verb κεκοσμημένοι, 'adorned,; in 21:19 is a term used of the bride image in 21:2. *Jos. As.* 18:6 [similarly] describes Aseneth dressing in her bridal trousseau... [Her] name is changed to 'City of Refuge,' behind whose walls people find shelter. The seven maids who attend [her] receive a blessing from the heavenly man [17:6; Burchard, *OTP*]: 'May the Lord God the Most High bless you. And you shall be seven pillars of the City of Refuge, and the fellow inhabitants of the chosen of that city will rest upon you forever (and) ever'" (Aune, *WBC* 1164-1165). For an extensive discussion of the building/city-bride in *Jos. As.*, see Gideon Bohak, "*Joseph and Aseneth*" and the Jewish Temple in Heliopolis (Atlanta: SBL, 1996), 67-81. See also Ross Kraemer, *When Aseneth Met Joseph* (New York: Oxford U P, 1998), 29-30.

²⁵⁷ Judith Lynn Sebesta, "Visions of Gleaming Textiles and a Clay Core: Textiles, Greek Women, and Pandora," in *Women's Dress* (ed. Llewellyn-Jones), 126. On Roman brides' accessories, see Hersch, *Roman Wedding*, 162-164.

common on many festive occasions, giving rise to commercial flower gardens).²⁵⁸ Catullus bids a bridal figure, “circle your forehead with flowers of smooth-smelling marjoram,” and Plutarch claims that “in Boetia, when they veil the bride, they give her a crown of asparagus.”²⁵⁹ Crowns such as these could be elaborate in mythological settings; Catullus imagines the centaur “Chiron came bearing gifts from the forest, for whatever flowers the fields bear, all that Thessaly produces on its great mountains... all these he brought woven together in mingled garlands, and the household laughed, caressed by the pleasing aroma.”²⁶⁰ Many biblical and early Jewish texts seem to imagine crowns and wreaths as being made of something more durable than plants, often assimilating them to the metal ones of rulers.

Ruben Zimmerman notes that

Metaphors of the crown/wreath can be found in several scriptures of Jewish tradition, often linked to Jerusalem or Zion [e.g., Lam. 2:15, Bar. 5:1-2].... A clear connection between the metaphor of the crown and the wedding can be found in Ezk. 16 and Cant. 3. In Ezk. 16:12, the foundling is crowned with a beautiful crown while she is adorned as a bride (στεφανον κουχήσεως). The bride described in Ezk. 16 is not only “worthy to reign” (Ezk. 16:13), but, more to the point, she also serves as a metaphor for Jerusalem. Further, in Cant. 3:11 the crown is associated with marriage as the lover is compared to King Solomon, who was crowned by his

²⁵⁸ Laetitia La Follette describes this as “the bridal corolla or crown, a wreath of flowers and herbs that the bride was supposed to pick herself” (“Costume of the Roman Bride,” 56). On flower garlands and floral commerce in the Roman world, *CIL* 980 has “To Fors Fortuna from violet, rose, and garland sellers.” For wedding crowns and the flowers used in them, see James Lawson, “The Roman Garden,” *G & R* 19 (1957); Phillip Thomas, “Red and White: A Roman Color Symbol,” *Rheinisches Museum Philologie* 122 (1979); Wilhelmina Jashemski, “The Garden of Hercules at Pompeii” (II.viii.6): The Discovery of a Commercial Flower Garden,” *Am. J. Arch.* 83 (1979); Claire Holleran, *Shopping in Ancient Rome* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2012) 56-60. On flowers and garlands in weddings, see Archer, *Her Price*, 193-194; Oakley and Sinos, *Wedding*, 16-18; Julia Dyson, “Lilies and Violence: Lavinia’s Blush in the Song of Orpheus,” *Cl. Philol.* 94 (1999); Jacqueline, Clarke, *Imagery of Colour and Shining*, 175-193; W. Derek Suderman, “Modest or Magnificent? Lotus versus Lily in Canticles,” *CBQ* 67 (2005); Hersch, *Roman Wedding*, 89-94; Marine Bretin-Chabrol, “Vigne mariée où fleur coupée : La mise en scène d’une parole féminine dans le carmen 62 de Catulle,” *Cahiers «Mondes anciens»* 3 (2012) [n.p.]; Susan Marks, “History vs. Ritual.” and The common exchange of garlands between acquaintances at celebratory occasions did not survive into the Christian era, as Lawson observes. The closest formal analogy is probably lei exchange in modern Hawai’i, a nearly unstudied topic into which further research might be desirable.

²⁵⁹ Catul., *Car.* 61.6-7, ad. Godwin 33 (*cinge tempora floribus/ suave olentis amarae*) Plut., *Prae. Conj.* 2 (*Moralia* 138D), ad. Babbitt 301; ἐν Βοιωτίᾳ τὴν νύμφην κατακαλύψαντες ἀσφαργωνιᾷ στεφανοῦσιν.

²⁶⁰ Catul., *Car.* 64.279-284, ad. Godwin 69; *advenit Chron portans silvestria dona/ nam quoscumque ferunt campi quos Thessala magnis/ montibus ora creat.../ hoc indistinctis plexos tulit ipse corollis/ quo permulsa domus iucundo risit odore.*

mother on the day of his wedding... According to *JosAs* 18:5-6 Aseneth is described, demonstrated also by the royal girdle (*JosAs* 18:6), as a royal bride setting a golden wreath on her head. Simultaneously, with her adornment as a bride a transformation from mourning to great joy takes place. Thus, the bridal garland becomes, together with the bridal jewelry, a symbol of heavenly transformation, depicted and promised in the image of the wedding. The intertextual parallel to Rev. becomes obvious here (154-155).

VEILS AND COLOUR

The bride had placed atop her crown by her mother an approximately saffron-coloured veil.²⁶¹ Unveiling and re-veiling may have occurred before witnesses and/or the bridegroom (a custom that Gen. 24 may imply), and the veil may have been diaphanous. What is assured that the bridal veil was a distinctive garment and that its wearing did not prevent witnesses from ascertaining the bride's identity. Painters give special emphasis to this observance, although there is some ambiguity as to the representation. Art and literature agree that the bridal garment *par excellence*. Thus Juvenal satirizes a woman with "Thus she rules her man; but soon she resigns her dominion and passes through a succession of homes, with her *flammeum* in tatters, and then flies back."²⁶² Catullus bids a bridal figure "take the bridal veil gladly, here, come here" and announces the bride's appearance with "I see the veil coming" (61.115; *flammeum video venire*).²⁶³ Whether the veil was diaphanous or not, its colour was similar to that of egg yolks, saffron, yellow crocuses, or flame.

²⁶¹ On the veil and the meanings and practices associated with it, see Matitiahu Tsevat, "The Husband Veils a Wife (Hittite Laws, Sections 197-98)," *J Cuneiform St.* 27 (1975), 235-240; Oakley and Sinos, *Wedding*, 25-26; John Scheid and Jesper Svenbro, *The Craft of Zeus: Myths of Weaving and Fabric* (1994; tr., Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard U P, 1996), 57-72; van der Toorn, "Significance of the Veil;" Douglas Cairns, "Veiling, αἰδώς, and a Red-Figure Amphora by Phintias," *J hellenic St.* 116 (1996), 152-158; Vêrilhac and Vial, *Mariage grec*, 304-312; Jacqueline Clarke, *Imagery of Colour and Shining*, 175-193; Llewellyn-Jones, *Aphrodite's Tortoise, passim*, and "House and veil;" Lynda McNeil, "Bridal Cloths, Cover-Ups, and *Kharis*: The 'Carpet Scene' in Aeschylus' *Agamemnon*," *G & R* 52 (2005); Hersch, *Roman Wedding*, 94-106; Deschodt, "Images et mariage" [n.p.].

²⁶² Juvenal 6.224-226, ad. Braund; ...*set mox haec regna relinquit/ permutatque domos et flammea conterit inde& avolat et sprete repetit vestigia lecti*.

²⁶³ Catul., *Car.* 61.8 (*flammeum cape laetus bucl buc veni...*) and 61.115 (*flammeum video venire*), both ad. Godwin.

Jacqueline Clarke, while reminding her readers that there was no dye lot standardization in antiquity, observes that

Luteus to the ancients was the colour of marriage and the colour of women [Catullus 61; Pliny Minor, *Hist. Nat.* 21.22.46]... There are several Roman wall paintings [such as the Aldobrandini and the Villa of Mysteries frescoes] in which brides or bridal figures are depicted with yellow attire... Catullus [61.160] depicts the bride with golden feet, possibly suggesting the yellow colour of the shoes. While this evidence is by no means conclusive it does suggest that it is more likely that yellow (probably a strong yellow, tending toward red/orange) was the colour associated with marriage (180-181).²⁶⁴

The bride's veil, which symbolized the bride herself in the same way as a wedding dress does today, was in Latin definitively *luteus* and had a name (*flammeum*) that also suggested its colour. The Roman sources consistently indicate that a bride's veil "had" to be this colour in the same way that a modern Western bride's dress "has" to be white or many south Asian ones' "have" to be red with gold embellishment. Given how insistent they are, it is significant that none of Plutarch's ten wedding-related "Roman Questions" are about the veil. Its importance in Greece was no less than it was in Rome, and the colour of this consummate bridal symbol did not strike him as different. The golden cast of the New Jerusalem that Greg Carey observes is established in contrast with Babylon's purple and scarlet is probably coincidental, although it does not diminish the bridal impression.²⁶⁵

²⁶⁴ Jacqueline Clarke, *Imagery of Colour & Shining*, 180-181. She discusses Catullus 61 in detail: "Colour imagery in the poem is mostly concentrated around the figure of the bride. Indeed, most of the colour images not directly employed of the bride can be traced back to her in some way. Catullus applies colour words to objects such as the torches and the marriage bed in a way that personifies and feminizes them (the torches' golden hair, the white foot of the bed), recalling the bride and her beauty. The colour words that are applied to Hymen at the outset (the *flammeum*, the yellow slippers) are, in the course of the poem, transferred to the bride and along with them some of Hymen's aura of divinity. Words for shining are frequently associated with the bride and she has the golden feet characteristic of some [mostly female] deities" (192). See also Athalya Brenner, "White' Textiles in Biblical Hebrew and in Mishnaic Hebrew," *Hebrew Ann. Rev.* 4 (1980); Phyllis Culham, "Again, What Meaning Lies in Colour!" *ZPE* 65 (1986); Liza Cleland, "The Semiosis of Description: Some reflections on fabric and colour in the Brauron Inventories," in *The Clothed Body in the Ancient World* (ed. Liza Cleland et al.; Oxford: Oxbow, 2005), 87-96; John Hutchings, "Colour in Folklore And Tradition — The Principles," *COLOR* 29 (2003); Penelope Walton Rogers, "Dyes and dyeing," in *Oxford Handbook of Engineering and Technology in the Classical World* (ed. John Oleson; Oxford: Oxford U P, 2008), 25-28; Mireille Lee, "Dress and Adornment," 186-188.

²⁶⁵ Carey, "A Man's Choice," 147-152. See also Aune, *Revelation*, 1165 and Smalley, *Revelation*, 547.

PROCESSION

In the east, the groom travelled to the bride's house (or departed from it after a stay there) with a certain degree of fanfare and expectation. The bride's parents might then address blessings to the couple, although little information remains, *Gen. Rabbah* has

R. Gamaliel married off his daughter. She said to him, "Father, pray for me" He said to her, "May you never come back here." She produced a son. She said to him, "Father, pray for me." He said to her, "May the cry of 'woe' never leave your lips." She said to him, "Father, on two occasions for rejoicing which have come to me, you curse me!" He said to her, "Both of them were blessings. Because there will be peace in your home, may you never come back here, and because your son will live, may you never stop saying 'Woe': 'Woe, my son has not yet eaten!' 'Woe, he has not yet drunk!' 'Woe, he has not yet gone to school!'" (*Gen. Rab.* 26.4A-F, ad. Neusner 281).

There was sometimes a show of the bride's being reluctant or resistant to leaving her natal home, or of her family's resistance to let her go.²⁶⁶ In Athens, laments were part of the proceedings; in Rome, epithalamia acknowledged this real or imagined reluctance, as in Catullus 61: "you who seize the tender virgin to carry to her husband, O hymeneal Hymen" (3-4, *qui rapis teneram ad virum/ virginem o hymenaeae Hymen*); "you take the blossoming girl into the wild youth's hand" (56-57, *tu fero iuveni in manus/ floridam ipse puellulam*); "Freeborn modesty slows you. So, heeding this even more, you weep because you must go" (79-81, *tarden ingenuus pudor/ quem tamen magis audiens/ fles quod ire necesse est*; all ad. Godwin 33-37).

²⁶⁶ On the observances of the bride's leaving home, see Seaford, "Wedding Ritual;" Archer, *Her Price*, 195-196; Oakley and Sinos, *Wedding*, 20; van der Toorn, *From Her Cradle*, 66-69; Vêrilhac and Vial, *Mariage grec*, 299-302, 333-335, 354-357; Zlotnick, *Dinah's Daughters*, 92-102; Kenneth Campbell, *Marriage and Family*, 11; Joseph Fleishman, "Shechem and Dinah — in the Light of Non-Biblical and Biblical Sources," *ZAW* 116 (2004); Nicklas, "Marriage in the Book of Tobit," 146-150; Michael Martin, "Betrothal Journey Narratives;" Doson-Robinson, "Helen's 'Judgment of Paris,'" Hersch, *Roman Wedding*, 114-115, 144-148, 162-164; Geoffrey Miller, *Marriage in the Book of Tobit*, 116-123.

TORCHES

Leave the bride did,²⁶⁷ though, in a procession that was torchlit even if it occurred during the day. These are ubiquitous in pottery's wedding scenes, and Romans were specific about them: "Why in the marriage rites do they light five torches, neither more nor less, which they call *cereones*?" wonders Plutarch.²⁶⁸ Ovid, speaking of the *lemuria*, advises, "During this period, unmarried girls, bide your time and save the wedding torch for better days... Hymen, hide your torches and stay away. Mournful tombs need gloomy torches."²⁶⁹ Torches of the right kind, like the veil, in literature can be a metonymy for the bride and were essential to the wedding. Catullus has "Raise the torches, boys. I see the *flammeum* coming."²⁷⁰ The smoke from Babylon's burning (Rev. 19:3) is a fitting accompaniment to the hymn (in the classical sense) that follows (Rev. 19:6-9).

In art and literature, the bridal procession that the torches illuminate is often in a horse-drawn chariot driven by the groom, a heroic resonance that may have been incorporated into practice among aristocratic Greeks. Mule- or even ox-drawn carts were standard for their humbler peers,²⁷¹ who might also walk, as did Roman brides. Wealthy brides in the east were carried on a litter, although most probably went on foot. Whatever

²⁶⁷ For the procession, see Corbett, *Roman Law*, 91-93; Grimal, *Love*, 55-56; Winandy, "Litière de Salomon," Charles Donahue, "The Case of the Man Who Fell into the Tiber," *Am. J. Legal His.* 22 (1978); Redfield, "Notes," 188-189; Archer, *Her Price*, 196-197; Roland Murphy, *Song of Songs* 151-152; Erika Simon, "Diptych of the Symmachi and Nicomachi," Oakley and Sinos, *The Wedding*, 26-34; Ilan, *Jewish Women*, 95-95; Mackay, "Narrative Tradition;" Vêrilhac and Vial, *Mariage grec*, 312-326.

²⁶⁸ Plutarch, *Quaes. Rom.* 2 (*Moralia* 263F), ad. Babbitt 7; Διὰ τί οὐ πλείονας οὐδ' ἐλάττονας ἀλλὰ πέντε λαμπάδας ἄπτουσιν ἐν τοῖς γάμοις ἃς κηρίωνας ὀνομάζουσιν.

²⁶⁹ Ovid, *Fasti* 2.557-562, ad. Nagle 72; *dum tamen haec fiunt viduae cessate puellae expectet puros pinea taeda dies/ nec tibi quae cupidae matura videbere matri/ comat virgineas hasta recurva comas/ conde tuas Hymenaeae faces et ab ignibus atris/ aufer. habent alias maesta sepulchra faces.*

²⁷⁰ Catul., *Car.* 61.114-115; *tollite o pueri faces/ flammeum video venire.*

²⁷¹ On the use of carts in Greece, see Oakley and Sinos, *The Wedding*, 29-32, 44; Vêrilhac and Vial, *Mariage grec*, 314-316; Mackay, "Narrative Tradition," 296-300

the means of conveyance, she would often be accompanied to the groom's house by a matron who was reputed to be happily married, called a *pronuba* in Rome. In Athens, a male figure called a παράνυμφος also played a role. Maidens and young boys, ideally those with both parents still living, also accompanied the bride. The whole event was public, and Greek orators and Latin rescripts emphasize that witnesses to the bridal procession can attest to the validity of a marriage. The procession itself did not make the wedding legally effective, but it indicated the marital intent that was legally necessary, affirmed the community's acceptance of the marriage that the procession indicated, and was evidence of the bride's real identity. Witnesses to the event could testify in cases of contested citizenship, legitimacy, and inheritance. It was therefore in the interest of the families involved, especially the bride's family, to make the procession as memorable as possible. Facilitating such testimony was the attention that hosts directed to the bridal party, if they could afford it, by hiring musicians and dancers. The songs that they performed often likened the bride to fruit picked at optimum ripeness or to a flower (see ch. 1).

THE BRIDE'S ARRIVAL

Arriving at the groom's house, there were usually ceremonies of hand-clasping (*dextrarum iunctio*) and ritual words (e.g., *Ubi te Gaius, ego Gaia*) between the couple, the welcoming of the bride by her in-laws and her coming across the new house's threshold and approaching its hearth. Plutarch asks "why [the Romans then] bid the bride touch fire and water?" and why "they do not allow the bride to cross the threshold of her home herself, but

have her escorts lift her over?”²⁷² She would also take fruit that the groom’s family offered her, the preference being for quinces or, even better, pomegranates, well known from the most famous mythic recounting of this ceremony. The procession and welcoming were enough to constitute marriage in Roman law, even if the groom was not present for them.²⁷³ Outside Rome, though, and ideally in Rome, he was present. The bride might be join him at the banquet (where the sexes might or might not mix) or might already be sequestered in the bridal chamber. More foods associated with fertility, such as additional fruit or sesame, might be offered to or by the bride; Plutarch says that “Solon ordered that the bride should eat some quince before retiring to bed with the bridegroom. He meant to suggest (I suppose) that the first favour of lip and voice should be harmonious and sweet” (*Moralia* 138B, cite). Honey was also an important entry on the nuptial menu, not solely because of the analogy between housewife and queen bee. The most detailed and perhaps most studied account of its ceremonial consumption is in *Jos. As.* 16,²⁷⁴ with its extended sequence of the heavenly man’s bringing Aseneth a miraculous honeycomb to eat and telling her that “the bees of the paradise of delight have made this from the dew of the roses of life that are in the paradise of God” (16:14, *OTP*), but the image is common and ancient. Honeycombs are intimately connected to the spectacular violence of Samson’s abortive wedding: first he kills a lion with his bare hands (Jdg. 14:5-6) and subsequently finds a honeycomb, whose contents

²⁷² *Quaest. Rom.* 1, 29, ad. Babbitt 7, 52; διὰ τί τὴν γαμουμένην ἄπτεσθαι πυρὸς καὶ ὕδατος κελεύουσι; διὰ τί τὴν γαμουμένην οὐκ ἔωσιν αὐτὴν ὑπερβῆναι τὸν οὐδὸν τῆς οἰκίας ἀλλ’ ὑπεραίπρουν οἱ προπέμποντες.

²⁷³ Catullus 61.76-77, 159-161. See Kantorowicz, “On the Golden Marriage Belt;” Archer Taylor, “I Am Thine and Thou Art Mine” in *Hommages à Georges Dumézil* ([n. ed.]; Brussels: Broché 1960); Charles Donahue, “The Case of the Man Who Fell into the Tiber” (*Am. J. Legal His.*, 1978); Oakley and Sinos, *Wedding*, 34-35; Katzoff, “Greek and Jewish;” Hersch, *Roman Wedding*, 177-190, 199-206, 208-212, 274-279.

²⁷⁴ On honey in *Jos. As.*, see Randall Chesnutt, *From Death to Life: Conversion in “Joseph and Aseneth,” JSPs.* sup. 16 (1995), 128-135; Moyer Hubbard, “Honey for Aseneth,” *JSPs* 8 (1997): 97-111; Kraemer, *When Aseneth Met Joseph*, 37-40, 64-67; Anatheia Portier-Young, “Sweet Mercy Metropolis,” *JSPs* 14 (2005): 133-157.

he eats, in the carcass (Jdg. 14:8-9), and then at his wedding celebration he offers a riddle based on the incident and kills thirty townsmen who discovered the answer through the bride's deceit (Jdg. 14:10-20).²⁷⁵ Ovid, addressing matrons about the Kalends of April, instructs them after washing a cult statue of Venus to

dry her neck and replace her golden necklaces on it;
now give her more flowers, now give her the fresh-blown rose...
Do not hesitate to take poppy pounded with snowy
milk and liquid honey squeezed from the comb. When
Venus was first escorted to her eager spouse [Vulcan],
she had such a draught, and from that time she was a bride.²⁷⁶

Athenaeus records the existence of something called a *krēon*, “a cake or loaf, which among the Argives is carried from the bride to the bridegroom. It is baked over coals, and friends are invited to a meal at which it is served with honey, as Philitas reports in his *Miscellany*.”²⁷⁷ While the guests were eating, music, entertainment came from more music and dancing and sometimes by wedding addresses to the bride and groom.²⁷⁸ This may have been another occasion on which the groom was likened to a victor.

²⁷⁵ On this incident, see especially Philip Nel, “The Riddle of Samson,” *Biblica* 66 (1985): 534-545; Galpaz-Feller, *Samson*, 107-116; Niditch, *Judges*, 147f.

²⁷⁶ Ad. Nagle 108-109; Ovid, *Fasti* 4.137-138, 151-154:
aurea siccato redimicula reddite collo
nunc alii flores nunc nova danda rosa est...
nec pigeat tritum niveo cum lacte papaver
sumere et expressis mella liquata favis.
cum primum cupido Venus est deducta marito
hoc bibit. ex illo tempore nupta fuit.

²⁷⁷ Athenagoras, *Deipnosophists* 14.645D, ad. Olson 73 (κρήιον· πλακοῦς ἄρτος ὃν Ἀργεῖοι παρὰ τῆς νύμφης πρὸς τὸν νυμφῖον φέρουσιν. ὁπτᾶται δ' ἐν ἄνθραξιν καὶ καλοῦνται ἐπ' αὐτὸν οἱ πῖλοι παρατίθεται δὲ μετὰ μέλιτος ὥς φησιν Φιλίτας ἐν Ἀτάκτοις).

²⁷⁸ See Hague, “Ancient Greek Weddings Songs;” Oakley and Sinos, *Wedding*, 22-25; Lonsdale, *Dance and Ritual Play*, 206-233; Vêrilhac and Vial, *Mariage grec*, 299-304, 334-357; Hersch, *Roman Wedding*, 156-159, 212-220; Sam Mirelman and Walther Sallaberger, “The Performance of a Sumerian Wedding Song (CT 58, 12),” *ZAVA* 100 (2010); Bretin-Chabrol, “Vigne mariée.”

THE BRIDAL CHAMBER

The entertainment probably continued at least until the feast ended and the couple (or the groom) was escorted with much merriment to a specially constructed temporary nuptial chamber (where the bride might be waiting); this is the *thalamos* or *huppah*, which was then a free-standing chamber, of early Jewish and Christian mysticism. Although they were temporary, they may have been decorated at least as much as the houses; *Gen. Rabbah* remarks of the seventh day of creation that “Geniba said, ‘The matter may be compared to the case of a king who made a marriage canopy for himself. He plastered it, painted it, and decorated it. And what was the marriage canopy lacking? Only a bride to come into it. So too what did the world lack? It was the Sabbath.’”²⁷⁹ In Rome, the couch of this chamber was eventually placed in the house’s receiving area. Relatives and friends might sing bawdy songs outside. Here, too, there were traditions and procedures; Plutarch asks among the Romans “Why does a man first approach the bride not by light but in darkness?”²⁸⁰ and the

²⁷⁹ *Gen. Rab.* 10.2B; Neusner 107.

²⁸⁰ Plut., *Quaes. Rom.* 65 (*Mor.* 279F), ad. Babbitt 100; Διὰ τί τῇ νύμφῃ τὸ πρῶτον οὐκ ἐντυγχάνει μετὰ φωτὸς ὁ ἀνὴρ ἀλλὰ διὰ σκότους.

next day, the bride's mother and sometimes the groom's examined the scene for evidence of consummation.²⁸¹

If the bride was very young, the observances of the nuptial chamber may have been delayed for several years. More research into this possibility is desirable, as what exists is very limited, perhaps owing to the absence of much evidence. This very absence, however, is compelling: epitaphs consistently report childbirth-related deaths and deaths of adolescent girls, but very rarely the two together.²⁸² Reading around the margins of Xenophon's *Oeconomicus* is also suggestive. The bride there is fourteen at her marriage and spends an unspecified but considerable period of time in a sort of home economics practicum. During this period Ischomachus refers to children as a hope for the future, not an immediate possibility, and it is only after the wife has become a competent housekeeper (and weaver, having come to the marriage unable to weave) that marital sexuality is hinted

²⁸¹ Catullus 61.164-188, 204-205, 224-228, e.g., allude to the merriment of "bedding down." Claude Vatin provides one of the most extensive modern discussions in his *Recherches sur le mariage*, 211-228; see also Redfield, "Notes," 191-192; Giulia Sissa, *Greek Virginity* (1988; tr., Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard U P, 1990), 93-99; Archer, *Her Price*, 198, 205-206; Oakley and Sinos, *Wedding*, 34-37; van der Toorn, *From Her Cradle*, 70-75; Ilan, *Jewish Women*, 97-100; VÉrilhac and Vial, *Mariage grec*, 3254-326; St. Panayotakis, "The Knot and the Hymen;" Satlow, *Jewish Marriage*, 173-177; Kenneth Campbell, *Marriage and Family*, 114; Hersch, *Roman Wedding*, 151-156, 220-221. On the theme in sacred marriage and marriage mysticism in the so-called "gnostic tradition," see Robert Grant, "The Mystery of Marriage in the Gospel of Philip," *Vig. Chr.* 15 (1956); Jorunn Buckley, "A Cult-Mystery in *The Gospel of Philip*," *JBL* 99 (1980); Risto Uro, "The Bridal Chamber and Other Mysteries," in *Sacred Marriages* (ed. Nissinen and Uro); Darren Iammarino, "Similarities Between Sethian Baptism and the Bridal Chamber of Thomas Gnosticism and Valentinianism," *Intermountain West J Religious St.* 1 (2009); Hugo Lundhaug, *Images of Rebirth* (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 104-112. See also Glass, "Some Observations," 151-154; Richard Valantasis, "The Nuptial Chamber Revisited: The *Acts of Thomas* and Cultural Intertextuality," *Semeia* 80 (1997); Galpaz Feller, *Samson*, 105-107; Elizabeth Clark, "The Celibate Bridegroom and His Virginal Brides: Metaphor and the Marriage of Jesus in Early Christian Ascetic Exegesis," *Church His.* 77 (2008), 7-18; Calum Carmichael, *Sex and Religion*, 53-56; Loader, *Pseudepigrapha on Sexuality*, 166-171; Geoffrey Miller, *Marriage in the Book of Tobit*, 123-125.

²⁸² The is noteworthy for two reasons. First, mortality is highest for ≤ 15 maternal age ≥ 40 ; absent effective contraception and abortion, heterosexually active females in the younger bracket are likelier to die than their celibate peers. Laments for girls who died ages 12-20 are plentiful, but nearly all are that they died unmarried; almost none mention death in childbirth which, again, epitaphs usually note. Second, the girls likeliest to marry around the minimum age, usually twelve, were the richest and most elite, i.e., those most likely to be commemorated durably.

at. The *Oeconomicus* does not record a real situation, but a possibly years-long delay in consummation, if that is what it implies, is presented as unremarkable.

POSTNUPTIAL PROCEEDINGS

Most first-time brides, however, were not much younger or older than twenty. If the wedding night went as planned, and it usually did, additional days or weeks of celebration might follow among the couple's families and close friends and neighbours.²⁸³ Shortly afterwards there followed here presentations of postnuptial gifts to the bride from her parents. In the case of the Greek *phernē*, these were usually

...female things, and particularly things with which women make themselves sexually attractive. Their arrival marks the transformation of the bride into the matron. From one who has been adorned by others, she becomes one who can adorn herself and thus continue to draw to her the husband who has captured her. The instruments of sexual power have come into her hands (Redfield 1982: 194).

This was also true of Roman bridal gifts, which likewise among the wealthy could be precious metal and bejeweled objects; the Projecta casket is a famous late example. They could also include real estate, as in the Judean desert documents and some Roman deeds; indeed, designating wealth transfers to married daughters as additions to the bridal gift seems to have been a legal dodge of restrictions, where they existed, on married women's property ownership. Still, things were not always friendly; Plutarch claims that "[i]n the African city of Leptis, the custom is for the bride, the day after her marriage, to send a message to her husband's mother, asking for a pot. The mother-in-law refuses, and says she does not have one. This is to ensure that the bride knows from the start the

²⁸³ See Morgenstern, *Rites of Birth*, 107-116; Oakley and Sinos, *Wedding*, 38-40; Hannah Cotton, "The Archive of Salome Komaise Daughter of Levi: Another Archive from the 'Cave of Letters,'" *ZPE* 105 (1995); Vêrilhac and Vial, *Mariage grec*, 326-332; Matthew Dillon, "Post-Nuptial Sacrifices on Kos," Satlow, *Jewish Marriage*, 178-180; Hersch, *Roman Wedding*, 221-222.

stepmotherliness of a mother-in-law and is not angry or upset if something worse follows later.”²⁸⁴

There appears to be nothing analogous to this phase of events in the marriage of the Lamb and the celestial Jerusalem. Their wedding marks the beginning of a perfected eschatological order in which such concerns would seem to have no relevance, and it is, in the end, metaphorical. Jerusalem has no obvious “mother” to examine the bedding and certainly no mother-in-law to refuse a household loan. It is Babylon, not Jerusalem, who will face “something worse.”

²⁸⁴ Plut., *Prae. Con.* 35 (*Mor.* 143B), ad. *Selected Essays and Dialogues* (Oxford, 1993) 292; ἐν Λέπτει τῆς Λιβύης πόλει πατριὸν ἐστὶ τῇ μετὰ τὸν γάμον ἡμέρᾳ τὴν νύμφην πρὸς τὴν τοῦ νυμφίου μητέρα πέμψασαν αἰτεῖσθαι χύτραν. ἡ δ’ οὐ δίδωσιν οὐδὲ φησιν ἔχειν ὅπως ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς ἐπισταμένη τὸ τῆς ἐκυρᾶς μητρειῶδες ἂν ὕστερόν τι συμβαίνει τραχύτερον μὴ ἀγανακτῇ μηδὲ δυσκολαίνει.

Chapter Three

“THE CHOICE BETWEEN TWO CITIES”

Revelation’s conclusion centres the dichotomy between Babylon and Jerusalem. The text places the two cities allegorized as feminine celestial figures in proximity to one another — the heavenly multitude’s taunt-song over fallen Babylon segues directly into an acclamation for Jerusalem (Rev. 19:1-8) — facilitating the comparison. Chs. 17-18 describe Babylon in detail that receives parallels in nearly every facet of Jerusalem in chs. 21-22. A dichotomy also exists between Babylon and the woman of Rev. 12-13, and thus does a parallel between that woman and the heavenly Jerusalem. The repeated, explicit (anti-)parallels function within a specific rhetorical context:

Revelation introduces the two cities first as “women” or feminine figures dressed in contrasting clothing in order to invoke recognition of a “two-women” ethical *topos* that was well-known in Jewish, pagan, and early Christian contexts. The *topos* furnished a structure for exhorting the audience to shun the evil alternative and embrace the good (New Jerusalem).²⁸⁵

Barbara Rossing provides a thorough analysis of this convention’s history in ancient rhetoric and its deployment in Revelation; Gordon Campbell similarly explores its deployment in collectivized representations of “women” elsewhere in Revelation (i.e., also in chs. 2-3 and 11-14), as do Klaus Wengst and Paul Duff, while Edith Humphrey details its situation in the context of EJECA apocalyptic texts.²⁸⁶ One of the most famous examples is Herakles’ choice between pleasure and virtue, whose allegories, Emma Stafford observes, many authors contrast in familiar terms:

²⁸⁵ Rossing, *Choice between Two Cities*, 181.

²⁸⁶ Wengst, “Babylon the Great,” 189-202; Duff, *Who Rides the Beast?*, 83-112; Humphrey, *The Ladies and the Cities*, *passim*. See also Campbell, “Antithetical Feminine-Urban Imagery,” Witherington, *Revelation*., 220-222, 266-268; Boxall, *Revelation*., 249-251.

[In Xenophon's *Memorabilia*, 2.1.21-2] Virtue and Vice are represented as women in the first place because the nouns they personify are grammatically feminine, but the elaboration of their appearance owes much to social conventions about "good" and "bad" women. Virtue is "good-looking," but her prettiness is natural, her whole body expressive of "purity," "modesty" and "reserve," virtues of the citizen wife, all set off by her "white clothes." Vice, on the other hand, is described in terms that one would expect to be applied to the *hetaira* — her face is made up and her figure is "straighter than it was by nature," while her clothes reveal rather than cover a body which shows signs of an over-indulgent lifestyle. Though it is not explicitly stated that Vice is beautiful, it is to be assumed that her appearance is superficially attractive, to reflect the superficial attractions of the life she offers... Silius Italicus' figures [in his telling of Scipio's (=Hercules') choice, *Punica* 15.18-128] are close to their models [in Xenophon], Virtue again modest and dressed in white, Pleasure smelling of Persian perfume and attired in extravagant Tyrian purple and gold.²⁸⁷

These allegories are part of a traditional juxtaposition of the figures of the wife and the prostitute in classical literature, a juxtaposition Ariadne Staples explores with special reference to Roman myth (62-71). In biblical contexts, Virtue and Vice, the bride/wife and the prostitute, resemble not only Revelation's Jerusalem and Babylon but also Lady Wisdom and the Strange Woman in Proverbs 1-9, an instance that Gale Yee, Richard Clifford, Carol Fontaine, Claudia Camp, Tova Forti, Stuart Weeks, and Christopher Ansberry have all examined.²⁸⁸ These figures have many non-canonical descendants, e.g., in the Qumran literature where they may appear together or singly, as Sidnie Crawford and Scott Jones detail and Kamila Blessing, Melissa Aubin, Benjamin Wright Matthew Goff also consider;²⁸⁹

²⁸⁷ Stafford, "Vice or Virtue?" 75. Stafford does note that "By contrast, St. Basil describes Vice as 'withered up' (*katesklēkenai*), 'squalid' (*auchmein*.) and 'severe' (*syntonos*) to look at (*On the Value of Greek Literature* 5.71-2), a modification meant to conform to Cynic ideals. Lucian's figures are likewise characterized by their appearances — Sculpture is described as being rough and manly in appearance, with callused hands and unkempt clothing while Education has a beautiful face and orderly appearance (*Dream* 6)" (ibid).

²⁸⁸ Yee, "I Have Perfumed My Bed;" Clifford, *Proverbs*, 62-73, 101-107; Carol Fontaine, *Smooth Words* (Sheffield: Sheffield Ac. P, 2002), 42-65; Claudia Camp, "Becoming Canon," in *Seeking Out* (ed. Troxel et al.), 371-387; Tova Forti, "The *Isha Zara* in Proverbs 1-9," *Hebrew St.* 48 (2007); Stuart Weeks, *Instruction and Imagery in Proverbs 1-9* (New York: Oxford U P, 2007), 69-73, 84-94; Christopher Ansberry, *Be Wise, My Son, and Make My Heart Glad* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2010), 50-63.

²⁸⁹ Crawford, "Lady Wisdom and Dame Folly," and Jones, "Wisdom's Pedagogy;" cf. Blessing, "Desolate Jerusalem and the Barren Matriarch: Two Distinct Figures in the Pseudepigrapha," *JSP* 9 (1998); Melissa Aubin, "'She is the beginning of all the ways of perversity:' Femininity and Metaphor in 4Q184," *WiJ* 2 (2001); Matthew Goff, "Hellish Females: The Strange Woman of LXX Proverbs and 4Q *Wiles of the Wicked Woman* (4Q184)," *JSS* 39 (2008).

and in the deuterocanonical wisdom texts (e.g., Sirach and Wisdom) that Judith McKinlay, Jane Webster, Joseph Dodson, Ibolya Balla discuss.²⁹⁰

Less allegorical female pairs appear elsewhere in the OT and its daughter texts. Athalya Brenner, for example, explores their frequent depiction in narratives of notable births.²⁹¹ Phyllis Kramer draws special attention to initially barren co-wives²⁹² and to Naomi's daughters-in-law in her consideration of these pairs whose members "are seen by the text itself and by later rabbinic traditions as opposites in their personalities and actions. One of these individuals is seen positively, the other negatively. Post-biblical exegetical traditions emphasize these distinctions, casting one member of the pair as hero/ine and the other as villain."²⁹³ Such traditions include rabbinic and patristic readings as well as non-canonical texts that develop the trope. Robert Kraft usefully contextualizes this reception history within the development of a more general "two-ways tradition" in early Judaism and in early Christianity.²⁹⁴

²⁹⁰ Judith McKinlay, *Gendering Wisdom the Host* (Sheffield: Sheffield Ac. P, 1996), 166-178; Jane Webster, "Sophia: Engendering Wisdom in Proverbs, Ben Sira and the Wisdom of Solomon," *JOT* 78 (1998): 63-79; Joseph Dodson, *The "Powers" of Personification: Rhetorical Purpose in the Book of Wisdom and the Letter to the Romans* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2008), 101-114; Peter Balla in *The Pseudepigrapha on Sexuality* (Loader), 392-398.

²⁹¹ Athalya Brenner, "Female Social Behaviour" (*Vet. Test.*, 1986).

²⁹² She notes specifically that "One motif that pervades several of the pair stories... [is that] the initially barren, taunted woman ultimately bears a son whose destiny is more meaningful than that of the child-bearing wife's son... In post-biblical times these figures are often idealized, even romanticized, and become the role models who people, it is implied, should emulate" (Kramer, "Biblical Women," 230).

²⁹³ *Ibid.*, 222. Kramer points to rabbinic reception proceeding from the sense that "While seemingly a passive or neutral figure, Orpah is recalled by many readers in a negative sense. As the story unfolds further, and Ruth is well-rewarded for her kindness to Naomi, Orpah's choice becomes more of a contrast to that of Ruth's [*sic*]. Had Orpah acted independently, she would not appear to have done anything wrong; all she did was what Naomi insisted she do. Ironically, it is only when contrasted with Ruth's disobedience that Orpah's action seems negative" (*ibid.*, 225).

²⁹⁴ Kraft, "Early Developments."

These studies have established foundations not only for understanding the background and use of the “two-women’ ethical *topos*” but also for the choices toward and away from which authors use it to exhort audiences. This is especially true of Barbara Rossing’s work on Revelation, which also reveal the ways in which it is typical of the rhetoric, e.g., it juxtaposes *luxuria* against a kind of restraint — Jerusalem is richly arrayed, but not drunk and fornicating — especially by focusing on clothing and adornment. The deployment of the “two-women” iteration of the “two-ways” *topos* is especially fitting for the ancient rhetoric of extravagance&vice vs. restraint/virtue. Extravagance or *luxuria* is usually understood to result from a lack of the quintessential feminine virtue, σωφροσύνη. Ancient rhetoric thus consistently construed extravagance as a feminine vice, as Christopher Berry, among others, explicates in his commentary on Livy’s *History* 34.3:

Women are “untamed creatures” with “uncontrollable natures” who want no restrictions on their spending and luxury. [Livy says the elder] Cato prophesied that if the [*lex Oppia* of 215 BCE, which banned women from owning much gold, wearing multi-coloured clothes, or riding in carriages in the city] was repealed [twenty years later] there would be great competition and rivalry among the wives, each wishing to outdo the other in conspicuousness... [It is] not surprising to see luxury being associated with women since its “softness” is what emasculates. Pliny in a typical aside [*His. Nat.* 12.41] laments the cost incurred by our luxuries (*deliciae*) and our women, while Juvenal is notorious for his misogynous association of the wantonness and irresponsibility of women with a society given over to wealth and luxury. On a more general level these connections between women, beasts and uncontrollable (therefore less rational) behaviour... reflect the assumption that it is males who embody what is distinctive about humanity.²⁹⁵

Plutarch’s advice to a married couple is illuminating:

Eurydice, I would have you read what Timoxena wrote to Aristylla about [the evils of] the love of ornament, and try to memorize it. As for you, Pollianus, do not think that your wife will avoid extravagance and expense if she sees that you do not despise it in other matters, but

²⁹⁵ Christopher Berry, “Luxury and the Politics of Need and Desire,” *His. Political Thought* 10 (1989), 605; cf. Susan Steward, *Cosmetics & Perfumes in the Roman World* (London: Tempus, 2007), 121-148.

take pleasure yourself in golden cups, painted rooms, or elaborate tack for your horses and mules. If extravagance rules in the men's quarters, it cannot be driven from the women's.²⁹⁶

Plutarch addresses both spouses, but it is the wife who he sees as primarily prone to luxury.

It is her impulses that must be curbed, and her husband must not expect that she will succeed in this if he fails to do so. Eradicating extravagance from the women's quarters is the primary concern; keeping it from the men's is a precondition to the main goal, despite the fact that most men probably had and spent more money than their wives.

Just as Revelation's condemnation of luxury accords with its use of the "two-women ethical *topos*," its allegorization of female figures as cities is far from unique (see ch. 1). This convention allows the text to contrast the "women's" inhabitants²⁹⁷ and rulers²⁹⁸ in detail, emphasizing the hatred of Rome. Many authors, notably Robert Gundry, Richard

²⁹⁶ Plutarch, *Prae. Con.* 48 (*Moralia* 145A), ad. *Selected Essays and Dialogues* (Oxford, 1993) 295; περὶ δὲ φιλοκοσμίας σὺ μὲν ὥς Εὐρυδίκη τὰ πρὸς Ἀρίστυλλαν ὑπὸ Τιμοξένας γεγραμμένα ἀναγνοῦσα πειρῶ διαμνημονεύειν σὺ δὲ ὥς Πολλιανὴ μὲ νόμιζε περιεργίας ἀφέξεσθαι τὴν γυναῖκα καὶ πολυτελείας ἂν ὁρᾷ σε μὲ καταφρονούντα τούτων ἐν ἑτέροις ἀλλὰ καὶ χαίροντα χρυσώσεσιν ἐκπωμάτων καὶ γραφαῖς οἰκημάτων καὶ χλίδωσιν ἡμιόνων καὶ ἵππων περιδεραίοις. οὐ γὰρ ἐστὶν ἐχελάσαι τῆς γυναικωνίτιδος ἐν μέσῃ τῇ ἀνδρωνίτιδι τὴν πολυτέλειαν ἀναστρεφόμενῃν.

²⁹⁷ Babylon after her fall "has become a dwelling place of demons, a haunt of every foul spirit, a haunt of every foul bird, a haunt of every foul and hateful beast" (ἐγένετο κατοικητήριον δαιμονίων καὶ φυλακὴ παντὸς πνεύματος ἀκαθάρτου καὶ φυλακὴ παντὸς ὀρνέου ἀκαθάρτου καὶ μεμισμένου, 18:2), whereas "nothing unclean will enter [the new Jerusalem], nor anyone who practices abominations or falsehood" (οὐ μὴ εἰσέλθῃ εἰς αὐτὴν πᾶν κοινὸν καὶ ποιῶν βδέλυγμα καὶ ψεῦδος, 21:27). At the defeat of Satan, "a loud voice in heaven" (φωνὴν μεγάλην ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, 12:10) exhorts, "Rejoice then, you heavens and those who dwell in them" (διὰ τοῦτο εὐφραίνεσθε οὐρανοὶ καὶ οἱ ἐν αὐτοῖς σκηνοῦντες, 12:12), a command that seems to be taken up after Babylon's end (19:1-5).

²⁹⁸ Thus Babylon "in her heart... says, 'I rule as a queen; I am no widow, and I will never see grief'" (ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ λέγει ὅτι κάθημαι βασίλισσα καὶ χήρα οὐκ εἰμί καὶ πένθος οὐ μὴ ἴδω, 18:7), and an angel says of her, "the nations have drunk of the wine of the wrath of her fornication, and the kings of the earth have committed fornication with her" (ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ οἴνου τοῦ θυμοῦ τῆς πορνείας αὐτῆς πέπωκαν πάντα τὰ ἔθνη καὶ οἱ βασιλεῖς τῆς γῆς μετ' αὐτῆς ἐπόρνευσαν, 18:3; cf. 18:9). One of the consequences for this behaviour, an angel tells fallen Babylon, is that "the light of a lamp will shine in you no more" (φῶς λύχνου οὐ μὴ φάνῃ ἐν σοὶ ἔτι, 18:23). In the case of the new Jerusalem, in contrast, "the glory of God is its light, and its lamp is the Lamb. The nations will walk by its light, and the kings of the earth will bring their glory into it" (ἡ γὰρ δόξα τοῦ θεοῦ ἐφώτισεν αὐτὴν καὶ ὁ λύχνος αὐτῆς τὸ ἀρνίον καὶ περιπατήσουσιν τὰ ἔθνη διὰ τοῦ φωτός αὐτῆς καὶ οἱ βασιλεῖς τῆς γῆς φέρουσιν τὴν δόξαν αὐτῶν εἰς αὐτήν, 21:23-24). That the kings implicitly submit to the authority of the Lamb is consonant with the situation of Rev. 12-13, in which the woman "gave birth to a son, a male child, who is to rule all the nations with a rod of iron" (ἔτεκεν υἱὸν ἄρσεν ὃς μέλλει ποιμαίνειν πάντα τὰ ἔθνη ἐν ῥάβδῳ σιδηρᾷ, 12:5).

Bauckham, and Lee Pilchan²⁹⁹ have contributed to a robust understanding of what Jerusalem is argued to offer and, along with others such as Allison Trites, J.P.M. Sweet, Adela Yarbro Collins, Michelle V. Lee, Gordon Zerbe, and Jan Willem van Henten, of what the choice of her involves (e.g., μαρτυρία and in some cases martyrdom).³⁰⁰ This research informs my analysis of some of the social realities involved in the depiction of the cities and exploration of another facet of the contrast between them: their ultimate fates, both of which the text presents as just. My aim here is to use this rhetoric of luxury as a lens for understanding what Schüssler Fiorenza calls the “justice and judgment” of Babylon’s fate. Revelation’s verdict on *dea Roma* is that she deserves to die in the *arena Romana*, and that those who are on God’s side, as it were, will rightly enjoy watching. In order to do this, it is necessary to understand that in John of Patmos’ world, the killing of a woman richly adorned as a deity for the entertainment of a cheering crowd was not a misogynistic fantasy. It was a predictable, though not everyday, occurrence in the social life of the Roman empire. I argue that Revelation’s attitude toward the Roman games (and *Roman* games they were), was negative and that what chs. 17-19 depict is “Babylon’s” dose of her own medicine. I also argue that this punishment is inseparable from her *luxuria*, of which slave-trading is a key component.

²⁹⁹ Gundry, “The New Jerusalem,” *Nov. Test.* (1987); Bauckham, *Theology*, 126-141; Lee Pilchan, *New Jerusalem*, 267-276, 289-291.

³⁰⁰ Trites, *NT Concept of Witness*, 154-174; Sweet, “Maintaining the testimony,” 101-107; Collins, *Crisis and Catharsis*, 99-107; Lee, “Call to Martyrdom;” Zerbe, “Revelation’s Exposé;” van Henten, “Concept of Martyrdom,” 587-618.

To be clear in proceeding, I do not contest scholarly consensus on the relevant issues. Critiques of luxury, ancient and modern, are often caricatures and are frequently leveled by members of the very same groups at which they are aimed. They rarely reflect economic reality and often have as much or more to do with other socio-political differences as with the perceived problem of luxury. Their economic and social understandings of excess are often disconnected from its realities. I do not contest that the typification of idleness as feminine, the association of luxury with women, and the passing over of “typically male” excesses in these critiques are the result and the expression of misogyny. Many of these wealthy male authors eschewed work as servile, and some of them then castigated wealthy women for sharing their views. Revelation is part of this discourse. What I contest is that the image of wealthy slaveholders that these works present is inaccurate. Furthermore, although men in these societies bore far heavier political and economic responsibility, it is appropriate to consider female targets of the critique in a text that (however problematically) dichotomizes female rather than male figures.

Focusing on cloth production can illuminate the dichotomy of luxurious indulgence and praiseworthy works. This activity’s significance in antiquity related in large part to its practicalities, which is not necessarily obvious to modern audiences but is vital for understanding ancient textile production. Post-industrial consumers often see only end-point products whose origins have become less and less visible over centuries of mass mechanization. Many people today have little idea of the processes by which cotton, flax, wool, or polymers are spun into yarn and woven into fabric (or harvested, finished,

cut, and sewed), whereas this was one of the first tasks girls learned in antiquity. Large spinning machines and looms moved these processes out of homes and into assembly-line factories in the nineteenth century, but centuries of domestic change preceded this shift. Prior to it, industrial looms replaced domestic spinning frames, which in their own time had replaced spinning jennies, which were the themselves the successors to spinning wheels. From the beginning of the last millennium of the common era, spinning wheels made obsolete a technology that predated writing by millennia: hand spinning. The methods of cloth production assumed by ancient texts were becoming obsolete centuries before the Protestant Reformation, such that later audiences tend not to realize that “one of the largest and most labour intensive of all ancient industries was that of producing cloth” (W.H. Manning, 598). This is not the place to review ancient Mediterranean textile technology; what matters for present purposes is an appreciation for the outlines of the present situation, namely that what was traditionally women’s domestic task of transforming raw material into thread and thence fabric was the linchpin of the textile industry. Wool and flax were sold and bought in raw batches; the limiting reagent was processing labour. Cesare Marchetti describes the system neatly:

If you “linearize” your clothes, you would be astonished at how much thread there is in a suit — it may be a kilometer or two — and in the original way of making that — by twisting the thread from a bundle of fibers with the help of a small tool — an innumerable number [*sic*] of hours went into the making of that thread. This spinning was so important and time-consuming that a moral value had to be attached to it, and in fact the Roman matron of virtue stayed at home and spun the wool, as was written on the epitaphs: *Domui mansit, lanam fecit*. The quintessential breakthrough was the invention of the spinning wheel [in China around the early Song period]... The year of 1050 saw the first drawing of this machine, which speeded up by a factor of 10 or perhaps 100, the rate at which the bundle of fibers was spun. This led to an obvious breakthrough in the production of clothes around the year 1200, when the machine slowly diffused to Europe, where the already existing loom was a quite efficient

machine with respect to the known spinning methods. Thus the bottleneck of spinning was removed (92).³⁰¹

This bottleneck would have been more pronounced in the making of the body-covering draped clothing worn in ancient Mediterranean societies, which involved many times more fabric than the tailored clothes of later centuries. It persisted, though, until the spinning wheel became established. Once it did so, Marchetti explains, there was an exponential increase in the availability of rags and thence far more paper than could be made using, e.g., vellum (western Europe) or hand-spun silk (China). The increased availability of paper facilitated efforts to increase the speed with which text could be put to it. The rest, of course, is history.

Part of that history is the rise of cotton, which had been an uncommon material in the ancient Mediterranean world. The lower south of the U.S. proved a more congenial growing environment, and the development of more efficient cotton processing techniques gave rise to of a slave-based textile economy whose bottleneck was harvesting, not processing. Meanwhile, with sorting, carding, spinning, and weaving fast departing from the domestic realm by about 1800, the task that could symbolize a woman's accomplishments in the antebellum U.S. was sewing, which for upper-class women often meant fancy embroidery. Home sewing machines did not change this on a

³⁰¹ C. Marchetti, "A Postmortem Technology Assessment of the Spinning Wheel: The Last Thousand Years," *Technological Forecasting and Social Change* 13:2 (Feb. 1979): 91-93. For detailed but not overly technical descriptions of spindle-and-loom cloth production, see Elizabeth Wayland Barber, *Women's Work: The First 20,000 Years* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1994), 34-41; John P. Wild's introduction to David Jenkin, *Cambridge History of Western Textiles* (Cambridge: Cambridge U P, 2003), 11-19 and "Textile Production," Oleson, *Oxford Handbook of Engineering*, 466-75; Cesare Rossi et al., *Ancient Engineers' Inventions: Precursors of the Present*. (Dordrecht, 2009) 235-37. See also Joan Bouza Koster, "From Spindle to Loom: Weaving in the Southern Argolid," *Expedition* 19 (1976), 29-39; Helen Bradley Foster, "Greek Sparto: Past and Present," *Textile* 4.1 (2006): 36-66, esp. p. 41-52. On the ancient textile economy see also Manning, "Industrial Growth," 586-605; K.D. White, *Greek and Roman Technology*, 39-41; John Peter Wild, "The Roman Horizontal Loom," *Am. J. Arch.* 91:3 (Jul. 1987): 591-597, and "The Textile Industries of Roman Britain," *Britannia* 33 (2002): 1-42, which contains much technological information that is broadly applicable; CEHGRW, Sitta von Reden, "Classical Greece: Consumption," 397-9, and Dennis P. Kehoe, "The Early Roman Empire: Production," 564-6.

wide scale until after the Civil War: they only became a market commodity in the mid-1850s. Still, the presence of slave labour seems to have been an important factor in the plantation south's slowness to adopt a range of industrial devices, including those used in "women's work." Enclosed indoor stoves, for example, were very rare in the lower south until after the war, but they were a staple of upper-class domestic architecture in the northern Americas at least a generation before it. Jane Censer documents the rapidity with which southern households that could afford stoves acquired them once white housewives lost their ability to outsource cooking to slaves.³⁰² The spindle and distaff may have been long gone, but the separate kitchen based on an open fire and oven proved more adaptable.

It is with reference to ancient textile economies and the rhetoric of them that Revelation distinguishes the bride first by her clothing (ἐδόθη αὐτῇ ἵνα περιβάληται βύσσινον λαμπρὸν καθαρὸν), with an immediate specification about the *production* of that clothing (τὸ γὰρ βύσσινον τὰ δικαιώματα τῶν ἁγίων ἐστίν) (19:8). We saw in ch. 1 that textile production (as opposed to textile finishing) was a shared, powerful symbol for the virtuous married woman and her economically important activities,³⁰³ connected

³⁰² See Censer, *The Reconstruction of White Southern Womanhood*, 78-82, on the social history of both technologies. Indoor stoves: Priscilla Brewer, "'We Have Got a Very Good Cooking Stove': Advertising, Design, and Consumer Response to the Cookstove, 1815-1880," *Winterthur Portfolio* 25:1 (Spr. 1990): 35-54; Clifton Ellis, "The Mansion House at Berry Hill Plantation: Architecture and the Changing Nature of Slavery in Antebellum Virginia," *Perspectives in Vernacular Architecture* 13:1 (2006), 25-27; Howell John Harris, "'The Stove Trade Needs Change Continually': Designing the First Mass-Market Consumer Durable, ca. 1810-1930," *Winterthur Portfolio* 43:4 (Win. 2009), 366, 374. Sewing machines: Elizabeth M. Bacon, "Marketing Sewing Machines in the Post-Civil War Years," *Bul. Business Hist. Soc.* 20:3 (Jun. 1946): 90-94; Robert B. Davies, "'Peacefully Working to Conquer the World': The Singer Manufacturing Company in Foreign Markets, 1854-1889," *Business His. Rev.* 43:3 (Aut. 1969), 300-305.

³⁰³ On free women's labour in antiquity, see Susan Treggiari, "Lower Class Women in the Roman Economy," *Florilegium* 1 (1979); Brock, "Labour of Women;" Scheidel, "The Most Silent Women;" Sian Lewis, *The Athenian Woman: An Iconographic Handbook* (London: Routledge, 2002), 60-90; Saller, "Women, Slaves, and the Economy," in *Early Christian Families* (ed. Balch and Osiek), 185-207; Orlando Patterson, "Slavery, gender, and work in the pre-modern world and early Greece," in *Systems* (ed. Dal Lago and Katsari), 32-69.

her to her marital home, and retained this role even in the imperial Roman economy. We saw also in ch. 2 that the preparation of clothes by the bride and her kinswomen and peers was part of wedding observances. Lena Larsson Lovén specifically observes that

[t]he bride was expected to have woven her bridal outfit on the old-fashioned upright loom, *tela stans*, as part of the preparations for the wedding. The weaving of the bridal woolen tunic and the hair-net the bride herself was a symbol of her ability to weave for her husband, and it also symbolized her new position as a housewife responsible for the clothes and textiles in the family. The bridal dress was the symbolic proof that she had learned to master her new role as the female head of the family, and textile production was the wife's major contribution to the economy of the household. This essential, wifely task was further emphasized in the wedding by the occurrence of a distaff and a spindle in the marriage procession[, which] were carried by the bride herself, or by an attendant. When the procession arrived at the bride's new home... the entrance could be adorned with woolen fillets (230).

Spinning and weaving were the occupations *par excellence* of the good housewife, but one of the main duties of domestically employed female slaves (in our period, a small minority of female slaves) in antiquity was also cloth production on behalf of the household. The economy of enslaved textile production existed with a culture in which free textile production was idealized and better-off women's supposed reluctance to do it and taste for imported fabrics were bemoaned as an expression of *luxuria*, as in Xenophon's *Memorabilia*.³⁰⁴ It was in this context that Suetonius claims that Octavian Augustus "raised his daughter and granddaughters to accustom them to wool-work" (*filiam et neptes ita instituit ut etiam lanificio*) and that "[e]xcept on special occasions he wore common clothes for the house, made by his sister, wife, daughter, or granddaughters" (*veste non temere alia quam domestica usus est ab sorore et uxore et filia neptibusque confecta*).³⁰⁵ He marks these women's being taught to sew as unusual and

³⁰⁴ The *Memorabilia* advocates women's contributing to their households' assets and their own physical and mental well-being by taking up the textile production in which they were trained as girls, rather than draining their households by not working on the grounds that work is servile. This, Xenophon suggests, will lead to ruin. He is careful to insist that citizen women should do honourable work such as weaving. Disgraceful tasks (not specified) are properly left to slaves. On the *Memorabilia*, see Pomeroy, *Goddesses, Whores* (1995), 71-73.

³⁰⁵ Suetonius, *Aug.* 64.2, 73.1, ad. Rolfe 221, 239.

laudable, but this can only have been the case for the very richest of free women. Such imagery nonetheless proved politically durable:

Although the ways of producing textile in the Augustan period were different from the situation in Archaic Rome, the idea of women performing domestic wool work persisted as a symbol of a virtuous female responsible for the household, and representing traditional values... There are no official monuments from the time of Augustus that illustrate any aspect of wool-working women, so prominent in the Imperial ideology... However, later in the 1st century AD, there is a state monument where the ideology surrounding wool-working women can be seen. This is the temple of Minerva in the *Forum Transitorium* in Rome... in the frieze of the temple raised by Emperor Domitian and the frieze depicts the myth of Arachne... This motif is a unique example in Roman state art, but it is not likely to be a coincidence that it appeared in the reign of Domitian. His protective goddess was Minerva and, as emperor, he was anxious to identify himself with the social and cultural policy of [Octavian]. The decoration of the Minerva temple is to be seen in this light, as a tribute to social stability and traditional values through the virtuous, wool-working, Roman women (Lovén 233-4).³⁰⁶

Spinning and weaving were among the few tasks that were only for women and expected of all women across the spectra of legal and social status, age, economics, and more. The consequences of these expectations, however, varied. Suzanne Dixon observes that while “a Roman matron of any social level accepted responsibility, as supervisor and participant, for supplying the clothing needs of [the *familia*]... [t]he work considered low-grade if done by a slave in a factory context or by a contract-weaver to support her family was elevated to a cultural emblem if performed by a housewife or mistress of her own establishment” (68).³⁰⁷ Given that many relatively prosperous women also had other business involvements outside their households, the textile production that they did undertake or supervise could acquire additional resonance.³⁰⁸ Sheramy Bundrick’s observations of the iconography of textile production is also instructive:

³⁰⁶ In this vein, Brian William Jones argues that Domitian’s “proverbial reliance on Minerva [is] clearly indicated in his coins,” 165 of which depict her, as opposed to twelve of Vespasian’s (“Some Thoughts,” 251).

³⁰⁷ Dixon, “Exemplary Housewife or Luxurious Slut? Cultural Representations of Women in the Roman Economy,” in Fiona McHardy and Eirann Marshall, *Women’s Influence on Classical Civilization* (London: Routledge, 2004), 68; cf. Goff, *Citizen Bacchae*, 52.

³⁰⁸ I am grateful to Lynn Kozacs for pointing me toward this observation in her comments.

In highlighting the economic prosperity of the *oikoi*, the vase paintings imply that the family has sufficient resources that the women of the house do not have to produce textiles for outside sale; in other words, they are not professional woolworkers (ταλασιουργοί)... Literary sources (e.g., Xen. *Mem.* 2.7) indicate that at times of financial need... citizen women could make textiles or wreaths for sale at market, but this was not the ideal. The reality may have been different, but the vases show an idealized world, where whatever work is done does not look particularly strenuous or difficult. More laborious activities, such as cooking or cleaning, are largely omitted from the iconographic repertoire. Showing a citizen woman spinning or weaving had the added cachet of associating her with aristocratic women of myth and epic, such as Penelope or Andromache (319).

This accords with the broader classical literary record, which was the output and reading material of the same social stratum as the vases. Wives consistently receive praise for producing textiles, but very rarely for cooking, cleaning, water-carrying, field-tending, or child care. Musonius Rufus argues a daughter as well as a son should receive philosophical training because “such a woman is likely to be energetic, capable of enduring ills, prepared to feed her children at her own breast and assist her husband with her own hand. What others would consider to be slaves’ work, she will be willing to do.”³⁰⁹ Texts such as Xenophon’s *Economics* provide much more detailed instructions for supervising spinning and weaving than they do for any of the latter tasks. Free women who were not wealthy performed all of these tasks; wealthy ones apparently did not. Child care is an instructive example. Advice for choosing a nurse or pedagogue abounds, but there exists almost none on how to care for or raise children, and narrative texts emphasize their protagonists’ relationships with their nurses, not with their mothers. The received ideal seems to have been that legitimate children were begotten by husbands and instructed by *pedagogoi*, borne by wives and fed and tended by nurses.³¹⁰ The prosperous “honeybee” wife worked hard at

³⁰⁹ Musonius Rufus 3.18, ad. Lutz 43; ὅθεν εἰκὸς εἶναι τὴν γυναῖκα ταύτην καὶ αὐτουργικὴν καὶ κακόπαθον οἷαν ἂ μὲν ἂν τέκῃ τρέφειν μαστῶ τῷ ἑαυτῆς τῷ δὲ ἀνδρὶ ὑπηρετεῖν χερσὶ ταῖς ἑαυτῆς· ἂ δὲ δουρικὰ νομίζουσιν ἔνοι ταῦτα ἀόκνως ποιεῖν.

³¹⁰ On nurses and their role, see Sandra Joshel, “Nurturing the Master’s Child,” *Signs* 12 (1986); Sian Lewis, *Athenian Woman*, 81–83; Wrenhaven, *Reconstructing*, chs. 3–5 *passim*.

weaving and supervising, but as many of her other “feminine” tasks as economically possible fell to the drones.

Slave-owning wives’ assigning domestic labour to their property is no surprise; the question is how much labour they assigned them, and how much truth there is in complaints that the wealthiest women, in Columella’s words, “so abandon themselves to luxury and idleness that they do not deign to undertake even the superintendence of wool-making” (*De Ag.* 12.0.9).³¹¹ Some authors, including Columella, make analogous claims about men, and I do not dispute that those who focused on the wealthiest *women* were thereby misogynist. However, close reading of ancient texts strongly suggests that many of the richest people, who may have been widely despised and envied, were hardly more productive than accused. We may perhaps start by noting what domestic acts elite male writers, artists, and patrons did not represent their wives doing or express desire to have them perform. This is not the same thing as what they did not need or want to have done, only what they did not need or want to have done *by their wives*. A succinct illustration is *M. Ket.* 5:5:

These are the tasks that a wife must perform for her husband: she must grind grain, bake and do washing, cook, and breastfeed her child, make his bed, and work in wool. If she brought him one slave [f.; in the dower property], she need neither grind, nor bake, nor wash; if two, she need neither cook nor breastfeed; if three, she is not required to make his bed or to work in wool; if four, she may sit on a raised seat. R. Eliezer says: Even if she brought him a hundred slaves [f.], he can make her do wool-work, since idleness leads to lewdness.³¹²

The text posits specific tasks as fundamental to the household, which are equated here explicitly and elsewhere implicitly with the distinguishing tasks of a wife. A man needs a wife, according to most rabbinic and Greco-Roman ideology, and he needs wifely tasks to

³¹¹ Ad. H.B. Ash (1968) 179, *Nunc vero cum pleraeque sic luxu et inertia diffluant ut ne lanificii quidem curam suscipere dignentur*.

³¹² *M. Ket.* 5.5, ad. Blackman and Mestel 150-51.

be done. What is not required is for the same person to meet these needs. All a wife *needs* to practice is monogamy; every other duty that falls to a wife can be outsourced to a slave. Even in Eliezer's view, a wealthy wife's textile production is only an aid to monogamy, not a requirement in its own right. Miriam Peskowitz, commenting on this text, makes an observation of the rabbinic authors that is equally applicable to their Greek and Roman counterparts: "[They] express no desire for well-kept houses, or for the actual property and resources that a woman's wages add to their families' well-being. The surplus value of women's labour [in textile production] was not conceived in terms of actual products and services... [but in] feminine domesticity, loyalty to husbands, and appropriate practices for being a Jewish wife" (131-2), similar to the situation that Sheramy Bundrick identifies as depicted in earlier visual art (see above). Wealthy men express no desire for their houses to be well-kept or for all parts of their property and resources to be increased by their wives. The men who and were written about and who commissioned painted vases and large monuments — that is, the wealthiest men — did not need their wives actually to make any textiles, much less do heavier work, and it would appear that by and large their wives did not meet this absent need. Sarah Pomeroy correctly observes of classical Athens that "[w]ealthier women were distinguished by exercising a managerial role, rather than performing all the domestic work themselves" (72). Theano is very explicit on this point: "Authority to rule the household is granted by the law to you younger women as soon as you are married... The primary

area of authority in the house for wives is over the slaves.”³¹³ Centuries later, Musonius Rufus sought to “examine in detail the qualities suitable for a woman who would lead a good life... In the first place, a woman must be a good housekeeper, that is, a careful accountant of everything that pertains to the welfare of her household, and capable of ruling its slaves.”³¹⁴ Xenophon exhibits similar thinking when he has Ischomachus tell his wife that some of her specific duties “are pleasant to carry out. It is delightful to teach spinning to a house slave who did not know how when you got her, and to double her value; to take in hand a girl who is ignorant of housekeeping and service and after instructing her and making her trustworthy and serviceable to find her worth any amount.”³¹⁵ Ischomachus’ figure of a wife agrees readily with him, as she always does, but Xenophon constructs no figure of a slave to offer her opinion. Atlantic slaves did not find such instruction delightful. Mary Prince recalls that after being sold at age fourteen,

...my [new] mistress set about instructing me in my tasks. She taught me to do all sorts of household work; to wash and bake, pick [over] cotton and wool, and wash floors, and cook. And she taught me (how can I ever forget it!) more things than these; she caused me to know the exact difference between the smart of the rope, the cart-whip, and the cow-skin... there was scarcely any punishment more dreadful than the blows I received on my face and head from her hard heavy fist (6).

³¹³ Theano 12.1 (*Ep. Call.*), tr. ad. I.M. Plant 72. Plutarch displays similar reasoning in the *Sayings of Spartan Women* (27-28; *Moralia* 242) when he recounts that “A woman who was being sold as a slave, when asked what she knew how to do, said, ‘To be faithful.’ Another, taken captive and asked a similar question, said, ‘To manage a house well’” (ad. Babbitt 467; Λάκαινα πιπρασκομένη καὶ ἐρωτωμένη τί ἐπίσταται ἔφη πιστὰ ἦμεν. Ἀλλή ἀίχμαλωτευθεῖσα καὶ ἐρωτωμένη παραπλησίως εὐ οἰκεῖν οἶκον ἔφη). Spartan women were icons of σωφροσύνη and freedom in Greek rhetoric; the implication, which becomes explicit at other points in the text, is that these women have fallen unjustly into slavery and by their responses prove that they are “truly free” (i.e., in their character).

³¹⁴ Musonius Rufus 3.7-8, ad. Lutz 39; σκοπῶμεν δὲ καὶ καθ’ ἐν ἑκάστων τῶν προσηκόβτων γυναικὶ τῇ ἐσομένῃ ἀγαθῇ... αὐτὴ καὶ οἰκονομικὴν εἶναι τὴν γυναικα καὶ ἐκλογιστικὴν τῶν οἴκῳ συμφερόντων καὶ ἀρχικὴν τῶν οἰκετῶν.

³¹⁵ Xenophon, *Oec.* 41, ad. Marchant 427, 429; Ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὶ ἔφη ἐγὼ ἴδια ἐπιμέλεια ὧ γυναι ἡδεῖαι σοι γίγνεται ὅποταν ἀνεπιστήμονα ταλασίας λαβοῦσα ἐπιστήμονα ποιήσῃ καὶ διπλασίου σοι ἀξία γένηται καὶ ὅποταν ἀνεπιστήμονα ταμείας καὶ διακονίας παραλαβοῦσα ἐπιστήμονα καὶ πιστὴν καὶ διακονίας ποιησαμένη παντὸς ἀξίαν ἔχῃς.

Providing such instruction was an important role for the rich wife. By ancient standards, this and avoiding adultery were her only major tasks. If she managed that much, she might be praised for spinning and weaving, whether or not she actually did any. Columella, for example, for all his disapproval of the idle rich's *luxuria* and the women's refusal to spin and weave, does not recommend that they actually do work. Instead, as Kristina Milnor discusses,³¹⁶ he recommends applying Xenophon's household advice to enslaved overseers, who are to embody economic virtue *on behalf* of their owners. Even Xenophon's omissions are revealing: Ischomachus "said [to my wife] it was excellent exercise to mix flour and knead dough; and to shake and fold cloaks and bedclothes; such exercise would give her a better appetite, improve her health, and add natural colour to her cheeks."³¹⁷ He commends these habits as beneficial to his wife's appearance and health, not to the household's operation. He also does not suggest that she draw water, cook, or clean, tasks that the woman of Prov. 31 does not perform either.

Whether the wealthiest women did any significant wool work is as questionable as whether the wealthiest men did any significant labour of any other kind. If Columella states in a jeremiad that they do not, other sources such as Suetonius simply assume as much (see above). Cloth production was in ideology and in practice one of the single largest occupations of most free women and was represented as their most essential and virtuous task. Yet Suetonius does not comment on Octavian's having to go out of his way for his *filiaefamilias* to operate at what was supposed to be the default mode. Whether

³¹⁶ Kristina Milnor, *Gender, Domesticity, and the Age of Augustus: Inventing Private Life* (Oxford: Oxford U P, 2005), 275-79.

³¹⁷ Xenophon, *Oec.* 10.11, ad. Marchant 451; ἀγαθὸν δὲ ἔφην εἶναι γυμνάσιον καὶ τὸ δεῦσαι καὶ μάξαι καὶ ἱμάτια καὶ στρώματα ἀνασεῖσαι καὶ συνθεῖναι. γυμναζομένην δὲ ἔφην οὕτως ἂν καὶ ἐσθίειν ἥδιον καὶ ὑγιαίνειν μᾶλλον καὶ εὐχρωτέραν φαίνεσθαι τῇ ἀληθείᾳ.

Suetonius is accurately reporting either the girls' work or claims about it, his reportage indicates that their not doing any textile work was at least a plausible assumption.

Pliny's praise for Trajan's wife is even more revealing: "When she sees her husband travel without pomp or intimidation, she also goes about quietly, and as far as her sex permits, she follows his example of walking on foot [i.e., not in a litter]."³¹⁸ Only the smallest minority of women in Rome found that their sex necessitated their being carried, usually by slaves, from place to place. The rest walked. Pliny, whose social background was akin to Trajan's, praises Plotina for being unassuming. Less friendly audiences such as existed but left few records might have interpreted it more along the lines of praise for not always being too lazy to walk.

Even among the rich, few couples were as wealthy as Trajan and Plotina. Nevertheless, a close reading of texts about ideal wives indicates skepticism about whether these "honeybees" worked as hard as the male authors of the texts claimed, any more than wealthy men such as the agricultural manuals worked as much or lived as modestly as those texts suggest. The industrious wife of Xenophon's *Oeconomicus*, for example, enters marriage without any domestic skills:

If when she came [into my house] she knew no more than how, when given wool, to turn out a cloak, and had seen only how the spinning is given out to the maids, is not that as much as could be expected? For in control of her appetite, Socrates, she had been excellently trained; and this sort of training is, in my opinion, the most important to man and woman alike.³¹⁹

³¹⁸ Pliny Minor, *Panegyricus* 83.8, ad. Radice 519; *an cum videat quam nullus te terror nulla comitetur ambitio non et ipsa cum silentio incedat ingredientemque pedibus maritum in quantum patitur sexus imitetur.*

³¹⁹ Ad. Marcahnt 415; Xen., *Oec.* 7.6: οὐ γὰρ ἀγαπητόν σοι δοκεῖ εἶναι εἰ μόνον ἦλθεν ἐπισταμένη ἔρια παραλαβοῦσα ἱμάτιον ἀποδεῖξαι καὶ ἑωρακυῖα ὥς ἔργα ταλάσια θεραπαίνας δίδοται ἐπεὶ τά γε ἄμφι γαστέρα, ἔφη πάνυ καλῶς ὧ Σώκρατες ἦλθε πεπαιδευμένη· ὅπερ μέγιστον ἔμοιγε δοκεῖ παίδευμα εἶναι καὶ ἀνδρὶ καὶ γυναικί.

The girl has gained her incomplete impression of her role from her role model for being a married woman of a certain social standing. As she says to Ischomachus, “But how can I [help you]; what power do I have? All the power is yours. My task, as my mother has said, is to be modest.”³²⁰ She is of course happy for Ischomachus to disabuse her of the notion that she should do no work, eagerly applying herself to household management. But her role is just that: managerial, and managerial in relation to slaves, who are the drones to her queen (*Oec.* 7.33). Her job, Ischomachus reiterates, is to supervise work and allot provisions, not to perform the labour herself.

This provides grounds to infer that even the ideal “honeybee” wife did less work than the drones in her colony and less work than her male admirers claimed. But this gives little insight into the question of how accurate the image of the idle rich wife actually was.³²¹ This is where modern evidence is potentially illuminating, with caveats. First, what applies to one system does not automatically translate to the other. Second, gender prejudice rather than reality underlies both the construction of rich *women* as the embodiment of idleness and the idea that their menfolk were any less idle. Planter-class men outsourced much of plantation management to overseers and pursued leisure activities with abandon. Thomas Chaplin, who kept one of the most complete diaries of any nineteenth-century male planter, is a case in point. Chaplin demonstrated little skill at managing his South Carolina sea islands plantation (which he never accepted was unsuitable for cultivating Andean potatoes), spent inadvisably on consumer durables and

³²⁰ Ad. Marchant 419; Xenophon, *Oec.* 7.14: Τί δ’ ἂν ἐγὼ σοι... δυναίμην συμπᾶσαι τίς δὲ ἡ ἐμὴ δύναμις ἀλλ’ ἐν σοὶ πάντα ἐστίν. ἐμὸν δ’ ἔφησεν ἡ μήτηρ ἔργον εἶναι σωφρονεῖν.

³²¹ On this, see Joshel, “Nurturing;” Brock, “Labour of Women;” Scheidel, “The Most Silent Women;” Saller, “Women, Slaves, and the Economy,” in *Early Christian Families* (ed. Balch and Osiek); 185–204; Ulrike Roth, “Inscribed Meaning” and *Thinking Tools*, both *passim*; Orlando Patterson, “Slavery, gender, and work.”

liquor, frequently quit his plantation for town parties with inconsistent substitute supervision, and appears to have been obsessed with hunting plovers.³²² The aftermath of the Confederacy's defeat revealed that he and many male planters, as Amy Morsman details, had few skills apart from managing slaves.³²³

There is a wealth of primary evidence for female labour relations in the U.S. plantation system, and in the wake of Catherine Clinton's work and the debate that it provoked, extensive scholarship on the occupation of planter-class wives,³²⁴ the domestic labour of female slaves, and the interactions between them has emerged,³²⁵ Elizabeth Fox-Genovese's and Thavolia Glymph's being some of the most prominent. Here again clothes-making provides a useful lens, despite the technological gap. Fox-Genovese observes that although

[p]roduction of clothing did not alone, or even primarily, account for the burdens that [wealthy white] southern women felt were imposed by their duty to care for and manage their

³²² Plovers are fast-moving wading birds in family *Charadriidae*. Those that frequent eastern North America are neither pests nor large enough to bother eating. Chaplin was equally intent on hunting wildcats but never actually saw one.

³²³ Morsman, *The Big House after Slavery*, 13-53.

³²⁴ On planter-class women's activities, see Fox-Genovese, *Within the Plantation Household*, *passim*; Richard Sears, "Working Like a Slave," *Register of the Kentucky Hist. Soc.* 87 (1989); Leah Atkins, "High Cotton;" Kathleen Brown, *Good Wives*, 296-306; Censer, "Changing World" and *Reconstruction of White Southern Womanhood*, both *passim*; Faust, *Mothers of Invention*, 45-52, 74-79, and "Moment of Truth," 150-159 in Robert Paquette and Louis Ferleger, *Slavery, Secession, and Southern History* (Charleston: U South Carolina P, 2000); Wilma King, "The Mistress and Her Maids," in *Discovering the Women*, (ed. Morton) Laura Edwards, *Gendered Strife*, 116-144, and *Scarlett Doesn't Live Here*, 72-84, 172-184; Weiner, *Mistresses and Slaves*, 23-49; Inge Dornan, "Masterful Women;" Cecily Jones, *Engendering whiteness*, *passim*; Glymph, *Out of the House of Bondage*, *passim*; Morsman, *Big House*, 35-50.

³²⁵ On the labour of female slaves, see, in addition to the previous note (especially Fox-Genovese and Glymph), Virginia Meacham Gould, "If I Can't Have My Rights, I Can Have My Pleasures, and If They Won't Give Me Wages, I Can Take Them: Gender and Slave Labor in Antebellum New Orleans," in *Discovering* (ed. Morton), 178-198; Weiner, *Mistresses and Slaves*, 7-22; Joan Martin, *More Than Chains and Toil*, 9-28; in *Neither Lady Nor Slave* (ed. Susanna Delfino and Michael Gillespie; Chapel Hill: U North Carolina P, 2002), Timothy J. Lockley, "Spheres of Influence: Working White and Black Women in Antebellum Savannah," 102-120, and Stephanie McCurry, "Producing Dependency: Women, Work, and Yeoman Households in Low-Country South Carolina," 57-71; Cynthia Kennedy, *Braided Relations, Entwined Lives*, *passim*; Dunaway, *African-American Family*, 163-176; Emily West, *Chains of Love*, 80-110; Diana Berry, "Swing the Sickle," 13-47.

[unfree] servants[, it] offers a good example of the complex relations between mistress and slaves, for without the slaves' labor the mistress could not have produced the clothing, even if she did not "see" that labor. As in so many other instances, she saw herself as doing what was in fact done for her, albeit under her direction. Her attitude paralleled that of the typical planter, who would note that he had "ploughed my field." Historians have not commonly taken those assertions at face value and have recognized that a man with twenty or so slaves resorted to a metaphor in claiming to perform his own labor. Those same historians have, however, been less quick to recognize the metaphor as invoked by [wealthy white] southern women.... [whose] papers abound with accounts of barrels of flour opened, gardens tended, clothes washed, candles made — all as if done on their own. The making of slave clothes is telling only because it offered the mistress an occasion to make explicit her sense of being burdened by the care of her slaves (1988: 128-129).

Planter-class women, then, understood themselves to be very busy with clothes-making, just as Ischomachus' wife or Octavian's were claimed to be occupied similarly. In the case of modern women, it is apparent that few people outside their own sliver of society agreed. Harriet Jacobs recalled that "It was *her* [Jacobs' grandmothers'] labor that supplied my scanty wardrobe. I have a vivid recollection of the linsey-woolsey dress given me every winter by Mrs. Flint. How I hated it! It was one of the badges of slavery" (20). Kate Cumming, an Edinburgh-born woman who came to identify herself fully as a (white) southerner, revealed a number of assumptions when she said, "I have often alleged as a reason for [slaveowners who were by birth] foreigners and northerners illtreating [*sic*] negroes so much more so than southerners, that the negro, like his master, is not over-fond of work."³²⁶ Cumming was middle-class, not planter-class, but her glimmer of insight — that slaveowners were averse to work — is a rare concession. Planter-class women revealed in their very claims of industry how little productive work they actually performed. Gertrude Ella Clanton Thomas, the daughter of one wealthy planter and bride of another, wrote during the second trimester of her first pregnancy "I feel indeed like a new being taking more interest in reading — [*sic*] sewing and everything else.

Amanda is making it for I have no semstress [*sic*] and knowing so little, and disliking so

³²⁶ K. Cumming, 29 Nov. 1863, p. 176.

much the use of the needle, I am often troubled in having my sewing done.”³²⁷ She identified her new interests as virtuous (reading and sewing), but it would appear that by “sewing,” she meant “fashion.” After the war and emancipation, preferring paying former slaves to washing her own laundry, she admitted unabashedly that “I had no idea what was considered a task in washing so I gave [the hired laundress] all the small things belonging to the children taking out all the table cloths sheets counterpanes &c — She was through by dinner time appeared to work steady... So much for hiring by the day.”³²⁸ At this point she had spent a full decade supervising others’ laundering, with the ability to whip or sell them if the results disappointed her.

Mrs. Thomas was not exceptional of women of her class. Nancy Bostick De Saussure wrote decades after the war of her planter-wife mother that “Another care of hers was to provide clothing for all the [plantation’s] negroes, of whom there were over five hundred. To accomplish this, seamstresses [who were also slaves] were at work all the year round; three in the house and five or six in the negro quarters... All the [clothes-]cutting was done under my mother’s supervision...” (42). Clothes-making was Mrs. Bostick’s “care” but her slaves’ task. Elizabeth Lyle Saxon, born into a wealthy family in 1832, recounted later that when the Civil War began in 1861, “Money had now to be raised for the soldiers, and, as usual, women had to raise a good share of it. Every household became a workshop and women congregated by hundreds in halls to sew for the soldiers. Negroes were knitting stockings; children knit, and women that never touched a needle before knit far into the night with eyes so dim with tears they could

³²⁷ E.C. Thomas, 28 Sep. 1855, p. 136.

³²⁸ *ibid.*, 27 May 1865, p. 272.

scarcely see their needles” (31). History made clear the feelings of the “Negroes [who] were knitting stockings.” Saxon also wrote admiringly of a neighbouring planter wife that

Madam B. always had her preserves made in open kettles in the large yard, where they were directly under her line of vision... She was a notable housekeeper. All the sewing, cutting, and giving out of clothing fell under her own directions, as well as the distribution of medicines, etc. And just here I would say the world held no equal of such housekeepers. It was like managing a State [*sic*] on a small scale, and Mrs. B. was one of the best. Though extremely large, and sitting much on her chair, she had her [slave] factotums, Jennie and Kitty, constantly on the run, supervised by some older domestic, and often by one of her daughters (19).

She describes slaves “constantly on the run” performing a range of demanding tasks but credits them to a wealthy free woman whose habit of “sitting much on her chair,” Saxon insinuates, left her too obese to walk. Catherine Devereux Edmonston took pride in producing clothes for the Confederate army. She wrote in 1862 that “I have [my slave] Dolly’s spinning work to arrange & superintend. She commences some yarn for me to knit for the soldiers & I have to go into the Pork house loft & select, or make her do it, such wool as I wish for my own work before the Plantation [*sic*] spinners commence on it.”³²⁹ The nature of her “own work” with wool is unclear; she later records that “My own homespun dress was much admired & queries made as to whether I had spun it myself. I was sorry to be forced to answer in the negative, for I have never been forced to lay my hand to the distaff. Perhaps I had better learn, for who knows what my future is to be?”³³⁰ Although Mrs. Edmonston assumed herself qualified to superintend slaves’ knitting and sewing, she required an entire day to mend three pairs of socks.³³¹

³²⁹ C.D. Edmonston, 17 Nov. 1862, p. 268. For a detailed discussion of Edmonston’s diaries, see Faust, “Moment of Truth.”

³³⁰ Ibid, 29 Sep. 1863, p. 472.

³³¹ Ibid, 1865 (date uncertain), p. 606.

Clothes-making was no more an isolated instance in Atlantic than in ancient slavery. Wealthy white women saw themselves as steadily occupied or outright burdened by the supervision of tasks that their slaves actually performed. These were tasks that less wealthy white women performed for themselves and that the wealthiest women, as they realized in the war's aftermath, were not competent supervise — if, indeed, they made any attempt to do so. Nancy De Saussure recalled that her mother gave “unceasing care and attention to her children, and personally supervised every detail of their education” (17), although her slave-managing rounds dictated that she do this while her children “were busy in school all those hours. We had a schoolhouse on the plantation where we went after breakfast with our governess... We also had a music teacher, so we were expected to devote many hours to practicing music, and thus we were employed while mother [*sic*] was busy housekeeping” (42-43). That is, Saussure credited her mother with “personally supervising every detail” of her children's education when in fact she did not even walk them to an on-site school, let alone instruct them. Susan Dabney Smedes, the daughter of a wealthy planter, wrote in her book-length eulogy for her father that the outbreak of the Civil War, at which time she was twenty and unmarried, meant

...rigid self denial for [my father] and his children. He could not bear the thought of seeing his daughters deprived of comforts... His chivalrous nature had always revolted from the sight of a woman doing hard work. He determined to spare his daughters all such labor as he could perform. [U.S.] General Sherman had said that he would like to bring every Southern woman to the wash-tub. “He shall never bring my daughters to the wash-tub,” Thomas Dabney said. “I will do the washing myself.” And he did it for whole years. He was in his seventieth year when he began to do it... This may give some idea of the labors, the privations, the hardships, of those terrible years.³³²

In the Dabneys' view, if female slaves were unavailable to do the work thought appropriate to them, anything was preferable to having it done by rich white women.

³³² Smedes, *Memorials of a Southern Planter* (1887) 233-234.

The construction here of Sherman's famous (though possibly apocryphal) words is itself telling: "Southern woman" in this context reads "pro-Confederacy woman," all of whom were white;³³³ what would change if Sherman had his alleged way would be that *every* white woman in the south would wash clothes. Some pro-Confederacy women in the south were already doing so and had been since they were old enough to perform the labour involved. It was a regular chore, not a matter of "rigid self denial." The tensions that emerged in Confederate society over the course of the war made clear that many white women who used slave labour, or aspired to do so, could without condemning slavery condemn wealthier whites for their perceived excesses. This anger could prompt shock and offense from its targets. Ella Gertrude Clanton Thomas, the daughter of one wealthy Georgia planter and the wife of another, when staple food shortages were becoming pressing in early 1862 wrote in her diary that

Meal is selling in Augusta for \$2.00 pr bushel. Pa has offered in the papers to sell meal at his Rowell Plantation for one dollar to the familys [*sic*] of Volunteers from Richmond and Columbia Countys [*sic*]. Saturday morning two pieces came out about it in the *Constitutionalist*, one of them signed "A poor soldiers [*sic*] wife" wishing to know how they were to get the meal, that the mill was in the country, they had no Horses and coould [*sic*] not be expected to turn themselves into beasts of burden, that it would not be cheap at 10 cts pr bushel unless delivered. Now this is encouraging truly. Pa can sell every bushel of meal that he has at \$2.00 pr bushel and what reason is there that he should not? but upon such ungrateful wretches (14 Apr. 1862; 170).

Nor did she confine the expression of these feelings to the privacy of her diary. Ideals of gender and class propriety in public expression were not so restrictive that she felt any reservations when she

³³³ This is an issue of its own; many white Unionists, including Sherman himself, were initially motivated by just that, unionism, and only became invested in ending slavery as the war dragged on. Even then, the main impetus was often punishing the Confederacy (most of whose supporters *were* primarily motivated by preserving and extending slavery) rather than concern for people who were enslaved. But the subtext is clear enough in this case: southern women were already cleaning Confederacy supporters' clothes in wash-tubs. It was just that the southern women who were cleaning them were not always the ones who supported the Confederacy.

stopped writing in my Journal and commenced an answer to “The Poor Soldier's wife” who replied in such an ungrateful manner to Pa's offer to sell meal. It was a long reply, fearlessly written and inspired by a womanly horror of such conduct. It is too long to copy into this book. I don't know wether [*sic*] the Editor [of the *Chronicle*] will publish it or not, but if he does not the Editor of the *Constitutionalist*, certainly shall” (17 Apr. 1862; *ibid*).

Her position was such that she did not understand why a pro-slavery white woman who was poorer than she would resent other pro-slavery whites whose wealth insulated them the realities of the market in staples.

Ella Thomas was not an isolated example of a white antebellum lady too prosperous to have any experience with the labour that was ostensibly their main responsibility to supervise. Eliza Frances Andrews, for example, shortly after emancipation wrote not only that “I always intend to dress as well as my means will allow, but shall attempt nothing in the way of finery so long as I have to sweep floors and make up beds”³³⁴ — not the most arduous of household tasks — but also that, although hired freedwomen did the cooking and table service for some surprise visitors, she and her kinswomen

had the other work to do, besides looking after all the company. I was never so tired in my life; every bone in my body felt as if it were ready to drop out, and my eyes were so heavy that I could hardly keep them open. I don't find doing housework quite so much of a joke as I imagined what it was going to be, especially when we have company to entertain at the same time, and want to make them enjoy themselves. By the way, Mrs. Jordan says I was right [after all] in dusting the top shelves first, so the laugh is on the other side.³³⁵

At least four white women whose major duty for years had been supervising domestic slaves lived in the household, and not a single one of them knew to dust from top to bottom. Many of Andrews' peers never reconsidered their assumptions about domestic labour. One planter-class woman, Rebecca Latimer Felton, commented decades after the war on a stereotype “that Southern white women were constitutionally lazy [partly] because of idle habits” that, although

³³⁴ Andrews' diary, 25 Aug. 1865; p. 380.

³³⁵ *Ibid*, 23 Aug. 1865; p. 376.

[d]oubtless we had plenty of idle people as in other sections... the wife and mother on an ante-bellum Southern plantation was rarely one of such idle ones. Sometimes there was a housekeeper who was most frequently coloured, but the mistress of a plantation had to be efficient to keep things going with the necessary amount of economy and caution... For one thing I will mention the prevalence of a most generous hospitality. Invited people came, of course, but the great majority came when the notion took them... It required administrative talent, executive ability, and unwearying patience not to mention economy to conduct such establishments, and to give satisfaction to guests and hostesses. Such a household had hotel appearances, without hotel remuneration.

Her views were in keeping with those of other wealthy, formerly slaveholding women whose writings (ca. 1890-1920) formed the nucleus of the “Lost Cause” effort to “rehabilitate” the memory of the old Confederacy.³³⁶

But rich white women by all evidence felt sorely tried by watching other people work. Sarah Hicks Williams, the daughter of a Northern abolitionist family who married a wealthy planter in 1853, complained in a letter to her parents that at planting time

it’s “Miss Sarah here” and “Miss Sarah there” & then little children must run to Mama and the little black images will be around. I lie down at night tired enough to sleep like a rock & yet cannot tell what I have done but trot after the children, trot after the Negroes, trot after the chickens, eggs, & hens & turkeys & trot, trot, trot, all day. Then too, I have not the satisfaction of using my hands as I would like to do. This waiting other peoples [*sic*] motion is not my will, but it is the Lord’s will & I know I ought to be more submissive and patient.

Mrs. Hicks’ letters and journal entries over the next twelve years reveal that she did at least become more submissive and patient to the Lord’s will. Planter’s daughter Sarah Lois Wadley was practicing for an anticipated future role as a plantation household manager when she as a sixteen-year-old “went again to my room and by working hard finished arranging the books, and had my room scoured. Thursday I directed a servant about scouring a desk and the shelves and some other things.”³³⁷ She spent one morning

³³⁶ Most scholarly books published in the last few decades about the historiography and social history of the Civil War contain substantial discussions of this subject. See especially Censer, *Reconstruction of White Southern Womanhood*, 207-274; Sarah E. Gardner, *Blood & Irony: Southern White Women’s Narratives of the Civil War* (Chapel Hill: U North Carolina P, 2004); cf. Leah Atkins, “High Cotton.” Ch. 12 of the Genoveses’ *Mind of the Master Class* (383-406) provides some useful background.

³³⁷ Wadley’s diary, 6 Feb. 1861; p. 110.

“hard at work sweeping and dusting... and feel quite tired. I am so easily fatigued, perhaps if I took more exercise of this kind I might be stronger.”³³⁸ She was at least more competent than Eliza Frances Andrews.

Drew Gilpin Faust, examining white Southern women’s responses to the Civil War, notes that “[i]f plantation mistresses were indeed working hard... they must have been devoting themselves to organizational and managerial tasks — for war and emancipation revealed that many white women felt themselves entirely ignorant of how to perform basic functions of everyday life.”³³⁹ Some white historians have shared their thinking; the editor of Ida Powell Dulaney’s diary, for example, says in the introduction to it that “It was Ida who made [Oakley, a plantation with 69 slaves] a comfortable and welcoming home... Under Ida’s capable direction, there was always delicious food on the Oakley table supplied from [the plantation’s produce]” (xxi) before acknowledging on the same page that it was in fact the slaves who did this. Indeed, when many of those slaves left, Mrs. Dulaney wrote that “the unusual bodily fatigue of doing our own work begins to tell on us — Ma has not been able to leave her bed since the Yankees left and seems completely broken down in mind and body. For myself, though I go about the house and am able to perform my usual duties, I feel so weak and badly that I fear I shall break down before long.”³⁴⁰ Faust provides a range of examples of similarly fatigued planter-

³³⁸ Ibid, 10 Nov. 1860; p. 79.

³³⁹ Faust, *Mothers of Invention*, 77-78. On white women’s managerial roles in Euro-Atlantic slave systems and the scholarship on them, see Leah Atkins, “High Cotton;” Kathleen Brown, “Beyond the Great Debates: Gender and Race in Early America,” *Reviews in Am. His.* 26 (1998); Weiner, *Mistresses and Slaves*, 23-49; Cecily Jones, *Engendering Whiteness*, 129-43. See also the preceding notes.

³⁴⁰ Diary, 28 Dec. 1864; p. 192. What “the Yankees” had done to leave Mrs. Powell “completely broken down” involved not physical assault but verbal insult and theft of some portable valuables, coupled with departing female house slaves’ appropriating the contents of their former owners’ wardrobes and jewelry boxes.

class women: “a Louisiana lady who had ‘never even so much as washed out a pocket handkerchief with my own hands,” a mother of three who on the departure of her slave nurse wrote her sister that she “never knew before the trouble of children,” a housewife who recalled that she “had never cooked a meal when the negro women left, and had a hard time learning,” and most astoundingly one Amanda Worthington, who “reported her difficulties in learning to boil water” (ibid). Other historians paint similar scenarios.

Marci Weiner draws attention to Ella Clanton Thomas’ writing a relative in 1865 that she had “made the first cakes I ever accomplished. I remember trying once before to work up some flour without success... my back ached when I was through;” Elizabeth Coxe, who upon the departure of her former slaves “had to do what housework [the remaining servant Maumer] could not manage, and I became quite an expert ironer, also making all the bread and many other things;” Caroline Ravenel, who despaired that “We are literally our own servants except for cooking. We make up our own rooms, & Mamma has been at the wash tub for two or three weeks. It almost makes me cry to see here” (1998: 193-197). Thavolia Glymph (2008: 109) notes the mistress of a large plantation who after the departure of her slaves complained that “the ladies had to get up and get breakfast” and to the seventeen-year-old daughter of a wealthy planter whose entire “family moved into one room of the house. It was all that [the girl] could ‘manage to keep neat and clean’ by herself and her ‘first experience in work of this kind.’”

Planter-class women, then, remembered the pre-emancipation period as one in which they worked tirelessly to manage their households, and the post-emancipation period as one of deprivation and suffering. The female slaves who worked under the supervision of such white women remembered circumstances differently. This is visible

in their recollections of clothes-making, which their owners, as discussed above, credited to themselves and viewed as demanding work of great symbolic as well as practical significance. Tempe Herndon Durham, a former slave who lived on a plantation that commercially produced wool as well as other commodities, recalled that although two slaves were “the head weavers, they looked after the weaving of fancy blankets,” the owner’s wife “was a good weaver too. She weave the same as the *slaves*. She say she love the clacking sound of the loom and the way the shuttles run in and out carrying a long tail of bright coloured thread. Some days she sat at the loom all morning peddling with her feet and her white hands flitting over the bobbins.”³⁴¹ This woman was a hobbyist, choosing to weave because she enjoyed the sounds and sights of the loom and working little enough that what Durham remarked of her hands was that they were white — as was the rest of her, presumably; the point is that they were “lady’s hands,” not toughened or reddened by work. Another former slave, Betty Cofer, who as a girl was “trained to cook and clean and sew” by a plantation owner’s wife, remembered that the woman, “Miss Julia[,] cut out all the clothes and then the coloured girls sewed them but she looked them all over and they better be sewed right! Miss Julia bossed the whole plantation.”³⁴² In other words, although Julia Jones had enough skill with a needle to train her slaves to a high degree of competency, she did no actual work beyond the cutting out of clothes, the easiest part of clothes-making. The time-consuming and eye-straining task of actually sewing them she imposed on slaves. Mrs. Cofer did not specify what befell the seamstresses if the garments failed to “be sewed right.” Isabella Jackson

³⁴¹ WPA, *The American Slave: NC Narratives* 14.1, p. 285.

³⁴² WPA, *The American Slave: NC Narratives* 11.1 p. 170.

said, decades later, “I can still see [my sister Margaret] weaving the cloth — Boom! Boom! — and she hear that all the day and get mighty tired. The Mistress get her then sure. Rap her on the head with almost anything handy, but she hit pretty easy, just trying to scare her that’s all... The whippings was done by the master and the overseer.”³⁴³

Weaving and sewing were often only one part of enslaved women’s work. Charity Anderson recounted in that “I waited on the Missy and the children. I laid out all their clothes on Saturday night on the chairs, and then Sunday mornings I’d pick up all the dirty clothes, they didn’t have to do a thing... I sure could wash, iron, knit, weave, bless you, I could finish my day’s work around the house and then weave six or seven yards of cloth.”³⁴⁴ The weaving was for plantations’ as well as for the slaves’ own clothes and sale. One WPA worked reported from an interview with Emmaline Heard that on the plantation where she was born,

Every woman had a certain amount of weaving and spinning to do at home [i.e., in their quarters] after coming in from the fields. Emmaline says that her mother had to card bats at night so that the two older sisters could begin spinning the next morning... [The loom] was operated by hands and feet. Until midnight, the spinning wheels could be heard humming in the slave cabins. At the hour of twelve, however, a bell was rung, which was the signal for the slaves to cease their spinning and go to bed... Two dresses a year were allowed the women, while two cotton shirts and two pair of cotton pants were given the men. Everyone received one pair of shoes. Emmaline’s father was a shoemaker by trade and made shoes for both slaves and the Harper family [who owned his]. The slaves['] shoes were called “*negro shoes*,” and made from rough horse and mule hide. The white folks’ shoes were made from soft calf leather.³⁴⁵

If slaveholding women saw themselves as industrious and capable at supervising such work, their property disagreed equally strongly. Elizabeth Keckley, a freed dressmaker, as a slave worked in the house of a clergyman who “was burdened with a helpless wife, a girl

³⁴³ WPA, *Oklahoma Narratives* v. 13, p. 152.

³⁴⁴ WPA, *The American Slave* sup. ser. 1, v. 1, p. 14-15.

³⁴⁵ *Georgia Narratives* IV.2, 149.

that he had married in the humble walks of life. She was morbidly sensitive, and imagined that I regarded her with contemptuous feelings because she was of poor parentage... I did the work of three servants.”³⁴⁶ Harriet Jacobs said that her owner’s wife, “Mrs. Flint, like many southern women, was totally deficient in energy. She had not the strength to superintend her household affairs; but her nerves were so strong, that she could sit in her easy chair and see a woman whipped” (22). Jacobs experienced nerves as the woman’s only area of strength, also recalling, for example, that when Mrs. Flint first

was expecting to be a mother, and if she should want a drink of water in the night, what could she do without her slave to bring it? So my aunt was compelled to lie at her door, until one midnight she was forced to leave, to give premature birth to a child. In a fortnight she was required to resume her place on the entry floor, because Mrs. Flint’s babe needed her attentions (217).

Mary Prince recalled the work her owner’s wife did do: after “he had [hand-lashed] me for some time [for breaking a dish] he sat down to take breath; then after resting, he beat me again and again, until he was quite wearied, and so hot (for the weather was very sultry) that he sank back into his chair... [M]y mistress went to bring him [a] drink” (8).

Ida Powell Dulaney wrote one May,

My spring needle work is nearly over, and my quiet summer holiday beginning. The constant succession of visitors, gardening season, clothes making [at which she records supervising slaves working], etc., have kept me so constantly employed that I am thin as a lath, and I must acknowledge sometimes very weak, and even painfully weary, but I anticipate now a glorious recuperating [*sic*] time of pleasant reading, cooling baths and refreshing naps, all having a tendency to fatten me like a pig.³⁴⁷

The slaves who made Mrs. Dulaney’s entertaining possible and drew cooling baths might not have agreed that her recuperation was “glorious.”

Catherine Edmonston overlooked a similar point in recounting that she

³⁴⁶ Keckley, *Behind the Scenes* (1868) 31-2.

³⁴⁷ Dulaney’s diary, 22 May 1863, p. 161.

Had an amusing illustration of the value in which Cuffee³⁴⁸ holds himself to-day. Sharper & Frank [Edmonston, Catherine's young son] were playing in the Lot when little George [a slave] came up with the sheep. Sharper began to banter him about his size & among other things wound up the climax by telling him he "warnt worth a hundred dollars." "How much are you worth?" said Frank. "Me I am worth 500 dollars!" "And such an one?" "200 dollars," & so on until Frank, not wishing to be out done, said "And me! How much am I worth?" "Lord Marse Frank," said Sharper in a tone of ineffable disdain "You's white! You aint worth nothing!" Frank accepted his Anglo Saxon lot with an air & tone I thought of mortification!³⁴⁹

This is far from the only recorded instance of enslaved children playing at sale either among themselves or with free children. "Little George" and the other such children must have been too young to understand fully what they were mimicking. But underlying this exchange were views that even young children were beginning to absorb from their parents, a view with which poorer whites might exceptionally have agreed and that Greek comic dialogues also express: rich slaveowners, of whom "Babylon" is Revelation's representation, were not only useless, but worthless.

THE SPOILS OF "BABYLON"

We saw in ch. 1 that the ideal "honeybee" wife practiced good economy, to which monandry was foundational and of which textile production was emblematic. Jerusalem's monandry, if any, receives no direct mention; if Humphrey's reading is correct, she is no παρθένος, even if her holiest (male) inhabitants are (14:1-6).³⁵⁰ Babylon's lack of monandry, however, is apparent: "in her heart she says... 'I am no widow, and I will never see grief'" (ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτῆς λέγει ὅτι... χήρα οὐκ εἰμὶ καὶ πένθος οὐ μὴ ἴδω, 18:7) suggests the

³⁴⁸ "Cuffey" (or some variation of it) was a term, generally derogatory, that in white usage designated an abstracted (but implicitly male) African or African-American. It seems to have derived from the personal name Kofi, which was fairly popular in some of the West African communities victimized by the Atlantic slave trade.

³⁴⁹ Edmonston's diary, 19 Mar. 1861; *Journal of a Secesh Lady*, ed. Crabtree and Patton (1979) 45.

³⁵⁰ Humphrey, *The Ladies and the Cities*, 103-118.

possibility that she has the status opposite of a widow's, i.e., that of a married woman, or perhaps an eligible virgin. But her presumed or at least possible marriage does not keep her from being a “great whore... with whom the kings of the earth have committed fornication” (τῆς πόρνῆς τῆς μεγάλης... μεθ’ ἧς ἐπόρνευσαν οἱ βασιλεῖς τῆς γῆς, 17:1; 18:3b) and “the mother of whores” (ἡ μήτηρ τῶν πορνῶν, 17:5) who holds “in her hand a golden cup full of... the impurities of her fornication” (ἐν τῇ χειρὶ αὐτῆς γέμον... τὰ ἄκαθαρτα τῆς πορνείας αὐτῆς, 17:4). But whether Jerusalem is a παρθένος or not, the text does connect her to the textile-producing activities of a good wife. She is “clothed in fine linen, bright and pure, for the fine linen is the righteous deeds of the saints” (περιβάλῃται βύσσινον λαμπρὸν καθαρὸν· τὸ γὰρ βύσσινον τὰ δικαιώματα τῶν ἁγίων ἐστίν, 19:8). As the city and the inhabitants (saints) blend into one another, so the reference is to a trousseau that the bride herself has made (see ch. 2). But where Jerusalem (or its inhabitants) produces textiles, Babylon (or its vassals) imports them. The same “purple and scarlet” and “fine linen” in which she is clothed (17:4; 18:16) are explicitly listed as import commodities: “the merchants['] of the earth... [cargo of] fine linen, purple, silk, and scarlet” (18:12). This is the classic apparel of Vice and rhetoric of luxury (see above).

Jerusalem, of course, is richly arrayed as well:

The wall is built out of jasper, while the city is pure gold, clear as glass. The foundations of the city wall are adorned with every jewel; the first jasper, the second sapphire, the third agate, the fourth emerald, the fifth onyx, the sixth carnelian, the seventh chrysolite, the eighth beryl, the ninth topaz, the tenth chrysoprase, the eleventh jacinth, and the twelfth amethyst. The twelve gates are twelve pearls...

This seems to be an amplification of Isaiah “I shall lay your paving in antimony and set you with sapphires; I shall put a gem on your beacons, firestones on your gates, and precious stones on all your boundary” (Isa. 54:11-12). It is also a reappropriation of Ezekiel’s lament

for Tyre; prior to its sin, “You were in Eden, God’s garden. You were covered entirely in precious stones” (Ezek. 28:13), with the text naming nine specific gems. The latter echo is especially pronounced given that the merchants’ lament in Rev. 18:11-14 closely parallels the Tyrian king’s in Ezek. 28:1-10. This has led some interpreters to suggest that Babylon’s riches are not themselves at issue; e.g., Paul Duff, among others, argues that

Although some have made much of what certainly looks like John’s disdain for the wealth of “Babylon”... a quick glance at the description of the new Jerusalem... presents us with an image of wealth just as extravagant — if not more so — than that found in connection with “Babylon”... the luxuriant attire of “Jerusalem” is not only as opulent as that of “Babylon” but also quite similar... [But] no voice of condemnation is directed against either “Jerusalem’s” sumptuous attire or her wealth.³⁵¹

It is true Revelation assumes rather than explicates moral and ethical standards and that the text’s own evaluation of actual wealth in the existing world is difficult to determine. NT/EC attitudes varied considerably. What is certain is that, in Revelation’s view, *Babylon*’s wealth is irremediably wicked. Jerusalem’s, because she is virtuous and her splendour is virtuously obtained, is not, as not only Barbara Rossing but also Robert Royalty and Greg Carey notably detail.³⁵² Part of the condemnation of “Babylon” is *her* use of the wealth and not necessarily the wealth itself, as Ian Boxall suggests (see above). Just as προσκύνησις is exhorted if its object is God (e.g., Rev. 4:10, 7:19, 14:6, 15:4, 19:10, 22:3-9) and condemned if it is not (e.g., Rev. 9:20, 13:4, 13:4-15, 14:9-11, 16:2, 19:20, 20:4), so gold, jewels, and fine linen are evaluate positively when they are associated with someone “good” and negatively when

³⁵¹ Duff, *Who Rides the Beast?* 63; cf. Provan, “That general criticism is much more about religion than it is about economics; or to put it another way, economic sins are only ever a function of idolatry, so far as the Old Testament is concerned, and it is on the idolatry that the emphasis falls, rather than upon the economics” (“Foul Spirits,” 88). Ian Boxall, “Revelation’s difficulty with Babylon cannot be with material wealth per se, but rather the exploitative means by which it is achieved, and to which it is put. It will be taken up, redeemed, along with so much else of human culture and creativity, in the new heavens and the new earth” (*Revelation*, 242). Rev. 17-19 is very much about idolatry and may envision the redemption of human creativity, but it is difficult to read as *only* about idolatry or as portraying the continuation of mundane creative processes.

³⁵² Royalty, *Streets of Heaven*, *passim*; Carey, “A Man’s Choice,” 147-158.

with someone “bad.” This is not unusual logic. Christopher Berry notes a similar dichotomy’s operating in the Roman rhetoric of *luxuria*:

Cicero neatly encapsulated the key point when he remarked that “the Roman people loathe private luxury but they love public splendour” [*Pro. Mun.* 76].... as Rome grew in power this ideal fusion [between military and political success] broke down. Integral to this collapse was the effect of the wealth that accompanied this military success. Ideally this wealth was properly utilized for the public good.... Luxury represented the use of wealth to serve private satisfactions... In the [imagined] past, when the Republic was virtuous, which is to say when its citizens were frugal, any “surplus” [of war spoils] was spent (as Cicero remarked) on public splendour. But once wealth and riches were desired for private consumption then the ideal of public service was corrupted.³⁵³

That is, whether something was “luxury” or “splendour” depended less on what it was or how it was obtained than by who was using it and in what way. Many biblical texts evaluate cloth, jewels, and ornamentation similarly. Revelation most obviously shares the thinking of the major prophets, who use these commodities to indicate both favour/marriage/wealth and idolatry/adultery/extravagance. Proverbs 1-9 likewise evaluates a young man’s accepting an apparently wealthy woman’s invitation to dine and drink in her house according to whether the would-be hostess is Lady Wisdom or the Strange Woman, not the terms of the invitation itself. Jerusalem’s gold, jewels, and linen are good because she worships God and maintains faithful testimony. Babylon’s are bad because she is idolatrous and, accordingly, a πόρνη.

There is another problem with reasoning like Duff’s, one that is necessarily separate from the considerations of Royalty’s and others’ studies of the dichotomies. It is also one that few feminist critiques of Rev. 17-22 have addressed, one that may be easy to overlook

³⁵³ Berry, “Luxury and Politics,” 611-612. He further observes of the inconsistencies of Roman attitudes toward opulence that “perception or awareness of an increase in opulence and government instability. In this way “luxury” is a significant component in the repertoire of explanations, justifications and consequent modes of self-understanding that were available to educated Romans. It is a mistake to regard recourse to *luxuria* as “mere” rhetoric; all the more so since the Romans themselves would never have so regarded it... luxury has a place in the relatively abstract speculations of the moralists *and* in the concrete political activities of the age” (ibid, 597-598).

because it is so simple. This is that “Babylon” and its wealth wealth, unlike the new Jerusalem and its, have an earthly reality. Revelation’s Babylon “really is” Rome itself, and the commodities listed are ones really traded throughout (and beyond) the empire. Insofar as the text reflects on Jerusalem temple as well as Rome, the implicit former Jerusalem also “really was” a city on a coastal plain in the Levant. The sandstone structures that gave it its characteristic golden cast were made by human hands. The new Jerusalem is heavenly and thus different.³⁵⁴ Its “clothes” are made by “righteousness” (δικαιώματα, 19:8), not by spinning, weaving, fulling, and sewing. It has “each of [its twelve] gates made by a single pearl” (οἱ δώδεκα πυλῶνες δώδεκα μαργαρίται ἅνὰ εἰς ἕκαστος τῶν πυλώνων ἦν ἐξ ἑνὸς μαργαρίτου, 21:21). Given that the gates are in walls 144 cubits (about 66 meters or 216 feet) high (21:17), even the most exotic pearls that “Babylon” obtained or traded (17:4; 18:12, 16) could be nothing like this imposing. The gold that “Babylon” wears (i.e., that Rome displays) and trades along with the pearls is real gold mined and refined under real circumstances, whereas the “pure gold, clear as glass” of which the heavenly Jerusalem is built (ἡ πόλις κρυσίου καθαρόν ὅμοιον ὑάλῳ καθαρῷ, 21:18) can exist nowhere on earth.³⁵⁵ While adorning a 12,000 stadia-long foundation for a wall 144 cubits wide with jasper and then repeating the process with eleven other gems might in principle be a worldly possibility, practical considerations would obviate it as a viable undertaking. Babylon obtains her “cinnamon, spice... wine, olive oil, choice flour, and wheat” (κιννάμωνον καὶ

³⁵⁴ Thus Richard Bauckham notes that “if Babylon is the actual city of Rome, Jerusalem is not the actual city which the Romans had captured and sacked some time before Revelation was written... [similarly,] the city of 11:2 is not the earthly Jerusalem, in which Revelation shows little interest” (*Theology*, 126–7).

³⁵⁵ It might not be outside the capacities of all engineering, at least under laboratory conditions, but glass-clear gold was certainly outside John of Patmos’ reality.

ἄμωμον... καὶ οἶνον καὶ ἔλαιον καὶ σεμίδαλιν καὶ σῖτον, 18:13) through agriculture and commerce. Celestial Jerusalem has “the river of the water of life... and on either side of the river is the tree of life with its twelve kinds of fruit” (...ποταμὸν ὕδατος ζωῆς... ἐν μέσῳ τῆς πλατείας αὐτῆς καὶ τοῦ ποταμοῦ ἐντεῦθεν καὶ ἐκείθεν ξύλον ζωῆς ποιοῦν καρποὺς δώδεκα, 22:1-2) for approximately the same reason, it seems, as Eden had similar features: God put them there. If this re-created Eden is like its predecessor, agriculture and perhaps cooking will be unnecessary. Jerusalem’s food and drink are, the text implies, finer than Babylon’s, but there are key differences in how each city obtains them.

Economic realities, then, also inform the charge of luxury that is lodged against Babylon, and these economic realities would have been apparent to the communities that John addresses (and, indeed, everyone else).³⁵⁶ The world of Revelation, i.e., the high Roman empire, was far more globalized than would have been imaginable three or even two centuries early. Some clothing was manufactured in domestic factories and bought ready-made, and in any city in the empire it was possible to buy goods whose provenance was mysterious to the inhabitants. But most aspects of production were far more visible in the Roman world than in the post-industrialized. This gap may be why scholars are puzzled about the evaluation of Babylon’s wealth in contexts other than that of idolatry. Metals and jewels are not simply “traded.” They are mined and processed first. Wine does not appear in casks or wheat generate refined flour, and flax neither cultivates itself nor exudes linen.

³⁵⁶ Thus Susan Hylen notes, “The lengthy descriptions of finery (18:12-13, 16) not only suggest the gravity of the sin in the extent of wealth that is represented but also tie the criticism to actual practice familiar within the Roman Empire. While a spiritual critique of wealth is possible (as [in Rev.] 3:17), the concrete nature of the wealth described in this chapter seems to exclude a purely spiritual analysis. As a whole, Rev 18 depicts real criticism of the economic practices of the Roman Empire. However, it is not necessary to choose between economic and other types of sins. The multiplicity of sins is important to the interpretation of this chapter” (“Power and Problem,” 213).

Labour produces these commodities, and in the NT world, that labour was provided by slaves.

That the trade in consumer commodities drove the trade in slaves was no less essential or obvious a fact in the Roman than in the Atlantic world, a situation that Andreau and Descat, Walter Scheidel, and W.V. Harris, among others, have explicated.³⁵⁷ It is in this light that “the wickedness of the whole commercial operation is taking place is indicated by the injustice and inhumanity of the slave trading with which the list concludes and by which it is infected” (Stephen K. Smalley [2005] 434). This infection is literal in the sense that most of the commodities listed relied on slave labour for commercial production. Even a decontaminated trade catalogue, however, might remain a list of poisons. It is true that Revelation does not argue that the mere existence or use of metal, linen, and other commodities is somehow sinful. Nor does there seem to be a sense that the presence of ores and minerals in the earth, or resin and spice plants on it, is the product of a corrupted world order. Commercial trade in these commodities, however, is another matter, and one that seems to have been far more visible in antiquity than to the end-point consumers in post-industrial societies in today’s globalized economy. Its brutality may have been especially visible to the communities of Revelation, given the commercial prominence of Asia Minor’s coastal communities. Barbara Levick, noting this, draws attention to the region’s “staple and familiar exports: Greek-speaking slaves, for example, even when the wars of the Republic came to an end. There were still the *threptoi*... Then there were

³⁵⁷ See Rauh, *Sacred Bonds*, 41-56; Gary Young, *Rome’s Eastern Trade* (London: Routledge, 2001) *passim*; Temin, “Labor Market;” Andreau and Descat, *The Slave*, 66-77; Mattingly, “Comparative advantages;” Scheidel, “Human Mobility in Roman Italy, II” and “Comparative economics” in *Systems* (ed. Dal Lago and Katsari), 105-126; in *CEHGRW*, Willem M. Jongman, “The Early Roman Empire: Consumption,” 592-618 and Dennis Kehoe, “The Early Roman Empire: Production,” 543-569; W.V. Harris, *Rome’s Imperial Economy*, 155-187. Cedric Yeo’s “Development of the Roman Plantation” is dated in some respects but still very insightful. See also Levick, “The Roman Economy: Trade in Asia Minor.”

specialties apparently produced on a large scale, such as linens, woolens, and marbles” (182). Slavery not only infects the list but also generates it.

BODIES AND SOULS OF MEN

The question of some critics as to what aspects of Babylon’s trade Revelation considers problematic in themselves is an answerable one: all of them. Again, this nexus of condemnation does not establish Revelation as an abolitionist text. It can at least as easily be understood as sharing in such common ancient (and non-ancient) attitudes as the one that some (but not all) slaveholding practices exceed the boundaries of decency and that “too much” use of slave labour results from moral and material decadence. Juvenal, no critic of slavery, is a case in point of identifying “excessive” severity toward slaves as characteristic of female wantonness. If a rich wife is annoyed by some delay, Juvenal says,

her hairdresser, poor Psecas, is subject to having
her hair torn out and her breasts and shoulders bared.
“Why is this curl sticking up?” The cowhide [whip] descends
to punish the heinous crime of an errant tress.
What has Psecas done? How is it the girl’s fault
that your nose displeases you?³⁵⁸

The context is undeniably misogynistic, but this section’s misogyny may lie more in its silence on analogous behaviour from male slaveholders. Juvenal is using a familiar image: Ovid laments of the former glory of his mistress’ hair that “your hairdresser’s body was always whole. She worked before my eyes often, and her arms were never mauled or needle-

³⁵⁸ Ad. Rudd 54; Juv., *Sat.* 6:490-495:
disponit crinem laceratis ipsa capillis
nuda umero Psecas infelix nudisque mamillis.
altior hic quare cincinnus, taurea punit.
continuo flexi crimen facinusque capilli.
quid Psecas admisit quatenus est hic culpa puellae
si tibi displicuit nasus tuus...

pricked.”³⁵⁹ He implies that this was an unusual state of affairs. Neither Juvenal’s words nor Ovid’s can be taken as providing an accurate description of rich wives’ “average” behaviour toward female slaves, but no law or custom protected slaves from much worse treatment by owners of either sex.

Wherever Revelation’s image of “Babylon” fits into this mosaic of reality and interpretation, it does condemn “Babylon’s” trade in σώμάτων καὶ ψυχᾶς ἀνθρώπων (as opposed to the more common usage of simply σώματων) and embeds it in a much larger economic matrix. The sources do not support a benign reading of slaves’ lives in any sector of it. Agricultural manuals such as Cato the Elder’s, Varro’s, and Columella’s reveal some of the workings of the Roman plantation (*latifundus*) system and the situations of slaves employed in crop production (field maintenance, planting, cultivation, and harvesting), or animal husbandry. Tread-milling grain on a commercial basis was especially painful and injurious; assignment to it was a proverbial and real threat.³⁶⁰ Mining was penal, which in practice may have meant that physically suitable slaves could be accused of some offense and sold or assigned to a state mining operation. It seems to have been a death sentence,

³⁵⁹ Ovid, *Amores* 1.14.16-18:
Ornatix tuto corpore semper erat.
ante meos saepe est oculos ornata nec umquam.
Brachia derepta saucia fecit acu.

³⁶⁰ On the commercial grain trade and slavery, see Yeo, “Development and Marketing;” G.E. Rickman, “The Grain Trade under the Roman Empire,” *MAAR* (1980); Andreau and Descat, *The Slave* 68-76; D. Kessler and Peter Temin, “The organization of the grain trade in the early Roman Empire,” *Econ. His. Rev.* (2007); Keith Bradley, “Slavery in the Roman Republic, in *CWHS* I, 242-262; Joshel, *Slavery*, 166-179.

killing most labourers within a handful of years. Working with mined ores was also insalubrious and, as with mining, seems to have been solely slave labour.³⁶¹

Literary and archaeological sources as well as comparative analysis have made it clear that the trade supplying labour to these and other industries was as hellish as any of its Atlantic descendants, as work such as Keith Bradley's and Sandra Joshel's has made undeniably clear:³⁶²

...physical examination on the *catasta* reduced the slave to the level of an object — an object that was generally mute, passive, and devoid of any human dignity... [like] an ox or a cow or a mule that had to be put through its paces before the buyer and seller could strike a deal. Indeed, the aedilician edict regulating the sale of [draught animals] as well as the sale of slaves, requiring similar disclosure of diseases and defects... [as in the Atlantic world,] so also slaves sold on the auction block in Rome, or in some other major Mediterranean city, were often at the time of sale at the end of a process that had begun with enslavement in a distant region [and that] had involved a forced migration [in squalor] and the disruption of familial and other social bonds (Bradley 1991: 129-130).

³⁶¹ Mining was always at least a quasi-state operation; "The [Roman] mining domains were complex operations that called for significant labor requirements... [Asturian communities, e.g.] lost their autonomy and economic independence in being obliged to produce (on a large scale) a commodity that went directly to the fisc. Roman state interests prompted a functional reorientation of the inhabitants of the mining areas that can be seen clearly in settlement morphology, distribution, and function. The mechanisms used for controlling territory and production were not, evidently, separate from the mechanisms of social control... [Asturian and other] settlements provided work as tribute (*operae*)," Almudena Orejas and F. Javier Sánchez-Palencia, "Mines, Territorial Organization, and Social Structure in Roman Iberia," *Am. J. Arch.* 106 (2002), 593. See John Healy, *Mining and Metallurgy in the Greek and Roman World* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1978), 68-100; Peter Ørsted's "Roman State Intervention? The Case of Mining in the Roman Empire," in *Production and Public Powers in Classical Antiquity* (ed. Elio Lo Cascio and D.W. Rathbone; Cambridge: Cambridge Philological Soc., 2000, 70-76 and "Roman Gold Mining," *KVHAA Konferenser* 51, 2001: 15-26; Erik Magntorn, "*Ruina Montium*: A case study of Roman gold mining in north-west Spain," *KVHAA Konferenser* 51 (2001), 27-34; Antonio Mateo, "Roman Mining on Public Land: From the Republic to the Empire," in *Tâches publiques et entreprise privée dans le monde romain* (ed. J.-J. Aubert; Geneva: U Neuchâtel, 2003), 135-178; F. Hugh Thompson, *Archaeology of Greek and Roman Slavery*, 144-170; Francesco Salerno, "*«Minime in... facie scribatur»*: Constantine and the *damnati ad metella*," in *Esclavage* (ed. Anastasiadis and Doukellis), 327-33; in *OHETCW*, Paul T. Craddock, "Mining and Metallurgy," in *OHETCW*, 93-120.

³⁶² Bradley, "Regular, Daily Traffic;" Joshel, *Slavery*, 77-110. See also F.H. Thompson, *Archaeology*, 23-46; Benaissa, "A Syrian Slave Girl (*ZPE*, 2010); in Bradley & Cartledge, David Braund, "The Slave Supply in Classical Greece," 112-133, Michelle George, "Slavery and Roman Material Culture," 391-397, and Walter Scheidel, "The Roman Slave Supply," 297-305.

Bradley, with due acknowledgment of the risks of comparison and the need for caution, draws attention to the account in ch. 2 of Olaudah Equiano's autobiography³⁶³ and notes that some elements of it would have been familiar to Chariton:

The disruption, Callirhoe says at one point, had been tolerable as long as she had been able to hear Greek spoken and to see the sea; but as her journey eastwards continued and she faced the prospect of entering the domain of the Persian King [*sic*] across the Euphrates, 'then longing for her country and her family welled up in her, and she despaired of ever returning'... [Then,] and this was not a new refinement in cruelty as Olaudah Equiano thought[,] there was the element of separation from family, the rupturing of social bonds never likely to be repaired. Indeed, this was impossible in cases where Rome enslaved the women and children of a reduced population but killed the men [as is documented for multiple occasions]... an orator portraying the fall of a city was expected, so Quintillian makes clear, to rouse the emotions of his audience as a matter of convention by describing a mother's efforts not to lose her child in the confusion and chaos of the scene... One thinks in this connection of the pitiable representation on the Column of Marcus Aurelius of the captive German woman, surrounded by Roman troops, clinging desperately to her young son (ibid, 131-132).

A plight like Callirhoe's was realistic enough — freeborn people were kidnapped into slavery — but apparently unlikely enough to befall the wealthy élites of Chariton's audience that it could be romanticized for their entertainment. How this would have read to the enslaved scribes who likely took it down from Chariton and read it to that audience's members, or to non-wealthy or non-citizen freeborn people who actually were at risk of being kidnapped into slavery, is unclear. But the fact that Callirhoe, like other romance heroines, escapes the ordinary realities of slavery and is restored to her high freeborn station reinforces the secure status of the implied audience.

The slaveowners who may have enjoyed reading such imaginary scenes did consider real ones unpleasant. Ancient sources mention it in only passing but do so consistently. These discomfited slaveholders, unlike their modern counterparts, were not confronted with organized abolitionism or non-slaveholding societies, but the writers among them spent enough time explaining why slavery was part of the proper or "natural" social order to

³⁶³ *The Interesting Narrative of the Life of Olaudah Equiano, or Gustavus Vassa, the African*. (1789). See also the brief "Narrative of Asa-Asa, a Captured African," published along with Mary Prince's autobiography in 1831.

suggest that something prompted these justifications. Giuseppe Cambiano argues plausibly that anti-slavery ideas were current, if rare among the literary classes, in Aristotle's Athens, as does Theresa Urbainczyk that it is necessary at least to entertain the possibility in classical Rome, possibilities that Peter Garnsey considers in detail and that N.R.E. Fisher, Andreau and Descat have also explored.³⁶⁴ Individual slaveowners probably entertained private considerations. In the case of modern slavery, these considerations could enter much larger public discourses if those slaveowners became politically influential.³⁶⁵

If direct ancient sources are sparing, modern ones can provide at least some perspective. Again, evidence for one group does not simply hold for the other, but it is clear that in both slave systems there operated a powerful rhetoric of the slave-trader as a dishonest, rapacious, and cruel individual who had no place in polite society. In both cases, it was by all appearances just that: rhetoric. Full-time slave trading was not a status profession, but real or professed approbation of it was part of these slave systems' operation, a socially accepted strategy by which slaveowners could remove most or all of the blame for slavery's unsavoury aspects from the people who kept the "system" in business: themselves. Even the category of "slave-trader" was also flexible. Cato the Elder, Varro, and Columella repeatedly advise generating income by selling slaves, but their writings were considered manuals for the respectable profession of agriculture, not treatises on the sordid practice of commerce. Vespasian's early financial troubles brought about the undignified necessity of his engaging in trade, for which his admiring biographers apologize. His reputation seems

³⁶⁴ Giuseppe Cambiano, "Aristotle and the anonymous opponents of slavery," *S & A* 8 (1987); N.R.E. Fisher, *Slavery*, 88-92; Garnsey, *Ideas*, *passim*; Andreau and Descat, *The Slave*, 128-136; Urbainczyk, *Slave Revolts*, 75-80 127-136.

³⁶⁵ See Wiltshire, "Jefferson, Calhoun;" Orlando Patterson, "Slavery: The Underside of Freedom," *S & A* 5 (1984); Deyle, "Irony of Liberty;" Lacy Ford, "Owning Slaves, Disowning Slavery" in her *Deliver Us from Evil*.

to have unscathed despite the fact that, as A.B. Bosworth argues as close to conclusively as is possible, ancient audiences would have understood immediately that the “mules” in which he dealt were not jack/mare offspring but castrated adult men.³⁶⁶

In the antebellum U.S. too, many slaveowners whose primary occupation was “respectable” (e.g., they were not professional slave-traders or pimps) drew significant income from the sale of slaves. This was true from the colonial period, as Rachel Lin demonstrates for Providence (one of its major ports)³⁶⁷ and it became even more so after the combination of a semi-effective ban on slave importation (1808) and the annexation of additional territories created a high demand for enslaved agricultural labour in the lower south that was supplied by the upper.³⁶⁸ Many elected officials, planter aristocrats, and

³⁶⁶ A.B. Bosworth, “Vespasian and the Slave Trade,” *Cl. Q.* 52 (2002).

³⁶⁷ Rachel Lin, “The Rhode Island Slave-Traders: Butchers, Bakers, and Candlestick-makers,” *S & A* 23 (2002). See also Darold Wax, “Robert Ellis, Philadelphia Merchant and Slave Trader,” *Pennsylvania Magazine of History & Biography* 88 (1964); Julia Smith, *Slavery and Rice Culture in Low Country Georgia 1750-1860* (Knoxville: U Tennessee P, 1985), 93-112; Kenneth Morgan, “Slave Sales in Colonial Charleston,” *English Hist. Rev.* 453 (1998); Robert Desrochers, “Slave-for-Sale Advertisements and Slavery in Massachusetts, 1704-1781,” *William & Mary Q.* 59 (2002).

³⁶⁸ This discussion draws on Bancroft, *Slave Trading in the Old South* (1931), 365-381 and Michael Tadman’s introduction to the reprint of it (Charleston: U South Carolina P, 1996; xxviii-xxxviii); Tom Wells, “Charles Augustus Lafayette Lamar: Gentleman Slave Trader,” *Georgia Hist. Q.* 47 (1963); Smith, “Slavetrading in Antebellum Florida,” *Florida Hist. Q.* 50 (1972); Richard Tansey, “Bernard Kendig and the New Orleans Slave Trade,” *Louisiana Hist.* 23 (1982); Daniel Littlefield, “Charleston and Internal Slave Redistribution,” *South Carolina Hist. Magazine* 87 (1986); Michael Tadman, *Speculators and Slaves* (Madison: U Wisconsin P, 1989) and “The Hidden History of Slave Trading in Antebellum South Carolina,” *South Carolina Hist. Magazine* 97 (1996); Herman Freudenberger and Jonathan Pritchett, “The Domestic United States Slave Trade,” *J Interdisciplinary His.* 23 (1991); Deyle, “Irony of Liberty;” Wahl, “Jurisprudence;” Jonathan Pritchett, “The Interregional Slave Trade and the Selection of Slaves for the New Orleans Market,” *J Interdisciplinary His.* 27 (1997) and “Quantitative Estimates of the United States Interregional Slave Trade, 1820-1860,” *J Economic His.* 61 (2001); Ariela Gross, *Double Character*, 30-35, 51-62; Lightner, “The Founders;” Dunaway, *African-American Family*, 18-50; Gudmestad, *Troublesome Commerce*; in Walter Johnson, *Chattel Principle*, Lacy Ford, “Reconsidering the Internal Slave Trade,” 143-164, and Michael Tadman, “The Interregional Slave Trade in the History and Myth-Making of the U.S. South,” 117-142; Jonathan Martin, *Divided Mastery*, *passim*; Daina Berry, “In Pressing Need of Cash,” *JAAH* (2007); George Brooks, “Samuel Hodges, Jr., and the Symbiosis of Slave and ‘Legitimate’ Trades, 1810s-1820s,” *Int’l. J Afr. Hist. St.* 41 (2008); Klas Rönnbäck, “Consumers and Slavery: Diversified Markets for Plantation Produce and the Survival of Slavery in the Nineteenth Century,” *Fernand Braudel Ctr. Rev.* 33 (2010); Anthony Carey, *Sold Down the River* (Mobile: U Alabama P, 2011), 42-70; Leonardo Marques, “Slave Trading in a New World: The Strategies of North American Slave Traders in the Age of Abolition,” *J Early Republic* 32 (2012).

yeomen farmers derived significant income from selling slaves to speculators without damaging their own reputations. This was even true of attorneys for whom handling private and semi-private slave sales was a primary source of business, and of poorer slaveowners who depended partly hiring out their slaves. As long as any of these people could claim some other primary occupation, they were not considered slave traders *per se*. Some slaveholders did socially disdain those who were. Catherine Edmonston, for example, noted with contempt in a Civil War-era diary entry that “[Confederate General Nathaniel Bedford] Forrest, Fanny tells us [*sic*] is illiterate & vulgar, a negro trader in his antecedents. He makes no pretension to anything, not even military skill, does not desire a large command, says he can do more with a small one.”³⁶⁹ Another wealthy planter woman wrote in her diary of a slave who dissatisfied her, “I don’t know what had best be done with her... I don’t want her here and I dislike very much indeed to sell her to a Speculator,”³⁷⁰ shortly after which she sold the woman in question to a speculator. Avoiding direct involvement in slave sales could in fact serve as self-vindication for slaveholders such as Dolly Lewis Burge (the daughter of a Maine abolitionist family who married a southern planter), who in November 1864 wrote in her diary that

I have never felt that slavery was altogether right, for it is abused by men, and I have often heard [my husband] say that if he could see that it was sinful for him to own slaves, if he felt that it was wrong, he would take them where he could free them. He would not sin for his right hand. The purest and holiest men have owned them, and I can see nothing in the scriptures which forbids it. *I have never bought or sold slaves* and I have tried to make life easy and pleasant to those that have been bequeathed me by the dead. I have never ceased to work. Many a Northern housekeeper has a much easier time than a Southern matron with her hundred negroes.³⁷¹

³⁶⁹ Edmonston, 30 Nov. 1863; *Journal of a Secesh Lady*, 498.

³⁷⁰ Gertrude Ella Clanton Thomas, 13 January 1859, p. 170 in Virginia Ingraham Burr’s edition, *Secret Eye* (Chapel Hill: U North Carolina P, 1990).

³⁷¹ Burge, *A Woman’s Wartime Journal* (1918), 13-14; italics mine.

Mr. Burge was not an isolated example. South Carolina planter Thomas Chaplin wrote in his diary in 1845 that

[Economic t]rouble gathers thicker & thicker around me. I will be compelled to send about ten prime Negroes to town next Monday, to be sold. I do this rather than have them seized and sold in Beaufort by the sheriff — or rather sacrificed... I never thought that I would be driven to this very unpleasant extremity. Nothing can be more mortifying and grieving to a man than to select out some of his Negroes to be sold. You know not to whom, or how they will be treated by their new owners. And Negroes that you find no fault with — to separate families, mothers & daughters, brothers & sisters — all to pay for your own extravagances. People will laugh at your distress and say it serves you right, you lived beyond your means, though some of the same never refused to partake of that hospitality and generosity which caused me to live beyond my means. (3 May 1845; Walker 347-348).

Although he blamed his own bad economy and was troubled the concerns of humanity, he still spoke of being “compelled” by the sheriff and rapacious creditors and “hospitality and generosity which caused me to live beyond my means.” He construed himself as a wronged party who did not *choose* to resort to the “very unpleasant extremity” of obtaining money by selling slaves. Such an understanding enabled him to do exactly that with a clear enough conscience to carry on, and indeed to complain the next day that “it is the most unpleasant thing I have ever had to do, and truly hope it may never occur again. The Negroes at home are quite disconsolate, but this will soon blow over. They may see their children again in time.”³⁷² Many slaveowners might have concurred with Chaplin. Harriet Jacobs, for example, recalled that her owner “Dr. Flint always had an aversion to meeting slaves after he had sold them. He ordered [one such slave] Rose out of the house [where she had returned temporarily]; but he was no longer her master, and she took no notice of him. For once the crushed Rose was the conqueror. His gray eyes flashed angrily upon her; but that was the

³⁷² Chaplin’s diary, 4 and 5 May 1845; Walker 348 (in Rosengarten, *Tombe*). Chaplin was not a skilled plantation manager; he “had to” do it several more times, and later annotated the entry with the observation that “could I or anyone foreseen [*sic*] how things would be 19 years after, when every Negro was set free by ‘force of war’ I & everyone else would have gladly put them all in our pockets” (ibid).

extent of his power” (125).³⁷³ This understanding of slave sales as uniquely troubling *to slaveholders* is evident in the thinking of one formerly planter-class woman who in 1912 recalled without irony that “the slave market I did not like, [*sic*] that was raelly [*sic*] the only objectionable thing about slavery, the being bought and sold.”³⁷⁴

As Bradley observes, we have even less record of Roman slaves’ than of free Romans’ experiences of this “objectionable thing about slavery.” They cannot have been identical to one another or to modern ones. But slave sales were part of the fabric of urban life in the empire, and no one could have remained oblivious to them (even if many were largely indifferent). The fact that we cannot know with certainty what they experienced is not license to ignore their experiences. At the very least, the practices of pre-sale slave displays and examinations in antiquity (which romance novels, as well as epics and tragedies featuring captured Trojan noblewomen, omit) are well enough known. Some practical similarities certainly existed between them and the experiences of Olaudah Equiano, for example, as Keith Bradley has noted (see above), or Octavia Albert, who was about fifteen years old when her Louisiana owner

got broke, and his big plantation and all his slaves were seized and sold for debts... I had never seen an auction sale before, although I had often heard of it... rich planters from all along the coast and some merchants and others from New Orleans, who wanted house servants or other help for their stores, were there in large numbers... the slaves, numbering about two hundred and fifty head, counting men, women, and children, were all put together on one side [of the stock house]; and all the wagons, teams, horses, cows, calves, and other cattle on another; and

³⁷³ Jacobs recounts that Rose was allowed by the speculator who had bought her to return temporarily to her prior residence before he departed with his wares for markets further south. A few ex-slaves posted money for the security, which was accepted because Rose had been sold away from all her relatives years earlier and hated Dr. Flint so much that she was eager to be sold to anyone else. Jacobs may have been able to discern Dr. Flint’s pattern of behaviour because some slaves were sold locally and could have returned on occasion (e.g., holidays) to visit relatives, etc.

³⁷⁴ Mary Norcott Bryan (b. 1841), *A Grandmother’s Recollection of Dixie* p. 23. Ella Clanton Thomas recorded it in her diary when “the division of [my husband’s] father’s estate took place, Negroes, Land and &c — It is surprising with what perfect indifference I view the accumulation of so much property — I don’t believe I am at all mercenary in my disposition” (5 Jan. 1859, p. 169).

the buyers were all in front of the auction-block... After [the legal agent] had sold the plantation, wagons, mules, horses, and cattle he began to sell the slaves. Some were bought by neighboring planters, some by the merchants and others that had come from New Orleans, and others were bought by negro traders to be placed in the market and sold again. My mother was bought by one of the New Orleans merchants; but I was bought by a negro trader... Every day buyers came and examined such slaves as they desired to buy. They used to make them open their mouths so that they could examine their teeth; and they used to strip [both men and women] naked, from head to foot, to see whether they were perfectly sound... When they would put them naked that way they used to switch them on the legs to make them jump around so that buyers could see how supple they were.³⁷⁵

Octavia Albert was reunited with her mother twenty years later, after abolition. Most slaves in the antebellum U.S. and in ancient slave societies were less fortunate. Perhaps some had kinship of experience with Mary Prince, whose owner opted to sell her and her siblings but keep their mother. The owner spared himself the task of bringing them to market:

Whilst she was putting on us the new [clothes] in which we were to be sold, [my mother] said, in a sorrowful voice, (I shall never forget it!) "See, I am *shrouding* my poor children; what a task for a mother... I am going to carry my little chickens to market," (these were her very words)... [W]eeping as she went, [she] called me away with the children Hannah and Dinah, and we took the road that led to Hamble Town, which we reached about four o'clock in the afternoon. We followed my mother to the market-place, where she placed us in a row against a large house, with our backs to the wall and our arms folded across our breasts. I, as the eldest, stood first, Hannah next to me, then Dinah; and our mother stood beside, crying over us... At length the vendue master, who was to offer us for sale like sheep or cattle, arrived, and asked my mother which was the eldest. She said nothing, but pointed to me. He took me by the hand, and led me out into the middle of the street, and, turning me slowly round, exposed me to the view of those who attended the vendue. I was soon surrounded by strange men, who examined and handled me in the same manner that a butcher would a calf or a lamb he was about to purchase, and who talked about my shape and size in like words — as if I could no more understand their meaning than the dumb beasts. I was then put up to sale. The bidding commenced at a few [Bermudan] pounds, and gradually rose to fifty-seven [£38 sterling], when I was knocked down to the highest bidder; and the people who stood by said that I had fetched a great sum for so young a slave... I then saw my sisters led forth, and sold to different owners: so that we had not the sad satisfaction of being partners in bondage. When the sale was over, my mother hugged and kissed us... [and] went home with nothing (3-4).

³⁷⁵ In *The House of Bondage, or, Charlotte Brooks and Other Slaves* (1890), 103-105. Albert recalled that "My old mistress was sorry to part with me and a little pet calf she had raised around the big house. So she had us kept until the last to see if she could not keep us; but old master's debts could not be met after every thing else had been sold, so the calf and I had to be sold. The negro trader bought me and the calf together for five hundred and thirty dollars" (104).

The justice of slave-trading Babylon's end, in terms of both the indictment and the penalty, owe much to OT texts about the downfall of wicked rulers such as Jezebel (2 Kg. 9) and enemy cites and nations, e.g., Isa. 13, 23, 34, 40; Jer. 2-4, 7, 24-25, 33, 50-51; Ezek. 16, 23, 26-28 in the major prophets alone; many commentaries explore the specific allusions in detail, as do Iain Provan and David Mathewson.³⁷⁶ Roman imagery, as Larry Kreitzer, Steven Friesen³⁷⁷ detail, is equally prominent in Revelation's visionary web. The text draws on these allusions from multiple traditions to emphasize that Babylon has earned her punishment and that it fits the crime: "Render to her as she herself has rendered" (ἀπόδοτε αὐτῇ ὡς καὶ αὐτὴ ἀπέδωκεν, 18:6). Rome's penalty is spectacular destruction in the literal Roman sense. Babylon is placed at the centre of every attention: "kings of the earth" (οἱ βασιλεῖς τῆς γῆς, 18:9) and apparently "the merchants of the earth" (οἱ ἔμποροι τῆς γῆς, 18:11), and "all shipmasters and seafarers, sailors and all whose work is on the sea" (πᾶς κυβερνήτης καὶ πᾶς ὁ ἐπὶ τόπον πλέων καὶ ναῦται καὶ ὅσοι τὴν θάλασσαν ἐργάζονται, 18:17b) will "see the smoke of her burning and stand far off, in fear of her torment" (βλέπωσιν τὸν καπνὸν τῆς πυρώσεως αὐτῆς ἀπὸ μακρόθεν ἐστηκότες διὰ τὸν φόβον τοῦ βασανισμοῦ αὐτῆς, 18:9-10) when "the ten horns that you saw and the beast [come to] hate the Whore; they will make her desolate and defoliated; they will devour her flesh and burn her up in fire" (τὰ δέκα κέρατα ἃ εἶδες καὶ τὸ θηρίον οὗτοι μισήσουσιν τὴν

³⁷⁶ Provan, "Foul Spirits;" Mathewson, "Isaiah in Revelation," 189-210; cf. Sweet, *Revelation*., 252-258, 262-275; Prigent, *L'Apocalypse*., 259-275; Boring, *Revelation*, 185-186; Aune, *Revelation*., 929-941, 983-1012; Beale, *Revelation*., 850-929; Osborne, *Revelation*., 607-657; Boxall, *Revelation*., 240-244, 254-256; Smalley, *Revelation*., 426-466; Blount, *Revelation*., 309-313, 325-338. See also Royalty, *Streets*, 59-65; Moyise, *OT in the NT*, 117-127; Huber, *Thinking with and Seeing*, 50-60.

³⁷⁷ Kreitzer, "Sybelline Oracles 8;" Friesen, *Imperial Cults*, *passim*.. See also Boring, *Revelation*., 178-183; Aune, *Revelation*., 919-929; Blount, *Revelation*., 314-320. See also François Bovon, *New Testament Traditions and Apocryphal Narratives* (Allison Park, Pennsylvania: Pickwick P, 1995), 138-143.

πόρνην καὶ ἡρμωμένην ποιήσουσιν αὐτὴν γυμνὴν καὶ τὰς σάρκας αὐτῆς φάγονται καὶ αὐτὴν κατακάουσουσιν ἐν πυρί, 17:16). The kings, merchants, and seafarers all lament, “weeping and mourning aloud” (κλαίοντες καὶ πενθοῦντες, 18:15; cf. 18:11, 19).

Real Roman spectacles of the kind in which “Babylon” meets her end broadcast their Romanness at every level, including through mythic re-enactments that ended with the real deaths of participants, to which Perpetua famously objected.³⁷⁸ This might have been marked in Ephesus, for example, in a way that it was not in Rome and more proximate cities (e.g., Pompeii). “Babylon” is not much of a disguise for Rome; in subjecting her to this fate, Chris Frilingos argues,

John’s book demands that his audience forget the Rome they “know” from the cult shrines and monuments of Asia Minor. The book instead cloaks the Roman Empire in an ancient costume, creating thus a writhing, drunken version of the great πόλις (Rev. 18:2, 6). The “makeup” that this portrayal applies to Rome calls to mind the “mythological enactments” and “fatal charades” of capital punishment in the Roman arena. There, as we have seen, mythological themes were evoked in the execution of [supposed] criminals. Here, Revelation has transformed the “myth-maker” into a “myth” of its own: Babylon, the ancient enemy of Israel, is summoned from the past and called into service.³⁷⁹

Recent scholarship has endeavored to correct the longstanding misimpression that Christians were disproportionately victims in the arena, that the widespread adoption of Christianity was what ended the games, and that ancient Christians did not attend or

³⁷⁸ See Roland Auguet, *Cruelty and Civilization: The Roman Games* (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1972) 28-33; Keith Hopkins, *Death and Renewal* (Cambridge: Cambridge U P, 1983), 1-23; K.M. Coleman, “Fatal Charades: Roman Executions Staged as Mythological Enactments,” *J Roman St.* 80 (1990); Erik Gunderson, “The Ideology of the Arena,” *Cl. Antiquity* 15 (1996); Carlin Barton, “The Emotional Economy of Sacrifice and Execution in Ancient Rome,” *HR/RH* 29 (2003); Donald Kyle, *Sport and Spectacle in the Ancient World* (Malden, Massachusetts: Blackwell, 2005) 312-323; Christian Mann, “Gladiators in the Greek East: A Case Study in Romanization,” *Int’l. J. His. Sport.* 26 (2009); Argyro Tataki, “Nemesis, Nemeseis, and the Gladiatorial Games at Smyrna,” *Mnemosyne* 62 (2009); Jesper Carlsen, “Exemplary Deaths in the Arena: Gladiatorial Fights and the Execution of Criminals,” in *Contextualizing Early Christian Martyrdom*, (ed. J. Engberg et al.; Bern: Peter Lang, 2011), 76-84; Garrett Fagan, *The Lure of the Arena: Social Psychology and the Crowd at the Roman Games*. (Cambridge: Cambridge U P, 2011) 13-38; . See also Frilingos, “It Moves Me to Wonder.”

³⁷⁹ Frilingos, “Sexing the Lamb,” 297-317; Seesengood, *Competing Identities*, 70-84; See also John W. Marshall, “Who’s on the Throne?”, 136-139, and “Gender and Empire: Sexualized Violence,” 27-31; Stephen Moore, “Metonymies of Empire: Sexual Humiliation and Gender Masquerade in the Book of Revelation,” in Liew Tat-Siong and R.S. Sugirtharajah, *Postcolonial Interventions* (Sheffield: Sheffield Ac. P, 2009).

approve of games. But some contemporary writers did oppose the games in what we might call ethical terms, and Christian³⁸⁰ and Jewish opponents constructed revulsion at the games as a characteristic or even a component of Christian (or Jewish) identity or practice. One midrash uses such a tenet to explain Ruth 1:16: "...[Naomi] began laying out for [Ruth] the laws that govern proselytes. She said to her, 'My daughter, it is not the way of Israelite women to go to theatres and circuses put on by idolators.' [Ruth] said to her, 'Where you go, I will go.'"³⁸¹ Such a construction was not a complete and/or accurate description of reality, but it did exist and had currency. It would be similarly erroneous to assert that people in antiquity took the games for granted or accepted them as a fact of social life when the evidence suggests that, as in the case of slavery, at least some philosophical objections were widespread. These very objections may have helped the games to continue as much as anything else, again as with slavery, but they did exist and cannot be presumed to have been anomalous. Equally mistaken would be any blanket assertion that Roman spectacles were an unremarkable iteration of socially approved violence or that they simply "made sense" or were "functional" within a Roman cultural context and offend only ethnocentric modern sensibilities. Furthermore, spectacles in general and blood sports in particular did garner moral objections from different quarters. These objections, like ancient objections to slavery, were often different from modern ones and were not entirely consistent, but they

³⁸⁰ See Barton, "Savage Miracles;" G.W. Bowersock, *Martyrdom and Rome* (Cambridge: Cambridge U P, 1995) 41-57; Leonard Thompson, "The Martyrdom of Polycarp: Death in the Roman Games," *J Rel.* 82 (2002); François-Emmanuel Boucher, "Les sacrifices sanglants, les gladiateurs et les premiers chrétiens," *Religiologiques* 23 (2001); Fagan, *Lure of the Arena*, 174-184.

³⁸¹ *Ruth Rab.* 20.3; Neusner 80. The extant form of the midrash is late, perhaps dating to the sixth century CE, but it preserves some traditions centuries older, and given that the imperial circuses had declined hundreds of years before the final redaction, this is likely to be one of them. See also Mark Zvi Brettler and M. Poliakov, "Rabbi Simeon ben Lakish at the Gladiator's Banquet," *HTR* 83 (1990).

existed. Some of them were voiced by wealthy, powerfully situated Romans. Seneca the Younger, for example, objects that

...what we have now is murder pure and simple. The combatants have nothing to protect them; their whole bodies are exposed to the blows; every thrust they launch gets home... There are no helmets and no shields repelling the weapons. What is the point of armor? Or of skill? All that sort of thing just makes the death slower in coming... The spectators insist that each on killing his man shall be thrown against another to be killed in his turn; and the eventual victor is reserved by them for some other form of butchery; the only exit for the contestants is death. Fire and steel keep the slaughter coming. And all this happens [at lunchtime] while the arena is virtually empty³⁸²

The existence of strong pagan objections to the games, however, did not keep EJEC writers from construing such opposition as distinctively Jewish or Christian. Christian polemicists mark spectatorship as a pagan activity both in apologetic literature at least ostensibly aimed at non-Christians and in hortatory writings addressed to Christian audiences. This evinces some early church leaders' perceiving, no doubt correctly in many cases, that church members *were* attending spectacles and that they were not supposed to be. Many of these writings also condemn theatrical performances, chariot races, and other forms of entertainment, many of which could overlap with blood sports.³⁸³ However, they (along with non-EJEC writings) do sometimes reserve the strongest language for these, as in

Minucius Felix:

³⁸² Ad. Futrell 91; Sen., *Ep.* 7.3-4: *Nunc omissis nugis mera homicidia sunt. Nihil habent quo tegantur ad ictum totis corporibus expositi numquam frustra manum mittunt. Hoc plerique ordinariis paribus et postulaticis praeferunt. Quidni praeferant non galea non scuto repellitur ferrum. Quo muni menta quo artes omnia ista mortis morae sunt. Mane leonibus et ursis homines meridie spectatoribus suis obiciuntur. Interfectores interfectoris iubent obici et victorem in aliam detinent. caedem. Exitus pugnantium mors est. Ferro et igne res geritur. Haec fiunt dum vacat arena.* On pagan objections to the games more broadly, see Magnus Wistrand, *Entertainment and Violence in Ancient Rome* (Ekblads, 1992) 15-29 and Pierre Cagniard, "The Philosopher and the Gladiator," *Cl. World* 93 (2000).

³⁸³ For example, military and mythological re-enactments that ended in the real deaths of the "actors" were popular events. Chariot racing probably involved no small number of fatalities, human and equine (horses' physiology being such that a broken leg is fatal). Ingvild Gilhus notes that, contrary to common perceptions that "sentimental" attachment to non-human animals is a modern phenomenon, expressions of sympathy for the animals brutalized for and killed in the arena are not lacking in ancient sources (ch. 9, "Fighting the Beasts," in her *Animals, Gods and Humans* [London: Routledge, 2006]). See also Auguet, *Cruelty and Civilization*, 107-119; Christopher Epplett, "The Capture of Animals by the Roman Military," *G & R* 48 (2001); Kyle, *Sport and Spectacle*, 264-269, 323-329; Fagan, *Lure of the Arena*, 125-133.

We have good reason to abstain from the vicious delights of your processions and spectacles; we know from which rites they originated and condemn their pernicious attractions. At the curule games, who would not shrink from the frenzy of the struggling mob? or the organized bloodshed of the gladiatorial shows? ...For feigned sorrows [the actor] moves you to tears by unreal nods and gestures, till in the arena you clamor for the bloodshed for which upon the stage you weep.³⁸⁴

Minucius Felix employs the emic category of spectacles, which places gladiatorial combats alongside stage plays as a form of public entertainment, to categorize what he deems abhorrent to Christians. He considers both theatre and combat to be debased and fundamentally idolatrous, and he does not deem blood sports worse than theater. He does, however, see blood sports as inherently wrong and pagan, that is, un-Christian. Tertullian evinces both of the same tendencies, proclaiming to pagans that “Your public games, too, we renounce, as heartily as we do their origins... We have nothing to do, in speech, sight, or hearing, with the madness of the circus, the shamelessness of the theater, the savagery of the arena, the vanity of the gymnasium.”³⁸⁵ Once again, combat does not receive special condemnation. Instead, Tertullian alludes to the convergence of these aspects of spectacle in making an argument similar to Minucius Felix’s: “You really are still more religious in the amphitheater, where over human blood, over the dirt and pollution of capital punishment, your gods dance, supplying plots and themes for the guilty.”³⁸⁶ Elsewhere, however, Tertullian singles out blood sports for special condemnation. He describes the *munus* as “the

³⁸⁴ Minucius Felix, *Octavius* 37.11-12 ad. Rendall and Kerr 431 (*Nos igitur... merito malis voluptatibus et pompis vestris et spectaculis abstinemus quorum et de sacris originem novimus et noxia blandimenta damnamus. Nam in ludis currulibus quis non horreat populi in se rixantis insaniam in gladiatorii homicidii disciplinam... idem simulatis doloribus lacrimas vestras vanis gestibus et nutibus provocat sic homicidium in vero flagitatis in mendacio fletis*)

³⁸⁵ Tertullian, *Apologeticus* 38.4, ad. T.R. Glover 173; *Aequè spectaculis vestris in tantum renuntiamus in quantum originibus eorum... Nihil est nobis dictu visu auditu cum insania circi cum impudicitia theatri cum atrocitate arenae cum xysti vanitate.*

³⁸⁶ Ibid, 15.4, ad. p. 179; *Plane religiosiores estis in cavea ubi super sanguinem humanum super inquinamenta poenarum proinde saltant dei vestri argumenta et historias noxiis ministrantes.*

most famous, the most popular spectacle of all” (*insignissimi spectacula ac receptissimi cognitio*) and claims that

The ancients thought that by this sort of spectacle they rendered a service to the dead, after they had tempered it with a more cultured form of cruelty. For of old, in the belief that the souls of the dead are propitiated with human blood, they used at funerals to sacrifice captives or slaves of poor quality whom they bought. Afterwards it seemed good [to them] to obscure their impiety by making it a pleasure. So after the persons procured had been trained in such arms as they then had and as best they might — their training was to learn to be killed! — they then did them to death on the appointed funeral day at the tombs. So they found comfort for death in murder... But by and by they progressed to the same height in refinement as in cruelty; for the pleasure of the holiday lacked something, unless savage beasts too had their share in tearing men’s bodies to pieces.³⁸⁷

At least one early church writer, Athenagoras, does in fact treat blood spectacles separately from other aspects of spectacle. Refuting the charge that Christians practice cannibalism, he claims that “we cannot endure even to see a man put to death justly.. Who does not count the gladiatorial and beast combats among the most interesting things, especially the games that you sponsor? But we, deeming seeing a man put to death to akin to killing him, shun such spectacles.”³⁸⁸ He goes on to name induced abortion and infant exposure as practices that Christians consider equivalent to murder, making no mention of bloodless, or at least not necessarily bloody aspects of spectacle. Public executions and gladiatorial spectacles are part of the category of violence, not of sport. Cyprian of Carthage writes along similar lines,

If you now turn your eyes and countenance toward the cities, you find a death procession packed with people that makes you even sadder than if you were walking alone. The

³⁸⁷ Ibid 12, ad. p. 263-265; *Officium autem mortuis hoc spectaculo facere se veteres arbitrabantur posteaquam illud humaniore atrocitate temperaverunt. Nam olim quoniam animas defunctorum humano sanguine propitiari creditum erat, captivos vel mali status servos mercati in exequiis immolabant. Postea placuit impietatem voluptate adumbrare. Itaque quos paraverant armis quibus tunc et qualiter poterant eruditos tantum ut occidi discerent mox edicto die inferiarum apud tumulos erogabant. Ita mortem homicidiis consolabantur... Sed paulatim proVecti ad tantam gratiam ad quantam et crudelitatem quia feriarum voluptati satis non fiebat nisi et feris humana corpora dissiparentur.*

³⁸⁸ Athenagoras, *Embassy for the Christians* 35.4-5, ad. Schaff; Οὐς γὰρ ἴσασιν οὐδ’ ἰδεῖν κἀν δικαίως φονευόμενον ὑπομένοντας... Τίς οὐχ ἤττον περισπουδάστους τὰς δι’ ὀπλῶν ἀγωνίας καὶ διὰ θηρίων καὶ μάλιστα τὰς ὑφ’ ὕμῶν ἀγομένας ἔχει· Ἀλλ’ ἡμεῖς πλησίον εἶναι τὸ ἰδεῖν τὸ φονευόμενον τοῦ ἀποκτεῖναι νομίζοντες ἀπηγορεύσαμεν τὰς τοιαύτας θέας.

gladiatorial game is laid on so that the bloodshed might entertain eyes that reflect a merciless blood lust. Bodies are filled with strong food for energy, and limbs bulge with the firm weight of muscle [mass]. Thus fattened up for punishment, they can have a more expensive death. A man is slain for human sport. The ability to kill is a skill, it is an exercise, it is an art: wickedness is not only advertised but taught by the advertisement. What, I must say, is more inhuman, what is harsher?³⁸⁹

Tatian's thinking is similar. After condemning wrestling events, he proclaims that "These are the lesser evils; anyone would shrink from mentioning the greater ones."³⁹⁰ He excepts himself from "anyone" and continues:

Some men are so abandoned as to make a profession of idleness and actually sell themselves to be murdered; the hungry man sells himself and the rich man buys the murderers-to-be. The spectators take their seats and the gladiators engage in single combat about nothing, and no one goes down to their aid. Are your celebrations of this kind really a good thing? Your great man collects his camp of murderers by promising them a bandit's keep, so bandits are what come out of it. You all gather to watch, and while on the one hand you criticize the president of the games for his villainy, you also criticize the gladiators themselves. Someone who happens to miss the murder is vexed, because he was not condemned to be a spectator of wicked and bloody acts. You sacrifice animals in order to eat meat and you buy men to provide human slaughter for the soul, feeding it with bloodshed of the most impious kind. The bandit murders for the sake of what he can get, but the rich man buys gladiators for the sake of murder.³⁹¹

³⁸⁹ Cyprian, *Ep. ad Donatum* 7.7 ad. Brent 55; *Iam si ad urbes ipsas oculos tuos atque ora convertas celebritatem offendes omni solitudine tristiore. Paratur gladiatorius ludus ut libidinem crudelium luminum sanguis oblectet. Inpletur in sucum, cibis fortioribus corpus et aruinae toris membrorum moles robusta pinguescit ut saginatus in poenam carius pereat. Homo occiditur in hominis voluptatem et ut quis possit occidere peritia est usus est ars est scelus non tantum geritur sed docetur. Quod potest inhumanius quid acerbius dici.*

³⁹⁰ Tatian, *Oratio ad Graecos* 23, ad. Whittaker 47; τὰυτὰ μὲν ἐστὶ τῶν κακῶν τὰ ἐλάττωνα· τὰ δὲ μείζονα τίς οὐκ ἂν ἐξεῖπεῖν ὀκνήσειεν.

³⁹¹ Ibid; ἀργίαν τινὲς ἐπανηρημένοι διὰ τὴν ἀσωτίαν ἑαυτοὺς εἰς τὸ φονευθῆναι πιπράσκουσιν· καὶ πωλεῖ μὲν ἑαυτὸν ὁ πεινῶν ὁ δὲ πλουτῶν ὠνεῖται τοὺς φονεύσοντας. καὶ τούτοις οἱ μαρτυροῦντες καθίζονται μονομαχοῦσι τε οἱ πυκτεύοντες περὶ οὐδενός καὶ ὁ βοηθήσων οὐ κάτεισιν. ἄρα γε τὰ ροιαῦτα ὑφ' ὑμῶν καλῶς ἐπιτελεῖται τὸ μὲν γὰρ στρατόπεδον τῶν μαιφονούντων ὁ προῦχων ἐν ὑμῖν συναγείρει λη στοτροφεῖν ἐπαγγελλόμενος οἱ δὲ ληστεύοντες ἀπ' αὐτοῦ προΐασιν καὶ πάντες ἐπὶ τὴν θεὰν σύνιτε κριταὶ γινόμενοι τοῦτο μὲν πονηρίας ἀγωνοθέτου τοῦτο δὲ καὶ αὐτῶν τῶν μονομαχούντων. ὁ δὲ τῷ φόνῳ μὴ περιτυχῶν λυπεῖται διότι μὴ κατεκρίθη πονερῶν καὶ μιαρῶν ἔργων θεατὴς γενέσθαι. θύετε ζῶα διὰ τὴν κρεωφαγίαν καὶ ἀνθρώπους ὠνεῖστε τῇ ψυχῇ διὰ τὴν ἀνθρωποσφαγίαν παρεχόμενοι τρέφοντες αὐτὴν αἱματεκχυσίαις ἀθεωτάταις. ὁ μὲν οὖν ληστεύων φονεῖ χάριν τοῦ λαβεῖν ὁ δὲ πλουτῶν μονομάχου ὡς ὠνεῖται χάριν τοῦ φονεῦσαι.

Tatian and Cyprian are accurate in suggesting that most gladiators were slaves.³⁹² Mary Beard and Keith Hopkins further suggest that most were young slaves, having determined that have determined that the median age of gladiators with commemorations extant in Italy is 22.5 and estimated average career length around 5.5 years (2005: 87). Although only a minority of combats actually ended in a participant's death, almost all gladiators did eventually die in the arena. Beard and Hopkins further note boys who survived until seventeen lived on average to be forty-eight. If the average or median starting age for gladiators was seventeen,³⁹³ of course, boys would have been sold, bought, and put into training for this purpose years earlier.

These, then, are some sources for Revelation's hatred of "Babylon," i.e., (*dea*) *Roma*, an allegorical figure whose representation is also that of a rich, luxury-loving Roman woman. It is a representation that relies on stereotypes but that is also a response to social realities. The response is not comprehensive: slave trading, one of Babylon's foremost sins, may not receive consistent condemnation; and the text evaluates wealth, power, and violence not in their own right but according to who possesses or practices them. But they are integral to Revelation's vision of cosmic justice, both in its positive and its negative aspects. "Babylon's" initial position of power is a gendered in ways that are largely conventional for Revelation's setting, as is her eventual fate. The same is true of the celestial Jerusalem.

³⁹² See Kyle, *Sport and Spectacle*, 269-274, 313-317; Valerie Hope, "Fighting for Identity: The Funerary Commemorations of Italian Gladiators," in *The Epigraphic Landscape of Roman Italy* (ed. A. Cooley; London: Inst. Cl. St., 2001), 93-113; Carlsen, "Exemplary Deaths in the Arena," 84-91.

³⁹³ The average and median are likely to have been approximately the same in this instance; see Mary Beard and Keith Hopkins, *The Colosseum*. (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard U P, 2005), 86f. See also M.J. Carter, "Gladiatorial Combat," Fagan, *Lure of the Arena*, 209-229;

Chapter Four: Jerusalem

The antithesis between the “cities” in Revelation, as is common in the “choice between two women” trope,³⁹⁴ builds on a broader one between prostitution and, rather than virginity as might be expected today, but rather what was expected to succeed virginity: marriage. The stark and troubled division between a prostitute and a wife was a powerful cultural rhetoric. Sometimes it is overt, as Eugene Bushala observes of Horace: *Satire* 1.2 turns on “what one might call the motif of sexual choice which, in his terms, included three amatory possibilities, [i.e., *matronae*, brothel *ancillae*, and freed mistresses... His interest is] not in which of the three kinds of women is best but rather which man is really searching for” (312). Most instances are subtler, but the pronounced opposition is, for example, why in examining Roman-era visual art “we are able to identify women most clearly in the roles of *meretrices* and *matronae*... conventionally at least, women were described, whether explicitly or implicitly, as belonging to one or the other social group... with all the implications that went with these extremes.”³⁹⁵ The distinction operated in reality as well as in representation. Distinguishing between genuinely disreputable women such as prostitutes and merely low-status women whose work (e.g., in inns) could be but was not inevitably disreputable was a social concern. Gillian Clark’s synopsis of the late Roman legal issues could apply to much of the Greco-Roman world:

³⁹⁴ See Archer, “The Virgin and the Harlot;” A.T. Hanson, “Rahab the Harlot in Early Christian Tradition,” *JNTS* 46 (1978); Galambush, *Jerusalem in the Book of Ezekiel*, 117-123, 130-141; Angela Bauer, *Gender in the Book of Jeremiah*, 16-42; Milena Kirova, “Why Should the Harlot Be a Woman? Gender Identity as Allegorical Strategy of Representation in Prophetic Texts,” *Bible and Critical Theory* 1 (2005), 35.1-35.16; Phyllis A. Bird, “Prostitution in the Social World and Religious Rhetoric of Ancient Israel,” in *Courtesans* (ed. McClure), 50-68; Simcha Fishbane, *Deviancy in Early Rabbinic Literature*, 85-102; Karin Adams, “Metaphor and Dissonance.”

³⁹⁵ Susan Stewart, *Cosmetics & Perfumes*, 101. See also Andrew Dalby, “Levels of Concealment: The Dress of *Hetairai* and *Pornai* in Greek Texts,” in *Women’s Dress* (ed. Llewellyn-Jones), 111-124.

Since there was no certainty about the father of a prostitute's children, there was no valid marriage with a prostitute, or with a woman in the entertainment business, which, then as now, shaded into prostitution. Actresses, like any woman on public view, were assumed to be available sexual partners... [with them] there could be no charge of unlawful sexual intercourse (*strupum*), which applied only when the woman was marriageable or quasi-married as a concubine. The others were "those on whom *strupum* is not committed."³⁹⁶

If such "rehabilitation" of prostitutes was unlikely in reality, it was less so in literature, where it formed a minor theme. The "she-wolf" who nursed Rome's founding foundlings is sometimes glossed as a prostitute (based on *lupanar*, "brothel"). The conflict of Genesis 38 depends on whether a woman who is by all appearances an especially dishonourable prostitute is recognized as actually being a levirate wife and legitimate ancestress. Tamar's afterlife includes entry in Matthew's genealogy of Jesus, where she joins an even less reputable woman: Mt. 1:5 lists Rahab as the mother of Boaz. Whatever tradition informs this has at least some congruence with the OT text (Josh. 6:22-25):

Joshua said to the two men who had scouted the land, "Go into the prostitute's house, and bring out of it the woman all who are hers, as you swore to her." So the youths from the scouting party went in and brought out Rahab and her father, her mother, her siblings, and all who belonged to her — they brought all her kindred out — and set them outside the camp of Israel... They lived in the midst of Israel from this day (Josh. 6:22-25).

Rahab is no virgin bride or, so far as the text specifies, any kind of bride at all. But "they lived in the midst of Israel from this day" and are construed as a recognized family or lineage within it. It may not be coincidental either that Rahab hides the spies "with the stalks of flax that she had laid out on the roof," i.e., among the symbols of wifhood. Her signal, the crimson cord tied in the window of her house (Josh. 2:18, 21), not only recalls the protection of Israel's firstborn sons (Exod. 12) but also the cord and the crimson thread of Tamar's story.

³⁹⁶ Gillian Clark, *Women in Late Antiquity: Pagan and Christian Life-styles* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1993), 29. See also Treggiari, "Lower Class Women;" Konstan, "Between Courtesan and Wife;" Ben-Zion Rosenfeld, "Innkeeping in Jewish Society in Roman Palestine," *JESHO* (1998); Kelly Olson, "Matrona and Whore: Clothing and Definition in Roman Antiquity," in *Courtesans* (ed. McClure), 186-204; Ariadne Staples, *From Good Goddess to Vestal Virgins* (London: Routledge, 2013), 63f.

Hosea and Ezekiel, on which Revelation draws so deeply, both present the image of a wife turned prostitute who is ultimately received again as a wife.³⁹⁷

DISSONANCE AND IRONY

Social reality was usually different; indeed, these narratives depend on what Karin Adams calls dissonance with it.³⁹⁸ Revelation's calling a slave-trading queen a πόρνη carries several degrees of irony. Most prostitutes in the Roman world were slaves, and the "lowest-class" ones who were designated πόρναι were probably especially likely to be slaves. The economy of prostitution could also be part of the household economy. Rebecca Flemming notes that

[f]emale bodies clearly counted amongst the economic resources not only of slave-dealers and owners, but also of any family network, available short- or long-term for the avoidance of penury and probably in some cases also for the pursuance of more particular and ambitious economic strategies... Both these mechanisms of prostitution were, broadly speaking, deemed legitimate in the Roman world; they function within two of its most basic power structures. Slaves and daughters in particular were legally positioned so they could be prostituted. (42).

Flemming is correct in observing that during much of the Roman period it was not illegal for a *paterfamilias* or *tutor* to prostitute a woman in his power. There is, however, very little reference in any texts, censorious or otherwise, to the prostitution of daughters by fathers or those with similar authority. It does not appear in comedy, satire, invective, or other genres. Such a thing may have occurred and indeed probably did occur, but the absence of

³⁹⁷ On this, see Rallis, "Nuptial Imagery;" Leah Bronner, *From Eve to Esther* (Louisville: WJK, 1994), 143-158; Francis Landry, *Hosea* (1995; 2nd ed., Sheffield: Phoenix P, 2011), 35-46; Ben Zvi, "Observations on the Marital Metaphor;" Kelle, *Hosea 2*, 266-283; Sherwood, "A Leader's Misleading;" Dearman, *The Book of Hosea*, 119-131; Yates, "Jeremiah's Message of Judgment and Hope;" Liang Wang-Huei, "Is She Not My Wife?"; Bernard Robinson, "Rahab of Canaan—and Israel," *SJTOT* 23 (2009).

³⁹⁸ Adams, "Metaphor and Dissonance." On the imagery more generally, see Archer, "The Virgin and the Harlot;" Hanson, "Rahab the Harlot;" Galambush, *Jerusalem in the Book of Ezekiel*, 117-123, 130-141; Angela Bauer, *Gender in the Book of Jeremiah*, 16-42; Kirova, "Why Should the Harlot Be a Woman?"; Bird, "Prostitution in the Social World," in *Courtesans* (ed. McClure); Fishbane, *Deviancy*, 85-102.

evidence, combined with the abundance of evidence for other circumstances of prostitution and the disposition of daughters in the *familia*, in this case suggests evidence not of absence altogether, but of great rarity. There is, conversely, a strong association between slaves, who had no legal fathers or socially recognized mothers, and prostitution.

In addition to the casual association of prostitution and slavery, ancient sources express horror at the idea of free women being involved in prostitution. This horror may take the form of opprobrium at voluntary prostitution or of outrage at involuntary prostitution. The latter is particularly evident in those romance novels in which a freeborn girl of aristocratic lineage is kidnapped into slavery and threatened with sale into prostitution. Revelation's metaphor proceeds from the common assumption that πόρνηαι are characteristically lewd and dishonourable, an assumption that it does not problematize.

Jennifer Glancy and Stephen Moore caution interpreters to avoid this oversight:

[t]he glamour attaching to certain courtesans in some of the literary sources should not blind us to the fact the typical location of prostitutes on the Roman socioeconomic scale was exceedingly low. In common with many other classicists, Cohen contends that, throughout antiquity, the term πόρνη was, for all intents and purposes, a virtual synonym of δούλη, "[female] slave. Roman prostitutes catered to clients who themselves were typically of low status." Roman males with sufficient economic means to own slaves "had little reason to frequent brothels," as John Clarke remarks. "They purchased slaves to fulfill their sexual desires." With regard to the numerous graffiti advertising prostitutes that have been found at Pompeii, Clarke observes: "Analysis of the names of the prostitutes reveals that they were all slaves (both male and female). And their owners were usually ex-slaves." Such appears to have been the case throughout the empire. The servile associations of prostitution are crucial to Roman barbs indicting the imperial family for involvement in prostitution.. [and] for appreciating the full force of John's ironic portrayal of Babylon as a πόρνη who services the kings of the earth.³⁹⁹

³⁹⁹ On prostitution and slavery in antiquity, see Susan Treggiari, "Libertine Ladies," *Cl. World* 64 (1971), 196-198; Flemming, *Quae Corpore*;; Sian Lewis, *Athenian Woman*., 112-114; Glancy, *Slavery*, 54-70; Hezser, *Jewish Slavery in Antiquity*, 179-182; Edward Cohen, "Free and Unfree Sexual Work," in *Courtesans* (ed. McClure), 95-124; Thomas McGinn, *Prostitution, Sexuality, and the Law in Ancient Rome* (Oxford: Oxford U P, 2003), 288-319 and *Economy of Prostitution in the Roman World* (Ann Arbor: U Michigan P, 2007), 55-61, 176-177; Wrenhaven, "Identity of the 'Wool-Workers,'" Carly Daniel-Hughes, "The Sex Trade and Slavery at Meals," 165-178 in *Meals in the Early Christian World* (ed. D.E. Smith and H. Taussig; New York: Macmillan, 2012); and Deborah Kamen, "Sale for the Purpose of Freedom," *Cl. J* 109 (2014).

The text reiterates the cultural trope of the prostitute as debauched and worthless, evincing no reflection on it and giving no consideration to the realities of prostitution. The greatest blame falls on the πόρνη: although “[m]en... may well ally with the whore... [i]t is the female hooker, not the male ‘johns,’ who is the root of the problem” (Blount 2009: 310). The johns would seem to be “the kings of the earth, who committed fornication and lived in luxury with her” (οἱ βασιλεῖς τῆς γῆς οἱ μετ’ αὐτῆς πορνεύσαντες καὶ στρηνιάσαντες, 18:9; cf. 17:17), but though they bewail her fate, they do not share in her punishment. They are, however, shamed as the sort of low-status men who would have recourse to a πόρνη — slaves, in other words, an insult not to be underestimated. But they recede from view as the narrative segues from the destruction of Babylon to the glorification of her antithesis, Jerusalem. The station to which Jerusalem is exalted, i.e., wifedom, of course remains an inferior one. Husband is superior to wife just as God/the Lamb is superior to non-God/the Lamb. Revelation does not appear to question the inequality on which marriage was premised according to ancient cultural norms. Women were uniformly a socio-legally disabled class relative to their male peers.

CLOSE RELATIVES

“Relative to their male peers,” however, is a vital distinction. Even citizen women in classical Athens, who had fewer rights and liberties than many other dominant-status women in antiquity, enjoyed significant advantages over slaves of either sex. David Schaps, critiquing an equation between the two that he notes in some late twentieth-century research, delineates critical distinctions to keep in mind:

- A free woman had authority over the slaves in her οἶκος and was entitled to the respect of slaves outside it. A male slave had no analogous privilege over a female one.

- A free woman's κύριος had duties toward her that were socially expected and legally enforceable, and she had some recourse against him. A slave's δεσπότης, in contrast, had neither duties toward him/her nor restrictions on his/her own power.
- A free woman could not be sold, or transferred to a different household at whim.
- A free woman could not be detained, whereas a slave could be seized as collateral or evidence.
- Being subject to physical punishment of any kind was a defining characteristic of slave status but never appears as that of a free woman; masters had the explicit authority to beat their slaves, while κύριοι had no such right (although domestic violence doubtless occurred).
- A free woman's property, while not under her control, could not be alienated from her, whereas a slave had no claim to any property.
- A free woman could petition to be removed from the control of her κύριος; slaves could claim sanctuary but were not entitled to have their claims heard.
- Free women seem to have had liberty to speak as they chose to the people they encountered (e.g., family and household members), while slaves' speech was habitually restricted.
- No man except the husband of a free woman had any sexual claims to her, and a free woman could not be legally compelled to engage in prostitution or other forms of sexual activity (the sources give the greatest prominence by far to this distinction) ("What Was Free," 165-177).

Schaps concerns himself with the *poleis* system of classical Athens, but the substance of his observations holds for other times and places in antiquity. The wealthiest women, who were disproportionately of citizen status, were probably especially privileged, but even women of humbler means or freeborn non-citizens possessed many of these advantages. And while a citizen-status woman might be more or less advantaged relative to her husband in imperial Rome versus classical Athens, for example, a slave of either sex had the same lack of standing in nearly any situation. In some cases the distinctions between free women's status and slaves' were even greater than the ones Schaps identifies. By the late republican period, for example, a freeborn *matrona* subject to Roman law was never in her husband's legal power (archaic *manus* marriage excepted) and could be more independent from her *tutor* than many Greek women could be from their κύριοι. She had the legal right by the first century CE to divorce her husband for any reason and could withhold her consent to marriage. Free Roman, Palestinian, and Egyptian women also could and often did control their own not inconsiderable property. By contrast, the legal and practical conditions of Romans' slaves were congruent with those of others. Some variations did exist:

manumission and upward mobility seem to have been more common in Roman contexts, while Athenian slaveowners were at least in principle forbidden from killing their human property at will. But slaves of both sexes in every corner of the empire lacked only not only all the rights of free men, but also all the rights of free women. Free women in every context had more rights than enslaved men, while maleness afforded no legal advantage over femaleness to slaves. A husband and head of household might be a κύριος to his wife, but he was a δεσπότης to his slaves.

Marriage and slavery were both fundamental components in the conceptualization of the οἶκος or *domus* and of the state, whatever its organization, in the Greco-Roman world. This schema resulted from their understanding as opposite, not similar, kinds of unequal relationship. Ancient writers construe slavery as a societal institution as foundational as marriage. It is not only marriage and the state that were interdependent on each other, but also slavery along with them.⁴⁰⁰ As Schaps notes,

The oppositions of male and female, free and slave, were among the most basic parameters of the Greek mental universe. Thales or Socrates was thankful to fortune for three things: that he had been born a human being and not a beast, then a man and not a woman, and, third, a Greek and not a barbarian (*D.L.* 1.33). For Aristotle a household consisted of master and slave, husband and wife, father and children (*Pol.* 1253b.5-7). For Saint Paul there was in Christianity [*sic*] neither Jew nor Greek, neither free nor slave, neither male nor female (Gal. 3:28); elsewhere, we must understand, these oppositions held. Each has chosen his pairs somewhat differently, but in some three dichotomies — free or slave, male or female, Greek or barbarian — described the world of humanity as the Greeks saw it (162).

The fundamental unit of society, for Aristotle and most other writers, is the household rather than an individual. The household has a head to govern it: a free, adult, male citizen. His headship, however, consists of multiple aspects. One sphere of his authority is his role

⁴⁰⁰ See Saller, *Patriarchy, Property, and Death*, 132-165, and "Symbols of Gender and Status," in *Women and Slaves* (ed. Joshel and Murnaghan) *Women*, and in the same volume Holt Parker, "Loyal Slaves and Loyal Wives: The crisis of the outsider-within and Roman *exemplum* literature" and Annalisa Rei's "Villains, Wives, and Slaves in the Comedies of Plautus;" Hezser, "Impact of Household Slaves," 377-390, 402-411, and *Jewish Slavery in Antiquity*, 73-82, 194-201.

as the κύριος to his legitimate wife, “the female” in the primary partnership. But the relationships between marriage, slavery, and social order could be fundamental in making distinctions between in- and out-groups: “our” institutions of them are proper, civilized, and natural, while “theirs” are depraved, backward, or at the least eccentric. Aristotle schematizes this set of interrelationships in the *Politics* explicitly and in detail:

The first coupling together of persons to which necessity gives rise is that between those who are unable to exist without one another: for instance the union of female and male for the continuance of the species. This is not of deliberate purpose, but with man as with the other animals and plants... [Then there is] the union of natural ruler and natural subject for the sake of security: he that can foresee with his mind is naturally ruler and naturally master, and he that can do these things with his body is subject and naturally a slave... Thus the female and the slave are by nature distinct (for nature makes... one thing for one purpose; for so each tool will be turned out in the finest perfection if it serves not many uses but one). Yet among the barbarians the female and the slave have the same rank, because their conjugal partnership is [the same as] one between a male and a female slave. Hence the saying of the poets, “It is right that Greeks should rule barbarians,” implying that barbarian and slave have the same nature. The household, then, is first composed from these two partnerships, and Hesiod was right when he wrote “First and foremost a house and a wife and an ox for the plowing,” for the ox is the poor man’s slave.⁴⁰¹

This incongruity between female in power and slave in power is crucial to Aristotle’s evaluation of wife/slave equivalence as characteristic of barbarians. Uncivilized, i.e., non-Greek people do manage to reproduce, of course, and they do own slaves, but by blurring marriage and mastery they deprive themselves of the essence of both. To view a wife in the same way as a slave, or to treat her in the same way, is unworthy of a Greek citizen and a manifestation of the barbarian’s inferiority. This is what justifies Greeks’ rule over barbarians, a rule that included enslavement of them. Male barbarians treat their wives as slaves, thus the union of male barbarians and their wives are the unions of male and female slaves, thus barbarians are slaves.

Slaves were alienated from the households to which they belonged in other ways in which wives were not alienated from the households into which they married and

⁴⁰¹ Aristotle, *Politics* 1252b, ad. Rackham.

thus joined as subordinates. In the social and legal contexts of much of the NT-era Mediterranean, while the husband and wife come together to create something like themselves, that is, a (free) human, the security that constitutes “common interest” of the owner/slave relationship is literally the owner’s brainchild. The slave’s physical labour has no goal in its own right; it is solely something that the master harnesses in order to effect the security that he has conceived of. Nor is it a necessity, as the female’s contribution to reproduction is: “the poor [free citizen] man’s slave is the ox.” Reciprocity is absent from this relationship: Aristotle construes the slave as incapable of thought, whereas the owner is implicitly capable of performing the same labour as the slave. This is a crucial reason that “the female and the slave are by nature distinct”: females, however inferior they might be to males, bring an essential independent contribution to the goal of reproduction, whereas slaves’ labour has only a supportive role.

“ALIENATED AND DISHONOURED”

Aristotle’s insinuation that barbarians’ marriages are really only servile unions rests on the fact that only free people could marry. Marriage was, among other things, a legal arrangement and to this extent it could be a public matter. Slaves, by definition, were excluded from the public:

Slaves in the city are possessions; are they part of the city? No, answers Aristotle: “...nor are freedmen...” (*Politics*, 1.1278a.1). Possessions also do not belong to the city; the only logical conclusion is that the slave belongs to the household. Thus Aristotle differentiates between the political authority and the authority of the master in the household. And in so doing, he legitimates the belief that the slave is not part of the city, that he only has meaning in the *oikia* (Andreau and Descat, *The Slave*, 131).

The inability of slaves to assent to contracts or testify in court made them legal as well as social non-persons. If slaves could not assent to contracts or testify under oath, they could

neither assent to the contract of marriage nor undertake the oaths necessary to establish it.⁴⁰² This reasoning resounded throughout centuries of legal and political practice; it was one of the most direct similarities between Roman and Anglo-Atlantic slave law. This distinguished the latter from systems incorporating the civil code, which had evolved over the centuries from its Roman basis. Germanic law had recognized slave marriages since the early middle ages, as had Iberian law, which was transplanted to Iberian colonies. Spanish and Portuguese law gave slaves full access to marriage in the Catholic church, wherein the sacrament was in principle identical for every party to it. This was not the case in the (mostly) Protestant colonies of common-law England. Case law, which in Atlantic as well as Mediterranean settings was the primary theater in which slave law played out, was explicit about this point. Arnold Sio provides a useful summary of the results:

...in the ante-bellum South, marriages between slaves had no legal standing... The denial of legal marriage meant, in conjunction with the rule that the child follow the condition of the mother, that the offspring of [female] slaves had no legal father... In the law there was no such thing as fornication or adultery among slaves... Roman slaves were also legally incapable of marriage. Any union [involving at least one slave was] *contubernium*, as opposed to *conubium*. A marriage was terminated if either party became enslaved. Infidelity between slaves could not be adultery[,] although a [male] slave could be guilty of adultery with a married free woman... The children of slaves were the property of the owner of the mother, and since the economic use of slaves... was at the discretion of the master, slaves were bought and sold without regard for their families (294).

The relationship between marriage and the state had changed considerably between antiquity and the nineteenth century, of course. For present purposes, though, the two systems were similar in this respect; indeed, the latter deliberately imitated the former. The result in practical terms was that “on the legal evidence which defines the authority of the master in the areas of parentage and kinship... there is nothing sufficiently distinctive to distinguish the legal status of the slave as property in the United States from that in

⁴⁰² See Georges Fabre, *Libertus* (Rome: École Française, 1981), 165-187; Saller, “Slavery and the Roman Family;” Alan Watson, *Roman Slave Law*, 76-81; Hezser, *Rabbinic Law*, 141-149; Judith Evans Grubbs, “Between Slavery and Freedom,” *Roman Legal Trad.* 9 (2013), 40-41, 66-71.

Rome” (ibid, 296). Jurists explained in no little detail slaves’ lack of *connubium* as a consequence of their inability to make contracts, and sometimes explicitly cited Roman law as a precedent. One of the few systematic treatises on American slave law noted that

the inability of the slave to contract extends to the marriage contract, and hence there is no recognized marriage relation in law between slaves. This was true of the Roman slaves. There was among them a recognized relation, termed ‘contubernium,’ from which certain consequences flowed, especially manumission. For instance, it was incest for a manumitted slave to contract marriage with his manumitted sister. The same effects have been held to flow from a marriage during slavery, after manumission, in Louisiana. In fact, the courts there seem to hold, that after manumission, the marriage contract becomes valid for all purposes.⁴⁰³

The citation of the Roman law of slavery as a legitimizing precedent is common in American defenses of slavery. The similar legal situations had similar repercussions (and, in fact, emerged partly as a codification of similar practices). Unlike antiquity, however, antebellum slavery abounds in documents registering objection rather than implied assent to these circumstances. Henry Bibb, who also escaped slavery, wrote

There is no legal marriage among the slaves of the South; I never saw nor heard of such a thing in my life, and I have been through seven of the slave states. A slave marrying according to law, is a thing unknown in the history of American Slavery... I am happy to state that many fugitive slaves, who have been enabled by the aid of an over-ruling providence to escape to the free North with those whom they claim as their wives, notwithstanding all their ignorance and superstition, are not at all disposed to live together like brutes, as they have been compelled to do in slaveholding Churches. But as soon as they got free from slavery they go before some anti-slavery clergyman, and have the solemn ceremony of marriage performed according to the laws of the country (38-39).

⁴⁰³ Thomas R.R. Cobb, *An Inquiry into the Law of Negro Slavery in the United States of America* (Philadelphia: T. & J.W. Johnson, 1858) 242-243 (USLCIA). Cobb is probably referring to the case law flowing from *Giroud v. Lewis* (1819), in which the Louisiana Supreme Court “treated [slaves’] marriages as creating a natural obligation that would give forth full civil effects after emancipation... Judge Matthews began [the opinion] by noting that slaves have no legal capacity to assent to contracts of any kind, yet they may undoubtedly marry with the consent of their master. Their marriage, while in a state of slavery, cannot produce any civil effect... Yet, he concluded, their marriage received retroactive validation upon emancipation... [thus] regarding a slave marriage as constituting a natural obligation which may be converted into civil obligations once the obligor acquires *un état civil*” (Vernon Palmer, *Through the Codes*, 157). The ruling, of course, was the product of a civil law system that was increasingly confronted with a common one after Louisiana’s incorporation into the United States in 1812. For a detailed discussion of this state of affairs as it related to the law of slavery, see Palmer (*passim*). He notes that “[it] is probably no coincidence that the Court’s opinion [in *Giroud v. Lewis*] was extremely short and devoid of citations” (ibid).

Other former “fugitive slaves” of both sexes wrote similarly, and the subject was prominent in abolitionist discourses of every kind. It was often a point of persuasion aimed at winning sympathy and interest for the cause, featuring, for example, as the main plot driver in abolitionist novels that were written and widely read by white women, as Tess Chakkalakal has notably detailed. Abolitionist William Goodell quoted half a dozen statutes and rulings to demonstrate that

[the] obligations of marriage are evidently inconsistent with the conditions of slavery and cannot be performed by a slave. The husband promises to protect his wife and provide for her. The wife promises to be the help-meet of her husband. They mutually promise to live with and cherish each other, till parted by death. But what can such promises by slaves *mean*? The “legal relation of master and slave” renders them void! It forbids the slave to protect even himself. It clothes his master with authority to bid him inflict deadly blows on the woman he has sworn to protect. It prohibits his possession of any property wherewith to sustain her. His labor and his hands it takes from him. It bids the woman assist, not her husband, but her owner! Nay! it gives him unlimited control and full possession of her own person, and forbids her, on pain of death, (as will be shown,) to resist him, if he drags her to his bed! It severs the plighted pair, at the will of their masters, occasionally, or for ever! ...What, then, can the marriage vows of slaves *mean*? (1853: 107-108)⁴⁰⁴

The preservation of such explicit objections is a modern phenomenon, but Patterson’s “natal alienation and permanent dishonour” resulting from similar circumstances are apparent in ancient material. Patterson draws attention to “the large number of tomb inscriptions in which freedmen, and sometimes their masters on their behalf, celebrated... an event that was to remain a source of pride to their descendants: the simple fact that they

⁴⁰⁴ Goodell, *The American Slave Code in Theory and Practice* (New York: Am. & Foreign Anti-Slavery Soc., 1853) 107-108; cf. Chakkalakal, *Novel Bondage*, *passim*. Excellent scholarship on this subject is not lacking; see, e.g., Norrece T. Jones, *Born a Child of Freedom, Yet a Slave* (Hanover, New Hampshire: Wesleyan U P, 1990), 37-63; Walvin, *Questioning Slavery*, 96-116; Brenda Stevenson, *Life in Black and White*, *passim*; Amy Dru Stanley, *From Bondage to Contract*, 138-217; Maire Jenkins Schwartz, *Born in Bondage*, 155-204; Dunaway, *African-American Family*, *passim*; Scully and Paton (ed.), *Gender and Slave Emancipation*; Walters, “The Erotic South,” Altink, *Representations of Slave Women*, 91-128; Husband, *Antislavery Discourse*, 11-20, 113-128; Gregory D. Smithers, *Slave Breeding* (Gainesville: U Florida P, 2012) 20-43; Heather Andrea Williams, *Help Me to Find My People*, 49-116. On the legal aspects directly, see Barry Crouch, “Chords of Love,” Laura Edwards, *Gendered Strife*, 24-65; Darlene Goring, “History of Slave Marriage in the U.S.,” *John Marshall Law Rev.* (2005); Cynthia Kennedy, *Braided Relations*, 95-104; Amy Dru Stanley, “Instead of Waiting for the Thirteenth Amendment.”

had been manumitted” (1981: 236). Judith Evans Grubbs notes the implications of these data:

...the inherent vulnerability of slaves to sexual exploitation does not imply that slaves and former slaves had no family life or did not also feel the importance of marital and parental bonds... [Epigraphic data] have demonstrated that not only were people of free (often freed) and slave status living together in permanent relationships and raising families, but they also appropriated the terminology of legal marriage to describe these relationships, which were properly termed *contubernia* rather than *conubia*. The freedman butcher Aurelius Hermia described his freedwoman wife as “chaste, modest, unknown to the common crowd, faithful to her husband.” The freedwoman Furia Spes commemorated her “dearest husband” (*coniunx carissimus*) with whom she had been “bound by love” since youth: an “evil hand” had separated them (1993: 62-3).

Recent archaeological interpretations have also drawn attention to the ways in which freed people represented themselves as natally connected and honourable by employing the imagery of marriage (e.g., the *stola*, the hand clasp, and marital documents) in funerary imagery.⁴⁰⁵

These commemorative practices were a response to manifest social circumstances. Slaves and freed people emphasized their partnerships precisely because the slaveholders who controlled their lives accorded such relationships little respect. A.M. Duff, whose book-length study of Roman freedmen is one of the first devoted to the subject, draws attention to Martial’s epigrams: “Let the right of progeny be given to you, Zoilus, even the right of seven [sons]. But no one will give you a mother or a father” (*Ep. 11.12; ius tibi natorum vel septem Zoile detur/dum matrem nemo det tibi nemo patrem*).⁴⁰⁶ The unusual Greek name suggests Zoilus’ status as an imported slave rather than a descendent of free Romans. Martial concedes, not without contempt, that Zoilus could obtain the right to be called the

⁴⁰⁵ See Fabre, *Libertus*, 187-195; Saller and Shaw, “Tombstones and Roman Family Relations;” D’Ambra, “Mourning;” Michele George, “A Roman Funerary Monument with a Mother and Daughter, in *Women and Slaves* (ed. Joshel and Murnaghan); Jeannine Diddle Uzzi, “The Power of Parenthood in Official Roman Art,” *Hesperia Sup.* 41 (2007), 70-79.

⁴⁰⁶ See A.M. Duff, *Freedmen in the Early Roman Empire* (Oxford: Clarendon P, 1928), 68.

father of seven sons, but reminds him that he is not anyone's son. A consequence of this state of affairs was that patrimony was the prerogative of free men alone, in both the patrilineal slave societies of the ancient Mediterranean⁴⁰⁷ and those of the modern Atlantic.⁴⁰⁸ Slaves did not receive at birth names that identified them in relation to their fathers, as free children did. In Atlantic societies, they had no family names, while in antiquity, their names marked them as outsiders and were often only temporary. Greek-speaking slaveowners tended to name their human possessions with the same identifiers that designated them in ownership documents. Brant notes that while

Greek owners sometimes gave their slaves Greek names... slaves might also be known by an ethnic formed into name: "Thratta" [for example] is often found, whether or not the bearer was strictly Thracian in origin. Or a name associated with their supposed place of origin: a Thracian might be called Daos, or a Phrygian Manes, for example. Appearance was another prompt to naming, easy for the master to remember: for example Xanthias ("Blondy")... the slave's response to them can only be guessed at. All the more so, when names were changed according to the master's fancy, upon purchase or resale perhaps (2011: 129).

In the Pauline churches, Lydia, Fortunatus, Euodia, Tychicus, Onesimus, Epaphras, Apphia stand out as slaves or former slaves. Such vulgar, striving freedmen as Zoilus were a staple of Roman satire, most famously embodied by Trimalchio. Here Martial reminds such a figure that his birthright is slavery. He has similar words for one of his other stock freedmen:

The senate attends your birthday dinner,
Diodorus; it's a rare equestrian who's not invited,
and you expend thirty sesterces' charity on each.

⁴⁰⁷ See C. Wayne Tucker, "Women in the Manumission Inscriptions," Glancy, *Slavery*, 73-77; Hezser, *Jewish Slavery in Antiquity*, 182-186; Christopher Jones, "Hyperides and the Sale of Slave-Families," *ZPE* 164 (2008), 19-20; in *CWHIS* (ed. Bradley and Cartledge), Jonathan Edmondson, "Slavery and the Roman Family," 337-361, Gardner, "Roman Slavery and Roman Law," 423-425, and Golden "Slavery and the Greek Family," 143-151. On slaves and naming, see Jean Straus, *L'achat et la vente des esclaves dans l'Égypte romaine* (Munich: K.G. Saur, 2004), 249-262; Clive Cheesman, "Names in *por* and Slave Naming in Republican Rome," *Cl. Q.* 59 (2009); Wrenhaven, *Reconstructing*, 31-42.

⁴⁰⁸ See Margaret Burnham, "An Impossible Marriage: Slave Law and Family Law," *Law and Inequality* 5 (1987); Noreece Jones, *Born a Child of Freedom*, 37-63; Fede, *People without Rights*, 221-237; Thomas Morris, *Southern Slavery and the Law*, 41-49; Dunaway, "Diaspora, Death," 137-142; Jonathan Martin, *Divided Mastery*, 46-65; Daina Berry, "Swing the Sickle," 88-102; Heather Williams, *Help Me to Find My People*, 48-88.

But no one, Diordorus, calls you his son.⁴⁰⁹

It is freedmen, not freeborn bastards, who are Martial's and Petronius' symbols of illegitimacy.

Although slaves were denied participation in marriage, they were often involved with it in other ways. Free people made use of slaves to endure the frustrations of marriage. Some of these frustrations resulted from unequal expectations of monogamy. Free men who were unmarried and desired sex with a woman, or who were unsatisfied with what their wives provided, had a presumed right of sexual access to their slaves. Jennifer Glancy notes that "Since sexual exclusiveness is the mark of female honour, female slaves lived with a state of perpetual shame" (2002: 28) and speaks of the results as "sexual surrogacy" in which slaves preserve the honour of free people by serving as an outlet for the dishonourable lusts of people (usually free men) who would otherwise insult or assault free people, especially free women (ibid, 21-26). Glancy cites examples from divorce rescripts, Petronius' *Satyricon*, *Leukippe and Clitophon*, Artemidorus, and the *Acts of Andrew*. The last is one of many EJEC texts that, like Revelation, idealizes celibacy for the faithful, men as well as women. Most texts (e.g., hagiographies) do emphasize (free) female continence over male, and sometimes presented "sexual surrogacy" as a means to establish it. Thus, Glancy notes, the *Acts of Andrew*

did not condemn the sexual use of a slave, at least if that practice permitted an elite Christian woman to remain unsullied by sexual contact. Rather, [it] condemned the hubris of a slave who overestimates the significance of a sexual relationship with her owner... [It] does denigrate one version of upper-class sexual ethics, which posits procreative, conjugal sex as a civic duty. However, it promotes another version of upper-class sexual ethics, in which

⁴⁰⁹ Martial 10.27:

*Natali Diodori tuo convivā senatus
accubat et rarus non adhibetur eques
et tua tricenō largitur sportula nummos
nemo tamen natum te Diodore putat.*

abstinence from polluting sexual activity is a distinctively elite prerogative. This latter ethical system served not only upper-class interests but also explicitly Christian interests (ibid, 23).

In this, she notes, the text is in keeping with a status quo in which “a wife who wished to limit and control her sexual activities could rely on household slaves... to satisfy her husband’s particular appetites without endangering her own status or her children’s position as heirs” (ibid 22). Glancy notes the precedent of Plutarch, who uses the supposed behaviour of Persian kings as an example: “If a private citizen [likewise] indulges in indecency with a courtesan or a female slave, his wife ought not to be angry or annoyed, but reflect that it is his respect for her that makes her husband share his intemperance or violent behaviour with another woman.”⁴¹⁰ This is not novel advice; Theano, for example, offers similar counsel at greater length in *Ep.* 13. Xenophon of Athens, meanwhile, notes that “when a wife’s looks outshine a slave’s and she [the wife] is fresher and more prettily dressed, it’s a ravishing sight, especially when the wife is also willing to oblige, whereas the slave’s services are compulsory.”⁴¹¹

These texts that discuss the subject in detail are exceptional; most take it for granted. Musonius Rufus criticizes prevailing norms by condemning the self-indulgence of “the man who makes sexual use of his slave, which some people consider blameless, since every owner is held to have the authority to use his slaves as he wishes.”⁴¹² Plutarch attributes similar logic to a Spartan woman, a conventional figure of rectitude, who was sold

⁴¹⁰ Plutarch, *Prae. Conj.* 16 (*Moralia* 140B), ad. *Selected Essays* 287; ἂν οὖν ιδιώτης ἀνὴρ ἀκρατὴς δὲ περὶ τὰς ἡδονὰς καὶ ἀνάγωγος ἑξαμάρτη τι πρὸς ἐταίραν ἢ θεραπαινίδα δέῃ τὴν γαμέτην μὴ ἀγανακτεῖν μηδὲ χαλεπαίνειν λογιζομένην ὅτι παροινίας καὶ ἀκολασίας καὶ ὕβρεως αἰδούμενους αὐτὴν ἑτέρα μεταδίδωσιν.

⁴¹¹ Xenophon, *Oec.* 10.12, ad. Marchant 451; ...ὁπόταν ἀνταγωνίζηται διακόνῳ καθαρωτέρα οὔσα πρεπόντως τε μᾶλλον ἡμεισμένη κινητικὸν γίγνεται ἄλλως τε καὶ ὁπόταν τὸ ἐκοῦσαν χαρίζεσθαι προσῇ ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀναγκαζομένην ὑπηρετεῖν. “Ravishing” is Marchant’s word.

⁴¹² Musonius Rufus 12.11, ad. Lutz 87; ...ὁ δούλῃ ἰδίᾳ πλησιάζων ὅπερ νομίζουσι τινες μάλιστα πῶς εἶναι ἀναίτιον ἐπεὶ καὶ δεσπότης πᾶς αὐτεξούσιος εἶναι δοκεῖ ὃ τι βούλεται χρῆσθαι δούλῳ τῷ ἑαυτοῦ.

into slavery: “When the crier asked her what she knew how to do, she said, ‘To be free.’

And when the buyer ordered her to do something not fitting for a free woman, she said,

‘You will be sorry that your vice has cost you such a property’ and committed suicide.”⁴¹³

This commendable Spartan woman does not object to slaves’ being compelled to do

whatever implicitly sexual dishonourable task her owner had in mind, only to a free-in-spirit

woman’s being compelled to do them. Chariton tells a similar story of his manifestly

fictional heroine Callirhoe, a freeborn girl who is kidnapped by pirates, sold into slavery, and

purchased by a foreign potentate who is attracted to her godlike beauty. Her reply to the

messenger who conveys his advances is

I have been deprived of my country and my parents, but the one thing I have not lost is my noble birth. So, if Dionysius merely wants me as a concubine to satisfy his passion, I will hang myself rather than submit to being treated like a slave. But if he wishes to have me as his legal wife, then I am willing to become a mother... If he does not wish to become a father, let him not become a husband.⁴¹⁴

Callirhoe gets a happy ending, but other characters in similar situations are less fortunate.

Some authors make the connection between freedom and chastity (and thus slavery and the

lack of it) much more explicitly in their stories. In Livy’s telling of Verginia, for example, the

tyrant Appius Claudius

...conceived a guilty passion for [Verginia,] a girl of plebeian birth... [whose father] had betrothed his daughter to Lucius Icilius... [Appius Claudius] tried to prevail on Verginia by presents and promises. When he found her virtue fast against all enticement, he... commissioned a client, Marcus Claudius, to claim the girl as his slave, and to bar any claim on the part of her friends to retain possession of her until the case was tried.... [At a hearing, Icilius] exclaimed, “...I am going to marry this maiden, and I am determined to have a chaste wife... my fiancée will not be kept outside her father's house...” [And Verginius] cried, “It is to Icilius and not to you, Appius, that I have betrothed my daughter; I have brought her up for

⁴¹³ Plutarch, *Sayings of Spartan Women*, 30 (*Moralia* 242D), ad. Babbitt 469; ...τοῦ κήρυκος πυνθανομένου τί ἐπίσταται ἐλευθέρᾳ εἶπεν ἡμεν. ὥς δὲ ὁ ὠνησάμενος προσέταττε τινα αὐτῇ οὐχ ἀρμόζοντα ἐλευθέρᾳ εἰπούσα οἰμώξῃ φθονήσας σεαυτῷ τοιοῦτου κτήματος ἐξήγαγεν ἑαυτήν.

⁴¹⁴ Chariton, *Callirhoe* 3.1.6-7, ad. Goold 135; πατρίδος γονέων ἐστέρημαι μόνην οὐκ ἀπολώλεκα τὴν εὐγένειαν. εἰ μὲν οὖν ὥς παλλακὴν θέλει με Διονύσιος ἔκειν καὶ τῆς ἰδίας ἀπολαύειν ἐπιθυμίας ἀπάγξομαι μᾶλλον ἢ ὕβρει δουλικῇ παραδώσω τὸ σῶμα· εἰ δὲ γαμετὴν κατὰ νόμους κάγῳ γενέσθαι θέλω μήτηρ... εἰ μὴ θέλει πατὴρ γενέσθαι μηδὲ ἀνὴρ ἔστω.

wedlock, not for outrage. Are you determined to satisfy your brutal lusts like cattle and wild beasts?"....[But having been thwarted,] he took up a butcher's knife and plunged it into her breast, saying, "In doing this, my child, I vindicate your freedom in the only way I can."⁴¹⁵

Verginia's chastity and her freedom have become coterminous. This story was well known, and the same concepts that inform Livy's version are equally strong elsewhere. Dionysius of Halicarnassus, for example, says that Verginius' words to his daughter were "Child, I send you to your buried ancestors free and well-reputed. The tyrant has it that if you live, you cannot be either."⁴¹⁶ Verginia is likely an apocryphal figure, but similar reasoning of marriage and status has been at work elsewhere. Pseudo-Demosthenes' *Against Neaera* is a famous ancient example, although its historicity is complicated uncertain. Some more recent instances' is not.⁴¹⁷

⁴¹⁵ Livy, *History of Rome* 3.44-48, ad. Roberts (LCL); *Ap. Claudium virginis plebiae strupandae libido cepit. pater virginis L. Verginius... desponderat filiam L. Ilcio... Appius amore amens pretio ac spe perlicere adortus postquam omnia pudore saepta animaduverterat ad crudelem superbamque vim animum convertit. M. Claudio clienti negotium dedit ut virginem in servitutem adsereret neque cederet secundum libertatem postulantibus vindicias.... [inquit Icilius] expediri virgas et secures iube; non manebit extra domum patris sponsa Icilio... Icilio inquit [Verginius] Appi non tibi filiam despondi et ad nuptias non ad struprum educavi. placet pecundum ferarumque ritu promisce in concubitus ruereab lanio cultro arrepto hoc te uno quo possum ait modo filia in libertatem vindico.*

⁴¹⁶ Dio. Hal., *Ant. Rom.* 11.37.6; Ἐλευθέραν σε καὶ εὐσχήμονα τέκνον ἀπποστέλλω τοῖς κατὰ γῆς προγόνοις· ζῶνα γὰρ ταῦτα οὐκ ἔξῃν ἔχειν ἀμφοτέρα διὰ τὸν τύραννον.

⁴¹⁷ One of the most infamous rulings in the history of slavery litigation was *Dred Scott v. Sanford* (60 U.S. 393, 1856). Justice Benjamin Curtis dissented from the majority decision against Scott's liberty and cited Scott's marriage, which he interpreted as legally valid: "...the inquiry is whether, after the marriage of the plaintiff [Scott] in the [free Wisconsin] Territory, with the consent of [his owner] Dr. Emerson, any other State or country can, consistently with the settled rules of international law, refuse to recognise and treat him as a free man when suing for the liberty of himself, his wife, and the children of the marriage... the female to whom he was married having been taken to the same military post of Fort Snelling as a slave, and Dr. Emerson claiming also to be her master at the time of her marriage, her status, and that of the children of the marriage, are also affected by the same considerations... In that Territory, they were absolutely free persons, having full capacity to enter into the civil contract of marriage.... What, then, shall we say of the consent of the master that the slave may contract a lawful marriage, attended with all the civil rights and duties which belong to that relation; that he may enter into a relation which none but a free man can assume — a relation which involves not only the rights and duties of the slave, but those of the other party to the contract, and of their descendants to the remotest generation? In my judgment, there can be no more effectual abandonment of the legal rights of a master over his slave than by the consent of the master that the slave should enter into a contract of marriage in a free State, attended by all the civil rights and obligations which belong to that condition" (60 U.S. 599-600). Curtis' argument, in other words, was not only that Dred Scott was married because he was not a slave, but also that Dred Scott was not a slave because he was married. See Lea VanderVelde and Sandhya Subramanian, "Mrs. Dred Scott," *Yale Law J* 106 (1997); Stuart Streichler, *Justice Curtis in the Civil War Era: At the Crossroads of American Constitutionalism*. (Charlottesville: U Virginia P, 2005), 142-150.

INDULGENCE

If rich free men took sexual access to slaves for granted, the rich free women for whom slaves sometimes served as “sexual surrogates” do not seem to have been equally accepting of the circumstances. It would seem that not all wives accepted the counsel that Theano and Plutarch offered, and that many who rejected it blamed parties other than their husbands. Valerius Maximus recounts that the extraordinary matron

Tertia Aemilia, wife of the elder Africanus and mother of Cornelia Gracchiae, was so accommodating and patient that although she knew that one of her slaves had become a favourite of her husband, she pretended to be ignorant of the situation, lest she, a woman, charge a great man, world-conquering Africanus, with a lack of self-control. Indeed, her mind was so far from revenge that after Africanus’ death she freed the slave and gave her in marriage to her [Tertia’s] freedman.⁴¹⁸

Tertia’s not punishing the slave for Africanus’ excesses manifests her excellent character. It is not something that Valerius Maximus expects his audience to take for granted. Few ancient sources speak so directly on this topic, although wives’ blaming mistresses (usually free rivals) rather than husbands is a literary commonplace extending back to Hesiod’s presentation of Hera’s jealousy. The experience of most female slaves in this situation did not interest Valerius Maximus or his peers, but insofar as they considered it, it would seem that they expected it usually to be worse. Certainly cruelty such as Tertia Aemilia avoided would not be an anomaly. Harriet Jacobs, one of the few female ex-slave memoirists to address the systematic sexual exploitation of slaves, wrote that in most such cases “[t]he mistress, who ought to protect the helpless victim, has no other feelings towards her but those of jealousy and rage.... Even the little child, who is accustomed to wait on her mistress and her children, will learn, before she is twelve years old, why it is that her mistress hates

⁴¹⁸ Val. Max, *Fac. ac dic.* 7.1, ad. Bailey 73; *atque ut uxoriā quoque fidem attingamus Tertia Aemilia Africani prioris uxor mater Corneliae Gracchorum tantae fuit comitatis et patientiae ut cum sciret viro suo ancillulam ex suis gratam esse dissimulaverit ne domitorem orbis Africanum femina magnum virum impatientiae reum ageret tantumque a vindicta mens eius afuit ut post mortem Africani manumissam ancillam in matrimonium liberto suo daret.*

such and such a one among the slaves. Perhaps the child's own mother is among those hated ones" (45). One of the milder examples she recalls is her seeing a distraught woman whose "mistress had that day seen her [i.e., the slave's] baby for the first time, and in the lineaments of its fair face she saw a likeness to her husband. She turned the bondwoman and her child out of doors, and forbade her ever to return. The slave went to her master... [who] promised to talk with her mistress, and make it all right. The next day she and her baby were sold to a Georgia trader" (184).

Subtler vagaries of free people's marriages than "sexual surrogacy" could also affect slaves. The book of Tobit recounts that

...Sarah, the daughter of Raguel, was reproached by one of her father's maids. For she had been married to seven husbands, and the wicked demon Asmodeus had killed each of them before they had been with her as is customary for wives. So the maid said to her, "You are the one who kills your husbands! See, you have already been married to seven husbands and have not borne the name of a single one of them. Why do you beat us? Because your husbands are dead?" (Tob. 3:7-9).

The text invites its audience to sympathize with Sarah. Cato the Elder, whose agricultural manual was far from unknown in antebellum plantation society, suggests in effect that slaves assume all the responsibilities of marriage without any of the rights. He gives instructions to his overseer about his housekeeper that use marital terms and concepts:

See that the housekeeper performs all her duties. If the master has given her to you as wife, keep yourself only to her... Restrain her from extravagance. She must visit the neighbouring and other women very seldom, and not have them either in the house or in her part of it. She must not go out to meals, or be a gadabout. She must not engage in religious worship... without the orders of the master or mistress; let her remember that the master attends to the devotion for the whole household. She must be neat herself, and keep the farmstead neat and clean. She must clean and tidy the hearth every night before she goes to bed... whenever a holy day comes, she must hang a garland over the hearth, and on those days pray to the

household gods as opportunity offers. She must keep a supply of cooked food on hand for you and the [other] slaves... and she must store [every foodstuff] away diligently.⁴¹⁹

Cato's instructions read like an amalgam of Xenophon, Plutarch, and Juvenal apart from the expectation that a slave husband, unlike a free one, should practice monogamy. The housekeeper is to be kept from all the vices to which free wives (*uxores*) too are prone: *luxuria*, extravagance in socialization and dining, and devotions that do not reflect the explicit will of the *paterfamilias*. She also has the same duties as a *matrona* does for her physical dwelling: personal and domestic cleanliness, ritualistic hearth practices, and the production and maintenance of stores of at least fifteen specific foodstuffs, and “know[ing how] to make good flour and fine spelt” (*farinam bonam et far suptile sciat facere* 143.3; ad. *ibid*). Even his instruction that the overseer “make [the housekeeper] stand in awe of you” (*ea te metuat facito*, *ibid*), while atypical of Roman marital advice, is consistent with Cato's thought.

BUILDING THE HIVE

One of the other ways in which slaves were most often involved in ancient and modern legal marriage, though, was as property. In the antebellum U.S., many states' “Married Women's Property Acts” were fundamentally concerned with human property (see introduction). This was a substantial component of many upper class dowries. Sarah Hicks Williams, the daughter of a northern abolitionist family who married a southern plantation owner, wrote to her parents of her troubled relationship with her mother-in-law, “Mother

⁴¹⁹ Cato, *De Ag.* 143.1-3, ad. Hooper and Ash 125; *Vilicae quae sunt officia curato faciat. Si eam tibi dederit dominus uxorem ea esto contentus... Ne nimium luxuriosa siet. Vicinas aliasque mulieres quam minimum utatur neve domum neve ad sese recipiat. Ad cenam nequo eat neve ambulatrix siet. Tem divinam ni faciat neve mandet... iniussu domini aut dominae. Scito dominum pro tota familia rem divinam facere. Munda siet villam conversam mundeque habeat; focum purum. circumversum cotidie priusquam cubitum eat habeat... festus dies cum erit coronam in focum indat per eosdemque dies lari familiari pro copia supplicet. Cibus tibi et familiae curet uti coctum habeat... haec omnia quotannis diligenter uti condita habeat.*

Williams scolds [me] about as much as ever. But I don't care as much for it, for I know I have tried to do right... She will never forgive Ben for not marrying 'Negroes', never, never, never" (22 May 1855; 411). One former slave "said [to a WPA interviewer] that it was the custom in slavery times that a slave be given to the son or daughter by the white people when they got married." Another, Nancy Washington, recounted that although "My master never have so much coloured people like some of them other white folks have... [he] had enough to give every one of his daughter a servant apiece when they get marry."⁴²⁰ This was how Polly Colbert's parents came together: "My mother, Liza, was owned by the Colbert family and my father, Tony, was owned by the Love family. When Master Holmes and Miss Betty Love was married they fathers give my father and mother to them for a wedding gift" (*OK Narr.* 13, 33). Hannah Crasson's "master would not sell his slaves. He give them to his children when they married off though" (*NC Narr.* 11.1, 189).

The voices of human beings who were affected by this interface of marriage and slavery are lacking for the ancient world. The words of those who caused it, though, have endured to reveal the practice. Ancient records of marriage gifts routinely include slaves among the items transferred, along with cash, jewelry, textiles, household articles, and real estate. Legal documents from Egypt demonstrate that this was the case among the range of cultural groups there and across the span of (as well as after) antiquity. One first-century CE receipt, for example, is for a dowry of not only 1,260 silver drachmas and valuable durable goods but also "a female child slave, born in the [Persian dowry-giver's] houser, whose name

⁴²⁰ Nancy Washington, *SC Narr.* 14.4, 184. Most U.S. slaveowners referred to their slaves as "servants" or "Negroes," not "slaves."

is Ammounous and who was born of the slave Thaubas and is five years of age.”⁴²¹ The document emphasizes Ammounous’ status as a home-born slave, a prized commodity, and specifies who gave birth to her: she is “from the slave Thaubas.” Thaubas is not listed as μήτηρ, nor Ammounous as θυγάτηρ, as the free people are named in relation to one another at the beginning of the document. The discrepancy is consistent with typical usage, which in turn reflects social fiction and legal reality: free people are parents, sons, daughters, and siblings, while slaves are “from slaves (f.)” Jennifer Glancy observes that while “legal documents frequently named the enslaved mothers of slaves[, this was] only as a means of identification. To say that a slave had a certain slave as a mother was an identifying marker as would be a reference to a scar, lisp, or limp” (2002: 19). This is Orlando Patterson’s “natal alienation, the denial of kinship to slaves. Marriage contracts such as this one demonstrate it especially starkly because the alienation that they record is placed directly in the service of the natal continuity of the free. The papyrus shows the groom’s parents promoting their son’s welfare and the bride’s κύριος hers by means that depend on Thaubatos’ incapacity to do the same. If she had any say in the disposition of the property she had borne (or, for that matter, if she was still in Horion’s possession, or even still alive), the contract is silent on the matter. Certainly she had no legal claim to any, just as Ammounous had no legal claim to any particular mother or to any father at all. In socio-legal terms, female slaves gave birth to bastards who received their mothers’, not their fathers’, status. *P. Tet.* 343 is far from unique in its treatment of marriage gifts in general or their human component in particular. A Roman father, for example, endowed his daughter with arable land, gold jewelry, clothing,

⁴²¹ *P. Tet.* 343, ad. Husselman et al. 337; ἐμ προσφορᾶς ἄνευ διατιμήσεως ἀπὸ τῶν ὑπαρχόντων αὐτῷ δουλικῶν σωμάτων οἰκογενὴν πεδίσκην δούλην ἣ ὄνομα Ἀμμουνουῖς ἐκ Θαυβάτος δούλης ἔχουσιν ἡλικίαν ἑτῶν πέντε ἢμ παραδώσι Ὀπίων...

household durables, “and a perfume box and a basket and the slave Heraida and her tunic and old mantle.”⁴²² The slave’s clothes, which are markedly inferior to the bride’s, are part of the same property as her body. A Greek mother, Thermoutharian, augmented her husband Isidoros’ dower gift of cash, jewelry, and 165 drachmas’ worth of textiles with two enslaved children. The bride’s parents, Isidoros and Thermutharion,

agree that after their [own] death the two children, Isarion and Epitychia (born to the above-mentioned slave Sarapus), together with the the off spring who may henceforth be born to them and those children’s offspring, will belong to their daughter Kronia [the bride] or, if she does not survive, to her children. The remainder of the possessions consisting of wooded lands and (arable) lands and building sites which they will leave behind will belong to their other child, Kronion alias Sabinus. The [inanimate moveable property] that they will leave behind will belong to the same Kronia... Thermutharion will [until her death] have the power to manage the two (slave-)children, Isarion and Epitychia (together with all the offspring who from this moment on will be born to them) in any manner she may desire...⁴²³

Kronia’s bequest demonstrates the way in which slaves given in marital transfers could also serve as investment properties for the new household. Not only could their labour add to its prosperity and their persons to its assets, but because slave status and ownership were maternally determined, a female slave could be, almost literally, a nest egg for the new household. Legal records demonstrate the detailed arrangements that could be made for such property, as in the case of a Greek bride named Thais to whose parental dowry of cash, clothing, and jewelry her grandmother also

...confers upon the said Thais [the slave] Callityche and her future offspring, the services and the profits from her to be shared by the husband with the bride so long as they live together; and it shall not be lawful for the husband to [sell or manumit?] the slave without his wife’s consent nor anything that is brought to him by his wife, nor to sell or mortgage or otherwise

⁴²² *P. Mich.* 4703.14-16, ad. Sanders 115; *et cathedran pyxidam cophinum et servam paternam Heraidan et materna tunica et palliu tribacum*.

⁴²³ *P. Lond.* II. 294 II.34-57, ad. Sijpesteijn 169-170; κουράτορος μετὰ τὴν ἑαυτῶν τελευτὴν εἶναι τῆς θυγατρὸς Κρονείας ἢ μὴ περιούσης τῶν αὐτῆς τέκνων τὰ ἐκ τῆς προγεγραμμένης δούλης Ζαραπούτος προγεγονότα ἔγγονα δὴτ’ Ἰσάριον καὶ Ἐπιτυχίαν σὺν τοῖς ἐξ αὐτῶν ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν ἐσομένοις ἐγγόνοις καὶ τὰ ἐκ τούτων ἐσόμενα ἔγγονα τὸ δὲ λοιπὸν εἶναι τῷ ἐτέρῳ αὐτῶν υἱῷ Κρονεῖῳ τῷ καὶ Ζαβίνῳ τῶν υἱῶν αὐτῶν καταλειφθησομένων ὑπαρχόντων δενδρικῶν καὶ κλήρων καὶ οἰκοπέδων ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν ὑπὸ αὐτῶν καταλειφθησομένων ἐπιπλόων καὶ σκεύη καὶ ἐνδομενεῖαν εἶναι αὐτῆς Κρονίας... τὴν δὲ Θερμουθάριον ἅμα κατὰ τῶν δουλικῶν ἐγγόνων δύο Ἰσαρίου καὶ Ἐπιτυχίας μετὰ πάντων καὶ τῶν ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν ἐξ αὐτῶν ἐσομένων ἐγγόνων ἔχειν τὴν ἐξουσίαν οἰκονομεῖν ὥς ἐάν αἰρήται καθάπερ ἐκόντες συνκεχωρήκασιν.

dispose of his property[, which consists of] a house, yard and court and its fixtures and his slaves Sarapous and Nicarous and the children of Nicarous, Sarapous and Cerdon and Epicharmus, and the future offspring of them or any others, or any additional property which he may acquire, without the consent of the bride.⁴²⁴

Here Patterson's "natal alienation" and "general dishonour" converge in the patriarchal social system (patriarchal in the literal sense). Slaves had no recognized fathers and no recognized honour and thus, Jennifer Glancy observes, "a householder who impregnated a female slave increased his stock of slaves" (*Slavery*, 21). Slaveholders were not circumspect in this matter even in the antebellum U.S., where such conduct was one of the most common and potent indictments of them. Annie Burton, a former slave, wrote in her memoir that "If a slave man and woman wished to marry, a party would be arranged some Saturday night among the slaves. The marriage ceremony consisted of the pair jumping over a stick. If no children were born within a year or so, the wife was sold" (5). Harriet Jacobs wrote before abolition that "Women [slaves] are considered of no value, unless they continually increase their owner's stock. They are put on a par with [domestic] animals" (76). Frederick Douglass' onetime hirer

may be said to have been guilty of compelling his woman slave to commit the sin of adultery... Mr. Covey was a poor man; he was just commencing in life; he was only able to buy one slave; and, shocking as is the fact, he bought her, as he said, for *a breeder*. This woman was named Caroline... She was a large, able-bodied woman, about twenty years old. She had already given birth to one child, which proved her to be just what he wanted. After buying her, he hired a married man of Mr. Samuel Harrison, to live with him one year; and him he used to fasten up with her every night! The result was, that, at the end of the year, the miserable woman gave birth to twins. At this result Mr. Covey seemed to be highly pleased, both with the man and the wretched woman. Such was his joy, and that of his wife, that nothing they could do for Caroline during her confinement was too good, or too hard, to be done. The children were regarded as being quite an addition to his wealth (62-63).

⁴²⁴ *P. Oxy.* 496, ad. Grenfell and Hunt 211; ...δίδωσι τῇ αὐτῇ Θαΐδι Καλλιτύχης καὶ τῶν ἐσομένων ἐξ αὐτῆς ἐκγόνων τὴν δὲ δουλείαν καὶ ἀποφορὰς αὐτῆς συνέξει ὁ γαμῶν... τῇ γαμουμένῃ ἐφ' ὅσον σύνεισι ἀλλήλοις οὐκ ἐξόντος τῷ γαμοῦντι εἴσθαι τὴν δούλην... οὐδὲ τι προσφερόμενον οἰκίαν καὶ αἴθριον καὶ αὐλὴν καὶ τὰ ταύτης χρηστήρια καὶ δούλα σώματα Χαραποῦν καὶ Νικαροῦν καὶ τὰ τῆς Νικαροῦτος ἐκγονα Ζαραποῦν καὶ Κέρδωνα καὶ Ἐπίχαρμον καὶ τὰ ἐσόμενα ἐξ αὐτῶν ἢ ἄλλων ἐκγονα καὶ ἃ ἐάν πρὸς τούτοις ἐπικτήσθαι ἢ προσκ... πωλεῖν οὐδὲ ὑποτιθεσθαι οὐδὲ ἄλλως καταχρηματίζειν χωρὶς εὐδοκousης τῆς γαμουμένης (internal ellipses editors').

Mr. Covey was not exceptional. Another former slave recalled, “My master wanted his slaves to have plenty of children. He never would make you do much work when you had a lot of children, and had them fast. My ma had nineteen children, and it looked like she had one every ten months. My master said he didn’t care if she never worked if she kept having children like that for him.”⁴²⁵ Even this owner’s words were not completely honest: While he exempted the woman from fieldwork, which was within the range of common treatment for pregnant slaves, nonetheless he “put Ma in the kitchen to cook for the slaves who didn’t have families.” Nancy Washington, whose less-than-wealthy owner still managed to give each of his daughters a slave as a wedding gift (see above), was circumspect: “My Master never have so much coloured people like some of them other white folks have... Never have nothing but women coloured peoples. My Master say he ain’t want no man coloured peoples.”⁴²⁶ Harriet Jacobs was more direct: “if the white parent is the *father*, instead of the mother, the offspring are unblushingly reared for the market” (81). This was true regardless of paternity. When Jacobs resisted her owner’s advances and chose to have children with a free African-American, “My children grew finely; and Dr. Flint would often say to me, with an exulting smile, ‘These brats will bring me a handsome sum of money one of these days’” (122).

This was the common practice of slaveowners who were aware of strong socio-religious condemnation of such behaviour, condemnation that was linked to potentially effective political opposition. Such slaveowners and their apologists consistently made public denials that any such situations were common, no matter how plain or abundant the

⁴²⁵ WPA, *GA Narr.* IV.4, 361.

⁴²⁶ WPA, *SC Narr.* 14.4, 184.

evidence to the contrary. It is not surprising that slaveowners in a society where such condemnations were fewer and less effective were open about this facet of slavery. David Braund suggests that there “is every likelihood that we underestimate the extend of slave-breeding in Greek society... Xenophon presents [it] as an entirely unremarkable practice.”⁴²⁷ In the passage to which Braund refers, Xenophon speaks of

...the women [slave]’s quarters... [which are] separated by a bolted door from the men’s, so that nothing which ought to be moved may be taken out, and that the slaves may not breed without our leave. For honest slaves generally prove more loyal if they have offspring together, but the disobedient ones are likely to become worse if they are allowed to be together.⁴²⁸

Edmund Brant would concur, noting a multitude of references scattered throughout medical literature “showing, for example, that even a sickly slave woman with multiple symptoms might be bought and soon taken in search of a cure and restored to menstruation. Presumably she had been sold cheap as damaged stock but was now restored and able to reproduce” (2011: 126).

These are all urban writers. The agriculturalists who wrote about the *latifundi* were, if anything, less circumspect. Varro, who had read Xenophon thoroughly, is baldly concerned with population. Without reference to any desirable or undesirable traits, he says by way of recommendation that “To women, too, who are unusually prolific, and who ought to be rewarded for the bearing of a certain number of offspring, I have granted exemption from work and sometimes even freedom after they had reared many children. A mother of

⁴²⁷ David Braund, “The Slave Supply in Classical Greece,” in *CWHS* (ed. Bradley and Cartledge), 125..

⁴²⁸ *Oec.* 9.5, ad. Marchant 441; τὴν γυναικωνίτιν... θύρα βαλανωτῇ ὥρισμένην ἀπὸ τῆς ἀνδρωνίτιδος ἵνα μήτη ἐκφέρηται ἔνδοθεν ὅ τι μὴ δεῖ μήτε τεκνοποιῶνται οἱ οἰκέται ἄνευ τῆς ἡμετέρας γνώμης. οἱ μὲν γὰρ χρηστοὶ παιδοποιησάμενοι εὐνούστεροι ὥς ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ οἱ δὲ πονηροὶ συζυγέντες εὐπορώτεροι πρὸς τὸ κακουργεῖν γίγνονται.

three sons was exempted from work; a mother of more freed.”⁴²⁹ He makes no mention of how these women became “unusually prolific” in the first place, much less their reactions to the consequences of their fertility. The better behaviour that he thinks family life will bring slaves is simply an additional benefit: “The foreman are to be made more zealous by rewards [including *peculia* and] mates from among their fellow-slaves to bear them children; for by this means they are made more steady and much more attached to the place. Thus, it is on account of such relationships that slave families of Epirus have the best reputation and bring the best prices.”⁴³⁰ Varro’s wording is revealing: overseers are to have spouses in order to give them children. Free men, in contrast — or, by the logic of the slave system, men, a category that excluded slaves — took or received wives in order to have legitimate children, alternatively specified as free children. A rare privileged slave might be granted what his owner termed a *conjunx* and a *familia*, but this was predicated on the fact that they were not “really” either. Attachment to partners and children increased slaves’ productivity and commanded higher prices when an owner decided to sell them away from the rest of their community. This would not seem to have been an uncommon occurrence; *vernae* or otherwise termed “home-born slaves” were marked because they were different from most slaves. The value ascribed to them indicates that they were not common enough to be taken for granted. The vulnerable *familiae* that slaveowners sometimes encouraged were not a measure of humanity afforded to slaves. They were an investment. Varro also makes clear

⁴²⁹ Columella, *De Ag.* 1.8.19, ad. Ash 95; ...*qui strenue atque industrie se gerunt. Feminis quoque fecundioribus quarum in subole certus numerus honorari debet otium nonnumquam et libertatem dedimus cum complures natos educassent. Nam cui tres erant filii vacatio cui plures libertas quoque contingebat.*

⁴³⁰ Varro, *De Ag.* 1.17.5, ad. Hooper and Ash 227; *Praefectos alacriores faciendum praemiis dandaque opera ut habeant peculium et coniunctas conservas e quibus habeant flios. Eo enim fiunt firmiores ac coniunctiores fundo. Itaque propter has cognationes Epiroticae familiae sunt illustriores ac cariores.*

that the concept of human livestock, Aristotle's "man-footed creature," was thriving in the Roman world:

The science [of animal husbandry] embraces nine divisions under the three topics of three divisions each: the topic of the smaller animals, with its three divisions, sheep, goats, and swine; the second topic, that of the larger animals, with likewise its three classes naturally separate, oxen, donkeys, horses. The third topic comprises animals which are kept not for the profit derived from them, but for the purpose of the above groups, or as a result of them, [namely] mules, dogs, and herdsmen...⁴³¹

Lest there be any mistake about his meaning — for example, should anyone think of increasing herdsmen asexually (for example, through capture) without *re*-producing them, Varro has one of the dialogue's participants, Atticus, clarify the point:

How will you get a ninefold division in the case of mules and herdsmen, where there is neither breeding nor bearing? ...I grant you that in the case of the humans the category can be retained, as they keep women in their huts in the winter ranches, and some have them even in the summer, thinking that this is worthwhile in order to more easily keep the herdsmen with their herds; and by reproduction they enlarge their slave gangs and make the cattle-raising more profitable.⁴³²

This is far from the language of legitimacy and posterity that characterized discussions on the purpose of marriage. Attempts to reconcile the two were the stuff of satire, as in Martial:

Quirinalis won't consider having a wife,
although he wants to have children. He's found
a way to do it: he fucks the maids
and populates house and farm with equestrian slaves.

⁴³¹ Varro, *De Ag.* 2.1.12, ad. Hooper and Ash 319; *Ea partes habet novem discretas ter ternas ut sit una de minoribus pecudibus cuius genera tria oves caprae sus, altera de pecore maiore in quo sunt item ad tres species natura discreti boves asini equi. Tertia pars est in pecuaria quae non parantur ut ex iis capiatur fructus sed propter eam aut ex ea sunt, muli canes pastores.*

⁴³² Varro, *De Ag.* 2.1.25-26 (cf. 2.10.6-9), ad. Hooper and Ash 329; *Quod pacto enim erunt in mulis et pastoribus novenae partes ubi nec admissurae nec feturae observatur? ...Sed do etiam in hominibus posse novenarium retineri numerum. quod in hibernis habent in villis mulieres, quidam etiam in aestivis et id pertinere putant quo facilius ad greges pastores retineant et puerperio familiam faciunt maiorem et rem pecuariam fructuosiore.* Mules are the sterile offspring of a jackass and a mare.

He's the father of a real *familia*, Quirinalis.⁴³³

WAITING FOR THE BRIDEGROOM

All of this would have been in the background of the upper-class weddings for which slaves performed the labour. The scribes who wrote and messengers who carried invitations, the cooks and servers who provided the wedding banquet, in Rome the *ornatrices* who arranged the bride's hair and the gladiator whose blood stained the spear used to part it, in the east the bearers who carried the litter, the musicians who accompanied the processions — all were likely to be slaves. Comedies indicate as much, with parents of the bride and groom ordering slaves to perform a range of wedding preparations. Presumably slaves, too, would have cleaned up after the festivities had concluded.

Slaves also performed most of the labour involved in the elaborate weddings of the antebellum U.S. elite, but their experiences differed from the Roman world's slaves' in that the latter do not seem to have been allowed weddings at all. Marci F. Weiner, examining the writings of free and enslaved South Carolina plantation women of the mid-nineteenth century, notes that

Once the details of [slave] courtship were resolved [to the slaveowners' approval], white women often ensured that the resulting weddings were memorable.... [assuming] that slave women were eager for the finery and delicacies that they could provide. White women also assumed that, like them, black women considered weddings important and thus were only

⁴³³ Martial, *Ep.* 1.84:
uxorem habendam non putat Quirinalis
cum velit habere filios et invenit
quo possit istud more futuit ancillas
domumque et agros implet equitibus vernis
pater familiae verus est Quirinalis.

indulging their wishes. Given the fragility of slave marriages... mistresses' assumptions could mask slaves' very different experiences (1998: 82).⁴³⁴

American slaves' weddings reinforced their natal alienation: they had no legal force.

Ancient evidence suggests a potentially different situation. Given the manifest interest of ancient Mediterranean slaves' and former slaves' manifest interest in appropriating for themselves the status and the full cultural vocabulary of marriage (see above), it would be unwise to reject the possibility that weddings, the symbol and the inception of marriage, were relevant. What makes Revelation notable in this contexts is the detail with which it deploys the slavery/prostitution and freedom/marriage equivalence. Like most other texts, it does not identify the dichotomy directly. There was little reason for any text to do so: it was foundational and thus needed no explanation. This has obscured the issue for modern scholarship, where status has only recently become a subject of interest in the study of marriage. Proclamations about the central importance of marriage in women's lives in antiquity are broadly accurate insofar as they speak of free women. Indeed, Greek and Latin texts use not only the categories of free and enslaved person but just as much those of person (ἄνθρωπος, *homo*) and slave (δούλος, *servus*). A γυνή or *mulier* is usually a woman whose freedom is assumed. A δούλη or *serva* is a slave whose femininity is marked.

This is not to say that associations between marriage and slavery did not exist in ancient culture. The early Roman *coemptio* form of marriage was a "fictive sale" of the bride

⁴³⁴ Weiner cites a range of primary evidence for her observations, noting in particular white women's boasting of the wedding accoutrements and entertainments they had provided and the implications of such actions and claims (ibid; cf. 260 n.41, 42). On slaves' weddings in the antebellum U.S., see also Thomas Will, "Weddings on Contested Grounds," *Historian* (1999), 99-117; Marie Schwartz, *Born in Bondage: Growing Up Enslaved in the Antebellum South* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard U P, 2000), 199-205; Emily West, *Chains of Love*, 19-34; Berry, "Swing the Sickle," 55-59; Rebecca Fraser, *Courtship and Love Among the Enslaved in North Carolina* (Jackson: U Mississippi P, 2007), 88-100; Patrick O'Neil, "Bosses and Broomsticks: Ritual and Authority in Antebellum Slave Weddings," *J Southern His.* 75 (2009);. On specific practices and their role, see Alan Dundes, "'Jumping the Broom': On the Origin and Meaning of an African-American Wedding Custom," *JAF* 433 (1996), and C.W. Sullivan, "'Jumping the Broom': A Further Consideration of the Origins of an African-American Wedding Custom," *JAF* 436 (1997).

to the groom, and post-exilic Jewish sources demonstrate a similar understanding of the deuteronomic *mohar* payment, a mistake that both Labovitz and Satlow explore in detail.⁴³⁵ Athenian domestic ritual enacted the slave's status as a dependent outsider within in a ceremony for slave purchase, the καταχύσματα, whose similarities to bride-welcoming customs Kelly Wrenhaven emphasizes. Although and because classical political thought considered the antithesis between marriage and slavery to be foundational, there was a logic to bringing a newly acquired slave into the household with a wedding-like ceremony. This ceremony, Wrenhaven notes, itself invited contrast with the bringing of a bride into the household:

This ceremony, which consisted of “showering” nuts and dried fruit such as figs over the new bride or slave, was intended to bring good fortune, presumably to the *oikos* or, more specifically, to the husband or master. Aristophanes indicates that this custom took place at the hearth, where the new slave or bride would... receive the offering (*Wealth* 795). Where the bride would keep her given name, however, the slave would be provided a new one (2012: 31-32).

The καταχύσματα, then, emphasized that someone was being incorporated into the household and was expected to be beneficial to the household. Regardless of who was being incorporated, though, it evoked marriage, upon which the household in part rested and from which slaves were barred. I would suggest, however, that the showering of nuts and fruit over a bride was supposed to benefit her as well as her new husband and household. These were understood to represent wealth and fecundity, both of which were considered blessings for wives. Entering matrimony, i.e., potentially becoming the mother of legitimate children, was a fulfillment for a (free) woman and gave her access to the eventual role of an ancestress and a place in the domestic cult.

⁴³⁵ See especially Satlow, *Jewish Marriage*, 164-166, 199-206; Labovitz, *Marriage and Metaphor*, 210-220, and “The Purchase of His Money: Slavery and the Ethics of Jewish Marriage,” in *Beyond Slavery* (ed. Brooten).

For a slave, in contrast, entering a new household conferred benefit only to others. A slave's contribution to a household's resources was of no more direct benefit to the slave him- or herself than was a plow's. A household's members, not its property, benefitted from the increase of that property. All this would seem to have special potency in the case of a male slave, who was not only reminded that he could never receive or give a woman in marriage (see below) but also of the ways in which he was potentially feminized. Thus Demosthenes, for example, according to prevailing mores impugns several parties' morality by reproaching a freedman who "has not scrupled to marry his mistress and lives as a husband with her who scattered the sweetmeats over him when he was bought as a slave."⁴³⁶ This man has not only violated the taboo on sexual contact between free women and servile men but in doing so has taken on the role of a wife rather than a husband. Aristophanes exploits this implication of the ceremony for comic effect in *Plautus*, wherein the free protagonist's wife makes to mark the entry of their slave's guest into the house. She first proclaims to the slave, Cario, that "you've brought me such good news, I'll string a garland of cakes for you!"⁴³⁷ That is, she is so happy about his news that she wants to incorporate&marry/feminize&buy him a second time. Aristophanes extends the irony by having her suggest a similar welcome (788-790a) to the guest himself, a recently blind beggar who is actually the god Asclepius in disguise. The guest is not specified to be a slave, but the humour lies in the housewife's offer of the hospitality appropriate to one. Plutus/Asclepius saves face for both of them and declines in her offer in its connotation but accepts in its

⁴³⁶ Demosthenes, *Or.* 45.74, ad. Murray; οὐκ ὥκνησε τὴν δέσποιναν γῆμαι καὶ ἡ τὰ καταχύσματ' αὐτοῦ κατέχευε τόθ' ἡνίκ' ἐωνήθη ταύτῃ συνοικεῖν οὐδὲ προῖκα πέντε τάλανθ' αὐτῷ γράψα.

⁴³⁷ Aristoph., *Plu.* 764-766a; ad. O'Neill; κάγω δ' ἀναδρῆσαι βούλομαι εὐαγγελίᾳ σε κριβανωτῶν ὄρμαθῶ τοιαῦτ' ἀπαγγείλαντα.

tokens, telling her, “I will accept [the token gifts] at your fireside, as custom dictates. That way we will avoid a ridiculous scene; it is not proper for a poet to throw dried figs and dainties to the spectators.”⁴³⁸ This text may suggest that by receiving the gifts at the hearth, Plutus/Asclepius is departing from the κατὰ φύσιν, at least as Aristophanes knows it. This would accord with the ideal (not the reality) of a wife’s domain as being inside the physical household and the domestic slave’s task of departing from it to perform vulgar chores such as grocery shopping on her behalf.

Slaves’ actual weddings, however, seem to have been oxymoronic in the world of the Roman empire. The exclusion is proverbial: the *Gospel of Philip*, for example, tells its hearers that “a bridal chamber is not for the animals, nor is it for the slaves, nor for defiled women; but it is for free men and virgins” (69; *NHLE* 151). Karen Hersch argues plausibly that some Roman slaves may have observed some wedding customs for themselves (2010: 29-33), but the only reference to one sanctioned by slaveowners is in Plautus’ *Casina*. The prologue addresses the impossibility of the scenario:

There are people here now who I think
are saying, “By Hercules! What’s this? Slave weddings?
Will slaves marry, or take a wife?
They’ve invented something that no people does.
But I insist: It *does* happen in Greece and Carthage
and even in our own country in Apulia.
There, slaves’ weddings are an even greater
affair than free people’s. If anyone wants,
bet a pitcher of mead against me — as long as we have
a Phoenician or a Greek to judge, or even
an Apulian, for that matter.

⁴³⁸ Ibid, 795-799; ἔνδον γε παρὰ τὴν ἐστίαν ὥσπερ νόμος ἔπειτα καὶ τὸν φόρτον ἐκφύγοιμεν ἄν. οὐ γὰρ πρεπῶδες ἐστὶ τῷ διδασκάλῳ ἰσχάδια καὶ τρωγάλια τοῖς θεωμένοις προβαλόντ’...

What? No takers? I see that no one is thirsty!⁴³⁹

Slave weddings happen somewhere in the world, Plautus insists — not so far away as to be unfathomable, but far enough that no one who can confirm or deny his words is likely to challenge him. Plautus mocks the occasion even as he establishes it, and the prologue preempts the issue so that the plot can proceed unencumbered by it.⁴⁴⁰

Marriage itself sometimes emerges as the division between slavery and freedom, i.e., a means of emancipation.⁴⁴¹ A wedding effects manumission in *Callirhoe*, although the detail is easy for a modern reader to overlook. The kidnapped young lady Callirhoe agrees to a union with her purchaser Dionysios on the condition that he marry her as a legitimate wife, a condition he accepts. Chariton narrates their actions and considerations in detail, but there is no mention of any formal act of manumission. This could have occurred in a

⁴³⁹ Ad. de Melo 19; Plau., *Cas.* 67-78:
sunt hic inter se quos nunc credo dicere
quaeso hercle quid istuc est serviles nuptiae
servin uxorem ducent aut poscent sibi
novom attulerunt quod fit nusquam gentium.
at ego aio id fieri in Graecia et Carthagini
et hic in nostra terra in Apulia
maioreque opere ibi serviles nuptiae
quam liberales etiam curari solent.
id ni fit mecum pignus si quis volt dato
in urnam mulsi Poenus dum iudex siet.
vel Graecus adeo vel mea causa Apulus.
quid nunc. nihil agitis. sentio nemo sitit.

⁴⁴⁰ Here I differ from Hersch, who argues that while the *Casina* “suggests that a slave wedding was unusual [in Rome]... not one of the characters in the play declares the idea... to be aberrant; even neighbors offer to help the *materfamilias* in her preparations for the festivities” (*Roman Wedding*, 30). Based on the play’s opening, I infer the opposite. She also observes (ibid) that it is the slaveowners, not the slaves themselves, who arrange the match and host the wedding in the wedding. Slaveowners certainly attempted to effect or prevent specific unions for their slaves, and in the former case some may have employed ceremony, but there is a telling absence of evidence for slaves’ weddings. One of the only other complete texts that presents an analogous situation is *Daphnis and Chloe*, but the protagonists turn out to be free after all. Longus is somewhat cagey about status and legality in any event.

⁴⁴¹ VanderVelde and Subramanian, “Mrs. Dred Scott;” Paul Lokken, “Marriage as Slave Emancipation in Seventeenth-Century Rural Guatemala,” *Americas* 58 (2001); Francesca Reduzzi Merola, “L’esclave qui agit comme un homme libre: «*Servus vicarius emit mancipioque accepit puellam*»,” in *Esclavage* (ed. Anastasiadis and Doukellis), 315-319; Streichler, *Justice Curtis*, 142-150.

liberty-granting ceremony, as in Roman law, or through fictive sale to a deity, as in the Athenian cultural sphere. Instead, the narrative proceeds directly from Dionysios' assent to his wedding preparations. He wants to marry Callirhoe immediately, on his rural estate, but decides on city nuptials instead:

He thought about it in these terms. "Am I really going to marry her out here in the middle of nowhere as if she really were a slave? I'm not such an ingrate that I won't have a ceremony to celebrate my wedding to Callirhoe... It would be best, in the case [that the marital claim is later contested on the grounds of Callirhoe's free birth] to say, 'I don't remember how, but I heard a free woman was visiting the area. I married her, legally and publicly, in the city, and she agreed to the marriage herself... I'll be in a stronger position for the trial if I act before the law as a husband and not as a master.'⁴⁴²

He plans to cease being her master, which at this point in the text he undeniably is, without ever freeing her. She will be freed by her wedding.

Chariton's implicit audience could register this scenario as plausible (relatively speaking) in part because of its correlation to reality. A free or freed man could not marry a female slave, whether she belonged to him or to someone else, but some manumissions occurred to allow slaves to marry a freed or free person. Male slaves could be freed in order to marry freedwomen whose manumissions had preceded their own, but it was more common for female slaves to be manumitted in order to marry free men. The gender discrepancy connects to the taboo on sexual contact between freeborn women and non-free men, but violations of that taboo (albeit imagined ones) are instructive. Seneca the Elder sets his forensic students a hypothetical case in which "a tyrant gave slaves permission to kill their masters and rape their mistresses... Though all the other slaves raped their mistresses, [one] man's slave kept [his owner's] daughter inviolate. When the tyrant had been killed,

⁴⁴² Chariton, *Callirhoe* 3.2.7-9, ad. Trzaskoma 39-40; Καὶ τότε οὖν ἐπέστησε τοιούτοις λογισμοῖς "ἐν ἔρημίᾳ μέλλω γαμεῖν ὥς ἀληθῶς ἀργυρώντον. Οὐχ οὕτως εἰμὶ ἀχάριστος ἵνα μὴ ἑορτάσω τοὺς Καλλιρρόης γάμους..." Ἀριστον οὖν τότε λέγειν "ἐγὼ γυναῖκα ἐλευθέραν ἐπιδημήσασαν οὐκ οἶδ' ὅπως ἤκουσα· ἐκδομένην ἑαυτὴν ἐν τῇ πόλει φανερώς κατὰ νόμους ἔγημα'..." Ἰσχυρότερος γενήσομαι πρὸς τὴν κρίσιν ἄνδρὸς οὐ δεσπότου νομῶ χρώμενος.

the chief men [who had fled] returned and crucified their slaves. But this man manumitted his slave, and betrothed his daughter to him. His son accuses him of insanity.”⁴⁴³ In the disputes that follow, at least two of the students assigned to represent the sons lament the situation with untranslatable puns linking weddings and manumission: *Nuptiis suis manu missus est* (7.6.3; “He is put in his own hand at his wedding”) and *ita iste dexteram sororis meae nisi dum manu mittitur non contigit* (7.6.12; “so *this* man did not bring my sister’s right hand together [with his] until he was put in his own hand”). Another, less verbally striking contribution confirms the impression that the wedding ceremony is a manumission ceremony: *Eadem hora et libertum fecit et generum* (7.6.10; “the same hour made him a freedman and a lineage member”).

It is this transformation that illuminates the nuptial conclusion of Revelation. If “Babylon” and her royal cortège are a πόρνη and her Johns, “Jerusalem” and her inhabitants are a differently designated group of honourless people. Revelation designates literal slave trading as the apex of sin, but it also employs a casual rhetoric of slavery in what seems to be the same unproblematized way as other EJEK texts. If the superscription is original, such language opens the whole book: God “gave [it] to show his slaves” (ὁ θεὸς δεῖξαι τοῖς δούλοις) through “his slave John” (τῷ δούλῳ αὐτοῦ Ἰωάννῃ, 1:1). Even if it is not, the epistolary section still has God condemning Jezebel for “beguiling my slaves to fornicate” (πλανᾷ τοὺς ἑμοὺς δούλους πορνεῦσαι, 2:20), establishing a recurring designation for the faithful, generally (7:3, 19:5, 19:10, 22:3, 22:6) or as prophets (10:7, 11:18,

⁴⁴³ Seneca, *Controv.* 7.6, ad. Winterbottom 119; *Tyrannus permisit servis dominis interemptis dominas suas rapere... Cum omnes servi dominas suas vitiassent servos eius virginem servavit. Occiso tyranno reversi sunt principes. In crucem servos sustulerunt ille manu misit et filiam collocavit. Accusatur a filio dementiae.*

15:3) or witnesses (19:2). Indications of status also expresses “everyone,” as in “all, both rich and poor, both slave and free” (13:16, καὶ τοὺς πλουσίους καὶ τοὺς πτωχοὺς καὶ τοὺς ἐλευθέρους καὶ τοὺς δούλους; cf. 19:18) or more simply “everyone, free and slave” (πᾶς δοῦλος καὶ ἐλεύθερος, 6:15). Both these usage types are common in contemporary Jewish and Christian literature.⁴⁴⁴ Revelation, unlike some other texts, uses them only in passing, not exploring what it means to be, for example, a slave of God, or to have been ransomed or purchased by Christ. At one level, they are simply idioms, used by the free to liken ideal behaviour to the conduct expected of “[violently dominated,] natively alienated and generally dishonoured persons.”

At another level, however, the situation appears more complicated. Marvin Suber Williams observes an intensification of the language of slavery in Revelation’s concluding chapters:

...[οἱ δοῦλοι] is utilized in the opening section [of Rev. 22] of those who will occupy the most prominent place with God and the Lamb. But this opening section belongs to the larger narrative that discloses the prominence of οἱ δοῦλοι in Rev. 22.3-4. Everything that precedes 22.3-5 is what I label as a long, expansive prelude that raises the question: To whom is John referring to [*sic*] as the inhabitants of the New Jerusalem? The answer is found in Rev. 22.3-5 — “the slaves.”

Williams’ exegesis focuses on other aspects of the text, but his observations make clear that the language of slavery intensifies around the imagery of marriage. The faithful are called the slaves of God no fewer than three times in Rev. 19:1-10, after no more than six times and possibly as few as four in the eighteen preceding chapters. It occurs twice again when the seer is led into his new home, the celestial Jerusalem. A host of factors inform this usage,

⁴⁴⁴ See Martin, *Slavery as Salvation*, 87-116; Combes, *The Metaphor of Slavery*, *passim*; Byron, *Slavery Metaphors*, 49-58, and *Recent Research on Paul and Slavery* (Sheffield: Phoenix P, 2009), 67-91; Glancy, *Slavery*, 29-38, and “Slavery and the Rise of Christianity,” in *CWHS* (ed. Bradley and Cartledge), 457-461; Hezser, “Impact of Household Slaves,” 418-424, *Jewish Slavery in Antiquity*, 327-345, and “Slavery and the Jews,” in *CWHS* (ed. Bradley and Cartledge), 449-452; Harrill, *Slaves in the NT*, 17-34.

and it does not occur only because or most importantly because of the nuptial association, any more than crowns and white garments do so. But one of the functions that it serves is to unify the metaphors of slavery to God and marriage to God in a context of eschatological completion. In the world ruled by “Babylon,” the faithful are to endure as the devoted slaves of God, even while being abused by the slave-trader “Babylon.” At the same time, they are awaiting the bridegroom to whom they were betrothed during Christ’s appearance on earth. The cosmic fulfillment of Christ’s *paraousia* does not necessarily involve abolition (although slavery may not exist in the new Eden). What it does entail is manumission of good slaves for the purpose and by the means of marriage.

Conclusion

Revelation's imagery of eschatological marriage and weddings is deeply intertwined with its imagery of slavery. These interlocked metaphors operate within the context of the book's hatred of Rome and its vision of justice in the final restoration of cosmic order. Retributive violence is an integral part of the justice imagined. "Babylon" has drawn Revelation's hate with its violent economy of luxury and slavery. This hate is not necessarily completely consistent in intellectual or ethical terms, but it presents an internally coherent vision of poetic justice. This justice involves "Babylon's" receiving exactly what it has inflicted: spectacular and very real violence and degradation that would have been inescapably familiar to ancient audiences. That "good" people will enjoy Babylon's overdue punishment and well-deserved suffering is a necessary product of the text's fundamental opposition between Babylon and Jerusalem. Jerusalem's wedding is likewise the mirror image of Babylon's demise. The justice that this vision articulates is the product of eschatological cosmology and social-historical circumstances alike. The socio-historical components of Revelation's ethos are intimately connected not only to gender and sexuality, which have been well studied, but equally to slavery and freedom, which have been less explored. They are no less problematic or more straightforward, and one of their most important aspects is also one of the most complicated to address: that of reception history.

Biblical scholarship in the English-speaking world in part grew out of attempts to determine what the Bible "really said" about slavery. From the emergence of the Atlantic slave trade until the widespread abolition of legal slavery, Jews and Christians argued over whether the Bible permitted or prohibited involvement with slavery, and over how it did so. In the mostly anglophone, Protestant sphere of the U.S. slave system, slaveholding

interpreters developed reading strategies consistent with their own way of life, and abolitionists with their own lives and values. The divide between them was made apparent when established Protestant denominations (e.g., U.S. Methodists, Baptists, and Presbyterians) fissured along sectional lines and evolved accordingly. Molly Oshatz (2011) argues that attempts to bring abolitionism (among whites) strictly in line with biblical views of slavery were crucial to the emergence both of modern liberal Protestantism and countervailing strands of Protestantism (both again mostly among whites).⁴⁴⁵ Abolitionist hermeneutics were essential to the development of African-American initiated Protestant churches, as well as to rejection of biblical authority among some non-white and white abolitionists.⁴⁴⁶ This was also the context in which, J. Albert Harrill notes, exegeses of Hebrew and Greek terms such as עֶבֶד and δούλος “constituted an early form of biblical criticism” (2006: 191). He observes that while critical and historical approaches to the Bible are correctly understood to have emerged in response to discoveries in the natural science, biblical studies historiographers

have neglected, however, another significant ingredient in this cultural mix. The antislavery and abolitionist interpretations of the New Testament during the American slave controversy

⁴⁴⁵ The scholarship on modern controversies (among whites) over whether the Bible condemns or condones slavery is fairly robust. Willard Swartley provides a useful synopsis (literally) of some major arguments and hermeneutics in the ft chapter of his *Slavery, Sabbath, War, and Women*. (Kitchener, Ontario: Herald, 1983); cf. David Brion Davis, *The Problem of Slavery*,) 523-556; Genovese and Fox-Genovese, “Religious Ideals,” “Divine Sanction of Social Order,” and *Mind of the Master Class*, 505-527; Mark Noll, “The Bible and Slavery,” in *Religion and the American Civil War* (ed. R.M. Miller et al.; New York: Oxford U P, 1998), 43-73; Harrill, *Slaves in the NT*, on abolitionist (166-180) and pro-slavery (180-191) exegesis; Syvester A. Johnson, “The Bible, Slavery, and the Problem of Authority,” in *Beyond Slavery* (ed. Brooten), 232-248 in Brooten, *Beyond*. See also John Campbell, “Necessary Remembrance.”

⁴⁴⁶ On Black, abolitionist hermeneutics, see Jordan, *Black over White*, 122-128, 212-215, 422-26 542-45; Genovese, *Roll, Jordan*, 232-55; John Saillant, “Origins of African-American Biblical Hermeneutics in Eighteenth-Century Black Opposition to the Slave Trade and Slavery,” in Vincent Wimbush, *African-Americans and the Bible* (New York: Continuum, 2000), 237-250; Randall C. Bailey, “But It’s in the Text! Slavery, the Bible, and the African Diaspora,” in *Black Theology* (ed. Reddie). For a discussion of abolitionist rejections of biblical authority, see Allen Dwight Callahan, *Talking Book* (New Haven, Connecticut: Yale U P, 2006), 21-40, who explores the complexities of reception among enslaved African-Americans.

also pushed biblical exegetes toward a critical hermeneutics, preparing the way in the United States for the eventual reception of German higher criticism. When biblical studies emerged as a professional academic discipline... it thus had more than one precedent. Educated Americans were already accustomed to a more sophisticated kind of biblical criticism if they had followed the literature of antislavery and abolitionism (ibid, 166).

To Harrill's description might be added a mutually influential situation in controversies over the slave trade and abolition in Britain, and much of the same holds true for the reception of non-Jewish and -Christian classical texts. Abolitionist⁴⁴⁷ and pro-slavery⁴⁴⁸ readers used at least some of the same hermeneutical strategies to support their conclusions, and further reading strategies developed from these very conflicts. Biblical studies as a discipline arose in part from this fight, some of the strategies of which remain familiar.⁴⁴⁹ One result is that scholars who address ancient slavery, whether they are aware of it are not, are already

⁴⁴⁷ These include by Harrill's reckoning (1) "plain sense" reading of OT passages as indicating the sinfulness of slavery and taking them as a given in reading the NT, (2) historical and etymological arguments that terms such as *and* *δούλος* refer to free servants, (3) understandings of ancient slavery as benign and unlike modern slavery, (4) reasoning that the only slavery tolerated in the Bible was white slavery, (5) hermeneutics of "core principles" such as liberty and equality, (6) seeing biblical teaching as a "seed growing secretly" that would bear the fruit, after social and moral development, of abolition, (7) seeing the "plain sense" of various NT passages to be the prohibition of slavery, (8) "hermeneutics of moral intuition" in which the conscience must guide and test all interpretations, (9) eschatological readings that mostly among white interpreters posited the imminent or already begun moral transformation of humanity, including the abolition of slavery and more often among Black interpreters involved more traditional eschatology (*Slaves in the NT*, 166-180). Harrill also notes that (1) and (7) tended to be more prominent in Black than in white biblical interpretation.

⁴⁴⁸ Harrill (ibid, 180-191) argues that pro-slavery biblical exegesis was usually a response to anti-slavery exegesis rather than a spontaneous evolution of interpretation (anti-slavery exegesis, of course, was a response to slavery). He schematizes [all this], which was unsurprisingly confined to white biblical interpretation, [as follows]: (1) Literal readings of *דָּבָר* and *δούλος* as "slave" and emphasis on the lack of prohibitions of slavery, (2) commendation of slaveowners as believers in the gospels and acceptance of them into churches according to NT epistles, (3) a paternalist interpretation of the Golden Rule, (4) a racist paradigm of slavery as progress, bringing Christianity to African heathens, (5) rejection of "seed growing secretly" and hermeneutics of moral intuition, and (6) arguing for the "spiritual sense" of passages that abolitionists took as establishing equality or condemning slavery. Traditional eschatology was also present in proslavery exegesis, although more rarely than in Black antislavery exegesis.

⁴⁴⁹ Thus Harrill: "The opposing values of literalism and moral intuition remain at odds in American religious culture, shaping contemporary debates over race relations, military conflict, capital punishment, poverty, abortion, full emancipation of women, and lesbian and gay rights. Ready answers to these moral questions all too often fall short of persuasive power because they merely repeat the truth claims found in the nineteenth-century battle over slavery and the Bible. Biblical criticism is seldom able to settle contemporary moral debate, but contemporary moral debate can and does shape broad and influential trends in biblical criticism" (ibid, 192). While his focus is on the U.S., there are similar situations elsewhere.

comparing it to modern slavery. When they consider biblical texts involving slavery, they are inevitably doing so in the shadow of modern history.

But just as Revelation does not necessarily read as an anti-slavery text in historical terms, neither am I satisfied that it must be read, theologically or even historically, as accepting slavery. John M. Campbell cautions that it is when “you begin with some of the key assumptions of post-enlightenment Protestantism [that] both the Old Testament and the New Testament read much more easily and more obviously as pro-slavery texts than as abolitionist ones” (Reddie 2010: 117). Thus, while the “plain sense” of many biblical texts does assume the existence of slavery, the conclusions that post-Enlightenment Protestant-based historical readings draw from this are not necessarily accurate. Campbell’s critique of this often tacit line of thinking is worth quoting at length:

...the vigorous disputes that raged through the White churches and the White academy were between two approaches to the Bible that were both, in their own way, determined to be “plain sense.” Both the developing historical-critical method and the opposing evangelical inerrancy theory, ‘which was only a slight refocusing of the Princeton theology that had been so resistant to an abolitionist Bible,’ sought to take their stance on the plain sense of the text... Both approaches also continued to believe that they could approach the Bible with a reasonable objectivity; they gave no thought to White ethno-centrism or racism or other factors that might be distorting their perspective on the “essential” meaning of the text... although slavery as a legally recognized institution was eventually abolished, the masters’ way of reading the Bible, including the key assumption of White, male objectivity when approaching the text, was effectively left intact and unchallenged... The importance of African Diaspora perspectives and slavery was effectively lost (ibid, 119-120).

Indeed, it is worth remembering, albeit often not remembered in biblical scholarship, that at the outset of the Atlantic slave trade, many western Christians did assume that slavery violated biblical prohibitions or Christian doctrine. It seems unwise to proclaim that Revelation stakes out a specific, discernible position on slavery that a modern interpreter can reconstruct.

After the end of legal slavery in the Western hemisphere, however, the subject largely receded from the view of academic biblical and classical studies for the next century. This

seems unlikely to be coincidental to professional demographics, which are themselves closely related to religious demographics. It is worth noting too that churches in the U.S. split strongly along racial lines from the Second Great Awakening onward. Lectionary and liturgical emphases reflect this split, and the greater emphasis on apocalyptic texts, including Revelation, in predominantly African-American than in mostly white mainline denominations has provoked comment at least since the Civil War era.⁴⁵⁰ Revelation rarely served as a proof text in slavery debates, but it was a common motif not only in African-American but even in white abolitionist preaching, exegesis, and rhetoric. This was notable in connection with the violence that came to characterize controversies over slavery in the 1850s and eventually impelled war after the secession crisis of 1860-61. Despite the abundant source material, however, very little of the scholarship on religion and the Civil War examines biblical reception. Given the ongoing effects of this complicated history, this seems as vital an area for further study as it is a painful one.

⁴⁵⁰ This is a topic in its own right, but see, e.g., John Kampen, "The Genre and Function of Apocalyptic Literature in the African American Experience," in *Text and Experience* (ed. D.L. Smith-Christopher; Sheffield: Sheffield Ac. P, 1995); Gayraud Wilmore, *Pragmatic Spirituality* (New York: NYU P, 2004), 167-185; Blount, *Can I Get A Witness?*, *passim*; Reddie, *Black Theology*, *passim*.

Primary Works Consulted

I. ANCIENT

Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture. *Genesis 1-11*, ed. A. Louth and M. Conti (OT 1). Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 2001.

_____. *Genesis 12-50*, ed. M. Sheridan (OT 2). Downers Grove, Illinois: IVP, 2002.

_____. *John 1-10*, ed. J.C. Elowsky (NT 4a). Downers Grove, Illinois: IVP, 2006.

_____. *Matthew 1-13* (NT 1a). Downers Grove, Illinois: IVP, 2001.

_____. *Matthew 14-28* (NT 1b). Downers Grove, Illinois: IVP, 2002.

Anthologia Palatina. *The Greek Anthology*, ed. W.R. Paton, 5 v. (LCL 67). London: William Heineman, 1916.

Aristophanes. *Birds. Lysistrata. Women at the Thesmophora*, tr. J. Henderson (LCL 179). Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard U P, 2000.

_____. *Clouds. Wasps. Peace*, tr. J. Henderson (LCL 488). Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard U P, 1998.

_____. *Fragments*, tr. J. Henderson (LCL 502). Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard U P, 2008.

_____. *Frogs. Assemblywomen. Wealth*, tr. J. Henderson (LCL 180). Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard U P, 2002.

Aristotle. *Athenian Constitution. Eudemian Ethics. Virtues and Vices* (LCL 295), tr. H. Rackham. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard U P, 1935.

_____. *Metaphysics*, tr. H. Tredennick and G.C. Armstrong, v. 2 (LCL 287). Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard U P, 1935.

Athenagoras. *Athénagore. Supplique au sujet des chrétiens et Sur la résurrection des morts*, tr. B. Pouderon (Sources Chrétiennes 379). Paris: Éd. du Cerf, 1992.

Bible. *Biblica Hebraica Stuttgartensia*, ed. K. Elliger et al. (1967), 5th ed. Stuttgart: Deutsch Bibelgesellschaft, 1997.

_____. *Biblia Sacra Iuxta Vulgatam Versionem* (1969), ed. R. Weber, rev. R. Grysen. Deutsch Bibelgesellschaft, 2007.

_____. *The Greek New Testament*, ed. K. Aland et al. (1966), 4th rev. ed. Stuttgart: Deutsch Bibelgesellschaft, 2001.

_____. *HarperCollins Study Bible* (NRSV). San Francisco: HarperCollins, 1989.

_____. *Septuaginta*, ed. A. Rahlfs, rev. R. Hanart. Stuttgart: Deutsch Bibelgesellschaft, 2006.

Birnbaum, S.A. *The Bar Menasheh Marriage Deed*. Istanbul: Nederland Historisch-Archaeologisch Institut, 1962.

Campbell, David A., ed. *Greek Lyric*, 5 v. (LCL 142ff). Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard U P, 1982.

Cato, Marcus Portius. *On Agriculture*, tr. W.D. Boyd (LCL 283). Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard U P, 1934.

Catullus, Gaius Valerius. *Poems 61-68*, ed. John Godwin (Classics). Warminster: Aris & Phillips, 1995.

- _____. *The Shorter Poems*, ed. John Godwin (Classics). Warminster: Aris & Phillips, 1999.
- Chariton Aphrodisens. *Callirhoe*, ed. and tr. G.P. Goold (LCL 481). Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard U P, 1995.
- Cicero. Marcus Tullius. *Letters to Atticus*, ed. D.R. Shackleton Bailey, 4 v. (LCL 7-8, 97, 491). Cambridge (MA): Harvard U P, 1999.
- _____. *Letters to Friends*, ed. ibid, 3 v. (LCL 205, 216, 230). Cambridge (MA): Harvard U P, 2001.
- Claudianus, Claudius. *De Raptu Prosperinae*, ed. Claire Gruzelier (Oxf. Cl. Mon.). Oxford: Clarendon P, 1993.
- Columella, Lucius Junius Moderatus. *On Agriculture*, tr. H.B. Ash, 3 v. (LCL 361). Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard U P, 1941.
- Courtney, E., ed. *Musa Lapidaria: A Selection of Latin Verse Inscriptions* (Am. Cl. St. 136). Atlanta: Scholars P, 1995.
- Cyprianus, Thascius Caecilius. *Sancti Cypriani Episcopi Opera*, ed. M. Simonetti and C. Moerschini. Turnholt: Brepols, 1976.
- Euripides. *Cyclops. Alceste. Medea*, tr. D. Kovacs (LCL 12). Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard U P, 1994.
- _____. *Trojan Women. Iphigenia among the Taurians. Ion*, tr. D. Kovacs (LCL 10). Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard U P, 1999.
- French, David H., ed. *The Inscriptions of Sinope*, v. 1 (IGSK 64). Bonn: Dr. Rudolf Habelt GMBH, 2004.
- Friedman, M.A., ed. *Jewish Marriage in Palestine*, v. 2. Tel Aviv: U P, 1981.
- Gibson, Elsa. "The Rahmi Koç Collection. Inscriptions. Part IV, a Grave Monument of Roman Imperial Date." *ZPE* 42 (1981): 209-212.
- Hesiod. *The Shield. Catalogue of Women. Other Fragments*, tr. G.W. Most (LCL 503). Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard U P, 2007.
- Hooper, Richard W. *The Priapus Poems: Erotic Epigrams from Ancient Rome*. Urbana: U Illinois P, 1999.
- Horsfall, Nicholas. "CIL VI 37965 = CLE 1988 (Epitaph of Allia Potestas)." *ZPE* 61 (1985): 251-272.
- Horsley, G.H.R. and S. Mitchell, ed. *The Inscriptions of Central Pisidia* (IGSK 57). Bonn: Dr. Rudolf Habelt GMBH, 2000.
- Horst, Pieter W. van der and Gerard Mussies. "A Greek Christian Epitaph in Utrecht." *ZPE* 110 (1996): 285-289.
- Höschele, Regina and David Konstan. "Posidippus col. IV 30-35 = 25 Austin-Bastianini." *ZPE* 156 (2006): 99-102.
- Hunt, A.S. and C.C. Edgar, ed. *Select Papyri*, 2 v. (LCL 266, 282). London: William Heinemann, 1932.
- Jones, C.P. "Two Epigrams from Nicomedia and Its Region." *ZPE* 21 (1976): 189-191.
- Jonnes, Lloyd, ed. *The Inscriptions of Heraclea Pontica* (IGSK 47). Bonn: Dr. Rudolf Habelt GMBH, 1994.

- _____, ed. *The Inscriptions of the Sultan Dağı I* (IGSK 62). Bonn: Dr. Rudolf Habelt GMBH, 2002.
- Kavanagh, Bernard J. "Lollia Saturnina." *ZPE* 136 (2001): 229-232.
- Klinck, Anne L., ed. *Women's Songs in Ancient Greece*. Montreal and Kingston (ON): McGill-Queen's U P, 2008.
- Kolendo, J. and V. Božilova, ed. *Inscriptions grecques et latines de Novae (Mésie Inférieure)* (Ausonius Pub. Mémoires 1). Bordeaux: De Boccard, 1997.
- Kuehn, Clement A. "A New Papyrus of a Dioscorian Poem and Marriage Contract: *P. Berol.* Inv. No. 21344." *ZPE* 97 (1993): 103-115.
- Longus. *Daphnis and Chloë*, tr. J. Henderson (LCL 69). Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard U P, 2009.
- _____. *Daphnis and Chloë*, tr. J.R. Morgan (Aris & Phillips Cl. Texts). Oxford: Aris & Phillips, 2004.
- Marcovich, Miroslav. "The Alcestis Papyrus Revisited." *ZPE* 65 (1986): 39-57.
- Martialis, Marcus Valerius. *Epigrams of Martial Englished by Divers Hands*, ed. J.P. Sullivan and P. Wigham. Berkeley: U California P, 1987.
- Menander. *Menander*, ed. W.G. Arnott, 3 v. (LCL 459-461). London: William Heinemann, 1968.
- Midrash. *Genesis Rabbah*, tr. Jacob Neusner, 3 v. (BJS 104-106). Atlanta: Scholars P, 1985.
- _____. *The Midrash on Psalms*, tr. William G. Braude, 2 v. (YJS 12-13). New Haven, Connecticut: Yale U P, 1959.
- _____. *Ruth Rabbah: An Analytical Translation*, tr. Jacob Neusner (BJS 183). Atlanta: Scholars P, 1989.
- Milligan, George. *Selections from the Greek Papyri*. Cambridge: Cambridge U P, 1912.
- Mishnah. *The Mishnah*, tr. Herbert Danby. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1933.
- _____. *Mishnayot*, ed. Philip Blackman (2nd ed.), 6 v. New York: Judaica P, 1963-64.
- Musonius Rufus. *Musonius Rufus* ed. Cora E. Lutz (Yale Cl. St. 10). New Haven: Yale U P, 1947.
- Nag Hammadi Library in English*, ed. James M. Robinson (1978), 3rd ed. San Francisco: Harper, 1990.
- Noy, David, et al., ed. *Inscriptiones Judaicae Orientis*, v. 1, 3 (TSAJ 101, 102). Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004.
- _____. *Jewish Inscriptions of Western Europe*, 2 v. Cambridge: Cambridge U P, 2005.
- Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, ed. James H. Charlesworth. 2 v. Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1983.
- Oliver, James H. "The Epitaph of Severa Seleuciane at Rome." *ZPE* 33 (1979): 116.
- Ovidius Naso, Publius. *Ovid's "Fasti,"* tr. J.G. Frazer (LCL 257). Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard U P, 1965.
- Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, ed. B.P. Grenfell and A.S. Hunt et al., 27 v. London: Egypt Exploration Fund, 1898.
- Page, Denys L. *Select Papyri*, v. 3 (LCL 360). Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard U P, 1941.

- Pausanias. *Description of Greece*, tr. W.H.S. Jones et al., 5 v. (LCL 93ff.). Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard U P, 1918.
- Philo Alexandrensis. *Philo*, 10 vol., ed. F.H. Colson, (LCL 226ff.). London: William Heinemann, 1961.
- Pindar. *Nemean Odes. Isthmian Odes. Fragments*, tr. W.H. Race (LCL)485. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard U P, 1997.
- Plant, I.M., ed. *Women Writers of Ancient Greece and Rome: An Anthology*. Norman: U Oklahoma P, 2004.
- Plautus, Titus Maccius. *Plautus*, tr. W. de Melo, 5 v. (LCL 60ff.). Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard U P, 2011.
- Plinius Caecilius Secundus, Gaius. *Letters*, tr. B. Radice, 2 v. (LCL 55, 59). Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard U P, 1969.
- Plinius Secundus, Gaius. *Natural History*, tr. H. Rackham et al., 10 v. (LCL 33off.). Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard U P, 1938.
- Plutarchus, Lucius Mestrius. *Life of Cicero*, ed. J.L. Moles (A & Ph Clas.). Oxford: Aris & Phillips, 1988.
- _____. *Moralia*, tr. F.C. Babbitt and E.N O'Neil, 16 v. (LCL 197ff.). Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard U P, 1927.
- _____. *Selected Essays and Dialogues* (World's Classics). Oxford: Oxford U P, 1993.
- Prentice, William Kelly. *Greek and Latin Inscriptions*. New York: Century Co., 1908.
- Pseudo-Demosthenes. *Demosthenes, Speeches 50-59*, tr. Victor Bers (Oratory Cl. Greece 6). Austin: U Texas P, 2003.
- Ricl, Marijana, ed. *The Inscriptions of Alexandria Troas* (IGSK 53). Bonn: Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, 1997.
- Sanders, H.A. "A Latin Marriage Contract." *TPAPA* 69 (1979): 104-116.
- Seneca, Lucius Annaeus Maior. *Declamations*, ed. M. Winterbottom, 2 v. (LCL 463-4). Cambridge (MA): Harvard U P, 1974.
- Seneca, Lucius Annaeus Minor. *Four Dialogues*, ed. C.D.N. Costa (Classics). Warminster: Aris & Phillips, 1994.
- Sijpesteijn, P.J. "A Latin Funeral Inscription." *ZPE* 68 (1987): 151-152.
- _____. "Marriage Agreement with Property Division to Take Effect after Death and Other Documents." *ZPE* 111 (1996): 163-170.
- _____. "Marriage Contract in the Form of a Bank Diagramme (P. Mich. Inv. 6551)." *ZPE* 35 (1979): 119-122.
- Storey, Ian C., ed. *Fragments of Old Comedy*, 3 v. (LCL 514-516). Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard U P, 2011.
- Talmud. *The Babylonian Talmud*, ed. I. Epstein, 34 v. London: Soncino P, 1936.
- _____. *The Talmud of Babylonia: An American Translation*, ed. Jacob Neusner (BJS 63f). Atlanta: Scholars P, 1984.
- Tatian. "*Oratio ad Graecos*" and *Fragments*, ed. M. Whittaker (Early Xn. Texts). Oxford: Clarendon P, 1982.

- The Tebtunis Papyri*, ed. B.P. Grenfell et al., 4 v. London, Oxford: Henry Frowde, U P, 1902.
- Terentius Afer, Publius. *The Woman of Andros. The Self-Tormentor. The Eunuch*, tr. J. Barsby (LCL 22). Cambridge, MA: Harvard U P, 2001.
- _____. *Phormio. The Mother-in-Law. The Brothers*, tr. ibid (LCL 23). Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard U P, 2001.
- Theophrastus. *Characters*, tr. J. Rusten and I.C. Cunningham (LCL 225). Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard U P, 2003.
- Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*. Irvine, California: U California, Irvine, 2001.
- Tosefta: Nashim*, tr. Jacob Neusner, 6 v. New York: Ktav, 1977.
- Trzaskoma, Stephen M., tr. *Two Novels from Ancient Greece*. Indianapolis: Hackett, 2010.
- Turner, E.G., ed. *The Hibeh Papyri*, v. 2 (Greco-Roman Memoirs 32). London: Egypt Exploration Soc., 1955.
- Varro, Marcus Terentius. *On Agriculture*, tr. H.B. Ash (LCL 283). Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard U P, 1934.
- Warmington, E.H., ed. *Remains of Old Latin*, 3 v. (LCL 294, 314, 329). Cambridge (MA): Harvard U P, 1967.
- Whitehorne, John. "Posidippus 25 A-B and Ancient Life Expectancy." *ZPE* 162 (2007): 57-60.
- Xenophon, of Athens. *Anabasis*, tr. C.L. Brownson (LCL 90). Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard U P, 1918.
- _____. *"Memorabilia" and "Oeconomicus"*, tr. E.C. Marchant and O.J. Todd (LCL 168). Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard U P, 1923.
- _____. *Scripta Minora*, tr. E.C. Marchant and G.W. Bowersock (LCL 1925). Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard U P, 1925.
- Xenophon, of Ephesus. *Anthia and Habrocomes*, tr. J. Henderson (LCL 69). Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard U P, 2009.

II. MODERN

- Albert, Octavia V. Rogers. *The House of Bondage, or, Charlotte Brooks and Other Slaves*. Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe, 1890.
- Andrews, Eliza Frances. *The War-Time Journal of a Georgia Girl, 1865-1865*. New York: D. Appleton and Co., 1908.
- Andrews, William L., ed. *Slave Narratives after Slavery*. Oxford: Oxford U P, 2011.
- Ball, Charles. *A Narrative of the Life and Adventures of Charles Ball, a Black Man*. New York: John S. Taylor, 1837.
- Bellagamba, Alice, et al., ed. *African Voices on Slavery and the Slave Trade*. New York: Cambridge U P, 2013.
- Bibb, Henry. *Narrative of the Life and Adventures of Henry Bibb, an American Slave*. New York: District Court (Southern District), 1849.
- Bird, Edgeworth and Sallie. *The Granite Farm Letters*, ed. John Rozier. Athens: U Georgia P, 1988.
- Bland, Sterling Lecater, Jr., ed. *African American Slave Narratives: An Anthology*, 3 v. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood P, 2001.
- Born in Slavery: Slave Narratives from the Federal Writers' Project, 1936-1938*. Washington, D.C: Lib. Congress, 2001.
- Bryan, Mary Norcott. *A Grandmother's Recollections of Dixie*. New Bern, North Carolina: Owen G. Dunn, 1912.
- Burge, Dolly Sumner Lunt Lewis. *A Woman's Wartime Journal*. New York: Century Co., 1918. DocSouth.
- Burton, Annie L. *Memories of Childhood's Slavery Days*. Boston: Ross Publishing Co., 1909.
- Burwell, Letitia M. *A Girl's Life in Virginia before the Civil War*. New York: Frederick A. Stokes, 1895.
- Chesnut, Mary Boykin Miller. *The Private Mary Chesnut: The Unpublished Civil War Diaries*, ed. C.V. Woodward and E. Muhlenfeld. New York: Oxford U P, 1984.
- Craft, William and Ellen. *Running a Thousand Miles for Freedom*. London: William Tweedie, 1860.
- Cumming, Kate. *Kate: The Journal of a Confederate Nurse*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State U P, 1998.
- Dawson, Sarah Morgan. *A Confederate Girl's Diary*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1913. DocSouth.
- De Saussure, Nancy Bostick. *Old Plantation Days: Being Recollections of Southern Life before the Civil War*. New York: Duffield & Co., 1909. DocSouth.
- Douglass, Frederick. *Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass, an American Slave*. Boston: Anti-Slavery Office, 1845.
- Drumgoold, Kate. *A Slave Girl's Story*. Brooklyn, 1898. DocSouth.
- Dulany, Ida Powell. *In the Shadow of the Enemy* (journal), ed. Mary L. Mackall et al. (Voices of the Civil War). Knoxville: U Tennessee P, 2009.
- Edmondston, Catherine Ann Devereux. *Journal of a Secesh Lady*, ed. B.G. Crabtree and J.W. Patton. Raleigh: NC Div. Archives & His., 1979.

- Equiano, Olaudah. *The Interesting Narrative of the Life of Olaudah Equiano, or, Gustavus Vassa, the African*. London, 1789.
- Felton, Rebecca Latimer. *Country Life in Georgia in the Days of My Youth*. Atlanta: Index Printing Co., 1919.
- Foster, Frances Smith, ed. *Love & Marriage in Early African America* (Northeastern Lib. Black Lit.). Boston: Northeastern U P, 2008.
- Gates, Henry Louis, Jr., ed. *The Classic Slave Narratives* (1987). New York: Signet Classics, 2012.
- Jacobs, Harriet ["Linda Brent"]. *Incidents in the Life of a Slave Girl*. Boston, 1861. DocSouth.
- Jackson, Mattie S. and L.S. Thompson. *The Story of Mattie J. Jackson*. Lawrence, Kansas: Sentinel, 1866.
- Jervey, Susan R. and Charlotte S. Jervy Ravenel. *Two Diaries from Middle St. John's, Berkeley, South Carolina, February-May, 1865*. St. John's Hunting Club, 1921. DocSouth.
- Keckley, Elizabeth. *Behind the Scenes, or, Thirty Years a Slave, and Four Years in the White House*. New York: G.W. Carleton & Co., 1868.
- Lewis, Catherine M. and J. Richard, ed. *Women and Slavery in America: A Documentary History*. Fayetteville: U Arkansas P, 2011.
- McDonald, Cornelia Peake. *A Woman's Civil War*, ed. Minrose Gwin. Madison: U Wisconsin P, 1992.
- Merrick, Caroline Elizabeth. *Old Times in Dixie Land: A Southern Matron's memories*. New York: Grafton P, 1901.
- Pitts, Reginald H. and DoVeanna S. Fulton Minor, ed. *Speaking Lives, Authoring Texts: Three African American Women's Slave Narratives*. Albany: SUNY P, 2010.
- Prince, Mary. *The History of Mary Prince, a West Indian Slave*. London: F. Westley and A.H. Davis, 1831.
- Rosengarten, Theodore and Susan W. Walker. *Tombee: Portrait of a Cotton Planter*. New York: Quill, William Morrow, 1986.
- Rozier, John, ed. *The Granite Farm Letters: The Civil War Correspondence of Edgeworth & Sallie Bird*. Athens: U Georgia P, 1988.
- Saxon, Elizabeth Lyle. *A Southern Woman's War Time Reminiscences*. Memphis, Tennessee: Pilcher Printing Co., 1905.
- Sinkler, Emily Wharton. *An Antebellum Plantation Household*, ed. A.S.W. LeClercq. Columbia: U South Carolina P, 1996.
- Smedes, Susan Dabney. *Memorials of a Southern Planter*. Baltimore: Cushings & Bailey, 1887. DocSouth.
- Thomas, Ella Gertrude Clanton. *Secret Eye* (journal), ed. Virginia Ingraham Burr. Chapel Hill: U North Carolina P, 1990.
- Thompson, L.S. *The Story of Mattie J. Jackson*. Lawrence, Massachusetts: *Sentinel*, 1866. DocSouth.
- Veney, Bethany. *The Narrative of Bethany Veney, a Slave Woman*. Worcester, Massachusetts: George H. Ellis, 1889.

Williams, Sarah Frances Hicks. "Plantation Experiences of a New York Woman." *NC Hist. Rev.* 33 (1956): 384-412, 539-546.

Secondary Works Consulted

- Aitken, Ellen B. "At the Well of Living Water: Jacob Traditions in John 4." 342-352 in C.A. Evans, *Scripture in Early Judaism and Christianity*. Sheffield: Ac. P, 2000.
- Albaladejo Vivero, Manuel. "El color en el vestido, símbolo de identidad en el mundo antiguo." *Herakleion* 4 (2011): 47-58.
- Alberici, Lisa A. and Mary Harlow. "Age and Innocence: Female Transitions to Adulthood in Late Antiquity." *Hesp. Sup.* 41 (2007): 193-203.
- Alexiou, Margaret. *After Antiquity: Greek Language, Myth, and Metaphor*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell U P, 2002.
- Almeida, Maria Aparecida de Andrade. "Os cavaleiros apocalípticos." *Oracula* 4.7 (2008): 3-16.
- Alston, Richard, et al. *Ancient Slavery and Abolition: From Hobbes to Hollywood*. Oxford: Oxford U P, 2011.
- Álvarez Valdés, Ariel. "La Nueva Jerusalén del Apocalipsis." *Revista Bíblica* 66.3-4 (2004): 173-194.
- Amba, R. *Bonds of Love: Methodic Studies of Prophetic Texts with Marriage Imagery (Isaiah 50:1-3 and 54:1-10, Hosea 1-3, Jeremiah 2-3)* (Studia Semitica Neerlandica 40). Assen: Van Gorcum, 1999.
- Amunátegui Perelló, Carlos. "Problems Concerning *familia* in Early Rome." *Roman Legal Tradition* 4 (2008): 37-45.
- Anastasiadis, Vasilis I. and Panagiotis N. Doukellis, ed. *Esclavage antique et discriminations socio-culturelles*. Bern: Peter Lang, 2005.
- Anderson, Gary. "Celibacy or Consummation in the Garden? Reflections on Early Jewish and Christian Interpretations of the Garden of Eden." *HTR* 82.2 (Apr. 1989): 121-148.
- Andersen, T. David. "Renaming and Wedding Imagery in Isaiah 62." *Biblica* 67.1 (1986): 75-80.
- Andreau, Jean et al., ed. *Économie antique. La guerre dans les économies antiques* (Entretiens d'archéologie et d'histoire). Saint-Bertrand-de-Comminges: Musée archéologique départemental, 2000.
- ____ and Raymond Descat. *The Slave in Greece and Rome* (2006), tr. M. Leopold (WISC). Madison: U Wisconsin. P, 2011.
- Andrés Pérez, Javier. "Aproximación a la iconografía de *Roma Aeterna* como vía de transmisión de un mito." *El Futuro del Pasado* 1 (2010): 349-363.
- Apel, Dora. *Imagery of Lynching: Black Men, White Women, and the Mob*. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers U P, 2004.
- Archer, Léonie J. *Her Price is Beyond Rubies: The Jewish Woman in Greco-Roman Palestine* (JSOT Sup. 60). Sheffield: JSOT P, 1990.
- ____. "The Virgin and the Harlot in the Writings of Formative Judaism." *Hist. Workshop* 24 (Aut. 1987): 1-16.
- Argyrou, Vassos. *Tradition and Modernity in the Mediterranean: The wedding as symbolic struggle* (Cam. St. Soc. Cul. Anth. 101). Cambridge: Cambridge U P, 1996.

- Arrowsmith, William. "Luxury and Death in the *Satyricon*." *Arion* 5:3 (Aut. 1966): 304-331.
- Arterbury, Andrew E. "Breaking the Betrothal Bonds: Hospitality in John 4." *CBQ* 72.1 (Jan. 2010): 63-81.
- Atkins, Leah Rawls. "High Cotton: The Antebellum Alabama Plantation Mistress and the Cotton Culture." *Agricultural His.* 68:2 (Spr. 1994): 92-104.
- Aubin, Melissa M. "'She is the beginning of all the ways of perversity': Femininity and Metaphor in 4Q184." *Wif* 2.2 (Spr. 2001): 19 p.
- Auguet, Roland. *Cruelty and Civilization: The Roman Games*. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1972.
- Aune, David E. "Following the Lamb." 269-284 in R.N. Longenecker, *Patterns of Discipleship in the NT*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996.
- _____. "Influence of Roman Imperial Court Ceremonial on the Apocalypse of John." *Bibl. Res.* 28 (1983): 5-26.
- _____. *Revelation*, 3 v. (WBC 52). Dallas: Word Books, 1997.
- Austin, Norman. "The Wedding Text in Homer's *Odyssey*." *Arion* 1.2 (Spr. 1991): 227-243.
- Avagianou, Aphrodite A. *Sacred Marriage in the Rituals of Greek Religion*. (Eur. U St. 15, 54). Bern: Peter Lang, 1991.
- Avalos, Hector. *Slavery, Abolitionism, and the Ethics of Biblical Scholarship*. Sheffield: Phoenix P, 2011.
- Baade, Hans W. "The Bifurcated Romanist Tradition of Slavery in Louisiana." *Tulane Law Rev.* 70 (1995): 1481-1499.
- _____. "The *Gens de Couleur* of Louisiana: Comparative Slave Law in a Microcosm." *Cardozo Law Rev.* 18 (1996): 535-586.
- Bakaoukas, Michael. "Tribalism & Racism among the Ancient Greeks." *Anistoriton J* 9 (Mar. 2005): 15 p.
- Baker, H.D. "Degrees of Freedom: Slavery in Mid-First Millennium BC Babylonia." *World Arch.* 33:1 (Jun. 2001): 18-26.
- Balch, David L. and Carolyn Osiek, ed. *Early Christian Families in Context*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003.
- Balme, Maurice. "Attitudes to Work and Leisure in Ancient Greece." *Greece & Rome* 31:2 (Oct. 1984): 140-152.
- Bancroft, Frederic. *Slave Trading in the Old South* (1931). Columbia: U South Carolina P (Southern Classics), 1996.
- Baptist, Edward E. "'Cuffy,' 'Fancy Maids,' and 'One-Eyed Men': Rape, Commodification, and the Domestic Slave Trade in the United States." *Am. Hist. Rev.* 106:5 (Dec. 2001): 1619-1650.
- Barber, E. Susan. "'The White Wings of Eros': Courtship and Marriage in Confederate Richmond." 119-132 in C. Clinton, *Southern Families at War*. New York: Oxford U P, 2000.
- Barbiero, Gianni. *Song of Songs: A Close Reading* (2004), tr. M. Tait (Sup. VT 144). Leiden: Brill, 2011.

- Bardaglio, Peter W. *Reconstructing the Household: Families, Sex, and the Law in the Nineteenth-Century South* (St. Legal His.). Chapel Hill: U North Carolina P, 1995.
- Barr, David L., ed. *The Reality of Apocalypse: Rhetoric and Politics in the Book of Revelation*. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- _____. *Tales of the End: A Narrative Commentary on the Book of Revelation*. Santa Rosa, California: Polebridge P, 1998.
- _____. "Towards an Ethical Reading of the Apocalypse." *SBL Seminar Papers* 36 (1997): 358-373.
- _____. *Who Rides the Beast? Prophetic Rivalry and the Rhetoric of Crisis in the Churches of the Apocalypse*. New York: Oxford U P, 2001.
- Barton, Carlin A. "The Emotional Economy of Sacrifice and Execution in Ancient Rome." *HR/RH* 29:2 (Sum. 2003): 341-360.
- _____. "Savage Miracles: The Redemption of Lost Honor in Roman Society and the Sacrament of the Gladiator and the Martyr." *Representations* 45 (Win. 1994): 41-71.
- _____. "The Scandal of the Arena." *Representations* 27 (Sum. 1989): 1-36.
- Baskin, Judith R. *Midrashic Women: Formations of the Feminine in Rabbinic Literature* (Brandeis Ser. Jewish Women). Hanover, New Hampshire: U P New England, 2002.
- Batey, Richard. *New Testament Nuptial Imagery*. Leiden: Brill, 1971.
- Batten, Alicia J. "Neither Gold nor Braided Hair (1 Tim. 2.9; 1 Pet. 3.3)." *NTS* 55:4 (Oct. 2009): 484-591.
- Bauckham, Richard. "Economic Critique of Rome in Rev. 18." 47-90 in L. Alexander, *Images of Empire*. Sheffield: JSOT P, 1991.
- _____. *The Theology of the Book of Revelation*. (NT Theology). Cambridge: Cambridge U P, 1993.
- Bauman, Richard A. *Women and Politics in Ancient Rome*. London: Routledge, 1994.
- Baumann, Gerlinde. *Love and Violence: Marriage as a Metaphor the Relationship between YHWH and Israel in the Prophetic Books* (2000), tr. L.M. Maloney. Collegeville, Minnesota: Liturgical P, 2003.
- Beale, Gregory K. *The Book of Revelation*. (New Int'l. Gk. Test. Comm.). Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans, 1999.
- Beasley-Murray, George Raymond. *The Book of Revelation*. (1974), 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1981.
- Beckles, Hilary M. "White Women and Slavery in the Caribbean." *His. Workshop* 36 (Aut. 1993): 66-82.
- Bediako, Kwame and Gilliam M. "Bible studies on slavery and freedom." *J Afr. Christian Thought* 10.1 (Jun. 2007): 3-8.
- Beissinger, Margaret H. "Rites of Passage and Oral Storytelling in Romanian Epic and the NT" *Or. Trad.* 17.2 (2002): 236-258.
- Bell, Catherine M. *Ritual: Perspectives and Dimensions*. New York: Oxford U P, 1997.
- Bell, Duran. "Defining Marriage and Legitimacy." *Current Anth.* 38.2 (Apr. 1997): 237-253.

- Bell, Elizabeth. "Weddings and Pornography: The Cultural Performance of Sex." *Text Performance* 219.3 (Jul. 1999): 173-195.
- Ben-Ami, Issachar and Dov Noy. *Studies in Marriage Customs* (Folk. Res. Ctr. St. 4). Jerusalem: Magnes P, 1974.
- Ben Zvi, Ehud. "Observations on the Marital Metaphor of YHWH and Israel in its Ancient Israelite Context." *JSTOT* 28.3 (2004): 363-384.
- Benaissa, Amin. "A Syrian Slave Girl Twice Sold in Egypt." *ZPE* 173 (2010): 175-189.
- Berger, Teresa. "'Wisdom Has Built Her House' (Prov. 9:1): Gendering Sacred Space." *St. Lit.* 38.2 (2008): 171-183.
- Berlin, Ira. "The Structure of the Free Negro Caste in the Antebellum United States." *J Soc. His.* 9:3 (Spr. 1976): 297-318.
- Bernabé, Carmen. "Of Eunuchs and Predators: Matthew 19:1-12 in a Cultural Context." *BTB* 33 (2003): 128-134.
- Berry, Christopher J. "Luxury and the Politics of Need and Desire." *His. Pol. Thought.* 10:4 (Win. 1989): 597-613.
- Berry, Diana R. "'In Pressing Need of Cash': Gender, Skill, and Family Persistence in the Domestic Slave Trade." *JAAH* 92:1 (Win. 2007): 22-36.
- _____. *"Swing the Sickle for the Harvest Is Ripe: Gender and Slavery in Antebellum Georgia"*. Urbana: U Illinois P, 2007.
- Bieberstein, Sabine. "Disrupting the Normal Reality of Slavery," tr. B. McNeil. *JSTNT* 79 (Sep. 2000): 105-116.
- Bierkan, Andrew T. "Marriage in Roman Law." *Yale Law J* 16:5 (Mar. 1907): 303-327.
- Biguzzi, G. "A Figurative and Narrative Language Grammar of Revelation." *Nov. Test.* 45.4 (Oct. 2003): 383-402.
- Blessing, Kamila. "Desolate Jerusalem and the Barren Matriarch: Two Distinct Figures in the Pseudepigrapha." *JSPs* 9 (1998): 47-69.
- Blickenstaff, Marianne. *"While The Bridegroom is with Them"* (JSTNT Sup. 292). London: T & T Clark, 2005.
- Blount, Brian K. *Can I Get a Witness? Reading Rev. through African-American Culture*. Louisville: WJK P, 2005.
- _____. *Revelation: A Commentary* (NT Library). Louisville: WJK P, 2009.
- _____. "The Witness of Active Resistance." 28-46 in Rhoads, *From Every People*. Minneapolis: Fortress P, 2005.
- _____, ed. *True to Our Native Land: An African-American New Testament Commentary*. Minneapolis: Fortress P, 2008.
- Blundell, Sue and Nancy Sorkin Rabinowitz. "Women's Bonds, Women's Pots: Adornment Scenes in Attic Vase-Painting." *Phoenix* 62:1 (Spr. 2008): 115-144.
- Bodel, John and Saul M. Olyan, ed. *Household and Family Religion in Antiquity* (AWCH). Malden, Massachusetts: Blackwell, 2008.
- Bogen, David Skillen. "The Maryland Context of *Dred Scott*: The Decline in the Legal Status of Maryland Free Blacks 1776-1810." *Am. J Legal His.* 34:4 (Oct. 1990): 381-411.
- Boles, John D. *Black Southerners 1619-1869* (New Perspectives on the South). Lexington: U P KY, 1983.

- Boismard, Marie Emile. "L'ami de l'Époux." 289-295 in A. Gelin, *À la rencontre de Dieu*. Le Puy: X. Mappus, 1961.
- Boles, John B. *Black Southerners 1619-1869* (New Perspectives on the South). Lexington: U P KY, 1983.
- Bosworth, A.B. "Vespasian and the Slave Trade." *Cl.* 252:1 (2002): 350-357.
- Boucher, François-Emmanuel. "Les sacrifices sanglants, les gladiateurs et les premiers chrétiens." *Religiologiques* 23 (Spr. 2001): 229-246.
- Bouchet, Cécile. "La «fabrication» de la mariée." *Ethnologie française* 29.4 (Oct.-Dec. 1999): 627-639.
- Bourland Huizenga, Annette. "Advice to the Bride." 223-247 in C. Evans and H. Zacharias, *Jewish and Christian Scripture as Artifact and Canon*. (SSEJ 13/LSTS 70). London: T & T Clark, 2009.
- Bovon, François. *New Testament Traditions and Apocryphal Narratives* (PrThMon 36). Allison Park, Pennsylvania: Pickwick, 1995.
- Bowen, Nancy R. "A Fairy Tale Wedding? A Feminist Intertextual Reading of Ps. 45." 53-71 in Bowen and B.A. Strawn, *A God So Near*. Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 2003.
- Bowersock, G.W. *Martyrdom and Rome*. Cambridge: Cambridge U P, 1995.
- Bowman, John Wick. *The First Christian Drama: The Book of Revelation*. Philadelphia: Westminster P, 1968.
- Boxall, Ian. *The Revelation of Saint John*. Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publ., 2006.
- Boyarín, Daniel. *Dying for God: Martyrdom and the Making of Christianity and Judaism*. (Figurae: Reading Medieval Culture). Stanford: U P, 1999.
- Bradley, Keith R. "Animalizing the Slave: The Truth of Fiction." *J Roman Studies* 90 (2000): 110-125.
- _____. "On the Roman Slave supply and Slavebreeding." *S & A* 8:1 (1987): 42-64.
- _____. "'The Regular, Daily Traffic in Slaves': Roman History and Contemporary History." *Cl. J* 87.2 (Dec. 1991): 125-138.
- _____. "*Servus Onerosus*: Roman Law and the Troublesome Slave." *S & A* 11:2 (1990): 135-158.
- _____. *Slavery and Society at Rome*. Cambridge: Cambridge U P, 1994.
- _____ and Paul Cartledge, ed. *Cambridge World History of Slavery*, v. 1. Cambridge: Cambridge U P, 2011.
- Braund, David. "The Luxuries of Athenian Democracy." *G & R* 41:1 (Apr. 1994): 41-48.
- Bremen, Riet van. "Family Structures." 313-330 in A. Erskine, *A Companion to the Hellenistic World* (BCAW). Malden, Massachusetts: Blackwell, 2003.
- Brenner, Athalya. "'White' Textiles in Biblical Hebrew and in Mishnaic Hebrew." *Hebr. An. Rev.* 4 (1980): 39-44.
- Bretin-Chabrol, Marine. "Vigne mariée ou fleur coupée: La mise en scène d'une parole féminine dans le carmen 62 de Catulle." *Cahiers «Mondes anciens»* 3 (2012). 11 p.
- Brettler, Marc Zvi and Michael Poliakoff. "Rabbi Simeon ben Lakish at the Gladiator's Banquet: Rabbinic Observations on the Roman Arena." *HTR* 83:1 (Jan. 1990): 93-98.

- Bridgewater, Pamela D. "Un/Re&Discovering Slave Breeding in Thirteenth Amendment Jurisprudence." *Washington & Lee Race and Ethnic Ancestry Law J* 7 (2001): 11-43.
- Briggs, Sheila. "Slavery and Gender." 171-192 in J. Schaberg et al., *On the Cutting Edge*. New York: Continuum, 2003.
- Brock, Roger. "The Labour of Women in Classical Athens." *Cl. Q* 44:2 (1994): 336-346.
- Bronner, Leila Leah. *From Eve to Esther: Rabbinic Constructions of Biblical Women*. (Gender and the Biblical Tradition). Louisville: WJK, 1994.
- Brooke, Christopher Nugent Lawrence. *The Medieval Idea of Marriage*. Oxford: Oxford U P, 2002.
- Brooks, George E. "Samuel Hodges, Jr., and the Symbiosis of Slave and 'Legitimate' Trades, 1810s-1820s." *Int'l. J. Afr. Hist. St.* 41:1 (2008): 101-117.
- Brooten, Bernadette, ed. *Beyond Slavery: Overcoming Its Religious and Sexual Legacies* (Black Religion/Womanist Thought/Social Justice). New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.
- Brown, Kathleen M. "Beyond the Great Debates: Gender and Race in Early America." *Revs. Am. His.* 26:1 (Mar. 1998): 96-123.
- . *Good Wives, Nasty Wenches, and Anxious Patriarchs: Gender, Race, and Power in Colonial Virginia*. Chapel Hill: U North Carolina P, Omohundro Inst., 1996.
- Brütsch, Charles. *La Clarté de l'Apocalypse* (1955), 5th ed. Geneva: Éditions Labor et Fides, 1966.
- Bryan, Christopher. *Render to Caesar: Jesus, the Early Church, and the Roman Superpower*. Oxford: Oxford U P, 2005.
- Buckland, W.W. *The Roman Law of Slavery: The Condition of the Slave in Private Law from Augustus to Justinian*. Cambridge: Cambridge U P, 1908, repr. 1970
- and Arnold D. McNair. *Roman Law and Common Law: A Comparison in Outline* (1936), rev. F.H. Lawson. Cambridge: Cambridge U P, 1965.
- Buell, Denise Kimberly. "Race and Universalism in Early Christianity." *J ECS* 10.4 (Win. 2002): 429-468.
- Bundrick, Sheramy D. "The Fabric of the City: Imaging Textile Production in Classical Athens." *Hesperia* 77.2 (Apr. 2008): 283-334.
- Burkes, Shannon. "Wisdom and Law: Choosing Life in Ben Sira and Baruch." *J SJ* 30.3 (Sep. 1999): 253-276.
- Burnham, Margaret A. "An Impossible Marriage: Slave Law and Family Law." *Law and Inequality* 5 (1987): 187-225.
- Burrus, Virginia. "Torture and Travail: Producing the Christian Martyr." 56-71 in A-J. Levine, *Feminist Companion Patristic Literature*. Cleveland: Pilgrim P, 2009.
- Bush, Jonathan A. "Free to Enslave: The Foundations of Colonial American Slave Law." *Yale J Law & Human.* 5 (1993): 417-447.
- Bushala, Eugene W. "The Motif of Sexual Choice in Horace, *Satire* 1.2." *Classical J* 66:4 (Apr. 1971): 312-315.

- Byron, John. *Recent Research on Paul and Slavery*. Sheffield: Phoenix P, 2008.
- _____. *Slavery Metaphors in Early Judaism and Pauline Christianity*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003.
- Cagniat, Pierre. "The Philosopher and the Gladiator." *Cl. World* 93:6 (Jul. 2000): 607-618.
- Caird, George B. *A Commentary on the Revelation of St. John the Divine*. London: Adam & C. Black, 1966.
- Cairns, Douglas L. *Aidos: The Psychology and Ethics of Honour and Shame in Ancient Greek Literature*. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1993.
- _____. "Veiling, αἰδώς, and a Red-Figure Amphora by Phintias." *J Hellenic St.* 116 (1996): 152-158.
- _____. "Weeping and Veiling: Grief, Display and Concealment in Ancient Greek Culture." 37-57 in T. Fögen, *Tears in the Greco-Roman World*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2009.
- Callahan, Allen Dwight, et al. "Introduction: The Slavery of New Testament Studies." *Semeia* 83-84 (1998): 1-15.
- _____. *Talking Book: African Americans and the Bible*. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale U P, 2006.
- _____ and Richard A. Horsley. "Slave Resistance in Classical Antiquity." *Semeia* 83-84 (1998): 133-151.
- Calomiris, Charles W. and Jonathan B. Pritchett. "Preserving Slave Families for Profit: Traders' Incentives and Pricing in the New Orleans Slave Market." *J Economic His.* 69:4 (Dec. 2009): 986-1011.
- Cambiano, Giuseppe. "Aristotle and the Anonymous Opponents of Slavery," tr. M. di Gregorio. *S & A* 8.1 (1987) 22-41.
- Campbell, Gordon. "Antithetical Feminine-Urban Imagery and a Tale of Two Women-Cities in the Book of Revelation." *Tyndale Bul.* 55.1 (Jan. 2004): 81-109.
- Campbell, Kenneth M., ed. *Marriage and Family in the Biblical World*. Downers Grove, Illinois: IVP, 2003.
- Campbell, Mavis. "Aristotle and Black Slavery: A Study in Race Prejudice." *Race & Class* 15:3 (Jan. 1974): 283-301.
- Cannon, Katie Geneva. "Slave Ideology and Biblical Interpretation." *Semeia* 47 (1989): 9-23.
- Carey, Anthony Gene. *Sold Down the River: Slavery in the Lower Chattahoochee Valley of Alabama and Georgia*. Tuscaloosa: U Alabama P, 2011.
- Carlon, Jacqueline M. *Pliny's Women: Constructing Virtue and Creating Identity in the Roman World*. Cambridge: Cambridge U P, 2009.
- Carlsen, Jesper. "Exemplary Deaths in the Arena: Gladiatorial Fights and the Execution of Criminals." 75-91 in J. Engberg et al., *Contextualising Early Christian Martyrdom*. Bern: Peter Lang, 2011.
- Carmichael, Calum. *Sex and Religion in the Bible*. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale U P, 2010.
- Carrington, Philip. *The Meaning of Revelation*. London: SPCK, 1931.
- Carson, Cary. "Banqueting Houses and the 'Need of Society' among Slave-Ownning Planters in the Chesapeake Colonies." *Wm. Mary Q* 70:4 (Oct. 2013): 725-780.

- Carter, M.J. "Gladiatorial Combat: The Rules of Engagement." *Cl. J.* 102:2 (Dec. 2006): 97-114.
- Cartledge, Paul. "Greek civilisation and slavery." 247-263 in T.P. Wiseman, *Classics in Progress*. Oxford: Oxford U P, 2002.
- _____. "Like a Worm i' the Bud? A Heterology of Classical Greek Slavery." *G & R* 40.2 (Oct. 1993): 163-180.
- Cashin, Joan E. "According to His Wish and Desire: Female Kin and Female Slaves in Planter Wills." 90-119 in C.A. Farnham, *Women of the American South*. New York: NYU P, 1997.
- _____. "'Decidedly Opposed to the Union': Women's Culture, Marriage, and Politics in Antebellum South Carolina." *Georgia Hist.* 278:4 (Win. 1994): 735-759.
- Castelli, Elizabeth A. *Martyrdom and Memory: Early Christian Culture Making* (Gender, Theory, and Religion). New York: Columbia U P, 2004.
- Castronovo, Russ. "Enslaving Passions." 145-168 in T. Fessenden et al., *Puritan Origins of American Sex*. New York: Routledge, 2001.
- Cavalier, Odile. *Silence et fureur: La femme et la mariage en Grèce*. Avignon: Fondation du Musée Calvet, 1996.
- Censer, Jane Turner. "A Changing World of Work: North Carolina Elite Women, 1865-1895." *NC Hist. Rev.* 73:1 (Jan. 1996): 28-55.
- _____. *North Carolina Planters and Their Children, 1800-1860*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State U P, 1984.
- _____. *The Reconstruction of White Southern Womanhood 1865-1895*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State U P, 2007.
- Chafe, William H. "Sex and Race: The Analogy of Social Control." *MA Rev.* 18:1 (Spr. 1977): 147-176.
- Chakkalakal, Tess. *Novel Bondage: Slavery, Marriage, and Freedom in Nineteenth-Century America*. Urbana: U Illinois P, 2011.
- Charles, R.H. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Revelation of St John*, 2 v. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1920.
- Charlesworth, James H. *How Barisat Bellowed: Folklore, Humor, and Iconography in the Jewish Apocalypses and the Apocalypse of John* (DSS and Christian Origins Library 3). North Richland Hills, Texas: BIBAL P, 1998.
- Cheesman, Clive. "Names in *por* and Slave Naming in Republican Rome." *Cl.* 259:2 (Dec. 2009): 511-531.
- Cherry, David. "Marriage and Acculturation in Roman Algeria." *Cl. Philol.* 92:1 (Jan. 1997): 71-83.
- _____. "The Minician Law: Marriage and the Roman Citizenship." *Phoenix* 44:3 (Aut. 1990): 244-266.
- Chesnutt, Randall D. *From Death to Life: Conversion in Joseph and Aseneth* (JSPs Sup. 16). Sheffield: JSP P, 1995.
- Childs, Brevard S. *Isaiah: A Commentary* (OT Lib.). Louisville: WJK, 2001.
- Clark, Elizabeth A. "The Celibate Bridegroom and His Virginal Brides." *Church Hist.* 77:1 (2008): 1-25.
- Clarke, Jacqueline. *Imagery of Colour & Shining in Catullus, Propertius, & Horace* (Lang Cl. Ser. 13). New York: Peter Lang, 2003.

- Clavin, Matthew J. *Toussaint Louverture and the American Civil War: The Promise and Peril of a Second Haitian Revolution*. Philadelphia: U Pennsylvania P, 2011.
- Cleland, Liza et al., ed. *The Clothed Body in the Ancient World*. Oxford: Oxbow, 2005.
- Clifford, Richard J. *Proverbs* (OT Library). Louisville: WJK P, 1999.
- Clinton, Catherine. "Caught in the Web of the Big House: Women and Slavery." 19-34 in W.J. Raser et al., *The Web of Southern Social Relations*. Athens: U Georgia P, 1985.
- _____. *The Plantation Mistress: Woman's World in the Old South*. New York: Pantheon, 1982.
- _____. "Public Women" and Sexual Politics during the American Civil War." 119-134 in O.V. Burton et al., *The Struggle for Equality*. Charlottesville: U Virginia P, 2011.
- _____. "Southern Dishonor: Flesh, Blood, Race, and Bondage." 52-68 in C. Bleser, *In Joy and in Sorrow*. New York: Oxford U P, 1991.
- _____ and Nina Silber, ed. *Battle Scars: Gender and Sexuality in the American Civil War*. New York: Oxford U P, 2006.
- Cohen, Boaz. "On the Theme of Betrothal in Jewish and Roman Law." *PAAJR* 18 (1948): 67-135.
- Cohen, David. "Seclusion, Separation, and the Status of Women in Classical Athens." *G & R* 36:1 (Apr. 1989): 3-15.
- Coleman, Kathleen M. "The contagion of the throng: absorbing violence in the Roman world." *Hermathena* 164 (Sum. 1998): 65-88.
- _____. "Fatal Charades: Roman Executions Staged as Mythological Enactments." *J Roman St.* 80 (1990): 44-73.
- Collins, Bruce. *White Society in the Antebellum South* (St. Modern His. 2). London: Longman, 1985.
- Collins, Matthew S. "The Question of Δόχη: A Socioliterary Reading of the Wedding at Cana." *BTB* 25:3 (Fall 1995): 100-109.
- Combes, I.A.H. *The Metaphor of Slavery in the Writings of the Early Church*. Sheffield: Ac. P, 1998.
- Conway, Colleen M. *Behold the Man: Jesus and Greco-Roman Masculinity*. New York: Oxford U P, 2008.
- Corrigan, Mary Beth. "Whether they be ours or no, they may be heirs of the kingdom: The Pursuit of Family Ties among Enslaved People in the District of Columbia." 169-194 in Paul Finkelman, *In the Shadow of Freedom*. Athens: Ohio U P, 2010.
- Cothenet, Edouard. "L'église, épouse du Christ (Eph 5; Apoc 19 et 21)." 81-106 in A.M. Triacca and A. Pistoia, *L'église dans la liturgie*. Rome: CLV, Edizioni Liturgiche, 1980.
- Cotton, Hannah M. "Women and Law in the Documents from the Judean Desert." 123-147 in H. Melaerts and L. Mooren, *Le rôle et le statut de la femme en Egypte hellénistique, romaine et byzantine*. Paris: Peeters, 2002.
- Couffignal, Robert. "Les structures figuratives du Psaume 45." *ZAW* 113.2 (Apr. 2001): 198-208.
- Countryman, L. William. *Dirt Greed and Sex: Sexual Ethics in the New Testament and Their Implications for Today*. Philadelphia: Fortress P, 1988.

- Court, John M. *The Book of Revelation and the Johannine Apocalyptic Tradition*. Sheffield: Ac. P, 2000.
- _____. et al. *The Johannine Literature*. Sheffield: Ac. P, 2000.
- _____. *Myth and History in the Book of Revelation*. London: SPCK, 1979.
- Cover, Robert M. *Justice Accused: Antislavery and the Judicial Process*. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale U P, 1975.
- Crane, Eva. *A Book of Honey*. Oxford: Oxford U P/Int'l. Bee Research Assn., 1980.
- _____. *The World History of Beekeeping and Honey Hunting*. London: Duckworth, 1999.
- Crawford, Sidnie White. "Lady Wisdom and Dame Folly at Qumran." *DSD* 5:3 (Sep. 1998): 355-366.
- Crenshaw, James L. "A Mother's Instruction to Her Son (Prov. 31:1-9)." *Perspectives Rel. St.* 15.4 (Win. 1988): 9-22.
- Croatto, J. Severino. "Desmesura y fin del opresor en la perspectiva apocalíptica." *Rev. Bib.* 52:3 (1990): 129-144.
- Crouch, Barry A. "Booty capitalism" and capitalism's booty: Slaves and slavery in ancient Rome and the American South." *S & A* 6:1 (1985): 3-24.
- _____. "The 'Chords of Love': Legalizing Black Marital and Family Life in Postwar Texas." *JAAH* 79.4 (Aut. 1994): 334-351.
- Culham, Phyllis. "Again, What Meaning Lies in Colour!" *ZPE* 65 (1986): 235-245.
- D'Ambra, Eve. "The Cult of Virtues and the Funerary Relief of Ulpia Epigone." *Latomus* 48:2 (Apr. 1989): 392-400.
- _____. "Mourning and the Making of Ancestors in the Testamentum Relief." *Am. J Arch.* 99:4 (Oct. 1995): 667-681.
- _____. and Guy P.R. Métraux, ed. *The Art of Citizens, Soldiers and Freedmen in the Roman World* (BAR Int'l. Ser. 1526). Oxford: Archaeopress, 2006.
- D'Arms, John H. *Commerce and Social Standing in Ancient Rome*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard U P, 1981.
- d'Avray, D.L. *Medieval Marriage: Symbolism and Society*. Oxford: Oxford U P, 2005.
- da Silva, Aldina. "The Condition of Women in Mesopotamian and Biblical Literature." 51-73 in G. Caron, *Women Also Journeyed with Him*. (1995). Collegeville, Minnesota: Liturgical P, 2000.
- Dal Lago, Enrico and Constantina Katsari, ed. *Slave Systems Ancient and Modern*. Cambridge: Cambridge U P, 2008.
- Dalby, Andrew. *Empire of Pleasures: Luxury and Indulgence in the Roman World*. London: Routledge, 2000.
- Dalmon, Sébastien. "Les Nymphes dans les rites du mariage." *Cahiers «Mondes anciens»* 2 (2011). 13 p.
- Dalrymple, Rob. "These Are the Ones." *Biblica* 86.3 (2005): 396-406.
- Daniel-Hughes, Carly. "The Sex Trade and Slavery at Meals." 165-178 in D.E. Smith and H. Taussig, *Meals in the Early Christian World*. New York: Macmillan, 2012.

- Daniels, Christine. "Getting His [Or Her] Livelyhood': Free Workers in Slave Anglo-America, 1675-1810." *Agricultural His.* 71:2 (Spr. 1997): 125-161.
- Darr, Kathryn Pfisterer. "Alas, She Has Become a Harlot,' but Who's to Blame? Unfaithful-Female Imagery in Isaiah's Vision." 55-76 in L.M. Luker, *Passion, Vitality, and Foment*. Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Trinity P Int'l., 2001.
- Dasen, Véronique and Thomas Späth, ed. *Children, Memory, and Family Identity in Roman Culture*. Oxford: Oxford U P, 2010.
- Daube, David. "Historical Aspects of Informal Marriage." *Revue int'le. des droits de l'antiquité* 25 (1978): 95-107.
- Davila, James R. "Ritual in the OT Apocrypha." 123-145 in K.D. Dobos and M.Kőszeghy, *With Wisdom as a Robe*. Sheffield: Phoenix P, 2009.
- Davis, David Brion. *In the Image of God: Religion, Moral Values, and Our Heritage of Slavery*. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale U P, 2001.
- _____. *Inhuman Bondage: The Rise and Fall of Slavery in the New World*. Oxford: Oxford U P, 2006.
- _____. "Looking at Slavery from Broader Perspectives." *Am. Hist. Rev.* 105:2 (Apr. 2000): 452-466.
- _____. *The Problem of Slavery in the Age of Revolution, 1770-1823*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell U P, 1975.
- _____. *The Problem of Slavery in Western Culture*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell U P, 1966.
- Davis, Ellen N. "Youth and Age in the Thera Frescoes." *Am. J Arch.* 90.4 (Oct. 1986): 399-406.
- Davis, S. "The May Tabu on Roman Marriage and a Parallel." *Man* 56 (Mar. 1956): 37-42.
- Day, Peggy L. "Metaphor and Social Reality: Is. 23.17-18, Ezk. 16.35-37 and Hos. 2.4-5." 63-71 in J. Kaltner and L. Stulman, *Inspired Speech*. London: Continuum, T & T Clark, 2004.
- De Troyer, Kristin. "On Crowns and Diadems for Kings, Queens, Horses and Men." 355-367 in B.A. Taylor, *IX Congr. Int'l. Org. LXX Cog. St.*. Atlanta: Scholars P, 1996.
- Debrohun, Jeri B. "Redressing Elegy's *Puella*: Propertius IV and the Rhetoric of Fashion." *JRS* 84 (1994): 41-63.
- Decock, Paul B. "Hostility against the Wealth of Babylon: Revelation 17:1-19:10." 263-286 in J.T. Fitzgerald et al., *Animosity, the Bible, and Us*. Atlanta: SBL, 2009.
- _____. "The Transformative Potential of the Apocalypse of John." *Acta Theologica* sup. 15 (2011): 183-199.
- Delfino, Susanna and Michele Gillespie, ed. *Neither Lady nor Slave: Working Women of the Old South*. Chapel Hill: U North Carolina P, 2002.
- Derrett, J. Duncan M. "The Disposal of Virgins." *Man* 9.1 (Mar. 1974): 23-30.
- Deschodt, Gaëlle. "Images et mariage, une question de méthode: le geste d'anakalypsis." *Cahiers «Mondes anciens»* 2 (2011): 13 p.
- deSilva, David A. *Seeing Things John's Way: The Rhetoric of the Book of Revelation*. Louisville: WJK, 2009.

- Deutsch, Celia. "Transformation of Symbols: The New Jerusalem in Rev 21:1-22:5." *ZNW* 78 (1987): 106-126.
- Deyle, Steven. "The Irony of Liberty: Origins of the Domestic Slave Trade." *J Early Republic* 12:1 (Spr. 1992): 37-62.
- Diddle Uzzi, Jeannine. "The Power of Parenthood in Official Roman Art." *Hesperia Sup.* 41 (2007): 61-81.
- Dixon, Suzanne. "Exemplary Housewife or Luxurious Slut? Cultural Representations of Women in the Roman Economy." 56-74 in F. McHardy and E. Marshall, *Women's Influence on Classical Civilization*. London: Routledge, 2004.
- _____. *The Roman Family*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins U P, 1992.
- Donahue, Charles, Jr. "The Case of the Man Who Fell into the Tiber." *Am. J Legal Hist.* 22:1 (Jan. 1978): 1-53.
- Dornan, Inge. "Masterful Women: Colonial Women Slaveholders in the Urban Low Country." *J Am. St.* 39:3 (Dec. 2005): 383-402.
- Dowden, Ken. *Death and the Maiden: Girls' Initiation Rites in Greek Mythology*. London: Routledge, 1989.
- duBois, Page. *Slavery: Antiquity and Its Legacy* (Ancients and Moderns). London: I.B. Tauris, 2010.
- Duff, Paul B. *Who Rides the Beast?* New York: Oxford U P, 2001.
- Dumézil, Georges. *Mariages Indo-Européens* (Bibliothèque Historique). Paris: Payot, 1979.
- Dunak, Karen M. "Ceremony and Citizenship: African-American Weddings, 1945-60." *Gender & His.* 21:2 (Aug. 2009): 402-424.
- Dunaway, Wilma A. *The African-American Family in Slavery and Emancipation*. New York: Cambridge U P, 2003.
- _____. "Diaspora, Death, and Sexual Exploitation: Slave Families at Mountain South." *Appalachian J* 26:2 (Win. 1999): 128-149.
- Dundes, Alan. *The Hero Pattern and the Life of Jesus*. Berkeley: Center for Hermeneutical Studies, 1977.
- _____. "'Jumping the Broom': On the Origin and Meaning of an African-American Wedding Custom." *JAF* 109.433 (Sum. 1996): 324-329.
- Duran, Nicole. "Having Men for Dinner: Deadly Banquets and Biblical Women." *BTB* 35.4 (Nov. 2005): 117-124.
- Dusinberre, William. *Strategies for Survival: Recollections of Bondage in Antebellum Virginia*. Charlottesville: U Virginia P, 2009.
- Edwards, Catharine. *Death in Ancient Rome*. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale U P, 2007.
- _____. *The Politics of Immorality in ancient Rome*. Cambridge: Cambridge U P, 1993.
- Edwards, Douglas R. "Religion, Power and Politics: Jewish Defeats by the Romans in Iconography and Josephus." 293-310 J.A. Overman and R.S. MacLennan, *Diaspora Jews and Judaism*. Atlanta: Scholars P, 1992.
- Edwards, Laura F. *Gendered Strife & Confusion: The Political Culture of Reconstruction*. Urbana: U Illinois P, 1997.

- _____. "Law, Domestic Violence, and the Limits of Patriarchal Authority in the Antebellum South." *J Southern His.* 65:4 (Nov. 1999): 733-770.
- _____. "The Marriage Covenant Is at the Foundation of All Our Rights." *Law His. Rev* 14.1 (Spr. 1996): 81-124.
- _____. *Scarlett Doesn't Live Here Anymore: Southern Women in the Civil War Era*. Urbana: U Illinois P, 2000.
- Edwards, Thornton B. "The Sugared Almond in Modern Greek Rites of Passage." *Folklore* 107 (1996): 49-56.
- Eliade, Mircea. *Naissances mystiques: essai sur quelques types d'initiation*. (Essais 92). Paris: Gallimard, 1959.
- Eliav-Feldon, Miriam, et al., ed. *The Origins of Racism in the West*. New York: Cambridge U P, 2009.
- Ellul, Jacques. *Apocalypse: The Book of Revelation*. (1975), tr. G.W. Schreiner. New York: Seabury P, 1977.
- Emerton, J.A. "Lice or a Veil in the Song of Songs 1.7?" 127-140 in A.G. Auld, *Understanding Poets and Prophets*. Sheffield: Sheffield Ac. P, 1993.
- Engerman, Stanley L. *Terms of Labor* (Making of Modern Freedom). Stanford: U P, 1999.
- Epplert, Christopher. "The Capture of Animals by the Roman Military." *G & R* 48:2 (Oct. 2001): 210-222.
- Erasmio, Mario. *Reading Death in Ancient Rome*. Columbus: Ohio State U P, 2008.
- Evans-Grubbs, Judith. "Between Slavery and Freedom: Disputes over Status and the Codex Justinianus." *Roman Legal Tradition* 9 (2013): 31-93.
- _____. *Law and Family in Late Antiquity*. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1995.
- _____. "Marriage More Shameful Than Adultery." *Phoenix* 47.2 (Sum. 1993): 125-154.
- _____. "'Pagan' and 'Christian' Marriage: The State of the Question." *J ECS* 2:3 (Win. 1994): 361-412.
- Exum, J. Cheryl. "Seeing Solomon's Palanquin (Song of Songs 3:6-11)." *Bibl. Interp.* 11.3/4 (2003): 301-316.
- _____. *Song of Songs: A Commentary* (OT Library). Louisville: WJK P, 2005.
- Fabre, Georges. *Libertus: Recherches sur les rapports patron-affranchi à la fin de la république romaine* (Col. l'Éc. Fr. Rome 50). Palais Farnèse: École Française de Rome, 1981.
- Fagan, Garrett G. *The Lure of the Arena: Social Psychology and the Crowd at the Roman Games*. New York: Cambridge U P, 2011.
- Falk, Ze'ev W. *Jewish Matrimonial Law in the Middle Ages* (Scripta Judaica 7). Oxford: Oxford U P, 1966.
- Farrer, Austin M. *The Revelation of St. John the Divine: Commentary on the English Text*. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1964.
- _____. *A Rebirth of Images: The Making of St. John's Apocalypse*. Westminster: Dacre P, 1949.
- Faure-Ribreau, Marion. "Ce que les femmes se disent entre elles: les duos féminins dans la comédie romaine." *Cahiers «Mondes anciens»* 3 (2012). 11 p.

- Faust, Drew Gilpin. *Mothers of Invention: Women of the Slaveholding South in the American Civil War* (1996). New York: Vintage, 1998.
- _____. "A Southern Stewardship: The Intellectual and the Proslavery Argument." *Am. Q.* 31:1 (Spr. 1979): 63-80.
- Fede, Andrew. *People without Rights: An Interpretation of the Fundamentals of the Law of Slavery in the U.S. South*. New York: Garland, 1992.
- _____. "Legitimized Violent Slave Abuse in the American South, 1619-1865: A Case Study of Law and Social Change in Six Southern States." *Am. J. Legal His.* 29:2 (Apr. 1985): 93-150.
- _____. "Toward a Solution of the Slave Law Dilemma: A Critique of Tushnet's 'The American Law of Slavery.'" *Law His. Rev.* 2:2 (Aut. 1984): 301-345.
- Fedeli, Paolo. *Catullus' Carmen 61*. Amsterdam: J.C. Gieben, 1983.
- Fehribach, Adeline. "The 'Birthing' Bridegroom: The Portrayal of Jesus in the Fourth Gospel." 104-129 in Levine and Blickenstaff, *John* v. 2. Cleveland: Pilgrim P, 2003.
- _____. *The Women in the Life of the Bridegroom*. Collegeville, Minnesota: Liturgical P, 1998.
- Fekkes, Jan. "'His Bride Has Prepared Herself': Rev. 19-21 and Isaian Nuptial Imagery." *JBL* 109.2 (Jun. 1990): 269-287.
- Fentress-Williams, Judy. *Ruth* (Abingdon OTC). Nashville: Abingdon P, 2012.
- Ferrari, Gloria. *Figures of Speech: Men and Maidens in Ancient Greece*. Chicago: U Chicago P, 2002.
- _____. "What Kind of Rite of Passage Was the Ancient Greek Wedding?" 27-42 in D.B. Dobb and C.A. Faraone, *Initiation in Ancient Greek Rituals and Narratives*. New York: Routledge, 2003.
- Feuillet, A. "Les 144,000 Israélites marqués d'un sceau." *Nov. Test.* 9.3 (1967): 191-224.
- _____. "Visión de conjunto de la mística nupcial en el apocalipsis." *Scripta Theologica* 18.2 (1986): 407-431.
- Finley, Moses I. *Ancient Slavery and Modern Ideology*, 2nd ed. (1980). Princeton: Marcus Wiener, 1997.
- Fishbane, Simcha. *Deviancy in Early Rabbinic Literature: A Collection of Socio-Anthropological Essays* (Brill Ref. Lib. Early Judaism 27). Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Fisher, N.R.E. *Slavery in Classical Greece* (1993) (Cl. World). Bristol: Bristol Cl. P, 1995.
- Fisher, William W., III. "Ideology and Imagery in the Law of Slavery." *Chicago-Kent Law Rev.* 68 (1992): 1051-1086.
- Fitzgerald, William. *Slavery and the Roman Literary Imagination*. Cambridge: Cambridge U P, 2000.
- Flebbe, Jochen. "Feasts in John." 107-124 in C. Tuckett, *Feasts and Festivals*. Leuven: Peeters, 2009.
- Flemming, Rebecca. "*Quae Corpore Quaestum Facit*: The Sexual Economy of Female Prostitution in the Roman Empire." *J Roman St.* 89 (1999): 38-61.
- Flesher, Paul Virgil McCracken. "Slaves, Israelites and the System of the Mishnah." 101-109 in A.J. Avery-Peck, *New Perspectives on Ancient Judaism* v. 4 (Studies in Judaism). Lanham, Maryland: U P America, 1989.

- Fogel, Robert William. *Without Contract or Consent: The Rise and Fall of American Slavery*. New York: W.W. Norton, 1989.
- Fontaine, Carole. *Smooth Words: Women, Proverbs and Performance in Biblical Wisdom*. (JSOT Sup. 356). Sheffield: Sheffield Ac. P, 2002.
- Forbis, Elizabeth P. "Women's Public Image in Italian Honorary Inscriptions." *Am. J. Philol.* 111:4 (Win. 1990): 493-512.
- Ford, Lacy K. *Deliver Us from Evil: The Slavery Question in the Old South*. New York: Oxford U P, 2009.
- Forret, Jeff. "Slave-Poor White Violence in the Antebellum Carolinas." *NC Hist. Rev.* 81:2 (Apr. 2004): 139-167.
- _____. "Slaves, Sex and Sin: Adultery, Forced Separation and Baptist Church Discipline in Middle Georgia." *S & A* 33:3 (Sep. 2012): 337-358.
- Forsythe, Gary. "Ubi te gaius, ego gaia: New Light on an Old Roman Legal Saw." *Historia* 45.2 (1992): 240-241.
- Forti, Tova. *Animal Imagery in the Book of Proverbs* (Sup. VT 118). Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- _____. "Bee's Honey: From Realia to Metaphor in Biblical Wisdom Literature." *VT* 56:3 (Jul. 2006): 327-341.
- _____. "The *Isha Zara* in Proverbs 1-9: Allegory and Allegorization." *Hebrew St.* 48 (2007): 89-100.
- Foster, Helen and Donald Johnson, ed. *Wedding Dress Across Cultures* (Dress, Body, Culture). New York: Berg, 2003.
- Foster, Thomas A. "The Sexual Abuse of Black Men under American Slavery." *J His. Sexuality* 20:3 (Sep. 2011): 445-464.
- Fox-Genovese, Elizabeth. "Antebellum Southern Households: A New Perspective on a Familiar Question." *Fernand Braudel Ctr. Rev.* 7:2 (Fall 1983): 215-253.
- _____. *Within the Plantation Household: Black and White Women of the Old South*. Chapel Hill: U North Carolina P, 1988.
- _____ and Eugene D. Genovese. "The Divine Sanction of Social Order: Religious Foundations of the Southern Slaveholders' World View." *J AAR* 55:2 (Sum. 1987): 211-233.
- _____. *The Mind of the Master Class: History and Faith in the Southern Slaveholders' Worldview*. New York: Cambridge U P, 2005.
- France, R.T. *The Gospel of Matthew* (NICC NT). Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.
- Frangoulidis, Stavros. "Scaena Feralium Nuptiarum." *Am J Philol* 120.4 (Win. 1999): 601-619.
- Franke, Katherine M. "Becoming a Citizen: Reconstruction Era Regulation of African American Marriages." *Yale J Law & Human.* 11 (1999): 251-309.
- Frankfurter, David. "The Legacy of Sectarian Rage: Vengeance Fantasies in the New Testament." 114-128 in D.A. Bernat and J. Klawans, *Religion and Violence*. Sheffield: Phoenix P, 2007.
- Franzmann, Majella. "The City as Woman: The Case of Babylon in Isaiah 47." *ABR* 43 (1995): 1-19.

- Fraser, Rebecca J. *Courtship and Love Among the Enslaved in North Carolina* (Margaret Walker Alexander Ser. Afr.-Am. St.). Jackson: U Mississippi P, 2007.
- Frayn, Joan M. *Sheep-Rearing and the Wool Trade in Italy during the Roman Period* (ARCA 15). Liverpool: Francis Cairns, 1984.
- Freudenberger, Herman and Jonathan P. Pritchett. "The Domestic United States Slave Trade: New Evidence." *J Interdisciplinary His.* 21:3 (Win. 1991): 447-477.
- Frey, Jörg, et al., ed. *Imagery in the Gospel of John*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007.
- _____. "The Relevance of the Roman Imperial Cult for the Book of Revelation." 231-256 in J. Fotopoulos, *The New Testament and Early Christian Literature in Greco-Roman Context*. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- Friesen, Steven J. *Imperial Cults and the Apocalypse of John: Reading Revelation in the Ruins*. New York: Oxford U P, 2001.
- Frilingos, Chris. "'It Moves Me to Wonder': Narrating Violence and Religion under the Roman Empire." *J AAR* 77.4 (Dec. 2009): 825-852.
- _____. "Sexing the Lamb." 297-317 in Stephen D. Moore and Janet Capel Anderson, *New Testament Masculinities*. Atlanta: SBL, 2003.
- _____. *Spectacles of Empire*. Philadelphia: U Pennsylvania P, 2005.
- Frymer-Kensky, Tikva, et al., ed. *Gender and Law in the Hebrew Bible and the Ancient Near East*. (JSJ Sup. 262). Sheffield: Sheffield Ac. P, 1998.
- Gabrielsen, Vincent. "Piracy and the Slave Trade." 389-404 in A. Erskine, *A Companion to the Hellenistic World* (2003), 2nd ed. Malden, Massachusetts: Blackwell, 2005.
- Gaddis, Michael. *There Is No Crime for Those Who Have Christ: Religious Violence in the Christian Roman Empire*. Berkeley: U California P, 2005.
- Gafney, Wilda C.M. "A Black Feminist Approach to Biblical Studies." *Encounter* 67.4 (Aut. 2006): 391-403.
- Galambush, Julie. *Jerusalem in the Book of Ezekiel: The City as Yabweh's Wife*. Atlanta: Scholars P, 1992.
- Galpaz-Feller, Pnina. *Samson: The Hero and the Man*. (Bible in History 7). Bern: Peter Lang, 2006.
- Gardner, Jane F. "The Adoption of Roman Freedmen." *Phoenix* 43:3 (Aut. 1989): 236-257.
- _____. *Family and Familia in Roman Law and Life*. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1998.
- Gardner, Sarah E. *Blood & Irony: Southern White Women's Narratives of the Civil War, 1861-1937*. Chapel Hill: U North Carolina P, 2004.
- Garland, David. "Penal Excess and Surplus Meaning: Public Torture Lynchings in Twentieth-Century America." *Law & Soc. Rev.* 39:4 (Dec. 2005): 793-833.
- Garnsey, Peter. *Ideas of Slavery from Aristotle to Augustine*. Cambridge: Cambridge U P, 1996.
- _____. "Legal Privilege in the Roman Empire." *P & P* 41 (Dec. 1968): 3-24.

- Garrison, Daniel H. *Sexual Culture in Ancient Greece*. Norman: U Oklahoma P, 2000.
- Geddes, A.G. "Rags and Riches: The Costume of Athenian Men in the Fifth Century." *Cl. Q* 37:2 (1987): 307-331.
- Genovese, Eugene D. "The Chivalric Tradition in the Old South." *Sewanee Rev.* 108:2 (Spr. 2000): 188-205.
- _____. *Roll, Jordan, Roll: The World the Slaves Made*. New York: Vintage, 1972.
- _____. "'Our Family, White and Black': Family and Household in the Southern Slaveholders' World View." 69-87 in C. Bleser, *In Joy and in Sorrow*. New York: Oxford U P, 1991.
- _____. "Toward a Kinder and Gentler America: The Southern Lady in the Greening of the Politics of the Old South." 125-134 in C. Bleser, *In Joy and in Sorrow*. New York: Oxford U P, 1991.
- _____. "Yeomen Farmers in a Slaveholders' Democracy." *Agricultural His.* 49:2 (Apr. 1975): 331-342.
- George, Michele. "Slave Disguise in Ancient Rome." *S & A* 23.2 (2002): 41-54.
- Gilhus, Ingvild Sælid. *Animals, Gods and Humans: Changing Attitudes to Animals in Greek, Roman and Early Christian Ideas*. New York: Cambridge U P, 2006.
- Gillespie, Michele. "Peddling the Lost Cause: A Southern White Woman at Work." 219-237 in O.V. Burton et al., *The Struggle for Equality*. Charlottesville: U Virginia P, 2011.
- _____. "Woman in the Old South." Ch. 7 in L.K. Ford, *A Companion to the Civil War and Reconstruction*. Malden, Massachusetts: Blackwell, 2005. 19 p.
- Gillis, Carole and Marie-Louise B. Nosch, ed. *Ancient Textiles: Production, Craft and Society* (Anc. Textiles 1). Oxford: Oxbow, 2007.
- Gimelli, Louis B. "Louisa Maxwell Cocke: An Evangelical Plantation Mistress in the Antebellum South." *J Early Republic* 9:1 (Spr. 1989): 53-71.
- Gini, Anthony. "The Manly Intellect of His Wife: Xenophon, *Oeconomicus* Ch. 7." *Cl. World* 86:6 (Jul. 1993): 483-486.
- Glancy, Jennifer A. "Family Plots: Burying Slaves in Deep Historical Ground." *Biblical Interpr.* 10.1 (2002): 57-75.
- _____. "The Mistress of the Gaze: Masculinity, Slavery, and Representation." *Semeia* 74 (1996): 127-145.
- _____. "The Mistress-Slave Dialectic." *JSTOT* 72 (Dec. 1996): 71-87.
- _____. *Slavery in Early Christianity*. New York: U P, 2003.
- _____. "Slaves and Slavery in the Matthean Parables." *JBL* 119.1 (Mar. 2000): 67-90.
- _____ and Stephen D. Moore. "How Typical a Roman Prostitute Is Revelation's 'Great Whore?'" *JBL* 130:2 (2011): 551-569.
- Glass, Jonathan. "Some Observations on Psalm 19." 147-159 in Glass et al., *Listening Heart*. Sheffield: JSTOT P, 1987.

- Glazebrook, Allison. "Cosmetics and *Sôphrosunê*: Ischomachos' Wife in Xenophon's *Oikonomikos*." *Cl. World* 102:3 (Spr. 2009): 233-248.
- _____, ed. *Greek Prostitutes in the Ancient Mediterranean, 800 BCE-200 CE*. Madison: U Wisconsin P, 2011.
- Glymph, Thavolia. *Out of the House of Bondage: The Transformation of the Plantation Household*. New York: Cambridge U P, 2008.
- Goff, Barbara E. *Citizen Bacchae: Women's Ritual Practice in Ancient Greece* (JPICL). Berkeley: U California P, 2004.
- Goff, Matthew. "Hellish Females: The Strange Woman of LXX Proverbs and 4Q *Wiles of the Wicked Woman* (4Q184)." *JSS* 39.1 (Mar. 2008): 20-45.
- Golden, Mark. "The Effects of Slavery on Citizen Households and Children: Aeschylus, Aristophanes and Athens." *HR/RH* 15:3 (Fall 1988): 455-475.
- Goldin, Claudia Dale. *Urban Slavery in the American South 1820-1860: A Quantitative History*. Chicago: U Chicago P, 1976.
- Goldstein, Jonathan A. *I Maccabees* (Anchor Bible 41). Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Co., 1976.
- González Torres, Yolotl. "La prostitución en las sociedades antiguas." *Estudios de Asia y Africa* 24:3 (Sep. 1989): 398-414.
- Gordis, Robert. *The Song of Songs and Lamentations* (1954), rev. ed. New York: Ktav, 1978.
- _____. "A Wedding Song for Solomon." *JBL* 63.3 (Sep. 1944): 263-270.
- Gordon, Beverly. *Textiles: The Whole Story*. London: Thames & Hudson, 2011.
- Goring, Darlene C. "The History of Slave Marriage in the United States." *John Marshall Law Rev.* 39 (2005): 299-234.
- Goud, T. "Who Speaks the Final Lines? Catullus 62: Structure and Ritual." *Phoenix* 49.1 (Spr. 1995): 23-32.
- Gould, Philip. *Barbaric Traffic: Commerce and Antislavery in the Eighteenth-Century Atlantic World*. Coambridge, MA: Harvard U P, 2003.
- Gould, Virginia Meacham. "'The house that was never a home': Slave family and household organization in New Orleans, 1820-50." *S & A* 18:2 (1997): 90-103.
- Green, Barbara. "Pregnant Passion: Gender, Sex, and Violence in the Bible." 221-233 in C.A. Kirk-Duggan, *Pregnant Passion*. Atlanta: SBL, 2003.
- Greenberg, Moshe. "Ezekiel 16." 143-150 in J.H. Marks, *Love & Death in the Ancient Near East*. Guilford, Connecticut: Four Quarters, 1987.
- Greenfield, Guy. "Paul and the Eschatological Marriage." *Southwestern J Theol* 26 (Fall 1983): 32-48.
- Greengus, S. "Old Babylonian Marriage Ceremonies and Rites." *J Cuneiform St.* 20.2 (1966): 55-72.
- Griffin, Jasper. "Augustan Poetry and the Life of Luxury." *JRS* 66 (1976): 87-105.

- Griffith, R. Drew. "In Praise of the Bride: Sappho Fr. 105(A) L-P, Voigt." *TAPA* 119 (1989): 55-61.
- Grimes, Ronald L. *Deeply into the Bone: Re-Inventing Rites of Passage* (Life Passages). Berkeley: U California P, 2000.
- _____. *Marrying & Burying: Rites of Passage in a Man's Life*. Boulder, Colorado: Westview P, 1995.
- _____. *Rite out of Place: Ritual, Media, and the Arts*. Oxford: Oxford U P, 2006.
- _____. *Ritual Criticism*. (St. in Comp. Religion). Columbia: U South Carolina P, 1990.
- Gross, Ariela J. "Beyond Black and White: Cultural Approaches to Race and Slavery." *Columbia Law Rev.* 101:3 (Apr. 2001): 640-690.
- _____. *Double Character: Slavery and Mastery in the Antebellum Southern Courtroom*. Princeton: Princeton U P, 2000.
- Grossberg, Michael. *Governing the Hearth: Law and the Family in Nineteenth-Century America* (St. Legal His.). Chapel Hill: U North Carolina P, 1985.
- Gudmestad, Robert H. *A Troublesome Commerce: The Transformation of the Interstate Slave Trade*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State U P, 2003.
- Guest, Deryn. *Beyond Feminist Biblical Studies* (Bible in the Modern World 47). Sheffield: Phoenix P, 2012.
- Guida, Annalisa. "From *Parabolē* to *Sēmeion*: The Nuptial Imagery in Mark and John." 103-120 in Elizabeth Struthers Malbon, *Between Author and Audience in Mark*. Sheffield: Phoenix P, 2009.
- Gunderson, Erik. "The Ideology of the Arena." *Cl. Ant.* 15:1 (Apr. 1996): 113-151.
- Gundry, Robert H. "The New Jerusalem: People as Place, Not Place for People." *Nov. Test.* 29.3 (1987): 254-264.
- Gunkel, Hermann. *Creation and Chaos in the Primeval Era and the Eschaton*. (1921), tr. K. W. Whitney. Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans, 2006.
- _____. "Psalm 19:1-6: An Interpretation." *Biblical World* 21.4 (Apr. 1903): 281-283.
- Haarhoff, T.J. "The Bees of Virgil." *G & R* 7:2 (Oct. 1960): 155-170.
- Hadden Sally E. *Slave Patrols: Law and Violence in Virginia and the Carolinas* (Harvard Hist. St. 138). Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard U P, 2001.
- Haenchen, Ernst. *John 1: A Commentary on the Gospel of John Chapters 1-6* (1980), tr. R.W. Funk (Hermeneia). Philadelphia: Fortress P, 1984.
- Hague, Rebecca. "Greek Wedding Songs: The Tradition of Praise." *J Folklore Res.* 20.2 (Jun. 1983): 131-143.
- Hansen, Karen Tranberg. "The World in Dress: Anthropological Perspectives on Clothing, Fashion, and Culture." *Ann. Rev. Anthr.* 33 (2004): 369-392.
- Harlow, Mary, ed. *Dress and Identity* (BAR Int'l. Ser. 2356). Oxford: Archaeopress, 2012.
- Harmon, Daniel P. "The Family Festivals of Rome." *ANWR* 2.16.2 (1978): 1592-1603.

- Harper, Kyle. *Slavery in the Late Roman World, AD 275-425*. Cambridge: Cambridge U P, 2011.
- Harrill, James A. *Slaves in the New Testament: Literary, Social, and Moral Dimensions*. Minneapolis: Fortress P, 2006.
- _____. "The Use of the New Testament in the American Slave Controversy." *Rel. Am. Cul.* 10:2 (Jun. 2000): 149-186.
- _____. "The Vice of Slave Dealers in Greco-Roman Society." *JBL* 118.1 (Spr. 1999): 97-122.
- Harris, Marla. "Not Black and/or White: Reading Racial Difference in Heliodorus's *Ethiopica* and Pauline Hopkins's *Of One Blood*." *Afr. Am. Rev.* 35:3 (Aut. 2001): 375-390.
- Harris, William V. "Demography, Geography, and the Sources of Roman Slaves." *J Roman St.* 89 (1999): 62-75.
- _____. *Rome's Imperial Economy: Twelve Essays*. Oxford: Oxford U P, 2011.
- _____. "Towards a Study of the Roman Slave Trade." *MAAR* 36 (1980): 117-140.
- Harrison, Kimberly. *The Rhetoric of Rebel Women: Civil War Diaries and Confederate Persuasion*. (Studies in Rhetorics and Feminisms). Carbondale: Southern Illinois U P, 2013.
- Harissis, Haralampos V. and Anastasios V. *Apiculture in the Prehistoric Aegean*. (BAR Int'l. Ser. 1958). Oxford: Archaeopress, 2009.
- Harlow, Mary, ed. *Dress and Identity* (BAR Int'l. Ser. 2356). Oxford: Archaeopress, 2012.
- Harris, W.V. *Rome's Imperial Economy: Twelve Essays*. Oxford: Oxford U P, 2011.
- Hart, David B. "The 'Whole Humanity': Gregory of Nyssa's Critique of Slavery in Light of His Eschatology." *Scot. J Theol.* 54.1 (2001): 51-69.
- Hawkins, Tom R. "The Wife of Noble Character in Proverbs 31:10-31." *Bibl. Sac.* 153 (Jan. 1996): 12-23.
- Hawley, Richard and Barbara Levick, ed. *Women in Antiquity: New Assessments*. London: Routledge, 1995.
- Haynes, Stephen R. *Noah's Curse: The Biblical Justification of American Slavery*. New York: Oxford U P, 2002.
- Hemelrijk, Emily A. *Matrona Docta: Educated women in the Roman elite from Cornelia to Julia Domna*. London: Routledge, Taylor & Francis, 1999.
- Henten, Jan W. van. "The Concept of Martyrdom in Revelation." 587-618 in J. Frey et al., *Die Johannesapokalypse* (WUNT 287). Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012.
- Herman, Shael. "The Contribution of Roman Law to the Jurisprudence of Antebellum Louisiana." *Louisiana Law Rev.* 56 (1995): 257-315.
- Hersch, Karen R. *The Roman Wedding: Ritual and Meaning in Antiquity*. Cambridge: Cambridge U P, 2010.
- _____. "Ethnicity and the costume of the Roman Bride." 135-141 in E. Herring and K. Lomas, *Gender Identities in Italy in the First Millennium BC*. Oxford: Archaeopress, 2009.
- Hezser, Catherine. *Jewish Slavery in Antiquity*. Oxford: Oxford U P, 2005.

- _____, ed. *Rabbinic Law in its Roman and Near Eastern Context*. (Texts & St. Anc. Judaism 97). Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003.
- Hinds, Stephen. "First among Women: Ovid, *Tristia* 1.6 and the Traditions of the 'Exemplary' Catalogue." 123-142 in S.M. Braund and R. Mayer, *Amor: Roma*. Cambridge: Cambridge Philological Soc., 1999.
- Hock, Andras. "From Babel to the New Jerusalem (Gen 11,1-9 and Rev 21,1-22,5)." *Biblica* 89.1 (2008): 109-118.
- Hodes, Martha. *White Women/Black Men: Illicit Sex in the Nineteenth-Century South*. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale U P, 1997.
- Hodkinson, Stephen and Dick Geary, ed. *Slaves and Religions in Graeco-Roman Antiquity and Modern Brazil*. Newcastle-upon-Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publ., 2012.
- Hoffmann, Lawrence A. and Paul F. Bradshaw, ed. *Life Cycles in Jewish and Christian Worship*. Notre Dame, Indiana: U Notre Dame P, 1996.
- Hoffmann, Matthias Reinhard. *The Destroyer and the Lamb* (WUNT 2, 203). Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005.
- Holleran, Claire. *Shopping in Ancient Rome: The Retail Trade in the Late Republic and the Principate*. Oxford: Oxford U P, 2012.
- Holt, Sharon Ann. "Symbol, Memory, and Service: Resistance And Family Formation in Nineteenth Century African America." 193-210 in L.E. Hudson, *Working toward Freedom*. Rochester, New York: U Rochester P, 1994.
- Hood, Elizabeth F. "Black Women, White Women: Separate Paths to Liberation." *Black Scholar* 9:7 (Apr. 1978): 45-56.
- Hope, Valerie. "Fighting for Identity: The Funerary Commemorations of Italian Gladiators." 93-113 in A. Cooley, *The Epigraphic Landscape of Roman Italy*. London: Inst. Cl. St., 2001.
- Hopkins, Keith. *Conquerors and Slaves*. Cambridge: Cambridge U P, 1978.
- _____. *Death and Renewal* (Sociological St. Rom. Hist. 2). Cambridge: Cambridge U P, 1983.
- _____. "Novel Evidence for Roman Slavery." *P & P* 138 (Feb. 1993): 3-27.
- _____ and Mary Beard. *The Colosseum*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard U P, 2005.
- Horsley, Richard A. "The Slave Systems of Classical Antiquity and Their Reluctant Recognition by Modern Scholars." *Semeia* 83-84 (1998): 19-66.
- _____. "Spiritual Marriage with Sophia." *Vig. Chr.* 33:1 (Mar. 1979): 30-54.
- Horst, Pieter W. van der. *Japheth in the Tents of Shem: Studies on Jewish Hellenism in Antiquity* (Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology 32). Leuven: Peeters, 2002.
- Howard-Brook, Wes and Anthony Gwyther. *Unveiling Empire: Reading Revelation Then and Now* (Bible & Liberation). Maryknoll, New York: Orbis, 1999.
- Hubbard, Moyer. "Honey for Aseneth: Interpreting a Religious Symbol." *JSPs* 16.8 (Jul. 1997): 97-110.

- Huber, Lynn R. "Gazing at the Whore: Reading Revelation Queerly." 302-320 in T.J. Hornsby and K. Stone, *Bible Trouble*. Atlanta: SBL, 2011.
- _____. *Like a Bride Adorned: Reading Metaphor in John's Apocalypse* (Emory St. Early Christianity 9). New York: T & T Clark Int'l., 2007.
- _____. "Sexually Explicit? Re-reading Revelation's 144,000 Virgins as a Response to Roman Discourses." *JMMS* 2.1 (Jan. 2008): 3-28.
- _____. *Thinking and Seeing with Women in Revelation*. (Lib. NT St. 475). New York: Bloomsbury, 2013.
- Humphrey, Edith McEwan. *The Ladies and the Cities: Transformation and Apocalyptic Identity* (JSPs Sup. 17). Sheffield: Sheffield Ac. P, 1995.
- _____. "On Visions, Arguments, and Naming." 164-178 in Z.A. Crook et al., *Identity and Interaction in the Ancient Mediterranean*. Sheffield: Phoenix P, 2007.
- _____. "The Sweet and the Sour." *SBL Seminar Papers* 30 (1991): 451-460.
- _____. "A Tale of Two Cities and (At Least) Three Women." 81-96 in David L. Barr, *Reading the Book of Revelation*. Atlanta: SBL, 2003.
- Hunter, David G. "Augustine and the Making of Marriage in Roman North Africa." *J ECS* 11:1 (Spr. 2003): 63-85.
- _____. *Marriage, Celibacy, and Heresy in Ancient Christianity: The Jovianist Controversy*. Oxford: Oxford U P, 2007.
- Husband, Julie. *Antislavery Discourse and Nineteenth-Century American Literature*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.
- Hutchings, John. "Colour In Folklore And Tradition — The Principles." *COLOR* 29:1 (Feb. 2004): 57-66.
- Hylen, Susan. "The Power and Problem of Revelation 18." 205-219 in C. Kirk-Duggan, *Pregnant Passion*. Atlanta: SBL, 2003.
- Ilan, Tal. *Jewish Women in Greco-Roman Palestine* (TSAJ 44). Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1995.
- Ingalls, Wayne. "Ritual Performance as Training for Daughters in Archaic Greece." *Phoenix* 54.1 (Spr. 2000): 1-20.
- Ingersoll, Thomas N. "The Slave Trade and the Ethnic Diversity of Louisiana's Slave Community." *Louisiana His.* 37:2 (Spr. 1996): 133-161.
- Ipsen, Avaren. *Sex Working and the Bible* (BibleWorld). London: Acumen, 2009.
- Ipsen, Pernille. "'The Christened Mulatresses': Euro-African Families in a Slave-Trading Town." *Wm. & Mary Q.* 70:2 (Apr. 2013): 371-389.
- Isaac, Benjamin. "Proto-Racism in Graeco-Roman Antiquity." *World Archaeology* 38.1 (Mar. 2006): 32-47.
- Jackson, Bernard S. "Biblical Laws of Slavery: A Comparative Approach." 86-101 in L.J. Archer, *Slavery and Other Forms of Unfree Labour*. London: Routledge, 1988.
- Jacobelli, Luciana. *Gladiators at Pompeii*. Rome: «L'Erma» di Bretschneider, 2003.

- Jacoby, Karl. "Slaves by Nature? Domestic Animals and Human Slaves." *S & A* 15.1 (1993): 89-99.
- Jaffee, Martin S. *Early Judaism: Religious Worlds of the First Judaic Millennium*. (1997), 2nd ed. Bethesda: U Maryland P, 2006.
- James, Sharon L. "The Economics of Roman Elegy: Voluntary Poverty, the *Recusatio*, and the Greedy Girl." *Am. J. Philol.* 122:2 (Sum. 2001): 223-253.
- ____ and Sheila Dillon, ed. *A Companion to Women in the Ancient World*. Malden, Massachusetts: Blackwell, 2012.
- Jenkins, David, ed. *Cambridge History of Western Textiles*, v. 1. Cambridge: Cambridge U P, 2003.
- Jenkins, Ian. "Is There Life after Marriage?" *Bull. Inst. Classical Studies* 30.1 (Dec. 1983): 137-145.
- Jensen, Hans J. Lundager. "The Cosmic Wedding and the Brief Life on Earth." 136-157 in K. Jeppesen et al., *In the Last Days*. Aarhus: Aarhus U P, 1994.
- Jensen, Joseph. "Does *Porneia* Mean 'Fornication'? A Critique of Bruce Malina." *NT* 20.3 (Jul. 1978): 161-184.
- Johnson, Walter. "The Slave Trader, the White Slave, and the Politics of Racial Determination in the 1850s." *J. Am. His.* 87:1 (Jun. 2000): 13-38.
- ____, ed. *The Chattel Principle: Internal Slave Trades in the Americas*. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale U P, 2004.
- Johnston, David. *Roman Law in Context*. (Key Themes in Anc. His. 10). Cambridge: Cambridge U P, 1999.
- Jones, Bernie D. *Fathers of Conscience: Mixed-Race Inheritance in the Antebellum South* (St. Legal His. South). Athens: U Georgia P, 2009.
- Jones, Brian William. "Some Thoughts on the Propaganda of Vespasian and Domitian." *Cl. J.* 66:3 (Feb. 1971): 251.
- Jones, Cecily. *Engendering whiteness: White women and colonialism in Barbados and North Carolina, 1627-1865* (St. in Imperialism). Manchester: U P, 2007.
- Jones, Christopher. "Hyperides and the Sale of Slave-Families." *ZPE* 164 (2008): 19-20.
- Jones, Hilary. "Marriage à la Mode to Weddings at Town Hall: Marriage, Colonialism, and Mixed-Race Society in Nineteenth-Century Senegal." *Int'l. J. Afr. Hist. St.* 38.1 (2005): 27-48.
- Jones, Ivor H. *The Matthean Parables* (Sup. Nov. Test. 80). New York: E.J. Brill, 1995.
- Jones, Meriel. *Playing the Man: Performing Masculinities in the Ancient Greek Novel* (St. Cl. Lit. and Gender). Oxford: Oxford U P, 2012.
- Jones, Noreece T. *Born a Child of Freedom, Yet a Slave: Mechanisms of Control and Strategies of Resistance in Antebellum South Carolina*. Hanover, New Hampshire: Wesleyan U P, 1990.
- ____. "Rape in Black and White." 93-113 in J.D. Winthrop, *Slavery and the American South*. Jackson: U P Mississippi, 2003.
- Jones, Scott J. "Wisdom's Pedagogy: A Comparison of Proverbs VII and 4Q184." *Vet. Test.* 53.1 (Jan. 2003): 65-80.

- Joshel, Sandra R. "Nurturing the Master's Child: Slavery and the Roman Child-Nurse." *Signs* 12:1 (Aut. 1986): 3-22.
- . *Slavery in the Roman World*. Cambridge: Cambridge U P, 2010.
- and Sheila Murnaghan, ed. *Women and Slaves in Greco-Roman Culture*. London: Routledge, 1998.
- Kampen, John. "The Genre and Function of Apocalyptic Literature in the African American Experience." 43-65 in D.L. Smith-Christopher, *Text and Experience*. Sheffield: Sheffield Ac P, 1995.
- Kampen, Natalie Boymel. "Biographical Narration and Roman Funerary Art." *Am. J. Arch.* 85.1 (Jan. 1981): 47-58.
- . *Family Fictions in Roman Art*. Cambridge: Cambridge U P, 2009.
- Kantorowicz, Ernst H. "On the Golden Marriage Belt and the Marriage Rings of the Dumbarton Oaks Collection." *D. Oaks Pap.* 14 (1960): 1-16.
- Katzoff, Ranon. "Greek and Jewish Marriage Formulas." 223-234 in Katzoff et al., *Classical Studies in Honor of David Sohlberg*. Ramat Gan: Bar-Ilan U P, 1996.
- Keener, Craig S. *A Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999.
- . *The Gospel of John: A Commentary*, 3 vol. Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson, 2003.
- Keller, Catherine. "The Breast, the Apocalypse, and the Colonial Journey." *JFSR* 10.1 (Spr. 1994): 53-72.
- Kempter, Mylène. "La signification eschatologique de Jean 3.29." *NTS* 54 (2008): 43-59.
- Kennedy, Cynthia M. *Braided Relations, Entwined Lives: The Women of Charleston's Urban Slave Society* (Blacks in the Diaspora). Bloomington: Indiana U P, 2005.
- Kerényi, C. *Zeus and Hera* (1972), tr. C. Holme (Bollingen Ser. 5). Princeton: Princeton U P, 1975.
- Kiely, Terrence F. "The Hollow Words: An Experiment in Legal Historical Methods as Applied to the Institution of Slavery." *DePaul Law Rev.* 25 (1875): 842-894.
- Kilpatrick, Ross Stuart. "The Early Augustan 'Aldobrandini Wedding' Fresco." *MAAR* 47 (2002): 19-32.
- King, Deborah K. "Multiple Jeopardy, Multiple Consciousness: The Context of a Black Feminist Ideology." *Signs* 14:1 (Aut. 1988): 42-72.
- Kingsmill, Edmée. *The Song of Songs and the Eros of God: A Study in Biblical Intertextuality*. Oxford: Oxford U P, 2009.
- Kleiner, Diana and Susan Matheson, ed. *I, Claudia II: Women in Roman Art and Society*. Austin: U Texas P, 2000.
- Kober, Alice E. "Some Remarks on Color in Greek Poetry." *Cl. Weekly* 27:24 (30 Apr. 1934): 189-191.
- Koester, Craig R. *Revelation and the End of All Things*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001.
- . "Roman Slave Trade and the Critique of Babylon in Rev. 18." *CBQ* 70.4 (Oct. 2008): 766-786.
- . *Symbolism in the Fourth Gospel* (1995), 2nd ed. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress P, 2003.

- Koger, Larry. *Black Slaveowners: Free Black Slave Masters in South Carolina, 1790-1860*. Columbia: U South Carolina P, 1985.
- Koltun-Frumm, Naomi. *Hermeneutics of Holiness: Ancient Jewish and Christian Notions of Sexuality and Religious Community*. New York: Oxford U P, 2010.
- Konstan, David. "Between Courtesan and Wife: Menander's *Perikeiromene*." *Phoenix* 41:2 (Sum. 1987): 122-139.
- Kraemer, Ross Shepard. *Her Share of the Blessings: Women's Religions among Pagans, Jews, and Christians in the Greco-Roman World*. New York: Oxford U P, 1992.
- _____. *When Aseneth Met Joseph*. New York: Oxford U P, 1998.
- _____. "When Aseneth Met Joseph: A Postscript." 128-135 in R.A. Argall et al., *For a Later Generation*. Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Trinity P Int'l, 2000.
- Kraft, Robert A. "Early Developments of the 'Two-Ways Tradition(s),' in Retrospect." 136-143 in R.A. Argall et al., *For a Later Generation*. Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Trinity P Int'l, 2000.
- Kramer, Phyllis S. "Biblical Women that Come in Pairs." 218-232 in Athalya Brenner, *Genesis*. Sheffield: Sheffield Ac. P, 1998.
- Kreitzer, Larry. "Sibylline Oracles 8, the Roman Imperial *Adventus* Coinage of Hadrian and the Apocalypse of John." *JSPs* 4:3 (Apr. 1989): 69-84.
- Krowl, Michelle A. "For Better or for Worse: Black Families and 'the State' in Civil War Virginia." 35-57 in C. Clinton, *Southern Families at War*. New York: Oxford U P, 2000.
- Kyle, Donald G. *Spectacles of Death in Ancient Rome*. London: Routledge, 1998.
- _____. *Sport and Spectacle in the Ancient World* (Ancient Cultures). Malden, Massachusetts: Blackwell, 2007.
- La Fontaine, Jean Sybil. *Initiation*. (Themes in Social Anthropology). Manchester: Man. U P, 1986.
- Labovitz, Gail Susan. *Marriage and Metaphor: Constructions of Gender in Rabbinic Literature*. Lanham, Maryland: Lexington, Rowman & Littlefield, 2009.
- Lambrecht, Jan, S.J. *Out of the Treasure: The Parables in the Gospel of Matthew* (LTPM 10). Louvain: Peeters, 1991.
- Lang, Bernhard. "Women's Work, Household and Property in Two Mediterranean Societies: A Comparative Essay on Proverbs XXI 10-31." *Vet. Test.* 54.2 (Jan. 2004): 188-207.
- Larsen, Lawrence H. *The Urban South: A History* (New Perspectives on the South). Lexington: U P Kentucky, 1980.
- Larson, Jennifer. *Greek Heroine Cults* (WISC). Madison: U Wisconsin P, 1995.
- Lauderville, Dale, O.S.B. *Celibacy in the Ancient World*. Collegeville, Minnesota: Liturgical P, 2010.
- Lawler, Lillian B. "Bee Dances and the 'Sacred Bees.'" *Cl. Weekly* 47:7 (15 Feb. 1954): 103-106.
- Lawson, James. "The Roman Garden." *Greece & Rome* 19:57 (Oct. 1950): 97-105.

- Leader, Ruth. "In Death Not Divided: Gender, Family, and State on Classical Athenian Grave Stelae." *Am. J. Arch.* 101:4 (Oct. 1997): 683-699.
- Lee, Desmond. "Science, Philosophy, and Technology in the Greco-Roman World: I." *G & R* 20:1 (Apr. 1973): 65-78.
- Lee, G.M. "John XV 14 'Ye are My Friends.'" *Nov. Test.* 15.4 (Oct. 1973): 260.
- Lee, Michelle V. "A Call to Martyrdom: Function as Method and Message in Revelation." *Nov. Test.* 40.2 (Apr. 1998): 164-194.
- Leathers Daniels, Marion. "'The Song of the Fates' in Catullus 64." *Clas. J.* 68.2 (Dec. 1972): 97-101.
- Lee, Mireille M. "'Evil Wealth of Raiment': Deadly Πέπλοι in Greek Tragedy." *Clas. J.* 99.3 (Feb. 2004): 253-279.
- Lee Pilchan. *The New Jerusalem in the Book of Revelation: A Study of Revelation 21-22 in Light of its Background in Jewish Tradition*. (WUNT II, 129). Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001.
- Lefkowitz, Mary R. "Wives and Husbands." *G & R* 30:1 (Apr. 1983): 31-47.
- Légasse, Simon. "La parabole de dix vierges." 349-360 in Jean Delorme, *Paraboles Évangéliques*. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1989.
- Leick, Gwendolyn. *Sex and Eroticism in Mesopotamian Literature*. London: Routledge, Taylor & Francis, 1994.
- Lemcio, Eugene E. "The Parables of the Great Supper and the Wedding Feast." *HBT* 8.1 (Jun. 1986): 1-26.
- Lemon, Hugo. "The Development of Hand Spinning Wheels." *Textile His.* 1:2 (Dec. 1969): 83-91.
- Lemos, Tracy Maria. *Marriage Gifts and Social Change in Ancient Palestine*. Cambridge: Cambridge U P, 2010.
- Lerner, Gerda. "Women's Rights and American Feminism." *Am. Scholar* 40:2 (Spr. 1971): 235-248.
- Levick, Barbara. "The Roman Economy: Trade in Asia Minor and the Niche Market." *G & R* 51:2 (Oct. 2004): 180-198.
- Levine, Amy-Jill. and M. Mayo Robbins, ed. *A Feminist Companion to the Apocalypse of John*. London: T & T Clark, 2009.
- _____. *A Feminist Companion to Patristic Literature*. London: Continuum, T & T Clark, 2008.
- Lewis, David. "Near Eastern Slaves in Classical Attica and the Slave Trade with Persian Territories." *Cl. Q.* 61:1 (May 2011): 91-113.
- Lewis, Sian. *The Athenian Woman: An Iconographic Handbook*. London: Routledge, Taylor & Francis, 2002.
- Liang Wang-Huei. "Is She Not My Wife, and Am I Not Her Husband?" *HBT* 31 (2009): 1-11.
- Lightman, Marjorie and William Zeisel. "Univira: An Example of Continuity and Change in Roman Society." *Church His.* 46.1 (Mar. 1977): 19-32.
- Lightner, David L. "The Founders and the Interstate Slave Trade." *J Early Republic* 22:1 (Spr. 2002): 25-51.

- . *Slavery and the Commerce Power: How the Struggle Against the Interstate Slave Trade Led to the Civil War*. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale U P, 2006.
- Lin, Rachel Chernos. "The Rhode Island Slave-Traders: Butchers, Bakers and Candlestick-Makers." *S & A* 23:2 (Dec. 2002): 21-38.
- Lincoln, Andrew T. *The Gospel According to Saint John*. (Black's NT Comm.). London: Continuum, 2005.
- Lincoln, Bruce. *Emerging from the Chrysalis: Studies in Rituals of Women's Initiation*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard U P, 1981.
- Lind, Göran. *Common Law Marriage: A Legal Institution for Cohabitation*. New York: Oxford U P, 2008.
- Litsas, Fotios K. *The Greek Folk Wedding: Preliminary Studies*. Chicago: U Chicago P, 1981.
- Littlefield, Daniel C. "Charleston and Internal Slave Redistribution." *SC Hist. Mag.* 87:2 (Apr. 1986): 93-105.
- Llewellyn-Jones, Lloyd. *Aphrodite's Tortoise: The Veiled Woman of Ancient Greece*. Cardiff: Cl. P Wales, 2003.
- . "House and veil in ancient Greece." *BSAS* 15 (2007): 251-258.
- and Sue Blundell, et al. *Women's Dress in the Ancient Greek World*. London: Duckworth, 2002.
- Loader, William A. *The Pseudepigrapha on Sexuality*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans., 2011.
- Lockley, Timothy J. "Crossing the race divide: Interracial sex in antebellum Savannah." *S & A* 18:3 (Dec. 1997): 159-173.
- Lokken, Paul. "Marriage as Slave Emancipation in Seventeenth-Century Rural Guatemala." *The Americas* 58:2 (Oct. 2001): 175-200.
- Long, Gary Alan. "A Lover, Cities, and Heavenly Bodies: Co-Text and the Translation of Two Similes in Canticles (6:4c; 6:10d)." *JBL* 113.4 (Dec. 1996): 703-709.
- Longenecker, Bruce W. "Rome, Provincial Cities and the Seven Churches of Rev. 2-3." 281-291 in P.J. Williams et al., *The New Testament in Its First Century Setting*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004.
- Lonsdale, Steven. *Dance and Ritual Play in Greek Religion*. (An. Soc. His.). Baltimore: Johns Hopkins U P, 1993.
- Lunceford, Joe E. *Parody and Counterimaging in the Apocalypse*. Eugene, Oregon: Wipf & Stock, 2009.
- Lyons, Deborah. "Dangerous Gifts: Ideologies of Marriage and Exchange in Ancient Greece." *Cl. Ant.* 22:1 (Apr. 2003): 93-134.
- Maartens, Pieter J. "Mark 2:18-22: An Exercise in Theoretically-Founded Exegesis." *Scriptura* 2 (1980): 1-54.
- MacDonald, Margaret Y. "Slavery, Sexuality and House Churches." *NTS* 53.1 (Jan. 2007): 94-113.
- Mackay, E.A. "Narrative Tradition in Early Greek Oral Poetry and Vase-Painting." *Or. Trad.* 10.2 (1995): 282-303.
- Mackenzie, Caroline. "The bride becomes the interior son." *Bangalore Theol. Forum*. 19.4 (Oct. 1987): 301-311.
- MacLachlan, Bonnie and Judith Fletcher, ed. *Virginity Revisited* (Phoenix Sup. 44). Toronto: U Toronto P, 2007.

- Maddex, Jack P., Jr. "Proslavery Millennialism: Social Eschatology in Antebellum Southern Calvinism." *Am. Q.* 31:1 (Spr. 1979): 46-62.
- Malina, Bruce J. "How A Cosmic Lamb Marries." *BTB* 28 (Sum. 1998): 75-83.
- Malul, Meir. "*Susapinnu*: The Mesopotamian Paranymp and His Role." *JESHO* 32.3 (Oct. 1989): 241-278.
- Mann, Christian. "Gladiators in the Greek East: A Case Study in Romanization." *Int'l. J. His. Sport.* 26:2 (2009): 272-297.
- Manning, C.E. "Stoicism and Slavery in the Roman Empire." 1518-1563 in *ANRW* 36.3. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1989.
- Manning, W.H. "Industrial Growth." 586-605 in J. Wachter, *The Roman World* v. 2. London: Routledge, Kegan Paul, 1987.
- Marchetti, C. "A Postmortem Technology Assessment of the Spinning Wheel." *Technological Forecasting and Social Change* 13 (1979): 91-93.
- Marques, Leonardo. "Slave Trading in a New World: The Strategies of North American Slave Traders in the Age of Abolition." *J Early Republic* 32:2 (Sum. 2012): 233-260.
- Marshall, Amani. "'They Will Endeavor to Pass for Free': Enslaved Runaways' Performances of Freedom in Antebellum South Carolina." *S & A* 31:2 (2010): 161-180.
- Marshall, John W. "Collateral Damage: Jesus and Jezebel in the Jewish War." 35-50 in E. Leigh Gibson and S. Matthews, *Violence in the New Testament*. New York: T & T Clark Int'l., 2005.
- Marsman, Hennie J. *Women in Ugarit and Israel* (Oudtestamentische Studiën 49). Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- Martin, Clarice M. "The Eyes Have It: Slaves in the Communities of Christ-Believers." 221-239 in R. Horsley, *Christian Origins*. Minneapolis: Fortress P, 2005.
- _____. "Polishing the Unclouded Mirror: A Womanist Reading of Rev. 18:13." 82-109 in David Rhoads, *From Every People and Nation*. Minneapolis: Fortress P, 2005.
- Martin, Dale B. "Ancient Slavery, Class, and Early Christianity." *Fides et Historia* 23.3 (Sum. 1991): 105-113.
- _____. *Sex and the Single Savior: Gender and Sexuality in Biblical Interpretation*. Louisville: WJK, 2006.
- _____. *Slavery as Salvation: The Metaphor of Slavery in Pauline Christianity*. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale U P, 1990.
- Martin, Joan M. *More Than Chains and Toil: A Christian Work Ethic of Enslaved Women*. Louisville: WJK, 2000.
- Martin, Jonathan D. *Divided Mastery: Slave Hiring in the American South*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard U P, 2004.
- Martin, Michael W. "Betrothal Journey Narratives." *CBQ* 70.4 (Oct. 2008): 505-523.
- Masanya, Mmadipoane (Ngwana 'Mphahlele). "A *Bosadi* (Womanhood) Reading of Prov. 31:10-31." 145-157 in M.W. Dube, *Other Ways of Reading*. Atlanta and Geneva: SBL, WCC, 2001.
- Mason, Matthew. "Keeping up Appearances: The International Politics of Slave Trade Abolition in the Nineteenth-Century Atlantic World." *Wm. Mary Q* 66:4 (Oct. 2009): 809-832.

- Massingberd Ford, J. "The Divorce Bill of the Lamb and the Scroll of the Suspected Adulteress. A Note on Apoc. 5, 1 and 10, 8-11." *JStJ* 2 (1971): 136-143.
- _____. "The Parable of the Foolish Scholars (Matt. xxv 1-13)." *Nov. Test.* 9:2 (Apr. 1967): 107-123.
- Matand Bulembat, Jean-Bosco. "Head-Waiter and Bridegroom of the Wedding at Cana." *JSTNT* 30.1 (2007): 55-74.
- Mathews, Donald G. "The Southern Rite of Human Sacrifice." *J Southern Rel.* 3 (2000). 8 p.
- Mathews, Mark D. *Riches, Poverty, and the Faithful: Perspectives on Wealth in the Second Temple Period and the Apocalypse of John*. (SNTS Mon. 154). Cambridge: Cambridge U P, 2013.
- Mathewson, David. "Isaiah in Revelation." 189-210 in Steven Moyise and M. Menken, *Isaiah in the NT*. London: T & T Clark, 2005.
- _____. "A Note on the Foundation Stones in Revelation 21.14, 19-20." *JSTNT* 25.4 (Jun. 2003): 487-498.
- Matory, J. Lorand. "Free to Be a Slave: Slavery as Metaphor in the Afro-Atlantic Religions." *J Rel. Afr.* 37:3 (2007): 398-425.
- Matthews, John. *Roman Perspectives*. Swansea: Cl. P Wales, 2010.
- Mattingly, David J. "Comparative advantages. Roman slavery and imperialism." *Archaeological Dialogues* 15:2 (Dec. 2008): 135-139.
- _____. and D.S. Potter, ed. *Life, Death, and Entertainment in the Roman Empire*. Ann Arbor: U Michigan P, 2010.
- Mattingly, Gerald L. "The Palmyrene Luxury Trade in Revelation 18:12-13." *ARAM* 7:1 (1995): 217-231.
- Maxwell, Susan. "A Marriage Commemorated in the Stairway of Fools." *Sixteenth Cen. J* 36.3 (Fall 2005): 717-741.
- Mayhew, Robert. "King-Bees and Mother-Wasps: A Note on Ideology and Gender in Aristotle's Entomology." *Phronesis* 44:2 (May 1999): 127-134.
- McClure, Laura K. and Christopher A. Faraone, ed. *Prostitutes and Courtesans in the Ancient World* (WISC). Madison: U Wisconsin P, 2006.
- McCullough, Anna. "Female Gladiators in Imperial Rome: Literary Context and Historical Fact." *Cl. World* 101:2 (Win. 2008): 197-209.
- McCurry, Stephanie. "The Two Faces of Republicanism: Gender and Proslavery Politics in Antebellum South Carolina." *J Am. His.* 78:4 (Mar. 1992): 1245-1264.
- _____. "Women Numerous and Armed: Gender and the Politics of Subsistence in the Civil War South." 1-26 in J. Waugh, *Wars within a War*. Chapel Hill: U North Carolina P, 2013.
- McElya, Micki. *Clinging to Mammy: The Faithful Slave in Twentieth-Century America*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard U P, 2007.
- McGinn, Thomas A.J. *The Economy of Prostitution in the Roman World: A Study of Social History and the Brothel*. Ann Arbor: U Michigan P, 2007.

- _____. "The Legal Definition of Prostitute in Late Antiquity." *MAAR* 42 (1997): 73-116.
- _____. *Prostitution, Sexuality, and the Law in Ancient Rome*. New York: Oxford U P, 2003.
- McIlraith, Donal A. "For the Fine Linen is the Righteous Deeds of the Saints." *CBQ* 61.3 (Jul. 1999): 512-529.
- _____. "The Nuptial Response to Christ in the Apocalypse." *Pacific J Theol.* 21 (1999): 26-38.
- McKeown, Niall. "Had They No Shame? Martial, Statius and Roman Sexual Attitudes towards Slave Children." 57-62 in S. Crawford and G. Shepherd, *Children, Childhood, and Society* (BAR Int'l. Ser. 1696). Oxford: Archaeopress, 2007.
- _____. *The Invention of Ancient Slavery?* London: Duckworth, 2007.
- _____. "Seeing Things: Examining the Body of the Slave in Greek Medicine." *S & A* 23:2 (2002): 29-40.
- McKinlay, Judith E. *Gendering Wisdom the Host*. (JSOT Sup. 216). Sheffield: Sheffield Ac. P, 1996.
- McKivigan, John R. and Stanley Harold, ed. *Antislavery Violence: Sectional, Radical, and Cultural Conflict in Antebellum America*. Knoxville: U Tennessee P, 1999.
- McNeal, Richard A. "The Brides of Babylon: Herodotus 1.196." *Historia* 37.1 (1988): 54-71.
- McNeil, Lynda. "Bridal Cloths, Cover-Ups, and *Kharis*: The 'Carpet Scene' in Aeschylus' *Agamemnon*." *G & R* 52.1 (2005): 1-17.
- McPherson, James M. *Battle Cry of Freedom: The Civil War Era*. New York: Oxford U P, 1988.
- McWhirter, Joyce. *The Bridegroom Messiah and the People of God* (SNTS Mon. 138). Cambridge: Cambridge U P, 2006.
- Mein, Andrew. "Ezekiel's Women in Christian Interpretation." 159-184 in Mein and P.M. Joyce, *After Ezekiel*. New York: T & T Clark Int'l., 2011.
- Merz, Annette. "Why Did the Pure Bride of Christ (2 Cor. 11.2) Become a Wedded Wife (Eph. 5.22-33)?" *JSNT* 79 (2000): 131-147.
- Meyers, Carol L. *Rediscovering Eve: Ancient Israelite Women in Context*. New York: Oxford U P, 2012.
- Míguez, Néstor. "Apocalyptic and Economy: A Reading of Revelation 18 from the Experience of Economic Exclusion." 250-262 in F.F. Segovia and M.A. Tolbert, *Reading from this Place*, v. 2. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress P, 1995.
- Miller, Dean A. "Biblical and Rabbinic Contributions to an Understanding of the Slave." 189-199 in W.S. Green, *Approaches to Ancient Judaism*. Missoula, Montana: Scholars P, 1978.
- Miller, Geoffrey P. "Contracts of Genesis." *J Legal St.* 22.1 (Jan. 1993): 15-45.
- _____. *Marriage in the Book of Tobit*. (Deuterocanonical and Cognate Lit. St. 10). Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2011.
- Miller, Kevin E. "The Nuptial Eschatology of Revelation 19-20." *CBQ* 60.2 (Apr. 1998): 301-318.
- Millett, Paul. "Aristotle and Slavery in Athens." *G & R* 54:2 (Oct. 2007): 178-209.

- Mills, Harriane. "Greek Clothing Regulations: Sacred and Profane?" *ZPE* 55 (1984): 255-265.
- Milnor, Kristina. *Gender, Domesticity, and the Age of Augustus: Inventing Private Life*. Oxford: Oxford U P, 2008.
- Minear, Paul S. *Images of the Church in the New Testament*. Philadelphia: Westminster P, 1960.
- Mirelman, Sam and Walther Sallaberger. "The Performance of a Sumerian Wedding Song (CT 58, 12)." *ZAVA* 100:2 (Dec. 2010): 177-196.
- Mitchell, Mary Niall. "'Rosebloom and Pure White,' Or So It Seemed." *Am.* 254:3 (Sep. 2000): 369-410.
- Mitchell, Stephen and Constantina Katsari, ed. *Patterns in the Economy of Roman Asia Minor*. Swansea: Cl. P Wales, 2005.
- Mitchell-Boyask, Robin. "The Marriage of Cassandra and the *Oresteia*." *TAPA* 136.2 (Aut. 2006): 269-297.
- Mohr, Clarence L. *On the Threshold of Freedom: Masters and Slaves in Civil War Georgia*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State U P, 2001.
- Moore, Carey A. *Tobit*. (Anchor Bible 40A). New York: Doubleday, 1996.
- Moore, Stephen D. "The Beatific Vision as a Posing Exhibition: Revelation's Hypermasculine Deity." *JNT* 60 (1995): 27-55.
- . "Metonymies of Empire: Sexual Humiliation and Gender Masquerade in the Book of Revelation." 71-97 in Liew Tat-Siong and R.S. Sugirtharajah, *Postcolonial Interventions*. Sheffield: Phoenix P, 2009.
- Morawiecki, Lesław. "The Symbolism of Minerva on the Coins of Domitianus." *Klio* 59 (1977): 186-193.
- Morgan, Jennifer L. *Laboring Women: Reproduction and Gender in New World Slavery* (Early Am. St.). Philadelphia: U Pennsylvania P, 2004.
- Morgan, Kenneth. "Slave Sales in Colonial Charleston." *English Hist. Rev.* 453 (Sep. 1998): 905-927.
- Morganstern, Julian. *Rites of Birth, Marriage, Death and Kindred Occasions Among the Semites*. Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College P, 1966.
- Morris, Thomas D. *Southern Slavery and the Law, 1619-1860* (St. Legal His.). Chapel Hill: U North Carolina P, 1996.
- Morrow, Glenn R. *Plato's Law of Slavery in Its Relation to Greek Law*. Urbana: U Illinois P, 1939.
- Morsman, Amy Feely. *The Big House after Slavery*. Charlottesville: U Virginia P, 2010.
- Morton, Patricia, ed. *Discovering the Women in Slavery: Emancipating Perspectives on the American Past*. Athens: U Georgia P, 1996.
- Mounce, Robert H. *The Book of Revelation*. (1977), rev. ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.
- Moxnes, Halvor, ed. *Constructing Early Christian Families: Family As Social Reality and Metaphor*. London: Routledge, 1997.
- Moyer, Clinton J. "The Beautiful Outsider Replaces the Queen: A 'Compound Topos' in Esther 1-2 and Books 5 and 6 of Chariton's *Chaereas and Callirhoe*." *Vet. Test.* 60.4 (Jan. 2010): 601-620.

- Moyise, Steve. "Ezekiel and the Book of Revelation." 45-58 in A. Mein and P.M. Joyce, *After Ezekiel*. New York: T & T Clark Int'l., 2011.
- _____, ed. *Studies in the Book of Revelation*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2001.
- Muddiman, John. *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Ephesians* (Black's NTC). London: Continuum, 2001.
- _____. "The So-Called Bridal Bath at Ezk. 16:9 and Eph. 5:26." 137-146 in H.J. de Jonge and J. Tromp, *The Book of Ezekiel and Its Influence*. Aldershot, Hampshire: Ashgate Publ., 2007.
- Munro, Jill M. *Spikenard and Saffron: The Imagery of the Song of Songs* (JSOT Sup. 203). Sheffield: Sheffield Ac. P, 1995.
- Murphy, Frederick James. *Fallen Is Babylon: The Revelation to John*. Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Trinity P Int'l., 1998.
- Murphy, Roland E. *Proverbs* (WBC 22). Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1998.
- _____. *The Song of Songs* (Hermeneia). Minneapolis: Fortress P, 1990.
- _____. "Wisdom and Eros in Proverbs 1-9." *CBQ* 50.4 (Oct. 1988): 600-603.
- Myers, K. Sara. "The Poet and the Procuress: The *Lena* in Latin Love Elegy." *J Roman Studies* 86 (1996): 1-21.
- Navarro Puerto, Mercedes. "La *parthenos*: Un futuro significativo en el aquí y ahora de la comunidad (1 Cor 7,25-28)." *Estudios bíblicos* 49.3 (1991): 353-387.
- Nathan, Geoffrey. *The family in late antiquity: The rise of the Christianity and the endurance of tradition*. London: Routledge, 2000.
- Nebreda, Sergio Rosell. "Vestiduras blancas: Apocalipsis como iconografía vida." *Boletín Encuentro* 5 (Nov. 2009): 35-52.
- Neufeld, Dietmar. "Under the Cover of Clothing: Scripted Clothing Performances in the Apocalypse of John." *BTB* 35.1 (2005): 67-76.
- _____. "Sumptuous clothing and ornamentation in the Apocalypse." *HTS* 58.2 (2002): 664-689.
- Nicholson, Bradley J. "Legal Borrowing and the Origins of Slave Law in the British Colonies." *Am. J Legal His.* 38:1 (Jan. 1994): 38-54.
- Nicklas, Tobias. "Marriage in the Book of Tobit." 139-154 in G. Xeravtits and J. Zsengellér, *The Book of Tobit in Text, Tradition, Theology*. Leiden: Brill, 2005.
- Nicolet, Claud. *Rendre à César: Économie et société dans la Rome antique*. Paris: Gallimard, 1988.
- Niditch, Susan. *Judges: A Commentary* (OT Library). Louisville: WJK, 2008.
- Nissinen, Martti and Risto Uro, ed. *Sacred Marriages: The Divine-Human Sexual Metaphor from Sumer to Early Christianity*. Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 2008.
- Noël, Timothy. "The Parable of the Wedding Guest." *Perspectives in Religious Studies* 16:1 (Spr. 1989): 17-27.

- Noll, Mark A. "The Bible and Slavery." 43-73 in R.M. Miller et al., *Religion and the American Civil War*. New York: Oxford U P, 1998.
- Nolland, John. *The Gospel of Matthew* (NIGTC). Bletchley: Paternoster P, 2005.
- North, Helen F. "The Mare, the Vixen, and the Bee: *Sophrosyne* as the Virtue of Women in Antiquity." *Illinois Cl. St.* 2 (1977): 35-48.
- _____. *Sophrosyne: Self-Knowledge and Self-Restraint in Greek Literature*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell U P, 1966.
- Novick, Tzvi. "'She Binds Her Arms': Rereading Proverbs 31:17." *JBL* 128.1 (Mar. 2009): 107-113.
- Noy, David. "Matchmakers and Marriage-markets in antiquity." *EMC/CV* 34 (1990): 375-400.
- Nylan, Michael. "Golden Spindles and Axes: Elite Women in the Achaemenid and Han Empires." 251-281 in S. Shankman and S.W. Durrant, *Early China/Ancient Greece*. Albany: SUNY P, 2002.
- Nwachukwu, Oliver O. *Beyond Vengeance and Protest: A Reflection on the Macarisms in Revelation*. (St. Bib. Lit. 71). New York: Peter Lang, 2005.
- O'Brien, C.C. "The White Women All Go for Sex': Frances Harper on Suffrage, Citizenship, and the Reconstruction South." *Afr. Am. Rev.* 43:4 (Win. 2009): 605-620.
- O'Bryhim, Shawn. "Myrrha's 'Wedding' (Ov. Met. 10. 446-70)." *ClQ* 58.1 (2008): 190-195.
- O'Neil, Patrick W. "Bosses and Broomsticks: Ritual and Authority in Antebellum Slave Weddings." *J Southern His.* 75.1 (Feb. 2009): 29-48.
- Oakes, James. *The Ruling Race: A History of American Slaveholders*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1982.
- _____. *Slavery and Freedom: An Interpretation of the Old South*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1990.
- Oakley, John Howard. "Nuptial Nuances." 63-73 in E.D. Reeder, *Pandora*. Baltimore: Walters Art Gal., 1995.
- ____ and Rebecca H. Sinos. *The Wedding in Ancient Athens* (WI St. Classics). Madison: U Wisconsin P, 1993.
- Ogden, Jack. *Jewellery of the Ancient World*. New York: Rizzoli, 1982.
- Øklund, Jorunn. "Why Can't the Heavenly Miss Jerusalem Just Shut Up?" 311-332 in C. Vander Stichele and T. Penner, *Her Master's Tools?* Atlanta: SBL, 2005.
- Okoye, James C. "Sarah and Hagar: Genesis 16 and 21." *JSTOT* 32.2 (Dec. 2007): 163-175.
- Okure, Teresa. "Jesus and the Samaritan Woman (Jn 4:1-42) in Africa." *Theol. St.* 70.2 (Jun. 2009): 401-418.
- Olasope, Olankunbi. "Univira: The Ideal Roman Matrona." *Lumina* 20.2 (Oct. 2009): 18 p.
- Oleson, John Peter, ed. *Oxford Handbook of Engineering and Technology in the Classical World*. New York: Oxford U P, 2008.
- Olson, Daniel C. "Matthew 22:1-14 as Midrash." *CBQ* 67.4 (Oct. 2005): 435-453.
- _____. "'Those Who Have Not Defiled Themselves with Women.'" *CBQ* 59.3 (Jul. 1997): 492-510.

- Ondřejová, Iva. "The Role of Jewellery in Ancient Societies." 367-386 in G.R. Tsetskhladze, *The Black Sea, Greece, Anatolia and Europe in the First Millennium BC*. Leuven: Peeters, 2011.
- Ormand, Kirk. *Controlling Desires: Sexuality in Ancient Greece and Rome*. Westport (CT): Praeger, 2009.
- _____. *Exchange and the Maiden: Marriage in Sophoclean Tragedy*. Austin: U Texas P, 1999.
- _____. "Marriage, Identity, and the Tale of Mestra in the Hesiodic Catalogue of Women." *Am. J. Philol.* 125.3 (Aut. 2004): 303-338.
- _____. "More Wedding Imagery: 'Trachiniae' 1053 ff. *Mnemosyne* 46.3 (May 1993): 224-227.
- Osborne, Robin. "Law, the democratic citizen and the representation of women in classical Athens." 38-60 in Osborne, *Studies in Ancient Greek and Roman Society*. Cambridge: Cambridge U P, 2004.
- Osgood, Josiah. "Nuptiae Iure Civili Congruae: Apuleius's Story of Cupid and Psyche and the Roman Law of Marriage." *TAPA* 136:2 (Aut. 2006): 415-441.
- Oshatz, Molly. *Slavery and Sin: The Fight against Slavery and the Rise of Liberal Protestantism*. Oxford: Oxford U P, 2011.
- Ott, Victoria E. *Confederate Daughters: Coming of Age during the Civil War*. Carbondale: Southern IL U P, 2008.
- Overstreet, R. Larry. "The Temple of God in the Book of Revelation." *Bibl. Sac.* 166 (Oct. 2009): 446-462.
- Owens, Leslie H. *This Species of Property: Slave Life and Culture in the Old South*. New York: Oxford U P, 1976.
- Palmer, Humphrey. "Just Married, Cannot Come." *Nov. Test.* 18.4 (1976): 241-257.
- Palmer, Vernon Valentine. *Through the Codes Darkly: Slave Law and Civil Law in Louisiana*. Clark, New Jersey: Lawbook Exchange, 2012.
- Panayotakis, St.. "The Knot and the Hymen: A Reconsideration of *Nodus Virginitatis* (*Hist. Apoll.* 1)." *Mnemosyne* 53.5 (Oct. 2000): 599-608.
- Paquette, Robert L. and Louis A. Ferleger, ed. *Slavery, Secession, and Southern History*. Charlottesville: U Virginia P, 2000.
- Paradise, Jonathan. "A Daughter and Her Father's Property at Nuzi." *J. Cuneiform St.* 32.4 (Oct. 1980): 189-207.
- _____. "Marriage Contracts of Free Persons at Nuzi." *J. Cuneiform St.* 39.1 (Spr. 1987): 1-36.
- Parasinou, Eva. "'Lighting' the World of Women." *G & R* 47.1 (Apr. 2000): 19-43.
- Parca, Maryline and Angeliki Tzanetou, ed. *Finding Persephone: Women's Rituals in the Ancient Mediterranean*. (SAFPC) Bloomington: Indiana U P, 2007.
- Parent, Anthony S., Jr. *Foul Means: The Formation of a Slave Society in Virginia, 1660-1740*. Chapel Hill: U North Carolina P, Omohundro Inst., 2003.
- _____. and Susan B. Wallace. "Childhood and Sexual Identity Under Slavery." *J. His. Sex.* 3.3 (Jan. 1993): 363-401.
- Park Rohun. "Revelation for Sale: An Intercultural Reading of Revelation 18 from an East Asian Perspective." *Bible and Critical Theory* 4.2 (2008): 12 p.

- Parker, A.J. "Trade within the Empire and beyond the Frontiers." 635-653 in J. Wachter, *The Roman World*, v. 2. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1987.
- Paton, Robert Louis and Louis A. Ferleger, ed. *Slavery, Secession, and Southern History*. Charlottesville: U P Virginia, 2000.
- Pattemore, Stephen. *The People of God in the Apocalypse* (SNTS Mon. 128). Cambridge: Cambridge U P, 2004.
- Patterson, Cynthia B. *The Family in Greek History*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard U P, 1998.
- . "Marriage and the Married Woman in Athenian Law." 48-72 in S. Pomeroy, *Women's History and Ancient History*. Chapel Hill: U North Carolina P, 1991.
- . "Plutarch's 'Advice on Marriage': Traditional Wisdom through a Philosophic Lens." *ANWR II* 33.6 (1992): 4709-4723.
- Patterson, Orlando. *Freedom in the Making of Western Culture*. New York: Basic Books, 1991.
- . *Slavery and Social Death*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard U P, 1982.
- . "Slavery: The Underside of Freedom." *S & A* 5:2 (1984): 87-104.
- Patterson, Richard D. "A Multiplex Approach to Psalm 45." *Grace Theol. J* 6.1 (Spr. 1985): 29-48.
- Pavlovskis, Zoja. "Statius and the Late Latin Epithalamia." *Cl. Philol.* 60.3 (Jul. 1965): 164-177.
- Pearce, Sarah. "Jerusalem as 'Mother-City' in the Writings of Philo of Alexandria." 19-36 in J.M.G. Barclay, *Negotiating Diaspora*. London: T & T Clark Int'l., 2004.
- Pemberton, Elizabeth G. "The Name Vase of the Peleus Painter." *J Walters Art Gallery* 36 (1977): 62-72.
- Penn, Michael Ph. "Identity Transformation and Authorial Identification in *Jos. As.*" *JSPs* 13.2 (2002): 171-183.
- Penner, Lindsay. "Gender, Household Structure, and Slavery: Re-Interpreting the Aristocratic *Columbaria* of Early Imperial Rome." 143-158 in R. Laurence and Agneta Strömberg, *Families in the Greco-Roman World*. London: Continuum, 2012.
- Pérez Fernández, Miguel. "Rabbinic Texts in the Exegesis of the New Testament." *Rev. Rabbinic Judaism* 7 (2004): 95-120.
- Perry, Menakhem. "Counter-Stories in the Bible: Rebekah and her Bridegroom, Abraham's Servant." *Prooftexts* 27.2 (Spr. 2007): 275-323.
- Peskowitz, Miriam. "Domesticity and the Spindle." 118-134 in J.W. van Henter and Athalya Brenner, *Families and Family Relations as Represented in Early Judaism and Early Christianities*. Leiden: Deo, 2000.
- Petersen, Lauren H. and Patricia Salzman-Mitchell, ed. *Mothering and Motherhood in Ancient Greece and Rome*. Austin: U Texas P, 2012.
- Philippides, Katerina. "Terence's *Eunuchus*: Elements of the Marriage Ritual in the Rape Scene." *Mnemosyne* 48.3 (Jun. 1995): 272-285.

- Phillips, William D., Jr. *Slavery from Roman Times to the Early Transatlantic Trade*. Minneapolis: U Minnesota P, 1985.
- Pickering, Andrew S.F. "The Persistence of Rites of Passage." *Br. J Sociology* 25.1 (Mar. 1974): 63-78.
- Pinn, Anthony B. *Terror and Triumph: The Nature of Black Religion*. Minneapolis: Fortress P, 2003.
- Pippin, Tina. *Apocalyptic Bodies: The Biblical End of the World in Text and Image*. New York: Routledge, 1999.
- _____. *Death and Desire*. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox P, 1992.
- _____. "The Revelation to John." 109-130 in Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza et al., *Searching the Scriptures*, v. 2. New York: Crossroad, 1994.
- _____. "Revelation/Apocalypse of John." 627-632 in Carol A. Newsom et al., *Women's Bible Commentary* (1992), rev. ed. Louisville: WJK, 2012.
- _____ and J. Michael Clark. "Revelation/Apocalypse." 753-768 in D. Guest et al., *The Queer Bible Commentary*. London: SCM P, 2006.
- Pomeroy, Sarah B. *Goddesses, Whores, Wives, and Slaves: Women in Classical Antiquity* (1975), 2nd ed. Chapel Hill: U North Carolina P, 1995.
- Pope, Marvin H. "A Mare in Pharaoh's Chariotry." *BASOR* 200 (Dec. 1970): 56-61.
- Porter, J.R. "Folklore between the Testaments." *Folklore* 91.2 (1980): 133-146.
- Portier-Young, Anthea E. "Sweet Mercy Metropolis: Interpreting Aseneth's Honeycomb." *JSPs* 14.2 (Feb. 2005): 133-157.
- Prigent, Pierre. *L'Apocalypse de saint Jean*. Lausanne: Delachaux et Niestlé, 1981.
- _____. *Et le ciel s'ouvrit: apocalypse de saint Jean*. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1980.
- Pritchett, Jonathan B. "The Interregional Slave Trade and the Selection of Slaves for the New Orleans Market." *J Interdisciplinary His.* 28:1 (Sum. 1997): 57-85.
- _____. "Quantitative Estimates of the United States Interregional Slave Trade, 1820-1860." *J Economic His.* 61:2 (Jun. 2001): 467-475.
- _____ and Herman Freudenberger. "A Peculiar Sample: The Selection of Slaves for the New Orleans Market." *J Economic His.* 52:1 (Mar. 1992): 109-127.
- Propp, William H. "Is Psalm 45 an erotic poem?" *BR* 20.2 (Apr. 2004): 33-37, 42.
- Provan, Iain. "Foul Spirits, Fornication and Finance: Rev. 18 from an OT Perspective." *JNTS* 64 (1996): 81-100.
- Rainbow, Jesse. "Male μαστοί in Revelation 1.13." *JNTS* 30.2 (Dec. 2007): 249-253.
- Rallis, Irene Kerasota. "Nuptial Imagery in the Book of Hosea." *SVTQ* 34:2 (Jan. 1990): 197-21.
- Ramírez Fernández, Dagoberto. "The Judgment of God on the Multinationals: Revelation 18." 75-100 in L.E. Vaage (tr.), *Subversive Scriptures*. Valley Forge, Pennsylvania: Trinity P Int'l, 1997.

- Ranasinghe, Alexander. "The Betrothal and Marriage Customs of the Hebrews during the Time of Christ." *Folklore* 81.1 (Spr. 1970): 48-62.
- Rappaport, Roy A., ed. *Ritual and Religion in the Making of Humanity* (St. Soc. Cul. Anth. 110). Cambridge: Cambridge U P, 1999.
- Rauh, Nicholas K. *The Sacred Bonds of Commerce: Religion, Economy, and Trade Society at Hellenistic Roman Delos, 166-87 B.C.* Amsterdam: J.C. Gieben, 1993.
- Rawson, Beryl. "Roman Concubinage and Other De Facto Marriages." *TAPA* 104 (1974): 279-305.
- _____. ed. *A Companion to Families in the Greek and Roman Worlds* (BCAW). Malden, Massachusetts: Blackwell, 2011.
- _____. *The Family in Ancient Rome: New Perspectives*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell U P, 1986.
- _____. *Marriage, Divorce, and Children in Ancient Rome*. Canberra: Humanities Research Ctr., 1991.
- Reader, William W. "The Twelve Jewels of Rev. 21:19-20." *JBL* 100:3 (Sep. 1981): 433-457.
- Reddie, Anthony G. *Black Theology, Slavery and Contemporary Christianity: 200 Years and No Apology*. Farnham, Surrey: Ashgate, 2010.
- Redfield, James. *The Locrian Maidens: Love and Death at Troy*. Princeton: Princeton U P, 2003.
- _____. "Notes on the Greek Wedding." *Arethusa* 15.1/2 (Spr. 1982): 181-201.
- Rehm, Rush. *Marriage to Death: The Conflation of Wedding and Funeral Rituals in Gk. Tragedy*. Princeton: Princeton U P, 1994.
- Reilly, Joan. "Many Brides: 'Mistress and Maid' on Athenian Lekythoi." *Hesperia* 58.4 (Oct. 1989): 411-444.
- Ribeiro, Aileen. *Dress and Morality*. London: B.T. Batsford, 1986.
- Richter, Paula B., ed. *Wedded Bliss: The Marriage of Art and Ceremony*. Salem, Massachusetts: Peabody Essex Museum, 2008.
- Ringgren, Helmer. "The Marriage Motif in Israelite Religion." 421-428 in P.D. Miller, Jr., et al., *Ancient Israelite Religion*. Philadelphia: Fortress P, 1987.
- Rissi, Matthias. *The Future of the World: An Exegetical Study of Revelation 19:11-22:15* (SBT 23). London: SCM, 1972.
- Roark, James L. *Masters without Slaves: Southern Planters in the Civil War and Reconstruction*. New York: W.W. Norton, 1977.
- Roberts, Giselle. "The Confederate Belle: The Belle Ideal, Patriotic Womanhood, and Wartime Reality in Louisiana and Mississippi, 1861-1865." *Louisiana His.* 43:2 (Spr. 2002): 189-214.
- Roberts, Michael. "The Use of Myth in Latin Epithalamia from Statius to Venantius Fortunatus." *TAPA* 119 (1989): 321-348.
- Robertson, Martin. "The Boscoreale Figure-Paintings." *JRS* 45.1/2 (1955): 58-67.

- Roisman, Joseph. *The Rhetoric of Manhood: Masculinity in the Attic Orators*. Berkeley: U California P, 2005.
- Roloff, Jürgen. *The Revelation of John*. (1984), tr. J.E. Alsup. Minneapolis: Fortress P, 1993.
- Rönnbäck, Klas. "Consumers and Slavery: Diversified Markets for Plantation Produce and the Survival of Slavery in the Nineteenth Century." *Fernand Braudel Ctr. Rev.* 33:1 (2010): 69-88.
- Roose, Hanna. "The Fall of the 'Great Harlot' and the Fate of the Aging Prostitute." 228-252 in A. Weissenrieder et al., *Picturing the New Testament*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005.
- Rose, Marice E. "The Construction of Mistress and Slave Relationships in Late Antique Art." *Woman's Art J* 29:2 (Fall 2008): 41-49.
- Rosell, Sergio. "John's Apocalypse: Dynamic word-images for a new world." *HTS* 67.1 (2011): 5 p.
- Rosenfeld, Ben-Zion. "Innkeeping in Jewish Society in Roman Palestine." *JESHO* 41:2 (1998): 133-158.
- Rosenmeyer, Patricia A. "Girls at Play in Early Greek Poetry." *Am. J Philol.* 125.2 (Sum. 2004): 163-178.
- Rosivach, Vincent J. "Agricultural Slavery in the Northern Colonies and in Classical Athens." *CSSH* 35:3 (Jul. 1993): 551-567.
- _____. "Enslaving *Barbaroi* and the Athenian Ideology of Slavery." *Historia* 48:2 (1999): 129-157.
- Ross, Donald L. "Aristotle's Ambivalence on Slavery." *Hermathena* 184 (Sum. 2008): 53-67.
- Rossi, Cesare, et al. *Ancient Engineers' Inventions: Precursors of the Present*. (His. Mechanism and Machine Sci. 8). Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer, 2009.
- Rossing, Barbara. *The Choice Between Two Cities*. Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Trinity P Int'l, 1999.
- _____. "City Visions, Feminine Figures and Economic Critique." 181-196 in B.G. Wright and L.M. Wills, *Conflicted Boundaries in Wisdom and Apocalyptic*. Atlanta: SBL, 2005.
- Roth, Martha T. "Age at Marriage and the Household: A Study of Neo-Babylonian and Neo-Assyrian Forms." *Comp. St. Soc. His.* 29:4 (Oct. 1987): 715-747.
- _____. "Marriage and Matrimonial Prestations in First Millennium B.C. Babylonia." 245-259 in Barbara S. Lesko, *Women's Earliest Records*. Providence, Rhode Island: Brown U P, 1989.
- Roth, Sarah N. "'How a Slave was Made a Man': Negotiating Black Violence and Masculinity in Antebellum Slave Narratives." *S & A* 28:2 (2007): 255-275.
- Roth, Ulrike. "Inscribed Meaning: The *Vilica* and the Villa Economy." *PBSR* 72 (2004): 101-124.
- _____. *Thinking Tools: Agricultural Slavery between Evidence and Models*. London: Inst. Cl. St., 2007.
- Rothenbuhler, Eric W. *Ritual Communication*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage, 1998.
- Roy, J. "An Alternative Sexual Morality for Classical Athenians." *G & R* 44.1 (Apr. 1997): 11-22.
- _____. "*Polis* and *Oikos* in Classical Athens." *G & R* 46.1 (Apr. 1999): 1-18.
- Royalty, Robert. *The Streets of Heaven: The Ideology of Wealth in the Apocalypse of John*. Macon: Mercer U P, 1998.

- Rubiera Cancelas, Carla. "Las esclavas en la regulación jurídica. Algunas notas desde el *Digesto*." *El Futuro del Pasado* 2 (2011): 439-451.
- Ruef, Martin and Alona Harness. "Agrarian Origins of Management Ideology: The Roman and Antebellum Cases." *Organization St.* 30 (2009): 589-607.
- Rugemer, Edward Bartlett. *The Problem of Emancipation: The Caribbean Roots of the American Civil War*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State U P, 2008.
- Ryder, M.L. "Wools from Antiquity." *Textile His.* 5:1 (Oct. 1974): 100-110.
- Sabetai, Victoria. "Eros Reigns Supreme: Dionysos' Wedding on a New Krater by the Dinos Painter." 137-160 in R. Schlesier, *A Different God? Dionysus and Ancient Polytheism*. Berlin: De Gruyter: 2011.
- _____. "Marriage Boiotian Style." *Hesperia* 67.3 (Jul. 1998): 323-334.
- Safrai, S. "Home and Family." 728-792 in Safrai and M. Stern, *The Jewish People in the First Century*, v. 2. Philadelphia: Fortress P, 1976.
- Salamito, Jean-Marie. "Christianisme antique et économie." *Antiquité Tardive* 14 (2006): 27-37.
- Saller, Richard P. "Men's Age at Marriage and Its Consequences in the Roman Family." *Cl. Philol.* 82:1 (Jan. 1987): 21-34.
- _____. *Patriarchy, Property, and Death in the Roman Family*. Cambridge: Cambridge U P, 1994.
- _____. "Slavery and the Roman Family." *S & A* 8.1 (1987): 65-87.
- Salmon, Marylynn. *Women and the Law of Property in Early America* (St. Legal His.). Chapel Hill: U North Carolina P, 1986.
- Sánchez-Eppler, Karen. "Bodily Bonds: The Intersecting Rhetorics of Feminism and Abolition." *Representations* 24 (Aut. 1988): 28-59.
- _____. *Touching Liberty: Abolition, Feminism, and the Politics of the Body*. Berkeley: U California P, 1993.
- Sanders, E.P. *Judaism: Practice and Belief, 63 BCE-55 CE*. London: SCM P, 1992.
- Sandoval, Timothy. *The Discourse of Wealth and Poverty in the Book of Proverbs* (Bib. Interp. 77). Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- Šarkić, Srđan. "The Concept of Marriage in Roman, Byzantine, and Serbian Mediaeval Law." *Recueil des travaux de l'Institut d'études byzantines* 41 (2004): 99-103.
- Satlow, Michael L. *Jewish Marriage in Antiquity*. Princeton: Princeton U P, 2001.
- _____. "The Metaphor of Marriage in Early Judaism." 13-42 in J.W. van Henten and Athalya Brenner, *Families and Family Relations*. Leiden: Deo, 2000.
- _____. "Slipping toward Sacrament." 65-89 in R.L. Kalmin and S. Schwartz, *Jewish Culture and Society under the Christian Roman Empire*. Leuven: Peeters, 2003.
- Schaeffer, Judith A. "The Costume of the *Korai*: A Re-Interpretation." *CSCA* 8 (1975): 241-256.

- Schafer, Daniel L. "Family Ties That Bind: Anglo-African Slave Traders in Africa and Florida." *S & A* 20:3 (1999): 1-21.
- Schafer, Judith K. "'Open and Notorious Concubinage': The Emancipation of Slave Mistresses by Will and the Supreme Court in Antebellum Louisiana." *Louisiana His.* 28:2 (Spr. 1987): 165-182.
- _____. "Roman Roots of the Louisiana Law of Slavery: Emancipation in American Louisiana, 1803-1857." *Louisiana Law Rev.* 56 (1995): 409-422.
- Schaps, David M. "What Was Free about a Free Athenian Woman?" *TAPA* 128 (1998): 161-188.
- Schear, Leslie. "Semonides Fr. 7: Wives and Their Husbands." *EMC/CV* 28.1 (1984): 39-49.
- Scheid, John and Jesper Svenbro. *The Craft of Zeus: Myths of Weaving and Fabric* (1994), tr. C. Volk (Revealing Antiquity 9). Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard U P, 1996.
- Scheidel, Walter. "Human Mobility in Roman Italy, II: The Slave Population." *J Roman St.* 95 (2005): 64-79.
- _____. "The Most Silent Women of Greece and Rome: Rural Labour and Women's Life in the Ancient World (I)." *G & R* 42.2 (Oct. 1995): 202-217.
- _____. "Quantifying the Sources of Slaves in the Early Roman Empire." *JRS* 87 (1997): 156-169.
- _____. "Roman Funerary Commemoration and the Age at First Marriage." *Cl. Philol.* 102.4 (Oct. 2007): 389-402.
- _____. et al., ed. *The Cambridge Economic History of the Greco-Roman World* (Cambridge Histories). Cambridge: Cambridge U P, 2007.
- Scheinberg, Susan. "The Bee Maidens of the Homeric Hymn to Hermes." *Harvard St. Cl. Philol.* 83 (1979): 1024-1028.
- Schellenberg, Ryan S. "Seeing the World Whole: Intertextuality and the New Jerusalem (Rev. 21-22)." *Persp. Rel. St.* 33:4 (Win. 2006): 467-476.
- Schneiders, Sandra M. "The Face Veil: A Johannine Sign (John 20:1-10)." *BTB* 13 (Aug. 1983): 94-98.
- Scholz, Susanne. "Gender, Class, and Androcentric Compliance in the Rapes of Enslaved Women in the Hebrew Bible." *lectio difficilior* 1 (2004). 33 p.
- Schremer, Adiel. "For Whom is Marriage a Happiness? *mMo'ed Qatan* 1:7, and a Roman Parallel." 289-305 in Irene Wandrey et al., *A Feminist Commentary on the Babylonian Talmud*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007.
- Schultz, Celia E. *Women's religious activity in the Roman Republic* (St. His. Gr. Rome). Chapel Hill: U North Carolina P, 2006.
- Schüssler Fiorenza, Elisabeth. "Babylon the Great: A Rhetorical-Political Reading of Revelation 17-18." 243-269 in David Barr, *Reality of Apocalypse*. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- _____. *The Book of Revelation — Justice and Judgment*. Philadelphia: Fortress P, 1985.
- _____. "The Composition and Structure of the Book of Revelation." *CBQ* 39.3 (Jul. 1977): 344-366.
- _____. "The Followers of the Lamb." *Semeia* 36 (1986): 123-146.

- _____. "The Quest for the Johannine School." *NTS* 23.4 (Jul. 1977): 402-427.
- _____. "Revelation." 407-427 in E. Epp and G. MacRae, *The New Testament and Its Modern Interpreters*. Philadelphia: Fortress P, 1989.
- Schwartz, Marie Jenkins. *Born in Bondage: Growing Up Enslaved in the Antebellum South*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard UP, 2000.
- Schweninger, Loren. *Families in Crisis in the Old South: Divorce, Slavery, and Property*. Chapel Hill: U North Carolina P, 2012.
- Scott, John A. "Hebe the Maiden and Hebe the Wife." *Cl. J* 25.6 (Mar. 1930): 465-466.
- Scully, Pamela. *Liberating the Family? Gender and British Slave Emancipation in the Rural Western Cape, South Africa, 1823-1853* (Soc. His. Africa). Portsmouth, New Hampshire: Heinemann, 1997.
- _____ and Diana Paton. *Gender and Slave Emancipation in the Atlantic World*. Durham, North Carolina: Duke UP, 2005.
- Seaford, Richard. "The Tragic Wedding." *J Hellenic St* 107 (1987): 106-130.
- _____. "Wedding Ritual and Textual Criticism in Sophocles' *Women of Trachis*." *Hermes* 114.1 (1986): 50-59.
- Sealey, Raphael. *Women and Law in Classical Greece*. Chapel Hill: U North Carolina P, 1990.
- Sears, Richard. "Working Like A Slave: Views of Slavery and the Status of Women in Antebellum Kentucky." *Register of the Kentucky Hist. Soc.* 87:1 (Win. 1989): 1-19.
- Sebesta, Judith Lynn and Larissa Bonfante, ed. *The World of Roman Costume* (WISC). Madison: U Wisconsin P, 2001.
- Seesengood, Robert Paul. *Competing Identities: The Athlete and the Gladiator in Early Christianity* (Lib. NT St. 346). New York: T & T Clark, 2006.
- Segelberg, Eric. "The Gospel of Philip and the New Testament." 204-212 in A. Logan and A. Wedderburn, *New Testament and Gnosis*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1983.
- Selms, A. van. "The Best Man and Bride — From Sumer to St. John." *JNES* 9.2 (Apr. 1950): 65-75.
- _____. "The Origin of the Title 'The King's Friend'." *JNES* 16.2 (Apr. 1957): 118-123.
- Selvidge, Marla J. "Powerful and Powerless Women in the Apocalypse." *Neotestamentica* 21:6 (1992): 157-167.
- Serghidou, Anastasia, ed. *Peur de l'esclave - Peur de l'esclavage en Méditerranée ancienne*. Besançon: Ps U de Franche-Comté, 2007.
- Serwint, Nancy. "The Female Athletic Costume at the Heraia and Prenuptial Initiation Rites." *Am. J Arch.* 97.3 (Jul. 1993): 403-422.
- Severy, Beth. *Augustus and the Family at the Birth of the Roman Empire*. New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis, 2003.
- Sgourou, Marina and Anagnostis P. Agelarakis. "Jewellery from Thasian Graves." *ABSA* 96 (2001): 327-364.

- Sharma, Ursula. "Women and Their Affines: The Veil as a Symbol of Separation." *Man.* 13.2 (Jun. 1978): 218-233.
- Sharpless, Rebecca. "Southern Women and the Land." *Agricultural His.* 67:2 (Spr. 1993): 30-42.
- Shaw, Brent D. "Latin Funerary Epigraphy and Family Life in the Later Roman Empire." *Historia* 33:4 (1984): 457-497.
- Shin, E.C. "The conqueror motif in chapters 12-13: a heavenly and an earthly perspective in the Book of Revelation." *Verbum et Ecclesia* 28.1 (2007): 207-233.
- Siebert-Hommes, Jopie. "'On the third day Esther put on her queen's robes' (Esther 5:1)." *lect. dif.* 3:1 (2002): 9 p.
- Sim, David C. "The Man without the Wedding Garment (Matthew 22:11-13)." *Heythrop J* 31 (1990): 165-178.
- Simon, Erika. "The Diptych of the Symmachi and Nicomachi." *G & R* 39.1 (Apr. 1992): 56-65.
- Sissa, Giulia. *Greek Virginity* (1988), tr. Arthur Goldhammer. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard U P, 1990.
- Sklar, Kathryn Kish. "A Women's History Report Card on Hillary Rodham Clinton's Presidential Primary Campaign, 2008." *Feminist St.* 34:1 (Spr. 2008): 315-322.
- Skinner, Marilyn B. *A Companion to Catullus* (Companions to the Ancient World). Malden, Massachusetts: Blackwell, 2007.
- Sklenář, R. "How to Dress (for) an Epyllion: The Fabrics of Catullus 64." *Hermes* 134.4 (2006): 385-397.
- Smalley, Stephen S. *The Revelation to John*. Downers Grove, Illinois: IVP, 2005.
- Smedley, Audrey. *Race in America: Origin and Evolution of a Worldview* (1993), 3rd ed. Boulder: Westview P, 2007.
- Smit, Peter-Ben. "Jesus and the Ladies: Constructing and Deconstructing Johannine Macho-Christology." *Bible and Critical Theory* 2.3 (2006). 15 p.
- Smith, Amy C. "Politics of weddings at Athens: an iconographic assessment." *Leeds Int'l. Cl St.* 40.1 (2005): 1-32.
- _____. *Polis and Personification in Classical Athenian Art*. (Monumenta Graeca et Romana 19). Leiden: Brill, 2011.
- _____ and Sadie Pickup, ed. *Brill's Companion to Aphrodite*. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- Smith, Jonathan Z. "The Garments of Shame." *His. Religions* 5.2 (Win. 1966): 217-238.
- Smith, Julia Floyd. *Slavery and Rice Culture in Low Country Georgia 1750-1860*. Knoxville: U Tennessee P, 1985.
- _____. "Slavetrading in Antebellum Florida." *FL Hist.* 250:3 (Jan. 1972): 252-261.
- Smith, Warren S. "Husband vs. Wife in Juvenal's Sixth Satire." *Cl. World* 73:6 (Mar. 1980): 323-332.
- _____, ed. *Satiric Advice on Women and Marriage: From Plautus to Chaucer*. Ann Arbor: U Michigan P, 2010.
- Smithers, Gregory. *Slave Breeding: Sex, Violence, and Memory in African American History*. Gainesville: U Florida P, 2012.
- Snaith, John G. *The Song of Songs* (New Century Bible Commentaries). New York: Marshall Pickering, 1993.

- Sogno, Cristiana. "Roman Matchmaking." 55-71 in Sogno et al., *From the Tetrarchs to the Theodosians: Later Roman History and Culture, 285-450 CE* (Yale Cl. St. 34). New York: Cambridge U P, 2010.
- Somerville, Diane Miller. "The Rape Myth in the Old South Reconsidered." *J Southern His.* 61:3 (Aut. 1995): 481-518.
- Sorabji, Richard. *Emotion and Peace of Mind: From Stoic Agitation to Christian Temptation*. (Gifford Lectures). Oxford: Oxford U P, 2000.
- Spatafora, Andrea. *From the "Temple of God" to God as the Temple: A Biblical Theological Study of the Temple in the Book of Revelation*. (Tesi Gregoriana Serie Teologia 27). Rome: Editrice Pontificia Università Gregoriana, 1997.
- Stafford, Emma. "Vice or Virtue? Herakles and the art of allegory." 71-96 in L. Rawlings and H. Bowden, *Herakles and Hercules*. Swansea: Cl. P Wales, 2005.
- Stanley, Amy Dru. *From Bondage to Contract: Wage Labor, Marriage, and the Market in the Age of Slave Emancipation*. Cambridge: Cambridge U P, 1998.
- . "Instead of Waiting for the Thirteenth Amendment: The War Power, Slave Marriage, and Inviolable Human Rights." *Am. Hist. Rev.* 115.3 (Jun. 2010): 732-765.
- Staples, Ariadne. *From Good Goddess to Vestal Virgins: Sex and Category in Roman Religion*. London: Routledge, 2013.
- Stenström, Hanna. "Feminists in Search for a Usable Future: Feminist Reception of the Book of Revelation." 240-266 in W.J. Lyons and J. Økland, *The Way the World Ends?* Sheffield: Phoenix P, 2009.
- Stephenson, John W. "Veiling the Late Roman House." *Textile His.* 45:1 (May 2014): 3-31.
- Stevenson, Brenda. *Life in Black and White: Family and Community in the Slave South*. Cary, North Carolina: Oxford U P, 1997.
- Stevenson, Gregory M. "Conceptual Background to the Golden Crown Imagery in the Apocalypse of John (4:4, 10; 14:14)." *JBL* 114.2 (Jun. 1995): 257-272.
- Stewart, Susan. *Cosmetics & Perfumes in the Roman World*. Stroud, Gloucester: Tempus, 2007.
- Stone, Michael E. "The City in 4 Ezra." *JBL* 126.2 (Jun. 2007): 402-407.
- . "The Interpretation of Song of Songs in 4 Ezra." *JStJ* 38 (2008): 226-233.
- Story, J. Lyle. "All Is Now Ready: An Exegesis of 'The Great Banquet' (Lk. 14:15-24) and 'The Marriage Feast' (Mt. 22:1-14)." *Am. Theol. Inquiry* 2.2 (Jul. 2009): 67-79.
- Stowe, Steven M. *Intimacy and Power in the Old South: Ritual in the Lives of the Planters* (New St. Am. Intellectual Cul. His.). Baltimore: Johns Hopkins U P, 1987.
- Strano, Michele M. "Ritualized Transmission of Social Norms Through Wedding Photography." *Communication Theory* 16 (2006): 31-46.
- Straus, Jean A. *L'achat et la vente des esclaves dans l'Égypte romaine* (APVG 14). Munich: K.G. Saur, 2004.

- Straw, Carole. "A Very Special Death': Christian Martyrdom in Its Classical Context." 39-57 in M. Cormack, *Sacrificing the Self*. New York: Oxford U P, 2002.
- Streichler, Stuart. *Justice Curtis in the Civil War Era: At the Crossroads of American Constitutionalism*. Charlottesville: U Virginia P, 2005.
- Stroup, Sarah Culpepper. "Making Memory: Ritual, Rhetoric, and Violence in the Roman Triumph." 29-46 in J.K. Wellman, *Belief and Bloodshed*. Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield, 2007.
- Suggs, M. Jack. "The Christian Two Ways Tradition." 60-74 in David E. Aune, *Studies in New Testament and Early Christian Literature*. Leiden: Brill, 1972.
- Suhr, Elmer G. *The Spinning Aphrodite*. New York: Helios Books, 1969.
- Sullivan, C.W., III. "Jumping the Broom': A Further Consideration of the Origins of an African-American Wedding Custom." *JAF* 110.436 (Spring 1997): 203-204.
- Suter, Hans-Jürg. *The Wedding Report: A Prototypical Approach to the Study of Traditional Text Types*. Amsterdam: J. Benjamins, 1993.
- Sutton, Robert F., Jr. "Nuptial Eros." *J Walters Art Gal.* 55/56 (1997): 27-48.
- _____. "On the Classical Athenian Wedding." 331-359 in Sutton and R.V. Schoder, *Daidalikon*. Wauconda, Illinois: Bolchazy-Carducci, 1989.
- _____. "The Visual Discourse of Marriage in Classical Athens." *J Walters Art Gallery* 55/56 (1997): 27-48.
- Swanepoel, M.G. "Ezekiel 16: Abandoned Child, Bride Adorned or Unfaithful Wife?" (1990). 84-104 in P. R. Davies and David J.A. Clines, *Among the Prophets*. Sheffield: *JSTOT* P, 1993.
- Swarzenski, Georg. "A Marriage Casket and Its Moral." *Bull. Mus. Fine Arts* 45.261 (Oct. 1947): 55-62.
- Sweet, J.P.M. "Maintaining the testimony of Jesus: the suffering of Christians in the Revelation of John." 101-117 in W. Horbury and B. McNeil, *Suffering and Martyrdom in the New Testament*. Cambridge: Cambridge U P, 1981.
- Swete, Henry Barclay. *The Apocalypse of St. John*. (1906), 3rd ed. London: Macmillan, 1922.
- Swift, L.A. "Mixed Choruses and Marriage Songs: A New Interpretation of the Third Stasimon of the *Hippolytos*." *J Hel. St.* 126 (2006): 125-140.
- Tadman, Michael. "The Hidden History of Slave Trading in Antebellum South Carolina: John Springs III and Other 'Gentlemen Dealing in Slaves.'" *SC Hist. Mag.* 97:1 (Jan. 1996): 6-29.
- _____. *Speculators and Slaves: Masters, Traders, and Slaves in the Old South*. Madison: U Wisconsin P, 1989.
- Takács, Sarolta A. *Vestal Virgins, Sibyls, and Matrons: Women in Roman Religion*. Austin: U Texas P, 2008.
- Tangherlini, Timothy R. "'Where Was I?': Personal Experience Narrative, Crystallization and Some Thoughts on Tradition Memory." *Cultural Analysis* 7 (2008): 41-76.
- Tansey, Richard. "Bernard Kendig and the New Orleans Slave Trade." *LA His.* 23:2 (Spr. 1982): 159-178.

- Tanzer, Sarah J. "Ephesians." 325-348 in Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza et al., *Searching the Scriptures*, v. 2. New York: Crossroad, 1994.
- Tataki, Argyro B. "Nemesis, Nemeseis, and the Gladiatorial Games at Smyrna." *Mnemosyne* 62 (2009): 639-648.
- Tavo, Felise. *Woman, Mother and Bride* (Biblical Tools and Studies 3). Leuven: Peeters, 2007.
- Tawil, Hayim. "Paved with Love (Cant 3,10d): A New Interpretation." *ZAW* 115 (2003): 266-271.
- Taylor, Timothy. "Believing the Ancients: Quantitative and Qualitative Dimensions of Slavery and the Slave Trade in Later Prehistoric Eurasia." *World Arch.* 33:1 (Jun. 2001): 27-43.
- Taylor, Ula. "The Historical Evolution of Black Feminist Theory and Praxis." *J Black St.* 29:2 (Nov. 1998): 234-253.
- Temin, Peter. "The Labor Market of the Early Roman Empire." *J Interdisciplinary His.* 34:4 (Spr. 2004): 513-538.
- Teugels, Lieve. "Unraveling the Rabbis' Web: A Response to Miriam Peskowitz." 135-142 in J.W. van Henter and Athalya Brenner, *Families and Family Relations as Represented in Early Judaism and Early Christianities*. Leiden: Deo, 2000.
- Thomas, Phillip L. "Red and White: A Roman Color Symbol." *Rheinisches Mus. Philologie* 122:3 (1979): 310-316.
- Thompson, Dorothy J. "The Hellenistic Family." 93-112 in G.R. Bugh, *The Cambridge Companion to the Hellenistic World*. Cambridge: Cambridge U P, 2006.
- Thompson, F. Hugh. *The Archaeology of Greek and Roman Slavery* (Reports Res. Committee Soc. Antiquaries London 66). London: Duckworth, 2002.
- Thompson, Leonard L. "The Martyrdom of Polycarp: Death in the Roman Games." *J Rel.* 82:1 (Jan. 2002): 27-52.
- Thompson, Lloyd. "Roman Perceptions of Blacks." *Electronic Antiquity* 1.3 (Aug. 1993). 8 p.
- Thompson, Wesley. "Weaving: A Man's Work." *Cl. World* 75:4 (Mar. 1982): 217-222.
- Thomsen, Ole. *Ritual and Desire: Catullus 61 and 62 and Other Ancient Documents on Wedding and Marriage*. Aarhus: Aarhus U P, 1992.
- Tilborg, Sijef van. "The meaning of the word γαμῶ in Lk 14:20; 17:27; Mk 12:25 and in a number of early Jewish and Christian authors." *HTS* 58.2 (2002): 802-900.
- _____. "The Danger at Midday: Death Threats in the Apocalypse." *Biblica* 85.1 (2004): 1-23.
- Too Yun Lee. "Alcman's *Partheneion*: The Maidens Dance the City." *QUCC* 56.2 (1997): 7-29.
- Toorn, Karel van der. *From Her Cradle to Her Grave: The Role of Religion in the Life of the Israelite and the Babylonian Woman*. (1987), tr. S.J. Denning-Bolle (Bibl. Seminar 23). Sheffield: JSOT P, 1994.
- _____. "The Significance of the Veil in the Ancient Near East." 327-339 in Wright et al., *Pomegranates*. Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 1995.
- Towers, Frank. *The Urban South and the Coming of the Civil War*. Charlottesville: U Virginia P, 2004.

- Treacy-Cole, Diane. "Women in the Wilderness: Rereading Rev. 12." 45-58 in R. Sugirtharajah, *Wilderness*. London: T & T Clark, 2005.
- Trebilco, Paul. *Self-Designations and Group Identity in the New Testament*. Cambridge: Cambridge U P, 2012.
- Treggiari, Susan. "Contubernales in CIL 6." *Phoenix* 35.1 (Spr. 1981): 42-69.
- _____. "Family Life among the Staff of the Volusii." *TAPA* 105 (1975): 393-401.
- _____. "Jobs in the Household of Livia." *PBSR* 43 (1975): 48-77.
- _____. "Libertine Ladies." *The Classical World* 64.6 (Feb. 1971): 196-198.
- _____. "Lower Class Women in the Roman Economy." *Florilegium* 1 (1979): 65-86.
- _____. *Roman Marriages*. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1991.
- Trites, Allison A. *The New Testament Concept of Witness* (SNTS Mon. 31). Cambridge: Cambridge U P, 1977.
- Trocmé, Etienne. "Jean 3, 29 et le thème de l'époux dans la tradition préévangélique." *RSR* 69.1 (Jan. 1995): 13-18.
- Trotter, James M. "The Genre and Setting of Psalm 45." *ABR* 57 (2009): 34-46.
- Trümper, Monika. *Greco-Roman Slave Markets: Fact or Fiction?* Oxford: Oxbow, 2009.
- Tsagalis, Christos. *Inscribing Sorrow: Fourth-Century Attic Funerary Epigrams* (Trends in Cl. sup. 1). Berlin: De Gruyter, 2008.
- Tsevat, Matitahu. "The Husband Veils a Wife (Hittite Laws, Sections 197-98)." *J Cuneiform St.* 27.4 (Oct. 1975): 235-240.
- Tsouvala, Georgia. "Integrating Marriage and *Homonoia*." 701-718 in A.D. Nikolaidis, *The Unity of Plutarch's Work*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2008.
- Tucker, C. Wayne. "Women in the Manumission Inscriptions at Delphi." *TAPA* 112 (1982): 225-236.
- Tufte, Virginia J. "'High Wedlock Then Be Honored': Rhetoric and the Epithalamium." *Pacific Coast Philology* 1 (Apr. 1966): 32-41.
- Tushnet, Mark V. *The American Law of Slavery 1810-1860: Considerations of Humanity and Interest*. Princeton: Princeton U P, 1981.
- Udoh, Fabian E. "The Tale of an Unrighteous Slave (Luke 16:1-18[13])." *JBL* 128.2 (Jun. 2009): 311-335.
- Urbainczyk, Theresa. *Slave Revolts in Antiquity*. Durham: Acumen, 2008.
- Valantasis, Richard. "The Nuptial Chamber Revisited: The *Acts of Thomas* and cultural intertextuality." *Semeia* 80 (1997): 261-76.
- Valler, Shulamit. "Business Women in the Mishnaic and Talmudic period." *WiJ* 2:2 (Spr. 2001). 14 p.
- _____. *Women and Womanhood in the Talmud* (1993), tr. B. Rozen (Brown Judaic St. 321). Atlanta: Scholars P, 1999.

- Van Nortwick, Thomas. *Imagining Men: Ideals of Masculinity in Ancient Greek Culture* (Praeger Ser. Anc. World). Westport, Connecticut: Praeger, 2008.
- Van Til, Kent. "Luxury: Sign of the Beast, or of the Blessing?" *J Rel. Soc.* sup. 10 (2014): 217-228.
- Vander Hart, Mark D. "Preparing the City-Bride for Her Lord: An Exegetical Exposition of Isaiah 62:1-12." *Mid-America J Theol.* 1.2 (1985): 117-132.
- Vander Stichele, Caroline. "Just a Whore: The Annihilation of Babylon According to Rev. 17:16." *lec. dif.* 1:1 (2000): 11 p.
- Vanderford, Chad. "Proslavery Professors: Classic Natural Right and the Positive Good Argument in Antebellum Virginia." *Civil War His.* 55:1 (Mar. 2009): 5-30.
- VanderVelde, Lea and Sandhya Subramanian. "Mrs. Dred Scott." *Yale Law J* 106:4 (Jan. 1997): 1033-1122.
- Vasconcellos, Pedro L. "La Victoria de la Vida." *Revista de Interpretación Bíblica Latinoamericana* 34 (1999): 74-87.
- Vasvári, Louise A. "A Comparative Approach to European Folk Poetry and the Erotic Wedding Motif." *Comparative Literature and Culture* 1:4 (Dec. 1999): 2-8.
- Vatin, Claude. *Recherches sur le mariage et la condition de la femme mariée à l'époque hellénistique* (Bib. écoles fr. d'Athènes et de Rome 216). Paris: E. de Boccard, 1970.
- Vérilhac, Anne-Marie and Claude Vial. *Le mariage grec du Vie siècle av. J.C. à l'époque d'Auguste* (Bulletin de Correspondence Hellénique Sup. 32). Athens: École française d'Athènes, 1998.
- Vernant, Jean-Pierre and Pierre Vidal-Naquet. *Travail & esclavage en Grèce ancienne* (1985) (Historiques 44). Paris: Éditions Complexe, 1988.
- Vetter, Bernard Keith. "Another Legal Transplant: The Application of the Roman Law of Slavery in the United States — The Unique Case of the State of Louisiana." *Fundamina* 11 (2005): 375-384.
- Vidal-Naquet, Pierre. "Slavery and the Rule of Women in Tradition, Myth and Utopia." 186-200 in R.L. Gordon et al., *Myth, Religion, and Society*. Cambridge: Cambridge U P, 1981.
- Villers, Robert. "Le mariage envisagé comme institution d'Etat dans le droit classique de Rome." 285-301 in H. Temporini, *ANWR* 2.14. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1982.
- Villiers, Pieter G.R. de. "Entering the Corridors of Power: State and Church in the Reception History of Revelation." *Acta Theologica* 33:2 (2013): 37-56.
- Vlach, John Michael. "'Without Recourse to Owners': The Architecture of Urban Slavery in the Antebellum South." *Perspectives in Vernacular Architecture* 6 (1997): 150-160.
- Wade, Richard C. *Slavery in the Cities: The South 1820-1860*. New York: NYU P, 1964.
- Wagner-Hasel, Beate. "Marriage Gifts in Ancient Greece." 158-172 in Michael L. Satlow, *The Gift in Antiquity*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 2013.
- Wahl, Jenny B. "The Jurisprudence of American Slave Sales." *J Economic His.* 56:1 (Mar. 1996): 143-169.

- Wainwright, Geoffrey and Karen Westerfield Tucker, ed. *Oxford History of Christian Worship*. Oxford: Oxford U P, 2006.
- Walker, Juliet E.K. "Racism, Slavery, and Free Enterprise: Black Entrepreneurship in the United States before the Civil War." *Business His. Rev.* 60:3 (Aut. 1986): 343-382.
- Wallace-Hadrill, Andrew. "The Social Spread of Roman Luxury." *PBSR* 58 (1990): 145-192.
- Wallenstein, Peter. *Tell the Court I Love My Wife: Race, Marriage, and Law — An American History*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002.
- Walters, Ronald G. "The Erotic South: Civilization and Slavery in American Abolitionism." 3-24 in D.J. Libby et al., *Affect and Power*. Jackson: U P MS, 2005.
- Walvin, James. *Black Ivory: Slavery in the British Empire* (1992), 2nd ed. Malden, Massachusetts: Blackwell, 2001.
- _____. *Questioning Slavery*. New York: Routledge, 1996.
- Washburn, Dorothy K. "Remembering Things Seen: Experimental Approaches to the Process of Information Transmittal." *J Archaeological Method and Theory* 8.1 (Mar. 2001): 67-99.
- Watson, Alan. *The Law of Persons in the Later Roman Republic*. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1967.
- _____. *Roman Slave Law*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins U P, 1987.
- _____. *Roman Law & Comparative Law*. Athens: U Georgia P, 1991.
- _____. "Roman Slave Law: An Anglo-American Perspective." *Cardozo Law Rev.* 18 (1996): 591-598.
- _____. "Roman Slave Law and Romanist Ideology." *Phoenix* 37.1 (Spr. 1983): 53-65.
- _____. "Seventeenth-Century Jurists, Roman Law, and the Law of Slavery." *Chicago-Kent Law Rev.* 68 (1992): 1343-1354.
- _____. *Slave Law in the Americas*. Athens: U Georgia P, 1989.
- _____. "Thinking Property at Rome." 419-451 in P. Finkelman, *Slavery and the Law*. Madison: Madison House, 1997.
- Watson, Harry L. "Conflict and Collaboration: Yeomen, Slaveholders, and Politics in the Antebellum South." *Social His.* 10:3 (Oct. 1985): 273-298.
- Watson, Patricia. "Non Tristis torus et tamen pudicus: The Sexuality of the *Matrona* in Martial." *Mnemosyne* 58:1 (3005): 62-87.
- Wax, Darold D. "Robert Ellis, Philadelphia Merchant and Slave Trader." *PA Mag. His. & Bio.* 88:1 (Jan. 1964): 52-69.
- Weeks, Stuart. *Instruction and Imagery in Proverbs 1-9*. Oxford: Oxford U P, 2007.
- Weems, Renita J. "Do You See What I See? Diversity in Interpretation." *Church and Soc.* 82:1 (Sep. 1991): 28-43.
- Weiler, Ingomar. "Inverted *Kalokagathia*." *S & A* 23.2 (2002): 9-28.

- Weinberger, Leon J. "God as Matchmaker, A Rabbinic Legend Preserved in the Piyyut." *JAAAR* 40:2 (Jun. 1972): 238-244.
- Weiner, Marli F. *Mistresses and Slaves: Plantation Women in South Carolina, 1830-80*. Urbana: U Illinois P, 1998.
- Wells, Tom Henderson. "Charles Augustus Lafayette Lamar: Gentleman Slave Trader." *GA Hist. Q.* 47:2 (Jun. 1963): 158-168.
- Wengst, Klaus. "Babylon the Great and the New Jerusalem: The Visionary View of Political Reality in the Revelation of John." 189-202 in H.G. Reventlow et al., *Politics and Theopolitics in the Bible and Postbiblical Literature*. Sheffield: Ac. P, 1994.
- Wenham, Gordon L. "Betûlāh 'A Girl of Marriageable Age.'" *VT* 22.3 (Jul. 1972): 326-348.
- Wenthe, Dean O. "The Parable of the Ten Bridesmaids." *Springfielder* 40:1 (Jun. 1976): 9-16.
- West, Emily. *Chains of Love: Slave Couples in Antebellum South Carolina*. Urbana: U Illinois P, 2004.
- _____. *Family or Freedom: People of Color in the Antebellum South*. Lexington: U P Kentucky, 2012.
- Westbrook, Raymond. "Slave and Master in Ancient Near Eastern Law." *Chicago-Kent Law Rev.* 70 (1994): 1631-1676.
- Wayne, Jeannie. "Southern Women during the Age of Emancipation." Ch. 21 in L.K. Ford, *A Companion to the Civil War and Reconstruction*. Malden, Massachusetts: Blackwell, 2005. 19 p.
- Wheeler, Arthur Leslie. "Tradition in the Epithalamium." *Am. J. Philol.* 51.3 (1930): 205-223.
- White, Shane and Graham. "Slave Hair and African American Culture in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries." *J Southern His.* 61:1 (Feb. 1995): 45-76.
- Whitfield, B.G. "Virgil and the Bees: A Study in Ancient Apicultural Lore." *G & R* 3:2 (Oct. 1956): 99-117.
- Whitman, Stephen. "Diverse Good Causes: Manumission and the Transformation of Urban Slavery." *Soc. Sci. His.* 19:3 (Aut. 1995): 333-370.
- Wickramasinghe, Chandima S.M. *Slavery from Known to Unknown: A Comparative Study of Slavery in Ancient Greek Poleis and Ancient Sri Lanka* (BAR Int'l. Ser. 1463). Oxford: Archaeopress, 2005.
- Wiedemann, Thomas. *Emperors and Gladiators*. London: Routledge, 1992.
- ____ and Jane Gardner. "Introduction." *S & A* 23.2 (2002): 1-8.
- Wiesen, David S. "The Contribution of Antiquity to American Racial Thought." 191-212 in J.W. Eadie, *Classical Traditions in Early America*. Ann Arbor: U Michigan, 1976.
- Wilkie, Jane Riblett. "The Black Urban Population of the Pre-Civil War South." *Phylon* 37:3 (1976): 250-262.
- Will, Thomas E. "Weddings on Contested Grounds: Slave Marriage in the Antebellum South." *Historian* (1999): 99-117.
- Williams, David T. "The Femininity of the Son." *Scripture* 65 (1998): 81-93.
- Williams, Francis E. "Fourth Gospel and Synoptic Tradition." *JBL* 86.3 (Sep. 1967): 311-319.

- Williams, Gordon. "Some Aspects of Roman Marriage Ceremonies and Ideals." *JRS* 48.1/2 (1958): 16-29.
- Williams, Heather Andrea. *Help Me to Find My People: The African American Search for Family Lost in Slavery*. Chapel Hill: U North Carolina P, 2012.
- Williams, Margaret H. "Image and Text in the Jewish Epitaphs of Late Ancient Rome." *JStJ* 42 (2011): 328-350.
- Williams, Marvin Suber. "Early Christian Formation as a Paradigm of Liberation: Studying the Role of Δούλος in Rev. 21.1-22.5." 264-286 in J.H. Ellens, *Text and Community*, v. 1. Sheffield: Phoenix P, 2007.
- Williams, Ritva H. "The Mother of Jesus at Cana." *CBQ* 59.4 (Oct. 1997): 679-692.
- Williamson, George C. *The Book of Ivory*. London: Frederick Muller, 1938.
- Willis, Lawrence M. "Jewish Novellas in a Greek and Roman Age: Fiction and Identity." *JStJ* 42 (2011): 141-165.
- _____. "The Depiction of Slavery in the Ancient Novel." *Semiotica* 83-84 (1998): 113-132.
- Wilmore, Gayraud S. *Pragmatic Spirituality: The Christian Faith through an Africentric [sic] Lens*. New York: NYU P, 2004.
- Wilson, Andrew. "Machines, Power and the Ancient Economy." *J Roman St.* 92 (2002): 1-32.
- Wilson, Bee. *The Hive: The Story of the Honeybee and Us*. London: John Murray, 2004.
- Wilson, E. Faye. "Pastoral and Epithalamium in Latin Literature." *Speculum* 23.1 (Jan. 1948): 35-57.
- Wilson, John R. "The Wedding Gifts of Peleus." *Phoenix* 28.4 (Winter 1974): 385-389.
- Wilson, Katharina M. and Elizabeth M. Makowski. *Wykked Wyves and the Woes of Marriage: Misogamous Literature from Juvenal to Chaucer*. Albany: SUNY P, 1990.
- Wiltshire, Susan Ford. "Jefferson, Calhoun, and the Slavery Debate: The Classics and the Two Minds of the South." *Southern Humanities Rev.* 11 (1977): 33-40.
- Wimbush, Vincent L., ed. *African Americans and the Bible*. New York: Continuum, 2000.
- _____. "Interpreters — Enslaving/Enslaved/Runagate." *JBL* 130:1 (Mar. 2011): 5-24.
- Winandy, Jacques. "La Litère de Salomon (Ct. III 9-10)." *Vet. Test.* 15.1 (Jan. 1965): 103-110.
- Winiarski, Catherine E. "Adultery, Idolatry, and the Subject of Monotheism." *Rel. & Lit.* 38.3 (Aut. 2006): 41-63.
- Winterer, Caroline. *The Mirror of Antiquity: American Women and the Classical Tradition, 1750-1900*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell U P, 2007.
- Wistrand, Magnus. *Entertainment and Violence in Ancient Rome: The attitudes of Roman writers of the first century A.D.* (Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis). Västerrik: Ekblads, 1992.
- Witherington, Ben III. *Revelation*. (New Century Bible Commentary). Cambridge: Cambridge U P, 2003.
- Wood, Betty. *Slavery in Colonial Georgia 1730-1775*. Athens: U Georgia P, 1984.

- Wood, Kirsten E. *Masterful Women: Slaveholding Widows from the American Revolution through the Civil War* (Gender and Am. Culture). Chapel Hill: U North Carolina P, 2004.
- Woodbury, Leonard. "Cyrene and the Teleuta of Marriage in Pindar's Ninth Pythian Ode." *TAPA* 112 (1982): 245-258.
- Wrenhaven, Kelly L. "The Identity of the 'Wool-Workers' in the Attic Manumissions." *Hesperia* 78:3 (Jul. 2009): 367-386.
- _____. *Reconstructing the Slave: The Image of Slave in Ancient Greece*. Bristol: Bristol Cl. P, 2012.
- Wright, Benjamin G. "Doûlos and País as Translations of 'ebd.'" 263-277 in B.A. Taylor, *IX Congr. Int'l. Org. LXX Cog. St. Cambridge 1995* (45). Atlanta: SBL, 1997.
- _____. *Praise Israel for Wisdom and Instruction: Essays on Ben Sira and Wisdom, the Letter of Aristeas and the Septuagint*. (JSJ sup. 131). Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- Wyetzner, Peter. "Sulla's Law on Prices and the Roman Definition of Luxury." 15-33 in Jean-Jacques Aubert and B. Sirks, *Speculum Iuris*. Ann Arbor: U Michigan P, 2002.
- Yamauchi, Edwin M. "Cultural Aspects of Marriage in the Ancient World." *Bibl. Sac.* 135:539 (Jul. 1978): 241-252.
- Yarbro Collins, Adele. *The Combat Myth in the Book of Revelation*. Missoula, Montana: Scholars P, 1976.
- _____. *Crisis and Catharsis: The Power of the Apocalypse*. Philadelphia: Westminster P, 1984.
- _____. "Feminine Symbolism in the Book of Revelation." *Bibl. Interp.* 1.1. (Feb. 1993): 20-33.
- _____. "Insiders and Outsiders in the Book of Revelation and Its Social Context." 187-218 in Jacob Neusner and E.S. Frerichs, *"To See Ourselves as Others See Us"*. Chico, California: Scholars P, 1985.
- _____. "Persecution and Vengeance in the Book of Revelation." 729-749 in D. Hellholm, *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East*. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1983.
- _____. "Reading the Book of Revelation in the 20th Century." *Interpretation* 40.3 (Jul. 1986): 229-242.
- _____. "Revelation 18." 185-204 in Lambrecht, *L'Apocalypse johannique*... Gembloux: Éditions J Duculot, 1980.
- _____. "Vilification and Self-Definition in the Book of Revelation." *HTR* 79.1-3 (Jan. 1986): 308-320.
- Yee, Gale A. "'I Have Perfumed My Bed with Myrrh': The Foreign Woman ('išša zārā) in Prov. 1-9." 110-126 in Athalya Brenner, *A Feminist Companion to Wisdom Literature*. Sheffield: Sheffield Ac. P, 1995.
- Yeo, Cedric A. "The Development of the Roman Plantation and Marketing of Farm Products." *FinanzArchiv* 13:2 (1951): 321-342.
- Yiftach-Firanko, Uri. *Marriage and Marital Arrangement: A History of the Greek Marriage Document in Egypt*. Munich: C.H. Beck, 2003.
- Yoder, Christine Roy. *Proverbs* (Abingdon OT Com.). Nashville: Abingdon P, 2009.
- _____. *Wisdom as a Woman of Substance: A Socioeconomic Reading of Prov. 1-9 and 31:10-31* (BZAW 304). Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 2001.

- Young, Gary K. *Rome's Eastern Trade: International Commerce and Imperial Policy, 31 BC-AD 205*. London: Routledge, Taylor & Francis, 2001.
- Youni, Maria S. "Transforming Greek practice into Roman law: manumissions in Roman Macedonia." *Legal His. Rev.* 78 (2010): 311-340.
- Yuge Tôru, ed. *Le monde méditerranéen et l'esclavage: Recherches japonaises* (Ann. Lit. U Besançon 426, CRHA 99). Paris: Belles Lettres, 1991.
- Zaidman, Louise and Pauline Pantel. *Religion in the Ancient Greek City* (1989), tr. P. Cartledge. Cambridge: Cambridge U P, 1992.
- Zerbe, Gordon. "Revelation's Exposé of Two Cities: Babylon and New Jerusalem." *Direction* 32.1 (Spr. 2003): 47-60.
- Zhou Yiqun. "Spatial Metaphors and Women's Religious Activities in Ancient Greece and China." 199-227 in S. Pathak, *Figuring Religions*. Albany: SUNY P, 2013.
- Zimmermann, Ruben. "Nuptial Imagery in the Revelation of John." *Biblica* 84.2 (2003): 153-183.
- Zlotnick, Helena. *Dinah's Daughters: Gender and Judaism from the Hebrew Bible to Late Antiquity*. Philadelphia: U Pennsylvania P, 2002.
- _____. "From Jezebel to Esther." *Biblica* 82.4 (2001): 477-495.