LEABHARLANN CHOLÁISTE NA TRÍONÓIDE, BAILE ÁTHA CLIATH | TRINITY COLLEGE LIBRARY DUBLIN
Ollscoil Átha Cliath | The University of Dublin

Terms and Conditions of Use of Digitised Theses from Trinity College Library Dublin

Copyright statement

All material supplied by Trinity College Library is protected by copyright (under the Copyright and Related Rights Act, 2000 as amended) and other relevant Intellectual Property Rights. By accessing and using a Digitised Thesis from Trinity College Library you acknowledge that all Intellectual Property Rights in any Works supplied are the sole and exclusive property of the copyright and/or other IPR holder. Specific copyright holders may not be explicitly identified. Use of materials from other sources within a thesis should not be construed as a claim over them.

A non-exclusive, non-transferable licence is hereby granted to those using or reproducing, in whole or in part, the material for valid purposes, providing the copyright owners are acknowledged using the normal conventions. Where specific permission to use material is required, this is identified and such permission must be sought from the copyright holder or agency cited.

Liability statement

By using a Digitised Thesis, I accept that Trinity College Dublin bears no legal responsibility for the accuracy, legality or comprehensiveness of materials contained within the thesis, and that Trinity College Dublin accepts no liability for indirect, consequential, or incidental, damages or losses arising from use of the thesis for whatever reason. Information located in a thesis may be subject to specific use constraints, details of which may not be explicitly described. It is the responsibility of potential and actual users to be aware of such constraints and to abide by them. By making use of material from a digitised thesis, you accept these copyright and disclaimer provisions. Where it is brought to the attention of Trinity College Library that there may be a breach of copyright or other restraint, it is the policy to withdraw or take down access to a thesis while the issue is being resolved.

Access Agreement

By using a Digitised Thesis from Trinity College Library you are bound by the following Terms & Conditions. Please read them carefully.

I have read and I understand the following statement: All material supplied via a Digitised Thesis from Trinity College Library is protected by copyright and other intellectual property rights, and duplication or sale of all or part of any of a thesis is not permitted, except that material may be duplicated by you for your research use or for educational purposes in electronic or print form providing the copyright owners are acknowledged using the normal conventions. You must obtain permission for any other use. Electronic or print copies may not be offered, whether for sale or otherwise to anyone. This copy has been supplied on the understanding that it is copyright material and that no quotation from the thesis may be published without proper acknowledgement.

THE HOUSE KEY

HOUSE as KEY

to understanding

ACTS

(the micro-text)

within its

ROMAN IMPERIAL CONTEXT

(the macro-text)

2 Volumes

Volume 1 : Text

Anne O'Keeffe

A thesis submitted in fulfilment of the

requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

School of Hebrew, Biblical and Theological Studies

Trinity College

University of Dublin

2001

TRINITY COLLEGE
11 APR 2002
LIBRARY DUBLIN

THESIS 6732.1
~~6732.1~~
~~7120.1~~
6732.1

DECLARATION

This thesis has not been submitted as an exercise for a degree at any other university. Except where stated, the work described therein was carried out by me alone.

I give permission for the Library to lend or copy this thesis upon request.

Signed Anne O'Keeffe

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my supervisor, Professor Seán Freyne for his constant enthusiasm, support and challenge throughout this project. I am also grateful to Professor Claudine Dauphin and to Doctor Marianne Sawicki for their help and kindness in what were the early and difficult stages of the work. I remember with gratitude all those who have accompanied me during these years of study, years which have also brought so many exciting, demanding and painful changes to my life. Finally, I acknowledge the valuable financial support I have received from Trinity College (in the form a Post-Graduate Scholarship and an award from the Centre for Mediterranean and Near Eastern Studies) and from the Irish-Scottish Province of the Society of the Sacred Heart.

Summary

While "house" has long been recognized as key to understanding Christianity and its world, my contention is that its analytical potential has actually been under-utilized by scholars. The study demonstrates how conscious use of the broad, flexible concept of "house" results in a valuable analytical tool which in turn sheds new light on Acts in its Roman imperial social world.

In the introduction, a review of scholarship both highlights the importance of the "house" for an understanding of early Christianity and provides pointers for further research. Concretely, the review reveals the need for reflection on the nature of "house"; at the level of content, it notes the (over-)emphasis on house(hold) as ideal or type (at the expense of actual households and dwellings) and the paucity of house scholarship dealing with Acts; methodologically, the challenge observed is for New Testament scholars to stand ever more fully in the territory shared with classicists by going beyond a simplistic and distorting background / foreground approach and by working competently with a range of material beyond the purely biblical. In the light of these observations, the proposal is to explore anew the meaning of "house" and to use the perspective gained in a reading of Acts (the micro-text) in its Roman imperial social world (the macro-text). The categorization macro-/micro-text is a succinct encapsulation of the text/context relationship articulated in the study: it expresses two key facts, namely (i) that Acts is a small but inextricable part of a larger text and (ii) that the empire is itself a multi-faceted text or mosaic of micro-texts which needs to be read.

Part 1 re-visits "house" in order to understand it anew. Focusing on "house" today, Ch. 1 problematises the apparently simple term and forces a re-thinking of its meaning and hermeneutical potential. The initial exploration is of the word itself - of its wide semantic field and principal meanings ("dwelling" and "household"). Drawing on human-scientific material, the reality of these two separate entities as social constructs and keys to society is then discussed and the neglected relationship between dwellings and households is articulated with the aid of social-spatial theory. Turning to the ancient world, Ch. 2 explores the meanings of οἶκος / οἰκία, *domus,* בית and synonyms. The chapter reveals the breadth and flexibility of "house" in antiquity and reinforces the capacity of (physical and sociological) houses to function as doors onto society. The focus on terminology also contributes to the articulation of two important definitions: first, that of the broad concept of "house" which is adopted as analytical tool and secondly, that of "oikic sources" (sources on housing and households) which are to serve as data.

Part 2 (Chs 3-5) is the reading of the macro-text. Using the concept of house as "household", Ch. 3 explores the early Roman Empire as a household-writ-large. Turning to physical houses, Ch. 4 focuses on dwelling / user relationships both in the typical town-house and in habitations in general. Using the concept of "physical house", Ch. 5 looks at what housing in the colonial or contact zone reveals about the relationship between imperial power and colonized people. The chapters of Part 2, therefore, function as a triptych: each stands as a distinct image yet together they offer a panoramic view of the empire which is subsequently shown to illuminate one of its tiny, constituent parts, namely the (micro-)text of Acts.

Turning to this micro-text, Part 3 (Chs 6 and 7) presents a reading of Acts shaped by the insights of Part 2 and aided by the flexible house tool. Regarding the analytical tool, it is a three-fold concept of house (as "household-writ-large", "οἶκος Ἰσραήλ" and "dwelling") which provides both framework and understanding. Ch. 6 shows how the movement uses the two world wide houses in which it is embedded (namely, the household-writ-large and the οἶκος Ἰσραήλ) as model and foil in its process of identity formation. In Ch. 7, further insight into early Christianity is gained by focusing on another type of οἶκος / οἰκία, namely, the physical house. Attention to the two-way relationship between dwellings and users shows reinforces the notion of Christianity as a united and trans-local οἶκος and reveals a movement profoundly shaped by its presence in different types of domestic premises. In sum, Christianity of Acts is an emerging and unified world-wide house; it is, however, from a humble base in all kinds of (physical) houses that this growth takes place and it is precisely because each of these little houses represents a different social / spatial location that the movement's life is shaped and expressed in infinitely diverse ways.

The study contributes to New Testament scholarship in the areas of methodology and content. Regarding the former, its contribution is two-fold. First, the macro- / micro-text concept is a useful model for all who study texts in context. More specifically, by situating biblical texts firmly in their Graeco-Roman context, it serves as a challenge to biblicists and classicists alike to widen their field of enquiry and competence. Secondly, the study demonstrates how a broader understanding of "house" results in a more effective and flexible analytical tool, one capable of generating new angles of vision. At the level of content, the study provides a fresh perspective on Acts, depicting Christianity as a movement shaped by its social / spatial location in houses both world-wide and local.

VOLUME 1 : TEXT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Title i
Declaration ii
Acknowledgements iii
Summary iv
Table of Contents v
Abbreviations

Introduction 1

Previous Investigations of the "House" in Early Christianity 2
Initial problem 2
Principles of selection 2
Classification 3
Setting the scene: Filson and Michel 4
Filson 4
Michel 5
Conclusion 6
1. The House in Early (or Pauline) Christianity from the Perspective of Social History 6
Judge 6
Malherbe 8
Klauch 10
Meeks 12
Conclusion 14
2. House(hold) Studies in relation to Specific Texts 15
Balch 16
Verner 18
Crosby 20
Carter 21
Matson 22
Conclusion 23
3. The House in Specific Texts from a Social-Scientific Perspective 24
Elliott - 1 Peter 25
- Luke-Acts 26
Barton 28
Love 29
Conclusion 30

4. The House as Physical Setting 31
Murphy-O'Connor 31
White 32
Blue 34
Conclusion 36
5. House as Family 36
Osiek and Balch 36
Moxnes (ed.) 37
Conclusion 40
6. The House from a Feminist Perspective 40
Schüssler Fiorenza 41
Feminist Commentaries 43
Tanzer 43
Corley 43
Conclusion 44
Previous investigations ... in sum... 45

Observations made... issues raised... 46
Terminology 46
Content 48
Emphasis on "the" household obscures the significance of actual households and dwellings 49
Acts and "house" scholarship 49
Methodology 51
In sum.... 52
The present study 52

PART 1: "HOUSE" REVISITED AND UNDERSTOOD ANEW

Introduction 55

Chapter 1 : What is meant by "house" ... today ? 56

House: The Word 56
A lexical definition 56
"House" in the thesaurus 59
Conclusions: contributions and limitations of a "word" approach 60
House: The Reality 61
Physical house or dwelling 61
Variety 62
World-in-miniature 63
Gender 64
Ideology 66
Home 67
In sum .. 69
Household 70

An amorphous definition 70
Variety and change 71
Household and society 72
Household and ideology 73
In sum... 74
Physical house and household: the relationship 75
A two-way relationship 75
Two-way relationship between built environment and users 75
Social / spatial theory 77
Possible distortions of the physical house / household relationship 78
Interpretations of housing evidence 79
Relationship between dwelling and social form 79
Further aspects of relationship: the idea of home 80
In sum.. 81
House: Findings and Implications 82
House: The word 82
House - the reality 82
Physical house / household: the relationship 84
Conclusion 84

Chapter 2 : "House" in antiquity 85

House terminology 85

Greek Terminology : "οἶκος", "οἰκία" and related terms 87
Two terms: "οἶκος" and "οἰκία" 87
Attempts to distinguish them 87
No real distinction 88
In sum 89
Meanings of "οἶκος / οἰκία" 89
General or generic term for physical house 90
Other terms for "dwelling" 90
Any abode 92
Home 92
Household - the social unit 93
Estate, possessions 94
Social and political institution 95
Words with οἰκ- root 95
Greek terminology: summary and conclusions 97

Latin Terminology: "*domus*" and related terms 99
Meanings of *"domus"* 99
"Familia" and other social group terms 102
"Domus" and the variety of "dwelling" terminology 103
Insula 104
Cenaculum 105
Rooms and lodgings 107

Further housing terms 110
Latin terminology: summary and conclusions 111

Hebrew Terminology: "בית" 112
Meanings of "בית" 112
Dwelling 112
Social group 115
Other meanings 117
בית and paronomasia 118
Hebrew Terminology: summary and conclusions 119
Conclusions and Implications 120
"House" as model 120
"Oikic" sources 121

PART 2 : READINGS OF THE EARLY ROMAN EMPIRE (THE MACRO-TEXT)

Introduction 122

Chapter 3: The empire as "household-writ-large" 126

Four aspects of empire as household 126
1. From *Pater Familias* to *Pater Patriae* 127
pater familias 127
patria potestas as a model for state magistrates 131
princeps as *pater patriae* 131
2. Domestic Religion and State Religion 135
Domestic religion 135
deities 136
family roles 139
functions 141
State religion 141
deities and cults with domestic parallels 141
Emperor and *pater familias* 145
imperial cult and that of *Genius* of the *pater familias* 145
princeps and *pater familias* as *pontifex* 148
3. Family Values 150
Cults 150
Curator morum 152
Family values and household ideology 155
4. Slavery and Patronage 156
Familia Caesaris 156
Patronage 159
Four aspects of "empire as household".. In sum... 161

The House-Building of Augustus 162
House-building backwards : pedigree and self-justification 162
divus Iulius and *divi filius* 163
divi filius, Mars, Venus, Romulus and Aeneas 164
the *gens Iulia* 166
Household building forwards : the succession 167
sons-in-law: Marcellus and Agrippa 167
grandsons: Gaius and Lucius Caesar 168
stepson: Tiberius 170
Augustus and house building : typical and unparalleled 171
House-building monuments 174
The house-building of Augustus.. in sum... 176
Chapter conclusion 177

Chapter 4: Typical *domus* and other *domus* 178

Typical *Domus* : Physical construct and architectural type 180
Presenting the typical [Roman atrium(-peristyle town) house 180
the typical ground plan 181
actual ground plans 182
the atrium-peristyle type 184

Dwelling / User Relationships in the typical Roman town-house 186

Typical town-house / typical household 186
the evidence from religion 187
Typical town-house and male householder / patron / public figure 192
salutatio 192
other reception activities 195
typical town-house / typical householder.. in general 196
in sum... 200
Typical town-house and elite woman 201
Typical town-house and slaves 205
Typical town-house ... in conclusion 208

Other *Domus* : Other Dwelling / User Relationships 210

Dwelling size : / social status 211
Housing's influence on identity, lifestyle, relationships 213
Users' influence on dwellings 217
Housing and households (housefuls) 220

Chapter Conclusion 222

Chapter 5 : Housing in the "contact zone" 223

Housing and Contact ... In General 224
Rome's on-going contact with the Greek world 224
Imperial imprint across the οἰκουμένη 225
Complex contact: imposition, importation, adoption, adaptation 230
The Evidence from Jerusalem 234
Reading contact through housing evidence 234
Locating the evidence 235
the Upper City 235
the houses 236
Reading the evidence of contact 238
ground plans of the courtyard house 238
water installations 239
the evidence 239
ritual baths 240
décor 242
wall-paintings 243
mosaics 245
objects 246
fire and destruction 248
In sum 250
Chapter Conclusion 251

Part 2 : Summary and Conclusion 253

PART 3 : THE HOUSE READING OF ACTS (THE MICRO-TEXT)

Introduction 254

Chapter 6: Acts, Christianity and Two World-Wide Houses 255

Acts, Christianity and the empire as household-writ-large 255
The empire as household-writ-large 255
Self-definition within the world of the household-writ-large 256
Self-definition beyond the world of the household-writ-large 261
God as father 261
The Christian οἰκουμένη 263
Disrupting the οἰκονομία 266
Religion 266
Finance 270
Disturbing the peace 272
Acts, Christianity and the empire as household-writ-large.. in sum... 275

Acts, Christianity and the οἶκος ᾽Ισραήλ 276
The οἶκος ᾽Ισραήλ 276
Self-definition within the οἶκος ᾽Ισραήλ 281
In-house division 287
A house divided 292
The house trajectory.. in sum... 295
Acts, Christianity and Two World-Wide Houses ... in Sum... 297

Chapter 7: Acts and In-House Christianity 298

Houses, Christianity and the Opening Scenes in Jerusalem 300
The upper room (ὑπερῷον) 300
The houses of the Jerusalem community 305
The opening chapters... In sum... 310

Moving on... 312
The house of Cornelius 312
.. and another elite house(hold) type.. 318
The house of Lydia 322
The upper room at Troas 330

Gathering the findings.. 336
In-house Christianity as a united, unified movement 336
.. in domestic premises 337
.. house-like in nature.. 339
In-house Christianity as a diverse movement 340
.. diverse images of community 341
.. unity and diversity.. juxtaposed.... 341

Conclusion 345
The study ..replayed.. in brief 345
Methodology assessed 347
macro-text and micro-text 347
"house" as analytical tool 348
The image of Christianity in Acts 349

Appendix 1
ξενία and μίσθωμα - Paul's Accommodation in Rome 352

Appendix 2
Acts, Women and the Double Message 356

Bibliography 359

Abbreviations

Abbreviations of Classical authors, texts (literary, papyrological and epigraphical) follow those in the *Oxford Classical Dictionary*, supplemented by those in Liddell-Scott.

Abbreviations of Biblical texts follow those of the (N)RSV.

Abbreviations of Mishnaic sources follow those outlined in H. Danby, *The Mishnah* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1933). For abbreviations of later Jewish writings, see (for example) *A Dictionary of the Targumim, The Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi and the Midrashic Literature*, compiled by M. Jastrow (New York: The Judaica Press, 1971).

Abbreviations for grammatical terms follow those of the *Oxford English Dictionary.*

AB	Anchor Bible
ABD	*Anchor Bible Dictionary.* Edited by D. N. Freedman. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
AJA	*American Journal of Archaeology*
ANRW	*Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt.* Edited by H. Temporini and W. Haase. 93 vols. Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 1972-
ASOR	American Schools of Oriental Research
AUSS	*Andrews University Seminary Studies*
BAFCS	*The Book of Acts in its First Century Setting.* Edited by B. W. Winter. 5 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans / Carlisle: The Paternoster Press, 1993-1996.
BAGD	*A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature.* Edited by W. Bauer, W. Arndt, F. W. Gingrich, F. Danker. 2nd edition. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979.
BAR	*Biblical Archaeology Review*
BASOR	*Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*
BBR	*Bulletin for Bible Research*
BCH	*Bulletin de correspondance hellénique, 1877-.*
Bib	*Biblica*
BJS	Brown Judaic Studies
BRev	*Bible Review*
BTB	*Biblical Theology Review*
BWANT	*Beiträge zur Wissenschaft von Alten und Neuen Testaments*
BZ	*Biblische Zeitschrift*
CAH	*Cambridge Ancient History*
CODS	*The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Sociology.* Edited by G. Marshall. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994.
CJ	*Classical Journal*
CR:BS	*Currents in Research : Biblical Studies*
DJ	*Jahrbuch des Deutschen Evangelischen Instituts für Altertumswissenschaft des Heiligen Landes*

EDNT	*Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament.* Edited by H. Balz and G. Schneider. 3 vols. Grand Rapids: Michigan: 1009-1993.
EKK	Evangelish-Katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament
ExpTim	*Expository Times*
FRLANT	Forsuchungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testament
GNS	Good News Studies
GRBS	*Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies*
Hesp.	*Hesperia*
HTR	*Harvard Theological Review*
HTS	*Harvard Theological Studies*
HNT	Hermeneia New Testament Commentary
ICC	International Critical Commentary
IEJ	*Israel Exploration Society*
IES	*International Encyclopedia of Sociology.* Edited by F. Magill. London: Fitzroy Dearborn, 1995.
JE	*Jewish Encyclopaedia.* 12 vols. New York and London: Funk and Wagnalls, 1901.
JBL	*Journal of Biblical Literature*
JHS	*Journal of Hellenic Studies*
JJS	*Journal of Jewish Studies*
JRH	*Journal of Religious History*
JRS	*Journal of Roman Studies*
JSOT	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament
JSNT	Journal for the Study of the New Testament
JQR	*Jewish Quarterly Review*
KP	*Der Kleine Pauly*
LCL	Loeb Classical Library
Liddell-Scott or LSJ	*A Greek-English Lexicon.* H. G. Liddell, R. Scott, H. S. Jones. 9th edition. Oxford: Clarendon, 1940.
Lewis and Short	*A Latin Dictionary.* Founded on Andrews' edition of Freunds's Latin Dictionary. Revised, enlarged and in great part rewritten by C. T. Lewis. Oxford: Clarendon: 1987.
MAAR	Memoirs of the American Academy of Rome.
NAB	New American Bible
NAC	New American Commentary
NCV	New Century Version
NEAEHL	*New Encyclopedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land,* Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1993. Edited by E. Stern.
NewDocs	*New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity: A Review of the Greek Inscriptions and Papyri published in 1976-1978.* Edited by G. R. H. Horsley. 7 vols. Sydney: Ancient History Documentary Research Centre, Macquarie University, 1981-1983.
NICNT	New International Commentary on the New Testament
NIV	New International Version
NJB	New Jerusalem Bible
NovT	*Novum Testamentum*

NRSV	New Revised Standard Version
n.s.	New Series
NTS	*New Testament Studies*
OCD	*Oxford Classical Dictionary*
OED	*Oxford English Dictionary*
PBSR	*Papers of the British School at Rome*
PW	*Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft.* Edited by G. Wissowa. 49 vols. Stuttgart: Metzler / Druckenmüller, 1893-1978.
PW Supp	Supplement to *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie*
REJ	*Revue des études juives*
RSR	*Religious Studies Review*
SBL	Society of Biblical Literature
SBLMS	Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series
SBLDS	Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series
SB	*Stuttgarter Bibelstudien*
SBS	Stuttgarter biblische Studien
SQE	*Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum.* 10th edition. Edited by K. Aland. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelstiftung, 1978.
TAPhA	*Transactions of the American Philological Association*
TDNT	*Theological Dictionary of the New Testament.* Edited by G. Kittel and G. Friedrich. 10 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964-1967.
TNTC	Tyndale New Testament Commentaries
TToday	*Theology Today*
TynBull	*Tyndale Bulletin*
TZ	*Theologische Zeitschrift*
UNT	Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
USQR	*Union Seminary Quarterly Review*
VC	*Vigiliae Christianae*
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
ZNW	*Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*
ZTK	*Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche*

INTRODUCTION

INTRODUCTION

From the perspective of one studying the New Testament with a previous training in Classics, an exciting development in biblical studies is the growing interest in the social world of early Christianity. Within that strand of scholarship, a topic which recurs is that of the "house ". While it has long been recognized that "house" is a central institution in the Graeco-Roman world and a key to the interpretation of some Christian texts, my contention is that this key has been under-utilized by scholars. Addressing this lacuna, this study aims to explore anew the meaning of "house" and to use the perspective gained in a reading of Acts (the micro-text) in its Roman imperial context (the macro-text). The study itself is divided into three parts: the first re-visits "house" and draws attention to its potential as a hermeneutical tool; the second uses aspects of this "house" tool in a reading of the empire while the third homes in on one of empire's constituent parts, namely the text of Acts.

As will be demonstrated, exciting, new insights into early Christianity are gained in the process. The picture of Christianity to emerge is of a movement whose identity is forged in the context of its social / spatial location in houses both world-wide and local. The two world-wide houses in which it is embedded, namely the household-writ-large of the empire and the οἶκος Ἰσραήλ provide both model and foil for Christian self-definition. Like these two world-wide houses, Christianity too is an οἶκος in which all members are united under a supreme head and one with an expanding οἰκουμένη. It is, however, a house with an identity and life of its own: one with its own membership and system of management, its own beliefs, ethos and message, its own rituals and values. While constituting a united world-wide house, Christianity is at one and the same time a collection of diverse in-house communities. Each of these stands as a model of Christianity and each is as different as the premises it occupies, be it upper room in Jerusalem or Troas, elite Roman *domus* in Caesarea or workshop-*cum*-dwelling in Philippi. In sum, the Christianity of Acts is an emerging and unified world-wide house; it is, however, from a humble base in all kinds of (physical) houses that this growth takes place and it is precisely because each of these little houses represents a different social / spatial location that the movement's life is shaped and expressed in infinitely diverse ways.

PREVIOUS INVESTIGATIONS of the "HOUSE" in EARLY CHRISTIANITY

Plunging into the vast array of New Testament-related scholarship on the topic simultaneously underscores the centrality of the "house" for Christianity and reveals how further work is possible. It is the evidence for this double conclusion which is presented in this introduction. An initial review of scholarship is followed by the formulation of a proposal, namely to explore anew the meaning of house and to use the perspective gained in a reading of Acts in its Roman imperial context.

Initial problem

The initial problem facing a reviewer of scholarship on the house in early Christianity is precisely what material to choose. If one considers terminology alone, the words "οἶκος" and "οἰκία" (and words with οἰκ- root) occur so frequently in the sources [1] that it is difficult to overlook the topic in any work on early Christianity. Apart from lexical ubiquity, the house is inextricably linked to other themes of significance to the new movement. These include its community structure, organization, identity and ethics, its religious practice, hospitality and mission and relations between members and with non-members in the wider society. [2] The house, however, is studied less *per se*, than in relation to other topics and despite its apparent significance, there is no corpus of major works on the house. [3] Faced with the "everywhere and nowhere" nature of the topic, therefore, principles of selection are necessary.

Principles of selection

The first principle of selection adopted in this review is that material on the house be *specific* or *substantial*. Some works (books, chapters, articles) deal specifically with the

---

1 See W. F. Moulton, A. S. Geden, H. K. Moulton (eds), *Concordance to the New Testament*, 5th edn (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1978), 686-690.

2 On the variety of studies related to the house, see J. H. Elliott in *A Home for the Homeless: A Sociological Exegesis of 1 Peter, Its Situation and Strategy* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1981), 166-167 and 238-239.

3 Elliott (*Home,* 165) notes that the "need for a comprehensive up-to-date study of *oikos* in the New Testament in general has long been recognized but has yet to be met."

house in early Christianity in general or in relation to a specific text. Others offer a substantial treatment of the topic, while dealing primarily with a different focus. Given the quantity of such material, a second principle is that works chosen in the review are *illustrative* and *representative* of significant contributions on the subject.

Classification

While a wide variety of studies fall within the broad topic of "house", all are classifiable as works on the social world of early Christianity. [4] A frequent method of classifying such studies is to use a methodological principle, charting a general shift from social description to social theory.[5] The primary aim here, however, is not to discuss methodologies but rather to classify significant contributions to the study of the house in early Christianity. After an initial setting of the scene by examining the contributions of Filson [6] and Michel, [7] therefore, the scholarship is classified and assessed under the following six categories:

1. The house in early (or Pauline) Christianity from the perspective of social history
2. House(hold) studies in relation to specific texts
3. The house in specific texts from a social-scientific perspective
4. The house as physical setting
5. House as family
6. The house from a feminist perspective

Although clearly not watertight, [8] the above groupings do allow major perspectives and contributions on the house to emerge.

---

4 Following J. H. Elliott (in "The Recent Emergence of Social-Scientific Criticism" in *What is Social-Scientific Criticism* [Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993], 18), studies of the social world of early Christianity are understood as "concerned in any way with 'social matters.' "

5 See J. Z. Smith, "The Social Description of Early Christianity", *Religious Studies Review* 1/1 (1975), 19-25 and Elliott, *Social-Scientific*, Ch. 3.

6 F. V. Filson, "The Significance Of The Early House Churches", *JBL* 58 (1939), 105-112. This article will be discussed on pages 4-5.

7 O. Michel, "οἶκος", *TDNT* 5: 119-159.

8 W. A. Meeks (*The First Urban Christians: The Social World of the Apostle Paul* [New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1983]), for example, writes as a social historian yet also draws on sociological theory.

Setting the scene: Filson and Michel

As indicated above, articles by Filson and Michel serve as an introduction to the review. These works represent very different approaches but each is significant for its contribution to house study in early Christianity and each continues to be of influence in scholarship.

Filson

Filson's article [9] acknowledges the many valuable approaches to the study of the early church, yet calls for a new approach in New Testament scholarship: namely, a serious consideration of the physical and social dimensions of the early Christian house churches. The call to move in that direction contrasts with previous approaches which focused on "*concepts* and theological *ideas.*" [10]

Filson first considers the New Testament evidence for the importance and function of house churches. Drawing on literary and archaeological evidence, he then notes the continued influence of house-gatherings in the second and third centuries. Finally he points out "five ways in which a study of the house churches furthers understanding of the apostolic church." [11] For him, such a study explains:

i. the distinctively Christian worship and sense of communion from the beginning.
ii. the emphasis on family life in early Christian literature, despite the fact that the movement was often seen as one "of the dispossessed." [12]
iii. the social tensions and divisions among different house-church groups.
iv. the social status of early Christians ,who represented a cross-section of society.
v. the development of church polity.

---

9 Filson, "House Churches". See page 3, n. 7.

10 Elliott, *Home,* 165.

11 Filson, "House Churches", 109-111.

12 Filson, "House Churches", 112.

As Elliott notes, Filson's brief article is "programmatic rather than exhaustive." [13] Far from being an outdated work, contemporary social world scholars of the house still explore the issues raised by Filson and continue to use his work as a valuable point of departure. [14]

Michel

In contrast to Filson's physical and social focus, Michel's *TDNT* entry on οἶκος (οἰκία and words with οἰκ- root) represents a lexical and theological approach. οἶκος is explored under nine headings, namely:

i. General Greek and Hellenistic usage
ii. "House" and "House of God" in the Old Testament
iii. "House of God" in Jesus and the Gospels
v. Early Christian Sayings about the Earthly Temple and Contacts with Oriental Symbolical Use
vi. "House of God" as an Early Christian Image for the Community
viii. "House" as Family and Race
ix. "House" as a Group in the Structure of the Christian Community.

The wide range of sources used includes Classical, Jewish and Christian literary texts, inscriptions and papyri.

Michel's article is a comprehensive gathering of house material. It outlines the etymology and semantic field of the term "οἶκος" and provides an over-view of its theological importance. While a study of οἶκος from a theological perspective is of limited value for an exploration of house in the social world, [15] it still provides an excellent summary of material on which contemporary scholars continue to draw.

---

13 Elliott, *Home,* 166.

14 References to Filson are found in many studies quoted in this chapter, namely, those of Klauch, Malherbe, Elliott, Schüssler Fiorenza, Meeks and Crosby.

15 As noted by Elliott, *Home,* 165. Michel notes ("οἶκος", 130 n.42) that "the importance of the οἶκος and *familia* in the structure of the Christian community has not as yet been fully recognised."

Conclusion

The works of Filson and Michel represent different approaches to the house in early Christianity, but each may be considered a seminal or classic work on the topic. Taken together, they provide something of a pre-1960 *status quaestionis* and function as a prelude to the review.

1. The House in Early (or Pauline) Christianity from the Perspective of Social History

Studies in this first group examine the house in early (or Pauline) Christianity from the perspective of social history. Illustrative of this approach are works by Judge, Malherbe, Klauch and Meeks. While their approaches vary considerably, all examine the house in its wider historical context, as a central institution in society in general and in the life of Christianity in particular. The studies situate early Christian history firmly within the broader field of ancient history, thus enabling New Testament texts to be seen in context.

Judge: *The Social Pattern of the Christian Groups in the First Century* [16]

A significant contribution from 1960 is Judge's study of the household as both a central social institution in antiquity and one with a key role in the Christian movement. Judge's overall thesis is that early Christian ideas of social obligation need to be seen in the context of the social institutions of the time, namely the city- state, household and unofficial association. He explores these institutions as they are reflected in New Testament texts, devoting Chapter Three to a study of the household.

Judge shows how the household functioned as a significant and independent institution from Homeric times onwards, a function still visible in its portrayal in Matthew's gospel. It was an institution later in conflict with the Republic and democratic ideology until Caesarism harnessed its potential, by itself becoming a household-writ-large, complete with

---

16 E. A. Judge, *The Social Pattern of the Christian Groups in the First Century: Some Prolegomena to the Study of New Testament Ideas of Social Obligation* (London: Tyndale, 1960). See, in particular, Chapter Three : "The Household Community : *Oikonomia*", 30-39.

Pater (Patriae), subordinate members and dependents, *clientela* and *amicitia*.

In early Christianity, as in its environment, the household was central and Judge sees it as key to understanding the social composition of the early communities. The first leaders were converted heads of households, "a socially pretentious section of the population of the big cities", [17] while the members were the household dependents. These were family members, slaves and clients and friends who represented a cross-section of society, [18] but one that excluded the tiny upper classes and (largely rural) bottom layers. The idea that communities reflected the composition of converted households was a new development. It was a challenge to Deissmann's view that the first Christians came from the poorest sections of society [19] and it remains a significant contribution to the on-going debate about the social status of the early Christians. [20] As outlined by Judge, the household was also important for the new movement's spread and survival. Households became the "natural or necessary way of establishing the new cult" and houses were "the soundest basis for the meetings of Christians" [21] Furthermore, because of its status as a institution, "the entrenched rights of the household as a religious and social unit offered the Christians the best possible security for their existence as a group." [22] A final influence of the household is noted in the increasing use of household terminology by New Testament writers to express their theological ideas. Along with its strengths, Judge also recognizes the limitations of the household structure for an understanding of early Christianity. He notes

---

17 Judge, *Social Pattern,* 60.

18 Judge follows Filson's view (" House Churches", 111) that the church was "more of a cross-section of society than we have sometimes thought" but he develops it substantially.

19 See G. A. Deissmann, *Light from the Ancient Near East: The New Testament Illustrated by Recently Discovered Texts of the Graeco-Roman World* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1990).

20 For examples and summaries of the debate, see "Social Level and Literary Culture" in A. Malherbe, *Social Aspects of Early Christianity*, Second Edition (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983), 29-59, D. C. Verner, *The Household of God: The Social World of the Pastorals,* SBLDS 71 (Chico: Scholars Press, 1983), 3-5 and Appendix 7: The Social Location of the Corinthian Christians in A. C. Wire, *The Corinthian Women Prophets: A Reconstruction through Paul's Rhetoric* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990), 217-219.

21 Judge, *Social Pattern,* 36.

22 Judge, *Social Pattern,* 76.

the tension between the traditional hierarchy of family / household and the socially homogeneous association of equals, with which Christianity could also be compared.

As a classicist, Judge stresses the contribution of historians to a field dominated by theologians. His work, therefore, represents a corrective to the tendency of many New Testament scholars to de-historicize or de-contextualize early Christianity. As he himself notes, by situating Christian material within its context, one gains a better understanding of the ancient readers, their world and their relations with public authorities. Judge's social historical approach has been rightly criticised for its unexamined assumptions [23] and, one could add, for a lack of source critique. In defence of the approach, [24] however, Judge stresses the value of engaging in "painstaking" historical "field work" [25] and of using categories of interpretation from the environment rather than ones from later periods. [26] Critique aside, Judge's work on the centrality of the household in early Christianity remains influential.

Malherbe : "House Churches and their problems" [27]

While Judge writes as a classicist, it is as a New Testament scholar that Malherbe contributes to the social history of early Christianity. His chapter on "House Churches and Their Problems" builds and expands on previous scholarship and it forms part of his larger study of the "social aspects of early Christianity." Echoing Filson, he stresses the

---

23 With regard to studies of the movement's social organization, Smith's view ("The Social Description of Early Christianity", 20) is that "unfortunately, [they] have been clouded in the majority of cases by unquestioned apologetic presuppositions and naive theories. Judge [1960] is all too typical."

24 E. A. Judge, "The Social Identity of the First Christians: A Question of Method in Religious History", *JRH* 11 (1980), 201-217, especially 201-202, 212-213.

25 Judge, *Social Identity*, 212.

26 This is an argument against social-scientific approaches which will be discussed later in the chapter.

27 Malherbe, "House Churches and Their Problems" in *Social Aspects*, 60-91. This chapter originated in 1975 as part of a lecture series aiming to highlight areas of concern to scholars interested in a sociological approach to early Christianity. In 1983, it appeared (with no major changes) in the second edition of *Social Aspects*.

importance of investigating the "physical and sociological circumstances of early Christian communal life" and whether and how those circumstances affected that life. [28]

The first section deals with the initial spread and establishment of communities. Following Judge, Malherbe holds that household conversions explain the earliest composition of the communities. He emphasises the advantages of the household structure as a provider of group solidarity, a solidarity based not merely on law but "more on economic, and especially psychological, social, and religious factors." [29] Communities were, however, more than households (he argues): the fact that non-household members gradually joined gave the groups "a broader constituency." [30] Once a church was established, the house was used as a space for meeting and as a centre offering hospitality to travelling Christians. House churches, therefore, became vital points of a large Christian network. As stressed by Malherbe, the hospitality of house churches was essential in an age of mobility and was a key factor in the spread of Christianity. Hospitality became an expression of Christian love: this was an important value (Malherbe maintains), the theological implications of which have yet to be explored.

The second section and part of the third is devoted to an outline and assessment of Theissen's work on the Corinthian church. [31] Malherbe acknowledges Theissen's valuable work on the social stratification of the community, while noting that he offers less on the issue of theological problems. For him, Theissen's emphasis on internal social differences represents a significant change of focus from approaches which view Christianity and Roman society as both homogeneous entities and one which are quite distinct. He notes that MacMullen's work [32] on the stratified and vertical nature of Roman society sheds light on the picture painted by Theissen. While the focus on the church as a cross-section of society is both new and enlightening, however, Malherbe ends by calling for a return to and

---

28 Malherbe, "House Churches", 60.

29 Malherbe, "House Churches", 69.

30 Malherbe, "House Churches" 69.

31 For references to Theissen's works, see Malherbe, "House Churches", 71 notes 23-25.

32 R. MacMullen, *Roman Social Relations: 50 BC to AD 284* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1974), 88-120.

re-exploration of the study of house churches "in the light of the relationship between *collegia* and household communities." [33]

Although Malherbe, like Judge, may be accused of the historian's use of unexamined categories, he is explicit in his adoption of a descriptive over an analytical approach. [34] He sets out to identify material which "might profitably engage the attention of scholars interested in sociological study of early Christianity." [35] Thus while the chapter reads better as a collection of evidence than as a sustained argument, the treatment of house-churches, hospitality and mobility is valuable.

Klauch : Hausgemeinde und Hauskirche im frühen Christentum [36]

While Malherbe's approach is proto-sociological,[37] Klauch's work is more explicitly exegetical. The focus of his study is the house (both the *Hausgemeinde* and the *Hauskirche*) in early Christianity. The four sections deal with terminology, the *Hausgemeinde* in early Christian writings, the *Hauskirche* in the pre-Constantinian period and comparable house-based religious groups in the wider Gentile and Jewish world.

Klauch begins with a useful discussion of οἶκος / οἰκία terminology, a discussion surprisingly rare in house scholarship. The semantic field of the term "house" is outlined and the findings are summarised diagrammatically. [38] The basic distinction is between house

---

33 Malherbe, "House Churches", 91. Such a study would investigate further the link between house churches and *collegia*, a link recognized since Renan's discovery of *CIL* 9148 (*collegium quod est in domo Sergiae Paullinae*).

34 Malherbe (*Social Aspects*, 20) argues that "we should strive to know as much as possible about the actual social circumstances of those communities before venturing theoretical descriptions or explanations of them."

35 Malherbe, *Social Aspects*, ix.

36 H. J. Klauch, *Hausgemeinde und Hauskirche im frühen Christentum* (Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1981.) The book is summarised in "Die Hausgemeinde als Lebensform im Urchristentum", *Münchener Theologischen Zeitschrift* 32 (1981), 1-15.

37 P. J. Richter ("Recent Sociological Approaches to the Study of the New Testament", *Religion* 14 (1984), 77-90) uses the terms proto-sociological and sociological to categorize research on the social world of early Christianity.

38 Klauch, *Hausgemeinde,* 16.

as "dwelling" and house as "family". The meanings are related, however, and they overlap in the term "household". Throughout the book, Klauch also insists that "family" and "house congregation" are not to be equated. Thus, when characterizing a Christian house gathering, one may emphasize the fact that it met in a house or that it consisted primarily of family members.

The significance and variety of the "house" emerges in the study of the early Christian writings. There is an exploration of the four Pauline uses of "ἡ κατ᾽ οἶκον ἐκκλησία" and of what it reveals about the nature, composition and activity of the groups. Work on Acts centres on the primitive community and on the so-called οἶκος formula. In the Synoptics, the focus is on the house as a hospitality centre for missionaries and place of catechesis, while in the Post-Pauline literature, the notion of the *Haus Gottes* is central.

Both literary and archaeological evidence is used to explore the *Hauskirche* of the pre-Constantinian period. Although valuable, this is chronologically beyond our scope. In the final part, the importance of the house in pagan and Jewish religious movements is outlined and this evidence provides a broader context in which to situate early Christianity. Klauch proceeds to demonstrate how the new movement, in its use of the house, both resembled and differed from other religious groups in its environment.

Klauch's work is both historically descriptive and exegetical and expresses a clear hermeneutical desire, a hope that the study be of contemporary ecclesiastical interest. [39] Working on such a broad canvas in so short a book means, however, that breadth is chosen

---

[39] Another study which adopts a historical and hermeneutical approach but which is written for a more popular audience is R. Banks, *Paul's Idea of Community: The Early House Churches in Their Historical Setting* (Exeter: The Paternoster Press, 1980). Bank's primary interest is in community not house churches.

at the expense of depth. Furthermore, unexplored assumptions about the historical situation are evident, for example, in the attempts to calculate house-church size. [40] Such calculations are somewhat arbitrary and hypothetical. The book is significant, however, in that it focuses exclusively on the house over the whole period of early Christianity and in the wider Graeco-Roman and Jewish world. It also provides an overview of the important yet changing functions of "house" in New Testament texts.

Meeks : The First Urban Christians: The Social World of the Apostle Paul [41]

In contrast to Klauch's exegetical approach and exclusive focus on the house, Meeks deals with the house or household in the course of a much broader study of the social world. A social historian, [42] Meeks's focus is on ordinary urban Pauline Christians in their social world: the world they shared with their contemporaries and that which they themselves created.

In the description of the urban environment of Pauline Christianity, the individual household is presented as both "the basic unit in the establishment of Christianity in the city [and] the basic unit of the city itself." [43] Drawing on previous scholarship, the traditional *domus, familia,* οἶκος (as the basic unit of society) [44] is described in detail.

---

40 Klauch offers two methods or arriving at group size. In part 1, the calculation is based on the number of people capable of fitting in an *atrium*. On pages 100-101, he mentions the use of group theory to calculate a workable small group.

41 See page 3 n. 9 for the full reference.

42 For details of the methodology of Meeks, see *Urban Christians*, 1-7. Meeks writes as a social historian, hence his classification in this section. He also draws (albeit eclectically) on social theory. His use of it has, however, been criticised. See J. H. Elliott, Review of W. A. Meeks, *The First Urban Christians: The Social World of the Apostle Paul*, *RSR* 11 (1985), 329-335, S.K. Stowers, "The Social Sciences and the Study of Early Christianity" in W. S. Green (ed.), *Approaches to Ancient Judaism* (Atlanta: Scholars Press 1985), 149-181, esp. 168-181 and B. Holmberg, *Sociology and the New Testament: An Appraisal* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990), 129-134.

43 Meeks, *Urban Christians*, 29.

44 The description of the house follows that of Judge, Malherbe ... i.e. it consisted of a *pater familias* or head of household (usually male), women, children, slaves, clients, labourers, tenants. *Amicitia* and *clientela* were important aspects of the system. The household generally had a shared religion and could become the basis of a cultic association. Clubs often existed

[45] To understand the social structure of early Christianity, Meeks considers the household the most important model from the environment. It explains the use of the houses as meeting places and loci for rituals, the many household conversions, the naming of groups after householders and the internal conflicts and factions. The use of household and familial terminology is noted (by Meeks) in the Christian language of belonging while a correlation between the life experience of the local household group and its beliefs is also observed. Furthermore, the intimacy of Christian community is seen to offer a place of belonging to people (women and Jews among them) experiencing "status inconsistency." [46] While an understanding of the household helps to explain much about Christian community, Meeks acknowledges that it does not explain everything. [47] He notes that the household and Christian community are not synonymous and he recognizes the tension between the hierarchy of the household and certain egalitarian values of the communities.

Meeks discusses how three other models from society contribute to an understanding of Christianity: these are the voluntary association, the synagogue and the philosophical school. Like the household, each explains (and fails to explain) certain aspects of the Christian groups. Furthermore, instead of appearing as alternatives to the household, the three models are linked to it: thus (argues Meeks), some associations were formed in households. Not only did synagogue members initially gather in houses, rather the synagogue model combines elements of both household and association and carries the sense of participation in a larger body. Finally, Pythagorean and Epicurean philosophical schools are also shown to resemble households and voluntary associations. The household emerges, therefore, as the model *par excellence* for Pauline Christian

---

within a large household.

45 Earlier in the chapter (Meeks, *Urban Christians* , 23-25) reference is made to the reaction of moralists and satirists to a perceived threat to the family. This is the result of the changing role of women in society, a change seen in their upward mobility and increased participation in business and religion.

46 Meeks's main sociological thesis is that the chief members of the Pauline communities suffered from status inconsistency and that this resulted in cognitive dissonance. See *Urban Christians*, Chapters 2 and 6.

47 As outlined by Meeks (*Urban Christians*, 77) aspects of the movement which it does not help to explain include its rituals, symbols, beliefs and antihierarchical sentiments, the importance of itinerant apostles and charismatics, its trans-local unity and the source of its power and leadership.

groups.

Meeks brings together a wealth of scholarship and develops the work of previous social historical scholarship. His study reveals the importance of the οἶκος in both the wider social world and the internal world of the Pauline communities and this double focus is interesting.

Conclusion

Although studies in this section differ in emphasis and importance, they are united in their focus on early Christianity as a whole and in their adoption of a historical approach for the investigation of the movement's social world. As mentioned above, social historical methods have been criticised for their unexamined historical presuppositions, [48] their focus on description rather than analysis. Furthermore, in the studies reviewed, the household is assessed in a(n overly) positive manner. Despite flaws, however, social historical approaches contribute a great deal. They alert us to the significance of the οἶκος as a social, political, economic and religious institution in the ancient world. They reveal its role in the spread, structure, composition and theological concepts of early Christianity. Studying the οἶκος in the whole period of early (or Pauline) Christianity has, however, both advantages and disadvantages. What is lost in a rather static, monolithic, often uncritical portrayal of the household is certainly gained in a clear overview of the absolute centrality of the household in both the external and internal social worlds.

---

[48] Elliott (Review of *Urban Christians*, 332) quotes G. Barraclough (*Main Trends in History* [London: Holmes and Meier, 1979], 50) and notes that "a chief problem of historians is that their 'conceptualization tends to be implicit, arbitrary and unsystematic.' "

2. House(hold) Studies in relation to Specific Texts

Common to studies in this second group is an exploration of New Testament texts in which there is household material. This material includes the so-called household codes and references to the οἶκος as social institution. Methodologically, the works are both literary and historical.

Most household material comes in the form of *Haustafeln* [49] (or "household codes"). The term has been applied by scholars to certain New Testament texts [50] dealing with correct household management, with the duties and responsibilities of household members. *Haustafeln* now form a specialization in their own right and have generated a large body of scholarship. [51] Debate has centred on the form, origin and function and interpretation of these codes. Suggested origins include Stoicism (Dibelius,[52] Weidinger [53]), Hellenistic Judaism (Crouch [54]) and Christianity itself (Schroeder [55]). More common, however, is the view that the codes originated in the discussion of household management

---

49 The German term *Haustafeln* means "tables of household rules."

50 The texts in question are Col 3:18-4, Eph 5:21-6:9, 1 Pet 2:11-3:12, 1 Tim 2:8-15, 5:1-2, 6:1-2, Tit 2:1-10, 3:1.

51 For a summary of *Haustafeln* scholarship, see J. E. Crouch, *The Origin and Intention of the Colossian Haustafel*, FRLANT 109 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1972), 9-36 and D. L. Balch, *"Let wives be submissive...": The Domestic Code in 1 Peter*, SBLMS No. 26 (Chico: Scholars Press, 1981), 1-9.

52 M. Dibelius, *An die Kolosser, an die Epheser an Philemon*, HNT (Tübingen: Mohr, 1913).

53 K. Weidinger, *Die Haustafeln, ein Stück urchristlicher Paraenese*, UNT 14 (Leipzig: J.C. Heinrich, 1928).

54 Crouch, *Colossian Haustafel.*

55 D. Schroeder, "Die Haustafeln des Neuen Testaments (ihre Herkunft und theologischer Sinn", (Ph.D., Hamburg, 1959).

(Lührmann, [56] Thraede,[57] Balch [58]) as expressed by Aristotle in his *Politics* 1.1253b, 1-14 and *Nicomachean Ethics* 8.1160b. 23-1161a.10. The household matters discussed are the three key relationships (those between husband and wife, parent and child, master and slave) and fourthly, the acquisition of wealth. Among the many suggested functions of the Christian household codes are paraenesis (Dibelius), the countering of social instability (Crouch) or false teaching (Schweizer), apology (Balch), integration and mission (Elliott). Finally, the theological relevance of the codes has been questioned in the light of contemporary attitudes to women [59] and slavery. [60]

In this section, one example of *Haustafeln* study is reviewed, namely Balch's work on the code of 1 Peter. Other works considered are Verner's study of household in the social world of the Pastorals as a whole, studies by Crosby and Carter relating to the οἶκος in Matthew's gospel and Matson's study of the household conversion narratives in Acts.

Balch : *"Let wives be submissive...": The Domestic Code in 1 Peter.* [61]

As indicated in the original Ph.D. title, Balch's concern is with the origin, form and apologetic function of the *Haustafel* in 1 Peter. He argues that the Christians of 1 Peter, like other religious minorities, used the code to defend themselves against charges of threatening household stability. Since the household was the foundation of the state,

---

56 D. Lührmann, "Neutestamentliche Haustafeln und antike Okonomie" , *NTS* 27 (1980), 83-97.

57 K. Thraede, "Zum historischen Hintergrund der 'Haustafeln' des NT", 359-368 in E. Dassmann and K.S. Frank (eds), *Pietas, Festschrift für Bernhard Kötting*, JAC Ergänzungsband 8 (Munich: Aschendorff, 1980).

58 Balch, "*Let wives be submissive..*"

59 See E. Schüssler Fiorenza, *Bread not Stone: The Challenge of Feminist Biblical Interpretation* (Boston: Beacon, 1984), 65-92.

60 See F. Laub, *Die Begegnung des frühen Christentums mit der antiken Slaverei*, SBS 107 (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1980).

61 D. L. Balch, *"Let wives be submissive...": The Domestic Code in 1 Peter* is a reworking of his Ph.D. (Yale, 1974), " 'Let wives be submissive...': The Origin, Form and Apostolic Function of the Household Duty Code (*Haustafel*) in 1 Peter."

threats to its order were of fundamental political and social significance.

Balch locates the origin and form of the *Haustafel* in the topos on household management. [62] As outlined above, this concerns relationships within the household (namely, those of husband-wife, parent-child and master-slave) and the acquisition of wealth. He traces its use in Graeco-Roman philosophical traditions: from Plato, through the middle Platonists to Stobaeus in the fourth century C.E. and in the Aristotelian tradition through the Peripatetics to three dependent writes, Philodemus, Arius Didymus and Cicero. For the period of 1 Peter, evidence comes from the Stoics, Hellenistic Jews (like Philo and Josephus) and Neo-Pythagoreans (such as Bryson). He argues, therefore, that the topos would have been well known to Christian writers.

Having located the origin and form of the *Haustafel*, Balch explores its functions as both propaganda and apologetic. As propaganda, it was used by those in power to encourage good citizenship. Provincial governors, in particular, needed to maintain Roman customs and *politeia* over against potentially subversive foreign practices. [63] As apologetic, it was used by Eastern religious minorities charged with threatening the *status quo* by deviating from traditional practices of household management. As Balch illustrates, examples of this form of apologetic writing are found in Josephus and Dionysius of Halicarnassus. It is in the light of this stereotypical accusation of subversion and apologetic [64] response that Balch situates the *Haustafel* of 1 Peter. The code is framed by a call to be subordinate to social institutions (2:13-17) and by general exhortations to all (3:8ff.) To counter any accusations coming their way, Christians (while remaining believers and refusing to worship Roman gods) are encouraged to behave in a manner acceptable to the wider society.

Balch notes the particular form of the *Haustafel* in 1 Peter: the absence of the parent-child relationship, the fact that masters, unlike their slaves, are not exhorted in any way and the fact that the exhortation to wives is more severe than that delivered to

---

62 This topos is itself part of the wider topos on the πολιτεία since the πόλις is composed of οἶκοι.

63 Balch, "Let wives be submissive", 117, 132-133.

64 The code of 1 Peter is not strictly speaking an apology to outsiders but rather an encouragement to Christians to prepare such a defence.

husbands. The demand that wives be quiet and submissive (despite their suffering) is, according to the text, for missionary purposes, or more concretely for the conversion of their non-Christian husbands.

Drawing on philosophy and the history of religions, Balch provides a wealth of documentation for household subordination both as a *sine qua non* of society and as an aspect of apologetic religious writings. Such thorough groundwork, prior to the focus on 1 Peter, is useful and enlightening. In the thesis (but not in the book), Balch touches briefly on the hermeneutical implications of his work. The problem he raises but does not answer is the question of how a text like the *Haustafel* of 1 Peter is to be received or interpreted by Christians today.

Verner : *The Household of God: The Social World of the Pastorals.* [65]

Inspired by 1 Tim 3:14-15, Verner explores the central image of the church as the "household (of God)" in the Pastorals. In the texts, the household functions as the "basic social unit in the church and... the church [is] a social structure modelled on the household." [66] Verner argues that the sustained development of the household image reveals both the structure, strata and tensions of the church of the Pastorals and the social position and perspective of the author.

In order to provide a social context for the study, Verner explores the household (οἶκος, οἰκία, *domus, familia)* in both the Hellenistic and Roman worlds. An "institution for the citizenry" [67] and thus upper-class by definition, it was (he outlines) characterised by its patriarchal and hierarchical structure and it also functioned as a religious institution. By contrast, a lower-class, non-citizen group was not regarded as a traditional household. In the traditional household, Verner explains, tension arose over the role of subordinate household groups. In particular, the changing social roles of women

---

65 D. C. Verner, *The Household of God: The Social World of the Pastorals* (Ph.D., Emory University, 1981) was published as SBLDS 71 (Chico: Scholars Press, 1983).

66 Verner, *Household* , 1.

67 Verner, *Household*, 79.

represented a threat to the household which was a symbol of order and stability in society. There was conflict, therefore, between new practices and old values.

Turning from the treatment of the household in the wider world, Verner moves to consider its form and function in the church of the Pastorals. He first examines the use of the *Haustafel* tradition and detects both external influence in the form of the topos "concerning household management" [68] and an internal Christian adaptation in the "station code schema." [69] As summarised in 1 Tim 3:14-15, such material is used to depict the church as the "household (of God)" and to order relations and behaviour within that church.

Using the household evidence from both the letters and the wider social world, Verner next explores the social strata, structure and tensions in the church of the Pastorals. In general, he finds that the patriarchal, upper class nature of the traditional household is reflected in the church. There is tension, however, between the emancipatory tendencies adopted by subordinate members (especially women) and the social values of "prosperity and propriety" [70] promoted by the author and held by the wealthy male leaders. In this context, therefore, the use of the household is not only descriptive but prescriptive. Verner concludes that the author uses the image to reinforce hierarchical structures in a church perceived to be under threat from disruptive elements. Such elements, however, are inspired by radical values already present in Christianity.

Verner provides a thorough exploration of the social world of the Pastorals, in which the concept of the "household (of God)" is central. Of particular significance is his assessment of the provenance, nature and perspective of source material: he acknowledges the upper-class nature of literary sources for the household, turns to archaeological materials for evidence of lower-class households, distinguishes the author's perspective

---

68 For the influence of the topos "concerning household management", Verner follows Balch very closely. See Verner, *Household*, 84-85.

69 As noted in Verner (*Household*, 90) , the term comes from H. von Campenhausen, *Polykarp von Smyrna und die Pastoralbriefe* (Hiedelberg: Carl Winter, Universitätsverlag, 1951). For details of the schema, see Verner (*Household*, 86-106). It is recognizable from its special structure and form, its function as Christian paraenesis in specific situations and its address to groups in the church, not just masters/slaves, husbands/wives, parents /children. In *ABD* 3: 318-9, however, Balch claims that Verner is wrong to argue that the schema is specifically Christian. He refers to Epict. *Dis.* 3.12.10; 3.14.4-5; Tobit 4:3-21; Philo *Cher.* 48-49, *Spec. Leg.* 2.67-68; 3.127.

70 Verner, *Household*, 146.

from the actual situation in the church [71] and carefully mines the social material encoded in his evidence.

Crosby : House of Disciples: Church, Economics and Justice in Matthew [72]

Departing from the traditional *Haustafeln* texts, Crosby studies the house in the gospel of Matthew. His interest is in the relationship between church, economics and justice and in its possible relevance for today. His hypothesis is that "Matthew's ordering of the house - be it church order or economics (house order) - demands justice at its core. This justice can be identified as the salvific (re)ordering of relationships with God and others, as well as the socio-political (re)ordering of resources not only in the house church, but throughout the world (οἰκουμένη) and throughout the earth itself (ecology)." [73]

Crosby describes the house as the "assumed primary metaphor" [74] in both the wider environment and the gospel. In antiquity, the house was the centre of social, political, economic and religious life. In Matthew, it functions as a significant and unifying theme, offering a key to understanding the link between church, economics and justice. Justice (Crosby explains) involves the right ordering of relationships and resources, both of which are located in the house. He argues that this re-ordering of relationships and resources illustrates a household type more collegial than patriarchal. This is illustrated in a form of non-patriarchal *Haustafel* in 17:24 - 18:35 and 19:1-20:16. An image of this new house community occurs in 12:46-50, where the disciples of Jesus are "inside" the house, while traditional patriarchal family members are "outside".

Crosby has a strong hermeneutical interest and considers that a "reader-response interactive hermeneutic" [75] is essential if the gospel is to be relevant for all time (28:19-20).

---

71 Verner, *Household*, 127.

72 M. H. Crosby, *House of Disciples: Church, Economics and Justice in Matthew* (Maryknoll: Orbis, 1988).

73 Crosby, *House,* 2-3.

74 Crosby, *House,* 10-12.

75 Crosby, *House,* 263.

He argues that there is a connection between church, economics and justice in both the prosperous urban milieu of Matthew and the affluent first world of today. He claims that the "ethical key" common to past and present is "justice" or "rightly-ordered relationships and resources". [76] Such re-ordering needs to occur in both church and society and requires conversion at individual and communal levels. Drawing on addiction theory, Crosby's model of conversion envisages freedom from "society's addictions" and reflects the twelve step recovery programme.

Crosby's notion of a more collegial household appears vague and uncritical and he plays down the tension between so-called patriarchal and collegial households. His thorough work on the house as "assumed primary metaphor", however, highlights its significance in both the ancient environment and in the gospel of Matthew. The house is portrayed as an institution simultaneously assumed and redefined by Christians.

Carter : *Households and Discipleship: A Study of Matthew 19-20* [77]

Working also with Matthew, Carter focuses specifically on chapters 19-20. He argues that the audience's knowledge of the traditional household code is key to the interpretation of the text. Furthermore, the text contributes to an understanding of the picture of discipleship which is developed in the gospel as a whole.

Carter draws on audience-oriented criticism, historical criticism and Turner's concept of liminality. [78] He argues that in chapters 19-20, reference is made to the four themes of the household code, namely the rule of husband over wife, father over children, master over slave and the gaining of wealth. These (he maintains) are themes with which the audience is familiar. According to Carter, however, the traditional code is "subverted" [79] and its message rejected. Instead of the hierarchical and patriarchal household, a new model for discipleship is promoted. Such a model involves "what could be called,

---

76 Crosby, *House,* 263.

77 W. Carter, *Households and Discipleship: A Study of Matthew 19-20.* JSNTSS 103 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994).

78 For a discussion of methodology, see Carter, *Households*, Ch. 2.

79 Carter, *Households*, 9.

somewhat anachronistically, more egalitarian patterns for disciples" [80] and constitutes an "alternative household structure". Carter proceeds to argue that the idea of an "alternative household structure" contributes to the understanding of discipleship developed in Matthew's gospel as a whole. Using Turner's concept of "liminality", discipleship is said to involve an "anti-structure existence", marginality of identity and life-style and opposition to hierarchical social structures.

The significance of the household in the social world is emphasized in this study. Carter reveals that the household code is the underlying assumption, shared by author and audience and one which gives unity and coherence to chapters 19-20. The code's reference to household relationships and income is familiar. It is, therefore, in the light of the familiar that a redefinition takes place.

Matson : *Household Conversion Narratives in Acts: Pattern and Interpretation* [81]

As outlined by Matson in the preface, this study is a "literary investigation of a noteworthy phenomenon in Luke's story of the early church: the conversion of entire households to the Christian faith". The author adopts a narrative-critical method to interpret the four household conversion texts of Acts against a "pre-established pattern of household evangelistic activity in Luke."

Part 1 establishes the pattern of household evangelizing by linking it to the words and actions of Jesus in the gospel. Chapter 2 deals with the household mission of the Seventy-Two (Lk 10.1-16), a text which represents a significant and purely Lukan creation. Chapter 3 turns to that of the Lukan Jesus himself, revealing how he "[e]nters the house", converts the household of of Zacchaeus (Lk 19.1-10) and "[s]tays in the house", that is, how he heals, dines, teaches, breaks bread and brings salvation.

Having outlined the pattern of household evangelistic activity in the gospel, Part 2 demonstrates how this pattern is implemented in Acts. Chapter 3 is dedicated to the seminal

---

80 Carter, *Households*, 9.

81 D. L. Matson, *Household Conversion Narratives in Acts: Pattern and Interpretation*, JSNT Supplement Series 123 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996).

story of Cornelius (Acts 10.1-11.18) while the following chapter deals with the household conversions of Lydia (16:11-15), the Roman jailer (16:25-34) and Crispus (18:1-11). In each case, Matson locates what he terms the global and proximate context of each narrative. He reads it against the story of the Seventy-Two, highlights the pattern and variation involved and determines its literary function.

As expressed by Matson himself, his study gives literary insight into a subject dominated by theological and sociological interpretations. His use of Malherbe, Elliott, Esler and Theissen (amongst others), however, reveals that the text of Acts requires that the literary approach be supplemented and complemented by one which is historical and / or sociological. More generally, the study opens up new areas of exploration in Acts and sheds new light on the much-debated question of the "unity" and "disunity" between Luke's two volumes.

Conclusion

The variety of approaches and conclusions adopted in these studies make a general critique somewhat difficult. Works in this section illustrate the value of focusing on specific texts, as opposed to the broad sweep of early Christianity. The combination of historical and exegetical approaches results in a sharpened focus, in a more detailed study of the centrality of the house in a variety of New Testament texts. In common with the studies in section one, the οἶκος is clearly depicted as a central social institution. What also emerges is the particular function of household material in specific texts: different strategies are adopted in different texts by different authors for different purposes. As outlined above, the traditional οἶκος shapes the development and self-definition of Christianity but it does so in a variety of ways.

3. The House in Specific Texts from a Social-Scientific Perspective

Studies in this third category make explicit use of the social sciences [82] to study the house in specific New Testament texts. The theoretical basis for the methodology comes from the sociology of knowledge (which claims that every form of knowledge has a social basis) [83] while the tools of social analysis come from the social sciences, in the form of theory and models. With new questions, generated from new theories and hypotheses, the aim is to explain (rather than simply describe) the available social data. Social-scientific studies of the New Testament fall into two main approaches: the first focuses on a broad canvas, namely, the "social and cultural, features, contours of early Christianity and its social environment",[84] the second centres more specifically on the analysis of Biblical texts. The examples below illustrate this second focus where the social-sciences are used to complement traditional methods of criticism in the interpretation of particular texts. The selected contributions are Elliott's studies of 1 Peter and Luke-Acts, Barton's work on Corinthians and Love's article on Matthew.

---

82 For detailed treatment of these approaches, see J. G. Gager, "Shall We Marry Our Enemies ?: Sociology and the New Testament", *Interpretation* 37/3 (1982), 256-265, B. J. Malina, "The Social Sciences and Biblical Interpretation", *Interpretation* 37/3 (1982), 229-242, Holmberg, *Sociology and the New Testament,* Richter, "Recent Sociological Approaches to the Study of the New Testament", J. H. Elliott, "Social-Scientific Criticism of the New Testament: More on Methods and Models", *Semeia* 35 (1986), 1-26 and *What is Social- Scientific Criticism*?, C. Osiek, "The Social Sciences and the Second Testament: Problems and Challenges", *BTB* 22/2 (1992), 88-95, M. A. Tolbert, "Social, Sociological and Anthropological Methods" in E. Schüssler Fiorenza (ed.), *Searching the Scriptures.* Volume 1. *A Feminist Introduction* (London: SCM, 1993), 255-271, P. F. Esler, *The First Christians in their Social Worlds: Social-Scientific Approaches to New Testament Interpretation* (London: Routledge, 1994).

83 This is in contrast to the "fallacy of idealism" described by B. Holmberg in *Paul and Power: The Structure of Authority in the Primitive Church as Reflected in the Pauline Epistles,* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980) 205ff. and again in *Sociology and the New Testament*, 2: "This is the view, mostly quite unreflected, that the determining factors of the historical process are ideas and nothing else, and that all developments, conflicts and influences are at bottom developments of, and conflicts and influences between, ideas."

84 Elliott, *Social- Scientific Criticism*?, 32.

Elliott : *A Home for the Homeless: A Sociological Exegesis of 1 Peter, Its Situation and Strategy* [85]

While the book's title summarises Elliott's thesis that for "the *paroikoi* of society there is a possibility of life and communion in the *oikos tou Theou*, a home for the homeless", [86] the subtitle reveals the author's contribution to οἶκος study, [87] namely the methodology of sociological exegesis [88] and the focus on 1 Peter.

The argument develops from detailed exploration of the contrasting terms "πάροικος" and "οἶκος τοῦ θεοῦ". Elliott describes the addressees as "παροίκους" (1 Peter 2.11), as "resident aliens" in every sense but spiritual. [89] Drawing on Wilson's typology, [90] he classifies the group as a "conversionist sect" in conflict with society and (following Simmel and Coser [91]) he maintains that this conflict serves to strengthen group solidarity. His argument is that the letter seeks to strengthen group identity, solidarity and boundaries and to stress believers' new position as members of "the household of God". For him, the οἶκος τοῦ θεοῦ functions as the central integrating element at every level - literary, theological, social , psychological and religious.

---

85 See page 2 n. 3 for the full reference.

86 Elliott, *Home,* 288.

87 Elliott (*Home*, 166-167) groups the many studies which address the "practical, social and ideological implications of Christian community as *oikos*" on the basis of thematic starting points. These are: infant baptism; slaves; household codes; social stratification and socioreligious conflict; ministry and church order; place of Christian liturgical assembly; missionary activity; patterns of social obligation; the relation of hospitality, social stratification and other types of household organization (the guilds) to the household structure and problems of early Christian communities. For bibliographical references, see *op. cit.*, 238 (nn.8-11) and 239 (nn.12-17).

88 For a discussion of methodology, see Elliott, *Home*, 1-13.

89 Despite Elliott's insistence that πάροικος and οἶκος are not spiritual terms here, even he himself does not avoid their spiritual and metaphorical connotations.

90 B. R. Wilson, "An Analysis of Sect Development", *American Sociological Review* 24 (1959), 3-15 is discussed in Elliott, *Home*, 102ff. Holmberg (*Sociology and the New Testament*, 94) critiques Elliott for allowing the model to influence his reading of the historical evidence.

91 Reference to G. Simmel, *Conflict*, trans. K. H. Wolff (Glencoe: Free Press, 1955) is in Elliott, *Home*, 113-114, 152 n. 30. See Elliott (*op. cit.*, 113-117, 152 n.31, 163-164) for mention of L. Coser, *The Functions of Social Conflict* (New York: Free Press, 1956).

As a background to 1 Peter, Elliott provides a dense and useful summary of the significance and function of the οἶκος in both the Graeco-Roman world and the Bible. He notes that the οἶκος constituted for the Christian movement as well as for its environment a "chief basis, paradigm and reference point for religious and moral as well as social, political and economic organization, interaction and ideology." [92] He observes that "the household had a dominant influence not only on the structure and internal conduct of the early Christian groups but also on their theological perspective and sociological symbols." [93] This exploration of the wide semantic field of οἶκος alerts us to the power and versatility of the term and to its overlapping social, economic, political and religious meanings. It is a study significant in its own right, not just as a preliminary to work on 1 Peter.

In his portrayal of the centrality of the οἶκος τοῦ θεοῦ in 1 Peter, however, Elliott appears to adopt (rather than simply explore) the author's perspective. Thus, for example, he analyses neither the interests reflected and promoted by the author nor the possible consequences of the exhortations for the slaves and wives, an aspect so central to this text. He claims, instead, that the household code, while not promoting a break with social practice, does reverse traditional hierarchy by advocating a suffering servant model for all believers. Like the author, Elliott portrays the οἶκος (τοῦ θεοῦ) in a positive, virtually idealistic, light.

Elliott : "Temple versus Household in Luke-Acts" [94]

Another significant study by Elliott on the house in early Christianity is the article "Temple versus Household in Luke-Acts". His thesis is that, in Luke-Acts, both Temple and household represent significant but opposing social institutions. It is the household, however, which is the social and ideological embodiment of the gospel of universal

---

92 Elliott, *Home,* 213.

93 Elliott, *Home,* 192.

94 Elliott, "Temple versus Household in Luke-Acts" in J. Neyrey (ed.), *The Social World of Luke-Acts: Models for Interpretation* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1991), 211-240.

salvation while the Temple acts as a "negative foil". [95] Structurally and thematically (Elliott argues), the frame and focus shifts from the Temple (in the gospel) to the household (in Acts), illustrating the actual movement of the gospel from Palestine to the diaspora. The article, therefore, is as much a study of "Temple to Household" as "Temple versus Household".

Drawing on existing exegesis,[96] Elliott begins with an analysis of the temple/household contrast. This is then examined using an anthropological model of alternate types of ancient social relations. "Redistribution" is illustrated by the Temple and "reciprocity" is operative in the household. This analysis builds on the work of both Malina and Moxnes (following that of Marshall Sahlins.) [97] The aim is to show the narrative and thematic function of both household and Temple and to highlight their relevance within the Lucan social context.

With regard to the household and Temple, there is detailed study of the terms themselves, the Lucan scenes in which they feature and their significance therein. It is the household, however, which is the focus of attention here. As Elliott illustrates, Luke-Acts, more than any other New Testament writing, emphasises the central role of houses and households in the spread of the Jesus movement. The household provides the setting for the ministry of Jesus and his followers, for the gospel's acceptance and the church's growth. It accounts for the new movement's organization, social relations and values. It functions as symbol of the Kingdom of God and chief metaphor for social life in that kingdom. It thus operates historically and metaphorically.

Elliott, like the author, presents the household in a wholly positive light. As in the previous study, there is little separation between the perspective of author and interpreter. The article remains, nonetheless, an excellent study of the importance and wide-ranging function of the household in Luke-Acts.

---

95 Elliott, "Temple versus Household", 239.

96 See the work of H. Mottu, "The Pharisee and the Tax Collector: Sartian (*sic*) notions as applied to the reading of Scripture", *USQR* 29 (1973), 195-213.

97 See B. J. Malina, *Christian Origins and Cultural Anthropology: Practical Models for Biblical Interpretation* (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1986) and H. Moxnes, *The Economy of the Kingdom: Social Conflict and Economic Relations in Luke's Gospel* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988).

Barton : *"Paul's Sense of Place: An Anthropological Approach to Community Formation in Corinth"* [98]

Barton draws on the anthropology of social boundaries (in particular on the work of Douglas, Geertz, Leach and Turner) in order to explore two texts from 1 Corinthians. His thesis is that the conflict expressed is due to the ambiguity regarding the boundary between church and household. In sum, ἐκκλησία and οἶκος represent related but different realities.

With regard to the first passage (1 Cor. 14: 33b-36), Barton explains how the boundary separating church from household is marked by gender-defined speech. Paul argues that wives may speak at home but not in church. Traditional sexual roles in the household are, therefore, reinforced in the church which is being defined as public, male space, in contrast to the home which is the private, female sphere. [99] Paul's opponents, the free-speaking women, do not accept an ἐκκλησία / οἶκος boundary because the "church-in-house" offers them the chance to extend their activity and authority. By promoting a strong ἐκκλησία / οἶκος boundary (Barton argues) Paul resists female (and indeed male) innovation.

In contrast (the author maintains), it is the absence of an ἐκκλησία / οἶκος boundary which results in the increased power of wealthy householders and in increased competition among them. This is illustrated by divisiveness at meals. In a conflict over commensality (1 Cor. 11: 17-34), Paul differentiates between practices in the ἐκκλησία and the οἶκος, thus making the meal the boundary marker between church and household. The disciple tries to limit the disruptive intrusion of household-centred power by representing the church as one large household (with himself as father), [100] by using non-

---

98 S. C. Barton, "Paul's Sense of Place: An Anthropological Approach to Community Formation in Corinth", *NTS* 32 (1986), 225-246.

99 Barton notes, however, that the public/private split is itself a male construct and that men actually dominated in both spheres.

100 For an article on this topic, see S. J. Joubert, "Managing the Household: Paul as *paterfamilias* of the Christian household group in Corinth" in P. F. Esler (ed.), *Modelling Early Christianity: Social-Scientific Studies of the New Testament in its Context* (London and New York: Routledge, 1995), 213-223. Joubert draws on concepts from cultural anthropology in order to explore Paul's role as *paterfamilias* in the community at Corinth.

household metaphors for the church and by developing a different type of sacred meal.

Barton recognizes that recent scholarship has stressed the influence of the household model on early Christian churches but notes a lack of emphasis both on the extent of this influence and on the ways in which it was regarded. While scholars acknowledge that ἐκκλησία and οἶκος are related but not synonymous, their precise relationship has frequently remained somewhat vague and undefined. This article alerts us to conflict resulting from the in-house(hold) existence of Christian communities and indeed invites further exploration of the complex ἐκκλησία / οἶκος relationship.

Love : *"The Household - A Major Social Component for Gender Analysis in the Gospel of Matthew"* [101]

Using macrosociology as a methodology, Love investigates gender specific behavior in Matthew through a social analysis of the household. His conclusion is that the Gospel "presupposes a rigid, hierarchical authority-centred social structure largely based on the paradigm of the household. Although exceptional or deviant gender behavior exists, it does not burst the societal boundaries of the household of advanced agrarian societies." [102]

Drawing on Lenski,[103] Love selects the advanced agrarian model as the societal type most appropriate for the first century Roman Empire. Of all societal types, it is the most male-dominated and hierarchical. In both the household and society, gender roles and status are clearly defined, women functioning chiefly in the private and men in the public sphere. With the use of this model, Love analyses the household (as both social reality and metaphor) in order to understand gender specific status and roles in Matthew. He explores the household as the basic social unit of society, a hierarchical unit used to describe kingdom, nation, city, village and family. He examines actual families and gender relations portrayed in the gospel and highlights the household as a frequent example in the teaching

---

101 S. L. Love, "The Household - A Major Social Component for Gender Analysis in the Gospel of Matthew", *BTB* 23/1 (1993), 21-31.

102 Love, "The Household", 21.

103 See G. and L. Lenski, *Human Societies: An Introduction to Macrosociology,* 5th edn (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1987.)

of Jesus.

Exceptions to the advanced agrarian model are noted in the apparent reversal of hierarchical authority in Matthew's community, in the rejection of the patriarchal family by the eschatological family of God and in the place of women in the new movement. However significant these examples may be (claims Love) they are not sufficient indication of a break in the societal mould. Rather (he argues) the Gospel is firmly embedded in its social world, namely an advanced agrarian society. Although the hermeneutical implications of these findings for Christians living in an advanced industrial society have not been addressed, Love states that article's thesis cannot be used to support the divinely ordained nature of the Matthaean societal model.

Love's article reveals how the Matthaean household reflects an advanced agrarian society. Unearthing the rigidly ordered society reflected in the gospel represents a significant contribution to house studies. There is, however, a certain determinism and lack of critique in the use of the model. Thus, for example, Love's unquestioned use of the public / private division of space (a notion which has been seriously questioned in recent years) [104] points to the possible androcentric bias in the model. [105] This, in turn, raises the question to what extent the model colours an assessment of the evidence.

Conclusion

There is no doubt but that, building on traditional methods, social-scientific approaches to the house offer new insight into well-read texts. Elliott, in particular, provides an extremely thorough exploration of the many meanings, functions and resonances of the term "οἶκος". Using οἶκος material, Barton sheds new light on the long-debated problem of conflict in Corinth and Love reveals the society reflected and (he

---

104 It is above all in the field of sociology that the public/private division has been both questioned and rearticulated primarily by feminists. For the critical debate in response to M. Z. Rosaldo and L. Lamphere (eds), *Woman, Culture and Society* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1974), see the Social Science Citation Index. For a rearticulation of the public/private question, see L. J. Nicholson, "Feminist Theory: The Private and the Public" in L. McDowell and R. Pringle (eds), *Defining Women: Social Institutions and Gender Divisions* (Cambridge: Polity, 1992), 36-43. In contrast to Love's neglect of the question, see Barton's treatment above.

105 On the androcentric bias in sociological models, see E. Schüssler Fiorenza, *In Memory of Her: A Feminist Theological Reconstruction of Christian Origins* (London: SCM, 1983), 93 n.9.

argues) unchallenged in Matthew. While theory and models are used explicitly, however, such social-scientific material tends to be presented as undisputed, with no reference to its critique or acceptance within its own field. [106]

4. The House as Physical Setting

Studies in this group consider the house in the physical sense and draw on archaeological and literary sources dealing with actual dwellings. The studies do not aim to provide a history of architecture, but rather to situate Christianity in its social context. That they are fewer in number than those on households is itself a significant fact which is addressed below. Contributions by Murphy-O'Connor, White and Blue are considered. For present purposes, the chief value of these studies lies in underlining the obvious but necessary fact that house has a physical meaning and that attention to this meaning yields information on early Christianity.

Murphy-O'Connor : "House-Churches and the Eucharist" [107]

The article "House-Churches and the Eucharist" is an example of how archaeology contributes to an understanding of New Testament texts. Murphy-O'Connor posits an explanation of 1 Cor. 11: 17-34 by using archaeological information on housing. His sources include the Villa at Anaploga (the only known example of a Corinthian house from the Pauline period) and similar houses in other locations. Using measurements of these

---

106 Holmberg (*Sociology and New Testament*, 154) notes that "[e]ven if life is short, the least an exegete ought to do in the strange terrain of sociology is to familiarize him/herself with what has happened to the preferred idea or model in the scholarly discussion of the sociologists themselves". Whether or not scholars actually do this is not always obvious. Furthermore, as noted above (in Schüssler Fiorenza, *Memory,* 93 n.9), the apparent objectivity of sociological models masks at least an undeclared androcentric bias. This then begs the question, "what other bias remains hidden ?" On a wider level, it raises the issues of perspective and subjectivity / objectivity in all scholarship.

107 J. Murphy-O'Connor, "House-Churches and the Eucharist"in *St. Paul's Corinth: Texts and Archaeology* (Collegeville: Glazier / The Liturgical Press, 1983), 161-69. This contribution appears in a collection of primary sources (both textual and archaeological) on Corinth from the first century B.C.E. to the second C.E.

houses and drawing on scholarship on the Corinthian church, [108] he calculates the available space as a way of determining the size of "the whole church" (1 Cor. 14:23) which the text describes as gathering in the house of Gaius. Citing ancient literary sources which depicts a two-tier system of hospitality,[109] he proceeds to posit that a similar situation is illustrated in the Corinthian church. More specifically, he suggests that there were about nine wealthy Christians reclining in the *triclinium* (1 Cor. 8:10), while between thirty and forty stood in the *atrium* (1 Cor. 14:30).

This brief study attempts to use evidence of physical houses to explain the activity of so-called house-churches in the New Testament period. As noted in Elliott's introduction, biblical scholars have failed to use the results of years of archaeological work in Corinth by the American school. In the light of this critique, O'Connor's attempt is both laudable and enlightening. His reconstruction of the event (based on the hypothesis that the Villa of Anaploga is like the house of Gaius) is plausible, but the attempt to calculate numbers at the gathering is more suspect.

White : The Social Origins of Christian Architecture [110]

White's two volumed work is a re-working of his doctoral thesis. The first volume contains the text while the second is the collection of archaeological and documentary material on which the argument is based. As explained in Chapter 1, the author's aim is to present "a more comprehensive analysis of the beginnings of Christian development in

---

108 He refers to Banks, *Community*, D. E. Smith, "Social Obligation in the Context of Communal Meals: A Study of the Christian Meal in 1 Corinthians in Comparison with Graeco-Roman Meals" (Unpublished Th.D. Dissertation, Harvard University , 1980) and G. Theissen, *The Social Setting of Pauline Christianity : Essays on Corinth*, ed. and trans. with an introduction by J. Schültz (Philadephia: Fortress, 1982).

109 The ancient sources are Pliny the Younger, *Letters* 2:6, Martial, *Epigrams* 3:60; 4:85 and Juvenal, *Satire V*: 162.

110 L. M. White, *The Social Origins of Christian Architecture*. Vol. 1: *Building God's House in the Roman World: Architectural Adaptation among Pagans, Jews and Christians.* Vol. 2: *The Christian Domus Ecclesiae and Its Environment : A Collection of Texts and Monuments,* HTS 42 (Valley Forge, Pennsylvania: Trinity Press International, 1996). This is a re-working of his doctoral dissertation, *Domus Ecclesiae, Domus Dei: Adaptation and Development in the Setting for Early Christian Assembly* (Ph.D., Yale, 1982).

church building",[111] that is, to outline the progression from the house church of the Pauline period to the basilica of the Constantinian age. While the main focus is on the collection of primary evidence, the approach is also analytical for White "seeks a historical reconstruction and interpretation of the development process".

In Chapter 2, the theories of the beginnings of Christian architecture are examined: these are the "atrium house" and basilical theories, the house theory and Krautheimer's three-stage developmental model.[112] White outlines the need for a more detailed model to explain the process of architectural adaptation. His recognition of architectural adaptation shifts the focus from the purely architectural to the social and environmental factors involved in the process.

As argued by White, the change from house churches to basilicas coincided with important developments in the social aspects and religious practices of the Christian movement. Christians were, however, but one of many groups adapting private buildings for worship. In Chapter 3, White explores the phenomenon of private cults from a "constructive context" and gives special consideration to the case of the Roman Mithraeum. In the following chapter, attention turns to Judaism. The author shows how Jews of the Graeco-Roman Diaspora adapted domestic premises for religious purposes. In Chapter 5, White deals with Christian evidence and presents a three-fold model for the phrases of growth and adaptation. These he classifies as "the house church" (the "unrenovated space of the Pauline period"), [113] the "*domus ecclesiae*" (the specifically adapted building, the *house of the church*) [114] and the "large more regular hall[s] of assembly", the *aula ecclesiae*. [115] His model of adaptation is a "dynamic process" [116] geared to the community's social and physical needs.

---

111 White, *Building God's House*, 9.

112 See R. Krautheimer, *Early Christian and Byzantine Architecture*, 3rd edn, Pelican History of Art (New York: Penguin Books, 1979) and the *Corpus Basilicarum Christianarum Romae*, 5 vols (Vatican City: Pontifical Institute of Archaeology, 1937-1977).

113 White, *God's House*, 111.

114 White, *God's House*, 111.

115 White, *God's House*, 128.

116 White, *God's House*, 147.

White's collection of sources is a monumental achievement and a work in its own right. That he has accompanied this primary material with a valuable text is more than an added bonus. Together, the volumes offer a valuable picture of early Christianity in context. As expressed by White, "[b]y looking at the stages and methods of architectural adaptation in the context of the larger environment we see a barometer of the historical and social circumstances of development." [117] The work is a resource for and a challenge to scholars of early Christianity and ecclesiastical historians. The former (White notes) have until recently shown little interest in the physical setting of the house [118] and the latter have continued to borrow theory long abandoned by architectural historians.[119]

Blue : "Acts and the House Church" [120]

Blue sets out to examine the physical conditions of the house churches, which for the first three centuries constituted the gathering places of the early Christians.

In the first part, he outlines the historical framework. Drawing on the work of Krautheimer and on its recent refinements by White,[121] he presents a three-stage model of the development of Christian architecture in the pre-Constantinian / pre-basilical period. Blue's interest lies in the first and second of these stages, namely, in the period when Christians met in both unrenovated and renovated domestic spaces. In Part 2, he turns to the text of Acts and begins with the early Palestinian communities as outlined in chapters 1-12. He makes extensive use of literary and archaeological material to illuminate the

---

117 White, *God's House*, 148.

118 White, *God's House*, 11.

119 White, *God's House*, 15.

120 B. Bradley Blue, "Acts and the House Church" in D. W. J. Gill and C. Gempf (eds), *The Book Of Acts In Its First Century Setting* , Vol 2, *The Book of Acts in Its Graeco-Roman Setting* (Grand Rapids and Carlisle: Eerdmans and Paternoster Press, 1994), 119- 222.

121 The work of White is reviewed in the previous section. The work reviewed was the 1996 version and Blue's article is from 1994. Given that the later version of White does not differ substantially to the earlier texts cited by White, the article of Blue is placed after that of White in this review. Blue mentions White's thesis and notes that a portion of this work is published as *Building God's House in the Roman World: Architectural Adaptation among Pagans, Jews and Christians*. The ASOR Library of Biblical and Near Eastern Archaeology (Baltimore and London: The John Hopkins University Press, 1990).

conditions of the earliest community in the upper room (1.13), the house at Pentecost (2.2) and the house of Mary (12.12). He presents evidence of dwellings in Capernaum, Jerusalem, Gerizim, Samaria and Syria, arguing that such excavations provide glimpses of the type of conditions under which Christians met. Part 3 deals with Acts 13-28, that is, with the movement "to the end of the earth" (1.8), .. in a house. He supplements the meagre evidence of Acts with material from the Pauline epistles and with archaeological reports from Corinth, Rome, Lullingstone (Britannia) and Dura-Europos. The fourth and final section explores "[h]ome owners in the New Testament". This represents something of an unexpected turn both from place to people and from Acts to the broader canvas of the New Testament. Blue examines the evidence of the Corinthian church, the issue of god-fearers, the cases of Phoebe, Junia Theodora and Lydia and finally what he labels "other references". He concludes his article by emphasizing the importance of both house and homeowner in the expansion and establishment of Christianity in the Graeco-Roman world.

Blue is a meticulous gatherer of information and his article provides a valuable attempt to marry the literary and archaeological evidence relating to early house churches. The basic problem, however, is that the house church (defined by White as the "unrenovated space of the Pauline period" [122]) is of its nature architecturally unidentifiable.[123] Blue, therefore, does not (and indeed cannot) reach the specificity he appears to desire. In many cases, the most one can argue (and this in itself is valuable) is that Christians gathered in places *like* those he mentions.

Conclusion

First and most importantly, the studies in this section remind us to take seriously the meaning of house in the physical sense. This reminder is not for the archaeologist or architectural historian alone but for all who are interested in the social world of early Christianity. Secondly, the studies illustrate how attention to physical houses opens doors onto the new movement and its world. Thirdly, questions and methodological problems are raised by the studies. Given the lack of archaeological evidence of Christian houses

---

122 White, *God's House*, 111.

123 White, *God's House*, 21.

from the earliest period, any attempt to use archaeology or architectural information is problematic and requires a developed methodology.

5. House as Family

The studies in this section deal with the family and as such are classifiable as scholarship on the house(hold). Those considered are a work by Osiek and Balch's on families in the New Testament and a collection edited by Moxnes entitled *Constructing Early Christian Families.*

Osiek and Balch : Families in the New Testament: Households and House Churches [124]

Osiek and Balch's study (*Families in the New Testament*) is subtitled *Households and House Churches.* Against the background of both pro-and anti-family statements in the New Testament, the authors set out to demonstrate what the family was like for the first Christians. In the process, they provide a wealth of scholarship illustrated by figures and photographs.

Part 1 deals with the "[m]aterial and social environment of the Graeco-Roman household". Chapter 1 outlines the physical environment in which families lived. It draws extensively on both literary evidence of Roman writers and archaeological evidence from a variety of sites across the Mediterranean. It moves from a consideration of the "[a]rchitectural aspects of social life" and an account of "[e]veryday reality" to the New Testament evidence of gatherings in domestic premises. Turning from archaeology, Chapter 2 discusses social patterns (such as honour and shame) from the perspective of cultural anthropology. Chapter 3 (entitled "The Social World") deals with important issues like patronage, clients and freedpersons, gender roles, and education. In Part 2, attention turns to the evidence of early Christian families. Aspects explored include the social location of Christian families (Ch. 4), gender roles, marriage and celibacy within these

---

[124] C. Osiek and D. L. Balch, *Families in the New Testament World : Households and House Churches* (Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster John Knox Press, 1997).

social units (Ch. 5), education and learning (Ch. 6), slavery (Ch. 8), meals and religious celebrations (Ch. 8). For those unfamiliar with the social world of the New Testament, this volume is an invaluable and easily readable handbook; for those who are, it is a pithy and up-to-date synopsis of a vast array of sources. If the downside to such a study is that it tends to be descriptive rather than analytical, the advantage is that it serves as a valuable door onto old and new scholarship in Classics, scholarship which is of vital significance for New Testament studies.

Moxnes (ed.), Constructing Early Christian Families: Family as Social Reality and Metaphor [125]

As outlined in the sub-title, the study explores the family "as social reality and metaphor." While the ultimate interest is in early Christian families, these are understandable only when seen in the larger context of the Graeco-Roman world of which they are a part.

Part 1 deals with "The social context of early Christian families" in Palestine and the Graeco-Roman world. In the first essay (Ch.2), [126] Moxnes situates the study within the context of modern family studies. He highlights the need to include information on such areas as the household, kinship and marriage. He also argues that studies of early Christian families should make use of the social sciences and attend to the social and cultural context of ancient families. While Moxnes' focus is on methodological issues, Guijarro's study (Ch.3)[127] of the family in first-century Galilee is more material. Combining literary, historical and sociological approaches and drawing on recent archaeological evidence on houses, he reconstructs four different family types and this reconstruction forms the basis for discussing how the Jesus movement interacted with "family". In Chapter 4, Barclay [128] explores the

---

125 H. Moxnes (ed.), *Constructing Early Christian Families: Family as Social Reality and Metaphor* (London: Routledge, 1997).

126 Ch.2 (pp. 13-41): H. Moxnes, "What is Family? Problems in Constructing Early Christian Families".

127 Ch.3 (pp.42-65) : S. Guijarro, "The Family in First-Century Galilee".

128 Ch. 4 (pp.66-80): J. M. G. Barclay "The Family as the Bearer of Religion in Judaism and Early Christianity".

notion of the family as bearer of religion in antiquity. In contrast to Judaism where the family had a central role in the preservation of tradition, Christianity had an ambiguous attitude to the family. Noting both an "anti-familial" trend and one that tried to embed the movement in the household, he argues that these two strands represent developments which need not be harmonised. [129] In the final essay of Part 1 (Ch. 5), Barton [130] deals with the relativization of family ties in Jewish and Graeco-Roman traditions. The material, valuable in its own right, also provides a wider canvas against which to view anti-family traditions in the Gospels. The essay reveals how rejection of the family is often found in groups (like the Therapeutae or Essenes) which define themselves as alternative groups, modelled after the household. Descriptions of these communities in terms of "spiritual kinship" or "spiritual household" are similar to those used of Christian groups by New Testament and Gnostic authors.

Part 2 deals with the "Family as Metaphor". Lassen's study (Ch.6) [131] shows how the Roman family in general and fatherhood in particular served as both ideal and metaphor in the Roman world. The subsequent essays explore family metaphors in Christian texts. Esler (Ch. 7) [132] focuses on Paul's use of family imagery (especially that between brothers) in Galatians 5.13-6.10 and shows how this contributes to the process of identity formation. Sandnes (Ch.8) [133] too explores Paul's use of brotherhood terminology in relation to Christian community. He argues against those who view household and brotherhood as contrasting patriarchal and egalitarian models. Claiming that Christian community was more patriarchal than we might like to believe, he points to the juxtaposition of master /slave and brotherhood terminology in Paul's letter to Philemon in support of his thesis that Christian

---

129 As outlined by Moxnes in the introduction (*Constructing Early Christian Families*, 3-4), the subsequent chapters deal more clearly on one or the other of these trends: Barton, Martin, Uro and Gilhus deal with the "anti-familial" trend, while those by Esler, Sandnes and Aasgaard focus on the attempts to re-embed discipleship in some forms of family structures.

130 Ch. 5((pp.81-100): S. C. Barton, The Relativisation of Family Ties in the Jewish and Graeco-Roman Traditions".

131 Ch. 6 (pp. 103-120): E. M. Lassen, "The Roman Family: Ideal and Metaphor".

132 Ch. 7 (121-149): P. F. Esler, "Family Imagery and Christian Identity in Gal. 5.13 to 6.10".

133 Ch. 8 (pp. 150-165): K. O. Sandnes, "Equality within Patriarchal Structures: Some New Testament Perspectives on the Christian Fellowship as a Brother- or Sisterhood and a Family".

brotherhood was embedded in the household and only gradually modified that social structure. While the link between Christian brotherhood language and its socio-historical context is assumed by Esler and Sandnes, it is explicitly studied by Aasgaard (Ch. 9). [134] He explores brotherhood ideas in Paul's letters and compares and contrasts them with those articulated by Plutarch in his treatise "On brotherly love. " The final essay by Fatum (Ch 10) [135] is a "gender hermeneutical reading" of 1 Thessalonians. Her argument is that the text's use of brotherhood language betrays an androcentric and patriarchal perspective which makes it difficult to imagine how women could ever be fully integrated into the community at Thessalonica.

The third and final part of the book deals with "[f]amily, sexuality and asceticism in early Christianity". Martin (Ch. 11) [136] explores Paul's asceticism (as expressed in 1 Cor 7, 1 Thess 4 and Rom 1) and compares it to that of other ancient writers. Uro (Ch. 12) [137] focuses on asceticism and anti-familial language in the Gospel of Thomas, through a study of passages related to marriage and sexuality. The third and final essay by Gilhus (Ch. 13) [138] deals with family structures in Gnostic religion.

This study offers many and varied perspectives on the family (and the related concept of household) in the Graeco-Roman world, a topic of central importance yet one rather under-explored. The study reveals both the value for New Testament studies of forays into the Graeco-Roman world and the wealth provided by a variety of methodologies and approaches.

---

134 Ch. 9 (pp. 166-182): R. Aasgaard, "Brotherhood in Plutarch and Paul: Its Role and Character".

135 Ch. 10 (pp. 183-197): L. Fatum, "Brotherhood in Christ: A Gender Hermeneutical Reading of 1 Thessalonians", 183-197.

136 Ch. 11 (pp. 210-215): D. Martin, "Paul without Passion: On Paul's Rejection of Desire in Sex and Marriage".

137 Ch. 12 (pp. 216-234): R. Uro, "Asceticism and Anti-Familial Language in the *Gospel of Thomas*".

138 Ch. 13 (pp.235-249): I. S. Gilhus, "Family Structures in Gnostic Religion".

Conclusion

Studies on the family in antiquity are either synonymous with or related to those of the household. Apart from the wealth of material provided by the two particular studies reviewed here, what is equally significant is the contextual approach they illustrate. In situating early Christian families within their world, the various authors reveal a welcome familiarity and ease with all ancient sources. In so doing, they bridge the gap which often exists between New Testament and Classical Studies.

6. The House from a Feminist Perspective

Studies in this section offer a feminist perspective on the house in early Christianity. The critique centres chiefly on the model of the household and focuses on texts (or parts thereof) in which such material is present.

As part of a wider movement of feminism, feminist biblical criticism [139] involves both critique and re-vision. On the one hand, it is a "critique of culture in the light of patriarchy". [140] Adopting a hermeneutics of suspicion, practitioners critique so-called

---

139 For treatment of the feminist perspective and methodology in the field of biblical studies, see Schüssler Fiorenza, *Memory,* 3-95; M.A. Tolbert (ed.), The Bible and Feminist Hermeneutics, *Semeia* 28 (1983); A. Yarbro Collins (ed.), *Feminist Perspectives on Biblical Scholarship* (Chico: Scholars Press, 1985); K. Doob Sakenfeld, "Feminist Perspectives on Bible and Theology: An Introduction to Selected Issues and Literature", *Interpretation* 42 (1988), 5-18; S. M. Schneiders, "Feminist Ideology Criticism and Biblical Hermeneutics", *BTB* 19 (1989), 3-10; P. Trible, "Feminist Hermeneutics and Biblical Studies", in A. Loades (ed.) *Feminist Theology: A Reader* (London: SPCK, 1990), 23-40; J. C. Anderson, "Mapping Feminist Biblical Criticism: The American Scene, 1983-1990", *Critical Review of Books in Religion, 1991 Annual* (American Academy of Religion / Society of Biblical Literature, 1991).

140 Feminism as defined by Trible, "Feminist Hermeneutics and Biblical Studies", 23. As defined by Sakenfeld ("Feminist Perspectives", 5), a feminist is "one who seeks justice and equality for all people and who is especially concerned for the fate of women - all women - in the midst of 'all people'. "

Patriarchy, is described by J. Dewey ("Feminist Readings, Gospel Narrative and Critical Theory", *BTB* 23/4 (1992), 168) as a "system in which a few men dominate other men and all women and children, slaves and colonized peoples (Schüssler Fiorenza) and within each level of the hierarchical structure, the man dominates 'his' women and children". According to G. Lerner (*The Creation of Patriarchy* [New York, London: Oxford University Press, 1986], 242-243), patriarchy is "the system, historically derived from Greek and Roman law, in which the male head of the household had absolute legal and economic power over his dependent female and male family members." Both definitions are relevant in this thesis.

objective scholarship on the basis of the sociology-of-knowledge. Biblical texts (they argue) have been shaped by an androcentric [141] and patriarchal perspective and by failing to examine this perspective and the interests at stake, interpreters (consciously or unconsciously) adopt and perpetuate the gender-specific views of the Biblical authors. On the other hand, feminist biblical studies are capable of offering an alternative reading or reconstruction of the past, the aim being "to restore women to history and history to women". [142]

Following the historical analysis of biblical texts, their theological evaluation is made "in terms of a feminist scale of values". [143] Given the use of the Bible to perpetuate the subordination of women, what is oppressive is condemned theologically, while what is liberative is valued as a resource for emancipation. As in every theology of liberation, feminist biblical critics adopt an advocacy stance (on behalf of women) and work for social change.

Schüssler Fiorenza : In Memory of Her: A Feminist Theological Reconstruction of Christian Origins

In the course of her "(f)eminist (t)heological (r)econstruction of Christian (o)rigins", Schüssler Fiorenza charts and assesses the shift from "house" to "household" church in early Christianity.

The importance of both travelling missionaries and house churches (or churches-in-houses) in the pre-Pauline period is stressed. The fact that Christians met in houses had significant implications: as outlined by Schüssler Fiorenza, it permitted role flexibility and created new opportunities for women in particular; it influenced the movement's theological development and provided the model for Christian community and leadership,

---

141 As defined by Dewey ("Feminist Readings", 168), androcentrism means "that the male is understood as the human norm, the woman as other and inferior".

142 As expressed by J. Kelly-Gadol ("The Social Relations of the Sexes: Methodological Implications of Women's History", *Signs* 1 [1976], 809), this is the aim of feminist history.

143 Schüssler Fiorenza, *Memory,* 60.

a model based more on *collegia* and cult groups than on the patriarchal family. For her, the pre-Pauline baptismal text of Galatians 3:27-28 is considered key to the ethos of such early house churches. This reconstruction of the early Christian movement is in contrast to Theissen's notion of "love patriarchalism", [144] in which Christianity is viewed as a socially well-integrated movement based on the patriarchal family.

As described by the author, tension was generated in traditional households by the teaching and practice of house churches. Attempts to resolve this tension are seen in the development of the household church. Household metaphors and codes are used by Christian authors (demonstrates Schüssler Fiorenza) in order to reinforce the patriarchal order of the household, frequently in the name of Jesus Christ. The author charts this increasing patriarchalization, noting (for example) that while in 1 Peter, the code has an apologetic function, in the Pastorals, the "household of God" becomes equated with the patriarchal household, a social unit stratified according to age and gender. [145]

By tracing the trajectory from "house" to "household" churches and exploring the changing possibilities and consequences for women, the book offers a new perspective on the house in early Christianity. On a wider level, Schüssler Fiorenza sees the whole roots of Western misogyny in the rules for the household as the model of the state. She calls, therefore, for a critique of Aristotle's politics and economics as well as his anthropology.

Feminist Commentaries [146] : *Tanzer: Ephesians* [147]

The focus of this commentary on Ephesians is the household code (5:22-6:9), in particular the exhortation to wives and husbands on marriage in 5:22-23. Tanzer argues

---

144 As discussed in Schüssler Fiorenza, *Memory*, Ch. 3.

145 In contrast to the gradual patriarchalization of Christianity (exemplified in the development of the "household" church), Schüssler Fiorenza sees a different tradition illustrated in the original gospels, one offering traces of an alternative vision and praxis for women.

146 The examples below are taken from E. Schüssler Fiorenza (ed.), *Searching the Scriptures.* Vol. 2: *A Feminist Commentary* (London: SCM, 1995).

147 S. J. Tanzer, "Ephesians", 325-348 .

that the household code is a later addition to Ephesians, which echoes material in the original letter but develops it in a different way. [148]

Tanzer rejects the view that the *Haustafel* functions as a Christian apology. The code (she argues) advocates behaviour and attitudes which are different from those common in the Graeco-Roman world of that time. Women were becoming increasingly "liberated" and so it is simply wrong to argue that a text which advocates a diametrically opposing movement does so in order to reflect (or not disturb) society at large. Rather than seeing it as an apology, she considers that the code is a reflection of an already "outmoded and idealized view of the patriarchal Roman household", [149] a view in tension with actual social practice. It functions to promote (and justify theologically) the household as a model for early Christianity which is envisaged as a hierarchical movement with Christ as head or ruler. When such a prescriptive code is read as an authoritative text (Tanzer argues), it functions to silence and marginalise women.

Feminist Commentaries: Corley: 1 Peter [150]

Accepting Balch's thesis of the apologetic function of the *Haustafeln* in 1 Peter, Corley argues that its adoption is at the expense of both women and slaves. These people (she maintains) must endure submission, terror and abuse (2:18; 3:5-6) in order to prevent further "persecution" of the church and to create "harmony" (3:11) with the wider Graeco-Roman society. Corley highlights the text's ethic of submission, an ethic seen in both the model of the suffering Christ and in the household code. Such an ethic has been used throughout history (she argues) to justify oppression and violence. In contrast to the cosy message of a "home for the homeless" portrayed by Elliott, Corley judges that "(o)f all Christian Testament texts, the message of 1 Peter is the most harmful in the context of

---

148 This is no apologetic strategy on Tanzer's part, as she situates the code firmly within Christianity. Furthermore, as a Jewish feminist, she is alert to the tendency of Christians either to "blame the Jews or blame the Graeco-Roman world" for the misogyny of their texts.

149 Tanzer, "Ephesians", 332.

150 K. E. Corley, "1 Peter", 349-360.

women's lives", [151] one which "does not reflect God's liberating Word". [152]

Conclusion

The critique of the household is the key feminist contribution. In all the studies, the oppressive implications for women of Christian household code texts are highlighted. As Schüssler Fiorenza observes, the demands of the *Haustafeln* contrast with the opportunities open to women in the early house-churches. Feminist critique also reveals how an androcentric and patriarchal authorial perspective is often adopted by interpreters, who then overlook the implications of the text on different groups of receivers. Such an observation applies to most of the scholarship reviewed in the previous sections of this chapter. [153] Furthermore, the critique raises the hermeneutical question of the relevance of these household code texts today. One may question the advocacy stance of feminists or the (theological) evaluation of texts on the basis of their oppressive or liberative potential for women. Critique of the household is, however, important in its own right and it functions as a corrective to the often idealized and uncritical approach to this institution in many scholarly works.

---

151 Corley, "1 Peter", 355.

152 Corley, "1 Peter", 357.

153 Exceptions may include the above works by Verner and Barton.

Previous investigations.... in sum.....

As illustrated in the review, the house in early Christianity has received a great deal of scholarly attention and has been approached from numerous perspectives. The composition, status and function of the upper-class household in the Graeco-Roman world has been explored and its role as the central social institution and basic unit of society well emphasised. Turning to Christianity, both the traditional οἶκος and housing evidence have been used by scholars to provide insight into a wide variety of New Testament texts. Furthermore, the household has been seen as key to understanding many aspects of the movement, including its structure, social composition, spread, survival, internal tensions and theological ideas. While the review illustrates the extensive work on the topic, however, it also highlights a number of issues which point the way to further investigation.

OBSERVATIONS MADE ... ISSUES RAISED ...

Terminology

A first observation is the lack of clarity surrounding "house" terminology. With regard to Greek, there is confusion and contradictory evidence regarding the meanings, similarities and / or differences between the terms "οἶκος" and "οἰκία". Klauch is one of the few scholars to outline the broad and overlapping nature of both terms [154] and the only one to summarise it in diagrammatic form. [155] Elliott's presentation is less clear and consistent. In *A Home for the Homeless*, he explains that

> "*oikos /oikia* designates ..a building, dwelling, residence; a room or chamber; a hall or meeting place; a storehouse or treasury; a palace; a building in which a divinity is thought to reside, a temple; a burial chamber or tomb; a household, family or lineage; household goods, substance, estate, inheritance; a reigning house or dynasty; a clan, tribe, tribal confederation, nation or state; and a social, commercial or religious organization or community."[156]

In "Temple versus Household," by contrast, he refers to οἰκία as "house" and to οἶκος as "household" [157] and this simplistic definition assumes a clear-cut distinction between the two terms. According to Michel, however, while Greek had originally distinguished between οἶκος and οἰκία, a less rigid distinction is evident in the New Testament. [158] Thus, while most scholars do not address the issue of Greek terminology, the evidence of those who do so also fails to provide clear answers.

Turning to English terminology, an even greater lack of clarity and consistency appears. The problem is that the terms "house", "household" and "home" are rarely defined, frequently juxtaposed and used interchangeably. Elliott, for example, writes somewhat

---

154 Klauch, *Hausgemeinde,* 16.

155 See Klauch's diagram on page 11 n. 39 above.

156 Elliott, *Home*, 182.

157 Elliott, "Temple versus Household", 225.

158 Michel, "οἶκος", 131-134.

vaguely of "[h]ouses, homes and households" providing the setting for events in the life of Jesus and his followers.[159] In other studies, "house" and "home" are used as synonyms [160] which refer to a "dwelling" or "private residence". [161] The terms "home owner", [162] "householder", [163] "house-church owner" [164] or "master or mistress of the house" [165] are all used of the same type of person. [166] "House church" is another term used by many, [167] but one more assumed than defined. White alone offers a clear definition and his is specifically architectural. [168] Meeks's understanding is that ἡ κατ᾽ οἶκον ἐκκλησία is "the basic cell of the Christian movement ", one whose "nucleus was often an existing

---

159 Elliott, "Temple versus Household", 225. On pages 225 and 226, the terms "houses" and "households" appears together side by side and undefined in his work.

160 As found in Blue, believers met in "homes" ("Acts and the House Church", 120, 130..) and in "houses" (*op. cit.*, 121). Filson ("House Churches," 106) refers to the "house" of Mary and the "home" of Prisca and Aquila. On page 107, he mentions the "house" of Clement and then refers to such a place as a "home". On the following page, he calls the Dura-Europos premises both a "house" and a "home". On meeting in "homes", see also Filson (*op. cit.*, 106, 109) and Malherbe ("House Churches", 68).

161 On private residences, see Filson, "House Churches," 108 and 109. See Meeks (*Urban Christians*, 56) for reference to meeting "private houses".

162 See Blue, "Acts and the House Church", 172 ff. and 189.

163 See for example, Matson, *Household Conversion*, 185.

164 White, *God's House*, 106.

165 Schüssler Fiorenza, *Memory*, 175.

166 The different use of words is captured in three expressions of Paul's aim or practice: according to Filson ("House Churches", 111), it is to "win a *household* with a *home* large enough to serve as a center of Christian activity". Blue ("Acts and the House Church", 152) describes it as the "conversion of a *home owner* who is capable of benefaction, including a *house"* for Christians to meet Malherbe ("House Churches", 68-69) refers to Paul's work to "convert entire *households* .... and then to use these *houses* as the bases for his further activity".

167 See reference to "the house church" in Filson, Malherbe, Fiorenza, White and Blue. Filson ("Early House Churches", 106) argues that the "importance and function of *the house church* should be carefully considered". Malherbe ("House Churches", 61) states that "... no major work has been devoted to *the* New Testament *house church*,.." See the section on "*The house church*" in Schüssler Fiorenza (*Memory*, 175-184). White (*God's House*, 103-110) devotes a section to "*the house church*" and Blue's article is entitled "Acts and *the House Church*". Italics are mine.

168 As mentioned above (page 33), White (*God's House*, 111) defines the house church as the "unrenovated space of Pauline period."

household". [169] "House church" and "household church" appear as synonyms in the works of Malherbe [170] and White.[171] For Schüssler Fiorenza, however, the house church and that modelled on the household are very different realities. [172] This distinction is implied in the works of Judge and Meeks who highlight differences between *collegia* and household as models of Christian community . [173]

In sum, the review reveals a certain fluidity in the definition and use of both Greek and English "house" terminology. What this terminological fluidity suggests is the lack of reflection on the nature of houses and the relationship between "dwelling house " and "household." This is, therefore, both scope and need for clarification in this area.

Content

The second observation regards content and two aspects are highlighted. The first relates to the use of evidence on households and housing from the Graeco-Roman world and the second concerns the text of Acts.

---

169 Meeks, *Urban Christians*, 75.

170 "House Churches" is the title of Malherbe's article and term "house church" appears (for example) on pages 60, 61, 62, 91. The term "household church" appears on page 69 and the term "household communities" appears on page 70. These are the Christian groups labelled in Filson ("House Churches", 109) as "house gatherings" and in Meeks (*Urban Christians*, 76) as "household assemblies". See also Meeks' reference (*op. cit.*, 76) to the "household assembly in Philemon's house".

171 See White, *God's House*, 110. See also Matson (*Household Conversion*, 184), who refers to the "mission to houses" and the "household mission".

172 Schüssler Fiorenza presents the whole trajectory of early Christianity as a move from the former to the latter. In her opinion, the former functions as an egalitarian movement, more like *collegia* and cult groups and the pre-Pauline baptismal text of Gal 3:27-28 is key to its ethos. By contrast, (argues Schüssler Fiorenza) the church based on the structures of the οἶκος represents a patriarchalization of the Christian community.

173 The distinction between in-house and household church is also implied Barton's study of the boundary (or lack of it) between ἐκκλησία and οἶκος in relation to 1 Cor 14.33b-36 and 11.17-34.

emphasis on "the" house(hold) obscures the significance of actual households and dwellings

In most studies, οἶκος / οἰκία is understood primarily and almost exclusively as "household". More specifically, it refers to a particular form or ideal type of household: this is the upper-class institution defined by Aristotle and other political philosophers, the social unit regarded as the basic building block of society. This house(hold) type is the subject of most "house" scholarship, although the variety and conflicting evidence [174] noted in the review blurs the common focus. The sheer volume of scholarship on "the" house(hold) also tends to obscure the lack of emphasis on actual households and physical houses. Recent studies like those by White, Blue or Osiek and Balch are re-dressing the balance and enlarging the canvas by drawing on the ever-increasing sources on dwellings and households provided by historians and archaeologists. There remains scope, however, for further mining of such sources.

Acts and "house" scholarship

What emerges from the review is the fact that there is both an abundance of evidence of housing and households in Acts and a paucity of house studies with an exclusive or major focus on the text. House scholarship has tended to focus on early Christianity in general, on texts with *Haustafeln* and more recently, on the gospel of Matthew. House evidence from Acts contributes much to studies of early Christianity in general, such as those by Meeks, Klauch and Malherbe. At times, however, this evidence

---

174 According to Crosby and Carter, the οἶκος in Matthew promotes egalitarian tendencies. Love, by contrast, considers that this household material points to an acceptance of a hierarchical, patriarchal model of society. The household as a model of community is judged positively by Elliott in relation to both 1 Peter and Luke-Acts, while its negative implications for women have resulted in its being severely critiqued by feminists. A variety of opinions on 1 Peter (Balch, Elliott and Corley) is also noted. See also J. H. Elliott, "1 Peter, Its Situation and Strategy : A Discussion with David Balch" in C. H. Talbert (ed.), *Perspectives on First Peter* (Macon, Georgia: Mercer University Press, 1986), 61-78.

is presented as subordinate to that of Paul. [175] "House" studies focusing on Acts include Matson's *Household Conversion Narratives in Acts*, Elliott's "Temple versus Household in Luke-Acts" and Blue's "Acts and the House Church". To these may be added more fragmentary material: articles on housing in (Luke-)Acts, (such as Cadbury's "Lexical Notes on Luke-Acts III. Luke's Interest in Lodging"), [176] works on the so-called οἶκος formula ("x and [all] his / her household ") [177] and more popular works on ecclesiology which draw on material from Acts to present a picture of the early house church.[178] In sum, given both the presence of "house" material in Acts and its relative lack of scholarly attention, there is ample scope for a re-visiting of the topic. While accepting that Acts was written by the author of the third gospel and that the two volumes are inter-related, Acts is also a self-contained work worthy of study in its own right, a fact more readily acknowledged in the case of Luke's first volume. [179]

---

175 In Klauch, section 1 on the Pauline letters (*Hausgemeinde*, 21-47) is longer than section 2 which is devoted to Acts (*op. cit.*, 47-56). Furthermore, material from Acts is included in the parts of section 1 which deal with "Die Hausgemeinde von Priska und Aquila" and "Hausgemeinden in Korinth". On the Pauline letters and Acts as sources, see Meeks (*Urban Christians*, 7) and see his use of evidence from Acts (*op. cit.*, 29). While Meeks does not say that Pauline evidence is primary, his treatment of the household as model of community (*op. cit.*, 75-77) gives more weight to Pauline sources than to material from Acts.

176 H. J. Cadbury, "Lexical Notes on Luke-Acts III. Luke's Interest in Lodging", *JBL* 45 (1926), 305-322. Cadbury acknowledges that the interest in lodging (in the second half of Acts in particular) was noted by Harnack.

177 See 10.2; 11. 14; 16.15; 16. 31 [33-34] and 18.8. Apart from its use in Jn 4.53, the formula appears nowhere else in the New Testament. For references to scholarship dealing with the topic, see Matson (*Household Conversion*, 13-14 nn.11-12).

178 See, for example, Banks, *Community.*

179 While there is agreement that the author of Acts is the same person who wrote what is called "the gospel according to Luke", there is disagreement over the precise relationship of the two works. Since the influential work of H. J. Cadbury (*The Making of Luke-Acts* [London: SPCK, 1958; originally published 1927]), many now accept the unity of Luke-Acts. More recently, however, the nature of the text as a "single continuous work" (Cadbury, *op. cit.*, 8-9) has been both challenged and modified , with the result that some now consider Luke and Acts as two volumes which are *both* interrelated *and* self-contained. On the unity of Luke-Acts, see (for example) M. Parsons, "The Unity of Luke-Acts: Rethinking the *Opinio Communis*" in N. Keathley (ed.), "*With Steadfast Purpose": Essays on Acts in Honor of Henry J. Flanders* (Waco: Baylor University Press, 1990), 29-53. On the literary or narrative unity, see C. H. Talbert, *Literary Patterns, Theological Themes and the Genre of Luke-Acts* (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1974) and R. C. Tannehill, *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts: A Literary Interpretation*, 2 vols (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986). Turning to disunity, J. M. Dawsey ("The Literary Unity of Luke-Acts: Questions of Style - A Task for Literary Critics", *NTS* 35 [1989], 48-66) argues that

Methodology

A third observation arising from the review (and one closely related to content) is that of methodology. What is highlighted through the great diversity of studies reviewed is the multi-disciplinary approach which work on the house in early Christianity necessarily demands. This approach presents both dangers and challenges.

One such danger is found in what may be termed the background / foreground approach. In many studies material from the Graeco-Roman world is used by scholars as background information to illuminate what lies centre-stage, namely the Christian realm or a New Testament text. While such a focus is understandable in biblical studies, the understanding of the wider Graeco-Roman world as background is problematic. The false impression created is that the wider (social, political, historical, geographical ...) world is an objective, monolithic and static reality "out there". It appears as a world to be described rather than analysed, a world to be conveyed to biblical scholars in potted hand-book format. The challenge, therefore, is to go beyond the methodology of filling-in-what-is-necessary-from-the-historical-context-in-order-to-understand-the-biblical-text-or-Christian-world. Put another way, it is to honour the context more fully and to develop a better articulation of the text / context relationship.

Taking seriously the challenge to work with the context or so-called background, however, it is easy to find oneself in new territory, in disciplines beyond one's primary field of expertise. The inevitable pitfalls are dilettantism and eclecticism but these may also represent but initial stages on the journey. Whether dealing with the movement in general or with a specific text, therefore, what is required of the biblical scholar is that one work on a large canvas and possess (or develop) a range of skills: these include the capacity to analyse (rather than simply describe) ancient literature other than biblical texts, to interpret

---

stylistic differences between the two works are overlooked while S. D. Moore ("Narrative Commentaries on the Bible: Context, Roots and Prospects", *Forum* 3/3 [1987], 29-62) contends that Luke and Acts are edited collections of divergent source material and arguments for narrative unity for either (or both) causes one to ignore this fact. On the view of Acts as independent but related, see M. Parsons (*The Departure of Jesus in Luke-Acts. The Ascension Narratives in Context* [Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987]) and F. Ó Fearghail (*The Introduction to Luke-Acts: A Study of the Role of Lk 1.1-4.44 in the Composition of Luke's Two-Volume Work* [(Rome: Biblical Institute, 1991].

non-literary material in the form of archaeological sources, inscriptions and images, to visit other disciplines for models and theoretical insights. This is no easy task but as seen in the review the rewards are great: namely, greater insight into Christianity and the increasing de-compartmentalization of New Testament studies.

In sum, a methodological challenge for one intent on exploring further the house in early Christianity is to proceed along the road so competently begun by the scholars reviewed above and to stand more fully and competently in the overlapping territory of Classics and Biblical studies.

In sum

The observations on terminology, content and methodology lead to the conviction that despite the attention given to house scholarship, further work is both possible and necessary.

THE PRESENT STUDY

In the light of the observations made above, the proposal is to explore anew the meaning of "house" and to use the perspective gained for a reading of Acts in its Roman imperial social world. The empire is considered as macro-text while Acts is viewed as the micro-text. The designation "macro- / micro- text" is a succinct encapsulation of the text / context relationship as articulated in this study. Concretely, it highlights two key aspects of that relationship: the first is that Acts (as text) is a small but inextricable part of a larger text or world; the second is that the empire is a multi-faceted text or mosaic of micro-texts which itself needs to be read. The text of the study is presented in volume one while a second volume consists of the accompanying figures. The text consists of three major parts and a concluding section.

Part 1: "House" revisited and understood anew

Part 1 consists of two chapters and is concerned with re-visiting "house" in order to understand it anew. As a point of departure, *Chapter 1* begins by examining what is meant by "house" today. An initial focus on the word "house" reveals the term's wide

semantic field. The focus then shifts from word study to the reality of the primary and secondary meanings of house, namely "dwelling" and "household". Drawing on human-scientific material, these separate realities are presented as social constructs and hermeneutical keys to any society. With the aid of social-spatial theory, attention then turns to an articulation of the relationship between dwellings and households. By problematising and exploring what is a deceptively simple term, the chapter provides valuable ground-work for the study.

Having prepared the ground, the laying of foundations begins in *Chapter 2*, where attention turns to "house" in antiquity. The exploration begins (as it did in Chapter 1) with terminology. The focus is on house terms from the languages of empire (Greek and Latin) and from that of an ethnic minority (Hebrew) or more concretely, on the meanings of οἶκος / οἰκία, *domus,* בית and synonyms. The investigation leads first to a clarification of the concept of "house" which serves as analytical tool in this study. In contrast to other works, "house" is understood in both a physical and a sociological sense. Furthermore, the concept's breadth and flexibility - its ability to function at literal and metaphorical levels - is to be consciously exploited rather than simply noted. The terminological study also results in the development of a category called "oikic sources", that is, sources on both housing and households. It is these sources which form the data for the readings of both macro- and micro-text.

Part 2: House readings of the early Roman empire (the macro-text)

Part 2 presents the house readings of the macro-text and consists of three chapters. Using the concept of "household", *Chapter 3* explores the early Roman Empire as a household-writ-large. It deals, first, with general aspects of the imperial structure as household and secondly, with the "house-building" of Augustus. Turning to physical houses, *Chapter 4* explores dwelling / user relationships in the typical town-house and in habitations in general. While the former reveals the strong house(hold) ideology in the Roman world, the latter opens other vistas on that same world: revealing it as a place of variety and flux, one in which multiple identities are under construction. Still concentrating on dwellings, *Chapter 5* explores housing in colonial territory or in what is termed the contact zone. The first half draws on evidence from across the empire while the second

focuses on sources from Jerusalem. The study shows what housing reveals about the complex and ever-changing relationship between imperial power and colonized people. The three chapters are united in their focus on the empire and in their use of "house" as analytical concept. Each, however, works with a different notion of "house" and presents a specific angle on the empire. Taken together, they amount not merely to a multi-faceted reading of the macro-text but to one which provides a valuable vantage point from which to view Acts anew.

Part 3: The house reading of Acts (the micro-text)

Turning from the macro-text of the Roman imperial world, Part 3 zooms in on one of its constituent aspects, namely the Christian text of Acts. Thanks to both the flexible house tool and important insights from Part 2, a fresh perspective is gained on this micro-text, or more specifically, on early Christianity as portrayed therein. The reading itself consists of two chapters. *Chapter 6* deals with Christianity's self-definition in relation to the two world-wide houses in which it is embedded, namely the household-writ-large (i.e. the empire) and the οἶκος Ἰσραήλ. In *Chapter 7*, further insight into early Christianity is gained by focusing on physical houses. Attention to the two-way relationship between dwellings and users shows Christianity to be an in-house movement in a double sense: a unified, trans-local οἶκος in which all are siblings and a diverse movement whose life is shaped by its location in very different types of domestic premises. The chapters of Part 3, therefore, reveal how Christian identity is forged in the context of the movement's location in both world-wide and local houses. Christianity is in essence akin to a house in the contact zone, a structure fashioned from imperial and native elements but one with a nature all its own.

Conclusion

In the concluding section, the task is one of gathering and assessing. The argument as a whole is first drawn together and attention is then given to the study's contribution to the field of New Testament studies, at the level of both methodology and content.

INTRODUCTION

The review of scholarship pointed to a lack of clarity surrounding "house" terminology, both Greek and English. It was suggested that this revealed a failure to reflect on the nature of houses, in particular the relationship between dwellings and households. This failure stems largely from the fact that a house is apparently such a familiar and simple reality as to require no exploration. While true at one level, this is also an erroneous assumption, and all the more so when dealing ancient evidence. An essential prerequisite for the present study, therefore, is a re-visiting of "house" and this is the subject of Part 1. Chapter 1 examines what is meant by "house" today, while Chapter 2 focuses on house terminology in antiquity. Together these chapters provide the foundations for the work to follow. They lead to the concept of house used in this study and to a definition of house material as sources on both housing and households. It is this concept and these sources which are used as (respectively) analytical tool and data for the readings of the early empire and Acts.

CHAPTER 1

WHAT IS MEANT BY "HOUSE" ... TODAY ?

The focus of this first chapter is on "house" today and is presented in four parts: the first examines the English word "house", the second explores the reality of house as both "dwelling" and "household", the third focuses on the relationship between physical (dwelling) houses and households, the fourth gathers the findings and outlines the implications for the subsequent "house" readings of the empire and Acts. By problematising the concept of "house", investigating its meaning(s) and providing insight into its hermeneutical potential, the chapter serves as an expander of consciousness and functions as a valuable preliminary before crossing ancient thresholds.

HOUSE : THE WORD

A lexical definition

A point of departure for understanding "house" is the lexical definition. From the *OED*'s lengthy entry , the extract below is a list of the meanings of the "simple word" [1] or noun "house". [2]

---

[1] Part I deals with "The simple word" or noun in contrast to part 11 which focuses on "Phrases", part 111 (on "Attributes and Combinations") and to other entries concerned with compound words, words with house prefixes and with the verb, "to house".

[2] The emphasis is on the noun. This is the essential first step since many definitions of the verb assume an understanding or prior definition of the noun. See, for example, "to receive or put into a house" or "to erect a house". Along with such circular definitions, meanings of the verb include "to build", "to harbour", "to lodge", "to give shelter, refuge to".

House *sb.*1 [3]

I. The simple word.

1. A building for human habitation; *esp.* a building that is the ordinary dwelling place of a family.

b. The portion of a building, consisting of one or more rooms, occupied by one tenant or family. *Sc.* and *dial.*

c. The living-room in a farmhouse, etc.; that which the family usually occupy, as distinguished from the parlour, bedrooms, etc. *dial.*

2. A building for human occupation, for some purpose other than that of an ordinary dwelling. (Usually with defining prefix : see ALMSHOUSE, BAKEHOUSE...etc., etc.,)

b. a place of worship (considered as the abode of the deity); a temple; a church.

c. a building for the entertainment of travellers or of the public generally; an inn, tavern.

3. A building for the keeping of cattle, birds, plants, goods etc.

4. a. The place of abode of a religious fraternity, a religious house.

b. a college in a university

c. a boarding-house attached to and forming a portion of a public school; the company of boys lodged in such a house.

d. The building in which a legislative or deliberative assembly meets; *transf.* the assembly itself; a quorum of such an assembly.

e. Applied also to the deliberative assemblies of the Convocation of an ecclesiastical province, of the Convocation and Congregation of a University, etc; formerly also to a municipal corporation.

f. a place of business; *transf.* a business establishment, a mercantile firm.

g. A theatre, PLAYHOUSE; *transf.* the audience at attendance at a theatre, or other place of entertainment.

5. The persons living in one dwelling; the inmates of a house collectively: a household, family.

6. A family including ancestors and descendants; a lineage, a race: esp. one having continuity of residence, of exalted rank, or high renown.

7. *transf.* and *fig.* (from 1).

a. *fig.* Dwelling-place; place of abode, rest, deposit, etc.

b. *transf.* The habitation of any animal.

c. A receptacle of any kind.

8. *Astrol.*

a. A twelfth part of the heavens as divided by great circles through the north and south points of the horizon; the whole sky, excluding those parts that never rise and that never

---

[3] In the *OED*, each of the meanings listed below is drawn from or illustrated by a variety of (literary) examples.

set, being thus divided into twelve houses, numbered eastwards, beginning with the *house of the ascendant* and each having some special signification attached to it.

b. A sign of the zodiac considered as the seat of the greatest influence of a particular planet; each of the seven planets, except the sun and moon, having two such houses, a *day house* and a *night house*.

9. Each square of a chess-board.

As is clear from this lexical definition, the term "house" has a wide semantic field. These many meanings, however, are classifiable under two main headings, [4] namely:

i. "House" as abode. The primary meaning of "house" is "a building for human habitation". The term is generally used of a whole edifice, but is also applicable to a part thereof. From this definition of "house" comes its figurative meaning as "place of abode, rest, deposit" and its transferred meaning, "the habitation of any animal". More generally, "house" is used as a general unit of division, containment or organization, a boundary marker or receptacle.

ii. "House" as sociological group. The secondary meaning of "house" is a group of people, most commonly a household or the inhabitants of a dwelling. Other houses in the sociological sense include groups formed by kinship, or lineage. More generally, the term is applied to those associated with or present in a building (such as a theatre, school, parliament).

In conclusion, therefore, the lexical definition illustrates the meaning(s) of house as "abode" and "social unit". Furthermore, it highlights the complexity and flexibility of the English term and points to its many and varied meanings, literal, transferred and figurative. At a more general level, both the universal and the time-and-place-bound nature of "house".

---

[4] Given the many related definitions of "house", their similarity and overlap, a grouping of meanings is neither a denial of polysemy nor the creation of an artificial synthesis. In contrast to some terms, the many meanings are linked semantically and not simply at the level of etymology. On similarity at the latter level only, see J. Barr, *The Semantics of Biblical Language* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1961).

is observable from the lexical definition. The former is noted in the general or generic definitions of "house" as "dwelling" and "household"; the latter is illustrated in the definition of "house" as "a boarding-house attached to and forming a portion of a public school; the company of boys lodged in such a house", [5] a definition which reveals the narrow world of British public schools.

"House" in the thesaurus

The thesaurus material functions as supplement or complement to the lexical definition. In the index of the *Collins Roget's Thesaurus,* [6] for example, the following references are listed under the noun house:

audience
cabin
dwelling
structure
council
race
family
lineage
company
cloister
theatre
market
workplace
casino
attender
astrology

---

5 In the Supplement to the *OED* (published in 1976), the following definition was added: "in day school, a division of the school for purposes of organization and games or other competition".

6 See R. L. Chapman (ed.), *Collins Roget's International Thesaurus* (Glasgow: HarperCollins, 1996).

Further attention to these entries reinforces the fact that "house" is applied to an extensive range of physical and sociological realities. The thesaurus therefore serves to enflesh the lexical definition and to underscore the term's flexibility.

Conclusions: contributions and limitations of a "word" approach

A "word" approach is a necessary and valuable starting point for understanding what a house is. The lexical definition points to the term's wide semantic field and highlights its great versatility. In sum, it introduces one to the concept of "house". A word approach, however, also presents certain limitations. [7] The first of these is the inability to go beyond the level of general or abstract concept. According to the dictionary, for example, a house is a "building for human habitation". This definition tells one little or nothing about the function, varieties and significance of houses. A household is also defined lexically as the "persons living in one dwelling; the inmates of a house collectively: a household, family" but this reveals nothing about the forms, functions and and meaning(s) of such social units. A second limitation of a word approach is the unexplained juxtaposition of meanings. The dictionary explains neither the presence of so many meanings nor if and how they are related. Thus, for example, no insight in provided into any relationship between house as "dwelling" and house as "household". In order to understand "house", therefore, it is necessary to go beyond a lexical definition or word approach It is not simply the word, but the reality of house which must be explored.

---

[7] See Barr's critique of word approaches in his *The Semantics of Biblical Language.* He is particularly criticial of Kittel's *TWNT (TDNT).* A similar critique is expressed in his *Biblical Words for Time* (London: SCM, 1962).

HOUSE : THE REALITY

In this second part, the focus shifts from a study of the word "house" to an exploration of the reality of its two principal meanings, namely "dwelling" and "household". Drawing on human-scientific material, housing and households are shown to be social constructs which functions as valuable hermeneutical keys to society.

Physical house or dwelling

Physical houses or dwellings are key aspects in the study of any society or culture. [8] Long recognized as a topic of importance in anthropology, housing is studied in all the social sciences, in history, architecture and archaeology and has become a focus of cross-disciplinary scholarship. [9] In recent years, it is frequently explored from a feminist

---

[8] Many references cited below are found in D. Spain, *Gendered Spaces* (Chapel Hill and London: The University of Carolina Press, 1992). For a general study of housing, see E. G. Arias, *The Meaning and Use of Housing: International Perspectives* (Aldershot: Avebury, 1993).

[9] Given the relevance of housing to several topics in anthropology, examples from this discipline abound. One important example quoted in this section is P. Bourdieu, "The Berber House" in M. Douglas (ed.), *Rules and Meanings: The Anthropology of Everyday Knowledge* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1973), 98-110. Further examples include: K. G. Isikowitz and P. Sorensen (eds), *The House in East and Southeast Asia* (London: Curzon Press, 1982), P. Oliver, *Dwellings: The House Across the World* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1987), R. Waterson, *The Living House: An Anthropology of Architecture in South-East Asia* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990). See also studies by historians and architectural historians: E. Gauldie, *Cruel Habitations: A History of Working Class Housing, 1700-1918* (London: Unwin University Books, 1974), M. Girouard, *The Victorian Country House* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1979), G. Wright, *Moralism and the Model Home: Domestic Architecture and Cultural Conflict in Chicago, 1873-1913* (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1980), J. Franklin, *The Gentleman's Country House and Its Plan,* 1835-1914 (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1981), C. E. Clark, *The American Family Home*, 1800-1960 (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1986), J. Burnett, *A Social History of Housing*, 1817-1970 (London: Methuen, 1986), M. Barley, *Houses and History* (London: Faber and Faber, 1986). For studies on housing within a wider social debate, see the following: in the area of geography, L. S. Bourne, *The Geography of Housing*, (London: Edward Arnold, 1981); in relation to economics, M. Berry, *Marxist Approaches to the Housing Question* (Birmingham: University of Birmingham, 1979), J. Ermisch, *Housing and the National Economy* (Aldershot: Gower, 1990), R. Forrest and A. Murie, *Housing and Family Wealth* (London: Routledge, 1995); in cross-disciplinary study, S. Kent (ed.), *Domestic Architecture and the Use of Space: An Interdisciplinary Cross-Cultural Study* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990); in the social and political arena, SDP, *Housing: A Choice for All*, Green Paper n. 18 (London: SDP, 1985), J. Blackwell *et al.* (ed.), *Housing: Moving into Crisis?* (Dublin: Combat Poverty Agency, 1990) and the three reports by P. Bacon, submitted to the Minister (of the Irish Republic) for Housing and Urban Renewal (1998-2000).

perspective and in relation to gender issues. [10] There is, therefore, a vast range of house studies, with many different perspectives and concerns. From a perusal of such material come a number of observations which contribute to an understanding of what a physical house is.

Variety

The first observation in relation to housing studies is the infinite variety of dwellings. Houses vary in structure and design, in function and significance, in geographical, social and historical location. While the thesaurus provides a glimpse into variation in dwelling types, housing studies reveal a vast panorama: from the Berber house of Kabylia (Algeria) to the country house of Victorian England, from the dwellings of the Marakwet of Kenya to the high rise apartments of contemporary cities of eastern Europe. Along with variety of housing is the multiplicity of scholarly interpretations of this variety. Housing design is influenced by environmental, material and cultural factors and such factors are assessed differently by different authors. [11] Furthermore, scholarly interpretations of housing range on a continuum from the more physical and material to the more cultural and conceptual.

Both the omnipresence and the variety of dwellings (and the multiplicity of their interpretation) contributes to an understanding of what a house is. On the one hand, a house is universally understood as some form of human habitation. It is a familiar reality, one

---

10 L. McDowell, "City and Home: Urban Housing and Sexual Division of Space" in M. Evans and C. Ungerson (eds), *Sexual Division: Pattern and Processes* (London: Tavistock, 1983), 142-163, H. L. Moore, *Space, Text and Gender: An Anthropological Study of the Marakwet of Kenya* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), D. Spain, *Gendered Spaces*.

11 Factors influencing housing include environmental conditions (like climate, topography), material circumstances (such as available materials, level of technology), economic resources and cultural aspects. For treatment of this topic, see for example, A. Rapoport, *House Form and Culture* (Englewood Cliffs : Prentice-Hall, 1969), R. J. Lawrence, "Domestic space and society: A cross-cultural study", *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 24 (1982), 104-130 and "Transition Spaces and Dwelling Design", *Journal of Architectural and Planning Research* 1 (1984), 261-271 and Kent (ed.), *Domestic Architecture.* See R. R. Wilk ("The built environment and consumer decisions" in Kent [ed.], *op. cit.*, 34-42) on the particular decisions which influence consumers or inhabitants. For a model which integrates ecological and cultural actors in housing design and use (over against one which regards the environment as passive), see D. Sanders "Behavioral conventions and archaeology: methods for the analysis of ancient architecture" in Kent (ed), *op. cit.*, 43-72, especially page 44.

manifest cross-culturally and throughout history. On the other hand, the infinite variety of housing suggests that the notion of house is anything but universal and familiar. Each case is unique and must be studied in relation to its own specific context or world.

World-in-miniature

A second observation is that a house is a world-in-miniature, a microcosm of the world in terms of symbol systems, social relations and practices. An illustration of the house as microcosm of the universe is the Berber dwelling (figs 1.1-3). [12] Bourdieu shows how this structure is organized according to a series of oppositions or contrasts which operate at both a functional and symbolic level. Examples include fire-water; day-night, cooked-raw, male-female, light-shadow, up-down, inside-outside. These are the same oppositions said to govern the universe as a whole, the same oppositions which order the Berber world both spatially and conceptually. [13]

A house functions as a microcosm of society in terms of social relations and practices. Thus, for example, in upper class Victorian country houses, different rooms were provided for different groups of people (figs. 1.4-5). [14] Clearly defined areas existed for servants and family, women and men, parents and children. Such houses revealed the divisions and hierarchies operating in society as a whole. Furthermore, they did not merely

---

12 For details, see Bourdieu, "The Berber House." See fig 1.1: Plan of the house: (Bourdieu, *op. cit.*, fig. 1), fig. 1.2: The double space orientation of the house (Bourdieu, *op. cit.*, fig. 2) and fig. 1.3: In the Berber house, the female side is associated with the dark and nature while the male side is associated with light and culture (from Spain, *Gendered Spaces* [after Oliver]). Another example is the Turkish *yurt,* described by Hillier and Hanson (*The Social Logic of Space,* 180) as "one of those striking cases where the interior of the dwelling is seen as a microcosm of the universe".

13 As well as being a microcosm of the universe, the Berber house is portrayed by Bourdieu as being in opposition or subordination to it. This point will be discussed in the observation on gender.

14 See fig. 1.4: Plan of Bearwood (Spain, *Gendered Spaces*, 116-121 [after Franklin, *The Gentleman's Country House,* 143-145]) and fig. 1.5: Plan of Thorsby Hall, Nottinghamshire (1864-1875): Fig 1.2 in A. Wallace-Hadrill, *Houses and Society in Pompeii and Herculaneum* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994) [after Girouard].

reflect, but actively contributed to the reinforcing of those social relations and practices. [15]

Since a house functions as a world-in-miniature, information about housing is simultaneously information about society. The fact that dwellings are a door onto extra-mural realities also emerges from contemporary debates about housing which take place in the context of a broad, socio-political agenda. [16]

Gender

A third observation is the relationship between gender and house. [17] First, there has been a traditional association of women with the house and of the house with women: the house has commonly been seen in a special way as the place of women. Furthermore, both woman and house are frequently judged the subordinate element in a variety of dichotomies or contrasts. Thus, for example, Bourdieu interprets the Berber house as being simultaneously both a microcosm of the world and a reality in opposition or subordination to it. [18] The house is subordinate to the wider world in the same way as east is to west, nature is to culture and woman is to man. The house-universe pair becomes yet another opposition, alongside all other intra-house ones. This is but one example of the common association of house-woman- as inferior in contrast to world-man-as superior. [19] Further evidence of the association of woman and house appears in discussions about

---

15 This point is developed in a later section dealing with the relationship between the built environment and its users.

16 See examples at the end of page 61 n. 9.

17 The gender / house question merits attention. It is, however, also open to distortion since it results in an overemphasis on one aspect of social relations. In reality, there is generally a complex interplay of several factors like gender, race, class.

18 The house-universe pair becomes yet another opposition, alongside the ones mentioned above. All oppositions are expressed by the formula a:b ; b1: b2 (where a = wider world, b = house, b1/b2 = any opposition within the house [e.g. fire/water] and b2 = the "lower" part of the equation.

19 What is significant is that the association is made. The concern is neither to question Bourdieu's analysis nor to re-examine Berber houses from a different perspective.

private and public realms. [20] The contrast between house-woman-domestic-inferior and world-public-man-superior is age-old but in recent years, this dichotomy has become the subject of scholarly critique. The relevant point here is the fact that woman-and-house have been associated in a way that man-and-house have never been.

The second point is that houses (their layout and the meaning given to it) contribute to the construction and maintenance of gender relations. The question of gender relations in the house is of particular interest to feminist scholars. Areas of investigation include, for example, the links between sexual segregation in housing and low status of women, the relationship between changes in domestic planning and changes in social relationships and finally, the consideration of gender and race in a domestic context. [21]

---

20 The notion of public / private has been a key dichotomy or contrast in Western political thought, in the definition of women and in feminist theory. There is extensive documentation of the history and critique of the topic. For insight into the debate, see the Social Science Citation Index for responses to M. Z. Rosaldo and L. Lamphere (eds), *Woman, Culture and Society* (Stanford, California: University of Stanford Press, 1974), for example, C. Pateman, "Feminist Critiques of the Public / Private Dichotomy" in S. I. Benn and G. F. Gaus (eds), Public and Private in Social Life (London: Croom Helm), 281-303.

Arguments are made for the value of the terms, for their rearticulation and for their abandonment. J. B. Elshtain, in *Public Man, Private Woman: Women in Social and Political Thought* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1981) uses the terms "public" and "private" "as a conceptual prism through which to see the story of women and politics from Plato to the present". She criticizes feminists for trying to collapse private/public identities, thus running the risk of fascism. A different approach is illustrated by L. J. Nicholson, "Feminist Theory: The Private and the Public" in L. McDowell and R. Pringle (eds), *Defining Women: Social Institutions and Gender Divisions* (Cambridge: Polity, 1992), 36-43. She argues, not for the abandoning, but for the rearticulation of the public / private division.

For a summary of the concept and of the anthropological critique (on both theoretical and empirical grounds), see 4-6 of M. Sawicki, "Making the Best of Jesus", paper delivered at the *SBL* Conference 1992, 1-37 and 15-17 and the Introduction in McDowell and Pringle (eds), *Defining Women.* For a discussion of the nineteenth century British middle class view that "the woman's place is in the home", see D. Gittins, *The Family in Question: Changing Households and Familiar Ideologies* (London: Macmillan, 1985), 20-32.

21 See, for example, S. Ardener, *Women and Space: Ground Rules and Social Maps*, 2nd rev. edn (Oxford / Providence: Berg, 1993) and Moore, *Space, Text and Gender.* For links between sexual segregation in housing and low status of women, see Spain, *Gendered Spaces.* For the link between changing housing design and changing social relations, see for example, D. Haydn, *The Grand Domestic Revolution* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1980), C. Rock, S. Torre and G. Wright, "The Appropriation of the House: Changes in House Design and Concepts of Domesticity" in G. Wekerle, R. Paterson, D. Morley (eds), *New Space for Women* (Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 1980), 83-99. For a consideration of both gender and race in a domestic context, see E. Fox-Genovese, *Within the Plantation Household: Black and White Women of the Old South* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1988).

Ideology

A fourth observation is that houses often function as part of a larger ideological project. [22]

Housing is frequently an important feature in colonial regimes. In Latin America and India, for example, colonisers built as- if-at-home, a fact which represents cultural conquest as much as nostalgia or unfamiliarity with local practices. Such houses, therefore, function as advertisements, symbols and reminders of foreign presence and control. [23]

Housing has long functioned in the construction of an ideal: an ideal time (be it past, present or future) or ideal social relations. The country house of Victorian times, for example, has been seen as a nostalgic attempt to recapture an agrarian past. While in reality, upper-class wealth derived from industry, the (false) image projected in the country estate was that it was land-based. Furthermore, as illustrated above, such houses represented and reproduced, in an ideal or perfect way, the hierarchies and divisions in society as a whole. [24]

Studies have also highlighted the link between the promotion of model (or ideal) homes and model (or ideal) social units. In her study, *Moralism and the Model Home*, Wright notes that the "associations a culture establishes at any particular time between a model or typical house and a notion of the model family do encourage certain roles and assumptions". [25]

Houses, therefore, are both ideological as well as physical and utilitarian structures. They can function as part of a wider plan to promote (or reject) cultural values and social

---

22 As defined by the Concise *OED*, ideology is a "manner of thinking characteristic of a class or individual, ideas at the basis of some economic or political theory".

23 On the topic of colonial architecture, see for example, J. Morris *et al.*, *Architecture of the British Empire* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1986), V. Fraser, *The Architecture of Conquest: Building in the Vice-royalty of Peru, 1535-1635* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), N. AlSayyad, *Forms of Dominance on the Architecture and Urbanism of the Colonial Enterprise* (Aldershot: Avebury, 1992).

24 See Spain, *Gendered Spaces*, 112. For details of these houses, see works by Franklin and Girouard, cited on page 61 n. 9.

25 Wright, *Moralism and the Model Home,* 1.

forms.

Home

A fifth and final observation is the association of housing with the notion of home. [26] While the sense of home is not linked exclusively to a physical house, [27] it very frequently is. On the one hand, there is increasing use of "home" as a virtual synonym for "dwelling". In the US, the terms have often been used interchangeably. In Britain and Ireland, too, estate agents speak of "home owners" and newspapers report incidents of violence "in the home". On the other hand, house and home are clearly differentiated, a fact encapsulated in the phrase "to make a house a home". A home is made from (or in) a house but consists of "something more." [28] In this house / home contrast, house represents anonymous, physical space while home carries connotations of personal space and of the psychological sense of belonging and security.

A romanticized expression of the link between a house and a sense of at-homeness is conveyed by the Irish poet, Pádraic Colum in *An Old Woman of the Roads* : [29]

---

26 For treatment of the idea of "home", see D. N. Benjamin, *The Home: Words, Interpretations, Meanings and Environments* (Aldershot: Avebury, 1995). In the Introduction, Benjamin notes that "[p]opular identification of the home with the house is only one small part of the story." Identification of housing and home is, however, common.

27 The sense of home may be linked with a broad geographical location (area, country..). It may also be a psychological sense, as the saying "home is where the heart is" illustrates.

28 Although the idea of home as "a house-with-something-more" is critiqued by A. Rapoport ("A Critical Look at the Concept 'Home' ") in Benjamin (*The Home*, 25-52), popular use of the idea is considered of relevance here.

29 S. Sternlicht (ed.), *Selected Poems of Pádraic Colum* (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1989).

O, to have a little house!
To own the hearth and stool and all!
The heaped up sods upon the fire
The pile of turf again' the wall!

To have a clock with weights and chains,
And pendulum swinging up and down!
A dresser filled with shining delf
Speckled and white and blue and brown!

I could be busy all the day
Clearing and sweeping hearth and floor,
And fixing on their shelf again
My white and blue and speckled store!

I could be quiet there at night
Beside the fire and by myself,
Sure of a bed, and loth to leave
The ticking clock and shining delf!

A further insight into the significance of the house / home association is provided by the notion of homelessness. [30] According to a recent sociological definition: [31]

> "Homelessness refers to a marginalized condition of detachment from society and to the lack of bonds that connect settled persons to a network of institutions and social orders. The presence or absence of homelessness in a world without physical and technological shortages reveals the varying degrees to which societies have eradicated exploitation and oppression and /or have established social justice and liberty."

---

30 A similar approach to the notion of home is also mentioned by Benjamin, *The Home*, 294.

31 Definition in the *IES* (1995).

The assumption is that being housed is intrinsic to a sense of home or conversely, that a sense of home comes from being housed. As studies of homelessness reveal, [32] people's sense of belonging and their actual participation in (Western) society are profoundly linked to being housed. Focus on homelessness and lack of housing, therefore, provides as much insight into a society as does consideration of housing.

In sum...

The meaning of "house" as "dwelling" is contained in both lexicon and thesaurus. While these latter convey but a broad outline, housing studies provide detail, colour and shading. It so doing, it contributes to the task of this chapter, namely that of understanding what a house is.

Across cultures and through time, housing, in its widest sense, appears as a constant. Constant too is its variety since housing has many forms, functions and meanings. Its functions are practical, social, symbolic and ideological. A physical house or dwelling is, therefore, a valuable window onto society or a social unit, a structure which both reveals and creates a society's social relations, organization, values and beliefs.

---

[32] See G. Barak, *Gimme Shelter: A Social History of Homelessness in Contemporary America* (New York: Praeger, 1991), S. Golden, *The Women Outside: Meanings and Myths of Homelessness* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992) and P. Kennett and A Marsh (eds), *Homelessness: Exploring the New Terrain* (Bristol: Policy, 1999). Examples relating to the Irish context include J. Blackwell and S. Kennedy (eds), *Focus on Homelessness: A New Look at Housing Policy* (Dublin: Columba Press, 1988), E. O'Sullivan, *Homelessness and Social Policy in the Republic of Ireland* (TCD: Department of Social Studies, 1996) and *Homelessness, Housing Need and Asylum Seekers in Ireland: A Report for the Homeless Initiative* (Dublin: Homelessness Initiative, 1997).

Household

The focus now turns from physical houses to households. As indicated above, the term "house" may refer to the household, that is, the social unit (however defined) inhabiting a dwelling. From ancient to contemporary times, the household, in its various forms, has been a concern of philosophers, historians, anthropologists, sociologists, economists, politicians and feminists in various disciplines. The purpose of this section is to explore what modern studies reveal about the household as social construct and key to society. [33]

An amorphous concept

A first observation is that "household" is an amorphous concept, a fact well illustrated in its definition in a dictionary of sociology: [34]

> household. a group of persons sharing a home or living space, who aggregate and share their incomes, as evidenced by the fact that they regularly take meals together - the "common cooking-pot" definition. Most households consist of one person living alone, a nuclear family, an extended family, or a group of unrelated people. The definition is sometimes so varied so as to exclude, or include, households of non-related people who may set very variable limits, in practice, to the extent of their income-sharing or common expenditure

According to this definition, a household is very literally "what a physical house holds in terms of people". It may be composed of one person or several, of kin or non-kin inhabitants who may or may not share resources. A similar understanding is found in

---

33 Given the vast range of material, the following function as launching pads: R. Netting *et al.* (eds), "Introduction" in *Households: Comparative and Historical Studies of the Domestic Group* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984), xiii-xxxviii, R. Wilk and R. Netting, "Households: Changing Forms and Functions" in *op. cit.* , 1-28, H. L. Moore, "The Problem of the Household" in *Feminism and Anthropology* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1988), 54-67, F. Harriet, S.A. Resnick, R. D. Wolff, *Bringing It All Back Home: Class, Gender, Power in the Modern Household* (London: Pluto, 1994), N. Jorgensen, *Investigating Families and Households* (London: Collins Educational, 1995) and G. A. Allan (ed.), *The Sociology of the Family: A Reader* (Malden: Blackwell, 1999).

34 *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Sociology* (1994).

Laslett and Wall who apply "houseful" [35] to the same social unit.

variety and change

The closely related second observation is that there is a great variety of household forms. Households are formed by many types of social unit: by individuals, families [36] (in all their diversity) and a whole range of other co-dwelling persons (fig. 1.6). [37] Differences among households occur from culture to culture and region to region. [38] Household variation may exist in the same place among people of the same culture; [39] it may

---

35 This "neutral or suspensive term" is used by P. Laslett and R. Wall (eds), *Household and Family in Past Time* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972), 36. The term "household" often becomes identified with one particular type of social unit, to the exclusion of all others. In order to emphasize the basic sense of household, unattached to any one form, Laslett uses the term "houseful" to mean "all persons inhabiting the same set of premises." Thus houseful has a similar meaning to household as defined in census forms.

36 The terms "household" and "family" are often used interchangeably. While the terms may overlap, they are not synonymous. For an example of the non-overlap of family and household, see the evidence from the Nayars (Kerala, India) in K. Gough, "The Nayars and the definition of marriage", *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 89 (1959), 23-34.

The family itself is complex reality which is the subject of constant re-examination. As illustrative of studies on the modern family, see A. Wilson, *Family* (London: Tavistock, 1985), D. Gittins, *The Family in Question : Changing Households and Familiar Ideologies* (London: Macmillan, 1985), B. Thorne with M. Yalom (eds), *Rethinking the Family: Some Feminist Questions*, Revised edition (Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1992). For a historical study, see M. Segalen, *Historical Anthropology of the Family* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986). A family (in whatever way defined) may be a household yet a sense of family may extend beyond the household. The interest here is in household, the defining characteristic of which is co-residence rather than relationship by kin, obligation or law. Because of the family / household overlap, however, family studies are used to provide information on households.

37 See fig. 1.6: The contemporary family, encapsulated in illustration, from *The Guardian*, 25/20/2998. On household variety, see also R. N. Rapoport, M. Fogarty and R. Rapoport (eds), *Families in Britain* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1982), E. D. Macklin and R. H. Rubin (eds), *Contemporary Families and Alternative Lifestyles: Handbook on Research and Theory* (Beverly Hills, London, New Delhi: Sage, 1983).

38 For geographical variation in household, see J. L. Flandrin, *Families in Former Times* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979).

39 In a studies of West Indian families in Britain (published in the early eighties) for example, three household types were found to co-exist - the nuclear family, common-law household and mother-centred family. For details see G. Driver, "West Indian Families: An Anthropological Perspective" and J. Barrow, "West Indian Families: An Insider's Perspective" in Rapoport *et al.* (eds), *Families in Britain*, 205-219 and 220-232 respectively. On fluidity of domestic

occur because of class difference, material circumstances or personal choice. Furthermore there may be as many perspectives on, as members of, the same household. [40] Finally, whatever the form, households are not static but change over time. [41]

household and society

A third observation is that household and society are related. The relationship, however, may be envisaged in different ways. Most commonly, the two are seen as closely associated. In the work of anthropologists, households are generally described as the units which people identity as most significant or basic to their society. [42] These households provide stability in society [43] and fulfil a variety of functions (social, psychological, economic, political, moral and religious). They are an integral part of society, given that household forms and relations are profoundly related to and influenced by social, political and economic life of the wider world of which they form a part. [44]

The household / society relationship may also be described in terms of a dichotomy

---

arrangements in a black American urban community (as studied in the seventies), see C. Stack, *All Our Kin: Strategies for Survival in a Black Community* (New York: Harper and Row, 1974).

40 A head of household, child or resident employee may each have a different perspective on the same household.

41 On variation in household and family composition through time, see M. Anderson, *Approaches to the History of the Western Family, 1500-1914* (London: Macmillan, 1980), J. Donzelot, *Policing the Family* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1980). On variations in a household over the life cycle, see C. Turner, *The Family and Kinship in Modern Britain* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1969), J. Goody (ed.), *The Developmental Cycle in Domestic Groups* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971), L. K. Berkner, "The Stem Family and the Development Cycle of the Peasant Household: An 18th Century Austrian Example" in *American Historical Review*, vol. 77, no. 2 (1972), 398-418, T. Hareven, *Family Time and Industrial Time* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1982).

42 Moore, *Feminism and Anthropology*, 54.

43 Such an approach to the household is typical of structural functionalists.

44 See Harris ("Households as natural units") for the importance of extra-household relations. This is further illustrated by the fact that the household is a topic of debate in many domains. See J. Smith *et al.*, *Creating and Transforming Households: The Constraints of the World Economy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), D. Preston, *Households and the Analysis of their Livelihood Strategies* (Leeds: University of Leeds, 1992), S. Jackson and S. Moores (eds), *The Politics of Domestic Consumption* (London: Prentice Hall, 1995).

or tension. Instead of being a society-in-miniature, a cell or organ of society, a household is capable of standing apart. A so-called alternative household, for example, defines itself in opposition to the wider society and to its values and practices. Households are also seen to be different from society in general when the focus is on intra-household relationships, roles and organization or on household as private or personal realm. [45] A household, therefore, is both a part of and apart from society in general.

Household and ideology

A fourth observation relates to household and ideology .[46] Views about the household (and its relations, organization, functions) are often but one aspect of a wider ideological or belief system. Bases for such belief system are many, including politics, economics, psychology, religion and feminism. [47] At any one time or place, one household form may be dominant. Examples include the traditional patriarchal family or the above-mentioned upper-class Victorian country household. [48] Such forms dominate not because they are natural or numerous, but because they are portrayed, promoted and perceived as model, ideal or norm. There is, therefore, a correspondence between dominant household forms and ruling ideologies. [49]

---

45 Illustrative of an intra-household focus are interactionist approaches to the family, as mentioned by Wilson, *Family*, 31. See the afore-mentioned material on public/private debates.

46 To argue for the influence of ideology is not to deny material circumstances as a determining factor in household variation. For a more comprehensive approach, see C. Hall, "The early formation of Victorian domestic ideology" in S. Burman (ed.), *Fit Work for Women* (London: Croom Helm, 1979), 15-32. Hall argues that definitions of the home, motherhood... are not fixed but change in response to social, economic, legal and ideological circumstances.

47 An example of a religiously inspired household was the Oneida community, described by Wilson, *Family*, 16-18. A nineteenth century Christian group, founded by Noyes, it strove for spiritual, economic and sexual equality.

48 In addition to previously cited works by Franklin, Girouard, Spain and Hall, see N. Smelser, "The Victorian Family" in Rapoport *et al.* (eds), *Families in Britain,* 59-74.

49 Critiques of traditional family/household forms in Marxism, feminism and radical psychology take account of ideology. For a Marxist critique, see F. Engels, *The Origins of the Family, Private Propety and the State* (London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1884) and L. Althusser, *Lenin and Philisophy and Other Essays* (London: New Left Books, 1971). Marxists consider the family as part of the "ideological state apparatus", an instrument of bourgeois social control and an obstacle to the revolution. For a feminist approach, see M. Barrett and M. McIntosh, *The*

The description of households as alternative points as much to the presence in society of an accepted norm as to the co-existence of a plurality of forms. [50] Alternative structures may indeed co-exist alongside a dominant household type. They may also create tension if they become numerous and influential, thus resulting in the dominant household form (and its underlying ideology) being threatened, weakened or seen to be in crisis. [51]

In sum....

"House" in the sense of "household" is an amorphous and complex reality. Realities expressed in the related terms such as "family" or "living together" are equally so. On the one hand, household is a general concept, embracing a wide variety of in-house social units. On the other hand, it has specific meanings in particular times and places. A household is commonly the basic unit of society which it reflects and reproduces in terms of social relations, structures and beliefs; it is also a social structure capable of standing in opposition to the wider society and its values.

Anti-Social Family (London: Verso / NLB, 1982), S. Moller Okin, *Justice, Gender and the Family* (New York: Basic Books, 1989), L. Morris, *The Workings of the Household: A US - UK Comparison* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1990), Thorne with Yalom, *Rethinking the Family.* Words of radical psychology (now almost thirty years ago) include R. D. Laing, *Politics and the Family* (London: Macmillan, 1971) and D. Cooper, *The Death of the Family* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1971).

50 On alternative households, see A. Rigby, *Alternative Realities* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1974), A. McCulloch, "Alternative Households" in Rapoport *et al.* (eds), *Families in Britain.*

51 The "family in crisis" theme is an old one, expressed by ancients and moderns alike. Social problems, real or imagined, are linked with a decline in family life. See the concern among (Right-wing, conservative, western) politicians with "family values" especially in debates on crime and economics.

PHYSICAL HOUSE and HOUSEHOLD : THE RELATIONSHIP

Two important points have emerged from the exploration thus far. The first is that house means "dwelling and / or household". The second is that dwelling and household are two very different realities. The question which then arises is what relationship, if any, exists between the two. [52] In one sense, everyone knows that a relationship exists. Furthermore, defining it seems unproblematic. Simply put, a physical house (or dwelling) is defined by the fact that people live in it and a household is a group of people who live in a house. The relationship is one of in-dwelling: in other words, a physical house is lived in and a household lives. This common-sense definition, however, reveals a difficulty of the chicken and egg variety. Is housing meant to accommodate an already defined household, family or social unit? Or is a group defined as a household by virtue of its cohabitation in a particular dwelling? In short, is housing constructed by (or for) a household or is a household constructed by a house? At the heart of the relationship, therefore, is an essential circularity. As a further step in understanding what a house is, the task of this section is to articulate the physical house / household relationship.

A two-way relationship

Two-way relationship between built environment and users

A significant contribution to the physical house / household topic is found in scholarship which argues for a two-way relationship between the built environment and its users. On the one hand, housing design has power to influence people. The nature of this influence is, however, a subject of debate: some insisting on the controlling power of

---

52 This topic is addressed in Laslett and Wall, *Household and Family in Past Time*, 35-38. A. Wallace-Hadrill draws on this work in "Houses and Households: Sampling Pompeii and Herculaneum" in B. Rawson (ed.), *Marriage, Divorce and Children in Ancient Rome* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), 191-227. A slightly reworked version of this text appears as chapter 5, "Houses and Households" in Wallace-Hadrill, *Houses and Society*. At the basis of the chapter lies the distinction between (dwelling) houses and households. Further reference to the work will be made in chapters dealing with the ancient world.

architecture, [53] others arguing that space functions more as a mnemonic, reminding people of behaviour or relationships appropriate in a given area. [54] Whether by control or suggestion, however, what is agreed is that physical house users may be affected by the design of the premises. On the other hand, users have power to influence. People are no mere passive recipients of spatial "suggestions". Apart from constructing domestic space by planning and building physical houses, users are engaged in the ongoing construction of their meaning(s). Meanings are not fixed or inherent in the organisation of domestic space but must be invoked through the activities of social actors. [55]

In sum, the built environment influences its users and users influence (or give meaning to) the built environment. By highlighting the controlling power of just one of these elements, one may argue for a one-way relationship between built environment and user. The evidence suggests, however, a more dynamic two-way process in which both place and people are influential.

---

53 An example is "A structuring structure: the Swahili house" by L. W. Donley-Reid in Kent (ed.), *Domestic Architecturee,* 114-126. Donley-Reid argues that architecture plays an active role in forming social hierarchies and power structures. The extent of the controlling power of architecture is, however, a much-debated topic. The view in Kent (*op. cit.*, 2) is that "the use of space influences architecture more strongly and consistently than the other way around." A similar point is noted by R. Gutman, "The Social Function of the Built Environment" in A. Rapoport (ed.), *The Mutual Interaction of People and Their Built Environment: A Cross-Cultural Perspective* (The Hague: Mouton, 1976), 37-49. He states that architects "mention the numerous ways in which a user fails to carry out the intentions the architect thought he had incorporated into the design of the building, Architects themselves live in a curiously divided world. They adamantly assert that buildings are major determinants of the flow of human culture yet they constantly complain that the inhabitants of buildings are 'unsympathetic users'."

54 Kent (*Domestic Architecture*, 2), drawing on the work of A. Rapoport (*The Meaning of the Built Environment: A Non-Verbal Communication Approach* [Beverley Hills: Sage, 1982]) notes that architecture can suggest new behaviour as well as being a mnemonic, reminding users of certain forms of behaviour. The fact that "the built environment is neutral, inhibiting or facilitating but not determining" is stressed by Rapoport in Kent (*op. cit.*, Ch. 2) and in "Socio-cultural aspects of man-environment studies" in Rapoport (ed.), *Mutual Interaction,* 7-35, especially 9.

55 This is the central thesis in Moore (*Space, Text and Gender,* Ch. 5) and key to her analysis of household space among the Marakwet of Kenya. She draws on the work of Bourdieu, in particular his analysis of Kabyle cosmology and space in "The Berber House" and *Outline of a Theory of Practice* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977). His main point, notes Moore, is that space comes to have meaning through practice. He thereby challenges the notion that there is an inherent or fixed meaning in a spatial order, regardless of the activities of social actors and the economic and social conditions which inform these activities.

Social / spatial theory

Further insight into the two-way relationship between the built environment and its users is found by drawing on social-spatial theory. [56] From this vast field of study, what is of relevance is the general concept of the inseparability of social and spatial relations [57] and this concept is illustrated in *Space, Place and Gender,* a work by the contemporary geographer Doreen Massey. [58] The concept has two constituent elements. The first (a

---

56 Social / spatial relationships are explored in different ways in different disciplines. Originally a concern of (radical) geography (and of Marxist geographers), it is now a topic studied in a wide range of human sciences. Given the vastness and complexity of the topic, the studies listed below are simply illustrative of material available. Works cited earlier in this chapter and of relevance to this topic include: Ardener (ed.), *Women and Space*, Bourdieu, "The Berber House", *Outline of a Theory of Practice* , Hillier and Hanson, *The Social Logic of Space,* Kent (ed.), *Domestic Architecture,* Moore, *Space, Text and Gender.* Other studies of note include H. Lefebvre, *The Production of Space* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1991; 1st edition, 1974), M. Foucault, *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings*, 1972-1977, ed. and trans. by C. Gordon (Brighton: Harvester, 1980), M. de Certeau, *The Practice of Everyday Life* (Berkeley: University of California, 1988); H. Liggett and D. C. Perry (eds), *Spatial Practices: Explorations in Social / Spatial Theory* (Thousand Oaks, London, New Delhi: Sage, 1995). In geography, see M. Keith and S. Pile (eds), *Place and the Politics of Identity* (London; Routledge, 1993), D. Massey, *Space, Place and Gender* (Cambridge: Polity, 1994); in anthropology, see C. Lévi-Strauss, *Structural Anthropology* (New York: Basic Books, 1963), in sociology, see A. Giddens, *Central Problems in Social Theory* (London: Macmillan, 1979), *A Contemporary Critique of Historical Materialism*, vol. 1, "Power, property and state" (London and Basingstoke: Macmillan , 1981); in archaeology, D. L. Clarke, *Spatial Archaeology* (London: Academic Press, 1977), I. Hodder, *The Spatial Organization of Culture* (London: Duckworth, 1978).

57 The concept of the inseparability of social and spatial relations is a broad, general concept, a commonplace or axiom in many disciplines. While inseparability is conceptualized in many different ways, the point highlighted here is the *fact* (not the *nature*) of social / spatial inseparability. However, in contrast to views of the spatial as either reflection or distortion of the social order, Moore's concept of it as a "produced representation" of that order is preferred. Following Bourdieu (and others), Moore (in *Space, Text and Gender*) discusses the relationship between systems of signification and socio-economic conditions in terms of a theory of production. She argues that the idea of spatial organization as mirror or distortion does not help us to understand either the working of ideological formations. Neither does it help explain why some representations appear as closer or more accurate "reflections" of the historical conditions which generate them than others. Using the idea of "produced representation", she examines not only how and why representation works, but she discusses the relationship between ideology and changing socio-economic circumstances.

58 Massey's *Space, Place and Gender* is a collection of articles grouped around three themes: Space and social relations, Place and identity, Space, place and gender. The themes are developed through analysis of issues of geographical diversity (especially in terms of economic and social structure) in the United Kingdom over the past thirty years. Particular stress is laid on the importance of class and the construction of gender relations. The book provides insight into debate-in-progress and presents a variety of opinions on the topics.

slogan of the seventies) is that "space is a social construct", that is, space is constituted by "stretched-out" social relations. [59] This view was soon regarded as insufficient because of its depiction of space as a static map of social relations, which required the interpretation of social analysts. The spatial was completely downplayed as a passive end-product or by-product of social relations. To counterbalance this one-sided view, therefore, came the second element (the slogan of the eighties), namely that "the social is spatially constructed." Spatial organization was seen as essential to the production of the social and not merely to its result. This view highlighted the dynamism, power [60] and "causal effecticity" [61] of space.

In the light of Massey's outline of the inseparability of social and spatial relations, dwelling houses must be understood in terms of the social relations which constitute them and not in spatial terms alone. The corollary of this is that social relations, including those in a household, cannot be analysed without reference to their spatial dimension. In sum, physical houses provide a map of the inhabitants' social relations, a map of their life and times. Likewise social groups or households live within spatial boundaries, a fact which affects their relations and activities. There is, therefore, a correspondence or symbiotic relationship between physical houses and households.

Possible distortions of the physical house / household relationship

In addressing the relationship between buildings and users, possible distortions occur in two major areas. The first is in the interpretation of housing evidence and the second is in the (mis)understanding of the relationship between dwelling form and social form.

---

59 As Massey's discussion of "space-time" reveals, it is important to note that social relations are also stretched out over time.

60 Massey argues for the dynamism of space and supports her view from radical geography, gender debate and physics. In other words, space is not viewed as stasis, flat surface, dehistoricized and depoliticized reality, views which Massey notes in the work of E. Laclau, *New Reflections on the Revolution of our Time* (London: Verso, 1990) and F. Jameson, *Postmodernism or the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism* (London: Verso, 1991). For details, see Massey, *Space, Place and Gender*, 249ff.

61 Massey, *Space, Place and Gender*, 255.

Interpretation of housing evidence

With regard to the interpretation of housing evidence, possible distortions or limitations include the following: First, while a physical house may be a useful map of social relations, this is a static and partial picture. Such a map conceals the dynamic nature of the spatial, its power to influence. Furthermore, it provides no insight into the changing nature of social relations. Secondly, both buildings and architectural plans have, of their nature, a fixed quality. This may create an illusory sense of permanence and stability. In reality, the physical state, function and / or meaning of a building does change over time. Thirdly, focus on the house in architectural plans or in stone can overshadow the human users and give the illusion that they are irrelevant. Fourthly, multiple interpretations may occur since the same physical space is open to different readings. [62] Alertness to the possibility of several and / or conflicting interpretations is, therefore, advisable. In sum, caution is required when interpreting housing evidence.

Relationship between dwelling form and social form

The second area of possible distortion is the (mis)interpretation of the relationship between dwelling form and social form. As illustrated above, there is a correspondence between the upper-class Victorian household and dwelling house. It is, however, incorrect to assume a simple, one-to-one relationship between dwelling form and social form. On the one hand, social relations or forms cannot be deduced automatically from housing form alone. The same physical space may be used by a variety of social groups. Insight into these groups must come from evidence other than housing design or remains. On the other hand, the same type of household or social group may occupy different forms of housing. The physical house / household relationship, therefore, may be one of multiple or complex

---

62 See Moore, *Space, Text and Gender*, Ch. 5. Moore develops an "interpretative approach" to the study of space based on an analogy with textual exegesis. In particular she draws on Ricoeur's concept of "distanciation" and Eagleton's work on the ideological production of literary texts. The concern is with meaning-creation. Moore states her interest in how spatial order comes to have meaning, why alternative meanings exist, how it is that some interpretations may be thought more appropriate than others. The ability to define an interpretation as appropriate (or not), she argues, is both a function and a dimension of political power.

correspondence.

Further aspects of the physical house / household relationship : the idea of home

A further aspect of the physical house / household relationship is its connection to the idea of home. [63] Studies reveal that this concept of home is complex and ambiguous: it is both concrete and abstract, literal and symbolic. It is also found to vary from culture to culture. [64] Home is a physical place, commonly (but by no means always) synonymous with one's dwelling house. Furthermore, it embraces relationships within this given place. The concept has important affective connotations which often include feelings of affection, security and belonging. The term also operates at abstract and symbolic levels. While the notion of home may be associated with many different places, social groups, feelings and ideas, it is most often grounded in a particular dwelling and its inhabiting social group or household. [65]

This dwelling / household / house / home association fall within the wider context of debates about identity and place. In this much-disputed area, two main trends are discernible. One approach seeks to define identity and place as bounded, fixed, closed, another sees them as open, flexible and changing. [66] As noted above, dwellings and households are in a process of constant change. The notion of home, however, is often

---

63 The concept was discussed briefly above in relation to housing. For treatment of many aspects of the idea of "home", see the collection of articles and bibliography in Benjamin (ed.), *Home*.

64 In the Afterword of Benjamin (*Home*, 299), the home is defined as "that spatially localized, temporally defined, significant, and autonomous physical frame and conceptual system for the ordering, transformation, and interpretation of the physical and abstract aspects of domestic daily life at several simultaneous spatio-temporal scales, normally activated by the connection to a person or community, such as a nuclear family. It is thus the autonomous interpretation of domestic life, and that which is interpreted."

65 A sense of home may have nothing to do with physical houses or households. For those subject to domestic violence, for example, physical house / household becomes the place of danger. The horror of such situations, however, is precisely because the ideal of home as a place of safety is so strong.

66 There are many views on the topic of identity and place. It is discussed in geography, politics, psychology. It is particularly relevant in relation to nationalism. See, for example, its treatment in Massey (*Space, Place and Gender*) and Keith and Pile (*Place and the Politics of Identity).* In Part II, Place and Identity, Massey critiques the bounded approach to place, seeing the notion as open, porous, dynamic.

rooted in ideas which are fixed: in the idea of a solid dwelling place and of an ideal(ized) household or family. While the notion of home generally outlives the physical house or actual household in which it was formed, the perceived or illusory link between dwelling, household and home may long persist.

In sum .....

While the term "house" refers to two different realities, namely dwelling (or physical house) and occupants (or household), there is usually a two-way relationship between them. This relationship has to be problematised and explored in each particular case, drawing on both housing and household information. One important aspect of housing / household is the link with the concept of home.

HOUSE: FINDINGS and IMPLICATIONS

In this final section, the findings of the exploration are gathered and implications are drawn for the study as a whole.

House: the word

The exploration of "house" began with a consideration of the English word itself. This investigation revealed that "house" had many meanings, literal, figurative and transferred. Most, however, were shown to stem from what were considered the primary and secondary meanings of the term, namely "dwelling" and "household". Focus on the word was valuable in that it served as an introduction to the concept of "house". The initial focus on terminology will be mirrored in the study of "house" in the ancient world. There however, the study of words and meanings will be a more complex and lengthy affair. It will lead, however, to a fuller understanding of the concept of "house", a concept which will be adopted as an analytical tool.

House - the reality

In pursuit of a fuller understanding of "house", the exploration moved beyond the word study to a focus on the realities to which the term referred. While aware of the wide semantic field of "house", the chapter focused on the reality of its two principal meanings, namely "dwelling" and "household". Dwellings and households were shown to have world-reflecting-and-creating power and so were judged capable of functioning as hermeneutical keys to (any) society.

The nature of physical houses and households as realities both universal and specific was noted. Given the fact that they are universal and familiar in the sense of being present in all cultures and ages, the task of looking at house in antiquity appears far from daunting, at least initially. It is, however, precisely because most people do live in dwellings and

households that it is all too easy to make naturalistic, [67] ethnocentric and universalistic assumptions, to import into antiquity the unexamined experience of other times and places. [68] Throughout the study, therefore, care in this area in particular will be required. As well as being universal realities, physical houses and households were shown to be local, individual or particular: varying in form, function and meaning as well as reflecting and being shaped by a vast number of (social, cultural, material, personal...) factors. As outlined above, insight into a particular world is gained only through attention to the specific factors and details involved in each case. In relation to the study of antiquity, therefore, it will be by attending to specifics that doors will be opened. More concretely, issues raised in this chapter relating to house(s) and variety, ideology, gender and society will serve as eye-openers for the readings of the early empire and Acts.

---

67 On naturalistic assumptions, see O. Harris "Households as natural units" in K. Young *et al.* (eds), *Of Marriage and the Market* (London: CSE Books, 1981), 49-68. Harris demonstrates that such assumptions operate in M. Sahlins's *Stone Age Economics* (London: Tavistock, 1974). Sahlins contrasts intra-household sharing with inter-household relations of "exchange" and "balanced exchange". The critique of Harris (discussed in Moore, *Feminism and Anthropology,* 55-56) is that Sahlins assumes household sharing to be natural and universal whereas, in fact, it is not. There is ample evidence of households where resources are not pooled. For an example of a society where spouses do not share resources within the household, see P. Caplan, "Cognatic descent, Islamic law and women's property on the East Africa coast"in R. Hirschon (ed.), *Women and Property, Women as Property* (London: Croom Helm, 1984), 23-43.The point is worth noting given the use of Sahlins' work by contemporary New Testament scholars like Moxnes and Elliott. Notions of "reciprocity" and "exchange" are central to the former's work on Luke and the latter's article on "Temple versus Household in Luke-Acts".

68 On importing assumptions into house reconstruction, see the discussion in M. Sawicki in ("Caste and Contact in the Galilee of Jesus: Research Beyond Positivism and Constructivism", draft of 25/8/1995 for publication in J. A. Overman (ed.), *Galilean Archaeology and the Historical Jesus: The Integration of Material and Textual Remains* (Philadelphia: Trinity Press, forthcoming) relating to the reconstruction (from Talmudic times) of a house, in Qisrin (or Qatzrin), a village in the Golan Heights. Details of the original reconstruction appear in an article, A. Killebrew and S. Fine, "Qatzrin: Reconstructing Village Life in Talmudic Times", *BAR* 17 (1991), 44-56. Sawicki claims that there are "undeclared *conceptual* imports or assumptions brought to this site". Drawing on historical evidence, she challenges "the assumption that the building always housed a nuclear family". She claims that "the projection of an idealized family imports elements of modern Western patriarchal housing into the past, by designating the area around ovens as kitchens, the places where the women cooked" and questions the designation of the large interior room of the house (the dining room or *traqlin)* as a "multi-purpose family room". Sawicki concludes that "patriarchal heterosexual domestic organization is projected onto a past constructed out of the ruins of Qisrin to *validate present-day values.*"

Physical house / household : the relationship

An exploration of "house" raised the important question of the relationship between "dwelling" and "household" and this relationship will also be of relevance for the reading of ancient evidence. Furthermore, the study revealed the contribution of both housing and household sources to an analysis of the building / user relationship. A reminder of the value of housing evidence is useful, given the fact (noted in the review) that New Testament scholarship has devoted more attention to households (or to one particular form of household). The dangers of misinterpreting the physical house / household relationship were also highlighted. This is worthy of note since it is all too easy to assume (rather than argue for) a correspondence between the two. Finally, physical house / household analysis provided insight into the power of the concept of "home", a concept which includes the notion of dwelling / household / home / belonging. As will be demonstrated, the concept is equally powerful in the ancient world.

Conclusion

The title of this chapter, "what is meant by 'house'?" has the nature of a Socratic question. It appears simple, but its simplicity is deceptive. The struggle and search to answer has brought clarity, a broader perspective and has raised further questions. It has revealed something of the complexity of the English term "house" and something of its reality in the modern world. The chapter, therefore, provides a necessary starting point for entering ancient houses. As we approach antiquity, the question "what is meant by 'house' ?" is as valuable as the answer. It presupposes that one does not know the answer but is searching for the evidence.

CHAPTER 2

"HOUSE" IN ANTIQUITY

Attention now turns to "house" in the ancient world. As with Chapter 1, this present chapter begins with a focus on terminology. The focus on words and meanings provides the ground-work on which the study is built for it leads to an understanding of the concept of "house". As outlined in the latter part of the chapter, it is this concept which provides both model and data for the readings of the early imperial world and Acts which follow in Chapters 3-7.

HOUSE TERMINOLOGY

Just as the attempt to understand "house" today began with a discussion of words and meanings, so also does that of "house" in antiquity. In contrast to the issue of contemporary English terminology, however, that of words and meanings in the multi-lingual [1] world of the early Empire is more complex. The exploration starts with the semantic field of οἶκος / οἰκία. Moving to Latin, the other language of empire, the term "*domus*" and its synonyms are considered in the second section. In the third, attention turns to the Hebrew "בית". Hebrew is significant as the ancestral tongue of a minority

---

[1] In the Roman Empire, however, there was a complex intertwining of language and culture. There was a strong Greek influence in Rome, in terms of language and culture, a fact captured pithily by Hor. *Epis.* 2.1.156-7: *Graecia capta ferum victorem cepit et artis intulit agresti Latio* (Captive Greece made captive her savage victor and brought the arts into rustic Latium). See A. Wardman, *Rome's Debt to Greece* (London: Paul Elek, 1976). As is clear from J. M. G. Barclay, *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora from Alexander to Trajan (323 BCE - 117 CE)* (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1996), a distinctive Jewish culture continued to be expressed in Greek.

group within the empire; this is a group whose traditions and writings are of particular relevance to Acts. This Christian text, however, like many documents influenced by a Jewish world, written by Jews or connected with Judaism was written in Greek. The methodology adopted involves identifying house terms and discerning their meaning from the context, [2] insofar as this is possible. [3] The contexts are the ancient texts and these are largely, though not exclusively, literary. [4] Most date from early Imperial times but material from other periods is often required to illustrate a term's meaning. [5]

---

2 A similar approach is used by R. P. Saller in "*Familia* and *domus*: defining and representing the Roman family and household" in *Patriarchy, Property and Death in the Roman Family* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 74-101. See also his earlier article, "*Familia, Domus* and the Roman Conception of the Family", *Phoenix* 38 (1984), 336-355.

3 While scholarly work does much to deduce the meanings of house terms, one difficulty is that while ancient terms survive, their precise meaning-in-context is often unclear. Since the realities to which terms refer no longer exist, we are left with words and guessed-at meanings. Further discussion of this point is contained in the Latin section. See G. Hermansen ("The *Medianum* and the Roman Apartment", *Phoenix* 24 [1970], 342-347) for reference to debates over certain Latin housing terms. Another methodological difficulty is the danger of equating translation and meaning, a danger all the more possible with an apparently familiar and universal reality like "house.

4 Inscriptions are also used. Further details regarding sources will be dealt with when necessary.

5 The potential danger with a wide frame is to assume that meanings of words remain static over time. In this chapter, attention has been paid to the date of sources.

Greek Terminology : "οἶκος", "οἰκία" and related terms [6]

This first section deals with Greek terminology and explores the meaning(s) of "οἶκος", "οἰκία" and related terms.

Two terms: "οἶκος" and "οἰκία"

Two Greek words (namely, "οἶκος" and "οἰκία") translate into English as "house" and appear with great frequency in the sources. The initial task is to address if and how these words are related.

attempts to distinguish them

The words "οἶκος" and "οἰκία", though lexically and semantically related, are accorded separate entries in dictionaries and there is evidence, both ancient and modern, to support the view that they are not synonymous. A reference frequently cited is Xenophon's *Oeconomicus* 1.5 (from the fifth century B.C.E.):

> "But what do we mean now by an estate (οἶκος)? Is it the same thing as a house (οἰκία) or is all property that one possesses outside the house (οἰκία) also part of the estate (οἶκος)?"

However one translates the terms, the point is that the author makes a distinction between them, a distinction echoed in modern authors. As noted in Liddell-Scott, for example,

> "in Att. law, οἶκος was distd. from οἰκία, the former being the *property* left at a person's death, his (*sic*) *estate*, the latter the *dwelling-house* only, as stated by X. *Oec.* 1.5, cf. Hdt. 7.224; Jul. *Gal. Fr.* 12 etc."

---

[6] Where possible, the Loeb editions of ancient texts have been used. The New Testament used is the 25th edition of the Nestle-Aland Greek text. Secondary sources include Liddell-Scott (or LSJ), *BAGD*, *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der Classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, P. Chantraine, *Dictionnaire Etymologique de la Langue Grecque: Histoire des Mots* and Michel, "οἶκος", *TDNT*.

Drawing on this definition, Michel explains:

> "[O]riginally Gk distinguished οἶκος from οἰκία, cf. Xenoph. *Oec.* 1,5... Οἶκος had then a broader range than οἰκία, being the whole of a deceased person's possessions, what he (*sic*) leaves behind, whereas οἰκία is simply his (*sic*) residence." [7]

As noted in the review, Elliott too differentiates between " 'house' (*oikia*) and 'household' (*oikos*)". [8] Indeed whenever a distinction is made between the terms, it is between οἰκία as "dwelling, residence, place of habitation" and οἶκος as "household, dynasty". [9]

no real distinction

A more thorough reading of the sources, however, reveals that it is impossible to maintain a rigid or consistent distinction between "οἶκος" and "οἰκία", certainly in the early Imperial period. Dictionary compilers apart, in fact, no one actually does. Texts show that first, the terms are virtually synonymous or interchangeable and secondly, the aforementioned distinction between "οἶκος (household)" and "οἰκία (physical house)" cannot be sustained. In the gospel of Mark, for example, both the "οἰκία Σίμωνος" (1.29, 14.3) and the "οἶκος τοῦ ἀρχισυναγώγου" (5.38) are dwellings. Philo (*De Ios.* 38) describes an οἰκία as a "πόλις" in miniature, but in the very same sentence he refers to this (same) πόλις as an "οἶκος μέγας". Philo also uses the term "οἰκία"

---

7 See, Michel, "οἶκος", *TDNT* 131. Brackets are mine.

8 As expressed by Elliott ("Temple versus Household", 225), "In Luke-Acts, 'house' (*oikia*) and 'household' (*oikos*) comprise family and kin, personnel and property."

9 Within our chosen period, this distinction between a narrower term οἰκία (physical house) and a wider term οἶκος (household) is apparently observable and sustainable. Οἰκία is undoubtedly the term most frequently used to refer to the physical house. See the use of οἰκία in the following: examples: Joseph. *BJ* 4.37 (the house into which the centurion, Gallus, hid when separated from his troops), *ibid.*, 4. 486ff (the houses in Gerasa burned by L. Annius and his troops), Strabo 16.2.13 (houses in Aradus), 16.2.23 (houses in Tyre) and 16.4.3 (houses in Arabia). The meaning of οἶκος as "household" is seen, for example in Philonic references to the imperial house(hold) or dynasty as either the Σεβαστὸς οἶκος (eg. Philo, *In Flacc.* 104, 23, 49) or the Κλαυδίων οἶκος (Philo, *Leg.* 33).

of the household of Pharaoh [10] and the divided "οἰκία" (3.25) to which the evangelist refers is (like the kingdom with which it is coupled) more than a purely physical structure. Evidence shows that even in the earlier period Xenophon's distinction between the terms "οἶκος" and "οἰκία" should not be absolutized. In Aristotle's oft-quoted passage on the household, [11] it is οἰκία (and not οἶκος), which is used. Furthermore, according to Pseudo- Aristotle's *Oeconomica* 1.2.3, [12] the component parts of an οἰκία are not walls and a roof but rather (i) human beings (ἄνθρωπος) and (ii) goods and chattels (κτῆσις).

In sum....

While there are two words "οἶκος" and "οἰκία", no division on the basis of semantics can be consistently sustained. Rather, sources reveal interchangeability and flexibility of usage. For the purposes of this study, therefore, the two will be treated as one unit.

Meanings of "οἶκος / οἰκία"

Source exploration reveals that "οἶκος / οἰκία" is a broad, flexible term with a wide semantic field. Within that field lie two principal meanings, namely "dwelling" and "household" (in the sense of both people and possessions). By extension, other types of abode and social units, as well as the notion of "home", are included.

general or generic term for "dwelling"

---

10 See Philo, *De Ios.* 37, 38, 46, 50. Joseph's authority over the other slaves, his responsibility for οἰκονομία , a role comparable to (and a prerequisite for) πολιτεία leaves no doubt that his task as "τῆς οἰκίας ἐπίτροπος" (*De Ios.* 38) involved more than maintenance of a physical building.

11 Arist. *Eth. Nic.* 8.1160b23 - 1161a10.

12 The text is believed to have been written by a disciple of Aristotle in the fourth century B.C.E.

A basic meaning of "οἶκος / οἰκία" is "dwelling" and it is the term almost universally used when referring to physical houses. οἶκος / οἰκία, however, is a general or generic term and one which gives no details about the type of housing mentioned. It is the context which provides the details, be it regarding location, size, architecture, structure, lay-out, decor, function, owners / inhabitants. Such details are provided, for example, in Strabo's description of salt houses at Gerrha (Arabia), [13] multi-storeyed dwellings at Aradus, Tyre and Babylon [14] and in Josephus' picture of mountain habitations in Gamala [15] and upper and lower class residences in Jerusalem. [16] Further details about particular types of housing are provided by studies of dwellings by archaeologists and social historians. [17]

Other terms for "dwelling"

While "οἶκος / οἰκία" is by far the most common term for a "dwelling" of any kind, synonyms do exist. Some are general or generic terms for dwellings, while others refer to particular types of housing. "δόμος" is a general term for dwelling and is used as a poetic synonym for "οἶκος / οἰκία". This is also true of the related term "δῶμα", though evidence from later periods reveals a more specific meaning, namely "the

---

13 Strabo notes (16.3.3) that at Gerrha on the coast of Arabia, houses were made of salt. He describes how the scorching sun caused the salt flakes to fall off with the result that people had to sprinkle them with water to keep the walls firm.

14 On multi-storeyed (πολυόροφος, πολύστεγος) houses, see Strab. 16.2.13; 16.2. 23; 16.1-5.

15 According to Josephus (*BJ* 4.7), οἰκίαι in Gamala were "built against the steep mountain side and huddled together, one on top of the other (πρὸς ὀρθίῳ δὲ τῇ λαγόνι δεδομημέναι πεπύκνωντο δεινῶς ἐπ' ἀλλήλαις αἱ οἰκίαι)".

16 See Joseph. *BJ* 5.168 for reference to Herod's οἶκοι in Jerusalem as sumptuous (πολυτελεῖς). In *BJ* 5.171, there is mention of the luxurious and ornate upper residential quarters of Mariamme's tower (πολυτελεστέραν δὲ καὶ ποικιλωτέραν τῶν ἄλλων τὴν οἴκησιν εἶχεν ἐπάνω). For reference to properties of the wealthy (πλουσιώτεροι) and the poor (πενέστεροι) in Jerusalem, see *BJ* 5.424ff.(especially 427).

17 See, for example, A. G. McKay, *Houses, Villas and Palaces in the Roman World* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1975) and Y. Hirschfeld, *The Palestinian Dwelling in the Roman-Byzantine Period* (Jerusalem: Franciscan Printing Press / *IEJ,* 1995).

housetop".[18] While the meaning of a term may change from the general to the particular, as is the case with δῶμα, the opposite also occurs. Terms for specific parts of the building, such as "στέγος / στέγη (roof)" [19] or "ἑστία (hearth)", [20] are used of the whole dwelling. Turning to particular housing types, terms applied to royal residences are "βασίλειον" or "βασίλειος". [21] Those referring to temporary and rented dwellings include "κατάλυμα" which means "lodgings" [22] and the presence of multiple dwellings is indicated by the term "συνοίκια". [23]

---

18 Δῶμα (meaning "(physical) house") is found in Homer (*Il.* 21.44 *etc.*) and in the tragedians (Aesch. *Ag.* 607; Soph. *Trach.* 332, Eur. *Or.* 301 *etc.*). It means "housetop" in LXX Deut 22.8, Mt 24.17 and *P. Oxy.* 475.22. This is similar to the diminutive "δωμάτιον".

19 στέγος / στέγη means "roof" in Aesch. *Ag.* 897 and Mk 2.4 but means "house, dwelling" in Aesch. *Ag.* 310, 3.518.

20 Examples from the fifth century B.C.E. include: Pind. *Ol.* 1.11, *Pyth.* 11.13. The term also appears frequently in the tragedians. See, for example, Aesch. *Ch.* 264.

21 Strabo (1.2.25) refers to the residence of the king (βασίλειον) on the island of Meroë or of Stenyclarus (in the centre of Messenia) designated as a royal residence by Cresphontes (8.4.7). Josephus (*BJ* 5.176) refers to the palace of Herod in Jerusalem as ἡ τοῦ βασιλέως αὐλὴ (note also " εἰς τὴν βασιλικὴν αυλὴν" in *BJ* 4.567, referring to Herod's palace) and Pausanias (1.3.1) mentions the Royal Portico in the district of Cerameicus "where sits the king when holding the yearly office called the kingship: καλουμένη στοὰβασίλειος, ἔνθα καθίζει βασιλεὺς ἐνιαυσίαν ἄρχων ἀρχὴν καλουμένην βασιλείαν.

22 See, for example, Polyb. 2.36.1, Aristeas 181, LXX Ex 4.24, Mk 14.14.

23 An explanation of this term is found in a fourth century B.C.E. work, Aeschines, *Against Timarchus,* 124: "where for example, several people hire one house and occupy it, dividing it between them, we call it a συνοίκια but where one person only dwells, an οἰκία." This is the only reference of συνοίκια cited in Liddell-Scott. The passage as a whole reveals, with a hint of humour or irony, that the same building can have any number of names depending on the inhabitants. This raises questions about how common the term συνοίκια actually was. More evidence about such buildings is found in B. W. Frier ("The Rental Market in Early Imperial Rome", *JRS* 67 [1977], 32, n. 31) : "At Athens, *synoikiai* are lodging houses accommodating on short-term leases the lower classes (Is. 6.19-21) or travellers (Ps.-Xen., *Ath. Pol.* 1.17; Aeschin. 1.43); they are often run by entrepreneurial middlemen called *naukleroi*: Is. 6.19, Harp., Phot., Hesch., s.v.; Ammon. 330; Poll. 1.75. As to the papyri, the subject has not been treated in secondary literature. These sources are helpful. It is a building with one (*P. Petrie* 1.12.7, *P. Petrie* II, p. 23: 238/7 B.C.; *PSI* X 1159. 19: second century A.D.) or more (*BGU* VII 1573. 25:141/2 A.D.) owner, for whom it comes to be named (*P. Petrie* III 73: third century B.C.; *P. Fouad* III 59.2: after 75/6: *P. Fayum* 37.3: third century A.D.; *SB* VIII 9902 col. B II.3: fourth century A.D.; compare, for Athens, Aeschin. 1.126). It is managed by a superintendent (*P. Petrie* III. 73) and has many tenants (*P. Fouad* III 59.2; *P. Mich.* VIII 481.34: early second century A.D.; *P. Fayum* 37.3, a police report on a tenant), renting flats (*P. Fayum* 31.13, with a note: *c.* A.D. 129; *P. Berl. Leihgabe* 16 col. B II, col. C 10: A.D. 161) or stores (*P. Petrie* III 73). A tenant pays six months' rent for another person (*BGU* II 362 col. XIII 5: *c.* A.D. 215). *Synoikiai* are often associated with Alexandria (*P. Petrie* I.12.7, with note

any abode

While οἶκος / οἰκία refers primarily to a "dwelling", the semantic field of the term extends to a variety of abodes (human, animal and divine) as is seen across a range of texts from different historical periods. οἶκος / οἰκία functions as a synonym for "σκηνή", for example, as seen in the reference to the "tents" of Jacob, Leah and the maidservants (LXX Gen 31.33). The same term embraces the semantic field of "φωλεία, φωλία, φωλεός (cave, den, hole)". [24] It is used to describe the cave of the Cyclops (*Od.* 9.478) and the abode of an animal (*Gp.* 15.2.22). With regard to divine dwellings, οἶκος / οἰκία appears as a synonym for "ναός", "ἱερόν" and "οὐρανός2. The qualified terms "οἶκος τοῦ θεοῦ" (Joseph. *BJ* 4.163; Mk 2.26) and "οἶκος προσευχῆς" (Mk 11.17) refer to the temple of Jerusalem while heaven (οὐρανός) is described as the οἶκος of God (Artem. 2.68p.p.159). Οἶκος / οἰκία also means "abode in the very widest sense": it describes the position of a planet (Ael. *NA* 12.7) and a funeral monument (*BCH* 2.610). At a more metaphorical level, the term is applied (as in 2 Cor 5.1-10) to the "σῶμα" or "human body" (ἡ ἐπίγειος ἡμῶν οἰκία τοῦ σκήνους).

home

In certain prepositional phrases, the term "οἶκος / οἰκία" often translates best as the English "home" rather than the more literal "house". Thus, for example, context demands that the phrase "εἰς [τὸν] οἶκόν", frequently used in Mark, [25] be more accurately translated "going home" rather than "going (in)to one's house." [26]

---

above; *BGU* IV 115.16.19: 13 B.C.: *P. Mich.* VIII 481.34). If *BGU* II 362 col. XIII 5 can be generalized, *synoikiai* may include apartment houses; there is no exact translation of *cenaculum* in the sense of apartment. *SB* X 10233 (fifth century A.D.) may be a rent-receipt register from a lodging house."

24 For references to φωλεία, φωλία, φωλεός, see Ael, *NA* 6.3, Mt 8.20, Lk 9.58 and for troglodytes, see Strab. 11.5.7.

25 Mk 2.11, 3.20, 7.17, 7.30, 8.3, 8.26, 9.28.

26 The same point may be made with the phrases "at home" (κατ' οἰκίαν: Pl. *La.* 180d; κατ' οἶκον : Soph. *El.* 929; κατ' οἴκους : Hdt. 3.79 or ἐπὶ τῆς οἰκίας : Xen. *Eph.* 5.4), "homewards" (εἰς οἶκον: Aesch. *Eum.* 459; πρὸς οἶκον: Aesch. *Ag.* 867) and "from

Along with the sense of dwelling, οἶκος / οἰκία has a sociological meaning, embracing a semantic field similar to, but broader than, the English "household" and "family." As outlined by Aristotle, the (upper-class patriarchal) οἰκία of Classical Greece is composed of husband, wife, children and slaves. [27] οἶκος / οἰκία carries the sense of "dynasty" or "ruling line" such as the "οἶκος" of Cypselus in Corinth, [28] the Roman "Καίσαρος οἰκία" or the Egyptian "ἡ τῶν Πτολεμαίων οἰκία". [29] Another social group with an identity through time and space is the Israelite or Jewish race, described variously as the "house" of Israel, Judah, Jacob or David. [30] More generally, οἶκος / οἰκία carries the sense of house as a "group with a common identity or function", such as the "οἰκία Ἡροφίλου" (Erot. *Praef.*). [31] Other terms to describe social units labelled "οἶκος / οἰκία" include "γένος" [32] and "ἔθνος" [33] (which are applied to racial

---

home" (ἀπ᾽ οἴκου : Thuc. 1.99).

27 This definition is in *Politics* 1. 1253b.

28 Strabo (8.6.20) mentions the reigning house (οἶκος) of the tyrant Cypselus, who ruled in Corinth for three generations. See also Pausanias (21.10), for the line or house (οἶκος) of Amphion which was eventually utterly overthrown.

29 Philo, *In Flacc.* 35 (Καίσαρος οἰκία) and *De Vita Mos.* 2. 30 (ἡ τῶν Πτολεμαίων οἰκία).

30 For innumerable references, see the concordance to the LXX. In the New Testament, see, for example, Mt 10.6, 15.24 and Acts 7:42 (οἶκος Ἰσραήλ), Lk 1.33 (οἶκος Ἰακὼβ) and Lk. 1.17 (οἶκος Δαυὶδ).

31 As cited in Liddell-Scott, this was a medical school.

32 While γένος means "house, clan, family", it more commonly denotes a wider or less specific collectivity (human, animal and plant) than that conveyed by οἶκος / οἰκία. It includes the concepts of "race, stock, kin". A γένος, according to fifth century B.C.E. evidence (Hdt. 1.101) is a subdivision of an ἔθνος.

33 While the reference cited in the preceding note applies to the socio-political organization of the time, later sources confirm that ἔθνος is broader or more general than the largely kin-linked γένος. Commonly used in the plural, ἔθνος refers to a (frequently foreign) nation or people. It is applied, for example, to non-Jews (Acts 7.45), Gentile Christians (Rom 15.27) and is used by those in Rome to describe the (non-Italian) provinces (App. *BCiv.* 2.13, Hdn 1.2.1). In one inscription (*IG* 2 444), ἔθνος is used in Athens to refer to clubs of non-Athenians. In this case, the term's connotation of foreignness (or otherness) is maintained while referring to a smaller collectivity.

groups and broader collectivities or species) and "θίασος", "σύνοδος" and "ἔρανος" which are used of clubs and associations typical of the Roman world. [34]

estate, possessions

As seen in the previously-cited quotation of Xenophon (*Oec.* 1.5), another meaning of οἶκος / οἰκία is "estate." [35] This includes assets, property, possessions and resources, both material and human. [36] By extension, οἶκος / οἰκία means "everything one has" in both the literal and symbolic sense. Sometimes this "everything" is vast, as in the case of the whole land of Egypt, referred to as the "οἶκος" of the king. [37] At other times, it is limited as illustrated in the reference to the widows' "houses" (Mk 12.40: οἰκίας τῶν χηρῶν..) described as being devoured by the scribes.

Social and political institution

As "household", οἶκος / οἰκία functioned in the Graeco-Roman world as the basic social and political institution. [38] Its nature and significance is noted, albeit in different

---

34 Such associations were more common in the Roman than the Greek world. See, for example, J. Waltzing, *Etude historique sur les corporations professionelles chez les Romains*, 4 vols (Louvain: Peeters, 1895-1900).

35 From earlier periods, see Homeric references, see *Od.* 2.64, 7.314, *Il.* 15.498; from Herodotus, 3.53, 7.224. See references in Attic law cited in Liddell-Scott.

36 The institution of slavery meant that human beings were classified as possessions.

37 Elliott (*Home*, 171) writes: "For a resident of Egypt, such as Philo, we may assume the knowledge of a long-standing local conception; namely, that the whole land was the personal possession (*oikos*) of the king." Elliott is drawing on the work of M. Rostovtzeff, *The Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World*, 3 vols, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1941) 2: 1309 and *The Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire*, 2nd edition revised by P. M. Fraser (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957), 1: 278.

38 For description, analysis and critique, see the review section on house(hold) studies dealing with *Haustafeln* and οἶκος / οἰκία as a central social institution. See in particular Balch, *"Let wives be submissive..": The Domestic Code in 1 Peter* and Verner, *The Household of God* and Schüssler Fiorenza, *Memory.*

ways, in Homeric society [39] in the city states of the Classical period and beyond. Indeed, as indicated by Aristotle and others, the structure of society is encapsulated by the terms "οἶκος / οἰκία" and "πόλις" [40] or put another way, society is built ἐξ οἰκῶν.

Words with οἰκ- root

Further insight into the breadth of the term(s) "οἶκος /οἰκία" is gained by noting the large number of words with an οἰκ- root. At the level of morphology, words which share an οἰκ-root are formed by the addition of suffixes (e.g. -ιος, -ιον, -ιδιος), prefixes (e.g. prepositions) and other nouns. While such words need not be related semantically, [41] many so-called οἰκ- words actually are. The shared and broad semantic field of many of these words include the notion of house, dwelling, family, administration, service / slavery and belonging (to a group or place). All these οἰκ- terms, therefore, provide a larger semantic canvas against which to view οἶκος /οἰκία.

First, there are words with form and meaning similar to οἶκος and οἰκία in the sense of "dwelling", "habitation" or "building". These include the diminutives "οἰκίδιον" (from οἶκος) and "οἴκημα" (from οἰκία), the words "οἰκίον", "οἰκίσκη", "οἰκηματικός", "οἰκίσκος", "οἰκητήριον", "οἴκησις". [42] Secondly, there are words which mean "of or belonging to the house (hold)." Terms, referring to both persons (frequently slaves) and objects, include the adjective "οἰκεῖος (of the house)", the nouns "οἰκέτης (household servant)", "οἰκέτις (female slave)", [43] "οἰκετεία (household of slaves)", "οἰκετικόν (all the slaves)", "οἰκεύς",

---

39 For details, see M. I. Finley, *The World of Odysseus* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1977).

40 See Arist. *Pol.* 1 and Philo, *De Ios.* 37-39, where links between οἶκος and πόλις, οἰκονομικός and πολιτικός, οἰκονομία and πολιτεία are evident.

41 While words with a common root may have different meanings, the point emphasized in this section is that many words with an οἰκ- root *do* share a common semantic field. The section, therefore, is not an exercise in either "etymologising" or "root fallacy", as described and criticised in Barr, *Semantics.*

42 At a wider level, from an extension of the meaning of the verb "οἰκέω" come terms to do with colonization and settlement, such as "οἰκισία (settlement)", "οἰκισις (colonization)" and "οἰκιστής (colonizer)".

43 Chantraine includes a reference from Theocritus where the term means "mistress of the house."

"οἰκιακός (member, inmate of the house)". Thirdly, the οἰκ- root functions as a building block for a whole constellation of terms: while some of these compound terms are related at the level of etymology alone, many have a clear semantic relationship. [44] Common examples include οἰκοδομ- terms (οἰκοδόμος, οἰκοδομέω...) which refer to οἶκος / οἰκία as "building", both literal and metaphorical, οἰκονομ- words (οἰκονομέω, οἰκονομία, οἰκονόμος...) which deal with "house management" and οἰκοδεσποτ- compounds (οἰκοδεσποτέω, οἰκοδεσπότης...) referring to "dominance or rule of the οἶκος / οἰκία". Another form of compounds results from combinations of οἰκ- with prepositional prefixes. Hence come terms beginning with κατοικ-, ἐνοικ-, περιοικ-, μετοικ-, συνοικ-, ἐξοικ-, ἐπιοικ-, ἀποικ-, παροικ-.. Finally, further meanings are created by multiple combinations (ἐποικοδομέω....) or compounds formed by combinations with other nouns. These examples illustrate the endless potential for word creation from the οἰκ- root. For present purposes, the main point is that "οἶκος / οἰκία" is but one word in a wider and common οἰκ- currency. Along with the array of οἰκ- terms comes the potential for association-making at phonetic or semantic level. [45]

Greek terminology : summary and conclusions

Since "οἶκος" and "οἰκία" function as virtual synonyms, they are referred to as one unit in this study. Like the English "house", "οἶκος / οἰκία" is a broad, flexible term with many meanings, both physical and sociological and it is one capable of functioning at literal and metaphorical levels. It is a general or generic term for "dwelling" and by extension is used of a range of abodes. It refers to a variety of social groups, including households, families, wider kinship groups and those formed by choice or history. It includes the sense of estate, goods and chattels. Finally, οἶκος / οἰκία (in the sense of "household") is the basic social and political unit in the Greek world.

Many meanings of "οἶκος / οἰκία" are semantically related in a way never possible

---

44 Here the term "compound" refers to the combination of the root οἰκ- with another part of speech.

45 Such association-making is the basis of Elliott's thesis (in *Home)* where he argues that at the heart of 1 Peter lies the contrast between "οἶκος" and "πάροικος".

in the case of some polysemic terms.[46] Thus, for example, the link between the meanings of οἶκος / οἰκία as "dwelling" and "house(hold)" may be understood (as outlined in the previous chapter) in terms of the two-way relationship between the built environment and its users. Other meanings are related by a process of transfer or extension. Examples include the transfer of meaning from οἶκος / οἰκία as "dwelling" to any abode and from "house(hold)" to other social groups. Similarly, there is a progression of transfer from the meaning of οἶκος / οἰκία as both "dwelling" and "house(hold)" to "estate, possessions" and then again to the meaning "everything one has", understood at either a literal or metaphorical level While Greek has synonyms for a range of dwellings and social groups, "οἶκος / οἰκία" is the term most frequently used in the sources for all aspects of the semantic field. The closest equivalent is "δόμος" but this term is more poetic (and archaic) and occurs with nothing like the frequency of οἶκος / οἰκία. The latter is ubiquitous and basically non-specialised, though in political writings it acquires a quasi-technical status as social institution. Apart from its polysemy and ubiquity, a further aspect of the term "οἶκος / οἰκία" is that it functions as one coin in a wider currency of οἰκ-words.

The Greek term, therefore, is broader and more all-embracing than the English "house". The one commonly used term "οἶκος / οἰκία" covers the semantic field of several English ones. There is simply no single word in the English language which means "dwelling" (be it human, divine, animal or other), "household" (and a host of other social groups), "estate, possessions" and furthermore refers to the basic social and political unit in society. In contrast to Greek, a wider lexical stock is used in English and furthermore, the meaning of several of these terms does not overlap. [47]

The study of the term(s) "οἶκος / οἰκία" contributes much to the present study. First, it alerts the modern reader to the concept of "house" in antiquity: to a concept both literal and metaphorical, a concept capable of functioning at many and changing levels, a concept broader and more versatile than the modern English equivalent. One of the

---

[46] Compare, for example, the English word "bar".

[47] English has the term "household" (as well as "house") to refer to the social unit. The basic unit of society is more typically the "family" or indeed the "individual." Furthermore contemporary social and political organization could never be summarized as pithily as it was in antiquity by the two terms "οἶκος" and "πόλις".

implications of this breadth and versatility is the importance of being attentive to particular uses and meanings-in-context. It is all too easy either to miss meanings and nuances or to fall into the trap of overload, that is, of reading too many meanings into a context which does not demand it. [48] Secondly, a study of terminology exposes readers to the central social and physical realities to which the term "οἶκος / οἰκία" refers, namely dwellings and households. Even a limited exploration of these realities for the purposes of terminological definitions reveals the potential of house(hold) as a door onto the social world , as a hermeneutical key to society.

---

48 A specific use of "οἶκος / οἰκία" may express, not the term's full semantic field, but one or other aspect of it. This is a case of what Barr (*Semantics,* 218) labels "illegitimate totality transfer". The "[e]rror arises when the 'meaning' of a word (understood as the total series of relations in which it is used in the literature) is read into a particular case as its sense and implication there."

Latin Terminology - "*Domus*" and related terms

Turning from Greek, this present section investigates Latin terms with a semantic field similar to that of "οἶκος / οἰκία", most notably *"domus"*. Treatment of *"domus"* leads, first, to consideration of other household terms (notably *"familia")* and secondly, to an exploration of the range of Latin terms for dwellings. [49]

meanings of *domus*

The many meanings of *domus,* like οἶκος / οἰκία, include "dwelling", "home", "household" and "estate." Turning first to the physical sense, *domus* is used both as a general term for "physical house" [50] and as one to designate a specific type of dwelling. With regard to the former, dwellings from urban apartments to rural villas are labelled *"domus"* in legal sources. [51] A *domus* is further defined as the "place where a person lives, has one's accounts and put one's affairs in order". [52] If one has several residences, the principal one is regarded as the *domus*, the place where the *lar* is established. [53] Turning from the general to the particular, *domus* refers to "a spacious, urban house of the wealthier classes, usually occupied by a single family or household". [54] Like οἶκος / οἰκία, *domus*

---

49 Secondary sources include Lewis and Short, *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*, Encyclopedic Dictionary of Roman Law, B. Rawson (ed), *The Family in Ancient Rome: New Perspectives* (London: Croom Helm, 1986), S. Dixon, *The Roman Mother* (London: Croom Helm, 1988), J. F. Gardner and T. Wiedemann (eds), *The Roman Household: A Sourcebook* (London: Routledge, 1991), Saller, "*Familia* and *domus*."

50 Saller ("*Familia* and *domus*", 81 n. 18) cites the following as examples of *domus* as physical house only: Cic. *Cat.* 4.12, *Verr.* 2.5.80, *Cael.* 60, *Mil.* 64, *Phil.* 2.91; Val. Max. 5.7.3; Columella *Rust.* 4.3.1; Sen. *Constant.* 12.2, *Ep.* 41.7 (*familia formoso et domus pulchra*); Quint. *Decl.* 337, p. 325; Pliny *Ep.* 7.27; Tac. *Ann.* 13.18, 15.38, 41, 43, 50, 52, *Hist.* 3.33; Suet. *Aug.* 5, 72.1, *Calig.* 22.4, *Ner.* 16.1, *Dom.* 1.1.

51 According to the *lex Cornelia de iniuriis,* people could take action for insult against others who forcefully entered their *domus*, understood as any residence (*Dig.* 47.10.5.pr.5).

52 *Dig.*16.203: *ubi quisque sedes et tabulas haberet suarumque rerum constitutionem fecisset.*

53 *Dig.* 25.3.1.2: *ubi larem matrimonio collocarent.*

54 This is the type of structure described by Vitruvius and illustrated in archaeological discoveries. For a description of a *domus*, see Vitr. *De Arch.* 6.3 and McKay, *Houses, Villas and Palaces,*

also describes any sort of abode. In the *Aeneid* alone, the term is used of the dwelling-place of the gods, nests, a labyrinth and a sacred grotto. [55] Furthermore, as with οἶκος / οἰκία, *domus* embraces the meaning of the English "home". [56] Applied narrowly, home refers to one's "physical house and family", understood more broadly, it includes one's "homeland, country, native place". [57] Moving to the sociological level, d*omus* (like οἶκος / οἰκία) means "household", a social unit far which is wider than our modern (nuclear) family. [58] As illustrated by jurists and other writers, this basic social unit includes a married couple, their unmarried children and their servants / slaves. Other possible members include adoptees, foster-children, foundlings and even clients. [59] The term is used of the imperial house, as the phrases "*domus Caesarum*" or "*domus Flavia*" [60]

---

especially chapters 2 and 3. See Mart. 1.108.3 for a comparison between his addressees's *domus.. pulchra* and his own *cenaculum* (or garret). For a similar comparison see Juv. 3.223ff.

55 Verg. *Aen.* 6.27 (labyrinth), 6.81 (a sacred grotto), 10.1, 101 (the dwelling-place of the gods), 5.214, 8.235 (the abode of birds).

56 In translating the frequently used *domum* (to the house, homewards), *dom[u]i* (at home) and *domo* (out of the house, from home), the terms "house" or "home" are both required and are function interchangeably. Third or second century B.C.E. references from Plautus's *Amphytrio* include *domui* (2.1.12), *domum* (1.1.40) and *domo* (1.3.4). For *domi* (at home), see Mart. 5.22.

57 The broader sense is conveyed in the words of Aeneas on landing in Italy: *hic domus, haec patria est patria domusque* (Verg. *Aen.* 7.122). See also 5.638, 8:114, 10.138 and Tac. *Hist.* 1.29 (p*atria domusque*).

58 According to Saller ("*Familia* and *domus*" 83), "[w]hen writers wished to convey that core family unit, they employed the phrase *uxor* (or *coniunx*) *liberique*; so Cicero referred to Sex. Roscius having his *domus* and his *uxor liberique* at Ameria and Seneca listed among a man's misfortunes his having to bury *liberos coniugem.*" This is a definition of the core unit from the husband's perspective.

59 Saller ("*Familia* and *domus*", 81-82) discusses the composition of the *domus* as "household". Much evidence is found in the legal discussions of *penus* (the household stores) and other sources include Sen. *Ira* 3.35. Saller notes that "Seneca castigates the man who complains of the loss of *libertas* in the *res publica*, but then destroys it in his own *domus* by forbidding his slave, freedman, wife or client to talk back to him." See also Rawson, "The Roman Family" (in Rawson [ed], *Family,* 7) for reference to evidence of *alumni*, freedmen/women, foundlings... that is, non-biological household members.

60 *Domus* refers to the emperor's relatives and the imperial dynasty. See reference to the *domus Flavia* in Tac. *Hist.* 2.101, 3.75. Pliny (*Pan.* 7.5) considered it laudable that Nerva, in contrast to most of his predecessors, did not confine his search for a successor *intra domum*

illustrate. Groups as narrow as brothers [61] and as distant as those beyond the sixth degree [62] are classified as *"domus"*. The term is applied to broader descent and racial groups [63] and to non-kin-based associations such as philosophical schools. [64] As well as referring to place and people, the term *"domus"* (like οἶκος / οἰκία) refers to one's assets, inheritance or estate. [65] According to Tacitus, for example Volusius strengthened his *domus* with great riches and according to Seneca, one of a son's duties as heir of an estate is to hand on the *domus* "in an undiminished state" (*in integro statu*) when he dies. [66] As summarised by Saller, "*domus* was used with regard to household and kinship to mean the physical house, the household including family and slaves, the broad kinship including agnates and cognates, ancestors and descendants and the patrimony". [67] While no one use of the term carries all the meanings and connotations of the semantic field, it is also true that "all ...meanings of *domus* are related and shade into one another." [68]

---

61 Sen. *Cons. ad Polyb.* 3.4.

62 See the following examples cited in Saller ("*Familia* and *domus*", 84): Caesar is described as part of the *domus* of Pompey, his son-in-law (Sen. *Ben.* 5.16.4). Pliny describes distant kin as part of his *domus* and as deserving of his patronal support. In his letter of thanks to Trajan for transferring to his own staff Caelius Clemens, *adfinis* of his previous wife's mother, Pliny is pleased that Trajan extended his beneficence not merely to himself (Pliny) but to his whole *domus* (Pliny, *Ep.* 10.51). When Iunius Mauricus asked Pliny to suggest a husband for his orphaned niece, Pliny nominated Minicius Cilicianus in part for the virtues of *tota domus* including his father, his maternal grandmother and uncle (*Ep.* 1.14.6). Tiberius gave Aemilius Lepidus the unclaimed *hereditas* left by the wealthy Lepida "from whose house he seems to be" (Tac. *Ann.* 2.48: *cuius e domo videtur*). As Saller explains (*op. cit.*, 85), "[t]he fact that Lepidus could not claim the estate through the normal procedure indicates that the kinship must have been beyond the sixth degree."

63 On broad descent groups, see Saller ("*Familia* and *domus*", 85 and notes.) For *domus* as "household, family, race", see Verg. *Aen.* 1.284, 3.97.

64 For *domus* referring to a philosophical school, see Sen. *Ep.* 29, *Ben.* 5.15.

65 Apuleius (*Apol.* 76) accuses his arch enemy Rufinus of being a wastrel with a *domus exhausta et plena liberis.* According to Saller ("*Familia* and *domus*, 86), this meaning is less common.

66 Tac. *Ann.* 3.30 and Sen. *Consolatio ad Marciam* 26.2.

67 Saller, "*Familia* and *domus*", 342.

68 As explained by Saller ("*Familia* and *domus*", 86-87), "[w]hen a Roman spoke of the pleasures of his *domus,* it is often impossible to discover whether he meant his physical house or the family and servants in it over whom he exercised *potestas*. Or again, when pride is expressed in a *domus*, it could be pride in a physical *domus* or the household establishment of the wider circle of kin who derived from a single household. Further, the distinction between *domus* as the

"familia" and other social group terms

In its reference to social groups, *"domus"* has semantic links with other Latin terms, most notably *"familia"*. According to Ulpian (*Digest* 50.16.195. 1-14), *familia* refers to both *res* (estate, property) and *personae* (people) but sources suggest that it more commonly refers to the latter. With regard to people, Ulpian notes that (in the strictly legal sense) the term *"familia"* refers to all persons in the *potestas* of a *paterfamilias* or head of household. [69] In non-legal parlance, however, siblings are still regarded as *familia* even after the death of the head of household, when each becomes *sui iuris* or legally independent. Other groups to whom the term *"familia"* applies include *agnati* (blood relatives through the male line), [70] servile members of the household and the wider and indefinable group of "all persons born of the blood of the same ultimate ancestor." In addition to Ulpian's list, the term is used of groups or associations, like those of gladiators for example. [71] *Familia* is both broader than "(nuclear) family" in that it includes references to slaves and often narrower in that it might refer to slave members only. The term also differs from *"domus"* and this is seen in the case of a woman married *sine manu:* [72] from a legal point of view, she is not a legal member of her husband's (or children's) *familia*

---

living extended family and *domus* as the descent group is often not worth specifying. When the deaths of Gaius and Lucius left Augustus with a *domus deserta* (not true on any definition of *domus*), the reader is meant to understand that Gaius and Lucius were lost from the *domus* as the living circle of kin, but also and more important, that they were lost as potential successors in Augustus' *domus* in the sense of dynasty."

69 Ulpian notes that, according to law, even a *pupillus* (or underage, orphaned boy) can be a *paterfamilias* because he holds *dominium in domo* (power in the house). According to Saller ("*Familia* and *domus"*, 76), "this definition of *familia*, tied to the law of property, continued to have notable economic and social consequences, but it was essentially archaic to the extent that it did not coincide with the way Romans of the classical period regularly used the word outside the legal context."

70 In contrast to *agnati, cognati* who are blood relations on either the male or female line are not considered *familia*. According to Saller ("*Familia* and *domus"*, 77), " ..a survey of Latin literature produces only a very few exceptional passages in which cognate kin are included in the *familia* and more where they are by implication excluded."

71 For companies or groups (*familia*) of gladiators, see Suet. *Aug.* 42 and Cic. *Sull.* 19.54.

72 This form of marriage is in contrast to *confarreatio*, *coemptio* and *usus*, where the wife came under the *potestas* of her husband. On Roman marriage, see Rawson, "Roman Family", 20ff.

despite the fact that in practice, she is an integral part of her married household or *domus*.[73] More generally, while *domus* and *familia* may refer to *res* and *personae*, most evidence shows the latter referring to people only. Furthermore, even at the level of persons, *familia* is narrower than *domus* in that it rarely applies to cognates. Differences aside, the semantic fields of the terms *"familia"* and *"domus"* overlap to a considerable degree: both are applied to social groups - to households, families, kinship groups and (less commonly) to non-kin associations. In their reference to broad kinship groups, their meaning overlaps with terms such as *"gens"*, [74] *"genus"*, *"stirps"*, *"natio"*, *"populus"*. [75]

"Domus" and the variety of "dwelling" terminology

While *domus* is a general term for "physical house", Latin (in contrast to Greek) has an abundant range of terms for dwellings. These include *casa, insula, villa, aedes, domicilium, habitatio, mansio, sedes, tectum, tugurium, cella, aedificium, taberna, cenaculum, hospitium, lares.* Indeed, nowhere is the issue of "definitional messiness" [76] so obvious as in the area of Latin housing terminology. While Latin words have survived, however, questions of their meaning, translation and reference points in the social world are more problematic. The task here is to take a number of terms and decipher their meaning-in-context from ancient texts. Given the complexity of the evidence, secondary material on

---

73 In law, she remains in her father's *familia*, until she becomes independent on his death. In non-legal parlance, however, *familia* was sometimes taken to include the wife."

74 On *familia* as part of a *gens*, see Suet. *Ner.* 1 and Quint. 1.4.3. According to Lewis and Short, *gens* is "a race, clan embracing several families united together by a common name and by certain religious rites; originally only patrician, but later also plebs... " References include Sall. *Iug.* 95.3, Cic. *De Or.* 1.39.176, *Rep.* 2.25, Hor. *Sat.* 2.5.15. For *gens* (or *genus*) in its widest sense as "human race", see Cic. *Fin.* 5.23.65; Hor. *Carm.* 1.3.26.

75 On these terms, see Lewis and Short.

76 This phrase is borrowed from Saller ("*Familia* and *domus*", 74). Another example of "definitional messiness" being addressed is in P. W. Foss, "Kitchens and Dining Rooms at Pompeii: The Spatial and Social Relationships of Cooking and Eating in the Roman Household" (Ph.D., University of Michigan 1994). Foss devotes much space to exploring words and meanings.

housing is used to supplement the evidence provided by ancient writings. [77]

insula

The term *"insula"* has been much debated, but the most accepted meaning is "multiple dwelling." [78] The word is used of both spacious multi-storey apartment blocks and poorer quality buildings which were subdivided as dwelling units [79] and frequently let. [80] The quality of *insulae* varied, therefore, from the well-built and spacious unit to the *ruina.*

---

77 Secondary sources include A. Boëthius and J. B. Ward-Perkins, *Etruscan and Roman Architecture* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1970), J. E. Packer, "Housing and Population in Imperial Ostia and Rome," *JRS* 57 (1967) 76-95 and *The Insulae of Imperial Ostia.* MAAR 31 (Rome, 1971), McKay, *Houses, Villas and Palaces,* P. Garnsey, "Urban Property Investment" in M. I. Finley (ed.), *Studies in Roman Property by the Cambridge Research Seminar in Ancient History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976), Frier, "Rental Market", Hermansen, "The *Medianum* and the Roman Apartment" and *Ostia: Aspects of Roman City Life* (Alberta: 1982), Wallace-Hadrill, *Houses and Society,* Foss, "Kitchens and Dining Rooms".

78 The meaning of *insula* is discussed in Packer ("Housing and Population", 83), McKay (*Houses, Villas and Palaces*, 83) and R. Meiggs (*Imperial Ostia* [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1960], (note 110) 237. Packer notes that G. Calza understood each *insula* to be a separate apartment-house (n.33) and that, for A. von Gerkan, *insula* meant, not "apartment-house" but simply "flat" (n. 34). After consideration of the evidence, the author himself concludes that it "would seem more reasonable ...to regard *insula* as meaning not 'apartment-house', as Calza has suggested, but only 'multiple dwelling', a definition not firmly connected with any architectural type." Similarly, for McKay, the term *insula* "no doubt originally applied to a plot of land bounded by streets, was gradually extended to multiple dwellings which included older homes which had been subdivided into rooming-houses or *pensioni* and the larger, more commodious multi-storeyed apartment buildings." Meiggs defines the *insula* as "the large, normally high block divided into separate apartments which can be separately let".

79 On all *insulae* evidence, see Packer, "Housing and Population", 82.

80 On the rental market, see Frier, "Rental Market." Evidence of units for renting in multiple dwellings or *insulae* is seen in *CIL* 4.138. In this advertisement, the following parts of the *insula* Arriana Polliana of Gnaeus Alleius Nigidius Maius at Pompeii are offered for rent: *locantur ex Iulis primis tabernae cum pergulis suis et c[e]nacula equestria et domus* (shops with upper balcony rooms, 'equestrian' lodgings, a house or houses). For identification of this building, see Wallace-Hadrill (*Houses and Society,* 107), Fig. 5.8: fig. 4.26 in this study. *Insula* contains *cenacula, tabernae* and a storage room under the stairs. Similarly according to *CIL* 4. 1136, the *Praedia Iuliae Felicis* offers 5 year leases on booths, shops, upper balcony rooms and lodgings: *In praediis I[uli]ae Ap. f. Felicis / locantur / Balneum venerium et nongentum, tabernae, pergulae / cenacula ex idibus Aug. primis in idus Aug. sextas anno[s co]ntinuo[s qu]inque.....*

Such property provided an income, often a sizeable one, for owners. Martial (4.37.4), for example, refers to rent owing from urban property (*ex insulis*) and farms. According to the *Dig.* 19.2.30, the jurist Alfenus (*c.* 39 B.C.E.) estimates the rental of a complete block at 30,000 sesterces, the various apartments then being sublet to individuals to give 10,000 sesterces to the

[81] Archaeological evidence [82] represents the former, whose remains have at least survived. By contrast, literary sources now provide the only insight into the cheaper, less solid dwellings of the poorer classes. [83] In Rome, many of these multi-storey buildings were structurally unsound, in constant danger of going on fire [84] or collapsing. Furthermore, overcrowding made the situation even more dangerous. [85]

cenaculum

Another much discussed dwelling term whose meaning changed over time is *"cenaculum"*. [86] It originally meant "dining room", changed to "dining room on an upper

---

speculator. On wealthy speculators earning big profits, see Garnsey, "Urban Property Investment", 126 ff. See in particular 190 n.11, 12 for evidence regarding Cicero. According to Gell. *NA* 15.1.2 ff, however, while the income from such buildings is great, their structural instability means that the dangers are even greater.

81 For the use of the term *"ruina"* in relation to such buildings, see Juv. 3.190-202.

82 See Packer, *Insulae of Imperial Ostia.* On the Ephesian evidence, see McKay, *Houses, Villas and Palaces*, 212-217.

83 Despite the contribution of both archaeological and written material, Packer (Housing and Population", 82) notes the absence of information on the size, number of rooms and general condition of the average apartment in Roman multiple dwellings.

84 On these buildings in the Late Republic, see Cic. *Att.* 14.9. Cicero seems to regard the collapse of buildings as an everyday occurrence. Evidence of the early decades C.E. comes from Seneca (*Ben.* 4.6.2; 6.15.7 and *Ira* 3.35. 4-5). In the latter, he describes tenement walls as "crumbled, cracked and out of line" (*parietes insularum exesos, rimosos, inaequales.*) Despite the rebuilding after the fire in Nero's reign, bad conditions continued. See Mart. 1.108.3; 1.117.6-7; 3.30.3; 4.37; 5.22; 6.27.1-2; 7.20.20; 8.14 and Juvenal 2.12-13; 3.6ff, 166, 190-202, 223-225, 235, 268-277; 11.12-13. Even if these authors did exaggerate, the structural instability of many Roman buildings led the emperor Trajan to impose on all new houses a height limit of 60 Roman feet (Aur. Vict. *Caes.* 13.13).

85 On people living right up to roof level, see Juv. 3. 198-208; 3. 232-235.

86 The origin and development of the term is discussed by Wallace-Hadrill (*Houses and Society,* 108). Early evidence comes from both Plautus and Ennius (in the early second century B.C.E.) In Plautus' *Amphitryo* (863), Jupiter refers in jest to his abode as "*in superiore...cenaculo*" and

Ennius (*Ann.* 30.51 cf. Tert. *Adv Valent.*7) uses the phrase "*cenacula maxima caeli"* (great attics of the heaven). With regard to the latter, Foss ("Kitchens and Dining Rooms", 89) notes that "Tertullian, source of this quote is still aware of both meanings for *cenaculum* when he tries to explain this passage. Tertullian postulates that Ennius might have described these chambers either on account of their lofty nature (*cenacula* as upper story rooms) or because Ennius has read a passage of Homer in which Jupiter feasts there (*cenaculum* as dining-rooms)."

floor" and by the first century B.C.E., described "all rooms on the upper floor." [87] The term gradually came to refer to apartments or lodgings on upper floors. [88] While *cenacula* were generally found in *insulae,* [89] *domus* too could be sub-divided into such units. [90] As is known from archaeology, such *cenacula* were approached by external stairs from the street or from stairs within the building itself. [91] The quality and type of *cenacula* varied considerably [92] and they were associated with all but the very highest strata of society. The multi-roomed apartment is the *cenaculum*-type most discussed by jurists and best illustrated in Ostian *insulae*. Such a unit consisted of two large rooms at either end of a

---

87 See Varro, *Ling.* 5.162: *ubi cubabant cubiculum, ubi cenabant cenaculum vocitabant, ut etiam nunc Lanuvi apud aedem Iunonis et in cetero Latio ac Fateris et Cordubae dicuntur. Posteaquam in superiore parte cenitare coeperunt, superioris domus universa cenacula dicta.* Though noting that the old meaning persisted in certain places, the change from "dining room" to "all upstairs rooms" is illustrated.

88 Frier ("Rental Market", 28) states that (in the early Imperial period) the "*cenaculum* (along with its synonym *aediculae*) is a general description of any multi-room apartment within an *insula*, apartment building.." Regarding upstairs location, Wallace-Hadrill (*Houses and Society,* 108) writes that "the ease with which an upper room could be made available for a lodger and accessible from the street or within can be seen in Livy's narrative of the Bacchanalian scandal of 187 B.C.: When Hispalia Fecenia turns informer, the consul finds her safe lodgings in a cenaculum in his in-law's house and has the stairs to the street blocked off and replaced by internal stairs (Livy 39.14.2)". Literary evidence of the upstairs location of such dwellings, includes Vitruvius' reference to *cenacula* on "upper floors with fine views over the city" (2.8.17) and Martial's evidence (1.108.3, 1.117.7) which suggests that his own *cenaculum* was up three flights of steep stairs.

89 See *CIL* 1136, 6.29791 and 4.138 on *cenacula* as sub-divisions of an *insula.* A further example is *Dig.* 19.2.30 : *Qui insulam triginta conduxerat, singula coenacula ita locavit, ut quadraginta ex omnibus colligerentur...*

90 On the division of a *domus* into *cenacula,* see *Dig.* 7.1.8: If there is a legacy of the usufruct of a dwelling house (*domus*), the usufructuary must not let out rooms in it or divide the building up into separate apartments (*per cenacula diuidere domum*); the usufructuary may however let it for hire (*locare*) but must let it as a house (*domum locare*).

91 According to Wallace-Hadrill (*Houses and Society,* 108-110), external staircases provide evidence of the minimum extent of lodgers. For further reference to the types of staircases, see B. Rapske, *The Book of Acts and Paul in Roman Custody* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1994), Fig. 20 a, b.

92 On the variety, see Frier, "Rental Market", 27-31. On Ostian evidence, see *op. cit.*, 28, n.5. Evidence of better quality *cenacula* includes Suet. *Aug.* 45.1, 87.2, *Vit.* 7.2, Vitr. *De Arch.* 2.8.17, Mart. 1.108, Varro. *Sat. Men.* 589. References to less good units include Cic. *Leg. Agr.* 2.96, Frontin. *Aq.* 1.76.2, Hor. *Ep.* 1.1.90, Juv. 10.18, Quint. *Inst.* 6.3.64.

corridor, off which lay a series of smaller rooms.[93] It either served as the dwelling of an individual or family / household or was further sublet, a practice known as "*cenaculum exercere*". [94] Other *cenacula* consisted of smaller, single and multi-roomed dwelling units, [95] including those attached to ground-floor (work)shops. [96]

rooms and lodgings

The study of *insulae* and *cenacula* points both to the existence of rented accommodation and to the variety of living units. Further evidence of rented property is seen in references to "*cenacula meritoria*", "*meritoria*" or "*conductum*". [97] While many of these units were spacious apartments, a large number of small units existed at the lower end of the property market. These included subdivided *cenacula,* cheap rooms on top

---

93 According to the *Dig.* 9.3.5.1ff., these rooms or areas were named *cubicula, exedrae* and *medianum*. On these terms, see Frier, "Rental Market", 29 (and notes). On the word "*medianum*", see also A. Herdlitczka, *RE* Suppl. 6.386 and Hermansen, "The *Medianum* and the Roman Apartment", 345-347. For reference in papyrus leases to the renting of *exedrae*, see Frier, *op. cit.* 29 n. 17. The legal sources are mostly contemporary with Ostian evidence (i.e. about 100- 225 C.E).

94 See *Dig.* 9.3.5.1. See Frier, "Rental Market", 28 n. 10. It is unclear how common the practice of subletting was but tenants did so in order to help pay their own rent. As explained by Frier (*op. cit.*, 34), "[r]ents for such properties were high; indeed the lowest rent ever recorded for.. a *cenaculum* is HS 2,000 a year (Cic. *Rosc. Com.* 28), the rent paid to a freedman in the second century B.C. (Plut. *Vit. Sull.* 1.6). Rents mounted extravagantly in imperial Rome." For statistics on luxury rent, see Frier (*op.cit.*, 34 n.39).

95 According to I. M. Sutherland ("Colonnaded *cenacula* in Pompeian domestic architecture, " [Ph.D., Duke University , 1990]), 6) , in Pompeii, where there is no evidence of (Ostian-style) *insulae*, a *cenaculum* means "any room in the second storey of a house, other than an intermediate level (mezzanine), which forms part of the living quarters and is intended to accommodate a regular traffic of people in the fulfillment of its designated function".

96 See *Dig.* 33.7.7.: *taberna(m) cum caenaculo* .. in an *insula,* referring to a shop and living apartment. As seen in the preceding note, however, Sutherland does not regard mezzanines, attached to (work)shops as *cenacula.* On shop-flat complexes, see Wallace-Hadrill, *Houses and Society* and Foss, "Kitchens and Dining Rooms". See the discussion of *taberna* below.

97 See Suet. *Vit* 7.2 (*cenacula meritoria*), *Dig.* 19.2.30 (*conductum*), and Juv. 3.234 (*meritoria*). *Meritoria* refers to places or rooms let out for a short time (*meritoria facere*) (*Dig.* 7.1.13). Juvenal (3.23-235) claims that only the wealthy sleep, since it is too noisy to do so in *meritoria.*

floors of buildings, [98] (work)shop-*cum*-living quarters and inn or boarding house accommodation. The terms *"cella"*, [99] *"tabulata"* [100] or *"tenebra"* [101] are used by Juvenal and Martial of high-rise, cheap and and often badly-lit units, while in the Republican period, (work-)ship / dwellings were best known as *tabernae*. [102] *Taberna* also means "inn" [103] and indeed, this is the most common meaning of the term in the later or Imperial period. [104] "Inn", however, translates not merely *"taberna"* but a host of other terms, including

---

98 In a multiple-dwelling, the higher the accommodation the cheaper it was. See aforementioned references in Juvenal, especially to 3.201-202 where people are said to live like the doves, under the roof-tiles: "*ultimus ardebit quem tegula sola tuetur / a pluvia, molles ubi reddunt ova columbae.*"

99 To take three references from Martial, a *cella* is described as "grimy" or *fusca* (3.30.3), up two hundred stairs (7.20.20-21) and not such a good place to live (8.14.5). The term also refers to a porter's lodge (Vit. *De Arch.* 6.10) and the abode of of slaves (Cic. *Phil.* 2.27.67) or servants (Cato, *Rust.* 14).

100 In Juv. 3.199, there is reference to smoke pouring out a third floor attic "*...tabulata tibi iam tertia fumant.*" *Tabulata* is in fact a general term referring to a (floor)-boarded space, a floor or storey.

101 Juv. 3. 223-225 contrasts a *domus* with a dark, rented garret or *tenebrae*: "*quanti nunc tenebras unum conducis in annum.*"

102 These units, at street level, formed part of larger *domus* or *insulae*. A (work)shop - dwelling as indicated in *Dig.* 33.7.7.: *taberna(m) cum caenaculo* .. in an *insula.* Its commercial nature is evident from the reference to the unit being willed "together with the merchandise" (*cum mercibus* ...). Similarly *Dig.* 50.16.185 reads that ". we regard a house (*taberna*) as 'equipped' which possesses wares and people ready for doing business." Such structures are well attested in the archaeological evidence. See Packer, ("Housing and Population," 84-86), Wallace-Hadrill (*Houses and Society*) and Foss ("Kitchens and Dining-Rooms").

103 Foss ("Kitchens and Dining Rooms", 35, n.147, citing T. Kleberg, *Hôtels, restaurants et cabarets dans l'antiquité romaine* [Uppsala: Almqvist and Wiksells ,1957]) notes that in " the Republican age, the term *taberna* also meant 'shop' but this meaning eventually gave way to 'tavern, cabaret' ." *Taberna* also has other, less commonly cited meanings, including "any slight structures used for a dwelling, hut, cottage". See the *pauperum tabernae* of Hor. *Carm.* 1.4.13. As noted by Frier ("Rental Market, 32), "[i]n Cicero (*Inv.* 2..4.14-15), a *taberna* is an inn run by a *caupo,..*; this sense (rather than 'shop') prevails into the second century A.D."

104 With regard to inns, boarding houses or taverns, the evidence is complex, given the wide range of both terms and premises. The best source is Kleberg, *Hôtels, restaurants et cabarets.* On pages 6-19, he outlines the evolution of the terminology. Packer (1978) examines the archaeological evidence and R. Laurence, *Roman Pompeii: Space and Society* (London: Routledge, 1994) addresses their place in the urban context. See also L. Casson, *Travel in the Ancient World* (London: Allen and Unwin, 1974). From both primary and secondary sources, it is difficult to ascertain the similarities and differences between such inns and taverns.

"deversoria", *"stabula"*, [105] *"cauponae"*, [106] *"popina"* [107] and *"hospitia"*. [108] The English word "inn", therefore, is applied to a whole range of ancient premises, each one providing some (different) combination of food, drink, entertainment, sex and lodgings. At times, it is difficult to distinguish inn accommodation from that offered by cheap lodgings[109] for they overlap at the level of terminology, [110] reality and leasing arrangement. [111] What is of relevance here is that many premises functioned as (short and long term) lodgings and thus are classifiable as forms of housing.

---

105 See Livy 21.63.10 and Suet. *Vit.* 7ff. Foss ("Kitchens and Dining Rooms", 35, n. 145) notes that "*[d]eversorium* refers further to hostels located on country roads between town and a *stabulum* may have additional stables for housing carts and animals".

106 According to Foss ("Kitchens and Dining Rooms", 35), a "diner that combined the features of a restaurant, a tavern and sometimes a brother was known commonly as a *caupona*, a more disreputable version was a *ganea*, *ganeum* or *gurgustium.*" For *caupona*, see Cic. *Pis.* 22(53), Hor. *Sat.* 1.5.51, for *ganea*, see Livy 26.2.15 and Suet. *Tib.* 34. According to Kleberg (*Hôtels, restaurants et cabarets* 1-11), the term *caupona* became gradually more pejorative, thereby acquiring a meaning similar to that of *ganeum* and *gurgustium*. Kleberg and Foss, however, note that since privileged Latin authors rarely frequented such establishments, their negative opinions (which dominate the sources) are largely classist.

107 *Popina* refers to a premises which serves food. See Juv. 8.172, 11.81 and Mart. 5.70.3. Foss ("Kitchens and Dining Rooms," 35), describes as a *popina* or *taberna*, a "lunch-counter that offered only food and wine, not lodging."

108 *Hospitium* also means "lodging" in a general sense. See, for example, Juv. 3.210 (..*hospitio tectoque* - lodging and shelter), 3.166 (.. *magno hospitium miserabile*: paying a big rent for a miserable lodging). The term is used of an inn (Pliny, *Ep.* 6.19.4; Apul. *Met.* 1.7; 9.4 and *Dig.* 4.9.6.3), the rented dwelling of a poor person (Juv. 3.166), a rented apartment (*Dig.* 9.3.5.1; 19.2.13.7).

109 An example of such accommodation is found in the *Satyricon* of Petronius, in the simple room (*locus*, *cella*) rented by Encolpius. The room in the *deversorium* (inn) is described as a "*locus*" (cf. Greek *topos*) and a *cella* (Petron. *Sat.* also 81.1, 94. 4, 7; 95. 3, 5, 7). As explained by Frier ("Rental Market", 31), the room is one of many in the inn (97.7): "His door can be locked from inside or outside... The furniture of his rooms includes only a bed up against the wall (84.8-9) and a large wooden candlestick (95.6); one remembers the similarly Spartan furnishings in the rented garret of Cordus (Juv. 3.202-207)."

110 A word like *cella* is used to mean both the poor, garret accommodation mentioned by Martial (see n. 100) and a single room in a boarding-house or brothel. See Petronius (*Satyricon* 94-97) for references to *cella* as "a single room in a boarding house" and Juvenal 6.122, 128 for the same term meaning "a room in a brothel". As illustrated overleaf (n. 99), the case of *hospitium* is somewhat similar.

111 Apart from "Rental Market" cited above, see also B. Frier, *Landlords and Tenants in Ancient Rome* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1980).

further housing terms

The list of housing terms extends well beyond the most common ones already discussed. [112] Further examples include terms for specific types of dwelling (*villa,* [113] *casa,*[114] *tugurium,* [115] *palatio*), words for dwellings in general (*domicilium,*[116] *aedes,* [117] *habitatio,* [118] *aedificium* [119]) and those which, by transferred meaning or metonymy refer to housing forms (*lares,*[120] *tectum,*[121] *sedes,*[122] *mansio* [123]). For palaces and imperial

---

112 Definitions listed below are taken from Lewis and Short.

113 *Villa* generally refers to a (large) country house. See Ter. *Haut.* 4.49, Hor. *Carm.* 2.3.18, 3.22.5, *Epod.* 1.129. For archaeological evidence of *villae*, see for example McKay, *Houses, Villas and Palaces,* chapter 5. On the problem of defining a villa, see J. Percival, J. *The Roman Villa: An Historical Introduction* (London: B. T. Batsford Ltd., 1976), 13-15.

114 *Casa* is "any simple or poorly built house, a cottage, hut, cabin, shed etc." See Luc. 5.1011, 6.1254. In Mart. 6.43, it refers to small country house. For reference to the *Casa Romuli*, the thatched cottage of Romulus on the Capitoline Hill, see Vitr. *De. Arch.* 2.1.

115 *Tugurium* is a "hut, cottage, cot..of shepherds, peasants.." See Varro, *Rust.* 3.13, Pliny 16.9.14.35. According to *Dig.* 50.16.180, "...every building which is more fitting for rural protection than for urban housing is meant. Ofilius says that a hut (*tugurium*) is named from its tiled roof (*tegularium*), just as a toga is named because we are covered by it."

116 *Domicilium* is general term meaning "habitation, dwelling, domicile, abode". See Caes. *BGall.* 1.30, *BCiv.* 1.86.3 and *Dig.* 5.1.19. If people had several residences, *domicilium* referred to the principal one.

117 *Aedes* or *aedis* is a general term meaning a "building for habitation". See Vitr. *De Arch.* 4.7.1.

118 *Habitatio* usually means a "dwelling", as in Plaut. *Most.* 2.2.73 and Vitr. *De Arch.* 2.8.17. It also refers to the rent for a dwelling, as in Caes. *BCiv.* 3.21.1 and Suet. *Iul.* 38.

119 *Aedificium* means "building of any kind, edifice, structure".

120 *Lares* refers to the hearth, the deities of the house and by extension to the home or house. See Mart. 10. 58.10 for *lares* as "house" or "home".

121 *Tectum,* literally "covering", means "roof" and "ceiling". The meaning is transferred to mean "roofed building for dwelling.. house, abode, cover, shelter, quarters".

122 The meaning of *sedes* (literally "seat") is transferred to refer to "a place where one stays, a seat, dwelling place, residence, habitation, abode, temple etc.". Hence, Juvenal (3.2) makes his *sedes* or home at Cumae. See also Cic. *Rep.* 1.16.41.

123 *Mansio* (from *maneo*) means a "place of abode". See, for example, Mart. 10.58.10 and Vulg. Joann. 14.2, 23. It often refers to "night quarters, lodging place, inn", as in Suet. *Tib.* 10. See also *mala mansio* (bad quarters) in *Dig.* 47.10.15 and 16.3.7.

dwellings, the most common Roman terminology may be described as *domus*-plus-epithet, as illustrated in the examples *"Domus Aurea"*, *"Domus Flavia"*, *"Domus Tiberiana"* or *"Domus Transitoria"*. [124]

Latin terminology: summary and conclusions

Like οἶκος / οἰκία, *domus* means physical and sociological "house", functions literally and metaphorically and carries religious and affective overtones. In contrast to Greek, Latin has a wider stock of terminology, both in relation to social groups and dwellings. While the household was the basic unit of society, the term did not develop as much of a quasi-technical echo (from use in philosophical and political writings) as did οἶκος / οἰκία. Furthermore, the term *"domus"* did not form part of a wider and common currency, based on etymology and semantics, as was noted in the case of "οἶκος / οἰκία".

The exploration of *"domus"* (like that of οἶκος / οἰκία) highlights the need to be alert to the term's wide semantic field, its capacity to function at different levels and its role (as both housing and household) as a key to the Graeco-Roman world. The abundance of housing terminology is particularly noteworthy and contrasts with the ubiquitous and general οἶκος / οἰκία. While a study of these terms reveals that many function as (virtual) synonyms, plurality of terminology also points to plurality of abodes. More specifically, it points to differentiation and variety of habitation and this in turn suggests the world-revealing power of housing in Roman society.

---

[124] For details of these as buildings, see McKay, *House, Villas and Palaces*.

Hebrew Terminology : "בית"

In this section, attention turns to בית, the Hebrew term with a semantic field most akin to that of οἶκος / οἰκία and *domus*. [125] Examples of usage are drawn from biblical and rabbinic writings and meanings are further elucidated from secondary sources on housing and households. בית sources, therefore, represent a broader time span than do most Greek and Latin texts cited in this chapter, which date largely from the early Imperial period.

Meanings of "ב י ת"

dwelling

Like οἶκος / οἰκία and *domus*, בית is a general term used of a variety of abodes, human, divine and animal. Turning first to human habitations, biblical and rabbinic sources reveal that בית is a generic term applied to a range of dwellings: from tents, to the basic housing unit of "..at least one room, four by six cubits", [126] to good quality dwellings like the luxurious, ivory-decorated houses of Samaria, [127] to King David' s cedar palace. [128] As with οἶκος / οἰκία, it is the context which provides the specification, be it regarding construction, size, quality or location. It is in the legal arguments of rabbinic writings in particular that the definition of בית as "dwelling" is enfleshed. These writings

---

125 Secondary sources include Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon, Jenni and Westermann, *Theologisches Handwörterbuck zum Alten Testament, Hebräisches und Aramäisches Lexikon zum Alten Testament, A Dictionary of the Targumim, The Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi and the Midrashic Literature, The Jewish Encyclopedia.* See also L. E. Stager, "The Archaeology of the Family in Ancient Israel," *BASOR* 260 (1985) 1-35, N. K. Gottwald, *The Tribes of Yahweh: A Sociology of the Religion of Liberated Israel, 1250-1050 B.C.E.* (Maryknoll: Orbis, 1979: Republished with new preface, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999).

126 On this unit, see M. Baba Bathra 6.4, cited in Hirschfeld, *Palestinian Dwelling*, 217.

127 See Deut 8.12 and Hag 1.4 (good quality dwellings), 1 Kings 22.39; Amos 3.15 (the houses of Samaria).

128 See Ex 12.7; Deut 6.7 (private house), Gen 33.17 (tent), Gen 12.15, 2 Sam 11. 2, 9; 1 Kings 9.1, 10, 14.26, 15.18; Esther 1.9; Jer 39.8; Is 22.22 (palaces and royal houses, citadels and fortresses .

provide copious details about housing, living conditions and lifestyle. [129] The sources provide insight into the planning and measurement of sites, [130] the construction of dwellings and the craft-workers involved. [131] Turning to specific house parts, they reveal information on the construction of walls [132] (made from stone, wood, earth, bricks and mortar), [133] of ceilings, roofs,[134] windows,[135] entrances [136] and flooring methods.[137] Attention is paid to possible damage to walls and ceilings in particular. [138] Sources refer to the main divisions of space and the activities carried out in them: namely the תרקלן (living room),[139]

---

129 Citations from rabbinic writings are found in Hirschfeld, *Palestinian Dwelling*.

130 See M. Eruvin 5.5 and Midrash Rabbbah: Genesis 1.1.

131 On craft-workers, see for example T. Shabbat 11.1 and P. T. Baba Metzia 10, 12c.

132 On the construction of walls, see Hirschfeld, *Palestinian Dwelling*, 230-234

133 On stones, wood and earth, see M. Nega'im 12.2 and other examples cited in Hirschfeld, *Palestinian Dwelling*, 281 n. 4. See also references to recycled stone (M. Baba Metzia 10.1), bricks (M. Sotah, 8.3; Midrash Rabbah: Leviticus, 20.4), mortar (M. Baba Metzia 10.5) and lome-based cement (T. Sotah 15.9). On construction material, see also Lev 14.37, 39, 45, Amos 5.11(plaster) and 2 Sam 7.2,7; 1 Kings 7.2; Is 22.8 (cedar).

134 On ceilings and roofs, see Hirschfeld, *Palestinian Dwelling*, 237-248. In Palestine, roofs were commonly thick layers of plaster over a base of beams and branches. See rabbinic sources on beams (M. Eruvin 1.5) of date palm (Midrash Rabbah: Genesis 41.1) cedar and sycamore (Is. 9.9), often placed over a bed of reeds (M. Kelim 20.5). On roof maintenance, see M. Moed Katan 1.10 (stone-rolling), re-plastering (Sifre on Deuteronomy 42: Midrash Rabbah: Leviticus 35.12) and on collapsing roofs, see Mekhilta de Rabbi Ishmael 15. See M. Baba Bathra 2.5 (on gutters) and 3.6 (on drainpipes).

135 On rabbinic sources dealing with windows, see references cited in Hirschfeld, *Palestinian Dwelling*, 255-258. See details on "Egyptian" and "Tyrian" windows , window frames (M. Baba Bathra 3.6), grills (T. Eruvin 7.12), lintels, awnings for shade, small funnel-shaped nature (Midrash Rabbah, Leviticus 31.7) and elevated position.

136 On rabbinic sources on entrances and their accessories see examples cited Hirschfeld, *Palestinian Dwelling*, 249-255. These include references to door posts, lintels thresholds (M Shabbat 10.2; T. Shabbat 1.6), door bells / knockers (T. Kelim, Baba Metzia 1.13), security devices (M. Kelim 12.5 T. Yom Tov 1.11), sites of the *mezuzah* (P. T. Megillah 4, 75c). .

137 On flooring methods, see Hirschfeld, *Palestinian Dwelling,* 270-271. These include earth, plaster and mosaic (P. T. Shabbat 7, 10b)

138 On damage to walls, see for example, M. Baba Metzia 10.5, 11.7, 8.30, Midrash Rabbah, Leviticus 20.4, T. Ohalot 7.5, Sifre Zuta 15, M. Baba Bathra 2.1, P.T. Shabbar 4, 6d.

139 The term derives from the Latin *triclinium*. See Hirschfeld (*Palestinian Dwelling*, 260-261) and T. Kelim, Baba Metzia, 5.3; M. Eruvin 6.6)

קיטון (bedroom),[140] courtyard, [141] the upper floor, which was either a complete or partial (עליה) structure [142] and the roof. [143] In addition to biblical and rabbinic sources, further insight into the variety of dwellings labelled בית is found in secondary sources. In *The Palestinian Dwelling in the Roman-Byzantine Period,* for example, Hirschfeld draws on literary, archaeological and anthropological material to present four types of dwellings (the simple house, complex house, courtyard house and house with shop). McKay's study of housing in the (Graeco-)Roman world is also a source for dwellings classifiable by Jews as "בית", given the fact that the Jewish Diaspora extended across the Roman empire.

Along with human dwellings, בית (alone or in combination with other nouns) is applied to abodes in the wider sense. Human-occupied spaces to which the noun refers include a tomb and Hades. [144] Like οἶκος / οἰκία, the term is used of abodes divine, animate and inanimate: בית is used of the Jerusalem temple (House of God) and the temples of idols; [145] It is applied to animal abodes, as for example, that of a wild ass, sparrow, stork, spider, moth or calf. [146] At a more abstract level, it describes the tabernacle of the covenant. [147] Other receptacles or places for inanimate things, referred to as "בית",

---

140 The term comes from the Greek "κοιτών". See Hirschfeld (*Palestinian Dwelling*, 261 and P. T. Rosh Hashana 4, 59b.

141 On the construction of the courtyard and the various activities carried out there, see Hirschfeld, *Palestinian Dwelling*, 272-274 and rabbinic sources cited there.

142 See Hirschfeld (*Palestinian Dwelling*, 247). Its functions included rest and refreshment, but it also served "as an office or meeting place for the heads of the clam, the community leaders, protegés of the owner and people seeking favors". See M. Nedarim 7.4, M. Eruvin 6.6, M. Shabbat 1.4.

143 On the use of roof-space for a variety of domestic activities (including drying foodstuffs,, resting, sleeping and studying), see Hirschfeld (*Palestinian Dwelling*, 246-247) and M. Eruvin 10.3, T. Pesachim, 6.11, T. Yom Tov 4.1 and M. Toharot 9.6.

144 See Is 14.18 (tomb) and Job 17.13 (Hades).

145 See, for example, 1 Kings 6.5, 37; 7.12; Is 66.1; 1 Chron 9.11, 13, 26 (on the Jerusalem temple) and Is 37.38; 44.13; 1 Sam 5.2 (on pagan temples).

146 See Job 39.5-6 (wild-ass), Ps. 84.3-4 (sparrow), Ps 104.17 (stork), Job 8.14 (spider), Job 27.18 (moth) and 1 Sam. 6.7, 10 (calf).

147 See Ex 23.19; Josh 6.24; 1 Sam 1.7, 24; 3.15.

include holders for poles and containers for perfume [148] and yet further delimited spaces include, for example, a shed, a stony place in the earth and an altar trench. [149]

social group

Like οἶκος / οἰκία, the term "בית" is used of a variety of social groups. In Ancient Israel, the term "בית אב (father's house)" referred to the extended family or household, a patrilineal and patrilocal unit which comprised all the offspring of a single living patriarch. [150] Ideally, it included a husband, wife, unmarried daughters,[151] sons (together with their wives and children), slaves (and their families), resident aliens, resident Levites (sometimes) and any widows and orphans under the authority and protection of the family head. In all, it could number some 50-100 persons who lived in a cluster of dwellings. The בית אב was the basic unit of Israelite kinship and social structure, the primary social unit both for the individual and the nation. It had a wide range of functions, rights and responsibilities: it was the basic unit of Israel's system of land tenure. [152] Along with its economic role, its functions were military and judicial. It was also central in the experience and preservation of the covenant relationship with Yahweh and functioned as vehicle for the continuity of the faith, history, law and traditions of the nation. The בית אב formed part of a wider social unit, the clan, phratry or משפחה. This endogamous unit [153] was formed by the agnatic descendants of a common ancestor. As described by Gottwald, the

---

148 See Ex 25.27 (poles) and Is 3.20 (containers for perfume).

149 See Job 38.20 (shed), Job 8.17; Neh 2.3; Ezek 41.9 (stony place in the earth) and 1 Kings 18.32 (an altar trench).

150 On the definition of a בית אב (and related terms), see Gottwald, *Tribes of Yahweh,* Part VI and C. J. H. Wright, "Family", *ABD* 2 :761-769.

151 A married daughter entered her husband's בית אב.

152 To be labelled a "house", the group had to possess land. On the house / land link in Israel, see C. J. H. Wright, *God's People in God's Land: Family and Property in the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990).

153 The Israelite clan was normally endogamous in order to preserve Israel's system of land tenure (Num 36.1-12).

clan was a "[p]rotective association of extended families" [154] and protection was indeed one of the group's primary functions. The clan also had supportive and restorative roles in the social and economic spheres [155] while a further feature of the Israelite clan was its territorial identity. The clan was itself part of a yet wider social unit, the tribe (שבט, מטה). As summarised by Wright, [156] this unit ".. was the primary unit of social and territorial organization in Israel. The tribes bore the names of the twelve sons of Jacob/Israel, with Joseph divided into Manasseh and Ephraim. ... Although, as the nomenclature shows a person's tribal identity was important and in wartime the military levy was on a tribal basis, in terms of practical social impact on ordinary life, the tribe was the least significant of the circles of kinship within which one stood." In ancient Israel, therefore, the term "בית" referred to the basic building block of society. As outlined by Gottwald, the term was also used metaphorically of both the clan and tribe. [157]

The reality of households, to which the term "בית" was still applied by Hebrew-speaking Jews, changed over time: the growth of the monarchy and subsequent foreign invasions lessened the autonomy and power of the household and changes in land ownership affected its economic basis. [158] By Graeco-Roman times, the traditional extended household existed alongside other models similar to those throughout the empire. In relation to first century Galilee, for example, Guijarro is able to re-construct four family types, distinguishable on the basis of dwelling-form, number of family members, capacity for mutual support, land ownership and social group:[159] these he labels "large", "multiple", "nucleated" and "scattered".

Moving beyond Palestine, one of the "striking" conclusions to emerge from a study

---

154 Gottwald, *Tribes of Yahweh*, 257ff.

155 Rights included reclaiming inheritance (Num 27.8-22) and obligations included redeeming members sold into slavery (Lev 25.48-49) and land sold to foreigners.

156 Wright, "Family", 761.

157 See Gottwald, *Tribes of Yahweh*, sections 29.2 and 29.3.

158 See S. Guijarro Oporto, *Fidelidades en Conflicto: La ruptura con al familia por causa del discipulado y de la misión en la tradición sinóptica* (Salamanca: Publicaciones Universidad Pontificia de Salamanca, 1998), 77 and references cited in note 5.

159 Guijarro Oporto, "The Family in First Century Galilee".

of Jewish families edited by Cohen is these social units were similar to those of non-Jews co-existing in the Graeco-Roman world. [160] It is indeed striking but in a sense different from that used by Cohen. While Jewish families may have resembled others in their environment by being "extended", "nucleated" or "large", their religious observance (circumcision, dietary laws..) meant that in many important respects, they were different - different in the sense of preserving a unique religious and ethnic identity.

Like οἶκος / οἰκία, the term "בית" is applicable to households in the wider sense. The term describes a dynasty or royal house, like that promised to David by God. [161] At a metaphorical level, therefore, "to build a house" for someone means to "provide offspring".[162] בית is used of broad descent or ethnic groups such as the House of Israel, of rabbinic schools such as the Houses of Hillel and Shammai. [163] Like *familia*, the term is also applied to the "King's house" or courtiers. [164]

other meanings

Like οἶκος / οἰκία, בית refers to both "persons and property belonging to a household". [165] More generally, the term has a range of metaphorical, transferred and figurative meanings which are even more numerous and varied than those of οἶκος / οἰκία. בית is used, for example, of one's inner being or innards, [166] of the transitory nature of the human body [167] and as a euphemism for sexual intercourse .[168] In the

---

160 S. J. D. Cohen (ed.), *The Jewish Family in Antiquity* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993). See page 2, in particular.

161 See 1 Sam 20.16; 1 Kings 12.26, 13.2.

162 See Deut 35.9, 1 Sam 2.35; 2 Sam 7.27.

163 See T. Be[t]sah 1.1.

164 Is 22.18.

165 See Gen 39. 1, 2; Ex 20.17; 1 Kings 13.8.

166 See Gen 6.14; Ex 25.11, 37.2, 28.26; 2 Sam 5.9.

167 Job 4.19.

168 Y. Sabb 9.12a, Mikv 8.4.

quotation "woe to the house through which vegetables are always passing", [169] for example, "house" refers to the body or digestive system. [170] In compounds, the term has a virtually endless list of meanings, a fact well documented in lengthy lexical entries.

בית and paronomasia

The vast semantic field and flexibility of בית means that the term is open to word play or paronomasia, a feature characteristic of Hebrew literature. One of the best known examples is found in 2 Samuel 7. David sets out with the desire to build a בית (house or temple) for God, but in the end it is God who promises a בית (dynasty) for the monarch. At the very heart of this key text, therefore, lies a pun based on the double meaning of word "בית".

---

169 T. Berakoth 44b.

170 In M. Yoma 1.1, as a result of a typically Jewish form of Scriptural interpretation, בית is taken to refer to a wife. The text in question is Lev 16.6 "since it says 'And he shall make atonement for himself and for his house' " and according to the Mishnaic text, " 'his house'- this refers to his wife".

Hebrew terminology: summary and conclusions

Οἶκος / οἰκία finds its closest Hebrew equivalent in the polysemic term "בית". Like οἶκος / οἰκία, בית refers to the physical reality of dwellings and a host of abodes, literal and metaphorical. It is applied to a variety of social groupings, including "house(hold)", "family", "dynasty" and "race." Throughout the wide historical period represented by the written sources, these meanings of "בית" are constant though clearly the realities to which they refer did not remain static. The Hebrew term, however, has an even wider semantic field than its Greek and Latin counterparts. Furthermore, it is in בית's frequent use in compounds with other nouns that its versatility and chameleon-like semantic quality emerge. Significantly too, the use of word play involving בית reveals an awareness and exploitation of the term's versatility by ancient writers.

A study of Hebrew terminology, therefore, reveals the limitless meanings and flexibility of the term "בית". It highlights the need to be attentive to the meanings in context and to possible word play. The attempt to define בית (like οἶκος / οἰκία and *domus*), leads inevitably to an exploration of the social world. In contrast to an exploration of Greek and Latin terminology, focus on the Hebrew term is an explicit reminder, at the level of language, of the presence of a culture within a culture: it offers a glimpse of a people simultaneously within the empire yet one with a history and tradition of their own. While the use of Hebraized Greek and Latin terms (like "traklin" and "kiton") point to the influence of Graeco-Roman culture on the Jews, a focus on בית as "household" (and its link with the ancient clan and tribe) reveals something of the particular structures with which Jews, even those of later ages, are familiar.

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

The review exposed a certain lack of clarity regarding the definition and use of house terminology. This, it was argued, stems from a lack of reflection on the nature of "house", a nature presumably considered too self-evident to merit scrutiny. Chapters 1 and 2 have provided a re-visiting of the topic and thus lay the foundations for the chapters which follow. Chapter 1 offered a reflection of "house" today, an essential prerequisite for understanding οἶκος / οἰκία, *domus* and בית in antiquity. Chapter 2's study of ancient house terms provides further equipment and insights for the task ahead.

"House" as model

First of all, the exploration leads to the concept of "house" which is to serve as model or analytical tool. Recent scholarship in the social sciences has emphasised the need for a model (or interpretational framework); put another way, such scholarship has highlighted the impossibility of working without one. [171] As explained by Carney, a model is a formal, consciously used "cognitive map" [172] or "chunking [173] device." [174] It functions

---

171 For a useful and frequently cited treatment of models for the non-social-scientist, see T. F. Carney, *The Shape of the Past: Models and Antiquity* (Lawrence, Kansas: Coronado Press, 1975), 1-42.

172 According to Carney (*Shape of the Past,* 7), "a model is an outline framework, in general terms, of the characteristics of a class of things or phenomena. This framework sets out the major components involved and indicates their priority of importance. It provides guidelines on how these components relate to one another. It states the range within which each component or relationship may vary. A model is something less than a theory and something more than an analogy."

173 According to Malina ("Social Sciences and Biblical Interpretation", 231), human beings "chunk" or abstract similarities in order to deal with complexity. They thereby reduce the number of items being dealt with.

174 As defined more technically by Malina (" Social Sciences and Biblical Interpretation", 23), a model is "an abstract, simplified representation of some real world object, event, or interaction constructed for the purpose of understanding, control, or prediction". In Elliott (*What is Social-Scientific Criticism?* , 132), the definition is as follows:

> "model, social: An abstract selective representation of the relationships among social phenomena used to conceptualize, analyze, and interpret patterns of social relations, and to compare and contrast one system of social relations with another. Models are heuristic constructs that operationalize particular theories and that range in scope and complexity according to the phenomena being analyzed."

as a conscious viewing perspective and as a heuristic device for the interpretation of complex data. Rather than adopting a ready-made model from the social-sciences, it is the concept of "house" which serves as the interpretational framework for this study. While the use of "house" as tool or model is not new, the particular version to be used in this study is. In most studies, it is either the notion of household or that of dwelling which predominates. Here, "house" is understood in both the physical and sociological sense. Furthermore, the breadth and flexibility of the term is openly acknowledged and exploited. The adoption of this versatile and multi-stranded model proves immensely useful: it makes it possible to view on one and the same canvas realities usually considered quite distinct, namely the household (as basic unit of society), individual households, physical houses and world-wide houses (like the imperial house or house of Israel); it permits one to work with the notion of "house" as ideal and reality and to explore the correlation (or non-correlation) between housing and households. As will be seen, this yields fruitful readings of the inter-related "texts" of the early empire (the macro-text) and Acts (the micro-text).

"Oikic" sources

Secondly, the terminological exploration results in the formulation of a category used in this study, namely that of "oikic" sources. As "house" is understood in the sense of both housing and household, all sources relating to these physical and sociological realities are raw material for the study. Given that there is no English adjective to convey this idea, the term "oikic" is coined. In the chapters which follow, it is oikic sources both primary and secondary, literary, inscriptional and archaeological, which are considered as texts to be read. If "house" is the model, then oikic sources are the data; model and data together provide hermeneutical keys both to the early imperial world and to one particular Christian text which forms part of that world.

PART 2

HOUSE READINGS

of the

EARLY ROMAN EMPIRE

(THE MACRO-TEXT)

INTRODUCTION

Having laid the foundations for the study, attention now turns to the house readings themselves. The focus in Part 2 is the early Roman empire, which as explained in the Introduction, is considered the macro-text. [1] This macro-text is read using the multi-faceted analytical tool of "house" and the rich material on housing and households. Three readings are presented, each in a separate chapter. Individually, each chapter represents a distinct and unique angle on the empire; taken together, the three amount to a broad and enlightening view of the macro-text. Chapter 3 demonstrates how the imperial structure is but a household-writ-large. Working with the physical house, Chapter 4 explores dwelling / user relationships in the Roman town-house and other habitations. Having exposed the *domus* ideology of the Roman world and the infinitely varied reality in which it was operative, Chapter 5 reveals yet another vital aspect of the Roman world, namely the multi-faceted relationship between imperial power and colonized people. This emerges from a focusing on houses in the provinces or in what is termed the contact zone.

Before embarking on these chapters, however, a word about sources is required. Sources for the readings of the macro-text include written texts and architectural remains as interpreted by both archaeologists and social historians. With regard to the nature of written sources, three aspects need to be borne in mind: first, most are written from the perspective of the upper-class, educated, male; secondly, much house material has to be extracted from texts with other foci and thirdly, evidence from Italy outweighs that from the provinces. Regarding architectural sources, the partial nature of this material must be noted: housing remains often represent only the better quality dwellings [2] or those

---

1 See Introduction (page 52).

2 Packer ("Housing and Population," 82) explains that apartment remains in Rome represent only the best buildings of the time and are not typical of the cheaper dwellings which dominated the capital. Similarly Hirschfeld (*Palestinian Dwelling,* 24) notes that ".scholars naturally tend to study houses in a relatively good state of preservation - which were most often the well-built residences of the wealthy classes."

constructed from durable materials. [3] Furthermore, archaeological sources are heavily influenced by contemporary decisions regarding digs. [4]

All oikic sources used in the study are considered texts which require reading. [5] While the theory of text originated in relation to written material, the notion of textual metaphor has long been used in anthropology [6] and archaeology [7] to refer to other meaning-bearing realities such as human activity or physical space. Archaeology has focused both on the parallel reading of written sources and physical remains [8] and on the relationship between (physical) text and reader. Consideration of the various reading theories used in archaeology is helpful in clarifying issues relating to this study. The

---

3 Hirschfeld (*Palestinian Dwelling* 24) explains that the typical stone houses in the Hauran and Negev are well preserved in contrast to the mud and brick housing of the valley and foothills.

4 As noted by Wallace-Hadrill (*Houses and Society*, 68), distortion results from the tendency of scholars to focus on the better remains and ignore the rest. This is typical of work in Pompeii and serves to increase the gulf between rich and poor. Thus, for example, the reputation of Regio VI as a "smart quarter" is .. "partly due to the virtual obliteration of all but the show houses." The "big digs" of classical archaeology, sponsored by large and wealthy institutions, have shown less interest in housing than in significant public buildings. The link between funding and what is considered important to dig is discussed on pages 321-322 of M. Sawicki, Archaeology as space technology: Digging for gender and class in holy land, *Method and Theory in the Study of Religion* 6 (1994).

5 Many recent studies have shown the complexity of the notions of both text and reading. See W. G. Jeanrond, *Text and Interpretation as Categories of Theological Thinking*, trans. T. J. Wilson (Dublin: Gill and Macmillan, 1988) and *Theological Hermeneutics: Development and Significance* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1991).

6 An example from the field of anthropology is Moore, *Space, Text and Gender.* She sets out an "interpretative approach" to the study of space based on an analogy with textual exegesis and uses the idea of a cultural text to construct an analytical framework.

7 The notion and implications of textual metaphor is discussed by E. Engelstad, Images of Power and Contradiction: Feminist Theory and Post-processual Archaeology, *Antiquity* 65 (1991), 502-514.

8 For pointers to developments in modern archaeological theory, I acknowledge the work of M. Sawicki. A useful summary of the relationship between physical and textual remains in the discipline of historical archaeology is provided on pages 4-7 of the draft of her article, "Spatial Management of Gender and Labor in Greco-Roman Galilee", subsequently published on pages 7-28 of D. R. Edwards and T. Mc Cullough (eds), *Archaeology and the World of Galilee: Texts and Contexts in the Roman and Byzantine Periods* (Atlanta: Scholars, 1997). See also Sawicki, "Caste and Contact".

approach in traditional classical (and biblical) archaeology [9] was largely text-led, its aim to find the places and objects referred to in ancient texts. Physical remains, therefore, were simply things- referred-to and not-valuable-texts-to-be-read-*per-se*. In the new or processual archaeology of the sixties and seventies, [10] written sources and remains were both read, but it was to written material only that a hermeneutics of suspicion was applied. Archaeological remains were considered untouched by ideology, hence purer or more objective. As such, they were thought capable of confronting the written material. In post-processual archaeology of the eighties, [11] however, written texts, material remains and the interpreter's own position were all read with suspicion. A "recursive" [12] relationship between texts and things, both then and now was noted. [13] More recently,

---

9 New theoretical developments are happening in the area of classical archaeology. On classical archaeology, its challenges and developments, see work by the classicist, S. L. Dyson, "From New to New Age Archaeology: Archaeological Theory and Classical Archaeology - A 1990s Perspective", *American Journal of Archaeology* 97 (1993), 195-206. Also illustrative of a more critical and theoretical approach is the collection by E. Scott (ed.), *Theoretical Roman Archaeology: First Conference Proceedings* (Aldershot: Avebury, 1993).

10 New Archaeology (or processual archaeology) first focused on the pre-historic period but its methods were later applied to historical periods. For an example of this new archaeology, see L. R. Binford, *An Archaeological Perspective* (New York: Seminar Press, 1972). See also P. J. Watson *et al.*, *Explanation in Archaeology: An Explicitly Scientific Approach* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1971).

11 Post-processual archaeology developed in the eighties under the inspiration of post-modernism and hermeneutical and critical social theory. Archaeology was seen as an ideological activity done in the present to serve present interests. Illustrative examples include the following works by Ian Hodder: "Postprocessual archaeology", *Advances in Archaeological Method and Theory* 8 (1985): 1-26, *Reading the Past* and "Post-modernism, post-structuralism and post-processual archaeology" in I. Hodder (ed.), *The Meaning of Things: Material Culture and Symbolic Expression* (London: Unwin Hyman, 1989), 64-78.

12 As noted by Sawicki, ("Spatial Management", 6-7), the term "recursive" is used by Leone, Little, Potter and their colleagues. See articles in *Historical Archaeology* 26 (1992) and see M. P. Leone and B. J. Little, "Artifacts as Expressions of Society and Culture: Subversive Genealogy and the Value of History" in S. Lubar and W. D. Kingery (eds), *History from Things: Essays in Material Culture* (Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1993), 160-181.

13 This represented a post-modern constructivist position, where the past was constructed in the present, shaped by the questions, models and social locations of the investigator. Having identified three strands of post-processual archaeology, T. C. Patterson ("History and the post-processual archaeologies", *Man* 24 [1989], 555-556) notes that they "all reject the notion that the past is directly accessible, an object to be read by the trained professional from the archaeological record."

Wylie [14] observed (in contemporary feminist practice) an attempt to make a path between the positivism of the new archaeology and the relativism and constructivism of post-processual methods. [15] She noted that data were not completely determined by the investigators since archaeological material could challenge expectations and hypotheses. From studies in archaeology, therefore, three important fact emerge: the first is that all sources, both written and physical must be read, the second, that the investigator must be subject to investigation and the third, that both sources and investigator speak. Turning from archaeology, further insight into the question of interpreting sources or reading texts is provided in Jeanrond's theory of reading. [16] Jeanrond reveals that the activity of reading is not a simple decoding process, but a complex two-way activity, involving reader and text. In short, the work of Jeanrond and that of many archaeologists and anthropologists contribute to explaining what is meant by stating that all oikic sources, be they written or physical, are texts to be read.

---

14 A. Wylie is a historian of the science of archaeology. See her paper, "Angles of Vision: The Engendering of Archaeology Past and Present", presented to a conference on "The Women and Gender Question in Science", Minneapolis 1995.

15 Wylie's observations point to the rapid developments in the field of archaeology. On page xv of the Foreword of Scott (*Theoretical Roman Archaeology*), Hodder notes that even recent categories of processual and post-processual are no longer really helpful or accurate.

16 See Jeanrond, *Text and Interpretation,* 104-119. In contrast to Iser's emphasis on the effect of the text on the reader and Fish's post-modern focus on the effect of the reader on the text, Jeanrond argues for the influence of both.

CHAPTER 3

THE EMPIRE as "HOUSEHOLD-WRIT-LARGE"

The reading of the macro-text begins with a presentation of the imperial structure as a "household-writ-large". [1] Working with the concept of house as "household", the chapter reveals how the traditional Roman household is adopted and adapted as a model for the construction of the imperial system. Adopting a wide-angled view, the first section examines four general aspects of the imperial structure as household. These aspects are related by their link to *patria potestas*, the Roman institution and ideology of "father - power". [2] A second section focuses more narrowly on the "house-building" activity of Augustus, that is, the conscious attempt of the *princeps* to build a dynasty.

FOUR ASPECTS OF "EMPIRE as HOUSEHOLD"

This first section presents four contributory elements to the construct of the "empire as household". The first aspect examined is the progression from the role of *pater familias* to that of *princeps* as *pater patriae*. A second focuses on religion, examining parallels between domestic and state levels. A third examines so-called family values promoted in cults and legislation during the Augustan period. A fourth examines the area of slavery and patronage, focusing in particular on the transition from the *familia* of an individual to the *Familia Caesaris*. These four broad aspects flow, albeit in different measure, from *patria potestas* which Romans themselves recognized as an institution particularly characteristic of their society. [3] As described by Lacey, [4] *patria potestas* (extending

---

1 This is not a novel concept. See Judge, *Social Pattern,* 30-39. This present chapter, however, spells the concept out in more detail.

2 My own translation.

3 See *Cod. Iust.* 1.9.2, Gai. *Inst.* 1.55.

4 On *patria potestas*, see W. K. Lacey, "*Patria Potestas*" in Rawson (ed.), *Family,* 121-144.

from the domestic domain into that of the state) was *the* central institution in the Roman world, one which expressed and shaped Roman ideology and provided the world view within which society was organized.

1. From *pater familias* to *pater patriae*

Exploration of the unique role of the Roman *pater familias* and its use as model for both state magistrates and the position of emperor contributes to the construct of the empire as household-writ-large. As the head of the household was *pater familias*, so (by logical progression from a Roman perspective) was Augustus *pater patriae*.

Pater familias [5]

A *pater familias* was the head and chief priest [6] of a *familia*, the basic social and property-owning unit in the Roman world. Under his control (*potestas*) were his wife (if married *cum manu*), [7] his unmanumitted children, his son's children [8] and his slaves. When a *pater familias* died, his wife and children became legally independent (*sui iuris*). [9]

---

5 This section draws principally on the work of J. Gardner, *Women in Roman Law and Society* (London: Croom Helm, 1986), 5-11. On the family in general, J. P. V. D. Balsdon, *Roman Women: Their History and Habits* (London: Bodley Head, 1962), S. Pomeroy, *Goddesses, Wives, Whores and Slaves: Women in Classical Antiquity* (New York: Schocken, 1975), Rawson (ed.). *Marriage, Divorce and Children* and *Family,* M. Bettini, *Anthropology and Roman Culture: Kinship, Time, Images of the Soul*, trans. J. van Sickle, (Baltimore and London: John Hopkins University Press, 1988), T. Wiedemann, *Adults and Children in the Roman Empire* (London: Routledge, 1989), Gardner and Wiedemann (eds), *Roman Household,* K. R. Bradley, *Discovering the Roman Family: Studies in Roman Social History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), S. Dixon, *Roman Mother* and *The Roman Family* (Baltimore and London: John Hopkins University Press, 1992), E. M. Lassen, "The Roman Family".

6 Household religion is discussed in the next section.

7 As noted by Pomeroy (*Goddesses*, 152), "If ... marriage was contracted with *manus*, the bride became part of her husband's family, as though she were his daughter, as far as property rights were concerned" and " [a] wife could become subject to her husband's *manus* in three ways: either by the two formal marriage ceremonies known as *confarreatio*..and *coemptio* or by *usus* (continuous cohabitation for a year)." On marriage *cum manu* and on Roman marriage generally, see Gardner, *Women,* 31-80 and Pomeroy, *Goddesses*, 155.

8 A daughter's children belonged to the *familia* of their father.

9 They ceased to be *alieni iuris* (subject to another's control).

Each adult son himself became (and acquired the powers of) a *pater familias*. Custody of daughters (and prepubertal sons) passed to the nearest male relative (agnate) unless the father had designated another guardian in his will. [10] A woman never became a legal head of household, had no *potestas* over her children but, as *mater familias,* was merely the wife of a *pater familias*. [11]

A *pater familias* had extraordinary and life-long powers over those in his *potestas,* including the power of life and death (*ius vitae necisque*). A father had the right to refuse to rear a newborn child and the mother had no legal power to prevent this. [12] He was entitled to punish his children and even to inflict the death penalty. [13] Sources for the early history of Rome (such as Valerius Maximus [14] and Livy) [15] reveal that daughters were often put to death because of sexual activity considered unacceptable by their fathers. The *lex Julia de adulteriis* of Augustus in 18 B.C.E. allowed a father to kill a

---

10 On *tutela* (especially in regard to women), see Pomeroy, *Goddesses*, 150-155. A woman's legal capacity was limited by having a tutor, whose authorisation was required for many legal transactions.

11 As Gardener (*Women*, 6) explains, "*materfamilias* in Latin was merely the term used to designate the wife, or strictly the wife in *manus* of a *pater familias*." She had no *familia.* As explained in the *Digest* (50.16.195.5), "she is both the source and the end of her own *familia*."

12 According to Gardner (*Women*, 6), "[c]hild exposure was practised, and was not made illegal until A.D. 374, although the evidence does not allow us to determine whether there was any discrimination against girl babies"...and she notes that "[s]ome of these powers, originating in a very primitive stage of Roman society when protection of the group rested on self-help rather than the rule of law, had become in their extreme form rather an embarrassment by the classical period." She refers to F. Schultz (*Principles of Roman Law* [Oxford: Clarendon, 1936], 166 ff.) for treatment of their gradual humanising.

13 See the Twelve Tables 4.2 and also the formula of adoption by *adrogatio in* Gell. *NA* 5.19.9. This was finally abolished in the reign of Valentinian and Valens.

14 According to Val. Max. (6.1.3), Pontius Aufidianus killed both his daughter and her lover and *paedagogus,* Fannius Saturninus. Atilius, himself a former prostitute, condemned his daughter to death because she was guilty of *stuprum* (sexual immorality) (6.1.6).

15 According to Livy 1.26, Horatia was engaged to one of the Curiatii. In a feud between her own three brothers and three of Curiatii, two of the former and three of the latter were killed, including Horatia's fiancé. Because she grieved for him, her surviving brother stabbed her, saying "Thus perish every Roman woman who mourns an enemy (of Rome)." Although her brother had to do penance for the murder, his father stated that if his son had not killed Horatia, he would have done so himself by virtue of his power as *pater*. See the case of Verginia in Livy 3.44-58, also Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 11. 28-49 and Diod. 12.24.

daughter caught in the act of adultery in his own or his son-in-law's house. [16] A *pater familias* also had the right of sale or surrender of a child. By the early empire, noxal surrender [17] (rather than actual sale) was common. Since a *pater familias* was liable for offences committed by his children or slaves, he could either pay damages or surrender the culprit. In the latter case, a notional sale formally ended *potestas*. [18] A *pater familias* had extensive property rights. Those *in potestate* of a father could neither own nor inherit property, neither could they make a will. Everything given to such a person belonged to the *pater*. While an adult son could have a wife, family and public career, he legally owned nothing as long as his father was alive. His position, therefore, was akin to that of a slave with a *peculium* (allowance or savings) [19] A *pater familias* had legal rights regarding the marriages and divorces of his children. Children required their father's consent to marry.[20] Until the time of Marcus Aurelius, a father could even dissolve his children's marriages against their will. [21] In order to divorce, a woman required the consent of her father, if she

---

16 The fact the that man had also to be condemned to death and that both had to be killed immediately was actually regarded as a restriction on the *ius vitae necisque*. According to Gardner (*Women*, 7), "it is possible that the intention was in practice to discourage such killing."

17 This involved the handing over of a person who had committed an injury (*noxa*). It was done by the *pater familias* to the injured party. For details, see Gardner, *Women*, 7-8.

18 With regard to the noxal surrender for children, Gardner (*Women*, 8) notes that "Justinian, formally abolishing noxal surrender except for slaves, says: 'The ancients permitted this also both for male and female children in the *familia*. Modern society, however, has considered that such harshness is rightly to be rejected and this has passed out of common usage. For who allows his son and especially his daughter to undergo noxal surrender to another, so that the father is almost at personal risk, rather than the son, while in the case of daughters due regard for modesty rightly excludes this?.' The implication is that surrender had in practice been abandoned earlier for both sexes." See Gai. 4.74, 79; *Inst*. 4.8.7; *Dig*..9.4.2 and 32 ff.

19 Only those who were *sui iuris* had the *ius commercii*, the right to incur financial obligations without the consent of their *paterfamilias*.

20 Children's consent was also required. If they were very young, however, this was probably a mere formality. Although the legal minimum age for the marriage of girls was twelve and fourteen for boys, betrothal could happen much earlier. According to *Dig*. 23.2.19 and Cic. *Att*. 6.6.1, *Fam*. 3.12.2 and from the time of Augustus, children could appeal to a magistrate if their father refused to permit their marriage.

21 On the evidence of Paulus. *Sent*. 5.6.15, (after the time of Marcus Aurelius), a father was forbidden to break up a happy marriage (*bene concordans matrimonium*).

were married *sine manu.* [22] In the case of a marriage *cum manu*, a couple had to get the consent of the husband's father (if still alive). [23] The powers of the *pater familias* were, therefore, great and largely unchecked. Furthermore, such powers were unparalleled in Greek law. As Gardner notes, "[a]lthough the authorities sometimes intervened to check abuses of disciplinary powers, and although the *pater* was expected to consult a council of family or friends [24] before exercising severe discipline, no legal restrictions were introduced until later imperial times." [25]

In reality, however, there is evidence of adult sons leading independent lives, of women controlling property [26] and of older sons and daughters taking the initiative with regard to marriage. [27] Such examples are not simply cases of old law out of step with current social practice; rather they are illustrations of the on-going co-existence of a strong patriarchal [28] ideology, enshrined in law, despite current practice. Further illustration of this ideology is the fact that despite problems (such as those arising from the anomalous position of adult sons), the Romans never considered abolishing the power of the *pater familias*. Rather, they simply tried to ease the situation by a series of legal reforms such as the *libera administratio* of *peculium.* [29] *Patria potestas*, therefore, was no ancient and problematic law but rather a mind-set or ideology which was so deeply rooted as to be

---

22 According to Gardener (*Women*, 11), the husband in a *sine manu* marriage did not apparently require his father's consent to divorce. The situation of a son and daughter seeking divorce was therefore not the same.

23 A daughter married *sine manu* was under her father's *potestas* and so she required his consent for divorcing her husband. If married *cum manu*, she was under the power of her husband (or of his father if still alive) and required the consent of one or other of them in order to divorce.

24 This was known as a *consilium.*

25 Gardner, *Women*, 6.

26 Pomeroy, *Goddesses*, 161-163.

27 Cicero's daughter Tullia is perhaps the best known example. As noted by Pomeroy (*Goddesses*, 157-158), "Cicero arranged two marriages for his daughter Tullia; but the third husband, the charming degenerate Dolabella, was selected by Tullia and her mother in Cicero's absence. The marriage was legal, but a disgruntled Cicero contemplated dissolving it by not paying the instalments on his daughter's dowry."

28 The term "patriarchal" is used here in its most literal sense, namely, "the rule of the father(s)."

29 Lacey, "*Patria Potestas*", 134-135.

unquestioned. In the world in which it was all-pervasive, a household was quite simply an entity under the control of a *pater familias*.

Patria potestas as a model for state magistrates

The Roman mentality of *patria potestas* extended to state level, where the *pater familias* became a model for magistrates. According to Lacey, Rome's chief magistrates (the consuls) were a type of state *pater familias*. He argues that a consul's *imperium* was a power similar to the *potestas* of a *pater familias.* [30] *A* consul had the *auspicia,* the same right to determine the will of the gods for the *res publica* as did the *pater familias* for his *familia*. In practice, there were few checks on a consul's power. Other Roman magistrates, though present, were really assistants [31] and a consul's power was in fact checked only by his consular colleague. Like a *pater familias,* a magistrate was expected to seek advice, to consult his *consilium* of peers. Although acting without its support resulted in a loss of *dignitas* and in the questioning of his judgement, neither magistrate nor *pater familias* was actually obliged to take a *consilium*'s advice.

Princeps as *pater patriae*

While there is a parallel between a domestic *pater familias* and a state magistrate, there is an even stronger link between the former and a *pater patriae*. Given the Roman mind-set of *patria potestas*, it is not surprising that the title "*pater patriae*" was the highest honour a Roman man could be given in recognition of great national service. [32] Camillus,

---

30 Cicero (*Leg.*3.1.2 ff) saw links between the magistrates, the laws and *imperium*. He thought that no *domus, civitas* or *gens* could be maintained without *imperium*.

31 The exception is the tribunate which had no connection with *patria potestas*. A tribune's function, however, was not to plan policy or take political initiatives, but rather (as mentioned by Lacey ("*Patria potestas*", 133) to prevent (consular) actions which were not in the interest of the plebeians. Lacey also notes that there is no evidence of tribunes intervening to prevent a *pater familias* from taking action against family members. The *pater familias,* therefore, was in an even more autocratic position than the consul.

32 For examples, see P. A. Brunt and J. M. Moore (eds), *Res Gestae Divi Augusti: The Achievements of the Divine Augustus* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1967), 80 n. 35.

a legendary saviour of Rome (from the Gauls), is described by Livy [33] as a second Romulus and a *pater patriae*. The title had been bestowed unofficially on Cicero after he had suppressed the Catilinarian conspiracy. According to Dio Cassius and Suetonius ,[34] Julius Caesar had been officially recognized as *pater patriae*. Meanwhile, in the post-Augustan period, Tiberius is said to have declined the honour [35] and on the grounds of youth, Nero did likewise. [36]

It was Augustus who capitalized most on his designation as *pater patriae.* The title was officially conferred on him in 2 B.C.E. by the senate and people in recognition of his role in ending years of civil war and in restoring constitutional government. The event is recorded in the final chapter of the *Res Gestae,* Augustus's own record of his achievements. [37] Having been designated *pater patriae*, the title (writes the *princeps* himself) was to be "inscribed in the porch of my house and in the *Curia Julia* and in the *Forum Augustum* below the chariot which had been set there in my honour by decree of the Senate". Furthermore, Augustus does not merely record the bestowal of the title as one achievement among many; rather, he presents it as his crowning glory and indeed the account forms the climax of the whole *Res Gestae*. The same event is described by Suetonius, albeit in more highly dramatic and emotional language:

> The whole body of citizens with a sudden unanimous impulse proffered him the title of Father of his country; first the commons, by a deputation sent to Antium and then, because he declined it,

---

33 Livy 5.49.7.

34 Dio Cass. 44.4.4 and Suet. *Iul.* 76 and 85.

35 Suet. *Tib.* 26.

36 Suet. *Ner.* 8.

37 Brunt and Jones, *Res Gestae*. See also Z. Yavetz, "The *Res Gestae* and Augustus' Public Image" in F. Millar and E. Segal (eds), *Caesar Augustus : Seven Aspects*, (Oxford: Clarendon, 1984), 1-36. The *Res Gestae* is the name given to one of four documents left by Augustus on his death in 14 C.E. It is referred to by Suetonius (*Aug.* 101.4) as "*indicem rerum a se gestarum*". It is recognized as a form of funeral oration or Roman *elogia*. Typical of the genre, the document is factually correct, but both selective and slanted to suit the purposes of the subject. In the case of Augustus, its aim was to show and justify his unique position.

RG 35 contains an account of his reception of the title *pater patriae*: *Tertium decimum consulatum cum gerebam, senatus et equester ordo populusque Romanus universus appelavit me patrem patriae, idque in vestibulo aedium mearum inscribendum et in curia Iulia et in foro Aug. sub quadrigis quae mihi ex s.c. positae sunt censuit.....*

again at Rome as he entered the theatre which they attended in throngs and all wearing laurel wreaths; the Senate afterwards in the house not by a decree or by acclamation but through Valerius Messala. He speaking for the whole body said, 'Good fortune and divine favour attend thee and thy house, Caesar Augustus; for thus we feel we are praying for lasting prosperity for our country and happiness for our city. The Senate in accord with the people of Rome hails thee Father of Thy Country.' Then Augustus with tears in his eyes replied as follows (and I have given his exact words, as I did those of Messala: "Having attained my highest hopes, Father of the Senate, what more have I to ask of the immortal gods than that I may retain this same unanimous approval of yours to the very end of my life." [38]

It is understandable why Augustus gloried in his presentation as *pater patriae*. Being a *pater*, whether *familias* or *patriae,* was to have power. Yet being a position which was both familiar and familial, it was more acceptable than the title "king", for example. Augustus had obtained a unique constitutional position and operated as a *de facto* supreme ruler. [39] He was careful, however, to present his position, not as something new and non-Roman, but rather as a combination and expression (albeit unparalleled) of a series of traditional roles. [40] The title "*pater patriae*", a logical progression from the traditional *pater familias,* was perfect for his purposes. It was in the person of Augustus, as "*pater*

---

38 Suet. *Aug.* 58.2: *Patris patriae cognomen universi repentino maximoque consensu detulerunt ei: prima plebs legatione Antium missa; dein, quia non recipiebat ineunti Romae spectacula frequens et laureata; mox in curia senatus, neque decreto neque adclamatione, sed per Valerium Messalam. Is mandantibus cunctis: "Quod bonum," inquit, "faustumque sit tibi domuique tuae, Caesar Auguste! Sic enim nos perpetuam felicitatem rei p. et laeta huic precari existimamus: senatus te consentiens cum populo R. consalutat patriae patrem." Cui lacrimans respondit Augustus his verbis - ipsa enim, sicut Messalae, posui - "Compos factus votorum meorum, p.c., quid habeo aliud deos immortales precari, quam ut hunc consensum vestrum ad ultimum finem vitae mihi perferre liceat?*

39 For a brief account of the constitutional position of Augustus, see Brunt and Jones, *Res Gestae*, 8-16. For more detailed treatment, see R. Syme, *The Roman Revolution* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1939).

40 As noted by Brunt and Jones (*Res Gestae*, 5) regarding the honours bestowed on Augustus, "more than once he [Augustus] stresses that they were bestowed by the people as well as the senate, and emphasizes that he was unwilling to accept untraditional, i.e. unrepublican honours or powers.....[but] it may be true that he [Augustus] accepted no individual office or position for which no Republican precedent whatever could be found, questionable though some of the precedent were, but he naturally did not mention that there was no precedent for any one man holding so many different positions and powers at the same time."

atque princeps ", [41] that the roles of *pater familias* and *pater patriae* became most obviously fused.

Further evidence of this fusing of roles in Augustus is seen in his use of the senate as a *consilium.* [42] As a *pater familias* consulted his *consilium* of peers, so Augustus as state father consulted the senate, the state *publicum consilium.* [43] He formed another *consilium* consisting of a committee of senators and also had a *consilium* of friends or *amici* who did much of the official business. [44] Besides consulting the senate on state affairs, he informed them of what was apparently family business, such as the banishment of his daughter, Julia. [45] In Augustus, therefore, the distinction between the role of *pater familias* and state father disappeared. In a way unprecedented in Republican Rome, the *princeps* was *pater* both of his personal family and of the state. The *patria* or vast *orbis terrarum* was a *familia,* a great household under his *potestas. Pater patriae* was, therefore, no longer a merely symbolic or honorific title but the reality of the powerful position of Augustus, as *princeps* or first emperor.

---

41 Hor. *Carm.* 1.2.45ff. Horace had prayed, in about the year 29 B.C.E, that Augustus might postpone his return to the heavens but remain on earth as "*pater atque princeps*" (father and chief citizen). See also Ov. *Fast.* 2. 127-144, which includes an address to Augustus as "*sancte pater patriae"* (Holy Father of your Country).

42 On Augustus and *consilium*, see Lacey, "*Patria Potestas"*, 139-140.

43 The so-called restoration of the *res publica* after the civil wars meant that the senate nominally regained its role as the *publicum consilium.* The arch erected by the Senate for the victor in the civil war bore the inscription "*res publica restituta"* and *RG* 34 records Augustus's claim to have transferred the republic back to the senate and people of Rome. For a discussion of the significance of this *res publica restituta* and for its numismatic representation and symbolism, see Zanker, *Images*, 89-98. See, in particular , 91, fig. 74, the image on an *aureus* of 12 B.C.E, which depicts Augustus helping the fallen *res publica* to her feet.

44 Lacey, "*Patria Potestas",* 139. With regard to the senators, Lacey notes that they "were chosen partly by office, partly by lot [and their] membership changed, either in whole or in part, every six months."

45 Suet. *Aug.* 65.2. Another example is noted by Lacey ("*Patria Potestas"*, 139): "Augustus had earlier introduced his adopted sons, Gaius and Lucius Caesar, to the *publicum consilium* from the time they were given the *toga virilis* and became *principes iuventutis*, consuls designate and priests, in the same way that noble youths were as a matter of course introduced to their fathers' *consilium* on being given their *toga virilis*." As will be noted below, such apparently family business had political significance.

2. Domestic religion and state religion [46]

Further evidence of the construct of empire as household-writ-large is found in the area of religion. At a general level, just as the well-being of the *familia* was intimately linked to the proper worship of household deities, so was there believed to be a symbiotic relationship between the well-being of Rome and the veneration of her gods. First, many state deities were also those of the family and were worshipped in a similar way. Secondly, the emperor's religious role (in the imperial cult and in the office of *pontifex*) was a magnification of that of the *pater familias*.

Domestic Religion [47]

Despite scant information, [48] what does emerge from literary and archaeological sources is the fact that a great deal of Roman religious life was conducted at household level.[49] A variety of deities (including *Lares*, *Penates*, Vesta, the *Genius* and Janus) were represented and worshipped at *lararia* (household shrines) (figs 3.1-6) [50] and a range of

---

46 See Lacey, "*Patria Potestas*" , 125-130.

47 This section draws substantially on D. Orr, "Roman Domestic Religion: The Evidence of the Household Shrines", *ANRW* II.16.2, 1156-1191. This is an abbreviated form of this thesis "Roman Domestic Religion: A study of the household deities and their shrines at Pompeii and Herculaneum." See also H. H. Scullard, *Festivals and Ceremonies of the Roman Republic* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1981), D. P. Harmon, "The Family Festivals of Rome", *ANRW* II.16.2, 1592-1603 and M. Beard, J. North and S. Price, *Religions of Rome*, 2 vols (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998).

48 Part of the difficulty (as mentioned in Orr ["Religion", 1559]) is that there "was no priestly college to make the domestic cult concrete and no written dogma to express its traditions." With regard to the history, Orr emphasizes that little is known about the origins of most household deities.

49 According to Orr ("Religion", 1559), "Roman domestic religion incorporated three important foci. Each focus maintained its own unique set of rituals and deities. At the hearth (living fire) a great religious power was to be propitiated. In the fields, or small gardens, and later in household chapels, the chief tutelary powers of the home were honoured. finally, in the storerooms and cupboards certain sets of gods were watchful and omnipresent."

50 For information on *lararia,* see Orr ("Religion", 1575-1590). *Lararia* have been classified into three main types: the niche type, the *aedicula* (miniature temple type) and the wall painting type. See figs 3.1-6 (Orr, "Religion", Plates 1-4, 16, 20). All *lararia* share two elements, namely, epresentations of the images of the deities and provision for sacrifice before these images.

rituals was performed. Roman domestic religion promoted the well-being of the *familia* [51] and reinforced its identity, solidarity and ideology. While all household members were involved in the cult, however, sources highlight the role of the *pater familias.* [52]

deities

While tutelary spirits in general were referred to as *Lares,* [53] protective or "watchful" [54] spirits of the household were known as *Lares domestici, Lares familiae* or simply *Lares.* [55] Their worship was an essential element of the domestic cult [56] and was

---

51 A family's well-being was believed to be intimately linked to the proper worship of its gods. As noted in the conclusion of Orr's thesis, Roman poets often mention the relationship between the family and its gods. Problems resulted from a neglect of the *ius divinum.* Plautus (*Aulularia* 15-20), for example, offers a humorous description of how a young man came to grief because he neglected his *Lar.* The humour makes sense only against the background of commonly accepted attention to household cultic duties.

52 As Dixon (*Roman Family,* 101, 215 n.10) notes, in the ritual of the newborn, legal and literary sources concentrate on the action of the *pater familias* in lifting and accepting the baby (*tollere liberos:* to raise children).

53 Domestic *Lares* followed people on their journeys. This belief is echoed in Tibullus 1.1.13-25. Preparing to set out on military service, he hopes that his *Lar* will protect him. *Lares* were also tutelary spirits in non-domestic contexts. Their many spheres of operation are illustrated in the epithet accompanying the substantive *lares:* e.g. the *Lares viales* (guardians of roads and travellers), *Lares permarini* (guardians of sea-voyagers), *Lar militaris* (protectors of soldiers) or *lares ludentes* (protectors of the games).

54 Ovid (*Fast.* 5.142) mentions that "*pervigilantque Lares*".

55 The *Lares* were so closely associated with the home, that the word was used metonymously for "house." On the metonymous use of *Lar*, see Luc. 2.331; 2.729; 5.537, 7.346, Catull. 31.9, Hor. *Sat.* 1.2.56, Verg. *G.* 3.344, Mart.10.61.5. See also the discussion of terminology in the previous chapter.

56 According to Orr ("Religion", 1567), [t]he household *Lares* were offered spelt (Juvenal 9.138), grapes, garlands of grain, honeycakes and honeycombs (Tib. 1.10.21-24). First fruits, wine and blood offerings were also dedicated to the Lares (Hor. *Sat.* 2.5.12-14; *Carm.* 4.5.33-36) . Tibullus (2.1.59-60) mentions a circlet of spring flowers which crowned the heads of his wooden Lares. The *Lares* were worshipped in the home on holidays and perhaps were given some daily attention, according to the piety of their masters (Mart. 3.58.23). Some *Lares* were described as smoke-grimed and black, probably due to their proximity to the hearth. The domestic *Lares* promoted health and welfare in the home.

closely associated with that of the *Genius* of the family. [57] A succinct description of the protective functions of the *Lar familiaris* over generations is found in the opening lines of Plautus' *Aulularia* where the spirit explains how "[f]or many years now I have possessed this dwelling and preserved it for the sire and grandsire of its present occupant". [58] In domestic shrines of Campania, for example, such *Lares* are usually portrayed as joyful beings, in dancing pose, carrying *rhyta* (drinking horns) filled with wine (figs 3.7-9). [59]

The *di Penates* were guardian spirits of the *penus* (household storeroom). They protected the food supply, the household's means of subsistence. They were worshipped before the hearth and were closely associated with the *Lares* and Vesta. Indeed, the term *Penates* is often used as a collective term for all household deities. [60] One of the *Penates*, Vesta, was the goddess who protected the home, the immovable place of belonging. Described by Ovid as "nothing but living flame", [61] the goddess was embodied in the flame in the hearth, the major centre for the household cult. [62] It is probable that the fire was tended by women [63] and that the goddess worship consisted of daily sacrifice offered on the flame of the family altar.

In the domestic context,[64] the *Genius* was the guiding and living *numen* (spirit) of

---

57 See the evidence of Ov. *Fast.* 5.145 and *CIL* 445, 452. According to *CIL* X 86, X 1235, *Lares* were often found in inscriptions at Pompeii dedicated also to the *Genius* of the family.

58 See Plaut. *Aulul.* Prologue 1-5: *ego Lar sum familiaris .. hanc domum iam multos annos est quom possideo et colo patri auoque iam huiius qui nunc habet*".

59 For details of the representation of *Lares* in the household shrines of Campania, see figs 3.7-9. (Orr, "Religion", 1568-1569 and Plates 8, 10, 11).

60 See Orr, "Religion", 1563.

61 Ov. *Fast.* 6.291.

62 Referring to the hearth, Orr ("Religion", 1560) explains: "[s]ince the earliest periods of Roman history it functioned as an important area for the propitiation of household *numina* (Ovid, *Fast.* 6.301-308). During religious festivals the house-wife decorated it with flowers and the fire received offerings of perfume, wine and cakes. These days included the Kalends, Nones and Ides on the month and family anniversaries." See Cato, *Rust. [or Agr].* 143.2 and Ov. *Tr.* 5.5.10. For reference to the close association of Vesta with the fire in the hearth, see Servius, *Aen.* 1.292.

63 The women concerned were either the mother or daughters of the family.

64 Outside the domestic context, every individual (*CIL* X 772), household (*CIL* VIII 2597), legion (*CIL* VII 103), cohort (*CIL* VII 440) and guild (*CIL* XIV 10) could have a *Genius*.

the family, but it referred in a special way to that of the *pater familias*. [65] The *Genius* represented the power of fertility and ensured the continuity of the family. The *Genius* was worshipped on the wedding day and every birthday of the *pater familias*. [66] It was by the *Genius* that household members swore. In many *lararium* paintings of Pompeii, the *Genius* is portrayed as a togate male figure, usually bearing a *patera* [67] and sometimes a *cornucopia*. He is often accompanied by a serpent which is an apotropaic device and a sign of sacredness and good fortune (figs 3.7, 9, 10). [68]

On the one hand, the *Genius* was associated exclusively with men. There was a female counterpart, a guardian spirit of women called the *Juno*. [69] Uncertainty, however, surrounds the nature of (the) *Juno*, who was intimately connected with the life of women. [70] She has been variously described as the female equivalent of the *Genius*, the Roman counterpart of Hera, a moon goddess and a deity of youth (given the derivation from *iuvenis*). [71] Juno, however, was possibly both a great goddess and one whose power was

---

65 A *Genius* also protected objects or places (*Genius loci*). Both kinds of *Genius* occurred in the domestic shrines.

66 See *CIL* X 860, 861 and Tib. 2.2.1. According to Orr ("Religion," 157), the sacrifice included "a bountiful supply of wine and honeycakes which were partaken by gods and worshippers. (Ov. *Tr.* 3.13.17) . Blood sacrifices included pigs and occasionally lambs (Hor. *Carm.* 3.17.14 ff)".

67 A *patera* is a shallow dish used in sacrificial ceremony to pour out libations.

68 According to Orr ("Religion," 1574-1575), the *Genius* is somewhat similar to the Greek *Agathos Daimon.* Both also share the symbol of the serpent. For representation of the *Genius* in household shrines, see figs 3. 7, 9, 10 (Orr, "Religion", Plates 8, 11, 9).

69 On the Juno, see Orr, "Religion," 1570-1571. For a reference to *Juno*, see Petron. *Sat.* 25.4. For both *Juno* and *Genius*, see Pliny, *NH* 2.16 and Tib. 4.6.1.

70 According to the *OCD*, she has been associated with (or incorporated the functions of) "Lucina, who causes children to see the light of day, Opigena, who brings help to women in childbirth, Cinxia, *numen* of the bride's girdle, Iterduca, who brings her to her new home..." and other figures.

71 *Juno* is said to be derived from *iunix*, the feminine form of *iuvenis*. As noted by Orr ("Religion," 1570), "it reflected a 'youth' concept in the representation of procreative force." Orr cites R. E. A. Palmer (*Roman Religion and Roman Empire,* Five Essays, The Haney Foundation Series 15 [Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 1974], 4), who thinks Juno was the goddess of youth, male and / or female.

present in individual women as a tutelary *numen* (*iuno*). [72] On the other hand, the *Genius* was used to designate father and mother. There is evidence of it being substituted for the *Juno* [73] and epigraphical evidence records the naming of a *Genius* in association with women. [74] However, as in most cases of "male-embracing-female" terms, the male association prevails. Furthermore it is the image of the male *Genius*, apparently that of the *pater familias* which predominates in household shrines.

Finally, Janus [75] was the *numen* of the *ianua* or outer door of the house. [76] He had his place at the *fauces,* the border between the house and beyond. As *bifrons* (two-faced), he looked both inwards and outwards. Although not represented in Campanian *lararia*, for example, this is not unusual since images of the god are rare (fig. 3.11). [77]

It was common for other deities to be incorporated into and worshipped at *lararia.* [78] Venus, the *Lares* and *Penates*, Janus and the *Genius* (and Juno), however, remained the principal deities of traditional Roman domestic religion.

family roles

All household members were involved in worship and many rituals celebrated important moments in life. Eight or nine days after the birth of a baby, for example, the rites of *dies lustricus* [79] or the *sollemnitates nominalium* [80] were completed. By such rites,

---

72 This is suggested in the *OCD.*

73 As cited by Orr, *CIL* XI 1820: *Genio Sancte Sacrum IUL Silvanus V E.*

74 As cited by Orr, *CIL* VIII 22770: *D M S Genio Tarquitiae Marcelli Matri Piissimae.*

75 The word means a "gate" or "barbican".

76 Janus was regarded as the god of beginnings, given that one had to pass through the door to enter (begin a visit to, or stay in) a premises.

77 *Ianus bifrons* is depicted on coins. See fig. 3.11 (Scullard, *Festivals*, fig. 40, no. 35) for a bronze libral *as*, of 225-217 B.C.E.

78 Orr, "Religion", 1559.

79 A description of these rites is found in Harmon, "Family Festivals", 1596-1597. See also Macrob. *Sat.* 1.16.36. As outlined by Harmon, "[a]t the time of birth the door was wreathed and a flame was lit upon the altar (Stat. *Silv.* 4.8.40). Soon after birth, the infant was placed upon the ground and lifted up by the father (*suscipere* or *tollere*), an act which signified the father's

children were apparently purified, named and accepted as family members. Another important milestone, celebrated with sacrifice, was a young person's coming of age. A boy celebrated the donning of the *toga virilis*, [81] while a girl's rite of passage occurred the day before her marriage, when she dedicated objects symbolic of girlhood [82] to the household gods. [83] Other aspects of the *sacra privata* included the birthday celebration of each family member, [84] rituals associated with marriage and death. [85]

While all members of the household were involved in domestic religion, sources highlight the role of the *pater familias* as a type of family chief priest. On behalf of those who were legally in his power, he offered the necessary sacrifices to deities who protected the household in exchange for such propitiation. In Roman society, a family's religion (just like its name) was transmitted through *patres familiarum*. By contrast, the religious roles of other members remain largely unrecorded. [86] With regard to women, however, it is unclear to what extent wives participated in (or were excluded from) domestic worship, [87] what precisely their activities involved and signified. Details recorded include the bride's

---

recognition of the child as his own (August. *De civ. D.* 4.11; Suet. *Ner.* 6.1)."

80 Tert. *De Idol.* 16.

81 See, for example, Sen. *Ep.* 4.2, Ov. *Fast.* 3.777. This may be the rite called *sollemnitas togae purae* in Tert. *De Idol.* 16. Harmon ("Family Festivals", 1598) notes that "numerous sources indicate that it was customary for the father and son to go together in the company of their friends to the Forum and Capitolium on this day, where relatives made an offering to Juventas in the temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus for those who had come of age (Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 4.15.5)."

82 These included objects such as *pupa* ("doll" or "puppet") and *mania* ("bugbear" or "bugaboo").

83 According to Pers. 2.70, she offered these to Venus.

84 As noted by Harmon ("Family Festivals", 1597), such celebrations were "marked by thanksgiving offerings (Ov. *Tr.* 3.13.13-15), by sacrifices of cakes and burning of incense (Pliny, *NH* 18.84, Mart. 10.24) - and of course, by the conferral of gifts upon the person celebrating the natal day".

85 For details, see Harmon, "Family Festivals", 1598-1603.

86 As noted by R. Shepard Kraemer (*Her Share of the Blessings: Women's Religions Among Pagans, Jews, and Christians in the Greco-Roman World* [Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 1992], 50), little is known about the role of women in domestic religion.

87 As outlined in Pomeroy (*Goddesses*, 152) for a wife, a *manus* marriage resulted in a change of religion, namely from that of her father to that of her husband. If married *sine manu*, she

anointing of the doorpost of her new home, [88] the offering to her by the groom of fire and water, a symbolic bestowal of her authority over the house. [89] A new *mater familias* presided over the household *sacra* from the day after the wedding. [90] Such information, though scanty, appears vast in contrast to what is known about the role of children and slaves, both male and female, in Roman domestic religion.

functions

Roman domestic religion strengthened the identity and solidarity of the *familia*. First, it reinforced identity backwards. For family members (and for the *pater familias* in particular), it was a reminder of, and a means of identification with, their ancestors. *Imagines* of these ancestors were brought out from storage for family funerals. Secondly, it functioned to strengthen the *familia* in the present by protecting its well-being, guarding the home from evil and solidifying family ties. Thirdly, it ensured continuity of the family name into the future. In short, Roman domestic religion was father-led and strengthened the identity of the *familia* under the head of the *pater familias*.

State religion

The concern here is to demonstrate how state religion (especially under Augustus) was but a magnified version of the household cult.

deities and cults with domestic parallels

The most obvious examples of parallels between state and domestic religion are the cults of Vesta, the *Lares* and *Penates*. Vesta was the living, immovable flame at the

---

remained in her father's *familia* and could continue to participate in its cult.

88 Plut. *Quaest. Rom.* 31.

89 Paulus, *ex Fest.* 77L(2).

90 Macrob. *Sat.* 1.15.22.

hearth of both home and state, the goddess who had her *sedes* [91] in Rome. In her shrine, there were no images, only the fire tended by the Vestal Virgins. [92]

The Vestal Virgins [93] were priestesses who guarded the fire in the house of Vesta to ensure the prosperity of Rome as a whole, just as ordinary Romans tended the fires in their hearths to ensure the prosperity of their households. [94] Vestal Virgins were six in number,[95] came from elite families, were consecrated in childhood, [96] served for thirty years , [97] and enjoyed considerable privileges, power and status. [98] Illustrative of their

---

91 As noted in Ch. 2 (page 110 n. 122), one's *sedes* is one's home. It is one's place of belonging by inalienable right. One's *sedes* is immovable and Vesta has hers in Rome.

92 According to Ov. *Fast.* 6.291, "*nec te aliud Vestam quam vivam intellege flammam*" (Vesta is naught but the living flame) and 6.297-8, "*ignis inextinctus templo celatur in illo, / effigiem nullam Vesta ned ignis habet*" (an undying fire is hidden in that temple but there is no effigy of Vesta nor of the fire).

93 Primary sources include Gell. *NA* 1.12 and Plut. *Vit. Num.* 10. On Vestal Virgins, see R. Shepard Kraemer, *Maenads, Martyrs, Matrons, Monastics: A Sourcebook on Women's Religions in the Greco-Roman World* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988), 79 and *idem*, *Blessings,* 50-51, 81-84, M. Beard, "The Sexual Status of the Vestal Virgins", *JRS* 70 (1980), 12-27; J. Hallett, *Fathers and Daughters in Roman Society: Women and the Elite Family* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984), Pomeroy, *Goddesses*, 210-214.

94 Drawing on Hallett (*Fathers and Daughters*, 84, esp. n. 29), Kraemer (*Blessings*, 81) states that "many scholars now believe that the Vestal Virgins were originally the daughters of Rome's priest-king who guarded the fire that represented the father's power to create and sustain life".

95 There were initially two Vestals but their number was increased to six.

96 According to Gell. *NA* 1.12, prospective Vestal Virgins had to be aged between six and ten. Both parents had to be alive and neither could have been a slave or a person with a low-status occupation. The girls had to be free from bodily blemishes or speech or hearing defects and under the authority of their fathers.

97 After thirty years of service, they were free to marry. Plutarch states, however, that few former Vestals chose to marry and that those who did rarely had happy marriages.

98 As outlined by in Pomeroy (*Goddesses*, 213-214), these privileges included the freedom from *tutela* (male guardianship), the right to make a will and bequeath property while their fathers were still alive, to give legal testimony, to have a *lictor* (a public attendant, a privilege generally reserved for aristocratic men). They were the only women allowed to drive through Rome in a *carpentum* (a two-wheeled wagon), a fact which conferred high status on its occupant. While other women had to sit on the top tiers of seats in theatres, Augustus assigned the Vestals places on the imperial podium (Suet. *Aug.* 44.2-3; Vitr. *De Arch.* 5.6). Criminals accidentally meeting a Vestal on the way to execution were spared. These privileges had such implications of status that the "rights of Vestals" were often conferred upon female members of the imperial family who were frequently portrayed as Vestals on coins.

ambiguous [99] position, however, is the fact that although they were freed from *tutela* and paternal *potestas* [100] and were *sui iuris* with respect to property, Vestal Virgins were under the control of the *pontifex maximus*. [101] Vestals who allowed the flames to be extinguished were scourged and those who broke their vows of chastity were incarcerated and left to die. [102] Such punishment often occurred in turbulent political periods and exemplified the (male) tendency to associate the fate of Rome with the chastity of her women. [103]

The state cult of the *Penates* was closely linked with that of Vesta. It was in the inner part of the shrine of Vesta that the city's *Penates* were stored. [104] This *penus* (store-cupboard) was a vital necessity in a city where food supply was never taken for granted. In guarding the *penus*, the Penates protected the means of subsistence and thus the life of the city (and Empire). In public worship, the *Penates* were two youthful gods, [105] sometimes considered to be the deities brought to Italy by the Trojan Aeneas. [106] The

---

99 Drawing on the work of Beard, Shepard Kraemer (*Blessings*, 82-83) discusses the ambiguous and anomalous position of the Vestals.

100 On the evidence of Gaius 1.145, as early as the laws of the XII Tables (451-450 B.C.E) it was stated that a Vestal was to be freed from the power of her *pater familias*.

101 Lacey ("*Patria Potestas*", 126-128), points out that the Romans treated the persons and property of its citizens in different ways. It was the person, and not the property, of a Vestal which was under the control of the *pontifex maximus*. The situation of the *filius familias* was the reverse. His position with regard to property was akin to that of a slave yet in relation to his career, he was treated as a property owner.

102 According to Livy, after the defeat of Rome at Cannae in 216 B.C.E, two Vestals were executed (22.57.2). A century later, amid similar tensions, three Vestals suffered the same fate (*Per.* 63). According to Suetonius (*Dom.* 8.3-5) and Pliny (*Ep.*4.11.5-16), Domitian made public examples of the Vestals by holding capital trials of them and their lovers.

103 Pomeroy, *Goddesses*, 211. Hallett (*Fathers and Daughters*, 87), argues that accusations against the Vestals may have been brought by "well-born and powerfully situated families [who] coveted for their own prepubescent daughters the places that would be left vacant by such executions".

104 See Tac. *Ann.* 15.41.1 and Macrob. *Sat.* 3.4.11-13.

105 According to Orr ("Religion", 1562) there is archaeological evidence that the cults of the *Dioscuri* (Castor and Pollux) and the *Penates* were fused.

106 Virgil (*Aen.* 2.512-514, 2.717-720, 2.293-295, 3.12, 4.596-599) regards the *Penates* as the deities brought from Troy.

principal temples of the *Penates* and the *Lares* were both rebuilt under Augustus. [107] The *Lares praestites* [108] were the guardians of the state of Rome. Augustus encouraged new cults of the *Lares* at the major *compita* [109] (crossroads) of the newly established city districts (*vici*). [110] As these cults became linked to that of the *Genius* of Augustus, [111] the *Lares* became known as *Lares Augusti*. Indeed Augustus, as protector of the state, was himself akin to a *Lar*. Finally, the god Janus had a state presence, as a god of beginnings. [112] At his temple, was the ceremonial doorway of the city , the site for the ritual beginnings of war and peace. [113] This gate was analogous to the doorway of the house through which the bride passed on her wedding day, a ritual which marked her change of position from that of outsider to that of *familia* member.

In sum, there are clear parallels between the deities worshipped at domestic and state levels. As with *patria potestas*, the development seems to have occurred from domestic to the state level (rather than vice-versa). [114] This parallel is a contributory element to the construct of the Roman state as household-writ-large.

---

107 *RG* 19.

108 Ov. *Fast.* 5.129.

109 The annual festival celebrated at the crossroads in honour of the *Lares* was known as the *Compitalia.*

110 The *vici* were new administrative units (256 in all) established by Augustus in 7 B.C.E. The *Lares* of the district were worshipped in pairs. They were depicted dancing and holding a *cornucopia* and between them was a togate statue of the *Genius Augusti* to which the cult was mainly directed.

111 The cult of the *Genius* of Augustus is discussed in a later section.

112 According to the *OCD*, "he is named at the beginning of any list of gods in a prayer, even before Jupiter (as Livy 8.9.6); the first month of the reformed calendar, *Ianuarius*, is his and his festival comes in it. His priest is the *rex sacrorum*, his proper offering a ram, and the place the Regia (Varro, *Ling.* 6.12; Ov. *Fasti* 1.318)."

113 Janus, the spirit of living water, was also connected with the bright sky, the half-yearly cycles of the sun, chaos, time and was the *numen* of house doors.

114 There is no evidence that domestic religion was an imposition from state authorities. Once established, however, domestic and state levels reinforced each other.

Emperor and *pater familias*

Moving from the general to the individual, this part focuses on the religious role of the *princeps*. The two aspects considered are the imperial cult and the role of *pontifex*. In both, the *princeps* is akin to a great *pater familias*, a fact which contributes to the construct of empire as household-writ-large.

The imperial cult and that of the Genius of the pater familias

There are significant parallels between the traditional cult of the *Genius* of the *pater familias* and the new and rapidly spreading imperial cult. [115] If the empire was a household-writ-large and the emperor its *pater patriae*, then one way of viewing the imperial cult was as a universalisation or magnification of the cult of the *Genius* of the *pater familias*. While the Greek tradition of ruler worship contributed much to the development of the imperial cult, so too did Roman paternalism and its expression in domestic religion.

The Greek east already had, in the ruler cult, a means of communication between leader and subject. It was this which contributed to the development and spread of the imperial cult. Furthermore, Hellenistic tradition in general influenced the portrayal of the imperial ruler as a divine figure. Just as Greek rulers from the time of Alexander the Great had been portrayed as Zeus, so Augustus was depicted in the guise of Jupiter, as seen on the *Gemma Augustea,* for example (fig. 3.12). [116] Female members of the Imperial house were also portrayed as a variety of deities, including Diana, Venus, Ceres, Pietas, Concordia

---

115 On the imperial cult, see G. W. Bowersock, *Augustus and the Greek World* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1965), 113-121. S. R. F. Price, *Rituals and Power: the Roman Imperial Cult in Asia Minor* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984) and Beard *et al.*, *Religions*, 169, 318, 206-210, 336, 348-363. See C. Habicht, *Le culte des souverains dans l'empire romain* (Geneva: Fondation Hardt, 1973), 39 ff. for the imperial cult under Augustus. Outdated but useful is L. R. Taylor, *The Divinity of the Roman Emperor* (Middletown: American Philological Association Monograph 1, 1931, reprinted New York: Scholars, 1975). For a detailed discussion of officials in the imperial cult in Asia, see R. A. Kearsley, "Asiarchs, *Archiereis* and the *Archiererai* of Asia", *GRBS* 27 (1986), 183-192.

116 See fig. 3.12 (P. Zanker, *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus* [Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1988], fig. 182). On the *Gemma Augustea* , of about 10 C.E., Augustus is seen in the guise of Jupiter, enthroned beside Roma.

(figs 3.13-15). [117] While Roman rulers were carefully portrayed as mortals, [118] divine association (along with the type of "no less than celestial honours" [119] accorded Augustus, for example) enhanced one's self-image and functioned as a way of espousing certain virtues and values. Such divine association gave a ruler *dignitias* and *gravitas* and conferred on him a more-than-mortal aura.

Along with its eastern roots, the cult also had links with that of the *Genius* of the *pater familias*. Just as the latter's *Genius* was worshipped in the home, so in every city throughout the empire, there were temples and shrines where the *Genius* and *numen* of Augustus, his patron gods and virtues were worshipped, usually together with *Roma*. In deference to Roman sensibilities, there were no temples of Augustus in the capital during his lifetime, yet his *Genius* was worshipped, together with the *Lares,* in the sanctuaries of the city's *vici.* On the evidence of Pompeii, the cult was also strong in other Italian cities (fig. 3.16). [120]

In Roman *vici,* sanctuaries were established and maintained by locals, in particular by the four *magistri* and four *ministri* who were elected to annual office. In the shrines, the *Genius* of Augustus was represented as a *togatus capite velato* (fig. 3.17) [121] and this image of the togate [122] *princeps* in sacrificial pose soon became the accepted and popular

---

117 See Zanker, *Images*, 234-235. In fig. 3.13 (Zanker, *Images*, fig. 176c), a coin depicts Julia as Diana. Fig. 3.14 (Zanker, *Images*, fig. 184) is a cameo in which Livia is linked to a number of goddesses: As noted by Zanker, the mural crown and tympanon link her to Cybele or *Magna Mater*, the sheaf of grain, to Ceres, while the garment slipping from her shoulder is reminiscent of Venus. Yet she also wears the *stola*, the dress of Roman matrons. As fig. 3.15 (Zanker, *Images*, fig. 196) shows, any goddess could be linked to the imperial house through the hairstyle or facial features of one "princess" or another.

118 This represents a contrast to their Greek counterparts who were much less reticent about portraying rulers as deities .

119 According to Philo (*Leg.* 149-150), "πᾶσα ἡ οἰκουμένη" voted him "τὰς ἰσολυμπίους τιμὰς".

120 In the Forum at Pompeii, two new sanctuaries were reserved exclusively for the cult of the emperor. Furthermore, a large *aedicula* for this purpose was erected in the new market, Eumachia's building was dedicated to *Concordia* and *Pietas Augusta* and a Temple of *Fortuna Augusta* stood in the northern extension of the Forum. See fig. 3.16 (Zanker, *Images*, fig. 241).

121 For an illustration of the veiled togate Augustus, see fig. 3.17 (Zanker, *Images*, fig. 104).

122 Augustus made the *toga* a kind of official Roman state dress and a symbol of the proper matronly attitude. See Suet. *Aug.* 40.5. Married women also had a special dress, the *stola.* For a discussion see Zanker, *Images*, 162-166.

norm for honorary statues. As the *Genius* of the *pater familias* had been worshipped in this form in family shrines, so was the *pater patriae* honoured in similar guise. The image skilfully evoked a sense of humility, *pietas, Romanitas*, humanity and familiarity. Furthermore, the fact that it was worshipped widely reinforces the power and divinity associated with it (fig. 3.18). [123]

Through the imperial cult, the emperor's presence permeated daily life. Apart from the constant visual reminders of the ruler in monumental architecture (in the form of statues, temples..), the year was regulated by great imperial feast days. [124] Just as the important events of the *pater familias* were celebrated within the family, so festivals of the emperor were celebrated empirewide. Furthermore, other celebrations were gradually linked with the *princeps* and his family. New sanctuaries, for example, were dedicated only on festival days of the imperial house. All festivals included feasts, games and holidays. For many (poor) people, such celebrations represented a break and escape from the daily struggle for survival. For the priests and priestesses of local wealthy families who sponsored the imperial cult, such office-holding was a way of expressing and maintaining their own positions of power. [125] For the emperor himself, the cult functioned as an important vehicle for the rapid spread of imperial ideology.

In sum, the imperial cult was both an extension of that of the *Genius* of the *pater familias* and an expression of Roman *patria potestas.* The cult functioned to unite peoples from far-flung corners of the empire as worshippers of one individual's *Genius* and as participants in a ritual which regulated the rhythm of life. In a vast, diverse and pre-

---

123 Zanker, *Images*, 128. See fig. 3.18 (Zanker, *Images*, fig. 110) for an illustration of these widely worshipped statuettes.

124 As noted by Zanker, *Images*, 114, the sources for the festival calendar of the early Empire come largely from Ovid's *Fasti* and from marble calendar inscriptions found in various Italian cities.

125 Drawing on Kearsley ("Asiarchs"), Shepard Kraemer (*Blessings,* 84-87) notes that priestesses served in the cult of the Roman emperor in the Roman province of Asia. An example is (the 2nd century C.E.) Tata of Aphrodisias, in western Asia Minor. During her term of office, Tata paid for religious festivals and public entertainments and offered sacrifices for the hearth of the imperial family. In return, she would have received public honours and privileges. Tata came from a famous family, with impeccable credentials. For details of these, see Tation, *CIJ* 738, Shepard Kraemer, *Maenads*, 60. Her family of origin was more important than the question of who her husband was. On the expenditures involved, see R. van Bremen, "Women and Wealth" in A. Cameron and A. Kuhrt (eds), *Images of Women in Antiquity* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1985), 223-242.

technological empire, the cult was not merely a means of maintaining central control. [126] Rather it also served to foster in Roman subjects a sense of connectedness, loyalty and gratitude [127] towards the emperor and to create a sense of belonging within the *orbis terrarum*, which was the domain of the *pater patriae*.

Princeps and pater familias as pontifex

As the *pater familias* was portrayed as a type of domestic chief priest, so was the *pater patriae* the chief priest of state. This parallel is most obvious in the role of *pontifex maximus*, a role already mentioned in relation to the Vestal Virgins. As the *pater familias* had (legal) power over the women who tended the domestic hearth, so the *pontifex maximus* controlled the Virgins guarding the flame at the symbolic hearth and heart of the state.

As well as being *pontifex*, Augustus was a member of the other three major colleges of priests, namely the *augures, XV viri sacris faciundi* and *VII viri epulonum*. His other religious roles included being "*frater arvalis, sodalis Titius, fetialis ...*" (figs 3.19a-c) [128] The concentration of religious office in the hands of Augustus was unprecedented and made him a type of supreme high priest. In the Republican period, prominent men had usually

---

126 The cult functioned as a form of social control. As explained by Zanker (*Images*, 134-135), in earlier periods, district and guild cults had been somewhat unruly and had often been outlawed. By 7 B.C.E., however, such reformed associations became an important point of contact between ruler and people.

127 One expression of gratitude is recorded in Suetonius (*Aug.* 98): "As he sailed by the gulf of Puteoli, it happened that from an Alexandrian ship which had just arrived there, the passengers and crew, clad in white, crowned with garlands and burning incense, lavished upon him good wishes and the highest praise, saying that it was through him they lived, through him that they sailed the seas and through him that they enjoyed their liberty and good fortunes."

128 *RG* 7.3 provides a list of the religious offices held by Augustus. Brunt and Jones (*Res Gestae*, 49-50) explains the terms as follow: *pontifices* advised on state cults, while *quindecimviri* supervised foreign cults. Augurs interpreted divine signs of approval or disapproval regarding official action. The *septemviri epulonum* organized public banquets in honour of the gods and the *fratres Arvales* celebrated an ancient agricultural rite. The *sodales Titii* are obscure. The *fetiales* were concerned in the making of treaties and in declarations of war. See figs 3.19 a-c (Zanker, *Images*, fig. 103 a-c) for numismatic evidence of his participation in the four major priesthoods.

held no more than one priesthood. [129] The individual priesthoods had specific functions and also exercised political influence in times of crisis, through interpretation of omens and consultation of the Sibyllline books. Under Augustus, the colleges lost their influence, as the *princeps* took on the role of chief religious officer of state and mediator between heaven and earth. [130] It was as such that he is depicted on *the Ara Pacis* (figs 3.20-21). [131]

In sum, focus on religion reveals a picture of the early empire as a household under the *princeps*. Parallels between domestic and state religion are striking and offer insight into the family-based nature and ideology of the Roman state. Under Augustus, state worship of deities venerated in the home received particular attention. More specifically, the religious role of *princeps* (in the imperial cult and as state chief priest) represents a magnification of that played by the *pater familias* in Roman domestic religion.

---

129 Brunt and Jones, *Res Gestae*, 50.

130 For a discussion, see Zanker, *Images*, 118-125. As he explains (on page 121), "[b]ad omens were eliminated, the purified Sibylline Books remained well hidden beneath the cult statue of Palatine Apollo and before military campaigns the princeps himself took the (always positive) auspices."

131 See fig. 3.20 (Zanker, *Images*, fig. 100), fig. 3.21 (Zanker, *Images*, fig. 126). The *Ara Pacis* was erected by the senate and people of Rome to honour Augustus. On the *Ara Pacis* in general, see E. Simon, *Ara Pacis Augustae* (Tübingen: Wasmuth, 1967), M. Torelli, *Typology and Structure of Roman Historical Reliefs* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1982), Ch. 2.

3. Family values

This third aspect examines evidence of so-called family values in both cults promoted in the Augustan age and in actions of Augustus as "*curator morum*" (guardian of morals). [132]

Cults

Further evidence of the familial nature of the Roman state comes in the form of cults and festivals centred on marriage, childbearing and children, fertility and chastity. These cults were not familial in the sense that domestic Roman religion was: that is, centred in the home, involving all household members and concerned with the well-being of the group. Rather they are family cults in the sense that they celebrated ideals, values and behaviour considered essential for the good of the family. They were not primarily home-based but were celebrated at various times throughout the year by categories of people, especially classes of women. [133]

Examples of such cults include that of *Venus Verticordia* (Changer of Hearts [towards virtue]). It was celebrated by so-called respectable women and promoted ideals of domestic harmony and marital fidelity. [134] *Fortuna* cults associated with *Pudicitia* (chastity), both *Patricia* and *Plebeia,* were confined to *univirae* and were concerned with

---

132 *RG* 6.

133 Cults were not for women-in-general but were appropriate to the already existing categories of women in society. A Roman woman was patrician or plebeian (class), slave or free, a young virgin, celibate adult, wife, *univira* (a women who had been married only once) or widow, respectable or disreputable. Cults, therefore, both reflected and reinforced divisions according to class, free or slave status, age, marital status and moral standard. For these festivals, see Pomeroy, *Goddesses*, 206-210 and Shepard Kraemer, *Blessings*, 50-70. For example, the cult of *Fortuna Virginalis* was for young girls; cults and festivals for Roman *matronae* (married free-born women) included the *Matronalia* (March 1), *Veneralia* (April 1), *Bona Dea* (May 1), *Vestalia* (June), *Matralia* (June 11), the secret rites to *Bona Dea* (December) and *Carmentalia* (Mid- January).

134 On the evidence of Val. Max. 8.15.12 and Pliny, *NH* 7.120, the cult of *Venus Verticordia* was founded during the war against Hannibal, as a public admonition to adulteresses. It was celebrated on April 1. It thus stood in contrast to another celebration on the same day, that of *Fortuna Virilis,* the worship of sexual relationships outside marriage by non-respectable women. For details, see Pomeroy, *Goddesses*, 208-209.

the upholding of conjugal ideals. [135] The cult of *Fortuna Primigenia* of Praeneste centred on mothers and childbirth [136] and one of the shrines visited by Roman *matronae* seeking a resolution to marriage conflicts was that of *Dea Viriplaca* (Goddess-Husband-Pleaser). [137]

All these cults and festivals were concerned with marriage and the bearing of children, that is, with values essential to the survival of the Roman family. Both men and women were involved in marriage and parenthood, but extant sources show a preoccupation with women. While certain rites may have been personally fulfilling for women, many also functioned to reinforce social categories and values. An oft-used Roman belief, perpetuated by Augustus, was that a perceived moral decline in the present could be reversed by returning to (an ideal of) traditional family values. In practice, this usually meant shaping the behaviour and values of (elite) [138] women. [139]

The overtly familial focus of these native Roman cults is emphasized by comparison with contemporaneously popular Oriental religions which reflected and promoted different values. As illustrated above, traditional Roman religion was a communal affair; it was concerned with both family and state and was largely propitiary or petitionary in nature. It reflected and shaped the social order, its categories, hierarchies, values and behaviour. As in the Roman state, so in Roman religion, the power of *patria potestas* was central. It was exercised in the free-born family and, by extension, in the state-as-family. By contrast, the

---

135 On the cults of *Pudicitia Patricia* and *Pudicitia Plebeia*, see Pomeroy, *Goddesses*, 207-208.

136 She was also an oracular deity. The cult of *Fortuna* Praeneste was not confined to women, for men were also interested in her promise of virility, material success and economic prosperity.

137 Val. Max. 2.1.6. Shepard Kraemer (*Blessings* 51) explains that by "translating this name as 'Goddess Husband-Pleaser', Amy Richlin ("Rituals of the Body: Roman Women's Religion", Unpublished paper delivered at Princeton University and elsewhere in the fall of 1989) renders explicit the underlying perception that a harmonious marriage was one in which a husband was pleased".

138 According to our sources, elite women were the focus of many cults. This, however, does not exclude the possibility that there were cults for non-elite women. The fact is that every aspect of lower-class life is badly represented in the historical record.

139 This is but one aspect of the Roman belief that the fate of Rome was linked to the (sexual) behaviour of its women. This has already been noted in the case of the Vestal Virgins. Further evidence on the preoccupation with the behaviour of women is illustrated in the speech Livy (34.2.14-34.3.3) attributes to Cato's defense of the Oppian Law. See Shepard Kraemer, *Blessings*, 59.

cult of the Egyptian goddess Isis [140] (for example) was flexible, open to worshippers of both sexes, of ages and classes. Worship was personal, stressed individual responsibility and had great emotional appeal. The cult had little interest in tradition or hierarchies [141] and thus it served to undermine the social order.

While many of the above-mentioned native cults and festivals were of ancient origin, the main sources for these religious rites come from writers of the later Augustan era. [142] This is because many were revived, manipulated and promoted by the *princeps* as part of a wider programme of re-building after the civil war. In this, Augustus drew heavily on the traditional belief that the problems of Rome were linked to its population's immorality and neglect of the gods.

Curator morum

As expressed by Horace, marriage, children, the people and the homeland had been corrupted [143] and reparation for ancestral sins would only happen when temples were rebuilt. [144] Augustus himself set about becoming cult reviver, temple builder, "founder and restorer

---

140 For the cult of Isis, see Pomeroy (*Goddesses*, 217-226) and Shepard Kraemer (*Blessings,* Ch. 6). As explained by Pomeroy (*op. cit.,* 217), "Isis was a national divinity of ancient Egypt dating back at least to 2500 B.C., but she was a goddess with accretions of myths and rituals of many lands by the time she reached the shores of Italy at the end of the second century B.C."

141 This disregard for traditional social order helps explain official resistance to the cult. For details of the cult in both the Republican and Imperial periods, see Pomeroy, *Goddesses*, 223-225. Shepard Kraemer (*Blessings*, 76-77), however, shows how the cult (in Rome) could also be seen to reinforce the ideal of woman as wife and mother.

142 See Shepard Kraemer, *Blessings*, 59 (drawing on Pomeroy, *Goddesses* 209). The main sources for cults include Livy's *Annals of Rome*, Ovid's *Fasti* and Juvenal's *Satire* 6. At the time, extensive use was made of Varro's (116-27 B.C.E.) sixteen volumed *Antiquitates rerum divinarum.* In the work, he collected everything that was still known of the ancient cults and attempted to reconstruct what had been lost.

143 Hor. *Carm.* 3.6.17-20: *fecunda culpae saecula nuptias / primum inquinavere et genus et domos: / ..../ in patriam populumque fluxit.*

144 Hor. *Carm.* 3.6.1-4: *Delicta maiorum immeritus lues ,/ Romane, donec templa referecis / aedesque labentes deorum et / foeda nigro simulacra fumo.*

of all sanctuaries" and guardian of morals. [145] While as *curator ... morum*, he was concerned with the wider *mores maiorum* (ancestral values), [146] many of his actions included the promotion of so-called family values. This was done through moral legislation (*leges Iuliae*) [147] and personal example.

With regard to child-bearing, Augustus instituted a series of rewards and punishments aimed at encouraging couples to have as many children as possible. The *ius liberorum* (right of children) granted privileges to women and men with offspring. Thus, for example, there was exemption from guardianship to freeborn women with three children and to freedwomen with four. The more children a man had, the greater were his chances of gaining public office. Furthermore, he could stand for such office as many years before the legal minimum age as he had children. [148] To make the most of child-bearing years, the marriage age for girls was set at twelve. Widows and divorcees were actively encouraged to remarry. [149] By contrast, the chief penalty for childlessness (in the case of both men and women) was a limitation on the right to inherit. [150] Penalties for being unmarried and childless began for women at age twenty and for men at twenty-five.

Augustus continued to promote the value of child-producing in ways other than

---

145 Livy 4.20.7. Despite his claims in *RG* 20.4, Augustus did not, in fact, repair all the temples in the city. As noted by Zanker (*Images*, 109-110), for example, the Temple of the Dionysiac Triad (*Liber* [*Bacchus*], *Libera* and *Ceres*) on the Aventine was not rededicated until 17 C.E. under Tiberius. See Dio Cass. 50.10 and Tac. *Ann.* 2.49. Augustus was most interested in deities and temples closely associated with himself, namely the temple of Apollo on the Palatine and that of *Mars Ultor* in the forum of Augustus.

146 See Zanker (*Images*, 156-166) for discussion of the *mores maiorum*.

147 Most of our knowledge comes from secondary sources. These include the compilations of Gaius and Ulpian, themselves incorporated in the sixth century *Corpus Iuris Civilis* of Justinian. See Gai. *Inst.* 1.145, 1.194, 2.111, 2.144, 2.206-208, 2.225-227, 2.286, 3.42-54. ; Ulp. *Epit.* 16.1-3, 29.3-7; *Dig.* 4.4.37. On Augustan moral legislation, see P. Csillag, *The Augustan Law on Family Relations* (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1976) and S. Treggiari, *Roman Marriage: "Iusti Coniuges" from the Time of Cicero to the Time of Ulpian* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1991).

148 On privileges, see also Dio Cass. 53. 13.2-3 and 56.10.

149 As noted in Pomeroy (*Goddesses*, 161), the Augustan legislation encouraging widows to remarry was in tension with the traditional ideal of the *univera*, who remained faithful to the memory of her husband.

150 With regard to women, see Pomeroy , *Goddesses*, 151-2, 163, 166 and 197-198.

legislation. On one occasion, he read to the senate a speech of the censor Q. Metellus entitled "On Increasing the Birthrate" (*de Prole Augenda*). Though the text dated from 131 B.C.E., he saw its contemporary relevance and thus read it "as if it had just been written". [151] When, in 9 C.E., the *equites* protested against the marriage laws, "he [Augustus] had the children of Germanicus brought in, held one in his arms and had the others sit in their father's lap, and by his expression and gesture demonstrated that they should take the young man as their model". [152]

Along with child-bearing, the other Augustan preoccupation was marriage. In a word, the married were rewarded, the unmarried punished. This punishment usually came in the form of a decreased right to inheritance. To increase the number of legal unions, the *lex Iulia de maritandis ordinibus* recognized as valid, marriages between freeborn and freed, with the exception of senators and their sons who might not marry *libertae*. [153] In keeping with the desire to produce stable marriages, the *lex Iulia de adulteriis coercendis* declared adultery a public (and not merely a private) offence. Women, however, were punished more severely than men. A husband was obliged to divorce his wife and bring her to trial. [154] If convicted, she lost half her dowry, the adulterer was fined some of his property and both were separately exiled. The father of an adulteress was even permitted to kill her if she were still under his power. [155] While a wife could divorce her husband for adultery, she was not obliged to do so and the husband was not liable for criminal prosecution. [156] The same double standard applied to *stuprum* (sexual immorality). While an upper-class man could not have sexual relations with an unmarried or widowed upper-class woman, he could do so with a prostitute. By contrast, upper-class women could have

---

151 Livy, *Per.* 59: ".. *velut in haec tempore scriptam*.." See also Suet. *Aug.* 89.

152 Suet. *Aug.* 34.

153 *Dig.* 23.2.44. See also Dio Cass. 54.16.1-2.

154 According to *Dig.* 48.5.1-4, he or someone else could bring her to trial.

155 *Dig.* 48.5.21(20). For Julian laws on marriage and adultery, see G. Rotondi, *Leges Publicae Populi Romani*, ([reissued] Hildesheim: Olms, 1912), 443-447.

156 As Pomeroy (*Goddesses*, 159) explains , "[t]he law may have been more stringent than the real situation, for the jurist Ulpian later commented: 'It is very unjust for a husband to require from a wife a level of morality that he does not himself achieve.' " See *Dig.* 48.5.14 (13).5.

no sexual relations outside marriage. [157] Thus, when the daughter and grand-daughter of Augustus were found guilty of illicit sexual intercourse, he exiled them and forbade their burial in his tomb. [158] In this, he acted not simply as a punitive *pater familias,* but as an *exemplum* of the standards he sought to promote. A further reminder of the severe punishments for sexual behaviour deemed inappropriate is seen on a *denarius* issued during the period. It depicts the unchaste Vestal Tarpeia who betrayed Rome out of love for the Sabine king being burnt alive (fig. 3.22). [159]

family values and household ideology

Evidence from cults and from the legislation and personal example of the *princeps* points to the promotion of a familial or household ideology. The twin pillars of the ideal were marriage and child-bearing. The emphasis here is neither on the complex reasons for the crusade nor on its apparently unsuccessful results, [160] but rather on the fact of its existence. In other words, the fact that it was being promoted is more important than the reality that it might have failed. As in many historical periods (including our own), encouraging family values by regulating sexual *mores* is largely for socio-political reasons, for the maintenance of a stable society. Central to the Roman system was the maintenance of the patriarchal upper-class household. As seen in the sexual double standard and the focus on women's cults, however, the promotion of a household ideal involved regulating the activity of women more than that of men.

---

157 *Dig.* 48.5.6.1.

158 Suet. *Aug.* 65: *Iulias, filiam et neptem, omnibus probris contaminatas relegavit.* See also *ibid.*, 101.

159 See fig. 3.22 (Zanker, *Images*, fig. 127b), for a *denarius* (of P. Petronius Turpilianus, Rome, 16 B.C.E.) depicting the burning of Tarpeia. Propertius (4.4) dedicated an elegy to the story (4.4) and used it as an example of what happens when religion and morality are despised.

160 The success or failure of the drive is difficult to assess but the consensus seems to regard it as relatively unsuccessful. Opposition to Augustan legislation resulted in modifications as outlined in the *lex Papia Poppaea* (9 C.E.). See Suet. *Aug.* 33-34.

4. Slavery and patronage

A further example of the imperial regime as a household-writ-large was the presence of the *Familia Caesaris,* the slaves and freedpersons of the emperor. Just as many Roman households had both slave members [161] and freed associates, so too did the imperial household, albeit on a vaster and more complex scale. This part examines the area of slavery and patronage, [162] in particular, the transition from the *familia* of an individual to the *Familia Caesaris.*

Familia Caesaris [163]

As wealthy Roman families usually had both urban and rural property, their slave members consisted of a *familia urbana* (working in city dwellings) and a *familia rustica* (employed on country estates). Within these two traditional divisions, male and female slaves carried out a great variety and specialization of services. As in freeborn society, so in the servile domain too, there was a complex status ladder revealing that the membership was far from homogeneous. Although slaves were generally manumitted by the age of about thirty, such *liberti / libertae* often continued their association with their former owners in a patron / client relationship.

---

161 On slave households, see M. I. Finley, *Ancient Slavery and Modern Ideology* (London,: Chatto and Windus, 1980), K. R. Bradley, *Slaves and Masters in the Roman Empire: A Study in Social Control* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987), S. Treggiari, "Domestic staff at Rome in the Julio-Claudian period, 27 BC to AD 68", *Histoire sociale / Social History* vi (1973), 241-255, "Jobs in the household of Livia", *PBSR* xliii (1975) 48-77, "Questions on women domestics in the Roman West" in *Schiavitù, Manomissione e Classi Dipendenti nel Mondo Antico* (Rome: L'Erma di Bretschneider, 1979), 185-201, "Women as property in the early Roman Empire" in D. Kelly Weisberg (ed.), *Women and the Law: A Social Historical Perspective* (Cambridge: Schenkman, 1982), 7-33.

162 On patronage, see R. P. Saller, *Personal Patronage Under the Early Empire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), A. Wallace-Hadrill (ed.), *Patronage in Ancient Society* (London: Routledge, 1989), P. A. Brunt, *The Fall of the Roman Republic and Related Essays* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988), chapters 7 and 8.

163 The main source of information is P. R. C. Weaver, *Familia Caesaris: A Social Study of the Emperor's Freedmen* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972). According to Weaver, evidence for the *familia Caesaris* is abundant and is available from the time of Augustus to the early third century.

The *Familia Caesaris* consisted of slaves and freedpersons. Slaves belonged to, or came into the possession of, the emperor either as personal property (gained by family inheritance, private bequest, gift or purchase) or as part of the *patrimonium* passed from emperor to emperor. [164] The *familia* also included ex-slaves, the *Augusti liberti / libertae.* The *Familia Caesaris* was more numerous, more specialized and of higher status [165] than any other Roman *familia.* The slave and freed members of the imperial house formed an *ordo libertorum et servorum principis,* a special status-group in Roman society. Their position and status was clearly indicated in their nomenclature. Thus, for example, imperial slaves added "*Caes(aris) ser(vus)*", "*Aug(usti) vern(a)*", "*Aug(usti)*" or "*Caes(aris)*" to the single name they traditionally possessed. [166]

The main division within the *Familia Caesaris* was between those employed in the personal or domestic service of the emperor and those engaged in administrative duties. Staff of the domestic service, both men and women, worked in imperial residences. The wide range of tasks assigned to them were akin to those of their counterparts engaged in the services of any wealthy Roman household. Their positions ranged from the menial, such as that of *custos* and *aedituus* (guard and keeper) through those with some skill, *topiarius*

---

164 In the reigns of Augustus and Tiberius in particular, many slaves came into imperial possession. As explained by Weaver (*Familia*, 199, 212-213), this fact is detectable in *agnomina* (second names) ending in *-ianus* (and less frequently *-anus* and *-inus*). These names are derived from the *nomen* or *cognomen* of the *familia* of a former master. The ending *-ianus* expresses the transfer of *dominica potestas* from one master to another in a way akin to the transfer of *patria potestas* in the case of adoptees. However the former did not have the *tria nomina* of a freeborn person (see below). Weaver notes that such names are not be confused with ordinary, personal names ending in *-ianus*.

165 As Weaver (*Familia,* 2) notes, the fact that the emperor was master and patron of the *Familia Caesaris* conferred high status on members. While the *familia* did form an elite among slaves and freed people, this was not equally true for all its members, nor for all periods. Inscriptional material reveals much social differentiation *within* the *Familia Caesaris.*

166 According to Weaver (*Familia*, 2-3), "the emperor's freedmen, in addition to the usual *tria nomina* of a Roman citizen (*praenomen, nomen* (*gentilicum*) and *cognomen*) took the status indication '*Aug(usti) lib(ertus)*" or '*Aug(usti) l(ibertus)*'. This they displayed with pride as a status symbol even in the period beginning with the first century AD when the freedmen of private citizens were ceasing to use any form of freedman indication at all. Imperial freedmen would thus appear as, e.g., *T. Claudius Aug. l. Onesimus, T. Flavius Aug. lib. Onesimus*, ... in each case deriving their *praenomen* and *nomen* from the emperor who manumitted them: e.g. 'Ti Claudius' from Claudius or Nero, 'Ti. Flavius' from Vespasian Titus or Domitian, ... In many cases they omitted their *praenomen* and *nomen* and would appear with *cognomen* (personal name) and status indication only, e.g. *Onesimus Aug. lib.*, still positively identified as a freedman of an emperor."

(ornamental gardener), *tricliniarchus* (in charge of the dining-room) or *archimagirus* (head chef) to the managerial posts of *procurator* and *subprocurator domus Augustianae*. The head of domestic organisation with financial responsibility for its budget was the *procurator castrensis*. [167] Even more influential were the *cubicularii,* who along with the freedmen *ab admissione* controlled access to the emperor. They thereby had influence on affairs which extended beyond the purely domestic.

Staff engaged in administrative duties served the emperor in his magisterial capacity and constituted a form of civil service. The main areas of responsibility were finance and public services (such as aqueducts or roads) and most were assigned to men. There was a range of duties in many departments, in both Rome and the provinces. Furthermore, status varied according to the function and the (geographical) location of the post. [168] Posts ranged from the sub-clerical (such as the *pedisqui*, *custodes, nomenclatores* and *tabellarii*), through junior and intermediate clerical grades (like *adiutor, vicarius, dispensator, a commenatriis* and *tabularius*) and those of senior clerical rank (the *tabularii a rationibus* and the *proximi)* to the senior administrative positions of *procurator, a rationibus, ab epistulis, a libellis.* Holders of senior positions often earned their emancipation and proceeded to gain promotion and honours, a fact which scandalized the traditional Roman aristocracy. [169]

Many of the *Familia Caesaris* were skilled at a trade, as the terms *vestifex / vestifica* (tailor or dressmaker) or *argentarius* (silver-smith) indicate and their handiwork was used within the imperial household. [170] There were also manual labourers or craftworkers, such as *lapidarii* (stonemasons) or *marmorarii* (marble-cutters) whose skills

---

167 Weaver (*Familia*, 2-3) mentions that this post formed part of the procuratorial career of a *libertus* which could include positions in both domestic and administrative services, particularly those of a financial nature.

168 Weaver, *Familia,* 7. There was wide variation in the status attached to a post of the same rank in different departments. The status dimension was also linked with the location of different sections of the same department. The head office in Rome took precedence over branch offices in provincial centres and there were further status differences between these latter.

169 As noted in *Weaver* (*Familia,* 279, 282), Felix the procurator of Judaea who investigated the charges against Paul was a freedman of the imperial household who had been advanced to full membership of the equestrian order. See Acts 23.24-24.27 (in particular).

170 Weaver, *Familia,* 7-8. Some products may have been sold on the open market or to other members of the *familia*, but this was not the main purpose of such activities.

were required to realize imperial building projects. The trade and skills of many of the *Familia Caesaris,* therefore, contributed to the economic self-sufficiency of the imperial household.

Indeed the entire *Familia Caesaris,* domestic and administrative, skilled and unskilled, of high and low status, men and women.., provided a cheap labour force and loyal bureaucracy essential for the running of the imperial structure. Continuity of service was ensured by the fact that emperors inherited ownership and patronal rights over the slaves and freed personnel of their predecessors. Despite the practice of emancipation, numbers were guaranteed not least because the emperor could recruit as *servi,* children born to imperial slaves before manumission. Furthermore legislation ensured that numbers did not fall. Thus, for example, according to the *Senatusconsultum Claudianum,* [171] *ingenuae* marrying imperial slaves and freedmen lost their freeborn status. As *servae* or *libertae*, their children were slaves and thus were eligible for recruitment into the *familia Caesaris.* [172] Recruitment also came from *vicarii* (the slaves of imperial slaves) who were legally the property of the emperor.

While the imperial structure resulted in the growth of a huge, professional and highly specialized staff, this was not presented as an alien and novel development. Rather it appeared as an extension of the traditional and familiar Roman *familia,* thereby contributing to the notion of the empire as a household-writ-large.

Patronage

As noted above, the *Familia Caesaris* consisted of members, both slave and freed. In addition, many *liberti / libertae* had continued association with their former master in a

---

171 Weaver, *Familia,* 162-169. The *Senatusconsultum Claudianum* was passed in 52 CE. The issues dealt with were (i) the legal status of wives of imperial slaves and freedmen who were *ingenuae*(freeborn) and (ii) the status of the children of such unions. See Gai. *Inst.* 1.84 and Tac. *Ann.* 12.53.1.

172 Before this, the children of such unions were freeborn and not members of the *Familia Caesaris.* Since slaves could not be legally married, children born to servile unions (*contubernum*) acquired the status of their mothers. If mothers were freeborn, so were the children. Children could, however, be adopted by their fathers on manumission.

relationship of patronage. [173] Along with these ex-slaves, the emperor also had large numbers of free-born *clientes* and *amici*. Roman society, at all levels, was long organized around such patron-client networks and while patronage was not strictly a household system, there are links between the institutions of household, slavery and patronage.

As an individual Roman man was *pater familias*, master and patron, so was the emperor, but in magnified form. Being master was an intrinsic part of the role of *pater familias*. Being patron was an extension of the roles of *pater* and *dominus*. All three functions contributed to the paternalistic,[174] hierarchical system on which Roman society was based. As patron, the emperor had many *beneficia* (favours, services) to bestow, including manumission, offices, statuses, privileges, immunities and money. [175] These were gained by those with access to him and these included his family as well as senators and governors. These latter officials in turn became brokers of further *beneficia* to lesser clients. In return,[176] the emperor received loyalty and gratitude expressed in both dedications (on stones, altars..) and gifts bequeathed to him. [177] The emperor was, therefore, at the apex of the hierarchy, as *pater patriae*, principal master and patron.

---

173 Patronage is an exchange relationship between people (patron and client) of unequal social status. See definition in Saller, *Patronage*, 1. For patronage-related terminology, see *ibid.*, 8ff.

174 A governor's role could be described in paternalistic terms. Like a father, a proconsul was praised for his indulgence towards his subjects, tempering his desires and restraining them with gentle remedies (Apuleius, *Flor.* 17).

175 Quoting F. Millar (*The Emperor in the Roman World* [London: Duckworth, 1977]), 114), Saller, (*Patronage*, 58) writes that the example of Pliny was probably "not untypical of that of reasonably well-placed senators as a whole." During a term of less then two years as governor of Bithynia, there is evidence of six patronal requests submitted to the emperor (*Ep.* 10) for : an unspecified senatorial post (10.26), a staff appointment (10.51), an equestrian *militia* (10.87), citizenship (10.94), the *ius trium liberorum* (10.104), approval for private use of the *cursus publicus* (10.120).

176 Every one in receipt of a *beneficium* was expected to return it in some way.

177 See J. Gaudemet ("Testamenta ingrata et pietas Augusti", Studi Arangio - Ruiz vol. 13, 115 ff) for evidence concerning emperor's refusal to accept legacies under certain conditions. Gaudemet notes that all those known to have named Augustus or Tiberius in their wills had profited from imperial largesse or *clementia*. See also R. S. Rogers, "The Roman Emperors as heirs and legatees", *TAPhA* 78 (1947), 140-158.

FOUR ASPECTS OF "EMPIRE AS HOUSEHOLD" ... IN SUM .....

This first section of the chapter outlined four contributory aspects to the construct of empire as household-writ-large. The first aspect focused on the Roman *pater* and on the logical progression, in Roman terms, from *pater familias* to *pater patriae.* It examined the use of this latter title, by Augustus, for both the development and the acceptance of the role of *princeps.* The second aspect dealt with evidence of parallels between domestic and state religion, in terms of deities, functions and roles. Emphasis centred on the role of *pater*, both *familias* and *patriae*. A third aspect studied the family values and household ideology in cults revived in the Augustan period and in the moral legislation of the *princeps.* The fourth studied the *Familia Caesaris* and the related institutions of household, slavery and patronage. The four aspects were intimately connected to the Roman institution of *patria potestas* and pointed to the household ideology operative in society. Father power was clearly seen in the *pater*-led nature of the Roman household, a social structure which in turn served as a model for the imperial system.

THE HOUSE-BUILDING OF AUGUSTUS

This second section presents the house-building or dynasty-creating activities of Augustus as another aspect of the empire as household-writ-large. Once in power, Augustus set about constructing a dynasty backwards and forwards. [178] The building backwards involved the re-writing of history in the portrayal of his ancestry. This was in order to claim and highlight both his divine origins and the significance of his family in the history of Rome. The construction forwards involved the attempt to establish a dynasty, by grooming a successor. [179]

House-building backwards : pedigree and self-justification

The unique and powerful position of Augustus needed to be justified by a unique and powerful pedigree. Since this did not exist, it had to be invented. Such pedigree-inventing and self-justification is here referred to as house-building backwards. In imitation of Hellenistic royal families, Roman aristocrats traditionally traced their families back to Greek deities or heroes. Identification with divine and mythological figures was believed to invite patronage, protection and to bestow legitimation (figs 23-26). [180] In his new, dominant role in the Roman state, Augustus too sought legitimacy from the past. He

---

178 This section draws heavily on evidence provided by Zanker, *Images.*

179 Evidence for this house-building is recorded in literature, monumental architecture and coinage. On coinage, see H. Mattingly , *Coins of the Roman Empire in the British Museum I - VI.* (London: British Museum Publications, 1923-1976) and Mattingly *et al. The Roman Imperial Coinage I - IX* (London: Spink, 1923-1981). There is a revised edition of Vol. I (From 31 BC to AD 69) by C. H. V. Sutherland (London: Spink, 1984). See also Sutherland, *Roman History and Coinage 44 BC - AD 69* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1987), R. A. G. Carson, *Principal Coins of the Romans*, 3 vols (London: British Museum, 1978-1981), J. P. C. Kent, *Roman Coins* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1978).

180 For treatment of Augustus as protégé of Apollo, see Zanker, *Images*, 48-53, 85-89. Augustus developed this image over many years. Apollo represented discipline and morality, he was god of peace and reconciliation and prophet of the new age. By association, therefore, Augustus, too incarnated these qualities. He used as his seal the sphinx symbol of the *regnum Apollinis,* wore Apollo's laurel wreath and had these objects imaged on his coinage. Even his residence was close to Apollo's temple on the Palatine. For illustrations of the links between Augustus and Apollo, see figs 3.23, 24 a-b, 25, 26 (Zanker, *Images*, figs 40, 36a-b, 38, 39).

portrayed himself as a *divi filius* in a double sense: he was adopted son and heir of the deified Julius Caesar [181] and he was also son of more ancient ancestral deities. Furthermore, he re-wrote the history of Rome by portraying the Julians as the most important family in the state.

divus Iulius and divi filius

By consciously presenting himself as *divi filius* (adopted son of the deified Julius Caesar), Augustus sought to legitimize his position and build a strong house backwards (figs 3.27a-c) . [182] The memory of Julius Caesar was actively promoted: he was included in the state cult and a comet, the *sidus Iulium,* was regularly used as the symbol of his deification. [183] The symbol is seen on coins, statues, rings and seals. On the statue of Caesar in the Forum, for example, a large *sidus Iulium* appears on the pediment and an e oversized dedication, "*Divo Iulio*", is found below. While the *sidus Iulium* or *Caesaris astrum* evoked the memory of Julius Caesar, it gradually became a symbol of the *saeculum aureum* (golden age) and provided legitimation and recognition of Augustus as *divi filius* and leader with an impeccable nomenclature and ancestry. [184]

---

181 On the adoption of Octavian by Julius Caesar, see for example, M. Grant, *The Twelve Caesars* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1975), 54.

182 See figs 3.27a-c (Zanker, *Images*, figs 28 a-c) for numismatic evidence of the link between *divus Iulius* and *divi filius*.

183 According to Zanker (*Images*, 34-35), "[w]hen Octavian in July of 44 staged the *Ludi Victoriae Caesaris,* a comet appeared in the sky. Augustus later recorded in his autobiography that his comet had been visible all over the world for seven days and had been generally understood as a sign of Caesar's apotheosis. For this reason , he put a star on the head of the statue of Caesar dedicated soon after in the Forum, 'but inwardly he rejoiced in the sign of the star, to which he would himself ascend' (Pliny, *NH* 2.93.94). Elsewhere we learn that it was Octavian himself who inspired in people this belief in the star and that he set the *sidus Iulium* upon all Caesar's statues and later the star shone on his own helmet." See figs 3.28, 29 (Zanker, *Images*, fig. 25a and fig. 132a).

184 According to Cicero (*Phil.* 13.11.24), M. Antony is reported to have referred to Octavian, as the youth "*[q]ui omnia nomini debet*" (who owed everything to a name).

divi filius, Mars, Venus, Romulus and Aeneas

Augustus claimed descent from both Mars (and his son Romulus) and Venus (and her grandson Aeneas). [185] As outlined by Virgil, Mars seduced Rhea Silvia, daughter of the king of Alba Longa. She thus became father to the twins (Romulus and Remus) and ancestor of the Romans. Rhea Silvia, however, belonged to the Trojan family of Aeneas, who was the grandson of Venus. The story of Romulus and the legend of Troy thus combined to provide a double divine ancestry for the *princeps*.

Given special prominence, therefore, was Mars, god of war, Rome's *Ultor* (Avenger) and guarantor of Roman *virtus*. A massive temple to the god was constructed and it occupied the central position in the Forum of Augustus (figs 3.30–32). [186] It honoured Mars's role as avenger of Rome against the Parthians. [187] Although ascribed to Mars, this event was actually a victory of Augustus. Coins celebrating the defeat linked both god and *princeps*. Thus, for example, an *aureus* depicts a triumphal arch for Augustus as victor while a *denarius* bears a small temple of Mars *Ultor* , with the god holding the *signa* returned by the vanquished Parthians (figs 3.33-35a-b). [188] As well as being the mere descendant of Mars, therefore, the image of the *princeps* is seen to merge with that of the god. In his description of the temple of Mars *Ultor*, Ovid makes explicit this link

---

185 Julius Caesar did too. Not only did Augustus build a Temple to his ancestress *Venus Genetrix* in his *Forum Iulium* but, according to Suetonius (*Caes.* 78), he sat in the entrance to this temple to receive senators.

186 According to *RG* 21.1, the temple was built by Augustus on his personal property (*in privato solo*) and was financed by the spoils of war (*ex manibiis*). The Temple of Mars thus took over certain distinctions which had previously been reserved for the Capitoline Temple of Jupiter. See figs 3.30, 31, 32 (Zanker, *Images*, figs 92, 150, 149).

187 As noted by Zanker (*Images*, 108, 194-195), the temple was vowed by Octavian at Philippi (42 B.C.E), but was finally dedicated forty years later. By that time, Mars had proved himself Rome's avenger a second time against the Parthians. It was this avenging (and not the victories of civil war) that was to be celebrated. While the defeat occurred in 20 B.C.E., it was given special significance in Augustan ideology as the start of the golden age.

188 See fig. 3.33 (Zanker, *Images*, fig. 146a) for the *aureus* (of Spain, 19/18 B.C.E.) and fig. 3.34 (Zanker, *Images*, fig. 89b) for the *denarius* (of Spain, 19/18 B.C.E.). See also figs 3.35 a-b (Zanker, *Images* figs 145a-b).

between the greatness of Mars, that of the temple and that of Augustus. [189]

Augustus also claimed descent from Venus, the goddess of love. Indeed, much of the imagery of the new age celebrated fertility and prosperity, qualities granted by Venus. The goddess was depicted, along with Mars, on the pediment of the temple in the Forum (fig. 3.36). [190] A *denarius* of Octavian also illustrates the doubly divine ancestry, depicting Venus *Genetrix* with the arms of Mars and the caption *Caesar Divi F(ilius)* (fig. 3.37). [191]

Aeneas (the grandson of Venus) and Romulus (the son of Mars) were also given pride of place, their deeds and complementary virtues celebrated. Of divine descent, they were ancestors of Augustus, ancestors of the Roman people and exemplars of the valued qualities of *pietas* and *virtus.* These were qualities promoted and modelled by the *princeps* himself. Aeneas was the *exemplum pietatis,* a virtue first exemplified *en famille.* A traditional and ubiquitous image was that of the hero fleeing Troy in flames, carrying his aged father Anchises (who bore their *Penates*) and holding his little son Ascanius by the hand (figs 3.38-39). [192] By contrast, Romulus was the *exemplum virtutis* (fig. 3.40). [193] As described by Ovid, Aeneas and Romulus stood as counterparts of Mars and Venus in the central niches of the two large *exedrae* in the forum of Augustus. [194]

In sum, Augustus cultivated a double divine ancestry and hence an unambiguously straight line of descent through the two great national heroes, Romulus and Aeneas. Furthermore, this resulted in a certain fusion of identity between descendant and ancestor.

---

189 "*et deus est ingens et opus..... spectat et Augusto praetextum nomine templum, / et visum lecto Caesare maius opus* (The god is huge and so is the structure.... One beholds, too, the name of Augustus on the front of the temple; and the building seems ... still greater when one reads the name of Caesar." For the full description, see Ov. *Fast.* 5.550ff.

190 See fig. 3.36 (Zanker, *Images*, fig. 151).

191 See fig. 3.37 (Zanker, *Images*, 35, fig. 27c).

192 See fig. 3.38 (Zanker, *Images*, fig. 156a). The image appeared on rings, lamps, statuettes... Its constant (over-)use led to its being parodied, as seen in fig. 3.39 (Zanker, *Images,* fig. 162).

193 See fig. 3.40 (Zanker, *Images*, fig. 156b) for an illustration of Romulus.

194 Ov. *Fast.* 5. 563-7: *hinc videt Aeneam oneratum pondere caro...hinc videt Iliaden humeris ducis arma ferentem* ..(On this side he sees Aeneas laden with his dear burden ... On the other side he sees Romulus carrying on his shoulders the arms of the conquered leader). See aforementioned fig. 3.40.

the gens Iulia

Another aspect of Augustus's house-building backwards was the portrayal of the *gens Iulia* as the most significant of all Roman families. Given that this was not actually true, the portrayal required a re-writing of history. While Roman aristocrats had traditionally advertised the importance of their *gens* with statues of important ancestors, Augustus did it *en grand.* One example of this, noted in the description above, is the statuary in the *exedra* and colonnade outside the Temple of Mars *Ultor* [195] (figs 3.32, 41-42). On one side are statues of "*..tot Iuleae nobilitas avos...*", [196] the worthiest men in his *gens*: these include Aeneas, the kings of Alba Longa and members from both the Republican period and from Augustus's own day. [197] The impression created was that the Julian family had distinguished itself throughout Roman history in a way that was both continuous and unparalleled. The inference was that it continued to do so under Augustus. Indeed the whole of history pointed to Augustus.[198] This impression was further reinforced by the figures juxtaposed as counterfoils to the *Iulii.* On the opposite colonnade was a row of *summi viri,* [199] those "*qui imperium p. R. ex minimo maximum reddidissent*", men who were to serve as worthy examples for present and future rulers. [200] In contrast to the unbroken line of the *Iulii*, these men appeared as important yet ancestorless and once-off

---

195 For illustrations, see figs. 3.32, 41, 42 and 3.32 (Zanker, *Images*, figs 149, 166, 164).

196 Ov. *Fast.* 5.564. As explained in *ibid.*, 5.566, under each statue in the *exedra* was inscribed the famous deeds of the person concerned: .. *claraque dispositis acta subesse viris*..

197 There was no statue of Julius Caesar. As a god, he could no longer be placed among mortals

198 As Zanker (*Images,* 212-213) notes, a similar interpretation is found in the poetry of Virgil. It is the basic idea in the great scene in the Aeneid (6.792) when Anchises in the underworld shows Aeneas the great Romans of the future down to Caesar Augustus : ...*aurea condet / saecula qui rursus Latio regnata per arva / Saturno quondam*.. (He brings the golden age back to Latium, Saturn's onetime realm). In giving the traditional stories of Venus, the Fall of Troy and the wanderings of Aeneas new meaning, Virgil's Aeneid contributed to the creation of the new national myth. Both the future rule of the Julian house and indeed the entire history of Rome were portrayed as predestined for triumph and salvation.

199 Alexander Severus, *Historia Augusta*, 28.6.

200 According to Suetonius (*Aug.* 31), Augustus claimed that those "who had raised the estate of the Roman people from obscurity to greatness", men now honoured in the portrait gallery, were to serve as standard setters for all rulers.

greats from otherwise insignificant families.

This portrayal of the *gens Iulia* involved a revision of history. The truth was that the *Iulii* were a relatively insignificant family from the fourth to the second century B.C.E.. Furthermore the history of Rome was one of intense rivalry between its leading families, with none in a position of complete and continued predominance.

House-building forwards : the succession

Roman history had been rewritten to reach a golden climax in Augustus. By continued construction, this new era was to stretch into the future with Augustus as "..τοῦ Σεβαστοῦ γένους ἀρχή...". [201] Augustus's house-building in a forwards direction involved seeking a successor to ensure that what he had established would not only survive but would remain in-house. The project was as self-conscious and evident as the house-building backwards.

Sons-in-law: Marcellus and Agrippa

As Augustus had a daughter but no son, he (like other Roman *patres*) sought a male heir. [202] This involved a complicated process of marriage alliances, grooming and adoption. Thwarted in his many attempts, the succession was a question that occupied him for years. [203]

His initial interest lay, not in his step-sons Tiberius and Drusus, but rather in his nephew and son-in-law Marcellus.[204] Marcellus was appointed high priest and aedile and

---

201 Philo, *Leg.* 149: .. what we may call the source and fountain-head of the Augustan stock in general ..was also the first and greatest and the common benefactor (πρῶτος καὶ μέγιστος καὶ κοινὸς εὐεργέτης).

202 Augustus and his first wife, Scribonia had one child, a daughter Julia. He and his second wife, Livia had no children.

203 Primary evidence for the succession is found in Tac. *Ann.* 1.3, Suet. *Tib.* 23.

204 According to Sutherland, (drawing on Syme, *Revolution,* 331-348) Marcellus "was the first in a tormented series of machinations by which Augustus clearly sought to project his own power into a future dynasty". On Marcellus, see also Plut. *Vit. Marc.*

his image appeared regularly on coins. [205] He died prematurely, however, in 23 B.C.E. Augustus then turned to the powerful Agrippa [206] who, in 21 B.C.E., became Julia's next husband. [207] Of plebeian origin but an excellent general, Agrippa was dignified with successive consulships and together with Augustus, he was portrayed on several coins (figs 3.43-44b). [208] Agrippa's death in 12 B.C.E., however, meant that Augustus had to look elsewhere for his house-building project.

Grandsons: Gaius and Lucius Caesar [209]

Augustus then set his hopes on his grandsons, Gaius and Lucius Caesar, who were two of Julia and Agrippa's five children. In 17 B.C.E., the *princeps* adopted into the Imperial family the newborn Lucius and his three year old brother, Gaius. Officially, therefore, each became *Augusti Caesaris filius, Divi Julii nepos.* Thus began the long process of grooming for succession. The boys received the title *princeps iuventutis,* [210] had consulships marked out for them and were awarded honours and high public office when still very young. While keeping a certain distance, Augustus was careful to promote

---

205 See Sutherland (*History and Coinage*, 24-25 [see 10a]) for a description of a provincial *aes* which may commemorate the marriage of Julia and Marcellus in 25 B.C.E.

206 According to Dio Cassius (54.6.5), Maecenas said that Augustus must either make him his son-in-law or destroy him.

207 Marcellus had already been married to Marcella, one of the two sisters of Marcellus and they had children.

208 See fig. 3.43 (Sutherland, *History and Coinage*, fig.10b [RIC 1.2 p.51 nos 155-8]) for bronze *aes* coins from the mint of Nemausus (Nîmes) in Gaul, dated 20 B.C.E to 10 C.E. The obverse bears the heads of Agrippa and Augustus back to back. As Agrippa had been chief strategist and coadjutor of Augustus in the civil war, it was as such that he is depicted wearing a combined rostral crown (adorned with the "beaks" of ships captured at Actium and elsewhere) and laurel-wreath. Further numismatic evidence is provided in figs 3.44 a-b (Zanker, *Images*, fig. 168a-b). See also Sutherland, *History and Coinage*, 25, fig. 10d [RIC 1.2 p.73. no. 406]). A *denarius* of Rome, from 13 B.C.E., has, on the obverse, the words *CAESAR AVGVSTVS* and the bare head of Augustus. The reverse bears the words *C(aius) SVPLC(ius) PLATORIN(us)* and depicts both Augustus and Agrippa.

209 On Gaius and Lucius Caesar, see *RG* 14.

210 This title had no real political significance but it soon became a kind of official title for the successor to the throne.

the boys. [211]

Evidence of the boys' position as important and intimately linked to Augustus is seen in numismatic and monumental sources. Thus for example, *aurei* and *denarii* of Lugdunum (from the period 2 B.C.E. to 4 C.E. or beyond) have on the obverse the laureate head of Augustus and the words *CAESAR AVGUSTVS DIVI F(ilius) PATER PATRIAE*, while the reverse reveals the words *C(aius) L(ucius) CAESARES AVGUSTI F(ilii) COS (Consules) DESIG(nati) PRINC(ipes) IVVENT(utis)* surrounding the two young men (figs 3.45-46b).[212] The boys were depicted on the *Ara Pacis Augustae* (figs 3.47-a-b), [213] the altar erected by the Senate from 13 to 9 B.C.E. in honour of Augustus's safe return from campaigns in Gaul and Spain. They "occupied a prominent position in a procession which is otherwise (as far as we can tell) composed of members of the imperial house, arranged according to the order of dynastic succession." [214]

Even a physical likeness to Augustus was cultivated. Official portraits of Gaius and Lucius closely resembled that of Augustus (figs. 3.48a-b), [215] in contrast to those of their brother Agrippa *Posthumus* (fig. 3.49) [216] which resemble those of their biological father, Agrippa. According to Suetonius,[217] the *princeps* even made sure that the boys imitated his handwriting.

---

211 The (feigned) concern to avoid appearing too partisan is seen in the comment of Suetonius (*Aug.* 5.6): that " [h]e never commended his sons to the people without adding 'if they are worthy.' He always lamented bitterly that whenever these youths appeared, the whole people stood up and applauded." In 5 B.C.E., Augustus had himself elected consul (for the first time in seventeen years) in order to escort the fifteen year old Gaius into the Senate. From then on, whenever possible, the two princes accompanied the *princeps* at all his public appearance.

212 See fig. 3.45 (Zanker, *Images,* fig. 173 = Sutherland, *History and Coinage*, fig. 10c). Gaius and Lucius are togate, each is resting his hand on a shield. A spear lies behind each shield and above, lies a priestly *simpulum* and *lituus*. See also figs. 3.46a-b (Zanker, *Images*, figs 167 a-b).

213 See figs. 3.47a-b (Zanker, *Images*, figs. 169, 170). For a more detailed discussion of their presentation, see 217-218. Zanker notes that some recent articles in the *American Journal of Archaeology* have posited new identifications of various figures on the frieze.

214 Zanker, *Images*, 218.

215 See figs 3. 48 a-b (Zanker, *Images*, 220, figs 174, 175).

216 Agrippa *Postumus* was the third son of Julia and Agrippa. He was not initially admitted into the Julian family. For a portrait, see fig. 3.49 (Zanker, *Images*, fig. 176).

217 Suet. *Aug.* 64.

The tragedy for Augustus was that the premature deaths of both young men deprived him of sons and heirs. [218] After their deaths, the youths were honoured as new national heroes. Throughout the empire, monuments were dedicated to them. [219] In Rome, the voting precincts were named after them. Augustus also gave their names to the *Basilica Julia* in the Forum and to the park near the Naumachia in Trastevere (*Nemus Gai et Luci Caesaris*). While such posthumous honours contributed to the on-going construction of the Augustan house, the reality was that the *princeps* had to begin his heir-seeking once again.

Stepson: Tiberius

After the deaths of Gaius and Lucius Caesar, Augustus adopted his remaining grandson, Agrippa *Posthumus* (whom he eventually disinherited) [220] and his stepson Tiberius (who had been in voluntary exile on Rhodes for some eleven years). [221] Augustus chose Tiberius as his new son-in-law, that is, as husband to the twice-widowed Julia. Since he was already married, he first had to divorce his wife Vipsania Agrippina. [222]

Already a distinguished military commander,[223] Tiberius was formally presented to the armies and was made partner, with Augustus, in both military command and tribunician power. With regard to the latter, *aurei* and *denarii* of Lugdunum (from 13 or

---

218 A succinct reference to this is found in the *RG* 14: (*Filios meos*), *quos iuvenes mihi eripuit fortuna* ...

219 Zanker, *Images*, 221. Examples include the Maison Carrée in Nîmes. For an illustration, see Zanker, *op. cit.*, 256, fig. 201.

220 According to Tacitus (*Ann.* 1.3), Livia had influenced the ageing Augustus to banish his only surviving grandson, Agrippa *Postumus*, to the island of Planasia. According to Suet. *Aug.* 65, Augustus soon disowned Agrippa because of his low tastes and his violent temper (..*ob ingenium ac ferox*..) and sent him off to Surrentum.

221 Tiberius Nero was the son of Livia and Tiberius Claudius Nero. His younger brother was Claudius Drusus.

222 Agrippina and Tiberius had one son, Drusus.

223 When Augustus adopted his grandsons, his stepsons Tiberius and Drusus were thirty five and twenty one years old respectively. Never regarded as potential successors, they brought glory to the dynasty by their role as military commanders. Since Augustus was the official commander-in-chief (he had *imperius maius*), their victories were officially his. For details of their achievements and the honours accorded them, see Zanker, *Images*, 224-230.

14 C.E.) bear, on the reverse, the head of Tiberius and the inscription *TIB(berius) CAESAR AVG(usti) F(ilius) TR(ibunicia) POT(estate) XV*, while the obverse bears the laureate head of Augustus and the words, *CAESAR AVGVSTVS DIVI F(ilius) PATER PATRIAE.* [224] A bronze of Rome (from 10 or 11 C.E.) has on the obverse the inscription *TI(berius) CAESAR AVGUST(i) F(ilius) IMPERAT(or) V,* while the reverse reads *PONTIFEX TRIBVN(icia) POTESTATE XII.* [225]

As investigation of the succession reveals, Augustus's heir was far from being a first choice. Not least was the fact that Tiberius was a member of the famous Claudian *gens.* Furthermore, he was never assimilated into the new mythology of the *Julii*, as the grandsons of the *princeps* had been. Despite his best and sustained efforts, therefore, the succession-seeking of the *princeps* had been something of a disappointment. As Pliny writes, "In fine, this god - whether deified more by his own action or by his merits I know not - departed from life leaving his enemy's son his heir." [226] The appointment of Tiberius did mean, however, that Augustus had, at the time of his death in 14 C.E., a son and heir, thereby ensuring continuity and laying the foundations of an imperial house.

Augustus and house-building : both typical and unparalleled

The house-building of Augustus is exemplified in his complex heir-seeking procedure. Such house-building was both typical of Roman aristocrats and at the same time, quite unprecedented. Having achieved a position unparalleled in Roman history, what Augustus had to bequeath was unique. By seeking to keep his power and position in-house, he was not merely perpetuating an already existing unit, but establishing an imperial dynasty.

On the one hand, the succession-preoccupation of Augustus was typical of Roman aristocratic *patres* who ensured continuity of name, power and possessions into the next generation. If a man did not have a son, he simply adopted one and groomed him as heir.

---

224 See Sutherland, *History and Coinage*, 25, 27, 10f (RIC 1.2 p. 56. no. 225f.).

225 See Sutherland, *History and Coinage*, 24, 27, 10e (RIC 1.2 p.78. no. 49).

226 Pliny, *NH* 7.150: *in summa deus ille caelumque nescio adeptus magis an meritus herede hostis sui filio excessit.*

While this appears normal and natural, it is in fact a highly conscious dynasty-making activity. One aspect of this is the role of nomenclature. [227] Roman names were never really personal but simply those of the *familia,* either biological or adoptive. As in many societies, family names were passed down through the male line, carried by either biological sons or adopted ones from lesser families. [228] In Rome, however, the names of sons followed those of fathers almost without alteration and daughters were given feminine forms of family names. [229] In this way, the identity of noble houses was consciously constructed and the edifice constructed functioned as a vehicle for the safe-guarding of power and possessions.

The political significance of such house-building is seen in the Republic, where power was concentrated in the hands of a few leading families. [230] Dynasties such as the *Valerii, Fabii* and *Cornelii* [231] controlled political power through the consulate, an office which permanently ennobled the entire family of the holder. Indeed certain periods of Roman history are referred to by the names of such families, families like the *Scipiones* or

---

227 On Roman names, see R. Syme, "*Imperator Caesar*: a study in nomenclature", *Roman Papers* 1 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979), 361-377, D. R. Shackleton Bailey, "Adoptive nomenclature in the late Roman Republic" in *Two Studies in Roman Nomenclature*, 2nd edition (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991). Weaver (*Familia*) makes extensive use of nomenclature in his study. A study of Roman succession law also highlights the family-orientated nature of society. Apart from the *Digesta*, see for example, Saller, *Patriarchy, Property and Death*, 161-180 and J. A. Crook, "Women in Roman Succession" in Rawson (ed.), *Family*, 58-82.

228 As mentioned by Weaver (*Familia,* 213), *agnomina* (second names) in *-ianus* are commonly found from the second century B.C.E. onwards among senatorial families in cases of adoption, when the *nomen* of the adoptive father was taken but that of the real father retained, with the suffix *-ianus* added as a second *cognomen* (or *agnomen*). On his adoption by C. Iulius Caesar, for example, the young C. Octavius became C. Iulius Caesar Octavianus. This nomenclature expresses the transference of *patria potestas* by adoption.

229 Examples include Iulia, Claudia or Octavia. If there were two daughters, they could be distinguished by the designation *maior* (elder) or *minor* (younger). If there were more, they were often differentiated by a numerical name such as Claudia Tertia or Claudia Quinta. See Pomeroy, *Goddesses*, 165 and (for a more extensive treatment), I. Kajarito, "Women's *Praenomina* Reconsidered", *Arctos* n.s. 7 (1972), 13-30.

230 On the powerful role paid by noble families in Republican Rome, see discussions in Syme, *Revolution* and Judge, *Social Pattern,* Ch. 3. On genealogy and family propaganda, see T. P. Wiseman, "Legendary Genealogies in Late Republican Rome", *Greece and Rome* 21 (1974), 153 -164.

231 Other families mentioned by Syme include the *Tarquinii, Sulpicii, Manlii, Servilii, Pulchri, Nerones, Sempronii, Livii, Claudii Marcelli, Marcii, Junii, Domitii, Caecilii Metelli, Claudii, Pompeii.*

Metelli. The intense rivalry of families is illustrated in the pretentious and self-aggrandizing monumental architecture, in which groups sought to out-do each other in novelty of design and expense. [232] When a line was threatened with extinction, continuity was ensured by adoption or alliance. [233] House-building was, therefore, not merely a personal or family matter, but rather an essential element of the political life of Republican Rome. In this sense, Augustus's heir-seeking was a typical and traditional Roman activity.

On the other hand, the situation of the *princeps* was unique. His unprecedented constitutional position meant that what he sought to bequeath was both greater than and different from what he had inherited. [234] His bequest was not the heritage of the Julians, the house into which he had been adopted and whose history he revised. It was, rather, the seeds of an imperial dynasty. As already described, the search for a son and heir was a more complicated task than the eventual result appeared. His Claudian stepson and son-in-law was accepted as heir only after the deaths of several previously groomed candidates. [235]

Augustus did not carry out his dynasty building unaided. His daughter Julia played an important role in Augustan house-building. While she herself could not succeed him, the six possible succession candidates were intimately connected to her. She was married to three of them and the mother of the other three. Thus while family names and political office passed vertically through the male line, this could only happen if women moved horizontally in marriage, from family to family, as heirs and alliance providers.

Augustan house-building, in typical Roman tradition, was a calculated process. It combined primogeniture, adoption, patronage and merit. It involved marriages and political office. The point was not simply to find a capable successor but rather to present that candidate as natural son and heir. Augustus followed Roman traditional aristocratic

---

232 See Zanker (*Images,* 11-18) for details.

233 Syme (*Revolution*, 8) mentions that the *Fabii* and *Cornelii Scipiones* were saved from extinction by adopting some of the *Aemilii*. Other survival strategies included seeking alliances with plebeian families or the help of *novi homines*, orators and soldiers, in gaining the consulate. As Syme notes, the *Claudii* were great exponents of this policy.

234 For a brief treatment of the constitutional position of Augustus, see Brunt and Moore, *Res Gestae*, 8-16.

235 If one includes Agrippa *Postumus*, it is five.

practice in that in the absence of a biological son, he adopted one thereby keeping power and possessions in-house. The difference between Augustus and other fathers was that he had more power than any to bequeath and more difficulty than many in finding an heir.

House-building monuments

Further evidence of the house-building of Augustus is the number of monuments (re)built and (re)named after members of his family. [236] As Suetonius explains, "[s]ome buildings he put up in the name of others, for example his grand-children, his wife, or his sister, such as the *Porticus Gaii et Luci Caesaris* (in the Forum), the *Porticus* of Livia and that of Octavia, and the Theatre of Marcellus." [237] Nowhere is this tendency more evident than in the *forum* of Augustus, transformed from the *Forum Romanum* into the "showpiece of the *gens Iulia*" (fig. 3.50). [238] This *forum,* filled with buildings named after Julians, became simultaneously the geographical core of city and empire and a space celebrating Augustus and his family.

The house-building was as much a construction as a (re-)naming programme. Augustus completed some of Julius Caesar's major plans, the *Basilica Iulia* [239] and *Forum*

---

236 According to Suetonius (*Aug.* 28), "Augustus beautified the city, whose appearance had in no way reflected its greatness and glory and was besides constantly plagued by floods and fires, and so utterly remade it, that he could justly boast that he found Rome a city of brick and left it a city of marble." A major contribution to the programme of *publica magnificentia* was made by Agrippa (Sen. *Ben.* 3.32.4). For details of the building plans of Augustus and Agrippa, see Zanker, *Images*, 135-145.

237 Suet. *Aug.* 29. Reference has already been made to the naming of structures after the deceased Gaius and Lucius Caesar.

238 See fig. 3.50 (Zanker, *Images,* fig. 61). Zanker, 79-82, charts the transformation of the *Forum Romanum* by Octavian after Actium (31 B.C.E.) as an example of how he took possession of the city.

239 Augustus enlarged the *Basilica Iulia*, erected an ornate portico before the *Basilica Aemilia* and named these after his deceased grandsons.

Iulium. [240] He dedicated the Temple of *Divus Iulius* in the Forum,[241] as well as the new Curia (fig. 3.51),[242] which was to bear the name *Iulia*. Among the impressive buildings bearing the name of Augustus, the greatest was a mausoleum built to serve as a family tomb (figs. 3.52-53). [243] Of this *tumulus Iuliorum* Strabo wrote: [244]

> "Most worthy seeing is the so-called *Mausoleion*, a large mound set upon a tall socle by the river. It is planted with evergreen trees up to the top. Above stands the bronze statue of the Emperor Augustus. Within the mound are the graves intended for him, his relatives and friends. Behind there is a large grove with splendid walks, in the midst of which is an elevated place where Augustus's corpse was burnt."

Other public buildings were simply renamed. Temples and porticoes built by triumphant leaders of the second century B.C.E. were restored as monuments to the imperial house. The *Porticus Metelli*, built in 147 B.C.E. by Q. Caecilius Metellus, for example. became the *Porticus Octaviae*. [245]

Through their association with public buildings, therefore, the *Iulii* had a ubiquitous presence in Rome. It was as if the whole city, the centre of the empire, was the personal domain of the *gens* of Augustus and everything within centred on them. As on the (aforementioned) *Ara Pacis,* the centre-stage position of Augustus and his family is carefully constructed. As expressed by Ovid, the wish generated was "that the house which

---

240 He inherited from Julius Caesar a range of building projects, either incomplete or not even begun.

241 This was done as part of the triple triumph (Illyrium, Egypt and the Battle of Actium) celebrated by Augustus in 29 B.C.E.

242 See fig. 3.51 (Zanker, *Images*, fig. 62a) for *denarii* portraying the façade of the Curia.

243 The original construction was eighty-seven metres wide and nearly forty metres high. It consisted of two concentric cylinders, each sheathed in marble or travertine between which trees were planted on the sloping terrain. For details, see Zanker (*Images*, 72-77) and see also figs 3.52 and 3.53 (Zanker, *op. cit.*, figs 57 and 59). Zanker suggests that the structure also served as a huge base for a statue of Augustus. He notes that Augustus's plan to be buried in Rome was a reputation-enhancing exercise. This is in contrast to Marc-Antony, who wished to be buried beside Cleopatra in Alexandria, a fact which was fatal to his reputation in the capital.

244 Strab. 5.3.9.

245 He built it after his naval victory over the Macedonian king Perseus.

ensures peace may last forever". [246]

As reference to the Maison Carrée in Nîmes indicated, this house-building was not confined to Rome but occurred throughout the empire. In Eresos, on Lesbos, for example, a wealthy citizen erected not only a Temple of Augustus at the harbour, but also a sacred precinct for Caius and Lucius Caesar in the Agora and a sanctuary for Livia. [247] The fact that cult places were associated with members of the emperor's family perpetuates the house-based ideology of the imperial system.

Not only had Augustus built a house, he had inspired or compelled others to hope for its well-being and work for its survival. He left massive, enduring reminders in stone of himself as both *princeps* and *pater* of a family which was (according to Augustan revisionism) the greatest in Roman history.

THE HOUSE-BUILDING OF AUGUSTUS... IN SUM ....

This second section of the chapter examined the house-building activities of Augustus as a contributory element of the construct as empire as household-writ-large. The first aspect was the house-building backwards, the creation of a pedigree to legitimate his powerful and unprecedented position. This he did by claiming divine ancestry and re-writing (or distorting) history to present the *gens Iulia* as the most illustrious family in Rome. The second aspect was the house-building forwards, the attempt to find a worthy son and heir on whom he could bequeath all he had, thus keeping power and possessions in-house. The third aspect examined the dynasty building of Augustus against the background of traditional Roman family and dynastic politics, seeing it as both following a precedent and representing a new departure. The fourth and final aspect viewed a number of monuments, reminders in stone of the greatness of the newly created dynasty.

---

246 Ov. *Fast.* 1.719: .. *utque domus, quae prestat eam, cum pace perennet*..

247 Zanker, *Images*, 298.

CHAPTER CONCLUSION

From the review of scholarship, the household was seen as the central and basic social institution in the ancient world. Building on that evidence, this chapter has presented the macro-text of the early empire, or more specifically the Augustan period, as a household-writ-large. Judge had already pointed out that the Caesarian system was not the result of "sinister dynasticism" but was rather "the product of the characteristic Roman sentiments of the family's obligation to its own tradition, and the loyalty of dependents to the patronal household".[248] This chapter represents both an unpacking and a development of his insight. The first part focused on four general aspects, flowing from *patria potestas*, which contributed to the notion of empire as household. These were first, the development from *pater familias* to *pater patriae*, secondly, the parallels between domestic and state religion, thirdly, the promotion of family values through cults, legislation and personal example and fourthly, the move from *familia* to *familia Caesaris*. The second section focused on the house-building activities of Augustus, namely his efforts to establish a pedigree, find an heir and erect monuments in honour of the new dynasty. All these aspects contribute to a plausible reading of the Roman system as a household-writ-large.

To write of a household-writ-large is to deal with a construct and the essence of every construct is that it is built. As seen above, Augustus laid the foundations of the imperial system by constructing a house that was more powerful than that of his contemporaries. The imperial system was merely a magnification of the traditional Roman system of house-building around a powerful *pater familias*. Name and line (and with it power and possessions), however, were preserved only with the help of women as marriage partners and child-bearers and of men of other names being adopted. Such family building was a conscious and calculated process.

In this chapter, the household served as a tool to understand the imperial system. In the next two chapters, it is through the lens of physical houses that insight into the imperial world is gained.

---

248 Judge, *Social Pattern,* 33.

CHAPTER 4

TYPICAL *DOMUS* and OTHER *DOMUS*

The house(hold) provided the perfect model for empire precisely because it was the building block of society. The nature of the οἶκος as building block and key to society was highlighted in the review but this chapter offers a fresh perspective on the topic. This it does by working with "house" in the sense of "dwelling" and by drawing on the theoretical insights outlined in Chapter 1 regarding the relationship between dwellings and users. [249] More specifically, what is of relevance from that discussion is an understanding of (i) the inseparability of social / spatial relations [250] (ii) the dynamic two-way relationship between dwelling and household [251] (iii) the necessity to articulate (rather than simply assume) the precise nature of the relationship [252] (iv) the role of political power in determining what social / spatial configurations are given weight in a society. [253]

The chapter deals with what dwelling / user relationships reveal about the Roman imperial world. The initial and major focus is on the typical *domus,* that is, the dwelling most commonly associated with the Roman world. This atrium(-peristyle) house is first

---

249 See the discussion in Ch. 1 (pages 75-81).

250 As noted in Ch.1 (pages 78-79 and notes) social / spatial relationships are explored in different ways in different disciplines. Works discussed included Kent (ed.), *Domestic Architecture,* Moore, *Space, Text and Gender* and Massey, *Space, Place and Gender.* Particular reference was made to Massey's articulation of the inseparability of social and spatial relations.

251 On the built environment / user relationship, see Ch. 1 (pages 75-76 and notes). On the controlling influence of buildings, see "A structuring structure: the Swahili house" by Donley-Reid in Kent (ed.), *Domestic Architecture,* 114-126. On the built environment as suggestive (rather than controlling) see Kent (*Domestic Architecture*, 2). Regarding the influence of users on buildings, see Moore (*Space, Text and Gender,* Ch. 5).

252 See Ch. 1 (page 79).

253 See Ch. 1 (page 79) for reference to Moore, *Space, Text and Gender*, Ch. 5. As noted there, Moore is interested in how spatial order comes to have meaning, why alternative meanings exist, how it is that some interpretations may be thought more appropriate than others. The ability to define an interpretation as appropriate (or not), she argues, is both a function and a dimension of political power.

presented in physical terms as an architectural type. The study proceeds to explore the two-way relationship between this dwelling and four types of users, namely (i) the elite household or family (ii) the male householder / patron / public figure (iii) the Roman matron / upper-class woman and (iv) slaves. As will be demonstrated, each of these spatial / social configurations is important in its own right and illustrates an important facet of society. Taken together, however, all four configurations reflect and reinforce the "right" roles required of household members and visitors. They thereby contribute to the construction and maintenance of the house(hold) or *domus* ideology so vital to the Roman system. At one and the same time, however, a serious threat to the system -and a "justification" for its strengthening - is shown to operate in the town-house as independent, powerful women live out roles considered "untraditional".

Moving from the typical *domus* to a broader canvas, the latter part of the chapter focuses on the nature and significance of other dwelling / user configurations in the Roman world. Issues are explored under four headings, namely (i) dwelling size : social status (ii) housing as influence on identity, life-style and relationships (iii) users' influence on dwellings and (iv) housing and households (housefuls). While typical *domus* / user relationships show the power of, and threat to, house(hold) ideology in the Roman world, configurations involving other dwellings open other doors onto that same world: revealing it as a place of social diversity and flux, one in which a plurality of identities and relationships are under construction.

Typical *domus :* physical construct and architectural type

As noted above, the initial and major focus of this chapter is on dwelling / user relationships in the so-called typical *domus* and on what such relationships reveal about the Roman imperial world. Before turning to a reading of these spatial / social configurations, a focus on the premises in question is in order. Drawing on sources both primary and secondary, literary and archaeological, this preliminary section consists of a description of the "typical *domus*" as physical construct or architectural type. As will be seen, it is a type comprising a number of architecturally recognizable features but one broad enough to embrace many dwellings built over several centuries in many locations across the Roman world.

Presenting the typical [Roman atrium(-peristyle) town] house [254]

While *domus* is a generic term for a wide variety of dwellings,[255] exploration of sources reveals the term to be virtually synonymous with one particular form of upper-class housing in Republican and Imperial times. This is the dwelling known as the Roman town house, the atrium or atrium-peristyle house, the traditional house or simply the Roman house. [256] It is a structure architecturally distinguishable from, say, the maritime or

---

254 Works consulted on the Roman house include: Boëthius and Ward-Perkins, *Etruscan and Roman Architecture,* G. Hermansen, "*Domus* and *Insula* in the City of Rome", *Classica et Mediaevalia: Dissertationes* (1973): 333-341, McKay, *Houses, Villas and Palaces,* L. Jr Richardson, *Pompeii: An Architectural History* (Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 1988), E. K. Gazda (ed.), *Roman Art in the Private Sphere: New Perspectives on the Architecture and Decor of the Domus, the Villa and Insula* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1991), W. F. Jashemski, *The Gardens of Pompeii,* 2 vols (New Rochelle, N.Y.: Aristide D. Caratzas, 1979 and 1993), J. Clarke, *The Houses of Roman Italy* 100 B.C.-A.D.250 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993), A. Wallace-Hadrill, "The Social Structure of the Roman House", *Papers of the British School at Rome* 56 (1988): 43-97 and *Houses and Society*, R. Laurence, *Roman Pompeii: Space and Society* (London and New York: Routledge, 1994), R. Laurence and A. Wallace-Hadrill (eds), *Domestic Space in the Roman World: Pompeii and Beyond,* JRASS 22 (1977), Foss, "Kitchens and Dining Rooms".

255 For the definition of "*domus*", see Ch. 2 (pages 99-102).

256 Modern authors assume the existence of this typical Roman house. Boëthius and Ward-Perkins (*Etruscan and Roman Architecture)* refer to the "town house or *domus*" (in contrast to the *villa*) and note that "[a]s late as the first century B.C., the atrium-house with or without a peristyle

urban *villa* or the apartment-filled *insula.*

the typical ground plan [257]

Scholars have re-constructed ground plans of the typical *domus* using two sources in particular, namely the writings of (the Roman architect) Vitruvius [258] and the archaeological evidence from Pompeii and Herculaneum. Examples include Clarke's "Patrician *domus* of the third century B.C." (fig.4.1a) [259] and Dwyer's "ideal Pompeian house" (fig. 4.1b), [260] the *"Domus Italica"* in McKay [261] (fig. 4.2) and the Roman peristyle house (fig. 4.3) illustrated in Osiek and Balch. [262] On such plans, the areas of the house are clearly labelled and accompanying descriptions explain these labels: thus, for example, it is explained that from the front door, one entered the *fauces* (main entrance corridor). Rooms to the right and left of this corridor were accessible from elsewhere: those accessed from the street were generally self-contained units like *tabernae* or shops while those entered from inside the house formed an integral part of the building. The *fauces* led to the atrium (central room or hall) with its *impluvium* (pool) into which water fell

---

garden was the standard residence of the well-to-do Roman, whether in Rome or in Campania", (312). McKay (*Houses, Villas and Palaces)* distinguishes (in separate chapters) "Italian town houses...", "Italian Villas..." and "Italian Multiple Dwellings". Clarke (*The Houses of Roman Italy)* uses the classification of the "patrician domus" (p. 2), the "Hellenized domus-with-peristyle" (p. 12) and defines *domus* (in his Glossary, p. 374) as "the traditional atrium house, especially of the Republican period" (in contrast to the *villa* or *insula*). Gazda (*Roman Art in the Private Sphere*, 7) mentions "... one of these two main types of well-to-do private residences in Roman Italy - atrium town house, or *domus*" and the title of E. Dwyer's essay in the same collection (on pages 25-48) is "The Pompeian Atrium House in Theory and in Practice".

257 While some dwellings had upper storeys, ground plans only are considered here.

258 Vitruvius deals with town houses in Ch. 6 of his *De Architectura.*

259 Fig. 4.1a (Clarke, *The Houses of Roman Italy*, fig. 1 [After Brown, *Roman Architecture*, fig. 6]).

260 The same plan from Brown is labelled by Dwyer as the "idea Pompeian house". Fig. 4.1b (Dwyer, "The Pompeian Atrium House", fig. 1-1 [Brown, *Roman Architecture,* fig. 6]).

261 Fig. 4.2 (McKay, *House, Villas and Palaces*, fig. 6, *Domus Italica* [(Luckenback). L. Crema, fig. 95, Fototeca Unione]).

262 Fig. 4.3 (Osiek and Balch, *Families*, fig. 3 : a typical *domus* [Drawing by D. Wells]).

through the *compluvium* (opening in the roof). A number of *cubicula* (small rooms) were located off the atrium but the main space was occupied by the *tablinum*, usually flanked by *alae* (wings). In the more traditional Italic house, there was simply a *hortus* (garden) at the rear of the house. From the Hellenistic period, this area to the back was the location of the peristyle or colonnaded garden area, off which were located the *triclinium* (dining-room), and possibly other rooms such as *oeci*, *pinacothecae* (picture galleries) and *exedrae*. The typical ground plan was axial and symmetrical. From the entrance, one had a vista through the house: through *fauces*, atrium and *tablinum* to the garden or peristyle beyond. This important view through the house was achieved through geometric axiality or optical illusion.

actual ground plans

Turning from typical to actual ground plans, evidence from Pompeii and Herculaneum reveals both the ideal type and the huge diversity within it. On the one hand, there is strong evidence of a house type. In several hundred structures, the essential elements of *fauces,* atrium, *tablinum, cubicula, hortus* and / or peristyle garden, arranged on an axial line, are identifiable. [263] Pompeian examples of the type-with-*hortus* include the so-called house of the Surgeon (VI.1.10) (fig. 4.4) [264] and that of Marcus Lucretius (IX.3.5) (fig. 4.5). [265] Atrium-peristyle houses include the houses of the Faun (VI.12. 2) (fig. 4.6), [266] the Silver Wedding (V.2) (fig. 4.7), [267] the Vettii [268] (figs. 4.8-9), the

---

263 Dwyer, "The Pompeian Atrium House", 26.

264 Fig. 4.4 (McKay, *Houses, Villas and Palaces*, fig.11 [Mau-Kelsey, fig. 127]).

265 Fig. 4.5 (Dwyer, "The Pompeian Atrium House", fig. 1-6 [K. Nelson after E. Falkener, *The Museum of Classical Antiquities*, 2nd edn (London, 1860)]).

266 Fig. 4.6 (Dwyer, "The Pompeian Atrium House", fig. 1-4 [K. Nelson after *Real Museo Borbonico* vol. 8 (1832), pl. A]).

267 Fig. 4.7(McKay, *Houses, Villas and Palaces*, fig. 9 [Mau-Kelsey, fig. 141]).

268 Fig. 4.8(McKay, *Houses, Villas and Palaces*, fig. 21 [Nash, *Roman Towns*, fig. 43a]. Fig. 4.9: Wallace-Hadrill, *Houses and Society*, fig. 3.4).

Menander (I.10.4) (fig. 4.10) [269] in Pompeii and the "Samnite house" at Herculaneum (V. 1-2) (fig. 4.11). [270]

On the other hand, there is great variety under the umbrella of the type. There are variations of size, shape, design and arrangement of characteristics, examples of which emerge from even the limited range of houses mentioned above. *Domus* vary in size, for example, from the relatively small Samnite house (with an area of approximately 180 sq. m.), to the large house of the Menander (about 1700 sq. m.) to the palatial house of the Faun (some 2865 sq. m.). While the *fauces*-atrium-*tablinum*-peristyle pattern was originally built within a rectangular or squarish building, additions or losses over time could result in a range of designs and shapes, while still conforming to the basic pattern. The house of the Menander, for example, had a large peristyle, five major reception rooms, private baths, an extensive service area with its own atrium and was laid out in an irregular, cross shape. In the case of the house of Marcus Lucretius, [271] re-building resulted in an L-shaped plan and proportions regarded as "un-Vitruvian." [272]

Even houses which appear to conform to the type are not always what they seem. While the house of the Faun is rectangular and conforms closely to Vitruvian specifications, it has two atria and two peristyles. The plan of the Samnite house gives the impression that it is a typical atrium-peristyle structure. While this may have originally been the case, excavations reveal that in its final phase it was reduced in size, its peristyle apparently buried in the adjoining house. [273] Even the house of the Vettii, which appears closest to the typical house, lacks a *tablinum*. In sum, from even a tiny sample of ground plans, it is possible to note both the existence of an architectural type and the variety within it. Further variations emerge from Wallace-Hadrill's study of housing in Pompeii

---

269 Fig. 4.10 (Clarke, *The Houses of Roman Italy*, fig. 6 [Maiuri, *Casa del Menandro*, pl. 1]).

270 Fig. 4.11 (McKay, *Houses, Villas and Palaces*, fig. 16 [V. Catalano, fig. 14]).

271 According to Dwyer ("The Pompeian Atrium House", 36), the house of Marcus Lucretius appears to have been remodelled or even rebuilt following the earthquake of 62 C. E.

272 See discussion in Dwyer , "The Pompeian Atrium House", 37.

273 Wallace-Hadrill, *Houses and Society,* 127, 161, 201, 228 n.35.

and Herculaneum. [274] While the atrium and garden / peristyle plan is common, it is neither universal nor standardized. Some houses have both atrium and peristyle, others have an atrium but no garden or peristyle and yet others have a peristyle garden and no atrium. Gardens are both non-colonnaded and colonnaded and even among the latter, the number of colonnades vary from one to eight. Further diversity results from changing architectural fashions and regional difference, with atria and peristyles apparently more common in Pompeii than in Herculaneum. Indeed there is such diversity (Wallace-Hadrill argues) that it is difficult to draw rigid distinctions between atrium-peristyle houses and non-atrium-peristyle houses. Rather, it is better to speak of a continuum, of variations on a theme. It is however, variation among larger houses only, given that over half the dwellings units in Wallace-Hadrill's representative sample have neither atrium nor peristyle, however broadly defined.

the atrium-peristyle type

In sum, the *domus* was an architectural type broad enough to embrace many dwellings built over several centuries in many locations. Even in Pompeii and Herculaneum, the type was both identifiable and elusive. Unlike a modern architect's plan reproduced *en masse* in housing estates, the *domus*-type was not a single blue-print replicated throughout Roman cities. [275] At a physical level, it consisted of the *fauces*-atrium-*tablinum-hortus* / peristyle pattern, that is, a number of proportionately-related features which were recognizable in a wide variety of houses. The pattern could be maintained, while the size and details of planning were adapted according to individual need, over time, by those with resources to do so. The notion of a type persisted despite the fact that Roman town houses changed over time. [276] Evidence of such change

---

274 See Wallace-Hadrill (*Houses and Society*, 67-82) for details of the sample taken and classification made.

275 There was no blue-print for "*the domus*" despite common assumptions that this is what the work of Vitruvius represents.

276 Exploration of architectural history reveals a complex debate about the development and decline of the atrium house. The focus here is not on the details of that architectural history, but rather on the existence of a type.

is recorded in debates concerning the traditional atrium house, the subsequent development of the peristyle, [277] the decline (or not) of the atrium and *tablinum* complex [278] and its replacement by the colonnaded court. There is, therefore, a wide range of house forms, but rather than being distinct and unrelated, they may be classed as sub-types of one major type, the *domus* or typical Roman town house.

If the dwelling is considered typical, it is not solely on the basis of its survival in the archaeological record. Even more significantly, it is not the housing type occupied by most Romans. [279] Rather it is regarded as typical because it forms part of a powerful spatial /social configuration in which important aspects of Roman social relations are expressed and re-created. It is to an exploration of this configuration that attention now turns.

---

277 On the historical development of the peristyle, see Boëthius and Ward-Perkins, *Etruscan and Roman Architecture*, 155-156 and McKay, *Houses, Villas and Palaces*, 34-35.

278 On the decline of the traditional atrium complex in favour of peristyle and surrounding rooms, see Ward-Perkins (*Etruscan and Roman Architecture*, Ch. 14), Richardson (*Pompeii*, 240-241) and McKay (*Houses, Villas and Palaces*, 41, 46]). See Dwyer ("The Pompeian Atrium House", 39-40 n.1) for a synthesis of debates concerning the decline of the atrium as an architectural feature and the decline (or not) of the atrium house itself. Dwyer himself argues against commonly-held theories of decline.

279 On the small percentage of people living in a *domus*, see R. MacMullen, *Roman Social Relations: 50 B.C-A.D. 284* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1974), 62f.

Dwelling / user relationships in the typical *domus*

Attention turns from a focus on the physical *domus* to an exploration of how such a premises functions within a number of spatial / social configurations which highlight important aspects of Roman social relations. Four such configurations are considered, namely those between town-house and (i) elite household or family (ii) male householder / patron / public figure (iii) Roman matron / upper-class woman and (iv) slaves. While each of these relationship is important in its own right, all four relationships together reflect and reinforce the "right" roles required of household members and visitors. They thereby contribute to the construction and maintenance of the house(hold) or *domus* ideology so vital to the Roman system. At one and the same time, however, a serious threat to the system is shown to operate in the town-house as independent, powerful women live out roles considered "untraditional". This challenge of women serves to expose the *domus* ideology for what it is: namely, a mechanism of social control and a function of political power.

typical town house and typical household

Attention turns first to the relationship between the typical town house and what is considered the typical household or sociological *domus*. This is the unit consisting of a married couple, their children, slaves / servants and dependents. [280] Evidence from domestic religion [281] (already discussed in Chapter 3) is used here to demonstrate a strong two-way relationship between dwelling and household, a relationship solidified by its association with the notion of home. Furthermore, the study reveals how this dwelling / user relationship contributes to the construction of a household's identity in a given place and more generally, to the strengthening of traditional family and ancestral values. The spatial / social configuration, therefore, contributes to social stability and reinforces the

---

280 This is the image common in legal sources. For Ulpian's strictly legal definition of a *familia*, see *Dig.* 50.16.195, discussed in Ch. 2 (pages 102-103).

281 For a discussion of household religion, see Ch. 3 (pages 135-141).

basic building block of society, a block from which the household-writ-large is constructed. It thereby serves the wider "house-building" agenda of empire seen in the last chapter.

the evidence from religion

It is above all from sources on domestic religion that the two-way relationship between atrium house (or more specifically, the atrium itself) and the elite, patriarchal household is seen. The atrium was the physical centre and characteristic feature of the traditional Roman house. It was also the place most associated with domestic religion. It was here that rituals marking family milestones were celebrated; it was here, for example, that a bride was received into the family of her husband and his ancestors; here that a baby was welcomed at initiation ceremonies. [282]

The atrium was commonly a site for the *lararium* (or household shrine). It was in the *lararium* that the household gods were represented and here that the family gathered to worship them. Chief among these household gods were the *Lares* (*domestici* or *familiae*) [283] who were protective spirits of household members and their posterity. They were closely associated with the *Genius* of the family and of the *pater familias* in particular. Through *Lares* worship at atrium-based activities, therefore, the unity and hierarchical structure of the family unit (under the *potestas* of the *pater familias*) was solidified. Furthermore, the family's life and identity within a particular place was reinforced.

While the family's unity in the present and future was celebrated through *Lares* worship, identity-formation across time was also seen in atrium-based religious activity. According to Polybius and Pliny, [284] the atrium was the traditional display site for *imagines* of (male) ancestors, that is, for the wax-busts worn by family members at the funeral of

---

282 See Ch. 3 for references to such ceremonies. For further treatment, see Dixon, *Roman Mother*, Appendix 1 and *Roman Family*, 101, 215 n.10, Harmon, "The Family Festivals of Rome", 1596-1597 and Eyben, *Sozialgeschichte*, 323-327.

283 The *Lares* dwelt in the house. If one had several dwellings, they were established in the chief residence.

284 Polyb. 6.53 and Pliny, *NH* 35.6-7.

the *pater familias.* [285] In other words, at a time when household stability was threatened by the death of its head, the *imagines* served an important function. It was the function of fostering in *domus* members a sense of belonging to a male-led "dynasty", a dynasty stretching back in history and one capable of moving into the future.

A further feature of the atrium was its traditional association as the place of the hearth. The hearth was a major centre for household cult and was traditionally seen as the immovable place of belonging. Embodied in the flame was Vesta, who ensured the prosperity of the individual *domus* just as she did that of Rome itself. Her constant presence and protection was symbolised in the flame tended by the women of the household on a daily basis - a task which replicated, at micro-level, that of the Virgins who ensured the protection of the state by guarding the fire in the house of Vesta. Vesta was but one of the *Penates* (the guardian sprits of the *penus*) and atrium-based worship of these deities (like that of the *Lares*) was believed to guarantee the family's well-being.

The atrium-based rituals of Roman domestic religion, therefore, rooted the identity of participants in a particular social unit and a physical space. In short, they rooted identity in a *domus*-in-a -*domus*, that is in a *pater familias*-headed family and in an atrium-centred town-house. Identity in a *domus*-in-a -*domus* was strong because this social / spatial entity was "home". As outlined in previous chapters, home is the primary place of belonging and is a concept often rooted in a solid dwelling and an ideal(ized) family. While it generally outlives the dwelling or family where it was formed, a perceived or illusory link with these entities may long persist.[286] Through atrium-based domestic religion, therefore, Romans expressed and reinforced their fundamental sense of belonging, one forged and experienced in the present, but one which stretched back to include the ancestors, forwards to posterity and heaven-wards to the deities.

---

285 See Dwyer, "The Pompeian Atrium House", 41 n.5. Although the right of keeping such ancestral images really belonged to heads of patrician families, it became a custom copied by lesser ranks of society. According to Dwyer (p.26-27), "[u]nder the late Republic and early Empire it was the undisguised ambition of *novi homines*, or men elevated to patrician status, to have such images. In Pompeii, there is no proof that the marble and bronze portraits of distinguished ancestors that were prominently displayed in numerous atriums (fig. 1-2) all belonged to members of the patrician class."

286 See the discussion in Ch. 1 (pages 80-81 and notes). On the idea of "home", see Benjamin (ed.), *Home*. The concept of "home" is also linked to that of identity and place. See Massey (*Space, Place and Gender*) and Keith and Pile (*Place and the Politics of Identity).*

The notion of the typical *domus*-in-a-*domus* (as fostered in domestic religion) functioned as an ideal as much as a reality. It was an ideal which persisted despite the fact that actual households and dwellings changed over time. Physical *domus* were clearly subject to change and decay, though their solidity (many of which are still visible in the archaeological record) gave the impression that they were static and unchanging structures. With regard to households, the much-used Aristotelian definition of married couple, children and slaves masked the diversity and fluctuating nature of actual family units. [287] While a typical family may have had at its core a nuclear unit,[288] the core did not remain constant, given the high incidence of premature death, [289] divorce [290] and remarriage. [291] Households consisted of ever-changing serial nuclear units of remarried husbands and wives with or without children, [292] children natural, adopted or fostered, who were siblings, half-siblings or step-siblings. [293] Even the most typical and stable of nuclear

---

287 The instability of Roman families is highlighted by Bradley in two chapter of his Roman Family, namely "Dislocation in the Roman family" (pages 125-155) and the previously cited "Remarriage and the Structure of the Upper-Class Family at Rome". As Bradley concludes (*Roman Family*, 171-172) : "Because of these factors, the upper-class Roman family certainly has to be regarded as a dynamic entity, but one that in its life course had little regularity of shape. It was, rather, an extremely fluid organism, subject to constant interruption, disruption and reconstitution. It embraced both kin and non kin members within a single household and beyond, and combined elements of nuclearity with more extensive associations of vital importance. Perhaps it is not altogether surprising, therefore, that the most common term of reference used by Romans to designate their families was not an abstract noun but simply, as Cicero so often wrote, the open-ended adjectival form, *mei*."

288 By "nuclear unit" is meant father, mother and (dependent) child(ren).

289 On premature death due to warfare, childbirth and disease, see R. Syme, *The Augustan Aristocracy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986), 15-31.

290 See S. Treggiari, "Divorce Roman Style : How Easy and Frequent Was It?", M. Corbier, "Divorce and Adoption as Roman Familial Strategies (Le Divorce el l'adoption 'en plus') " in Rawson (ed.), *Marriage, Divorce and Children,* 31-46 and 47-78 respectively. .

291 See M. Humbert, *Le remariage à Rome: étude d'histoire juridique et sociale* (Milan: Giuffrè, 1972) and K. R. Bradley, *Roman Family,* 156-176 ("Remarriage and the Structure of the Upper-Class Family at Rome") / "Remarriage and the Structure of the Upper-Class Roman Family" in Rawson (ed.), *Marriage, Divorce and Children,* 79-98.

292 On childless couples and childlessness, see for example, Balsdon, *Roman Women*, 210, Pomeroy, *Goddesses*, 158-159 and on deliberate childlessness, see Dixon, *Roman Family*, 119-123.

293 For treatment of serial nuclear families, see Bradley, *Roman Family*, 129-139, 156-176.

units changed over time, [294] as couples aged and children set up separate homes as either single or married adults [295] or (less commonly) created multi-generational groupings by remaining in the parental dwelling. [296] The picture of family as fostered in domestic religion, therefore, contributed to the construction of an ideal family, ain ideal which co-existed alongside the changing reality of actual families.

The process of identity formation described above in relation to the traditional Roman family may be compared and contrasted with the process operative among contemporaneous Jews. Jewish identity too was forged in the context of domestic religion. In general terms, the requirements of purity and dietary laws expressed and created a sense of identity and separateness. The celebration of festivals (such as Passover) fostered a sense of belonging *both* to one's own individual house(hold) *and* to the house of Israel, an entity with a identity across time and space. As will be discussed in chapter 5, ritual baths (*miqva'ot*) found in the houses of the Jerusalem elite functioned as both instrument and proclamation of Jewish purity and pedigree. [297] For Jews (as for traditional Romans), therefore, a dwelling could function as part of a spatial/ social configuration which contributed to the process of identity formation. The difference, of course, lay in the nature of the identity the configuration sought to reflect and create.

A study of Roman domestic religion, therefore, points to the powerful two-way relationship between atrium house and traditional household, a relationship through which the identity of the traditional family was expressed and re-created. On the one hand, the household influenced or conferred meaning on the atrium by engaging in religious

---

294 See Dixon, *Roman Family*, Ch. 5: "The Family Through the Life Cycle." See also reference in Ch. 2 (page 72 n. 41) to L. K. Berkner, "The Stem Family and the Developmental Cycle of the Peasant Household: an Eighteenth Century Austrian Example."

295 On adult sons having separate residences, see for example Cic. *Cael.* 1-18, Plut. *Vit. Sull.* 1.2, 1.4, *Vit. Cat. Mai.* 1.1, 4.1. For treatment of these cases, see Bradley, *Roman Family*, 163-164.

296 On a case of two married sons eating (and living) with their parents, see Plut. *Vit. Crass.* 1.1: καὶ τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς αὐτοῦ γυναῖκες ἦσαν ἔτι τῶν γονέων ζώντων, καὶ πάντες ἐπὶ τὴν αὐτὴν ἐφοίτων τράπεζαν. For details, see Bradley, *Roman Family*, 163. For evidence of multi-generational households in an earlier period, see Plut. *Vit. Cat. Mai.*, 24, Val Max. 4.4.8, Plut. *Vit. Aem.* 5.6 and 28.9. The multi-generational is usually considered rare in Rome because as it receives little documentation in the sources. See for example, Rawson ,"Roman Family", 14.

297 On the construction of Jewish identity, see the treatment in Ch. 6 (pages 276-281). On ritual baths, see Ch. 5 (pages 240-242).

activities. On the other hand, the atrium (with its *lararium*, hearth, *imagines*..) had power to influence. This it did by acting as a mnemonic, reminding household members of the rituals associated with the space and of the meanings such rituals expressed. [298] Through this two-way relationship between physical and sociological *domus,* the identity of the household in a particular place was proclaimed, strengthened and re-created from generation to generation.

While the *domus*-in-the-*domus* was a traditional or ancient Roman configuration, it was of particular significance in the early imperial period. As seen in the last chapter, Augustus sought to ensure political stability by bolstering the basic unit of society, namely the *pater familias*-headed household. [299] As self-appointed *curator morum*, he was concerned with the *mos maiorum* (ancestral tradition) and sought to promote family values through both moral legislation (*leges Iuliae*) and personal example. The concern with marriage, children, fertility and chastity were also echoed in his other crusade, namely the revival of ancient cults and festivals. Laws and cults together promoted so-called family values and reinforced the traditional role of women in society. The atrium-based religious activities described above served a similar political agenda in that they too promoted the household ideology so central to traditional Roman society and to the Augustan project.

---

298 As explained in Ch. 1, Kent (*Domestic Architecture*, 2), (drawing on the work of Rapoport) notes that architecture can suggest new behaviour as well as being a mnemonic, reminding users of certain forms of behaviour.

299 See the section on "Family Values" on Ch.3 (pages 150-155).

typical town house and male householder / patron / public figure

Attention turns to a second spatial / social configuration operating within the typical town house, namely the relationship between the dwelling and the male, upper-class householder who is also patron and public figure. The initial focus is on the *salutatio,* while the second part deals with other reception activities. As will be seen, a two-way dynamic between premises and users contributes to the establishment and strengthening of the "appropriate" relationships between patron, *clientes* and *amici*. Building on these findings, the third part looks in more general terms at how the premises functions as expression and instrument of the owner's self-image and status. This image-building was a vital necessity for the upper-class male in Roman society, a necessity which the ancients themselves recognized. Together, the three parts yield insight into some of the threads from which the Roman social system was woven.

salutatio [300]

The *salutatio* illustrates how space and social actors interacted in the on-going imaging and construction of patron / client relationships. On the one hand, users of the town house conferred meaning on the premises by their activities and relationships. On the other, these activities and relationships were powerfully shaped by the space itself, or more specifically, by the typical *fauces*-atrium-*tablinum* structure of the town house.

With regard to the social actors, clients, patron (and some of his slaves) participated in the *salutatio*. By their actions, they conferred meaning on the house, according it the nature of an office or quasi-public space. Every morning, clients both rich and poor arrived at their patron's house to present their respects or requests. If they came in large numbers, [301] clients had to wait or queue until it was possible to gain access

---

300 On the *salutatio*, see Saller, *Patronage,* 61-62, 128-129. For ancient evidence, see Sen. *Brev. Vitae* 14.3f., Juv. 3.124-125, Columella, *Rust.* 1. praef. 9, Mart. 2.18; 3.36; 3.38... and *CIL* VI 21975).

301 On the numbers involved, see the reference to Seneca's retirement from political life, when he drove from his house the visiting crowds or "*coetus salutantium*" (Tac. *Ann.* 14.56).

to the patron who conducted his business in the *tablinum*.

Through the daily *salutatio*, the relationship between patron and client was demonstrated and reinforced. It was a relationship involving a single socially superior patron and his many socially inferior clients. In the *salutatio*, the essentially "double" nature of this relationship was captured. On the one hand, it was a relationship of mutual loyalty and inter-dependence. It benefited both parties in that patron received support, while the client got various types of *beneficia.* [302] On the other hand, it was a relationship which reinforced social hierarchies and inequalities. For clients, the *salutatio* was often a difficult and humiliating experience, [303] one which reinforced their sense of social inferiority.

The activity of social actors was but one side of the story. The other was the role of the house itself - or more specifically, the *fauces*-atrium-*tablinum* axis - which played a key role in the *salutatio.* As already mentioned, the typical Roman town house was built in such a way that it was possible (through geometric axiality or optical illusion) to have a direct line of vision from the front door through *fauces*, atrium, *tablinum* (to garden or peristyle, if present). It was this characteristic axiality which shaped activities and relationships in the *salutatio.*

First of all, the patron's socially superior position as in relation to that of his clients was expressed and reinforced by his physical location in the *tablinum.* The fact that the *tablinum* was built a few inches higher than the other rooms meant that the patron was literally on display, as if on stage. [304] It was here that he held court and was clearly seen

---

302 According to Martial (3.7 and 8.42), attending *salutationes* was a way for municipals moving to Rome to earn their subsistence. In his day, the going rate for attendance was 100 *quadrantes.* For the *beneficium* of housing, see *Dig.* 9.3.5.1.

303 See Martial 10.70, 74 and 82 on the life of a *cliens* as difficult and tiring. Referring to provincials seeking office in Rome, Plutarch (*Mor.* 814D) writes of "οἱ πολλοὶ γηράσκουσι πρὸς ἀλλοτρίαις θύραις, τὰ οἴκοι προσλιπόντες" [those who grow old haunting the doors of others' houses, while leaving their own affairs uncared for] and this may refer to *salutationes* Seneca (14.3) writes that senators seeking magistracies have to endure *mille indignitates,* which may be a reference to the humiliations of attending *salutationes.* There is also evidence (Mart. *Ep.* 4.68; Hdn. 2.6.7) of clients being paid to suffer abuse as entertainment at patrons' dinners. Aristocrats as well as lower-class *clientes* paid their respects. Martial (12.26; 10.10), for example, writes of a senator going out in the early morning and "treading innumerable thresholds" in pursuit of a consulship. Both he and Juvenal complain of the unfair competition created by senators for non-elite clients.

304 Dwyer, "The Pompeian Atrium House", 27-28.

to do so. At the raised centre of the house, [305] he was visible to clients at the entrance, in the *fauces* and the atrium. The central position and elevated nature of the *tablinum*, therefore, put the spotlight on the patron. This served as image and reminder of the patron's position as the socially superior one into whose presence subordinate clients were directed.

The socially inferior position of clients in relation to their patron was further highlighted by their "journey" along the axial line of the house. For the clients, the entrance, *fauces* and atrium served as waiting or queueing areas. The waiting function of these areas was further highlighted by the provision of "halting" posts in the form of benches, situated outside the door, [306] in the *vestibulum, fauces*, *alae* and *atrium.* [307] The view through the house meant that clients moving through the premises were ever in sight of their goal, namely an encounter with the patron. The actual experience of moving through *fauces* and atrium, however, was that of being slowly funnelled or filtered towards the patron. The *fauces*-atrium-*tablinum* axis, therefore, served as a mnemonic for clients, reminding them of their role *qua* clients. The often time-consuming process of making one's way though a "policed" and crowded house while ever in sight of the patron was surely an experience which reinforced in clients a sense of being the lesser partner in the relationship.

In the *salutatio*, therefore, both the spatial layout of the town house and the social actors contributed to the expression and consolidation of patron-client relationships. In the *tablinum* / patron configuration was captured the reality of the upper-class male, "enthroned" at the heart of his house, in the act of receiving his numerous clients. By contrast, the link between *fauces*-atrium and clients highlighted their dependence and inferiority. Furthermore, it expressed in a very literal way, the fact of their being accorded

---

305 McKay, *Houses* (*Villas and Palaces*, 34) notes that "Patroni's argument, steadfastly supported by Pierre Grimal that the real nucleus of the Italic house lay not in the atrium but in the *tablinum*., has great merit and is probably correct." See also *op. cit.*, 241n.40.

306 Archaeologists have speculated that benches outside the doors of houses were for waiting *clientes.* See, for example, A. Mau, *Pompeii. Its Life and Art,* trans. F. W. Kelsey (London; Macmillan, 1902,) 248-258.

307 For reference to clients waiting in the atrium, see Hor. *Epist.* 1.5.31: *...atria servantem postico falle clientem.*

little space in the system. In sum, the two way dynamic between town house and users as seen in the *salutatio* both reflects and creates important aspects of patron / client relationships. As seen in the last chapter, it was of such relationships that the Roman (social, economic, political) system was constructed, a system which had as supreme patron, the emperor himself. [308]

other reception activities

A focus on other reception functions also illustrates how the relationship between town house and users contributes to the construction and maintenance of Roman social relations. As will be seen, there was a strict correspondence between the part of the house where visitors were received and the status and / or number of the people involved. In this correspondence were reflected and reinforced the relationships between householder, his *clientes* and *amici*.

As discussed above, large numbers of lesser *clientes* could enter the house uninvited. These were received by the patron, but confined to the *fauces*-atrium-*tablinum* axis or "common" rooms (as Vitruvius calls them). By contrast, invited guests were entertained in *triclinia, oeci* and other "private" rooms off the peristyle. [309] The guests in question were the householder's social equals or superiors. As would be expected, the areas where they were received were the best furnished and most beautifully decorated in the house. They were also those furthest inside the premises, those reached by passing through corridors and areas guarded by slaves.

There was, therefore, a clear correlation between the space used and the guests received. In essence, the most important guests were entertained in the best rooms. On the one hand, the householder and guests conferred meaning on the spaces in question. Indeed their activities so dominated the space that the areas in and around the peristyle became largely or primarily associated with reception functions and with the social relationships they expressed. On the other hand, these areas themselves acted as mnemonics. When present in such fine spaces, visitors were reminded of the social position

---

308 See Ch. 3 (pages 159-160).

309 On the distinction between common and private rooms, see Vitruvius, *De Arch.* 6.5.1.

of the host who could provide such a premises. Furthermore, they were made aware of their own elevated status and their place as important guests.

Within the peristyle area itself, yet further dimensions of the link between social and spatial relations were in evidence. Selected large groups were entertained by the host in big reception rooms, smaller numbers dined in *triclinia* and meetings of ones and twos occurred in *cubicula*. In some houses, this phenomenon of graded intimacy was seen in the presence of entertainment suites, in which a large reception room was linked to one or more small, more private *cubicula*. In some instances, therefore, there was a direct correlation between the level of intimacy one had achieved with one's host and the size of the room in which one was received.

In sum, it is clear how both atrium-peristyle dwelling and its user(s) contributed to the creation and on-going re-creation of aspects of Roman social relations. On the one hand, the activities of patron / client, patron / *amici* conferred meaning on domestic spaces. By the actions of human users, sections of the *domus* were transformed into a spatial map of the relations between patron and client, patron and *amici*. On the other hand, the building was no mere passive recipient of human action but rather a powerful influence on it. Day after day, it controlled human behaviour and movement (as much as any slaves on duty). By reminding householder / patron, *clientes* and *amici* of their rightful roles and relationships, it functioned as an instrument in the construction and reinforcement of the social system.

typical town house / typical householder... in general ..

As already seen, the social / spatial dynamic operative in the *salutatio* and in reception activities both reflects and reinforces the relationships between upper class owner, his *clientes* and *amici*. Furthermore (it was argued), it was these very relationships which constituted the threads from which the fabric of Roman society was woven. Moving from *salutatio* and reception activity, this section explores in more general terms how the town-house functioned as expression and instrument of the owner's self image and status. [310]

---

[310] On the link between the quality and decoration of a Roman's house and the social standing of the owner, see T. P. Wiseman, "*Conspicui postes tectaque digna deo*: the public image of

The Romans themselves understood there to be a direct and appropriate correlation between the town house and its upper-class male owner. Seen in purely practical terms, upper class Romans who were office-holders and patrons were considered to need large domestic premises because they conducted much of their business at home. [311] This marks a difference from the practice operative in the Greek world. In Classical Athens, for example, it was in the buildings and open-air spaces of the *polis* that the elite, male citizens carried out most of their public affairs and duties. In that society, the dwelling house was much more of a private space, a space (as will be discussed in the next section) primarily associated with upper class women. In the Roman world, by contrast, elite dwellings functioned - along with monumental buildings and public urban spaces - as significant *loci* of *negotium*.

At one level, the town-house was conferred with the nature of a quasi-public space because of the activities carried out there. At another, this nature was built into the very structure of the premises itself. The allusion to public buildings was achieved primarily through the use of architectural forms associated with Greek monumental buildings. The column was the most obvious and most characteristic of these public forms. [312] Others included the *fastigium* (triangular pediment) [313] and the basilica-like

---

aristocratic and imperial houses in the late Republic and early Empire" in *L'Urbs. Espace urbain et histoire* (Coll. Ec. Fr. Rome), Vol. 98 (1987), 393-413.

311 See Cicero (*Off.* 1.138-139) for the type of house appropriate for a man of rank.

312 Columns are most commonly found in atria, peristyles and so-called "Corinthian *oeci*." As explained by Wallace-Hadrill (*Houses and Society*, 20-21), the term "peristyle" comes from Greek *public* architecture and "[l]ong rows of columns suggest the public portico, the stoa, and ..... in rectangular form point to the hallmark of a Hellenistic city, the gymnasium." He notes that in some cases the allusion is explicit. Cicero, for example, when decorating his Tuscan villa, wanted ornaments suitable for his "*palaestra* and *gymnasium*" and wanted them to be "γυμνασιώδη" (Cic. *Att.* 1.6). See further documentation in H. Sulze, "*Peristylium*" *PWSupp* 7: 950-971. On Corinthian *oeci*, see Wallace-Hadrill, *Houses and Society*, 22. Examples are found in the Pompeian houses of the Labyrinth and the Silver Wedding (fig. 2.5). The closest parallel to this feature are "the festal tents and ships constructed by Ptolemy II and other Hellenistic kings for public receptions and festivals on a massive scale" and such structures are mentioned in Callixeinos, *Athenaeus* 5.196-209. The columns here "transport.. diners into a world of luxury and monumentality." See also Vitr. *De Arch.* 6.3. 8-10.

313 On "*fastigium*", see *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* 7: 320. For examples, see Wallace-Hadrill *Houses and Society,* figs 2.3 and 2.4.

"Egyptian *oecus*". [314] Through the use of such architectural forms, visible and "loud" links between dwellings and public spaces were suggested and forged. [315] Furthermore, the message conveyed was that the town-house (and by association, its owner and his activity) formed an important and integral part of the *urbs,* which in turn functioned as a building block of empire.

While *we* may miss the significance of the above-mentioned architectural allusions, people in the ancient world did not. The Romans were acutely aware of the relationship between houses with monumental features and their (male) owners who occupied (or aspired to) high-ranking social positions. Vitruvius, for example, spells out this correlation: [316] He writes of high-ranking, office-holding members of society whose houses had "princely vestibules, lofty halls and very spacious peristyles, plantations and broad avenues finished in a majestic manner ... [with] libraries and basilicas..." Clarifying the issue even further, he explains that such houses had the "magnificence of public structures" because in them, official business, reception functions "public deliberations ... private trials and judgments.." were conducted. [317]

Romans were also aware of the connection between a man's house and his reputation. They knew that dwellings did not merely reflect, but also helped to establish the owner's social standing and self-image. As explained by Tacitus, a man's "reputation and following hung on ... wealth, housing and trappings". [318] Cicero too mentions the fact that a man's dignity "may be enhanced by the house he lives in", though (he concedes) it

---

314 This feature is described by Vitruvius (*De Arch*, 6.3.9) as being "*basilicarum ea similitudo.*"

315 Trimalchio uses the language of public buildings to boast about his house, which he transformed from a tiny place into a temple or palace: *aedificavi hanc domum. ut scitis, casula* (or *cusuc.*) *erat; nunc templum est* (Petron. *Sat*. 77.4).

316 Vitr. *De Arch.* 6.5.1-3.

317 Vitr. *De Arch.* 6.5.2. : *..vestibula regalia alta, atria et peristylia amplissima, silvae ambulationesque laxiores ad decorem maietatis perfectae; praeterea bybliothecas, basilicas non dissimili modo quam publicorum operum magnificentia comparatas, quod in domibus eorum saepius et publica consilia et privata iudicia arbitriaque conficiuntur.*

318 Tac. *Ann.* 3.55: *ut quisque opibus, domo, paratu speciosus per nomen et clientelas inlustrior habebatur.*

is "not wholly secured by it." [319] While Cicero expressed the wish that the "the owner should bring honour to his home, not the house to its owner", his statement may be taken as an indication that a two-way "enhancement" process between owner and dwelling was closer to the norm.

Romans themselves were conscious of this enhancement process and upper -class men certainly knew they were on show when conducting business at home. [320] As a result, they wanted to present themselves in the best possible light by having fine dwellings. Many spent vast sums of money on their housing thereby seeking to increase - and not merely reflect - their social status. This display of wealth in domestic premises peaked in the imperial period when there was a noted increase in the number and magnificence of reception rooms. [321] This change was criticized by ancient elite moralists as a vulgar display of wealth and one typical of *nouveaux riches* in particular. For the former, it was interpreted as a symptom of moral decline, an abandonment of civic responsibility and traditional values. [322] While modern criticism has often simply reiterated such views,

---

319 Cic. *Off.* 1.139: *Ornanda enim est dignitas domo, non ex domo tota quaerenda, nec domo dominus, sed domino honestanda est,..*

320 See the exchange (described in Vell. Pat. 2.14.3) between Livius Drusus (*tribunus plebis* in 91 B.C.E.) and his architect. When the latter promised to make the house "completely private and free from being overlooked by anyone", Livius replied, "No, you should apply your skills to arranging my house so that whatever I do should be visible to everybody." The next owner, Cicero (*Dom.* 100), boasted of the visibility of the property: *In conspectu prope totius urbis domus est mea* (My house stands in full view of virtually the whole city).

321 See Wallace-Hadrill (*Houses and Society*, 52-55) for details of rooms. In the case of some dwellings, this accompanied a "decline" in the place of atrium and *tablinum*.

322 The "moral decline explanation" of ancient authors is discussed by Dwyer, "The Pompeian Atrium House", 31-32. From as early as the second century B.C.E., with territorial expansion and Hellenization, there had been criticism of the introduction of things foreign and non-traditional. See, for example, the critique of columns (Pliny, *NH* 36.4-8) and new forms of decoration; see also the criticism of those, like Q. Metellus, who introduced them (Vell. Pat. 1.11.5). Dwyer (*op. cit.*, 43-44) refers to criticisms by Cato, Livy, Sallust, Varro, Pliny, and Cicero, amongst others. Increased luxury was always judged to be destructive of traditional morals and values in family and public life. As explained by Dwyer (*op. cit.*34 ff.), moralizing criticism continued under the empire. Attacks on *liberti* are particularly strong in Juvenal and Petronius and criticism is also exemplified in the satirizing of Trimalchio, the fictional character of Petronius.

[323] the increase in luxurious reception space must also be read as evidence of the struggle for survival and upward mobility in a cut-throat society. In the Roman world, where housing functioned as a vital mode of self-presentation, conspicuous consumption on dwellings was considered a social necessity. It was, however, a so-called necessity which also put huge pressure on those who participated in the struggle. [324]

In sum .....

As well as being the abode of the *pater familias*-headed household, the typical house was intimately associated with the male head of household as patron and public figure. In a "world oiled by patronage", [325] in which an upper-class male's success depended on his "power base" [326] of *amici* and *clientes,* the town house had an important social function. It was a place of work and reception, a place where important social contacts were cultivated. It functioned as both expression and instrument of the elite man's social status and self-image. Furthermore, the Romans themselves were acutely aware that the size, design and decor of an elite man's house were not simply an expression of the owner's self-image and social status but also an instrument in their creation. In other words, they were aware of the dynamic two-way relationship existing between building and user(s), a key relationship in the on-going construction of the social system.

---

323 Dwyer ("The Pompeian Atrium House", 32) discusses how modern criticism has been deeply influenced by the views of ancient critics of the *domus*.

324 See the discussion in Cic. *Leg.* 3.30.

325 Wallace-Hadrill, *Houses and Society*, 59.

326 Wallace-Hadrill, *Houses and Society*, 12.

typical town-house and elite woman

Turning to a third social / spatial configuration operating in the town house, attention centres on the relationship between the premises and the upper class woman. As will be seen, this relationship reveals a complex message about elite women in the Roman world. On the one hand, there is evidence that such women had greater freedom than their counterparts in Classical Greece. On the other, the evidence reveals the attempt to control them by reinforcing house-based, traditional roles. Indeed, it is precisely because their new-found freedom threatened the system of household and state that the attempt to curb them was considered "essential". Further evidence of the double message about women is the fact that while the house was generally associated with the woman, the premises was actually depicted as much - or even more- the place of the upper class male. In the house, as in the household-writ-large of the empire, the *pater* was dominant.

The position of elite women in Roman society has been well documented. [327] In contrast to their sisters in Classical Greece, Roman women were educated and had enormous wealth, power and freedom. They controlled vast fortunes despite the legislation stating that this was impossible. They exercised political power through their men and also functioned as patrons and business women in their own right. [328] They also had freedom of movement outside the home - they could, for example, conduct business, organize gatherings, visit, shop, participate in religious activities and attend festivals. By late Republican / early imperial times, their position was regarded as a threatening, destabilising factor in society, a society built on the patriarchal family. The "solution" was to strengthen the family. In essence, this strengthening involved controlling women through

---

327 See previously cited works by Dixon, Rawson, Pomeroy, Balsdon and Shepard Kraemer.

328 Women acted as patrons but not political office-holders. See references in Osiek and Balch (*Families,* 50-53, 241-242 nn. 9-17, 27-28, 233 n.100). On female heads of household in funerary inscriptions, see D. B. Martin, "The Construction of the Ancient Family: Methodological Considerations", *JRS* 86 (1996), 53 -56 and also 56 n. 58. Some of these independent women were widows, other *univirae* while yet others were wives with an apparently superior position to that of their living husbands. As defined by Pomeroy (*Goddesses*, 161), a *univira* is a "woman who died having known only one husband." According to Martin ("Ancient Family", 55-56), the superior position of a wife is indicated by funerary inscriptions dedicated by women while their husbands were still alive. See also M. B. Flory, 'Where women precede men: factors influencing the order of names in Roman epitaphs', *CJ* 79 (1983), 216-224.

the promotion of traditional wifely and motherly roles.

Exploration of the house / woman relationship reveals evidence of *both* the new-found freedom of elite Roman women *and* the backlash. Turning to the former, insight into the position of upper-class women is captured in the spatial organization of the town-house itself. In short, the absence of a γυναικών (or women's quarters) is a spatial expression of women's freedom (of movement and association) both in the house and beyond. In Greek houses, the separation of the sexes was expressed spatially in the provision of separate quarters for men and women. [329] Women usually inhabited the more remote rooms, that is, those away from the street and from the more public areas of the house. If a house had two floors, the wife and female slaves generally lived upstairs.[330] This segregation of the sexes did not end in Classical times but continued to operate in Greek-dominated areas of the Roman world. Thus for example, Vitruvius mentions that Greek houses in his day (still) had an *andron* (ἀνδρῶν), where men met and dined separately from the women. [331]

By contrast, there was no such spatial segregation in the typical Roman town-house. This absence of women's quarters was a physical expression of the fact that Roman women were not shut away but moved freely within the house. One result of this freedom of movement was women's ability to associate with men. While the hosting of evening dinners was an essential part of an elite man's "job", Roman wives too attended such functions. Furthermore, as is evident from Juvenal, they were sufficiently educated

---

329 On the Greek house in Classical times, see S. Walker, "Women and housing in Classical Greece" in A. Cameron and A. Kuhrt (eds), *Images of Women in Antiquity* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1983), 81-91, M. Jameson, "Domestic space in the Greek city-state" in S. Kent (ed.), *Domestic Architecture and the Use of Space* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 92-113, D. Small, "Initial study of the structure of women's seclusion in the archaeological past" in D. Walde and D. Willows (eds), *The Archaeology of Gender: Proceedings of the 22nd Annual Chacmool Conference*, (Calgary: University of Calgary, 1991), 336-342, L. Nevett, "Gender Relations in the Classical Greek Household: The Archaeological Evidence", *Annual of the British Archaeological School in Athens* 90 (1995), 1-29.

330 Pomeroy, *Goddesses*, 80.

331 Vitruvius, *De Arch* 7.4: In these halls men's banquets are held. For it was not customary for women to join men at dinner. Now these peristyles are called the men's block, for in them men meet without interruption from the women.

to be able to participate in the intellectual life of their male associates. [332] At such gatherings, they were surely capable of making contacts and of exercising the power and influence they were acknowledged to have had over men in the public sphere. Another result of women's freedom within and beyond the house was their ability to use domestic premises as *loci* for the development of their own contacts and interests - ones unconnected with the roles of wife and mother. It was surely in their spacious homes that they held their literary salons,[333] here too that they gathered to explore and express their new religious affiliations such as those to Judaism, Christianity or eastern mystery religions.

While women's freedom was suggested by the absence of a γυναικών, the attempt to control it was seen in another aspect of the elite dwelling / women relationship. In short, it was seen in the ideal of the stay-at-home wife and mother. As well documented, the ideal woman kept house, worked in wool,[334] bore children, loved her husband and was happy to stay at home.[335] In essence, the promotion of such an ideal was an effort to enforce / reinforce traditional roles for women. While the ideal expressed traditionally-held values, its promotion in late Republican and Imperial times served the wider political agenda of ensuring social stability by simultaneously bolstering the patriarchal family and curbing the movement and power of women. The ideal, therefore, had the same function as the (afore-mentioned) Augustan marriage legislation, the "resurrection" of traditional cults and the promotion of domestic religion.[336]

---

332 While satirising women, Juvenal (6.434-456) gives evidence of their presence at dinner parties and of their knowledge of poets and poetry, public speaking , rhetorical devices, the classics and rules of grammar.

333 Pomeroy, *Goddesses*, 174.

334 In epitaphs, women are lauded as workers of wool. See ". *lanifica pia"* (*CIL* 6. 11602) and " *lanam fecit...*" (*CIL* 1. 1007).

335 See *CIL* 6. 11602 :.. *optima et pulcherrima, lanifica pia pudica frugi casta domiseda*, *CIL* 1. 1007: .... *Suom mareitum corde deilexit souo. ...Sermone lepido, tum autem incessu commodo. Domum servavit, lanam fecit*..... On chastity and fidelity, see also *CIL* 6. 34268. On the praise of the stay-at-home wife in epitaphs, see *CIL* 1.1007 ("*Domum servavit*") and *CIL* 6. 11602 ("*domiseda*").

336 Pomeroy (*Goddesses*, 184-185) mentions inscriptions (on coins of imperial women) which promote traditional "womanly" virtues: These include Pietas, indicating their loyalty to the traditional religion; Fides, denoting their faithfulness to one man, continuing after his death. Pudicitia, asserting that their sexual conduct was beyond reproach.

Further reflection on the elite dwelling / woman relationship in the Roman world reveals yet more evidence of the double message about women. On the one hand, the woman was commonly associated with the physical house, understood as private space. Her traditional duties - as wife, *mater familias* and household manager / slave-body supervisor [337] - were all house-based. Furthermore, the fact that she was debarred from political office meant she was excluded from the public, male-dominated sphere. This resulted in her confinement to and association with the "non-public" or private sphere.

On the other hand, elite women were in many ways less associated with the house than were their men-folk. Put another way, the Roman house was more strongly portrayed as the space of the elite male than that of his wife. The town-house was the place where images of *his* ancestors were displayed and the place to which *his* bride had to move. It was the place where *his* clients and *amici* came and it functioned as an expression and instrument of *his* self-presentation and social enhancement.

By contrast, it was through dress, jewellery, vehicles and slaves that an elite woman's wealth and position were advertised. While a fine house was considered a social necessity for an elite man, a woman's status symbols were often criticised (by men!) as mere luxuries. On closer examination, however, the appropriateness of female status symbols is evident. These symbols were movable and so could be taken from place to place, from home to home, from marriage to marriage. This is essential for women who were mobile in a way Roman men were not. It was, after all, the woman who had to move from the house of her father to that of her husband(s). While many elite women owned houses and headed households most lived as daughters and wives in houses that were never really theirs. For these latter women in particular, movable means of status were essential.

Summarising the evidence, the elite town-house / woman relationship reveals the mixed message about elite Roman women. On the one hand, the lack of γυναικών points to their freedom; on the other, the ideal of the stay-at-home wife and mother functions to curb their movement. It was precisely because elite women were perceived as a destabilising force in household and state that a return to traditional roles was promulgated. Furthermore, the fact that the typical house was so strongly linked with the

---

337 See the work of Fortunata, the *domina* in Trimalchio's house (Petron. *Sat.* 37, 67).

elite man highlights the reality that in the Roman private (as well as the public) sphere it was the male (as *pater* and public figure) who was accorded dominance.

typical town house and slaves

Attention turns to a fourth social / spatial relationship, namely that between typical Roman town-house and slaves. While Ch. 3 referred to the importance of slavery in the household-writ-large, [338] this section homes in on the issue at the level of the individual (elite) house.[339] As will be seen, the town house / slave relationship reflects and reinforces the position of slaves as omnipresent, indispensable workers, yet ones whose presence, work and family life is subordinated to that of their free owners.

A first aspect of the town-house / slave relationship concerns the power (or lack of it) to confer meaning on domestic space. In elite dwellings, slaves were numerous and omnipresent, performing many and varied services indispensable for the running of the household. They functioned (for example) as *cubicularii*, *pedisequi*, *ancillae* in the bedrooms of the *dominus* and *domina*; as servers, cooks, tasters, carvers and entertainers in the dining room; they fulfilled the roles of secretaries, clerks and *dispensatores* for the *dominus* and worked as nurses, *paedagogi*, tutors, grammarians and philosophers with children. [340] All these activities, however, were services commanded or desired by slave owner(s). Thus for example, while the *vilica* (chief steward's wife) functioned as housekeeper, it was the *domina* who had the overall supervisory role as household manager. In the elite Roman dwelling, therefore, slaves did not function as social actors imposing their own meaning on space; rather, they acted as the auxiliaries of their owners. Servile actions (indispensable as they were) were basically those planned or commanded by free owners. It was these latter who had power to confer meaning on what was basically *their* domestic space but they used / needed the services of slaves in order to do so. In other words, slaves functioned as the instruments of socially superior actors, a function which highlights their low social status.

---

338 See Ch. 3 (pages 156-159).

339 For bibliographical references, see Ch. 3 (page 156 n.161).

340 On their presence and roles in the household, see Wallace-Hadrill, *Houses and Society*, 39.

A second and related aspect of the town-house / slave relationship is the role of slaves as "human architecture". [341] In carrying out owners' wishes, slaves could acquire the characteristics of physical space itself. As already noted, physical space can act as a mnemonic or controlling mechanism, suggesting or compelling appropriate behaviour or relationships in a given area. In the Roman town-house, slaves often took on such a function. During the morning *salutatio*, for example, an *ostiarius* [342] functioned like the door itself, controlling the entrance to the house. Such slaves were commonly chained, reinforcing the notion of their being a fixed feature of the premises. Further inside the house, other slaves acted as "doors", "corridors", "walls" and "waiting benches": by allowing and forbidding access to rooms and facilitating the circulation of people to and from the patron. In sum, they functioned as "human architecture" controlling the movement of people as much as the physical layout of the building. This reification was dehumanising and illustrated in a vivid way the inferior position of slaves in the elite household.

A third aspect of the town-house / slave relationship - and yet another which focuses on servile inferiority - is the process by which slaves were rendered invisible (to owners and guests). In short, slaves had no real space of their own. Most Roman houses had no separate or identifiable slave quarters. With regard to sleeping arrangements, for example, slaves were found bedded down in storage rooms and at the doors of owners' bedrooms. Where architecturally separate servile quarters did exist, [343] they were not slave homes as such. While slaves lodged there, such quarters also functioned as the household service area - the area where menial tasks like cooking and washing took place, one largely ignored by non-servile household members and guests. These areas were marginalised (fig.

---

341 For the term, see Wallace-Hadrill, *Houses and Society*, 39.

342 Furthermore, their guard-dog status was often reinforced by the possession of such an animal. As suggested by Osiek and Balch (*Families*, 231n.75), see K. Schneider, "*Ianitor*", *PW* (1916) 9: 692-693 and W. Hatto, "*Ianitor*", *KP* (1975) 2: 1310. Slave door-keepers stayed in a room near the entrance to the house (Petron. *Sat.* 29.1; Suet. *Vit.* 16; Varro, *Rust.* 1.13.2) and in earlier times were chained (Columella, *Rust.* praef. 10; Suet. *Rhet.* 3). They sometimes had a dog (Sen. *Dial.* 5.37.2; Petron. *Sat.* 29.2) and both they and their animals were often bribed to gain entry (Cic. *Verr.* 3.8; Hor. *Carm.* 3.14.20; Mart. 5.22.9; Sen. *Dial.* 1.14.2).

343 According to Bradley (*Slavery and Society*, 84-86), slaves were usually housed in small rooms called *cellae* or *cellulae*, also used for storage purposes.

4.12) by distance or difficulty of access [344] and they were marked by plainness of decor (figs 4.13-15). [345] Such plain decor functioned as a mnemonic for slaves and non-slaves alike: for the latter, it was like a "no entry" sign, reminding them to by-pass the low status activity and people there; for slaves with access to all areas, the contrast between richly decorated reception rooms and drab servile quarters served as a constant reminder of their inferior place in the order of things.

A third aspect of the town-house / slave relationship concerns the connection between dwelling and family. This dwelling / family correspondence is best illustrated by comparing the identity and experience of (different) people who occupied the same dwelling. Turning to the elite family members, the elite Roman experienced himself / herself as part of a *domus*-in- a-*domus*, that is, of a single sociological unit living in a single physical house. [346] The experience of a slave was quite different: it was one of belonging to a (servile) family, who lived alongside other (servile) families, all of whom (until manumission) formed part of an elite household which resided in an elite dwelling. At a numerical level, therefore, the ratio of elite dwelling to elite family was one to one, whereas the elite dwelling / slave family ratio was one to many. At the level of identity, elite household members experienced themselves as members of one (albeit large) household whereas slaves had a double identity, being members of the elite household *and* of their own families.

Importantly, it is the identity of the elite household / family that was highlighted in Roman society. As outlined earlier in the chapter, the town house / household relationship (as seen in domestic religion) contributed to the strengthening of the family, regarded as the building block of society. It was, however, the elite family which was at issue, one

---

344 See fig. 4.12 (Wallace-Hadrill, *Houses and Society*, fig. 3.1).

345 See figs 4.13 and 4.14 (Wallace-Hadrill, *Houses and Society*, figs. 3.5 (after Jashemski) and 3.6). The large service area of the villa of Oplontis, for example, is marked out by diagonal black and white stripes, a style commonly associated with low-status spaces. In the house of the Vettii, there is a contrast between the opulently decorated atrium, reception rooms and peristyle and the dark, ill-decorated bedrooms and storerooms used by the slaves. See also fig. 4.15 (Wallace-Hadrill, *Houses and Society*, fig. 3.7 [after Elia]).

346 On the definition of the (physical) *domus* as the "residence of a single family", see McKay, *Houses, Villas and Palaces*, Glossary 270.

defined as "a married couple, their children and slaves". [347] This much-used Aristotelian definition completely overlooked the fact that servile members of the *domus*-in-the-*domus* also formed couples, produced children and even had their own slaves. Furthermore, the simple designation "slaves" homogenised servile members, ignoring the fact that strict social hierarchies existed among them. [348]

In short, while there was generally assumed to be a one to one correspondence between elite dwelling and elite household / family, this was not the case for slaves. From a servile perspective, the experience was one of a single dwelling occupied by many families - by servile families higher, lower or equal on the "pecking order" as well as by the family of the owner / occupier. Typically, however, the lives and identities of these slave families was overshadowed by that of the elite family to which they belonged.

A focus on the typical dwelling / slave relationship, therefore, highlights the mixed message about slaves in the Roman world. On the one hand, they were ubiquitous and indispensable. Indeed, the very system of the individual household and that of the household-writ-large was built on slavery. On the other hand, they were subordinated and marginalised.

typical house .. in conclusion

So far, the focus has centred on the relationship between the typical Roman town-house and four types of users, namely, (i) the elite household or family (ii) the male householder / patron / public figure (iii) the Roman matron / upper-class woman and (iv) slaves.

The configurations reveal that the town-house was a multi-functional space on which meanings were conferred by a variety of social actors and a space which actively contributed to the shaping of these meanings. Rooms were far more open and flexible with regard to function than those in our contemporary Western dwellings where labels like bedroom, utility room, kitchen, dining room, study... reflect and determine use quite specifically. An area like the Roman atrium, for example, was used by different people

---

347 Arist. *Pol.* 1. 1253b.

348 See Wallace-Hadrill (*Houses and Society*, 39) on social hierarchies among slaves.

for different purposes at different times of the day. [349] It functioned as the place where children played, [350] women spun,[351] the family worshipped, clients gathered and domestic tasks were carried out. [352] The atrium - like other spaces in the town-house - was, therefore, a space which functioned in a variety of spatial / social configurations.

All these configurations, however, were not of equal social value. Those involving the family as a whole and the male householder / patron were accorded more space in the sources than (say) those involving (all) slaves and elite children. The fact that some actors dominated over others who shared the same space was clearly a question of power. [353] In the Roman system, the powerful, dominant actors were the household (considered as a single unit) and the father / patron figure. As outlined in Chapter 3, the household was the basic unit of society and provided the model for the imperial structure. The key figure in the system was the upper-class male householder. As *pater familias*, he was head of the household. As patron and public figure, he was an essential thread in the web of patronal relationships which constituted the Roman political system.

At the core of the Roman system, therefore, lay a house(hold) or *domus* ideology. It is this ideology, above all, that the town-house / users relationships reflect and reinforce. Thus while each of the social / configurations explored above is important in its own right, taken together the four contribute to the strengthening of the elite patriarchal household and the related institutions of slavery and patronage. They put the spotlight on the household, they highlight the role of patron, they promote the

---

349 See Laurence (*Roman Pompeii*, 125-129) who argues for a temporal division of the house: the space was male-dominated during the morning *salutatio* and female-dominated during the central part of the day.

350 See Verg. *Aen.* 7.379: *quem pueri magno in gyro vacua atria circum / intenti ludo exercent* and Lucr. 4.401-404: *atria vorsari et circumcursare columnae.*

351 See Arn. *Adv. Gent.* 2.67.

352 From her study of artefacts from a single house (I.8.14), J. Berry ("Household artefacts: towards a re-interpretation of Roman domestic space" in Laurence and Wallace-Hadrill [eds], *Domestic Space,* 183-195) shows that even spaces normally associated with reception and display were multi-functional. On domestic activities in atria and peristyles, see P. M. Allison, "Roman households: an archaeological perspective" in H. M. Parkins (ed.), *Roman Urbanism. Beyond the Consumer City* (London and New York: Routledge, 1997), 136-138.

353 As cited in Ch. 1 (page 79), Moore (*Space, Text and Gender*, Ch. 5) argues that the ability to define the meaning of space as appropriate (or not) is a question of political power.

traditional ideal of wife and mother and they reinforce the indispensable yet subordinate position of slaves. In sum, the social / spatial configurations fashion social relationships and identities considered vital for the construction and maintenance of stability in society.

While household ideology is captured in certain spatial / social relationships within the town-house, the threat to the system is also see in operation there. As the evidence regarding elite women reveals, the very reason women were being forced into their "proper place" was precisely because they were abandoning it. The typical *domus*, therefore, is a space which reflects and reinforces the struggle to promote and destabilise the household ideology on which the Roman system was built.

Other *domus* : Other dwelling / user relationships

While a focus on the town-houses provides valuable insight into the Roman world, such premises represented but a tiny proportion of the housing stock. Moving to a broader canvas, therefore, this section focuses on dwellings in a generic sense and explores the nature and significance of dwelling / user relationships other than those considered in the town-house. The issues are explored under four headings, namely (i) dwelling size : social status (ii) housing as influence on identity, life-style and relationships (iii) users' influence on dwellings and (iv) housing and households (housefuls).

While the four town-house / user relationships revealed the strength of and threat to house(hold) ideology in the Roman world, the configurations involving other *domus* - or housing in general - provide further views of this same world: a world of social diversity, a world in flux, a world in which a plurality of identities is under construction. As in the first part, the emphasis is on cities of the Roman west. This does not exclude consideration of the ethnic question, for clearly, cities were multi-ethnic and well as socially diverse spaces. The ethnic issue will receive extensive treatment in the next chapter, which deals with housing as expression and instrument of contact between imperial power and indigenous people. A further re-visiting of dwelling / user relationships occurs in Chapter 7 in the context of early Christianity.

Dwelling size : social status [354]

An exploration of relationships between dwellings and users other than those outlined in the typical *domus* opens doors onto the Roman world. In short, a clear correlation between dwelling size and the status of the owner / occupier points to the stratification of this world.

As outlined in Chapter 2, there was a huge variety of habitations in the cities of Roman Italy. As well as atrium-peristyle houses, there was a broad range of apartments and single rooms, of vastly varying size and quality. There were the luxurious apartments on the ground floors of *insulae* and spacious units on upper floors, which were often subdivided and let (figs 4.16-18b). [355] There were single and multi-roomed rental units (reached by internal or external stairs), units located in both divided town houses (fig. 4.19) [356] and in what may be termed mini-*insulae* or "transitional tenements" (fig. 4.20). [357] There were living quarters attached to (work-) shops (fig. 4.21), [358] in freestanding structures, in small houses (and fig. 4.22) [359] and to the right and left of *fauces* of atrium-peristyle houses (fig. 4.23). [360] Finally, there were any number of low-quality single rooms in boarding houses and on the upper floors of high-rise blocks.

Further insight into this varied housing map is found in a study by Wallace-Hadrill.

---

354 Further consideration of the housing map / social map is found in Chapter 5. there the emphasis in on the relation between imperial power and indigenous peoples.

355 See figs 4.16-18a-b (McKay, *Houses, Villas and Palaces*, Plates 36, 34, figs 33 and 34 [after Meiggs]).

356 See fig. 4.19 (Wallace-Hadrill, *Houses and Society*, fig. 5.10 [after Maiuri]) for apartments in the house of the Bicentenary (H V.14/15).

357 On "transitional tenements", see McKay, *Houses, Villas and Palaces*, 82. See fig. 4.20 (Wallace-Hadrill, *Houses and Society*, fig. 5.15 [after Maiuri]). The *Casa a Graticcio* in Herculaneum (111. 13-15) has two upstairs apartments. The front one is accessible from the street, the back one, from the courtyard within. For details on this house, see McKay (*op. cit.*, 82) and Wallace-Hadrill (*op. cit.*, 66, 110, 199).

358 See fig. 4.21 (Wallace-Hadrill, *Houses and Society*, fig. 4.11, Type 1).

359 See fig. 4.22 (Wallace-Hadrill, *Houses and Society*, fig. 5.12 [after Maiuri]). A section of a shop / house at Herculaneum V.17. The upper apartment is accessible from the street.

360 See fig. 4.23 (Wallace-Hadrill, *Houses and Society*, fig. 6.5) for the location of possible shops at the front of the house of the Bicentenary.

He studied a sample of (i) seven adjacent blocks (78 houses) in Regio I of Pompeii, (ii) eight blocks (104 houses) in Regio VI of Pompeii and (iii) four blocks (52 houses) in Herculaneum. He then classified the premises into four (almost) equal groups according to size, the average area in square metres for the first being 10-45, for the second, 50-170, for the third, 175-345, and for the fourth, 350-3000. [361] His study, therefore, is a clear illustration of the great variety of house sizes in a given area.

A focus on types and dimensions of dwellings reveals that there was a strict correspondence between the size, quality and location of a person's habitation and that person's place in the social hierarchy. At one end of the scale, was the owner-occupier of an atrium-peristyle house, most probably a wealthy Roman of the senatorial or equestrian orders. At the other was the occupier / lodger of a high rise, low-quality premises of some 10 square metres [362] - in all likelihood, a poor person, of slave, freed or free status and possibly foreign. This is the type of person described by Lampe as living in the Trastevere and the area around Porta Capena, that is, the swampy, poorest, most densely populated areas of Rome. [363]

Between the two extremes lay a range of habitations which also had its correspondence on the social scale - with better-off people in larger apartments, those with slightly less in smaller apartments... and craft-workers in *tabernae* or workshop-*cum*-dwellings. As well as spatial segregation on the horizontal level, a type of vertical segregation also operated: upper or middle class tenants resided in larger apartments on lower floors while slaves and freedpeople were crowded into upper floors. This process of stratification occurred across the empire: it was visible in the multi-occupancy blocks of Italian cities and in the earlier versions of such *insulae* in cities of the east, like

---

361 See Wallace-Hadrill, *Houses and Society*, 67-82. While looking at "average" sizes, one must also remember that diversity exists within each quartile.

362 On small units, see R. Jewett, "Tenement Churches and Communal Meals in the Early Church: The Implications of a Form-Critical Analysis of 2 Thessalonians 3/10 ", *Biblical Research* 38 (1993), 26.

363 Jewett ("Tenement Churches", 27-28) draws on P. Lampe, *Die stadtrömischen Christen in den ersten beiden Jahrhunderten*, 2nd edition, Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1989. First edition, 1987.

Ephesus and Tyre. [364]

A map of housing size is, therefore, a map of social relations. There is a clear correlation between the amount of space owned / occupied by a person and that person's place on the social ladder. In short, the dwelling size / social status points to the rigid stratification operative in Roman society. The map provides a more vivid image than that expressed in polarities such as elite /non-elite, upper / lower classes. It illustrates not just the extreme rich and poor ends of the Roman social ladder, but depicts the stratification in between: in what are often lumped together indiscriminately as lower or non-elite classes. Housing illustrates in a three-dimensional way (and far more eloquently than reference to status or wealth) just what stratification actually looked like.

A further aspect illustrated by the dwelling / social map is the relationship of economic (inter-)dependence between people on the social scale. At the top of the scale, property was used by the wealthy as a commercial asset. [365] Further down the scale, tenants also made financial gains by sub-letting rooms. There were, therefore, multiple relationships of dependence between landlords and tenants, tenants and sub-tenants and this reality is well attested in sources on the rental market cited in Chapter 2. [366] While such relationships were of a primarily economic nature, they also expressed and reinforced (inter-)dependence at the political and social level. Elite property owners, for example, received from their trader-tenants, not only revenue, but also electoral support and social status. In turn, traders received patronal protection and security. [367]

Housing's influence on identity, life-style, relationships

While the relationship between dwelling and user(s) is two-way, attention here

---

364 On the multi-storeyed (πολυόροφος, πολύστεγος) houses in eastern cities, see Chapter 2 (page 90) . The case at Ephesus is discussed in Chapters 5 and 7.

365 On the amount of economic activity across all housing sizes, see Wallace-Hadrill, *Houses and Society*, fig. 6.11. Urban *insulae* were regarded as an excellent, albeit risky, investment. See Gell. *NA* 15.1.3, Hdn 7.12.6.

366 On letting and sub-letting, see Chapter 2 (104, 107) and Frier, "Rental Market".

367 See Wallace-Hadrill (*Houses and Society*, 121) on the multiplicity of social ties between trader and elite property owner / patron.

focuses on the influence of the former. The influential power of the built environment has been underscored both in the theoretical work of Chapter 1 and in the reading of the typical *Roman* town-house. The present concern is the power of housing to control or make suggestions to its users. More specifically, the question is how it influences identity, life-style and relationships.

Housing has a powerful influence on the identity and self-image of the user / inhabitant. Of its nature, housing has a permanent, static quality. On a daily basis and over the years, it is capable of reminding people of who they are and where they belong. In today's world (as in antiquity), address matters and one's identity is shaped by one's geographical and spatial location. As mentioned in Chapter 1 and in the discussion of the typical *domus*, dwellings are a particularly strong influence on identity formation given their intimate association with the concept of home.

Earlier in the chapter, the Roman town-house was shown to function as an expression and instrument of the upper-class, male patron's self-image and status. Furthermore, the Romans' own consciousness of this phenomenon was highlighted. A similar process was operative throughout the system. Thus for example, inhabitants of good-quality *cenacula* were constantly aware of their socio-economic position further up the scale than that of their co-residents on the floors upstairs. Day after day, poor people living in a garret or temporarily resident in boarding house *cellae* were reminded that they belonged on the margins of Roman society. Occupying little, cramped and poor quality space reinforced a sense of having an insignificant place in the scheme of things. Somewhere in between, the identity of artisans was shaped twenty four hours a day in their workshop-*cum*-dwellings, surrounded by the tools, products, smells ... and buyers of their trade. In sum, housing reinforced identity within the hierarchy of Roman society. Internally, it was written on people's souls. Externally, it was erected in stone (wood, marble ...), engraved on the city scape and thus advertised to the world. It was, therefore, a proclamation of the stratified way the Roman world was.

Along with identity, living conditions are shaped by housing. One issue is the obvious correlation between poor health and poor housing conditions. Another less obvious one in relation to antiquity relates to the function and meaning of houses as dwelling places. For us (in the urban, Western world of the 21st century), a "(physical) house" is largely the place of the domestic, the private, the personal. Attention to Roman

housing at the lower end of the scale, however, forces a re-thinking of the definition or meaning of houses as "dwelling" places. [368]

While poor habitations were indeed homes and places where people slept, stored possessions..., domestic life as we know it was not confined to the four walls of such "houses". In non-elite dwellings in particular, many activities which we classify as domestic were carried on outside or elsewhere. This was due as much to the size of the premises and the quality of facilities (or lack of them) as to the culture or climate. While cooking, for example, could be done in charcoal braziers in some single units, occupants of such lower-class habitations frequently ate at a common kitchen or restaurant, evidence of which has been well documented by Foss. [369] The lack of running water and toilet facilities also meant that tasks relating to personal hygiene took place outside the habitation. Even at the upper end of the scale, public baths were the norm and constituted a Roman institution in its own right. In sum, the nature of dwelling units meant that, for many, domestic tasks were not confined to one place but "stretched out" in space. This resulted in life being a more communal or less private affair than that experienced by many of us today.

The extent to which non-elite, domestic life was communal or extra-mural had important implications for relationships. Three such relationship issues are mentioned, namely, those of (i) kinship or family, (ii) an ethnic group, the Jews and (iii) artisans. With regard to kinship and family, small, urban habitations exercised a significant influence on relationships. In the countryside, the housing density was generally low with the result that people had no problem enlarging or altering their dwellings as the need arose. The traditional, courtyard-style house of rural Palestine, for example, facilitated changing or growing families [370] in that it was a relatively simple matter to accommodate new members by building on a new room or wing to the existing structure. In many cases, urban tenements too had expansion possibilities. Indeed it is said that many *insulae*

---

368 In Chapter 1 (pages 82-83), attention was drawn to the simultaneously universal and culture-specific definition of a dwelling and the danger of making naturalistic and ethnocentric assumptions was emphasised.

369 See Foss, "Kitchens and Dining Rooms". See also Chapter 2 (pages 108-109) and McKay, *Houses, Villas and Palaces*, 86.

370 See Chapter 2 (pages 114) and Hirschfeld (*Palestinian Dwelling*).

evolved naturally from the gradual addition to *tabernae* of upper floors. [371] In other words, people built upwards if they needed more space.

Such additions, however, were not always possible in the city. Many small units within *insulae* could not be altered structurally to accommodate the needs of a growing family. The options open to an expanding, non-elite urban family or to a rural family relocating in the city were three-fold: (a) to pack more people into the same space [372]; (b) to rent one or more units in the vicinity; (c) to split up and move into separate areas. Each of these options had an effect on relationships. The first made for a higher population density, a lower standard of living and more strained relationships; the second resulted in the creation of kin- or ethnic-based quarters; the third caused the break-up of natural, religious or ethnic bonds.

On the issue of ethnic bonds, attention turns to the Jews. Jewish identity was reflected and constructed across time and space through the worship of their deity and the observance of their law.[373] Of crucial importance at domestic level were the dietary and purity laws. In cities of the Diaspora,[374] choices open to observant Jews were to eat at home (alone or with others) or to eat at Jewish-only restaurants / kitchens. The eating at home option was open to those whose premises had kitchen and dining facilities. Furthermore, if space permitted, such Jews could invite others to join them in keeping their laws and celebrating home-based festivals like Passover. Such table fellowship would facilitate the perpetuation of Jewishness and reinforce a sense of community at family or inter-family level.

By contrast, poorer Jews who had no means of cooking at home would have to eat out at street restaurants or stalls. The effect of such a practice would be to create ethnic-based enclaves. While the Jewish ghettoes of later centuries were not a feature of

---

371 McKay, *Houses, Villas and Palaces*, 84.

372 Ancient cities were very overcrowded. J. E. Stambaugh (*The Ancient Roman City* [Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1988]), 337) has calculated a population density of 300 per acres for the residential areas of Rome, which is almost 2.5 times higher than 20th century Calcutta. Large houses too could be more populated than one might expect, peopled as they were with large households comprising of large number of slave families.

373 On the construction of Jewish identity, see the treatment in Chapter 6 (pages 276-281).

374 For maps of the Diaspora, see Volume 2: Figs 6.4 and 6.5.

the Roman world, there is evidence of Jews living or congregating together in large cities such as Rome, Antioch and Alexandria.[375] Housing and restaurants / communal kitchens, therefore, could (like synagogues or the *miqva'oth* described in the next chapter) function as loci for the expression and creation of Jewish identity. A similar phenomenon will be discussed in Chapter 7 in the case of Christians.

The contribution of dwellings to the strengthening of bonds is also detectable in the case of *tabernae* (workshop-*cum*-dwellings). Whether these were located at the front of *domus,* clustered around the forum and along the main roads leading to it, or (as in the case of bad-odour-producing work)[376] outside or on the margins of cities, craftspeople tended to live and work alongside each other. [377] This proximity facilitated the formation of social as well as professional bonds. Such bonds were seen in the omni-presence of *collegia* in antiquity and in the existence of artisans networks, evidence of which will also be noted in Chapter 7 in relation to early Christianity.

Users' influence on dwellings

While housing has power to influence users, the converse is also true. This was outlined in Chapter 1, illustrated in the case of the typical *domus* and will be further developed in Chapter 7. Attention here focuses on the way human users shape and re-shape the built environment, thereby giving it new meanings and functions. Just as dwellings influence users in the area of identity, lifestyle and relationships, so too users influence dwellings in a similar way.

Evidence suggests that inhabitants of Roman cities were not averse to changing the function of dwellings from that originally intended. They actively engaged in the conferring of new meanings on such spaces. In other words, houses functioned as a tool with which people fashioned and re-fashioned the world for their own unique purposes. Thus, for example, what appears (and presumably was) a single large, owner-occupied

---

375 See evidence cited in M. H. Williams, *The Jews among the Greeks and Romans: A Diasporan Sourcebook* (London: Duckworth, 1998), 15-19.

376 See I. Richter Reimer, *Women in the Acts of the Apostles: A Feminist Liberation Perspective*, trans. L. M. Maloney (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995), 107.

377 On the location of *tabernae*, see McKay, *Houses, Villas and Palaces*, 80.

atrium-peristyle house could be converted into a multiplicity of housing units. [378] Such is the case of the Pompeian house of Pansa / *insula Arriana Polliana* (VI.6.1) of Gnaeus Alleius Nigidius Maius. While the ground plan reveals a large rectangular block suggestive of a typical atrium-peristyle house (figs 4.24-25), [379] a well-known graffito reveals that the block was subdivided and let as *tabernae cum pergulis suis* ([work-]shops with upper balcony-rooms), "*c[e]nacula equestria*" ("equestrian" lodgings) and "*domus*" (house or houses). [380] A plan of the subdivided property (fig. 4.26) [381] shows an atrium-peristyle unit surrounded by some dozen shops, three small houses (in the form of a central space off which rooms open) (figs 4.27-28) [382] and a number of external stairs to apartments above. Consciously over-riding the original spatial suggestions provided by the building, therefore, a later owner stamped new meanings on the premises, presumably for economic gain.

Users- such as professional or religious groups - were also capable of re-defining the functions of dwellings and this is illustrated at Dura-Europos. Followers of Mithras, for example, originally used a room in a private house for the installation of their mithraeum. No structural change was required and the house retained its domestic character. It was at a later stage only that the superstructure of the building was demolished in order to enlarge the mithraeum. The Durene synagogue too was originally located in a domestic premises. Here too, it was a case of transforming the interior only for the purposes of worship. As with the mithraeum, so with the synagogue, complete structural change happened at a later date. The Christian evidence from Dura consists of a premises with the external appearance of a house but one which has been re-designed

---

378 See F. Pirson, "Rented accommodation at Pompeii: the evidence of the *Insula Arriana Polliana* VI 6" in Laurence and Wallace-Hadrill (eds), *Domestic Space*, 165-181.

379 Fig. 4.24 (McKay, *Houses, Villas and Palaces*, fig. 8 [M. Grant, fig. 8])and fig. 4.25 (McKay, *Houses, Villas and Palaces*, fig. 13 [M. Grant. fig. 21]).

380 *CIL* 4.138: *insula Arriana Polliana [C]n. Al[le]i Nigidi Mai. locantur ex Iulis primis tabernae cum pergulis suis et c[e]nacula equestria et domus. conductor convenito Primum [C]n. Al[le]i Nigidi Mai. ser(vum).* See the citation in Ch. 2 (104 n. 80).

381 For a plan of the property showing the subdivided units, see fig. 4.26 (Wallace-Hadrill, *Houses and Society*, fig. 5.8). It is discussed on *op. cit.* 106.

382 See Wallace-Hadrill, *Houses and Society*, 80-81 on Type 2 for reference to such "small houses." See figs 4.27 and 4.28 (Wallace-Hadrill, *Houses and Society*, fig. 4.11, Type 2a and 2 b).

internally and used exclusively as an assembly hall. [383] Through the actions of Christians, Jews and followers of Mithras, therefore, domestic premises at Dura-Europos were transformed: in the early phases, existing dwellings were used as meeting places. With the growth or official recognition of the religious groups concerned, domestic premises lost their original function. While retaining the external appearance of dwellings, they underwent a metamorphosis into centres of religious activity.

Further evidence of users' ability to change the meaning of the cityscape emerges from sources on the rental market. Such sources suggest a multiplicity and flexibility of units in what may initially appear as a single, residential premises. While external staircases or multiple doors may be physical pointers to the subdivision of houses into individual, rental units, [384] legal and epigraphical material reveals further evidence of the practice. In cases of joint ownership, for example, properties were often divided, [385] thereby creating separate "houses." Owners (as opposed to usufructuaries) of properties could divide them into a variety of rental units, [386] for any number of uses. A former single dwelling could become the site of rooms (*meritoria*) [387] and apartments, a boarding-

---

383 On the evidence from Dura-Europos, see White, *God's House*, 47-59 (mithraeum) 74-77 (synagogue), 111 ff. (*domus ecclesiae*).

384 Multiplicity of doors may also be evidence of multiple entrances to a single dwelling.

385 If a house were owned by two people (with each using a separate part of it), neither could undertake structural work without the other's consent. Disputes often resulted in proceedings for division of property (*Dig.* 8.2.26). According to Ulpian, you could sell part of a house, just as you could sell part of a farm; but if the master constructed a partition wall to divide what had been built as a single unit, "as they often do" (*ut plerique faciunt*) then it became two houses (*Dig.* 8.4.6).

386 Evidence comes in indirect form from *Dig.* 7.1.13.7ff. The text (from the first century C.E. jurist, the younger Nerva) lists what a usufructuary cannot do a property: *Item si domus usus fructus legatus sit, meritoria illic facere fructuarius non debet nec per cenacula dividere domum: atquin locare potest, sed oportebit quasi domum locare.* The implication is that an owner (as opposed to a usufructuary) can undertake such changes.

387 As noted by Frier ("Rental Market", 31 n.26), "[t]his is the widest sense of the word, frequent in inscriptions (e.g. *CIL* 6.15640; 10.1450, 3750)."

house, a (gay) hotel / brothel (fig. 4.29), [388] bakery, [389] fullery (fig. 4.30), [390] horticultural plot. [391]

Users, therefore, were not passive recipients of spatial suggestions provided by buildings architecturally definable, originally intended or formerly used as dwellings. Rather they were active agents, capable of conferring new functions and meanings on such spaces. This they did in any number of ways: namely, by giving an additional (economic, religious) function to an existing dwelling; by completely over-riding the spatial suggestions provided by the architecture, by stripping premises of their domestic functions altogether or by stamping meaning on a not-yet-defined or multi-functional unit.

Housing and households (housefuls)

The fourth and final spatial / social configuration considered is that between housing and household (or houseful). Put another way, it concerns that between dwelling and in-dwelling social form. As noted in Chapter 1, there is never a simple, one-to-one correspondence between dwelling form and social form. Where a close correspondence does exist, it is because the configuration functions as a model or ideal in society. Examples of such ideals (already mentioned in this study) are the Victorian country house(hold) and the Roman *domus*-in-the-*domus*. Actual dwelling / household combinations, however, are always less easily classifiable. Household form cannot be deduced in any simplistic manner on the basis of housing evidence, though such deductions are frequently made. [392] The converse is also true, namely that information about

---

388 See fig. 4.29 (Gazda [ed], *Roman Art,* fig. 4-1). See J. R. Clarke, "The Decor of the House of Jupiter and Ganymede at Ostia Antica: Private Residence Turned Gay Hotel?" in Gazda (ed.), *op. cit.,* 89-104.

389 According to Wallace-Hadrill (*Houses and Society*, 138-13), evidence of four mills in the house of the Labyrinth (6.11.8-10) suggests that it housed a commercial bakery at some stage.

390 See Wallace-Hadrill (*Houses and Society*, 138-139) on the Fullonica Stephani (I. 6.7). Fig. 4.30 (Wallace-Hadrill, *op. cit.,* fig. 6.12).

391 See Jashemski (*Gardens of Pompeii*) for analysis of viticulture, floriculture, market gardening... in Pompeian gardens.

392 See reference to the study of Oporto Guijarro in chapter 1 (page 116).

households or inhabitants is no simple guide to housing form. Rather in each particular case, the relationship and its dynamic, two-way nature must be defined rather than assumed.

Turning to the Roman world, the point to highlight is the fact there was an infinite number of possible and actual dwelling / household combinations. As already noted, there was a multiplicity of habitation units. There was also a multiplicity of indwelling units: These included families (of all shapes and sizes), single units (bachelors [393] or courtesans, [394] with or without staff) and non-kin units (freed women living together, [395] groups of itinerant craft-workers, religious groups like Christians ....) Inhabitants were further classifiable according to their place on the social scale (rich -poor; slave, freed, free) and to their ethnic origin. Yet more classifications of inhabitants included those of owner-occupier and tenant (both long or short stay), dweller and worker / dweller.

Given the multiplicity of dwellings and in-dwelling social units, housing / houseful configurations in the Roman world were potentially endless. Furthermore, the two-way relationship between dwelling and users meant that the identity of each and every social unit (and not just the elite household) was reflected and reinforced in the particular spatial location it occupied. In the houses of the Roman world, therefore, a plurality of identities was constantly under construction. Furthermore, this plurality of identities co-existed alongside the ideal or institution of the household, the household which functioned as the building block of society and the model for empire.

---

393 On bachelors, see Bradley (*Roman Family*, 163-164).

394 See Balsdon, *Roman Women*, 226-229.

395 A funerary inscription erected by two slave women (of different owners) raises the possibility that such women could have co-habited after manumission. See *TAM* III.495 (Martin, "Ancient Family", 48 n.33).

CHAPTER CONCLUSION

While Chapter 3 presented the empire as a household-writ-large, this chapter has viewed the imperial world through a housing lens. More specifically, it has explored what a number of dwelling / user relationships reveals about that world. The initial focus was on the relationship between typical town-house and four types of users, namely, (i) the elite household or family (ii) the male householder / patron / public figure (iii) the Roman matron / upper-class woman (iv) slaves. In these relationships was seen the simultaneous process of strengthening and challenging the traditional house(hold) ideology on which the imperial system was constructed. Moving to the broader picture, attention switched to dwelling / user configurations other than those in the typical *domus*. Looking at issues such as the correlation between dwelling size and social status, the influential power of dwellings and users and the infinite variety of housing / households (housefuls) relationships opens doors onto a world of vast social diversity, a world in flux, a world in which a plurality of identities was under construction. Further insight into the link between housing and the construction of identity will be demonstrated in the chapters which follow: in Ch. 5, the discussion centres on the relationship between imperial power and native people while in Ch. 7, the emphasis is on early Christianity.

CHAPTER 5

HOUSING in the "CONTACT ZONE"

Having exposed the *domus* ideology of the Roman world, this chapter presents yet another way in which house functions as key to the macro-text. In contrast to chapter 3 which worked with "house" in the sense of "household", it is the notion of physical house which is dominant here. Concretely, the focus is on housing in the "contact zone". This term "contact zone" [1] describes a place where cultures meet, struggle and establish some form of on-going, often unequal, relations. The term is particularly applicable to colonial situations where imperial power meets indigenous culture. While traces of the encounter are discernible in many aspects of a culture, the focus here is on housing, or more specifically on urban housing. The chapter illustrates how housing from the early Imperial period reveals much about the complex and ever-changing relationship between colonizer and colonized. The first part draws on a range of evidence from across the empire, while the second centres on one provincial location, namely Jerusalem.

---

[1] For this "manufactured" term, see M. L. Pratt, *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation* (London and New York: Routledge, 1992), 4-6. The book is a study of travel and exploration writing about Africa and South America in relation to European economic and political expansion since about 1750. Using the concept of transculturation, Pratt explores the influence of both the metropolis on the periphery and the periphery on the metropolis and this results in an analysis which goes beyond the simple colonizer / colonized approach. Sawicki ("Caste and Contact", 2, 22 and "Spatial Management", 3-4) draws on insights from the Americanist "archaeology of contact" in order to suggest hypotheses about the Roman / Jewish encounter in first century Galilee.

HOUSING and CONTACT ... IN GENERAL

This first part of the chapter focuses on imperial / provincial-indigenous contact using housing evidence from across the empire. As a point of departure, the first section demonstrates Rome's on-going contact with the "captured" Greek world. The second deals with housing as an expression and instrument of imperial presence throughout the provinces while the third focuses on the complex, multi-faceted nature of the contact between colonizer and colonized as seen through the lens of dwellings.

Rome's on-going contact with the Greek world

An exploration of the empire's contact with other cultures begins with Rome's relationship to Greece. In Chapter 2, reference was made to Horace's succinct expression of how "captured Greece made captive her .. victor". [2] One way in which Rome's on-going "captivity" or indebtedness to Greece is manifest is in domestic construction. Romans made use of Greek forms and they employed the skills of Greek architects, interior designers, mosaicists and marble workers. [3] In the previous chapter, Greek influence on the traditional Roman *domus* was mentioned and this influence included the development of the peristyle and the introduction of features reminiscent of monumental architecture (figs 5.1-4). [4] The typical *domus*, therefore, was no pure Roman invention; rather, it was an amalgam, a structure which witnessed to the contact between native and foreign, between east and west, between old and new empires. It was not merely the *domus* but the *insula* too that bore the mark of the Greek tradition. The notion of eastern influence on the *insula* has been given more serious consideration since the discovery of two

---

2 *"Graecia capta ferum victorem cepit...."* See Ch. (page 85 n.1) for Hor. *Epis.* 2.1.156-7.

3 McKay, *Houses, Villas and Palaces*, 157.

4 Fig. 5.1: House at Priene (A. W. Lawrence, *Greek Architecture*, 3rd edn [Harmondsworth, Penguin, 1973], fig. 139), fig. 5.2 : House at Olynthus (Lawrence, *op. cit.*, fig. 137), fig. 5.3: House of the Faun, Pompeii (McKay, *Houses, Villas, and Palaces*, fig. 14 [Mau-Kelsey, fig. 132]), fig. 5.4: House of *Fortuna Annonaria*, Ostia (Ward-Perkins, *Roman Imperial Architecture* fig. 128A).

multiple-occupancy blocks at Ephesus (figs 5.5-6). [5] These blocks seem to corroborate ancient evidence of high-rise structures in eastern cities such as Babylon, Tyre and Aradus [6] long before their appearance in Rome or Ostia (figs 15.7-8). [7] Both *domus* and *insula*, therefore, are witnesses to the on-going contact of cultures. While the physical solidity of dwellings gives the impression that they are static and unchanging structures, housing types are, in fact, subject to constant change and cross-fertilization.

Imperial imprint across the οἰκουμένη

While still focusing on housing evidence, attention shifts from Greek's influence on Rome, to Rome's imprint on the οἰκουμένη. The Roman Empire, as the Greek world before it, became synonymous with the οἰκουμένη, the *orbis terrarum* or inhabited world. [8] This implied a hegemony which was political and cultural as well as geographical. [9] One example of the imperial imprint in the provinces is the evidence on housing characterised as typically Roman, or Graeco-Roman (if the previous discussion of cross-

---

5 For examples of multiple dwellings from Ephesus, see figs 5.5 and 5.6 (McKay, *Houses, Villas and Palaces,* fig. 68 [Akurgal, fig. 169] and fig. 69 [Akurgal, fig. 170]). The excavations have been the work of the Austrian Archaeological Institute, in particular, that of F. Miltner, F. Eichler and H. Vetters. On the on-going and inconclusive debates regarding the origins of Roman *insulae*, see McKay, *op. cit.* 83-84.

6 Strabo mentions the high-rise buildings of Babylon (16.1.5), Tyre (16.2.23) and Aradus (16.2.13). Pomponius Mella 2.7.6 also refers to those in Aradus.

7 On Ostian *insulae,* see fig. 5.7and 5.8 (McKay, *Houses, Villas and Palaces,* fig. 31 [F. E. Brown, fig. 80] and Pl. 34). On Ephesus, see McKay , *op. cit.,* 212-217, 256 nn. 381, 382.

8 See *Michel, "* οἶκος*", TDNT 5:* 157-159. Examples of where οἰκουμένη refers to the Roman empire include *POxy.* 7. 1021. 5 ff., *OGI* 666.3 ff. and 668.5, Joseph. *BJ.* 1.6333, Luke 2.1, Acts 17.6; 24.5, Lucian. *Macr.* 7. 3.

9 This Roman control of the *orbis terrarum* is expressed by Vitruvius: *De Arch.* 1.1 : *Cum divina tua mens et numen, imperator Caesar, imperio potiretur orbis terrarum invictaque virtute* (When your Highness's divine mind and power, O Caesar, gained the empire of the world, Rome gloried in your triumph and victory) and Vitr. *De Arch.* 6.1.11: *Ita divina mens civitatem populi Romani egregiam temperatamque regionem conlocavit, ut orbis terrarum imperii potiretur* (Thus the divine mind has allotted to the Roman state an excellent and temperate region in order to rule the world). On the political unity of the empire, see for example, A. N. Sherwin-White, *The Roman Citizenship,* 2nd edn (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1973).

fertilization is to be taken into account).[10] Indeed, exploration of Roman housing is often a journey through the empire, a guide to the provinces. McKay's study of *Houses, Villas and Palaces in the Roman World*, for example, outlines Roman housing types (such as town-house, *palatium*, multiple dwelling and villa) and shows them *in situ*, across the vast geographical span of the empire: he charts dwellings in Rome and Italian cities and then on to through "European Provinces and Britain" to the "Eastern Provinces and North Africa." Similarly, in the rural context, Percival studies examples of *The Roman Villa* in province after province in the western part of the Empire. [11] Connections are made across continents through the shared presence of Roman housing - "Roman" in the chronological sense of dating from the time of Roman occupation and "Roman" in the influence of their plans, building techniques and décor. [12] The presence of (atrium-)peristyle housing from the Roman period (figs 5.9-12), [13] therefore, is one feature which links Herculaneum and Pompeii to places such as Vasio (Vaison-la-Romaine, France)[14] and Glanum (Saint Rémy, France),[15] Ptolemais (Cyrenaica, Libya)[16] or Aphek-Antipatris (Palestine). [17] Also detectable across the provinces are examples of lower-class dwellings (such as *tabernae* and single-roomed accommodation) seen in Italian cities.[18] As the secondary sources show, some two thousand years later, the history and geography of the empire can still be written

---

10 On the archaeological evidence of Roman culture in general across the empire, see, J. Wacher (ed.), *The Roman World*, 2 vols (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1987).

11 Percival, *Roman Villa,* Ch. 4.

12 As in Chapter 4, the focus is on plan and form, rather than on décor, furnishings and contents.

13 On atrium-peristyle housing, see the following figures: figs 4.4-11 in the previous chapter; fig. 5.9: House of the Labyrinth, Pompeii (McKay, *Houses, Villas and Palaces,* fig. 10), fig. 5.10: House of the Silver Bust in Vasio (McKay, *op. cit.,* fig. 55 [Boëthius and Ward-Perkins, fig. 136]), fig. 5.11: Palazzo delle Colonne at Ptolemais (McKay, *op. cit.,* fig. 72 and 73 [Pesce, Pl. XI), fig. 5.12: House at Aphek (Antipatris) (Hirschfeld, *Palestinian Dwelling*, fig. 66 [after Kochavi]) .

14 For housing at Vasio, see McKay, *Houses, Villas and Palaces,* 161-162, 251-215 n. 293.

15 For housing at Glanum, see McKay, *Houses, Villas and Palaces*, 159-161, 251 n. 292.

16 For housing at Ptolemais, see McKay, *Houses, Villas and Palaces*, 225-228, 258 n. 406.

17 See P. Beck and M. Kochavi, "Aphek" in *NEAEHL* 1: 62-72.

18 For examples at Glanum, see McKay, *Houses, Villas and Palaces*, 162.

from housing evidence. Housing, therefore, functions both as expression and instrument of empire: more succinctly, οἶκοι / οἰκίαι are elements in the construction of the Roman οἰκουμένη.

An interesting aspect of the οἶκοι / οἰκίαι - οἰκουμένη link is that a language of conquest and domestication is used in the context of house building. As expressed in Statius *Silvae*, 2.2, Pollius (who is the builder of the villa) is said to have conquered or tamed (*domuit*) the site. [19] Furthermore, claims the poet, nature herself gave way to this settler (.. *hic victa colenti cessit*). [20] It is the same verb "*domo*" which is used of the villa roof's "mastery" over the rocks (..*longoque domat saxa aspera dorso*..). [21] Like advancing armies, the villa and other maritime dwellings appear to make forcible inroads into the cliffs (..*intrantesque domos*..). Even mountains retreat (..*recedere*..) at their approach. [22] The villa of Pollius is comparable to a city [23] or a watch-tower. Sentry-like, the house surveys the surrounding area and controls the landscape surveyed by ordering it into perfect views to be "brought inside." [24] Another way in which the house is linked with the idea of conquest is by functioning as a show-case for the display of objects like Grecian marbles, objects which are in fact spoils or trophies brought to Italian shores from foreign lands. [25]

---

19 Stat. *Silv*. 2.2. 54--56. Pollius transformed the site by changing mountains into plains, wild country into halls and he made tall woods grow where before there had not even been land. The insight about conquest was developed during a reading of B. Bergmann, "Painted Perspectives of a Villa Visit: Landscape as Status and Metaphor" in Gazda (ed.), *Roman Art,* 49-70.

20 Stat. *Silv*. 2.2.52-53.

21 Stat. *Silv*. 2.2.31.

22 Stat. *Silv*. 2.2.58-59.

23 Its porticus is "*urbis opus*" (as vast as a city) (Stat. *Silv*. 2.2.31)..... like a walk at the Lechaeum (harbour of Corinth) (Stat. *Silv*. 2.2.35). As noted by Bergmann ("Painted Perspectives", 68 n.19), the comparison with cities was a topos of praise used for homes around Bay of Naples. Strabo (5.4.8) describes the Bay of Naples as "one continuous city" and Pliny (*Ep*. 2.17.27) compares parts of Laurentum with many cities.

24 H. Mielsch, *Die römische Villa : Architectur und Lebensform* (Munich: Beck, 1987), 58. A similar control of nature was achieved by Roman wall-painters who represented vast panoramic views of conquered sea and land.

25 Stat. *Silv*. 2.2. 85 ff.

House-building, therefore, is described in terms of environmental conquest. In Statius's poem, the environment is the land around the Bay of Naples, the conqueror or *dominus* is Pollius and by extension, the luxury maritime villa itself. As studies of housing throughout the Empire reveal, the environment is often the far-flung province and the conquering *dominus* is Roman power or influence. The use of conquest or domestication language in the context of house-building is a feature worthy of note. At one level, it is illustrative of a mentality of domination which is operative in society in general. The notion of world control is well exemplified, for example, in the *Res Gestae* of Augustus. [26] The preface announces, that Augustus "brought the world under the empire of the Roman people" [27] and the subsequent text demonstrates this by providing lists of territory and peoples conquered (or re-conquered) under his leadership. [28] This *orbis terrarum* with Rome at its centre, is portrayed in Roman propaganda as extending "to the limits of the earth." [29] It is realm constantly charted and advertised in such forms as Agrippa's world

---

26 On the *Res Gestae*, see Ch. 3 (pages 131 n.32 and 132 n. 37).

27 The preface refers to "*Rerum gestarum divi Augusti, quibus orbem terrarum imperio populi romani subiecit, et impensarum quas in rem publicam populumque fecit..*" As noted by Brunt and Moore (*Res Gestae*, 38), it "was clearly devised for a provincial copy of the *RG* but it is presumably modelled on the title of the original at Rome." See also *ibid.*, 1-2.

28 Chapters 25-33 of the text provide a geographical survey of the Roman empire and the successes over foreign nations. As outlined by C. Nicolet (*Space, Geography and Politics in the Early Roman Empire* [Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1991], 20), "the document contains no less than fifty-five geographical names divided into four large categories. First come Rome and Italy along with the names of fourteen provinces: Achaia, Aegyptus, Africa, Asia, Cyrenae, Galliae [*sic*], Germania, Hispaniae [*sic*], Illyricum, Macedonia, Narbonensis, Pisidia, Sicilia and Syria. Secondly, there are the names of countries and peoples: peoples defeated and annexed, peoples subjected, countries to which expeditions or exploratory missions were sent, ancient enemies of peoples with whom Augustus was the first to have contact, distant peoples who sent deferential embassies, and finally peoples who requested or received kings from the Romans. There are twenty-four such peoples or countries: the Adiabeni, Aethiopia, the Albani, Arabia Eudaimon, Armenia, the Bastarnae, the Britanni, the Charydes (or Herudes), the Cimbri, the Daci, the Dalmati, the Germani, the Hiberi, India, the Marcomani, the Medi, the Pannoni, the Parthi, the Sabaei, the Sarmatae, the Scythae, the Semnones, the Suevi and the Sugambri. Thirdly, there are the names of the four rivers: the Albis, the Danuvius, the Rhenus and the Tanaïs (the Don); one mountain range, the Alpes; three seas: the Oceanus (the one in the northwest), the Hadrianum mare and the Tuscum mare and the Oriens; and fourthly, the names of towns (or of *oppida*) numbering six: Actium and Ariminum, Gades, Mariba, Meroë and Nabata."

29 According to Diodorus Siculus 40.4, Pompey (by conquering "all the nations that dwell between the Pontic and the Red Seas") extended the "frontiers of the empire to the limits of the earth" (τὰ ὅρια τῆς ἡγεμονίας τοῖς ὅροις τῆς γῆς).

map [30] and Strabo's geography which is but a verbal map of a world (largely) under Roman control. [31] The concern with control and domination also includes the counting of people (census) and the quantifying of their property, "especially real and landed property" (the cadastres). [32] In a society in which this ideology of world control is predominant, it is not surprising that conquest metaphors are applied to all aspects of life.. including house-building. At another level, the description of villa-building in terms of world-conquest is more than a metaphor. Roman-style houses were an instrument and expression of imperial conquest, a sign of the Roman way in foreign lands and cultures. In other words, incorporation into the Empire was seen in the presence of certain types of housing. The demise of empire too was signalled in housing evidence. With the decline of the empire came a gradual decline in the appearance of housing types regarded as typically Roman, as evidence regarding both the peristyle house [33] and the rural villa [34] has illustrated.

---

30 On the world map of Agrippa, see Nicolet, *Space, Geography and Politics,* Ch.5: Representation of Space: Agrippa's Geographical Work. See also O. A. W. Dilke, *Greek and Roman Maps* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1985). Commissioned under Julius Caesar (100-44 B.C.E.) and completed under Augustus, it is known today through literary sources only. Pliny (*NH* 3.[2].17), informs us that this map of the *orbis terrarum* was put on display for all Romans to see (*cum orbem terrarum urbi spectandum propositurus esset..*) in a *porticus* in the imperial capital. The place in question is identified by Nicolet (*Space*, 100) as the *Porticus Vipsania* in the *Campus Martius*. J. M. Scott ("Luke's Geographical Horizon" in Gill and Gempf [eds], *The Book of Acts in its Graeco-Roman Setting,* 488-489), argues that the map was used as an instrument of propaganda to further Roman imperial expansion by promoting the establishment of colonies and encouraging trade throughout the empire and beyond.

31 The work of Strabo provides a detailed description of an οἰκουμένη largely under Roman control. On the pro-Roman sentiments of Strabo, see the Introduction of the Loeb edition, especially xix-xxi. See also Josephus (*BJ* 2.345-401) who states (in a speech in the mouth of King Agrippa II at the start of the war) that the universe is subject to Rome (ὑποτέτακται τὰ πάντα).

32 Nicolet, *Space, Geography and Politics,* 149. For detailed treatment, see Nicolet's Ch. 6: Control of the Human Sphere: The Census and Ch. 7: Control of the Fiscal Sphere: The Cadastres.

33 S. Ellis, "The End of the Roman House", *American Journal of Archaeology*, Vol. 92 / 4 (1988), 564-576. Ellis argues that the disappearance of the Roman peristyle house marks the end of the ancient world and its way of life. No new peristyle houses were built after 550 C.E.

34 Percival, *Roman Villa,* 41. According to Percival, the decline of the villa was inevitable. An institution integrated into the social and economic organization of the Roman world was unlikely to survive its collapse and remain untouched.

The notion of "Roman world, Roman housing" gives the impression that contact between imperial power and indigenous people was a one-way process, a simple matter of building Roman houses in foreign parts. The link between Roman οἰκουμένη and οἶκοι / οἰκίαι, however, reveals the contact to be multi-faceted. Some examples do involve contact "from above", in the form of imposition or importation of Roman style buildings in both new and re-founded cities. The example of housing from Roman Corinth [35] (albeit scanty) is illustrative of this tendency. While Corinth had a long history, its destruction by the Romans in 146 B.C.E. resulted in its being virtually unoccupied for a century. The colony, refounded and re-built [36] under the orders of Julius Caesar in 44 B.C.E. was, therefore, a virtually new city; it was in fact a "little Rome" [37] which had few links with its former glory. [38] While only four houses have been excavated, [39] each reveals

---

35 Corinth was the capital of the Roman province of Achaia. It was a wealthy, commercial and cosmopolitan city, more significant than Athens at the level of politics, economics and intellectual life. For a list of ancient references to Corinth, see Murphy-O'Connor, *St. Paul's Corinth* : They include texts from Pausanias, Antipater of Sidon, Polystratus, Cicero, Crinagoras, Strabo, Livy, Propertius, Vitruvius, Philo, Petronius, Pliny the Elder, Josephus, Martial, Dio Chrysostom, Plutarch, Juvenal, Pliny the Younger, Athenaeus, Suetonius, Appian, Aelius Aristides, Apuleius, Alciphron, Dio Cassius, Philostratus. See also Blue, "Acts and the House Church", 119-222.

36 On the rebuilding of Corinth, carried out in various phases, see Boëthius and Ward-Perkins, *Etruscan and Roman Architecture*, 369 ff .

37 According to J. H. Kent (*Corinth VIII / 3. The Inscriptions 1926-1950* [Princeton: American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 1966], 23), from the beginning "the colony was organized on a tri-partite basis of an assembly of citizen voters, a city council and annual magistrates; her civic government, which continued to function without any major changes until early Byzantine times, thus conformed to a pattern typical of the great majority of Roman *coloniae*, and was in effect a miniature replica of the government of Republican Rome." Its official title (as noted by Kent, *Corinth*, 60, 70) was *Colonia Laus Julia Corinthiensis.*

38 See Boëthius and Ward-Perkins (*Etruscan and Roman Architecture*, 369 ff.) for reference to the restoration of the city's Hellenistic buildings and features.

39 See J. Wiseman, "Corinth and Rome I : 228 B.C. - A.D. 267", *ANRW* 7 /1:528. See also H. S. Robinson, *The Urban Development of Ancient Corinth* (Princeton: American School of Classical Studies in Athens, 1965) and for a summary of the evidence, see Blue, "Acts and the House Churches", 153-161.

significant parallels with dwellings of the wealthy in Italy. The first, though incomplete, [40] is a large first (or second) century dwelling (figs 5.13-14). [41] It has rooms of similar proportion to the Pompeian House of the Vettii [42] and displays the characteristic Roman atrium, *impluvium* and mosaics. [43] The second house, the so-called villa at Anaploga (figs 5.15-16), [44] also has an atrium and *impluvium*. In addition, it possesses a room (possibly a *triclinium*) with a mosaic floor. [45] A marble-floored atrium was discovered in the third house which is an early Roman structure. [46] In the fourth, there were three rooms with mosaic floors. [47] The archaeological evidence, therefore, paltry as it is, confirms the existence of wealthy residential quarters referred to in the writings of ancient authors. [48]

---

40 Only five rooms have been excavated. Shear claims, however, that the house was originally bigger. See T. L. *Corinth*: *Results of Excavations Conducted by the American School of Classical Studies at Athens.* Vol. 5: *The Roman Villa* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1930) 17 and "Excavations at Corinth in 1925", *AJA* 29 (1925), 391

41 See Shear, "Excavations" , 391-397. The house is situated near the Sicyonian Gate about a kilometre from the theatre. See figs 5.13 and 5.14 (Blue, "Acts and the House Church", fig. 17 [after Shear, *Roman Villa,* fig.3] and fig. 18 [based on Shear, *op. cit.*, pl.1]).

42 See fig. 4.9: House of the Vettii, Pompeii (Wallace-Hadrill, *Houses and Society*, fig. 3.3).

43 For the detail of the mosaics, see Shear, *Roman Villa*, 19 f. and "Excavations", 391 ff.

44 This house is situated about 750 meters west of Temple E and south of the Odeion. Although excavated in 1962-64, the findings have not been published. The mosaic floors, however, have been published by S. G. Miller, "A Mosaic Floor from a Roman Villa at Anaploga", *Hesp.* 41 (19720, 332-354, Pl. 65-73. On the Villa of Anaploga, see fig. 5.15 for the ground plan and fig. 5.16 for a reconstruction (Blue, "Acts and the House Church", fig. 19 [based on Miller, "A Mosaic Floor", fig. 2] and fig. 20 [based on the drawing by L. Ritmeyer]).

45 See fig. 13d, Room 3, Fig. 19 for the atrium and *impluvium*. For the *triclinium* and mosaic floor, see Miller, "Villa at Anaploga", 333, n. 8. See also Murphy-O'Connor, *St. Paul's Corinth*, 155.

46 The atrium is part of a part of a large house located outside the *peribolos* around Temple "E" (fig. 21). The details of this house are still unpublished. Although discovered in 1933 [by Sterling Dow], it has received but little attention from J. K. Anderson in "Corinth: Temple E Northwest. Preliminary Report 1965", *Hesp.* 36 (1967), 1-12).

47 Reported by S. S. Weinberg, *Corinth; Results of Excavations Conducted by the American School of Classical Studies at Athens.* Vol. 1, *v: The Southeast Building, The Twin Basilicas, The Mosaic House* (Princeton: The American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 1960) 113-122, Pl. 53-57. The house is dated to about 200 C.E. and is located on the east wall of the South Basilica.

48 Dio Chrysostom (*Or.* 6.1) refers to the wealth and beauty of Corinth and Athens. In *Or.* 6.3-4, he refers to Craneion as "a spacious park-like suburb, which was the most desirable residential

Furthermore, it reveals housing which may be described as Roman in both chronological and stylistic senses. Romanization, however, was not simply a process "from above", a military conquest followed by plantation of people and all things Roman. Like all colonization, it involved a degree of "collusion of belief and expression...between those above and those below." [49] This collusion of provincials is a complex phenomenon, involving (as it did) a struggle to survive, a desire for self-enhancement by integration in the Roman world and a need to "establish a sense of belonging in a society that perpetually threatened to reject them." [50] Just like the issue of Roman citizenship, for example, so the building of Roman-style dwellings by indigenous people is one example of the contact of collusion. Such dwellings were, in the main, the homes of the provincial ruling classes. As has been outlined earlier, (good) housing both expressed and created (high) social status. These house-owners were also the sponsors of building projects fostered by laws and municipal charters. [51] Their houses were an advertisement of the fact of being Roman, a signal of the adoption of Roman ways and values. They pointed to a level of integration into the social, cultural and economic life of the Roman empire [52] and to a Roman influence in the minutiae of daily life. Conversely, provincials were themselves agents in the

---

and recreational area in Corinth....." On the wealth of Corinth, see also Theissen, *Social Setting,* 100 f.

49 From M. Griffin, "*Urbs Roma, Plebs* and *Princeps*" in L Alexander (ed.), *Images of Empire* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991) and quoted in the Introduction, 14. This view is echoed in contemporary studies of more recent European empires. See, for example, P. Marshall, "Overseas Expansion and Empire", *History Today 41* (May, 1991), 32-36 (esp. p. 33). A similar view is found K. Branigan's essay ("Images - or Mirages - of Empire? An Archaeological Approach to the Problem" in Alexander (ed), *Images of Empire*, 91-106) on the archaeological evidence for indigenous views of the Roman empire from Roman Britain.

50 Wallace-Hadrill, *Houses and Society*, 184.

51 On laws and municipal charters fostering building schemes, see McKay, *Houses, Villas and Palaces*, 157. For a fuller discussion and reference to the building of houses by provincials, see M. Goodman, *The Roman World, 44BC-AD180* (London: Routledge, 1997), 150-152. As noted by Goodman, see also G. M. Rogers, *The Sacred Identity of Ephesos: Foundation Myths of a Roman City* (London: Routledge, 1991) on how local magistrates used civic evergetism to mediate between the desires of their compatriots and the Roman state.

52 This is how Percival (*The Roman Villa*, 36, 38) reads the evidence of thousands of villas, of somewhat similar plan, in the western provinces of the empire.

construction of empire.[53] By the collusion, represented in their Roman-style building, they extended the meaning, value and visibility of *Romanitas* to the ends of the *orbis terrarum*.

Another aspect of contact between imperial power and province is the marriage or dialogue of cultures. In the area of housing, this is seen in the juxtaposition of elements of Roman and indigenous style. In Alesia (Alise-Sainte-Reine, Côte d'Or), [54] for example, houses have been found to combine both Celtic and Roman elements. The former in seen in deep storage cellars, while the latter is detectable in strong stone walls with narrow windows. Similar local flavour has been noted in the case of rural villas.[55] On the one hand, the juxtaposition phenomenon reveals both inculturation (the expression of *Romanitas* in the local context) and transculturation (the picking and choosing from Roman elements on the part of provincials for use in a new self-expression). On the other hand, it is indicative of national resistance to imperial power. Housing bearing juxtaposed Roman and native elements often occurs in areas where national sentiment ran high. In this regard, the case of Alesia is significant. It was the capital of the Mandubii who (under their leader, Vercingetorix) led the Gallic resistance against Rome. [56] Further examples come from Palestine and it is to the evidence from Jerusalem that attention now turns.

---

53 On the constructed nature of *Romanitas,* see Wallace-Hadrill, *Houses and Society*, 185.

54 McKay, *Houses, Villas and Palaces*, 164, 252 n. 295.

55 See Percival, *Roman Villa.*

56 They were defeated by Julius Caesar in 51 B.C.E.

THE EVIDENCE FROM JERUSALEM

Reading contact through housing: a vignette from Jerusalem

The imperial / indigenous encounter has been documented in Palestine in a way unparalleled in many other Roman provinces.[57] This is because written sources [58] by provincials (such as Josephus and Christian authors) [59] offer insight into Jewish-Roman relations from an indigenous perspective and thus provide a complement to the purely Roman version of history. The relative abundance of such sources has enabled the complex history of the period to be explored: from the arrival of Pompey in 63 B.C.E., through the establishment of the procuratorship in 6 C.E., to the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus in 70 C.E. and the planned establishment of *Aelia Capitolina* under Hadrian in 135 C.E. Interwoven with such Roman interventions, is the parallel decline of the Hasmonaean kingdom, the rise and role of the Herodian dynasty,[60] the first revolt of 66-70 C.E.[61] and the Bar Kochba revolt of 132-135 C.E. [62]

Along with written sources, archaeology is also unearthing valuable evidence of the

---

57 On the history of the period see E. Schürer, rev. G. Vermes *et al.*, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ*, 175 BC - AD 135 (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1973-1987), Vol. 1. 243-557. The unparalleled nature of the evidence been stressed by Goodman, *The Roman World, 44 BC-AD 180*, 251.

58 For examples of the abundant material from a Jewish perspective, see the revised Schürer, Vol. 1, 17-122.

59 On Josephus, see T. Rajak, *Josephus: The Historian and His Society* (London: Duckworth, 1983).

60 On Herod (the Great), see Joseph. *AJ* 15 -17: 1-8 and *BJ* 1.18-33. See also A. H. M. Jones, *The Herods of Judaea* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1938). On the members of the Herodian dynasty, see the revised Schürer, Vol 1: 287-329, 336-357, 442-454, 471-483.

61 See M. Goodman, *The Ruling Class of Judaea: The Origins of the Jewish Revolt against Rome, AD 66-70* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987).

62 See P. Schäfer, *Der Bar Kokhba - Aufstand: Studien zum zweiten jüdischen Krieg gegen Rom* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1981) and B. Isaac and A. Oppenheimer, "The Revolt of Bar Kochba: ideology and modern scholarship", *JJS* 36 (1985), 33-60.

contact of cultures. [63] The vast building programme of Herod the Great (37 B.C.E. - 4 C.E.), for example, is very literally a monumental source of information on the period. [64] As this section demonstrates, however, many aspects of the multi-faceted encounter between empire and province emerge from reading a much less spectacular "text", namely, a small sample of housing material from Jerusalem. [65]

Locating the evidence

the upper city

The housing evidence from Jerusalem [66] comes from the Jewish Quarter of the old city (fig. 5.17-19). [67] In the Second Temple period, this area was known as the "upper city" or "upper market". [68] Situated on the west side of Jerusalem, it was higher than other parts of the city and enjoyed a cool sea breeze. As a result, it was (according to

---

63 For an overview, see M. Avi-Yonah (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land,* 4 Vols (London: Oxford University Press, 1976). See also reports of work in progress published in the *IEJ.*

64 Herod built monuments, fortresses and palaces (at Masada, Jerusalem and Jericho), entire cities (like Samaria-Sébaste) according to the best of Roman standards. His *magnus opus* was the rebuilding of the Jerusalem Temple.

65 On housing in Jerusalem, see N. Avigad, "Excavations in the Jewish Quarter of the Old City of Jerusalem, 1969/70 (Preliminary Report)", *IEJ* 20 (1970), 1-8, "Excavations in the Jewish Quarter of the Old City of Jerusalem, 1970 (Second Preliminary Report)", *IEJ* 20 (1970), 129-140, *Archaeological Discoveries in the Jewish Quarter of Jerusalem. Second Temple Period,* (The Israel Museum, Jerusalem. Goldman-Schwarz Hall. Spring 1976. Cat. No. 144), *Discovering Jerusalem* (Nashville: Nelson, 1983).

66 On Jerusalem, see M. Avi-Yonah, "Jerusalem in the Hellenistic and Roman Periods", Chapter 6 in M. Avi-Yonah (ed.), *The World History of the Jewish People.* Vol. 7: *The Herodian Period* (London: W. H. Allen, 1975). On the description of the city in general, see Joseph. *BJ* 5.4-5 and Tac. *Hist.* 5.2.3.

67 Fig. 5.17: Jerusalem at the end of the Second Temple Period (Avi-Yonah, "Jerusalem in the Hellenistic and Roman Periods", *World History* 7, 209), fig. 5.18: A plan of the old city (Avigad, *Discovering Jerusalem*, fig. 2) and fig. 5.19: The excavated sites in the Jewish Quarter (Avigad, *Discovering Jerusalem*, fig. 8).

68 Joseph. *BJ* 2. 305: τὴν ἄνω καλουμένην ἀγορὰν. For other references to the upper market, see Joseph. *BJ* 2. 315, 339 and 5.137.

ancient sources) the residential area of the "δυνατοὶ" (the powerful) and the "ἀρχιερεῖς" (high priests),[69] that is, the important and the wealthy. [70] The discovery of housing dating from the Herodian period [71] provides valuable evidence of a residential area, known previously through written sources only, in a city more renowned for its monumental architecture.

the houses

The main evidence consists of the remains of three houses. There are, in addition, elements and fragments from residences no longer surviving. The first dwelling is the so-called Herodian house, located in Area E (figs 5.20-21). [72] Dated to the reign of Herod (the Great) or slightly earlier, it is a spacious house, with an excavated area of some 200 square metres. Its rooms are arranged around a central courtyard, with a beaten earth floor, in which there are four sunken ovens. To the south, is a cistern for water storage and to the north, a large stepped bath. The house was demolished as part of the road-building planned at the end of Herod's reign. [73] The pavement laid over the ruins probably formed part of one of Upper City's main streets, leading to Robinson's Arch at the corner of the Temple Enclosure.

The second house is the so-called Palatial Mansion (figs. 5.22-23), [74] situated in a row of buildings in Area P, overlooking the Temple Mount. Because of its size and

---

69 Joseph. *BJ* 2.315.

70 On the upper city, see Avi-Yonah, "Jerusalem in the Hellenistic and Roman Periods", *World History* 7 236-238.

71 By the term "Herodian" is meant the period (37 B.C.E. -70 C.E.). For a discussion of the term, see Avigad, *Discovering Jerusalem*, 83.

72 On the Herodian house, see the plan in fig. 5.20 and the excavated area looking northwest in fig. 5.21 (Avigad, *Discovering Jerusalem*, figs 64 and 61). For details, see Avigad, *op. cit.*, 83-95. For Area E, see fig. 5.19.

73 Joseph. *AJ* 20:219-222 refers to the paving of the city streets.

74 See fig. 5.22 for a plan of the Palatial Mansion (Avigad, *Discovering Jerusalem*, fig. 84) and fig. 23 for an isometric view of the premises (Avigad, *op. cit.*, fig. 86 [after Ritmeyer]). For details, see Avigad, *op. cit.*, 95-120. For area P, see fig. 5.19.

splendour, so far unparalleled in Jerusalem, it may in fact have been more than a purely domestic dwelling. [75] With an area of over 600 square metres, it consists of a number of rooms arranged around a central courtyard, thus giving it the appearance of a single dwelling. On the ground floor, the fairly well-preserved western wing consists of two rows of interconnected rooms. On the eastern wing, only a small bathroom remains. Two stairways lead to a lower level, in which several rooms survive and these are built on a type of terrace. A notable feature of the remains is the large number of vaulted stepped pools. This house was burned and destroyed in 70 C.E.

The third dwelling is the Burnt house in Area B (figs 5.24-25). [76] It is so called because it was the first of its type found and is more impressive than other burnt houses later discovered. The area uncovered (some 55 square metres) is believed to be part of the subterranean storey of a bigger structure. Dense building in the location, however, prevents further excavation. [77] The plan, as far as it can be reconstructed, includes a small paved courtyard, five rooms (including a kitchen) and a stepped bath. This house was destroyed by fire in 70 C.E.

Along with these three dwellings, a number of house-parts have been unearthed. These include water installations (such as baths and cisterns), fragments of painted plaster, stucco, and mosaics pavements and a whole variety of objects and vessels. Having located the housing evidence from Jerusalem in the Herodian period , the next task is read it with a focus on issues of contact.

---

75 As noted by Hirschfeld (*Palestinian Dwelling*, 105 n.49), R. Jaeckle ("Das Prätorium des Pilatus in Jerusalem", *DJ* 2 [1990], 59-72) claims that this was the Hasmonaean palace of Jerusalem.

76 See fig. 5.24 for a plan of the Burnt House and fig. 5.25 for an artist's view of the residence (Avigad, *Discovering Jerusalem*, figs 120 and 121). For details, see, Avigad, *op. cit.*, 120-139.

77 Because of the densely built-up nature of the Jewish quarter, identification of the street system has proved impossible and the extent of explorable terrain has been limited.

Reading the evidence of contact

Ground plans of the courtyard house

The evidence of ground plans offers an important point of departure. While the three houses mentioned above differ to a considerable extent, what they do share is a plan in which the rooms are arranged around a simple, inner, non-columned courtyard. [78] This was a sheltered, private space used for a variety of domestic tasks, as (for example) the sunken ovens in the courtyard of the Herodian house illustrate. Such courtyard houses are examples of a traditional housing type found throughout Palestine and the Ancient Near East for millennia. [79] It is a type associated with the rich, [80] for while most Palestinian houses had some form of courtyard, [81] only the wealthy could afford the luxury of spacious urban houses with internal courtyards.

The characteristic feature of the type, namely the internal courtyard, compares and contrasts with the columned atrium and peristyle of wealthy, urban Graeco-Roman houses. In terms of ground plan, the Jerusalem housing differs from both the Greek peristyle house and the Roman *fauces*-atrium-*tablinum*-garden / peristyle type. In a city where the reconstructed Temple Mount (figs. 5.26-27), [82] the centre of Jewishness, bore many of the marks of Graeco-Roman architecture, it is curious that the dwellings of the upper quarter

---

78 On traditional courtyard houses, see Hirschfeld, *Palestinian Dwelling*, 57-85.

79 On the architectural history, see Hirschfeld, *Palestinian Dwelling*, 22-23 and 103 n.3.

80 Hirschfeld (*Palestinian Dwelling*, 22) mentions that ".. courtyard houses, which served as the residences of government officials or local aristocracy, and followed the building traditions of Mesopotamia and Egypt, were excavated in the main Canaanite cities of Megiddo and Tell el-Farah."

81 See Hirschfeld (*Palestinian Dwelling)* on "simple" (24-44) and "complex" (44-57) houses. The simple type was a house built at one side of the courtyard. The complex form, typical in rural settlements, consisted of dwelling units and various wings arranged around part of the courtyard. Many household activities were carried out in the courtyard and people also slept there in summer. In the countryside, courtyards also served as places to store fodder and shelter animals.

82 The Temple Mount. See fig. 5.26: Reconstruction of Western and Southern Walls of the Temple Mount: Herodian period (Avi-Yonah [ed.], *Encyclopedia,* Vol. 2: 604-605) and fig. 5.27: the Court of Women with gate leading into the Court of Israel (Reconstruction by Avi-Yonah in M. Grant, *Herod the Great* [London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1971], 160).

were decidedly traditional in form. In other words, despite centuries of Hellenization dating from the time of Alexander [83] and despite an increasing Roman presence in the first centuries B.C.E. and C.E., the influence on the house plans of the wealthy in Jerusalem, as indeed throughout Palestine in general, [84] appears to have been minimal.

Water installations

- *the evidence*

Apart from the courtyard evidence, the second most striking feature of the houses are the water installations: [85] There are cisterns (hewn into the bed-rock [86]) for the storage of rainwater. [87] For personal use, there is a variety of bath-tubs (fig. 5.28),[88] stepped rock-hewn pools (both open [figs. 5.29a-b] [89] and vaulted [fig. 5.30] [90]) and steam-baths. While water installations are found in the three houses mentioned above, [91]

---

83 For a bibliography and summary of Hellenization, see L. Grabbe, *Judaism from Cyrus to Hadrian*, Vol 1: The Persian and Greek Periods (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992), 147-170. On the history of the region before the Roman conquest, see the revised Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People*, Vol.1: 125-242.

84 On (the relative lack of) atrium-peristyle housing in Palestine, see Hirschfeld, *Palestinian Dwelling*, 85-97.

85 On water installations, see Avigad ("Archaeological Discoveries in the Jewish Quarter of Jerusalem", 14-15) and also the above-mentioned references to the three houses.

86 Cisterns were plastered with grey mortar containing organic matter like soot or ash which acted as a sealing agent.

87 Rain was the principal source of water in the residential quarter.

88 Fig. 5.28: Bath tub (Avigad, *Discovering Jerusalem*, fig. 176).

89 Figs. 5.29 a-b: Stepped pools (Avigad, *Discovering Jerusalem*, figs 143-144).

90 Fig. 5.30: Vaulted pool in area F-3 (Avigad, *Discovering Jerusalem*, fig. 147). Avigad ("Archaeological Discoveries in the Jewish Quarter of Jerusalem", 14) applies the term "reservoir" to a number of vaulted, stepped pools of various sizes (the average being 3 by 4 m.). It is unclear whether they were for water-storage or for bathing.

91 The eastern wing of the ground floor of the Palatial Mansion contains a bathroom, with a small stepped pool, while on the lower level, are many cisterns and stepped pools. The Burnt house has a small, stepped bath and the Herodian residence has a cistern for water storage and a large,

many others are scattered throughout the Jewish Quarter and are evidently part of residences no longer traceable. Many are grouped together in bathroom complexes, such as the one in Area T-4 with its vestibule, stepped bath, store pool and bathroom (figs 5..31-32). [92] In sum, there is an abundance of facilities connected with the storage and use of water.

- *ritual baths*

The stepped pools have been interpreted as ritual baths or *miqva'ot*. [93] Biblical law (Lev. 11-15) had prescribed ritual bathing, the purpose of which was to restore cultic purity to things and persons that had lost it. It was not until later rabbinic law, however, that detailed specifications for the design of the tank, as well as the amount and kind of water were outlined. [94] The ritual bath was to have a minimum depth of 1.2 meters and was to hold no less than 40 *seahs* (about 750 litres) of spring or rainwater, drawn directly into the bath. [95] Furthermore, separate entrances and exits ensured the separation of descending bathers (who were impure) and ascending ones (who had been purified). [96] It is on the basis of their resemblance to such descriptions that the Jerusalem stepped pools are classified as *miqva'ot*. The double entrance has been observed in a pool in the Palatial Mansion and a

---

stepped and (partly) vaulted pool.

92 On the bathing complex in Area T-4, see figs 5.31-32 (Avigad, *Discovering Jerusalem*, figs 175 and 145. See Area T-4, on fig. 5.19.

93 On Jewish ritual baths, see Avigad, *Discovering Jerusalem*, 139-143. See also R. Reich, "Miqwa'ot (Jewish Ritual Baths) in the Second Temple Period and the Period of the Mishnah and Talmud" (In Hebrew, with English summary) (Ph.D. Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 1990.) Although it is not certain that the pools are *miqva'ot*, Avigad, Reich and others have argued that they are.

94 On *miqva'ot*, see *JE* s.v. "Mikweh", "Ablution", "Bathing" and E. P. Sanders, *Judaism. Practice and Belief, 63 BCE - 66CE* (London: SCM, 1992), 224-229.

95 According to Avigad (*Discovering Jerusalem*, 139), since this was not always easy, impure water was made suitable by contact with ritually pure water. A special store pool of at least 40 seahs' capacity, therefore, was often installed near the ritual bath in order to hold pure rainwater.

96 As noted by Avigad (*Discovering Jerusalem*, 142), there is reference in the Mishnah (*Shekalim* 8.2)to separate entrances and exits for ritual pools.

token separation (in the form of a stairs with a dividing line) is visible in another in Area J (fig. 5.33). [97] What may have been footbaths, used before entering a ritual pool, were also found, such as the one in the Herodian house (figs 5.34a-b). [98] The presence of *miqva'ot*, in Jerusalem as elsewhere, is read as a sign of Jewish presence, for adherence to the purity laws was a uniquely Jewish practice.

The presence of so many *miqva'ot* in the upper quarter of Jerusalem is perhaps not surprising. In the capital, ritual purity was of special concern to those with religious duties associated with the Temple. As already noted, many of the most influential and aristocratic of these, namely the ἀρχιερεῖς (the high or chief priests), [99] lived in the Upper City. Supported generously by the people for their service, these were some of the wealthiest families in Jerusalem and according to Philo, even the poorest priests were well-to-do. [100] The presence of ritual baths was one way of ensuring and advertising their piety. It was also a means of safeguarding the (religious, social and economic) privileges to which they were entitled as members of the priestly caste.[101] By their observance of the rules of ritual bathing, both female and male members of priestly families contributed to the on-going construction of their ethnicity and caste. [102]

---

97 Fig. 5.33: Steps with token division in Area J (Avigad, *Discovering Jerusalem*, fig. 149). See Area J on fig.5.19.

98 Figs 5.34 a-b: The footbath (Avigad, *Discovering Jerusalem*, figs. 62 and 63). As suggested by Avigad (*op. cit.*, 86), this may be the footbath described in Mishnah, *Yadaim* 4.1. It was found near the entrance to the bath and consists of a stone with a bowl-like hollow; it has a knob at the centre, surrounded by three perforations.

99 As noted by Sanders (*Judaism*, 328), at the level of both Hebrew and Greek terminology, it is impossible to distinguish between "high" and "chief" priests.

100 Philo, *Spec. Leg.* 1.133.

101 The observance of ritual purity was not the preserve of the aristocratic priestly caste. Pharisees and Essenes, for example, had their own (strict) interpretation and practices regarding purity. It is interesting that most ritual baths (with one exception) found in the aristocratic Jewish Quarter do not have storage pools, the function of which was to purify (by contact) any drawn water added to the bath because of evaporation. Their absence reveals a standard of ritual purity other than that held by the Pharisees. By contrast, in the smaller houses in other parts of Jerusalem, presumably occupied by Pharisees, most *miqva'ot* have storage pools attached to baths. For the discussion, see Sanders, *Judaism*, 226-227.

102 On the notion of the *miqveh* as an instrumentality for creating Jewishness, see Sawicki, "Archaeology as space technology", 341-343. Sawicki is actually discussing the evidence for Sepphoris but her remarks are applicable in the Jerusalem context too.

A *miqveh,* therefore, was used for a singularly Jewish ritual. It was especially essential in the Upper City, where male priests had to observe, and be seen to observe, a high level of ritual purity in order to maintain their pedigree. As argued by Sawicki, the abundance of *miqva'ot* in the Roman period was also an expression of adaptation and (symbolic) resistance to Roman water architecture (aqueducts, baths, fountains...) which was everywhere on display. The *miqveh* was a way of making and remaking Jewishness, which was constantly under threat from without, as well as from within. [103]

While *miqva'ot* are quintessentially Jewish, however, they are often found throughout the Jewish Quarter in bathroom complexes akin to those seen throughout the Hellenistic and Roman world.[104] The cold-water *miqveh* appears as one of a series of facilities, akin to the *frigidarium,* after which one could bathe in a tub of warmed water or have a uniquely Roman-style steam bath. [105] This *miqveh-in-the-bathroom* phenomenon offers a fascinating glimpse into issues of contact: On the one hand, it shows that (upper-class) Jews welcomed and participated in the (Graeco-)Roman world and its culture and on the other, it demonstrates how they succeeded in asserting their ethnic identity within that world. This is a phenomenon which will emerge from several other aspects of housing remains.

Décor [106]

Examples of wall-paintings, stucco and mosaic pavements have been found in the Palatial Mansion and, in fragment form, throughout the Jewish Quarter.

---

103 See Sawicki, "Caste and Contact", 28-30 and "Spatial Management", 26-34.

104 For details, see for example, F. Yegül, *Baths and Bathing in Classical Antiquity* (New York: MIT, 1992).

105 See Avigad ("Archaeological Discoveries in the Jewish Quarter of Jerusalem", 14-15) on the steam baths. Hypocausts (heating chambers) have been found beneath their mosaic floors.

106 On décor, see Avigad (*Discovering Jerusalem*) for details of the houses (already given) and see also his sections on "The Menorah Graffito and Fresco Fragments" (147-150) and "Early Mosaic Pavements" (144-146).

- *wall-painting*

Both the walls and ceilings of the Palatial Mansion's large room 4 were ornamented in stucco (fig. 5.35). [107] The walls were in imitation ashlar masonry (fig. 5.36), [108] a style which originated in Greece and was common in the Hellenistic cities of Asia Minor. In the late Hellenistic period, the style reached Italy and remained in fashion (as evidenced in the so-called First Style at Pompeii) [109] until the first century B.C.E. The geometric pattern of the ceiling in the mansion is similar to examples found in Pompeii in the first century B.C.E. (figs 5.37-38). [110] In room 3, a wall some two and half metres high, is covered with frescoes: this consists of red and yellow panels with imitation windows and other ornamental features (fig. 5.39), [111] ending in a type of cornice. This example of true and costly fresco [112] is akin to many found at Pompeii. In room 5 of the house, fragments of a fresco were discovered underneath plain plastered walls. Depicting "fluted Ionic columns bearing a schematic Doric frieze" (figs 5.40a-b), [113] these fragments represent the first example of an architectural painting known in Palestine and resemble architectural frescoes of the Second Style of Pompeii. As noted (but not explained) by Avigad, [114] this fresco-under- plain plaster represents a contrast to Pompeii: there it was the *earlier* (as

---

107 Fig. 5.35: A room in the Palatial Mansion with walls and ceiling ornamented in stucco (Avigad, *Discovering Jerusalem*, fig. 90). For the hall, see fig. 5.22, room 4.

108 Fig. 5.36: Imitation ashlar masonry in stucco (Avigad, *Discovering Jerusalem*, fig. 88).

109 On the styles at Pompeii, see A. Mau, *Pompeii. It Life and Art*, trans. F. W. Kelsey , new edition revised and corrected (London: Macmillan, 1902).

110 Fig. 5.37-38: Moulded stucco fragments from the ceiling of the hall and reconstructed geometric pattern (Avigad, *Discovering Jerusalem,* figs. 89 and 91).

111 Fig. 5.39: Palatial Mansion, fresco from room 3 depicting panels and architectural motifs (Avigad, *Discovering Jerusalem*, fig. 103).

112 See Avigad (*Discovering Jerusalem*, 99, 149) for a description of fresco technique. In fresco, painting is done onto fresh, wet plaster. The pigment is thereby absorbed and thus can neither peel off nor be erased.

113 Avigad, *Discovering Jerusalem*, 103. Figs 5.40a-b: Fresco beneath plain plaster, depicting a column and entablature (Avigad, *op. cit.,* figs. 104 and 105).

114 Avigad, *Discovering Jerusalem*, 103.

opposed to the later) walls which were in stucco of imitation ashlar (the First Style) while frescoes came into vogue at a later date (Second Style). Painted plaster fragments have been found in other houses in Area A. Illustrating both fresco and *secco* [115] techniques, they come in many colours and in a variety of floral and architectural patterns (fig. 5.41). [116] The motif of apples and pomegranates with foliage, for example, is part of a well-known garland motif in Hellenistic-Roman art (figs 5.42-43). [117] In its naturalistic nature and high quality, it is typical of Hellenistic painting and also resembles early wall paintings at Pompeii. Finally, unpainted plaster fragments of an incomplete *menorah* (seven-branched candelabrum) were found (fig. 5.44). [118] The fragment is significant in that depictions of this Jewish symbol were rare at this time but its precise location and interpretation within a house context is impossible.

Wall paintings in the houses of the wealthy Jerusalemites, therefore, were those seen in the homes of their social peers in both Hellenistic and Roman society. Frescoes in Jerusalem, however, differ from those abroad in their almost complete lack of animate motifs. Jews of the period, Hellenizers and friends of Rome included, apparently adhered to biblical prohibitions against the use of graven images. [119]

---

115 See Avigad (*Discovering Jerusalem*, 149) for a description of dry or *secco* technique. It is a simple and less costly method. As the paint is applied directly to dry plaster, the pigment tends to peel off and is effaced by touching.

116 Fig. 5.41: Fresco fragments (Avigad, *Discovering Jerusalem*, fig. 168-171). See Area A on fig. 5.19.

117 See fig. 5.42: fresco fragment depicting pomegranates and foliage and fig. 5.43: fragment with apples and foliage (Avigad, *Discovering Jerusalem*, figs 166 and 167).

118 Fig. 5.44: Menorah fragment (Avigad, *Discovering Jerusalem*, fig. 154).

119 According to Avigad, this is also true of frescoes at Masada and Jericho. He cites the exceptional example (p. 150) of fresco fragments depicting birds, which was found in excavations (led by Broshi) on Mount Zion.

- *mosaics* [120]

Many mosaics have been found in or near rooms where water is used. On the lower level of the Palatial Mansion, the vestibule of a vaulted pool was paved in mosaic. This had a black and white checkerboard pattern set in a red frame (fig. 5.45). [121] On the eastern wing of the ground floor, the mosaic pavement of a small bathroom depicts a six-petalled rosette in black and red (fig. 5.46). [122] A somewhat similar three-petalled rosette pattern appears in a mosaic in a bathroom in Area F-4 (fig. 5.47). [123] In the vestibule of a bathing complex in Area F-3, there is a mosaic with a square in wave-crest pattern, enclosing a circle with a rosette (figs 5.48a-b). [124] According to Avigad,[125] the rosette pattern was common in Jewish art of this period.

Mosaics are less common in rooms other than bathroom complexes. In room 2 of the Palatial Mansion, fragments of a mosaic floor reveal an outer frame with meander pattern and an inner round border of guilloche design. The corners between the round and the square frames contain pomegranates. [126] A floor in Area F has a frame of triangular crowsteps, a guilloche and a wave-crest pattern in black and red, while its central part

---

120 As noted by Avigad (*Discovering Jerusalem*, 144), the mosaic pavements found in Jewish Quarter are among the first found in Jerusalem and the first ascribed to the Second Temple period. Ten ornamental ones and numerous plainer ones have been discovered, although many are partially destroyed. Contemporaneous mosaics have been found in Herod's palaces in Masada and Jericho.

121 Fig. 5.45: Vestibule with mosaic pavement in checkerboard pattern (Avigad, *Discovering Jerusalem*, fig. 100).

122 Fig. 5.46: Mosaic pavement in bathroom of the Palatial Mansion (Avigad, *Discovering Jerusalem*, fig. 162).

123 Fig. 5.47: Mosaic-paved bathroom in area F-4 (Avigad, *Discovering Jerusalem*, fig. 163). See Area F-4 on fig. 5.19.

124 Figs 5.48a-b: Mosaic pavement in vestibule of bath complex in Area F-3 (Avigad, *Discovering Jerusalem*, figs. 160 and 161). The presence of a spindle bottle, situated between the frame and circle, helps to date the mosaic to the time of Herod the Great at the latest. See Area F-3 fig. 5.19.

125 Avigad, *Discovering Jerusalem*, 144.

126 See figs 5.57-58 in the "fire and destruction" section below.

consists of intertwined meanders (fig. 5.49). [127] A mosaic pavement in Area O-2 has a central rosette within a square frame. In the corners between the roundel and square frame is a pattern resembling the Greek letter gamma (fig. 5.50), [128] one which became common in the Roman-Byzantine period. Traces of another form of flooring, known as *opus sectile* to the Romans, were found in a room in Area M. Made up of coloured stone tiles (rather than small cubes), this floor pattern has been reconstructed to reveal an interlocking circles made up of alternating black squares and red triangles (fig. 5.51).[129]

As with wall-paintings, so too with mosaics and tiled floors, there is a lack of animate motifs. On the one hand, therefore, the residents of the upper city had a décor akin to the best of Hellenistic and Roman style, one revealing a high level of both artistic skill and cost. On the other hand, they gave both frescoes and mosaics a decidedly local flavour by their following of the biblical injunction against graven images.

Objects

While recognizing that the interpretation of object finds is always problematic, consideration is given to a limited number of artifacts which illustrate themes of contact already raised. The first observation is the abundance and variety of stone objects. These include large and small vessels (bowls, plates, cups...), objects both hand-carved and turned on a lathe (fig. 5.52) and of a high artistic standard. [130] There are also tables - a high, rectangular, single-legged type (fig. 5.53) [131] and a round, low three-legged model (fig.

---

127 Fig. 5.49: Mosaic pavement with meander fret-pattern in Area F (Avigad, *Discovering Jerusalem*, fig. 165).

128 Fig. 5.50: Mosaic pavement in are Area 0-2 (Avigad, *Discovering Jerusalem*, fig. 164). See Area 0-2 on fig. 5.19. On the gamma motif, see Avigad , *op. cit.*, 164.

129 Fig. 5.51: *Opus sectile* (Avigad, *Discovering Jerusalem*, fig. 152). See Area M on fig. 5.19.

130 Fig. 5.52: Vessels (Avigad, *Discovering Jerusalem*, fig. 141). These single-legged tables are mentioned in Talmudic literature (Tosefta, *Kelim, Baba Bathra* 3.4).

131 Fig. 5.53: Rectangular stone table (Avigad, *Discovering Jerusalem*, fig. 94). The rectangular table has a single, central leg and an ornamented rectangular top.

5.54). [132] A number of factors contributed to the abundance of stone vessels in Jerusalem. First, such costly ware was fashionable. Stone vessels and furniture are not unique to Jerusalem. Vessels have been found, for example, in the Hellenistic city of Delos in Asia Minor. [133] Stone tables originated in the Hellenistic East and were later common throughout the Roman world. [134] Secondly, there was an availability of local stone and a thriving tradition of stone-craft. Thirdly, stone vessels were of use to observant Jews as such objects were apparently unsusceptible to uncleanness. [135] In contrast to a pottery vessel which had to be broken when it became ritually unclean, a stone one preserved its purity and usability even after contact with uncleanness. In sum, stone-ware too bears witness to a complex contact of cultures: while upper-class Jews were followers of international fashion, they also contributed to it, in that their uniquely ethnic need for stone vessels led to the development of a high quality native stone industry.

Further evidence of the priestly family / Temple / Upper city connection is found in a single stone object found in the Burnt house. This is a weight which bears an inscription in Hebrew (in the square Aramaic script), namely, "(of) Bar Kathros" or "(of) the son of Kathros" (fig. 5.55).[136] In the Babylonian Talmud, mention is made of the House of Kathros, a high priestly family in the Second Temple period. The family is accused of

---

132 Fig. 5.54: Round stone table (Avigad, *Discovering Jerusalem*, fig. 188). These three-legged tables are mentioned in Mishnah, *Kelim* 22.2. The smaller, round, low tables had a limestone top and three wooden legs.

133 Avigad, *Discovering Jerusalem*, 174.

134 Avigad, *Discovering Jerusalem*, 168-171. Hellenistic and Roman paintings and reliefs show rectangular tables used as serving tables to hold drinking vessels. They also depict round ones which were used for meals and were surrounded by guests reclining on couches. It is also noted (*op. cit.*, 172) that Livy (a contemporary of Herod) mentions "tables with one leg" among booty from Asia Minor in the second century B.C.E. when such objects were still a novelty in Rome. Varro (in the first century B.C.E.) describes a "stone table for vessels, square and elongated, on a single small column...: many placed it in the house alongside the central pool. On and near it, when I was a lad, they would put bronze vessels."

135 See Mishnah *Kelim* 10.1 and *Parah* 3.2. As noted by Avigad, one of the clearest literary witnesses to Jewish ritual of purity of stone vessels is in John 2.6 : Now six stone jars were standing there, for the Jewish rites of purification, each holding two or three gallons.

136 Fig. 5.55: Stone weight with inscription, "[of] Bar Kathros" (Avigad, *Discovering Jerusalem*, fig. 128).

slander and (along with others) is said to have abused its privileged position. [137] The truth or falsity of the accusation is not the issue but rather the association of the (Greek) name "Kathros" with an aristocratic, priestly family in Jerusalem. Given the fact that it is an uncommon name and that the weight was found in an area in which priestly families lived, Avigad proposes that the Kathros of the inscription is both a member of the priestly family and the owner of the house. Furthermore, on the basis of the amount of ovens, pots, vessels, mortars, measuring cups and weights found in the basement rooms, it is postulated that the building houses a type of workshop, in which products (like incense or spices) destined for the Temple were produced. [138]

Other objects discovered in the area include luxury items common in wealthy homes throughout the Hellenistic and Roman world. In the Herodian house, for example, findings include a set of red, Eastern *terra sigillata* ware (the finest pottery of late Hellenistic times) and equally fine, Italian-made, Western *terra sigillata* ware. Discovered in the Palatial Mansion were fragments of a superb glass vessel, made by the famous, first century C.E. Phoenician craftsman, Ennion (figs 5.56a-b). [139] *Amphorae* found in the Herodian house bearing Latin inscriptions suggest that the inhabitants drank imported Italian wines, despite the Jewish precept forbidding consumption of foreign, gentile products. [140] In short, both glass-ware and pottery reveal contact with a wider world of international wealth.

Fire and destruction

As noted above, many of the houses were destroyed in 70 C.E. While the account of the destruction of the city is well-known from literary sources, [141] marks of the actual

---

137 See the folk-song preserved in the Babylonian Talmud, *Pesahim* 57. 1. In particular, see the line, " Woe is me because of the *House of Kathros*,....woe is me because of their pens."

138 Avigad, *Discovering Jerusalem*, 129-131.

139 Figs 5.56a-b: Glass pitcher made by Ennion (Avigad, *Discovering Jerusalem*, figs 95 and 96).

140 See Avigad (*Discovering Jerusalem*, 88, 107) on the pottery and glass-ware respectively.

141 For ancient evidence of the first revolt and of the war with Rome, see Joseph. *BJ* 2.271-8. 455, *Vit*. 4-74, Tac. *Hist*. 5.1-13, Suet. *Vesp*. 4-5, 7-8, *Tit*. 4-5, Dio Cass. 66.4-7. The revised

conflagration are now strikingly visible in the housing evidence. In the Palatial Mansion, for example, there are traces of fire on the frescoes in room 3 (fig. 5.39). [142] In room 2, fire-damage is evident both on the ash-covered and charred mosaic floor and in the carbonized ceiling beams which are now collapsed onto the floor (figs 5.57-58). [143] In the Burnt house, excavations revealed rooms full of fallen stones, burnt wood and ashes. Such material covers many objects on the floor (fig. 5.59), [144] recalling (as it does to Avigad) Josephus's description of Roman soldiers looting houses after the conquest of the city. It is in this house too that the only human remains of the tragedy were found in the skeletal remains of the arm of a young woman, leaning against a wall (fig. 5.60). [145] Finally, lying in the debris of fire and destruction are coins from the years of revolt, a revolt which eventually led to the devastation wreaked in Jerusalem. [146]

Until these findings, the event was most vividly recorded in the words of Josephus, [147] who describes the capture and burning of the Upper City, the slaughter of the inhabitants and the looting of residences. Added to these words, there is now another text of those events of the seventh and eighth of *Gorpiaeus* 70 C.E., a text in the form of stone, ash and bone. The text of fire and destruction illustrates another aspect of contact between imperial power and province, namely that of violence, of military might overcoming opposition. It was a contact played out in most provinces, at different times, throughout the empire but one perhaps less eloquently recorded in other places. The

---

Schürer (484-513) deals with events from 66-74 C.E. and for the siege and capture of Jerusalem, see 501-508 in the same volume.

142 See fig. 5.39 above.

143 Fig. 5.57: a burnt mosaic pavement in room 2) and fig. 5.58: carbonized wooden beams lying on the mosaic pavement (Avigad, *Discovering Jerusalem*, figs 108 and 109).

144 Fig. 5.59: One of the burnt rooms, with heaps of broken objects (Avigad, *Discovering Jerusalem*, fig. 133).

145 Fig. 5.60: Skeletal remains in the burnt kitchen (Avigad, *Discovering Jerusalem*, fig. 138).

146 Avigad (*Discovering Jerusalem*, 123) notes that coins found in the Burnt house include some of the Roman procurators of Judaea and many of the First Jewish revolt against Rome, bearing the legends: "Year Two / The Freedom of Zion", "Year Three / The Freedom of Zion", "Year Four: Of the Redemption of Zion." For further details of coinage found in the Jewish Quarter, see Avigad, *op. cit.*, 194-196.

147 On the destruction of the Upper City, see Joseph. *BJ* 6.392 ff.

encounter between provincial and imperial power did indeed involve ingenious strategies of collaboration and friend-making (demonstrated most notably in the Herodian dynasty). Life in Roman provinces was indeed frequently characterized by a pragmatic live and let live approach. The fire and destruction evidence in Jerusalem housing, however, is a reminder that analysis of empire must include Roman war-mongering, a reality in stark contrast with the propaganda of *pax*-making. [148]

In sum:

The housing from the Jewish Quarter of Jerusalem reveals a whole spectrum of contact between imperial power and native province. [149] There is, firstly, the contact of non-involvement, the picture of cultures in parallel. This is seen in the presence of the traditional courtyard housing plan or put negatively, the absence of the Roman-style *domus*. This presence or absence is a sign that domestic architecture was largely uninfluenced by the designs of both Hellenistic and Roman worlds. Secondly, there is the contact of collaboration and participation. This is seen in the fact that wall-paintings, mosaics and luxury goods in the Upper City houses were those shared by wealthy people throughout the Roman controlled οἰκουμένη. Thirdly, there is the contact of creative ethnicization or "autoethnography",[150] in which there is a complex interweaving of native and foreign, local and international. Décor without animate motifs, the phenomenon of the *miqveh-in-the-Graeco-Roman bathroom* and the abundance of stone vessels exemplify how the cosmopolitan is provincialized, ethnicized or localized. The process involves a

---

148 The notion of the *pax Romana* must not blind one to the reality of war and control. The notion of peace was associated with Augustus in particular, with the beginning of the principate. See *RG*, esp. 25-33, Philo, *Leg.* 147, Strabo 6.4.2, Tac. *Ann.* 3, App. *BC* 5.54, Vell. Pat., 2.89. 3-4, Dio Cass. 56.40.1; 43.4. For the imagery of peace, prosperity and fertility propagated in the Augustan era (an era labelled an *Aurea Aetas*), see Zanker, *Images,* Ch. 5, esp. 167-192.

149 The notion of different forms of contact was developed after reading Sawicki's "Spatial Management". Her categories are labelled "imperial incisions", "collaborative adaptation" and "resistive response." As noted above, Sawicki draws on the Pratt's analysis of "contact".

150 As found in Pratt (*Imperial Eyes*, 7), "autoethnography" "refers to instances in which colonized subjects undertake to represent themselves in ways that *engage with* the colonizers' own terms." Pratt is referring to written texts in particular but the term may also be applied to non-verbal texts.

simultaneous participation in and adaptation of foreign, imperial fashion. The result is a new cultural expression. Finally, there is the contact of conquest, illustrated in the evidence of fire and destruction. In sum, while scholarship has tended to focus on the broad concepts of Hellenization and Romanization and to discuss these in relation to literary *corpora* or monumental architecture, housing evidence (limited though it is) offers valuable insight into the complex and multi-faceted encounter between imperial power and indigenous response.

CHAPTER CONCLUSION

Official Roman propaganda and the old "empire is good" wing of imperial studies argue that Rome brought civilization and peace to barbarians. [151] By contrast, some indigenous people and advocates of an "empire is bad" standpoint claim that the encounter with Rome brought nothing but oppression and cultural rape. [152] While in no way denying

---

151 See M. Rostovtzeff (*Rome*, trans. J. D. Duff [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1960], 215), in which he describes the benefits conferred on humanity by the Roman Empire. Peoples were influenced by .. the "civilizing mission" of Rome... "not by constraint or violent means, not by arms or by transferring nations from place to place, but by peaceful methods and by the natural attraction of a higher form of life offered by a dominant state and nation." Quoted in the Introduction of Alexander (ed.), *Images of Empire.*

152 See P. A. Brunt, "*Laus imperii*" in P. D. A. Garnsey and C. R. Whittaker (eds), *Imperialism in the Ancient World* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978), 190-191: "Under the Principate the worst features of republican misrule were obliterated; above all, peace and order were better preserved. But exploitation did not end.... Provincial revenues were spent lavishly on feeding and amusing the inhabitants of Rome and beautifying the city, to say nothing of court expenditure. These privileges were not challenged by provincials in the senate or on the throne. Equality as between Italians and provincials was not attained, until all were sunk in equal misery." Ancient critiques of empire, examples quoted in Alexander (ed.), *Images of Empire* include (p. 13):
(i) (p.13): b. Šab. 33b [N. R. M. de Lange (trans.), "Jewish attitudes to the Roman Empire" in Garnsey and Whittaker (eds), *Imperialism,* 268]:
"Rabbi Judah (bar Ilai), Rabbi Yose (ben Halafta) and Rabbi Simeon (bar Yonai) were sitting talking... Rabbi Judah began: 'How splendid are the works of this people [i.e. the Romans]! They have built market places, baths and bridges' Rabbi Yose said nothing. Rabbi Simeon bar Yohai answered him: 'Everything they have made thy have made only for themselves: market-places, for whores; baths, to wallow in; bridges, to levy tolls"
(ii)(p.90): *Dio Cassius* [62.6.4], who puts the following words into the mouth of the British Queen Boudicca in 60 CE: "men who are aggressive, dishonest, greedy and irreligious - if indeed we should call 'men' who bathe in warm water, eat exotic dishes, drink unmixed wine, smear themselves with oil, lie on soft cushions and sleep with boys (who are in any case past their prime), being slaves to a lyre-player (and a bad one at that)." (trans. John Wade).

the destructive nature of imperialism, the encounter between imperial and indigenous world is a complex phenomenon, one worthy of more serious analysis than a simplistic and superficial goodies and baddies approach. A more useful insight into the colonial encounter is that provided by an analysis of contact. The concept of "contact" enables one to explore strategies of conquest and colonization, resistance and adaptation, in short, the phenomenon of the empire both "writing" and "writing back". [153] Furthermore, the chapter demonstrates how housing, long overshadowed by monumental remains,[154] provides a fruitful locus for viewing the simultaneously destructive and creative contact between imperial power and native province.

---

153 The notion of the empire "writing back" is found in relation to post-colonial literature. See B. Ashcroft, *"The Empire Writes Back": Theory and Practice in Post-Colonial Literatures* (London: Routledge, 1989).

154 The focus on monumental architecture has been archaeological, academic and financial. Rather than being the result of the state of preservation of the evidence, such neglect is indicative of the traditional "big dig" sponsored by big institutions, a phenomenon discussed briefly by M. Sawicki, "Archaeology as Space Technology", 321-322. An example of the imbalance is seen in Corinthian excavations. As noted by Blue ("Acts and the House Church", 126), there has been "little public interest in domestic architecture. In Corinth, for example, approximately 99% of the remains are commercial, civic, religious, *etc*."

PART 2 : SUMMARY and CONCLUSION

The review highlighted the fact that οἶκος functioned as a key to the world in which early Christianity took root. The three chapters of Part 2, however, reveal further ways in which this is so and the broader view results from the switch from a single to a multiple concept of "house". Using the concept of "household", a picture of the empire as household-writ-large was outlined in Chapter 3. It was shown that the house(hold) provided a familiar and useful model which was consciously adopted and adapted for the structures of state. As well as being a model for empire, the "house" was a building block of society and Chapter 4 presented a new perspective on this reality. Turning to physical houses, attention centred on dwelling / user relationships both in the typical town-house and in habitations in general. While the former showed the power of and threat to house(hold) ideology in the Roman world, configurations involving other dwellings opened other doors onto that same world: revealing it as a varied and stratified place in which a plurality of identities was under construction. The following chapter outlined yet another way in which "house" was key to the macro-text. The complex relationship between imperial power and colonized people was explored thanks to the concept of "dwelling house" and to housing evidence from the provinces. The chapter thus provided an essential complement to Chapters 3 and 4, namely a view of and from the provinces.

While each chapter is capable of standing alone, the three together form a unity. All focus on the early imperial period and for the reading of this "text", all use the concept of "house" and data on houses. It is by viewing the chapters together, as one would a triptych, that a unique and multi-faceted picture of the macro-text is gained. While valuable in its own right, this picture is also a *sine qua non* for the reading of the micro-text (Acts) which follows in Part 3. Part 2, therefore, represents the view of a wide-angled lens on a complex panorama while Part 3 is that of a zoom lens, homing in on one tiny, constituent part. As will be demonstrated, the reading of the Christian text of Acts is illuminated by the three major topics explored in Part 2: namely, the notion of empire as household-writ-large, the concept of the typical *domus* and other dwelling / user configurations and the process of identity-making in the contact zone.

PART 3

The HOUSE READING of ACTS

(THE MICRO-TEXT)

INTRODUCTION

Moving from the macro-text of the empire, Part 3 homes in on one of its constituent parts, namely the micro-text of Acts. [1] In the reading of Acts, as in that of the empire, a flexible concept of "house" serves as an analytical tool and a broad range of oikic material provides the data. The use of the tool and data, along with the insights gained in the chapters of Part 2 result in a new view of Acts, or more specifically, of early Christianity as portrayed in the text. As will be demonstrated, the nature and development of Christianity is profoundly shaped by its spatial / social location, or more specifically, by its presence in houses both world-wide and local. The movement which emerges may be compared to a house in the contact zone. As outlined in Chapter 5, dwellings throughout the Roman world carried in their structure and contents the marks of contact between colonizer and colonized. They witnessed to Roman conquest and hegemony, to local adoption of imperial styles and to their creative adaptation and re-creation by peoples in the provinces. The Christianity of Acts tells a similar tale of adoption, adaptation, re-creation and identity-making The two chapters which constitute Part 3 focus on this identity-making process. Chapter 6 explores Christianity's relationship to the two world-wide houses in which it is embedded, namely the household writ-large and the οἶκος Ἰσραήλ. Further insight into the movement is provided in Chapter 7 by focusing on another type of οἶκος, namely the physical house or dwelling. Attention to the dynamic, two-way relationship between dwellings and users shows Christianity to be an in-house movement in a double sense: a unified, ecumenical οἶκος in which all are siblings and a diverse movement whose life is shaped by and manifest in the many and varied domestic premises which it occupies.

---

[1] As outlined in the introduction, Acts is classified as one of the "texts" which constitute the mosaic of micro-texts or macro-text which is the Roman imperial world.

CHAPTER 6

ACTS, CHRISTIANITY and TWO WORLD-WIDE HOUSES

As outlined overleaf, a house in the contact zone is a useful analogy for the Christianity of Acts. Like such a dwelling, the movement displays Roman and native (in this case, Jewish) aspects yet also stands as a new creation, an entity with a shape and identity of its own. The focus of this chapter, therefore, is on the role of *Romanitas* and Jewishness in the process of early Christian self-definition. Put another way, the chapter demonstrates how Christianity's growth and identity formation takes place within, alongside and over against the two world-wide houses of which the movement is a part, namely the household-writ-large of the empire and the οἶκος Ἰσραήλ.

Acts , Christianity and the empire as household-writ-large

This first section deals with the movement's relationship to the household-writ-large that is the empire. It reveals how early Christianity's self-definition is influenced by the imperial house(hold) and how the movement proves itself a potentially subversive element within the Roman realm, even as it simultaneously refutes charges of sedition.

the empire as household-writ-large

As demonstrated in Chapter 3, the notion of "house" is useful for understanding the role of the emperor and the nature of the imperial system. First of all, the emperor was head of the οἶκος Σεβαστός or imperial house. This house was not merely a court in Rome but the epicentre of a vast imperial structure which was itself an οἶκος-writ-large. As set forth in chapter 3, the role of emperor was a magnified version of the

traditional *pater familias* and the system of patronage and slavery operating empire-wide was but a vaster and more complex version of the system operative at household level. The imperial structure replicated, albeit *en grand*, the same all-embracing quality characteristic of an individual οἶκος. This it did by exercising social, economic, legal, political, psychological and religious functions, thereby affecting every sphere of human life. The house(hold) of the emperor, like that of an individual, also had its οἶκος in the sense of estate or property. The imperial estate may be said to have comprised the entire Roman-controlled οἰκουμένη, [1] just as the οἶκος of the Egyptian ruler had long been understood to extend to the whole country under his rule. [2]

self-definition within the world of the household-writ-large

While the term "οἶκος Σεβαστός" does not appear in Acts, one can nevertheless speak of the presence of the imperial house in the text. Evidence of the Roman world is in fact evidence of the house(hold)-writ-large or the domain of the οἶκος Σεβαστός.

This household-writ-large has an imposing presence in Acts. An important strand of the text is the depiction of Christianity as a movement embedded in the world of the imperial house. It is above all in Paul's appeal to Caesar (25.11: Καίσαρα ἐπικαλομαι) that the picture of believers living under the protection of the imperial householder and remaining within his οἶκος is crystallized. First of all, the appeal procedure points to the emperor's role as powerful *pater familias* who dispenses justice and as universal patron from whom clients seek help. While Acts bears witness to many aspects of the vast imperial infrastructure - in the form of officials, [3]

---

1 As noted in Ch. 5 (page 225 n.8), the Roman Empire (as the Greek world before it) became synonymous with the οἰκουμένη, the *orbis terrarum* or inhabited world. See Michel, "οἶκος", *TDNT 5:* 157-159.

2 As mentioned in Ch. 2 (page 94 n.37), Elliott (*Home*, 171) writes: "For a resident of Egypt, such as Philo, we may assume the knowledge of a long-standing local conception; namely, that the whole land was the personal possession (*oikos*) of the king."

3 See references to proconsuls, procurators, tribunes, lictors. The proconsul (ἀνθύπατος) was the official in charge of a Roman senatorial province. On Gallio, see 18.12, 14, 17. On Felix (the Roman governor in Judaea), see 23.24, 26, 24.2, 22,.24, 25, 27, 25.14 and on his successor (24.27: διάδοχος) Festus, see 24.27, 25.1, 4, 9, 12, 13, 14, 22, 23, 24 and 26.24, 25, 32. On Felix, see C. K. Barrett (*A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles*. ICC. 2 vols [Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1994, 1998], 1080-1081. See 25.6-12, for

client kings, [4] military personnel, [5] provincial courts [6] and administrative

---

Paul's appearance before Festus at the βῆμα at Caesarea and on "Paul before Felix and Festus," see A. N. Sherwin-White, *Roman Society and Roman Law in the New Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1963), Lecture 3. On Festus, see Barrett (*Acts,* 117-118) and J. A. Fitzmyer (*The Acts of the Apostles: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary,* AB Vol. 31 [New York: Doubleday, 1998], 740-741.) On the tribune Claudius Lysias, see (for example) 21.31, 37; 23.17-18, 26-28. This term "tribune" (χιλίαρχος) is the equivalent of the Latin, *tribunus militum* and in a Roman legion, there were usually six such *tribuni.* On the tribune, see Fitzmyer, *Acts,* 698-699. In Acts 16.20, 22, 35, 38, the chief magistrates of the Roman colony of Philippi are accurately referred to as στρατηγοί, following the general term ἄρχοντες in 16. 19. As explained by Barrett (*Acts*, 789), the term is an equivalent of the Latin "*praetor*", "though the original sense of the Greek word was military, of the Latin judicial. Under the Empire, the office of praetor intervened in the *cursus honorum* between that of *aedile* or plebeian tribune and consulship and it was the duty of praetors to preside in the courts and supervise the public treasury." As noted by Sherwin-White (*Roman Society*, 92), however, *praetor* was "going out of fashion and becoming an archaism by the year 63 B.C." and the "senior magistrates of a Roman colony of the late Republican period or later were called *duoviri iuri dicundo*". Thus he concludes (on page 93), the author of Acts "is simply using the commonest Hellenistic title to render the untranslatable term *duoviri*". On the lictors (ῥαβδοῦχοι), see 16.35. On flogging (ῥαβδίζειν), a typical Roman form of chastisement, see 16.22. According to C. J. Hemer (*The Book of Acts in the Setting of Hellenistic History* [Tübingen: Mohr, 1989; Reprinted Winona Lake, Indiana; Eisenbrauns, 1990], 186), it is presumably administered by the ῥαβδοῦχοι (16. 35) (Lat. : *lictores)* attendant on colonial magistrates. As explained by Barrett (*Acts*, 800), the "word denotes one who carries a rod or staff or office (ῥάβδος)... In Rome itself the lictors bore the *fasces* as their badge of office; those attending for example Consuls and Praetors had, in addition to ceremonial duties, the task of carrying out arrest and punishments; those attached to officials in a colony such as Philippi would no doubt have the same task assigned to them - here, unusually, that of rectifying wrongful arrest and punishment."

4 On client kings, see Herod Agrippa I and Agrippa II (25.13). Herod Agrippa I (10 B.C.E. - 44 C.E.) features in 12.1 and his death is recounted in 12.23. As explained by Fitzmyer (*Acts,* 466), "he was a friend of the emperor Gaius Caligula, who assigned him in 37 to rule over the territory of Philip the tetrarch in northern Transjordan and accorded him the title *rex*, 'King'. When Herod Antipas was exiled in A.D. 39, his territory (Galilee and Perea was added to the domain of Herod Agrippa I. In 41 his territory was expanded to include all of Judea..." King Agrippa II (27-93? C.E), who appears in 25.13, is the son of Herod Agrippa of 12 1. As explained by Barrett (*Acts*, 11344), he "had been educated in Rome, remained there at least till the death of his uncle, Herod of Chalcis, in 48. Shortly after this event Claudius conferred on him his uncle's kingdom together with charge of the Temple in Jerusalem and the right to appoint the high priest (Joseph. *AJ* 20.222, 223). .... Later his kingdom was extended to the north. He took the Roman side in the Jewish War, after which he retained no territories west of Jordan."

5 Apart from Cornelius, see 22.25, 26, 23.17, 23, 24.23, 27.1, 6, 11, 31, 43. Amongst the reference to soldiers, see 23.23 (on cavalry and "δεξιολάβους" [this term is discussed in Barrett, *Acts,* 1077-1078]) and 28.28 (on the στρατιώτης guarding Paul).

6 See mention of the βῆμα in Corinth (18.12, 16,17) and the "βῆμα Καίσαρος" in Caesarea (25.10). As outlined by Barrett (*Acts*, 871), the βῆμα "denotes the place where the judge his court, and is determined by the presence of the judge, not topographically." See also reference to proconsular assizes in Ephesus.: that is, there is mention of courts (19.38: ἀγοραῖοι) being open and proconsuls (ἀνθύπατοί) being present. According to Hemer (*Acts,* 123),

divisions [7] - repeated reference to the *provocatio* [8] results in the head of house being given a central place. It is to him and to his imperial capital that the latter part of the text flows. Paradoxically, his presence is all the more imposing because he never actually makes a personal appearance. [9]

Turning from the person of the emperor to that of Paul, the appeal to Caesar points, secondly, to the disciple's position as household member, servant or client. The membership badge required for an appeal to the emperor is Roman citizenship. Paul is indeed Ῥωμαῖος and repeated reference is made to this fact. [10] Furthermore, the disciple's position as loyal servant is highlighted. Again and again it is stressed that both he and other believers are legally and politically within the bounds of the household-writ-large. While the frequent arrests, beatings [11] and imprisonment [12] of disciples suggest they are enemies of the imperial order, the text demonstrates that this is not the case. Official Roman assessment of the evidence is summarized in the letter written by the tribune Claudius Lysias to the procurator, Felix : "I found that he [Paul] was accused about questions of their law but charged with nothing deserving death or imprisonment" (23.29). [13] In other

---

Ephesus was the capital of a *conventus* or assize-district".

7 Reference to the city (in 16.12) as "πρώτη [τῆς] μερίδος" is not a(n inaccurate) reference to Philippi as the capital of Macedonia (which it is not). Rather it is an accurate description of the city as belonging to the first region of Macedonia, that is, to one of the four *regiones* into which the Romans divided the province. See Sherwin-White (*Roman Society*, 93ff.) for evidence regarding the division of Macedonia into four *regiones* or sub-provinces by the Romans.

8 See references in 25.11-12, 21, 25-26, 32; 28.19. On the *provocatio*, see Sherwin-White, *Roman Society,* 57-70.

9 On Caesar, see 17.7, 25.8, 10, 11, 12, 21, 26.32, 27.24, 28.19. For a reference to Claudius, see18.2.

10 For references to Paul as Ῥωμαῖος, see 16.37,38; 22.25,26,27,29; 23.27. On Paul's Roman citizenship, see Sherwin-White, *Roman Society,* Lecture 7 and for a summary of the citizenship question, see Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 144-145.

11 On the "beating and binding" of disciples, see Sherwin-White, *Roman Society*, 71 ff.

12 In the speech to the Ephesian elders, Paul says that "imprisonment and afflictions" (20.23: δεσμὰ καὶ θλίψεις) await him and throughout the text there is abundant evidence of both. For detailed treatment of Paul's imprisonment, see Rapske, *Roman Custody.*

13 In Corinth, Jews accuse Christians of "persuading people to worship contrary to the law." (18.13). While this is an essentially Jewish complaint, it is presented in political terms as an offence against *the* (i.e. Roman) law. As a result, Paul is brought to the βῆμα but the

words, the representatives of Caesar recognize that accusations against Paul relate not to *the* (ie. Roman) law but to that of the Jews. [14] Their view thus concurs with the disciple's own assertion, expressed when arraigned before the "βῆμα Καίσαρος" (25.10) in Caesarea, that he has not offended against Caesar (25.7-8).

As well as the appeal to Caesar, the text provides further evidence of Christianity's place as servant situated firmly within the boundaries of the imperial οἶκος. First, the life of the movement takes place within the geographical οἶκος of the emperor. The acts (as opposed to the aspirations) of the apostles all take place in lands under Roman control (figs 6.1-3).[15] Secondly, disciples are portrayed as having friends and associates within the Roman imperial network. "Legates" of the emperor such as Sergius Paulus, the proconsul of Cyprus (13.7-12) and the centurion Cornelius become believers. In Ephesus, disciples are befriended by Asiarchs (19.31) among whose number may be priests of the imperial cult. [16] Thirdly and more generally, the text portrays Christianity embedded in a world which is

---

proconsul Gallio refuses to judge what he considers an issue of Jewish (not Roman) law (18.15) and simply expels the accusers (18.16). In Caesarea, Paul asserts that he has not offended against "the law of the Jews or the temple or Caesar (25.7-8)". The Roman procurator, Festus, confirms that the disciple has indeed "done nothing deserving death" (25.25). See "Paul and the Proconsul Gallio" in Sherwin-White, *Roman Society*, 97-107.

14 In other words, the text claims that Rome regards charges against Christians as internal religious matters, despite the "political twist" given them by Jews. See Sherwin-White, *Roman Society*, 50.

15 Fig. 6.1: Map of the early Roman Empire: G. Barraclough (ed.), *The Times Concise Atlas of World History*, 5th rev. edn (London: Times Books, 1994), 30-31; Fig. 6.2: The Journeys of the Apostle Paul in *The Greek New Testament*, 3rd edn. (Stuttgart: United Bible Societies, 1983); Fig. 6.3: Map in E. Haenchen (*The Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary*, trans. B. Noble and G. Shinn under the supervision of H. Anderson and with the translation revised by R. Mc L. Wilson [Oxford: Blackwell, 1971].

16 As explained by Barrett (*Acts*, 930), "the meaning of this term is disputed, and the question is complicated by the fact that it seems to have changed in the course of time. ... The main problem lies in the relation (if any) between the office of Asiarch and that of High Priest of the cult of Rome in the league..of Asia." He cites Taylor (*Beginnings* 5: 261) whose explanation is that ".. from the Asiarchs designated in each year as the foremost men of Asia one was chosen to act as high priest of the emperor, and then as temples of the league were built, one was selected to serve at the league temple in each city. Thus all Archiereis would have been Asiarchs, but all the Asiarchs would not have acquired the distinction of the highpriesthood. As the number of league temples grew, in time there would have been a priesthood for every Asiarch, and the two terms would thus come to be identical in meaning. It is possible that this was already the case in the time of Paul or at least in that of Luke". By contrast, however, Kearsley's conclusion (cited by Barrett) is that ".. the Asiarchy was quite separate from the provincial high-priesthood, at least during the period covered by the evidence considered above [fifty years after Acts 19]. See also Sherwin-White, *Roman Society*, 88-90.

utterly and visibly Roman. [17] Indeed the sheer depth of *Romanitas* documented in Acts has led some scholars to argue that the text is an *apologia* of Christianity to the empire or the empire to Christianity. [18] Fourthly and finally, an important illustration of this *Romanitas* is the portrayal of Christianity as a movement of households. As will be discussed in greater detail in chapter 7, the conversions of Cornelius (10.2-11.18), Lydia (16.13-15), the jailer (16.25-34) and Crispus (18.8) along with their respective households reveals a movement thoroughly embedded in the structures of its world. As already outlined in Chapters 3 and 4, this was a world in which the household was the basic unit of society and the model for empire.

---

17 On the Roman world in Acts, see D. R. Edwards, "Surviving the Web of Roman Power: Religion and Politics in the Acts of the Apostles, Josephus and Chariton's *Chaereas and Callirhoe*" in Alexander (ed.), *Images of Empire*, 178-201. According to Sherwin-White (*Roman Society*), the historicity of Acts on matters geography, politics, law and administration is strong. In H. W. Tarja, *The Trial of St. Paul: A Juridical Exegesis of the Second Half of the Acts of the Apostles* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1989), the historical accuracy of legal terminology, penal procedure and state institutions relating to Paul's trials before Roman officials is attested. As one (obviously pro-Roman) scholar remarks, the text ranks as the "..best available picture of the *Pax Romana* and all that it meant - good roads, and posting, good police, freedom from brigandage and piracy, freedom of movement, toleration and justice." See G. Hewart, ("Presidential Address", *PCA* 24 [1927], 27) cited in M. A. Powell, *What are they saying about Acts*? (New York / Mahwah: Paulist, 1991), 133 n.17.

18 According to H. Conzelmann (*The Theology of St. Luke,* trans. G. Buswell, 2nd edn [London: Faber and Faber, 1960]), the author presents a political apology for Christianity to the Roman empire. This view is challenged by C. K. Barrett (*Luke the Historian in Recent Study* [London: Epworth Press, 1961], 63) who doubts apologetic motive and wonders whether any Roman official could have been expected to filter out "so much of what to him would be theological and ecclesiological rubbish in order to reach so tiny a grain of relevant apology." Conzelmann's thesis is "turned upside down" (a pun on Acts 17.6) by P. Walaskay, ("*And So We Came To Rome*" *: The Political Perspective of St. Luke* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983]) who argues that Luke is defending the empire to the Church. A similar notion is found in P. F. Esler (*Community and Gospel in Luke-Acts*: *The Social and Political Motivations of Lucan Theology* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987]). According to Esler, Luke provides "legitimation" of Roman Christianity for the Roman Christians themselves. In other words, he wants to reassure them of the possibility of joint allegiance to the empire and Christianity. According to both B. S. Easton ("The Purpose of Acts" in F. C. Grant (ed.), *Early Christianity: The Purpose of Acts and Other Papers* [Greenwich: Seabury, 1954]) and Haenchen (*Acts*), Acts was written to convince the Roman government that Christianity should be granted official status as a legitimate religion.

self-definition beyond the world of the household-writ-large

While early Christianity is depicted geographically, legally and politically within the household-writ-large that is the empire, this is not the complete picture. At one and the same time, Acts portrays Christianity as a potentially subversive element within the domain of the οἶκος Σεβαστός and as a movement simultaneously modelling itself on and defining itself over against this realm. Attention now turns to the ways in which this is manifest.

God as father

One example of Christian self-definition as both like and greater than the household-writ-large in which it is embedded is the description of God in language normally applied to the emperor. It is to the Christians' God and to this deity alone that the term "πατήρ" is applied. It is noteworthy that the term is not used of Caesar, despite the text's portrayal of him as patron, arbiter and head of state. Its absence for the supreme *pater* is all the more striking because (as we have already seen in Chapters 3 and 4) father imagery and ideology was all pervasive in the Roman world. The use of the term "father" for God alone is evidence of the downplaying of Roman household ideology. If this represents downplaying at the macro-level, evidence of the same process at micro-level will be noted in Chapter 7, as the (arche)typical Roman householder, Cornelius, recognizes the greater authority of Peter. In Acts, therefore, it is God who holds the *patria potestas* so characteristic of the Roman world. As well as being πατήρ, the text also refers to God in terms such as κύριος and δεσπότης. [19] These were terms commonly applied to (individual) householders and were also used of deities and rulers, who in the Roman world, included emperors and client kings such as members of the Herodian Dynasty. [20]

---

19 See 1.4; 1.7; 2.33 (πατήρ), 1.24, 17.24 (κύριος) and 4.24 (δεσπότης).

20 See K. H. Rengstorf, " δεσπότης", *TDNT* 2:44-49. On "κύριος", see W. Foerster, *TDNT* 3: 1039-1058, 1081-1098 and G. Quell, 1058-1081. Rengstorf (*op. cit.*, 2:44-45) lists the meanings of " δεσπότης" under six heading, namely: (a) master of a house who normally rules unconditionally his family and household (b) lord as distinct from slave (c) absolute ruler... (d) used of gods when emphasising their power (e) used for the Roman ruler (*POxy.* 9.1204, 15) (f) astrological term (more commonly οἰκοδεσπότης) to denote the planets inasmuch as

While the text contains no direct attack on the imperial father, it does carry an implied critique. While the description of God is in language akin to that used of the emperor, the text implies that the Christian deity is not simply like, but far greater than, any ruler, earthly or divine. In other words, such rulers are not simply models, but foils for the God of the Christians. This Most High God (16.17: ὕψιστος) of theirs is creator of heaven, earth and sea [21] and bestower of all life (17.25). [22] This deity knows what is in human hearts [23] and its Spirit foretells (through prophets) world events like the famine which took place in the reign of Claudius. [24] It is the Christians' God, and not the emperor or his representatives, who is judge and dispenser of justice. This God is capable of judging not merely the οἰκουμένη (17.31), but the "living and the dead" (10.42). It is divinely-appointed disciples, not Caesar and his magistrates, who communicate this message of "justice and ... future judgement". [25] Furthermore, in a world where the emperor was traditionally advertised as the bearer of peace and hailed as saviour, [26] Luke's second

---

these make their influence felt at certain times on the οἶκος which each of them has in a picture of the zodiac. Liddell-Scott also cites an example in Dio Cassius (55.12), in which Augustus objects (or feigns objection?) to the term. With regard to κύριος, Foerster (*TDNT* 3: 1049-1050) gives examples of the term used of Augustus (*BGU* 1197, I, 15; *P. Oxy.* 8.1143, 4), Herod the Great (*Ditt. Or.* 415), Agrippa 1 and 11 (*Ditt. Or.*, 418, 423, 426, 425). In Liddell-Scott, references to the use of the term "κύριος" for Roman emperors include *BGU* 1200. I.1 (Augustus) and *P. Oxy.* 37.i.6 (Claudius).

21 On God as creator, see 4.24, 14.15, 17.24. On the notion of creator as both a Greek and a Jewish idea, see Barrett, *Acts*, 839-840.

22 17.25: διδοὺς πᾶσι ζωὴν καὶ πνοὴν καὶ τὰ πάντα.

23 See 1.24 for reference to God as " καρδιογνώστης" and see also 15.8.

24 See 11.28 for the prophecy of Agabus. The famine was to take place "ἐφ' ὅλην τὴν οἰκουμένην". As noted by Barrett (*Acts*, 563), references to this event are found in Joseph. *AJ* 3.320; 20.51-53; 20.101.

25 24.25: ... περὶ δικαιοσύνης καὶ ἐγκρατείας καὶ τοῦ κρίματος τοῦ μέλλοντος..

26 On the association of Augustus with good news, peace and salvation, see the Priene inscription (cited in F. W. Danker, *Benefactor: Epigraphic Study of a Graeco-Roman and New Testament Field* [St. Louis: Clayton Publishing House, 1982], 217). Note the claims of Augustus in *RG* 13 (*cum per totum imperium populi Romama terra marique esset parta victoriis pax..),* 25 (*Mare pacavi a praedonibus*) and 26.2, 3 (*pacavi....*). See references in Ch. 5 (page 250 n. 147).

volume [27] claims (as does his first) that it is the gospel which offers εἰρήνη and σωτηρία.[28] In sum, believers are indeed members of another household, one whose πατήρ is greater than any earthly *pater patriae*. [29]

the Christian οἰκουμένη

A second aspect of the new movement's self-definition as akin to and greater than the household-writ-large is the depiction of the emerging Christian οἰκουμένη, a realm set to extend beyond the οἶκος of the emperor. As outlined in Acts 1.8, disciples are commissioned by the risen Jesus to witness "ἔν τε Ἰερουσαλὴμ καὶ ἐν πάσῃ τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ καὶ Σαμαρείᾳ καὶ ἕως ἐσχάτου τῆς γῆς". Like the commission, the subsequent witness of the disciples is described in territorial terms. The mission is initially successful in Jerusalem where the number of disciples is said to "multipl[y] greatly" (6.7). [30] It spreads to "all Judaea and Samaria and Galilee" [31] and then, beyond Samaria and Phoenicia to Cyprus and Antioch. Paul and his companions, in a series of missionary journeys, extend the witness if not literally to the "end of the earth", at least to numerous locations between Jerusalem and Rome.

The concept of expansion outwards from Jerusalem is profoundly Jewish and the Jewish connection is also seen in the fact that (prospective) believers come from the non-

---

27 As noted by J. A Fitzmyer (*The Gospel According to Luke I-IX* [New York: Doubleday, 1981], 393-394), in Luke's gospel, the "real bearer of peace and salvation to the whole world" is not Augustus but Jesus. Terms like "saviour" (Lk 1.11:σωτήρ) and "peace" (Lk 1.14: .. εἰρήνη..) typically associated with Augustus are used of Jesus. Furthermore, "[b]y relating Jesus' birth to a worldwide census, Luke hints at the worldwide significance of that birth."

28 See references to "εἰρήνη" in 7.26; 9.31; 10.36; 12.20; 15.33; 16.36; 24.2 (and Lk : 1.79; 2.14,29; 7.50; 8.48; 10.5,6; 11.21; 12.51; 14.32; 19.38,42; 24.36), to "σωτήρ" in 5.31; 13.23 (and Lk 1.47; 2.11) and to "σωτηρία" in 4.12; 7.25; 13.26,47; 16.17; 27.34; 28.28 (and Lk 1.69,71,77; 19.9),

29 Regal imagery also appears. Christians serve "another king" (17.17) and preach another "kingdom" (see 8.12; 19.8; 20.25; 28.23, 31).

30 On the mission in Jerusalem, see also 5.28 and 12.25.

31 On work in these regions, see 8.14, 9.31, 10.37. Peter is depicted "here and there.." in the region, ministering specifically at Lydda, Joppa and Caesarea (9.32). Philip is portrayed witnessing in a "city of Samaria" (8.5) and on the road between Jerusalem to Gaza (8.26ff.). He is "found" in Azotus and preaches in all the towns between there and Caesarea (8.40).

Roman controlled Diaspora, from lands such as Parthia,[32] Elam, Medea and Ethiopia. [33] While acknowledging this Jewish influence (one developed in the following section on the house of Israel), the picture of the Christian οἰκουμένη in Acts must also be read as an attempt to imitate and even rival the οἶκος of the emperor. As already mentioned, Diodorus Siculus wrote of the Roman realm (at the time of Pompey) stretching to "the limits of the earth" and Strabo produced a geographical account of the οἰκουμένη largely under imperial control. [34] The Christians describe their realm in similar terms: from the opening lines of the text, it is evident that the mission is to extend "to the end of the earth," [35] that is, to a world beyond the οἶκος of the emperor. [36] While it has already been

---

32 As noted by Scott ("Horizon", 491 and 523), Parthia was independent despite the claims of Augustus (*RG* 29.2 and 32.2) that it was part of the Roman empire. While the return of the Roman standards from the Parthians was indeed a diplomatic (and much celebrated) victory, this did not mean that the Parthian empire became subject to Rome.

33 According to Strabo (1.1.6), the idea that the Ethiopians lived at the ends (ἔσχατοι) of the earth, on the banks of the Oceanus" went back to Homer. Reference cited in Scott, "Horizon" 536 n. 203.

34 See Ch. 5 (page 228 n. 29 and page 229 n. 31).

35 The phrase "ἕως ἐσχάτου τῆς γῆς" is rare, occurring in Greek literature five times in the Septuagint (Is. 8.9, 48.20, 49.6, 62.11, Pss Sol. 1.4), twice in Acts and in Christian writings showing knowledge of Isaiah and / or Acts but nowhere else in ancient Greek literature (Search conducted on *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* Pilot CD Rom C). The phrase has been understood in a number of ways, including Rome, Spain and the farthest reaches of the world. As outlined by Tannehill (*Acts,* 17 n.26): " As W. C. van Unnik has convincingly argued, the Greek phrase refers 'very definitely to the end, the extreme limit of the world ... For ancient people these limits lay at the Atlantic by the Germans, Scythians, Indians and Ethiopians.' Pss Sol 8.15 is sometimes cited in support of Rome, but van Unnik indicates that this reference to one who came 'from the end of the earth' probably means that Pompey came not from Rome but from Spain, where he fought for many years before going to the east." See W. C. Van Unnik, "Der Ausdruck 'ΕΩΣ 'ΕΣΧΑΤΟΥ ΤΗΣ ΓΗΣ' (Apostelgeschichte 1.8) und sein altestamentlicher Hintergrund" in *Sparsa Collecta: The Collected Essays of W. C. van Unnik* (Leiden: Brill, 1973, 1980, 1983), 399-400. See also T. C .G. Thornton, "To the End of the Earth: Acts 1.8 ", *ExpTim* 89 (1977-78)374-375. R. Brawley (*Luke-Acts and the Jews: Conflict, Apology and Conciliation* [Scholars Press, 1987], 32-33) argues that "to the end of the earth" is an ethnic rather than a geographical phrase on the basis of the references to Gentiles that precede and follow 13.47. According to E. E. Ellis (" 'Das Ende der Erde' (Apg 1.8)," *BBR* 1 [1991] 123-132), the "end of the earth" refers specifically to Spain and demonstrates Luke's knowledge of Paul's (planned) mission to Spain. The phrase reappears later in the text. Paul and Barnabas speak of being commanded to be a "light to the Gentiles (φῶς ἐθνῶν ..), .. [to] bring salvation to the uttermost parts of the earth" (13.47: ..ἕως ἐσχάτου τῆς γῆς). This is a direct quotation of Is 49.6.

36 See Casson (*Travel,* Ch. 3: Expanding Horizons, 58-64) on the geographical knowledge of the world in pre-Roman times. Conquerors, traders and explorers had revealed a world bordered in the west by Britain and Celtic lands and in the east by the Indus valley (West Pakistan).

mentioned that the apostolic activity of Acts takes place within imperial confines, this is but part of a wider mission to the whole inhabited earth. The concrete reality of the movement's spread beyond the Roman οἰκουμένη is demonstrated in references to lands (cited above) which are beyond Roman control. The mission which proceeds outwards from Jerusalem in a typically Jewish fashion is an east-west expansion. When viewed against the backdrop of empire, this expansion appears to imitate or invert the process of Romanization, [37] which for the inhabitants of the eastern Mediterranean was experienced as a movement from west to east.

Acts, therefore, presents an expanding Christian οἰκουμένη: while expressing this realm in Jewish terms, the text does not merely engage in "mimetic desire" of the empire [38] but claims to rival the process of Romanization. Christianity is as yet a little organization, but it consciously defines itself over against the domain of the imperial house. Just as the *Res Gestae* of earlier times appeared as a verbal map of the *pater patriae*'s territory, [39] so Acts appears as a map of the realm of the Christians' πατήρ and his "offspring" (17.28-29). In contrast to the *Res Gestae,* however, Acts has no language of conquest and no reference to military campaigns.[40] Disciples are depicted as pro-active, non-violent agents of the word and this is illustrated both in their travels and in the many

---

Much exploration had also been done of the African coast. On geographical knowledge in the early empire, see Nicolet, *Space, Geography and Politics,* Ch. 3: Errors and Truths: Geographical Knowledge of the Time, 57- 84 and Ch. 4: Explorations and Expeditions during the Roman Empire, 85-94.

37 Further treatment of the east / west process is found in the house of Israel section in the second half of this chapter.

38 Drawing on the work of R. Girard (*Violence and the Sacred*, trans. P. Gregory [Baltimore and London: The John Hopkins University Press, 1977], especially 145), V. K. Robbins ("Luke-Acts: A mixed population seeks a home in the Roman Empire" in Alexander [ed.], *Images of Empire*, 202-221) outlines the implied author's mimetic desire toward Rome (203-205). As explained by Robbins, "mimetic desire is at work wherever humans engage in joint activities with one another, form groups with boundaries, and establish rituals and traditions involving speech and action. Mimetic desire functions where there is a subject, an object and a rival. The proposal is that humans desire objects and not others in a particular social context, because one or more other persons in the setting desire those same objects."

39 As expressed by Nicolet (*Space, Geography and Politics,* 9), the *Res Gestae* "appears almost as a commentary to a map and to require the guidance of a drawing."

40 On extending frontiers, founding colonies, adding territory, see *RG* 30, 30.2.

and varied verbs used of their activity. [41] The divine word itself is effective and alive, capable of growing, multiplying and spreading apparently unaided like a plant. [42] As a result, ever-increasing numbers of people believe and are baptized as "citizens" of the new realm. [43]

Disrupting the οἰκονομία

The most obvious example of Christianity's self-definition over against the household-writ-large is the evidence of activities and attitudes disruptive of the imperial system's οἰκονομία. These activities and attitudes are noted in the area of religion, finance and security, key areas essential for the functioning of any household.

religion

As outlined in chapter 3, religion was an integral part of both the individual household and of the household-writ-large. It functioned both to express and reinforce cohesion within the οἶκος or *domus*. At the macro-level, Acts contains neither an explicit reference to nor attack on the most obvious religious expression of the household-writ-large, namely the imperial cult. The text's sidestepping of the issue seems a deliberate omission, given its predominance throughout the οἰκουμένη. The "no comment" position means that in the area of religion Christians cannot be accused of offending against Caesar. The position adopted is, however, no argument from silence in support of either

---

41 The disciples' communication of the word is highlighted by a whole series of verbs. In addition to διδάσκω and εὐαγγελίζω / εὐαγγελίζομαι (for references, see Ch. 7 [pages 311-312 n. 63]) , others include λαλέω (4.29, 31; 8.25; 11.19; 13.46; 14.25, 16.6, 32;), καταγγέλω (4.2; 13.5, 38; 15.36; 16.17; 17.3, 13, 23, κήρυσσω (8.5; 9.20; 19.13; 20.25; 28.31), παρρησιάζομαι (9.27, 28; 13.46; 14.3; 18.26; 19.8; 26.26), διαμαρτύρομαι (2.40; 8.25; 18.5; 20.21; 20.24; 23.11; 28.23), μαθητεύω (14.21), διαλέγομαι (17.2, 17; 18.4, 19; 19.8, 9; 20.7, 9; 24.12, 25), διανοίγω (17.3). See also the use of πείθω (13.43; 17.4; 18.4; 19.8, 26; 26.28; 28.23, 24), ἐκτίθημι (11.4; 18.26; 28.23), παρατίθημι (17.3), ἐπιδείκνυμι (18.28), συμβιβάζω (9.22), βαστάζω (9.15).

42 On the growth (αὐξανω, πληθύνω) of the word, see 6.7, 12.24, 19.20.

43 On increasing numbers, see 2.41, 47; 4.4; 5.14; 11.21, 24; 14.1; 16.5; 21.20. The verb "προστίθημι" means "to add to, increase, give, grant, proceed, win over."

the imperial cult or any other religion sanctioned (or not least not condemned) by the emperor. As the text reveals, Christians engage in a radical and sweeping critique of all so–called pagan religions. In so doing, they chip away at a central pillar of the individual and state οἶκος.

The text's portrayal of events in Ephesus reveals the two-fold approach of silence regarding the imperial cult and critique of (other) pagan worship. In Ephesus, the silence regarding emperor worship is particularly deafening for as the archaeological evidence reveals, the cult was especially visible there. As noted by Thomas, "[a]side from the numerous inscriptions, monumental building complexes dot the city. Far larger than the double Temple of Divus Iulius and Dea Roma, the Temple of the Flavian Sebastoi, as it is known from inscriptions, stands on its massive artificial terrace to the southwest of the upper agora.." [44] Furthermore, it was in the late first century C.E. with this Temple of the Sebastoi that the specialized use of the term "νεωκόρος" [45] for cities with a provincial temple of the imperial cult began. [46] It is striking that while the term is used of Ephesus in Acts (19.35), it is not in relation to the city's hosting of the imperial cult but rather to its role as "temple-keeper" of the cult of Artemis.

According to the text, disciples are accused of attacking the world-famous cult of Artemis [47] and threatening the city's position as "temple keeper" (19.35: νεωκόρον..)

---

44 C. M. Thomas, "At Home in the City of Artemis: Religion in Ephesos in the Literary Imagination of the Roman Period" in H. Koester (ed.), *Ephesos: Metropolis of Asia* (Valley Forge, Pennsylvania: Trinity Press International, 1995).

45 See S. Friesen, *Twice Neokoros: Ephesus, Asia and the Cult of the Flavian Imperial Family* (Leiden: Brill, 1993), 55-56. As explained by Friesen ("The Cult of the Roman Emperors in Ephesos: Temple Wardens, City Titles and the Interpretation of the Revelation of John" in Koester [ed.], *Ephesos,* 229-250), ".. the term began as the title for an official who had special responsibilities related to the precincts of a deity. During the Roman imperial period, however, "neokoros" took on a specialized meaning. It became the technical term for a city where a provincial temple for the emperors was located. Thus, in the secondary literature the words "neokoros" and "neokorate" have become synonymous with provincial imperial cults." On the following page he explains that "[b]efore neokoros became a formal city title in Asia in the late century, the term has evolved from a title for a temple official to a title for a benefactor and finally to a metaphor for a city."

46 Price, *Rituals and Power*, 65 n. 47, cited in Friesen, "Cult", 230.

47 Ephesian Artemis was universally recognized and revered. See Barrett, *Acts*, 922-923.

and guardian of some (unspecified) sacred object. [48] Shrines to the goddess were found throughout the world,[49] but Ephesus was universally recognized as the centre of the cult [50] and its temple of Artemis was of legendary renown. [51] Furthermore, the inviolability of the sanctuary had long been recognized and the place continued to be regarded as a place of asylum. [52] Although in Acts, the town clerk denies that the disciples are "sacrilegious" or "blasphemers" (19.37), [53] the opinion of the silver-smith Demetrius is closer to the truth. He fears that the temple of Artemis may soon "count for nothing" [54] and that the goddess may be deposed (καθαιρεῖσθαι) from her magnificence" (19.27), a fear founded on the fact that "... throughout all Asia .. [Paul] has persuaded .... a considerable company of people saying that gods made with hands are not gods" (19.26). [55]

This is precisely what Paul preached in Athens. In a city described as κατείδωλος (17.16), the disciple denigrates idols and icons. He claims that God neither dwells in shrines which are χειροποιήτος nor requires human service. [56] He argues that God

---

48 19.35: .. τοῦ διοπετοῦς. As noted by Barrett (*Acts*, 936), the adjective literally means "that which fell down from Zeus". "The object was presumably some kind of meteorite, having perhaps human form". He notes the view that "such objects could be used as a counter to Jewish and Christian attacks on paganism as the worship of objects of human manufacture" but goes on to argue that "..the religious evaluation and use of meteorites must have long preceded this polemical interest".

49 On the literary and archaeological evidence of Artemisian shrines throughout the world, see Thomas, "At Home in the City of Artemis", 92-93.

50 The city was home to all the lore about the goddess and here were brought together her many images. On the images of Artemis, see Thomas, "At Home in the City of Artemis", 85 -98.

51 On "τὸ τῆς μεγάλης Ἀρτέμιδος ἱερὸν" (19.27), see Livy 1.45.2. Even at that early date, the temple of Artemis (Diana) at Ephesus enjoyed great renown. It was reputed to have been built through the cooperation of the cities of Asia (*iam tum erat inclitum Dianae Ephesiae fanum; id communiter a civitatibus Asiae factum fama ferebat*). See also Herodotos 2.148, Strabo 14.1.20, 22ff. and Pausanias 2.25; 4.31.8; and 10.38.6.

52 On asylum at the Artemision, see Thomas, "At Home in the City of Artemis", 98-106.

53 19.37: .. ἱεροσλους.. .. βλασφημοῦντας.

54 19.27: .. εἰς οὐθὲν λογισθῆναι..

55 19.26: .. οὐκ εἰσιν θεοὶ οἱ διὰ χειρῶν γινόμενοι...

56 According to 17.24, God... does not live in "ἐν χειροποιήτοις ναοῖς κατοικεῖ" and the following verse, there is a claim that the deity is not served "ὑπὸ χειρῶν ἀνθρωπίνων".

is not "like gold, or silver or stone, a representation by human art and imagination" and he proceeds to demonstrate the superiority of Christianity to people described as "very religious" [57] but living in "the times of ignorance". [58] A somewhat similar dismissal of Graeco-Roman religion takes place in Lystra, where the age-old worship of Zeus and Hermes is dismissed as "vain things" or μάταια (14.15) and the citizens who mistake disciples for the two gods are portrayed as somewhat foolish. [59] In Athens and Lystra, as in Ephesus, therefore, Paul implies that officially-sanctioned Graeco-Roman cults are inferior to Christianity in the same way that Stephen's speech implies that the temple is idolatrous. [60]

As depicted in Acts, therefore, the worship of the Christian God is presented as the one and only true religion. This is an uncompromising stance in the household-writ-large in which polytheism is the norm and in which the attitude to religious groups is largely one of live and let live, at least until the *status quo* is threatened. [61] While the text sidesteps the issue of the imperial cult, the new movement is depicted as dismissing all so-called pagan deities and cults with which it comes in contact. Furthermore, it claims a religious

---

57 The term as used in 17.22 is "δεισιδαιμονέτερος".

58 17.30: ... τοὺς ... χρόνους τῆς ἀγνοίας...

59 When the misguided citizens mistake Paul and Barnabas for the two deities, the disciples indicate the blasphemy involved by tearing their garments (14.14). As noted by Barrett (*Acts,* 679), this is a Jewish reaction to blasphemy.

60 Drawing on the prophet Isaiah (66.1-2), Stephen asserts that God does not live in structures made by human hands (7.48: οὐχ ὁ ὕψιστος ἐν χειροποιήτοις κατοικεῖ). As explained by Esler (*Community and Gospel,* 245 n.10):

> "The force of this statement... .... is reinforced by the fact that in the Septuagint the word here used for a dwelling (χειροποιήτος) made by hand is reserved exclusively for pagan idols, and that it is reminiscent of the words Stephen has just used of the golden calf (7.41). .... Stephen... is making the radical statement that the very notion of God dwelling in a man-made temple is actually idolatrous."

61 As explained by Sherwin-White (*Roman Society*, 79-80), "[o]fficially the Roman citizen may not practise any alien cult that has not received the public sanction of the State, but customarily he might do so as long as his cult did not otherwise offend against the laws and usages of Roman life, i.e. so long as it did not involve political or social crimes. The Julio-Claudian period was characterized by general laxity towards foreign cults, which spread freely in Italy and Rome. But this laxity is occasionally interrupted by a sharp reversal of policy when the extravagances of a particular sect call down a temporary and ill-enforced ban upon its activities. This is notable in connexion with Druids, Magians and devotees of Isis. The grounds of such bans, however, are found not in the general principle of excluding alien cults as such, but in the criminal by-product of the cults: the *scelera* or *flagitia cohaerentia nomini*, as Pliny (*Ep.* 10.96.2) puts the matter in his letter about the Christians of Pontus"

supremacy which no Roman religion, including the imperial cult, ever does. More specifically, in Ephesus, disciples attack another world-wide cult centred in a provincial capital of the Roman east, to which they come neither to worship nor seek asylum but rather to belittle its fame and power. The parallel with Rome and her ruler cult is subtle but more than possible.

finance

While events in Ephesus were discussed above in relation to religion, they are equally relevant to the inter-related area of economics.[62] More concretely, they illustrate the Christian movement's potential for threatening the economic fabric of both the individual household and that of the household-writ-large.

In Ephesus, the craft-workers' concern is that the arrival of Christianity will result in the collapse of their flourishing silver industry. The workers make silver shrines (19.24: ..ναοὺς ἀργυροῦς..)[63] and the sale of these objects brings "no little business" (19.24: οὐκ ὀλίγην ἐργασίαν) to the craftsmen. By turning people away from the worship of Artemis, Paul calls their trade into disrepute (εἰς ἀπελεγμὸν) and threatens their εὐπορία (19.25). In Philippi, too, ἐργασία is threatened as a result of the religious activity of believers for the owners of a slave girl who practises soothsaying (μαντεύομαι)[64] lose their source of income when her spirit of divination (πνεῦμα πύθωνα) is expelled by the disciples (16.16 ff.).[65]

As depicted in Acts, therefore, Christians attack the institution of the private household by threatening the livelihood of individuals. As highlighted in studies reviewed in the Introduction, the οἶκος was the basic economic unit of society and throughout the

---

62 The interconnected nature of the religious realm with all others - economic, social, political - is one of the most obvious differences between the ancient world and our own. Nowhere is the connection of all realms so obvious than in the individual household and this is replicated at the level of empire.

63 For Barrett (*Acts*, 922), these were probably small portable shrines for carrying in processions.

64 On the girl's "πνεῦμα πύθωνα" and her soothsaying ability (μαντεύομαι), see Barrett (*Acts* 785).

65 The girl brought "ἐργασίαν πολλὴν" (16.16) to her masters who lost their "ἐλπὶς τῆς ἐργασίας" (16.19) after the expulsion.

Graeco-Roman world, making money was long regarded as essential aspect of household management. As well as disrupting the individual household's οἰκονομία, Christians also pose a potential threat to the economics of the household-writ-large. [66] As already noted, the imperial network extended it tentacles into every sphere of life and in the economic realm, its influence was particularly evident in the area of taxation. Threats to an individual's money-making ability were by implication threats to the economy of the household-writ-large. As events in Ephesus reveal, Paul's preaching has an impact on a whole economic network. Shrines made by the silver-smiths are illustrative of the many objects for private worship produced on a large scale in the city in imperial times.[67] In undermining the cult of Artemis, therefore, Paul is threatening an important aspect of the city's financial life. Furthermore, his critique has wider financial implications for the silver-smiths' work is representative of a type of economic activity widespread throughout the empire. As suggested in Acts, therefore, Christianity has the potential to cause financial ruin to a city and thus by implication to upset the economic balance of the household-writ-large. This is a potential the movement proceeds to realize. It is the Roman writer Pliny who records Christianity's negative influence on the related spheres of religion and economics. In a letter to the emperor Trajan, he notes that the movement has resulted in the abandonment of pagan temples, the suspension of their sacred festivals and the collapse of the market for sacrificial animals. [68] As will be discussed in more detail in Chapter 7, the Christian practice of sharing and re-distributing wealth - exemplified in the Jerusalem community and in Antioch, for example - constitutes an independent financial system, one

---

66 On the economy of the Roman empire, see (for example), Rostovtzeff, *Social and Economic History*, M .I. Finley, *The Ancient Economy* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1973), A. H. M. Jones (and edited by P. A. Brunt) *The Roman Economy: Studies in Ancient Economic and Administrative History* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1974). See also W. V. Harris (ed.), *The Inscribed Economy: Production and distribution in the Roman Empire in the light of the instrumentum domesticum,* Journal of Roman Archaeology Supplement Series 6 (1993).

67 On these objects, see Thomas, "At Home in the City of Artemis", 93-94.

68 See Pliny (*Ep.* 10.96.10) who writes of the resurgence of so-called paganism when Christianity was repressed:"It is certain at least that the temples, which had been almost deserted, begin now to be frequented; and the sacred festivals, after a long intermission are again revived; while there is a general demand for sacrificial animals which for some time past have met with but few purchasers" (*Certo satis constat, prope iam desolata templa coepisse celebrari, et sacra sollemnia diu intermissa repeti passimquie venire victimas, quarum adhuc rarissimus emptor inveniebatur).* The reference is in Barrett, *Acts,* 927.

which represents a challenge to the centralised system of the household-writ-large and the house of Israel.

disturbing the peace

Another way in Christianity disrupts the οἰκονομία of the household-writ-large is in the area of peace and security. A central preoccupation of the imperial administration was the issue of security. The destruction of Jerusalem in 70 C. E., already mentioned in the last chapter, reveals the treatment meted out to those who threatened the power, stability and unity of the realm. In Acts too, there is an allusion to imperial action against those disturbing the peace, albeit on a far less dramatic scale than in Jerusalem. The event in question is the expulsion of Jews from Rome by Claudius because of behaviour deemed disruptive from an official point of view. [69] What the text describes in greater detail, however, is just how the new movement disrupts the management of the household-writ-large. Even as Acts claims that Christians do not disturb the peace, the text simultaneously and paradoxically provides evidence of disciples' capacity for doing precisely this in several cities of the οἰκουμένη.

In the Roman colony of Philippi, [70] they are said to disturb (16.20: ἐκταράσσω) the city and are accused of advocating customs which are illegal for Romans. [71] As explained by Sherwin-White, this latter charge is both unusual and reminiscent of an archaic

---

69 18.2: .. διὰ τὸ διατεταχέναι Κλαύδιον χωρίζεσθαι πάντας τοὺς Ἰουδαίους ἀπὸ τῆς Ῥώμης.. According to a reference in Suetonius, Claudius expelled the Jews from Rome because they constantly made disturbances at the instigation of Chrestus (Christos). The text found in *Claud.* 25.4 is as follows: *Iudaeos impulsore Chresto assidue tumultuantis Roma expulit.* The edict is usually placed in 49 C.E., following the (fifth century) text of Orosius who attributes the date to Josephus. See *Historiae adversum Paganos*, 7.6.15-16: *Anno eiusdem nono expulsos per Claudium urbe Iudaeos Iosephus refert, sed me magis Suetonius movet, qui ait hoc mode: Claudius Iudaeos impulsore Chresto assidue tumultantes Roma expulit.* The above text is quoted in Richter Reimer, *Women in Acts,* 213. The edict of Claudius has received extensively scholarly discussion and for references, see Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 631.

70 Philippi was refounded as a Roman colony about 40 B.C.E and thereafter, there was a strong Roman influence, seen in its predominantly Latin epigraphy. It was renamed *Colonia Augusta Julia Philippensis* by Octavian when he received the title "Augustus" in 27 B.C. E.

71 16.20: they advocate "ἔθη" which it is not lawful (οὐκ ἔξεστιν) for us Romans (Ῥωμαίοις) to accept or practise.

practice of cults being outlawed for being un-Roman. [72] However (he continues), it is "[p]erhaps characteristic that it is in an isolated Roman community in the Greek half of the Roman empire that the basic principle of Roman 'otherness' should be affirmed, whereas in Italy the usual custom prevailed of treating alien cults on their merits." [73] Disciples, in other words, are a potential threat to the *Romanitas* of Philippi, a city which jealously guards its status of colony.

In Thessalonica, the activity of disciples results in the city being set in uproar (17.5). Here, they are accused of turning the world upside down (οἱ τὴν οἰκουμένην ἀναστατώσαντες οὗτοι), of acting against the decrees of Caesar (ἀπέναντι τῶν δογμάτων Καίσαρος) and of saying there is another king (17.7). The "decrees of Caesar" [74] are concerned with preventing disturbance of the world. Such charges are particularly unwelcome in Thessalonica, a *civitas libera* [75] or city allowed a certain local autonomy because of its proven loyalty within the imperial system. [76] So however "obscure, and possibly garbled" [77] the expression of these charges is, they are undoubtedly political in nature. While the city magistrates (who are correctly referred to as

---

72 For details of the discussion, see Sherwin-White, *Roman Society*, 788-82. He explains (*op. cit.*, 80) that "[w]hat is remarkable in the charges against Paul at Philippi is that the dormant principle of incompatibility is revived against an alien sect. ... The latest known exposition of this principle was that of Livy in the speech he attributes to the Roman consul in charge of the famous inquiry into the Bacchanalian scandal of the second century B.C."

73 Sherwin-White, *Roman Society*, 82.

74 On the decrees of Caesar, see Sherwin-White, *Roman Society*, 51f., 100 n.4, 103.

75 For further details on the Thessalonian episode, see Sherwin-White, *Roman Society*, 95-96.

76 Thessalonica (Salonika) was situated at the head of the Gulf of Therme, not far from the Axios (or Vardar) river. It was a strategic centre for communications and commerce, given its location on the *Via Egnatia* and its position as the chief port of Macedonia. The city was developed under Cassander (c. 315 B.C.E) and grew in size until occupied by the Romans and made the capital of the province of Macedonia (c.148 B.C.E.). According to Pliny (*NH* 4.38), it became a free city (*civitas libera*) in 42 B.C.E. In the imperial period, while the governor resided there, the city also retained a certain independence. This was seen in the fact that a local government, headed by the so-called politarchs (see Acts 17.6, 9) was allowed from the time of Augustus. It appears that Thessalonica officially honoured its Roman benefactors and the goddess Roma. In the reign of Augustus, a temple was erected to Julius Caesar as a god. While Thessalonica was not made a colony until the mid-third century C.E., Roman building was extensive from the second century onwards.

77 Sherwin-White, *Roman Society*, 96.

πολιτάρχαι) let the disciples go, they do not do so before taking security from Jason (17.9: λαβόντες τὸν ἱκανόν).[78]

After disturbing the Thessalonians and their city authorities (17.8: ταράσσω), the disciples cause a similar situation in Ephesus.[79] While mention has already been made of the silver-smiths' concern, their subsequent protest results in confusion (19.29: σύγχυσις) and uproar (20.1: θόρυβος) and the town clerk [80] is worried that a charge of riot (19.40: στάσις) may be levelled against the citizens. Such a charge could result in a loss of autonomy for Ephesus, the capital of the Roman province of Asia but a city which retains a "regular assembly" (19.39: ἔννομος ἐκκλησία) in the tradition of the old city-states. [81] In Ephesus as elsewhere, disciples are again involved, albeit indirectly, in a disturbance of the peace. In sum, while Acts portrays Christians being declared innocent of charges of sedition, the text at one and the same time describes the movement (as the Jews describe Paul before Felix) [82] as "an agitator among all Jews throughout the world" (24.5-6). [83] Despite the *apologia*, Christians do in fact threaten the stability of the household-writ-large.

---

78 As explained by Sherwin-White (*Roman Society,* 95*),* this "is the equivalent of the Lain *satis accipere*, correlate of *satis dare*" which is used in connection with "the offering and giving of security in civil and criminal procedures."

79 On the Ephesus incident, see Sherwin-White, *Roman Society*, 83ff.

80 On the position of the γραμματεὺς, see Sherwin-White (*Roman Society*, 86-87) and Barrett (*Acts*, 934-935).

81 Ephesus was part of Ionia in Asia Minor which had been settled by the Greeks. In antiquity, the city was an important port at the mouth of the river Caÿster and handled commerce to and from the river valleys of the Hermus and the Maeander. The city is inland now as the river gradually silted up. It was part of the "common route" and also functioned as the centre of regional urban development. Ephesus was the capital of the Roman province of Asia and received the coveted title "First and greatest Metropolis of Asia". See Strabo 14.64. With the rise of Augustus and the implementation of his urbanization policies, Ephesus was revitalized, a fact still visible in the vast archaeological remains - in its theatre, temples (of the imperial cult, of Artemis, Hestia, Serapis..), baths...

82 Before Felix, the spokesman of the high priest and elders accuses Paul of being "pestilent fellow (λοιμὸν), an agitator among all the Jews throughout the world (κινοῦντα στάσεις πᾶσιν τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις τοῖς κατὰ τὴν οἰκουμένην),.... (24.5-6).

83 As argued by Sherwin-White (*Roman Society*, 51-52), this is a political accusation which virtually echoes that of the emperor Claudius when summing up his objections to some Jewish action. In a letter of Claudius to the Alexandrines, he refers to Jews "κοινήν τινα τῆς οἰκουμένης νόσον ἐξεγείροντας (stirring up a universal plague throughout the world)". The similarity with the text of Acts is remarkable and deliberate.

ACTS, CHRISTIANITY AND THE EMPIRE AS HOUSEHOLD-WRIT-LARGE ... IN SUM...

Just as many houses discussed in Chapter 5 were shown to bear witness to the multi-faceted contact with imperial power, so the Christianity of Acts also carries a complex message about the household-writ-large that is the empire. On the one hand, Christianity is firmly within and of the empire. It is a movement increasingly composed of households, the basic unit of society and model for empire. At a geographical level, the sphere of apostolic activity is the Roman controlled οἰκουμένη. Legally and politically too, the new movement is within the system and Christians are not convicted of any offences against the state. On the other hand, Christians implicitly challenge the position and power of the emperor by revealing that believers worship a πατήρ", κύριος or δεσπότης with greater power. They aspire to a realm greater than the οἶκος of the emperor and the text portrays disciples in the process of constructing that very realm. As they do, disciples disrupt the οἰκονομία of the household-writ-large. Religious practices sanctioned by Caesars are portrayed as idolatrous and misguided. Both the financial order and the *pax Romana* are threatened by apostolic activity. Christianity, therefore, is at one and same time both within the domain of the οἶκος Σεβαστός and capable of turning this οἰκουμένη upside down. This is no confused double message. Rather it is part and parcel of the new movement's attempt at self-definition. In other words, the household-writ-large is a world-wide οἶκος which serves as model and foil in the process of Christian self-definition. Attention turns next to another such house.

Acts, Christianity and the οἶκος Ἰσραήλ

An important aspect of dwellings in the contact zone is their witness to native tradition. As depicted in Acts, the native tradition which shapes early Christianity is that of the house of Israel. This οἶκος Ἰσραήλ is, like the empire, a world -wide house. As will be demonstrated below, the οἶκος Ἰσραήλ, even more than the οἶκος Σεβαστός and its domain, is the house both within and over against which the new movement defines itself. The section itself is divided into four parts, each of which illustrates a strand of the evidence or a facet of the trajectory. The first draws on textual evidence to offer a definition of the οἶκος Ἰσραήλ as an ethnic group with an identity across time and space. The second explores the text's portrait of early Christianity as a movement situated firmly within the house of Israel. The third charts the increasing hostility and division between disciples and other members of the οἶκος Ἰσραήλ. The fourth and final part highlights the text's image of Christianity as a rebuilt or new house. Taken together, these parts portray how believers set out to reconstruct the οἶκος Ἰσραήλ but end up building a new house or σκηνή.

the οἶκος Ἰσραήλ

Before looking at the place of Christianity within or beyond the house of Israel, attention turns first to an understanding of this οἶκος. As defined in Chapter 2, the οἶκος Ἰσραήλ (2.36) is depicted as "a group with an identity through time and space." In Acts, this definition is greatly enfleshed and this enfleshment is most evident in speeches of Jewish disciples to other Jews who are not (or not yet) Christian.[84]

As illustrated in Acts, the οἶκος Ἰσραήλ is an ethnic group with a common

---

[84] These include speeches of Peter (at Pentecost [2.14-36, 38-40], at Solomon's portico [3.12-26], before the rulers, scribes and elders [4.8-12, 19-20] and with the apostles, before the council [5.29-32]), of Stephen (7.2-53) and of Paul (at Antioch of Pisidia [13.16-41, 46-47], on the barrack steps in Jerusalem [22.1, 3-21], before the council [23.1, 3, 5-6], before Agrippa [26.2-23] and before the local Jewish leaders in Rome [28.17-22, 25-28]).

ancestry and deity. There is repeated reference to shared πατέρες [85] and named "fathers" include Abraham, Isaac and Jacob (7.8, 12, 14). [86] The Jewish deity is described as the God of these three ancestors (3.12; 7.32) or more generally, "ὁ θεὸς τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν". [87] Other named forebears include Joseph, Moses, Aaron, Joshua, Saul, David and Solomon [88] and prophetic ancestors include Samuel (3.24; 13.20) and Isaiah (28.26).

The text demonstrates how identity within the house of Israel is under constant and conscious construction from father to son. As the example of the first and major ancestors reveals, Abraham begot (ἐγέννησεν) Isaac, who in turn fathered Jacob, who was father of the twelve patriarchs (7.8). The twelve patriarchs are ultimately the "fathers" of the twelve tribes (26.7). [89] The monarchs Saul and David are described in father / son terminology as (respectively) "son of Kish" and "(son) of Jesse". [90] The on-going construction of Jewish identity from father to son is further expressed and reinforced in

---

85 The phrase is used by Christians among themselves (15.10) and more commonly to fellow Jews. The term abound in Stephen's speech: thus, οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν could find no food during the famine in Egypt and Canaan (7.11), Jacob sent "τοὺς πατέρας ἡμῶν" into Egypt in search of grain during the famine (7.12), Jacob and "οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν" went into Egypt and died there (7.15), the new king in Egypt forced "τοὺς πατέρας" to expose their infants (7.19), Moses was in the wilderness with "τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν" (7.38), "οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν" (7.39) rejected Moses (7.39), "οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν" (7.44) had a tent of witness in the wilderness, and "οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν" (7.45) brought it in with Joshua when they dispossessed the nations God thrust out before "τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν" (7.45). See also Paul's speech in Antioch where he speaks of God's choice of "τοὺς πατέρας ἡμῶν" (13.17). Before Agrippa, he emphasizes the divine promise made "εἰς τοὺς πατέρας ἡμῶν" (26.6).

86 See references to Abraham (3.25; 7. 2, 8, 16, 17), described as " πατήρ ἡμῶν" (7.2), Isaac (7.8) and Jacob (7.8, 12, 14). See also 7.46, for reference to " τῷ οἴκῳ Ἰακώβ", translated in the RSV as the "God of Jacob". According to Haenchen (*Acts,* 285), "the best MSS replace θεῷ by οἴκῳ, probably inserted for an illegible θεῷ by an early copyist, on the analogy of the recurrent οἶκος Ἰακώβ. A C restore the θεῷ of the Psalm." On the textual problems regarding this phrase, see Fitzmyer, *Acts,* 383.

87 See 3.13, 5.30, 7.32, 22.14.

88 See references to Joseph (7.9, 13, 14), the (twelve) πατριάρχαι (7.8, 9), Moses (3.22, 7.20ff, 29, 32, 35, 37, 40, 44; 15.21; 26.22;), Aaron (7.40), Joshua (7.45), Saul (13.21), David (2.25, 34; 7.45; 13.22, 34, 36; 15.16). There is also mention of the law of Moses (13.29; 28.23).

89 On the term " φυλή", see C. Maurer, *TDNT* 9: 245-250.

90 See 13.20 (υἱὸν Κίς) and 13.22 (τὸν τοῦ Ἰεσσαί).

what is claimed to be the divinely ordained practice of male circumcision (7.8). [91]

As outlined in Acts, the language of sonship extends beyond the narrowly biological or literal level to express a sense of belonging to the social entity that is the house of Israel. Moses' fellow Israelites in Egypt (7. 23, 37) are described as "sons of Israel" and the same term is applied to Jews of centuries later, namely the leaders in Jerusalem (5.21) and recipients of the gospel (10.36). Filial language also makes explicit the relationship between past and present members of the house of Israel. In Jerusalem, for example, Peter draws a connection between his listeners as "οἱ υἱοὶ τῶν προφητῶν" and their ancestors as πατέρες (3.25). [92] At one level, this filial language may be regarded as no more than an idiom or translation of the Hebrew term "בן". [93] At another level, it points to the fact that identity is constructed not simply within one's kin or family of origin, [94] but within the ethnic group that is the house of Israel.

Along with paternal and filial language, that of brotherhood is also used to convey a sense of belonging to the house of Israel. In the text of Acts, the address form "ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί" [95] is frequently found in speeches of Stephen, Peter and Paul to Jewish [96]

---

91 Along with the "διαθήκη περιτομῆς" (7.8), see references to the circumcision party (11. 2) and to the circumcision of Timothy (16.3)

92 The covenant made "..πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας" (13.32) is fulfilled in "you, the children" (13.33: . τοῖς τέκνοις ἡμῖν). On the corrupt nature of the text and the difficulty surrounding the term "ἡμῖν", see H. Conzelmann , *Acts of the Apostles. A Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles*, trans. J. Limburg, A. Thomas Kraabel and D. H. Juel, HNT, Edited by E. J. Epp with C. R. Matthews (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987), 105. See also the parent / child analogy: in Antioch, Paul speaks of the promise made "to the ancestors" being fulfilled "to us, their children" (13.32-33).

93 On the wide semantic field of "בן", see the *Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon.*

94 On wider tribal belonging, see the reference to Saul as "υἱὸν Κίς, ἄνδρα ἐκ φυλῆς Βενιαμίν" (13.20). On kinship, see B. J. Malina, *The New Testament World: Insights from Cultural Anthropology*, revised edition (Louisville: Westminster / John Knox Press, 1993) and K. C. Hanson, "BTB Readers Guide: Kinship", *BTB* 24/4 (1994), 183-194.

95 At Pentecost, Peter addresses the crowd described as "Ἰουδαῖοι, ἄνδρες εὐλαβεῖς ἀπο παντὸς ἔθνους τῶν τὸν οὐρανόν" (2.5) as "ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί" (2.29) (and also as all "those who dwell in Jerusalem" [2.14]). In a speech to the people in Solomon's portico, he uses the form "ἀδελφοί" (3.17). In Stephen's speech, it is the Jewish συνέδριον who are called "ἄνδρες ἀδελφοὶ" (7.2), while in Antioch of Pisidia, the "ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί" (13.38) refer to Paul's synagogue audience, which includes both Jews and god-fearers. Later in Jerusalem, Paul uses the same form of address to both the people (22.1) and the council (23.1, 6), the latter also being called simply "ἀδελφοί" (23.4). In Rome, the term appears in a speech (on the lips) of Paul to local Jews. (28.17). Stephen's hearers and one of Paul's

audiences. While "ἀδελφοί" is one of the most common terms for *Christians* in Acts, [97] the term also designates membership of a Jewish "brotherhood". Thus, while Jews are (diachronically) sons of the ancestors, from a synchronic perspective, they are united as ἀδελφοί. This sense of pan-Jewish solidarity is further highlighted by the fact that the term "ἀδελφοί" is not used as an address to audiences which are largely or exclusively Gentile. [98]

Along with familial terminology, the more generic terms "γένος", "λαὸς" and "ἔθνος" are used to express the fact that the house of Israel is an ethnic group to which all Jews (both past and present) belong. Paul's synagogue audience in Antioch of Pisidia, for example, is described as "sons of the race of Abraham" (13.26: υἱοὶ γένους Ἀβραὰμ). In this description, the term "γένος" refers (as it usually does it Acts) to a group with a common origin. [99] Furthermore, the sense of belonging to this ethnic group is reinforced by filial and paternal language. The term "λαός" [100] too expresses ethnicity

---

Jerusalem audiences are called both "ἄνδρες ἀδελφοὶ" (7.2, 22.1) and "πατέρες" while Paul's synagogue audience in Antioch of Pisidia are referred to as "ἄνδρες ἀδελφοὶ, υἱοὶ γένους Ἀβραὰμ" (3.26).

96 The Jewishness of the Pentecost audience is further highlighted by their designation as "ἄνδρες Ἰουδαῖοι" (2.14) and "ἄνδρες Ἰσραηλῖται" (2.22). This latter term is used by Peter to address the crowd at Solomon's portico (3.12) and by Gamaliel to address fellow Jews in the council (5.35). See also the use of "ἄνδρες Γαλιλαῖοι" (1.11) by the heavenly messengers to refer to the apostles.

97 On "ἀδελφοί" as one of the most frequent terms to describe Christians, see H. J. Cadbury, "Note XXX. Names for Christians and Christianity in Acts" in K. Lake and H. J. Cadbury (eds), *Acts of the Apostles: Additional Notes*. to the Commentary, Vol. 5 of F. J. Foakes -Jackson and K. Lake (eds), *The Beginnings of Christianity* (London: Macmillan and Co., 1920-1933. Reprinted by Grand Rapids: Baker, 1979), 378-379.

98 In the house of Cornelius, Peter uses no specific form of address when speaking to his Gentile hearers (10.34-43). In Athens, Paul's audience is addressed as " ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι" (17.22). At Ephesus, they are "ἄνδρες Ἐφέσιοι" (19.35). The simple "ἄνδρες" is the term of address applied to both an audience at Lystra (14.15) and to Paul's companions on board ship (27.21).

99 As noted by Tannehill (*Acts,* 218), the term "γένος" as used in Luke-Acts always refers to "a human group with common origin or social life" and never simply to a "kind" or "species". Apart from the uses mentioned above, it is used (as in 4.36 and 18.2, 24) when indicating a person's nation or place of origin. See also "ἐκ γένους ἀρχιερατικοῦ" in 4.6.

100 It is called "[λαὸς] μου ." (7.34) by a deity who is named "ὁ θεὸς τοῦ λαοῦ τούτου Ἰσραὴλ" (13.17). Although not applied exclusively to Israel, the term "λαός" is used by Stephen of the Israelites in Egypt (7. 17, 18), by Peter of the crowd of "ἄνδρες Ἰσραηλῖται" (3.11, 12) at Solomon's portico, by Paul of a Jerusalem audience addressed

and in the text, it almost always refers to Jews. [101] While "λαός" (meaning "the Jewish people") commonly appears in contrast to the "Gentiles (ἔθνη)", [102] the text also contains instances in which the term "ἔθνος" is used of the Jewish nation. [103]

In Acts, the sense of the house of Israel as a group with an identity over time is particularly evident in two major tellings of its history: in Stephen's speech, this history is traced from Abraham to Solomon and in Paul's Antioch address, it is recounted from the days in Egypt to the time of David. The fact that Israel is an entity which stretches across space as well as time is communicated through the references to places where the ancestors wandered or inhabited. The spatial nature of the house in the first century C.E. is illustrated in references to the presence of Jews in city after city across the Mediterranean. Like Diaspora maps (figs 6.4-5), [104] the text of Acts points to the world-wide nature of the οἶκος Ἰσραήλ.

As depicted in Acts, therefore, the house of Israel is an ethnic group with an identity across time and space. It has a shared deity, ancestry and history and it is a group to which all Jews belong. Identity within the οἶκος is constructed from male generation to generation and house-building continues into the world of early Christianity where Jews are depicted as both "sons" of the ancestors and members of a common "brotherhood".

---

in Hebrew (21.39, 40) and of his own people against whom he claims to have done nothing wrong (28.17). Jewish leaders are referred to as rulers "of the people" (4.8: .. τοῦ λαοῦ) and Galilean followers of Jesus as witnesses "to the people." (13.31: .. πρὸς τὸν λαόν). In the words of Peter, Moses declared that every soul that does not listen to that prophet shall be destroyed "from the people" (3.23: ἐκ τοῦ λαοῦ). See also 23.5, for reference to the high-priest as a ruler "of your people" (τοῦ λαοῦ σου).

101 According to N. Dahl ("A People for His Name", *NTS* 4 [1958], 319-327), the term "λαός" always signifies Israel, apart from Acts 15.14 and 18.10. See H. Strathmann, "λαός", *TDNT* 4: 39-57.

102 See the contrast between "λαὸς" and " ἔθνη" in 26.23 and 28.26-27.

103 See 10.22, 24.10 26.4 and 28.19. On the term "ἔθνος", see G. Bertram, *TDNT* 2: 364-369 and K. L. Schmidt, *TDNT* 2: 369-372.

104 Fig. 6.4: The Jewish Diaspora in the Roman Empire in S. Freyne, *The World of the New Testament* (Delaware: Glazier / Dublin: Veritas, 1980). Fig. 6.5: The Mediterranean Diaspora: main sites listed in the text of Barclay, *Jews*.

self-definition within the οἶκος Ἰσραήλ

One prominent strand of the text is the presentation of early Christianity as a movement which is rooted in this house of Israel. As depicted in Acts, the movement's message is set within the context of Israel's expectations, its mission is directed initially and primarily at Jews and its membership is composed largely of loyal Jews and Gentiles with a connection to Judaism.

As outlined in the text, Jesus is a true son of Israel and the fulfilment of age-old Jewish expectations. He is described as the seed (σπέρμα) of Abraham (3.25-26) in whom "the families of the earth shall be blessed". [105] He is not merely the heir of David (2.30; 13.23) [106] but is superior in that (unlike the monarch) he did not see corruption (13.34-35, 37). [107] Emphasis is laid on the fact that Jesus' place within Israel is long promised and divinely sanctioned. He is, for example, the prophet foretold by Moses (3.22ff.), the "pre-appointed" [108] Christ (3.20) and the promised saviour (13.23) to Israel. [109] Even his death at the hands of fellow Jews is pre-ordained [110] (claims the author) and

---

105 The blessing of Gen 12.3 and 22.18 is reinterpreted to imply that the seed of Abraham refers, not to his ancestors in general, but to Jesus alone. On the reference to σπέρμα as referring to Jesus alone, see Haenchen (*Acts,* 209 n.6) and Conzelmann (*Acts*, 30). In Antioch, it is implied that Jesus is son of God and this interpretation arises from applying the words of Psalm 2.7 (namely "υἱός μου εἶ σύ, ... γεγέννηκά σε") as spoken by God to the risen Jesus (13.33).

106 According to 2.30, Jesus is "ἐκ καρποῦ τῆς ὀσφύος" of David. Jesus is said to come from David's line (13.23: τούτου ... ἀπὸ τοῦ σπέρματος ..) as Saviour to Israel. See M. L. Strauss, *The Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts: The Promise and Its Fulfilment in Lukan Christology* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1995).

107 On this argument regarding corruptibility, see Haenchen, *Acts,* 411-412.

108 3.20: ..προκεχειρισμένον

109 Jesus is sent according to the promise (13.23: κατ' ἐπαγγελίαν).

110 On the one hand, therefore, those at Jerusalem who condemned Jesus failed to understand the words of their own prophets and ancestors concerning the pre-ordained one yet on the other hand, their actions were actually a fulfilment of those very prophetic utterances (13.27). Peter tells his audiences at Pentecost, "you" were responsible for the death of Jesus (2.23, 3.13-15). He claims that the people and rulers acted in ignorance and that their action was a fulfilment of that spoken by God (προκατήγγειλεν...) through the prophets (3.17- 18). Thus either despite or because of Jewish action, Jesus was delivered "according to the definite plan and foreknowledge of God" (τῇ ὡρισμένῃ βουλῇ καὶ προγνώσει τοῦ θεοῦ..) (2.23), raised by God (2.24, 3.15, 13.30) and made Lord and Christ (2.36). See also the references

leads to his being exalted by God and made "Christ and Lord" (2.36).

The text sets the message, as well as the person, of Jesus within the context of the house of Israel. It was to Israel that the message of John (13.24) and that of Jesus (5.30) were addressed and it is to the "πᾶς οἶκος Ἰσραὴλ" (2.36) [111] that the gospel of the risen One must now be declared. [112] Emphasis on the Israel-centred nature of the gospel is further highlighted in the text. Peter explains to the Gentile audience in the house of Cornelius that the word was sent "to Israel" (10.36). [113] Even more explicitly, Paul tells his synagogue audience in Antioch of Pisidia that "it was necessary that the word of God ... be made known to you first" (13.46). [114] As portrayed in Acts, therefore, the message of Jesus Christ, while ultimately for all nations, [115] is understood to be initially and primarily for the house of Israel. The fact that the mission to Jews continues (albeit with major difficulties) to the end of the book underscores this belief. [116]

The mission is expressed in geographical terms which illustrate a world view

---

to Pentecost as a fulfilment of Joel's prophecy (2.17-21: Joel 2.28-32) and to the long tradition of prophetic witness to Jesus (3.18ff.). See 4.10, 5.30 for similar views expressed by Peter to Jewish audiences in Jerusalem and see also Paul's speech in Pisidia of Antioch.

111 See also 4.10, for reference to ".. παντί τῷ λαῷ Ἰσραήλ".

112 "John preached a baptism of repentance ".. παντὶ τῷ λαῷ Ἰσραήλ ..." (13.24), and Jesus "τῷ Ἰσραήλ ..." (5.31). See also references to apostles asking about the restoration of the kingdom "τῷ Ἰσραὴλ" (1.6).

113 10.36: .. τοῖς υἱοῖς Ἰσραὴλ..

114 13.46: ὑμῖν ἦν ἀναγκαῖον πρῶτον λαληθῆναι τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ.

115 A universal vision is expressed in Luke-Acts. The message on the lips of Simeon, echoing that of Isaiah (Is. 52.10), is that salvation is for "all peoples" (Lk 2.31: ... κατὰ πρόσωπον πάντων τῶν λαῶν..), that Jesus is to be a "light of revelation to the Gentiles and to your people Israel" (Lk 2..32: .. φῶς εἰς ἀποκάλυψιν ἐθνῶν καὶ δόξαν λαοῦ σου Ἰσραήλ). John the Baptist too proclaims salvation for "all flesh" (Lk 3.6: .. πᾶσα σὰρξ..) and at the end of the gospel the disciples are told that "repentance and forgiveness of sins should br preached... to all nations, beginning from Jerusalem (Lk 24.47: εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, ἀρξάμενοι ἀπὸ Ἰερουσαλήμ ..). In Acts, Paul and Barnabas repeat the command of being a "light to the Gentiles (13.47: .. φῶς ἐθνῶν), ... [to] bring salvation to the uttermost parts of the earth" (..ἕως ἐσχάτου τῆς γῆς), while towards the end of the text, it is claimed that the "risen Christ would proclaim light both to the people and to the Gentiles" (26.23: ... τῷ τε λαῷ καὶ τοῖς ἔθνεσιν).

116 See the argument in F. Ó Fearghail, "Israel in Luke-Acts", *Proceedings of the Irish Biblical Association* 11 (1988), 23-43 which contrasts with the views of J. T. Sanders in *Jews in Luke-Acts* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987).

articulated in the house of Israel over generations. [117] One such articulation is found in an alleged letter of King Agrippa I to the emperor Gaius. [118] As outlined in the letter, Jerusalem is the centre of world [119] and the hub from which colonies spread throughout the οἰκουμένη. This universal expansion is described as a spread into "the mainlands", "the most highly esteemed of the islands" and "the countries below the Euphrates". These three categories (argues Scott) are a "*pars pro toto* table of nations in relative distance from Jerusalem and .. Judaea", revealing the influence of the table of nations tradition of Genesis 10. [120] A similar view of movement from "Jerusalem outwards to the nations" is found in Acts and this movement functions as the geographical horizon of the text and provides a broad organizational frame [121] for the narrative. As expressed in Acts 1.8 and illustrated throughout the text, Jerusalem is the point of departure and the centre for the Christian

---

117 On the Jewish world view, see Scott, "Horizon", 495-499.

118 Philo. *Leg.* 276-329. For further details, Scott notes ("Horizon", 495 n.42) the following: on the Philonic authorship of Agrippa's letter to Gaius, see D. R. Schwartz, *Agrippa 1: The Last King of Judaea* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1990), 179, 200-202 and S. Zeitlin, "Did Agrippa write a letter to Gaius Caligula", *JQR* n.s. 56 (1965), 22-31.

119 As stated by Philo (*Leg.* 281), Jerusalem is the mother city, both of Judaea and of many other countries, in virtue of the colonies sent out at various times (.. μητρόπολις δὲ οὐ μιᾶς χώρας Ἰουδαίας ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν πλείστων, διὰ τὰς ἀποικίας ἃς ἐξέπεμψεν ἐπὶ καιρῶν εἰς μὲν τὰς ὁμόρους). As noted by Scott ("Horizon", 498 n.52), "Philo's concept of Jerusalem as Mother also stems from Isa. 54.1-3, which expects that, in the time of the Restoration, Zion, a barren woman up to that point, will have so many children that the place of her tent will need to be continually enlarged to the right and to the left, until her seed shall inherit the nations (cf. Isa. 49.19-20)." Jerusalem is also depicted as the highest mountain Zion to which all peoples will one day return (see Is 2.4).

120 For treatment of this text, see Scott ("Horizon", 499-501). Genesis 10 lists the nations of the earth (traditionally seventy or seventy- two) which are all said to have sprung from the three sons of Noah after the flood (Gen 10.32; also 9.19). According to Scott (*op. cit*, 500) despite certain problems, the main lines of the earth's division among the sons are "relatively clear: these are the nations of *Japheth* in the northern and western lands, including Asia Minor and Europe (Gen 10.2-5); the nations of *Ham* in Egypt and North Africa (Gen 10.6-20); and the nations of *Shem* in Mesopotamia and Arabia (Gen 10.21-31)." On the traditional number, seventy or seventy-two, see *op. cit.*, 500 n. 55.

121 See Scott, "Horizon", 525. According to Conzelmann (*Acts*, 7), "Verse 8b indicates the plan of the book." For Tannehill (*Acts*, 17), however, the notion that 1.8 is programmatic for the structure of Acts is "true only in a limited way." He argues that while Jesus outlines the mission, Acts ends with the mission still incomplete. Although reference to Jerusalem, Judaea and Samaria correspond roughly to developments in Acts 2-9, important steps beyond that point are ignored. There is, for example, no reference to the gospel spreading to Antioch, Asia Minor or Greece, no reference to Rome and no firm basis for identifying "the end of the earth" with the imperial capital.

mission. [122] The mission is to spread to "all Samaria and Judaea and to the end of the earth" (1.8), that is, in three missions [123] "according to the three sons of Noah who constitute the Table of Nations: *Shem* (2.1-8.25), *Ham* (8.26-40) and *Japheth* (9.1-28:31)." [124] Further evidence of the Jewish world view is the fact that its geographical horizon extends to territories like Parthia and Elam, lands outside Roman control but ones with a long-established Jewish presence. [125]

Turning from the message to the membership of the new movement, believers are in the main portrayed either as Jews or as Gentiles with Jewish sympathies. The Jewishness of believers is strongly emphasized, albeit juxtaposed with evidence to the contrary. The early Jerusalem community continues to worship and teach in the Temple (2.46, 3.1, 5.12, 20, 42). Towards the end of the text, there are said to be many Jewish Christians (around Jerusalem) all zealously obedient to the law (21.10: ..πάντες ζηλωταὶ τοῦ νόμου ...). The Lukan Paul is portrayed not simply as a Ἰουδαῖος, [126] but as a loyal one. [127] He was educated under Gamaliel according to

---

122 The focus on Jerusalem is noted by Scott ("Horizon",526 n.166). The city is not merely the Jewish capital but is also the centre of the new movement. Following the commission of 1.8, Jerusalem is the place to which the disciples return (1.12), the locus of the first communities (2.44ff; 4.32 ff.), the city from which (most) believers disperse after the persecution (8.1). It is a centre in which the leadership is based (8.1; 15.2,4,6 ...) and to which other disciples report (15). See also D. D. Sylva, "Death and Life at the Centre of the World" in D. D. Sylva (ed.), *Reimaging the Death of the Lukan Jesus* (Frankfurt: Hain, 1990), 153-217.

123 Scott, "Horizon", 531.

124 The move from Jerusalem outwards bears a Jewish influence; it is not simply a case of inverting the Roman conquest of the East.

125 As noted by Scott ("Horizon", 523) ".. the geographical horizon of Luke-Acts is larger than the Roman Empire. In Acts, Jews from Parthia and Elam are living in Jerusalem (2.5), while the Ethiopian eunuch, portrayed as reading the book of Isaiah and travelling from worship in Jerusalem is obviously at least a Jewish sympathiser (8. 27-28)."

126 See Paul's declaration of himself as an " (ἀνὴρ) Ἰουδαῖος" (21.39, 22.3).

127 Esler, *Community and Gospel*, 125-128.

ancestral law (22.3),[128] worships the ancestral God (24.24), [129] observes ancestral customs (28.17)[130] and speaks the ancestral language, Hebrew. [131] He desires to celebrate Pentecost at Jerusalem (20.16), worships there (24.11), brings alms and offerings to the Temple (24.17-18) where he is found purified (24.18: ἡγνισμένον). He attends synagogue regularly (9.20, 13.14, 17.2), circumcises Timothy (16.1-3), makes a Nazirite vow in Cenchreae (18.18), is involved in a similar vow of four men in Jerusalem (21.24). He is apologetic when informed that he has insulted the High Priest, an offence explained in Ex 22.28. Further evidence of disciples' membership of the house of Israel is found in their speeches to other Ἰουδαῖοι where they refer to Jewish ancestors, the Jewish race and its twelve tribes as "ours". [132] Turning from the Jewish to Gentile Christians of Acts, it is noteworthy that most have connections with Judaism. These "virtual" Jews include Cornelius, Lydia, Titius Justus, the Ethiopian eunuch and presumably some of the unnamed god-fearers to whom disciples preach in the Diaspora synagogues. [133] No link with Judaism is stated in the case of the Philippian jailer but equally significant is the silence regarding his obviously pagan or "idolatrous" background. [134] This silence about pagan Gentiles and the corresponding focus on those with Jewish sympathies is characteristic of the text as a whole.

---

128 22.3: .. κατὰ ἀκρίβειαν τοῦ πατρῴου νόμου..

129 24.24: .. τῷ πατρῴῳ θεῷ ..

130 28.17: .. τοῖς ἔθεσι τοῖς πατρῴοις..

131 See 21.40 and 22.2.

132 In Stephen's speech, the Israelites in Egypt are referred to as "τὸ γένος ἡμῶν" (7. 19). In 27.6, Paul refers to the twelve tribes as "τὸ δωδεκάφυλον ἡμῶν". See the references to οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν on page 277 n. 85.

133 See 13.16 (for example) for a reference to god-fearers in the synagogue of Antioch of Pisidia. A god-fearer is a Gentile with close ties to Judaism The terms "εὐσεβής" and "φοβούμενος τὸν θεὸν" are outlined by Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 449-450. The latter is often seen as the equivalent of the more Hellenistic expression " σεβομένος τὸν θεόν (worshipping God, God-worshipper)" which appears in Acts 13.50; 16.14; 17.4,17; 18.7. See also 18.13; 19.27. Fitzmyer gives an extensive bibliography on the topic in *op. cit.*, 450.

134 While it is not explicitly stated that he is a "pagan" or even a "Gentile", this is assumed on the basis of a lack of reference to his connection with Judaism. See Matson, *Household Conversion*, 167.

At one level, the depiction of the new movement's embeddedness in the house of Israel is historically accurate. The gospel message does arise out of the Jewish world, it is destined first and foremost for Jews and most of its earliest adherents are indeed Ἰουδαῖοι. The οἶκος Ἰσραήλ is, therefore, the womb in which the movement is formed and the home in which it grows. At another level, however, this picture of Christianity's rootedness in Israel is not the whole truth. As will be discussed more fully in chapter 7, disciples stretch and crack the boundaries of their ethnicity by associating and eating with Gentiles and so their loyalty to Judaism is, at very least, questionable. [135] The text implies, for example, that emissaries from Cornelius accept Peter's invitation to lodge with him (10.23) and that the apostle himself stays (and eats) in the centurion's house (10.48, 11.2-3). Paul and companion(s) do not reject Lydia's offer of hospitality (16.15) and the text has an explicit reference to disciples eating in the Philippian jailer's house (16.34). In the face of this reality, the text's (over-)emphasis on the new movement's Jewishness is something of a distortion. This distortion or half-truth is, however, part of Luke's presentation of early Christianity as a legitimate and divinely sanctioned development of Judaism. [136] As will be demonstrated below, this definition is forged within a context of in-house conflict.

---

135 For a discussion of the literary and historical evidence for the Jewish ban on dining with Gentiles, see Esler, *Community and Gospel*, 76-86. In sum, concludes Esler (*op. cit.*, 84), "[f]rom the fourth century BCE right through into the second century CE and beyond, there is a wealth of evidence, both from classical authors and in Jewish sources, for the fact that Jews were zealous in keeping themselves apart from the Gentiles by means of definite boundaries perceived as originating in the Mosaic code.... The antipathy of Jews towards table-fellowship with Gentiles, in the full sense of sitting around a table with them and sharing the same food, wine and vessels, was an intrinsic feature of Jewish life for centuries before and after our period."

136 See Esler, *Community and Gospel*, 16-23, 65-70.

in-house division

In-house conflict is inevitable given the fact that Christianity simultaneously asserts its place with the οἶκος Ἰσραήλ yet continues to develop in ways unacceptable to traditional Judaism. Acts reveals how members of the house of Israel become (to use the gospel image) members of a house in which there is division (..διαμερισμόν...), one in which there "will be five divided, three against two and two against three" (Lk 12.51-53). [137]

Division within the οἶκος Ἰσραήλ is all pervasive in the text. On the one hand, Jews accuse believers of being disloyal members of the house. Stephen is accused (by allegedly false witnesses) of speaking against Moses, God, the temple and the law (6.11, 13). He is said to claim that Jesus of Nazareth will destroy "this place" (i.e. the temple) and change the customs given by Moses (6.13). [138] Before Gallio, fellow Jews charge Paul with persuading people to worship God "contrary to the law" (18.13). [139] In Jerusalem, Jews from Asia claim he is teaching people everywhere "against the people, the law and this place" (21.28). [140] Furthermore they assert (wrongly) that he has "defiled this holy place" (21.28) [141] by bringing Greeks into the temple. Later, before the governor Felix, similar charges are made by the spokesman of the high priest and elders. Paul is accused of being "pestilent", "an agitator among all Jews throughout the world", a "ring-leader of the sect of the Nazarenes" and finally of trying to profane the temple. [142]

In response to these charges, believers strenuously assert their place within the

---

137 Lk 12.52: ... πέντε ἐν ἑνὶ οἴκῳ διαμερισμένοι...

138 Jesus is said to destroy "τὸν τόπον τοῦτον" and change "τὰ ἔθη" (6.13).

139 18.13 : .. παρὰ τὸν νόμον.

140 21.28: .. κατὰ τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ τοῦ νόμου καὶ τοῦ τόπου τούτου.

141 21.28: κεκοίνωκεν τὸν ἅγιον τόπον τοῦτον.

142 24.5-6: For we have found this man a pestilent fellow (λοιμὸν), an agitator among all the Jews throughout the world (κινοῦντα στάσεις πᾶσιν τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις τοῖς κατὰ τὴν οἰκουμένην), and a ring-leader of the sect of the Nazarenes. He even tried to profane the temple (..βεβηλῶσαι) ..." On "Nazarenes", see Cadbury, "Names", 386-387. According to Cadbury, the Greek use of the term, as found in Acts, "is unique in early Christian literature as the name of a group".. but "doubtless represents a genuine usage among the varieties of names applied to the believers."

house of Israel. Paul denies offending against the law and the temple (25.8) [143] and claims that neither his observance nor his message are out of step with the law and prophets (24.14, 26.22). [144] Even as believers prove their Jewishness, however, the very structure of the οἶκος Ἰσραήλ is under threat because of their association with Gentiles.

Moving beyond the strategy of self-defence, disciples embark on a counter-attack. It is not they, but their accusers, who are portrayed as unfaithful members of the house. The speech of Stephen contains a stinging critique of the temple and a damning attack of the disciple's Jewish contemporaries and their ancestors (7.47-53). Turning first to the central institution in pre-70 C.E. Judaism, Stephen draws on the prophet Isaiah [145] in support of his argument that God does not live in structures made "by human hands" (7.48). [146] As already explained above, this term "χειροποιήτος" [147] carries the connotation of idolatry [148] and so, as Esler explains, "Stephen is not just entering the fray on the much debated question of the sense in which God could be said to dwell in the Temple; he is making the radical statement that the very notion of God dwelling in a man-made temple is actually idolatrous." [149]

The words of Stephen, therefore, sound like a battering ram pounding against the house: the οἶκος built by Solomon and the οἶκος Ἰσραήλ who regard this structure as the centre of the world. Turning from the first to the second house, the focus of attack

---

143 25.8: . οὔτε εἰς τὸ νόμον τῶν Ἰουδαίων οὔτε εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν ... τί ἥμαρτον.

144 See 24.14: πιστεύων πάσι τοῖς κατὰ τὸν νόμον καὶ τοῖς ἐν τοῖς προφήταις γεγραμμένοις and .26.22: .. οὐδὲν ἐκτὸς λέγων ὧν τε οἱ προφῆται ἐλάλησαν μελλόντων γίνεσθαι καὶ Μωϋσῆς. Paul also stresses his life as a Pharisee: "κατὰ τὴν ἀκριβεστάτην αἵρεσιν τῆς ἡμετέρας θρησκείας ἔζησα Φαρισαῖος" (26.5).

145 For the reference in 7.49-50, see Is 66.1-2.

146 7.48: ...οὐχ ....ἐν χειροποιήτοις κατοικεῖ ... In 7.7, however, Stephen acknowledges that Abraham's ancestors would worship "in this place" (ἐν τῷ τόπῳ τούτῳ), an expression which usually refers to the temple.

147 The term is reminiscent of the term used of the golden calf. See 7.41: καὶ ἐμοσχοποίησαν ... καὶ ἐυφραίνοντο ἐν τοῖς τῶν χειρῶν αὐτῶν.

148 See the discussion on pages 268-269. As noted by Esler (*Community and Gospel*, 245 n.10), all fourteen instances of "χειροποιήτος" found in the Septuagint are used of idols.

149 Esler, *Community and Gospel*, 134-135, cited above on page 269 n. 60.

shifts from the temple to Stephen's Jewish contemporaries and their ancestors. The ancestors are charged with persecuting the prophets and rejecting those who announced the advent of the "Righteous One", while the descendants are said to have betrayed and murdered this δίκαιος. The description of contemporaries as "stiff-necked.. uncircumcised in heart and ears" (7.51) [150] and resistant to the Spirit echo prophetic critiques. [151] It thus serves to reinforce the link between past and present infidelity. [152] This sense of unfaithfulness over generations is succinctly captured in the phrase "ὡς οἱ πατέρες ὑμῶν καὶ ὑμεῖς" (7.51). It is striking that the ancestors, consistently labelled as "our(s)" earlier in the speech, [153] are now referred to as "your(s)". By this change from first to second person, Stephen signals his dissociation from those whom he classifies as disloyal members of the house of Israel. A similar strategy of critique operates in Paul's Roman speech, where reference to "your fathers" (28.26) appears within a context of attack. There too, Jewish rejection of the disciple's message is portrayed as a continuation of the dull-heartedness, deafness and blindness of their ancestors, whose behaviour (claims the author) was foreseen by the Spirit and condemned by the prophet Isaiah. [154]

As depicted in Acts, the conflict between Christians and other members of the house of Israel operates at the physical as well as the verbal level. In the early days in Jerusalem, Stephen is killed (6.57-60) and believers are persecuted at the hands of fellow Jews.[155] In synagogues and cities of the Mediterranean Diaspora, Jews are shown to reject the gospel, "speak evil of the Way" (19.9), "oppose and revile" (18.2) believers and drag them before civil authorities (e.g. 18.2). In Antioch of Pisidia, for example, Jews participate (with

---

150 7.51: Σκληροτράχηλοι καὶ ἀπερίτμητοι καρδίαις καὶ τοῖς ὠσίν...

151 See, for example, Ex 33.3, 5 on being "stiff-necked" and Jer 9.26 on being "uncircumcised in heart." On rebelliousness against the word, see Num 27.14, on rebelliousness and grieving God's holy Spirit, see Is 63.10 and on closed ears, see Jer 6.10.

152 This disobedience is further concretised in the parallel between Moses and Jesus. As the ancestors rejected Moses, so do the descendants reject Jesus. For reference to the Moses / Jesus typology in Stephen's speech in scholarship, see Esler, *Community and Gospel*, 124-125.

153 On the abundant references to "our ancestors", see page 277 n. 85.

154 For the reference in Acts 28.26-27, see Is 6.9-10.

155 On persecution of Christians in Jerusalem, see 8.1, 9.13 and 22. 4-5.

leading men and women of the city) in a "persecution" against disciples and drive them out (13.50). In Iconium, those labelled as "οἱ .. ἀπειθήσαντες Ἰουδαῖοι" (14.2) stir up Gentiles to oppose believers whom they try to "insult and stone"(14.5). In Lystra, Jews arrive from Antioch and Iconium and their intervention results in Paul being stoned and left for dead (14.19). "Jealous" Thessalonian Jews stir up opposition both in their own city (17.5 ff) and in neighbouring Beroea (17.13). In Greece, a plot is made by Jews against Paul (20.3) [156] and Ἰουδαῖοι in Jerusalem are depicted trying to kill him (21.31) and taking a solemn oath to plan his death (23. 12 ff.).

The negative portrayal in Acts of those somewhat misleadingly labelled as "the Jews" has led many critics to regard the text as profoundly anti-Semitic. [157] More apt, however, is an interpretation of the evidence as an example of conflict or division within the οἶκος Ἰσραήλ as disciples carry out their mission and struggle in the process of self-definition. Stephen's attack on other Jews and on the temple is reminiscent of prophetic utterances of old and the in-house nature of such critique has long been recognized. [158] The negative portrayal of Ἰουδαῖοι in Acts is also characteristic of post-70 Judaism, a period when many Jewish groups struggle to define their identity over against other members of the house. [159] As explained more explicitly by Freyne, the process of

---

156 See 20.3 for mention of this ἐπιβουλή.

157 For details of the anti-Semitic position, see Tannehill, *Acts,* 2 n.1. An extreme charge of anti-Judaism is made by Sanders, *Jews in Luke-Acts*. Other material includes L. Gaston, "Anti-Judaism and the Passion Narrative", 127-153, S. G. Wilson. "The Jews and the Death of Jesus", 155-164 in P. Richardson (ed.), *Anti-Judaism in Early Christianity*, Vol. 1, Studies in Christianity and Judaism 2 (Waterloo, Ontario: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1986), Brawley, *Luke-Acts and the Jews* and the articles in J. Tyson (ed.), *Luke-Acts and the Jewish People. Eight Critical Perspectives* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1988), Weatherly, *Jewish Responsibility for the Death of Jesus in Luke-Acts*. For alternative views, see Tannehill, "Israel in Luke-Acts: A Tragic Story", *JBL* 104 (1985), 69-85 and Ó Fearghail, "Israel in Luke-Acts".

158 Intra-Jewish critiques of the temple are expressed in 1 Kings 8.27 and Isaiah 66.1 (which is quoted in Acts). For a summary of the views of the Essenes who also engaged in temple critique, see the summary in Sanders, *Judaism,* Ch. 16. What is different about the critique of Acts is that while it refers to a pre-70 period, it was written in all probability after the destruction of the temple. On the question of dating, see the summary in Fitzmyer (*Acts* 51-55).

159 On Judaism at the time, see Sanders, *Judaism,* J. Neusner, *Formative Judaism*: *Religious, Historical and Literary Studies*, 3 vols (Chico: Scholars Press, 1982-1983) and L. Grabbe, *Judaism from Cyrus to Hadrian* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992).

"defining the self" involves "vilifying the other". [160] This vilification is all the more bitter when the self and the other share much in common and this is the case with members of the house of Israel.

More generally, the negativity towards "Jews" is the Christian response to widespread Jewish rejection of the gospel. [161] This rejection represents a challenge to its self-understanding and stands as a dilemma which the text does not solve. [162] To put it crudely, the perspective of Acts is that believers are "goodies" and non-believing Jews are "baddies" who reject a message destined for them. Christians are presented persisting in their mission to Israel despite hostility and opposition. [163] At certain key points in the text (13.46; 18.6; 28.28), Jewish rejection of the gospel is presented as the reason for the move to the Gentiles and this represents a change from the initial presentation of the Gentile mission as an intrinsic and divinely-sanctioned part of the plan. [164]

---

160 See S. Freyne, "Vilifying the Other and Defining the Self: Matthew's and John's Anti-Jewish Polemic in Focus" in J. Neusner and E. Frerichs (eds), *"To See Ourselves as Others See Us": Jews, Christians, Others in Antiquity* (Chico: Scholars Press, 1985), 117-144. As noted by Freyne (*op.cit.*, 118), the worst insults are usually reserved for those who impinge most on our sense of identity. Such a threat may provoke a violent response, a desire to destroy the "other". This human experience was thematised in the ancient world in a set of rules for *vituperatio.* He suggests (*op.cit.*, 119) that vilification, both in Matthew and John, arises from a need to define the identities of their communities within Judaism and that the idea of *vituperatio* is a vantage point for evaluating so-called anti-Jewish rhetoric in the texts.

161 While many Jews reject the message, the text also records that many do not. For success among Jews, see 2.41, 4.4, 6.7, 13.43, 14.1, 17.4, 12 and 21.20.

162 For Tannehill (*Acts*, 2), the conflict with unbelieving Jews is a central problem in the text. Furthermore, his view is that the mission to bring salvation to Jews through the message of Jesus ended in tragic disappointment and while aware of the problem, the author could not solve.

163 The text, however, remains ambiguous on the question as to whether Christians abandon the Jewish mission altogether. Even after solemn declarations of turning to the Gentiles (13.46, 18.6), Paul is again found preaching in Jewish synagogues. This is in contrast to the final announcement of a move to the Gentiles (28.28). Coming at the end of Acts, this final declaration leaves open-ended the question of whether further dialogue with other Jews is intended. For a synopsis on scholarship regarding the question of whether mission to the Gentiles replaces, supplements or complements the mission to Israel, see Powell, *Acts*, 68-72.

164 This Gentile mission, originally an expression of a universal Jewish vision, is gradually depicted as carried out despite or because of Jewish rejection. According to Luke, in Antioch of Pisidia, it is because Jews have "thrust (ἀπωθεῖσθε)" the word of God and "judge yourselves unworthy of eternal life" that Paul and Barnabas declare that they are turning to the Gentiles (13.46). In Corinth, they do so in the face of opposition and blasphemy (18.6: ἀντιτασσομένων δὲ αὐτῶν καὶ βλασφημούντων). On the universal vision of (Luke-)Acts, see page 282 n. 115.

In sum, Acts paints a picture of in-house division between Christians and other members of the house of Israel and such in-house division is reminiscent of the conflicts between brothers over property and inheritance which are recorded by Plutarch.[165] In this depiction of sibling rivalry, the text is describing a historical period in which Christianity is not yet separate from Judaism.

a house divided

As outlined in a previous chapter, disputes between siblings often lead to a literal or physical division of dwellings [166] In Acts, too, in-house division eventually leads to a division of the house.

Jewish rejection of the gospel results in a growing and ultimately irreconcilable division between Judaism and Christianity. [167] According to Esler (drawing on Horbury), [168] Luke's community had been separated from the synagogue at the time of writing. [169] This separation is suggested in Paul's forced withdrawal from synagogues (18.7, 19.9) [170] and towns (13.50, 17.10, 17). It is anticipated in Luke's first volume in the expulsion of Jesus from the synagogue and town of Nazareth (Lk. 4.28-30) [171] and in ostracism

---

165 For a discussion of brotherly disputes in Plutarch, see Aasgaard, "Brotherhood", 172- 173.

166 On the division of dwellings, see the evidence cited in Ch. 4 (pages 219-220).

167 On division between Christianity and Judaism, see A. F. Segal, *Rebecca's Children: Judaism and Christianity in the Roman World* (Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press, 1986), Chapters 5 and 6.

168 Esler (*Community and Gospel*, 55-56), citing W. Horbury, "The Benediction of the *Minim* and early Jewish-Christian Controversy", *JTS* 33 (1982), 19-61.

169 For a summary of the debate concerning the dating of Acts, see Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 51-55. With regard to Christianity's separation from the synagogue, see J. L. Martyn, *History and Theology in the Fourth Gospel* (New York and Evanston: Harper and Row, 1968), 29-31. The most obvious sign of Christian expulsions from the Jewish synagogue is in the use of word "ἀποσυνάγωγος" in John 9.22, 12.42, 16.2). The evidence in Luke is not so explicit.

170 According to 18.7, Paul "removes" (μεταβὰς) himself from the synagogue and in 19.9, an even stronger sense of withdrawal and separation is expressed: ἀποστὰς ἀπ᾽αὐτῶν ἀφώρισεν τοὺς μαθητάς.

171 On the Nazareth synagogue episode, see Esler, *Community and Gospel*, 56-57.

predicted early in the text (Lk. 6.22). [172] In the Lukan portrayal, it is Jewish opponents who are blamed for the division [173] for again and again, Paul and his companions return to preach to Ἰουδαῖοι, despite Jewish hostility and rejection and despite their own solemn declarations of turning to the Gentiles.

The portrayal of Christians as members driven from the house of Israel is, however, but one side of the story. The other is the assertive image of believers as a group with a separate identity, an identity explicitly defined over against the οἶκος Ἰσραήλ. Signs of this independent identity abound in Acts. Most obviously, the new movement is shown to appropriate Jewish words and structures. Thus, for example, while Christians in Acts sometimes use the term "ἀδελφοί" to address their Jewish siblings, the word is appropriated by disciples to refer to each other. As will be demonstrated more fully in the next chapter, ἀδελφοί commonly describes relationships, not within the house of Israel, but in Christianity. Further appropriation and transference are seen in the application to Gentiles of terms like "γένος" and "λαός", terms previously reserved for Jews. [174] At the so-called Jerusalem council, James refers to God forming, from the Gentiles, a "people (λαὸν) for his name" (15.14). In the Athenian speech, Paul cites a pagan poet in in support of his argument that all humans (and no longer Jews alone) are God's "γένος"(17.28, 29). This image highlights what is portrayed in Acts, namely, the creation of a new entity, one composed of both Jews and Gentiles. Another sign of the new movement's self-definition over against Israel is the adoption by Christians of the model of the Jewish office of πρεσβύτεροι [175] for their own independent authority structure. Finally, the virtual abandonment of the term "Ἰουδαῖοι" for Christian Jews and the appearance of a new word, namely Christians, are highly effective means of conveying the new movement's separateness from Judaism. In Acts, Ἰουδαῖοι is applied almost

---

172 Lk 6.22: Blessed are you when people hate you and when they exclude (ἀφορίσωσιν ..) you and cast out your name as evil, on account of the son of Man!

173 On blaming Jewish opponents for the split, see Esler, *Community and Gospel*, 67.

174 On γένος and λαὸς, see the discussion on pages 279-280.

175 On Jewish elders in Acts, see 2.17; 4.5, 8, 23; 6.12; 23.14; 24.1; 25.15. On the term as applied to Christian leaders, see 11.30; 14.23; 20.17, 28. See G. Bornkamm, "πρεσβύτερος", *TDNT*: 6:651-683.

exclusively to members of the house of Israel who oppose the gospel Indeed the depiction of "Jews" as other or enemy [176] is so effective that readers frequently take it at face value and overlook the Jewishness of Christianity which the text simultaneously portrays. It is by the new term "Christians", used "first" at Antioch (11.26) that believers are henceforth to be best known. [177]

More generally, the Christianity of Acts is a movement both separate from and superior to Judaism. Reference has already been to Christianity's inclusive table-fellowship which represents a flagrant rejection of Jewish food and purity laws and in the next chapter, the new movement's own rituals of initiation and participation will be discussed. At times, Christian disciples are portrayed as superior to their Jewish counterparts. Thus, for example, the text depicts Paul's instruction of the proconsul Sergius Paulus as more fruitful than that of Bar-Jesus or Elymas (13.6-12). [178] This latter is disparagingly labelled a "magician, a Jewish false prophet" (13.6) and addressed as "son of the devil" and "enemy of all righteousness"(13.10). [179] In Ephesus, the disciple's miraculous powers are shown to exceed those of Jewish exorcists such as the sons of Sceva (19.11-17). [180] In all these examples, the identity and separateness of the new movement is expressed and it is clearly an identity expressed over against the house of Israel. This evidence of a serious dividing of the house reveals that while the text purports to describe the period of earliest

---

176 On the use of "οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι" in contexts of opposition to Paul, for example, see 13.50, 14.2, 14.19, 17.5, 17.13, 18.5-6, 18.12, 20.3, 21.11, 21.27, 23.12.

177 On the term, see Barrett, *Acts,* 556-557.

178 On Bar-Jesus or Elymas, see Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 501-502.

179 13.6: τινὰ μάγον ψευδοπροφήτην Ἰουδαῖον... On the incident, see 13.6-12.

180 These are first referred to as a group of Jewish exorcists (19.13: τινες ..τῶν περιερχομένων Ἰουδαίων ἐξορκιστῶν) and then later as "the seven sons of a priest named Sceva". There has been considerable debate about this "priest named Sceva" and this is discussed in Fitzmyer, *Acts,* 649-650.

As noted by Haenchen (*Acts*, 564 n.1), the Jews "enjoyed a special reputation as exorcists with their magic formulae allegedly going back to Solomon." See excursus 21, 'Zur altjüdischen Dämonologie' in P. Billerbeck and H. L. Strack. *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch, Vol. 2:* Markus, Lukas und Johannes und die Apostelgeschichte (Munich: 1986-1989). Haenchen refers to Joseph. *AJ* 8.45-49 and other texts on Jews and exorcism cited by Conzelmann (*Acts,* 163) are Justin. *Dial.* 80.9-10; Lucian. *Philops.* 16. According to Fitzmyer (*Acts,* 649), however, little is known of exorcising activity among Jews. See, however, Mk 9.38, Lk 9.49-50; 11.19.

Christianity, it simultaneously reflects the historical period in which it was written, a period when there was a break between Christians and Jews. [181]

the house trajectory.... in sum...

The complex picture presented in Acts is that while the world-wide οἶκος Ἰσραήλ is the home in which the new movement grows and struggles for identity, it is also the house from which Christianity eventually grows away. In portraying the movement's multi-stranded relationship with Judaism, the text reflects a long and difficult trajectory.

As expressed in Peter's speech at Pentecost, believers originally understand that they have a message for the whole house of Israel. Historically, early Christians are mostly Jews and as outlined in Acts, their self-definition, message and mission are all articulated in house of Israel language. A more assertive expression of their self-understanding within the house of Israel is found in a construction metaphor on the lips of James at the so-called Jerusalem council (15.16). The metaphor, based on a text of Amos, is one of "rebuild[ing] the dwelling of David which has fallen" (ἀνοικοδομήσω τὴν σκηνὴν Δαυὶδ τὴν πεπτωκυῖαν), of rebuilding its ruins and setting it up (ἀνοικοδομήσω καὶ ἀνορθώσω αὐτήν..). [182] As depicted in Acts, therefore, Christians are reformers or restorers of the tradition. They believe they are charged with the task of rebuilding a structure which has been damaged or destroyed by their fellow Jews. As is clear from Stephen's speech, the σκηνή is symbolic of much that is most sacred, ancient and pure in the tradition of Israel. The image of the tent recalls the "σκηνὴ τοῦ μαρτυρίου", [183] a structure built according to divine instructions and one carried by the ancestors in the period of the wilderness. It is also reminiscent of the "..σκήνωμα τῷ οἴκῳ Ἰακώβ" (7.46), the habitation for God sought by the monarch David. As the speech

---

181 On the dating of Acts, see the reference on page 292 n. 169.

182 See Amos 9.11-12, Jer 12.15 and Is 45.21. On the use of Amos in this text, see Fitzmyer (*Acts*, 555-556). See also Haenchen, *Acts*, 448.

183 As noted by Haenchen (*Acts*, 284 n. 2), the "σκηνὴ τοῦ μαρτυρίου" is the LXX translation for both "אהל עדות" (tent of the testimony) and "אהל מועד" (tent of the assembly).

reveals, this structure stands in marked contrast to the "οἶκος" (7.47) eventually constructed by Solomon, a house never commissioned by God. [184]

While Christians are portrayed as reformers or restorers of the οἶκος Ἰσραήλ, the text also reveals how they eventually become builders of a new construction. Paradoxically, it is in another type of house, namely domestic premises, that the new self-definition over against the house of Israel first begins to take shape. To paraphrase Isaiah, [185] believers begin by trying to enlarge the space of the σκηνή and stretch out the curtains of the habitation but what they produce gradually becomes an unrecognizable space for members of the οἶκος Ἰσραήλ. The new σκηνή is one constructed by many Jewish σκηνοποιοὶ: [186] disciples like Paul, Aquila and Priscilla and other metaphorical tent-makers The structure is fashioned from raw material which is largely Jewish. The fact (be it tragedy or destiny), however, is that this new tent is pitched in new spaces and eventually becomes the shelter for new inhabitants.

---

184 On the tent / house progression, see Conzelmann, *Acts*, 55-56. The progression is from the "σκηνὴ τοῦ μαρτυρίου" to the "..σκήνωμα τῷ οἴκῳ Ἰακώβ" (7.46) sought by David, to the "οἶκος" built by Solomon.

185 See Is 54.2.

186 On σκηνοποιός, see W. Michaelis, "σκηνή" in *TDNT* 7: 393-394 and Richter Reimer, *Women in Acts*, 199-203. As noted by Richter Reimer (*Women in Acts,* 199), the term is a New Testament *hapax legomenon* and is not found in the LXX. It appears in literary sources only (see Michaelis, *op. cit.*, 393-394) and not at all in Greek inscriptions.

ACTS, CHRISTIANITY AND TWO WORLD-WIDE HOUSES ... IN SUM....

If early Christianity is akin to a house in the contact zone, then its imperial and native (Jewish) features have been studied in this chapter. Put in the categories used above, the chapter has focused on the movement's relationship to the household-writ-large of the empire and the house of Israel. The picture of early Christianity to emerge is of a movement in process of self-definition both within and over against the Roman and Jewish houses with which it is connected. Further aspects of the emerging movement's identity, life and development will be revealed in the next chapter.

CHAPTER 7

ACTS and IN-HOUSE CHRISTIANITY

In Chapter 6, a study of early Christianity's relationship to the household-writ-large and the house of Israel yielded insight into the self-definition of the movement. It revealed a movement shaped by its Jewish roots and Roman milieu but one with an emerging life and identity of its own. In this present chapter, further insight into Christianity is gained by focusing on another type of οἶκος, namely the physical house. The category of (physical) house is used here in its general or generic sense as "abode", "dwelling" or "habitation" of any kind. [187] As such, it embraces a range of premises - those referred to as οἶκος or οἰκία, upper rooms (ὑπερῷον) and Paul's lodgings in Rome (a premises discerned from the much-debated terms "ξενία" and "μίσθωμα"). [188]

The reading of the textual evidence is informed by two sources, namely the theoretical insights outlined in Chapter 1 and the evidence of dwellings discussed in Chapters 2, 4 and 5. With regard to the theory, [189] what is of significance is the dynamic two way relationship existing between the built environment and its users, [190] between the spatial and the social.[191] Structurally, the chapter consists of three sections. The first focuses on the opening chapters and explores dwelling / user relationships under

---

187 On the meaning of "house"as a general or generic term for any abode, see Ch. 1 (pages 58-59). On the similarly generic nature of the terms οἶκος / οἰκία, *domus* and בית see (respectively) Ch. 2, pages, 90, 99, 112.

188 On these terms, see Appendix 1.

189 See Ch. 1 (pages 75-81).

190 On the built environment / user relationship, see Ch. 1 (pages 75-76 and notes). On the controlling influence of buildings, see "A structuring structure: the Swahili house" by Donley-Reid in Kent (ed.), *Domestic Architecturee,* 114-126. On the built environment as suggestive (rather than controlling) see Kent (*Domestic Architecture*, 2). Regarding the influence of users on buildings, see Moore (*Space, Text and Gender,* Ch. 5).

191 As noted in Ch.1 (pages 78-79 and notes) social / spatial relationships are explored in different ways in different disciplines. Works discussed included Kent (ed.), *Domestic Architecture,* Moore, *Space, Text and Gender* and Massey, *Space, Place and Gender.* Particular reference was made to Massey's articulation of the inseparability of social and spatial relations.

two headings, namely the upper room (ὑπερῷον) and the houses of the (early) Jerusalem community. Focusing on evidence later in the text, the second section explores the theme under three headings, corresponding to three different types of premises, namely, the house of Cornelius (elite house), the house of Lydia (workshop-*cum*-dwelling) and the upper room at Troas (*cenaculum-in-insula*). The third and final section is a gathering and assessing of the findings.

In general terms, the study of this chapter reveals how profoundly shaped the movement is by the symbiotic relationship between dwellings and users. On the one hand, believers use dwellings for their own unique purposes. On the other hand, the dwellings themselves exercise an influence on the movement. More specifically, the exploration reveals that the two-way relationship between particular dwellings and particular users contributes to the depiction of a movement whose unity and diversity is profound. The five particular dwelling / user(s) configurations are united in their depiction of Christianity as an in-house movement in the multiple sense of being based in and shaped by its presence in domestic premises, constituting a house-like (or fictive kinship) group and (often) comprising households. At one and the same time, however, each of the five dwelling / user(s) configurations, precisely because of its spatial / social location, represents a unique face of the movement. It is this depiction of in-house Christianity as simultaneously united and diverse, as the same and different, that makes for the complex, panoramic perspective of Acts.

Turning attention from houses which are world-wide to those which are local and small-scale, therefore, provides both reinforcement and expansion of the image of Christianity presented in the previous chapter. Christianity is indeed seen to be an emerging world-wide house like the οἶκος Ἰσραήλ and the household-writ-large. As seen in this chapter, however, it is from its base in many and various (physical) houses that the movement develops into such a structure.

Houses, Christianity and the opening scenes in Jerusalem

The importance of the dynamic, two-way relationship between dwellings and users in the shaping of Christianity is in evidence from the opening chapters of Acts. Concretely, it is seen in two different sets of spatial / social relations, namely those operative in the upper room and in the houses of the Jerusalem community. Attention to these dwelling / user configurations serves as a valuable point of departure and provides a foretaste of things to come in the text as a whole. Specifically, it shows Christianity to be an in-house movement in the double sense of (i) being based in and shaped by its presence in different types of domestic premises and (ii) having a house-like or fictive kinship nature.

the upper room (ὑπερῷον)

The first premises of significance in Acts is the upper room in Jerusalem, its users the followers of the risen Jesus who re-group, stay and pray there after the Ascension (1.13-14).

With regard to the premises itself, the upper room was a common feature of many Palestinian dwellings. Such spaces were multi-purpose units and as the name suggests, they were situated on upper floors. As outlined in Chapter 2, upper rooms or floors (עליה) were used by owners as spaces for resting, meeting and entertaining. Such rooms, often accessible by external stairways, were also rented out or given on loan [192] as dwellings and / or meeting places. While the same term "ὑπερῷον" is used of poor-quality *cenacula* or *cellae* in Graeco-Roman style *insulae,* evidence of such buildings has

---

192 While women are portrayed in the upper rooms of Jerusalem and Joppa, ὑπερῷον in Acts is not the γυναικών of Classical Greek times, but rather a more general space for meeting and possibly dwelling.

On the significance and multi-purpose nature of such premises, see Ch. 2 (page 114, n. 142). See also Blue ("Acts and the House Church", 134), who draws on the work of Billerbeck and Klauch and S. Safrai and M. Stern (eds), *The Jewish People in the First Century: Historical Geography, Political History, Social, Cultural and Religious Life and Institutions*, 2 vols (Philadelphia: Fortress / Assen: Van Gorcum, 1974-1976), 730ff.

See Hirschfeld (*Palestinian Dwelling*) on external staircases to upper living areas (*op. cit.*, 26 and fig. 3), on staircases from courtyards to upper floors (*op. cit.*, 57 and fig. 33), on upper floors as living spaces (*op. cit.*, 264-265, 289) and on the use of the attic or עליה as a space used for resting, meeting, entertaining (e.g. 247).

not been found in Jerusalem. [193] The upper room of 1.13, therefore, is a typically indigenous or Near-Eastern feature.

The upper room of 1.13 is probably the same place the disciples shared with Jesus as a temporary base in the city and where they celebrated the Passover which was also the last supper. In Luke's gospel, the place is referred to as the ἀνάγαιον (Lk 22.12) and κατάλυμα (Lk 22.11). As already noted, κατάλυμα is a term commonly used of temporary accommodation. [194] The rarer ἀνάγαιον [195] (which like ὑπερῷον conveys the sense of a premises upstairs) is described by the evangelist as a large space, belonging to a householder, which is furnished and available for the disciples' use. [196]

With regard to the users of the ὑπερῷον, the text reveals that they include eleven of the twelve apostles known from the gospel, [10] "the women" [11] and the

---

193 As noted in Ch. 2 (pages 105-109), there was also a whole range of upper level premises for renting in Graeco-Roman cities. See *P. Oxy* 1129 for a contract for the lease of two dining-rooms in a house (including all such appurtenances) in the city: ἀπὸ οἰκίας οὔσης ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ ... δύο τοπους ἤτοι σὺν χρηστηρίοις πᾶσ. An account of a house rental in Crocodilopolis (c. 177 B.C.E.) includes the rental of the upper rooms which yielded 300 dr. per month (τοῦ ἄνω οἴκου φέροντες τοῦ μηνὸς (δραχμὰς), (*P. Mich.* Inventory 3197, unpublished, which appears in *Select Papyri*. LCL. Vol. 1: *Private Affairs*, trans. A. S. Hunt and C. C. Edgar (London : Heinemann, 1932-1934), no. 184. See Blue, "Acts and the House Church", 133, notes 51 and 52.

194 See the definition on page 91 n. 22 and see also Cadbury, "Lodging", 321. In the RSV, κατάλυμα is translated as "guest-room".

195 The only examples given in Liddell-Scott are Lk 22.12 and Mk 14.15.

196 According to K. Lake and H. J. Cadbury , *The Acts of the Apostles: English Translation and Commentary* (Vol. 4 *of* F. J. Foakes-Jackson and K. Lake [eds], *The Beginnings of Christianity,* 5 vols [London: Macmillan and Co., 1920-1933; Reprinted by Grand Rapids: Baker, 1979], 10), the ὑπερῷον is perhaps identical with the ἀνάγαιον of Lk 22.12. See Blue, "Acts and the House Church", 135. As noted by Blue (*op. cit.*, 133), the text does not indicate whether this upper room is rented or is part of a believer's house placed at the community's disposal.

10 They are named in 1.13 as "Peter and John and James and Andrew, Philip and Thomas, Bartholomew and Matthew, James the son of Alphaeus and Simon the Zealot and Judas the son of James".

11 On the textual problems, see V. Lawson, "Gender and Genre: The Construction of Female Gender in the Acts of the Apostles" [Ph.D. Trinity College, Dublin, 1997], 152. Lawson explains how Codex Vaticanus (B) reads 'with women' (σὺν γυναιξὶν) while Codex Bezae (D) has 'with the women and children' (σὺν ταῖς γυναιξὶν καὶ τέκνοις). "The inclusion of children suggests that the women are present in their capacity as wives and mothers, rather than as believers in their own right." The anti-female bias of Codex D has been noted by Haenchen, *Acts*, 154 n. 3. See also Schüssler Fiorenza, *Memory*, 53.

ἀδελφοί or siblings [12] or Jesus. The women are generally regarded, not as the wives of the apostles, [13] but as those mentioned in Lk 8.2-3 and 23.49-24.10: [14] that is, women like Magdalene, Joanna, Suzanna and Mary (the mother) of James who (like the twelve) are faithful followers of Jesus. The eleven, the women and the blood relatives of Jesus, [15] therefore, constitute the earliest community, which is portrayed as a group united "with one mind". [16] The group is representative of the *Jesusbewegung,* [17] a movement based not on blood ties but on free association. The group illustrates the fictive kinship nature of Christianity or, in other words, of a movement which applies to itself the language and bonds typical of kinship, one of the central institutions in the Mediterranean world. [18]

There is evidence of a two-way relationship between building and users, between ὑπερῷον and believers. On the one hand, believers confer meaning on the space by who they are and what they do; on the other hand, the space itself contributes actively to the creation and expression of Christian identity. More specifically, attention to the relationship reinforces the nature of community as fictive household and highlights the "double" identity of this household as both Jewish and Christian-in-the-making.

With regard to the nature of community, the upper room / users relationship

---

12 Barrett (*Acts,* 90) concludes his discussion: "... it is fair to add that the most natural meaning of ἀδελφός is blood-brother, that foster brother is not impossible, and that cousin is very improbable." As argued by Lawson ("Gender and Genre", 159), the reference to " 'his brothers' is a generic term which probably conceals the presence of the female relatives of Jesus."

13 For Barrett (Acts, 89), the "most natural way" of translating this phrase is "with their wives".

14 See Lawson, "Gender and Genre", 153-154 and n. 55. For further details, see *op. cit.,* 152-161.

15 While in Mark and Luke, Jesus is portrayed substituting his biological family with a spiritual one, in Luke the possibility remains open that family members too may become disciples. See the comparison and contrast between Lk 8.19-21 and Mk 3. 31-33 in Lawson ("Gender and Genre", 147- 149) and T. Karlsen Seim, (*The Double Message: Patterns of Gender in Luke-Acts* [Edinburgh : T. and T. Clark, 1994], 66-67).

16 1.14: ὁμοθυμαδὸν. In this context, the adverb means "unanimously, with one mind".

17 On the term "Jesus movement", see G. Theissen, *Sociology of Early Palestinian Christianity*, trans. J. Bowden (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1978), 1.

18 On elective association and non-kin groups, see B. J. Malina, "Early Christian Groups" in Esler (ed.), *Modelling Early Christianity,* 96-113 (esp. 108-110). As described by Malina (*op. cit.*, 109), "..elective associations would form fictive kin in that they presumed mutual loyalty and solidarity among persons presumed to be what they have been labelled. Given the kinship labels used by Paul, for example, his would clearly be fictive kin groups." On kinship in the Mediterranean world, see the works of Malina and Hanson cited in Ch. 6 (page 279 n.94).

expresses and reinforces the identity of believers as fictive household. On the one hand, believers confer on the upper room the nature of a dwelling by actually residing there (however temporarily). [19] On the other hand, the living space itself strengthens the identity of the community as a pseudo-household. Like a house, the upper room's function as an abode helps to foster in believers a sense of themselves as community. They are not merely fictive kin in the metaphorical sense but also in the sense of being co-residents.

Yet further information about this particular fictive household is gleaned from consideration of their spatial location. The premises occupied by the entire and numerous group is in Jerusalem, that is, far from the residents' place of origin in Galilee; it is part (but not all) of a house; it is rented (from an unnamed householder) rather than owned by any one of them. The premises, therefore, reflects and reinforces the believers' condition as rural folk who have left "οἰκίαν" (Lk. 18.29) and "τὰ ἴδια" (Lk 18.28) to embark on an itinerant lifestyle for the sake of the gospel, [20] as folk who re-group as fictive "house" in a new space as part of this radical process.

The upper room / believers relationship also illustrates the process described *en grand* in Chapter 6, namely the process of early Christian self-definition both within and beyond Judaism. On the one hand, those who meet in the upper room are Jewish. They pray in the ὑπερῷον but as mentioned in subsequent chapters, [21] they also attend the temple. Like all other Jews, therefore, they celebrate and practise their faith in both a domestic and a public context. On the other hand, the emerging identity of the group as an entity in its own right, an entity separate from mainstream Judaism is also conveyed in events in the upper room.

The first indication of the formation of an embryonic movement is the actual re-grouping and praying in the upper room. While the events of 1.13-14 are the only ones

---

19 According to Haenchen (*Acts,* 153), permanent residence is implied by the phrase "ἦσαν προσκαρτεροῦντες" (1.13). By contrast, Barrett (*Acts,* 87) argues that "we can hardly suppose that all the persons mentioned were *residing* in one room; the meaning must be that they habitually met there."

20 See "The Wandering Radicals: Light Shed by the Sociology of Literature on the Early Transmission of Jesus Sayings" and "We Have Left Everything..... (Mark 10.28): Discipleship and Social Uprooting in the Jewish-Palestinian Society of the First Century", Chapters 1 and 2 in G. Theissen, *Social Reality and the Early Christians: Theology, Ethics and the World of the New Testament*, trans. M. Kohl (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1993).

21 See 2.46, 3.1, 5.20-21, 42.

explicitly set in the ὑπερῷον, the narrative evidence suggests that the room functions as the locus of other important gatherings, gatherings in which the new and emerging identity of believers is expressed. Thus, for example, the ὑπερῷον is most likely to be the space [22] in which the ἀδελφοί engage in the solemn ritual of re-constituting the Twelve by electing Matthias to the ministry and apostleship (1.15-26). It is also probable that the same upper room is situated within the house οἶκος (2.2) [23] in which believers are gathered "all together in one place" (2.1: ..ἦσαν πάντες ὁμοῦ ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό·) at Pentecost, the place where disciples are baptised in the Spirit (1.5) and empowered to go forth as witnesses (1.8). Whether historically or at a purely narrative level, therefore, the upper room of 1.13 continues to operate as a place in which the identity of the new movement is forged, a place where group structures are put in place and where members are initiated and strengthened.

While the upper room functions in Acts as a place where identity is forged and expressed, this represents a continuation of and development from the gospel. It was there, after all, that the link between upper room and identity-in-formation was first seen. It was in the upper room (ἀνάγαιον [Lk 22.12] and κατάλυμα [Lk 22.11]) that Jesus celebrated the Passover meal with his disciples, a meal which was also the Last

---

22 There is no mention of a change of venue from the previous section (in the ὑπερῷον), but in the absence of a stated change, it is likely that the venue remains the same.

With regard to the number gathered - said to be some 120 - what remains unexplained is the movement's apparent growth from the smaller post-ascension gathering of 1.13-14. The number may reflect a slightly later period when believers re-grouped and the movement expanded in the city. The figure may also allude to the minimum number (of males) required by Jewish law to form a community with its own council, thus suggesting that from a Jewish perspective, "the disciples were a body of sufficient size to form a new community" (I. H. Marshall, *The Acts of the Apostles: An Introduction and Commentary*, TNTC [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans / Leicester: Inter-Varsity, 1980], 64). Reference to the 120, therefore, functions as yet another sign of independence from Judaism and is one which probably reflects the time of writing rather than that being written about.

Blue ("Acts and the House-Church", 131 n. 45) asks where such a large number could meet and notes that the ".. question is usually left unasked (Pesch being the exception). See R. Pesch, *Die Apostelgeschichte* (Einsiedeln: Neukirchener, 1986), 77ff. Blue dismisses the claim of B. Bowman Thurston ("τὸ ὑπερῷον in Acts i.13", *ExpTim* 80 [1968], 21-22) that it is impossible for a room in a private house to accommodate such a group. He shows (*op. cit.*, 133-138) that such premises were indeed available in Jerusalem. He also suggests (*op. cit.*, 133, 135) that the gathering mentioned in 1.15 may take place, not in the upper room alone, but rather in a larger area: an entire upper level or annex of rooms.

23 According to Blue ("Acts and the House Church, 132), the Pentecost event takes place in the upper room. He considers that the upper room is part of the house referred to in Acts 2.2.

Supper. In other words, a uniquely Jewish festival, celebrated in traditional fashion in a domestic context, was the womb out of which another ritual was being engendered, namely the Christian breaking of bread. Like the event itself, the identity of the disciples present was "double", in the sense of being at one and the same time thoroughly Jewish and Christian-in-the-making.

The upper room's function as a locus of identity-under -transformation continues in Acts. At a purely practical level, it continues because the ὑπερῷον is the earliest believers' temporary home in the city. At another level, believers' continued presence in the upper room contributes to the forging and fixing of identity in that place. In such a process, the place itself acts as a mnemonic, reminding users of their (hi)story and encouraging its on-going construction. In other words, the place "holds" the memory of the group. In turn, this "holding" contributes to the formation of identity and the growth of tradition. As depicted in Acts 1.13-14, therefore, the upper room has a function akin to the Roman town-house in that it creates and reinforces the identity of those using or occupying it.

In sum, the two-way relationship between upper room and its occupants points to the nature of Christianity as a fictive kinship or house-like movement. It is a movement rooted in Judaism but one simultaneously in process of developing a new and separate identity. The social/spatial configuration of 1.13-14 is the first image of Christianity in Acts, the first illustration of what may be termed the in-house character of the movement. It is in-house in the sense of being house-like in composition and in-house in the generic sense of meeting in domestic premises.

The houses of the (early) Jerusalem community

The other significant social / spatial configuration in the early chapters of Acts is that between the early Jerusalem community members and their houses. Here again, attention to the two-way relationship between premises and their users reveals important aspects of early Christianity, namely its rituals, practices and composition. Furthermore, it points to an in-house nature which is both like and unlike that portrayed in 1.13-14.

Like the upper room, these houses become emerging-Christian spaces through the religious activity carried out in them by believers. As well as worshipping and teaching

"ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ", [24] believers do so "κατ' οἶκον" (2.46; 5.42). It is "κατ' οἶκον" too that they break bread and eat "with glad and generous hearts" (2.46-47). Whether this ambiguous phrase "κατ' οἶκον" means "in physical houses", "from house(hold) to house(hold)", "in households" or "at home", [25] what is clearly unambiguous is that the context is domestic.

While Christian activity confers a new, religious function on houses, houses too are influential. The domestic location is influential in shaping the kind of rituals and activities which become particularly characteristic of the Christian or Lukan community, namely the breaking of bread [26] and joyful, inclusive meal-sharing. Indeed Acts' emphasis on meals (with or without Eucharist) [27] is a direct result of the movement's meeting in domestic locations. [28] It is no coincidence that the Lukan writings, which emphasise the

---

24 See 2.46, 3.1, 5.20-21, 42. See also 21.26, (24.11), 24.17-18.

25 Ambiguity arises in relation to the translation and meaning of the phrase κατά + οἶκος which appears four times in the text (see 2.46, 5.42: κατ' οἶκον, 8.3: κατὰ τοὺς οἴκους, 20.20: κατ' οἴκους). Commentators do not clarify whether it means "in (physical) houses", "in household groups", "at home" or "from house to house". According to the RSV, it is "in their homes" (RSV for 2.46: κατ'οἶκον) that the community in Jerusalem break bread and "at home" too (RSV for 5.42: κατ'οἶκον) that they teach and preach. The NRSV renders the phrase (in 2.46 and 5.42) "at home" but in a note gives an alternative, "from house to house". Haenchen does not comment on the actual phrase, but he refers to meals taking place " 'at home' - or in a number of houses" (*Acts*, 192 on 2.46), to "home gatherings" (*Acts*, 254 on 5.42), to "Christian homes" (*Acts*, 294 on 8.3) and to "the house-churches" (*Acts*, 591 on 20.20). F. F. Bruce (*The Acts of the Apostles: The Greek Text with Introduction and Commentary,* 3rd edition revised and enlarged [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990], 133; cf. also 179) refers to the "κατ' οἶκον" of 2.46 as "by households" and "κατ' οἴκους" of 20.20 (*op. cit.*, 431) as "in your houses". In conclusion, the phrase undoubtedly carries the meaning of "dwelling", but it most probably embraces the sociological meaning of household and the psychological sense of "home". See the discussion about home (and homelessness) in Ch. 1 (pages 67-69).

26 The phrase "κλάω ἄρτον" is also found in 20.7,11 and 27.35. As noted by Fitzmyer (*Acts*, 271), the phrase seems to be the "formal reference to celebration of the Lord's supper."

27 On eucharist / meals, the "single Christian sacrament of table fellowship", see B. Reicke, *Diakonie, Festfreude und Zelos in Verbindung mit der altchristlichen Agapenfeier* (Uppsala: A. B. Lundequistska Bokandeln, 1951), esp. 14.

28 On Lukan meals, see J. Navone, *Themes of St. Luke* (Rome: Gregorian University Press, 1970), 11-37, R. Karris, *Luke: Artist and Theologian: Luke's Passion Account as Literature* (New York: Paulist, 1985), 44-78, H. Moxnes, "Meals and the New Community in Luke", *Svensk Exegetisk Årsbok* 51-52 (1986-1987), 158-167, J. H. Neyrey, *The Passion According to Luke: A Redaction Study of Luke's Soteriology* (New York: Paulist, 1985), 8-11 and "Ceremonies in Luke-Acts: The Case of Meals and Table-Fellowship", 361-387 in Neyrey (ed.), *The Social World of Luke-Acts*, 361-387.

values of inclusivity and celebration are the ones in which domestic premises feature most prominently.[29] More generally, the movement's location "κατ' οἶκον" helps reinforce in its members a sense of community, a sense of being at home - spatially, socially, psychologically.

In its use of houses and domestic rituals in the process of identity formation, the early Christians resemble other Jews and Romans. As seen in Chapter 4, the town-house was a powerful instruments in the identity creation of the traditional Roman family. In the Jewish case, too, the practice of dietary laws and the celebration of festivals in the home reinforced identity within the house of Israel. In contrast to Jews and Roman, however, the emerging Christians are a nascent group and as seen above in relation to Passover and the breaking of bread, they are a group undergoing transformation within and out of Judaism.

Along with rituals, meals and "at homeness", the composition of the community is another aspect to emerge from consideration of the houses / users relationship, one such being its composition. The community which meets "κατ' οἶκον" is in many respects quite different from that in the upper room in that it is urban-based, larger and more socially diverse. The phrase "κατ' οἶκον" seems to imply a plurality of bases and thus points to a community which is both city-based and of a certain size.[30] Furthermore, the fact that these bases are owned rather than rented reinforces the settled or resident nature of the community. This represents a contrast with the believers of 1.13-14 who are a group of Galilean pilgrims.

Other aspects of the community are seen in their ability to sell houses. The relationship between dwellings and users, therefore, is not one of occupation / residence alone. Believers who are "κτήτορες .. οἰκιῶν" (4.34) sell property and share the proceeds with those in need, either directly or through the apostles (2.44-45; 4.34). There is praise for the exemplary behaviour of Barnabas (4.36-37) in this regard and a reminder of the punishment meted out to Ananias and Sapphira for their dishonesty and failure to share (5.1-11). On the one hand, this practice of selling property points to the socially

---

29 On the centrality of houses and households in Luke-Acts, see Elliott ("Temple versus Household").

30 Implicit in the scattering after the persecution (8.1) is the understanding that the community is actually based in the city.

diverse nature of the community, to the presence among it of the needy and not-needy. [31] On the other hand, it reveals the community's attempt to bridge the divide, to create a more just or egalitarian group.

By selling property and sharing the proceeds, believers are creating a community in which the division between "haves" and "have nots" is lessened: a community in which they can live as ἀδελφοί in the material as well as the spiritual sense. It is appropriate, therefore, that this community be described as the living embodiment of a utopian ideal well-known in the ancient world [32] - that is, as a group "of one heart and soul" (2.32: καρδία καὶ ψυχὴ μία) which has "all things in common" (2.44, 4.32: πάντα [or ἅπαντα] κοινά). It is surely because this community strives for material (as well as spiritual) sharing that its celebrations are described as joy-filled occasions [33] and not the divisive events recorded at Corinth and Thessalonica, for example, where social division and practical problems are all too apparent. [34]

The selling of property and the sharing of proceeds is also reminiscent of the gospel imperative to "sell your possessions and give alms"(Lk. 12.33). The text suggests, therefore, that some believers are responding positively to Jesus' call by divesting themselves of property. At one and the same time, however, the text portrays a group which keeps its property, meets there and merely disposes. The evidence of the Jerusalem community, therefore, is of a group aware of its original inspiration but one content to settle down in the urban, world. Depending on one's perspective, this settling down may be viewed as inculturation or selling out.

Just as the social / spatial configuration of 1.13-14 was shown to highlight the "double" identity of believers, so too does the relationship between Jerusalem community and their houses. On the one hand, Christians are still depicted as loyal Jews,

---

31 On the moneyed nature of the Jerusalem community, see Judge, *Social Pattern*, 54f. and Blue, "Acts and the House Church", 137.

32 See D. L. Mealand, "Community of Goods and Utopian Allusions in Acts II-IV", *JTS* 28 (1977), 96-99.

33 Believers eat "with glad and generous hearts" (2.46: .. μετελάμβανον τροφῆς ἐν ἀγαλλιάσει καὶ ἀφελότητι καρδίας).

34 As noted by Jewett ("Tenement Churches" 33), Reicke (*Diakonie*) points out that Acts 2.46 is the only New Testament passage that refers to such joyous celebrations as completely unambiguous.

who worship and teach "ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ". On the other, their emerging identity as a separate group is also evident. It is seen most clearly in their own unique religious activities carried out "κατ' οἶκον". It is also seen in the attempt to live "all things in common". By selling properties and sharing the proceeds, believers are establishing their own internal economic system, a system based on reciprocity. Furthermore, this sharing of resources appears to be a feature of the emerging movement as a whole for in a later chapter of Acts, believers at Antioch are depicted gathering funds to help their famine-struck "siblings" in Jerusalem (11. 28-30).

The internal economic system must also be viewed in the context of the two major economies of the day, namely the Roman system and Temple Treasury. Reference has already been made in Chapter 6 to the financial system of the household-writ-large and to how Christianity undermined this system. [35] The pooling of resources by believers is further evidence of a process of self-definition over against the empire. It also represents self-definition in relation to Judaism. With regard to the Jewish system, the Temple Treasury functioned as the centre for the collection and re-distribution of wealth, according to the interests of those in power. [36] Believers' more reciprocal micro-economic system [37] is something of a declaration of identity in relation to this system. It is also an intimation of tension between believers and other Jews, a tension already documented in Chapter 6. [38]

In sum, the two-way relationship between the early Jerusalem community and its houses opens doors onto the rituals, composition, ideals and reality of the community. The picture to emerge is different from that in 1.13-14, but what it shares is an in-house nature in the sense of meeting in domestic premises and forming part of a larger house-like

---

35 See Ch. 6 (pages 270-272).

36 For a summary of the temple and household as contrasting systems, see the summary in Elliott, "Temple and Household", 231. He draws on the work of Moxnes (who follows Marshall Sahlins).

37 See the argument of Elliott in "Temple versus Household" (discussed on pages 26-27 of the Introduction).In his discussion of the house as a new sacred space, Matson (*Household Conversion*, 129-33) draws on the findings of Elliott. On the mounting conflict with temple authorities, see Tannehill, *Acts,* 59-101.

38 In the early chapters, more explicit reference to the tension is seen in the in the events concerning Stephen and the growing conflict with temple authorities. On the mounting conflict with temple authorities, see Tannehill, *Acts,* 59-101.

movement.

Another vignette of the in-house Jerusalem community is seen in a later chapter, in the οἰκία of Mary (12.12-17). Mary and her premises serve as further illustration of the well-off nature of certain believers in the city. With its fortress-like "πυλῶν" (gate[way]) and "θύρα" (door), the house itself appears a solid and substantial property, the home of well-to-do householder. [39] Mary's own position as not needy is further evidenced in the reference to the παιδίσκη [40] on her premises. While it has been argued that Rhoda is not Mary's servant girl, [41] her ability to hear Peter's knock (when no one else does) and her swiftness in opening the door suggests one accustomed to performing this particular task in this particular house.

Like Barnabas, Mary puts her property at the service of the community; unlike him, she does so by offering it for their use rather than by selling it. Her οἰκία provides a space for "many" believers to gather in prayer and Peter's arrival there on his deliverance from prison points to its nature as a regular gathering place. Such service both illustrates the sharing noted in Acts 2 and 4 and constitutes a form of patronage. It is not the model of patronage seen in Chapter 4, namely, that typified by elite, Roman public-office-holding men; rather it is a model practised by well-off women in the (Graeco-) Roman and Jewish world and now adopted by the emerging Christian community. [42]

The group gathered in Mary's house both exemplifies and develops the picture of the Jerusalem community described above. Its diversity - in terms of gender, social status and place of origin - is succinctly illustrated in the four named individuals depicted in or

---

39 As noted by Lawson ("Gender and Genre", 212), while she is identified in relation to her son, John Mark, the house is said to be hers. On Mary as a widow, see Lawson, *op. cit.*, 212 n.41. As argued by Seim (*Double Message*, 101), Mary is an example (like Martha and others) of "relatively well-off and autonomous women who have their own house and place it at the disposition of others, whether the community or itinerant preachers..."

40 As noted by Lawson ("Gender and Genre", 212), Rhoda is probably a slave. "Παιδίσκη" is a diminutive form of the term "παῖς". On Rhoda, see Lawson, "Gender and Genre", 212-214.

41 She may be a member of Mary's house(hold) but as noted by Richter Reimer (*Women in Acts,* 241*)*, the "text does not say that Mary is her owner." On the idea of Rhoda being granted leave to take part in community gatherings, see L. Schottroff, *Lydia's Impatient Sisters : A Feminist Social History of Early Christianity,* trans. B. and M. Rumscheidt (Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster John Knox Press, 1995), 125-126

42 On women's patronal roles, see Ch. 4 (page 201 n.80)

associated with the premises: these are the possibly Rhodian παιδίσκη Rhoda, the Galilean fisherman Peter, the better-off Jerusalemite householder Mary and her son John-Mark. Reference to the mother and son reveals another element of the Jerusalem community, namely its family or trans-generational nature. Furthermore, mention of the servant girl develops the picture from a purely family to a household unit. The group in Mary's, therefore, has a kinship unit at its core but comprises a group wider than family, a group which shares a common identity as believers. It is a diverse group of kin and non-kin, of household and non-household members united in a common faith. In sum, the community which meets "κατ' οἶκον" is, therefore, in-house in a triple sense: it is composed of family or households, meets in houses and constitutes a fictive kinship group.

The opening chapters ... in sum

In the opening chapters of Acts, therefore, it is clear that the relationship between domestic premises and users is key to understanding early Christianity as depicted in the text. In general terms, the exploration reveals how the movement is shaped by the dynamic, two-way relationship between dwellings and users. On the one hand, believers are shown to use domestic premises for their own unique rituals and activities and furthermore, as a way of generating funds to ensure material as well as spiritual togetherness. On the other hand, the domestic premises themselves are active agents: reinforcing the identity of believers as members of a fictive-kinship movement and influencing the development of characteristically Christian rituals (breaking bread) and practices (eating together).

As yet there is no opposition between (physical) house and temple. Rather, believers practise their faith both "ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ" and "κατ' οἶκον". In this juxtaposition the identity-in-transformation of believers is captured: Temple attendance reveals their Jewishness and the new rituals celebrated "κατ' οἶκον" points to their membership of a group which is in process of becoming other-than-Judaism.

The two dwelling / user(s) configurations studied so far reveal a movement in which there is both unity and diversity. The two configurations are united in their depiction of Christianity as a house-like movement in the double sense of (i) being based

in and shaped by its presence in domestic premises and (ii) forming a house-like or fictive kinship movement. [43] At one and the same time, the configurations are different in that they represent two quite distinct images of community, two phases or stages of the movement: the first and earliest is the one in the upper room which consists of the non-kin companions of Jesus; the second is the socially diverse, urban based community comprising household and non-household members which meets "κατ' οἶκον". As the text progresses, there is both reinforcement and development of the picture of Christianity to emerge in the opening chapters.

---

[43] It is in the early chapters above all, that the solidarity of fictive kinship is conveyed. It is seen, for example, in the use of "φίλοι" (4.23), a self-designation commonly used by fellow members of philosophical societies in antiquity. The sense of a being community with "all things in common" is further conveyed by the term "κοινωνία" (2.42). It is reinforced by repetition of the adverb "ὁμοθυμαδὸν" (unanimously, with one mind) and of the phrase "ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό". The phrase "ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό" occurs in the New Testament in Acts 1:15, 2:1, 47 and 1 Cor 11.20; 14.23 and its meaning is discussed in Blue, "Acts and the House Church", 131 n.44. According to B. Metzger (*A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* [London: United Bible Societies, 1971], 305), the phrase is common in Greek and acquired a quasi-technical meaning in the early church. It may be rendered "in church fellowship" or as expressed by M. Wilcox, *The Semitisms of Acts* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1965), 95, "in church".

Moving on .....

As the text moves beyond the opening chapters, further insight into the nature and development of Christian community is gained by focusing on the two-way relationship between dwellings and users. The evidence is explored below under three headings: (i) the house of Cornelius, (ii) the house of Lydia and (iii) the upper room at Troas. These represent three quite different spatial locations, namely an elite house, a workshop-*cum*-dwelling church and a *cenaculum-in-insula.* As will be demonstrated through these three dwelling / user(s) relationships, the text reinforces and develops the picture of Christianity as an in-house movement in the double sense of (i) being based in and shaped by its presence in domestic premises (ii) forming a trans-local, house-like or fictive kinship movement. At one and the same time, however, each of the three spatial / social configurations, precisely because of its location, presents a unique face of this in-house movement.

The house of Cornelius

Turning first to the house of Cornelius, attention focuses on what the symbiosis between this elite dwelling and its users reveals about early Christianity. Like the dwelling / user configurations of the opening chapters of Acts, this one too is an in-house community in the generic sense of being a Christian group in a domestic premises. It is also in-house in the sense of becoming a community in an elite house, a type in which important, new aspects of the Christian movement are demonstrated.

The household and premises of Cornelius are the closest one finds in Acts to what was described in Chapter 4 as the Roman *domus*-in a- *domus*. Cornelius himself is a ἑκατοντάρχης (centurion) [44] of the Italian cohort [45] (10.1). As such, he is a Roman

---

[44] As outlined by Fitzmyer (*Acts,* 449), "[i]n Roman military service a *centurio,* a noncommissioned officer, commanded a *centuria* or *curia*, a division of a hundred soldiers. There were 59 centurions in a legion, which in the Augustan period normally numbered 6,000

citizen [46] and a high-ranking military man of substantial wealth and status. [47] Those explicitly mentioned in his house(hold) and entourage are blood relatives (10.24: τοὺς συγγενεῖς αὐτοῦ), [48] close friends (10.24: .. τοὺς ἀναγκαίους φίλους), two servants and a devout soldier who wait on him (10.7). These are illustrative of the many household members, staff, military personnel and *amici* [49] which a Roman man of his rank would be likely to possess. He is also described as a god-fearer, that is, a Gentile sympathiser with Judaism. [50] Cornelius, therefore, represents a new type of believer: a wealthy member of the Roman military establishment who is attracted to Judaism.

The premises, by implication, is also a new type: that of a wealthy householder,

---

men, the first centurion being in command of 200."

45 10.1: ἑκατοντάρχης ἐκ σπείρης τῆς καλουμένης Ἰταλικῆς..). As explained by Fitzmyer (*Acts*, 449), "[t]he Greek term 'σπεῖρα' which occurs again in 21.31 and 27.31, normally translates the Latin *cohors* (Polyb. 11.23.1) but can also render *manipulus* (Polyb. 6.24.5), another subdivision of the legion. The cohort was usually one-tenth of a legion and comprised 600 soldiers. This would mean that Cornelius belonged to the 'Cohort called Italica' but was not in charge of all of it. Roman historians are not all in agreement about the total number of a Roman legion in the Augustan period." With regard to the Italian cohort, Fitzmyer (*Acts*, 449) explains that it was "... undoubtedly the *Cohors II miliaria Italica civium romanorum voluntariorum*, a contingent of auxiliary archers known to have served in the Roman province of Syria from various Latin inscriptions (*CIL* 6.3528; 11.6117; *ILS* 3.2.9168). It served in Syria from 69 B.C. on into the second century C.E. It is a matter of debate whether such Roman troops would have been stationed in Caesarea during the reign of Herod Agrippa 1 (41-44 C.E.; see Joseph. *AJ* 19.8.2 [343])."

46 As noted by Fitzmyer (*Acts,* 449), "[a]s a centurion, Cornelius would have been a Roman citizen".

47 As explained by Robbins ("Luke-Acts", 207-208), a centurion "receives a mustering-out pay after serving his duty sufficient for him to be a member of the order of decurions. The status of decurion entitled a person to be a member of the council in a city in the eastern Roman empire. In Rome itself, office-bearers were drawn almost entirely from 2 orders, the senatorial and the equestrian. To qualify for senatorial rank, it was necessary to hold 'property worth 250,000 times the day's wage of a labourer' with somewhat less than half that amount for equestrian rank. Decurions were expected to possess about one-tenth of the amount required for a senator. In the eastern region of the empire, decurions rather than senators or equestrians were the council members and magistrates were almost always elected from the decurions. Thus the decurions were the local aristocracy in the eastern empire, and a centurion was either already a decurion or well on his way to becoming one."

48 On the use of the term to denote "blood relations", see Lk 1.58,; 2.44; 14.12; 21.16.

49 These were the *amici*. See the treatment of *amici* and *clientes* in Ch. 3 (pages 159-160) and Ch. 4 (pages 192-196).

50 On the god-fearers, see Ch. 6 (page 285 n.133).

patron and member of the army. It is situated in Caesarea, the capital of the Roman province of Judaea, a city reconstructed by Herod along classically (Graeco-)Roman lines and renamed after his imperial patron. [51] The house of Cornelius, therefore, is not the isolated or insignificant military base of a commander in some "outback" in the far east of the empire. Rather, it is an elite dwelling, home to a large household and located in an archetypal urban centre of the Roman-controlled world. Based on housing evidence from similar imperial centres (such as those cited from Corinth in Chapter 5 [52]), it is probable that the house is what may be described as typically Roman - that is, of the spacious, atrium-peristyle variety and decorated with characteristically Roman-style mosaics, wall-paintings...

As in the typical *domus* described in the first part of Chapter 4, so in the house of Cornelius, an intimate relationship exists between dwelling and household, between dwelling and male householder / patron / public figure. Like the Roman town-house, the house of Cornelius functions as both expression and instrument of the householder's self-image, in this case, that of a wealthy centurion. The house is also a monument to *Romanitas* in the contact zone in the same way as many houses cited in chapter 5 were shown to be : it is a proclamation of Roman military presence in Judaea and of Roman life in the form of customs, religion and values. What the evidence of Acts also reveals is that this quintessentially Roman premises contributes to the construction of Cornelius' identity as god-fearer and more importantly as Christian.

Reference to Cornelius as a god-fearer reveals that before any contact with Christianity, his premises functioned as something more than an expression and instrument of *Romanitas*. Rather, it was a place where quasi-Jewish identity was forged. In Acts, however, the centurion's Jewish-inspired religious activities serve less as an illustration of his status as god-fearer and more as a prelude to his identity as a Christian The centurion is described praying at home at the ninth hour and as learning (in a vision) that his prayers and alms have ascended as a memorial before God. The text, therefore, implies a double contrast: between the religious activities of human agents (Gentile prayer and

---

51 On Caesarea (Maritima), see R. L. Hohlfelder, "Caesarea", *ABD* 1:798-803 and bibliography listed. See also Joseph. *BJ* 1.408 and *AJ* 15.331-341.

52 On the elite houses of Roman Corinth, see Ch. 5 (pages 230-231).

Jewish sacrifice) and the premises in which they are conducted (house and temple) at the same evening hour. [53] The implication is that the prayer of this Gentile is as acceptable to God as the temple sacrifices of Jews. Furthermore (the author suggests), the house stands as an alternative to or substitute for the temple, a new sacred space where the age-old division between Jew and Gentile (expressed and reinforced spatially in the temple lay-out) is not operative. [54] In sum, the domestic premises and its god-fearing occupant together contribute to the expression of a new and shocking truth, a truth which paves the way for what is to follow.

What does follow reveals how these particular premises and user(s) contribute to the shaping of Christianity. The occupants of and visitors to the house of Cornelius confer a new function on this elite Roman premises by the religious activity they carry out there. The activity in question is a Christian initiation: it is a Pentecost-like event in which Peter preaches the gospel, the Spirit descends on those present who then speak in tongues, praise God and are eventually baptised (10.22-48). Through this initiation, therefore, the centurion's house which is a strong symbol of *Romanitas* is transformed into a space associated with a new, religious movement, a movement shown in Chapter 6 to be a potentially subversive element within the empire. In other words, this most Roman of domestic spaces is Christianized or conversely, Christian space extends into this typically Roman house. This demonstrates at micro- or local level what was seen in the last chapter, namely the growth of the Christian οἰκουμένη.

As in every spatial/social configuration, the dwelling too is eloquent or influential.

---

53 As noted by Esler (*Community and Gospel*, 162), the vision of Cornelius comes at the ninth hour, that is, the hour of evening sacrifice. As explained by Fitzmyer (*Acts*, 277), this is the hour of prayer known from as the *Tamid*, the continual burnt offering (Ex 29.39; Num 28.3-4,8; Ezek 46.13-15; Dan 9.21), when Jews would pause to pray or go to the temple. This is what Peter and John are described doing in Acts 3.1. Esler explains (162 n. 110) that the reference to prayers and alms ascending as a memorial before God has parallels in the Septuagint and is reminiscent of the fragrance of sacrifice rising before God. The prayers and alms are acceptable to God instead of the sacrifices which Cornelius (as a Gentile) could not enter the Temple to offer himself. The author implies that God has broken down barriers between Jew and Gentile by treating the prayers and alms of a Gentile as the sacrifices of a Jew.

54 On the division of space in the temple, see Sanders, *Judaism*, 54-72 (esp .61-62). The outermost court was that of the Gentiles. From there, one progressed (if "qualified") to the court of (Jewish) women. Next was the court of (male) Israelites and beyond that was the court of the priests. Those permitted to do so progressed to the sanctuary, where at its innermost part was found the holy of holies.

Like the premises in Jerusalem, the house of Cornelius itself contributes to the development of practices and values which become characteristic of Christians. In this particular case, those in question are inclusive table-fellowship and hospitality. After the initiation, Peter is invited to stay and the fact that he does "enter" and "eat" is evident from a later criticism of him by "the circumcision party". [55] While joy-filled meal taking was seen in the Jerusalem houses, the startling development here is the implication that such table-fellowship takes place between Jews and Gentiles. [56] Another feature of this fellowship is that between the elite Cornelius and the socially inferior Peter. This coming together of different classes in the new movement recalls the attempt of the Jerusalem community to bridge the gap between the haves and have nots. Furthermore, the invitation and its acceptance illustrate the hospitality soon to become so characteristic of Christians. [57] Presumably, the quality of hospitality offered in a premises like that of Cornelius is in keeping with the high social level of the householder.

Attention to this particular dwelling / user configuration also points to another aspect of Christianity, namely, the existence of the church in an elite house. This is best described as a Christianized version of the typical *domus* of Chapter 4. Such *domus*-in-*domus* leave their own unique mark on the nature and development of the Christian movement. First of all, a *domus*-in-*domus* (like that of Cornelius) result in communities which have at their core an elite household and in which the hierarchical and patriarchal structures operative in the household and household-writ-large are mirrored rather than transformed.

In such elite house churches, Christianization results in the temporary suspension,

---

55 Peter is questioned by the circumcision party (11.2: .. οἱ ἐκ περιτομῆς) as to why he went to the uncircumcised and ate with them (11.3: .. εἰσῆλθες πρὸς ἄνδρας ἀκροβυστίαν ἔχοντας καὶ συνέφαγες αὐτοῖς.) Peter's own version of events, however, leads to the first recognition and ratification of the Gentile mission by the movement's leaders in Jerusalem. See 11.1-18. The conclusion (as expressed in 11.18) is that they "glorified God" for granting to the Gentiles "repentance unto life". The Gentile mission is later given further ratification at the so-called Jerusalem council of Acts 15.

56 On the Jewish ban on dining with Gentiles, see reference on Ch. 6 (page 286 n.135).

57 On hospitality in the Lukan writings, see Cadbury, "Lodging" and *Luke-Acts*, 251ff. On hospitality and Christianity, see Malherbe, *Social Aspects*, 66-69, 92-112.

rather than the radical re-ordering, of such structures. [58] Temporary suspension or subversion is seen when Cornelius and Peter eat together and when the centurion, who is after all the most quintessentially Roman of householders in Acts kneels before Peter in worship (10.25). Cornelius acknowledges a divinely-sanctioned authority greater than that which he, a Roman *pater familias*, patron and centurion possesses. In matters religious, therefore, the command is transferred to another authority, to the non-Roman and socially inferior Peter.

A second way in which Christianity is shaped by *domus*-in-*domus* (like that of Cornelius) is in its possession of elite patrons and leaders. As in the household and household-writ-large, so in the Christian community, elite householders become key figures, taking on the function of leaders, hosts, spokespersons or patrons. [59] Furthermore, the presence of Christian *domus*-in-*domus* means that networks of patronage operative in the household-writ-large are adopted and adapted by the new movement. Reference to the *amici* of Cornelius, for example, points to his role as male householder within the Roman patronage system [60] and suggests that a similar role is emerging for him in the new movement.

A third way in which elite house churches shape Christianity is by contributing to its numerical expansion. In antiquity, the faith of the household was commonly identified with that of its head [61] and so the baptism of a elite householder resulted in multiple or

---

58 A failure to engage in a radical re-ordering of social-spatial relations within the *domus* is confirmed in New Testament *Haustafeln*. See the discussion of *Haustafeln* in the Introduction (pages 15-18).

59 Much has been written about the role of householders as patrons of communities. See H. Moxnes, "Patron -Client Relations and the New Community in Luke-Acts" in Neyrey (ed.), *The Social World of Luke-Acts*, 241-268.

60 See the sections on "Patronage" in The Empire as Household -Writ-Large in Ch. 3 and on the role of the "typical town house and male householder / patron / public figure" in Chapter 4.

61 As expressed in by B. J. Malina and J. Neyrey (in "First-Century Personality: Dyadic, Not Individual" in Neyrey (ed.), *The Social World of Luke-Acts*, 72-73), "[f]or people of that time and place, the basic, most elementary unit of social analysis is not the individual person but the dyad, a person in relation with and connected to at least one other social unit, in particular, the family." For further details, see the full article in *op. cit.*, 67-96.

corporate [62] conversions. Conversion of Cornelius, for example, results in that of a large and socially diverse group of people, comprising family members, *amici,* slaves / servants and attending military personnel.

Exploration of the social / spatial configuration in the house of Cornelius, therefore, reveals another example of in-house Christianity, another way in which dwellings and users contribute to the nature and development of early Christianity. Along with the two examples discussed in the opening chapters, Acts 10-11 adds the elite house church or the Christian *domus*-in-a-*domus*. It is a type chronologically later than those in Jerusalem, one which represents growing "contact" with the Roman-controlled world. Put briefly, this is an emerging, local congregation which has as its core a hierarchical - possibly elite - household and which gathers in the domestic premises of and under the patronage of a householder. Furthermore, Theissen's famous "love-patriarchalism" is the "seemingly inevitable by-product" of an elite house model. [63] In such "love-patriarchalism", the hierarchical social order is retained while mutual respect and love are fostered by patrons who serve as leaders of the communities in their houses. [64]

.. and another elite house(hold) type...

While the *domus*-in-*domus* of Cornelius is the most typical of elite house churches in Acts, the type appears in other guises in Acts, most notably in the house of Crispus in Corinth (18.8). On the one hand, this church is akin to that of Cornelius in that it is headed by an elite householder around whom the wider community gathers. On the other hand, it represents a different type of elite house(hold) church which reflects and creates other important faces of the Christian movement.

---

62 As noted by Haenchen (*Acts*, 361), the baptism of the first Gentile (Cornelius) results in the baptism of a congregation. This corporate significance of household conversions is discussed by Matson, *Household Conversion*, 13, 86. He argues (*op. cit.*, 38 n.55) that household salvation stories incorporate both a corporate and an individual response.

63 See Jewett, "Tenement churches", 23-24.

64 Theissen, *Social Setting*, 11, 107.

Crispus himself is an ἀρχισυνάγωγος, [65] that is, a synagogue leader responsible for organizing services and for maintaining the building. [66] He is, therefore, both a wealthy man [67] and a prominent member of the Jewish community in Corinth. His influence in the city is further highlighted by the fact that his conversion (along with that of his household [68]) results in that of many other Corinthians (18.8).[69]

His house, by implication, is an elite premises. It is probably one typical of many such premises in the contact zone: one which stands as a witness to both Roman and non-Roman (in this case, Jewish) identity. With regard to the house's *Romanitas,* the likelihood of its being a typical *domus* is suggested by its situation in Corinth, a city described in Chapter 5 as a little Rome. [70] More specifically, the archaeological evidence discussed in that chapter demonstrated the existence of elite houses with characteristically Roman design and decor. [71]

With regard to the house's non-Roman or Jewish nature, it is likely that the house (before the initiation of its owner) displayed something akin to the "miqveh in the bathroom phenomenon", [72] noted in elite Jerusalem houses; that is, as the house of

---

65 For other references to rulers of the synagogue, see 13.15 and 18. 17. See also Jairus in Lk 8.41 and 8.49.

66 See Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 509-510. As explained by Matson (*Household Conversion*, 61 n. 46), "[w]hile the synagogue president had charge over these functions, it was the ὑπηρέτης who performed the actual tasks (cf. Lk 4.20)."

67 See Theissen, *Social Setting* , 73-75. He explains (*op. cit.*, 74), that "[s]ince upkeep of the synagogue required money, there was reason to entrust this office to a wealthy man who would be in a position, should the occasion arise, to supplement the community's funds with his own contribution." See also Malherbe, *Social Aspects*, 72.

68 As noted by Barrett (*Acts,* 868) and Fitzmyer (*Acts*, 627), this is possibly the Κρῖσπος of 1 Cor 1.14.

69 Haenchen (*Acts*, 535) argues that the conversion of Crispus "was strategic for the expanding mission at Corinth, making a great impression upon the gentile God-fearers and resulting in further conversions" and according to Theissen (*Social Setting*, 73), the conversion of Crispus was "of great significance for the founding of the community in Corinth" and was responsible for "setting off a small wave of conversions." As explained by Fitzmyer (*Acts*, 627), Crispus is an example of one of the many Corinthians who believe.

70 On Corinth, see Ch. 5 (page 230).

71 See Ch. 5 (pages 230-232 and figures).

72 See Ch. 5 (pages 241-243)

prominent Jew, it probably combined (Graeco-) Roman style features with the instrumentality for creating and re-creating Jewishness. It was undoubtedly a place in which laws and practices ensuring Jewish ethnicity were observed. This was all the more important in a cosmopolitan city of the empire like Corinth.

With the conversion of Crispus, a space previously associated with the on-going articulation of Jewishness, now changes function. The premises (like the householder) becomes an expression and instrument of Christianity, a place in which a new religious identity is forged and celebrated. It becomes a space which now stands in opposition to the synagogue, a space proclaiming a different message. Given the high profile of the householder, it is a message which surely echoes loud and clear.

In sum, while the elite house church is most fully exemplified in the case of Cornelius, the example of Crispus also functions as an illustration of the type. At first sight, the two individuals and their premises are different. The communities are united, however, in the sense of having an elite household at their core, comprising and / or influencing a circle wider than that of the immediate οἶκος and gathering around the person and / or in the premises of a householder who acts as patron. The two are simultaneously illustrations of a type and pointers to the diversity operating within it.

The house of Lydia

Attention turns next to the house of Lydia (16.14-15, 40). Once again, the focus is on how the relationship between dwelling and user(s) reflects and shapes Christianity. Like the other three spatial / social configurations considered so far, this one both exemplifies and expands on the picture of Christianity as an in-house movement. Like the communities in the houses of Mary, Cornelius and Crispus, it has a household at its core, gathers in a domestic premises and constitutes a fictive kinship or house-like group. Unlike them, it is a community shaped by a rather different social / spatial location, namely a workshop-*cum*-dwelling.

The first set of users mentioned are Lydia and her household. Lydia herself is a god-fearer from Thyatira and a πορφυρόπωλις [73] by trade. She is probably not a prosperous [74] merchant trading in a luxury item, as it is the cheaper and lesser quality vegetable purple which is common in Thyatira, [75] a city renowned for its dyeing works. [76]

---

73 The term "πορφυρόπωλις" refers to people who work both in dyeing and in the sale of dyed products. The much more commonly found Latin equivalent (" *purpurarius / a*") is attested in *CIL* 1.1413, 2.2235, 5.1044, 5. 7620, 9.5276, 10.540, 10.1952, 6.4016, 6. 9843-48, 6.32454, 6.33888, 11.1069a, 14.473, 14.2433. See Richter Reimer, *Women in Acts*, 141 nn. 203, 205, 206. According to Pliny (*NH* 9.129, 35.46), work with purple was normally done in workshops (*purpurariis officinis*). See Richter Reimer, *op. cit.*, 106-107, 142 n.210.

74 See Matson, *Household Conversion*, 143.

75 See Richter Reimer, *Women in Acts*, 104-105, 141 n, 198. This work is still in operation today.

76 On textile work in Thyatira, see Richter Reimer (*Women in Acts*, 99-100) and Hemer (*Acts* 114-115, 231). Wool spinners (λανάριοι or *lanarii*), tailors (*CIG* 3480: ἱματευόμενοι or *vestiariorum*) and dyers (*CIG* 3496, 3497, 3498: βαφεῖς or *tinctores*) were typical. As outlined by Richter Reimer (*op. cit.*, 138-139 n. 155, 139 notes 156-157), *CIG* 3496 and 3497 date from the time of Caracalla when dyeing and clothing manufacture were under direct imperial control, but Thyatira had long been famous for its textile production and dye works. Strangely, no Thyatiran inscription mentions *purple* dyers but only βαφεῖς. Hemer notes a reference to the Thyatiran purple trade and its continuing links as a Macedonian colony within the homeland in a second century inscription of Thessalonica (*IG* 10.2.1.291). The guild of πορφυροβάφοι in "Eighteenth Street" of that city set up a memorial to a colleague from Thyatira. According to Pliny, wool-dyeing was introduced by the Lydians at Sardis (*NH*, 7.196: *inficere lanas Sardibus Lydia [invenerunt]*) and the invention of linen and nets was also ascribed to a Lydian, Arachne (*NH* 7.196: *linum et retia Arachne [invenit]*). See Richter Reimer, *op. cit.*, 139 nn. 159, 160.

Rather, she is possibly an employee [77] in a small-scale purple workshop and one of a group of *purpurarii* [78] who work together. As such, she is engaged in a dirty and despised craft [79] and is typical of many women working in textile production. Many were slave or freed [80] and Lydia's servile background is indicated by her name, if this is interpreted as an *ethnicon*. [81] Furthermore, her presence in Philippi points to a mobility forced on craft-workers after manumission. [82] While it has been argued that Lydia is a widow or divorcee,

---

77 As explained by L. Schottroff ("Lydia: A New Quality of Power" in *Let the Oppressed Go Free. Feminist Perspectives on the New Testament,* trans. A. S. Kidder [Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1993], 132), "In general, the manufacturing and the sale of dyed products were done by the same people. That means the dye house was operated by an owner with several employees. Those employed both worked in the dye house and sold the wool." From this evidence, Richter Reimer (*Women in Acts*, 108) concludes that Lydia was an employee in one of the many dye works in Thyatira.

78 As outlined by Richter Reimer (*Women in Acts*, 105, 141 n. 207), inscriptions such as *CIL* 1.1413, 2.2235, 5.1044, 6.4016, 6.32454, 14.473, 14.2433 usually refer to whole groups of *purpurarii (ae).* Many of these included both men and women, but as *CIL* 6.984 and 6. 9848 reveal, women often formed the majority within the group.

79 On textile production as (slave and freed) women's work, see Pomeroy, *Goddesses*, 198-202, 247-248. According to Pliny (*NH* 19.47), the production of purple cloth using vegetable dyes was a filthy (*sordidum*) job. According to the elite perspective of Cicero (*De Off.* 1.42, 150-151) many manual occupations are regarded as *"sordidi"* (filthy) and unworthy (*inliberales*) of a free person. See also Plut. *Vit. Per.* 1.3-4 : "Often we take pleasure in a thing but we despise the one who made it. Thus we value aromatic salves and purple clothing (τῶν ἀλουργῶν), but the dyers (.. βαφεῖς) and salve makers remain for us common and low craftspersons [because they do work that is unworthy of a free person] [ἀνελευθέρους .... βαναύσους)." The contempt was further fuelled by the fact that many craft workers came from the East, as noted in Juv. *Sat.* 3.62 ff. See Richter Reimer, *Women in Acts*, 105-107, 142 notes 211- 218 and 145 n. 253.

80 See Richter Reimer, *Women in Acts*, 107, 142 nn . 219, 220, 143 n. 226. According to *CIL* 1.1413, 6.4016, 6.9847, 14.473, for example, *purpurarii / ae* were slaves or freed persons.

81 "Lydia" is possibly an *ethnicon* (the Lydian woman), although the name is also attested as a proper name. For the name, see references in Hemer, *Acts,* 144 and n. 32 and 231. If an *ethnicon*, it reveals the woman's servile origins (see Richter Reimer, *Women in Acts*, 108, 143 n. 228). *Ethnica* were applied to slaves and *hetaerae* to describe "special features of their origin and nationality and thus particular racial or ethnic characteristics that served to single out their bearers. It was possible for an *ethnicon* to become a personal name, so that freed persons continued to bear the *ethnicon* as their own name." See also Schüssler Fiorenza (*Memory*, 178).

82 *Purpurarii* were mainly freed persons who settled in other cities to do their work normally in small groups. According to *Dig.* 38.1.45, *purpurarii* (as *negotiatores vestiarii)* were also slaves, who (on manumission) could only continue to work in the same place if their former *patronus* suffered no economic or social injury (*laesio*) as a result. Thus many small merchants were forced to become itinerant as they could no longer work in their home place after manumission. *CIL* 6.9845, for example, refers to a *hospes* (stranger) who lived in foreign

heading a large and prosperous household of many slaves, [83] it is more likely that she is the head of a household which is (or is part of) an itinerant group of purple-workers, a type of *collegia* which is conceivably all female given the predominance of women among such craft-workers. [84] Lydia (like Cornelius), therefore, is representative of a new type of believer: a god-fearing, female, migrant craft-worker of servile or freed status.

Her premises at Philippi, therefore, is that of an itinerant craft-worker, the type of workshop-*cum*-dwelling which typically ranged in size from 12 to 27 square metres. [85] Given the (already noted) [86] tendency of craft-workers to operate alongside each other, Lydia's workshop-*cum*-dwelling is probably one of a group of similar premises in the area. Its location (near the house of prayer) "outside the gate to the riverside" (16.13) is highly probable on two counts : first, dyeing was one of the so-called dirty crafts usually practised outside or on the edges of cities,[87] secondly, the craft itself required large

---

cities in order to work there. For the movement of workers from East to Rome, see Juv. *Sat.* 3.61 ff. For information about freed persons continuing to work for their former patrons, see Richter Reimer, *Women in Acts*, 107, 108, 142 n. 221, 142 n.222, 142-143 n. 223 and 143 n. 224.

83 This suggestion is based on two assumptions: first, that Lydia is wealthy and secondly, that work with purple cloth requires much labour. On the slave question, see Klauch (*Hausgemeinde*, 52) and Haenchen (*Acts*, 499) and on her possible widowhood, see C. F. Nösgen (*Commentar über die Apostelgeschichte des Lukas* [Leipzig: Dörfling und Franke, 1882]) 309. The argument is similar to that made for Mary (12.12). Examples are cited in Richter Reimer, *Women in Acts,* 110-111, 144 n. 241, 143 n.237. Klauch (*op. cit.,* 19) tries to discern the composition of Lydia's household (and that of Cornelius) from contextual evidence. On the household, see Richter Reimer, *op. cit.,* 109- 110, 143 nn. 235, 236, 237.

84 According to Schottroff ("Lydia", 133), a number of women's groups "accepted the Jewish religion on their own accord and practised it .. without male leadership or any other form of legitimization." Richter Reimer (*Women in Acts*, 111, 144 n.244) notes that the "existence of women's houses is also attested for Naples by *IG* 14.760." See Waltzing, *Etude historique* 1 (especially 52 ff., 90 ff., 128 ff., 332 ff), 2 (especially 247 ff.) on *collegia* and 4:205, 254 ff. on women's guilds. On slaves and freed persons in leading positions (such as *patronus / a*) in such groups, see *CIL* 14.251. Slaves and freed persons were often organized in *collegia* and "houses" and it was not exceptional for one of them to be head or *patronus /a* of a group. See Richter Reimer, *Women in Acts*, 112, 144 n. 247.

85 Lampe (*Christen,* 73) cites measurements of artisans' workroom/shops or workshop/houses in Corinth, referring to some with an area of 12 sq. m., others of 27 sq. m. He also mentions literary of such craft work being carried on in dwelling spaces, e.g. Apul. *Met.* 9.24-25.

86 See Ch. 4 (page 217).

87 See mention of this in Ch. 4 (page 218 n.187). Work in dye works and tanneries had to be conducted outside the city because of the smell. *CIL* 1.1413 refers to a purple workshop situated outside the city of Rome in the Via Salaria.

amounts of water. [88] Lydia's workshop-*cum*-dwelling, therefore, represents a new type of "house" to be associated with Christianity.

Like the other domestic premises discussed above, users confer on this space a new religious function. After the baptism of Lydia and her household, the disciples are invited to come to her house (16.15), [89] an invitation which implies that once again Jews and Gentiles eat together. Like the house of Cornelius, therefore, the premises of Lydia becomes the locus of post-initiation hospitality. In contrast to the elite house, however, a simple, small workshop-cum-dwelling functions here as a locus for inclusive eating. In addition to the post-baptismal celebration, the text indicates that the premises' role as Christian space is on-going. Following the release of Paul and Silas from prison, their first port of call is Lydia's where they see the "ἀδελφοί" (16.40). Reference to the "ἀδελφοί" points to the fact that the new believers are women and men who are united as members of a fictive kinship or house-like movement.

In its status as Christian space, the premises of Lydia also stands in contrast or opposition to the Jewish προσευχή. [90] In this it resembles the house of Cornelius

---

88 See Richter Reimer, *Women in Acts*, 107, 142 n.216.

89 As noted by Matson (*Household Conversion*, 142) it is only *after* Lydia hears Paul at the place of prayer that she invites him to "enter into my house and stay." Esler's argument (*Community and Gospel*) is that "even though the Gentile mission and fellowship intrinsic to it are depicted by Luke as having been twice authorized by Jerusalem church, his presentation of Paul's role in bringing the Gospel to the Gentiles still reveals traces of embarrassment. This is apparent in Luke's suppression of specific references to Paul's eating with Gentiles before Acts 15, of course, but it is also evident in the way he presents the occasions where this does occur." One of the examples Esler gives (*op. cit.*, 101) is that case of Lydia. It is because she is a Gentile that the disciples need to be persuaded to stay at her house.

90 On the "προσευχή", see 16.12. For the debate relating to this term, see M. Hengel, "Proseuche und Synagoge: Jüdische Gemeinde, Gotteshaus und Gottesdienst in der Diaspora und in Palästina" in G. Jeremias, H. W. Kuhn and H. Stegemann (eds), *Tradition und Glaube: Das Frühe Christentum in seiner Umwelt. Festgabe für Karl Georg Kuhn zum 65* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1971), 157-184. See also Appendix 2 (pages 207-225) in I. Levinskaya, *The Book of Acts in its Diaspora Setting,* BAFCS Vol. 5 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans / Carlisle: The Paternoster Press, 1996), Richter Reimer, *Women in Acts*, 79-92 and Blue, "Acts and the House-Church, " 152 n.128. Richter Reimer concludes that on the basis of "inscriptional evidence for the use of the term, and the archaeological and historical commentary on it by the editors of various collections of inscriptions, there is no doubt that in every case it refers to a building in which the Jewish communities of the Diaspora gathered." Matson too (*Household Conversion*, 144-145) notes that in Hellenistic Jewish literature, the term is virtually synonymous with συναγωγή (n.52) and that this is its most likely meaning here (n.53). As noted by Richter Reimer (*op. cit.*, 2-83), a major problem in regarding προσευχή as a synonym of συναγωγή is the fact that the meeting mentioned in Acts is all-female. This attitude is illustrated by Blue, who argues that while προσευχή "could be a

which was shown to function as an alternative to the Temple and that of Crispus which was transformed into a place of opposition to the synagogue. As the home of a god-fearer, the workshop-*cum*-premises of Lydia had formerly stood alongside the προσευχή, both metaphorically and physically, as a place where Jewish identity was reflected and created. After the conversion of Lydia and her household, the self-same premises still stands near the place of prayer "outside the gate to the riverside" but it stands as a monument to a new tradition, as a "sacred" place where Christian identity is proclaimed.

Further investigation of the Lydia / workshop-*cum*-dwelling configuration reveals important aspects about the social location, nature and development of Christianity. First of all, it reveals that the movement has taken root in the craft-working classes. Along with Lydia, the most notable craft-workers mentioned in Acts are the σκηνοποιοὶ [91] Paul and the couple, Priscilla and Aquila. In addition, there is Tabitha, the textile-worker who produces items of clothing (9.39: χιτῶν and ἱμάτιον) [92] and Simon the tanner (βυρσεύς) (9.43, 10.6, 32) in whose house Peter stays while in Joppa. Like Lydia, he is engaged in a dirty craft and has a premises near water, in his case "by the seaside" (10.6, 32). [93] The presence of such craft-workers in Acts demonstrates Christianity's presence on a non-elite echelon of society, one far lower than that occupied by Cornelius or Crispus. This means that the movement has in its ranks a sizeable number of people of servile origin and freed status. While Lydia's servile origin has been mentioned above, a study of

---

reference to a synagogue as it sometimes is elsewhere ..... however, since there is no mention of men, it is unlikely that a synagogue is envisioned."

91 On σκηνοποιός, see W. Michaelis, "σκηνή" in *TDNT* 7: 393-394 and Richter Reimer, *Women in Acts*, 199-203. As noted by Richter Reimer (*op. cit.*, 199), the term is a New Testament *hapax legomenon* and is not found in the LXX. It appears in literary sources only (see Michaelis, *op. cit.*, 393-394) and not at all in Greek inscriptions.

92 On this type of work, see Richter Reimer, *Women in Acts*, 99-101

93 According to Fitzmyer (*Acts,* 446), the trade "was often scorned by ancient Pharisees because of the odours associated with it." See J. McConnachie, "Simon a Tanner (βυρσεύς) (Acts ix. 43; x. 6, 32)", *ExpTim* 36 (1924-25), 90. Haenchen (*Acts,* 340 n.1) and Conzelmann (*Acts*, 77 n.8) note that tanners and leather-workers were often despised by the rabbis. Despite the contempt, notes S. Krauss (*Talmudische Archäologie* [Leipzig, 1910-12; Reprinted Hildesheim, 1966], 254), at least one rabbi (Joseph ben Halafta) is supposed to have been a tanner by trade. The issue is also discussed in Richter Reimer, *Women in Acts,* 201, 221, n.33.

nomenclature points to a similar conclusion in the case of Priscilla and Aquila. [94]

As well as affecting the social location of Christianity, craft-workers also shaped the movement in other significant ways. One such influence relates to the structure of community. The conversion of people such as Lydia and her οἶκος results in a community quite different in composition from that grouped around Cornelius. Put negatively, such a group does not have at its core a hierarchical, patriarchal, elite household and a circle of *amici* at close quarters. Rather, as noted above, the community is grouped around an all (or largely) female household headed by a non-elite woman. Given the strong connections between craft-workers, it is also probable that the community is bound as much by professional solidarity as by ties of kinship. [95] A professional bond as textile workers may also unite Tabitha and the χῆραι (9.39, 41), bonds out of which they form a Christian female collectivity in the form of an established group or order of widows. [96] Such work ties have a spatial, as well as a social, dimension and the inevitable result would be the formation of close-knit Christian communities or enclaves like those established by Jews in certain cities. [97] A community like that in Lydia's premises, therefore, is more akin to a *collegium* (like the one "*in domo Sergiae Paullinae*") than to an elite household. [98] The *collegium* is the most natural and familiar model for craft-workers and is surely their legacy to Christianity.

---

94 Based on a study of nomenclature, it has been suggested that the couple are freed slaves of the Acilian family in Rome. See J. Murphy -O'Connor, "Prisca and Aquila: Travelling Tentmakers and Church Builders", *BRev* (December, 1992), 43-44.

95 See Ch. 4 (page 218).

96 This group pre-dates those attested in 1 Timothy 5. 3-16 and post-biblical texts. On the order of widows, as outlined in 1 Tim. 5-3-36 and on the author's attempt at regulative restriction of the order's original character, see Seim, *Double Message*, 237-24. Seim (*op. cit.*, 237) notes that "[a]ccording to the common conjecture of most commentators, the author of 1 Tim 5.3-16 initiated a new order to settle the problem of widows in the communities. But this understanding is no longer quite so-well accepted." Like G. Stählin ("χήρα", *TDNT* 9: 452), she maintains that the presence of such a group is reflected here and in Acts 6.1. Sections on orders of widows are found in third and fourth century texts, most notably *the Didascalia and the Constitutiones Apostolorum.* See J. Basler, "The Widow's Tale: A Fresh Look at 1 Tim 5.3-16", *JBL* 103 (1984), 23-41 and B. Bowman Thurston, *The Widows: A Women's Ministry in the Early Church* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989).

97 See ch. 4 (pages 217-218).

98 See *CIL* 9148 (*collegium quod est in domo Sergiae Paullinae*), cited in the Introduction (page 10 n.33).

Another important aspect of community arising from consideration of Lydia and her premises is the issue of premises provision. The example of Lydia dispels any notion that Christian premises-providers belong to the wealthy, upper class or that they always provide spacious elite houses like that of Cornelius. The premises of Lydia, for example, is small and possibly malodorous place and Christians must eat and pray there surrounded by the tools of the purple-worker's trade. The question of premises provision is linked to the issue of patronage and leadership. While it is commonly assumed that patrons and leaders come from the elite or better-off, the example of Lydia provides a model of a female, non-elite patron and / or leader quite different from than that exemplified by Cornelius. As a premises-provider, Lydia is indeed a type of patron and leader. Given her initial receptivity to the word (16.14) and her powers of persuasion over the visiting disciples (16.15), it is probable that she is a leader and charismatic Christian around whose person and in whose premises the community gather spontaneously.

A final way in which craft-working life shapes Christianity is through its mobility. As noted above, the πορφυρόπωλις Lydia works in Philippi but actually comes from Thyatira. Such mobility, forced on craft-workers because of their trade, results in the spread of Christianity. Put simply, Christian craft-workers or craft-working Christians function as worker / missionaries, combining their trade with spreading the gospel. [99] Paul, for example, practises his craft as he goes about preaching in Corinth (18.3-4). The migrant couple Priscilla and Aquila too are evangelising tent-makers or tent-making evangelists. They are depicted in Italy (18.2), Corinth (18.1-2) and Ephesus (18.19) and while the edict of Claudius explains their move from Rome, [100] the market for their craft is surely a determining influence in their mobility. In their travels, they engage in evangelising activities, such as the instruction of Apollos in Ephesus (18.24-26) [101].

---

99 On the association of craft-work and missionary work and the tendency of scholars to split them, see Richter Reimer, *Women in Acts*, 196 and 208-209. Taking an example from the Pauline letters, Murphy-O'Connor (*Corinth*, 177) argues that the "way the participle and main verb are combined in 1 Thess 2.9, 'working we proclaimed' [ἐργαζόμενοι ... ἐκηρύξαμεν] indicate that Paul did not separate work and preaching. Indeed, one of the advantages of leather-working was that he could easily do both."

100 On the edict, see Ch. 6 (page 272 n. 69).

101 Having heard Apollos teaching "accurately" (18.25) (in the synagogue), Priscilla and Aquila "took him" and expounded to him the way of God "more accurately" (18.26). T. Karlsen Seim, (*The Double Message: Patterns of Gender in Luke-Acts* [Edinburgh : T. and T. Clark, 1994],

Both the mobility and professional bonds of craft-workers contribute to the development and consolidation of inter-city or trans-provincial Christian networks. They also result in the widespread practice of non-elite hospitality in the movement. Evidence of the Christian craft-working network and its characteristic hospitality is visible in Acts. When Paul arrives in Corinth, for example, he goes to stay with Priscilla and Aquila. He works alongside them because as the texts says "he [is] of the same trade" (18.3). He receives hospitality in their Corinthian home, be it a workshop-*cum*-dwelling [102] or tent. Following Lydia's baptism, her premises will provide a similar function for other believers; conversely, if and when she moves on, she will seek out Christian purple-workers in other locations. The tent-making couple, like Lydia, therefore, provide a model of hospitality which is far different from reception functions of the patron classes, systems of support other than those of upper class patronage.

In sum, an investigation of the relationship between Lydia and her dwelling both reinforces and expands the picture of in-house Christianity. On the one hand, it resembles the images studied so far in that it depicts Christians - household and non-household members alike - gathering together in a domestic premises as "ἀδελφοί" or participants in a house-like movement. On the other hand, the in-house Christianity seen in Lydia's premises represents a new face of the movement. What is new is its location in the workshop-*cum*-dwelling of a woman who is a Gentile, migrant purple-worker of servile origin. As has been demonstrated, exploration of this spatial / social location points to the many ways in which non-elite craft-workers and their world shaped Christianity.

130] argues that "[e]ven if προσελάβοντο αὐτον can mean only that they drew him aside, it probably indicates that they took him to their home."

102 See also Murphy-O'Connor (*Corinth*, 176-177) for a hypothetical reconstruction of the couple's workplace in Corinth based on archaeological data supplemented by evidence from Paul's letters.

The upper room at Troas

Attention turns next to the upper room at Troas (20.8). Again the focus is on how the relationship between premises and users reflects and shapes Christianity. Like the spatial / social configurations considered so far, this one reveals the new movement as in-house in the sense of gathering in a domestic premises and forming a house-like or fictive kinship group. In contrast to the others, however, Acts 20 7-12 sees believers in a very different type of premises, namely an upper room of an *insula.* As will be seen, this spatial location reflects and shapes the movement in its own unique way.

The premises in 20.8 is referred to as a "ὑπερῷον". While this is the same term used of the place where the earliest Christians re-group in Jerusalem, the upper room in Troas is not the typically Palestinian space of 1.13. Rather, it is a non-elite room or apartment situated on the third floor of a (Graeco-)Roman style *insula.* The presence of such an *insula* in Troas is not surprising given that multi-storey buildings are well-attested in the east. As noted in previous chapters, high-rise structures in Babylon, Tyre and Aradus are mentioned by Strabo [103] and two large multi-occupancy blocks (which pre-date those in Rome or Ostia) [104] have been discovered at Ephesus. [105] With regard to the upper room itself, it is probably akin to most other *cenacula* in the (Graeco-)Roman world in being a unit rented rather than owned. Like other *cenacula* too, it is primarily a dwelling or (as noted in Chapter 4) a space in which *some* of what we consider the functions of living are carried out. [106] Its position on the third floor (20.9: ἀπὸ τοῦ τριστέγου) suggests a non-elite premises for in ancient cities, the lower

---

103 Strabo mentions the high-rise buildings of Babylon (16.1.5), Tyre (16.2.23) and Aradus (16.2.13). Pomponius Mella 2.7.6 also refers to those in Aradus.

104 On Ostian *insulae,* see fig. 5.7 and fig. 5.8 (McKay, *Houses, Villas and Palaces,* fig. 31 [F. E. Brown, fig. 80] and Pl. 34).

105 For examples of multiple dwellings from Ephesus, see figs 5.5 and 5.6 (McKay, *Houses, Villas and Palaces,* fig. 68 [Akurgal, fig. 169] and fig. 69 [Akurgal, fig. 170]). On Ephesus, see McKay , *op. cit.,* 212-217, 256 nn. 381, 382.

106 As noted in Ch. 4 (pages 214-215), many activities which we associate with a dwelling (cooking, bathing...) were performed outside the home. In other words, basic functions of living were stretched out.

strata of society occupied upper(most) floors. [107]

That the ὑπερῷον or *cenaculum* of 20.8 is a small space or a space too small for the gathering is gleaned by the reference to the young man sitting on the window-sill (20.9). The implication is that the room is crowded and that someone (one who is young and agile) is forced to occupy what turns out to be (for him) a dangerous spot. While it could be argued that the young man is merely seeking out the airiest or coolest place, this too is suggestive of a crowded room. The premises, therefore, is a *cenaculum-in-insula* and as such, it represents yet another type of "house" used by the Christians of Acts.

Turning from the ὑπερῷον to its occupants, the textual evidence is less clear. Those present are described in the first person plural and as in all the other so-called "we passages" of Acts, [108] it is difficult to ascertain who precisely is present. A closer reading of the text, however, reveals that the gathering comprises two - possibly three- sets of people. First of all, there is Paul and at least one other companion who travelled to Troas from Greece via Philippi (20.3, 6). Secondly, it probably includes the seven named male companions of Paul who had reached Troas before he did. These are "Sopater of Beroea, son of Pyrrhus, Aristarchus and Secundus from Thessalonica, Gaius from Derbe, Timothy [from Lystra], Tychicus and Trophimus from Asia (20.4). [109] What unites these individuals is their identity as Christians, missionaries and travelling companions of Paul. [110]

The identity of virtually all of them as precisely that is confirmed in Acts and

---

107 On the correlation between upper floors and low social location, see Ch. 4 (213-214). On *cenacula*, see also Ch. 2 (105-109).

108 As explained by Fitzmyer (*Acts*, 98), the "narrative of Acts is usually recounted in the third person..., but ... there are four distinct passages in which the narrative changes suddenly from the third person to the first plural ... They are 16.10-17; 20.5-15; 21.1-18; 27.1.28-16.... The author never tells us who are meant by this 'we' and one naturally supposes that he is including himself among them but this is part of the problem that these passages cause." For further details, see Fitzmyer, *op. cit.,* 98-103. For a summary of scholarship on the so-called "We passages", see S. E. Porter, Excursus: The 'We' Passages in Gill and Gempf (eds), *The Book of Acts In Its Graeco-Roman Setting,* 545- 574.

109 On these names, see Barrett (*Acts,* 947-949) and Fitzmyer (*Acts*, 665-666).

110 Barrett (*Acts,* 947) argues that they are not assistant missionaries but rather representatives from (Jewish-Christian) communities who (along with Paul), bring alms to Jerusalem (24.17). However, Trophimos (for one) is an unlikely candidate. His Gentile identity is confirmed both by his name and by the trouble caused by his alleged entry into the temple (21.29).

elsewhere in the New Testament. Timothy, for example, is certainly a "disciple" (16.1); Gaius and Aristarchus are described in 19.29 as "Paul's companions in travel" while in Philemon 24, the latter is referred to as the disciple's "συνεργός". [111] Tychicus is a "beloved brother and faithful minister in the Lord" (Eph 6.21 and Col 4.7) , [112] Sopater is possibly the Sosipater and "kinsman" of Paul mentioned in Romans 16.21 and Trophimos, a believer sent greetings in 2 Tim 4.20. Furthermore, the presentation of some of their names in pairs is reminiscent of the disciples sent out "two by two" (Lk 10.1) by Jesus.

Thirdly, the references both to Eutychus (nowhere described as a believer) and to those who take him away (20.12) suggest that people from Troas are present at the gathering. That they are so-called pagans is suggested by the marked absence of Jewish and Christian networks in the city. According to Acts, there is no mention of a synagogue or Jewish contacts in Troas, no reference to Christian hosts or ἀδελφοί to welcome the travelling disciples, such as happens to them in other places along the way. [113]

Turning to the relationship between upper room and users, therefore, the evidence suggests that the premises is rented by travelling Christians / missionaries because they have no contacts or base in the city. The likely scenario is that the group of seven who reach Troas before Paul rent a cheap *cenaculum* in an *insula*. It is here they wait for the disciple and his companion(s) and where they all then proceed to spend a week (20.6). The rented, non-elite *cenaculum* in a city - which is home to none of them - reflects and strengthens the identity of a non-elite group which lives and travels together as a pseudo-household, a group united (not by kin, profession or place of origin) but by their membership of the Christian movement. As in 1.13-14, so here too, the relationship between the premises and its Christian users expresses and reinforces the identity of the group as people on the move.

Like all spatial / social configurations considered so far, the upper room / believers relationship in Troas reveals the use of domestic premises as loci of religious activity. On

---

111 He also reappears at 27.2. See also Col. 4.10 where he is referred to as Paul's "fellow prisoner".

112 See also Titus 3.12 and 2 Tim 4.12.

113 When the self-same group arrives in Tyre, Ptolemais, Caesarea and (in or near) Jerusalem, for example, it is offered hospitality by (respectively) ,Philip (21.6) and Mnason (21.16).

the one hand, believers confer a religious function on the multi-functional ὑπερῷον. This they do by having an all-night gathering (20.7-12) which begins with a speech of Paul, is interrupted by his involvement in the miraculous revival of Eutychus [114] and ends with a communal Eucharist / meal and conversation. On the other hand, the particular type of domestic premises involved shapes the movement. The type of meal / Eucharist, for example, is influenced by its setting in such a place. It is certainly no elite banquet but rather a simple affair with food either cooked on whatever facilities are available on the premises or brought / bought in from street vendors or communal kitchens downstairs. The absence of a host, hostess or servants means that the (male) group has to provide for the Eucharist / meal by pooling resources, in the form of money and / or culinary skills. Such sharing of resources makes for what Jewett calls "love communalism" or or "agapaic communalism", [115] that is, an egalitarian ethos he contrasts with the afore-mentioned "love patriarchalism".

Like some of the above-mentioned Christian spaces, the upper room in Troas functions in the process of self-definition over against Judaism. Unlike these premises, however, it does not stand as a symbol of opposition to the temple, synagogue or προσευχή for no such building is depicted in the city. Rather it stands as the space where the new, sacred time of the movement is marked, a time which differs from the Jewish sacred time, the sabbath. It is "ἐν δὲ τῇ μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων" [116] that Christians break bread, a day which recalls the resurrection of Jesus "on the first day

---

114 The Eucharist is interrupted by the restoration of life scene (20.9-10, 12). As Paul preaches into the night, Eutychus falls asleep, falls out the third floor window and is left for dead. Paul goes down to him and tells those gathered not to fear as the lad is still alive. The narrative ends with the young man being taken away alive. As noted by Haenchen (*Acts*, 585), the story resembles the well-known Elijah (1 Kings 17.21-24) and Elisha narratives (2 Kings 4.18-37).

115 Jewett, "Tenement Churches", 33.

116 20.7: Ἐν δὲ τῇ μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων.. The timing is much debated by scholars. According to Conzelmann (*Acts*, 169), it is unclear whether the group met on "Saturday night or early Sunday morning or Sunday night and early Monday morning. Lake and Cadbury argue for the latter since Luke divides the day in the manner of the Greeks.... The findings however are not unequivocal." Fitzmyer's position *(Acts*, 668-669) is that "Luke is using the Jewish reckoning of the day from sunset to sunset,.." and with regard to whether it refers to Saturday night and early Sunday morning or Sunday night and early Monday morning, it "is probably the former." For a similar phrase, see Mk 16.2 and 1 Cor 16.2. Along with 1 Cor 16.2 (and possibly Rev 1.10 f.), this is one of the first references to a celebration on the first day of the week. See also Haenchen (*Acts,* 584) and Barrett (*Acts*, 950-952). For Sunday worship, see also *Did* 14.

of the week". [117] The upper room, therefore, is the locus for a characteristically Christian ritual carried out in the movement's now characteristically sacred time.

Yet another aspect of the upper room / believers relationship outlined in 20.7-12 is its potential influence on the nature and development of the movement. Put simply, the presence of Christians in the upper room at Troas has the potential to influence the development of other *cenaculum-in-insula* congregations. The possibility for contact with others in such an area is great. As mentioned in Chapter 4, it was a characteristic of ancient, urban, non-elite abodes in particular that many functions of living took place beyond the walls of one's dwelling. The travelling Christians, therefore, would have plenty opportunity to meet and influence people at kitchens, baths, toilets.... Even intra-mural activities carried out in small, poor-quality accommodation would be visible and audible to all and sundry. The gathering of 20.7-12 is certainly one to attract the attention of those nearby: it is an all-night affair during which the place is lit up, a fellow falls out the window and people are talking and eating! Furthermore (as suggested above), it is probable that non-Christian neighbours either came in or were invited to hear Paul speak.

With regard to social composition, other *cenaculum* communities (like the Christian group in Troas) would comprise lower class believers who live temporarily or permanently in rented accommodation. Secondly, they would not be large. While it is true that far more people are capable of fitting into a space than we in the affluent western world might imagine, group size is also influenced by spatial considerations. This is all the all more evident when people need to eat and possibly cook together. In contrast to premises on the ground floor, those upstairs lack the facility for people to spill out into the street or courtyard. Finally, such communities would be characterised by a more egalitarian ethos than that found in elite house(hold) congregations or those patronised by the upper classes.

Jewett makes a strong case for the existence of such egalitarian communities (or what he calls "tenement churches") in Rome and points to groups such as those named in Romans 16.14 and 16.15. [118] These groups presuppose a spatial location and social composition quite different from communities patronised by the wealthy or composed of

---

[117] Lk 24.1: τῇ δὲ μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων.

[118] See Jewett, "Tenement Churches", especially 27-31.

elite households. Based in the tenements of poor areas such as the Trastevere and Porta Capena, they comprise the urban underclass - slaves and poor *liberti / libertae*. Evidence of a *cenaculum-in-insula* cell in Rome is glimpsed at the end of Acts in the premises of Paul. From his base in rented accommodation, [119] the captive disciple continues to preach the gospel and welcome all who come to him (28.31). His presence there for some two years (28.30) and his passion to communicate and celebrate his faith surely results in the formation of a new, non-household-based Christian cell.

In sum, an investigation of the relationship between the upper room at Troas and its users both reinforces and expands the picture of in-house Christianity. On the one hand, it resembles the images presented so far in that it depicts Christians celebrating their faith in a domestic premises and constituting a fictive-kin or house-like movement. On the other hand, the in-house Christianity seen in Troas presents something new. What is new is its spatial location in a ὑπερῷον or *cenaculum* of a (Graeco-)Roman style *insula*. As has been demonstrated, Christian presence in this spatial and social location reflects and shapes the movement: its highlights above all, the movement's location at the lower strata of society and its on-going faithfulness - in new times and places - to the egalitarian ethos and itinerant lifestyle of the Jesus movement.

---

119 On discerning Paul's accommodation from the disputed terms "ξενία" and "μίσθωμα", see Appendix 1.

Gathering the findings ...

This chapter has focused on five types of premises (the upper room in Jerusalem, the houses of the Jerusalem community, the house of Cornelius, Lydia's house and the upper room in Troas) and has explored what the relationship between these dwellings and their users reveals about early Christianity. In general terms, the exploration reveals how profoundly shaped the movement is by the two-way relationship between dwellings and users. On the one hand, believers use domestic premises for their own unique purposes. On the other hand, the domestic premises themselves are instrumental in influencing the nature and development of the movement. More specifically, the exploration reveals that the two-way relationship between particular dwellings and particular users contributes to the depiction of a movement whose unity and diversity is profound. The five particular dwelling / user(s) configurations are united in their depiction of Christianity as an in-house movement in the multiple sense of being based in and shaped by its presence in domestic premises, constituting a house-like (or fictive kinship) group and (often) comprising households. At one and the same time, however, each of the five dwelling / user(s) configurations, precisely because of its spatial / social location, represents a unique face of the movement. It is this depiction of in-house Christianity as simultaneously united and diverse, as the same and different, that makes for the complex, panoramic perspective of Acts and raises further questions about the movement's nature and development.

In-house Christianity as a united and unified movement

In all five dwelling / users configurations, Christianity is depicted as a movement based in and shaped by its presence in domestic premises and constituting a fictive kinship group. It is in the depiction of this multiple in-house nature, common to all five examples, that a sense of united and unified movement is created.

...in domestic premises.....

Just as both the Roman town house and houses in the contact zone functioned as loci where identity was expressed and created, so too in Acts, houses in the generic sense are places where Christian identity formation occurs.

As portrayed throughout Acts, dwellings are the most common venue for gatherings and rituals of the new movement. In turn, the domestic location itself influences the movement: (i) It shapes what soon become characteristically Christian rituals (breaking bread), practices (inclusive meal-sharing) and values (hospitality). (ii) The in-house location contributes to the sense of community, in that it both expresses and reinforces a sense of companionship and at-homeness in its members. It contributes to the self-understanding of Christians as members of a fictive house(hold) and to the use of house terms for the movement. [120] (iii) Domestic location also has an effect on the composition of community, one such being the conversion of households and families. This results in communities which have at their core the οἶκος structures of society (both elite and non-elite). It also leads to the exposure of children to the movement and thus to the beginning of what may be termed "cradle Christianity". Yet another effect of domestic location on the movement is the participation of women and their involvement as patrons and leaders.

As the primary space for the rituals and gathering of Christians, "the house" (in a general or generic sense) functions in the process of self-definition over against the house of Israel and the household-writ-large. With regard to the former, houses are used to exemplify and reinforce the wider Christianity / Judaism rift outlined in Chapter 6. At the start of Acts, house(s) and temple function together as complementary loci of believers' (Jewish) religious activity. As Jews, believers worship *both* "ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ" *and* "κατ' οἶκον", that is, in *both* the domestic *and* the public realm. As the text progresses, however, the public or specialized spaces of Judaism (namely, the temple, συναγωγή and προσευχή) become places of hostility and rejection, places where

---

[120] This is also a feature of other New Testament texts, a point which emerged strongly in the review. In 1 Timothy, for example, the church is explicitly described as the "οἶκος θεοῦ" (3.15). In Ephesians, the community is imaged as "members of the household of God" (2.19) and believers are "children" (5.1,8) or "sons" (1.5) of a God portrayed as "father" (3.14, 4.6; cf. 1.2,3).

believers' faith can no longer be celebrated. As a result, multi-functional domestic premises become the almost exclusive loci for the rituals and gatherings of the new movement. In other words, as believers develop an identity separate from Judaism, they lose their access to Jewish sacred spaces and their worship is confined to the domestic sphere. In short, believers eventually worship "κατ' οἶκον" *only*.

At a historical level, the lack of specialized or monumental sacred spaces points to the nascent or insignificant nature of emerging Christianity. [121] In this, it contrasts with Judaism, a long-established religion with its own public places of worship both in Jerusalem and throughout the Diaspora. Christianity could hope to establish such sacred spaces only as it grew, acquired financial resources and received state recognition. In Acts, however, the absence of official sacred space is not portrayed as a lack or disadvantage. Rather, Christians appear to have their own "sacred" space in the form of houses. Moreover, as places associated with the new movement, the houses of Acts stand in opposition to the temple and synagogue. [122] In this regard, it is note-worthy that the term "house" is never applied to the locus of any Sabbath gathering, despite the fact that many synagogues were in fact located in domestic premises. [123] In other words, the impression (or illusion) created in Acts is that houses are the domain of Christians.

Turning from Judaism, the domestic "sacred" spaces of Christians also function in the process of self-definition over against the household-writ-large. They differ from the

---

121 As White (*God's House, C*h. 3) demonstrates, many small or emerging (religious) associations used dwellings as a first and natural sacred space. See also the reference to *CIL* 6.9148 (*collegium quod est in domu Sergiae Paullinae*), cited in the Introduction (page 10 n.34). In its lack of official sacred spaces, the movement resembles other Jewish groups of the post-70 / post-temple period. See Neusner's treatment of the Pharisees and Rabbis in "Varieties of Judaism in the Formative Age" on pages 59-89 of his *Formative Judaism* II.

122 While a suggestion of the house / temple contrast was seen in the Cornelius episode, explicit house / synagogue contrasts appear in cities of the Diaspora: in Philippi, the προσευχή (16.13) contrasts with the houses of Lydia (16.15, 40) and the jailer (16.34), in Corinth, the synagogue (16.34) contrasts with the premises of Crispus and Titius Justus, (18.7) while in Thessalonica, the συναγωγή and the house of Jason are set in opposition (17.1-5).

123 As noted by Matson (*Household Conversion,* 177 n.185), "Prior to 70 CE, συναγωγή primarily denoted a 'gathering' or 'assembly' of the Jews, a usage appearing in Acts (6.9; 9.2). Luke, however, almost always uses the term of a physical place of assembly (Lk 4.15-16, 33; 6.6; 21.12; Acts 9.20; 13.5, 14; 17.1, 10, 17; 18.4;, 19; 19.8), even showing knowledge of a special synagogue structure (Lk 7.5). Despite the fact that the earliest synagogue meetings took place in homes, Luke preserves the rhetorical contrast by reserving the οἶκος / οἰκία terminology only for places of Christian worship and assembly."

sacred spaces of (Graeco-)Roman religions, from great pagan temples, such as that of Artemis (19.27) in Ephesus; they also differ from monumental spaces which symbolise Roman administration and power or spaces accorded official significance by the presence of officials or client kings. These include βῆμα (in Caesarea and Corinth), Herod's praetorium (23.35) and the ἀκροαστήριον (25.23) (in Caesarea). [124] On the one hand, therefore, Acts reveals that early Christianity has no public buildings in which to proclaim and celebrate its identity; on the other hand, the movement celebrates its own unique and emerging identity in the (albeit small) domestic spaces it has "colonised".

.. *house-like in nature* ...

In all five dwelling / user(s) configurations, Christianity is also in-house in the sense of constituting a fictive kinship group and (often) comprising households. Christians, both kin and non-kin, household members and others, are united as ἀδελφοί [125] in an οἶκος-like movement in which God is πατήρ. [126] In its house-like structure Christianity resembles the οἶκος Ἰσραήλ and the household-writ-large. Like these houses, it has a membership united under a supreme head of house. Like them too, it is not a group of equals : it has its "officials" in the form of "apostles .. elders",

---

124 References to the βῆμα in Corinth and Caesarea are cited in Ch. 6 (pages 257-258 n.6). Paul is imprisoned in Herod's praetorium (23.35). The ἀκροαστήριον (25.23) is where he appears before Festus and where officialdom is indicated by the arrival of Agrippa and Berenice "with great pomp" (φαντασία) along with the "tribunes and the prominent men of the city". As explained by Barrett (*Acts*, 1088), the "πραιτώριον Ἡρῴδου" (23.35) was the "palace built by Herod the Great and taken over by the Roman administration. We have no archaeological or other information about it (except that it existed) and its site remains unknown." According to him (*op. cit.*, 1145-1146) the ἀκροαστήριον (25.23) is "a place designed, or used, for the purpose of hearing; often a lecture room, here perhaps *audience chamber*? ....."

125 As noted by Fitzmyer (*Acts*, 222), the term "ἀδελφοί" (one of the most common names for Christians in Acts) refers to Christians in Acts 1.16; 9.30; 10.23b; 11.1,12,29; 12.17; 14.2; 15.3, 22, 32,33,40; 17.6, 10, 14; 18.18, 27; 21.7, 17,20; 28.14,15) and "perhaps also in 15.7; 113.23, where it may refer however, solely to those assembled at the 'Council'." On the use of "ἀδελφοί" by Christians, see also Cadbury, "Names", 378-379.

126 On God as "πατήρ", see 1.4; 1.7; 2.33.

ἐπίσκοποι. [20.28].. [127] and its ministry-holders in the form of prophets and teachers (13.1]). Furthermore, as in all ancient houses, less attention is paid to female than to male participants despite their participation and leadership roles. [128] Christianity also resembles the two world-wide houses in being a trans-local, ecumenical phenomenon, with a membership spread across the Mediterranean. Like them too, it is a movement under on-going construction - spatially, socially and across time.

In the case of Christianity, however, it is a new house, one in process of being "built up" (9.31: οἰκοδομουμένη..). [129] It is an οἶκος with a life and nature all its own: one with its own particular "father" and household membership, one with its own beliefs and teachings, its own rituals, practices and values; it is a house with its own οἰκονομία in the form of social and financial organization; one which has its own sacred spaces to communicate and celebrate its faith. In Acts, therefore, Christianity is seen as a little movement based in (physical) houses. It is from this humble location that it begins to grow into a world-wide house which equals / rivals the οἶκος Ἰσραήλ and the household-writ-large.

In-house Christianity as a diverse movement

While the five dwellings / user(s) configurations form part of the same in-house religious movement, each one is quite different. In other words, the five examples reveal a movement as diverse as it is unified. Each of the spatial / social configurations represents a different model or image of Christian community and it is precisely because of its

---

127 For references to "the apostles and elders", see 15.2, 4, 6, 22, 23; 16.4. For Christian elders, see also 11.30, 14.23 and 21.18. While apostles are historically part of both the Jesus movement and the earliest Jerusalem community, their authority is given added (or even excessive) weight when read back from the church of Luke's day in which offices such as πρεσβύτεροι and ἐπίσκοποι. (20.28) are well-established. On the term "elders" as applied to Christian and Jewish leaders, see Ch. 6 (pages 293-294 and note 175). On "πρεσβύτεροι" and "ἐπίσκοποι" in 21.28, see Barrett, *Acts*, 974-977.

128 Acts, however, gives a double message about women: on the one hand, women are depicted as important members of the Christian community, as heads of house (Mary, Lydia), teachers (Priscilla), prophets (the daughters of Philip) and on the other, female disciples are given far less attention than their male counterparts. Women are rarely given voice and are subordinated to their male counterparts. It is the males who hold leadership positions in the movement and who are accorded more space in the text. For more detailed treatment, see Appendix 2.

129 See also reference to the word's power "to build up" (20.32: οἰκοδομῆσαι) its members.

particular spatial / social location that this is so.

.. diverse images of community...

The first dwelling / user configuration, both narratively and chronologically, is that depicted in 1.13-14. This is the group in the upper room, the first Christian cell and the one closest to the Jesus movement in terms of composition and place of origin. The second, both in Acts and in terms of historical development, is the Jerusalem community which celebrates and communicates its faith "κατ' οἶκον". This is a socially diverse, urban community which strives for material as well as spiritual κοινωνία.

The next three dwelling / user configurations illustrate the move outwards from Jerusalem and represent communities in quite different spatial / social locations. The third is the elite house(hold) church in the house of the quintessential Roman Cornelius. This is the Christianized *domus*-in-*domus*, a model which shows how the new movement happily "colonises" elite household(s) and Roman patronage networks. The fourth is the workshop-*cum*-dwelling church of Lydia, a house(hold) church in the premises of a migrant craft-worker of servile origin. While it too has an οἶκος at is core, it is a non-elite, female-headed group united as much by professional as kinship ties. It is, in essence, more akin to a *collegium* than to a household model. The fifth is the *cenaculum-in-insula* church, the egalitarian community of missionaries on the move. It represents a later, urbanised version of the Galilean *Jesusbewegung* and is also a model open to all poor disciples who inhabit the *cenacula* of (Graeco-)Roman cities.

.. unity and diversity.. juxtaposed...

The five dwellings / user(s) configurations are part of the same movement but each reveals a different image of community. The examples, therefore, present in-house Christianity as a movement in which there is both unity and diversity. This simultaneous presentation of unity and diversity makes for a unique and panoramic perspective on Christianity and raises further questions about the movement's nature and development.

On the one hand, Acts depicts in-house Christianity as a united, harmonious and homogenised movement. It depicts a community in which there is no division between

rich and poor Christians in the Jerusalem community (such as that recorded in 1 Corinthians), no tension between Christian masters and slaves (like that between Philemon and Onesimus), no disharmony between local communities and travelling missionaries (such as that chronicled by Crossan in a recent study [130]). It lays no emphasis on the differences between, for example, elite household churches or those in upper rooms. It gives the impression that all post-initiation celebrations meals - such as those in the houses of Judas, [131] Cornelius, the Philippian jailer [132] and Lydia are the same.

---

130 In the New Testament, see (for example) the evidence in Corinth and Galatia. Tension between householders and itinerant disciples is discussed by J. D. Crossan in *The Birth of Christianity: Discovering What Happened In The Years Immediately After The Execution* (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1999). Part VII is dedicated to the itinerants and Part VIII, to the householders. As he himself summarises in the introduction to Part VII (on pages 354-355):

> "Part VII showed that there was from the earliest evidence a dialectic of itinerants and householders going back to the time of the historical Jesus. The kingdom of God was made present not just in the itinerants but in the interaction of itinerants and householders, in a new community of healing and eating, of shared material and spiritual resources. The itinerants expected and received *external* opposition and even persecution. But did they also encounter *internal* opposition - dissent and criticism from those who had already accepted them? Was there resistance not only by non-Christians from outside but by Christians from within the kingdom-of-God movement. And did that internal negation give a far greater sense of failure to the itinerants than any external one ever could?
>
> Part VII "gave the voice of the itinerants; Part VIII gives the voice of the householders. In Part VII the itinerants spoke out; in Part VIII the householders talk back. For the itinerants we have the Q Gospel document, for the householders we have the *Didache* document...."

131 The initiation of Saul (in the οἰκία of Judas in Straight Street, Damascus) (9.10 -19). .. Saul's sight is first restored as Ananias lays hands on him and prays for the Spirit. After his baptism, the energy lost during his three day fast is restored by the taking of food.

132 Following the evangelization and baptism of the jailer and his household somewhere within or in the environs of the house, the jailer brings Paul and Silas into the house and "sets a table before them"(16.34: .. παρέθηκεν τράπεζαν... Matson (*Household Conversion*, 163) focuses on this phrase "to set a table" (see Lk 10.8; 11.6; 1 Cor 10.27). "When applied figuratively, τράπεζα (table) denotes a meal or food". (See... Acts 6.2; 1 Cor 10.21; *Did.* 11.9). The image of the table "is striking given its prior appearance in the Gospel of Luke":

> .. the hand of the one betraying me is with me on the table [ἐπὶ τῆς τραπέζης] (22.21)
>
> .. in order that you might eat and drink at my table in my kingdom.. [ἐπὶ τῆς τραπέζης] (22.30)

As noted by Matson (*op. cit.*, 164), " [o]f the four gospels, only Luke contains a reference to the 'τράπεζα' at the institution of the Lord's supper. According to A. A. Just Jr. (*The Ongoing Feast: Table Fellowship and Eschatology at Emmaus* [Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1993], 245), Luke's usage of "τράπεζα" at 22.21 gives the Last Supper the character of table-fellowship. Both Matthew (26.23) and Mark (14.20) use the term "dish" (τρύβλιον) and Paul uses the expression "τραπέζης κυρίου" (table of the Lord) to refer to the Lord's Supper at 1 Cor 10.21.

On the other hand, the self-same text produces evidence to suggest that the Christianity is anything but a homogenised phenomenon. It gives enough detail to discern how the movement is shaped and expressed in different ways in different spatial / social locations. Thus for example, the nature and development of table-fellowship and Eucharist is undoubtedly affected by location. Christian meals / Eucharists are surely influenced by or modelled on other repasts taken in the same place, be they the banquets of elite house(hold)s or the pot-luck / carry-out affairs of *cenacula* of *insulae*. Similarly, the type of hospitality offered to Peter in the *domus* of Cornelius, for example, is surely different from that extended by the apostle to the centurion's emissaries in the small, probably malodorous, workshop-*cum*-dwelling of Simon the tanner (10.23).[133] In a word, Acts both conceals and reveals the fact that there is variety rather than uniformity in the practice of Christian life precisely because it is lived out in different locations.

Another fact both concealed and revealed by Acts is the relationship (or lack of it) between communities based in the same cities but occupying different social strata. In Caesarea, for example, there is the elite house(hold) church of Cornelius. In the same city is the community in the house of the relocated Philip[134] and his four daughters who prophesy (21.8-14). [135] This is described as an open house for travelling missionaries and a base for Christian (and especially prophetic) activity. [136] In Philippi, there is the community in Lydia's workshop-*cum*-dwelling and the household group in the barracks / house of the δεσμοφύλαξ, a lesser official of the Roman establishment. [137] In neither city

---

133 In an understated foretaste of what is to occur in the house of Cornelius, Peter welcomes the emissaries to stay overnight. 10.23: εἰσκαλεσάμενος οὖν αὐτοὺς ἐξένισεν. The fact that they stayed overnight is evident from the reference to departing on the next day (10.23: Τῇ δὲ ἐπαύριον ..).

134 Philip is one of many believers scattered after the persecution in Jerusalem. See Ch. 6 (page 263 n.31) for references to the travels of Philip.

135 On these women, see Appendix 2.

136 Philip "the evangelist" and "one of the seven" (21.8) is based in Caesarea. The group in his house is described as "ἡμεῖς τε καὶ οἱ ἐντόπιοι" (21.12). The "we" refers to a number of transient disciples, while "the people there" includes a Christian προφήτης named Agabus (21.10; cf. 11.27-28) and perhaps Philip, his four daughters and other believers from the household or local area.

137 While de Vos argues that he is a public slave, it is more commonly thought that he comes "from the ranks of the Roman military establishment" (Matson, *Household Conversion*, 157),

is there mention of communities coming together. In Acts, therefore, new communities within the same city appear to be juxtaposed in different spatial / social locations. This resembles the picture painted by Lampe in Rome where poor communities inhabit poor regions like Trastevere and Porta Capena while affluent ones are found in affluent areas like the Aventine. [138]

This suggests that while believers are indeed united as siblings, the concrete way in which they live out their faith is shaped by social / spatial location. What Acts simultaneously reveals and conceals, therefore, is that the experience of Christianity at any one time is not homogeneous but hugely varied. This evidence challenges any simplistic notion that the movement developed in a linear fashion: from a golden age of egalitarian community in the gospel to a later patriarchal, hierarchical household phenomenon. Rather the evidence of Acts depicts the one movement developing in different ways in different locations.

If Acts depicts a movement shaped by spatial / social location, it also shows how believers are not locked permanently into a Christianized version of the Roman social order. Travelling disciples, like Peter, Paul and their companions are depicted moving from city to city, from elite house churches to those in workshop-*cum*-dwellings: that is, quite literally " κατ' οἴκους" (20.20): For these disciples and for all others who cross the spatial / social divide, the experience must be demanding and exciting: at one level it is difficult for believers to move from their (social or physical) place of origin. Similarly, it is demanding to try to forge a new identity and new relationships in an old and familiar place; at another level, however, it is exciting to contribute to the construction of a new οἶκος and οἰκουμένη, to get even glimpses of the movement's potential to turn the established ones upside down.

---

a group in whose salvation the author shows an interest in the gospel.

138 Jewett, "Tenement churches", 28.

CONCLUSION

Moving to the final phase, the work as a whole is first gathered. Attention then turns to an assessment of the study's two methodological pillars, namely the concept of macro- and micro-text and the analytical tool of "house". Moving from methodology to content, the final focus is on the image of early Christianity as presented in the study and on its significance within New Testament scholarship.

The study .. replayed .. in brief....

A review of scholarship on house in early Christianity simultaneously highlighted the importance of the "house" for an understanding of early Christianity and provided pointers for further research on the topic. It revealed the need and scope for clarity on the nature of "house", in particular on the difference (and relationship) between physical and sociological houses. At the level of content, attention was drawn to two aspects: first, the (over-)emphasis on house(hold) as ideal or type (at the expense of actual households and dwellings) and secondly, the paucity of house scholarship with a focus on Acts. Methodologically, the challenge noted was to stand ever more fully in the territory shared by Classics and Biblical studies by going beyond a simplistic and distorting background / foreground approach and by working competently with a range of (literary, archaeological..) material beyond the purely biblical. In the light of these findings, the proposal formulated was to explore anew the meaning of "house" and to use the perspective gained in a reading of Acts (the micro-text) in its Roman imperial social world (the macro-text). The chapters which followed did precisely that and in so doing, they built on (rather than demolished) existing house scholarship.

Part 1 constituted the re-visiting of "house". Focusing on "house" today, Chapter 1 problematised an apparently simple term and forced a re-thinking of its meaning and hermeneutical potential. An initial focus on the word "house" revealed the term's wide semantic field and its principal meanings, "dwelling" and "household". The reality of these two separate entities both as social constructs and keys to society was then outlined with the help of human-scientific material. The neglected relationship between dwellings and

households was next articulated with the aid of social-spatial theory. Equipped with fresh insight into "house", Chapter 2 entered the ancient world. An investigation of the meanings of οἶκος / οἰκία, *domus,* בית and synonyms revealed the breadth and flexibility of "house" in antiquity. Furthermore, the investigation reinforced the capacity of (physical and sociological) houses to function as doors onto society. The focus on terminology also led to the articulation of two definitions considered central to the study: first, that of the broad concept of "house" which was adopted as analytical tool and secondly, that of "oikic sources" (sources on housing and households) which were to serve as data.

Part 2 constituted the reading of the macro-text and consisted of three chapters. All were united in their focus on the empire and in their use of "house" as analytical tool. Each, however, presented a specific angle on the empire. Using the concept of house as "household", Chapter 3 explored the early Roman Empire as a household-writ-large. It dealt with general aspects of the imperial structure as household and with the "house-building" of Augustus. Turning to physical houses, Chapter 4 focuses on dwelling / user relationships in the typical town-house and in other habitations of the Roman world. Still dealing with the "physical house", Chapter 5 focused on housing in the contact zone. Drawing on evidence from across the empire and from Jerusalem in particular, the emphasis was on what housing revealed about the relationship between imperial power and colonized people. The chapters of Part 2, therefore, functioned as a triptych: each stood as a distinct image yet together they offered a panoramic view of the empire, one which was subsequently shown to illuminate one of its tiny, constituent parts, namely the (micro-)text of Acts.

Turning to this micro-text, Part 3 (Chapters 6 and 7) presented the reading of Acts, a reading made possible thanks to insights from Part 2 and to the flexible house tool. With regard to the analytical tool, it was the three-fold concept of house (as "household-writ-large", "οἶκος Ἰσραήλ" and "dwelling") which provided both a framework and new understanding in Part 3. The picture of Christianity to emerge in Part 3 is of a movement whose nature and development was shaped by its social / spatial location, in houses both world-wide and local. It was, therefore, akin to a house in the contact zone, a structure fashioned from imperial and native elements but one with a nature all its own.

In Chapter 6, Christianity was seen as embedded in the household-writ-large and the house of Israel and at one and same time, in process of self-definition over against these

two world-wide houses. In Chapter 7, further knowledge about the life of early Christianity was gained by focusing on another type of οἶκος / οἰκία, namely, the physical house. Attention to the two-way relationship between dwellings and users revealed Christianity to be an in-house movement in the double sense of being (i) a unified, ecumenical οἶκος community and (ii) a diverse movement whose life was shaped by and manifest in the many and varied domestic premises it occupied, premises illustrative of different strata of society.

Methodology assessed .....

Following the aide-memoire provided by the summary, attention turns next to an assessment of the two key issues of methodology, namely the concept of macro / micro-text and the use of "house" as analytical tool.

macro-text and micro-text

As outlined in the introduction, [1] the text /context relationship envisaged in this study was expressed in the concept of macro- / micro-text. While Acts was to the fore in the sense that the ultimate interest was in early Christianity, its classification as micro-text encapsulated the fact that this biblical text was viewed not an isolated entity but rather as an inextricable part of a larger context. This world or context was classified as a macro-text or mosaic of micro-texts. Its definition as "text" meant that it was envisaged not as static background but as a reality which required reading.

While the concept of macro- / micro-text provided a useful framework for this particular study, its relevance extends beyond it. At a general level, the concept is useful for scholars of any discipline who study texts in context. It is a succinct articulation of the three aspects essential to any such study, namely, an understanding of (i) the text as part of a wider context (ii) the nature of this wider world or context (iii) the relationship between the two. More specifically, the concept of macro- / micro-text serves as a

---

[1] See Introduction (page 52).

challenge to scholars of early Christianity and classicists and encourages dialogue between them. For biblical scholars, the challenge is to move with greater ease in the macro-text of the Graeco-Roman world: to apply critical faculties to non-biblical and non-literary material and to become ever-more familiar with Classical scholarship. Conversely, the challenge posed to classicists is that of embracing more fully the Christian world and its texts within their field of study. Finally, a macro- / micro-text model asks of biblicists and classicists that they engage in on-going and creative dialogue within the shared space they occupy, namely the early centuries of the common era.

"house" as analytical tool

If the concept of macro / micro-text provided the broad canvas for working with Acts in context, "house" is the tool with which the work was executed. The study demonstrated how a greater understanding of the breadth and flexibility of "house" increases one's ability to use it as a more effective analytical tool, a tool capable of generating new insight.

Observation of the "house" tool used in other New Testament studies both reinforced a belief in its usefulness and led to the conviction that its hermeneutical potential was under-utilized. Something of a voyage of discovery into this potential occurred during the re-visiting of house in Part 1. Of particular significance was the focus on housing (and not simply household) as key to society, the articulation of the dwelling / user relationship and study of ancient house terminology. The concept of house which emerged was more faithful to the wide meaning(s) of οἶκος / οἰκία: it was a broad and flexible concept, embracing physical and sociological senses of "house" and capable of operating at literal and metaphorical levels. In contrast to studies which worked with either a single sense of "house" or which failed to clarify the dwelling / user question, this present work employed an analytical tool which was plural, one which both made explicit and exploited the concept's chameleon-like nature. This flexible tool has made it possible to analyse (rather than simply describe) the wider world or macro-text. The use of the house tool (as house / housing / household) has opened doors onto the reality and ideology of the Roman world, onto the on-going and conscious construction of its social systems and onto the complex relationship between colonizer and colonized. While these insights are illuminating in their

own right, they are also invaluable for the light they shed on Acts. Turning to Acts itself, the flexible tool has yielded insight into early Christianity, revealing it as a movement in process of shaping its own identity from the raw materials found in its social / spatial environment. Throughout the study, the house tool has resulted in the bringing together of elements usually seen as un-related - elements such as the activities of Augustus and Christian self-definition, provincial housing and early Christianity, Roman and Jewish elements of Acts - and in so doing, has yielded a fresh perspective on a Christian text and its context.

The image of Christianity in Acts

In the area of content as well as methodology, the study makes a contribution to New Testament scholarship. This it does by its reading of Christianity as a particular type of in-house movement, a united and diverse movement shaped by both the global and local houses it occupies.

Turning first to global houses, Christianity's relationship to the household-writ-large points to the movement's *Romanitas.* While the *Romanitas* of Acts has long been recognized by scholars, what is clear from Chapter 6 is that the term relates as much to the Christian movement as to its social world. Even as the movement defines itself over against the household-writ-large, it simultaneously reveals itself as part and parcel of this world. Ancient householder, emperor and Roman οἰκουμένη provide model and foil for the portrayal of the Christian deity and of the movement's emerging realm. Like the empire, the movement is increasingly composed ἐξ οἰκῶν and is structured as a (fictive) household. The fact that both commission (1.8) and subsequent apostolic witness are expressed in explicitly geographical language is a further sign of the text's imperial context. Literature in which journeys and geography predominate are common in imperial situations [2] and in the Roman world, this style or (sub-)genre is exemplified by the *Res Gestae*, the

---

[2] The link between travel literature and imperialism is demonstrated by Pratt, *Imperial Eyes.* For a study of geography and politics in the early Roman empire, see Nicolet, *Space, Geography and Politics.*

writings of Strabo and Pausanias and a multiplicity of travel tales. [3]

Turning to the house of Israel, an important aspect of early Christianity to emerge is its Jewish nature. The Christianity of Acts is set firmly within the house of Israel. The movement's message and mission are related to Israel's expectations; the movement is shaped by a Jewish world-view and is directed primarily at Jews; its membership consists largely of loyal Jews and Gentiles with a connection to Judaism. Emphasis on the movement's Jewishness is particularly worthy of note, given the accusations of anti-Semitism levelled against the text. The study sheds further light on the much debated Jewish question in Acts by presenting the movement's complex relationship with Judaism in terms of a trajectory: from membership with the house of Israel, to in-house division, to separation from the house, to the establishment of a new structure. In this trajectory is captured the long and difficult process of development, the struggle for self-understanding and the on-going articulation of identity.

A focus on physical houses yields further insight into how Christianity is shaped by its social / spatial environment. Ch. 7 reinforces the image of Christianity as a world-wide house modelled on, yet different from, the household-writ-large and the οἶκος Ἰσραήλ, a house in which all members are united under a supreme head. It is a house with an identity and life of its own: one with its own membership and system of management, its own beliefs, ethos and message, its own rituals and values. While constituting a single, united world-wide house, Christianity is at one and the same time a movement constituted by a multiplicity of very different in-house communities. These communities or cells are as different as the premises they occupy, be it upper room in Jerusalem or Troas, elite Roman *domus* in Caesarea or workshop-*cum*-dwelling in Philippi. Each one of the cells stands as an image or model of community, an example of how precisely social / spatial location contributes to the nature and development of the movement. To use the term "house church" of Acts, therefore, is to refer to a reality both

---

[3] Note the accounts of territorial conquests by historians (such as Livy or Suetonius) and the work of Pausanias which Casson (*Travel,* Ch. 18) classifies as the "Baedecker of the Ancient World". Other travel accounts cited by Casson include those of Aemilius Paulus in the second century B.C.E. (recorded in Livy 45.27-28) and of the Greek intellectual Aristides in the second century C.E. (*Or.* 27.1-8). From the fourth century, accounts of Christian travellers include those of the Bordeaux Pilgrim, Etheria (or Egeria), Paula, Melania the Elder and Melania the Younger. References to these works are given in Casson, *op. cit.,* 365.

singular and plural, united and diverse.

Finally, the image of early Christianity presented in this study differs from those most commonly associated with Acts, namely a utopian community in Jerusalem, a household movement and an emerging institution. [4] In contrast to such images, the one presented here is more multi-dimensional and more faithful to the volume and range of material presented by the author. Theologically, it is a fascinating image of a community shaped by its infinitely varied social / spatial environment, an environment both global and local. It is an image of a community struggling with the process of inculturation or contextualization, a challenge facing Christians and adherents of historical religions in every age.

---

[4] The former amounts to an idealization of primitive Christianity, the latter, a critique of the text's so-called early Catholicism. For a summary of "Early Catholicism in Luke-Acts", see Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 23-27. As explained there, the notion of *Frühkatholizismus* appeared some hundred years ago in E. Troeltsch, *Die Soziallehren der christlichen Kirchen und Gruppen,* Gesammelte Schriften 1 (Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1912), 1:83. First used in sociological writings, it was later found in theological discussions, apparently for the first time, in A. Ehrhard, *Urkirche und Frühkatholizismus* (Bonn: Buchgemeinde, 1935). The term was used to describe the elements of early Christianity which characterize it as an ordered institution of salvation, a church with sacraments, hierarchical offices, and a tradition involving a deposit of faith. Originally used of the church as depicted in early patristic writers and the Pastorals, it was later applied to Luke-Acts, as seen in Vielhauer's article on the Paulinism of Acts.

APPENDIX 1 : *ξενία and μίσθωμα - Paul's accommodation in Rome*

The terms "ξενία" (28.23) and "μίσθωμα" (28.30) are generally taken to refer to Paul's accommodation in Rome. The difficulty (as outlined by Cadbury [1]), however, is that the nouns "if used as commonly supposed of a place of abode, are almost if not quite unparalleled". [2] While the debate is on-going, a study of evidence outlined below leads to the conclusion that the text does carry references to dwellings.

ξενία

According to 28.23, the local Jewish leaders came to Paul "εἰς τὴν ξενίαν", a phrase most commonly rendered "at his lodging". [3] The two problems with this translation are first, the term is rarely attested in the sense of temporary accommodation at the time [4] and secondly, ξενία also means hospitality or entertainment. [5] Consideration of the latter meaning leads Cadbury to suggest that the phrase be translated "to the reception which he [Paul] tendered them", a translation which reinforces the Lukan

---

1 Cadbury, "Lodging".

2 Cadbury, "Lodging", 319.

3 The term "ξενία" is translated as "lodging" in the RSV. According to Liddell-Scott, its meaning is "probably lodging". In his commentary on the phrase "εἰς τὴν ξενίαν", Haenchen (*Acts* , 723) refers to the "inn" in which Paul has rented a room.

4 Cadbury, "Lodging", 321 and n. 30. According to Cadbury, the terms "ξενών" or "κατάλυμα" are more frequently used to refer to temporary accommodation and ξενοδοχεῖον is a frequent substitute for ξενών in Hellenistic Greek. Turning to loan words of Rabbinic Aramaic, Cadbury notes that the language "uses commonly for the place where strangers lodge 'אכסניא' (κατάλυμα, khan, Heberge, logis). Unless this is a new Aramaic formation from ξένος or its root, it is a direct transliteration from ξενία and constitutes the best support for giving that word the meaning usually assigned to it in Acts 28.23."

5 See Cadbury, "Lodging", 320. Lake and Cadbury (*Beginnings* 4, 346) translate the term as "hospitality." Examples from the papyri convinced J. H. Moulton and G. Milligan (*The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament Illustrated from the Papyri and Other Non-Literary Sources* [London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1930], 433) that in Acts , ξενία means "hospitality" rather than "lodging". For a lengthy entry on the term, see Liddell-Scott.

theme of hospitality. [6] Cadbury himself concludes, however, that here the meanings actually amount to the same thing: in other words, either the Jews were received in Paul's lodging or they were entertained where he was (staying). The definition of "ξενία" as some kind of temporary accommodation is reinforced by its appearance in Philemon 22, the only other New Testament text in which the term is used. [7] Further support for this meaning is found in the Vulgate. There the phrase "εἰς τὴν ξενίαν" is translated "*in hospitium*" [8] and as outlined above, *hospitium* refers to some type of dwelling. [9] On balance, therefore, the evidence suggests that the term "ξενία" refers to a dwelling or lodging.

μίσθωμα

The second term referring to Paul's Roman dwelling is "μίσθωμα". [10] According to Acts 28.30, Paul lived for two years "ἐν ἰδίῳ μισθώματι", a phrase rendered either "in his own hired dwelling" [11] or "at his own expense." [12] While "hired dwelling" and "expense / earnings" are different, both are linked to the verb "μισθόω"

---

6 Cadbury, "Lodging", 320 and n.29. On hospitality, see for example, Malherbe, *Social Aspects,* 94-97 and on table-fellowship, see Karris, *Luke: Artist and Theologian,* 44-78 and Esler, *Community and Gospel,* 71-109. According to Cadbury ("Lodging", 320-321), it may be difficult for us to think of Paul the prisoner entertaining local Jews. The view of Haenchen (*Acts*, 723 n.4) is that " 'hospitality' does not fit here: "Paul does not invite the Jewish leaders to dinner, but they come to the inn where he lives."

7 In Philemon, the term "ξενία" is usually translated as "guest-room" (see RSV). While this is not applicable in the case of Acts (because Paul is not portrayed as anyone's guest), what is useful is that the term is understood as a form of accommodation, albeit temporary.

8 Noted by Rapske, *Roman Custody,* 237.

9 While "*hospitium"* was used of lodging in general, it was more commonly translated as "inn". As noted in Ch. 2 (pages 107-109), however, rigid categories cannot be drawn between inns and non-elite dwellings, which comprised a range of units both single and multi-roomed, temporary and permanent. Under the umbrella term "inn", see the number of Latin terms (such as *taberna, deversoria, stabula, cauponae, popina, hospitia)* discussed in the section of Ch. 2 cited above.

10 The difficulty in understanding this term is stressed by D. L. Mealand, "The Close of Acts and Its Hellenistic Greek Vocabulary", *NTS* 36 (1990), 583.

11 Examples include RSV (note), NIV. For details, see Rapske, *Roman Custody*, 178 n.27.

12 See RSV. Lake and Cadbury (*Beginnings* 4, 348) translate the phrase as "at his own cost". Cadbury ("Lodging", 322) suggests "on his own earnings" and "at his own expense".

which means "to hire" or "to rent". [13] The different translations reflect the disagreement over whether it is a dwelling or Paul's labour which is rented. The problem with translating μίσθωμα as "hired-dwelling" or "lodging" is that its use in this sense is (to date) unique. [14] The more usual meanings, as given in Liddell Scott, include (1) a contract-price, a courtesan's price (2) a contract (3) rent. After an extensive survey, Mealand [15] considers that the term is best understood in the light of the inscriptional (rather than the literary) evidence [16] and concludes that μίσθωμα is a technical term meaning "rent". [17] This suggests that the evidence of Paul's living in rented accommodation [18] is not based on a unique use of μίσθωμα as "hired dwelling". The latter remains a possibility, [19] however, for Cadbury argues that an interest in lodging may have led the author "to use concretely of a room or apartment at Rome two words [namely, ξενία and μίσθωμα] of different, less tangible meaning." [20] Evidence from the Vulgate does nothing to clarify the issue. [21] In conclusion, while the term

---

13 According to Liddell-Scott, the verb has the following meanings: let out for hire, farm out; II- Med., fut. have let to one; III- Pass., aor: to be hired for pay.

14 Haenchen (*Acts*, 724 n.2) notes that the term is nowhere found to have this meaning. In Liddell-Scott, Acts 28.30 is the only reference cited for the sense of μίσθωμα as "hired house". According to Cadbury, ("Lodging", 311-322), the term is not defined as such even in old lexica and as yet, no parallel has been found. On the lack of parallel, see also Mealand, "The Close of Acts", 583-584.

15 As explained by Mealand ("The Close of Acts", 584-585), there are some seventy-seven instances of μίσθωμα in forty million words on Compact disc of the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* of 1988, plus at least four other examples known from inscriptions. There are thirty-three from Patristic writings, thirteen from the LXX, four from Philo, one in the New Testament, twenty-six from other Greek writers and four in the inscriptions.

16 As argued by Mealand ("The Close of Acts", 584), the literary examples, by contrast, are either derogatory or refer to payments in respect of public contracts or the contracts themselves.

17 Mealand's study reinforces a meaning long recognized in scholarship. See Moulton and Milligan, *Vocabulary*, 414.

18 Rapske (*Roman Custody*, 239) suggests that ξενία be taken "as an informal or generic term for rental accommodation".

19 See Rapske, *Roman Custody*, 179.

20 Cadbury, "Lodging", 320.

21 In the Vulgate, "ἐν ἰδίῳ μισθώματι" is translated "*in suo conducto*". While *conductum* can mean "lease contract" (see Cic. *Nat.D.* 3.74, Sen. *Ben.* 3.7.1, Quint. *Inst.* 4.2.61, Ulp.

"μίσθωμα" (and its translation) is problematic, textual evidence supports the idea of Paul staying in a hired dwelling.

Paul's accommodation ... in sum ...

The use of "ξενία" and "μίσθωμα" suggest that Paul was in rented accommodation in Rome. [22] As noted in Chapter 2, the rental market consisted of rooms and apartments at the middle and lower range of the market. While it has been suggested that Paul's was an upper storey unit, [23] this is impossible to confirm. Furthermore, arguments in favour of his inhabiting a large premises, based on the fact that many [24] came to visit him, are unsound. [25]

Dig. 4.9.3.1, 39.2.13.6, 47.2.52.8. it also has the sense of "hired residence" (see Cic. *Clu.*175, Sen. *Ben.* 7.5.3, Petron. *Sat.* 9.4.)

22 According to Casson (*Travel,* 204), Paul "hired lodgings" in Rome.

23 According to Bruce (*Book of the Acts*, 509) Paul hired an apartment on the third floor (or higher) of a building.

24 28.23: ..πλείονες...; 28.30: ...πάντας..

25 Rapske (*Roman Custody*, 180), for example, makes this assumption. Apart from the inherent inaccuracies of the numbers game, it is often culturally conditioned. In poor regions of Latin America, for example, large groups meet in what we in the so-called developed world would consider a hovel.

APPENDIX 2 : Acts, Women and the Double Message

Acts provides a double message on the question of women. At one and same time provides the evidence and downplays it. While all believers are united in a fictive kinship group, more attention is paid to male than to female disciples. This is a double message [1] which echoes through the text and leads to diametrically opposing positions among scholars.[2] On the one hand, Christianity is an ἐκκλησία of both men and women (8.3: ἄνδρας καὶ γυναῖκας); Tabitha is a μαθήτρια [3] just as Mnason (21.16) or Ananias (9.10) is a μαθητής." This is typical of Lukan gender pairings .[4] It is also illustrative of the prophecy of Joel (quoted in 2.17-21) which states that the Spirit is to be poured out on "manservants and maidservants"[5] and that both "sons and daughters" will

---

1 Seim (*Double Message,* 259) concludes that the text "transmits a double message. ... [Luke] manages the extraordinary feat of preserving strong traditions about women and attributing a positive function to them, while at the same time harbouring an ironic dimension that reveals the reasons for the masculine preferences in Acts' presentation of the organisation of the Christian group, of the public missionary activity and legal defence before the authorities." According to Lawson ("Gender and Genre", iv), there is a " male-oriented reader perspective" which reinforces the "androcentrism of the narrative", yet the text as a whole is found to be "less hierarchical and less androcentric than its genric counterparts".

2 The double message enables scholars to present very contradictory positions: namely, that Luke is either "a champion of women" or a presenter of "a programmatic androcentrism which consciously is silent about women and makes them invisible." Reference to scholarship defining Luke as "champion of women" is found in C. L. Martin, "The Acts of the Apostles", in Schüssler Fiorenza (ed.), *Searching the Scriptures,* Vol. 2*: A Feminist Commentary*, 769. For more negative assessments, see Schüssler Fiorenza (*Memory*) and E. Tetlow, *Women and Ministry* (New York: Paulist, 1980). As noted by Seim (*Double Message,* 3), the gospel seems to lead the interpretation in a direction friendly to women, while the silence or restriction in Acts seems to lead to the opposite conclusion.

3 Tabitha is the only woman in the New Testament to whom the feminine form "μαθήτρια" is applied. As noted by Richter Reimer (in a discussion of the term in *Women in Acts*, 34-35), "μαθήτρια" is used of Mary Magdalene in the Gospel of Peter 12.50. Outside the biblical text, μαθήτρια and μαθητρίς are seldom found and when they are, it is always (as in the case of Diogenes Laertius 4.2, 8.42) in connection with disciples of philosophical schools. For further examples , see Richter Reimer, *op. cit.,* 63 n.11. See also Haenchen (*Acts*, 338) and Rengstorf ("μαθητής", *TDNT* 4: 460-461).

4 On the danger of interpreting these pairings as very pro-women. see M. R. D'Angelo, "Women in Luke-Acts: A Redactional View", *JBL* 109 (1990), 3:441-461, cited in a discussion of Ross Kraemer (*Blessings,* 129).

5 2.18:... ἐπὶ τοὺς δούλους μου καὶ ἐπὶ τὰς δούλας μου....

prophesy. [6] On the other hand, female disciples are rarely given voice and are subordinated to their male counterparts. It is the males who hold leadership positions [7] in the movement and who are accorded more space in the text. Thus, for example, there are women in the upper room but (in contrast to the men) all but Mary are nameless and all are apparently ineligible to replace Judas. [8] Lydia converts with her household but the household conversions of Cornelius and the jailer are given more attention. Philip's four unmarried daughters are described as prophets [9] (21.9: . θυγατέρες τέσσαρες παρθένοι [10] προφητεύσαι) but the text gives them no voice. While the importance of these women is attested in early church sources, [11] it is the prophecy of (the male) Agabus which is recorded as taking place in their home. [12] Priscilla is mentioned in chapter 18 but she is

---

6 2.17: .. οἱ υἱοὶ ὑμῶν καὶ αἱ θυγατέρες ὑμῶν..

7 See Lawson ("Gender and Genre" , 157-159) on the devaluing of women's roles and (*op. cit.*, 264) on their silence. On the subordination of women to the male leadership in Acts, see Richter Reimer, *Women in Acts*, 200, 220 n. 19, citing Krauss, *Talmudische Archäologie,* 262.

8 Lawson ("Gender and Genre", 158) explains that the women are not considered eligible to replace the missing member of the twelve as a witness of the resurrection, even though "they meet the most important criteria in that they accompanied the twelve from the time of the baptism until the departure of Jesus (Acts 1.21-22) and have already been witness to the resurrection (Acts 1.22)." She notes (*op. cit.,* 159 n 70) that the "question of gender is not raised in the mainstream commentaries" and while Tannehill (*Acts*, 23) draws attention to the gospel account of women accompanying Jesus from Galilee, he fails to take up the issue of their lack of eligibility to replace Judas.

9 Lawson (" Gender and Genre", 24) notes that the daughters are unnamed and remain in the shadow of both their father and the prophet Agabus.

10 As noted by Richter Reimer (*Women in Acts*, 248), "it is difficult to determine whether this simply means 'unmarried' or 'girls of a marriageable age', or whether it refers to a necessary condition for prophetic activity." On these options, see also *op. cit.*, 257 nn. 88, 89, 90.

11 Conzelmann (*Acts* 178 n. 9) cites the reference to them in Eus. *Hist. Eccl.* 3.39.9. Schüssler Fiorenza (*Memory,* 299), writes that their fame was " - according to Eusebius - so great that the provinces of Asia derive their apostolic origin from them. Papias, their contemporary in Hierapolis, claims them as one of the living sources who hold him the wonderful story about the raising to life of the wife of Manaen. He also 'reproduced a story about a woman who falsely accused before the Lord of many sins' but Eusebius does not tell us whether Papias heard this story, too, from the daughters of Philip." See *Hist. Eccl.* 3. 39.7-17. See also P. Corssen, "Die Töchter des Philippus", *ZNW* 2 (1901), 289-299.

12 Haenchen (*Acts*, 601) notes that the daughters are mentioned, but that their prophesying is not.

portrayed more as an adjunct to her husband Aquila [13] than as the important disciple recognized in other Christian writings. Even though potential Christian women are present at gatherings in synagogues or market-places, [14] for example, disciples address the gatherings in exclusively male terms. [15] While the constant use of "ἄνδρες" may be characteristic of speech in the public domain, [16] it is also undeniably man-to-man talk. All these examples guard against any unrealistic notions that Christianity, as a fictive kinship group, is a discipleship of equals in any modern sense.

---

13 Reference to Aquila comes before any mention of Priscilla, described simply as his wife (18.2: .. γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ,). This is in contrast to 18.18, 26 and to New Testament references (2Tim 4.19; Rom 16.3) where her name appears first. While this is said to be an expression of her higher status, it is unclear whether this is within the social hierarchy or the Christian community. See Haenchen (*Acts*, 534) on the awkwardness of the clause. in 18.2. This and other text critical problems relating to the text are discussed in Richter Reimer, *Women in Acts*, 197-199.

14 The presence of women in synagogues is deduced from references to an all-women audience in Philippi (16.13), to women believers in Thessalonica (17.4) and Beroea (17.12) and to female opponents in Antioch (13.50). (Jewish) women are also portrayed as followers of Jesus (1.14), as early converts (5.14) and members of the community in Jerusalem (12.12-17) and as persecuted believers (8.3, 9.2).

15 See "ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί" (2.29; 3.26; 7.2; 13.38; 22.1; 23.1, 6; 28.17), "ἄνδρες Ἰουδαῖοι" (2.14), "ἄνδρες Ἰσραηλῖται" (2.22) "ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι" (17.22), "ἄνδρες Ἐφέσιοι" (19.35) and simply ἄνδρες (2.5; 14.15; 27.21).

16 Seim (*Double Message*, 255) notes that "Acts' emphatic use of masculine forms of address in discourses held by men reflected the situation that the public world was reckoned to be exclusively the world of men. This does not exclude the possibility that women might be present, but they did not count."

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ancient texts and translations

Most texts and translations of Greek and Latin authors are found in the *Loeb Classical Library*. Many Christian texts are also found in the *Ante-Nicene Fathers* or the *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers.* See also the following:

Aland, K., Black, M., Martini, C. M, Metzger, B. and Wikgren, A., eds. *The Greek New Testament*. 3rd edition (corrected). United Bible Societies.

Aland, K., ed. *Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum*. 10th edition. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelstiftung, 1978.

Brunt, P. A. and Moore, J. M., eds. *Res Gestae Divi Augustus: The Achievements of the Divine Augustus*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1967.

Danby, H., ed. *The Mishnah*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1933.

Dean, J. E., ed. *Epiphanius' Treatise on Weights and Measures: The Syriac Version.* Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1935.

Funk, F. X., ed. *Didascalia et Constitutiones Apostolorum 1.* Paderborn, 1905.

Hennecke, E and W. Schneemelcher, W., eds. *New Testament Apocrypha.* Translated by R. McL. Wilson. 2 volumes. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1963-1965.

Wilkinson, J. *Egeria's Travels. Newly translated with Supporting Documents and Notes.* Revised edition. Jerusalem: Ariel / Aris and Phillips, 1981.

Papyrological and inscriptional collections

Arangio-Ruiz, V. and Pugliese Carratelli, G., eds. *Tabulae Herculanenses* in *La Parola del Passato* 1 (1946): 379-385, 3 (1948): 165-184, 8 (1953): 455-463, 9 (1954):54-74, 10 (1955): 448-477, 16 (1961):66-73.

Arangio-Ruiz, V., ed. *Studi epigrafici e papirologici*. Naples, 1974.

BGU *Berliner griechische Urkunden Ägyptische Urkunden aus den Königlichen Museen zu Berlin).* Berlin,, 1985.

CIL *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum.* Berlin, 1863 -.

Hunt, A. S. and Edgar, C. C., eds. *Non-Literary Papyri: Private Affairs*. LCL Cambridge: Harvard University Press / London: Heinemann 1932-1934.

IG *Inscriptiones Graecae.* 14 volumes. Berlin, Prussian Academy, 1873 -

ILS *Inscriptiones Latinae Selectae.* Edited by H. Dessau. 3 volumes. Berlin, Weidmann, 1892-1916. Reprint of 3 volumes in 5, 1954-55.

OGI *Orientis Graeci Incriptiones Selectae*. Edited by W. Dittenberger. Leipzig,

1903-1905.

P. Oxy. Grenfell, B. P. and Hunt, A. S, eds. *Oxyrhynchus Papyri.* 1898-

PSI *Papiri greci e latini.* Pubblicazioni della Società italiana per la ricerca dei papiri greci e latini in Egitto. Firenze, 1912 -.

Schwyzer Schwyzer, E. (ed.). *Dialectorum Graecarum Exempla epigraphica potiora.* Leipzig, 1923.

SIG *Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum.* Edited by W. Dittenberger. 4 volumes. 4th edition. Hildesheim: Olms, 1960.

Supp. Epigr. *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum.* Adjuvantibus P. Roussel, A. Salač, M. N. Tod, E. Ziebarth. Edited by J. J. E. Hondius. Leyden, 1923.

TAM *Tituli Asiae Minoris.* Edited by E. Kalinka. Vienna, 1920.

UPZ *Urkunden der Ptolemäerzeit.* I: *Papyri aus Unterägypten.* Berlin and Leipzig, 1922. II: *Papyri aus Oberägypten.* Berlin and Leipzig, 1935. Edited by U. Wilcken.

Secondary works

Aasgaard, R. "Brotherhood in Plutarch and Paul". In *Constructing Early Christian Families*, 166-182. Edited by H. Moxnes.

Abrahamsen, V. *Women and Worship at Philippi.* Portland: Astarte Shell Press, 1995.

_____. "Women Artisans in the Service of the Church", *Sisters Today* 65/2 (March 1993), 96-103.

Adam, J. P. *Roman Building: Material and Techniques.* Translated by A. Mathews. London: Batsford, 1994.

Allan, G. A. (ed.). *The Sociology of the Family: A Reader.* Malden: Blackwell, 1999.

Allison, P. M. "Roman households: an archaeological perspective". In *Roman Urbanism: Beyond the Consumer City*, 112-146. Edited by H. M. Parkins.

_____. *The Archaeology of Household Activities: Dwelling in the Past.* London; Routledge, 1999.

Alexander, L., ed. *Images of Empire.* Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991.

AlSayyad, N. *Forms of Dominance on the Architecture and Urbanism of the Colonial Enterprise.* Aldershot: Avebury, 1992.

Alston, R. "Houses and households in Roman Egypt". In *Domestic Space in the Roman World,* 25-39. Edited by R. Laurence and A. Wallace-Hadrill.

Althusser, L. *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays.* London: New Left Books, 1971.

Amiry, S. and Tamari, V. *The Palestinian Village Home.* London: British Museum, 1989.

Anderson, J. Capel. "Mapping Feminist Biblical Criticism: The American Scene, 1983-1990", Critical Review of Books in Religion , 1991 Annual. American Academy

of Religion / SBL, 1991.

Anderson, J. K. "Corinth: Temple E Northwest. Preliminary Report 1965", *Hesperia* 36 (1967), 1-12.

Anderson, M. *Approaches to the History of the Western Family, 1500-1914*. London: Macmillan 1980.

Anderson, Ø. "The Widows, the City and Thucydides (11.45.2)", *Symbolae Osloensis* LXII (1987), 33-50.

Archer, L. J. "The Role of Jewish Women in the Religion, Ritual and Cult of Graeco-Roman Palestine". In *Images of Women in Antiquity*, 271-28. (or 273-287). Edited by A. Cameron and A. Kuhrt.

Archer, L. J. *Her Price is Beyond Rubies: The Jewish Woman in Graeco-Roman Palestine*. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990.

Ardener, S., ed. *Women and Space: Ground Rules and Social Maps*. 2nd revised edition. Oxford, Providence: Berg, 1993.

Arias, E. G. *The Meaning and Use of Housing: International Perspectives*. Aldershot: Avebury, 993.

Ashcroft, *B. "The Empire Writes Back": Theory and Practice in Post-Colonial Literatures.* London: Routledge, 1989.

Attridge, D., Bennington, G. and Young, R., eds. *Post-Structuralism and the Question of History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

Aurenhammer, M. "Sculptures of Gods and Heroes from Ephesos". In *Ephesos: Metropolis of Asia*, 251-280. Edited by H. Koester.

Avigad, N. "Excavations in the Jewish Quarter of the Old City of Jerusalem, 1969-70. Preliminary Report", *Israel Exploration Journal* 20 (1970), 1-8.

_____. "Excavations in the Jewish Quarter of the Old City of Jerusalem, 1970. Second Preliminary Report", *Israel Exploration Journal* 20 (1970), 129-140.

_____. *Archaeological Discoveries in the Jewish Quarter of Jerusalem. Second Temple Period. The Israel Museum, Jerusalem. Goldman-Schwarz Hall. Spring 1976. Catalogue Number 144.*

_____. *Discovering Jerusalem*. Nashville: Nelson, 1983.

Avi-Yonah, M, ed. *Encyclopedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land.* 4 volumes. London: Oxford University Press, 1976.

_____ ed. *The World History of the Jewish People.* Volume 7: *The Herodian Period*. London: Allen, 1975.

_____ and Stern E., eds. *Encyclopaedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land.* 4 volumes. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1976-1978.

Bach, A. "Reading Allowed: Feminist Biblical Criticism Approaching the Millennium", *Currents in Research : Biblical Studies* 1 (1993), 191-215.

Bachmann, M. *Jerusalem und der Tempel: Die geographisch-theologischen Element in*

der lukanischen Sicht des jüdischen Kultzentrums. BWANT 9. Stuttgart, Berlin, Cologne, Mainz: Kohlhammer, 1980.

Bacon, P. and Associates in association with F. MacCabe and A. Murphy. *An economic assessment of recent house price developments: report submitted to the Minister for Housing and Urban Renewal.* Dublin: Stationery Office, 1998.

_____. *The housing market; an economic review and assessment: An economic assessment of recent house price developments: report submitted to the Minister for Housing and Urban Renewal.* Dublin: Stationery Office, 1999.

Badian, E., ed. *Roman Papers 1.* Oxford: Clarendon, 1979.

Bailey, D. R. Shackleton. *Two Studies in Roman Nomenclature.* 2nd edition. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991.

Balch, D. L. " 'Let wives be submissive.....' The Origin, Form and Apologetic Function of the Household Duty Code (Haustafel) in 1 Peter". Ph.D. Yale, 1974.

_____ *"Let Wives Be Submissive.".: The Domestic Code in 1 Peter.* SBLMS No. 26. Chico: Scholars Press, 1981.

_____. "Household Codes", *Anchor Bible Dictionary* 3: 318-320.

Balsdon, J. P. V. D. *Roman Women: Their History and Habits.* London: Bodley Head, 1962.

_____. *Roman and Aliens.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1979.

Balz, H. and Schneider, G., eds. *Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament.* 3 volumes. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990-1993.

Banks, R. *Paul's Idea of Community: The Early House Churches in their Historical Setting.* Exeter: The Paternoster Press, 1980.

Banks, R. & J. *The Home Church: Regrouping the People of God for Community and Mission.* Sutherland, Australia: Albatross Books Pty, 1986.

Barak, G. *Gimme Shelter: A Social History of Homelessness in Contemporary America.* New York: Praeger, 1991.

Barclay, J. M. G. *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora from Alexander to Trajan (323BCE-117CE).* Edinburgh: T. and Clark, 1996.

_____. "The Family as the Bearer of Religion in Judaism and Early Christianity". In *Constructing Early Christian Families*, 66-80. Edited by H. Moxnes.

Barker, D. C. "Census Returns and Household Structures". In *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity 1979* (1987), Item 21: 87-93. Edited by G. R. H. Horsley *et al.*

Barley, M. *Houses and History.* London: Faber and Faber, 1986.

Barr, J. *The Semantics of Biblical Language.* London: Oxford University Press, 1961.

Barraclough, G. *Main Trends in History.* London: Holmes and Meier, 1979.

_____, ed. *The Times Concise Atlas of World History.* 5th revised edition. London: Times Books, 1994.

Barrett, C. K. *Luke the Historian in Recent Study.* London: Epworth Press, 1961.

_____. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles.* ICC. 2 volumes. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1994, 1998.

Barrett, M. and McIntosh, M. *The Anti-Social Family.* London: Verso / NBL, 1982.

Barrow, J. "West Indian Families: An Insider's Perspective". In *Families in Britain*, 220-2322. Edited by R. N. Rapoport *et al.*

Barton, S. C. "Paul's Sense of Place: An Anthropological Approach to Community Formation in Corinth", *New Testament Studies* 32 (1986), 225-346.

_____. "The Communal Dimension of Earliest Christianity: A Critical Survey of the Field", *Journal of Biblical Literature n.s.* 43 (1992), 399-427.

_____. *Discipleship and Family Ties in Mark and Matthew.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

_____. "The Relativization of Family Ties in Judaism and Early Christianity". In *Constructing Early Christian Families*, 81-100. Edited by H. Moxnes.

Basler, J. "The Widow's Tale: A Fresh Look at 1 Tim 5.3-16", *Journal of Biblical Literature* 103 (1984), 23-41.

Bauckham, R, ed. *The Book of Acts in its Palestinian Setting.* BAFCS volume 4. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans / Carlisle: The Paternoster Press, 1995.

Bauman, R. A. *Women and Politics in Ancient Rome.* London: Routledge, 1992.

Beard, M. "The Sexual Status of the Vestal Virgins", *Journal of Roman Studies* 70 (1980), 12-27.

Beard, M, North, J. and Price, S. *Religions of Rome.* 2 volumes. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Beck, P. and Kochavi, M. "Aphek", *New Encyclopedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land* 1: 62-72. Edited by E. Stern.

Bek, L. *Towards Paradise on Earth: Modern Space Conception in Architecture: A Creation of Renaissance Humanism.* Analecta romana Instituti danici. Supplement 9. Rome, 1980.

Benjamin, D. N. *The Home: Words, Interpretations, Meanings and Environments.* Aldershot: Avebury, 1995.

Benko, S. and O'Rourke, J. J., eds. *The Roman Empire as the Setting of Primitive Christianity.* London: Oliphants, 1972.

Bennett, T. "Texts in History: The Determinations of Readings and Their Texts". In *Post-Structuralism and the Question of History,* 63-81. Edited by D. Attridge, G. Bennington and R Young.

Bergmann, B. "Painted Perspectives of a Villa Visit: Landscape as Status and Metaphor". In *Roman Art in the Private Sphere*, 49-70. Edited by E. K. Gazda.

Berkner, L. K. "The Stem Family and the Development Cycle of the Peasant Household: An 18th Century Austrian Example", *American Historical Review* 77 / 2 (1972).

Berry, J. "Household artefacts: towards a re-interpretation of Roman domestic space".

In *Domestic Space in the Roman World,* 183-195. Edited by R. Laurence and A. Wallace-Hadrill.

Berry, M. *Marxist Approaches to the Housing Question.* Birmingham: University of Birmingham Press, 1979.

Bertram, G. "ἔθνος: People and Peoples in the LXX", *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* 2: 364-369.

Bettini, M. *Anthropology and Roman Culture: Kinship, Time, Images of the Soul.* Translated by J. van Sickle. Baltimore and London: The John Hopkins University Press, 1988.

Billerbeck, P. and Strack, H. L. *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch.* 6 volumes. 9th edition. Munich: 1986-1989. 2 Bd: Markus, Lukas und Johannes und die Apostelgeschichte.

Binford, L. R. *An Archaeological Perspective.* New York: Seminar Press, 1972.

Black, M. *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels.* 3rd edition. Oxford: Clarendon, 1967.

Black, R. A. "The Conversion Stories of the Acts of the Apostles: A Study of their Forms and Functions". Ph.D. Emory, 1985.

Blackwell, J. and Kennedy, S., eds. *Focus on Homelessness: A New Look at Housing Policy.* Dublin: Columba Press, 1988.

Blackwell, J. *et al. Housing - Moving into Crisis.* Dublin: Combat Poverty Agency, 1990.

Blass, F. and Debrunner, A. *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature.* Translated by R. W. Funk. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961.

Blinzler, J. *Die Brüder und Schwestern Jesu.* SBS 21. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1967.

Blue, B. Bradley. "Acts and the House Church". In *The Book of Acts in Its Graeco-Roman Setting,* 119-222. Edited by D. W. J. Gill and C. Gempf.

Boatwright, M. T. "Plancia Magna of Perge: Women's Roles and Status in Roman Asia Minor". In *Women's History and Ancient History*, 249-272. . Edited by S. Pomeroy.

_____. "Matidia the Younger", *Echos du Monde Classique / Classical Views* 36 (1992), 19-32.

Bokser, B. M. "Unleavened Bread and Passover, Feast of", *Anchor Bible Dictionary* 6: 755-765.

Boulvert, G. *Esclaves et Affranchis Impériaux sous le Haut-Empire Romain.* Naples: Given, 1970.

Bourdieu, P. "The Berber House". In *Rules and Meanings: The Anthropology of Everyday Knowledge,* 98-110. Edited by M. Douglas.

_____. *Outline of a Theory of Practice.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977.

Bourne, L. S. *The Geography of Housing*. London: Edward Arnold, 1981.

Bowersock, G. W. *Augustus and the Greek World*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1965.

Bradley, K. R. *Slaves and Masters in the Roman Empire: A Study in Social Control*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987.

_____. *Slavery and Society at Rome*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

_____. *Discovering the Roman Family: Studies in Roman Social History*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991.

_____. "Remarriage and the Structure of the Upper-Class Roman Family". In *Marriage, Divorce and Children in Ancient Rome*, 79-98. Edited by B. Rawson.

Branigan, K. "Images - or Mirages - of Empire? An Archaeological Approach to the Problem". In *Images of Empire*, 91-106. Edited by L. Alexander.

Brawley, R. *Luke-Acts and the Jews: Conflict, Apology and Conciliation*. SBLMS 33. Atlanta : Scholars Press, 1987.

Bremen, R. van. "Women and Wealth". In *Images of Women in Antiquity,* 223-242. Edited by A. Cameron and A. Kuhrt.

Brooke, R. *The Collected Poems of Rupert Brooke with a Memoir by Edward March*. 3rd edition. Reprinted London: Sidgwich and Jackson, 1979.

Brooten, B. *Women Leaders in the Ancient Synagogue: Inscriptional Evidence and Background Issues*. BJS 36. Chico: Scholars Press, 1982.

Broughton, T. R. S. "The Roman Army". In *The Beginnings of Christianity*. Part 1. *The Acts of the Apostles*. Volume 5: *Additional Notes*, 427-445. Edited by F. J. Foakes Jackson and K. Lake.

Brown, F. E. *Roman Architecture*. London: Studio Vista, 1968.

Brown, R., Donfried, K. P., Fitzmyer, J. A., Reumann, J., eds. *Mary in the New Testament. A Collaborative Assessment by Protestant and Roman Catholic Scholars*. Philadelphia: Fortress / New York: Paulist, 1978.

_____. *The Birth of the Messiah: A Commentary on the Infancy Narratives in Matthew and Luke*. Garden City: Doubleday, 1979.

Bruce, F. F. *The Book of the Acts*. NICNT. Revised edition. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988.

_____. *The Acts of the Apostles: The Greek Text with Introduction and Commentary*. 3rd edition revised and enlarged. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990.

Brunt, P. A. *"Laus Imperii"*. In *Imperialism in the Ancient World,* 319-330. Edited by P. D. A. Garnsey and C. R. Whittaker.

_____. *The Fall of the Roman Republic and* Other Related Essays. Oxford: Clarendon, 1988.

Burman, S., ed. *Fit Work for Women*. London: Croom Helm, 1979.

Burnett, J. *A Social History of Housing, 1817-1970.* London: Methuen, 1986.

Bussmann, C. and Radl, W., eds. *Der treue Gottes trauen: Beiträge zum Werk des Lukas: Für Gerhard Schneider.* Freiburg im B.: Herder, 1991.

Cadbury, H. J. "Lexical Notes on Luke-Acts III - Luke's Interest in Lodging", *Journal of Biblical Literature* 45 (1926), 305-322.

_____. "Note XXX. Names for Christians and Christianity in Acts". In *The Acts of the Apostles: Additional Notes to the Commentary*, 375-392. Edited by K. Lake and H. J. Cadbury.

_____. *The Book of Acts in History.* London: Black, 1955.

_____. *The Making of Luke-Acts.* London: SPCK, 1958. Originally published 1927.

_____. "Four Features of Lukan Style". In *Studies in Luke-Acts*, 87-102. Edited by L. A. Keck and J. L. Martyn.

Cameron, A. and Kuhrt, A., eds. *Images of Women in Antiquity.* Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1983.

Campbell, R. A. *The Elders: Seniority within Earliest Christianity.* Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1994.

Campenhausen, H. von. *Polykarp von Smyrna und die Pastoralbriefe.* Hiedelberg: Carl Winter, Universitätsverlag, 1951.

Carcopino, J. *Daily Life in Ancient Rome: The People and the City at the Height of the Empire.* Translated by E. O. Lorrimer. London: Penguin, 1941. Reprinted 1981.

Carney, T. F. *The Shape of the Past: Models and Antiquity.* Laurence, Kansas: Coronado Press, 1975.

Carson, R. A. G. *Principal Coins of the Romans.* 3 volumes. London: British Museum, 1978-1981.

Carter, W. *Households and Discipleship : A Study of Matthew 19-20.* JSNT Supplement Series 103. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994.

Carson, R. A. G. *Principal Coins of the Romans.* 3 volumes. London: British Museum, 1978-1981.

Case, S. J. "John Mark", *Expository Times* 26 (1914-1915), 372-376.

Cassidy, R. *Jesus, Politics and Society: A Study of Luke's Gospel.* Maryknoll: Orbis, 1978.

Casson, L. *Travel in the Ancient World.* London: Allen and Unwin, 1974.

Certeau, M. de. *The Practice of Everyday Life.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988.

Champlin, E. *Final Judgments: Duty and Emotion in Roman Wills, 200 B.C. - A. D. 250.* 1991.

Chantraine, H. *Freigelassene und Sklaven im Dienst der römischen Kaiser: Studien zu ihrer Nomenklatur.* Wiesbaden: Steiner, 1967.

Chantraine, P. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque : historie des mots.* Paris: Klincksieck, 1974.

Chapman, R. L., ed. *Collins Roget's International Thesaurus*. Glasgow: HarperCollins, 1996.

Chisholm, K. and Ferguson, J., eds. *Rome: The Augustan Age: A Source Book*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1981.

Claassen, C., ed. *Exploring Gender Through Archaeology. Selected Papers from the 1991 Boone Conference*. Madison, Wisconsin: Prehistory Press, 1992.

Clark, C. E. *The American Family Home, 1800-1960*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1986.

Clarke, D. L. *Spatial Archaeology*. London: Academic Press, 1977.

Clarke, J. R. *The Houses of Roman Italy, 100 BC - AD 250: Ritual Space and Decoration*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1991.

_____. "The Décor of the House of Jupiter and Ganymede at Ostia Antica: Private Residence Turned Gay Hotel?" In *Roman Art in the Private Sphere*, 89-104. Edited by E. K. Gazda.

Cohen, S. J. D., ed. *The Jewish Family in Antiquity*. BJS 289. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993.

Collins, A. Yarbro, ed. *Feminist Perspectives on Biblical Scholarship*. Chico: Scholars Press, 1985.

Comblin, J. *Atos dos Apóstolos*. 2 volumes. Comentário Bíblico N.T. Petrópolis, 1987.

Conkey, M. W. and Spector, J. D. "Archaeology and the Study of Gender". In *Advances in Archaeological Method and Theory* 7: 1-38. Edited by M. B. Schiffer.

Conn, H. C. "Lucan Perspective and the City", *Missiology* 13 (1985), 409-428.

Conzelmann, H. *The Theology of St. Luke*. Translated by G. Buswell. London: Faber and Faber, 1960.

_____. *Acts of the Apostles. A Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles*. HNT. Translated by J. Limburg, A. Thomas Kraabel and D. H. Juel. Edited by E. J. Epp with C. R. Matthews. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987.

Cooper, D. *The Death of the Family*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1971.

Corbier, M. "Divorce and Adoption as Roman Familial Strategies (Le Divorce et l'adoption 'en plus')". In *Marriage, Divorce, Children in Ancient Rome*, 47-78. Edited by B. Rawson.

Corbo, V. C. *Cafarneo 1: Gli Edifici della Città*. Jerusalem: Franciscan Printing Press, 1965.

Corley, K. E. *Private Women, Public Meals: Social Conflict in the Synoptic Tradition*. Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson, 1993.

_____. "1 Peter". In *Searching the Scriptures*. Volume 2: *A Feminist Commentary*, 349-360. Edited by E. Schüssler Fiorenza.

Corssen, P. "Die Töchter des Philippus", *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 2 (1901), 289-299.

Coser, L. *The Functions of Social Conflict*. New York: Free Press, 1956.

Crook, J. A. *Law and Life in Rome*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1967.

_____. "Women in Roman Succession". In *The Family in Ancient Rome*, 58-82. Edited by B. Rawson.

Crosby, M. H. *House of Disciples: Church, Economics and Justice in Matthew*. Maryknoll, New York: Orbis, 1988.

Crossan, J. D. *The Birth of Christianity: Discovering What Happened In The Years Immediately After The Execution*. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1999.

Crouch, J. E. *The Origin and Intention of the Colossian Haustafel*. FRLANT 109. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1972.

Csillag, P. *The Augustan Law on Family Relations*. Budapest: Akamémiai Kiadó, 1976.

D'Angelo, M. R. "Women in Luke-Acts: A Redactional View", *JBL* 109 (1990), 3:441-461.

_____. "Colossians". In *Searching the Scriptures*. Volume 2: *A Feminist Commentary,* 313-324. Edited by E. Schüssler Fiorenza.

Dahl, N. "A People for His Name", *New Testament Studies* 4 (1958), 319-327.

Danker, F. W. *Benefactor: Epigraphic Study of a Graeco-Roman and New Testament Field*. St. Louis: Clayton Publishing House, 1982.

Dassmann, E. and Frank, K. S., eds. *Pietas: Festchrift für Bernhard Kötting*. Munich: Aschendorff, 1980.

Davies, W. D., Finkelstein, L. and Sturdy, J., eds. *The Cambridge History of Judaism*. Volume 2: *The Hellenistic Age*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

Dawsey, J. M. "The Literary Unity of Luke-Acts: Questions of Style - A Task for Literary Critics", *New Testament Studies* 35 (1989), 48-66.

Deissmann, G. E. *Light from the Ancient Near East. The New Testament Illustrated by Recently Discovered Texts of the Graeco-Roman World*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1990.

De Vos, C. S. "The Significance of the Change from ΟΙΚΟΣ to ΟΙΚΙΑ in Luke's account of the Philippian Gaoler (Acts 16.30-34)", *New Testament Studies* 41 (1995), 292-296.

De Waele, F. J. "The Roman Market North of the Temple at Corinth", *American Journal of Archaeology* 34 (1930), 432-454.

Dewey, J. "Feminist Readings, Gospel Narrative and Critical Theory", *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 23/4 (1992), 167-173.

Dibelius, M. *An die Kolosser, an die Epheser, an Philemon*. Tübingen: Mohr, 1913. 3rd edition, 1953.

_____. *Studies in the Acts of the Apostles*. Translated by M. Ling. London: SCM, 1956.

Dilke, O. A. W. *Greek and Roman Maps*. London: Thames and Hudson, 1985.

Dixon, S. *The Roman Mother*. London: Croom Helm, 1988 / Routledge, 1990.

_____. *The Roman Family*. Baltimore and London: The John Hopkins University Press, 1992.

Donley-Reid, L. W. "A Structuring Structure: The Swahili House". In *Domestic Architecture and the Use of Space*, 114-126. Edited by S. Kent.

Donzelot, J. *Policing the Family*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1969.

Douglas, M., ed. *Rules and Meanings: The Anthropology of Everyday Knowledge*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1973.

Drerup, H. "Bildraum und Realrum in der römischen Architektur", *Römische Mitteilungen* 66 (1959), 145-174.

Driver, G. "West-Indian Families: An Anthropological Perspective". In *Families in Britain*, 205-219. Edited by R. N. Rapoport *et al.*

Drury, J. *Tradition and Design in Luke's Gospel: A Study in Early Christian Historiography*. London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1976.

Dupont, J. *The Sources of Acts: The Present Position*. London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1964.

Dwyer, E. "The Pompeian Atrium House in Theory and in Practice". In *Roman Art in the Private Sphere,* 25-48. Edited by E. K. Gazda.

Dyson, S. L. "From New to New Age Archaeology: Archaeological Theory and Classical Archaeology - a 1990s Perspective", *American Journal of Archaeology* 97 (1993), 195-206.

Edwards, D. R. "Surviving the Web of Roman Power: Religion and Politics in the Acts of the Apostles, Josephus and Chariton's *Chaereas and Callirhoe*". In *Images of Empire*, 178-201. Edited by L. Alexander.

_____ and McCollough, eds. *Archaeology and the World of Galilee: Texts and Contexts in the Roman and Byzantine Periods*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997.

Ehrhard, A. *Urkirche und Frühkatholizismus*. Bonn: Buchgemeinde, 1935.

Eliot, T. S. *The Four Quartets*. London: Faber and Faber, 1944.

Elliger, W. *Paulus in Griechenland, Philippi, Thessaloniki, Athen, Korinth*. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1978.

Elliott, J. H. *A Home for the Homeless: A Sociological Exegesis of 1 Peter, Its Situation and Strategy*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1981. Revised edition, 1990.

_____. Review of *The First Urban Christians: The Social World of the Apostle Paul* by W. A. Meeks, *Religious Studies Review* 11/4 (1985), 329-335.

_____. "Social Scientific Criticism of the New Testament: More on Methods and Models", *Semeia* 35 (1986): *Social Scientific Criticism of the New Testament and Its Social World,* 1-26.

_____ . "1 Peter, Its Situation and Strategy: A Discussion with David Balch". In *Perspectives on 1 Peter*, 61-78. Edited by C. H. Talbert. Macon, Georgia:

Mercer University Press, 1986.

_____ "Temple versus Household in Luke-Acts". In *The Social World of Luke-Acts,* 211-240. Edited by J. Neyrey.

_____. *What is Social-Scientific Criticism?* Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993.

Ellis, E. E. " 'Das Ende der Erde' (Apg 1.8), " *Bulletin for Bible Research* 1 (1991), 123-132.

Ellis, S. "The End of the Roman House", *American Journal of Archaeology* 92/4 (1988), 564-576.

Elshtain, J. Bethke. *Public Man, Private Woman: Woman in Social and Political Thought.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1981.

Engels, F. *The Origins of the Family, Private Property and the State.* London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1884.

Engelstad, E. "Images of power and contradiction: feminist theory and post-processual archaeology", *Antiquity* 65 (1991), 502-514.

Ermisch, J. *Housing and the National Economy.* Aldershot: Gower, 1990.

Esler, P. F. *Community and Gospel in Luke-Acts: The Social and Political Motivations of Lucan Theology.* SNTSMS 57. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978.

_____. *The First Christians in Their Social Worlds: Social-Scientific Approaches to New Testament Interpretation.* London: Routledge, 1994.

_____ , ed. *Modelling Early Christianity: Social Scientific Studies of the New Testament in its Context.* London: Routledge, 1995.

Evans, M. and Ungerson, C., eds. *Sexual Division : Pattern and Processes.* London: Tavistock, 1983.

Eyben, E. "Sozialgeschichte des Kindes im römischen Altertum". In *Zur Sozialgeschichte der Kindheit* . Edited by J. Marhn and A. Nitschke. Münich : Verlag Karl Alber, 1986.

Fatum, L. "Brotherhood in Christ: A Gender Hermeneutical Reading of 1 Thessalonians". In *Constructing Early Christian Families*, 183-197. Edited by H. Moxnes.

Feeney, D. *Literature and Religion at Rome: Cultures, Contexts and Beliefs.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Feldman, L. H. " 'Proselytes and Sympathisers' in the Light of the New Inscriptions from Aphrodisias", *Revue des études juives* 148 (1989), 265-305.

Ferguson, E. "When You Come Together: *Epi to Auto* in Early Christian Literature", *Restoration Quarterly* 16 (1973), 202-208.

Fiensy, D. *The Social History of Palestine: The Land is Mine.* Lewiston / Queenston / Lampeter: Edwin Mellen Press, 1991.

Filson, F. V. "The Significance of the Early House Churches", *Journal of Biblical Literature* 58 (1939), 109-112.

Finley, M. I. *The Ancient Economy*. London: Chatto and Windus, 1973.

_____, ed. *Studies in Roman Property by the Cambridge Research Seminar in Ancient History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976.

_____. *The World of Odysseus*. 2nd edition. London: Chatto and Windus, 1977.

_____. *Ancient Slavery and Modern Ideology*. London: Chatto and Windus, 1983.

Fish, S. *Is There A Text in This Class? The Authority of Interpretive Communities*. Cambridge, Massachusetts and London: Harvard University Press, 1980.

Fitzgerald, J. T. "*Haustafeln*", *Anchor Bible Dictionary* 3: 80-81.

Fitzmyer, J. A. *The Gospel According to Luke I-IX. The Gospel According to Luke X-XXIV*. AB volume 28. New York: Doubleday, 1981, 1985.

_____. *Luke the Theologian: Aspects of His Teaching*. New York: Paulist, 1989.

_____. " 'A Certain Sceva: A Jew, A Chief Priest' (Acts 19.14)". In *Der treue Gottes trauen: Beiträge zum Werk des Lukas: Für Gerhard Schneider*, 299-305. Edited by C. Bussmann and W. Radl.

_____. *The Acts of the Apostles: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB Vol 31. New York: Doubleday, 1998.

Flandrin, J. L. *Families in Former Times*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979.

Flory, M. B. "Where women precede men: factors influencing the order of names in Roman epitaphs", *Classical Journal* 79 (1983), 216-224.

Foakes-Jackson, F. J. and Lake, K., eds. *The Beginnings of Christianity*. Part 1. *The Acts of the Apostles*. 5 volumes. London: Macmillan and Co., 1920-1933. Reprinted by Grand Rapids: Baker, 1979.

Foerster, W. "κύριος", *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* 3: 1039- 1058, 1081-1098.

Forrest, F. and Murie, A. *Housing and Family Wealth*. London: Routledge, 1995.

Foss, P. W. "Kitchens, Dining Rooms at Pompeii: The Spatial and Social Relationship of Cooking to Eating in the Roman Household". Ph. D., Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1994.

_____. M. *Power / Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972-1977*. Edited and translated by C. Gordon. Brighton: Harvester, 1980.

Fox-Genovese, E. *Within the Plantation Household: Black and White Women of the Old South*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1988.

Franklin, J. *The Gentleman's Country House and Its Plan, 1835-1914*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1981.

Fraser, V. *The Architecture of Conquest: Building in the Vice-Royalty of Peru, 1535-1635*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

Freyne, S. *Galilee from Alexander the Great to Hadrian, 323 B.C.E. to 135 C.E. A Study of Second Temple Judaism*. Delaware: Glazier, 1980.

_____. *The World of the New Testament*. Delaware: Glazier, 1980 / Dublin:Veritas,

1980.

_____. "Vilifying the Other and Defining the Self". In *"To See Ourselves As Others See Us" : Jews, Christians and Others in Antiquity*, 117-144. Edited by J. Neusner and E. Frerichs.

Frier, B. W. "The Rental Market in Early Imperial Rome", *Journal of Roman Studies* 67 (1977), 76-95.

_____. *Landlords and Tenants in Ancient Rome.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1980.

Friesen, S. *Twice Neokoros: Ephesus, Asia and the Cult of the Flavian Imperial Family.* Leiden: Brill, 1993.

_____. "The Cult of the Roman Emperors in Ephesos: Temple Wardens, City Titles and the Interpretation of the Revelation of John". In *Ephesos: Metropolis of Asia*, 229-250. Edited by H. Koester.

Funk, R. W. "The Watershed of the American Biblical Tradition: The Chicago School, First Phase, 1892-1920", *Journal of Biblical Literature* 95 (1976), 4-22.

Fustel de Coulanges, N. D. *The Ancient City: A Study of the Religion, Laws and Institutions of Greece and Rome.* Translated by W. Small. London: Simpkin, Marshall, Hamilton, Kent and Co. Ltd, 1916.

Gager, J. G. "Religion and Social Class in the Early Roman Empire". In *The Roman Empire as the Setting of Primitive Christianity*, 99-120.

_____. "Shall We Marry Our Enemies?: Sociology and the New Testament", *Interpretation* 37/3 (1982), 256-265.

Gardner, J. F. *Women in Roman Law and Society.* London: Croom Helm, 1986.

_____ and Wiedemann, T., eds. *The Roman Household: A Sourcebook.* London: Routledge, 1991.

Garnsey, P. D. A. "Urban Property Investment". In *Studies in Roman Property by the Cambridge Research Seminar in Ancient History*, 126-136. Edited by M. I. Finley.

_____ and Whittaker, C R., eds. *Imperialism in the Ancient World.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978.

Gaston, L. "Anti-Judaism and the Passion Narrative". In *Anti-Judaism in Early Christianity*, 127-153. Edited by P. Richardson.

Gaudemet, J. "Testamenta ingrata et pietas Augusti", *Studi Arangio-Ruiz* 13 (Naples, 1953), 115 ff.

Gauldie, E. *Cruel Habitations: A History of Working Class Housing, 1700-1918.* London: Unwin University Books, 1974.

Gaventa, B. R. *From Darkness to Light: Aspects of Conversion in the New Testament.* Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986.

Gazda, E. K., ed. *Roman Art in the Private Sphere: New Perspectives on the Architecture and Décor of the Domus, Villa and Insula.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan

Press, 1991.

George, M. "*Servus* and *domus*: the slave in the Roman house". In *Domestic Space in the Roman World*, 15-24. Edited by R. Laurence and A. Wallace-Hadrill.

Georgi, D. "The Early Church: Internal Jewish Migration or New Religion?", *Harvard Theological Review* 88/1 (1995), 35-68.

Gero, J. M. and Conkey, M. W., eds. *Engendering Archaeology: Women and Prehistory.* London: Blackwell, 1991.

Giddens, A. *A Contemporary Critique of Historical Materialism.* Volume 1: *Power, Property, State.* London and Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1981.

Gilchrist, R. "Women's Archaeology?: Political Feminism, Gender Theory and Historical Revision", *Antiquity* 65 (1991), 495-501.

Gill, D. W. and Gempf, C., eds. *The Book of Acts in its Graeco-Roman Setting.* BAFCS Volume 2. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans / Carlisle: The Paternoster Press, 1994.

Girard, R. *Violence and the Sacred.* Translated by P. Gregory. Baltimore and London: The John Hopkins University Press, 1977.

Girouard, M. *The Victorian Country House.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1979.

Gittins, D. *The Family in Question: Changing Households and Familiar Ideologies.* London: Macmillan, 1985.

Gold, B. K., ed. *Literary and Artistic Patronage in Ancient Rome.* Austin: University of Texas Press, 1982.

Golden, S. *The Women Outside: Meanings and Myths of Homelessness.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992.

Goodman, M. *The Ruling Class of Judaea: The Origins of the Jewish Revolt against Rome, A.D. 66-70.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

_____. *Mission and Conversion: Proselytizing in the Religious History of the Roman Empire.* Oxford: Clarendon, 1994.

_____. *The Roman World, 44 B.C. - A.D. 180.* London: Routledge, 1997.

Goodspeed, E. J. "Gaius Titius Justus", *Journal of Biblical Literature* 69 (1950), 382-383.

Goody, J., ed. *The Developmental Cycle in Domestic Groups.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971.

Gottwald, N. K. *The Tribes of Yahweh. A Sociology of the Religion of Liberated Israel, 1250-1050 B.C.E.* Maryknoll: Orbis, 1979. Republished with new preface. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.

Gough, K. "The Nayars and the definition of marriage", *Journal of the Royal Archaeological Institute* 89 (1959), 23-34.

Grabbe, L. *Judaism from Cyrus to Hadrian.* Volume 1: *The Persian and Greek Periods.* Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992.

Grahame, M. "Public and private in the Roman house: investigating the social order of the

Casa del Fauno". In *Domestic Space in the Roman World,* 137-164. Edited by R. Laurence and A. Wallace-Hadrill.

Grant, F. C., ed. *Early Christianity: The Purpose of Acts and Other Papers.* Greenwich: Seabury, 1954.

Grant, M. *Herod the Great.* London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1971.

_____. *The Twelve Caesars.* London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1975.

Gray, J. "Roman Houses in which Paul Preached the Kingdom of God", *Union Seminary Quarterly Review* (1903-1904), 310-319.

Green, W. S., ed. *Approaches to Ancient Judaism.* Volume 5: *Studies in Judaism and Its Greco-Roman Context.* Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985.

Griffin, M. "Urbs Roma, Plebs and Princeps". In *Images of Empire*, 19-46. Edited by L. Alexander.

Guijarro Oporto, S. "The Family in First Century Galilee". In *Constructing Early Christian Families*, 42-65. Edited by H. Moxnes.

_____. *Fidelidades en Conflicto: La Ruptura con la Familia por causa del Discipulado y de la Misión en la Tradición Sinóptica.* Salamanca: Publicaciones Universidad Pontificia, 1998.

Gutman, R. "The Social Function of the Built Environment". In *The Mutual Interaction of People and their Built Environment : A Cross-Cultural Perspective*, 7-35. The Hague: Mouton, 1976.

Habicht, C. *Le culte des souverains dans l'empire Romain.* Geneva: Fondation Hardt, 1973.

Haenchen, E. *The Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary.* Translated by B. Noble and G. Shinn under the supervision of H. Anderson and with the translation revised by R. Mc L. Wilson. Oxford: Blackwell, 1971.

Hall, C. "The early formation of Victorian domestic ideology". In *Fit Work for Women*, 15-32. Edited by S. Burman. London: Croom Helm, 1979.

Hallett, J. P. *Fathers and Daughters in Roman Society: Women and the Elite Family.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984.

Hanson, K. C. "BTB Reader's Guide: Kinship", *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 24/4 (1994) , 183-194.

Hareven, T. *Family Time and Industrial Time.* New York: Cambridge University Press, 1982.

Harmon, D. P. "The Family Festivals of Rome", *Aufstieg und Niedergand der römischen Welt* II.16.2, 1592-1603.

Harnack, A. von. *Die Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentums in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten.* 2nd revised edition. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1906. Translated by J. Moffatt as *The Mission and Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries.* 2 volumes. London: William and Norgate, 1908. Volume 1 reprinted, New York:

Harper and Row, 1962.

Harriet, F,. Resnick, S. A. and Wolff, R. D. *Bringing It All Back Home: Class, Gender, Power in the Modern Household.* London: Pluto, 1994.

Harris, O. "Households as natural units". In *Of Marriage and the Market*, 49-68. Edited by K. Young, C. Wolkowitz and R. McCullagh.

Harris , W. V. ed.. *The Inscribed Economy: Production and distribution in the Roman Empire in the light of the instrumentum domesticum.* Journal of Roman Archaeology Supplement Series 6 (1993).

Hatch, E. *The Organization of the Early Christian Churches.* Oxford, Cambridge: Rivingtons, 1880.

Hatto, W. "*Ianitor*," *Der Kleine Pauly*: *Lexikon der Antike* 2: 1310.

Haydn, D. *The Grand Domestic Revolution.* Cambridge: MIT Press, 1980.

Hegermann, H. "The Diaspora in the Hellenistic Age". In *The Cambridge History of Judaism.* Volume 2: *The Hellenistic Age*, 115-166. Edited by W. D. Davies *et al.*

Hemer, C. J. "Alexandria Troas," *Tyndale Bulletin* 26 (1975), 79-112.

_____. *The Book of Acts in the Setting of Hellenistic History.* Edited by C. H. Gempf. Tübingen: Mohr, 1989. Reprinted Winona Lake, Indiana; Eisenbrauns, 1990.

Hengel, M. *Acts and the History of Earliest Christianity.* Translated by J. Bowden. London: SCM, 1980.

_____. "Proseuche und Synagoge: Jüdische Gemeinde, Gotteshaus und Gottesdienst in der Diaspora und in Palästina". In *Tradition und Glaube: Das Frühe Christentum in seiner Unwelt: Festgabe für Georg Karl zum 65*, 157-184. Edited by G. Jeremias, H. W. Kuhn and H. Stegemann.

_____. "The Geography of Palestine in Acts. " In *The Book of Acts in its Palestinian Setting*, 27-78. Edited by R. Bauckham.

Herdlitczka, A. "*Medianum*", *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie* Supplement 6.386

Hermansen, G. "The *Medianum* and the Roman Apartment", *Phoenix* 24 (1970), 342-347.

_____. "*Domus* and *Insula* in the City of Rome", *Classica et Mediaevalia: Dissertationes* (1973), 333-341.

_____. *Ostia: Aspects of Roman City Life.* Edmonton: University of Alberta Press, 1982.

Hezser, C. "Privat und öffentlich im Talmud Yerushalmi und in der griechisch-römischen Antike". In *The Talmud Yerushalmi and Graeco-Roman Culture* 1: 423-579. Edited by P. Schäfer.

Heyob, S. Kelly. *The Cult of Isis Among Women in the Graeco-Roman World.* Leiden: Brill, 1973.

Hillier, B. and Hanson, J. *The Social Logic of Space.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984.

Hirschfeld, Y. *The Palestinian Dwelling in the Roman-Byzantine Period.* Studium Biblicum Franciscanum, Collectio Minor 34. Jerusalem: Franciscan Printing Press / *IEJ,* 1995.

Hock, R. F. *The Social Context of Paul's Ministry: Tent-Making and Apostleship.* Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980.

Hodder, I. *The Spatial Organization of Culture.* London: Duckworth, 1978.

_____. "Postprocessual Archaeology". In *Advances in Archaeological Method and Theory* 8: 1-26. Edited by M. B. Schiffer.

_____. *Reading the Past: Current Approaches to Interpretation in Archaeology.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.

_____. "Post-modernism, post-structuralism and post-processual archaeology". In *The Meaning of Things: Material Culture and Symbolic Expression*, 64-78. Edited by I. Hodder. London: Unwin Hyman, 1989.

Hohlfelder, R. L. "Caesarea", *Anchor Bible Dictionary* 1: 798-803.

Holmberg, B. *Paul and Power: The Structure of Authority in the Primitive Church.* Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980.

_____. *Sociology and the New Testament: An Appraisal.* Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990.

Holmes, B. T. "Luke's Description of John Mark", *Journal of Biblical Literature* 54 (1935), 63-72.

Hope, V. "A roof over the dead: communal tombs and family structure". In *Domestic Space in the Roman World,* 69-88. Edited by R. Laurence and A. Wallace-Hadrill.

Horbury, W. "The Benediction of the *Minim* and Early Jewish-Christian Controversy", *Journal of Theological Studies* 33 (1982), 19-61.

House, A. C. "Defilement by Association: Some Insights from the Usage of **ΚΟΙΝΟΣ/ ΚΟΙΝΟΩ** in Acts 10 and 11", *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 21 (1983), 143-153.

Humbert, M. *Le remariage à Rome: étude d'histoire juridique et sociale.* Milan: Giuffrè, 1972.

Humphreys, S. C. *The Family, Women and Death: Comparative Studies.* 2nd edition. Michigan: University of Michigan Press, 1993.

Ilan, T. "The Attraction of Aristocratic Women to Pharisaism During the Second Temple Period", *Harvard Theological Review* 88 /1 (1995), 1-33.

_____. *Jewish Women in Greco-Roman Palestine: An Inquiry into Image and Status.* Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1995.

Isaac, B. and Oppenheimer, A. "The Revolt of Bar Kochba : Ideology and Modern Scholarship", *Journal of Jewish Studies* 36 (1985), 33-60.

Iser, W. *The Act of Reading : A Theory of Aesthetic Response.* London and Henley: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1978.

Isikowitz, K. G. and Sorensen, P. eds. *The House in East and Southeast Asia.* London:

Curzon Press, 1982.

Jackson, S. and Moores, S., eds. *The Politics of Domestic Consumption.* London: Prentice Hall, 1995.

Jaeckle, R. "Das Prätorium des Pilatus in Jerusalem", *Jahrbuch des Deutschen Evangelischen Instituts für Altertumswissenschaft des Heiligen Landes* 2 (1990), 59-72.

Jameson, F. *Postmodernism: The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism.* London: Verso, 1991.

Jameson, M. "Domestic space in the Greek city-state". In *Domestic Architecture and the Use of Space*, 92-113. Edited by S. Kent.

Jashemski, W. F. *The Gardens of Pompeii.* 2 volumes. New Rochelle: Aristide D. Caratzas, 1979 and 1993.

Jeanrond, W. G. *Text and Interpretation as Categories of Theological Thinking.* Translated by T. J. Wilson. Dublin: Gill and Macmillan, 1988.

_____. *Theological Hermeneutics: Development and Significance.* Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1991.

Jeremias, G., Kuhn, H. W. and Stegemann, H. eds. *Tradition und Glaube: Das Frühe Christentum in seiner Unwelt: Festgabe für Georg Karl zum 65*, 157-184. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1971.

Jeremias, J. *The Origins of Infant Baptism: A Further Study in Reply to Kurt Aland.* Translated by D. M. Barton. London: SCM, 1963.

_____. *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus.* Translated by N. Perrin. London : SCM, 1966.

Jervell, J. *The Unknown Paul: Essays in Luke-Acts and Early Christian History.* Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1984.

Jewett, R. "Tenement Churches and Communal Meals in the Early Church: The Implications of a Form-Critical Analysis of 2 Thessalonians 3.10", *Biblical Research* 38 (1993), 23-42.

Johnson, S. E. *Paul the Apostle and His Cities.* GNS 21. Delaware: Glazier, 1987.

Jones, A. H. M. *The Herods of Judaea.* Oxford: Clarendon, 1938.

_____. *The Cities of the Eastern Roman Empire.* 2nd edition. Oxford: Clarendon, 1971.

_____. and edited P. A. Brunt. *The Roman Economy: Studies in Ancient Economic and Administrative History.* Oxford: Blackwell, 1974.

Jorgensen, N. *Investigating Families and Households.* London: Collins Educational, 1995.

Joubert, S. J. "Managing the Household: Paul as *paterfamilias* of the Christian household group in Corinth". In *Modelling Early Christianity*, 213-223. Edited by P. F. Esler.

Judge, E. A. *The Social Pattern of the Christian Groups in the First Century.* London: Tyndale, 1960.

_____. "The Early Christians as a Scholastic Community", *Journal of Religious History* 1 (1960), 4-15, 125-127.

_____. "The Social Identity of the First Christians: A Question of Method in Religious History", *Journal of Religious History* 11 (1980), 201-217.

Just, A. A., Junior. *The Ongoing Feast: Table Fellowship and Eschatology at Emmaus.* Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1993.

Kajarito, I. "Women's Praenomina Reconsidered", *Arctos* n.s. 7 (1972), 13-30.

Kampen, N. *Image and Status: Roman Working Women in Ostia.* Berlin: Mann, 1981.

Karris, R. *Luke: Artist and Theologian: Luke's Passion Account as Literature.* New York: Paulist, 1985.

Kearsley, R. A. "Asiarchs, *Archiereis* and the *Archiererai* of Asia", *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 27 (1986), 183-192.

Keathley, N., ed. *"With Steadfast Purpose": Essays on Acts in Honor of Henry J. Flanders.* Waco: Baylor University Press, 1990.

Keck, L. A. and Martyn, J. L., eds. *Studies in Luke-Acts.* London: SPCK, 1966. Reprinted Philadelphia: Scholars Press, 1980.

Keith, M. & Pile, S., eds. *Place and the Politics of Identity.* London: Routledge, 1993.

Kee, H. C. *Christian Origins in Sociological Perspective: Methods and Resources.* Philadelphia: Westminster, 1980.

Kelly-Gadol, J. "The Social Relations of the Sexes: Methodological Implications of Women's History", *Signs* 1 (1976),

Kennett, P. and Marsh, A., eds. *Homelessness: Exploring the New Terrain.* Bristol: Policy, 1999.

Kent, J. H. *Corinth VIII / 3. The Inscriptions 1926-1950.* Princeton: American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 1966.

Kent, J. P. C. *Roman Coins.* London: Thames and Hudson, 1978.

Kent, S., ed. *Domestic Architecture and the Use of Space: An Interdisciplinary Cross-Cultural Study.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

Killibrew, A. and Fine, S. "Qatzrin: Reconstructing Village Life in Talmudic Times", *Biblical Archaeology Review* 17 (1991), 44-56.

Kittel, G. and Friedrich, G. *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament.* 10 volumes. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964-1967.

Klauch, H. J. *Hausgemeinde und Hauskirche im frühen Christentum.* SBS 103. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1981.

_____. "Die Hausgemeinde als Lebensform im Urchristentum", *Münchener Theologischen Zeitschrift* 32 (1981), 1-15.

_____. *The Religious Context of Early Christianity: A Guide to Graeco-Roman*

Religion. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 2000.

Kleberg, K. *Hôtels, restaurants et cabarets dans l'antiquité romaine*. Uppsala: Almqvist and Wiksells, 1957.

Knibbe, D. "*Via Sacra Ephesiaca*; New Aspects of the Cult of Artemis Ephesia". In *Ephesos: Metropolis of Asia*, 141-156. Edited by H. Koester.

Koester, H. ed. *Ephesos: Metropolis of Asia. An Interdisciplinary Approach to its Archaeology, Religion and Culture*. Harvard Theological Studies 41. Valley Forge, Pennsylvania: Trinity Press International, 1995.

_____. "Ephesos in Early Christian Literature". In *Ephesos: Metropolis of Asia*, 119-140. Edited by H. Koester.

Kraemer, R. Shepard. *Maenads, Martyrs, Matrons, Monastics: A Sourcebook on Women's Religions in the Greco-Roman World.* Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988.

_____. *Her Share of the Blessings: Women's Religions among Pagans, Jews and Christians in the Greco-Roman World.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992.

Krauss, S. *Talmudische Archäologie*. 3 volumes. Leipzig, 1910-1912. Reprinted Hildesheim: Olms, 1966.

Krautheimer, R. *et.al. Corpus Basilicarum Christianarum Romae*. 5 volumes. Vatican City: Pontifical Institute of Archaeology, 1937-1977.

_____. *Early Christian and Byzantine Architecture*. 3rd edition. New York: Penguin Books, 1979.

Krodel, G. A. *Acts.* Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1986.

Kurz, W. S. *Reading Luke-Acts: Dynamics of Biblical Narrative*. Louisville: Westminster Press / John Knox, 1993.

Lacey, W. K. "*Patria Potestas*". In *The Family in Ancient Rome*, 121-144. Edited by B. Rawson.

Laclau, E. *New Reflections on the Revolution of our Time*. London: Verso, 1990.

Laing, R. D. *Politics and the Family*. London: Macmillan, 1971.

Lake, K. and Cadbury, H. J. *Acts of the Apostles: English Translation and Commentary*. Volume 4 of *The Beginnings of Christianity*. Edited by F. J. Foakes-Jackson and K. Lake.

_____, eds. *Acts of the Apostles: Additional Notes*. to the Commentary. Volume 5 of *The Beginnings of Christianity*. Edited by F. J. Foakes -Jackson and K. Lake.

Lampe, P. *Die stadtrömischen Christen in den ersten beiden Jahrhunderten*. 2nd edition. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1989.

Lange, N. R. M., de. "Jewish Attitudes to the Roman Empire". In *Imperialism in the Ancient World*, 255-281. Edited by P. D. A. Garnsey and C. R. Whittaker.

Laslett, P. and Wall, R., eds. *Household and Family in Past Time*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972.

Laub, F. *Die Begegnung des frühen Christentums mit der antiken Sklaverei*. SBS 107.

Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1980.

Laurence, R. *Roman Pompeii: Space and Society*. London: Routledge, 1994.

Laurence, R. and Wallace-Hadrill, A. eds. *Domestic Space in the Roman World: Pompeii and Herculaneum*. Journal of Roman Archaeology Supplement Series 22 (1997).

Lawrence, A. W. *Greek Architecture*. 3rd edition. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1973.

Lawrence, R. J. "Domestic space and society: A cross-cultural study", *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 24 (1982), 104-130.

_____. "Transition Spaces and Dwelling Design", *Journal of Architectural and Planning Research* 1 (1984), 261-271.

Lawson, V. "Gender and Genre: The Construction of Female Gender in the Acts of the Apostles". Ph.D., Trinity College, Dublin, 1997.

Lee, C. L. "Social Unrest and Primitive Christianity". In *The Roman Empire as the Setting of Primitive Christianity*, 121-138. Edited by S. Benko and J. J. O'Rourke.

Lee, R. *Communes as Alternative Families*. M. Phil., North-East London Polytechnic, 1979.

Lefebvre, H. *The Production of Space*. 2nd edition. Oxford: Blackwell, 1991.

Lefkowitz, M. R. and Fant, M. B. *Women's Life in Greece and Rome: A Sourcebook in Translation*. London: Duckworth, 1982.

Leone, M. P. "The Productive Nature of Material Culture and Archaeology", *Historical Archaeology* 26 (1992), 130-133.

_____ and Little, B. J. "Artifacts as Expressions of Society and Culture: Subversive Genealogy and the Value of History". In *History from Things: Essays in Material Culture*, 160-181. Edited by S. Luber and W. D. Kingery.

Lenski, G. and J. *Human Societies: An Introduction to Macrosociology*. 5th edition. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1987.

Lerner, G. *The Creation of Patriarchy*. New York and London: Oxford University Press, 1986.

Lévi-Strauss, C. *Structural Anthropology*. New York: Basic Books, 1963.

Levine, A. J., ed. *"Women Like This": New Perspectives on Jewish Women on the Greco-Roman World*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991.

Levinskaya, I. *The Book of Acts in its Diaspora Setting*. BAFCS volume 5. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans / Carlisle: The Paternoster Press, 1996.

Liggett, H. and Perry, D. C., eds. *Spatial Practices: Critical Explorations in Social / Spatial Theory*. Thousand Oaks, London, New Delhi: Sage, 1995.

Loades, A., ed. *Feminist Theology : A Reader*. London: SPCK, 1990.

Love, S. L. "A Macrosociological View: 'The Household': A Major Social Component for Gender Analysis in the Gospel of Matthew", *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 24/1 (1993), 21-31.

Luber, S. and Kingery, W. D., eds. *History from Things: Essays in Material Culture*.

Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1993.

Lüdemann, G. *Early Christianity According to the Traditions in Acts.* Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989.

Lührmann, D. "Neutestamentliche Haustafeln und antike Okonomie", *New Testament Studies* 27 (1980), 83-97.

Luttwak, E. N. *The Grand Streategy of the Roman Empire. From the First Century AD to the Third.* Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 1976.

McConnachie, J. "Simon a Tanner (βυρσεύς), Acts ix.43; x.6.32", *Expository Times* 36 (1924-1925), 90.

McCulloch, A. "Alternative Households". In *Families in Britain*, 322-337. Edited by R. N. Rapoport *et al.*

McDowell, L. "City and Home: Urban Housing and Sexual Division of Space". In *Sexual Division: Pattern and Processes*, 142-163. London: Tavistock, 1983.

_____ and Pringle, R., eds. *Defining Women: Social Institutions and Gender Divisions.* Cambridge: Polity Press, 1992.

Magie, D. *Roman Rule in Asia Minor to the End of the Third Century after Christ.* 2 volumes. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1950. Reprinted Salem: Ayer, 1988.

McKay, A. G. *Houses, Villas and Palaces in the Roman World.* London: Thames and Hudson, 1975.

Macklin, E. D. and Rubin, R. H., eds. *Contemporary Families and Alternative Lifestyles: Handbook on Research and Theory.* Beverly Hills, London, New Delhi: Sage, 1983.

MacMullen, R. "Women in Public in the Roman Empire", *Historia* 29 /2 (1980), 208-218.

_____. *Roman Social Relations: 50 BC to AD 284.* New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1974.

Malherbe, A. *Social Aspects of Early Christianity.* 2nd edition. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983.

Malina, B. J. *The New Testament World: Insights from Cultural Anthropology.* Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1981. Revised edition, 1993.

_____. "The Social Sciences and Biblical Interpretation", *Interpretation* 37/3 (1982), 229-242.

_____. *Christian Origins and Cultural Anthropology: Practical Models for Biblical Interpretation.* Atlanta : John Knox Press, 1986.

_____ and Neyrey, J. "First-Century Personality: Dyadic, Not Individual". In *The Social World of Luke-Acts*, 67-96. Edited by J. Neyrey.

_____. "Early Christian Groups". In *Modelling Early Christianity,* 96-113. Edited by P. F. Esler.

Malinowski, F. X. "The Brave Women of Philippi", *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 15 (1985), 60-64.

Marshall, I. H. *The Acts of the Apostles: An Introduction and Commentary.* TNTC. Leicester: Inter-Varsity / Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980.

Marshall, P. "Overseas Expansion and Empire", *History Today* 41 (May 1991), 32-36.

Martin, C. L. "The Acts of the Apostles". In *Searching the Scriptures.* Vol 2: *A Feminist Commentary*, 763-799. Edited by E. Schüssler Fiorenza.

Martin, D. B. "The Construction of the Ancient Family : Methodological Considerations", *Journal of Roman Studies* 86 (1996), 40-60.

Martyn, J. L. *History and Theology in the Fourth Gospel.* New York and Evanston: Harper and Row, 1968.

Massey, D. *Space, Place and Gender.* Cambridge: Polity Press, 1994.

Matson, D. L. *Household Conversion Narratives in Acts: Pattern and Interpretation.* JSNTSS 123. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996.

Mattingly , H. *et al. The Roman Imperial Coinage I - IX.* London: Spink, 1923-1981. Revised edition of C. H. V. Sutherland. Volume 1: *From 31 BC to AD 69.* London: Spink, 1984.

_____. *Coins of the Roman Empire in the British Museum I - VI.* London: British Museum Publications, 1923-1976.

Mau, A. *Pompeii: Its Life and Art.* Translated by F. W. Kelsey. New edition revised and corrected, London: Macmillan, 1902.

Maurer, C. "φυλή", *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* 9: 245-250.

Maxey, M. *Occupations of the Lower Classes in Roman Society.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1938.

Mealand, D. L. "Community of Goods and Utopian Allusions in Acts II-IV", *Journal of Theological Studies* 28 (1977), 96--99.

_____. "The Close of Acts and Its Hellenistic Vocabulary", *New Testament Studies* 36 (1990), 583-597.

Meeks, W. *The First Urban Christians: The Social World of the Apostle Paul.* New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1983.

_____. *The Moral World of the First Christians.* London: SPCK, 1987.

Meiggs, R. *Roman Ostia.* 2nd edition. Oxford: Clarendon, 1973.

Metzger, B. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament.* London: United Bible Societies, 1971.

Meyer, B. F. *The Early Christians: Their World Mission and Self-Discovery.* Delaware: Glazier, 1986.

Michaelis, W. "σκηνή", *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* 7: 393-394.

Michel, O. "οἶκος ", *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* 5: 119-159.

Mielsch, H. *Die römische Villa: Architektur und Lebensform.* Munich: Beck, 1987.

Millar, F. *The Emperor in the Roman World.* London: Duckworth, 1977.

_____ and Segal, E., eds. *Caesar Augustus: Seven Aspects.* Oxford: Clarendon, 1984.

Millar, S. G. "A Mosaic Floor from a Roman Villa at Anaploga", *Hesperia* 41 (1972), 332-354.

Minear, P. S. "Luke's Use of the Birth Stories". In *Studies in Luke-Acts*, 111-130. Edited by L. A. Keck and J. L. Martyn.

Moltmann Wendel, E. *The Women Around Jesus*. New York: Crossroads, 1982.

Moore, H. L. *Space, Text and Gender: An Anthropological Study of the Marakwet of Kenya.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.

_____. *Feminism and Anthropology*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1988.

Moore, S. D. "Narrative Commentaries on the Bible: Context, Roots and Prospects", *Forum* 3/3 [1987], 29-62.

Morris, J. and Fermor-Hesketh, R. *Architecture of the British Empire*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1986.

Morris, L. *The Workings of the Household: A US - UK Comparison*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1990.

Mottu, H. "The Pharisee and the Tax collector : Sartian (*sic*) notions as applied to the reading of Scripture", *Union Seminary Quarterly Review* 29 (1973), 195-213.

Moule, C. F. D. "Once More, Who Were the Hellenists?", *Expository Times* 70 (1958-1959), 100-102.

Moulton J. H. and Milligan, G. *The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament Illustrated from the Papyri and Other Non-Literary Sources.* London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1930.

Moulton, J. H. and Howard, W. F., eds. *A Grammar of New Testament Greek.* Volume 2: *Accidence and Word Formation*. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1979.

Moulton, W. F, Geden, A. S., Moulton, H. K. *Concordance to the New Testament*. 5th edition. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1978.

Moxnes, H. "Meals and the New Community in Luke", *Svensk Exegetisk Årsbok* 51-52 (1986-1987), 158-167.

_____. *The Economy of the Kingdom: Social Conflict and Economic Relations in Luke's Gospel.* Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988.

_____. "Patron-Client Relations and the New Community in Luke-Acts". In *The Social World of Luke-Acts*, 241-268. Edited by J. H. Neyrey

_____, ed. *Constructing Early Christian Families: Family as Social Reality and Metaphor*. London: Routledge, 1997.

Munck, J. *The Acts of the Apostles*. Revised translation by W. F. Albright and J. C. S. Mann. Garden City: Doubleday, 1967.

Murphy-O'Connor, J. *St. Paul's Corinth: Texts and Archaeology.* Collegeville, Minnesota: Glazier, 1983.

_____. "Priscilla and Aquila: Travelling Tentmakers and Church Builders", *Bible Review* (December 1992), 40-52.

Navone, J. *Themes of St. Luke*. Rome: Gregorian University Press, 1970.

Netting, R., McCorkle., Wilk, R. and Arnould, E. J., eds. *Households: Comparative and Historical Studies of the Domestic Group*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984.

Neufeld, K. H. "Frühkatholizismus: Idee und Begriff", *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 94 (1972), 1-28.

Neusner, J. *Formative Judaism*: Religious, Historical and Literary Studies. 3 volumes. Chico: Scholars Press, 1982-1983.

_____ and Frerichs, E., eds. *To See Ourselves As Others See Us" : Jews, Christians and Others in Antiquity*. Chico: Scholars Press, 1985.

Nevett, L. "Gender Relations in the Classical Greek Household: The Archaeological Evidence", *Annual of The British Archaeological School in Athens* 90 (1995), 1-29.

Neyrey, J. H. *The Passion According to Luke: A Redaction Study of Luke's Soteriology*. New York: Paulist, 1985.

_____. ed. *The Social World of Luke-Acts: Models for Interpretation*. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1991.

Nicolet, C. *Space, Geography and Politics in the Early Roman Empire*. Jerome Lectures 19. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1991.

Nicholson, L. J. "Feminist Theory: The Private and the Public". In *Defining Women : Social Institutions and Gender Divisions*, 36-43. Edited by L. McDowell and R. Pringle.

Noble, J. *House Churches: Will They Survive?* Eastbourne: Kingsway Publications, 1988.

Nock, A. Darby "The Book of Acts". In *Essays on Religion and the Ancient World* 2: 821-832. Edited by Z. Stewart. Cambridge:Harvard University Press, 1972.

Nösgen, C. F. *Commentar über die Apostelgeschichte des Lukas*. Leipzig: Dörfling und Franke, 1882.

Oberlinner, L. *Historische Überlieferung und christologische Aussage: Zur Frage der "Brüder Jesu" in der Synopse*. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1975.

Ó Fearghail, F. *The Introduction to Luke-Acts: A Study of the role of Lk 1.1-4.44 in the Composition of Luke's Two-Volume Work*. Rome: Biblical Institute, 1991.

_____. "Israel in Luke-Acts", *Proceedings of the Irish Biblical Association* 11 (1988), 23-43.

Okin, S. Moller. *Justice, Gender and the Family*. New York: Basic Books, 1989.

Oliver, P. *Dwellings: The House Across the World*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1987.

Oporto, S. Guijarro. *Fidelidades en Conflicto: La ruptura con al familia por causa del discipulado y de la misión en la tradición sinóptica*. Salamanca: Publicaciones Universidad Pontificia de Salamanca, 1998.

_____. "The Family in First Century Galilee". In *Constructing Early Christian Families,* 42-65. Edited by H. Moxnes.

Orr, D. "*Roman domestic religion: A study of the Roman household deities and their shrines at Pompeii and Herculaneum*". University Microfilm International. Ann Arbor. Degree date 1972.

_____. "Roman Domestic Religion: The Evidence of the Household Shrines", *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* II.16.2, 1556-1591.

Osiek, C. "The Social Sciences and the Second Testament: Problems and Challenges", *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 22/2 (1992), 88-95.

_____. and Balch, D. L. *Families in the New Testament World: Households and House Churches.* Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster John Knox Press, 1997.

O'Sullivan, E. *Homelessness and Social Policy in the Republic of Ireland.* Trinity College Dublin: Department of Social Studies, 1996.

_____. *Homelessness, Housing Need and Asylum Seekers in Ireland: A Report for the Homeless Initiative.* Dublin: Homelessness Initiative, 1997.

Overbeck, J. A. *Pompeii.* Rome: L'Erma di Bretschneider, 1968. Originally published, 1884.

Overman, J. A. "The God-fearers: Some Neglected Features", *Journal for Study of the New Testament* 32 (1988), 17-26.

_____ , ed. *Galilean Archaeology and the Historical Jesus: The Integration of Material and Textual Remains.* Philadelphia: Trinity Press (forthcoming).

Owens, E. J. *The City in the Greek and Roman World.* London: Routledge, 1991.

Packer, J. E. "Housing and Population in Imperial Ostia and Rome", *Journal of Roman Studies* 57 (1967), 76-95.

_____. *The Insulae of Imperial Ostia.* Memoirs of the American Academy of Rome, 31. Rome, 1971.

Palmer, R. E. A. *Roman Religion and Roman Empire.* 5 Essays, The Haney Foundation Series, 15. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1974.

Parkins, H. M., ed. *Roman Urbanism: Beyond the Consumer City.* London and New York: Routledge, 1997.

Parsons, M. *The Departure of Jesus in Luke-Acts: The Ascension Narratives in Context.* Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987.

_____. "The Unity of Luke-Acts: Rethinking the *Opinio Communis*". In "*With Steadfast Purpose": Essays on Acts in Honor of Henry J. Flanders,* 29-53. Edited by N. Keathley .

Pateman, C. "Feminist Critiques of the Public / Private Dichotomy". In *Public and Private in Social Life*, 281-303. London: Croom Helm, 1983.

Patsch, H. "Die Prophetie des Agabus", *Theologische Zeitschrift* 28 (1972), 228-232.

Patterson, T. C. "History and the post-processual archaeologies", *Man* 24 (1989), 555-

566.

Pellauer, D. "The Significance of the Text in Paul Ricoeur's Hermeneutical Theory". In *Studies in the Philosophy of Paul Ricoeur*, 98-114 Edited by C. E. Reagan.

Perrin, N. and Duling, D. *The New Testament: An Introduction.* 2nd edition. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich Inc., 1982.

Pervo, R. I. *Luke's Story of Paul.* Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990.

Pesch, R. *Die Apostelgeschichte*. EKK Einsiedeln: Neukirchener, 1986.

Peskowitz, M. "The Work of Her Hands". Ph. D., Duke University, 1993.

_____. "Family/ies in Antiquity: Evidence from Tannaitic Literature and Roman Galilean Architecture". In *The Jewish Family in Antiquity,* 9-36. Edited by S. J. D. Cohen.

Peterse, C. L. J. "Notes on the design of the House of Pansa (VI.6.1) in Pompeii", *Mededelingen Nederlands Instituut Rome* 46 (1985), 35-55.

Petersen, J. M. "House-Churches in Rome", *Vigiliae Christianae* 23 (1969), 264-272.

Peterson, E. *Frühkirche, Judentum und Gnosis*. Studien und Untersuchungen. Rome, Freiburg, Vienna: Herder, 1959.

Percival, J. *The Roman Villa: An Historical Introduction*. London: B. T. Batsford Ltd., 1976.

Pilch, J. J. and Malina, B. J. *Biblical Social Values and Their Meaning: A Handbook.* Peabody: Hendrickson, 1993.

Pirson, F. "Rented accommodation at Pompeii: the evidence of the *Insula Arriana Polliana* VI 6". In *Domestic Space in the Roman World*, 165-181. Edited by R. Laurence and A. Wallace-Hadrill.

Polhill, J. B. *Acts.* NAC 26. Nashville: Broadman, 1992.

Pomeroy, S. B. *Goddesses, Whores, Wives and Slaves: Women in Classical Antiquity.* New York: Schocken Books, 1975 / London: Hale, 1976.

_____ , ed. *Women's History and Ancient History*. Chapel Hill and London: University of North Carolina Press, 1991.

Porter. S. E. "Excursus: The 'We' Passages". In *The Book of Acts in its Graeco-Roman Setting*, 545-574. Edited by D. W. Gill and C. Gempf.

Powell, M. A. *What are they saying about Luke*? New York / Mahwah: Paulist, 1989.

_____. *What are they saying about Acts*? New York / Mahwah: Paulist, 1991.

Power, A. *Estates on the Edge*: *The Social Consequences of Mass Housing in Northern Europe.* Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1997.

Pratt, M. L. *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation.* London and New York: Routledge, 1992.

Praeder, S. M. "Acts 27.1-28.16: Sea Voyages in Ancient Literature and the Theology of Luke-Acts", *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 46 (1984), 683-706.

Preston, D. *Households and the Analysis of their Livelihood Strategies*. Leeds: University

of Leeds Press, 1992.

Price, S. R. F. *Rituals and Power: The Roman Imperial Cult in Asia Minor*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984.

Procksch, O. "ἅγιος" (in the New Testament), *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* 1: 100-110.

Quell, Q. "κύριος" (as an Old Testament name for God), *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* 3: 1058-1081.

Radl, W. "χείρ", *Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament* 3: 462-463.

Rajak, T. *Josephus: The Historian and His Society*. London: Duckworth, 1983.

Rapoport, A. *House Form and Culture*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1969.

_____, ed. *The Mutual Interaction of People and their Built Environment: A Cross-Cultural Perspective*. The Hague: Mouton, 1976.

Rapoport, R. N., Fogarty, M. and Rapoport, R., eds. *Families in Britain*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1982.

Rapske, B. *The Book of Acts and Paul in Roman Custody*. BAFCS volume 3. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994.

Rawson, B. "Family Life among the Lower Classes at Rome in the First Two Centuries of the Empire", *Classical Philology* 61 (1966), 71-83.

_____, ed. *The Family in Ancient Rome: New Perspectives*. London: Croom Helm, 1986.

_____. "The Roman Family". In *The Family in Ancient Rome*, 1-57.

_____. "Children in the Roman *Familia*". In *The Family in Ancient Rome*, 170-200.

_____. *Marriage, Divorce and Children in Ancient Rome*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1991.

Reagan, C. E., ed. *Studies in the Philosophy of Paul Ricoeur*. Athens: Ohio University Press, 1979.

Reekmans, T. "Juvenal's Views on Social Change", *Ancient Society* 2 (1971), 117-161.

Reich, R. "Miqwa'ot (Jewish Ritual Baths) in the Second Temple Period and the Period of the Mishnah and Talmud". Ph. D., Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 1990.

Renfrew, C. and Bahn P. *Archaeology, Theories, Methods and Practice*. London: Thames and Hudson, 1991.

Rengstorf, K. H. " δεσπότης", *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* 2:44-49.

_____. "μαθητής," *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* 4: 415-460.

Rich, J. and Wallace-Hadrill, A., eds. *City and Country in the Ancient World*. London and New York: Routledge, 1991.

Richardson, L., Jr. *Pompeii: An Architectural History*. Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 1988.

Richardson, P., ed. *Anti-Judaism in Early Christianity*. Volume 1. Waterloo, Ontario: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1986.

Richlin, A. "Rituals of the Body: Roman Women's Religion". Unpublished paper

delivered at Princeton University and elsewhere. Autumn 1989.

Richter, P. J. "Recent Sociological Approaches to the Study of the New Testament", *Religion* 14 (1984), 77-90.

Richter Reimer, I. *Women in the Acts of the Apostles: A Feminist Liberation Perspective*. Translated by L. M. Maloney. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995.

Ricoeur, P. *Le Conflit des Interprétations: Essais d'herméneutique*. Paris: Seuil, 1969.

_____. *Interpretation Theory: Discourse and the Surplus of Meaning*. Fortworth, Texas: Texas Christian University Press, 1976.

_____. *The Rule of Metaphor: Multi-Disciplinary Studies of the Creation of Meaning*. Translated by R. Czerny. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1978.

Rigby, A. *Alternative Realities*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1974.

Riddle, D. W. "Early Christian Hospitality: A Factor in the Gospel Transmission", *Journal of Biblical Literature* 57 (1938), 141-154.

Robbins, V. K. "By land and by sea: The we-passages and ancient sea voyages. " In *Perspectives on Luke-Acts*, 215-242. Edited by C. H. Talbert.

_____. "Luke-Acts: A mixed population seeks a home in the Roman Empire". In *Images of Empire*, 202-221. Edited by L. Alexander.

Robinson, H. S. *The Urban Development of Ancient Corinth*. Princeton: American School of Classical Studies in Athens, 1965.

Robinson, O. F. *Ancient Rome: City Planning and Administration*. London: Routledge, 1992.

Rock, C., Torre, S. and Wright, G. "The Appropriation of the House: Changes in House Design and Concepts of Domesticity". In *New Space for Women*, 83-99. Edited by G. Wekerle, R. Paterson and D. Morley.

Rogers, G. M. *The Sacred Identity of Ephesos: Foundation Myths of a Roman City*. London: Routledge, 1991.

Rogers, R. S. "The Roman Emperors as heirs and legatees", *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 78 (1947), 140-158.

Roget, P. Roget's *Thesaurus of English Words and Phrases*. The Everyman Edition. Revised by D. C. Brown, 1952. New edition by B. Kirkpatrick. London: Penguin, 1998.

Rorbaugh, R. L. "The Pre-Industrial City in Luke-Acts: Urban Social Relations". In *The Social World of Luke-Acts*, 125-149. Edited by J. Neyrey.

Rosaldo, M. Z. and Lamphere, L., eds. *Woman, Culture and Society*. Stanford: University of Stanford Press, 1974.

Rostovtzeff, M. *The Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World*. 3 volumes. Oxford: Clarendon, 1941.

_____. *The Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire*. 2nd edition revised by P. M. Fraser. Oxford: Clarendon, 1957.

_____. *Rome*. Translated by J. D. Duff. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1960.

Rotondi, G. *Leges Publicae Populi Romani*. Reissued. Hildesheim: Olms, 1912.

Ruether, R. Radford and McLaughlin, E., eds. *Women of Spirit: Female Leadership in the Jewish and Christian Traditions*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1979.

Russell, L., ed. *Feminist Interpretation of the Bible*. Oxford and New York: Blackwell, 1985.

Safrai, S. and Stern, M., eds. *The Jewish People in the First Century: Historical Geography, Political History, Social, Cultural and Religious Life and Institutions*. 2 volumes. Philadelphia : Fortress / Assen: Van Gorcum, 1974-1976.

Sahlins, M. *Stone Age Economics*. London: Tavistock, 1974.

Sakenfeld, K. Doob. "Feminist Perspectives on Bible and Theology: An Introduction to Selected Issues and Literature", *Interpretation* 42 (1988), 5-18.

Saller, R. *Personal Patronage under the Early Empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.

_____ and Shaw, D. B. "Tombstones and Roman family relations in the Principate: civilians, soldiers and slaves", *Journal of Roman Studies* 74 (1984), 124-156.

_____. "*Familia, Domus* and the Roman Conception of the Family", *Phoenix* 38 (1984), 336-355.

_____. "Corporal Punishment, Authority and Obedience in the Roman Household". In *Marriage, Divorce and Children in Ancient Rome,* 144-165. Edited by B. Rawson.

_____. *Patriarchy, Property and Death in the Roman Family*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

_____and Kertzer, D., eds. T*he Family in Italy from Antiquity to the Present*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1991.

Sanders, D. "Behavioral conventions and archaeology: methods for the analysis of ancient architecture". In *Domestic Architecture and the Use of Space*, 43-72. Edited by S. Kent.

Sanders, E. P. *Judaism: Practice and Belief, 66 B.C.E - 66 C.E.* London: SCM, 1992.

Sanders, J. T. *The Jews in Luke-Acts*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987.

Sandnes, K. Olav. "Equality within Patriarchal Structures: Some New Testament Perspectives on Christian Fellowship as a Brother- or Sisterhood and a Family". In *Constructing Early Christian Families*, 150-165. Edited by H. Moxnes.

Sawicki, M. "Making the Best of Jesus". Paper delivered at *SBL* Conference, 1992.

_____. "Caste and Contact in the Galilee of Jesus: Research beyond Positivism and Constructivism". In *Galilean Archaeology and the Historical Jesus: The Integration of Material and Textual Remains* (forthcoming). Edited by J. A. Overman.

_____. "Archaeology as space technology: Digging for gender and class in holy land", *Method and Theory in the Study of Religion* 6 (1994), 319-348.

_____. "Spatial Management of Gender and Labor in Greco-Roman Galilee". In *Archaeology and the World of Galilee: Texts and Contexts in the Roman and Byzantine Periods,* 7-28. Edited by D. R. Edwards and T. McCollough.

Schäfer, P. *Der Bar Kokhba-Aufstand: Studien zum zweiten jüdischen Krieg gegen Rom.* Tübingen: Mohr, 1981.

_____, ed. *The Talmud Yerushalmi and Graeco-Roman Culture.* Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1988.

Schiffer, M. B., ed. *Advances in Archaeological Method and Theory.* Volumes 1 (1978) - 11 (1987). New York: Academic Press, 1985.

Schmidt, K. L. "ἐκκλησία", *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* 3: 501-536.

_____. "ἔθνος" in the New Testament", *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* 2:369-372.

Schneider, K. "*Ianitor,*" *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft* 9, 692-693. Edited by G. Wissowa.

_____. "Purpura, πορφύρα," *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft* 46, 2000-2020. Edited by G. Wissowa.

Schneiders, S. M. "Feminist Ideology Criticism and Biblical Hermeneutics", *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 19 (1989), 3-10.

Schottroff, L. "Women as Disciples. " In *Let the Oppressed Go Free,* 80-130. = "Frauen in der Nachfolge Jesus in Neutestamentlicher Zeit". *In Befreiungserfahrungen. Studien zur Sozialgeschichte des Neuen Testaments,* 96-133. Munich, 1989. First published in *Tradition der Befreiung. Sozialgeschitchtliche Bibelauslegungen Band 2. Frauen in der Bibel,* 91-133. Edited by W. Schottroff and W. Stegemann. Munich, 1980.

_____. *Let the Oppressed Go Free: Feminist Perspective on the New Testament.* Translated by A. S. Kidder. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1993.

_____. *Lydia's Impatient Sisters: A Feminist Social History of Early Christianity.* Translated by B. and M. Rumscheidt. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1995.

Schroeder, D. *Die Haustafeln des Neuen Testaments (ihre Herkunft und theologischer Sinn).* Ph. D., Hamburg, 1959.

Schultz, F. *Principles of Roman Law.* Oxford: Clarendon, 1936. Reprinted 1951.

Schürer, E. *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ, 175 B.C. - A.D. 135.* New version revised and edited.

Volume 1 revised and edited by G. Vermes and F. Millar. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1973.

Volume II revised and edited by G. Vermes, F. Millar and M. Black. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1973.

Volumes IIIi and IIIii revised and edited by G. Vermes, F. Millar and M. Goodman.

Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1986, 1987.

Schüssler Fiorenza, E. . *In Memory of Her*: *A Feminist Theological Reconstruction of Christian Origins*. London: SCM, 1983.

_____. *Bread Not Stone: The Challenge of Feminist Biblical Interpretation.* Boston: Beacon, 1984.

_____, ed. *Searching the Scriptures. A Feminist Commentary.* 2 volumes. New York: The Crossroad Publishing Company, 1994 / London: SCM, 1995.

Schwartz, D. R. *Agrippa 1: The Last King of Judaea*. Tübingen: Mohr, 1990.

Scott, E., ed. *Theoretical Roman Archaeology: First Conference Proceedings*. Aldershot: Avebury, 1993.

Scott, J. M. "Luke's Geographical Horizon". In *The Book of Acts in its Graeco-Roman Setting,* 483-544. Edited by D. W. Gill and C. Gempf.

Scott, J. W. "Gender: A Useful Category of Historical Analysis", *The American Historical Review* 91 (1986), 1053-1075.

Scullard, H. H. *Festivals and Ceremonies of the Roman Republic*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1981.

SDP. *Housing: A Choice For All*. Green Paper no. 18. London: SDP, 1985.

Segal, A. F. *Rebecca's Children: Judaism and Christianity in the Roman World.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1986.

Segalen, M. *Historical Anthropology of the Family*. Translated by J. C. Whitehouse and S. Matthews. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.

Seim, T. Karlsen. *The Double Message: Patterns of Gender in Luke-Acts*. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1994.

_____. "The Gospel of Luke". In *Searching the Scriptures*. Vol 2: *A Feminist Commentary*, 728-762. Edited by E. Schüssler Fiorenza.

Shear, T. L. "Excavations at Corinth", *American Journal of Archaeology* 29 (1925), 381-397.

_____. *Corinth: Results of Excavations Conducted by the American School of Classical Studies at Athens*. Volume 5: *The Roman Villa*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1930.

Sherwin-White, A. N. *Roman Society and Roman Law in the New Testament*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1963.

_____. *The Letters of Pliny: A Historical and Social Commentary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1966.

_____. *The Roman Citizenship*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1939. 2nd edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1973.

Shiloh, Y. "The Four-Room House: Its Situation and Function in the Israelite City", *Israel Exploration Journal* 20 (1970), 180-190.

Silva, R. " 'Eran, pues, de oficio, fabricantes de tiendas [σκηνοποιοί] (18.3)", *Estudios*

Bíblicos 24 (1965), 123-124.

Simmel, G. *Conflict*. Translated by K. H. Wolff. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1955.

Simon, E. *Ara Pacis Augustae*. Tübingen: Wasmuth, 1967.

Sjoberg, G. *The Preindustrial City: Past and Present*. London: Collier Macmillan, 1965.

Small, D. "Initial study of the structure of women's seclusion in the archaeological past". In *The Archaeology of Gender: Proceedings of the 22nd Annual Chacmool Conference*, 336-342. Edited by D. Walde and D. Willows.

Smelser, N. "The Victorian Family". In *Families in Britain,* 59-74. Edited by R. N. Rapoport *et al.*

Smith, D. E. *Social Obligation in the context of Communal Meals: A Study of the Christian Meal in 1 Corinthians in Comparison with Graeco-Roman Meals.* Unpublished Th. D., Harvard University, 1980.

Smith, J. and Walerstein, I. *Creating and Transforming Households: The Constraints of the World Economy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

Smith, J. Z. "The Social Description of Early Christianity", *Religious Studies Review* 1/1 (1975), 19-25.

Soden, H. von. "ἀδελφός", *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* 1: 144-146.

Spain, D. *Gendered Spaces*. Chapel Hill and London: University of North Carolina Press, 1992.

Spencer, F. S. *The Portrait of Philip in Acts: A Study of Roles and Relations*. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992.

Stack, C. *All Our Kin: Strategies for Survival in a Black Community*. New York: Harper and Row, 1974.

Stagg, F. *The Book of Acts: The Early Struggle for an Unhindered Gospel*. Nashville: Broadman, 1955.

Stager, L. E. "The Architecture of the Family in Ancient Israel", *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 260 (1985), 1-35.

Stählin, G. "φίλος", *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, 9: 146-171.

_____. "χήρα", *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* 9: 440-465.

Stambaugh, J. E. *The Ancient Roman City*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1988.

Stauffer, E. "Zur Kindertaufe in der Urkirche", *Deutsches Pfarrerblatt* 49 (1949), 152-154.

Stern, E., ed. *The New Encyclopaedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land*. Jerusalem: IEJ, 1993.

Sternlicht, S., ed. *Selected Poems of Pádraic Colum*. Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University Press, 1989.

Stowers, S. K. "The Social Sciences and the Study of Early Christianity". In *Studies in Judaism and Its Greco-Roman Context*, 149-181. Edited by W. S. Green.

Strathmann, H. "λαός", *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* 4: 39-57.

Strauss, M. L. *The Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts: The Promise and Fulfilment in Lukan Christology*. JSNTSS 110. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.

Stuhlmacher, P. *Der Brief an Philemon.* EKK 18. Einsiedeln: Neukirchener, 1975. 2nd edition, 1981.

Suhl, A. "Zum titel prōtos tēs nēsou (Erster der Insel), Apg 28.7", *Biblische Zeitschrift* 36 (1992), 220-226.

Sulze, H. "*Peristylium*", *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie* Supplement 7:950-971.

Sutherland, C. H. V. *Roman History and Coinage, 44 B.C. - A.D. 69.* Oxford: Clarendon, 1987.

Sutherland, I. M. "Colonnaded *cenacula* in Pompeian domestic architecture". Ph. D., Duke University, 1990.

Sylva, D. D., ed. *Reimaging the Death of the Lukan Jesus*. Frankfurt: Hain, 1990.

Syme, R. *The Roman Revolution.* Oxford: Clarendon, 1939.

_____. *The Augustan Aristocracy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986.

_____. "*Imperator Caesar*: A Study in Nomenclature". In *Roman Papers* 1, 361-377. Edited by E. Badian.

Talbert, C. H., *Literary Patterns, Theological Themes and the Genre of Luke-Acts.* Missoula: Scholars Press, 1974.

_____. ed. *Perspectives on Luke-Acts*. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1978.

_____ ed. *Perspectives on 1 Peter*. NABPR Special Studies Series, Number 9. Macon: Mercer University Press, 1986.

Tannehill, R. C. "Israel in Luke-Acts: A Tragic Story", *Journal of Biblical Literature* 104 (1985), 69-85.

_____. *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts: A Literary Interpretation.* Volume 1: *The Gospel According to Luke*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986. Volume 2: *The Acts of the Apostles*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990.

Tanzer, S. J. "Ephesians". In *Searching the Scriptures*. Volume 2: *A Feminist Commentary,* 325-348. Edited by E. Schüssler Fiorenza.

Tarja, H. W. *The Trial of St. Paul: A Juridical Exegesis of the Second Half of the Acts of the Apostles*. WUNT 35. Tübingen: Mohr, 1989.

Taylor, L. R. *The Divinity of the Roman Emperor*. Middletown: American Philological Association. Monograph 1, 1931. Reprinted New York: Scholars Press, 1975.

Tetlow, E. *Women and Ministry*. New York: Paulist, 1980.

Thébert, Y. "Private Life and Domestic Architecture in Roman Africa". In *From Rome to Byzantium*, 319-409. Edited by P. Veyne.

Theissen, G. "Wanderrakikalismus: Literatursoziologische Aspekte der Überlieferung von Worten Jesu im Urchristentum, " *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 70 (1973), 245-271. Translated by A. C. Wire in *Radical Religion* 2 (1975), 84-93 and also published in Theissen, *The Social Reality and the Early Christians*, 33-59.

_____. *Sociology of Earliest Palestinian Christianity.* Translated by J. Bowden. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1978.

_____. *The Social Setting of Pauline Christianity: Essays on Corinth.* Edited and translated by J. H. Schultz. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982.

_____. *Social Reality and the Early Christians: Theology, Ethics and the World of the New Testament.* Translated by M. Kohl. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1993.

Thomas, C. M. "At Home in the City of Artemis: Religion in Ephesos in the Literary Imagination of the Roman Period". In *Ephesos: Metropolis of Asia*, 81-117. Edited by H. Koester.

Thompson, J. B., ed. *Paul Ricoeur: Hermeneutics and the Human Sciences.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981.

Thorne, B. with Yalom, M., eds. *Rethinking the Family: Some Feminist Questions.* Revised edition. Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1992.

Thornton, T. C. G. " 'To the End of the Earth' : Acts 1.8", *Expository Times* 89 (1977-1978), 374-375.

Thraede, K. "Zum historischen Hintergrund der 'Haustafeln' des NT". In *Pietas: Festchrift für Bernhard Kötting*, 359-368 . Edited by E. Dassmann and K. S. Frank..

Thurston, B. Bowman. "τὸ ὑπερῷον in Acts 1.13", *Expository Times* 81/1 (1968), 21-22.

_____. *The Widows: Women's Ministry in the Early Church.* Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989.

Tolbert, M. A., ed. The Bible and Feminist Hermeneutics. *Semeia* 28 (1983).

_____. "Defining the problem: The Bible and Feminist Hermeneutics", *Semeia* 28 (1983), 113-126.

_____. "Social, sociological and anthropological methods". In *Searching the Scriptures.* Volume 1: *A Feminist Introduction,* 255-271. Edited by E. Schüssler Fiorenza.

Torelli, M. *Typology and Structure of Roman Historical Reliefs.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1982.

Torjesen, K. J. *When Women Were Priests: Women's Leadership in the Early Church and the Scandal of their Subordination in the Rise of Christianity.* San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1993.

Treggiari, S. "Domestic staff at Rome in the Julio-Claudian period, 27 B.C. - A.D. 68," *Histoire Sociale / Social History* 6 (1973), 241-255.

_____. "Jobs in the Household of Livia", *Papers of the British School at Rome* 43 (1975), 48-77.

_____. "Jobs for Women", *American Journal of Ancient History* 1(1976), 76-104.

_____. "Questions on Women Domestics in the Roman West". In *Schiavitù,*

Manomissione e Classe Dipendenti nel Mondo Antico, 185-201. Rome: L'Erma di Bretschneider, 1979.

_____. "Women as property in the early Roman Empire". In *Women and the Law: A Social Historical Perspective*, 7-33. Edited by D. Kelly Weisberg. Cambridge, MA: Schenkman, 1982.

_____. "Divorce Roman Style: How Easy and Frequent Was It?" In *Marriage, Divorce and Children in Ancient Rome*, 31-46. Edited by B. Rawson.

_____. *Roman Marriage: Iusti Coniuges from the Time of Cicero to the Time of Ulpian*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1991.

Trible, T. "Feminist Hermeneutics and Biblical Studies". In *Feminist Theology: A Reader*, 23-40. Edited by A. Loades.

Troeltsch, E. *Die Soziallehren der christlichen Kirchen und Gruppen. Gessamelte Schriften 1*. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1912. 2nd edition, 1919. Translated by O. Wyon as *The Social Teaching of the Christian Churches*. 2 volumes. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1960.

Turner, C. *The Family and Kinship in Modern Britain*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1969.

Tyson, J. ed. *Luke-Acts and the Jewish People. Eight Critical Perspectives*. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1988.

Unnik van, W.C. *Sparsa Collecta: The Collected Essays of W. C. van Unnik*. Leiden: Brill, 1973, 1980, 1983.

Untergassmair, F. G. "ἑκατοντάρχης", *Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament* 1:405.

Verner, D. "The Household of God: The Social World of the Pastorals". Ph. D., Emory University, 1981

_____. *The Household of God: The Social World of the Pastorals*. SBLDS 71. Chico: Scholars Press, 1983.

Veyne, P. *A History of Private Life*. Volume 1 : *From Rome to Byzantium*. Translated by A. Goldhammer. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1987.

Wacher, J., ed. *The Roman World*. 2 volumes. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1987.

Walaskay, P. *"And So We Came To Rome": The Political Perspective of St. Luke*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

Walde, D. and Willows, N. D., eds. *The Archaeology of Gender. Proceedings of the Twenty-Second Annual Conference of the Archaeological Association of the University of Calgary*. Calgary: University of Calgary Press, 1991.

Walker, S. "Women and housing in Classical Greece". In *Images of Women in Antiquity*, 81-91. Edited by A. Cameron and A. Kuhrt.

Wallace-Hadrill, A. "The Social Structure of the Roman House", *Papers of the British School at Rome* 56 (1988), 43-97.

_____. *Patronage in Ancient Society*. London: Routledge, 1989.

_____. *Houses and Society in Pompeii and Herculaneum*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994.

_____. "Re-thinking the Roman atrium house". In *Domestic Space in the Roman World,* 219-240. Edited by R. Laurence and A. Wallace-Hadrill.

Walters, J. "Egyptian Religions in Ephesos". In *Ephesos: Metropolis of Asia*, 281-310. Edited by H. Koester.

Waltzing, J. *Etude historique sur les corporations professionelles chez les Romains*. 4 volumes. Louvain: Peeters, 1895-1900.

Ward-Perkins, J. B. and Boëthius, A. *Roman Imperial Architecture*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1981. Previously published as parts 2-4 of *Etruscan and Roman Architecture* by A. Boëthius and J. B. Ward-Perkins. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1970.

Wardman, A. *Rome's Debt to Greece*. London: Paul Elek, 1976.

Waterson, R. *The Living House: An Anthropology of Architecture in South-East Asia*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1980.

Watson, G. R. "Legion", *Oxford Classical Dictionary*, 591.

Watson, P. J., LeBlanc, S. A. and Redman, C. L. *Explanation in Archaeology: An Explicitly Scientific Approach*. New York: Columba University Press, 1971.

Weatherly, J. A. *Jewish Responsibility for the Death of Jesus in Luke-Acts*. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994.

Weaver, P. R. C. *Familia Caesaris: A Social Study of the Emperor's Freedmen and Slaves*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972.

_____. "Children of the freedmen (and freedwomen). The Case of the 'woman who calls herself Petronia Justa'," In *Marriage, Divorce and Children in Ancient Rome*, 166-190. Edited by B. Rawson.

Weidinger, K. *Die Haustafeln, ein Stück urchristlicher Paranese*. UNT 14. Leipzig: Heinrich, 1928.

Weigandt, P. "Zur sogenannten 'Oikosformel' ", *Novum Testamentum* 6 (1963), 49-74.

Weinberg, S. S. *Corinth: Results of Excavations Conducted by the American School of Classical Studies at Athens*. Volume 1.v: *The Southeast Building, The Twin Basilicas, The Mosaic House*. Princeton: The American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 1960.

Wekerle, G., Paterson, R. and Morley, D., eds. *New Space for Women*. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 1980.

White, L. M. "*Domus Ecclesiae, Domus Dei*: Adaptation and Development in the Setting for Early Christian Assembly". Ph. D., Yale University, 1982.

_____. *Building God's House in the Roman World: Architectural Adaptation among Pagans, Jews and Christians*. The ASOR Library of Biblical and Near Eastern

Archaeology. Baltimore and London: The John Hopkins University Press, 1990.

_____. *The Social Origins of Christian Architecture*. Volume 1: *Building God's House in the Roman World: Architectural Adaptation among Pagans, Jews and Christians.* Volume 2: *The Christian Domus Ecclesiae and Its Environment : A Collection of Texts and Monuments.* HTS 42. Valley Forge, Pennsylvania: Trinity Press International, 1996.

Wiedemann, T. *Adults and Children in the Roman Empire*. London: Routledge, 1989.

Wikenhauser, A. "Doppeltraüme", *Biblica* 29 (1948), 100-111.

Wilkinson, J. *Jerusalem Pilgrims before the Crusades*. Jerusalem: Ariel, 1977.

Wilcox, M. *The Semitisms of Acts*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1965.

Wilk, R. and Netting, R. "Households: Changing Forms and Functions". In *Households: Comparative and Historical Studies of the Domestic Group,* 1-28. Edited by R. Netting *et. al.*

Wilk, R. R. "The built environment and consumer decisions". In *Domestic Architecture and the Use of Space*, 34-42. Edited by S. Kent.

Williams, M. H. *The Jews among the Greeks and Romans: A Diasporan Sourcebook* London: Duckworth, 1998.

Wilson, A. *Family*. London: Tavistock, 1985.

Wilson, B. R. "An Analysis of Sect Development", *American Sociological Review* 24 (1959), 3-15.

Wilson, S. G. "The Jews and the Death of Jesus". In *Anti-Judaism in Early Christianity*, 155-164. Edited by P. Richardson.

Wire, A. Clark. "John H. Elliott, *A Home for the Homeless: A Sociological Exegesis of 1 Peter, Its Situation and Strategy* and David L. Balch, *"Let wives be submissive": The Domestic Code in 1 Peter:* A Review", *Religious Studies Review* 10/3 (1984), 209-216.

_____. *The Corinthian Women Prophets: A Reconstruction through Paul's Rhetoric*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990.

Wiseman, J. "Corinth and Rome 1: 288 B.C. - A.D. 267", *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* VII/1, 438-548.

Wiseman, T. P. "Legendary Genealogies in Late Republican Rome", *Greece and Rome* 21 (1974), 153-164.

_____. "*Pete nobiles amicos*: poets and patrons in late Republican Rome". In *Literary and Artistic Patronage in Ancient Rome*, 28-49. Edited by B. K. Gold. Austin: University of Texas 1982.

_____. "*Conspicui postes tectoque digna deo*: the public image of aristocratic and imperial houses in the late Republic and early Empire", *L'Urbs. Espace urbain et histoire* (Collection de l'École Française à Rome) 98 (1987), 393-413.

Wissova, G., ed.. *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft.*

49 volumes. Stuttgart: Metzler / Druckenmüller, 1893-1978.

Wright, C. J. H. *God's People in God's Land: Family and Property in the Old Testament.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990.

_____. "Family", *Anchor Bible Dictionary* 2:761-769.

Wright, G. *Moralism and the Model Home: Domestic Architecture and Cultural Conflict in Chicago, 1873-1913.* Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1980.

Wrigley, E. A. "Reflections on the history of the family", *Daedalus* 106 (Spring 1977), 71-85.

Wylie, A. "Angles of Vision: The Engendering of Archaeology Past and Present". Paper presented to a conference on "The Women and Gender Question in Science". Minneapolis, 1995.

Yadin, Y. "The expedition to the Judaean desert, 1960", *Israel Exploration Journal* 11 (1961), 48.

_____. *Bar Kokhba.* New York: Random, 1971.

_____, ed. *Jerusalem Revealed: Archaeology in the Holy City, 1968-74.* Jerusalem: New Haven, 1976.

Yarbro Collins, A. *Feminist Perspectives on Biblical Scholarship.* Chico: Scholars Press, 1985.

Yavetz, Z. "The *Res Gestae* and Augustus' Public Image". In *Caesar Augustus: Seven Aspects*, 1-36. Edited by F. Millar and E. Segal.

Yegül, F. *Baths and Bathing in Classical Antiquity.* New York: MIT, 1992.

Yeivin, Z. "Ancient Chorazin Comes Back To Life", *Biblical Archaeology Review* 13/5 (1987), 22-36.

Young, K., C. Wolkowitz, C. and McCullagh, R., eds. *Of Marriage and the Market* London: CSE Books, 1981.

Zanker, P. *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1988.

Zeitlin, S. "Did Agrippa write a letter to Gaius Caligula", *Jewish Quarterly Review* n.s. 56 (1965), 21-31.