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ABSTRACT

This dissertation investigates the notion of women’s seclusion in ancient Greece as embodied in the Greek term *gynaikonitis*, which is loosely defined as the women’s quarters of a Greek house. The *gynaikonitis* is understood as an architecturally delineated space in a remote part of the house that confined women in an effort to restrict contact with unrelated men. Interpretation of the meager literary testimony on household space has resulted in a standard picture of the Greek house as a place that imprisoned women in order to monitor and control their activities. In this study, the legitimacy of this view is evaluated by tracing the term *gynaikonitis* and its usage in various literary contexts, seeking out the iconographic and spatial correlates for specific women’s quarters in Greek houses, and addressing the more general problem of the use of domestic space from the perspective of the family, but most importantly, from the perspective of women.

This study explores how architectural space can affect behavior at the household level in a way that encourages or hinders interaction between inhabitants, visitors and strangers. Within a framework that views architecture as being socially meaningful, houses are examined for their capacity to divide space along gender lines, to control movement and access, to promote or inhibit visual and physical contact between inhabitants and strangers, and to mediate between inside and outside and between private and public space. Cultural notions about space, crowding, privacy, friendship and gender roles are also considered and integrated with the material sources for women’s lived reality in order to highlight ambiguous or conflicting attitudes within Greek society.
The main objective of this dissertation is to address the issue of women’s seclusion in a holistic manner by considering the history and development of the concept of women’s seclusion, assessing the literary and iconographic sources for evidence of women’s space, and locating correlates for women’s space in the archaeological remains of Greek houses. In order to evaluate the conventional impression of women as being confined and secluded in their houses, this study explores the concept of “male” and “female” space within the context of the Greek house, establishes whether or not the literary construction of the *gynaikonitis* was translated into built form, and determines how and to what extent this affected the daily lives of women.
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INTRODUCTION

“A New Racket for the Girls”

It has been argued that studying gender in the past is an impossible task, and I myself have been swayed more than once in that direction over the last couple of years. Engendering the past is not a simple task, nor will I claim that the struggle has come to an end. Classical archaeologists have lagged far behind other branches of archaeology in acknowledging and accepting the legitimacy of scholarship informed by gender, and one of the reasons for this is that gender has been considered primarily a conceptual, intangible form of inquiry.¹ Scholars feel that we will never “see” gender or social relations of any sort in the same way as we see objects or buildings.²

By far, the greatest obstacle for scholars has been a marginalization of the field at large, with gender studies being viewed as “a new racket for the girls,” that “shouldn’t be allowed to roll too far.”³ Even in more recent years the sentiment is much the same, with anecdotes about conferences on gender archaeology that are “attended by a host of female archaeologists, plus a few brave males who perhaps aspire to political correctness.”⁴ Such statements echo the sentiments of many archaeologists who believe that feminist archaeology and the archaeology of gender are one and the same, and who do not take either field very seriously. In my opinion, gender should be another structuring principle fundamental to interpreting past societies, not a topic better left for trail-blazing men or for women looking for “a new racket” to pass their time.

Archaeology is an interpretive science based on material culture; material culture is a component of social life with objects used to express, create and transform meaning, and some of this meaning is necessarily related to gender. Adding women and stirring, however, will not work. Over the years, archaeological studies have been “engendered” through the insertion of women into traditional interpretive and stylistic frameworks, but this method has subverted key questions and has resulted in assumptions about gender that are problematic and which now need re-investigation.

Houses and studies of the internal dynamics of households have also had their fair share of skeptics. Studies focusing on the relationship between domestic space and inhabitants, and in particular those that deal with gender, have been perceived as trivial and insignificant pastimes for scholars. It is believed that archaeology is too limited methodologically to sustain such research and that questions about behavior and space are difficult to reconstruct with any reliability. Those who argue against this, in fact, are thought to be at risk of not practicing archaeology in a scientific and “responsible” way because they engage an insider’s view, which is, according to them, utterly unattainable in archaeology. As scholars of antiquity, we must be willing to admit that each and every approach we use to analyze the past, both micro and macro, is inherently limited. The sensible strategy would be to encourage a diversity of options and some degree of methodological and theoretical pluralism, instead of working in disciplinary isolation or compartmentalizing research and methodological frameworks in other fields.

---

Home is a Name, a Word, and it is a Strong One:

By deconstructing such perceptions about the discipline, a more general awareness and acceptance of the household and household space as important factors in archaeological inquiry can be achieved. Firstly, research at the household level provides us with an alternative to a history of political and military events and of political institutions, by concentrating on peoples’ decisions about their dwellings, their lifestyle, and the allocation of space. Domestic architecture is also a “durable material and symbolic expression of life.” Houses, like pottery, implements, coins and jewelry, are artifacts that have been constructed and given shape by people. They are unearthed by archaeologists through meticulous and painstaking techniques and can be studied in terms of their construction and aesthetics or for their ability to transmit cultural information. The spaces we inhabit house the attitudes and traditions through which we both conform to and confront the world beyond, through which we learn to negotiate acceptable relationships, but also to formulate our own.

Houses are physical structures that provide shelter, comfort, and security from the outside world, “a sanctuary from the perils outside,” but they can also act as the medium by which the outside world exercises control over movements, activities, and behaviors. As settings for social interaction, houses are closely related to culture. According to Amos Rapoport, most of culture consists of habitual and routinized behavior that translates into built form, and it is this ability to organize space and therefore human action that makes buildings so important for a study about gender performance. Architecture can provide settings for certain activities, communicate

---

information, express and support beliefs, help to establish individual or group identity, and encode value systems.\textsuperscript{12} Though architecture can never totally dictate the behavior that occurs within its spaces, beyond its divisions, and behind its screens, it can guide and reinforce behavior by structuring patterns of movement and encounter through which human relationships and cultural traditions are formulated and sustained.

Houses are architectural spaces, but more importantly, they are loci for learning who we are, including confirmation of one’s gender identity and what that identity means. They are places where one’s primary relationship with society is established and absorbed and they are also products of on-going social negotiations. Considering dynamics within the household or at the scale of the household may yield insights into how the complexities of social status may be reflected in daily practice.\textsuperscript{13} Engendering spatial architecture is not simply about how artifact distributions or spatial divisions correspond to gendered activities, it is also about how through the participation in and performance of agreed meanings people are confirmed in their gendered identities, and also how these can be challenged.

Where Might One Find Gender at Home?

In this study, archaeological research on the household intersects with the archaeological study of gender by exploring the house as a locus in which people of different genders interact on a regular basis. The goal of this dissertation is to delve into the way physicality of space in houses may be used as a means of structuring social relations, and to attempt to find the spaces in Greek houses of the Classical period that designate those social relations that express gender.

\textsuperscript{12} Rapoport, \textit{Vernacular Architecture}, 299.
Space and human activity can be divided along lines of status, age, sex or gender. Public toilets, for example, are differentiated biologically, according to sex, but space that is set apart by gender is socially constructed. A kitchen may be gendered feminine because cooking is something that is, traditionally at least, connected with women. Socially-generated divisions must be continually re-produced because these are not intrinsic, but instead are bound up in activities. Gender relations may be played out as spatial distinctions between activity areas, rights of access, and the orientation or distribution of people in private and public settings. The organization of space can reinforce notions about social identities, gender included, and can reproduce certain roles and power structures, but only to the extent that people recognize and respect them.\textsuperscript{14} Archaeology can effectively engage with questions about how gender affects and is affected by spatial organization and spatial divisions, in other words, how gender can be mapped out in space.

In this study, houses will be examined for their capacity to communicate cultural notions about gender and how these notions take on tangible form. In order to extrapolate the cultural meanings that buildings encode, it is necessary to examine the literary and artistic constructions of gender, to look for the spatial correlates of gender in the architectural remains of houses, and to weigh this information against ancient Greek cultural ideologies about gender. But before we can attempt to “read” gender in houses, we must first consider the question of why we read gender.

Gender has been treated in a very simplistic and dichotomized way, for example, in terms of binary constructions like male/female, public/private and outside/inside. The opposition between domestic and public spheres is the universal framework employed by scholars to assess male and female roles in a society, but what cast the sexes into dichotomous terms may have

\textsuperscript{14} M.L.S. Sørensen, \textit{Gender Archaeology} (Malden: Polity Press, 2000), 151.
more to do with earlier scholarship and contemporary cultural ideologies than with historical inquiry. In order to responsibly assess the more specific, but also widespread, paradigm of women’s seclusion in ancient Greece, it is of fundamental importance to expose the biases which early scholars brought to their investigations of women and household space. These have weighed down scholarship on the issue and continue to do so even today.

Outline of Chapters:

In Chapter 1 we will explore the scholarship on the issue of women in ancient Greece and the widespread notion of seclusion in “women’s quarters.” We will discuss the role of the Victorian scholars who set the groundwork for the field of Classics as a discipline and whose contemporary beliefs about female nature and woman’s position in civic society colored subsequent scholarship on the topic. A discussion of the works of the most influential of these scholars, including how their views of contemporary civil society have crept their way into modern analytical models of assessing Classical cultures, will follow. Chapter 1 will demonstrate how our current understanding of women in Classical Greece has been shaped by elite Victorian ideology about gender and how exposing the biases contemporary scholars bring to their investigations of household space and women can afford a more critical perspective on gender ideologies. I will argue that new avenues of research like gender archaeology and ethnography have the potential to re-assess overgeneralizations about women and to explore how the performance of gender may have deviated from the ideal.

Chapter 2 will explore the notion of women’s seclusion in “women’s quarters” by investigating the Greek term gynaikonitis in its various literary contexts. This chapter will demonstrate that scholars have depended almost solely on ancient literature as a source for
ancient housing and how this textual tyranny has affected our perceptions of women. The literary evidence for the *gynaikonitis* will be examined in order to demonstrate that ancient authors refer to domestic space incidentally and very loosely define architectural terms. The discussion will also highlight how textual sources often emphasize and reinforce the role of society’s elites instead of addressing behavior across a broader social spectrum, and how not taking such issues into consideration can lead to a distorted picture of domestic behavior and space. In particular, this chapter will critically assess the texts themselves and attempt a re-reading of the testimony on the *gynaikonitis*. In so doing, this discussion will re-investigate the relationship between the texts and the archaeological and iconographic evidence in an effort to better understand the relationship between ideologies and actual behavior.

In Chapter 3, the iconographic sources for domestic space will be examined within the discourse on women’s seclusion. Vase paintings, in particular, are valuable sources for providing information about aspects of society that are for the most part undocumented, but they are also imbued with their own set of methodological problems associated with their manufacture, use, export and deposition. Pictorial material can distort our view of the material past if not treated with caution and appropriately contextualized. If vase paintings are sifted and sorted, however, so that their point of reference can be isolated, as is here attempted, then they can be useful for reconstructing the roles and responsibilities of women. Vase paintings are also problematic because of their lack of precision and attention to architectural detail, so that finding a spatial correlate for women’s space in them is a difficult task. Vase paintings are not substitutes for actual remains of houses, but they can no doubt help to clarify some of the issues surrounding women’s space, such as women’s activities. In particular, the elements which scholars have taken to be illustrative of the “women’s quarters” of houses and of the confined
lives of women will be assessed for architectural correlates, and will be analyzed within a symbolic framework of representation about women’s lives.

Chapters 4 and 5 are dedicated to analysis of the physical remains of dwellings in Athens and Attica, supplemented with comparable examples from other parts of Greece. The structures will be assessed for their capacity to communicate gender through an investigation of the patterning of space and activity areas. Archaeologists have sometimes approached houses as if they were empty shells, with layouts of buildings emphasized at the expense of three-dimensional proportions, windows, perspectives, decoration, etc. The layout of a building is indeed important, but it is not the only criterion in archaeological inquiry. Though the find spots of the majority of household items are not generally noted in excavation reports, when this information is available, it is invaluable for reconstructing patterns of activity within houses. The approach I take in these chapters is one that views dwellings not only as housing people, but also activities like cooking, eating, working, and socializing that leave vestiges and constitute a wealth of potential information for formulating insights into household behavior.

Locating activities, of course, is not the same as locating gender, so that a more sophisticated assessment of the architectural and artifactual evidence will be attempted by means of environment-behavior studies and ethnography. Archaeologists dig up dwellings and domestic artifacts, not social behavior, so that it is sometimes necessary to incorporate theoretical and methodological frameworks from other disciplines that provide more alternatives with which to view the data. Ethnographic studies are also integrated in order to enhance our knowledge about household behavior and to highlight potential diversity, but in no means are

---

they superimposed upon patterns of household behavior from different temporal, cultural or spatial situations.\textsuperscript{17}

\textbf{Hopes and Aims for the House:}

My hope for this study is that it will demonstrate that household behavior, and in particular that behavior associated with gender, is a feasible but also rewarding topic for investigation. The value of studying the day-to-day lives of people has positive consequences for our understanding of social dynamics, because houses are expressions of active social will rather than passive social behavior. They are active environments responsive to taste and need, and they are frequently organized to accommodate the social habits of people.\textsuperscript{18} Architecture is a reflection of behavior and spatial use, which, in turn, is a reflection of culture.

In order to answer the questions we are asking about behavior along gender lines, we need to have the confidence to move beyond the study of post-holes,\textsuperscript{19} as is here attempted. Contemporary theory of the household in the social sciences, however, has had little impact on the theory or practice of archaeology. Social approaches to the built environment emphasize the social processes that produce space and the reproduction of the social order through the use of the built environment, and these are indispensable for this study. The built environment can be viewed as a nonverbal way of communicating cultural norms and social order, but also as a text that can be “read” and analyzed according to its own vocabulary, grammar and syntax. The house can act as a “sociogram,”\textsuperscript{20} not simply of a family, but of something much more, of a

\textsuperscript{17} This has, on occasion, been done. See, for instance, Walker, “Housing and Women,” 84.
\textsuperscript{20} Hillier and Hanson, \textit{Space}, 159.
social system. This dissertation moves beyond mud-bricks, tiles and post-holes to view the house as a meaningful product of human building activities related to the social.

Gender archaeology, despite the fact that it has not been the catalyst it should be in standard archaeological practice and interpretation, is an improved archaeology that helps to expose the ways in which an emphasis on dichotomies and on power and prestige has obscured gender in the past.\(^\text{21}\) Archaeology has been and still is dependent upon other social sciences for much of its theoretical insight into gender, and this means that as an archaeologist working on gender an analytical framework must be developed that incorporates methods and frameworks from other fields.\(^\text{22}\) The paucity of evidence from antiquity in general makes it especially necessary for those interested in recovering women’s lived reality to engage in interdisciplinary research efforts, as this study tries to do.

In general, analyses of material culture in cultural context have increased, though textual analysis continues to dominate studies of gender in the field of Classics.\(^\text{23}\) The written sources tell us about power relations between men and women and about the attitudes of elite men, as much as they do about the use of space. We have tended to work in “disciplinary isolation,” neglecting the research and methods of other disciplines that can provide more alternatives and more perspectives with which to view the evidence. In the case of the home environment, there is a large quantity of diverse and unintegrated work, and some of this, in fact, confronts problems similar to the ones this study confronts. The more types of evidence that can be weighed in an analysis, the more convincing and secure an argument can be.\(^\text{24}\)


This study tries to avoid disciplinary isolation by assessing the nature of all the evidence concerning domestic space. It attempts to move beyond the textual tyranny so common in studies of this kind, to consider theoretical work on housing, to incorporate ethnographic studies, to employ methodological frameworks in differing archaeological contexts, and to integrate Classical archaeology with other archaeologies that have a tradition of employing more anthropological approaches to the archaeological record. In this way, a more informed and comprehensive picture of the way space in Greek houses may or may not have been organized along gender lines can be pieced together.
CHAPTER 1: THE STUDY OF WOMEN IN ANTIQUITY

1.1 The First Classicists and the Study of Women

J.J. Rousseau, like other thinkers of the Enlightenment, “developed the theoretical foundations for the interrelationship between ancient and modern democracy.”25 As a theorist, Rousseau drew on Athenian, but especially Spartan constitutional features, to support his own socio-political ideas.26 In his Emile and The Social Contract, he considered Classical Athens and Sparta the archetypes for the incorporation of women into the ideal state.27 In a letter, Rousseau extends advice on whether or not public theater would be beneficial to the citizens of Geneva, remarking that “The ancients had, in general, a very great respect for women; but they showed this respect by refraining from exposing them to public judgement…They had as their maxim that the land where morals were purest was the one where they spoke the least of women, and that the best woman was the one about whom the least was said.”28 He goes on to pose the question: “Which is more honorable to women and best renders to their sex the true respect due it, the ancient way or ours?”29

Throughout the letter, Rousseau explicitly compares the ancient Greek model of decency for women to that of his own time, and expressly states his preference for the former model: “There was no common place of assembly for the two sexes; they did not pass the day together.

26 For example, see J.J. Rousseau, “Letter to M. d’Alembert on the Theater,” in Politics and the Arts, trans. A.Bloom, (Glencoe: Free Press, 1960), 133: “Thus did that Sparta, which I shall have never cited enough as the example that we ought to follow…”
27 For the Athenian model, see ibid., 88-89 and 133-135 for Sparta. For the Greek model of education, in general, see id., Emile, ou de l’Education (Frankfurt, 1762), especially 5-53.
29 Ibid., 49.
This effort not to become sated with one another made their meetings more pleasant. It is certain that domestic peace was, in general, better established and that greater harmony prevailed between man and wife than is the case today.\(^{30}\) As the above-mentioned references indicate, the history of the private family and of women has, from the Enlightenment, traditionally been presented as a moral history,\(^{31}\) regularly concentrating on the issue of the “status” or “position” of Greek women, and its bearing on contemporary European society.

Mary Wollstonecraft, one of the earliest and one of the most eminent feminists of this period, argued against Rousseau’s views in her 1792 publication *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman*. Her reproof of Rousseau’s opinion, in particular, of women’s submission to men, is explicitly yet derisively articulated: “It is acknowledged that they [women] spend many of the first years of their lives in acquiring a smattering of accomplishments: meanwhile strength of body and mind are sacrificed to libertine notions of beauty, to the desire of establishing themselves,—the only way women can rise in the world,—by marriage… they dress; they paint, and nickname God's creatures.—Surely these weak beings are only fit for a seraglio!—Can they govern a family, or take care of the poor babes whom they bring into the world?”\(^{32}\) By alluding to the so-called seclusion of women, which Wollstonecraft vehemently objected to, she was merely drawing on an idea that was current in popular culture.

As this discourse suggests, the perception of women in antiquity had already become a hotly debated issue in literary and philosophical circles of the 18\(^{\text{th}}\) century. In fact, the topic had managed to produce a considerable amount of literature even before the first Classicists attended to the matter. One such scholar was Karl A. Böttiger, who as a writer and editor, took up the

\(^{30}\) *Ibid.*, 89.


matter. Böttiger, known to posterity primarily as a Classicist and archaeologist, would later be singled out as the originator and propagator of the seclusion theory.

1.2 K.A. Böttiger and The Origins of the Secluded Woman Paradigm

The orthodox opinion of scholars that women were kept within the confines of the home seems to have been formally disseminated at least by the early 19th century.33 The creation and proliferation of the paradigm was fueled by its pertinence to contemporary concerns about property and family, and was legitimated by the supposedly universal norms and behaviors of Classical Greece. Most 19th century scholars followed in the footsteps of their predecessors – both esteemed and authoritative – blindly accepting this ideology as historic reality.34 This model was to plague work on gender in Classical antiquity for many years.

Karl Böttiger was the first Classical scholar to articulate the negative view that would later achieve canonical status. As an editor for an arts journal, Böttiger was called upon to review how the development of contemporary theater was influenced by the example of ancient Greek drama.35 His first article, which appeared in Der Teutsche Merkur in 1796, focused on the question of whether or not women in ancient Athens attended the theater.36 Böttiger sought to refute an assertion of the 16th century scholar Isaac Casaubon, who held that Athenian women

were present at dramatic performances. Böttiger argued that they would not have been present because they were, under normal circumstances, not permitted to be seen in public and rarely left their houses. He claimed that Athenian men kept their wives sequestered, and that the life of an Athenian woman was something that approached Oriental harem-slavery, what he called “orientalischen Haremssclaverei.” As a corollary to this came the assumption that the exclusion of women from public life – like the theater – was derived from the low esteem in which women were held by men.

The scholarly debate about the status of women in ancient Athens, in fact, originated from the discussion of this narrower question. Within a span of just over ten years and by means of three brief articles barely exceeding thirty pages of text, Böttiger managed to set the stage for the general and widely-held assumption that women in ancient Greece, and more specifically in Athens, were kept in almost harem-like isolation. It was the 18th century European view of the role of women in the theater, and in particular, that advanced by Böttiger, that was the firebrand that kindled the investigation of, and set the parameters for, the scholarly

---

37 I. Casaubon, Characteres ethici, sive Descriptiones morum graece (Lyons: Franciscum le Preux, 1592), on the “Characters” by Theophrastus, V.10.7.  
study of the status of women in ancient Greece.\textsuperscript{42} Though Karl Böttiger has often been neglected in the history of the field, and seems to have been “forgotten soon after his death,”\textsuperscript{43} he surely left his mark. As a frequent contributor and editor of the journals \textit{Teutsche Merkur} and \textit{Amalthea}, Böttiger was able to reach a broad audience, and as a colleague of every major figure in the cultural elite of Germany, including Goethe himself, his work was widely distributed and also well-received in literary circles.\textsuperscript{44}

The socio-political culture of the following decades helped to solidify such claims, for at this time, the strivings of feminism “were being subverted into the ideology of separate spheres and the cult of domesticity.”\textsuperscript{45} A notable example of the philosophical climate of the period is Herbert Spencer, who disparaged feminist claims to political liberties and rights by arguing that women’s “natural” place within the home was a necessary complement to the competitive world of men. He feared that women’s “softer hearts” would undermine and inhibit the realization of new forms of social excellence.\textsuperscript{46} In 1861, J.J.Bachofen formulated the central elements of the theory that where male political participation was most advanced, there one finds a heightened inequality between the sexes. Based on the assumption that politics and patriarchy worked together to deprive women of status, Bachofen argued that because Athens carried political involvement to its highest development, this condemned “…woman to a status of inferiority.”\textsuperscript{47}

\textsuperscript{42} Böttiger’s 1837 article was prompted by an article written by F.Schlegel in 1797 (“Uber die Diotima,” in \textit{Studien des Klassischen Altertums, Kritische Friedrich-Schlegel-Ausgabe}, vol.1 (Munich: F.Schoningh, 1961), 70-115) who opposed the view held by Bottiger that women in Athens were uneducated, secluded, and despised).
\textsuperscript{43} E.F.Sondermann, \textit{Karl August Bottiger. Literarischer Journalist der Goethezeit in Weimar} (Bonn: Bouvier, 1983), quote from back cover advertisement.
\textsuperscript{44} J.E.Sandys, \textit{A History of Classical Scholarship} (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1908), 70, 74.
\textsuperscript{45} Katz, “Theater,” 121.
Fustel de Coulanges’ work may be said to begin where Bachofen’s left off. Fustel claimed that the state emerged only through the demolition of the family-based form of society, which, according to him, had the most repercussions for women.\footnote{D.N.Fustel de Coulanges, *The Ancient City: A Study on the Religion, Laws and Institution of Greece and Rome*, trans. W. Small (Boston: Lee & Shepard, 1896), 255, 33-39, 57-59, 77, 106.} Friedrich Engels was no misogynist, though he too argued that the state emerged at the expense of family groups, and that along with the defeat of the family came the defeat of woman.\footnote{F.Engels, *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State* (Boston: New England Free Press, 1884), 129-130.} For Engels, Classical Athens served as a useful illustration of the dangers of excessive domination of the public over the private sphere, and used this to highlight the inequities in his own society.\footnote{See S.M. Spencer-Wood, “Household,” 168; *ead., The Archaeology of Inequality*, ed. R.H.McGuire and R.Paynter (Cambridge: Blackwell, 1991), 223.}

Mainstream Victorian theory seems to have cast the sexes into dichotomous and contrastive terms. The ideology of separate spheres among 19\textsuperscript{th} century scholars took root because it was promoted by most of the upper and middle classes.\footnote{Ibid.} They legitimated their gender ideology by tracing its descent to Athens, but in particular, to the philosopher Aristotle, and uncritically accepted male-generated philosophical writings as historic reality. As a result of this contemporary phenomenon, scholars projected their ideology onto the cultures of the Classical world, dividing spheres, spaces and artifacts along strict gender lines.\footnote{Ibid. On this issue, see A.Vickery, “Golden Age to Separate Spheres? A Review of the Categories and Chronology of English Women’s History,” *Historical Journal* 36 (1993), 384-414. This ideology was supported by the structuralist school in anthropology founded by Levi-Strauss in the 1880s, and by earlier Enlightenment philosophers from Descartes to Locke and Rousseau (A.Nye, *Feminist Theory and the Philosophies of Man* (New York: Croom Helm, 1988), 6). See also, G.Lerner, *The Creation of Feminist Consciousness: From the Middle Ages to Eighteen-seventy* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993). This has been critiqued by L.Nixon, “Gender Bias in Archaeology,” in *Women in Ancient Societies: An Illusion of the Night*, ed. L.J.Archer, S.Fischler and M.Wyke (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1994), 8-13.} Victorian
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gender ideology – which stressed that women were at all times and everywhere domestic, irrational and subordinate – not only colored, but also was impressed upon, accounts of the past.

1.3 The Established Paradigm and “Oriental Seclusion”

Because of its relevance to the social and cultural issues of the period, the early years of the debate under Böttiger were marked by a certain intellectual enthusiasm. Böttiger’s views on women and the theater, and by association, on women in antiquity, were soon popularized by Wilhelm Becker’s historical novel Charicles. In it, Becker flatly asserted that a woman’s life was a type of slavery, confined to the prison-like gynaikonitis (women’s quarters), which was “a place of durance little differing from the Oriental harem.”53 The metaphor of the seraglio or harem had developed a widespread currency in the 18th century, and played a key role in the image of the “Orient” that was created by European scholars. By the 19th century, references to the harem became standard features in ancient Greek social histories.54

That women in ancient Greece lived in Oriental seclusion can be viewed as a topos that has fueled a debate not only about the past lived experience of women, but also a discourse about the place of women in modern bourgeois society.55 The process began at the end of the 18th century when Greece was under Turkish occupation and therefore part of the East.56 Scholars’ fascination with all things “Oriental,” together with their perception of separate spheres,

---

56 Ibid., 243.
obscured their understanding of the particular ways men and women interacted at home in ancient Greece. Christoph Meiners, in his *History of the Female Sex*, coined the term “oriental seclusion,” arguing that “in its general conduct to the sex, and its laws concerning women, [the Greeks] appeared much more closely allied to the Orientals.” He argued that, from the time of Homer, the Greeks secluded their wives and daughters like in Oriental countries, and others followed with similar views. The suggestive image of the seraglio employed by early scholars was without a doubt coupled with the negative undertones of female oppression.

Albert Trever’s *History of Ancient Civilization* helped to disseminate this view by stressing the inferior status of women in Classical Athens and their secluded existence. Grote’s standard volumes on the history of ancient Greece also propagated the model. He claimed that “The free citizen women of Athens lived in strict and almost Oriental recluseness…destitute of all mental culture and accomplishments.”

Similarly, J.P. Mahaffy’s widely read *Social Life in Greece from Homer to Alexander*, championed the view that Greek society sharply delineated public from private, and that women in ancient Athens were confined to their houses. Accordingly, Mahaffy espoused the position that believed in the “Asiatic jealousy with which women of the higher classes were locked up in imperial Athens, and the contempt with which they were systematically treated.”
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which for him represented the glorious yet costly triumph of politics and the state over the family and domestic life.\(^{63}\)

W.H.S.Jones took this position one step further, arguing that “This cramped life resulted in ignorance and lack of self-control. The Athenian lady’s virtue was a “cloistered virtue”…The physique of the race, as well as the morality (in the widest sense) of the women, must have suffered from the exclusion from open-air life and physical exercise.”\(^{64}\) In this period of historical inquiry and the burgeoning of Classics, scholars like Jones seem to have had quite the imagination. The unfounded statements one finds in the 19\(^{th}\) century scholarship about women in ancient Greece that directly reflect a fixation with contemporary notions of the Orient are inexhaustible, and obviously beyond the limits of this discussion.\(^{65}\)

The question of women’s status in ancient Greece was passed down to the 20\(^{th}\) century with much of the same moral and ideological charge as it had in earlier centuries. One example may suffice to illustrate the prevailing attitude of the time. In 1923, F.A.Wright, in a book surprisingly dedicated to the exploration of feminism in Greek literature, sought to validate the long-established theory. Wright’s main thesis is that “…the Greek world perished from one main cause, a low ideal of womanhood and a degradation of women,”\(^{66}\) and that “The position of women and the position of slaves – for the two classes went together – were the canker-spots


\(^{64}\) W.H.S.Jones, *Greek Morality in Relation to Institutions* (London: Blackie and Son, 1906), 87-88.

\(^{65}\) There is an extensive list of works that share such an opinion. Some of these are: L.Whibley, *A Companion to Greek Studies* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1905), 520-523: the Athenian wife was “perfectly negligible”; J.Donaldson, *Woman: Her Position and Influence in Ancient Greece and Rome, and among the Early Christians* (New York: Longmans, 1907), 52: a woman was “to remain inside and to be obedient to her husband”; G.Lowes-Dickinson, *The Greek View of Life* (Chautauqua: Chautauqua Press, 1909), 161: a woman’s life was full of “domestic drudge”; T.R.Glover, *From Pericles to Philip* (London: Methuen, 1917), 346: the Athenian woman was “secluded, dull, and uncompanionable.”

\(^{66}\) F.A.Wright, *Feminism in Greek Literature from Homer to Alexander* (London: Routledge, 1923), 1.
which, left unhealed, brought about the decay first of Athens and then of Greece.” 67 These arresting proclamations are found on the first page of his book and set the mood for the rest of the study. Many of Wright’s claims are similarly striking, for example, that “women were kept as slaves,” 68 and that an Athenian woman was “a harem-prisoner.” 69 Though taken to the extreme, Wright’s position that women were subjugated and segregated, mirrors the dominant opinion of most of his contemporaries. 70

Though the prevailing belief was that women in ancient Greece were suppressed and secluded, there was, even from the 19th century, considerable disagreement on the issue. Jacobs, already in 1830, challenged the orthodox view. In his essay, he made the case that segregation may have been a matter of custom rather than law, and demonstrates that the matter was even contested in his own time. 71 Given that Jacobs’ attempts to go against the grain were to no avail, it is quite difficult to see this. As we have witnessed in the works of Mahaffy and Wright, 72 the theory of women’s seclusion in ancient Greece, and, in particular, in Classical Athens, was a widespread idea featured in every major work on Classical antiquity.

The application of the harem and of “Oriental seclusion” to the condition of women in ancient Greece continued for some time. In the course of the 20th century, however, the label “Oriental” was removed from the discourse, and was thereafter referred to simply as “seclusion.” Despite its name change, the cost of such a take on the study of women in antiquity was just as high.

67 Ibid.
68 Ibid., 2.
69 Ibid., 57.
70 For example, U.von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, Griechischen Tragoedien (Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1926), 102; J.Langdon-Davies, A Short History of Women (New York: Literary Guild of America, 1927), 157, 162.
71 F.Jacobs, Vermischte Schriften (Gotha: Ettingerschen Buchhandlung, 1830), iii.254, 273, 205-206, 229, 242.
1.4 Championing and Challenging the Paradigm

A.W. Gomme’s famous polemic of 1925 was concerned with challenging the dominant opinion. Gomme declared that his goal was to prove that “there is a conflict of evidence; that much that is relevant is ignored and other evidence misunderstood and misapplied; that is, that the confidence in the prevailing view is quite unjustified.”

The historian reconsidered the orthodox view of his time, and despite his laudable efforts to draw attention to the unfounded set of assertions about the position of women, there was a prolific number of papers and books championing the opinion that women in ancient Greece led cloistered lives. In 1926, for instance, Rostovtzeff claimed that “Democracy banished women from the street to the house: the kitchen and the nursery, and the gynaecium, a special part of the house reserved for women and children, now became their sphere.” In 1941, Thomson argued that “the attitude toward women corresponded to the attitude toward slaves,” and in 1961, Bonnard made a similar analogy.

The views of Marx and Engels, which were popular at the time, helped to fuel studies of inequity, and soon, the belief that democracy and private property led to disparities between the sexes hardened into a rule. The theory was applied to the Athenian woman, who, it was argued, had been “banished from the street to the house” with the advent of democracy.

---

73 Gomme, “Women,” 1-25, esp.2 for the quote.
A.W. Gomme’s new assessment of the evidence for the lived reality of women in antiquity arrived just a few years after women obtained the right to vote. The seclusion of Greek women in women’s quarters and their subsequent “liberation” by scholars follows a clear logic: it is connected to the relationship between public and private as it developed after the Enlightenment. Meiners, for example, imagined seclusion in the house for women at a time when there was a division of public and private life in his contemporary society, where public space was to be occupied by men and private space by women. In contrast, the change of perspective toward freedom and movement, as seen in Gomme’s work, runs parallel to the fight for female emancipation. Instead of reconstructing the past, the scholars succeeded instead in bringing to light their own present.

In 1951, Kitto’s widely read *The Greeks*, followed the orthodox opinion. He remarked that “The Athenian house was divided into the ‘men’s rooms’ and the ‘women’s rooms’: and the women’s part was provided with bolts and bars.” However, Kitto expressed his reservations: “The Athenian had his faults, but...to say that he habitually treated one-half of his own race with indifference, even contempt, does not, to my mind, make sense.” Victor Ehrenberg, too, voiced concerns about the perceptions of women in ancient Greece, acknowledging the exaggeration of women’s seclusion, though still asserting woman’s subordinate role in society. Reservations about the prevailing view were insufficient to sway the conservative crowd,


however. Most contemporaries were loathe to alter their views, and continued to reiterate the same points, giving little or no attention to the apprehension expressed by Kitto, Gomme and others.\textsuperscript{83}

By this time, the discussion of women as a scholarly issue had basically degenerated into a succession of short articles.\textsuperscript{84} W.K. Lacey’s study of 1968, \textit{The Family in Classical Greece}, however, was a welcome addition, seeking to place woman and the family within a larger social framework. Lacey issued a strong call for a new social history of the Greek family and brought attention to the overstated Greek ideal. He stressed that women in Classical Athens were probably not much less well off than contemporary women.\textsuperscript{85} In general, however, Lacey’s approach shares the same tendencies as many of his predecessors, emphasizing the dismal side of an Athenian woman’s life. Scholars of women’s history had, up until that point, been able to accomplish little more than issuing caveats against the abuse of the ancient testimony and the careless reiteration of the old ideas.\textsuperscript{86} However, an outbreak of interest in all things feminine in the early 1970s,\textsuperscript{87} especially within Classics,\textsuperscript{88} breathed new life into the issue.


\textsuperscript{86} See, for example, A. Hackett and S. B. Pomeroy, “Making History: The First Sex,” \textit{Feminist Studies} 1 (1972), 97-108.

\textsuperscript{87} The second-wave Women’s Movement, also referred to as the Feminist Movement or the Women’s Liberation Movement, refers to a period of feminist activity that began in the early 1960’s through the 1970’s, and which sought to address unofficial legal inequalities, the workplace, the family, and reproductive rights. It is not surprising to find that some or all of these contemporary issues can be found to have influenced the larger part of the literature on women in antiquity in this period. See further, M. L. S. Sørensen, “On Gender Negotiation and its Materiality,” in \textit{Archaeology and Women, Ancient and Modern Issues}, ed. by S. Hamilton, R. D. Whitehouse, and K. I. Wright (Walnut Creek: Left Coast Press, 2007), 41-54; F. Davis, \textit{Moving the Mountain: the Women’s Movement in America since 1960} (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1991).

\textsuperscript{88} Some important examples from 1969 to 1979 alone: E. Burck, \textit{Die Frau in der Griechisch-Römischen Antike}
D.C. Richter’s article of 1971, though very brief, did much to bring attention to the weaknesses inherent in most papers and books published on the topic. Richter asserted that it was the preconceptions regarding the proper place of women of the late 19th and early 20th century that influenced readings of the Greek evidence, precipitating wildly exaggerated judgments about women. For Richter, the opinion that Greek women were essentially harem-prisoners, was a gross overstatement based on the distortion of the ancient evidence.\(^{89}\) He hits the mark when he duly notes: “The doors of the gynaikwn remain closed as if Gomme, Kitto and Seltman had not already shot the locks.”\(^{90}\) Richter aptly recognized the predilection of scholars for recitation of the views of previous authorities, and called upon them to cease “glibly and sententiously” holding onto this traditional view.\(^{91}\) Unfortunately, Richter opened himself to criticism by swinging the pendulum too far in the other direction, claiming that Athenian men were justified for their suspicions, given that the women were undisciplined and promiscuous.\(^{92}\) Despite the pitfalls in Richter’s argument, his paper is a demonstrative example of the lively
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\(^{89}\) Ibid., 2.

\(^{90}\) Ibid.

\(^{91}\) Ibid., 7.
scholarly climate at that time. His essay is also a reminder, however, that the advances in this field of research had been negligible, and had taken on a cyclical rather than a linear nature.

1.5 Sarah Pomeroy and the Study of Women in Antiquity

It was not until S.B. Pomeroy’s 1975 work, *Goddesses, Whores, Wives and Slaves*, that the study of women in antiquity was revived and again taken seriously. Prior to the publication, the study of women had been, broadly speaking, a minor, yet overdone topic, being included in the majority of general surveys on ancient Greece. Pomeroy’s work, in contrast, promoted a more or less holistic approach to women in antiquity, warning that any document or genre offers only a partial view, and that to understand women’s life, an assortment of evidence must be consulted and examined according to specific criteria. Pomeroy took some very important steps in addressing consistent failings in the scholarship, like the tendency of scholars to make vast overgeneralizations, and the regular presence of male bias in the modern scholarship.

In particular, Pomeroy tackled the wide divergence of scholarly opinion on the issue of women’s status, which she argued was a result of the evidence employed. She claimed that “The principal reason for the two viewpoints lies in the genre of the evidence consulted...The question of the social status of women is part of a larger dispute concerning the appropriate source of

---

Pomeroy’s admonition is fully justified given the predominantly
text-based analyses used by most scholars. She was able to demonstrate that assumptions
generated about the lived experiences of Greek women from within poetry or prose alone are
flawed, and that one cannot confuse the study of a specific, male-authored text with the study of
an entire sex within a culture.

Though Pomeroy is worthy of praise for bringing attention to the flawed methodologies
of preceding scholars and for presenting a more balanced view of the evidence, Pomeroy herself
painted a picture of a Classical Athens in which women were secluded. Like other authorities,
she exaggerated the bleaker side of their lives, which has been attributed by some to her
propensity for partial quoting or for misrepresenting the scholarship. In general, though,
Pomeroy’s work is impressive, drawing on new methods and sources of evidence. We must be
grateful to Pomeroy for attempting this material. She not only collected a massive body of
evidence on women in antiquity, but also set the standard for this field of study, which had yet to
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97 Pomeroy, Goddesses, 95. This excludes, of course, studies which examine women in the text of a specific author and reach conclusions about that author’s values, but do not claim to be speaking for the external historical reality of the author (e.g. P.A.Marquardt, “Hesiod’s Ambiguous Views of Women,” *CP* 77 (1982), 283-291). For an assessment of some of the literature on the topic, see S.B.Pomeroy, “The Study of Women in Antiquity: Past, Present, and Future,” *The American Journal of Philology* 112 (1991), 263-268.
98 For this opinion, see S.K.Dickison, “Women in Antiquity: A Review Article,” *Helios* 4 (1976), 62; E.Fantham, “Review,” *Phoenix* 30 (1976), 80. Pomeroy claims that Athenian houses were “dark, squalid, and unsanitary” (Goddesses, 79), based on a study by Wycherley (*How the Greeks Built Cities* (London: Macmillan, 1962), 177), though Wycherley also makes it a point to explain that “the divergence” between public and private buildings “must not be exaggerated.” Pomeroy also claims that women were only trained in the domestic arts (Goddesses, 74), though scholars like W.K.Lacey (*The Family in Classical Greece* (London: Thames & Hudson, 1968), 163) and F.A.G.Beck (*Greek Education 450-350 BC* (New York: Barnes and Noble, 1964), 85-88) have given good evidence to demonstrate otherwise.
be formulated in any unified fashion. Her book was unique for its time, and is still considered an essential text for anyone interested in the study of Greek women.

The explosion of interest in “women in antiquity” in the 1970’s provided abundant material for reappraising the traditional view. In spite of this, the conclusions were the same, largely due to the fact that the basic principles on which the discussion rested remained unquestioned. There are, however, a few notable exceptions. In 1978, Signe Isager, in a very brief article about the so-called women’s quarters, challenged Pomeroy’s interpretation of the literary sources. Based on a handful of texts, Isager argued that this area of the house served as a bedroom for unmarried women, but that it was not used to confine women during the day by means of a bolted door. Despite her new perspective on the literary evidence, Isager’s statements were mostly overlooked by contemporary scholars. Apart from this independent and isolated voice, the inherited paradigm held firm.

The scholarly dialogue inevitably led to frustrations about the entire issue itself. In 1984, Pauline Schmitt-Pantel declared that “An assessment of the last ten years’ great profusion of studies demonstrates, in my view, that any treatment of Greek women as an isolated category leads to a methodological impasse.” Though the stalemate did not impede the production of
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102 *Ibid.* 39-40. Isager’s reasoning is that the water and fire sources of the house were located on the ground floor, so that if the women’s quarters were on the upper storey it would be difficult to conduct daily chores.
103 In M.R.Lefkowitz and M.B.Fant’s source book (*Women’s Life in Greece and Rome, A Source Book in Translation*) (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1982), there is no mention of Isager’s 1978 article, though several works published after 1978 have been included in the book (e.g. M.Beard, “The Sexual Status of Vestal Virgins,” *JRS* 70 (1980), 12-27). The general disregard with which scholars of women’s studies have treated Isager’s article is unacceptable, but may be explained by its length (three pages) or even perhaps by its language (Dutch).
works on the topic, with the late 80’s and 90’s seeing a large number of studies, there were some serious impediments. There was some truth to Schmitt-Pantel’s appraisal of the methods employed by scholars, and this can be witnessed in the way that many utilized the exact same data but came to radically different assessments of women. Blake Tyrrell, for instance, used myth to argue that “The outer door of the house was the boundary for the free Greek woman.” Mary Lefkowitz, however, uses similar evidence to come to the conclusion that “myth portrays marriage and motherhood…as the best conditions most women desire, and in which women can be best respected by society and happiest in themselves.” The issue at hand seems to have been not so much the type of evidence that was being used, but the ways in which it was approached and handled by each scholar.

For the most part, the methodology employed did not change, nor did the orthodox view. In Women in the Classical World, Elaine Fantham stressed the secluded lives of women, for example, and Sue Blundell in Women in Ancient Greece, highlighted the strict division between public and private spheres, though she judged the seclusion of women to be an ideal that was probably seldom put into practice. More recently, however, Cynthia Patterson assessed the methods employed by scholars, criticizing those who used Greek moral and ideological
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writings about men and women to form direct conclusions about reality.\textsuperscript{110} It has now, a decade later, become more apparent that the widespread belief of women’s seclusion and the assumption that domestic space was strictly gendered, is a result of scholars’ dependence on, and confidence in, the ancient testimony. This has resulted in a general disregard, or at times, rejection of all other records. Material evidence in the form of vase paintings, house plans, and artifact assemblages, constitute a wealth of data that has only sporadically been exploited. Conceptions like the seclusion of women that persist in literature,\textsuperscript{111} are due, in part, to the unyielding philological tradition and the reluctance to consider material remains as independent evidence.

1.6 New Approaches: Material Evidence

There was, and still is, a tendency among scholars with a focus on women in antiquity to neglect the material evidence. A number of studies, however, have gone beyond the literature, taking into account representations on vases, archaeological remains of houses, and household artifacts, in order to examine the daily lives of ancient Greek women. One such study, for instance, is Eva Keuls’ 1985 publication \textit{The Reign of the Phallus}. Keuls used an assortment of evidence, both literary and iconographical, in an attempt to demonstrate that Greek society was oppressive towards, and denigrating of, women.\textsuperscript{112} Her book highlights the disconcerting elements of ancient Greek society, which can be nicely summed up: “In the case of a society dominated by men who sequester their wives and daughters, denigrate the female role…it is not inappropriate to refer to a reign of the phallus. Classical Athens was such a society.”\textsuperscript{113} Eva

\textsuperscript{110} C.B. Patterson, \textit{The Family in Greek History} (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1998), 126.

\textsuperscript{111} For the most recent example, see \textit{Worshiping Women: Ritual and Reality in Classical Athens}, ed. N. Kaltsas and A. Shapiro (New York: Alexander S. Onassis Public Benefit Foundation, 2008), which does not even mention that there is considerable debate on the issue of women’s quarters.

\textsuperscript{112} Keuls notes, in fact, that one of her motivations for writing mainly on Athens, is because “its phallocracy…was severe and crass…” (\textit{Phallus}, 12, also 1, 6, 30, 87, 98-99, 108-110, 116, 204).

\textsuperscript{113} \textit{Ibid.}, 1.
Keuls supports and furthers the argument for gendered domestic space, arguing that “even architecture reflected the genital notions concerning the societal roles of men and women.”114 She makes extensive use of depictions of women on Attic vases to make her case that Athenian women were locked up in separate women’s quarters.

According to Keuls’ analysis, the vase paintings contain visual codes, a type of shorthand, which can be deciphered. For example, representations of seated women in front of a closed double door or beside a wool-basket, are, for Keuls, illustrative of the women’s quarters.115 One can find fault with much of the methodology Keuls employs in her treatment of the vases,116 but most alarming is her firm conviction that certain iconographical features – such as double doors – point to separate women’s quarters and nothing else. One can make the case that closed double doors could suggest a number of different settings. The methodological issues that confront a scholar dealing with vase painting are immense, and these are conspicuously absent in Keuls’ publication.117 This is the point that Sian Lewis raises in her 2002 study. Lewis lays emphasis on the fact that the vases with so-called domestic scenes have not been unearthed in domestic contexts, but, rather, were found mostly in burials.118 She also argues that vase paintings become more and more indistinct in terms of setting and subject matter, and that many times it is almost impossible to decipher them.119 The sharp and discerning manner with which Lewis deals with vase painting is a far cry from Keuls’ more straightforward approach.

114 Ibid., 97, 210-213.
116 A fine example of this is her use of Baroque and Dutch painting to determine the symbolic meaning of a depiction of brides’ slippers on Attic vases. See Keuls, Phallus, 121-122.
117 Keuls, Phallus, 3: “…the basic meaning of a vase painting is clear…”
119 Lewis, Athenian Woman, 130. Lewis claims that this begins in the mid-5th century B.C. and continues until the end of red-figure vase painting. For ambiguity in vase painting in general, see also D.Williams, “Women on Athenian Vases: Problems of Interpretation,” in Images of Women in Antiquity, ed. A.Cameron and A.Kuhrt.
However, vase paintings are only one of the many avenues that have been pursued in the discourse on gendered space. Susan Walker was one of the first scholars to incorporate actual remains of excavated houses, yet Walker’s main objective is to find ways of “assimilating the archaeological evidence about women and housing…to that acquired from other sources.” To be more precise, the sources she refers to are almost entirely made up of written documents. Rather than giving the archaeological data its due as independent evidence, Walker cites literary passages extensively and imposes these onto the physical remains, championing the view that Greek society was “practising purdah,” and that women were confined to “cramped and dreary quarters.”

Walker argues that storerooms, rooms with hearths and rooms with loom weights were those set out for women, and plots out male and female space in the floor plans of the houses. Even though these reconstructions were for a long time widely accepted, we must be apprehensive about Walker’s approach. Firstly, because women were likely to make use of certain areas of a house does not merit an interpretation of mutually-exclusive spaces for men and women. Moreover, a tiny sample size of Greek houses together with an out-of-context
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121 Ibid., 81.
123 Walker, “Women and Housing,” 87-90, Figs.6.2b, 6.3b, 6.4b, and 6.5b.
124 E. Fantham et al., Women in the Classical World: Image and Text (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994), 104, Fig.3.17; Hoepfner and Schwandner, Haus, 22-50, Fig.33; Pomeroy, Xenophon Oeconomicus, 296.
ethnographic comparison, do not make for a thorough analysis. These are only a few of the many problems.

Walker’s questionable approach to dividing household space and her penchant for forcing the literary sources upon the archaeological remains, are trends that continued to prevail in the discussion of gendered space. One of the best examples of this rather static approach towards Greek housing is Hoepfner and Schwander’s Haus und Stadt im klassischen Griechenland. The authors subdivide houses into house types (Typenhäuser) and assign these types to different cities, but more importantly, they assign spaces exclusively to women in all of these houses despite the lack of adequate data. In spite of this, the last ten years or so have seen more guarded and discerning methods when looking at the archaeological remains. In the 1990’s, papers written by archaeologists like Michael Jameson and Lisa Nevett investigated domestic space in Greek cities. Michael Jameson challenged the view held by Susan Walker and others, that seclusion of women is visible in the organization of space and detectable in the archaeological remains of houses. He stressed the adaptability of household space, noting that

---

125 Walker, “Women and Housing,” 84.
127 Ibid., 62, 179, 231, 273.
most furniture and equipment seems to have been portable, and that the function of few rooms can be identified by their plan or construction.\textsuperscript{129}

Lisa Nevett adopted an intermediate stance in the debate, neither entirely challenging nor fully championing the existence of separate women’s quarters in Greek houses.\textsuperscript{130} She justified this position by emphasizing the limited nature of and variability in the extant architectural remains of houses, as well as the lack of any “systematic attempt to establish the material correlates which would allow us to identify such a room in the archaeological record.”\textsuperscript{131} Despite her caution, Nevett’s work conveys the great potential of material remains. She maintains that there is a richness of data that “can and should be recovered from the archaeological context,” but that such classes of finds are often disregarded.\textsuperscript{132} What Nevett is referring to are the mundane artifacts of day-to-day life that have been overlooked in archaeological reports and publications in favor of more eye-catching finds. Even when such data is accessible, one must be sure to account for accretion and depletion processes during the habitation, abandonment, and post-abandonment phases of archaeological sites, which can often

\textsuperscript{129} Jameson, “Domestic Space,” 98-101, 104: “Attempts to divide space along these lines are arbitrary…”


skew reconstructions of household activities.\textsuperscript{133} The selective and discriminatory reports of archaeological remains Nevett describes is what sometimes prevents us from addressing certain questions as to the overall picture of life at home in Greek cities. With a few exceptions,\textsuperscript{134} Nevett’s evaluation of the present nature of archaeological inquiry is accurate, which is why it is in need of serious reconsideration.

Archaeologists like Lisa Nevett and Michael Jameson have succeeded in bringing attention not only to the importance of material evidence for the study of the use of space and domestic activities, but also its potential for exploring larger-scale behavior.\textsuperscript{135} Up to this point, the systematic study of the domestic realm undeservedly held a peripheral position in Classical scholarship. The investigation of structural remains has the potential to lead to an understanding of cultural patterning of space, but it does not necessarily have the potential to lead to an understanding of the behavior of those who inhabited them. Analyses based on architectural remains alone cannot form a coherent picture of the setting in which social relationships took place. Houses cannot entirely inform us about the people who once occupied them, and they cannot readily expose the attitudes and ideas of a society. Instead, by avoiding “disciplinary


\textsuperscript{134} Only a few sites with domestic architecture have been meticulously published. Most notable is the site of Halieis (Ault, *Halieis II*) and to some extent Olynthos (Cahill, *Olynthus*). For some attempts at using artifact assemblages for studying domestic architecture, see B. A. Ault, “Classical Houses and Households: An Architectural and Artifactual Study” (PhD diss., Indiana University, 1994), and L. C. Nevett, “Variation in the Form and Use of Domestic Space” (PhD diss., Cambridge University, 1992).

isolation,” and approaching the problem in a more holistic manner, by combining material and non-material evidence and theoretical and methodological frameworks, we can improve our familiarity with the realities of daily life at the household level and in a broader social context.

1.7 New Avenues: Gender Theory and Space

To a large extent, Classical archaeology and art history have lagged far behind in recognizing and accepting the legitimacy of feminist scholarship. Unlike other disciplines, Classical archaeology is quite late in applying feminist perspectives to the evidence. While anthropologists and other social scientists published influential works specifically on gender, archaeologists remained quiet. For the most part, Classical archaeology has slotted women into conventional interpretive frameworks, instead of employing the now vast literature on gender in other disciplines or developing new ways for looking at the evidence. This has sometimes been called the “add women” or “add women and stir” method, and quite rightly so. Despite well over two hundred scholarly articles or books on the topic in the past twenty years, serious and informed outlooks on gender in mainstream Classical archaeology are far from plentiful.

---


The study of gender has received an undeserved amount of criticism and an unfair assessment. The sentiment can best be demonstrated by Paul Bahn’s stinging evaluation of gender studies: “The latest outbreak…is gender archaeology, which is actually feminist archaeology (a new racket for the girls)…but the bandwagon shouldn’t be allowed to roll too far…before the empresses’ lack of clothes is pointed out by gleeful cynics.”\textsuperscript{141} Bahn’s tongue in cheek approach to the issue conveys the skeptical attitude of most of his peers. One explanation for the lack of gender research in archaeology is its marginalization based on the belief that gender is inherently inaccessible in archaeological contexts. Lewis Binford and others have argued that it is futile to analyze such concepts because they are too complex to reconstruct with any reliability, and that those who pursue such projects cannot be said to be conducting scientific archaeology.\textsuperscript{142} In other words, the premise is that we will never “see” gender in the material remains.\textsuperscript{143}

For many archaeologists with a materialist or processual approach, gender seems intangible and abstract, too far removed from more traditional methods of interpretation. Post-processual archaeologists, however, who often develop and apply social and symbolic theory in archaeological research, disagree. K.S.Lesick, for instance, has made the case that archaeologists study the interaction between humanity and material forms, and that these material forms act as templates to structure thoughts. In other words, the material is affected by the immaterial. He suggests that using gender concepts to structure interpretation is no more

\textsuperscript{141} P.Bahn, “Bores, Bluffers and Wankas: Some Thoughts on Archaeology and Humour,” \textit{Archaeological Review from Cambridge} 11 (1991), 321.
artificial than relying on typologies based on perceived usage, form, or material composition. If gender, which is sometimes historically constructed, also affects the material record, then there is enormous potential for Classical archaeologists to explore it. The scant evidence from antiquity that pertains to women makes gender theory, as part of an interdisciplinary approach, necessary for those interested in recovering women’s lived reality. If an archaeology of gender is to be realized, some degree of acceptance of both methodological and theoretical approaches is required.

One field in which gender theory has played an essential role for some time now is the study of physical space. Amos Rapoport laid the foundations for the symbolic study of space, arguing that dwellings are more than physical structures, they are institutions and cultural phenomena, whose built form is influenced more by socio-cultural factors than by climate, technology or economics. In other words, culture is grounded in space, and how a group designs its housing relates in some way to its cultural habits. Rapoport argued that the built environment provides visual, aural or even olfactory cues whereby people judge or interpret the situation and act accordingly. Put another way, the built environment encodes social information, which is in turn decoded by the users. That is, architecture loosely contains behavior.


For Rapoport, the purpose of organizing space, and therefore time, is to arrange and structure communication, and with it, interaction, dominance or avoidance. If, for example, there are rules separating women from men, then there should be devices or regulations to maintain that separation. A variety of physical mechanisms, such as barriers and entrances, and non-physical mechanisms, such as etiquette and depersonalization, work to control unwanted interaction in subtle ways. Rapoport demonstrated how architecture is “symbolic technology” that not only provides a setting for certain activities, but communicates information and encodes value systems, providing a framework for human action and behavior.

Susan Kent was one of the first to apply Rapoport’s theories to actual architectural remains. She argued that architecture, like language, may be considered a symbolic system that expresses and reinforces social structure. Artifacts, which are found inside a built environment, are also part of this system, because they are outcomes of cultural processes. In her case study of the Minoan settlement of Myrtos in Crete, Susan Kent demonstrated that when combined with the analysis of architectural and artifactual remains, there is great potential for the symbolic study of space.

Michael Jameson’s work on urban space incorporated many of Rapoport’s models, and made the connection between household space and social conceptions. Donald Sanders also brought behavior into the discussion, claiming that individual behavioral decisions, which reflect

153 Ibid., 53-71.
more general cultural values, are embodied in the formation and use of the built environment.\textsuperscript{155} He describes the ways in which architecture conveys meanings through sign systems established by cultural conventions, which, in turn, act as cues for behavioral response. Though houses are frequently organized to accommodate the social habits of people,\textsuperscript{156} we must not, however, think of structures and their contents as road signs which predict what type of behavior actually takes place within them. Even Rapoport himself admitted that the built environment does not determine behavior, but instead facilitates or inhibits it.\textsuperscript{157} In this vein, we should view houses as active environments responsive to social will and necessity, rather than as neutral containers of behavior.

Studies dealing with gender and space, in particular, are of prime importance for this investigation because of the way they have dealt with the question of how physical space structures social relations.\textsuperscript{158} The physicality of architecture may be used to formulate social relations by providing a physical opportunity for either inclusion or exclusion, though even this is dependent on the occupants, who can either choose to accept or reject it. By integrating gender studies, archaeology has the power not only to effectively address how physical space

\begin{thebibliography}{99}
\end{thebibliography}
becomes a “cultural landscape,”\textsuperscript{159} but also more specifically how gender affects and is affected by spatial organization.

Houses have been hailed as the “archive of antiquity,”\textsuperscript{160} because the study of houses acts as a counter-balance to the political and military histories of great men, and calls attention to actual lived experiences. We are no longer satisfied with history that tells us about imperialism but not slavery, military generals but not vase-painters, and temples but not private houses. Accounts of Classical Greece have thus far been built on lopsided foundations, but a fuller and more complex assessment of domestic space and women can be achieved by rejecting disciplinary isolation, slanted perspectives and narrow approaches. We must employ every piece of evidence at our disposal – theoretical, material and textual – so that we may draw a clearer picture from the haze that was the lived reality of women in ancient Greece.

\textsuperscript{159} M.L.S. Sørensen, \textit{Gender Archaeology} (Malden: Polity Press, 2000), 155.
\textsuperscript{160} G.P.R. Metraux, “Ancient Housing: Oikos and Domus in Ancient Greece and Rome,” \textit{Architectural History} 58 (1999): 400.
CHAPTER 2: READING GENDER IN THE LITERARY SOURCES

2.1 The *Gynaikonitis* in Literature

Historians of ancient architecture have been plagued by the apparent lack of any settled usage or standard meaning of many architectural terms found in the literary sources; the women’s quarters, or *gynaikonitis*, is among them. It is commonly acknowledged that ancient authors took little interest in precision when defining terms, if this is done at all, but were instead more concerned with the literary effect than with the technical exactitude of their works. In fact, most texts that make reference to the *gynaikonitis* deal only incidentally with the form and arrangement of space in Greek houses; domestic architecture is featured mostly as a setting for other more central issues.

The term *gynaikonitis* is one that is fraught with interpretive difficulties, like so many other Greek architectural terms, but is perhaps even more problematic than many others because of its association with the broader topic of women’s confinement. The word *gynaikonitis* is found in various literary genres; it is mentioned in architectural treatises, in philosophical dialogues and even in law court speeches. Depending on its literary context, it can take on a number of different meanings: a family’s living quarters, an area for women and often children, or even a space reserved for household slaves. The term *gynaikonitis* is referred to in several literary works, but is most fully developed in three texts: Xenophon’s *Oeconomicus*, Lysias’ *On the Murder of Eratosthenes* and Vitruvius’ *de Architectura*.

---

2.2 Defining Men’s and Women’s Space

The term *gynaikonitis* has been often defined by what it is not. It is most frequently found in association with, but also set off against, the word *andronitis*. According to its use in the texts, the *andron* was a room in a house that was used for formal banqueting; it is often translated as a dining room. The *andronitis* is a clear cognate of *andron*, but it is a feminine noun, whereas the term *andron* takes a masculine definite article. The *andronitis* seems to differ from the *andron* in that it refers to an area rather than to a specific room of a house; it, like its cognate, is also frequently contrasted to the *gynaikonitis*. For example, when consulting the word *andronitis* in a lexicon for its definition, the word *gynaikonitis* is given as its opposite, or antonym, without any explanation.

Only the *andron*, the men’s dining room, has a clear function and a somewhat clear form. The *andron* often has characteristic features, both in the textual and archaeological record, which clearly identify it as a place where guests dine and unwind. For example, in Xenophon’s *Symposium*, a dinner party (ἐστίν θανάτου) takes place in such a space, and in Aeschylus’ *Libation Bearers*, guests are directed to the *andron* so that they may rest. On the other hand, it is clear from the literary sources that this was not a space in which men routinely dined; they did not eat here alone every night when there were no guests to be entertained. Instead, this seems to have been a space reserved for special occasions.

Not all houses seem to have had an *andron*, however. In Plato’s *Symposium*, for example, no reference is made to the room in which the male gathering is held. The word is not employed in Xenophon’s *Oeconomicus* either; the text refers to a set of rooms called the
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162 For example, Xen. Symp. 1.4; Aesch. Ag. 244 and Lib. 712; Eur. Her. 954; Hdt. 1.34.
163 Xen. Symp. 1.4; Aesch. Lib. 712-714.
διαίτητήρια, which were the living spaces for the family, given the meaning of its correlated noun δίαιτα.\textsuperscript{165} These rooms are also decorated (κεκαλωσισμένα), suggesting that they were meant to be seen, and perhaps took on a public function on special occasions, like the andrones. Not only does the passage suggest that not all houses had andrones – even if they were quite large houses – but also that dining could be quite flexible.

Dining could have taken place informally in the kitchen, in the courtyard if the weather was fair, or perhaps in a more private area of the house like the upper storey. In Lysias’ speech On the Murder of Eratosthenes, Euphiletus does not mention that his house has an andron; his dinner guest eats with him on the second storey of his house (ἀναβάντες εἰς τὸ ύπερῷον ἐδείπνοομεν).\textsuperscript{166} Though one could attribute this to the alteration of space in the house, he gives no indication whatsoever that his house had a specific room for dining, even under normal circumstances; he mentions that he and his wife dined upstairs together as well, implying that the space was not reserved for male dinner parties.\textsuperscript{167}

While the term andron has an identifiable meaning, the word andronitis does not; it is obviously a cognate of andron, but its definition is much more convoluted. In Xenophon’s Oeconomicus, the contrast between the gynaikonitis and andronitis is highlighted. Isomachus’ house is a kind of idealized arrangement of space; it is built for storage and offers a vast system of categorization of disparate items; an infinite number of objects can be stored and easily located. Isomachus and his wife establish a carefully delineated taxonomy based on a series of separations and divisions. Clothing, bedding and footwear is separated along gender lines (μετὰ ταύτα κόσμου γυναικός τόν εἰς ἑορτάς διηροῦμεν, ἐσθήτα ἀνδρός τήν εἰς ἑορτάς καὶ

\textsuperscript{165} Xen. Oec. 9.4. See also LSJ\textsuperscript{9} s.v. δίαιτα (‘way of living’).
\textsuperscript{166} Lys. 1.22.
\textsuperscript{167} Lys. 1.11-12. Also, dining rooms like the τρίκλων συγγενείας (Athen. Deipn. 71e-f quoting Men. Thyr.) could be used by the family at large.
Each group is, in turn, assigned its own specific site within the house, its “natural” place, with the result that one space does not infringe on another. Isomachus’ storage system is one that designates and orders, but also separates. He does not clearly explain, however, what distinguishes the bedding that belongs in the andronitis from the bedding that belongs in the gynaikonitis, though a bolted door (θύρα βαλανωτῇ ὑρισμένῃ ἀπὸ τῆς ἄνδρωνίτιδος) suggests that the objects contained in them were of considerable value.

The gynaikonitis and andronitis may have been separate spaces, even sometimes separated by a bolted door, but we should not yet identify either as a particular room or a series of rooms in a fixed location, nor for that matter, as specifically meant to separate all female and male members of a household. The andron, as we have seen, is not present in all houses; it was a special room designed to accommodate special dinner parties. Members of a household could dine in other rooms of the house on a daily basis, and often, together.

2.3 Vitruvius’ *De Architectura* and the Greek House

Vitruvius is sometimes loosely referred to as an architect, but it is more accurate to describe him as a codifier of existing architectural practice; he is the first Roman for whom we have surviving records for this field. For the greater part of his career Vitruvius served, not as what we would call an architect, but as military engineer in Julius Caesar’s legions in the 1st
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century B.C., responsible for designing catapults, siege engines, forts and walls. His treatise on architecture is not a handbook or survey of the architecture of his own or any other time, but rather a treatise on architecture as a liberal art. The architectural historian Frank Brown has argued that his principles are at once true to the realities of his time yet abstract enough to serve a variety of aesthetic agendas.

As a source for Greek architecture, Roman treatise writer, Vitruvius, is problematic, but his De Architectura is the most comprehensive architectural text surviving from antiquity and the only such text to survive. It covers such diverse subjects as the construction of harbors, clocks, aqueducts, water pumps and siege engines, as well as construction materials, ornamentation and different finishes and colors. For Vitruvius, architecture is concerned with the entire man-made environment, with man’s manipulation of natural materials and forces, and with the laws that govern man and nature. Only a tiny fraction of the topics he covered would today be regarded as actually belonging to architecture. The De Architectura, however, gives the longest account we have of the form of a Greek house.

The sources Vitruvius consulted are highly debatable. Most of the written sources Vitruvius claims that he has employed are Greek, and these are almost entirely made up of specialist commentaries on specific buildings and monographs on technical problems. Vitruvius seems to have synthesized such Greek treatises from the period 350 to 100 B.C. and supplemented this by adding his own lessons from his personal experiences. An awareness of

174 *Ibid.*, 17-18. There are 42 source books that Vitruvius lists (Vitr. 7 preface 12 and14).
local peculiarities in Spain, Gaul, Asia Minor and Greece is probably a combined product of his experience with Caesar and of diligent tourism.\(^{175}\)

Some scholars, however, have argued that Vitruvius probably had no real source for Greek housing, and that in his description of domestic architecture, he used an amalgam of hearsay about the function of Greek houses together with contemporary examples of large-scale houses in Italy and Asia Minor.\(^{176}\) In fact, it is debated whether or not Vitruvius ever left Italy. Scholars have argued that he knew about Greek architecture only from books and this is the reason for the occasional errors he makes.\(^{177}\) Even if Vitruvius had visited Greece, the treatise was written in the 1\(^{st}\) century B.C. when architectural forms and principles in Greece had already undergone some significant changes, and these will be discussed below.

Vocabulary and terminology is recognized as a major problem as well. Vitruvius is often working with Greek terms, and it is unclear whether or not he understands the meanings of these terms in their original sense. What he often does is transliterate the Greek and then briefly explain what a terms means in a Greek context and how this compares to a Roman context, though he is not always clear. In fact, Vitruvius himself notes the inconsistency in terminology. He fully acknowledges that the technical terms used for household spaces are different in Greek than they are in Latin and can often signify different things.\(^{178}\)

There are a number of terms that concern our discussion and that Vitruvius employs in his treatise. Of course, the obvious one is the *gynaeconitis*, but there is also the *andronitis, oecus*


\(^{177}\) For instance, Vitruvius claims that the Temple of Olympian Zeus in Athens was hypaethral, though it was unfinished when he wrote about it and partially in ruins while building had stopped (Vitr. 3.2.8). The lack of first-hand knowledge would also explain the scarcity of monuments from classical Greece as opposed to contemporary ones from Asia Minor. Many of the architects who worked in Asia Minor would have spent time in Rome in this period.

\(^{178}\) Vitr. 6.7.5 ff.
and thalamos, among others. He uses these terms in his discussion of the form of the Greek house, with particular attention paid to the gynaeconitis and andronitis. Concerning the gynaeconitis, Vitruvius says the following:

In his locis introrsus constituuntur oeci magni, in quibus matres familiarum cum lanificis habent sessionem. In prostadis autem dextra ac sinistra cubicula sunt conlocata, quorum unum thalamos, alterum amphithalamos dicitur. Circum autem in porticibus triclinia cotidiania, cubicula, etiam cellae familiaricae constituuntur. Haec pars aedificii gynaeconitis appellatur.

Hereabouts, towards the inner side, are the large rooms in which mistresses of houses sit with their wool spinners. To the right and left of the prostas there are chambers, one of which is called the thalamos, the other the amphithalamos. All round the colonnades are dining rooms for everyday use, chambers, and rooms for the slaves. This part of the house is termed gynaeconitis.\footnote{Vitr. 6.7.2. See, M.H. Morgan, trans., \textit{Vitruvius, the Ten Books on Architecture} (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1914), 186.}

Vitruvius describes the gynaikonitis as a large area with various rooms – workrooms, dining rooms and chambers – that are focused around an inner court. The private nature of this area of the house is stressed; the rooms of the gynaeconitis are arranged around an inner court, that is, around a court that is far removed from the main street entrance.

Emphasis is also placed on functionality; there are rooms devoted for household work, dining rooms that are to be used for taking casual meals, and chambers reserved for the slaves. In fact, Vitruvius’ passage on the gynaeconitis has an uncanny resemblance to Isomachus’ encyclopedic system of storage in Xenophon’s \textit{Oeconomicus}, where objects are grouped by type and function and every item has its proper place; the success of the whole household system
Vitruvius demonstrates that areas of activity were divided in the house, whereby each room and area had its own special function. Concerning the gendered division of space and labor, Vitruvius tells us only that there were rooms reserved for the lady of the house and her servants for household work; there is no statement, however, that suggests that the *gynaeconitis* was intended for women only.

Of the *andronitis*, which is contrasted to the *gynaeconitis* by way of its position, Vitruvius says this:

Coniunguntur autem his domus ampliores habentes lautiora peristylia…Habent autem eae domus vestibula egregia et ianuas proprias cum dignitate porticus…ad meridiem vero spectantes oecos quadratos ita ampla magnitudine, uti faciliter in eo quattuor tricliniiis stratis ministrationum ludorumque operis locus possit esse spaciosus. In his oecis fiunt virilia convivia; non enim fuerat institutum matres familiarum eorum moribus accumbere. Haec autem peristylia domus andronitides dicuntur, quod in his viri sine interpellationibus mulieum versantur. Praeterea dextra ac sinistra domunculae constituuntur habentes proprias ianuas, triclinia et cubicula comoda, uti hospites advenientes non in peristylia sed in ea hospitalia recipiantur. Nam cum fuerunt Graeci delicatiores et fortuna opulentiores, hospitibus advenientibus instruebant triclinia, cubicula, cum penu cellas...

In connection with these there are ampler sets of apartments with more sumptuous peristyles...Such apartments have fine entrance courts with imposing front doors of their own...to the south, large square rooms of such generous dimensions that four sets of dining couches can easily be arranged in them, with plenty of room for serving and for amusements. Men's dinner parties are held in these large rooms; for it was not the practice, according to Greek custom, for the mistress of the house to be present. On the contrary, such peristyles are called the men's apartments, since in them the men can stay without interruption from the women. Furthermore, small sets of apartments are built to
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180 See Xen. *Oec*. 8.13, 8.20, 9.6-8. Also note Vitruvius’ attention to weather and the seasons (6.4.2), which is paralleled in Xenophon (*Oec*. 9.4).
the right and left, with front doors of their own and suitable dining rooms and chambers, so that guests from abroad need not be shown into the peristyles, but rather into such guests' apartments. For when the Greeks became more luxurious, and their circumstances more opulent, they began to provide dining rooms, chambers, and store-rooms of provisions for their guests from abroad…

The description Vitruvius gives us of the *andronitis* is something different. The area of the house that is called the *andronitis* is one which is devoted to entertaining; there are larger rooms, lavish peristyles, store rooms, dining rooms devoted to entertaining guests, and guest rooms to accommodate visitors from abroad. Clearly, Vitruvius meant to emphasize the public nature of this wing of the house and to contrast this to the *gynaeconitis*. Vitruvius asserts that *andrones* were used only for men and thus fittingly named because women were not allowed to enter them. Cornelius Nepos, writing in the 1st century B.C., follows the same line of thought as Vitruvius. He notes the discrepancies between Greek and Roman culture, pointing out that Greek women did not dine with men, and that they were permitted only to reside in the innermost apartment of their house, the *gynaeconitis*. Of course, this could have operated only in formal dining situations.

Vitruvius, too, stresses that this area was reserved for men, since it was in this part of the house that men would not be disturbed by the women. On the contrary, one may argue that Vitruvius is actually suggesting something else, that it is the women who have full run of the house. He implies that it is the men who are limited to this one area if they desire to be without interruption (sine interpellationibus) from any women; he suggests that in any other area of the
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182 Vitr. 6.7.4.
183 Corn. Nepos *Vit.* praef. 6-7. This will be discussed later; there is some evidence to suggest that men and women actually did dine together, though perhaps not everyday (Lys. 1.10, 1.11, 1.13).
house the men would come into contact with the women who would be engaging in their daily
tasks and rightfully so.

2.4 Vitruvius Translates the *Gynaikonitis*

Vitruvius’ description of the typical house contains several terms that are not clearly
defined. For instance, Vitruvius refers to rooms called *oeci*; he usually employs this term to refer
to rooms devoted to dining and entertaining (In his oecis fiunt virilia convivia), but he also uses
it to denote a room given over to women’s work, such as spinning and weaving (In his locis
introrsus constituuntur oeci magni, in quibus matres familiarum cum lanificis habent
sessionem). Vitruvius himself notes the discrepancy; he explains how the word *oecus* is not
used by the Greeks to refer to dining rooms as is the case in Latin, but rather that they use the
word *andron* (Graeci enim andronas appellant oecus, ubi convivia virilia solent esse). In fact,
what is used to denote a dining room in Greek, *andron*, is what the Romans, according to
Vitruvius, called a corridor. The Greeks use the word *mesauloe*, according to the author, to refer
to the passageways between two courts, whereas the Romans used the word *andrones* to refer to
these corridors. The confusion is clearly wide-ranging.

The term *thalamos* is also used by Vitruvius to denote some sort of chamber that is in the
area of the *gynaeconitis*, and is preceded by the *amphithalamos* (In prostadis autem dextra ac
sinistra cubicula sunt conlocata, quorum unum thalamos, alterum amphithalamos dicitur…haec
pars aedificii gynaeconitis appellatur). From his description, it seems to denote a living room
or bed chamber rather than a dining room. The word *thalamos* is used by Vitruvius only once,

---

184 Vitr. 6.7.4, 6.7.2.
185 Vitr. 6.7.5.
186 Vitr. 6.7.5.
187 Vitr. 6.7.2.
and it is found in the *gynaeconitis* of the house; more specifically, it is situated to one side of the *prostas*, what Vitruvius calls the porch of the house.\(^{188}\)

Vitruvius actually confounds the terms *prostas* and *pastas*; he claims that some people call this porch a *pastas* and some call it a *prostas* (hic locus apud non nullos prostas, apud alios pastas nominatur),\(^{189}\) but these are two distinct structures in the Greek sense of the words. In Greek houses, the *prostas* is a part of a building between two antae, that is, two projecting wall ends; the *prostas* acts as a type of covered porch or vestibule at the short end of a room. The *pastas*, on the other hand, is a broad porch that opens off of two or more rooms, and usually takes up a large part of the house.\(^{190}\) That a bedroom would be so close to an open space is perhaps unlikely, suggesting that the *thalamos* was something similar to a living room.

It is obvious that Vitruvius confounds and confuses several architectural terms related to the house specifically. He mistakenly asserts that the *prostas* and *pastas* are one and the same structure, claims that the word *mesauloe* in the Greek sense of the word is the equivalent of the *andron* in the Roman sense, and uses the word *oecus* indiscriminately for a number of different rooms. Vitruvius himself recognizes his own uncertainty in the translation of Greek to Latin terms.\(^{191}\) He exposes just how problematic the terminology is, even for someone well-versed in this field; this point also raises doubts as to whether or not Vitruvius had first-hand knowledge of Greek domestic architecture, and therefore whether or not we should believe him.

---

\(^{188}\) Vit. 6.7.1.
\(^{189}\) Vit. 6.7.1.
\(^{190}\) Hdt. 2.148, 2.169; Eur. *Orest.* 1371.
\(^{191}\) Vit. 6.7.5 ff. For the use of these terms, see L.Callebat and P.Fleury (eds.), *Dictionnaire des termes techniques du De architectura de Vitruve* (Zurich: Olms-Weidmann, 1995), 181-183.
2.5 Vitruvius’ Model: The Two-Court House

Vitruvius describes the Greek house as possessing two peristyle courts joined by a corridor (inter duo autem peristyla et hospitalia itinera sunt, quae mesauloe dicuntur, quod inter duas aulas media sunt interposita).\textsuperscript{192} Wilhelm Becker, who was probably the first modern scholar to comment on Vitruvius’ passage on Greek house plans, found that his two-court house was the correct model, and helped to disseminate the view that the two courts were assigned to men and women separately.\textsuperscript{193} Even in recent decades, such ideas have been reiterated in the scholarship.\textsuperscript{194} Though there is some evidence for double-courtyard houses, mainly from post-Classical sites, Vitruvius’ gendered distinction of the courts has yet to be substantiated.

As was discussed above, one could make the case that he had no real knowledge of housing in Greece in the Classical period, and that even his knowledge of housing in later periods was secondhand.\textsuperscript{195} It is also unclear what Vitruvius is using as his model house; we do not know which period or region he is referring to. Joachim Raeder, who has written one of the most insightful commentaries on Vitruvius’ treatise, speculates that the gendered division Vitruvius describes may not have been derived from actual social practice that he witnessed.\textsuperscript{196} In fact, there is no other extant text that suggests that the \textit{andronitis} and \textit{gynaikonitis} were assigned to two separate courts, as Vitruvius claims. Raeder finds that the house Vitruvius uses as his model is characteristic of the Hellenistic period; houses began to accommodate large

\textsuperscript{192} Vitri. 6.7.5.
\textsuperscript{193} W.A. Becker, \textit{Charikles. Bilder altgriechischer Sitte, zur genaueren Kenntnis des griechischen Privatlebens} (London: John W.Parker and Son, 1854), 260, 462, 465. He also helped to disseminate the view that was beginning to circulate at that time that women in Athens were secluded in their quarters, to the “prison-like” \textit{gynaikonitis}.
\textsuperscript{194} See, for instance, K.Reber, “Aedificia graecorum. Zu Vitruvs Beschreibung des griechischen Hauses,” \textit{AA} (1988): 662-663, who cites the houses at Eretria; this and other archaeological evidence will be discussed in a later chapter.
reception rooms and took on more extravagant features, and there are many sites in Greece with houses that demonstrate substantial expansion.\textsuperscript{197} This was not the case in the Classical period, however. The double courtyard house is almost non-existent at this time, and even later the form is reserved for palatial structures.\textsuperscript{198} Vitruvius is most likely referring to the houses he had seen perhaps in Italy and Sicily rather than to those of earlier periods in Greece proper.

Vitruvius’ emphasis on wealth is something that should be examined. In describing the Greek house form, he explains how extravagant dining rooms and guest quarters existed in Greek houses when the Greeks were wealthier (nam cum fuerunt Graeci delicatiore et fortuna opulentiores, hospitibus advenientibus instruebant triclinia, cubicula, cum penu cellas).\textsuperscript{199} What this could suggest is either that his Greek house model is taken from a more sumptuous period of history, for example, in the later 4\textsuperscript{th} and 3\textsuperscript{rd} centuries B.C., or that it is taken from a period before the decline of Greek independence in the 2\textsuperscript{nd} century B.C., or perhaps both. His use of the double courtyard house model warrants such an opinion, given that it is in the Hellenistic period that such enlarged house plans are established. His list of specialized rooms that look out onto gardens (viridia), however, bear more of a resemblance to the luxury villas and houses of late Republican Rome and vicinity, rather than to Greek houses.\textsuperscript{200} What seems to be without question is that Vitruvius’ description of the Greek house is based on lavish multi-court peristyle houses that resemble palaces rather than the modest houses of Classical Greece.

\textsuperscript{197} For instance, at Delos. See \textit{ibid.}, 353-359.
\textsuperscript{198} The double courtyard house will be discussed in more detail in the next chapter. In general, see Nevett, \textit{House and Society}, 107-116, 144-147. Houses with double courtyards are very rare before the 3\textsuperscript{rd} century B.C., and even then they are uncommon on the Greek mainland. For houses with double courtyards in the Greek world, see C.Makaronas and E.Giouri, \textit{Οι οικίες αρπαγής Ελένης και Διονύσου της Πέλλας} (Athens: Athens Archaeological Society, 1989), 18-19; P.Ducray, “La maison aux mosaics à Erètrie,” \textit{AK} 22 (1979): 3-13; G.Karadedos, “Υπεροχλασμικό σπίτι στη Μαρώνεια Θράκης,” \textit{Egnatia} 2 (1990): 265-297; B.Tsakirgis, “The Domestic Architecture of Morgantina in the Hellenistic and Roman Periods” (PhD diss., Ann Arbor, 1988), 210-228.\textsuperscript{199} Vitr. 6.7.4.
\textsuperscript{200} Vitr. 6.3.7-11, 6.4.1-2; I.D.Rowland and T.N.Howe, \textit{Vitruvius. Ten Books on Architecture} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 256.
What Vitruvius was attempting to demonstrate was the presence of distinct quarters in the Greek house. Though Vitruvius’ model of the Greek house appears to have been derived from the Hellenistic period, it suggests that the gynaeconitis was meant to act as the general living quarters of a family, while the andronitis was intended for the entertainment of guests and the accommodation of visitors. Vitruvius’ discussion of domestic architecture deals with the very highest level of status, in both Greek and Roman contexts, which explains why there is much emphasis on entertaining and providing accommodation for visitors. The owners of such homes could have had dealings with foreign businessmen or politicians so that their houses would have required separate quarters for such guests. Though there are a few sources that refer to some form of segregation between the sexes, Vitruvius’ de Architectura does not appear to be among them. Instead, his model, based on a large-scale plan reflecting the post-Classical period, seeks to illustrate the ideal plan of a house for a man of means: sizeable, well-organized, and consisting of both public and private areas to accommodate his lifestyle.

2.6 Xenophon’s Oeconomicus: A Portrait of a Household

Unlike Vitruvius’ treatise, which is directly concerned with architecture, Xenophon’s Oeconomicus is a discourse on the management of an estate. It was perhaps completed sometime between 394 and 371 B.C. while he was in exile from Athens. Because Xenophon was not an orator practicing in Athens, he does not observe the restrictions and rules that the

---

201 For example, Diodorus Siculus, writing at about the same time as Vitruvius, stipulates that the fortress at Ammon in Egypt was secured by triple walls which divided three distinct areas: the outer ring which surrounded the barracks for the guards, the middle ring which housed the court of the women along with the living areas of the women, children and relatives and a sanctuary to the god, and the innermost ring that enclosed the palace (Libr. 17.50.3).

202 Xenophon may have been working on it even after 362 B.C. however. In the years he spent outside of Athens, he heard non-Attic vocabulary and frequently employs synonyms derived from non-Attic dialects in his work. See further, Pomeroy, Xenophon Oeconomicus, 4-8, 10-11.
orators demonstrate, so that his style is characterized by diversity rather than by uniformity.203

The text is presented as a set of precepts concerning the proper way to manage one’s estate. The *Oeconomicus* conforms to the ancient definition of a dialogue since it is a discourse consisting of questions and answers on a philosophical or political subject. It is unlike other discourses, however, for example Plato’s *Symposium*, in that there is no real debate between opposing viewpoints. It is unique in Classical philological dialogue also because it combines both ethical and practical agricultural instruction.204

It is doubtful that Xenophon wrote the *Oeconomicus* exclusively for Athenian readers. Xenophon spent nearly half of his life away from Athens, and judging from the literature that survives, he was the first writer to use the literary koine,205 suggesting a wide readership. Some have argued that Xenophon’s dialogue was intended for a broad international audience based on the nature of the discussion.206 Estate management is not an esoteric subject. The topic must have appealed to a diverse audience, Athenian and non-Athenian, large and small landowner, wealthy and of moderate means. Though one would not claim that this is an instruction manual on how to run a successful estate,207 it is surely a text from which some sound advice could be extracted.

---

203 His versatility is also exhibited in the wide range of genres he employed; Xenophon wrote history, philosophical treatises, a historical novel and many essays. See Pomeroy, *Xenophon Oeconomicus*, 14, with Dio Chrys. 18.14-17.


205 See A.Thumb, “Zur neugriechischen Sprachfrage,” *NJbb* 17 (1906): 704-712. Both ancient and modern critics have failed to reach a consensus in evaluating Xenophon’s style; most admire his Attic style, though this is ill-defined, while some have drawn attention to his deviation from pure Attic vocabulary. For the un-Attic language of Xenophon, see, for example, Hermogenes of Tarsus, *On Types* 405; Phrynicus of Bithynia, *Eclogue* 62; Galen, Comm. on Hippocrates 58.1; *Suda* s.v. ἀγλευκός; Photius s.v. ἀγλευκός. The modern critics are W.G.Rutherford, *The New Phrynichus* (London: Macmillan and Co., 1881), 124, and T.Mommsen, *Beiträge zur Lehre der griechischen Präpositionen* (Berlin: Weidmann, 1895), 2. Plutarch, however, had a different opinion of Xenophon’s work; he claims that Xenophon used the pure Attic style (*Mor.* 79D). For a similar, modern, opinion, see A.Croiset and M.Croiset, *Histoire de la littérature grecque*, iv (Paris: A. Fontemoing 1895), 410.

206 For example, Pomeroy, *Xenophon Oeconomicus*, 8-9.

207 Moses Finley claimed that the treatise contained “not one sentence that expresses an economic principle” (*The Ancient Economy* (rev. ed.) (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999), 19).
The advice that can be drawn from the *Oeconomicus*, both practical and ethical, is somewhat Socratic in nature. All the sources testify to Xenophon’s interest in philosophy; in fact, he is categorized not as a historian but as a philosopher, and is known to have been a pupil of Socrates.\(^{208}\) The passage that concerns us reproduces a conversation that allegedly took place in the latter part of the 5\(^{th}\) century B.C. between the philosopher Socrates and the protagonist Isomachus, a wealthy landowner. Probably in an attempt to enhance the veracity of his report, Xenophon represents himself as an auditor of conversations he could have never attended.\(^{209}\) Xenophon is not an eye witness to the events he is narrating.

Many scholars have questioned the reliability of the text. Sarah Pomeroy, for instance, has pointed to the frequent use of anachronisms, and warns that we should not read the *Oeconomicus* as though it were based on notes taken at the time of the conversations with Socrates, but rather as “a literary reminiscence with a germ of historical reality.”\(^{210}\) Others have stressed the idealistic nature of the text, both in terms of the economic and the social values expressed in it.\(^{211}\) It could be said, however, that Xenophon’s viewpoint coincided with those

---


\(^{210}\) Pomeroy, *Xenophon Oeconomicus*, 30.

current in his day,\textsuperscript{212} and that we should not expect to find in the \textit{Oeconomicus} any real opposition to the traditional views in contemporary Greek society.

\subsection*{2.7 Estate Management and the Oikos}

Among the views highlighted by Xenophon in his text is the important role played by the household, the \textit{oikos}. The \textit{oikos} – the estate, household or family – was a large entity embracing the members of a family, slaves, animals, land, a house, and anything that was produced, consumed and distributed by the household.\textsuperscript{213} The \textit{oikos} was the basic unit of Greek society, and it is discussed in the literature well before Xenophon, but he is the first to focus on the subject of the household as a unit of production specifically and in a didactic manner. \textit{Oikovoumía}, from where the title \textit{Oeconomicus} is derived, denotes the science of household or estate management with which Xenophon concerns himself.

In conjunction with some specific advise on administering, supervising, cultivating and buying and selling, the \textit{Oeconomicus} also develops a number of general ideas that are ethical in nature. The work of the landowner, as opposed to the craftsman, is viewed as beneficial both to himself and to others. The landowner not only takes care of his estate, but also trains his body so that he may be a better soldier, acts as a courageous defender of his homeland because of his stake in the land, offers rich sacrifices to the gods and is generous and hospitable to his friends.\textsuperscript{214} All of these personal and civic advantages center on the principle of commanding or managing. To manage the \textit{oikos} is to command. It is in this framework that Xenophon

\begin{thebibliography}{99}
\bibitem{212} For example, L.R. Shero, “Xenophon’s Portrait of a Young Wife,” \textit{CW} 36 (1932): 20.
\bibitem{213} For the definition, see Pomeroy, \textit{Xenophon Oeconomicus}, 31.
\end{thebibliography}
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introduces the most important aspect for the success in the management of the oikos: the relationship between husband and wife.

More than was usual, Xenophon focuses his attention on the private sphere, but in particular, on the wife, who as mistress of the house is essential to the good management of the estate. In the treatise, Socrates asks Critobulus: “Is there anyone to whom you entrust more serious matters than to your wife?” Xenophon is the first Greek author to give full recognition to the value of a wife and of her contribution to the household economy. He is also the first to view the roles of husband and wife as complementary rather than contrasting the two. In the Oeconomicus, Socrates decides to question a wealthy landowner named Isomachus on the proper management of an estate, because he has been deemed a “gentleman” by men, women, citizens and non-citizens alike. Isomachus, in recounting how he came to be called a “gentleman,” discusses the management of his farm, his household, as well as his relationship with his wife.

Isomachus recalls how his wife was very young when they married and untrained, but that over time she became a fitting partner; their common purpose soon made them the best of allies. Isomachus claims that his wife is quite capable (ικανή) of looking after the house by herself; he is of the opinion that a woman is as equally capable as a man of possessing memory (μνήμη), diligence (ἐπιμέλεια) and self-control (ἐγκράτεια), and even of exercising power (ἐξουσία). Isomachus’ household is one in which a wife who has learnt her lessons well can

---

215 Xen. Oec. 3.12.
216 Xen. Oec. 7.26-27. In a similar vein is Plat. Rep. 449C-472. Like Plato, Xenophon too was a student of Socrates. Unlike Xenophon, however, Plato wished to do away with the family altogether. For the opinion that it is Isomachus’ wife who emerges as the true philosopher, rather than Isomachus himself, see A.Gini, “The Manly Intellecit of His Wife: Xen. Oec. Ch.7,” CW 86 (1993): 486. For sophrosyne as a virtue of both man and woman in the Oeconomicus, see H.North, “The Mare, the Vixen and the Bee: Sophrosyne as the Virtue of Women in Antiquity,” ICS 2 (1977): 46.
217 Xen. Oec. 6.16-17.
exercise this power even over her own husband.\textsuperscript{220} This attitude to gender-construction is found to be relatively unique in Greek literature. Though it would be overstated to read the text as a deliberate proposal for women’s liberation,\textsuperscript{221} even those who have denigrated Xenophon have recognized that the figure of Isomachus often displays a surprising decency, gentleness and warmth towards his wife; accusations of misogyny cannot be maintained. Isomachus demonstrates a very Socratic interest in the ethical aspects of everyday life, in particular, the fulfillment of men’s and women’s virtues, which is underscored in his account of the household. He emphasizes their common home, finances, and eventually, children.\textsuperscript{222}

Xenophon’s main concern, however, is with economic matters like the value of metals, the laws of supply and demand, and the division of labor.\textsuperscript{223} Xenophon discusses the sexual division of labor that was fundamental to Greek society and this is relevant to our discussion. Isomachus notes that for a woman it is a finer thing (καλλιτο) to stay inside than to be out in the fields.\textsuperscript{224} His use of the comparative form of the adjective, however, implies that this is not an absolute law, but rather a suggestion. In fact, Isomachus even shows hesitation (φάνεται) when he argues that women are better suited to indoor tasks and men to outdoor tasks.\textsuperscript{225} Overall, the \textit{Oeconomicus} presents a view of marriage as an economic partnership whose goal is the increase

\textsuperscript{220} See, for instance, Xen. \textit{Oec.} 7.32, 10.1.
\textsuperscript{224} Xen. \textit{Oec.} 7.30.
\textsuperscript{225} Xen. \textit{Oec.} 7.22.
of property; the division of labor simply facilitates this.\(^{226}\) Xenophon treats the family as a social relationship for production and is the first to stress the use-value of women’s work. Isomachus not only values his wife’s contribution to the household, but also acknowledges that this may exceed his own (τὸ δὲ πάντων ᾣδιστον, ἦν βελτίων ἐμοῦ φανῆς, καὶ ἐμὲ σὸν θεράποντα ποιήσῃ).\(^{227}\)

Some have chosen to read the text as an attempt at making a distinction between an inferior domestic realm of women and a superior public realm of men.\(^{228}\) On the contrary, the \textit{Oeconomicus} implies that the domestic realm and the wife’s duties are just as important to the financial health of the household as Isomachus’ duties. Though man and woman do not have the same aptitudes (διὰ δὲ τὸ τὴν φύσιν μὴ πρὸς πάντα ταύτα ἄμφοτέρων εὖ πεφυκέναι), they complement one another by being competent where the other is deficient (ἂ τὸ ἕτερον ἔλλειπεται τὸ ἕτερον δυνάμενον).\(^{229}\) Generally speaking, it is the husband’s duty to bring provisions into the house, but the wife’s duty to manage and safeguard those provisions, though the two roles are complementary; the absence of one would make the other’s contribution senseless (γελοια).\(^{230}\)

Through the mouthpiece of Isomachus, it is put forward that the man has need of the wife as much as the wife has need of the husband (διὰ τοῦτο καὶ δέονται μᾶλλον ἀλλήλων καὶ τὸ ζεύγος ὀφελιμώτερον ἐαυτῷ γεγένηται), and that the two must work together (ζεύγος) for


\(^{227}\) Xen. \textit{Oec.} 7.42, but also 7.13-14, 7.32.


\(^{229}\) Xen. \textit{Oec.} 7.28.

their household to thrive.\textsuperscript{231} Isomachus asserts that women and men are complementary in their biological nature, but that both husband and wife must successfully accomplish their duties so that their household will prosper. A wife’s duties are no less important than a husband’s to the well-being of the \textit{oikos}. Despite the specific nature of the roles that man and woman play in the marriage relationship, the proper functioning of the household is dependent upon the successful accomplishment of the activities of male and female equally.

In its concern with the \textit{oikos}, the \textit{Oeconomicus} is particularly a product of the 4\textsuperscript{th} century B.C. According to historians, social institutions tend to become a subject of study only when they are perceived as beginning to deteriorate or change.\textsuperscript{232} Some scholars have argued that Xenophon wrote the \textit{Oeconomicus} with the intention of illustrating the correct model to emulate.\textsuperscript{233} The character of Isomachus represents this well. He is the paradigm of the gentleman farmer, the owner of an estate, industrious, methodical and devoted to his household, rather than a man of trade and commerce who might be capricious, haphazard and fly-by-night. Xenophon’s text exhibits the subtle shift from the public concerns voiced in 5\textsuperscript{th} century literature, to the financial problems and self-interest expressed in the 4\textsuperscript{th} century; this may not be an accident of survival in the sources, but may reflect actual socio-economic change.

\textsuperscript{231} Xen. Oec. 7.28.
\textsuperscript{233} See further J. Luccioni, \textit{Les Idées politiques et sociales de Xénophon} (Paris: Ophrys, 1947), 72. It is certainly reasonable, at the very least, to suppose that one of his motives was the poor state of Athenian agriculture at the time. Pomeroy (\textit{Xenophon Deconomicus}, 31-32), argues that the Peloponnesian War had subverted the old socio-economic substructure of the Athenian oikos. See, for instance, Thuc. 2.35-46. For art following similar trends, see J.J. Pollitt, \textit{Art and Experience in Classical Greece} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972), 136-137; R. Sutton, “The Interaction Between Men and Women Portrayed on Attic Red-Figure Pottery” (PhD diss., University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1981), 221-225.
2.8 Orderliness and Flexibility in Isomachus’ House

Isomachus’ house can be understood as a kind of idealized creation in its approach to space. According to Alex Purves, who has studied space in narrative, the organization of space is an expression of the human ability to classify and categorize, and in Isomachus’ house this comes very close to “a supreme encyclopedic vision.” Isomachus’ house is a structure that is built for storage of material goods and provides for a vast system of categorization of disparate items; an infinite number of objects can be stored, located and retrieved. His excursus on the proper method for storing household objects demonstrates an almost compulsive concern for orderliness.

For Isomachus, storage is not only essential but also an exquisite thing. When an object is in its place, it is more beautiful (ἄπαντα καλλίω φαίνεται κατὰ κόσμον κείμενα). It is not the utensils or the shoes themselves which are καλός, but more so the spaces between each of them (καὶ τὸ μέσον δὲ πάντων τοῦτων καλὸν φαίνεται) and their orderly relationship with one another (ἐκποδῶν ἐκάστου κείμενου). Isomachus shows his wife the possibilities of the house, revealing no more than a series of simply decorated rooms (οὐ γὰρ ποικίλμασι κεκόσμηται) as a prelude to sorting out the contents that might be housed in each of them most expediently (ὅπως ἄγγεῖα ὡς συμφορώτατα ἢ τοῖς μέλλουσιν ἐν αὐτοῖς ἔσεσθαι). His house is the site of production and storage of large amounts of goods, and it needed to adapt to hold a considerable number of things. It has the ability to reproduce the amount of available space for storage almost indefinitely, and no matter how small the area within the house, there

---

234 A. Purves sees this as evidence of the increasing trend toward encyclopedic collecting (Space and Time in Ancient Greek Narrative (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 198, 216). On encyclopedism, see J. P. Small, Wax Tablets of the Mind: Cognitive Studies of Memory and Literacy in Classical Antiquity (New York: Routledge, 1997), 44-45.
236 Xen. Oec. 8.20.
237 Xen. Oec. 9.2-6.
will always be enough interstitial space to prevent one category from overstepping the next.\footnote{Xen. \textit{Oec.} 7.33, 8.13, 8.20. See further, A.Purves, \textit{Space and Time in Ancient Greek Narrative} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 216. For the importance of storage in the domestic economy, see B.A.Ault, \textit{“Oikos and Oikonomía: Greek Houses, Households and the Domestic Economy,”} in \textit{Building Communities: House, Settlement and Society in the Aegean and Beyond}, ed. R.Westgate, N.Fisher and J.Whitley (London: British School at Athens, 2007), 263-265.}

The οἶκος is more than a form of shelter for the family; it is a center of production. It is here defined by its capacity for storage, and consequently by its organizational principles. Isomachus and his wife establish a carefully delineated taxonomy based on a series of separations and divisions; bedding, clothing and shoes, for instance, are separated by gender (ὑποδήματα γυναικεῖα, υποδήματα άνδρεῖα).\footnote{Xen. \textit{Oec.} 9.2-3. Also translated simply as “an internal room” by R.Osborne (“Buildings and Residence on the Land in Classical and Hellenistic Greece: The Contribution of Epigraphy,” \textit{BSA} 80 (1985): 121-122). It has also been translated as “bedroom” (L.Strauss, \textit{Xenophon’s Socratic Discourse: an Interpretation of the Oeconomicus} (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1970), 41). Because it is used by Isomachus here to denote a place where the best linens but also where the best utensils were stored, it seems more likely to have been a storeroom rather than a bedroom.} Each group is, in turn, assigned its own specific site within the house, its “natural” place (προσηκούσας) to which it inherently belongs.\footnote{Xen. \textit{Oec.} 9.6-10.} There is a system of designated, ordered storage for all objects in Isomachus’ house, and this taxonomy functions very well. His house, in fact, is constructed as a series of storage spaces.

Isomachus alludes to the possibilities (τῆς οἰκίας τῆν δύναμιν) and therefore the flexibility of household space, by demonstrating how the rooms are simply designed (οὐ γὰρ ποικίλμασι κεκόσμηται) so that they may serve as convenient receptacles (ἂγγεῖα) for the storage of certain objects.\footnote{Xen. \textit{Oec.} 9.2 (συμφορώτατα) and 9.8 (προσηκούσας).} For instance, the storeroom (θάλαμος ἐν ὀχυρῷ) housed the most valuable items.\footnote{This is the case also in many Greek villages today, where rooms are sparsely furnished (Du Boulay, \textit{Village}, 24), and where women spend a considerable amount of time taking things out and putting them away (E.Friedl, \textit{Vasilika: A Village in Modern Greece} (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1962), 43).} He implies that the use of space was not predetermined, but instead could be altered according to the type and quantity of objects that needed to be stored; Isomachus and his
wife will choose where each item should best be stored (χώραν τε δοκιμασώμεθα τὴν προσήκουσαν ἐκάστοις ἔχειν). The description of the system of storage demonstrates how the spatial capacities of the house can be increased and altered almost ad infinitum. In the dialogue, Isomachus uses the example of a Phoenician merchant ship he once saw, and at which he had marveled because of the way it could stow cargo by means of tiny separate compartments (πλεῖστα γὰρ σκεῦ ἐν σμικροτάτῳ ἄγγείῳ διακεχωρισμένα ἔθεασάμην). Isomachus’ house, much like the Phoenician ship, is compartmentalized, but it is also adaptable and accommodating.

2.9 The Division of Space in Isomachus’ House

Isomachus relates how he familiarized his new wife with his house by giving her a grand tour. One of the rooms he showed her was the living rooms for the family (διαίτητηρία δὲ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις). These rooms were decorated (κεκαλωμομένα) in Isomachus’ house, suggesting that they were meant to be seen. He also shows his wife other areas of the house. He states:

ἐδείξα δὲ καὶ τὴν γυναικωνίτιν αὐτῇ, θύρα τοιαλυτή ὑρισμένην ἀπὸ τῆς ἀνθρωπότιδος, ἵνα μῆτε ἐκφέρηται ἑυδοθεῖς ὁ τι μὴ δεῖ μῆτε τεκνωσώνται οἱ οἰκέται ἄνευ τῆς ἡμετέρας γνώμης. οἱ μὲν γὰρ χρηστοὶ παιδοποιησάμενοι εὐνοῦστεροι ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ, οἱ δὲ πονηροὶ συζυγεῖν εὐπορώστεροι πρὸς τὸ κακουργεῖν γίγνονται.

I showed her the women's quarters too, separated by a bolted door from the men's, so that nothing which ought not to be moved may be taken out, and that the servants may not breed without our permission. For honest servants generally prove more loyal if they

243 Xen. Oec. 8.10.
244 Xen. Oec. 8.11. On this, see A.C. Purves, Space and Time in Ancient Greek Narrative (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 213.
245 Xen. Oec. 9.4. The term διαίτητηρίου is clearly correlated with the noun δίαττα, a way of living. This space may have contained the formal dining room (ἀνθρῶν) (Robinson and Graham, Olynthus VIII, 167-172).
have a family; but rogues, if they live in wedlock, become all the more prone to mischief.\(^{246}\)

In this passage, Isomachus is referring specifically and exclusively to the slaves of his household (οἰκὲται). The *andronitis* and *gynaikonitis* are reserved for the servants, while the *diaiteteria* are meant for the free members of the household. His reasoning for the division between female and male slaves in the home by a bolted door (θύρα βαλανωτῆ) is similarly unambiguous, since he explains that this barrier is intended to prevent theft (ῐνα μήτε ἐκφέρηται ἕνδοθεν ὃ τι μὴ δεῖ) and unauthorized reproduction among the slaves (μήτε τεκνοποιῶνται οἱ οἰκὲται ἄνευ τῆς ἥμετέρας γυνῶμης).\(^{247}\)

Some scholars, such as Sarah Pomeroy, have read the bolted door (θύρα βαλανωτῆ) as being something more conniving: that the door required a key so that only the master of the house could have sexual access to the slaves.\(^{248}\) Though liaisons between masters and their slaves are well documented,\(^{249}\) this interpretation is not supported by the evidence given in the passage. Firstly, the wife herself is given the key to the quarters so that she may care for the slaves.\(^{250}\) In addition to this, it is the door that separates (ὤρισμένην) the male from the female slaves that is bolted, that is, the door between these two rooms.\(^{251}\) If Pomeroy were correct in her interpretation, then the locked door would have instead been the one found separating each of


\(^{247}\) Such doors would have likely been locked from the outside (Lys. 1.13; Aristoph. *Thes.* 414-423).

\(^{248}\) Pomeroy, *Xenophon Oeconomicus*, 297.


\(^{250}\) Xen. *Oec.* 7.37: ὅτι δὲ ἄν κάμη τῶν οἰκέτων, τούτων σοι ἐπιμελητέων πάντων, ὅπως θεραπεύῃται (‘you will have to see that any servant who is ill is cared for’).

\(^{251}\) The verb ὀρίζω takes the accusative (τῆν γυναικῶντιν) together with the genitive case (τῆς ἀνδρωνίτιδος), implying separation from or acting as a boundary to something. In this instance, the women’s quarters are quite clearly being separated from (note the presence of ἄπο) the men’s quarters by means of a bolted door (LSJ s.v. ὀρίζω). Cf. Hdt. 2.16.
the slave quarters from the rest of the house, rather than separating the male and female slave quarters from one another, as Isomachus suggests.

The separate quarters are clearly not meant to isolate Isomachus’ wife. He implies that she is seeing these chambers for the first time on the tour (ἐδειξα…αυτῆι), and, accordingly, that she has not been residing in them since she moved in. Isomachus’ account also suggests that he slept in the same bed (ἐξ εὐνῆι) as his wife, or at least in the same quarters, which would require that the wife did not reside in the women’s quarters, the gynaikonitis.252 In a different passage, Isomachus even relates how his wife should see to the servants if they are ill (τοῦτον σοι ἐπιμελητέον πάντων), and therefore, demonstrates that she has full access to all areas of the house, including the male servants’ quarters, the andronitis.253 Clearly the bolted door is not meant for her.

Sarah Pomeroy’s commentary on the Oeconomicus – an otherwise discerning and insightful study on social history – fails to liberate itself from centuries old perceptions. She maintains that women in Athens were kept in seclusion and resided in the most protected part of the house; she argues that Isomachus used a locked door to guard only the gynaikonitis because “he counted his women among his most valuable possessions.”254 This is a gross misinterpretation; Isomachus himself relates how it was the slaves (οἰκέται), not the free women

---

252 Xen. Oec. 10.8. There is, however, some debate as to whether or not couples slept in the same bed. Keuls argues, for example, that the narrowness of beds would have made sleeping together inconvenient (Phallus, 212). Only fragments of beds, however, have been found in domestic contexts since these were made of perishable materials; those which are extant were made of stone but are found in tombs. The beds found in funerary contexts are, for the most part, about 1 meter wide, which would suggest they accommodated only one person (Andrianou, Furniture, 31-42). Some beds, however, seem to have been wide enough to accommodate two people (K.Sismanidis, Κλίνες καὶ Κλίνοιδες Κατασκευές των Μακεδονικών Τάφων (Athens: Archaiologiko Tameio, 1997), 93, 189-192).

253 Xen. Oec. 7.37.

254 Pomeroy, Xenophon Oeconomicus, 234, 295-296, though she qualifies this by claiming that this type of seclusion “could be practiced only by a household with at least one slave.” It is generally agreed upon, however, that only but the poorest households in Athens did not have at least one slave (see Lys. 24.6), so that this model would apply to almost all Athenians.
of the household, who were kept under lock and bolt. He explains how the bolted door (θύρα βάλσανωτῆς) was meant to separate the male slave quarters from the female slave quarters, and does not even specify which of the two groups (male or female or both) the door was meant to confine.

Pomeroy’s hypothesis that Isomachus was making an effort to protect the women, “the most valuable possessions,” by means of the door, is on shaky ground. Isomachus does not appear to be concerned with the safety of the women. Rather, his main intention is to prevent the female slaves in the gynaikonitis from procreating without authorization (μὴ τεκνοποιῶνται οἱ οἰκέται ἄνευ τῆς ἕμετέρας γυνώμης). The bolted door also served as a deterrent for thievery (ὅσα μὴ έκφέρηται ἐνδοθεν ὁ τι μὴ δει). Isomachus refers to the objects, presumably supplies such as linens and foodstuffs that were housed in this space, which were not to be removed. He stipulates that the slave quarters, in this case the andronitis and gynaikonitis, were under lock and key to prevent the pilfering of these valuables. That such doors were locked from the outside, and that the term ἐνδοθεν (‘from within’) is used, strengthens the argument that they were meant to be deterrents to theft, rather than as means for safeguarding women.

Rather than suggesting rigidly defined and divided space, Isomachus’ house demonstrates a remarkably flexible and accommodating nature; its capacity for storage of objects of differing type is almost infinite. Even if everything in his house has its proper place, the passage also illustrates how this could be modified and adapted to suit different circumstances. More importantly, the gynaikonitis in Isomachus’ house is reserved for the female household servants,

255 Xen. Oec. 9.5.
256 Xen. Oec. 9.5.
257 For textual evidence on doors locking from the outside, see Lys. 1.13 and Aristoph. Thes. 414-423. Valuables were housed in this area of the house. The analogy of the andronitis and gynaikonitis in a house is used to make plain the differences between the cities of Sparta and Athens in terms of wealth and luxury, implying that the gynaikonitis – or Athens, housed many valuables (Theon. Progym. 215).
while the *andronitis* is reserved for the male servants, and the two areas are separated by a bolted door. The door is meant as a deterrent to both theft and unauthorized reproduction among the slaves; it has no bearing on Isomachus’ wife whatsoever, who has full run of the house.

Instead of substantiating the theory that women were locked up in the most remote part of a house, Xenophon’s *Oeconomicus* demonstrates that women, in particular wives, could possess a great deal of freedom and authority. Isomachus’ wife is an equal partner in the management of the household; her duties are just as important as her husband’s. Her responsibilities also give her full access to all areas of the house. Because Isomachus’ wife is capable (ικανή) of looking after the house herself, Isomachus spends his time conducting business in town or getting exercise on his farm by doing cavalry drills,\(^{258}\) rather than supervising his wife’s daily activities.

2.10 Lysias’ *On the Murder of Eratosthenes*: Oratory, Adultery and Honor

Like other literary genres, oratory or public speech writing has its own specific context and its own set of objectives. Lysias’ *On the Murder of Eratosthenes* is a forensic speech and was likely delivered in an Athenian court of law in about 390 B.C.\(^{259}\) Although orations are a category of text that ancient historians, especially social historians, regularly use, they are all too often approached on a superficial level. S.C.Todd has called this the “dipping” or “index” approach,\(^{260}\) because the speeches are often used as a sourcebook of quotations. The orations,

---

\(^{258}\) Xen. *Oec.* 7.3, 11.14-24. Isomachus seems to have had a considerable amount of leisure time; he had a bailiff who managed his farm and his slaves so that he could take care of business in town (Xen. *Oec.* 11.22-24, 12.3-9, 15.1). In general, if a man could, he would have use slaves to help him with his work or do his work for him (Xen. *Mem.* 2.3.3), so that he could act as a full citizen, both politically and socially (M.H.Jameson, “Agriculture and Slavery in Classical Athens,” *CJ* 73 (1978): 125-126). For rural settlements, see further Jones, *Rural Athens*, 17-47.


\(^{260}\) See S.C.Todd, “The Use and Abuse of the Attic Orators,” *G&R* 37 (1990): 164-169, who finds that scholars often simply read around a few lines of the text to verify that it says what they thought it did.
however, are unusually sophisticated in nature, and require particular attention; they also offer some of the richest source material available on the history of Athens in this period.

One of the issues surrounding the authority of forensic speeches is their context. Knowing whether or not the editions we possess were the editions used by clients in the law courts, for example, is of great consequence. What we do know is that the speeches were considered to be compulsory reading for anyone who wished to pursue a public career, and that many of the orators published their speeches in order to increase their reputation. It is plausible that as a result of this, speech writers chose to publish speeches written for difficult cases in order to attract new clients. In fact, this could be said of Lysias’ *On the Murder of Eratosthenes*, a speech claiming justifiable homicide. A major concern when using speeches like this is that we do not know for sure that they were used in court; they may have been written solely to be part of a handbook on oratory. Lysias’ speech, for instance, has been singled out as being a display piece, in other words, that it was either a much-revised speech used in court or even a completely fictional one used as an example for students of oratory.

Scholars have also pointed to the problem of the speech writer’s objectives. Some have argued that orators lied deliberately in their speeches so as to guarantee success for their client, because a litigant hired a speech writer with the sole objective of winning the case. The speeches, however, are more than simply fine pieces of rhetoric. We should not summarily dismiss the Attic orators based on the context of their art; perhaps we should instead ask whether

261 Antiphon is thought to be the first orator to actively promote a market for law court speeches. On this, see Quint. *Inst.* 3.1.11; Plut. *Vit. X Or.* 832c-d.


263 For instance, L. Spengel, *Sunagoge Tekhnon sive Artium Scriptores* (Stuttgart: J.G. Cotta, 1818), and W. Wyse, *The Speeches of Isaeus* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1904), esp. 652. The standard objection to such an assessment has been based on the theory that an Athenian jury could not have been so dim-witted as to believe outright lies. For such a view, see A. R. W. Harrison, *The Law of Athens I* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968), 122 n.1.
such speeches were recorded because they embodied what was ordinary or because they represented what was exceptional in a court of law. Statements made that might help a case, of course, should be approached with caution. On the other hand, information offered which gives the impression of being fortuitous, should not be dismissed, but rather given particular attention.

2.11 Lysias on Adultery and Lawful Homicide

For us, adultery is a private matter; the Greeks, however, had a different opinion. In Greek thought, both rape and adultery were viewed as acts of *hybris* against the men to whom the women were attached. A man who found his wife in an act of adultery was forced to divorce her with the threat of loss of civic rights, and a woman suffered civic penalties, such as exclusion from attending public sacrifices. For them, adultery threatened the family unit by creating the risk that an illegitimate child might be introduced into it and that control of any property might be passed outside the family’s bloodline. In addition to this, the family’s cults would pass into the hands of one whose services were unwelcome to the dead or who would neglect those sacred duties. Because adultery could be difficult to detect and pinpoint in time, such a charge could even tarnish the status of those children who might actually be legitimate.

Adulterers were considered to be dangerous because they brought another man’s *oikos* under their own control. An adulterer could have power over a woman and convince her to manage her household at his bidding, so that he could gain control also of the *oikos*’ material

---

possessions. It is a telling fact that the general criminal category of *kakourgoi* into which adulterers fell was also a category associated with crimes that involved penetration into an *oikos*, such as trespassing and burglary.\(^{267}\) In Lysias’ speech, for example, various forms of the word *oikos* are frequently used to denote something that has been entered, penetrated or violated by the adulterer Eratosthenes.\(^{268}\) In this way, we get the impression that Eratosthenes’ transgression is viewed as something much greater than intercourse with a married woman.

In the speech, the defendant Euphiletus claims that the law stipulated that any man who found his wife, mother, daughter or sister in an unauthorized sexual act had the right to kill the man, in other words, the adulterer, seducer or rapist.\(^{269}\) The clause that Euphiletus cites may date to the 6\(^{th}\) century B.C., but even so, it may have constituted a default law at the time the speech was delivered even after more specific legislation was developed.\(^{270}\) Others have questioned the validity of the law, claiming that it may have been a dead letter by this time.\(^{271}\) In the Athenian legal system, litigants were responsible for finding and quoting any laws they thought pertained to their case. The problem with this is that litigants could introduce irrelevant material or misrepresent the laws without interruption from the magistrates who presided over the court, though knowledgeable members could heckle the speakers.\(^{272}\) Lysias 1, in fact, contains one of the most skilful manipulations of the law. Euphiletus tries to create the impression that the law

\(^{268}\) Lys. 1.6, 1.9, 1.15, 1.23, 1.41 (place or building) and 1.25, 1.33, 1.36, 1.38, 1.40 (something entered or violated). On this, see S.C.Todd, *The Shape of Athenian Law* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993), 204-206.
\(^{269}\) According to Demosthenes (23.53-57) this is the Draconian Law of about 620 B.C. Plutarch, however, attributed the law to Solon (Solon 23.1). The law seems to have been inscribed on a stele which was set up somewhere in Athens. Lysias (1.30) calls it “a law of the Areopagus.” See further, M.Gagarin, *Drakon and Early Athenian Homicide Law* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1981), 28, with Dem. 23.22, 23.28 and 23.37.
\(^{272}\) Though there were written records housed in the Metroon from the 5\(^{th}\) century B.C., these were haphazard (A.L.Boegehold, “The Establishment of a Central Archive at Athens,” *AJA* 76 (1972): 23). The penalty for citing non-existent laws was death according to Demosthenes (26.24), though there is no such attested case.
commands the death of the adulterer, but in reality, the law instead stipulates that a man who takes this measure rather than inflicting other forms of punishment cannot be condemned for murder.273

Although the Athenian legal system has been alternatively described as a forum for negotiation between elite litigants and mass jurors, a public stage on which elites competed for prestige, and an arena for socially constructive feuding behavior,274 more recent studies argue that legal reasoning, rather than rhetoric and assault, played a far greater role in the courts than is acknowledged. For instance, it seems that there was a rule forbidding irrelevant statements in the homicide courts, and that judicial decisions were based on the legal and factual issues of the case, rather than character or social standing, but this is difficult to prove.275 Slander tactics, as we know, were not altogether absent; litigants usually stop just short of defaming their opponents with the hopes of piquing the jury’s imagination and planting the seed of doubt.

2.12 Characterization and Narrative in Lysias’ Speeches

Lysias’ speech, like many others, has been read as a piece of persuasive narrative. J.R.Porter, for example, has argued that the speech gives the impression of “unrehearsed simplicity,” because it offers a plausible account of the defendant’s actions and at the same time

273 Lys. 1.30-36, but also 1.50 (‘I obeyed the city’s laws’). On this, see E.M.Harris, “Did the Athenians Regard Seduction as a Worse Crime than Rape?” CQ 40 (1990): 371-373, and J.J.Bateman, “Lysias and the Law,” TAPA 89 (1958): 276. For the other types of punishment for adulterers, see J.Roy, “Traditional Jokes About the Punishment of Adulterers in Ancient Greek Literature,” Classical Monthly 16 (1991): 73-76, with Aristoph. Cl. 1083-1084 and Pl. 168; Dem. 59.6. In Lysias 1.25 Eratosthenes tries to strike a bargain with Euphiletus to no avail, but suggests that a cash settlement was at least conceivable.


275 Giving information of one’s service to the state or slander of one’s opponent was very likely inadmissible. See further, A.Lanni, “The Homicide Courts and the Dikasteria: A Paradigm not Followed,” GRBS 41 (2000): 327, 317-318; Lys. 3.46; Lyc. 1.11-13; Pollux 8.117. For slander, see Lys. 3.46.
conveys a believable impression of the speaker himself.\textsuperscript{276} Characterization, or ethopoiia, is acknowledged as one of Lysias’ great gifts to oratory; his technique of conveying something of the character of the speaker had the effect of rendering the speech more genuine and less rehearsed.\textsuperscript{277} Characters are even made more believable by the admission of blemishes, giving the jurors greater confidence in the honesty of the speaker.

In Lysias 1, characterization is frequently, but obliquely, used by the speaker to argue against the charge he is facing.\textsuperscript{278} Because adulterers were rarely killed, a jury might be suspicious and cynical towards a man who relinquished the usual remedies of monetary compensation and/or various forms of public humiliation.\textsuperscript{279} The portrait Lysias paints of Euphiletus is one of a simple and naïve farmer who readily accepts his wife’s explanations for questionable activities, but who is also hot tempered and uncompromising. Characterization serves as a kind of persuasion; Euphiletus’ gullibility is what helps to convince the jury that he would have lacked the ingenuity necessary to form any plan of entrapment or abduction.\textsuperscript{280} In this way, Lysias provided his client with the personality his argument seemed to demand.


\textsuperscript{278} Characterization makes up over 40% of the total length of the speech (C.Carey, Selected Speeches (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 61).

\textsuperscript{279} For the other types of punishment for adulterers, see J.Roy, “Traditional Jokes About the Punishment of Adulterers in Ancient Greek Literature,” Classical Monthly 16 (1991): 73-76, with Aristoph. Cl. 1083-1084 and Pl. 168; Dem. 59.6. In Lysias 1.25 Eratosthenes tries to strike a bargain with Euphiletus to no avail, but suggests that a cash settlement was at least conceivable.

\textsuperscript{280} For Euphiletus as a gullible man, see Lys. 1.9, 1.13-14; Wolpert, “Lysias 1,” 415; J.J.Bateman, “Some Aspects of Lysias’ Argumentation,” Phoenix 16 (1962): 160. The suspicion would have been that Euphiletus may have organized the meeting between Eratosthenes and his wife in order to legally commit murder (Lys. 1.37). The case would have been tried by the Delphinion, the court which heard homicide cases in which the accused admitted the act but maintained that it was justified under the law (C.Carey, \textit{Trials from Classical Athens} (New York: Routledge, 1998), 27; W.T.Loomis, “The Nature of Premeditation in Athenian Homicide Law,” \textit{JHS} 92 (1972): 95; Dem. 23.74). Euphiletus is even made out to be slightly flawed to gain sympathy from the jury by tacitly affirming his indiscretions with a female servant (Lys. 1.12-13).
Euphiletus’ defense speech is an invaluable source for Athenian social history. It provides important evidence for a large range of topics and is the only extant speech that directly cites the Athenian law on adultery, but “the very qualities that make it such a valuable source also make it difficult to interpret.”\textsuperscript{281} The peripheral, but pertinent, information that Euphiletus provides us with, like the description of his house, cannot be readily confirmed or denied. Because it is difficult to determine how true to life Euphiletus’ words are, the speech has attracted considerable negative attention from scholars. J.R.Porter, for instance, argues that the speech must be completely fictional; he finds that it employs stock characters and situations similar to those found in fictional stories of adultery. Such an outlandish story, Porter claims, would never have succeeded in defending a man in court faced with such a serious charge.\textsuperscript{282}

Lysias 1 begs further analysis, however, because it has been used to demonstrate that women were isolated in their homes,\textsuperscript{283} despite the fact that the speech is about adultery. One could perhaps extrapolate from the speech something about how individual women were actively involved both in challenging and in upholding societal norms. Men depended on women to regulate the household and women’s’ willingness or reluctance in protecting the integrity of the oikos, their ability to gather and disseminate information, and to provide men access to space otherwise inaccessible to them, gave them an undeniable power.\textsuperscript{284} Female networks, for

\textsuperscript{281} Wolpert, “Lysias 1,” 415.
\textsuperscript{283} For such an opinion, see R.Just, Women in Athenian Law and Life (New York: Routledge, 1989), 106. Scholars have even argued that women’s confinement is confirmed by the Athenian courts themselves, asserting that it is a painstaking effort “merely to establish the identity or even existence of a given woman after long years inside the home” (R.Garner, Law and Society in Classical Athens (London: Croom Helm, 1987), 85).
\textsuperscript{284} Wolpert, “Lysias 1,” 415-416. He underlines the specifically female networks of information that permitted women to act as the agents of social control, governing the lives of both men and women alike due to their access to knowledge and their ability to ruin a person’s reputation through their gossip. On social control, see also V.Hunter, Policing Athens: Social Control in the Attic Lawsuits, 420–320 B.C. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994),
example, play a prominent role in Lysias 1, and most notable among them is the way in which the adulterous affair is communicated exclusively through female channels.  

Underlying the case of Lysias 1 is the distinction between cultural ideals and actual social practice. For instance, if women did, in fact, live in seclusion, then Eratosthenes would never have had the opportunity to meet Euphiletus’ wife. The separation of men from women must have given Athenian women a significant degree of autonomy. Men stayed away from their homes most of the day, so that women must have been, in actual practice, neither confined nor under the surveillance of men. No matter how hard Euphiletus in Lysias 1 attempts to paint a picture in his narrative of a strictly divided oikos, the actions themselves show otherwise. Lysias 1 does not portray a world in which women were secluded and supervised; the picture is much more complex. The disparities between legal formalities and lived realities must have been considerable, and it is difficult to understand the extent to which laws designed to regulate the lives of women at a formal level actually operated at the level of everyday life. Though women were restricted by the rules imposed on them by men, as well as by other women, and were limited in the ways they could act, they also had the capacity to alter, change or challenge those same rules.

2.13 The Provisional and Flexible Nature of Euphiletus’ House

Lysias 1 is often discussed with reference to Greek domestic architecture for the rare glimpse it provides into the urban home of an Athenian man named Euphiletus. It is one of only

---


285 Lys. 1.15.

286 Law court speeches suggest that kyrieia, guardianship, for example, was a much hazier, less formalized institution than social and legal historians have generally thought (V.Hunter, “Women’s Authority in Classical Athens,” EMC 33 (1989): 43-47).
a few pieces of literary evidence for the internal organization of a Classical Athenian house. Some scholars have taken this passage at face value, maintaining that it is evidence for the “standard arrangements” of a Greek house, but this assessment is far from accurate. The information Euphiletus provides the reader about his house is haphazard. On the one hand, he mentions many things without feeling the need for explanation, but on the other hand, seeks to justify some of these through emphasizing and thoroughly describing them; one of these is his little house, his oikidion, the arrangement of which he feels obliged to explain (δεὶ γὰρ καὶ ταυθ’ ύμιν διηγήσασθαι). In the speech, Euphiletus is accused of murdering his wife’s supposed lover, and in his defense, gives the jury a careful account of the house:

Πρώτον μὲν οὖν, ὡς ἀνδρεῖς, (δεὶ γὰρ καὶ ταυθ’ ύμιν διηγήσασθαι) οἰκίδιον ἐστὶ μοι διπλών, ἵσα ἔχον τὰ ἄνω τοῖς κάτω κατὰ τὴν γυναικωνίτιν καὶ κατὰ τὴν ἀνδρωνίτιν. ἐπειδῆ δὲ τὸ παιδίον ἐγένετο ἡμῖν, ἢ μήτηρ αὐτὸ ἐθήλαζεν ἵνα δὲ μὴ, ὁπότε λούσθαι δέοι, κινδυνεύῃ κατὰ τὴς κλίμακος καταβάσασθα, ἐγὼ μὲν ἄνω διητώμην, αἱ δὲ γυναῖκες κάτω. καὶ οὕτως ἦδη συνειδησιμένου ἦν, ὡστε πολλάκις ἢ γυνὴ ἀπῆει κάτω καθευδήσασα ὡς τὸ παιδίον, ἵνα τὸν τίτθον αὐτῷ διδῷ καὶ μὴ βοᾶ.

Now in the first place I must tell you, sirs (for I am obliged to give you these particulars), my dwelling is on two floors, the upper being equal in space to the lower, with the women’s quarters above the men’s quarters below. When the child was born to us, its mother suckled it; and in order that, each time that it had to be washed, she might avoid the risk of descending by the stairs, I used to live above, and the women/ my wife below. That was what we’d got used to, that my wife would often go downstairs to sleep by the baby, to feed it for it not to cry.

---

288 It is interesting to note that real cases involving adultery are thinly represented in our sources. The unflattering implication that a man might not be looking after his authority very well (Aeschin. 1.107), the potential messiness of divorce, and perhaps status differences between the offended party and the adulterer all provide reasons why real cases involving adultery are rarely represented in the sources.
The passage gives us a suggestive glimpse into an ancient Greek house in which the women’s quarters (γυναικωνιτίνων) are located on the upper storey, and form a distinct suite from the men’s quarters (ἀνδρωνιτίνων) on the lower level. He and his wife switched quarters (ἔγνω μὲν ἄνω διητώμην, αἱ δὲ γυναῖκες κάτω) for the sake of their newborn baby, which would have been a sensible choice given the danger involved (κινδυνεύη κατὰ τῆς κλίμακος καταβαίνουσα). From this excerpt we gather that women usually inhabited the upstairs of the house. The change of sleeping quarters following the baby’s birth is explained in such detail as to suggest that this would have seemed rather unusual to the jury. Instead of establishing that there were distinct women’s and men’s quarters, the speech actually demonstrates how the arrangement of space in the house could be easily modified to accommodate changing requirements.290 It is telling that Euphiletus felt the need to explain the arrangement of his house, but needed no defense for its flexibility.

The passage also indicates that Euphiletus’ wife needed regular access to the house’s water supply; this seems to have been located in the courtyard of the house, implying that it was at ground level, and would have likely been in the form of a well or cistern. Given the tasks that a woman usually had to do each day – cleaning, washing, cooking – she would have to be near a water and heat source, which were both located on ground level.291 His wife would have also required access to some sort of drain or rudimentary toilet.292 In this case, it seems unlikely that she would spend much time on the upper level of the house, even if they were her ‘usual’

290 For a similar opinion, see Cahill, Olynthus, 151; C.Antonaccio, “Architecture and Behavior: Building Gender into Greek Houses,” Classical World 93 (2000): 527. The thesis that the gynaikonitis may denote a conceptually demarcated space rather than something with identifiable physical boundaries will be explained in further detail later.
291 M.Jameson found that portable terracotta braziers were more commonly used given the dearth of hearths found in excavated houses (“Domestic Space,” 105-106). See further, Tsakirgis, “Hearth, Braziers and Chimneys,” 226-229.
292 At Olynthus drains open onto the street through an opening in the wall (Robinson and Graham, Olynthus VIII, 205ff, pl.55).
quarters. If women usually spent their time upstairs, then Euphiletus’ wife would have had to climb down the stairs each time she had to wash and change the child, which would have been many times a day. In this case, the stairs seem to have been located outdoors, along the exterior of the house. The stairs were quite possibly little more than a ladder (τῆς κλίμακος καταβαίνουσα) giving direct access to the courtyard,\(^{293}\) and thus rendering the task tedious and possibly even precarious. Though putting his wife on the ground floor like this could be seen by the audience as giving her full run of the house, Euphiletus is most likely intending to characterize himself as a kind and considerate husband who cares about his wife’s safety.

In a different vein is Xenophon’s *Oeconomicus*, in which Isomachus is explicit about the separate quarters set aside for the male and female slaves and how these two spaces are divided by a bolted door; this would necessitate that the male and female quarters are on the same level of the house. The evidence given by Euphiletus in Lysias’ speech, however, demonstrates that the women’s quarters (γυναικωνίτις) were located on the upper level (ἀνω) of the house until the spaces were rearranged.\(^{294}\) The small size of the house (οἰκίδιον) in Lysias’ oration may have necessitated the placement of these quarters on the second storey, in contrast to the picture Isomachus paints for us of a substantially larger house. At the very least, it demonstrates that there was no standard arrangement for these quarters.

2.14 Sleeping Arrangements in Euphiletus’ House

The *gynaikonitis* has been viewed not only as an area of the house in which women lived and worked, but also as a place in which they slept. Eva Keuls, for example, has argued that

\(^{293}\) This is the case at Olynthus. See, *ibid.*, 267ff.
\(^{294}\) Lys. 1.9-10.
couples did not sleep in the same bed.\textsuperscript{295} There is, of course, some debate on this matter, but the evidence of Lysias 1 and other sources says otherwise.\textsuperscript{296} In his description, Euphiletus explains that his wife would often leave him and go downstairs (πολλάκις ή γυνή ἀπῆκατω) so that she could sleep (καθευδήσουσα) with the child.\textsuperscript{297} It is the birth of the baby that leads Euphiletus to leave his young bride to her own devices; his trust became absolute only when he believed it to be merited, that is, only after their child was born (ἐπεὶ δὲ μοι παῖς γίγνεται, ἐπίστευον ἡδή καὶ πάντα τὰ ἐμαυτοῦ ἐκείνη παρέδωκα).\textsuperscript{298} Taking a wife, in the Athenian system of arranged marriages, meant taking a stranger into one’s house; a trial period, as the passage suggests, was normal before a husband would allow his wife to run his household, because it served to create trust (οἰκειότητα) between husband and wife.\textsuperscript{299}

Euphiletus’ lengthy aside, more importantly, helps to illustrate the sleeping arrangements in the house. His wife would leave his quarters at night to tend to, and also sleep with, the baby.

\textsuperscript{295}Keuls, \textit{Phallus}, 212.
\textsuperscript{296}For the suggestion that couples slept together, see C.Carey, \textit{Selected Speeches} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 69. Archaeological remains of beds that come from funerary contexts suggest single occupancy (Andrianou, \textit{Furniture}, 31-42), though some beds were wide enough to accommodate two people (K.Sismanidis, \textit{Κάινες καὶ Κλίνοικοι} Κατασκευές των Μακεδονικόν Τάφων (Athens: Archaiologiko Tameio, 1997), 93, 189-192).
\textsuperscript{297}Lys. 1.9.
\textsuperscript{298}Lys. 1.6. Note the use of ἐπίστευον ἡδή (‘from then on’). The passage is used by Euphiletus to showcase the extreme faith he had in his wife, but also to stress that his wife’s adultery began after the birth of their child – to avoid any doubt as to the child’s legitimacy (J.R.Porter, “Adultery by the Book: Lysias 1 (On the Murder of Eratosthenes) and Comic Diegesis,” in \textit{Oxford Readings in the Attic Orators}, ed. E. Carawan (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 70). The new arrangement also facilitated a reversal in sexual roles; the wife took full advantage of her more uninhibited position to carry on the affair (R.Garner, \textit{Law and Society in Classical Athens} (London: Croom Helm, 1987), 86-87).
and this would imply that the couple normally slept in the same suite.\textsuperscript{300} Euphiletus suggests that this was certainly expected, at least on the night of his return from the countryside. This is also implied in Xenophon’s \textit{Oeconomicus}; Isomachus suggests that he spends nights with his wife, among other reasons, because he sees her first thing in the morning.\textsuperscript{301} In general, sleeping arrangements in a house could be adjusted to suit changing needs. In Plato’s \textit{Protagoras}, for instance, a storeroom is transformed into a bed-chamber for overnight guests; this is accomplished by moving couches (κλίναις) into the storeroom and piling cushions (στρώμασίν) and blankets (κοφδίωις) on top of them, thereby transforming the couches into beds.\textsuperscript{302} Though at first glance Lysias’ oration would seem to support the notion of independent and disconnected quarters, we find instead that Euphiletus’ wife needed to justify her absence from her husband’s side at night.

There is evidence, however, that the marital bed of couples was traditionally situated in the husband’s room.\textsuperscript{303} If couples slept together in the same room and bed, then this would imply that they did not sleep in the \textit{gynaikonitis}. If the husband’s room with the marital bed was an area of the \textit{andronitis}, then in Euphiletus’ house it would have been situated originally on the ground floor, which is an odd position for such a private chamber. Of course, it need not be part of the \textit{andronitis}. It is implied in the \textit{Oeconomicus}, for example, that Isomachus and his wife sleep in the same room, and this is very much distinct from the \textit{andronitis} and \textit{gynaikonitis} of the house which are spaces reserved for the servants.\textsuperscript{304} The same could be said of Euphiletus’ house; there could have been a separate room for the couple that was reserved for sleeping on the

\textsuperscript{300} It appears that Euphiletus and his wife usually took their meals together as well (Lys. 1.11), though not on an occasion when Euphiletus had invited a male friend (Lys. 1.23). In general, though, “family meals” are rarely represented in classical literature (Dem. 47.55), though this need not be a consequence of segregation along gender lines; the rarity of family meals could be a result of conflicting schedules.

\textsuperscript{301} Xen. \textit{Oec}. 10.8.

\textsuperscript{302} Plat. \textit{Prot}. 315c-d.

\textsuperscript{303} See further, Oakley and Sinos, \textit{Wedding}, 35, 138 n.103, with Soph. \textit{Trach}. 912-922.

\textsuperscript{304} Xen. \textit{Oec}. 10.8, 9.5.
upper level of the house, which was neither the space called the andronitis nor the space called the gynaikonitis.

2.15 The Design of Euphiletus’ Little House

The form of the word oikos Euphiletus employs in his description is telling; it is the diminutive (oikidion) and is meant to emphasize the owner’s pitiable financial means. Though it does not appear that Euphiletus was a very wealthy man, his poverty should not be exaggerated. Surely not all Athenian houses will have had two floors. The fact that Euphiletus owned land outside of Athens, as well as several household servants, paints a picture of a man of at least modest financial means.

Euphiletus indicates that his home had two storeys, that is, that his house was double (διπλός). He relates how the upper part was equal to the lower part in size, with the women’s apartments above the men’s apartments (ισα ἔχουν τὰ ἄνω τοῖς κάτω κατὰ τὴν γυναικωσίαν και κατὰ τὴν ἄνδρωντιν). The preposition κατὰ takes the accusative case (τὴν γυναικωσίαν...τὴν ἄνδρωντιν) where it suggests motion over or through a space; it implies that the γυναικωσία and the ἄνδρωντι are spaces within the upper and lower levels of the house, rather than the two spaces themselves. If it were the case that the upper floor were solely the γυναικωσί and the lower level were solely the ἄνδρωντι then the word κατὰ would not have been employed here. Euphiletus is trying to emphasize that the parts, which

---

305 For example, Simon’s house in Lysias 3.6 only had one floor (S.Usher and M.Edwards, Antiphon and Lysias (Warminster: Aris & Philips, 1985), 223). For the land Euphiletus owned, see Lys. 1.11 and 1.8. For the servants, see Lys. 1.12. On the number of servants he owned, see M.J.Edwards, Five Speeches: Speeches 1, 12, 19, 22, 30 (London: Bristol, 1999), 71.

306 Lys. 1.9 is the only recorded use of the word διπλός to indicate a two-storeyed building; terms that are used later to indicate two-storeys are διστέγος (e.g. Strab. 15.3.8) and διώροφος (e.g. App. Pun. 95). See G.Morgan, “Euphiletus’ House: Lysias 1,” TAPA 112 (1974): 116.

307 Lys. 1.9.
were likely used as living quarters, were equal in size and quite distinct from any other rooms the house may have contained.

The word ἑσα (‘equal’) could also refer to the layout of the house. Gareth Morgan, who has studied the text in association with the plan of the house, has argued that the floor plans of the upper and lower storeys of the house were identical. He posits that it was structurally unattainable for a house whose walls were made of mud brick to possess different partition walls above and below; unless supported by a corresponding wall beneath, a wall on the upper level of the house would not be able to sustain itself. On the other hand, the upper floor plan could have had fewer wall divisions. Even more feasible than this, however, is an upstairs with partitions between rooms that were made of less bulky materials, such as wood or cloth. The absence of any door sockets for interior rooms at some sites, suggests that more temporary fixtures, such as curtains or tapestries, were often employed to divide space.

In Euphiletus’ house, there must have been at least two rooms on the upper level: an inner one which could be locked from the outside (in which Euphiletus is playfully confined by his wife as a ploy to keep him from witnessing the affair), and an outer one which gives access to the staircase or ladder (by which Euphiletus’ wife descends to conduct the affair). The outer room could have been the quarters for the slaves, since female servants often slept outside their

---

308 Gareth Morgan attempted a reconstruction of Euphiletus’ house based on the archaeological remains of one of the houses from the area near the Areopagus in Athens – House D, which will be discussed later (“Euphiletus’ House: Lysias 1,” TAPA 112 (1974): 116, 120-121). For House D, see Young, “Industrial District,” 217 ff.

309 The literary sources for curtains (e.g. παραπετάσματα) are Pollux 10.32; I.G. I 1 421, lines 173-174, 205; Aristoph. Wasps 1215 and Frogs 938; Paus. 5.12.4; Athen. 5.196c; Plut. Alex. 51. Some visual evidence for curtains is the Frieze of the Actors from the House of the Comedians on Delos (V.Bruno, Hellenistic Painting Techniques: The Evidence of the Delos Fragments (Leiden: E.J.Brill, 1985), 22-30, pls. 3, 5a), the Ikarios relief from Naples (G.M.A.Richter, The Furniture of the Greeks, Etruscans and Romans (London: Phaidon, 1966), fig.600), and funerary wall paintings (R.Benassai, La pittura dei Campani e dei Sanniti (Rome: L’Erma, 2001), 77-78, Figs. 98-99). For partitions in buildings, see Thuc. 1.133. Actual wooden partitions have been found in Herculaneum (J.J.Deiss, Herculaneum, Italy’s Buried Treasure (Malibu: Getty Trust, 1989), 87). For lack of door sockets at Olynthus, see Robinson and Graham, Olynthus VIII, 153ff and 249ff. For the portable nature of wooden doors, see W.K.Pritchett and A.Pippin, “The Attic Stelai: Part II,” Hesperia 25 (1956): 233-235 and J.H.Kent, “The Temple Estates of Delos, Rheneia and Mykonos,” Hesperia 17 (1948): 293.
mistress’ room, or at least nearby, so that they could tend to her or her children.\footnote{G. Morgan, “Euphiletus’ House: Lysias 1,” \textit{TAPA} 112 (1974): 118, with Hom. \textit{Od.} 23.228-230.} What makes this distinction clearer is the term Euphiletus uses for the inner room: δωματίων; the word is usually utilized to denote a bed-chamber or bedroom, not a living room. In Lysias 1 this is the word used for the room that Euphiletus will sleep in, where he is shut in by his wife (ἀπεκλήσθεν ἐν τῷ δωματίῳ) and also where he finds his wife in bed with Eratosthenes (ὡσαντες δὲ τὴν θύραν τοῦ δωματίου...κατακείμενον παρὰ τῇ γυναικί...ἐν τῇ κλίνῃ γυμνῶν ἔστηκότα).\footnote{Lys. 1.17, 1.24. The word δωματίων can denote ‘chamber’, but more specifically a ‘bed-chamber’ (e.g. Plat. \textit{Rep.} 390c), and sometimes is translated simply as ‘bed’ or ‘couch’ (e.g. Aristoph. \textit{Lys.} 160; Hom. \textit{Il.} 14.296) (\textit{LSJ} s.v. δωματίου). Its usage suggests that it was a room which was private in nature and usually contained a bed.} When Euphiletus dines with his friend upstairs (ὑπερῷον), however, he is less precise in his language, and does not specify which room he is entertaining in.\footnote{Lys. 1.23: ἀναβάτες εἰς τὸ ὑπερῷον (‘we climbed to the upper level’). The word ὑπερῷον has a long history in Greek and is commonly interpreted as upper storey or a room on the upper storey (e.g. Hom. \textit{Il.} 2.514, 16.184) which is approached by means of a staircase (e.g. Hom. \textit{Od.} 1.330), but can also sometimes denote an attic (e.g. Aristoph. \textit{Pl.} 811, \textit{Kn.} 1001) (\textit{LSJ} s.v. ὑπερῷον).} The space Euphiletus refers to here could be the main upstairs living space, rather than a specific room.

Access to the upper storey of Euphiletus’ house, where he is now living, may have been an exterior staircase or ladder, and perhaps this is directly accessible from the courtyard.\footnote{Lys. 1.9.} This is made more probable by the fact that when Euphiletus comes home and goes upstairs to dine with his friend, his wife’s lover is presumably already in the house on the ground floor, yet he fails to notice him.\footnote{Lys. 1.11-12.} It would also explain why Euphiletus could slip out on the fateful night of the murder without anyone taking notice. Euphiletus is upstairs sleeping when his maid informs him that Eratosthenes is in the house with his wife; he tells the maid to look after the door as he goes down silently and exits the house (καταβὰς σιωπῇ ἔξερχομαι) in order to round up...
Here we find strong evidence for an external staircase; this would take Euphiletus down to the lower level of the house and outside onto the street without being spotted by his wife and lover who were in an inner room on the ground floor.

According to Christopher Carey, however, the exchange of living quarters would make more sense if we assume an internal staircase, so that the upper storey could only be approached through the rooms downstairs, which would normally have been the men’s quarters. This is supported to a certain extent by the suggestion that there was a single door leading from the house to the courtyard (ἡ μέταυλος θύρα). However, Euphiletus’ explanation of the way he exited and entered the house without being noticed by the couple on the ground floor makes this unlikely. If he were forced to enter one of the rooms on the ground floor in order to access an internal staircase to reach the second storey, then the couple would have surely spotted him. It is more plausible that the staircase was external, allowing Euphiletus to come and go without being perceived.

In his testimony, Euphiletus explains how certain signs helped to confirm his wife’s affair, for example, the creaking (ἐψῴει) of the door leading to the house (ἡ μέταυλος θύρα) and of the courtyard door (ἡ αὐλειος) in the middle of the night. In terms of physical space, the μέταυλος θύρα seems to have been the door from the house proper into some form of unroofed but enclosed space, most likely the courtyard, while the αὐλειος θύρα is the outer door separating the courtyard from the street. From this passage we gather that the main house door as well as the door leading out into the street were opened, and this is born out by Euphiletus’

315 Lys. 1.23.
317 Lys. 1.17. The plural form of θύρα is most commonly used. However, in cases where this noun is preceded or followed by another noun in the attributive sense, as in Lys. 1.17 (μέταυλος θύρα), it is often in the singular form (e.g. Dem. 47.53; Xen. Oec. 9.5). Sometimes, the singular form of the noun is used to indicate double doors (e.g. Hom. Il. 24.317-319).
318 Lys. 1.17.
wife who justifies the noise by saying she had to leave to relight a lamp at their neighbor’s home.\textsuperscript{319} Though Euphiletus does mention that the house had a hearth, it is possible that cooking was done on a portable brazier that would normally be extinguished before bedtime.\textsuperscript{320} This would provide his wife with a plausible justification for her exit from the house in the middle of the night. In this case, however, the noise Euphiletus heard was likely the unbarring of the doors by his wife in order to let her lover out.

Despite the obvious fact that Euphiletus’ wife had full run of the house and engaged in risky and daring activities without the knowledge of her husband,\textsuperscript{321} scholars have read Lysias’ speech as affirmation of a standard arrangement in which women were kept under surveillance, secluded and confined. The placement of the women’s quarters on the upper level of Euphiletus’ house, as well as the bolted door, has been used to make this point.\textsuperscript{322} There is, indeed, evidence for women spending time on the upper storeys of houses,\textsuperscript{323} but this by no means suggests that they were confined to this space. Ruth Scodel argues that Lysias I is proof that women were not only restricted to living in inaccessible quarters on the upper storey of houses, but were also locked in.\textsuperscript{324} Her argument is founded on an incident which occurs when Euphiletus unexpectedly returns from the countryside; his wife detains him upstairs (\textit{προστιθεσαι τὴν θύραν...τὴν κλεῖν ἐφέλκεται}) so that she may go downstairs to her lover unhindered. Euphiletus’ account suggests that there was a bolt on the door that could be secured from the

\textsuperscript{319} Lys. 1.14.

\textsuperscript{320} For the hearth, see Lys. 1.27. On braziers, see Tsakirgis, “Hearth, Braziers and Chimneys,” 226-229.

\textsuperscript{321} Note how it is only after Euphiletus is informed through female channels that he learns of the affair: a rejected lover of Eratosthenes sends her maid to tell Euphiletus of the affair (Lys. 1.15-16), his own maid agrees to help him learn the truth about his wife (Lys. 1.18-21) and is instrumental in the success of the plan to catch the lovers in the act (Lys. 1.23-24).


\textsuperscript{323} For example, Aristoph. \textit{Eccl.} 697; Eur. \textit{Phoen.} 88-89.

outside.\textsuperscript{325} Ruth Scodel claims that this area of the house was originally the women’s quarters of the house before the baby was born; she finds that the passage confirms that the women would have been locked into these quarters by the master of the house.\textsuperscript{326}

At no point, however, does Euphiletus articulate that the room that has the bolted door was once the \textit{gynaikonitis}. The information we are given about this room is that it is on the upper storey of the house (\(\alpha\pi\tau\epsilon\iota\epsilon\iota\kappa\alpha\tau\omega\)), it is where Euphiletus sleeps (\(\epsilon\kappa\alpha\theta\epsilon\vartheta\delta\omicron\)) and perhaps dines (\(\mu\epsilon\tau\alpha\ \delta\epsilon\ \tau\delta\ \delta\epsilon\iota\pi\nu\omicron\nu\)), and is secured by a door that can be bolted (\(\tau\eta\nu\ \kappa\lambda\epsilon\iota\nu\ \epsilon\phi\epsilon\lambda\kappa\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota\)).\textsuperscript{327} This room, in fact, appears to be the exact same chamber (\(\delta\omega\mu\alpha\tau\iota\omicron\nu\)) that he is locked up in by his wife (\(\alpha\pi\epsilon\kappa\lambda\iota\sigma\theta\eta\nu\ \epsilon\nu\ \tau\omega\ \delta\omega\mu\alpha\tau\iota\omega\)), and therefore, where he usually spends the night with his wife. If it is, indeed, the same room, then it would have been used as the couple’s bedroom, and there is no reason to believe that this was the \textit{gynaikonitis}, nor even a room that was part of the \textit{gynaikonitis}.

In addition to this, Euphiletus does not tell us whether other rooms of the house had similar door fittings. Even if this were the only room in his house with such security measures, however, many reasons could be found for this. The obvious one is privacy; since the \(\delta\omega\mu\alpha\tau\iota\omicron\nu\) was used as the couple’s bedroom, a lock would have safeguarded against unwanted entry, especially in a small urban home like Euphiletus’. Even more plausible, however, is that the lock on the door of the chamber in Euphiletus’ house had the same purpose as it did in Isomachus’ house. Though in Isomachus’ house the locked door (\(\theta\omicron\rho\alpha\ \beta\alpha\lambda\alpha\nu\omega\tau\eta\)) is used to separate the female from the male slave quarters (the \textit{gynaikonitis} from the \textit{andronitis}), it also

\textsuperscript{325} Lys. 1.13. The word \(\kappa\lambda\epsilon\iota\zeta\) refers to the horizontal bar or bolt that was drawn or undrawn by a latch or by a pin slipped into the bolt. Cf. Xen. \textit{Oec.} 9.4: ‘bolted door’.


\textsuperscript{327} Lys. 1.10, 1.11, 1.13.
acts as a deterrent for theft, since costly linens and other supplies were usually kept here.\textsuperscript{328} That this may have been the purpose of the bolted door in Euphiletus’ house as well, is supported by the fact that Euphiletus stresses household property in his speech. Euphiletus claims that one of the things an adulterer accomplishes in seducing the wife of another man is to gain control of another man’s household ($\pi\alpha\sigma\alpha\nu\varepsilon\pi\epsilon\kappa\epsilon\iota\nu\omega\varsigma\;\tau\iota\eta\nu\;\omicron\kappa\iota\iota\alpha\nu\nu\gamma\varepsilon\gamma\omicron\nu\epsilon\nu\varsigma\iota\iota$),\textsuperscript{329} and in this way underscores the consequent danger to the property of the family that such an act might entail.

2.16 The Surveillance of Women or Euphiletus Saves Face

Greek standards of modesty seem to have demanded that a woman be protected from any sort of physical contact with any man not her husband. It is the men who receive the active role of defending a woman’s purity by vigilance against the sexual advances of other men and also from a woman’s own dangerous impulses.\textsuperscript{330} This is suggested by the countless references to adultery in Greek literature, some of which imply that illicit sex was fairly widespread among women.\textsuperscript{331} Numerous orations attest to the dishonor men feel when their women are compromised. Euphiletus, for example, claims that Eratosthenes disgraced ({$\hat{\eta}\sigma\chi\nu\nu\epsilon$}) his children and humiliated him by entering his house and seducing his wife.\textsuperscript{332} In this context, the house is

\textsuperscript{328} Xen. \textit{Oec.} 9.5
\textsuperscript{329} Lys. 1.33. The fear is mirrored by Aristophanes (\textit{Thes}. 414 ff). Dem. 47 demonstrates that simply entering a man’s home when he is not there could be tantamount to theft; here, there is a break in, and no one is prepared to enter the house himself while the head of the household is absent. According to Jane Gardner, Athenians were anxious about adultery because legitimate sons were the exclusive heirs of their father’s property; land was still very important as it meant that a man had a greater stake in the wellbeing of his community, and could therefore be trusted (“Aristophanes and Male Anxiety – The Defence of the Oikos,” \textit{G\&R} 36 (1989): 59-61).
\textsuperscript{332} Lys. 1.4.
viewed as a secret domain and any violation of the house is an attack on the honor of its men and the chastity of its women.

Euphiletus’ honor as a man and husband is in large part defined through the chastity of his wife. It is in Euphiletus’ best interests to represent his household as one that abided by the behavior the watchful community thought necessary to maintain respectability; the safeguarding of women is the chief means by which this sexual purity is demonstrated to the community. Euphiletus takes care to emphasize his wife’s proper behavior by relating how it is he or the maid who goes to the market and does the shopping and never his wife. When she does leave the house it is for a legitimate and socially-acceptable purpose, like the funeral of Euphiletus’ mother or for the Thesmophoria festival.

We discover, however, that Euphiletus spent a lot of time in the countryside, sometimes several days at a time (ἠκοντα διὰ χρόνου). On the night in question, he came home unexpectedly (ηκων μὲν ἀπροσδοκήτως ἐξ ἄγρου), in other words, he did not come home earlier than he had anticipated when he left that morning, but rather he came home on a different day altogether. The passage suggests that Euphiletus spent days at a time on his farm while keeping a house in the city in which his wife, child and servants lived. Such an arrangement demonstrates that the small farmer could tend to his land while still taking part in the political, economic and social activities of the city.

---

333 In fact, insulting a woman by saying that she addresses those who pass her by on the street, that she answers the door herself or that she talks with men, are all roughly equivalent to saying that she is promiscuous (Theophr. Char. 28.3). A similar account is given of a modern Lebanese village; a ‘good girl’ does not speak to anyone (J.Williams, The Youth of Haouch el Harimi, a Lebanese Village (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1967), 76-77). For an analogous report from modern rural Italy, see J.Davis, Land and Family in Pisticci (London: Athlone, 1971), 48-49. For a comparative study in modern rural Greece, see J.K.Campbell, Honour, Family and Patronage. A Study of Institutions and Moral Values in a Greek Mountain Community (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1964), 185, 203, 268-274, 301-320; Du Boulay, Village, 121-200; M.Handman, La Violence et la ruse: hommes et femmes dans un village grec (Aix-en-Provence: Edisud, 1983), 71-175.

334 Lys. 1.8, 1.16, 1.18 (shopping), 1.8 (funeral), 1.20 (Thesmophoria).

335 Lys. 1.12, 1.11 but also 1.20.
According to Robin Osborne, city life was “permeated by the country at every level.”\(^{336}\)

The countryside absorbed the time and energy of the majority of its inhabitants, influenced its politics and shaped its schedule of activities; the town was not independent of the land around it. The general consensus now is that both slave and hired labor were no doubt a common supplement to the farmer, even for those of modest means,\(^{337}\) though neighbors could also assist one another without being hired or subservient. This could, in fact, be the case with Euphiletus, who does not mention that he has any help on his farm, and could help explain why he dines with his neighbor after coming home from the fields.\(^{338}\) Such help, however, was not readily available or dependable, especially at peak times of the farming cycle. Euphiletus, for example, does not find many of his neighbors at home on the night he discovers his wife in bed with her lover.\(^{339}\) The typical pattern, however, whether it is stated or not, is of a farmer who works his land with as many slaves as he can afford, whether permanent or temporary, so that he can have sufficient leisure time to function as a citizen.

It is generally believed that population pressures led to a more intensive exploitation of land in Attica, but that the systems and techniques that were employed to meet these new material needs took into consideration the maintenance of the Athenian social system.\(^{340}\)

---


\(^{338}\) Lys. 1.22-23.

\(^{339}\) Lys. 1.23. Of course, his neighbors were not necessarily farmers. It has been seen as both correct and misleading to argue that the majority of the population was still involved in agriculture (K.Vlassopoulos, “Free Spaces: Identity, Experience and Democracy in Classical Athens,” *CQ* 57 (2007): 49-51).

Diversification rather than specialization in crops seems to have been the rule of thumb; whenever the produce of an estate is mentioned in our sources, a variety of crops is usually described. This system would have spread work more evenly throughout the year, with wheat and barley harvested in the spring, grapes in the summer, olives in the autumn, and the other months being utilized for tilling, sowing and converting the harvested crops into grain, wine and oil. Agricultural labor was, nevertheless, marked by sharp seasonal fluctuations that left the farmer “underemployed” at various times of the year; this made living in or near the city while holding farmland in its immediate surroundings a feasible scenario for someone like Euphiletus. Because traditional agrarian techniques were not continuous throughout the year, the farmer could share in the equally occasional and seasonal activities of the city.

There is no doubt that Euphiletus spent a large portion of his time on his farm away from the city and his family, in particular, during harvest season. That he had sufficient time to supervise his household on a daily basis is highly improbable; he, in fact, views the death of his mother as the beginning of all evils (ἐπειδή δὲ μοι ἢ μήτηρ ἐτελεύτησε, πάντων τῶν κακῶν ἀποθανοῦσα αἵτια μοι γεγένηται), because it was she who kept watch over the household while he was absent. Because Euphiletus spent most of his days and many of his nights on his farm, his wife would have been required to leave the house on occasion to tend to errands, and this perhaps would have raised red flags for the jury. Euphiletus may be trying to save face with the jury by stressing that his wife had a maid who did the shopping, so that he does not appear to

341 For example, see Dem. 42.20, but also 42.7 and 42.24.
343 See further, E.M.Wood, Peasant-Citizen and Slave: The Foundations of Athenian Democracy (New York: Verso, 1988), 109-110, who argues that the view of Athenians as being wholly dependent on slave labor for their leisure time and participation in politics is far too simplistic.
be too cavalier about the comings and goings of his wife, and, for that reason, a negligent husband who deserved his lot. The reality, however, must have been quite different; as a farmer, Euphiletus probably spent most of his hours on his farm in the country rather than in the city keeping a watchful eye on his household.

2.17 Shame and Honor in Lysias’ Against Simon

The issue of appearances is broached in another law court speech by Lysias, which deals with wounding with intent to kill. Simon had attempted to abduct a young man from the defendant’s home and a scuffle ensued. In the defendant’s speech, he gives an account of the attack upon his home:

Hearing that the boy was at my house, he came there at night in a drunken state, broke down the doors (ἐκκόψας τὰς θύρας), and entered the women’s rooms (εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὴν γυναικόωντιν): within were my sister and my nieces, whose lives have been so well-ordered (κοσμίως) that they are ashamed (αἰσχύνεσθαι) to be seen even by their kinsmen. This man, then, carried insolence (ὑβρεῖς) to such a pitch that he refused to go away until the people who appeared on the spot...feeling it a monstrous thing that he should intrude on young girls and orphans, drove him out by force.344

The term hybris is generally used to denote certain types of excessive or outrageous behavior, frequently involving assault, and commonly with sexual overtones.345 Here it is employed to suggest impudence against women who warranted respect. The nighttime entry into the house by Simon is exacerbated by the fact that he is intoxicated (μεθύων). The account of the event is intended to paint a picture of Simon as an insolent man who behaved outrageously by entering a

---

345 LSJ s.v. ὑβρίς. For the use of the term to denote an outrage against a person, especially a violation like adultery or rape, see Lys. 1.2; Dem. 19.309; Isoc. 4.114; Aeschin. 1.116, 1.118, 1.29.
part of the house that was not meant to be accessible to casual visitors, nor even close friends. He touches upon the inviolability of the home, but also the fine upbringing and extreme humility of the women, values which were, at least in theory, fervently upheld.

From the defendant’s account of the intrusion we learn that there was an area of the house specifically set aside for women (γυναίκωνιτιν), though no mention is made as to where this was located. He also tells us that Simon broke down the doors and entered this area. The use of the plural form for the doors of the house (τὰς θύρας) could indicate that the defendant’s house had two main doors, one separating the house proper from the courtyard and another leading from the courtyard into the street, as in Euphiletus’ house in Lysias 1.\textsuperscript{346} If this were the case, it would mean that Simon broke into an interior room of the house in which the women were sitting. On the other hand, it is possible that the plural form is used for the singular, implying that Simon broke open a single door, perhaps with two panels.\textsuperscript{347} If this is true, then it implies that Simon found the women near the main street entrance of the house rather than in a room in the innermost part of the house.

If Simon were looking for a young man, as the defendant claims, it is odd that he would force his way into an area which was presumably only for women, the gynaikonitis, and whose arrangement was standard, as scholars have stipulated. One would not normally expect the women’s quarters to have been so easily accessible from the street, though the wording implies movement into the space (εἰσεπληθευ). Perhaps Simon was not expecting to find the women where he did. This could imply either that the women were not where they should have been, or that

\textsuperscript{346} For the two separate doors of Euphiletus’ house, see Lys. 1.13.

\textsuperscript{347} The use of the plural in Lysias 3.6 could be a case of employing the plural for the singular. Stephen Todd finds that because the form is repeated later (3.23) it makes it sound intentional, that is that there were two doors (\textit{A Commentary on Lysias, Speeches 1-11} (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 313). This is not necessary; the plural form is often used for double-paneled or folding doors (e.g. Hdt. 1.9.3; Hom. \textit{Od.} 17.267, 6.19; IG 12.313.123, 12.372.195). For evidence of double doors at Olynthus, see Cahill, \textit{Olynthus}, 98, 113, 125, 131, 239, 241-242.
the women’s quarters were not where they should have been. Either way, the passage demonstrates the ambiguous nature and placement of this area in the house.

It is quite possible, in fact, that the women were in the courtyard when Simon barged in on them; there is plenty of textual evidence that demonstrates that women and children often spent a considerable amount of time in the courtyards of houses, so this may have been expected. It seems to have been common courtesy to knock, for example, before entering a man’s house so as not to intrude on women and children in the courtyard. If, on the contrary, the women in the defendant’s house were not supposed to be where they were found, then it would at minimum suggest that the internal divisions of the house were flexible and socially negotiated, rather than fixed and standard.

The ‘misplaced’ women would also perhaps imply that the litigant’s excursus on their modesty was nothing but a rhetorical exaggeration employed to present his family and himself as respectable and upstanding. The statement could be an outright lie that is meant to stress the ideal of female seclusion and make the intrusion into the house seem all the more repugnant. An allegation of intrusion into areas where women are present is quite a commonplace charge in oratory, and though it is usually an effective charge, it is not always a very reliable one.

2.18 Dramatic Literature and the Character of the Gynaikonitis

Like oratory and philosophical discourses, dramatic texts have also been employed to assess the lives of women. Some scholars have voiced the opinion that the words and deeds of fictional characters are fictional themselves, and are almost impossible to judge as social

348 For example, Dem. 47.56. In many Greek villages today, considerable time is spent in the courtyard, especially in the summer months; cooking, for example, commonly takes place in the court (Du Boulay, Village, 24-25).
349 On the common practice of knocking, see Plut. Mem. 3.8.
350 For the routine nature of the charge, see Dem. 21.79, 37.45 and 47.53.
commentary because they are totally and solely the product of Athenian men.\textsuperscript{351} Most Greek literature was written by men, however, so that if all scholars held the same point of view then it would make any attempt to reconstruct the lives of women an utterly hopeless one. One may argue that all literary genres have their own set of rules and their own independent goals, so that it is simply a matter of finding those rules and goals so that we may assess their value for our study.

Kenneth M. De Luca has argued that the practical value of reading the comedies of Aristophanes, for example, comes from their ability to greatly influence mass opinion. Comedy deals with contemporary issues and personages and aims at generating doubt about issues we might otherwise take too seriously.\textsuperscript{352} Even the exercise of following a play, of watching or imagining the action unfold, affects us in a way that is very difficult for other literature, for instance prose, to do. As one commentator on Aristophanes has noted: “The instrument by which the poet probed the popular discontent was that most effective of all means when skillfully used – a laugh.”\textsuperscript{353} What this suggests is that laughter is experienced through comedy, and once we experience comedy it is difficult to remove it from our thinking.

The women in comedy, with whom we are concerned, are obviously fictional characters in the context of a play. Such women, however, may be closer to the lived reality of Athenian women than the cloistered ladies depicted in law court speeches.\textsuperscript{354} For some, the incidental information from Aristophanes’ works offers better evidence for women’s daily life than the set-pieces of Euripides or the idealized treatises of Xenophon. Aristophanes’ comedies are not

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{352} K.M. De Luca, \textit{Aristophanes’ Male and Female Revolutions: A Reading of Aristophanes’ Knights and Assemblywomen} (New York: Lexington Books, 2005), xiii-xiv.
\item \textsuperscript{353} M. Croiset, \textit{Aristophanes and the Political Parties at Athens}, trans. J. Loeb (London: Macmillan, 1909), xv.
\item \textsuperscript{354} K.J. Dover, “Classical Greek Attitudes to Sexual Behaviour,” \textit{Arethusa} 6 (1973): 69, with Lys. 3.6.
\end{itemize}
mechanical products of male ideologies; they are rather cognizant manipulations and satires of them.\textsuperscript{355} Comedy makes a habit of treating in a humorous way topics that are derived from real life, and in this way offers considerable insight into actual Athenian social practices.

2.19 Aristophanic Comedy and Male Fears: Locking Up and Other Precautions

Scholars acknowledge that comedy is a means of banishing our suspicions and fears by causing us to laugh at them,\textsuperscript{356} and one of the most commonly raised fears in Aristophanic comedy is the fear of adultery and of being cuckolded.\textsuperscript{357} As noted above, adultery was not a private issue in Athens because there were both serious legal and political consequences to illegitimacy. Aristophanes’ comedies portray husbands who inquire about their wives, who are suspicious when they find them outside the house, and who look under beds with the expectation that they will find lovers there.\textsuperscript{358} The women of comedy, however, are not blameless; they peek out of the door to catch a glimpse of the man they are admiring, put themselves on display for the opposite sex, or take lovers.\textsuperscript{359}

In the \textit{Thesmophoriazousae}, a woman named Mika makes a speech to the assembly and claims that Euripides the playwright consistently represents women as adulterers, drunks and traitors. Because of this, the city’s men have grown suspicious of their every move and the crimes they once could get away with have now become impossible to carry out.\textsuperscript{360} The women’s complaint is not that Euripides lies, for they themselves admit that they are exactly

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item Aristoph. \textit{Eccl.} 520, 1008 and \textit{Thes.} 414, 519, 785-800.
\item Aristoph. \textit{Thes.} 400-428. Note how Mika does not deny the charges.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
what he says they are, but rather that he has publicized these deeds. According to Mika, everyone would be better off if these transgressions were concealed.

As the passage in the *Thesmophoriazousae* suggests, husbands began to keep a watch on their wives and started locking them up (ἐίτα διὰ τούτον ταῖς γυναικωνίτισιν σφραγίδας ἐπιβάλλουσιν ἡδη καὶ μοχλοὺς τηροῦντες ἡμᾶς). Putting seals (σφραγίδες) on doors, like the lock and bolt, was a means of ensuring that any unauthorized entry or exit would not go undetected; the door was sealed with clay in which impressions were made with a ring that belonged only to the owner. In order for the integrity of the home to remain intact, the household and its women had to be above suspicion. In the *Lysistrata*, for example, it is suggested that a man who invites someone to go to his house while he is away is basically inviting him to commit adultery with his wife. The locking and sealing of doors is a precaution that is taken in order to keep women safe within the house, that is, to keep untrustworthy men out. All this, however, is often wasted effort.

The men in the *Thesmophoriazousae*, however, also began to lock up their possessions (ὅδ' ἡμῖν πρὸ τοῦ αὐταῖς ταμεύσαι) and denied access to their wives by fashioning special keys that could not be reproduced (οἱ γὰρ ἄνδρες ἡδη κλείδια αὐτοῖ φοροῦσι κρυπτά κακοηθέστατα Λακωνίκ’ ἁττα…πρὸ τοῦ μὲν οὖν ἢ ἀλλ’ ὑποίξαι τὴν θύραν ποιησαμέναι οἱ δακτύλιοι τριῳβόλου…). Not only did the master of the house lock up the storeroom, but he also kept the key on his person so that his wife could not ‘borrow’ it. In contemporary society, adultery is usually accompanied with a feeling of being affronted or betrayed, but this is

---

364 Aristoph. *Lys.* 404-419.
365 Euripides claims that there is no wall or property that is as difficult to guard as a woman (fr. 320).
not what one finds in Aristophanes. Why should a husband keep things locked up from his own wife? In our sources, adultery is often a matter of who has control of the family’s resources. Euphiletus in Lysias 1, for instance, claims that an adulterer not only shames a man’s family, but also obtains access to the husband’s possessions.367

At first glance, property does not strike one as being directly related to adultery, but for the Athenian citizen it was. Athenians like Euphiletus and others were anxious about adultery because legitimate sons were the exclusive heirs of their father’s property. Legitimacy had to be proved in order to inherit property, and even slander could prevent a child from inheriting from his father.368 Owning land also meant that a man had a greater stake in the wellbeing of his community, and could therefore be trusted by his fellow Athenians.369 The kind of behavior that Aristophanes singles out, deception and adultery, is that which threatens the security of the oikos, and ultimately, the city at large on which it was based.

2.20 A Tragic Excursus: Παρθενών as a Synonym for Γυναικωτίς

Tragic literature, like comic literature, was formulated by Athenian citizens who were conscious of the social ideals of their city and were affected by them. This does not mean that we should take the actions and words of an Antigone or of an Iphigenia at face value, but that we should at least assess their take on the social values of their community as reflected in their words and deeds. Though the word γυναικωτίς does not occur in the dramatic works of Aeschylus, Sophocles or Euripides, the term παρθενών does. It appears a handful of times in

367 Lys. 1.33.
the plays of Aeschylus and Euripides, mostly in its plural form (παρθενώνες), and seems to denote a young maiden’s chamber.370

The term is often used to signify a space that is relatively inaccessible and well protected. In Euripides’ Iphigenia in Tauris, the παρθενών is used to house the spear of Pelops, a precious family heirloom,371 apparently because this was a very private room.372 The element of guarding or protecting something that is cherished or that needs supervision is well demonstrated in Euripides’ Iphigenia in Aulis; Clytemnestra explicitly states that the young women are well guarded in their fortified maiden’s chambers (ὁχυροίσι παρθενώσι φρονούνται καλῶς).373 The παρθενών is clearly intended for young unmarried girls who were under the tutelage of a nurse and whose chastity needed to be strictly protected to ensure proper maturation, i.e. marriage.

Though the above dramatic works relay the sense of what the παρθενών was – a chamber for girls that was well protected – they do not, however, tell us where in the house it was located. Euripides’ Phoenician Women is a case in point; Antigone leaves her maiden quarters (παρθενώνας ἐκλιπεῖν) to climb to the roof of the house to watch the Argive army outside the city of Thebes.374 Not only do we not get a sense of where the chamber was located in proximity to other rooms, but we cannot even ascertain whether she is coming from the upper or lower storey of the house. Donald Mastronarde has read the emphasis on Antigone’s maidenhood and the seclusion it appears to require as a literary device that exploits conventional

370 See Aesch. PB 646; Eur. Phoen. 89, 194, 1265, 1275; Eur. IA 738, 1175; Eur. IT 826. See LSJ s.v. παρθενών. Alternatively, the term is also employed for the cella in a Greek temple, though it is usually in the singular form in such cases (e.g. Dem. 22.76; IG 12.301.13; SIG 695.23).
371 Eur. IT 826. In a similar fashion Penelope locks up Odysseus’ bow and quiver in a remote room of the house to which only she holds the key (Hom. Od. 21.1-15). Though the word παρθενών specifically is not used here, the idea is the same.
373 Eur. IA 738.
etiquette about unmarried girls not wandering about in the open. He claims that this device is employed by Euripides to represent Antigone’s action in the play by illustrating her emergence from a protected innocence and exaggerated maidenly modesty into the harsh realities of unsheltered adult life. This opinion is espoused by other scholars who see Antigone as the archetype of a well-behaved maiden who fully buys into the ideology of the society in which she lives. Over the course of the play, however, she rejects the social conventions that have previously governed her behavior, and this is epitomized by her refusal to consent to marriage.

What is made clear in Euripides’ Phoenician Women is that women’s physical movements were subject to strict social rules. Antigone begins the play in her maiden quarters, obedient to male authority; when she does leave her chamber she has the permission of her mother and is chaperoned by an elderly maid. Even after taking these precautions, the maid stresses the importance of her remaining unseen, even by other women, because of the gossip she will instigate (ἐπίσχες, ὑς ἀν προφερενήσω στίβοι, μή τις πολίτων ἐν τρίβω φαντάζεται, κάμωι μὲν ἐλθῇ φαύλος ὑς δούλω ψόγος, σοι δ’ ὑς ἀνάσσῃ).

Antigone herself is hesitant to come into view, but by the end of the play, she is not ashamed to expose her face for all to behold (οὐ προκαλυπτομένα βοτρυχώδεος ἀβρα παρηίδος οὐδ’ ύπο παρθενίας τὸν ύπο βλεφάροις φοίνικ’…αἰδομένα φέρομαι). Antigone has cast away social convention.

According to Laura Swift, Antigone’s choice to forgo marriage and follow her father into exile is “emblematic of her inability to follow the social rules.” Like many rites of passage, young girls’ transitions are conceptualized as potentially hazardous times. Unsuccessful

---

transitions, like Antigone’s failure to achieve maturity through marriage, are seen as being
detrimental to the wider community, as well as to the girls themselves. Part of the play’s impact,
in Swift’s opinion, is “to affirm the importance of managing sexual and familial relations
appropriately,” and to remind the audience that a harmonious and well-functioning society is
dependent on this.\textsuperscript{381} The play demonstrates the problem of sexual development and the risks to
the individual and to the wider community when social norms are undermined. What should be
highlighted, however, is that social norms, no matter how rigidly enforced, could be challenged
and even disregarded.

2.21 Ideology versus Social Practice

Scholars often considered statements like those discussed above and others to be reliable
descriptions of actual conduct, and they employ them to support the view that women were
isolated and secluded to preserve their chastity or respectability. One must be able, however, to
distinguish between ideology and social practice, that is, to recognize the difference between the
body of doctrine, myth and belief that guides society from the way in which ideology is adhered
to, manipulated or ignored in the daily life of the community. As we witnessed in the case of
Euphiletus’ wife whose adultery was publicized in a law speech, social codes are reproduced
usually in a very mediated way and are sorted using the filters of desire and reservation. They
more or less reproduce the system in which they are generated, but they never directly
correspond to the social constraints of the community. It is precisely in this space – the space
between society as a system and society as a set of individual motives – that we may locate the

\textsuperscript{381} Ibid., 78.
play of ideology; this is also what marks the gap between the way society works and the way it presents itself to the subject’s consciousness.

The gap is difficult to find when one is dealing with numerous other obstacles that arise when working with an ancient culture, such as deficient and/or partial sources, author bias, lack of first-hand accounts, etc. What tends to happen is that the gap is neglected, and what is brought to the forefront is the ideology that the society projects. Scholars have argued that in Athens the general opinion was that a woman ought to be modest at all times and places, silent, and enclosed in her house. Pierre Brulé has blatantly upheld this view; “ideology says it all,” he claims. Brulé, like others, has argued that this is adequate, that it is not relevant if it is not proven that all women everywhere remained at home and did not speak to men from the outside world; he finds it irrelevant if practice was more flexible than this. It appears to be far more important, however, to find this truth, or, at least, the compromise between a society’s model or archetype and what it outputs. From what we have seen in Lysias 1, there is a great deal more to say about how a community’s ideology is manipulated and transgressed, rather than how it is conformed to.

The separation of spheres of activity, for example, has long been viewed as one of these basic ideologies. Quite frequently, one witnesses the concentration among scholars on binary gender oppositions and dichotomies of public-private, outside-inside, and male-female. This is based on several ancient texts that uphold such a view, one of which is Xenophon’s *Oeconomicus.* The separation of spheres of activity, however, does not necessitate physical

---

384 For example, J.P.Vernant, *Myth and Thought Among the Greeks* (London: Routledge, 1983), 127-175.
385 Isomachus asserts that man is suited to work outside the home because he is stronger, while woman is weaker and is suited to interior spaces (Xen. *Oec.* 7.23).
sequestration or seclusion. Even if women did not openly operate in the public sphere as men did, it does not necessarily follow that they did not have public, social and economic spheres of their own, nor that these categories were not fluid and manipulable. We are too often misled by the ideal models formulated by ancient writers of the ideal *oikos*.

It has been argued that it is impossible to be certain of just how far social reality corresponded to the social ideal of female seclusion, but perhaps such a cynical view is unwarranted. David Cohen, for instance, has taken a more optimistic approach to the problem by employing social anthropological studies of modern Mediterranean societies. Among other things, he has demonstrated that the forms of social organization prevalent in these traditional communities produce the typical patterns of male-female role divisions one finds in Classical Athens. Of course, comparative data is fraught with its own set of dangers, but by being one of the first to tap into this neglected source of information, Cohen has helped to breathe new life into this subject.

The need to combine theory with practice is urgent; any study can be improved by having multiple lines of evidence. Disciplinary isolation has resulted in the neglect of research and findings obtained in other fields that confront similar issues; in the case of domestic architecture, there is a particularly impressive amount of unintegrated work. The ideal of gendered separation of spheres of activity in Athens will act as a test case. It is clear that many women in Athens worked outside the home; the literary evidence for such activities was compiled long ago. Aristotle, a man well-known for making binary divisions, makes this point himself; he

---

388 See I.Hodder, *Theory and Practice in Archaeology* (London: Routledge, 1992), 1-3. Such studies will be discussed in more detail later with respect to the physical evidence of houses.
relates how in a democracy it is impossible to prevent poor women from leaving their homes to work. Women’s activities, such as attending religious festivals and rituals, but also daily chores, regularly took women out of doors. Lysias 1 is a case in point. As noted above, Euphiletus was not destitute and his wife was not employed outside the home, but Euphiletus seems to have been absent much of the time. Euphiletus’ absence may have required his wife to see to many errands outside the home, though he does not dare admit this.

David Cohen uses comparative material from modern Mediterranean societies that similarly separate the male and female spheres to argue that Athenian women had their own circle of friends, particularly neighbors, and visited them frequently. In these societies, it can be said that adultery served as a focus of obsessive sexual fears precisely because women regularly engaged in activities that brought them into some sort of contact with other men. Certainly some Athenian families were wealthy enough to afford enough slaves for women to stay at home, but this does not demand that they did; it is oftentimes the wealthiest women who figure prominently in religious life, such as arranging festivals. In some modern Mediterranean societies wealthy men claim that their wives are “secluded at home,” but this ‘seclusion’ actually includes activities that regularly take them outside, like attending church, performing charity work and visiting friends and relatives.

---

390 Aristot. Pol. 1300a7, 1323a5-7.
391 For religious activities: Aristoph. Ach. 253, 1056, 1067-1068; Isaeus 8.18-20, 3.80, 6.49; Dem. 43.63; Lys. 1.8; Thuc. 2.45.2; Eur. IT 1140. For chores: Aristoph. Lys. 327-331; Eur. El. 109-111, Hipp. 130.
392 Euphiletus owned land outside the city, a house in the city and several slaves. It should be pointed out, however, that he did not provide a wet-nurse for his wife, which seems to have been common practice in Athens. They were common even among the relatively poor (Dem. 57.42). See Lys. 1.9 (house), 1.11 (land), 1.9 (lack of wet-nurse), 1.8 and 1.12 (slaves). On shopping, see Lys. 1.8, 1.16, 1.18.
393 For example, Aristoph. Eccl. 460, Lys. 300; Dem. 53.4, 55.23-24, 58.40; Lys. 32.10; Eur. El. 1130, Andr. 950; Theophr. Char. 10.13.
394 For such an example, see M. Handman, La Violence et la ruse: hommes et femmes dans un village grec (Aix-en-Provence: Edisud, 1983), 105-125.
David Cohen has found that part of men’s fear of adultery actually arises from their ignorance about what their wives do all day. In the plays of Aristophanes, for instance, husbands have an almost compulsive suspicion of their wives; they are apprehensive when they find them outside the house and even look under the bed for lovers. The men in Aristophanes’ comedies do not believe that their womenfolk spend their days in isolated quarters of the house, and it is probably this autonomy that fuels their anxieties. The women’s sphere and women’s freedom within its loose boundaries permitted them to engage independently in social, religious and economic activities that regularly took them out of the house. Even though the speaker in Lysias 3 would like his audience to believe that his womenfolk do not interact with any men, the reality may have been quite different.

It has been said that the conflict between a society’s projected ideal and what people do independently is not usually resolved, but rather manipulated in a game with a complex set of rules and prohibitions. This point can be clarified by using the example of a Lebanese village called Haouch el Harimi that Cohen brought to our attention some time ago. In the village of Haouch, the honor of a woman is measured by her proximity to the house and her distance from strangers; this is the ideal. When the women of the village were interviewed about what they did all day, they claimed that they just stayed at home and saw their neighbors. The obvious question would then be to ask how the neighbors got to their house in the first place if no woman was ever supposed to leave her own.

397 Aristoph. Eccl. 520, 1009 and Thes. 395-397, 414, 519, 785-800; cf. Lys. 3.6.
398 This is one of the major themes of Bourdieu’s work (Outline of a Theory of Practice (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977)).
It has been observed that in societies that demand such a strict code of conduct for their women, it is not the case that women never leave the house, but that they never leave the house without a legitimate excuse.400 The women of Haouch, if asked, will explain that they must visit a friend in need, fetch water from the fountain house, or borrow spices from a neighbor, even though this may be only partly true. Even this custom, however, can be manipulated by women in order to challenge social convention. In her study of the village of Haouch, for example, Judith Williams noted how girls would often empty the contents of their water jars in alleys so that they would have an excuse to go back to the fountain to gossip with their friends or flirt with boys.401 Though going to the fountain was a legitimate excuse to leave the house, the intention of the girls was not to fetch water. By observing social convention and offering a valid reason for leaving the house, the girls, in fact, succeeded in manipulating and in finding their way around their community’s social norms.

In the town of Gerania just northwest of Athens, grocery shopping, like fetching water, is employed as an excuse for leaving the house. The women of the town will claim that they need to buy groceries in the morning so that they can cook the midday meal, but instead use this as a pretext for socializing with their friends. It is common practice in Gerania for the women to visit the local shop or grocer once or even twice a day. Because the women must bring something home with them from the store, they buy non-perishable items like rice, pasta, sugar and dried beans, instead of buying perishables like milk or eggs.402 Such foodstuffs could of course be acquired much more efficiently on a weekly basis, rather than everyday, but this would entail far

400 This can be work, a trip to the fountain house, or paying a visit to a neighbor. See, Du Boulay, Village, 159, 191.
less social interaction for the women. Though it is expected that the women of Gerania will have a valid excuse for leaving the house each day, like a trip to the store for necessities for the home, the women are in fact doing whatever pleases them through socially sanctioned channels.

This discussion is not intended to demonstrate that Athens in the Classical period was exactly the same as modern Mediterranean societies; it certainly was not. Rather, these societies can provide an analytical framework for studies dealing with similar issues. Contemporary societies with similar social standards with regard to sexuality and the family can assist in sifting through the varying views of women that the ancient sources convey. In this way, we may gain a better understanding of the incongruities that underlie the patterns of social practice and read beyond the texts themselves.

2.2.2 Defining the Gynaikonitis

As we have noted, the lack of any settled usage or meaning for many architectural terms in the literary sources has plagued architectural historians, and the gynaikonitis is among them. Most authors took little interest in precision; even Vitruvius, an architect and architectural treatise writer, felt the need to point out the problem of terminology. To one familiar, however, with Greek intellectual pursuits, this is surprising; the educated Greek had a fairly careful grooming in geometry and architecture. Ben Perry determined long ago that the careless application of simple architectural terms was a common characteristic of the period down to the 5th century B.C. He argued that the average Greek “was always versatile and paratactic” by

---


It is essential, then, to distinguish technical jargon and professional language from the simplistic descriptive expressions that we have encountered in this discussion.

Neither the andronitis nor gynaikonitis have been shown to have any one definite meaning; usage by ancient authors varies considerably. The andronitis, for example, often merely signifies an expansion of the andron or dining room for the entertainment of guests, as in Vitruvius’ De Architectura. The word gynaikonitis is sometimes used to denote the quarters for female slaves, as in Xenophon’s Oeconomicus, or it can simply signify the court and surrounding rooms for family use in which women lived when no guests were present, as in Lysias 3. This variation must be taken into consideration when assessing the paradigm of women’s seclusion in specific women’s quarters of a house.

The existence of the words andronitis and gynaikonitis, as well as their frequent contrast with one another, as in Vitruvius’ treatise, helped to disseminate the theory of the two-courtyard house, and with it, the gendered house. As we have noted, it was only in later periods that houses attained the level of luxury and grandeur necessary for such an arrangement, but even this does not necessitate separate quarters. In all other references, no mention is made of separate courts divided along gender lines. In fact, it is only in Lysias 1 and Xenophon’s Oeconomicus that we get explicit references to the gynaikonitis and andronitis in contemporary sources, though, of course, their definitions differ a great deal.

In Xenophon’s treatise, the gynaikonitis is beside the andronitis and separated by a bolted door, but it is reserved for the household slaves. In contrast, Isomachus’ wife spends her days managing a thriving household, and her nights with her husband in their bedroom. In fact, she is

---

406 See A. Gardner, “The Greek House,” JHS 21 (1901): 299-305, who believes that this was a result of the loss of political freedom, and so the Greek man found it necessary to add to his house a separate court and suite of apartments for the use of himself and his guests.
not even aware of the *gynaikonitis* until her husband gives her the grand tour of the house. In Lysias 1, the *gynaikonitis* was originally on the upper storey of the house while the *andronitis* was on the lower storey. It is clear that the spaces are not rigidly defined, nor that gender is a real factor in terms of use of these spaces. Euphiletus’ wife has full run of the house because of their newly established bond: their baby. She spends her days on the first floor of the house with her baby and her evenings with her husband upstairs; she is not restricted in her movements. In fact, Euphiletus gladly obliges the new mother: he entertains his friend upstairs in a private room so as to give his wife and child their privacy instead of on the first floor of the house, and he happily endures his wife’s larking about and tolerates sleeping alone so that she can tend to the baby. The women illustrated in these texts clearly are neither secluded nor confined in their own quarters.

It is possible that in some cases the *gynaikonitis* denoted a loosely defined area of a house that was considered to be quite private. As we saw in Lysias 1, not only was the *gynaikonitis* on the upper storey of the house, but so was the bedroom of the couple; perhaps it was not a single enclosed room, but rather a suite that contained several rooms, including a master bedroom. Of course, Euphiletus’ house had an urban setting that likely did not allow very much lateral expansion, so that an upper storey was necessary to accommodate the family, which included several servants and a child. Isomachus’ system is different; his house is clearly larger than Euphiletus’ so that expansion outward is possible. In fact, there is no reference to a second storey. Isomachus’ wife is clearly not confined to the women’s quarters because these have been set aside for the female servants in his encyclopedic system of organization.

From the literary sources, we cannot characterize with certainty any autonomous structure or room as being the *gynaikonitis*, nor that it was intended to confine wives, mothers or
daughters. We can only say that there were more private areas in a house that are sometimes referred to as the *gynaikonitis*, but these areas also frequently contain rooms in which men can be and are present, whether it be for dining or sleeping. Depending on the literary context, the *gynaikonitis* can take on a number of different meanings: a family’s living quarters, an area for women and children, or even a space reserved for household slaves. The *gynaikonitis* cannot, however, be defined as a fixed or even standard space in a Greek house whose purpose was to protect the purity of women through surveillance and confinement.
3.1 Iconography and the Export Market

There is a growing reliance on figural pottery to reconstruct the lives of Athenian women. This has come about, on the one hand, by the scarcity of extant textual sources that discuss the lives of women, and on the other hand, by the wealth of scenes of women on Attic pottery. Because of this, there is a desire to recreate ancient social realities using vase painting to fill in whatever gaps exist in the literary sources, rather than viewing vase painting as a source of evidence in its own right. Attic vases have become attractive sources of information for the lived experience of women, and it is, in fact, quite tempting to read the scenes on vases in a straightforward fashion.

The interpretation of the images, however, is a thorny matter. The reason for this is that the way in which an image is read is heavily dependent on the experience of the viewer. An image can communicate various ideas and convey various meanings under different circumstances; with a different viewer there will be a different response. In the case of Attic pottery, however, it has not always been clear who the viewer was, nor for that matter, for whom images were produced. Before asking what the images mean and what they can suggest for women’s life and women’s seclusion, it is necessary to ask for whom they were intended, and with whom they were meant to communicate.

Central to this discourse is the role played by Etruscans as consumers of Attic pottery. Attic pottery, in fact, first came to light as a result of excavations at the Etruscan cemeteries of Vulci and Cerveteri, with a large quantity also unearthed at the sites of Gela and Paestum. This

---

meant that it took some time for the vases to be recognized as Greek rather than Etruscan.\textsuperscript{408} The sheer quantity of evidence that was obtained from Etruscan contexts, much of which was intact, suggested that in the 6\textsuperscript{th} century B.C. pottery from Athens dominated the Western market. Indeed, it has been estimated that as much as 70\% of all extant Athenian pottery with known provenance ended up in Etruscan hands.\textsuperscript{409} Studies concentrating on the find-spot of vessels imply that this trade was not random, and draw attention to possible changes in markets with a predilection at different sites for certain shapes of vases.\textsuperscript{410}

The bulk of material in Etruscan contexts has raised the question of whether Athenian vase-painters decorated their products with their customers in mind or painted primarily for their fellow-Athenians.\textsuperscript{411} Whether or not Athenian vases were made to order, bearing images requested by Etruscan customers, or were selected from images chosen independently by Athenian painters, is of great consequence for this study. The task of the interpreter of images is infinitely more difficult when dealing with vases that have been taken out of their original social context. If the craftsman’s knowledge of Etruscans as consumers did, indeed, result in alterations in the imagery and shape of Attic pottery, then this could accordingly depreciate the

\textsuperscript{408} J.Boardman, \textit{Athenian Black Figure Vases} (New York: Oxford University Press, 1974), 9-10.

\textsuperscript{409} It must be noted, however, that only about half of all extant Attic vases have a known provenance (L.A.Hannestad, “The Reception of Attic Pottery by the Indigenous Peoples of Italy: the Evidence from Funerary Contexts,” in \textit{The Complex Past of Pottery}, ed. J.P.Crielaard, V.Stissi and G.J.van Wijngaarden (Amsterdam: J.C.Gieben, 1999), 306).


pottery’s value as a historical record for Athens. Despite a good deal of recent attention by scholars, no consensus has been reached.\footnote{Robin Osborne and Clemente Marconi, for instance, have written articles with opposed viewpoints within the same publication. Osborne maintains that vases were, originally at least, made for an Athenian audience. Based on scenes depicting warriors, in particular, Scythians, he argues that that explanations of the iconography must be sought in Athens itself rather than in external markets (“Images of a Warrior,” in \textit{Greek Vases: Images, Contexts and Controversies}, ed. C.Marconi (Boston: Brill, 2004), 42, 49, 52). Marconi, on the other hand, employs the heroic warrior motif to argue that there is nothing in these scenes which suggests that they were made specifically for an Etruscan, or, for that matter, an Athenian clientele. He supports the view that such images were generic enough so as to appeal to different audiences and to suit different contexts (“Images for a Warrior,” in \textit{Greek Vases: Images, Contexts and Controversies}, ed. C.Marconi (Boston: Brill, 2004), 39-40). For the generic quality of Attic vases and their appeal to the Etruscan market, see also J.G.Szilagyi, “Les Adieux. A Column-krater of the Syracuse Painter,” \textit{Bulletin du Musée Hongrois des Beaux-Arts} 92-93 (2000): 23-46; J. de la Gernière, “Les acheteurs des cratères corinthiens,” \textit{BCH} 112 (1988): 83-90.}

Some scholars have chosen to sidestep the issue of context altogether. They argue that the large mass of Attic pottery in Etruria is a result of bias in excavations, that Attic pottery has been found in greater numbers (and in better condition) in Etruscan cemeteries simply because more excavation has been carried out there than in Greek cities.\footnote{For example, K.Arafat and C.Morgan factor in the problem of excavation bias, which they claim makes statistics untrustworthy (“Athens, Etruria and the Heuneburg: Mutual Misconceptions in the Study of Greek-Barbarian Relations,” in \textit{Classical Greece: Ancient Histories and Modern Archaeologies}, ed. I.Morris (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 114-116). For the problem of comparative statistics between Etruscan and Greek sites, see also R.Osborne, “Why Did Athenian Pots Appeal to Etruscans?,” \textit{World Archaeology} 33 (2001): 280.} Some have chosen to ignore the client and to restrict their interest to the Athenian producer and his social environment,\footnote{For example, C.Bérard, “Imagiers et artistes,” \textit{Études de Lettres} 4 (1983): 2-4, and F.Lissarrague, \textit{L’autre guerrier. Archers, peltastes, cavaliers dans l’imagier attique} (Paris: Découverte, 1990), 5.} arguing that Athenian vase painting was interpreted but not shaped by Etruscan consumers. Nigel Spivey, for example, maintains that the vases have two readings, one imposed by the painter, and the other imposed by the customer, though the imagery was fixed and decided at the moment of its creation.\footnote{N.Spivey, “Greek Vases in Etruria,” in \textit{Looking at Greek Vases}, ed. T.Rasmussen and N.Spivey (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 149. For the view that Athenian painters determined their subjects, see J.Boardman, “The Sixth-Century Potters and Painters of Athens and their Public,” in \textit{Looking at Greek Vases}, ed. T.Rasmussen and N.Spivey (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 80. This view would demand that non-Athenian customers might choose to read the image in different ways from that intended by the Athenian vase-painter, but would then be, at some level, wrong.} Standing in opposition to this is Sian Lewis, who proposes a sophisticated system of supply and demand, in which Athenian potters and painters were aware and responsive to
Etruscan tastes. Lewis claims that we want the vases to be about Athens because they are a valuable source of information, especially where the literary evidence fails us, and this is often the case. She insists that the argument that all pots were made in Athens by Athenian craftsmen (irrespective of what happened to that vase after it was made) cannot be employed to demonstrate that the iconography is an Athenian cultural creation. Lewis recommends considering the provenance and trade circumstances of a pot before we interpret its imagery, because we may be “looking at the imagery through an Etruscan prism whether we know it or not.”

Lewis is right to stress provenance when interpreting imagery and it is fair to say that a few specific vessel shapes were intended to respond to Etruscan tastes. An illustration of this is the production and export of Nikosthenic neck-amphorae found in abundance at Cerveteri, or of kyathoi found in Vulci and Orvieto, which give the impression of imitating Etruscan bucchero pottery. In these particular cases, considerable pains were taken to satisfy Etruscan tastes, at

418 According to Lewis, treating the imagery of painted pottery as wholly Athenian, obscures more important facts about the influence of customers outside Athens on the products they purchased, though attempts to discern such changes in subject to appeal to a new clientèle have fallen flat (Athenian Woman, 133).
419 Lewis, “Representation and Reception,” 190.
least where shape is concerned. The question that needs to be asked, however, is whether the
evidence for adaptation across-the-board is convincing. Is it plausible to trust that the need to
meet the demands of an export market was the occasion of the modification of Attic pottery, in
shape, or more importantly, in imagery? If so, to what extent were Athenian painters catering for
a foreign market?

3.2 The Vase Market: Objets D’Art or Ballast?

Surrounding the issue of tailor-made vases for an export market is the question of
whether this would have been a feasible and desirable undertaking for the Athenians. The work
of Arafat and Morgan, in particular, has been valuable for its examination of the inner workings
of the export trade. They call attention to the lack of evidence for direct involvement of
Athenians in trade to Etruria. Since it is almost impossible to draw any correlation between
Athenian interests and regions where Attic pottery is found, they argue that Athens played a very
small role in shipping its pottery. As a possible reason for this, Arafat and Morgan cite the
oikos-economy, a system that was based on the cultivation of land, and which aimed at self-
sufficiency rather than at producing a surplus for export. They argue that the rigid farming cycle,

---

Group of Black-Figure Vases: From the Athenian Kerameikos to the Tombs of South Etruria (Amsterdam: Dutch
Archaeological and Historical Society, 2003), 123-124), who sees the so-called Tyrrenian amphorae as Athenian
creations in all respects. For nonsense Greek inscriptions on the Tyrrenian amphorae as indicators that the vases
were tailor-made, see A.Snodgrass, “The Uses of Writing on Early Greek Painted Pottery,” in Word and Image in
H.R.Immerwahr, Attic Script: A Survey (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990), 44-45. For the opinion that Attic
wares were also made for the Thracian market, see J.H.Oakley, “Attic Red-FIGURED Beakers: Special Vases for the

421 K.Arafat and C.Morgan, “Athens, Etruria and the Heuneburg: Mutual Misconceptions in the Study of Greek-
Barbarian Relations,” in Classical Greece: Ancient Histories and Modern Archaeologies, ed. I.Morris (Cambridge:
Cambridge University Press, 1994), 110; B.R.Macdonald, “The Distribution of Attic Pottery from 450 to 375 B.C.,
The Effects of Politics on Trade” (PhD diss., University of Pennsylvania, 1979). For non-Athenian traders, see
as well as the short sailing season, were limiting factors in terms of meeting foreign demand. 422 On the whole, they paint a picture of ad hoc rather than organized business between Athenian craftsmen, shippers and customers. 423 Their work serves to highlight the dangers inherent in overestimating the scale of foreign trade.

The intrinsic value of pots has also played a substantial role in the trade dispute. Some scholars maintain that decorated pottery was a profitable trade commodity, thereby fueling organized export and import of such objets d’art. 424 As markers of their appeal as status pieces, they point to the way in which many vases were interred in Etruscan tombs, and also mended with lead clamps after accidents rather than discarded. 425 Some scholars, however, have cast doubt on this, noting that there is no real way to confirm whether the breaks on the vases were made through daily use or during the journey from Athens. 426 Scholars have also viewed the practice of depositing ceramic vessels in tombs as a sign they were used as substitutes for more costly and more precious metal ones. 427 Countering this argument, though, are the many tomb-

423 Ibid., 110, 115.
426 L. A. Hannestad, for example, points to the fact that many of the vessels do not have their original lids, suggesting that they were lost during daily use (“The Athenian Potter and the Home-Market,” in Proceedings of the Third Symposium on Ancient Greek and Related Pottery, ed. J. Christiansen and T. Melander (Copenhagen: Nationalmuseet, 1988), 222-230).
paintings in Etruria that depict both metal and ceramic vases side by side in dining contexts, implying concurrent use. Work conducted on commercial graffiti seems to support the view, however, that vases were not very high-priced. Potter’s marks and dipinti on exported vessels suggest that the prices for painted pottery – at least those that were recorded – were quite low. The cost of figure-decorated pottery by some of the most renowned vase painters in Athens, in fact, pales in comparison to the attested prices for metal wares.

The relatively low attested cost of painted vases has given rise to the notion that pottery must not have formed a major part of any cargo because it would not have been commercially viable to do so. Some have argued that ceramic vessels were merely “parasitic” on the main items of trade – foodstuffs, metals and slaves – riding piggyback on more profitable cargoes. The study of remains of actual shipwrecks seems to lend support to the theory that fine wares were not traded long distances on their own. In spite of the fact that general trends are hard to


For low prices, see M.Vickers, “Imaginary Etruscans: Changing Perceptions of Etruria since the Fifteenth Century,” *Hesperia* 7/8 (1985/6): 162. J.Boardman, however, argues that prices scratched on vases were put on in the potters’ quarter and are wholesale, so we are probably underestimating their value (“Trade in Greek Decorated Pottery,” *OJA* 7 (1988): 32). For the marks, see A.W.Johnston, *Trademarks on Greek Vases* (Warminster: Aris & Philips, 1979), 33.
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identify given the dearth of known shipwrecks, it is clear that variety in the cargoes of ships was a common phenomenon.\textsuperscript{432}

The evidence of shipwrecks and potter’s marks triggered the controversial work of David Gill and Michael Vickers that advanced the idea that vases were used solely as ballast or space-fillers.\textsuperscript{433} Opposition to this view was fierce, however, with critics pointing to the abundance of Attic wares found abroad, as well as that some of these give the impression of pandering to Etruscan tastes.\textsuperscript{434} A more commonsense argument against the notion of vases acting as ballast, however, was that presented by John Boardman many years ago. He made the case that vases were fragile and would have had to be packaged carefully for transport by sea, but also unloaded with caution so that they could be delivered to the point of sale intact.\textsuperscript{435} The effort required for vase export was such that it would likely not have been undertaken on the scale it had if there had not been a stronger and more lucrative motive than simply serving as a counterweight to other cargo. A more moderate stance, such as this, which considers the export of fine wares as


something that was “desirable but not indispensable,” is preferable. Owing to the limited evidence that we have surrounding the profitability of trade in painted pottery, this is the most responsible position for which to advocate. In thinking of the scale and organization of trade in pottery, it seems fitting to avoid both extreme models and sweeping conclusions. One must acknowledge that there was some overseas demand for decorated pottery, but for what reason and for what return, is still a matter of debate.

3.3 The Etruscan Market and Tailor-Made Vases

Most problematic, and most important for our discussion, however, has been the attempt to discover specific examples of iconography chosen to appeal to an Etruscan clientèle. The range of subjects on Nikosthenic amphorae, for example, does not differ significantly from that on vases of the same period not destined for the Etruscan market. The dominant impression is that Athenian vase painters depicted what interested them and their circle of colleagues and buyers, without regard to a vase’s final destination. This is also the opinion of Robin Osborne, who has brought attention to the discrepancy between vase shape and iconography. He notes that the degree of variation between the iconographies of the two assemblages is negligible, questioning whether Etruscans had much concern for what was depicted on the vases, as opposed to shape. Osborne advances the idea that Etruscans bought a kind of “picture-dictionary” and

---


used this discriminately to supplement the native iconographic repertoire, which paled in comparison to the Athenian one.\textsuperscript{439} He suggests that Etruscan demand may have affected the shapes of pots made in Athens, but not the general range of imagery.\textsuperscript{440}

One workshop, however, seems to have been the exception to this general rule. The late 6\textsuperscript{th} century B.C. Nikosthenic workshop produced the so-called Perizoma Group, named for the loincloths, or \textit{perizomata}, worn by the athletes depicted on many of the vessels.\textsuperscript{441} This characteristic garment has been identified as characteristically un-Greek, especially in an athletic context.\textsuperscript{442} Alan Shapiro has employed this evidence, along with the fact that many of the vessels from this workshop depict respectable-looking women reclining with men at symposia, to lend support to the view that these vessels were produced with the Etruscan market in mind.\textsuperscript{443} In spite of this, Shapiro maintains that the scenes deviate just enough from the usual Athenian repertoire to be recognizable, though without betraying any detailed knowledge of Etruscan society.\textsuperscript{444}

Sian Lewis has recently taken this approach one step further. She notes that about 70-80%
of all Attic vases with scenes of athletics, not including Panathenaics, traveled abroad, with only about 15% staying in Attica.\textsuperscript{445} Lewis finds differences between those vessels bearing athletic scenes found in Etruria and those found in Attica, both in iconography and in shape, which she suggests can be explained as a response to overseas demand.\textsuperscript{446} She argues that the demands of the market shaped not only the shape of vessels, but also the images that were painted on them, suggesting that the vases were “a series of carefully crafted responses to the market.”\textsuperscript{447}

Unjustified weight, in my opinion, has been placed on the export market as a factor in deciphering the meaning of images. Though provenance should be a consideration when analyzing the images, believing that most exported pottery was “made to order” or that customers conducted “product research,”\textsuperscript{448} is unfounded. As pointed out by Christoph Reusser, it may be the case that popular Athenian subjects were intelligible in Etruria even if the subtleties were lost.\textsuperscript{449} It should also not be compulsory to think that all the imagery would have to be meaningful in an Etruscan context so that it would be desirable to them because Attic pottery did not necessarily function in the same way when it reached Etruria. The Panathenaic prize amphora is such a case. The images on these vases were created for a very particular, civic and


\textsuperscript{446} S.Lewis, “Athletics on Attic Pottery: Export and Imagery,” in \textit{The World of Greek Vases}, ed. V.Nørskov, L.Hannestad, C.Isler-Kerényi and S.Lewis (Rome: Quasar, 2009), 143-146. The vessels found in Etruria are distinct in terms of iconography (“pot-bellied” athletes, respectfully clad women) and are mostly found on kylikes, whereas vases with athletic scenes found in Attica appear on pots with ritual significance (choes, loutrophoroi, lebetes and alabastra).


ritual purpose connected with the city of Athens, but also acquired value in Etruscan markets. There, Panathenaics were interred with the deceased and often mended with iron clamps, suggesting that the people of Etruria placed importance on the vases, whether or not they could relate to the specific social and political relevance these had for an Athenian audience.⁴⁵⁰

Decades ago, T.B.L. Webster suggested that Athenian vases were made for and sold to Athenian customers, and sometimes later sold in the export market.⁴⁵¹ Webster built his theory of a second-hand vase market on the evidence of vases with specific motifs and inscriptions, and claimed that many of these should be considered gifts or special commissions, being used first in Athens and then shipped to Etruria.⁴⁵² Though Webster’s proposal was rejected by most,⁴⁵³ the question of whether or not the vases were first- or second-hand is important and relevant for the production and function of pots in Athens. Second-hand trade is accepted for Panathenaic amphorae,⁴⁵⁴ yet at the same time, it is more or less universally agreed that the workshop producing the Nikosthenic amphorae targeted production toward the Etruscan market in

---

⁴⁵⁰ Panathenaic amphorae, 80 of which have been found in Etruria, were interred in tombs, though 76 out of the 80 have an unknown provenance. There is a case, however, where the Etruscan word “suthina” has been inscribed on a Panathenaic, designating the vase as ‘for the grave’ (M. Bentz, Panathenäische Preisamphoren, Eine athenische Vasengattung und ihre Funktion vom 6.-4. Jahrhundert v.Chr (Basel: Vereinigung der Freunde antiker Kunst, 1998), 97-99, 111-113, 139). Panathenaics seem to have been kept long after the oil they contained was spent as they are often found with repair holes and some were used as urns (N. Spivey, “Greek Vases in Etruria,” in Looking at Greek Vases, ed. T. Rasmussen and N. Spivey (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 143). See also E. Rystedt, “Athens in Etruria: A Note on Panathenaic Amphorae and Attic Ceramic Imagery in Etruria,” in Across Frontiers: Etruscans, Greeks, Phoenicians and Cypriots, ed. E. Herring et. al. (London: Accordia, 2006), 504-505; J. D. Beazley, “Panathenaica,” AJA 47 (1943): 441-465; E. N. Gardiner, “Panathenaic Amphorae,” JHS 32 (1912): 179-193. For changes in use of imported wares, see L. A. Hannestad, “The Reception of Attic Pottery by the Indigenous Peoples of Italy: The Evidence from Funerary Contexts,” in The Complex Past of Pottery, ed. J. P. Crieland, V. Stissi and G. J. van Wijngaarden (Amsterdam: J. C. Gieben, 1999), 303-318.

⁴⁵¹ T. B. L. Webster, Potter and Patron in Classical Athens (London: Methuen, 1972), 52, 62, 163.

⁴⁵² Ibid., 42-62, 163.


choosing an in-demand shape. B.B. Rasmussen has recently revived the issue and is in favor of a second-hand market. He argues that many of the Greek inscriptions were not randomly placed on the vases and that this demonstrates that the vases were meant for use in Athens. In addition to this, many vases carry motifs that would have been fully understood in an Athenian context despite their non-Athenian find spot. The theory of a second-hand market has been unjustifiably neglected, in my opinion, and deserves far more attention from scholars.

3.4 Domestic Scenes: Detecting Athens in Attic Vases

The notion of a sophisticated system of trade in which both vessel shape and iconography were tailor-made for foreign customers, has attracted much attention from scholars, though sadly without concrete answers. For a number of reasons, however, this need not condemn our present discussion to conjecture. This study focuses primarily on the years after 475 B.C., a period which follows the zenith of export of Athenian vessels to Etruria. Though the greater quantity of vases prior to 475 B.C. was unearthed in Etruria, there seems to have been a shift in markets after this time whereby Etruria loses its place as the main center of import. There is also a noteworthy change in the movement of vases in general, with a much higher proportion of Attic


wares staying at home. Fortunately, it is this body of evidence that forms the largest part of our discussion.

The profusion of vases found in Athens itself from about the second quarter of the 5th century B.C. onwards is remarkable for its diminished repertoire of figural scenes, in striking contrast to the vase paintings primarily found abroad and produced before this time. Along with being conspicuously more predictable and more homogenous in nature, the vase paintings also exhibit a marked concern with women. From this point onwards, there is a proliferation not only of scenes depicting women in domestic environments, but also of quotidian life. Though there are a far greater number of depictions of women, these frequently represent a much narrower range of themes, such as women leisurely going about their daily chores, but more frequently these portray women dressing in fine garments, arranging their hair in intricate updos, and adorning themselves with jewelry and other accoutrements.

For almost all of the vase types, the number of domestic scenes begins to multiply in about 475 B.C., which generally peaks in about 450 (Fig.1). There is a steady amount of domestic scenes on the vases from 450 to after 425 B.C., with a slow and steady decrease beginning in about 400. The only vessels that do not follow this general scheme are lekanides

---

459 This opinion is essentially universal. See, for instance, E.Götte, *Frauengemachbilder in der Vasenmalerei des fünften Jahrhunderts* (Munich: Uni-Druck, 1957), 16-28; D.Williams, “Women on Athenian Vases: Problems of Interpretation,” in *Images of Women in Antiquity*, ed. by A.Cameron and A.Kuhrt (Detroit: Wayne State University, 1983), 92-106; D.C.Kurtz, “Mistress and Maid,” *AnnArchStorAnt* 10 (1988): 141-149; O.E.Tzachou-Alexandri, *Αισθήματα Αθηναίων στην Αρχαία Ελλάδα* (Athens: Tameio Archaiologikon, 1998), 50, 58, 70; S.Lewis, “Shifting Images: Athenian Women in Etruria,” in *Gender and Ethnicity in Ancient Italy*, ed. T.Cornell and K.Lomas (London: Accordia, 1997), 143. Many scholars connect this sudden increase in women’s scenes with a change in Athenian social attitudes, such as a change in female status or greater demand from female customers (e.g. J.Boardman, *Athenian Red-Figure Vases: the Classical Period* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1989), 219), while others explain the transformation from heroic to domestic scenes as a consequence of a new-found interest in private life (e.g. J.Bažant, “Les vases athéniens et les réformes démocratiques,” in *Images et Société en Grèce ancienne: l’iconographie comme méthode d’analyse*, ed. C.Bérard, C.Bron and A.Pomari (Lausanne: Université de Lausanne, 1987), 33-40). According to Sian Lewis, however, a change in markets offers a much better explanation for these shifts, whereby prior themes that were part of the demand from Etruscans were no longer required (*Athenian Woman*, 132; ead., “Representation and Reception,” 187-188).
The number of scenes on the oinochoai comes to a complete halt in 400 B.C., while the lekanides, in fact, see an increase of domestic scenes after this time, which runs against the trend. While the quantity of domestic scenes on the other vessels tapers off after 400 B.C., the number of scenes on the lekanides increases exponentially, perhaps owing to usage or production. On the whole, the vases follow a pattern that suggests a newfound interest in domestic scenes beginning in 475 B.C., which peaks in 450 and ultimately fades from about 400 B.C. onwards.

The proliferation of domestic scenes after 475 B.C. coincidentally occurs on types of vessels thought to have been regularly employed by women (Fig.2). These types include lebetes, pyxides, alabastra, hydriai and white-ground lekythoi. Together, these vases carry a total of 67% of all domestic scenes painted from 475 to 300 B.C. (Fig.3). In particular, the number of domestic scenes on lekythoi (32%) and on hydriai (17%) forms the two largest groups. Comparatively speaking, however, the values representing the total number of domestic scenes according to vase shape are skewed due to the number of vases of particular shapes that have actually survived. For example, from the period 475 to 300 B.C., there are far more extant Attic cups, about 5,442, as opposed to about 413 pyxides (Fig.4). This is the reason why the cups make up quite a substantial proportion of the total domestic scenes in the chart (9%), equivalent

460 The flood of domestic scenes on the lekanides after 400 B.C. could perhaps be associated with the specialization of the shape in terms of use for jewelry, but perhaps also to put childhood toys away for safe-keeping for girls who were about to be married (on this, see Photius, s.v. lekanis). Lekanides are very often found in funerary contexts in Athens, which may account for their abundance (see M.C.Villanueva Puig, “Les vases attiques du Vie et du Ve siècles trouvés en contexte funéraire à Athènes,” in Le vase grec et ses destins, ed. P.Rouillard and A.Verbanck-Piéard (Munich: Biering & Brinkmann, 2003), 63-66). One can be quite certain that it was used primarily by women given the number of times it is represented in scenes of wedding preparations and women at their toilette (Oakley and Sinos, Wedding, 6, 38).

to that of pyxides (9%), though the cups are not considered vessels typically employed by women, contrary to the attested use of pyxides (Fig.3).

By correlating the number of domestic scenes with the number of extant vases for each vase shape, the figures can be weighted, and in this way a more pronounced percentage is observed. Proportionately speaking, only about 2% of scenes found on cups are domestic in nature, while 31% of scenes found on pyxides belong to this group (Fig.5). Between 475 and 300 B.C., the most common iconography on lebetes (44%), pyxides (31%), alabastra (31%) and hydriai (26%), is related to domestic life.

Usage, however, is only one aspect that should be factored in; context is another. The work of Sian Lewis, which correlates vase shape to find-spot, is invaluable for the methodological criteria it establishes for working with the vase paintings. Lewis posits that there are several types of purely Athenian vessel shapes; these vases did not regularly travel outside of Attica and are found almost exclusively in Athenian contexts, whether as grave-goods in burials or as dedications at sanctuaries. She also argues that these particular vessels possess many common characteristics that suggest their purpose was fixed.  

462 For Lewis, white-ground lekythoi, pyxides, lebetes, loutrophoroi, krateriskoi and choes are essentially Athenian in terms of use, as well as in provenance.  

463 This approach will prove valuable when sifting through and assessing the vases bearing domestic scenes. Many of the shapes that have a large quantity of domestic imagery in their

---

462 Lewis, “Representation and Reception,” 180. These vessels bear iconography which reflects their function very closely and often illustrate their own vessel shape.  
corpus of figural scenes are also present in Lewis’ list of “Athenian” vase shapes. The premise that vases produced for home-use rather than for export reflect more accurately the interests and attitudes of Athenians is one that is almost universal. Because the task of the interpreter of images is made far more difficult when dealing with vessels taken out of their original context, vases that are found for the most part in Athenian contexts will form the bulk of the material employed in this study. Coincidentally, these are also the vases that most often bear domestic scenes. The vases, primarily white-ground lekythoi and red-figure pyxides, but also lebetes and hydriae, fall into this group of vessels with an Athenian point of reference, comprising about 67% of the total number of vases with representations of women in domestic scenes between 475 and 300 B.C. (Fig.6).

The focal point of this study will be the group of vases with pertinent scenes of women found in Athenian contexts and likely intended for home-use. Since the greater part of relevant domestic scenes is found on these types of vessels, the scenes, by association, should be regarded as Athenian, both in production and consumption. In other words, the shape of the vessel can assist in identifying the intended audience of the images by limiting the point of reference to Athens. In turn, this will facilitate the reading of the scenes through restricting the possible meanings of the iconographic units. The vases discussed in this chapter, along with their imagery, should be viewed through an Athenian rather than through an Etruscan lens.


465 The bulk of this data comes from the “Pottery Database,” Beazely Archive, Classical Art Research Centre, Oxford University, http://www.beazley.ox.ac.uk/databases/pottery.htm.

466 This is not to say that the signifying potential of the iconography on “Athenian” vase-shapes was limited to Athens, but rather produced with an Athenian audience in mind.
3.5 Imagery as Language on Attic Vases

The proliferation of scenes pertaining to women on Attic vases after 475 B.C., as we have witnessed, is striking. The importance of assessing the reliability of this evidence is crucial to any iconographic study. In the previous section, the corpus of vases with domestic scenes was filtered by factoring in the context and function of the vases. Domestic scenes with women are found in far greater number on vase forms most often employed by women, and many of these vase forms were produced for the domestic Athenian market, which suggests that they reflect the interests and attitudes of Athenians themselves, and women, in particular. Put another way, the function and context of the vases themselves have limited the possible points of reference for the images found on them.

At present, the vases that were classified as domestic in use and Athenian in context will be discussed in terms of their imagery. Analyses of images are always fraught with dangers, such as the danger of over simplification, over interpretation, misrepresentation and distortion. Before there can be any serious discussion of the meaning or connotation of specific images on the vases, certain aspects of the paintings must be assessed, and these are imperative to any such discourse. This inquiry will take into account, for instance, the plausible objectives of the vase painter and the devices that were used to attain these objectives; particular attention will be paid to symbolism and syncopation. Of great consequence will be an appraisal of the imagery’s expression of societal norms, that is, whether the paintings were intended to be straightforward manifestations of daily life, illustrations of myth and legend, an amalgam of these two, or none of these.
Vase paintings have been viewed as “seductive potential glimpses” into quotidian female life; scenes on vases give the false impression of simplicity and beg to be interpreted in a very literal way. Because vases, for the most part, are perceived as examples of “popular art,” unlike sculpture which had a very public orientation, the vase paintings are read as representing the ideas, attitudes and behaviors which permeated the everyday lives of individual Athenians.

There is probably no scholar who would claim that vase painters were working in a self-indulgent vacuum; they were living in a society that was very conscious of and responsive to images, and we may be quite confident that what they depicted was also what most Athenian people deemed relevant and significant. This does not necessitate, however, that there was a one-to-one relationship between what was illustrated on the vases and the lived experience of Athenian women.

The content of an image and its frame of reference, or meaning, is something of a challenge to ascertain. This has been exacerbated by the assumption that images can be assigned into one of two groups, myth or genre, and that we can distinguish between the two. Genre refers to the group of images that depict a variety of non-mythological subjects that give the impression of being drawn from everyday life. Mythical scenes were separated from genre

---


470 For this definition, see V.Sabetai, “The Poetics of Maidenhood: Visual Constructs of Womanhood in Vase-Painting,” in Hermeneutik der Bilder, Beiträge zur Ikonographie und Interpretation griechischer Vasenmalerei, ed. S.Schmidt and J.H.Oakley (Munich: Verlag C.H.Beck, 2009), 103. This categorization begins with T.Panofka who used vases from Etruria as sources for Greek life (Bilder Antiken Lebens (Berlin: Reimer, 1843)), and continues with E.Pottier (Catalogue des vases antiques de terre cuite II (Paris: Musée National du Louvre, 1896), 47-48).
scenes not on the basis of elements located in the pictures themselves, but on our ability to recognize a story in them; scenes of myth were those that told an identifiable story about Achilles, Odysseus or Herakles, and scenes of genre did not. For example, Robert Sutton’s study of vase paintings showing the departure of warriors suggested that such scenes were not trying to portray mythical events, but rather events derived from real life.\footnote{R.F.Sutton, “The Interaction Between Men and Women Portrayed on Attic Red-Figure Pottery” (PhD diss., University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1981), 229-230.} After numerous cases of mistaken identification of images on vases, however, this system of classification was criticized for being far too arbitrary.\footnote{Compare the reading of a dining scene by S.Reinach (Répertoire des vases peints grecs et étrusques, Vol.1 (Paris: E.Leroux, 1899), 474) and then the same scene by J.D.Beazley (“Some Inscriptions on Vases III,” AJA 39 (1935): 487). For a critique of this classification, see J.Bažant, Studies on the Use and Decoration of Athenian Vases (Prague: 1981), 13-22; F.Harvey, “Painted Ladies: Fact, Fiction and Fantasy,” in Proceedings of the 3rd Symposium on Ancient Greek and Related Pottery, ed. J.Christiansen and T.Melander (Copenhagen: Nationalmuseet, 1988), 242-254; V.Zinserling, “Zum Problem von Alltagsdarstellungen auf attischen Vasen,” in Beiträge zum antiken Realismus, ed. M.Kunze (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1977), 39-56.}

Scholars chose to bypass the problem of classification by arguing that life informs all figural representations, mythical or not. This interpretation supposes that scenes of myth are an equally good source of information for actual practices once we have removed the elements that seem improbable by using our “common sense.”\footnote{This is expressed by J.Dummer, “Realität des Lebens und Realitätsschwund in der Vasenmalerei,” in Beiträge zum antiken Realismus, ed. M.Kunze (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1977), 60. For a critique of this approach, see N.Bryson, “Semiology and Visual Interpretation,” in Visual Theory: Painting and Interpretation, ed. N.Bryson, M.A.Holly and K.Moxey (New York: Polity Press, 1991), 61-66.} According to this reading, images can function in either sphere, in both myth and genre; it makes no difference whether the representation belongs to the world of the divine, imaginary or the here and now. For instance, F.Lissarrague and A.Schnapp argued that a scene with a warrior carrying a dead man on his shoulders could be a depiction of Ajax carrying Achilles if the names of the warriors are inscribed on the vase, but it could also be an illustration of contemporary practice.\footnote{F.Lissarrague and A.Schnapp, “Imagerie des grecs ou Grèce des imagiers? Le temps de la réflexion 2 (1981): 286-297.} The viewer could essentially choose either category as a lens for viewing the representations on the vases.
because the images were purposely ambiguous. Mary Beard, in fact, asserted that this was the most responsible approach to reading the vases. She argued that the meaning of the scenes was to be found in the “subtle interplay of both registers” because “we are not just dealing with a figure who is either Hector or an Athenian hoplite…we are dealing with a figure who can be and is both.”

The notion that all images can be both reflections of reality and derived from myth was recently critiqued by Gloria Ferrari, who argues that there is genre on Athenian vases. She employs vases with depictions of women at the fountain house to argue that they are genre scenes in the typical sense that a trip to the fountain was an ordinary activity, but that they are not depictions of reality and that we are not confronted with contemporary life. Ferrari finds that categorizing scenes as either mythical or real is not a useful way to make sense of the images. She finds that genre scenes can speak in the present tense but are not reality either, so that we should not equate realism with genre. The distinction in antiquity between myth and reality, in fact, was blurred even by the most methodical historians; Thucydides, for example, often represents figures who are mythical in our sense of the word as if they were historical figures. Because the gulf between the two categories was not as wide in Greek thought as it is in the modern mind, Ferrari believes that it is more important to search for meaning through context than in an image’s “reality.”

---


Representations on vases should not be perceived as snapshots taken from daily life; vase paintings are surprisingly sophisticated in nature and have their own set of rules and conventions that can govern imagery. The problem of trying to recover meaning from vase paintings was tackled by Claude Bérard and others in the pioneering study *La Cité des Images*. Bérard applied the theories founded on structural linguistics to the plastic arts, seeing imagery, like verbal language, as a system of communication that could convey the values of the society it belonged to. Through several case studies, Bérard demonstrated the potential of the study of signs – semiotics – as a methodological approach to the interpretation of imagery.

As a result of Bérard’s work, a large number of scholars now views images as cultural constructs that have their own language; in order to understand the social and cultural values that the images reflect, the language, which is made of signs or codes, must be deciphered. Semioticians, when studying language, focus on identification of repeated “lexical items” and “syntax” in order to understand how a text coheres. In the plastic arts, these terms can be defined as “the smallest identifiable iconographic unit,” which is the unit that cannot have anything removed from it without dissolution of the recognizable form. Put simply, a “lexical item” in the context of vase painting can either be an individual figure or an object, while “syntax” refers to the compositional structure of those figures or objects in the scene.

Ann Steiner has applied this model to the study of Athenian vases. She has found that the visual imagery on vases can be viewed as a unified language with its own rules of grammar and

---

syntax, which is encoded through visual symbols much as it is encoded through verbal symbols in ordinary language. Steiner notes that repetition, or redundancy, is an indispensable agent in virtually all of this communication because it diminishes the unexpectedness of the information that is being conveyed, which renders it more predictable.\footnote{A.Steiner, \textit{Reading Greek Vases} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 12. On the importance of redundancy, see E.R.Leach, \textit{Claude Levi-Strauss} (New York: Viking Press, 1974), 63-64; J.Campbell, \textit{Grammatical Man: Information, Entropy, Language and Life} (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1982), 58.} She observes that a large part of Athenian imagery is repetitive in nature and can therefore be viewed as a redundant system that transmits a set of key messages to the receiver, or viewer, in this case.

Determining the grammar and syntax of this language, however, is a more complicated matter. Gloria Ferrari has expressed what many others do, namely, that imagery is a system that relies upon a set of standard conventions that conveys the ideas and values of a particular community. However, we have been denied direct access to this system. That is, we do not have an automatic understanding of the pictures because we are not part of that community. In spite of this, Ferrari argues that there are ways of recovering the original meanings, which include tracing an image through its possible contexts, and identifying which elements are required in each case to secure a figure to a particular context so that it will produce a certain meaning.\footnote{Ferrari, \textit{Figures of Speech}, 22-25. Her analysis is based on the theories of U.Eco, \textit{A Theory of Semiotics} (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1976), 61.} Ferrari applied this model and argued that visual figures, like words, are projections of thought. As a result, an image should be viewed as a representation of something that is not shown or at least not fully

shown, whose task it is to depict not what actually exists but what is conceivable.\textsuperscript{484} Ferrari demonstrates how visual representations of maidens, for example, do not permit us to view the actual condition of women in ancient Greece, but rather the ways in which femininity was defined by that culture through a system of signs or metaphors.\textsuperscript{485}

There is now a growing consensus that images on vases cannot be approached as documents that aim at conveying straightforward historical information. They are rather symbols, metaphors and emblems that stand in lieu of the actual concepts and ideas the artist is trying to communicate.\textsuperscript{486} Pictorial images on vases are symbolic representations that produce meaning within a particular socio-cultural context. This meaning, however, is complex and still poorly understood. Structuralist, anthropological and semiotic studies have recently been employed to understand the means by which we can recover the meanings artists had inscribed in their depictions without having direct access to their system; they have had some fruitful results.

Viktoria Sabetai, like Gloria Ferrari, sees vase paintings as concrete configurations that evoke, in a metaphorical way, the notions, concepts and ideas that reflect collective thought. The image, however, is a selective representation of life that reflects, but also transforms the world by a process of clarification, accentuation and exaggeration. By employing scenes on vases depicting maidens at the fountain house, she finds that the task of the vase painter, rather than

\textsuperscript{484} Ferrari, \textit{Figures of Speech}, 7, 19, 20. See also N.Goodman, \textit{Languages of Art: An Approach to a Theory of Symbols} (Indianapolis: Hackett, 1976), 38: “If representation is a matter of choice and correctness a matter of information, realism is a matter of habit.”


creating a true-to-life image, was to “poetically visualize metaphors.” She sees painting as a kind of “silent poetry,“ and argues that artists created images that were pictorial “figures of speech,” like the metaphors, metonymies and adjectives employed in poetry.

Certain scenes depicting women, much like the example of the maidens at the fountain, are regularly formulaic and generic in nature, and usually of limited narrative capacity. Apart from the occasional inscription naming some of the women in the scene, there is nothing in them to denote specificity. As Sabetai has observed, “it is as if the painter drew from a pool of stock iconographic units, just like a writer draws from a pool of words to produce a text.” The painter seems to have been mainly concerned with expressing conceptual ideas, rather than with accurately illustrating scenes drawn from everyday life. The resulting images can therefore be seen as constructions or “figures of speech” in which each element is chosen as part of a larger system of signs and symbols.

One must proceed with caution, however, when attempting to decode this language. The scenes should not be viewed as mirror images of women’s life; they should be read, rather, as representations of the ideas, concepts and beliefs of the society that produced them. The conviction that underlies any study of images on vases is that those images embody meaning. Athenian imagery, especially in the case of women’s scenes, is far too redundant and selective to

---


488 For the notion of painting as silent poetry, read Simonides in Plut. Quaest. Conv. 748 a 4-8.

simply have been “the idle musing of an individual imagination.” The images must have been chosen for the issues they raised, serving a function analogous to that served by myth and cult: they transmitted and solidified the values that were implicit, but not necessarily explicit, in that culture. The scenes on vases convey in visual form the values that defined the community. Just as the oral and written tradition was instrumental in transmitting the standards, rules and expectations of human society, so too imagery gave concrete, visible form to those abstractions. For our purposes, the images should be viewed in this light, albeit in a somewhat modified and adapted state.

3.6 Reading Household Space on Attic Vases

As already stressed, images on vases should not be viewed as snapshots, but instead as syncopated representations of ideas. Vase painters had to find means by which to render things that could not actually be seen, and mechanisms had to be devised to avoid confusing one image with the other. The images also had to be constructed so that they fit into awkward or confined spaces. In other words, the vase painter was limited both by the space to be filled and by the shape available. For the most part, the vase painter employed the pars pro toto method to denote space; the scenes are abridged, telling details are reduced to a minimum, and the context or setting is incomplete. Accepting that the iconography on vases favors excerpts, rather than complete depictions of settings on account of the restricted pictorial field, is the key to interpreting the scenes.

Vallois’ study of depictions of architecture on vases demonstrated that Greek vase painting, like the rest of Greek art, is based primarily on the human figure. In the world of Attic vase painting, the overwhelming majority of pictorial attention falls upon the human figure,

which often occupies a “negative” space and exists in a sort of void. Vase painters sometimes defined this negative space by means of architectural elements, ranging from full depictions of buildings to short-hand columns or doors. The vase painter did not render architectural elements with the precision and care with which he rendered the human form. In fact, the architectural components in the scenes most often convey no explicit setting at all; usually, there is only a vague indication of place, suggested, most commonly, by a column or a door.

Attic vase painters did not often render complete buildings, but rather were satisfied by the mere suggestion of a building. Their representations were also highly variable. It has been argued that even the architecture depicted on well-executed vases is “lawless,” lacking strict canonical rules and differing remarkably from that known to us by means of extant remains. Despite this negative view of the value of examining architectural elements on vases for our understanding of architecture, most seem to agree that these representations can in fact enlighten us about architectural practices for which we have meager evidence.

Philip Oliver-Smith, who compiled the first comprehensive catalog of architectural elements in vase painting, argued that vase painters were not architects and called attention to the problematic nature of evaluating the architecture on vases. At the same time, however, the vase painters were clearly not allowing their imaginations to run unchecked, since they had

---

494 P.E.Oliver-Smith, “Architectural Elements on Greek Vases before 400 B.C.” (Phd diss., University of Pennsylvania, 1969). Most of the works containing architecture after 400 B.C. (mostly of South Italian manufacture) reflect the growing influence of large-scale wall painting and stage scenery, and thus relate a kind of spatial and architectural conceptualization very different from their predecessors (B.Brandes-Druba, Architekturdarstellungen in der unteritalischen Keramik (Frankfurt: P.Lang, 1994)).
specific uses for the structures in their paintings. According to Oliver-Smith, the purpose of the architecture for the vase painter was to set the scene for a narrative or action and to lend credibility to the depicted events. The artist preferred to portray the component structural parts of a building rather than to replicate actual standing buildings, because he was more concerned with the story he was trying to tell than with architectural accuracy. Were he to overload his picture with intricately rendered and well-articulated architecture, the human figures would lose importance.

Rarely did the vase painter depict a building in full. Instead, most vase painters avoided painting full-scale architecture because of technical reasons associated with the problems of space and perspective, or because of aesthetic considerations associated with a greater interest in human figures and actions. Painters were content with allowing a portion of a building to represent the whole, because it was the human action that gave the clues with which one might further define setting or location.

3.7 Containing Space: Doors, Columns and Walls

Vases depicting women in what seem to be indoor settings (Fig. 7a) are often entitled “the women’s quarters,” or “the gynaikonitis,” as if we know for sure what the term meant and

---

496 One likely exception is the depiction of the Kallirhoe fountain – which is labeled – on a hydria from Athens (Athens Akropolis 732), though it does not much help with reconstructing its actual appearance. See B.Graef, Die antiken Vasen von der Akropolis zu Athen (Berlin: Gruyter, 1925), 89-91, pl.47.
498 One of the few examples is Bonn 994, on which a house is sketchily depicted with closed double doors, an upper storey with columns (or staircase) and an entablature with triglyphs and metopes.
499 Athens, National Museum 1629; Beazley, ARV, 1250.34, 1688.
that, architecturally speaking, such quarters existed in houses. Architectural elements, such as pillars and doors, are frequently found in the vase paintings and these have been used to locate the scenes in interior or indoor space. More specifically, these elements are said to define and delimit space, but also to indicate an enclosed area, one marked off from the rest of the house.

Most of the vase paintings that portray women do indeed take place in or in front of some form of built environment. This may be indicated by a door, a column, or when none of these are present, by a wall that is understood to exist because of the various objects that are depicted hanging on pegs: vessels, mirrors, bags, sashes, and, sometimes, sandals (Fig. 8).\(^5\) Usually, large architectural structures are absent, but doors are commonly portrayed, especially on pyxides, and particularly from the second half of the 5th century B.C. The most obvious indication of a structure, the double door, is usually read as an abbreviation for the entire house (Fig. 9, Fig. 10, Fig. 11).\(^6\) Eva Keuls, who has worked on representations of women, argues that the closed door is a standard clue in identifying the *gynaikonitis* in which women were confined.\(^7\) Keuls has designated the double doors as the visual signals for the *gynaikonitis*, but her own and similar opinions on the issue of women and space is, rather than strict iconographic analysis, partly a reflection of the traditional scholarly baggage that has weighed down studies on women.

There are obvious difficulties in depicting space on vases. Instead of painting all of the architectural details of a building, the vase painter usually chose to portray sketchily one of its

---


---

most recognizable features – the double door – in an attempt at brevity. Doors, in general, whether they are open or closed, act as topographical reference points for the scene. They mark the border of a building’s outer and inner space, and can stand as a visual marker of the whole house or part of a house.\textsuperscript{504} That doors are depicted on a large number of Attic wares and originate from many different workshops, suggests that the motif was conventional and widespread among vase painters and was a standard way of denoting buildings, in particular, houses.

Doors are given a great deal of attention in the vase paintings. They are generally rendered with much detail and are unusually pronounced. For instance, they often stand alone, isolated from other architectural elements (Fig.10). Despite the fact that doors are sometimes executed without concern for accuracy and linear perspective (Fig.12),\textsuperscript{505} they are rendered in a way that demonstrates a particular concern with detail. The doors are most often depicted as double doors, that is, with two panels that open away from one another. Each door panel is usually composed of two wooden boards, but sometimes there are three, and these are reinforced by horizontal rails and vertical stiles secured by nails, which prevented the warping of the wood.\textsuperscript{506} The doors generally sit on a thick threshold and are topped by a thin lintel, but sometimes a cornice is added as well. Oftentimes, a lock is depicted, and some representations depict the locking or unlocking of doors with keys (Fig.13).\textsuperscript{507} Much of the time there is a star-shaped feature on the door as well, and this has been read as a knocker. The door knocker is

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item Athens, National Museum 1588; Beazley, \textit{ARV},\textsuperscript{2} 1023.144.
\item See Vitr. 4.6. For excavated metal fittings, see D.M.Robinson, \textit{Excavations at Olynthus X: Metal and Minor Miscellaneous Finds, An Original Contribution to Greek Life} (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1941), 249, 252, 260 ff., pls.65-83.
\item Berlin, Antikensammlung 2382; J.D.Beazley, \textit{Attic Red-Figure Vase-Painters} (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1942): 1083.4.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
generally rectangular or in palmette form, but could also be a simple ring. In addition to this, a leather strap is often rendered on the bottom section of the door with which it was kept ajar; it is on occasion attached to the wall beside the door.\textsuperscript{508}

Painters often take great care in portraying the double doors, complete with wooden panels and rails and stiles, for example, but little attention is given to space. On open doors, one can at times make out the hinges the doors swing on (Fig.14),\textsuperscript{509} and sometimes, even, the painter has used curving lines to demonstrate to the viewer either the natural grain of the wood or the polished surface of the panels (Fig.7b). Despite the attention and detail often given to depictions of doors, the images are anything but straightforward. For one, vase painters do not always seem to have been interested in visual verisimilitude. As in any representational mode that draws upon activities of daily life and its concrete manifestations, the resulting images do not provide documentations or “snapshots” of reality. For instance, when doors are depicted ajar, a rudimentary linear perspective is employed; converging lines are used to give the impression that the door panels are opening away from one another. Much of the time, the doors are rendered in a way that implies that they are opening inwards toward another space and away from the women (Fig.7a, Fig.7b). Horizontal lines painted behind the doors on one vase painting seem to indicate the back wall of the room in the distance (Fig.7b); the band could perhaps denote a narrow painted molding that runs along the walls.\textsuperscript{510} Generally speaking, however, the vase paintings are not usually this clear.

The presence of ajar doors cannot always determine whether a scene is taking place in an indoor or outdoor space, because we are not sure which way doors usually opened. Long ago,

\textsuperscript{509} Paris, Louvre CA 587; Beazley, \textit{ARV};\textsuperscript{2} 1094.104, 1682.
William Mooney studied doors on theaters, which often denote house doors, and found that they likely opened outwards onto the stage, though representations of stage doors on vases say otherwise (Fig.15).  We might expect the construction of the stage door to be a reflection of actual house doors, but we should keep in mind that the stage was free of any external considerations, unlike the house.  The literary evidence from the late 6th to the 4th century B.C. demonstrates that house doors that encroached onto the street (τὰς θύρας τὰς ἀνοιγμένας ἔξω) were charged heavy penalties.  The front door of the house in Plato’s *Protagoras* seems to have observed this ruling and opened in towards the house rather than onto the street, since it is slammed shut in the face of visitors.

This is the formula that is employed in many of our scenes.  When a vase painter wished to depict ajar double doors, he usually painted them as opening inwards with a normal swing, that is with the panels swinging away from the person opening the door (Fig.7a, Fig.12, Fig.14).  Even in scenes that appear to be taking place in an exterior area, the doors of buildings often follow the same principle and open inwards and away from the main scene in the foreground (Fig.16), though there are some exceptions (Fig.28b).  The comparison demonstrates that the doors depicted on vases are not likely accurate depictions of actual house doors, but also that we should not employ the direction the doors swing in a vase painting as secure grounds for establishing whether or not a space is an indoor or outdoor one.  The difficulties of placing an
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512 W.W. Mooney, “The House-Door on the Ancient Stage” (PhD diss., Princeton University, 1914), 42-47.  Stage doors, however, seem to have opened outwards, as is demonstrated by lines from the plays themselves (e.g. Soph. *Ant.* 1186 ff; Aristoph. *Wasps* 138 ff.; Men. *Samia* 85 ff., 151 ff., 210 ff. and *Epitr.* 485).
514 Plat. *Prot.* 314 d.  The same seems to be true in Plut. *Mor.* 597 d and *Pelop.* 11.4.
515 Vienna, Kunsthistorisches Museum 3719; *Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum*: Wien, Kunsthistorisches Museum 1, 40-41, Pls.48,49.
isolated door within the context of a house’s architectural structure should not be overlooked, and care must be taken to weigh this iconographic element against others in the vase paintings.

The frequent presence of a wall, like the door, has been seen as proof of indoor space. The wall is understood to exist in the paintings because of the various household items that are depicted hanging on pegs. Objects such as vases, mirrors, ribbons and sandals, are often painted in the background, and seem to hang in mid-air, though it is implied that these are actually hanging on pegs on a wall (Fig.8). The presence of a wall is clearly indicated, but to view the wall as being situated in the interior of a house, is not at all necessary.517 The wall can in fact be seen as the outer face of a house. An exterior wall can be implied by means of an overhanging eave over a door (Fig.16) or by a series of columns that suggest a covered portico (Fig.20).518 In these scenes, the various items that hang on the wall in the background, such as a small sack or pouch, demonstrate that household objects hanging from pegs do not demand that the viewer read an indoor scene.

Furniture, too, such as chairs and stools, has also been employed to support placing the women in an indoor environment. In most of the scenes, there is usually at least one woman who sits on a chair or a stool, and sometimes there are other pieces of furniture in the scene, such as small tables. There is no need to view this as evidence for an interior space, however, since it is widely acknowledged that furniture was portable.519 Beds, couches, chairs, stools and tables

517 At Olynthus, shelves have been postulated in the pastades of some of the houses (Cahill, Olynthus, 89, 99-100, 105, 109.
were light enough to be picked up and carried (Fig.17). There is plentiful testimony, in fact, for furniture being moved, borrowed and even pilfered. Flexibility and adaptability seem to have characterized the nature of household furnishings and space, and this is reflected in the vase paintings as well (Fig.18). Neither the presence of furniture, nor, for that matter, of objects hanging on the wall, should be utilized to argue for a strictly indoor setting.

Space on vases, as we have seen, can be difficult to decipher. It is sometimes unclear which figures or objects are meant to be perceived as ‘behind’ or ‘in front of’ the architectural features, or which ‘side’ of the architecture is the interior or exterior. Doors and columns delineate space, but that this space specifically represents an interior region of a house is not required. For example, pillars can just as easily represent courtyards, temples, altars and gymnasia (Fig.19). Instead of implying indoor space, doors and columns may sometimes imply more open spaces, such as the courtyard of a house, which usually consisted of a series of pillars or posts with which to support a second storey.

One vase painting depicts a group of seated women engaged in spinning who are surrounded by tall, sturdy-looking columns (Fig.20). The series of columns depicted on the vase may well suggest that the women are working under a covered portico adjoining a house or a courtyard. For one, the portable nature of chairs and wool-working implements like the distaff made working in a covered but well-ventilated space of the house feasible and most likely preferable in the hot summer months. This is made all the more likely by the large number of

---

521 See, for instance, Dem. 30.28; Lys. 19.31, 32.6; Men. Dysk. 920-945.
columns in the scene. The four columns, which have been fluted to suggest masonry,\footnote{On the proportions of columns and their corresponding fabric, see P.E.Oliver-Smith, “Architectural Elements on Greek Vases before 400 B.C.” (Phd diss., University of Pennsylvania, 1969), 18-19.} could represent one side of a colonnade, and this would make for a large peristyle. No such colonnades have been found in the interiors of actual houses, and in general, only one column is depicted in interior scenes (Fig.7a). The possibility that the women on the vase (Fig.20) are spending their days under the portico of a court is something that must be given consideration.

The likelihood of a courtyard setting for a good quantity of the scenes is quite high. In fact, this could explain why, in addition to economy of space, the vertical loom is very rarely represented in the vase paintings, despite the regular depiction of the distaff and wool basket.\footnote{In some rural villages in Greece, spinning is done while watching children, socializing with women or even while riding on mules; so constant is the occupation of spinning that women have loops attached to their dresses to provide additional support for the distaff (J.B.Koster, “From Spindle to Loom: Weaving in the Southern Argolid,” Expedition 19 (1976): 34-35). See further, E.J.W.Barber, Women’s Work: The First 20,000 Years; Women, Cloth and Society in Early Times (New York: Norton, 1994).} There are only a handful of vases with representations of the upright loom, and only one of these has a secure Athenian provenance (Fig.21).\footnote{This is: New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art 31.11.10; J.D.Beazley, Attic Black-Figure Vase-Painters (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1956): 154.57, 688. Some of the others are: Chiusi 1831, Harvard 1925.30.127 and Corinth CP 2038.} Putting aside its early date, it is one of the few portrayals of active weaving. The women stand and bend, and push and separate the threads, thereby demonstrating the physical constraints of using the warp-weighted vertical loom. Studies focused on weaving have determined that the vertical loom required a wall or rafters to lean on, necessitating an indoor space, or at least some architectural structure for support. As well, weaving on this type of loom does not seem to have been a portable task, unlike the act of spinning; once a loom was set up and weaving had begun, it would have been difficult to move

---

Thus, the risk of inclement weather, such as rain or extreme heat, may have prevented women from placing their looms in an open-air court.

The hand-loom, too, like the upright loom, is only rarely illustrated on Attic vases (Fig.14). The vase paintings we do have depict a lyre-like implement that is small enough to fit on a woman’s lap. Though there is no archaeological evidence for the implement, likely because it was made of wood, it seems to have been used for either weaving or embroidery, or, perhaps, both. The frequent presence of a wool basket in the scenes and the patterned textile on the frame itself make this a very likely possibility.

The limitations imposed on the vase painter cannot explain why the wool basket is repeatedly illustrated in scenes of women, as opposed to both the large upright loom and the small textile frame. Like the wool basket, which figures prominently in the scenes, the door also is a standard feature. That these serve as a focal point in many of the scenes suggests that there is some significance in their depiction; this cannot be explained simply as the result of the vase painter’s devices for signifying wool-work, in the case of the wool basket, and for denoting space, in the case of the double doors.

---

528 The loom with its weights was large and heavy, and needed to be fixed securely; the top of the loom had to rest against a wall or a rafter in the roof and would have been unyieldly to move (M.Hoffmann, *The Warp Weighted Loom: Studies in the History and Technology of an Ancient Implement* (Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 1964), 302; E.Broudy, *The Book of Looms: A History of the Handloom from Ancient Times to the Present* (Hanover, NH: University Press of New England, 1993), 23-28).

529 These include: Louvre CA 587, London BM 1905.11.2.3, Aleria 2095, University of Durham 3, Art Institute of Chicago 1911.456 and 1889.27. The implement occurs on red-figure vases from the mid-5th century B.C. at the same time as women begin to be depicted wearing hair nets, snoods and sakkoi, suggesting a possible use (L.Clark, “Notes on Small Textile Frames Pictured on Greek Vases,” *AJA* 87 (1983): 93).

530 Some have called the implement a lyre, but almost all of them have textiles on them and none have a sound box (L.Clark, “Notes on Small Textile Frames Pictured on Greek Vases,” *AJA* 87 (1983): 96).
3.8 Abbreviation and Abridgement in Scenes of Women

As already noted, Greek vase painting is concerned primarily with the human figure; it may be argued that it is the human figure that gives meaning to the objects in any given scene. The vase paintings are not simply concerned with suggesting a door or a chair or a column, but rather about transmitting an idea, a reflection of thought. There is no reason to believe that this idea, conveyed by symbols like the door or wool basket, however, carried negative connotations of confinement and seclusion for women. Scholars have argued that the closed doors demonstrate, through the pars pro toto method, the space that was supposedly assigned to women, the *gynaikonitis*. They claim that such scenes advance the view that women were required to stay indoors, which is expressed not only by the closed doors, but also by the chair the woman often sits on that symbolized her sedentary life (Fig.7a). On the contrary, the women in the scenes do not appear at all discontented or despondent with their surroundings, and this begs a more thorough interpretation of the double doors.

The double doors serve as a focal point in many of the scenes, and there is good reason to believe that there is some significance inherent in the door itself. It is not very likely, given its dominant presence, that the door is simply a means of denoting an architectural element of a house. According to Elizabeth Haight, the symbolism of the house door is well attested in Attic drama. In its simplest form, the door stands for some sort of structure, be it palace, house or grotto, and is witnessed in the simplified background of the dramatic stage (Fig.15). It can become, however, an important symbol for the home and for the family, and even a

---

532 Blundell, “Marriage,” 42.
personification of a young maiden and a symbol of unrequited love.\textsuperscript{534} If the door, as Haight argues, is a persistently recurrent and meaningful symbol in literature, then why does this not also apply to the plastic arts?

On the vases, a woman sometimes gestures towards the door (Fig.22),\textsuperscript{535} looks back at the door (Fig.23),\textsuperscript{536} or touches the door as she walks passed it. On occasion, one finds depictions of women who appear to be running either towards (Fig.24)\textsuperscript{537} or away from the door (Fig.25).\textsuperscript{538} Sometimes the woman is simply standing in between double doors that are ajar (Fig.26).\textsuperscript{539} The door is not just a backdrop, nor simply set decoration, but rather a stage prop that is touched, looked at and interacted with. In the language of images, it is a symbol, the smallest identifiable iconographic unit, whose meaning can be found by tracing its syntax or its compositional structure in less abridged scenes.

Doors are depicted not only in scenes composed mainly of women, nor only on vessels that are associated with women’s adornment. They also occur on larger vases, such as the well-known volute krater in Florence usually referred to as the François vase (Fig.27).\textsuperscript{540} On this large-scale vase, as opposed to the pyxides that carry the door motif, the whole façade of a house has been portrayed without thought of economy of space. Not only the double doors, but in antis columns, Doric capitals, a frieze of triglyphs and metopes, and a gabled roof are illustrated to suggest the house of Peleus and Thetis. The scene depicts Thetis who is anxiously awaiting the

\textsuperscript{535} Athens, National Museum 1591; Beazley, \textit{ARV},\textsuperscript{2} 955.1.
\textsuperscript{536} Athens, National Museum 14909; \textit{RA} 36 (1950): 41-61.
\textsuperscript{537} Mississippi, University Museum P 108; \textit{Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum}: Baltimore, 3, PL.43.2.
\textsuperscript{538} Athens, Agora Museum P 2283; Beazley, \textit{ARV},\textsuperscript{2} 1223.5.
\textsuperscript{539} London, British Museum E 773 (1873.1-11.7); Beazley, \textit{ARV},\textsuperscript{2} 1670.
\textsuperscript{540} Florence, Museo Archeologico Etrusco 4209; J.D.Beazley, \textit{Attic Black-Figure Vase-Painters} (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1956), 76.1, 682.
approaching chariot of guests; this is implied by the door that is ajar and through which the viewer can see Thetis pulling her mantle to the side, underlining her married status.  

The significance of the door in large wedding procession scenes, such as on the François vase, was skillfully but only incidentally noted by Sally Roberts in her monograph on Attic pyxides. She advanced the idea that the representations of the house façade along with a procession of guests, was a standard way of denoting the movement of a maiden from her childhood home to her husband’s home as a new bride. This is most evident on a lekythos by Amasis on which is portrayed a similarly detailed architectural façade that acts as the backdrop for the scene (Fig.28a). Here, the viewer can see a figure, who has been identified as the groom’s mother, standing between open double doors and raising a torch for the approaching newlyweds (Fig.28b).

The rite of marriage was a tripartite procedure that consisted of the separation of the participants from their original status, the actual transition to a new status (the so-called “liminal” stage), followed by their incorporation into a new state of existence. As van Gennep observed, weddings tend to emphasize the act of transition since the change of status from single to married involved an actual physical relocation of the bride. This transition is witnessed in the procession scenes often found on large vessels and was the central act of the wedding that brought the bride to her new home. Torches, songs and dances accompanied the procession, serving an apotropaic purpose during this critical “liminal” time. The bride’s mother brought
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541 The one leaf of the door is omitted to suggest that it is open. There are other houses that appear in early black-figure painting associated with the marriage of Peleus and Thetis (Athens Akropolis 587; London BM 1971.11-1.1). The complete veiling of the face for Athenian women seems to have been limited to brides (Plut. Mor. 232 C; Aesch. Ag. 1178-1179; Eur. IT 372-373; C.M.Galt, “Veiled Ladies,” AJA 35 (1931): 373-393).
544 For the wedding procession and its accompaniment by torches, see Eur. IA 732-735, Phoen. 344-346, Hel. 722-724, Tro. 308, Med. 1028. For the apotropaic nature of fire and noise, see E.Samter, Geburt, Hochzeit und Tod.
a torch lit from her hearth to light and protect her daughter until she was received by the groom’s mother, who is often shown waiting at the door carrying torches ablaze.545

Architectural façades are quite popular in wedding scenes. In particular, the double door becomes almost a signature feature of wedding scenes on Attic vases. As suggested by Oakley and Sinos, this could be explained by the fact that the doors serve as realistic markers for the beginning and end of the wedding procession, but also because they serve more symbolically to represent the transition from maiden to wife, since the bride must walk through them to accomplish the ritual.546 The scenes are labeled “wedding processions” because they form an entire narrative, complete with bride and groom riding a chariot and guests heading towards a well-articulated structure. In contrast, the scenes pertaining to our discussion have no full-scale architectural façades, no elaborate settings, no torch-bearing relatives and no procession of wedding guests. The images are usually labeled “domestic,” or more specifically, “women in the women’s quarters,” but such a classification is unjustified in light of the comparative material.

The procession scenes are read as full-scale wedding narratives, and rightly so, but this should not disqualify a large quantity of our scenes from being viewed in the context of the wedding.547 The conspicuous presence of doors in scenes with women, as well as other features, can be viewed as symbols through which some of this information is conveyed to an informed viewer, albeit in an abridged manner. It is unsurprising that the wedding procession scenes usually occur on large vessels, while the so-called “domestic” scenes occur on smaller vase

(Leipzig: Druck und Verlag, 1911), 58-66, 83-85. An illegitimate marriage was referred to as “a wedding without torches” (Ap.Schol. on Eur. Alc. 989). Objects and people passing over boundaries are guarded even today in rural Greece; food that is given to a guest to take home is covered or wrapped in a cloth so that no one will know what it is.

545 See also London 1920.12-21.1; Berlin F 2372, F 2530 and 3373.
546 Oakley and Sinos, Wedding, 31. Scenes of departing warriors also highlight movement as they are often accompanied by columns, but no doors.
547 B.Dunkley (“Greek Fountain-Buildings before 300 B.C.” BSA 36 (1935-36): 177) suggests that the shift from ornate facades to abbreviations may be associated with technique, since black-figure lends itself to decoration consisting of many small elements, while red-figure lends itself more to broader treatment.
types. The simpler scenes, typically found on pyxides, give the impression of being condensed versions of the complete wedding processions seen on kraters and lekythoi.

A pyxis in Paris demonstrates this relationship most clearly (Fig. 29). On the vessel is a representation of a bride who is being led by the wrist in the classic “cheir’ epi karpo” gesture by the groom to his home. The house, however, is neither well-articulated nor complete, but is rather implied by the double doors, which act as the beginning and end point of this condensed wedding procession. On occasion, however, fuller narratives are found on smaller vessels. For example, on another pyxis the bride and groom are portrayed riding on a chariot (Fig. 30a) leaving the bride’s home, the door of which is still open (Fig. 30b). A woman, perhaps an attendant, but most likely a relative, catches a final glimpse of the bride through the half-open double doors. Women carry boxes and vessels, and are accompanied by others who hold torches in a long procession to the groom’s house. Such scenes are, understandably, never labeled as being set in the women’s quarters; they are clearly set outdoors and men are almost always present. This scene and others will serve, however, to connect the wedding procession with scenes located in the so-called “women’s quarters.”

A representation on a vessel will make the relationship between wedding scenes and the scenes of the “women’s quarters” the more clear. In one depiction, a maiden is being led, again by the wrist, toward a door by a lyre-playing Eros (Fig. 31a), while on the other side, the maiden appears again, gently touching the door frame as Eros flies towards her with a chest (Fig. 31b). There is no groom, no procession, no torches and no guests, but the wedding imagery is transparent. By passing the threshold of the door, the scene portrays the physical relocation of

548 Paris, Louvre L. 55 (N3348); Beazley, ARV² 924.33.
the woman to the groom’s home, but also alludes to the woman’s transition to a new status, that of matron, through the rite of marriage; the door acts both as the physical and metaphorical sign of transition for the woman.

In the scenes that are said to be taking place in the women’s quarters, the elements of a fully built environment and of a procession of guests, which are present in the wedding procession scenes, are missing. This should not, however, prohibit a similar reading of the scenes. A pyxis in London, for instance, portrays a typical “women’s quarter” scene of women engaged in adorning themselves by way of hair accessories and other accoutrements (Fig.32a).\textsuperscript{552} The depiction alludes to the wedding ritual by way of two lebetes gamikoi – a type of vase likely given to a bride on her wedding day – sitting on tall stands and placed on the door sill (Fig.32b).\textsuperscript{553} Upon closer inspection, figures can be made out who are engaged in some type of adornment; it can be discerned that one of the figures on the lebes is carrying ribbons with which she will tie up her hair for the wedding ceremony.

Lending support to this reading is the loutrophoros that is also depicted on the pyxis (Fig.32b). It is a conspicuous sign that a wedding is or has taken place, since this type of vessel was used to hold the water for the ritual bridal bath.\textsuperscript{554} The vessel seems to have been filled with water at a prescribed source and was a crucial element in the wedding ritual;\textsuperscript{555} the procession taking the bride to fetch her bathwater must have been a clear visual signal that a wedding was underway. Despite the lack of a full procession, the viewer should read this scene and similar ones in the context of marriage.

\textsuperscript{552} London, British Museum E 774 (1874.5-12.1); Beazley, \textit{ARV},\textsuperscript{2} 1250.32.
\textsuperscript{553} For the lebes gamikos, see Oakley and Sinos, \textit{Wedding}, 6-7.
\textsuperscript{554} On the loutrophoros, see \textit{ibid.}, 6-7, 15-16, Figs.16-19; Men. \textit{Samia} 729-730; Pollux 3.43; Harpocration s.v. \textit{loutrophoros kai loutrophorein}. For the importance of bathing, see most recently U.Kreilinger, \textit{Anständige Nacktheit: Körperpflege, Reinigungsriten und das Phänomen weiblicher Nacktheit im archaisch-klassischen Athen} (Rahden: Leidorf, 2007), 119-146.
\textsuperscript{555} For the water source, see Thuc. 2.15.5. On the importance of the bridal bath, see Eur. \textit{IT} 818-819, \textit{Phoen.} 347-348.
At the most basic level of interpretation, the doors represented on vase paintings symbolize some type of domestic architecture. A more complex reading, however, could assert that the doors denote liminality because of the impending transition of a woman from the status of maiden to matron through the wedding rites and through the physical movement over the threshold. The affinities of such scenes to scenes of wedding processions make this a very likely scenario. There is, of course, more evidence with which to supplement this interpretation. Just as the loutrophoros and lebetes were depicted on the pyxis above, so the presence in the scenes of emblems and symbols of the wedding rite are common on other vases; their presence is not a chance event.

3.9 Signaling the Wedding: Baskets, Chests, Girdles, Ribbons, Mirrors

The emblems or symbols that appear on vases alluding to the wedding most often recall the enhancement of the bride through grooming and adornment. Perfume, hair accessories, belts and garlands are only some of the means by which the self-interested bride contentedly embellishes herself with the help of her friends and relatives before her wedding; these items are standard features in the vase paintings. Unlike the double doors, some of these symbols seem to form part of the set décor of the scene rather than part of the repertoire of props; the figures in the scenes usually do not touch, interact with or pay much attention to these objects. Nonetheless, they are conspicuous in the scenes and ever present. One of these pieces of set décor seems to be the kalathos or wool basket.

The wool basket is a prominent feature in scenes of women’s adornment, yet it usually bears no immediate reference to the making of textiles. As noted earlier, the general lack of active weaving or spinning is striking in the scenes; the basket is almost never used for work,
with a few exceptions (Fig.20, Fig.26). Though the wool basket, or *kalathos*, is a sign of wool working and the domestic arts, evidence of actual wool-working is limited to the presence of the wool basket itself in the vast majority of examples. Frequently, a woman sits by her wool basket, accompanied by other women who bring perfume, jewelry chests, sashes or mirrors, and in general, the woman is unconcerned with the basket beside her. The wool basket is conspicuous, though, for this reason exactly. Even if the basket is not utilized, it is constantly present, emphatically displayed, and, sometimes, prominently showcased (Fig.22).\(^556\) It is quite often one of the few elements in the scene. This is not a phenomenon specific to vases, however, for this is also the case with funerary monuments;\(^557\) it seems to be part of a larger trend.

Traditionally, the wool basket, along with the distaff and spindle, small and convenient symbols of wool-work, have been read as symbolizing a woman’s *philergia* or industry.\(^558\) Sometimes, vase painters even inscribed the word “philergos” beside figures in scenes who were engaged in spinning to make this association more obvious.\(^559\) Sheramy Bundrick has argued that the scenes allude to the female contribution to the household through the time-consuming production of textiles.\(^560\) No one would deny the sizeable contribution of women to their household economy, especially considering the time and skill needed to produce clothing, and also because textiles were regarded as a form of wealth that could be traded for goods or translated into cash. The women, however, are almost never weaving, and only seldom spin

\(^556\) See also Paris, Musée Auguste Rodin 531; Tubingen, Eberhard-Karls Universität S101566; Athens, Keramikos 9127; London Market, Ede 6295; Brussels, Musées Royaux A1684.

\(^557\) For an example of a kalathos on a funerary monument, see Athens NM 7908a-b. For the few ceramic kalathoi found, see R.T. Williams, “An Attic Red-Figure Kalathos,” *Antike Kunst* 4 (1961): 27-29. Those with figural decoration are: Athens NM 474, San Simeon 9828, Munich 2416, University of Durham 3 and Berkeley 8/3342.

\(^558\) This was one of the main qualities set out by Aristotle for girls (*Rhet.* 1361 A 1-7).

\(^559\) See, for example, Paris Cabinet de Medailles 7236; *ARV*\(^2\) 624, 81.

thread. Instead, they sit beside the wool basket, carefree and unconcerned with the container and the onerous work associated with it.

Contrary to what our instincts would dictate, the wool basket does not appear to be a sign of active wool-work. Gloria Ferrari has put forward that the wool basket is rather an object associated with courtship.\footnote{Ferrari, \textit{Figures of Speech}, 26, 56, 88-89. The connotations of courtship in pursuit scenes will be discussed in a later section of this chapter.} She notes how the wool basket often occurs in scenes where women, such as Europa or Aethra, are being chased or abducted by male suitors. In a panic, the women either hold the wool basket high above their head as they flee (Fig.33)\footnote{Athens, Acropolis Museum 2341; D.Callipolitis-Feytmans, \textit{Les plats attiques à figures noires} (Paris: Boccard, 1974), Pl.48.} or drop the basket as they set off (Fig.34).\footnote{London, British Museum E 174; Beazley, \textit{ARV} \textsuperscript{2} 229.39.} The wool basket takes a prominent position in the scenes, though it does not serve any immediate purpose in the narrative. For Ferrari, the scenes with wool baskets are neither concerned with domestic chores nor strictly speaking with notions of the dutiful wife.\footnote{Ferrari, \textit{Figures of Speech}, 56-57.} She makes the case that the images in fact demonstrate that spinning is the mark of women who are young, beautiful and elegant, and that they allude to the women’s sexual allure to the opposite sex.\footnote{Female wool-workers have often been called “spinning hetairai,” because of the appearance of the money-pouch (G.Rodenwaldt, “Spinnende Hetären,” \textit{AA} 47 (1932): 7-22; M.Meyer, “Männer mit Geld,” \textit{Jdl} 103 (1988): 87-103; E.C.Keuls, “The Hetaera and the Housewife: The Splitting of the Female Psyche in Greek Art,” \textit{Meded} 44-45 (1983): 32). Ferrari, however, argues that the pouches could hold objects like knucklebones, not just coins (“Money Bags?” \textit{AJA} 90 (1986): 218). For the scenes as representing the husband as provider for his family, see Bundrick, “Fabric of the City,” 299-301; H.A.Shapiro, “Fathers and Sons, Men and Boys,” in \textit{Coming of Age in Ancient Greece}, ed. J. Neils and J. H. Oakley (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2003), 102.}

The wool basket, however, occurs not only in scenes of courtship and abduction, but also in scenes of adornment and wedding ritual (Fig.35).\footnote{Berlin, Antikensammlung 3373; \textit{Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum}: Berlin, Antikensammlung-Pergamonmuseum 1, 74-76, Beilage 8.2, Pls.159,160,161.} In Athens, the wool basket was a common gift presented to a bride the day after the wedding, quite likely in an attempt to remind
the bride of her household duties. We are told, in fact, that a bride gave the groom a *chlamys*, a finely woven wool garment, as proof of her skill in wool working. In this respect, the kalathos seems to have been a metaphor for wifehood, though this is not compatible with the fact that the basket is out of service.

The scenes in which the wool basket figures are not about producing textiles or even about domestic duties. The kalathos, along with other objects, is presented to women engaged in elaborate scenes of adornment and self-enhancement through finely woven garments, intricate updos and perfumes; the women, however, demonstrate no eagerness whatsoever to make use of the basket and to get to work. Instead, the wool basket, like the other objects the woman is offered, acts as a visual symbol of the larger theme of the wedding.

Chests and boxes, like the wool baskets, consistently occur in scenes of women. These have often been read as symbols of containment and confinement, and likened to the isolation of women in the house. Lissarrague, for instance, finds that the boxes in the scenes relate to the idea of concealing and putting away, and that they give concrete visual form to the distinction between an outdoor and an indoor space in which women themselves are detained. To be sure, the women do not appear to be detained in any way. On the contrary, they cheerfully go about their business and in good company.

One could read the presence of chests and boxes in the scenes in a multitude of ways if it were not for the other objects that accompany them. Considering that the boxes are carried by
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568 Pollux s.v. *epaulia*.
women and occur in scenes of women’s adornment, these could, in fact, allude to a woman’s role in contributing to the wealth of the household and to her essential role in managing those same goods.\(^{570}\) Such containers could hold textiles that the woman had produced herself or small objects of value, such as jewelry (Fig.36).\(^{571}\) Sheramy Bundrick argues that such portable boxes may have been the containers that held the dowry and gifts a bride brought with her to her husband’s new home, and which gave the woman considerable clout in a marriage.\(^{572}\) Filled with valuables, these small portable boxes would have demonstrated the bride’s wealth as they were carried in the wedding procession (Fig.30b);\(^{573}\) they would have also been the physical reminders that she could take her things and return to her father’s home if need be.

One of the most unmistakable indicators of the wedding rite is the *zone*, an article of clothing worn by women as a belt or girdle. According to King, though it was a decorative accessory in daily life, it represented the most important transitional moments in a woman’s life: puberty, marriage and childbirth.\(^{574}\) The loosening of a woman’s girdle was symbolic of the opening of the womb itself during critical points of transition in a woman’s life, particularly on the wedding night and in childbirth (Fig.37).\(^{575}\) Girdles were dedicated by women before their wedding to Artemis, for example, and sometimes girdles were also dedicated after the wedding

\(^{570}\) For the importance of a wife’s management of household resources, see Xen. *Oec.* 7.31-6.

\(^{571}\) Oxford, Ashmolean Museum 551; Beazley, *ARV*;\(^{2}\) 1328.98, 1315.


\(^{573}\) In some modern villages in Greece, clothing and even furniture are brought to the groom’s house (E.Friedl, *Vasilika: A Village in Modern Greece* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1962), 43).

\(^{574}\) For the loosening the *zone* during transitional points in a woman’s life, see H.King, “Bound to Bleed: Artemis and Greek Women,” in *Images of Women in Antiquity*, ed. A.Cameron and A.Kuhrt (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1983), 120-121; Pind. *O.* 6.39; Call. *H.* 4.209; Suda s.v. Λυσίζωνος γυνή. On the wedding night, a woman’s womb would need to be “opened” to receive her husband’s seed, and in childbirth, the womb would need to be opened in order to allow the passage of the child. See also Athens, NM 1205 and New York, MMA 06.1021.130.

\(^{575}\) New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art 08.258.17; Beazley, *ARV*;\(^{2}\) 999.181.
to Aphrodite by husbands. In fact, one vase painting may illustrate such a dedication (Fig.38). In the scene, Artemis stands with a torch in her right hand, perhaps a bridal torch, while a woman stands beside her loosening her belt. The girdles are appropriate motifs for the preparatory stages of the wedding, and, according to Nikos Bezantakos, are synonymous with a girl who is about to be transformed into a woman through the ritual of marriage.

Binding of the hair, like binding of the waist, was also significant in the wedding ritual. Frequently, ribbons are hanging on the wall in the background (Fig.39), and act as the visual indicators that a wedding is being celebrated in the house, much like the garlands and sprigs that one often finds in such scenes. Usually the ribbons are being carried by young women who approach the seated woman, in this case the bride. Sometimes, however, the women are portrayed in the act of binding their hair with the ribbons to form intricate updos (Fig.40). In general, beautification of the bride, be it with hair accessories, garments or jewelry, is a constant theme in such scenes. These accoutrements are also the tools of Aphrodite and thus may underscore the bride’s entry into the goddess’ sphere of influence.

Hair-tying and also hair-cutting, in general, are suggestive of transitions both with respect to age and to status, connecting the scene in this sense to the transition of the wedding. In one
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577 Syracuse, Museo Archeologico 21186; Beazley, ARV, 2 993.80.
578 The epithet, lysisunos, was commonly given to Artemis as her role of overseeing the loosening of the “zone.” See, Hesych. s.v. Δυσίκωνος; Schol. Ap. Rhod. I.288; Orphic Hymn 2.7 and 36.5.
580 Munich, Antikensammlung 7578; Beazley, ARV, 2 1126.3.
581 Athens, National Museum 14790; Beazley, ARV, 2 1126.4
582 On adornment for the wedding, see Achill. Tat. Leucippe and Clitophon 2.11.2-4; Xen. Sym. 2.3. For the association with Aphrodite, see J.Redfield, “Notes on the Greek Wedding,” Arethusa 15 (1982): 193-194.
scene, a maiden labeled “Iphigenia” stands on the threshold of the door with such a ribbon tied around her head and gestures towards it (Fig.26); both her gesture and her position emphasize the transitional nature of the scene. The ribbons are used to bind the bride’s flowing hair, just as the girdle is used to bind the bride’s waist. In this context, it should be noted that the untying of a bride’s belt by the groom on the couple’s wedding night was a standard metaphor for taking a woman’s virginity. In adornment scenes, brides are sometimes tying their belts, but far more common are the scenes in which the bride is being offered ribbons; perhaps it is because hair-tying, as opposed to waist-binding, was less explicitly sexual in nature. The bride uses the ribbons to bind her hair in a gesture that mimics the tying of the girdle, and through this, encourages the viewer to look to the imminent untying by the groom.

The image of the bride as an aesthetically orderly and attractive woman is something that is stressed in the scenes of adornment. The frequency with which mirrors appear in the background hanging on the walls is remarkable. Occasionally, a female companion holds up the mirror for the bride to see, or the bride raises the mirror to gaze at her own reflection (Fig.41). Sue Blundell has read the scenes of the bride and her mirror as a “spectacle,” arguing that a woman who is adorned is a woman to be looked at. For her, the scenes put women in all their finery on display to the outside world, without fear of disapproval. There is, indeed, a staged quality to the representations; the women are prominently exhibited, with special concentration on the seated woman, to whom most of the attention is directed (Fig.42). The seated figure, however, is usually unaware of the other women as she gazes at herself in the mirror, amazed by
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584 Blundell, “Marriage,” 49.

585 Athens, National Museum 1585 (CC1561); Beazley, ARV, 2 1360.2.

586 Blundell, “Marriage,” 43.

587 Mississippi, University Museum 1977.3.91 (13417); Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum: Baltimore, Robinson Collection 2, 36-38, Pls. (293,294,294A-C) 50.1A-B, 51.1A-B, 51.A-C.
the sight that she sees, and is taken aback by her own transformation. The reflective surface of
the mirror, in fact, is associated in Greek thought with the acquisition of a new identity through
initiation or a rite of passage.\textsuperscript{588} The process of beautification that the bride has undergone has
produced fine results, but also an irreversible change.

3.10 Marriage as Erotic Pursuit

We have seen how in its simplest form, a door can denote a house, and in the context of
our discussion, it can also mark the beginning and end of a wedding procession, and ultimately,
the transformation of a maiden into a woman. That is, the door can indicate both metaphorical
and actual movement. As we have already briefly noted, the double doors are given especial
prominence in domestic scenes because of the way women interact with them. Women often
scurry this way and that way, dart away from or towards the door, or dash away from another
figure in the scene (Fig.24, Fig.25). This movement has often been read as demonstrating the
hustle and bustle of wedding preparations, though some have noted the similarity of the running
women in our scenes to the running women in pursuit scenes.\textsuperscript{589}

Pursuit scenes, as they are called, usually consist of females, oftentimes nymphs, Nereids
or maenads, who are being chased by males attempting to sexually assault them (Fig.43).\textsuperscript{590} The
females flee from the male pursuer with their head turned back towards him, and often make
gestures of alarm or supplication.\textsuperscript{591} The males, often satyrs or other mythical figures, sneak up
on the females or run after them, but to no avail, since their desires are not usually reciprocated.

\textsuperscript{588} R.Seaford, “In the Mirror of Dionysus,” in \textit{The Sacred and the Feminine in Ancient Greece}, ed. S.Blundell and
\textsuperscript{589} For instance, S.Schmidt, \textit{Rhetorische Bilder auf attischen Vasen: visuelle Kommunikation im 5. Jahrhundert v. Chr.}
 (Berlin: Reimer, 2005), 136.
\textsuperscript{590} Chicago, Art Institute 05.345 (1905.345); Beazley, \textit{ARV},\textsuperscript{2} 445.259, 1653.
\textsuperscript{591} See M.D.Stansbury-O’Donnell, “Structural Differentiation of Pursuit Scenes,” in \textit{An Archaeology of
Such scenes appear on hundreds of vases in the 5th century B.C., but especially before the mid-5th century,\(^{592}\) that is, just prior to the peak seen in the number of domestic scenes that we have been discussing.

The work of Christiane Sourvinou-Inwood has been an important contribution to how we interpret the scenes. Sourvinou-Inwood viewed the pursuit of mortal women as having erotic connotations since the theme seems to be founded on divine pursuit scenes that result in marriage, such as Peleus’ pursuit of Thetis (Fig.44).\(^{593}\) They are also similar to a variety of other pursuits that are erotic in nature, such as scenes in which various women are being pursued by Eros. Sometimes, even the position of the hands of the pursuer and the maiden is telling; occasionally, their finger tips almost touch, producing not only an erotic charge, but also giving the impression of consensual contact, which deconstructs the intimated violence that is about to take place.\(^{594}\)

The erotic pursuit has iconographic elements that suggest that it connotes marriage and the wedding as well. Many of the iconographic elements of the erotic pursuit are also found in nuptial scenes, and this can be said to suggest an image of legitimate marriage as an erotic union.\(^{595}\) Despite the almost complete absence of free choice of partners in the official institution of marriage, erotic love seems to play an important role in the vase paintings, and this is reflected in the metaphor of the erotic pursuit.


\(^{594}\) Ibid., 140. For the opinion that pursuit scenes emphasize the subjugation of women, see M.D. Stansbury-O’Donnell, “Structural Differentiation of Pursuit Scenes,” in An Archaeology of Representations, ed. D. Yatromanolakis (Athens: A. Kardamitsa, 2009), 341-372.

Firstly, the act of running itself is associated with male and female initiations, of which, marriage is one of the most important. The meanings produced by the erotic pursuit include connotations of sexually colored violence because sexual intercourse will be forced on the female who is being pursued. In certain ways, violence, or at least staged violence, plays a role in marriage as well: mock-abduction was part of the wedding ceremony in many regions of Greece. Marriage is suggested in these scenes through the model of pursuit and abduction, paralleling the bride’s own “resistance” in the mock-abduction of the wedding rite.

The women in our domestic scenes sometimes follow this same scheme. In one, a woman is fleeing away from the door, her garment flowing behind her, but looks back towards the door and gestures towards it with her hand (Fig.25). The running woman, as seen in this vase painting, is a parallel for the fleeing woman in pursuit scenes, thereby adding an erotic dimension to the wedding imagery present in the domestic scenes. The running women on our vases seem to be closely linked with the running women in pursuit scenes because of the wedding imagery that is consistently found in both. In pursuit scenes, wreaths are commonly worn by the pursuer and others, which were also worn by bridegrooms during the wedding ceremony. Though it was worn in many other festive occasions, its combination here with other elements relating to the nuptial sphere and its occurrence in many pursuit scenes, suggests that it too alluded to the marriage ceremony. The female who is being pursued, however, usually


wears a diadem instead of a wreath, which was similar to that worn by brides in the wedding ceremony. In this context, the diadem, like the wreath, contributes to nuptial allusions. The pursued maiden also sometimes wears a fillet, and this is represented in many wedding scenes, as we have already seen.⁵⁹⁹

In our scenes, the mythical women – Nereids, nymphs and maenads – are replaced by mortal women and the pursuit is state-sanctioned marriage, rather than abduction and rape. This is suggested by the setting; most erotic pursuits take place outdoors, while our running women are located in some type of domestic environment, indicated by a door or column (Fig.25). The combination of column and door is clearly used to denote a house. The fact that the running woman is contained between a door and a column would suggest that she is located in the space enclosed by the two indicators; here, the columns and door together do not signify a generic house, but rather place the running woman in a house courtyard.⁶⁰⁰ Instead of an ongoing pursuit in a vague setting, as in the case of the maenads and satyrs, our running women are placed in a relatively defined space by means of columns and doors so that their course has an end. As Steffen Schmidt has argued, the door in such scenes marked the spot where the woman’s pursuit came to an end.⁶⁰¹ One may add that this is also where the maiden is metaphorically caught and abducted through the process of marriage.

On the one hand, there is the wild young male pursuing the frightened and untamed maiden, and on the other, the domesticated and civilized form of pursuit, or marriage, which adheres to the normal order of the city. The running woman in domestic scenes may allude to

⁶⁰⁰ In representations with a door only, the location of the pursuit is less clear; it could indicate that the pursuit is taking place inside the house, in the courtyard of the house, or, if the door represents the front door of the house, in the street.
the pursuit scenes in order to suggest the erotic dimension of marriage. In the context of the wedding, the wild but desirable girl is pursued and metaphorically captured and tamed through marriage. Here, erotic pursuit is a metaphor for the wedding, a state-sanctioned union that is an integral part of society. This model helps define the ideal, canonical marriage, symbolically expressed through the iconography and theme of pursuit, which adds an erotic or sexual dimension to the legitimate institution of marriage represented.

3.11 Depictions of Domestic Life: Drudgery and Confinement?

As we have seen, Eva Keuls, like other scholars after her, has asserted that indoor settings on vase paintings can be identified by pieces of furniture or by objects hung on walls. More specifically, she argues that the closed double door is a standard clue in identifying the gynaikonitis in which women were supposedly kept under lock and bolt. In her discussion, Eva Keuls employs a depiction on a pyxis in Dallas, which, according to her, is representative of the women’s quarters and of women’s seclusion (Fig.45a-d). The vase painting depicts closed double doors that are divided into panels by slats fastened with black studs or nails (Fig.45a). Beside the door is a seated woman with a bird in her lap; she is approached by a woman carrying a chest and who extends this out to her (Fig.45b). A kalathos or wool basket is placed at her feet. Beside the basket is a nude little boy who runs toward a woman pulling at her garment (Fig.45c). Another woman stands with a bird perched on her outstretched arm; she faces a
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604 Dallas, Museum of Fine Arts 1968.28; Keuls, Phallus, 109-113, Figs.94, 97. The vase painting has been employed by other scholars to demonstrate the confined lives of women, for example, E. D. Reeder, Pandora: Women in Classical Greece (Baltimore, MD: Walters Art Gallery, 1995), 205, who argues that the scene depicted on the vase takes place “in the women’s quarters…double doors identify the scene…the female realm is an environment of enclosures…” See also, H. Hoffman, Ten Centuries that Shaped the West: Greek and Roman Art in Texas Collections (Houston: Dallas Museum of Fine Arts, 1970), 423.
woman who runs in the other direction, but continues to look back at the woman with the bird (Fig.45d).

This vase painting has been viewed as an illustration of women’s confinement, but such a reading is not necessary. We have discussed how the closed double door can act as a topographical marker by symbolizing the home; the pars pro toto method is often used on vases, especially small ones like pyxides, because the field is limited. Doors are also representative of the wedding, because objects that have nuptial significance frequently accompany them. For example, chests are often brought to the bride, as is the case with the example in Dallas, which would have contained the bride’s jewelry or trousseau (Fig.45b), and this played a prominent role in the wedding procession. Sashes and ribbons are also present in scenes with doors; they are often found hanging in the background, as in Keuls’ example (Fig.45c), carried by maidens, used to bind the bride’s hair (Fig.40), or to tie her girdle. In such a context, the tying of the girdle was synonymous with a girl who was about to become a woman.605 The doors, when accompanied by other nuptial imagery, denote the wedding procession in an abbreviated form, which on larger vessels is more fully rendered (Fig.27, Fig.28b). We have seen how this is demonstrated in the abridged scenes; sometimes a woman peers through one of the open panels of a door and awaits the approaching procession (Fig.30b), sometimes the bride herself is being led by the groom through the doors (Fig.29), or on occasion a bed, which symbolizes the couple’s wedding night, is depicted behind ajar doors (Fig.7b, Fig.14). The abbreviated scenes, like the vase Keuls uses to designate the women’s quarters, demonstrate that the door is a symbol of the journey of the bride, both physically and spiritually, rather than a symbol of confinement.

---

The example in Dallas that Keuls uses to illustrate the seclusion of women also has erotic undertones that emphasize the romantic dimension of marriage. As earlier noted, running women often appear in scenes with nuptial significance, as they do in Keuls’ example (Fig.45b, 45d). The wool basket is also associated with the pursuit, and of course, with domestic scenes. The women on the pyxis run towards the right, their garments billowing in the wind, yet they turn back to face their pursuer. The door in the scenes acts as a barrier for the running women; it acts as the finish mark for their course and the pursuit, where the maiden would cross the threshold of marriage and give up her virgin status to become a wife. The running woman alludes to the erotic pursuit by which the wild but desirable girl is captured and may imply that there is a romantic or sexual facet to marriage. This is nowhere more obvious in the vase painting than in the figure of the nude little boy, who runs towards a young woman grasping at her garment (Fig.45c). The nude boy is reminiscent of the Eros figures in scenes of sexual pursuit, and the maiden pulling her garment is a common gesture made by those who are being pursued (Fig.44). Together, the Eros figure and the pursued maidens bear a striking resemblance to the scenes of erotic pursuit we have discussed, and therefore may symbolize the sexual dimension of marriage.

Perhaps the most interesting aspect of the vase painting is the bird that is twice illustrated in the scene. In the first instance, the bird sits peacefully on the lap of the seated woman (Fig.45b); in the second, it is perched on a woman’s arm, which is extended towards a woman who flees towards the door (Fig.45d). Domesticated animals often appear in scenes with women; birds such as swans, geese, cranes, doves and pigeons, are the most common type of animal found. At minimum, one could say that the bird creates a more playful mood, especially in light of the fact that they are usually depicted in scenes of leisure and play, and are
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606 Lewis, Athenian Woman, 159-161.
commonly associated with children. Birds, however, were also often given as gifts by suitors. Because birds are so difficult to catch, a young woman who received such a gift would know that her admirer had taken great pains to obtain it for her. Bird names, such as “pigeon” or “dove” could even be terms of endearment for lovers.

Though birds are often rendered inaccurately or carelessly, they are often marked by certain characteristic details of silhouette, plumage, feathers or pose, so that identification is possible. According to Elke Böhr, the bird in this vase painting is a wryneck. It can be recognized by its long back, which is often extended, its row of spots on the side feathers, the cross stripes on its tails and wings, and the circle around its eye. Though the wryneck is not usually found in vase paintings, it may, in fact, be identified in another vase painting we have discussed (Fig. 7a). The wryneck’s alternate name is iynx, or ἰύξιν in Greek, and it is important to note that it was considered to be a magical bird and was employed by witches as a love charm. The word iynx is also the name for a magical device that was invented by Aphrodite by stretching a wryneck bird on a wheel; it was employed by the goddess to induce Medea to fall in love with Jason, and in general, was used as a sort of charm to attract lovers or to bring back faithless ones.

The magic iynx wheel seems to have resembled a common children’s toy. A cord was passed through two holes in the middle of the wheel, which sometimes had spokes, and the ends
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607 Ibid., 165.
609 See Aristoph. Pl. 1011. Small birds have even been read as having erotic undertones especially when they are perched on women’s finger tips or sitting in their laps (Aristoph. Birds 707; C. Celle, “La femme et l’oiseau dans la céramique grecque,” Pallas 42 (1995): 118-123).
612 Pind. P. 4.212-219, N. 4.35; Theocr. Id. 2.17; Xen. Mem. 3.11.17; Ael. HA 15.19; Aristoph. Lys. 1110; Diog. Laert. 6.2.76.
were tied together so that the cord formed a loop; the wheel was then spun by hand a few times to put kinks into the loop, and by alternatively pulling and releasing the loop from either end, the wheel would move rapidly. The wheel probably moved back and forth in a swaying motion rather than in a spinning or whirling motion; the word ἔλκω (draw), for instance, is often attached to it, suggesting a linear movement, but it is also suggestive of its magical ability to draw in or attract. The actual wryneck bird, the iynx, may have even derived its name from this magical charm because of the way it sways its neck from side to side when it is courting. In other ways, too, the iynx bird is associated with love. In myth, Iynx was the name given to the daughter of Echo and Pan, who was bewitched by Zeus and turned into a wryneck by a jealous Hera. Iynx is also the name given to the daughter of Peitho, who made Zeus fall in love with Io, and for which, she was transformed into a wryneck.

According to Sarah Johnston, the power of the iynx seems to have been derived not from its movement, but rather from its voice, because the wheel, when spun, made a humming or whistling noise. In fact, the very name of the iynx demonstrates its importance in terms of sound, for it is cognate with words that are used to denote shouting or crying out. The iynx’s sound has been compared to the Sirens’ bewitching song, in that its humming could be used as a
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615 Call. Sch. Theocr. 2.18; Sch. Pind. N. 4.56. Even the word iynx itself had connotations of love and desire in Greek thought (Aesch. Pers. 988; Lykophron 310).
616 For example, ἠυκα ς (shout, cry out), ἠυκα νος (a shout, a cry), ἠυκτης (a singer).
tool of enchantment.\textsuperscript{618} In fact, one source clearly states that it was used by wives to compel their husbands to do what they otherwise would not.\textsuperscript{619}

Depictions of iynx wheels have been identified in vase paintings as well, and many of these paintings deal explicitly with the themes of love and marriage. For example, a iynx wheel can be recognized in a vase painting we discussed in the context of wedding preparations; a young woman holds it as it hangs on its cord (Fig.46).\textsuperscript{620} Terracotta votives identified as iynx wheels have been preserved and these bear a resemblance to the representations found on the vases (Fig.47).\textsuperscript{621} The majority of the time, however, the wryneck or iynx bird itself is found in the vase paintings. On the Dallas vase, for example, the bird sits in the lap of a woman (Fig.45b) and is later perched on a woman’s outstretched hand (Fig.45d). One could simply claim that the bird is a pet, but based on its linguistic and mythical background, it seems more significant to stress its symbolism. Nowhere is this more apparent than in one vase painting where both the iynx bird and the iynx wheel are depicted; here, the iynx bird holds a string in its beak from which the iynx wheel is suspended (Fig.48).\textsuperscript{622} The bird, as a common gift given by suitors, is an emblem of the act of courtship, and as a magical wheel devised by Aphrodite, it is an emblem of desire. The iynx, as an iconographic motif, represents the ability to win the heart of one’s beloved, and on our vase, it may also allude to the desire to sustain that love within marriage.

\textsuperscript{618} For its use as a tool of enchantment, see Suda, s.v. ίνυξ, and Opp. Hal. 1.565. See further, S.I. Johnston (“The Song of the Iynx: Magic and Rhetoric in Pythian 4,” TAPA 125 (1995): 186-191), who associates the iynx with Aphrodite but also with peitho as well, i.e. persuasion.
\textsuperscript{619} Hel. Aeth. 8.5.7-5-6.
\textsuperscript{620} London, British Museum E 774 (1874.5-12.1); Beazley, ARV.\textsuperscript{2} 1250.32. There are also other depictions of the iynx in the hands of a woman, like Malibu, Getty Museum 87.AE.23 and possibly New York, MMA 39.11.8a, b depicting the birth of Aphrodite (the inventor of the iynx wheel) (G.M.A. Richter, “Newly Acquired Athenian Vases,” BMMA 35 (1940): 37, n.4).
Though Eva Keuls and others have read the vase painting on the Dallas pyxis as an illustration of the seclusion and confinement of women, the interpretation presented here sees it in a different light. The vase painting, according to this reading, abounds with nuptial imagery. The wool basket will be given to the bride as a wedding gift, the sash will bind the bride’s hair or waist, and the chest contains the bride’s most prized possessions, including the jewelry that she will wear to complete the process of beautification, as well as to infuse her beloved with desire for her. In particular, the nude Eros figure in the scene is a concrete symbol of the passion and longing a woman could instill in a man who was in pursuit. Rather than exhibiting the constricted and lackluster lives of women, the vase painting portrays a woman’s powers and wiles in the contest of love. The wryneck, or iynx, acts not only as an emblem of courtship but of the power that a woman possessed in that process; she was not simply a bystander, but instead was an active participant, spinning the wheel to attract her beloved. The vase painting, in this light, is concerned with love and passion in the context of marriage, and a woman’s primary place within that institution.

3.12 The Symbolism of Space: Transformation and Transition

Like the young woman in our scenes who undergoes a metamorphosis by means of cosmetics, accessories and jewelry, so the young bride is transformed through the rite of marriage. Vase painters emphasize the transformative character of the wedding through the physical aspects of the metamorphosis: new clothing, intricate hair-dressing and the application of make-up and perfumes. The presents offered to the bride are the implements of beauty that

623 Other objects that women hold, like book rolls, have also been viewed as representing the wily ways of women (A.Glazebrook, “Reading Women: Book Rolls on Attic Vases,” Mouseion 5 (2005): 25-35).
will enable the bride to sustain her allure.\textsuperscript{624} Through these devices, the maiden is given a new identity; she is converted into a physically desirable and sexually mature woman.

Through conspicuous use of various symbols, in particular, the double door, the vases highlight transition and transformation, rather than confinement. As discussed earlier, the door in literature can symbolize a house in an abbreviated manner, but it can also stand as a metaphor for the maiden; closed doors symbolize rejection of a suitor’s advances, and open doors signal consent. In the vase paintings, the metaphor of the willing bride, ready to embark on the journey from maidenhood to matron, is not this obvious, but it is still legible. The doors, chests, ribbons and mirrors serve as the visual signals of the wedding ceremony, while the actions of the figures in the scenes convey to the viewer what the verdict will be. In the scenes, the doors are either shut or ajar, chests are either open or closed, ribbons are either tied or untied, baskets are either employed or disregarded, and mirrors either hang idly on the wall or reflect the bride’s new image.

That the scenes are concerned with initiation and transformation, rather than with the physical imprisonment and isolation of women, is nowhere more obvious than on a pyxis in London (Fig.26). On the vase are depicted several women engaged in various activities. The standard symbols are all present: double door, wool basket, chest, fillets and mirror. A seated woman seems to be at work, pulling yarn from her wool basket, and gives us a rare glimpse of a wool basket employed for work. A woman carrying an alabastron, a vase used for perfume, presents it, perhaps, to the woman who is seated at her wool basket; a mirror hangs on the wall behind her. One woman offers a basket to another woman who is drawing her mantle either to cover or uncover her face. Another woman is drawing a long necklace from the open chest she
is carrying and rushes toward the double doors. At this point, there is a young woman holding fillets and standing hesitantly on the threshold of the half-open door.

The scene on the London pyxis abounds with wedding imagery: the alabaster will be used to perfume the bride after her bath, the fillets will be coiled and wound around her intricate updo, the chest holds the delicate jewelry she will wear, and the mirror on the wall will be witness to her physical transformation. The basket that the woman carries appears to be filled with spherically-shaped fruit, and this may perhaps be the *melon*, a round fleshy fruit that was either an apple or quince; this was given to the bride before she entered the bridal chamber, and it was thought to have been effective in encouraging intimacy. In the context of the wedding, the bride’s acceptance of the *melon* may have symbolized her consent to marry. It is no surprise that the *melon* often appears in scenes related to the wedding ceremony; brides being led by the groom to the bridal chamber are often depicted holding them in their hands (Fig.49).

On the London pyxis, the woman being offered the basket of fruit is either veiling or unveiling herself, and it is a gesture that presages the bride’s own action when she reveals herself for the first time to the groom in a part of the wedding ceremony known as the *anakalypteria*.

The bride herself, however, is not recognizable at first glance, but the visual symbols help in her identification. She is surely the young woman who stands on the threshold of the door, partially inside the space where the other women are, and partially outside; she holds the fillets that will bind her hair as a bride, and examines the activities of the other women, yet she has not quite crossed the threshold. Standing timidly at the door, vulnerable and uneasy about what
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625 Plut. Sol. 20.3 and Mor. 138d and 279f.
627 Toronto, Royal Ontario Museum 929.22.3; Beazley, ARV² 1031.51.
awaits her on the other side, she represents the young maiden on the verge of being initiated into the world of women; the door is a symbol of the imminent transition, along with the finery and cosmetics that will aid in her transformation.

Some depictions on vases send a more straightforward message. This is nowhere more concrete than in the depiction of a bed that sometimes finds its way into our domestic scenes (Fig.7a, Fig.14). Through half-open doors, one finds a carved bed topped with embroidered linens and pillows, and it is an explicit reference to the wedding night. The nuptial connotation of the vase is anchored by the presence on its other side of Aphrodite, Eros and personifications of harmony, persuasion, youth and pleasure. The nuptial bed is present in another vase painting (Fig.50a), but this time, the groom is depicted leading his bride to a bedroom (Fig.50b), indicated by ajar double doors again (Fig.50a). The nuptial bed is the most marked symbol of the maiden’s pending transformation. This is reinforced by the presence of the mother of the groom, who holds the torches for the couple, leaving no doubt as to the scene’s association with the wedding. The conspicuous, yet unnecessary, presence of the door communicates to the viewer, through redundancy and repetition, its instructive value; the door calls attention to the liminal nature of the scene while the nuptial bed explicitly refers to the wedding.

The iconography of the second half of the 5th century B.C. abounds with pictorial references to marriage. Wedding scenes were produced in vast numbers after about 460 B.C., in

630 Boston, Museum of Fine Arts 03.802; S.Schmidt and J.H.Oakley, eds., Hermeneutik der Bilder: Beiträge zur Ikonographie und Interpretation griechischer Vasenmalerei (Beihefte zum Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum Deutschland IV) (Munich: Verlag, 2009), 20, Fig.7 (A).
631 The depiction of the marriage bed is, nonetheless, relatively rare on vases. The image of marriage presented here is rather romantic, suggesting a physical and emotional bond between husband and wife. R.F.Sutton observes that most grooms in wedding scenes are beardless and therefore closer in age to the brides, but also that the mutual gaze of bride and groom is one of desire and consent (“On the Classical Athenian Wedding: Two Red-Figure Loutrophoroi in Boston,” in Daidalikon: Studies in Memory of R.V.Schoder, ed. R.F.Sutton (Wauconda, Ill: Bolchazy-Carducci, 1989), 344-345). Compare the opinion of Keuls, who sees the bed as a visual reminder of “a wife’s sexual duties” (Phallus, 118-119). See also Louvre CA 587, Berlin 2406, Boston MFA 03.802.
accordance with the trend seen in depictions of women.\textsuperscript{632} The trappings of Aphrodite are copious in both types of scenes, as are the visual symbols of transformation and change. Interest seems to have shifted to the bride and her female companions, who together embark on the journey toward womanhood. Most of the scenes portray the young bride along with her retinue of female friends and relatives, who lavish attention on her. In fact, there are very few scenes that portray men. On one of these, the vase painter has depicted a young male, perhaps the groom, who gazes admiringly at a seated young woman, who can be identified as the bride by her crown and belt (Fig.51).\textsuperscript{633} The bride, however, pays no attention to him, and instead, surveys the gifts that the other women are offering her. Only the tiny winged Eros seems to notice the groom.

Such scenes have been read in many ways. Some have viewed them as confirmation of the importance of beauty as a means of inspiring the gaze of men.\textsuperscript{634} Others have taken a more complex approach, seeing in them a deliberate projection of domestic bliss and leisure in a period of political and social turmoil in Athens, so-called “escapist” art that is common in times of external pressure.\textsuperscript{635} One might say that viewing the visual evidence as having a one-to-one relationship with historical events is going a bit too far in terms of interpretation. Sian Lewis has argued that the development of the adornment scene, or toilette, is revealing of attitudes towards women, finding that such scenes portray a “completely secluded and self-centered pastime.”\textsuperscript{636} She notes that the repetitive and stylized qualities that the motif acquires over the course of the

\textsuperscript{632} Oakley and Sinos, \textit{Wedding}, 45.
\textsuperscript{633} Oxford, Ashmolean Museum 1927.4067; Beazley, \textit{ARV}² 1179.
\textsuperscript{636} Lewis, \textit{Athenian Woman}, 142.
5th century B.C. demonstrate a deterioration of interest in women. There is no doubt that the scenes become more uniform and conventional over time, and perhaps even more monotonous, but this phenomenon need not be regarded as a sign of disinterest. A large quantity of vases was being produced with scenes portraying women and increasingly so in all-female company. Even when men are present in the scenes, no attention is given them (Fig.51). The women are engrossed by their own activities; they adjust their clothing, arrange their hair and gaze longingly at their reflection in the mirror. Rather than articulating a diminished concern on the part of the vase painters, they instead seem to express a growing sensitivity to female desires.

The women are on display, showcasing their beauty in poised fashion. As the women cross the threshold of marriage, they come into view, revealing and presenting themselves as sexually mature women. Rather than confirming that women were kept from the threatening gaze of men by being confined to segregated areas of the house, the vase paintings showcase the women and their daily activities. Eva Keuls understands this trend as male voyeurism into the private world of women, arguing that a woman’s image can always be eroticized by a male viewer. The viewer’s response to the images, however, cannot be reproduced. On the other hand, it is widely acknowledged that the vase shapes on which most of the representations of women’s adornment occur are those most likely to have been employed by women themselves. The scenes were very possibly intended to be viewed by women, and perhaps also to some degree, in the context of the wedding. In light of this information, an impression, however vague, can be formed as to the reaction of the viewer.

637 Ibid., 142-145.
640 Keuls, Phallus, 240-259.
The paintings illustrate a world of beauty and frivolity; the mood they instill is one of tranquility and ease. The women rarely work or care for children, and do not concern themselves with the obligations of daily life. In reality, married life could be filled with monotonous housework and drudgery, and women would have been well aware that a marriage could be both physically and emotionally stressful.\textsuperscript{641} The vase paintings, however, communicate wealth and leisure. Sue Blundell has seen in these charming depictions the mechanism by which a bride-to-be could be reassured and comforted about her life as a wife and mother (Fig.52).\textsuperscript{642} By filling her eye with images of grooming and adornment, the scenes could help to alleviate the anxiety of a young maiden on the verge of crossing the threshold of marriage, and possibly instill in her self-confidence so that she would be more capable of asserting herself in her own home.\textsuperscript{643}

The life of a married woman was surely more varied and complex than the picture one obtains from the vases, but on the other hand, there is also nothing in them to suggest the opposite, that women were confined to dark and dreary quarters and locked in. The women are engaged in lighthearted tasks, they enjoy each other’s company, and are surrounded by finery of all sorts. The woman that is usually seated, and who is customarily identified as the bride, is lavished with attention by the other women; they bathe her, dress her in fine clothing, arrange her hair and fasten jewelry on her. No doubt, this is intended as a compliment, just as their uninterrupted gaze is. The young woman herself often looks into a mirror to see the end result of the preparations, and fixes her eyes on the new image of herself. She has undergone a transformation of sorts; she is now a beautiful bride, empowered by the devices of Aphrodite.

\textsuperscript{642} Buffalo, Museum of Science C 23262; Oakley and Sinos, \textit{Wedding}, 122, Fig.122.
A pronounced interest in women’s activities, and in particular, in the crucial transition from maiden to matron, seems to have been the stimulus for the vase painters. Rather than striving to present an image of women as confined and isolated members of a household, the painters may have been, in fact, making every effort to communicate through visual symbols the physical and emotional transition of a young woman; through these images, a hesitant young maiden may have been encouraged to cross the daunting threshold of marriage. This reading is most obvious in the case of the ajar double doors.

The closed door in the vase paintings has been viewed as a marker of an indoor environment, but more specifically, as a boundary, demarcating the zone of the house within which women were presumably confined. On the other hand, the door can also stand as a metaphor for a critical transition in the life of a woman. In the vase paintings, this transition finds visual form in the image of the young maiden who stands on the threshold; she is timid and hesitant (Fig.26). The maiden pauses and examines the sight before her because she has not quite decided whether she must traverse this liminal space. She is confronted by women who are poised and elegant, carefully arranging their hair, dabbing themselves with perfume and take no notice of the wool basket that lies at their feet. The half-open doors, the carved wooden chests filled with fine jewelry, the delicate ribbons hanging on the walls, and the glinting mirrors create a comforting and welcoming environment for the maiden, and serve as the repetitive visual signals that the wedding will surely come to pass.

Through conspicuous use of various symbols, in particular, the ajar double doors, the vase paintings highlight the transformation and transition that is on the horizon for the young woman, rather than her immobility and confinement. Vase painters may not have been interested in visual exactitude with respect to the built environment, and distinguishing interior from
exterior space is not always a simple task, but this was a matter of preference. The vase painter employed architectural elements to set the stage for a narrative, or in this case, for communicating a message; like most Greek art, vase painting was concerned with the human figure. The women in the scenes gaze at, gesture towards, touch and interact with the stage props the vase painter has provided them with, in an attempt to give visual meaning to those objects and to communicate meaning to the viewer. In this case, the viewer is the young maiden who is simultaneously at the most exhilarating and vulnerable juncture of her life. Rather than imprisoning her, the door opens onto this unfamiliar yet exciting new chapter.
CHAPTER 4: READING GENDER IN THE HOUSES OF URBAN ATHENS

4.1 Looking for Gender in Buildings

Finding gender distinctions in the built environment by seeking out the places and circumstances under which men and women interacted or avoided one another has furnished scholars in many disciplines with an attractive, though challenging, focus for investigation. Like the vase paintings and literature we have already discussed, architecture has its own set of methodological problems. The superstructures of the majority of houses were built using perishable materials like wood and mud, which have decayed or eroded, so that most houses unearthed have been reduced to their stone foundations. It is frequently the case that excavated houses are devoid even of their artifacts, since inhabitants regularly took household items that were of value with them when they abandoned their dwelling, or discarded items that were no longer useful in dumps or wells. On occasion, household implements and wares were removed or pilfered after the houses were abandoned by their inhabitants. The deficient material record is a very serious problem for archaeologists to contend with. Of course, this can be offset by supplementing the archaeological evidence for houses with other sources of information, though even this has been a cause for confusion in the past.

The desperate shortage in the number of houses that are still more or less standing and that have been left unscathed by post-abandonment processes like salvage and re-use, agricultural development, and also, unfortunately, looting, is in fact a negligible impediment when confronted with the immense obstacle posed by the strong philological tradition maintained by scholars of Classical antiquity. The literary sources have often served as the
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644 For example, valuable household items like threshold blocks, steps, roof tiles, and woodwork are sometimes removed from houses when they are abandoned (Young, “Industrial District,” 224) and refuse is often thrown into wells (T.L.Shear, Jr., “The Athenian Agora: Excavations of 1989–1993,” Hesperia 66 (1997): 512-514).
primary source of information in the study of Classical housing, even though they devote little attention to precision where the arrangement of space is concerned. As we have seen, the term *gynaikonitis* can take on a number of different meanings, such as a family’s living quarters or even a space reserved for household slaves. The long tradition of interpreting the literary testimony and viewing it as an objective account of lived reality has had a great influence on the way in which archaeological data is employed. What frequently results from this approach is a history based on literary sources, while the archaeological remains serve as the illustrations of this history, mere triflings compared to the ‘truth’ derived from the literary testimony. A good number of scholars have treated material remains as if they are a reflection of, sometimes even a direct picture of, the information gleaned from the literature, or have assigned a secondary role to the archaeological evidence instead of viewing it as an independent source for housing.

The weight that is placed on the literary sources by scholars, despite its shortcomings, has resulted in attempts to make the archaeological evidence “fit in” with the written testimony. Sometimes great pains are taken to assimilate the actual remains of ancient houses with the literary accounts. Susan Walker, for example, neatly divided household space into exclusively women’s or men’s areas based on the assumption that women’s spaces were storerooms, rooms with hearths and generally any room that was far from the entrance (Fig.53a, Fig.53b). Why these spaces were only inhabited by women and why they were meant to confine them, is nowhere accounted for. Because of the sometimes scanty archaeological remains due to the perishable nature of building materials, Walker’s reconstruction of household space along strict
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646 Walker, “Women and Housing,” 84.
gender lines was for some time widely accepted. Even if the walls of houses were made of stone, how could we possibly know for whom each space was meant when no single author tells us what women’s space is, nor, for that matter, what its physical properties are?

A popular approach for finding gender distinctions in the domestic environment, and a common organizational mechanism for studying households more generally, has been the identification of vestiges of “women’s work.” Because space that is set apart by gender is not intrinsic but rather socially constructed, it must be continually reproduced by way of activities. Likewise, the division of labor according to gender is based on cultural expectations that specify what types of activities are considered “women’s work” and therefore shape, but do not dictate, what women do in the course of their daily lives. Through identifying a range of activities associated with women, along with where, how and when they engage in these activities, if possible, activity areas can be located. In the context of Classical housing, however, the detection of specific activity areas has proven to be a somewhat futile undertaking.

Activities traditionally assigned to women, such as weaving, have been sought in the archaeological remains of houses by collecting data on loom weights. The research has demonstrated that loom weights are found in almost every room of the house, and occasionally even in areas that were supposedly off-limits to women, such as the andron, the dining room in which men entertained guests (Fig. 54). Though such data shows that there is no overall pattern in the spatial distribution of loom weights, sizeable numbers of loom weights are
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647 E. Fantham et. al., *Women in the Classical World: Image and Text* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994), 104, Fig. 3.17; Pomeroy, *Xenophon Oeconomicus*, 296.
frequently discovered in the courtyards and porticoes of houses or adjacent to these spaces.\textsuperscript{651} The discovery of loom weight clusters in these areas implies that some type of wool working was taking place here and suggests that large, bright and well-ventilated spaces were ideal for such activities. It also suggests that the women who were engaged in these tasks were not confined to small, dark rooms, as has been maintained. Spinning wool and weaving was an incredibly labor-intensive activity before the modern era and must have taken up most of the hours of the day, as it still does in some rural communities.\textsuperscript{652} Since women were usually the ones employed in such activities, it follows that they must have spent the majority of their time in open and semi-open spaces of their houses, rather than in cramped quarters.

Another avenue for locating gendered space is the identification of controls. This method is founded on the assumption that visual contact between women and visitors was restricted by means of angled or off-center doorways (Fig.55). Many houses, even in the center of Athens, however, do not seem to have used such devices; some entrances led directly to the core of the house. But even if the street door of a house is angled, why does this suggest seclusion for women? Preventing passersby from peering into a house increases privacy and can be used to safeguard the family at large, not only women. There are fundamental differences between a desire for family privacy from outsiders and the desire for privacy between inhabitants of the same house. In other words, we must ask whether privacy mechanisms were aimed at controlling interactions between the inhabitants themselves or between inhabitants and strangers.

\textsuperscript{651} See Cahill, \textit{Olynthus}, 171-178, Fig.38. Note, however, that the find-spot of loom weights was not always noted. Large clusters of weights enough for one loom – about 10 – are not often found (N.Cahill, “Olynthus: Social and Spatial Planning in a Greek City” (PhD diss., University of California, Berkeley, 1991), 342-343). Others have estimated that between 60 and 70 loom weights were necessary (G.R.Davidson and D.B.Thompson, \textit{Small Objects from the Pnyx I} (Hesperia Supplement 7) (Baltimore: ASCSA, 1943): 69-70; D.M.Robinson, \textit{Excavations at Olynthus, XII: Domestic and Public Architecture} (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1946), 34-35, n.105).

These are but some of the methodological issues that such a study is faced with. If we cannot find the answers we are looking for using the traditional methods, then perhaps we are asking the wrong questions, or, at least, using frameworks and methods that are inapt at answering the questions we are posing. Buildings are some of the most complex artifacts created by people, so that it is fitting for their analysis to be equally complex. In order to be examined, architecture as a physical entity requires analytical tools, but as a product of human activity, it requires social theory as well. An integrative approach that encompasses both quantitative and qualitative methodologies may tease out from the fragmentary remains the physical aspects of space, but also lay bare the intangible aspects of houses and permit us a glimpse into the daily experience of their inhabitants.

4.2. Buildings and Space

Traditionally speaking, architectural history has been dominated by art history. Architecture has been the concern of geographers, sociologists and anthropologists, so that we might expect to find some of the most important of these works in the bibliographies of archaeological studies specifically dealing with architecture, but we usually do not. In archaeological works, attention is most often paid to describing and measuring buildings and analyzing their composition, or to explaining changes in form from a socio-political or environmental-climatic perspective. Classical archaeologists, in particular, seem to have given little thought to architectural theory, with a few notable exceptions. Though buildings are
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most often discussed by means of visual analysis, their most far-reaching effects are connected to space.

Society arranges people in space, and it also arranges physical space by way of buildings, boundaries and zones. This takes on a definite and recognizable spatial order. Spatial order is one of the most striking means by which we recognize cultural differences, that is, the different ways in which members of a society live out and reproduce their social existence. Houses, for instance, serve the same basic needs of cooking, eating, bathing and sleeping, but a glance at examples from different nations and different periods reveals an astonishing variety in the way space is ordered.655

The house has been viewed as a “pattern of space”656 that is governed by conventions about the types of space, how they are arranged and connected, and which activities are associated with them. In everyday life, the experience of space is an intrinsic, but also unconscious, dimension of the way in which we experience society itself;657 there is a connection between the production of space and the reproduction of social relations because buildings are both the medium and the outcome of human action. Spatial structures constrict, guide, channel, hinder and stage various activities and social actions; at the same time, space is constructed by the activities and social actions that constitute society.658 Society, then, is intrinsically spatial, and space is intrinsically social.

Scholars in a number of fields have come to recognize the vital importance of the built environment for the social lives of people, with the study of place, landscape and environment

656 J.Hanson, Decoding Homes and Houses (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 2.
657 B.Hillier and J.Hanson view space as a morphic language by which society is constituted and understood by its members (Space, 198).
becoming quite trendy in recent years. Environment-behavior studies, as a field, began in the 1970’s as an attempt to base the design of environments on scientific, research-based knowledge of how human behavior and environments interact. As a methodological framework that asks why and how people design, shape, use and react to their environment, environment-behavior studies become relevant for archaeology. Archaeology’s attention to material culture makes it the human science closest to environment-behavior studies. Environment-behavior studies can aid in understanding built environments in an archaeological context, because their goal is to throw light on human behavior.

The principle that guides environment-behavior studies is the theory that just as culture is not a random assemblage of behaviors and beliefs, so the environment is not a random assemblage of things and people. According to Amos Rapoport, buildings are seen as a system of settings within which a certain system of activities takes place. Buildings, or physical settings, structure patterns of movement and encounter and therefore directly influence social relations (Fig.56). Houses, in particular, as settings for social interaction, are closely related to culture. Culture provides the rules, information and instructions about what to do, how to behave and how to build; most of culture consists of habitual and routinized behavior that translates, through human actions and other factors, into built form. It is cultural activity that
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gives meaning to particular spaces in the landscape and that makes them “places.” Buildings are made of stone, brick and timber, but it is the human activities organized within that makes them truly meaningful. A building’s ability to organize space, and therefore human action, is its most important characteristic.

4.3 Buildings as Nonverbal Communication

Every day we enter settings and built environments, pick up on the cues encoded in these, match them to relevant cultural knowledge, and act accordingly. We know what a setting is, which cues specify the nature of the setting, and which behavior is appropriate, but why? The reason, according to environment-behavior studies, is because buildings communicate, though we cannot “hear” them do so in the strict sense of the word. Just as people are able to read facial expressions, hand gestures and subtle adjustments in posture without even a word being uttered, so the built environment is able to “speak” to users. According to theories of nonverbal communication, meaning can be imparted without the use of words. Communication can be achieved not only by active nonverbal means, such as by proximity, facial expressions, hand gestures and posture, but also by passive nonverbal channels, like physical structures and the arrangement of space. Because structures can be viewed as “physical expressions of cognitive domains,” they encode information that can be conveyed to users in order to obtain meaning.

The nonverbal cues in the built environment let people know what type of context they are in, that is, people are made aware of who should do what, where, when and how.\textsuperscript{669} It has been argued, in fact, that the nonverbal aspects of communication are the most important in the sense that they are the most immediately noted, that is, they are the “noisiest.”\textsuperscript{670} While verbal communication is received by the auditory sense, nonverbal communication is received mostly visually, but also the auditory, tactile and even olfactory senses are put to use. Nonverbal communication is therefore multi-channel. One such channel, which had been largely ignored before the work of Rapoport,\textsuperscript{671} is the built environment.

According to E.T.Hall, virtually everything that people are and do is associated with the experience of space.\textsuperscript{672} The built environment, or socially constructed space, “speaks” to people through various channels that provide the information they need in order to “hear” it. These channels can be fixed features, semi-fixed features and non-fixed features.\textsuperscript{673} Fixed-feature elements, such as walls, floors, streets, etc., change very slowly or rarely over time and are usually under the control of codes and regulations; their location, size and arrangement communicate meaning. Fixed features, in order to communicate meaning, are supplemented by semi-fixed features; these are the furnishings and fittings found in a building that can and often do change fairly quickly and easily. In Rapoport’s opinion, the semi-fixed features tend to communicate more than fixed-features because the users of a building exert far more influence.

\textsuperscript{669} Rapoport, \textit{Built Environment}, 59.
\textsuperscript{672} E.T.Hall, \textit{The Hidden Dimension} (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1966), 171.
\textsuperscript{673} Ibid., 101-112.
over semi-fixed features and therefore these have an element of “personalization.” The use and arrangement of furniture, textiles, wall and window treatments, etc., which is not usually demonstrated in fixed features, may be more significant because of the emotional, personal and symbolic connotations they have.

In archaeology, fixed and semi-fixed features are employed to make inferences about non-fixed features. Non-fixed features are elements related to human behavior, such as shifting spatial relations, body positions and postures, and eye contact and other nonverbal cues. In order to make inferences about non-fixed elements, i.e. behavior, archaeologists must rely on the fixed and semi-fixed features that they have access to. Human reactions and performance change in response to the effects of people’s surroundings, but the cues by means of which those surroundings are judged are environmental, such as room size and location, windows, doors, furnishings, etc. The physical, social and abstract cues present in the built environment provide information that constrains and guides behavior that is appropriate to the situation.

In nonverbal language, of course, ambiguities can arise. Crucial to the proper functioning of this system, therefore, is redundancy, because cues that are redundant or repetitive help to prevent interpretations and responses that are unconventional. The effectiveness of nonverbal communication depends on adequate redundancy and also on predictability of use. Chain stores, for example, like McDonalds and Barnes & Noble, are a case in point; they are lucrative because each time we see a particular sign, roof type or building shape, we can successfully predict the
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674 Rapoport, *Built Environment*, 92-93.
678 Rapoport, *Built Environment*, 56-60.
services, products and behaviors because of the predictability of the cues.\textsuperscript{679} The definition of a situation can only occur, however, when the interpreters are at least somewhat familiar with the customs of the group and have enough knowledge to interpret the situation in terms of the cues present.\textsuperscript{680} Among the Bedouin, for example, a heap of ashes is used to intercept visitors (or strangers),\textsuperscript{681} but this cue would be imperceptible to an outsider. More explicit cues like fences, doors, hallways, etc., will usually communicate quite clearly just how far a stranger or visitor should venture, and are also more perceptible in the archaeological record.

Houses, then, as major loci of social interaction, are fundamental to nonverbal communication. For Rapoport, the house is a “teaching medium”\textsuperscript{682} that communicates by way of cues; people rely on these cues in order to act appropriately. Once the cues in the built environment are learned, they act as a mnemonic device that is a reminder of appropriate behavior. Many behaviors – cooking, eating, socializing, sleeping – are used to define boundaries and assert or define identity. In other words, habitual behavior is a major component of culture; this is how we know how to dress, eat, speak, what manners to use, etc. The built environment, in particular houses, helps us engage in these activities more appropriately by providing the contexts for appropriate behavior and interaction. Rapoport maintains that environments predict, guide and prescribe behavior by making certain behaviors more likely by restricting the range, but without being determining.\textsuperscript{683} Behavioral responses are limited when the cues are noticed, read and understood, and if one is prepared to obey them.\textsuperscript{684}

\textsuperscript{679} Ibid., 187.
\textsuperscript{682} Rapoport, \textit{Built Environment}, 67, 77.
\textsuperscript{683} Ibid., 77.
\textsuperscript{684} The possibility of refusal to act appropriately is something which has already been discussed in the context of literature (e.g. Lys. 1). The designer of a building can only make certain that cues are noticed.
4.4 Environment-Behavior Studies and Archaeology

Though the field of environment-behavior studies has been viewed by Rapoport as forming a “seamless whole”685 with archaeology, such studies cannot be applied to archaeological remains without some adjustment. Archaeologists interested in the social role of buildings face major challenges in interpreting material remains because these may be little more than foundations for walls. Rapoport’s work may be well-suited to the study of extant houses, but in an archaeological context, it will only take us so far. When dealing with archaeological remains, we have no direct access to the non-fixed elements – human behavior – though we usually have at least part of the fixed and semi-fixed elements at our disposal, such as walls, doors, floors, etc.686 Rapoport’s framework can advance our understanding of the relationship between human behavior and material culture, but it cannot compensate for the incomplete archaeological record.

Theories of environment-behavior were applied, in a modified fashion, to archaeological remains by Susan Kent in the 1980’s, though she did not seem to know about the field at all.687 She dealt with activity systems, how these are distributed in systems of settings, the meanings derived from them, the ways these are translated into built environments and the effects these have on people. Though she did not realize it at the time, Kent’s multi-disciplinary approach helped to bridge a very large gap. Initially, environment-behavior studies found an audience among urban planners, architects, designers and cultural geographers, but the scope of environment-behavior studies should be far wider than this.

In an attempt to make environment-behavior studies more applicable to archaeological contexts, K.D.Fisher has recently supplemented the usual list of fixed-feature elements (walls, floors) with properties that may have affected social interaction, but which have generally been neglected. These include the shape of a space, room capacity, characteristics of walls and characteristics of doorways. For instance, a long, narrow space may promote brief interactions between people, while deterring extensive periods of interaction, such as sitting, eating, cooking, etc. Room capacity can also influence what sorts of activities occur. Walls determine the structure of a building, but they are also important for the meanings they encode in their materials and decoration. Doorways can be equally informative, since they bear heavily on the accessibility of a space; openings that are wide promote movement. By making slight modifications to the methodology formulated by Rapoport, which sees the built environment as encoding meaning, the archaeological remains can be adequately interpreted.

4.5 Spatial Analysis: Access Graphs and Interaction Potential

Integrating the qualitative techniques of environment-behavior studies with a more quantitative set of tools is crucial in an archaeological context, in particular when comparing buildings of varying size and shape, as is the case with houses. It is difficult to compare visually buildings with different layouts or with different dimensions, so that in order to ascertain their syntactical properties we must move beyond ground plans. Access analysis, the analytical
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690 For instance, K.D.Fisher has demonstrated that in Bronze Age Cyprus ashlar masonry was used in socially and ideologically important contexts (“Building Power: Monumental Architecture, Place and Social Interaction in Late Bronze Age Cyprus” (PhD diss., University of Toronto, 2007), 256-259).
691 K.D.Fisher has factored details such as doorway width and wall elaboration into his access graphs, thus providing a fuller picture of space syntax for the ashlar building at Enkomi on Cyprus (“Placing Social Interaction: An Integrative Approach to Analyzing Past Built Environments,” Journal of Anthropological Archaeology 28 (2009): Fig.6).
technique developed by B.Hillier and J.Hanson, allows us to do precisely this. Because architecture “provides the material preconditions for the patterns of movement, encounter and avoidance, which are the material realization – as well as sometimes the generator – of social relations,” determining the space syntax of a building is crucial to studying interaction. It is based on the assumption that the way spaces are connected affects how people move through and use those spaces, and that such movement affects in some way the behavior of people.

According to space syntax theory, particular relationships of accessibility and visibility develop in a building that create probable movement and encounter patterns for the inhabitants, but also between the inhabitants and those who enter as visitors or strangers. Some spaces in this arrangement will be highly accessible and more likely to promote social encounters, while others will not be very accessible and will promote segregation. Factors that may be used to assess accessibility include the patterns of communication between spaces or the degree to which visitors are allowed to access particular areas.

Access analysis is useful in studying the social use of domestic space because it allows for spatial configurations to be represented in graph form (Fig.57a, Fig.57b). The technique itself involves the creation of “access maps” for buildings whereby built space is represented as a graph. The basic unit of analysis is the “bounded space,” a space that is defined or enclosed by physical boundaries like walls; the bounded space is represented as a circle and relations of accessibility between bounded spaces are represented by line segments that link these circles. Each unit of space, including transitional spaces like hallways, is represented as a circle with a
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692 Hillier and Hanson, *Space*, ix.
695 Hillier and Hanson, *Space*, 147-148, Fig.85-86.
line connecting each to illustrate that there is access, or permeability, between spatial units.\textsuperscript{696} The resultant map is an aid to visualize the pattern of access of a building plan.\textsuperscript{697}

Access analysis can be useful in analyzing communication between rooms (spatial relations), as well as access or prohibition (control) realized through the permeability or openness of a building. It considers the arrangement and interconnections between spaces, and also looks at the patterns of interactions between inhabitants and between inhabitants and strangers in terms of the patterns created by boundaries and entrances.\textsuperscript{698} The invention of the access graph is more than a simple illustrative tool. Access graphs can inform us of the realities of living in a particular building, that is, where physical encounters between inhabitants and between inhabitants and strangers might occur and how these might be controlled. They can also reveal the patterns of boundaries and controls that may reflect social relations in a broader sense, like dependence or autonomy.\textsuperscript{699} For these reasons, spatial analyses are valuable for assessing issues of interaction and privacy within a building, and are therefore pertinent to this study.

Though access analyses are best applied to structures that are standing with a full data set, they can nevertheless be employed to analyze partial archaeological remains. The success of access analysis is dependent on the nature of the available evidence as well as the consistency

\textsuperscript{696} Access graphs can also be justified. All the spaces which are of the same depth – the number of spaces one must traverse in order to arrive in that space from the starting point – are aligned in horizontal rows above the space of origin. The advantage of the justified access graph is that it renders obvious the basic syntactic properties of the building. See \textit{ibid.}, 149, Fig.88-91.

\textsuperscript{697} A building's syntactic properties can also be quantified, for instance, the depth of each space from the exterior – which provides a general sense of how accessible a space is to visitors, the control value – a measure of local relations, that is, the degree of control a space exerizes over its immediate neighbors, and relative asymmetry – a measure of how accessible a space is from any other space. A problem occurs, however, when the number of spaces in a building increases; in this case, the relative asymmetry value gets disproportionately smaller. See \textit{ibid.}, 109-113, Table 3.

\textsuperscript{698} Of course, this is not to say that the social is directly reflected in the spatial (E.Leach, “Does Space Syntax Really ‘Constitute the Social’?” in \textit{Social Organization and Settlement}, ed. D.R.Green, C.Haselgrove and M.Spriggs (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978), 385-401).

\textsuperscript{699} Access maps, however, cannot take into consideration the temporal frequency of these interactions, even though they articulate where and under what circumstances physical encounters occur (Hillier and Hanson, \textit{Space}, 148; J.Hanson, \textit{Decoding Homes and Houses} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 27).
with which the data is used. It is most effective when there is some information about separate spaces and their communication, for example, when spaces are differentiated by walls and partitions rather than by screens, furnishings, or patterns of behavior that cannot usually be ascertained in an archaeological context. Though, in general, space syntax techniques remain fairly uncharted waters for Classical archaeologists, they have been employed recently to study the architectural remains at various sites, including Pompeii, Enkomi, Çatalhöyük and others.

The properties of space syntax are indispensable for grasping the patterns of movement and interaction through which social interaction is observed, and it is for this reason that it can be a useful tool for archaeologists even if they are often faced with the problem of an incomplete material record. What we can do is build on the strengths of access analysis while addressing its limitations by integrating it with other analytical methods, such as environment-behavior studies. Mark Grahame, in his study of Pompeian houses, for instance, has combined access analysis with the nonverbal communication analyses of Rapoport, to measure “interaction potential,” namely the odds that a space will have of hosting social interaction. Spaces can be analyzed in
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700 A major criticism leveled at access analysis is that it cannot work fully unless something is known about social structure (E. Leach, “Does Space Syntax Really ‘Constitute the Social’?” in Social Organisation and Settlement: Contributions from Anthropology (London: British Archaeological Reports, 1978), 385-401), but Classical archaeologists have both written evidence and other material evidence that they can use to supplement the access analyses, so that this is feasible.


703 See Grahame, Reading Space, 56-57.
terms of their syntax through access analysis and then combined with data concerning semi-fixed or fixed-feature elements that may affect potential interaction.

Such a line of inquiry is useful for determining likely contexts of interaction, but also for shedding some light on the possible types of interaction occurring in those settings, for instance, brief and impromptu gatherings or more lengthy and structured occasions. Areas where momentary encounters might happen are “movement spaces” since they serve as conduits for people moving from place to place, and usually take the form of narrow, rectangular hallways (Fig.74). “Circulation spaces,” on the other hand, are spaces that enable people to encounter one another for longer periods of time, and are usually large, square spaces.704 Space syntax, when fine-tuned by means of theories of interaction potential, can be employed to ascertain the different types of social relations – either through distancing or delineating – that a building imparts.

Because architecture cannot create its own social theory, it is necessary to combine space syntax with nonverbal communication theories in order to better understand the living patterns that space can impart. Social interactions take place in contexts that are a product of the manipulation of both fixed and semi-fixed elements; the location of doors and walls guides movement and encounter, while even width of doorways or wall construction can play a role in interaction. By making the intangible aspects of life – movements and interactions – more tangible, an understanding of the house as something that is lived and experienced by its inhabitants, can be achieved. Determining the way in which spaces communicate with one another as well as the extent to which these spaces are accessible and from which spaces, is one such avenue. By examining the archaeological remains of built space in Athens and Attica, we
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704 Ibid., 56.
may ascertain how inhabitants, and women more specifically, interacted with and experienced space within the context of their homes.

4.6 The Athenian City-Center: Districts, Houses and Space

Ancient literary sources have contrived an image of Athens as a city whose large, marble temples and public buildings were inconsistent with its narrow, confined and dirty residential districts. Visitors to ancient Athens complain that there is no proper water-supply, that the streets are haphazard and the houses shabby; they are in disbelief at the condition of the houses in such a celebrated and renowned city. Indeed, the modest character of Athenian houses is stressed time and time again. Demosthenes, though in a more flattering light, claims that Athenian houses were all unpretentious. He denounces the ambitions of politicians of his own time whose homes were “more splendid than their neighbors, and even than public buildings,” and contrasts these to the 5th century houses which were so modest that even those of “their famous men, of Miltiades or of Aristeides…are not at all more splendid than those of their neighbors.” The ancient authors have passed on a great deal of interesting, if incidental, information about the houses of their own time, but we must turn to the archaeological evidence for an assessment of the picture they have painted for us. The archaeological evidence, it seems, has reinforced this general impression of simplicity and irregularity that the literary
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sources have passed down to us, even though their comments are sometimes far too colorful to have been wholly truthful.

Most of the known ancient houses of Athens were found in the southwest quarter of the city, on the slopes of the hills west of the Acropolis or in the valleys between them. The unevenness of the ground has, no doubt, contributed to the overall oddities in the line of the streets and the lay-out of building plots there.\textsuperscript{708} Main thoroughfares sometimes narrow to become alleys, roads twist and bend, and on sloping ground, may even become flights of stairs. Plots of land sometimes had to expand or contract, avoid or exploit outcrops and hollows, and buildings were often cut deeply into hillsides if floors were to be made level. Excavations in the area west of the Areopagus and also close to the Agora have provided examples of houses that are for the most part small, unpretentious and irregularly planned; some of these exemplify the limitations imposed on the builder by his site, for example, those houses found in close proximity to the Athenian Agora (Fig.58). These houses have confirmed the impression we have obtained from the literary sources for the residential districts of Athens.

The Athenian Agora, just north of the Acropolis, was the commercial and industrial district of Athens. The monuments and public buildings in this space pressed in upon the boundaries of the Agora from all sides, and this is exhibited in both the literary and archaeological evidence.\textsuperscript{709} The area was busy and noisy, and seems to have been flooded with impudent people; measures were put in place to maintain order.\textsuperscript{710} Even Aristophanes relates the vulgarity of the Athenian Agora in advice given to a sausage-seller: “That is exactly why you

\textsuperscript{708} W.Judeich, \textit{Topographie von Athen} (Munich: Beck, 1931), 287-299; Thompson and Wycherley, \textit{Agora}, 173-185; Jones, “Attica,” Fig.1.
will be great, because you are shameless (θρασύς), no better than a common market rogue (πονηρός)."711 Allowing for some comic license on the part of Aristophanes, it seems, nonetheless, that the Agora was teeming with vendors of all sorts. In fact, the scenes sometimes involve women interacting with strange men both as customers and as fellow-traders.712

The Agora appears to have been crowded with buildings as well, with small shops and houses on its fringes, and always ready to encroach haphazardly on the central square. One man’s shop on the southwest, for instance, abutted the official boundary marker of the Agora.713 The shortage of space, in particular during the late 5th century B.C.,714 may have precipitated such desperate measures. The greatest concentration of shops and houses seems to have been, thus far, on the east side of the Agora, which was for a long time more open than the other sides and less occupied by public buildings.715 We know that bronze-workers, marble-cutters, metalworkers, potters and others worked in the Agora after the Persian Wars;716 their little workshops have left characteristic traces and successive layers of debris from such activities. It has been estimated that one-third of the citizen population of Athens was engaged in trade and crafts,717 and women, too, formed part of this workforce.718 Butchers, potters and other artisans, such as coroplasts and sculptors, sold their goods in the bustling industrial district southwest of

711 Aristoph. Kn. 181.
714 Scattered remain show that hastily-built structures, probably shops, invaded the northeast corner, reaching towards the Panathenaic Way in the late 5th century B.C. This may be due to the influx of people from rural areas during the Peloponnesian War (Thuc. 2.17.1), who then decided to stay (H.A.Thompson, “Excavations in the Athenian Agora: 1951,” Hesperia 21 (1952): 100-101).
715 Thompson and Wycherley, Agora, 170.
Specific areas, in fact, were named after the wares sold there, so that a customer would know where to go to purchase a particular product.

Few provisions were made in the city center, however, for urban planning; the lines between residential and commercial areas were blurred in a jumble of houses, shops and public buildings. One writer sarcastically remarks that everything in Athens is sold together in the same place; for instance, laws, lawsuits, indictments and witnesses to summons could be purchased in the same place as figs, grapes, apples and other commodities. He suggests that the city was characterized by a general disorganization and untidiness. That the market impinged on political and judicial life is demonstrated by the many notable people in Athenian history who seem to have found in the Agora an intellectual and spiritual home. Socrates frequented perfume shops, barbers’ shops and cobbler’s shops in the Agora to discuss political issues and lawsuits, because it was there, according to the philosopher, that knowledge was gained. In Athens, the lines between residential, industrial and socio-political seem to have been blurred not only topographically, but conceptually as well.

In the process of excavating the Athenian Agora, remains of houses were unearthed, most of which were located on the slopes of the Kolonos Agoraios and the Areopagus, but also in the valley between the Areopagus and the Pnyx. These areas seem to have been densely populated in the 5th century B.C., perhaps as a result of the post-Persian War clean-up effort in central
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722 This may have been slightly mitigated in the 2nd century B.C. when the Stoa of Attalos was built; its colonnades provided walkways and masked the rickety bazaar district.
723 Plat. Phaedrus 230c-d; Diog.Laert. 2.13.122; Lys. 24.20; Isocr. 7.15; Plut. Max. Princ. 776b. The aristocrat Kallikles certainly thought Socrates was wasting his time in such company (Plat. Gorg. 491a).
Athens. The constraints of space likely played a crucial role in construction here, where houses sometimes served as both places of residence and places of work.\textsuperscript{724} Athens was a city that had grown naturally, without any city plan or formal design. Despite the extensive damage done to Athens by the Persians in 480/79 B.C., the Athenians did not take that opportunity to rebuild their city according to the more structured and rational principles of orthogonal town planning. In other words, they did not rebuild using a grid plan, which would have resulted in regular city blocks, evenly dispersed streets and uniform house plots.\textsuperscript{725} The only uniformity demonstrated by the houses here is found in their consistent lack of uniformity, varying considerably in size, shape and plan. The courtyard, however, roughly centrally located and entered from the street, is a standard feature of each house.

The sub-agora districts, around the political and religious center, and especially the southwestern offshoot of the Agora, have provided some of the best archaeological evidence for urban residences from Athens in the Classical period. The houses exhibit the vast difficulties of building on a site that is restricted in terms of space and in a town that has an irregular plan. They are also representative of the common practice in Athens of integrating commercial with residential, with houses serving as both residence and workplace.

4.7 The House of Simon

Situated at the very edge of the Athenian Agora, the commercial center of the city, is the House of Simon (Fig.59; Appendix 1.1). In fact, the house’s northeast corner abuts the boundary


\textsuperscript{725} Compare Olynthus and Peiraeus which were planned on a grid (Hoepfner and Schwandner, \textit{Haus}, 68-113, 22-42).
stone (*horos*) marking the limit of the Agora;\(^{726}\) it is also bordered on its east and northwest by
two streets that exit the Agora and run toward the Pnyx. The constraints of the house’s position
are illustrated by its irregularly-shaped plot, but also by the polygonal limestone walls that retain
two sides of a terrace. A well that was located inside the court of the house contained large
amounts of broken pottery that had been discarded, and which indicated that the well was in use
by 500 B.C. Only twenty years later the house came to a disastrous end with the Persian sack of
480/79, and all of the rubbish was dumped into this same well.\(^{727}\) The house was not long
abandoned though; within a few years it was rebuilt along its old lines,\(^{728}\) so that the house
should be viewed as part of the post-Persian clean-up.

Though the house has not been completely excavated,\(^{729}\) it has been ascertained that it
extended about 12.8 meters on the west side and probably as far on the south side, where it was
bounded by another terrace wall. The house centered on an open courtyard that was situated on
the northeast side and measured about 5 by 6 meters; the court’s northwest wall also formed the
wall of the main street. A post hole found on the north side of the court suggests that there was a
porch set against the north wall of the house and that it faced south, as is the case with many
other houses here and elsewhere.\(^{730}\) This structure would have permitted the low winter sun to
warm and light the interior, while at the same time it blocked the high summer sun and kept the
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\(^{726}\) See H.A. Thompson, “Excavations in the Athenian Agora: 1953,” *Hesperia* 23 (1954): 51-55, Pl.13b; Thompson,

\(^{727}\) The well was 12 meters deep and had a heavy deposit of lime suggesting prolonged use. In 480/49 B.C. the roof
of the house was torn off so that the mud-brick walls, without protection from winter rains, and without a new coat
of weather-proofing lime-wash (Thuc. 3.20; Dem. 3.29, 23.208), soon washed over the floors (Thompson, “House of
Simon,” 235). A pit found in the yard which was used as the household dump or cesspool yielded ostraka bearing
the names of Aristeides, Themistokles and others, which are dated to the late 480’s B.C. and attest to the early phase
of the house before its rebuilding after the Persian sack.

\(^{728}\) The new inhabitants abandoned the old well and dug a new one to the west of it. They filled up their old
cesspool with stones and ostraka – all of which dated to 480-479 B.C., indicating that the house was not long
deserted (Jones, “Attica,” 70).

\(^{729}\) This is because the Middle Stoa and Roman civic offices sit on top of it.

\(^{730}\) Thompson, “House of Simon,” 237. For porches at Halieis, see *AD* 30 (1975): 66. For those at Olynthus, see
interior of the house cool (Fig. 60). Some of the internal partition walls have been preserved, demonstrating that the court was flanked on its south and west sides by three rooms. Though there have been no excavated traces of the main house door, the use of the street wall as the house’s northwest wall, along with the position of rooms south and west of the court, imply that the main street entrance was located on the east side of the house.

The floor of the house yielded some unusual objects dating from the mid-5th century B.C.; these were iron nails, small bone rings and a whetstone. The excavators identify these finds as cobbler’s tools, serving as hobnails and bone eyelets for leather shoes and the whetstone for sharpening knives. The house seems to have served as a workshop, a cobbler’s shop, though it does not appear to have been a very large establishment; to judge from the large hobnails found here, the owner dealt largely in boots for the army or sturdy sandals, perhaps repairing rather than fashioning them himself. The finds suggest that from about 450 to 410 B.C., the house was owned by a cobbler who set up shop in his house. The owner’s name, Simon, has been ascertained by a drinking cup that was found just outside the house, and which bears an inscription with this name; he may in fact be the same Simon who is known from the literary sources to have entertained in his shop the likes of Socrates and Pericles.

In general, the house gives the impression of a rickety and slipshod construction that was perhaps typical of many houses in the center of Athens. Despite the unpretentious size and

731 According to Socrates (Xen. Mem. 3.8.8), when a house faces the south, the winter sun shines into openings and warms the interior, while in summer the sun passes high above roofs and keeps interiors cool.
733 The floors of the court and of a room adjoining it, were made of rolled yellow clay that was renewed seven times during its two-hundred year existence. Along with the cobbler’s tools, were also found the usual artifacts – broken pottery, lamps and coins. See Thompson, “House of Simon,” 237.
734 Ibid. There were no traces of leather though; the climate does not permit survival of such material.
735 Ibid., 240.
736 The inscription names Simon as the owner of the cup, which is dated to the latter part of the 5th century B.C. D.B. Thompson has proposed that the cup, since it was found outside the house, may have served as a doorknocker or as a street sign for his shop. See ibid., 238.
737 See Plut. Max. Princ. 776b. Simon the shoemaker is known primarily from the account given by Diogenes Laertius (Vit. 2.122-124) and others (Syn. Dion 14).
furnishings of the house, the owner possessed a large amount of fine pottery used for dining, which attests to the occupant’s considerable wealth. The absence of any specialized space in the house for dining, however, is noteworthy. In fact, in most of the houses in this central area of Athens, as we shall see, there are no specialized dining rooms. At other sites, they are usually the only architecturally identifiable spaces in a house; at Olynthus, for example, raised borders for couches, unaligned doors and occasionally painted plaster walls or mosaic floors, help to secure this identification (Fig.61).

The lack of any such features in the remains of the House of Simon suggest that either the owner did not partake in the entertaining of guests whatsoever, or that he did so informally, by placing chairs, cushions and tables in a room of his house for his guests. As we have already noted, furniture was often light and portable, but it was also highly adaptable (Fig.17, Fig.18). Upholstered furniture was not used in antiquity, so that wooden chairs and couches were usually covered with blankets, coverlets and pillows. Couches could be easily transformed into beds by setting cushions (στρώματα) and blankets (κουβέντα) on them, as Callias does in Plato’s *Protagoras* to make room for another house-guest. Given the large amounts of painted pottery that were used by the owner, it appears that the entertainment of guests was generally informal in nature and points to the flexible, rather than fixed, nature of space in the house.

This informality in the use of space is also corroborated by the fairly wide distribution of cobbler’s tools in the house, suggesting that the owner plied his trade in the living quarters of the house as well. The distribution of finds in the house suggests that both the courtyard and the
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738 The pottery had been discarded in the house’s well (Thompson and Wyckerley, *Agora*, 174).
739 There are only two identified androns in the houses of central Athens, one in a house on the north slope of the Areopagus (Shear, Jr., “Agora: 1971,” 146-156) and another in a house in the valley below the Pnyx (H.A.Thompson, “Activity in the Athenian Agora 1960-1965,” *Hesperia* 35 (1966): 37-54).
740 For dining rooms at Olynthus, see Robinson and Graham, *Olynthus VIII*, 171-179.
roofed rooms were used as work spaces. The rooms opening off the central unroofed court could have been used in inclement weather, in particular, the porch sitting on the north side of the court. Under these circumstances, interactions between the inhabitants of the house and customers must have been frequent, and likely also unavoidable, considering the small size of the house and the small number of separate rooms, as is suggested by the house’s access graph (Appendix 1.1).

The lack of any type of buffer zone between the street and inner house also contributes to the overall impression that the house gives of being exposed to the bustling street just outside it; there seem to have been no physical devices, for instance a vestibule, separating the main street door from the living quarters of the house. This suggests that the inhabitants must have been interrupted constantly by the noise of the cobbler’s activities and by the traffic of customers. Needless to say, the small size of the house, the accessible nature of the living areas, and the lack of mechanisms for avoiding interactions between inhabitants and customers, implies that domestic and commercial activities were carried out in close proximity to one another and that inhabitants could not avoid interactions with strangers. This would greatly limit the amount of privacy for the inhabitants of the house, women included.

Such circumstances seem to have been present in other houses in the area as well. For a more complete and coherent picture of this type of Athenian workshop-house, one must examine the area just south and west of the House of Simon. Throughout antiquity, several of the main roads of Athens, for instance Piraeus Street, Areopagus Street and others, merged at a large intersection just outside the southwestern corner of the Agora. The resulting crossroads was full of activity since anyone entering or leaving the market, or heading toward the Pnyx or western
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quarters of the city, had to pass this way. This area, just southwest of the Agora, seems to have been devoted to both residence and workshop. Excavations unearthed the remains of one such small workshop-house, which was situated on the northeast side of the busy intersection.

4.8 The House of Mikion and Menon

Though the ancient remains had been heavily damaged by subsequent buildings, and only the northeast and southeast corners were relatively well-preserved, enough evidence could be salvaged to piece together a reconstruction of the structure commonly referred to as the House of Mikion and Menon. The house was continuously occupied for almost two centuries, during which time it underwent at least three different phases of structural modification. It was built in about 475 B.C., as part of the post-Persian clean-up, and destroyed at the end of the 4th century.

A partial plan of the house can be reconstructed (Fig.62; Appendix 1.2). In its first phase, which lasted about 50 years from 475 to the 420’s B.C., the house had an overall width from corner to corner of 19.75 meters, with a large stretch of polygonal masonry forming the southeast wall of the house along the street. From the fragmentary segments of walls and floors, some of the rooms could be distinguished. Three irregularly shaped rooms were arranged around an equally irregular and narrow courtyard that was roughly centrally located. The east wall of the
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744 Ibid., 383, Fig.1. There were at least five renewals of the floors in the house during this time. Compare the seven renewals in the House of Simon.
745 Ibid., 385, n.4. Initially, a massive artificial filling was dumped on the site and leveled off to compensate for the natural northward slope of the area. In this filling were found pottery sherds dating to the end of the 6th century to the early 5th century B.C.; the excavators have inferred from this that the area was leveled as part of cleaning operations just after the Persian sack of Athens in 480 B.C., and it was upon the leveled debris of that destruction that the earliest phase of the house was erected.
746 Ibid., 385-386, n.5, Fig.2, Pl.102, a. The pottery on the floors was consistently from the third quarter of the 5th century with the latest pieces dating to 430-420. The preserved length of the wall is 8 meters, and it stands to 0.55 meters almost throughout; its upper surface is made of limestone blocks which have been carefully trimmed to form a smooth face, though the outer faces along the street have been left rough.
court borders the street, and it is here that the main house entrance must have been located. The second phase in the 420’s B.C. is marked by the addition of more partitions within the house, and not long after, in the second quarter of the 4th century, the house possessed ten rooms. One of the rooms on the west side was not connected with the rest of the house, and may have formed a separate shop with direct access from the street.

The refurbished house continued in use for another 50 years until its final destruction. Throughout the almost two centuries of its existence, the building served both as a private residence and as a workshop for a family of marble workers. The floors were strewn with a heavy layer of marble chips and dust along with bone and bronze on the south and east sides, and unfinished sculpture was found in one of the cisterns in the courtyard along with small tools of lead. The names of the first and the last craftsman who dwelt here have been preserved by chance; the first is Mikion who inscribed his name on a small bone tool, and the last is Menon who inscribed his name on two kantharoi that date to the final destruction of the house at the end of the 4th century B.C.

The well in the court yielded great quantities of olive pits, grape seeds and apricot pits at its lowest level, implying that at the time of destruction the contents of the pantry and the kitchen cabinets were thrown down the well and covered in turn with broken tiles and burnt timbers of the collapsed roof.

There were also a large number of terracotta figurines found in the western cistern (D.B.Thompson, “Three Centuries of Hellenistic Terracottas, I, B and C,” Hesperia 23 (1954): 87-107) though none of the installations of this house suggested that they had been used by coroplasts (T.L.Shear, Jr., “The Athenian Agora: Excavations of 1968,” Hesperia 38 (1969): 389, n.11-12).

Lead strips, about 10-15 cm in length, were likely used as pencils for preliminary drawings on marble. See H.Bankel, “Griechische Bleistifte,” AA (1984), 409-411.

A more general ruin and depopulation of this entire industrial area, coincides with the destruction and abandonment of the house of Mikion and Menon. After years of economic weakness and political turmoil, along
large amounts of broken common ware pottery found in the well and cisterns from the middle of the 4th century.

The little house of Mikion and Menon is situated in a district that in the Classical period was inhabited by artisans and craftsmen, whose shops occupied older buildings increasingly in the 4th century. The house appears to have served as home and workshop to a family (or families) of workers in marble; residues of these activities demonstrate that such work took place mostly along the street side, with the largest concentration of tools and vestiges of stone carving found on the east and south sides of the house. A room on the southwest corner of the house may have served as a shop for selling the products of their trade. Unlike the other rooms of the house, which were accessible only by means of the courtyard (Appendix 1.2), this room could be accessed directly from the street. The identification of this room as a shop is borne out by the evidence of houses at other sites with similar arrangements. At Olynthus, for instance, shops were sometimes accessed only from the street, so that the domestic quarters could not be directly approached from the shop.

A shop that was disconnected from the living quarters of a house would have limited the interactions between the inhabitants of the house and customers to the shop, which may have afforded the household some semblance of privacy; this is not the case with the House of Simon, as we have seen, which seems to have blurred the line between commercial and domestic. Given that this area was one of the busiest in the city, with commercial activity of all sorts taking place here, a shop separated from the main living quarters of the family would have allowed for some

---

with at least several fires, the area was slowly deserted at the end of the century (R.S.Young, “Sepulturae Intra Urbem,” Hesperia 20 (1951): 113-114).

754 Disconnected shops have not been incorporated into the access graphs because these do not contribute to the overall pattern of social relations for the household; shops are not part of the living quarters.

755 For instance, House A vi 8, as well as others (Hoepfner and Schwandner, Haus, 112). Because Olynthus is an orthogonally planned city, we know the size of the house plots, since these are all standard; thus, it is clear that the shop was part of the plot of the adjoining house.
solace from the commotion produced on a daily basis by the craftsmen and customers in the shop.

4.9 House C and House D

Southwest of Mikion’s and Menon’s House, in the valley between the Areopagus and the Pnyx, lies another structure that seems originally to have been built as two separate houses, House C and House D (Fig.63; Appendix 1.3). The area was characterized by large amounts of residue from commercial activities like marble working, which dated to the 5th and 4th centuries B.C. Marble chips were found scattered along the streets so that the excavator called the main thoroughfare ‘The Street of the Marble Workers.’ The Street of the Marble Workers ran southward from the Agora to the bridge at Piraeus Street. The road seems to have been closed to wheeled traffic, and by the time the Great Drain was extended to this part of the city, it must have been no wider than 2 meters. The deep wheel-ruts worn in the surface of Piraeus Street and in the paving slabs of the bridge where it crossed the Great Drain, suggest that this was a busy area. The houses found on this street have an original 5th century B.C. phase and a 4th century phase that coincides with the construction of the extension of the Great Drain. Houses C and D sit on the east side of the Street of the Marble Workers, along with other houses, though these are less well-preserved.

House C, which was limited by the roadway and the drain, was cut into the hillside on the west side, most likely to conserve space, and shared party walls with the houses on either side of

756 Young, “Industrial District,” 160, 229, 234, 244, 250.
757 Ibid., 163-165. This is suggested by the lack of wheel-ruts and is corroborated also by the foundations of the house at the road’s north-west corner, which were not bedded as deep as the 5th century street level. The street level in the 4th century must have risen sharply to attain the level of the bridge at Piraeus Street, either by a flight of steps or by means of a steep ramp.
758 This is because the street was confined to the space left over between the pre-existing houses and the new drain.
759 See Young, “Industrial District,” 150-151. Piraeus Street is 8.6 meters wide when it reaches the bridge.
it. The house, though trapezoidal in shape, was quite commodious; it had the dimensions of 18.4 meters on the east side, 15.9 on the west, 17.1 on the north and 14.4 on the south.\textsuperscript{760} The main entrance, which gave access to the Street of the Marble Workers from its northwest corner,\textsuperscript{761} was formed by a long passage leading from the street to the courtyard; two rooms were accessed solely from this passage,\textsuperscript{762} though most of the other rooms of the house were accessed directly from the court (Appendix 1.3). The corridor leading from the street to the courtyard was approximately 2 meters wide, and could therefore accommodate more than one person at a time, though it became narrower the further one moved into the house.\textsuperscript{763} This perhaps served to constrict views into the living areas of the house from the street entrance.\textsuperscript{764}

A second door served a corner room on the north side, which gave access only to this one room. The room, which fronted the Street of the Marble Workers, did not communicate with the rest of the house.\textsuperscript{765} Arrangements were made for waste water to be carried from this room into the street drain and in a later period it was given its own water supply by means of a well and a cistern. Because the room had its own water supply and was not connected with the house, the excavators identified the room as an independent shop, much like those we have seen in other houses in Athens, like in the House of Mikion and Menon. Its position on a major roadway, and the fact that it juts out at its corner onto the road, also points to its use as a retail space. In fact,

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{760} Ibid., 202, Fig.7. The lines of the house were not parallel to one another so that there are no 90° angles.
\item \textsuperscript{761} Ibid., 203.
\item \textsuperscript{762} Ibid., 203, Fig.11.
\item \textsuperscript{763} The excavators considered identifying the passageway as a “pastas” because it borders the court and carries through to the other side of the house; it was dismissed because it lies to the west rather than the north of the court and was divided by a wall rather than by a colonnade, as at Olynthus (D.M.Robinson, \textit{Excavations at Olynthus, XII, Domestic and Public Architecture} (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1946), 466-467). Narrow corridors about 1.5 meters wide are also attested for the houses in the Piraeus (Hoepfner and Schwandner, \textit{Haus}, 40) and at Halieis (\textit{AD} 30 (1975): 66).
\item \textsuperscript{764} An opposite arrangement has been identified in some of the houses at Halieis, where the corridor from the street widens from 0.9 to 1.3 meters as one moves into the courtyard area (\textit{AD} 30 (1975): 68).
\item \textsuperscript{765} See Young, “Industrial District,” 206. Its western door jamb has been preserved making the identification of the door position certain.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
this space seems to have outlived the rest of the house by some years, suggesting perhaps that it was a favorable location for a shop.

Despite the irregular shape of the house, the courtyard was positioned centrally and had a rectilinear shape; it had a simple earth floor and no colonnade. On the court’s northwest side, however, there may have been a single-columned portico that acted as an extension of the entrance-corridor; as already noted, this could be a shady spot in high summer and a warm sun-trap in the winter. The courtyard later was incorporated into the entrance-corridor, with the result that the court was lengthened, and this attests to its importance in the overall scheme of the house.

A room to the west of the court is thought to have functioned as a kitchen, primarily because it opens directly from the courtyard. Its position meant that any smoke that accumulated from cooking fires could be directly expelled into the open air court. At Halieis, rooms identified as kitchens because of the presence of hearths, plastered floors and an abundance of cooking ware, attest to such an arrangement. There was no evidence for a chimney there, so that some other means of expelling smoke was employed. The lack of evidence there for a door to the court and the placement of the hearth at the end of a spur wall between two rooms, suggest that the hearth was placed in this position so that smoke could be carried out easily by the draft coming from the court.

---

766 Ibid., 225.
767 Ibid., 205-206. The open court had a drain running westward underneath it that was made of inverted roof tiles (this was still in situ). The excavators assume that this was the main drain of House C since the inlet for side drainage in the west wall of the Great Drain (when it was built) lay opposite this drain.
768 The ‘kitchen’ was also adjacent to a room that may have been used as a bathroom, because of the two drains in its floor, lending credence to this identification.
769 For this method of ventilation, see V. Svoronos-Hadjimichalis, “L’évacuation de la fumée dans les maison grecques des Ve et IVe siècles,” BCH 80 (1956): 484-492.
770 This is House 6 at Halieis (AD 30 (1975): 67, Fig.2). An almost identical arrangement is seen in House 7 as well (Ault, Halieis II, Fig.7).
Small openings in the top part of walls could have also expelled smoke from cooking fires, for example, at Argilos in northern Greece; this method of ventilation would create a vertical passage through which air is caused to flow upwards and force the fumes out of the house. At other sites, for example at Orraon in northwest Greece, well-preserved stone-built houses provide evidence for such an arrangement. Rooms identified as kitchens had small openings placed high up on the wall facing the court in an effort to rid the room of smoke generated by cooking activities (Fig.64). In rooms with hearths at the same site, doors faced the open-air court, while small windows were placed on the wall directly opposite the door; in this way, the air that flowed from the court would help drive the smoke emitted by the hearth towards the windows (Fig.65). Such rooms also seem to have been built taller than other rooms in order to facilitate the expulsion of smoke and to provide more comfortable living quarters.

A common way of ridding the house of smoke seems to have been by an opening in the roof that could be closed by means of a cover tile. This seems to be the device used in the house of Philocleon, who attempts to escape from his house by way of the flue (κάπνη) in the kitchen; his attempt is foiled when a board (τηλια) is clapped over the opening and weighted with a log (ξύλον). A similar device, in fact, is employed in many traditional houses in contemporary Greece, where openings in the roof for the expulsion of smoke can be covered by a plate (Fig.66).

---

772 See Dakaris, “To Ὀρραον,” 129, Figs.4, 7.
773 Ibid., 127, Fig.4, Fig.10.
774 Aristoph. Wasps 139-148. That the κάπνη (καπνοδόκι) was an opening is indicated by a passage in Herodotus (8.137) that describes how sunlight could find its way in to the room this way.
775 See also Kokkinos, Παραδοσιακή Κατοικία, 114-115, 119, Fig.214.
Though more elaborate provisions have been noted, like the flues in Olynthian houses, House C in Athens and others demonstrate that even a simple solution, such as an opening in a wall, could be adequate for eliminating smoke produced by cooking activities.

There is evidence for other household activities in House C as well. A large room, measuring 3.7 by 4.5 meters, was adjacent to the room identified as a kitchen and fronted the open court. On its floor were scattered a large quantity of loom weights and a spindle whorl, suggesting that weaving and/or spinning took place here, or at minimum, that this is where supplies for such activities were kept. The room benefited from its close proximity to the courtyard, which would have provided it with an ample amount of sunlight and fresh air, and would have been suitable for the laborious tasks related to textile production.

The largest room in House C measured 6.6 by 4.45 meters and was situated close to the entrance-corridor, facing south towards the court. Based on the fact that this would have likely been the most comfortable room in the house, because of its size and because of its advantageous orientation, the excavators argued that this was used as a dining room. The room, however, did not possess the typical characteristics of a dining room seen at other sites like Olynthus and Halieis, such as an off-center door, drain, cement pavement and foundations for the placement of couches, so that such an identification may be false. In addition to this, rooms for dining are usually square in shape in order to accommodate couches along the walls, so that the room’s

---

776 See Robinson and Graham, *Olynthus VIII*, 194-195; J.W. Graham, “Olynthiaka, 5-6,” *Hesperia* 23 (1954): 328-346. Chimney pots have not been found in any Classical houses, though cover tiles (ὁμαλή) have been identified (B.Tsakirgis, “A Chimney Pot from the North Slope of the Acropolis,” *Hesperia* 70 (2001): 175). For references to chimneys (καπνικός), see Aristoph., *Wasps* 126-127, 139-148; Hdt. 4.103, 8.137; Pollux 2.54.
777 Young, “Industrial District,” 206.
779 Young, “Industrial District,” 206.
irregularity also may have precluded it from taking on such a function. It may have been a flexible space, in fact, that could be adapted to a wide range of functions, such as sleeping, living and dining, by means of portable furnishings. As we have already seen, even storerooms could be converted into living quarters, if the need arose.

In general, House C was a sizeable house, and its dimensions, though irregular, compare quite closely with the more spacious houses at sites like Olynthus. Though the house did not exhibit any evidence of further space in the form of a second storey, as by the presence of stone stair bases or beam holes in the walls, a second floor should not be ruled out. The walls of House C, which were composed of sun-dried brick laid on low stone socles, were surely thick enough to support a second storey, averaging between 0.4 and 0.5 meters thick. Though the walls were substantial, this does not, however, require that there was an upper floor in any of its phases, so that we must presume that the ground floor housed all of the living spaces for the family.

In the 4th century, when the Great Drain extension was built, House C was enlarged on its east side by about 1 meter, with the result that the wall acquired an outward flare. The

---

781 Plat. Prot. 315c-d.
782 See Robinson and Graham, Olynthus VIII, 29-39.
783 Evidence of a second storey comes mainly from stone stairbases at Olynthus (ibid., 271-273). One foundation for a staircase has been found in the Piraeus, in House 9 (G.A.Steinhauer, M.G.Malikouti and B.Tsokopoulos, Πειραιάς: Κέντρο Ναυτιλίας και Πολιτισμού (Athens: Ephesos, 2000), 100; Hoepfner and Schwandner, Haus, 39). The staircase bases may have disappeared as readily as the threshold blocks did – which were large and heavy (Young, “Industrial District,” 207), and were likely re-used in later phases of the house and carried elsewhere after its abandonment in the mid-4th century. Beam holes have been identified in the stone-built walls of the houses at Orraon and also in House A at Argilos (S.I.Dakaris, W.Hoepfner, E.-L.Schwandner and D.Gravani, “Ανάσκαφη στον Αμύότοπο,” Διοδόντη 5 (1976): 433; A.Poulin, “La maison A du site d’Argilos, un exemple de l’architecture domestique en Grèce antique” (MA thesis, Université de Montréal, 2001), 71, Pl.39,2).
784 None of the sun-dried mud bricks were found even partially complete, but the house was covered by a mass of earth which suggests that these were the dissolved bricks (Young, “Industrial District,” 208).
785 The walls of House C are comparable to those at Olynthus (Robinson and Graham, Olynthus VIII, 227-228). The minimum requirement seems to be 0.35 meters (J.Gwilt, Encyclopedia of Architecture (London: Longmans, 1881), 404; Vitruvius 2.8.17).
786 See Young, “Industrial District,” 209-210. The latest pottery in the fill of a trench dates to 410 B.C., so that the alterations should be dated to just after 410. The owner of the house took this opportunity to build a new east wall on top of the west drain wall by which the house was enlarged, adding a strip of about 1.25 meters along its east
courtyard was extended by including part of the entrance-corridor, which must have resulted in more light reaching the adjacent rooms from the court. More considerable changes, however, were made at the northeast corner with a new partition wall that resulted in House C connecting with the house adjacent to it, House D, by means of a door left in the new north wall (Fig.68); this door led only to House D. The excavators believed that the joining together of the two houses was a result of the owner of House C acquiring House D, or perhaps the other way around.

House D, which lay to the north of House C, was accessed from the Street of the Marble Workers. It was considerably smaller than House C, with half as many rooms, and even more irregular in shape. House D measured about 13.5 meters from east to west and 10.4 meters from north to south. It had a small court (4.3 by 4.8 meters) that was entered at opposite corners by two corridor entries from two relatively small doors, the one opening to the Street of the Marble Workers and the other to the lower alley by the Great Drain. The house had only four rooms, two of these sitting at opposite ends of the court, and the other two forming a set, the one room giving access to the other, and forming the shorter wing of the house (Appendix 1.4).

The courtyard of House D, in its 5th century phase, had a stone base lying close to the west wall that must have been intended to carry a wooden column. The excavators believed that the column may not have supported a shed roof because it sat only 1 meter from the wall, and would not have been very advantageous. However, it seems to be the case that the courtyard

---

787 Ibid., 214.
788 Ibid. Whatever the explanation, in its final phase, the door was blocked and the houses again were separated with no internal communication between them.
789 Ibid., 217.
790 Ibid., 217 n.98. It measured only 1.2 meters wide.
791 Ibid., 222, Pl.71a.
was the main work space of House D, which is paralleled by other houses in this area. In its 4th century phase, remains of a large hearth, along with scraps of iron and bronze and a lead curse tablet calling down a horrible fate on rival bronze workers, illustrate the commercial activities that took place here. The house was probably employed for metal-working, but for reshaping refined or already cast metal rather than as a foundry. The porch would have extended over the whole southeast part of the court, providing a convenient place to work in inclement weather. The court may have been a work space covered by a shady porch in its early phase, and later took on a more commercial character, as is indicated by the presence of the hearth.

Like House C, House D had also been extended further to the south when the Great Drain was built. In this second phase, the south corridor-entry was blocked, rendering it useless, and a new door was opened giving access to House C. This suggests that the two houses were now used as one establishment, perhaps with House C acting as a residence and House D mainly as a workshop, especially given the latter’s abundance of evidence for metallurgy. The domestic character of House C is indicated by a room adjacent to the court that had a large assemblage of loom weights, a spindle whorl and portions of a brazier. In fact, this is the largest collection of loom weights recovered from one place in an Athenian house; whether they were found in a heap at the time of recovery or had fallen in a line from the loom itself is unknown. The brazier, spindle whorl and loom weights could have been used here or in the neighboring courtyard when
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792 Ibid., 229. For instance, House H seems to have been a marble workshop and it too had a shed-like structure on the north side of its court.
793 For the curse tablet, see J.B.Curbera and D.R.Jordan, “A Curse Tablet from the ‘Industrial District’ near the Athenian Agora,” Hesperia 67 (1998), 215-218. Note, however, that the find-spot of the curse tablet has been debated. Based on letter style, the owner of House D was likely a smith named Aristaichmos or Pyrrias (Young, “Industrial District,” 222-223, Pl.74a).
794 A large quantity of marble chips were found in the second phase floor of the court implying marble was carved here as well, though the main operation seems to have been metalworking.
795 Marble chips and scraps of metal indicate the work of a mason or metalworker (Jones, “Attica,” 74).
weather permitted; with water from the courtyard well and access to a number of other rooms around the unroofed space, the original southern house, House C, provided ample accommodation for domestic activities for the people living here.

House D, like House C, had walls made of mud-brick that sat on a low stone socle, with a width of about 0.45 meters. The walls were surely thick enough to support a second storey, though there was no positive evidence that the house had one; no stone slabs for wooden staircase bases were found, nor was there any evidence for stone or mudbrick platforms for stair landings. The old corridor in House D, however, that had given access to an alley when it was separate from House C, was now a deep, narrow space, that may have served as a fitting place for a staircase landing.

As we have already noted, when the houses were connected in the 4th century, House D may have served primarily as a workshop while House C acted mostly as a residence. At some point in the second half of the 4th century B.C. the two houses were abandoned and fell into ruin, with the exception of the shop in House D which continued to thrive into the 3rd century. The most important feature of both houses, however, seems to have been the central courtyard; this is approached by means of a corridor from the street and gives access to the various rooms that surround it. Neither house had a colonnaded courtyard, but there may have been a small shaded porch in the 5th century phase of both houses, providing a suitable work space that was

---


798 The fill that overlay the ruins was a homogenous mass of red clay-like earth without sherds – the original mud-brick walls. The houses were abandoned and everything of value (threshold blocks, steps, roof tiles, woodwork) was taken with the departing inhabitants. The approximate time of the abandonment was given by evidence in the form of pyres that were scattered through the rooms but also pottery that came from the earth thrown into the well and cistern in House C when it was abandoned and filled. See Young, “Industrial District,” 224, 225, Pl.71c.

799 The porch, usually referred to as the ‘pastas,’ is a standard feature on the North Hill at Olynthus, dating to about 432 B.C. (Robinson and Graham, *Olynthus VIII*, 13-17). House C, however, is somewhat earlier than those houses, so that the fully developed ‘pastas’ may not have emerged in Athens yet.
protected from the rain and sun, but which benefited from the light and ventilation provided by the open air court. The courtyard was essential to all houses we have so far encountered.

Houses C and D attempt to inhibit views into this space by means of a long corridor (Appendix 1.3, 1.4), though in the House of Simon and the House of Mikion and Menon (Appendix 1.1, 1.2) the main street entrance gives direct access to the court. The open nature of these houses may have provided light and ventilation to rooms adjacent to the court, but given the commercial character of the houses, it may have also supplied the craftsmen living there with a well-lit space for working and a convenient showroom for customers. House C/D, however, attempts to provide a barrier between commercial and domestic areas by means of a vestibule that blocks part of the courtyard; this may have been a result of a desire to protect the living quarters from the heat and noise of the metal-working that took place in House D.

Unlike some of the houses at other sites, in particular at Olynthus, House C and House D in Athens exhibited no specialized dining rooms, at least from what we can tell architecturally; this may allude to the informal nature of entertaining guests in those houses, though this does not mean that guests were not entertained here. A host could derive prestige from receiving guests, and it has been argued that the more visitors and the larger the distance they traveled, the more prestigious the entertaining, it follows that the presence of entertaining facilities like specialized *andrones*, along with their size and appearance, can say something about the importance of entertaining for the household, and perhaps also for its social status. The lack of any specialized rooms for entertaining guests in a house may point to its relative modesty and obscurity, but it does not preclude that formal dining took place there. As we noted earlier, the

---

801 See Robinson and Graham, *Olynthus VIII*, 180, Fig.11.
House of Simon yielded a very large amount of fine painted pottery,\textsuperscript{803} which suggests that formal entertaining took place in that house, even though no specialized dining rooms were located. Of course, portable furniture could accommodate such activities (Fig.17, Fig.18); stools and couches could be temporarily moved into living rooms or even courtyards for such events (Fig.69),\textsuperscript{804} so that specialized rooms with fittings for couches are not required.

Generally speaking, the houses in this area of Athens are characterized by a lack of specialized spaces for particular activities, such as dining. The houses exhibit simple house plans with a focus on an open-air court that gives access to most rooms of the house. Most of the houses also lack architectural devices that were meant to screen particular household activities. With the exception of a few narrow corridors to shield the household at large from being viewed from the street, the majority of rooms were both within view and accessed from the central court (Appendix 1.1-1.4). House C and D exhibited mechanisms designed to inhibit views into the interior by means of a corridor from the main street entrance, which is exhibited at some other sites as well.\textsuperscript{805} Given their central position in a major commercial area of the city, this would be a rational way of maintaining some semblance of privacy for the household. In a similar vein are the shops in the House of Mikion and Menon and in House C/D, which were disconnected from the living quarters. On the other hand, the projecting north corners of House C/D, which resulted in an encroachment onto the Street of the Marble Workers, would seem to have invited interaction from the street, rather than to have demanded privacy.

\textsuperscript{803} For instance K.Lynch ("Pottery from a Late Archaic Athenian House in Context" (PhD diss., University of Virginia, 1999)), who discusses a house west of the Stoa Poikile that had no andron, though its well deposit provided evidence for dining in the form of fine-ware pottery.  
\textsuperscript{804} \textit{Ibid.}, 243-245. Dining could take place in a multitude of rooms, for instance, courtyards, and even outdoors. Also see the vase painting that depicts a woman moving a stool to a spot under a porch (G.M.A.Richter, \textit{Ancient Furniture: A History of Greek, Etruscan and Roman Furniture} (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1926), Fig.88).  
\textsuperscript{805} For instance, the house at Dystos on Euboea (T.Wiegand, “Dystos,” \textit{Ath. Mitt.} 24 (1899): 458 ff., Fig.5).
4.10 Residence and Business

The houses that we have examined are situated in the heart of a densely populated area; they all front busy roads which lead from the Agora to destinations all around and outside the city, and are positioned at crossroads which would have allowed potential customers to readily access their shops. As was already noted, shops, though often incorporated into the living quarters of houses, were located along major thoroughfares and were often convenient meeting places. At other sites too, shops and workshops and sometimes fairly heavy industrial activities, were located in residential areas. For example, living rooms, dining rooms and other areas of houses were often converted into workrooms or shops by the installation of equipment or facilities, like the well and cistern that were added in House C. In the Piraeus, as well, houses were often connected to shops that were accessed directly from the street, illustrating the commercial character of the town.

In the center of Athens, a homeowner may have found that he was living next to a sculptors’ or a cobbler’s shop, or even a smithy. He may have had to contend on a daily basis with the commotion, noise and perhaps even the foul odors that must have characterized these areas. Even worse, the threat of fire from living in close proximity to a blacksmith’s or a potter’s shop, for example, must have been a constant cause for anxiety for the residents. What would
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806 Aeschin. 1.124; Isoc. 7.15, 18.9.
807 In House A vii 8 at Olynthus, the andron and anteroom were converted into a workroom and access to it was limited only from the street (Hoepfner and Schwandner, Haus, 112). At Halieis, many houses were equipped with oil-presses and ‘koprones’ – a receptacle used to collect household refuse that was employed to fertilize the land – which demonstrate an attempt at increasing agricultural productivity (Ault, Halieis II, 63-65, 79-81).
810 The threat of fire was real (R. Hampe and A. Winter, Bei Töpfer und Ziegern in südtitalien Sizilien und Griechenland (Mainz: Römisch-Germanischen Zentralmuseums, 1965), 3 ff., 17 ff.) and may have even been the
today be considered unfit living conditions, but also a severe violation of zoning laws, must have been a general phenomenon in Athens in the Classical period. Those living in the center of Athens may have been accustomed to such conditions.

In general, there seems to have been no attempt to separate commercial or industrial facilities from residential quarters in Athens, though efforts were sometimes made to screen these activities from the living quarters of houses, as is demonstrated by House C/D. Here, it must be noted, there was an ample amount of space for doing so. In other houses, like in the little House of Simon, this was not the case, nor do we know for certain that this was considered essential. The restricted amount of space that characterized most of the houses in this area of central Athens must have been a serious limiting factor; this is manifested not only in the way domestic space is arranged around a large open courtyard, but most importantly, in the flexible manner in which spaces are utilized.

4.11 Houses on the Areopagus

Outside the immediate vicinity of the Agora is a residential district that has a slightly different character than the area we just now discussed. The detailed exploration of the north slope of the Areopagus confirmed that the area was comprised of houses of irregular shape and size. These houses were served by narrow alleys that joined to the main thoroughfares of the city; the street on the eastern side continued to the Agora, though no wheel-ruts or other evidence

---


811 This is based on the large number of wells and cisterns found in the vicinity (H.A.Thompson, “Activities in the Athenian Agora: 1957,” Hesperia 27 (1958): 147).
of wheeled traffic were observed.\(^812\) The main lines of the block were established as part of the post-Persian reconstruction in the second quarter of the 5\(^{th}\) century B.C.

The best-preserved block in the area was bound by narrow side streets to the east and west, and measured 25 by 22 meters (Fig. 70).\(^813\) The block was composed of four residences arranged in two pairs and separated by a north-south running party wall. The uniformity in construction, as well as the use of a party wall between the two halves of the block, suggest that the four units were part of one overall plan.\(^814\) They seem to be the only houses in Athens that came closest to regular planning, both as a block and as individual plots, though they are only a pale reflection of the houses found in cities that were planned according to the strict rules of orthogonal planning.

The houses themselves average about 11 by 11 meters each, and are modest in size compared to houses at other sites like Olynthus.\(^815\) Each house seems to have had a courtyard around which were arranged the rooms; some showed evidence of a porch as well. In general, they are not uniform in plan, despite the fact that they are uniform in size. Generally speaking, there are not very many specialized spaces in the houses, as far as we can tell architecturally,\(^816\) nor is there any evidence of an upper storey that might point to additional spaces for specialized activities. At just over 100 square meters of ground floor space, there would have been little opportunity to separate different individuals or activities within the houses here.

---

\(^812\) Thompson and Wycherley, *Agora*, Fig. 42.


\(^814\) Ibid.

\(^815\) At Olynthus, the houses are about 17 by 17 meters each (Robinson and Graham, *Olynthus VIII*, 29-41).

\(^816\) An exception is a storeroom identified in one house based on the presence of beddings for storage vessels (H.A. Thompson, “Activities in the Athenian Agora: 1958,” *Hesperia* 28 (1959): 100, Pl. 17).
The northeast slopes of the Areopagus have produced three houses dated to the Classical period (Fig.71; Appendix 1.5-1.7), and of these, only two specialized rooms have been identified. In the westernmost house of the three, for instance, a dining room was distinguished by its off-center doorway. In the central house, two rooms were identified, the one a dining room with a raised platform for the placement of couches, an off-center doorway and a mosaic floor, as well as a formal living room with a mosaic pavement. The large size of the house, at 25 by 19 meters, may explain the presence of specialized rooms for entertaining, though smaller houses in the Piraeus sometimes have facilities for formal dining and attest to the importance of this social custom.

Access to the houses in this area was relatively open. The two houses on the east and west sides were approached by means of a door that led directly into the open courtyard (Appendix 1.5, 1.7). No attempts at screening the courtyard were made, so that the court itself could be viewed from the street when the door was open. This suggests that there was little desire for privacy mechanisms that would have shielded the living quarters of the houses, for example as with the angled or narrow corridors in other houses in the city.

---

817 See Shear, Jr., “Agora: 1971,” 147, Fig.4. Most of these are only partially preserved. The easternmost and westernmost houses were built in the second quarter of the 5th century and were occupied into the 4th century B.C. The center house was built at the end of the 5th century, but was remodeled in the last quarter of the 4th century; it was occupied until the mid-2nd century B.C.

818 Ibid. The room could have accommodated 5 couches (0.7 by 1.8 meters each).

819 Ibid., 152, Fig.4, Pl.31b. It could have accommodated seven couches.

820 Ibid., 153, Pl.32a.

821 Ibid., 152-156. It had not always been so extensive. Probably in the last quarter of the 4th century B.C. it was extended at least 7 meters on the west and several more meters on the east, most likely by combining two different houses.

822 For dining rooms in the houses of Piraeus, see O.Alexandri, AD 29 (1973-4): 153, Fig.37; ead., AD 30 (1975): 29-31, 33, Pl.29a; V.K.Eickstedt, Beiträge zur Topographie des antiken Piräus (Athens: Archaiologike Etaireia, 1991), 101, Fig.53. Many prosperous Athenians owned residences in the Piraeus (Xen. Sym. 1.2; Dem. 48.12, 48.27, 49.22; Lys. 32.8), so that the presence of a specialized dining room may have more to do with the social standing of the resident rather than the size of the house.

823 See Shear, Jr., “Agora: 1971,” Fig.4.
The large central house, however, was approached by means of a long corridor from a side street on the east, rather than from the north side like the other two houses (Appendix 1.6). This may have been a means of avoiding undue traffic from the busy northern road that led to the Agora. On any given day, the northern road would have been flooded with vendors and customers moving to and from the Agora, so that providing the house with an entrance on its eastern side would have afforded the household some peace and some privacy. Internally, however, there seems to be little effort to segregate or screen areas of the house; each room could be accessed directly from the spacious courtyard. Even access to the dining room, which is often preceded by an anteroom to block sight-lines in towns like Olynthus, is not controlled here.\(^{824}\) This arrangement suggests that the few attempts at privacy in the house were aimed at strangers thronging the streets, rather than at those within the house, so that segregated spaces for women can be ruled out.

Unlike the houses earlier discussed, which were situated in the heart of the city and adjacent to the bustling Agora, the houses on the slopes of the Areopagus exhibit some provision for formal dining spaces; they also exhibit some attempts at maintaining household privacy. The privacy mechanisms noted in the houses may be a result of their location; the slopes of the Areopagus were developed rapidly into a popular residential district,\(^{825}\) most likely because the area was relatively open and green, and away from the clamor of the market and the odors of the industrial activities that took place there. The houses built in this area, in contrast to those that were built in close proximity to the Agora, were neither physically circumscribed by already existing roads nor psychologically constrained by masses of strangers thronging the streets, and

\(^{824}\) Though the dining room is comparable in size to those found at Olynthus, most of the dining rooms there, in contrast, are fronted by an anteroom (Robinson and Graham, *Olynthus VIII*, 173-174, 176-178).

\(^{825}\) Shear, Jr., “Agora: 1971,” 147.
their plans often illustrate this. The district was, however, only a few minutes walking distance from the center of the city, so that there must have been at least some element of noise and disorder from which the household might have wanted to shield itself.

At a distance from the valleys and hills of southwestern Athens, there must have been a large expanse of houses stretching out over the more level ground to the north, south and east of the Acropolis, though these are also the areas now covered by the streets and buildings of modern Athens. Even if the evidence we have is of a partial kind and the houses that have been discovered have been uncovered only in small parts, the distribution pattern suggests that there was a good spread of houses right up to the city walls, with possibly a scatter of houses beyond them. One of the best examples of an Athenian house, in fact, is found just inside of the city walls, on the fringes of the city proper (Fig.72). It is located below modern Aristeides Street, and was a fair-sized house, measuring about 16.5 meters square. Living rooms lined the north side of the house, with the corner room serving as a dining room complete with mosaic floor, off-center doorway and grooves outlining the position of couches along the walls (Fig.73). In

826 Of course, there is no regular plan generally speaking. Note the “Flügelhofhaus” plans around the Pnyx which are characterized by a central area with a courtyard and wing-like sectors with secondary rooms. The rooms are not directly accessed through the courtyard, but rather sequentially in a hierarchic arrangement. Only a few houses, however, have been designated “Flügelhofhauses,” despite Lauter and Lauter-Bute’s argument that this is specifically an Athenian type of house (H.Lauter-Bute and H.Lauter, “Wohnhäuser und Stadtviertel des klassischen Athen,” AM 86 (1971): 118-119). As well, the houses may date slightly prior to the 5th century, since the area of the Pnyx was one of the oldest and because a passage dated to 346 B.C. (Schol.Aesch. 1.81) refers to the area as having been abandoned for some time.

827 Most of the unearthed remains have resulted from rescue excavations when streets were opened to install pipelines or when buildings were re-developed. These have confirmed the lines of the city walls, streets and houses, though they are often disturbed or overlain by later constructions.


829 See further, I.Threpsiades, “Ἀνασκαφαὶ οἰκιστικῶν ὀδών Ἀριστείδος 6,” AD 16 (1960): 29-32, Pl.30-31. The house plan is a result of adapting existing structures or of adhering to a plan in spite of substantial repairs. In the court were also two wells, which date the house to the 4th century B.C.

830 This is not the only dining room found in the area. The house at 9 Menander Street, which had two adjoining rooms with pebble mosaic floors, an off-center doorway and raised platform for couches, could have accommodated fifteen couches (O.Alexandri, AD 22 (1967): 98-100, Pl.91-92; I.N.Travlos, Pictorial Dictionary of Ancient Athens (London: Thames & Hudson, 1971), Fig.512, 513). The size of this andron is substantial, surpassing those seen in other houses, but also in public buildings like the South Stoa.
front of the dining room was the courtyard. There must have been a shaded portico within the
court because of a tall stuccoed column that was found in situ.\textsuperscript{831} This house demonstrates the
disparity between those houses in the center of the city and those in outlying regions. It is an
example of what is typical of many houses in the area: straight walls, right-angled corners, and
square or rectangular rooms. They exhibit greater regularity than many of the houses in the
southwestern quarters of the city,\textsuperscript{832} and may be a reflection of the ease of layout on more level
ground.

Irregularities often resulted from the presence of outcrops of rock and uneven slopes,
cramped plots and winding streets, which is frequently the case in the Athenian city-center. Such
constraints resulted in irregularity in house shape and size, but also a more general disorder
of whole districts, which were characterized by slipshod house façades whose walls often
encroached onto the narrow, winding streets and alleys. This jumble of house wall and street
line, of thoroughfare and alley, and of house and shop, was what gave Athens its distinctive
disorderly character; the residential areas of Athens were so remarkably disordered that they
made their mark on those who visited the city who were familiar with the regular city plans
employed in other urban centers.

The city of Athens was also, generally speaking, densely populated. Residency for
Athens, of course, was not a static pattern, since we know that there was an influx of people from
suburban areas during the Peloponnesian War. We are told that space was so restricted in the
city that the residents sometimes encroached even onto reserved areas, like shrines and defensive

\textsuperscript{831} The column was 1.57 meters tall and stucco-covered. Because the column stood only about 1.5 meters away
from the front of the dining room, however, there is some doubt if it was used as a support for a portico (Jones,
“Attica,” 95).

\textsuperscript{832} Hints of the existence of at least some short lengths of straight streets and houses with straight walls and squared
corners may be noted. See, I.N.Travlos, \textit{Pictorial Dictionary of Ancient Athens} (London: Thames & Hudson, 1971),
Fig.379-381 (houses north of Olympeion), 709-710 (Tripod Street); \textit{AD} 21 (1966): 72; \textit{AD} 22 (1967): 83; \textit{AD} 23
towers. Though this was a temporary solution to an unexpected problem, many of the families no doubt decided to stay permanently. The scarcity of level ground and a general lack of space in Athens must have demanded that residents be content with whatever plot was offered them; based on the examples we have, these could be trapezoidal in shape, miniscule in size, and situated in noisy and malodorous districts of the city.

It has become clear that the location of a house can have an impact on its general characteristics. Houses situated in the heart of the city and in close proximity to the Athenian Agora, for example, very rarely make provisions for specialized rooms, nor do they seem to screen themselves from the outside world. With the exception of the presence of narrow corridors or recessed doorways that give indirect access to the courtyards of some of the houses, the overall impression obtained from the urban houses is one of openness. Shops and places of residence are often integrated and house doors open onto busy thoroughfares, rendering them almost vulnerable to the havoc in the streets.

Internally, as well, the houses do not often exhibit any attempts at screening areas from one another. Instead, the interiors possess an open and unrestricted quality with all of the rooms of the house generally accessed directly from the open-air courtyard. The court, as we have noted, was also the space of the house most suited to household activities like washing and cooking; inhabitants must have spent considerable time in the courtyard, women especially, so that interactions with visitors would have been frequent and common. The court also controlled access to other spaces of the house so that inhabitants were obliged to pass through that space to gain entry. The court would have been a primary “circulation space” in the house in that its central location, square shape and considerable size were factors that encouraged social

---

833 Thuc. 2.17.1-3. For movement into the city, see also Thuc. 2.14.1; Aristoph. Eccl. 241-244.
834 For temporary quarters becoming permanent ones in this context, see Aristoph. Kn. 792-793.
interaction (Fig. 74).\textsuperscript{835} The high interaction potential of courtyards meant that they would have shaped the overall pattern of interaction in the house more than any other space; in this way, a street door that led directly to the courtyard would have been open to constant contact with the outside world, almost vulnerable to it. It of course follows that in this case no mechanisms were employed to shield the inhabitants, women included, from social interaction. Our discussion of interaction necessarily brings us to the subject of privacy, to ask how privacy can be defined and how it can be achieved, but also to question whether privacy, in particular for women, was desired in central Athens.

4.12 Privacy and the Control of Social Interaction

Distance or proximity of one house to another, of one room to another, and of one person to another, plays a role in all potential contact. Interaction, whether it occurs between men and women, inhabitants of the same residence, or strangers, and whether it involves the visual, aural or olfactory faculties, falls within the discourse on privacy. Privacy can be defined as “selective control of access to the self or to one’s group,”\textsuperscript{836} or as “the avoidance of unwanted interaction with other people.”\textsuperscript{837} Though privacy has been viewed as a cultural universal, it is manifested differently in different cultures, because “selective,” “unwanted” and “interaction” are all culturally variable.\textsuperscript{838} Privacy is generally viewed as the control of unwanted interpersonal interaction, but how one avoids unwanted interaction, once it is defined, is also variable.\textsuperscript{839} The rules of privacy in any culture influence the flow of information and communication at

\textsuperscript{835} In contrast to this is the “movement space” which acts as a conduit for movement; the “movement space” tends to be long and narrow, as is the case with corridors, for example, and will not generally host a lengthy episode of of interaction (Grahame, Reading Space, 56-58).

\textsuperscript{836} Altman, Privacy, 18.


\textsuperscript{838} See further, E.T.Hall, The Hidden Dimension (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1966), 131-164.

\textsuperscript{839} Altman, Privacy, 12-17.
individual, group and social levels. Key issues associated with privacy are the elements of choice and control over both the proxemics of physical space, but also the acquisition of knowledge about people.

According to Amos Rapoport, privacy is associated with the organization of communication. Privacy is manifested in the built environment by means of “privacy filters,” or mechanisms; these can be physical, temporal, social and psychological. For instance, interaction, and therefore communication, can be avoided through rules (manners, avoidance, hierarchies), psychological means (internal withdrawal, depersonalization), behavioral cues (structuring of activities in time), and through physical separation (walls, doors, locks, etc.). Each of these mechanisms operates in two directions; they function actively in the sense of inhibiting sight and sound, but also reflexively in the sense of avoiding being seen and heard. In addition, the mechanisms are related to context; a particular amount and type of interaction may be acceptable in one context, but not in another, even within the same culture. In most cases, multiple mechanisms are used to provide the necessary redundancies for the correct communication of privacy signals. The denial of any privacy mechanism, however, means that the optimum balance of information is not communicated, which can lead to stress and potential conflict.

Privacy controls, by governing both spatial, visual and aural access, serve to provide norms of behavior for individuals and groups. A choice is made between isolation and interaction that involves both social distance and avoidance rules, affecting the circumstances under which people encounter one another. According to Donald Sanders, the physiological and

841 See further, Altman, Privacy, 32-42.
842 Ibid., 10-12, 32-50.
social aspects of privacy affect and are reflected in the organization of the built environment.\textsuperscript{844} In other words, buildings structure space and time, but they also structure cultural norms and expectations.\textsuperscript{845} Houses, for instance, provide loci for encounters between household members, guests and visitors, but the extent, duration, frequency and timing of such encounters is culturally variable. Building structure and internal organization of rooms, in conjunction with boundary controls such as doors, provide settings that allow both interaction and separation, though the desired level of privacy, of course, is subjective. Because the desired amount of interaction and separation varies from culture to culture, it is essential to examine perceptions and definitions of privacy within that society.

4.13 Privacy in the Greek City

The general view of the Greek city is that it was “a moral community of men permanently united by a common way of life,”\textsuperscript{846} rather than a group of self-interested individuals joined temporarily for mutual profit and protection. An Athenian, for instance, did not possess rights against the commonwealth; he might demand and be granted certain privileges, but these were more than outweighed by his duties to the community at large. The peculiar division between a narrow public and broad private realm that is characteristic of most


political regimes seems to have been alien to the Greek experience. Aristotle puts it well; he argues that the Greek city was a *koinonia*, a political community.

In an ideal society, there is by definition no need for a private sphere to which the individual can retreat; if social institutions function properly, then there should be no need for privacy. For the Athenian, individual privacy had the negative connotations of deprivation and exclusion; privacy, to them, looked like a cover for the evasion of ethical and social obligations. The word ἰδιότης, for instance, refers to a person in a private station, essentially someone who does not hold public office, but it can also mean a person lacking knowledge, an ignoramus. Xenophon even uses the word to imply that a fellow-citizen is in bad shape, in other words, that he lacks the athletic training that characterized a man fully participating in the social order.

Xenophon also furnishes us with the only existing detailed account of private life; in the mouth of Isomachus, a wealthy landowner, we are told that he takes great pride in his estate and in his rural lifestyle. However, he does not view his idyllic rural estate as a refuge from public and social obligations. Instead, Isomachus sees his country estate as a means of training his body for active military duty, providing the state with surplus produce, and attending to the affairs of his city and of his friends in his leisure time. His property, in fact, is within walking distance from town so that he can easily attend to business there.

---


850 See, for instance, Hdt. 1.59; Plat. *Rep.* 578c.

851 Dem. 4.75; Xen. *Oec.* 3.9; Plat. *Prot.* 345a and *Tim.* 20a; Men. *Sam.* 71.


According to Paul Rahe, the claims of the Athenian civic community were total, with the only exception being the household, the *oikos*. The city depended on the preservation of this one refuge of privacy for the procreation, rearing and nourishment of its future citizens.\(^{855}\) This attitude towards the family is nowhere more evident than in Aristotle’s vehement critique of Plato’s design in *The Republic* to abolish the family.\(^{856}\) The word *oikos*, in Greek, refers both to the house and the persons who inhabit it, so that spatially, the private sphere in Athens begins with the house. The Athenian orators implicitly identify the house as the primary locus for the private,\(^{857}\) and view the privacy of the household as being dictated by two factors: physical intrusions and the outflow of information.

The house represents a physical embodiment of claims of privacy; law court speeches and dramatic texts place great emphasis on the inviolability of both physical house and household. Intrusion into the interior of the house by non-family was considered an outrage in Athens;\(^{858}\) the *kyrios*, the man of the house, was permitted to defend his home from intruders, even up to the point of exercising lethal force in the case of theft and adultery.\(^{859}\) While Athenians did not formally codify the separation of private and public spheres and did not articulate the private freedoms that were safeguarded from government interference, they did view state intrusion upon the private sphere as an outrage.\(^{860}\) The courtyard and gate of the house seem to have been the boundaries of the private sphere, a sort of liminal area marking the

---


\(^{856}\) See Arist. *Pol.* 1261a4-1264b25.

\(^{857}\) See, for instance, Dem. 3.25-26, 23.206-208; Isoc. 15.282, 252.

\(^{858}\) See, for example, Dem. 18.132.

\(^{859}\) See Cohen, *Law, Sexuality, and Society*, 115-116; Lys. 1.21-25, 1.34; Dem. 24.113, 23.60, 23.53. His license to respond to less serious intrusions, however, such as trespass, vandalism or door-breaking, was probably more limited, but law suits were common (Dem. 53.15-16, 21.81, 47.45, 37.33; Aesch. 1.62).

political transition from public to private. Those who violated the boundary between public and private were said to be publicly cursed. According to Greek custom, it was considered necessary and appropriate to knock before entering a man’s house, which might seem unnecessary if women were actually locked away. Though the Athenians believed that the boundaries of the oikos should be inviolable and the kyrios free to act as he wished within his realm, the ideal privacy of the oikos and autonomy of its kyrios could come into direct conflict with the requirements of communal life.

Behavioral zones and their boundary controls also regulate what might be called information flow. Concepts and concerns of reputation affected the everyday lives of people, so that information, both visual and aural, would have been particularly important for maintaining privacy. This is especially true in light of the fact that household space was limited, with the result that contact between people was often inevitable. The private sphere, as represented by the family and the house, though a significant barrier, was not, however, an impenetrable one. Friendship, φιλία, was a permissible intrusion into the private sphere, because close friendship meant being accepted into the house, including into the presence of its women. As Plato says in the Laws, friendship brings to light what would otherwise remain concealed. In the defense speech of Euphiletus, a cuckolded husband, we are told that his friends help him punish his wife’s lover. They take part both in his shame and in his attempt to restore his household’s

862 Plat. Sym. 212c; Lys. 3.6; Dem. 47.53; Plut. Mem. 3.8.
864 Cohen, Law, Sexuality, and Society, 84. The term is also used for kin: wife and children (Aesch. Pers. 851, Eum. 216; Soph. OT. 366; Eur. Med. 16), husband (Hom. Od. 15.22), wife (Hom. II. 9.146). For the view that friendship is the most intimate bond, see Aristot. Rhet. 1166a30ff., 1171a-1172a. Marriage was also a permissible intrusion, given that women moved into their husband’s home.
865 Plat. Laws 738d-e. In a similar vein is Lys. 7.18, 28.
honor; their testimony could secure Euphiletus’ acquittal and therefore safeguard his life.\textsuperscript{866} Though traditional interpretations regard the house, its women and its secrets as closed off from intrusion by the community, examination of social practices and beliefs related to friendship demonstrates the limitations of this view.

David Cohen has argued that in ancient Athens neighbors knew everything; they reported quarrels, love affairs and immorality, so that the neighborhood helped to make social control effective.\textsuperscript{867} A neighbor could be one’s closest observer. To counteract this, individuals may have acted their roles in conformity with community expectations.\textsuperscript{868} Du Boulay, in her study of a contemporary Greek village, writes: “the public nature of village life makes it such that villagers read the lives of others from signs and indications much as a hunter tracks an animal by its prints…a girl away with her goats for longer than the customary time means an illicit rendezvous in the forest.”\textsuperscript{869} The judgment of the community about private life depends upon inferences made from public behavior; for one’s reputation, the appearance of honor, in other words, is often more important than the reality. Aeschines tells us that it is reputation that makes private deeds public knowledge.\textsuperscript{870} In Athenian society, public opinion, operating through the politics of reputation based upon honor and shame, served as a powerful coercive force.\textsuperscript{871}

\textsuperscript{866} Lys. 1.23-27. His friends actually witness his wife and lover in bed naked (\textit{ibid.}, 1.24). As witnesses, they could have secured his acquittal since Euphiletus was faced with capital punishment if guilty of entrapment. See also Lys. 3.7 where neighbors help to repel an intruder in the middle of the night.
\textsuperscript{869} Du Boulay, \textit{Village}, 199.
\textsuperscript{870} See Aeschin. 1.127-130, 1.153-155, 3.162.
\textsuperscript{871} Shame could force men to provide dowries or marry orphaned women (Dem. 4.10; Isaeus 1.39, 2.37).
Demosthenes argues that Athens, because it was a democracy, could not cover up the shame of its citizens since information could not be concealed easily.\textsuperscript{872}

In Classical antiquity, the notion of one’s “own space” is unlikely to have existed due to the general restricted amount of household space. Houses usually had few rooms in total and even these were normally small. Separate spaces in modern houses such as reading-rooms or game-rooms, for example, were likely non-existent in Athenian houses. Concepts of crowding, as well, like concepts of personal space, deal with the size of the space and the number of people within it;\textsuperscript{873} the physical structuring of a neighborhood, for instance, can influence the social encounters of people living there. Houses in Athens were cramped closely together, so that neighboring families must have been quite intimate with one another.\textsuperscript{874} Narrow, winding streets, houses built close to one another or sharing party walls, and doors and windows opening directly onto main thoroughfares must have impeded the maintenance of privacy, if this was desired. Spontaneous encounters and person-to-person interaction were likely to have occurred both at the house and at the neighborhood level in Athens.

4.14 Reading Privacy in the Built Environment

Some scholars have argued that privacy as a social construct is unlikely to have any physical manifestation.\textsuperscript{875} Privacy should be viewed, however, as one of the more important factors governing constructed space. Privacy is a factor that shapes human behavior and human activities, which are, in turn, accommodated or hindered by the built environment. Donald Sanders has made the case that privacy, as reflected through choices between isolation and

\textsuperscript{872} Dem. 22.31, 60.26.
\textsuperscript{873} See further, Altman, \textit{Privacy}, 86-98.
\textsuperscript{874} Dem. 55.23-24, 53.4; Aristoph. \textit{Lys}. 300.
interaction, can be detected in buildings through the arrangement of space and through the transitions between those spaces. Privacy, as a distinctly human response, deals with options and choices within any given situation or set of circumstances. Territoriality, distancing and other proxemic devices are used by all societies to obtain a desired level of interaction in a given setting. Concepts of personal space, territory and crowding differ from culture to culture so that these can affect the level of privacy and inter-personal encounters within a building. Though the degree to which privacy is desired is culturally variable, it is achieved through privacy controls that can be analyzed architecturally, such as the restriction of access and the obstruction of sight-lines.

Many privacy response mechanisms and their rules are directly reflected in the organization of the built environment. Though some privacy controls may have been conceptual or esoteric and have therefore left no trace, archaeologists can still ascertain a number of the devices in the built environment used to achieve privacy. The structuring of privacy can be evaluated through the study of the relations between interior and exterior space or by comparing barriers and boundaries. If, for example, transitions are an important part of the architectural organization of a building, then boundary demarcation will be relatively clear and territoriality will be an important aspect of privacy control. Closed spaces, remote rooms and areas of restricted access may suggest a longing for privacy. Physical separation can also be achieved.

---

878 Ibid. For instance, Australian Aborigines sweep around their homes to indicate the boundary between their camp and their private family space, while in old Norwegian farmhouses a particular beam in the ceiling marks the point at which visitors must wait to be admitted (Rapoport, “Vernacular Architecture,” 298; id., “Australian Aborigines and the Definition of Place,” in Shelter, Sign and Symbol, ed. P.Oliver (London: Barrie & Jenkins, 1977), 38-51).
through distancing by way of the position of rooms in relation to one another or by the placement of barriers and screens. The position of doors, partitions and windows also play an important role in controlling boundaries in a house.

Physical barriers, however, are not the only means by which privacy can be attained. Privacy can be achieved also through the manipulation of vision and hearing. What could be heard and seen by whom, from where and when, may have affected the location and timing of activities within the house. Roofs, doors and furniture can mask noise and affect sound transfer between rooms, but these are missing, so that we have no way of knowing the extent or level of intrusion of noise in these houses. Though it is impossible to map the “auditory geography” and soundscapes of the houses we are dealing with, experimentation with sun-dried mud brick structures indicates that they are almost sound-proof; howling winds, rattling roofs and shouting from the street, may not have been heard from within the houses.

Intangible barriers may have affected opportunities for privacy within the house as well. Texture, lighting and scent may have played a role in signaling types of space. For example, auditory or even olfactory cues such as the smell of incense or smoke from a hearth or brazier, could have delineated space. Lighting must have similarly affected the organization of activities within houses, with living areas likely positioned closest to the main natural light source located in the front entrance and courtyard. Objects that have perished, such as plants or curtains, may have also facilitated family privacy by providing shade and screening activities within the

---

Curtains, in particular, seem to have been used frequently as internal partitions in houses, though we are unable to interpret these now. The almost complete absence of pivot holes in interior rooms of the houses at Olynthus, for instance, may indicate that curtains instead of doors were employed. The tangible barriers that can be ascertained, however, are numerous, so that it is feasible to pinpoint attempts at privacy in the archaeological remains of houses.

Patterns of relationships between individuals in a house are influenced by, and in turn influence, the organization of space. Though the lived reality could have been far more complicated than what we can ascertain today, by analyzing the arrangement of architectural elements within a house, we can reconstruct the patterns of movement and access that shaped the daily activities and interactions of the people living there. Houses in Athens, as well as houses in other areas of Greece, for example, share a number of basic similarities in the way space was organized. The single-entrance courtyard house, which employs a broadly centripetal plan, is common to most sites. Houses were structurally oriented towards their interior, with suites of rooms facing and opening onto a central courtyard area. Courtyards provided the house, which usually had only a few small windows, with necessary light and ventilation. The courtyard acted as an exterior space, but one that was also the private space of the family, in the sense that it was not public.

---

885 Pollux (10.32) tells us that curtains were used for the doors of bedchambers.
886 See Robinson and Graham, *Olynthus VIII*, 251. That there were doors and that these simply worked on hinges must also be entertained however.
887 See further, Nevett, *House and Society*, 83-103. Compare the opposite arrangement, where rooms are organized sequentially, the one leading into the next. Such an arrangement isolates the innermost rooms while the outermost rooms are those for receiving visitors (L.W. Donley-Reid, “The Structuring Structure: the Swahili House,” in *Domestic Architecture and the Use of Space*, ed. S. Kent (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 120-121).
Scholars have considered the characteristically inward-oriented courtyard house to be a result of a desire for increased privacy, of establishing, in other words, an additional physical barrier between the interior of the house and the surrounding community. The interior open-air courtyard, the size and arrangement of rooms, as well as the size and placement of doors and windows, are factors that influence interaction, and therefore privacy, in a home. By analyzing the characteristics of certain architectural elements, we may be able to deduce the actual lived patterns of social interaction in a house.

4.15 Visual and Physical Accessibility: Windows and Doors

Houses typically had a simple exterior façade with a single street door and only a few windows. The structural advantages of a wall with few openings are many; wall failures often occur around openings like windows and doors because it is here that pressure concentrates, resulting in points of structural weakness. As far as we can ascertain, where windows do exist, these are usually placed high up on the wall. Both representations of windows (Fig.75a, Fig.75b) and the little archaeological evidence we have suggest that windows on exterior walls were rare, but also that they occurred in places that are relatively inaccessible. In one literary account, a man wishes to enter a house without authorization from the homeowner; the advice

---

given him is that he should enter through a window (θυρίς) by fastening a rope to it and then to himself, and to lower himself into the house (καθίσσα δήσας σαῦτον). The passage clearly suggests that the window is far above his head, so that great effort is required in order to access it.

Stone-built houses in northwest Greece, like those at Kassope and Orriaon, corroborate the literary testimony. The windows in House 1 at Orriaon, for instance, are placed particularly high up on the walls (Fig.76). Windows would have sat close to the overhanging eaves of the roof, which would have kept the dust and rain out. Doors of houses also demonstrate a similar concern for keeping rain and other unwanted things out of the house while providing proper ventilation. Vase paintings, for example, sometimes depict two-paneled doors that can be divided horizontally in such a way that the bottom half may remain shut while the top half can be opened (Fig.77). This type of door is called a “Dutch” or “stable” door because its original purpose was to keep farm animals from wandering into houses, while at the same time maintaining proper ventilation.

Contemporary traditional Greek houses are often furnished with such doors because they keep the elements and animals or pests out of the house, while at the same time allowing an adequate amount of air and sunlight to filter through the open half of the door (Fig.78). Dutch

---

895 For instance, London, British Museum F65; Beazley, ARV, 2, 1154.35.
896 Dutch doors are often incorporated into child care facilities today because they can confine young children in a room while allowing the childcare provider to monitor the children from another room.
897 See Kokkinos, Παραδοσιακή Κατοικία, 116, Figs. 202, 203. In some traditional Greek communities, Dutch doors can signify whether or not guests are welcome. For example, in the summer during the mid-afternoon siesta, the upper half of such doors are often left open to allow cool breezes to enter, while the lower half is kept shut to indicate that guests are not desired at that time.
doors are advantageous also because they allow both visual and oral communication with
neighbors, salespeople or passersby without giving them entry to the private space of the home.

Typically small windows could also have a peculiar tapering quality, like in the houses at
Orraon; here, slit-like windows, which faced main thoroughfares, are narrower on the exterior,
decreasing substantially in width towards the outside of the house (Fig.79). Most of these face
the advantageous south and west sides of the house, benefiting from the sun that streamed in for
most of the day. Tapered windows, that is, windows with a much smaller surface area on the
exterior of the house than on the interior, would also minimize the amount of cold wind entering
the house in the winter months; this would have been particularly important in a relatively
cool area like northwest Greece in which Orraon is situated. Windows that narrowed towards the
exterior of the house may be viewed as an attempt to maximize the amount of fresh air entering
the house, while at the same time minimizing the exposure of the interior of the house to the cold
and perhaps also to curious eyes; the defensive nature of the site of Orraon may have also been
the motivation behind this feature.

Though we do not have direct evidence for the size and shape of windows in Athenian
houses, Attic vase paintings sometimes illustrate little tapered windows on houses; through the
rules of linear perspective, the painter employs diagonal lines to indicate that the windows are
narrower on the outside than on the inside of the house (Fig.75b). A similar arrangement can be
seen in traditional houses in contemporary Greece, where windows are not only placed high up

---

898 See Dakaris, “To ‘Orraçois,” Fig. 7. Note how windows/openings facing the interior of the house do not taper, as
in Room (h) of House 1, while those which overlook a main road get narrower towards the outside (Rooms (f), (e)
and (d)).
900 Orraon was a Molossian border town of Ambracia that was defensive in nature and characterized by large city
gates, narrow streets, a lack of communal spaces, as well as provisions for large water reservoirs, demonstrating its
defensive character (Dakaris, “To ‘Orraçois,” 115, n.21).
901 See the hydria in Madrid (Museo Arqueologico Nacional L199) (W. Hoepfner and E.-L. Schwandner, Haus und
Stadt im klassischen Griechenland (Munich: Deutscher Kunstverlag, 1986), Fig.260).
on the wall to protect the interior from rain by means of the overhanging eave of the roof, but are also relatively small in size and taper towards the exterior (Fig.80). The width of some of these windows decreases substantially, between 20 and 30 centimeters, towards the outside of the house, suggesting that this is an intentional design feature rather than an error in execution.

Given the absence of window glass and the high cost of wood for shutters, positioning windows as close as possible to the projecting eaves of the roof would have been a practical means of preventing the interior of the house from being affected by rain and other precipitation. Windows placed high up on the wall would have also allowed light and fresh air to enter and smoke to escape. A similar arrangement is employed in modern houses in hot, arid regions; here, narrow windows are positioned just below the roof of the house in order to allow less dense hot air to escape and therefore cool the interior. Windows above eye-level would have also prevented passersby from peering in; this would have established a relatively solid barrier between the interior of the house and the community beyond the front door. In contrast, windows on the interiors of houses seem to have been more common. These faced the open-air courtyard, thereby receiving air and light without the nuisance of being seen from the street outside. From what we can tell from the archaeological remains, these were not usually tapered, suggesting that the entry of cold winter winds was not a concern in this internal, though open-air, space.

Not all windows in houses were small in size. Some of the windows reconstructed for dining rooms, in particular, seem to have been composed of two large bays up to a meter tall. At

---

902 See Kokkinos, Παραδοσιακή Κατοικία, 114-115, Figs.198, 200.
904 Windows facing the interior (and courtyard) of the house are thought to have been more common than those facing the exterior. See L.Couve, “Fouilles à Délos,” BCH 19 (1895): 500.
Olynthus, a set of three small column capitals with cuttings that match likely belonged to a large double window;\(^{905}\) the one column capital would have sat atop the central mullion of the window separating the two bays, while the other two column capitals would have capped the pillars that served as the window jambs. In some of the houses in the Peiraeus, remnants of small architraves were found; these would have been supported by slender pillars, no doubt for sizeable double windows (Fig.81).\(^{906}\) At Priene, too, the remains of thin pillars with Doric capitals suggest that they were the jambs for windows with two bays,\(^{907}\) lending credence to this identification. Windows of this size would have admitted an ample amount of light and air, and this may have been imperative in the rooms for which much of the evidence exists, such as formal dining rooms. At Oraon, for example, the windows in the dining room of House 1 are larger than those in other rooms (Fig.82).\(^{908}\) Since formal dining usually took place in the late hours of the afternoon,\(^{909}\) it would have been crucial to attain a well-lit and comfortable environment for dinner guests. Though the evidence for windows of this size and sophistication is relatively rare, it demonstrates the need for achieving comfortable conditions, at least for entertaining guests, through the admission of light and air.

---

\(^{905}\) The two side capitals are almost identical to one another, though reversed, and suggest that they are a pair. The rear sides of the two end capitals were left rough and without a profile, suggesting that they would not have been seen from the rear; these would have served as the window jambs. The middle capital was cut on both sides and would have served as the central mullion of the two-bay window (D.M. Robinson, *Excavations at Olynthus, II: Architecture and Sculpture* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1930), 93-94, Figs.220, 221).

\(^{906}\) See Hoepfner and Schwandner, *Haus*, 106, Fig.84 (Olynthus), and 42, Fig.34 (Piraeus). Such sophisticated windows have been reconstructed for public buildings in Athens, like the Parthenon (M. Korres, “Der Pronaos und die Fenster des Parthenon,” in *Pathenon-Kongress Basel I* (Mainz: Philipp von Zabern, 1984), 47-54, Fig.1) and perhaps also the Pinakotheke (J. Travlos, *Pictorial Dictionary of Ancient Athens* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1971), 482, Fig.618).

\(^{907}\) Hoepfner and Schwandner, *Haus*, 42.

\(^{908}\) These are roughly square in shape and measure 0.65 by 0.6 m. (Dakaris, “To ʿOppaov,” 121-122, Pl.38b).

\(^{909}\) The term “formal dining” is here employed in order to avoid the aristocratic connotations of the “symposium.” Aristophanes (*Wasps* 1208-1215) suggests that lower-class Athenians did not attend symposia. See further, K.M. Lynch, “More Thoughts on the Space of the Symposium,” in *Building Communities: House, Settlement and Society in the Aegean and Beyond*, ed. R. Westgate, N. Fisher and J. Whitley (London: BSA, 2007), 243-249.
Generally speaking, however, openings like windows and doors were usually few in number and diminutive in size. This feature may reveal a concern for physical security; law court speeches suggest that the fear of burglary or intrusion into the house was a cause for anxiety. Athenians seem to have been extremely concerned about the breaching of the home’s boundaries, an anxiety which likely arose from the real vulnerability of home, family and property in a world without a police force in the modern sense of the word. Testimony to the Athenian public’s anxieties about home invasion is found in the way litigants exploit their audience’s concerns, accusing their opponents of breaking down the doors of homes and bursting in on the family within. Maintaining privacy from curious passersby was perhaps a more frequent menace. In a densely populated city like Athens, where citizen and slave were sometimes indistinguishable from one another, and where foreigners thronged the streets, it may have been quite reasonable to do so.

4.16 Courtyards: An Interior Exterior Space

Athenian houses, as well as those elsewhere in Greece, revolved both physically and socially around the axis of the courtyard because houses had few windows and depended on the

---

911 For instance, Lys. 3.6, 12.10; Dem. 21.78, 47.52-54; Aeschin. 1.59. The streets themselves could also be dangerous: Plut. *Per.* 5.2-3; Aristoph. *Wasps* 1396-1408.
912 This is what Pseudo-Xenophon (*Athen. Pol.* 1.10-12) tells us at least. On the basis of law court speeches (e.g. Lysias 23; Aeschin. 1.54-64; Dem. 59, 47.61) scholars have argued that there was a general blurring of identities (K. Vlassopoulous, “Slavery, Freedom and Citizenship in Classical Athens: Beyond a Legalistic Approach,” *European Review of History* 16 (2009): 348-360).
913 For the impression that Athenians were not all familiar with one another, see Thuc. 8.66; Isoc. 15.172. The great attraction of Athens for the foreigner seems to have been the economic opportunities which it provided, since political and social privileges were few (R.K. Sinclair, *Democracy and Participation in Athens* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 28-34). Slaves and metics not only exercised the same professions as the lower classes of citizens, but they also lived in the same areas (H.Klees, *Sklaveleben im klassischen Griechenland* (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1998), 64-74; B.A. Ault, “Housing the Poor and Homeless in Ancient Greece,” in *Ancient Greek Houses and Households*, ed. B.A. Ault and L.C. Nevett (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2005), 140-159).
Courtyards, in fact, are a part of traditional vernacular architecture in the Mediterranean region even today, and are viewed as an environmentally responsive building form for warm, dry climates. The courtyard did not merely provide the house with an open yet sheltered space, but protected against the wind, mitigated the effects of solar excess, and exploited natural cooling strategies to maintain comfortable conditions within the house.

The large surface area of the court is heated directly by the sun during the day and produces warm air (Fig.83); as evening advances, a cool breeze enters the court that pushes the less dense warm air upwards in a process of convection. The air in the court is thereby replaced by the cooler evening air and will seep into the surrounding rooms. In the morning, the courtyard will warm up slowly and remain cool until late in the day when the sun begins to shine directly into it. In this way, the courtyard serves as a “reservoir of coolness” by re-radiating heat to the sky and thereby limiting temperature stress, even in extreme conditions. The mud-brick walls of the rooms surrounding the court also contribute to this moderating effect; mud-brick is the most non-conductive building material known, so that heat is transferred relatively slowly through it, thereby minimizing temperature fluctuation within the house (Fig.84).

---


917 Though this will be discussed in detail later, see P. Oliver, “Earth as a Building Material Today,” OAJ 5 (1983): 34; J. L. von Blon, “Mansions of Mud: How California is Meeting the Housing Problem by Building in Adobe,”
As a consequence of the crucial role the courtyard played in Classical houses, few rooms communicated with one another because they were usually never more than one room away from the temperature-moderating courtyard. This made the court the primary artery of circulation within the house, not only in Attica, but also at other sites like Olynthus, Orraon and Halieis (Appendix 1.14-16). The entry of a stranger into a house, by and large, required passage through the court. A stranger, when trying to secure entry into a house, will be confronted by the inhabitants of the house in some sort of focused interaction, and if successful, he will advance from ‘stranger’ to ‘visitor’ status. Because the reception of a stranger requires focused interaction rather than brief contact, it will usually occur in a space that supports prolonged periods of interaction, usually called ‘social occasions’. According to Mark Grahame who has studied interaction potential, spaces that facilitate ‘social occasions’ are usually large, square spaces that are easily accessible from many other areas of the house (Fig. 74). The space closest to the entrance of the house that could provide for such interaction is, generally speaking, the courtyard, a large, square area from which most rooms were approached. Such a space promoted circulation and social interaction so that this was probably the space within which strangers were received and therefore played a key role in movement patterns.

The open-air court was usually the largest single space of a house; on average, it occupied about 25% of the total usable area, as it did also at Orraon, Halieis and in many of the houses in the Piraeus, and was normally the primary locus for daily activities. It was an

---

918 For guidelines on calculating ‘interaction potential,’ see Grahame, Reading Space, 56–57, 63.  
919 For Orraon: Dakaris, “To Ὀρραῶ,” 121. For Halieis: Ault, Halieis II, 60. For the Piraeus: Hoepfner and Schwandner, Haus, 40, Fig. 20. More generally, on the size of the courtyard, see B. A. Ault “Die klassische Aule. Höfe und Freiraum,” in Geschichte des Wohnens I: 500 v. Chr.–500 n. Chr. Vorgeschichte – Frühgeschichte – Antike, ed. W. Hoepfner (Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 1999), 537. In some rural houses, the courtyard could take up more than 50% of the ground floor area, which is perhaps a result of a need for more outdoor work space for agricultural activities (Jones et. al., “Vari,” 366).
exterior, yet interior, space of the house, in which chores or socializing could take place outdoors, but simultaneously away from the gaze of others. The processing and storage of crops, food preparation, cooking, eating, washing and even craft production could have been carried out here, as we have already seen (Fig.20); the surfaces of courtyards, which were usually paved with water-resistant lime or cobblestones, were adapted to the many activities that took place there. The courtyard also seems to have been a reception space, acting as an open-air sitting area for the family; meals could also be prepared here by means of portable braziers (Fig.85) and enjoyed in an outdoor but private setting, as they are even today (Fig.86).

The constant penetration of this multi-functional space by strangers, however, would have likely disrupted the routines of daily life. The courtyard is usually the first major household space entered upon leaving the street so that it served as a gentle transition from the public sphere to the private realm. While the house itself stood as a private haven from the public world, it was marked by semi-public and private spaces. The court can be seen as the public space of the private house, the mediator between the more private spaces of the house and the external public world. The courtyard and its gate were the physical boundaries of the house and the private sphere of the oikos, a liminal area marking the transition from public to private;

violation of this boundary, it seems, could bring a public curse on the transgressor. For this reason, perhaps, courtyards seem to have been sometimes preceded by an entrance-corridor that would have controlled if and how strangers were admitted to the house, and were frequently surrounded by a tall screen wall that shielded, both visually and acoustically, the activities that took place in the house from the street (Fig.87).

Narrow entrances to the court (Fig.68) minimized views into the house from the street and beyond, and were often angled or staggered ("dog’s leg corridor") to direct views onto a blank wall, vestibule or hallway, but no further. Oftentimes, a house’s interior could only be seen from within, or at the transition point between the hallway and the courtyard beyond. This seems to have been a common feature of many houses, though not all, in a way that suggests that the typical courtyard house was meant to be seen from within rather than from without, as Gardner and Jevons quite correctly argued in 1895. Note, for example, the anecdote Thucydides provides about the town of Plataea; upon invasion by Theban forces the residents decided to take action by digging through the party walls of their houses (διορύσσοντες τοὺς κοινων τοίχους παρ’ ἀλλήλους) and meeting with one another without being seen in the streets (ὀπως μὴ διὰ τῶν ὀδῶν φανεροὶ ὤσιν ἱόντες).

---

926 Thuc. 2.3.3. In a similar vein, the Medieval houses on Chios had flat roofs for defensive purposes, whereby neighbors could access the adjacent roof because houses were connected (A.V.James and L.Kalisperis, “Use of House and Space: Public and Private Family Interaction on Chios, Greece,” in House Life: Space, Place and Family in Europe, ed. D.Birdwell-Pheasant and D.Lawrence-Zúñiga (Oxford: Berg, 1999), 210).
see into the houses, so that one gets the impression that the houses were inward-facing without windows giving visual access to the interior.

The family’s behavior also could have mediated between public and private. By means of open or closed doors or window shutters, the household could have indicated to passersby whether or not it desired company. In Plato’s *Symposium*, the door to the courtyard is left open for dinner guests who will soon be arriving,\textsuperscript{927} signifying that they are welcome to enter the home. Comparable modern examples come from traditional Greek communities as well. Houses address the street in a dynamic manner when families change the appearance of the house to reflect their own attitude towards visitors. Doors and shutters on windows, for example, can be indicators of the degree of openness of a family; open shutters or open doors will imply that the family is willing to entertain guests.\textsuperscript{928} Even the family’s own physical presence is telling. If the members of a household are sitting in the courtyard with the court gate open, as opposed to sitting in a more private area of the house, then this conveys to the passerby that the house is open to receiving guests.

With most rooms opening off the courtyard, it would have been difficult to hide activities occurring in the rooms adjoining it. If people were present in the courtyard, the adjoining rooms would be visible, unless of course the doors were closed and lamps were used for lighting. Since the courtyard was the largest supplier of air and light, but also perhaps fire and heat, this may not have been feasible most of the time, so that all household activities taking place in this area were on view. Courtyards, because they were open to the sky, would also increase the likelihood of

\textsuperscript{927} Plat. *Sym.* 714e.
\textsuperscript{928} The gate itself is another marker. In many communities, passersby will stop at the courtyard gate and lean over, waiting to be invited in (A.V.James and L.Kalisperis, “Use of House and Space: Public and Private Family Interaction on Chios, Greece,” in *House Life: Space, Place and Family in Europe*, ed. D.Birdwell-Pheasant and D.Lawrence-Zúñiga (Oxford: Berg, 1999), 212). Because the gates cannot usually be locked, they serve as a symbolic rather than a functional barrier to social interaction; they mark the transition between the house and the street.
people hearing and seeing their neighbors. Small, high windows helped to focus both sound and vision inwards. Adjacent houses with differing roof heights or differing numbers of floors would have provided opportunities for overlooking. Neighbors, if sitting on their balconies or terraces, or even just peering out their windows, could have seen and heard the activities that were occurring in the open courtyards of their neighbors. This suggests that the courtyard house was not as shut-off from the outside world as is often assumed. It is no coincidence that courtyards are usually on the most public side of the house, situated towards the main entrance from the street. Though the court is attached to the house, it is, in a way, outside it, serving to connect the house, both spatially and socially, to public life.

4.17 Family Privacy: Mediating between Public and Private

As we have witnessed, in densely populated areas with a severe circumscription of territory like Athens, house walls often abutted streets, or jutted out into the road, creating a continuum rather than a sharp division between exterior and interior; it may be said that extending the house into the street even encouraged socializing. Sometimes, there is evidence for balconies overlooking busy thoroughfares. Southwest of the Agora, for example, one 5th century B.C. house had a row of stone bases, perhaps for wooden pillars, which were set just

---

929 In the Middle East residents never consider adding a third storey to their courtyard houses so as not to intrude on their neighbors’ privacy (A.Bekleyen and N.Dalkılıç, “The Influence of Climate and Privacy on Indigenous Courtyard Houses in Diyarbakır, Turkey,” *Scientific Research and Essays* 6 (2011): 920).
930 In 4th century Athens, restrictions were placed on windows and balconies overlooking the street (Aristot. *Ath. Pol.* 50).
931 Even today, courtyards are generally positioned close to the main entrance (Du Boulay, *Village*, 11).
932 For example, the House of Simon at the edge of the Athenian Agora (Thompson, “House of Simon,” 234), and Houses C and D whose north corners encroached onto the Street of the Marble Workers (Thompson and Wycherley, *Agora*, Fig.41). In some Greeks towns walls are deliberately extended into the street and chairs are placed against them in order to stretch the private space of the home into the public arena (A.V.James and L.Kalisperis, “Use of House and Space: Public and Private Family Interaction on Chios, Greece,” in *House Life: Space, Place and Family in Europe*, ed. D.Birdwell-Pheasant and D.Lawrence-Zúñiga (Oxford: Berg, 1999), 213-216; R.Hirschon, “Essential Objects and the Sacred: Interior and Exterior Space in an Urban Greek Locality,” in *Women and Space: Ground Rules and Social Maps*, ed. S.Ardener (London: Croom Helm, 1979), 83-84).
outside the wall facing the street (Fig.88). The pillars likely supported a small second storey balcony, which would have been perched directly overtop the bustling street; people sitting on this balcony would have seen, but also would have been seen, by their neighbors and by anyone on the street below. This apparent emphasis in Athens on sociability may, in fact, have been a dictate of neighborhood life that could not be avoided; perhaps friendship with a neighbor, the person next door, was a desired relationship, since it could be a constant and convenient source of help and companionship.

The simple exterior façade, the directed view inward and the interior arrangement of houses may have been a deliberate attempt to ensure the privacy of the occupants, both male and female. The arrangement of rooms around the courtyard and the manipulation of interior views to create visual axes, shaped views from the street outside into the house. Wallace-Hadrill has claimed that the Greek house “is concerned with creating a world of privacy, of excluding the inquisitive passer by.” Rather than axially arranging rooms and symmetrically framing views, the typical Greek courtyard house tends to fragment one’s frame of vision and limits the extent of sight-lines by staggering movement spaces like corridors. From the street, household space was often shielded from strangers, but the open interior of the house gave both visual and aural access to neighbors, suggesting that household activities were not kept hidden from those who

---

933 This is House L in the Industrial District. The bases were only 1 meter from the wall, ruling out a street-level verandah (Young, “Industrial District,” 246-247, Fig.7). Other scenarios have been proposed, however, such as a narrow wooden staircase and landing, or a closed balcony window (Jones, “Attica,” 75). The house was built before the Great Drain was extended to this part of town, so that the balcony would have faced a wide thoroughfare, rather than a small alley running parallel to the drain’s route.

934 A similar arrangement is postulated for House A at Argilos, where activities occurring on the upper floor could be seen from the street below (A.Poulin, “La maison A du site d’Argilos, un exemple de l’architecture domestique en Grèce antique” (MA thesis, Université de Montréal, 2001), 76).

935 For a modern Greek village with a similar mentality of neighborhood friendship, see Du Boulay, Village, 217.

were intimates of the family, but rather from those who were just passing by, and, perhaps, peering in.

Privacy mechanisms can control interactions at the level of the family or community, but also at the level of the individual. Restricted household space and the immediate proximity of people to one another in crowded cities like Athens would have provided limited opportunity for personal privacy as we, today, understand it.\footnote{Scholars have argued how modern concepts of privacy – but also modern perceptions of offensive noises and smells – were likely very different in antiquity (E.-L.Schwander (“Handwerkerviertel in Gründungsstädten des 5. und 4. Jahrhunderts,” in Πρακτικά του ΧΙΙ Διεθνούς Συνεδρίου Κλασικής Αρχαιολογίας (Αθήνα, 4-10 Σεπτεμβρίου 1983), v.4 (Athens: Ypourgeio Politismou, 1988), 185).} Scholars have argued for the less private nature of ancient Greek lives in general; they emphasize familiarity between people in the community and how typically small houses would have offered few chances for solitude.\footnote{P.Gardner and F.B.Jevons, A Manual of Greek Antiquities (London: Charles Griffin and Co., 1895), 35; B.Moore, Privacy: Studies in Social and Cultural History (London: M.E.Sharpe, 1984), 165. For a modern parallel in rural Greece, see L.Sciama, “The Problem of Privacy in Mediterranean Anthropology,” in Women and Space: Ground Rules and Social Maps, ed. S.Ardener (Oxford: Croom Helm, 1981), 92-100.} The family may have had some semblance of privacy from the rest of the community, but the individual members of the family seem to have had little privacy of their own. In ancient houses, of course, there are some attempts at maintaining privacy inside the house, for example, through the internal division of space by means of partition walls or by the presence of unaligned doorways, though these devices do not come close to our concept of privacy.

The concept of privacy as a cultural universal has been studied by Alan Westin, who argues that privacy of the family is crucial in those societies where communal life makes solitude impossible.\footnote{A.Westin, “The Origins of Modern Claims to Privacy,” in Philosophical Dimensions to Privacy, ed. F.D.Schoeman (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), 60.} Put simply, the privacy of the family is fundamental to the well-being of a society that emphasizes community life. The communal nature of Athenian society might explain why the themes of loneliness and isolation are conspicuously absent in the surviving Classical

\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
  \item \footnote{Scholars have argued how modern concepts of privacy – but also modern perceptions of offensive noises and smells – were likely very different in antiquity (E.-L.Schwander (“Handwerkerviertel in Gründungsstädten des 5. und 4. Jahrhunderts,” in Πρακτικά του ΧΙΙ Διεθνούς Συνεδρίου Κλασικής Αρχαιολογίας (Αθήνα, 4-10 Σεπτεμβρίου 1983), v.4 (Athens: Ypourgeio Politismou, 1988), 185).}
  \item \footnote{A.Westin, “The Origins of Modern Claims to Privacy,” in Philosophical Dimensions to Privacy, ed. F.D.Schoeman (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), 60.}
\end{itemize}
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literature,\textsuperscript{940} and why physical privacy, in the modern sense of the word, may not have been a major concern in ancient Athens. In Athenian houses, the chances for providing separate chambers for all family members, as is usually the case today, must have been very small, thereby limiting the amount of personal space for each individual member of a household.

The privacy of the family at large from the watchful community, on the other hand, was something that was, on occasion, desired. This is illustrated by the inward-looking nature of the courtyard house, which exposes itself and its activities to its members and to its intimates, but which sometimes shuts itself off from the inquisitive stranger. In a densely populated city like Athens,\textsuperscript{941} where citizen and slave were indistinguishable from one another, foreigners thronged the streets, vendors sold their wares from shops in their homes, and houses projected onto busy thoroughfares, it may have been quite wise to do so. Despite the fact that the architectural remains of houses may at times reveal the precautions taken to ensure the spatial and visual opportunities for privacy of the urban home, such provisions are usually made with regard to the stranger looking in on the family unit, rather than with regard to neighbors and friends or between the inhabitants themselves.

\textsuperscript{940} Though, of course, this does not mean that these feelings did not exist.

\textsuperscript{941} Isokrates (15.172) calls Athens a ‘torrent’ (χειμαρροῦς) because of the multitude of people living there and because of the lack of sharp boundaries.
5.1 Looking for Gender in the Attic Countryside

Just as the conceptual distinction between public and private in Athens appears to have been relatively weak, so it seems to have been between town and country. In political status, there was no sharp divide between city (asty) and countryside (chora), so that the distinction between town-dwellers and countrymen was ill-defined and ambiguous. According to Robin Osborne, there was no divide between the man who lived in town and the man who lived in the country, but rather there existed “a distinction based on behavior.”942 The Athenian countryman may have had the same political rights and obligations as the urban population and also a close relationship with the city by voting in the Assembly, buying and selling in the markets and taking part in festivals,943 but his social behavior was quite different from that of the urban dweller.

As we have seen, physical spaces, which are socially-constructed and a product of behaviors and activities, can convey social information. Dwellings are not merely locations or containers for activities, but rather spaces in which and through which certain kinds of social relations and identities are defined and emphasized through actions that draw on cultural beliefs about class, age, and, of course, gender. Through the physical cues and organization of domestic space, appropriate behaviors and interactions are reinforced. Our physical surroundings can be evaluated, for example, in terms of their accessibility, interaction potential, and communication, to ascertain the behaviors and activities that occurred in them. Study of the dynamic arena of the

house can also reveal how concepts of gender are negotiated and defined through physical space and how this is not necessarily the same in a rural context.

5.2 Town and Country: Athenians and the Urban Ideal

For the majority of citizens, a prominent role in the political life of Athens was facilitated by more or less permanent residence in the city. Pericles, for instance, had land in Cholargos, but resided in Athens.\textsuperscript{944} Themistocles, even though he was from a deme near Sounion, purchased a house in Athens so that he could live there permanently.\textsuperscript{945} Some of those who lived in Athens, however, seem to have owned farmland just outside of the city center; Euphiletus, the cuckolded husband we met earlier, owned a house in the city, but farmed his land in the country, traveling back and forth on an almost daily basis.\textsuperscript{946}

As for the wealthiest of these landowners, that is, those who may have lived in the city at a great distance from their rural properties, there is no doubt that they relied at least in part on slave-labor. Some chose to live on their farms, and enjoy the life that the countryside had to offer, like Isomachus, though even he traveled to the city regularly.\textsuperscript{947} Though a peasant farmer may have been more actively involved in local deme politics, his participation in the city’s affairs seems to have been quite frequent. This may be explained, at least in part, by the sharp seasonal fluctuations of agricultural labor that left the farmer underemployed at various times in the year,\textsuperscript{948} or, perhaps, by the close proximity of the farms to the city.

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{944} Thuc. 2.13. \\
\textsuperscript{945} Plut. Them. 1.1, 22.2. \\
\textsuperscript{946} Lys. 1.11, 1.12, 1.20. \\
\textsuperscript{947} Xen. Oec. 11.14. \\
\end{flushright}
The question of residence is one that has been debated for quite some time. Scholars have argued that the proper functioning of the democracy demanded that people live together in villages, but epigraphic evidence has revealed that plots of land were often purchased in isolation and also that two-thirds of boundary stones associated with such plots are from extramural areas of Attica. The epigraphic evidence suggests that house and land were often purchased together in rural areas, so that we may assume that many families lived permanently on farmstead residences instead of commuting back and forth from the city each day.

Corroborating this assessment of the evidence is the fact that obligations for membership in the citizen body did not usually require one’s physical presence in a deme center. How much time a landowner spent on his land would have depended on his other obligations and on his tastes; a man utterly unimpressed with the neighborhood in which his plot of land was located, for example, could decide to live elsewhere. Well-to-do owners may have owned a house in town and had the ability to permanently maintain a staff in the countryside. Isomachus, the wealthy landowner, on the other hand, chose to reside on his large rural estate; his farmstead was only a short horse-ride to the city, however, which is where he spent a considerable amount of his

---


952 The only occasions which demanded physical presence in a deme center were induction into a deme and participation in sortition for the Council (Aristot. *Constit. Ath.* 42.1, 62.3).

953 See, for example, Dem. 55.11 where a man leases land in the countryside but prefers to live in the city.
time. The evidence from literature generally presents a picture of a middling or upper class that has frequent dealings with the countryside.

The ancient testimony has revealed that more or less permanent residents of both town and country were in occasional contact with one another, with trips to the Assembly, seasonal visits to the market, and participation in festivals. The enforced confinement of the extramural population of Attica within the city’s walls, beginning with the first of the annual Peloponnesian invasions in 431 and continuing down to the mid-420’s, seems to have intensified relations between country and city dwellers. The sustained presence of the rural population of Attica in Athens, in fact, corresponds chronologically to the evolution of the subject matter in Attic comedy. It was with Aristophanes’ *Acharnians, Clouds* and *Peace* in the 420’s B.C. that the effects of this intense cultural interaction were first impressed upon the urban Athenian literary and artistic circles with new characters, caricatures, parodies and story lines. Some of this came in the form of the idealization of the rustic lifestyle, while a good quantity of it developed into a negative critique of rural life, in particular, an unkind characterization of country dwellers as boors.

Theophrastus’ *Characters*, for example, is a collection of sketches of persons with objectionable traits. Among these is the *Agroikos*, the rustic, which is useful for the light it sheds on the life of the country dweller and for the question of city-country interaction and residence. The sketch portrays a boorish farmer who walks to town to attend the Assembly.

---

956 Note, for instance, the character of Trygaios who recalls the vices of the city (*Aristoph. Peace* 190-191, 632-648) and praises rural life (*ibid.*, 569-581); but even he admits that he can’t find everything he needs on his farm, but which must be procured in the city (*ibid.*, 562-563, 999-1015).
958 The author assumes that the reader will be an urbanite. That his intent is a demeaning one can be surmised by the titles of other characters: *Stupidity* (14), *Surliness* (15), *Cowardice* (25), *Avarice* (30), etc.
While in the city, he wants to procure for himself salted fish that will keep until his next trip to the city, which implies that it might be some time before he returns. He lives on his farm with his dog and servants, but ventures into the city to partake in political activities, attend festivals, and purchase food and services from retailers. Our farmer not only possesses enough leisure time to do so, but also seems to be relatively prosperous; he owns several slaves who help him on his farm, and while in town he intends to spend quite a considerable amount of money on services and provisions.

Though the Theophrastan caricature of an unrefined or boorish farmer may be the product of an active urbane imagination,\textsuperscript{960} it also implies that farmers could go to town and return to their farm on a daily basis. This also finds support in the portrayals of some of the characters we have seen before, like Euphiletus, who lives in the city and travels to his farm each day, or Isomachus, who lives on his farmstead, but can easily get to the city on foot to attend to his affairs.\textsuperscript{961} The literary evidence suggests that city and country were interconnected, both politically and economically, but socially this may not have been the case. The social behavior of the country dweller in Attica, as well as the physical manifestation of this behavior in the organization of domestic space, may have been quite unlike that of the city dweller.

5.3 Small Towns in Attica: Halai Aixonides

The ancient sources demonstrate that the coastal areas between the city of Athens and the southern region of Sounion were comprised of a large number of demes; surface traces of settlements have corroborated this, even though excavation of Classical remains in this area has been sporadic. Vestiges of small rural settlements have been found widely distributed

\textsuperscript{960} Jones (\textit{Rural Athens}, 214) argues that this may leave the false impression that visits were more frequent than they actually were.
\textsuperscript{961} Lys. 1.11, 1.12, 1.20; Xen. \textit{Oec.} 11.14.
throughout Attica, though fully-excavated houses are few; this is primarily a result of incomplete excavations, since most work conducted in this area has been limited to surface survey. Ground surveys and rescue excavations have revealed some village houses and streets from this period, most notably at Ano Voula. The expansion of the modern suburbs of Athens down the coastal plain and the redevelopment of the land led to chance discovery, as well as to permanent loss, of many remains. Here, rutted roadways, house foundations, mosaic floors, hearths, cisterns and pottery sherds have been found, and are mainly of Classical or Hellenistic date. Reports published of fieldwork at Ano Voula have identified a substantial number of houses, many of which follow a canonical layout around a central courtyard.

The deme of Halai Aixonides, the modern town of Ano Voula in south Attica, is a center that has supplied us with material of the late 5th to mid-4th centuries B.C., though this is sometimes fragmentary. Rescue excavations have shown that the deme was made up of clusters of houses (Fig.89), perhaps owing to the vast network of roads in the area. Halai Aixonides seems to have supported its population by means of agriculture; aerial photography has identified extensive terracing for farming in the area, and there is evidence for many different types of agricultural activities, for example, apiculture and viticulture. The deme of Halai was probably not a very wealthy one, since it lacked any real profit-making industry, though this does not mean that it was not an important deme. It may, in fact, be a prime example of what a

---

963 Though Archaic and Roman material has also been found, demonstrating continuity in occupation.
965 See Andreou, “Αἰγίνιον Αλών,” 191 n.21. About 70 houses have come to light in Voula, as opposed to only about 7 in nearby Glyfada.
966 Ibid., 195.
967 Ibid., 207.
968 The clearest evidence for industry in the Halai Aixonides area is associated with pottery production; at least three pottery workshops have been located (Andreou, “Αἰγίνιον Αλών,” 207). This may be contrasted to the situation in Thorikos where there was heavy industry associated with the silver mines at Laurion (Jones, “Attica,” 63).
typical deme looked like; because it subsisted on agriculture, the community must have been made up of small farmers who resided permanently on the land.

Since investigation of the area has been limited primarily to rescue excavations, one of the few buildings that has been fully excavated is a house on the Papacharalambous plot that dates from the late 5th to the mid-4th century B.C. (Fig.90; Appendix 1.8). The house is rectangular in shape, and follows the canonical layout for a courtyard house with four rooms opening off of a central rectangular court on the south; later, a few more partitions were added. In size, it was quite small originally, at about 95 square meters, though it was enlarged in a later phase to about 122 square meters. The house, in each successive phase, progressively encroaches onto the adjacent street, with the result that the lines between public and private are blurred. The house was also quite accessible from the outside, with two entrances (Appendix 1.8). It was accessed from the main road by a door on its south façade, but also from a second entrance in the back on its north façade, which gave access to a little alley and an adjacent house. Though the two entrances were situated at opposite ends of the house, they both led to the central courtyard from which all of the rooms of the house were accessed.

The two main house doors were roughly aligned with one another, permitting a maximum amount of light to penetrate. The alignment of the doors also suggests an openness not generally seen in the urban areas we discussed in previous sections. Many of the houses in the larger urban areas occasionally had off-set doorways and long corridors, which would block sight-lines from the outside, and suggest that an effort was made to uphold the privacy of the household. At


The Kalampokas plot has provided us with more examples, though the remains are often fragmentary. In the north-east sector of the plot canonical courtyard houses have been identified (ibid., 196, Fig.7; W.Hoepfner, “Athen und Attika,” in Geschicchte des Wohnens I, ed. W.Hoepfner (Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlands-Anstalt, 1999), 253-256. See also the houses on the Kalounenos plot (E.Tsivarakos, “Ανασκαφή εις Άνω Βούλαν,” AD 24 (1969): 89-90), a house on the Nenka plot (A.Liankouras, “Οδός Δραγαστανίου,” AD 29 (1973-74): 60-61), and portions of several structures from the Logothetis plot (A.Kyriazopoulou, “Βούλα – Άνω Βούλα,” AD 40 (1985): 54-62).
Halai, in contrast, the doorways lead from the streets and houses outside to the interior courtyard of the house, from which all the rooms of the house could be accessed. This implies that the houses here were not greatly concerned with protecting the household from visual or physical interaction with neighbors or passersby; in fact, the rear doorway of the house faces the front façade of the neighboring house on the block, suggesting a sociable and neighborly way of life.

Though cisterns, bathroom facilities and workshops have been identified in the remains of houses, there is no secure evidence for specialized dining rooms.\(^972\) There is also an apparent absence of decorative features such as colonnaded courtyards, mosaic floors and painted walls, even though the houses are of reasonable size and date to a time when such features become more common. The lack of embellishment may not be a reflection of poverty, however. For instance, foundations for large round towers have been identified at Halai (Fig.89), as they have at other sites in Attica and elsewhere.\(^973\) The towers are often connected with a house, but also with agricultural facilities like threshing floors, as is the case with the Princess Tower and the Cliff Tower in the Agrileza Valley just north of Sounion,\(^974\) lending support to the theory that the towers were connected with farming (Fig.91). It is believed that the towers served as workrooms or storerooms, and would have been several storeys high, jutting out from the landscape. The towers were, perhaps, explicit statements of relative wealth, though the lack of domestic embellishment reflects the simple lifestyle of the people.

With doors giving access both to the main thoroughfares of the area and between houses adjacent to one another, the dème of Halai Aixonides gives the impression of being an open

\(^{972}\) W.Hoepfner reconstructs androns in three of the four houses though this is not based on architectural evidence ("Athen und Attika," in Gechichte des Wohnens I, ed. W.Hoepfner (Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlands-Anstalt, 1999), 253-256).


\(^{974}\) Jones, “Attica,” 117-119, Fig.18.
community, without fear of suspicious passersby or nosy neighbors. Given the relatively easy manner in which domestic space is accessed by the outside world, relations between households must have been quite extensive at Halai, and this may have something to do with its suburban character.

5.4 Industrial Towns: Thorikos

While Halai is a prime example of a simple farming community, the most extensive evidence for a rural settlement comes from a single deme center, Thorikos in southeast Attica, where the excavated material includes residential complexes of the 5th and 4th centuries B.C. Unlike Halai Aixonides, which had an agricultural character, Thorikos was characterized by heavy industry. Several of the houses excavated here seem to have served an industrial and/or commercial function, in addition to being places of residence (Fig.92). This combination of residence and industry finds parallels in Athens and at Olynthus, which were already discussed. At Thorikos, however, the domestic quarters are often combined with facilities for processing silver ore, such as washeries, since silver was mined in the immediate vicinity. The scale of industry at Thorikos far exceeds that of the small businesses that were operated by the residents of Athens from their own homes, so that Thorikos and the city of Athens are not directly comparable.

976 See H.Mussche, Thorikos I (Gent: Comité des fouilles belges en Grèce, 1963), 97-104; id., Thorikos II (Gent: Comité des fouilles belges en Grèce, 1964), 48-62; id., Thorikos III (Gent: Comité des fouilles belges en Grèce, 1965), 57-60; id., Thorikos IX (Gent: Comité des fouilles belges en Grèce, 1977/82), 38.
977 The expansion and decline of Thorikos seems to have been directly related to local silver-mining (Hdt. 7.144), which also affected the economy of Athens (Jones, “Attica,” 63).
We have seen that town and country houses alike were built of the same materials and how Attica was by and large a region of mud-brick, tile-roofed houses. One can cite the speeches of Demosthenes that emphasize that the houses of the rich in Athens were indistinguishable from those of the poor.\footnote{Dem. 3.25-26, 13.29, 23.207. See also, Ps.Xen. \textit{Ath. Pol.} 1.10-12.} On the other hand, the important role played by mining and processing of silver ore raises the possibility that Thorikos may not have been a typical example of an Attic settlement, if there is such a thing. For example, Thorikos may have had a large resident slave population and this could have affected the material culture of the area;\footnote{I.Morris, “Remaining Invisible: The Archaeology of the Excluded in Classical Athens,” in \textit{Women and Slaves in Greco-Roman Culture}, ed. S.Murnaghan and S.R.Joshel (London: Routledge, 1998), 197-211.} this may have resulted in accommodations that lacked the amenities expected by citizen or metic families at other sites.

The arrangement of space, of course, is what inhibits or promotes such interactions. The spatial patterns in the houses at Thorikos can be ascertained from the archaeological remains; in this way we can determine what, if any, discrepancies were present in the social relations of the inhabitants there.

The houses at Thorikos retain the basic layout seen in the single-entrance, courtyard houses, that is, they have an open courtyard with rooms arranged around it. There are some fundamental differences, however, with the way space is organized in the houses at Thorikos. The courtyard, though it is always present, seems to play a somewhat different, less dominant role than is the case in the single-entrance courtyard houses at other sites. For instance, many of the rooms were entered sequentially or as suites, rather than individually from the courtyard or portico of the house (Appendix 1.9, 1.10). In other words, the courtyard did not control access to all of the rooms. This is the case, for example, with House 1 in the Industrial Quarter, the Tower

Compound in Insula 3, as well as Houses 3 (Fig.93a; Appendix 1.9) and 4 in Insula 3 (Fig.93b; Appendix 1.10). This arrangement would have impeded any attempt to monitor activity from a single location, both in different parts of the house and movement between different rooms. On the other hand, that rooms were accessed sequentially suggests added control to the inner areas of the house, and perhaps, the most private family spaces; this could be a result of the industrial character of many of the districts, which may have required separate spaces for family, workers, slaves, etc. As a parallel, the shops identified in Athens and at Olynthus, for example, have separate street doors, and do not usually connect with the main living areas of the houses. Such mechanisms could point to an attempt to keep the frequent interactions between workers or clients at arm’s length from the living spaces of the family, but not necessarily from women specifically, for which there is no positive evidence.

Multiple street doors in several of the houses at Thorikos, such as House 1 in the Industrial District and the Tower Compound in Insula 3, contribute to the overall impression of subdivided domestic space. House 1, for instance, was built on a terrace so that the two house doors, in fact, gave access not only to different areas of the house, but also to different levels (Fig.94). The door on the north side gave access to the rooms on ground level and on the upper floor by means of a staircase, while the door on the south side gave access to the courtyard of the

---


982 There was no evidence of industrial activities in Insula 3, however (P.Spietaels, *Thorikos VII* (Gent: Comité des fouilles belges en Grèce, 1977/82), 42).

983 For House 1, see H.Mussche, *Thorikos I* (Gent: Comité des fouilles belges en Grèce, 1963), 87-97; id., *Thorikos V* (Gent: Comité des fouilles belges en Grèce, 1968), 103. For the Tower Compound, see H.Mussche, *Thorikos III* (Gent: Comité des fouilles belges en Grèce, 1965), 60-71; id., *Thorikos IV* (Gent: Comité des fouilles belges en Grèce, 1966/67), 121-130. For the plans, see L.C.Nevett, “Between Urban and Rural: House-Form and Social Relations in Attic Villages and Deme Centers,” in *Ancient Greek Houses and Households*, ed. B.A.Ault and L.C.Nevett (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2005), Fig.6.1d, f, g.
house by way of a corridor. In this way, there would have been limited potential for controlling contact between certain parts of the house from a central location, enabling members of the household to come and go relatively easily from two different directions.

When entering House 1 from either of its two doorways, visual and spatial access to all of the rooms is not possible. In contrast, houses that have a central courtyard from which all rooms are accessed, do permit extensive views into the interior. Organizing space in a hierarchical manner based on floor level as in House 1 would have signaled to anyone entering the house that the further one moved into the house or higher up, the more private the area. The industrial character of the area may explain the arrangement of space. The household may have been obligated to facilitate interactions with the outside, i.e. with workers, slaves, etc., but at the same time wanted to protect the family and its daily activities from potentially awkward or threatening interactions with outsiders.

The industrial nature of many of the houses at Thorikos is reflected in the extent to which decoration is employed as well. Though the houses of the Classical period are sparsely decorated, generally speaking, by the beginning of the 4th century B.C. larger houses sometimes feature columned courtyards, painted walls and mosaic floors. At Thorikos, there are no columnar courtyards and no mosaic floors, even by the 4th century when they are almost universal for the dining rooms of houses, if these were present. In one house at Thorikos, the excavators have identified a dining room, but this is founded only on the presence of painted

---

984 H.Mussche, *Thorikos II* (Gent: Comité des fouilles belges en Grèce, 1963), 90. The corridor measured 2.66 meters.
985 *Ibid.*, 88-90, Figs. 104-105. The terracing contributes to the overall hierarchical arrangement of space in the house. Anyone entering the door on the higher north side of the house would have been able to reach most rooms fairly easily, because there were staircases leading both up (perhaps to bedrooms) and down to the courtyard. On the lower south side, on the other hand, the house was accessed by means of a corridor that led to the small courtyard (Jones, “Attica,” 123-126, Fig.20).
wall-plaster;\textsuperscript{987} typical features of dining rooms elsewhere, such as a raised border for the placement of couches, an off-center doorway and mosaic floor, are lacking in this house.

In general, Thorikos is not characterized by comfortable or lavish dwellings, nor, for that matter, by specialized spaces for dining or other activities, though this does not imply in any way that the area was destitute. Instead, the settlement is set apart by the presence of industrial amenities and storage facilities. Large, stone-built towers placed within enclosure walls of estates attest to a desire for security of goods and perhaps also people, as well as to the wealth of the area.\textsuperscript{988} The houses, however, are not provided with comfortable or embellished living areas like specialized dining rooms, which were employed for the formal reception of guests. Individual household space seems to have been used in a flexible manner, as is indicated by the large size of the rooms and their small number; space must have been multi-functional. In general, the houses at Thorikos lack the architectural and aesthetic features of houses seen elsewhere, like the dining rooms witnessed frequently at Olynthus and in a few cases at Athens,\textsuperscript{989} that would imply a public or social awareness that was dependent upon a particular arrangement of domestic space.

The spatial syntax of the houses at Thorikos suggests that they were relatively open to interaction with the wider community (Appendix 1.9, 1.10). Some houses, for instance, have

\textsuperscript{987} H.F.Mussche, J.Bingen and T.Hackens, “Thorikos 1963: Rapport Préliminaire su la Première Campagne de Fouilles,” \textit{L’Antiquité Classique} 34 (1965): 31, 33. In fact, the room identified as a dining room demonstrates a further peculiarity in that it has two doorways.

\textsuperscript{988} Demosthenes (47.56) relates how a tower (πύργος) on an estate had protected both household objects and female slaves from harm during an incursion. For the Tower Compound at Thorikos, see H.Mussche, \textit{Thorikos} III (Gent: Comité des fouilles belges en Grèce, 1965), 60-71; id., \textit{Thorikos} IV (Gent: Comité des fouilles belges en Grèce, 1966/67), 121-130; id., \textit{Thorikos} IX (Gent: Comité des fouilles belges en Grèce, 1977/82), 12-62; P.Spielaerts, \textit{Thorikos} VII (Gent: Comité des fouilles belges en Grèce, 1970/71), 39-110. The large towers scattered over the landscape are not limited to mining areas, however; they are found more widely in Attica and elsewhere, so that their use should not be restricted to activities related to mining (J.H.Young, “Studies in South Attica: Country Estates at Sounion,” \textit{Hesperia} 25 (1956): 122-146; H.Lohmann, “Das Kastro von H.Giorgos (Ereneia),” \textit{Marburger Winckelmannprogramm} (1989): 64-65, n.160).

two doors, each giving access to one half of the house; a similar layout was demonstrated with houses that were adjoined by workshops or stores elsewhere. This arrangement would have increased access to the interior of the house by enabling members of the household to come and go relatively easily. At the same time, two points of access to opposite ends of the house from the street would have helped to divide domestic space into two areas, perhaps more public and more private spaces.

Supporting this reading is the role the courtyard plays in the houses. At Thorikos, the courtyard serves a less crucial function in controlling patterns of movement. In contrast to the courtyard houses that were discussed earlier, even those with two entrances, the rooms in the houses at Thorikos are not arranged around the court and accessed directly from it, but instead, are accessed one from the other in a hierarchical arrangement. In other words, the courtyard does not control access equally to all of the rooms in the house, suggesting a hierarchy in levels of privacy. The sequential arrangement of the rooms in the houses promotes segregation between inhabitants and strangers, but also privacy within the house, especially for the innermost regions.

The division of the house into more public and more private areas by means of two house doors, together with less centralized control from the court and the sequential arrangement of rooms, demonstrates a desire for separating certain areas of the house from others. The industrial activities of the area and the direct involvement of the inhabitants of the settlement in these activities may have meant that domestic space was constantly being encroached upon by people and goings-on that were related to such enterprises. The constant menace of industrial and commercial activities impinging on the daily activities of the household may have been quite real; the layout of the houses at Thorikos may reflect a concern for safeguarding the family unit.
from the potentially threatening world outside. It may have been necessary to divide space in the house in this way in order to protect the family from disagreeable people or unpleasant circumstances, as well as to shelter the family’s private activities from the eyes of those outside.

The number of residential buildings known from Attic deme settlements is limited at present, and it is difficult to know for certain whether or not, and to what extent, the houses currently known are likely to be representative of the majority of deme houses. With the exception of Thorikos, the picture that is formed is one of contrast with the houses found in the city of Athens. This may well suggest that there were corresponding differences in the social lives of households in the two types of settlement.\textsuperscript{990} If the measures sometimes taken in Athens to control access to the house by means of narrow or angled corridors are indicative of a concern for household privacy, then the relative lack of such devices in the deme houses, especially those at Halai, may indicate a corresponding lack of such concerns, or, perhaps a different method of doing so that has left no trace.

The absence of specialized rooms for dining and embellishment of any kind, even in large houses, suggests also that the deme house may not have served as the location for formal entertainment of visitors. This is in contrast to some of the urban houses already discussed that had ample amounts of fine ware pottery, and in a few cases, specific rooms set out for dining, though these rooms could have been employed for other purposes as well. The inhabitants of smaller communities may have been more closely acquainted, so that such formal dining was considered unnecessary, but this does not mean that the entertainment of guests did not take

\textsuperscript{990} The presence of entertaining facilities, along with their size and appearance, can say something about the importance of entertaining for the household, and perhaps also for its social status (K.Lynch, “More Thoughts on the Space of the Symposium,” in \textit{Building Communities: House, Settlement and Society in the Aegean and Beyond}, ed. R.Westgate, N.Fisher and J.Whitley (London: BSA, 2007), 246-249). A host could derive much prestige from receiving guests; the more visitors and the larger the distance they traveled, the more prestige the host acquired (A.Çevik, “Social Meanings of Household Spaces,” \textit{Archaeological Dialogues} 2 (1995): 47-48).
place. In a small community, there may have been less incentive to make an impression on a
visitor by creating ostentatious surroundings; perhaps it was even avoided for reasons of
modesty. As we noted earlier, however, most houses in Athens did not have a formal dining
room, yet they yielded large amounts of finely painted pottery, suggesting that dining did take
place despite the lack of specialized rooms for such purposes. Since furniture was portable
and easily arranged to accommodate such activities, we must not rule out formal dining simply
because dining rooms have not been located.

In general, the houses in the demes demonstrate a conspicuous lack of embellishment, but
poverty should not be viewed as the reason for this; as we have seen, the presence of large
circular towers in the area imply storage of large quantities of agricultural produce or other
goods. Though specialized dining rooms are not present, this does not necessarily imply that the
reception of guests did not take place. The entertainment of visitors could have been a more
informal occasion, with furniture and furnishings adapted for the event; this may have been
especially true in a smaller deme environment where most people may have known each other.

The houses in the deme settlements are also generally more open in terms of access than
the urban houses in Athens and elsewhere that we have discussed; this suggests that in smaller
towns interactions with neighbors and the community at large must have been extensive and
frequent. The multiple doors in many of the houses corroborate this; these give direct access
from the central courtyard to the main thoroughfares, but also to the smaller alleys that ran in
front of neighboring houses. In this way then, houses in the same neighborhood were connected

991 As we noted earlier, however, the House of Simon did not have a formal dining room yet it yielded a very large
amount of fine ware pottery (Thompson and Wycherley, *Agora*, 174).
to one another spatially by doorways and alleys, contributing to the overall sociability between neighboring houses.

5.5 Isolated Rural Houses in Attica

Studies on the size and distribution of Attica’s population have suggested that for most of the 5th and 4th centuries B.C. more than two-thirds of Athenian citizens, like Isomachus himself, likely resided outside of the city proper. Though Attica was comprised of a conglomerate of settlements shaped into villages, some of which we have discussed, the landscape also appears to have consisted of isolated farmsteads in areas with dispersed populations. Though many Athenians must have lived in the rural and coastal villages that formed the core of many of the extra-urban deme centers, like Halai Aixonides, some Athenians seem to have resided on farmsteads that were situated at a distance from villages and towns, on what scholars call “isolated” sites.

The widespread use of intensive surface surveys has revealed that in certain periods there was a prevalence in the countryside for numerous, but relatively small, isolated sites. Aside from the few military, cultic and funerary sites that have been located, the isolated residential
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993 This may have been a dictate of neighborhood life; a neighbor could be a constant and convenient source of help and companionship. For a modern parallel in Greece, see J.Du Boulay, Portrait of a Greek Mountain Village (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1974), 217.
994 See Jones, Rural Athens, 41.
995 For example, E.Kirsten and A.Philipsson (Die griechischen Landschaften (Frankfurt: Klostermann, 1952), 1002) argued that isolated farmsteads were unknown in Attica, but this has proved to be false.
996 As we have noted, their position has been explained as a result of dependency on the staple industry of agriculture, with land sometimes located far from the nearest nucleated settlement so that commuting was not an option. See V.J.Rosivach, “The Distribution of Population in Attica,” GRBS 34 (1993): 391-407.
997 M.Jameson, “Class in the Ancient Greek Countryside,” in Structures Rurales et Sociétés Antiques (Actes du Colloque du Corfou (14-16 Mai 1992), ed. P.N.Doukelis and L.G.Mendon (Paris: Belles Lettres, 1994), 55. They show up as concentrations of pottery and tile fragments and sometimes as the remains of walls of buildings. It could be argued that an increase in the number of sites simply indicates a higher population in the area as a whole. If a nucleated center is no more than a 1.5 or 2 hours away, a rural building may only be a secondary or temporary residence of an inhabitant of a nearby town (R.Osborne, Classical Landscapes with Figures: The Ancient Greek City and its Countryside (London: G.Philip, 1987), 69-70).
sites are characterized by terraces, storage facilities and other evidence of agricultural activities. Many of these isolated sites would have likely employed an extensive system of farming, with field crops left fallow every two years; this would have required the farmer to spend more time on the estate and to provide ample storage facilities for agricultural produce. Some scholars have argued that large properties in relatively isolated areas suggest a willingness to exploit more remote and perhaps more marginal land, with wealthier Athenians owning instead a number of scattered parcels of land in order to minimize natural risks.

We should not necessarily imagine the farmers as peasants who were poised on the edge of economic disaster, however, since large estates on the outskirts could be quite lucrative. We are told, for instance, that an Athenian man possessed a very large plot of land that was located at a great distance from the city; it was an ἐξοχατία. He profited from his land mostly by selling timber, so that we may be quite sure that the land was not suitable for agriculture, perhaps
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999 An extensive system may be less productive per unit of land but more profitable to the owner because it was less labor intensive. An intensive system, on the other hand, would require less fallow time because of the mixture of field crops, vines, fruit trees and vegetable gardens, and is associated with more dense sites. It would be much more demanding in terms of labor however (B.H.Slicher van Bath, “The Yields of Different Crops (Mainly Cereals) in Relation to the Seed c.810-1820,” Acta Historiae Neerlandica 2 (1967): 60-65). See also M.Jameson, “Agriculture and Slavery in Classical Athens,” CJ 73 (1977/78): 122-145; P.Halstead, “Traditional and Ancient Rural Economy in Mediterranean Europe: plus ça change?” JHS 107 (1987): 77-87; J.F.Cherry, J.L.Davis and E.Mantzourani, eds., Landscape Archaeology as Long-Term History (Los Angeles: UCLA Institute of Archaeology, 1991), 462-465.

1000 R.Osborne, Demos: The Discovery of Classical Attica (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), 60-63. A typical property large enough to support a family of five is estimated to have been between 3.6 and 5.4 hectares in size (A.Cooper, “The Family Farm in Greece,” CJ 73 (1977-78): 162-175).


1002 Dem. 42.5. For another use of the word, see Aeschin. 1.97.
because it was mountainous or marginal, or both. Nonetheless, the landowner had acquired a great fortune from this isolated plot.

Generally speaking, of course, land close to a nucleated settlement would be more valuable to the owner; savings in time in commute, proximity to consumers if surplus is produced, as well as access to labor, fertilizer from houses, and even water, are just some of the advantages that close proximity to a city offered. To secure a good yield from land in a remote area, a farmer might have to invest much time and manpower constructing buildings, terraces and roads. The presence of such amenities can shed light on the residence patterns of the landowners. Whether the landowner lived on the land for part or all of the year, or not at all, can be demonstrated perhaps by the makeup and arrangement of the farmstead, as well as by its facilities and furnishings. The farmstead of a man who chose to live in the city while entrusting his land to a bailiff, for instance, might have a different character from the house of a man who lived there with his family. Such features can illustrate the differences between homes in rural environments and those in urban ones, and perhaps also the economic resources and social experience of the people who lived in those houses.

5.6 The Vari House

The remains of a farmhouse were discovered not a great distance from the modern town of Vari in southeast Attica on one of the southernmost ridges of the Hymettos range. Due to its topographical location, the excavators gave the house the name ‘Vari House.’ It lay in a relatively secluded position, being nearly 3 kilometers from the town of Vari, perhaps the ancient
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1005 Jones et. al., “Vari,” 356, Fig.1.
deme of Anagyrous, and 2 kilometers from the Vari-Koropi road (Fig.95; Appendix 1.11). The house was built at the southern tip of a long rocky spur, and was surrounded by a walled enclosure that extended to the edges of either side of it and down the slope, which is a feature common to other farmhouses as well.\footnote{For the enclosure wall around a farmhouse at Karystos on Euboea, see D.R.Keller and M.B.Wallace, “The Canadian Karystia Project: Two Classical Farmsteads,” \textit{EMC} 32 (1988): 154, Fig.4. Traces of terracing on the west slopes of the valley suggest an earlier tradition of cultivation near the Vari house (Jones et. al., “Vari,” 356).}

The pottery sherds found at the site represented the general range of table and domestic pottery of a single household, most of which dated to the main occupation period in the latter part of the 5\textsuperscript{th} century B.C.\footnote{The pottery from the Vari House belongs to a class that has not been very closely dated, so that exact dates cannot be assigned to the house’s construction and abandonment. The range of pottery, however, is comparable to that from the Dema House (Jones et. al., “Dema,” 88, 100). Also, no specific historical event can be used to give the house a specific chronological context (Jones et. al., “Vari,” 374).} A large quantity of the pottery from the Vari House, however, finds parallels in the Athenian Agora deposits that date from the middle to the end of the 4\textsuperscript{th} century B.C.\footnote{These include the Hedgehog Well, the Coroplast’s Dump (350-320 B.C.), and Group A pottery (340-310 B.C.). See D.B.Thompson, “Three Centuries of Hellenistic Terracottas, I, B and C,” \textit{Hesperia} 13 (1954): 72-75; id., “Three Centuries of Hellenistic Terracottas,” \textit{Hesperia} 11 (1952): 121 ff.; H.A.Thompson, “Two Centuries of Hellenistic Pottery,” \textit{Hesperia} 3 (1934): 311-480.} Though the finds suggest that the house was inhabited for more than one period, there was no evidence for a radical reconstruction of the basic form of the house.\footnote{Jones et. al., “Vari,” 360. There was some modification, but no succession of floors or fills or alternating levels of occupation/destruction. The remains as found point to one period of construction/occupation.} After its occupation, the house seems to have been partially dismantled or robbed, since there was nothing of value or utility left in the house. The scarcity of even roof tiles would suggest that the house was deliberately abandoned by its owner, who probably took away whatever was serviceable to him.\footnote{Ibid., 372, 418. Another possibility is that the house was dismantled by others before the damage caused by weather or vandals. Even the Laconian rain and cover tiles have mostly disappeared; these were likely salvaged and re-used. Among the finds were pot sherds, a few coins, and a spindlewhorl. Lysias (19.31) notes the disappearance of valuable materials from houses standing empty after being confiscated by the state. On transportable fixtures from houses in general, see Thuc. 2.14.1 and 2.17.1-3.}
Despite the fact that the Vari House has been viewed as a farmhouse, it contained no clear evidence of this in the form of wine presses, quern stones or crushing wheels, as at other sites like Olynthus and Halieis, to prove that the owner of the house was an active farmer. There is also no great complex of subsidiary buildings or facilities at Vari that could have been used to process or store crops or to house livestock. For example, at some sites in south Attica, Euboea and elsewhere, threshing floors are found in close proximity to farmhouses. Of course, the large quantity of a peculiar type of pottery that was found at Vari is telling. Large open-mouthed jars with interior ridges, rings and lids were unearthed here and together they have been identified as beehives. The large number of such vessels suggests that apiculture was practiced on a considerable scale here. Similar vessels have been found, for example, at Trachones and Sounion in Attica, and even in the Athenian Agora. Though beekeeping could have been practiced as a hobby to ensure the household’s supply or as a small profit-crop, the general isolation of the house in the countryside and its position in an enclave in the hills, suggest that this may have been the basis of the occupants’ livelihood.

1011 Farm equipment has been found at many sites, not just isolated farmsteads. Their discovery in towns indicates that town dwellers were involved in agriculture and this underlines the close connection between urban and rural. See Robinson and Graham, Olynthus VIII, 337-342, Pl.81-83; M.H.Jameson, “Excavations at Porto Cheli and Vicinity, Preliminary Report I: Halieis, 1962-1968,” Hesperia 38 (1969): 322-324, Pl.81.
1012 There is, however, a small annex and a large enclosure connected with the house.
1014 For the pottery, see Jones et. al., “Vari,” 397-414. For analysis of the pottery, see R.P.Evershed, S.N.Dudd, V.R.Anderson-Stojanovic and E.R.Gebhard, “New Chemical Evidence for the Use of Combed Ware Pottery Vessels as Beehives in Ancient Greece,” Journal of Archaeological Science 30 (2003): 4-9. For beehives in antiquity, see Aristot. HA 553a-554b, 623b-627b and GA 759a-761a; Varo, RR 3.16.15; Columella 9.6.1-2; Strab. 9.1.23; Pliny, NH 11.13.32; Paus. 1.32.1; Plut., Solon 23.6.
1016 Honey was the most potent sweetener and quite expensive, so producing honey for a household’s consumption would have been economical. Hanging a hive in the courtyard, as people do in other parts of the world today, would have been the most likely method used in cities. See S.I.Rotruff, “Urban Bees,” AJA 106 (2002): 297; G.Lüdorf, “Leitformen der attischen Gebrauchskeramik: Der Bienenkorb,” Boreas 21/22 (1998/99): 76-83; B.A.Sparkes and L.Talcott, The Athenian Agora XII: Black and Plain Pottery (Princeton: ASCSA, 1970), 217-218.
The Vari House, despite its isolated character, was carefully laid out on a site that required laborious leveling and terracing to obtain an even surface. It was built with stone foundations and a mud-brick superstructure, like most houses of this period, and followed a rectangular plan (Fig.96). It measured about 17.6 by 13.7 meters externally and 16.4 by 12.5 meters internally. In size, it is comparable, at about 241 square meters, with the larger urban houses in Athens, such as those built on the slopes of the Areopagus, but it is considerably smaller than even the most modest houses at Olynthus.

Though the mud-brick superstructure of the house has since collapsed and partially eroded away, the stone foundations were preserved. These display variation in thickness, with the exterior walls ranging between 0.6 and 0.8 meters in width, and the interior walls more widely varying between 0.3 meters at their narrowest (in the north side) and 0.8 meters at their widest (at the southwest side). A wall’s width decided its weight-bearing strength and the number of floors it could carry. There is no question about the capacity of the outer walls to carry an upper floor. They exceed by a good margin that thickness Vitruvius ruled to be strong enough for one upper floor, about 0.5 meters, and were more than capable of taking the extra weight and outward thrust of a second storey. It is probably no coincidence that the walls of the
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1017 Jones et. al., “Vari,” 360, Fig.3.
1018 Mud-brick requires no special equipment or more than a modest level of training and is virtually without cost since it can be obtained on or near the site of building. Mud construction is employed in the Middle East, India, N.Africa, S.Europe and even in the S.W.United States (P.Oliver, “Earth as a Building Material Today,” OAJ 5 (1983): 32, 35).
1019 There were some variations due to the bulkiness of the stonework, so that the walls measured 17.6 meters on the south side, 17.7 on the north, 13.7 on the west and 13.85 on the east. Though the house suffered some damage over time (due to digging and wartime disturbances), the main elements of the ground plan were preserved: the lower parts of the thick exterior walls, a pavement, three stone column bases, the earth floors of the rooms along the north and south (Jones et. al., “Vari,” 358-359, Fig.2).
1021 There is also variation in the height of the preserved remains (Jones et. al., “Vari,” 361).
1022 See Vitru. 2.8.17. Modern parallels show that mud-brick houses with an upper floor employ a thickness of about 0.7 meters for all exterior weight-bearing walls, though this thickness is unnecessary for only one upper floor (Robinson and Graham, Olynthus VIII, 227-228).
houses at Olynthus adopted this width uniformly, since many of the houses there preserved staircases and landings that confirmed the existence of an upper floor.\(^{1023}\)

The internal walls of the Vari House, however, may not have had the same capacity. The socles for the northern rooms, about 0.3 meters thick, fall significantly below Vitruvius’ safety limit of 0.5 meters. A concern for economy does not seem to have been the motivation here since lack of space or materials was not a limiting factor. According to the excavators, the walls were thinly-built because their main function was to divide space within the house.\(^{1024}\) Some walls in Olynthian houses, for instance, fall below the 0.4 to 0.5 meter norm, though these were only partitions. Modern experience has suggested, in fact, that the Vitruvian safety-limit was overly-cautious, since walls of even 0.3 meter thickness can support an upper floor. Analysis of mud-brick structures has shown, in fact, that they are much stronger than ordinarily supposed, so that extremely thick walls are unnecessary. Because mud is a compressive material, it can take a considerable amount of vertical pressure and additional weight in the form of extra floors.\(^{1025}\) Greek builders seem to have generally exceeded the modern safe minimum for wall thickness, suggesting that the thin interior partitions of the Vari House did not carry an upper floor.\(^{1026}\) The thickness of the exterior walls of the Vari House actually may have less to do with the structural safety of the house and more to do with temperature regulation and security.

In the southwest corner of the house is a room whose walls are 0.65 meters thick and 0.8 meters or more high, dwarfing the narrower and shorter socles of the northern rooms. These walls must have carried greater weight and height so that this room rose tower-like above the
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\(^{1023}\) Staircases are considered certain in at least 18 cases at Olynthus. The stairways did not lead to roofs since these were sloping and tiled, not flat. See Robinson and Graham, *Olynthus VIII*, 214-219, 267-280.

\(^{1024}\) Jones et. al., “Vari,” 439.

\(^{1025}\) Mud-bricks develop a compressive strength of 400 pounds to the square inch (J.L.von Blon, “Mansions of Mud: How California is Meeting the Housing Problem by Building in Adobe,” *Scientific American* 122 (1920): 232). Mud-brick is, however, susceptible to earthquake damage since earthquakes trigger movement in walls that can cause roofs to collapse (P.Oliver, “Earth as a Building Material Today,” *OAJ* 5 (1983): 31-32, 36, Fig.2).

\(^{1026}\) See Jones et. al., “Vari,” 440.
roofs of all the others. Many parallels can be found for towers in private houses, but also with towers associated with agriculture or mining, such as those in south Attica and on the island of Siphnos. That towers were not unfamiliar sights in Attica is confirmed by some ancient references and inscriptions that refer to towers as components of farmhouses; sometimes we are even explicitly told that the towers are used as a place of refuge in times of danger. The tower in the Vari House is clearly not an isolated feature or an accretion projecting from the main building, but an integral part of the house, which perhaps served to store agricultural produce or supplies for the household, and could be employed as a safe haven if this was required.

Thicker exterior walls would also be advantageous for the inhabitants in terms of temperature regulation. Mud-brick walls act as climate moderators because heat transfer through sun-dried mud is relatively slow; walls of this material can store heat and gradually release this heat to warm the interior. Temperature tests have established that mud-brick is one of the most non-conductive building materials, so that it can minimize temperature fluctuation within a building (Fig.84). Experimentation with mud-brick in southern California, for instance, has demonstrated that it registers no more than a 6° difference between extreme winter cold and extreme summer heat. Compared to concrete, which exhibits large fluctuations in indoor air temperature, mud-brick remains relatively constant even with extreme temperature changes.

1027 Ibid., 436.
1029 See Dem. 47.53-56; Luc. Timon 42; IG XI 2 287A.154-155, 164-169; IG XII 5 872.52. For modern parallels, see Jones et. al., “Vari,” Pl.81a-b.
1030 The tests were conducted in February and September, which show the greatest temperature variance. See further, J.L.von Blon, “Mansions of Mud: How California is Meeting the Housing Problem by Building in Adobe,” Scientific American 122 (1920): 218.
The rooms along the perimeter of the house would have been more exposed to the sun and elements than those in the interior of the house, which were shielded by the extensive system of porticoes, thereby requiring thicker mud-brick walls. Despite the shabby appearance of mud-brick, its function as a temperature regulator may perhaps explain the unnecessarily thick exterior walls in the Vari House.

In spite of its generous size, the Vari house proved to be quite simple in terms of embellishment. All the rooms in the house had earth floors, unlike the more sophisticated floors found in some of the houses in Athens and Olynthus, which were dressed with plaster and covered with mosaics or flagstones.\(^{1032}\) In the Vari House, with the exception of the courtyard, there was only a small patch of flagstone paving in a corner room, perhaps laid to facilitate cooking or washing.\(^{1033}\) In a rural house, earthen floors, as opposed to flagstone floors, not only had the advantage of not requiring great cost or energy to maintain, but they also would have been less difficult to work on and warmer to walk on. The flagstone in the exterior space of the courtyard is commonplace, as we have seen, because a paved floor would shed rain, dry quickly, and brush clean easily (Fig.97). A flagstone floor, in fact, would be far more durable than a floor covered with plaster or cobblestones,\(^{1034}\) and would seem like a sensible choice for a rural residence like the Vari house.

In plan, the Vari house had a rectangular shape, with a row of five equally-sized rooms along the north side opening to the south. The courtyard extended along the whole front of the


\(^{1033}\) Jones et. al., “Vari,” 430.

northern rooms and faced south, towards the main entrance of the house. The Vari House conforms to a plan in which its width is greater than its depth, allowing it to capitalize on the advantageous southern orientation that is common to many houses. At urban sites that had uniform city blocks, like at Olynthus, and those presumed for the Piraeus, houses were limited on all sides by streets and alleys and were forced to adhere to regular house plots, but at Vari and other rural sites in Attica, there were no limitations, so that a preference, it appears, for a wider frontage, could be satisfied.

Other than the paved courtyard, it is usually difficult to identify the function of the rooms of a house. This is a problem that has been raised on more than one occasion. The general uniformity of the rooms and the lack of household fixtures make it very difficult to identify whether or not these were designed and reserved for a specific purpose. Though there are several rooms in the Vari House, there are few discrepancies in size and shape, and also in the treatment of the floors and walls, that may have given clues as to their function. This could
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1036 Ibid., 420. The builder went to great lengths to adhere to this southern aspect; the house extended across a ridge and a massive substructure was constructed so as to permit the front of the house to face the south. It may have been more convenient to position the house lengthwise along the ridge and build floors at different levels to avoid extensive terracing into the slope, but this would have placed the house at a disadvantage with its end facing the south while its front faced east or west.
1037 The house illustrates the recommendations of ancient authors. A house that turned its back on the cold winds of the north and faced directly south to the midday sun trapped the maximum amount of warmth and light in the winter. See Xen. Mem. 3.8.8-9, Oec. 9.4; Aristot. Oec. 1.6.7-8; Aesch. PB 450-453; Eup. 378.
1038 For Olynthus, see Robinson and Graham, Olynthus VIII, 55, 63 ff., Pl.84-85. The Piraeus remains largely covered by modern structures and an orthogonal plan is not wholly confirmed for the site, but the evidence thus far attests to a regular plan (G.A.Steinhauser, M.G.Malikouti and B.Tsokopoulos, Παραδείγματα Κάστρων Ναυτικής και Πολιτισμού (Athens: Ephesus, 2000), 95-96) with house plots of about 228 square meters (V.K.Eickstedt, Beiträge zur Topographie des antiken Piräus (Athens: Archaeologike Etaireia, 1991), 99). Hoepfner and Schwandner (Haus, 38), however, argue for house plots of 241 square meters. A similar plan was established at Halieis, though here widening streets – especially near the southeast gate of the city where wheel ruts attest to much traffic in the area – seem to have caused some irregularity (AD 30 (1975): 64, 68).
1040 Robinson and Graham, Olynthus VIII, Pl.89, 94, 95, 97, 99. Five or more rooms are found only in the largest houses at Olynthus (ibid., Pl.95-96).
1041 The lack of differentiated size of the rooms may be a sign of the lack of specialized space in the Vari farmhouse, as also perhaps the lack of differentiation in wall and floor treatment. For a different situation at Olynthus, see Robinson and Graham, Olynthus VIII, 167-213, 281-282, 284-285, 291.
be a result of the house’s rural character, but it is also perhaps a reflection of the more general phenomenon seen in Athenian urban houses, which, for the most part, lack specialized spaces for particular activities.

From what we can tell architecturally, however, the room in the northwest corner of the house may have served as a kitchen, or at least as a place where cooking took place. It had a flagstone pavement in one corner, which would have cleaned easily, projecting compartments about 0.3 meters high, which may have acted as shelving or as seating,\textsuperscript{1042} and a small stone column, which may have originally supported some type of heating or cooking implement, such as a portable brazier.\textsuperscript{1043} In a room on the northeast side of the house, a low base, roughly rectangular in shape, was set alongside the west wall; the excavators thought it might be a hearth or a stand for a brazier, like those found in the houses at other sites,\textsuperscript{1044} though there were no traces of burning nor any deposit of ash. Another feature in this room was a bench or couch of earth and stones laid against the east wall. Based on parallels from other sites,\textsuperscript{1045} these were probably seats, the wider ones likely couches; with a width of 0.8 meters and a length of 3.4 meters, such a bench would have been able to accommodate at least two people. Together, the bench and the possible traces of a hearth, suggest that this room may have been utilized as a sitting room.

\textsuperscript{1042} Similar compartments/benches set against walls have been found in the Priest’s House at Vouliagmeni (F.D.Stavropoulos, “Ιερατική Όικία εν Ζωοστήρι της Αττικῆς,” \textit{AE} (1938): 12, 15-17, Fig.12, 15). For similar features in modern houses, see Kokkinos, \textit{Παραδοσιακή Κατοικία}, 128-129, where benches also act as compartments.

\textsuperscript{1043} Though the column does not date to the latest phase of the house (Jones et. al., “Vari,” 364), it sat on top of ashy soil, thereby corroborating this identification. Also, the room contained the largest number of pottery sherds in the whole house.

\textsuperscript{1044} Similar bases made of stones and terracotta are found at Olynthus (Robinson and Graham, \textit{Olynthus VIII}, 186-188, Pl.52, 97; D.M.Robinson, \textit{Excavations at Olynthus XII: Domestic and Public Architecture} (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1946), Pl.158, 160, 163) and in the Dema House (Jones et. al., “Vari,” 76, 78, 110).

The room situated in the corner of the northeast area of the house would have been the only room not accessed directly from the courtyard, but rather from a room to the east of the court; it would have enjoyed much more privacy than the other rooms of the house. A column base found just outside of this room, set oddly close to the wall, has some parallels from other sites. Column bases set in close proximity to a wall or door may have been used as fixtures for screens or partitions.\(^\text{1046}\) The two rooms adjacent to this room and to the east of the courtyard, were linked together by means of another long, low, L-shaped bench of earth and rubble; this bench may have served as a seat or a stand of some sort.\(^\text{1047}\) Such seats or narrow benches are not rare, and have been identified at other sites.\(^\text{1048}\) They are even common today in traditional Greek houses, which tend to be sparsely furnished; they serve as both seats (Fig.98a) and storage spaces (Fig.98b).\(^\text{1049}\) With the addition of a few cushions, the hard bench becomes a relatively comfortable couch, whether for sitting or sleeping; simplicity in terms of furnishings and adaptability, as we have seen, were advantageous because they helped conserve space in a house.

The courtyard was the largest, and perhaps the most important, space in the Vari House; it was T-shaped, with its broader northern part extending across the full width of the house along the front of the northern rooms. It measured 16.4 meters wide and 5.05 meters deep. The narrower, southern part was 9.2 meters wide and 3.7 meters deep. Out of the 205 square meters of the whole house’s area, the court comprised 117 square meters of this, that is, more than 50% of the whole surface area of the ground floor of the house.\(^\text{1050}\) The courtyard was differentiated very clearly from the rooms of the house by way of its flagstone paving, which stood out against
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\(^{1046}\) For example, at Draphe (BCH 81 (1957): 515, Fig.12) and Karellaes (Jones et. al., “Dema,” 102).

\(^{1047}\) Jones et. al., “Vari,” 436.


\(^{1049}\) See Kokkinos, Παραδοσιακή Κατοικία, 128-129, Figs.247-248.

\(^{1050}\) Jones et. al., “Vari,” 366.
the earthen floors of the other rooms. The only differentiation in the court was the sloping level
of the floor from the middle towards the southern side and entrance of the house.

Column bases within the court indicate that part of the area was covered with porticoes. Stone
column bases embedded in the pavement of the court, together with emplacements for
other bases, would have supported wooden shafts.\textsuperscript{1051} Their position suggested an arrangement
of two rows of columns: five columns along the north set 2.5 meters in front of the rooms and
two columns set between the south rooms.\textsuperscript{1052} Considering the number and placement of the
columns, it would appear that only about 25% of the total area of the courtyard was actually
unroofed, which translates to about 23 out of 98 square meters.\textsuperscript{1053} The roofed areas of the
courtyard would have permitted the inhabitants of the house to conduct chores or agricultural
activities in the spacious courtyard even in inclement weather, and attests to the importance of
the court and its porticoes as an area for work.

To the south of the paved court was the main entrance to the house; the door led directly
into the court, without any attempts at inhibiting sight-lines (Appendix 1.11). The door was 2.4
meters wide between the jambs,\textsuperscript{1054} and most likely had two panels; the width of the door would
have permitted two people to pass comfortably at any one time. Outside the house door, over a
raised walk or veranda, was a shed and a low enclosure wall that was perhaps used to hem in an
apiary garden.\textsuperscript{1055}

The Vari House has been reconstructed as a simple, schematic house, with rooms on the
north, all quite independent and opening to the two porches in the courtyard (Fig.99). It was

\textsuperscript{1051} The wooden shafts would have been placed in round sockets cut into the top of the bases.
\textsuperscript{1052} Jones et. al., “Vari,” 367.
\textsuperscript{1053} Compare this arrangement to the one at Olynthus, where the “pastas” adjoining the courtyard acts more like a
room than a portico; this may be a result of the cooler climate at Olynthus.
\textsuperscript{1054} A set of steps may have preceded the entrance (Jones et. al., “Vari,” 369).
\textsuperscript{1055} Several beehives were stacked horizontally here and held together with thick layers of mud, which would have
been good insulation from cold and heat for the bees (Jones et. al., “Vari,” 370, 443).
most likely a single-storey building, with the exception of the multi-storey tower in the southwest corner. The roof system could be restored as a gable roof in the northern half,\textsuperscript{1056} and as a one-pitch roof over the rest of the house, sloping inwards to the court.\textsuperscript{1057} Overhanging eaves would have most likely protected the white-washed mud-brick walls. A few small windows probably pierced the walls; though these windows have left no trace, the rooms in the northern part of the house would have been quite dark if they were dependent only on the light coming from the court through open doorways. The court was the largest single space in the Vari House, implying that social interaction took place here; that most of the court was roofed suggests that the area was crucial to the proper functioning of the house, even in inclement weather. The lack of specialized dining rooms or rooms with specific functions, attests to the adaptability of domestic space; the presence of possible bases on which to place portable braziers illustrates that cooking and other household activities could be carried out in more than one location. The built-in benches in the Vari House are one of the few fixtures that could be identified; these could have accommodated people for sitting or for sleep, depending on the time of day or needs of the household.

The impression one obtains from the plan and furnishings of the Vari House is one of simplicity; rooms are generally equal in size and lack characteristic details. Comparable examples of houses from other sites in Attica and elsewhere of the same period, as well as modern parallels, demonstrate that this was the general rule. Minimalism in terms of furnishings and furniture is fitting, of course, for a rural home, but this also saved space, permitting the household to perform its daily tasks without being constrained by room function. As we have already seen, spaces free of cumbersome furniture and fixtures could be used for a multitude of

\textsuperscript{1056} The longer fall of the gable roof would be over the rooms, while its shorter fall would be over the portico.
\textsuperscript{1057} The tower, which would have had its own gable or one-pitch roof, would be clear of these roofs (Jones et. al., “Vari,” 442, Fig.17).
purposes simply by re-arranging light and portable furniture like chairs and stools, or by equipping the furniture with cushions and coverlets. For a house that likely relied on agriculture or apiculture for its survival, it would be crucial to provide enough space, both inside and outside, to conduct such activities. At the same time, the Vari House was a residence, meaning that it also had to supply space for cooking, washing, sitting and sleeping; simplicity in furnishings appears to have been the answer for this rural house.

5.7 The Dema House

Another isolated residence is the Dema House. It is located beside a continuous defensive wall in northwestern Attica, almost 10 kilometers from the city of Athens (Fig.100; Appendix 1.12). Its name is derived from the name of this defensive wall, the Dema Wall, though it has other names. The remains of the Dema House, found just 13 meters from the wall, had been heavily disturbed by ploughing and erosion; at some point in its history, in fact, it was completely razed to the ground. Theft and salvaging must also be considered, since the house did not furnish many finds, as was the case with the Vari House.

1058 The Dema wall, which is about 4,360 meters long, closes the large gap between the Aigaleos and Parnes mountain range, and works as an artificial barrier. It is sometimes also referred to as the Aigaleos-Parnes wall or the Ano-Liosia wall because of its relation to the nearest modern village with that name. See J.E. Jones, “Τὸ Δέμα: A Survey of the Aigaleos-Parnes Wall,” BSA 52 (1957): 152-153).
1059 Ibid., 184-185. The house stood in front of the most strategically important part of the wall and this would have made it vulnerable at a point where strength was particularly demanded, so that the excavators argued that the wall was built after the house was abandoned. Had the wall existed when the house was built, the house would not have been placed in front of the wall, but behind it. In this way, we may rule out a defensive function for the house.
1060 Ibid., 161, 172. Its south side was especially damaged.
1061 This may be attributed to a later and partial reoccupation of the house after a long period of disuse (J.E. Jones, “A Country House in Attica,” Archaeology 16 (1963): 279). Compare the houses at Olynthus which were sacked, fired and abandoned, yet produced many finds (Robinson and Graham, Olynthus VIII, 344-354).
From the finds that we do have, a date for the occupation of the house has been pieced together. Fragments of pottery, as well as tiles, were found in and around the house; the pottery sherds were, for the most part, contemporary with one another, dating between the end of the 5th century and the beginning of the 4th century B.C. On the basis of the ceramic evidence, the excavators have argued that the Dema House was constructed in approximately 420 B.C., and suffered damages only shortly thereafter. The ceramic evidence, together with historical considerations, makes the period 420-410 B.C. the most likely for the occupation of the house.

The Dema House, despite its close proximity to the later defensive wall, appears to have been a private residence and a free-standing country-house. It was probably a farmhouse, but it is not so termed because no subsidiary structures or facilities directly connected with agriculture, like sheds, stables, olive presses and treading floors, were located. The Dema House measures about 22 by 16 meters overall and would have been an imposing residence in terms of its size at 352 square meters; it is substantially larger than the other farmhouse we have looked at, the Vari House, and is comparable, in fact, to some of the largest houses at Olynthus. Given the isolated nature of the site, there were no limits to size other than the resources of the

---

1062 See J.E. Jones, “Τὸ Δέμα: A Survey of the Aigaleos-Parnes Wall,” BSA 52 (1957): 184. About 30 sherds, some of which were part of the same vessel, were collected from within the house. Half of these were semi-glazed and the other half were fully glazed and of good quality.

1063 Ibid. J.E. Jones believes that the house was likely built during the Peace of Nicias (421-415 B.C.), and that it was devastated during the Declean War by the Spartans (413 B.C.). Placing the house to a time before 421 B.C. would be unlikely historically because of the route taken by the Spartan army when it invaded Attica (Thuc. 2.19.2, 2.13.2, 2.13.4). For the plundering even of wood and roof tiles, see W.G. Hardy, “The Hellenica Oxyrhynchia and the Devastation of Attica,” CP 21 (1926): 346-355.

1064 Jones et. al. “Dema,” 103. Several authors imply the existence of fine country houses: Thuc. 2.65.2; Isoc. 7.52; Xen. Oec. 9.2-9.7. On farmsteads in Attica in general, see Jones, Rural Athens.

1065 The dimensions of the Dema House are almost the same as those of the most pretentious houses at Olynthus, like the Villa of Good Fortune and the House of the Comedian – roughly 22 to 25 meters in length and 17 meters in depth) (Robinson and Graham, Olynthus VIII, 92). It also approximates the dimensions of the houses at Priene, which occupied plots of 23.6 by 17.7 meters, and measured internally about 22.2 by 16.2 meters (Jones et. al., “Dema,” 106 n.53). Jones has suggested that the dimensions of the Dema House, in fact, correspond to some idea of an optimum size for a comfortable and convenient residence (ibid., 106 n.54). He argues that “Hippodamian planning” in the 5th century B.C. introduced standardization, and that through the acceptance of convenient proportions, norms into planning in general. We find not only uniform house-plots in use at Olynthus but also some coincidences in the dimensions of house-blocks at Olynthus, Miletus and Priene.
owner, as opposed to the cities that had to cope with an existing overall plan, adjacent buildings and infrastructure.

The house was built on rubble foundations that were between 0.45 and 0.5 meters thick, both in the exterior and in the interior of the house, which would have supported mud-brick walls. Vertical striations on some large orthostates may have served to hold in place a form of stucco, as suggested by similar markings in Athenian town houses, though no trace remains of clay or plaster covering have been pinpointed. It is safe to assume, however, that the walls were lime-washed externally to make them weatherproof, a practice periodically adopted in Athens for public buildings. In construction, the Dema House resembles the houses in Athens by the Agora, in the Industrial Quarter and on the slopes of the Areopagus, though these are far more modest in size.

The floors of the house, despite the house’s impressive size, are made of packed earth. Mosaic, cobble and pavement were commonly used in larger houses at Olynthus and elsewhere, and even in a few rural sites in Attica cement and tile-mosaic are found. Earthen floors, however, were the most common type of flooring in Olynthus and elsewhere; at Athens, while cobblestone was sometimes used for the courtyard, earth floors are the only types of floors found in urban houses of the 5th century B.C. The large number of Corinthian tile fragments found

---

1066 The foundations were in some places preserved up to 0.5 meters. In the north-east corner of the courtyard, a thick deposit of red earth and sherds marked the disintegration of the mud-brick superstructure. See Jones et. al., “Dema,” 75; id., “Τὸ Δέμα: A Survey of the Aigaleos-Parnes Wall,” BSA 52 (1957): 172.
1068 For its use in Athens, see Dem. 3.29, 23.208. The Spartans seem to have employed this even for temporary siege-walls (Thuc. 3.20).
1069 For example, at Draphi (BCH 80 (1956): 246-248; BCH 81 (1957): 515-517; BCH 82 (1958): 681) and Karellas (PAAH (1919): 37). For Olynthus, see Robinson and Graham, Olynthus VIII, 158, 281 ff.
in the Dema House reinforces the impression of understated wealth. For reasons of economy, but also perhaps because of their greater weight, Corinthian tiles are far less common in houses than Laconian tiles. The large quantity of Corinthian tiles in the house highlights the wealth of the owner, though this is done in an inconspicuous way, since embellishments are few.

In plan, the Dema House is typical of its time with an open central courtyard around which rooms are arranged. The central court is the largest single element in the house, measuring 11.8 by 10 meters, and comprises one-third of the total area of the house. The north side of the court had a slightly higher floor level than the south, which is a feature that was witnessed in the Vari House as well; this may have been a means for rainwater to drain into the street or a special channel. Though no wells or cisterns were found in the courtyard of the house, there was some indication for a conduit running toward the house. A country house, however, might have its water-supply close by but not necessarily within its walls, since it was not restricted spatially. Unlike urban houses, which were constrained by adjacent houses or thoroughfares and were compelled to place wells and cisterns in their courtyards, rural houses could take the liberty of placing water receptacles in a more remote location so as to conserve the space of the house for other activities.

Adjoining the courtyard along its north side was a portico that measured 7.1 by 4.6 meters. Evidence of this comes in the form of a column base that was found in this area and which must have been one of many bases used to hold the wooden columns supporting the floors (H.A.Thompson, “Excavations in the Athenian Agora: 1953,” Hesperia 23 (1954): 39-45 (South Stoa), 58 (law courts)).

Laconian tiles were also used in the Dema House, most likely for subsidiary roofs, and not the main roof over the northern rooms. See Jones et. al., “Dema,” 108.

The water-channel was located by means of tracing rock-cut sections and crop-marks leading toward the house and under the Dema Wall, but the conduit could not be directly traced to the house (Jones et. al., “Dema,” 81-83, Fig.2).

portico’s roof. The use of columns for the portico instead of pillars sets it apart from the standard practice at Olynthus, but follows Athenian custom. The roughly-hewn base and its diameter correspond to others in Classical Athenian houses, including columns known to have supported an upper storey. The occurrence of columns and stair bases in some houses at Olynthus, Argilos and elsewhere, have demonstrated that the columns, no less than the pillars, might support galleries that overlooked the central court.

Though the destruction of the house has removed vital evidence for the planning and interpretation of the building, we can tell that most of the rooms were accessed directly from the open courtyard, with doorways between 0.65 and 1.3 meters in width. Though there is a relative lack of artifacts and features in the individual rooms by which to ascertain their function, the excavators have posited possible uses for some of these. A relatively square room in the northwest corner of the house, with an off-set doorway, for example, may have been a dining room. Though it lacks a decorated floor or bases for placing couches, it may have been a simpler form of dining room, with its off-center door reflecting the common method of setting dining couches along the walls so that these would be clear of the corners.

---

1075 The base was made of a square block of limestone, about 0.3 meters in diameter and 0.1 meters high. It did not have a mortise hole in its upper surface to receive the tenon, however, which would have been conclusive proof of this (Jones et. al., “Dema,” 108).
1076 Robinson and Graham, Olynthus VIII, 165-166, 239-248.
1077 Similar bases can be found at the rural sites of Draphi and Karellas, and in the houses of the industrial quarter (Young, “Industrial District,” 205, 222, pl.71a) and on the Areopagus in the city center (H.A.Thompson, “Activities in the Athenian Agora,” Hesperia 28 (1959): 100).
1080 If this is the case, it would have accommodated seven couches (1.8 by 0.8 meters) (ibid., 109-110). For a reconstruction of the andron, see H.A.Thompson, “Excavations in the Athenian Agora: 1953,” Hesperia 23 (1954): 39-45, Fig.4.
A room in the center of the northern area of the house may have been a kitchen, according to the excavators, though there were no deposits to suggest cooking fires, nor any evidence for a flue of the type seen at Olynthus. In the middle of one room in the northeast sector of the house, a shallow oval pit was found that produced a gray-colored deposit (Fig.101); this may have been a hearth or at least a pit used to hold a brazier, rather than an open fire, since it showed no signs of fire damage. The oval pit is unlike the hearths occasionally seen at other sites; in House D in Athens and in some houses in the Piraeus and Olynthus, fixed hearths were found that were rectangular in shape. The oval pit in the Dema House bears similarities, however, to an oval pit identified as a hearth in a 4th century B.C. house at Draphi in Attica (Fig.102). Though open fires might be expected to leave ash and discoloration in the area, this is not found in the Dema House; at most, the pit may have been used as a stand for a portable brazier.

The Dema House, in its overall plan, was rectangular with a set of rooms on its north side facing the courtyard to the south (Fig.103; Appendix 1.12). The main entrance seems to have been situated toward the east side of the house. The door was about 2.15 meters wide and was set in about 0.6 meters from the house wall; the doorway formed a prothyron, a type of small entryway or porch, which would have helped to shelter anyone awaiting admission to the house.

---

1082 There is no trace of the pillared partitions that formed flues in the kitchens at Olynthus. See Robinson and Graham, Olynthus VIII, 189-199.
1083 The pit was lined with stones and tile fragments (J.E. Jones, “A Country House in Attica,” Archaeology 16 (1963): 277-279).
1084 Shear, Jr., “Agora: 1971,” 147, Fig.3; Hoepfner and Schwandner, Haus, 34-35, Fig.27; Robinson and Graham, Olynthus VIII, 186-188.
1085 The oval pit at Draphi had sides that were built up high like hearths usually do (BCH 81 (1957): 515-516, Fig.12). Its central location also makes it likely that it was used as a hearth, though hearths are not always placed in centrally, for instance in House 7 at Halieis (L. Foxhall, “House Clearance: Unpacking the ‘Kitchen’ in Classical Greece,” in Building Communities: House, Settlement and Society in the Aegean and Beyond, ed. R. Westgate, N. Fisher and J. Whitley (London: BSA, 2007), 237, Fig.25.3a).
and is a common feature at Olynthus, Piraeus and Halieis. The prothyron gave access to the courtyard that was situated to the west of it. The house’s orientation towards the south followed ancient precept, as is the case with most other houses we have discussed. In the Dema House, this is augmented by exploitation of its position against a slope to the north; this natural feature would have protected the north side of the house from cold winds in winter and from the high angle of the sun in summer.

The courtyard, the most important and largest space in the house, seems to have been furnished with a portico that sat in front of the northern set of rooms. The portico would have shielded those in the court from the glaring sun and from winter rain. It would also have provided sheltered communication between the rooms and the court. The importance of an outdoor, but roofed, work area cannot be overstated. The large number of artifacts found in this area indicates that the portico in the Dema House served a key role in the daily functioning of the household. Though the total number of artifacts found in the house was small, especially in a house of this size, those that came to light were found, for the most part, in the courtyard. Storage jars, water vessels, cooking ware, tableware and mortars were among some of the finds in this area. Other objects, like loom weights, spindle whorls, as well as a quernstone and hammerstone, were found in the courtyard as well, denoting its multi-functional character.

1086 See Jones et. al., “Dema,” 79. At least 18 houses at Olynthus had such entryways (Robinson and Graham, Olynthus VIII, 154-156). For Piraeus, see Hoepfner and Schwandner, Haus, 40. For Halieis, see AD 30 (1975): 66.
1087 See Xen. Mem. 3.8.8-9, Oec. 9.4.
1088 The Dema House has elements common to the pastas house of Olynthus, so that this resemblance and the knowledge that a portico of some form did exist, prompted the excavators to restore a pastas in the northern half of the house. See Jones et. al., “Dema,” 108.
1089 Ibid., 96-99, Fig.10-11. The tableware includes kraters, amphorae, skyphoi, kylikes, a kantharos, two-handled cups (bolsals), one-handled cups, bowls, jugs, olpai, oinochoai, askoi, lekanides and salt cellars. Pottery of everyday use included jugs, large bowls, lekanai, amphorae, mortars, casseroles, a hydria, chytrai or cooking pots. The coarseware includes amphorae, mortars, casseroles, a hydria and a chytra.
1090 Jones et. al., “Dema,” 83-87, Fig.3-4.
The courtyard and portico appear to have been work areas, where the family might process food, cook and take meals (Fig.86), and spin wool (Fig.104, Fig.20).

Spaces employed for particular activities or set out for particular inhabitants of the house have not been located. A large house like this one might be expected to have specialized areas used for storage, working, cooking, dining or sleeping, but no such spaces have been located with any certainty. As we have already noted, both literary and archaeological evidence suggests that space could be quite flexible and that rooms could be transformed by re-arranging light and portable furniture.\(^{1091}\) If we knew the function of the rooms, perhaps we could deduce whether or not the inhabitants would have required the extra floor space that the addition of a second storey would have offered. Because of the great width of the walls, the excavators posit that there was an upper storey with additional rooms, which may have served as bedrooms.\(^{1092}\) This reading is speculative, however, given the fact that there was no indisputable example of a stair base in the house.\(^{1093}\)

The disappearance of finds like column bases and roof tiles, which imply looting or salvage, does not make the task of moving from ground plan to three-dimensional reconstruction simple. Based on the ground floor of the house, however, it appears that there was a lack of

\(^{1091}\) Plato (Prot. 315d) confirms that space could be arranged according to circumstances, however; a store-room on the ground floor is transformed into a bedroom to accommodate an influx of guests in the house.

\(^{1092}\) According to Jones, the ground floor of the Dema House provides few large rooms and most of these are ill-suited to have been used as bedrooms since one has a large pit or hearth, another a vestibule behind the door, and another a floor on two levels (“Dema,” 111-113, n.91). If an upper storey existed, it would have been situated over the north block of rooms and would have had an open gallery over the north portico overlooking the courtyard (ibid., 113 n.96, Fig.13). Lysias (1.9-10) and Aristophanes (Thesm. 479-489) indicate that bedrooms upstairs were normal. See also, Aristoph. Eccl. 607-609; Arist. Ath. Pol. 50.2, Oec. 1347a; Antiphon 1.14. For a similar arrangement at Halieis, see AD 30 (1975): 67-68. For Olynthus, see Robinson and Graham, Olynthus VIII, 227-228.

\(^{1093}\) A possible interpretation of stone kerbing and displaced stone slabs in one of the north-east rooms of the house, is that they form part of a staircase, representing the limit of an adobe-built landing for a two-flight staircase as well as a stairbase. Analogies from other sites find some discrepancies in size and placement of such a staircase, for instance, the stone slab in the Dema House is 0.85 meters (Jones et. al., “Dema,” 113 n.93) which is smaller than the Olynthian average. Also, the Olynthian stairbases are found usually in the courtyard or portico, or sometimes within a kitchen or utility room (Robinson and Graham, Olynthus VIII, 96, 227-228, 271; J.W.Graham, “Olynthiaka, 5-6,” Hesperia 23 (1954): 327-328, Fig.1, 2), while the slab in the Dema House was found in a corner room with no identifiable function.
specialized spaces for particular activities. A conspicuous absence of furnishings and furniture would have permitted the inhabitants of such a house to go about their daily routines without being inhibited by room function. Spaces without a specific function could have been employed for a large number of activities simply by re-arranging pieces of furniture to accommodate the needs of the household. Simplicity in terms of furnishings, as we have seen with most houses, may have been a solution to daily and seasonal variations in the activities of this household.

5.8 Living in the Country: Property, Boundaries and Walls

Any discussion of domestic space in rural Attica should consider the social and economic conditions of the region, because the creation and use of space is socially constructed. Space is a result of the dynamic interaction between people and their environment and must be constantly re-produced through daily activities shaped by the social and economic circumstances of a household. As we have seen, for example, with the presence or absence of specialized dining rooms in houses, architectural mechanisms can give concrete form to the activities a household considers integral for its preservation. In an archaeological context where household activities cannot be observed by the investigator, reading space is a particularly difficult thing to do, but it is not impossible when supplemented by literary or even ethnographic evidence.

The peasant farmer in ancient Greece was faced with the pressure of protecting the family property; the smallholder’s stance toward his property must have been primarily protective, as opposed to the larger landholder, who could afford to be liberal and acquisitive. The burden of conservatism lies even more heavily on the fact that their relative weakness and economic vulnerability was sometimes exploited. Land held by the household, like the residence itself, was

---

1094 The vulnerable position of the small landholder sometimes was exploited to the point of dispossession through debt, foreclosure, purchase or even expropriation. However, this was mitigated by that fact that dispossession was
was private space. Knemon, the main character in Menander’s *Dyskolos*, makes this distinction clear when reprimanding an intruder entering his fields by asking, “Don’t you know the public road?” Boundaries of fields were marked with walls that were extremely important in separating properties from one another and in locating boundaries between private and public. It is possible to view the conception of the boundary as a space derived from the necessities of agricultural production. This is reinforced by Solon’s constitutional reforms which placed heavy weight on limits; he required that spaces should be left between the trees, ditches and other provisions of one plot of land from a neighboring one, thereby helping to preserve and protect the resources of a household. The preservation of property must have been an absolute necessity for those residing in the countryside, for it was a necessary step toward attaining self-sufficiency and economic prosperity.

Markers like boundary stones (*horoi*) delineate boundaries of the demes, and generally represent attempts to maintain control of land. Large, circular towers that jut out from the landscape may also be the physical signs of a concern for safeguarding property and securing resources. The towers that are found at Thorikos and elsewhere in Attica are often surrounded by enclosure walls; the walls encircle the towers and domestic buildings on an estate, thereby demarcating the boundaries of the land. The multi-storeyed towers were likely employed for

---

not solely determined by economic power and the laws of the market, but was rather inextricably linked to political rights and juridical privilege as well (E.M.Wood, *Peasant-Citizen and Slave: The Foundations of Athenian Democracy* (London: Verso, 1988), 119).

1095 Men. Dysk. 115. Of course, Knemon is considered to be a misanthrope, so that his behavior is not generally considered to have been acceptable.


storage of agricultural produce, and some literary evidence points to their use for the protection of people. Demosthenes relates how female slaves locked themselves up in a tower during an incursion onto their master’s property; though the thieves took most of the household furniture, the tower stood firm, protecting the slaves and the items in the tower from harm. In areas where house and farmland were wholly interconnected, boundaries, walls and towers would have helped to safeguard a family’s property, and perhaps even the family itself, from thieves and incursions.

Intrusion into the interior of the house by non-family, as we have already seen, was considered an outrage in Athens. The courtyard and gate of the house seem to have been the boundaries of this private sphere, a sort of liminal area marking the political transition from public to private. Law-speeches indicate that fear of incursions was very real, and we know from Thucydides that rural areas were particularly vulnerable in times of war; it was common practice for invading armies to pillage and raze land outlying towns. In light of the evidence, it seems justified that in the countryside provisions like walls and towers were made, though this should not imply that country dwellers were isolated from the surrounding community.

5.9 Living in the Country: Women and Agriculture

Any discussion of household space should also take into consideration the surroundings of the houses we are concerned with, because these can affect patterns of social interaction for


100 Dem. 47.56.

101 See, for example, Dem. 18.132. The *kyrios* – man of the house – was permitted to defend his home from intruders. See also Lys. 1.21-25, 1.34; Dem. 24.113, 23.60, 23.53, 53.15-16, 21.81, 47.45, 37.33; Aeschin. 1.62. See further, Cohen, *Law, Sexuality, and Society*, 115-116. While Athenians did not formally codify the separation of private and public spheres and did not articulate the private freedoms which were safeguarded from governmental interference, they did view state intrusion upon the private sphere as an outrage (Lys. 12.8, 12.30-31).


103 Thuc. 2.13.
inhabitants. Interactions among inhabitants of small communities may have been different than those in densely populated cities like Athens. Though the evidence suggests that inhabitants in rural areas felt threatened by possible incursions onto their property or by household theft, they may not have been subject to the same social risks or scrutiny that likely typified compact urban neighborhoods. Literary accounts mention women in the countryside visiting their neighbors regularly. Women who were neighbors seem to have paid each other visits on a daily basis and needed no excuse to do so, such as to borrow an item or to receive some assistance. The argument for protection from aggressive vendors or from strangers visiting or residing in the city can be ruled out for rural areas; residing in widely dispersed residences in a rural setting may have permitted the relative freedom with which women seem to have moved.

Areas that were less cramped and less threatening would have allowed women the freedom to venture out of doors with less risk to their person or to their reputation. The back door in houses at Halai Aixonides, for instance, may directly reflect such a situation. The relative lack of constant scrutiny from neighbors and passersby that must have characterized rural areas may have played a part in this. In literary accounts, young women who live in the countryside are often found visiting their neighbors. In fact, studies have shown that settlement size and views about women’s honor, i.e. virginity, are closely linked. In some modern peasant communities, for example, a woman’s virginity is protected with less vigor; pregnancy for an engaged girl, for instance, merely hastens the marriage date and is often welcomed by all.

R.Osborne (Demos: The Discovery of Classical Attika (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), 88-92) has argued that deme centers were a main forum for social and political activity, and that the importance of the city of Athens has been overestimated. In general, however, there is little evidence about which to base our impressions of the everyday lives of women in the countryside (A.D.Fitton Brown, “The Contribution of Women to Ancient Greek Agriculture,” LCM 9 (1984): 71-74).


R.Osborne (Classical Landscape with Figures (London: George Philip, 1987), 70) argues that farmers could use the labor of their wives and children with impunity because they were far from the public gaze.
concerned. Relaxed social ideals, in this case, are viewed as being a result of the importance tied to fecundity because of the value of extra hands on the family farm.

Women in rural Attica will probably have not been barred from agricultural labor. Any brief glance at the urban sector reveals the commitment of women to a broad range of economic activities. The subject of women in agriculture, however, is a problematic one, because we lack the information needed for the size and pattern of landholdings, the number of slaves, the labor required to cultivate a unit area for various crops, and the amount of time a citizen’s wife could spare from domestic tasks for labor elsewhere. A certain amount can be said, however, from analogy. First, there is evidence for hired labor on farms, and part of this workforce is composed of women. We may assume that most women who lived in rural areas and who belonged to households that lived by agriculture, were required, at least at certain times like harvest season, to offer their labor. Modern peasant communities claim that women’s work is essential to the family farm, especially seasonally. What is more, the irregular availability of women’s labor owing to child-rearing and other domestic duties, will have also been more conducive to farming; women’s labor is more compatible with the periodic demands of agricultural work like sowing and reaping, than with continuous work in trade or crafts.

1109 See, for example, Dem. 57.45; Aristoph. *Cl.* 1358. Though we may be quite certain that these women belonged to the lowest economic classes.
1112 See R. Brock, “The Labour of Women in Classical Athens,” *CQ* 44 (1994): 343. In plough cultures like ancient Athens women are more frequently assigned auxiliary work like assisting men with ploughing or weeding the fields.
Of course, differences in availability of unfree or dependent labor will have been a major factor as to whether or not women were expected to work. The observation by Aristotle that the poor have to use their wives and children as slaves since they cannot afford to own slaves,\textsuperscript{1113} will certainly have applied also to the rural population of Attica. The consequences for the wives, mothers and daughters of the poor, however, are never spelled out. The daughter of the misanthrope in Menander’s comedy helps her father on the farm, but this is because he is exceptionally reclusive and anti-social, and does not want to interact with any slave, hired help or neighbor.\textsuperscript{1114} Young women in modern rural societies often help on the family farm because relative poverty makes it impossible for them to live in the traditional and “most desirable way,”\textsuperscript{1115} i.e. a sheltered life. As Aristotle relates, one cannot “prevent the wives of the poor from going out when they want to.”\textsuperscript{1116} All members of the family must have been bound to labor on the land, since family labor could not readily be diverted to other enterprises. In view of this, the necessary labor of women seems to have taken them outside the house.

5.10 Living in the Country: Neighbors and the Neighborhood

The majority of the rural houses that we have discussed do not make many provisions for protecting the interior of the house, despite the desire to protect one’s land from incursion by means of enclosure walls and towers. Unlike the houses in the city of Athens, which sometimes have a narrow or dog-leg corridor to limit sight-lines from the street door, rural houses are relatively open in nature. In the Vari House, a veranda leads to the main house door that gives

\begin{itemize}
\item Aristot. \textit{Pol.} 1323a.
\item Aristot. \textit{Pol.} 1300a6-7.
\item Aristot. \textit{Pol.} 1323a.
\item Aristot. \textit{Pol.} 1300a6-7.
\item Aristot. \textit{Pol.} 1300a6-7.
\item Aristot. \textit{Pol.} 1300a6-7.
\end{itemize}
direct access to a large open courtyard from which all rooms of the house are approached (Appendix 1.11). At Halai Aixonides in southern Attica, the houses have entrances both from the main street on the south and from an alley on the north side of the house (Appendix 1.8), which led to an adjacent house. The neighboring house on the other side of the alley would have therefore been able to communicate both visually and aurally with the house. In addition, both front and rear doors of the houses led to the courtyard, and this gave access to all of the rooms. In this way, the houses are open in nature, directly exposing the interior court and its adjacent rooms both to the main street and to the rear alley.

The open character of these houses may be connected to the rustic lifestyle of the inhabitants. As late as the Classical period, the majority of Athenian citizens resided in the villages located throughout the countryside, but during the Peloponnesian War the rural population was relocated within the city walls for protection from the invading Spartan army. Thucydides relates that this move was very difficult (χαλέπτιῶς) for the rustic population. Plutarch explains how the residents of rural Attica were now confined to small and stifling (πνιγηροῖς) houses or barracks and penned up like cattle (ὡσπερ βοσκήματα καθεργείμένους); though they had been accustomed to an outdoor and active life, they were now compelled to lead a sedentary and inactive one (διαίταν οἰκουρόν και ἄργην). The passages demonstrate that Athenians who lived in the countryside spent most of their time outdoors, perhaps tending to their plots of land, and this no doubt involved daily interactions with their neighbors and other members of their community.

---

1118 Andreou, “Αἰξωνίδου Αλώος,” 201, Figs.9-11.
1119 Aristot. Pol. 1319b; Thuc. 2.15.
1120 Plut. Per. 34.2-4.
1121 Thuc. 2.14-15.
1122 Plut. Per. 34.4.
Some indication of this interaction and of the social structure in rural Attica is provided by the ancient literary testimony. Hesiod, in the *Works and Days*, highlights the importance of a neighbor for the countryman by means of advice about the proper treatment of one.\textsuperscript{1123} He recommends behaving kindly toward one’s neighbors (τὸν φιλέοντα φιλεῖν), and, if possible, to show them more kindness than they have shown you (λώιον). For Hesiod, a good neighbor is not only a great strength (ἐσθλοῦ), but also a blessing (μέγ’ ὀνειρο); a good neighbor is even more important than a good friend because a neighbor who has been treated with kindness will come at once if there is need of him (ὡς ἄν χρηίζων καὶ ἐς ὑστερον ἀρκιον εύρης). According to Hesiod, in fact, kindness toward one’s neighbor involves being affable by paying him regular visits (τῶ προσίοντι προσείναι). The passage serves to illustrate the important role that sociability played in rural communities, and more specifically, in the maintenance of friendly relations with neighbors.

The village may have functioned as an extension of the household, especially in times of need and shortage, when immediate and readily available help might have been crucial. Hesiod stresses the importance of being on good terms with one’s neighbors for the assistance they might offer in the future; the close proximity of a neighbor (ὅς τις σέθεν ἐγγύθι ναίει) is not an insignificant factor for his way of thinking.\textsuperscript{1124} In emergencies, in particular, a neighbor may have been more valuable than even a close relative.\textsuperscript{1125} As we have seen in the case of Euphiletus, who gathers his neighbors to trap his wife and her lover *in flagrante*, neighbors could give protection from violence and also come to your defense as witnesses in the law courts.\textsuperscript{1126}

A more frequent example of neighborly service, however, would have been the process of

\textsuperscript{1123} Hes. *WD* 2.343-351. A bad neighbor, however, is a calamity (πῆμα) (Hes. *WD* 2.346).
\textsuperscript{1124} Ibid., 343.
\textsuperscript{1125} In other words, neighbors could come at once, without making preparations, but relatives might live far away and so be delayed in coming to one’s aid.
\textsuperscript{1126} Lys. 1.23-24.
lending and borrowing equipment, tools and foodstuffs. This most certainly affected relations between neighbors, since not only were those lending supplies providing help which could be expected to be repaid in the future, but they were also establishing ties of friendship.

The importance of being friendly to one’s neighbors is nowhere more visible than in Menander’s *Dyskolos*, where the main character Knemon farms a large piece of land on his own without any help from hired laborers or friends.\textsuperscript{1127} The implication is that he is a misanthrope who desires no interaction with his neighbors or people generally, and is chastised for this.\textsuperscript{1128} Knemon detests crowds; he runs away from his farm because of the constant flow of passersby and by the throngs of people (πολυπληθείας) who knock at his door.\textsuperscript{1129} Though Knemon’s reaction to the situation is likely exaggerated for comic effect, the incident serves to highlight what must have been common in most rural neighborhoods of Attica. People walk by Knemon’s home and knock at his door, disrupting his solitude, but this, according to the other characters in the play, is customary. Visiting neighbors seems to have been a part of daily life in the countryside. Neighbors, in particular women, paid each other visits without cause or reason and often were close companions. Demosthenes relates how two women in the same rural neighborhood would frequently call on one another; this is considered to be proper and fitting (εἰκός) since both women lived in the countryside (ἐν ἀγρῷ) and were neighbors (γείτνιωσῶν).\textsuperscript{1130} The passage implies that living in the country and being neighbors is an impetus or motivation for being close friends, though perhaps not a precondition.

\textsuperscript{1127} Men. *Dys*. 328-331.
\textsuperscript{1128} Men. *Dys*. 1-10.
\textsuperscript{1129} Men. *Dys*. 164-168.
\textsuperscript{1130} Dem. 55.23-24.
A good neighbor could be the most valuable resource in a time of need,1131 so that maintaining affable relations with the household that was nearest to you was not only socially responsible, but shrewd as well. The presence of tall enclosure walls and towers attached to rural estates indicate that the threat of incursion or theft was real, so that friendly relations with one’s neighbors may have helped to minimize such incidents. The towns of rural Attica, which were less cramped than their urban counterparts, would have meant that members of the community were familiar with one another, thereby allowing, perhaps, a greater freedom of movement. Women, in particular, would have been able to move outside their houses with less physical risk to their person, but also to their reputation.

In rural areas, familiarity with one’s neighbors would have meant that inhabitants did not have to contend with the same social risks as those who lived in the city. Social control could be quite effective in a small neighborhood where neighbors could closely observe each other’s behavior.1132 The houses at Halai Aixonides, which could be accessed both from the main street and from a back alley, exposed their central courtyard and adjacent rooms, as well as the people and activities therein, to their neighbors (Appendix 1.8).1133 Unlike the houses in Athens, which sometimes have a narrow or dog-leg corridor to limit sight-lines from the street door, the majority of rural houses we have discussed do not make many provisions for protecting the interior. In this way, the houses would have exposed themselves to the scrutiny of neighbors and this could have had an effect on the extent to which social ideals were observed, though this is difficult to judge. It can be said, however, with little uncertainty, that the houses of Attica reveal

1131 Hes. WD 2.343-351.
1133 Andreou, “Αὐξονίδου Άλων,” 201, Figs.9-11.
a high level of accessibility both from outside and within, suggesting that spaces meant to seclude women, or any other group of people, are absent.
CONCLUSIONS

Challenging the Paradigm

The Greek word *gynaikonitis* has been translated in a casual and reckless manner as the “women’s quarters” of a Greek house, despite the fact that this definition has serious consequences for our reconstruction of women’s lives in ancient Greece. Because of its association with the broader topic of women’s confinement, the term is fraught with interpretive difficulties, though this was overlooked by the majority of early scholars who were heavily influenced by the works of the Enlightenment. Studies undertaken by scholars of the Enlightenment were fueled by contemporary concerns about woman’s place in society and drew on Classical models to support their ideas about the proper place of women in the private sphere. It was the 18th century European view of the position of women that was the firebrand that kindled the investigation of, and set the parameters for, the study of women in ancient Greece. By the 19th century the paradigm that women in ancient Athens lived in a state of harem-like isolation had already produced a considerable amount of literature, even before the first Classicists and archaeologists tended to the matter.

The socio-political culture of the following decades solidified these claims. Most of the 19th century scholars promoted the ideology of separate spheres for men and women and projected this ideology onto the cultures of the Classical world. Victorian gender ideology,
which stressed that women were at all times and everywhere domestic, irrational and subordinate, not only colored, but also was impressed upon, accounts of the past. These views were popularized by historical novels and political works of the period that argued that a woman’s life in ancient Greece was a type of slavery. Influenced by the image of the “Orient” created by European scholars, the view of the imprisoned woman soon became a standard feature in ancient Greek social histories. The statements one finds in the late 19th and early 20th century scholarship about women reflect scholars’ own fascination with the Orient rather than the actual condition of women in ancient Greece.

It was not until A.W. Gomme’s challenge to the paradigm in the 1920’s, coincidentally just after women were granted the right to vote, that the scholarship on women was criticized for its neglect and misrepresentation of the ancient evidence. Despite Gomme’s efforts, most works on the issue supported the traditional opinion that women in ancient Greece led cloistered lives. The views of Marx and Engels that were prevalent at the time fueled the belief that democracy led to disparities between the sexes and lent support to the notion that Athenian women had been banished from the street to the house with the advent of democracy.


The sole opposition to this view was F. Jacobs (Vermischte Schriften (Gotha: Ettingerschen Buchhandlung, 1830), iii. 254, 273, 205-6, 229, 242), but he did not gain support.


Athens, because it carried political involvement among male citizens to its highest development, was thought to have condemned women to a status of inferiority.\footnote{1142}

I hope that I have sufficiently demonstrated that the opinion of scholars is connected to contemporary notions about the relationship between public and private and follows a clear logic. Scholars imagine seclusion in the house for women at a time when there is a marked division between public and private space in contemporary society, and this is colored by concepts of foreign seraglios when Western interest is on the East. In contrast, the change of perspective in Gomme’s work runs parallel with the formal process of women’s emancipation in Gomme’s own time, and reflects his own present more than that of women in ancient Greece. The preconceptions regarding the proper place of women in the 19th and early 20th centuries distorted readings of the ancient evidence, and this led to gross misconceptions about women that most scholars were hesitant to challenge.\footnote{1143}

In more recent years, the work of Pomeroy and other Classical scholars encouraged a more comprehensive approach to women in antiquity. Pomeroy advised against confusing the study of a specific male-authored text with the study of an entire sex within a culture, as well as making assumptions about the lived experiences of women from within dramatic texts.\footnote{1144} Other


scholars argued that the problem with the study of women in antiquity was not so much the type of evidence being used, but rather the way the evidence was being handled, pointing to scholarship that utilized the same data, but which came to radically different assessments of it. 1145

Re-Defining the Gynaikonitis

Decades later, it has become apparent that the widespread notion of women’s seclusion is a result of scholars’ dependence on the ancient testimony, but even more than this, it is a result of their sometimes casual treatment of the literary sources. As we have noted, the lack of any established architectural terms in the literary sources has been a great challenge for architectural historians and has resulted in a very loose definition of the term gynaikonitis as “the women’s quarters of a house.” Our discussion of the use of the word in texts demonstrated, however, that the gynaikonitis could be employed as the living quarters of a family or even as quarters for household slaves. In Xenophon’s Oeconomicus, it is the female servants who reside in the gynaikonitis of Isomachus’ house in order to prevent unauthorized procreation. Isomachus’ wife, in contrast, shares the same quarters as her husband and manages the household, which, no doubt, required considerable freedom of movement. In Lysias 1, the gynaikonitis is a space on the upper storey of Euphiletus’ house that is “relocated” to the first storey, so that Euphiletus’ wife can more easily tend to her newborn baby. Under normal circumstances, however, Euphiletus and his wife slept in the same quarters. The women illustrated in these texts are neither secluded nor confined to specific quarters of the house.

Position of Women in Classical Athens,” JHS 100 (1980), 39. Note, however, that even Pomeroy adheres to the view that women were secluded (Goddesses, 80, 88). 1145 See, for instance, the works of W.B.Tyrrell (The Amazons: A Study in Athenian Mythmaking (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1984), 45) as compared to M.R.Lefkowitz (Women in Greek Myth (London: Duckworth, 1986), 133).
It is possible that in some cases the *gynaikonitis* denoted a more private part of a house, as we saw in Lysias 1, where the *gynaikonitis* was on the upper storey of the house. The urban setting of Euphiletus’ house did not allow very much freedom in terms of lateral expansion, so that an upper storey was probably necessary to accommodate Euphiletus’ family and servants, unlike Isomachus’ large estate, which was situated in the suburbs. In the literary sources, it is nowhere evident that the *gynaikonitis* was an autonomous space or room within which the women of a household were secluded or confined. We can only say that there were more private areas in a house, which are sometimes referred to as the *gynaikonitis*, but these areas frequently contain rooms in which men can be and are present, whether for dining or sleeping. Our discussion of the literature has found that the *gynaikonitis* can denote a family’s living quarters or even a space reserved for household slaves, but it does not denote a fixed or even a standard space in a Greek house whose purpose was to seclude or imprison women.

**Re-Visualizing the Gynaikonitis**

Studies whose subject has been women in Classical Greece have concentrated on the literary evidence, despite the fact that, as we have seen, it does not lend support to the notion that women were confined in specific quarters of the house. Scholars who have gone beyond the literature to take into account the visual representations of household space and women within that space, have, for the most part, forced the literary constructions of women and household space onto this evidence instead of seeing it in its own right. Eva Keuls’ study underscored the importance of visual representations, namely in the form of vase paintings, as sources for aspects of ancient Greek culture that are otherwise undocumented. At the same time, Keuls’ work espoused the traditional viewpoint of scholars past, that women were oppressed and denigrated.
by men in a type of “reign of the phallus” that included domestic space, and this has been repeated even in some of the most recent texts.1146

Our extensive discussion of the elements that scholars have taken to be illustrative of the confined nature of women’s lives, I trust, has exposed the flaws inherent in such an argument. Architectural elements like pillars, doors, and walls need not be read as physical markers of confinement, since these often are found in contexts with men and/or in exterior space, like the wrestling pit. A wall or an open door can represent the exterior face of a building and a series of columns can suggest the colonnade of an open-air courtyard. The portable nature of furniture and household implements meant that domestic chores and family activities could be performed in a number of rooms of the house, in particular, the open-air court, which provided a well-ventilated and well-lit space for the household.1147

There is no reason to believe that architectural elements like doors and pillars, or implements like wool baskets or distaffs, carry negative connotations of confinement and seclusion for women. The iconography of the second half of the 5th century B.C. abounds with pictorial references to marriage, and there are surprising parallels between these images and those that scholars have read as women’s quarters. Rather than confirming that women were confined to segregated areas of the house, the vase paintings showcase the women and their daily activities, illustrating, for the most part, a world of beauty, self-indulgence and leisure, rather than work and drudgery. The vase paintings, most of which were intended for a female audience, could have been the mechanism by which a bride-to-be could be reassured and

1147 For portable furniture, see Andrianou, Furniture, 86-87; Plat. Prot. 315c-d. For portable implements, see J.B.Koster, “From Spindle to Loom: Weaving in the Southern Argolid,” Expedition 19 (1976): 34-35. For the court as a center of activity, see M.Jameson, “Private Space and the Greek City,” in The Greek City: From Homer to Alexander, ed. O.Murray and S.Price (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990) 171-95. This is also the case today in many Greek villages (Du Boulay, Village, 24-25).
comforted about her future as a wife and mother. Images of grooming and adornment, and luxury and leisure, could have helped to alleviate a young maiden’s apprehension about marriage. The doors that are often depicted in the vase paintings we have discussed may have been a symbolic marker of this important transition, rather than a physical marker of the confined lives women are said to have led. Through conspicuous use of various symbols, in particular, the double doors, the vase paintings highlight the transformation and transition that the young maiden will embark on, rather than her immobility or confinement.

Re-Locating the Gynaikonitis

As we have seen, vase paintings are a thorny subject because of their lack of precision and attention to architectural detail, so that they should not be viewed as snapshots of actual buildings or employed as concrete evidence for the lived reality of inhabitants in a Greek house. Neither vase paintings, nor texts for that matter, should be substitutes for the actual physical remains of houses. Because much of the time houses have been reduced to their stone foundations and are devoid of their artifacts, it is easier to assimilate the scanty archaeological remains with the more plentiful literary and visual evidence in an attempt to generate an overall picture, but this is negligent. In its early stages, the use of archaeological remains as evidence for women and housing meant finding ways of assimilating the material evidence with the evidence acquired from texts. Rather than giving archaeological evidence its due as an independent source of information, textual evidence was imposed upon the physical remains, and this resulted in overgeneralizations and assumptions that are now problematic.

Beginning with Michael Jameson in the 1990’s, archaeological remains of houses were given the attention they deserved, and scholars began to see the inconsistencies between the literary and archaeological evidence for Greek houses. Attempts to designate specific areas of a house for women have been founded on activity patterns, but these efforts have generally been futile. Activities typically assigned to women, like spinning wool and weaving, have left behind few traces for archaeologists, and the small numbers of loom weights and spindle whorls found on sites in Greece make proper analysis across sites impossible. In addition, the lack of a convincing pattern in the distribution of loom weights in Greek houses does not lend itself readily to locating women’s space. The tendency of loom weights for being unearthed in the courtyards and porticoes of houses, in fact, suggests that women spent the majority of their day in well-lit and well-ventilated spaces of their houses, rather than in cramped, dark quarters. The mobile nature of wool-work, which we have discussed in some detail, meant that it could be carried out in various rooms of the house according to the season or time of day. Specific spaces were not required for wool-work and other household activities, and this is visible in the architectural remains as well.

Cooking, dining and entertaining, as I have tried to demonstrate, could be accomplished in a number of different places. Both the archaeological and literary evidence points to space that was not, in most cases, specialized by function. In Greek houses, the number of fixed hearths that have been unearthed is very small, while light, terracotta grills and braziers are
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1150 See L.Foxhall, “Small, Rural Farmstead Sites in Ancient Greece,” in Chora und Polis (Schriften des Historischen Kollegs 54), ed. F.Kolb, E.Müller-Luckner (Munich: R.Oldenbourg, 2004), 265, Fig.18.

1151 See Cahill, Olynthus, 169-179; Robinson and Graham, Olynthus VIII, 209; Ault, Halieis II, 78-9.

1152 See Cahill, Olynthus, 171-178, Fig.38. For spinning and weaving as being labor-intensive, see J.B.Koster, “From Spindle to Loom: Weaving in the Southern Argolid,” Expedition 19 (1976): 34-35.

1153 J.Dubisch, Gender and Power in Rural Greece (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1986), Fig.2.
found in great quantities. The fact that a large amount of cooking ware is found in the courtyards of houses and that the presence of kitchens in Greek houses is rare, meant that a large proportion of dining and cooking activities must have taken place in the large, open-air space of the courtyard. Most of the houses we have examined in Athens had no specialized dining rooms, unlike some of the houses at other sites like Olynthus, and this testifies to the informal nature of entertaining.

The presence of dining facilities demonstrated the importance of entertaining guests and no doubt bestowed status on the owner of the house, but formal spaces for dining were not required for entertaining guests, as the House of Simon exhibits with its full collection of fine dining ware. Both the literary and visual evidence indicate that entertaining could be accomplished in many places by re-arranging light furniture for such events, so that a formal arrangement for dining may not have been the rule. The drinking party, or symposium, was a highly ritualized activity, so that a formal dining room or andron would have been reserved for special occasions, and this would seem like a gross misuse of precious space given the generally modest size of houses. If it were present, the andron, when not accommodating formal dining events, was probably employed for other purposes as well. On special occasions, men

1157 Thompson and Wycherley, Agora, 174.
1159 The larger size of the windows of andrones (Hoepfner and Schwandner, Haus, 42, 106, Fig.34, Fig.84) would have furnished the house with a good work and living space.
gathered in the andron for ritualized dining, but on a regular basis, household space seems to have been given over wholly to female activities.  

The few andrones that were unearthed in Athenian houses were not preceded by an anteroom, unlike those at Olynthus. They were situated close to the main street door and adjacent to the open courtyard, thereby exhibiting no effort to inhibit views or to prevent access. It is commonly held that the andron was a space off-limits to women and as such was a marker of gendered space, but this should not apply to the city of Athens, however, where houses are characterized by their simplicity and flexibility of space. Though there is some evidence for formal dining in Athens, it is by no means the rule, nor a mark of segregation.

Architectural remains and artifact assemblages can inform us about space, but they cannot always inform us about the attitudes and ideas of the people who once occupied those spaces. Because archaeologists do not dig up social customs, they must incorporate a theoretical framework in order to ascertain the social habits of the people that the houses accommodated, but also to effectively address how physical space can impart information about gender. In order for an archaeology of gender to be realized, some degree of acceptance of both methodological and theoretical approaches is required. Amos Rapoport, whose work has influenced my own, laid the theoretical foundations for the symbolic study of space, arguing that dwellings are not simply physical structures, but rather institutions and cultural phenomena grounded in space. Spatial structures, boundaries and zones can constrict, guide, channel, hinder and stage various activities and social actions, but at the same time these are also constructed by the activities and

---

1160 See Vitr. 6.7.1-2.
social actions that constitute society. The resulting spatial order permits us to recognize the different ways in which members of a society live out and reproduce their social existence.

Physical settings structure patterns of movement and encounter, and, as has been argued here, directly influence social relations. Buildings can provide the visual, aural or even olfactory cues by which people may interpret a particular situation and act according to the expectations of their culture. Features like walls, doors, and corridors, can constrain and guide behavior, changing human reactions and performance within a particular setting. As we have seen, for example, long, narrow spaces encourage brief interactions between people, while large, square spaces support extensive periods of interaction. Relationships between individuals in a house are also influenced by, but also influence, the organization of space. The position of doors, partitions, and windows, as we have seen, play an important role in controlling boundaries in a house, but these have been confused with a more general boundary distinction between men and women. The assumption that architectural devices like angled corridors or off-center doorways testify to a desire for restricting visual and physical contact between men and women, and for excluding women, should not be upheld, since these devices may actually be evidence for a need for family privacy. Preventing passersby from peering into a house by means of angled doorways or off-set entrances increases privacy for the household and safeguards the family at large, not just women.

By analyzing the arrangement of architectural elements within a house, as we have done, we can, to the best of our ability as non-witnesses, reconstruct the patterns of movement and access that shaped the daily interactions of the people living there. The houses in Athens we have discussed, as well as houses in other areas of Greece, were structurally oriented toward

---

1163 See Rapoport, *Built Environment*, 56-60.
their interior, with most rooms facing and opening onto the central courtyard.\textsuperscript{1164} The stone-built houses at Orraon, combined with the literary and artistic evidence, demonstrate that windows were small, tapered openings, so that the courtyard was the primary source of light and ventilation for the house.\textsuperscript{1165} Windows above eye-level would have prevented passersby from peering in, and these reveal a real concern for physical security and privacy, which may have been a wise precaution to take in a densely populated city like Athens.\textsuperscript{1166}

The location of a house could considerably impact the extent to which privacy measures were employed and this becomes clear when examining the houses situated in the heart of Athens. The houses in close proximity to the Athenian Agora sometimes screen themselves from the outside world by means of narrow corridors or recessed doorways that give indirect access to the courtyard (Appendix 1.3-1.4, 1.6). At the same time, however, there is an overall impression of openness, with house doors opening onto busy streets and with internal rooms opening directly from the courtyard (Appendix 1.1-1.2, 1.5, 1.7). The courtyard was the primary artery of circulation within the house and this is illustrated by the fact that rooms are almost always positioned as close as possible to it (Appendix 1.1, 1.3-1.5, 1.7-1.8, 1.11-1.16). Since the court controlled access to most rooms of the house, inhabitants were required at least to pass

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{1164} Compare the opposite arrangement, where rooms are organized sequentially, the one leading into the next; such an arrangement isolates the innermost rooms while the outermost rooms are those for receiving visitors (L.W.Donley-Reid, “The Structuring Structure: the Swahili House,” in Domestic Architecture and the Use of Space, ed. S.Kent (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 120-121).


\textsuperscript{1166} Law court speeches (Lys. 3.6, 12.10; Dem. 21.78, 47.52-54; Aeschin. 1.59) suggest that the fear of burglary or intrusion was a cause for anxiety.
\end{footnotesize}
through it, though, of course, the large size of the court encouraged social interaction of longer
duration.\footnote{1167}{The space could be more than 25% of the total surface area, as in the Vari House (Jones et. al., “Vari,” 366).}

The open-air courtyard, because it was a well-ventilated and well-lit space, was a fitting
place in which to conduct household chores. It also served as a sitting area for family or guests,
where meals could be prepared and consumed in an outdoor setting, but without being under the
constant scrutiny of passersby.\footnote{1168}{See Tsakirgis, “Hearths, Braziers and Chimneys,” 226, 228-229; B.A.Ault “Die klassische Aule. Höfe und Freiraum,” in Geschichte des Wohnens I: 500 v. Chr.–500 n. Chr. Vorgeschichte – Frühgeschichte – Antike, ed. W.Hoepfner (Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 1999), 537.} The courtyard’s close proximity to the street door, however,
meant that interactions with visitors must have been quite frequent. Because it was usually the
first major household space entered upon leaving the street, it acted as a mediator between the
more private spaces of a house and the external public world. Oftentimes, narrow entrance-
corridors that were staggered or angled kept strangers at a distance by minimizing views into the
house from the street and directing them onto a blank wall or hallway. The family’s own
physical presence in the courtyard or the family’s behavior could also mediate between public
and private space by indicating to passersby whether or not it desired company, as through open
or closed doors and window shutters.\footnote{1169}{See Plat. Sym. 714e. For comparable modern examples, see A.V.James and L.Kalisperis, “Use of House and Space: Public and Private Family Interaction on Chios, Greece,” in House Life: Space, Place and Family in Europe, ed. D.Birdwell-Pheasant and D.Lawrence-Züniga (Oxford: Berg, 1999), 212.}

With most rooms opening off the courtyard, it would have been difficult to hide activities
occurring here or in the rooms adjoining it. The doors and shutters of rooms were probably left
open most of the time in order to benefit from the air and daylight the courtyard provided, but
probably also to benefit from the household heat source, which was likely kept in the court. In
this way, household activities taking place in the courtyard must have been visible to all in the
house. The courtyard was also open to the sky, so that this would have furnished neighbors
sitting on their balconies or looking out their second storey windows with ample opportunity for eavesdropping. These factors demonstrate that the courtyard acted as a mediator between various spaces of the house, but also connected the more private areas of the house with the public realm outside. The courtyard house, rather than shutting itself off, actually connects private to public in a rather seamless way.

The notion of one’s own space is unlikely to have existed in Athens, where the restricted amount of household space and the close proximity of houses made this difficult. Houses were huddled together in clusters between narrow streets so as to make spontaneous encounters and person-to-person interaction quite frequent. House walls often abutted streets or jutted out into the road, and balconies sometimes overlooked busy thoroughfares, creating a continuum between exterior and interior space and thereby emphasizing sociability. On the other hand, the simple exterior façades of houses and the way in which houses directed views inward, testify to a deliberate attempt to ensure the privacy of both the male and female occupants from the inquisitive stranger or passerby. The open interior of the courtyard house, however, from which most rooms were directly accessed, gave both visual and aural access to neighbors, suggesting that household activities were not hidden from those who were intimates of the family, but rather from strangers. Those just passing by would have been confronted with a blank façade and a tall courtyard wall, so that they would not have been able to observe the activities taking place inside the house.

In a densely populated city like Athens, where foreigners thronged the streets, vendors sold their wares from shops, and houses projected onto busy thoroughfares, it may have been

---

1171 For example, the House of Simon (Thompson, “House of Simon,” 234), House C and D (Thompson and Wycherley, *Agora*, Fig.41) and House L (Young, “Industrial District,” 246-247, Fig.7).
quite wise to shield the activities of the family. Ancient authors testify to the pandemonium that characterized the city of Athens. Isocrates, for instance, compares the population of Athens to a turbid flood (χειμάρρους) that catches up everything in its course and sweeps this along wildly so that it is impossible to grasp or define (οὐκ ἐυσύνωντός ἐστιν οὐδὲ ἀκριβής) the multitude of people residing in the city. One gets the sense that Athens was not only a populous city, but one which blurred the lines between citizen and non-citizen, and resident and foreigner, thereby necessitating privacy measures through which the family might be safeguarded from the unfamiliar threat outside. Architectural remains of houses occasionally reveal the precautions taken to ensure the spatial and visual opportunities for privacy of the urban home, but such provisions are usually made with regard to the stranger looking in on the family unit, rather than with regard to neighbors and friends or between the inhabitants themselves.

In smaller communities, the patterns of social interaction seem to have been slightly different than those in the city of Athens. Houses in rural areas were not subject to the same social risks that characterized the densely populated urban neighborhoods, so that protection from aggressive vendors or from foreigners residing in the city was not generally necessary. The houses at Halai, which were accessible both from the main street and the alley between adjacent houses, illustrate the neighborly way of life that must have characterized many of the demes of Attica (Appendix 1.8). Thorikos may have been an exception to the rule because it was an industrial area that was home to countless slaves who worked in the silver mines. The houses there occasionally demonstrate a desire for separating work from the home environment, for example, as with disconnected areas of the house (Appendix 1.9-10).

---

1172 Isoc. 15.172. For the sense that Athenians were not all familiar with one another, see Thuc. 8.66.
1173 For the blurring of identities, see Ps.Xen., Athen. Pol. 1.10-12; Lys. 23; Aeschin. 1.54-64; Dem. 59, 47.61. See further, K.Vlassopoulos, “Slavery, Freedom and Citizenship in Classical Athens: Beyond a Legalistic Approach,” European Review of History 16 (2009): 348-360.
Residence in rural areas that were less cramped and less threatening must have allowed women the freedom to venture outside with less risk to their person or to their reputation. The literary sources testify to women in the countryside visiting their neighbors on a regular basis and how this was customary. Architecturally, this behavior is substantiated by the houses at Halai, which were easily accessed both from the street and a narrow back alley that connected with neighboring houses (Appendix 1.8). Since the physical structuring of a neighborhood influences social encounters, houses that communicate in this way would have emphasized sociability and neighborly relations, but in so doing, would also have limited the amount of privacy for the family unit. The importance of being on good terms with one’s neighbors for the assistance they might offer in times of need or for their help in agricultural tasks should not be understated. A neighbor could be more valuable than even a close relative, especially in a rural context. The importance of lending and borrowing, or assisting in the fields, is nowhere more visible than in Menander’s character of the Dyskolos, a man who so detests people that he refuses help of any kind from neighbors and is reprimanded for his lack of social skills. Menander’s play demonstrates how complete self-sufficiency did not make for good neighborly relations and highlights the vital role that daily interactions with neighbors played in the formation of bonds of friendship. The evidence shows that visiting one’s neighbors was the proper code of conduct and that being neighbors was a motivation for being intimate friends.

As we have seen from modern peasant communities, women’s work is compatible with the periodic demands of agricultural work and women’s contribution to the agricultural

1175 See Hes. WD 343; Lys. 1.23-24.
1176 Men. Dys. 1-10, 328-331.
1177 Ibid., 164-168.
1178 See Dem. 55.23-24.
workforce is essential for most families involved in agriculture.\textsuperscript{1179} Aristotle’s assertion that the poor use their wives and children as slaves because they cannot afford to own slaves must be taken with a grain of salt, but it shows, however, that women were expected to work outside the house if there was need, and there often was.\textsuperscript{1180} The daughter of the misanthrope in Menander’s comedy, for instance, helps her father on the farm.\textsuperscript{1181} Though this is an exceptional case, we can assume that all members of a family were expected to lend a helping hand, especially if we consider that such labor could not readily be diverted to other types of employment. The example serves to highlight how, more generally, residence in rural areas must have allowed a greater amount of freedom for women to move outside their homes with less risk than their urban counterparts.

Replacing the Paradigm

Both in the center of Athens and in the more suburban areas of Attica, privacy mechanisms are used to control interactions at the level of the family and at the level of the individual. Restricted household space, especially in the city center, would have afforded little personal privacy for inhabitants, so that precautions were taken to ensure the spatial and visual privacy of the house. The family was provided with some privacy and solitude from passersby and onlookers by means of narrow corridors and walled exteriors, but the amount of personal space and privacy individual members of the family enjoyed must have been very small.

The arrangement of rooms around the open-air courtyard no doubt fostered a general feeling of openness and perhaps also of vulnerability. In view of the fact that the courtyard was

\textsuperscript{1181} Men. \textit{Dys.} 327-334.
typically the largest space of a house and the primary source of air and light, it served as the
main work and living area for the family and as a place for entertaining friends and neighbors.
Because of the crucial role the courtyard played in the life of the family, most rooms of houses
were situated as close as possible to it. In this way, inhabitants in adjacent rooms were able to
view the activities taking place in the courtyard, just as those who happened to be in the
courtyard had visual access to adjacent rooms. Positioned as it was close to the main street
entrance of the house, the courtyard would have also seen a steady influx of friends, neighbors
and perhaps also strangers, and this would have meant that the daily household activities of
women and the family at large were not infrequently disrupted.

The typical courtyard house in Athens and Attica was not shut-off from the outside
world. Large, open-air courtyards promoted visual and physical interaction between inhabitants
of the same house, but also connected the private space of the family with public life outside.
Though the courtyard house sometimes shielded itself from the outside world or from the
inquisitive stranger by means of tall, blank walls, or long, angled corridors, the open and
generally accessible nature of the house’s interior granted both visual and physical access to
those who entered. Daily household activities were not concealed or kept hidden from those who
were intimates of the family or even from those who came in from the street, but rather from
those who were just passing by and perhaps peering in to get a closer look.

In Athens, a city with a dense and diverse population, this may have been a wise
precaution to take, not exclusively for women, but for the family at large. As we have seen in
Athenian literature, intrusion into the interior of the house was considered an outrage and
punishable by law,\(^\text{1182}\) and anyone who violated the boundary between public and private – the

gate and courtyard of the house – was publicly cursed. The line between public and private, however, was often blurred by the transitional nature of the courtyard itself. As both a public space in the private home and a link that connected the private space of the home with the public world outside, the courtyard’s ambiguous character no doubt made it necessary to establish such legislation. The requirements of communal life, however, dictated that neighbors be affable with one another and guests be shown hospitality. Such relationships were established and sustained through frequent and regular social interaction, namely in the form of paying visits, and this social convention is reflected in the houses themselves.

Houses in Athens and Attica revolved both physically and socially around the axis of their large, open-air courtyards. Courtyards functioned as the main work, living, and reception space of the house, so that a visitor entering the courtyard would have been confronted with a large, open space in which inhabitants were carrying out daily chores, taking meals or socializing. After crossing the threshold of the main street entrance, a visitor would have come face to face with men, women and children going about their daily tasks in close quarters with one another, and in whichever space was available and suited for the task at hand. The notion of one’s own private space or of spaces suited for specific activities or people, was likely a luxury that only the rare Athenian household, if this, could have afforded. In light of the literary, iconographic and archaeological sources at our disposal, our definition of the gynaikonitis as an architecturally and conceptually defined space in Greek houses, which confined and secluded women, cannot be sustained. For this evidence, in fact, demonstrates a far greater mobility and autonomy for women than has been acknowledged.
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1.2 House of Mikion and Menon (P)
1.3 House C
1.4 House D
1.5 West House, Areopagus
1.6 Central House, Areopagus
1.7 East House, Areopagus

(P) Proposed layout
1.8 Papacharalambous Plot, Halai
1.9 House 3, Insula 3, Thorikos
1.10 House 4, Insula 3, Thorikos
1.11 Vari House
1.12 Dema House
1.13 House 9, Piraeus
1.14 House A VII 8, Olynthus
1.15 House 7, Halieis
1.16 House 1, Orraon
ILLUSTRATIONS

![Graph showing the occurrence of domestic scenes by vase shape over time from c. 500 – 375 B.C.]

**Fig. 1.** Occurrence of Domestic Scenes by Vase Shape over Time: c. 500 – 375 B.C.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vase Shape</th>
<th>Number of Domestic Scenes</th>
<th>Proportion of Total Domestic Scenes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lekythos</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydria</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyxis</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lekanis</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebes</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cup</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oinochoe</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pelike</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabastron</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loutrophoros</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total = 1,350</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total = 100 %</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fig. 2.** Occurrence of Domestic Scenes According to Vase Shape: 475 – 300 B.C.

*This category includes vase shapes that do not figure prominently on their own in terms of domestic scenes (e.g. kraters, amphorae, skyphoi, stamnoi, plates, etc.) but also fragmentary pieces of various vases.*
Fig. 3. Quantity of Domestic Scenes According to Vase Shape: 475-300 B.C.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vase Shape</th>
<th>Number of Domestic Scenes</th>
<th>Total Number of Vases</th>
<th>Proportion of Domestic Scenes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lebes</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabastron</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyxis</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lekanis</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydria</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lekythos</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>5210</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oinochoe</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>921</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loutrophoros</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pelike</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1304</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cup</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>5442</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 4. Occurrence of Domestic Scenes by Vase Shape: 475 – 300 B.C.

Fig. 5. Proportion of Domestic Scenes According to Each Vase Shape: 475 - 300 B.C.
Fig. 6. Context of Vases Bearing Domestic Scenes: 475 – 300 B.C.
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