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Abstract

This volume contains studies on Classical Antiquity presented to Professor Pontus Hellström on his 75th birthday in January 2014. The 41 papers cover subjects ranging from the Etruscans and Rome in the west, to Greece, the landscape of Karia, and to the Sanctuary of Zeus at Labraunda. Many papers deal with new discoveries at Labraunda, but sites in the surrounding area, such as Alabanda, Iasos, and Halikarnassos are well represented, as well as Ephesos and Smyrna. Many architectural studies are included, and these examine both Labraundan buildings and topics such as masonry, Vitruvius, the Erechtheion, stoas, watermills, and Lelegian houses. Other papers deal with ancient coins, ancient music, Greek meatballs, and Karian theories on the origin of ancient Greece.
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Irrespective of cultural, chronological, and geographical settings, the house can be regarded as a dynamic and ideological construction that encodes the principles and praxis of the group using the house.¹ The ancient Greek world was no exception, and the household (the oikos), as a social unit, embraced the lived lives of all the members of society, free and not-free, old and young, men and women. It comes as no surprise, therefore, that the Classical oikos—as a phenomenon and concept—has long occupied a principal position within studies of Athenian society, which may be followed in the vast number of publications.² At a conceptual level, the oikos has been considered vital for the survival of the fundamental ideological dichotomy of Athenian society: the household was the secluded space for the private life of the citizen, so often associated with women and children, whereas the male members have been seen as part of the public and political masculinise sphere, the polis.³ These male members were also representatives at the rituals performed collectively within the polis, and as such they served as symbols for the political and ceremonial life of the polis.⁴ The oikos, on the other hand, was seen as a private domain free from state intrusion; as such it was important to the conceptualization of Athenian democracy.⁵ In other words, the oikos effectively served to set the limits of both the public sphere and the public space.

The aim of this short contribution is to reconsider the Greek oikos as a space for the social interaction of those who inhabited the house, and how social relations based on identities such as gender, age, status, and so forth may have defined the inner workings of this entity— and, by implication, how it may have worked to help define the social and physical boundaries between oikos and non-oikos. This will be done through a discussion of previous studies on social space and illustrated by some literary sources and analogies. A pattern which emerges is that it is not merely a question

² Marek 1966; Foxhall 1989; MacDowell 1989; Jameson 1990a, 1900b; Cox 1998; Roy 1999; Wolpert 2001; Nevett1995; 1999; 2010; Morgan 2010.
⁵ Cohen 1991, 97.
of *oikos* and *polis* being separated along social lines that are also intrinsically physical and material; instead, perhaps we should think of social space as making its physical counterpart more fluid and flexible. Similarly, it is not only an issue of male and female, but this critical dimension intersects with others in a manner which at once needs to be explored, and also offers an opportunity to shed light on the various boundaries, limits, and transition zones that were part of everyday life in Classical antiquity.

As such, this piece sets out to apply a relatively new approach to Greek society of Classical antiquity. Intersectionality\(^6\) as a means of understanding multiple oppressions within the realm of the ancient Greek world has been applied in a few recent studies that focused mainly on textual evidence.\(^7\) Such an approach, allowing for a more complex and contextual reading of ancient sources, helps us conceptualize the ancient house in a slightly different fashion than has typically been the case previously.

**Archaeology, Classical antiquity, and social relations**

The problems and limitations of identifying behaviour and social relations in the urban and private settings, between, for example, free and not-free, male and female, through archaeological evidence such as architectural remains are well known.\(^8\) Similarly, the need for archaeologists to study space and architecture not only as a physical phenomenon but also as social space has been recognized.\(^9\) As M. Parker Pearson and C. Richards show, approaching the issue from differing disciplinary and cultural perspectives provides better opportunities for identifying the lived lives of the inhabitants.\(^10\) This approach is of assistance to us when we examine the shift in archaeology, which was identified by M. Diaz-Andreu and S. Lucy, from focusing on cultures to identities, and thus we may slowly engage more in the relationship between society and the individuals of that society.\(^11\) Identity by them understood ‘as individuals’ identification with broader groups on the bases of differences socially sanctioned as significant’.\(^12\) The gains from identifying the limitations inherent in the use of archaeological material alone as evidence of behaviour are obvious. As M. Jameson put it in an early article, the distribution of artefacts may be one way to add nuances, but other methods and analyses are also essential. This may include, or so Jameson suggests, studies of circulation patterns and boundary control devices, but the possibilities offered by studies on ethnography and archaeology from other areas also deserve consideration.\(^13\)

---

7 Bjelland Kartzow 2009; Berg 2010; Sjöberg 2012.
8 Jameson 1990b, 109.
9 Kooyman 2006.
12 Diaz-Andreu & S. Lucy 2005, 1.
The usefulness of analogies has, however, long been disputed. An early and detailed review by Alison Wylie, for example, provides a rich set of negative reactions and problems encountered, but also positive examples.\textsuperscript{14} With respect to Classical society, J. Morgan notes the ambiguity inherent in using analogies and associated conceptualizations, including references to the \textit{oikos}. Referring to the characterization by the excavators of Olynthus, where spatial arrangements are labelled “dangerous”, Morgan notes that “we force the reader to make an assumption about what kind of artefacts would be in the room and what kind of behaviour took place there”.\textsuperscript{15} On the other hand, as Lisa Nevett has underlined, as long as no mindless application of any one-to-one correspondence is embarked upon, “such studies of other cultures enable us to see connections between specific spatial configurations, modes of behaviour and their associated ideologies”.\textsuperscript{16}

The research strategy adopted here will therefore include cross-cultural studies of houses and their members. By using analogies as a complimentary contribution our horizons will be widened. Quite simply, knowledge about other societies will improve our ability to analyze and understand the material remains that archaeology helps us recover. The Classical texts, however, remain the main entry point to the present analysis of the \textit{oikos}.

Our reconstruction of gender relations and spatial division within the realm of the \textit{oikos} has traditionally set out from Classical texts by authors such as Xenophon and Lysias. However, the resultant portrayal of gender relations in the Classical world is largely normative. This must not be thought of as lacking in real-world relevance, though. The attitudes brought to the stage by the ancient authors can be found in many contexts, including in the early Homeric texts. Recall, for instance, how Penelope is enclosed in her female domain of the palace or how the Archaic writer Hesiod in \textit{Works and Days} describes how the young female member of the house stays indoors with her mother in the inner room.\textsuperscript{17}

Much later, the Roman architect and author Vitruvius pointed out, as a specific phenomenon that characterized the Greek house, the area called the women’s quarter, the \textit{gynaikonitis}. However, no archaeological evidence supports the existence of such an ancient Greek structure.\textsuperscript{18} This is a good illustration of the fact that using ancient literary material implies struggling with critical problems with sources similar to those encountered in the use of material evidence from other cultural contexts.\textsuperscript{19} The literary source material cannot be read as a literal and realistic description of how things were; that such a simplistic approach could lead us on to a severely biased understanding of ancient society has, of course, not gone unnoticed. Rather, Classical literature can with equal ease be understood as socially constructed, generalizing, political, androcentric, and

\textsuperscript{14} Wylie 1985.
\textsuperscript{15} Morgan 2010, 10.
\textsuperscript{16} Nevett 2010, 17.
\textsuperscript{17} Morris 1999, 307–308 ; Sjöberg 2012.
\textsuperscript{18} Jameson 1990a, 172; 1990b, 92; Goldberg 1999, 144; Nevett 2010, 20.
\textsuperscript{19} Meskell 2002, 7–12.
economically elitist, or as ethnocentric and Athenocentric.\textsuperscript{20} The images projected by Hesiod, Xenophon, and others are considered, quite rightly, as idealized and ideological versions of the Greek family group; furthermore, they are chronologically asymmetrical.

This article recognizes these limitations, but favours the standpoint put forward by Ian Morris: by acknowledging the subjectivities displayed, the literary sources become valuable analogical documents of their particular time, in time closer and more specific than anthropological analogies afford.\textsuperscript{21} In line with the argument of Morris, the present work maintains that these texts can be usefully employed as important sources for our understanding of the complexity and the multiple levels of lived life within the \textit{oikos} as long as they are analyzed with all the biases in mind.

The \textit{oikos} and social relations

In relation to the \textit{oikos} as a site for social relations, scholarly interest has traditionally been devoted to questions concerning, for example, the identification of gender-specific locations. This includes the \textit{gynaikeion} being associated with the women of the household and the \textit{andron} as the male dining room. Here, ancient literature has been used to enhance our understanding of the concept. Concerning, for example, the Late Classical settlement of Olynthus, Nevett identified a large number of rooms as \textit{androns}, located alongside the other domestic quarters in such a fashion so as to possibly allow both male and female members of the house to use the same space, if not necessarily at the same time. The location of the \textit{andron} represents important male activity in the heart of the house, but also implies that the separation between the sexes may have been only temporary, as when it was not used for the male symposium the \textit{andron} could have been used for other purposes. In this particular case, it implies that the location of the entrance may have had a thoroughly practical rationale, namely not separating it from the rest of the house. Indeed, the juxtaposition of the \textit{andron} and other domestic areas may have represented a reminder of the power of the male householder. Irrespective of whether this is the case or not, the houses have a fairly complex organization and there is no evidence for a strict division of male and female areas. The gender relations may have instead been governed by the different activities.\textsuperscript{22}

This is in line with other works which argue that we are not able to identify these areas within the houses, at least not what is labelled as the \textit{gynaikonitis}.\textsuperscript{23} For instance, K.M. Lynch questions the existence of an exclusive, physically separate, \textit{andron} as necessary for social bonding. Instead, Lynch suggests that social gatherings for men could have been

\begin{itemize}
\item Morris 2000, 7, 155.
\item Nevett 1999, 68–74.
\item Jameson 1990a;1990b; Nevett 1995; 1999; 2010; Ault 2000; Goldberg 1999; Cahill 2002; Morgan 2010.
\end{itemize}
performed without the formal space of the andron; any room or the household courtyard would also have done.\textsuperscript{24} This implies of course that the architecture per se need not be a signal of social relations. This topos on the division of space within the Greek house was questioned by W. Graham, who was not convinced of such separation being a general practice. The rationale was that the evidence was still insufficient, and also that the houses at Olynthus did not show any traces of segregated space.\textsuperscript{25} This was later followed up by M. Jameson, who convincingly argued that by combining textual and physical evidence it was possible to observe some small specialization and private space, not defined through sharp gendered distinctions “but that the major and very real distinction between female and male space was essentially conceptual and behavioural”.\textsuperscript{26}

The problems connected to the identification and interpretation of the use of domestic space by individuals has been followed up by other scholars, including L. Nevett and N. Cahill.\textsuperscript{27} The detailed analyses and discussion on the houses at Olynthus led the latter to conclude that the kitchen-complex may have been intended for female activities in the household, this being based on observations of activities and artefacts associated with women, such as cooking and washing. However, finds associated with weaving, which was also defined as a female activity, were seldom found in the kitchen-complex. This may be explained by the use of the court, the pastas (a longer portico in front of the rooms), and rooms adjoining the open areas in the summer when other indoor activities may have moved outdoors.\textsuperscript{28} This is in line with an environmental explanation that was offered earlier by M. Jameson and L. Nevett.\textsuperscript{29} Also, B. A. Ault, in a detailed study of houses at Halieis, agrees that the distribution of artefacts better correlates with activity areas rather than gender specific use.\textsuperscript{30}

Why a gendered division of the private space? In an early article on women and housing, S. Walker discussed the separation of female and male members of the household as a symbol of status, but also as an important means of securing legitimate childbirth for the future transfer of wealth.\textsuperscript{31} The concept of the ideal family with the male as the norm, and as an entity with common interests in the protection of economic enterprise and blood ties, may be traced back to the Archaic poet Hesiod, who wrote that “wives give birth to children who resemble their parents”.\textsuperscript{32} In the \textit{Theogony} he expressed the need for a man to marry, as otherwise he will suffer when old and be “deprived of eldercare” and “when he has died his distant relatives divide up his substance”.\textsuperscript{33} (This is by no means a

\textsuperscript{24} Lynch 2007, 243–249.
\textsuperscript{25} Graham 1953, 199–203.
\textsuperscript{26} Jameson 1990a, 192; 1990b, 104.
\textsuperscript{28} Cahill 2002, 153–161, 191–193,
\textsuperscript{30} Ault 2005, 75.
\textsuperscript{31} Walker 1983, 81–82.
\textsuperscript{32} Hes. \textit{Op}, 233–234.
\textsuperscript{33} Hes.\textit{Theog}, 603–607.
tradition exclusive to the ancient world; it has been pointed out, for instance, that we may find it even in the modern context of American society where blood ties still remain significant for the definition of a family, as would also be true in many other mature industrialized societies.) The *Theogony* and *Works and Days* by Hesiod are our earliest literary evidence for the importance of the family as a social entity, and the values and norms important to Hesiod can also be traced in later contexts of the Classical family. These are norms and values that may have been of considerable significance for the formation of social identities based on gender, age, status, and so forth.

As already noted, the need to relate archaeological material to other aspects of society has long been recognized. This is especially so with respect to how norms and practices which made use of the private space within the house functioned, and how they were constituted and conceived of in the surrounding society. Lisa Nevett, in her major study on houses and society in the ancient Greek world, discussed these problems in relation to the interpretation of social relations. Her conclusion is that the organization of space is complex, but also that relations based on gender probably exercised a major influence on how the household was organized. L. Nevett concludes that there is no evidence for the traditional view on private space as divided into separate female and male areas. Instead, evidence as it exists points in the direction of a need to construct a private space that made it possible to control contacts between those outside and those inside. This in turn would have allowed the master of the house to control the movement of the female members of the house and male outsiders.

If so, this is in line with the observation of C.A.E. Luschnig and C. Lloyd that this is clearly visible in plays of Euripides where Medea, at her first exit from the *oikos*, opens with a speech about inside and outside. Euripides, in the first line, also exposes the political and social ideas of the *polis*—attitudes familiar to the male community—but in the first words of *Midea* social distinctions are also recognized and understood by both the female and male audience because they are citizens of the *polis*. It should be noted, however, as with C. Segal, that the division of male and female, which tends to place the latter inside, corresponds to social stereotypes of that time and not necessary to the reality of life, and in a tragedy this division characteristically works with the most extreme positions. According to Segal, Alcestis, for example, explores the complexity of the tragedy and the reality. On the one hand, she is the feminine, ideal wife who is devoted to family and home. On the other hand, this devotion to family and home makes her reach the status of the hero, and she is acclaimed with traditional male valour. These are two concepts of

---

34 Hill Collins 1998.
35 Jameson 1990b, 92.
36 Nevett 1999.
importance also within the realm of the ancient society, as is made evident in the literature from Homer and onwards.

How may we reconstruct details of past lives and societies? We should exercise care in drawing parallels across time and space, in particular if the societies compared are far removed from each other geographically or historically, or both. Even so, the use of analogies as a potentially useful approach to questions of spatial use and organization is well worth exploring. Thus, as shown by E. Friedl, the ideals of honour and shame were important for the family unit also in the 1950s village of Vasilika. Although there are difficulties in extrapolating those notions, within a Mediterranean setting also, this description of a Greek countryside village may serve to sensitize us as to how space can be used in societies where honour is seen as a major consideration. At Vasilika, there was a clearly defined gendered area such as the agora, which was a male world, and sporadically penetrated by children of both sexes. Girls could enter up to the age of 12 or 14, whereas elder females could enter the public area only to pass through it on their way to the fields or the church. There is a clear boundary between the gendered space of inside and the outside with female restrictions on entering the outside.

This last point may also be demonstrated by a study of how women perceive themselves to be at a risk from male violence in public space. Although violence was the main theme, the findings of research conducted in Reading, England, during the 1980s are conceivably of interest in discussing spatial movement in the ancient urban context. Females in that investigation were shown to associate the public arena with violence from unknown men, even though statistics show that they were more at risk at home. It was shown in the study that female members of the middle class families accompanied their children to activities, while within families from the working class area, the arrangement was more flexible—but still they were accompanied by someone. In this modern context, the gendered division of space is intensified when the children are in their early teens, boys may now move in a more unrestricted manner, whereas girls’ movements become more restricted, especially after dark. The parental control of daughters continued even when they reached the age of 16 and left school. The elder people connected a sense of vulnerability and public space with their daughters, affecting their use and behaviour of space.

The norms of gendered spaces

The contrast between family and outsiders, and the gender distinction, may be illustrated by Lysias who in the case “Against Simon” claims that Simon offended the house of the speaker when he entered the house by force and made his way into the room of the female members of the household; these women had, as Lysias relates the story, been brought up

---

41 Herzfeld 1980.
42 Friedl 1962, 12, 87–88; 1967, 98.
respectably and were ashamed of being seen, even by relatives. Another occasion is illustrated by the case “Against Evergus”, where men broke into the house and entered into the presence of children and the wife, who were having their lunch in the court, and with them was also the old nurse, who had become a free woman. The female slaves of the house were in a tower room where they lived, and they closed the door when the men intruded into the house. The men carried off furniture and we read that the wife was arguing with the intruders about the furniture, and also told them that it was her property, thereby interacting with male who were not kin—and apparently she did so with the appreciation of her husband, as he observed that she must have heard him say these things. This is in contrast to a neighbour who showed up, but did not enter the house as the master was absent.

This passage enables us to understand some of the complexity of the values and norms that may have existed among the free members of the Athenian polis, dictating behaviour when necessary. It was not appropriate for a citizen to enter the house of another male member if that male was not present. On the other hand, when her husband was absent, the wife was in charge of the household, permitting her verbal contact with male outsiders, as was apparently necessary due to violence on the property.

The customary moral values and norms of the Athenian society, implying that respectable women should not be offended, are illustrated by the passages in Demosthenes and Lysias. These are values that were probably adopted by both the male and female members, in a tradition that may be followed back to the first written Homeric texts. We know that values of seclusion and distance between genders still exist in societies where the honour of the male members of the family is closely attached to the sexuality of the female members of the family. As has been demonstrated by David Cohen, the meaning of separation has several levels. Athenian women were not supposed to leave the house, but were still meant to participate in diverse religious and social activities that required their presence outside the sheltered area of the house. Cohen illustrates the problem with an ethnographic parallel from a village in Lebanon, where the mothers said their daughters never left, as was in keeping with a cultural ideal dictated by the concepts of honour and shame. He also convincingly identifies the concepts of shame and honour as normative boundaries for sexuality in general, not only for homoeroticism, explicit in many Classical sources.

The modern case study may illustrate how to understand the gender division of space, both within the realms of the private and public spheres such as we may understand them within the wider context of the Classical world. We have, for example, legislation connected with the education of boys, forbidding male contact with male children. A speech by Aeschines offers insights into this law, which declares that the teacher of

---

44 Lys. In Sim, 3.6–7.
45 Dem.In Ever, 47.53–60.
the boys shall open the school-rooms no earlier than sunrise, and they shall be closed before sunset.\textsuperscript{48} The gender aspect is clearly defined, since the boys are those to be protected from sexual harassment; there seem to be no explicit concern for the girls and their protection, presumably because school was not part of their education and, as females, it was expected that they were under the control of the family. The text thereby provides information about the public sphere as being dangerous for children (read: male children) and the importance of protecting them from male assaults. In this respect we may follow the parallels described in the Reading case, where male children were also protected until the age of 11, whereas it was important to protect girls until the age of about 16–17 years, a situation not mirrored in the laws referred to by Aeschines. We may, however, use the testimonial from both Lysias and Demosthenes as an indication of the need to protect the female members of the family. In the Classical texts, this is probably exaggerated, as in the ethnographical parallel from Lebanon, with the purpose of emphasizing that the behaviour of the female members of the family corresponded to the normative, accustomed rules of the society.

The movement in and across private and public space by females, but also young boys, such as that described in Classical literary sources and analogies may have been regulated and even enforced by intersecting identities such as age, social status, and sexuality. Their young age and subservient status within the family and the explicit defence of their sexuality as important for the honour of the family constituted inequalities for these individuals within the frame of their lived, spatial, everyday life. The explicit and implicit restriction on the use of social space by females and young boys may, in the wider social realm, be connected to their reputation and the prevailing norms of the society as concerns honour and shame. As argued by B. Kooyman, boundaries are often associated with visible physical barriers and archaeology has focused more on physical remains than social boundaries.\textsuperscript{49} Nonetheless, the social boundaries may have been as obvious and transparent as the physical for those inhabiting the Classical house.

Conclusion

To summarize, the discussion on the division of gendered domestic space, and how it may have reflected or influenced actual behaviour, is vast and impossible to communicate in a short article. We may observe, however, that the ongoing discussion of gender-specific areas has rather often terminated in an observation that we are not able to identify these areas within the houses, at least not what is labelled as the \textit{gynaikonitis}. As a corollary, we may also observe that the physical confines of the household—the very structure that the house and its various component parts represents—need not be identical to the division between public and

\textsuperscript{48} Aeschin. \textit{In Tim}, 1.9–13.
\textsuperscript{49} Kooyman 2006, 424–425.
private space. The possibility of shifting uses of domestic space, across activities, genders, and other social relationships, should also alert us to the potential usefulness of thinking in terms of the *polis* and *oikos* as not having boundaries hewn in stone, but rather boundaries constructed on social space. Just as male members of the household could entertain men of affairs in spaces that were else used for purely domestic purposes, women and children, other dependents, and slaves did venture beyond the seclusion of the house into public space, but to varying (if largely unknown) degrees, and were still under the watchful eyes and constraints imposed by those to whom they were subordinate. This would be of equal relevance for women and men, children and older members of the household, and domestic helpers and the master of the house.

In a study on social relations and possible social inequalities within the Greek *oikos* that is currently in progress, this issue will be explored in more detail using both quantitative and qualitative data. Instead of focusing exclusively on the distribution of artefacts as a source of information, this will be done, amongst others means, by identifying archaeological installations that are believed to reflect interaction and behavioural patterns of various groups who inhabited the *oikos*. The complexity of identifying groups and individuals, and patterns of social and economic relations, has long been (and is still) an issue for debate; but it also affords an opportunity to deal with questions of a social character, such as status and the application of additional identities, such as age, ethnic identities, and so forth, rather than aiming for a purely descriptive typology. In short, outcomes can be found at the intersection of various given or ascribed categorizations. The power of the Classical *oikos* is in its dual functions as an ideological construction and a fundamental principle of social organization, which shape the status of its members across several dimensions.

***
The Greek oikos: a space for interaction, revisited and reconsidered

Bibliography

Ancient sources


Modern authors


Jebb, R.C. 1886. ‘The Homeric house, in relation to the remains at Tiryns’, *JHS* 7, 170–188.


